

## **EVENT MODALITY IN BALKAN TURKISH. FORMAL AND SEMANTIC VARIATION IN CONTACT Part 2: Volitive modality**

**Julian Rentzsch**

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz  
rentzsch@uni-mainz.de

This article constitutes the second part of a two-part study on event modality in selected Turkish varieties spoken in Kosovo, North Macedonia, Bulgaria, and Eastern Thrace (Turkey). Building on the analysis of expressions of possibility and necessity in Part 1, this part investigates expressions of volitive modality and their intra- and inter-dialectal variation in Western Rumelian Turkish and Eastern Rumelian Turkish contextualizing the dialectological data with reference to Modern Standard Turkish and Ottoman Turkish varieties. In addition to the consideration of lexical and semantic features, special attention is given to the complementation patterns, which involve both non-finite and finite linking strategies. The Balkan Turkish data will be discussed within the three-dimensional framework of heritage, universal tendencies, and language contact. The survey at the end of this part summarizes and compares the main findings of the study on expressions of possibility, necessity, and volition, and evaluate these findings in the context of Balkan linguistic.

**Keywords:** dialectology, language contact, semantics, morphosyntax, complementation.

# ПРЕДИКАЦИСКАТА МОДАЛНОСТ ВО БАЛКАНСКИОТ ТУРСКИ ЈАЗИК: ФОРМАЛНА И СЕМАНТИЧКА ВАРИЈАНТНОСТ ВО ЈАЗИЧЕН КОНТАКТ

## Дел 2. Волитивна модалност

**Јулијан Ренч**

Универзитет Јоханес Гутенберг, Мајнц  
rentzsch@uni-mainz.de

Статијата претставува втор дел од студијата за предикациската модалност во неколку турски варијанти во Косово, Северна Македонија, Бугарија и во Источна Тракија (Турција). Надоврзувајќи се на анализата на деонтичката модалност од првиот дел, во овој дел се истражуваат јазичните средства со кои се изразува волитивна модалност и нејзината внатрешна и меѓудијалектна варијација во западнорумелискиот и во источнорумелискиот турски јазик. Дијалектолошките податоци се разгледуваат во контекст на современиот стандарден турски јазик и на османлискиот турски јазик. Покрај лексичките и семантичките карактеристики, посебно внимание се посветува на стратегиите за комплементација, коишто опфаќаат нефинитни и финитни конструкции. Турските податоци од Балканот се разгледуваат од тројна перспектива: јазично наследство, универзални тенденции и јазичен контакт. На крајот од статијата се сумираат и се споредуваат главните сознанија од студијата за модалноста на можност, неопходност и волиција, од перспективата на балканската лингвистика.

**Клучни зборови:** дијалектологија, јазичен контакт, семантика, морфосинтакса, комплементација.

## Volitive modality

In this part of the study, expressions of volition will be investigated. These include notions that can be rendered in English with ‘to want’ and ‘to wish’, but also encompass expressions encoding intention. The potential for variation (and, consequently, the variation itself) is particularly high in volitive modality as there are two fundamental types of wish, which, strictly speaking, somewhat incorrectly, will be referred to in this paper as “same subject wish” (SSW) and “different subject wish” (DSW) for the sake of simplicity. These two types differ in whether the wisher, i.e., the person or conscious subject entertaining the wish, is identical to the projected performer of the action ( $S_i$  wants  $S_i$  to  $X = S_i$  wants to  $X$ ) or not ( $S_i$  wants  $S_j$  to  $X$ ).

In many languages it is reasonable to assume monoclausal structures for SSWs and biclausal ones for DSW. Whether this distinction is appropriate for all Turkish volitive expressions would require an extended discussion of the definition of clause and of structural issues, which will be set aside here. What is relevant for the present analysis is that DSWs require marking of the two persons, while SSWs may suffice with one. Thus, in addition to the potential variation in the matrix segment and the potential variation in the linking segment, which, as has been shown in part 1, already leads to a considerable variation in expressions of possibility and necessity, the SSW-DSW distinction provides further potential for structural variation. In fact, the full range of volitive expressions in the texts under investigation is nearly unmanageable and could easily warrant a monograph of its own. Consequently, it will be necessary to confine with selected representative types, mention aspects of the variation *en passant*, and leave out much interesting data.

In the domain of matrix segments, the volitive verbs *iste-* ‘to want’ and *dile-* ‘to wish’ as well as the noun *niyet* ‘intention’, borrowed from Arabic, will be considered, whereas other matrix segments such as the nouns *dilek* ‘wish’ and *arzu* ‘desire’, which also occur in the texts, will be left out. The usage of the two considered verbs overlaps, with a tendency of *dile-* to express more abstract and idealistic wishes, including wishes in prayers and curses, whereas *iste-* commonly encodes concrete and profane wishes. All examples for *dile-* included in this study represent DSWs, but occurrences of SSWs could likely be found in larger text corpora.<sup>1</sup> As full verbs, *iste-* and *dile-* are transitive and govern the accusative or the unmarked case (differential object marking); this fact must be taken into consideration when evaluating the complementation patterns in the volitive constructions.

