Complementation Patterns in Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī's *Čingiz-nāmä*: A Typological Approach to Subordination in Middle Turkic

Ötemiş Hacı'nın Cengiznâme'sinde Tümleç Örüntüleri: Orta Türkçe'de Altasıralamaya Tipolojik Bir Yaklaşım

Julian RENTZSCH[1]

[1]Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:
Julian Rentzsch (Prof. Dr.),
Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz,
Institute of Slavic, Turkic and Circum-Baltic
Studies, Mainz, Germany
E-mail: rentzsch@uni-mainz.de
ORCID: 0000-0003-1472-8046

ABSTRACT

This article investigates complement clauses, i.e., clauses entering an argument slot of a complement taking predicate, in Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī's *Čingiz-nāmä*, a 16th century Middle Turkic text from Khiva which demonstrates Qipchaq linguistic features. Three major classes of complementation will be investigated: direct quotations, propositional-type complement clauses, and state of affairs-type complement clauses. The multitude of surface forms will be encoded into abstract structural types which enable structural comparison. The aim is to establish the inventories of expression types for each class, to give representative examples for each type, and to compare the typological inventories. Besides the formal aspects, semantic issues are investigated as well. The aim of the paper is to provide data for synchronic comparison, and ultimately to contribute to our understanding of the evolution of the variation in clausal complementation among the Modern Turkic languages.

Keywords: Middle Turkic, Syntax, Subordination, Complementation, Grammaticalization

ÖZ

Bu makalede Ötemiş Hacı tarafından 16. yüzyılda Hiva'da yazılmış olan Cengiznâme'deki tümleç tümcecikleri incelenmektedir. Kıpçak Türkçesi özellikleri gösteren bu metinde, matris yüklemin anaöğe dilimlerine giren üç tümleç ulamı dikkate alınmakta: dolaysız alıntılar, önerme türü tümleç tümcecikleri ve işlerin durumu türü tümleç tümcecikleri. Yüzey biçimlerin biçimsel kalabalığı, soyut yapısal türlerle kodlanarak karşılaştırmalı incelemeye tabi tutulmaktadır. Makalenin amacı, üç çatı ulamın ifade türlerinin dizgelerini tespit etmek, her ifade türü için temsil edici örnekler sunmak ve dizgeleri tipolojik ölçütlere göre karşılaştırmaktır. Ayrıca biçimsel boyutun yanı sıra anlambilimsel sorunlar da ele alınmaktadır. Makale, eşzamanlı karşılaştırmalar için de veriler sunarak çağdaş Türk dillerinde tümleç tümcecikleri̇ndeki biçimbilimsel ve anlambilimsel çokluğun artzamanlı gelişiminin araştırılmasına da katkı sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Orta Türkçe, Sözdizimi, Altasıralama, Tümleç, Dilbilgiselleşme

Introduction

Turkic languages demonstrate several classes of subordinate clauses, including attributive clauses, adverbial clauses, and nominal clauses. Structurally, attributive clauses usually function as modifiers, adverbial clauses as adjuncts, and nominal clauses as complements. When pre-modern and modern Turkic varieties are investigated in light of these syntagmatic classes, it turns out that a relatively large set of formal types is available to realize them (e.g., not all complement clauses are nominal clauses), and that individual languages employ these tools in very different ways. While subordination in the Turkic languages has been studied frequently and extensively (for a recent comparative study on the modern Turkic languages, see Aydemir 2020), many issues concerning the diachronic developments which have led to the synchronic diversity remain unexplored. Historical grammars, such as Erdal 2004 for Old Turkic and Brockelmann 1954 for the Middle Turkic varieties of Central Asia, provide excellent surveys of the options available in the literary varieties, but give only limited information on the distribution of individual structures among historical dialects, information which is relevant to the study of the evolution of subsequent varieties in their respective area.

The present study is an attempt to contribute to our knowledge of the development of syntactic subordination in the Middle Turkic era. It investigates one specific class of subordination: complementation in a broad sense, with a focus on clausal complementation, but including constructions which some authors do not include into the discussion of clausal complementation *sensu stricto* (a more precise delimitation of the study will be given below). Subordinate clauses which are unambiguously attributive or adverbial, however, will be excluded.

The text examined for the purposes of this study (i.e., the corpus) is the *Čingiz-nāmä* by Ötämiš Ḫāǧǧī (ČN), a short text (24 folios, 47 text pages) composed in the first half of the 16th century in the Khanate of Khiva (Ivanics 2017: 42). It is thus a sample of an idiolect, which can be said to represent a dialect otherwise only weakly attested. The text belongs to the broader domain of Chaghatay literature but reveals the Qipchaq linguistic background of its composer, e.g. in the presence of pronominal N (with exceptions, though: e.g. *xïẕmatlarïda* besides *xïẕmatlarïnda*, 36b), the <POSS.3-ACC> variant *-(s)In* (with exceptions such as *sačïnï*, 53a), occasional instances of labial harmony (*üstümüzgä*, 43a), or the use of *-mAK* (rather than *-mAKčI*) in intentional/prospective finite forms (such as *meni čarlap almaq turur* 'he will summon me', 53a), features which are not completely alien to, but yet less typical of Southeast Turkic. With its recognizable Qipchaq features, it is likely that this text also displays dialect features in complementation patterns and can contribute to a future understanding of the development of later Turkic morphosyntax.

The aim of this study is predominantly typological, i.e., it will be attempted to identify the main structural patterns underlying different types of clausal complementation. The typology can in principle be applied to morphological and lexical material of various designs and is suitable for comparative studies as well. The formal classes also have a semantic side, of

course. Structural and semantic properties of complementation are closely intertwined. The partition of this paper is based on overarching functional and semantical criteria. In this respect, the primary approach of the present paper is onomasiological. Within the individual sections, however, the structural types will also be subject to semasiological investigation, of course.

Theoretical considerations, as discussed by Noonan (2007), Cristofaro (2003), and Dixon (2006), shall not concern us too much here but will be used as a general background on which the Middle Turkic data are evaluated. The abstractions made in this paper will be explained when they come up.

Terminological issues

For a proper understanding of this paper, the following terms and notions must be commented on. For the purposes of this study, a *clause* will be considered as consisting of at least a predicate. In linguistic studies on complementation, the matrix element of a complement clause is commonly labelled *complement taking predicate* (CTP), a term which will be adopted here. Note that predicates are not confined to the word class of verbs but may also include nouns, adjectives, and other word classes (cf. Dixon 2006: 11).

The term *complement* will be used synonymously with argument. Thus, a *complement clause* will be considered to be any clause that enters any argument slot of a CTP, including (but not confined to) the subject and the direct and indirect object slots. Mono-clausal constructions, i.e., structures in which the subject of the CTP and the subject of the CC are identical, will be included in the description of clausal complementation.

