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Grammaticalisation is an umbrella term for a set of partly unrelated processes that share a common result, namely the emergence of grammatical units. Although the Turkic languages represent a relatively homogeneous family of closely related languages, they are highly variegated in terms of how they express modal categories. The multitude of expressions stems from a restricted set of developments that can be empirically documented. This paper investigates heterogeneous specimens of expressions of modality in the Turkic languages and identifies the mechanisms that underlie the diachronic and synchronic variation that can be observed in Turkic modal constructions.
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1. Modality and Grammaticality in Turkic

The present paper is concerned with how grammaticalisation processes result in formal and semantic variation in Turkic expressions of modality. It presupposes an understanding of grammaticalisation as designating processes that produce grammatical markers, i.e. developments from lexical items into grammatical ones, from lexicogrammatical combinations into grammatical markers and from grammatical items into (more) grammatical ones. Grammaticality¹ is thought to form a triangular relationship with lexicality on the one hand and arbitrariness on the other. The term arbitrariness as used here designates the free and spontaneous combination of linguistic material (i.e.

*Acknowledgement. The research for this paper was made possible by a grant from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

¹This term is used here to designate the state of being grammaticalised, not the colloquial meaning of being grammatically correct.
lexical and grammatical items) according to the rules of a given language without a concrete preexisting model. With these characteristics, arbitrariness contrasts with both grammaticality and lexicality, which represent different types of conventionalisation. Linguistic items may differ in their location within the triangle of conventionalisation, depending on their degree of conventionalisation and their configuration with respect to the notions of grammaticality and lexicality. Conventionalisation paths do not necessarily evolve rectilinearly; a given item may change direction in the process of conventionalisation; for instance, it may first develop towards lexicality and assume grammatical meaning or be integrated into a paradigm at a later stage. The result of a conventionalisation process need not be unambiguously lexical or grammatical; indeed, items may hover between grammaticality and lexicality. Conventionalisation is potentially recursive: conventionalised items (lexical or grammatical) enter free combinations with other lexical or grammatical items (thus implying a return to arbitrariness). These free combinations potentially serve as a starting point for new processes of conventionalisation.

While there is no single, universally accepted theory of grammaticalisation and no general agreement about the types of processes it entails, it can be stated that the discourse on grammaticalisation has been decisively moulded by several such influential books as Traugott – Heine (1991), Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca (1994), Lehman (1995), Bisang – Himmelmann – Wiemer (2004) etc. These works will serve as a terminological and argumentative background for the present study, which, due to their differences in detail, will necessitate some additional discussion here and there. This holds especially true for borderline phenomena, i.e. expressions that fall within or near the grey area between arbitrariness and grammaticality.

The decision as to whether a given morphosyntactic construction is grammaticalised or not is often not straightforward. Consider ex. (1) from Uzbek and ex. (2) from Turkish:

(1) *Bu kitobni o‘qi-sh-im kerak.*
(2) *Bu kitabi oku-ma-m gerek.*

‘I must read this book.’

Both sentences represent one of the most common types of expression of necessity in the respective language. They are identical in terms of structure and meaning. They differ in actual formal representation as the two languages have developed differently in terms of phonology and as they employ different verbal nouns (Uzbek -(i)š, Turkish -mA); however, the underlying structure is the same, comprising a verbal noun with a possessive marker and a variant of the Turkic noun *kergek* ‘necessity’. The literal meaning of both sentences is ‘My reading this book is a necessity’, which, although inelegant-sounding in English, is sufficiently transparent so that

---

2 This amounts to combinational arbitrariness, which has to be distinguished from de Saussure’s arbitrariness (1962, pp. 100–101), which has to do with the form-meaning relationship and is ultimately formal. These two types of arbitrariness are cohyponymous.
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there is no need to assume that a semantic development caused a deviation from a pure combination of the meanings of the components involved in the construction.

The situation changes somewhat when the logical subject of the verb action, that is the personal referent of the modality, is not only expressed by the possessive marker, but also mentioned explicitly. (This can be done for the sake of emphasis in the case of the first and second persons and is possible in the third person in order to make clear who or what must perform or undergo the action):

(1a) Männer bu kitobni o’qi-sh-im kerak.
(2a) Ben-im bu kitabı oku-ma-m gerek.

‘I must read this book.’

In this case, Turkish follows the rules of Turkic genitive-possessive constructions, in which the head takes a possessive marker, while the possessor is in the genitive case. The logical subject in the necessitative construction is formally identified with the possessor in a genitive-possessive construction. In contrast, Uzbek deviates from this pattern as it puts the subject in the direct case. At first sight, the Uzbek variant of the necessitative construction appears to diverge from an underlying, more general syntactic principle, a situation that could be interpreted as a formal change that has resulted from grammaticalisation. However, this is not the case. As will be shown below (Section 3), the Uzbek variant is the more archaic one, while the Turkish variant has been adapted to the possessor-possessed structure.

Example (1a) can be regarded as grammaticalised as it displays a strategy for expressing the personal referent that deviates from the general rules of Turkic syntax, or, to be more precise, it constitutes its own rule. If we accept the grammaticality of ex. (1a), we will be inclined to consider ex. (1) grammaticalised as well, as it is essentially the same structure, albeit dispensing with the optional explicit mention of the subject. Example (2a) is more intricate; absent historical data that shows that the Turkic necessitative pattern originates in a secondary harmonisation with an etymologically alien syntactic principle, we might assume (2a) to be an arbitrary specimen of the regular Turkic possessor-possessed construction.

This, however, would be a naive conclusion. The mere fact that the form of the Turkish construction looks arbitrary is not a sufficient criterion for arbitrariness (even if the item does not boast such an adventurous biography), as formal change is not a necessary epiphenomenon of grammaticalisation (Bisang 2004). Actually, Turkic languages do display a strong tendency toward formal change in grammaticalisation processes, with analysable morphosyntactic constructions often gradually developing into suffixes as a result of phonetic attrition. This, however, does not mean that all processes of grammaticalisation necessarily operate in this manner, and, even in con-

---

3 That is, the participant most strongly involved in the necessary action, such as the actor or undergoer (depending on the argument structure and the semantic profile of the verb); cf. van der Auwera – Plungian (1998, pp. 83–84). This difficult-to-define entity will be labelled “personal referent” hereafter. The term is not meant to imply that this referent needs to be human or animate, but that it is characterised by the linguistic category person (and partly number).
tiguous grammatical constructions, the process of fusion and reduction is optional. The simple absence of formal change is therefore not sufficient to settle the question of arbitrariness.

