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PART I

Turkic structures
On the syntax of Mishar Tatar

1. Introduction
Mishar Tatar, which has developed under the strong influence of the Russian language, exhibits deviations from the canonical word order of Turkic languages. However, Mishar Tatar is not homogeneous: there are approx. 15 sub-dialects of Mishar Tatar. The range of the linguistic norms of the Mishar Tatar covers the norms of the standard Tatar language, where the speaker of Mishar Tatar can be recognized only by his specific accent, as well as more peculiar linguistic norms, which exhibit the impact of other languages, especially of Russian. The sub-dialects which are situated most distant from the Republic Tatarstan often demonstrate syntactic characteristics, which deviate from the standard Tatar language and consequently from other Turkic languages. The syntax irregularities are especially conspicuous in the western sub-dialects of Mishar Tatar: Kuznetsk (MKuzn.), Temnikov (MTmn.), Lämbir (MLmb.) sub-dialects spoken in Mordovia and Penza Oblast of Russian Federation. These sub-dialects are the closest geographically to the origin area of Mishar Tatar.

Drawing comparisons between constituent order strategies in Mishar Tatar, other Turkic languages, and Russian, this study investigates the integration and functionality of copied structures on different levels.

In the following, we will limit our scope to those sub-dialects which expose deviations.

Figure 1: The distribution of the Mishar Tatar sub-dialects
2. Noun phrase: the adnominal genitive, compounds

Besides its predicative function, the suffix +nIkI (< +nIŋ-kI) can also serve as a genitive or take part in the forming of compounds. The modifier mainly appears after its head. The systematic character of this phenomenon should be clearly indicated. The modified noun carries the possessive suffix only if the modifier is a definite noun:

(1) sästrä-sī kidyw-nikī (MTmn.)
    sister-POSS3 bridegroom-GEN
    ‘the sister of the bridegroom’

In case of nominal compounds, the modifier is marked by the suffix +nIkI, whereas the modified noun doesn’t carry the possessive suffix:

(2) pristavitil sud-nikī (MKuzn.)
    representative court-GEN
    ‘court’s officer’

The strategy of placement of the genitive after the modified noun is not new in Turkic languages which have contact with European languages, but only the Mishar Tatar use the suffix +nIkI, probably because this suffix has a normally predicative meaning and as a predicate appears after the noun it describes.

In some sub-dialects, e.g. Sergač (MSrg.), Čüpräle (MČpr.), the adnominal genitive appears generally in a prenominal position. However, the prenominal use in the sub-dialects MKuzn., MTmn., MLmb. is limited mainly to possessive pronouns:

(3) bīz-nikī atakay big ıştırugi kīsi idī (MLmb.)
    we-GEN father very strict person PST.COP
    ‘Our father was a very strict person’

The postnominal placement of the genitive is typical of Slavic languages. The same strategy is also observed in Trakai Karaim, Halič Karaim, and Gagauz:

(4) baš-i at-nin (Trakai Karaim)
    head-POSS3 horse-GEN
    ‘The horse’s head’

The modifier marked with the suffix +nIkI directly follows the modified entity or can be separated by clitics as dA ‘also’, glnA ‘only’ or by words, which can be described as short predicates, bar, yuk(tir), bula, küp, etc.

(5) ul bīrnī-gan cibik tal-nikī (MKuzn.)
    DEM germinate-PART wand willow-GEN
    ‘That’s a germinated willow wand’ (i.e., branch with blossoms)

(6) atsot-lar gīna kīš-nikī kal-īr (MKuzn.)
    waste-PL only person-GEN remain-AOR
    ‘Only the waste among human being will remain’
On the syntax of Mishar Tatar

(7) ĭš-ĭküpmŭškŭnŭkŭ (MTmn.)
work-POSS3 many hemp-GEN
‘There is a lot to do with hemp’

(8) kamaz-lar-ĭbarxalık-niki (MKuzn.)
truck-PL-POSS3 EXIST people-GEN
‘The people have trucks’

The frame ‘NP X NP+nIkI’ helps to present the most important information before the less important, to emphasize it. Such a rhema-thema structuring is a characteristic of East Slavic languages. This strategy serves for evaluating the information as unexpected, surprising, remarkable, and conspicuous.

