
TURCOLOGICA 110

The Uppsala Meeting

Edited by
Éva Á. Csató, Birsel Karakoç
and Astrid Menz



Uppsala University
Sweden, 2006

Harrassowitz Verlag

TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 110

2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The Uppsala Meeting

Proceedings of the 13th International
Conference on Turkish Linguistics

Edited by

Éva Á. Csató, Birsel Karakoç
and Astrid Menz



2016

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Logo: Enver Karakoç

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2016
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany
ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 978-3-447-10689-4
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19551-5

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Editors' preface | ix |
| Gerjan van Schaaik The Uppsala Meeting | xi |
| Lars Johanson Turkic: Portrait of a language family | 1 |
| Enver Karakoç Map: The Turkic language family | 8 |
| Oktay Ahmed Copied verbs in Turkish dialects of Macedonia | 9 |
| Başak Alango The Left Dislocation with 'var ya' | 19 |
| Z. Ceyda Arslan Kechriotis A new look at Exceptional Case Marking in Turkish | 34 |
| Sema Aslan Hints in Turkish | 45 |
| Molly Babel Multiple stresses in Aegean Turkish | 55 |
| Bernt Brendemoen Translating Orhan Pamuk | 64 |
| Hatice Çubukçu & Hatice Sofu & Meral Şeker Conversational code switching in Turkish-Arabic bilingual talk | 72 |
| Serap (Yelkenaç) Durmuş What does Tom reveal about the acquisition of motion verbs in Turkish? | 80 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Filiz Göktuna Yaylacı Göçmen sinemasında argo kullanımı: <i>Duvara Karşı, Kebab Connection, Kısa ve Acısız</i> filmleri | 89 |
| Mine Güven The semantics of <i>çok</i> ‘very, much, well’ and <i>-miş</i> participles in Turkish | 101 |
| Geoffrey Haig Towards simplifying the syntax of <i>sanmak</i> ‘to believe’ | 114 |
| Annette Herkenrath Deictic conjunctions in the Turkish of bilingual children? The language change of <i>o zaman</i> | 122 |
| Beste Kamali Sentence comprehension in Turkish Broca’s aphasia | 135 |
| Yuu Kuribayashi & Katsuo Tamaoka & Hiromu Sakai Psycholinguistic investigation of subject incorporation in Turkish | 144 |
| Hasan Mesut Meral The syntax of Turkish control | 151 |
| Nur Nacar-Logie Structure of spoken Turkish: Coordination and pragmatic markers | 161 |
| Noriko Ohsaki Valency-changing and non-valency-changing derivations in passives and causatives in the Kirghiz language | 170 |
| Neslihan Özmen-Veld Temporal relations in Turkish discourse: An optimization problem | 178 |
| Carol W. Pfaff & Meral Dollnick Contraction and extension in Diaspora Turkish: Explicit temporal clause linking in speech..... | 186 |
| Martine Robbeets Transeurasian basic verbs: Copy or cognate? | 198 |
| Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek Turkish word order in Germany among children aged 5–10: Evidence from the post-predicate elements | 213 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ayça Müge Sevinç & Cem Bozşahin Verbal categories in Turkish Sign Language | 220 |
| Vügar Sultanzade Differences in verb government between Turkish and Azerbaijanian | 230 |
| Jan-Olof Svantesson & Eric Nicander Gunnar Jarring's phonograph recordings | 236 |
| Filiz Taşdemir-Gündüz Does the postposition <i>gibi</i> have or lack semantics? | 239 |
| Ümit Deniz Turan (In)definiteness in eventualities: <i>-mlş</i> and <i>-mlş olan</i> participles in Turkish | 247 |
| Aygül Uçar Can meanings compete with each other? A proposal for the lexical entries of the polysemous verb <i>çek-</i> 'to pull' in <i>Türkçe Sözlük</i> | 255 |
| Abdurishid Yakup Morphosyntactic change in Uyghur since the 19th century | 263 |
| Deniz Zeyrek Anticausatives in Turkish: The role of the suffix <i>-(I)l/-(I)n</i> | 277 |
| Dingjing Zhang Some typological characteristics of Kazakh syntax | 285 |
| List of contributors | 291 |

Editors' preface

The 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, held 16–20 August 2006, has been hailed as a milestone in the history of Turkic studies at Uppsala University. Continuing a significant tradition of gatherings held biannually since 1982, the conference was convened by Éva Á. Csató, who just two years earlier had been appointed as the first professor of Turkic languages in Sweden. The enormous task of preparing for an event drawing over 150 participants was undertaken by a local team consisting of Astrid Menz, Zsuzsanna Olach, the convener herself, and the staff of Academic Conferences. Thanks to the excellent scholarly contributions, the conference was a great success and substantially contributed to the growth of Turkic linguistics.

Established in 1477 as Sweden's first university, Uppsala has a long history of studies of Turkic languages. From the very beginning, professors of Oriental languages were interested in Turkic languages, mainly for scholarly reasons but also because the subject was strongly promoted by the royal court. In a solemn speech given in 1674, Professor Gustaf Peringer praised the Oriental languages in general and particularly emphasized the richness and elegance of Turkish. He added that knowledge of Turkish was extremely useful in the diplomatic exchange with the Sublime Porte and the Tatar Khan of the Crimea. Having the possibility to communicate with these powers without interpreters was extremely valuable. Scholars, travellers and diplomats visiting the Ottoman Empire collected precious manuscripts, maps, engravings, and paintings which today make up the rich Ottoman collection of the University Library of Uppsala.

Today the Faculty of Languages at Uppsala constitutes an academic haven for studies in more than forty languages. As a well-established discipline at the Department of Linguistics and Philology, Turkic languages enjoys close cooperation with the other oriental disciplines, especially Semitic and Iranian languages, as well as with general linguistics and computational linguistics. It is our aspiration to let this volume document the importance of international collaboration in the field of Turkic language studies.

The volume contains a selection of the papers presented at the conference. Several participants, however, have already published their contributions in academic journals and books. We wish to apologize for bringing out *The Uppsala Meeting* after such a great delay.

Last but not least, we would like to thank Vanessa Karam and Everett Thiele for proofreading the English in this volume.

Uppsala and Istanbul, 15 July 2016

Éva Á. Csató, Birsel Karakoç, and Astrid Menz

The Uppsala Meeting

Gerjan van Schaaik

The 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics was held from 16–24 August 2006 at the University of Uppsala and was convened by Éva Ágnes Csató.

Comfortably situated in a tranquil and calming landscape, walking distance from the centre of the city, the venue of the conference was the *Språkvetenskapliga fakultet* (Linguistic Faculty) – a modernistic type of building which would have been rather inconspicuous to the onlooker had it not been surrounded by a park, a vast graveyard and a botanical garden named after Carl Linnaeus, who worked in Uppsala at Scandinavia's first university (founded 1477) as a natural scientist for fifty very fruitful years until his death in 1778.

Participants from all over the world had already streamed in when Prof. Lars Johanson gave his evening talk “Turkic: Portrait of a language family” on the first day of the conference. This was a very interesting run-up to the ensuing welcoming party organised by the Turkish Embassy.

According to the list of participants, some 120 people were expected. Indeed, it really was crowded and the number of different languages being spoken between old friends meeting up after so many years at times took on Babylonian proportions. Small wonder, given the origins of the participants: Turkey (58), Germany (12), USA (9), Russia (7), Netherlands (7), Japan (5), UK (4), Sweden (4), Greece (11), Cyprus (2), China (2), Norway (2), France (2), and one each from Macedonia, Canada, Hungary, and Austria.

