

On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Iş*

## On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Iş*

*Marcel Erdal*

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-University

Türkoloji-dilbilim sentezinin  
kurucularından büyük hocamız  
Doğan Aksan için  
candan sevgi ve saygılarla

Turkish verbal morphemes are notoriously polyfunctional: To give just two examples, *-(y)AcAg*<sup>1</sup> serves for producing a finite form, a participle and an event nominal,<sup>2</sup> *-mIş* both for producing the inferential finite form and the perfect participle. Linguists have spent quite some energy in trying to define such forms in such a way as to cover all their various functions. This effort is understandable from two points of view, one practical and the other theoretical. Firstly it is unpractical for forms to have different functions if one is writing a comprehensive grammar, since one has to deal with them in different places, and is then forced to delimit the functions clearly (which is not always easy). The second, theoretical objection to having distinct but homophonous forms stems from linguists' (justified) feeling that they may be imposing their own (foreign or foreign-inspired) distinctions where the language perhaps does not make them at all: There is, after all, so much semantically in common between perfect and inferential meaning, for instance.

*-(y)Iş* is a suffix which, I will try to show, does two distinct things, although these two things seem to overlap in practice: It firstly serves in word formation and secondly in grammar. The creative module of language competence definitely has to be kept apart from the daily business of utterance production. Words transparent to the speaker-hearer in the sense that they are perceived to be derived either belong to the received lexicon (they may in fact have been created hundreds of years earlier) or they may have been created by somebody close to the time of utterance, or even, in very rare cases, on the occasion of the utterance itself. To come to our topic, *anlayış* 'understanding', *gösteriş* 'show off', *açılış* 'opening ceremony', *çekiliş* 'lottery', *yanlış* 'error', *giriş* 'entrance' or *çıkış*

'exit' certainly come along as pre-created lexical items, words which one has to learn at some stage in life if one is to know what they stand for. So do some lexemes ending in /ş/ which show reciprocal meaning, e.g., *alışveriş* 'commerce', *dövüş* 'exchange of blows', *değiş tokuş* 'exchange trading', *sarmaş dolaş* 'close embrace' or *savaş* 'fight'. These remind us of the cooperative-reciprocal verbal formative *-(I)ş-*, although some related verbs like *alışmak*, *değişmek* or *dolaşmak* would not be considered to have cooperative-reciprocal meaning at least in their prevalent use.<sup>3</sup> All this clearly belongs into the lexicon, to which *creative* individuals can (and of course do) contribute at any time.

Such *lexical* creativity will not be the topic of the present paper. What I would like to deal with here is the *productive* use of *-(y)Iş*, whose products are not 'known' beforehand and are not created for becoming entries either in the social or the private lexicon: Being freely produceable whenever the grammatical need (to be determined in this paper) arises, such forms can be forgotten immediately after being used (unlike the lexemes mentioned above).

Let us sum up all the things which *-(y)Iş* can do<sup>4</sup> and which deverbal noun formatives like *-(I)m* (e.g. *doğ-um*, *tut-um*, *özle-m*), *-(I)n* (e.g. *ak-ın*, *yığ-ın*), *-(I)t* (e.g. *geç-it*, *ayırt*) or *-(I)k* (e.g. *soğ-u-k*, *aksa-k*, *aç-ık*) can do only to a very limited extent, if at all:

a) Unlike those latter, *-(y)Iş* has /y/ after vowel stems.

It is formed (b) from all sorts of derived stems (passives, causatives etc.) and, in fact, from any verb stem,

c) from the negative base (*-mA-*),

d) from the impossibilitative stem (e.g. *cesaret edemeyişimiz*),

e) from compound verbs with *et-* (as shown by this last example).

f) *-(y)Iş* is added to idioms composed of noun + verb, as in *öğelerin tümcedeyer alışları*, to be bracketed as *(yer al-)ış+ları*.

g) Possessive suffixes added to the *-(y)Iş* form refer to the agent.

h) It has verbal government (e.g. *bu işe geçişimiz*) and

i) can be qualified by words and expressions only used in adverbial function, e.g. *sımsıkı giyiniş*, *birer birer yiyiş*, *birden kayboluş*, *tümüyle kesiş*.

j) *-(y)Iş* forms govern gerunds, as in *adamin kesin olarak gelişi*.<sup>5</sup>

Some (but by no means all) grammars have therefore rightfully discussed this form together with nominals like *-mA*, *-mAk* and (the now probably antiquated) *-mAklık*, which refer to events. Note, by the way, that *-mA* is also found both in the productive grammar and in the word formation, in the latter domain denoting agents of intransitive verbs (e.g. *dolma*, *doğma büyüme*, *babadan kalma*) and objects of transitive ones (e.g. *dondurma*, *ezme*, *yazma*). *-mA+* nominals which are part of the grammar system and not of the lexicon, however, refer not to

