The Syntactic Valency of Some Verbs in The Book of Dede Korkut: Diachronic Differences

Vügar Sultanzade[*]

Abstract

This article examines the verbs in the text of *The Book of Dede Korkut (Kitab-ı Dede Korkut)* whose syntactic valency shows differences when compared to Modern Oghuz languages. The verbs that we examine are the following: *as-* 'to hang', *at-* 'to shoot', *bulış-* 'to meet', *doy-* 'to have one's fill of something; to become satiated', *iliş-* 'to be hitched, *incin-* 'to be offended', *ḳo- (ḳoy-)* 'to allow', *ḳon-* 'to settle; to peach', *ḳop-* 'to appear; to break out', *ḳur-; tik- (dik-)* 'to build; to set up, to pitch', *küs-* 'to be offended', *muştula-* 'to convey good news', *öp-* 'to kiss', *sarmaş-* 'to embrace one another'; *sor-* 'to ask', *sög-* 'to curse, to swear', *toğ-* 'to be born', *ur-* 'to strike; to beat', *usan-* 'to be tired of, to be bored', *yapış-* 'to grasp; to stick', *yaralan-* 'to be wounded'. These verbs are investigated from a diachronic point of view. The article also makes some explanations concerning the reasons for the diachronic changes.

Keywords

Dede Korkut, syntactic valency, verb, case, Turkish, Azerbaijani.

The notion of valency, originally a chemistry term, was introduced into modern linguistics by the French linguist L. Tesnière (1959). The syntactic valency of a verb is the syntactic positions which the verb opens for the sentence parts. Syntactic arguments take these positions. They can be ob-

---

[*] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Eastern Mediterranean University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Teaching - Gazimagusa / TRNC
vugar.sultanzade@emu.edu.tr

ligatory or optional. Obligatory arguments of the verb are necessary elements for a well-formed clause, while optional arguments are mere additions that may or may not occur in the sentence (Emons 1974: 3, Kaseviç 1988: 96). Two kinds of syntactic valency are distinguished: quantitative and qualitative valencies. The quantitative valency is the number of its arguments. The arguments of a verb may have different morphological forms and they organize a hierarchical configuration: some of arguments more closely relate to the verb than others. The qualitative valency is the types of its arguments (s. Katsnel'son 1972: 44-45). Rich discussion on many aspects of linguistic valency is found in the literature (Helbig & Schenkel 1969, Emons 1974, Růžička 1978, Kibardina 1979, Allerton 1982, Sommers 1987, Kaseviç 1988, Haegeman 1991, Fernández 2005-2008, Nikula 2006 etc). In modern linguistics, the term valency is used in a broader sense: it comprises not only verbs, but all words that can function as predicates, and it stands for the "combining power" of elements at all levels of the language system, not just the syntactic level.

Verb valency has received relatively little attention in Turkic linguistics. Studies in this field usually focus on modern languages (Tsalkalamanidze 1987, Abdülhayoğlu 1990, Ozil 1990, Karaman 1996, Sultanov 2001 etc.). However, to dwell on the diachronic changes in valency is important for the description of the development of the verb system and generally, of the historical grammar of the Oghuz languages.

In this article, the syntactic valency of the verbs in *The Book of Dede Korkut* (*Kitab-ı Dede Korkut)* is investigated diachronically. The aim is to list the verbs whose valency shows differences in comparison to the facts of Modern Turkish and/or Modern Azerbaijani and to try to explain the reasons of the corresponding diachronic changes. The modern languages in question are descendants of the Oghuz language represented in *The Book of Dede Korkut* (BDK).

BDK was chosen for the study because it is one of the first common and most important sources of the Oghuz languages. Two manuscripts of BDK are known: the Dresden (Drs.) and the Vatican (Vat.) manuscripts. Both of them are probably from the sixteenth century; however, the language of the texts "is consistent with the books belonging to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth centuries" (Lewis 1974: 22). The investigated data is based on the facsimile of Ergin 1989. For the translation of the data, Lewis 1974 is used; nevertheless, some examples are translated by the author of the paper himself.

Both quantitative and qualitative valencies can be historically changed. We take into consideration the changes of both types. However, the diachronic changes in number of arguments are rare. We mostly consider the changes in the morphological forms of arguments. The case changes were the subject of some papers (Aslanov 1960, Xəlilov 1991, Karahan 1999, Erdem 2004, Sev 2004, Demirci 2007). It is especially important to focus on these changes, because old forms are sometimes wrongly considered as transcriber errors and are adapted to the modern language in new editions. For example, the phrase "ikisini bir *yẻrden* kafire yetürelüm" 'let's deliver both of them to the infidel' written clearly in the Dresden manuscript (Drs. 17b 9-10) of *BDK* was wrongly recorded as "ikisini bir *yẻrde* kafire yetürelüm" (Zeynalov and Əlizadə 1988: 40, Ergin 1989: 92) and as "iki-sini bir *yẻre* kafire yetürelüm" (Tezcan and Boeshoten 2001: 46) in the new editions of the text.

The comparative and descriptive methods were used for the research. All the verbs of BDK were compared with the corresponding verbs of modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, and only the verbs with modified argument structure were chosen. These verbs are reviewed below in alphabetical order.

As- 'to hang'. The syntactic structures headed by this verb have three obligatory arguments. In the period of BDK, the semantic role of Locative indicating the hanging place was expressed by means of two different cases: a dative or a locative; cf.:

(1a) Meni *saŋa* asarlar, götürmegil ağac (Drs. 30a 1-2) 'They are going to hang me on you; do not support me, tree' (Lewis 1974: 52); Basub öl-dürmese anuŋ başını keserler, *burca* asarlar (Drs. 89b 2-3) 'If he does not subdue them and kill them, they will cut off his head and hang it on a turret' (Lewis 1974: 118-119); Ḳara başuŋ *terkiye* asayınmı? (Drs. 100a 9) 'Shall I hang your dark head on my saddle?' (Lewis 1974: 129).

