

## Notes on Some Aspects of Text Grammar in Uyghur, Based on Abduraxman Qahar's Short Story "Emethaji"

© Jochen Danneil. 2005. [contact@uyghur-language.net](mailto:contact@uyghur-language.net). [www.uyghur-language.net](http://www.uyghur-language.net)  
Please find the transcribed text in the attached document.

### The Source of the Text

The text which was examined is part of a short story by Abduraxman Qahar, titled "Emethaji". It was written in Ghulja, Xinjiang (China), in 1981 and published in the volume *Hekaye-powestliridin tallanma* ("Collection of Stories") (Qahar 1999:1-15). In the first part of the story the author describes the elderly man Emethaji from the writer's own perspective as a boy. Emethaji is a very poor man who is not native to Ghulja, where he is living now. He works and lives in a carpenter's workshop. He has no family and is a loner. Despite the fact that he does not associate with others, he is appreciated by the community for his uprightness, and for his singing. He would at times by night sing touching songs in a gifted manner. The question that haunts the story-teller is, why Emethaji is so sad and reserved. His father tells him: "Old Emethaji must have a pain that he can't talk about". In one scene, the writer gets the chance to observe Emethaji as he takes out a ring from a hiding place, and agonizes over some memories. Finally, Emethaji dies and among his things one finds some notes. The author, by now a graduate, is commissioned to take a look at these. He finds out that they contain Emethaji's life story. He writes up the scribbled and misspelled notes in a proper way. The result is the following story, as told from the perspective of Emethaji. It answers the question about the strange behavior of Emethaji, but it is also a story of its own right. The whole story comprises 15 pages. The first three brief chapters go from page 1 to 8. Chapter Four, which contains our part of the story, goes from page 8 to 15. In the following notes constant reference is made to the attached charted text by using the sentence numbers like (1) etc.

### I. Verb Forms

This section discusses which tense, aspect and mood the various forms express, and how they are used for the story line (foreground), or for background information respectively. The terminology follows Dooley and Levinsohn (1999:39ff.), who distinguish between "event" and "nonevent" information. **Event information** moves the story line forward. Events are usually told as having happened "at a particular time and place", and "in temporal sequence with other events" (Dooley and Levinsohn 1999:40). This is not the case for **nonevents (background information)**. As such, the following are listed: *participant orientation, setting, explanation, evaluation, discourse irrealis and performative information*. At the end of this section, the particles which are attached to finite verbs are explained as well.

These notes are focussed on finite verbs. Converbs (or "gerunds") and auxiliaries are not discussed here. Likewise, verbs which occur within direct speech are not the object of analysis here. Only the speech orienters are included, as e.g. in (6) "he said ...". Note: There are some finite verbs which are only followed by a comma rather than a period (in 4, 9, 23, 40, 60 (twice), 79, 88, 93).

The following finite verb forms occur in the text: (The terminology follows largely Tömür and Lee 2003).

Suffix	Alternative Forms	Term
-Di	-ti/-di	direct mood of simple past
-(V)ptu		indirect mood of simple past, or reported past tense
-Atti	-a(y)tti/-e(y)tti	habitual past, or past imperfect
-watatti	-wataytti	past continuous tense
-GhAn (+ idi/iken)	-qan/-ghan/ -ken/-gen	past participle
idi(-)		past form of "to be"
-mAQtA (idi)	-maqta/ -mekte	(past) progressive form
-de; -du; -la		particles

By far the most frequent tense is the **simple past (-Di)**. It is used for the events which move the story line forward. The form *-Di* conveys the additional information that the story-teller has witnessed the event. It is thus a "direct statement mood" form (Tömür and Lee 2003:320).

Wherever the story-teller conveys an event that he has not witnessed himself, but learned from others, he consequently switches to the **indirect mood (-V)ptu**, or "**reported past tense**". In fact, the source of information is sometimes given in the sentence, which is indicated by underlining in the examples below. The *-(V)ptu*-form is used in the following places:

(29) *Dadamning ... eshiki yolda ölüp qaptu.* -

"My dad's ... donkey died on the way." - The writer was not present himself.

(46) *Anargülning deyishiche ... deptu.*

"According to Anargül, he said ..."

(85) *Lekin, qaysi quliqim bilen anglay, ... Anargül ... öliwaptu.* -

"But, with which ear shall I hear, ... Anargül ... died."

(88) ..., *bu ish mundaq boptu:* -

"This thing happened like this: ..."; and several times in the following second-hand account (87-90).

(104) ... *anglisam, ... ölmeptu.* -

"I heard, he didn't die."

For *background* information, the following tenses are used.

A lot of *background* information is given in the **habitual past** (or past imperfect) (*-Atti*). The reporting of these facts certainly contributes to the development of the whole story, but these facts are not as prominent as the events told in simple past (*-Di*). This is true for the following sections, grouped by content:

*Setting* information:

(2-3) describes the father's (minor character!) profession (*qilatti, satatti*).

