

Contrastive Analysis of Temporal Converb Constructions between Turkish and Lezgian

Doğan BAYDAL¹ , Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Department of English Translation and Interpretation
doganbaydal@omu.edu.tr

Recommended citation: Baydal, D. (2025). Contrastive Analysis of Temporal Converb Constructions between Turkish and Lezgian. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 9(1), 1-14.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1538237>

Abstract: The aim of this contrastive study is to analyze temporal converb constructions between Turkish and Lezgian and it is a morphological analysis since it examines inflectional temporal converb constructions between two languages. The contrastive analysis involves three methodological steps: description, juxtaposition, and comparison and the analysis is based on the classifications of temporal converb constructions by Nedjalkov (1998) and Çetintaş Yıldırım (2004), namely, (i) simultaneity, (ii) anteriority and (iii) posteriority meaning relationships. The temporal converbial suffixes examined in this study are -(y)IncA (when), -DIğİ zaman (when), -DIğİndA (when), -(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as), -DIğİndAn beri (since), -DIktAn sonra (after), -mAdAn önce (before), -(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until), -ken (while) and -DıkÇA (whenever) in Turkish and -la (when), -walđi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as), -zamaz (as soon as), -daldı (before) and -daldı (until) in Lezgian. In terms of meaning relationships, the results of the study show that although Turkish and Lezgian employ same strategies in that both languages express three temporal relationships of anteriority, posteriority, and simultaneity for temporal converb constructions; the number of the suffixes and temporal meaning relationship parameters differ for these categories. In terms of morpho-syntactic relationships, the results of the study show that all converbial suffixes are added to the base verb segment in Turkish and they are attached to verb stems or participles in Lezgian. Moreover, temporal converbial suffixes may be simple and composite in both languages.

Keywords: *temporal converb clauses, contrastive morphology, syntax, Turkish, Lezgian*

INTRODUCTION

Contrastive analysis (CA) has been widely employed in both linguistics and language education (Yule, 2006; Fromkin et al., 2012). Krzeszowski (1990) states that when learning a new language, learners typically concentrate on the differences and are mostly unaware of the similarities. If they do notice any similarities, they often find them amusing and surprising, as such discoveries are generally unexpected. As well as learners, grammarians want to know what distinct language systems have in common. Krzeszowski (1990) defines contrastive linguistics “an area of linguistics in which a linguistic theory is applied to a comparative description of two or more languages, which need not be genetically or typologically related” (p.10). For instance, despite not being genetically related, Turkish and Arabic share many grammatical features, such as using an affixing system to convey different grammatical functions and having vowel harmony.

Chesterman (1998) states that all comparisons are based on the fundamental assumption that the objects being compared have some commonalities, which provide a basis for identifying differences. Krzeszowski (1990) defines this system as “*tertium comparationis*”. According to this system, any two or more objects can be compared based on various features, and consequently, they may be found to be similar in some aspects while differing in others. In terms of these features, *tertium*

¹ ORCID: [0000-0001-9392-4779](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9392-4779)

Submitted: 24.08.2024

Accepted: 09.02.2025



comparationis suggests that every aspect of language, at every level of organization, as well as every text and its components, can be compared with corresponding elements in another language (Willems et al., 2004). Thus, different types of contrastive studies can be identified based on the standard of comparison used and the type of equivalence considered. Krzeszowski (1990) states that formal correspondence and semantic equivalence can be used as the basis for comparison in specific types of contrastive studies, such as those focusing on syntax and morphology. For example, if only formal criteria are considered, English articles cannot be compared to anything in languages that lack articles.

Turkish and Lezgian share several morphosyntactic features commonly found in both Northern and South Asia, including extensive suffixing in agglutinating morphology, a consistent head-final word order, and the use of non-finite subordination. Both Turkish and Lezgian language systems have suffixing system in conveying temporal converb functions and the suffixing systems have semantic equivalence. Thus, morphological processes are contrasted in this study.

Contrastive Morphology

Crystal (2008) defines contrastive morphology as an approach within the field of linguistics that involves comparing the morphological systems of two or more languages. Although Hüning (2009) argues that word formation does not appear to be very popular in contrastive linguistics, recent literature does include contrastive studies of morphological phenomena (Lefer & Cartoni, 2011). Willems et al. (2004), for example, examines how the relationship between the meaning of suffixal forms of derived nouns in various languages can be compared. Other researchers take a similar approach, such as Van Goethem (2007), who compares French and Dutch preverbs both in terms of morpho-syntax and semantics, and Lefer and Cartoni (2011), who suggest a contrastive method based on meaning for examining prefixation in English, French, and Italian. Their approach seems to integrate the concepts of “semantic-syntactic equivalence” and “translational equivalence”, both of which are recognized forms of “*tertium comparationis*” in the established practice of CA. Gast (2008) adopts a slightly different approach by comparing verb-noun compounds in English and German, connecting the observed differences to both external language history (such as language contact) and internal linguistic factors. Gast’s contrastive analysis, therefore, incorporates system equivalence, which is defined as the relationship between paradigms that are comparable due to sharing a common grammatical label. In this study, morphological processes in the formation of temporal converb constructions of two languages are dealt with.