The use of +nIkI as a genitive marker does not implicate a full abandonment of +nIn. Both suffixes are used in parallel.

The cases, where the +nIn ~ +nIk suffix is preferred:
1) in set expressions (9),
2) as the part of a correlative construction (10),
3) in the presence of other modifiers along with the genitive (11), and
4) when the modified noun is used in an oblique case (12)–(13).

(9) axirätkâñ-û-nûnalâmâtwar-îr (MKuzn.)
afterlife day-POSS3-GEN omen-PL-POSS3
‘The omens of the apocalypse’

(10) šultabišmak-nîkîmdirîstutîr-a,
DEM riddle-ACC who correct implement-PRS
šunînbul-îrtay-î (MTmn.)
DEM.GEN be-AOR foal-POSS3
‘Who solves this riddle, to that person the foal will belong’

(11) bûtûnlabar-lar-nî,vesdânya-nînikînçîyûz-ûndâ
allnews-PL-ACC wholeworld-GENsecondsurface-POSS3-LOC
bul-ganxabar-lar-nîsulî-y (MKuzn.)
occur-PART news-PL-ACC tell-PRS
‘It tells all the news, the news which occur in the other part of the whole world’

(12) allahutâtalâanîngûnâxîn-înkiçîr-îr (MKuzn.)
AllahTa’ala hissin-POSS3-ACC forgive-AOR
‘Allah Ta’ala will forgive his sin’

(13) xatînnaranînsûri-ylarxâltûxâl-înyâksiîlîn-îniy (MKuzn.)
woman-PL only ask-PRS-3PL conditions-POSS3-ACC youngbride-GEN
‘Only women ask for the conditions of young bride’

The modifier with +nIkI appears very rarely in an oblique case, also here often as an afterthought.

(14) kul-lar-îndaakpirçâtkâmalay-larnikîn-da (MLmb.)
hand-PL-POSS3-LOC whitegloveboy-PL-GEN-LOC
‘In their hands are white gloves, in the boys’ hands’
3. Verb arguments

Whereas the position of a noun object depends on the discourse structure of the sentence, there is a strong tendency to place the infinitive, which has the suffix \(+(A/I)rgA\), after its head:

(16) \(\text{šundïy waxït tiyïs yït-årgä} (\text{MKuzn.})\)

‘Such times should come’

(17) \(\text{anï bul-a îšlä-rgä ačïly kamïr-dan} (\text{MTmn.})\)

‘It can be made from leavened dough’

4. Subordinate clauses

4.1 Right branching

Mishar Tatar can apply the right-branching subordination methods of clauses with finite verbs by using the relative pronoun \(\text{kas} ñï\) ‘which’ (< kaysï), relative adverbs \(kaya\) ‘where’, and \(kačan\) ‘when’ in relative and temporal clauses. In a nominal relative clause, the nominal relative pronoun refers to something known and concrete, which can be specified.

4.1.1 The relative pronoun \(\text{kas} ñï\)

The relative pronoun \(\text{kas} ñï\) ‘which’ (sometimes kaysï) is very common in the most Mishar sub-dialects. The relative clauses introduced with the relative pronoun \(\text{kas} ñï\) are obligatorily postnominal and follow the noun phrase which they modify. The antecedent demands the agreement of the relative pronoun in number. It is not compulsory that the relative clauses directly follow the noun phrase that they modify. A relative clause can be represented by a nominal sentence and be positioned between the subject and the predicate of the matrix clause.

