

Festschrift
To Commemorate the 80th Anniversary of
Prof. Dr. Talat Tekin's Birth
ISSN 1226-4490

International
Journal of
Central
Asian Studies

Volume 13 2009

Editor in Chief
Choi Han-Woo

The International Association of Central Asian Studies
Korea University of International Studies

Necessity Operators in Turkish and Uyghur

Abdurishid Yakup

Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin

Abstract: The present paper attempts to provide a brief description of the ways expressing the modal notion necessity in the two significant Turkic languages, Turkish and Uyghur. It constantly compares both grammatical and lexical means expressing necessity in the both two languages and tries to illustrate common properties of and departures between Turkish and Uyghur in expressing necessity.

Key words: necessity operators, description, comparison, Turkish, Modern Uyghur

The modal notion necessity is coded in some Turkic languages by means of specific suffixes, while in some other language varieties within the same language family it is expressed with modal auxiliaries and morphosyntactic units. The Old Turkic necessitative suffix *-gUIXk* survived at least in two peripheral Turkic varieties Khalaj and the Khotan dialect of Uyghur, whereas the languages in the Southwestern branch of Turkic developed a new necessitative marker during the last several centuries. In addition to the Old Turkic modal auxiliary *k(ä)rgäk* considerable Turkic varieties introduced new modal auxiliaries from some contact languages; the verbal complement preceding modal auxiliaries also made different developments in divergent Turkic varieties. Proper description and analysis of these synchronic and diachronic processes not only shed some light to the study of tense, aspect, modal categories in Turkic but also is useful for broad typological analysis of modality, including necessity as a whole. Morphological affixes expressing necessity in Turkish and Turkmen are relatively well described;

see Clark 1998: 294-296; Kornfilt 1997: 373; Lewis 2000: 126-128. Some recent publications began also to pay attention to other means of expressing necessity except suffixes; see Göksel et al. 2005: 351-355; Özsoy 2005: 95-97. However, the modal categories, including necessity in many other Turkic languages remained unexplored. The present paper attempts to provide a brief survey of the ways expressing necessity in the two significant Turkic languages Turkish and Uyghur that represent two different branches of Turkic, the Southwestern Turkic (Oghuz Turkic) and Southeastern Turkic (Uyghur Turkic). It constantly compares both grammatical and lexical means expressing necessity in Turkish and Uyghur.¹

1. Modal suffixes

In Turkish necessity is marked by means of the suffix *-mAlI* on the verb; it goes back to the Ottoman Turkish *-mAlU* appeared in the fourteenth century. In earlier period this suffix seems to be used as part of a composite predicate, expressing prospective aspect, rather than necessity; see Kerslake 1998: 194.² Predominantly, *-mAlI* expresses deontic necessity, that is the event is expected or forced to occur because of local, general external circumstances, and which may thus be partly beyond the power and control of the participant (Nuyts 2006: 3). Put differently, the form in question stands both for weak necessity, as in (1a), and necessity, as in (1b-c):

(1a) Arkamda bıraktığım iğrenç dünyaya bir kere daha **dönmeliyim**. (*Çalışkuşu* 111)

‘I have to return once again to that sick world which I have given up.’

b) Vasiyetini **yapmalı**, her an ölümüne **hazır olmalıydı** artık. (*Nasreddin* 128)

‘Now he had to prepare his testament and hold himself ready for his death any moment.’

¹For linguistic terms and framework used in this paper mainly see Bybee et al. 1995, Boland 2006 (volume 1), Nuyts 2006, de Haan 2006, Palmer 2001, Sweetser 1990 and Van der Auwera et al. 1998.

²Besides Turkish, two further Turkic languages Azarbaijan and Turkmen in the Southwestern branch display comparable necessitative suffix of same origin; see Schönig 1998: 255; Clark 1998: 294-197.

c) “**Söylememelisin**,” dedi İpek. “Ona da bizlerden, babamdan hiç **bahsetmemelisin**.” (Kar 91)

‘You shouldn’t tell anyone,’ said İpek. ‘You shouldn’t say anything to him about us, or about my father, either.’