(8-9) tell how other children go to school, while Emethaji can only dream about it (*oqushatti, ketettim, qilattim*).

(14) tells how Emethaji stands on the sidelines while the others are playing (*turattim*).

(17-18; 23) relay how Anargül keeps giving things to Emethaji, and vice versa, and their relationship develops (*keletti, tengleytti, deytti, ketetti, ketmeytti, yeytti, maxtaytti*).

Pieces of *evaluation*:

- (21) "... I kept thinking" (*oylap ketettim*)  
 (26) "... she lifted up my heart" (*kötüretti*)  
 (44) "..., but (the prospect of) my working in that yard gave (ongoingly) all two of us hope." (*beghishlaytti*)  
 (66) might be subsumed here as well. "The girl stood there silently" (*turatti*) expresses her helplessness, and thus the scene ends.

*Participant orientation:*

- (11) "In our class studied also Metkerimbay's daughter Anargül." (*oquytti*).

Two times, the author uses the **past continuous tense (-watatti)**, formed by combining the continuous suffix *-wat* and the iterative suffix *-atti*, to convey background information. The first occurrence is in (13):

"The children were playing." (*oynawatatti*).

This is *setting* information and leads the reader to picture a certain scene. On this "stage", two things happen: The boy stands on the side, and the girl comes and takes him to join the others. For "I stood", the *-Atti*-form is used, here not in its function as habitual, but as continuous. Then, what the girl does is rendered in simple past (*-Di*).<sup>1</sup>

The form *-watatti* is also used in (59):

"Anargül was coming." (*keliwatatti*).

The time point of reference here is the action of the *preceding* clause ("I lifted my head and looked.") The action that was going on in the moment when he looked up, is described with the past continuous tense (*-watatti*). Then, the writer switches back to simple past (*-Di*) for telling what further happened.

There is one other occurrence of *-watatti*, in direct speech:

(37) "..., with what hopes are my parents having me study?" (*oqutuwatatti*).

In the preceding sentence, he just said that studying has become impossible for him. Thus, here, *-watatti* - while using the continuous suffix - really describes an action that has just ceased (thus the translation "had they have me study"), but gives rise to his thoughts and questions. The studying is still present in the speaker's mind.

Habitual past (*-Atti*) and past continuous (*-watatti*) intrinsically express imperfective aspect, and it is a common tendency for *background* to be expressed by imperfective aspect forms (Dooley and Levinsohn 1999:40).

Four finite verb forms are built with the **past participle (-GhAn)**: *qalghanikenmen* (4), *qalghanidi* (53), *öliüwalghaniken* (88), *üzüwetkeniken* (91). These forms signal *background* information as well. None of these move the event line forward, but they help for a better understanding of the circumstances.

In (4) we find a resume: "I remained living as the last one". This is *setting* information. The fact of him being the only child is relevant in the next paragraph, where his parents sacrifice for sending their son to school.

In (53) there is an *explanation or evaluation* of the storyteller. He draws attention to how important the girl is becoming for him. Obviously, this raises the tension and contributes to appreciating what further happens.

In (88) ("She had indeed died."), the news of Anargül's death, already delivered in (85) as an event, is confirmed to be true after his research in the city. The statement could be qualified as *explanation*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, the duration of the action expressed by *-Atti* can be confined by the action expressed with *-watatti*. How the two tenses relate to each other needs further investigation.

The sentence (91) is set in parenthesis even in the original text. The author so shows that he is "filling the reader in" with a detail of *explanation* that will help to understand the previous sentence.

The copula *iken* is joined to the participle to signal that the writer has gathered the information either from others, or by drawing conclusions from facts observed.

In (4), he speaks about himself, but the events lie in his early childhood, so he cannot recall them, but only learned about them from his parents. Some of his siblings may have actually died before he was born.

In (88, 91), after having gone to town, he finds out from people who were closer to the event that the rumor about the death is true.

In one instance (53), the **direct judgment copula *idi*** is attached, because he speaks about his own situation and about what the girl means to him.

Thus, ***iken* and *idi* relate to each other in the same way as *-(V)ptu* (marking reported past) and *-Di* (for simple past).**

The present text does not contain any participle (*-GhAn*) on its own, without either *idi* or *iken* attached, although the same form which functions as a participle also functions as a finite verb.<sup>2</sup>

(93) may be mentioned in this context as well:

"I hadn't thought the tiniest bit that such a tragedy had hidden in the girl's life, ..." (*oylimaptikenmen*).

