

FOR REFERENCE
JUN 10 1982

TENSE, ASPECT AND MODALITY
IN THE USE OF THE
TURKISH AORIST

by
Nergis ENMUTLU
B.A. in Eng.Lit., Boğaziçi University, 1982

Submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in
Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
Linguistics

Bogazici University Library



39001100317067

14

Boğaziçi University
1984

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Hikmet Sebüktekin who provided me with helpful advice and criticism during the course of my study. I am most thankful to Dr. Eser Taylan and Dr. Sumru Özsoy for pointing out the formal and stylistic shortcomings, for their guidance and constant encouragement in my research and for their detailed comments on the earlier versions of this thesis.

TENSE, ASPECT AND MODALITY
IN THE USE OF THE TURKISH AORIST

This study is concerned with explicating various temporal, aspectual and modal phenomena involved in the use of aorist in Turkish which is referred to as a present-time denoting suffix in the grammars of the language.

The starting point of the study was data analysis. The different uses of the aorist such as: expressing present, future and past time, omnitemporal and gnomic utterances, possibility, necessity and habituality have been dealt with. In so doing, it has been found out that aorist is the main way to express non-deictic propositions in Turkish. It has to be noted that, in these propositions, the function of the aorist is not one of tense. This point seems to explain the reason why the Turkish aorist is often referred to as geniş zaman 'broad tense'.

It has also been stated that the aorist does have a temporal function but only in expressing past and future. Hence, it can be referred to as a tense only in connection with past and future.

One of the important functions of the aorist is to denote possibility and necessity which belong to the modal scale. All the modal uses of the aorist is the 'natural outcome

of its future reference.

The aorist, in its habitual use represents a series of individual events which as a whole make up a state stretching back into the past and forward into the future. This aspectual function is the result of a structural description of the world rather than a phenomenal one. This is the main difference between the progressive and aorist in their habitual uses.

The above functions of the aorist are examined both in the complex sentences within the study and in simple sentences that are formed with semantically classified verbs such as state verbs, action verbs, etc., in which the predicate bears the aorist suffix as a separate section in the appendix to provide a chance of comparison.

It has been put forth that the aorist does not in itself have a rhetorical function. The context of utterance and its interaction with linguistic and extralinguistic factors as well as the semantics of the verbs cause the variation in meaning.

As a result, it has been proposed that, contrary to the former beliefs, -(i)r does not denote present time. Hence the thesis provides a warning against careless generalization about tense usage.

GENİŞ ZAMAN EKİ -(i)r' İN KULLANIMINDA
ZAMAN, KİPLİK VE GÖRÜNÜŞ KAVRAMLARI

Bu çalışmada geniş zaman eki -(i)r 'in çeşitli kullanımlarının zaman (tense) kiplik (modality) ve görünüş (aspect) açısından bir değerlendirilmesi yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın başlangıç noktası örnek çözümlemesidir. -(i)r ekinin şimdiki, geçmiş ve gelecek zaman, olasılık, gereklik ve alışkanlık belirtme işlevleri incelenerek bunun sonucunda bu ekin en yaygın olarak gösterimsiz önermelerde (non-deictic utterances) kullanıldığı görülmüştür. -(i)r 'in geniş zaman eki olarak adlandırılmasının başlıca nedeni budur. Ancak, gösterimsiz önermelerde edim zamanı ile önermeyi söyleyiş anı arasında bir ilinti kurulmadığı için, bu durumda bu ekin işlevi 'zaman' (tense) değildir.

-(i)r eki yalnızca gelecek ve geçmiş zaman belirttiği durumlarda söyleyiş anı ile edim arasında ilinti kurar. İşte ancak bu durumda işlevi zaman belirtmektir.

Geniş zaman ekinin aynı zamanda kiplik de belirtmesi, gelecek zaman işlevinin doğal sonucudur. Olasılık ve gereklik işlevleri kiplik kavramı açısından değerlendirilmiştir.

Geniş zaman ekinin en sık görülen kullanımlarından biri bitmemişlik görünümünün (imperfective aspect) bir ayrımı olan alışkanlık belirtmesidir. Bu işlevin incelenmesi sırasında alışkanlık belirtmede -(i)r ile benzer görevi olan şimdiki zaman eki -(i)yor arasında bir karşılaştırma yapılmıştır. Bunun sonucunda, -(i)r eki ile alışkanlık belirtmenin, kişinin ya da nesnenin yapısal (structural) anlatımına dayandığı, -(i)yor ile aynı anlamı vermenin ise olaycılık (phenomenal) anlatımına dayandığı sonucuna varılmıştır.

Geniş zaman ekinin yukarıda belirtilen işlevleri çalışmanın içinde çoğunlukla karmaşık cümlelerde incelenmiştir. -(i)r ekinin anlamca sınıflandırılmış eylemlerle yapılmış basit cümlelerde belirttiği anlamlar ise karşılaştırma yapmak amacıyla ekde gösterilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, bu ekin yalnızca kendi başına yukarıda belirtilen anlamları içermediği, önermenin söylendiği ortamın, dile ait ya da dilden başka nedenlerin ve eylemin anlamsal sınıfının anlamda çeşitliliğe yol açtığı vurgulanmıştır.

Bu çalışma ile geleneksel tanımlamanın aksine, geniş zaman ekinin şimdiki zaman anlatımında kullanılmadığı ortaya konup, zaman, kiplik ve görünüş kavramlarında dikkatsiz genelleme yapılmaması gerektiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....	3
1.1. Tense.....	3
1.2. Modality.....	9
1.3. Aspect.....	13
II. TEMPORAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST.....	20
2.1. Non-Deictic Uses of the Aorist.....	22
2.1.1. Timeless Propositions.....	22
2.1.2. Omnitemporal Propositions.....	22
2.2. Deictic Uses of the Aorist.....	29
2.2.1. Historic Present	29
2.2.2. Fictional Use.....	32
2.2.3. Simultaneous Action.....	33
2.2.4. Future Reference.....	33
FOOTNOTES.....	35
III. MODAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST.....	37
3.1. Aorist Expressing Epistemic Modality.....	37
3.1.1. Epistemic Possibility.....	38
3.1.2. Epistemic Necessity.....	40
3.2. Aorist Expressing Deontic Modality.....	45
3.2.1. In Giving Permission.....	46
3.2.2. Speaker Taking the Responsibility.....	47
3.2.3. Speaker Reporting the Necessity.....	47
3.2.4. Speaker Lays the Obligation.....	47
3.2.5. Speaker Gives an Undertaking.....	47
3.3. Aorist Expressing Dynamic Modality.....	51

	Page
3.3.1. Making an Offer.....	53
3.3.2. Speaker Speaks on Behalf of Someone Else..	53
3.3.3. Action Taken by the Person Addressed.....	53
3.3.4. Offering and Suggesting.....	54
3.3.5. Future Reference of Neutral Possibility...	54
3.3.6. Future Reference of Subject-Oriented Possibility.....	55
FOOTNOTES.....	57
IV. ASPECTUAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST.....	59
Habitual-Structural	
FOOTNOTES.....	75
V. CONCLUSION.....	76
FOOTNOTES.....	80
APPENDIX A.....	81
APPENDIX B.....	84
APPENDIX C.....	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	87

"Indeed; it is no exaggeration to say that there is probably no tense, mood or aspect in any language whose sole semantic function is the one that is implied by the name that is conventionally given to it in grammars of the language."

(Lyons, 1977:682)

INTRODUCTION

There are two present-tense morphemes in Turkish; namely -iyor and -(i)r which are attached to verb bases. The progressive -iyor expresses the continuity of the situation and at the same time it is the main way for the description of present events. The aorist -(i)r has various functions besides its use as a time - denoting morpheme. This term, which is borrowed from Greek grammar, means 'unbounded'.

One of the functions of the aorist is to denote continuing activity, but to equate, for example yaparım with 'I do' and yapıyorum with 'I am doing' is a misleading oversimplification. Fundamentally, yaparım means 'I am a doer' and according to context it may represent: 'I habitually do' 'by and large I am the sort of person who does', 'I am ready, willing and be able to do' and, 'I shall do'. Thus, aorist may carry modal functions of possibility, futurity, hypothetical truths and an aspectual function of habituality.

Verbal expressions have traditionally been discussed in terms of tense, aspect and mood or modality, indicating roughly, the temporal placement of an event relative to the speech act, the temporal contour of the event and the attitude of the speaker towards the event respectively. All three of these broad factors intersect in the use of the Turkish aorist -(i)r.

This study is concerned with explicating various temporal, aspectual and modal phenomena involved in the so-called aorist in Turkish. Following Friedrich, (1974:6)

we refer to the aorist as 'aspectoidal' ! Because, in the aorist, the habitual and present tense are taxonomically coordinate, and they intersect at the surface in various ways. Thus, the temporal functions in a manner closely resembling the aspectual ones.

An attempt will be made to account for the diversity of tense-aspect-modality functions of this morpheme. This study aims to provide a basic, but not an exhaustive description of some limited but interesting factual observations and the generalizations underlying them.

The main approach of our study will be a semantic one. Thus, focusing on one morpheme, we are going to deal with the meanings expressed by it.

Chapter I presents the background of the study. The basic concepts such as tense, modality and aspect will be dealt with.

Chapter II discusses the temporal functions of the aorist making a distinction between deictic and non-deictic usage.

Chapter III discusses the modal functions of the aorist and, thus, tries to clarify the underlying meaning of the statement which is used in the definition of ^{the} aorist as : 'it expresses willingness of the speaker and possibility.'

Chapter IV deals with the aspectual function of the aorist and attempts to bring a new explanation to the problem with the help of ^{the} structural-phenomenal distinction.

I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1.1. Tense

"Geniş zaman", adından da anlaşılacağı gibi, her zamanı içine alan, fiilin her zaman ortaya çıktığını ve çıkacağını ifade eden zamandır.' (Ergin, 1962:275)

'The present tense has two important uses. One of these,..... is to express habitual or repeated actions, or to make statements that are considered to be always true, without restriction as to time. The other important use,..... is to express the willingness of the subject to perform the given action! (Underhill, 1976:147,148)

Having read the descriptions above, we can simply draw a conclusion saying: "Aorist is not a tense". Then, what are our criteria for our conclusion, in other words, what is tense?

Tense relates the time of the situation referred to, to some other time, usually to the moment of speaking. It is referred to as a deictic category because it locates the time of a situation relative to the situation of the utterance.

The commonest tenses found in languages are present past and future. In the present tense, the situation that is described is located temporally as simultaneous with the moment of speaking.

(1) Nesrin şarkı söylüyor.

'Nesrin is singing a song'

The axis of orientation is the present moment; the verbalization and the event take place at the same time.

The speaker both experiences the event and describes it.

In the past tense, the situation is located prior to the moment of speaking:

(2) Nesrin şarkı söyledi.

'Nesrin sang a song'.

Again, the axis of orientation is the present moment and the speaker recalls an experienced event that has been actualized in the past.

In the future tense, the situation is located subsequent to the moment of speaking.

(3) Nesrin şarkı söyleyecek.

'Nesrin will sing a song'

At point present, the speaker anticipates the event which she hasn't yet experienced.

It is often implied that the distinction between past, present and future is essential to the notion of tense. Present tense is essentially used for description; past tense refers to the events that have already taken place. In other words, both the present and the past tenses are factual. However, the recognition of futurity as factual and as a tense is a controversial issue to discuss because the future can never be predicted. The statements of future only reflect the speaker's attitude. Futurity is never a purely temporal concept. It necessarily includes an element of prediction or some related modal notion.

The most basic tense-distinction in the Turkish tense system, as it is in the vast majority of the tense systems of other languages, is the distinction between past and non-past.

It is sometimes claimed that there are languages without true tenses, for example Chinese or Yoruba, and this is correct in the sense that such languages may lack tenses morphologically marked in the verb, or indeed systematically elsewhere. But we can confidently assume that there are no languages where part of an M-tense system is not realised somewhere in time-adverbials. (Levinson, 1983:78)

It is axiomatic that all events take place in time and that there are only two possible practical relationships between events: they must be either simultaneous or sequential.

If it is kept in mind that linearity and seriality are bound together in dealing with events and time, it follows that there are only three possible order relationships between events and any axis of orientation: the event being perceived may be anterior to, simultaneous with, or posterior to the event used as an axis of orientation (the perception). No other order relationship is even theoretically possible. This may seem to explain why man can deal with events in only three fashions; past, present and future. We can perceive them, recall them, or anticipate them.