(1b) Bu otuz iki baş kim *burcda* asılmış idi kağan aslanıla kara buğ[r]anuŋ yüzin görmemişleridi (Drs. 88b 8-9) 'Those thirty-three heads which hung on the battlements had never so much as seen the faces of the raging lion and the black camel' (Lewis 1974: 118).

The most noticeable example of the use of this argument is the following parallel sentences that contain the dative case in one of the manuscripts and the locative case in the second one:

(1c) Kazan Begüŋ karıcık anası deve *boynına* asılu getdi (Vat. 84b 10) / Kazan Begüŋ karıcuk olmış anası kara deve *boynında* asılu getdi (Drs. 21a

225
●

9-10) 'Prince Kazan's old mother went, hanging round the neck of a black camel (Lewis 1974: 43).

This difference is understandable. The point is that "early Turkic literary languages exhibit considerable variation, variable norms that allow a choice of linguistic elements according to individual, situational and stylistic needs. Texts are often mixed in the sense of carrying features of more than one branch" (Johanson 1998: 87). The text of BDK is one of them. The difference in the forms of the argument of the verb *as-* reflects this variation in the BDK period. When the regional written languages were formed later, they chose one of these forms as a standard norm. In Turkish, the semantic role of Locative is formed in the dative case in such constructions; e.g.:

(1d) *Burca* onu asarlar 'They hang it on the battlements'.

In Modern Azerbaijani, however, the argument is formed by the suffix –*dAn,* a form developed on the basis of the Old Turkic locative-ablative in -*dA* (Serebrennikov and Gadjieva 1986: 84); e.g.:

(1e) *Bürcdən* onu asarlar 'They hang it on the battlements'.

At- 'to shoot'. This is actually a polysemantic verb. Besides the meaning of 'to shoot', it has also the meanings of 'to throw', 'to drop' and 'to put in'. The argument structure of polysemantic verbs may vary according to the meaning. The verb *at-* makes mainly three-valent structures in its different meanings. Most of these structures have been subjected to no considerable changes since the BDK period. However, in BDK, the verb was used differently in the meaning of 'to shoot'. The epic contains the following example:

(2a) *Qız* bir oḥıla *Ḵan Turalıyı* atdı (Drs. 101b 3-4) 'The girl shot Kan Turali with an arrow';

In this example, the verb has two obligatory arguments: the subject and the direct object. To express the similar situation with the verb *at-*, a three-valent structure is used in Modern Turkish (as well as in Azerbaijani). Cf.:

(2b) *Kız Turala ok* attı / *Qız Turala ox* atdı 'The girl shot an arrow at Tural'.

However, the meaning of the verb *at-* is not exactly the same in the cases (2a) and (2b). The difference concerns the reasoning of the action (s. Chen and De Giacomo 1999: 84-85). In the case of BDK, the shoot action necessarily results in achieving the goal[1], while in the modern languages, the action may

result in achieving the goal or not. The diachronic change in the valency of the verb *at-* is probably due to its meaning modification.

The expression of the goal of shooting is also different: it is formed with the dative case in Turkish and Azerbaijani, while it is denoted by the direct object in BDK; besides (2a), consider the following example:

(2c) Daz yėrde *torğay* atmağa yaḥşı (Drs. 56a 10-11) 'It'll do for shooting larks at close range' (Lewis 1974: 79).

Bulış- 'to meet'. This is a two-valent verb. In BDK, it governs the dative case or it is construed with the postposition *ile* 'with'; cf.:

(3a) [Sen] Beyrek adlu bir *yigide* bulışmaduŋmı? (Drs. 54a 5-8; Vat. 78a 5-6) 'Did you not meet a man named Beyrek?' (Lewis 1974: 77).

(3b) Begler, kardaş uğrına *Depegöz ile* bulışuram, ne buyurursız? (Drs. 114a 5-6) 'Princes, I shall meet Goggle-eye for my brother's sake; what do you say?' (Lewis 1974: 145).

The difference in the valency structures reflects the nuance in the semantic of the verb, which has the meaning 'to meet *by chance'* in (3a) while it means 'to meet *by planning'* in (3b).

In Modern Turkish, the verb *buluş-* is used just in the second sense, therefore, it does not govern a dative. The corresponding argument of the verb is formed by the postposition *ile*; e.g.:

(3c) Ali *arkadaşlarıyla* Taksim'de buluşuyor 'Ali is meeting with his friends in Taksim'.

This verb does not exist in Modern Azerbaijani.

Doy- 'to have one's fill of something; to become satiated'. Like in Modern Turkish, the verb requires a dative in BDK:

(4a) *Yigitlige* doymadum, canum yazıḳ (Vat. 89a 10; cf.: Drs. 30a 7) 'I have not had my fill of being a prince; alas for my soul' (Lewis 1974: 52).

In older Turkic written sources, the verb governs an ablative; for example, in *Ferheng-nāme-i Sa'dī:* Ḳaḳıġanısaŋ ḥalk *senden* doyar (Tietze 2002: 648). It is the same in Azerbaijanian; cf.:

(4b) Bax, *bu həyatdan* doymamışam 'Look, I have not had my fill of this life'.

The change in BDK seems to be a result of analogy with the case frame of another verb. The point is there was a homonymous verb *doy-* (*döy-*) 'to suffer, to have patience', which governed the dative case. In fact, this verb

became an archaism in Modern Turkish. Azerbaijani, on the other hand, keeps a phonetic variant (*döz-*) of this verb.

İliş- 'to be hitched' is a two-valent verb. The object of the verb is in the locative case in the BDK text:

(5a) Ve yā boġanuŋ *boynuzında* ilişem (Drs. 90a 13) 'Or on the horn of the bull I may be hitched'.

The verb *iliş-* seemed to govern a dative as well. It can be seen in the following example, where the causative form of the verb is used:

(5b) Atından ėndi, çılbırını bir *ṭala ilişdürdi* (Drs. 135a 11) 'He dismounted, and hitched the reins over a branch'.

In Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, the verb *iliş-* governs a dative only.