Given the large number of participants and a duration of only three conference days, the Organisation Committee had more or less been left with no other choice than to reserve the early hours of the morning and afternoon of the first two days for plenary sessions for keynote lectures, and to spread the rest of the lectures over no less than four parallel sessions between coffee break and lunch and between tea time and the beginning of the evening. Also, a number of poster sessions were organised in the central hall of the conference building.

The following keynote lectures were included in the programme: David Nathan: *Language endangerment, documentary linguistics, and the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project*; Donald Stilo: *An introduction to the Araxes Linguistic Area: The participation of Azerbaidjani and eastern dialects of Turkish*; Ulrike Zeshan: *Not just “Turkish on the hands”. The grammar of Türk İşaret Dili*; Victor Friedman: *Turkish in Romani outside of Turkey: Balkan perspectives*; Sumru Özsoy: *Birbirleri as an (un)anaphor*; Irina Nevskaya: *Prospective and Avertive in Turkic languages*; Jaklin Kornfilt: *Subject-agreement correlations in some Turkic lan-*

guages and their syntactic effects; Bernt Brendemoen: *Translating Orhan Pamuk*; Abdurishid Yakup: *Morpho-syntactic change in Uyghur since the 19th century*.

Poster sessions were presented by: Erika Gilson: *Future LCTL capacities in the United States: The Turkic case*; Nalan Kızıltan: *The judgement of linguistics courses in Turkish high schools*; Duygu Aydın: *Definitions in monolingual Turkish dictionaries compiled for primary school children*; Zeynep Doyuran & Güray Köniğ: *A comparative analysis of lecture registers in Turkish universities with Turkish and English media of instruction*; Bilhan Doyuran-Kartal: *The effects of external migration on the acquisition of native language: The example of the Turkish immigrants' children in Austria*; Başak Alango: *The left-dislocation with a discursive phrase var ya or ya*; Klara Bicheldey: *Interrogative-imperative sentences and their semantics (on Khakas material)*; Kevser Candemir: *The influence of Turkish on Caucasian languages*; Mustafa Durmuş: *Stylistic variations of 'dead' in the Ottoman poet biographies*; Tuba İsen Durmuş: *The varieties of language of the "Poetry's originality and style" in "Fahriye" sections of Kasidas*; Ahmet Pehlivan & Ahmet Adalier: *Standard Turkish as an educational language in North Cyprus primary education*; Filiz Taşdemir: *Is 'gibi' a significant or an insignificant postposition?*; Sebahat Yaşar: *A study on the use of flower names formed by comparison in the texts*; Özlem Yağcıoğlu: *The role of teaching punctuation marks in teaching a foreign language*; Gönül Yüksel: *The redundancy in the poetry*.

The individual papers accepted by the selection committee can, *cum granum salis*, roughly be categorised as follows:

1. Discourse and pragmatics: Seza Doğrugöz & Ad Backus: *New information in the postverbal area? Evidence from spoken Turkish*; Nur Nacar-Logie: *Structure of spoken Turkish: Co-ordination and pragmatic markers*; Şükriye Ruhi: *Reference to Self in Turkish: Implications for cognitive and cultural linguistics*; Nalan Büyükkantarcıoğlu & Duman Derya: *Use of argumentation fallacies as a manipulative discourse strategy in Turkish politics*; Zeynep Erk Emeksiz: *Discourse functions of negative markers in Turkish*; Neslihan Özmen: *Temporal relations in Turkish discourse: An optimization problem*; Sema Aslan: *Hinting strategies in Turkish from the perspective of opacity*; Firdevs Karahan: *Controversy, polemics, conflict and dispute as strategy: A comparative analysis of the disagreement speech in the original and Turkish adaptation of a reality TV show Çırak ('The Apprentice')*.

2. Psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics: Yuu Kuribayashi, Tamaoka Katsuo & Sakai Hiromu: *Psycholinguistic investigation of subject incorporation in Turkish*; Yasemin Bayyurt: *'Face threat-face repair' sequences in Turkish TV talk shows*; Filiz Göktuna: *The use of slang in immigrant cinema: The films Head on, Kebab connection, Short and Painless (Kurz und schmerzlos)*; Çiler Hatipoğlu: *Age, gender and the meaning of sen and siz in Turkish*; Neslihan Kansu-Yetkiner: *Many faces of facework in conversational humor: The case of taboo discourse among Turkish women*; Beste Yolcu-Kamali: *Sentence comprehension in Turkish Broca's aphasia: Are traces deleted?*.

3. Semantics: Gerjan van Schaik: *The case of postpositions: Semantic roles, predicates or floating categories?*; René Schiering: *Morphologization in Turkish: Implications for phonology in grammaticalization*; Ezel Babur: *Interjections in Turkish: Small units of language with large performance*; Mustafa Aksan & Yesim Aksan: *Event semantics and the role of degree modification in Turkish verbal constructions*; Ümit Deniz Turan: *Clausal (in)definiteness*; Ayca Müge Sevinç: *Verbal categories in Turkish sign language TID*; Mine Güven: *The semantics of çok 'very, much, well' and -mİş participles in Turkish*; Filiz Kılıç: *The semantic and functional analysis of future participle construction -A turgan in Kyrgyz*; Demet Corcu: *A semantic discussion on genericity operator and the modal suffix -Ar*; Sergei Tatevsov, Ekaterina Lyutikova & Mikhail Ivanov: *Double passive as a causative: Evidence from Karachay-Balkar*; Geoffrey Haig: *The Judgement-construction: The syntax of sanmak revisited*.

4. Lexical matters and word formation: Aygül Uçar: *Can meanings compete with each other? A proposal for the lexical entries of polysemous verb çek- 'pull' in Turkish dictionary*; Aydın Özbek: *On çek- as a light verb*; Tooru Hayasi: *Lexical composition of the vocabulary of Eynu, a Modern Uyghur-based secret language spoken in the Southern Xinjiang*; Hülya Kasapoğlu Çengel: *On the Kypchak lexicology in the Tore Bitigi written in Armenian Kypchak*; Tatyana Borgoyakova: *Preverbs in Khakas*; Cem Bozşahin: *Kadıköy İskelesi and a tale of two compounds*; Hitay Yüksek: *Deriving verbs*; Deniz Zeyrek: *Anticausatives in Turkish*; Noriko Ohsaki: *Valency-changing and non-valency-changing derivation in passive and causative in the Kirghiz language*; Faruk Yıldırım: *The process of word derivation in the secret language of Abdal*; Tamara Tugujekova: *Compound nouns with the first part adjectives of colour in the Khakas language*; Irina Tarakanova: *The substantive word-formation in Khakas, Yakut and Turkish..*

5. Syntax: Mehmet Kutalmış: *On the functions and application types of the adverb kaçan in Armeno-Kipchak*; Kenjegül Kalieva: *The Kirghiz postverbal constructions -A tur- and -(I)p tur- and the processes of their grammaticalization*; Emine Yazar: *Wh-complement clauses in postverbal position*; Hasan Mesut Meral: *On control in Turkish*; Dilek Uygun: *Scrambling bare singular nominal objects in Turkish*; Süleyman Ulutaş: *Feature percolation: Evidence from Turkish relative clauses*; Ceyda Arslan-Kechriotis: *A new look at Turkish ECM*; Gülşat Aygen: *Morpho-syntactic variation and methodology: problems and possible solutions*; Litip Tohti: *Cross-categorial syntactic properties of Uyghur nominals*; Dingjing Zhang: *A mechanism of changing Kazakh syntactic structure*; Cem Keskin: *Structural case-licensing nouns in Turkish?*

6. Dialectology: Kaoru Furuya: *On some dialectal variations of honorifics in Modern Uzbek*; Nurettin Demir: *Dialects in literature*; Oktay Ahmed: *Verbs in Turkish dialects in Macedonia made with words entered via Macedonian language*.

