

Werk

Titel: Subordination of existence and possessive clauses in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic lan...

Autor: Karakoç, Birsal

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2017

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021 | LOG_0025

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Subordination of existence and possessive clauses in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages

Birsel Karakoç

Karakoç, Birsel 2017. Subordination of existence and possessive clauses in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages. *Turkic Languages* 21, 199–233.

In the present paper I investigate subordination of existence and possessive clauses in contemporary Oghuz (Southwest) and Kipchak (Northwest) Turkic languages from comparative and typological points of view. One of the typological features of Turkic languages is that existence and possessive clauses are based on the same predicates. The characteristics and crosslinguistic distribution of two predicate types used in complementation and relativization of these clauses will be analyzed; these are the non-verbal predicate {BAR} and the verbal predicate {BOL}. The following results have been found. Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as Turkmen, an East Oghuz language spoken in Central Asia, use both {BAR} and {BOL} (in their bare forms or in various extended forms). The respective clauses in these languages are accordingly characterized by a formal diversity which to a certain extent ensures that distinct semantic notions are encoded by distinct formal devices. While {BAR} is also attested in some Turkish dialects, Standard Turkish (West Oghuz) makes exclusive use of {BOL}, a verb that allows ambiguities by being able to appear in quite a number of meanings and functions. In Turkic varieties that, as a result of intensive contact with Iranian or Slavic languages, exhibit right-branching and finite subordinate clauses, {BAR} appears as a typical predicate.

Keywords: Kipchak Turkic, Turkish dialects, Turkmen, subordination, possessive clause, existence clause

Birsel Karakoç, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-75621 Uppsala, Sweden. E-mail: birsel.karakoc@lingfil.uu.se

1. Introduction

In this contribution I investigate subordination of existence and possessive clauses in contemporary Oghuz (Southwest) and Kipchak (Northwest) Turkic languages from comparative and typological points of view. Turkic languages are characterized by their lack of a verb corresponding to ‘to have’ in English or its cognates, as found in many European languages.¹ Instead, in Turkic, predications indicating possession are typically marked by existential predicates, which means, that existence and possessive clauses are based on the same predicates and share essential categorial affinity. Two core types of predicates are available in these clauses: i. the non-verbal

1 See Stassen (2009) for a crosslinguistic typology of predicative possession; see also Aikhenvald & Dixon (eds.) (2013).

predicate {BAR} meaning ‘existent’, ‘present’, and ii. the verbal predicate {BOL} with quite a number of meanings and occurrences.² Examples (1–4) illustrate these two predicate types as used in non-subordinate (main) clauses; (1–2) are existence clauses, and (3–4) convey predicative possession.

- (1) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Üstelde kitap bar.
 table-LOC book existent
 ‘There is a book on the table.’
 Lit.: ‘on the table book *existent*’
- (2) South Kipchak, Noghay
Burun-burun zamanda bir kan bol-γan.
 former-former time-LOC a khan BOL-PTER
 ‘Once upon a time *there was* a Khan.’ (Karakoç 2005: 64)
 Lit.: ‘once upon a time a Khan *was/existent*’
- (3) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Ardabil
Menim bi dene oğlum var, bi dene kızım.
 I.GEN a piece son-PSS1SG existent a piece daughter-PSS1SG
 ‘I *have* a son and a daughter.’ (Karini 2009: 283)
 Lit.: ‘my, my a son, my a daughter *existent*’
- (4) South Kipchak, Noghay
Ƙanıñ üş kızi üş kedesi bol-γan.
 khan-GEN three daughter-PSS3 three son-PSS3 BOL-PTER
 ‘The Khan *had* three daughters and three sons.’ (Karakoç 2005: 64)
 Lit.: ‘Khan’s, his three daughters, his three sons, *were/existent*’

In existence clauses, the noun referring to the existent entity is syntactically positioned after the noun that is marked by the locative case and denotes the location (1–2).³ As for the possessive clauses, where the possessor takes a genitive case and the possessee agrees with the possessor in person and number, the existential predicate {BAR}, negated as {YOƘ}, performs a function comparable to that of the verbs ‘to have’, ‘to possess’ (3). The verb {BOL} ‘to be(come)’, negated as {BOLMA}, is capable of conveying various dynamic or static meanings in copular, existence and pos-

- 2 It is possible to find further types resulting from linguistic renewals, such as *bulun-* ‘to be found’ in Turkish existence clauses, e.g. *Masada bir kitap bulunuyor* [table-LOC a book be found-PRS] ‘There is a book on the table’. The present paper focuses on the core types {BAR} and {BOL}.
- 3 The locational copular clauses, such as *Kitap üstelde* [book table-LOC] ‘The book is on the table’ (South Kipchak, Kazakh), where the syntactic order of the constituents, and hence the information structure, is realized differently, are not included in the present analysis.

sessive clauses (Karakoç 2005, 2007 [2002], forthcoming). In existence clauses, it can denote a dynamic ('to come about', 'to come into being') or a static ('there is/are', 'to exist') meaning (2). Similarly, it indicates dynamic ('to acquire', 'to take possession of') or static ('to have', 'to possess') possession (4) in possessive clauses.

The morphosyntactic, semantic and discursive qualities of these predicate types in non-subordinate (main) possessive clauses have been comparatively analyzed for Oghuz and Kipchak languages in Karakoç (forthcoming). The purpose of the present paper is to explore their characteristics and distribution in subordinate (non-main) existence and possessive clauses. The analysis will focus on complement clauses (Section 2) and relative clauses (Section 3). Typological properties of these clauses in some Turkic languages that developed under intensive contact with Slavic or Iranian languages will be analyzed separately in Section (4). Adverbial clauses are excluded from the present paper, as they constitute a large and diversified domain of subordination including various formal and semantic subdomains (temporal, causal, conditional, purposive, etc.), which, I think, deserve an elaborate separate analysis.

The data analyzed was gathered from a number of literary sources, published texts including among others traditional/oral genres, internet sites, linguistic descriptions and grammars, and corpora of spoken vernaculars (published for instance in the context of master's or doctoral theses). Examples are also taken from my own collection of recordings.⁴ Standard Turkish examples are rendered in the official orthography. Examples from other Turkic languages and vernaculars, which are found in various transcriptions or Cyrillic- or Latin-based orthographies, are rendered in a crosslinguistic Turcological transcription. The notations given in small caps within curly brackets, for instance {BAR}, are intended to cover possible phonological variants of the given cognates in languages under investigation. Morphological glossings of forms or structures in the running text are shown in square brackets.

2. Complementation of existence and possessive clauses

The non-verbal predicate {BAR} is attested in nonfinite complement clauses of older Turkic varieties, for instance *ahčasi var idukina* [money-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT] 'that X has money' (Eckmann 1982–1983: 95) in Mamluk Kipchak from the Middle Turkic period. In contemporary Standard Turkish, the use of {BAR} is widely restricted to non-subordinate, main clauses (for its limitations—lexical/idiomatic uses and special meanings—in embedded constructions, see 2.3.). This means, that the verbal predicate {BOL} is the main choice in Turkish subordinate clauses, where it can appear with its various dynamic and static meanings (Karakoç 2007 [2002]). In contemporary Kipchak languages, however, and in Turkmen, which

4 I would like to thank Raima Auyes Khan, Shynar Auelbekova, Uldanay Jumabay, Aynur Aibixi, Said-Ali Kudaynetov, Kenjegul Kalieva, and Ak Welsapar who kindly discussed some of the examples presented in this paper.

belongs to the eastern sub-branch of Oghuz Turkic, {BAR} alongside {BOL} is productively operative in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, {BAR} is still in use, though not frequently, in complement clauses of some Turkish dialects.

2.1. Morphosyntactic appearances of the predicates {BAR} and {BOL}

In my crosslinguistic data, following morphosyntactic patterns of {BAR} are found. Under complementation, the bare predicate {BAR} (or the negated {YOK}) can be directly followed by a possessive suffix, which refers to the subject of the complement clause,⁵ and a case suffix, marking the syntactic role of the complement within its superordinate clause, e.g. *bar-ï-n* [existent-PSS3-ACC] ‘that there is’, ‘that X exists’, ‘that X has’. Further, there are extended forms of {BAR} containing: i. the nonfinite copular marker {EKEN} meaning ‘that X is’, e.g. *bar eken-* in Kazakh, Noghay, Kirghiz, Kumyk, etc., or the corresponding nonfinite copular suffix *-IdIK-* ‘that X is’ in Turkish dialects: *var-ïdIK-*, ii. the suffix {LIK},⁶ e.g. *bar-liK-* in Karachay-Balkar, Tatar, Bashkir, Turkmen, *joq-tuK-* in Kirghiz, etc., iii. the nonfinite copular marker *eken-* followed by the suffix {LIK}, e.g. *bar eken-diK-*, *žoq eken-diK-* in Kazakh. The possessive and case suffixes attach to the extended forms, e.g. *bar eken-i-n* [existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Noghay, *bar-liy-i-n* [existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Tatar, *bar eken-dig-i-n* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Kazakh (‘that there is’, ‘that X exists’, ‘that X has’).

As a verbal predicate, {BOL} behaves differently. Under complementation, in order to be capable of forming a nominal base for the subsequent possessive and case markers, {BOL} first takes a nonfinite suffix, such as *-DIK* or *-mA* in Turkish, or *-GAN* in Kipchak Turkic languages, e.g. *ol-duK-*, *ol-ma-* in Turkish, *bul-yan-* in Bashkir. {BOL} takes participles denoting prospectivity in different languages, e.g. *bol-ayaK-* in Noghay, *bul-ačaK-* in Tatar, *ol-acaK-* in Turkish, *bol-a turyan-* or *bolor-* in Kirghiz. In Kipchak and Turkmen complement clauses, {BOL} can be found in extended forms containing: i. the nonfinite copular marker {EKEN} attached to the participial base, e.g. *bol-yan eken-* in Noghay, and ii. the suffix {LIK} attached to the participial base, e.g. *bol-yan-duK-* in Kirghiz. Possessive and case suffixes attach to the simple or extended forms, e.g. *bul-yan-ï-n* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Bashkir, *ol-duğ-un-u* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish, *bol-yan-diğ-i-n* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Kazakh, *bol-yan eken-i-n* [BOL-NFIN COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Noghay (‘that there/it

- 5 Note that in an existential complement clause, the noun referring to the existent entity is the syntactic subject with which the possessive suffix attached to the predicate agrees. In a possessional complement clause, the possessive suffix on the predicate refers to the possessed element.
- 6 Though some researchers consider this suffix to be derivational (e.g. Rentzsch 2005 in the context of modern Uyghur), following Johanson (2006: 60) I leave open the possibility of tracing it back to an older copular form.