The verb, in the form *ilin-*, was construed both with a dative and a locative in Turkic written sources; for instance, in *Muqaddimat-ul Edeb*: ilindi *anga* (s. Yüce 1993: 68), but: bunca *zülfünde* ki canım iline (Kadı Burhanettin 1943: 154).

In the written sources up to the XVIII century, the dual form of the arguments, i. e. with the dative and locative cases, can be seen in some other verbs as well (s. Mirzəzadə 1990: 46-47). The reason for such parallelism is that the location and the direction functions within the morpheme *-dA* were not completely differentiated till that time.

İncin- 'to be offended'. This two-valent verb requires the dative case in BDK:

(6a) İmdi incinme, ḫanum, evvel anuŋ elin *öpdügümüze* (Drs. 39a 9) 'Now, my Khan, do not be offended that we kissed his hand first'.

However, the verb assigns the ablative case to its argument both in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani (here, the verb has the form *inci-*); e.g.:

(6b) Zeliha bu *sözden* incindi / Züleyxa bu *sözdən* incidi 'Zeliha was offended by this word'.

The verbs *inci-* and *incin-* were subject to a special investigation by P. Yavuazarslan (2003). This article includes many examples from old and modern Turkic languages. In none of these examples do we find the dative case assigned to the verbs' complements. We see in these examples just the ablative case if the verb takes an object; e.g.:

(6c) İncimek olmaz *cefalardan* (Fuzuli XVI C.); İncinürem dostlar *sohbetinden* ki, yavuz ḫulkumı eyü gösterürler (Mahmûd b. Kadî-i Manyas XV

C.); Gerçek möhübbe cövrü cefa çünki yar eder; Neyçün *cefadan* incine, gemden melul ola (Nesimi XIV C.) (s. Yavuzarslan 2003: 95-96, 98).

Thus, it is a traditional fact that the ablative case is assigned to the argument in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani. On the other hand, the use of the verb with a dative is rather rare in the history of the Turkic languages. However, the instance in BDK is not a unique example. Such a use is attested, e.g., in Ahmedî, a poet of XVIII C.:

(6d) Bu *söze* incindi Zeliha dir aŋa (Kadıoğlu 2009: 26).

Ḳo- / ḳoy- 'to permit, to allow'. This verb, which has two forms in BDK, is in fact a polysemantic word. *Ḳo- (ḳoy-)* is basically a transitive three-valent verb in most of its meanings ('to put', 'to put on', 'to set') and governs an accusative and a dative. In these cases, we do not observe diachronic changes in the argument structure of the verb. The change has occured in the syntactic structures where the verb has the meaning 'to let, to permit, to allow'. The verb has this meaning in Azerbaijani. The verb used in this meaning in BDK was an intransitive one, even though it was a three-valent verb in this case as well; however, it was construed with two datives:

(7a) Menüm cānumı alur olsaŋ sen alġıl, ʿAzrāyīle almaġa ḳomaġıl (Drs. 82b 9-10) 'If You will take my soul, take it Yourself; do not let Azrael take it' (Lewis 1974: 111).

One of the arguments (the object of permission) of the verb has changed its morphological form in time because it is uncommon for Turkic languages to mark two distinct complements in a simple sentence with the same formal marker. Besides, language users tend to use the same valency structures for the different meanings of a verb. The complement in question is marked with the accusative case in Modern Azerbaijani; cf.:

(7b) Mənim canımı alsan, sən al, *Əzrayılı* almağa qoyma.

Thus, the verb *qoy-* in this meaning has gained the same argument structure that its other meanings have.

Ḳon- 'to settle; to make a halt; to peach'. The above-mentioned *-A/ -dA* parallelism, the reason of which discussed in the cases of the verbs *as-* and *iliş-*, is more clearly observed in the argument structure of the verb *ḳon-*, which is the reflexive form of the verb *ḳo-*. The verb governs a dative in some places of the BDK text, but in other parts of the monument, it takes a locative. Cf.:

(8a) Meger bir gün köprisinün *yamacında* bir bölük oba ḳonmış idi (Drs.79b 8-9) 'Now one day a portion of a tribe encamped on the slope of the bridge' (Lewis1974: 108);

(8b) Oğuz gėne eyyāmıla gelüb *yurdına* ḳondı (Drs.108b 10) 'Time passed, and the Oghuz came back and settled in their old home' (Lewis1974: 140); Bu yandan daḫi bazırganlar gelübeni *Ḳara Dervend ağzına* ḳonmışlardı 'Meanwhile, the merchants had come and settled in the Pass of Kara Dervend'.

Now, in Turkish and in Azerbaijani, the meaning of the verb became narrow, more precisely, the meaning 'to settle; to make a halt' became archaic. The first argument of the verb *kon-* (*qon-*) can denote only birds and flying insects. The verb governs a dative; for example:

(8c) Kuş *bir ağaca* kondu 'The bird perched on a tree'.

The morpheme *-dA* in the argument structure of this verb has lost productivity. It should be noted that we take into account the obligatory arguments, otherwise the locative sense can be optionally expressed with the locative case, like in all verbs; i.e.: Kuş *köyde* bir ağaca kondu 'The bird perched on a tree in the village'.

Ḳop- 'to appear; to break out'. The verb has also the meaning of 'to break off'. In this meaning, it is a two-valent verb and governs an ablative. It was not subjected to any changes. However, in the meaning of 'to appear; to break out', a considerable valency change has emerged. It is seen that the verb by this meaning is used as a two-valent verb in BDK. In one place of the text, the verb *ḳop-* takes - as in its other meaning - an ablative, the semantic role of which is Locative:

(9a) Resūl'aleyhi s-selām zemānına yaḳın *Bayat boyından* Ḳorqut Ata dėrler bir er ḳopdı (Drs.3a 2) 'Close to the time of the Prophet, on whom be peace, there appeared in the tribe of Bayat a man called Korkut Ata' (Lewis1974: 190).

