

The Languages and Linguistics of Europe  
WOL 1

# The World of Linguistics

*Editor*

Hans Henrich Hock

Volume 1

De Gruyter Mouton

# The Languages and Linguistics of Europe

A Comprehensive Guide

*Edited by*

Bernd Kortmann

Johan van der Auwera

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-022025-4  
e-ISBN 978-3-11-022026-1

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

The languages and linguistics of Europe : a comprehensive guide /  
edited by Bernd Kortmann, Johan van der Auwera.

p. cm. – (The world of linguistics; 1)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-022025-4 (alk. paper)

1. Europe – Languages. 2. Linguistics – Europe. 3. Multilingualism – Europe. 4. Language and culture – Europe. I. Kortmann, Bernd, 1960– II. Auwera, Johan van der.

P380.L346 2011

410.4–dc22

2011016469

*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.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Cover image: Thinkstock/iStockphoto

Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz GmbH & Co. KG, Lemförde

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

# Table of contents

List of contributors . . . . .	xi
Introduction	
<i>Bernd Kortmann and Johan van der Auwera</i> . . . . .	xv
<b>I. Typology of European languages</b>	
1 The Baltic languages	
<i>Axel Holvoet</i> . . . . .	3
2 The Celtic languages	
<i>Patricia Ronan</i> . . . . .	31
3 The Germanic languages	
<i>John Ole Askedal</i> . . . . .	47
4 The Romance languages	
<i>Johannes Kabatek and Claus D. Pusch</i> . . . . .	69
5 Slavonic languages	
<i>Björn Hansen</i> . . . . .	97
6 The Caucasian languages	
<i>Michael Daniel and Yury Lander</i> . . . . .	125
7 The Turkic languages of Europe	
<i>Astrid Menz</i> . . . . .	159
8 The Uralic languages	
<i>Johanna Laakso</i> . . . . .	179
9 Albanian	
<i>Dalina Kallulli</i> . . . . .	199

vi	Table of contents	
10	Basque <i>Martin Haase</i> . . . . .	209
11	Greek <i>Anastasios Tsangalidis</i> . . . . .	223
12	Maltese <i>Thomas Stolz</i> . . . . .	241
13	Romani <i>Yaron Matras</i> . . . . .	257
14	European signed languages – towards a typological snapshot <i>Myriam Vermeerbergen and Lorraine Leeson</i> . . . . .	269
 <b>II. Areal typology and language contact</b>		
 <b>II.1. Areal typology</b>		
15	Standard Average European <i>Johan van der Auwera</i> . . . . .	291
16	Balkan Sprachbund features <i>Olga Mišeska Tomić</i> . . . . .	307
17	The Circum-Baltic languages <i>Bernhard Wälchli</i> . . . . .	325
18	Mediterranean languages <i>Andrea Sansò</i> . . . . .	341
 <b>II.2. Language contact</b>		
19	Language contact in the North of Europe <i>Jan-Ola Östman</i> . . . . .	359
20	Language contact in the East and Northeast of Europe <i>Dieter Stern</i> . . . . .	381

21	Language contact in Southwestern Europe <i>Claus Pusch and Johannes Kabatek</i> . . . . .	393
22	Language contact in South-Eastern Europe <i>Peter M. Hill</i> . . . . .	409
23	Language contact of minority languages in Central and Southern Europe: a comparative approach <i>Walter Breu</i> . . . . .	429
<b>II.3. Minority languages</b>		
24	The old minority languages of Europe <i>Stefan Tröster-Mutz</i> . . . . .	455
25	The immigrant minority languages of Europe <i>Guus Extra</i> . . . . .	467
<b>II.4. Non-standard varieties</b>		
26	Dialect vs. standard: a typology of scenarios in Europe <i>Peter Auer</i> . . . . .	485
27	Border effects in European dialect continua: dialect divergence and convergence <i>Curt Woolhiser</i> . . . . .	501
28	Non-standard varieties in the areal typology of Europe <i>Adriano Murelli and Bernd Kortmann</i> . . . . .	525
<b>III. Language politics and language policies in Europe</b>		
29	Minorities, language politics and language planning in Europe <i>Jeroen Darquennes</i> . . . . .	547
30	Language policies at the Germanic-Romance language border: the case of Belgium, Luxembourg and Lorraine <i>Peter Gilles</i> . . . . .	561

31	Feminist language politics in Europe <i>Antje Lann Hornscheidt</i> . . . . .	575
32	English as a threat to other European languages and European multilingualism? <i>Juliane House</i> . . . . .	591
33	English in intranational public discourse <i>Päivi Pahta and Irma Taavitsainen</i> . . . . .	605
34	Language in political institutions of multilingual states and the European Union <i>Ruth Wodak and Michał Krzyżanowski</i> . . . . .	621
35	Language and the church: European perspectives <i>John Myhill</i> . . . . .	639
36	Language and the school: European perspectives <i>Joachim Grzega</i> . . . . .	655
 <b>IV. History of European languages</b>		
37	The prehistory of European languages <i>Robert Mailhammer</i> . . . . .	671
38	The impact of migrations on the linguistic landscape of Europe <i>Paolo Ramat</i> . . . . .	683
39	The Renaissance and its impact on the languages of Europe <i>Heidi Aschenberg</i> . . . . .	697
40	Multilingual states and empires in the history of Europe: the Habsburg Monarchy <i>Jan Fellerer</i> . . . . .	713
41	Multilingual states and empires in the history of Europe: the Ottoman Empire <i>Lars Johanson</i> . . . . .	729



42	Multilingual states and empires in the history of Europe: Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union <i>Dieter Stern</i> . . . . .	745
43	Multilingual states and empires in the history of Europe: Yugoslavia <i>Christian Voß</i> . . . . .	761
44	Language and nation building in Europe <i>Sue Wright</i> . . . . .	775
<b>V. Research traditions in Europe</b>		
45	Research traditions up to and including the 18th century <i>Nicola McLelland</i> . . . . .	791
46	19th century linguistics: practice and theory <i>Pierre Swiggers</i> . . . . .	805
47	European Structuralism <i>Jörn Albrecht</i> . . . . .	821
48	European functionalism <i>Rosanna Sornicola</i> . . . . .	845
49	Generative grammar in Europe: some historical impressions <i>Martin Everaert and Eric Reuland</i> . . . . .	867
	Index of languages and varieties . . . . .	887
	Index of names . . . . .	895
	Index of subjects . . . . .	908

# 7 The Turkic languages of Europe

Astrid Menz

1. Introduction
2. The Turkic languages of Europe
  - 2.1. The Oghuz languages of Europe
  - 2.2. The Kipchak languages of Europe
  - 2.3. Chuvash
3. Typological characteristics of the Turkic languages of Europe
  - 3.1. Phonetics and phonology
  - 3.2. Morphology
  - 3.3. Syntax
4. Linguistic changes due to language contact

## 1. Introduction

The Turkic language family comprises a group of genetically related languages spoken over a vast geographic area, from North-Siberia to Iran, and from North-West Europe to Northern China. The question of a genetic relatedness of the Turkic languages with Mongolic, Tungusic, and even Korean and Japanese, forming the so-called Altaic language family, is still debated (for a recent introduction to the discussion see Robbeets 2005: 18–29).