### On the Verbal Noun in $-(y)Iş$

agents or objects but to events, actions or processes.  $-mA$ , therefore, shows a duality similar to that of  $-(y)Iş$ . For many intents and purposes,  $-mAk$  and non-lexical  $-mA+$  are alternants: They are synonymous and freely interchanged in the locative and dative. As qualifiers in izafet groups,  $-mA+$  seems to appear in lexicalised phrases,  $-mAk$  in free junctures; only  $-mAk$  serves as unmarked direct object, only  $-mA+$  with the accusative and genitive suffixes. With the ablative we have  $-mAk+tAn$ , presumably because  $-mAdAn$  is too similar to the negative converb. Postpositions govern the  $-mAk$  form. Before possessive suffixes, the opposition between the two is also neutralised away, being represented by the shorter alternant:  $-mAk$  is not found with possessive suffixes.

The group of event nominals also includes the uses of  $-dlg+$  and  $-(y)AcAg+$  when referring to events, actions or processes and not to one of the participants in such events. In this sense,

(1) Bu kitabı Ali'nin yazdığını kimse bilmiyordu

and

(2) Talât Paşa konusundaki kitabı Ali'nin yazacağını kimse düşünmüyordu.

are in one paradigm with

(3) Böyle bir kitabı Ali'nin yazmasını kimse istemiyordu.

(1) and (2) differ from

(4) Ali'nin yazdığı kitap

and

(5) Ali'nin yazacağı kitap

in that *kitap* is not, in (1) and (2), deleted from the subordinated stretch. This is part of the polyfunctionality of  $-(y)AcAg+$  (and  $-dlg+$ ) mentioned above: They refer either to the event (like  $-mA+$  and  $-(y)Iş+$ ) or to one of the participants of the event (to the direct object in (4) and (5)), which  $-mA+$  and  $-(y)Iş+$  never do. Since kernels (which help us distinguish between various meanings of their satellites) are optional for Turkish relative clauses, it follows that

(6) Ali'nin yazdığı

is ambiguous in that it can signify both

(6a) 'what A. wrote' and

(6b) 'the fact that A. wrote something, was active as a writer' or some similar meaning. *-mA+* and *-(y)Iş+* are not connected with any such ambiguities, as they can (as part of grammar production, not as part of the lexicon) only refer to actions, events or processes but not to any entities participating in these. Note that *yazdığı*, *yazacağı* and *yazabileceği* are adjectival in (4), (5) and

(7) Ali'nin Talât Paşa hakkında bir kitap yazabileceği düşüncesi

but appear in nominal function in (6) when used both as participle (6a) and as event nominal (6b); hence my dislike for using the term verbal adjective for participles ((4), (5) and (6a)) and verbal noun for what I call event nominal in (1), (2), (3), (6b) and (7).

*-mA+* / *mAk*, *-(y)Iş+*, *-(y)AcAg+* and *-dlg+* are verbal to the same degree: They all exhibit the verbal behaviour listed under points a – j above. On the other hand, they all differ from finite verbs as well as from converbs and other adverbial verb constructions in referring to the agent by means of possessive suffixes appended to them and governing the agent NP in the genitive.

It has been known since Lees, 1965 that *-dlg+* and *-mA+* differ from each other in that the former correlates with nominals describing events as factive, the latter as non-factive ones: *-mA+* nouns actually do not refer to events at all, but to mental projections. Such mental projections can be formed for any point in (relative) time, past, present or future. *-(y)AcAg+* differs from the other two verbal nouns in being used when the speaker firmly places an event he is speaking of into the future. Bazin, 1968: 114-126 has the best formulations I have seen to date on the semantic and structural differences between these forms. What he has to say on the factivity distinction deserves quoting:

Alors que le nom d'action en *-me* exprime l'action en général, et notamment l'action *virtuelle*, le nom d'action en *-dik* exprime l'action *réelle*, présente ou passée, le fait positif, ou, par extension, ce qu'on considère comme un fait positif. ... La différence de valeur entre le nom d'action en *-(y)ecek* et celui en *-me* ... réside en ceci, que le nom en *-me* est employé pour exprimer une action virtuelle conçue comme objet de volonté, de crainte, de désir etc. (bref, d'une impulsion psychologique non objective) de la part d'un sujet qui est autre que celui de cette action virtuelle (...),

### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)İş*

tandis que le nom d'action en *-(y)ecek* exprime, soit une éventualité ou un futur conçus objectivement (...), soit une *intention prêtée au sujet logique de l'action future* (*geleceğini zannediyorum* peut aussi être compris: "je crois qu'il a l'intention de venir").