Temporal Converb Constructions

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) define converbs as “the subordinate verb forms that occur in non-finite adverbial clauses (p. 399). An example from Turkish is given in (1):

- (1) Kalabalık ol-duğumuz için bir ekmek daha al-mıştım.
crowded become-CONV one bread more buy-PERF-PST-1SG
'As there were going to be a lot of us, I had bought another bread.'

(Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, p. 400)

In example (1), converbial marker gives the meaning of reason. The clause which bears the converbial marker is subordinate clause while the clause which has the meaning of result is main clause. In his research on typological parameters of converbs, Nedjalkov (1995) identifies three primary types of converbs, with the first category being specialized converbs. These can be further divided into two categories: (i) temporal converbs and (ii) non-temporal converbs. The second category is contextual converbs, which can convey meanings like simultaneity, anteriority, posteriority, cause, concession, manner, accompanying circumstances, condition, goal, place, and more. The third type is narrative (coordinative) converbs. These converbs can describe three or more completed actions in sequence, helping to progress the narrative.



According to Banguoğlu (1995), temporal converbial endings are added to verbs in subordinate clauses to indicate a time relationship, thereby linking these clauses to the main clause. An example from Old Uyghur is given in (2):

- (2) Asak-ni ber-gınca bo yem-ni ye-zün
 donkey-ACC give-CONV this feed-ACC eat-3SG
 ‘Until someone gives the donkey back it will eat this.’

(Schulz, 1978, p. 127)

In example (2), the converbial ending is attached to the verb stem, connecting the subordinate clause to the main clause by indicating time relationship. Çetintaş Yıldırım (2004) talks about three categories of temporal relations. These are: (i) simultaneity, (ii) anteriority and (iii) posteriority relationships. In simultaneity relationship, a minimum of two events occurring simultaneously on the timeline is necessary. An example from Polish is given in (3):

- (3) Piszac te słowa, przyzomniała mi sie zeszloroczna rozmowa
 write-CONV these words remembered to.me self last.year conversation
 ‘While writing these words, I recall last year’s conversation.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 33)

In example (3), two events, namely “writing” and “recalling”, happen at the same time. In anteriority relationship, the action in the converb clause occurs prior to the action in the main clause. A related example from Lithuanian is given in (4) below:

- (4) Rut-ai isej-us is misk-o patekejo saule
 Ruta-DAT go.out-CONV from forest-GEN rose sun
 ‘When Ruta went out of the forest, the sun rose.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 33)

In example (4), the event in the main clause takes place right after the event in the converb clause. In anteriority relationship, the action in the converb clause occurs following the action in the main clause. An example from Nivkh is given in (5):

- (5) P’i vi-nə ənke ni tə k’e ov-d’ tvi-yət-nə-d’.
 self go.away-FUT before I this net repair finish-PERF
 ‘Before I go away, I will finish repairing this net.’

(Nedjalkov, 1995, p. 111)

In example (5), the subordinator clause denotes temporal antecedence. In other words, first the event in the subordinator clause happens and then the event in the main clause is realized.

In this contrastive analysis, the temporal converb constructions between Turkish and Lezgian are studied based on the classification of Nedjalkov (1995) and Çetintaş Yıldırım (2004).

Previous Research

In this section, different studies that contrast languages in terms of converb construction strategies are presented. Nedjalkov (1995) contrasts Russian and Turkmenian in terms of coordinative converbs and states that coordinative function of converbs is shared by Russian converbs and Turkmenian also has suffixes that gives this coordinative function for converbs. The Russian example in (6) below can be rendered in Turkmenian by means of four converbs in “-p” and a clause-final finite verb.



- (6) On posodel k dveri postučal, posmotrel, v zamočnucu
 He go.up-PST to door knock-PST look-PST in lock-POSS
 skvazinu postojal minuty dve da i tak i
 hole stay-PST minute two PST and thus also
 usel ni s čem.
 leave-PST NEG with what

(Nedjalkov, 1995, p. 98)

‘He went up to the door, knocked, looked through the keyhole, stood for about two minutes, and then went away without anything.’

