

## Avertive marking in Turkmen and Uyghur: On some characteristic features

Türkmence ve Uyghurcada Yaklaşma: Bazı Özellikleri Üzerine

### Gulshen Sakhatova

Ass. Prof., Department of Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies

University of Cyprus, Nicosia / Cyprus

e-posta gulshen.sakhatova@ucy.ac.cy

orcid 0000-0001-7642-035X

doi 10.54316/dilarastirmalari.1103035

#### Atıf

##### Citation

Sakhatova, Gulshen (2022).  
Avertive marking in Turkmen  
and Uyghur: On some  
characteristic features.  
*Dil Araştırmaları*, 30: 183-  
197

#### Başvuru

Submitted  
13.04.2022

#### Revizyon

Revised  
18.04.2022

#### Kabul

Accepted  
21.04.2022

#### Çevrimiçi Yayın

Published Online  
31.05.2022

#### Öz

T Bu çalışmada Doğu Oğuz Türk dilleri grubunda yer alan Türkmencede ve Karluk Türk dilleri grubunda bulunan Uyghurcada ‘yaklaşan eylemin gerçekleşmesine az kaldı(ydı)’ anlamını şekillendiren dil bilgisel ve sözlüksel mekanizmalar incelenecektir. Her iki dilde de bu anlamı ifade eden yapıların {tas} işaretleyicisini içermesi ilgi çekicidir. Bu benzerliğin yanı sıra, yapılarda biçimsel ve anlamsal değişiklikler görülmektedir: {tas} işaretleyicisinin Türkmencede özerk olduğunu ve fiile bağlı olmadığı görülürken, Uyghurcada onun, Kal- fiilin bir bileşeni, yani {tas Kal-} ‘az kalmak/yaklaşmak’ şeklinde kullanıldığını görmek mümkündür. Ayrıca, Uyghurca kompleks bir fiil yapısı sunarken, Türkmencedeki fiil biçimleri oldukça basittir. Çalışmada, yukarıda adı geçen özelliklerin incelenmesi ve karşılaştırılmasıyla birlikte, {tas} işaretleyicisinin iki dilde farklı işlevleri üstlendiğini, onun çeşitli gramerleşme sürecinden geçmiş olduğu ve Türkmencedeki kökü {tas/taz/tis} kökenli fiillere dayanabileceğine dair başlangıç niteliğinde varsayımlar öne sürülmüştür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Türkmence, Uyghurca, Türkmencede ve Uyghurcada yaklaşma, Türk dillerinde kip ve kiplik

#### ABSTRACT

The following paper aims to draw attention to grammatical markers and lexical units that shape the avertive meaning ‘action narrowly averted’ in two Turkic languages: Turkmen as an East Oghuz Turkic language, and Uyghur as a Karluk Turkic language. It is attested that in both languages the speakers to express this meaning use the marker {tas}. In Turkmen {tas} occurs autonomously and is not bound to the verb form, while in Uyghur it appears as an integral constituent of the analytical verbal form {tas Kal-} ‘to be near/little left’. As far as for the verbal forms, Uyghur offers a weight-bearing verbal structure, while the verbal

form in Turkmen is rather simple. Describing and contrasting these formal and semantic properties, the paper discusses that: a) the functions of the marker {tas} differ in both languages, b) {tas} in Turkmen has become a grammaticalized marker and its conceivable lexical origin are likely the Turkmen motion verbs with the roots {tas/taz/tis}..

**Keywords:** Turkmen, Uyghur, avertive in Turkmen and in Uyghur, avertive in Turkic languages, mood and modality in Turkic languages

## 0. Introduction

Languages of the world apply different lexical units and/or grammatical morphemes, when expressing the meaning ‘action narrowly averted’. Scholars have paid substantial attention to these mechanisms across languages. Some authors have drawn attention to lexical and morphological means and have analyzed those within the domains of tense/aspect. Other scholars have confined their investigations to semantics, that is from the modality point of view. Different perspectives on the phenomenon have resulted in different definitions and have led to the emergence of various terminological denotations and interpretations. Some terms, such as ‘avertive’ which has offered by Kuteva (1998), Kuteva et al. (2019), ‘prospective’/‘immediate or imminent future’ by Comrie (1976), Talmy (1985), Bybee et al. (1994), ‘anti-resultative’ by Plungian (2001), are better known than others.

Limited to the Turkic languages, for the phenomenon under discussion, Johanson (2017) offers the term ‘propinquities’, emphasizing the aspectual value of the meaning.

Speaker’s attitude toward a probable event along with his assessment of it are considered defining characteristics in this discussion in studies by Lichtenberk (1995), Dobrushina (2006), Kuteva et al. (2019). The term ‘apprehensive’ has been used here to refer primarily to modality domain - speaker judgment of a probable event with unwelcome consequences (Plungian 2011, p. 337), or as ‘non-realization of an undesirable verb situation’ (Kuteva et al., 2019, 852, 859). Dobrushina, among the forty different languages has examined apprehensive constructions in Turkic languages such as in Altai, Kumyk, Mishar, and Tatar.

