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1. Introduction

This contribution records and classifies the types of expressions of modality found in a prominent pre-modern Anatolian Turkish text, the Dede Qorqud Oğuznameleri (DQ). For the purpose of this study, the text of the Vienna Manuscript, the more comprehensive of the two extant manuscripts, was consulted. The reading of the text that is adopted for this study is in complete accordance with the edition by Tezcan and Boeschoten (2001), which is the most reliable edition available. The transcription has been moderately adapted to the principles of Johanson and Csató (1998, pp. XVIII–XIX).

Both the Vienna Manuscript and the shorter Vatican Manuscript are likely to date to the 16th century, and references in the text to historical events proves that also...
the redactions cannot be older, nor much younger than the 16th century (Boeschoten 2008, p. 295), although the process of formation of the text must have evolved through several centuries. Given that the text can neither be older, nor much younger than the 16th century, the DQ is a fairly well datable Oghuz text, which is probably better described as Middle Anatolian Turkish than as “Old Ottoman” (cf. Mansuroğlu 1959, who treats this text under the heading Old Ottoman). It is much to young to qualify for Old Ottoman, and both the linguistic features and the content situate this text in the east of the Anatolian peninsula. The language is certainly not Ottoman Turkish in the proper sense of the word, as Ottoman Turkish was a literary language predominantly formed in the western parts of the Anatolian peninsula and became increasingly influenced by Rumelian dialects after the occupation of Edirne (1365) and Istanbul (1453), while the linguistic features of the DQ are well reconcilable with the situation mirrored in present-day Eastern Anatolian dialects.

The expressions of modality in the DQ are categorised here according to the classification proposed in Rentzsch (2010a), which distinguishes three major functional classes of modality in the Turkic languages, namely modality\(_1\) (MOD-1), comprising modal items in the (potential) scope of aspect, modality\(_2\) (MOD-2), comprising items on the same layer as aspect, and modality\(_3\) (MOD-3), comprising items that can have aspect items in their scope. These functional classes have rough semantic correspondences, in that MOD-1 prototypically encodes event modality, MOD-2 comprises the moods and prospective (“Future”) items, and MOD-3 encodes epistemic modality. However, items of the lower classes are often capable of covering the semantic domains of the higher classes as well. Initially this happens in terms of secondary interpretations (readings) of the core meaning of a given item, but ultimately items may shift the functional class. That is, lower level items are often the source for higher level items in grammaticalisation processes, a phenomenon that is very familiar from many other languages as well (cf. Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca 1994, pp. 176–242). The issue will become clear from the discussion of the data in this contribution, especially in Section 4.

The three modal umbrella categories are further subdivided according to semantic criteria. MOD-1 includes the domains of ability/possibility, permission, necessity and wish/desire. MOD-2 includes the emotive categories\(^1\) Imperative, Voluntative and Optative, the Conditional mood as well as neutral or prospective items (the so-called Future). The MOD-3 items found in the DQ are not so variegated that they require further semantic subclassification here, but items of this class principally can range from epistemic certainty (conviction) to uncertainty (doubt). Many Turkic languages, including Modern Standard Turkic, display a much broader spectrum of epistemic items than those actually attested in the DQ.

---

\(^{1}\) That is, categories that express a modal attitude of the speaker or another conscious subject toward the action. The term is adopted, with some changes in usage (cf. Rentzsch 2010a), from Marty (1908).
2. MOD-1

2.1. Ability and Possibility

The normal expression of possibility, which has become standardised as -(y)Ebil- in its positive variant and -(y)EmE- in its negative variant in Turkish, and as -(y)Ebilm- and -(y)Ebilme- in Azerbaijani, generally occurs in its negative variant in the DQ. Of the more conservative form -(y)VmE-, both variants with a low (1) and a high (2) vowel obviously occur indiscriminately. Even the same verb can appear with both forms.

(1) Boğa ayağ üstine turamadi düşdi.
   ‘The bull was unable to stand on its legs and collapsed.’
   (10b4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 38)

(2) Bir dağı urdï, deve ayağ üzerine turümadi yiqildï.
   ‘He kicked once again, and the camel was unable to stand on its legs and collapsed.’
   (96b5–6; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 132)

The younger form in -(y)Ebil- (which is not permitted in Standard Turkish in negated form) appears as well. It is well conceivable that it still preserves a reflex of its original value of internal ability as in Old Turkic, where -(y)Vbıl- contrasted with -(y)V/-GElU- in terms of the opposition [±internal] (cf. von Gabain 1941 [1974], pp. 129–130). Most occurrences of -(y)Ebil- in the DQ are interpretable in terms of to manage or to be capable. However, it is not clear whether there is still a systematic opposition between -(y)VmE- and -(y)Ebilme- in the DQ.

(3) Naşibinden artuğın yeye bilmez.
   ‘He cannot eat more than his share.’
   (3b2–3; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 29)

(4) Nêçe kim bu düşi gördüm, şundan berü ‘aqlum uşsum dère bilmen.
   ‘As I had this dream, I am no longer capable to collect my thoughts and my mind.’
   (23b5–6; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 53)

(5) Qalanışın yora bilmen.
   ‘I am unable to interpret the rest of it.’
   (23b9; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 53)

There are a couple of other constructions belonging to the domain of possibility that involve a form of the verb ol- ‘to become, to be’. In these constructions, ol-invariably appears in the Aorist third person singular, i.e. olur ‘it is possible’ (< ‘it becomes’) and olmaz ‘it is impossible’ (< ‘it does not become’). The semantics of these constructions seem to transgress the core domain of possibility and to cover permission (‘may’) as well. While these constructions are in the first place impersonal by nature, the modality can be personalised in some of them.
Modal usages of the verb bol-/ol- in terms of possibility, as well as more complex constructions building on these usages, are fairly widespread in the Turkic languages. In many cases, bol- can be inflected for aspect and tense, and in some languages even for person (Schönig 1987, pp. 4–12).