The only really useful addition to what can be found in the relevant chapters in Bazin, 1968 or, in more patchy fashion, elsewhere is Csató, 1990: 86, who summarily presents a set of observations on collocational differences between different event nominals and the semantic classes of predicates which govern them. Such collocational differences should be elaborated upon, a task which we will not undertake here. Consider, in this connection, the following<sup>6</sup>:

- (8) Özal'ın Amerika'ya gidişi, dönüşü, ameliyata karar verşi, ameliyattan hiç korkmayışı, "Dünyanın dua üzerinde durduğunu" açıklaması, ... tele-uydu aracılığıyla Bakanlar Kurulu'na katılışı ... törenlerle kutlanmalıdır.

None of these instances of *-(y)İşI* or *-mAsI* can be replaced by *-dİğI*; *-(y)İşI* and *-mAsI* can be interchanged here, but this alters the meaning.

What do we know about *-(y)İş+* that would make speakers use it instead of using *-mA+ / mAk*, *-(y)AcAg+* or *-dİg+* when they have the choice, then?

What has most often been noticed about this formation is that it refers to the manner of performing the action involved, the way the event takes place: *Ahmedin yaşayışı* is 'the way in which A. lives',<sup>7</sup> *o adamın çok tuhaf bir yürüyüşü var* 'That man has a very strange way of walking'. *Filânın düşünüşü yüksek, görüşü geniş* make one think of somebody's way of thinking, his way of seeing things; similarly *Orhanın giyinişi, öğretmenın anlatışı, Alinin anlatışı güzeldir, bir yaralı kuş bakışı* or *ok gibi bir fırlayış*. The proverbs *Her yiğidin bir yoğurt yiyişi vardır* and *Ay doğuşundan, insan yürüyüşünden belli olur* are well known. The following sentence is quoted in different grammars:

- (9) Onlarda taklit edilemeyen şey giydikleri değil giyinişleri idi ... peçelerini bir iştirişleri vardı ki onu herkesin peçesinden başka bir şey yapardı (Haşit Ziya Uşaklıgil).

The instances in (10-12) also refer to how the action is carried out:

- (10) *-iş* yapılı adların da biçim anlamından sıyrılıp sıyrılmaması kullanımına bağlıdır 'Whether the nouns formed with *-iş* depart or do not depart

(-mA+) from the meaning 'manner' depends on their use (-Iş+), i.e. 'on the way they are used'.

- (11) Şu çatal tutuşuna, kadehi tiksinir gibi dudaklarına yaklaştırışına bak!  
(12) Bayram Ağa buna büsbütün içerlemişti; giderken omuzlarını oynatışından için için küfrettiği anlaşılıyordu.

There are some idiomatic uses to which only -(y)Iş is put. One of these is the expression *Kaçış o kaçış, Giriş o giriş* etc., which implies that the action being described was dramatic and had further-reaching results. One other idiomatic expression has been noticed by Gencan, 1979: 213-4, who gives the following examples for it: *burada terbiyesiz ağzını bir açış açtı, aman Allahım, sığınacak yer aradık* (Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar); *Koşu başladı, Tezcan doru atıyla bir atlayış atladı, herkes heyecanla sarsıldı.*

The locative of -(y)Iş nouns, both without and with possessive suffixes, forms gerundial phrases signifying 'at, or a relatively short time after the event related in the main verb takes place'. Thus *dönüşte* or *dönüşümüzde* signifies 'during or upon (our) return'. This can be qualified by *her* 'every':

- (13) Eski ahbablar her gidişimde seni sorar dururlar.

-(y)Iş+poss.+DA can be replaced by -dIğ+poss.+DA both without and with *her*.

However, not all examples of freely produced -(y)Iş forms fall into the above categories. Either, therefore, some additional meanings and uses of -(y)Iş must have been missed, or there must be some overall classification covering all possible instances of non-lexical -(y)Iş. What else, then, can we say about verb instances appearing with this suffix?

F i r s t l y , event nominals in -(y)Iş+ are countable when the speaker counts the events they represent; those in -dIğ+ and -(y)AcAg+ are not. -mA+ forms appear to be countable when used without possessive suffixes referring to agents. Thus, e.g.,

- (14) Köye ikinci gidişimde Zehra beni çeşme başında mini mini bir bebekle karşıladı.