In another place, the verb is construed with a dative, which plays this time another semantic role (Experiencer):

(9b) Neler ḳopdı *menüm başuma* (Drs.124a 1) 'What has broken over my head' (Lewis 1974:155).

As is partially seen from the examples, everything - from living creatures to natural events – could be the subject of the verb *kop-* in the meaning 'to appear; to break out'. However, in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, their

number is limited to a few words like *feryat* 'cry', *tufan* 'storm', *fırtına* 'gale, storm', which express any violent commotion or natural disturbance. Such a semantic restriction has affected the syntax, too: the verb in the mentioned meaning is used today as a mono-valent verb only, for example: *tufan ḳoptu* 'a storm broke out'; *feryat ḳoptu* 'there was a cry'; etc.

Ḳur- and **tik-/ dik-** 'to build; to set up, to pitch'. These transitive verbs have other meanings, too; but these meanings are not discussed here because there are no diachronic valency changes in these cases. Having the meaning 'to build; to set up, to pitch', the verbs are two-valent ones. Their third –optional– argument, expressing the space, appears in BDK in two forms: in the dative and the locative cases; cf.:

(10a) *Ala Ṭaġa* çadırın otağın *dikdi* (Drs.148b 11) / *ḳurdı* (Vat.104b 6) 'He pitched his tents on the many-coloured mountain' (Lewis 1974: 183); Gök alaŋ, görklü *çemene* çadır *tikdi* (Drs.65a 11-12) 'He pitched a tent on the green field, the beautiful meadow'; Ḳazan gök alaŋ, [görklü] *çemene* çadır dikdürdi, otağın *ḳurdı* (Drs.153b 5-6) 'Kazan had tents pitched on the green field, the beautiful meadow, and he set up his pavilion' (Lewis 1974: 188);

(10b) Ḳırḳ *yėrde* (yet in Vat. 83b 10: *yėre*) otaḳ *dikdi* (Drs.62b 9) 'He set up tents in forty places' (Lewis 1974: 87); Ṭoḳuz *yėrde* bādiyeler *ḳurılmışıdı* (Drs.63a 13 - 63b 1) 'In nine places vats were set'.

This parallelism -*A*/ -*dA*, which exists also in Modern Turkish, has disappeared in Azerbaijani. Unlike the above-mentioned verb *iliş-*, it is the dative suffix that has gone out in this case. Today, the verbs *qur-* and *tik-* are only used with the locative case as an optional argument; e.g.:

(10c) Quşlar *ağacda* yuva qurdu 'The birds built a nest on the tree'; Onlar *Nardaranda* yeni bir ev tikdilər 'They built a new house in Nardaran'.

Küs- 'to be offended' is a two-valent verb. The second argument is in the dative case in BDK:

(11a) Bayındır Ḥanuŋ baḥşi-şin öŋine dökdi, *ḥana* küsdi, divānından çıḳdı (Drs. 121a 8-9) 'He threw Bayindir Khan's gifts in front of him, he was enraged (lit. was offended – V.S.) against the Khan, and he left the court (Lewis 1974: 152).

In old Turkic sources, for instance, in *Diwan Lughat at-Turk*, it is seen that the verb governs an ablative, not a dative; cf.:

(11b) Ol *andın* küsdi (Kaşğarlı 1998a: 12) 'He (she) was offended by him (her)'.

It is interesting that, according to al-Kashgari, this is an Oghuzian verb (Kaşğarlı 1998a: 12). The dual form of the verb's argument structure seems to reflect the dialect differences in the old Oghuz language. Both forms exist in Modern Oghuz languages. The verb *küs-* is used in Turkish like in BDK. In Azerbaijani, however, the second argument of the verb is in the ablative case; e.g.:

(11c) O, *xandan* küsdü 'He was offended by the khan'.

Muştula- 'to convey good news' was used with a nominative and a dative in BDK:

(12a) *Ḫatun…* "Oğluŋ geldi" dėyü *Aruza* muştuladı (Drs. 113b 12-13) 'The lady conveyed the good news to Aruz: "Your son came".

Both the sound and the argument structures of the verb have changed in Modern Azerbaijani. The verb's form is now *muştuluqla-*, and it governs an accusative, not a dative; e.g.:

(12b) Qadın *Arazı* muştuluqladı 'The woman brought Araz the good news'.

At the first glance, we see here a qualitative valency change, i.e., the change of the form of the complement. The main point, however, seems to be in decrease of the valent's number. In Modern Turkish, the verb *muştula-* is a three-valent one. The third argument in the accusative case expresses the good news, for example:

(12c) [O] cezaevleri sorununun *çözüldüğünü* muştuladı halkımıza (H. Öndül) 'He brought our people the good news that the prisons problem was solved'.

Very likely, *muştula-* was a three-valent verb in the period of BDK, as in Modern Turkish. Absence of the third argument in the text indicates that its use was not necessary. In Azerbaijani, this optional argument has later completely got out from the valency frame of the verb, and another event has as well emerged: as the suffix *-la* is characteristic for transitive verbs, the second argument expressing the address of the good news has moved from the position of the indirect object to the direct one.

Öp- 'to kiss'. If the action expressed by some verbs (*öp-, vur-*) affects the part of the whole, for instance, the body-part of a living creature, the part and the whole find their expression in the sentence in one and the same argument or in two different arguments. In the first case, the verb becomes two-valent, and the expression of the whole and the part as an *izafet* group constitutes one argument; e.g.:

(13a) *Atasınuŋ anasınuŋ ellerin* öpdi (Drs. 90b 5) 'He kissed his father's and mother's hand' (Lewis 1974: 120).

In the second case, the whole and the part appearing as distinct arguments change the main verb to a three-valent one. In this case, the whole and the part take the direct and indirect object positions, respectively. The indirect object is expressed with a locative in BDK; e.g.:

(13b) Ḳırḵ cübbeye bürinüb otuz yėdi ḵal'e beginüŋ mahbūb *ḵızlarını* çalub bir bir boynın ḵucan, *yüzinde ṭudaġında* öpen... (Drs. 33a 10-12) '...who wrapped himself in forty robes, stole away the beloved daughters of the lords of thirty-seven castles, clasped them round the neck one by one and kissed their faces and their lips' (Lewis 1974: 56).