While not being a past participle form, the ***-(V)ptiken*** form (*-(V)ptu + iken*) is considered an alternative form for *-GhAniken*, whereby the latter is more typical for literary usage and the former one for colloquial speech. Its usage in this place may help to convey a more vivid expression of what is going on in the speaker's mind at that point. He is moved by having found out a fact which he had not expected in the least. He is pondering the events. This is *evaluation*.

As to *iken*, here it does not signal indirect knowledge in its strict sense, as he speaks about himself. But, he is realizing only now, in retrospect, that he had misjudged the situation as it appeared to him. He had not been aware of Anargül's suffering. Thus, here, *iken* points to his discovery of being wrong, i.e. to a surprise, or newly found fact.

One other form that provides *background* information is the **past form of "to be" (*idi-*)**, when it stands on its own as a finite verb. It then describes a **state**.

It is used where a participant is first introduced, or described in a new scene (4, 12, 70). Thus, it contains *participant orientation*.

Further, the story-teller uses *-idi* where he concludes what a unique role the girl had for him (96), and also where he describes the significance of the donkey for his family's income (29). These are instances of *explanation*.

The story contains two verbs in the **past progressive form *-mAktA*** (infinitive + locative suffix). Both are set into the past by adding the copula *idi*.

(81) "And my days *were passing* with longing for Anargül." (*ötmekte idi*).

(97) "The Red River *was flowing* making horrible waves." (*aqmaqta idi*).

---

<sup>2</sup> The difference between the form with and without *idi* would be a topic that deserves separate discussion.

Both sentences give *setting* information. It is not unusual for the **-mAktA**-form to be used for describing weather and nature (as in 97) when the author wants the reader to picture the scene where something happens.

In this short story the following **particles** are used:

The suffix **-de** can serve two distinct functions (see Friederich 2002:198f.), and examples for both can be found in the story. Sometimes, **-de** connects two actions tightly in showing that they follow each other swiftly. Such is the case in (15, 21, 40, 60). At other times **-de** has the role of an intensifier, putting emphasis on the proposition. The children's mockery in (20) contains such a clause.

*Elachilar tapqanni teng yeydu-de!* - The excellent ones will eat what's there together! One may ask the question whether such a particle occurs more often in certain passages of the text, for example at the climax or paragraph transitions, but such a higher concentration in certain places could not be found.

For the sake of completeness, the occurrence of the particle **-du** (in direct speech) should be mentioned. It is added to the participle in (21) (*yaratqandu*). **-du** can express uncertainty or doubt (Friederich 2002:199). Here, it lends the question a tone of agony ("Why on earth ...").

A converb with the suffix **-la** comes up twice:

(15) *tartipla*: "... pulling me by my hand she took me to the playground."

(23) *elipla*: "... she took the pomegranates happily and ate them."

The particle **-la**, in this kind of usage, "indicates that another action occurs immediately after, or not long after the occurrence of the [first] action" (Tömür and Lee 2003:499).

In this text, the **present-future tense** is only used in the last two sentences, where the prospect for the future is given (*bolidu, bolimen*), and one other time in (102), where *bilmeymen* ("I don't know") logically continues to be true at the point when the story is told.

### An Additional Note on the Usage of Tenses in Fairytales and Legends<sup>3</sup>

Three fairytales of different length were examined, all of which were published in *Uyghur xelq chöchekliri* (1995): *Qayna chögün* - "The Kettle" (pp. 130-133), *Bözchi yigitning batur atilip qelishi* - "How it Came about that the Linen Weaver Boy was Called a Hero" (pp. 161-164) and *Bulbulgoya* - "The Nightingale" (pp. 199-214).

The usage of tenses in fairytales differs partly from other narratives. **The tense generally used for the plot** is the **-(V)ptu**-form (not **-Di**). Usually, the **-(V)ptu**-form is used for the indirect mood. Its usage in fairytales then contributes to the characteristics of this genre. In verbless sentences, **iken** is added to attain the same effect. (E.g. 130, 204.). (Cf. Tömür / Lee 2003:242f., 322).

The **-GhAniken**-form (and its rarer equivalent **-ptiken**) is used differently from usual narratives. While usually this form denotes *background* information which is gathered indirectly, in fairytales it is sometimes used in the middle of the events, at places where one could also employ the **-p**-form or the **-(V)ptu**-form. It is often followed by a comma, and the sentence is continued, with another (finite) verb appearing at the end. (E.g. 161, 131). But the **-GhAniken**-form can also come to stand at the end of the sentence. (E.g. 202.)

---

<sup>3</sup> Numbers in this section are page numbers.

The occurrences of *-GhAniken* are unevenly distributed over the fairytales that were considered, and its usage partly seems to be a matter of personal style. But mostly the purpose of using *-GhAniken* is apparently **to raise tension and signal an imminent event that is surprising or significant**, and which is then rendered with the *-(V)ptu*-form. (E.g. 131, 163f, 202.)