BE’,⁷ ‘that X EXIST’, ‘that X HAVE’). Furthermore, {BAR} and {BOL} can occur in combination, e.g. *bar bol-γan-ī-n* [existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Kazakh, *var ol-duğ-un-u* [existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish, *bar bol-γon-duγ-u-n* [existent BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Kirghiz.

Table (1) reviews morphosyntactic structures of {BAR} and {BOL} as presented so far. It should be pointed out that not all these structures are available to the same extent in all languages investigated. Each language has its own preferences and limitations. For instance, {BAR} has a restricted use in Standard Turkish (see 2.3), whereas it can still be found in combination *var-idiK* in Turkish dialects. Thus, the table aims to summarize formal possibilities found in the entire body of cross-linguistic data.

Table 1: Structures of predications attested in existential and possessional complement clauses

		-{LIK}	+{LIK}
{BAR}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BAR}-PSS-CASE	{BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE
	+ [COP.NFIN]	{BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE	{BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE
{BOL}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE	{BOL}-NFIN-LIK-PSS-CASE
	+ [COP.NFIN]	{BOL}-NFIN-EKEN-PSS-CASE	-
{BAR}+{BOL}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BAR}+{BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE	{BAR}+{BOL}-NFIN-LIK-PSS-CASE

In complementation of interrogative clauses conveying existence or possession, we find two patterns: i. where {BAR} and its negated form {YOK} are combined, for instance *bar-joğ eken-i-n* [existent nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Kirghiz, *bar-īn-ī yoy-un-ī* [existent-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-PSS3-ACC], *bar-diy-īn-ī ya yoj-duy-īn-ī* [existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC or nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC] or *bar-yoj eken-lig-in-i* [existent nonexistent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Turkmen (‘whether there is (or not)’, ‘whether X exists’, ‘whether X has’), and ii. where the verbal predicate {BOL} and its negated form {BOLMA} are combined, the first part taking the converb suffix {IP} and the second negated part taking a nonfinite suffix, for instance *ol-up ol-ma-diğ-in-i* [BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish or *bol-up bol-ma-diγ-īn-ī* [BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkmen (‘whether there/it BE (or not)’, ‘whether X EXIST’, ‘whether X HAVE’).

7 The notation of the words ‘be’, ‘exist’ and ‘have’ using small caps is intended to cover the possible dynamic or static meanings of {BOL} in past or present contexts, for instance BE will present ‘become(s)’, ‘is/are’, ‘became’, ‘was/were’. This issue will be analyzed further below in 2.5.

2.2. Complement clauses based on {BAR}

The following examples from Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as from Turkmen and Turkish dialects, illustrate the morphosyntactic structures of the predicate {BAR} (or the negated {YOK}) in complement clauses. (5–9) exemplify the structure of the bare predicate {BAR} in existence clauses (5–7) and possessive clauses (8–9), where possessive and case markers are directly attached to the bare form.

- (5) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ah bilar donyala Negim kebi tebigetteñ katı zolomona
 INTER they world-LOC N. like nature-GEN hard cruelty-PSS3-DAT
taşlanyan balalar da bar-ï-n belheler.
 throw-PAS-PAR child-PL also existent-PSS3-ACC know-CD-3PL
 ‘If only they knew that there are also children like Negim who are left to nature’s hard cruelty.’ (BA)
 Turkish: ‘Ah bunlar Negim gibi tabiatın katı zulmüne bırakılan çocukların da *olduğunu* bilseler.’
- (6) South Kipchak, Karakalpak
Bala bulardıñ başında bir kayıñıñ bar-ï-n biledi.
 child these-GEN head-PSS3-LOC a trouble-GEN existent-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-3SG
 ‘The child understands that they are in trouble.’
 Lit.: ‘... that there is trouble on their heads ...’ (KA)
 Turkish: ‘Çocuk, bunların başında bir dert *olduğunu* anlar.’
- (7) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Bilmeym oylarında ne bar-ï-n.
 know-NEG-PRS-1SG thought-PL-PSS3-LOC what existent-PSS3-ACC
 ‘I do not know what they think.’ (Muhamedowa 2016: 32)
 Lit.: ‘... what there is in their thoughts ...’
 Turkish: ‘Kafalarında/fikirlerinde ne *olduğunu* bilmiyorum.’
- (8) South Kipchak, Noghay
... onıñ anasına usaytayan yerleri bar-ï-n
 ... she-GEN mother-PSS3-DAT resemble-PAR place-PL-PSS3 existent-PSS3-ACC
köredi.
 see-PRS-3SG
 ‘... he sees that she has features resembling those of her mother.’ (Kapaev 1989: 161)
 Turkish: ‘Onun annesine benzeyen tarafları *olduğunu* görür.’
- (9) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Azamat biyznesti damıtuw üşün tayı қандай usinıs-pikirleri
 A. business-ACC develop-INF for another what offer-opinion-PL-PSS3

bar-ï-n suradı.
 existent-PSS3-ACC ask-PST
 ‘Azamat asked what kind of proposals and opinions they had for business develop-
 ment.’ (Muhamedowa 2016: 36)
 Turkish: ‘Azamat, işi geliştirmek için başka ne gibi önerileri *olduğunu* sordu.’

The complement clauses in (10–21) are based on the extended form {BAR-LIK} (or the negated {YOK-LIK}). (10–12) exemplify existential complement clauses, while (13–21) contain possessive clauses.

(10) North Kipchak, Tatar

Yigit şul uq vakit, çibiķ bilen kükte hikmet
 young man immediately rod with globe-LOC magic
bar-lïy-ï-n sizip ...
 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC recognize-CV
 ‘The young man immediately recognizes with a rod that there is a magic in the globe
 ...’ (TA)
 Turkish: ‘Genç hemen çubukla kürede bir sihir *olduğunu* anlayıp ...’

(11) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Olar aθil bu dünýäde yamanlïyïň, duşmançilïyïň
 they in fact this world-LOC malice-GEN enmity-GEN
bar-dïy-ïn-i-da⁸ unudupdurlar.
 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC-also forget-PTER-3PL
 ‘They have probably forgotten that there is malice and enmity in this world.’ (Welsapar 1988: 44)⁹
 Turkish: ‘Onlar asıl bu dünyada kötülüğün ve düşmanlığın *olduğunu* da unutmuşlar.’

(12) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Öz aralarında şeyle adamïň bar-lïy-ïn-a
 self among-PSS3PL-LOC such person-GEN existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT
olar inanyarlar.
 they believe-PRS-3PL
 ‘They believe that there is such a man among themselves.’ (Welsapar 2006: 126)
 Turkish: ‘Kendi aralarında böyle bir adamın *olduğuna* onlar inanıyorlar.’

8 In my Turkmen data, both *bar-diK-* (as found in this example) and *bar-liK-* (for instance in (12)) are attested. The former is regarded as a written variant. Similarly, *bar eken-diK-* is considered the more formal variant of *bar eken-liK-* (Ak Welsapar, p.c.).

9 According to Ak Welsapar, author of the book from which this example is taken, the use of *bar-liK/bar-diK* is similar to that of *bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK-*, which means that they are interchangeable (compare (29)).

- (13) North Kipchak, Tatar
Bulattıñ aqçası bar-lıy-ı-n (yuq-lıy-ı-n)
 B.-GEN money-PSS3 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC (nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC)
beläm.
 know-PRS-1SG
 'I know that Bulat has (doesn't have) money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 151)
 Turkish: 'Bulat'ın parası *olduğunu (olmadığını)* biliyorum.'
- (14) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneñ aqsahı bar-lıy-ı-n (yuq-lıy-ı-n)
 Z.-GEN money-PSS3 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC (nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC)
beläm.
 know-PRS-1SG
 'I know that Zilä has (doesn't have) money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146)
 Turkish: 'Zilä'nin parası *olduğunu (olmadığını)* biliyorum.'
- (15) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneñ nisä balahı bar-lıy-ı-n belmäyem.
 Z.-GEN how many child-PSS3 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG
 'I don't know how many children Zilä has.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 147)
 Turkish: 'Zilä'nin kaç çocuğu *olduğunu* bilmiyorum.'
- (16) South Kipchak, Noghay
 ... *tek oqıtuvşı sorasa, oqıwşıdıñ biliminiñ*
 ... only teacher ask-CD student-GEN knowledge-PSS3-GEN
bar-lıy-ı körindi.
 existent-LIK-PSS3 appear-PST
 '... when the teacher asked, it became apparent that the student had knowledge.' (Kapaev 1989: 161)
 Turkish: 'Öğretmen sorunca öğrencinin bilgili *olduğu* (bilgisinin *olduğu*) göründü.'
- (17) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Men koy jayıp cıkkın törlördön anda-sanda alardı
 I sheep herd-CV go out-PAR field-PL-ABL sometimes they-ACC
uçuratıp kalıp, miltiymdin joq-tuy-un-a ökünüp tim
 come across-CV PV-CV rifle-PSS1SG-GEN nonexistent-PSS3-DAT regret-CV quiet
bolçumun.
 BOL-HAB.PST-1SG
 'I sometimes suddenly came across them on the fields where I was tending my sheep. I would regret not having my rifle and used to stay quiet.' (Kasapoğlu 2005: 363)
 Turkish: '/.../ Tüfeğimin *olmamasına* pişman olup sesimi çıkarmazdım.'
- (18) East Oghuz, Turkmen
İlki bilen-ä şu kârde on baş yıl stažimñ
 first of all this job-LOC fifteen year experience-PSS1SG-GEN

bar-diy-ın-ı *yatladayın.*
 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC remind-OPT1SG
 ‘First of all, let me remind you that I have fifteen years experience on the job.’ (Clark 1998: 379)
 Turkish: ‘Öncelikle bu işte onbeş yıllık bir tecrübemin *olduğunu* size hatırlatayım.’