7. Language acquisition and second language learning: Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek: *Turkish word order in Germany in children aged 5–10*; Emel Türker: *Bilingual Turkish children's use of Turkish in Norway*; Aslı Altan-Çiğer: *Acquisition of a null*

subject language; Mine Nakipoğlu & Aslı Üntak: *What does the acquisition of stems that undergo phonological alternation reveal about rule application?*; Serap Yelkenaç: *What Tom reveals about the acquisition of motion verbs in Turkish*; Kutlay Yağmur: *Assessment of language proficiency in bilingual children: Empirical findings of the Cito test of German and Turkish in Duisburg*; Elma Nap-Kolhoff: *Acquisition of discourse markers in Turkish: a multiple case-study of 2–4 year old Turkish children in the Netherlands*; Mehmet Özcan: *The emergence and function of Turkish Tense Aspect Modality Markers in the narratives produced by children 3 to 9 plus 13*; Mehmet Akıncı, Bengi Keskin & Aylın Küntay: *Using connectives in narratives in Turkish: A comparison of Turkish-French bilingual and monolingual children and teenagers*; Annette Herkenrath: *Deictic conjunctions in the bilingual children? The language change of 'o zaman'*; Despina Papadopoulou et al.: *Case morphology in Turkish: evidence from Greek learners of Turkish as L2*.

8. Bilingualism and language contact: Şirin Tufan: *Strategies of harmonising utterance structure in Gostivar Turkish*; Birsal Karakoç: *Evidentiality in Turkish-German bilingual children*; Carol Pfaff: *Explicit and implicit clause linkage in spoken Turkish of Turkish/German bilingual children in Berlin*; Mustafa Sarı & Zuhale Karahan Kara: *The effect of Arabic on Turkish vocabulary from Old Anatolian Turkish to Ottoman Turkish*; Süer Eker: *Semantic borrowings in Turkish-Persian language contact*; Éva Kincses Nagy: *Verbal borrowings in Turkic languages*; Jochen Rehbein: *Ki – Form and function of a Turkish particle and its contact-induced reinterpretation by bilingual children*; Matthias Kappler & Stavroula Tsiplakou: *Is there a common Cypriot subjunctive?*; Didem Koban: *The effects of English on Turkish collocational knowledge of Turkish speakers in New York City*; Hatice Çubukçu & Hatice Sofu: *Code-switching in Arabic-Turkish bilingual talk*; Belma Haznedar: *The overuse of subjects in Turkish-English bilingual first language acquisition: Evidence for cross-linguistic interference*; Nazmiye Çelebi: *Immigration and language contact in Cyprus*; Dilek Elçin: *On contact-induced collocations of Chaghatay Turkic*.

9. Historical linguistics: Martine Robbeets: *The linguistic continuum from Japanese to Turkic: Area and family?*; Hans Nugteren: *The position of Lop within or outside the dialects of Modern Uyghur*; Fikret Turan: *Expressing Western life style and industrial revolution in early Tanzimat Turkish: Composition of terms, phrases and Western vocabularies in Seyahatname-i Londra*; Claudia Römer: *Postterminality in Ottoman documents*; Heidi Stein: *Remarks on temporal clauses in Iran-Turkic texts (16th century)*; Zsuzsanna Olach: *Contact induced linguistic features in a Halich Karaim poem of the 17th century*; Rosa Tadinova: *To a question about kinds of burials in early Turkic (according to language, archeology and ethnography)*; Jan-Olof Svantesson: *Gunnar Jarring's phonograph recordings*.

10. Phonetics and phonology: Pola Aydinler: *The properties of postverbal area with flat intonations in spoken Turkish*; Molly Babel: *Multiple stresses in Aegean Turkish*; Nihan Ketrez & Charles Yang: *Harmonic word boundaries in Turkish*; Barış Kabak & Anthi Revithiadou: *The phonology of clitic groups: Evidence from*

Turkish and Asia Minor Greek; Christiane Bulut: *Phonological features of Turkic varieties in West-Iran*; Astrid Menz & Christoph Schroeder: *A new approach to Turkish orthography: Challenging the myth of phonological adequacy*.

11. Contrastive studies: Celia Kerslake: *A contrastive study of apposition in English and Turkish*; Vügar Sultanzade: *Differences in verb government between Turkish and Azerbaijani*; Svetlana Prokopeva: *Comparative analysis of Yakut and German comparative phraseological units*.

Following the long-standing tradition of the ICTL, the organisers spread the necessary work-load over the limited number of conference days in such a way that there was time to go and see the university library, *Carolina Rediviva*, with its beautiful exterior and breath-taking interior – which all of the conference-goers had a chance to admire at the reception offered by the University. On the last day of the conference, most participants enjoyed an excellent dinner at *Eklundshof*, a wonderful restaurant on the outskirts of Uppsala.

Turkic: Portrait of a language family

Lars Johanson

In this paper, I invite the members of the Turkic language family, to which Turkish belongs, to sit for a quick portrait or snapshot.

The Turkic-speaking world is comprehensive. It extends from the Southwest, Turkey and her neighbors, to the Southeast, to Eastern Turkistan and farther into China. From here it stretches to the Northeast, via South and North Siberia, up to the Arctic Ocean, and finally to the Northwest, across West Siberia and East Europe; see the map of the Turkic language family below.

The area comprises a great number of different languages. The regions in which Turkic languages are spoken include Anatolia, Azerbaijan, the Caucasus, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, the immense areas of West and East Turkistan, South, North and West Siberia, and the Volga region. In the past, the Turkic-speaking world also included compact areas in the Ponto-Caspian steppes, the Crimea, the Balkans, etc.

There are currently about twenty Turkic standard languages, the most important being Turkish, Azeri, Turkmen, Kazak, Karakalpak, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Uyghur, Tuvan, Yakut, Tatar, Bashkir and Chuvash.

Due to their development at the end of the twentieth century, after the breakdown of the Soviet Union, many Turkic languages have acquired increased political importance as the national languages of a set of new autonomous states.

A language family

According to the criteria provided by traditional comparative linguistics, Turkic is a language family, a group of related languages descended from a single ancestral language. We can clearly prove that Turkish, Uzbek, Yakut, Chuvash and others are interrelated, just as we can prove that Swedish, Lithuanian, Greek and Armenian are relatives within the Indo-European family. There was a period in which scholars had doubts about the affiliation of Chuvash, but today it is clear that this is also a genuine Turkic language.

There is thus reason to assume a Turkic protolanguage and its subsequent differentiation, which may be represented in the form of a genealogical tree, a family tree, or a pedigree, in common metaphorical parlance. But a linguistic family is somewhat different from a family of human beings of common ancestry. The latter go back to two parents, but a linguistic family is a single-parent family. It only includes mothers and daughters. It comprises codes with one single parent each, that is “mother codes”. It is fashionable today to speak of so-called mixed languages,

which are claimed to have two parents, but they are, if they exist, utterly marginal phenomena.

Family members

Let us arrange the modern Turkic languages together to sit for a family portrait. What do we get? About 20 languages in the political sense, established by political decisions, connected with a certain history, culture, literature, political structure, etc., and endowed with their own institutions. Most were created in the 20th century through relatively arbitrary acts of language policy. Many emerged as rather loose bundles of more or less interrelated dialects. Each has some kind of standard language, and related non-standard varieties overroofed by the standard. There are also unroofed varieties outside the area of validity of the standard languages.

Classifications according to political and purely linguistic criteria may yield different results. Thus, East Anatolian Turkish is closer to Azeri with respect to genealogical proximity and similarity than to the rather strongly Istanbul-based national language of Turkey. Karakalpak is linguistically a dialect of Kazakh, but is a language in the political sense. Dolgan is a dialect of Yakut according to the interintelligibility criterion, but its speakers consider it a language in its own right.