It should be understood though that *-GhAniken* is *also* used in its more typical function, to report something that happened earlier (pluperfect). (E.g. 201; and see below under "Beginning".)

In fairytales, the *-idiken*-form (absent in the above-discussed narrative), seems to **replace** the *-Atti*-form:

- It is used in the introduction to describe the *background*, i.e. the things that had continued over a period of time before the storyline itself begins. (See, e.g. 130, where a whole paragraph is written with the *-idiken*-form (or, in a verbless sentence, just *iken*). Then, after *bir küni* ("one day") signals the start of the storyline, the tense changes.)
- It is also used for an incident that goes on for a while in the middle of the fairytale (where *-(i)p turatti* would be an alternative). (See 204.)
- Further, it is used to render a constant behavior that is based on a virtuous attitude, which explains a concrete action and is thus *explanation*. (E.g. 130.) (See also Tömür and Lee 2003: 345, 353).

The *-(wat)KUdek*-form serves (a) to relate the content of dreams (as in stories as well) (e.g. 199), (b) to tell about surprising or exciting appearances (e.g. 203, 163), and (c) - combined with *bolsa-* as a conditional (where, in texts other than fairytales *-Ghan bolsa-* might suffice) (e.g. 208, 209).

As to *-GhAn*-forms, these are rare. In direct speech (not closely examined here), there is at least one occurrence of *-GhAnidi-* (205). This matches the usual usage of that tense, as does the one occurrence of *-GhAn* (199).

Beginning: To introduce characters, the *-GhAniken*-form is used (161, 199). In combination with this, or exclusively, the *-idiken*-form is used, as was mentioned before (130, 161).

End: Two fairytales end, quite unspectacularly, with *-(V)ptu*-forms (133, 164), the third one with *-GhAniken* (214). This form is a bit surprising, since here, at the very end of the text, it can neither be used to raise tension (as in other cases, see above), nor as a kind of pluperfect (see above). It is said to sound a bit more remote than an *-(V)ptu*-form would, but could be replaced by the latter.

### Conclusion

We have examined finite verb forms and have seen how the simple past, both in its direct mood (*-Di*) and in its indirect mood (*-(V)ptu*), is used to relate foreground information, i.e. events that move the story line forward. In contrast, the various other past tenses serve to provide background information (or "nonevents") of different kinds. The distinction by Dooley and Levinsohn of event and nonevent information (or fore- and background), and their categories of background information, proved fitting for the analysis of this Uyghur discourse.

From a language learner's perspective, the analysis of a text is advantageous in that it provides ample context for the usage of certain verb forms, whereas isolated example phrases do not always allow for a clear decision as to which verb form is the most appropriate one to be used.

The usage of verb forms in fairytales differs to some degree from other narratives.

## II. Participant Reference

Although there are common tendencies, different languages follow different patterns in how they refer to the various characters in a certain type of text. The assumption is not that a writer will consciously think about the kind of reference he is going to use in each and every sentence, but that there are conventions in the use of the language which he follows. The observations illustrate the principle of economy in the language. **In general, participants are not identified in a more detailed manner than needed for unambiguous reference.** If they are, there is usually a specific reason for it. One should beware of generalizing the following observations too quickly. Nevertheless, they may serve as a starting point for further studies.

The following observations are restricted to animate participants. Props are not examined. Primary consideration is given to subject references, and references within the content of direct speech are not in focus.

### Overview of Participants

Major part.	Emethaji	The story teller. Tells how his friendship with Anargül develops, how her father causes him to be separated from her, and why he finally has to flee from his home village.
	Anargül	Emethaji's classmate and girl-friend from a rich family.
Minor part.	Emethaji's father	A poor saltseller. He takes a loan from Metkerimbay and can not pay it back. When he dies, his son becomes Metkerimbay's serf.
	Anargül's father Metkerimbay	A rich landowner. He disapproves of his daughter Anargül's friendship with the pauper's son Emethaji.
	Others	Emethaji's mother, his siblings, other pupils of his age, his fellow serfs, a potential bride-groom, a search commando, Emethaji's family's donkey and Metkerimbay's dog.

### Introduction of Participants

"Major participants commonly have a formal introduction, where as minor participants do not." (Dooley and Levinsohn 1999:58). They continue to explain: "A **formal introduction** is linguistic material which instructs the hearer not only to activate the participant, but also to be prepared to organize a major part of the mental representation around him/her."

In the case of the present story, this applies as follows: Emethaji is introduced by a whole clause: "I am the son of Kerimachun from the village of Qoghan near Kashgar." (1). For Anargül as well, an explanation about her identity is given before the action goes on: "In our class studied Metkerimbay's daughter Anargül too." (11).