- (7) Ol gapa jakynlas-yp gapa-ny dyrkyldat-yp gupun desegin-den
 he door approach-CONV door-ACC knock-CONV lock-GEN hole-ABL
 seredi-p bir iki minut tur-up xaç zatsyz git-di.
 look-CONV one two minute stand-CONV nothing without go.away-PST
 (Dimitriev, 1992, p. 401)

‘He went up to the door, knocked, looked through the keyhole, stood for about two minutes, and then went away without anything.’

It is clearly observed from (6) and (7) that this function of converbs from Russian and Turkmenian is like the function of the English conjunction “and” and sometimes “but”. Haspelmath (1995) contrasts Russian, Estonian and Lithuanian in terms of monofunctional or canonical converb construction and states that this type of converb is primarily represented by the Russian forms ending in “-a -v/-vsi”, the Estonian forms ending in “-des”, and the Lithuanian form ending in “-das”. A related example from Estonian is given in (8) below:

- (8) Ületa-des joge pöördus ratsanik ulati paremale.
 cross-CONV river turn-PST horseman always right
 ‘Crossing the river, the horseman always turned right.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 104)

It is seen in example (8) that the converbial ending is monofunctional and is not combined with another functions like participle, infinitive, gerund or finite verb as bifunctional converbs do. Bisang (1995) analyses verb serialization and converb constructions and contrasts Chinese and Yoruba in terms of functional areas and finds that coordination cannot be expressed through verb serialization in all serial languages. In Chinese, for example, verb serialization can be used to convey coordination and topicalization as can be seen in example (9) below:

- (9) Zhangsan ni gui-xia-lai qui
 Zhangsan you kneel-go.down-come beg
 ‘You knelt down in order to beg Zhangsan.’

(Bisang, 1995, p. 172)

In example (9), verb serialization is used to convey topicalization. In Yoruba, however, verb serialization cannot express coordination as it is seen in example (10) below:

- (10) Ayo se işu o si je e
 Ayo cook yam he and eat it
 ‘Ayo cooked yam and he ate it.’

(Bickel, 1991, p. 40)

Iefremenko et al. (2021) examine the development of adverbial subordination through converbs (verbal adverbs, adverbial participles) in Turkish as a heritage language in Germany and the



U.S. and contrast it with the use of Turkish in Turkey, where it is the majority language. The results of the study show that unlike in canonical Turkish, converbs in heritage Turkish can be multifunctional, allowing them to express both simultaneity and causality, for instance. Additionally, it is demonstrated that converbs in heritage Turkish can function as both modifying and non-modifying elements. A related example was given in (11) below.

- (11) Adam top-u el-in-den kaç-ır-ıp yol-a
 Man ball-ACC hand-POSS-3SG-ABL slip-CAUS-CVB road-DAT
 gid-iyo top.
 go-PROG-PRS(3SG) ball
 ‘The man lets the ball slip from his hands and the ball goes on the road.’
 (Iefremenko et al., 2021, p. 145)

As it is seen in example (11), although the converb construction “-ıp” was described as a (post) terminal, non-modifying converb in the literature, it is used in the modifying function in heritage language. The potential factors contributing to this variation include language contact, sociolinguistic differences between speaker communities in Germany and the U.S., and the age of the speakers.

The examples from different studies that contrast languages in terms of converb construction strategies show that there may be minor and major differences in terms of morpho-syntactic strategies in conveying converb constructions.

Aims of the Study

The aim of this study is to contrast Turkish and Lezgian in terms of the temporal converb constructions (by referring to simultaneity, anteriority and posteriority temporal meaning relationships) and analyze the temporal converb constructions by referring to three methodological steps of contrastive analysis, namely description, juxtaposition and comparison.

Research Questions

As it was stated earlier, languages employ various parameters for converb constructions (ranging from specialized converbs to contextual converbs and narrative converbs) and these parameters have different classifications. In this study, particular attention is paid to the specialized converbs, namely, temporal converb constructions and the research questions that guide the present study are in accordance with the purpose of the study:

1. What are the temporal converb construction strategies of Turkish and Lezgian?
2. How is the correspondence between the items being compared?

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Contrastive studies involve three methodological steps: *description*, *juxtaposition*, and *comparison*. The description step involves selecting the items to be compared and providing an initial characterization of these items using a language-independent theoretical framework. Juxtaposition entails searching for and identifying cross-linguistic equivalents. In the comparison phase, the degree and type of correspondence between the compared items are determined. The temporal converbial suffixes examined in this study are -(y)IncA (when), -DIğI zaman (when), -DIğIndA (when), -(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as), -DIğIndAn beri (since), -DIktAn sonra (after), -mAdAn önce (before), -(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until), -ken (while) and -Dıkça (whenever) in Turkish. These suffixes were taken from the classifications of Kornfilt (1997), Göksel and Kerslake (2005) and Akkuş (2019). In Lezgian, the temporal converbial suffixes -la (when), -walđi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as), -



zamaz (as soon as), -daldi (before) and -daldi (until) are examined. They were taken from the classification of Haspelmath (1995) on temporal specialized converbs.

