

Werk

Titel: A synopsis of Turkic volitional moods

Autor: Johanson, Lars

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2014

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0018 | LOG_0009

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

A synopsis of Turkic volitional moods

Lars Johanson

Johanson, Lars 2014. A synopsis of Turkic volitional moods. *Turkic Languages* 18, 19–53.

A wide range of notions are grammaticalized as moods in Turkic languages. This paper deals with Turkic moods expressing volition. Turkic languages possess different grammatical moods to express volition, primarily the imperative, voluntative, optative and hypothetic (conditional) moods, indicating volitive, directive and commissive notions. The markers of these categories and their usages in different Turkic languages are briefly discussed in a comparative perspective. Moreover, modal facets of the aorist and particles accompanying volitional moods are presented.

Lars Johanson, Seminar für Orientkunde, Universität Mainz, Hegelstraße 59, DE-55122 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: johanson@uni-mainz.de

1. Turkic moods

Turkic languages possess well-developed systems of distinct grammatical moods expressed by verbal inflections in main clauses.

The moods cover a wide range of notions in the conceptual domain of modality. They normally include indicative, imperative, voluntative, optative, hypothetic, necessitative, potential, confirmative and presumptive notions. There is no interrogative mood.

Most markers used in modern languages are attested in similar shapes at the oldest documented stages of Turkic, where they already represent high degrees of grammaticalization. Nothing is known about their possible origin in independent lexical elements and about their paths of grammaticalization. There is no indication that they were copied from other languages.

The following survey is based on a few principles which will be presented here. See also Johanson (2009, 2011, 2012, 2013b, 2014).

1.1. Realis and irrealis

The morphologically unmarked indicative is the realis mood, conveying factuality. It is used for neutral, straightforward assertion, indicating that the utterance is intended as a statement of fact, i.e. that something is the case, e.g. Turkish <Gel-di> ‘X came’.

The other moods belong to the irrealis sphere, used for utterances that are not intended as statements of fact. They express wish, desire, hope, requirement, necessity, possibility, counterfactuality, etc. The conceptual and functional boundaries be-

tween them are not always distinct. Even in one and the same language, the usages of different grammatical moods often overlap.

1.2. Subjective modality

The moods usually express subjective modality, the addresser's cognitive or affective attitude to the propositional content. They signal meanings of subjective reasoning, personal involvement, emotions and personal judgments.

One kind of subjective modal meanings is concerned with volition, the addresser's will with respect to the realization of the propositional content. Volitional moods indicate desire, need, hope, fear, purpose, command, demand, request, intention, encouragement, incitement, permission, appeal, warning, advice, recommendation, promise, etc.

A second kind of subjective modal meanings concerns epistemic evaluation, based on the addresser's assessment of the propositional content as more or less certain or likely. Epistemic moods indicate certainty, confirmation, reliability, probability, likelihood, potentiality, presumption, uncertainty, doubt, counterfactuality, etc. They may grade the addresser's commitment to the truth of a sentence along scales such as low probability ('might be the case'), possibility ('may be the case'), high probability ('should be the case') and very high probability ('must be the case').

A third kind of subjective modal meanings concerns deontic modality, i.e. possibility and necessity in terms of freedom and duty to act, for instance permission ('may act'), obligation or advice ('should act', 'ought to act'), compulsion ('must act').

1.3. Objective modality

The moods cannot, however, be defined totally in terms of subjectivity. They are not exclusively addresser-oriented. Objective modality distinctions present evaluations of the believability, obligatoriness or desirability of a propositional content as being independent of the addresser's own stance. Voluntatives and optatives may be less dependent on the addresser's own will, the hypothetic mood less dependent on the addresser's own imagination, the necessitative mood less dependent on the addresser's own assessment, etc. The moods may express desiderability, necessity, potentiality, etc., in a more general sense of 'what should/may/would be', e.g. 'it is desirable, wanted, requested, conceivable, necessary, probable, possible, acceptable, permissible'. The evaluation may be made according to the standards of a higher will, laws, traditions, social conventions, etc.

Objective epistemic moods are thus used to evaluate the likelihood of the occurrence of events in terms of general knowledge, e.g. whether they are certain, probable, possible, conceivable, improbable, doubtful, impossible, etc.

Objective deontic moods are used to evaluate events with respect to moral, legal or social norms, e.g. whether they are obligatory, necessary, acceptable, allowable,

permissible, unacceptable, prohibited or forbidden. If subjective and objective modality are combined, subjective modality takes the objective modality in its scope.

1.4. Personal and impersonal interpretation of subject referents

The moods are often, particularly in older Turkic languages, open to different interpretations with respect to the subject referent, when this is not expressed explicitly. A remnant of this vagueness is found in modern Turkish, where the third-person necessitative marker {-mAll} shows both personal and impersonal uses, e.g. <Gel-meli> <come-NEC> ‘X ought to come’ or ‘It is necessary to come’, ‘One ought to come’. Identity of the addresser and subject referent is possible in the first person, e.g. Turkish <Gid-ey-im> ‘I want to go’ = ‘I want myself to go’. A similar vagueness may occur with respect to agents and patients. The East Old Turkic necessitative marker {-GU} is an example of this, since it can refer to both agents and patients, e.g. *ber-gü* <give-NEC> ‘someone who shall give’ or ‘something that shall be given, something to give’.

1.5. Inherent properties of participants

The Turkic moods do not express inherent properties of participants of events in which they are involved, e.g. the subject referent’s intention (‘intents to act’) or ability (‘can act’). Expressions of this kind are based on the internal structure of predications and will not be dealt with here.

2. Turkic volitional moods

Turkic languages possess different grammatical moods to express volition, primarily the imperative, voluntative (hortative, jussive), optative and hypothetic (conditional) mood. They indicate volitive, directive and commissive notions.

Volitive notions express desirability, the wish for something to occur in the sense of ‘it is desirable that’. They include senses of wish, hope, desire, willingness, intention, commitment, etc.

Directive modalities are used to encourage or elicit action. They include directives, demands, requests, entreaties, commands, admonitions, warnings, exhortations, impositions, incitations, proposals, recommendations, advice and permissions.

Commissive modalities express promises, threats and other speech-acts that commit the addresser to future action.

Volitional moods naturally refer to the future. The volitional content may be realizable or unrealizable. Though sentences using these moods normally express the will of the addresser, they can also, as mentioned, be interpreted as independent of the addresser’s own stance. They should be distinguished from devices that denote the will of the subject referent.

The moods often lack complete paradigms for all grammatical persons. This is why traditional grammars of individual Turkic languages tend to merge parts of the paradigms into new composite paradigms. For instance, they frequently construct

“imperative” paradigms that also comprise 3P voluntatives and “optative” paradigms that also include 1P voluntatives. For the historical development of the respective paradigms see Johanson (2013a).

Turkic volitional moods display considerable formal and functional differences. They are subtle categories, subject to strong vacillation. It is impossible to establish sharply defined original spheres of use from which the various usages can be derived. All attempts to determine the fundamental notions originally attached to the individual moods have failed.

Emphatic elements, particles or suffixes expressing encouragement can be added to various forms of volitional moods.

3. The imperative mood

The imperative is a volitional mood expressing the addresser’s wish for some future state of affairs. It gives direct, straightforward commands in order to request, instruct, incite, urge, appeal, warn, curse, advise, direct or permit. In all Turkic languages, it differs from the other volitional moods in its semantic, syntactic and morphological properties, and it does not form genuine paradigms with any of them. In imperative sentences, the wishing person is the addresser, which is not necessarily the case in sentences based on other volitional moods.

The essential feature of imperatives is that they only refer to second persons. The addresser turns directly to one or more addressees with a request to perform or not to perform a given action. Imperatives do of course not oblige the addressee to perform the action in question. The subject of an imperative sentence is the addressee, taken as the potential (but not necessarily the actual) controller of the desired state of affairs. Imperatives can also be used as rhetoric apostrophes addressing absent persons.

3.1. Subjects

Null subjects are normal in imperative sentences, e.g. Kazakh *Kel!* ‘Come!’. Explicit subjects are less usual but possible, e.g. *Sen kel!*. It may sometimes be difficult to distinguish imperative subjects from vocative forms of address, e.g. *Aynur, kel!* ‘Aynur, come!’. The latter are not morphologically marked in Turkic but typically separated from the rest of the sentence by an intonational break, which is not the case with imperative subjects.

3.2. Characteristics

Imperatives exhibit the following characteristics:

- Imperative sentences have appellative function in the sense of Bühler’s “Ausruf” or “Appell” (1934), ‘conative’ function in Jakobson’s terminology (1960: 355), belonging to the “plan locutoire” in the terminology of Damourette & Pichon (1911–1940), thus similar to vocatives and interjections. Other volitional moods belong to the “plan délocutoire”, e.g. Turkish ⟨Yaşa-sın!⟩ ⟨live-VOL⟩ ‘May X live!’.

- Like sentences based on other volitional moods, imperative sentences cannot be tested for their truth value. This is possible with indicative declarative sentences such as *Kel-di* ‘X came’. No answer is possible to the question whether *Kel!* ‘Come’ is true or not.

- Imperative forms do not carry person-number markers except plural suffixes, e.g. Turkish *«Gel-in!»* ‘Come!’.

- Imperatives cannot combine with interrogative markers, whereas other volitional moods can, e.g. Turkish *«Gid-eli-m mi?»* *«go-VOL1PL Q»* ‘Shall we go?’.

- Imperatives cannot combine with copula particles.

- Imperatives cannot occur with evidential markers. It is not possible to indicate whether the request is based on some source or not.

- Imperatives do not occur with past tense markers. The addressee is obviously not requested to carry out an action in the past. Possible distinctions are those between an immediate and a more remote action. In Yakut, a “present” imperative requests immediate action, whereas a “remote” imperative calls for later fulfillment.

3.3. Imperative singular

As in many other languages, the imperative singular is homonymous with the bare verb stem, e.g. Orkhon Turkic *Ičik!* ‘Submit!’, Gagauz *Yolla!* ‘Send!’, Tatar *Uķi!* *«Уқы!»* ‘Read!’, *İşlä!* *«Эшлә!»* ‘Work!’, Chuvash *Śi!* ‘Eat!’, *Śir!* ‘Write!’, *Vula!* ‘Read!’, *Kil!* ‘Come!’. The marker of the thematic base is thus {-Ø}.

In Yakut, the immediate imperative represents the {-Ø} type, e.g. *As!* ‘Open!’, *Bar!* ‘Go!’, *Käl!* ‘Come!’. The remote imperative, however, has the singular marker {-A:r}, probably copied from Mongolic, e.g. *Bar-a:r!* ‘Go (then)!’.

Khalaj imperatives are exceptional, unknown to other Turkic languages, formed irregularly with a number of specific markers. Most types are developed from postverbal constructions with converbs plus auxiliary verbs. For details see Doerfer (1998).

- A few verbs may occur without a suffix, particularly in objectless constructions, e.g. *Kör!* ~ *Ker!* ‘See!’, *Ve:r!* ‘Give!’, *Vur!* ‘Strike!’.

- The most frequent type, occurring particularly with monosyllabic stems, uses the postconsonantic marker {-i} and the postvocalic marker {-y} ~ {-yi}, e.g. *Al-i!* ‘Take!’, *Başla-y(i)!* ‘Begin!’. It seems to go back to a transformativizing postverbal construction formed with the old auxiliary *īδ-* ‘to send, to release’ (Johanson 2005).

- The second largest type, occurring with intransitives (including reflexives, passives, reciprocals), employs the marker {- (U)p} ~ {- (U)p-A}, e.g. *Höl-üp!* ‘Die!’, *Ƙa:l-up!* ‘Stay!’, *Kö:š-üp!* ~ *Küöš-üpä!* ‘Hide!’. It seems to go back to a postverbal construction with the consonant-final converb in {- (V)b} plus the auxiliary verb *är-* ‘to be’.

- Another imperative marker is {- (y)i:r}, e.g. *Bas-i:r!* ‘Press!’ ← *bas-* ‘to press’, which might go back to a postverbal construction with the vowel-final converb plus the auxiliary *är-* ‘to be’, i.e. **Bas-ī är!* (‘Be pressing!’). Dialectal variants include

forms such as *Ḳo:(y)-ur!* ‘Put!’ ← *ḱo:-* ‘to put’ and *Va:y-ur!* ‘Bind!’ ← *va:-* ‘to bind’.

- One type, which occurs with a few monosyllabic vowel stems, e.g. *yu:-* ‘to wash’, *ye:-* ‘to eat’, exhibits the markers {-pi} ~ {-p} ~ {-pA}, e.g. *Ye:-pi!* ‘Eat!’, *Yu:-pi!* ‘Wash!’. The plural forms contain an element *d*, e.g. *Ye:-pi-d-i:z* ‘Eat’, which points to an old construction with the auxiliary *ī:δ-* ‘to send, to release’.

- Another type, represented by the two initiotransformative verbs *tur-* ‘to stand up, to stop, to stand, to wait’ and *yor-* ‘to sit down, to sit’, uses the marker {-A:r} to signal the posttransformative phase, e.g. *Tul-a:r!* ‘Stand!’, *Yul-a:r!* ~ *Yila:r!* ‘Sit’. It may go back to a construction consisting of a vowel-final converb plus *är-* ‘to be’, e.g. **Tur-u är!* ‘Stand!’ (‘Be standing!’) with later dissimilation of the stem-final *r* > *l*.

- Some types go back to directional postverbal constructions. The markers {-Vk} ~ {-Vkä} occur with verbs of motion, e.g. *Kir-äk!* ‘Enter!’ ← *ki:r-* to enter. This type has developed from the combination of a vowel-final converb with the auxiliary *käl-* ‘to come (‘hither’), e.g. > **Kir-ä käl!* ‘Come in!’, a cislocative construction indicating motion toward the deictic center. The imperative of *yet-* ‘to take, to carry, to lead (away)’ is *Yit-ik!* ~ *Yet-ik!* ~ *Yit-ük!* ‘Bring!’, going back to < **Yet-i käl!* ~ **Yet-ü käl!* (‘Come bringing!’). The verbs *käl-* ‘to come’ and *käliüt-* ‘to bring’ form their imperatives by means of the preposed element {yV-}: *Yäkä!* ~ *Yäk!* ‘Come!’, *Yetükä!* ‘Bring!’. Though they may seem to contain prefixes, they rather go back to postverbal constructions with *käl-*, e.g. **Yor-i käl-* ‘to come wandering’. The imperative of *var-* ‘to go’ is *Yova!* ~ *Yov!* ‘Go!’, developed from the postverbal construction **yor-ī bar-* ‘to go wandering’, a translocative construction indicating motion away from the deictic center.