Any act of observation, the actual experiencing of any act of observation, the actual experiencing of any event automatically becomes an axis of orientation. This act is the objective referent of the term 'point present'. Man can place himself in relation to events in four fashions. He can recall at point present, any experienced event. And, he can anticipate events which he has not experienced. In addition, he can contemplate an event on a high level of abstraction. Then,

this event may be considered to be outside of time, that is, not oriented to any axis. Before the observer begins to speak, he establishes an order relation between himself and the event to be reported.

Traditionally, tense is believed to be an inflectional category of the verb. It is a fact that tense, like person is realised in the morphological variations of the verb in most of the languages Turkish, being an agglutinative language is an example of this type.

But semantically, however, tense is a category of the sentence, since situations are not described by verbs alone, but rather by the verb together with its arguments. Although tense is usually indicated in the verbal morphology, it does not only characterize the verb itself but it characterizes the whole sentence. For example the following sentence has an aorist suffix attached to the verb:

(4) Ben yarın gelirim.

'I will come tomorrow'

The aorist may denote habituality, futurity, possibility and present time. In example (4) above, it is the adverb yarın 'tomorrow' that helps us to clarify the meaning of the aorist. Therefore, the meaning of the tense is deduced from the whole sentence, not from the verb alone.

Tense, as distinct from deictic temporal reference, is not a universal feature of language (Lyons, 1977:678). All languages do not have tense distinctions but they all have various adverbs or particles of time like şimdi 'now', sonra 'soon', bugün 'today' and dün 'yesterday'. They are used to

indicate deictic temporal reference.

Another important point in discussing tense is the concept of "tenselessness." There is a distinction between the timelessness of propositions and the tenselessness of sentences.

Three types of propositions can be distinguished for which the question of time reference does not arise: a) Timeless propositions, b) omnitemporal propositions and c) gnomic utterances (Lyons, 1977:680).

In timeless propositions, the situation or state of affairs that is described is outside of time. Eternal truths of mathematics are examples of this kind.

(5) İki kere iki dört eder.

'Two and two makes four.'

Omnitemporal propositions, whose truth-value is constant, describe things that have been, are and always will be so:

(6) Güneş doğudan doğar.

'The sun rises in the east.'

Omnitemporal propositions are time-bound but they are temporally unrestricted. That means, although they are time-bound, they can not be limited, stopped or restricted in time, because man does not have the power to stop them, like the rising of the sun. Any proposition that is not timeless is called time-bound.

Linguists refer to general truths as 'gnomic'. Proverbs and aphorisms in all cultures are examples of this type :

(7) Balık baştan kokar.

'Corruption starts at the top.'

Gnomic utterances are very complex. Some of them are timeless and some of them are omnitemporal. They are used to express tendencies, generalities and assumed regularities. In other words, they have a modal and an aspectual character.

In Turkish, all three types-timeless, omnitemporal propositions and gnomic utterances-are expressed typically by the non-past tense, aorist. But these utterances have nothing to do with present time. Because they are time-bound, their temporal status is non-deictic.

To sum up, There are two quite different ways of conceiving and talking about time: the dynamic way and the static way (Lyons, 1977:682). The dynamic way is the tensed way. This indicates distinctions as past, present and future to present the situations.

(8) Ben bavulları bagaja koyarım.

'I'll put the suitcases in the trunk!

In the above example, the reference is made to future and it is an example of dynamic expression of time.

(9) Her koyun kendi bacağından asılır.

Prov. 'Every mutton is hung by its own legs.'

'Every one is responsible for himself.'

(10) Kızılırmak Karadeniz'e dökülür.

'Kızılırmak flows to the Blacksea.'

Examples (9) and (10) express the static way- or tenseless way. The situations are viewed as they are in a permanent order.

The dynamic conception of time is deictic and the static conception is not. The crucial fact about tense is that it is a deictic category.

1.2.Modality

In addition to tense, we also need to define modality in order to explain the different uses of the aorist. For example, in the sentence below, the aorist suffix has nothing to do either with expressing time relations or habituality:

(1) Öğleden sonra yağmur yağar.

'It may rain in the afternoon.'

We can not refer to the above sentence as future because we can never know whether it is going to rain or not. It only reflects the speaker's prediction.

Modality may be interpreted as a psychological attitude on the part of the speaker towards an event, an action, or a state.

Modality is a semantic term relating to the meanings that are usually associated with mood. The relation between mood and modality is similar to the one between tense and time.

Mood, like tense, is frequently realised by inflecting the verbs, as in Turkish or modifying it by means of 'auxiliaries' as in English.

Modality can best be explained by comparing a class of sentences which express simple statements of fact with sentences that include the speaker's commitment. The sentences that are unmarked for mood are traditionally called indicative or declarative.

The sentences that reflect the speaker's commitment with respect to the factual status of what he is saying- his emphatic certainty, his uncertainty, or doubt-are said to be in the modal system.

In Turkish, the aorist, the past tense, the presumptive past, the future tense are in the so-called declarative mood, whereas the imperative, wish-conditional, necessity, obligation and possibility belong to the modal scale.

However, there is not a very clear-cut distinction between the declarative mood and the modal scale as it is implied in the above classification. Because, the same forms are used both to express modality and indicate temporal reference. Turkish future tense suffix -(y)ecek is an example of this type. It both expresses modality and indicates time.

Philosophers have for a long time debated whether the future can ever be regarded as factual, since we can never know what is going to happen. Lyons points out that it is possible to treat tense as a modality and to include tense logic in modal logic (1977:809).

The above view may shed light to future tense and future tense may be explained in relation to modal logic.

Three basic kinds of modality can be distinguished; 'epistemic', 'deontic' and 'dynamic'. Dynamic modality can be further subdivided into 'neutral' and 'subject oriented' (Lyons, 1977:823, Palmer, 1977:36).

Epistemic modality is exemplified by possibility and necessity and the most important characteristic of this modality is that it is the modality of propositions. That is, it expresses the judgements about the possibility of an event

occurring. An example of epistemic possibility is as follows:

(2) İmtihani başarırsın, sakın korkma.

'You'll succeed in the exam, don't worry.'

In example (2), the speaker anticipates that the hearer will succeed. The proposition reflects this belief; it does not make an assertion about the other person's ability, habit or structure. Hence it is the epistemic possibility that is conveyed.

(3) is an example of epistemic necessity:

(3) Bulaşıkları yıkarsın, çöpleri atarsın. O zaman izin veririm.

'You have to do the dishes, throw away the garbage. Then, I will give you permission.'

In example (3), the speaker lays an obligation and expresses his will, there is no circumstantial condition for his statement. Thus, it is epistemic necessity.

Deontic modality is basically performative as opposed to epistemic modality which is non-performative. It can best be described as 'discourse oriented'.

(4) Pekala, doğum gününe erkek arkadaşlarını da çağırmana izin veririm, ama içki yok!

'All right, I give permission, you can also invite your boyfriends to your birthday party but no alcoholic drinks!'

In uttering the above sentence, the speaker is understood to perform an action. That is, he actually gives the permission. He does not state something, but he simply does something.

Dynamic modality indicates that the subject or the circumstance has the power to cause the event to take place. There are two kinds of dynamic modality-circumstantial and subject oriented.

(5) Çamlıca tepesine çıkarsanız, bütün Boğaz'ı olduğu gibi görürsünüz.

'If you go up the Çamlıca Hill, you can see all of the Bosphorus as it is!

Example (5) reflects circumstantial dynamic modality, The conditions are given in the embedded sentence. In the example below:

(6) Ricardo Fogli Eurovision'da birinci olur.

'Ricardo Fogli may be the winner in the Eurovision Song Contest.'

the subject's capacity to perform the action is implied; That is, he has a very beautiful voice and song. As it will be held again in the modal functions of the aorist, the dynamic modality is the one that is mostly reflected either by the help of the embedded clause or the shared, known context, together with the verb and the aorist.

1.3.Aspect

Aspect is a different way of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation (Comrie,1976:3). That is, reference is made to the internal position of the situation, while there is no explicit reference to the beginning or the end of the situation.

(1) Nesrin, blucinin üzerine kareli gömlek giyer.

'Nesrin wears checked shirts with jeans.'

Example (1) describes the subject's act of wearing checked shirts as a characteristic type of behaviour for an extended period of time. The situation is viewed as a characteristic feature of a whole period-which is called habitual. Habitual is a subdivision of imperfective aspect.

(2) İçeri girdiğimde Nesrin uyuyordu.

'Nesrin was sleeping when I entered.'

In the above example, the first verb girdiğimde presents the background to some event, while the event is introduced by the second verb-uyuyordu.

Uyuyordu refers to the situation of Nesrin's sleeping, it makes explicit reference to the internal temporal constituency of the situation.

Although both aspect and tense are concerned with time, they are concerned with time in very different ways. Aspect, which differs from tense as a grammatical category is non-deictic. It has such distinctions as extension in time, instantaneity, completion, noncompletion, iteration, non-iteration. These distinctions are marked overtly far more widely throughout the languages of the world than tense is. (Lyons,

Although both tense and aspect may be found in the same language, it is not uncommon for there to be gaps and asymmetries. For example in Turkish, there is an aspectually unmarked past-tense form but there is no corresponding simple non-past form.

(3)a.Nesrin gitti. 'Nesrin went'

The above sentence is aspectually unmarked and it states the situation as a fact.

b. Nesrin gider. 'Nesrin goes'

c. Nesrin gidiyor. 'Nesrin is going'

Although the above sentences are both in present tense they are marked. Example (b) is marked as habitual and (c) is marked as progressive. Turkish does not have an aspectually un-marked way of expressing present time.

The notion of aspect is less familiar to non-linguists than the notions of tense and mood. This is a matter of historic accident. Because although it is put forward recently that aspect is ontogenetically more basic than tense, in that children whose native language has both, come to master the former more quickly than they master the tense system. (Lyons, 1977:703,705) It has traditionally been stated as a subcategory of tense.

The term aspect is used to refer to the opposition of perfective and imperfective. The perfective looks at the situation from outside, without necessarily distinguishing any of the internal structure of the situation.

(4)a.Geçen sene bu otelde kaldık.

'Last year we stayed in this hotel'.

The imperfective looks at the situation from inside, and as such is crucially concerned with the internal structure of the situation, since it can both look back towards the start of the situation and look forwards to the end of the situation, and indeed is equally appropriate if the situation is one that lasts through all time, without any beginning and without any end:

(4)b. Geçen sene bu otelde kalıyorduk.

'Last year, we were staying in this hotel.'

As the examples (4) a and (4) b show the difference explicitly, in (4)b, although there is no difference in the duration of staying in the hotel, the sentence with the imperfective seems to have a longer duration as opposed to the limited time meaning of the perfective in (4)a. This is due to the difference in concentration on the situation because perfective indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinction of the various separate phases that make up that situation.

A sequence of forms with perfective meaning will normally be taken to indicate a sequence of events.

(5) Fırtına damı çökertti, elektrik direklerini devirdi.

'The storm collapsed the roof and overthrew the electric posts.'

Since each of the two situations is presented without regard to its internal constituency, a natural interpretation is to take them as events that occurred in succession, each one complete in itself, more over, they will normally be taken

to have occurred in the order in which they are presented in the text.

The perfective cannot be defined as describing a situation with limited, as opposed to unlimited duration; bir saat 'one hour', on yıl 'ten years' are limited periods but both perfective and imperfective forms can be used to describe such duration (Comrie ,1976:17).

(6) a. Bir saat bekledim. 'I have waited for an hour'.

b. Bir saattir bekliyorum. 'I have been waiting for an hour.'

Although both of the above examples have a duration of 'one hour', example (a) is perfective because it is situation external and (b) is imperfective because it is situation internal.

Perfectivity indicates a completed action. It denotes a complete situation, with beginning, middle and end. The use of 'completed' however, puts too much emphasis on the termination of the situation, whereas the use of the perfective puts no more emphasis, necessarily on the end of a situation than any other part of the situation, rather all parts of the situation are presented as a single whole.

Since the imperfective indicates a situation in progress, and since the perfective indicates a situation which has an end, the only new semantic element introduced by the perfective is that of the termination of the situation.

Perfectivity involves lack of explicit reference to the

internal temporal constituency of a situation, rather than explicitly implying the lack of such internal temporal constituency. Thus it is quite possible for perfective forms to be used for situations that are internally complex, such as those that last for a considerable period of time or include a number of distinct internal phases, provided only that the whole of the situation is subsumed as a single whole.

(7) a. Bir zamanlar onu çok seviyordum.

'Once upon a time, I used to love her
very much.'lit..'I was loving'

b. Bir zamanlar onu çok sevdim.

'Once upon a time, I loved her very much.'

As the above sentences illustrate, the act of loving lasts for a long period and in example (7) a. it is expressed by an imperfective form, but although it has duration, it can be expressed by perfective as it is seen in example (7) b. as well.

The general area of imperfectivity is subdivided into two quite distinct concepts of habituality and continuousness.