Even semantic criteria are not always instructive. Grammaticalisation may be characterised by an increase in abstraction, or “bleaching”, but this is not very obvious in the examples provided above.

It could be argued with some justification that the construction has been integrated into a paradigm for competing root modals – including items that encode necessity, possibility, desire and so on as well as Zero as the unmarked member – which enter into systematic semantic oppositions with one another. The grammaticality of this construction would be the result of a paradigmaticisation. This argument, however relevant as it may be in relatively clear cases like this, merely shifts the problem to another level for while we might in fact be inclined to establish a “paradigm” for root modals the delimitation of this paradigm is far from clear. For example, we might find it difficult to decide whether or not permissive items (expressing ‘to let, to allow’) belong to this paradigm, and as soon as we attempt to establish the grammaticality of these items the same problem will arise.

Even the criterion of obligatoriness, i.e. compulsoriness to specify a given category (cf. Lehmann 1995, p. 139, Bisang 2004, p. 112), which has been claimed to be a criterion of grammaticalisation (cf. the discussion by Wiemer – Bisang 2004, pp. 8–9), is only of limited relevance in a domain like modality, which is highly optional per se. Most utterances in Uzbek and Turkish can dispense with markers of modality. Moreover, there is often more than one option to convey a given modal notion. A wide selection of (arbitrary and non-arbitrary) expressions is available for the notion of necessity in both languages, <VN-POSS+*gerek> being far from the only option. However, if the idea of obligatoriness is not applied to the whole construction but to its individual components (i.e. if it is viewed in light of a lack of paradigmatic variability, see Haspelmath 1989, p. 296), we find that all the example sentences mentioned above show certain obligatory properties because in this particular construction of necessity, Turkish only permits the verbal noun in -mA(K). It is not possible to replace -mA(K) with another verbal noun, such as one in -mIš or -(y)Iš. 4 Thus, <-mA-POSS+gerek> is a fixed expression that cannot simply be altered. 5 It is obligatory in that if this type of expression of necessity is chosen it must be in this form. The absence of flexibility in the Turkish construction is a symptom of grammaticalisation. 6 (The same applies, mutatis mutandis, to the Uzbek construction.)

---

4 This is precisely what other Turkic languages do, e.g. Old Uyghur (-mIš) and Uzbek (-(y)Iš).
5 This phenomenon could be considered a “deep structure fossilisation” – i.e. the actual morphological material remains variable (depending on the phonological features of the verb stem and the subject referent of the modality) – while the underlying construction is fossilised. We will return to a more classic example of fossilisation below.
6 If either paradigmaticisation or fossilisation is considered a sufficient criterion for grammaticalisation, this implies that grammaticalisation need not involve a change in either form or meaning.
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2. Auxiliarisation

Root modality is most typically expressed in Turkic by constructions that entail a main verb and an auxiliary segment. Such constructions may eventually develop into suffixes as a result of phonetic reduction (a tendency which is not important for this paper). There are also some suffixes of different origin (such as -mAKčI), but these will be disregarded here. This chapter will concentrate on three semantic subdomains of modality, namely necessity, possibility, and wish.

The auxiliary segment in Turkic modal constructions is either nominal or verbal (where the adjective nominal will henceforward be used to refer to both nouns and adjectives). While the constructions that have appeared in the course of Turkic language history are far from uniform in this respect, nominal auxiliaries most typically occur in expressions of necessity, while verbal auxiliaries are most typical of expressions of possibility and wish.

As auxiliarisation necessarily involves a choice of how to combine the main verb with the auxiliary segment and this choice becomes binding (obligatory, see Section 1) in the system of a given linguistic variety, all auxiliary constructions, by definition, display a certain degree of grammaticalisation. This even holds true for varieties that permit more than one choice, as certain patterns are preferred over others that would, in theory, be equally suitable.

Hence, all auxiliary constructions to be discussed in this paper will be considered a product of grammaticalisation even if a given construction does not deviate from our expectations regarding the grammatical norms valid in any free combination of morphological and lexical material.

Virtually all Turkic auxiliary verbs originate in full verbs; in other words, they are attested in full verb functions in some diachronic stage.7 This is particularly obvious with bol- ‘to become’ and bil- ‘to know’, which developed into auxiliaries in possibility constructions in many Turkic varieties, as well as with küse- ‘to want’, saqîn- ‘to think, to desire’, tile- ‘to seek’ and iste- ‘to seek’, which became involved in expressions of wish. Also, u- ‘to be capable’, most frequently encountered in an auxiliary function in Old Turkic possibility constructions, is attested as a (transitive!) full verb in Old Uyghur, e.g. Šimnu küčiŋe gop-uy uγaγ ‘By the power of Ahriman he will be capable of everything’ (Clauson 1972, p. 2). All these verbs take direct objects (which appear in the accusative if specific and in the unmarked case if unspecific) in full verb functions, except bol-, in which both (potential) arguments appear in the unmarked case. It is therefore worth noting that these verbs do not combine with verbal nouns in auxiliary functions in Old Turkic (a strategy that has gained some currency since the Middle Turkic period)8 but use converbs as linking devices between

---

7 As grammaticalisation is usually irreversible (Haspelmath 1999), full verb functions can generally be regarded prior to auxiliary functions even in cases where auxiliary functions are more frequently attested.

8 A possible exception is bol-, which is frequently attested with a verbal noun with a possessive marker in Old Uyghur. Some of these constructions clearly just mean ‘his/her/its X-ing happens’, but occasionally an interpretation in terms of participant-external possibility cannot be ruled
main and auxiliary verb. Two converbs predominate in Old Turkic modal constructions: the intraterminal converb -(y)V and the purposive converb -GAI. In the Runic inscriptions it is -(y)V that is used, while in Old Uyghur the picture is more mixed: u-combines with both -(y)V and -GAI (the latter being significantly more frequent), while bol-, kiše- and saqïn- combine with -GAI almost exclusively.10 Bil-, early auxiliary usages of which are occasionally attested in Old Uyghur (e.g. Birig išlet-ü bil-meki üze ‘As he manages to use the ink brush’, Xuanzang Biography VIII: 1042),11 combines with -(y)V. Tile- and istic- are not attested as auxiliaries before the Middle Turkic era. In summary, it is clear that modal constructions with verbal auxiliaries conform to the pattern <CV+AUX> in Old Turkic.