- The marker {-Uv} ~ {UvA} occurs with the motion verbs *yat-* ‘to lie (down)’ and *yet-* ‘to carry away’. The imperative forms *Yat-uv!* ‘Lie down!’, ‘Go to sleep!’ and *Yet-uv!* ~ *Yet-üv!* ‘Carry away!’ seem to be developed from a translocative postverbal construction with the auxiliary *bar-*, ‘to go’ e.g. **Yatu bar!* ‘Go to sleep!’ (literally ‘Go lying down!’).

- A few verbs employ the imperative marker {-A:l}, e.g. *Käd-ä:l!* ‘Dress!’ ← *käd-* ‘to dress’, *Tut-a:l!* ‘Seize!’ ← *tut-* ‘to seize, to hold’. It has developed from a postverbal construction expressing subject version (‘to act for oneself’), e.g. *Tut-a:l!* < **Tut-a al-* (literally ‘Seizing take!’).

The stems going back to postverbal constructions have been thought to be very archaic, since they lack equivalents in East Old Turkic and are not found in other Turkic languages. This impression is not necessarily correct. The stems going back to postverbal constructions should not be called “imperative” stems, since they are also used for voluntatives, optatives and preterites.

3.4. Imperative plural

The simplest imperative plural marker is represented by East Old Turkic $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}$. The marker $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}$ appears in many later languages such as Chaghatay, Uyghur, Ottoman, Azeri, Kazakh, Karakalpak and West Siberian Turkic, e.g. *Tur-uη!* ‘Stand up!’, *Kör-üη!* ‘See!’, *Oqu-η!* ‘Read!’. Some scholars have tried to identify the 2PL marker as the 2SG possessive suffix.

According to Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī, the Oghuz (Ghuzz) and Kipchak Turks used $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-Iz}\}$, i.e. $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}$ + person-number marker of the pronominal type $\{-\text{Iz}\}$. Middle Kipchak shows forms such as *Bar-uη-üz!* ‘Go!’. Ottoman employs $\{-(\text{U})\eta\}$ and $\{-(\text{U})\eta\text{-Uz}\}$, e.g. *Dut-uη!* ‘Hold!’, *Ara-η!* ‘Search!’, *Bäklä-η-üz!* ‘Wait!’, *Dilä-η-üz!* ‘Beg!’. The normal forms in modern languages are the unaccented suffixes $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}$ and $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-Iz}\}$.

The West Oghuz suffixes are $\{-(y)\text{I}\eta\}$ and $\{-(y)\text{I}\eta\text{-Iz}\}$, e.g. *Uyu-yuη!*, *Uyu-yuη-uz!* ‘Sleep!’. The modern Turkish markers are $\{-(y)\text{I}\eta\}$ and $\{-(y)\text{I}\eta\text{-Iz}\}$, e.g. $\langle\text{Yaşayın!}\rangle \leftarrow \langle\text{yaşa-}\rangle$ ‘to live’, $\langle\text{Koş-un!}\rangle$, $\langle\text{Koş-un-uz!}\rangle \leftarrow \langle\text{koş-}\rangle$ ‘to run’. Gagauz, Azeri and South Oghuz exhibit similar forms, e.g. *Başla-yîn!* ‘Begin!’, *Oqu-yun!*, *Oqu-yun-uz!* ‘Read!’. These forms are mostly claimed to contain a hiatus-bridging glide *y*, inserted as a buffer consonant after vowel-final stems, but the long vowel of the Turkmen postvocalic variant $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}/\{-\text{:}\eta\}$, e.g. *Ya:ša-η!* ‘Live!’, rather points to the contraction of an old sequence $*VyV$.

Uzbek displays forms such as *Čik-iη!*, *Čik-iηiz!* ‘Go out!’, *Oқи-η!*, *Oқи-ηiz!* ‘Read!’. The Tatar marker is $\{-(\text{Ø})\text{I}\eta\text{Iz}\}$, e.g. *İşl-iğiz!* $\langle\text{Эшлерез!}\rangle$ ‘Work!’ $\leftarrow$ *ışlä-* $\langle\text{эшлә-}\rangle$ ‘to work’, *Utır-iğiz!* $\langle\text{Утырыгыз!}\rangle$ ‘Sit down!’ $\leftarrow$ *utır-* $\langle\text{утыр-}\rangle$ ‘to sit (down)’. Bashkir exhibits the similar marker $\{-(\text{Ø})\text{I}\eta\text{I}\delta\}$, e.g. *Al-iğid!* $\leftarrow$ *al-* ‘to take’, *İşl-iğid!* $\leftarrow$ *ışlä-* ‘to work’.

The Yakut immediate imperative takes on the plural marker $\{-(\text{I})\eta\}$, e.g. *Bar-iη!* ‘Go!’, whereas the remote imperative takes on $\{-\text{A:r-I}\eta\}$.

The Chuvash plural marker is $\{-(\text{Ø})\text{I}\eta\}$ < $*\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{I}\eta\}$, e.g. *Śir-ir!* $\langle\text{Сырăр!}\rangle$ ‘Write!’ $\leftarrow$ *śir-* ‘to write’, *Ķal-ir!* $\langle\text{Калăр!}\rangle$ ‘Speak!’ $\leftarrow$ *kala-* ‘to speak’, *Vul-ir!* $\langle\text{Вулăр!}\rangle$ ‘Read!’ $\leftarrow$ *vula-* ‘to read’, *Pir-ir!* $\langle\text{Пырăр!}\rangle$ ‘Go!’ $\leftarrow$ *pir-* ‘to go’, *Tixt-ir!* $\langle\text{Тăхтăр!}\rangle$ ‘Stop!’ $\leftarrow$ *tixta-* ‘to wait, to stop’.

Forms with the nominal marker $\{-\text{IAr}\}$, i.e. $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-IAr}\}$, were used already in Old Uyghur, Karakhanid and East Middle Turkic, e.g. *Bar-iη-lar!* ‘Go!’, *Baĳ-iη-lar!* ‘Look!’, *Eşid-iη-lär!* ‘Hear!’. These types are also found in modern languages, e.g. Uzbek *Čik-iη-lär!* ‘Go out!’, *Oқи-η-lär!* ‘Read!’, Uyghur *Kir-iη-lär!* ‘Enter!’. Compare phonetic variants such as Kazakh $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-dAr}\}$, e.g. *Kel-iη-der!* ‘Come!’, Kirghiz, Altay, Khakas, Tuvan $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-Ar}\}$ < $*\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-IAr}\}$, Baraba Turkic $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-nAr}\}$, Dukhan $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-Ar}\}$. Shor displays the marker $\{-(\text{I})\text{A:r}\}$, negated $\{-\text{BA-IAr}\}$.

The pronominal marker $\{-\text{Iz}\}$ and the nominal marker $\{-\text{IAr}\}$ combine pleonastically in forms such as $\{-(\text{I})\eta\text{-Iz-IAr}\}$, which are found already in Old Uyghur and Karakhanid, e.g. *Sor-uη-üz-lar!* ‘Ask!’, *Kör-üη-üz-lär!* ‘See!’.

Modern forms include Uzbek *Čik-iniz-lär!* ‘Go out!’, *Oқи-ηiz-lär!* ‘Read!’, Kazakh *Kel-iη-iz-der!* ‘Come!’; cf. Kirghiz $\{-(I)\eta-Iz-dAr\}$.

Khalaj plural forms such as *Al-di:z!* ‘Take!’ may have developed from *i:δ-* plus an old possessive suffix $\{-VG\check{V}z\}$.

3.5. Polite imperatives

By virtue of their direct appeal to the addressee(s), imperatives may convey a connotation of familiarity. In many situations, however, they give the impression of being too straightforward and therefore impolite.

Plural markers can make imperatives more indirect and add a tone of politeness. They may be used to address a single individual and a set of individuals at various politeness levels.

Already in Old Uyghur, the simple plural marker $\{-(I)\eta\}$ can be used for polite address to one person of high rank, e.g. *Tur-uη!* ‘Stand up!’, said to a king. The plural in $\{-(I)\eta-lAr\}$ is employed for addressing more than one person, without any specific polite connotation (Gabain 1941: 110–111). In Karakhanid and Chaghatay, however, $\{-(I)\eta-lAr\}$ and $\{-(I)\eta Iz-lAr\}$ form honorific imperatives for sets of individuals.

In Ottoman, the plural in $\{-(y)I\eta-Iz\}$ was considered “plus distinguée” than the one in $\{-(y)I\eta\}$ (Deny 1921: 389). Also in modern Turkish, where $\{-(y)In\}$ and $\{-(y)In-Iz\}$ are used for a single individual and a set of individuals, the long form is considered more polite.

In Kazakh, $\{-(I)\eta-Iz\}$ is used for polite address to single individuals, e.g. *Kel-iη-iz!* ‘Please come!’. The familiar marker $\{-(I)\eta-dAr\}$ is used for several addressees who are closely related to the addresser, younger, of lower rank, etc., e.g. *Kel-iη-der!*. It may also be used for praying to God. The marker $\{-(I)\eta-Iz-dAr\}$ is used for polite address to several persons, e.g. *Kel-iη-iz-der!*. The diachronic development is sketched in Abish (forthcoming): The plural in $\{-(I)\eta\}$ was first used as the polite form for addressing one person. The pronominal plural marker $\{-Iz\}$ was added to address a set of individuals. The extended form $\{-(I)\eta-Iz\}$ later came to be used for a polite address to a single individual. The form in $\{-(I)\eta\}$ therewith lost its function. The double-marked plurals in $\{-(I)\eta-dAr\}$ and $\{-(I)\eta-Iz-dAr\}$, formed by adding $\{-LAr\}$, were introduced to signal polite address to a set of individuals.

Uzbek employs the polite forms $\{-(i)\eta\}$, $\{-iη-lär\}$, $\{-iηiz-lär\}$, e.g. *Oқи-η!*, *Oқи-η-lär!*, *Oқи-ηiz-lär!* ‘Please read!’.

In Uyghur, polite imperatives are formed with $\{-(i)\eta\}$ for a single addressee and $\{-(i)\eta-lAr\}$ for a set of addressees, e.g. *Kir-iη!*, *Kir-iη-lär!* ‘Please enter!’. A respectful form used for a single individual or a set of individuals is $\{-si-lA\}$, e.g. *Käl-si-lä!* ‘Please come!’, *Kir-si-la!* ‘Please enter!’.

In some South Siberian languages, the addition of $\{-Ar\}$ to $\{-(I)\eta\}$ makes an imperative request more polite.

The Chuvash plural marker also indicates a more polite request, e.g. *Śir-İR!* «Ҫырăр!» 'Please write!', *An śir-İR!* «Ан ҫырăр!» 'Please do not write!'.

3.6. Negated imperatives

Negated imperative (prohibitive) sentences indicate that a certain action is not permitted, appealing to the addressee not to carry it out. They can be used for warnings, cautionary advice, etc.

The negative marker is normally {-mA} or {-MA}, e.g. Turkish «Git-me!» 'Do not go!', Kazakh *Bar-ma!* 'Do not go!', *Kör-me-ŋ-iz!* 'Do not see!', *Žaz-ba-ŋ-dar!* 'Do not write!', *Ket-pe-ŋ-iz-der!* 'Do not leave!'. Even in Khalaj, the negative imperative is formed regularly, e.g. *Var-ma!* 'Do not go!'.

Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī cites Karakhanid negated plurals of the type *Qod-ma-ŋ-lar!* 'Do not leave it!'. Oghuz and Kipchak tribes are said to use forms of the type *Qoy-ma-ŋ-iz!*. Examples of later plural forms include Ottoman *Inan-ma-ŋ-uz!* 'Do not believe!', Azeri *Unut-ma-yin!* 'Do not forget!', Karaim *Bar-ma-yiz!* 'Do not go!', Tatar *Al-ma-ğiz!* 'Do not take!'.

The negative forms of the Yakut immediate imperative exhibit a vowel before the marker. The singular form is {-I-mA}, e.g. *Käl-i-mä!* 'Do not come!', *Bar-İ-ma!* 'Do not go!', *Ah-İ-ma!* 'Do not open!'. The plural form is {-I-mA-ŋ}, e.g. *Bar-İ-ma-ŋ!* 'Do not go!'. The marker may well go back to a postverbal construction. The negative marker of the remote imperative is {-(I)m}.

Chuvash employs the preposed negation particle *an* + the invariant bare stem, e.g. singular *An pır!* «Ан пыр!» 'Do not go!', *An śir!* «Ан ҫыр!» 'Do not write!', *An vula!* «Ан вула!» 'Do not read!', plural *An vul-İR!* «Ан вулăр!» 'Do not read!'.

It has been assumed that the prohibitive particle *an* is copied from Finno-Ugric (Benzing 1959: 745). Ramstedt had, however, supposed that Chuvash *an* is a petrified relic of an Altaic **e-ŋ*, derived from a negation verb **e-* 'not to be' (1952: 83). According to Robbeets (2015: 178), who takes a similar standpoint, *an* is originally a second-person imperative going back a Proto-Turkic **ä-ŋ*, which consists of an old negative auxiliary **ä-* 'not to be' + a 2P imperative **-ŋ*. This proposal is supported by the occurrence of the negative auxiliary **e-* in other Transeurasian (Altaic) languages. Mongolic, Tungusic and Korean employ a special negation auxiliary **e-* in preposed position. There are similar Uralic forms.

According to Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī, the Oghuz used a negative particle *aŋ* 'no, not', whose doubled form is described as an exclamation: Someone who is given an order may answer *aŋ aŋ* 'no, no' (Clauson 1972: 165).

The Chuvash construction should be compared to the formation of the Latin negative imperative as a combination of the imperatives *Noli!//Nolite!* and the infinitive, e.g. *Noli me tangere!* 'Do not touch me!'. In a similar way, the ancestor of Chuvash may have possessed a construction consisting of a preposed negative auxiliary verb and an invariant form of the lexical verb. This would mean that an old imperative

marker *{-ŋ}, carried by the auxiliary, is still carried by the Chuvash negation particle.

