T.C.
Mersin Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF
MODAL ADVERBS IN TURKISH

122245

122245

Yaşam U. Bıldırcın

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yeşim AKSAN

Mersin
Eylül, 2002

Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğüne,

Bu çalışma, jürimiz tarafından İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalında YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Başkan_____

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özler ÇAKIR

Üye_____

Doç. Dr. Mustafa AKSAN

Üye_____

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yeşim AKSAN

Onay

Yukarıdaki imzaların, adı geçen öğretim elemanlarına ait olduklarını onaylarım.

Prof. Dr. Zafer GÖKÇAKAN

Enstitü Müdürü

24/09/2002

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Finally, I present my deepest thanks to my family, first of all to my mother Selma Doğan and my dear sister Uygar Doğan who have patiently listened to my endless complaints and been a source of strength and understanding to me, and then to my dear husband Selçuk and my cutest son Ekin without whose support and tolerance this study would not have been completed.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Adverb (Tr. Belirteç, Osm. Zarf) is a word category that belongs to the open word class, as with the noun, verb and adjective. That means it is open to constant addition and thus represents a very diverse set of words. Vardar's definition (1988:39) summarizes the definitions that belong to traditional grammars (Gencan, 1979; Ergin, 1986; Banguoğlu, 1990; Ediskun, 1992). He defines adverb as the unit that effects, i.e. strengthens or constraints, the meaning of another unit in a sentence, namely a verb, an adjective, a preposition or another adverb. The underlined words in the statements (1) to (4) represent examples of adverbs indicating time, quality, certainty and quantity.

(1) Kardeşim <u>bugün</u> geliyor (time)

'My sister is arriving <u>today</u>.'

(2) Öğretmen <u>etkileyici</u> konuştu. (quality)

'The teacher talked <u>effectively</u>.'

(3) <u>Elbette</u> okula gideceğim. (certainty)

'I <u>definitely</u> will go to school'

(4) <u>Çok</u> yorulmuşsun. (quantity)

'You look very tired.'

In all languages, adverbs form a very complex category because of the diversity of their functions. According to traditional grammars like the ones stated above, Turkish adverbs are the subjects of different kinds of classifications. The most shared semantic classifications are, sometimes in different terms, adverbs of time (or temporal

adverbs) (5), place (locative or directional adverbs) (6) and quantity (7). The next classification group that follows these types of adverbs are demonstrative (8) and interrogative adverbs (9).

(5) Okullar <u>yarın</u> açılıyor. (temporal)

'The schools are starting <u>tomorrow</u>.'

(6) Hepsi birlikte <u>aşağıya</u> indiler. (place/direction)

'They went <u>downstairs</u> all together.'

(7) Bu genç <u>çok</u> çalışıyor. (quantity)

'This guy works <u>very</u> hard.'

(8) <u>İşte</u> sana sözünü ettiğim kitap. (demonstrative)

'<u>Here</u> is the book I have mentioned.'

(9) <u>Nereye</u> gidiyorsunuz ? (interrogative)

'<u>Where</u> are you going?'

The most complicated group that is classified in many different ways is the adverb of manner. What makes this category complicated is that its content differs from grammarian to grammarian. For example while Banguoğlu (1990) classifies the adverbs 'açık' (light) and 'iyi' (well) in example statements (10), (11) as 'adverbs of quality' and holds them apart from adverbs of manner, Gencan (1979) gives adverbs of quality as a subpart of adverbs of manner like he does for adverbs of certainty (e.g. mutlaka) or adverbs of expectation (e.g. inşallah).

(10) Açık sarı bir kazak giymişti.

'She has worn a light yellow jumper.'

(11) Söylenenleri iyi hatırlıyorum.

'I remember what is being said well.'

Besides these mostly shared classifications, one can view other kinds of adverb clauses in traditional grammars, sometimes given under the heading of adverbs of manner. Example statements (12) to (16) reflect some of these classifications.

(12) Kuşkusuz doğruyu söylemiştir. (certainty)

'Doubtlessly, he has told the truth.'

(13) Keşke hasta olmasaydın. (desiderative)

'I wish you were not ill.'

(14) İnşallah seni görmemişlerdir. (expectation)

'I hope they have not seen you.'

(15) Belki buraya geliyordur. (possibility)

'Possibly, he is coming here.'

(16) Eğer biliyorsan soruma cevap ver. (condition)

'If you know the answer, answer my question.'

It is clear that the whole set of statements above reflects the modal function of adverbs. Using different terms for the same function does not fulfill the demand of the contemporary linguistic theory which makes use of comprehensive concepts and generalizations in classifications. Thus, instead of these semantically particularized names

and lists given above, we can easily use the broader term 'modal adverbs' including the uses of adverbs which convey the speaker's attitude towards the truth value of his/her utterance.

Syntactically, it is possible to find adverbs occupying various positions in Turkish sentences. Following the idea about the two distinct functions of adverbs as predicate phrase or verb phrase constituent leads us to the classification of adverbs as 'sentential' vs. 'predicative' on the basis of syntactic factors. Predicative adverbs are closely related to the other constituents, basically the main verb, of the sentence. On the other hand, sentential adverbs are the ones which interact conjunctively with the rest of the sentence and exhibit semantic implications either on the subject or the speaker of the sentence. That is, a sentential adverb takes the whole sentence into its scope regardless of its position in the sentence. Whether it occurs sentence initially, finally or pre-verbally, it does not lose the function of modifying the whole sentence. Another property of sentential adverbs is that they can occur by themselves as full sentences in discourse.

(17) A: Baban mezuniyet törenine gelecek mi?

'Will your father come to your graduation ceremony?'

B: <u>Elbette</u>.

'Of course, he will come.'

<u>Belki</u>.

'It is possible that he will come.'

<u>Keşke</u>.

'I wish he would come.'

Thus, sentential adverbs have the capacity of expressing a complete thought by themselves. When they are used in a sentence, they modify the whole idea of that sentence; that is, what they express influence the idea in the sentence as a whole. The relationship between sentential adverbs and the sentence in which they occur is mainly a semantic one.

Classifying Turkish adverbs on the basis of their semantic properties is a subject which is still under discussion because of the diversity of meanings that adverbs impose to the sentences in which they occur. As stated before, traditional approaches to adverbs determine a semantic classification on the basis of four main categories, i.e. adverbs of time, location and direction, quantity and manner. However, it is obvious that this classification is inefficient in representing the role that adverbs play in Turkish. For example, they cannot explain how such adverbs like *mutlaka, inşallah, belki* change the interpretation of a sentence like (18).

(18) (a) Sabahları sahilde koşuya çıkarız. (habit)

'We go for a run on the beach in the morning.'

(b) Mutlaka sabahları sahilde koşuya çıkarız. (certainty)

'We certainly go for a run on the beach in the morning.'

(c) İnşallah sabahları sahilde koşuya çıkarız. (expectation)

'I hope we will go for a run on the beach in the morning.'

(d) Belki sabahları sahilde koşuya çıkarız. (possibility)

'We may go for a run on the beach in the morning.'

Modern linguistic studies, such as Gödekli (1979), Erguvanlı Taylan (1996), Ruhi et.al. (1997), take a different perspective to this point and try to analyze the semantic properties of Turkish adverbs on a different scale that represents a broader data. Gödekli's (1979) semantic classification summarizes this different perspective. According to Gödekli, predicative and sentential adverbs should be analyzed separately because of their totally different functions. Predicative adverbs have close semantic relationships with the verbs based on their close syntactic relationships. They modify or add something to the meaning of the verb by indicating the time, place, degree of the action, the manner in which it is done, the reason for it or the instrument by which the action is done. In addition to this, presence or absence of a predicative adverb does not influence the truth value of the sentence, as shown in (19).

(19) Çocuk <u>mutlu mutlu</u> gülümsüyordu.

'The child was smiling happily.'

As the example proves, the manner in which the action is done does not change the truth value of that sentence. That is, the way the child was smiling does not change the fact that he was smiling.

Sentential adverbs, on the other hand, exhibit different semantic properties because of their whole sentence modification function. If we analyze the sentences (18) (b) and (d) again, we will clearly see that the presence of the modal adverbs of *mutlaka* and *belki* add different degrees of probability (*mutlaka* a high degree, *belki* a low degree) for the truth of the sentence from the speaker's viewpoint, but they do not imply anything

about its being a fact. This clearly shows that sentential adverbs contribute to both the syntactic and semantic structure of the sentence in which they occur.

In the light of this information, Gödekli (1979: 70) makes a more clear-cut semantic classification of Turkish adverbs as opposed to traditional grammars. She sub-classifies the adverbs that have similar syntactic functions, according to their semantic functions. Table 1. summarizes the classification of Turkish sentential adverbs on the basis of semantic properties.

Sentential adverbs			
Adverbial clauses	Modal adverbs	Evaluative adverbs	Conjunctive adverbs
Yanıma uzanıp	Belki	Neyse ki	Evvela
Geldiğini görünce	Herhalde	Ne var ki	Onun içindir ki
Elinden tutarak	İhtimal	Meğer	Bu açıdan
Şarkı söylemeden	Gerçekten	Aksi gibi	Estetik yönden
Düşündükçe	Hakikaten	Açıkça	Böylece
Mutfakta oturmuş	Muhakkak	Bana kalırsa	Aksi takdirde
Henüz varmıştı ki	Büyük olasılıkla		
Beklerken	Elbette		
Haber verse	Besbelli		
Gider gitmez	Kesinlikle		
	Galiba		
	Mutlaka		

Table 1. General outline of Turkish sentential adverbs.

In order to clarify the concept of 'modal adverb' which forms the main part of our study, it becomes necessary to mention the broader notion of 'modality' which will be studied in a detailed way in Chapter I, in a limited sense at this point of our study.

Lyons (1977: 18) defines modality as "the speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes". Palmer (1986: 95) analyses modality in three parts: epistemic, deontic and dynamic.

Epistemic modality can be defined as the speaker's attitude to the factuality of his/her statements and is sub-divided into two: "evidential modality" which includes the assertions made by the speaker clearly and confidently, and "judgment modality" which includes probability, necessity, the speaker's deductions and evaluations (Palmer' 1986: 95). The modalities of "inference" and "confidence" are sub-branches of judgments. The term "confidence" refers to the speaker's commitment in the truth of what he/she is saying based on a deduction from facts known or his/her beliefs. The speaker may signal strong (e.g. 'certainly', 'definitely') or weaker (e.g. 'perhaps') commitment to the factuality of statements by the use of certain modal expressions, i.e. modal verbs auxiliaries, adverbs etc.

Lyons (1977: 798-799) analyzes epistemic modality from a different perspective and determines two branches: "objective" and "subjective" modalities. Objective modality is based on the speaker's knowledge about the proposition reflected by his/her utterance and can be interpreted as 'this proposition is true depending on my knowledge'. Thus, the speaker takes the responsibility of the truth expressed by that proposition. The listener may judge, deny or approve the proposition depending on his/her knowledge. On the other hand, in subjective modality, the speaker does not express his/her attitude that much directly and clearly because the proposition hidden his/her utterance is judged on the basis of his/her own beliefs and thoughts, but not on knowledge that is thought to be shared between the listener and the speaker. Personal opinions, events that are not witnessed but heard from others, and temporal deductions are reflected via the use of this kind of modality.

As the contemporary Turkish studies (Kocaman, 1988; Erguvanlı Taylan, 1996; Ruhi et. al., 1997) implicate, adverbs indicating modal meanings such as necessity or

probability hold a significant place in the modality scale of Turkish. The limited information that the studies made so far leads us to analyze the semantic and syntactic properties of Turkish modal adverbs in detail in order to represent the notion of modality properly in the system of Turkish language.

Problems of the Study

In many languages, including Turkish and English, certain adverbs are used to express notions of modality and thus exhibit significance in the modality system of that language. This study attempts to analyze Turkish adverbs denoting modal notions and answer the questions below;

i. What are the major syntactic properties of Turkish modal adverbs in concern with

a) their syntactic domain (scope)?

b) their position in the sentence?

c) the influence of their position on the semantic interpretation of the sentence?

ii. What are the major semantic properties of Turkish modal adverbs regarding

a) their inherent meanings?

b) the way they contribute to the interpretation of the sentence?

c) their interaction with Turkish tense, aspect and modal markers?

Hypotheses

Our hypotheses are these:

i. Turkish modal adverbs have syntactic constraints regarding their position and scope in the sentence.

ii. They contribute to the semantic interpretation of the sentence

a. expressing different senses depending on the context of use

b. indicating different types of modality, i.e. epistemic or deontic.

c. their interaction with tense, aspect and modality markers is realized in the frame of three functions; i.e. disambiguation, modification and transformation.

Purpose of the Study

Modal adverbs perform a crucial part in the modality system of Turkish. Thus, as an important component of the system, they should be analyzed in detail. However, the traditional studies lack linguistic analysis and contemporary studies has a limited scope on the subject emphasizing only one particular size of the issue. This study is an attempt to analyze the functions of these lexical units in detail and provide a descriptive account of their position on the modality scale of Turkish. In order to achieve our aim, we have tried to explain the effects of syntactic positioning and the way that the modal adverbs interact with tense, aspect and modal markers of the sentence in which they occur, based on a comprehensive data. The results of such an analysis can contribute to the contemporary studies on Turkish grammar and thus can help Turkish students learning a second language

to have a better understanding of the modality system which is a main source of learning problems in language classrooms.

Data Collection

In order to form a comprehensive database, a wide variety of electronic texts were scanned and compiled. In addition, short stories, newspaper and magazine articles, and naturally occurring data (spontaneous native speaker speech) have formed an important part of our data.

Limitations

This study is particularly focused on a limited number of sentential modal adverbs conveying epistemic modality; i.e. *belki, herhalde, galiba, muhtemelen* in one group indicating degrees of possibility and inference, *mutlaka, kesinlikle, elbette* in the second group indicating confidence. The above mentioned adverbs were selected due to the frequency of their occurrence in the data collected for this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I deals with the notion of adverb as a part of speech and exhibits both traditional and contemporary approaches to the subject. It also provides an overall information on modality as a grammatical category and gives a general account of contemporary studies in Turkish which have been done on the topic of modality and modal adverbs.

Chapter II focuses on the representation of the data regarding the syntactic and semantic properties of the selected modal adverbs. It also includes detailed description of

Turkish tense, aspect and modal markers and the analysis of their interaction with the modal adverbs.

Conclusion summarizes the whole study and informs the basic results of our linguistic analysis.

CHAPTER I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The present chapter is intended to deal with adverbs in a general frame. Firstly, studies which provide us with information about adverbs as a parts of speech will be restated in order to exhibit more clear-cut classifications as opposed to traditional ones which were mentioned in 'introduction'. Secondly, the notion of modality will be focused on. Finally, an overall background of the contemporary studies will be summarized in order to see the representation of the notion of 'modal adverb' in Turkish.

I. 1. Adverb as a Parts of Speech

Schachter (1985: 3) adopts a traditional approach towards the grammatical classification of words and defines the term 'parts of speech' as "major classes of words that are grammatically distinguished in a language". He emphasizes grammatical criteria over semantic criteria for parts of speech classification because of the inadequate definitions the latter provide, such as 'a noun is the name of a person, place or thing'. An adequate 'parts of speech' classification should be based on grammatical properties; namely, the distribution of the word, its range of syntactic functions and the morphological or syntactic categories for which it is specifiable. His study provides a general traditional outline of parts of speech classification which can be summarized as the following:

i.   The assignment of words into parts of speech systems is based on grammatical properties and often language particular.

ii.   The name chosen for a particular parts of speech class may reflect universal semantic considerations.

iii. All languages make a distinction between open and closed parts of speech classes.