There are various conceptions of *complementizers* in literature, including broad ones which include bound complementizers (e.g., Noonan 2007: 55; Kehayov & Boye 2016: 7) and more restricted ones, confined to "words" or "particles" (cf. Dixon 2006: 24). In this paper, the term complementizer will be used for all kinds of subordinators which make a clause accessible to CTPs, irrespective of their morphological status. When necessary, more specific terms such as *bound complementizer* or *complementizer particle* will be used. Two classes of nominalizations will be distinguished in this article: The term *verbal noun* will be used for nominalizers which are inflectional markers, while the term *deverbal noun* will be used for derivational nominalizers. (The border between inflection and derivation is not always totally clear, a fact which will not create any difficulties in the present paper.)

The term *finite* will be used to describe the capacity of an item to form predicates of independent sentences, while *non-finite* will be used to designate the absence of this capacity (cf. Joseph 1983: 6–30 and Nikolaeva 2007 for elaboration on these highly problematic notions). Some Turkic markers are unambiguously finite or non-finite, while others may be *either* finite *or* non-finite, where the concrete status is determined by the paradigm to which it belongs to. (E.g., *-GAn* may be used as a finite or a non-finite item in many Turkic languages, but the concrete status can be established from the oppositions to other items.)

The term *proposition* will be used to designate an abstract truth bearer, i.e., a covert pragmatic entity which needs not to be immediately formally identifiable but can be retrieved from an utterance ("coercion", Boye 2012; cf. Rentzsch 2015: 18–20). Contrastingly, the term *state of affairs-type CC* is used for complement clauses without a truth value (cf. Dik 1997: 105; Boye 2012: 193).

The opposition *factual* versus *non-factual* refers to semantic qualities directly associated with concrete linguistic forms. Thus, the VN *-GAn* is [+factual], while the VN *-mAK* is [–factual] in the ČN (cf. Kornfilt 2007: 315 on Turkish).

In this article, the term *indicative* will be used for finite forms which present a proposition as valid at a given point of view, i.e., a semantic feature of certain finite items. The term *subjunctive* will be used in a purely syntactic way to designate finite verb forms used as a tool to subordinate the predicate of the CC to the CTP.

Methodology and delimitation

The scope of the paper comprises (I.) direct quotations, which typify a class of embedding and can be investigated in the context of complementation, furthermore (II.) propositional-type complement clauses, i.e. CCs from which a proposition can be retrieved (coerced), and finally (III.) state of affairs-type complement clauses, i.e. CCs without propositional content. These macro-classes will occasionally be labelled as Class I, Class II, and Class III, respectively, for the sake of convenience. Embedded quotations are included although some scholars, such as Cristofaro (2003: 108) and Dixon (2006: 10), exclude them from their studies of complementation, while, e.g., Noonan (2007: 121) includes them. The comparison of the structures attested for embedded quotations and for propositional-type CCs seems promising, and the comparative study of propositional-type CCs and SoA-type CCs is common in the literature on complementation. This is why these three classes are investigated in this study.

The study will exclude grammaticalized constructions involving converbs, such as postverbial constructions, etc. (Level 4 constructions according to Johanson 1995), although it can be argued that a construction like *-A bašla-* 'to start to' (e.g., in *farēšān sözlä-y bašla-dï* 'he started to talk confusedly', ČN 44a), not included in this paper, does not substantially differ in structure from Modern Standard Turkish *-mAyA başla-*, which in turn is structurally comparable to *-mAKGA qoy-*, included in this paper (ex. 69 below). The converb segment in a postverbial construction may absolutely be construed as a complement to a CTP (i.e., the postverbial segment). The reason for leaving out postverbial constructions is that including them would require a discussion in the context of adverbial clauses, which is beyond the scope of this paper. The number of items thus eliminated is quite small and comprises *-A al-* (39a), *-A bašla-* (41b), *-A bil-* (41b), *-(X)p al-* (52b), *-(X)p ber-* (37a), *-(X)p oltur-* (44a), *-(X)p qal-* (39b), and *-(X)p tur-* (58a), all strongly grammaticalized items with actional or modal meaning and little importance for the purposes of this paper.

The paper will introduce a set of abstract functional, morphological, and semantic categories that enable the encoding of concrete surface structures into abstract structural types which are mutually comparable. Although the text is relatively short and represents only a sample of one individual idiolect, it is impossible to present all tokens of a type in this paper, and even all subtypes of an umbrella category: Thus, for the type <CTP+COMP+[QUOTE]+te-> (Class I, Type 8), examples will be cited for the CTPs *mašhūr tur-* and *faryād qïl-* but not for the CTP *ay-* (which occurs, e.g., on 41b). Conversely, for the CTP *ay-,* examples will be cited for the types <CTP+[QUOTE]+te-> (Class I, Type 5) and <[QUOTE]+tep+CTP> (Class I, Type 2), and, moreover, for the etymologically related CTP *ayt-* an example for the type <VN-POSS-ACC+CTP> (Class II, Type 2). The decision which subtype to include and which to leave out is necessarily subjective and was partly led by the intention to represent both as many CTPs and as many types as possible. The limitation of subtypes notwithstanding, the data cited are considerably fine grained, and it is unlikely that an important type has been forgotten.

The text base for this study is the Tashkent Manuscript of ČN, for which facsimiles and editions are available (Judin & Baranova & Abuseitova 1992; Kawaguchi & Nagamine & Sugahara 2008; Kamalov 2009). For the present paper, the latter two editions, both of which take Judin et alii (1992) into consideration, have been used; however, Kawaguchi, Nagamine and Sugahara's edition has usually been given preference since it represents the Arabic graphemes in the transcription more accurately than Kamalov's. In cases of doubt, the facsimile in Kamalov 2009 has been consulted. The transcription has been slightly modified. These modifications mainly reflect personal taste rather than substantial insight into the phonetical and phonological niceties of the language underlying the manuscript. The Istanbul Manuscript of ČN (cf. Kafalı 2009) has not been considered in this paper.

Quotation embedding (Class I)

Quotation embedding is realized in numerous ways in ČN. The CTP may either precede or follow the quotation. If the CTP precedes the quotation, the complementizer *ki(m)* may be present. The quotation may or may not be followed by a quotative particle, which is usually *tep* in ČN. The phonetically more progressive form *dep* occurs on page 50a. In rare cases, *teyü* is used in the same function as *tep*:

(1) *fikr qïlurlar erdi kim [āyā bu kelgän kiši ne kiši bolɣay ekän bu el maǰlisdä bu ṭarīqa mutaḥayyir boldïlar] teyü*
'They were thinking: [What kind of person might this person who has come be? People in this assembly are so surprised.]' (51b)

Direct quotations within the ČN text are given in square brackets in this article.