As in part 1, fully glossed examples will be cited from Western Rumelian Turkish (WRT), while Eastern Rumelian Turkish (ERT) equivalents, if attested for a given type, will only be mentioned in parentheses. Before citing the examples for *iste-* in Balkan Turkish, let us look at three examples which illustrate the main uses of this verb in Standard Turkish:

- (45) *Ben*            *meme-m*                    *çık-sın*                    *iste-mi-yor-um.*  
 I                breast-POSS.1.SG        come.out-VOL.3        want-NEG-PROG-1.SG  
*Para*            *kazan-mak*                *isti-yor-um.*  
 money        earn-VN                    want-PROG-1.SG  
 ‘I don’t want my breasts to grow. I want to earn money.’  
 (ST, Asena 1987: 12)

<sup>1</sup> An example of *dile-* in a SSW (which moreover encodes a quite profane wish) is given in Rentzsch 2011: 56 ex. (24) for a historical Oghuz variety from Eastern Anatolia. The historical development of Turkic volitive verbs in terms of semantics and combinability would be an interesting object of comparative research.

- (46) *Cellat [...]* *olay* *yer-in-den* *en azından* *iki* *günlük*  
 executioner event place-POSS.3-ABL at.least two day-DNN  
*uzaklık-ta* *ol-ma-yı* *iste-r=di* *hep.*  
 distance-LOC be/come-VN-ACC want-AOR=PST always  
 ‘The executioner [...] always wanted to be at least two days away from the scene.’  
 (ST, Pamuk 1990: 279)
- (47) *Bu* *işaret-ler-i* *iyi* *oku-duğ-un-u*  
 DEM sign-PL-ACC good read-VN-POSS.3-ACC  
*Galip Bey-in* *bil-me-sin-i* *isti-yor[=du].*  
 NP-GEN know-VN-POSS.3-ACC want-PROG=PST  
 ‘He wanted Galip to know that he had read these signs well.’  
 (ST, Pamuk 1990: 132)

In example (45) there are two instances of *iste-*. The second one, <-mAK *iste-*>, represents the most fundamental type of expression for SSWs in Standard Turkish. Example (46) represents a variant of SSW, in which the verbal noun is marked with the accusative. This variant is also marked in terms of frequency marked and is relatively scarce. The difference between <-mAK *iste-*> and <-mAYI *iste-*> is hard to grasp; the marked variant seems to add some kind of emphasis.

The default expression of DSW is typified in example (47). The state of affairs (SoA) is marked by the short non-factual verbal noun *-mA*, at which the projected performer is marked with a possessive suffix. The resulting item is then marked with the accusative. The resulting structure can be represented as <-mA-sIn-I *iste-*>, to which the second segment *-(s)I(n)*, the possessive suffix, varies according to the person. In less formal (but not only spoken) registers, there is also a subjunctive construction type, which can be seen in example (45), realized here as *-sIn iste-*. The linking segment, as in the subjunctive constructions discussed in part 1, is a finite mood form, specifically the voluntative in the first and third persons and the optative or the imperative in the second persons. Note that the subjunctive strategy can also be employed in SSWs (e.g. *dinlen-eyim iste-dim* ‘I wanted to relax’, cf. Rentzsch 2010: 218 for more examples).

Almost all these types are attested in both Eastern and Western Rumelian Turkish, although with differences in frequency and specific realization; the examples provided will be given from WRT. The type <VN+*iste-*> (corresponding to <-mAK *iste-*> in ST) occurs in example (48). The type <VN-ACC+*iste-*> (= ST <-mAYI *iste-*>) is seen in example (49). Note that in this example the verbal noun used is not *-mA* but *-mAK*. The DSW construction <VN-POSS-ACC+*iste-*> appears in example (50). This corresponds to the ST item <-mAsInI *iste-*>. Variants of this type containing other forms can be found in the texts as well, including *-mAKIIGInI iste-* (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 83) with the infrequent verbal noun *-mAKIİK*. Example (51) typifies <*iste-*+SBJV> in a DSW. An SSW variant of this type would be *iste-rim onunle evlen-im* ‘I want to marry him’ (MK/Kanatlarci, Alievskva 2003: 158).