Following Robins (cited in Schachter, 1985: 4), we can define open classes as a category containing unlimited number of words; namely, nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs, whereas closed classes represent a fixed and usually small number of words that are essentially the same for all the speakers of a particular language. Thus, closed classes include members such as pronouns, conjunctions, noun adjuncts and verb adjuncts.

As stated above, adverbs are treated as a member of the open class category having many subclasses based on certain distinctive grammatical properties. Schachter (1985: 20) defines adverbs as a modifier of constituents rather than nouns and mentions subclasses such as sentence adverbs (e.g. unfortunately), directional adverbs (e.g. to school), degree adverbs (e.g. extremely), manner adverbs (e.g. slowly), and time adverbs (e.g. yesterday). In addition, some subclasses such as degree and sentence adverbs are counted as a part of closed classes because they contain only a fixed number of words. Schachter (1985) also states that the notional range of adverbs is variable according to the type of constituent they modify, i.e. verb modifiers often express time, place, direction or manner while modifiers of sentences commonly express the speaker's attitude toward the event being spoken.

Although it exhibits inadequacies of having very traditional boundaries as stated above, Schachter's work (1985) merits attention to emphasize the wide functional and notional range that adverbs represent if analyzed by such a traditional approach and how this analysis make it hard to draw clear boundaries between different parts of speech classes.

Quirk et. al. (1985: 438) admits that the adverb forms the most problematic class among the traditional word classes stating "… it is tempting to say simply that the adverb is an item that does not fit the definitions for other word classes". Due to this fact, certain types of items have been removed from the class entirely and several additional classes have been established in order not to retain this much subsets within a single adverbs class.

As for its function as a clause element, Quirk et. al. (1985: 439) mentions two distinct uses of adverbs: clause element adverbial as in 'He quite forgot about it', and premodifier of adjective and adverb as in 'They are quite happy/happily married'. They also inform peripheral uses of adverbs as elements distinct from subject, verb, object, and complement as in 'Perhaps my suggestion will be accepted'. This last use, i.e. adverbs as an optional element of the sentence, is named as the grammatical function of disjunct. Semantically, disjuncts are informed to express an evaluation of the speaker on the proposition of his/her utterance, and syntactically, they are thought to have a more peripheral relation in the sentence as opposed to other uses of adverbs. This identification of the adverb use well overlaps with our definition of modal adverbs which reflected as the speaker's comment on what is being said.

Emonds (1987: 3) suggests a generative point of view towards the distinctions between different parts of speech in the search of the answer to "What are the most basic grammatical categories in terms of which language ought to be discussed and taught at any level?", including both second level pedagogy and first language instruction throughout primary and secondary schools.

Emonds (1987) acknowledges that any theory of grammar must provide a language with certain categories of words and that, in order to be adequate, a particular

inventory of categories should state accurate rules and principles which express permissible category combinations. He also states that the pre-generative tradition, adopting the categories of classical grammarians, singles out eight or so parts of speech. For example, just like Schachter (1985), Curme (cited in Emonds, 1987: 4) and Sweet (cited in Emonds, 1987: 4) define eight parts of speech, i.e. noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection, and Quirk et. al. (1972: 49) add articles and demonstratives, which are searched under limiting adjectives in both Curme and Sweet, to this list.

All of these linguists define any part of speech in terms of language use. These definitions, such as "a noun is a word used as the name of a living being or a lifeless thing" or "the verbs is that part of speech that predicates, assists in predications, asks a question, or expresses a command" (Curme; cited in Emonds, 1987: 4), are thought to be seriously defective for a number of reasons. First of all, many grammatically central elements do not fit in any of the traditional categories. For example, English modal auxiliaries, which are stated under 'verb' in traditional grammars, have no features in common with 'verb' as a part of speech. They share similar features with verbal inflections, instead. In addition, some words which do not fit any other category tend to gather in the category of 'adverb'. This brings the conclusion that, in the traditional approach, it is not unusual for a certain category to include members which have nothing in common with each other.

(1)   Çok tatlı bir kızınız var. (adjective modifying intensifying adverb)

'You have a very cute daughter'

(2)   Kardeşiyle aşağıya indiler. (verb modifying locational adverb)

'They went downstairs with his brother'

The underlined words in the above examples are thought to belong to the same category, namely 'adverb', although they share no properties except for not being labeled in any other category in the system.

Another vagueness of traditional definitions is that they do not exhibit a general pattern because each of them is made for a particular need or purpose. That is, "some categories are defined by what they are, others by what they modify, others by what they introduce, and still another by what it replaces" (Emonds, 1987: 5).

The final criticism is that there is not principled distinction between the open classes of nouns, adjectives and verbs and the other closed classes suggested by the traditional definitions. For example, certain locational adverbs, which are labeled under open classes, have more in common with prepositions, a closed class member, than other subclasses of adverbs.

Emonds (1987) suggests that generative system can formulate generalizations which are not expressible in the traditional category system because of the reasons stated above. Based on this suggestion, he tries to draw more clear borderlines between adverbs and other open class members.

The first comparison is made between nouns and adverbs following the fact that the restrictions on proper nouns (e.g. no occurrence with 'the' when unmodified) suggest a first step for extracting some order out of the heterogeneous traditional part of speech 'adverb'. Analogous to the days of the week, the deictic adverbs such as 'today', 'tonight', 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow' are proper nouns.

(3)   Yesterday and today were difficult. (*The) Yesterday was more so.

(4)   I'd like to make it to (*the) tomorrow.

(5) Let's work on the pamphlet (*the) tomorrow(*s)

(6) *A yesterday is on my mind that a tomorrow.

(7) What will you be doing (*a) today?

(Emonds, 1987: 11; ex. 14)

The above examples proves the noun status of deictic adverbs based on their distribution as subjects, objects of verbs and objects of prepositions as well as adverbially functioning noun phrases. This conformation is also supported by the ability of such adverbs to take possesive form both in English and Turkish. For example, 'yesterday's newspaper', 'tonight's carefully planned attack', 'today's troubles', 'yarının baskısı', 'bu sabahın misafiri', 'dünün bıraktıkları'.

Emonds (1987: 13) also suggests a similarity between 'demonstratives' or 'deictics' (this/these, that/those), one special subclass of determiners that is distinguished by an inherent subcategorial feature ± PROXIMATE, and time and locational deictic pairs of 'now/then' and 'here/there', which can be distinguished based on the same semantic property. While traditional grammar classifies these latter four words as adverbs, the generative method of positioning minimal formal distinctions among similar categories supports analyses like the following;

NOW : DETERMINER, +PROXIMATE, TIME

THEN : DETERMINER, -PROXIMATE, TIME

HERE : DETERMINER, +PROXIMATE, PLACE

THERE : DETERMINER, -PROXIMATE, PLACE

Such adverbial deictic determiners can be objects of transitive prepositions (e.g. until now, since then, up to here, away from there). However, as Larson (cited in

Emonds, 1987: 15) states, they cannot serve as the subjects or objects of verbs. Thus, they "are permitted in N^{max} positions only the context $[_{pp}P\underline{\hspace{1cm}}]$, where P can be a lexical item or empty".

These explanations about the pairing of an open class member, namely a noun, with a closed class member, a determiner, clearly shows that these kind of pairings can be used as a basis for defining several traditional subcategories of grammar. This procedure seems universally valid. For example, in Indo-European and many other language families, the open class of adjectives is similarly paired with closed class of preceding modifiers specific to them. Traditional grammars label these modifiers as 'degree words' or 'adverbs of degree', e.g. very, quite, rather, so, too, how, more, most etc.

These pairings of determiner/noun and degree word/adjective has led Chomsky (cited in Emonds, 1987: 17) to prose a system of phrases where in an open class category X, which can be a noun (N), adjective (A) or verb (V), is the head and can be preceded in deep structure by an optional modifying closed class category, called the 'specifier of X' [SP (X)]. Let us show it in the way Chomsky's 'bar notation' does.

X^0 or X is the head

X^1 or X' is the combination of the head and its complement excluding specifier

X^{max} or X^2 or X" is the phrase

Thus, the adjective phrase 'so little' and the noun phrase 'some size' can be projected as the following.

$[[so]_{SP(A)} [little]_A]_{AP}$

$[[some]_{SP(N)} [size]_N]_{NP}$

In such projections, A may express color, size, shape etc. and SP(A) expresses the degree of these qualities and requires the presence of the head A in the AP.

(8)   *We found the tourists very resentful, but we found the residents even more.

(9)   We found the tourists very resentful, but we found the residents even more so.

(Emonds, 1987: 17; ex. 25)

Emonds (1987: 17) names the word 'so' as a "pro-adjective", analogous to the pro-noun 'one', and states that it can be modified only by a specifier which itself is a phrase, e.g. 'very much so', but not '*very so', or '*too so'.

In addition to these, SP(A)____ is given as a marked subclass of adjectives. This subclass of adjectives includes words with extreme meanings which cannot be modified further such as the following sentences show;

(10)   *We considered the performance [very/too/less] excellent.

(11)   *The backdoor has remained [quite/more/rather] unpainted for years.

(Emonds, 1987: 18; ex. 26)

As stated before, traditional grammars call SP(A) as adjective-modifying adverbs. However, this class has no similar distributional properties with, for example, the adverbs such as 'yesterday' which was analyzed as proper noun time deictics before. Proper nouns are heads of noun phrases, but degree words, which are labeled under the

same heading with adverbs in traditional grammars, are specifiers of their head adjective. Furthermore, classifying degree words as specifiers correctly brings out the parallels with the determiner system as stated below.

- Both classes of specifiers precede and modify X.

- Both give rise to some inflection on X.

- Ostention and wh-words are located in both specifiers.

- The specifier and the head form a phrase in both cases.

- Both specifier classes are closed.

Unfortunately, traditional terminology is incapable of expressing such similarities because traditional system does not let any parallels between 'limiting adjectives', i.e. determiners, and one subclass of adverbs.

As the examples given above clearly proves, generative grammar tries to define most of its categories by means of the open-closed pair of SP(X) and (X) based on the bar notation. This criterion helps to analyze the large productive class of adverbs more properly than traditional grammar does by providing it with similarities with other word classes and thus reduce its over-loaded account which is full of irrelevant groups of words.

According to the above-stated criterion, the adverbs which have the surface form 'A+ly' in English are clearly also adjectives, because they can be modified by the same closed class of specifiers, e.g. 'very slowly', 'rather interestingly', 'that clumsily', 'how bravely'.

The same explanation is valid for Turkish manner adverbs which make use of adjectives in the form of "A bir şekilde/biçimde", e.g. *çok sessiz bir şekilde, oldukça güzel bir biçimde.*

Emonds (1987: 19) suggests the term "adverbial AP" for the phrases given in the above examples using the term 'adverbial' to mean, in the traditional sense, what modifies a verb, adjective or clause. In contrast, an "adjectival AP" modifies a noun. Furthermore, the fact that one position for adverbial APs is the SP(A) position itself may provide us with a good explanation of why traditional grammar so comfortably combines 'A+ly' and degree words under the term 'adverb'.

(15) a. too obviously critical

b. as openly radical as is desirable

c. surprisingly deep

d. less fashionably dressed up

e. how relentlessly treeless

(Emonds, 1987: 19; ex. 29)

(16) a. çok açık bir biçimde sorumlu

b. şaşırtıcı bir şekilde düzgün

c. daha anlaşılmaz bir biçimde karışık

Emonds (1987: 20) also mentions a few As which do not tolerate '-ly' and which can only be used adverbially and calls these purely adverbial As, e.g. well, often, seldom, soon etc., as "bonfide As" on the basis of their perfectly regular SP(A) specifier system (very well, how often, as soon as, too seldom).

If we sum up the explanations made so far, we can conclude that the generative category A includes not only As but also the greatest number of what traditional grammar

calls adverbs based on their ability to co-occur with the degree words in an AP. If an AP modifies a N it is 'adjectival'; otherwise it is 'adverbial'.

Following the same criterion, i.e. pairing the open/closed classes of SP(X) and X, the open class of Vs should be paired with a closed class member which precedes and modifies only verbs, i.e. SP(V). In English, the first candidate for SP(V) is the modal auxiliaries (e.g. will, can, should etc.) and the second one is a class of time and aspect adverbials (e.g. just, soon, already, still, always, sometimes, never, ever, yet etc.). Both groups precede the head V and have no counterparts in the NP or AP systems. Both time/aspect adverbials and modals cannot modify Ns or As directly.

Emonds (1987: 22) indicates several reasons which favor time/aspect words over modals as the representatives of SP(V).

1. Vs do not occur with modals in some structural contexts. Thus, except for idioms, the modals lose credibility as a candidate for SP(V) because every phrase has its structural potential to contain a specifier paired with its head.

2. The fact that heads select the structural contents in which they occur also suggests that the modals are not SP(V) because they are not included in the 'maximal projection' of VPs. In fact, the modal is part of the sentence, not the VP.

3. In many languages (Turkish, Japan) the category of modals is always realized in the morphology of the verb and thus, they are thought to be in the same syntactic class as the verbal 'tense' endings.

4. In some languages (Korean) the tense/modal category can be paired at least with adjectives as well as with verbs.

5. There is further evidence that time/aspect adverbs are inside VP unlike modals. Many generative analyses of English propose that VPs can be zero in the context MODAL_____ , as in the following examples:

(17) Bill might take French and Mary might, too.

(18) Mary will visit us, but Sam won't.

(Emonds, 1987: 23; ex. 35)

Time/aspect adverbs cannot occur externally at the left edge of the 'VP deletion site' because they are included in VPs unlike modals.

(19) *Bill was taking Korean at ten, and six-year-old Mary already.

(20) *Mary may visit us, but Sam will never.

(Emonds, 1987: 23; ex. 36)

6. In an XP, the obligatory element is the head X and SP(X) is optional in general. This favors time/aspect words as SP(V) over modals because time/aspect words are optional while modals are obligatory, when they can appear.

All of the arguments stated above indicate that time/aspect adverbials are SP(V).

Emonds (1987) treats the temporal and spatial adverbs such as 'overhead', 'aboard', 'in', 'down', 'uptown' as prepositions because they can modify nouns as well as verbs as shown in the following examples;

(21) a. A sound right overhead woke us up.

b. There was a sound right overhead.

(22) a. Some noise upstairs scared her.

b. Climb right aboard.

(23) a. The people outside are mad.

b. John sent the students outside.

(Emonds, 1987: 31; ex. 51)

This overall approach of bar notation and open-closed pairings eliminates the irrelevant content that traditional grammar attributes to the category of adverbs and thus, helps to make the parts of speech system more clear in order to provide a safer base for further studies.

I. 2. A General Account on Modality.

The grammatical category of modality has been a crucial subject which attracted the attention of many researchers for a long time. As Hoye (1997) puts forward, it is an area which both philosophers and linguists share in their studies from different perspectives. In fact, the underlying philosophical system, which treats the phenomenon of

modality in terms of modal logic, forms the source of much of the terminology that linguists currently use. This study grounds on Palmer's (1986) classification in reflecting the fundamental concepts which forms the notion of modality.