Description

In this step, temporal converb constructions in Turkish and Lezgian are described.

As it was stated earlier, there are many classifications of temporal converb constructions. Banguoğlu (1995) classifies the temporal converbial endings into seven categories based on their meaning relationships, namely, (i) successive, (ii) temporal, (iii) simultaneity, (iv) initial, (v) limitation, (vi) anteriority and (vii) posteriority converbs. Nedjalkov (1998) divides temporal converb clauses into three categories, with the first group indicating a relationship of simultaneity, the second group indicating a relationship of anteriority and the third group indicating a relationship of posteriority. Kortmann (1998) categorizes temporal converbial constructions into seven types based on the semantic space of inter-clausal relationships. These categories are (i) simultaneity overlap, (ii) simultaneity duration, (iii) simultaneity co-extensiveness, (iv) anteriority, (v) immediate anteriority, (vi) terminus a quo and (vii) posteriority. Çetintaş Yıldırım (2004) holds the same view as Nedjalkov (1998) in classifying temporal converb constructions. She refers to three categories related to temporal relations, namely, (i) simultaneity, (ii) anteriority and (iii) posteriority relationships.

The *simultaneity* relationship requires at least two events occurring simultaneously on the timeline. In Turkish, this relationship is expressed through the converbial suffixes -ken (while), -DIĞİ zaman (when), -DIĞİnDA (when), and -DİKÇA (whenever). Examples (12), (13), (14) and (15) below show the simultaneity relationship.

- (12) Okul-a gider-ken arkadaş-ım-ı gör-dü-m.
 school-DAT go-CONV school-POSS see-PST-1SG
 ‘While I was going to school, I saw my friend.’
- (13) Zil çal-dığı zaman öğrenci-ler dışarı çık-ıyor-du
 bell ring-CONV student-PL out go-PROG-PST
 ‘When the bell rang, the students were going out.’
- (14) İş-e başla-dığında Samsun-da yaşı-yor-du.
 work-DAT start-CONV Samsun-LOC live-PROG-PST
 ‘When he/she started working, he/she was living in Samsun.’
- (15) Yemek ye-dikçe kilo al-ır-ım.
 food eat-CONV weight put.on-PRS-1SG
 ‘Whenever I eat food, I put on weight.’

In examples (12), (13), (14) and (15), the events in the subordinate clause happen at the same time with the events in the main clauses.

In the *anteriority* relationship, the event in the converb clause occurs before the event in the main clause. In Turkish, this relationship is expressed through the converbial suffixes -(y)InCA (when), -DIĞİnDA (when), -DIĞİ zaman (when), -(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as), -DIĞİnDAn beri (since) and -DIktAn sonra (after). Examples (16), (17), (18), (19), (20) and (21) below show the anteriority relationship.

- (16) Öğrenci-ler gid-ince okul bomboş kal-dı.



- Student-PL go-CONV school empty remain-PST
‘When the students went, the school remained empty.’
- (17) Yemek bit-tiğinde içeri gir-di-k.
Meal finish-CONV inside go-PST-1PL
‘When the meal finished, we went inside.’
- (18) Okul-lar kapan-dığı zaman güney-e git-ti.
School-PL close-CONV south-DAT go-PST-3SG
‘When the schools were closed, he/she went to the south.’
- (19) Tatil bit-er bit-mez memleket-i-ne geri dön-ecek.
holiday finish-CONV hometown-POSS-DAT back turn-FUT-3SG
‘As soon as the holiday finishes, he/she will turn back to his hometown.’
- (20) Ev-e gel-diğinden beri bir şey ye-mi-yor.
home-DAT come-CONV anything eat-NEG-PROG-3SG
‘He/she has not been eating anything since he/she came home.’
- (21) El-ler-in-i yıka-dıktan sonra yemek yi-yebilir-sin.
hand-PL-ACC wash-CONV meal eat-AUX
‘You can eat meal after you wash your hands.’

Examples from (16) to (21) show that the main clause event happens after the converb clause event.

In the *posteriority* relationship, the event in the converb clause takes place after the event in the main clause. In Turkish, this relationship is expressed through the converbial constructions - Dıġında (when), -Dıġı zaman (when), -mAdAn önce (before) and -(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until). Examples (22), (23), (24) and (25) below show the posteriority relationship.