In some instances, most often in the third person, *-mAll* is also used to express proposition-oriented necessity. In this case, the scope of necessity is the proposition and *-mAll* expresses certainty about the truth of the proposition, as in (2a-b), or the speaker’s own values and opinions about how the world should be (Boland 2006: 150), as in (2c-d). Some examples are:

(2a) Kapı açık, evde **olmalılar**. (Göksel et al. 2005: 345)

‘The door is open; they must be at home.’

b) İnsan, seçtiği hayatı sonradan benimseyecek kadar **sevmeli**. (Beyaz Kale 69)

‘A person should love the life he has chosen enough to call it his own in the end.’

c) Amerika Türkiye’ye **destek vermeli**. (Sabah, December 17, 2007)

‘United States of America must support Turkey.’

d) Tarihimiz anneler üzerinden **yazılmalı**. (Yeni Şafak, December 21, 2007)

‘Our history must be written by mothers.’

When *-mAll* is used in the first and third person, it may express participant-oriented necessity. However, this meaning of this suffix basically relies on the context. Consider:

(3a) Şimdi bir şeyi **yemeliyim**, yoksa çalışamam.

‘Now I have to eat something, other hand I can not work anymore.’

b) Şimdi onları küçümser duruma düşmemek için **gitmelisiniz**. (Kar 133)

‘In order not to cause terrible offence, you should go now.’

In Turkish, the verbal noun suffix *-mAk* is also used to express necessity, e.g. *Üzerinde hemen anlaştığımız ilke, çok fazla bilgi vermemek, ama verdiğimizizi hemen doğrulatmaktı* (Beyaz Kale 100) ‘We agreed at once that we should not give much information and mention only what was likely to be informed’.

Modern Uyghur displays three suffixes, *-GUIUK*³, *-mAsIik* and *-dIyan* to express necessity. The first one originates from the Old

³As a necessity marker *-GUIUK* also exists in Khalaj, but unlike the Uyghur suffix which is impersonal it is personal in Khalaj; see Doerfer 1988: 141-142.

Turkic necessitative suffix *-gUIXk*, which is the composite of *-gU* and *-IXk*; see Erdal 2004: 303. Perhaps, it has come to modern Uyghur via the Chaghatay literary language, in which *-GUIUK* basically had participial function but was hardly used as a necessity marker, because in Chaghatay the necessity is mainly marked by means of the suffix *-GU* along with other lexical and morphosyntactic means, e.g. *ärän ärdin örtmiş teg ök ham tişi tişilärdin örtgü ham öz qızidin* (Islam, *Mu'īnu'l murīd*, 180v: 17) 'Just as a man covers himself in the presence of other man, a woman, too, must cover herself in the presence of other woman, even in the presence of her own daughter.' (see Bodgrogligeti 2001: 261-262.) The necessitative suffix *-mAKIUK* existed in the early nineteenth-century written texts did not survive in the present day literary Uyghur language.⁴

In general, the Modern Uyghur necessity marker *-GUIUK* is impersonal, and it expresses proposition-oriented necessity, that is, there is no obligation actually laid on the participants: it is only the speaker's attitude towards the proposition that is expressed; see Boland 2006: 155. This suffix is basically specific to the Khotan dialect,⁵ while in the literary Uyghur language its usage is mainly restricted to poems, e.g. (cited from T. Eliyop, *Adām biz mälhämğä muhtaǰmiz*):

(4) Saylamliq asralsun deyilsä

kesälñiñ aldini **alǵuluq**

kesäldin alamät körülsä

hayalsiz doxturğa **baryuluq**

'If one says, 'The health should be protected''

'one must guard against illness.'

'as far as any symptom of a disease is known.'

'one must go to the doctor.'

Occasionally, *-GUIUK* also occurs as part of certain frozen expressions in the literary Uyghur language, e.g. *nemä degülük* 'what could be said', *käl desä kälgülük*, *kät desä kätkülük* 'One must come when one asks to come and must go away when one asks to leave', *kiçik balini*

⁴Le Coq 1921-1925 provides abandon examples for this suffix. Here let me just mention one of them: *är kişī xātunīyā' mārdañā bolmaqlyq* 'Man must be chivalrous to his wife'.