Branches and subdivisions

Most members of the family can be classified as varieties of higher groups, primary branches: the Oghuz (SW), the Kipchak (NW) branch, the Uyghur-Karluk (SE) branch. They have their specific features and it is mostly easy to decide which branch to which a given modern Turkic language belongs. Thus, Turkish is a variety of Oghuz, which is a variety of Turkic. Khalaj, spoken in Central Iran, and Chuvash, spoken in the Volga area, constitute special branches.

Members of language families, unlike individuals in a human family, divide into varieties and subvarieties. Through permanent differentiation, more specialized kinds of spoken Turkic have emerged. The family tree branches out into geographic varieties: dialect groups, regional dialects and basic local dialects. It also divides into social varieties, more or less important in terms of prestige. Applying a two-dimensional dialectology, we can delimit, geographically and socially distinctive varieties that combine distinctive features belonging to particular areas and layers. They contrast horizontally with their neighbors, and vertically with other social varieties, including standard varieties. Each has a certain range of validity, a communicative range. It is of course impossible to portray these myriads of varieties.

Sign language

Let me briefly mention a very specific problem of classification of Turkic. There is a largely unknown language in Turkey, the sign language of the deaf community, officially endorsed by new legislation in 2005. It is not a representation of spoken Turkish “in the hands”. Instead it has a structure of its own and in many respects is

radically different from Turkish, both in morphology and to a lesser extent syntax. Unlike spoken Turkish, it has complex classificatory constructions, numeral incorporation and verb agreement with both subject and object. It has no direct counterpart to the tense and case systems of spoken Turkish. The Turkish sign language is certainly not Turkic in the same sense as spoken Turkish is Turkic. But there are specific connections between the two languages which should be described. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that an elaborate Turkish sign language was in use at the Ottoman court as early as in the 16th century.

Field work

Parts of the Turkic linguistic world have so far been insufficiently investigated. Field work necessary in many areas.

Let me briefly mention the Swedish tradition of field research in the Turkic world. It begins with the research carried out by Swedish officers of Charles XII, who had fallen into captivity in Siberia after the battle of Poltava (1709). With his zealous scientific activity in Siberia, and his discoveries of inscriptions and manuscripts, Filip Johan von Strahlenberg (1676–1747) stands out as a kind of progenitor of Turcology or even Uralo-Altaistics. His monumental work “Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia” was printed in Stockholm in 1730.

On the upper course of the Yenisey, Strahlenberg and others had found burial-places and stone inscriptions written in an enigmatic script whose letters were similar to Nordic runes. Later, the language of the inscriptions turned out to be what has been called “Old Turkic”. The Turkic so-called “Runic script” was thus known as early as at the beginning of the eighteenth century, though it was to remain undeciphered until the end of the nineteenth century. The greatest discovery in the history of Turcology was made in the Orkhon valley in today’s Mongolia in the summer of 1889. A Russian scientific expedition discovered a number of large stone stelae covered with inscriptions. The texts were written with the same type of runiform signs as were already known from stones found by Strahlenberg and others. The discovery was reported very quickly, and the learned world began to take an intense interest in the problem of the “runes”. On December 15, 1893, the well-known Danish professor of comparative linguistics Vilhelm Thomsen announced that he had succeeded in deciphering the enigmatic script. It was suddenly possible to read East Old Turkic texts of the eighth century dedicated to the rulers of the Turk empire and glorifying their military achievements.

In the twentieth century, Swedish Turcology came to play a leading part in the investigation of the varieties spoken in Eastern Turkistan. The research was started by Gustaf Raquette, who had spent many years as a medical missionary in Yarkand and Kashgar and who, after his return to Sweden, took up a lectureship at the University of Lund. The research was continued by his pupil Gunnar Jarring, whose 1933 dissertation “Studien zu einer osttürkischen Lautlehre” won him a position as a university lecturer at the University of Lund. This was followed by a series of publi-

cations, the result of strenuous field work, e.g. texts from regions in Chinese and Afghan Turkistan that soon afterwards became inaccessible. Gunnar Jarring is internationally recognized as a pioneering explorer of unknown Turkic dialects in Central Asia.

In the last decades, much important documentary work has been carried out. Gerhard Doerfer's research in Iran, which has opened up new ground, is a splendid example of this. Let me also mention Éva Csató's investigations on the Karaim varieties spoken in Lithuania, and Halich and Elisabetta Ragagnin's current fieldwork on Dukhan, a hitherto undocumented variety of Sayan Turkic, spoken in Northern Mongolia.

Today we are facing new exciting possibilities for field work. The need for linguistic documentation is great. We need data not only from well-established Turkic languages, but also from less known vernacular varieties, peripheral languages, languages strongly influenced by contact, isolated languages displaying both archaic and innovative features, etc. Field research may bring further important data to light, possibly leading to considerable re-evaluations within Turkic linguistics. Linguistic documentation is an urgent task that is best carried out in international cooperation. It is exciting, particularly for young people, to take active part in documenting languages and collecting new primary data. We still need linguistically trained scholars who can produce empirically adequate and theoretically meaningful research.

Endangerment

Some of today's Turkic languages are endangered, or at least potentially endangered. The endangerment starts when young generations begin to pay less attention to their primary code and switch over to a dominant code because they find it more attractive and prestigious. Currently, increasing endangerment and death of languages is observed all over the world, a development that is leading to mass death of languages and, like other kinds of globalization, will extinguish variation in an irrevocable way. It is important to try to document endangered Turkic languages while it is still possible to do so. The Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project at SOAS in London is dedicated to documentary linguistics, trying to play a role in attacking the problem of language endangerment, by providing training, archiving, publishing, and funding of projects. The services of this project may become useful to some of the Turkic communities whose languages are endangered and to the researchers who work with them.

Copying

The members of the family we are trying to portray have emerged as a result of internal development and complex contact processes that include copying of foreign elements. Speakers of Turkic have taken over copies into their own primary code and non-Turkic speakers shifting to Turkic have carried over copies from their own primary code into their Turkic secondary code. Because of the unique mobility of

Turkic-speaking groups, contact-driven developments have been especially important.

The influence of Turkic on other languages has been equally great. One example is the Turkish influence on the Romani dialects of the Balkans, especially the extensive and varied copying and integration of grammatical structures. André Hesselbäck, Uppsala, has dealt with the Turkic influence on the Finno-Ugric language Mari. Don Stilo is working on shared phonological, grammatical and lexical features in languages of the South Caucasus, eastern Turkey, Northern Iran and Northern Iraq. What he refers to as the “Araxes Linguistic Area” involves heavy contact phenomena among five different language families: Turkic, Kartvelian, Indo-European, Semitic and Northeast Caucasian.

Because of contact-induced change, genealogically unrelated varieties have become more similar to each other, e.g. Uzbek Turkic and Tajik Persian. But we do not find mixed languages. Classical written Ottoman texts may contain 90% loanwords, but they still have to be defined as Turkic and not as Arabic or Persian. The same is true of languages such as Karaim and Gagauz, which are strongly influenced by Slavic. We find excessive copying of phonology, syntax, lexicon, etc., but never a turnover to the languages copied from.

Heavy code-copying does not cause code replacement. Shift does not mean successive transition from one code to another through intermediary stages characterized by increasing copying. Speakers of a dominated code do not take over larger and larger parts of a dominant code until they end up speaking the dominant code instead of the dominated one. Increasing influence on a dominated code does not lead to its abandonment. Languages are not abandoned for structural reasons.

The decisive factors for shift are social in nature. Languages are abandoned because they are no longer handed down. If social pressure leads to a negative attitude towards a recessive code, its speakers may avoid transmitting it to their children, who acquire it incompletely and, at best, grow up as semi-speakers.