- (48) *Konuş-mak* *iste-me-y-ler,* *zorla-ama-y-s.*  
 talk-VN want-NEG-PROG-PL force-NEG.POT-PROG-1.PL  
 ‘They don’t want to talk, we cannot force them.’  
 (MK/Debar, Erdem et al. 2024: 357)  
 [cf. ERT: *Ēr şēt-mek iste-rsen* ‘If you want to do thingamajig’ (TR/Tekirdağ/Yağcı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 271)]

- (49) *Baba-n-in*                      *bir*                      *dost-ı*                      *var=dı [...]*                      *hiç olmazsa*  
 father-POSS.2.SG-GEN                      one                      friend-POSS.3                      present=PST                      at.least  
*bāri*                      *sen-in=le*                      *görüŝ-meg-i*                      *iste-r.*  
 for.once                      you-GEN=with                      meet-VN-ACC                      want-AOR  
 ‘Your father had a friend, he wants to meet you for once at least.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 43)  
 [cf. ERT: *Ben iste-mem mihtar ol-ma-yı* ‘I don’t want to become a mukhtar’  
 (BG/Rhodopes/Karabulak, Mustafa-Rashidova 2024: 216)]
- (50) *Bi cün*                      *baba-si*                      *haçın*                      *dişari*                      *çik-miŝ,*                      *Ayo Osman*  
 one                      day                      father-POSS.3                      when                      out                      go.out-EVID.PST                      NP  
*ana-sın-dan*                      *kasaba-ya*                      *cütür-me-sın-i*                      *iste-miŝ.*  
 mother-POSS.3-ABL                      town-DAT                      bring-VN-POSS.3-ACC                      want-EVID.PST  
 ‘One day when his father has gone out Ayo Osman wants his mother to take him to town.’  
 (RKS/Prizren, Hafız 1985: 194)  
 [cf. ERT: *Diŝimleyen bi tarım politikasının izlen-me-sın-i isti-yüz* ‘We want a reliable  
 farming policy to be pursued’ (TR/Tekirdağ/Yağcı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 255)]
- (51) *İste-y*                      *mi-sın*                      *yini*                      *kofer-i*                      *ver-alım*  
 want-PROG                      Q-2.SG                      new                      suitcase-ACC                      give-VOL.1.PL  
*iste-y*                      *mi-sın*                      *esçi*                      *kofer-i.*  
 want-PROG                      Q-2.SG                      old                      suitcase-ACC  
 ‘Do you want us to give you the new suitcase or do you want the old suitcase?’  
 (RKS/Prizren, Hafız 1985: 209)  
 [cf. ERT: *İsti-yüz ŝimdi bu kara keçiler kalk-sın* ‘Now we want to get rid of these bad  
 goats’ (TR/Tekirdağ/Yağcı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 261)]
- The nonfinite strategy with dative shift (“infinitive” in \*-*mAGA*) occurs frequently in Balkan Turkish, in WRT especially in Kosovo and Adakale, but also in Vidin, and also in ERT. The full form can be seen in example (52) from Adakale (19th century) but is attested in the Vidin texts as well. The reduced form is seen in example (53).
- (52) *Bir gün*                      *bir*                      *odun*                      *tucar-i*                      *gel-ip*                      *çocuk-tan*  
 one                      day                      one                      firewood                      merchant-POSS.3                      come-CVB                      boy-ABL  
*odun-lar-ı*                      *satın al-may-a*                      *iste-r.*  
 firewood-PL-ACC                      buy-VN-DAT                      want-AOR  
 ‘One day a firewood merchant comes and wants to buy the firewood from the boy.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 205)  
 [cf. ERT: *Dilinden öp-me-ye istä-rmiŝ* ‘She wanted to kiss her tongue’ (BG/Kazanlık,  
 Kakuk 1958: 252)]
- (53) *Ē*                      *de-y*                      *sen*                      *ben-i*                      *ste-d-in*                      *ko-ma*                      *āç.*  
 PTCL                      say-PROG                      you.SG                      I-ACC                      want-PRET-2.SG                      put-VN.DAT                      hungry  
 ‘Well, she says, you wanted to keep me hungry.’  
 (RKS/Peja, Jable 2010: 223)  
 [cf. ERT: *İste-diler bizi Uzunköprüde bırak-mā* ‘They wanted to leave us in Uzunköprü’  
 (TR/Edirne/Meriç, Kalay 1998: 253)]

Another type different from what is usually seen in ST belongs to the subjunctive strategy but has an intervening complementizer particle between matrix clause and subordinate clause (cf. part 1 footnote 13 for *mümkün*, part 1 footnote 19 for *lazım*, and example [66] below for *niyet*). Example (54) typifies a DSW; an SSW variant of this type would be *İste-r-im ki gidüp onları gör-eyim* ‘I want to go and see them’ (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 105).

- (54) *İste-r-im ki bu kız-ı da kına gecesi-ne haykır-a-sın.*  
 want-AOR-1.SG COMP DEM girl-ACC too henna.night-DAT call-OPT-2.SG

‘I want you to invite this girl to the henna night.’

(Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 99)

[cf. ERT: *Biz de isti-yü-z ki çocuklarımız dā bi şeyler öğren-sin* ‘We want our children to learn something else’ (TR/Tekirdağ/Yağcı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 255)]

A rather rare type within the subjunctive strategy, which is mentioned due to its interesting structure, contains the quotation particle *deye* (ST *diye*), which in the present case functions as a postposed complementizer particle. *Deye* has been grammaticalized from a converb form (verbal adverb) of the *verbum dicendi de-* ‘to say’. Items like these occur in almost all Turkic languages, but the use in an expression of wish is not widespread in Turkish.