It is worth noting that both the particles *ki(m)* and *tep* are optional, and both may co-occur. Their function, however, differs in that *ki(m)* has a broader scope of use and can be used with CCs other than quotations, i.e., with propositional-type CCs and SoA-type CCs (see below). Contrastingly, *tep* is used with quotative CCs only. (There are other kinds of embeddings with *tep* in ČN, namely purpose clauses. These, however, are not CCs but adverbial clauses and fall beyond the scope of the present discussion.) Thus, both *ki(m)* and *tep* may be classified as complementizer particles, but *tep* is specifically quotative. It is therefore labelled with the term *quotative particle* in this contribution.

In ČN, inflected forms of the verb *te-* 'to say' can function as CTPs and be attached immediately to the right (ex. 2) or to the left (ex. 3) of the quotation, without any additional marking:

(2) *hanūz ol yolnïŋ ḥudūdï bar turur tedilär*
     'They said that [the side of the way still exists.]' (41a)

(3) *xᵛāǰa aḥmad tedi [rāstïn aytγïl ol kelgän kiši nä aytdï vä taqï seni čarlap beg nä aytdï]*
     'Khoja Aḥmad said: [Tell us the truth. What did that person who has come say, and then what did the lord say when he summoned you?]' (52b)

The first option, <[QUOTE]+te->, is especially frequent, while with CTPs preceding the quotation, another *verbum dicendi*, *ay-* 'to say', is more common (see below, ex. 7). An interesting case is the following, where short quotes are serialized and followed by one CTP only:

(4) *baʿžīlär [on üč yïl] baʿžīlär [on altï yïl pādšāhlïq qïldï] teptururlar*
     'Some say [he was king for 13 years], some say [for 16 years].' (43a)

This example gives the impression of a summarizing paraphrasis of various opinions, which are cited in a tentative way, without paying importance to completion and accurate record (which could have been accomplished by writing *baʿžīlär [on üč yïl pādšāhlïq qïldï] teptururlar baʿžīlär [on altï yïl pādšāhlïq qïldï] teptururlar*). This is an example of economical brevity.

CTPs other than *te-* only rarely follow quotations immediately, without the intervening quotative particle. A case in point is the following, where *tuy-* 'to hear' follows a finite verb form, which might represent a full quotation:

(5) *čūn begim [almasun] tuydï ersä burunqï ʿizzat vä ḥurmatnï käm qïla bašladï*
     'When the lady heard: [He shall not marry her], she began to reduce her former deference.' (53a–b)

More commonly, however, the quotative particle *tep* intervenes between quotation and a CTP other than *te-*:

(6) *šiban xan [muniŋ üstüngä ïlɣarmän] tep aydï*
     'Šiban Khan said: [I will ride against them.]' (39b)

Preceding CTPs represent the majority of tokens for quotation embeddings in ČN. Sometimes, the quotation follows the CTP without an intervening complementizer.

(7) *aydï [nä sorasïz soruŋ]*
     'He said: [Ask what you are going to ask.]' (52b)

(8) *ayturlar [ol ḥālda xanniŋ elindä bir qapsïz qalqan turur erdi]*
     'People say that [in this situation there was a shield without cover in the king's hand.]' (42a)

(9) *ol tüškän kišilärdin sorar erdilär [siz ol tepä bašïndaqï bir kišidin nečük qačtïŋïz]*
     'They asked the captives: [Why did you flee from this sole man on the hill?]' (42b)

The end of the quotation may be marked by the quotative marker *tep*.

(10) *maqtanurlar [biz sizlärdin artuq tururbïz] tep*
     'They praised themselves: [We are superior to you.]' (38b)

(11) *bular xabar tapdïlar [maskav pādšāhï qaršu keläturur] tep*
     'They obtained the information: [The king of Moscow is marching against us.]' (39b)

Frequently, the complementizer *ki(m)* is inserted between CTP and subsequent quotation.

(12) *keŋäš qïldïlar kim [nä iš qïlsaq bolur]*
     'They deliberated: [What can we do?]' (46b)

(13) *tört valīgä allāh taʿālādïn ilhām boldï kim [sizlär barïp özbegni islāmya daʿvat qïlïŋïzlar]*
     'The four saints received an inspiration by God: [Go and invite Özbeg to accept Islam.]' (48a)

(14) *sordïlar ki [sizlär nä kišilär turur nä iškä yüriyürsiz nä iškä barursïz]*
'They asked: [What kind of people are you, what is your business, what are your objectives?]' (48b)

Example (15) is semantically ambiguous between direct and indirect speech. As the embedded sentence is not followed by a quotative marker and communicates a reported content, it could also be a case of indirect speech. Similarly, example (16) can be interpreted in terms of a direct or an indirect command. As the structure of these examples is totally identical to direct quotations, they are mentioned here.

(15) *ayturlar ki [ol qalqa bir yalaŋ qayanïŋ üstündä tururlar]*
'People say: [The fortress stands on a naked rock.]'; 'People say that the fortress stands on a naked rock.' (40b)

(16) *šiban xan ḥukm qïldï ki [här māl vä yaraɣ ki här kišigä tüšüptur dast-yābï alïp qalmasunlar barčasïn keltürsünlär]*
'Šiban Khan commanded: [People shall not take possession of any goods and weapons which they have captured, but they shall bring me everything.]';
'Šiban Khan commanded that people should not take possession of any goods and weapons which they had captured, but that they should bring him everything.]' (39b)

Framing of quotations by both preceding *ki(m)* and subsequent *tep* is also common with preceding CTPs:

(17) *ḥukm qïldïlar kim [maŋa bu ḥikāyatlarnï kitābat qïlïp beriŋiz] tep*
'He commanded: [Write these stories down for me.]' (37a)

(18) *xanɣa xabar keltürdilär kim [yaɣïnïŋ gardï faydā boldï hēč učï qïraqï yoq turur] tep*
'They informed the king: [The dust of the enemy has become visible. He has no end and no limit.]' (42b)

(19) *qara noɣayɣa ündäkči keldi kim [beg sizni čarlaydur] tep*
'A messenger came to Qara Noɣay: [The lord is summoning you.]' (52a)

Remarkably, quotations may also be framed by a preceding CTP (other than *te-*) and a subsequent inflected form of *te-*. In such constructions, *ki(m)* may either be present (ex. 20) or absent (ex. 21–22). Example (21) is an instance of a proverb.