(18) \(\text{patpisat it-t-ï imam} [\text{kas} ñï kit-t-ï] (\text{MLmb.})\)

‘Those imam has signed, who has gone’

(19) \(\text{minim malay-im šul [kaysï fïrunt-ta ül-d-ï]} (\text{MKsn.})\)

‘My boy is those, who died at the front’

(20) \(\text{nuriya apa} [\text{kaysï kïfin-nïr-nï pïč-üčï}] \text{Nuriya older-sister REL.who body’s robe-PL-ACC cut-PART}\)

‘Nuriya apa, who cuts dead body’s robes, phones me’
The relative pronoun is governed by its role in the subordinated clause, not in the main clause. In other words, the case of the relative pronoun is determined by its function in the clause.

(21) *kargan-a-m, di-y, allahu täalä bilän*

swear-PRS-1SG say-PRS Allah Ta’ala POST.with

* [kasį̱-nín kul-in-da minim zanim] (MKuzn.)

REL.which-GEN hand-POSS3-LOC my soul-POSS1SG

‘I swear, he says, with Allah Ta’ala, in Whose hands is my soul’

The antecedent demands the agreement of the relative pronoun in number. The plural form is used with and without a possessive suffix:

(22) *æ üzgä kishî-lär [kasį̱-lar čin ült-argä bar-ir-lar],*

and other person-PL REL.which-PL really destroy-INF go-AOR-3PL

*alar indî dinsiz gînä (MKuzn.)*

they well godless only

‘And the other people who really go to destroy (it), well, those are just godless’

(23) *bar šîndiy kishî-lär*

EXIST such person-PL

* [kasį̱-lär-î ıš-kä zawapsiz kari-y-lar] (MČst.)

REL.which-PL-POSS3 work-DAT irresponsible regard-PRS-3PL

‘There are such people who irresponsibly regard the job’

The relative pronoun *kaysî* is also actively used in Trakai Karaim and Halič Karaim in the same function (cp. Musaev 1964: 223, 325f.). There, the use of the possessive suffix in the plural form is obligatory.

4.1.2 Relative adverbs

4.1.2.1 The relative adverb *kaya* ‘where’

The word *kaya* ‘where’ can also be used to introduce a relative clause expressing a place:

(24) *bar makkä-dä xaram mäčît-î,*

EXIST Mecca-LOC Haram mosque-POSS3

*xaram mäčît-î [kabatulla kaya] (MKuzn.)*

Haram mosque-POSS3 Kabatullah REL.where

‘There is a Haram mosque in Mecca, the Haram mosque, where Kabatullah is’

Again, besides Russian, the similarity can be found in Trakai Karaim and Halič Karaim:

(25) *men tani-d-im bu övčük-nü*

I recognize-PST-1SG DEM small.house-ACC

* [kaydu ös-t-üm] (Trakai Karaim)

REL.where grow-PST-1SG

‘I have recognized this small house where I grew up’
4.1.2.2 Temporal sentences introduced by the conjunction *kačan* ‘when’
Adverbial sentences with temporal meaning are introduced with the adverb *kačan* ‘when’. In such sentences, predicates are normally finite verb forms (26). However, they can be also infinite (27):

(26) [*kačan sili-y-lär*] angar-mi-y-m (MKrsn.)
   *when* talk-PRS-3PL understand-NEG-PRS-1SG
   ‘When they talk, I don’t understand’

(27) [*kačan yir yůrkač*, bůlki,]
   *when* earth swallow-CV maybe
   *ara-lar-ǐn-da* šundîy kîšî-lär bul-ǐr (MKuzn.)
   *among-PL-POSS3-LOC* such person-PL be-AOR
   ‘When the earth swallows (them) up, maybe such people will be among them’

The conjunction *kačan* ‘when’ introducing subordinated clauses with temporal meaning can be found in Trakai Karaim and Halič Karaim in two forms: *kačan* (Trakai Karaim) and *kacan* (Halič Karaim) (cp. Musaev 1964: 224):

(28) [kacan hodza yarřî-nî kista-y-d]
   *when* rich poor-ACC oppress-PRS-3SG
   bulut  kuyas-nî  kapla-y-d (Halič Karaim, proverb)
   *cloud* sun-ACC cover-PRS-3SG
   ‘When the rich oppresses the poor, the cloud covers the sun’

4.1.3 Borrowed subordinating conjunctions
There are also subordinating conjunctions borrowed from Russian without replacing them with their Tatar counterparts: *što* ‘that’ and *patamuštî* ‘because’.

(29) min indî at-̣-ǐm uže diy-ă [što bîznîn imam kit-t-ǐ] (MKuzn.)
   *I* well tell-PST-1SG already say-PRS that our imam go-PST-3SG
   ‘He says “Well, I told already, that our imam has gone”’

(30) [bigirāk tă uŋay mûškû-nî maruz artî bûl-ā-rgă],
   extremely CONJ easy hemp-ACC frost POST.after bind-INF
   patamuštî [mûškû yûmśar-aj] (MLmb.)
   because hemp soften-PRS
   ‘It’s extremely easy to bind hemp after frost, because the hemp softens’

4.1.4 Direct speech
The placement of a direct speech follows the same pattern – the direct speech is placed after the reporting verb:

(31) yarlî at-a [bar-ίyk pažaluy patča-ga] (MTmn.)
   poor tell-PRS go-VOL1PL I.suppose czar-DAT
   ‘The poor says: “I suppose, let’s go to the czar”’

(32) at [ǔz-ǐm bûl-d-ǐm] (MTmn.)
   tell.IMP2SG self-POSS1SG realize-PST-1SG
   ‘Tell (him): “I realized it by myself”’
The dominant strategy in Turkic languages is the placement of the reporting verb after the direct speech connected with an infinite form of the verb de- ‘say’ (e.g., dep or diye, cp. Kyrgyz süyömiin dep ayt “Tell that you love”).

5 Correlative clauses
Mishar Tatar can produce correlative clauses alongside with Trakai Karaim and Halič Karaim, but also Turkish. Here, there must be a demonstrative phrase in the main clause associated with the correlative clause.

(33) kayani al-d-ıŋ, [šul urıŋ-ga], kuy (MCna.)
where.ABL take-PST-2SG DEM place-DAT put.IMP.2SG
‘Put it in the place you took it’

(34) kın nırsı, tıllı-, şunı, kitır-ı-ı (MSrg.)
who what wish-PRS DEM.ACC bring-PRS-3PL
‘They bring that, what one wants’

(35) yul-ın-da kın pirut üçrı-ı, şunarga bir-ı (MM dł.)
way-POSS3-LOC who first meet DEM.DAT give-PRS
‘Whom he meets on his way first, to that person he gives (it)’

6 Dependent interrogative clauses
The implied questions formed with interrogatives or with an interrogative particle can be embedded as a complement clause in a complex sentence. The interrogative clauses play the role of a subject or of an object and appear in their positions. The verbs of thinking and reporting verbs are used.

(36) kúda uz-ı aıt-ı
affiancer self-POSS3 tell-PRS
[kası at-nı kın iv-ın-ı yıbır-ırga] (MT mn.)
which horse-ACC who house-POSS3-DAT send-INF
‘The affiancer tells himself which horse to send to whose house’

(37) [sin nırsı aıt-ı-sıng rinat-ı] ul anıa-mı-y (ML mb.)
you what tell-PRS-2SG Rinat-DAT he understand-NEG-PRS
‘(That,) What you tell to Rinat, he doesn’t understand’

(38) anıa-mı-y-m [nısta süli-y-sıŋ] (MSt.)
understand-NEG-PRS-1SG what talk-PRS-2SG
‘I don’t understand what you are talking’

7 Discourse-Pragmatic Structures
As in Russian, the preferable placement of the constituent expressing new information in the discourse is clause-final, after the finite verb:

(39) bırın bırın zaman-da, bir avıll-da,
past past time-LOC INDEF village-LOC
bır-gan [bır bay, bır sawdاغär, män bıır yarlıj new.
live-PRF INDEF reach INDEF merchant POST.with INDEF poor
In very old times, in a village lived a reach (person), a merchant, and a poor (person). They both went out for trade. The poor has a horse, the merchant has a cart.

The bridegroom gives the girl a ring.

But who lets him talk? It’s Allah Ta’ala Who lets him talk!

From here started the wedding (celebrations). (…) Then came nine cars. The wedding celebration was great.

However, the position of the identificational focus remains preverbal.

A TV doesn’t need a connection, what it needs is electricity.

Questions

As in Slavic languages, question words (wh-words in English) are typically clause-initial.

How are we supposed to guess that riddle?

Who has solved this task for you?

To whom does this ring belong? Who did this?

An adverb precedes the interrogatives:

Whom did lightning strike yesterday?
9 The position of the particles imĭš and ikăn
The placement of the particles imĭš and ikăn, which express indirectivity and mirativity, corresponds with the placement of their Russian counterparts (e.g., the word okazyvaets‘a ‘It has emerged that’):

(48) bak-sa-m, ikăn pauza-da tîr-a (MLmb.)
look-COND-1SG MIR pause-LOC stand-PRS
‘I look – it’s on pause!’

(49) īv-īgīz ikăn zur (Maxmutova 1978: 254)
house-POSS2PL MIR big
‘Your house is big!’

(50) sin imĭš süli-y-āl-ā-sīn mî? (MKuzn.)
you MIR speak-CV-be.able-PRS-2SG Q
‘You can speak?’

(51) ul ikăn bîr padša-nîn kîz-î (Kakuk 1996: 97)
DEM MIR INDEF padishah-GEN daughter-POSS3
‘Turns out, she is a daughter of a padishah!’

10 Conclusion

Mishar Tatar demonstrates many syntactic features which are not typical of Turkic languages and can only be explained by the contact phenomenon.

At the noun phrase level, there is a genitive modifier which is placed after the modified noun. In contrast to other contact influenced languages as Trakai Karaim, Halič Karaim or Gagauz, in which the modifier can also appear after the modified noun, the possessive suffix of the modified noun is omitted in the formation of compounds, whereas the modifier always carries the genitive suffix.

In a verb phrase, the tendency to place the infinitive after its head is observed.

Right branching in the clause subordination is also possible by use of the relative pronouns and relative adverbs. The native junctors are based on Russian ones. Although relative and correlative structures can also be found in other Turkic languages characterized by contact with Indo-European languages, their presence in Mishar Tatar is strengthened by the impact of Russian. The placement of direct speech after the reporting verb and the use of the dependent interrogative clauses with finite verb forms can be regarded as a copy of subordinative structures in Russian.

On the discourse-pragmatic level, the position of new information is at the end of a clause, as in Russian. While the position of the identificational focus remains immediately in front of the predicate core, the interrogatives appears as a clause-initial. The particles imĭš and ikăn, which are normally clause-final in Turkic languages, occur in the same positions as their Russian counterparts.

All of these features described above correspond to the features of Slavic languages, especially of Russian. Due to this fact, the syntactic developments in Mishar Tatar should be of concern as a result of the strong impact of Russian.
Abbreviations

ABL – Ablative
ACC – Accusative
AOR – Aorist
CAUS – Causative
COND – Conditional
CONJ – Conjunction
COP – Copula
CV – Converb
DAT – Dative
DEM – Demonstrative pronoun
EXIST – Existence copula
GEN – Genitive
IMP – Imperative
INF – Infinitive
LOC – Locative
MIR – Mirative
MOD – Modal
NEG – Negation
NP – Noun phrase
P – Pronoun
PART – Participle
PL – Plural
POSS – Possessive
POST – Postposition
PRF – Perfect
PST – Past tense form
Q – Question particle
REL – Relative pronoun
SG – Singular
VOL – Volitative
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