The parents of Emethaji, at least his father, and the father of Anargül are no marginal characters. Still they are to be counted among the minor ones, not the major ones. They are introduced indirectly: Since both Emethaji and Anargül are introduced with a reference to their fathers, the fathers are known from then on too, and do not require an introduction of

their own. They are called *dadam* ("my dad") and *Anargülning dadisi Metkerimbay* ("Anargül's dad Metkerim") respectively at the next occurrence (2; 32).

The remaining minor participants are simply mentioned in the course of the story-telling by a noun phrase; only one of them contains a name. Some occur only once in the whole story.

- o Emethaji's siblings (4) - *meningdin burun toghulghan töt oghul, töt qiz* - "four sons and four daughters born before me"
- o the other pupils (8) - *men demetlik balilar* - "the children of my age"
- o Emethaji's mother - included in *ata-anam* (37), *atam bilen anam* (49, 51) ("my father and mother"), and on her own as *anam*, "my mother", in (40)
- o Emethaji's fellow serfs (54) - *malaylirdin üç kishi* - "three of the serfs"
- o the potential bride-groom (89) - *sheherdiki bir chong bayning Sawur Baywechche atliq oghli* - "the son of a big bay in the town, Sawur Baywechche by name"  
Note: *Baywechche* is a role noun meaning "young master, young heir". Here, it has become part of the name, but functions similarly to a title. Compare the note below about the word *bay* in *Metkerimbay*.
- o the search commando (105) - *bayning ademliri, hökümet cherikliri* - "the bay's people and the government soldiers"
- o the donkey (3) - *bir eshikimiz* - "our one donkey"
- o the bay's dog (55) - *bayning etiwarliq ala iti* - "the bay's valued colorful dog".

### The Different Characters Examined Separately

#### 1. Emethaji

There are about equally as many occurrences of the pronoun *men* ("I") and sentences without *men*, with an implicit subject only. The term "implicit subject" rather than "zero subject" is applied, because even in sentences which do not have an explicit subject, the subject is identifiable by morphological agreement in other parts of speech - i.e. the verb ending or possessive markers etc. (The only occurrence of a "zero subject" - no explicit and no implicit subject - in the whole story is the clause *alghandin keyin* in (18).) Where Emethaji remains the same subject from the respective previous sentence, an implicit subject is used (83, 103f., 100 (across paragraph border)). This is also the case where his own thoughts are interspersed as direct speech (which can have a subject of its own), and afterwards he continues the talk *about* himself (9, 39, 43). (70f., 87, 108), where the preceding subject is not Emethaji, but a body part of his or similar, maybe subsumed here as well).

The sentences (56, 85, 96, 107) show that even where the subject changes, the use of the pronoun *men* is not obligatory. (22) belongs here too, even though the deviation from "I" as subject is very brief. It can not be determined in every case what makes the writer use a pronoun or not. Still, it is worthwhile noticing that *men* ("I") occurs at the very beginning, and then about 17 times, and in all cases there is a subject change (i.e. the previous sentence had another subject.) The only exception is (39). In other words, in this first person narrative the pronoun is hardly ever used when the subject stays the same. At the same time, by way of morphological agreement, the first person remains activated. This matches what Dooley and Levinsohn write: "After being introduced, the global VIP is often referred to by minimum but virtually constant coding." (1999:59). About (17f.) see further below.

#### 2. Anargül.

References to Anargül involve only three instances of subject continuity from one sentence to the next. In two of them, there is an implicit subject (19, 91), and one time *qiz* ("the girl") is used (12). (69) may be subsumed here as well: Anargül is part of the subject in (68), and "the girl's eyes" etc. are body-parts, which can be counted like the person herself. (About 17f. see



further below.) *Qiz* is also used where the subject changes (23, 66, 90, 92). - In all these cases, Anargül is either present on the scene (66, 68), or mentioned shortly before (23, 90, 92). Where such is not the case, the use of her name "Anargül" is required (11, 15, 40, 60, and also 108 "Anargül's spirit"). In these places, Anargül re-enters the stage. There are some other cases in which the proper name is used even when Anargül is present on the scene: In (79), the name might be used because from this point on Emethaji will not see her again, and/or maybe to underline the separation: "I left ..., Anargül stayed." In (88), the name might be used because of the connection with her death. In (94) the name is needed to express the singularity of the person for the writer, and similarly with "Anargül's words" in (74). At times, *Anargül* is used where *qiz* would suffice for identification (26, 78; 69 and 74 listed above). But "Anargül" is only used where the subject changes, and be it only from 1. person plural "we" (which includes her) to 3. person singular. In other words, her name is never used when she was the subject in the preceding sentence already.