(19) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Bu bir köpi *geçip, adı* *galan* *halk.*
 this a many-PSS3 pass-CV little-PSS3 remain-PAR people
Türkmenin gelejegini *bar-liy-ın-a* *mende indi* *ınam ad.*
 Turkmen-GEN future-PSS3-GEN existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT I-LOC now trust little
 ‘This is a folk where many vanished and few remained. Now, my faith that the Turkmen have a future has lessened.’ (Welsapar 2006: 113)
 Turkish: ‘Bu, çoğu yok olup azı kalan bir halk. Türkmenin geleceğinin *olduğuna* dair güvenim artık az.’

(20) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Onu miraθında *jedelli* *yerlerini* *bar-liy-ın-ı*
 X-GEN heritage-PSS3-LOC controversial place-PL-PSS3-GEN existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC
kim bilenok?
 who know-NEG.PTER3
 ‘Who doesn’t know that X has controversial issues in his heritage.’ (Welsapar 2006: 126)
 Turkish: ‘Onun mirasında tartışmalı yerlerin *olduğunu* kim bilmez?’

(21) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Akşagülün iki gđini *bar-diy-ın-a* *geş galdim.*
 A.-GEN two daughter-PSS3-GEN existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT surprise-PAST-1SG
 ‘I am surprised that Akşagül has two daughters.’ (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: ‘Akşagül’ün iki kızının *olduğuna* şaşırımdı.’

The clauses in (22–27) illustrate the use of the productive nonfinite copular morpheme *eken-* in the combination {BAR EKEN}. (22–23) exemplify existential complement clauses, while (24–27) denote possession.

(22) East Kipchak, Kirghiz

İçinde em ne bar eken-i-n *kaysi bir*
 inner-PSS3-LOC also what existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC which a
ayaldar bilişken *joş.*
 woman-PL know-REC-PTER nonexistent
 ‘Most of the women did not know what there was inside of it.’ (KIA)
 Turkish: ‘İçinde ne *olduğunu* kadınların birçoğu bilmiyordu.’

- (23) South Kipchak, Noghay
Šorađiň külemsirewinde bir yamanlık bar eken-i-n
 Š-GEN smile-PSS3-LOC a malice existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC
seze kelgen Paša ...
 feel-CV PV-PART P.
 'Paša, who has recognized that there is malice in Šora's smile ...' (Džanbidaeva & Ogurlieva 1995: 55)
 Turkish: 'Šora'nın gülümsemesinde bir kötülük *olduğunu* sezen Paša ...'
- (24) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Azamat biyznesti damıtuw üşün tayı kaday usinıs-pikirleri
 A. business-ACC develop-INF for another what offer-opinion-PL-PSS3
bar eken-i-n suradı.
 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC ask-PST
 'Azamat asked what kind of proposals and opinions they had for business develop-
 ment.' (Muhamedowa 2016: 36)¹⁰
 Turkish: 'Azamat, işi geliştirmek için başka ne gibi önerileri *olduğunu* sordu.'
- (25) South Kipchak, Noghay
... em onıj aylak üyken bibliotekası bar eken-i-n
 ... and X-GEN very big library-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC
esitken.
 hear-PTER
 '... and, he had heard that X had a very big library.' (Kazakov 1983: 21)
 Turkish: 'Hem onun çok büyük bir kütüphanesi *olduğunu* işitti.'
- (26) West Kipchak, Kumyk
Baliki, o gişi özünü raxmulu yüregi bar
 maybe that person self-GEN kind heart-PSS3 existent
eken-ge süyünüp yirleydir...
 COP.NFIN-DAT be glad-CV sing-PRS-COP
 'Maybe, this person is glad that he has a kind heart and is singing.' (KUA)
 Turkish: 'Belki o kişi merhametli bir yüreğinin *olmasına* sevinip şarkı söylüyordur.'
- (27) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Anın eski kitebi bar eken-i-n uktum.
 X-GEN old book-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST
 'I heard that X has old books.'
 Turkish: 'Onun eski kitapları *olduğunu* işittim.'

10 According to Muhamedowa (2006: 36), examples as given in (9) and (24) are free options with the same meaning.

The use of the extended predicate {BAR EKEN-LIK} is exemplified in (28–31). (28–29) contain existential complement clauses, while the complement clauses in (30–31) convey predicative possession.

(28) East Kipchak, Kirghiz

Bul kitepkanada eski kitepterdin bar eken-dig-i-n uktum.
 this library-LOC old book-PL-GEN existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PAST-1SG
 ‘I heard that there are old books at this library.’
 Turkish: ‘Bu kütüphanede eski kitapların *olduğunu* duydum.’

(29) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Olar aθil bu dünyäde yamanliýiň, duşmançilýiň
 they in fact this world-LOC malice-GEN enmity-GEN
bar eken-lig-in-i-de unudupdurlar.
 existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC-also forget-PTER-3PL
 ‘They have probably forgotten that there is malice and enmity in this world.’ (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: ‘Onlar asıl bu dünyada kötülüğün ve düşmanlığın *olduğunu* da unutmuşlar.’

(30) East Kipchak, Kirghiz

Tekebayev Atambayevdin kaçça baylyyi bar
 T. A.-GEN how much property-PSS3 existent
eken-dig-i-n açikka çygarat.
 COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC bring to light-PRS-3
 ‘Tekebayev brings to light how much property Atambayev has.’
 (<http://kaganat.kg/2017/01/31/tekebaev-atambaevdin-kancha-bajlygy-bar-ekendigini-achykka-chygarat/>)
 Turkish: ‘Tekebayev, Atambayev’in ne kadar varlığı *olduğunu* açığa çıkarıyor.’

(31) East Oghuz, Turkmen

Akjagülüň iki gädiňiň bar eken-lig-in-e
 A.-GEN two daughter-PSS3-GEN existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT
geň galdim.
 surprise-PAST-1SG
 ‘I’m surprised that Akjagül has two daughters.’ (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: ‘Akcağül’ün iki kızının *olduğuna* şaşırdım.’

The complement clauses in examples (32–37), representing the Turkish dialects, are based on the contracted forms of the Oghuz counterpart *var-idiK-*, a combination of {BAR} with the archaic copular morpheme *-IdIK-*.

- (32) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Aliefendi, Alanya
Öküz var-idi:-n za:tân bilmäyörüz.
 ox existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC anyway know-NEG-PRS-1PL
 ‘Wir wußten doch gar nicht, daß die Ochsen dort waren.’ (Demir 1993: 155)
 ‘We didn’t really know that the oxen were there.’
 Standard Turkish: ‘Öküz *olduğunu* zaten bilmiyoruz.’
- (33) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Babadağ, Denizli
Ne var ne yok, çoluk çöjuk?
 what existent what nonexistent child and the like
Amjañ añlattı ya ne var-dî:n-a, beş
 uncle-PSS2SG tell-PAST well what existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT five
evla:dîmiz va:, üç o:lan iki göz.
 child-PSS1PL existent three son two daughter
 ‘What do you have, child and the like? Well, your uncle told you, what we have; we have five children, three sons and two daughters.’ (Kanaç 2010: 137)
 Standard Turkish: ‘Ne var ne yok, çoluk-çocuk? Amcan anlattı ya ne(yimiz) *olduğunu*, beş evladımız var, üç oğlan, iki kız.’
- (34) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
Domatislerde, hormon olan domatislerde ilaç
 tomato-PL-LOC hormone BOL-PAR tomato-PL-LOC chemicals
var-idi: belli olur.¹¹
 existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3 obvious BOL-AOR
 ‘It will be apparent that there are chemical agents in tomatoes which have been injected.’
 Standard Turkish: ‘Domateslerde, hormon olan domateslerde ilaç *olduğu* belli olur.’
- (35) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
Domatislerde hormon yoğ-udu:n-u anlariz.
 tomato-PL-LOC hormone nonexistent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC recognize-AOR-1PL
 ‘We recognize that there is no hormone in tomatoes.’
 Standard Turkish: ‘Domateslerde hormon *olmadığını* anlarız.’
- (36) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
Ayşa Ankara’da halasînin var-idi:n-î yeni ö:rendi.
 A. Ankara-LOC aunt-PSS3-GEN existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC recently find out-PST
 ‘Ayşa recently found out that she has an aunt in Ankara.’
 Standard Turkish: ‘Ayşe Ankara’da halası(nın) *olduğunu* yeni öğrendi.’

11 Examples (34–37) are taken from a recording of a conversation with Züleyha Turan, a speaker of the given Turkish dialect.

- (37) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
Ayşanın bi ğizī var-idi:n-i duydum.
 A.-GEN a daughter-PSS3 existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that Ayşa has a daughter.’
 Standard Turkish: ‘Ayşe’nin bir kızı *olduğunu* duydum.’

The following examples illustrate subordination of interrogative clauses expressing existence or possession in the sense of ‘whether there is/are’, ‘whether X has’. Example (38) from Kirghiz contains a combination of {BAR} and {YOK} (*bar-çok eken-i-n*). Turkish equivalent of *bar-çok eken-i-n* would be *ol-up ol-ma-dığ-in-i*, a combination of the converbial *ol-up* with the negated participial *ol-ma-dığ-in-i*. Similarly, (39) from Turkmen and (40) from a Turkish dialect denote subordinate interrogative clauses.

- (38) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Anan činidayī suunun tūbündō aq bürtükčölör
 then bowl-LOC-KI water-GEN bottom-PSS3-LOC white particle-PL
bar-çok eken-i-n tekşeret.
 existent-nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC explore-PRS3
 ‘Then, they check whether there are white particles in the water at the bottom of the bowl.’ (KIA)
 Turkish: ‘Sonra kasedeki suyun dibinde beyaz parçacıkların *olup olmadığı* kontrol edilir.’
- (39) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Akjağülün ğidiniň bar-yok eken-lig-in-i¹²
 A.-GEN daughter-PSS3-GEN existent-nonexistent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC
Əoradim.
 ask-PAST-1SG
 ‘I asked whether Akjağül has a daughter or not.’ (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: ‘Akcağül’ün kızının *olup olmadığını* sordum.’
- (40) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Kulu
Var-idi:n-i yoğ-udu:n-u bilmiyon.
 existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG
 ‘I don’t know whether there is or not.’ (Adnan Küçükgöl, p.c.)
 Standard Turkish: ‘*Olup olmadığını* bilmiyorum.’