One type of these constructions in the DQ involves the verbal noun in -mEK and olmaz (the positive form does not occur in this text, although we may assume that it was permitted in the contemporary Anatolian Turkish dialects). The construction is impersonal, but a personal referent can often be inferred from the context:

1(6) Bunuŋ oğlı var, qardaši var, bunı öldürmek olmaz.
‘He has a son and a brother, we cannot kill him.’
(142b10–11; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 182)

1(7) Oğul, şabâh varub öylen gelmek olmaz, öylen varub ahasil gelmek olmaz.
‘Son, you cannot leave in the morning and return at noon, or leave at noon and return in the evening.’
(88a4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 124)

Another, more grammaticalised, type involves the Conditional in -sE and olmaz (no positive variant in the DQ). This type can be personalised by possessive markers, which are added to the Conditional suffix, as in example (9):

1(8) Şayılmağıla Oğuz begleri tükense olmaz.
‘The Lords of the Oghuz are not exhaustible by being counted.’
(33b1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 65)

1(9) Menüm ħwud qardašum varımüş, qayursam olmaz, qardašsuz Oğuzda āṭursam olmaz.
‘It turns out that I have an own brother, I cannot refuse that fact; without the brother I cannot stay with the Oghuz.’
(131a13–131b1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 169)

Still another type that occurs several times in the DQ involves an interrogated predicate and olur, rendering a construction that is interpretable in terms of ‘Can it be that…?’ In this construction, the postponed auxiliary olur ‘it is possible’ assumes the role of a particle that adds the modal notion of possibility to the sentence. The predicate of the core sentence can be positive or negated, but the segment -mI olur seems to be fossilised.

1(10) Qaytabanlar toruğunndan dönermi olur?
‘Is it possible that camels turn away from their foals?’
(100a12; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 136)

1(11) Kişi qoynında yatan helâliña sîrîn dêmezmi olur?
‘Is it possible that a man does not tell his wife, who sleeps in his arms, his secrets?’
≈ ‘A man may not hide his secrets from his wife who sleeps in his arms, may he?’
(123a11; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 159)
The origin of this construction seems to have been a sequence of two asyndetic predicates, in which the second one (*olur*) added the semantic component of possibility to the preceding sentence. The pattern instantiated in the examples above, on the other hand, is more integrated, with the invariable word form *olur* showing the characteristics of a particle. The interrogative marker *mi* integrates the possibility into its scope. The result is a construction that allows interpretations both in terms of event modality and epistemic modality.

2.2. Permission

In the Turkic languages, the category of permission tends to be served by a heterogeneous set of items such as Causatives, third person Voluntatives, possibility markers etc., which are capable to cover the domain of permission besides their respective semantic core domains. There is, however, also a characteristic type of constructions more narrowly designed to express permission, and this involves an auxiliary verb meaning ‘to put, to let’, normally *qoy*- etc. (*<*qoːð-), or, in the extreme west of the Oghuz area, *bïraq-*. There is a variegated set of linking devices between main verb and auxiliary, of which three appear in the DQ. The first is instantiated by example (12), in which the third person plural Voluntative links the main verb with the auxiliary. From the evidence in other Oghuz varieties, we can assume that the first person Voluntative and the second person Optative would complete the paradigm for the other persons, but these combinations are not actually attested in this text.

An alternative strategy can be seen in example (13), where the Conditional is employed as a linking device between main verb and auxiliary. This is a strategy that is common in expressions of possibility and necessity as well, see above (examples 8–9) and below (examples 18–20). In this particular example (which is the only one of this type in the DQ), the auxiliary is in the Conditional mood as well, in this case in order to express a request or command (cf. Section 3.4).

A third strategy involves a verbal noun in the Dative, which is also a widespread strategy in the grammaticalisation of modal constructions in Turkic. This type can be seen in example (14).

(12) *Qo beni, qadïn ana, čæⁿgehæle ursunlar, qo etumberland æksünkler, qara qavurma ætsünkler, qïrïq beg qïzïnu ænte iletsünkler.*

‘Mother, let them impale me on the hook, let them tear off my flesh and roast it, let them dish it up to your forty maids.’

(28b12–13; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 59)

---

[2] This process runs conversely to the widespread phenomenon of *scope increase* that is often observed in grammaticalisation processes in the domain of modality. This type of development could be described as a *scope decrease*. It is clearly not the interrogative marker that extends its scope, but the element *olur* that undergoes a process of stronger integration. This development resembles the process involved in the formation of tags, which start as matrix clauses and develop towards adverbials or clitics. See also Section 4.
2.3. Necessity

The bulk of expressions of necessity in the DQ involve the noun *gerek* ‘necessity, necessary’ as an auxiliary, which can be combined with the main verb by different strategies. A very common one is the combination of the verbal noun in -mEK with *gerek*, which can be seen in example (15). This is basically an impersonal construction. I am not aware that the derived personalised variant with possessive suffixes at the verbal noun, which has become common in Turkish and Azerbaijani, occurs in the DQ. However, there is an instance where the personal referent is marked not at the verbal noun, but at the auxiliary segment (16). In this example, *gerek* is combined with the past marker *idi*, which reactivates its prior dissociative meaning (cf. Rentzsch 2010b, p. 275) in order to weaken the force of the modality (*must/shall > should*). To this marker, a personal marker is added. The personal referent is additionally expressed overtly by the pronoun *sen* ‘you’ in the direct case. This example contains a negation, too, which is in the scope of the modal operator.

(15) *Begler, biliirmisz Qazana nêje hayf eylemek gerek? Boyê Uzun Borla Haêtûnîni getûrûp şagraq sürdürmek gerek.*

‘Lords, do you know how we must humiliate Qazan? We must bring his wife Borla with the long neck and force her to wait us with the drinking vessel.’