Consequently, -mA+ and -(y)Iş+ can receive the plural suffix (even though referring to events, e.g. *uzun bekleyişlerden sonra; pasaport sağlayıcı düzenlemeler, vakıflar kurmaları*), whereas -dIğ+ and -(y)AcAg+ can do so only in those cases where they refer to participators in an action but not where they refer to an event. In this sense, -(y)Iş and -mA+ / -mAk are nounier than -dIğ+ and -(y)AcAg+, if one disregards the participial use of the latter two.

### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Iş*

Secondly, Non-lexicalised *-(y)Iş* forms appear unable to qualify such mental or verbal content nouns as *haber(i)*, *düşünce(si)*, *fik(i)r(i)* or *rica(sı)* (as the other three can): \**Ali'nin seyahate çıkış(i) haberi / düşünce(si), / rica(sı)* seems rather odd, to say the least, and I have not come across even a single example of this sort. *-(y)Iş* forms can, however, qualify nouns like *şekil* 'form' or *durum* 'situation'.

Thirdly, I have not met any examples where *-(y)Iş* expresses tense, in contradiction to a statement by Csató, 1990: 83. The defective sentence

(15) Söyleyecek oluşuna sinirlendim

made up there<sup>8</sup> has no future reference whatever context one tries to put it in:

(15a) Saçma bir şeyler söyleyecek oluşuna sinirlendim

would signify 'I got mad at his/her being about to say some nonsense'. The sequence *-(y)AcAk ol-* refers to interrupted attempts and the like. *-(y)Iş* is, however, compatible with past or future reference (not to speak of the present): Cf. (21) or (23) for the former. For the latter, consider nominal reference to the content of the sentence *Fatma kesin olarak gelecek*. This is, I think, possible as

(16a) Fatma'nın kesin olarak geleceği

or, if this is a fact relevant to the present situation,

(16b) Fatma'nın kesin olarak gelişi.

(16c) Fatma'nın kesin olarak geldiği,

however, is not so good as a transformation of *Fatma kesin olarak gelecek*, *-dlg+* is clearly more 'non-future' than *-(y)Iş+* which, as it stands, is tenseless.

Fourthly, unlike *-mA+*, *-(y)Iş+* appears to be factive, i.e. the predication which non-nominalized *-(y)Iş+* forms govern is implied to be factual while *-mA+* forms carry no such implication:

(17) Teyzemin halıyı beğenmeyişi

implies that my aunt didn't indeed like that rug, as *kayboluş* in (18) implies that Bahir Vecdi has, in fact, disappeared:

(18) Şaduman, Bahir Vecdinin birden kayboluşuna bir mâna verememişti.

(19) Aysel'in merdivenlerden çıkışını gördüm

need not be translated as 'I saw the way Aysel came up the stairs' or '... how she came up the stairs' but can also be rendered with 'I saw her come up the stairs'; in any case, however, the speaker must have viewed her *while* doing so, the coming up being, moreover, factive: The sentence implies that she did, indeed, come up the stairs.

(20) Aysel'in merdivenlerden çıktığını gördüm

is just as factive as (19); here, however, the mere fact of coming up the stairs is registered; the speaker does not take notice of the process of her doing so. With *seyretmek* 'to view, to observe' in (21), on the other hand, *-dİg+* cannot replace *(y)İş+*, as *seyret-* is never limited to a mere registering of fact:

(21) Şerife hanımın beni kucaklayışını seyrediyordular.

(22) "Bu işi otuz senedir yapıyorum. Ondan önce ... bayan terzisiydim."  
"Yani nasıl oldu dikışı bırakıp buna geçişin?" (Schröder, 1995: 213, from an oral corpus)

asks for an account of the process (*geçiş*);

(22a) Nasıl oldu da dikışı bırakıp buna geçtin?

on the other hand, would ask the speaker for an explanation of the event, for its cause. *çatal tutuşuna* 'at his way of holding a fork' in (11) is particularly interesting because *çatal* appears without the accusative: Although the *-(y)İş* forms clearly refer to actual observable fact, it is assumed that the agent of *tutuş* would hold any fork the way he is holding the one observed in the context. The 'fork' is, in fact, generic.

As a f i f t h aspect of the *-(y)İş+* form we noted, discussing (19) and (20), that its use implied recourse to the preposition 'while', i.e. an event presented as an ongoing process. The term 'process' was further applied to (22). The unacceptability of

(22b) \*Nasıl oldu dikışı bırakıp buna geçtiğin?

would then follow from the use of *nasıl* 'how', which makes one look at the process, and especially from recourse to *ol-*: This verb is, in its past forms,



### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Iş*

opposed to *-(y)dl / idi* in signifying 'to become', something inherently imperfective. There appears to be a distinction perfective: imperfective in the opposition *-dlg+* : *-(y)Iş+*. This label covers also those instances which have been translated as 'ways of doing things', e.g. in (9-12). Consider

- (23) Tezel'in ... alaylı vurdumduymaz gülüşüne katılamıyacak ... denli yorgunum.

