

## ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ

УДК 811.512.161

Viktor G. Guzev, Özlem Deniz Yılmaz

SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD (THOUGHT-MOOD) IN TURKISH<sup>1</sup>

As well known, *judgement* is a way of thinking which is composed of two components, namely *logical subject* and *logical predicate*. *Logical subject* is an image and projection of object that was discussed about and “judgement component reflecting the topic of the idea” [1, p. 503]. *Logical predicate* is an image encompassing knowledge; a knowledge/a claim that was claimed (either validated or negated) about logical subject in the judgement [see 1, p. 413]. On the other hand, judgement can be expressed by two methods in the languages: words representing logical subject (ls) and logical predicate (lp) [for example *Hava* (ls) / *sıcak* (lp) “Weather is hot”; *Yedi* (ls) / *beşten büyük* (lp) “Seven is greater than five” etc.] (lexical method) or by means of a specific morphological form [*Sıcaktır* “It is hot”; *Sıcaktı* “It was hot”; *Geldim* “I came” etc. (In these examples, logical subject is expressed by personal endings while logical predicate is expressed by stem)] (morphological method) [2, p. 135]. We define noun or verb forms that express the judgement by morphological method similar to the examples shown above as *finite verbs* [For example see 3, p. 36–42; 4, p. 189–194; 5, p. 18–19; 6, p. 37–38 for the concept of *finite form*].

If we refer to the language means representing the judgement by morphological method as depicted above, then the meaning of each finite form would be “abstract image/design encompassing the judgement (logical subject + logical predicate) model.” The primary function of finite forms is to express this meaning. However, the sole categorical meaning of finite forms is not confined to “judgement image”. The abovementioned forms also have meanings of “modality,” “tense” or some of them carry meanings of “manner of action” and “aspect” in addition to this common categorical meaning [2, p. 135]. Therefore, the second-

---

Дениз Йылмаз Озлем Сабриевна — и.о. доцента, Институт тюркологических исследований Мраморноморского университета (Стамбул, Турция); e-mail: ozlemyilmaz\_spb@hotmail.com; ozlem.yilmaz@marmara.edu.tr

Гузов Виктор Григорьевич — профессор, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет; e-mail: vgguzev@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised version of the paper presented at 7<sup>th</sup> International Turkic Languages Congress (24–28 September 2012, Bilkent Hotel and Conference Center, Ankara, Turkey).

© Viktor G. Guzev, Özlem Deniz Yılmaz, 2013

ary function of these finite forms is that they express modality, tense, manner of action, aspect etc.

One of the secondary functions of finite forms, as expressed above, is to articulate the meanings of modality.

*Modality* is a conceptual category that expresses the character of objective relations reflected in the utterance content along with the character of the connection between the utterance content and reality [See 7, p. 192, 198, 200]. In addition, *modality* is a conceptual category that reflects the speaker's attitude and perception on the content of the utterance and it is described through different kinds of morphological and lexical means such as modal word [See 8; 9; 10], particle, syntactic structure, intonation, word order, and mood [See 11, p.237; 12; 13, p.3; 14, p. 307–308; 15, p. 14, 15, 19–24, 70–72, 83–105, 142–147. Also see 16; 17; 18].

While, the term of modality is mostly used to articulate the concepts mentioned above, linguists generally consider concepts such as “command”; “volition” that can express senses/nuances (thought images/units) (Russ. *smysl*)<sup>2</sup> of wish, intent, invitation, call, order, request, desire etc.; “being able to do something”; “condition”; “the necessity of the action”; “the conditions when the action could have potentially happened but actually did not occur”, namely “unrealized possibility”<sup>3</sup> [7, p. 191] as modality [For example cf. 7, p. 178, 191, 199–200].

*Mood* is a verb grammar category that reflects the speaker's attitude on the utterance content [See 20, p.312; 14, p.312], and the connection between the action represented by the verb and reality in the eyes of the speaker [21, p.321]. In other words, *mood* is a verb grammar category having a concrete meaning of modality [5, p.54]. According to V. V. Vinogradov, *mood* is the expression of modality by grammatical method [Cited by 21, p. 321]. The literature makes a distinction between two types of moods: *direct (indicative)* and *indirect (oblique moods)*. Indicative mood that informs that the utterance content overlaps with reality and that there is an accord between the utterance content and reality is a *direct mood*. In other words, indicative expresses that the action (situation, process) represented by the verb stem, happened, happens, or will happen as perceived by the speaker. Moods other than indicative, also named as *oblique moods* such as (imperative, optative, conditional, debitive, subjunctive etc.) are categorized as *indirect moods* [11, p. 248–249].