(27b4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 58)

(16) *Baba, bu sözî sen maça dêmek gerek idiûn.*

‘Dad, this you should not have told me.’

(89b4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 125)

*Gerek* frequently governs the Dative case in many Turkic varieties, especially when the argument is a plain noun. Verbal nouns can appear in the Dative as well, as in the following example, where *gerek* is combined with an aspect form of *ol-* ‘to become, to be’:

(17) *Aqinjîlarûn terkisi baği, üzengûsi qayîşî üzilür, dikmege gerek olur.*

‘The strap of the saddle of the raider, or the strap of his stirrup breaks, and it becomes necessary to stitch it.’

(96b8–9; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 132)

A pattern that is very frequent in the DQ is the combination of *gerek* with the main verb in the Conditional mood. This construction allows the expression of a per-
sonal referent, which can be indicated by suffixes at the Conditional marker (18–19). In example (19) the construction is again combined with the past marker idi in order to reduce the force of the necessity. While -sE gerek was originally clearly a marker for event modality, it can also be re-interpreted epistemically, which happens in example (20). This secondary interpretation has developed to the main meaning of this combination in modern Turkish.

(18) Čünkî dėdinq elbetde varsam gerek.
   ‘Now as you told me this, I have to go by all means.’
   (89b4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 125)

(19) Ne čoḡ olson? Ammâ bizüm bir begümüz oğlı vardur, bu üç nesneyi aŋa armaŋan aparsavuz gerek idi.
   ‘How could this be too much? But one of our lords has a son, and we should bring him these three things as a gift.’
   (38b2–3; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 70)

(20) Mere kāfir, kimün nesi olsa gerek, begümüz Qazanuŋ oğlıdur.
   ‘Hey infidel, who is he supposed to be? It is our lord Qazan’s son.’
   (145b2–3; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 185)

Not only verbal predicates can be marked by gerek, but also nominal predicates:

(21) Bizüm êlede gerek idinq ağač.
   ‘You should be in my home country, wood!’
   (30a3; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 60)

Besides the noun gerek, there are also stray occurrences of the verb gerek- in the DQ. One of these can be seen in example (22):

(22) Böyle oğul maŋa gerekmez.
   ‘Such a son I don’t need.’
   (12a11; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 40)

In the text there is also a single occurrence of a completely different and very striking construction with necessitative meaning:

(23) Elbetde ol agam þutlan qal’eye varmaynçag olmazam.
   ‘I must go to the fortress in which my brother is imprisoned by all means.’
   (133a12; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 171)

This construction contains a double negation, of which one is at the main verb var- ‘to go, to reach’, the other at the auxiliary ol- ‘to become, to be’. The construction also involves the converb -(y)InjE, which originally meant ‘until, instead of’ (cf. Mansuroğlu 1959, pp. 176–177) before it developed its meaning common in Modern Turkish (‘when’). Finally, the personal referent is marked at the auxiliary.

3 Note that in example (19) the first person plural marker is still -vUz (< biz) and not yet -K.
This expression of necessity represents a semantic structure which in modal logic is represented as \(<\neg \Diamond \neg p\>\), i.e. *it is not possible that not-\(p\)* (cf. Kaufmann – Condoravdi – Harizanov 2006, p. 76), and which is not uncommon at all in the languages of the world (de Haan 2006, p. 55). In the Turkic languages of Central Asia (such as Kazakh, Kirghiz, Uzbek and Uyghur), this semantic structure is more commonly expressed by a negative Conditional and the negated auxiliary bol-, i.e. \(<\neg \text{NEG-COND}=\text{be}-\neg \text{NEG}>\) (cf. Rentzsch 2005, pp. 66–67; Yakup 2009, pp. 487–488), which is a construction type found in a huge area including, besides some Turkic languages, Mongolic and Tungusic languages as well as Korean and Japanese.

The morphological material involved in the Middle Anatolian structure of example (23) on the other hand is not unique to the Dede Qorqud. It is also attested in the Chaghatay Turkic Baburnama, which is roughly contemporaneous with the DQ (16th century). Here we find that the segment -G\(\text{ÜncE}\) bol-, which is etymologically identical with Oghuz -(y)InjE ol-,\(^4\) is used to express the notion of possibility. With a double negation, this combination can be converted into an expression of strong necessity (this step, however, is not attested in the Baburnama).

2.4. Wish and Desire

In the DQ there is only a very limited set of expressions of willingness, wish and desire in the domain of MOD-1. The most common consists of a verb meaning ‘to want, to wish’ and a subordinate clause with the verb in the Optative, which is introduced by the complementiser ki(m), yielding a structure that can be rendered \(S_0\) *wants that \(S_0\) \(X\)-es*, where the subject of the “wish-verb” and the one of the subordinate clause could in theory be either identical or different. In practice, the subject is always iden-
tical in the DQ, but this is probably coincidental. As wish-verbs, both dile- (24–25) and iste- (26) occur. A prototype of the structure can be seen in example (24). In ex-
amples (25–26), the subordinate predicate is marked by a seemingly unmotivated past clitic idi. Idi in combination with the Optative would normally be expected either to weaken the strength of the Optative or to render a counterfactual wish. The first option is not feasible in these examples (*‘would like to’*), while the second one seems possible, as in both examples the wish is not granted. Another possible option would be that the past clitic shows an odd type of “agreement” with the suffix -di of the wish-verb.

(24) *Deli beg diledi ki Dedeyi depere čala.*\(^5\)

‘The lunatic nobleman wanted to hit Dede Qorqud at his head.’

(44a9–10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 75)

\(^4\) Both -G\(\text{ÜncE}\) and -(y)InjE originate from the nomen futuri in -G\(\text{Ü}\) and the Equative suffix -\(e\)E. That Chaghatay -G\(\text{ÜncE}\) was already a fossilised item can be seen from the fact that it contains a pronominal -\(n\)-, which normally was eliminated in Chaghatay.