In recent years, among the avertive, prospective and proximative categories, grammaticalization and modality issues have naturally attracted interest in Turcological linguistics, too. A number of scholars have conducted research on analytical/auxiliary verbal forms in both contemporary Turkic languages such as in Turkish and its varieties, Turkmen, Noghay, Uyghur as well as in historical languages as Old Turkic, Old Uyghur, etc. (Gökçe, 2007, 2013; Aslan Demir, 2013; Demir, 1993; Karakoç, 2017; Rentzsch, 2015, 2006; Deveci, 2021; Günşen, 2011; Doğan, 2015; *inter alia*). Following the tradition, that is, treating the meaning ‘action narrowly averted’ primarily as a modal phenomenon, Sakhatova (2018) identifies grammatical and lexical means that express apprehension in Turkish as spoken in Cyprus, and compares the findings with both in Standard Turkish, Turkmen as well as in Azerbaijanian.

In addition to these particular studies, the collective volume by Korn and Nevskaja and (2017) contains contributions, addressing the linguistic categories of Prospective

and Proximative in Turkic, and investigating the encoding of their semantics. Among studies on these categories in different Turkic languages and beyond, the volume includes Memtimin's case study, describing the Proximative in Modern Uyghur and Uzbek (2017, p. 359-370), the investigation by Nevskaya and Tazhibayeva, drawing parallels between the Proximative in Kazakh and Kirghiz (2017, p. 347-359).

Turning back to the avertive and its correlation with the categories mentioned above, according to Kuteva et al. (2019, p. 852, p. 859), the semantics of the avertive are elaborate, especially when compared with the 'Proximative' category (expressions for the non-realization of different degrees of the verb situation); in other words, for Kuteva (1998, p. 127) the Proximative indicates a temporal phrase located close before the initial boundary of the situation described by the main verb and indicates a moment shortly before the possible occurrence of the given verbal situation. It is emphasized further, that it is purely an aspectual gram, its essential semantic characteristic being imminence. I will return to the issue later, highlighting TAS in Turkmen and its relation to the Proximative.

The review of the Turcological research literature in terms of the avertive category has shown the following aspects:

- a) discussions over whether or not the avertive in Turkic is associated with the Prospective or Proximative have just begun;
- b) a recent line of research has focused on examining this correlation, taking tense/aspect categories as the most central grammatical parameters;
- c) little is known about both the marker {tas} in Turkic as well as its lexical origin in Turkmen or Uyghur;
- d) to the best of our knowledge, to date, no study has looked specifically at the avertive construction in Turkmen;
- f) concerning Uyghur, little research has been done on the avertive in Uyghur; Memtimin (2017, p. 368-370), primarily describing the Proximative, has yielded some important insights into the grammatical realization of the avertive meaning in Uyghur. Comparing morphosyntactic mechanisms in the proximative inventory in Uyghur and Uzbek, the study underlines that the verb *tas qal-* 'to nearly happen' is used as a mean to mark avertive. In addition, the scholar notes out that both 'avertive' and 'proximative' carry the notion of an imminent event.

Consider the following examples from Turkmen and Uyghur, showing not merely different word positions of the marker {tas}; they also vary in terms of the verbal formations:

#### Turkmen

- |    |                     |      |                |
|----|---------------------|------|----------------|
| a) | <b>taθ</b>          | meni | gör-üp-di      |
|    | AVER                | me   | see-PST-PRF3SG |
|    | S(h)e almost saw me |      |                |

## Uyghur

- |    |                |            |               |
|----|----------------|------------|---------------|
| b) | <b>öl-gili</b> | <b>tas</b> | <b>kal-dï</b> |
|    | die-PROSP      | AVER       | stay-PRF3SG   |
|    | He nearly died |            |               |

Using language data collected from both languages, the aim of this paper is fourfold:

First, expanding the term for the meaning ‘action narrowly averted’ to the term ‘approaching action narrowly averted’ (shortly, AANA) to identify the key grammatical and lexical variables, shaping AANA in both languages;

second, drawing a particular attention to the marker {tas} (afterwards also TAS) to highlight the functional differences between TAS in Turkmen and TAS in Uyghur;

third, to describe the morphologic-semantic properties of the weight-bearing verbal structure in Uyghur, shaping AANA;

fourth, to initiate a discussion, assuming conceivable lexical origin of the marker {tas} in Turkmen (on the relevance of studying diachronic sources of grammatical indicators see in Kuryłowicz, 1965; Bybee et al., 1994, p. 4-9; Haspelmath, 1989, p. 303; *inter alia*).

Thereby, I discuss mainly that:

- a) AANA in Uyghur is encoded by {-GILI + tas Kal-DI}, while AANA in Turkmen is encoded only by TAS;
- b) both languages evaluate differently ‘the degree of realization’ (Talmy, 1985, pp. 130-131) of an approaching event;
- c) TAS and its grammaticalization degrees differ in both languages as well;
- d) following the theories of grammaticalization mechanisms and paths across languages offered and analyzed by Lehmann (1986), Heine et al. (1991), Hopper and Traugott (1993, p. 132), Haspelmath (1999), Maysak (2005), and for Turkish by Gökçe (2007, 2013), to propose the motion verbs with the roots {tas-/daz-/tis-} as the conceivable lexical origin of the marker TAS in Turkmen. These verbs contain information about both the speed and manner of motion as well as the emotional state of animates involved in the movement, such as fear, anxiety.