The *subjunctive mood* is defined by terms such as *Konjunktiv*, *Subjunktiv* in German, *subjonctif* in French and *soslagatel'noye nakloneniye* in Russian. The subjunctive mood is an indirect mood showing that “the utterance content does not correspond to reality” [See 11, p.249]. In principle, this mood refers to situations of hypothetically unreal actions or unreal actions concerning the possibility of the action at a particular situation or mood of compromise as perceived by the speaker and unreal actions as a wish (unreal wish) [See 22, p.58]. In short, *subjunctive mood* is a verb conjugational category that articulates that the action has not come into effect in reality while it should have happened or it was possible and probable to have occurred through morphological method [5, p.35].

---

<sup>2</sup> See [19, p. 253–258, 267–290] for an explanation of the represented concept and term.

<sup>3</sup> We are in the opinion that V.Z. Panfilov's statement of *neosushchestvishayasya vozmojnost'* “unrealized possibility” (Turk. “gerçekleş(tiril)memiş olanak”) in regards to the definition of the abovementioned mood can correspond to the usage of this mood defined as generally subjunctive mood in Western languages in Turkish.

World languages make use of the language means expressing the meaning of modality where the utterance content does not correspond to reality and use these forms in their grammars. This fact led some Turkic language researchers (primarily D. M. Nasilov [23, p. 14–15] and then researchers such as V. G. Guzev [24, p. 96], N. E. Gadjaxmedov [22] etc.) to search for language units bearing similar meanings in Turkic languages. Accordingly, these studies helped pave the way for the discussion, investigation, and recognition of these abovementioned forms that had not been previously discussed in Turkic language grammars.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, this article aims to render a contribution to the recognition of the concept/meaning of “subjunctive” in addition to the recognition of subjunctive mood forms bearing this modality meaning in Turkish.

Morphemes bearing the meaning of subjunctive mood in Turkish are as follows:  $-(E/\acute{I})r\ idi$  (1) [its negative form  $-mEz\ idi$  (2)] and  $-(y)EcEk\ idi$  (3):

- (1) *Hangisini istesem, evvelâllah, ayağımın altına al-ır, evire çevire tepelıyebil-irdi-m.* [26, p. 5] “Whichever one I wanted, I could have trashed it soundly.” (This sentence aims to express the opposite of the action: In other words, in reality “I did not trash it soundly.”).
- (2) *Bu iyiliğın nasıl yapılacağını bilseydin, bu kadar çok iyilik yapmak iste-mezdi-n.* [27, p. 62] “If you had known how to make this favor, you would not have wanted to make a favor this much.” (“But you wanted.”).
- (3) *Teyzem, bu dakikada bana bir tatlı kelime söylemiş olsaydı, hafifçe yanağımına dokunsa, saçımı okşasaydı, ağlayarak kollarına atıl-acak, belki her şeyi söyle-yecekti-m.* [28, p. 112] “If my aunt had told me something nice at this moment, if she had touched on my cheek softly, if she had patted my hair, I would have fallen into her arms crying, maybe I could have told her everything.” (“But I did not fall into her arms crying and I did not tell her everything.”).

As can be seen from the examples shown above, the subjunctive mood forms are not primary elements in Turkish. Instead, these forms are secondary combined units composed of two morphemes [ $-(E/\acute{I})r + idi$  (its negative  $-mEz + idi$ ) and  $-(y)EcEk + idi$ ]. This feature along with the fact that subjunctive mood morphemes of  $-(E/\acute{I})r\ idi$  and  $-(y)EcEk\ idi$  are homonyms with indicative’s special tense categories “present tense in the past” ( $-(E/\acute{I})r/-mEz + idi$ ) and “future tense in the past” ( $-(y)EcEk + idi$ ) of the general tense must have prevented Turcologists to realize this category existing in other languages. However, the interaction between the meanings of the past and future tenses, the merging, clash, or contraction of these meanings are among one of the preconditions of the emergence of subjunctive mood’s meaning [See 24, p. 96–97; 29, p. 702]. The emergence of the meaning of subjunctive through the contraction of the meanings of the future and past tenses is a characteristic observed also in Indo-European languages: For example, Eng. ‘*You would have been awfully insulted if I didn’t try*’, Jules said. (Mario Puzo, *Godfather*), Fr. *S’il faisait beau, on irait se promener* etc.