\(^5\) Note the Directive case in the word form depe-re, which is nowadays obsolete (cf. Mansuroğlu 1959, p. 170).
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(25) Boğa dahi oglana sürdi geldi, diledi ki oglanı helâk qilaydı.
‘The bull approached the boy and wanted to annihilate him.’
(10a6–7; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 38)

(26) Dirse Hân istedi kim oglanjuğum üstine güvleyüp düşeydi, ol qırq nümɛrd qomadı.
‘Dirse Khan wanted to cast himself upon his little son, but the forty cowards did not let him do so.’
(13b3–4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 41)

Besides this structure involving a wish-verb and a subordinate clause, the more grammaticalised structure consisting of the verbal noun in -mEK and the auxiliary iste-, which has become normal in Standard Turkish and Standard Azerbaijani, can, albeit scarce, be found as well.6

(27) Qarğa quzugun qan görüp ołlanuy üstine qonmaq isteridi.
‘The crows and ravens saw blood and wanted to land on the boy.’
(15a9; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 43)

A completely different structure, which occurs several times in the DQ and occupies an intermediate position between the semantic domains of wish and necessity, consists of the Conditional and the adjective yêg ‘better’ (or ‘best’, Clauson 1972, p. 909). The underlying meaning of the structure is [It would be] better/best if, which is reinterpretable in terms of It would be desirable or SHALL–SHOULD, i.e. either a wish or a low degree of necessity. Despite of its fairly transparent meaning, it looks like a conventionalised modal construction.

(28) Qonuğ gelmeyen qara yêvler yiqïlsa yêg.
‘It would be best if tents without guests collapse. ≈ May it happen that tents without guests collapse! ≈ Tents without guests shall collapse.’
(4a7; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 30)

3. MOD-2

3.1. Imperatives

Imperatives express direct commands or requests of the speaker to an addressee. The Imperative singular appears in the DQ either as the bare stem or with the suffix -GIll, which Brockelmann assumes to derive from qil- ‘to make’ (1954, p. 225). There is no obvious difference in meaning that can be inferred from this text, and both variants co-occur in immediate vicinity to one another.

6 This structure is confined to same-subject wishes, i.e. S wants to X = Sı wants that Sı X-es.

Acta Orient. Hung. 64, 2011
Hāy Dirse Hān, baŋa qažab ētme, injiṭīb ajī sözler sāyleme! Yērūjden őrũ ṭurğil, ala čādirun yēr yūzine dikdürgil!

‘Alas, Dirse Khan, do not be angry with me, do not hurt me nor speak bitter words! Stand up from your place, erect your pied tent on the ground!’

(9a3–4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 37)

The plural Imperative appears both in the shape -(Ü)ŋ (30–31) and in the longer variant in -(Ü)ŋÜz (32). The data in the DQ is not sufficient to establish a semantic difference between these two variants, e.g. concerning a possible higher degree of politeness of the longer form. With regard to the morphological shape it is important to note that the form is -(Ü)ŋ(Uz), not -(y)Üŋ(Uz), as it must have been the case in the Ottoman Turkish varieties that have contributed to the formation of Modern Standard Turkish (cf. examples (31–32)).

(30) Gerek beni öldür-üŋ, gerek dirgür-üŋ, qoyu vėr-üŋ!

‘Either kill me or let me live and release me!’

(17b12–13; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 46)

(31) Begler, menüm daḥi ḥaqquma bir duʻa eyle-ŋ!

‘Lords, pray for me as well!’

(36a12–13; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 68)

(32) Begler, sız yē-ńūz, ič-ńūz, sōhbetińūz tağĭma-µuz!

‘Lords, eat and drink, do not dissolve your party!’

(65a2–3; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 98)

In the DQ there are some cases where an aspect form is combined with ol- in the Imperative. These combinations look like MOD-3 operators at first sight, but they are actually instances of participle aspect forms functioning as predicative attributes, as in the following example, where bilmiš is not part of a grammaticalised finite complex involving an aspect item and ol-, but has to be interpreted as a verbal adjective (*‘informed’*):

(33) Bu gelen, bilmiš oluŋ, yağŭdur.

‘What is coming there is the enemy, be informed!’

(65b8; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 98)

3.2. Voluntatives

The items collectively referred to as Voluntatives are actually a semantically inhomogeneous group of items, the linking element of which is that all of them can in certain contexts be interpreted in terms of a wish on behalf of the speaker or another conscious subject S.

---

7 That is, -(y)(Üz) after stems ending in vowels.
The VOL-1.SG (34–35) can often be interpreted as a wish or an intention of the speaker to perform the action, but it can also be appropriately used in contexts in which the action would be performed reluctantly and does not comply with the wish of the speaker. Hence, the core meaning of this item is the readiness of the speaker to carry out the action.

The VOL-1.PL (36) can express the same, i.e. the readiness of two or more speakers (or of one speaker that represents a group) to carry out the action, but it can also be used as an invitation or order to one or more persons to perform the action together with the speaker (‘let us X’).

If VOL-1 forms are used in requests, they are often interpretable in terms of asking the addressee for permission to perform the action. The underlying performative mechanism is transposing the wish or readiness to the addressee, i.e. Do you want me/us to X? or Are you ready for me/us X-ing? This mechanism is essentially a perspective move. This usage can be seen in examples (35–36). Another possibility of interpreting interrogated VOL-1 forms is an interrogated intention, i.e. Shall I/we X?

The VOL-3 expresses that the speaker or another conscious subject S considers it desirable or permissible that one or more persons, who are not the addressees, perform the action (37).

