

glottothèque languages of Anatolia, Caucasus, Iran, Mesopotamia



Turkic in the LACIM area

Syntax II

Complex sentences and alternative strategies of clause combining ('loan syntax')

Christiane Bulut University of Cyprus

Nicosia, March 14, 2022

visit glottothèque at: https://spw.uni-goettingen.de/projects/lacim/

contents

- (1) Simple sentences
- (2) Complex sentences
- (3) Alternative or copied strategies of clause combining ('loan syntax')

(2) Complex Sentences

Complex sentences are constructions containing more than one verb.

- In contrast to e.g. Indo-European or Semitic languages, Turkic complex sentences contain **just one** *finite* **verb**.
- According to this definition, Turkic has **no subordinated clauses based on finite verb forms**.
- The Turkic equivalent to Indo-European (or Semitic) subordinated clauses are structures based on *non-finite* verb forms (= subjunctors), such as verbal nouns and gerunds.
- These non-finite verb forms cannot occur independently, as they rely on the finite verb for necessary informations concerning time/mood, or agent. On their own, they would be untranslatable.

Non-finite verb forms

The basic principle of Turkic syntax: INFINITIZATION, NOMINALIZATION of subordinated or dependent clauses

Non-finite verb forms ('subjunctors') forming subordinated or dependent clauses



Nominalized action clauses: *Complement clauses*

(after verbae sentiendi et dicendi or modal verbs)

The CC below is based on the verbal noun in {-DIK}; syntactically the VN is in the position of a complement (in this case: ACC object) of the finite verb 'you said'. (1a) Bekle-diğ-i-ni → → → söyledin. wait:VN.POSS3SG.ACC → say:PST2SG 'You said that (s)he is/was waiting.'

An agent of the CC can be introduced as a genitive to the VN, as in ex. (1b): (1b) (Arkadas-im-in) → bekle-diğ-i-ni → → söyledin. friend:POSS1SG.GEN+wait:VN.POSS3SG.ACCsay:PST2SG 'You said that (my friend)/(s)he is/was waiting.'

```
A similar construction based on the verbal noun in {-mE} yields a modal CC
(2)→Arkadaş-ım-ın→ → bekle-me-si-ni→ → → söyledin.
friend:POSS1SG.GEN → wait:VN.POSS3SG.ACC → say:PST2SG
'You said that my friend should wait.'
```

(3) Alternative subordination strategies in Turkic CCs

Many older and present day Turkic languages also may apply Indo-European patterns to form CCs. These alternative constructions are still used in Standard Turkish, see ex. (3.a) and (3.b) below:

Turkic type

→ → 'I hope it will be useful to you.'
Alternative Indo-European type

 $(3.b) \rightarrow Um - ar - im \rightarrow \rightarrow (ki) \rightarrow \rightarrow is - iniz - e \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow yar - ar \rightarrow \rightarrow is - iniz - e \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow yar - ar \rightarrow - yar \rightarrow - yar - ar \rightarrow - yar - ar \rightarrow$

→ → hope:AOR1SG→(CONJ) work:POSS2PL.DAT→to be useful:AOR3SG

Turkic vs. Indo-European strategies in CCs

some characteristic differences

Turkic type CC	Indo-European (Iranian) CC
pre-positive (precedes the MC)/	post-positive (follows the MC)
left-branching	or right-branching
non-finite verb form	finite verb form
(VN, PART)	
no conjunctor	(conjunctor ki is possible, but
	rarely used)

After modal verbs or impersonal modal expressions, CCs are based

- on a modal VN, such as {-mAK, -mA, -(y)EcEK} (Turkic type),
- or a modal finite verb form in the aorist, prospective, optative, <u>voluntative</u>, imperative etc. (Indo-European type).

Models of CCs after *iste 'to want' in the MC: 'I want to go.'*

In the Turkic construction below, the dependent verb is nominalized. The modal/non-factive VN in {-mAk} is in the position of an unmarked direct object of the modal verb 'to want'.

In the LACIM areal, most CCs reflect the Indo-European type:

Turkic type:	Indoeuropean type:		
Turkish of Turkey	Modern Persian		
<u>Gitmek</u> istiyorum	<u>Mixwâham</u> beravam		
go:VN want:PRS1SG	DUR-want:PRS1SG go:SUB1SG		
	Iran/Iraq-Turkic		
	İstiräm gidäm want:PRS1 <u>SG go</u> :OPT1SG		
	Urum		
	ist-i:r-im gid-äm		
	want:PRS1SG_go: OPT1SG		

The example from Cypriot Turkic could go back to an older Iranian model. It could also owe its existence to more recent contacts with Cypriot Greek.

? Cypriot Turkish

İste-me-zgit-sinokul-a.want:NEG.AOR3SGgo:VOL3SGschool:DAT'He/she doesn't want to go to school.'

Compare the Greek model:

 Δ εν θέλει να πάει (στο) σχολείο. not want:PRS3SG that <u>go:SUBJ</u>3SG (<u>PREP.ART</u>)school

Relative constructions

Turkic type relative constructions

The choice of the non-finite subjunctor of the RC

In Turkic non-finite relative clauses, the choice of the non-finite verb form/subjunctor (= verbal nouns and participles) depends on the relation between the head and its corelate in the relative clause.