The laughing is indeed described in the manner it takes place. Note, however, that the speaker does not express his unablensness to join the manner in which the laughing is carried out but to join the laughing itself, albeit described as 'mocking' and 'insensitive'. Describing the manner of laughing is compatible with an imperfective verb form, but what is presented here is the laughing and not its characteristics; further on in the text, the passage

- (23') Tezel'in bu gülüşünü severim. Kısık. Dolgun.

similarly refers to that same characteristic laugh.

- (24) ANAP, yasanın 22. maddesine yaptığı bir değişiklikle döviz, altın ve gümrük kaçakçılarına pasaport verilmesini sağlamıştı. ... "altın kaçakçılığı sanıkları"nın yurtdışına çıkışları bu yasa değişikliği ile sağlanmıştı

usefully pins *-mA+* and *-(y)Iş+* against each other:<sup>9</sup> It has a *-mA+* form as object of *sağla-* 'to ensure, obtain, procure, provide' and then a *-(y)Iş+* form as subject of its passive derivate, *sağla-n-*. The first sentence focuses on the (indirect) agency of ANAP, the Motherland Party, which took place before the accused (we learn that one of them was a founder of this political party) received passports and left Turkey. The second sentence describes the flight from Turkey as active topic (which is one of the things which topics typically are), reminding the reader of the ANAP's action as decisive factor in the event's taking place. *-dlg+* is excluded in both cases: *sağla-* is what Csató, 1990: 86 calls a manipulative predicate, and she predicts that such predicates are incompatible with *-dlg+*. Are *-mA+* and *-(y)Iş+* interchangeable in these sentences? No, they are not. An event which one schemes for (the handing out of passports) would not be described as a process, especially not if it is itself the means to an end (the flight); the exit of the smugglers itself, however, is now an event standing out in the bright light of day, not a mere thought. Now take

- (25) Tezel artık nerdeyse benim elimde iki bardakla dönüşüme değil de, yanına dönüşüme seviniyor. Sanki yokluğumda biri ona, buluzunuz ne güzel, nerden aldınız, diye sormuş, o da bunu iyi kötü yanıtlamak zorunda kalmış.

*döndüğüme* could very well have replaced the two instances in (25). *dönüşüme* here describes how Tezel must have glanced towards the speaker coming back in her direction through the crowd at the reception, have lived this coming back as a process and not as a fact. Above, we expressed this distinction by opposing (marked) *seyret-* to (unmarked) *gör-*. But a verb like *sez-* can also describe the noting of a process:

- (26) Yaşamak, tabiatın en küçük kıvılcıklarını sezerek, hayatın ... akıp gidişini seyrederek yaşamak ... .

We find, s i x t h l y , that  $-(y)Iş+$  forms often serve as topics, a textual task not listed in Csátó, 1990 (who envisages only government). In (24), the  $-(y)Iş+$  form is the topic of its sentence while the  $-mA+$  form is not. The many  $-(y)Iş+$  forms in (8) are all topics, as are the ones in (28-30); none of these refers to the *manner* of the behaviour in question. The instance in (27) is also topic, although it is in the genitive case. This has, like (24), been chosen because it pins  $-(y)Iş+$  and  $-mA+$  against each other with parallel wording:

- (27) Her şeyin yılını gününü koyar o. ... Abisiyle, yengesiyile bağlarını tümüyle keşişinin bile bir günü, bir saati vardır. ... Yaklaşmaların da, uzaklaşmaların da gününü, saatini ötekilerin ayarlayıp kararlaştırdıklarını bir türlü göremiyor.

Here the  $-(y)Iş+$  form precedes the  $-mA+$  form whereas it follows it in (24). In (27) the  $-(y)Iş+$  form is, again, factive: We actually here learn for the first time that Tezel cut her family ties. *yaklaşmalar* and *uzaklaşmalar*, however, are not factive and have no specific reference. The following sentence can boast five event nominals (including *tutkunluk* with verbal government):

- (28) Dengeli bilim adamı oluşum, yirmi iki yaşında güzel bir kızın bana tutkunluğunu sezmemden gizli bir sevinç duymama da engel değil.