2.3. Restrictions of {BAR} in Standard Turkish complement clauses

The Turkish adjectival predicate *var*, a cognate of the Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen *bar*, is not capable of directly taking possessive and case markers in embedded

12 In this example, *bar-yok eken-lig-in-i* can be replaced by *bar-ın-ı yoğ-un-ı* or *bar-diy-in-i ya yok-duy-in-i* with the same meaning.

clauses (compare the unacceptable uses in (41) and (42) with the uses in (6) and (8) respectively), unless it—preferably combined with *yok*—appears in lexical and/or idiomatic expressions, e.g. (43–44). Compare *varımı yoğunu* in Turkish with the lexical use of *varī* in Azeri (45).

- (41) West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
 *Çocuk, bunların başında bir dert var-in-ı anlar.
 Intended: ‘The child understands that they had trouble.’
- (42) *Onun annesine benzeyen tarafları var-in-ı görür.
 Intended: ‘He sees that she has features resembling those of her mother.’
- (43) *var-in-ı* *yoğ-un-u* *bilmek* (**var-in-ı* *bilmek*)
 existent-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-PSS3-ACC know-INF
 ‘to know everything (all the details) about someone or something’
- (44) *var-in-ı* *yoğ-un-u* *kaybetmek* (**var-in-ı* *kaybetmek*)
 existent-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-PSS3-ACC lose-INF
 ‘to lose one’s all’ (Redhouse: 1218)
- (45) West Oghuz, Azeri
Bir kişinin, dövləti, var-ı, malı, qoyunu
 a man-GEN prosperity-PSS3 possession-PSS3 property-PSS3 sheep-PSS3
heddindən artıq çox idi.
 limit-ABL more many COP.PST
 ‘A man had an excessive prosperity, possession, property and sheep.’ (AA)

Further, the Turkish words *varlık* and *yokluk*, formal cognates of Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen {BAR-LIK} and {YOK-LIK}, never denote a complement clause in the sense ‘that there is (not)’ or ‘that X has (does not have)’. Compare the unacceptable examples (46) and (47) with (10) and (13) respectively. In cases in which *varlık* or *yokluk* appear as complements of superordinate clauses, it is a question of their lexical meanings (*varlık* ‘existence’, ‘being’, ‘wealth’, ‘possessions’; *yokluk* ‘absence’, ‘non-existence’, ‘lack’, ‘poverty’) (48–49). Compare examples (48–49) which exhibit a nominal complementation (‘existence’, ‘possession’) with example (50), which illustrates a clausal complementation based on the predicate *olduk-* ‘that there is’.¹³ At this point, it should be noted that Kipchak and Turkmen words {BAR-LIK} and {YOK-LIK} can also exhibit comparable lexical meanings, e.g. *barlıq* ‘the whole’, ‘abundance’, ‘wealth’, ‘existence’ in Noghay. See also the use of Kirghiz *barlıq* in example (30).

13 See Herkenrath & Karakoç (2017) for a recent analysis of criteria for distinguishing clausal versus nominal complementation in Turkish.

- (46) West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
Genç hemen çubukla kürede bir sihir var-lığ-in-ı anlayıp ...
 Intended: 'The young man immediately recognizes with a rod that there is a magic in the globe ...'
- (47) **Bulat'ın parası var-lığ-in-ı biliyorum.*
 Intended: 'I know that Bulat has money.'
- (48) *Bütün varlığ-in-ı bağışladı.*
 all possession-PSS3-ACC donate-PST
 'X donated all his/her possessions.'
- (49) *Böyle bir sorunun varlığ-in-ı inkar edemeyiz.*
 such a problem-GEN existence-PSS3-ACC deny-NEG.MOD.AOR-1PL
 'We cannot deny the existence of such a problem.' (Karakoç 2007 [2002])
- (50) *Böyle bir sorunun ol-duğ-un-u inkar edemeyiz.*
 such a problem-GEN BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC deny-NEG.MOD.AOR-1PL
 'We cannot deny that there is such a problem.'

The combined form *var ol-* is sometimes found in existential complement clauses, however, it displays restrictions by having a special meaning strongly implying an absolute existence ('that it exists') (51–53) or a dynamic existence ('that it comes into being/existence'). Hence, it does not occur in clausal complements simply corresponding to 'that there is' or 'that X has'. This specific meaning explains the relatively infrequent occurrence of *var ol-* in the data. It appears to be too strongly marked to be used in neutral existence clauses. Compare examples (54–55) with (22–25) above. The same is true for the negated form *yok ol-*, which is not found in complements corresponding to 'that there is not' or 'that X does not have'. In embedded clauses, it typically conveys a dynamic meaning ('that something/ someone disappears, vanishes, becomes nonexistent'), see (56) (Karakoç 2007 [2002]).

- (51) West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
var ol-duğ-u bilinmeyen bir şeyin ortaya çıkarılması
 existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3 know-PAS-NEG-PAR a thing-GEN find out-PAS-INF-PSS3
 'to find out something which you don't know exists at all'
 (<https://www.seslisozluk.net/var-oldugu-daha-once-bilinmeyen-bir-seyin-ortaya-cikarilmasi-nedir-ne-demek/>)
- (52) *Hep orada, karşımızda durmak, var ol-duk-ların-ı*
 always there in front of-PSS1PL-LOC stand-INF existent BOL- NFIN-PSS3PL-ACC
birbirlerine duyurmak, herkesten ayrı ve değişik
 one another-PSS3PL-DAT announce-INF everyone-ABL distinct and different

olduklarını ima etmek için.
 BOL-NFIN-PSS3PL-ACC imply-INF for
 ‘... so they might always be there, standing before us, announcing their existence, nay, their individuality and distinction.’ (Pamuk 2001: 130)¹⁴

- (53) *Sanki bu âlemde neden var ol-duğ-um-u bu*
 as if this world-LOC why existent BOL-PSS1SG-ACC this
usüllerle resmedilirse daha iyi kavrayacaktım.
 fashion-PL-INS depict-PAS-AOR-COP.CD-1SG more good understand-PROS-COP.PST-1SG
 ‘Had I been depicted in this fashion, it seemed, I’d better understand why I existed in this world.’ (Pamuk 2001: 132)
- (54) **İçinde ne var ol-duğ-um-u kadınların birçoğu bilmiyordu.*
 Intended: ‘Most of the women did not know what was inside of it.’
- (55) **Hem onun çok büyük bir kütüphanesi var ol-duğ-um-u işitti.*
 Intended: ‘and, he had heard that X had a very big library.’
- (56) *Bunun ispatı, kitapların, ciltlerin parçalanıp yok*
 this-GEN proof-PSS3 book-PL-GEN volume-PL-GEN torn-PAS-CV nonexistent
ol-ma-sı, ama içindeki resimli sayfaların, başka
 BOL-INF-PSS3 but inside-PSS3-LOC-KI illustrated page-PL-GEN other
kitapların, başka ciltlerin içine girerek sonsuza
 book-PL-GEN other volume-PL-GEN inside-PSS3-DAT enter-CV eternity-DAT
kadar yaşayıp Allah’ın âlemini göstermeye devam etmesidir.
 till live-CV Allah-GEN world-PSS3-ACC show-INF-DAT continue-INF-PSS3-COP
 ‘The proof of this resides in the fact that the illustrations in manuscripts and volumes that had been torn apart and vanished have passed into other books and other volumes to survive forever in their revelation of Allah’s worldly realm.’ (Pamuk 2001: 85)

2.4. Complement clauses based on {BOL}

As analyzed so far, in Standard Turkish the verbal predicate {BOL} remains the exclusive choice in both types of complement clauses, existential and possessional. That means that in the Turkish equivalents of all the examples given in (5–39), the bare form {BAR} or its extended variants {BAR-LIK}, {BAR EKEN} or {BAR EKEN-LIK} are to be replaced by {BOL} (compare the respective Turkish translations of these examples). In contrast to this, Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as Turkmen, have both {BAR} and {BOL} at their disposal. Consider existence and possessive clauses based on {BOL-GAN}, {BOL-GAN-LIK} or {BOL-GAN EKEN} in (57–61). In example (62) from Karachay-Balkar, {BOL-GAN} and {BAR-LIK} immediately follow each other in similar contexts. In these languages, {BAR} and {BOL} also appear in

14 In examples taken from Pamuk (1998), I keep the English translations made by Erdağ M. Göknar (see Pamuk 2001).

combination (63). Example (64) illustrates the use of {BOL} in a subordinate interrogative clause. Examples (65–69) illustrate {BOL} in combination with participles denoting prospectivity.

- (57) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Onıñ üyde bol-yan-ı-n (bol-yan-dıy-ı-n) kim ayttı?
 X-GEN house-LOC BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (or BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC) who say-PST
 ‘Who said that X was at home?’
 Turkish: ‘Onun evde *olduğunu* kim söyledi?’
- (58) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Murun bul kitepkanada eski kitepterdin bol-yon-duy-u-n uktum.
 earlier this library-LOC old book-PL-GEN BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that there used to be old books at this library.’
 Turkish: ‘Eskiden bu kütüphanede eski kitapların *olduğunu* duydum.’
- (59) South Kipchak, Noghay
Onıñ balası bol-yan eken-i-n esittim.
 X-GEN child-PSS3 BOL-NFIN COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that X had a child.’
 Turkish: ‘Onun bir çocuğu *olduğunu* duydum.’
- (60) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Onıñ kitapxanası bol-yan-ı-n (bol-yan-dıy-ı-n) estidim.
 X-GEN library-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (or BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC) hear-PST-1SG
 ‘I heard that X had a library.’
 Turkish: ‘Onun bir kütüphanesi *olduğunu* duydum.’
- (61) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneñ aqsahı bul-yan-ı-n beläm.
 Z.-GEN money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-1SG
 ‘I know that Zilä had money.’ (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146)
 Turkish: ‘Zilä’nin parası *olduğunu* biliyorum.’
- (62) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
Har bir taşda ne bol-yan-ı-n sezgendi.
 each stone-LOC what BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC recognize-PTER-COP
Ol taşlanı yırjın kibik aşıyandı.
 that stone-PL-ACC bread like eat-PTER-COP
Köp taşlada ne bar-lıy-ı-n sinayandı.
 many stone-PL-LOC what existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC examine-PTER-COP
 ‘He recognized what there is in each stone. He ate stones like bread and examined what there is in many stones.’ (KMA)
 Turkish: ‘Her bir taşta ne *olduğunu* anlamış. O taşları ekmek gibi yemiş. Birçok taşta ne *olduğunu* araştırmış.’