**The pronoun for the 3. person singular, *u* ("he/she/it")**, is hardly used at all as subject in the whole story, even though large parts of the story tell about characters in the 3. person singular (Anargül, Emethaji's father and Anargül's father). One occurrence is in (17), where it seems to be needed to switch from "we" in (16) to "she". Here, *u* is unambiguous. It cannot refer to the story-teller (1. person). Another one is in (60), referring to Anargül as well. The preceding subject is *yürükim* ("my heart"), referring to Emethaji. In this instance, *u* is actually not altogether unambiguous. Syntactically, it could refer to "my heart". But logically "my heart" is a near-equivalent of "I", so, if the reference to Emethaji had continued, the use of *u* ("it") was not to be expected, rather *men*, or a zero subject. Using *u* is enough to indicate a switch. In that sentence, *u* can only refer to Anargül, who was just mentioned before. Maybe the short alternative, *u*, is preferred over *qiz* to allow for quicker movement at this tense scene.

Sentences (17/18) are somewhat peculiar in that one finds the subject changing back and forth twice with not more than morphological agreement (*almisam*) as a signal, or not even this (*alghandin keyin*). This might be to make the bonding between the two children more vivid, but it does not occur at a peak. In any case, (18) shows that it is not needed to identify the subject explicitly as long as, logically speaking, the action can only be attributed to one certain character, and the reader can identify this participant himself.

### 3. Emethaji's Father.

He is mostly referred to as *dadam* ("my dad"). Only where both parents are in view, he is included in the expression *Ata-anam* ("my parents") or *atam bilen anam* ("my father and my mother") (in (49) as subject, in (51) as object). The writer refers to his father as *dadam* even where subject continuity is given (6) or where the pronoun *u* could suffice (3). The constant use of *dadam* for the father could be explained by the fact that he is a minor participant.

### 4. Anargül's Father.

Note: *Metkerim* is a proper name. *Bay* literally means "rich", but can also denote a rich person or big farmer (cf. (89)). When *bay* is used as part of the name (*Metkerimbay*), it becomes close to a title. In the present story it is sometimes used independently (*bay*). It then functions like a role noun. In the translation it is rendered as "the bay".

He is first mentioned with his full name *Metkerimbay* (11), and re-introduced as "Anargül's dad *Metkerimbay*"(32). In neither case he is the subject. One could suggest that this way of introducing him indirectly already gives a hint about him being a negative figure. There is no case where this person is present only as implicit subject. This points to him being a minor

participant. There are only two cases of subject continuity, in (62, 65), interrupted though by direct speech. Syntactically speaking, *bay* is not necessary in the speech orienter in (62). In (65), an implicit subject or the pronoun *u* would be highly ambiguous in the given scene. It could refer to the father or to the girl. Thus, *bay* is used. Where the subject changes, sometimes *bay* and sometimes *Metkerimbay* is used - *bay* in (67, 91, 101), and *Metkerimbay* in (51, 60, 89, 104). Like with Anargül (see above), the usage largely depends on the setting: Where the character occurs for the first time in a given scene, he is referred to with his full name. Again, one thing is clear: *Metkerimbay* is *only* used where the subject changes. In (45f.), where Anargül is mentioned in the pre-core part of the sentence, he is understandably called *dadisi* ("her dad"), not by his name.

Where Anargül's father is needed in a part of speech other than the subject (mostly as the possessor in a genitive construction), he is usually referred to just as *bay*: (*bayning qizi* - "the bay's daughter" (17), *bayning zori bilen* - "by the force of the bay" (35), *bay qorusigha* - "to the bay's yard" (43), *bayning iti* - "the bay's dog" (55), *bayning beghi* - "the bay's orchard" (79), *bayning samanxanisi* - "the bay's barn" (100)). This is not true for his very first mentioning (11) and for the sentence (32), which use the full form "Metkerimbay" in possessive constructions.

### 1. Person Plural

The author uses "we / our ..." as a subject twice for Emethaji and the girl, and twice for Emethaji and his family.

*bizmu* - "we too" (47)

*Anargül ikkimiz* - "Anargül [and myself], the two of us" (68)

*bizning turmushimiz* - "all our possession" (3)

*bizning bar-yoqi* - "our livelihood" (29).

In (47), the suffix *-mu*, which gives emphasis, could not be attached if there wasn't an explicit subject. Otherwise, *biz* was not absolutely needed. In (68), there is a subject change and Anargül's full name is given as a new and crucial scene begins. In (29), *bizning*, the genitive form of the pronoun ("our") is an extra-clear identification, because the ending *-miz* of the possessed would be enough.

### Exiting the Scene:

There seems to be a tendency to use the full name or a noun phrase where a participant is used for the last time as a subject.

Emethaji - (109) *Menmu* - "I, too".

Anargül - (79) *Anargül*. ("Anargül's spirit" is again subject at the end in (106)).