The forms of subjunctive mood cannot be interpreted as indicative forms since they do not inform that the utterance content overlaps with or corresponds to reality. In addition, these forms cannot be categorized as an indicative mood form because they do not articulate action or process that is a direct reflection of reality. We believe that we should

<sup>4</sup> According to Tumasheva, this mood has been recognized in Tatar, Bashkir, Chuvash, Khakas, and Tofa (Qaragas) languages [13, p. 3]. Also see [25].

make a distinction between meanings where “the content of the utterance corresponds to reality” and “the content of the utterance that does not correspond to reality” respectively while analyzing indicative and subjunctive moods. For instance, future tense in the past (*futur dans le passé*) among indicative’s tense forms and subjunctive (*subjunctif*) in French would support this view. These two French verb categories have a similar form [See 30, p.193–197]. In this respect, it is necessary not to mix indicative’s tense forms (4, 5) with those of subjunctive mood forms (6, 7, 8) in Turkish. Thus, these two categories should be considered as completely independent categories from one another.

- (4) *Yalnızca nakış ve tezhip yap-ardı-m; sayfa kenarlarını süsle-r, çerçeve içine renkler, renkli yapraklar, dallar, güller, çiçekler, kuşlar çiz-erdi-m*: [31, p. 10] “I only used to embroider and illuminate; I used to decorate edges of pages; and I used to draw colors, colored leaves, branches, roses, flowers, and birds:” (indicative’s present tense forms in the past).
- (5) *Okuduğumuz kitaplardan misal getir-ecek, ... bir zaman peygamberlerin en zengini olan Eyüp Peygamberin bir sıkıntı zamanında yabancıya el açtığını anlat-acaktı-m*. [26, p.79] “I would have given an example from the books we have read, ... I would have explained Prophet Shet, who was once the richest of all Prophets, had begged for a foreigner at a period of financial straits.” (indicative’s future tense forms in the past).
- (6) *Dünyanın en çirkin, fakat en doğru kadınına rastlasam, onu derhal sevebil-irdi-m, caddenin ortasında ayaklarına kapanabil-irdi-m*. [32, p.194] “If I met the ugliest but the most truthful woman of the world, I could love her immediately, I could throw myself at her feet in the middle of the street.” (subjunctive mood forms).
- (7) “Onu bilsen merak et-mezdi-n. Öyle korkunç bir adamdır ki ...” [33, p.285] “If you had known him, you would not have wondered him. He is such a terrible man...” (subjunctive mood form).
- (8) *Oğlan bir ağlasaydı, ben de dayanama-yacak, ... hüüngür hüüngür ağla-yacaktı-m*. [34, p.52] “If the boy started crying, I would not have resisted ... I would have cried my eyes out.” (subjunctive mood forms).

In Turkish subjunctive mood forms that express determined event, mostly determined action can be processed with finite forms expressing “unreal event” accompanying them and undertaking the mission of secondary predicate in the utterances. For instance, these mood forms can be used with conditional mood forms (-sE and -sE idi) that depict the action represented by the verb used in the subordinate clauses of compound sentences in the form of “unreal condition” (9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14) and with the past tense forms of optative mood (-(y)E idi) that articulate “unreal event” (15, 16, 17, 18) rather than wish/volition concerning the realization of the action.<sup>5</sup> However, this is not a universal rule. Aforesaid subjunctive mood forms (19, 20, 21) can also be active in simple sentences:

- (9) *Fakat eğer bir din edinmek iste-se-m mutlak Müslüman ol-urdu-m*. [33, p.83] “But if I wanted to have a religion, I would absolutely become a Muslim.”

<sup>5</sup> -sE form found in subordinate clauses, can demonstrate the action either in the characteristic of “real” or “unreal condition.” In other words, this form is indifferent as to whether the condition is real or unreal. However, when this abovementioned form accompanies subjunctive mood form found in the main clause, it always indicates “unreal condition.” Meanwhile, -sE idi form is marked with “unreal condition” contrary to -sE form. -(y)E idi form is used to denote “unreal event” in Turkish.

*Müslüman olurdum* “I would become a Muslim”, which is an subjunctive mood word form, found in the main sentence of the compound sentence is accompanied by *istese*m “if I wanted”, which is a finite word form showing the action in the form of unreal condition.

- (10) “*Seni sev-seydi-m çocukluğumda sev-erdi-m,*” diye yine fısıldadım. [31, p. 338] “I whispered again saying “if I had loved you, I would have loved you in my childhood”.”

Subjunctive mood word form of *severdim* “I would have loved” is used with the finite word form of *sevseydim* “if I had loved” representing the action in the characteristic of unreal condition.

- (11) *Şair ol-saydı-m, sevda şiri yaz-mazdı-m.* [35, p. 416] “If I were a poet, I would not write love poems.”

