

Depictive predicates in Kazakh in a comparative perspective

Irina Nevskaya* – Saule Tazhibaeva**

1. Introductory remarks

The article deals with secondary depictive predicates in Kazakh, a North West Turkic language, and North East (Siberian) Turkic. Examples of constructions with such predicates are as follows: *He returned tired, worked as a teacher*, etc. They contain two semantic predicates – a main one expressed by a verb form, and a secondary one, often expressed by a nominal form or an infinite verb form. Such predicates can refer to the subject of a syntactic construction as above, to an object or to nominals with other syntactic functions, e.g. *He drank his tea cold*, where *cold* describes the physical state of the entity *tea* which is the direct object of the main predicate. This nominal is *the controller of a depictive predicate* (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004). The major structural and semantic types of such predicates in Turkish were described in Schroeder 2004, in South Siberian Turkic in Nevskaya 2008.

In this article, we describe Kazakh language data and compare them with the South Siberian material. The Kazakh material on depictive constructions was obtained according to a questionnaire composed by Irina Nevskaya and applied also for the South Siberian languages; this ensures comparability of the data. This investigation is a part of an ongoing research aiming at a description of the category of depictives in all the major subgroups of Turkic. This research will show the areal distribution of various structural and semantic types of depictives and give a tentative explanation for this distribution.

2. Depictive predicates

Criteria for a depictive secondary predicate construction were defined in Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004 as follows:

- it is a clause-level construction containing “two elements, the main predicate and the depictive, where the state of affairs expressed by the depictive holds within the time frame of the eventuality expressed by the main predicate”;
- the depictive is “obligatorily controlled, i.e. there exists a formal relation to one of the participants of the main predicate”;

* Institute of Philology, Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Novosibirsk, Russia, Free Berlin University.

** Taraz State Pedagogical Institute.

- “the depictive does not form a complex or periphrastic predicate with the main predicate”;
- the depictive is neither a complement of the main predicate, nor is it a modifier of the controller;
- the depictive is dependent on the main predicate and belongs to the same prosodic unit as the main predicate (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004: 77–78).

There are certain constraints on the semantics of both the main predicate and the depictive one: the main predicate normally belongs to certain semantic groups: verbs of motion, state, change of state, etc. while depictive predicates often describe physical or mental states of their controllers (dead, drunk, hot, cooked, etc.).

Depictive predicates should be distinguished from similar phenomena:

- 1) manner adverbs, compare: a) *He left angry* and b) *He left angrily*. In the first context, *angry* refers to the emotional state of the agent and is a depictive; in the second context *angrily* is a manner adverb referring to the manner of the main action. In these English examples, the manner adverb is clearly marked as an adverb. However, sometimes depictives and manner adverbs are not distinguished formally, e.g. the German example *Er hat die Party wütend verlassen* can be understood in two ways: ‘He left the party a) *angry* (depictive), or b) *angrily* (manner adverb). In order to define the function of *wütend* we should assess the whole situation and decide whether *wütend* semantically refers to the subject (*Er war wütend* ‘He was angry’), or to the main predicate (*Er ging weg wütend* ‘He went away angrily, in an angry manner’).
- 2) resultatives, e.g. in the German sentence *Sie schlugen ihn halb tot* ‘They beat him half-dead’ – the resultative *halb tot* does not belong to the time frame of the main predicate (the state was achieved as a result of the action).
- 3) complements of the main predicate; in *He seemed tired*, *tired* is an obligatory complement of the predicate *seemed*; **He seemed* is ungrammatical;
- 4) main predicates in subordinate clauses, compare (a) *He went away outraged* and (b) *Outraged, he went away*. In (b), *outraged* is a main predicate. It does not belong to the prosodic unit of the main predicate (as the comma shows). In case we negate the main predicate, the scope of negation does not include *outraged*: *Outraged, he did not go away* = (Although he was) *outraged, he did not go away*. In (a), *outraged* is included into the prosodic unit of the main predicate and into its negation scope: *He did not go away outraged* means that the combination of two events is negated (he either stayed or he went away, but he was not *outraged*). Thus, the secondary predicate 1) is included into the prosodic structure of the main predicate and 2) it shares its modal features, for instance its scope of negation.

It is often not easy to distinguish depictives and main predicates in subordinate clauses, especially if there not no formal markers (like commas) as it is the case with converbs in Turkic and only prosodic and pragmatic criteria can be applied (Nevskaya 2010). Postpositional phrases with postpositions going back to converbial forms of certain verbs are also often a similar challenge (as in the case of the all-Turkic postposition *bolip*) be-

cause these converbs can exist alongside with such postpositions, e.g. (1) and (2). In (1), we have a depictive of role and social status expressed by a postpositional phrase *muyalim bolip* while in (2), *muyalim bolip* is a subordinate clause and *bol-* is its main predicate in the $-(X)p$ converb form: *bol-ıp*. In (2), *muyalim bol-ıp* is not included into the prosodic structure of the matrix clause (as the comma also shows), it possesses its own modal features, e.g. it is not included into the negation scope of the main predicate.