Regarding to the first-hand language data for this study, the Turkmen examples represents a convenience sample collected during field research in Turkmenistan; the speakers were between forty and sixty years of age, residents from Eastern and Southwestern language continua. The Uyghur examples were recorded through in-person and online interviews. The speakers were between thirty-five and sixty-five years of age, residents of Northwestern China, in the Xinjiang, Urumçi continuum. In addition, one example is taken from the *Uyghur-Russian dictionary* by Nadžip (1968). Examples will be given in the common Turcological transcription; comparative linguistics methods are used.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 1 provides an overview of how currently existing grammars, dictionaries and studies treat TAS. The examples from both languages and their formal characteristics are presented in section 2. Section 3 then deals with the morpho-semantic properties of the verbal forms in Uyghur. A closer look at *Kal-*, functioning as an auxiliary verb in several Turkic languages, is also shortly given. Section 4 presents the Turkmen motion verbs with the stems {*tas-/daz-/tis-*} which are proposed to be seen as the conceivable lexical origin of TAS in Turkmen. The last section summarizes and discusses both the most relevant findings as well as preliminary concluding remarks.

## 1. TAS in grammars, dictionaries and studies: A short overview

Before proceeding, a brief overview of how grammars, studies, and dictionaries treat TAS is in order. Note that Turkmen grammars describe TAS traditionally either among the modal words (Baýjanow and Petjikowa 2014, p. 353-354; Clark, 1998; *inter alia*) or among the particles (Baskakov and Khamzaev, 1964, p. 272-273). Further, Clark (1998, p. 385), referring to an action that was possible but did not come about, mentions its equivalent to English as ‘nearly, almost, hardly’. Several grammars note that modal words such as TAS emphasize the speaker’s attitude towards the event and are semantically empty (Nyýazow, 2009, p. 218-219; Esenmedowa, 2010, p. 343; Petjikowa et al., 2018, p.157). In contrast, Baskakov and Khamzaev (1964, p. 273) classify TAS as a quantitative particle, determining its equivalents in Russian as ‘almost, nearly’.

As far as descriptions of TAS in Uyghur are concerned, the *Uyghur-Russian dictionary* by Nadžip (1968, p. 275) classifies it as an adverb ‘little/almost’. In contrast, Raquette’s *Eastern Turki grammar* (1912, p. 188) describes TAS as a part of the verb complex <*tas qalmâk*> ‘to be near’. As it already mentioned earlier, Memtimin (2017, p. 368-370), comparing morphosyntactic mechanisms in the proximative inventory in Uyghur and Uzbek, notes that ‘*tas qal-/nearly happen*’, indicating a counterfactual event express ‘avertive’ in Uyghur.

To sum up the brief overview, Turkmen grammars define the marker TAS more as a modal word which does not indicate any semantic denotation and less than as a particle. In Uyghur, there seems to be general agreement that TAS currently appears to us as an adverbial add-on to the verb *Kal-*.

## 2. AANA constructions in Turkmen and Uyghur

In the following, the data collected from Turkmen and Uyghur are presented:

### Turkmen

- |     |                               |              |                      |
|-----|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| (1) | <b>taθ</b>                    | elimden      | yačir- <b>ip-dim</b> |
|     | AVER                          | my hand from | fall-PST-PRF1SG      |
|     | (It) almost fell from my hand |              |                      |

- (2) **taθ**                      **ukla-p**                      **γal-jar-dīm**  
 AVER                      asleep-CONV                      stay-CONT-PRF1SG  
 I almost fell asleep
- (3) **taθ**                      **gül-üp-dik**  
 AVER                      laugh-PST-PRF1PL  
 We almost laughed
- (4) **ilga-p**                      **taθ**                      **öl-üp-dik**  
 run-CONV                      AVER                      die-PST-PRF1PL  
 We nearly died running

Further, the Turkmen language data contains an example from a speaker who resides in the Lebap continuum (an eastern border area between Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan):

- (5) **tas**    **taman**                      **jikil-a**                      **otr-an-tim**  
 AVER completely                      fall-CONV                      sit-PRTC-PRF1SG  
 I almost fell completely                      (*was falling/doing fall*)

Let's look at the Uyghur examples below:<sup>1</sup>

### Uyghur

- (6) **jıqıl-ıp**                      **çüş-kini tas**                      **qal-dīm** (Nadzip, p.275)  
 fall-CONV                      fall-PROSP                      AVER left-PRF1SG  
 I almost fell down
- (7) **men**    **jıqıl-ıp**                      **ket-kili**                      **tas**    **qal-dīm**  
 I                      fall-CONV                      go away-PROSPAVER                      stay-PRF1SG  
 I almost fell / I was close to falling<sup>7</sup>
- (8) **sen**    **uhl-ap**                      **qal-yılı**                      **tas**                      **qal-dıñ**  
 you                      asleep-CONV                      stay-PROSP                      AVER                      stay-PRF2S  
 You almost fell asleep
- (9) **öl-gili**                      **tas**                      **qal-dīm**  
 die-PROSP                      AVER                      stay-PRF1SG  
 I almost died

From the examples in both languages, the following formal properties can be specified:

- a) TAS in both languages can be considered as an essential indicator, when expressing AANA;

<sup>1</sup> I would like to express my thanks to the colleague Abdurishid Yakup from the Academy of Sciences in Berlin for reviewing transcriptions of the examples from Uyghur. He confirmed that example (6) is originally from the Kashghar dialect of Uyghur. All remaining errors are mine.

b) the word position of TAS varies, indeed. TAS in Turkmen usually at the head and free, introducing AANA attracts listener's attention, while in the Uyghur material, TAS occurs at the end of the expression, within the verb formation with Kal-;

c) as for the verbal designs, the Turkmen examples include the simple verbal forms: the formant {-IpDI} (1, 3, 4) or by the definite imperfective or past continuous marker {-ýArdI} (2). In contrast, the Uyghur examples contain an analytical verb design, consisting of both the grammatical markers as well as the lexical unit: {-Ip} + {-GILI} + {tas Kal + -DI};

d) the Uyghur verb formation {tas Kal-} 'be close/little left/nearly happen' occurs in all examples marked with the perfective {-DI}.