Nominal auxiliaries behave differently in Old Turkic. The most frequent necessity construction in Old Turkic comprises the auxiliary noun kergek ‘necessity’12 and a verbal noun, which can be -mAK, -sVK, -GU and -mlï in Uyghur (Erdal 2004, pp. 525–527).13 The underlying structure can be represented as <VN+AUX>, thus conforming perfectly to the normal Turkic subject-predicate sentence structure, with the verbal noun phrase acting as the subject and the nominal auxiliary as the predicate.

However, the Old Uyghur corpus also contains examples in which kergek combines with the converb -GAI, thus conforming to the pattern <CV+AUX>: Bu nom erdinig bol få-yali tut-yali oqï-yali oqï-yali bitï-geli bitï-geli q’il-yali kergek ‘It is necessary to learn this Dharma jewel, to keep it in mind, to read it and have others read it, to write it and have others write it, and to teach it’ (Altun Yaroq P1.00.12.v15–17). This is likely to be the result of an analogical application of the formal structure typical of verbal auxiliaries to the construction with kergek. That is, the original structure <VN+AUX> is supplemented by a new option <CV+AUX>, which is adapted from the verbal auxiliary paradigm. Conversely, kergek can be said to be accommodated to the paradigm for verbal auxiliaries (paradigmaticisation).

From the Middle Turkic era onward, further options start becoming available. Plain verbal nouns are increasingly involved in modal constructions with verbal auxiliaries. In Khorezm Turkic (Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyāʾ, 14th century), tile- (originally ‘to seek’) combines with the verbal noun -mAK to form a volitive marker: Yüzüŋ ni bir kör-mek out, e.g. Ançulayu og ariŋ süüzük yeg hile biligig bul-maq-i bol-ar ‘The discovery of the pure and clear supreme wisdom happens/is possible to that degree’ (Altun Yaroq P1.02.22.v26). The situation in Uyghur might reflect a transitional stage from full verb to modal auxiliary and consequently the initial stage of grammaticalisation.

---

9 For the term, see Johanson (2000).
10 The existence of -(y)V bol-is alleged by von Gabain (1974, p. 127) and Erdal (2004, p. 259), and that of -(y)V saqïn- by von Gabain (1974, p. 129); however, neither of the two can be traced in the VATEC corpus, so they may be considered marginal.
11 If not stated differently, Old Turkic examples are cited from the VATEC database (see Sources).
12 This noun does not only occur as an auxiliary in Old Turkic, but also as a head noun and in the adnominal position (in the latter case translatable as ‘necessary’).
13 The choice of the verbal noun seems to depend on diachronic and/or dialectal parameters. The use of -sVK and -mAK in constructions with kergek seems to be older than the use of -GU and -mlï with the same auxiliary (the latter options appearing only in Buddhist times). -sVK in combination with kergek is confined to Manichean Uyghur.

---
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tile-yürmen ‘I want to see your face just once’ (108v19; Boeschoten – Vandamme – Tezcan 1995, p. 220). The underlying structure can be represented as < VN+AUX>, which formally corresponds to the standard pattern of Old Turkic nominal auxiliaries. In -mA tile-, however, the verbal noun phrase occupies the object slot of the auxiliary verb. Although tile- first appears in the auxiliary function in Middle Turkic, this construction continues the original Old Turkic argument structure of the full verb tile- ‘to seek’ and represents a very natural development. Also, bol- ‘to become’ becomes increasingly involved in possibility constructions of the < VN+AUX> type in Middle Turkic, e.g. Anatolian Oghuz (Dede Qorqud, 16th century) Oγul, şabāh varub öylen gel-mek ol-maz, öylen varub axšam gel-mek ol-maz ‘Son, one cannot simply leave in the morning and return at noon, or leave at noon and return in the evening’ (88a4–5; Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 124). In this construction, the verbal noun phrase fills the subject slot of the auxiliary verb.

From the 14th century onward, there are also attestations of auxiliaries with a verbal noun in the dative. Middle Kipchak (Codex Cumanicus, 14th century) combines both the verbal auxiliary tile- with the verbal noun -mA in the dative, e.g. Tilersen bil-ma-ga, söversen tengirni ge söümessen ‘You want to know whether you love God or whether you do not love him’ (123, Kuun 1880, pp. 162–163), and the nominal auxiliary kerek,14 e.g. Kerec busga sagizla-ma-ga ‘We must think about it’ (126, Kuun 1880, p. 170). This structure, which can be represented as <VN-DAT+AUX>, has no immediate formal model in Old Turkic. However, non-factual verbal nouns in the dative can form purposive adverbial clauses in the Turkic languages. In Old Uyghur, this task is performed by the verbal noun -GU in the dative (Erdal 2004, pp. 490–491), e.g. Tïnlïɣlarïɣ qutɣar-γu-qa bek beðük [qut] qolunmïš ‘They have asked for themselves for the firm, great bliss to deliver the creatures’ (Altun Yaroq B01.10.v08). Similar uses continue to exist in various Turkic languages, e.g. in Turkish with the verbal noun -mA: Ben sadece seni gör-me-ye geldim ‘I have only come to see you’ (song title). The structure <VN-DAT+AUX> can therefore be said to be an analogical formation to auxiliary constructions with the purposive converb -GAlI, which are amply documented in Old Uyghur. This analogy is built on the purposive semantics of both -GAlI and <VN-DAT>.15 It conforms to a universal tendency of purposive items to grammaticalise into a special type of “infinitive” (Haskelmath 1989).16 -mA was already sometimes contracted to -mA in the Codex Cumanicus, e.g. Iazukle kizi

---

14 The inclination of *kergek to take arguments in the dative case, which can be observed in some Turkic languages (e.g. Turkish Savaş-a hiç gerek yok ‘There is absolutely no necessity for war’) does not seem to be original. In Old Uyghur, kergek takes nominal arguments in the direct case: Üküš sav kergek ermez ‘There is no necessity for much talk’ (Maitrisimit 2.02.r23). However, some nominals do take arguments in the dative in Old Uyghur, e.g. amraq ‘amiable’ (Uzuntongılı qa amraq bolur ‘He is friendly to women’, TT VII 37, 6–7, cited from Clauson 1972, p. 163). Models like this might have contributed to *kergek assuming an argument structure with a dative slot.

15 Verbal nouns in the dative may also serve other functions in Turkic besides that of a purposive converb, especially to fill argument slots of verbs or nominal elements that govern the dative.