(20) *xan aydï [ṣayin yosaqlï söz aytaturur nä üčün qabūl qïlmadïŋ] tedi*
'The king said: [Sayin is speaking legitimate words. Why didn't you accept it?], he said.' (39a)

(21) *mašḥūr turur kim [qulaq ešitkän sözniŋ köprägi yalɣan] terlär*
'It is well-known that people say: [Most words which the ears hear are wrong.]' (37b)

(22) *faryād qïldïlar kim [muna iyäŋizniŋ bašï yerlig yeriŋizdin tepränmäŋiz] tedilär*
'They shouted: [Here is the head of your master. Don't you move from your places!]' (47b)

An interesting type is CTP framing, where the same complement taking predicate both precedes and follows the quotation. This type is attested in ČN in combination with the quotative particle *tep* only:

(23) *bu ṭarīqa duʿā qïlïŋïz kim [bir xudāyā, meniŋ dušmānïmnï biligsiz qïlɣïl (...)] tep duʿā qïlïŋïz*
'Pray the following way: [O Allah, the only one, make my enemy unconscious!]' (43b)

(24) *'āqibat aŋa qarār berdilär kim ikki tanūr qazɣaylar här birisini on araba süksük bilä qïzdurɣaylar [...] tep qarār berdilär*
'Finally, they decided: [Let people dig two ovens and heat them with ten carloads of saxaul.]' (48b)

The full inventory of types of quotation embedding in ČN is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Types of quotation embedding

Type	Structure	Examples
1a	<[QUOTE]+CTP>	(5)
1b	<[QUOTE]+te->	(2), (4)
2	<[QUOTE]+tep+CTP>	(6)
3a	<CTP+[QUOTE]>	(7–9)
3b	<te-+[QUOTE]+>	(3)
4	<CTP+[QUOTE]+tep>	(10–11)
5	<CTP+[QUOTE]+te->	(20)
6	<CTP+COMP+[QUOTE]>	(12–16)
7	<CTP+COMP+[QUOTE]+tep>	(17–19)
8	<CTP+COMP+[QUOTE]+te->	(21–22)
9	<CTP+COMP+[QUOTE]+tep+CTP>	(23–24)

As for the semantic types of CTPs, a broad selection is attested, including *verba dicendi* (*te-* 'to say', *ayt-* 'to say', *sor-* 'to ask', *faryād qïl-* 'to shout'), epistemic and evidential items (*xabar tap-* 'to receive an information', *xabar keltür-* 'to bring an information', *mašḥūr tur-* 'to

be known'), manipulative predicates (*du'ā qïl-* 'to pray', *ḥukm qïl-* 'to command'), etc. This broad spectrum of options suggests that besides utterance predicates and propositional attitude predicates, which have an obvious semantic affinity to quotations, virtually any predicate which can receive support by a quotation may be used as CTP for embedded quotations.

Proposition-type complement clauses (Class II)

Like with the embedding of direct quotations, propositional-type CCs are constructed with either a preceding CTP or a subsequent CTP in ČN. There are, however, fundamental differences. While structural types with preceding CTPs are followed by a full finite clause, mostly in an indicative form, and thus resemble Type 3 and Type 6 of Class I, those propositional-type CCs in which the CTP follows the CC usually demonstrate a factual verbal noun, functioning as a bound complementizer, with a possessive suffix and, depending on the specific pattern, potentially a case suffix (divergent patterns see below, Type 1b and 2b). In other words, left-branching CCs (i.e., those with a subsequent CTP) are non-finite.

Finite CCs with preceding CTP do not occur with the full typological inventory attested with quotative embeddings. They may display an optional intervening complementizer *ki(m)* but, naturally, never make use of the quotative particle *tep*.

Let us first investigate the non-finite complementation strategies with the CTP following the CC. In these complementation types, the predicate of the CC contains a factual verbal noun, usually *-GAn*, which is inflected by a possessive marker co-indexed with the subject referent. The subject of the CC, if overtly expressed at all, is mentioned in the unmarked (nominative) or in the genitive case. (The precise rules determining the case selection must be investigated comprehensively and language- or dialect-specifically. As the data for ČN are scarce, no rule can be identified for this variety.) The CC as a whole behaves like any noun phrase and accepts case suffixes depending on the combinational rules of the CTP.

There are CCs in the nominative case, which in a formal syntactic perspective enter a subject-predicate relationship with the CTP. These may typify subject clauses like in examples (25–27):

(25) *nä iš birlä vä ne kayfïyat birlä xan bolγanlarï maẕkūr ermäs erdi*
'It was not mentioned with which deeds and circumstances they had become king.' (36b)

(26) *bularnïŋ bir aš bišim xāmōš bolup mutaḥayyir bolγanï ol sababdïn erdi*
'It was for this reason that they remained silent for a while and were stunned.' (52a)

(27) *xannï körgänim ošal boldï*
'This is how I have met the king.' (44a)

Example (27) requires some elaboration, as the occurrence of the factual verbal noun *-GAn* might come as a surprise at first sight. (Modern Standard Turkish, for example, would normally use the non-factual verbal noun *-mA* in a similar context, not the factual verbal noun *-DIK*.) In the present example, the meeting with the king is presented as actually having taken place, and the report of what happened precedes this sentence in the text (predicates in the indicative, i.e., presented as true). Thus, seeing the king is presented as a fact here (implying the proposition: 'I have met the king'), and refers especially to the circumstances of the meeting, in a way resembling the verbal noun *-(y)Iş* (in its inflectional use in CCs) in Turkish (cf. Erdal 1998). Likewise, examples (28–29) reflect a usage of *-GAn* which deviates from the conventions in Turkish (where *iyi* 'good' as a CTP combines with the VNs *-mA* and *-(y)Iş*, but not *-DIK*), but which is well reconcilable with the options in other languages, as the English translation illustrates.

(28) *yaɣmur köp yaɣar mu tegäni yaxšï*
    'It is good that he asked (lit. 'said') whether there is much rain.' (44a)

(29) *vä taqï sïčqannï häm sorɣanï yaman ermäs*
    'And it is also not bad that he asked about the rats.' (44a)

The type <VN-POSS+CTP> is also attested with *yoq* as CTP, a combination which seems to encode propositional negation ("it is not the case that") and produces a reading of emphatical negation. Expression of negation by complement clauses is occasionally attested in the languages of the world (Noonan 2007: 144), and some modern Turkic languages have developed negation patterns such as *-GAn yoq*. Thus, this type of negation with *yoq* is not surprising from a diachronic and comparative point of view.

(30) *däšt vilāyatïnda ular bigin ʿādil vä ʿābid vä žābiṭ pādšāh kečkäni yoq turur*
    'In the steppe there has never been (lit.: passed) a king so just, pious and
    restrained as him (lit.: them).' (49b)

As example (30) shows, the factual verbal noun *-GAn* in the scope of *yoq* produces an indicative reading. Below, it will be demonstrated that the modal verbal noun in *-(V)r* in the scope of *yoq*, by contrast, produces an intentional reading (see ex. 62–63).