- (63) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Anın eski kitebi bar bol-γon-duγ-u-n uqtum.
 X-GEN old book-PSS3 existent BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
 'I heard that X had old books.'
 Turkish: 'Onun eski kitapları *olduğunu* duydum.'
- (64) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Akjağülün gıdınıñ bol-up bol-ma-dıγ-ın-ı Öorađım.
 A.-GEN daughter-PSS3-GEN BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC ask-PST-1SG
 'I asked whether Akjağül had a daughter or not.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün kızının *olup olmadığını* sordum.'
- (65) North Kipchak, Tatar
Bulattın aqçası bul-açay-ı-n (bul-ma-yaçay-ı-n) beläm.
 B.-GEN money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC) know-PRS-1SG
 'I know that Bulat is (not) going to have money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 151)
 Turkish: 'Bulat'ın parası *olacağını (olmayacağını)* biliyorum.'
- (66) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneñ aqsahı bul-maθin äyttelär.
 Z.-GEN money-PSS3 BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC tell-PST-3PL
 'They said that Zilä is not going to have money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 147)
 Turkish: 'Zilä'nin parası *olmayacağını* söylediler.'
- (67) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Men Akjağülün çayaθinıñ bol-jaq-dıγ-ın-ı (bol-jaγ-in-ı) bildim.
 I A.-GEN child-PSS3-GEN BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC (BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC)
 know-PST-1SG
 'I knew that Akjağül was going to have a child.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
 Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün çocuğunun *olacağını* bildim.'
- (68) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Ayşanin köp aqçası bol-o tur-γan-ı-n bilem.
 A.-GEN much money-PSS3 BOL-CV PV- NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-1S
 'I know that Ayşa is going to have much money.'
 Turkish: 'Ayşe'nin çok parası *olacağını* biliyorum.'
- (69) *Ayşanin balası bol-or-u-n uqtum.*
 A.-GEN child-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1S
 'I heard that Ayşa is going to have a child.'
 Turkish: 'Ayşe'nin çocuğu *olacağını* duydum.'

2.5. Ambiguity versus formal diversity: Attempting to explain the distribution

Needless to say, that the Turkish system allows for ambiguities since various dynamic and static contents of existence and possession (both in present and past contexts) are denoted by one and the same predicate. In contrast to this, Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen clausal complements are characterized by a formal diversity, which to a certain extent ensures that distinct semantic notions are marked by distinct formal devices. Such diversity as is found in Kazakh and Turkmen can be reviewed by following minimal pairs appearing to indicate similar overall readings, see (70–72). Note that in translations, the notation of ‘have’ in small caps is intended to cover possible static and dynamic meanings and subtle nuances in past or present contexts (see Footnote 7).

(70) South Kipchak, Kazakh

- a. *Siñlimniñ bar-ïn-a süyünemin.*
sister-PSS1SG-GEN existent-PSS3-DAT be glad-PRS-1SG
- b. *Siñlimniñ bar-lïy-ïn-a süyünemin.* [existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- c. *Siñlimniñ bar eken-ïn-e süyünemin.* [existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- d. *Siñlimniñ bar eken-dig-ïn-e süyünemin.* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- e. *Siñlimniñ bol-yan-ïn-a süyünemin.* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- f. *Siñlimniñ bol-yan-dïy-ïn-a süyünemin.* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- Overall meaning: ‘I am glad that I HAVE a sister.’

(71) South Kipchak, Kazakh

- a. *Miltïyïmnïñ žoy-ïn-a ökinemin.*
rifle-PSS1SG-GEN nonexistent-PSS3-DAT regret-PRS-1SG
- b. *Miltïyïmnïñ žok-tïy-ïn-a ökinemin.* [nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- c. *Miltïyïmnïñ žok eken-ïn-e ökinemin.* [nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- d. *Miltïyïmnïñ žok eken-dig-ïn-e ökinemin.* [nonexistent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- e. *Miltïyïmnïñ bol-ma-yan-ïn-a ökinemin.* [BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- f. *Miltïyïmnïñ bol-ma-yan-dïy-ïn-a ökinemin.* [BOL-NEG-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- Overall meaning: ‘I regret that I do not HAVE my rifle.’

(72) East Oghuz, Turkmen

- a. *Uyamïñ bar-ïn-a begenyärin.*
sister-PSS1SG-GEN existent-PSS3-DAT be glad-PRS-1SG
- b. *Uyamïñ bar-dïy-ïn-a begenyärin.* [existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- c. *Uyamïñ bar eken-ïn-e begenyärin.* [existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- d. *Uyamïñ bar eken-lig-ïn-e begenyärin.* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- e. *Uyamïñ bol-an-ïn-a begenyärin.* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
- f. *Uyamïñ bol-an-dïy-ïn-a begenyärin.* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
- Overall meaning: ‘I am glad that I HAVE a sister.’

In what follows, I will attempt to explain the complex formal diversity characterizing Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen by considering the following kinds of oppositions.

The first opposition pertains to the essential semantic domains of the predicate types {BAR} and {BOL}. The non-verbal predicate {BAR} and its extended forms are responsible for the static meanings in 'present' contexts ('that there is' or 'that X has'), whereas {BOL}, as a verb, largely but not exclusively implies dynamic readings ('that it comes/came into being/existence' or 'that X takes/took possession of). Furthermore, the {BOL} predicate, either in its bare form or its extended forms depending on the preferences of individual languages, is involved in the expression of static existence or possession, often emphasizing a 'past' reading ('that there was' or 'that X had').¹⁵ For instance, *bar-*, *bar-liK-*, *bar eken-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-yan-*, *bol-yan eken-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Noghay (compare e.g. 8, 16, 23, 25 and 59), *bar-*, *bar-liK-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bul-yan-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Bashkir and Tatar (compare e.g. 5, 14, 15 and 61) (see Ersen-Rasch 2009a and 2009b), *bar eken-(diK)-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-yan-(duK)-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Kirghiz (compare e.g. 17, 22, 27, 28, 30 and 58), *bar-*, *bar-liK-/bar-liK-*, *bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-an-*, *bol-an-diK-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Turkmen (compare e.g. 11, 12, 18–21, 29, 31 and 64). The situation concerning dynamic or static 'past' readings, depending on the given context, may cause some fluctuations in the use of {BOL} in Kipchak languages and Turkmen, even if not to the same degree as in Turkish. A further static domain typically expressed by {BOL} concerns the prospective aspect. In combination with participles denoting prospectivity, {BOL} conveys static existence or possession in future ('that there will be/is going to be' or 'that X will have/is going to have'). For instance, *bol-ayaK-* [+PROS] in Noghay, *bol-jaK-* or *bol-jaK-diK-* [+PROS] in Turkmen, *bul-açaK-* [+PROS] in Tatar, *bol-a turyan-* or *bolor-* [+PROS] in Kirghiz (examples 65–69). Possible functional expansions or limitations of {BOL} in particular languages need to be considered separately.

The second opposition arises, in my view, between the bare form {BAR} and its copulative extension {BAR EKEN}, both having the values [+STA, -PST]. This opposition might be a result of diachronic renewals. More concretely, the bare form {BAR} is a prototypical and basic form often found in varieties which can be characterized as oral, spoken, informal, vulgar or traditional, whereas {BAR EKEN} can be seen as a formation prevailing in more standardized and formal genres and language uses. Such an opposition can be observed in Noghay.

Another opposition occurs between those forms not containing the suffix {LIK}, i.e. *bar-*, *bar eken-*, *bolyan-*, and those containing it, i.e. *bar-liK-/bar-diK*, *bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK*, *bol-yan-diK-*. According to my observations, North and West Kipchak languages, as well as the South Kipchak language Noghay spoken outside of Central Asia, seem to use {LIK}-based formations relatively less frequently than the Central Asian Turkic languages Kazakh, Kirghiz and Turkmen, as well as Uzbek

15 It should be pointed out that "present" or "past" in such nonfinite clauses of Turkic languages are to be interpreted in relation to the viewpoint markers in the given superordinate clauses, and by considering the higher structures of the underlying discourse types.

and Uyghur, which belong to the Karluk branch. As regards providing a satisfactory explanation, which should go beyond such observations, I must recognize that this paper runs into some obstacles. It turns out not to be a trivial matter to gain a deeper insight into the factors behind this variation. The bare forms, as opposed to those containing {LIK}, are often considered to belong to spoken registers and traditional genres (see e.g. Zhang 2004: 324, Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146). In Turkmen, forms not containing {LIK} (*bar-*, *bar eken-*) are regarded as archaic and nonstandard, i.e. belonging only to some vernaculars, and thus are largely nonexistent in standard written language. The special contribution of {LIK}, be it semantic, pragmatic, genre-related, discourse type-related, variety-related, etc., as well as its dubious and disputable etymological source (see my comment in Footnote 6), is a comprehensive Turcological topic that needs to be investigated, not only in the context of our subject concerning existence and possessive clauses, but also for the entire verbal systems of the languages involved.¹⁶ In my opinion, the {LIK}-based forms as opposed to the bare forms (yet, only in varieties where this opposition is still operative and productive) seem to appear to highlight events in given speech situations (in our context, implying a stronger relevance of existence or possession) and thus are more appropriate for certain discourse types. This *ad hoc* observation needs to be questioned in further research by carefully taking into account, among other things, the above-mentioned linguistic areas.

A further opposition can be observed either between the simple form {BOL} and the combined form {BAR BOL}, as in Turkish, or between the simple forms {BAR}, {BOL} and the combined form {BAR BOL}, as in Kipchak varieties or in Turkmen. By strongly conveying absolute existence, the Turkish combination *var ol-* appears as a marked member of an opposition (*olduK-* versus *var olduK-*). This also seems to be the case for other languages, though more data and analysis are needed for the individual languages in this respect as well.

3. Relativization of existence and possessive clauses

Regarding the use of {BAR} and {BOL} in relative clauses, I found a comparable distribution across our languages. The non-verbal predicates {BAR} and {YOK}, alongside the verbal predicate {BOL}, are widely found in Kipchak and Turkmen relative clauses. Examples (73–74) from Kazakh and Turkmen respectively illustrate existential relative clauses based on the predicate {BAR} or {YOK}. In (73), the noun marking the location of the existence clause (*žer* ‘place’) is the relativized final head, whereas in (74) the relativized constituent (head noun) refers to the existent entity (*Türkmen filmleri* ‘Turkmen movies’).