In the development of Turkic we always have to reckon with contact situations in which mutually intelligible varieties have met and influenced each other. This was the normal situation in tribal confederations with their mobile heterogeneous groups. The encounters led to changes and the emergence of modified varieties.

There were dominant varieties, for example koinés, which may have copied extensively from other varieties but maintained their position and survived as such. Contacts between mutually intelligible codes can lead to glottogenesis, where a conglomerate of varieties of different origin develop into a more homogeneous variety. Today’s Kashgay, spoken in Iran, can probably serve as a model for similar situations in the history of Turkic.

One Turkic language?

Within the Turkic-speaking world, there are still ideologically motivated, linguistically nonsensical discussions on which idioms should be termed “languages” or “di-

alects". Many Turkish scholars refer to the family as one language, *dil*, and to each member as a dialect, *lehçe*. As always in questions of terminology, the criteria must be defined. The linguistic term "dialect" is used for varieties that stand in a relationship of mutual intelligibility to each other. And this criterion does not apply to the idioms we are trying to portray. The family members cannot chat freely with each other. Neighbors may do some small talk. But no member can converse directly with the whole family. Maybe this is even an essential condition for a happy family life.

It is also a misunderstanding that there was once one uniform Turkic whose unity was destroyed in modern times, i.e. that the differences within the Turkic family arose as a result of modern language policy. This idea is caused by a confusion of spoken and written languages. It is true, for example, that the validity of Chaghatay as a superregional literary language was reduced and finally destroyed by national languages such as Uzbek, Uyghur, Tatar, Turkmen, etc. This is something else and does not contradict the fact that the differentiation of spoken Turkic began very early.

Creation of a family language

The hope to create a language for the whole family seems to be futile. At the beginning of the 20th century, Tatar and Turkestanian intellectuals began to discuss whether a common written language should replace the different regional languages. Advocates of a cultural panturkism wanted to create a common standard as a unifying bond. Some of them imaged a common means of communication for all Turks "from the boatmen of Istanbul to the shepherds of Eastern Turkestan".

There was, however, disagreement about to what extent this language should lean on Tatar or on Ottoman. The Tatars had developed a written standard close to spoken Kazan Tatar, which also exerted considerable influence in Turkestan. One promoter of a common language was Isma'il Bey Gaspıralı, who published the newspaper *Terjiman* in the Crimea. His paper addressed all Turkic-speaking groups of Russia, thus aiming for as wide a communication radius as possible. In order to secure broad comprehensibility it used numerous Ottoman elements.

Consequently, the newspaper's language was criticized for being "artificial", a kind of Turkic Esperanto. The unification efforts remained fruitless for political reasons. It also became impossible to maintain the old supraregional languages and develop them into modern standards.

Today there are new dreams of a common Turkic, ideas of removing differences between the Turkic languages in order to create a unified language that might receive official status on international platforms, like, for instance, Chinese or Arabic.

These are hardly realistic ideas. The linguistic differentiation is an accomplished fact and irreversible. There is no "average" or "normal" Turkic to replace the "national" languages, and it has never existed.

Of course it would be possible to harmonize the standard languages, i.e. to reduce differences through coordinated language planning, creating unified systems of terminologies, etc. But even this meets insurmountable political obstacles.

Particularism is still prevailing. The language policies of the new Turkic republics are guided by a wish to create state languages to help establish new national identities for their populations. Not even the relatively realistic goals of harmonizing the writing systems have been reached. The chance to harmonize terminologies even seems to slip through the fingers of the reformers.

A wider family?

We all know from our personal lives that genealogical research can reveal wider family relations than one ever imagined. The question is: Does Turkic have relatives; i.e. is it part of a larger family? This issue has been discussed very emotionally and polemically for a long time. It has not been possible to prove that Turkic is related to Mongolic, Tungusic, etc. in the same sense that Germanic is related to Romance and Slavic, etc. On the other hand, no one has been able to disprove the relatedness of the so-called Altaic languages.

Certain linguistic features are not easily replaced by take-over copying. The genealogical affiliation of a high-copying code may be determined by means of the elements that generally are least susceptible to being replaced. In a book on structural factors in Turkic contacts I have ventured to claim that the suffixes standing closest to the stem of a Turkic verb, namely those expressing actionality and diathesis, are the ones most impervious to copying. Old morphemes expressing actionality and diathesis occurring next to the primary verbal stem display similarities in Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Korean and Japanese. They may be remnants of a proto-language that later split into different varieties subject to extensive copying of both kinds. Martine Robbeets, a Humboldt fellow at Mainz, has focused on genealogical questions of “Altaic”. She has found striking phonetic and semantic similarities between morphemes occurring next to the primary verbal stem over a huge area from Turkish to Japanese. These similarities cannot simply be due to mere chance. Robbeets has just published a book on the position of Japanese, asking the question: “Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?”

Thus it is still not clear how large the family is that we wish to invite to sit for our family portrait.

Copied verbs in Turkish dialects of Macedonia

Oktay Ahmed

1. Introduction

Turkish dialects in Macedonia (TDM) belong to western Rumeli (Balkan) dialects. They are archaic and under the heavy influence of surrounding Indo-European (IE) languages, mainly Macedonian, Albanian, Serbian, etc. These influences can be seen on all linguistic levels: phonetic, morphological, semantic, and especially the syntactic.

As of the 2002 census, 77,959 citizens of the Republic of Macedonia identified as ethnic Turks, which is 3.85% of Macedonia's total population of 2,022,547 (*Popis na naselenieto, domakjinstvata i stanovite vo Republika Makedonija*, 2002). Compared to previous censuses, we can conclude that the number of ethnic Turks in this country is slowly, but steadily decreasing. After World War II, the reasons for this were political, but since Macedonia separated from the former Yugoslavia in 1991, the decline has been due to economic reasons.

Dialectological research of the Balkan dialects began between the two world wars with Tadeusz Kowalski (Kowalski 1919). After him, many domestic and foreign linguists have worked on TDM, such as Gliša Elezović (Elezović 1925), T. Manević (Manević 1954), Gyula Németh (Németh 1956), Olivera Jashar-Nasteva, János Eckmann (Eckmann 1960, 1962), György Hazai (Hazai 1960), Ahmet Caferoğlu (Caferoğlu 1957), Louis Katona (Katona 1969), Suzanne Kakuk (Kakuk 1972), etc.

These research efforts were intensified after World War II. In Macedonia research work increased in 1965, when *Sesler*, a journal devoted to the culture and art of Macedonian Turks, was founded. The scientific approach to TDM research started after 1976, when the Department of Turkish Language and Literature was established at the Faculty of Philology in Skopje. The most intensive period of Macedonian Turcology extends from the 1990s until today; the Department launched a number of linguistic projects (Ago 1998), and many master's and doctoral theses have been successfully defended since then.¹

1 For more on these works, see my MA and PhD theses (Ahmed 2001, 2005).

2. Two ways of accommodating copied verbs

After a few years of field research, I found that many verbs used by Macedonian Turks are not of Turkish origin. I realized that this is not an insignificant case, and that it therefore should be treated and documented in a paper.

After the Ottomans withdrew from Macedonia in 1912, ethnic Turks were cut off from their motherland and linguistic ties with Turkey dropped to a minimal level. This vacuum resulted in TDM's accepting many words from IE languages spoken in the area. Even in the official language of Macedonian Turks, which is ST from the Republic of Turkey and which does not feature Macedonian words, there are many 'calques' copied from the Macedonian language (Ahmed 1997).

Thus, the topic of this paper is spoken Turkish dialects in Macedonia and, specifically, verbs in these dialects based on words mainly copied from the Macedonian language.² When speaking of non-Turkish words, we mostly think of Macedonian words, but as Macedonia was part of socialist Yugoslavia, whose official language was Serbian, there are many common Yugoslavian (mainly Serbian) words from that era. Because some of these words are still in use in colloquial Macedonian, I treat them as "copies from Macedonian", as they entered the Turkish dialects spoken in Macedonia via the Macedonian language.