⁵For a simple description of this suffix in the Khotan dialect see Sait et al. 1986.

mundaq ögütmigülik ‘A little child should not be taught in this way’ (Tömür 2003: 318)

As for the second suffix *-mAsIIK*, it is clearly a composite suffix based on the negative aorist suffix *-mAs*; it is rather frequently used in law entries, school rules etc. Basically, it denotes negated event-oriented necessity. Consider (5a-b):

(5a) Mäktäptä **haraq içmäslik, tamaka čäkmäslik**, savaqdaşlar bilän **uruşmasliq**. (*Oquyučılar qa’idiliridin*)

‘In the school (schoolboys) should not drink alcohol, should not smoke tobacco and should not fight with classmates.’

b) kesällärgä qopalliq **qilmasliq, takallaşmasliq**. (*Boйда doxturxanisi, qa’idä tüzümlär*)

‘(The employs of this hospital) must not act angrily to the patients and should not quarrel (with them).’

Very often, the verbal nouns in *-mAsIIK* also occur as complement of the modal auxiliaries *keräk* and *lazim*; see next section.

Somewhat different from the two suffixes discussed above, the suffix *-dIyan* (<copula *dur*-+*-yan*), expresses proposition-oriented weak necessity. After the subject of such sentences often the topicalizer *degän* is used (Tömür 2003: 318), e.g.

(6a) yaxşı bala degän **gäp aňlaydiyan**.

‘As for a good child, he/she should be obedient’

b) Oyul bala degän **gepidä turidiyan**.

‘As for a young boy, he must hold onto his word’

As it is well known, *-dIyan* actually is a present participle, and it is usage as a necessity marker, as we have seen, is dependent on context.

2. Modal auxiliaries

Both Turkish and Uyghur display several auxiliaries denoting necessity, which might be precisely called necessity auxiliaries. The Old Turkic necessitative auxiliary *k(ä)rgäk* ‘necessity, necessary’ survives in Turkish in the form of *gerek*, while in modern Uyghur it exists in the phonetic shape *keräk*, both basically result from the deletion of the velar consonant *g*. However, Turkish *gerek* and Uyghur *keräk* are used neither with the participles in *-mIš*, as in Old Turkic, nor with the verbal nouns in *-GU*, as in Old Turkic as well as medieval Islamic Turkic liter-

ary languages. The Turkish modal auxiliary *gerek* usually requires the preceding verb to occur in the verbal noun form in *-mAk*, while in Uyghur the embedded verb preceding *keräk* is generally marked with the verbal noun suffix *-(X)š*, in very few cases also with the verbal noun suffix *-mAK*.⁶ In Turkish the *-mAk + gerek* construction is impersonal, person is marked by adding possessive suffixes to the verbal nouns formed by means of another suffix *-mA*. Both verbal nouns in *-mAK + gerek* and verbal nouns *-mA + possessive suffixes + gerek* basically denote event-oriented necessity, as in (7a), and proposition-oriented necessity, as in the examples (7b-c):

(7a) Bu dünyada çok **çalışmak gerek** (Özsoy 2005: 96)

‘It is necessary to work hard in this world.’

b) Ölümlä **savaşmak gerekiyor**. (*Ölmeye yatmak* 2)

‘One has to fight with death.’

c) Ateist olması için kişinin önce Batılı **olması gerekir**. (*Kar* 82)

‘In order to be an atheist one first has to be Occidental.’

Personal forms of this construction may also express participant-oriented necessity. In this case, most often the predicate is forced to occur because of external circumstances, e.g.

(8a) Masanın iki ucuna oturup karşılıklı **yazmamız gerektiğini** söyledi. (*Beyaz Kale* 68)

‘He said we must sit at the two ends of the table and write facing one another.’

b) Kapıyı açtı, “**Gitmem gerek**,” deyip uzaklaştı. (*Kar* 118)

‘She opened the door and said, “I have to go”, and went away.’