16 See Herkenrath & Karakoç (2017) for an analysis of the complex forms *-mıŝIİK* and *-mAzIİK* in Turkish context.

- (73) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Kitap bar žerde yilim boladı.
 book existent place-LOC knowledge BOL-PRS-3SG
 ‘Where there are books there is knowledge.’
 Turkish: ‘Kitap *olan* yerde ilim olur.’
- (74) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Biđiň maqŇadimiz, iň täde we internet uýamında
 we-GEN intention-PSS1PL most new and internet site-PSS3-LOC
yođ Türkmen filmlerini /.../ Ňide yetirmekden ibarat.
 nonexistent Turkmen film-PL-PSS3 you-DAT provide-INF-ABL consisting
 ‘Our only goal is to provide you with the newest Turkmen films which are not available
 on internet sites.’ (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eeVI-s1XJIE>)
 Turkish: ‘Bizim amacımız, en yeni ve internet sitelerinde *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) Türkmen filmlerini size ulařtırmaktan ibaret.’

Examples (75–77) illustrate relativization of possessive clauses. In (75), from Kazakh, *žeti başi bar* ‘that has seven heads’ is an attribute to the head noun *sari kus* ‘yellow bird’. The possessee *žeti bas* ‘seven heads’ in the relative clause receives a possessive suffix agreeing in person and number with the possessor *sari kus* (head noun). According to some native speakers, *bar* in this position may be combined with *bolyan* (i.e. *žeti başi bar bolyan*). If the relative clause had been based on *bar bolyan*, the clause might have had a past reading: ‘that had seven heads’. Note that the corresponding clause in Turkish employs the predicate *olan* or the adjective *yedi başli*. Use of an adjective is also possible in Kazakh: *žeti basti sari kus*. In (77) from Kirghiz, the relative clause *bayar-körürü jođ* is based on the negated form {YOK}.

- (75) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Astında žatқан žeti başi bar sari kus eken.
 under-LOC lie-PAR seven head-PSS3 existent yellow bird COP.EVID
 ‘That which lies under it is evidently a yellow bird that has seven heads.’ (KXÄ: 42)
 Turkish: ‘Altında yatan yedi başi *olan* (or *yedi başli*) sarı (bir) kuş imiş.’
- (76) South Kipchak, Kazakh
mügedek balaları bar äyel
 invalid child-PL-PSS3 existent woman
 ‘a woman who has invalid children’ (Muhamedowa 2016: 38)
 Turkish: ‘sakat çocukları *olan* (bir) kadın’
- (77) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
İlgeri zamanda Baydad šaarında bayar-körürü
 former time-LOC Baghdad city-PSS3-LOC caregiver-PSS3

jök bir toyoloķ jetim jařayan eken.
 nonexistent a motherless-fatherless orphan live-PTER COP.EVID
 ‘In former times, in Baghdad, there was a motherless-fatherless orphan who did not
 have anyone to take care of him.’ (KIA)
 Turkish: ‘Eski zamanlarda Bađdat řhinde kendine bakan kimsesi *olmayan* anasız-ba-
 basız bir yetim yařarmıř.’

- (78) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Dayrası bar, toosu bar bařka jaķ
 river-PSS3 existent mountain-PSS3 existent other place
sendey körünböyt.
 you-EQU see-PSS-PRS-NEG-PRS3
 ‘Other places with rivers and mountains do not look like you.’ (KIA)
 Turkish: ‘Irmađı, dađı *olan* bařka yer senin gibi görünmez.’

{BAR} is frequently found in proverbs (79–84) or in general statements (85). Exam-
 ples (82–84) represent headless relative clauses, such as *ayası bar* ‘the one who has
 an older brother’ (82), *sözi bar* ‘the one who has something to say’ (83), where the
 genitive case marker directly attaches to {BAR}. In such proverbs, which might in-
 dicate fixed and archaic usages and express general, ageless wisdom, {BAR} and
 {BOL} cannot be interchangeable. Otherwise, {BAR} can be replaced by {BOL} with
 a similar reading (cf. example (85) with example (73) given above).

- (79) South Kipchak, Kazakh
İt žoķ žerde řořka üredi.
 dog nonexistent place-LOC pig increase-PRS3
 ‘In a place where there is no dogs, pigs will multiply.’
 Turkish: ‘İtin *olmadıđı* (or it *olmayan*) yerde domuz ürer.’

- (80) West Kipchak, Kumyk
Eriřiw bar üyde bereket bolmas.
 contention existent house-LOC blessing BOL-NEG.AOR
 ‘In a house where there is contention, there is no blessing.’
 ‘Kavga *olan* evde bereket olmaz.’ (KUA)

- (81) West Kipchak, Kumyk
Bala bar üyde balax yoķ.
 child existent house-LOC misfortune nonexistent
 ‘In a house where there are children, there is no misfortune.’
 ‘Çocuk *olan* evde bela olmaz.’ (KUA)

- (82) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Ayası bar-dıñ žayası bar.
 older brother-PSS3 existent-GEN collar-PSS3 existent
 ‘The one who has an older brother has a collar (i.e. he has security).’
 Turkish: ‘Ağabeyi *olanın* yakası olur.’
- (83) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
Sözi bar-ni kücü bardı.
 word-PSS3 existent-GEN strength-PSS3 existent-COP
 ‘The one who has a word [something to say] has strength.’
 Turkish: ‘Sözü *olanın* gücü vardır.’ (KMA)
- (84) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
Atası bar-ni, jili kelse da kesi jaş.
 father-PSS3 existent-GEN year-PSS3 come-CD also self-PSS3 young
 ‘The one who has a father is always young, even if his age has come.’
 Turkish: ‘Babası *olanın* yaşı gelse de kendisi gençtir.’ (KMA)
- (85) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Kitap bol-ğan žerde yilim boladı.
 book BOL-PAR place-LOC knowledge BOL-PRS-3SG
 ‘Where there are books there is knowledge.’
 Turkish: ‘Kitap *olan* yerde ilim olur.’

According to Ersen-Rasch (2009b: 143), in Tatar, a relative clause is based on {BAR} if it introduces new information (86). In other cases, as well as in past tense, {BOL} is preferred (87–88).

- (86) North Kipchak, Tatar
Aķçası bar bu keşe eşlämi.
 money-PSS3 existent this person work-NEG.PRS3
 ‘This person who has money does not work.’ (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 143)
 Turkish: ‘Parası *olan* bu kişi çalışmıyor.’
- (87) North Kipchak, Tatar
Aķçası bul-ğan Timur Berlinya bara.
 money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN T. B.-DAT go-PRS3
 ‘Timur, who has money, goes to Berlin.’ (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 142)
 Turkish: ‘Parası *olan* Timur Berlin’e gidiyor.’

(88) North Kipchak, Tatar

Elegräk aqčası bul-γan kız xäzer inde yarlı.
 earlier money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN girl now poor
 ‘The girl, who had money earlier, is now poor.’ (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 142)
 Turkish: ‘Eskiden parası *olan* bu kız şimdi fakir.’

Further, I rarely observe the use of the negated copular marker *emes* ‘not’ in Kazakh and Kirghiz relative clauses expressing ‘nonexistence’ (89–90). According to native speakers, these clauses might in a similar reading be formed with the predicate {YOQ} (91). The coverage and distribution of this interesting usage needs to be investigated.

(89) South Kipchak, Kazakh

Žerde de emes, kökte de emes bir altın saray ...
 earth-LOC also not sky-LOC also not a gold palace
 ‘A palace that exists neither on the earth nor in the sky ...’ (KXÄ: 29)
 Turkish: ‘Yerde de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) gökte de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) altın bir saray ...’

(90) South Kipchak, Kazakh

Ne kökte emes ne žerde emes, altınnan žasalıyan saray ...
 neither sky-LOC not nor earth-LOC not gold-ABL build-PAR palace
 ‘A palace, that exists neither in the sky nor on the earth, and that was built with gold ...’ (KXÄ: 30)
 Turkish: ‘Ne gökte ne de yerde *olan* (*bulunan*) altından yapılmış bir saray ...’

(91) South Kipchak, Kazakh

Žerde de žoq kökte de žoq bir altın saray ...
 earth-LOC also nonexistent sky-LOC also nonexistent a gold palace
 ‘A palace that exists neither on the earth nor in the sky ...’
 Turkish: ‘Yerde de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) gökte de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) altın bir saray ...’

As is obvious from the Turkish translations of the Kipchak and Turkmen examples, Turkish typically employs the verbal predicate {BOL} in relativization of existence and possessive clauses. {BAR} is not common, unless it occurs in combination with {BOL}. Similar to the analyzed complement clauses, however, the form *var ol-* denotes absolute existence (‘that/which absolutely exists’); see (92–93). Consider also the Kazakh form *bar bolıyan* in (94) and the Turkmen form *bar bolan* in (95). The negated form *yok ol-* usually indicates a dynamic meaning ‘that disappears, vanishes’, see (96).

- (92) West Oghuz, Turkish
Theophile Gautier için olduğu gibi o zamanki hanımlar
 T. G. for BOL-PAR-PSS3 like that time-KI lady-PL
ve beyler için de tabiat var ol-an,
 and gentleman-PL for also nature existent BOL-PAR
görülen, sevilen bir şeydi.
 see-PAS-PAR like-PAS-PAR a thing-COP.PST
 ‘As it was for Theophile Gautier, so was it for the ladies and gentlemen of that time,
 that nature was something which was existent, was seen and enjoyed.’ (Hisar 1955: 36)
- (93) West Oghuz, Turkish
“Evet, kör olmak ve var ol-ma-yan ülkelere
 yes blind BOL-INF and existent BOL-NEG-PAR country-PL-DAT
kaçmak” dedi Leylek.
 flee-INF say-PST stork
 “‘Aye”, said Stork, “going blind and fleeing to nonexistent countries”” (Pamuk 2001:
 489)
- (94) South Kipchak, Kazakh
semyası bar bol-yan jigit ...
 family-PSS3 existent BOL-PAR young man
 ‘the young man who has a family ...’ (Jumabay 2016: 39)
 Turkish: ‘ailesi var olan genç ...’
- (95) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Türkmen dilinde ol Ödöleriň ođal düypli
 Turkmen language-PSS3-LOC that word-PL-GEN earlier in depth
derňelmändigi için olar haqda hädیره çenli-de
 examine-PAS-NEG.PAR-PSS3 for they about now till
bar bol-an maýlumatlar o diyen köp däl.
 existent BOL-PAR information-PL such many not
 ‘Since those words have not previously been examined in depth in the Turkmen language,
 there has not been much information about them until now.’ (Azmun 2016: 12)
 Turkish: ‘Türkmen dilinde o sözler önceleri kapsamlı bir şekilde ele alınmadığı için
 şimdiye kadar onlar üzerine var olan bilgiler de o kadar fazla değil.’
- (96) West Oghuz, Turkish
İstanbul’un yirmi yılda bir yanıp yok
 Istanbul-GEN twenty year-LOC a burn-CV nonexistent
ol-ma-yan mahallesi mi var ki kitap kalsın?
 BOL-NEG-PAR quarter-PSS3 Q existent JUNC book remain-IMP
 ‘Is there a neighborhood in Istanbul that hasn’t been burned to the ground at least once
 every twenty years that we might expect such a book to survive?’ (Pamuk 2001: 207)

4. Contact-induced patterns for embedding existence and possessive clauses

In Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic varieties that develop under the strong linguistic influence of Iranian or Slavic languages, we usually find contact-induced right-branching relative or complement clauses based on finite verb forms.¹⁷ In the data for such contact languages, {BAR} is a usual predicate in embedded existence and possessive clauses. It typically appears as a finite form after a junctor, such as *ani* in Gagauz or *ki* in Iranian Azeri. Examples (97–98) from Gagauz illustrate finite and right-branching complementation of existence clauses. The clause *ani varmış gagauzlarda o soy adet* ‘that there was such a tradition among the Gagauz’ in (97) functions as a direct object argument of the superordinate clause *Dadu annattıydı Tezaa*. Example (98) has a comparable structure. Compare the Turkish translations of these contact-induced patterns.