- (55) *Senin can-ın-ı al-ma-yayım deye iste-r=se-n*  
 your life-POSS.3-ACC take-NEG-VOL.1.SG QUOT want-AOR-COND-2.SG  
*ayay-ın-dan don-lar-ın-ı at ta*  
 foot-POSS.2.SG-ABL pant-PL-POSS.2.SG-ACC throw.IMP too  
*bu ciger=le göt-ün-e düv-eyim.*  
 DEM liver=with arse-POSS.2.SG-DAT beat-VOL.1.SG

‘If you do not want me to kill you, take your pants off so that I can spank your arse with this liver.’

(Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 92)

The most striking derivation from the structures attested in Modern Standard Turkish is the *\*-mAGA* type (see examples [52]–[53] above) as it represents a violation of the original government rules of the full verb *iste-*, which takes direct objects as complements. The structure <-mAGA iste-> is very widespread in Balkan Turkish SSW expressions. It is also not entirely new, as the following example from Middle Ottoman shows (the author was born and raised in Pécs/Hungary; thus his idiolect can be supposed to be a pre-modern variety of WRT):

- (56) *Aşağı taraf-dan beç-iş dere-si yan-ın-da*  
 down side-ABL Vienna-GEN river-POSS.3 side-POSS.3-LOC  
*otur-mağ-a ve tabūr-ı qo-n-dur-mağ-a iste-di.*  
 sit.down-VN-DAT and camp-ACC put-REFL-CAUS-VN-DAT want-PRET

‘He wanted to settle down and to set up the camp at the banks of the river at Vienna from the lower side.’

(Middle Ottoman/TP 58b10–11, Gürışık 2005: 57)

Apart from the *iste-* structures mentioned so far, there are also idiomatic expressions such as <can-ı iste-+3.SG> (literally ‘his/her soul wants’) and <gönül iste-+3.SG> (literally ‘the heart wants’), of which several instances occur in the texts, e.g. *Bu kışın git-mē can-ım iste-yverü eme çok duramam* ‘In this winter I want to go, but I cannot stay long’ (TR/Edirne/Merkez, Kalay 1998: 200); *Ayvanlarımız iyi yāni, ama gönül iste-rdi ki dā iyi ol-sun* ‘So our animals are good, but the heart

wants them to be even better' (TR/Tekirdağ/Yağcı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 260). Such idiomatic expressions also potentially combine with various linking segments.

As for *dile-* 'to wish', the investigated texts contain several examples. (57) exemplifies a type which is also normal in ST (cf. *çalışmalarınızın başarılı ol-ma-sın-ı dile-rim* 'I wish you a successful work'). In (58), *dile-* is constructed with the subjunctive, whereas (59) displays the complementizer particle *ki* between the matrix clause and the complement clause.

- (57) *Ben-i dünya yüz-ün-e çıkar-ma-n-ı*  
 I-ACC world surface-POSS.3-DAT take.up-VN-POSS.2.SG-ACC  
*dile-r-im.*  
 wish-AOR-1.SG  
 'I wish that you bring me to the surface of the earth.'  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 21)

- (58) *Ah çocuk, dile-r-im Allah-tan Ceylen hanım-a*  
 PTCL Boy wish-AOR-1.SG god-ABL NP-DAT  
*günüñ ver-e-sin da, on-in ok-in-a*  
 heart give-OPT-2.SG too DEM-GEN arrow-POSS.3-DAT  
*uğra-ya-sın.*  
 get.into-OPT-2.SG  
 'Ah boy, I wish from God that you fall in love with Miss Ceylen and come under her arrow.'  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 34)

- (59) *Dile-r-im ki ben-i ana-m-in ev-in-e*  
 wish-AOR-1.SG COMP I-ACC mother-POSS.1.SG house-POSS.3-DAT  
*yolla-ya-sın hem de bana altın elmas ver-e-sin.*  
 send-OPT-2.SG and I.DAT gold diamond give-OPT-2.SG  
 'I wish that you send me back to my mother and give me gold and diamonds.'  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 52)

Constructions with the noun *niyet* 'intention' display a certain variation even in ST. The lexical noun *niyet* itself seems to have a propensity for complements in the dative, deriving from the inherent semantics of the noun (cf. English *intention to*). Idiomatic expressions such as *niyet-i yok* 's/he has no intention' (occasionally also unnegated with *var*) can either be constructed with the dative (*-mA-yA niyet-i yok* 's/he has no intention to X'), cf. example (60), or using a combination of the plain, uninflected verbal noun *-mAK* with the postposition *gibi* 'like' as a linking device (*-mAK gibi [bir] niyet-i yok* 's/he has no such intention like X-ing'), cf. example (61). Besides, there is a construction *-mA[k] niyet-in-de ol-* 'to be in the intention of X-ing', which is only constructed with a plain verbal noun (cf. example [62]), as well as some other expressions of minor frequency.