3.7. {-GII} and {-GIn}

In Old Uyghur, Karakhanid, Chaghatay, Old Ottoman, Uzbek, Uyghur, etc., singular imperative forms often contain an element {-GII} or {-GIn}, expressing reinforcement, urgency or insistence, e.g. Old Uyghur *Aya-yil!* ‘Do venerate!’. The markers are originally imperatives of *kil-* and *kīn-* ‘to do’, derivable from a root **kī-* ‘to do’. In the Turkic languages known to us, they are probably true imperatives rather than particles added to imperatives. A form such as Orkhon Turkic *Ber-gil!* might be the imperative of an old postverbal construction, interpretable as ‘Do give!’. The suffix {-GUr} ~ {-Gİr} is not a variant of {-GII} ~ {-GIn}, as has been assumed by some scholars.

Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī considers the form containing {-GII} the normal imperative, e.g. *Bar-yil!* ‘Go!’, *Kir-gil!* ‘Enter!’.

Middle Kipchak almost exclusively uses imperatives such as *Bar-yil!* ‘Go!’, i.e. examples of bare verb stems are seldom found.

Chaghatay exhibits forms such as *Ešit-gil!* ~ *Ešit-kil!* ‘Listen!’ and *Ye-mä-gil!* ‘Do not eat!’. For instance, the poet Nāvā’ī mostly employs forms with {-GII}.

Old Anatolian Turkish displays forms such as *Var-yil!* ‘Go!’, *Bil-gil!* ‘Know!’, *San-ma-yil!* ‘Do not think!’, *Ḳal-ma-yil!* ‘Do not stay!’. In Ottoman, {-GII} is rarely used after the 15th century.

{-GII} is seldom used in modern languages. In the otherwise very conservative language Khalaj it is only preserved in formulaic expressions typical of children’s games, e.g. *Täz-gil!* ‘Run!’ *Vur-gil!* ‘Hit!’, *Tut-yil!* ‘Catch!’.

The variant {-GIn} is used from late Uyghur and East Middle Turkic onward. It occurs in Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī’s Karakhanid materials, often in the Karakhanid poem *Ḳutaḍyu bilig* and in Khorezmian Turkic, e.g. Rabghūzī *Kör-gin!* ‘See!’, in Chaghatay, e.g. *Al-yin!* ‘Take!’, Nāvā’ī *Sor-yin!* ‘Ask!’, and in Middle Kipchak.

In modern languages, {-GIn} often has a precative meaning, expressing a less urging request, e.g. Uyghur *Kir-gin!* ‘Please enter!’.

It is common in Turkmen, West Kipchak, Tatar, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Uyghur, etc., e.g. Turkmen *Gel-gin!* ‘Come!’, Crimean Tatar *Al-yin!* ‘Take!’, Karaim *Bar-yin!* ‘Go!’, *Išan-yin!* ‘Believe!’, Uzbek *Oқи-gin!* ‘Read!’, *Čik-kin!* ‘Get out!’, Uyghur *Bar-yin!* ‘Go!’, *Tut-kin!* ‘Go on and seize!’. Under Uzbek and Uyghur influence, {-GIn} is used in the southern dialect of Kazakh, spoken in the Ili region.

Extended reinforcing forms, expressing higher degrees of emotionality, include Kirghiz {-GII-A}, Uyghur {GIn-A}, Äynallu {-GIn-A} ~ {-GIn-An}, Kashkay of Shiraz {-GIn-An}, Azeri dialects {-gII-An}, {-KIn-An}, {-KII-An}. Examples: Uyghur *Kir-gin-ä!* ‘Please enter!’, *Tut-kin-a!* ‘Please seize!’, South Oghuz *Baḡ-gin-än!* ‘Look!’, Kashkay *Al-gin-än!* ‘Do take it!’.

3.8. Emphatic particles

The particle or interjection {-A}, which has appeal function, is frequently added to imperatives already in Karakhanid, e.g. *Al-a!* ‘Take!’, *Kör-ä!* ‘See!’. Old Anatolian Turkish and Old Ottoman display forms such as *Al-a!* ‘Take it!’, *Bak-a!* ‘Look!’. In Khalaj, the appeal particle {-A} is still often added, e.g. *Ver-ä!* ‘Give!’.

Common additions to imperatives are markers of the type {-sA-η-A} and {-sA-ηIz-A}, consisting of the hypothetic suffix {-sA} + person-number marker + the appeal particle {-A}. The assumption that the singular form goes back to the personal pronoun *sän* ‘you’ + {-A} is obviously incorrect.

In Turkish, imperatives expanded with {-sA-n-A} and {-sA-nIz-A} are less formal or rigid than bare imperatives. In familiar registers, they express mild requests and encouragement rather than commands, e.g. <Gel-se-n-e!>, <Gel-se-niz-e!> ‘Please come!’. The less polite, or even vulgar, interjection <be> can be added, e.g. <Gel be!> ‘Come on!’.

Gagauz exhibits similar forms, e.g. *Al-sa-n-a!*, *Al-sa-niz-a!* ‘Please take it!’, *Sö-lä-sä-niz-ä!* ‘Please tell me!’. Azeri has forms such as {-sAn-A} ~ {-sAn-An}. Turkmen shows the singular marker {-θA-n-A} and the plural marker {-θA-ηIδ-lä:η} ~ {-θA-ηIδ-lä:}, e.g. *Gäl-θän-ä!*, *Gäl-θäηiδ-lä:η!* ~ *Gäl-θäηiδ-lä:!* ‘Please come!’. Kumyk and Crimean Tatar display forms such as {-sA-n-A} and {-sA}.

In Kazakh, the 2SG form {-sA-η} may change to {-sA-y} in colloquial registers to soften the imperative in the sense of humble begging, e.g. *Kel-se-y!* <come-HYP-2SG> ‘Please come!’ (Abish forthcoming).

The Chuvash particle {-sAm} plays a similar role, intensifying and softening requests and commands, e.g. *Ḳala-sam!* <say-PTCL> ‘Just say it!’, *Śi-säm-ir!* <eat-PTCL-IMP.PL> ‘Do eat!’.

Enclitic unaccentable particles of the type {-čU} may be added to imperatives in some languages. They can be used to implore, entreat, beg or encourage the addressee, thus softening the imperative request.

According to some authors, {-čU} expresses special urgency or emphasis in Karakhanid and East Middle Turkic. Maḥmūd al-Kāšḡarī reports that {-čU} is used only in direct address, and provides the examples *Käl-čü!* ‘Do come!’ and *Bar-ma-ču!* ‘Do not go!’ (Brockelmann 1917: 149–150). He mentions that {-šU} can be used instead, e.g. *Käl šü!* ‘Come!’, *Bar-yül šu!* ‘Go!’.

Some modern languages exhibit variants such as {-čI}, {-čİ}, {-šI}, e.g. Tatar *Al-čİ!* ‘Please take it!’, Kirghiz *Ḳoy-ču!* ‘Let it be!’, Kazakh *Kel-ši!* ‘Come, I beg you!’, Noghay *Bar-ši!* ‘Please go!’, *Kel-ši!* ‘Please come!’. White Noghay, however, exhibits the accentable imperative particle {- (A)š} instead, e.g. *Bar-aš!* ‘Please go!’, *Kel-aš!* ‘Please come!’. A strong Uzbek imperative is formed by means of {-či}, e.g. *Yāz-sā-ηiz-či!* ‘Come on, write!’.

The Turkmen suffix {- (Ø)A:y}, which expresses permission to perform an action, occurs in imperatives such as 2SG *Yaδ-a:y!* ← *yaδ-* ‘to write’, *I:šl-ä:y!* ← *i:šle-*

‘to work’, 2PL *Yaδ-a:y-iŋ!*, *I:šl-ä:y-iŋ!*. They can roughly be translated with ‘Feel free to act!’.

The Yakut suffix {-Iy} is added to consonant-final imperative stems, e.g. the immediate imperative *Bar-iy!* ‘Do go!’, *Käl-iy!* ‘Do come!’. The remote imperative has the marker {-A:r-Iy}, e.g. *Käl-ä:r-iy!* ‘Come (then)!’, *Bar-a:r-iy!* ‘Go (then)!’.

3.9. Imperatives of postverbal constructions

Imperatives can occur with postverbal constructions of various kinds, with the auxiliary taking on the imperative marker, e.g. Orkhon Turkic *Yäl-ü kör!* ‘See to it that you ride fast!’, Uzbek *Ƙıl-kör!* ‘Try to do it!’, *Gäpir-ib tur!* ‘Keep talking!’, Kazakh *Žaz-ıp žiber!* ‘Write it down!’. Certain postverbal constructions can be used for downtoning imperatives, i.e. to soften the request. For instance, the Kazakh construction {-A/-y} + *ƙoy-* can express polite, familiar requests, e.g. *Kel-e ƙoy!* ‘Please come!’ (Abish forthcoming).

4. The voluntative mood

Turkic voluntatives are, like imperatives and optatives, used in sentences indicating that a given action is desirable. Voluntative markers express notions of will, desire, wish, hope, intention, request, command, demand, entreaty, advice, recommendation, exhortation, warning, permission or possibility with respect to the fulfillment of the action. The voluntative is semantically close to the optative and the aorist. Second-person voluntatives are lacking; they are replaced by imperatives, optatives or aorists.

Voluntatives primarily express the addresser’s will, but the desirability may also be conceived of as impersonal: ‘it is desired that ...’, e.g. Turkish 3SG <Gel-sin> ‘May X come’.

The wish expressed may be meant to be fulfilled by the addressee or to be transmitted by the addressee as a relayed message for a third person. The realization of the action is not necessarily conceived of as dependent on the contribution of the subject referent.

The Chuvash and Khalaj voluntative markers deviate from those of the other Turkic languages. If the latter markers go back to Proto-Turkic, we may ask why they are absent in these two very conservative languages and whether the Chuvash and Khalaj markers may go back to still earlier stages.

4.1. Questions

Polar (yes-no) questions are formed with postposed question particles. The constructions solicit the opinion of the addressee(s).

First-person constructions request permission to perform an action.

1SG examples: Turkish <Gid-ey-im mi?>, Chuvash *PİR-am-i?* ‘Shall/may I go?’, Kumyk *Al-ay-īm-mī?* ‘Shall/may I take it?’, Uyghur *Tut-ay-mu?* ‘Shall/may I seize it?’.

1PL constructions may include the addressee as a potential co-performer, e.g. Turkish <Gid-eli-m mi?>, Uzbek *Bâr-ây-lik mi?* ‘Shall we go?’, Uyghur *Tut-ayli-mu?* ‘Shall we seize it?’.

Third-person constructions are often used to ask for permission or advice, e.g. Turkish <Gel-sin mi?>, Bashkir *Kil-hın-mi?* <Килһенме?> ‘Shall X come?’.

4.2. First-person voluntatives

1P voluntatives express the addresser’s or the addressers’ wish, intention, self-encouragement, willingness, readiness, decision or promise to perform the action in question: ‘I/we will act’, ‘Let me/us act’, ‘May I/we act’; in interrogative sentences: ‘Shall I/we act?’.

The voluntatives can also represent a higher will: ‘It is desirable that I/we act’. Examples: Turkish <Öl-ey-im> ‘May I die’, <Öl-eli-m> ‘May we die’, <Gid-ey-im> ‘Let me go’, <Gid-eli-m> ‘Let us go’.

The addresser(s) may ask the addressee(s) for permission to carry out the action. This can be paraphrased by means of lexical constructions with verbal predicates meaning ‘to allow’, ‘to permit’. Permissive readings are not compulsory but dependent on the context. The English causative-permissive phrase ‘Let me/us act’ is sometimes a misleading translation since it suggests some kind of imperative.

With 1SG voluntatives, the addresser is identical to the subject referent.

1PL voluntatives may have cohortative functions, expressing an appeal, incitement or invitation to act together with the addressee(s) and possibly other persons, e.g. Turkish <Bir kahve iç-eli-m> (one coffee drink-VOL1PL) ‘Let’s drink a coffee’, but also this reading is dependent on the context.

4.3. Third-person voluntatives

3P voluntatives signal requests, demands, commands, instructions, invitations, advice, permission, consent, etc. Unlike imperatives, they do not appeal directly to the persons or other entities from which the realization is expected. The realization is conceived of as less dependent on their participation and also on the contribution of the addressee(s). It may be suggested or urged that the action be performed by somebody other than the addresser and the addressee.

Though 3P voluntatives mostly express the addresser’s or some other person’s wish, they can also be used impersonally, in the sense of ‘it is desirable that’. The addresser may also express another person’s wish or request.

The functions may be jussive (commanding), exhortative (encouraging), strongly urging or permissive. Possible translations include ‘X shall/should do’, ‘May X do’, ‘Let X do’. The translation by the English permissive phrase ‘Let X do’ can be misleading, since it may suggest that the addressee is responsible for the realization.

4.4. Voluntative markers

A common voluntative thematic base is lacking. The markers are of unknown origin and cannot be reliably traced back to lexical sources; some hypotheses concerning the origins are discussed in Räsänen (1957: 204–210). The earliest documented 1SG and 1PL markers rather make the impression of being portmanteau morphemes, combining the expression of mood and person-number. As Menges remarks, “ancient suffixes of heterogeneous character have survived down into the historical period, having undergone, during the latter, some influences on the part of the existing suffixes denoting person” (1968: 140).

4.5. 1SG voluntative markers

Voluntative markers of the first person singular include the following:

4.5.1. {-(y)AyIn}, {-(A)yIn}

The first known 1SG voluntative marker, documented in East Old Turkic and Kuman, is {-(A)yIn}, negated {-m-AyIn}, e.g. *Bar-ayin* ← *bar-* ‘to go’, *Bol-ayin* ← *bol-* ‘to become’, *Käl-äyin* ← *käl-* ‘to come’, *Sözlä-yin* ← *sözlä-* ‘to talk’, *Kör-m-äyin* ← *kör-mä-* ‘not to see’.

The second vowel of the East Old Turkic marker is written plene as a front *i* in the Orkhon runiform script, i.e. <¹yi²n> ~ <²yi²n>. This points to the shape {-(A)yIn} and non-harmonic forms such as *Ɔon-ayin* ← *Ɔon-* ‘to settle’.

The earliest known Anatolian Turkish 1SG voluntative marker is, however, {-(y)AyIn}. It is a characteristic feature of West Anatolian texts of the 14th and 15th centuries, and it is still used in West Anatolian and some other Turkish dialects.