Relativization of the nominative; same first agent in MC and RC:

(1a) (Beni) <u>bekle-yen</u> <u>adam</u> <u>öğretmen(-dir)</u>.
me <u>wait:PART</u> man <u>teacher:is</u>
'The man **who** is/was waiting (for me) is a teacher.'

The participle in $\{-(y)An\}$ also appears if the head is the possessor of the agent of the RC (relativization of the genitive); the new agent is marked with a possessive suffix, as in:

(1b) **Kızı** (beni) bekle-yen adam öğretmen(-dir). <u>daughter:POSS</u>3SG (me) wait: PART man <u>teacher:is</u> 'The man **whose daughter** is/was waiting (for me) is a teacher.' Relativization of other cases, such as the accusative, dative, locative or ablative, is based on the VNs in $\{-DIK\}$, or the prospective ('future') participle in $\{-(y)EcEk\}$ etc. Example no (2a) below illustrates coreference of the head of the relative clause with the direct object of the relative clause, or, in other words, the position relativized is the accusative. The first agent of the RC is encoded in a possessive suffix on the VN:

(2) Gördüğüm adam çok çalışıyor.
 see:<u>VN.POSS</u>1SG man much work:PRS3SG
 'The man (whom) I saw/see works very hard.'

Relative constructions imitating Indo-European models

(3a) o gelin ki al-di-ŋ hiş yara-ma-z. (Cypriot Turkic¹) DEM bride CONJ take:PST2SG nothing to be <u>useful:AOR.NEG</u>3SG

'The bride (whom) you took is not worth anything/is of no use.'

(3b) *Al-diğ-ın* gelin hiç (işe) yaramaz. (Standard Turkish) take:<u>VN.POSS</u>2SG bride nothing:DAT to be useful:AOR.NEG3SG

The new element, the conjunctor ki, is a global copy of the Iranian/Persian conjunctor ke. Its material shape points to the language which, at some point, must have served as a model for this type of relative construction. A translation into Modern Persian reveals more structural similarities:

(3a) <i>o</i>	gelin	ki	al- <u>dı</u> -ŋ	hiş	yara-ma-z.	(Cypriot Turkic)
(3c) In	'aruze	ke	gerefti	<u>hič</u>	be <u>dard</u> namixwore.	(Modern Persian)
DE	M bride	CONJ	take:PST2S	SG nothing	to be <u>useful:PRS.NEG</u> 3SG	

Turkic vs. Indo-European/Iranian strategies of relativization

Turkic type RC	Indo-European (Iranian) RC	
pre-positive (precedes the head)/	post-positive (follows the head)	
left-branching	or right-branching	
non-finite verb form	finite verb form	
(VN, PART)		
no <u>conjunctor</u>	RC introduced by conjunctor ki	

The basic principle of Turkic syntax: INFINITIZATION, NOMINALIZATION of subordinated or dependent clauses

Non-finite verb forms ('subjunctors') forming subordinated or dependent clauses



Turkic adverbial clauses are based on **non-finite verb forms** called <u>converbs</u> or gerunds. As a rule, gerunds are not independently marked for tense/mood/aspect; they adopt this information from the finite verb. Gerunds may express a time relation to the main verb, such as duration and anteriority, simultaneity, or posteriority. The temporal gerund in $\{-(y)E^2II^4\}$ in the example indicates 'since, as long as'.

(4a)-Yad veräli→ → čirax dasti→var.
remember:GER → → lantern→ → exist→
'As long as one remembers, there have been lanterns ... '

Theoretically, agent marking by an analytic pronoun is also possible: (4b) *(Biz) <u>yad veräli</u> → → čirax dasti →var. we → remember:GER → → lantern → → exist. 'As long as we remember, there have been lanterns' Across the areal, temporal clauses often imitate Iranian models; see $o \ vaex \ ke \ biz \ yadde de verärde:k^h$ 'ever since we can remember' in ex. (4c) below. The Iranian-type temporal clause is actually a relative clause to the basic segment/head (*vaxt* 'time'). It is based on a finite verb form *verärde:k* in the habitual past.

 $(4c) \rightarrow vax' \rightarrow ke \rightarrow b1z \rightarrow ya:d verärde:k^h,$ that $\rightarrow time \rightarrow CONJ \rightarrow we \rightarrow remember:AOR.PST1PL$

 $\underline{e:l} \rightarrow \underline{gala:rdp} \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \underline{b1zim} \rightarrow \underline{bu} \rightarrow \underline{daylarae}:$ tribe-come:AOR.PST3SG-our \rightarrow \rightarrow DEMmountain:PL.DAT-

'Ever since we can remember, nomads used to come to our mountains, ... '

Summary

- Turkic complex sentences contain just one single finite verb form. Dependent clauses rely on non-finite verb forms, such as verbal nouns and converbs/gerunds; see the examples of CCs, RCs, and ADV clauses above.
- Across the varieties of the LACIM areal, the Turkic principle of forming dependent clauses via nominalization and infinitization of verbs may be replaced by alternative Indo-European strategies of combining 2 or more clauses based on finite verb forms.

this lecture

is part of the series *Glottothèque: Languages of the Anatolia, Caucasus, Iran, Mesopotamia; grammatical snippets online*, ed. by. C. Bulut, A. Donabédian-Demopoulos, G. Haig, G. Khan, P. Samvelian, S. Skopeteas, N. Sumbatova. Bamberg/Cambridge/Göttingen/Moskow/Nicosia/Paris: LACIM network.