- (22) Sınıf-a gir-diğimde sınav başla-mış-tı.
class-DAT enter-CONV exam start-PFV-PST
‘When I entered the classroom, the exam had started.’
- (23) Müdür deġiş-tiği zaman o çoktan iş-ten ayrıl-mış-tı.
manager change-CONV he/she already work-ABL leave-PFV-PST
‘When the manager changed, he/she had already left the job.’
- (24) Araba-yı çalıştır-madan önce lastik-ler-i kontrol et-ti-m.
car-ACC start-CONV tire-PL-ACC check-PST-1SG
‘Before I started the car, I had checked the tires.’
- (25) Abi-m ev-e gel-inceye kadar heyecan-dan uyuya-ma-dı-m.
brother-GEN home-DAT come-CONV excitement-ABL sleep-NEG-PST-1SG
‘I couldn’t sleep because of excitement until my brother came.’

In examples (22), (23), (24) and (25) first the event in the main clause is realized and then the event in the subordinate clause happens.



from.among throw-FUT

‘As soon as patience runs over the vessel, the people take the bad person and expel him/her from among them.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 429)

Example (30) shows that the suffix -zamaz is added to the imperfective stem form of the verb.

In examples (27), (28), (29) and (30), the action in the converb clause occurs prior to the action in the matrix clause.

The *posteriority* relationship in Lezgian is expressed through the converbial suffix -daldi (before/until). The meaning of the converb may change depending on the aspect of the main clause. When the main clause is either durative or negative, it indicates ‘until’ as it can be seen in example (31) below:

- (31) Dide Anni-di gülü-z fi-daldi muallimwil-e k’walax-na
 mother Anni-ERG husband-DAT go-PTCP-CONV teachership work-AOR
 ‘My mother Anni worked as a teacher until she got married.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 429)

When the main clause is completed, it indicates ‘before’ as it can be seen in examples (32) and (33) below:

- (32) Siw-aj gadr-aj cük’ündi-kaj çilel awat-daldi murk že-daj.
 mouth throw-PTCP spittle earth fall-CONV ice become-FUT-PST
 ‘Spittle thrown out of the mouth turned into ice before falling on the ground.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 429)

- (33) Wun xkwe-daldi wilik-ni zun sa sumud-ra ata-j-di ja
 you return-CONV before-also I one several-times come-AOR COP
 ‘I also came several times before you returned.’

(Haspelmath, 1995, p. 429)

In examples (31), (32) and (33), the action in the converb clause occurs after the action in the matrix clause.

Juxtaposition

In this step, cross-linguistic equivalents between Turkish and Lezgian temporal converb constructions are identified. Table 1 below shows the temporal converb construction strategies in Turkish and Lezgian.

Table 1. Temporal converb construction strategies in Turkish and Lezgian

	Turkish	Lezgian
Simultaneity	-ken (while)	
Relationship	-DIğI zaman (when)	-la (when)
	-DIğIndA (when)	
	-DıkçA (whenever)	



Anteriority Relationship	-(y)IncA (when)	-la (when)
	-DIđI zaman (when)	-walđi (as soon as)
	-DIđIndA (when)	-namaz(di) (as soon as)
	-(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as)	-zamaz (as soon as)
	-DIđIndAn beri (since)	
	-DIktAn sonra (after)	
Posteriority Relationship	-DIđI zaman (when)	-daldı (before)
	-DIđIndA (when)	-daldı (until)
	-mAdAn önce (before)	
	-(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until)	

It is clearly seen from Table 1 that simultaneity, anteriority and posteriority relationships for temporal converbial constructions are employed by both languages. In the next step, namely the comparison step, the detailed comparison of the table is provided.

Comparison

In this step, the *degree* and *type* of the correspondence between the items being compared are defined. The *degree* parameter indicates the number of structures to be compared, while the *type* parameter refers to the category of these structures.

In terms of *degree*, Turkish and Lezgian have same strategies in employing three temporal meaning relationships, namely, anteriority, posteriority and simultaneity. However, they significantly vary in the number of suffixes they employ in presenting these relationships. In simultaneity relationship, there are four converbial suffixes (-ken (while), -DIđI zaman (when), -DIđIndA (when), and -DıkçA (whenever)) in Turkish and just one converbial suffix (-la (when)) in Lezgian. In anteriority relationship, there are six converbial suffixes (-(y)IncA (when), -DIđIndA (when), -DIđI zaman (when), -(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as), -DIđIndAn beri (since) and -DIktAn sonra (after)) in Turkish while there are four converbial suffixes (-la (when), -walđi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as) and zamaz (as soon as)) in Lezgian. In posteriority relationship, there are four converbial suffixes (-DIđIndA (when), -DIđI zaman (when), -mAdAn önce (before) and -(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until)) in Turkish while there are two converbial suffixes (-daldı (before) and -daldı (until)) in Lezgian.