The bracketed vowel (A) in {-(A)yIn} has traditionally been regarded as a “connective vowel”, inserted between stem-final consonants and consonant-initial markers. On the other hand, the bracketed glide (y) in {-(y)AyIn} has been thought to be a hiatus-preemptory “buffer consonant” inserted between stem-final vowels and vowel-initial markers. In view of the generally rather conservative morphological structures of the Oghuz branch, {-(y)AyIn} may simply be older than {-(A)yIn}. This would mean that the original forms have changed through contractions caused by consonant deletion. Neither “connective vowels” nor “buffer consonants” would then be needed to explain the differences.

The marker {-(A)yIn} or {-(Ø)AyIn} is still alive in some Central Asian languages such as Kirghiz, Kazakh, Baraba, Shor, Tuvan and Tofan, e.g. Kirghiz *Kör-öyün* ← *kör-* ‘to see’, *Ɔar-ayin* ← *Ɔara-* ‘to look’, Kazakh *Kömektes-eyin* ← *kömektes-* ‘to help’. A similar form is Uzbek {-(ä)yIn}, e.g. *Äl-äyin* ← *äl-* ‘to take’. The Malkar dialect of Karachay-Balkar exhibits *Kör-eyin* ← *kör-* ‘to see’, *Bar-ayin* ← *bar-* ‘to go’. The Turkmen marker is {-AyIn} // {-(Ø):yIn}, e.g. *Gel-äyin* ← *gel-* ‘to come’, *Ya:š-a:yin* ← *ya:ša-* ‘to live’. The postvocalic variants bear witness to old contractions.

Karakhanid exhibits the shortened suffix {-(A)yI}, e.g. *Bar-ayı* ← *bar-* ‘to go’.

4.5.2. {-(A)y}

The shortest form, {-(A)y}, e.g. *Ƙil-ay* ← *ƙil-* ‘to do’, *Biti-y* ← *bit-* ‘to write’, *Kör-äy* ← *kör-* ‘to see’, *De-y* ← *de-* ‘to say’, is found in modern Uyghur, e.g. *Kir-äy* ← *kir-* ‘to enter’, in southwestern dialects of Kazakh, etc. Uzbek exhibits {-(ä)y}, e.g. *Al-äy* ← *äl-* ‘to take’. The marker {-(A)y} has been claimed to go back to the optative marker {-GAy}, which is, however, phonetically impossible.

4.5.3. {-(y)Ay-Im}, {-(A)y-Im}

The short marker {-(A)y} takes on 1SG person-number suffixes in many languages. Khorezmian Turkic (Rabghūzī) shows forms such as *Ƙil-ay-īm* ← *ƙil-* ‘to do’. Old Ottoman exhibits the type *Gör-äy-vän* ← *gör-* ‘to see’, *Sal-ay-van* ← *sal-* ‘to throw’, with the person-number suffix {-vAn} < *bän* ‘I’.

The markers {-(y)Ay-Im} and {-(A)y-Im} occur in the western parts of the Turkic-speaking world. Middle Kipchak exhibits {-(A)y-Im}, e.g. *Bär-äy-im* ← *bär-* ‘to give’. The Ottoman form is {-(y)Ay-Im}, maybe older than {-(A)y-Im}, e.g. *Ver-äy-im* ← *ver-* ‘to give’, *De-yä-yim* ← *de-* ‘to say’, *Başla-yay-īm* ← *başla-* ‘to begin’. It was widely spread in the 14th century and firmly established in the written language. It still exists in several variants in Central and East Anatolian dialects as well as in Balkan Turkish dialects.

The Ottoman marker is mainly found in contracted forms such as {-(y)-Im} ~ {-(y)-m} ~ {-i:m} ~ {-im}, e.g. *Gäl-i:m* ← *gäl-* ‘to come’, *Bäklä-yi-m* ~ *Bäklä-y-m* ← *bäklä-* ‘to wait’. The Azeri marker is {-(y)-Im}, e.g. *Gäl-im* ‘I will come’, *Başla-y-īm* ‘I will begin’.

Modern Turkish has the marker {-(y)Ay-Im}, negated {-mA-yAy-Im}, e.g. *Gid-ey-im* ← *git-* ‘to go’, *Yap-ay-im* ← *yap-* ‘to do’, *Yaşa-yay-im* ← *yaşa-* ‘to live’. In the spoken language, the postvocalic form is {-(y)-Im}, e.g. *Söyle-yim* ← *söyle-* ‘to speak, to tell’.

Gagauz exhibits both the long marker {-(y)Ay-Im}, e.g. *Bäklä-yäy-im*, and the short marker {-(y)-Im}, e.g. *Bäklä-y-im* ← *bäklä-* ‘to wait’, *Al-iy-īm* *Алайым* ← *al-* ‘to take’. Negated stems take on the short marker, e.g. *Gäl-mä-y-im* ← *gäl-mä-* ‘not to come’, *Al-ma-y-īm* ← *al-ma-* ‘not to take’.

The type {-(A)y-Im} or {-(Ø)Ay-Im} is found in West and North Kipchak languages, e.g. *Ƙil-ay-īm* ← *ƙil-* ‘to do’, *Kit-äy-im* ← *kit-* ‘to go away’, *Oƙu-y-īm* ← *oƙu-* ‘to read’. It is used in the West Kipchak languages Karachay-Balkar, Kumyk, Crimean Tatar and Karaim, e.g. Karachay-Balkar *Ač-ay-īm* ← *ač-* ‘to open’, negated *Ač-m-ay-īm*, Kumyk *Bar-m-ay-īm* ← *bar-ma-* ‘not to go’. As to the North Kipchak languages, the Bashkir marker is {-(A)y-Im}, e.g. *Al-ay-īm* ← *al-* ‘to take’, *İsl-äy-īm* ← *islä-* ‘to work’, *Ƙar-ay-īm* ← *ƙara-* ‘to see’. The Tatar counterpart is {-(Ø)İy-m}, e.g. *Al-iy-m* *Алыйм*, *İsl-iy-m* *Эшлим*, *İč-iy-m* *Эчим* ← *ič-* ‘to drink’. The segment *iy*, written *ый*, occurs after back stems, and *iy*, written *и*, occurs after front stems.

Chuvash employs 1SG {-(Ø)A-m}, e.g. 1SG *Kil-ä-m* ← *kil-* ‘to come’, *Pir-a-m* ← *pir-* ‘to go’, *Pul-a-m* ← *pul-* ‘to become/be’, *Šir-a-m* ← *šir-* ‘to write’, *Vul-a-m* ← *vula-* ‘to read’. The negation is expressed by means of the postposed copular particle *mar* < *är-mäz*, e.g. 1SG *Šir-a-m mar*, *Vul-a-m mar*. There is an alternative pattern with the preposed negative particle *an*, e.g. 1SG *An šir-am* ‘I will not write’ (4.9.).

Some Siberian languages such as Yakut exhibit contracted forms of the type {-I:-m}, e.g. Yakut *Käl-i:-m* ‘I will come’, *Bar-i:-m* ‘I will go’, negated {-Im-I:-m}, e.g. *Bar-īm-i:-m* ‘I will not go’. It has been suggested that {-Iy} in imperatives such as *Käl-iy!* ‘Do come!’ corresponds to {-AyI} (Poppe 1959: 682).

The Khalaj markers deviate considerably from all types dealt with above. They are mostly derived from old postverbal stems, e.g. 1SG {-d-U-m}, {-d-A-m}, e.g. *Kör-i-dü-m* ‘Let me see’. The element *d-* seems to be a remnant of a converb in {-di}.

4.6. 1PL voluntative markers

Voluntative markers of the first person plural include the following:

4.6.1. {-(A)II}, {-(y)AII}

The oldest known 1PL voluntative marker is {-(A)II}, found in East Old Turkic, Karakhanid, Kuman, Middle Kipchak and Chaghatay, e.g. East Old Turkic *Ķil-alī* ← *ķil-* ‘to do’, Chaghatay *Oķu-lī* ← *oķu-* ‘to read’, *Ūn-āli* ← *ün-* ‘to go out’, *Ötün-āli* ← *ötün-* ‘to venerate’, Middle Kipchak *Bar-alī* ← *bar-* ‘to go’. This type still occurs in some languages of the eastern area. The type {-AII}://{yII} is found in Kirghiz, South Altay, Shor, West Siberian, etc., e.g. Kirghiz *Ber-eli* ← *ber-* ‘to give’, *Ber-be-yli* ← *ber-be-* ‘not to give’.

The marker {-(A)II-m}, negated {-mA-II-m}, contains the person-number marker {-m} of the possessive type, e.g. Old Uyghur *Biti-li-m* ← *biti-* ‘to write’, other older languages *Bar-alī-m* ← *bar-* ‘to go’, *Kir-āli-m* ← *kir-* ‘to enter’. The type {-A)II-m} is also represented in later languages.

The type {-(A)II-K}, found in Middle Kipchak, Kuman and Chaghatay, takes on {-K} as a person-number marker of the possessive type, e.g. *Kör-āli-k* ← *kör-* ‘to see’, *Bar-alī-k* ← *bar-* ‘to go’. Old Anatolian Turkish exhibits {-(y)AII-K}, which may be older, e.g. *Baķ-alī-k* ← *baķ-* ‘to look’, *Yollī-yalī-k* ← *yolla-* ‘to send’. Kirghiz has the variant {-AII-K}://{yII-K}, e.g. *Ber-eli-k*, *Ber-be-yli-k*; there is a similar South Altay marker.

Chaghatay also employs {-(A)II-η}, with the person-number suffix {-η} of the possessive type, e.g. *Ič-āli-η* ← *ič-* ‘to drink’. Standard Turkmen exhibits the marker {-AII:-η}://{-(Ø):II:-η}, e.g. *Yaδ-alī-η* ← *yaδ-* ‘to write’, *Ya:š-a:lī-η* ← *ya:ša-* ‘to live’.

The marker {-(y)AIU-m} is attested in the oldest Ottoman documents, e.g. *Biliš-ālū-m* ← *biliš-* ‘to know each other’, *Ye-yālū-m* ← *ye-* ‘to eat’. A later, delabialized form is {-(y)AII-m}, e.g. *Säv-āli-m* ← *säv-* ‘to love’, *Uyu-yalī-m* ← *uyu-* ‘to sleep’,

typical of the western and northern parts of Anatolia and some Balkan dialects. Northern dialects of Khalaj display {-AlU-m}, copied from Oghuz. The postvocalic Ottoman forms are sometimes shortened to {-yIl-m}, e.g. *Oķu-yIu-m* ← *oķu-* ‘to read’ in dialects of northeastern Bulgaria. Some dialect forms are augmented by the element {-Iŋ}, according to some scholars copied from the imperative plural, e.g. *Gid-ālim-iŋ* ← *git-* ‘to go’.

The Standard Turkish marker is {(y)AlI-m}, e.g. <Gel-eli-m> ← <gel-> ‘to come’, <Yap-alı-m> ← <yap-> ‘to do’, <Ara-yalı-m> ← <ara-> ‘to search’, <Bekle-yeli-m> ← <bekle-> ‘to wait’. Gagauz exhibits similar markers.

4.6.2. {-AyIl}, {-AyIl-K}

Another type is {-AyI}, e.g. Uyghur *Kir-āy-li* ‘We will enter’. The Standard Uzbek marker is {-(ā)yI-k}, e.g. *Bār-āy-lik* ‘We will go’.

4.6.3. {-(A)y}

The shortest 1PL form is {-(A)y}. Like the shortest 1SG form, it takes on person-number suffixes.

The type {-(A)yI-K} as manifested in *Kit-āy-ik* ← *kit-* ‘to go away’, *Ķil-ay-ik* ← *ķil-* ‘to do’, is found in almost all Kipchak languages, e.g. Karachay-Balkar *Ač-ay-ik* ← *ač-* ‘to open’, Crimean Tatar *Al-ay-ik* ← *al-* ‘to take’, Karaim *Bar-ay-iχ* ← *bar-* ‘to go’, Bashkir *Al-ay-ik* <Алайык> ← *al-* ‘to take’, *İslä-yi-k* <Эшләйык> ← *ışlä-* ‘to work’, Kazakh *Al-ay-ik* ← *al-* ‘to take’, *Söyle-y-ik* ← *söyle-* ‘to speak’. The Tatar marker is {-(Ø)Iy-K}, e.g. *Al-iy-k* <Алыйк> ← *al-* ‘to take’, *İsl-iy-k* <Эшлик> ← *ışlä-* ‘to work’. The segment *iy*, written <ый>, occurs after back stems, and *iy*, written <и>, occurs after front stems.

The Oghuz marker {(y)Ay-IK}, e.g. Otoman *Otur-ay-i-k* ← *otur-* ‘to sit down/sit’, may be older than {-Ay-IK}://{y-IK}. It is now obsolete, but contracted forms such as {(y)A-K} are common in Eastern Turkish dialects, e.g. *Gäl-ä-k* ← *gäl-* ‘to come’, *Yap-a-χ* ← *yap-* ‘to do’, *Yap-mi-ya-χ* ~ *Yap-ma-χ* ← *yap-ma-* ‘not to do’. They are also used in informal spoken Standard Turkish. Azeri has the marker {(y)A-G}, e.g. *Al-a-ğ* ← *al-* ‘to take’, *Böl-ä-k* ← *böl-* ‘to divide’, *Başla-ya-ğ* ← *başla-* ‘to begin’. Azeri, South Oghuz and Khorasan Turkic dialects exhibit various similar forms.

Yakut has a set of markers consisting of {-A:yI-K}://{-(Ø):yI-K} + person-number markers of the pronominal type.

The Turkic languages of South Siberia show contracted forms of various shapes, e.g. Baraba, Küärik {-A:-K}. Also Uyghur displays numerous shortened forms.

4.6.4. Chuvash

Chuvash employs 1PL {- (Ø)A-r} with the pronominal plural marker {-r}, corresponding to Common Turkic {-z}, e.g. *Śir-a-r* ← *śir-* ‘to write’, negated *Śir-a-r mar*, *Vul-a-r* ← *vula-* ‘to read’, *Ķal-a-r* ← *ķala-* ‘to speak’.