The corresponding Uyghur construction verbal nouns in *-(X)š + keräk* is personal: person is marked by adding possessive markers directly to the verbal nouns. In contrast to the Turkish construction that mainly expresses event-oriented necessity or proposition-oriented necessity the Uyghur construction is rather frequently used to denote participant-oriented necessity in addition to the event-oriented necessity and proposition-oriented necessity. Below (9a-b) are some examples for the participant-oriented necessity, while (9c-d) express event-oriented necessity and proposition-oriented necessity, respectively:

⁶*-mAK + keräk* is archaic in Uyghur, it only occurs in the speech of seniors or historical literary works; we do not discuss this construction in this paper.

(9a) Ätä ätigän turup čeniqimän desäm burunraq **uxlišim keräk**.

‘If I want to get up early and train tomorrow it is necessary for me to sleep earlier.’

b) Bu kesäldin qutuluş üçün tamakini az **čekişiniz keräk**.

‘In order to escape from this disease you must reduce your smoking.’

c) Därs toqquzda başlinidu, sa’ät säkkizdä **yataqtin čiqış keräk**.

‘The lesson starts at nine o’clock, so (we) must leave from the apartment at eight o’clock.’

d) Hämmimiz tirişip **öginişimiz keräk**. (Tömür 2003: 267)

‘We must all work hard.’

The negated form of this Uyghur construction is suppletive, it is formed by adding *keräk* to another verbal noun formed with *-mAsIIK*, e.g. *ätä mehman kelidu, öydin čiqmasliqimiz keräk* ‘Tomorrow we will have a guest, we shouldn’t leave the apartment/house’, *bu işni dadıñiz bilmäsliki keräk, čünki dadıñiz u yärdä yoq edi* ‘your father shouldn’t know this matter, since your father was not there.’

Both Turkish and Uyghur exhibit certain identical modal lexemes of Arabic origin to express necessity: Turkish has *lazım* ‘necessary, ought’ (<Ar. *lāzim*), *şart* ‘condition, must, necessarily’ (Ar. *şarṭ*), whereas Uyghur displays *zörür* (<Ar. *zarūr*) in addition to *lazım* and *şart*. Turkish also displays secondary *gerekli*. In general, Turkish *lazım*, *şart* and Uyghur *lazım*, *şart* and *zörür* are used in the same syntactic environment and function, as *gerek/gerekli* or *keräk*; for the case of Turkish see Özsoy 2005: 96; Csató 1999. As a first approximation, it seems can be said that *şart/şart* and *zörür* denote relatively stronger event-oriented necessity than the necessity constructions containing *gerek/keräk* and *lazım/lazım*. Below are some examples from Turkish (10a-c) and Uyghur (10d-e):

(10a) Ama daha önce Hoca’yı unutmam **şarttı**. (*Beyaz Kale* 98)

‘But before that it was essential that I forget Hoja.’

b) Bu dünyada insanların çok çalışmaları **lazım/gerek/şart**. (Özsoy 2005: 96)

‘It is necessary for people to work a lot in this world./ It is obligatory for people to work a lot in this world.’

c) Bu işi **yapman gerekli**. (Csató 1999: 28)

‘It is necessary for you to do this job.’

d) Ätä sa’ät ikkidä bu yärdä **boluşınız keräk/lazım/şart/zörür**.

‘Tomorrow at two o’clock you have to be here. / It is obligatory for you to be here tomorrow at two o’clock.’

e) Ata-anılar balılarına rast **sözlişi keräk/lazım/şart/zörür**.

‘Parents must speak honestly to the children. / It is necessary for parents to speak honestly to the children.’

We do not possess yet any quantitative data, however, our impression is that Turkish *şart* seems to be less frequent than *gerek* and *lazım* in this function, while between the comparable modal auxiliaries in Uyghur no clear frequency difference is observed.

Translation literature shows that Uyghur necessity constructions containing *keräk*, *lazım* etc. cover almost all necessity notions expressed by means of the Turkish suffix *-mAll* as well as the necessity constructions *-mA* + *gerek* and *-mA* + possessive suffixes + *gerek*. This is clearly seeable from the translation of the sentences containing necessity markers from Turkish to Uyghur and vice versa. Compare the following sentences:

(11a) Bu mektepte nasıl bir felaketle karşılaştığımı tafsilatıyla **anlatmalıyım**. (*Çalıkuşu* 135)

‘I have to explain in detail what kind of disasters I have experienced in this school.’