Palmer (1986: 51) defines modality as a grammatical category expressing the speaker's subjective attitude with respect to the propositional content of the message. Similar to other grammatical categories, like tense, aspect, gender, number etc., it can be identified and compared across a number of unrelated languages. However, the notion of modality allows a number of possible definitions and thus forms a much vaguer category as opposed to other grammatical categories. The main reason for this vagueness is claimed to be its being related to the whole sentence semantically. That is, unlike other grammatical categories which are primarily related to the verb and thus which can be signaled by the grammatical forms in many languages, modality can be marked elsewhere than on the verb or within a verbal complex.

Grammaticalization, i.e. capturing grammatical categories in the grammatical forms, is not an easy process in the case of modality for various reasons. First of all, modality reflects a comprehensive content including attitudes, opinions, speech acts, possibility, necessity etc. This variation in meaning forms the main reason of the problems of grammaticalization. Second, markers of modality are various in number involving inflectional mood, modal verbs, clitics and particles. Finally, the extent of grammaticalization in different languages reflects considerable differences. For example, in Turkish, many of the features associated with modality are marked lexically rather than grammatically, e.g. *zorunda ol-, gerek-, umarım, korkarım* etc.

Palmer (1986) mentions two reasons why those lexical items should not be ignored. The majority of these lexical items exhibit a close relationship with grammatical

forms that mark modality and alternate with them in a comparative analysis of different languages or even within the same language. In addition, the speaker may use lexical forms in order to report modal expressions being used by another and the use modal forms in subordinate clauses depends, to some degree, on the choice of the lexical items in main clause.

There are some fundamental concepts which one needed to be understood well in order to achieve a good comprehension of the notion of modality. Proposition, i.e. "contents of the sentence" as Jespersen (cited in Palmer, 1986: 10) defines, is one of those concepts. Palmer points out the necessity of making a distinction between the modal and the propositional elements similar to the distinction between locutionary and illocutionary act, i.e. saying something vs. doing something, that was put forward by Austin (cited in Palmer, 1986: 15).

Lewis (cited in Palmer, 1986: 14) defines proposition as the following: "The proposition is assertable; the contents of the assertion ... can be questioned, denied or merely supposed and can be entertained in other moods as well". According to this definition, modality includes all the non-propositional elements of a sentence, i.e. tense, aspect, negation and question. However, the area of modality is not that much wide although there are some relationships between modality and tense, negation and interrogative. Modality, in Lyons's (1977: 452) words, can be defined as "the speaker's attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes". He also points out the distinction between "mood" and modality which is similar to that between tense and time or gender and sex. Mood is claimed to be a term included in verbal morphology. It is thought to be a morphosyntactic category of the verb, like tense and aspect, referring to verbal inflection. However modality does not need

to be expressed within the verbal morphology in all languages. This notion may be expressed through the use of modal verbs or particles as well as inflectional morphemes. Therefore, we may conclude that mood cannot be found in all languages whereas formal markers of modality are found within the grammars of all languages, though not always within the verb.

A third distinction which should be noted here is made between subjective and objective modality. Traditional logic has been more concerned with objective modality which excludes speakers. On the other hand, Palmer (1986) suggests that modality should be more related to subjective characteristics of an utterance, if it is described as the speaker's attitude. However, there are examples in which a clear distinction between subjective and objective readings cannot be made easily. For example, an utterance like 'You must leave at once' may reflect the speaker's insistence or a general necessity for leaving. In addition, some modality markers may indicate notions which are objective in the sense of excluding the speaker like giving permission or ability of the subject. Thus, the system of modality includes both the subjective and objective issues, the first reflecting the speaker's judgments based on his/her own beliefs and thoughts and the latter indicating that the judgment is grounded on facts or knowledge of the speaker.

"Factuality" is another concept which is important for the system of modality. Palmer (1986: 18) uses this term similar to Lyons's (1977: 794) "factivity" vs "non-factivity". According to Lyons, while non-factive utterances which are reflected through the use of modal verbs, modal adverbs or modal adjectives in English, are considered to be included in the system of modality, "straightforward statements of facts" (i.e. categorical assertions) may be described as "epistemically non-modal" (797). On the other hand, Palmer (1986) uses the term 'factual' as not concerning with statements of fact, but with

presuppositions which are contrasted with assertions. Thus, factuality, as opposed to factivity, becomes a part of modality as well.

Steele et. al. (cited in Palmer, 1986: 20) argues the elements expressing modality in two groups: i. possibility, probability and necessity, ii. permission, obligation, and requirement. As Hoye (1997: 40) points out that the discussion of the modal concepts given above goes back to Aristotle and classical Greek philosophy. He also states that "these notions seem to derive from the fact that human beings often categorize their attitudes and experience in terms of the way things might or must be, or might have been or must have been, other than they actually are or were".

Among several proposals concerning the number and type of modalities that need to be recognized, Palmer's (1986) classification seems to be the most basic one being as comprehensive as needed but not more.

Palmer (1986) bases his classification on the observation that quite different languages assign a single form in order to indicate either of the following readings reflected in the examples given below.

(24) Scott may visit us tomorrow ('Perhaps he will' vs. 'He's permitted to')

(25) The milk should be in the fridge. ('It probably is' vs. 'Its proper place is')

(26) Daryl must be at home ('I am certain that she is' vs. 'She is obliged to be')

Palmer (1986: 20) refers to the first readings of the above examples as "epistemic modality" and the second readings are regarded as "deontic modality". In Malinowski's (cited in Palmer, 1986: 20) terms, the distinction between deontic and

epistemic modality is part of a wider distinction between the use of language to inform as a "mode of action" and the use of language to act as a "countersign of thought". Therefore, we can say that epistemic modality is a type concerning with matters of knowledge or belief on which the speakers base their judgments about state of affairs, events or actions. Deontic modality, on the other hand, deals with the notions of possibility or necessity of acts "... performed by morally responsible agents" (Von Wright; cited in Lyons, 1977: 823). That is, deontic modality expresses that the speaker gives permission or lays an obligation for the performance of future actions.

Negation is said to be a good indicator of the distinction between the epistemic and deontic use.

(27) a. Daryl must be at home.

b. Daryl mustn't be at home. ('She is obliged not to be'- deontic)

c. Daryl can't be at home. ('I am certain that'- epistemic)

As Palmer (1986: 51) demonstrates, epistemic modality is a system indicating "the status of the speaker's understanding or knowledge", including both his/her judgments and the kind of warrant he/she has for what he/she says. He also discusses that there are at least four ways in which a speaker may indicate that he/she is not presenting what he is saying as a fact but rather:

i.   that he is speculating about it (e.g. I think that .../ It is possible that ...)

ii.   that he is presenting it as a deduction (e.g. I conclude that .../ It is to be concluded that ...)

iii. that he has been told about it (e.g. X said that .../ It is said that ...)

iv. that it is a matter of appearance based on evidence of senses (e.g. It appears that ...)

Although not being a universal distinction, each of the items above reflects the speaker's lack of commitment to the truth of the proposition being expressed. Palmer (1986: 52) groups these items in three, i.e. reflecting opinion (i), conclusion (ii), and report (iii, iv), and terms them as "speculative", "deductive", and "quotative" in respect.

These three types of modality can be argued under two different systems of epistemic modality, i.e. one system including opinions and conclusions which involve judgments made by the speaker, and the other including reports which indicate the kind of evidence the speaker has for his/her utterance (senses, other speakers etc.). Table 2. summarizes these two subsystems of epistemic modality.

Epistemic Modality		
Judgments		Evidentials
Speculative	Deductive	Quotative

Table 2. Subsystems of epistemic modality

Palmer (1986: 53) claims that some languages may have only one of the grammatical systems of epistemic modality while others may combine the both. For example, English expresses only judgments while German and Turkish uses the two systems.

Both judgments and evidentials can be seen as devices for the speaker to indicate that he/she wishes to modify his/her commitment to the truth of what is being said. There are many languages that distinguish a weak epistemic judgment from a strong one. For example, English modal verbs MAY and MUST reflect different degrees of modality. Palmer (1986: 57) discusses two possible approaches to the semantic distinctions caused by these verbs. In the first approach, the relation between them is clearly stated in terms of possibility and necessity, the former expressing what is epistemically possible and the other what is epistemically necessary. The possibility/necessity distinction is also clearly illustrated in the relationships that hold between the modal verbs in terms of negation.

(28) a. He may be there.

b. He may not be there. (It's necessary that he isn't there.)

c. He can't be there. (It's not necessary that he is there.)

Palmer's (1986) second approach is basically based on the kind of judgment being made, in particular between speculation and deduction. At this point Coates's suggestion is that;

> In its most normal usage, Epistemic MUST conveys the speaker's confidence in the truth of what he is saying, based on deduction from facts known to him (which may or may not be specified). MAY and MIGHT are the modals of Epistemic Possibility, expressing the speaker's lack of confidence in the proposition expressed.

(Coates, 1983: 131)

Possibility and necessity can be argued to be more basic to modality because as well as epistemic modality deontic modality involves these notions expressed by the same

modal verbs, i.e. MAY and MUST. This parallelism makes it possible to account for the inclusion of epistemic and deontic modality within a single overall system.

Palmer (1986: 61) also discusses that MAY and MUST are not the only epistemic markers in English. There is also the modal verb WILL which falls between weak MAY (indicating a possible judgment) and strong MUST (indicating the only possible judgment). The following examples prove that WILL indicates a reasonably judgment which can be identified with the notion of probability.

(29) a. They'll be at the supermarket at the moment.

b. That'll be the postman.

Palmer (1986: 62) suggests the term "Assumptive" for the use of epistemic WILL because this modal verb is not, in fact equivalent to the notion of probability. It indicates that the judgment expressed in the statement is based on the known facts, and sometimes on what is usually the case. Moreover, "... with the other items in the system like those that hold for 'possible' and 'necessary' in terms of negation". It should be noted here that although epistemic WILL and future WILL are totally different notions, it is not surprising to see the use of a single form to refer to both due to the fact that the future cannot be fully known, but can be précised based on known facts.

Coates (1983: 41) states that epistemic MUST reflects "... the speaker's confidence in the truth of what he is saying, based on a deduction from facts known" and that epistemic MAY holds "the speaker's lack of confidence in the proposition expressed".

Thus, there are two issues to be discussed. The first one is about 'confidence', i.e. the degree of commitment of the speaker, and the second one is about making inference

from other available information. Example statements with MUST below indicate that, to a certain degree, it denotes the facts on which the speaker's inference is based.

(30) His teeth were still chattering but his forehead, when I felt it, was hot and clammy. He said "I must have a temperature".

(Coates, 1983: 41)

(31) All the X-rays showed absolutely negative. There was nothing wrong, so it must be tension I suppose. (Palmer, 1986: 64)

Thus, we can talk about two different types of judgment, i.e. the first one indicating 'inference' and the other indicating 'confidence'. In inference, the speaker indicates that he/she bases his propositions on available information and in confidence he indicates the degree of commitment he/she has in what he is saying.

As stated before, the epistemic system consists of both evidentials and judgments in many languages including Turkish. Palmer (1986) points out that it is sometimes very hard to make a clear distinction between evidentials and judgments because the judgments of the speakers are naturally related to the evidence they have, i.e. they make an inference based on available information which can be seen as their evidence. Instead of trying to draw strict borderlines, Palmer suggests it's better to discuss whether a particular system is predominantly evidential or judgment.

In conclusion, in Palmer's (1986) classification, epistemic modality has two subsystems; i. judgments which includes statements expressing either inference or confidence, and ii. evidentials having 'quotatives' as the most important example.

In contrary with epistemic modality which is concerned with belief, knowledge, truth etc. deontic modality is related with action, by the speaker him/herself or by others. Jespersen (cited in Palmer, 1986: 96) defines the term 'deontic' as "containing an element of will". The differences of meanings associated with each type of modality denote that they are quite distinct categories although many languages (English, German, Turkish) make use of the same forms to express both.

The meanings expressed by deontic modality are shared by lexical verbs, like 'hope' or 'wish' as well. Palmer (1986: 97) presents "directives" and "commissives" as the most important types of deontic modality. Both of them are performative beside being subjective because they initiate action by others or by the speaker. This feature relates them to the future. In this respect, deontic modality is clearly different from epistemic modality. "Volitives" and "Evaluatives" are also thought to be deontic.

Similar to epistemic modality, deontic modality may express weak and strong meanings, again by using the modal verbs MAY and MUST. When used for giving permission, MAY expresses deontic possibility, and MUST, laying an obligation, expresses deontic necessity. For example, the statement 'You may/must come tomorrow' imposes the possibility or necessity of coming tomorrow upon the hearer.

Hoye (1997:43) points out the difficulties with subjectivity, an essential feature of epistemic modality, when it comes to an analysis of deontic modality because of the varying degrees of speaker involvement. For example, deontic requests like "Will lecturers kindly refrain from missing classes?" (ex.4) reflects no speaker involvement unless the speaker of such an utterance is an authority instigating the action. Hoye also suggests that the non-factuality of an utterance such as "Scott can cook" can be questioned although the modality conveys that the subject (Scott) has the ability to perform a particular action

(cooking). Palmer (1986: 102) argues that CAN in statements like the one above, is used "to express what seems to be a factual non-modal statement".

Hoye (1997) informs that a third type of modality is recognized by the linguists in order to solve the problem with the statements conveying ability. This third category, i.e. 'dynamic' modality, is not subjective unlike epistemic or deontic modality. In addition, it is thought to be subject-oriented instead of being speaker-oriented. That is, in dynamic modality the subject's but not the speaker's ability or willingness is conveyed.

According to Palmer (1986: 102) dynamic modality is mainly in concern with the following: ability and disposition (32), neutral modality (33), subject-oriented modality (32), (34) and the willingness use of WILL (34).

(32) John can speak four languages.

(33) You must go now if you wish to catch the bus.

(34) He'll come if you ask him to.

The example statements (32) and (34) are thought to be subject-oriented because they are not concerned with the speaker's attitude but they are rather concerned with the speaker's willingness of the subject. Compared with subject oriented uses, the status of neutral uses of modals are more problematic because they are not always clearly distinct from deontic modality. In English, the speakers usually use the modal verbs 'have to' 35(b) and 'can' 36(b) to disassociate themselves from the obligation or permission stated. The modal verbs MUST 35(a) and MAY 36(a) on the other hand, enables the speakers to associate themselves with the proposition.

(35) a. Jenny must finish her homework. (neutral)

   b. Jenny has to finish her homework (subject-oriented)

(36) a. You may park your car here (neutral)

   b. You can park your car here (subject-oriented)

In addition, while subject-oriented modals can be used in their past forms, this is not true for neutral uses of modals.

(37) He could speak four languages when he was young.

In conclusion, Palmer's (1986) classification provides us with three types of modality: epistemic, deontic and dynamic. Epistemic modality involves judgments which reflect notions like possibility, confidence, inference, and evidentials which expresses the speaker's clear and confident assertions. Deontic modality denotes actions, rather than the commitment of the speaker to the proposition of the sentence, like giving permission or laying on obligations. Dynamic modality is mainly concerned with the notions of ability or willingness of the speaker or the others.