As far as for the example from the Lebap continuum is concerned, it is interesting first of all due the complexity of its verbal form which distinguishes from the forms we have seen in previous Turkmen examples. The appearance of TAS with the intensifier *taman* 'whole/completely/end/final' on the one hand, and the morphologic combinations {An + DI} in *otrandim* and {-A + ot(u)r-} which are not characteristic for the standard and koine Turkmen on the other hand, make this example unique. In the standard Turkmen the verb *otur-* in the first meaning 'to sit down to live/ to be/to stay in a certain position/ to state', functioning within an analytical verbal formation occurs with the marker

{-Ip}, indeed. Besides, the Lebap speaker uses it together with the verb *jikil-* 'to fall' to express a dynamic event 'to fall'. In any case, the verbal construction {tas taman + -A + -otr-An-DI-} raises questions. To this issue I will turn my attention again in Section 6.

The next chapter looks closer at the Uyghur verb formation.

### 3. Analytical verb design in Uyghur

We have seen above that verbal forms in both Turkmen and Uyghur demonstrate various grammatical settings. Let's look closer at the Uyghur verbal formation {-Ip} + {-GILI} + tas Kal + -DI}.

The perfective {-Ip}, marking certain taxis forms and indicating either a preceding action or a simultaneous flow of an action accompanies the purposive prospective marker {-GILI} which conveys the meaning 'an action has not yet taken place, but it is expected'.

Notice that the prospective marker {-GILI} also known as {-(K)ALAX} is existent in different contemporary and historical Turkic languages. A number of studies has turned their attention to the marker and proposed different explanations, such as Borgoyakova and Burnakova (2021), Schönig (2007), Gökçe (2007), Deveci (2021), etc. There are also attempts to define its semantics. While Johanson (2017, p. 31) describes the marker {-GILI} as a *proximative* marker, referring to a pre-phase 'imminent', Benzing and Menges (1959, p. 4) classify it as 'a participle -yalaq', meaning 'not yet

having done’ (< \* -yan ele yoq), providing several examples from Khakas *paryalax*, from Tuvan *baryalaq* ‘not yet gone’ (on the marker {-gAII} in Old Turkic, see Erdal, 2004). Nevskaya (2010), notes out that the Old Turkic form {-gAII}, having prospective non-factive semantics, can have different functions such as the infinitive occurs in modal, prospective, emotional constructions, etc.

As far as for the perfective marker {-DI} in {tas Kal-} is concerned, it indicates within {tas Kal-} the meaning ‘little left/remaining for an approaching event to be realized’.

The following chapter shortly highlights the verb *-Kal*, its function and semantics as an auxiliary verb in the common Turkic.

### 3.1. *Kal-* as an auxiliary verb in Turkic

The verb *Kal-* ‘to stay, to remain, to stop, to interrupt (the course/progression of an action)’ appears also as an auxiliary verb in various Turkic languages. There are a number of studies which have written extensively about the verb in questions and its functions as an auxiliary verb in several Turkic languages (Graščenkov, 2015, pp. 55, 63-64; Džanmamov, 1967, p. 214-216; Tekujev, 1979, p. 33, 50-52; Sadvakasov, 1976, p. 199). They have yielded insights into its semantics in different lexical settings in Kumyk, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Karachai-Balkar, and Uyghur as spoken in Fergana which can be summarized as follows:

- (1) change from dynamic to static / onset of stiffness:

KRB: *arıp kaldı* ‘become tired’  
*karap kal-* ‘to stare’

- (2) action that happens suddenly / unexpectedly / accidentally / a rapid flow of an action / an action almost happened / ‘onset of unexpected and prompt action’:

KUM: *ole kalyan*  
‘he almost died’

KRB: *tas bolup kaldı*<sup>2</sup>  
lost/disappeared’

- (3) determination of an action / an irreversible event:

KRB: *jelüp kaldı* ‘he died’

- (4) incompleteness of an action:

Fergana UYG: *toxtap kaldım*  
I (suddenly) stopped’

Yakup (2005, p. 111), describing semantics of the verb *Kal-*, when functioning as an auxiliary verb in the Turfan dialect of Uyghur in China underlines that the combination of {-(X)p + qal-} indicates “an unexpected naturally completed action”, such as in *uxlap qal-* ‘asleep naturally/completely sleep/fall asleep (and stay in this state)’.

<sup>2</sup> With thanks to an anonymous reviewer which notes out that *tas bol-* is in fact, an individual lexeme in the given language.



Notice that – as an anonymous reviewer points out – the verb forms ‘to get lost, disappear, go astray’ can easily evolve into the semantic ‘to die’ in any language.