Emethaji's parents - (51) *Atam bilen anam* - "my father and my mother"

Anargül's father - (104) *Metkerimbay*

the donkey - (29) *Dadamning Awattin tuz toshuydighan eshiki* -

"Father's donkey with which he fetched salt from Awat"

### Conclusion

When the subject remains the same as in the preceding sentence, either an implicit subject suffices (with Emethaji, the story-teller, this is always the case), or a role noun is used (*qiz*, *bay*). Only in the case of Emethaji's father, "my dad" is used each time.

When the subject changes, an implicit subject might still suffice, as long as the reader can identify unambiguously who the subject is. Otherwise a role noun can be used. The referring expression with the "most-coding material" (Dooley and Levinsohn 1999:54) - be it the full name ("Anargül, Metkerimbay") or, in case of the story teller, the pronoun "I", and in case of his father the noun "my dad" - can be employed as well. This is more likely at the first

occurrence of that person in a given scene, or when it is deemed appropriate for reasons of prominence. The form with the most-coding material is *not* used where subject continuity is given - with the exception of the minor participant Emethaji's father. (It is a common phenomenon that for minor participants, which are less salient to the reader, pronouns are not used, while for major participants, who are more salient, the use of pronouns is normal.)

#### Speech orienters:

Speech orienters are the clauses used to introduce direct speech, like "He said: ..." in English. Alternatively, they are called "speech margins", "quote tags", or similarly. The following patterns are used. A full speech orienter (with explicit subject and verb of speaking) **seldom comes before the speech**, unless a longer quote is to be introduced. In this text, this can be seen in (20) where a longer talk of the children follows, and in (98f.), where there comes a longer sequence of thoughts by the writer, i.e. the main character Emethaji.

**The thoughts of the story-teller** (Emethaji), and questions that he asks himself, are often interspersed in the text **without any speech orienter** (9, 30f., 37f., 42, 95, 108). It is at times difficult where to set the beginning and end of the speech (108). Sometimes there is a speech orienter with the subject expressed by verb-agreement (21), or, in a dialog where Emethaji actually utters speech, even with *men* ("I") (71), probably in order to not allow ambiguity in the dialog.

As to Anargül's speeches: The dominant pattern is **Subject - Speech - Verb** (with agreement) (15, 23, 46, and 17, where the subject is contained in *qapaqlirini*). One time (72), in a dialog, the subject is not mentioned before the speech, but occurs as *u* ("she") after the verb (pattern: **Speech - Verb - Subject**), maybe because the speech is continued afterwards. Emethaji's father's only speech follows the above-mentioned usual pattern: **Subject - Speech - Verb** (6). This is not the case where Anargül's father's speech is related (61f.). This happens in a dramatic moment, and he was just mentioned in the preceding sentence, thus mentioning the subject again before the speech would be disturbing. It comes after the speech though as *bay*, probably because his talk then continues (cf. Anargül) (61f.).

In (75), the writer sees no need for a separate speech orienter with subject and verb of speech. But the preceding sentence mentions the subject (*men ... bastim* - "I ... hugged"), and it follows a colon. Also, the word *deymen* ("I say") is part of the speech itself. Apart from that, this speech occurs at a peak in the story. All this makes a speech orienter superfluous.

In (83), where the writer quotes a verse from his songs this vers is clearly indented in the text, thus a speech orienter is not needed.

(85) could be interpreted as a case for the pattern: **Subject - Speech - Verb**, whereby in place of the subject a paraphrasing clause is used.

Again, one cannot jump to definite conclusions after analyzing one text. But as more stories are examined, one can identify what kind of speech orienters are normal. At least one can state that in this area as well, the principle of economy, that is the avoidance of redundancy, is presumed. Speech orienters are handled flexibly, and are shortened or left out where the setting provides enough orientation for the reader to link speech to the right participant.

### III. Word Order

Uyghur follows the typical Turkic word order "Subject - Object - Verb (SOV)". Here, a look shall be taken at those **elements that appear outside of the core sentence**. Irregularities in the word order of a certain text can easily be identified once it is charted, as it was done in the attachment. For reference, two lines from the charted text are given here as samples.

Ref.	Introducers	Pre-nuclear / Fronted Elements	Core Sentence			Post-nuclear / Postposed Elements
			Subject	Objects / Predicate (if not verb)	Verb	
28	Biraq, shu künlerde	bizning ailige	bir peshkellik		keldi.	
	But, in those days	to our family	a misfortune		came.	
	But in those days came a misfortune upon our family.					
61			0		Chüsh	buyaqqal!
					come down	here!
	Come down here!					