Subjunctive mood word form of *yazmazdım* “I would not write” is used with the finite word form of *şair olsaydım* “If I were a poet” representing the action in the characteristic of unreal condition.

- (12) *Meselâ Tevfik âdi bir soytarı ol-sa çoktan itiraf ed-erdi. Kuvvetli bir erkek ol-sa bir kadın gibi ağla-mazdı.* [33, p. 176] “For example, if Tevfik were a vulgar clown, he would already confess. If he were a strong man, he would not cry like a woman.”. Subjunctive mood word forms of *itiraf ederdi* “he would confess” and *ağlamazdı* “he would not cry” are active with finite word forms of *soytarı olsa* “if he were a clown” and *erkek olsa* “if he were a man” representing the action in the characteristic of unreal condition.

- (13) *Eğer imam vaktinde yetişme-se, belki Emine onu döv-ecekti.* [33, p. 71] “If imam had not arrived on time, Emine maybe would have beaten her.”

Subjunctive mood word form of *dövecekti* “she would have beaten” is accompanied by finite word form of *yetişmese* “if he had not arrived” representing the action in the characteristic of unreal condition.

- (14) *Şayet, şu yatakta sızıp kendinden geçmiş adama kapılmamış ol-saydı-m bugün beni Anadolu kasabalarından birinde öğretmen olarak bul-acaktı-nız ...* [36, p. 138] “If I had not fallen in love with this drunk man sleeping on this bed, you would have found me as a teacher in one of the Anatolian towns today ...”.

Subjunctive mood word form of *bulacaktınız* “you would have found” is used with finite word form of *kapılmamış olsaydım* “if I had not fallen in love with” representing the action in the characteristic of unreal condition.

- (15) *Sen gerçek sevdalı olsaydın, sıkışmış obanın sıkışmışlığının üstüne varma-yaydı-n, belki de Ceren senin ol-urdu, alçak.* [37, p. 281] “If you had been truly in love and if you had not suppressed these poor nomad people, maybe Ceren would have been yours, coward.”.

Subjunctive mood word form of *olurdu* “she would have been” found in the main clause of the compound sentence is accompanied by finite word form of *sevdalı olsaydın* “if you had been in love” and *üstüne varmayaydın* “if you had not suppressed” informing unreal event in the subordinate clause.

- (16) *Herife bir temiz sopa çek-eydi-k, iş temizlen-irdi.* [16, p. 43] “If we had beaten the guy up, the problem would have been solved.”.

Subjunctive mood word form of *temizlenirdi* “it would have been solved” is used with finite word form of *sopa çekeydik* “if we had beaten” informing unreal event.

- (17) *Sen, erkekçe hareket ed-eydi-n bu olanlar ol-mazdı.* [38, p.59] “If you had acted like a real man, those happened would not have taken place.”

The determined action represented by subjunctive mood word form of *olmazdı* “those happened would not have taken place” is accompanied by the determining action in the finite word form *hareket edeydin* “if you had acted”.

- (18) *Buna benzer ufak tefek sahtekârlıkları hiç yapmamış değilim. Hele «Nur-i İrfan» mektebi kâtipliği devam ed-eydi bu işte az çok bir ihtisas bile edin-ecekti-m.* [26, p. 110] “It is not that I have not committed small frauds similar to this one before. Above all, if clerkship of «Nur-i İrfan» school had continued, I would even somewhat have specialized in this job.”

The determined action represented by subjunctive mood word form of *ihhtisas edinecektim* “I would have specialized in” is accompanied by the determining action in the finite word form *devam edeydi* “if it had continued”.

- (19) — *Niye bana söylemediniz? Ben yap-ardı-m.* (informant). “ — Why didn’t you tell it to me? I would do it.”
- (20) *Bunu söyleyen bir insana dokunul-maz, bırakıl-ır, elleri de öpül-ürdü.* [37, p. 178] “You would not touch a person saying this, you would leave him and you would kiss his hands.”
- (21) *Bir çok kadın daha ağıl-yacaktı ... Bir sürü ocak daha sön-ecekti!* [33, p.171] “Many more women were going to cry ... Many more families would perish!”