I. 3. Adverbs in the system of modality

As it was stated in previous sections, markers of modality are various in number and particular adverbs have the ability to express modal notions like possibility ('perhaps'), or certainty ('surely'). This section of the study will summarize the attitude of various researchers toward the analysis of the concept of 'modal adverbs'.

Halliday (1970: 322) argues that verbal forms of modality, i.e. modal auxiliaries in English, and non-verbal forms, i.e. lexical items such as modal adverbs, do

not exactly correspond one to one. That is, 'certainly' is not the synonymous of 'it is certain that'. Also, there is a group of non-modal items which reinforce the meaning of the modal items they are used with because they are felt to be equal as in (38).

(38) Perhaps Scott might have called you.

Those which do not express equivalent meanings are thought to perform a cumulative effect on the verbal modal form as in (39).

(39) Certainly Scott might have called you.

Thus, Halliday's (1970) view is based on the functions of modal forms, whether verbal or non-verbal. Following the tendency of these functions, it is obvious that modal notions can be expressed by either verbal or non-verbal forms or by combinations of both. Halliday (1970: 331) views these combinations not as a matter of stylistic variation, but rather as representations of different modality patterns such as "harmonic combinations" (I'm sure, surely, certainly).

Perkins (1983: 102) admits that there is no two modal expressions that have exactly the same meaning. His work can be counted among the first that signals the necessity of a descriptive account of non-verbal modal expressions including modal adverbs. He describes three semantic processes according to how sentential adverbs operate on the modality expressed by the verbal markers: i. thematization e.g. 'Possibly he will go', ii. interpolation e.g. 'He will possibly go', iii. adjunction e.g. 'He will go, possibly'.

The main concern of Lyons (1977: 807) is the logical characterization of the modal notions of necessity and possibility from the viewpoints of both semantics and philosophy. He suggests that a modal verb and a modal adverb form a "modally harmonic" or a "modally non-harmonic" combination. In the first type of these combinations both the modal verb and the adverb express the same degree of modality whereas the modal adverb either reinforces or completes the modal meaning expressed by the verbal element in the second combination.

Coates (1983) refers to adverb-modal verb co-occurrence in terms of harmonic combinations and the adverbs are termed as "hedges". The strategy of Coates bases on identifying and then isolating a core meaning for each modal verb which is independent of its context. However, Hoye (1997) rejects this view because he thinks it requires further evidence and it is better to approach modals in a range of different but related meanings. That is, a semantic study of modal markers is thought to assign each modal marker with a set of major meanings instead of a single core meaning because the distinctions between them are gradual rather than absolute.

Adopting Lyons's (1977) linguistic and philosophical proposals as a framework, Mathews (cited in Hoye, 1997: 23) grounds his views on speech act theory and the specification of different utterance types. He studies modal adverb-verb combinations in relation to epistemic modality and establishes a paradigm of these combinations such as 'will certainly', might possibly' and 'won't necessarily'. He observes that co-occurrence represents the natural conceptualization of modality in English.

In his various studies on English adverbials, which play a crucial part, Jacobson (cited in Hoye, 1997: 25-27) focuses on adverbial positions and the implications which transmobility has for adverbial classification. His work, mainly concerning with the

syntactic behavior of adverbs, distinguishes between adverbs of sentential and intrasentential orientation. Jacobson's attempt was to establish a formal criterion on which different categories of adverbs can be based and he also mentions adverbs of mood which reflect a modal character and carry out modal meanings in sentences. Based on their pragmatic, semantic and syntactic functions, he describes three main categories of adverbs: **i.** sentence modifiers which take the whole sentence into their scope, **ii.** focalizers which focus only on a particular constituent, and **iii.** conjuncts which connect sentences or constituents. He also mentions that modal adverbs characterizes three main categories of modal meanings, namely certainty, ('certainly', 'no doubt'), supposition ('probably', 'perhaps'), and opinion ('unfortunately', 'best of all').

According to Palmer (1986: 65) modal verbs and modal adverbs, which are thought to be their synonyms, do not express the same kind of meanings. That is, MUST, for example, do not indicate the modal meaning as modal adverbs 'certainly' or 'definitely' do because the modal adverbs simply reflect the speaker's commitment while the modal verb essentially describes the notion of deduction or inference from known facts. However, it is not this much easy to make clear distinctions between the two parts. For example, it is really hard to distinguish the weak possibility meaning of MAY form the meaning expressed by 'perhaps'.

Hoye (1997: 4-5) clearly draws attention to modal-adverb collocations and claims that modal adverbs play a relatively central role in the English modality system. He bases his study on the "modal-adverb synergism" and puts forward that the nature of these combinations depends on the basic meaning that the modal auxiliary conveys. The modal adverb may modify (40), complete (41), or even transform (42) this basic modal meaning expressed by the auxiliary.

(40) We'll send a car ... as soon as we <u>possibly</u> can. (ex. 8)

(41) It may <u>well</u> be that there were faults. (ex. 6)

(42) By the time you come back from honeymoon, probate will <u>probably</u> be

granted. (ex. 9)   (Hoye: 1997: 5)

The fundamental aim of his study is to identify the tendencies which modal-adverb co-occurrences follow and to describe the syntactic and semantic association between the modals and their adverb satellites. The primary reason of this attempt is the fact that focusing on the modal auxiliaries alone will leave the studies on modality in English incomplete. In fact, this observation is also true for studies on the modality system of Turkish.

I. 4. Modal Adverbs in Studies on Turkish

The main concern of the studies done on the modality system of Turkish (Slobin & Aksu, 1982; Yavaş, 1982; Kocaman, 1988; Kerslake, 1990) has been the semantics of different moods. Modal adverbs and their interactions with verbal inflections, as a crucial concept for the modality system, have attracted the attention of several researchers (Taylan & Özsoy, 1993; Ruhi et. al., 1997; Tosun, 1998).

At this stage of our study, we will demonstrate some of the studies which are believed to have important conclusions on the relation between modality and adverbs in Turkish.

Kocaman (1988: 463) states that Turkish modality system can be analysed under three different structural categories:

i.   Verbal inflections (e.g. *–mIş*, *-Ir*, *-EcEk*, *-mAlI*, *-Ebil* etc.)

ii.   Lexical verbs (e.g. *lazım, gerek, gibi görün-* etc.)

iii.   Modal adverbs (e.g. *galiba, belki, muhakkak* etc.)

In addition to the above-stated examples, Erguvanlı Taylan (2000) informs the existence of a special set of lexemes, i.e. *meğer, hani, sanki, keşke, güya, acaba, sakın* which can be argued to function as modal particles. The results of this analysis show that each modal particle selects a convenient verbal inflection which semantically completes the modal meaning expressed by the particle. For example, the particle *meğer* requires the predicate to be marked with the evidential *–mIş/-ImIş* whereas *hani* selects the enclitic *–IdI*. This work merits attention because it clearly states the modal meanings conveyed by the particles and tries to identify the dependency relations between the particles and verbal inflections.

Kocaman (1988) also argues that the use of modal adverbs helps to determine a particular reading of the statement where the context is not much of use. In other words, Turkish uses modal adverbs as overt means to prevent misunderstandings which are caused by morphemes reflecting more than one reading. For example, the modal adverb *herhalde* decreases the certainty level of the sentence and turns into a form of probability in (43) whereas *mutlaka* increasse the certainty level in (44).

(43) Yarın herhalde gelir. (ex. 1)

(44) Arkadaşın mutlaka işini bitirmiştir. (ex. 6)

(Kocaman, 1988: 467)

Although the verbs are in the indicative in the above utterances, the use of modal adverbs reflects the psychological state of the speaker. Therefore, the utterances express modal meanings via the use of modal adverbs. This proves that adverbs such as *herhalde* and *mutlaka* should definitely be included within the scope of modality. The only semantic function of modal adverbs stated in the study is emphasizing the modal notion expressed by the verbal inflection. The following example statements clearly show how modal adverbs reinforce the necessity (45) or possibility (46) readings of the sentences.

    (45) a. Bu şampuanı denemelisin.

          b. Bu şampuanı <u>mutlaka</u> denemelisin.

    (46) a. Yakında sana uğrayabilirler.

          b. Yakında <u>belki</u> sana uğrayabilirler.

In their study which aims to deal with teaching modality in Turkish, Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy (1993) present different uses of the modal adverbs *galiba, herhalde,* and *belki* and put forward that they are capable of changing the type of the modality in the frame of Palmer's (1986) classification.

The study analyses the modal meanings expressed by the modal adverbs stated above by the help of their interactions with particular inflectional morphemes such as *–DI, -Iyor* or *–DIr.* Following Kocaman's (1988) claim about the ways of marking modality which was stated in the previous paragraphs, Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy (1993) suggest that when the speaker is indefinite about the truth value of his/her utterance, he/she may express this through the use of the suffix *–DIr* (47a) a lexical verb reflecting prediction

such as *tahmin et-* (47b) or a modal adverb reflecting uncertainty such as *belki, herhalde* (47c).

    (47) a. Can bir bankada çalışıyordur. (ex. 3c)

          b. Can bir bankada çalışıyordur, <u>tahmin ediyorum</u>. (ex. 3b)

          c. Can <u>herhalde</u> bir bankada çalışıyordur. (ex. 3a)

                                (Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy: 1993: 3)

Based on the above examples, it is also stated that *herhalde* in 47(c) changes the inference reading of 47(a) into possibility.

As a result of analyzing such interactions, Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy (1993) define basic modal meanings for the adverbs *galiba, herhalde* and *belki*. They state that *galiba* mainly expresses inference while *herhalde* and *belki* indicates different degrees of confidence, the former strong and the latter weak, to the proposition of the utterance. In addition, *herhalde* and *belki* convey possibility readings which are counted as neutral 'in respect with subjectivity while *galiba* reflects subjective modality, i.e. it reflects inference based on beliefs but not known facts. Admitting that the notion of modality should inevitably analyzed in the frame of spoken and written contexts, it is claimed that modality in Turkish should be taught through coherent contexts to the students of Turkish as a foreign language. Another important conclusion of the study is that it puts forwards the need to determinate the syntactic and semantic functions of modal adverbs in detail in order to achieve a complete analysis of the modality system in Turkish.

Focusing on the modal adverbs *mutlaka, kesinlikle, galiba, herhalde, belki*, Ruhi et. al. (1997) discusses that modal adverbs reflect differences according to their interaction with verbal inflections, person suffixes and specific types of verbs. In addition,

it is observed that discourse connectors such as *de* or *ki* and intonation play an important part in determining the modality value of modal adverbs.

The study analyses the above-stated adverb on the criteria of subjectivity and degrees of confidence they indicate. According to the result of this analysis, the modal adverbs *mutlaka, herhalde* and *belki* reflect objectivity because they state judgments based on knowledge, whereas *kesinlikle* and *galiba* stating judgments based on belief express a subjective modality. In addition, while *mutlaka* and *kesinlikle* indicate a high degree of confidence, *herhalde, belki* and *galiba* diminish the degree reflecting weak confidence or lack of confidence.

Doğan & Kocaman (1999: 71) examine how personal attitude, which is thought to be a notion that allows determining the interaction between individuals, is reflected in Turkish and state that modal adverbs is a very common mean. It is claimed that modal adverbs such as *elbette, belki, aslında* indicate judgments in respect to the degree of reliability of the proposition in the frame of modal notions 'certainty' or 'possibility'.

(48)　a. Gerçekten size de uğrarız, <u>elbette</u>. (ex. 28)

　　　　b. <u>Belki</u> de hayatında hiç ağlamamıştır. (ex. 29)

　　　　c. <u>Aslında</u> sizi dinlemiyordum. (ex. 30)

<div align="right">(Doğan & Kocaman, 1999: 71)</div>

The study presents a general classification of modal adverbs due to their semantic functions in discourse (Doğan & Kocaman, 1999: 73).

i.　　　stating strong belief or trust to the proposition of the sentence (*elbette, kuşkusuz, mutlaka)*

ii. stating mistrust to the proposition of the sentence (*belki, muhtemelen, büyük olasılıkla*)

iii. stating confirmation to the proposition of the sentence (*aslında, gerçekten*)

Oktar & Cem Değer (1999: 51) provide us with information about the discourse functions in respect with the speech act value of modal adverbs. They claim that particular modal adverbs allow the speaker to prevent their utterances from criticism. That is, speakers use such adverbs to modalize their utterances and thus weaken their status of power in communication.

(49) Eylemi başlatanlar, Türkiye'nin bu günlere gelişinde ve getirilişinde birinci derecede sorumlulukları bulunan siyasetçiler ... Belki de Refah camiasından bazı kişileri eyleme karşı olumsuz tavır almaya zorlayan da bu.

(Oktar & Cem Değer, 1999: 50; ex. 17)

The writer of (49) does not express his/her personal confidence to the proposition of his/her sentence explicitly but rather prefers to state a more implicit expression via the use of *belki*.

CHAPTER II. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter, we are going to study the semantic and syntactic functions of two groups of sentential epistemic modal adverbs in Turkish;

a. stating possibility/probability and/or inference: *belki, herhalde, galiba, muhtemelen*

b. stating certainty: *kesinlikle, mutlaka, elbette*

As the research is grounded on the semantic and syntactic interaction between the above stated adverbs and the tense, aspect and modality markers in Turkish, it seems essential to restate the semantic properties of the so-called markers based on contemporary linguistic descriptions.

II. 1. The Semantic Properties of Tense, Aspect and Modal Markers in Turkish.

As an agglutinative language, Turkish tense, aspect and modality markers all operate on the main verb of the sentence via inflectional morphemes. As stated before, modality can also be marked through the use of certain lexical items such as adverbs (*belki, kesinlikle* etc.) or verbal or non-verbal predicates (*dile-, gerek-* etc.) (Kocaman, 1988; Erguvanlı Taylan, 2000). In order to obtain more considerable results about the interaction between the sentential adverbs indicating modality and the other tense, aspect and/or modality marking structures, this subsection will restate the studies done in this area and exhibit the results in a general frame.

As stated before, grammatical categories like tense, aspect and modality are expressed through verbal morphology in Turkish. The first grammatical category of our list stated above, i.e. tense, can be defined as the grammaticalisation of locating an event/state

in the axis of time taking 'the moment of speaking' as the main reference point. This temporal reference may be expressed both in the form of an affix which is morphologically bounded and has an obligatory nature, or adverbs of time, the use of which may be optional. Thus, the tense represents an event, a state, a process etc. on the time axis with respect to a reference point, namely the deictic center (i.e. the moment of speech). The event time may be before (past), simultaneous with (present) or after (future) the moment of speech. In (1) below, the form *-Iyor* expresses an event which takes place at the same time with the moment of speech, in (2) the *-DI* form indicates an event which has taken place prior the moment of speech and lastly in (3), the form *-EcEk* states that the event is to take place after the moment of speech.

    (1)   Ekin ders çalışıyor.

           'Ekin is studying'

    (2)   Ekin ders çalıştı.

           'Ekin has studied'

    (3)   Ekin ders çalışacak.

           'Ekin is going to study'

The category of aspect, on the other hand, expresses the internal structures of events in terms of temporal characteristics such as completion, duration, iteration etc. It is not a deictic category as opposed to tense and all languages do not have separate markers for tense and aspect. Thus, it is essential to clearly define both the semantic relations and the distinctions between these two categories. In (4), the event in the main clause is in the

past as indicated by –*DI*, and the form – *Iyor* preceeding –*DI* expresses that the event was not a completed but an ongoing one with respect to the reference point.