- (60) *Sıcak yatağ-in içinden çık-ma-ya*  
 warm bed-GEN from.inside get.out-VN-DAT  
*hiç niyet-im de yok=tu.*  
 at.all intention-POSS.1.SG too absent=PST  
 'I had no intention of getting out of the warm bed.'  
 (ST, Pamuk 2003: 193)

- (61) *On-u suçla-mak gibi bir niyet-im*  
 DEM-ACC accuse-VN like one intention-POSS.1.SG  
*ol-ma-ma-sın-a rağmen, alın-dı.*  
 be/come-NEG-VN-POSS.3-DAT although take.offense-PRET  
 ‘Although I had no intention of accusing him, he took offense.’  
 (ST, Ümit 2008: 101)

- (62) *Kendisi=yle evlen-me niyet-in-de ol-ma-yan*  
 s/he=with marry-VN intention-POSS.3-LOC be/come-NEG-PTCP  
*bir erkek*  
 one man  
 ‘A man who does not intend to marry her’  
 (ST, Pamuk 2008: 64)

In Balkan Turkish, the variation is considerable. An example with *-MAGA*, structurally similar to ST (60), is given in (63). The linking segment *-MAK* appears in example (64), which is roughly comparable to ST (62). Example (65) typifies the matrix segment *\*niyet var/yok* and in this respect resembles (63); however, (65) is constructed with the subjunctive. A subjunctive construction also occurs in (66), albeit not with *var/yok* but involving a cataphoric pronoun (*bu* ‘this’) and with an intervening complementizer particle between the matrix clause and the complement clause. The last three examples contain a slightly different matrix segment *\*niyet et-* ‘to intend’, formed with the auxiliary *et-* ‘to do’. The interesting variation lies in the selection of the linking segment: In (67), the verbal noun is in the dative, preserving the original government properties of the noun *niyet*, whereas in (68) *neyet et-* behaves like a transitive verb governing a direct object. In example (69), finally, *neyet et-* is constructed with the subjunctive.

- (63) *Evlen-meg-e neyet-im yok.*  
 marry-VN-DAT intention-POSS.1.SG absent  
 ‘I do not have the intention to marry.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 8)

- (64) *Ben de kendi-sin-i öldür-mek neyet-i=le*  
 I too self-POSS.3-ACC kill-VN intention-POSS.3=with  
*gel-d-im=se de, ben-i gör-ünce kendi-sin-i*  
 come-PRET-1.SG=COND too I-ACC see-CVB self-POSS.3-ACC  
*dere-ye at-tı orada boğul-dı.*  
 river-DAT throw-PRET there drown-PRET  
 ‘While I came with the intention to kill her, she threw herself into the river when she saw me and drowned there.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 204)  
 [cf. ERT: *Söna o işi yap-mak niyet-in=le tutuyor o kadının çantasını* ‘And then he grasps the bag of that woman with the intention to do that thing’  
 (TR/Tekirdağ/Bıyıklı Köyü, Tosun 2003: 220)

- (65) *Kim-in var idi niyet-i ügürtle-sın birangi*  
 who-GEN present PST intention-POSS.3 pick.up-VOL.3 some  
*kıs-çe, giyin-ır=di, su-da bogul-ur=di.*  
 girl-DIM dress.oneself-AOR=PST water-LOC drown-AOR=PST  
 ‘Who had the intention to pick a girl would dress up and bathe [lit. ‘drown’] in the water.’  
 (MK/Struga, Ahmed 2004: 324)



- (66) *Neyet-im*                    *bu*                    *idi*                    *ki*                    *memleket-im-e*  
 intention-POSS.1.SG    DEM                    PST                    COMP                    country-POSS.1.SG  
*git-tig-im*                    *gibi*                    *kendi-m-e*                    *nikā ed-er*                    *al-ayım.*  
 go-VN-POSS.1.SG                    as                    self-POSS.1.SG-DAT                    marry-AOR                    take-VOL.1.SG  
 ‘My intention was to marry her as soon as I got back home.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 166)
- (67) *Bey*                    *oğl-ı*                    *hāc-e*                    *git-meg-e*                    *neyet ed-er.*  
 beg                    son-POSS.3                    pilgrimage-DAT                    go-VN-DAT                    intend-AOR  
 ‘The son of the bey intends to go on pilgrimage.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 63)
- (68) *Padişah*                    *da [...]*                    *kız-in*                    *saray*                    *un-in-e*  
 king                    too                    girl-GEN                    palace                    front-POSS.3-DAT  
*git-meg-i*                    *neyet ed-er.*  
 go-VN-ACC                    intend-AOR  
 ‘The king intends to go to the girl’s palace.’  
 (Adakale, Kúnos 1907: 58)
- (69) *Em*                    *oyle*                    *ükümdar*                    *niyet ed-er*                    *ara-sın*  
 and                    such                    ruler                    intend-AOR                    ask-VOL.3  
*o*                    *kız-i*                    *kendi*                    *çöyce-sın-e.*  
 DEM                    girl-ACC                    own                    son-POSS.3-DAT  
 ‘And thus the ruler intends to ask the girl for his own son.’  
 (MK/Resen, Ahmed 2001: 143)