- (97) West Oghuz, Gagauz
Dadu annattıydı Tezaa, ani var-mış gagauzlarda
 grandfather tell-PST-COP.PST Teza-DAT JUNC existent-COP.EVID Gagauz-PL-LOC
o soy adet.
 such custom
 ‘Grandpa told Teza that there was such a custom among the Gagauz.’ (GA)
 Turkish: ‘Dede Teza’ya Gagauzlar’da böyle bir adet *olduğunu* anlatmıştı.’

- (98) West Oghuz, Gagauz
Bu işi Simu kendi da pek islaa annardı
 this issue-ACC S. self also very good understand-AOR-COP.PST
ani var bu dünneeda işler paasız, ani
 JUNC existent this world-LOC issue-PL invaluable JUNC
alıp satılmeerlar.
 buy-CV sell-PAS-NEG.AOR-3PL
 ‘Simu could understand this very well: there are things in this world which are invaluable and not for sale.’ (GA)
 Turkish: ‘Simu kendi de, bu dünyada pahasız (pahası olmayan), alıp satılmaz işler *olduğunu* çok iyi anlıyordu.’

The Gagauz examples in (99–100) show finite relativization of existence clauses introduced by the junctors *anġi* or *ne*, respectively. (101–104) exemplify a comparable role of the finite predicate {BAR} in relativizing existence clauses in Iranian Azeri.

17 See Menz (1999) for Gagauz, Csató (2000) for Karaim, and Kıral (2001) for Iranian Azeri.

- (99) West Oghuz, Gagauz
te o, ani yip var aya:nda, o benim çöjü.m.
 the one JUNC cord existent foot-PSS3-LOC that I.GEN son-PSS1SG
 ‘The one who has a cord on his foot, he is my son.’ (Moschkoff 1904: 61)
 Turkish: ‘Ayağında ip *olan*, o benim oğlum.’
- (100) West Oghuz, Gagauz
ƘurƘanin biri ŧiŧirmiŧti kendisini sarƘitmiŧti
 turkey-GEN one-PSS3 puff-PTER-COP.PST self-PSS3-ACC hang down-PTER-COP.PST
pupuliğasini da hiç bir ŧey görmezdi
 comb-PSS3-ACC and nothing see-NEG.AOR-COP.PST
ne var önünde.
 what existent in front-PSS3-LOC
 ‘A turkey puffed himself up and let his comb hang, so that he could not see what was in front of him.’ (GA)
 Turkish: ‘Hindinin biri ŧiŧirip kendini, ibiğini sarkıtmıŧtı ve önünde *olan* hiç bir ŧeyi görmüyordu.’
- (101) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
o resmler ki var-di ...
 that custom-PL JUNC existent-COP
 ‘those customs that exist ...’ (Doğın 2010: 235)
 Turkish: ‘*Olan (bulunan)* adetler ...’
- (102) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
Bizim mentegede hasillar ki var-di, almadı,
 we-GEN region-LOC product-PL JUNC existent-COP apple-COP
üzümdi, siğjıatdı, buğdadı, noxuddı.
 grapes-COP melon-COP wheat-COP chickpea-COP
 ‘The products which are found in our region are apples, grapes, melons, wheat and chickpeas.’ (Doğın 2010: 351)
 Turkish: ‘Bizim bölgemizde *olan (bulunan)* ürünler elma, üzüm, kavun-karpuz, buğday ve nohutur.’
- (103) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Ardabil
O arzular ki var-rar-ıdı buların mesem ürehlerinde
 that desire-PL JUNC existent-PL-COP.PST this-PL-GEN innocent heart-PSS3PL-LOC
 ‘Those desires which are found (which they had) in their innocent hearts ...’ (Karini 2009: 408)
 Turkish: ‘Bunların masum yüreklerinde *olan* arzular ...’
- (104) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
o ağ seğgel ki var-di mejlisde
 that white-bearded JUNC existent-COP gathering-LOC

o:n ğabağında ğoyalla yere.
 he-GEN in front-PSS3-LOC put-AOR-3PL ground-DAT
 ‘They put it on the ground in front of the elderly man (lit. white-bearded) who is in this gathering.’ (Doğan 2010: 379)
 Turkish: ‘O toplantıda olan (*bulunan*) aksakalın (yaşlı kişinin) önüne koyarlar yere.’

Examples (105–107) illustrate the copied pattern for relativization of possessive clauses in Gagauz and Iranian Azeri. In the Gagauz example in (105), the possessee *kuvedi* ‘his strength’ (head noun) attaches to the existential predicate {BAR}, which itself follows the junctor *ne kadar* ‘how much’. The relative clauses from Iranian Azeri (106–107) exhibit similar typological characteristics. Example (105) further includes a contact-induced pattern where the agreement (possessive) suffix is attached not to the possessed element (as is the usual procedure in Turkic), but to the predicate {YOK} (as similarly is the case in Persian) (see Karakoç, forthcoming). Similar finite right-branching structures based on the predicate {BAR} can also be found in Karaim, a West Kipchak contact language.

(105) West Oghuz, Gagauz

Bakdi ufarağ kivrağ boylu kıza da güldü
 look-PST small long height-DER girl-DAT and laugh-PST
ne kadar var-dî kuvedi.
 what much existent-COP.PST strength-PSS3
 ‘He looked at the little, tall girl and laughed with all his strength.’ (GA)
 Turkish: ‘Ufak, boylu kıza bakıp bütün gücüyle (sahip *olduğu* bütün güçle) güldü.’

(106) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia

... herkesin tavanî var-dî oxur, ğedir yuxarıya.
 someone-GEN strength-PSS3 existent-COP study-PRS3 go-PRS3 upward-DAT
Herkesin, tavanî yox-dî, êle penjimin aldî ya
 someone-GEN strength-PSS3 nonexistent-COP so fifth class complete-PST or
doğğuzun aldî ğeyidi ketde keşâverzjîğ eliri.
 ninth class complete-PST return-PRS3 village-LOC peasant-DER do-PRS3
 ‘... those who have strength study and make progress. Those who do not have strength come back to the village and work as peasants, after having completed the fifth or ninth class.’ (Doğan 2010: 400)
 Turkish: ‘Gücü olan okuyor, ilerliyor, gücü *olmayan* beşinci ya da dokuzuncu sınıfı bitirdikten sonra köye dönüp çiftçilik yapıyor.’

(107) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia

bir miğda:rîn dağidar na:tavannara, olarîn ki
 one part-PSS3-ACC portion-PRS3 weak-PL-DAT they-GEN JUNC
yox-larî-dî. Olarîn ki var-rarî-dî,
 nonexistent-PSS3PL-COP they-GEN JUNC existent-PSS3PL-COP

here pul goyallar, bi dene ğurbanniĝ alallar.
 all money put-PRS-3PL a piece animal for sacrifice buy-PRS-3PL
 ‘They portion out a certain part to the poor, to those who do not have (anything). Those who have (property), they all contribute money to buy an animal destined for sacrifice.’
 (Doĝan 2010: 383)
 Turkish: ‘Bir kısmını gücü *olmayanlara* (fakirlere) dağıtırlar. İmkanı (malı) *olanlar*, hepsi para koyup bir tane kurbanlık alırlar.

5. Recapitulation of the results

Table (2) gives a schematic overview of the morphosyntactic structures I have found in complement clauses of the investigated languages.¹⁸

Table 2: Structures of nonfinite clausal complements conveying existence or possession

	Type of clausal complementation	Morphosyntactic structure
1	Existence clause based on {BAR}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
2	Existence clause based on {BARLIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BARLIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
3	Existence clause based on {BAR EKEN}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR EKEN}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
4	Existence clause based on {BAR EKENLIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR EKENLIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
5	Existence clause based on {BAR IDIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR IDIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
6	Existence clause based on {BOL}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BOL}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix

Morphosyntactic structures found in nonfinite relative clauses are summarized in Table (3).

18 Extended structures of {BOL}, such as *bol-yan-dik-* in Kazakh and *bolyan eken-* in Noghay, are not shown in this table.

Table 3: Structures of nonfinite relative clauses conveying existence or possession

	Type of clausal relativization	Morphosyntactic structure
1	Existence clause based on {BAR}	[N-NOM + {BAR}] + HN-LOC [N-LOC + {BAR}] + HN-NOM
	Possessive clause based on {BAR}	[N (possessee)-PSS + {BAR}] + HN (possessor)
2	Existence clause based on {BOL}	[N-NOM + {BOL}-PAR] + HN-LOC [N-LOC + {BOL}-PAR] + HN-NOM
	Possessive clause based on {BOL}	[N (possessee)-PSS + {BOL}-PAR] + HN (possessor)
3	Relativization of nonexistence based on {EMES}	[N-LOC + {EMES}] + HN-NOM

Table (4) illustrates the inner structures of some of the contact-induced embedded clauses.