4.7. 3SG voluntative markers

The 3SG voluntative conveys meanings such as ‘May X act’, ‘X shall/should act’, ‘Let X act’, in interrogative sentences ‘Shall X act?’. It often has jussive meanings, used for issuing orders meant to be carried out by third persons. Voluntatives have desiderative meaning in some contexts and jussive meaning in other contexts, e.g. Uyghur *Käl-sun* ‘May X come’, ‘X shall come’. 3SG voluntatives occur in formulaic wishes, e.g. Turkish *Yeni yıl-ınız kutlu ol-sun* ‘new year-POSS2PL blessed be-VOL’ ‘May your new year be blessed’, ‘Happy new year!’, Kazakh *Aq zol bol-sın* ‘white way be-VOL’ ‘Happy journey!’.

When used in combination with voluntative suffixes, the Turkmen potential suffix {-Ø}A:y} expresses “meanings that are related to permission, such as suggestion, advice, insistence, caution or premonition” (Clark 1998: 297), e.g. *Yað-a:y-ayın* ‘Let me write’, *Yað-a:y-θin* ‘May X be allowed to write’.

The Orkhon Turkic 3SG voluntative marker is {-zUn}, e.g. *Bar-zin* ← *bar-* ‘to go’. It has been compared to Mongolic {-sU}, though *z* would rather be expected to correspond to Mongolic *r*. The initial consonant is *z* also after voiceless stops, e.g. *Bädidät-zün* ‘X shall paint’. This notation is probably not “simply graphic” (Menges 1968: 139), but rather renders the short stem-final vowel in intervocalic position before its loss, i.e. **Bädidät^o-zün*.

Karakhanid shows the variants {-sUn}, {-sU}, {-sUn-I}, {-zUn-I}, e.g. *Kıl-su* ← *kıl-* ‘to do’, *Käl-sün* ← *käl-* ‘to come’, *Bol-sun-ī* ← *bol-* ‘to become/be’, *Kör-sün-i* ← *kör-* ‘to see’. Other older languages display {-sUn}, e.g. Middle Kipchak *Bär-sin* ← *bär-* ‘to give’, Chaghatay *Bar-sun* ← *bar-* ‘to go’.

Most modern languages follow this pattern. Turkish uses {-sIn}, e.g. *Gel-sin* ← *gel-* ‘to come’. Azeri has corresponding forms, e.g. *Başla-sın* ← *başla-* ‘to begin’. South Oghuz usually exhibits {-sIn} ~ {-sIn} ~ {-sI}, Khorasan Oghuz normally {-sIn}. The Turkmen marker is {-θIn}, e.g. *Gel-θin* ← *gel-* ‘to come’. Kipchak languages display similar markers. Karachay-Balkar *Oqu-sun* ← *oku-* ‘to read’, Karaim *Bol-sun* ← *bol-* ‘to become/be’, Kazakh *Söyle-sin* ← *söyle-* ‘to speak’. Tatar shows {-sIn}, e.g. *İşlä-sin* ‘to work’, and Bashkir shows {-hIn}, e.g. *İşlä-hin* ‘to work’.

The Uzbek marker is {-sin}, e.g. *Bil-sin* ← *bil-* ‘to know’. Uyghur displays {-sun}, e.g. *Kir-sun* ← *kir-* ‘to enter’.

South Siberian languages display {-ZIn}, e.g. South Altay *Bar-zin* ← *bar-* ‘to go’, Tuvan *Joru-zun* ← *joru-* ‘to move’.

Yakut and Dolgan have an immediate voluntative in {-TIn}, with an initial dental stop instead of a sibilant, e.g. *Bar-din* ← *bar-* ‘to go’.

The corresponding Chuvash marker {-Tİr} is strikingly different, e.g. *Pul-DİR* ‘Пултăр’ ← *pul-* ‘to become/be’, *Śir-DİR* ‘Сыртрăр’ ← *śir-* ‘to write’, *Vula-DİR* ‘Вулатăр’ ← *vula-* ‘to read’, *Il-DİR* ‘Илтăр’ ← *il-* ‘to take’. The marker may go back to a causative, i.e. {-Tİr} < *{-tUr}, e.g. *Il-DİR* < **Al-tur*. Note, however, that the modern Chuvash causative marker is {-TAr}.

Khalaj uses a marker {-tA}, derived from older postverbal stems, e.g. *Al-ta* ‘May X take’, *Yäkäl-tä* ‘May X come’, *Kör-i-tä* ‘May X see’, *Yovar-ta* ‘May X go’. The marker is similar to Chuvash {-Tİr} and explainable in the same way. It may go back to a causative plus {-A}, a particle with appeal function. *Al-ta* may thus be parallel to Chuvash *Il-DİR* < **Al-tur*. This explanation supports the reconstruction of *{-ti} as a Proto-Turkic causative.

4.8. 3PL volunative markers

In later Old Uyghur, {-lAr} can be optionally added for multiple subject referents, i.e. {-zUn-lAr}. Most later languages use {-sIn-lAr}, e.g. Chaghatay *Kir-sün-lär* ← *kir-* ‘to enter’, Ottoman *Uyu-sun-lar* ← *uyu-* ‘to sleep’, Turkish <Gel-sin-ler> ← <gel- > ‘to come’, Azeri *Başla-sin-lar* ← *başla-* ‘to begin’. Turkmen displays {-θIn-lAr}, e.g. *İşle-θin-ler* ← *işle-* ‘to work’.

Many other languages have similar markers, e.g. Karachay-Balkar has {-sIn-lA}, e.g. *Oķu-sun-la* ← *oķu-* ‘to read’. The Tatar marker is {-sIn-nAr}, e.g. *İşlä-sın-när* <Эшләсеннәр> ← *işlä-* ‘to work’, and the Bashkir marker is {-hIn-dAr}, e.g. *İşlä-hın-där* <Эшләһендәр>. Kirghiz and Kazakh use {-sIn} for both single and multiple subject referents; Kirghiz can also form the plural {-(I)š-sIn}. The Uzbek marker is {-sin-lār}, e.g. *Bil-sin-lār* ← *bil-* ‘to know’.

The Yakut and Dolgan immediate volunative marker is {-TIn-nAr}, e.g. *Bar-din-nar* ← *bar-* ‘to go’, negated {-BA-tIn-nAr}, e.g. *Bar-ba-tin-nar*.

The Chuvash marker is {-Čİr}, realized as {-č:İr} after stems ending in vowels and -n, -l, -r, and as {-čİr} elsewhere, e.g. *Şir-č:İR* ← *şir-* ‘to write’, *Vula-č:İR* ← *vula-* ‘to read’, *Il-č:İR* ← *il-* ‘to take’. The suffix may go back to a combination of the Proto-Turkic cooperative suffix *{- (I)č}, which later became {- (I)š}, and a causative suffix, i.e. *{-č-tUr}, e.g. *Il-č:İR* < **Al-č-tur* (Benzing 1959: 745). Compare the role of {- (I)š} as a plural marker in Kirghiz and some other languages, e.g. Kirghiz *Käl-iš-ti* ‘They came’.

Khalaj displays the marker {-tA-lAr}, e.g. *Al-ta-lar* ← *al-* ‘to take’.

4.9. Negated 3P markers

Negated third-person voluntatives conveying prohibitive meanings are mostly formed regularly by addition of the negation suffix of the type {-MA}, e.g. Ottoman *Bağ-ma-sun* ‘X shall not look’, Yakut *Bar-ba-tin* ‘X shall not go’, Middle Kipchak *Kir-mä-sün-lär* ‘They shall not enter’.

Chuvash, however, employs the proposed negation particle *an*, e.g. *An vula-tİR* ‘X shall not read’, *An şir-tİR* ‘X shall not write’, *An şir-č:İR* ‘They shall not write’, *An vula-č:İR* ‘They shall not read’. Compare the Latin prohibitive, a combination of *ne* plus the present optative. The Chuvash construction may be surprising in view of the fact that voluntatives are not imperatives, but belong, like optatives, to the “plan délocutoire” (see 3.2). However, if {-Tİr} has developed from a causative marker,

the 3P voluntatives can be explained as going back to 2SG causative constructions with appeal function, literally meaning ‘Cause X not to act!’.

As already noted (4.5), constructions with the preposed particle *an* are alternative patterns for 1SG and 1PL negated voluntatives, e.g. *An śir-am*, *An śir-ar*.

4.10. Counterfactual voluntatives with past copular particles

Voluntatives sometimes combine with past copular particles of the type *är-di*, *i-di*, etc. The combinations mostly express counterfactual wishes, e.g. Old Uyghur *Kör-mä-yin är-di* ‘I wish I had not seen’, *Öl-sün är-di* ‘If only X would die!’, ‘Would that X died’, East Middle Turkic *Qıl-aq är-di* ‘Would that X did it’, Tatar *Bar-sın i-di* ‘Барсын иде’ ‘If only X would go’. Turkish combinations with {-(y)dl} such as *Git-sin-di* ‘X would go’, *Ne bil-sin-di?* ‘How should X know?’ can be used in narrated monologues (“free indirect discourse”, “erlebte Rede”) as a literary technique in fiction for direct representation of a character’s thoughts or other contents of consciousness (Johanson 1971: 266–267). This type is also common in right-branching syntactic constructions that have emerged under non-Turkic influence, e.g. Cypriot Turkish *Söyle-di-m gel-sin-di* {say-RET-1SG come-VOL-PTCL} ‘I said X should come’.

5. The optative mood

The optative mood fulfills a wide range of functions, developed along various diachronic paths. It conveys meanings of will, wish, desire, intention, hope, aspiration, goal, incitement, request, inducement, benevolence, amiability, blessings, curses, promise, advice, expectation, obligation, necessity and prediction of non-factual situations. The volitive meanings may lead over to potential, necessitative and counterfactual meanings. Negative optatives are admonitive, expressing fear, worry and warnings against the possible occurrence of an undesired situation.

The source of the optative was obviously a modal category with desiderative and epistemic components and with future time reference as a necessary inherent feature. No modern optatives convey purely prospective, non-modal meanings. The expression of wish is common to all of them, but there is often an epistemic component implying uncertainty about the occurrence of the desired situation.

Like the old Indo-European optative, the Turkic optative covers various deontic and epistemic notions of potentiality or necessity. Compare the use of the English auxiliary *may* both for strong wishes, e.g. *May X act*, and for epistemic or deontic possibility, e.g. *X may act*. The use of the Turkic optative for subjective and objective deontic modality has led to the development of epistemic modality. Thus, South Siberian optatives tend to express consent and permission, but also epistemic possibility or probability. The Tuvan optative is mostly described as expressing deontic and epistemic necessity.

The optative does not necessarily reflect the stance of the addresser. The addressee is not necessarily the expected performer of the desired action or its benefi-

ciary. The optative does not necessarily suggest that the realization of the event is dependent on the cooperation of the addressee or the subject referent, e.g. Kazakh 3SG *Ber-il-gey* {give-PASS-OPT} ‘May it be given’. Optatives do not appeal to the addressee(s) to help make the desired state of affairs true. It is irrelevant whether or not the addresser and the addressee are in control of the fulfillment.

First person optatives may express the addresser’s readiness to perform an action or a request for permission to perform it: ‘May I/we act’, ‘I/we will act’, ‘Let me/us act’, etc. The addresser and the subject referent may be identical, e.g. Kazakh *Al-γay-mın* {take-OPT-1SG} ‘May I get it’, ‘I want myself to get it’. Second person optatives, e.g. Ottoman *Gäl-ä-sin* ‘It is desirable that you come’, may be compared to the Indo-European 2SG subjunctive, e.g. **Bherēsi* ‘May you carry’. They may convey blessings and curses, e.g. Kazakh *Baқıttı bol-γay-sın!* {happy be-OPT-2SG} ‘May you be happy!’, and have often been used for sharp directives, e.g. Old Uyghur *Bar-ma-γay-sın* ‘You will not go’, and for commands in administrative styles, e.g. earlier Ottoman *Şöylä bil-ä-siz* ‘Sachez-le ainsi’ (Deny 1921: 414).

Optatives are often used to ask cautious questions, e.g. Ottoman *Äv-dä mi ol-a?* ‘Might X be at home?’, *Nä bil-ä-m?* ‘How could I know?’. Compare the use of the Latin deliberative subjunctive in doubtful questions, e.g. *Quid faciam?* ‘What shall I do?’.

5.1. Language-specific usages

The Turkic optative may originally have had a previsional meaning of predetermination, ordained by a higher force, i.e. fate or a divine decree. This function included prediction and potentiality, which also allowed the use in conditional clauses (protasis). Old Uyghur and Karakhanid optatives express modal nuances of wish, admission, potentiality, obligation and necessity. They are purely modal categories rather than “pure futures”. The expression of unfulfilled actions necessarily implies prospectivity, i.e. future time reference. Situations conceived of as desired, expected or possible can only be realized in the relative future. The prospective optative can be compared to the Indo-European prospective subjunctive and, for instance, the use of the English auxiliary *will*.

In later languages, optatives express a wide range of modal meanings, e.g. wish, hope, expectation, emphatic request, invocation, advice, directive, intention, possibility, permission and promise to realize unfulfilled actions. Since they refer to the future, the categories are often called “optative-futures”.

In the Northeastern branch, optatives have desiderative, permissive, necessitative and potential functions. The meaning of consent and permission is common in Khakas and Shor, e.g. Khakas *Käl-gäy* ‘X may come’. The Tuvan optative expresses agreement, consent, approval and permission. When accompanied by the particle {-IA}, however, it indicates necessity and obligation to carry out an action.

In Altay, Khakas and Shor, the optative may typically express the assessment of a future situation as possible or probable.

5.2. Optative markers

The optative markers consist of {-GAy} + person-number markers of the pronominal type. They are of unknown origin and cannot be traced back to any known lexical elements. The voluntative marker {-(A)y}, e.g. 1SG *Bar-ay-ım* ‘Let me go’, is not a phonetic variant of {-GAy}.

The marker {-GAy} is absent in the earliest known Turkic documents, the East Old Turkic inscriptions, but occurs in Old Uyghur manuscripts and in Karakhanid, e.g. 1SG *Bar-ıyay-män*, 3SG *Bar-ıyay*. The 3SG form lacks person-number markers, like the hypothetic (conditional) suffix {-sAr}. {-GAy} is claimed to have replaced {-DAĈI}, which vanished from the Late Uyghur and East Middle Turkic periods on.

Karakhanid, East Middle Turkic and Chaghatay display forms such as 2SG *Ķil-yay-siz* ← *Ķil-* ‘to do’, 3SG *Bol-yay* ← *bol-* ‘to become/be’, *Söv-gäy* ← *söv-* ‘to love’, *Bil-dür-mä-gäy* ← *bil-dür-mä-* ‘not to tell’.