## Survey

Considering the expressions for possibility, necessity, and wish together, the Balkan Turkish dialect material displays some remarkable intra- and interdialectal variation. At the same time, there are similarities and differences to Standard Turkish, with the differences increasing from east to west. The most striking variation occurs in the linking segment. The dominant variants in Balkan Turkish are clearly “infinitival” linking strategies with segments of the *-mAGA* type, developed from the verbal noun *-mAK* in the dative, and subjunctive linking strategies. Both strategies do exist in ST as well, but are combinationally more restricted. The former strategy is, with the matrix segments considered in this paper, confined to *niyet* ‘intention’ (with linking segment *-mAyA*), the latter to *iste-* ‘to want’. As has been shown by Römer (2012) for the 16th and Rentzsch (2018) for the 17th century, these types are attested for some matrix segments in Ottoman Turkish, thus they represent patterns that were available for the creation of new constructions through analogy, and language contact could contribute to certain patterns gaining prominence in a given Turkish variety (cf. also Rentzsch 2014 for a more global perspective on the Turkic languages).

Principally, as we have seen in the examples, both subjunctive and infinitive strategies occur in both Eastern and Western Rumelian dialects. Regarding their distribution across construction types, they are clearly more prominent in the west than in the east, but still more prominent in Eastern Rumelian dialects than in ST. In WRT, all major matrix segments investigated in this paper are attested with subjunctives, and many with verbal nouns in the dative (*\*-mAGA*). *Var* and *dile-* are never attested with *\*-mAGA* in the texts consulted for this study. WRT has subjunctive constructions with significantly more matrix segments than those investigated in this paper, including verbs such

as *başla-* ‘to begin’, *bekle-* ‘to expect’, *unut-* ‘to forget’, *utan-* ‘to be ashamed of’, *kork-* ‘to be afraid’, etc. The prominence of the subjunctive in WRT can certainly be attributed to influence from the surrounding contact languages such as Macedonian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Greek, although the pattern itself, as has already been mentioned, has a long history within the Turkic languages.

The subjunctive constructions registered in this paper present a certain challenge regarding their affiliation to constructions that represent different degrees of syntactic integration. Constructions such as *Lâzim ki sen onnari dâvet edesin* ‘It is necessary that you invite them’ (see part 1, footnote 19) must certainly be analysed in terms of a matrix clause and a subordinate clause, whereas the construction in *Gelin de bindallıyı giysin lâzım* ‘the bride has to wear the *bindallı*’ (see part 1, below example [33]) is clearly an auxiliary construction due to its inverted word order, which corresponds to the canonical Turkic pattern (which is frequently violated in Balkan Turkish). But what about *Lazım düşünelim* ‘We have to think’ (cf. part 1, example [33])? This example as such could be analysed either as an auxiliary construction (with Balkan-type word order) or as a construction consisting of a matrix clause and a complement clause in which the complementizer has been omitted.<sup>2</sup>

Unfortunately, while this study could shed some light on the number and distribution of the construction types, it was impossible to do a frequency analysis for the tokens, as the available text corpus is too small and the data too heterogeneous in terms of text types, number and sort of speakers consulted, and research methods. It would be desirable to have a comprehensive electronic corpus of Balkan Turkish texts from strategically selected dialects and a diversity of speakers, but it seems utopic that such a corpus will ever be established. My impression from the reading is, however, that also the token frequency of subjunctive constructions is massively higher in WRT than in ERT.

While the prominence of the subjunctive in Balkan Turkish is not surprising in light of the well-known infinitive loss in Balkan languages, one might at first sight be surprised about the importance of Haspelmath-type infinitives (i.e., the *-mAGA* type) in the Balkan Turkish dialects, which seem to be very widespread throughout the Balkans, albeit with strong foci in Kosovo, Central and Eastern Bulgaria, and Eastern Thrace, while they are much rarer in North Macedonia and Western Bulgaria. Compared to ST, one could even appropriately state that infinitive complementation strategies are more pervasive in Balkan Turkish (except North Macedonia and Western Bulgaria) than in ST. However, in light of the findings of Joseph (1983), at least the difference in this respect between the varieties in Kosovo and in North Macedonia can be explained. As Joseph has shown, the infinitive loss is most radical in Macedonian and in Greek, whereas Albanian has a renewed infinitive (*paskajore*). The degree of presence of infinitive-like structures in WRT seems to correspond to the situation in the major contact languages.

On the other hand, verbal nouns are generally more widespread in the Eastern Rumelian dialects, and while subjunctive constructions are significantly more prominent in these dialects than in ST, it would be clearly an exaggeration to speak of a serious “infinitive loss” – in the sense of scarcity of verbal nouns – in ERT dialects, and this even though the major contact language, Bulgarian, lacks an infinitive. As has been shown in this paper, Haspelmath-type infinitives (the *\*-mAGA* items) are significantly more widespread in ERT than in ST. There may be several reasons for this. First of all, the density of Turkish settlement historically was – and still is – significantly higher in the Eastern part of the Balkans, while in Western Rumelia, Turkish speaking groups have always been a small minority. The structural impact of contact languages can be expected to be stronger in areas with relatively few speakers. This may account for the massive dominance of subjunctive constructions in North Macedonia and Western Bulgaria. On the other hand, the geographical vicinity to Istanbul with its enhanced mobility and contact possibilities probably has

<sup>2</sup> Considering the whole example (*Ne isteyeceğimizi lâzım düşünelim*) it becomes clear that an analysis as matrix clause plus complement clause in its purest, original form is not possible because part of the SoA is separated from its predicate by the matrix segment.

linked the Eastern Rumelian dialects more strongly to this important linguistic centre, where non-finite complementation and linking techniques play a large role. It seems that the infinitive strategy and the subjunctive strategy are identified as equivalent and exchangeable patterns in ERT for those domains where a separate subject marking is not required.

Several problems could not be explored in the framework of this study. One of the open questions concerns the degree of conventionalization of some of the attested items; e.g., it is unclear whether constructions such as <mümkün-POSS+yok+SBJV> (example [12]), <-mAK için mümkün yok> (example [13]), and <SBJV+deye+iste-> (example [55]) represent stable patterns, i.e. are more than stray, almost idiosyncratic occurrences. Furthermore, the interaction of negation and modality could only be touched upon. It has been mentioned that *niyet* ‘intention’ in ST has a strong tendency to combine with a verbal noun in the dative when negated, whereas in unnegated constructions, plain verbal nouns seem to be more easily suitable as linking segments. The situation in the dialects is less clear. An interesting case present *var* and *yok* plus subjunctive, where the positive form with *var* encodes necessity, while *yok* is ambiguous between impossibility and prohibition. In the texts investigated for this study, *var/yok* plus subjunctive only occurs in WRT. As for the type *var/yok* plus subjunctive with an intervening question word, it is also confined to WRT according to the investigated database, but Menz documents it for Gagauz, too (1999: 59–66), so we may assume that it is not uncommon in ERT. This gap in our data shows that the Balkan Turkish dialect material consulted for this study is not comprehensive enough to obtain a clear picture about all existing conventionalized modal constructions.

As this study of eight selected matrix segments has shown, there is still a lot of research to do on complement clauses and auxiliary constructions in Balkan Turkish.

The following table shows the main constructions presented in this paper and their rough distribution among dialects according to the considered data. Constructions for which no example was noticed but which can be strongly postulated (for example, due to their presence in Gagauz) are marked with (\*).

MOD	Construction	ST	ERT	WRT
P	VN+bil-		x	x
P	VN-ACC+bil-	x	x	
P	VN-POSS-ACC+bil-	x		
P	VN-DAT+bil-		x	x
P	-bil+SBJV			x
P	-bil+Q+SBJV			x
P	VN+mümkün	x	(*)	x
P	VN-POSS+mümkün	x	(*)	
P	VN-DAT+mümkün			x
P	mümkün+SBJV			x
P	mümkün+COMP+SBJV			x
-P	mümkün-POSS+yok+SBJV			x
-P	VN+için+mümkün+yok			x
-P	VN-DAT mümkün yok		x	
-P	VN+yok	x	x	x
-P	VN+yok/VN-DAT+yok		x	x
-P	yok+SBJV			x
-P	yok+Q+SBJV		(*)	x
N	VN+lazım	x	x	x
N	VN-POSS+lazım	x	x	

N	lazım+SBJV		x	x
N	lazım+COMP+SBJV			x
N	VN-DAT+lazım		(*)	x
N	var+SBJV			x
V/N	PRO.VN-POSS+var	x	(*)	x
V/N	PRO.VN-POSS+gel-	x	(*)	x
V	VN+iste-	x	x	x
V	VN-POSS-ACC+iste-	x	x	x
V	VN-ACC +iste-	x	x	x
V	VN-DAT+iste-		x	x
V	iste-+SBJV	x	x	x
V	iste-+COMP+SBJV		x	x
V	SBJV+QUOT+iste-			x
V	VN-POSS.ACC+dile-	x		x
V	dile-+SBJV			x
V	dile-+COMP+SBJV			x
-V	VN-DAT+niyet-POSS yok	x		x
-V	VN+gibi+niyet-POSS yok	x		
V	VN+niyet-POSS.3	x	x	x
V	niyet+SBJV			x
V	niyet-POSS+COMP+SBJV			x
V	VN-DAT niyet et-			x
V	VN-ACC niyet et-			x
V	niyet et-+SBJV			x

### Acknowledgement

The initial research for this study was conducted during a post-doctoral fellowship at FON University Skopje between April 2016 and March 2017, which was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, RE 2727/4-1). The research stay was hosted by Liljana Mitkovska.