16 Note that in Turcology non-pursuasive items are occasionally labelled “infinitive” as well, e.g. the verbal noun in -mA.
kim tile-r kensi iazuchin ayt-ma 'A sinful person who wishes to confess his sins’ (125, Kuun 1880, p. 167). This synchronically opaque item is homonymous with a widespread deverbal noun that is attested since Old Turkic (von Gabain 1974, pp. 72, 78) and developed into a fully productive verbal noun in certain languages. The two items differ in origin and function in that the former is an adverbial element (i.e. a purposive converb, or “infinitive” in Haspelmath’s terms), while the latter is a nominal element that can take possessive and case markers and does not carry any purposive semantic load. -mA with an auxiliary, though originating in <VN-DAT+ AUX>, typifies a renewal of the old type <CV+ AUX>.

Still another auxiliary formation type that emerges in Middle Turkic times is basically a subjunctive structure. The modal meaning is encoded in a matrix clause, and the main verb appears in a mood form (voluntative, optative, conditional) in a subordinate clause. The mood form acts as a subjunctive. In the earliest instances, the two clauses are connected by a complementiser ki(m).

Typical specimens of this type feature auxiliary segments like tile-, iste- or another wish verb, or nominal elements like kerek ‘necessity’, mumkin ‘possible’, imkān ‘possibility’ etc. An example with tile- from Khorezm Turkic is Rasûl ‘A.S. tile-di kim bu kursînî kör-se, āyatu’l-kursînîy gavâbîn bil-se ‘The Prophet, peace be upon him, wished to see the throne and thus to know the merit of the Verse of the Throne’ (Qiṣṣa al-Anbiyâ’ 218v8–9; Boeschoten – Vandamme – Tezcan 1995, p. 497). Here, the subjunctive function is performed by the conditional in -sA. The Codex Cumanicus contains Kerec kim bis congul kösibile bac-key-bis ‘We must look with the eye of the heart’ (126, Kuun 1880, p. 169, cf. Grønbech 1942, p. 139), with the optative in -GAy as a subjunctive. From the Baburnama (Chaghatay, 16th century), we can cite Nève jiḥatdin mumkin ènes èdi kim alarya bèril-gey ‘In several respects, it was impossible that it be given to them’ (51b10–11). The structure underlying all these examples can be represented as <AUX+ COMP+ SBJV>. In this type, the order of the constituents is fixed.

This type of auxiliary construction is clearly influenced by contact with Persian, which uses similar structures. However, the main components involved in this type already existed in Old Turkic, where subordinate clauses were often introduced by question words such as kim ‘who’, qayu ‘which’, qačan ‘when’ and ne ‘what’ (von Gabain 1974, pp. 189–192), which had been grammaticalised to complementisers. The subjunctive slot in the Turkic constructions that have been modelled on Persian prototypes is filled by finite mood forms from the common Turkic morphological inventory.

It was already possible to omit the complementiser in quite early times and, depending on the individual variety, the word order became more flexible. In what follows we see an example of complementiser omission that features the auxiliary verb iste- and a conditional with the subjunctive function: Iste-rem alin qil-sa-m sejde ve öp-se-m labîn ‘I want to prostrate before you and kiss your lips’ (Chaghatay, Navâtî, cited after Brockelmann 1954, p. 413) from the second half of the 15th century. A Middle Azerbaijani transcription text from Iran (17th century, on the text see Johanson 1985) combines gerek with a third person voluntative: Cizun nourunz
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There is still another type in modern Turkic varieties which makes use of a verbal noun in the accusative case \(<\text{VN-ACC+ AUX}>\). This type is especially widespread with wish verbs, but is occasionally also found in expressions of possibility with \(\text{bil-}\).

Many Turkic languages communicate different-subject wishes (\(S_i \text{ wants } S_j \text{ to } X\)) with this structure. The subject of the wish is expressed by a personal marker on the wish verb, while the subject of the main verb is indicated by a possessive marker on the verbal noun (\(<\text{VN-POSS-ACC+ AUX}>\), e.g. Turkish \(\text{Başımız belaya gir-me-sin-i iste-niyorsun} \) ‘You don’t want me to get into trouble (lit. You don’t want my head to get into trouble)’ (Ümit 2003, p. 42). But even same-subject wishes (\(S_i \text{ wants } S_i \text{ to } X\)) can be conveyed with verbal nouns in the accusative, e.g. Uzbek \(\text{Kumush-bibi } shu \text{ chogg } \text{acha } garamag’an \) \(\text{va } qara-sh-ni } \text{ham } \text{tila-magan }\) \(\text{edi} \) ‘Kumushbibi had not looked at him until now and had not wanted to do so’ (Qodiriy 1926 [1994], p. 60), Modern Uyghur \(\text{Erler } \text{bilen } \text{oiltur-uş-ni } \text{xala-ydiyan }\) \(\text{ayallar} \) ‘Women that want to sit together with men’ (Hamut 2007, p. 45).17 Tuvan \(\text{Ekiri.ir-in } \text{küze-p }\) \(\text{tur }\) \(\text{sen }\) \(\text{be?} \) ‘Do you want to recover?’ (John 5.6)18 and Turkish \(\text{Neler } \text{olacağım } \text{bilmeden } \text{ve } \text{bil-me-yi } \text{iste-meden }\) \(\text{var }\) \(\text{gücümle } \text{ilerledim} \) ‘I moved on with all the power I had, not knowing what would happen and not wanting to know’ (Şafak 2009, p. 118). Yakut uses possessive markers both in same-subject and different-subject wishes, resulting in a unified pattern for same-subject and different-subject wishes (\(S_i \text{ wants } S_i/j \text{ to } X\)): \(\text{Aččik } \text{iit-al.} \text{iix-piñ } \text{hayar-bap-piñ} \) ‘I do not want to send them away hungry’ (Matthew 15.32).

\(\text{Bil-} \) in \(<\text{VN-ACC+ AUX}>\) constructions can be found, for example, in Turkish (\(\text{Tek } \text{gereken } \text{bekle-me-yi } \text{bil-mek}\) ‘The only necessary thing is to be able to wait’, Şafak 2009, p. 226) and Uzbek (\(\text{Bizning } \text{xalqning } \text{holiga } \text{yig’la-sh-ni } \text{ham } \text{bil-ma-yan}, \text{kul-ish-ni } \text{ham}\) ‘About the state of our people you can neither cry nor laugh’, Qodiriy 1926 [1994], p. 37).