Kazakh:

- (1) *Muyalim bolip žumis iste-gen.*
 teacher POST work work-PST
 'He worked as a teacher.'
- (2) *Muyalim bol-ıp, žumis iste-gen.*
 teacher be-CV work work-PST
 'Being a teacher, he worked (all his life).'

3. Depictives in South Siberian Turkic

Nevskaya 2006 described structural types of depictives in South Siberian Turkic (Altay, Shor, Khakas and Tuvan) and their correlations with the semantic types. Here, we remind only of some substantial features of South Siberian depictives.

Their major formal types are as follows: bare adjectives, adjectives in the dative case, possessive nominals with and without the dative case marker, intensified adjectives, adverbs, collective and distributive numerals, participles, converbs and nominal phrases with various postpositions derived from different infinite forms of existential verbs and of the verb 'do'. The main semantic types of depictive predicates correlate with their formal types. Different states of the semantic subject are expressed by adjectives and nominal phrases, collectivity and distribution by collective and distributive numerals, states as results of previous actions by participles, accompanying actions by converbs, roles and social status by nominal phrases with *polip*. In Tuvan, *polip* as a marker of subject controllers is opposed to *qıldır* appearing with object controllers.

The use of the dative case with depictives expressed by adjectives is one of the most striking features in this region; see Khakas example (3) with a subject controller and Tuvan example (4) with an object controller. The dative depictives "compensate" for the lack of abstract nouns and/or allow adjectives to occur with both subject and object depictives.

Khakas:

- (3) *Ol čiiit-ke üre-en.*
 he young-DAT die-PST
 'He died young.'

Tuvan:

- (4) *Ol et-ti čig-ge či-ir.*
 he meat-ACC raw-DAT eat-AOR
 'He eats meat *raw*.'

Although bare adjectives and adjectives with the dative case marker as depictives are encountered in all the languages of this region, their distribution and their place in the language systems of South Siberian languages is different. In Altay, the two types complement each other: bare adjectives appear with subject controllers (5) and adjectives in the dative with object controllers (6). A similar picture exists also in Tuvan.

Altay:

- (5) *Ol qalaŋi kel-d-i.*
 he a.little.drunk come-PST-3
 'He came *a little drunk*.'
- (6) *Ol čay-ni izü-ge le ič-er.*
 he tea-ACC hot-DAT PTCL drink-AOR
 'He drinks his tea only *hot*.'

Tuvan and Altay differ in this respect from Shor and Khakas. Tuvan and Altay use adjectives in the dative case to express object depictives, whereas Khakas and Shor can use bare adjectives for both subject (7) and object (8) controllers. As a result, Khakas and Shor form a new semantic opposition of depictives expressed by bare adjectives and those expressed by adjectives in the Dative – that of a temporary state, see (9) and (10.)

Shor:

- (7) *Ol ezirik kel-d-i.*
 he drunk come-PST-3
 'He came *drunk*.'
- (8) *Ol šay-di sooq iš-ča.*
 he tea-ACC cold drink-PRS
 'He drinks his tea *cold*.'

Khakas:

- (9) *Ol čit-ke üre-en.*
 he young-DAT die-PST
 'He died *young* (while he was still young).'
- (10) *Ol čey-ni izi-ge/sooχ-χa iz-ibis-ken.*
 he tea-ACC hot-DAT/cold-DAT drink-PFV-PST
 'He drank his tea *hot/cold* (while it is hot/cold).'

4. Kazakh depictives

We describe depictives in Kazakh according to their various semantic types:

- Physical state, social state, integrity, age
- Temporary states
- State of possession/non-possession (also in the metaphorical sense: that of social status, looks, physical state, mental state)
- Roles and status
- Equality
- States as action results
- Accompanying actions
- Collectivity/individuality
- Distribution

4.1. Kazakh depictives expressing the physical or social state of their controllers, their integrity and age belong to the following structural types: 1) depictives formed by bare adjectives with both subject (11) and object (12) controllers; 2) depictive adjectives with gradation markers with subject (13) and object (14) controllers; 3) depictives formed by the structural pattern *Adj bolip* with subject controllers (15) and by the pattern *Adj qilip/yetip* with object controllers, see (16) and (17). Only subject depictives are formed according to the structural pattern *NP-INSTR*: (*žaksi / žaman köñil-küy-men / ašuw-men/ ašuw-ıza-men*) (18). In Siberian languages, we find most of these structural types as well.