Uyghur: bu maktäptä qandaq palakätkä duç kalgänlikimni täpsiliy **sözlişim keräk** (*Çalıkuşu* 179)

b) Kim bilir belki **söylenmemesi lazım** gelen bir sırdır. (*Çalıkuşu* 198)

‘Who knows, perhaps there is a secret shouldn’t be spoken.’

Uyghur: kim bilidu, bälkim **demäslük keräk** bolğan sırdur.

c) Sen uni bextim döp **bilişig keräk**. (Öztürk 1994: 88)

‘You should consider it your fortune.’

Turkish: sen onu bahtım diye **bilmelisin**.

Necessity constructions might be modified by the modal adverbs *çoqum* ‘necessarily, definitely’ (in affirmative sentences), *qät’iy* ‘in any case, at any rate, whatever happens’ (in negated sentences) in Uyghur, e.g. *bu maqalä çoqum bügünki gezitta çıqışi keräk* ‘In any case this paper must appear on today’s newspaper’, *bügün qät’iy keçikmäslükimiz keräk* ‘Whatever happens, today we should not come late.’ In contrast to the constructions without *çoqum* and *qät’iy*, the modal constructions containing *çoqum* and *qät’iy* express strong necessity.

It should be noted that the conditional marker *-sA + keräk* construction in Uyghur basically does not express necessity (*gereklilik*), as Öztürk claims (1994: 87-88), but assumption of the speaker, very often also probability. Objectively, the realization of the event is not certain. For instance, *ular ätä kälsä keräk* means ‘Perhaps they will come tomorrow’ or ‘Presumably, they will come tomorrow’. Therefore, the translation of the example *yazsam keräk* into Turkish by means of *yazsam gerek* or *yazmalıyım* is not proper, since in Turkish the *-sA gerek* construction may be an elliptical conditional, as Lewis (2000: 268) explained, while the suffix *-mAll* signals necessity. Yes indeed, the *-sA keräk* construction in Uyghur sometimes may also express proposition-oriented weak necessity, that is, the construction denotes that S expects p to be true (Boland 2006: 154). Usually, the ground for such expectation is speaker’s personal knowledge or own opinion. However, make use of the *-sA keräk* construction in this sense is restricted to one verb *bol-* ‘to be’ and often used together with the modal expressions *oylaymänki* ‘I think’, *meniñ qarişimčä* ‘from my point of view’ etc., e.g. *meniñčä u uyğurlar içidiki äñ yaxşı muzikantlardin bolsa keräk* ‘From my point of view, he should be one of the best musicians among the Uyghurs’; see also the last two examples in Öztürk 1994: 88.

3. Morphosyntactic means

In Uyghur strong necessity is also expressed by means of double negation, namely with the NEG.COND + *bolma-* construction; see Rentzsch 2005: 66-67; Yakup 2006. Generally, the construction in question is used to denote participant-oriented strong necessity, that is “the argument x is forced to predicate. The source of this force may be internal characteristics, which expresses the meaning of internal need: x is forced by internal/intrinsic factors to PRED” (Boland 2006: 151). Very often the argument is forced to predicate because of external circumstances, as shall we see in (12d-e):

(12a) Käçürüñ, ämdi därhal obernıya **kirmisäm bolmaydu**.

‘Excuse me, I have to go to the WC urgently.’

b) Tamakini ämdi **taşlimisiñiz bolmıdı**, bolmısa ölisiz.

‘Now you have to give up smoking, other hand you will die.’

c) Bovaq ämdi **ämmisä bolmaydu**.

‘The child now must suckle.’

d) Män bugün **kätmisäm bolmaydu**, ätä yurtimizğa poyiz yoq.

‘I have to return today, tomorrow there is no train to our home land.’

e) Doxturnıñ degini boyıçä ämdi yänä dora **ičmisiniz bolmaydu**.