Habituals describe a situation which is characteristic of an extended period of time, so extended in fact that the situation referred to is viewed not as an incidental property of the moment but precisely as a characteristic feature of a whole period.

It is often assumed that habituality is essentially the same as iterativity i.e. the repetition of a situation, the successive occurrence of several instances of the given situation. Comrie (1976:27) states that this is misleading because of two reasons:

Firstly, the mere repetition of a situation is not sufficient for that situation to be referred to by a specifically habitual form.

(8) Ali beş kere hapşırdı. 'Ali sneezed for five times'.

His sneezing of five times can not be interpreted as habitual. It is just a repetition at a single moment.

Secondly, as it is seen in example (9), a situation can be referred to by a habitual form without there being any iterativity at all.

(9) Atatürk heykeli karakolun sağında dururdu.

'The statue of Atatürk used to stand on the right side of the police station'.

Any situation that can be protracted sufficiently in time, or that can be iterated a sufficient number of times over a long enough period can be expressed as habitual.

Progressivity, which is another subdivision of imperfectivity indicates duration but it is not directly related to the actual duration of the activity but rather to the indication of that duration. The non-progressive form merely reports the action as if it were replying to the question Ne yaptı? 'What did she do?'

(10)a. Dans etti. 'She danced.'

Whereas the progressive specifically indicates its duration, as if it were a reply to Vaktini nasıl geçirdi ?

'How did she spend her time?'

(10)b. Dans ediyordu. 'She was dancing'

The non-progressive does not deny duration but simply does not indicate it.

The progressive always indicates activity continuing both before and after the time indicated.

(11) Ona baktığımda gülüyordu.

'When I looked at him, he was laughing.'

His laughing both precedes and continues after my sight of him.

The progressive often suggests that the activity was unfinished, while the non-progressive normally suggests its completion. We may compare:

(12)a. Bu sabah çukulatalı kek yaptım.

'I made a chocolate cake this morning'

b. Bu sabah çukulatalı kek yapıyordum.

'I was making a chocolate cake this morning.'

In (12)a. The making of the cake has been completed. Where the progressive is used, the completion of the activity is not implied.

Very often, it is seen that misleadingly, aorist is treated as 'habitual' and the 'progressive' is treated as referring to action taking place at the present moment—thus making the distinction between habitual and non-habitual present action. However, the progressive as well as the aorist may be used in a habitual use. This point will be dealt with in Chap.IV.

II. TEMPORAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST

Deictic versus Non-deictic Usage

Before we go on to analyse the temporal functions of the aorist, it is worth our concern to define what deixis is because it is essential for the understanding of the distinction of the following two examples:

(1) Sırrını açma dostuna, o da söyler dostuna.¹

'Don't tell your secret to your close friend, he may tell his close friend, too.'

(2) Sözlüde 'indirect speech'ten de sorar.

'She may ask questions on the indirect speech as well in the oral exam.'

In example (1), There is no axis of orientation, it is not anchored to any time, it is non-deictic.

In example (2), the axis of orientation is the moment of utterance. The reference is made to the future. Therefore, it is deictic.

Deixis is the phenomenon through which the relationship between language and context is reflected in the structures of languages.

Time is a traditional category of deixis. It is an objective entity which man does something to, in and with-the fourth dimension of objective reality.²

Time deixis concerns the encoding of temporal points and spans relative to the time at which an utterance is spoken. This time is called coding time (CT), and it is distinct from receiving time (RT). Time deixis encodes times

as anchored to the time of utterance. Time deixis is commonly grammaticalized in deictic adverbs of time as: şimdi 'now', dün 'yesterday', but above all in tense. Tense is one of the main factors ensuring that all sentences when uttered are deictically anchored to a context of utterance.

Confusion over whether some sentences like the following are tenseless or 'eternal' in part stems from a deep equivocation over the term tense:

(3) iki kere iki dört eder.

'Two and two make four'.

(4) Inekler ot yer.

'Cows eat grass'.

Let us, following Lyons, distinguish the semantic or theoretical category of tense, which we may call metalinguistic tense (M-tense for short) from the verbal inflections that a traditional grammar of a particular language may call the tenses of that language, which we may call L-tenses.

M-tense can be given a purely deictic and strictly temporal interpretation but it is an empirical question as to what extent L-tenses can also be treated in the same way. Then, we may say that the above examples (3) and (4) are L-tensed since the verbs are inflected for the aorist, but they are M-tenseless that is, non-deictic.

M-tenses do not match up simply with L-tenses, for L-tenses nearly always encode additional aspectual and modal features too. For example, L-future tenses probably invariably contain a modal element.

The following classification of the non-deictic uses of the aorist is proposed.

2.1.Non-Deictic Uses of the Aorist

2.1.1. Timeless Propositions

A timeless proposition is one for which the question of time-reference simply does not arise; the situation or state-of-affairs that it describes is outside time altogether. Obvious examples of timeless propositions are the so-called eternal truths of mathematics and theology. It is interesting to note that all timeless propositions in Turkish are expressed by the aorist.

(5) Su, 100⁰ de kaynar ve o derecede donar.

'Water boils at 100⁰ and freezes at 0.'

(6) Bir diküçgende dikkenarların kareleri toplamı hipotenusün karesini verir.

'In a right triangle, the sum of the squares of the right sides gives the square of the hypotenus'

2.1.2. Omnitemporal Propositions

An omnitemporal proposition, on the other hand, is one that says that something has been, is and always will be so. It is a proposition whose truth value is constant. Omnitemporal propositions are also expressed by the aorist in Turkish. Perhaps, that is the reason why the Turkish aorist is referred to as geniş zaman 'broad tense'.

(7) Kuşlar, yumurtlayarak çoğalır.

'Birds reproduce by laying eggs.'

(8) Cisimler, üzerlerine düşen ışığı yansıtırlar.

'Things reflect the light that falls on them.'

Geographical statements, are likewise, for practical purposes, without time limit:

- (9) İstanbul Boğazı, Marmara ile Karadeniz'i
birbirinden ayırır.

'The Bosphorus separates the Marmara Sea and
the Blacksea.'

- (10) Sular, yerle gök arasında devamlı olarak
hareket eder ve yer değiştirirler.

'Water, continuously moves between the sky and
the earth and changes place.'

- (11) Dünyanın kendi eksenini ve güneş etrafında dönüşü
mevsimleri meydana getirir.

'The revolving of the earth round its axis and
round the sun gives way to the seasons.'

The above usages follow from the definition of the
unrestrictive use of the aorist in Turkish. Omnitemporal
propositions are one subclass of time-bound propositions. They
are time-bound but temporally unrestricted.

It is important to realize, however, that there is no
intrinsic connection between the grammatical category of tense
and still less between any particular tense and the expression
of either timeless or omnitemporal propositions. That means, it
is not important whether the language uses the past tense or
present to express timeless propositions because the tense
forms are not used to relate the time of the utterance to the
time of the event. In other words, they are not used deictically,
they are used in a non-deictic way.

The distinction between timelessness and omnitemporality
is difficult to draw and so too is the distinction between
omnitemporality and a variety of time-bound notions that
approximate to or resemble omnitemporality.

Linguists refer to so-called general truths as 'gnomic'. They are expressed in the proverbs and aphorisms that are passed on, in all cultures, from generation to generation. In these, the aorist is used to express general beliefs.

(12) Acele işe şeytan karışır.

Prov 'Great haste makes waste.'

(Lit. 'Devil steps into the hurried action.)

(13) Acı patlıcanı kırağı çalmaz.

Prov. 'A worthless vessel does not get broken.'

(Lit. The bitter egg-plant does not get frost-bitten.)

(14) Bıçak yarası geçer, dil yarası geçmez.

'A knife wound heals; a wound caused by words does not.'

The temporal status of the propositions embodied in gnomic utterances is extremely diverse: some are timeless and others are omnitemporal: but many of them could hardly be said to describe anything more than tendencies, generalities and assumed regularities:

(15) Dava kazanmak için haklı olmanız gerekmez.

'You don't have to be necessarily right in order to settle a litigation.'

(16) Yüzü güzel olanın huyu da güzel olur.

'One whose face is beautiful, so is her behaviour.'

As the above examples express, they are not general truths but subjective beliefs. For example, you may not agree that one does not have to be right in order to settle a litigation or that all the beautiful girls have good behaviours.

But the most important thing is that, the temporal status of the gnomic utterances expressed by the aorist, if they are time-bound, is non-deictic.

We can base our assertion of a general truth upon the evidence of our past experience, or upon our knowledge of what is usually the case. Gronic utterances are such that they tend to be concerned with matters of opinion rather than fact; and this brings them within the scope of epistemic modality.

A useful test in assigning an utterance as non-deictic is that, in all the non-deictic uses of the aorist, the answer to the question:

Kim der? 'Who says so?'

is always impersonal or öyle denir 'People believe that'.

Also, the answer to the question Ne zaman? 'When?' is always Her zaman 'All the time'.

(17) Çivi çiviği söker.

'One nail drives out another.'

a) Kim der? 'Who says so?'

Öyle denir. 'People believe that'

b) Ne zaman? 'When?'

Her zaman 'All the time.'

The timeless propositions, omnitemporal propositions and gnomic utterances can be nominalized by the -dik morpheme under a main S, such as herkesçe bilinir 'It is known by everybody'

(5)a. Su 100⁰ de kaynar ve 0⁰ de donar.

'Water boils at 100⁰ and freezes at 0⁰C.'

b. Suyun 100⁰ de kaynadığı ve 0⁰ de donduğu herkesçe bilinir.

'It is known by everybody that the water boils at 100⁰ and freezes at 0⁰.'

In the above example, the aorist suffix is replaced by the non-future -dik participle and the possessive suffix -i is added. Genitive suffix -in is attached to the subject.

However, with the deictic uses, we cannot do this replacement, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

(18)a. Ali yarın gelir. (Deictic-future reference)

'Ali comes tomorrow'.

b.* Ali'nin yarın geldiği herkesçe bilinir.

In non-deictic utterances we see that the things have always been, are and always be in the way that is described. Their truth value is constant. For this reason we can confidently use the non-future suffix -dik. But in the future use of the aorist, if we want to embed the sentence, we have to use the -yecek suffix which is a future-denoting suffix, since Ali's coming is not actualized yet. Then, although the sentence becomes grammatical in form;

(18)c. ? Ali'nin geleceği herkesçe bilinir.

'Ali's coming is known by everybody'

this time it becomes semantically incompatible because something expected to take place in the future can not be considered to be known by everybody.

Let us have a look at the past reference of the aorist:

(19)a. Tam o sırada doktor içeri girer.

'Just at that moment the doctor walks in'.

b.? Tam o sırada doktorun içeri girdiği
herkesçe bilinir.

'The doctor's having entered in is known
by everybody.'

Although the non-future suffix -dik does not cause a problem, this time, because the reference is made to past, 'it is known by everybody' causes the semantic incompatibility.

The application of the above syntactic test to the modal uses of the aorist will be dealt with in Chapter III and its application to the aspectual use of the aorist will be dealt with in Chapter IV. It has proved to be useful in distinguishing the non-deictic uses of the aorist from the deictic, modal and habitual uses. In the non-deictic use, this nominalization is grammatical, whereas in the other deictic, modal and habitual uses, it is ungrammatical or odd.

Another important point that should be noted is that the type of the sentence plays a big role in the interpretation of the utterance - a role which is similar to the role of the adverbs. The term 'type of sentence' refers to the structural properties of the S, that is whether the S is simple or complex. It has already been mentioned that when the sentence is simple, it is the semantics of the verb that assigns the function of the aorist. Simple sentences are dealt with in Appendix A. The data that formed the basis of investigation in this study nearly as a whole consist of complex sentences which are heavily marked with the subordinate clauses. In the process of defining the functions of the aorist, we have first classified the verbs semantically based on Chafe and Vendler's verb classifications (Appendix A) According to this classification, simple sentences which the predicate bears the aorist suffix are examined. The effect of the use of the different subjects and the change in the scope of the meaning of the S are indicated in the table in Appendix B.

As it is seen in Appendix A, when the sentence is a simple one, only the ambients among the other verb classes can express non-deictic reference that is marked on the aorist. And, it is obvious that in the subject position there is always the 3rd_p. (sing.or plural)

2.2.Deictic Uses of the Aorist

In all the uses of the aorist, even in the non-deictic usage, there is a basic association with the present moment of time (the moment of speech). In other words, the state or event has psychological reality at the present moment. This element of meaning does not exclude the possibility of its having actual being at a time other than the present. It is known that the aorist in special circumstances can refer to past and to future time exclusive of present time. In the 'historic present', it represents past events as if they were happening now; in the 'future present', it refers to future events regarded as already predetermined.