Besides this new type with a verbal noun in the accusative, all old types survive in individual modern Turkic varieties as well, partly with new auxiliaries (e.g. \(\text{al-} \) ‘to take’ in \(<\text{CV+ AUX}>\) constructions that denote possibility or \(\text{boda-}\) ‘to think’ (borrowed from Mongolic) in \(<\text{VN+ AUX}>\) constructions that denote a wish), partly with updated morphology (e.g. the converb \(-\text{Ip}\) in \(<\text{CV+ AUX}>\) constructions). Some structures have spread throughout the domain of modality and even beyond; for instance, in Vidin Turkish, \(<\text{SBJV+ AUX}>\) is no longer confined to volitive constructions (\(\text{Ben } \text{yi-yeyim } \text{seni } \text{iste-yim}\) ‘I want to eat you’, Németh 1965, p. 251) but also appears in expressions of possibility (\(\text{Bu } \text{hayvannar } \text{oqu-sun } \text{bil-ir }\) \(\text{mi}? \) ‘Can these animals read?’).

17 The wish verb in this example is \(\text{xala-} \) (\(<\text{xwāhla-}\)), which is a denominal verb from the Persian noun \(\text{xwāh} \) ‘wish’.

18 The wish verb is \(\text{küze-} \) (\(<\text{Old Turkic kāsē-}\). The linking device in this Tuvan construction contains, besides a verbal noun in \(-\text{Ir}\) and the accusative, an invariable third person possessive suffix (fossilisation).
Németh 1965, p. 185) and even with the auxiliary bašla- ‘to begin’ (Qïs bašla-r aylaš-iń ‘The girl starts to cry’, Németh 1965, p. 144).

The emergence of several competing strategies of linking auxiliaries to main verbs that differ in versatility within individual modal systems has led to a great variation in the modal constructions of the Turkic language family.

3. Expression of the Personal Referent in Turkic Modal Constructions

There is a great deal of variation with respect to how the grammatical category person and a potential personal referent (see footnote 3 above) are expressed in Turkic modal constructions. Part of this variation has to do with the type of construction; constructions involving an auxiliary verb are more liable to mark the verb for person, as a fully consolidated system of verb inflection was already present in the Old Turkic era and is likely to have been established well before the time of documented Turkic sources. However, there are other options as well, even in constructions that include an auxiliary verb (see below).

In modal constructions with a nominal auxiliary, the issue is more complicated. Even Old Turkic had a system of personal markers of pronominal origin for marking nominal predicates, e.g. qapaqči biz <doorkeeper we> ‘we are doorkeepers’ (Erdal 2004, p. 413). Here, the pronominal origin of the personal markers is still transparent. This is the initial stage in the development of a lexical marker into a grammatical one, the essential feature of which is movement from the topic position behind the predicate,19 where it can be cliticised, a process which can be observed in many later Turkic varieties (e.g. Turkish kapı-yı ‘we are doorkeepers’, Uzbek sog’-miz ‘we are healthy’). The fact that post-predicative biz in Old Turkic is more than a mere pronoun that has shifted its position in the sentence is clear from the Old Uyghur example Biz qamañığ ayıp oglisi biz ‘We are evil-thinkers of everything’ (Maitritismit 2.08.r12–13), where biz occurs twice, once as a pronoun in the topic position and once as a personal marker in the final position. Both the shape of the personal markers, which is identical with that of the pronouns, and their usage (optionality of the third person marking) indicate that the system of personal markers for nominal predicates was still under construction in the Old Turkic era, allowing for variation both among the contemporary dialects and within individual language varieties. It is very likely that on some Proto-Turkic stage not very remote from the documented time, the personal referent in sentences with nominal predicates was expressed exclusively by a pronoun in the topic position, as is the case in structurally similar languages like Classical Mongolian and Manchu as well as in Korean and Japanese.

19 Cf. Himmelmann’s important generalisation that “it is never just the grammaticising element that undergoes grammaticisation. Instead, it is the grammaticising element in its syntagmatic context which is grammaticised. That is, the units to which grammaticisation properly applies are constructions, not isolated lexical items” (2004, p. 31).
Old Uyghur modal constructions with a nominal auxiliary are not uniform in terms of the personal marking, a fact which is obviously interrelated in part with the lack of consolidation evident in sentences with a nominal predicate. Besides leaving the personal referent unexpressed (3), this being a strategy in its own right, there are two strategies, mentioned by Erdal in his Old Turkic grammar (2004, p. 525), of marking the personal referent in modal constructions that feature the noun kergek ‘necessity, necessary’, of which one has a pronoun in the topic position (4) and the other a possessive marker on the verbal noun (5). Example (5) contains an additional overt pronoun, rendering precisely the same deep structure as in the Uzbek example, ex. (1a), mentioned above (Section 1).

(3) Anïn bil-miš kergek.
‘Therefore, it is necessary to know the following.’
(Xuanzang Biography VII: 0224)

(4) Sen yme amtï köŋülüŋ in ïð-miš kergek.
‘You should now let your heart roam.’
(Erdal 2004, p. 525)

(5) Anïn men anta ažun tut-miš-ïm kergek.
‘Therefore, I should be reborn there.’
(Erdal 2004, p. 525)

If the necessary entity is not expressed by a verbal noun, as in these cases, but by a plain noun, Old Uyghur may employ a structure similar to the one in (4), which is exemplified in (6), where the personal referent (nom bošyt boşyundačü tüzünler) is in the unmarked case, but this language may also mention the personal referent of the necessity in the dative case (‘for X it is a necessity’), as shown in ex. (7).

(6) Nom bošyt boşyundačü tüzünler […] kërtgününlüŋ elig kergek.
‘Those who are going to learn the Dharma teaching need a faithful hand.’
(cf. Erdal 2004, p. 415)

(7) Maŋa […] bor kergek bolup…
‘I needed wine and…’
(Clauson 1972, p. 742; Erdal 2004, p. 415)

Hence, we can distinguish two major necessitative patterns as early as in the Old Turkic stage, namely one with a possessive marker and one without:

NEC-1 <X+kergek>
NEC-2 <X-POSS+kergek>

These can be subclassified according to what happens if a personal referent is explicitly mentioned by a pronoun or noun:
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All these strategies are attested in later stages of Turkic as well. To these we can add the variant we saw in the Turkish example, ex. (2a), which is identical with pattern NEC-2a, except that it has the personal referent in the genitive such that this pattern complies with regular genitive-possessive constructions. Given the Old Turkic data, it is highly probable that the Turkish pattern is a subsequent analogical accommodation of NEC-2a to the regular genitive-possessive pattern, although it is not entirely impossible that it is an older pattern that is simply not attested in Old Uyghur:

**NEC-2b <N-GEN+X-POSS+kergek>**

Pattern NEC-1 is frequently employed for impersonal necessity, such as in the Kazakh example (9), but NEC-1a does not seem to have survived in modern Turkic languages. This option, however, was still available in the Baburnama, a 16th-century Chaghatay text. In ex. (8), the personal referent is mentioned in the unmarked case (bir kişi ‘one person’), and there is no possessive marker on the verbal noun:

(8) *Bir kişi uyni hayda-maq kėrek, bir kişi dalv suvini tök-mek kėrek.*
‘One person must drive the cattle, another person must pour the water from the bucket.’ (274a8)

(9) *Kitapxana deyin tört ayaldama žür-üw kerek.*
‘To the library, one has to go four stops.’
(Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 67)

The Kazakh example, ex. (9), is taken from a context that makes it clear that it is the addressee who has to go four stops; this, however, is not explicitly expressed in the sentence. Depending on the context, any participant could be meant, or it could be a general statement about any person intending to go to the library. Except NEC-1a, all other patterns exist in Kazakh as well; (10) is an example of NEC-1b, (11) exemplifies NEC-2 without an overt mention of the personal referent, and (12) and (13) represent the patterns NEC-2a and NEC-2b, respectively.

(10) *Keš boldï. Mayan ket-üw kerek.*
‘It has become late. I have to go.’
(Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 131)

(11) *Sabagga bar-uw-ūm kerek.*
‘I must return to the class.’
(Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 60)
(12) *Al men rota komandiyri Olegke bar-uv-îm kerek.*  
‘And I must go to Oleg, the commander of the company.’  
(WEB-1)

(13) *Men-îŋ bekinip bar-uv-îm kerek.*  
‘I have to go there resolutely.’  
(Äwezov 1955, p. 24)

Besides the variants already mentioned, yet another option can be found in Kazakh, which is considered incorrect in light of the standard grammar, but turns up quite frequently:

(14) *Sol üšin men qanday dokumentter žïyna-w kerek-pin?*  
‘What documents do I have to collect for this?’  
(WEB-2)

This pattern, which will be labelled NEC-3 here and can be represented as &<\(\text{N-}\emptyset\)+\(\text{VN-}\emptyset+\text{kerek-PERS}\), seems to differ quite radically from the other ones in that the personal referent is marked (besides being explicitly expressed by the personal pronoun *men*) at the auxiliary noun *kerek*. While this type looks eccentric and is certainly marginal in the Turkic languages, it is by no means confined to Kazakh, but turns up here and there in the Turkic world. It is particularly frequent in the Kipchak Turkic languages of the Caucasus area, such as Kumyk, Noghay and Karachay-Balkar, where it has become the standard pattern. The following example is from Kumyk:20

(15) *Alïna γan tüšümnü tiyišli bagasïna satmaq učun imkanlıqlar boldur-ma-γa gerek-biz.*  
‘We have to create opportunities to sell the harvest being gathered at the necessary price.’  
(WEB-3)

This pattern, although not attested in Old Turkic, is not a recent development. It can be found in Middle Turkic, such as in Anatolian Oghuz (Dede Qorqut, manuscript from the 16th century; ex. 16) and in Chaghatay (Baburnama, 16th century, ex. 17), i.e. both in the western and eastern parts of the Turkic area:

(16) *Baba, bu sözi sen manja dé-me-mek gerek idin.*  
‘Father, this you should not have told me.’  
(89b4, Tezcan – Boeschoten 2001, p. 125)

---

20 Note the verbal noun in the dative (cf. Section 2), which, however, is not relevant to the present discussion.
Kiši umēdige goymay öz-üm og bar-maq kêrek êdim.
‘I should have gone myself, instead of placing my hope in other people (lit. instead of putting it into the hope of somebody).’

The strategy of marking the personal referent at *kergek looks eccentric and is usually considered a deviation from the Common Turkic norm. On the other hand, albeit not attested in Old Turkic, it is quite an old phenomenon and displays a considerable geographic dissemination, although it has mainly become standardised in the Caucasus. How did this pattern come into existence?

If we review the strategies of marking the personal referent in kergek constructions, it turns out that pattern NEC-3 actually derives from NEC-1. A transformation of the Old Turkic pattern biz ... kergek into (biz) ... kergek biz follows the same principle as the development *biz qapačči > (biz) qapačči biz ‘we are doorkeepers’ (see above) as soon as the substructure <VN+kergek> is reanalysed as a fused grammaticalised complex. It is not inconceivable that contact influence from other languages has contributed to the emergence of pattern NEC-3, for example, in terms of assigning preference to one of several options. I contend that the structure itself, on the other hand, is genuinely Turkic and is formed by analogy with the normal Turkic principles of personal marking on nominal predicates, principles which, as has been mentioned, probably developed not long before the Old Turkic era and were still in a process of formation then.

The mere fact that NEC-3 is of minor importance in the modern Turkic languages does not mean that this pattern is abnormal. With centuries of perseverance in the Turkic languages, it can be judged just as genuinely Turkic as all the other patterns.

Developments of personal marking strategies similar to those mentioned for the nominal auxiliary *kergek are occasionally reflected in the diachronic and synchronic data for verbal auxiliaries as well, albeit with a less complete set of subtypes. It has been briefly mentioned (Section 2) that Old Uyghur uses a construction that involves the purposive converb -GAL and the auxiliary bol- ‘to become’, which is an instance of the pattern <CV+AUX>, e.g. Ol yolca barip aritii sansardin oz-yali bol-maz ‘Walking on that path it is completely impossible to escape from Sansāra’ (Maitrisimit 0.08.r29–30). -GAL bol- is a marker of participant-external possibility (cf. van der Auwera – Plungian 1998), and it is, furthermore, intrinsically impersonal; that is to say it is not designed to indicate a personal referent. Similar markers survive in numerous Turkic varieties. In Chaghatay, -GAL is replaced by another converb -Iip, e.g. Su uluq bolgandin őt-üp bol-mas ‘Because the water is deep, one cannot cross’ (Baburnama 130b13). In Kazakh (and several other Kipchak languages), the converb segment has been replaced by a verbal noun in the dative, which, as was elaborated in detail above, is essentially a renewed converb: Osî ayaldamada da tüs-iw-ge bol-adî ‘It is also possible to get off at that bus stop’ (Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 53). This example typifies the structure <VN-DAT+AUX>. The Kazakh verbal noun plus dative segment -UwgA, which can be seen in this example, is, in point of
fact, etymologically identical to the Old Uyghur segment -GUKA, one task of which was to perform as a purposive converb.