Several examples of object clauses are also attested in ČN. In these cases, the verbal noun receives an accusative case marking. This type occurs with CTPs encoding notions from the domain of knowledge (ex. 31–32), with perception verbs (ex. 34), and with *verba dicendi* (ex. 35).

(31) *nä türlig urušlar, nä türlig mājarālar bolɣanïn [...] maʿlūm qïlïp*
    'to find out what kinds of wars and adventures happened' (37a)

(32) *ol kelgän kiši nä aytγanïn bilmän*
     'I do not know what that person who has come has said.' (52b)

(33) *andïn soŋ nä bolγanïn bilmädim*
     'I do not know what happened then.' (57b)

(34) *xannï ikki kiši kelip tutγanïn kördüm*
     'I saw how two people came and captured the king.' (57b)

(35) *ol kiši ki keldi xanniŋ ölgänin ayta keldi*
     'The person who has come has told you that the king has died.' (52b)

A CC in the ablative occurs in the following example. The case is selected according to the predictable government rules of the CTP *xabardār* 'informed (about)'.

(36) *hēč kiši aniŋ ölgänidin xabardār bolmadï*
     'Nobody received the information that he had died.' (43a)

When the predicate of the non-finite CC is not verbal but nominal (i.e., a noun or an adjective), the copula particle *ekän* serves as a carrier auxiliary for possessive and case markers. An example in the nominative is (37), one in the accusative is (38).

(37) *meniŋ sendin yašγa uluγ ekänim rāst*
     'It is true that I am older than you.' (38a)

(38) *men emgäklik ekäniŋni körätururman*
     'I see that you are agonized.' (55a)

There is also a possible strategy to complementize adjectival predicates by means of the denominal noun marker *-lIK*, attested only twice in the text and exemplified in (39). From the data at hand, it cannot be established with certainty whether this is a free alternative to *ekän* for constructing a complement clause (with the predicate *az* 'few') or whether *azlïq* is a bare noun here ('if he sees our small number'); in other words, whether the suffix *-lIK* functions as a derivational or an inflectional suffix, and whether (39) typifies a complement clause at all.

(39) *nāgāh taŋ atïp bizniŋ azlïqïmïznï körsä yaman turur*
     'It will be bad if suddenly the sun rises, and he sees that we are few/how few we are.' (57a)

Another type, different from those mentioned above, leaves the verbal noun unmarked and attaches the possessive marking to the CTP. This type, which can be seen in example (40), is structurally similar to a noun compound in which the first member is a clause, and not unlike the Turkish example *[bir gözün kendisini gözetlediği] duygusu* 'The feeling that an eye was watching him' (Pamuk 1990: 72; the CC is given in square brackets). Both the Middle Turkic and the Modern Turkish examples are no relative clauses, of course, and do not mean *'the information, which the king had died' and *'the feeling, which an eye observed him', respectively.

(40) *ol kelgän kiši [xan ölgän] xabarïn keltürdi*
       'That person who had arrived brought the information that the Khan had died.' (52a)

As for propositional-type CCs with CTPs preceding a finite clause, a frequent structure includes the complementizer particle *ki(m)*. As mentioned above, the predicate of the CC appears frequently in an indicative form. Examples (41–42) feature knowledge predicates as CTP, examples (43–44) the visual perception verb *kör-* 'to see' (where an actual visual perception is communicated in ex. (43), while ex. (44) demonstrates a metaphorical reading in terms of 'to notice'), and examples (45–47) expressions with various tasks of text structuring. Example (47), while structurally analysable as a clausal complement, exemplifies a development towards an adverbial clause (purposive clause): The item *anïŋ üčün kim* can be re-analysed in terms of 'because'.

(41) *maʿlūm bolɣay kim bu faqīr-i ḥaqīr [...] qadīm xiẓmatkārlarïndïn turur*
       'It shall be known that my humble self belongs to his old servants.' (36b)

(42) *čūn šiban xan bildi ki bular farāɣat boldïlar läškärin yïɣdurdï*
       'When Šiban Khan understood that they relaxed, he assembled his soldiers.' (40b)

(43) *kördi ki bir taɣ hēč qalmas*
       'He saw that one mountain never remains behind.' (44b)

(44) *ol yipni tutup olturɣan kiši kördi ki farēšān sözläy bašladï*
       'The man who held the rope noticed that he started to talk confusedly.' (44a)

(45) *andaɣ boldï kim [...] biz faqīrdin kelip taftīš vä taḥqīq qïlur boldïlar*
       'So it happened that they started to come to me and to interrogate me.' (36b)

(46) *yenä birisi alp atɣučï bahādur erdi andaɣ kim hämɣāyasï yoq erdi*
       'Another one was a heroic archer, such that there was nobody on his level.' (52a)

(47) *bu söz γalat oxšar aniŋ üčün kim ikki qavmdïn ikki ittifāq birlä bir yerdä xan bolmaqï muškil turur*

'This opinion seems to be wrong because it is difficult to be king in one place with two alliances from two tribes.' (46a)

The complementizer can also be omitted as in the following two examples:

(48) *kördilär qorniŋ tašïnda tört özgä ṣūratlïy kišilär bašlarïnï qoyu salïp olturur erdi*

'They saw that outside the walls four persons with outlandish faces were sitting around, hanging their heads.' (48b)

(49) *qamïšnïŋ tübindä kördi bir yalaŋ terlik kiygän yigit sudïn čïqïp yüz töbän tüšüp ikki bükülüp qaltïray yatïp erdi*

'In the depth of the reed he saw that a naked young man, only clad with a light shirt, had come out of the water and was lying on his stomach shivering.' (55a)

A special case is seen in example (50), where the CC contains a question word, in this case *kim* 'who'. In spite of their formal similarity, the question word *kim* and the complementizer *ki(m)* are, of course, synchronically distinct in function.

(50) *bilsäm [...] kim xan boldï*

'May I know who became king.' (36b)

Occasionally, the CC contains a mood form (Modality$_2$, Rentzsch 2015) instead of an indicative:

(51) *bolγay kim ża'īfasï xaṭïrïnγa tüšüp aṭlanγay*

'Perhaps he will remember his wife and mount the horse.' (44b)

This construction overlaps with a frequent type of SoA-type CCs (see below, ex. 77–78, ex. 80). In the present case, however, there is a proposition 'he will remember his wife and mount the horse', which is evaluated for its truth value ('maybe'). Thus, it is an epistemic expression. The construction is typologically similar to English (maybe < may be) and relatively widespread in the Turkic languages; for an almost identical construction in the Middle Oghuz Dede Qorqud Oγuznāmäläri (*ola kim* + OPT), cf. Rentzsch 2011: 66, ex. (67).