One could not replace *oluşum* by *olduğum* here, nor would *olmam* give the same meaning:  $-mA+$  being non-factive, the addressee would probably interpret *olmam* as ‘my becoming’ and not as ‘my actually being (a well-balanced scholar)’. Significantly, (28) is followed by the words *Değilmiş işte*: The speaker is himself surprised by the fact he expresses about himself in the sentence, something which could not have been taken care of by *olmam* in the topic part.<sup>10</sup>

### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Iş*

Here some additional examples for topical factive *-(y)Iş*, again unreplaceable by *-dlg+*:

- (29) İnsanlardan kaçışım, içimden geçenlerin en küçük bir parçasını bile etrafıma sezdirmekten çekinişim bana sebepsiz ve mânasız görünürdü.  
(30) Onun sessiz yaşayışı, ... insanların zaaflarına merhametle ve edepsizliklerine eğlenerek bakışı (buna) kâfi bir ifade değil miydi?  
(31) ‘doğru’ sözcüğünün ilgeç oluşunu ise şöyle gösterir:

The last sentence (written by Şeyda Ozil; the context shows Gencan to be the agent of the verb) would, I think, be less likely to have appeared with *olduğunu* instead of *oluşunu*, everything else remaining the same. Now delete the topicalizer *ise*, and *olduğunu* sounds a little better. If I am right, the *-(y)Iş* form is clearly linked to topicalization.

These examples will do for a preliminary survey. They make it certain, I think, that event nominals will be as interesting and as fruitful for discussion around Turkish grammar as relativisation has been for the last twenty years, and indeed for exploring grammar in general. Concerning *-(y)Iş+* we have, I think, been able to show that it forms factive imperfective event nominals, its domain thus being clearly delimited as against the ones of the other event nominals. If I am right about (16b) expressing ‘relevance to the present situation’ imperfectivity correlates with ‘present’ at least to a certain degree. Reference to manner is also made possible by imperfectivity. Factivity together with imperfectivity make *-(y)Iş+* nominals into natural topics. The qualities of *-(y)Iş* nouns mentioned as ‘first’ and as ‘second’ above seem to indicate that these nouns refer to events whereas the other three comparable nominals can also refer to the reflection of events as such in the mind. The only type of mental abstraction associated with *-(y)Iş* is that of manner. All this when Turkish speakers are occupied with subordination and not with word formation (or addressees with the recognition of this process).

\* \* \*

The *-Xş* formation is very creative in Old Turkic<sup>11</sup> and lives on in all Turkic languages (including Chuvash).<sup>12</sup> We find, however, that it does not exceed the bounds of word formation in most of these languages and stands in competition merely to *-(I)m*, *-(I)t* and the like. It turns out that the other Turkic languages in which this suffix has the shape *-yIş* and not *-ş* after vowels, where, that is, the suffix vowel is stable today, are Azeri and Turkmen. These two forming the Oguz group of Turkic languages together with Turkish, we can say that Oguz

Turkic is characterised by having *-(y)Iş* whereas all the other Turkic languages have *-(I)ş*.<sup>13</sup>

Information about the morphological use of *-(y)Iş* in Azeri as compared to that of other Turkic languages can be found in Sevortjan, 1966: 140-152. See Baskakov et al., 1970: 335-337 for the uses it is put to in Turkmen; according to them, the Turkmen form serves as name for the process of the action. This reminds us of our interpretation of its status in Turkish as imperfective event nominal. *-(y)Iş* can, in Turkmen, also be added to negative bases in *-mA-*, has verbal government and refers to the agent by possessive suffix. There are instances which serve as object of the verb *seyret-* as in Turkish (see above), while other examples focus on the manner of the action. The shape and function of *-(y)Iş* in early Western Oguz does not appear to have differed much from modern Turkish either; cf. Dede Korkut D 106:

- 32) Apul apul yoriyuşuñdan, aslan gibi turuşuñdan, kıñrılıban bakışuñdan, ağam Beyrege beñzedürem ozan seni. 'By your swaggering gait, by your standing up like a lion, by your squinting glance, o bard, you remind me of my master Beyrek'.

In this passage the *-(y)Iş* forms (no rounding of the suffix vowel; /y/ after vowel stems) describe the manner in which the addressee (referred to by the 2nd person possessive suffix) behaves, their use being factive: Their content serves as evidence for the identification of a person.