In contrast to Old Uyghur and the Baburnama variety of Chaghatay, Kazakh is capable of expressing a personal referent in this construction. This can be done according to two competing strategies. One option is to put the personal referent in the dative as in *Mayan univertitet žaqqa galay bar-uw-ya bol-adï?* ‘How can I get to the university?’ (Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 48), which typifies the pattern <N-DAT+X-VN-DAT+bol-> (cf. NEC-1b); the other option is to add a possessive marker to the verbal noun as in *Ol žerge 97-ši avtobuspen bar-uw-iñiz-ya bol-adï* ‘You can get there by bus number 97’ (Sulejmenova – Kadaševa – Akanova 1997, p. 48), which can be represented as <X-VN-POSS-DAT+bol-> (cf. NEC-2). Still another option is found in Altai Turkic, which uses a <CV+AUX> structure -(I)p bol- (like Chaghatay). As converbs can not usually take personal markers, Altai Turkic demonstrates the personal marking at the auxiliary (cf. NEC-3): *Men aldïmna Boyïm neni de ed-ip bol-boz-im* ‘I can do nothing on my own’ (John 5.30).

4. Fossilisation

The term fossilisation is not a very focused one, as it can be applied to various phenomena as long as a loss of flexibility is involved. With this broad conception of fossilisation, most of the constructions mentioned so far can be considered fossilised as they lack variability with respect to some structural properties within a given Turkic variety. For instance, the Uzbek and Turkish necessitative constructions in ex. (1) and (2) can be regarded as fossilised in that they only permit the verbal noun in -(I)š (Uzbek) and -mA(K) (Turkish), but not vice versa,21 nor do they permit other verbal nouns (such as the one in -mIš), although other Turkic languages demonstrate other options as a historical possibility. Verbal noun plus dative segments such as -mA(GA) (Koman, Middle Azerbaijani, Middle Ottoman) are invariable and can even undergo phonetic reduction to -mA (e.g. the Chuvash “infinitive”, cf. Pavlov 1965, pp. 260–264), another possible development resulting from fossilisation. The Turkish discontinuous construction *keşke X-SA*, which denotes an intensive wish, shows signs of fossilisation, as does the Tuvan same-subject volitive marker -(I)r-in küze- <VN-POSS.3.ACC+wish>, which features an invariable third person singular possessive marker regardless of the subject of the wish verb. The list of examples could be continued ad infinitum.

A striking case that shall be scrutinised more closely here involves the fossilised usage of the first person singular volutive in -(A)y in a Modern Uyghur imminent construction (‘to be about to X, to be going to X’). This phenomenon is usually regarded as a mistake in careful language usage22 but constitutes a frequent

---

21 In early 20th-century pre-standard Uzbek, -(MA)K was still possible in this construction.

22 The received standard displays number agreement of the volutive marker, i.e. there is an alteration between the volutive 1.SG -(A)y and the volutive 1.PL -(A)yli (but not person!).
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colloquial pattern that occasionally creeps into the written language as well. Here, the voluntative 1.SG, which usually expresses the readiness, intention or wish of the speaker to carry out the action, is combined with the verb stem de- ‘to say’, which can then take TAM as well as personal markers. The idea underlying this construction is ‘to say “I shall X”’, which in itself is very transparent and logical. One usage of this construction is actually to communicate an intention, but it also carries a derived imminential meaning, thus reflecting a universal grammaticalisation cline from desire to future (see Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca 1994, pp. 254–257). The shifted meaning can be seen in the following example, in which it occurs twice: *Biz aptobusqa čiqip qozyl-ay dé-gende, ottura kēče bol-ay dé-genidi* ‘When we were about to mount the coach again and set off, it was almost midnight’ (Šal 2006, p. 55). The literal meaning of this sentence is ‘When we said, “I shall get on the coach and set off”, it said, “I shall become midnight” (or midnight said, “I shall be”)’. The first occurrence in this example displays a violation of agreement rules. According to the general rules of Uyghur syntax, the first person plural pronoun *biz* requires the first person plural voluntative, which is not provided in this instance (but would be required in careful language use). The voluntative 1.SG obviously turns up irrespective of the subject of the phrase. The second occurrence reveals a context expansion of the voluntative 1.SG form involved, which can be combined with inanimate subjects (which in this case could either be impersonal (i.e. what would be expressed by the expletive pronoun *it* in English) or *ottura kēče ‘midnight’). The latter issue becomes even clearer in the example *Šerq qizirip kün čiq-ay dé-genidi* ‘The east became red, and the sun was about to rise’ (Sabir 2000, p. 4). Here, it is clearly *kün ‘sun’* that is the subject of the imminential construction (‘The sun said, “I shall rise”’).

The conventionalisation of this construction starts with the idiomaticisation of `<VOL-1+say>` as a fixed expression of an intention,23 which is followed by a semantic shift towards imminential meaning. The latter entails a context expansion to inanimate subjects. A further step is the (still?) optional fossilised use of the singular voluntative irrespective of number. Only time will tell how pervasive this phenomenon will eventually be.

5. Scope Increase

Root modality and epistemic modality differ not only in terms of semantics, but also with respect to the functional entity on which they operate. Root modality typically falls within the scope of aspect or mood, while epistemic modality (like evidentiality) is said to operate on the proposition (cf. Boye 2010, pp. 293–294), a fact which seems to mean that it takes aspect into its scope. The following considerations concern epis-

---

23 Similar constructions are also found in Middle Mongolian (<sU ke’e-, Secret History) and Manchu (<ki se-).
temic items in Turkish that have been grammaticalised from root modals and mood items, a process which implies an expansion of functional scope (scope increase).

The potential shift of items from the domain of root modality to that of epistemic modality constitutes a universal grammaticalisation cline (van der Auwera – Plungian 1998). In the Turkic languages, such a shift can evolve purely semantically, i.e. without any accompanying formal change, such as with the construction -sE kerek (i.e. the conditional combined with the noun *kergek ‘necessity’), which was originally a root modal that denoted necessity (see Erdal 2004, p. 527 for a Karakhanid example) but seems to have developed into a purely epistemic item in certain languages (such as Turkish).