‘According to the request of the doctor, now you must take your medicine again.’

This construction is also used to indicate event-oriented strong necessity. Put differently, the event is forced to occur because of deontic source, such as a general rule or law. Below are some examples:

(13a) Toxtamya qol qoyuštın burun başlıq bilän **mäslihätläşmisäk bolmaydu**.

‘Before we sign the contract we must consult with the boss.’

b) Kitab vaqtida **näşir qilinmisa bolmaydu**.

‘The book must be published on time.’

(c) Universitetta oqutquçı boluş üçün doktorluqni **tügätmisä bolmaydu**.

‘In order to work as university teacher one has to complete Ph.D.’

Very often, this construction is also be modified with the modal adverbs *čoqum* and *qät’iy*. In this case, the modal adverbs usually precede the whole double negated construction, e.g. *bu yıl qärzni čoqum/qät’iy qayturmisaq bolmaydu* ‘This year, at any rate, we must pay back our debt’, sometimes they might also be inserted between the negated units, e.g. *bu yıl qärzni qayturmisaq čoqum /qät’iy bolmaydu* ‘This year, whatever happens, we must pay back our debt.’ When the intensifiers precede the whole double negated construction, it has wide scope, while if they immediately precede the last negated unit, it has narrow scope.

Turkish has comparable double negated construction NEG.COND + *olmaz*, e.g. *olmazsa olmaz* ‘absolutely necessary’, *varmasam olmaz* ‘I have to go’. In general, this construction is used to express event-oriented necessity, as in (14a), but it also expresses participant-oriented necessity, as in (14b-c):

(14a) Böylelerine ara sıra **gözdağı verilmezse olmaz**. (*Çalığışu* 139)

‘Such persons sometimes have to be threatened.’

b) Sizleri **görmesem duymasam olmaz**. (*Sıkı dostlara hoşgeldiniz*, 02 Temmuz 2007)

‘I have to see you, feel you.’

c) **Gitmesen olmaz** mı? Daha çok erken.

‘Should you go? It is yet very early.’

In both two languages the double negated constructions are not used to denote proposition-oriented necessity.

As late Professor Hämit Tömür (2003: 317) writes, *-sA + bolidu* construction may also express weak necessity, e.g. *seniñ bu pikriñ toyra ämäs, waz käčsäñ bolidu* ‘This opinion of yours is wrong, you must give it up. However, such a use of this construction depends on context, and usually such constructions express possibility, e.g. *ämdi kätsiñiz bolidu* ‘Now you may go’; see Tömür 2003: 317-318; Friederich 2002: 188.

4. Less grammaticalized expressions

Besides affixes, modal auxiliaries and morphosyntactic means, there are also some specific expressions and constructions of expressing necessity both in Turkish and Uyghur. In contrast to affixes and modal auxiliaries they are relatively less grammaticalized, that is, the original lexical meaning of the expressions is clearly preserved. Turkish mainly uses the following two types of expressions (see Göksel et al. 2005: 353-354; Özsoy 2005: 96-97):⁷

- i. Verbal nouns in *-mAk + zorunda* (+ copula)
- ii. Verbal nouns in *-mAk + zorunda/mecburiyetinde kal-/ol-*

In Turkish both two types of expressions denote participant-imposed dynamic, that is, the needs/necessities are determined by the local circumstances of the participant. Some examples are:

(15a) Türkiye demokratik devlet modeline **geçmek zorunda**. (*Haberk*, 15 Aralık 2007)

‘Turkey is forced/obliged to move to the model of a democratic country.’

b) İş kehanete kalmadan, Hoca **çıkma zorunda kalmış**. (*Beyaz kale* 56)

‘Hoja had to leave before the subject of astronomy could arise.’

c) O zaman sen de yazını Avrupa’da **yayımlamak zorunda kalırsın**. (*Kar* 44)

‘In that case you will also have to publish your writing in Europe.’

d) Bu hafta sonu yine **nöbet tutmak zorunda/mecburiyetinde kalacağım/olacağım**. (Özsoy 2005: 96)

‘I will have to/be obliged to be on duty this weekend again.’