The meaning that “the utterance content does not correspond to reality” denoted by subjunctive mood forms can be reinforced with lexemes such as *az daha/kaldı/kalsın* “almost, nearly, about to”, *belki* “maybe”, *ramak kaldı* “be within an ace of” (22, 23, 24, 25, 26) lexically as pleonasm in Turkish:

- (22) *Az daha düş-ecekti-m.* (informant) “I was about to fall.”
- (23) *Hayvan ileriye doğru öyle bir fırladı ki, ben az kalsın sırt yerde bacaklar havada tepinekal-acaktı-m.* [34, p. 167] “The animal leaped forward in such a way that I almost stamped falling on my back and my legs upwards.”
- (24) *Sen gerçek sevdalı olsaydın, sıkışmış obanın sıkışmışlığının üstüne varmayaydın, belki de Ceren senin ol-urdu, alçak.* [37, p. 281] “If you had been truly in love, and if you had not suppressed these poor nomad people, maybe Ceren would have been yours, coward.”
- (25) *Teyzem, bu dakikada bana bir tatlı kelime söylemiş olsaydı, hafifçe yanağıma dokunsa, saçımı okşasaydı, ağlayarak kollarına atıl-acak, belki her şeyi söyle-yecekti-m.* [28, p. 112] “If my aunt had told me something nice at this moment, if she had touched on my cheek softly, if she had patted my hair, I would have fallen into her arms crying, maybe I could have told her everything.”

- (26) *Deriyi ramak kaldı tuzla-yacaktı-k.* [37, p.81] “We were within an ace of dying.”

Subjunctive mood form can also be used to express a wish in a polite way (27, 28) as will be shown in the examples below in Turkish:

- (27) — *Zühtü bey, zatiâliniz misiniz? — Benim n’olacak? — Hiç ... sorduk. Biraz pâzen al-acaktı-k da ...* [39, p. 164] “— Zühtü beg, is this you? — Yes it is me, why are you asking? — Nothing ... we just asked. We were going to buy some fustian ...”
- (28) — *Hani, anne, oyun oyna-yacaktı-k.* (informant) “Well, mother we were going to play a game.”

The copula of *değil* which constitutes negative predicate forms of the noun can also be used in the composition of finite verb forms.<sup>6</sup> We believe that this kind of a formation (29) should be deemed as subjunctive mood form if it has a meaning where “the utterance content does not overlap with or correspond to reality”:

(29) *Bunu söylese, ben oraya kadar git-mez değildi-m.* [32, p. 159] “If he had told me this, it is not that I would not have gone there.”

We can also express subjunctive (unrealized possibility) modality sense/nuance (thought image) in Turkish with forms such as *-mElİ idi* (30, 31), *-sE idi* (32, 33, 34), *-(y)E idi* (35, 36), *-sE* (37), *-(İ)yor idi* (38, 39). These forms do not have a primary function of denoting the fact that the action has not been put into effect even if it should have been or it was possible or probable. In other words, these abovementioned forms are not specialized in conveying this function. However, this does not mean that these abovesaid forms are subjunctive mood forms. Therefore, these forms are members/forms of the category under question:

(30) *Onun Beyliğinde kocaman bir adam küçücük bir çocuğu döveme-meliydi.* [37, p. 213] “In his Kingdom, a big man should not have been able to beat a small kid.”

(31) *Bizler bugün, ölümünden ellibeş yıl sonra, Atatürk'ün ilkelerini, yaptıklarını, daha iyilerini yapabilmek için, eleştirebil-meliydi-k.* [41, p. 33] “We should be able to criticize principles and deeds of Atatürk in order to be able to improve them today fifty-five years after his death.”

(32) *Keşke orada kalmış ol-saydı-m.* [34, p. 129] “I wish I had stayed there.”

(33) *Kızı Sekine Hanıma dedi ki: “Allah canımı al-saydı da, bugünü görme-seydi-m; bu felaketi işitme-seydi-m!”* [42, p. 113] ““I wish God had taken my life so that I had not witnessed today; I had not heard of this disaster!...” he said to her daughter Sekine.”

(34) *Keşki şahini isteme-seydi-m de, dedemin sözünü tut-saydı-m da, bu işler gelme-seydi başımıza, diye geçirdi içinden.* [37, p. 128] “I wish I had not wanted the falcon, I wish I had listened to my grandfather’s words, I wish these things had not happened to us, he was thinking through.”

(35) *Keşki ben senin gibi değilim, ben bir can için sana yalvarmam dediğinde, çocuğu bu yiğitliğinden dolayı bırak-aydı-m.* [37, p. 178] “I wish I had left him because of his courage when he told me that he was not like me and he would not beg for me for life.”

(36) *Kedilere benzeyebil-eydi-k keşke.* [43, p. 212] “I wish we could act like cats.”