2.2.1. Historic Present

The use traditionally known by the term 'Historic present' is best treated as a story-teller's account, whereby past happenings are portrayed or imagined as if they were going on at the present time.

Information about the time, place, participants in the events and situation may be given in separate orientation sections or as part of the narrative clauses. The separating function of the tense-switch is supported by the fact that phrases such as 'all of a sudden' or 'just at that moment' precede a switch. These phrases suggest that something new and unexpected is about to occur.

(20) Tam o sırada, sekreter içeri girer ve patronun beni hemen görmek istediğini söyler . Durumu tahmin et.

'Just at that moment, the secretary enters and says that the boss wants to see me immediately.

You can figure out the rest.'

The above utterance, making use of the historic present, is typical of a highly coloured popular style of oral narrative. By using the present to describe events which occurred in the past, the speaker presents them as if they were occurring in front of our eyes. This creates the effect of immediacy and makes the narrative more vivid and dramatic. This form occurs precisely at the point of the climax.

When the aorist is used in referring to past as in historic present, the aorist suffix may be replaced by the past tense suffix -di.⁴

(21.) Tam o sırada sekreter içeri girdi ve patronun beni görmek istediğini söyledi.

'Just at that moment the secretary entered in and told that the boss wanted to see me'

The answer to the question Ne zaman? 'When?' is always 'in the past'.

Try to think of a situation when you are being told the story above: The secretary's entrance, etc. Suppose you have missed some part of it. Although it is being told in present tense, it is odd for you to ask:

? Sekreter ne söyler?

'What does the secretary say?'

Instead, you ask using the past tense:

Sekreter ne dedi?

'What did the secretary say?'

The following example illustrates a similar extension

of the aorist to cover information which in strict historical terms belongs to the past:

- (22) Remarque, savařçıları, savař kışkırtıcılarını, insanlardan yana edebiyatçının yürekli kalemıyla yerer, iç yüzlerini apaçık ve bıkmadan anlatır. 'Remarque, criticizes the warriors and the provokers of war on behalf of the mankind by way of the brave pen of the man of letters and tells the real truth of them in a very clear way without getting tired of it'.

When discussing an artist and his surviving work, one feels justified using the aorist, because the work, and through it (in a sense) the artist are still alive. The whole career of a painter, writer or musician may, in fact, be viewed as timeless reconstruction from the works themselves. (Leech, 1971:8)

In historical summaries and tables of dates, the aorist is used in variation with the Past Tense:

- (23) 1 Mayıs 1950-Brecht ve karısı Helena Weigel, Berlin'de 1 Mayıs gösterilerine katılırlar , halkın Weigel'e 'Cesaret Ana' diyerek yaptığı büyük sevgi gösterileri Brecht'i etkiler. '1st May 1950: Brecht and his wife Helena Weigel join the 1st May manifestations in Berlin, the people's heartfelt demonstration of their admiration by addressing Weigel 'Mutter Courage' influences him!'

2.2.2. Fictional Use

Technically, a distinction may be made between the historic use of the present and its fictional use. It is customary for novelists and story writers to use the aorist to describe imaginary happenings. Transposition into the fictional present is a device of dramatic heightening, it puts the reader in the place of someone actually witnessing the events as they are described:

(24) Birdenbire Ayşe kalkar, kağıtları toplar ve pencereden dışarı fırlatır.

'All of a sudden Ayşe stands up, collects the papers and throws them out of the window.'

Aorist is also used very frequently in instalments of serial stories on the radio, television or in the popular "foto-roman" type of magazines:

(25) Çıkan kısmın özeti: Ahmet eve döner ve karısını ölü bulur.

'The story so far: Ahmet returns home and finds his wife dead.'

The passive-form of the aorist can be found in the travelogue itineraries:

(26) Karamürsel'e giderken, Gölcük'ten geçilir, yolda on dakika ara verilir.

'On the way to Karamürsel, you pass from Gölcük and give a break for ten minutes.'

However, the embedded clause is marked with the-ken suffix, which is an aspectual morpheme. This suffix refers to the internal temporal constituency of the situation and means 'in the process of.'

The aorist is very often seen in instruction booklets:

(27) Önce kapak açılır, sonra lastik yapıştırılır.

'First you open the cover, then stick the rubber

2.2.3. Simultaneous Action

When the aorist is used to signify an event simultaneous with the present moment, as in cookery demonstration,

(28) Üç yumurta alırım ve büyük bir kasede çarparım.

'I take three eggs and beat them in a big bowl.'

the audience can see what is happening, but the demonstrator reports it as well to make sure there is no misunderstanding.

But, the event probably does not take place exactly at the instant when it is mentioned. Therefore, it is subjective rather than objective simultaneity that is conveyed. This point will be dealt with again in the structural / phenomenal distinction in Chapter IV.

2.2.4. Future Reference

The aorist may refer to future time exclusive of the present:

(29) Önümüzdeki hafta işe başlarım.

'I start work next week.'

The future uses of the aorist is usually marked with time adverbials such as: önümüzdeki hafta 'next week', yarın 'tomorrow', etc.

In the future uses of the aorist, the answer to the question Ne zaman? 'When?' even in the absence of a future adverbial, is always in the future:

(30) Ödevi bitiririm.

'I'll finish the homework,'

When?-- Sometime in the future- not specified

or Hemen 'immediately', biraz sonra 'soon', etc.

If the answer to the question 'When?' is her zaman 'all the time', 'always', then it is habitual, not referring to future.

Because of the close relation between modality and the expression of future time, the future reference of the aorist will be dealt with in Chapter III, The Modal Functions of the Aorist.

At this point, it is worth looking at the Appendices A and B. It is interesting to note that actions, achievements, accomplishments and process-actions that are marked with the aorist can be used with all persons for deictic reference. However, states, processes and ambients may be used to draw deictic reference only with 3rd person singular and plural subjects.

FOOTNOTES

1 The aorist suffix is -(i)r . Allomorphs:er, ar, 1r
ir, ur, ür. The personal suffixes come after the aorist, 3rd
person is not marked.

2 Time is a traditional category of deixis. For the
physicist, time is the fourth dimension, an objective entity
characterized and defined by three attributes: 1-Linearity
2- durational infiniteness, and 3- the capability of being
divided into an infinite number of segments having an infinite
variety of magnitudes. In less scientific terms, time is what
is measured by clocks, the phases of the moon, the revolutions
of the earth upon its axis, and on the verbal level, by minutes,
hours, days, years, etc. In terms of human emotions and sub-
jective perception, time is what passes as we grow older and
what seems to go nowhere while we wait impatiently at a traffic
light. (Bull, 1963:4)

3 Non-future suffix. base + (-dik). This suffix forms
a substantive from every verb, a 'verbal nominal' denoting
a having performed the action (or experienced the state) denoted
by the verb. The form denotes that the action is (was)
complete. The performer of the action (or be-er in the state)
is supplied by possessed personal suffixes.

4

The past tense suffix is (-d₁) . This suffix added to all verb roots and bases makes a finite verbal predicate from denoting the performance of the action (or occurrence of the state) denoted by the verb, in the past.

III. MODAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST

In the first chapter, it was suggested that the expression of 'futurity' was as much a matter of mood, rather than tense. A careful study shows that all the modal uses of the aorist is the natural outcome of its having a future reference. And this future reference either concentrates on possibility or necessity.

We may now take up different kinds of modalities that are expressed by the aorist namely epistemic, deontic and dynamic and analyse the meanings associated with the aorist.

3.1. Aorist Expressing Epistemic Modality

It is the kind of modality with which judgements are made about the possibility or necessity that something is or is not the case. Epistemic modality is the modality of propositions rather than of actions, states and events.

The two basic kinds of possibility and necessity are expressed in the following examples:

Possibility:

(1) Adnan Bey olmazsa başkası çıkar karşıısına.

'If Adnan Bey isn't possible for her, some other one may appear suddenly in front of her.'

Necessity:

(2) Şimdi doğruca eve gidersin, pazartesi tekrar işinin başında olursun.

'Now you must (have to, should) go straight home, and be back on your job on Monday.'

3.1.1. Aorist Expressing Epistemic Possibility

Epistemic possibility indicated by the aorist can both refer to present or future.

At this point, we must state that the aorist is not the only marker of possibility in Turkish. Namely the suffix -(y)ebil denotes ability, possibility or permission to perform the action or be in the state denoted by the verb.¹

(3) Yarın gelebilirim.

'I may come tomorrow.'

The above example is similar to the one below:

(4) Yarın gelirim

'I may / will come tomorrow.'

But if example (3) is uttered after 'imtihanlarım bitti, yarın gelebilirim', then although it does not really exclude possibility, it may denote ability and may mean 'I can come tomorrow.'

The interesting thing about this suffix is that it is attached to the verb stems and adds a modal meaning to the verb and then the verbs that are formed with this suffix can be conjugated for all tenses.

(5) Yarın pikniğe gidebilecek.

In the above example, the reference is made to future. -(y)ecek is attached to the -(y)ebil suffix.

Under the heading of epistemic possibility, we should also perhaps handle the 'concessive' use of the aorist in a particular construction:

(6) Annem ne derse desin, giderim.

'Whatever my mother may say, I will go.'

(7) Ne kadar zor olursa olsun, üstesinden gelir.

'No matter how hard it will be, he can/may overcome it.'

The meaning in (6) is that of 'possible that', as 'My mother may say that.' We are concerned with the consideration of possible propositions. In example (7), there is the possibility of a hard situation. In other words, in both examples, the situation is hypothetical, in other words possible.

Epistemic possibility indicated by the aorist can be paraphrased in the following way:

Ben sanıyorum ki belki...

'As far as I am concerned, I think maybe.....'

Although -ki construction is basically foreign in Turkish structure and not much used, it has value as a test.

The underlying subject in epistemic modality is always the speaker, who utters that sentence. Epistemic possibility is subjective and reflects the belief of the speaker.

(8)a. Birde bakarsın bugün öğleden sonra haber gelir.

'To our surprise, news may come today in the afternoon.'

b. Ben sanıyorum ki belki bir de bakarsın bugün öğleden sonra haber gelir.

'I think, may be to our surprise, news may come today in the afternoon.'

The sentences that reflect epistemic possibility answer the question: Sence ne olur/olabilir?

'What may happen according to you?

(What's your idea about it?)

(1) Sence ne olur? 'What may happen according to you?

Bence (Ben sanıyorum ki belki) Adnan bey olmazsa başkası çıkar karşısına.

When we apply this syntactic test to deontic modality, we see that the sentences become semantically incompatible. Consider the following examples:

(9)a. Bir daha yalan söylemeyeceğime söz veririm.

'I promise that I won't tell lies again.'

b.? Ben sanıyorum ki belki bir daha yalan söylemeyeceğime söz veririm.

(The sentence has to be interpreted performatively not in reference to future)

c. Sence ne olur? According to you what may happen?

? Bir daha yalan söylemeyeceğime söz veririm.

The above examples are semantically incompatible because in deontic modality, it is the action that matters, not the proposition, whereas in epistemic modality, just the opposite is true.

3.1.2. Aorist Expressing Epistemic Necessity

(10) Yaptığın hatayı baban gelince tamir edersin, yoksa yüzüme bakma.

'You have to beg to be excused when your father comes, if you don't, I'll be cross with you.'

(11) Döndüğüne göre artık paramı verirsin.

'Since you've returned, you can give my money back.'

Examples (10) and (11) indicate what the speaker thinks should happen and so they have to be interpreted epistemically. But the ambiguity remains: We may interpret example (11) in two

ways - 1. I believe that you have to give my money back (epistemic) 2. Now that you are back, according to the circumstances, you'll give the money back. (This time it expresses circumstantial dynamic possibility.)

We noted earlier that epistemic modals are normally subjective, i.e. that the epistemic judgement rests on the speaker.

At this point, we should make clear that the aorist is not the only marker of necessity in Turkish.

We have a number of forms, namely; 'icap et'- 'gerek.' 'lazım' and ''zorunda'.² The necessity mood which is marked by the verbal suffix -meli is the most common way of expressing necessity. This suffix comes after verb stems.

(12) Çok çalışmalısınız. 'You must work more'.

However, with all the above mentioned constructions, the meaning is expressed in a very direct way, sometimes it may be considered as rude but with the aorist expressing necessity, the meaning is indirect and like a suggestion. Note the difference between the following examples:

(13)a. Önce bulaşığı yıkaman lazım, sonra ödevini bitirmelisin.

'First, you must wash the dishes, then you have to finish your homework.'

b. Önce bulaşığı yıkarsın, sonra ödevini bitirirsin.

'First, you have to wash the dishes, then you should finish your homework.'

Example (13)a. is more overt in expressing necessity.