⁷Perhaps, *muhakkak* ‘definitely’ might be counted for necessity adverb; see Kornfilt 1997: 376.

The first type of necessity expressions are negated by means of the negation copula *değil*, while the negation of the expressions of the second type, namely (ii), is formed by adding negation suffixes to the verbs *kal-* and *ol-*. Negated forms of these expressions usually express event-oriented necessity and weak proposition-oriented necessity. Consider the examples in (16):

(16a) “**Ölmek zorunda değilsin**,” dedi Ka. (*Kar* 177)

“‘You are not forced to die,’” Ka said.

b) Hiçbir şey **açıklamak zorunda değilim**.

‘I am not obliged to explain anything.’

c) Bu program ile güncel driver **aramak zorunda kalmayacaksınız**. (Aktif Mail.net, June 10, 2007)

‘With this program you will not be obliged to search for the actual driver.’

Uyghur also displays the following two types of less grammaticalized constructions expressing necessity:

(i) Verbal nouns in $-(X)\text{ş}+\text{dative}+\text{mäjbur}$

(ii) Verbal nouns in $-(X)\text{ş}+\text{dative}+\text{toyra kelidu}$

In the case of the first type of construction, verbal nouns do not take any personal markers, this means that person is indicated with the aid of personal pronouns in the subject function; in (ii) the verb is also not marked for person, person is indicated by adding possessive suffixes to the verbal noun. Similar to the case of the Turkish expressions, the Uyghur constructions also denote participant-imposed dynamic, actually a type of event-oriented necessity. Some examples are:

(17a) Biz uniñ deginini **qilişqa mäjbur**.

‘We are obliged to do what he says.’

b) Bu öydä turmaymän desñiz başqa yärdin öy **tepişñizğa toyra kelidu**.

‘If you don’t want to stay in this apartment, you have to find apartment in other place.’

c) Doktorluqqa kiriş üçün čät’äl tilidin **imtihan beriškä toyra kelidu**.

‘In order to become a Ph.D. student one has to take exam in a foreign language.’

The first type of expression, namely the expression (i) is negated by means of the negation copula *ämäs*, e.g. *biz uniñ deginini qilişqa mäjbur ämäs* ‘we are not obliged to do what he says’. The negation form of the expression (ii) is suppletive, that is, it is formed by another unit *hajätsiz*. However, unlike the *toyra kelidu*, *hajätsiz* does not require

the preceding verbal noun to be in dative, e.g. *doktorluqqa kiriş üčün čät'al tilidin imtihan beriş hajätsiz* 'In order to become a Ph.D. student it is not obliged to take exam in a foreign language.'

5. Conclusions

Both Turkish and Uyghur express necessity through verb inflection, by modal auxiliaries, by means of double negation as well as less grammaticalized lexical phrases. The semantic scope expressed by the Turkish necessity suffix *-mAll* covers deontic and epistemic modalities. They are basically realized as participant-oriented necessity (participant-internal and participant-external), event-oriented necessity and proposition-oriented necessity, sometimes only an expectation, namely weak necessity, while the Uyghur necessity suffix is impersonal and mainly expresses proposition-oriented necessity. Moreover, its scope of use is restricted to certain style of the Uyghur literary language. In Uyghur the modal/necessity auxiliaries are the most common means of expressing necessity, they are used to express almost all modal notions coded by the necessity suffix *-mAll* and comparable modal auxiliaries expressing necessity existing in Turkish. In contrast to the necessity expressed by suffixes and modal auxiliaries the double negation signals strong necessity, at least it is the case of Uyghur. Note, however, that there is no a binary opposition necessity vs. strong necessity both in Turkish and Uyghur, in certain instances there are even some overlaps in the notions expressed by the double negation and other operators. The degree of grammaticalization of the Turkish constructions *-mAk + zorunda* (+ copula), *-mAk + zorunda kal-lol-* etc. seems to be higher than the corresponding Uyghur units, being frequently used both spoken and written varieties of Turkish, while make use of the Uyghur phrases expressing necessity is mainly restricted to the written language, though this point was not discussed in this paper in detail.