Table 4: Contact-induced structures of embedded clauses conveying existence

Type of subordinate clause	Morphosyntactic structure
Finite complementation of existence based on {BAR}	Matrix + [JUNC + {BAR} + N-LOC + N-NOM]
Finite relativization of existence based on {BAR}	HN-NOM + [JUNC + {BAR} + N-LOC]

Concerning the distribution of these structures, the following results among others have been found:

Standard Turkish only makes use of complement structures in (6) in Table (2), and of relative clause structures in (2) in Table (3). The predicate {BAR} has extensive restrictions. This means that, being the only option, the predicate {BOL} is *per se* operative with its various static and dynamic meanings and can refer to both present and past contexts. It has been argued that this can be a potential source of ambiguities.

Some Turkish dialects still use complement structures based on the combination of {BAR} with the archaic nonfinite copular marker *-Idik-* (structure 5 in Table 2).

In the East Oghuz language Turkmen, and in Kipchak languages, {BAR} alongside {BOL} can be attested in its different bare and extended shapes. That is, these languages display existence and possessive structures as in (1–4) in Table (2), though, especially in Turkmen, structures in (1) and (3) are often regarded as archaic, vulgar and nonstandard. Further, the relative clause structures in (1–2) in Table (3) are available in these languages. The structure in (3) in Table (3), based on the negated copular marker *emes* ‘not’, seldom occurs in Kazakh and Kirghiz relative clauses expressing ‘nonexistence’.

In languages that have both {BAR} and {BOL} at their disposal, {BAR} typically denotes static readings referring to present contexts, whereas {BOL} is usually responsible for dynamic semantic domains. Fluctuations can however be observed in the sense that {BOL} can also convey static meanings, particularly referring to past contexts. The degree of such static usages and formal preferences (for instance *bolyandıK-* in Kazakh vs. *bolyan eken-* in Noghay) may vary across the languages. Furthermore, the domain for prospective existence and possession is mainly occupied by the verbal predicate {BOL}.

Gagauz, Iranian Azeri and Karaim, which to different degrees have undergone contact-induced language change, have developed right-branching and finite complement and relative clauses. In such constructions, {BAR} is the typical choice (see structures given in Table 4).

Table (5) is intended to present the results so far for the respective branches by comparing the functions of the nonfinite predicate types (which means that the contact-induced finite structures in Gagauz, Iranian Azeri and Karaim are not included in this table). In terms of the distribution of {BAR} and {BOL}, the Central Asian Oghuz language Turkmen shares common characteristics with the Kipchak languages.

Table 5: Predicate types used in nonfinite subordination of existence and possessive clauses

	West Oghuz	Kipchak Turkic & Turkmen (East Oghuz)
[+DYN]	{BOL}	{BOL}
[+STA]	{BOL} [-PST], [+PST], [+PROS] contexts	{BOL} mainly restricted to [+PST] or [+PROS] contexts
	{BAR} not common in West Oghuz, but available in complement clauses of some vernaculars	{BAR} productive in [-PST] contexts

Abbreviations

1	First person	LIK	Suffix in <i>-LIK</i>
2	Second person	LOC	Locative
3	Third person	MOD	Modality
ABL	Ablative	N	Noun
ACC	Accusative	NEG	Negation
AOR	Aorist	NFIN	Nonfinite suffix in a complement clause
BAR	Non-verbal predicate in {BAR}	NOM	Nominative
BOL	Verbal predicate in {BOL}	PAR	Participle

CD	Conditional	PAS	Passive
COP	Copular	PL	Plural
CV	Converb	PROS	Prospective
DAT	Dative	PRS	Present tense
DER	Derivational	PSS	Possessive
DYN	Dynamic	PST	Past tense
EQU	Equative	PTER	Postterminal
EVID	Evidential	PV	Postverb
GEN	Genitive	REC	Reciprocal
HAB	Habitual	Q	Interrogative
HD	Head noun	SG	Singular
INF	Infinitive	STA	Static
INS	Instrumental	X	he, she, it
INTER	Interjection	*	Ungrammatical structure
JUNC	Junctior		

References

- AA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 1993–1997. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 1/11: *Azerbaycan Türk edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 1/11: Turkic literature from Azerbaijan]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.) 2013. *Possession and ownership. A crosslinguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Azmun, Yusup 2016. *Söz kökimiz, öz kökimiz* [The roots of our words, our own roots]. Stockholm: Gün neşiriyaty. Stockholm: Gün neşiriyaty.
- BA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2004. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 29/30: *Başkurt edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 29/30: Bashkir literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Clark, Larry 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar*. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Csató, Éva Á. 2000. Karaim. In: Stolz, Thomas (ed.) *Minor languages of Europe*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Demir, Nurettin 1993. *Postverbien im Türkeitürkischen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung eines südanatolischen Dorfdialekts* [Postverbs in Turkish: With special consideration of a South Anatolian village dialect]. (Turcologica 17.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Doğan, Talip 2010. *Urmıye ağızları* [The dialects of Urmia]. PhD thesis. Kırıkkale: Kırıkkale Üniversitesi.
- Džanbidaeva, Dženetxan Kubraevna and Ogurlicva, Yelena Sidaxmetovna (eds.) 1995. *Nogaj literaturasy. 6. klass üşin* [Nogay literature. For grade 6]. Çerkessk.
- Eckmann, János 1982–1983. Memlük-Kıpçak edebiyatı [Mamluk-Kipchak literature]. In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*, 85–99.
- Ersen-Rasch, Margarete 2009a. *Baschkirisch. Lehrbuch für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene* [Bashkir. A textbook for beginners and advanced learners]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Ersen-Rasch, Margarete 2009b. *Tatarisch. Lehrbuch für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene* [Tatar. A textbook for beginners and advanced learners]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 1999. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 12: *Romanya ve Gagavuz Türk edebiyatı*. [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 12: Romanya ve Gagavuz Türk edebiyatı].

- Turkic literature from Romania and Gagauz literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Herkenrath, Annette & Karakoç, Birsal 2017. Two questionable candidates for subordinators: *-mİşIİK* and *-mAzIİK* in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 21, 46–78.
- Hisar, Abdülhak Şinasi 1955. *Boğaziçi mehtapları* [Bosporus moonlights]. Istanbul: Hilmi kitabevi.
- Johanson, Lars 2006. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 30–66.
- Jumabay, Uldanay 2016. Kazakh relative clauses in comparison with corresponding constructions in other Turkic languages. Unpublished term paper. Uppsala University, Uppsala.
- KA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2003. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi 23: Karakalpak edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 23: Karakalpak literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Kanaç, Işıl 2010. Denizli'nin Babadağ ilçesi ağzı [The dialect of Babadağ in Denizli]. Masters thesis. Denizli: Pamukkale University.
- Kapaev, İsa 1989. *Sülde. Birinşi kniga* [Sülden. First book]. Çerkessk.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen* [The finite verbal system in Noghay]. (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2007 [2002]. Nogayca ve Türkiye Türkçesinde tümleç yan cümlelerinde yüklemleştirciler [Predicators in Noghay and Turkish complement clauses]. In: Károly, László (ed.) *Turcology in Turkey*. (Studia uralo-altaica 47.) Szeged: Altajisztikai Tanszék. 337–359. First published in: Demir, Nurettin & Turan, Fikret (eds.) *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson. Lars Johanson Armağanı*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları. 193–215.
- Karakoç, Birsal (forthcoming). Predicative possession in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages. In: Johanson, Lars & Nevskaya, Irina & Federica Mazzitelli, Lidia (eds.) *Linguistic possession. New insights from the languages of Europe and North and Central Asia*. (Studies in Language Companion Series.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Karini, Jahangir 2009. Erdebil ili ağzları [The dialects of Ardabil]. PhD thesis. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Kasapoğlu Çengel, Hülya 2005. *Kırgız Türkçesi grameri* [Kirghiz grammar]. Ankara: Akçağ.
- Kazakov, Valerij 1983. *Togyz kaptal. Povest'ler men xabarlar* [Nine kaftans: Tales and stories]. Çerkessk.
- KIA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2005. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi 31, 32: Kırgız edebiyatı 1–2* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 31, 32: Kirghiz literature 1–2]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Kıral, Filiz 2001. *Das gesprochene Aserbaidshanisch von Iran* [The spoken Azeri from Iran]. (Turcologica 43.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- KMA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2002. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi 22: Karay-Malkar edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 22: Karachay-Balkar literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- KUA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2002. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi 20: Kumuk edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 20: Kumyk literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

- KXÄ = 1988. *Kazaq xalyk ädebijeti. Ertegiler* 1–3 [Kazakh folk literature. Fairy tales 1–3]. Almatı. Žazušy.
- Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax. Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel* [Gagauz syntax. A study of contact-induced language change]. (Turcologica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Moschkoff, Valentin A. 1904. *Mundarten der bessarabischen Gagausen. Gesammelt und übersetzt von V. Moschkoff* [Dialects of Bessarabian Gagauz. Text and translation by Moschkoff]. St. Petersburg.
- Muhamedowa, Raihan 2016. *Kazakh: A comprehensive grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Pamuk, Orhan 1998. *Benim adım kırmızı* [My name is Red]. İstanbul: İletişim yayınları.
- Pamuk, Orhan 2001. *My name is Red*. Translation by Erdağ, M. Gökner. London: Faber and Faber.
- Redhouse = *Redhouse sözlüğü. Turkish/Ottoman-English*. İstanbul 1997.
- Rentsch, Julian 2005. *Aspekt im Neuigurischen* [Aspect in Uyghur]. (Turcologica 65.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Stassen, Leon 2009. *Predicative possession*. (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2001. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 17, 18, 19: *Tatar edebiyatı* 1–3 [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 17, 18, 19: Tatar literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.
- Welsapar, Ak 1988. *Gawunkelle* [The melon head]. Ashgabat: Magaryf.
- Welsapar, Ak 2002. *Kepjebaş* [Cobra]. Stockholm: Gün neşiriyaty.
- Welsapar, Ak 2005. *Eğri gilç* [The bent sword on the old carpet]. Stockholm: Gün neşiriyaty.
- Welsapar, Ak 2006. *Müllî Tahirñ hudaýlğı* [Mulli Tahir]. Stockholm: Gün neşiriyaty.
- Zhang, Dingjing 2004. *Xiàndài hāsàkè yǔ shìyòng yǔfǎ* ['A practical grammar of Modern Kazakh']. Beijing: Chinese Minzu University Press.