The list of these verbs presented here is far from being complete. I have included them in order to illustrate my presentation.

The influence of the Macedonian language on TDM verbs can be treated on two levels: the morphological level and the syntactic level.

2.1 Morphological influence

On the morphological level, the verbs are derived with Turkish suffixes. The whole group consists of verbs derived with the Turkish *+IA-* verbal suffix or, sometimes, other suffixes. The classification of verbalizations on the morphological level is: verbalization with *+IA-* suffix only; verbalization with *+IA-* and the reflexive/passive suffix *-n-*; verbalization with *+IA-* and the reciprocal suffix *-ş-*.

Below are the examples for these three groups:³

+IA-

+IA- is a denominal suffix for verbalization in Standard Turkish (ST), but, as we can see in the examples below, this suffix can be used with both nouns and verbs in TDM. In contrast to ST, the use with verbs is more frequent.⁴

- 2 After working on this topic for a number of years and, so, compiling a large collection of examples, I assigned this topic as a term paper to my student *Feyhan Ruşid*. I use a few examples from her paper here that I had not registered before. I would like to thank her for her indirect contribution to this paper.
- 3 In order to make it simpler for Turcologists, I use Roman letters for Macedonian words in this paper. I use 't⁵' for Macedonian <u>, and Turkish 'ı' before the Macedonian <p> ('vowel R', вокално P). Other sounds are transliterated using Turkish letters.

bubala- ‘to learn (something) by heart’: *buba+la-* < v. *buba* PR3SG + *+la-*
çepkala- ‘to scrape’: *çepka+la-* < v. *çepka* PR3SG + *+la-*
çepkayle- ‘to scrape’: *çepka+(y)le-* < v. *çepka* PR3SG + *+la-*
çetkala- ‘to brush’: *çetka+la-* < v. *çetka* PR3SG + *+la-*
çkırtala- ‘to scratch, to draw, to write’: *çkırtala+la-* < v. *şkırtala* PR3SG + *+la-*
dutkala- ‘to stammer, to stutter’: *dutka+la-* < v. *dutka* PR3SG + *+la-*
fantazirala- ‘to fantasize’: *fantazira+la-* < v. *fantazira* PR3SG + *+la-*
fantazirayle- ‘to fantasize’: *fantazira+(y)le-* < v. *fantazira* PR3SG + *+la-*
farbala- ‘to colour, to dye, to paint’: *farba+la-* < v. *farba* PR3SG + *+la-*
fermala- ‘to treat (in any way)’: *ferma+la-* < v. *ferma* PR3SG + *+la-*
fermayle- ‘to treat (in any way)’: *ferma+(y)le-* < v. *ferma* PR3SG + *+la-*
gipsle- ‘to fill (something) with gypsum plaster’: *gips+le-* < n. *gips* + *+la-*
grebala- ‘to scratch’: *greba+la-* < v. *greba* PR3SG + *+la-*
grebayle- ‘to scratch’: *greba+(y)le-* < v. *greba* PR3SG + *+la-*
gritkala- ‘to nibble’: *gritka+la-* < v. *gritka* PR3SG + *+la-*
gujvala- ‘to wrinkle’: *gujva+la-* < v. *gujva* PR3SG + *+la-*
jdrigala- ‘to belch’: *jdriga+la-* < v. *jdriga* PR3SG + *+la-*
jmurkala- ‘to shut (ones) eyes’: *jmurka+la-* < v. *jmurka* PR3SG + *+la-*
klikala- ‘to click’: *klika+la-* < v. *klika* PR3SG + *+la-*
kuŕala- ‘to type’: *kuŕa+la-* < v. *kuŕa* PR3SG + *+la-*
meşala- ‘to mix’: *meşa+la-* < v. *meşa* PR3SG + *+la-*
mirtala- ‘to chat (on IRC with mIRC client)’: *mirta+la-* < v. *mirta* PR3SG + *+la-*
oŕkala- ‘to moan’: *oŕka+la-* < v. *oŕka* PR3SG + *+la-*
peŕkala- ‘to burn up (previous or new problems), to irritate (somebody with problems)’:
peŕka+la- < v. *peŕka* PR3SG + *+la-*
pırskala- ‘to splash, to sprinkle’: *pırska+la-* < v. *pırska* PR3SG + *+la-*
pipkala- ‘to touch’: *pipka+la-* < v. *pipka* PR3SG + *+la-*
plombala- ‘to fill (teeth)’: *plomba+la-* < n. *plomba* + *+la-*
prepkala- ‘to trip, to stumble’: *prepka+la-* < n. *prepka* + *+la-*
probala- ‘to sample, to test, to try on’: *proba+la-* < n. *proba* + *+la-*
pumpala- ‘to pump’: *pumpa+la-* < n. *pumpa* / v. *pumpa* PR3SG + *+la-*
reŕkala- ‘to give (somebody) attention’: *reŕka+la-* < n. *reŕka* / v. *reŕka* PR3SG + *+la-*
rimbala- ‘to work hard’: *rimba+la-* < v. *rimba* + *+la-*
seŕkala- ‘(briefly) to interrupt, to cut’: *seŕka+la-* < v. *seŕka* PR3SG + *+la-*
smetala- ‘to disturb’: *smeta+la-* < v. *smeta* PR3SG + *+la-*
smetale- ‘to disturb’: *smeta+le-* < v. *smeta* PR3SG + *+le-*
smetayle- ‘to disturb’: *smeta+(y)le-* < v. *smeta* PR3SG + *+ (y)le-*
snimala- ‘to record’: *snima+la-* < v. *snima* PR3SG + *+la-*
strijala- ‘to shear, to snip, to cut’: *strija+la-* < v. *strije* PR3SG + *+la-*
strugala- ‘to grate, to scrape, to scratch’: *struga+la-* < v. *struga* PR3SG + *+la-*
strugla- ‘to grate, to scrape, to scratch’: *strug+la-* < v. *struga* PR3SG + *+la-*
stutkala- ‘to crumple, to bruise, to fold’: *stutka+la-* < v. *stutka* PR3SG + *+la-*

- 4 All examples in this paper are given in this format: Verb in TDM ‘English translation’: morphemes of the verb in TDM < Macedonian part (verb Person-Tense / noun) + Turkish part (suffix).

şışala- ‘to pay attention (to somebody), to pass (somebody) successfully, to win’: *şışa+la-* < v. *şışa* PR3SG + *+LA-*
şkirtala- ‘to scratch, to draw, to write’: *şkirta+la-* < v. *şkirta* PR3SG + *+LA-*
stampala- ‘to print, to publish, to stamp’: *stampa+la-* < v. *stampa* PR3SG + *+LA-*
ştirkala- ‘to starch’: *ştirka+la-* < v. *ştirka* PR3SG + *+LA-*
şfayt⁸la-, şvayt⁸la- ‘to weld’: *şfayt⁸+la-, şvayt⁸+la-* < n. *şvayt⁸* + *+LA-*
titkala- ‘to ring somebody up on his/her mobile phone and to end call in order to be called back by his/her side’: *titka+la-* < v. *titka* PR3SG + *+LA-*
tropala- ‘to talk nonsense; to knock on the door’: *tropa+la-* < v. *tropa* PR3SG + *+LA-*
ırtala- ‘to draw’: *ırtı+la-* < v. *ırtı* PR3SG + *+LA-*
utkala- ‘to miss, to fail’: *utka+la-* < n. *utka* + *+LA-*
zezala- ‘to make fun of someone, to joke with one another’: *zeza+la-* < v. *zeza* PR3SG + *+LA-*
zvırt⁸nala- ‘to ring somebody up on his/her mobile phone and to end call in order to be called back by his/her side’: *zvırt⁸na+la-* < v. *zvırt⁸ne* PR3SG + *+LA-*
zyapala- ‘to stare’: *zyapa+la-* < v. *zyapa* PR3SG + *+LA-*

As could be seen from the examples given above, some verbs have more than one form: *çepkala-/çepkayle-*, *fantazirala-/ fantazirayle-*, *femala-/ fermayle-*, *grebala-/grebayle-*, *strugala-/strugla-*, etc.