References

- Bodrogligeti, András J. E. (2001). *A Grammar of Chagatay*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Boland, Annerieke (2006). *Aspect, tense and modality: Theory, typology, acquisition*. (LOT international series). Utrecht: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap.
- Bybee, Joan L. and Suzanne Fleischman (1995). "Modality in grammar and discourse: An introductory essay". In: J. L. Bybee and S. Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in grammar and discourse*. pp. 1-14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clark, Larry (1998). *Turkmen reference grammar*. Turcologica 34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes (1999). "Modalität in türkischen Komplementsätzen und ihre Entsprechungen im Deutschen". In: Lars Johanson and Jochen Rehbein (eds.) *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich*. pp. 23-32. Turcologica 39. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- de Haan, Ferdinand (2006). "Typological approaches to modality". In: William Frawley (ed.). *The expression of modality* (The expression of cognitive categories 1.). pp. 27-69. Berlin: New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Doerfer, Gerhard (1988). *Grammatik des Chaladsch*. Turcologica 4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Erdal, Marcel (2004). *A grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 8: Uralic & Central Asian Studies, 3.) Boston: Brill.
- Friederich, Michael (in Zusammenarbeit mit Abdurishid Yakup) (2002). *Uyghurisch*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. (Routledge comprehensive grammars) London and New York: Routledge.
- Kerslake, Celia (1998). "Ottoman Turkish". In: Johanson and Csató (eds.) 1998: 179-202.
- Nuyts, Jan (2006). "Modality: overview and linguistic issues". In: William Frawley (ed.), *The expression of modality*. (The expression of cognitive categories 1.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1-26.
- Johanson, Lars and Éva Á. Csató (eds.) (1998). *The Turkic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, Geoffrey (2000). *Turkish grammar*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997). *Turkish*. (Descriptive grammars) London and New York: Routledge.
- Özsoy, A. Sumru (2005). *Türkçe/Turkish*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Öztürk, Rıdvan (1994). *Yeni Uyğur Türkçesi grameri*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Palmer, Frank R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rentzsch, Julian (2005). *Aspekt im Neuuygurischen*. Turcologica 65. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sait, Muhammad Rahim and Muhtar Sirajidin (1986). “Xotän ševisidiki zörüriyät rayi toyrısida [On the necessity mood in the Khotan subdialect]”. *Til vâ Tärjimä* 6: 7-15.
- Schönig, Claus (1998). “Azerbaijan”. In: *Turkic Languages*. Johanson and Csató (eds.). pp. 248-260. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sweetser, Eve E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tömür, Hämit (2003). *Modern Uyghur grammar (morphology)*. Translated by Anne Lee. (Yıldız Dil ve Edebiyat 3.). İstanbul: Kitap Matbaası.
- Van der Auwera, Johan and Vladimir A. Plungian (1998). “Modality’s semantic map”. *Linguistic typology* 2: 79-124.
- von Le Coq, A. (1921-1925). *Das Lī kitābī*. (Körösi Csoma-Archivum.) Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung.
- Yakup, Abdurishid (2006). “Review of Rentzsch 2005”. *Orientalia Suecana*. LV, 195-198.

Primary literature

- Ağaoğlu, Adalet (2008). *Ölmeye Yatmak* (20. baskı.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası.
- Güntekin, Reşat Nuri. *Çalığışu*. (40. baskı) Ankara: İnkılap Kitabevi. [Uyghur translation by Tursun’ay Saqim published in Ürümchi in 1982. cited as *Čaliquşı*].
- Pamuk, Orhan (2002). *Kar*. (1. baskı) İstanbul: İletişim [English translation is basically after Maureen Freely, *Snow*, New York: faber faber, 2004].
- Pamuk, Orhan (2003). *Beyaz Kale*. (26. baskı) İstanbul: İletişim [English translation is after Victoria Holbrook, *The white castle*, New York: Vintage International, 1990].
- Tan, Nail (2006). *Nasreddin Hoca Senfonisi*. Ankara: Ürün Yayınları.