(30–37) — *Ne saadetler kaçırdım, Allahum, diyordu, ne ahmakçasına davrandım, nasıl kafamın dikine gittim ... Şehzadeye kul köle ol-malıydı-m, kadınlarının her emrini yap-malı, sultanların her yaptığını hoş gör-meliydi-m; Suzidil'den ayrılmamak için her çileye, güçlüğe katlan-malıydı-m. Tek onun yanında bulun-aydı-m, aynı damın altında onun havasında yaşa-saydı-m ... Beni isteme-se de, odama girme-se, surat et-se, hattâ, ne olur, gözümün önünde başkasıyla seviş-se de orada kal-saydı-m. Bir*

<sup>6</sup> If we consider that most verbal tense forms develop from verbal nouns (nominalizations) (for example see [40, p. 72, 74, 113–114, 146]) and that verbal noun forms represent the action in noun (namely object, quality or circumstance) images (for example see [6]), it should be deemed natural that the negative copula *değil* is used together with verb stems as will be seen from the examples below: *Fakat ben kendi hesabıma bu işe pek de şaşıyor değilim.* [26, p. 9] “On my side, it is not that I am so much surprised to what has happened.”; *Buna benzer ufak tefek sahtekârlıkları hiç yapmamış değilim.* [26, p. 110] “It is not that I have not committed small frauds similar to this one before.” etc.

*devlet kaybettim, ömrümün son devletini!* [36, p. 90] “My God I have missed so many happy moments, I have behaved in such a silly way, I have gone on my way, he was saying. I should have been at sultan’s son’s back, I should have done each and every order of his women, I should have condoned each deed of princesses; I should have withstood any kind of hardship and suffering in order not to separate from Suzidil. I only wish that I had stayed near her, I wish I had lived under the same roof with her. Even if she does not want me, she does not come to my room, she makes a face, or she makes love with someone else in front of my eyes, I should have stayed there. I lost happiness, the last happiness of my life!”

- (38) “*Hani sen yaz ortasına kadar kal-ıyordu-n?*” dedi Nilgün. [44, p. 290] ““Were not you supposed to stay until mid summer?” said Nilgün.”
- (39) *Sabahın bu saatinde bizi az daha ez-ıyordu-nuz ...* [44, p. 204] “You were about to run over us at this time of the morning...”

As noted at the beginning of the article, if we consider that modality meanings are conveyed by different methods in languages (morphological, morphological-lexical, lexical, intonation etc.), we should also pay attention to the methods used to convey the abovementioned subjunctive modality senses/nuances (thought images) and we should evaluate the language means accordingly. The carriers of subjunctive modality senses are not the morphological forms being subject to this article in the examples shown below. Instead, they are lexical means (40, 41, 42). Therefore, finite forms in these utterances are beyond the scope of our research:

- (40) *Keşke bu vapur, yıllarca, dalgalar üstünde, sonu karaya varmaz bir yolculukla çalkalan-sa, bütün denizleri aş-sa, dünyanın her iskelesine uğra-sa, hiçbir şehre indirmeden, yabancı yüzü göstermeden, geçim derdi çektirmeden, uskur ninnisi içinde, ölümüne kadar gök ile deniz arasında dön-se, dolaş-sa!* [36, p. 12] “I wish this ship labored on the waves through a journey without making landfall for years, passed all seas, stopped by all seaports of the world, wandered between sky and sea until its death with the melodies of propeller lullaby without laying down to any city, without seeing any foreigner, and without struggling to make a living.”. At first sight, it might seem that subjunctive modality is conveyed through word forms with *-sE çalkalansa* “it labored”, *aşsa* “it passed”, *uğrasa* “it stopped”, *dönse dolaşsa* “it wandered” in the example shown above, actually this meaning is conveyed through *keşke* “I wish”. When we get rid of *keşke*, then the abovementioned finite word forms connote to “real condition” (“possible reality”) and “desire” in regards to the realization of action stemming from its conditional meaning.
- (41) *Bağırarak-mış az kalsın.* [32, p. 32] “He was about to shout.”  
In this example, subjunctive modality sense/nuance is expressed by lexical method with the usage of *az kalsın* “about to”. When we get rid of *az kalsın* from the sentence, finite word form of *bağıracaktı* “they say that he will shout” turns into a word form adding meaning of “indirectness modality” to that of the future tense meaning.
- (42) — *Canım öyle yandı ki! Nerdeyse ağla-yacaktı-m.* (informant) “– I hurt myself in such a way that I was about to cry.”  
In this sentence, subjunctive modality sense is expressed by lexical method through the usage of *nerdeyse* “almost, nearly, about to”. If we get rid of the word

of *nerdeyse* “almost, nearly, about to”, then the sentence can be evaluated as an indicative word form.