Both in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, however, this object is formed by means of the ablative suffix; e.g.:

(13c) Beyin kızlarını *yüzlerinden, dudaklarından* öptü / Bəyin qızlarını *üzlərindən, dodaqlarından* öpdü 'He kissed daughters of the lord on the faces and lips'.

Such use of the form *-da/ -de* being different from the modern norm is not characteristic of BDK only. It is manifested in other old Oghuz sources as well, even in the XV century; e.g.:

(13d) yârı aġzın-*da* öpen dudaġın-*da* öper (s. Timurtaş 1994: 72) 'Who kisses the lover on the mouth kisses on the lips'.

The reason for the difference between this and today's forms is connected with the past of the suffix *-da/ -de*. As is known, this suffix has ablatival meaning in addition to the locatival one in early Old Turkic texts (Erdal 2004: 372). Although a separate ablative form (*-dAn*) came into being later, the use of the suffix *-da/ -de* continued in the cases where the ablative sense was weak, as in the above-given examples. Another example is *nėrede* bildüŋ (Drs. 73a 12) 'where did you know' instead of *nėreden* bildüŋ.

Sarmaş- 'to twine; to embrace one another' is a two-valent verb. It looks like the verb *iliş*-, according to its valency features, its -*ş* element and partly, its meaning. *Sarmaş*- also, like that verb, governs a locative and sometimes a dative. Cf.:

(14a) *Ṭopuġında* sarmaşanda ḵara saçlum (Drs. 8a 9) 'Your black hair entwines itself round your heels' (Lewis 1974:28);

(14b) İki pehlevān olub *bir birine* sarmaşdılar (Drs. 41b 7) 'They stood as wrestlers do and grasped each other' (Lewis 1974: 64).

233
●

As we talked about the reasons of such dual expressions above in connection with the verb *iliş-*, they are not repeated here.

In Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, the second obligatory argument of the verb *sarmaş-* can be only formed by the dative case or the postposition *ile* 'with'; e.g.:

(14c) İki pehlivan *birbirine (birbirile)* sarmaştı / İki pəhləvan *bir-birinə* (*bir-biri ilə*) sarmaşdı 'Two wrestlers grasped each other'.

Sor- 'to ask' is a three-valent verb. One of its semantic roles, i.e. the role of the participant to whom the question is addressed is realized in BDK in two forms, in the ablative and dative cases; cf.:

(15a) *Gelenden gėdenden* ḥaber soram (Drs. 132b 10-11) 'I shall ask news from those who come and go';

(15b) Mere, kāfir, nėce bir onı bunı sorarsın *maŋa*? (Drs. 145b 4-5) 'Infidel, why do you question me about this and that?' (Lewis 1974: 179).

It might be the result of the reflection of individual, situational, dialectal and stylistic differences in the period of BDK, like we see in the case of the verb *as-*. In most of modern Standard Turkic languages, the verb takes an ablative (s. Ersoy 2004: 60). It is the same in Modern Azerbaijani, where the verb is normally used rather in the form *soruş-* than *sor-*; e.g.:

(15c) Sən əvvəlcə *qızdan* soruş (Hacıbəyov 2005: 302) 'Ask first the girl'.

Standard Turkish, on the contrary, prefers the dative case; e.g.:

(15d) *Niyazi Bey'e* bunların ne olduğunu sordum (Seyfettin 2007: 149).

However, the ablative case is sometimes used as an argument form of the Turkish verb *sor-*, too; cf.:

(15e) Sebebini *sizden* soruyorum işte (Seyfettin 2005: 7) 'Thus, I am asking you about the reason'.

Sög- 'to curse, to swear, to revile' is another verb in the argument structure of which the situational, dialectal and stylistic differences of the BDK period become visible. This two-valent verb governs an accusative in certain places of BDK, while in other places of the text it takes a dative. Cf.:

(16a) Aġ saḳallu ḳocanuŋ *aġzın* sögdi (Drs. 11b 5-6) 'He reviled whitebearded elders' (Lewis 1974: 32);

(16b) Menüm *aġzuma* sögübdürüridüŋ (Drs. 52a 2) 'You were ever casting insults in my mouth' (Lewis 1974: 74).

Both of these forms exist in Turkic written monuments. The verb is only construed with an accusative in *Diwan Lughat at-Turk,* where it has the form *sök-*: Ol *anı* sökti (Kaşğarlı 1998b: 184) '(S)He swore him (her)'. In Sayf-i Sarayi's *Gülistan bi-t-türki*, on the other hand, it is a dative that the verb *sök-* takes:

(16c) Ol biçare tirlik-den ümidin kesip *sultanğa* sökti (8b: 9-10) 'That poor abandoned hope of surviving and reviled the king'.

As a result of sound changes, the verb has become the form *söv-* and *söy-* in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, respectively. The second argument of the verb is formed with the dative case in Turkish; e.g.:

(16d) [Derviş Hasan] … *din kardeşlerine* sövmeğe başladı (Seyfettin 1999: 115) 'Dervish Hasan began to curse his brothers in religion'.

In Standard Azerbaijani, however, the accusative case is the norm for this argument; e.g.:

(16e) …*bu çiskinlik payızı* söydü (Elçin 1973: 11) '…he cursed this drizzly autumn'.

In fact, in some dialects of Azerbaijani, *söy-* governs a dative, and sometimes, this case is also used in the standard language, too.

Toğ- 'to be born' is basically a mono-valent verb, but it has a second argument in the ablative form as an optional argument; e.g.:

(17a) *Oğlum* ṭoġmasun, ṭoğarsa on güne varmasun, beg babamuŋ kadın anamuŋ yüzin görmedin bu gerdege girürisem (Drs. 97a 4-6) 'May no son of mine be born or, if he is born, may he not live to his tenth day if I enter this bridal bower before I see the faces of my lord father and my lady mother' (Lewis 1974: 126); Yayḫan keşiş *oġlından oğlı* ṭoğar (Drs. 31a 11-12) 'She will bear a son from Yaykhan, the Priest'.