#### 1. Elements before the Subject

This section refers to column I in the chart ("**Introducers**"). The following can be found:

- **Conjunctions** (e.g. "because" (4), "and" (17), "but" (44), "maybe ... or ..." (108)).
- **Temporal phrases** (e.g. "one day" (6), "from this time on" (16), "later" (19)). They can consist of just one word, or be a lengthy phrase like in (13, 45). Generally, temporal phrases occur before the subject. In this text, there are close to 30 such cases. (Since these are the majority, the temporal phrases in those sentences which do not have an explicit subject were put into column I as well.) But temporal phrases can also come somewhere between subject and verb. In the present text we find this about 10 times. It is difficult to argue that all of these latter cases are a matter of emphasis, or to give other reasons for the shift. The writer can exercise a certain freedom in this area. (6 and 41) are examples for sentences which contain more than one temporal expression, in different positions. (Compare Stroy 1989:377ff. about word order and 370f., 409-411 about temporal clauses.)
- **Locative phrases** (e.g. "in our class" (11)).
- **Emphatic expressions** ("I still remember, ..." (13), "even" (40)).
- **Comparatives**: *Yamanlap qalghandek* - "like feeling wronged" (15) is apparently strongly underlined in this position. The same is true for the metaphor in (86): *Pütün alem qarangghuliship közümghe tiqilghandek* - "As if the whole world had darkened ...".
- **Question words** come in this position as well ("why" (21)). Due to limited data, it is difficult though to establish a clear rule about the order of question word and subject. (Cf. (15, 30, 91, 99) where there is no explicit subject.) Following (21), the question words in (15, 99) were put into column 1 in the chart, but not those in (30, 85, 91).
- **Exclamations** (*hoy* (62), *he* (63)).
- Furthermore, the speech orienter in (46) has the element "according to Anargül" in front of the subject.

If two of the above listed parts of speech occur in combination, the order is (as far as can be deduced from this text): Conjunction - Emphasis - Temporal phrase - Locative phrase, see (28, 20, 13, 8, 57).

## 2. Elements after the Verb

Elements following the verb appear in the last column in the chart (Post-nuclear Elements). There are but few cases of post-verbal parts of speech, and **all of them occur within direct speech**:

- Speakers address the person they are talking to after finishing the first sentence: ..., *balam* - "my child/son" (6); ..., *qizim* - "my daughter" (46) ("vocatives").
- Two times in the agitated speech of Anargül's father, the verb is not the last element. Once, in the case of an imperative, the locative follows: *Chüsh buyaqqä* - Come down here! (61); another time, an accusative object follows (64). Such is commonly found in direct speech in other texts too.
- A question tag is joined in (98): *emesmu* - "isn't he?".
- (Another case of post-verbal elements are the various forms of the verb *demek* - "to say", functioning as an indicator for the end of the quote (9, 85), but this is a syntactic necessity and has to do with the topic of "speech orienters".)

## 3. Deviations from SOV

The data on variations to SOV order is found in column II ("Fronted Elements"). There is no sentence where the subject comes after the verb. But there are cases where the subject comes to stand immediately in front of the verb *and an object occurs before the subject*:

28 " But, in those days *upon our family a misfortune came.*"

48 "Those days *over my little head an indescribably heavy misery came.*"

98 "But that time *to me all of a sudden a thought came.*"

In all these it is an indirect object (dative) that comes in pre-core position. In (98), "all of a sudden" is fronted too. A case with a fronted *bilen*-construction ("with"), which is usually placed between subject and verb as well, is (84):

"*With such longing, expectancy, one year passed by.*"

Furthermore, the following fronted elements are found (occurring in sentences that contain other parts of speech between subject and verb which are not fronted):

35 *bayning zori bilen* - "by the force of the bay"

94 *Men üchün* - "for me".

The variety of elements that come before the subject is noteworthy, especially the number of temporal and, to a lesser degree, local phrases and indirect objects.

## Bibliography

- Clifton, John M. and Deborah A. Clifton (editors). 2002. Comments on Discourse Structures in Ten Turkic Languages. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Dooley, Robert A. and Stephen H. Levinsohn. August 1999 edition. Analyzing Discourse: Basic Concepts.  
<http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/linguistics/textbooks/DooleyLevinsohn.pdf>.
- Engesaeth, Tarjei. 2002. A Textbook of Uyghur Grammar, Vol. 1. Unpublished; first printed in England.
- Friederich, Michael in cooperation with Abdurishid Yakup. 2002. Uyghurisch Lehrbuch. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Qahar, Abduraxman. 1999. Hekaye-powestliridin tallanma. Urumchi: Shinjang xelq neshriyati.
- Stroy Uygurskogo Yazyka. 1989. Akademiya Nauk Kazachskoy SSR, Institut Uygurovedeniya. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- Tömür, Hämit and Anne Lee (translator). 2003. Modern Uyghur Grammar (Morphology). Dil ve Edebiyat 3. Istanbul: Yildiz.
- Uyghur xelq chöchekliri. 1. Vol. 1995. Urumchi: Shinjang xelq neshriyati.