(4)   Okula vardığında, öğrencileri onu bekliyordu.

'When she arrived at the school, her students were waiting for her'

Erguvanlı (1996: 164) forms two paradigms indicating Turkish inflectional morphemes of tense, aspect and modality (see Table 3.).

Paradigm I		Paradigm II	
-*DI*	perfective aspect	-*IDI*	past tense
–*mIş*	perfect aspect	–*Imış*	evidential-modality
–*Iyor*	imperfective aspect	–*DIr*	factive/nonfactive- modality
Ø	imperfective aspect		
–*EcEk*	future-modality		
–*Ir*	aorist-modality		
–*mElI*	necessitative-modality		
–*EbIl*	ability-modality		
–*sE*	condition-modality		
–*(y)E*	optative-modality		

Table 3. Tense, aspect and modality markers in Turkish.

The classification stated above is done based on the fact that a morpheme from paradigm II. requires the presence of a morpheme from paradigm I on the verbal predicate in order to establish a well-formed structure. In addition, paradigm I consists of the morphemes which a main clause verb necessarily needs but the morphemes in paradigm II are not obligatory elements. The following forms state the configurations of a main clause verb in Turkish (Erguvanlı, 1996: 164).

    a. V + (voice) + paradigm I

    b. V + (voice) + paradigm I + paradigm II

       (* V + (voice) + paradigm II)

Thus, in form b, the morpheme closer to the verb-stem has the function of indicating aspect or modality and the other morpheme, which is from paradigm II, reflects tense, evidentiality or factivity/non-factivity. However, when the verb is marked by only one morpheme which has to be from paradigm I (form a), then the marker is more likely to be ambiguous in its function. That is, it is sometimes hard to distinguish whether the morpheme mainly reflects modality, tense or aspect. For example, as shown in (5) below, a past reference reading of –DI is also inherent besides its perfective meaning when there is no further tense marking, depending on the semantic class of the verb.

(5)   Ekin havuza gitti.

As the example statement above clearly shows, -DI expresses perfective aspect and, with an event indicated as a completed whole, the morpheme also refers to the past. Erguvanlı (1996: 165) concludes that " ... the language is using such grammatical morphemes rather economically by assigning them more than one function, letting extra-linguistic information, like speaker's and hearer's inference, context, world knowledge, shared knowledge, etc. disambiguate the functions of these markers". As it will be shown in the following section (II. 2), sentential modal adverbs, under certain conditions, perform the function of disambiguation indicating one of the functions of a certain morpheme. Before going on with the interaction between modal adverbs and the inflectional morphemes of paradigm I and II the functions of these morphemes will be summarized briefly.

II. 1. 1. –DI / -IDI

Yavaş (1980) claims that the morpheme –DI is the only tense marker in Turkish. Taking –DI as the only verbal inflection that has a basic meaning of tense implies that all other verbal-suffixes like –mIş, -EcEk, -Iyor and –Ir are primarily expressions of aspect or modal categories as opposed to traditional definitions. Also, the enclitic –IDI, which marks the non-verbal or inflected verbal predicates, is claimed to be a modality marker expressing the speaker's doubts about proposition of his/her sentence. However, Taylan (1997) states that, besides indicating past tense, -DI has also aspectual and modal values. Similarly, she claims that –IDI expresses past tense as well as it indicates modality. According to the results of this study –DI basically describes the speaker's direct experience or involvement with the event as opposed to –mIş which expresses an indirect experience of the speaker.

(6)   Seni bir arkadaşın aradı.

      'A friend of you has called'

(7)   Seni bir arkadaşın aramış.

      'I inferred/heard that a friend of you has called'

In sentence (6) the speaker informs that the event which he/she was directly involved took place before the moment of speaking through the use of –DI. In contrast, the speaker of sentence (7) states an event which is still located in the past but which he/she has not directly witnessed or lived through. Notions like direct or indirect experience are, in fact, among the elements of modality. Thus, the morpheme –DI not only expresses past tense, but also reflects a sense of certainty based on the fact that directly experienced

events reported as past cannot state uncertainty. As for the aspectual sense, -DI is claimed to mark the initial point of a change in the state that the speaker is talking about, as in (8).

(8) Bak şimdi çok sinirlendim işte!

'I am/have been really angry by now!'

The presence of the time adverb şimdi 'now' disables -DI to express past tense. It only conveys on aspectual notion in which it informs the starting point of a change of state, here being angry.

The enclitic -IDI which is taken as a separate morpheme, may indicate purely modal notions especially in counterfactual conditional constructions as in (9) below.

(9) Yarınki toplantıya gelseydin onu görürdün.

'If you attended the meeting tomorrow, you would see him'.

In (9) -IDI has no past tense value because of the use of yarın 'tomorrow', a future marking adverb. Instead, it expresses that the speaker knows the listener is unable to perform the event. Thus, it reflects the speaker's knowledge/belief with respect to the proposition and this is a modal notion. -IDI also becomes a politeness marker in formal requests and thus expresses modality as in (10) or (11) (Taylan, 1997).

(10) Müdürle görüşmek istiyordum.

'I want to see the principle, please'

(11) Bir çay daha alır mıydınız?

'Would you like another cup of tea?'

Besides its modal functions, *-IDI* also expresses past tense as in (12) and (13) below which have no other element indicating past.

(12) Hepimiz bir ağızdan şarkılar söylerdik.

'We used to sing songs altogether'

(13) Bunu bana sormalıydın.

'You should have asked this to me'

To sum up, the morpheme *-DI* primarily indicates past tense and completive aspect. With stative verbs, it marks the initial point of the change in the state. In both situations, it always informs the involvement of the speaker and this 'direct experience' sense enables *-DI* to express certainty as a modal notion. As for the enclitic *-IDI*, it expresses both modal notions like counterfactuality or polite requests in certain contexts. When there is no other evidence, it may well indicate past tense.

II. 1. 2. *–mIş / -ImIş*

According to Slobin & Aksu-Koç (1982) both the morpheme *–mIş* and the copula particle *–ImIş* stands for all three categories of tense, aspect and modality. *–mIş* is claimed to express past tense through the result of the action where the source of information is an 'indirect' one. For example, in (14), *-mIş* reflects past tense because the event is prior to the moment of speech and perfect aspect as the event is represented by its result. In addition, it indicates evidential modality because the speaker has reached this information through some kind of indirect experience (e.g. hearsay).

(14) Arkadaşın sana bir not bırakmış.

'I infer/heard that your friend has left you a note'

Johanson (2000: 61) mentions three uses of Turkish "indirective marker", *-mIş* and *–ImIş* from the perspective of modality. The first one of these uses is the "perceptive" one in which the event or its effect is perceived by the speaker as in (15) and (16).

(15) Çorba çok güzel olmuş.

'The soup tastes delicious'

(16) Çok büyümüşsün.

'You have grown up very much'

In the perceptive use, *-mIş/-ImIş* indicates a first-hand knowledge which is directly or indirectly (on the basis of effects, traces, consequences etc.) perceived by the speaker.

The "inferential" uses of *–mIş/-ImIş* include the events that are inferred by the speaker. That is, the speaker bases his/her knowledge on pure reflection or logical deduction.

(17) Anlaşılan karısı onu terketmiş.

'It is evident that his wife has left him'

The last and most known use of *–mIş/-ImIş* is its "reportative" use in which the event is reported to the speaker by someone else. This time, the source of the knowledge is a foreign source, i.e. reported speech or hearsay.

(18) Annemden duydum. Karısı onu terketmiş.

'I've heard from my mother that his wife had left him'

As the example statements above clearly indicate, whether the proposition reflects reportative, inferential or perceptive meanings always depends on the context. As it will be shown in section II. 2., modal adverbs may play a crucial part in this respect.

The copula particle –*ImIş* is said to denote indirectivity in all its occurrences (i.e. on non-verbal or inflected predicates) whereas –*mIş* convey indirectivity only when it marks finite verbs. The copula particle may form different combinations with a high number of different verb forms (e.g. –*Iyormuş*, -*IrmIş*, -*AcAkmIş* etc.). All these forms reflect indirectivity and the temporal readings may be defined by the preceeding suffix. For example, sentence (19) has a future reference because of –*EcEk* and indicate indirectivity because of –*ImIş* (Csato, 2000).

(19) Farklı odalarda kalacakmışız.

'Evidently, we will stay in different rooms'

Thus, the main function of Turkish evidential or indirective markers –*mIş/-ImIş* is to denote evidential modality based on three different sources of information, i.e. direct or indirect perception (perceptive), logical deduction (inferential) or hearsay (reportative). The indirective modal sense they convey may also indicate sudden discovery, new knowledge without proper psychological preparation, emotional distance from the event and so forth.

II. 1. 3. -*EcEk*

This morpheme, which has been described as the future tense suffix in Turkish, is claimed to convey certain modal notions like prediction, intention, volition etc (Yavaş,

1982). For example, when used with verb *ol-* 'be', the morpheme does not carry any future reference meaning. As (20) shows, it expresses the modal notion of necessity.

(20) Müdürün odası sağdan birinci kapı olacak.

'The principle's room will/must be the first door on the right'

Furthermore, statements which reflect a request or duty as in (21), how to do things as in (22) etc. may be expressed with *–EcEk*.

(21) Kamp süresince herkes altıda kalkacak.

'Everybody is going to wake up at six during the camp'

(22) Vidayı iyice sıkacaksın ki birden kopmasın.

'You will screw it so hard that it won't break immediately'

Especially in the sentences with first person singular subjects, *-EcEk* may denote an overt expression of intention as in (23).

(23) Bu sefer aklıma koydum. Bu yaz uzun bir tatile çıkacağım.

'I'm determinate that I am going to go on a long vacation this summer'

It is quite clear from the examples above that *–EcEk* does not simply mark future tense. It also indicates different modalities like intention or obligation depending on the context. Modal adverbs, as a part of this context, may help to disambiguate among different meanings of *–EcEk*.

II. 1. 4. –Iyor

This morpheme has been described as the progressive tense by Underhill (1976), and as the present I by Lewis (1976). The variety of the terms used to refer to this morpheme can be a good indicator of its tense and aspect functions.

Many researchers (Johanson, 1971; Yavaş, 1980; Erguvanlı, 1996; Subaşı, Uzun & Erk Emeksiz, 2002) clearly show that –Iyor mainly expresses imperfective aspect. Imperfective aspect presents an interval of the situation without referring to end points. That is, the interval on which the verb focuses could be internal, preliminary or resultant stage of the situation. The morpheme –Iyor may locate the event into an extended time period including the moment of speaking without making any reference to the endpoint of the event as in (24) and (25).

(24)   Yıllardır bu şehirde yaşıyorum.

'I have been living in this city for years'

(25)   Bebek aynı babasına benziyor.

'The baby resembles her father'

Time adverbs indicating the moment of speaking play an important part in the temporal function of –Iyor. For example sentence (26) refers to the moment of speaking due to the use of şu anda 'at present' and –Iyor denotes that the event is an ongoing one at the referred time.

(26)   Şu anda telefonda konuşuyor. Biraz bekleyin lütfen.

'He is talking on the phone at the moment'

Also Yavaş (1982) states that –*Iyor* may also indicate future certainty and thus a modal notion when used with adverbs of time referring to future. Sentence (27) indicates a planned activity or arrangement via the use of –*Iyor* with *yarın* 'tomorrow'.

(27) Yarın İstanbul'a uçuyoruz.

'We are flying to İstanbul tomorrow'

II. 1. 5. –*Ir*

Yavaş (1982) states that –*Ir*, i.e. the aorist, is the morpheme which reflects habitual aspect in Turkish. She also informs that it conveys a modality sense expressing future reference marking predictions. Generally, it forms semantically ambiguous sentences without convenient contexts as in (28) below.

(28) Saat sekizde evden çıkarım.

'I leave/will leave the house at eight o'clock'

The only way to disambiguate (28) is either to use a frequency adverb which clarifies the habitual reading as in (29) or to add an adverb of time indicating future which enables the future reference meaning as in (30).

(29) Her sabah saat sekizde evden çıkarım.

'I leave the house at eight o'clock every morning'

(30) Yarın saat sekizde evden çıkarım.

'I will leave the house at eight o'clock tomorrow'

As a marker of habitual aspect, the aorist is said to represent the event as a typical behavior or characteristic of the individual. The statements which reflect "constant truth value" (Subaşı Uzun & Erk Emeksiz, 2002: 5), i.e. proverbs and generalizations like laws of physics etc. are also marked with the morpheme –*Ir*. According to Carlson (cited in Subaşı Uzun & Erk Emeksiz, 2002: 11), the propositions which reflect generalizations possess a constant truth value and this value is only valid when the proposition is tenseless. In other words, -*Ir* is not the marker of present tense in Turkish. In fact, -*Ir* conveys objective modality in propositions reflecting generalizations and subjective modality when it states the subjective propositions of the speaker (e.g. future prediction, intention etc.).

The subjective modality sense of –*Ir* denote future events that are not planned or scheduled as in (31), willingness of the speaker as in (32) or claims that the speaker makes about future events as in (33).

(31) Yarın mesajını ona iletirim.

      'I'll give him your message tomorrow'

(32) -Kim şu parayı bozar? –Ben bozarım.

      '-Who will change this money? -I will'

(33) Bu işi en ucuz biz yaparız.

      'We are the ones who will do this task at the cheapest price'

Subaşı Uzun & Erk Emeksiz (2002) also argue that using modal adverbs seems to be one of the strategies to disambiguate among the different modality readings of –*Ir* although they leave these strategies out of their study about the morpheme –*Ir*.

II. 1. 6. –*DIr* vs Ø

The suffix –*DIr*, which may directly attach onto non-verbal predicates or verbal predicates with a suffix from paradigm I, is claimed to reflect purely modal notions (Tura, 1986). A parallelism of function between –*DIr* and the aorist is pointed out on the evidence that a verb+aorist form cannot take –*DIr* (*gel-ir-dir) since marking the same information twice, i.e. having parallel functions, would be redundant in languages. Similar to the aorist which codes properties viewed as permanent characteristics of an individual or entity in verbal sentences, -*DIr* may form factive non-verbal statements which possess constant truth value and thus reflect generic readings as in (34).

(34) Cem Yılmaz günümüz komedyenlerinin genç bir temsilcisidir.

'Cem Yılmaz is a young representative of the contemporary comedians'

In (34) –*DIr* conveys a generic reading which is necessarily factive.

Tura (1986) also analyzes –*DIr* as a non-factivity marker when used in sentences expressing judgments based on the speaker's knowledge or belief. In other words, -*DIr* in its non-factive sense, may convey inferences of the speaker upon actual or presumptive evidence as in (35).

(35) Yolculuk altı saat sürdüğüne göre, bu sıralar varmak üzeredirler.

'Due to the fact that the journey takes six hours, they should be about to arrive'

As (35) clearly indicates, -*Dlr* may reflect a prediction, and thus the modal notion of non-certainty as well as factive-certain readings.

Ø, as opposed to -*Dlr*, may convey deictic meanings in which the speaker makes no reference to the status of the event on the time axis. In other words, the speaker assigns the event a temporary status reflecting a simultaneous thought in contrast to a general truth. -*Dlr*, on the other hand, proclaims the event as a permanent issue. This distinction can be observed clearly in example statements of (36) and (37).