Regarding another parameter, *type*, it can be said that Turkish and Lezgian are similar because both languages use suffixes in presenting temporal converb constructions. However, they differ in the specific types of some inflectional temporal converb constructions.

The first comparison in *type* parameter is presented in terms of meaning relationships as it was shown in Table 1. In simultaneity meaning relationship, the situation in which the main clause is or was ongoing at the time the event in the subordinate clause occurs or occurred is expressed by converbial suffixes -DIđI zaman (when) and -DIđIndA (when) in Turkish while it is expressed by -la (when) in Lezgian. The situation in which there is temporal overlap between the main clause and the subordinate clause is expressed by the suffix -ken (while) in Turkish while it is not expressed as a specialized temporal converbial suffix in Lezgian. For this temporal overlap in Lezgian, the imperfective verb, indicated by the suffix “-z” conveys a sense of temporal overlap between the subordinate clause and the main clause. (Haspelmath, 1995). The situation in which there is a repetition relationship between the main clause and the subordinate clause is expressed by the suffix -DıkçA (whenever) in Turkish while it is not expressed as a specialized temporal converbial suffix in Lezgian. For repetition relationship in Lezgian, the manner of the main clause event convey this meaning.

In anteriority meaning relationship, the situation in which the onset of the main clause coincides with the end of the subordinate clause is expressed by the converbial suffixes -(y)IncA



(when), -DIğIndA (when) and -DIğI zaman (when) in Turkish while it is expressed by converbial suffix *la* (when) in Lezgian. The situation in which there is immediate occurrence of the action described in the main clause is expressed by the converbial suffix -(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as) in Turkish while it is expressed by the converbial suffixes -waldi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as) and zamaz (as soon as) in Lezgian. The situation in which there is a relationship indicating the starting point for the predicate in the main clause is expressed by the converbial suffix -DIğIndAn beri (since) in Turkish while it is not expressed as a specialized temporal converbial suffix in Lezgian. The situation which conveys pure anteriority of the converb clause is expressed by the converbial suffix -DIktAn sonra (after) in Turkish while it is not expressed as a specialized temporal converbial suffix in Lezgian.

In posteriority meaning relationship, the situation in which aspectual properties of the main clause give the meaning relationship of posteriority is expressed by the converbial suffixes -DIğIndA (when) and -DIğI zaman (when) in Turkish while such kind of aspectual properties of the main clause does not express posteriority relationship in Lezgian specialized converb constructions. The situation which conveys pure posteriority of the converb clause is expressed by the converbial suffix -mAdAn önce (before) in Turkish while it is expressed by the converbial suffix -daldi (before) in Lezgian. The situation which gives the meaning relationship of “up to the event” in the subordinate clause is expressed by the converbial suffix -daldi (before) in Lezgian while it is not expressed by a single suffix but by a morpheme and a postposition, namely, -(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until) in Turkish.

The second comparison in *type* parameter is presented in terms of morpho-syntactic relationships. Table 2 below shows the morpho-syntactic relationships in temporal converb clauses in both languages.

Table 2. Morpho-syntactic relationships in temporal converb clauses in Turkish and Lezgian

	Turkish	Lezgian
Converbial suffixes that are attached to base segments	-ken (while)	
	-DIğI zaman (when)	
	-DIğIndA (when)	
	-DıkçA (whenever)	
	-(y)IncA (when)	-
	-(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as)	
	-DIğIndAn beri (since)	
	-DIktAn sonra (after)	
	-mAdAn önce (before)	
	-(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until)	
Converbial suffixes that are attached to verb stems or participles		-la (when)
		-waldi (as soon as)
		-namaz(di) (as soon as)
	-ken (while)	-zamaz (as soon as)
		-daldi (before)
	-daldi (until)	

Johanson (1995) provides an in-depth analysis of converb constructions in Turkish, noting that “the converb segment is a non-finite unit that is structurally subordinate to a base segment” (p. 313). As it is seen in Table 2, all converbial suffixes in Turkish are attached to the base verb segment which was exemplified from (12) to (25). The only converb that can be added on finite verbs is -ken (while) on positive and negative versions of the aorist. In Lezgian, however, converbial suffixes are attached to verb stems or participles (Haspelmath, 1995). The suffix -la (when) is not directly attached to the verb stem but instead is added to imperfective, future, aorist, or perfect participles. The posterior converb -daldi (before/until) is attached to the imperfective stem of a verb as it is seen in examples (31) and (32). The suffix -waldi (as soon as) is added to the verb’s aorist participle form, which is



exemplified in (28). The suffix *-namaz(di)* (as soon as) is added to the verb's aorist stem form as it is seen in example (29). The suffix *-zamaz* (as soon as) is added to the verb's imperfective stem form as it is seen in example (30).