Fully fledged epistemic items (Modality$_3$) are also attested in CCs with preceding CTP. In this example, *bolγay* functions as an enclitic epistemic marker:

(52) *ma'lūm turur kim [...] öz uruɣïn tamām qïrɣan bolɣay*
    'It is known that he must have killed his whole progeny.' (45b)

Finally, a few instances of imaginative or hypothetical constructions, involving the postposition *teg* 'like', occur as well in the text. In example (53) the CTP is the Persian element *gōyā* (originally the present participle of the *verbum dicendi guftan* but copied as a fossilized element into many Turkic languages), while example (54) contains the CTP *xayāl qïl-* 'to imagine'. Both examples represent propositions ('He had not been ill' and 'Heaven and earth collapse above us', respectively) transferred to a hypothetical world.

Table 2 summarizes the types of proposition-type CCs in ČN.

Table 2: Types of proposition-type complement clauses

Type	Structure	Examples
1a	<VN-POSS+CTP>	(25–30)
1b	<ekän-POSS+CTP>	(37)
2a	<VN-POSS-ACC+CTP>	(31–35)
2b	<ekän-POSS-ACC+CTP>	(38)
3	<VN-POSS-ABL+CTP>	(36)
4	<VN+CTP-POSS>	(40)
5a	<CTP+COMP+IND>	(41–47)
5b	<CTP+COMP+MOD2>	(51)
5c	<CTP+COMP+MOD3>	(52)
5d	<CTP+COMP+teg>	(53–54)
6a	<CTP+IND>	(48–49)
6b	<CTP+QW+IND>	(50)

SoA-type complement clauses (Class III)

As demonstrated above, in proposition-type CCs, non-finite complementation strategies of various designs compete with finite strategies, and in some domains, such as knowing and seeing, both non-finite and finite strategies are attested. In state of affairs-type CCs, where the complement does not have propositional value, an affinity to non-finite structures suggests itself. Such constructions are indeed frequently attested in ČN. However, there are also examples of SoA-type CCs with a finite verb form. These are generally Modality$_2$-items, specifically the optative in -*GAy* and the conditional in -*sA* (both inflectable for person), in one case also the voluntative 1.SG in -*(A)yIn* (ex. 79). In the constructions under discussion here, the original modal semantics of these items are bleached (i.e., -*GAy* no longer encodes a desire, and -*sA* no longer a condition) and their sole function is to subordinate the predicate of the CC to the CTP. This functional class of finite forms is commonly known as *subjunctive* (cf., e.g., Sandfeld 1930: 176), and in the typological formulation of this article it will be encoded as

SBJV, regardless of its origin as either conditional, optative, or voluntative.

The semantic fusion between CTP and the predicate of the CC can be quite advanced in SoA-type CCs and may result in mono-clausal structures, which are not considered CCs by all scholars. Such constructions often encode event modality or deontic modality (Modality$_1$ and Modality$_2$, respectively), actional or manipulative notions ('let', 'request'), commentative meanings ('easy'), etc., in which the CTP assumes the role of an auxiliary, but there are also less conventionalized, "arbitrary" types of miscellaneous governed SoAs. As mono-clausal and bi-clausal constructions are highly similar in the Turkic languages (sometimes, they differ just in the presence or absence of a possessive marker), mono-clausal constructions are included in this paper. It must be emphasized that the constructions considered here are highly heterogeneous in terms of semantics, degree of conventionalization, and morphosyntactic function, and deserve detailed investigation in separate studies. In this paper, the formal typology of the items attested in ČN is focused on. The non-finite strategies will be considered first.

Examples (55–58) contain verbal nouns unmarked for possession and case. Formally, the CCs represent the subject argument of the CPT. The combination *-mAK bol-* in example (55) is a grammaticalized marker of participant-external possibility (cf. van der Auwera & Plungian 1998; Rentzsch 2015: 103–104), while the item *-mAK keräk* in example (56) is a necessity marker, in this context with a deontic reading. Example (57) evaluates the CC as 'easy', whereas *-mAK kesil-* is a phasal marker denoting 'to stop' (*kesil-* 'to be cut off').

(55) *ešitmäk bilä ẕabṭ qïlmaq bolmas*
   'It is impossible to grasp it through hearing.' (37a)

(56) *bularnï söylämäkkä öltürmäk keräk*
   'Instead of talking, one should kill them.' (48b)

(57) *sen bizniŋ ičimizdä xan bolup bizgä baš bolsaŋ anï öltürüp andïn ačïyïmïznï almaq āsān turur*
   'If you become our king and lead us, it is easy to kill him and take our revenge.' (52b)

(58) *qara kiši xan bolmaq mundïn kesilsün*
   'It must stop now that ordinary people become king.' (47b)

The next five examples typify a similar structure with an additional possessive marker indicating the subject of the CC. In example (59), the predicate of the CC is a neutral, non-factual nominalization, marked by *-mAKlIK*. The possessive suffix agrees with the subject, *yayï*, which is marked with the genitive here. The CC fills the subject slot of the CTP *qal-* 'to remain'. While example (57) above contained a CTP denoting 'it is easy', the CTP in example

(60) (=ex. 47) conveys the meaning 'it is difficult'. The structural difference is that the possessive marker in example (60) refers to two (fictitious) persons mentioned in the preceding sentence. The CTP in (61) is *oxša-*, originally 'to be similar, to seem', here in the derived meaning 'to be appropriate'. The verbal noun *-mAK* in the CC is marked with the second person singular possessive to mark the addressee as its subject.

(59) *tā bu čaqγa tegrü ʿāṣī bilä yaγïniŋ qïlïč yalï bolmaqlïqï ol ǰihatdïn qalïpturur*
'The habit of insurgents and enemies being executed remains till this day for that reason.' (40a)

(60) *bu söz γalat oxšar anïŋ üčün kim ikki qavmdïn ikki ittifāq birlä bir yerdä xan bolmaqï muškil turur*
'This opinion seems to be wrong because it is difficult to be king in one place with two alliances from two tribes.' (46a)

(61) *muŋa el kün vilāyat berip öz qašïŋda saqlamaγïŋ oxšamaγay*
'It will be inappropriate that you give him people and a province and keep him at your side.' (40a)

In the section on propositional-type CCs above, we saw the factual verbal noun *-GAn* in the scope of *yoq* with the reading of an emphatic negative indicative. Examples (62–63), contrastingly, contain the verbal noun *-(V)r*, which must have developed a modal meaning by the time of writing of ČN. The construction with *yoq* renders an emphatic negative intentional reading ('we shall never/by no means').