#### 4. Plausible lexical origin of TAS in Turkmen: motion verbs with the stems {tas/daz/tis}

Maysak (2005, p. 95), analyzing the paths of transformation of motion verbs to grammatical markers across languages, including also Turkic languages emphasizes the importance of considering the initial meaning of an entire construction as a whole (the lexical semantics of the auxiliary verb, its grammatical form, as well as the forms of the semantic verb), when embarking on the path of grammaticalization. If we presuppose that TAS is a modal word, aforementioned correlates with the statement made also by Tenišev (2002, p. 322-323) that modal words do not completely lose the semantic substance of their lexical origins, when they become grammaticalized units, still preserving also grammatical abilities.

Is it possible to reconstruct the etymology and all grammaticalization paths of TAS in Turkic, or in particular in both languages under discussion?

A small number of scholars such as Tatarinzev (2000, p. 103-105),

Shcherbak (1961, p. 99), Pekarskij (1959, pp. 2588-2599, 2601-2602), Radlov (1905, p. 915-917) have attempted to identify the origin of TAS in Turkic. Explanations and assumptions have been offered in which some of the studies argued in favor of the hypothesis of its Mongolian origin.

Concerning the Turkmen data analyzed here, TAS how it currently appears to us, is to be most probably seen as a marker, resulting from different stages of the grammaticalization paths, from once being a full-valued lexical item to becoming an obligatory marker. A diachronic evidence can be found that TAS has already occurred in the Middle and Early Modern Turkmen literary texts from the 16th and the 18th centuries: *Bezirgen aldi hayini, tas sindiripdi yayini* ‘Bezirgen took the traitor, and he almost inserted his bow’ (see Baýjanow and Petjikowa, 2014, p. 354).

I will save the examination of the grammaticalization paths of TAS based on diachronic data in Turkmen and Uyghur for future discussions, indeed. At this point, I only draw attention to the motion verbs with the roots {tas-/daz-/tis-} as the most likely origin of TAS in Turkmen. Among the phonological proximity, as already mentioned above, these verbs contain information about both the speed and manner of motion as well as the emotional state of animates involved in the movement, such as fear, anxiety. The dictionary entries on the verbs in question are presented below (Khamzaev, 1962, p. 235, 254, 648):

Table 1

(1) taθamak <sup>3</sup>	'to frighten and run away'
--------------------------	----------------------------

<sup>3</sup> An anonymous reviewer has remarked that this verb might very likely derive from a noun base TAS with +A- which is a denominal verb formative.

(2) taθatmak	'to scare and make them run away'
(3) dađ ýasamak	'to walk very fast, creating noises / to rush'
(4) dađlamak	'to start moving very quickly, to run with quick steps, to rush with strong noise'
5) tisginmek <sup>4</sup>	'to start moving suddenly / unexpectedly, flinch/shudder, e.g. while sleeping'

Emphasizing in addition, that the Turkmen speaker judges such as movements as unpleasant, noisy and inappropriate, there are also adverbs, such as *taθdan* 'suddenly, unexpected', and *deθtine* 'at once, immediately, promptly, right now, quickly' (Čaryjarov and Altajev, 1987, pp. 254, 648, 639-640).

The illustrated motion verbs contain information about:

- a) the manner of motion, indicating rapid or hasty motions, or fleeing in space with unfavorable sounds, and
- b) emotional states such as fear, being scared, experienced by animates.

Emphasizing the importance of a systematic investigation, for now, I argue in favor of the assumption that TAS in Turkmen inherited and kept its aspectual and emotional-modal features from its *ancestors*, the motion verbs with the roots {tas/daz/tis} roots.

## 5. Preliminary concluding remarks / discussions

The observations specified above allow us to make some general and particular preliminary conclusions:

1. TKM and UYG share TAS as a common formal marker, when expressing AANA.
2. Speakers of both languages, expressing AANA report further, a fragment of a dynamic action retrospectively, encoded in Turkmen by the markers {-IpDI} or {-ýArdI} and in Uyghur by {-DI} which at the moment of speech has already been averted.
3. There is a functional overlap, though more in Turkmen than in Uyghur; TAS in Turkmen demonstrates its highly complex and interwoven functions situated at the nodal point of at least two domains:
  - a) the mood (grammatical-aspectual) and
  - b) the modality (emotional states/speaker's attitude toward the approaching event).

<sup>4</sup> Referring to this lexeme an anonymous reviewer proposes further, to look up closer the Old Turkic lexeme *tegzin* 'to revolve, rotate, travel about', see Clauson (1972, p. 488) and assumes that most probably it does not descend from a verb root {tis-}. This and other similar matters should be research objects for future examinations, indeed.

4. TAS in Turkmen is therefore both a grammatical as well as a modal-emotional marker, possessing the threefold capacity to encode:

a) the manner of an action which has hasty/suddenly/unexpected started and rapidly ended;

b) the emotional state of fear (due to unwelcome consequences), and

c) the emotional state of relief (since the action was not realized / narrowly averted).

5. The argument that TAS is a grammatical and a modal-emotional marker in Turkmen is based on its conceivable lexical origin in Turkmen, the motion verbs with the stems {tas-/daz-/tis-}.