Also we can see that some verbs have various synonyms with the same meaning: *çkırtala-/şkirtala-*, *şfayt⁸la-/şvayt⁸la-*, etc.

The main distinctions between the morphological forms are territorial, northern and southern dialects being different.

The northern and southern dialects each have a single allomorph of *+LA-* suffix. When the Turkish verbalization suffix *+LA-* is used in northern dialects, the allomorph is *+LA-*, but in the southern (mainly southwestern) dialects we see the version in *+(y)le-*. So, once again, we see that Macedonian Turkish dialects do not have vowel harmony. It is possible that in the southern dialects people mix this suffix with the instrumental case suffix *+(y)LA+*, which originated from the suffixed form of the postposition *ile* ‘with’. Perhaps this is the reason why the *y* consonant is added before the suffix.

+LA-n-

These examples consist of Macedonian word with the suffixes *+LA-* and *-n-*. The *-n-* is the reflexive/passive voice suffix.

gırçlan- ‘to freeze, to be unable to do anything’: *gırç+la-n-* < n. *gırç* + *+la-n-*
gujvalan- ‘to wrinkle’: *gujva+la-n-* < v. (se) *gujva* PR3SG. ITR + *+la-n-*
ligalan- ‘to be mouth-watering’: *liga+la-n-* < n. *ligi* + *+la-n-*
nervozalan- ‘to be nervous, to be angered’: *nervoza+la-n-* < n. *nervoza* + *+la-n-*
pırçlan- ‘to stand rigidly, to swagger’: *pırç+la-n-* < n. *pırç* + *+la-n-*
sunçalan- ‘to sunbathe’: *sunça+la-n-* < v. (se) *sunça* PR3SG. ITR + *+la-n-*
şatıralan- ‘to colour one’s hair’: *şatıra+la-n-* < v. (se) *şatıra* PR3SG. ITR + *+la-n-*
şminkalan- ‘to apply make-up’: *şminka+la-n-* < v. (se) *şminka* PR3SG. ITR + *+la-n-*
şuşkalan- ‘to whisper’: *şuşka+la-n-* < v. (se) *şuşka* PR3SG. ITR + *+la-n-*

-*LA-ş-*

This group of suffixes is made of: Macedonian word + *+LA-* + *-ş-* In this case, *-ş-* is the reciprocal suffix.

fraerleş- ‘to be cool’: *fraer+le-ş-* < n. *fraer* + *+le-ş-*

girbolaş- ‘to stoop’: *girbo+la-ş-* < n. *girbo* + *+la-ş-*

smotanlaş- ‘to turn into a fool’: *smotan+la-ş-* < n. *smotan* + *+la-ş-*

When there is a front vowel in final position of a Macedonian word, this front vowel is changed to a back vowel before the affixation of the verbalization suffix: *brişe*: *brişala-*, *strije*: *strijala-*, *zvirt^šne*: *zvirt^šnala-*, *ligi*: *ligalan-*, etc.

2.2 Syntactic influence

The influence on the syntactic level lies in forming compound verbs. This occurs by adding Turkish auxiliary verb to copied Macedonian words.

In my lists I preferred compound verbs where both parts can be written together. When the first (non-Turkish) part is stressed on its final syllable, I write the two parts conjoined, as a single word. This is the result of Macedonian influence on MTD stress (Ahmed 2005: 233–237). On the other hand, when the first (non-Turkish) part is not stressed on its final syllable, then I write the two parts separately, as the Turkish auxiliary verb is also stressed.

This syntactic-level verbalization can be realized with many Turkish auxiliary verbs. I have registered the auxiliary verbs *al-*, *et-*, *ol-* and *yap-*. See the following few examples.

al-

spoy al- ‘to short-circuit’: n. *spoy* + *al-*

et-

blokiraet- ‘to block’: *blokira[+]et-* < v. *blokira* PR3SG + *et-*

brani^{et}et- ‘to defend’: *brani[+]et-* < v. *brani* PR3SG + *et-*

çastet- ‘to pay (for a drink or something else for somebody)’: *çast[+]et-* < v. *çasti* PR3SG + *et-*

çestitaet- ‘to congratulate’: *çestita[+]et-* < v. *çestita* PR3SG + *et-*

davi^{et}et- ‘to strangle (somebody), to suffocate (somebody), to choke (somebody), to drown (somebody)’: *davi[+]et-* < v. *davi* PR3SG + *et-*

diskutiraet- ‘to discuss’: *diskutira[+]et-* < v. *diskutira* PR3SG + *et-*

dopişaet- ‘to add (something to a writing)’: *dopişa[+]et-* < v. *dopişa* AOR3SG + *et-*

dosadet- ‘to bore, to tire’: *dosaduva[+]et-* < v. *dosadi* AOR3SG + *et-*

dosadiet- ‘to bore, to tire’: *dosadi[+]et-* < v. *dosadi* AOR3SG + *et-*

dozvoliet- ‘to allow, to let, to permit’: *dozvoli[+]et-* < v. *dozvoli* AOR3SG + *et-*

feniraet- ‘to dry one’s hair (with a hair drier)’: *fenira[+]et-* < v. *fenira* PR3SG + *et-*

glant^{et}iraet- ‘to smooth’: *glant^{et}ira[+]et-* < v. *glant^{et}ira* PR3SG + *et-*

gletovaet- ‘to smooth the walls (with a material)’: *gletova[+]et-* < v. *gletova* PR3SG + *et-*