Epistemic necessity can be paraphrased in terms of :

'Bence mutlaka.....-meli...

'According to me, absolutely.... must...'

(13)a. Önce bulaşığı yıkarsın.

'First, you have to do the washing up.'

b. Bence mutlaka bulaşıkları yıkamalısın.

'According to me, you must wash the dishes,'

Sentences that express epistemic necessity answer the question:

Sence ne yapmalı? 'According to you what must he/she do?'

When we apply the above criteria to deontic necessity, we see that it does not hold.

(14)a. Seçim sonuçları T.V.'de ilan edilir.

'The result of the elections are announced on the T.V.'

At this point, it is odd to ask the question as Sence T.V. ne yapmalı? 'What must the T.V. do? because it has nothing to do with the speaker's will. Thus, we cannot replace the aorist with -meli by adding 'According to me' at the beginning.

(14)b.? Bence mutlaka seçim sonuçları T.V'de ilan edilmeli.

'According to me, absolutely the result of the elections must be announced on the T.V.'

Although the sentence remains to be grammatical, the meaning of the modality changes, it becomes epistemic necessity. It reflects the subjective opinion of the speaker. This is due to the fact that epistemic necessity reflects the speaker's belief only, whereas deontic modality can report what someone else or an authority requires.

The clearest evidence of the subjective nature of the

epistemic modality expressed by the aorist is that the propositions are expressed only in the present, for the judgement and the act of speaking are simultaneous. The underlying meaning in both epistemic possibility and epistemic necessity is, 'At the moment, I think....' If the reference is for future, then it has to be interpreted in a dynamic, not in an epistemic sense.

When we apply the nominalization test which we have discussed in Chapter II in dealing with temporal functions of the aorist, we see that the sentences become ungrammatical as will be seen in the examples below.

- (15)a. Belki öğleden sonra haber gelir. (Epistemic Possibility)

'Maybe news may come in the afternoon.'

- b.* Belki öğleden sonra haberin geldiği herkesçe bilinir.

Because of obvious logical reasons, possibility is incompatible with 'It is known by everybody'. Also, in the modal uses of the aorist, the reference is always made to future.

- (16)a. Ben diyorum ki, baban gelince özür dilersin. (Epistemic necessity)

'I say that you have to apologise when your father comes.'

- b.* Ben diyorum ki, baban gelince özür dilediğin herkesçe bilinir.

There are very few adverbs that can be used with the aorist in the epistemic sense. They are confined mostly to those that themselves express judgements such as belki

'Maybe' and herhalde 'perhaps' are used to express possibility

(17) Belki şimdi bakıp gülümser.

'Maybe she may look and smile.'

Eminim 'I'm sure' and muhakkak 'absolutely, definitely' are used to express necessity.

(18) Akşama muhakkak dönersin.

'You must definitely return by the evening.'

It may be useful again to have a look at the simple sentences and see how epistemic modality is reflected in them. Our examples have shown that action and achievement verbs for all persons can express epistemic possibility whereas accomplishment and process-action verbs can express the same meaning with 1st and 3rd persons (singular and plural) states, processes and ambients express epistemic possibility with 3rd person (singular and plural) only.

As for epistemic necessity, we see that its use in simple sentences is very restricted. Accomplishments and process-actions reflect this meaning with 2nd and 3rd persons (sing. and plur.), actions with 2nd persons (sing. and plural) and 3rd person singular, whereas the achievement verbs only reflect epistemic necessity with 2nd person singular.

Before we go on to analyse deontic functions of the aorist, it is worth repeating that epistemic modality is the kind of modality that is most clearly distinct from the others in the sense that it only reflects the speaker's attitude towards the actions and situations.

3.2. Aorist Expressing Deontic Modality

The dividing line between deontic modality and the other two kinds- namely epistemic and dynamic modality is not very clear. The kind of modality that we call deontic is basically performative: By uttering a proposition, a speaker may actually give permission, make a promise, a threat or lay an obligation. Deontic modality is discourse oriented.

Performative utterances, as opposed to declarative sentences have no truth value. They are used to do something rather than to say that something is or is not the case. Austin refers to the declarative sentences as 'constative utterances' (Lyons, 1977:726). He states that their function is to describe some event, process or state-of affairs. Added to these, they have the property of being either true or false.

The distinction between constative and performative utterances rests upon the distinction between saying something and doing something by means of language (Austin,1962).

A performative utterance is an utterance whose syntactic realisation exhibits a performative verb as its highest surface predicate. In making the utterance, the speaker simultaneously performs the act it refers to. (Partridge,1982:29)

A performative is a verb which can be used to perform an explicit speech act. That means, the speaker, through its utterance explicitly does that and only that which its content denotes. (Partridge,1982:31)

The typical syntactic form of the performative is the 1st person indicative active. In Turkish, both the aorist and progressive can be used in performative utterances.

To be used as a performative, a verb must be analysable into three distinct components: it must be a verb of action, thus non-stative, because something is done by its utterance; for the same reason it must be a verb of saying; finally it must have an explicitness component which names the activity performed by the utterance of the particular performative.

We take the criterion of being performative as a starting point for defining deontic modality.

(19) Dünkü davranışım için özür dilerim.

'I apologise for my behaviour yesterday.'

(20) Yalvarırım dışarı çıkmayın.

'I beg (you), please don't go out.'

In examples (19) and (20), the speaker actually begs and apologizes.

Also, as we see in the following example, the speaker may take responsibility for the judgement without actually involving himself in a performative action.

(21) Bütün zararınızın ödeneceğine dair söz veriyoruz.

'We promise that all your loss will be paid.'

3.2.1. In Giving Permission

Deontic possibility consists essentially in the giving of permission

(22) Tabii izin veririm, defterleri incelersiniz. Ha, arama emriniz yanınızda, değilmi?

'Of course I can give permission, you may examine the notebooks, by the way you have the search warrant with you, haven't you?'

In example (22), the speaker actually gives permission when he is uttering the sentence.

3.2.2. Speaker Taking the Responsibility

When expressing deontic necessity, the speaker clearly takes responsibility for the imposition of necessity.

(23) Şimdi bu ilaçları almanızı tavsiye ederim,
bir hafta hiç aksatmadan kullanırsınız.

'Now I recommend you that you have to take
this medicine and use it very just for one week.'

3.2.3. Speaker Reporting the Necessity

Of course, a speaker may report what someone else or an authority requires. (Palmer, 1979:61)

(24) Anayasa şöyle der : Herhangi bir sebeple
boşalan bakanlığa en geç on beş gün içinde
atama yapılır.

'The constitution says: An appointment must be
made to the ministry that has become free for
some reason-within fifteen days-the latest.'

3.2.4. Speaker Lays the Obligation

Deontic necessity usually implies that the speaker is in a position to lay the obligation, and is thus in a position of some authority. With deontic necessity, we see that the subject is always either the 1st person singular or 1st person plural.

(25) Seni bir şartla takıma almaya söz veririm, bir
daha gece kulübüne gitmezsin.

'I promise to take you to the team only with
one condition that is, you must not go to a
night club anymore.'

3.2.5. Speaker Gives an Undertaking

Another function is that the speaker gives an undertaking or guarantees that the event will take place. It does

not merely lay an obligation, however strong but actually guarantees that the action will occur.

(26) Tahlil sonucunu yarın alırsın.

'You will take the result of the analysis tomorrow'.

(27) Merak etmeyin, tapu yarın elinize geçer.

'Don't worry, you will get the deed of real estate tomorrow.'

In the above examples, the speaker guarantees that the action will take place. However, the performative verb of 'to guarantee' does not surface. Although they lack explicit performatives, their illocutionary act makes the hearer understand as if they contain the performative garanti etmek 'to guarantee'. The intention is implicit; it is not conveyed directly by the utterance produced.

In examples (26) and (27), if the speaker is understood not to take the responsibility of guaranteeing, then the examples have to be interpreted epistemically because that time, they would express the speaker's attitude.

When we apply the nominalization test (i.e. embed the simple S in the form of a nominalization under the main S herkesçe bilinir.) that has been discussed in Chapter II, it is seen that the sentences become semantically incompatible.

(28)a. Galilei'yi görmenizi tavsiye ederim .

'I recommend you to see 'Galilei.'

b.? Galilei'yi görmenizi tavsiye ettiğim

herkesçe bilinir.

'My having recommended you to see Galilei is known by everybody.'

The above example became ambiguous because the primary

criterion for deontic possibility is its being performative. There is no relation between performing something and stating something because when we say 'It is known by everybody', we simply state something.

In analysing deontic modality, our verb classification has proved to be insufficient for this type in the sense that deontic modality requires a special type of verb- that is performative. Therefore, we could not have an example of deontic modality in our classification. In order to name a verb as performative, it has to pass four tests as we have already stated. These four tests and some performative verbs are stated in Appendix C.

The underlying subjects in deontic modality are either 1st p. or 3rd p. (3rd person - in reporting performative acts by people in authority.)

The sentences that express deontic modality can be paraphrased in terms of:

1. Şimdi diyorum/diyoruz/diyor ki. 'Now, I/we/he say/says that'.

But demek not in the sense of thinking but actually uttering words.

2. Şimdi garanti ediyorum/ediyoruz/ediyor ki.

'Now, I/we/he guarantee/guarantees that'

(22)a. Tabii, izin veririm, defterleri incellersiniz.

'Of course (I give permission) you may examine the notebooks.'

b. Şimdi diyorum ki izin veririm, defterleri incellersiniz.

'Now, I say that I give permission, you may

examine the notebooks.'

However, we cannot put yarın 'tomorrow' before the main verb in deontic utterances.

(29)a.? Kaç yıldır bu mesleğin içinde olduğunuzu
yarın söylermisiniz?

'Could you tell us tomorrow, for how many years you're in this business?'

(30)? Yarın izin verirmisiniz?

'Could you give permission tomorrow?'

(Not referring to future, in other words, it has to be actual giving of permission.)

When we put 'tomorrow' we see that the modal meaning changes in the sentences. This is due to the performative nature of deontic modality. The above examples can refer to future but they cannot express deontic modality.

3.3. Aorist Expressing Dynamic Modality

The last kind of modality that we will deal with, which is expressed by the aorist is dynamic modality:

There are two kinds of dynamic modality, neutral (or circumstantial) and subject oriented. Neutral possibility simply indicates that an event is possible. But the possibility of the event is due to the circumstances and it does not have anything to do with the modality of the proposition or the belief of the speaker.

- (31) Öğrenciler dışarda futbol oynuyor. Pencereden dışarı bak, onları görürsün.

'The students are playing football outside. Look through the window, you'll see them.'

- (32) Kimbilir, bu şartlar altında belki de tam tersi olur.

'Who knows, maybe under these conditions just the reverse will happen.'

The first example states that the students are observable at the moment while the second refers to future circumstantial possibility. This sense is clearer in examples where the subject is the impersonal 'you' or the sentence is in the passive.

- (33) İnsanın aklı karışır bunu çalışırken.

'One may become confused while studying this.'

In the above example, the condition is stated as: 'bunu çalışırken'. If the condition was not stated, only 'insanın aklı karışır' would express epistemic possibility

because that time it would have only expressed the speaker's idea.

(34) Hem susup, hem de karşısından kendi istekleri doğrultusunda davranış beklemek düş kırıklığı ile sonuçlanır.

'Both to remain silent, and to expect the behaviour in accordance with your will from the person opposite you ends with disappointment.'

Also, in the above example, the causes of the disappointment are explicitly stated and the result is expressed as the natural outcome of the reasons.

The description 'circumstantial possibility' is more appropriate if there is a clear indication of the circumstances in which an event is possible:

(35) Bir ülkede müsbet hukuk kuralları, tabii hukukun ilkelerine uydukları oranda değer kazanırlar.
'Positive law rules in a country gain value in proportion with the extent that they are in accordance with the principles of natural law'.

The following example is one of subject-oriented possibility where the subject has the power and necessary qualities to course the event:

(36) Geleceğim benim elimde. Ya hayatımı yeniden düzene sokarım , ya da mahvolurum.
'My future is in my hands. Either I put my way of life in order or I'll be ruined.'

However, we should not define subject orientation simply and strictly in terms of ability. Only animate entities may have ability, but personification is possible with

inanimates, where the indication is that they have the necessary qualities or 'power' to cause the event to take place as we see in example (5).

It is not always possible to distinguish between mere possibility and ability, between neutral and subject oriented possibility.

Aorist, in expressing dynamic modality, is often used not simply to say what one can do or what is possible , but actually to suggest, by implication, that action will, or should be taken. We can distinguish four different types of this use:

3.3.1. Making an Offer

It is regularly used with 'I' or exclusive 'we' to make an offer by the speaker or the speakers.

(37) Evet, istiyorsanız size bir fatura göndeririz.

'Yes , if you want we'll send you an invoice.'

3.3.2. Speaker Speaks on Behalf of Someone Else

It may also be used with the third person pronouns where the speaker speaks on behalf of someone else, but leaves it vague whether the initiative comes from him or not:

(38) Paketi almaya yarın Nesrin gelir, sonra o seni telefonla arar , oldu mu?

'Tomorrow Nesrin will come to take the packet, then she'll call you later, all right?'

3.3.3. Action Taken by the Person Addressed

With a second person pronoun it suggests that action be taken by the person addressed:

(39) Öğleden sonra daireden beni ararsın, bazı şeyler söyleyeceğim.

'Call me at the office this afternoon. I'll tell you something'.

3.3.4. Offering and Suggesting

If 'we' used inclusively, that means 'you' and 'I' or 'you' and 'we') it combines offer and suggestion.

(40) Erken gelirsin, önce bir iki tek atar , bir-
şeyler atıştırır, sonra çıkarız.

'Come early, first we can have a drink, then eat something and go out.'

It is, naturally, perfectly possible to ask questions with dynamic possibility. The commonest interrogative use is to request an action:

(41) Ben hemen unuturum, şuraya kısaca çizermisiniz yolu?

'I easily forget, would you draw the way in a short form over there?'

(42) Bavulun ucundan tutarmissınız biraz, çok ağır.

'Could you hold on the edge of the suitcase, it's too heavy.'

With future time reference, neutral and subject oriented modality function slightly different.

3.3.5. Future Reference of Neutral Possibility

With neutral possibility, the aorist may be used to refer to future events, provided the possibility can be seen as present; i.e. that it is possible for something to occur and that it will or may occur in the future:

(43) Kaçta çıkarsın?

'At what time will you go out?'

(44) İstediğin zaman İstanbul'a döneriz, yeter ki ev bulalım.

'We can return to İstanbul whenever you want, provided that we find a flat.'

Of course, the aorist is often used in a general 'timeless' present sense, and this extends not only into the present but also into the future too.

3.3.6. Future Reference of Subject-Oriented Possibility

With subject oriented possibility, the distinction between present ability and future ability is more obvious:

We can use the aorist to refer to future events, if the meaning is that there is capacity now which may be actualized in the future:

(45) Fenerbahçe, önümüzdeki sene şampiyonluğu alır.

'Fenerbahçe can get the championship next year.'

(46) Nesrin, Güzel Sanatlar Akademisi imtihanını kazanır.

'Nesrin can pass the examination of Fine Arts Academy.'

Nesrin and Fenerbahçe have the ability now, but they will perform the action resulting from that at a later time.

The first general point that must be made after giving all the above examples is that it is not the aorist alone that gives the meaning of dynamic possibility. As we have already observed, in circumstantial possibility, it is the subordinate clause that sets the scene. It prepares the minds to observe the conditions and then, the aorist gives the meaning of possibility which is not very different from epistemic possibility. The only difference is that in dynamic possibility, we have the conditions explicitly stated.

In subject oriented possibility, the semantics of the verb and its relation with the arguments of the sentence give the meaning of subject orientation. We naturally perceive it that way. The presupposition of example (45) and (46) is the natural outcome of the verbs 'kazanmak' (to win) and 'şampiyonluğu almak' (to get the championship). We naturally have the presupposition that they have the capacity.

All the examples given in this section were more or less complex sentences and nearly half of them had conditionals in the subordinate clauses.

The purpose of the section- Aorist Expressing Dynamic Modality - was not merely to focus attention onto the meaning of the aorist alone but to develop a sense of how the subordinate clause and the semantics of the verbs affect the meaning of the tense of the main verb.

As it can be seen in Appendix B, when the sentence is simple and marked on the aorist, achievement verbs and accomplishment verbs can give the meaning of subject-oriented possibility for all persons. However, actions give the same meaning with only the 1st person (singular and plural), with process-action verbs, it is seen that the 1st and 3rd person singular and plural give the subject oriented possibility. It is interesting to note that states, processes and ambients can not reflect this kind of modality.

When we look at the circumstantial dynamic modality, the reverse of the above result is seen, such as; this time states, processes and ambients can reflect circumstantial possibility (with 1st person and 3rd person singular and plural) whereas the others can not. This is due to the fact that circumstantial possibility is expressed by the help of the subordinate clauses.

FOOTNOTES

1

In Turkish, we do not have a special mood for possibility. It is solely marked either by the aorist or with 'yeterlik eylemi' (the verb of ability) as referred by Gencan. I believe, this is not a very proper name for this suffix because it marks possibility as well as capability. The suffix $-(y)a + (-bil)$ is added to the verb roots. Duvarı boyayabilirim. 'I can/may paint the wall.' The verb may be conjugated for all tenses: Dün gidebilirdim. 'Yesterday, I could go'. The negative of this form, the inabilitative is formed by the suffix $-(y)â$ plus the negative suffix $(-ma)$ without $(-bil)$. Gidebilirim. 'I may go' Gidemem, 'I can't go.' If the suffix $(-bil)$ is not deleted in the negative form, then it denotes possibility: Gidemeyebilirim. 'I may not possibly go.'

2

Aorist is not the only marker of necessity in Turkish. The necessity mood which is marked by -meli is the more common way to express necessity. This suffix forms from all verbs a participle denoting one who is under the necessity of performing the action (or being in the state) denoted by the verb. The necessity denoted is a rather impelling one.

Çok çalışmalısınız: 'You must work hard'

There are also other ways of expressing necessity in Turkish, namely : 1) Possessive constructions attached to the a) de-nominal verb -me and gerek (the verb may be conjugated for all tenses) b) lazım

This can be used with the broad tense suffix. -dır is attached to the nominals or it can be used with the verb ol . In this case, the verb can be conjugated. c) icap et .The verb may be conjugated. 2) Another way of marking the necessity is to put zorunda after the infinitives.

IV ASPECTUAL FUNCTIONS OF THE AORIST

Aspect, which deals with the temporal values inherent in the activity or state itself, characterizes the narrated event without involving the participants and without reference to the speech event. As it is stated by Friedrich, "Aspect, like number and taxis, is thus a nonshifter, and like number aspect implies quantifiable variables. Aspect does not serve to highlight the participants in the narrated event or the event itself." (Friedrich, 1974:38)

What he means by saying nonshifter is that emphasis or deixis is never one of its primary or even secondary functions.

So far, we have dealt with time reference of the aorist and its modal functions. The purpose of our dealing with aspect is to focus attention primarily upon habituality, which is a kind of imperfective aspect. It should now be clear that habituality is worth our concern because one of the main functions of the aorist is to express habituality.

However, marking the sentences with the aorist suffix is not the only way of expressing habituality in Turkish. Progressive suffix -iyor, besides its functions as denoting continuity and present time, is widely used to denote habitual actions as seen in the example below:

(1) Sabahları altıda kalkıyorum.

'I get up at six in the mornings.'

It is worth our concern here to investigate the similarities and differences between these two forms in expressing habituality. In doing so, we are going to make use of two theories, namely : Leech's temporal-permanent distinction

and Goldsmith and Woisetschaeger's metaphysical explanation of the progressive and habitual usage.

4.1. Imperfective is the term used for explicit reference to the internal temporal structure of a situation, viewing a situation from within:

(2) Geçen sene bugün hayatımın en mutlu gününü yaşıyordum.

'Last year today, I was living the happiest day of my life.'

Although the day has passed, it is finished, the speaker makes reference to the duration of the day, using the progressive marker -iyor.

Imperfective forms cannot be used to refer to situations lacking internal structure.

4.2. Habituals are the description of situations which are characteristic features of a whole period because they are extended in time to a great extent. For example:

(3) Yuvada yetişen çocuklar insanlardan uzak durur, kolay kolay konuşmazlar.¹

'Children who are raised in nursery schools stay away from people and do not speak easily.'

The aorist, in its habitual use represents a series of individual events which as a whole make up a state stretching back into the past and forward into the future:

(4) Gömleklerimi Kip'ten alırım.

'I buy my shirts at Kip.'

(5) Okula yürüyerek gider.

'He goes to school on foot.'

Examples (4) and (5) make one think of an established habit (a series of repeated events), not just of a single event.

Adverbial expressions of frequency reinforce the notion of repetition and help to figure out the habituality more clearly:

- (4) G mleklerimi /her zaman/ genellikle Kip'ten alırım.

'Always/generally I buy my shirts at Kip.'

Returning to Chapter II, let us try to apply the non-deictic test to the aspectual function of the aorist:

- (6)a. İ e arabayla gider.

'He goes to work by car.'

- b. ?İ e arabayla gitti i herkes e bilinir.

'His having gone to work by car is known by everybody'

Example (6) is a typical habitual use of the aorist. At first sight, the above sentence does not seem unacceptable because the habitual extends both to the past and future, thus it does not cause problems when it is used with the non-future suffix -dik. However, the example is odd because the habitual actions can never have 'truth' value, in other words, we cannot refer to them as 'facts' and obviously they cannot be known by everybody.

Habituality is in principle combinable with various other semantic aspectual values, which are appropriate to the kind of situation that is prolonged or iterated.

If the formal structure of the language permits combination of the overt markers of these various aspectual values, then we can have forms that give overt expressions

both to habituality and to some other aspectual value.

In Turkish, habitual can combine even with the progressive aspect:

(7)a. Her gece bu saatte şarkı söyler.

'She sings songs at this time every night.'

b. Ayşe'ye gittiğimde şarkı söylüyor olurdu.

'When I went to Ayşe, she used to be singing songs.'

As example (7)b shows, progressiveness is not incompatible with habituality: a given situation can be viewed both as habitual and as progressive: each individual occurrence of the situation is presented as being progressive and the sumtotal of all these occurrences is presented as being habitual.

However, there is a specific order in the sequence of progressive and habitual aspect. Although example (7)b is very commonly heard, the following is unacceptable:

(7)c * Ayşe'ye gittiğimde şarkı söyler oluyordu.

The progressive aspect is the more inner form and comes immediately after the verb and the habitual can be used after the progressive.

This specific order is especially important if the verbs are semantically different. ie., if the state verb follows an activity verb, then we can not refer to the activity verb with habitual and state verb with progressive aspect as in example (7)c. However, if both verbs are state verbs as in the example below;

a. Ayşe kardeşini sever görünüyordu.

'Ayşe seemed to (was seeming) to like her brother.'

b. Ayşe kardeşini seviyor görünürdü.

'Ayşe used to seem as if she liked (was liking)

both versions are possible. But if both verbs are activity verbs, like: running and playing,

c. Ayşe koşar , oynardı. 'Ayşe used to run and play.'

d. Ayşe koşuyor. oynuyordu. 'Ayşe was running and playing.'

e.* Ayşe koşuyor, oynardı.

f.* Ayşe koşar, oynuyordu.

the verbs have to be identical in their reference to habitual activity or progressivity.

A common misleading statement is one that treats the aorist as habitual and the progressive -iyor as referring to action taking place at the present moment-making the distinction between habitual and non-habitual present action.

(8)a. Hergün gazete okur. 'He reads the paper everyday.'

b. Şimdi gazete okuyor. 'He is reading the newspaper now.'

But, the progressive as well as the aorist may be used in a habitual sense.

(9)a. Yemeklerde gazete okur. 'He reads newspapers at meals.'

b. Yemeklerde gazete okuyor. 'He is reading newspapers at meals.'

The progressive is also used to indicate habitual activity that is repeated and sporadic.

(10)a. Hep birşeyler kırar. 'She always breaks things.'

b. Hep birşeyler kırıyor. 'She is always breaking things.'

(11)a. Araba hep bozulur. 'The car always breaks down.'

b. Araba hep bozuluyor. 'The car is always breaking down.'

The difference between the aorist and the progressive is that the latter expresses that what is happening happens very often but does not happen at set times.

The second habitual meaning is repetition of events of limited duration.

(12) Ne zaman ona gitsem bulaşıkları yıkıyor.

'Whenever I go to her, she's washing the dishes.'

(13) Yedibuçuk'ta gelme, yemeğ*i* o saatte y*iy*oruz.

'Don't come at half-past seven, we eat dinner at that time.'

Here, the notion of limited duration is applied not to the habit as a whole, but to the individual events of which the habit is composed. The result of substituting the progressive for the simple present is thus to stretch the time-span of the event.

(14) İşe otobüsle gidip geliyor.

'He goes to work by bus.' (lit. is going)

(15) Bu günlerde daha çok et y*iy*oruz.

'We're eating a lot more meat nowadays.'

The above activities are habitual, but they are over a limited period. Compare the following examples:

(16)a. Kızcağız hergün bütün evi temizliyor da gık bile dem*iy*oru.

'Even though the poor girl is cleaning the whole of the house everyday, she isn't

even saying a word.'

b. Kızcağız her gün bütün evi temizler de gık bile demez.

'Eventhough the poorgirl cleans the whole house everyday, she doesn't even say a word.'

In (16)a, she may react to this situation in the future since we do not know her character very well but in (16)b, we know her and we comment that this is her character, behaviour.

The period of time is normally shown to be limited by adverbials. The progressive, together with adverbials such as - bütün sabah-'all morning' uzun bir süre 'for a long time', devamlı 'continually' -may be used with verbs that indicate single momentary actions with the necessary implication that the actions were being repeated throughout time.

(17) Devamlı yukarı kata çıkıp iniyor.

'He is continually going upstairs and coming down.'

The progressive is not directly related to the actual duration of the activity but rather to the indication of that duration.

Especially to be noted is the distinction made by the progressive /non-progressive with respect to simultaneity and successivity where a point of time (or in the case of a habitual, a series of points of time) is indicated.

(18)a. Ona ne zaman gitsem, yemek yapar.

'Whenever I go to her, she cooks.'

b. Ona ne zaman gitsem yemek yapıyor.

'Whenever I go to her, she is cooking.'

On each occasion, the activity of cooking follows (non-progressive) or overlaps (progressive) my sight of her.

The progressive aspect generally has the effect of surrounding a particular event or moment by a 'temporal frame', which can be diagrammed simply: That is, within the flow of time, there is some point of reference from which the temporary eventuality indicated by the verb can be seen as stretching into the future and into the past.

(19)a. Saatim çok iyi çalışır.

'My watch works perfectly.'

b. Saatim çok iyi çalışıyor.

'My watch is working perfectly.'

In (19)a, the reference is made to the permanent state of the watch—My watch is generally a reliable one. In (19)b, the reference is made to the temporary state of the watch—My watch is not particularly reliable, it has gone wrong in the past, and may do so again. (20 a,b) illustrate this point further

(20)a. Mintax kolay temizler.

'Mintax cleans easily'

b. Mintax kolay temizliyor.

'Mintax is cleaning easily.'

First, there are two separate habitual or iterative uses of the progressive, corresponding to the single habitual use of simple past and present.

(21) Bu kış gitar dersleri alıyorum.

'I am taking guitar lessons this winter.'

(22) Annem akşamları bizden sonra yatar ,

Sabahları da hepimizden önce kalkar.

'My mother goes to bed after we do, and gets up before all of us.'

b. Annem akşamları bizden sonra yatıyor.

Sabahları da hepimizden önce kalkıyor.

'My mother is going to bed after we do, and getting up before all of us.'

The meaning is habit in existence over a limited period. It is the temporariness of the habit that is important. It indicates a shorter period.

4.3. One of the reasons why the aorist is often designated as 'habitual' is that it is rarely used in its non-habitual sense.

First, a non-progressive form merely reports an activity but if the speaker can observe it at the present time, so too can the hearer.

A second point is that, present activity is usually incomplete and therefore even when there is no specific reference to the duration of the activity, its incompleteness implies the use of the progressive. The progressive is, thus, the commoner form for reference to present activity. We can indeed treat it as the norm, and say that generally, the progressive is used for reference to present activity.

4.4. At this point, we may introduce Goldsmith and Woiwetschlaeger's abstract notion of 'metaphysical' status to explain progressive/habitual distinction. According to them, the choice of progressive/simple present reflects the speaker's distinction of structural-phenomenal. These correspond to two different types of knowledge about the world.

Our knowledge of the world consists to a large extent of the functions, occupations and responsibilities of people and things:

(23) Bu tank rakı ile çalışır.

'This tank runs on rakı.'

The above example may be uttered on the basis of having designed the tank in that way. There is no reference to particular events or tests.

This knowledge of the structure of the world contrasts with a 'phenomenal' description of the world:

(24) Kenterler'de 'Güneyli Bayan' oynuyor.

'Güneyli Bayan' is on at the Kenterler.'

A sentence like (24) simply describes what is happening. This is the situation that Leech refers as 'temporary' (1971:15). Consider the following sentences:

(25)a. Ehliyet sınavı bilgi ölçmüyor.

'The driving license exam isn't assessing knowledge.'

b. Ehliyet sınavı bilgi ölçmez.

'The driving license exam doesn't assess knowledge.'

The semantic analysis of this pair of sentences is that (a) describes a situation phenomenally, and (b) structurally

Let us consider a scenario that will make this point clear. Your radio is continuously buzzing and you decide to repair it yourself. You pinpoint the source of the trouble in a transistor and replace it. You can confidently assert that:

(26)a. Radyo artık parazit yapmaz.

'Radio doesn't make buzzing anymore.'

with or without turning on and testing it.

To say:

b. Radyo artık parazit yapmıyor.

'The radio isn't buzzing anymore.'

you would certainly have to turn on the radio first, and your comment would be just an observation, rather than a claim about its being repaired.

On the other hand, imagine you are listening to the radio with your friend at home and the radio is buzzing.

Your friend says:

Radyo parazit yapıyor.

'The radio is producing a buzzing sound.'

and goes to the kitchen. She comes in, and noticing no buzzing sound, she may well say.

Radyo parazit yapmıyor.

'The radio isn't producing a buzzing sound'.

it would be odd to utter in this context the aorist:

? Radyo parazit yapmaz.

'The radio doesn't produce a buzzing sound.'

What makes these two cases different is the presence or absence of repair, which is an example of the more general notion of change. According to Goldsmith and Woisetschlaeger, this sense of change is central to a deeper understanding of the structural/phenomenal distinction, a principal semantic contrast in their system.

In discussing aspect, we must not limit ourselves with time because aspect has nothing to do with the time line. Formerly, linguists tried to explain the progressive/aorist distinction with respect to time.

Consider the following sentences:

(27)a. Atatürk'ün portresi girişteki duvarda durur.

'Atatürk's portrait stands on the wall in the entrance.'

b. Atatürk'ün portesi girişteki duvarda duruyor.

'Atatürk's portrait is standing on the wall in the entrance.'

Leech proposes that (a) is appropriate if the location of the picture is permanent and (b) if we expect it to change or whether its place has been changed.

It is quite natural to think of structure as relatively enduring and of phenomena as relatively transitory. But a structure that was fixed one way at one time can change or be changed, and so become fixed in another way.

When we apply this analysis to the description of human beings, it seems to hold. The utterances using the aorist characterize a person and the utterances with the progressive report on behavior.

Imagine for example, that two friends are talking about a third person whom both of them know well. The third person is considered to be one who never puts on make-up. If they should see her with make-up at the canteen one day, the only appropriate way for them to comment on their observation would be to say:

(28)a. Ayşe artık makyaj yapıyor.

'Well then, Ayşe is putting on make-up.'

(She didn't use to but now...)

The use of the aorist in this context would be inappropriate:

b.? Ayşe artık makyaj yapar.

'From now on, Ayşe puts on make-up.'
since our statement is based on a single observation.

We say as much as we know, and if we know Ayşe well enough to be able to judge her as always putting on make-up then we would not normally weaken our statement by using the progressive. Therefore, if we do use the progressive, there is an implication that we know enough about the person to contradict the evidence.i.e. we know that Ayşe never puts on make-up.

At this point, let us return to the cookery demonstration example in 2.2.3. and try to explain that exceptional usage of the aorist with structural/phenomenal distinction:

A cook in a cookery demonstration can describe how to cook curry and use the aorist to describe what he is doing. This use of the aorist is generally held to be exceptional. Although at first sight it seems to contradict the phenomenal/structural distinction, as if the aorist was the proper way of describing observations.

However, this is not a counterexample because although the cook can say:

(29) Şimdi soğanları alırım,doğrarım ve tavaya
koyarım.

'And now I take the onions, chop them, and put
them into a pan.'

he cannot continue in the following way'

(30)* Şimdi soğandan gözlerim yaşarır, mendilimi
ararım, Hay Allah, nerede bu mendil!

The reason for the oddity of the above example is that

the cook's description is in fact not a description of what he observes himself doing, rather, it is a description of the structure of the experiment that he is performing.

Let us think of a scenario where the progressive form is used in the above example: My mother is busy with ironing in the balcony and thus she can neither watch, nor hear the T.V. A cook is describing a dish on the T.V. I observe him and narrate his performance to my mother, I could report in this way:

(31) Şimdi soğanları alıyor, doğruyor ve tavaya koyuyor. Şimdi de birşeyler arıyor. Mendilini çıkarıyor, gözlerini siliyor.

'Now, he is taking the onions, chopping them and puts them into the pan. Now, he is looking for something. He is taking out his handkerchief and he is rubbing his eyes.'

This is the expected phenomenal description. There is no incongruity in mixing descriptions of chopping the onions and looking for the handkerchief. It is natural description and it is phenomenal.

If we consider the following sentences, we can see that we may draw pragmatic inferences from the structural-phenomenal distinction : e.g . we might say of someone:

(32) Nesrin hep güvercinlere yem verir/ veriyor.

'Nesrin always feeds/is feeding pigeons.'

(33) Nesrin hep hamburger yer/ yiyor.

'Nesrin always eats/is eating hamburger.'

As it is seen in the above examples, the progressive is

used even though the non-progressive is possible. The distinction is that, there is a sense of mild reproof in the progressive sentences which we can call in Smith's terms-Viewpoint Aspect- Whereas in the sentences which the aorist is used, there is not any sense of reproof (1983:480) . The event is presented as habitual and belongs to the subject of the sentence.

4.5. At this point, the notion 'sentential aspect', which presents a situation, event, state from a particular point of view needs to be introduced. It represents the speaker's choice of perspective on the situation.

Two components of sentential aspect are recognized
a) situation aspect involves type of situation, e.g. event or state. b) View point Aspect involves type of perspective. e.g. simple or progressive.

To sum up, this approach to aspect is a speaker based approach, therefore it intersects with modality. As it has been put forth before, modality reflects the speaker's attitude towards the event. But in opposition to Aspect, modality has the characteristic of representing an event as hypothetical rather than actually taking place:

(34) Yarınki imtihandan 'A' alıırım.

'I can/may get 'A' in the exam tomorrow.'

In the above example, the event is not actualized. It is the speaker's attitude towards the event. It is hypothetical. But in:

(35) Postacı hergün kapıyı çalar.

'The postman rings the door everyday.'

We understand that the action is extended over time and it actually takes place as opposed to the modal statement which has not occurred yet.

When we take a look at the simple sentences in Appendix A, we can see that action verbs, achievement and accomplishment verbs may express habituality for all persons and process-action verbs can express habituality with 1st and 3rd persons, (sing. and plural) whereas state, process and ambient verbs do not have the ability to give this meaning in simple sentences.

FOOTNOTES

1

Negative form of the aorist:

-z after the negative suffix -me : dönmez

Ø : after the negative suffix -me preceding the 1st person
 suffixes -m and -yiz: dönmem- dön-me-Ø-m.

V. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the analysis that we have tried to make on three linguistic categories, namely-tense, modality and aspect, the first general point that must be made is that aorist does have a temporal function, but contrary to the former beliefs, not in referring to present time. It may be used deictically to refer to past or future. The aorist is used non-deictically for gnomic utterances and omnitemporal truths; therefore in such cases its function is not one of tense. It can be referred to as a tense only in reference to past and future. However, the future reference should also be held in connection with modality.

Diver suggests that the change in the temporal emphasis of tense forms is the result of the forms' collaboration with and their specification with an adverbial word or clause of time.¹ Up to this point, we agree with him but he goes on stating that- "One interprets a given tense-form in a particular way either because the key to the interpretation is given in the form of an adverbial specifier, or because the absence of such a key is itself equally clear as a pointer to which time is being referred to"(1963:168). But if we consider the following example, we see that out of context, it is ambiguous in at least five ways:

- (1) Yemek yerim. 'I eat.'
- 1.Future
 - 2.Habitual
 - 3.Promise
 - 4.Possibility
 - 5.Disagreeing (I do eat.)

So far, we have stated that the aorist is not equal to present time. The aorist, in all its uses either relates events to the moment of speaking or refers to events which are true at all times, including the moment of speaking or habitual events. Used in the context of the narrative clauses to report past events, the aorist makes reference to those events in the past and presents them as if they were occurring simultaneously with the speech time. The function of all verbal forms is in fact given by the context. Thus, the aorist does not have the meaning of past or future per se but the context clarifies it. In addition to the above factors, the semantics of the verbs themselves play a big role on the interpretation of the sentences. Verbs of state, for example, cannot be interpreted to have a future reading with the aorist.

(2) Ona inanırim. 'I believe him.'

(3) Acıyı hissederırim. 'I feel the pain.'