5. The event is differently evaluated; while Uyghur focuses on the real degree of realization, quantifying the realization grade of the **expected event** marked by the prospective marker {-GILI} with TAS within the auxiliary verb form with *Kal-*, as ‘for an approaching event little left to be realized’, Turkmen directs attention to evaluate the event, qualifying it as an event which have started suddenly, that is, it is **an unexpected event**. Moreover, TAS in Turkmen usually at the head, indicating the short presence of an unpredicted change in the course of an event specifies in addition, the speaker’s attitude towards the impending event as one with unwelcome consequences. With TAS at the head, the Turkmen listener knows already at the beginning of the speech that the speaker was afraid for a moment and then relieved since an unexpected event with unwelcome consequences narrowly averted.

Therefore, Uyghur, shaping AANA reports the degree of event’s realization, Turkmen on the contrary, evaluates it more toward the emotions associated with this event.

6. As far as for the degrees of grammaticalization of TAS in both languages concerned, the following can be seen. Haspelmath (1999, p. 1058), following Lehmann notes that functional elements becoming obligatory, they are fixed in their position, that is, speakers are no longer free to choose them in certain contexts. Most of the research on the grammaticalization has acknowledged that the factor of ‘obligatoriness’/‘obligatorification’ is one of the parameters in the high stage of grammaticalization (for important treatments, see Lehmann, 2002, p. 124-125). According to the scale of the grammatical development shown by Haspelmath (1999, p. 1058) *extravagance* > *increased frequency* > *routinization* > *obligatoriness* > *rule*, TAS in Turkmen, becoming an obligatory marker and occurring autonomously has arrived at a fairly high stage of its grammaticalization. With respect to TAS in Uyghur, becoming obligatory and being an integral part within the auxiliary verb formation with *Kal-*, it has currently arrived a formal property which is evocative of an advanced grammaticalization stage (for important approaches on grammaticalization stages in languages of the world, see also in Hopper and Traugott, 1993; Heine et al. 1991; *inter alia*).

7. The verbal designs vary in both languages. Uyghur, shaping AANA offers however, a complex morphological and semantical extensive verbal formation, while in the standard and koine Turkmen, on the contrary, it is strict. The example from the Lebap

continuum illustrates both a complex verbal formation as well as a morphological combination which distinguishes from those that exist in the standard Turkmen.

8. The semantics and encodings of AANA in both languages can be illustrated as follows:

Table 2

<p><u>Semantics AANA Uyghur:</u></p> <p>&lt;for <b>expected/approaching action little left</b>&gt; is encoded grammatically and lexically by:          {(-Ip) + -GILI} + {tas Kal-DI}</p>	<p><u>Semantics AANA Turkmen:</u></p> <p>&lt;<b>an unexpected event with unwelcome consequences suddenly begun but narrowly averted</b>&gt; is encoded by:          TAS + ({-IpDI} or {-ýArdI})</p>
<p><u>Semantics AANA Turkmen Lebap variety</u></p> <p>&lt;event was <b>ongoing</b> but narrowly averted&gt; is encoded by:          TAS taman + {-A + -An + -DI}</p>	

9. With regards to the meaning nuances of AANA in both languages, future studies should classify these, being inspired, e.g. by the already existing classifications by Kuteva et al. (2019, such as ‘frustrated initiation’, ‘V was about to’, ‘frustrated completion’ and/or ‘inconsequential’, etc.), Plungian (2001) as ‘anti-resultative’.

10. The issue of the correlation of the avertive in both languages with the categories ‘Prospective and Proximative’ could be the next research object as well. For the present, however, the formal properties show the following. The occurrence of the marker {-GILI} to express an expected event in Uyghur demonstrates the correlation with the Prospective meaning ‘an event is expected’. At the same time, the Proximative meaning ‘an event/a subject was going to/was about to’, that is, ‘an event is in its pre-stage’ may hold for TAS in Turkmen.

11. With respect to the construction {tas taman + -A + -otr-An-DI} from the Lebap province in Turkmenistan further studies are needed, considering the following points.

The actional verbal formation {-A otr-} is of interest for two reasons. Firstly, Turkmen grammars define the verb -otr ‘to sit /to live/ to be/to stay in a certain position/ to state’ together with the verbs *dur-* ‘stay’, *otur-* ‘sit’, *yat-* ‘lie’, and *yör-* ‘go’ either as ‘status verbs’ (Grunina, 2005, p. 82) or as ‘contracted/ descriptive’ verbs (Clark, 1998, p. 224). They are used as a part of an analytical verb formation to express an event in progress at the moment of speech, that means, the verb *otur-*, specifies an ongoing action. As it already mentioned earlier, in the standard and koine Turkmen it occurs however, as a default with the {-Ip} converbs, e.g. *ol işläp otirdi* ‘she was working ~ was doing work’. Kuteva (2001, p.43-74), regarding the auxiliatation of the verb forms ‘sit/stand’/‘lie’ across languages has proposed chains of grammaticalization, having arisen as an extended usage of the lexical encoding of spatial position of physical objects. Secondly, upcoming studies should look closer at the verb *ot(u)r-* in the common Turkic which obviously has moved along an auxiliatation path away from its initially lexical

meaning towards a grammaticalized aspectual meaning, that is, towards the continuative/durative/progressive.

12. Does the Lebab construction {tas taman + -A + -otr-An-DI} reflect an intermediate stage of grammaticalization of TAS in Turkic varieties from the language area? The examination of similar phenomena in other Turkic varieties, including Turkic languages in the neighborhood such as Uzbek, Karakalpak, with reliance on aspects of grammaticalization could assist further explanations listed.

13. Examining diachronic data can we outline grammaticalization paths and possible chains of TAS in Turkic, for instance, the scenarios of auxiliation in Uyghur?