- (11) *Ol saw kel-d-i.*
He sober come-PST-3
'He came sober.'
- (12) *Öz-iñ-niñ aqša-lar-iñ-di toliq al!*
self-POSS2SG-GEN money-PL-POSS2SG-ACC full take
'Take your money in full!'
- (13) *Ol žas-tay öl-d-i.*
he young-GRAD dye-PST-3
'He died as a quite young person.'
- (14) *Ol šay-di istiñ-tay iš-e-di.*
he tea-ACC hot-GRAD drink-PRS-3
'He drinks tea a bit hot.'
- (15) *Ol mas bolip kel-d-i.*
he drunk POST return-PST-3
'He returned drunk.'

- (16) *Ol šay-dī istiq qīlip iŝ-e-di.*
 he tea-ACC hot POST drink-PRS-3
 ‘He drinks tea hot.’
- (17) *Men sayan onī awruw žāne baqit-siz*
 I you:DAT him ill and happiness-without
yetip qaytar-a-mīn.
 POST return-PRS-1SG
 ‘I am returning him to you ill and unhappy.’
- (18) *Aliya ār.waqitta öte žaksī köñil-küy-men kel-e-di.*
 Aliya always very good mood-INSTR come-PRS-3
 ‘Aliya always comes to us in a very good mood.’

The most numerous group of depictives of this group form is formed according to the following structural pattern: *Adj türinde / küyde / hälinde / qalinde (tür / küy / qal / häl* ‘state, shape’), see (19) for a subject controller and (20) for an object one. In this pattern, alongside bare adjectives also adjectives of possession or non-possession (*Adj-IX, Adj-sXz*) can be used as depictives (21). This structural type is practically absent in South Siberian Turkic.

- (19) *Ol ädemi küy-in-de öl-d-i.*
 she beautiful state-POSS3-LOC dye-PST-3
 ‘She died as a beautiful person.’
- (20) *Men sayan onī bas-ī bütün žāne saw.*
 I you:DAT him head-POSS3 whole and healthy
tür-in-de ber-e-min.
 state-POSS3-LOC give-PRS-1SG
 ‘I am giving him back healthy.’
- (21) *Men sayan onī awruw žāne baqit-siz.*
 I you:DAT him ill and happiness-without
küy-in-de ber-e-min.
 state-POSS3-LOC give-PRS-1SG
 ‘I am giving him back ill and unhappy.’

4.2. Kazakh depictives expressing temporary states have the following structure: *Adj boyında/kezinde*, where *boyında* and *kezinde* are auxiliary nouns in the locative case: *boy* ‘length, duration’, *kez* ‘time, period’. Such depictives are used both with subject (22) and object (23) depictives. The adjective can bear an affix of possession/non-possession or gradation (23). Also compound adjectives representing lexicalized to a certain degree predicative expressions (*ayay-ī awır* ‘pregnant’) can be used together with the postpositions *boyında* and *kezinde* to express depictives (24). In South Siberian Turkic, depictives in the dative case form fulfill this function, see (9) and (10).

- (22) *Ol küŝ quwat-tī boy-īn-da / kez-in-de öl-d-i.*
 he strong state-with length-POSS3-LOC/period-POSS3-LOC dye-PST-3.
 ‘He died as a strong man.’

- (23) *Men onı kişken-tay kez-in-de kör-gen-min.*
 I him small-GRAD period-POSS3-LOC see-PST-1SG
 'I saw him as a small boy.'
- (24) *Ol äyel-in ayay-i awır kez-in-de*
 he wife-POSS3-ACC foot-POSS3 heavy period-POSS3-LOC
tasta-p ket-t-i.
 leave-CV leave:AUX-PST-3
 'He left his wife pregnant.'

4.3. The state of possession/non-possession (also understood metaphorically as possession of a social status, appearance, physical state, mental state) is expressed by derived from noun stems adjectives containing the affixes of possession/non-possession: *N-LX/-sXz*. It is noteworthy that such adjectives are mostly combined with the postpositions *bolip* to form subject depictives (25) and *qilip* to form object depictives (26). Only adjectives of non-possession can be used without the postposition *bolip* or *qilip*, see (27). In South Siberian Turkic, the adjectives of possession/non-possession do not combine with these postpositions.

- (25) *Ol žük-ti bolip oral-d-ï.*
 she load-with POST return-PST-3.
 'She returned pregnant.'
- (26) *Bala-lar-ïm-dï baqit-ti qilip saqta!*
 child-PL-POSS1SG-ACC happiness-with POST keep
 'Keep my children happy!'
- (27) *Ol bala-siz kel-d-i.*
 she child-without return-PST-3
 'She returned without a child.'