(36) Ekin çok zeki.

'Ekin is very intelligent'

(37) Ekin çok zekidir.

'Ekin is very intelligent'

Although English translations seem to be the same, (36) and (37) implicates different notions. In (36), the speaker utters a deictic statement conveying a temporal state of affairs about the subject. However in (37), the use of -*Dlr* conveys that being intelligent is a permanent characteristic of the subject.

In summary, the morpheme -*Dlr* reflect purely modal notions shifting between certain and non-certain (the disambiguation of which can be provided through the use of modal adverbs as it will shown in II. 2.). The absence of -*Dlr*, i.e. Ø, may reflect factive readings in which the speaker's judgment conveys as simultaneous thought and thus temporality in contrast with -*Dlr* which may state a permanent characteristic.

II. 1. 7. –Ebil

According to Kerslake (1990), this morpheme occurs closest to the verb stem and exhibits a wide range of morphosyntactic combinations with the other tense, aspect and modality marking suffixes. That is, it can co-occur with almost all the suffixes in paradigm I or II.

-Ebil is capable of marking different kinds of modal notions in Turkish. Following Palmer's classification (1986), Kerslake (1990: 85-88) states that it can express: i. epistemic possibility (a subjective judgment concerning the possibility of a proposition as in 37), ii. deontic possibility (possibility which is created by the speaker through the granting of permission as in 38), iii. subject-oriented dynamic possibility (concerning the ability of the subject to perform an action as in 39), iv. neutral (circumstantial) dynamic possibility (concerning the possibility of the performance of an action as in 40).

(37) Yarın seni arayabilir.

'She may phone you tomorrow'

(38) Bu kitabı ödünç alabilir miyim?

'May/Can I borrow this book?'

(39) Hem İngilizceyi hem Arapçayı anadili gibi konuşabilir.

'He can/is able to speak both English and Arabic like his mother tongue'

(40) Doktorunla görüşebildin mi?

'Were you able to see your doctor?'

These four different senses of *–Ebil* sometimes results in forming semantically ambiguous statements and pragmatic factors plays the most important part in determining

in which sense the statement will be understood. In addition to appropriate discourse contexts, the use of certain modal adverbs may disambiguate the different senses of *–Ebil*, a point which will be discussed in section II. 2.

II. 1. 8. *–mEll*

-mEll is the morpheme which indicates the necessitative mood in Turkish. That is, a verb marked with *–mEll* may express a necessity and/or obligation as in (41).

(41) Sabah erken kalkacaksın. Bugün erken yatmalısın.

'As you will wake up early tomorrow, you must go to bed early today'

However, necessity is not the only modal notion that is expressed via the use of *–mEll*. Depending on mostly contextual factors, it may convey the speaker's assumptions as in (42) or strong advice as in (43).

(42) Bugün Adana'da olmalı.

'He must be in Adana today'

(43) Yatmadan önce dişlerini fırçalamalısın.

'You must brush your teeth before you go to bed'

Kocaman (1990) points out the possibility that modal adverbs may play a crucial part in the process of disambiguation. In addition, it should be noted that Turkish makes use of lexical counterparts of *–mEll* (e.g. *gerek-, lazım, zorunda* etc.) in order to express necessity/obligation.

II. 1. 9. –sE / (y)sE

These morphemes are markers of the conditional mood. The suffix –sE occurs on verbal predicates whereas the enclitic (y)sE marks non-verbal predicates and verbal predicates which have an inflection from paradigm I. In their analysis of conditional constructions, in which the actualization of the proposition in the main clause depends upon the condition expressed in the conditional clause, Ruhi et. al. (2000: 22) determine three different configurations in Turkish.

a. Verb + sE   in the main clause, Verb + Ir/EcEk/IrDI   in the conditional clause.

b. Verb + tense/aspect/mood marker + (y)sE   in the main clause, Verb + Ir/EcEk   in the conditional clause.

c. Verb + sE + DI   in the main clause, Verb + EcEk/Ir + DI   in the conditional clause.

The statements which are formed in configuration b (44) reflect hypothetical conditional constructions whereas the statements of configuration c (45) express unreal conditions.

(44)   Ahmet çalışırsa/çalışıyorsa/çalıştıysa sınıfını geçer/geçecek. (ex. 11)

'If Ahmet studies hard, he will/is going to pass his exams'

(45)   Ahmet çalışsaydı, sınıfını geçerdi/geçecekti. (ex. 12)

'If Ahmet had studied hard, he would/could have passed his exams'

(Ruhi et. al., 2000: 22)

The statements of configuration a on the other hand, may be either hypothetical or unreal depending on the context. As it will be discussed in a limited sense in section II.2 the interaction between conditional constructions and epistemic modal adverbs deserves a more detailed analysis.

II. 1. 10. -(y)E

Kornfilt (1997) defines this morpheme as the optative marker which expresses wishes and desires. It is widely found in expressions which belong to spoken Turkish and which mainly indicate curses and good wishes for the second person singular/plural.

(46) Ağa gibi boyun devrile inşallah!

'I wish you die'

(47) Büyüyesin de gelin olasın.

'May you grow up and be a bride'

In embedded sentences, the optative may behave like the conditional and express unreal conditions.

(48) Önceden arayaydın, evden çıkmadan yakalardın.

'If you called earlier, you would find him at home'

The next section will demonstrate the syntactic and semantic functions of our selected modal adverbs, i.e. *belki, herhalde, galiba, muhtemelen, kesinlikle, mutlaka,*

elbette, in the light of the information that the data presents. Each modal is dealt with under different subsections reflecting both syntactic and semantic features.

II. 2. Epistemic Modal Adverbs in Turkish

II. 2. 1. *Belki*

The syntactic analysis proves that besides its sentential function, in which it takes the whole sentence into its scope, the modal adverb *belki* may focus on a constituent of the sentence.

(49)   Bütün gece, "Aşkım seni çok özledim" ve "Seni çok seviyorum" cümlelerini [[belki yüz defa] söylemek] zorunda kalıyorum.

(50)   Fareyi sevdiğim elimi [belki bin defa] yıkadım.

(51)   Sonra ise [[belki bugüne değin hiç ağlamadığım kadar] içli ve sulu] ağladım.

(52)   Bu gürültüler [belki sabaha dek] sürüyordu.

As the above stated examples indicate, *belki* may precede words of quantity indicating number and/or time (that answer the questions how many or how long) and thus does not take the whole sentence into its scope. Otherwise, it would be impossible to co-occur with a predicate as in (49), i.e. *zorunda kal-* , which exhibits a contradictory with *belki*. Another proof for its non-sentential use in such sentences is that when searching for different landing sites for *belki* , the sentences either lose (53, 55), or change (56) their meanings.

(53)   * Belki fareyi sevdiğim elimi bin defa yıkadım.

(54)   ? Bu gürültüler sabaha dek sürüyordu belki.

(55)   * Bütün gece, "Aşkım seni çok özledim" ve "Seni çok seviyorum"

cümlelerini yüz defa <u>belki</u> söylemek zorunda kalıyorum.

Thus, the modal adverb *belki* has a non-sentential function when used with quantity words as a part of the adverb phrase preceeding the main verb. In such cases, semantically it strengthens the idea that the given quantity is being exaggerated in order to emphasize how many times or how long the action is/was repeated or lasted. Accordingly, it performs the function of intensifying.

As a sentential modal adverb, *belki* expresses a neutral possibility of the speaker's commitment based on the known facts or knowledge of the speaker (Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy, 1993; Ruhi et. al., 1997).

(56)   <u>Belki</u> Semiha da bunun farkındadır.

(57)   Kız <u>belki</u> de bir şey soracaktı.

(58)   O da seni seviyordu <u>belki</u>.

The above stated sentences become factive ones without the use of *belki* which adds the meaning that the speaker is not sure about the truth value of his/her statement. This can be tested by the use of the modal particle *kimbilir* which inherently reflects the meaning of possibility.

(59)   Kimbilir, <u>belki</u> Semiha da bunun farkındadır.

(60)   Kimbilir, kız <u>belki</u> de bir şey soracaktı.

(61)   Kimbilir, o da seni seviyordur <u>belki</u>.

The modal adverb *belki* may occur sentence initially or finally, as in examples (56) and (58) indicating a lower degree of possibility in the latter position because the information structure of the sentence codes the postverbal position as background and thus lowers the content of the constituent. Also, it can precede the major constituents of the sentence unless it disturbs the phrase structure and thus makes the sentence unacceptable.

(62)   * İlerde okulun en popüler ismi <u>belki</u> olacak.

(63)   * Birşeyler <u>belki</u> yeriz.

(64)   * Söylesem en çok buna <u>belki</u> sevinecek.

Belki also has a discourse function as a 'repair' in the sense of correcting oneself similar to *aslında*. In other words, it can change the direction of the new information given by the proposition by altering the focus on another new information.

(65)   İlişkimizde bir ara endişelerim olmuştu ama düşündüklerimi ona, <u>belki</u> de kendime yakıştıramamıştım.

In the example above the speaker gives the new information that focuses on him/her rather than the other person which was in fact the focus point in the previous section not as a possibility. In fact, here *belki* does not behave sententially; rather, it functions as a repair which enables the speaker reflect the change in his/her thoughts immediately.

Besides this discourse function, *belki* is compatible with utterances performing the speech act of offer.

(66)   Sizi eve bırakayım. <u>Belki</u> birşeyler de yeriz.

The speaker of this sentence does not mean primarily that there is a possibility of eating something together. In fact he/she is offering the listener eating out.

Another interesting point of *belki* as a sentential modal adverb is its frequent co-occurrence with the particle *de*.

(67)   <u>Belki de</u> evlendikten sonra düzelirim.

(68)   <u>Belki de</u> haklıydı.

(69)   <u>Belki de</u> beni çok sevdiği için yalan söyleyebileceğimi düşünmemiştir.

(70)   <u>Belki de</u> kısmetimizi bu sessizlik kapatıyordur.

In each of the above sentences, *belki* indicates a neutral possibility and the particle *de* which moves the main focus position to the sentence from preverbal to sentence-initial position and thus provides *belki* with more emphasis. The above statements express the same meanings without *de* when *belki* is moved to the preverbal position when it is possible.

(71)   Evlendikten sonra <u>belki</u> düzelirim.

In fact, there are some obligatory situations where *belki* needs the intensification of *de*. This modal adverb may occur in list readings indicating the last of the possibilities in a list.

(72)   İlgi görmek, naz yapmak, <u>belki</u> <u>de</u> şımarmak ...Küçüklüğümden beri bunu şiddetle istiyorum.

In such a sentence like (72), *de* is an obligatory element intensifying the possibility list reading of *belki*. This particle is also obligatory when *belki* is used in a sentence having deictic reading, in contrast with generic reading, because the predicate is marked with Ø (Tura, 1986).

(73)   Bazen "Ya oğlumun başına da böyle bir şey gelirse" diye geceleri uyuyamıyorum. <u>Belki de</u> bunun nedeni bilinç altımdaki bir olay.

In the above example, *belki* needs its possibility reading to be intensified in order to have an acceptable sentence and the particle *de* gives the most basic solution. The reason for this obligatory need can be explained by the fact that *belki* expresses a modality based on knowledge, not belief. Thus, in a sentence with a Ø marked predicate revealing a judgment mostly based on the belief of the speaker, *belki* needs intensification in order to occur in such a context successfully.

When analysed its interaction with differet inflectional morphemes, *belki* exhibits some interesting uses. For example, with its inherent certainity meaning, *-Iyor* is

said to be incompatible with *belki*. When coordinated sentences conveying contradiction are in concern, *belki* may display a different kind of interaction with *–Iyor*.

(74)   <u>Belki</u> bana çok güveniyor ama insan sevdiğini birazcık kıskanmalı.

(75)   <u>Belki</u> o an rahatsız oluyor ama şu ana kadar birşey demedi.

(76)   <u>Belki</u> az kazanıyorum ama bana yetiyor.

As the '*kimbilir*' test stated previously indicates, the speakers of (74) to (76) do not merely state a possibility through the use of *belki* in contrast with the previous examples. In fact, here the speaker does not guess but rather know that the proposition of his/her sentence is correct. Thus, why is the weak possibility marker *belki* used here? The answer lies not only in the semantic but also in the pragmatic layer of the language use. Firstly, in the above statements *–Iyor* conveys a habitual meaning and reflects a high degree of certainty which is in contradiction with *belki* if it is to express a neutral possibility. In such an interaction, the certainty level of *–Iyor* influences the possibility meaning of *belki* and transforms it into a high degree of probability. Secondly, from the pragmatic point of view, the speaker uses *belki* to reduce the power of the antecedent clause i.e. the power it gains from factivity that is provided by *–Iyor*. The main reason is to enable the contradictory clause, which has a contradiction relation with the antecedent clause, to be accepted more easily by the listener. In other words, *belki* provides the speaker with a strategy of making his/her opinion more favorable compared with the contradictory ones. Possible rewrites of such sentences would convey the message "I know ... is true but I have reasonable objections".

We can observe a similar interaction with the future reference suffix *-EcEk*, again in compound sentences with contradictory meaning.

(77)   Belki üniversitedeki dosyasında bir leke olarak duracak ama bugüne kadar gösterdiğim sabrı ve anlayışı hiç anlamadı ki ...

(78)   Belki biraz bencilce olacak ama keşke o an "sana ne!" diyebilseydim.

(79)   Belki acımasız olduğumu düşüneceksin ama ayrılmaktan başka çare gelmiyor aklıma.

The above statements do not have readings reflecting *belki* as the weak possibility marker. Again, the speaker communicates information that he/she knows to be most probably true because the suffix *-EcEk*, which conveys a high degree of certainty (a more general one compared with *-Iyor*) rather than future reference, transforms the possibility interpretation into a high degree of probability.

In both of the interactions stated above, i.e. with *-Iyor* and *-EcEk*, the inflectional suffixes form the dominant part and affect the neutral possibility reading of *belki*. The reason is that they express a stronger modality than *belki* does. As Yavaş (1982) clearly states, *-EcEk* is more unmarked as compared to *-Iyor* which conveys a higher certainty between the two.

Another observation worth to discuss at this point is the co occurrence of *belki* with *-mIşDı* in similar contexts given below.

(80)   İşimi korumuştum belki ama karşılığında insanlık onurumu kaybetmiştim.

(81)   Belki kalbi kırılmıştı ama onun için en iyisi buydu.

Without *belki*, the above statements reflect a past perfective reading because of the suffixes, *–mIş* reflecting the perfective aspect and *–(y)DI* expressing simple past tense. They do not convey a prominent modal meaning. However, with the addition of *belki*, the perfective reading of *–mIş* is being transformed into a modal reading expressing a perceptive indirectivity (Johanson, 2000). Thus, again *belki* does not indicate a neutral weak possibility.

A very frequent use of *belki* in simple sentences is with the aorist *–Ir* which reflects both aspect & modality in Turkish.

(82)   Belki para falan çıkar.

(83)   Belki kardeşlerinle birlikte gelirsin.

(84)   Belki bunu okursun.

(85)   Anlattıkların belki de bu şekilde işe yarar.

(86)   Belki de evlendikten sonra düzelirim.