These languages also exhibit the variant {-GA} along with the older marker {-GAy}.

The short form survives in the Khalaj optative marker {-GA}, added to specific stems that partly go back to postverbal constructions, e.g. 3SG *Kör-i-gä* ← *kör-* ‘to see’, *Ol-i-ya* ← *ol-* ‘to become/be’, *Yä-käl-gä* ← *käl-* ‘to come’, 1SG *Kör-i-gä-m*. The Khalaj optative often has purposive or intentional meaning.

The typically Oghuz markers {-(y)Ay} ~ {-(y)A} have developed from {-GAy} ~ {-GA} through loss of the suffix-initial {G}, e.g. Azeri *Ged-ä* ‘May X go’. Texts in the so-called “olıya bolıya dili”, written in Anatolia in the 13th century, exhibit the variants {-GA} and {-GAy}. A rest of the form with final -y has until recently survived in *bol-ay ki*, a variant of *bol-a ki* ‘maybe’, ‘would that’.

Optatives with markers of the type {-GAy} still exist in many languages of the Northwestern, Northeastern and Southeastern branches, e.g. Kumyk, Crimean Tatar, Tatar, Noghay, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Uyghur, Altay, Shor, Tuvan, Khakas, Yellow Uyghur.

Examples (*bar-/par-* ‘to go’, *bär-* ‘to give’, *bil-* ‘to know’, *bol-* ‘to become /be’, *işlät-* ‘to work’, *käl-/kel-* ‘to come’, *kör-* ‘to see’, *sölä-* ‘to say’, *yâz-* ‘to write’):

Karachay-Balkar 1SG *Bol-yay-ım*, Halich Karaim 2SG *Bar-yay-s(än)*, Trakai Karaim 1SG *Bar-yäy-mın* ~ *Bar-yäy-m*, 2SG *Bar-yäy-sın* ~ *Bar-yäy-s*, Khakas 3SG *Bıl-gäy*, *Par-yay*, *Sölä:y* < *Sölä-gäy*, Tuvan 1SG *Bar-yay män*, 3SG *Bar-yay*, Tofan 3SG *Bär-gäy*, Altay 3SG *Bol-yoy*, Uyghur 3SG *İşlät-käy*, Kirghiz 3SG *Kel-gey*, Altay 1SG *Käl-gäy-im*, 2SG *Käl-gäy-iñ*, 3SG *Käl-gäy*, Tuba-kizhi 1SG *Kör-göy-im*, Uzbek 1SG *Yâz-yây-män*. The Qomul dialect of Uzbek displays forms such as {-GAy} and {-GIy}, e.g. *Vo:-yay* ‘May X become’ < **Bol-yay*, *Kä-giy* ‘May X come’ < **Käl-gäy*.

Kazakh displays the following markers:

1SG {-GAy-mIn}	1PL {-GAy-mIz}
2SG {-GAy-sIn},	2PL {-GAy-sIn-dAr},

The plural suffix {-LAr} cannot be added to the 3P marker.

Yakut possesses optative markers derived from *{-GA-K}, e.g. *Bar-ïay-ïm* ~ *Bar-ïä-m* 'I will go'.

Optatives are negated with {-MA}, e.g. Turkmen 2SG *Öl-mä:-siñ* < **Öl-mä-yä-siñ* 'May you not die', Uyghur 2PL *Kir-mi-gäy-si-lär* 'May you not enter'. Kazakh displays the following forms:

Examples (*bar-* ‘to go’, *žaz-* ‘to write’, *ket-* ‘to leave’, *kör-* ‘to see’, *küt-* ‘to wait’): 1SG *Bar-ma-yay-mìn*, 1PL *Kör-me-gey-miz*, 2SG *Küt-pe-gey-siñ*, 2SG.POL *Kör-me-gey-siz*, 2PL *Žaz-ba-yay-siñ-dar*, 2PL.POL *Ket-pe-gey-siz-der*, 3P *Žaz-ba-yay*, *Ket-pe-gey*.

Old West Oghuz possessed the 1SG marker $\{-(y)A-mAn\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä-män* ‘I will come’, opposed to the volitive marker $\{-(y)AyIn\}$ or $\{-(A)yIn\}$. The Old Anatolian Turkish 1SG marker $\{-(y)Ay-vAn\} \sim \{-(y)A-vAn\}$, e.g. *Gör-äy-vän* ‘I will see’, *Bul-a-van* ‘I will find’, was replaced by $\{-(y)A-m\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä-m* ‘I will come’, *Diñlä-yä-m* ‘I will listen’. This marker was, in turn, replaced by $\{-(y)A-yIm\}$, whose shape was influenced by the volitive marker. East Anatolian dialects have preserved $\{-(y)Am\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä-m* ‘I will come’. Azeri has $\{-(y)A-m\} < \{-(y)A-mAn\}$, e.g. *Al-a-m* ‘I will take’, *Gör-ä-m* ‘I will see’. However, Turkish $\{-(y)A-m\}$, e.g. $\langle$ Gel-e-m $\rangle$ ‘I will come’, has fallen into disuse.

The Old West Oghuz 1PL marker {-y)A-vUz}, e.g. *Gör-ä-vüz* ‘We will see’, changed to {-y)A-yUz} ~ {-y)A-yIz}. The negative form changed to {-mA-yIz}, thus merging with the 1PL aorist. The old marker was partly replaced by {-y)A-K}, e.g. *Gäl-ä-k* ‘We will come’. This marker was finally ousted by the voluntative, but it is still found in peripheral dialects, e.g. *Gid-ä-k* ~ *Gid-ä-γ* ‘We will go’. Azeri has

{-(y)A-G}, e.g. *Al-a-ġ* ‘We will take’, *Gör-ä-k* ‘We will see’. Tebriz Azeri exhibits 1PL {-(y)A-χ}. Turkish {-(y)A-K}, e.g. *«Gel-e-k»* ‘We will come’, is still in use.

The West Oghuz 2SG marker is {-(y)A-sIn}. Azeri exhibits {-(y)A-sAn}, e.g. *Al-a-san* ‘You will take’, *Gör-ä-sän* ‘You will see’. Turkish shows {-(y)A-sIn}, e.g. *«Gel-e-sin»* ‘You will come’; dialects also display {-(y)A-sIn} ~ {-(y)AsIn}.

The 2PL marker is {-(y)A-sInIz}, e.g. Turkish *«Gel-e-siniz»* ‘You will come’, Azeri *Al-a-sinüz* ‘You will take’, *Gör-ä-siniz* ‘You will see’. Dialects display {-(y)A-sIz}, {-(y)A-sInIz}, etc. Tebriz Azeri exhibits {-(y)A-sUz}.

The 3SG marker is {-(y)A}, e.g. Azeri *Al-a* ‘X will take’, *Gör-ä* ‘X will see’, *Gäl-ä* ‘X will come’, ‘May X come’. Turkish {-(y)A}, e.g. *«Gel-e»* ‘X will come’, is now obsolete.

The 3PL marker is {-(y)A-lAr}, e.g. Azeri *Al-a-lar* ‘They will see’, *Gör-ä-lär* ‘They will see’. Turkish {-(y)A-lAr}, e.g. *«Gel-e-ler»* ‘They will come’, is obsolete.

South Oghuz mostly displays the following markers:

1SG {-(y)A-m}	1PL {-(y)A-K}
2SG {-(y)A-sAn} ~ {-(y)A-n}	2PL {-(y)A-nIz}
3SG {-(y)A}	3PL {-(y)A-lAr}.

There are numerous other South Oghuz forms.

Some Khorasan Oghuz varieties display the non-Oghuz marker {-(GA)} ~ {-GAy}, e.g. *Ber-ġäy-siz* ‘You will/must give’.

The Khorezmian Turkic optative marker is {-(y)A}, a feature copied from Oghuz.

Older Turkmen markers of the type 1SG {-(y)A-mAn} and 1PL {-(y)A-K} vanished early, but 2SG {-(y)A-sIn} and 2PL {-(y)A-sInIz} also occur later on.

5.5. Decline of the optative

In several languages, the optative has declined and fallen into decay. Sometimes only parts of its paradigms were preserved. In Tatar, Uzbek and some other languages, the simple optative markers are lacking almost entirely.

The reason is that the semantics of the optatives largely overlapped with that of the voluntatives. The moods conveyed similar meanings, and there were often no clearcut boundaries between the types. The functions of the optative were largely taken over by voluntative, forms of the hypothetical mood in {-sA} and of the aorist.

The close relations between the moods have parallels in many other languages. A well-known case is the development of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative, whose close similarity led to fusion, i.e. absorption of the subjunctive by the optative.

In some modern Turkic languages, simple optatives only occur as archaisms and in formulaic expressions, e.g. Uzbek *Yâz-yay* ‘May X write’, Kazakh *Köp žasa-yay-sin* ‘May you live long’, Turkmen *Toy-un ħut-li bol-a* ‘May your feast be happy’.

They are often obsolete in other usages. Optatives are still common in Khorezmian varieties, which are not Uzbek dialects.

The Tatar optative in {-GAy} was once vital, with forms such as 1SG {-GAy-Im}, 2SG {-GAy-In}, 3SG {-GAy-I}. In modern Tatar, it has vanished except for some petrified remnants. Negated forms are sometimes still used in an admonitive sense, as warnings against possible undesired events, e.g. *Al-ma-ḡay-ī* 'X should not take it'. Bashkir {-GAy} is preserved in petrified remnants such as *bu-ḡay* 'it seems' < *bul-ḡay*. Turkmen first-person optatives vanished early, ousted by voluntatives.

The decline primarily concerned the simple optative forms. On combinations with past copulas see 5.8.

5.6. Ottoman Turkish

The danger of confusion of the two moods was especially high in the Oghuz branch, where the optative marker had the shape {(y)A} and was often hard to distinguish from voluntative markers. The Ottoman optative more and more overlapped semantically with the voluntative and partly fused with it. It was also closely intertwined with the aorist, which increasingly developed modal usages expressing inclination and predisposition.

Partial mergers took place. The functions of 1SG optative were taken over by the voluntative and the aorist. According to Deny, the 1SG voluntative ("imperative") marker was "en réalité simple doublet de la 1re person de l'optative" (1921: 932). The negated 1PL optative form {-m-AyIz} coincided with that of the aorist. The third-person markers had similar volitional functions as the voluntative markers, e.g. 2SG optative *Gäl-ä* vs. 2SG voluntative *Gäl-sin* ← *gäl-* 'to come'.

The first- and third-person markers went out of regular use by the 17th century. According to Adamović, who has attempted to determine the chronology of the decline (1985: 262), the 1SG optative marker {(y)A-m} lost its "future" function to the corresponding form of {(y)AġAG}. Other modal functions were taken over by the voluntative {(y)A-yIm}. The marker {(y)A-m} mostly vanished in the spoken language but was used in the written language well into the 18th century. It still occurs in East Anatolian dialects and in petrified forms in folk songs and folk tales.

The fate of the 1PL optative marker {(y)A-yIz} ~ {(A)-yIz} was similar. According to Adamović (1985: 266) it vanished in the spoken language by 1600, and its function was taken over by the 1PL voluntative marker {(y)AIIIm}. As noted, the negative form {-m-A-yIz} had already coincided with the negative form of the aorist. In the written language, {(y)A-yIz} ~ {(A)-yIz} retained its old functions until the 18th century. Apart from {-mA-yIz}, modern Standard Turkish exhibits no remnants of the 1PL optative form.

Only the second-person markers 2SG {(y)A-sIn} ~ {(y)A-sIn} and 2PL {(y)A-sInIz} ~ {(y)A-sInIz}, have been partly preserved in the spoken language.

Except for a few remnants, the Turkish simple optative paradigm has thus almost vanished.

The following replacements took place (*gäl-* 'to come'): 1SG optative $\{-(y)Am\}$, e.g. *Gäl-äm*, was replaced by 1SG voluntative $\{-(y)AyIm\}$, e.g. *Gäl-äyim*. 1PL optative $\{-(A)yIz\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä-yiz*, was replaced by 1PL voluntative $\{-(y)AlIm\}$, e.g. *Gäl-älim*. The third-person markers $\{-(y)A\}$ and $\{-(y)AlAr\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä*, *Gäl-ä-lär*, were replaced by $\{-sIn\}$ and $\{-sIn-lAr\}$, e.g. *Gäl-sin*, *Gäl-sin-lär*. The old opposition is still preserved in some dialects. In Standard Turkish, the optative occurs in formulaic expressions such as $\langle Kolay\ gel-e \rangle$ $\langle \text{easy come-OPT} \rangle$ 'May it (the work) come easy', $\langle Uğur-lar\ ol-a \rangle$ $\langle \text{good.luck-PL become-OPT} \rangle$ 'Good journey', and the older $\langle Boğaz\ ol-a \rangle$ $\langle \text{throat become-OPT} \rangle$ 'Enjoy your meal'. Even here, however, it tends to be replaced by the voluntative, e.g. $\langle Kolay\ gel-sin \rangle$ $\langle \text{easy come-VOL} \rangle$.

The second-person markers $\{-(y)A-sIn\}$ and $\{-(y)A-sInIz\}$, e.g. *Gäl-ä-sin*, *Gäl-ä-siniz*, could not be replaced, since no corresponding voluntative markers existed. *Gäl!* and *Gäl-in(iz)!* are imperatives and thus not qualified as substitutes. The second-person optative thus remained longer. Forms such as $\{-(y)A-sIn\}$ and $\{-(y)A-sInIz\}$ are still used in vernaculars; this is also the case in Gagauz, e.g. 2SG *Al-a-sîn* and 2PL *Al-a-sîñiz* ← *al-* 'to take'. In Standard Turkish, the types 2SG $\langle \text{Gel-e-sin} \rangle$ and 2PL $\langle \text{Gel-e-siniz} \rangle$ have been used until recently, e.g. in formal styles and in warnings or relayed commands; see avertive sentences such as $\langle \text{Sakın unut-ma-ya-sın} \rangle$ $\langle \text{beware forget-NEG-OPT-2SG} \rangle$ 'You should make sure not to forget it'.