## Conclusion

An analysis of materials in Turkish shows that forms of subjunctive mood *-(E/İ)r idi* (its negative form *-mEz idi*) and *-(y)EcEk idi* are compound morphemes and that they can be used in simple sentences or in the main clauses of compound sentences. In addition, this analysis reveals that “subjunctive modality” senses/nuances (thought images) can be strengthened lexically with word and word groups such as *az daha/kaldı/kalsın* “almost, nearly, about to”, *belki* “maybe”, *nerdeyse* “almost, nearly, about to”, *ramak kaldı* “be within an ace of” etc.

In Turkish, predicate category has a mechanism of form conjugation. Since mood categories are subcategories of category of predicate, all mood categories including the subjunctive mood carry a mechanism of form conjugation. To put it differently, *-(E/İ)r idi* (its negative form *-mEz idi*) and *-(y)EcEk idi* forms have six personal endings, namely these forms are conjugated for six persons.

To sum up, *subjunctive mood* informs that the action, which was necessary, probable, or possible, actually has not taken place. In other words, *subjunctive mood* demonstrates that the utterance content does not overlap with reality. This mood is made by morphemes of *-(E/İ)r idi* (its negative *-mEz idi*) and *-(y)EcEk idi* and it is a group of finite verb forms composed of two special categories.

## References

1. Kondakov Nikolay İ. *Logicheskiy slovar'*. Moskva: İzdatel'stvo “Nauka”, 1971. 566 p.
2. Deniz Yılmaz Özlem. “Türkçe Kelime Çekimi Ulamları Dizgesi Üzerine: Ad Çekimi Ulamları”. *Dil Araştırmaları*. № 10. Ankara, 2012. P. 123–139.
3. Guzev Viktor G. “O razgranichenii ponyatiy “finitnaya forma” i “lichnaya forma””. *Vostokovedeniye*. Otvetsvenniye redaktori V. G. Guzev, O. B. Frolova. Vypusk 18. Sank-Peterburg, 1993. P. 36–42.
4. Guzev Viktor G. “Bitimli (Finit) Şekillerin Türk Gramerindeki Yeri”. *Zeynep Korkmaz Armağanı*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2004. P. 189–194.
5. Guzev Viktor G. and Özlem Deniz-Yılmaz. *Opit postroyeniya ponyatiynogo apparata teorii turetskoy grammatiki: Uchebnoye posobiye na turetskom yazıke*. S.-Peterburg: İzdatel'stvo S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2004. 134 p.
6. Deniz Yılmaz Özlem. *Türkiye Türkçesinde Eylemsi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2009. 202 p.
7. Panfilov V. Z. *Vzaimootnosheniye yazıka i mishleniya*. Moskva: İzdatel'stvo “Nauka”, 1971. 232 p.
8. Ruhi Şükriye, Deniz Zeyrek and Necdet Osam. “Türkçede Kiplik Belirteçleri ve Çekim Ekleri İlişkisi Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler”. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*. Ankara: Kebikeç Yayınları, 1997. P. 105–111.
9. Dogan Gürkan and Ahmet Kocaman. “Sözcede Kişisel Tutum ve Belirteçler”. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*. İstanbul: Simurg, 1999. P. 65–78.
10. Erguvanlı-Taylan Eser and Ayhan Aksu-Koç. “Belirteçlerde Görünüş ve Kiplik İlişkisi”. *XXI. National Linguistic Congress Papers*. Mersin, 2007. P. 89–97.
11. Axmanova Ol'ga S. *Slovar' lingvisticheskix terminov*. İzdaniye vtoroye, stereotipnoye. Moskva: İzdatel'stvo “Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya”, 1969. 608 p.
12. Kocaman Ahmet. “Türkçede Kip Olgusu Üzerine Görüşler”. *TDAY Belleten 1980–1981*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1983. P. 81–85.
13. Tumasheva D. G. “Modal'niye formı tatarskogo glagola i mejkategorial'niye svyazi”. *Sovetskaya tyurkologiya*. № 4. Baku, 1990. P. 3–9.
14. Bussmann Hadumod. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Translated and edited by Gregory P. Trauth and Kerstin Kazzazi. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 530 p.
15. Kerimoglu Caner. *Kiplik İncelemeleri ve Türkçe*. 1. ed. İzmir: Dinazor Kitabevi, 2011. 340 p.

16. Öz Özcan Aynur. "Özbek ve Türkiye Türkçesinde "Olasılık-Tahmin" Bildiren Modal Sözcükler". *V. International Turkic Languages Conference Papers*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2004. P. 2253–2264.
17. Biray Nergis. "Kazak Türkçesinde Modal Söz (Kelimenin Dokuzuncu Türü mü?)". *Turkish Studies*. Volume 4/3. 2009. P. 338–361.
18. Dalı Hüseyin. "Keremedin (Milino) Ağzında Kiplik Anlamı Taşıyıcıları ve Bunların Sözdizimsel İşlevleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme". Paper presented at IV International Turkish Dialect Studies Workshop (27–29 October 2011, Trakya University, Edirne).
19. Meľnikov Gennadiy P. *Sistemologiya i yazıkovıye aspektı kibernetiki*. Moskva: Sovetskoye radio, 1978. 368 p.
20. Crystal David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. 529 p.
21. *Yazıkoznaniye. Bol'shoy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'*. Glavniy redaktor V.N. Yartseva. 2-ye izdaniye. Moskva: "Bol'shaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya", 2000. 688 p.
22. Gadjiamedov Nurmagomed E. "Soslagatel'noye nakloneniye glagola v kumıkskom yazıke". *Sovetskaya tyurkologiya*. № 6. Baku, 2000. P. 58–63.
23. Nasilov Dmitriy M. *Struktura vremen indikativa v drevneuygurskom yazıke (po pamyatnikam uygurskogo pisma)*. Avtoferat dissertatsii na soiskaniye uçenoy stepeni kandidata filologicheskix nauk. Moskva, 1963.
24. Guzev Viktor G. *Oчерki po teorii tyurkskogo slovoizmeneniya: glagol (na materiale staroanatoliysko-tyurkskogo yazıka)*. Leningrad: İzdatel'stvo LGU, 1990. 168 p.
25. Ul'mezova Leyla M. "O termine «soslagatel'noye nakloneniye» v tyurkskix yazıkax (na primere karaçayevı-balkarskogo i turetskogo yazıkov)". *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta*. Seriya 13. 2012. P. 42–46.
26. Güntekin Reşat Nuri. *Miskinler Tekkesi*. 3. ed. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka Kitabevleri, 1963. 208 p.
27. Nesin Aziz. *Memleketin Birinde / Hoptirnam*. 2. ed. Ankara: Bilgi Basımevi, 1969. 344 p.
28. Güntekin Reşat Nuri. *Çalıkuşu*. 39. ed. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi [date unknown]. 541 p.
29. Guzev Viktor G. "Teorik Türk Gramerinden: Fiilin Beş Genel Çekimleme Ulamı Üzerine". *IV. International Turkic Languages Congress Papers (24–29 September 2000)*. Volume I. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2007. P. 697–703.
30. Gak V.G. *Teoreticheskaya grammatika frantsuzskogo yazıka. Morfologiya. ...*, Moskva: "Visshaya shkola", 1979.
31. Pamuk Orhan. *Benim Adım Kırmızı*. 6. ed. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1999. 472 p.
32. Peyami Safa. *Yalnızız*. 4. ed. İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, 1997. 469 p.
33. Halide Edip. *Sinekli Bakkal*, İstanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitap Evi, 1936.
34. Halikarnas Balıkcısı [Kabaagaçlı Musa Cevat Şakir]. *Bütün Eserleri: 1. Aganta Burina Burinata!* 8. ed. Ankara: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1997. 186 p.
35. Nazım Hikmet. *Bütün Eserleri: 8 volumes. Volume 7: Romanlar*. Sofya: Narodna Prosveta, 1969.
36. Karay Refik Halid. *Sürgün*. 5. ed. İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi [date unknown]. 206 p.
37. Kemal Yaşar. *Bin Boğalar Efsanesi*. 3. ed. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1976. 271 p.
38. Güntekin Reşat Nuri. *Yaprak Dökümü*. 8. ed. İstanbul: İnkılâp ve Aka Kitabevleri, 1962. 160 p.
39. Nesin Aziz. *Deliler Boşandı*. 7. ed. İstanbul: Kardeşler Basımevi, 1981. 180 p.
40. Grönbech Kaare. *Türkçenin Yapısı*. Translated by Mehmet AKALIN. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1995. 148 p.
41. Nesin Aziz (1994), *Bir Tutam Aydınlık*, 2. ed., İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
42. Karaosmanoglu Yakup Kadri (1998), *Kiralık Konak*, 18. ed., İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları. 297 p.
43. Karasu Bilge (1999), *Göçmüş Kediler Bahçesi*, 5. ed., İstanbul: Metis Yayınları. 230 p.
44. Pamuk Orhan (1996), *Sessiz Ev*, 16. ed., İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları. 345 p.

Статья поступила в редакцию 23 апреля 2013 г.