(87)   Kimbilir, belki birgün bir de kitap yazarım.

The aorist operates as the future prediction marker in the sentences (82 to 85) and thus reveals a modal meaning which expresses possibility. What distinguishes the function of the aorist from reflecting habitual aspect is the use of the modal adverb *belki* which is used to indicate a neutral possibility in the sentences above. Therefore, *belki* disambiguates a possible reading of the aorist. As for the sentences (86), (87) which have the first person singular as subjects, *-Ir* may convey the willingness of the speaker

(Erguvanlı & Özsoy: 1993) when used without *belki*. However, the use of *belki* emphasizes a possible prediction of the speaker for his/her own future over his/her willingness and thus transforms the dynamic reading of *–Ir* into epistemic reading. All the observations stated so far are also valid when there occurs the negative form of the aorist. The example statements (88), (89) demonstrate that *belki* transforms the inference meaning conveyed by the negative *–Ir* into possibility. In fact, the interaction between the sentential modal adverbs and the operator of negation deserves a more detailed analysis which is out of he limitations of this study.

(88)   Belki bu yüzden artık eniştemle ilgili söylediklerime de inanmaz.

(89)   Ünlü olunca belki bizi tanımazsın.

As Tura (1986) states, the counterpart of *–Ir* for the non-verbal predicates or verbal predicates with another tense/aspect suffix is *–DIr*.

(90)   Bugüne dek farkında olmadan eksikliğini duyduğu şey belki de tutkulu bir aşktır.

(91)   Belki de bu mektupları yollayan sevgilisidir.

(92)   Beni huzursuz eden bu fikirdir belki.

As the above examples indicate, with non-verbal predicates *belki* disambiguates the non-factive reading of *–DIr* adding the meaning of neutral possibility. On the other hand, with the verbal predicates with another tense/aspect suffix whose reading is non-factive with or without *belki*, the function of the modal adverb is both to

complete the non-factive meaning of *–Dlr* and to transform the inference reading to possibility.

(93)   Belki de evlilik aşkı öldürüyordur.

(94)   Evden buraya gelmek için çıkmıştır belki.

(95)   Belki de görgüsüzlüğünü böyle kapatacaktır.

According to the observations stated so far, it is obvious that there is not such a strong interaction between *belki* and *–Ir* or *–Dlr* as compared to the one with *–Iyor* or *–EcEk*. As stated before, *-Iyor* and *–EcEk* convey a gradually high degree of certainty which thus have an impact on the possibility degree of *belki*. However, *-Ir* or *–Dlr* has non-factive and thus deictic readings which have a similar possibility degree as *belki* reflects. As a result, the interaction turns out to be a less active one than with *–Iyor* and *–EcEk*.

The modal adverb *belki* can also occur in unreal conditional clauses and weakens the certainty of the result clause.

(96)   Beni bir diri ile aldatsa, belki de affeder, bu kadar acı çekmezdim.

(97)   Annemle boşanacakları günlerde babam ölseydi, belki ben de onu nefretle değil aşkla anardım.

Without the modal adverb *belki*, the sentences above convey the reading that the result clause certainly would have been confirmed if some necessities had been fulfilled. The use of *belki* transforms this past certainty into a possibility and thus increases the unreality meaning of the sentence. For example, in (97) the possibility of remembering

his/her father with love for the speaker is so weak that even if the condition was fulfilled, he/she may not have confirmed the result.

As a result, the modal adverb *belki*, when used sententially, conveys different degrees of commitment of the speaker to the proposition of his/her sentence and thus reflects an epistemic modality. The possibility level of *belki* varies according to the inflectional suffixes it co-occurs. Its being open to such effects can be explained by its unmarkedness, i.e. expressing a neutral possibility. It also has a non-sentential use in which it takes quantity words into its scope (49-53). The particle *de* which frequently co-occurs with *belki* functions as an intensifier reinforcing the possibility reading of the adverb.

II. 2. 2. *Herhalde*

Unlike *belki*, the modal adverb *herhalde* does not have a non-sentential use. It always takes the whole sentence into its scope whether it occurs in sentence-initial, sentence-final or preverbal positions. As with all other sentential adverbs, it can follow the major constituents as in (98) to (100) but cannot be inserted into the phrase structure as in (101).

(98)   Herhalde okula gitmiştir.

(99)   Seni hatırlayamadı herhalde.

(100)   Bu saatte herhalde kalkmışlardır.

(101)   *Bu herhalde saatte kalkmışlardır.

Previous studies (Erguvanlı Taylan & Özsoy, 1993: Ruhi et al., 1997) provide us with the information that *herhalde* indicates a strong possibility depending on the knowledge but not belief of the speaker. In this respect, it can be said to reflect a neutral modality, i.e. not subjective as in the case of belief-based statements. This can be clearly observed in the sentences which are marked with the suffix *–DIr*, whether they have non-verbal predicates or verbal predicates with another tense/aspect suffix such as *–Iyor* or *–mIş*

(102)   Artık çürümüştür herhalde.

(103)   Herhalde o da sinir oluyordur.

(104)   Erkek arkadaşı herhalde öğrencidir.

As the above examples indicate, *herhalde* both disambiguate the non-factive reading of *-DIr* and transforms the inferentiality it reflects into strong possibility. A similar observation can be made for the interaction between *herhalde* and Ø.

(105)   Herhalde köpeğin ismi de Haozi.

(106)   Evde yoklar herhalde.

(107)   Herhalde matematiğin biraz zayıf.

With its strong possibility meaning, *herhalde* decreases the certainty level of the sentences reflected by Ø and thus enables non-factive readings. Thus, whether with – *DIr* or Ø, *herhalde* indicates a very high level of possibility and performs its function of transformation.

Herhalde also disambiguates the future reference meaning of *–Ir* as can be observed in the following examples which may reflect habitual aspect without *herhalde*.

(108)   Herhalde tüm arkadaşlarını çağırırlar partiye.

(109)   Tatil günlerimde herhalde bol bol kitap okurum.

The speakers of (108), (109) indicate the probability of some future events which are not planned or scheduled beforehand. In such uses, *herhalde* disambiguates the future prediction reading of *–Ir* by denoting a high level of probability. A similar interaction can be observed with *–EcEk*.

(110)   Herhalde babam da evde olacak.

(111)   Bu yemek herhalde kuzu etiyle pişirilecek.

The above sentences which have logical deduction (110) or obligatory (111) senses without *herhalde*, turn out to reflect a high degree of future probability because

herhalde agrees only with the future reference reading of *–EcEk*. In turn, *-EcEk* increases the probability level indicated by *herhalde*.

When used in sentences with predicates marked by *–mIş*, *herhalde* allows only the inferential reading of that suffix.

(112)   Taşınırken göbek bağımı kaybettik. Herhalde çöplerle birlikte atılmış.

(113)   Bu yaşta bunamış herhalde.

(114)   Herhalde babam anneme bize uygun bir dille gerçeği sormasını söylemiş.

Herhalde enables the above sentences to express the most probable inference via its interaction with the indirectivity marker *–mIş*. For example sentence (112) denotes the most probable logical explanation that can be made for the loss of the speaker's novel string.

Similarly, *herhalde* disambiguates the present progressive meaning of *–Iyor* except when it is attached to stative verbs which inherently exhibit the aspectual properties of [-dynamic] [+static] (e.g. *san-*, *düşün-*).

(115)   Biraz öne gittim. Kadın da yaklaştı."Herhalde yanlışlıkla oluyor" deyip biraz daha öne gittim.

(116)   Numaraların ilk bir iki hanesini girer girmez numaranın tamamı ekrana çıkınca "Herhalde bir şey çıkmayan numaraları otomatik olarak veriyor" diye düşündüm.

The sentences (115), (116) denote the probability of an action which happens 'at the moment of speaking'. As stated before, only stative verbs can indicate durativity, but not simultaneous actions, with *–Iyor*. Thus, *herhalde* is not incompatible with *–Iyor* in its durative meaning because of the aspectual properties, i.e. [-dynamic] [+stative], of stative verbs as in the following example.

(117)   Herhalde [benim onun bilmediği şeyleri bildiğimi] sanıyor.

Herhalde also denotes a very high degree of possibility in conditional clauses, whether they are real (118), unreal present (119), (120) or unreal past (121).

(118) Babası duyarsa işime son verir herhalde.

(119) Şu an çevremdeki insanlar bunu duysa, herhalde çok şaşırırlardı.

(120) Oğlunun yaptığını bir bilse kahrından ölür herhalde.

(121) Yalnız olsak herhalde kendime engel olamazdım.

The result clauses of the above sentences all indicate the most probable consequences among all possible ones. In other words, if the condition is/was fulfilled, the consequence in the result clause is the most probable –but not the definite- one.

Besides its interaction with different tense/aspect markers, the modal adverb *herhalde* exhibits interesting features when negation is in concern. As Erguvanlı (1986) states, negative sentences containing a reason or purpose clause can be ambiguous with respect to the scope of negation.

(122) Annem babamdan herkesin bildiği sebepten dolayı boşanmadı.

The above stated sentence does not clearly denote whether the whole sentence or just the reason is negated. If the whole sentence is negated, this means the parents hasn't divorced at all and thus (123) would be a possible statement to follow.

(123) Çocukları için ömür boyu ona ve yaptıklarına katlandı.

On the other hand, if the scope of the negation is the reason, then the reading will be that the couple has divorced but not because of the reason referred in the sentence. In that case (124) would be compatible with (122).

(124) Boşanmalarının sebebi çok daha sıradışıydı.

Enguvanlı suggests another way of negation, i.e. the use of *değil* instead of the negation suffix *–mE,* in order to disambiguate the statement.

(125)   Annem babamla herkesin bildiği sebepten dolayı boşanmış değil.

In (125) the scope of negation is clearly the reason referred in the sentence. Surprisingly, the use of *herhalde* in similar kind of ambiguous sentences results in the same way. That is, *herhalde* helps to disambiguate such sentences by clearing that the reason, but not the whole sentence, is negated.

(126)   Annem babamdan herkesin bildiği sebepten dolayı boşanmadı herhalde. Boşanmalarının sebebi çok daha sıradışıydı.

(127)   Çalışmalarından sırf üstlerine yaranabilmek için vazgeçmedi herhalde. Adamın yaptığı başka hesaplar da vardı.

As the above statements examplify, *herhalde* chooses the sentence-final position in such cases. The main reason can be the need to have a landing site much closer, as compared with the sentence-final position, to the reason clause which it negates. The same reason may not be valid for the negative statements which are given below.

(128)   O iğrenç yaratığı eve sokmayacaksın herhalde.

(129)   Bunca yemeği çöpe dökmeyeceksin herhalde.

(130)   O yağlı böreklerden yemeyeceksin herhalde.

The statements (128) to (130) obviously function as negative requests which turn out to be negative orders i.e. prohibitions without *herhalde*. Thus, besides its epistemic function, *herhalde* has also a deontic use when its speech act value is in concern in negative statements. This observation may form a good reason that why *herhalde* chooses to appear in sentence-final position in statements like (128) to (130). That is, as stated before, the postverbal position is the most unfocussed one in a sentence and this position makes it easier for *herhalde* to change its epistemic function into deontic. Without *herhalde*, the statements (128) to (130) are really strict prohibitions based on the presupposition that the listener is about to perform an undesirable action. For example, in (128) it can be presupposed that the listener will take a pet into the house which is

unfavoured by the speaker. The use of *herhalde* softens the illocutionary force of the utterance and turns it into a negative request.

The speech act value of *herhalde* is not limited with negative requests. It can also be used in statements performing speech acts such as asking for permission (131), making a polite request (132) or warning the listener (133).

(131) Artık çorabımı bağlamamda bir sakınca yoktur herhalde.

(132) Kilerin kapısını neden kilitlediğinizi bana söylersiniz herhalde.

(133) Adamın bir numaralı dolandırıcı olduğundan haberin yok herhalde.

With statements which lexically state necessity or obligation, *herhalde* can be said to be a determining constituent which limits the modality declared by the sentence within the boundaries of epistemic modality. In other words *herhalde* transforms the necessity or obligation reading of such statements into a high degree of possibility.

(134) Kanuni işlemleri başlatmak için herhalde şehre gitmeniz gerekir.

(135) Herhalde artık taşınmamız lazım.

Without *herhalde* the statements in (134), (135) denote obligation and thus deontic modality. However, when used with *herhalde*, the statements turn out to reflect epistemic obligations denoted lexically (i.e. gerek, lazım) and indicate that these obligations are only a matter of possibility via the use *herhalde*. In other words, the speakers are talking about a possible obligation, but not a certain one.

To sum up, the sentential adverb *herhalde* indicates a high degree of neutral possibility in its epistemic uses. It has an overt disambiguation function when negation is in concern with reason clauses. Besides, it has deontic uses with statements performing speech acts such as negative requests, polite requests, warnings or asking for permission. On the other hand, when obligation/necessity based deontic readings are in concern, *herhalde* performs the function of transformation and turns the deontic modality into epistemic. With conditional clauses, it enables the result clause indicate the most probable consequence(s).

II. 2. 3. *Galiba*

The modal adverb *galiba* has a marked subjective sense unlike the neutral meanings of *herhalde* and *belki*. This feature enables the speaker express judgments about himself/herself.

(136) Galiba nankörüm.

(137) *Herhalde nankörüm.

(138) *Belki nankörüm.

(139) Tam bir fanatiğim galiba.

(140) Galiba paranoyağım.

The example statements (137), (138) show that *herhalde* and *belki* is incompatible with the adjectives which indicate self-judgments of the speakers because they are unmarked, i.e. neutral, in sense of subjectivity. On the other hand, *galiba* reflects a high level of subjectivity and thus indicates the judgments based on the belief, but not knowledge, of the speaker. The use of *galiba* in sentences (136) and (140) also helps the speaker decrease the negative sense of the adjectives which indicate self-judgments.

In addition to its subjective sense, the examples stated above also exhibit the interaction of *galiba* with Ø. It can be clearly observed that Ø-marked predicates enables the inference reading of *galiba*.

(141) En iyisi bu galiba.

(142) Sizin bu tarafta toprak kutu yok galiba.

(143) Türksünüz galiba.

(144)   İtiraf.com'u iş torpili olarak ilk kullanan benim galiba.

(145)   Galiba şefkate ihtiyacım var.

(146)   Galiba bende uykusuzluk sorunu var.

(147)   Herhalde bende uykusuzluk sorunu var.

The statements above become factive ones without *galiba* which transforms the certainty reading of Ø into the inference of the speaker about him/herself as in (144), (145), (146) or the others (141), (142), (143). Besides, sentences (145), (146) clearly indicate that *galiba* expresses a subjective judgment based on the speaker's belief only whereas *herhalde* indicates the judgments of the others. For example, the speaker may utter sentence (147) based on the information provided by a doctor. Thus, it can be concluded that *galiba* transforms the factive-certain reading of Ø into a non-factive inference sense.

Galiba does not always express inference. It also has a sense of possibility based on the speaker's belief and thus again subjective. This meaning of *galiba* becomes clear when it is used with the suffix *-EcEk*, either in affirmative or negative sentences.

(148)   Galiba bir iş bulup çalışacağım.

(149)   Galiba o gelene kadar da bu terlemeler, yüz kızarıklığı ve dibe çöküş devam edecek.