The oldest primary sources for the Turkic languages are the so-called Köktürk runiform inscriptions of Mongolia from the late 7th century onwards. Old Turkic manuscripts from the 9th century onwards written in various scripts (Uyghur, Soghdian, Tibetan, etc.), have been found in North-Eastern China. As a result of the conversion to Islam of Turkic groups from the 10th century onwards, the impact of Arabic and Persian grew significantly, particularly among Turkic groups of the Central Asian region (Kipchak, Oghuz, Uzbek). In the 11th century, this cultural influence led to the introduction of the Arabic alphabet for writing Turkic. The varieties documented in various texts up to that time can, despite a certain linguistic variation they display, all be subsumed under the term Old Turkic (see Erdal 2004: 6–22).

Language-internal factors and geographic distribution as well as the growing impact of contact languages (Iranian, Mongolic, Uralic, and others) ultimately led to the formation of different branches of Turkic with their various subgroups and varieties. From the 15th century onwards up until the modern period in the 20th century with its nation building processes, two major literary varieties of Turkic – Ottoman and Chaghatay – were used as supra-regional literary languages. The use

of the Arabic alphabet provided for the intelligibility of written language material over a vast geographic area. Due to the nature of the Arabic alphabet and the conservative writing system employed for writing Turkic, however, many questions about the development of the Turkic languages in the Middle and Pre-Modern Turkic periods (13th to 19th centuries) remain as yet unsolved.

Currently, the Turkic language family consists of about 25 written and a number of non-written languages and varieties among which Turkish is the largest one, having the largest number of speakers and the broadest written language production. The modern languages are divided into the six subgroups: Chuvash, Khalaj, Northwestern or Kipchak Turkic, Southeastern, Northeastern, and Southwestern or Oghuz Turkic. This division is based on linguistic criteria and geographic distribution (see Johanson 1998: 82). The two branches Chuvash and Khalaj consist of only one language each, whereas the remaining four branches contain several sub-branches and varieties.

## **2. The Turkic languages of Europe**

Of the six sub-branches of the Turkic language family, three are represented in Europe: Oghuz, Kipchak, and Chuvash.

### **2.1. The Oghuz languages of Europe**

Oghuz or Southwest Turkic is the branch with most speakers and the largest single language Turkish (= Trk), which has approximately 70 million native speakers in Turkey, Cyprus, the Balkan countries, and North-Western Europe. The number of native speakers of Turkish can only be guessed, as statistics for Turkey, and also most of the Balkan countries as well as the Northwest European countries, do not exist. The very concept of native speaker is of course also a problem. Turkey has a population of about 70 million people, but the number of Turkish citizens having a first language other than Turkish is unknown. This uncertainty applies of course also to Turkish immigrants to Europe, who number about 3.5 million people. Turkish is the sole official language of the Republic of Turkey and one of the official languages of the entire Republic of Cyprus. In North-Western Europe it is the strongest immigrant minority language, with about 3 million speakers, and is included in the school curriculum in a variety of Northwestern European countries as well as in some Balkan states. The opinion, however, that Turkish language instruction should be removed from the curriculum because clinging to one's ethnic language supposedly hinders integration in mainstream society seems to gain ground lately, see the introduction in Extra and Yağmur 2004 and, as a case study, the documentation (Dokumentation 1993) on the discussion about a bilingual alphabetization project for Turkish children in Berlin.

The second Oghuz language spoken in Europe is Gagauz (= Ggz), with a total of about 250,000 speakers. The largest group of Gagauz people lives in the Republic of Moldova (147,500 in 2004) (<http://www.statistica.md/pageview.php?l=en&idc=334&id=2338> [24. 03. 2011].), where Gagauz has official language status in the autonomous region Gagauzia (or Gagauz Yeri). Smaller Gagauz communities live in the Ukraine (31,900 in 2001), Bulgaria, Romania, Greece, and Russia. Unlike the Turks of Turkey, who are almost all Muslims, the Gagauz are Orthodox Christians. Linguistically, Gagauz can be regarded as a dialect of Turkish that has developed individual features due to intensive contact with Slavic languages. Gagauz was declared one of the official languages of the Soviet Union in 1957. Since then it was written in Cyrillic script until in 1995 an alphabet based on Latin script was introduced which is slightly different from the alphabet used for Turkish. Gagauz is part of the curriculum at schools in Gagauzia.

## 2.2. The Kipchak languages of Europe

The Kipchak (Northwest Turkic) languages spoken in Europe are the Northern Kipchak languages Tatar (= Ttr) and Bashkir (= Bsh), the Western Kipchak languages Karaim (= Krm), Crimean Tatar (= CrTtr), Kumyk (= Kmk), and Karachay-Balkar (= Krch), and the Southern Kipchak language Noghay (= Nog). The majority of Kipchak language speakers are Muslims, with the exception of groups of Christian Tatars and the Karaim, who adhere to a form of Judaism.

There are about 5.5 million Tatars living in the Russian Federation (from the 2002 census, see [http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus\\_nac\\_02.php](http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/rus_nac_02.php) [24. 03. 2011]), about 2 million of whom are in the Republic of Tatarstan, followed by Bashkir with 1.6 million people, the majority of them (1.2 million) living in the Republic of Bashkortostan. Tatar and Bashkir are both official languages alongside Russian in their respective republics. It is worth noting that the Bashkir are a minority in their own republic, where 36 % of the population are Russian, 30 % Bashkir, and 24 % Tatar (but see Gorenburg 1999 for the fluctuation between Bashkir and Tatar identity in Bashkortostan). Tatar and Bashkir are linguistically closely related to each other, with differences mainly in phonetics and phonology.

Crimean Tatar is an endangered Western Kipchak variety, originally spoken on the Crimea, from where the Crimean Tatars were deported to Central Asia during World War II. Since the mid 1980s Crimean Tatars have been allowed to return to the Crimea, where, according to the census of 2001 (<http://www.ukrcensus.gov.ua/results/general/nationality> [24. 03. 2011]), about 250,000 Crimean Tatars live at present, 92 % of whom claim to have Crimean Tatar as their mother tongue. The number of Crimean Tatars in Uzbekistan is not certain.

Ethnic Kumyks are about 422,409 people and the group of Karachay-Balkars, who form a linguistic unit, consists of 192,182 ethnic Karachays and 108,426 ethnic Balkars. Kumyk and Karachay-Balkar are spoken mainly in the Caucasus re-

gions. They all have official language status alongside Russian and other languages in the republics where their majority is based. Kumyk has official status in the Republic of Dagestan; Karachay is one of the official languages of the Karachay-Cherkess Republic; and Balkar is an official language in the Kabardino-Balkar Republic.

Karaim is a highly endangered language spoken in Lithuania by fewer than 100 speakers.

The ethnic group of the Noghays has 90,666 members. Noghay is spoken mainly in Dagestan, where it has official language status, and in its adjacent regions (Noghay also has official language status in the Karachay-Cherkess Republic) and is the only European Turkic language belonging linguistically to the South Kipchak group (the South Kipchak languages spoken outside of Europe are Kazakh, Karakalpak, and Kirghiz).

### 2.3. Chuvash

Chuvash (= Chu) constitutes a branch of its own and is linguistically quite distant from all the other Turkic languages because its ancestor language split away from Turkic before the Old Turkic period. It is an official language in the Republic of Chuvashia where about 900,000 Chuvash people live. The total number of Chuvash in the Russian Federation is about 1.6 million. The Chuvash are predominantly Christian.

All Kipchak languages mentioned above as well as Chuvash are part of the curriculum in the regions where their speakers concentrate; Tatar is the medium of instruction in some schools and also in some branches of higher education in Tatarstan.

While the population figures are easily available for at least the ethnic groups of the Russian federation, estimating the number of native speakers is more complicated. In the 2002 census, knowledge of language was elicited only quantitatively, not qualitatively. The results cannot straightforwardly be connected with the figures for the ethnic groups. In any case, it is safe to say that a shift to Russian as the first language is not uncommon among all the minority groups in urban regions of the Russian Federation, while in rural areas the ethnic language has broader functionality and higher prestige and is thus not given up easily. On the other hand, we must also account for a certain influence of Turkic languages with higher prestige upon the less prestigious ones in areas where speakers are in close geographic contact. Thus, Tatar has a higher prestige than Bashkir and Chuvash, and speakers of those languages living in Tatarstan might give up their variety in favor of Tatar. Governmental influences in this area might even lead to a change in ethnic identity between linguistically closely related Turkic groups. As an example, see the study by Gorenburg (1999) for Bashkortostan. Turkish has gained

a certain influence on Gagauz in the course of the last 15 years that might eventually lead to diglossia among ethnic Gagauz who have close connections to Turkey (see Menz 2003).

Almost all Turkic languages of the former Soviet Union suffer from a certain degree of endangerment because of the overwhelming social dominance of Russian during Soviet times. Russian was then and is still the language of the sciences, technology, political, legal, and administrative institutions and thus enjoys a much higher prestige than the languages of the minorities, however large they might be. This dominance led to an underdevelopment of the lexicon of the languages in question in certain domains.

Chuvash, Tatar, Bashkir and their predecessors have been in a complex language contact situation with Finno-Ugric languages of the Volga region ever since speakers of Turkic arrived there (see Johanson 2000).

Mutual intelligibility is high between Turkish and Gagauz and also among the Kipchak languages. Intelligibility between Oghuz and Kipchak languages is also possible on a basic level of communication. Chuvash, however, is not intelligible for any of the other Turkic languages.

### 3. Typological characteristics of the Turkic languages of Europe

#### 3.1. Phonetics and phonology

Vowel phonemes: The Turkic languages typically employ a set of 8 vowel phonemes, most clearly represented in Turkish (see Table 1). Each back vowel has its front counterpart. Tatar, Bashkir, and Noghay have two *e* phonemes, /ɛ/ and /e/, and therefore 9 vowel phonemes. Tatar, Bashkir, Karaim, and Chuvash have centralized shortened or reduced vowels (lax). Chuvash has no /o/ and /ø/ phonemes, except for /o/ in Russian loanwords.

The Turkic languages of Europe typically have no long vowels in native words and no diphthong phonemes. Long vowels do appear in Arabic-Persian loans and as a result of syllable contraction. In some Gagauz words of Turkic origin, Ancient Turkic long vowels have been preserved; this mainly concerns long /a:/ and does not involve all Turkic words that had primary long vowels (see Pokrovskaja 1964: 29).

Table 1: Turkish (and Gagauz) vowel phonemes

	front		back	
high	i	y	u	u
low	ɛ	ø	a	o
	illabial	labial	illabial	labial

Consonant phonemes: In general, the plosives are pairs of voiced and unvoiced counterparts. Chuvash, however, has only unvoiced plosive phonemes that are pronounced fortis except between vowels or between sonorant and vowel, where they are pronounced lenis. All other languages have pairs of the voiced/unvoiced bilabial (/b/ and /p/), alveolar (/t/ and /d/), and palatal/velar (/k/ and /g/) plosives. All have at least one labiodental (/f/ or /v/), one alveolar (/s/ or /z/), and one postalveolar fricative (/ʃ/ or /ʒ/), and a postalveolar affricate (/tʃ/ or /dʒ/). In all these languages the nasals /m/ and /n/, laterals /l/ and /r/ and the approximant /y/ exist. Some Kipchak languages have a bilabial approximant /w/. The Kipchak languages with the exception of Karaim, also have a velar nasal phoneme /ŋ/.

The basic differences between Bashkir and Tatar concern the consonant correspondences shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Tatar and Bashkir consonant correspondences

Tatar	Bashkir	Tatar	Bashkir	
s-	h-	<i>sakal</i>	<i>hakal</i>	'beard'
{+s}	{+h}	<i>bul-sa</i>	<i>bul-ha</i>	'if it is'
č	s	<i>aŋ-</i>	<i>as-</i>	'to open'
s	θ	<i>bas-</i>	<i>baθ-</i>	'to press'
z	ð	<i>boz</i>	<i>boð</i>	'ice'

Secondary phonemes due to language contact are the unvoiced labiodental fricative /f/, which appears only in native interjections and in Arabic-Persian, French, and Russian loan-words, e.g. Trk *öf* 'uff' and Ttr *fonětika* 'phonetics', *fikër* 'idea' < Arabic, the alveo-palatal affricate /ts/ in Russian and Romanian loans, e.g. Ggz *furkulitsa* 'fork' < Romanian, as well as the alveolar fricative [ʒ] in Persian, French and Russian loans, e.g. Ttr *zaloba* 'complaint' < Russian.

Syllable structure: preferred syllables are (C)V(C); vowel sequences and consonant clusters are avoided with exceptions in final clusters consisting of a liquid or nasal (in Turkish and Gagauz also a sibilant) and a stop, e.g. Ttr */dyrt/* 'four', but */dus/* 'friend' < Persian *dost*, in Turkish */dost/*. In recent loanwords from Russian and English, final clusters with other combinations, as e.g. Ttr */nerv/* 'nerve' and even initial consonant clusters become more and more acceptable in all European Turkic languages, e.g. modern Trk */spor/* vs. the older pronunciation */supor/* 'sport' and Ttr */spektakl/* 'theatre play'. Pronunciation in these cases often depends on the speaker's foreign language knowledge.

All Turkic languages have inter-syllabic harmony. A syllable is either back or front, each following syllable adhering in this respect to the previous one, e.g. Bsh *[ciʃi]* 'person' and Ttr *[ayak]* 'foot'. This rule also applies to most suffixes, e.g. Bsh *[ciʃiler]* 'persons', Ttr *[ayaktar]* 'feet'. As can be seen from the above examples, the syllable harmony affects not only vowels but also those consonants

that have front and back allophones. In Karaim, due to the development of a set of palatalized consonants under the influence of non-Turkic languages, this system spread over all consonants: e.g. [b'er'd'i] 'he gave' as opposed to [bardɣ] 'he went', (see Csató 1999). Back and front allophones of /k/ and /g/ have different letters in some of the Cyrillic-based alphabets (Bashkir, Noghay) but not in the Latin-based ones (Gagauz and Turkish).

Loanwords do not always take part in harmonizing processes; suffixes attached to them, however, in general adhere to front:back-harmony, e.g. CrTtr *minare-ge* [minaret-DAT] 'to the minaret'. Only a limited number of suffixes are invariable and accordingly do not adhere to vowel harmony.

Turkish additionally has labial harmony in suffixes that contain a high vowel. These suffixes display a fourfold harmony according to frontness and roundedness of the vowel in the preceding syllable, e.g. *ev* 'house' > *evi* [house-ACC], *ot* 'gras' > *otu* [gras-ACC].

Bashkir has labial harmony after /œ/ and /o/ in suffixes that contain a mid vowel, e.g. *hæt* 'milk' > *hæt-tœ* [milk-ACC].

Consonant assimilation: Suffix-initial consonants may assimilate to the final consonant of the word they are attached to. The degree of assimilation differs in the various languages. The plural suffix<sup>1</sup>, for instance, is *-lAr* in Turkish, in Kumyk and Karachay-Balkar *-lA(r)*, but *-LAR* in all the other Turkic languages of Europe, displaying individual kinds of assimilation: In Gagauz the initial *L* is assimilated only after *n*, i.e. *gün* 'day' > *günnär* 'days', in Tatar, Karaim, Crimean Tatar, and Noghay after all nasals, thus *alym* 'method' > *alymnar* 'method', in Bashkir it is *-lAr* after vowels, *-tAr* after plosives, fricatives except /ð/, and affricates, *-dAr* after nasals, *l* and *ž*, and *-ðAr* after *y*, *w*, *r*, and *d*.

Suffix-initial plosives assimilate in all languages after voiceless consonants, e.g. dative *-GA* > Krm *uvul-ga* [son-DAT] 'to the son' but *it-ke* [dog-DAT] 'to the dog'.

Suffix-initial vowels may drop after vowel stems, e.g. Nog *ana-m* [mother-POSS 1SG] 'my mother' but *is-im* [matter-POSS 1SG] 'my concern'.

Stress is regularly on the last syllable. Suffixes attached to a stem take over the stress, e.g. Bsh *urám* 'street' *uramdár* 'streets' *uramdarđán* 'from the streets'. Some suffixes and clitics cannot carry stress, e.g. negation, copula elements, the question particle, etc. Names and loanwords may have different stress patterns.

### 3.2. Morphology

The Turkic lexicon basically consists of verbs and nouns, formally divided by the ability of the verbs to take a negation suffix in *-mA* added directly to the stem. The nouns can be subdivided into nouns proper, numerals, adjectives (with some difficulties, see Braun and Haig 2000 for Turkish), and pronouns. The Turkic languages have no definite article. A group of indeclinable words consists of adverbs, postpositions, conjunctions (mostly of non-Turkic origin), and interjections.



Turkic languages belong to the agglutinative language type. Words take suffixes that are attached to the stem and to each other, being rather clear-cut and staying relatively stable in the process. Suffix boundaries generally stay quite clear; variation is predictable according to vowel and consonant harmony, e.g. Trk *kapak* > *kapak-lar* > *kapak-lar-ı* > *kapak-lar-ın-da* and *kapak* > *kapağ-ı*, see below.

All Turkic languages have derivational and inflectional suffixes. The order of suffixes is not arbitrary: Derivational suffixes precede inflectional ones; the two groups also have an internally fixed order, and although combinability is high, it is rule-bound.

### 3.2.1. Derivation

Denominal and deverbal suffixes for verbs and nouns form new stems, e.g.

denominal nouns:	Chu <i>yurǎ</i> ‘song’	> <i>yurǎ-śǎ</i> ‘singer’;
denominal verbs:	Bsh <i>eš</i> ‘work’	> <i>eš-le-</i> ‘to work’;
deverbal nouns:	Krm <i>yalvar-</i> ‘to request’	> <i>yalvarış</i> ‘request’;
deverbal verbs:	Ttr <i>kurk-</i> ‘to fear’	> <i>kurküt-</i> ‘to frighten’.

All Turkic languages have suffixes for passive, reflexive, causative, and cooperative that precede the negation suffix, i.e. they are in the slot for derivational suffixes.

Besides synthetic derivation, nominal and verbal compounding is used to form new words. The most frequent type of nominal compounds consists of two (or more) nouns with a third person possessive suffix at the head noun, e.g. Ggz *yemiş aacı* [fruit tree-POSS3SG] ‘fruit tree’. (In cases where personal possession of a compound must be expressed, the compounding suffix is replaced by the necessary possessive suffix, thus *yemiş aacım* [fruit tree-POSS1SG] ‘my fruit tree’ *yemiş aaç-ları* [fruit tree-POSS3PL] ‘their fruit tree’, etc.) Juxtaposition of two nouns without possessive suffix is also possible, especially when the attribute denotes a material, e.g. Chu *čugun śul* [iron road] ‘railroad’.

Verbal compounds may consist of a noun (of foreign origin) and an auxiliary verb, e.g. Krch *sabir* ‘patience’ > *sabir et-* ‘be patient’, or a postverb construction, e.g. Nog *uşıp bar-* [fly-CVB go] ‘to fly away’.

### 3.2.2. Verb inflection

Closest to the verbal stem comes the negation suffix, *-mA*, which is followed either by finite or non-finite verb forms. *-mA* does not carry stress.

Finite forms are built with various aspecto-temporal markers followed by agreement markers. In all the languages two basic types of agreement markers (see Table 3) combine with the aspecto-temporal forms. The so-called copulative agreement markers combine with present tense, habitual present, perfect, and the future;

the so-called possessive type combines with past tense and conditional. The imperative and the optative mood have their own paradigms of personal markers.

Table 3: Verbal agreement markers

Copulative agreement marker						Possessive agreement marker				
	Ttr <sup>2</sup>	Krm	Nog	Chu	Trk <sup>3</sup>	Ttr	Krm	Nog	Chu	Trk
1.sg	-mĕn	-m	-MAn	-(Ă)p	-(y)Im	-m	-m	-m	-Ăm	-m
2.sg	-sĕŋ	-s	-sIŋ	-(Ă)n	-sIn	-ŋ	-y	-ŋ	-Ăn	-n
3.sg	∅	(-t)	(-DI)	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	-ĕ	∅
1.pl	-bĕz	-bIz	-MIz	-pĂr	-(y)Iz	-K	-K	-K	-ĂmĂr	-K
2.pl	-sĕz	-sIz	-SIz	-(Ă)r	-sInIz	-Gĕz	-yIz	-ŋIz	-Ăr	-nIz
3.pl	(-LAr)	-LAr, -dlAr	(-DIAr)	-ś(ĕ)	(-LAr)	(-LAr)	(-LAr)	(-IAr)	-ĕś	(-LAr)

The aspecto-temporal system of the Turkic languages is rather complex, consisting of primary suffixes and secondary combinations with auxiliary forms. The primary forms can roughly be divided into a tripartite system of markers for past, present, and future; for the various suffixes see Table 4. To these aspecto-temporal suffixes personal markers are added when used as predicators. Note that some of the suffixes in question serve also as markers for participles.