(62) *särkäš qïlurïmïz yoq turur*
'We shall never revolt.' (46b)

(63) *munïŋ üčün ev elimizdän ǰalā'-i vaṭan bolurïmïz yoq turur*
'Thus, we shall never emigrate from our homes and our realm.' (46b)

The CTPs *päs qïl-* 'to stop', *bärṭaraf qïl-* 'to refrain from' and *oxšat-*, here 'to find appropriate' (the causative of *oxša-* mentioned in ex. 61) govern CCs with a verbal noun in the accusative. Note that both the non-factual VN *-mAK* and the modal VN *-(V)r* are attested in the examples, partly with the same CTP (ex. 66–67).

(64) *ol ḥālda sözlämäkni päs qïlγaysïz*
'In that case, you shall stop talking.' (43b)

(65) *soŋïya qayta keŋäš etip aṭlanurnï bärṭaraf qïldï*
    'Then he held council again and refrained from mounting the horses.' (58a)

(66) *qan bay häm bu sözni ešitip bašda aṭlanurnï oxšatïp erdi*
    'And Qan Bay heard these words and first found it appropriate to mount the horses.' (58a)

(67) *munuŋ yayïsïnï buzup ketmäkni özümgä oxšata almayman*
    'I do not find it appropriate for myself to destroy his enemies.' (58a)

An instance of a CC in the genitive case is seen in example (68). The CTP is marked with a possessive marker. This type of structure corresponds to a common Turkic genitive-possessive construction.

(68) *özgä oylanlarïndïn ayrïlïp yurtïnda bolmaqïnïŋ ǧihatï yuqarïda ḏikr qïlïptururbïz*
    'We have mentioned above the reason why he had separated from [Jochi Khan's] other sons and been in his own homeland.' (50b)

Among the examples with a VN in the dative, a grammaticalized permissive item *-mAKGA qoy-* 'to let somebody do something' occurs in example (69), while various modal and utterance predicates in examples (70–72) combine with *-(V)r* plus the dative, a bound complementizer also found in some modern languages such as Tatar, Khakas, etc.

(69) *tā rāstlïq bilä xalāyïqlar arasïnda ḥukm qïlïp [...] birbiringä ẓulm ziyādalïq qïlmaqya qoymayaylar*
    'That they shall rule among the creatures and not allow them to do too much injustice to one another.' (36a)

(70) *barčasïn maʿlūm qïlïp xāṭïrlarïnda saqlarya raybat qïlïp*
    'to desire to find out everything and store it in the memories.' (37a)

(71) *emdi siz meni xanlaturya yaxšï ʿahd vä šarṭ qïlsaŋïz maṣlaḥatïŋïzdïn čïqmayïn*
    'If you swear honestly to make me king, I shall conform to your advice.' (52b)

(72) *begim sačïnï qaraya boyadï xanya tegärgä mayl qïldï*
    'The lady dyed her hair black and intended to marry the king.' (53a)

A possessive marker is added in example (73) to indicate a subject different from that of

the CTP. *Ölär* is probably a verbal noun (lit. 'dying'), not a deverbal noun, in this example (in spite of its translation into English as 'death').

(73) *bizniŋ ölärimizgä sabab bolup qïyāmatɣa tegrü yaman atnï betiŋä alma*
'Do not cause our death and acquire a bad reputation until the Day of Judgement.' (52b)

A CTP governing the ablative (*maqṣūd* 'intended') is seen in the following example:

(74) *'ālam vä ādamnï yaratmaqdïn maqṣūd anïŋ ẕāt-i šarīf vä 'unṣūr-i laṭīfi erdi*
'The aim of creating the world and mankind was [the Prophet's] noble personality and charming origin.' (36a)

Most of the subjunctive constructions occurring in ČN contain the complementizer *ki(m)* between CTP and CC. The semantic notions encoded by these constructions include desiderative and manipulative notions ('wish', 'desire', 'request', ex. 75–77), moral evaluations (ex. 78–80), and necessity (ex. 81).

(75) *yārānlardïn iltimās oldur kim [...] nāgāh ägär xaṭāsï yā ɣalaṭï vāqi' bolmïš bolsa ɣalaṭnï čïqarïp xaṭāsïnï rāst qïlsalar*
'My request to my friends is that in case errors or mistakes have occurred, they correct them.' (37a–b)

(76) *tilär erdim ki [...] bilsäm [...] kim xan boldï*
'I wanted to know who became king.' (36b)

(77) *maŋa dā'iya ol erdi kim bularnïŋ aḥvālïdïn [...] bilsäm*
'It was my desire to find out their situation.' (36b)

(78) *maŋa nä oxšar ki xan bolɣayman*
'In how far it behoves me to become king?' (38a)

(79) *munāsib körmädük bu däftärdä bitilgäy*
'We did not find it appropriate to be written in this book.' (44b)

(80) *ravā bolɣay mu kim öz iyäm oɣlï turɣanda men xan bolayïn*
'Would it be appropriate that I become king while my own master has a son?' (47a)

(81) *emdi sizgä vāǧib turur kim musulmānlarniŋ bašïndïn dafʿ qïlɣaysïz*
'Now you must remove him from among the Muslims.' (49b)

The subjunctive constructions without complementizer particles seen in examples (82–83) encode necessity. In example (82), necessity takes a negation into its scope, producing the reading 'must not, shall not'. Note the similarity of the expressions in examples (81) and (83).

(82) *keräk erdi andaɣ qïlmasaŋïz*
'You should not have done so.' (46b)

(83) *bälī sizgä vāǧib turur bu kāfirni musulmānlar bašïndïn dafʿ qïlɣaysïz*
'Yes, you must remove this infidel from the vicinity of the Muslims.' (50a)

While the complementizer *ki(m)* requires a fixed word order, with the CTP preceding the CC, subjunctive constructions without complementizer are potentially less restricted in their word order. In many Turkic varieties, *keräk* 'necessary' combined with the conditional in *-sA* may (sometimes must) follow the CC (cf. Rentzsch 2015: 130–132). This word order is not attested for *keräk* in the ČN, but there is an occurrence of *-sA bol-*, a grammaticalized item encoding participant-external possibility, which is also widely attested throughout the Turkic languages (cf. Rentzsch 2015: 113–115). In this construction, the CTP commonly follows the CC.

(84) *läškärniŋ oŋï soŋï yetüšdi läškäriniŋ qïrïɣïn körsä bolmas erdi*
'The right side and the final part of the army came together; it was impossible to see the limit of the army.' (42b)

The attested structural types of SoA-type complement clauses are surveyed in Table 3.