A fundamental difference that distinguishes the Voluntatives radically from markers of willingness and wish in the domain of MOD-1 is that the Voluntatives (as all MOD-2 items) intrinsically encode a conscious subject S (which is often, but need not necessarily be, the speaker) as a central deictic anchor point for the modal perspective or attitude toward the action. In other words, while it is possible to express the notion I want both by MOD-1 and MOD-2 items, notions like you want and s/he wants can only be expressed by MOD-1 items (at least in the Turkic languages). So, while items like the VOL-3 and the OPT-2 are often interpretable in terms of a wish, this wish is always related to a deictic centre, which is S, and is not transferrable to other persons (except in case of perspective moves in interrogative sentences, see above).

As for the form, for the VOL-1.SG both the conservative form -(y)EyIn (34) and the younger variant -(y)EyIm (35) are used indiscriminately. The VOL-1.PL is -(y)ElÜm (36), the VOL-3 is -sÜn in the singular and -sÜn(lEr) in the plural (37–38; 12).

(34) Allâh menüm évümi qurtarafaq olurïsa seni emîr-i âhür eleyeyin.
‘If God is going to save my home, I will make you Master of the Horse.’
(27b1–2; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 58)

(35) Oğul, dan dansu bu gün Oğuzda ne gördün? Eydür: Ne göreyim?
‘Son, what did you see among the Oghuz on this marvelous day? He answered: What shall I have seen? (“What do you expect me to see/have seen?”’)
(42a9–10; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 73)
(36) *Nėje saňt olmayalum?*
   ‘How could we not be angry? (“How could you expect us not to be angry?”’)
   (46b10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 77)

(37) *Mere oğlan, al şol barmağumdaki yüzüğü, parmağına taq. Saña oğ ve qılıç kâr eylemesün.*
   ‘Hey boy, take this ring from my finger and put it on your finger! [Then] arrows and swords shall not affect you.’
   (116a8–9; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 152)

Like the Imperative, the Voluntative of *ol-* occasionally combines with participles that function as predicative attributes, rendering complex structures that should not be confused with MOD-3 items:

(38) *Qažiňiq Tağı, aqar seniň şularuň, aqar iken aqmaz olsun.*
    *Biter seniň otlaruň, Qažiňiq Tağı, biter iken bitmez olsun.*
    *Qaçar seniň geyikeruň, Qažiňiq Tağı, qaçartiken qačmaz olsun, taša dönsün.*
   ‘Mount Qaziliq! Your brooks flow, may they become unflowing!
    Your grass grows, Mount Qaziliq, may it become ungrowthing!
    Your deer run away, Mount Qaziliq, may they become unrunning, may they turn to stone!’
   (15b8–10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 44)

3.3. Optative

The Optative in -(y)E belongs to the emotive type of MOD-2 items, which means that it expresses an immediate emotional or moral attitude of a conscious S (which may or may not be the speaker) towards the action. The semantic field covered by the Optative ranges from permission to obligation (roughly: MAY–SHOULD), which is a quite wide field\(^8\) allowing for a large spectrum of readings. These readings – which depend on the co-text or context of the utterance, the personal marking as well as partly on the semantics of the verb – range from intention or determination (*I will*), request or (moderate) order to an addressee (*you shall/should*), wish (*may I/you/he*) to future (*will*). The Optative also enables readings of epistemic assumption (*will, might*). It can be used for hypothetical and counterfactual (irrealis) expressions, especially but not exclusively combined with the past marker *idi* (which functions as a dissociative marker in these cases). The Optative (like the Voluntatives) is often used in subjunctive and subjunctive-like functions in various kinds of constructions involving subordinate clauses, including MOD-1 constructions.

The fact that in terms of pragmatic usage there are many overlaps between OPT-1 and VOL-1 on the one hand and OPT-3 and VOL-3 on the other is likely to have

\(^8\) One could say that this modal item is semantically non-focal.
contributed to the almost complete loss of the Optative of the first and third person in Modern Standard Turkish (but not in Azerbaijani!).

Given the vast variegation in readings, which may differ according to the context and even allow several interpretations in one context, only a small selection of examples that typify some of the most salient readings is given. Remember that besides the interpretations chosen for the translation, other readings may be possible for a given example.

The core meaning of the Optative (PERMISSION–OBLIGATION) is quite nicely reflected in the following example:

(39) *Andan şona menüm jānum alasın.*

‘After that, you may/shall take my life.’

(85a5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 120)

In interrogative sentences, the modal perspective of an OPT-1 can be switched to the addressee (i.e. a perspective move), like in example (40). We have seen a similar usage of the VOL-1 above, see especially example (36).

(40) *Nêcê saht olmayam?*

‘How should/could I not be angry?’

(119b12; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 156)

The determination or intention of the speaker(s) is conveyed in the following two examples (characteristically first person):

(41) *Dêgil bâya! Qara bašum şağliginda eylükler ëdem, köpek saña.*

‘Tell it me, then I will do you kindnesses, dog, as long as my sad head is alive.’

(25a12 – 13; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 55)

(42) *Jânverler serhengi devedür. Anunjìla dahi oyunin oynasun [...] andan şona qïzï vërevëz.*

‘The camel is the champion among the beasts. He shall perform his spectacle with the camel as well, then we will give him the girl.’

(94b8 – 10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 130)

The following two examples are likely to be interpreted in terms of a command or request (characteristically second person):

(43) *Tanjìa qizûni mana vëresin.*

‘Tomorrow you shall give me your daughter.’

(93b2; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 129)

(44) *Qanqûmaz yapisârlarîsa «Qazan hâtûni qanqûmuздur?» dëyû, qûrq vêrden ûvâz vëresiz!*

‘In case they ask one of you whom of you is Qazan’s wife, all the forty of you shall pipe up collectively.’

(27b8 – 9; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 58)
The following example is interpretable in terms of a wish:

(45) Ḥaqluya ḥaqqī dege, ḥaqsuza yüzí qaraliği dege.
‘May the righteous one get what he deserves, may the unjust one obtain disgrace!’