As well as the attachments of the temporal converbial suffixes to the segments, the verbal marking of non-finite converbial clauses varies significantly in form (Kornfilt, 1997). Table 3 below shows the verbal marking in temporal converb clauses in both languages.

Table 3. Verbal marking in temporal converb clauses in Turkish and Lezgian

	Turkish	Lezgian
Distinct Converbial suffixes	-ken (while)	-la (when)
	-DIğIndA (when)	-waldi (as soon as)
	-DıkçA (whenever)	-namaz(di) (as soon as)
	-(y)IncA (when)	-zamaz (as soon as)
Composite Converbial suffixes	-DIğI zaman (when)	
	-(A/I) r...-mAz (as soon as)	
	-DIğIndAn beri (since)	-daldi (before)
	-DIktAn sonra (after)	
	-mAdAn önce (before)	
	-(y)IncAyA kadar / dek (until)	

As it is seen in Table 3, in Turkish, *-ken* (while), *-DIğIndA* (when), *-DıkçA* (whenever) and *-(y)IncA* (when) are distinctively converbial suffixes and attached directly to the verb. However, in other instances, the converbial marker is a composite element composed of a multifunctional subordinator, like “-mAK” or “-DIK,” followed by a case marker and/or a postposition or nominal form. In *-DIğI zaman* (when), the converbial marker is a composite element, comprising a subordinator followed by a postposition. *(A/I)r...-mAz* (as soon as) can be described as a compound structure made up of the singular aorist form of a verb directly followed by the negated version of that same verb. The converbial marker *-DIğIndAn beri* (since) is a composite unit, made up of a subordinator followed by a postposition. *DIktAn sonra* (after) is followed by the postposition “sonra (after)” compulsorily. *-mAdAn önce* (before) is made up of the ablative marker “-dAn” and the morpheme “-mA,” and may optionally be followed by the postposition “önce (before)”. *-(y)IncAyA kadar / dek* (until) is made up of a subordinator followed by a postposition. In Lezgian, the converbial suffixes *-la* (when), *-waldi* (as soon as), *-namaz(di)* (as soon as), *-zamaz* (as soon as) and *-daldi* (until) are distinctively converbial suffixes and attached directly to the segments. However, “before” meaning of the converbial suffix *-daldi* can be emphasized by additionally using the postposition “wilik” which means “before” (Haspelmath, 1995). This usage is exemplified in (33) above.

CONCLUSION

As mentioned above, the aim of this study is to contrast Turkish and Lezgian in terms of the temporal converb constructions. In order to achieve the aim of the study, a contrastive analysis was carried out with the steps of description, juxtaposition and comparison. Based on the findings of the study, the research questions are answered as follows.

1. What are the temporal converb construction strategies of Turkish and Lezgian?

In terms of simultaneous meaning relationship, Turkish has the temporal converbial suffixes; *ken* (while), *-DIğI zaman* (when), *-DIğIndA* (when) and *-DıkçA* (whenever). In anteriority meaning relationship, it has the temporal converbial suffixes; *-(y)IncA* (when), *-DIğI zaman* (when), *-DIğIndA* (when), *-(A/I) r...-mAz* (as soon as), *-DIğIndAn beri* (since) and *-DIktAn sonra* (after). In posteriority meaning relationship, it has the temporal converbial suffixes; *-DIğI zaman* (when), *-DIğIndA* (when) - *mAdAn önce* (before) and *-(y)IncAyA kadar / dek* (until). In Lezgian, simultaneous meaning relationship is conveyed through the temporal converbial suffix; *-la* (when). Anteriority meaning



relationship is conveyed through the temporal converbial suffixes; -la (when), -walđi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as) and -zamaz (as soon as). Posteriority meaning relationship is conveyed through the temporal converbial suffixes; -daldı (before) and -daldı (until).