4.4. Similarly to South Siberian Turkic, Kazakh depictives of roles and status are formed according to the pattern *N bolip / qilip*, see (1). However, the pattern *N retinde / sekildi* with auxiliary nouns is also very active, see (28) for a subject controller and (29) for an object controller.

- (28) *Yekew-imiz basqa-lar-ya malay sekildi qizmet et-t-ik.*
 two-POSS1PL other-PL-DAT servant POST service work-PST-1PL
 'The two of us worked as servants for other people.'
- (29) *Ol meni muyalim retinde yes-in-de saqta-yan.*
 he me teacher POST memory-POSS3-LOC remember-PST
 'He remembered me as a teacher.'

4.5. Depictives expressing states that are results of previous actions are converbs. In Kazakh, the converb *-(X)p* has such a function. It is logical, that only subject controllers are possible with such depictives, see (30). Pay attention to the fact, that in Siberian Turkic, we find perfect participles in this function (Nevskaya 2008).

- (30) *Ol soyis-tan žaralan-ïp qayt-t-ï.*
 he war-ABL get.wounded-CV return-PST-3
 'He returned from the war wounded.'

4.6. Depictives expressing accompanying actions are also converbs; normally it is the vowel converb form *-A* contrarily to South Siberian Turkic where the converb *-(X)p* is mostly used in this function while the converb *-A* is very rare, see (31).

- (31) *Men ašuwlan-a ket-t-im.*
 I get.angry-CV leave-PST-1SG
 'I left feeling angry.'

4.7. Collectivity/individuality is expressed by a couple of adverbs, like the adverb *birge* 'together', see (32). Only subject controllers are allowed. South Siberian Turkic has similar patterns.

- (32) *Olar barliy-ï birge ömir sür-d-i.*
 they all-POSS3 together life live-PST-3
 'They all lived together.'

4.8. Distribution is expressed by distributive numerals, similarly to South Siberian Turkic, see (33) for a subject and (34) for an object controller.

- (33) *Yekewden kir-ijiz-der!*
 two:DISTR come-IMP2PL-PL
 'Come in two by two!'
- (34) *Kämpit-ti bir-birden že!*
 sweet-ACC one:DISTR eat
 'Eat the sweets one by one!'

5. Conclusions

Our preliminary analysis of depictives in South Siberian or North East Turkic and in Kazakh representing North West or Kipchak Turkic has revealed the following common features:

- The depictive semantics expressed in both branches of North Turkic is very similar.
- Quite a number of structural patterns for forming depictives are identical.
- Both branches encode minor semantic types in similar ways: distributive numerals for distributivity, converbs for accompanying actions, converbs or perfect participles for states as results of preceding actions, possessive nominals for the state of possession (including various metaphorical semantic shifts of the possession semantics).

Distinguishing features:

- Kazakh has an even richer system of encoding depictives than North East Turkic languages do.
- Kazakh makes use of numerous abstract nouns expressing the notion 'state' borrowed from Arabic or Persian: *tür / küy / qal / hal*.
- Kazakh consequently uses the postposition *bolıp* for marking subject controllers, while *qılıp / edip* marks object controllers. In North East Turkic, only Tuvan uses a similar opposition; here, *polıp* is a marker of subject controllers while *qıldır* appears with object controllers.

Literature

- Nevskaya, I. 2008. Depictive secondary predicates in South Siberian Turkic. In: Schroeder, Ch. et al. (eds.) *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond*. Oldenburg: BIS. 275–294.
- Nevskaya, I. 2010. Converbs as depictive secondary predicates in South Siberian Turkic. In: Boeschoten, H. & Rentzsch, J. (eds.) *Turcology in Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 191–200.
- Schroeder, Ch. 2004. *Depiktive im Sprachvergleich Deutsch-Türkisch. Eine kontrastiv-typologische Analyse*. Habilitationsschrift. Osnabrück
- Schultze-Berndt, E. & Himmelmann, N. P. 2004. Depictive secondary predicates in cross-linguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 8, 59–133.

Abbreviations

ABL – Ablative	N – Noun
ACC – Accusative	NEG – Negation
ADJ– Adjective	NP – Noun phrase
AOR– Aorist	NUM – Numeral
AUX – Auxiliary verb	PFV – Perfective (Aktionsart)
CV – Converb	PL – Plural
DAT – Dative	POSS – Possessive
DISTR – Distributive	POST – Postposition
GEN –Genitive	PPART – Perfect participle
GRAD – Gradation form	PRS – Present tense form
INSTR – Instrumental	PTCL – Particle
IMP – Imperative	PST – Past tense form
LOC – Locative	SG – Singular