5.7. Preserved optatives

The optatives are largely preserved in Azeri, South Oghuz and some Balkan and East Anatolian dialects of Turkish (*gör-* 'to see'):

1SG $\{-(y)Am\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä-m</i>	1PL $\{-(y)AK\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä-k</i>
2SG $\{-(y)ASAn\}$ e.g. <i>Gör-ä-sän</i>	2PL $\{-(y)ASİz\}$ e.g. <i>Gör-ä-siz</i>
3SG $\{-(y)A\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä</i>	3PL $\{-(y)AlAr\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä-lär</i>

2SG variants are $\{-(y)A-sIn\} \sim \{-(y)A-sİñ\}$, 2PL variants $\{-(y)A-sInIz\} \sim \{-(y)A-sİñIz\}$,

Certain Azeri dialects of Iran such as Tebriz Azeri, northwestern South Oghuz dialects and Khorasan Oghuz dialects maintain the voluntative vs. optative oppositions: 1SG $\{-(y)Im\}$ vs. 1SG $\{-(y)Am\}$ and 3SG $\{-sIn\} \sim \{-sİñ\} \sim \{-sI\}$ vs. 3SG $\{-(y)A\}$. Examples (*gör-* 'to see', *oxu-* 'to read'):

VOLUNTATIVE 1SG $\{-(y)Im\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ü-m</i> , <i>Oxu-yu-m</i>
OPTATIVE 1SG $\{-(y)Am\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä-m</i> , <i>Oxu-ya-m</i>
VOLUNTATIVE 3SG $\{-sIn\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-sün</i> , <i>Oxu-sun</i>
OPTATIVE 3SG $\{-(y)A\}$, e.g. <i>Gör-ä</i> , <i>Oxu-ya</i>

In the first-person plural, the optative in $\{-(y)AG\}$ is generalized in almost all dialects.

In many cases, the oppositions are neutralized. There are often fused paradigms, with volutative markers replacing optative markers or *vice versa*. Some varieties have generalized the OPT-1SG marker $\{-(y)A-m\}$ and the OPT-1PL marker $\{-(y)A-G\}$. Certain Khorasan Oghuz dialects distinguish OPT-1SG $\{-(y)A-m\}$ and VOL-1SG $\{-(y)Im\}$, while others use $\{-(y)A-m\}$ in both functions. 1PL $\{-(y)A-G\}$ is normally used for both. There is usually an OPT-2PL marker $\{-(y)A-\eta I z\}$. VOL-3SG markers have often replaced OPT-3SG markers.

5.7.1. Standard Azeri

In modern Standard Azeri, the optative is still highly productive. The paradigmatic relationship between the optative (‹arzu şəkli›) and the volutative (‹əmr şəkli›) is as follows (*get-* ‘to go’):

OPT-1SG $\{-(y)A-m\}$, <i>Ged-ä-m</i>	VOL-1SG $\{-(y)Im\}$, <i>Ged-i-m</i>
OPT-1PL $\{-(y)A-K\}$, <i>Ged-ä-k</i>	VOL-1PL —
OPT-2SG $\{-(y)A-sAn\}$, <i>Ged-ä-sän</i>	VOL-2SG —
OPT-2PL $\{-(y)A-sI(nI)z\}$, <i>Ged-ä-si(ni)z</i>	VOL-2PL —
OPT-3SG $\{-(y)A\}$, <i>Ged-ä</i>	VOL-3SG $\{-sIn\}$, <i>Get-sin</i>
OPT-3PL $\{-(y)A-lAr\}$, <i>Ged-ä-lär</i>	VOL-3PL $\{-sIn-lAr\}$, <i>Get-sin-lär</i>

5.7.2. Turkish and Gagauz

In modern Turkish, the development has led to a contamination of optatives and volutatives. Grammarians tend to subsume volutative and optative markers under one unified volitional (“subjunctive”) pseudo-paradigm with members of heterogeneous origin: volutatives for the first and third persons and optatives for the second person. The first- and second-person markers are sometimes even thought to possess a shared “suffix” $\{-(y)A\}$, e.g. in ‹Gel-e› and ‹Gid-eli-m›, which is historically incorrect. Examples (‹gel-› ‘to come’):

VOL-1SG $\{-(y)Ay-Im\}$, ‹Gel-ey-im›	VOL-1PL $\{-(y)All-m\}$, ‹Gel-eli-m›
OPT-2SG $\{-(y)A-sIn\}$, ‹Gel-e-sin›	OPT-2PL $\{-(y)A-sInIz\}$, ‹Gel-e-siniz›
VOL-3SG $\{-sIn\}$, ‹Gel-sin›	VOL-3PL $\{-sIn-lAr\}$, ‹Gel-sin-ler›

Gagauz exhibits a similar pseudo-paradigm.

5.8. Counterfactual optatives with past copula particles

Combinations of optative with copula particles of the type *är-di*, *e-di*, *i-di* have proven more viable than simple optatives. In many Turkic languages such as Turkmen, Karachay-Balkar, Crimean Tatar, Kumyk and Kirghiz, optatives almost exclusively occur in such combinations. They express counterfactual wishes, e.g. Kazakh *Bar-yay e-di* ‘Would that X went’, Turkish ‹Keşke gid-ey-di-m› ‘I wish I had gone’,

⟨Gele-y-di⟩ ‘Would that X had come’. Uyghur combinations are contracted to {-Giy-ti} and similar forms, e.g. *Al-mi-yiy-ti* ← *al-ma-* ‘not to take’.

5.9. Inclusive and exclusive 1PL markers

Some Turkic languages distinguish exclusive and inclusive (non-exclusive) 1PL forms. The inclusive forms may include the addressee(s), whereas the exclusive forms do not.

For instance, Altay Turkic displays the exclusive marker {-AIIK}://{:-IIK} and the inclusive marker {-AIIK-tAr}://{:-IIK-tAr}. Corresponding markers are West Siberian (Tomsk) {- (A)IIK} vs. {- (A)IIK-lAr}, Tuvan {- (A)II} vs. {- (A)II-ηAr} < *{- (I)η-lAr}, Tofan {-A:II}://{:-II} vs. {-A:II-ηAr}://{:-II-ηAr}, Khakas and Shor {-A:η}://{:-η} vs. {-A:ηAr}://{:-ηAr}. The exclusive plural markers have a relatively simple shape, whereas the inclusive markers are extended, derived from the simpler forms by means of plural markers.

The South Siberian Turkic inclusives have often been described as duals in the sense of ‘you and me’, ‘the two of us’. Pritsak’s definition of the Khakas and Shor non-exclusive suffixes as dual markers (1959: 618, 638) is categorically rejected by Menges (1968: 140).

The Yakut 1PL optative {-IA-K} excludes the addressee(s), e.g. *Bar-ia-χ* ‘We (not you) will go’, negated {-Im-IA-K}, e.g. *Bar-īm-ia-χ*. The 1PL markers {-IAγ-Iη} and {-IAγ-Aγ-Iη} may include the addressee(s), e.g. *Bar-ia-y-iη* ‘Let us go’, negated *Bar-īm-ia-y-iη*.

The situation in Siberian Turkic might suggest that the distinctions in question have been copied from neighboring Mongolic and Tungusic languages, which possess similar patterns. Similar distinctions in Turkmen may indicate that they may nonetheless ultimately go back to Proto-Turkic distinctions.

Standard Turkmen possesses the 1PL volutative markers {-AII}://{:-II} and {-AII:η}://{:-II:η}. The latter, which is derived from the simpler form, may exhort one or more addressees to act together with the addresser, e.g. *Gödlä-li:η* ‘Let us (all) look’. The simpler form is described as a dual, exhorting one single addressee to act together with the addresser, e.g. *Yad-ali* ‘Let us (two) write’, *Ya:ša-li* ‘Let us (two) live’.

6. The hypothetical mood

Most Turkic languages possess a hypothetical mood used in main clauses. It is an imaginative mood, expressing a possible reality, presenting a situation as seen by the mind’s eye in the sense of ‘Imagine it is the case!’, ‘What if it is the case?’. As such, it can convey volitional meanings of desire, wish and hope. It is an old volitional mood with functions largely overlapping with those of the volutative and the optative.

The independent use in main clauses is nowadays rather infrequent. The markers are mostly used as converb suffixes expressing hypothetical conditions in the protasis

of conditional sentences. It is often assumed that the hypothetical marker was originally a converb marker that developed into a finite marker (Pritsak 1963: 44, Tekin 1968: 185–186), but the independent use may well have been the primary one.

Orkhon Turkic and Old Uyghur exhibit the marker {-sAr}, to which person-number markers of the pronominal type are added, e.g. HYP-1SG *Al-sar män* ← *al-* ‘to take’. It may go back to the aorist of *sa:-* ‘to count, to think’. Since this verb had a long vowel (cf. *sa:n* ‘number’), an early aorist **sa:yur* may be supposed.

Only the Siberian branch has preserved the ancient suffix provided with person-number markers of the pronominal type. Yakut displays {-TAr} instead of {-sAr}. If the initial dental corresponds to Common Turkic *s*, it represents an irregular sound development. Forms of *bar-* ‘to go’:

1SG <i>Bar-dar-bîn</i>	1PL <i>Bar-dar-bît</i>
2SG <i>Bar-dar-ğîn</i>	2PL <i>Bar-dar-ğît</i>
3SG <i>Bar-dar</i>	3PL <i>Bar-dar-lar</i>

The marker {-sA} occurs from late Old Uyghur and Karakhanid on. Person-number markers of the possessive type, as used in the preterite paradigm, are generalized from early Chaghatay on, e.g. 1SG *Al-sa-m*, 1PL *Al-sa-ķ*. Person-number markers of this type are used in modern languages.

The origin of the new marker is unclear. East Old Turkic {-sA} and {-čA} seem to be allomorphs, e.g. *Bol-sa* ~ *Bol-ča* ← *bol-* ‘to become/be’. A similar relationship is found between the voluntative forms *Bol-zun* ~ *Bol-čun* ‘May X become/be’. The marker {-sA} has not necessarily emerged from {-sAr} through loss of *-r*. It does not show any traces of vowel length; Turkmen {-θA} has a short vowel. The occurrence of {-sA} in Chuvash shows that it existed in Proto-Turkic. The marker has also been explained in many other ways. It has been connected with an Altaic verb stem ‘to say’; cf. Manchu *-se*. There have also been attempts to derive it from the desiderative marker {-(I)G-sA-r}, which is not possible.

Modern languages possess markers of the type {-sA}, including Turkmen {-θA} and Bashkir {-hA}. Kazakh has the following paradigm:

1SG {-sA-m}	1PL {-sA-K}
2SG {-sA-η}, polite {-sA-ηIz}	2PL {-sA-η-dAr}, polite {-sA-ηIz-dAr}
	3P {-sA}

Negated:

1sg {-MA-sA-m}	1pl {-MA-sA-K}
2SG {-MA-sA-η}	2PL {-MA-sA-η-dAr},
polite {-MA-sA-ηIz}	polite {-MA-sA-ηIz-dAr}
	3P {-MA-sA}

The hypothetical mood expresses cautious, polite wishes and suggestions, e.g. Ottoman *Bak-sa-m* {look-HYP-1SG} ‘I will look’, ‘What if I look?’, *Gäl-sä-ñiz* {come-HYP-2PL} ‘What if you come?’, *Gir-sä-k* {enter-HYP-2PL} ‘Imagine that we enter’, Uzbek *Kel-sä-ñ* {come-HYP-2SG} ‘Imagine that you come’, ‘What if you came?’, *Ye-sä-k* {eat-HYP-1PL} ‘What if we ate?’, modern Turkish {*Ne pişir-se-m?*} ‘What shall I cook?’.

Second-person forms can be used instead of imperatives for more respectful or ‘benedictive’ requests, as a polite paraphrase of imperatives, e.g. Altay Turkic *Käl-zäñ!* ‘Please come!’. In Turkish familiar registers, imperatives are, as noted above (3.8), extended by a hypothetical form plus {-A} to express mild requests and encouragement.

Forms of the hypothetical mood provided with a copula such as *är-di*, *e-di*, *i-di* ‘was’ may express unfulfilled wishes, e.g. Uyghur *Yamyur yağ-si-ti!* {rain rain-HYP-PTCL} ‘If only it would rain!’. They can also express polite requests.

7. Modal facets of the aorist

The Turkic so-called aorist is originally an intraterminal category, for instance usable as a present tense item. A form such as *At-ar* could be used in a focal sense, ‘X is throwing’, and in less focal senses, ‘X throws’, ‘X usually throws’, ‘X will throw’. Almost all Turkic varieties have introduced new high-focal intraterminals. The aorist has therewith been limited to secondary functions. It has become a low-focal intraterminal used for general, generic statements or interpretable as habituality and with modal meanings such as inclination, intention, tendency, deontic or epistemic possibility or probability, e.g. ‘will act’, ‘intends to act’, ‘may act’, ‘tends to act’, ‘is likely to act’, etc. In many languages, particularly in the central parts of the Turkic-speaking areas, defocalization has developed further. The aorist categories of Noghay, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Uzbek, etc., mostly labeled “future”, “indefinite future” or “suppositional future”, have almost lost their aspectual values, representing the last residue of an originally indicative category.

This development is known from many other languages. Volitionals often go back to old indicatives, whose basic function has been formally renewed by new formations. The Indo-European *-e/o*-future-subjunctive, evidenced by Indo-Iranian, Greek and Latin, goes back to an old present which was ousted and limited to secondary functions.

In Chuvash, the aorist has survived as the so-called “indefinite future”, e.g. 1SG *Šir-ï-p* {Сырăп} ‘I will write’, *Vul-ï-p* {Вулăп} ‘I will read’, *İran kil-ï-p* {Іран килăп} ‘I will come tomorrow’, 3SG *Kil-ï* {Килă} ‘X will come’. The paradigm is as follows (*tup*- ‘to find’):

1SG *Tup-ï-p* {Тупăп}

2SG *Tup-ï-n* {Тупăн}

3SG *Tup-ï* {Тупă}

1PL *Tup-ï-pîr* {Тупăпăр}

2PL *Tup-ï-r* {Тупăр}

3PL *Tup-ï-ş* {Тупăç}

The marker $\{-(\emptyset)I\}$ does not, as has been claimed, represent the optative base $\{-GAy\}$. The postconsonantal alternants are reconstructable as $\{-Vr\}$, the postvocalic ones as $\{-yUr\}$, both with loss of $-r$ (Johanson 1975: 135).