The meaning of this verb, which form is used now as *doğ-*, has completely changed in Modern Azerbaijani: the verb *doğ-* carries today the meaning 'to give birth; to bear', not 'to be born'.[2] This meaning change, of course, has affected the argument structure of the verb, too. *Doğ-* is a two-valent verb and it governs the direct object; e.g.:

(17b) O, bu dəfə də *qız* doğdu 'She gave a birth to a daughter again'.

In Turkish, the verb *doğ-* has the same meaning and the same argument structure as the verb *toğ-* has in the BDK period.

Ur- 'to strike; to beat'. This transitive verb has two obligatory arguments. Nevertheless, if the action affects a body-part, the verb can become three-

valent, because the whole and the part can appear as distinct arguments, like in the case of the verb *öp-*. The argument expressing the part is formed by the locative case in BDK:

(18a) Oğlanı iki ṭalusınuŋ *arasında* urub yıḳdı (Drs. 13a 13 – 13b 1) 'He struck the boy on his shoulder-blades and knocked him down'.

The form of the argument has been changed to the ablative case both in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani; cf.:

(18b) Oğlanı *omuzundan (çiynindən)* vurdu 'He struck the boy on his shoulder'.

Usan- 'to be tired of, to be bored'. This intransitive verb governs a dative in BDK:

(19a) *Beglige* usanmadum (Drs. 82a 10; Vat. 89a 10) 'I have not tired of being a prince' (Lewis 1974: 110).

We have not met such a use of the verb *usan-* in old Turkic sources. In the checked sources as well as in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, the verb takes an ablative; cf.:

(19b) *Olardın* usanmaḳ (Arat 1992: 43) 'to be bored with them'.

(19c) Tur. Valid-eciğim, yirmi senedir kaymak *yemekten* usandım (Seyfettin 2007: 364) 'My dear mother, I got bored eating crème for twenty years'.

(19d) Az. Mən *ondan* usanmışam 'I am sick of him (her)'.

Yapış- 'to grasp; to stick, to adhere'. In BDK, this two-valent verb takes a dative in all its meanings; e.g.:

(20a) Ḳılıcınuŋ *balçaġına* yapışdı kim bunı çarpa (Drs. 135b 13 – 136a 1) 'He grasped his sword-hilt to strike this man' (Lewis 1974: 168); *Kanḳuŋuza* yapışurlarısa "Qazan ḥatunı ḳanḳı-ŋuzdur?" dėyü, ḳırḳ yėrden āvāz vėresiz (Drs. 27b 8-9) 'Whichever of you they happen upon and ask if she is Kazan's wife, you must all forty of you call out together, "That's me!"' (Lewis 1974: 50).

This is a characteristic feature of the verb in Modern Turkish. In the meanings 'to stick, to adhere', the verb *yapış-* is construed with a dative in Modern Azerbaijani, too. However, when the verb expresses the meaning 'to grasp', it governs the ablative case; e.g.:

(20b) O, Kərimin *qolundan* yapışdı 'He grasped Kerim on his arm'.

Such change may be due to analogy with the argument structure of the verb *tut-* which is synonymous to the word *yapış-* in this meaning.

Yaralan- 'to be wounded' (< **yarala-** 'to wound'). Like the verb *öp-*, these verbs' argument expressing the part is formed by the locative case in BDK. E.g.:

(21a) Üç *yèrde* yaralandum (Drs. 26a 10-11) 'I was wounded on three parts (of my body)'.

In these cases, the form of the argument has been changed to the ablative case in Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani, as in the case of the verbs *öp-* and *ur-*; cf.:

(21b) Üç *yerden* yaralandım 'I was wounded on three parts (of my body)'.

It is interesting to point out that the situation is different in the case of the verbs *tut-*, *sanc-*, which can be considered of the same type with the above-mentioned three verbs from the whole-part relations point of the view. No changes can be seen in the argument structure of these verbs, i.e., in BDK, the ablative case was as a rule used for the expression of the part, as in the modern Oghuz languages; e.g.:

(21c) Depegöz *boynuzından* berk ṭutdı (Drs. 116a 4) 'Depegöz took it tightly by the horn'; Uruz *gèŋ yaḳadan* süŋüsin sancdı ṭurdı (Drs. 68a 1-2) ''Uruz thrust his spear into broad slope and stood' (Lewis 1974: 93).

This shows that the expression of the part by means of the *-dAn* morpheme is not a new thing, it had begun even before the BDK period.

Conclusions

1. The comparison of the verbs in the BDK text with their Modern Turkish and Azerbaijani correlates shows that there is no definite trend in the direction of the valency changes. Both valency increase and decrease are seen in quantitative changes. And no case suffix has systematically been preferred in the qualitative valency modifications. The diachronic changes are summarized in the following tables:

a) the qualitative changes represented in the argument forms:

BDK	Turkish	Azerbaijani
-A → (doy-, incin-, küs-, ko/ koy-, usan-, yapış-)	-DAn (incin-, usan-)	1. -dAn (doy-, inci-, küs-, usan-, yapış-) 2. –I (qoy-)
-dA →	-DAn	-dAn

(öp-, ur-, yaralan-)	(öp-, vur-, yaralan-)	(öp-, vur-, yaralan-)
-A/ -dA → (as-, iliş-, kon-, kur-, sar-maş-, tik-/ dik-)	1. -A (as-, dik- iliş-, kon-, kur-) 2. –A/ ile (sarmaş-)	1. -A (iliş-, qon-) 2. –dA (qur-, tik-) 3. -dAn (as-) 4. –A/ ilə (sarmaş-)
-A/ -dAn → (sor-)	-	-dAn (soruş-)
-A/ -I → (sög-)	-A (söv-)	-I (söy-)
-A/ ile → (bulış-)	ile (buluş-)	-

b) the quantitative changes:

BDK	Turkish	Azerbaijani
1-valent → (toğ-)		2-valent (doğ-)
2-valent → (at-, kop-)	1-valent (kop-) 3-valent (at-)	1-valent (qop-) 3-valent (at-)
3-valent → (muştula-)		2-valent (muştuluqla-)

2. The following verb groups have been subjected to diachronic valency changes:

a) verbs of action and effort: *as-, at-, kon-*;
b) verbs with body-part complements: *öp-, ur, yapış-, yaralan-*;
c) verbs of offence: *incin-, küs-*;
d) verbs of satiation/ disgust: *doy-, usan-*;
e) verbs of speaking: *muştula-, sor-, sög-*;
f) verbs of creation: *dik-/ tik-, kop-, kur-, toğ-*;
g) verbs with reciprocal meaning: *bulış-, iliş-, sarmaş-*.

3. We can conclude based on the examined data that more verbs have been subjected to diachronic valency changes in Azerbaijani than in Turkish since the BDK period.

4. The diachronic valency changes take place mainly due to three reasons:

a) The valency of verbs in the BDK period was greatly influenced by dialectal, idiolectal and contextual factors. Certain verbs did not have a stable valency framework and could govern either a dative or another case. The verbs having simultaneously two possible argument structures have chosen certain valency patterns as a standard norm after the formation of the Turkish and Azerbaijani Standard languages.

b) As a result of the differentation of the location and the direction functions of the case morpheme *-dA*, some verbs which took a locative before have begun to govern a dative or an ablative.

c) The meaning of a verb has undoubtedly an influence on its valency. That is why the meaning changes were accompanied in certain cases by the change of the syntactic and semantic structures of the verb.

Comments

[1] It is the verb *vur-* 'to beat; to shoot' that is usually used in such cases both in modern Turkish and Azerbaijani.

[2] We do not take into consideration idiomatic phrases like *gün doğdu* 'the sun rose', *ay doğdu* 'the moon rose', where the verb *doğ-* has the meaning 'to rise'.

References

Abdülhayoğlu, Suphi (1990). *Türkisch-deutsches Valenzlexikon: Bedeutungsvarianten von 512 ausgewählten türkischen Verben, sowie von deren abgeleiteten Verbal- und Nominalformen*. Hohengehren: Schneider.

Allerton, D. J. (1982). *Valency and the English Verb.* London – New York: Academic Press.

Arat, Reşid Rahmeti (1992). *Edib Ahmed B. Mahmud Yükneki. Atebetü'l-Hakayık (2. Baskı).* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi.

Aslanov, V. (1960). "Fe'li İdarə ilə Əlaqədar Olaraq İsim Hallarının Miqrasiyası Haqqında Bə'zi Qeydlər". *Azərbaycan SSR EA Xəbərləri (İctimai Elmlər Seriyası)* 2: 100-109.

Chen, Xiao Jun and Giuseppe De Giacomo (1999). "Reasoning About Nondeterministic and Concurrent Actions: A Process Algebra Approach". *Artifical Intelligence* 107/1: 63-98.

Demirci, Kerim (2007). "Türkçedeki Hal Eki Nöbetleşmeleri Üzerine". *Karaman Dil-Kültür ve Sanat Dergisi*: 126-139.

Elçin (1973). *Gümüşü Narıncı.* Bakı: Gənclik.

Emons, Rudolf (1974). *Valenzen englischer Prädikatsverben.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Erdal, Marcel (2004). *A Grammar of Old Turkic.* Leiden-Boston: Brill.

Erdem, Mevlüt (2004). "Eski Anadolu Türkçesinde Fiiller ve Unsurları". *V. Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri I.* Ankara: TDK Yay. 951-958.

Ergin, Muharrem (1989). *Dede Korkut Kitabı. I: Giriş – Metin – Faksimile.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi.

Ersoy, Feyzi (2004). "Çuvaş Türkçesiyle Türkiye Türkçesinin Söz Dizimi Bakımından Karşılaştırılması". *V. Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı: Bildiri Özetleri.* Ankara: TDK Yay. 60.

Fernández, Beatriz Martinez (2005-2008). "Syntactic Valence in Role and Reference Grammar". *Journal of English Studies* 5-6: 233-244.

Hacıbəyov, Üzeyir (2005). *Seçilmiş Əsərləri.* Bakı: Şərq-Qərb.

Haegeman, Liliane (1991). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Helbig, G. und W. Schenkel (1969). *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben.* Leipzig.

Johanson, Lars (1998). "The History of Turkic". *The Turkic Languages.* London and New York: Routledge: 81-125.

Kadı Burhanettin (1943). *Kadı Burhanettin Divanı: I: Tıpkıbasım.* İstanbul: Alâeddin Kıral Basımevi.

Kadıoğlu, İdris (2009). *Diyarbakırlı Ahmedî. Yûsuf ve Züleyhâ (İnceleme, Metin, Dizin, Sözlük).* Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları (e-kitap).

Karahan, Leylâ (1999). "Yükleme (Accusative) ve İlgi (Genitive) Hâli Ekleri Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler". *3. Uluslararası Türk Dil Kurultayı.* Ankara: TDK Yay. 605-611.

Karaman, Tahir (1996). *Çağdaş Türkiye Türkçesindeki Fiillerin Durum Ekli Tamlayıcıları.* Ankara: TDK Yay.

Kaseviç, V. B. (1988). *Semantika. Sintaksis. Morfologiya.* Moskva: Nauka.

Kaşğarlı, M. (1998a). *Divanü Lûğat-it-Türk (TDK Yayınları: 522). Cilt 2.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

_____, (1998b). *Divanü Lûğat-it-Türk (TDK Yayınları: 523). Cilt 3.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Katsnel'son, S. D. (1972). *Tipologiya Yazıka i Reçevoe Mışlenie.* Leningrad: Nauka.

Kibardina, S. M. (1979). *Osnovı Teorii Valentnosti.* Vologda: İzdatel'stvo VGPI.