Beside Azeri and Turkmen, *-Iş* developed a richness of use comparable to that found in Turkish also in Özbek and Modern Uygur (so-called South-East Turkic, in other words) and, presumably under Özbek influence, in Kırgız. In these three languages it serves as part of the conjugation (though its functional qualities are very different from the ones it has in the Oguz languages), gets added to verb forms composed with auxiliaries and is included in analytical verb phrases, expresses the agent by possessive suffixes, is used with such predicates as *mümkün* 'it is possible' and shows verbal government. It is not factive and is not, in general, added to the suffix of verbal negation although passive or causative stems do appear with it.<sup>14</sup> See Kononov, 1960: 299-300, 303, 371-385 etc. for Özbek, Nadzhip, 1971: 113-115 for Modern Uygur, Imart, 1981, pars. 1252-1260 (especially 1256-60) for Kırgız. Kajdarov et al., 1966: 249-253 have an important comparison between Uygur *-mAk* and *-(I)ş*. All this beside the numerous derived *-Iş* forms found in all Turkic languages including these Southern ones.

What made the southern Turkic languages<sup>15</sup> single out the formation in *-Iş*, make it productive with any verb and turn it into a common ingredient of the conjugation with important tasks? What the southern languages have in common

### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)İş*

is their contact with Persian. A possible explanation for what happened to this formation is the Persian verbal noun in *-(y)īš*, borrowed into Ottoman in such words as *bahşiş*, *cüşiş*, *serzeniş*, *sipariş*, *alayış*, *nümayiş*, *asayış* or *sitayış*. They visualize that speakers of Turkish must have been quite intensively exposed to the formation. Persian further has, e.g., *kunīš* 'act', *manīš* 'sense', *ârâyīš* 'ornament', *pûšīš* 'covering', *buviš* 'becoming; the future', *parvarīš* 'education' and many more instances. The suffix was already common in Middle Persian in the form *-īšn*; it is therefore originally Persian and cannot have come about under Turkic influence.<sup>16</sup> As in Oguz, it has an intercalary /y/ in stems ending in vowels. It cannot be a coincidence that intercalary /y/ is so wide-spread in South-West (i.e. Oguz) Turkic (but only in that branch of Turkic) on the one hand, in Persian on the other hand: New Persian and Oguz came into existence at about the same time, under intensive contact with each other, and anti-hiatu /y/ is only one product of this early symbiosis.<sup>17</sup> What makes the connection between South-East Turkic *-(I)ş*, Oguz *-(y)İş* and this Persian suffix particularly likely is the fact that Persian *-(y)īš* is added only to present (i.e. imperfect) stems, never to stems of the preterite: Remember that Oguz *-(y)İş* always has imperfect meaning. Only in this areal context does this particular development of Southern Turkic as against Northern and North-Western Turkic, and the splitting away of the grammatical suffix from the formative, make sense. Note, though, that the Persian formation, though very common, does not appear to have encroached on the morpho-syntactic domain: It clearly belongs to word-formation and does not compete with the infinitive. Therefore, the explanation for the entrance of Turkish *-(y)İş* into the *-mA+ / -dIlg+ / -(y)AcAg+* paradigm is likely to be language-internal in any case: Being dependant upon morphological nominalization in so much of its subordinative syntax, Turkish needed distinctions other languages only make with the finite verb also for its event nominals. Perhaps, however, the formative *-İş* would not have been promoted into the key situation it has in all the Southern Turkic languages and particularly in Turkish if Persian had not had an identical sounding, very regular and wide-spread formative, and it would not have specifically associated with the imperfect, had that not been the case in Persian.

#### Notes

1. Morphemes are represented phonemically: Capitals refer to phoneme classes alternating under well-known phonological conditions; letters placed into brackets are present or absent under certain phonotactic rules. /g/ is, like other voiced consonants, devoiced word-finally (to give, in this case, *-yAcAk*) but collapses with /g̊/ between vowels.