Table 4: Basic aspecto-temporal markers

	Ttr	Kmk	Krm	Nog	Chu	Trk	Ggz
Past I	-DE	-DI	-DI	-DI	-R	-DI	-DI
Past II	-GAn	-GAn	-GAn	-GAn	-nĂ	-mIş	-mIş
Present I	-A	-A	-A	-A	-At	-(0)Iyor <sup>4</sup>	-er
Present II	-(V)r	-(V)r		-(A)r	∅	-(V)r	-(V)r
Future	-(y)AčAk	-(A)žAk	-(V)r	-(A)yAk	-Ă	-(y)Acak	-(y)AcAk

Although Table 4 looks as if the aspecto-temporal systems in the Turkic languages were quite similar, matters are a bit more complicated. The individual languages display semantic differences despite the fact that forms look very much alike and the building mechanisms for combined forms are structurally the same in all the languages except Chuvash.

Past: The basic past tense forms are the simple past (past I), which in all languages in question goes back to an Old Turkic formant *-Di* and an indirective past form (past II) conveying post-terminality and modal shades of evidential, inferential, hearsay, or surprise. This second past is marked by *-GAn* in the Kipchak languages, *-mIş* in the Oghuz Turkic languages, and by *-nĂ*, which cannot take personal markers, in Chuvash.

Present: In almost all the languages there are at least two present tense forms, differing semantically in that one is used to express an ongoing event while the other is a broader intra-terminal present form, conveying also intention and habituality.

As focal present tense forms tend to lose focality, they were regularly renewed throughout all the Turkic languages, most often by the help of a combination of a converb form and an auxiliary verb (mostly *tur-* ‘to stand’, but *yori-* ‘to walk’ in Turkish) that later became de-lexicalized and subsequently turned into a suffix. The second present tense in *-(V)r* in some languages developed into a mere modal prospective form. Noghay, for instance, has a tripartite system consisting of non-focal, low-focal, and high focal forms, *bar-ar-man* [go-PRSII-1SG] ‘I will (intend to) go’, *bar-a-man* [go-PRSI-1SG], ‘I go’ *bar-ayatur-man* [go-PRS-1SG] ‘I am going’, alongside other intra-terminal forms (see Karakoç 2005: 152–161).

Future: Besides conveying prospectivity the future tense has modal connotations in all Turkic languages in question. The Karaim future in *-(V)r* developed from the former present form that lost its focality (see Csató 1998: 48).

In addition to these basic simple suffixes, all languages have combinations of participles or converbs and forms of the copula or certain auxiliary verbs that bear aspecto-temporal markers, thus forming various new aspecto-temporal markers, e.g. habitual past forms as Krm *koy-ul-ur e-di* [place-PASS-PRSII AUX-PSTI3SG] ‘used to be placed’, Nog *üret-etagan bol-gan* [teach-HABIT AUX-PSTII3SG] ‘used to teach’; pluperfect in *-GAn edi*, CrTtr *algan edi-m* [take-PSTII PSTCOP-1SG] ‘I had taken’, or focal present tense as in Krch *isle-y tur-a-ma* [work-CVB AUX-PRSI-1SG] ‘I am working’.

Modal forms: The imperative is the bare stem of the verb in the singular and an unstressed personal suffix *-(y)In* in the Oghuz languages, *-Iglz/-IŋIz/-InIz* in the Kipchak languages and *-(0)Ar* in Chuvash in the plural. Negation is regular, i.e. Ttr *kayt* ‘go back!’ *kaytma* [go-back.NEG] ‘don’t go back!’; except in Chuvash, where the negated imperative is formed with a prepositional element *an*, which is most probably of Finno-Ugric origin: *sîr* ‘write!’, *an sîr* ‘don’t write!’. Besides the imperative, all languages have optative, voluntative, and necessitative forms.

Non-finite forms are converbs, verbal nouns, and participles. The main function of these non-finite forms is that of predicators in subordinated clauses (see the section on syntax). Moreover, they are used as elements in aspecto-temporal combinations.

Converbs: All languages have a coordinative converb in *-(X)p* or *-(y)Xp*, except Chuvash, which has *-sA*. Widespread use is also made of an intra-terminal converb in *-(y)A*. Besides primary non-analyzable converb forms, most languages make use of combinations of participle and case suffixes and/or postpositions to build converb forms with various semantic shades, e.g. CrTtr *-GAndA* ‘when ...’ < participle in *-GAn* + LOC, Trk *-DIk-tAn sonra* ‘after ...’ < participle in *-DIk* + ABL +

postposition. The conditional suffix is *-sA* (+personal marker) in most cases (Trk, Ggz, Ttr, Kmk, CrTtr, Krm, and Krch), *-hA* in Bashkir; for remote condition the past copula is added, e.g. CrTtr *-sA edi*, with the personal marker added to the copula. Chuvash forms an invariable real conditional with the converb *-sAn* that can also denote temporal relations and a remote conditional with the suffix *-(Ā)ttĀ* (+ personal marker).

Verbal nouns: Various verbal nouns, most prominently forms in *-(V)w* in the Kipchak languages, *-mA* in the Oghuz languages, and *-ni* in Chuvash serve as predicators in complement clauses.

Participles: Participle forms are *-DIk*, *-(y)An*, *-(V)r*, and *-(y)AcAk* in the Oghuz languages; *-(O)AkAn*, *-nĀ* and *-(O)As*, *-GAN*, *-(V)r*, and *-(y)ACAk* etc. in the Kipchak languages. Besides other functions, participle forms are used as predicators in dependent clauses, especially in relative clauses. Some participles can also appear in combination with auxiliary copula elements in complex finite predicates. Verbal nouns as well as most participles can take possessive suffixes as agreement markers.

### 3.2.3. Nominal inflection

Turkic languages have no grammatical gender. Nouns take plural, possessive, and case marking suffixes. The plural suffix is *-LAr* in all the languages but Chuvash, where it is *-sem* with the allomorph *-sen* before case suffixes. Possessive suffixes follow the plural in all languages but Chuvash, which has the reverse order noun-POSS-PL, e.g. Bsh *qul-dar-īm* [hand-PL-POSS1SG] but Chu *al-ēm-sem* [hand-POSS1SG-PL] 'my hands'. Last come the case markers, e.g. Bsh *qul-dar-īm-a* [hand-PL-POSS1SG-DAT] and Chu *al-ēm-sen-e* [hand-POSS1SG-PL-OBJ] 'to my hands'. The plural suffix is normally not used after quantifiers, e.g. Ggz *dokuz uşak* [9 child] 'nine children.'

The basic case markers are suffixes for genitive, accusative, dative, locative, and ablative (see Table 5). The nominative has no marker. Direct objects are unmarked if they are non-specific and in immediately prepredicative position, and marked for accusative if they are specific/definite or separated from the predicate. See the Chuvash example in (1), which is taken from Krueger (1961: 186).

- (1) *Ivan kēneke-ne vul-a-t* vs. *Ivan kēneke vul-a-t*  
 I. book-ACC read-PRS-3SG I. book read-PRS-3SG  
 'Ivan reads the book.' 'Ivan reads books.'

Chuvash has only one object-marking case suffix, both for specific/definite direct and indirect objects. In Kumyk and Karachay-Balkar the markers for genitive and accusative coincide.

Table 5: Case markers

	Ttr	Kmk	Krm	Nog	Chu	Trk + Ggz
Gen	-nĚŋ	-NI	-nIn	-DIŋ	-(n/y)Ěn <sup>5</sup>	-(n)In
Acc	-nĚ	-NI	-nI	-DI	-(n/y)A	-(y)I
Dat	-GA	-GA	-GA	-GA		-(y)A
Loc	-DA	-DA	-DA	-DA	-RA	-DA
Abl	-DAn	-DAn	-DAn	-DAn	-RAn	-DAn

All languages have additional case-like suffixes for instrumental, directive, etc.

Personal and demonstrative pronouns often exhibit changes of the stem in oblique forms. Most languages have a tripartite system of demonstratives denoting semantic differences that could be roughly described as different spatial reference. The reflexive pronoun is *kendi* in Turkish and Gagauz, *öz*, *üz*, and *üđ* in the Kipchak languages, and *χa* in Chuvash.

### 3.3. Syntax

Turkic languages are head-final languages. All modifying elements precede the modified ones, e.g. in a noun phrase indefinite article or demonstrative precedes adjective precedes noun, as in Ttr *běr matur žir* [INDEF.ART beautiful song] ‘a beautiful song’ or *bu matur žir* [DEM beautiful song] ‘this beautiful song’. Plurality, possession, and case are marked at the head of the noun phrase; there is no agreement between attributive and head noun *matur žir-lar-ı-na* [beautiful song-PL-POSS3SG-DAT] ‘for her/his beautiful songs’.

In genitive constructions the possessor marked with genitive precedes the head noun marked with possessive suffix, e.g. Nog *kinaz-din yurt-ı* [prince-GEN land-POSS3SG] ‘the land of a/the prince’. This word order can normally only be inverted in postverbal position. Only Gagauz and, to a much greater extent, Karaim make use of the inverted order also in preverbal position. In Karaim the head noun might even lack a possessive suffix (see Csató 2001: 14).

Postpositional phrases consist of a postposition as the syntactical head and a noun phrase. There are several types of postpositions: some developed from spatial nouns that might require genitive marking on the attribute Ggz *daa-yın iç-in-dä* [wood-GEN in-POSS3SG-LOC] ‘in the wood’ and *daa iç-in-ä* [wood in-POSS3SG-DAT] ‘into a wood’ < *iç* ‘underside, bottom side’, some from verbal stems that require case marking on the attribute depending on the valency patterns of the underlying verb, e.g. nog *üy-in-e karap* [house-POSS3SG-DAT towards] ‘towards her house’, and some are constructed with a noun in the nominative but a pronoun in the genitive, e.g. Ttr *ukuçi-lar bėlen* [student-PL with] ‘with the student’ but *an-iŋ bėlen* [(s)he GEN with] ‘with her’.

## 3.3.1. Simple sentences

Turkic languages in principle have predominantly SOV order in a neutral declarative sentence; word order variation serves semantic purposes. In terms of pragmatics, the topic takes the sentence-initial position with the focus in immediate preverbal position. The postverbal position serves for given or de-focused elements (see Erdal 1999). Thus, in the following example sentences (cited after Erguvanlı Taylan 1984: 11–12) capitals indicate focus position while underlining indicates topic and italics given elements.

- (2) a. *Ahmet yumurta-yı ye-di.* vs.  
 A. egg-ACC eat-PST3SG  
Ahmet ate THE EGG.
- b. *Yumurta-yı Ahmet ye-di.* vs.  
 egg-ACC A. eat-PST3SG  
 AHMET ate the egg.
- c. *Yumurta-yı ye-di Ahmet* vs.  
 egg-ACC eat-PST3SG A.  
*Ahmet* ate THE EGG.
- d. *Ahmet ye-di yumurta-yı*  
 A. eat-PST3SG egg-ACC  
 AHMET ate *the egg*.

Gagauz and Karaim, however, deviate from this pattern. Both languages employ SVO as the neutral word order in declarative sentences. With this word order change, which is due to the heavy influence of the surrounding socially dominant Indo-European languages, the position for the focus has changed to the postverbal position, see example (3) from Gagauz (Menz 1999: 188).

- (3) Q: *kim-i çağır-dı-lar?* A: *çar-ar-dı-lar yakın senselä-lär-i*  
 who-ACC invite-PST.3PL invite-AOR-PSTCOP-3PL near relative-PL.ACC  
 Q: ‘Who did they invite?’ A: ‘One normally invited close relatives.’

Nominal sentences have no copula in the present tense, the subject is expressed either by a personal markers attached to the nominal predicate or by a pronoun, e.g. Kmk *işçi-sen* [worker-2SG] ‘you are a worker’, Ttr *min student* [I student] ‘I am a student’. Negative existence is expressed by Trk *değil*, Ggz *diil*, Ttr and Bsh *tügël*, Kmk *tügül*, CrTtr *degil*, etc. as the predicate, e.g. Ttr *küzlëğëm zur tügël* [glasses-POSS1SG big not] ‘my glasses are not big’.

Constructions expressing possession either have a predicate *bar/var* Chu *pur* ‘existing’ or the negative in *yok/yuk* Chu *şuk* ‘not existing’. The possessor is expressed by a possessive suffix in the required form on the possessed, which precedes the predicate, e.g. Chu *laşa-m pur* [horse-POSS1SG existing] ‘I have a horse’, Ttr *minem segatëm yuk* [my watch-POSS1SG not existing] ‘I don’t have a watch’. *Bar/var* and *yok/yuk* are also used together with a locative adverbial in expressions

denoting ‘there is ...’, e.g. Nog *onda (...) terek-ler bar* [there tree-PL existing] ‘there are trees there’.

All languages in question have an interrogative particle *mi* for yes/no-questions that follows the element asked for; compare the examples in (4) for Turkish:

- (4) a. *Ali bugün gel-di mi?*  
 A. today come-PST3SG Q  
 ‘Did Ali come today?’
- b. *Ali bugün mü geldi?*  
 A. today Q come-PST3SG  
 ‘Did Ali come today?’
- c. *Ali mi bugün geldi?*  
 A. Q today come-PST3SG  
 ‘Did Ali come today?’

### 3.3.2. Complex clauses

Subordinated clauses are typically left-branching non-finite clauses, i.e. the subordinated clause precedes its head. They are generally constructed on predicates with non-finite verbal suffixes that function as subordinators. Besides this genuine Turkic syntactic pattern, virtually all languages employ structurally copied right-branching clauses built on models copied from Indo-European languages. While this is subject to certain restrictions (see Johanson 1977) and has relatively low frequency in most of the languages, Karaim and Gagauz have shifted to use right-branching subordinated clauses almost exclusively.

Constituent clauses are built on verbal nouns and participles that bear case marking according to the valency pattern of the governing predicate.

- (5) *İsrail’ radio-si memleket-te fiyat-lar-ı-niñ kene*  
 I. radio-POSS3SG land-LOC price-PL-POSS3SG-GEN again  
*art-kan-ı-ni bildir-di.*  
 rise-PTCP-POSS3SG-ACC announce-pstI3sg  
 ‘Radio Israel has announced that the prices in the country have risen again.’  
 CrTtr, Jankowski (1992: 383)

Karaim and Gagauz use finite right-branching clauses as constituent clauses which are introduced by a conjunction, see example (6) from Gagauz, where the conjunction used in a variety of subordinated clauses – but most prominently in constituent clauses – is *ani*.

- (6) *Hepsi sevin-ärdi ani kolhoz-a gir-di-k*  
 everybody be\_pleased-HABIT.PST3SG ANI kolkhoz-DAT enter-PST-1PL  
 ‘Everybody was pleased that we joined the kolkhoz.’  
 Ggz, Menz (1999: 192)

Karaim makes use of the junctor *ki* (< Persian *ke*) in constituent clauses, an element employed in most of the Turkic languages, which had at some point in time been in direct or indirect contact with Persian.

Relative clauses are built on participles, most prominently *-(y)An* and *-DIK* in Turkish, *-GAN* in the Kipchak languages, and *-nĀ* in Chuvash. Besides these, each language has a variety of participles that can be used as predicators in relative clauses conveying several aspecto-temporal nuances.

The main difference between the Turkish type of relative clauses and the other Turkic languages in question is that Turkish makes a formal distinction according to whether the first actant of the relative clause is co-referential with the head noun or not. In case it is, Turkish uses the participle in *-(y)An*. If it is not co-referential, it makes use of the participle in *-DIK*. The Kipchak languages and Chuvash use the same participle in both cases, thus:

- |     |     |  |             |     |                      |             |
|-----|-----|--|-------------|-----|----------------------|-------------|
| (7) | Trk | <i>gör-en</i>                                    | <i>adam</i> | Trk | <i>gör-düğ-üm</i>    | <i>adam</i> |
|     |     | [see-PTCP  | man]        |     | [see-PTCP-POSS 1SG   | man]        |
|     |     | ‘the man who sees’                               |             |     | ‘the man whom I see’ |             |
|     | Ttr | <i>küren</i>                                     | <i>adem</i> | Chu | <i>kurnă</i>         | <i>şin</i>  |
|     |     | [see-PTCP  | man]        |     | [see-PTCP            | man]        |
|     |     | ‘the man who sees / the man whom [subject] sees’ |             |     |                      |             |

In the Kipchak languages and in Chuvash the non-referential subject of the relative clause might be unexpressed if it is known or can be recovered from the context. It can be expressed in form of a pronoun, see the following example:

- (8) *Min de hin kil-gen yul-dan kil-dě-m*  
 I PTCL you come-PTCP road-ABL come-PSTI-1SG  
 ‘I also took the road you took.’ Bsh, Heß 2008: 356

Gagauz and Karaim as well as some Turkish dialects on the Balkans again employ a right-branching finite model as their main device for relative clauses. Karaim and Gagauz have developed relative pronouns making use of the interrogative adjectives Krm *kaysi* ‘which’ and Ggz *angi* ‘which’ that agree in number with the head noun and bear case morphology according to their semantic role within the relative clause (see example (9)). Among the Balkan Turkish dialects, the interrogative *ne* ‘what’ functions as junctor in right-branching relative clauses (see Friedman 2006: 39).

- (9) Ggz *adam angi-sı-nı gör-dü-m*  
 man rel-POSS3SG-ACC see-PSTI-1SG  
 ‘the man whom I saw’
- adamlar angi-ları-nı gör-dü-m*  
 man-PL rel-POSS3PL-ACC see-PSTI-1SG  
 ‘the men whom I saw’



All Turkic languages employ a variety of converb suffixes as predicators in adverbial clauses. Several adverbial relations can be expressed with converbs: time, cause, purpose, and condition. Some of the converbs do not allow for different subjects in main and dependent clause.

Most prominent is the coordinating converb *-Xp* in all languages in question but Chuvash, where its functional counterpart is *-sA*.

- (10) *Men škola-ga bar-ıp, seniñ belgi-ler-iñ-di kara-p*  
 I school-DAT go-CVB your result-PL-POSS2SG-ACC look-CVB  
*kel-eyatır-man*  
 come-PRS-1SG  
 'I went to the school, looked at your results and am coming [back] now.' Nog  
 Karakoç (2005: 155)

Although both Karaim and Gagauz have developed right-branching patterns for adverbial clauses, too, the syntactic shift is not as profound as with complement and relative clauses. Both still make use of several converbs, notably for adverbial clauses with temporal semantics.

#### 4. Linguistic changes due to language contact

All the Turkic languages in question show various traces of contact-induced linguistic changes. For the varieties of the Muslim speakers, the prestige languages Arabic and Persian had been a source for lexical borrowing but also for copying on other linguistic levels from the 11th century until modern times. Chuvash shows profound traces of Finno-Ugric influence, which in the first decade of its exploration even led to the belief that Chuvash was a Finno-Ugric language. The characteristics of this influence still need much further investigation. In modern times Russian was and still is the socially dominant language for all Kipchak languages of Europe as well as for Chuvash and Gagauz. Turkish, whose speakers tried to repel the Arabo-Persian influence in the first half of the 20th century, has recently borrowed a lot from English, especially in the lexicon. Besides these influences from typologically different languages, some of the Turkic languages in question are influenced by other, more prestigious Turkic languages. Crimean Tatar has been influenced by Ottoman Turkish, while Chuvash and Bashkir have been and are still influenced by Tatar, and Gagauz nowadays shows traces of the influence of Turkish.

Apart from obvious influences on the lexical level, all other linguistic levels are affected by language contact-induced changes. Due to the insertion of copied lexical items, foreign sounds are implemented in the systems. Intonation patterns are also affected by surrounding dominant languages. Morphology is the level where changes occur last and hesitantly, but cases like the Chuvash plural suffix or the borrowing of Slavonic feminine suffixes in *-(y)ka*, etc. into Gagauz and Karaim do occur.

Syntactic changes resulting from language contact can be observed particularly in the smaller languages spoken in an area they share with a typologically dissimilar dominant language. Among the Turkic languages of Europe, Karaim and Gagauz exhibit the most substantial syntactic changes, as has been exemplified in the section on complex sentences. Turkish in Germany might be on the way to a similar development.

Table 6: Typological features

Shared typological features		exceptions
sound harmony	yes	
agglutinative structure	yes	
suffix initial consonant	yes	
assimilation		
word-final stress	yes	
<i>genera verbi</i>	synthetic	
possessive construction	my xx exists	
adpositions	postposition	Karaim uses also prepositions
gender	no distinction	Gagauz has a derivational suffix for female members of nationalities and occupations as well as kinship terms
verbal negation	synthetic	
tense	3 partite (past, present, future)	
indirective	evidential, inferential, hearsay, surprise	
habitual present	yes	
mood	indicative vs. non-indicative, synthetic imperative, optative, volun- tative, necessitative, condi- tional, irrealis, possibility	Gagauz has developed an analytic modal form to express possibility
non-finite verb forms	= converbs, verbal nouns, participles	
head-final	yes	
genitive construction	genitive precedes head noun	Gagauz and Karaim can have inverted order
topic position	sentence-initial	
focus position	immediate preverbal	focus postverbal in Gagauz and Karaim
present tense copula	no	
subordinated clauses	non-finite, left-branching	finite, right-branching in Gagauz and Karaim

See also the following chapters in this volume: 25 by Extra and 41 by Johanson.

## Notes

- 1 In the following, suffixes are presented in a standardized form using capital letters for those elements that change according to the various phonological rules of Turkic and brackets for elements that may drop due to the nature of the stem they are attached to. In principle I follow the suffix notation of Johanson and Csató (1998). Regarding the transliteration of language examples: Gagauz and Turkish are written in a Latin-based alphabet; Tatar, Bashkir, Noghay, Chuvash, and Karaim are written in a Cyrillic based one. In what follows Turkish and Gagauz examples are given in their respective written language variety; for the languages in Cyrillic script I use a simplified transliteration system where *i* stands for *ы* = /ɯ/, *ö* for *ө* = /ø/, *ü* for *у* = /y/, *ě* for *е* and *ě* = /i/, *e* for *э* = /ɛ/, *y* for *й* = /j/, *r* for *р* = /r/, *k* for *к*, *қ* and *к* = /k/, *g* for *г* and *г* = /g/, *š* for *ш* = /ʃ/, *ž* for *ж* = /ʒ/, *č* for *ч* = /tʃ/, *ǰ* for *ж* and *ж* = /dʒ/. This has the disadvantage that similar phonemes are sometimes transcribed differently in the various languages but the advantage that Turkish and Gagauz examples do not differ from their original. Since examples from the remaining languages had to be transliterated, I opted for a system based on what is already found in the literature with a moderate adaptation to the Turkish spelling in order to make the examples more easily comparable.
- 2 Bashkir personal markers are essentially the same as the Tatar ones, displaying the typical sound correspondences described above.
- 3 Gagauz personal markers are the same as the Turkish ones.
- 4 Zero in parentheses (0) in a suffix notation means that a final vowel of a stem drops before this suffix, e.g. *ekle-* ‘to add’ + -(0)*iyor* > *ekliyor* ‘(s)he adds’.
- 5 Some Chuvash case suffixes are not as transparent as is usual in Turkic languages; thus, they may have different suffix-initial consonants according to the nature of the preceding stem-final vowel, a feature that is not found in any other Turkic language. Thus genitive and accusative start with an *n* after *a/e* and with a *y* after *i*, e.g. *šăši-ye* [mouse-OBJ], *laša-na* [horse-OBJ]. After reduced *ä/ě* and the labial vowels *u/ü* the situation is even more complicated (for details see Krueger 1961).

## References

- Braun, Friederike and Geoffrey Haig  
 2000 The noun/adjective distinction in Turkish. In: Aslı Göksel and Celia Kerslake (eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Lincoln College, Oxford, August 12–14, 1998*, 85–92. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Csató, Éva Á.  
 1998 Über die finiten Verbformen des gesprochenen Nordwest-Karaimischen. In: Nurettin Demir and Erika Taube (eds.), *Turkologie heute – Tradition und Perspektive. Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz*, Leipzig, 4.–7. Oktober 1994, 47–53. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Csató, Éva Á.  
 1999 Syllabic harmony in Turkic: The evidence of code-copying. In: Bernt Brendemoen, Elisabeth Lanza and Else Ryen (eds.), *Language Encounters Across Time and Space: Studies in Language Contact*, 341–351. Oslo: Novus.

- Csató, Éva Á.  
 2001 Karaim. In: Thomas Stolz (ed.), *Minor Languages of Europe. A Series of Lectures at the University of Bremen, April – July 2000*, 1–24. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Dokumentation  
 1993 Das Glück der Tüchtigen oder: Der Konflikt um die zweisprachige Alphabetisierung und Erziehung türkischer Schulkinder. Mit Stellungnahmen von Heidi Rösch, Norbert Dittmar, Ulrich Steinmüller und anderen. *Obst: Osnabrücker Beiträge zur Sprachtheorie* 47: 187–248.
- Erdal, Marcel  
 1999 Das Nachfeld im Türkischen und im Deutschen. In: Johanson, Lars und Jochen Rehbein (eds.), *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich*, 53–95. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Erdal, Marcel  
 2004 *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Erguvanlı Taylan, Eser  
 1984 *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar*. Berkeley et al.: University of California Press.
- Extra, Guus and Kutlay Yağmur (eds.)  
 2004 *Urban Multilingualism in Europe. Immigrant Minority Languages at Home and School*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Friedman, Victor A.  
 2006 West Rumelian Turkish in Macedonia and adjacent areas. In: Hendrik Boeschoten and Lars Johanson (eds.), *Turkic Languages in Contact*, 27–45. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Gorenburg, Dmitry  
 1999 Identity change in Bashkortostan: Tatars into Bashkirs and back. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22: 554–580.
- Heß, Michael  
 2008 *Relativische Prädikationen im Baschkirischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jankowski, Henryk  
 1992 *Gramatyka języka krymskotatarskiego*. [Grammar of Crimean Tatar]. Poznań: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza.
- Johanson, Lars  
 1977 Some remarks on Turkic ‘hypotaxis’. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 47: 104–118.
- Johanson, Lars  
 1998 The history of Turkic. In: Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, 81–125. London/New York: Routledge.
- Johanson, Lars  
 2000 Linguistic convergence in the Volga area. In: Dicky Gilbers, John Nerbonne and Jos Schaeken (eds.), *Languages in Contact*, 165–178. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Johanson, Lars and Éva Á. Csató (eds.)  
 1998 *The Turkic Languages*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Karakoç, Birsal  
 2005 *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Krueger, John R.  
 1961 *Chuvash Manual*. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Menz, Astrid

- 1999 *Gagausische Syntax: Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Menz, Astrid

- 2003 Endangered Turkic languages: The case of Gagauz. In: Mark Janse & Sijmen Tol (eds.): *Language Death and Language Maintenance: Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches*, 143–155. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pokrovskaja, Ljudmila A.

- 1964 *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka: Fonetika i morfologija*. [Grammar of Gagauz: Phonetics and Morphology]. Moskva: Nauka.

Robbeets, Martine Irma

- 2005 *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.