(57b10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 89)

The following example has the character of a prediction (future):

(46) Āhîr zemândâ ḡânîq gërû Qayîya dege. Kîmesne ellerînden almaya, āhîr zemân olup qiyâmet qopînğa.
‘In the end the khanate will be in the hands of the Qayî tribe. Nobody will take it from them until the Day of Judgment.’

(3a5–7; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 29)

An epistemic interpretation will be selected for the first Optative form in the following sentence:

(47) Olmaya kim bu ola!
‘This won’t be him! = It will not be the case that this is him! = Should this be him?’

(41a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 72)

Counterfactual and hypothetical usages of the Optative can be seen in examples (48–49), in (48) in the characteristic combination with īdi, in (49) without īdi.

(48) Qara hindû qullaruma buyuraydum, seni pâre pâre þogravalarîdî, ağač.
‘I would command my black Indian slaves to chop you into pieces, wood.’

(30a3–4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 60)

(49) Men senden ne gördüm, ne ögrenem?
‘What did I see from you, what should/could I have learned from you?’

(64b13; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 98)

Subjunctive and subjunctive-like usages of the Optative can be seen in the following two examples:

(50) Anûŋ kim oglî qîzî olmaya Tâŋrî te’älâ ani qarggayûbdur, biz daþî qarggaraz.
‘The one who has no son or daughter is cursed by God, and we curse him as well.’

(8b4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 36)

(51) Ėmdi, mere deli, geldûm ki senîŋ jânûŋ alam.
‘Now, you lunatic, I have come to take your soul.’

(81a9–10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, pp. 116–117)

The Old Uyghur cognate (-GEy) of the Middle Oghuz Optative was a prospective item (“Future”, von Gabain 1941 [1974], p. 115); hence we can assume a grammaticalisation cline from Future to Optative for the Middle Oghuz item. Readings like those in example (46) are reflexes of the earlier function of this item.
3.4. Conditional

While not much is known about the precise semantic design of the Conditional in Proto-Turkic, I assume the Conditional to be the hypothetical mood *par excellence* in the Turkic languages, coding a core meaning roughly equivalent to English *suppose*, *provided that*, *given (that)* etc. This assumption would reconcile both the converbial and finite usages of the Conditional as well as the range of possible readings. The two main readings of the Conditional that are attested in Old Turkic, namely the conditional (i.e. the protasis-constituting) and the temporal one (cf. Erdal 2004, pp. 479–481), are frequent in the Dede Qorqud as well, see (52) and (53) respectively. The conditional usage can easily be reinterpreted in terms of adversativity, a shade that can be felt even in example (52) but is more clearly discernible in example (54). The Conditional in the protasis of a conditional sentence is made counterfactual by adding the past marker *idî* (here in its dissociative function, example (55)). Conditionals in finite position are also interpretable in terms of an intensive wish (“desiderative”), see example (56), a usage that is equally derivable from the supposed hypothetical core meaning of the Conditional. Modern Standard Turkish usually adds the desiderative particle *keške* (< Pers. *kāški* ‘may it happen, would that’; cf. Rentzsch 2010a, p. 217, examples (12–13)) in order to signal this function; this element is missing in the example given here. Second person finite Conditionals are used as commands and have pragmatic functions similar to those of Imperatives. They are often combined with a particle -*E* (57).

(52) *Qara ešek bašïna uyan ursaŋ qaṭïr olmaz.*

‘Suppose that you bridle a donkey, it won’t become a mule = If you bridle a donkey it doesn’t become a mule.’

(3b6–7; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 30)

(53) *Aġïz açup őger olsam üstümüzde Taŋrï görkli.*

‘Now that I am going to open my mouth for the glorification, [I say:] God is beautiful.’

(4b11–12; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 31)

(54) *Örlešüben şular tašsa deniz tolmaz.*

‘Even if the rivers run over purlingly, the ocean will not be filled.’

(3b3; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 29)

(55) *Eger seniŋ ogluŋ olmasaydi bizüm məlimüz Gürjistända gëtimišdi, hepuɯüz tuštq olmišduŋ.*

‘If your son had not been there, our goods would have gone to Georgia, and we all would have fallen captive.’

(39a10–11; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 71)

(56) *Menüm daŋlı olsu Haŋ Bayındiruŋ qaršusıŋ alsa, türsa, qulliq eylese men daŋlı baqsam, sevinsem, qıvansam, güvensem!*

‘Suppose that = Would that I had a son, and would that he stood in front of Bayındır Khan and served him, and would that I could look, rejoice, be glad and rely on him!’

(36a5–7; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 68)
Bunda lâf urub nêdersin? Çünkî er dîlersin, varub babañi qurtarsaña ne!
‘Why are you talking big? If you want to vie with men, then go and save your father, what about that!’

(104a7–8; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 140)

In many Turkic varieties, including that of the DQ, the Conditional is also employed as a subjunctive type linking device in auxiliary constructions, see Section 2.

3.5. Prospective Items (Future)

There are no particular finite prospective (i.e. “Future”) items in the DQ. Prospective usages in finite position are served either by the Optative or by the intraterminal aspect (the so-called “Aorist”). Those Future items that occur in the DQ are verbal nouns that function either as substantives or, more commonly, as adjectives (depending on syntactic parameters). The form is usually -(y)EsI, but occasionally the more progressive form -(y)E mãk turns up as well. The readings produced by these items range from obligation and appropriateness (OUGHT–SHOULD, example (58)) to wish (59–60) and intention (61) as well as to posteriority of the relevant limit of the action (the actual future reading, examples (62–63)).

(58) Sen varası kâfir degül.
‘[These are] not infidels that you should approach.’