2. See below for this term.
3. I take instances like *dövüş* to be syncopated from \**dövüşüş*.
4. *At least* for (a) and (b), this covers also lexicalised items.
5. Other instances in (26) and (30).
6. From Uğur Mumcu, *Tarikat, Siyaset, Ticaret*, Istanbul 1988, p. 8. The examples (9)-(14), (18) and (21) ff. are also all authentic, a number of them drawn from grammar books where they are quoted by author's name. Turkish is, in this paper, left untranslated: I could have written the paper in Turkish in the first place, and it is being published in Turkey alongside with Turkish papers. Anybody who cannot understand the examples should first brush up their Turkish before thinking about nominalization.
7. *yaşayış* may very well have have gotten lexicalised with this meaning: Lexicalisation is an ongoing process and there is no reason why manner nominals should not be included in it. It would presumably be more difficult for *yürüyüş* in the following example to do so, seeing that it is already lexicalised as 'march, (long) walk'.
8. It should at least have had *bir şeyler* as object: When the content of speech is to remain unexpressed, one uses *konuşmak* instead of *söylemek*.
9. My feeling about *çıkış* in this sentence is that this is *not* the lexeme *çıkış* 'exit' but a form freshly formed to suit the context, but I may possibly be wrong.
10. The sentence is also interesting in opposing specific (and hence referential though indefinite) *güzel bir kız* to non-specific (and hence non-referential—predicative) *dengeli bilim adamı* (without *bir*).
11. See Erdal, 1991: 262-275. In that language it normally retains the suffix vowel also with stems ending in vowels. Since Old Turkic does not have any allomorphic /y/ at morpheme boundaries, this means that the suffix vowel replaces the stem-final vowel. The character X is here used as a symbol for the alternation /i ı ü u/ by vowel harmony; Old Turkic also has suffixes where only /i/ and /ı/ alternate, which can be shown by using I.
12. In Chuvash, the suffix is *-(Ā)ś*, where /ś/ corresponds to Common Turkic /\*ç/. This connects with such forms as Turkish *savin-ç* etc., which appear with *-In-İś* in some Turkic languages.
13. One would not want to wholly rule out the possibility of *-yİś* appearing sporadically with monosyllables in other branches of Turkic as well, but the only instance I have come across is *ye-yiś* from the verb 'to eat'. This first turns up in a Kipchak text

### On the Verbal Noun in *-(y)Is*

written in 14th century Syria, within, that is, the bounds of Oguz taken geographically (quoted by Berta, 1996: 461, 538-9). The same form appears also in Özbek and Modern Uygur, whereas Kırgız and Tuvan, for instance, have *dže-š* and *či-š* respectively.

14. The Özbek negative counterpart of *-Is* is *-maslik*. In Kırgız, *-ba-* does appear when the *-(I)š* noun is governed by *kerek*, as *oku-ba-š kerek*, *süylö-bö-š kerek* 'one should not read, one should not speak': The construction *-(I)š kārāk* is common in Özbek and New Uygur as well and the two must have associated at an early date.
15. The border between North and South in this case passing between the Kazakh and the Kırgız, then.
16. This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that Persian borrowed Turkic *-Is* nouns even at an early date. Such an instance is Persian *čališ* 'fight; march, gait', discussed in Doerfer, 1967: 32-33.
17. See Erdal, 1995 for another early result of this contact, which is expressed in many other domains as well. Intercalary /y/ did not, in Old Ottoman, automatically cover all domains it covers nowadays, but that is also a matter of dialect mixing and morphological levelling.

### Bibliography

- Baskakov, N.A., M.J. Hamzayev and B. Čaryjarov 1970: *Grammatika turkmenskogo jazyka*. Čast' 1, Fonetika i Morfologija. Aŝxabad, Izd. Ylym.
- Berta, Árpád 1996: *Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Türkischen*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Bazin, Louis 1968: *Introduction à l'étude pratique de la language turque*. Paris, Maisonneuve.
- Csató, Éva Ágnes 1990: 'Non-finite verbal constructions in Turkish'. Bernt Brendemoen (ed.), *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference Oslo ... 1989*. Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, pp. 75-88.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1967: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*, Bd. III. Wiesbaden, Steiner.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991: *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz. (*Turcologica* 9)

- the same, 1995: 'Das Futurum mit 'wollen': areale Kausalität, Universalien und Systemdruck'. M. Erdal and S. Tezcan (eds.), *Beläk Bitig. Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz (*Turcologica* 23), pp. 67-80.
- Gencan, Tahir Nejat 1979: *Dilbilgisi*. Gözden geçirilmiş IV. Baskı. Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Imart, Guy 1981: *Le Kirghiz (Turk d'Asie Centrale Soviétique). Description d'une langue de litterisation récente*. Aix-en-Provence, Publ. Univ. de Provence.
- Kajdarov, A.T. et al. 1966: *Hazirqi zaman Ujyur tili*. II Qisim, Morfologija ve sintaksis. Almuta, Qazaq SSR Penler Akademijasy.
- Kononov, A.H. 1960: *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva-Leningrad, Izd. Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Lees, Robert 1965: 'Turkish nominalizations and a problem of ellipsis'. *Foundations of Language* 1: 112-121.
- Nadzhip, E.N. 1971: *Modern Uigur*. Moscow, Nauka Publ. House.
- Schröder, Christoph 1995: 'Post-predicate arguments in Turkish'. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48: 204-218.
- Sevortyan, E.V. 1966: *Affiksy imennogo slovoobrazovanija v azerbajdžanskom jazyke. Opyt sravnitel'nogo issledovanija*. Moskva, Izd. Nauka.