(150)   Galiba kız arkadaşımdan ayrılacağım.

(151)   Kendileri andropoz dönemine girip balkon gibi göbeğe sahip olduklarında bunu hiç düşünmeyecekler galiba.

(152)   Galiba aradığım sözcükleri bulamayacağım.

(153)   Yakında çıldıracağım <u>galiba</u>.

(154)   Yakında manastıra kapanıp rahibe olacağım <u>galiba.</u>

All the examples prove that *galiba* disambiguates the future prediction or intention (as in 148, 149) reading of *–EcEk*. In other words, when used with suffix *–EcEk*, *galiba* indicates a future possibility based on the strong belief of the speaker.

It was stated before that *galiba* is incompatible with the suffix *–Ir* because they have parallel functions, i.e. they both express inference (Erguvanlı, & Özsoy, 1993: 7).

(155)   Yağmur dindi. *Trafik açılır <u>galiba</u>.

However, expressing inference is not the only function of *–Ir*. *Galiba* may well be used with the aorist shown in the following example.

(156)   Kendimi kirli sakalla hayal ettim de, yakışır <u>galiba</u>.

Especially when it is used in the least focused position, i.e. sentence finally, *galiba* disambiguates the future prediction meaning of the aorist. Sentence (156) becomes semantically odd without *galiba* which enables the reading '*yakışacağını düşünüyorum*'.

Unlike *herhalde* which is compatible with only the present progressive reading of *–Iyor*, *galiba* can be used with *–Iyor* only when the suffix expresses a non-progressive reading as in the examples below.

(157)   Bu koku <u>galiba</u> hoşuma gidiyor.

(158)   Umutsuz hayaller peşinde koşuyorum galiba.

(159)   Galiba ne istediğimi bilmiyorum.

(160)   Hayatın gücü yeterince fantazi yaratmıyor galiba.

Regardless of galiba, -Iyor does not express a progressive aspect in the sentences above. In other words, the inherent lexical meanings of the verbs in (157) to (159) cause -Iyor not to refer to 'the moment of speaking'. Based on these lexical meanings, the so-called suffix extends the characteristics reflected by the verb into a period of time including the moment of speaking. What the modal adverb galiba adds to the sentences with first person singular subjects as in (157) to (159) is that the speaker has just become aware of the fact denoted by the proposition of his/her utterance. In other words, the sentences (157) to (159) indicate the speaker has realized a new fact about him/herself. When the subject is not the first person singular as in (160), the sentence becomes awkward without galiba, which disambiguates the non-progressive sense of -Iyor and transforms the factive-certain reading into a possibility reading.

As for its interaction with the Turkish indirective marker –mIş, galiba enables the reportive as in (161) to (163) and/or perceptive as in (164), (165) reading of the so-called suffix.

(161)   Galiba siz birşey bulmuşsunuz.

(162)   Galiba bu sabah babamı görmeye gitmişsiniz.

(163)   Galiba daha önce piskoposun evinde aşçılık yapmış.

(164)   Galiba ödevini bitirmiş.

(165)   Hastalanmış galiba.

The sentences above may have readings between inferential and perceptive or reportive without the use of *galiba*.

The modal adverb *galiba* also transforms the certainty meaning reflected by the predicates marked by the suffix *-DI* into a high level of possibility. The difference of this possibility from the one reflected by *herhalde* is the sense of subjectivity that *galiba* has. In return, the factivity conveyed by *-DI* increases the possibility level of *galiba* to a very high degree.

(166)   Galiba kızımı kıskandım.

(167)   Galiba batağa saplandım.

(168)   Yanaklarımdan akan yaşları gördü galiba.

(169)   Galiba banka benim adres bilgilerimi aldı ve sevgilime verdi.

As the above-stated examples indicate, *galiba* exactly expresses the speaker's suppositions about certain past events or situations.

Similar to *herhalde*, the modal adverb *galiba*, becomes dominant in its interaction with lexical necessity/obligation markers (e.g. *gerek*, *lazım* etc.) That is, *galiba* transforms the necessity/obligation sense reflected lexically into an inference reading.

(170)   Bütün bu olanlardan sonra, galiba yine öpmem gerekiyor bu elleri.

(171)   Hiçbir giysimize sığamadık. Galiba biraz rejim yapmamız lazım.

(172)   Çevremdekiler yalan söylediğimi anlamaya başlayınca onlarla görüşmeyi kesiyorum. Galiba yakın zamanda yine çevre değiştirmem gerekecek.

The lexical deontic modality markers in (170) to (172) indicate a kind of obligation based on circumstances without the use of *galiba*. The use of the so-called modal adverb transforms the type of modality from deontic into epistemic by foregrounding a sense of inference. That is, *galiba* with lexical necessity/obligation markers, indicates the necessity/obligation reflected is based on an inference made by the speaker. An appropriate paraphrase under these circumstances would be 'I infer that ... is necessary'.

Consequently, the sentential modal adverb *galiba* indicates a subjective kind of epistemic modality enabling the speaker express self-judgments. It states possibility or inference according to the kind of interaction it has with the tense/aspect markers in the sentences. When used with statements indicating necessity/obligation it transforms the deontic readings into epistemic modality by foregrounding a sense of inference.

II. 2. 4. *Muhtemelen*

The modal adverb is derived from the adjective *muhtemel* which has an Arabic origin. It has really interesting uses especially when the syntactic domain is in concern. First of all, similar with *belki, muhtemelen* has non-sentential uses. As stated before, *belki* can be used non-sententially with quantity expressions indicating number or period of time. When used non-sententially, *muhtemelen* chooses defining relative clauses as the syntactic domain. As Erkman-Akerson & Özil (1998) state, there are three groups of structures which provide modification in Turkish (see Table 4).

Groups	Suffixes	Examples
Participles	*-En, -Mış, -DIk(ğ)I, -EcEk, -EceK(ğ)I*	*Akşam seni soran adam.* *Fırında pişmiş tavuk.* *Düğüne gelecek misafirler.* *Babasına alacağı hediye.* *Annemin diktiği elbise.*
Participle-like adjectives	*-Ir, -DIk, -mE, -IcI, -IlI, -EsI*	*Geçer akçe. tanıdık bir yüz. çelikten yapılma. sıkıcı. asılı. kör olası*
Adjectives	*-ik, -geç*	*atik, utangaç*

Table 4. Types of modification in Turkish.

The modal adverb *muhtemelen* can be used only with the first group of modifiers, i.e. participles as modifiers of nouns.

(173)   Bu küçücük adaya sıkışıp kalmış, [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ muhtemelen sayıları pek fazla olmayan] Türk vatandaşları]ndan biriyim.

(174)   Bir sonraki eşyam [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ muhtemelen evde olmayan] bir marka]dan olacak.

(175)   Hediye olarak bir şey bulamayan annem [$_{NP}$[$_{AP}$ muhtemelen ablama küçük gelen] iç çamaşırları]nı doğumgünümde bana vermişti.

(176) Kardeşi dışarda, elinde [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$muhtemelen çeşmeden doldurduğu]
iki pet şişe]yle onu bekliyordu.

(177) 10 yıl kadar once [$_{NP}$ [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ muhtemelen konaklamış olduğum] bir
otel]deki battaniye]den uyuz kapmıştım.

(178) Sevgiliniz olmaya aday, ya da [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ muhtemelen yeni sevgiliniz
olmuş] kişi]yle o ilk buluşmanın verdiği heyecana bayılıyorum.

(179) [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ *Muhtemelen bana getireceği] kitap] daha yeni basılmıştır.

(180) [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ *Muhtemelen Antalya'ya gidecek] uçak]ta yerimizi ayırttım.

As the examples above indicate, non-sentential *muhtemelen* is incompatible
with participle clauses marked with –*EcEk* and –*EcEk(ğ)I* when the event of the clause is
likely to happen in the near future and this certainty is foregrounded by verbs of
movement like *getirmek* or *gitmek*. In other words, sentences (179), (180) exhibit events
which have been scheduled before and *muhtemelen* is semantically incompatible with a
fixed future arrangement like the ones above. Because, as sentences (173), (178) clearly
show, *muhtemelen* indicates logical deductions or inference based on evident knowledge,
but not certainty, in relative clauses. Thus, it should be compatible with –*EcEk* when it
states logical deduction.

(181) [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ Muhtemelen yeni okulunuz olacak] bu bina]nın tarihi çok
eskilere dayanır.

(182) Tüm kurallarını herkesten iyi bildiğin, yıllardır hazırlandığın, kısacası
[$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ muhtemelen kazanacağın bir yarış]tan bahsediyorsun.

Thus, *muhtemelen* has a non-sentential use in which it takes participal modifying nouns, i.e. defining relative clauses, into its scope. In such a use, it conveys an inference based on known facts, i.e. shared background information or knowledge of the speaker. Based on this function, i.e. indicating inference based on facts or knowledge, *muhtemelen* can be said to be the counterpart of *galiba* which indicates inference based on belief. On the other hand, adverbs *galiba, herhalde* and *belki* cannot choose such a syntactic domain because of the morphological factors. *Muhtemelen* is harmonic with such a scope because of its adjectival root, i.e. *muhtemel,* which is a feature that the other possibility inference marking modal adverbs do not exhibit. Because of the same reason, reason clauses of different types can be under the scope of this adverb.

(183)   [Muhtemelen   ameliyat   korkum   yüzünden]   asla   silikon
        taktıramayacağım.

(184)   Doktor bu hastalığının [muhtemelen o yabancı kadınlarla ilişkisinden]
        kaynaklandığını çünkü bunun yabancılarda daha sık görüldüğünü
        söylemiş.

As a sentential modal adverb, *muhtemelen* has a very consistent syntactic use. That is, unlike the other sentential modal adverbs, *muhtemelen* can only be used sentence initially. It has to be placed at the beginning of the sentence which it takes into its scope. This rule can only be broken by syntactic obligations like the ones given below.

(185)   O, muhtemelen olayı hatırlamıyordur.

(186)   Bu, <u>muhtemelen</u> evinde daha önceden hazırlanmış bir plandı.

In sentences (185), (186) *muhtemelen* is not used at the very beginning in order to prevent a syntactic ambiguity. Otherwise, the subject pronoun *O* (he/she) in (185) and the reference word *bu* (this) in (186) would appear as demonstrative adjectives modifying the nouns *olay* (185) and *evinde* (186).

Muhtemelen keeps the same consistent attitude in its interactions with tense/aspect suffixes. It is compatible with certain suffixes whose modal meaning turns out to be in harmony with the logical inference it conveys. For example, the following statements exhibit its interaction with the future modal suffix *–EcEk*.

(187)   Bugün aramadın. <u>Muhtemelen</u> yarın da aramayacaksın.

(188)   <u>Muhtemelen</u> başlarda bizim muhabbetleri anlamayacaksın.

(189)   <u>Muhtemelen</u> yazılanları okuyunca beni tanıyacaksın.

(190)   Aileme bu korkularımı anlatamıyorum. <u>Muhtemelen</u> şımarıklıkla suçlanacağım ve ciddiye alınmayacağım.

(191)   Bu hareket babamı çileden çıkartıyor. <u>Muhtemelen</u> annemin vücudunun her yanı yine mosmor olacak.

(192)   Bütün bunlar <u>muhtemelen</u> düşünce bazında kalacak.

As shown in the sentences above, *muhtemelen* foregrounds the certain deduction meaning of *–EcEk* with which it conveys a reading of inference based on knowledge. If the aim of the speaker was to indicate a future probability, he/she would

prefer to use *büyük olasılıkla/ihtimalle*, a modal adverb which inherently exhibits a high level of possibility, instead of *muhtemelen*.

(193)   Beni istemesin ama bana inansın. Zaten hiç kimseyi istemiyor olacak <u>büyük ihtimalle/olasılıkla</u> .

(194)   Beni istemesin ama bana inansın. Zaten <u>muhtemelen</u> hiç kimseyi istemiyor olacak.

In (193), the speaker conveys a negative future probability whereas in (194) he/she indicates a logical result which is achieved by inferences based on the speaker's background knowledge.

The inference meaning of *muhtemelen* also effects the factive/certain reading of *-DI* and/or *-(y)DI*.

(195)   İstasyondan iki kişi bizim olduğumuz kapıya binince niyetlerini anlamamız uzun sürmedi. <u>Muhtemelen</u> boynumdaki kolyeyi alıp tren perondan çıkarken atlayacaklardı.

(196)   Sıtkı'ya salya sümük ağlayarak ve Oscarlık bir oyun sergileyerek annesine olayı duyuranlardan biri olmadığımı izah etmiş ve <u>muhtemelen</u> de ikna etmiştim.

(197)   Bu, <u>muhtemelen</u> babamıza olan hayranlığımızın bir ifadesiydi.

(198)   Aşımın zamanını bir hayli geçirdim ve üstelik bunu unutup sağlıksız beraberlikler yaşadım. <u>Muhtemelen</u> Hepatit B kaptım.

(199) Sanırım banyo kapısından benim yerde uzandığımı gördü ve muhtemelen bayıldığımı sandı.

(200) Anladım ki o artık bir itiraf.com kadını. Yani muhtemelen ilk itirafını yaptı.

(201) Onun yüzünden annem bana da çocukluğumdan beri potansiyel ruh hastası muamelesi yaptı. Sonuç: Muhtemelen ruh hastası oldum.

Being most obvious in (201), all the statements above demonstrate that *muhtemelen* transforms the certainty reading of *–DI/-(y)DI* into an inference which is made based on known facts.

When it is used with suffixes conveying parallel functions, i.e. indicating inference, like *–Ir* or *–DIr*, *muhtemelen* prevents a semantic anomaly by emphasizing its high probability reading instead of inference.

(202) Muhtemelen çaycılar bile sizden iyi kazanır.

(203) Arabasız geldiğimi fark edecekler korkusuyla onlara gidemiyor, otoparkta arabanın olmadığını görecekler diye de evime davet edemiyorum. Muhtemelen annem onlara karşı ne kadar ilgisiz olduğumu düşünüp ağlıyordur.

(204) O, muhtemelen olayı hatırlamıyordur çünkü en fazla 3 yaşında falandı.

(205) Adamın işi gücü ispiyon. Muhtemelen bu anlattıklarımı da sahibine aynen iletecektir.

All the statements above reflect inference readings regardless of *muhtemelen*. The presence of *muhtemelen* only helps to indicate the inference made by the speaker is the most probable among the options that the background information demonstrates. Both the suffix *-DIr* and *muhtemelen* have a function of indicating inference, i.e. they have parallel functions. Thus, in order to prevent a semantic anomaly, *muhtemelen* as a modal adverb shows its capacity of foregrounding a reading of probability instead of inference.

As for its interaction with conditionals, *muhtemelen* indicates that the event in the result clause is not a matter of high or low possibility (as in the case of *belki* and *herhalde*), but rather a logical result of the condition. That is, *muhtemelen* again indicates inference made on known facts in conditionals.

(206) Eğer yakalansaydık, muhtemelen bizi okuldan atarlardı.

(207) Eğer yaptığını millete duyursaydım, muhtemelen otobüste linç edilirdi.

(208) Doğduğumdan beri bana rahibe eğitimi vermemiş olsaydı, muhtemelen ben de yaşadıklarımı onunla paylaşırdım.

(209) Derdimi anlatabilsem, muhtemelen rahatlayacağım.

(210) