Two Distribution Patterns for -mIş in Cypriot Turkish

Christos H. Nikolaou

PhD Student, University of Cyprus

nicolaou.christos@ucy.ac.cy

As shown 1(a)-(b), *-mIş* in Cypriot Turkish shares the distribution pattern of *-mIş* in Standard Turkish (i.e. predicate inflection), as well as its two readings, i.e. the non-evidentiality reading and the surprise/ irony/ sarcasm reading (cf. 1a and 1b, respectively).

(1) a. *Türkiya'dakı zelzelede   bir sürü öksüz çocuk galmış*
         in Turkey   at earthquake a crowd orphan child remained
         'The earthquake in Turkey has left many orphans.'

      b. *Ekonomiyi   düzelteceklermiş*
         the economy they will straighten out
         'They will fix the economy.'
         [Bu memlekette ekonomi düzelir mi? Yalan söyleller size. Bu memlekette ekonomi mekonomi düzelmez.]
         'Can they really fix the economy in this country? They are lying. In this country the economy cannot be fixed.'

Demir (2002, 2018) discusses an additional distribution pattern for *-mIş* in Cypriot Turkish, where *-mIş* attaches to non-predicative XPs. The obvious research goals are to describe the distribution and the interpretation of *-mIş* attaching to non-predicative XPs. Related research questions include the following: Is this additional distribution pattern due to a change in the meaning of *-mIş*? Or is this alternative distribution a 'transparent' marker for its known meaning(s)? Demir's data, with his glosses, the corresponding sentences in Standard Turkish, according to Demir, and the English translations he provides, appear in 2(a)-(c). Demir's proposal for this additional distribution of *-mIş* in Cypriot Turkish links this distribution of *-mIş* to a proposal for the interpretation of non-predicative XPs hosting *-mIş*, i.e. 'a focal constituent interpretation'. In Demir's (2018) own words, 'The evidential copula *imiş* can occur in different positions within a sentence - apart from sentence-initial and sentence-final position. This mobility has a functional effect; i.e. *imiş* is used mainly as a focus marker, so its position depends on the position of the focus'. FP in the glosses stands for *Focus Particle*.

(2) a. ***Ahmet' miş***   *okul-a*   *git-me-ycek*   *yarın*
         Ahmet FP   school:DAT   go:NEG.FUT3SG   tomorrow
         ST Yarın okula Ahmet gitmeyecekmiş.
         'Ahmet says that <u>he</u> will not go to school tomorrow.'

      b. *Ahmet*   ***okul-a-mış***   *git-me-ycek*   *yarın*
         Ahmet   school:DAT.FP   go:NEG.FUT3SG   tomorrow
         ST Ahmet yarın okula gitmeyecekmiş.

'Ahmet says that he will not go to <u>school</u> tomorrow.'

   c. *Ahmet*   **yarın-mış**   *okul-a*   *gitme-ycek*
      Ahmet   tomorrow:FP   school:DAT   go:NEG.FUT3SG
      ST Ahmet okula yarın gitmeyecekmiş.
      'Ahmet says that he will not go to school tomorrow.'

As shown by natural speech examples (6)-(9), to be discussed further down, there is a factual argument against a working hypothesis along the lines that, in its use with non-predicative XPs, *-mIş* is a focus marker. Namely, foci are not the only non-predicative XPs that *-mIş* cliticizes onto. An additional argument against a 'focus marker' analysis for *-mIş* comes from what we know about 'new information' marking in Cypriot Turkish. Namely, (a) in Cypriot Turkish, just as in Standard Turkish, it is the immediately preverbal position that hosts new information constituents. And (b) Cypriot Turkish has clefts as shown in (3), where *o su* is a complementizer.

(3) Meyrem'dir   *o su*   *kısganır*   *beni*
    It is Meyrem   that   envy   me
    'It is Meyrem that envies me.'

Demir's proposal for analysing *-mIş* attaching to non-predicative XPs as a focal marker is not consistent with these independently established facts about Cypriot Turkish. Nor is there any information about the context for each one of the three examples in 2(a)-(c). More generally, it is not independently shown, i.e. on the basis of semantic and/or syntactic tests, that the non-predicative constituents hosting *-mIş* are standardly/ exclusively interpreted as new information/ narrow foci. Demir affirms, without proving, his claim, by juxtaposing the Cypriot Turkish examples with alleged equivalent sentences in Standard Turkish, and alleged English translations. In the equivalent sentences in Standard Turkish that Demir provides we see that, crucially, the constituent *-mIş* attaches to in Cypriot Turkish immediately precedes the verb in Standard Turkish. In fact, it is only in 2(b) that the constituent hosting *-mIş* appears in the immediately preverbal position also in Cypriot Turkish. The immediately preverbal position in Standard Turkish is known to host new information constituents.

In addition, Demir's proposal makes the tacit assumption that marking the focal constituent is the only interpretation that can be attributed to *-mIş* in 2(a)-(c). However, as we will see further down when we look at natural speech data, Cypriot Turkish *-mIş* in this alternative distribution pattern systematically expresses either 'surprise' or 'irony/sarcasm'. Apart from   *-mIş* there is no other functional category in these sentences that could be taken to mark this obligatory surprise/ irony/ sarcasm reading.

On the basis of examples like (5) below, Kappler and Tsiplakou (2018) argue that '{(i)miş} does not necessarily mark the adjacent element as the focus. […] Focus marking is obviously carried out by {da} rather than {i(miş)/mIş}'. In fact, example (4) does not appear to be the most appropriate example to argue against Demir's 'focus particle analysis' given that the host for *-mIş* is a predicate, rather than a non-predicative XP, as in Demir's examples. Crucially, Çatal (2012) does have an example where *da* and *-mIş* attach to a non-predicative XP (cf. (5)). With respect to {da}, Kappler and Tsiplakou argue that *da* in Cypriot Turkish has similar semantic properties as *dA* in Standard Turkish, namely that it is a focaliser, topicaliser and intensifier. However, example (5) does not seem to support a focus particle analysis either

for *-mIş* or *da*. In example (4) I have kept the glosses as they appear in the Kappler and Tsiplakou paper, similarly with example (5) from Çatal (2012).

(4) Gelecegmiş   da (mış)   alsın(mış)   seni
     come-FUT.DISS DC (DISS) pick up-SUBJ(DISS)   you-ACC

(5) Bekleylim   da Ali da mış gelecek   biziminan
     wait.OPT1PL   da Ali da mIş come.FUT3SG   we.GEN.INSTR

With respect to the semantics of {(i)miş}in Cypriot Turkish, Kappler & Tsiplakou (2018) claim that it functions as a non-evidential marker (as in Standard Turkish) and as a dissociative discourse particle with a dubitative meaning.

I will next look at natural speech data with *-mIş* attaching to non-predicative XPs (cf. (6)-(9)), within their contexts of use. In (6) *-mIş* attaches to a modality adverb, in (7) to a DP that does not constitute new information, in (8) to a DP of which a property (*bize gelecek*) is predicated, and in (5) the whole sentence (*Ali da mış gelecek biziminan*), and not just *Ali* is new information.

(6) *İllamış*   *bir*   *otele*   *gidecek*   *[Türkiye'den gelen sanatçıyı dinliyecek]*
     definitely-mIş   a   to hotel   he will go
     'He 'll definitely go to a hotel and he will listen to artist come from Turkey.'

(7) *[Babam desen, onun derdi apayrı]* *Davetiyemiş*   *dağıtmaycak*
                                          the invitation-mIş he will not give out
     'As for my father, he has a different approach. He doesn't want to give out the invitations.'

(8) *İhtiyarlarmış*   *bize*   *gelecek*
     elderly-mış   to us   they will come
     'The elderlies will visit us.'
     [görsünler ortamı (evi), apar topar daşındı benim eve]
      'in order to see the house and he moved to my house.'

Examples (6)-(8) illustrate the same interpretation for *-mIş* as earlier 1(b), Kappler and Tsiplakou's (4), Çatal's (5) and, arguably, Demir's 2(a)-(c), namely the interpretation informally described as surprise/ irony/ sarcasm. It is shown that, when *-mIş* attaches to non-predicative XPs, this is the only possible reading for *-mIş*, and the so-called non-evidentiality reading is excluded.

Arguably, the additional distribution pattern for *-mIş* in Cypriot Turkish is that of 2-position clitics. Examples (6)-(8) are consistent with this proposal, and even more so is (6), where *-mIş* is the second clitic that attaches to the constituent in first position. It is also possible for *-mIş* to attach to the first constituent in the verb phrase, rather than to the first constituent of the sentence (cf. (9), but also Demir's 2(b)-(c)). It is shown why this is not a problem for the proposal.

(9) *Babam? Babam   yeni yılmış   illa   mangal   yakacak*
     My father? my father   new year-mIş   definitely   barbecue   he will do
     'As for my father, the New Year's Eve he definitely wants to do a barbecue.'

Next, I reconsider examples where *-mIş* attaches to a predicate (cf. earlier (4) but also (10)). The question is whether these examples illustrate the first or the second distribution pattern

for *-mIş*. Arguably, the presence of *da* shows that (5) illustrates the second distribution pattern, while (10) could illustrate either pattern.

(10) *Dekormuş bunlar*
     décor-mIş   these
     'These stuffs are for decoration.'

Finally, I adopt an alternative description for the second reading of *-mIş* in the first distribution pattern and the only reading of *-mIş* in the second distribution pattern, and discuss whether this alternative description can offer an account for the emergence of the second distribution pattern.

References

Agouraki, Y. (2014). *On the interpretation of the Turkish marker -mIş*. (manuscript). University of Cyprus.

Balıkçıoğlu, O. (2017). *Mamıt ve Suç Ortakları*. Lefkoşa: TipografArt.

Çatal, A. A. (2012). *Kıbrıs Türk Ağızları*. PhD thesis, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi.

Demir, N. (2002). *Kıbrıs Ağızlarında imiş Hakkında*. Bilig 23/Güz, pp. 129-139.

Demir, N. (2018). 'Cypriot Turkish'. In Bulut, C. (ed.). *Linguistic Minorities in Turkey and Turkic-Speaking Minorities of the Peripheries*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kappler, M. and Tsiplakou, S. (2018). Miş and mishimou: an instance of language contact in Cyprus. In: Bulut, C. (ed.). *Linguistic Minorities in Turkey and Turkic-Speaking Minorities of the Peripheries*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kratzer, A. (1981). 'The notional category of modality'. in: by H.J. Eikmeyer and H. Rieser (eds.). *Words, worlds, and contexts: New approaches in word semantics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.