Although the above sentences could be interpreted as habitual, they cannot refer to future and they can not be used as promises. This is due to the semantics of the verbs. 'To believe' and 'to feel' are state verbs, not action verbs and they cannot be used in referring to future.

Bull says that forms "do not in a literal sense, perform functions. They have, rather certain combinatory potentials which make them unique within the total set of forms in the tense system. What is called a form function is actually the product of the interaction of the form and the other factors involved in the communication, that is, the systems combining with the form and the active participation of the hearer."

Thus we may conclude that the aorist does not in itself have a rhetorical function. Rather, the context of the narrative in which it is embedded, and its interaction with linguistic and extralinguistic factors, draw out forcefully that aspect of the aorist which includes the moment of speaking presenting the events as if they were occurring before us- Of the total set of forms in the tense system of Turkish, only the aorist can achieve this effect.

The purpose of this thesis was to bring out an ignored set of co-occurrence relations in the use of aorist. In so doing, a number of points of a more theoretical nature have been raised -in particular, how any theory might best handle these relationships-whether grammatical-(explaining the grammatical category of tenses by the inflection of the verb or lexical(tenses specified by the underlying adverbs) and more recent semantic approaches- namely Chafe's and Vendler's verb classifications and Smith and Goldsmith's approaches. The given information is not intended to be in any sense a final word on tense-aspect-modality relationship in the aorist.

In this study, we started with the aorist suffix -(i)r and then we tried to state the meanings related with it. In other words our approach was from form to meaning. A possible line of further research would be to start with meaning and note the forms used in expressing the different meanings. This would yield a more comprehensive analysis of an otherwise scarcely studied area in the grammar of Turkish, namely aspect, modality and tense distinctions and their interrelationships.

Another important subject for further research would be to study the relation of the verb with the subordinate clause.

If we consider the following sentences;

(4)a. Gittikçe onu görürüm. 'Whenever I go there
I see her.'

b. Gidince onu görürüm. 'When I go there, I will
see her.'

c. Gidip onu görürüm. 'I will go and see her.'

we see that the subordinate clause clarifies the meaning of the main verb. We have dealt with this subject in dynamic modality but in a very limited way. A comprehensive study would bring new insights to the subject.

Thirdly, a useful research would be to study how negation affects the meaning of the aorist in its different uses.

(5)a. Yarına tezin son bölümünü de getirirsin.

'You have to bring the last section of the
thesis tomorrow as well.'

The above sentence is an example of epistemic necessity but when it is negated, we see that the modal meaning changes.

b. Yarına tezin son bölümünü de getirmezsin.

'You won't bring even the last section of the
thesis tomorrow.'

This time, the sentence has a habitual reading. The speaker knows enough about the person's character and comments on his behavior. Hence, the analysis of the scope of negation on collected data will be interesting and useful.

While the thesis does not claim to be exhaustive, it does display the degree of complexity inherent in the expression of these relationships. It thus hopes to provide a warning against careless generalization about tense usage and undefined, vague labelling not based on the distinctions observed in the language.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 Diver states that labels such as future or habitual should not be given to the verb form alone, but the combination of the two forms, verb and adverbial, the adverbial reinforcing the verb's potential for referring in the general direction of a particular temporal aspect, and specifying this aspect further.

APPENDIX - A

The following verb classification is in a way a synthesis of Chafe's (1970) and Vendler's (1967) classification of verbs:

1. States: Stative verbs denote extended dynamic situations which have duration. These situations cover conditions, qualities or states of affairs that remain the same over time, unless something happens to change them.

A state verb is accompanied by a subject noun which is its patient.

(1) Hamur kuru olur.

'The dough will be dry.'

Meanings expressed:

1. Epistemic possibility (I think...)
2. Dynamic circumstantial possibility
(If you don't put enough butter...)
3. Future

2. Processes: These verbs describe events which denote a change in the state or condition of the subject noun, so that this event gives way to a new terminal state. The verb is accompanied by a subject noun which is its patient. These verbs answer the question 'What happens to N?'

(2) Çiçek solar. 'The flower dies'

(3) Bardak kırılır. 'The glass breaks'

Because of the semantics of the verbs, even without a context, we interpret them as circumstantial because they (the subjects) have not the capacity to do something.

Meanings expressed:

1. Circumstantial dynamic possibility
2. Epistemic possibility
3. Historic present.

3.a) Actions. These verbs describe actions which neither denote a change nor have an end result. They can be accompanied by subject nouns which are related to them as agents and specified as animate. They express an activity or action, something which someone does.

They answer the question 'What does N do?'

(4) Ev sahibi bizi bekler. 'The landlord waits for us.'

Meanings expressed: 1.Future reference

2.Epistemic possibility

3.Habitual/structural

b) Achievements : They occur at a single moment e.g. to reach the hill top, to win the race, to die.

(5) Süleyman yarışı kazanır. 'Süleyman wins the race.'

Meanings expressed : 1.Epistemic possibility

2.Dynamic possibility-subject oriented.

3.Habitual/structural

4.Historic present

c) Accomplishments: These verbs have a 'climax' which has to be reached if the action is to be what it is claimed to be e.g. to draw a circle, to build a house.

(6) Bir mil koşarım. 'I run a mile.'

Meanings expressed: 1.Subject-oriented dynamic modality

2.Habitual / structural

4-Process-actions: As a process, the verb denotes a change in the condition of an object N, its patient. As an action, it expresses what someone, its agent does. The agent, someone who does something, does it to something, the patient of a process. The patient undergoes a change of condition . These

verbs take agent Ns as subjects and patient Ns as objects

- (7) Kardeşim pastayı keser. 'My sister cuts the cake.'

Meanings expressed: 1. Future

2. Epistemic possibility

5-Ambients: These verbs are all encompassing states that cover the total environment, not a particular object within it. These verbs are subdivided as state-ambient and action-ambient.

a) State ambient:

- (8) Kış soğuk olur. 'The winters are cold.'

The meanings expressed : 1. General truth. Omnitemporal

2. Future.

b) Action ambient:

- (9) Kar yağar . 'It snows'

Meanings expressed: 1- Eternal/timeless proposition

2. Epistemic possibility

3. Future.

The consideration of the subjects of these types of verbs and the personal pronouns they take may give an insight to the explanation of the problem.

It is known that processes and ambients have inanimate subjects. Their subjects are inanimates. Because of their incapacity of performing actions, they cannot express deontic modality, and dynamic-subject oriented modality. They can express eternal/timeless truths such as:

- (10) Yaz sıcak olur. 'The summers are hot.'

(State ambient)

APPENDIX -C

Performative tests:

- 1- The Grammatical form must be I V
- 2- It has to be a semantic member of the verbs of saying
- 3- It has to be a verb of action
- 4- It has to have a semantic/pragmatic marker-the explicitness component.

Some performatives:

- 1-Anons etmek 'to announce'
- 2-Bahse girmek 'to bet'
- 3-Bildirmek 'to let know'
- 4-Dilemek 'to wish'
- 5-Emretmek 'to order'
- 6-Garanti etmek 'to guarantee'
- 7-Haber vermek 'to inform someone of something'
- 8-İddia etmek 'to claim'
- 9-İlan etmek 'to declare'
- 10-İsim koymak 'to name'
- 11-İtham etmek 'to accuse'
- 12-Karşı çıkmak 'to come out opposite' (in argument, etc.)
- 13-Mahkum etmek 'to sentence'
- 14-Protesto etmek 'to protest'

- 15- Söylemek 'to say'
- 16-Söz vermek 'to promise'
- 17-Tavsiye etmek 'to recommend'
- 18-Teşekkür etmek 'to thank'
- 19-Özür dilemek 'to beg pardon'
- 20-Yalvarmak 'to beg'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bache, Carl, "Aspect and Aktionsart: towards a semantic distinction," Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 18, 1982.
- Bauer, G., "The English Perfect re-considered", Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 6, 1970.
- Boyd, J. and Thorne, J. P., "The semantics of Modal Verbs," Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 5. pp. 57-74, 1969.
- Bull, W. E., Time Tense and the Verb: A Study in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics with Particular Attention to Spanish, Univ. of California Pub. in Linguistics, 19, 1963.
- Chafe, Wallace L., Meaning and the Structure of Language, The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Chapin, P. G., "Quasi-modals," Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 9, 1973.
- Comrie, Bernard, Aspect, Cambridge, 1976.
- Corvalan, Carme -Silva, 'Tense and aspect in Oral Spanish Narrative,' Language, Vol. 59 No. 4 pp. 760-781 Dec. 1982.

Crystal, David, "Specification and English Tenses,"

Journal of Linguistics , Vol.2, pp.1-94, 1966.

Dillon, G.L., "Perfect and other aspects in a case grammar

of English," Journal of Linguistics , Vol.9, 1973.

Diver, W., "The Modal System of the English Verb", Word, vol.20,

pp. 141-181, 1963.

Dowty, David R., "The Stative in the Progressive", Linguistic

Inquiry, Vol.6, No.4, pp.579-588.

Ergin, Muharrem, Türk Dil Bilgisi, , İ.Ü.Edeb.Fak.Yayınları,

İstanbul, 1962

Friedrich, Paul., "On Aspect Theory and Homeric Aspect,"

International Journal of American Linguistics

Vol. 40, pt.2, pp. 1-49 1974.

Fries, C.L., "The Expression of the Future", Language, Vol.3,

pp.87-95, 1927.

Gencan, Tahir Nejat, Dilbilgisi, TDK. Yayınları, Ankara, 1979.

Givon, Talmy, "The Time Axis Phenomenon", Language, Vol.49,

pp.890-925, 1973.

Goldsmith, John and Woisetschaeger, Erich., "The logic of the

English Progressive", Linguistic Inquiry, Vol.13, No.1,

Winter 1982.

Hatcher, A. Granville, "The Use of the Progressive Form in English, a new Approach", Language, Vol. 27, pp. 254-80, 1951.

Hornstein, Norbert, "Towards a Theory of Tense,"
Linguistic Inquiry, Vol. 8. No. 3, pp. 521-557, 1977.

Huddleston, R. O., "Some Observations on Tense and Deixis in English",
Language, Vol. 45, pp. 777-806, 1969.

Huddleston, R. O., "Past Tense Transportation", Journal of Linguistics
Vol. 13, pp. 43-52, 1977.

Johanson, Lars, Aspekt Im Turkischen, Uppsala Studia Turcica
Uppsalansia, 1971.

Katz, Jerrold J., Semantic Theory, Harper and Row, 1972.

Kimball, John P., Syntax and Semantics, Seminar Press. Inc., 1972.

Lakoff, Robin., "Tense and its relation to Participants,"
Language Vol. 46, pp. 838-49, 1970.

Leech, Geoffrey, N., Semantics, Pelican, 1974.

_____, Meaning and the English Verb, Longman, 1971.

Leech, G. and Svartvik, J., A Communicative Grammar of English,
Longman, 1981.

Levinson, Stephen., Pragmatics, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, Camb. Univ. Press, 1983.

Lewis, G.L., Turkish Grammar, Oxford Univ Press, 1967.

Lyons, John, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.

———, Semantics, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977.

Miller, J., "Towards a Generative Semantic Account of Aspect in Russian," Journal of Linguistics Vol. 8, pp. 217-236, 1972.

Moorisey, M.D., "The English Perfective and still/anymore." Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 9., 1973.

Moravcsik, Julius M. 'Tense, aspect and negation', Theoretical Linguistics, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 95-110, 1982.

Ney, J.W., "The Modals in English: a floating semantic feature analysis." Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 10, pp. 8-20, 1976.

Palmer, F.R. The English Verb. Longman, 1974.

———, "Modals and Actuality," Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 1-23, 1977.

———, Modality and the English Modals, Longman, 1979.

- Parkins, Michael H., "Core Meanings of the English Modals"
Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 18, No.2, pp. 245-273, 1982.
- Partridge, John Geoffrey, Semantic, Pragmatic and Syntactic
 Correlates, Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, 1982.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi Syntax and Semantics. Vol.5, Academic Press,
 1976.
- Sebüktekin, Hikmet Turkish-English Contrastive Analysis,
 Paris: Mouton, The Hague, 1971.
- Smith, Carlota S. 'A Theory of Aspectual Choice'
Language Vol. 59, No.3. pp.479-501, 1983.
- Swift, Llyod B. A Reference Grammar of Modern Turkish,
 The Hague, 1963.
- Underhill, Robert. Turkish Grammar, MIT Press, 1976.
- Vendler, Z., "Verbs and Times" Linguistics in Philosophy,
 Cornwell Univ. Press, pp.97-212, 1967.
- Wachtel, Tom. "Some Problems in Tense Theory," Linguistic Inquiry,
 Vol. 13. No.2, 1982.