Another strategy, which is particularly significant in Turkish, is to move the modal item into a higher-ranking scope position by means of the carrier auxiliary ol- (originally ‘to become, to be’), which is placed to the right of the aspect item, i.e. into the position that in many cases is iconically associated with higher scope. Compare ex. (18), in which the root modal item -Ebil-, which encodes the notion of possibility, is in the scope of the intraterminal aspect operator -(V)r (götürebilirim ‘I can take’), with ex. (19), in which the same item, attached to the carrier auxiliary ol-, takes the intraterminal aspect item -(I)yor into its scope to denote epistemic possibility (yaşıyor olabilirim ‘I might be experiencing’):

(18) İsterseniz sizi dergâha götür-ebil-irim.
‘If you want, I can take you to the Dervish lodge.’
(Ümit 2008, p. 61)

(19) Tamam geçici bir paranoya yaş-yor ol-abil-irdim.
‘Alright, maybe I was experiencing a temporary paranoia.’
(Ümit 2008, p. 121)

In ex. (20), there is a mood item -mElI, which encodes the deontic notion of obligation and which shares a common functional layer with aspect items. -mElI is moved into the scope position outside the aspect category (represented by the postterminal item -mIş) in ex. (21) and denotes epistemic necessity:

(20) Bilmek istiyorsan gel-meli-sin.
‘If you want to learn it, then you should come.’
(Ümit 2008, p. 161)

(21) Kendi sesime uyan-miş ol-mal-ybm.
‘I must have woken up from my own voice.’
(Ümit 2008, p. 57)

In some instances, scope increase can be accomplished without a carrier auxiliary as well, for instance if root possibility is combined with epistemic possibility. In the following example, the stem becer- ‘to succeed’ takes the root modal marker -EmE-, which is the negative counterpart to -Ebil-, resulting in becereme - ‘to be un-
able to succeed’, to which again -Ebil- (i.e. the same marker, just the positive variant, and this time with the function of an epistemic operator) is attached to designate epistemic possibility.

(22) Çocuklar da sütlü çay yapmayı becer-emeye-yebil-iyor-lar.

‘It is possible that the boys aren’t able to prepare a milk tea.’
(Ümit 2008, p. 86)

In this instance, the scope relation between root and epistemic modality is reflected iconically in the succession of the items, but the relation between aspect and epistemic modality is not reflected, unlike in ex. (19) and (21). This is due to the properties of the morphological material involved (i.e. the item -Ebil-), which (a) must be attached to a verb stem and (b) cannot constitute a finite predicate on its own. For this purpose, it requires an aspect or mood item, which must be affixed to the right.

This “double potential” construction is confined to precisely this combination, i.e. <NEG.POT-POT>; other combinations, i.e. <POT-POT>, <NEG.POT-NEG.POT> and <POT-NEG.POT>, are not (yet?) permitted.

Among the Turkic languages, Turkish is remarkably versatile in combining aspect with mood items and root modals to express epistemic notions.

6. Epilogue

In this paper, several processes have been pointed out that are united by the fact that they generate grammatical items. These processes, although commonly treated under the umbrella term grammaticalisation in the literature, pertain to partly different levels of analysis. Context expansion can happen on a semantic, syntactic or functional level. Fossilisation may relate to a particular morpheme, a class of morphemes, a complex morphosyntactic construction or just an abstract structure. Auxiliarisation designates processes with a specific outcome regardless of the underlying mechanism. Consequently, some of the processes can occur in concert: fossilisation may take place in an auxiliarisation process, a given construction may display both context expansion and fossilisation, etc.

Analogical mechanisms play an important role in the formation of grammatical constructions. Analogy can operate on both the formal and the semantic level. In the domain of auxiliarisation, we have seen the emergence of several morphological patterns which can prompt analogical formations in semantically related domains. There is a certain interaction and exchange between constructions with nominal and verbal auxiliaries, which were quite different in Old Turkic. This exchange – application of nominal auxiliary strategies onto verbal auxiliary constructions and vice versa – can be attributed to the conception of modal auxiliary constructions as a loosely associated paradigm, regardless of the provenance of the participating constructions.

Semantic analogy manifests itself, among other things, in the involvement of verbal nouns in the dative in constructions that involved a purposive converb in
earlier historical stages. Verbal nouns in the dative share a semantic component and overlapping syntactic properties with the converb -GA-li to the effect that they can enter into auxiliary constructions in which they were not originally present.

Old Turkic displays several options to express personal reference in modal constructions with a nominal auxiliary, a tendency which can be partly attributed to the fact that the system of personal marking in sentences with nominal predicates was just in the process of formation at that time. In the course of language history, different Turkic varieties have chosen different strategies to grammaticalise personal reference. Some Turkic languages permit more than one variant even today.

The multitude of processes and mechanisms that interact in the grammaticalisation of modal constructions has led to a considerable degree of variation in Turkic expressions of modality, which includes both widely disseminated patterns and variants as well as some highly unexpected forms. The latter appear less eccentric if seen in a larger syn- and diachronic perspective: Old Uyghur -GA-li kergek (necessity) has to be viewed in context with -GA-li u- (possibility), -GA-li bol- (possibility) and -GA-li küse- (wish); pre-standard Uzbek -(I)-šGa tila- (wish) has to be understood in context with Koman -mA-GA tile- and Middle Oghuz -mA-GA iste-, which in turn are structurally analogous to Old Uyghur -GA-li küse-; Middle Oghuz -mA-GA bil- (possibility) is structurally linked to -mA-GA iste-; Modern Uyghur -Gili bol- (possibility) is practically identical to Old Uyghur -GA-li bol-; Modern Kipchak -UwGA bol- and -mA-GA bol- (possibility) are analogous to Old Uyghur -GA-li bol-; Modern Uyghur -(I)-šKA bol- displays the same deep structure as Kipchak -UwGA bol- with another verbal noun; Koman -mA-GA kerek and Middle Azerbijani -sUn gerek (necessity) are analogous to Old Uyghur -GA-li kergek, etc. Chaotic as the overall picture may appear, every individual form is historically or analogically motivated and explainable.

Abbreviations

Ø Unmarked, zero
1 1st person
ACC Accusative
AUX Auxiliary
COMP Complementiser
CV Converb
DAT Dative
GEN Genitive
N Noun
NEC Necessitative
NEG Negation
PERS Person
PL Plural
POSS Possessive
POT Potential
S Subject
SBJV Subjunctive
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SG Singular
TAM Tense-aspect-mood
VN Verbal noun
X Variable linguistic item
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