imitiraet- ‘to imitate’: *imitira[+]et-* < v. *imitira* PR3SG + *et-*

intereset- ‘to be interested in’: *interes[+]et-* < n. *interes* + *et-*

iskoristiet- ‘to exploit, to use, to utilize’: *iskoristi*[+]*et-* < v. *iskoristi* AOR3SG + *et-*
izdaet- ‘to betray, to give it up (someone)’: *izda*[+]*et-* < v. *izdava* PR3SG + *et-*
izgradiet- ‘to build’: *izgradi*[+]*et-* < v. *izgradi* AOR3SG + *et-*
iznenadiet- ‘to surprise’: *iznenadi*[+]*et-* < v. *iznenadi* AOR3SG + *et-*
koçet- ‘to block’: *koç*[+]*et-* < v. *koçi* PR3SG + *et-*
koçiet- ‘to block’: *koçi*[+]*et-* < v. *koçi* PR3SG + *et-*
kopiraet- ‘to copy’: *kopira*[+]*et-* < v. *kopira* PR3SG + *et-*
lakiraet- ‘to wax’: *lakira*[+]*et-* < v. *lakira* PR3SG + *et-*
luduvaet- ‘to be mad, to rave, to have extreme fun’: *luduva*[+]*et-* < v. *luduva* PR3SG + *et-*
maltretiraet- ‘to maltreat’: *maltretira*[+]*et-* < v. *maltretira* PR3SG + *et-*
masiraet- ‘to (give a) massage’: *masira*[+]*et-* < v. *masira* PR3SG + *et-*
napadet- ‘to attack’: *napad*[+]*et-* < n. *napad* + *et-*
napadiet- ‘to attack’: *napadi*[+]*et-* < n. *napad* + *et-*
nişaniet- ‘to target’: *nişani*[+]*et-* < v. *nişani* PR3SG + *et-*
ogradiet- ‘to fence, to wall’: *ogradi*[+]*et-* < v. *ogradi* AOR3SG + *et-*
parkiraet- ‘to park’: *parkira*[+]*et-* < v. *parkira* PR3SG + *et-*
peçatiet- ‘to publish, to press’: *peçati*[+]*et-* < v. *peçati* PR3SG + *et-*
peşaçiet- ‘to walk’: *peşaçi*[+]*et-* < v. *peşaçi* PR3SG + *et-*
plâçkaet- ‘to rob’: *plâčka* [+]*et-* < n. *plâčka* / v. *plâčka* PR3SG + *et-*
plâçket- ‘to rob’: *plâčk*[+]*et-* < n. *plâčka* / v. *plâčka* PR3SG + *et-*
plombiraet- ‘to fill’: *plombira*[+]*et-* < v. *plombira* PR3SG + *et-*
podneset- ‘to endure, to bear, to tolerate’: *podnes*[+]*et-* < v. *podnesi* AOR3SG + *et-*
podnesiet- ‘to endure, to bear, to tolerate’: *podnesi*[+]*et-* < v. *podnesi* AOR3SG + *et-*
pratet- ‘to follow’: *prat*[+]*et-* < v. *prati* PR3SG + *et-*
pratiet- ‘to follow’: *prati*[+]*et-* < v. *prati* PR3SG + *et-*
preçet- ‘to balk, to butt in’: *preçi*[+]*et-* < v. *preçi* PR3SG + *et-*
preçiet- ‘to balk, to butt in’: *preçi*[+]*et-* < v. *preçi* PR3SG + *et-*
pretet- ‘to threaten’: *pret*[+]*et-* < v. *preti* PR3SG + *et-*
pretiet- ‘to threaten’: *preti*[+]*et-* < v. *preti* PR3SG + *et-*
preti^faet- ‘to outrun, to outstrip, (for a driver) to pass (a vehicle)’: *preti^fa*[+]*et-* < v. *preti^fa*
 PR3SG + *et-*
priyavet- ‘to denounce, to inform’: *priyav*[+]*et-* < v. *priyavi* AOR3SG + *et-*
priyaviet- ‘to denounce, to inform’: *priyavi*[+]*et-* < v. *priyavi* AOR3SG + *et-*
promaşet- ‘to miss’: *promaş*[+]*et-* < v. *promaşi* AOR3SG + *et-*
promaşiet- ‘to miss’: *promaşi*[+]*et-* < v. *promaşi* AOR3SG + *et-*
provo^firaet- ‘to provoke’: *provo^fira*[+]*et-* < v. *provo^fira* PR3SG + *et-*
raçunaet- ‘to calculate, to hope (something)’: *raçuna*[+]*et-* < v. *raçuna* PR3SG + *et-*
rasturiet- ‘to mess up, to disperse, to be more successful than others’: *rasturi*[+]*et-* < v.
rasturi AOR3SG + *et-*
rezerviraet- ‘to reserve’: *rezervira*[+]*et-* < v. *rezervira* PR3SG + *et-*
serviraet- ‘to serve’: *servira*[+]*et-* < v. *servira* PR3SG + *et-*
snimaet- ‘to record’: *snima*[+]*et-* < v. *snima* PR3SG + *et-*
stopet- ‘to stop’: *stop*[+]*et-* < n. *stop* + *et-*
stopiraet- ‘to stop’: *stopira*[+]*et-* < v. *stopira* PR3SG + *et-*
studiraet- ‘to study’: *studira*[+]*et-* < v. *studira* PR3SG + *et-*
şişaaet- ‘to pay attention (to somebody), to pass (somebody) successfully, to win, to cut (hair)’:
şişa[+]*et-* < v. *şişa* PR3SG + *et-*

ştrayket- ‘to strike (demonstrate)’: *ştrayk[+]/et-* < n. *ştrayk* + *et-*
şutiraet- ‘to shoot’: *şutira[+]/et-* < v. *şutira* PR3SG + *et-*
ťentriraet- ‘to centre’: *ťentrira[+]/et-* < v. *ťentrira* PR3SG + *et-*
ujivaet- ‘to enjoy’: *ujiva[+]/et-* < v. *ujiva* PR3SG + *et-*
ukluçiet- ‘to include’: *ukluçi[+]/et-* < v. *ukluçi* aor3sg + *et-*
verglæet- ‘to grind, to start (a car), to talk too much’: *vergla[+]/et-* < v. *vergla* PR3SG + *et-*
virtet- ‘to spin (somebody), not to pay attention to (somebody)’: *virt[+]/et-* < v. *virti* PR3SG + *et-*

zabeleji- ‘to register (with one’s eye)’: *zabeleji[+]/et-* < v. *zabeleji* AOR3SG + *et-*
zabrani- ‘to ban, to forbid, to prohibit’: *zabrani[+]/et-* < v. *zabrani* AOR3SG + *et-*
zalepi- ‘to glue, to paste, to shut one’s mouth’: *zalepi[+]/et-* < v. *zalepi* AOR3SG + *et-*
zamislet- ‘to imagine’: *zamisli[+]/et-* < v. *zamisli* AOR3SG + *et-*
zamisli- ‘to imagine’: *zamisli[+]/et-* < v. *zamisli* AOR3SG + *et-*
zapamtiet- ‘to remember’: *zapamti[+]/et-* < v. *zapamti* AOR3SG + *et-*

ol-

buniol- ‘to rebel, to protest (against), to be opposed (to)’: *buni[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *buni* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

bunol- ‘to rebel, to protest (against), to be opposed (to)’: *bun[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *buni* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

dogovoriol- ‘to arrange, to reach an agreement’: *dogovori[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *dogovori* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

dupliraol- ‘to duplicate’: *duplira[+]/ol-* < v. *duplira* PR3SG + *ol-*

faliol- ‘to praise (oneself)’: *fali[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *fali* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

glupiraol- ‘to be foolish’: *glupira[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *glupira* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

infit’iraol- ‘to infect’: *infit’ira[+]/ol-* < v. *infit’ira* PR3SG + *ol-*

interesol- ‘to be interested in’: *interes[+]/ol-* < n. *interes* + *ol-*

izdaol- ‘to surrender’: *izda[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *izda* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

iznenadiol- ‘to be surprised’: *iznenadi[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *iznenadi* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

izviniol- ‘to apologize’: *izvini[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *izvini* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

kırşol- ‘to make a mess’: *kırş[+]/ol-* < n. *kırş* + *ol-*

maçiol- ‘to agonize’: *maçi[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *maçi* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

namesti- ‘to establish oneself, to settle, to take a stand, to place oneself’: *namesti[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *namesti* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

nat’rtaol- ‘to come instantly’: *nat’rta[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *nat’rta* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

onesvestiol- ‘to swoon, to lose consciousness’: *onesvesti[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *onesvesti* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

osvejiol- ‘to refresh’: *osveji[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *osveji* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

poplava ol- ‘to flood’: *poplava ol-* < n. *poplava* + *ol-*

predaol- ‘to give up’: *prada[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *preda* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

raspravaol- ‘to argue’: *rasprava[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *rasprava* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

şatiraol- ‘to colour one’s own hair’: *şatira[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *şatira* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

şokiraol- ‘to be shocked’: *şokira[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *şokira* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

tuşiraol- ‘to shower’: *tuşira[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *tuşira* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

udvaraol- ‘to woo’: *udvara[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *udvara* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

udvariol- ‘to woo’: *udvari[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *udvara* PR3SG. ITR + *ol-*

yaviol- ‘to call, to answer the call’: *yavi[+]/ol-* < v. (se) *yavi* AOR3SG. ITR + *ol-*