(67a8; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 100)

(59) Bu ẽvi harâb oslañ ere varaldan 10 berü dañhî qarum töymadî yüzüm gûldê.
‘Since I married this guy, whose tent shall collapse, I have never had enough to eat nor any happiness in my life.’

(6a1–2; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 33)

(60) Bu yûqîlafaq ẽve un yoq, elek yoq.
‘In this tent, may it collapse, there is no flour and not even a sieve.’

(6b7–8; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 33)

(61) Qarşusûndan ol eri şançasum vaqût defedümi.
‘When I wanted to pierce that man from his front side, I scrutinised him.’

(105b4; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 141)

(62) Ay șaqar qoç, menûm nêreden helâk olafaqum bildümi.
‘Oh ram with a blaze, you knew what would accomplish my annihilation.’

(116a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 152)

9 Example (62) has -(y)E mãk as the predicate of a nominal clause, example (63) as a predicative attribute. In all other examples, the prospective item is in attributive position.

4. Epistemic Items

Epistemic notions can, as we have seen above, be conveyed by MOD-1 items (such as -sE gerek) and MOD-2 items (such as the Optative), provided there is an appropriate context that favours an epistemic interpretation. These are pragmatic readings derived from underlying core meanings that are actually non-epistemic but can be re-interpreted epistemically by means of metonymy. In the DQ, there are two grammatical or grammaticising items that seem to signal epistemic modality more systematically and do not belong to the layers of neither MOD-1 nor MOD-2. These are either MOD-3 operators, or constructions on the way to become MOD-3 operators.

One of these is the epistemic clitic =dur, a reduced form of *turur 'stands', which was formerly a copula item and occasionally turns up in the DQ as an epistemic marker that covers a semantic field ranging approximately from PERHAPS to CERTAINLY, i.e. a quite large field (which excludes, however, both DEFINITELY and UNLIKELY). In example (64), =dur co-occurs with the lexical epistemic item belki 'maybe', which narrows down the epistemic spectrum covered by =dur, resulting in epistemic insecurity (possible but not sure).

Another type of epistemic marker that appears frequently in the DQ is based on the Optative third person singular of ol- 'to become, to be', i.e. ola. There are several constructions involving this word form, which at the same time reflect different stages of grammaticalisation. A development in terms of meaning can be observed as well.

The primary stage comprises ola with the complementiser ki(m) and a dependent Optative in subjunctive-like function. This construction can be interpreted either as a strong wish ("desiderative"), i.e. a reading closer to the original emotive core meaning of the Optative, or as an epistemic modification of the sentence. In many cases there is a vacillation between both readings. Example (65) produces a quite clear reading of hope, while example (66) seems to favour an epistemic reading, and in example (67) both readings are possible:

(63) Eger çobanıla varajaq olurîsam qalîn Oğuz begleri benîm başuma qaçînê qaharlar.
‘If I become one who will go = If I will go together with the shepherd, the stout Oghuz lords will be mad at me.’
(27a1–2; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 57)

(64) Hānum, ürkdügümüz vaqtîn düšen menüm oğlan移交umdur belki.
‘My Khan, it might possibly be my little son that fell down when we were fleeing in panic.’
(108b13–109a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 146)

(65) Hānum, ürkdügümüz vaqtîn düšen menüm oğlan移交umdur belki.
‘My Khan, it might possibly be my little son that fell down when we were fleeing in panic.’
(108b13–109a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 146)

(66) Hānum, ürkdügümüz vaqtîn düšen menüm oğlan移交umdur belki.
‘My Khan, it might possibly be my little son that fell down when we were fleeing in panic.’
(108b13–109a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 146)

(67) Hānum, ürkdügümüz vaqtîn düšen menüm oğlan移交umdur belki.
‘My Khan, it might possibly be my little son that fell down when we were fleeing in panic.’
(108b13–109a1; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 146)

11 This is the main function of this item in Modern Standard Turkish as well (except in formalistic style, where =DIR is still used as a copula clitic). Cf. Rentzsch (2010a, p. 222).
(65) Öleyim ağzuy ičün oğul. Ola kim menüm gëçmiş günümü ağıdurtmayasin.
‘I die for your words, son. Hopefully you won’t remind me of my olden days.’
(125a5–6; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 161)

(66) Gelifş, oğlanı babasına qovlayalum. Ola kim öldüre, gëne bizüm ‘izzetümüz hürmetümüş anuy babası yamunda h’oş ola, artuq ola.
‘Come on, let us calumniate him at his father, maybe he will kill him and restore or even augment our dignity and respect.’
(11a11–13; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 39)

(67) Ulî toy eyle, hâjet dile, ola kim bir ağzı du’allah du’allah alqışıyla Tanrı bize bir müsâlmân ‘ayâl vêre.
‘Make a great feast and ask in prayer, maybe (may it be that) God, blessing the prayer, grants us a Muslim child.’
(9a9–10; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 37)

The construction <ola=ki(m)+OPT> is not just an arbitrary construction involving a matrix clause and a dependent clause, it rather behaves like a tag on the transitional stage between emotive and epistemic (or, in more traditional terms, between mood and epistemic modality). It shows clear signs of grammaticalisation; e.g. ol- in this type of construction does not take other aspect or mood markers (*olur ki, *oldi ki, *olsun ki). It is a construction that is on the cline from MOD-2 to MOD-3.

A next step, which is also attested in the DQ, is the omission of the completer ki(m) (the desiderative reading is impossible in this example):

(68) Allâhu te’âlâ meni qarqayubdur, beğler. Tâjum tahtum ičün ağlaram. Bir gün ola düşêm ölem, yérümde yurdumda kimse qalmaya.
‘God the Almighty has cursed me, lords. I cry about my crown and my throne. One day I will maybe fall to the ground and die, and no-one will remain in my place and my home.’
(36a3–4; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 68)

A final step, which turns up quite frequently in the DQ, is the lexicalisation of ola as a modal clitic in interrogative sentences. This item is very flexibly combinable and survives more or less unchanged in Anatolian Turkish varieties (cf. Rentzsch 2010a, pp. 222–224). It is the endpoint of a very widespread development matrix clause > tag > adverb (cf. de Haan 2006, p. 38). In terms of meaning, this item matches the profile of modal particles as they are familiar from German, Dutch or Chinese.