14. What differences and similarities exist between the grammaticalization paths of TAS in TKM and UYG?

15. Currently being tied to the verb Kal-, will TAS drop off from the verb due to the progression of grammaticalization? Which circumstances will motivate this process?

Crucial for further discussions is therefore, whether or not these results hold true for all Turkic languages in which TAS appears and has arrived different stages of the grammaticalization.

## Acknowledgments

My deeply-felt thanks for valuable suggestions go to two anonymous reviewers.

## Abbreviations

1SG	first person singular	KUM	Kumyk
1PL	first person plural	PST	past
3SG	third person singular	PRF	perfective
AVER	avertive marker	PROSP	prospective
CONT	continuous	PRTC	participle
CONV	converb	TKM	Turkmen
KRB	Karachai-Balkar	UYG	Uyghur

## References

- ASLAN DEMİR, S. (2013). Türkmencede Kılınış İşlemcisi olarak Art-Fiiller. *Türkbilgi*, 26, 67-90.
- BASKAKOV, N.A. & KHAMZAEV, M. Ya. (1964). *Sravnitel'naja grammatika russkogo i turkmenskogo jazykov*. Ashkhabat: Turkmenskoje izdatel'stvo.
- BAJANOW, B. & PETJKOWA, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Häzirki Zaman Türkmen Dili - Morfolojiya (Okuw Gollanmasy)*. Aşgabat: Türkmen Bilim Ministrligi.
- BENZING, J. & MENGES, K. H. (1959). Classification of the Turkic languages. In J. Deny et al. (Eds.), *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, Band 1, (pp. 1-10). Wiesbaden: By Franz Steiner Verlag.
- BORGOYAKOVA, K. N. & BURNAKOVA T. N. (2021). Peculiarities of the semantics and functions of the Khakas from -galah in a sentence. *Turkic Studies Journal*, vol. 3 (2), 54-63.
- BYBEE, J. L., PERKINS, R., PAGLIUCA, W. (1994). *The evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. The University of Chicago Press.
- CHARYJAROV, B. & ALTAJEV, S. (Eds.) (1987). *Bolshoj russko-turkmenskij slovar' v 2 tomach* [The Big Russian-Turkmen dictionary]. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- CLARK, L. *Turkmen Reference Grammar* (1998). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- CLAUSON, G. Sir (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