Table 3: Types of SoA-type complement clauses

Type	Structure	Examples
1a	<VN+CTP>	(55–58)
1b	<VN-POSS+CTP>	(59–63)
2	<VN-ACC+CTP>	(64–67)
3	<VN-POSS-GEN+CTP-POSS>	(68)
4a	<VN-DAT+CTP>	(69–72)
4b	<VN-POSS-DAT+CTP>	(73)
5	<VN-ABL+CTP>	(74)
6	<CTP+COMP+SBJV>	(75–81)
7a	<CTP+SBJV>	(82–83)
7b	<SBJV+CTP>	(84)

Conclusions

The three major functional classes broadly related with clausal complementation investigated in this paper display a highly diverse picture even within Ötämiš Ḥāǰǰī's *Čingiz-nāmä*, which represents only a relatively short sample of a 16th century Middle Turkic idiolect. The investigation of further texts of Middle Qipchaq provenience and different Chaghatay varieties will certainly produce an even more colourful picture. The umbrella categories – embedded quotations (Class I), proposition-type complement clauses (Class II), and state of affairs-type complement clauses (Class III) – have been investigated by introducing abstract parameters – functional, morphological, and semantic categories – which produce abstract structural types that render the multitude of surface expressions comparable. This method establishes manageable inventories of types – roughly speaking nine types of embedded quotations, six types of proposition-type CCs, and seven types of SoA-type CCs. From the data we can infer that some possible types that are not attested in this text are coincidentally absent, such as, e.g., a type <VN-GEN+CTP-POSS> in Class III, which would fill a gap which distinguishes Type 3 from Type 1 and Type 4 of the same class, or a type <ekän-POSS-ABL+CTP>, which would complete Type 3 of Class II by analogy to Type 1 and Type 2, etc. Even so, we find some patterns which distinguish the three classes: The quotative particle *tep* is, not astonishingly, attested in Class I only; verbal nouns are most prolific in Class III but firmly established in Class II, too; in Class II, types involving a verbal noun mostly also contain a possessive marker, while in Class III possessive suffixes are more often dispensable as this class also includes same-subject constructions, etc. Two macro-types which are represented in all three classes are <CTP+COMP+CC> {I-6; II-5; III-6} and <CTP+CC> {I-3; II-6; III-7}. Interestingly, the type <CTP+COMP+CC>, one of the most pervasive types, is often considered alien to Turkic language structure.

It is also worth mentioning that direct speech is overwhelmingly more widespread in this text than indirect speech. The clearest example of indirect speech is example (35) (with the CTP *ayt-* 'to say'), while example (25) (with the CTP *maẕkūr* 'mentioned') and example (36) (with the CTP *xabardār* 'informed') are connected to the indirect communication of information in a broader sense, and in example (15) (with *ayt-*) and (16) (with *ḥukm qïl-*) it is not entirely clear whether it represents direct or indirect speech.

In the long run, it would be promising to investigate the individual types identified in this micro-study in a more comprehensive perspective – either synchronically or diachronically – and to try to find expected types unattested in ČN in other Middle Turkic varieties. Other interesting studies could depart from classes of complement taking predicates (such as perception verbs, modal CTPs, *verba dicendi et sentiendi*, etc.), and explore the complementation patterns found with them, and their semantic implications. The distribution of structural types, and of concrete morphological material (such as in VN+CASE combinations) throughout the Turkic languages is another research domain in which much is still to be explored. The study of Turkic morphosyntax still has many interesting topics to offer.

Abbreviations

ABL	Ablative
ACC	Accusative
CC	Complement clause
ČN	Čingiz-nāmä
COMP	Complementizer
CTP	Complement taking predicate
DAT	Dative
GEN	Genitive
IND	Indicative
MOD1	Modality$_1$
MOD2	Modality$_2$
MOD3	Modality$_3$
OPT	Optative
POSS	Possessive
QW	Question word
SBJV	Subjunctive
SG	Singular
SoA	State of affairs
VN	Verbal noun

References

Auwera, Johan van der & Plungian, Vladimir A. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79–124.

Aydemir, İbrahim Ahmet 2020. *Çağdaş Türk Dillerinde Altasıralama Stratejileri.* Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları.

Boye, Kasper 2012. *Epistemic meaning. A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 43.) Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Brockelmann, C. 1954. *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens.* Leiden: Brill.

Cristofaro, Sonia 2003. *Subordination.* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Dik, Simon C. ²1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The structure of the clause.* Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2006. Complement Clauses and complementation strategies in typological Perspective. In: Dixon, R.M.W. & Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (eds.). *Complementation. A cross-linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–48.

Erdal, Marcel 1998. On the verbal noun in -(y)Iş. In: İmer, Kâmile & Subaşı-Uzun, Leyla (eds.). *Doğan Aksan Armağanı.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, 53–68.

Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic.* (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8/3.) Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Ivanics, Mária 2017. *Hatalomgyakorlás a steppén. A Dzsingisz-náme nomád világa.* Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Törtténettudományi Intézet.

Johanson, Lars 1995. On Turkic converb clauses. In: Haspelmath, Martin & König, Ekkehard (eds.). *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms – adverbial participles, gerunds*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 313–347.

Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive. A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics.* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 18.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Judin, V.P. & Baranova, Ju.G. & Abuseitova, M.H. (eds.) 1992. *Utemiš-hadži. Čingiz-name. Faksimile, perevod, transkripcija, tekstologičeskie primečanija, issledovanie.* Alma-Ata: Gylym.

Kafalı, Mustafa 2009. *Ötemiş Hacı'ya göre Cuci Ulusu'nun Tarihi.* Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Kamalov, İlyas (ed.) 2009. *Ötemiş Hacı. Çengiz-nâme.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.

Kawaguchi, Takushi & Nagamine, Hiroyuki & Sugahara, Mutsumi (eds.) 2008. *Ötämiš Ḥāǰī. Čingīz-nāma. Introduction, annotated translation, transcription and critical text.* (Studia Culturae Islamicae 94.) Tōkyō: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Languages.

Kehayov, Petar & Boye, Kasper 2016. Complementizer semantics – an introduction. In: Boye, Kasper & Kehayov, Petar (eds.). *Complementizer semantics in European languages*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 57.) Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–11.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 2007. Verbal and nominalized finite clauses in Turkish. In: Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.). *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations.* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 305–332.

Nikolaeva, Irina (ed.) 2007. *Finiteness. Theoretical and empirical foundations.* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Noonan, Michael ²2007. Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.). Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. 2: Complex constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52–150.

Pamuk, Orhan 1990. *Kara Kitap.* Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Rentzsch, Julian 2011. Modality in the Dede Qorqud Oğuznameleri. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 64, 49–70.

Rentzsch, Julian 2015. *Modality in the Turkic languages. Form and meaning from a historial and comparative perspective*. (Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Turkvölker 18.) Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.

Sandfeld, Kristian 1930. *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats.* (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris 31.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.