Lewis, Geoffrey (transl.) (1974). *The Book of Dede Korkut.* Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Mirzəzadə, H. (1990). *Azərbaycan Dilinin Tarixi Qrammatikası.* Bakı: ADU.

Nikula, Henrik (2006). "Aspekte der Valenzlexikographie". *Wörter – Verbindungen: Festschrift für Jarmo Korhonen zum 60. Geburtstag.* Frankfurt am Main: Lang. 103-112.

Ozil, Şeyda (1990). *Valenzwörterbuch deutsch-türkish* (Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachkeit, 38). Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.

Růžička, R. (1978). "Three Aspects of Valence". *Valence, Semantic Case and Grammatical Relations.* Amsterdam. 47-54.

Serebrennikov, B. i N. Gadjieva (1986). *Sravnitel'no-İstoriçeskaya Grammatika Tyurkskix Yazıkov.* Moskva: Nauka.

Sev, Gülsel (2004). "Çıkma Durumu Ekinin Nesne Görevinde Kullanımı". *V. Uluslararası Türk Dili Kurultayı Bildirileri II.* Ankara: TDK Yay. 2655-2666.

Seyfettin, Ömer (1999). *Bütün Eserleri: Hikâyeler 2.* İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.

_____, (2005). *İlk Düşen Ak.* Ankara: Elips Kitap.

_____, (2007). *Bütün Eserleri: Hikâyeler 3.* İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.

Sommers, H. L. (1987). *Valensy and Case in Computational Linguistics.* Edinburg.

Sultanov, Vugar (2001). "Türkçe Sözlüklerde Semantik-Sentaktik Bilgilerin Verilmesi". *Uluslararası Sözlükbilim Sempozyumu Bildirileri.* Gazimağusa: DAÜ Basımevi. 179-190.

Tesnière, Lucien (1959). *Eléments de syntaxe structurale.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Tezcan, S. ve H. Boeshoten (2001). *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri.* İstanbul: YKY.

Tietze, Andreas (2002). *Tarihi ve Etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi Lugatı.* İstanbul-Wien: Simurg.

Timurtaş, Faruk Kadri (1994). *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi: XV. Yüzyıl (Gramer – Metin – Sözlük).* İstanbul: Enderun.

Tsalkalamanidze, A. A. (1987). *Semantiko-Sintaksiçeskie Gruppı Glagolov v Uzbekskom Yazıke.* Tbilisi: Metsniereba.

Yavuzarslan, Paşa (2003). "Türk Dilinin Tarihî Söz Varlığından Bir Örnek (İncimek)". *Türkoloji Dergisi* 16 (2): 91-102.

Yüce, Nuri (1993). *Mukaddimetül-Edeb. (TDK Yayınları: 535).* Ankara: TDK Yay.

Xəlilov, Şaməddin (1991). "Orta Əsr Azərbaycan Ədəbi Dilində Hal Kateqoriyası və Onun Tarixi İnkişafı". *Azərbaycan Filologiyası Məsələləri. III. Buraxılış.* Bakı: Elm: 215-229.

Zeynalov, F. ve S. Əlizadə (1988). *Kitabi-Dədə Qorqud.* Bakı: Yazıçı.

Kitab-ı Dede Korkut'ta Fiillerin Sentaktik Değerliliği: Artzamanlı Farklar

Vügar Sultanzade*

Özet

Makalede, *Kitab-ı Dede Korkut* metninde geçen ve çağdaş Oğuz dillerinin malzemesiyle kıyaslamada sentaktik değerliliği farklılık gösteren fiiller tesbit edilmiştir. Bunlar aşağıdaki fiillerdir: *as-, at-, buluş-, doy- (toy-), iliş-, ḳo- (ḳoy-), ḳon-, ḳop-, ḳur-; tik- (dik-), küs-, muştula-, öp-, sarmaş-; sor-, sög-, toğ-, ur-, usan-, yapış-, yaralan-.* Bir yandan bu fiillerin değerliliği artzamanlı yöntemle araştırılarak uğradıkları değişimler gösterilmiş, öte yandan bu değişimlerin sebebleri hakkında fikir yürütülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Dede Korkut, sentaktik değerlilik, fiil, hâl, Türkiye Türkçesi, Azerbaycan Türkçesi.

* Doç. Dr., Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkçe Öğretmenliği Bölümü – Gazimagusa / KKTC
vugar.sultanzade@emu.edu.tr

243

•

Синтаксическая ценность глаголов в «Книге Деде Коркута»: диахронические различия

Вугар Султанзаде[*]

Аннотация

В этой статье выявлены глаголы, встречающиеся в тексте «Книги Деде Коркута», которые при сравнении с современными огузскими языками отличаются синтаксической ценностью. К ним относятся следующие глаголы: ас-, ат-, булыш-, дой-, илиш-, ко-(кой-), кон-, коп-, кур-, тик-(дик-), кюс-, муштула-, оп-, сармаш-, сор-, сог-, тог-, ур-, ушан-, япыш-, яралан-. С одной стороны на основе исследования диахроническим методом показаны изменения ценности этих глаголов, с другой стороны сделаны предположения о причинах этих изменений.

Ключевые Слова

Деде Коркут, синтаксическая ценность, глагол, падеж, турецкий язык, азербайджанский язык.

[*] Доц. Док., Восточносредиземноморский университет / Газимагуса
vugar.sultanzade@emu.edu.tr

This article examines the verbs in the text of The Book of Dede Korkut (Kitab-i Dede Korkut) whose syntactic valency shows differences when compared to Modern Oghuz languages. The verbs that we examine are the following: as- 'to hang', at- 'to shoot', bulis- 'to meet', doy- 'to have one's fill of something; to become satiated', ilis- 'to be hitched, incin- 'to be offended', ko- (koy-) 'to allow', kon- 'to settle; to peach', kop- 'to. appear; to break out', kur-; tik- (dik-) 'to build; to set up, to p...Â The article also makes some explanations concerning the reasons for the diachronic changes. Description