- COMRIE, B. (1976). *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DEMİR, N. (1993). *Postverbien im Türkentürkischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung eines südanatolischen Dorfdialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- DEVECI, B. C. (2021). Eski Uyğur Tükçesinde -gAll kılın- Birleşik Fiil Yapısı Üzerine. *Dil Arařtırmaları*, 28, 143-159.
- DOBRUSHINA, N. R. (2006). Grammatičeskiye formy i konstrukcii so značenijem opasenija i predostereženija” [The grammatical forms and constructions with the meaning of apprehension and warning], *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 2, 28–67.
- DOĞAN, T. (2015). Mut Yöresi Ağzında „Yaklaşma“ Bildiren -DI oldu- ve -(y)IK oluğ Yapıları. *Türk Dünyası İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 15 (1), 105-114.
- DZHANMAMOV, Ju. D. (1967). *Dejepričastija v kumykskom literaturnom jazyke sravnitel’no s drugimi tjurkskimi jazykami”* [Gerundivs in the Kumyk literary language comparing to different Turkic languages]. Moscow: Nauka.
- ERDAL, M. (2004). *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- ESENMEDOWA, A. (2010). *Häzirki zaman Türkmen dili. Morfologiya*. Ashgabat: Türkmen döwlet neşiryat gullugy.
- GÖKÇE, F. (2007). Eski Türkçede {-GalIr / -KAlIr} Eki Üzerine. *Türkbilgi*, 14, 97-115.
- GÖKÇE, F. (2013). *Gramerleşme Teorisi ve Türkçe Fiil Birleşmeleri*. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Arařtırma Enstitüsü.
- GRASHCHENKOV, P. V. (2015). *Tjurkskije konverby i serializacija: sintaksis, semantika, grammatikalizacija* [The Turkic converbs and serialization: syntax, semantics, grammaticalization]. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kultury.
- GRUNINA, E. A. (2005). *Turkmenskij Jazyk* [Turkmen language]. Moscow: Vostočnaja literatura RAN.
- GÜNŞEN, A. (2011). Divānu Lugati’t-Türk’ta „Yaklaşma“ Bildiren Füller. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (1), 235-248.
- HASPELMATH, M. (1989). From Purposive to Infinitive – A universal path of Grammaticization. *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 10, 287-310.
- HASPELMATH, M. (1999). Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics*, 37(6), 1043-68.
- HEINE, B. & CLAUSI, U. & HÜNNEMEYER, F. (1991). *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- HEINE, B. & KUTEVA, T. (2004). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOPPER, P. J. & TRAUGOTT, E. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- JOHANSON, L. (2017). Prospectives and proximatives. In A. Korn & I. Nevskaya (Eds.), *Prospective and Proximative in Turkic, Iranian and beyond* (pp. 29-35). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- KARAKOÇ, B. (2017). Nogayca Çokfiilli Yüklemler: Füllerden Gelişmiş Dilbilgisel Biçimlere Bütüncül Bir Bakış. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi*, 27, 189-216.
- KHAMZAYEV M.Ya. (1962). *Türkmen diliniñ sözlügi*. Ashchabad: Iz-vo AN TSSR.
- KORN, A. & NEVSKAYA, I. (2017). *Prospective and Proximative in Turkic, Iranian and beyond*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- KURYŁOWICZ, J. (1965). The Evolution of Grammatical Categories. *Diogenes*, 13(51), 55-71.
- KUTEVA, T. (1998). On Identifying an Evasive Gram: Action Narrowly Averted. *Studies in Language*, 22(1), 113-160.
- KUTEVA, T. (2001). *Auxiliation. An Enquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- KUTEVA, T. et al. (2019). The Grammar of ‘non-realization’. *Studies in Language*, 43(4), 850-895.
- LEHMANN, Chr. (1986). Grammaticalization and linguistic typology. *General Linguistics*. 26 (1), 3-22.
- LEHMANN, Chr. (2002). *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich: Lincom Europa. (First Published [1982] as akup 48, University of Cologne.)
- LICHTENBERK, F. (1995). Apprehensional epistemics. In J. L. Bybee & S. Fleischman (Eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, (pp. 293-327). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- MAYSAK, T. A. (2005). *Tipologija grammatikalizaciji konstrukcij s glagolami dviženija i glagolami pozicii* [Typology of grammaticalization of constructions with verbs of motion and position]. Moscow: Iz-vo Yazyki slavjanskoj kultury.
- MEMTIMIN, A. (2017). The Proximative in Modern Uyghur and Uzbek. In A. Korn & I. Nevskaya (Eds.), *Prospective and Proximative in Turkic, Iranian and beyond* (pp. 359-371). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- NADZHIP, E. N. (1968). *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'* [The Uyghur-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Iz-vo Sovetskaja Enciklopedija.
- NEVSKAYA, I. & TAZHIBAYEVA, S. The Category of Proximative in the North-Western Turkic languages. Kazakh and Kirghiz in a Comparative Perspective. In A. Korn & I. Nevskaya (Eds.), *Prospective and Proximative in Turkic, Iranian and beyond* (pp. 347-359). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- NEVSKAYA, I. (2010). The Old Turkic form -gall. In M. Kappler et al. (Eds.), *Trans-Turkic Studies. Festschrift in Honour of Marcel Erdal*. Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 49, (pp. 155.166). İstanbul: Mehmet Ölmez.
- NYÝAZOW, S. (2009). *Türkmen dili*. Aşgabat.
- PEKARSKIJ E.K. (1959). *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka*. Tom III, 2-je izd., Moscow: Nauka.
- PETJIKOWA, M. et al. (2018). *Türkmen Dili. Morfoloģiýa*. Aşgabat: Türkmen döwlet neşirýat gullugy.
- PLUNGIAN, V. A. (2003). *Obščaja morfoloģija. Vvedenije v problematiku* [The common morphology. Introduction to issues], 2.izd. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- PLUNGIAN, V. A. (2011). *Vvedenije v grammatičeskuju semantiku. Grammatičeskije značenija i grammatičeskije sistemy jazykov mira* [Introduction to the grammatical semantics. Grammatical meanings and grammatical systems of languages of the world]. Moscow: Iz-vo RGGU.
- PLUNGIAN, V.A. (2001). Antirezultativ: do I posle rezultata. In V.A. Plungian (Ed.), *Glagol'nyje kategorii* (pp. 50–88). Moscow: Russkie slovari.
- RADLOV V.V. (1905). *Opyt slovar'a t'urkskich narechij*. 3 (1). Sankt-Petersburg: Typographija Rossijskoj Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.
- RAQUETTE, G. (1912). *Eastern Turki grammar: practical and theoretical with vocabulary*. Berlin: Reichsdruckerei.
- RENTZSCH, J. (2006). Actionality Operators in Uyghur. *Turkic Languages*, 10 (2), 193-219.
- RENTZSCH, J. (2015). *Modality in the Turkic Languages. Form and Meaning from a Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.
- SADVAKASOV G. (1976). *Jazyk ujugurov ferganskoj doliny: leksika, morfoloģija i jazykovaja interferencija* [The language of Uyghurs of Ferghana Valley: Lexicon, morphology and language interference]. Moscow: Nauka.
- SAKHATOVA, G. S. (2018). Apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish. *Vesnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 10 (3), 315-329.
- SCHÖNIG, C. (2007). Notizen zum Partizip auf -GalAk. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 31 (II), 225–230.
- SHCHERBAK A.M. (1961). Nazvanija domashnich i dikich zhivotnych v t'urkskikh jazykach. In *Istoricheskoe razvitije leksiki t'urkskikh jazykov* (pp. 82-172). Moscow: Nauka.
- TALMY, L. (1985). Lexicalization Patterns. Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 3, *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* (36-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TATARINZEV, B.I. (2000). *Etimologičeskij slovar' tuvinskogo jazyka*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- TEKUJEV, M.M. (1979). *O glagol'nom slovosloženiji v karačajevo-balkarskom jazyke* [On verbal compounding in Karachai-Balkar]. Nalchik: Elbrus.
- TENISHEV, È. R. (Ed.) (2002). *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov: regional'nyje rekonstrukcii* [Comparative grammar of Turkic languages: Regional reconstructions]. Moscow: Nauka.
- YAKUP, A. (2005). *The Turfan Dialect of Uyghur*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.