7.1. Counterfactuals

As with the other volitionals, the addition of a copular particle such as *är-di*, *e-di* ‘was’ can convey counterfactual meaning, e.g. Kazakh *Bar-ar e-di* ‘X would go’, Turkish $\langle \text{Gel-ir-di} \rangle < \langle \text{Gel-ir i-di} \rangle$ ‘X would come’, Kumyk *Bar-ar-dī-m < Bar-ar e-di-m* ‘I would go’, *Bar-mas-ī-dī-m < Bar-mas e-di-m* ‘I did not use to go’, Karachay-Balkar *Ĵaz-ar e-di* ‘X would write’. Bashkir *İslä-r i-ni-m* ‘I would make it’. Comparable counterfactual constructions occur with the Khakas assertive past marker $\{-J\dot{I}K\}$, e.g. $\{-(A)r-jI\chi\}$.

The Chuvash marker $\{(\emptyset)I-tt\}$ expresses counterfactuality, e.g. *Yul-ī-ttī-m* ‘I would stay’, *Ŝir-ī-ttī-m* ‘I would write’, *Pul-ī-ttī-m* ‘I would be’. The paradigm is as follows (*tup-* ‘to find’):

1SG <i>Tup-ī-ttī-m</i> $\langle \text{Тупăттăм} \rangle$	1PL <i>Tup-ī-ttī-mĭr</i> $\langle \text{Тупăттăмăр} \rangle$
2SG <i>Tup-ī-ttī-n</i> $\langle \text{Тупăттăн} \rangle$	2PL <i>Tup-ī-ttī-r</i> $\langle \text{Тупăттăр} \rangle$
3SG <i>Tup-ī-čč-ī</i> $\langle \text{Тупăччă} \rangle$	3PL <i>Tup-ī-čč-ī-š</i> $\langle \text{Тупăччăш} \rangle$

The marker does not, as has been claimed, derive from a construction with *tĭr-* $\langle \text{тăр-} \rangle$ ‘to stand, to be’, preceded by a converb in $\{-I\}$. It is not a conditional or optative marker. *Tup-ī-ttī-m* does thus not correspond to Kipchak *Tap-γay är-di-m*, as some scholars have assumed. The form consists of the aorist marker + copular verb + person-number marker, thus corresponding to *Tap-ar är-di-m*; cf. Turkish $\langle \text{Yaz-ar-dım} \rangle$ ‘I would write’ $< \langle \text{Yaz-ar i-di-m} \rangle$ (Johanson 1975).

7.2. Chuvash concessive volitionals

Chuvash possesses a relatively infrequent concessive mood for the first and third persons. It expresses concessive notions (‘even if’) but also counterfactual wishes when followed by the past marker $\{-čč\}$, corresponding to Common Turkic *är-di*. The concessive marker $\{-in\}$ is added to the aorist and the imperative, respectively, and thus follows the person-number suffixes. The paradigm is as follows (*pĭl-* ‘to know’, *vula-* ‘to read’):

1SG <i>Pĭl-ī-p-in</i> $\langle \text{Пăлăпин} \rangle$	1PL <i>Pĭl-ī-pĭr-in</i> $\langle \text{Пăлăпăрин} \rangle$
3SG <i>Pĭl-in</i> $\langle \text{Пăлин} \rangle$	3PL <i>Pĭl-ī-š-in</i> $\langle \text{Пăлăшин} \rangle$
1SG <i>Vul-ī-p-in</i> $\langle \text{Вулăпин} \rangle$	1PL <i>Vul-ī-pĭr-in</i> $\langle \text{Вулăпăрин} \rangle$
3SG <i>Vul-in</i> $\langle \text{Вулин} \rangle$	3PL <i>Vul-ī-š-in</i> $\langle \text{Вулăшин} \rangle$

This mood is traditionally taken to form a paradigm together with the following suppletive 2P forms:

2SG <i>Pıl-ı-sın</i> «Пёлёсён»	2PL <i>Pıl-ı-sı-r</i> «Пёлёсёр»
2SG <i>Vul-ı-sın</i> «Вулăсăн»	2PL <i>Vul-ı-sır</i> «Вулăсăр»

These forms are identical with the corresponding aorist forms, though distinguished from them by different person-number markers. *Tup-ı-sın* «Тупăсăн» contrasts with the aorist *Tup-ı-n* «Тупăн», and *Tup-ı-sır* «Тупăсăр» contrasts with the aorist *Tup-ı-r* «Тупăр».

8. Particles accompanying volitional moods

Particles are sometimes necessary for forming specific volitional constructions. It was noted above that enclitic particles of the type {-çU}, {-çI}, {-çİ}, {-şU}, {-şI} may be added to imperatives in order to soften the request, e.g. Karakalpak *Kör-şi!* 'See!'. They can also be added to Chuvash forms containing {-sAm}, e.g. *Par-sam-ç:ı* 'Please give it!', *Pulış-sam-ç:ı!* 'Please help!'. Particles of this type are added to voluntatives, e.g. Kazakh *Bar-ayın şi* 'Please, I will go', Chuvash *İtlä-tır-ç:ı* 'X should listen'. Particles of this type often accompany the hypothetical mood in its volitional use, preventing purely conditional readings. e.g. Karakalpak *Kör-se-η-şi* 'You should see it', Kazakh *Kel-se şi* 'I hope X would come', Turfan *Kel-zä-çi* 'Would that X came', Taranchi *Qıl-sä-k-çü* 'We will do it'. The Chuvash particle {-ç:ı} // {-ç:ı} has the same function when added to the past aorist, e.g. *Kur-ıtt-ı-m-ç:ı* «Курăттăмччĕ» 'Would that I saw'. For a detailed account of Kazakh particles of this kind see Abish (forthcoming).

In modern Uyghur, hypothetical forms followed by the particle {kän} (< *ikän*) are used for modest requests, e.g. *U käl-si-kän* {X come-HYP-PTCL} 'May X come/ I wish X would come', *Bar-si-ηiz-kän* {go-HYP-2PL PTCL} 'I wish you would go'.

The addition of the particle {-lA} to Tuvan optatives to express consent, etc. was mentioned above. The same usage is found in several other South Siberian languages, e.g. Altay *Käl-gäy-im-lä* 'I will come'.

The Chuvash particle {-χα} softens requests, commands or suggestions, e.g. imperative 1PL *An şavl-ır-χα!* 'Do not make noise!', voluntative 1SG *Kiläm-χα* 'I will come', 3SG *Il-tır-χα* 'X should take it'. Karaim possesses an impersonal inhortative in *-mAs-χα*, denoting strong discouragement, e.g. *Urla-mas-χα* 'One shall not steal'.

The particle *dik* occurs in East Middle Turkic, e.g. *Tur dik!* 'Please stay!' in the poetry of Mir 'Ali-Şer Nāvā'ī (Brockelmann 1917: 225). Imperatives and voluntatives in Khakas and other modern languages take on a similar corroborative particle {-DAK}.

Forms of *qoy-* can be used as permissive particles in the sense of 'to let', e.g. in Gagauz imperative sentences such as *Qo git-sin!* 'Let X go!', *Qo gel-sin-när* 'Let them come'. Iranian Azeri uses the imperative *Ġoy!* in similar ways, e.g. *Ġoy o işlä-*

sin! ‘Let it/see to it that X does it!’. The volutative forms 1SG *Ġoy-um* and 3SG *Ġoy-sun* are used as well, e.g. *Ġoy-um o bunu iſlä-sin* ‘I will see to it that X does this’, *Ġoy-sun män bunu iſlä-yim* ‘X shall see to it that I do this’.

9. Benedictive and maledictive markers

Benedictive and maledictive markers constitute a specific type of volitional markers. Old Uyghur and East Middle Turkic languages such as Chaghatay possess the marker {-GUr}, e.g. *Ol öl-gür* ‘May X die’, which may derive from {-GU} + the copula *är-ür*. Several modern Turkic languages use the equivalents {-GUr} ~ {-Gİr} ~ {-Gİr} in curses and good wishes, e.g. Kumyk *Ana-ŋ öl-gür* ‘May your mother die’, Tatar *Kul-ŋ qur-ğır-ı* ‘May your hand wither’, Bashkir *Tıl-ŋ quru-gur* ‘May your tongue dry up’, Noghay *Köz-ŋ ſik-kir* ‘May your eye(s) be put out’, Kazakh *Öl-gir* ‘May X die’, Uzbek *Bây bol-gir* ‘May X become rich’, *Kör bol-gir* ‘May X become blind’, *Üy-i kuy-gir* ‘May his/her house burn’, Uyghur *Öl-gür* ‘May X die’, Khalaj *Say ol-yur* ‘May X be alive/in good health’, *Ku:or ol-yur* ‘May X be blind’. Though {-GUr} is normally not productive in Oğuz, it occurs in Salar, e.g. *Var-yur* ‘May X go’, *Vär-gür* ‘May X give’. Forms in {-GUr} can also be used adnominally, e.g. Kumyk *nalat bol-yur taw* ‘the damn mountain’.

A close semantic counterpart is Turkish {- (y)AsI} ~ {- (y)AsI-jA}, which has vanished except in some expressions employed for cursing. It is an imprecative element, used to invoke evil, i.e. to wish misfortune upon others, e.g. <Kör ol-ası> ‘May X become blind’, <Öl-esi-ce> ‘May Y die’, <Evi yan-ası-ca> ‘May X’s house burn’. It was once also used adnominally, e.g. <can-ı çık-ası karı> ‘the accursed woman’ (‘the may-her-soul-come-out woman’; Lewis 1967: 161).

In modern languages, the types {-GUr} ~ {-Gİr} and {- (y)AsI} ~ {- (y)AsI-jA} have mostly been replaced by volutative markers, e.g. Turkish <Sağ ol-sun> ‘May X be safe and sound’.

List of notations and abbreviations

Brackets of the type <> are used for glosses.

Small brackets of the type <> are used for orthographic forms. Standard Turkish examples are always quoted in orthographic forms.

Curly brackets of the type {} are used for morphophonemic transcriptions.

Hyphens are used to indicate morpheme boundaries.

The sign < means ‘has developed from’, and > means ‘has developed into’.

Simple arrows are used for morphological derivation. Thus ← means ‘is derived from’.

Double slashes // can be used to indicate postconsonantal and postvocalic alternants in one formula.

The sign Ø is used for a zero element.

A bracketed initial consonant sign indicates a glide that occurs after stem-final vowels and is absent after stem-final consonants. A bracketed initial zero sign (Ø)

indicates that a stem-final vowel is dropped when the marker is added. An initial {-:} indicates that the stem-final vowel is lengthened.

In examples, X indicates a pronoun that can be rendered as ‘it/he/she’ or ‘it/him/her’ in the English translation.

Abbreviations

HYP	hypothetic	P	person	PRET	preterite
IMP	imperative	PASS	passive	PTCL	particle
NEC	necessitative	PL	plural	SG	singular
NEG	negation	POL	polite form	VOL	voluntative
OPT	optative	POSS	possessive		

References

- Abish, Aynur (forthcoming) *Modality in Kazakh as spoken in China*. (Turcologica.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Adamović, Milan 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill.
- Benzing, Johannes 1959. Das Tschuwaschische. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.) *Philologiae turicae fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 695–751.
- Brockelmann, Carl 1917. *Ali's Qışsa-i Jūsuf*. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bühler, Karl 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: G. Fischer.
- Clark, Larry 1998. Turkmen reference grammar. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Clauson, Gerard, Sir 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Damourette, Jacques & Pichon, Edouard 1911–1940. *Des mots à la pensée. Essai de grammaire de la langue française*. Paris: J.-L.-L. d'Artrey.
- Deny, Jean 1921. *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli)*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1998. *Grammatik des Chaladsch*. (Turcologica 4.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gabain, Annemarie von 1941. *Altürkische Grammatik: mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen, auch neutürkisch*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium 24.) Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Jakobson, Roman 1960. Closing statements: Linguistics and poetics. In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.) *Style in language*. New York: Wiley. 350–377.
- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkischen Aspektsystems*. (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Johanson, Lars 1975. Das tschuwaschische Aoristthema. *Orientalia Suecana* 23–24, 106–158.
- Johanson, Lars 2005. Tuwinische Postverbien und chaladschische Imperative. In: Oelschlägel, Anett Christine & Nentwig, Ingo & Taube, Jakob (eds.) *'Roter Altai, gib Dein Echo!' – Festschrift für Erika Taube zum 65. Geburtstag*. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag. 183–186.
- Johanson, Lars 2009. Modals in Turkic. In: Hansen, Bjoern & de Haan, Ferdinand (eds.) *Modals in the languages of Europe. A reference work*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 44.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 487–510.

- Johanson, Lars 2011. Mood meets mood. In: Stolz, Thomas & Vanhove, Martine & Urdze, Aina & Otsuka, Hitomi (eds.) *Morphologies in contact*. (Studia Typologica 10.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 203–211.
- Johanson, Lars 2012. Notes on Turkic stance particles. In: Erdal, Marcel & Nevskaya, Irina & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Areal, historical and typological aspects of South Siberian Turkic*. (Turcologica 94.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 51–58.
- Johanson, Lars 2013a. The decline of the Ottoman optative. In: Demir, Nurettin & Karakoç, Birsal & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift / Éva Csató Armağanı*. Ankara: Hacettepe University. 253–260.
- Johanson, Lars 2013b. On non-canonical modal clause junction in Turkic. In: Josephson, Folke & Söhrman, Ingmar (eds.) *Diachronic and typological perspectives on verbs*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 134.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 159–171.
- Johanson, Lars 2014. On Old Turkic “vocative” moods. In: Ragagnin, Elisabetta & Wilkens, Jens (eds.) *Kutadgu nom bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission. 211–214.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Menges, Karl Heinrich 1968. *The Turkic languages and peoples*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Poppe, Nikolaus 1959. Das Jakutische. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 671–684.
- Pritsak, Omeljan 1959. Das Abakan- und Čulymtürkische und das Schorische. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 598–640.
- Pritsak, Omeljan 1963. Das Alttürkische. In: Spuler, Bertold (ed.) *Handbuch der Orientalistik Abt. I 5:1 Turkologie*. Leiden & Köln: Brill. 27–52.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf John 1952. *Einführung in die altaische Sprachwissenschaft 2, Formenlehre*. (Mémoires de la Société finno-ougrienne 104, 2.) Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Räsänen, Martti 1957. *Materialien zur Morphologie der türkischen Sprachen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica.
- Robbeets, Martine 2015. *Diachrony of verb morphology. Japanese and the Transeurasian languages*. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 291.) Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
- Tekin, Talât 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. Indiana & Bloomington: Mouton.