2. How is the correspondence between the items being compared?

In terms of *degree*, Turkish and Lezgian employ same strategies in that both languages express three temporal relationships of anteriority, posteriority, and simultaneity. However, the number of the temporal converbial suffixes differ. In Turkish, there are four suffixes expressing simultaneity, six suffixes expressing anteriority and four suffixes expressing posteriority. In Lezgian, there is just one suffix expressing simultaneity, four suffixes expressing anteriority and two suffixes expressing posteriority. In terms of *type* in meaning relationships, temporal ongoing parameter in simultaneity meaning relationship is employed by both languages while temporal overlap and temporal repetition parameters in simultaneity meaning relationship are employed just by Turkish. Onset coinciding and immediate anteriority parameters in anteriority meaning relationship are employed by both languages while starting point parameter and pure anteriority parameter are only employed by Turkish temporal converb constructions. Pure posteriority and until parameters in posteriority meaning relationship are employed by both languages, while aspectual properties denoting posteriority is employed just by Turkish. In terms of *type* in morpho-syntactic relationships; in Turkish, all converbial suffixes are added to the base verb segment while in Lezgian, converbial suffixes are attached to verb stems or participles. Moreover, the temporal suffixes; -ken (while), -DIđIndA (when), -DıkçaA (whenever), and -(y)IncA (when) in Turkish and -la (when) -walđi (as soon as), -namaz(di) (as soon as), -zamaz (as soon as), -daldı (before) and -daldı (until) are simple forms and are directly attached to the verb; -DIđİ zaman (when), -(A/D)r...-mAz (as soon as), -DIđIndAn beri (since), DIktAn sonra (after) and -mAdAn önce (before) temporal converbial suffixes in Turkish and -daldı wilik (before) converbial suffix in Lezgian are composite elements composed of a multifunctional subordinator and followed by a case marker and/or a postposition or nominal form.

This study reveals that although Turkish and Lezgian belong to different language families, both Turkish and Lezgian language systems have suffixing system in conveying temporal converb functions and the suffixing systems have semantic equivalence. Comparative studies serve as valuable resources in foreign language teaching. Challenges in learning a foreign language often stem from structural differences absent in the learner's native language. Such studies, which analyze and compare languages, provide support to both educators and learners of a foreign language.

REFERENCES

- Akkuş, M. (2019). *A usage-based investigation of converbial constructions in heritage speakers' Turkish living in the Netherlands* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Middle East Technical University.
- Banguođlu, T. (1995). *Türkçenin Grameri*. Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Bickel, B. (1991). *Typologische Grundlagen der Satzverkettung*. Zurich.
- Bisang, W. (1995). Verb serialization and converbs--differences and similarities. In Martin Haspelmath and Ekkehard König, eds., *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms*, 137-88. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chesterman, A. (1998). *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781444302776>
- Çetintaş Yıldırım, F. (2004). *Türkçe zaman ulaçlarının sözdizim ve anlambilim çözümlemesi* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Mersin University.
- Dimitriev, N. (1992). *The Structure of the Turkic Languages*. Moskva: Izdatel'stwo Akademii Nauk.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. M., Collins, P., Amberber, M., & Cox, F. (2012). *An Introduction to language*. (7th ed.) Cengage Learning.



- Gast, V. (2008). Verb-noun compounds in English and German. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 56(3), 269-282. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zaa.2008.56.3.269>
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Haspelmath, M. (1995). The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.227108>
- Hüning, M. (2009). Semantic niches and analogy in word formation. *Languages in Contrast*, 9(2), 183–201. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.9.2.01hun>
- Iefremenko, K., Schroeder, C., & Kornfilt, J. (2021). Converbs in heritage Turkish: A contrastive approach. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 44(2), 130–154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0332586521000160>
- Johanson, L. (1995). On Turkic converb clauses. In *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (pp. 313-348). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463-010>
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. Routledge, London
- Kortmann, B. (1998). The Evolution of Adverbial Subordinators in Europe. In M. S. Schmid, J. R. Austin, & D. Stein (Eds.), *Historical Linguistics 1997: Selected papers from the 13th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Dusseldorf, 10–17 August 1997* (p. 213). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.164.15kor>
- Krzeszowski, T. (1990). *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110860146>
- Lefer, M., & Cartoni, B. (2011). Prefixes in contrast. *Languages in Contrast*, 11(1), 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.11.1.07lef>
- Nedjalkov, V. P. (1995). Converbs: Control and interpretation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24(4), 433–450. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)00060-R](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00060-R)
- Nedjalkov, I. V. (1998). 7 Converbs in the languages of Europe. In *De Gruyter eBooks* (pp. 421–456). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110802610.421>
- Schulz, P. (1978). *Verbalnomina und Konverbien als adverbiale Ergänzungen im Alttürkischen*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen.
- Van Goethem, K. (2007). French and Dutch preverbs in contrast. *Languages in Contrast*, 7(1), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.7.1.05van>
- Willems, D., Defrancq, B., Coleman, T., & Noel, D. (2004). Contrastive analysis in language: identifying linguistic units of comparison. In *Palgrave Macmillan eBooks*. <http://nowparast.persianguig.com/document/Contrastive%20Analysis/Contrastive%20Analysis%20in%20Language.pdf>
- Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