(69) Yâ Rab, bu otâq kimâng ola?
‘God, whose tent might this be?’
(40a5; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 72)

(70) Mere bâzirgânlar, varan, iqlîm iqlîm aran, Beyregün öülüsi dirisi ḥabarîn getürêydingüz olami?
‘Merchants, go, search all regions, maybe you could bring news about whether Beyrek is dead or alive.’
(49a12–13; Tezcan–Boeschoten 2001, p. 79)
(71) *A begler, oglan qanjaru gëtdi ola?*  
‘Oh lords, where can the boy have gone?’  
(69a10; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 102)

Alternatively to <ola=ki(m)+OPT>, we find several instances of <bolay=ki(m)+OPT>, i.e. a more archaic form with the initial b- of *bol-* preserved and a more conservative Optative ending (both -(y)E and -Ey are derived from -GEy).

The epistemic reading of bolay(ki(m) is salient in examples (72–73), while the desiderative one is salient in (74). In (73), the degree of the epistemic probability is reduced by the dissociative marker *idi.*

(72) *Gel gedelüm ikisinden biri bolaykim jânîn vëre, aigli, menüm jânumî qoqîl.*  
‘Perhaps one of these two will give his soul. Take it and leave my soul alone!’  
(83a6–7; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 118)

(73) *Basat şimdi aqîndan geldi. Varayîn, bolayki maña bir esîr vêreydi, oğlanjuğum qurtaraydîm.*  
‘Basat has just returned from a raid. I will go to him, perhaps he could give me a prisoner, and I could save my little son.’  
(112b1–2; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 149)

(74) *Göreşdiler olamî, bolayki bizümîkî yêge.*  
‘They will have engaged in battle, may our party win!’  
(137a4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 175)

It is clear that the existence of the segment bolay does not make the DQ an example of the so-called “olga-bolga dili” (cf. Doerfer 1990, pp. 20–27). The language of the DQ is neither a “mixed” language incorporating both eastern and western components, nor is there reason to assume a substantial Khorasan Turkic influence. There are no other instances of preservation of b- in lexemes where we expect a loss in Western Oghuz, and the Optative is always -(y)E except in this single segment bolay. Bolay(ki(m) is rather an instance of fossilisation of an old construction, in which bolay=ki(m) was treated as an unanalysable unit (lexicalisation), and did not participate in the usual sound shift of the verb *bol-. Bolay(ki(m), which synchronically can be regarded a modal adverb, shows a remarkable perseverance through the centuries. It even occurs in the Turkish dialect of Vidin (Bulgaria, 20th century), i.e. a Western Rumelian spoken variety that is unsuspicious of Eastern Oghuz influence (75). In that dialect, it is a petrified archaism that turns up in conservative registers (in this case, a fairy-tale), and it is reasonable to assume the same for the four centuries older Dede Qorqud “epic” stories.

(75) *Memnun oldug, bolay-ki ağlamayaşsin qizîm.*  
‘We are happy, hopefully you will not cry, my daughter.’  
(Németh 1965, p. 148)
5. Survey

Table 1. MOD-1 items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-(y)EmE-</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ImE-</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)E bilme-</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
<td>3–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEK olmaz</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
<td>6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sE olmaz</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
<td>8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-m1 olur</td>
<td>Possibility (+Q)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOL/(OPT)+go-</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sE go-</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEGE go-</td>
<td>Permission</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEK gerek</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEGE gerek ol-</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sE gerek</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>18–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN+gerek</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOUN+gerek-</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEyIn</td>
<td>E olma-</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dile-+ki+OPT</td>
<td>WANT</td>
<td>24–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iste+-+ki+OPT</td>
<td>WANT</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mEK iste-</td>
<td>WANT</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sE yérg</td>
<td>It would be best if</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. MOD-2 items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>IMP.SG</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-GIl</td>
<td>IMP.SG</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(Ü)ŋ</td>
<td>IMP.PL</td>
<td>30–31, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(Ü)ŋÜz</td>
<td>IMP.PL</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)Eylın</td>
<td>VOL.1.SG</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)Eylım</td>
<td>VOL.1.SG</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)E1Üm</td>
<td>VOL.1.PL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sÜn(l</td>
<td>Er)</td>
<td>VOL.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)E</td>
<td>Optative</td>
<td>39–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sE</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>52–57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)EsI</td>
<td>“Future”</td>
<td>58–59, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(y)EjEK</td>
<td>“Future”</td>
<td>60, 62–63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. MOD-3 items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Type of meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=dur</td>
<td>MAYBE–CERTAINLY</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ola ki(m)+OPT</td>
<td>May it be–MAYBE</td>
<td>65–67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolay ki(m)+OPT</td>
<td>May it be–MAYBE</td>
<td>72–74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ola+OPT</td>
<td>MAYBE–CERTAINLY</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ola</td>
<td>MAY–MIGHT</td>
<td>69–71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations

COND  Conditional  
DQ  Dede Qorqud Oğuznamelesi  
IMP  Imperative  
MOD-1  Modality1  
MOD-2  Modality2  
MOD-3  Modality3  
NEG  Negation  
OPT  Optative  
OPT-1  Optative first person  
OPT-2  Optative second person  
OPT-3  Optative third person  
PL  Plural  
S  Conscious subject  
SG  Singular  
VOL  Voluntative  
VOL-1  Voluntative first person  
VOL-3  Voluntative third person
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