### Abbreviations

Glossing follows the conventions of the Leipzig Glossing Rules (version: 31 May 2015). In addition to the list of standard abbreviations mentioned there, the following abbreviations are used in this study.

AOR	aorist
BG	Bulgaria
DIM	diminutive
DNN	denominal noun
DSW	different-subject wish
ERT	Eastern Rumelian Turkish
EVID	evidential
MK	North Macedonia
N	necessity
OPT	optative
P	possibility
POT	potential
PRET	preterite
PRO	prospective

PTCL	particle
RKS	Kosovo
SoA	state of affairs
SSW	same-subject wish
ST	Standard Turkish
TP	Tārīḫ-i Peçevî
TR	Turkey
V	volitional
VN	verbal noun
VOL	voluntative
WRT	Western Rumelian Turkish

## Bibliography

- Ahmed, O. (2001). *Fonetički i leksički karakteristiki na turskiot govor vo Resen i Resensko*. MA thesis. UKIM, Skopje.
- Ahmed, O. (2004). *Morfosintaksa na turskite govori od ohridsko-prespanskiot region*. Doctoral thesis. UKIM, Skopje.
- Alievska, M. (2003). *Ženata kako lik vo turskite narodni prikazni od prilepsko i bitolsko*. MA thesis. UKIM, Skopje.
- Asena, D. (1987 [2006]). *Kadının adı yok*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.
- Erdem, M. D., İsmaili, B., Beyoğlu, B. and Bölük, R. (2024). *Kuzey Makedonya Türk Ağzları. Giriş-İnceleme-Metinler*. Elazığ: Asos Yayınları.
- Gürışık, B. (2005). *Peçevî Tarihi. 46b–80a. Metin, Dizin, Özel Adlar Sözlüğü*. MA thesis. Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Hafız, N. (1985). *Kosova Türk Halk Edebiyatı Metinleri*. Priştine: Kosova Üniversitesi Priştine Felsefe Fakültesi.
- Haspelmath, M. (1989). From purposive to infinitive – a universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10/1–2, 287–310.
- Jable, E. (2010). *Kosova Türk Ağzları. İnceleme–Metin–Sözlük*. Sakarya. Doctoral thesis. Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- Joseph, B. D. (1983). *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive. A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 18.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kakuk, S. (1958). Textes Turcs de Kazanlyk II. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8, 241–311.
- Kalay, E. (1998). *Edirne İli Ağzları. İnceleme-Metin*. (TDK Yayınları 694.) Ankara.
- Kúnos, I. (1907). *Materialien zur Kenntnis des rumelischen Türkisch. I: Türkische Volksmärchen aus Adakale, gesammelt, in Transkription herausgegeben und mit Einleitung versehen*. Leipzig – New York: Rudolf Haupt.
- Leipzig Glossing Rules (2015). <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf> (Accessed: 30 October 2021).
- Menz, A. (1999). *Gagausische Syntax. Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. (Turcologica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Mustafa-Rashidova, S. (2024). *Bulgaristan'daki Orta Rodop Türk Ağzlarının Fonetik, Morfolojik ve Sentaktik Özellikleri*. [Doctoral thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi.]
- Pamuk, O. (1990 [2004]). *Kara Kitap*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Pamuk, O. (2003 [2004]). *İstanbul. Hatıralar ve Şehir*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

- Pamuk O. (2008 [2018]). *Masumiyet Müzesi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Rentsch, J. (2010). Zur Modalität im Türkischen. In H. Boeschoten and J. Rentsch (eds.). *Turcology in Mainz – Turkologie in Mainz*. (Turcologica 82.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 209–224.
- Rentsch, J. (2011). Modality in the Dede Qorqud Oğuznameleri. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 64/1, 49–70.
- Rentsch, J. (2014). Zur Rolle der Analogie in der Grammatikalisierung türkischer Modalauxiliare. In N. Demir, B. Karakoç and A. Menz (eds.). *Turcology and Linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları, 357–374.
- Rentsch, J. (2018). SoA-type complement clauses in the Tārīḫ-i Peçevî. In: É. Á. Csató, J. Parslow, E. Türker and E. Wigen (eds.). *Building bridges to Turkish. Essays in honour of Bernt Brendemoen*. (Turcologica 116.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 265–284.
- Römer, C. (2012). On some peculiar datives in colloquial Middle Ottoman texts. In: T. Kahl, M. Metzeltin and H. Schaller (eds.). *Balkanismen heute – Balkanisms today – Balkanizmy segodnja*. (Balkanologie. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 3.) Münster: LIT, 185–194.
- Tosun, İ. (2003). *Tekirdağ Merkez İlçe ve Köyleri Ağzları*. MA thesis. Trakya Üniversitesi, Edirne.
- Ümit, A. (2008). *Bab-ı Esrar*. İstanbul: Doğan Kitap.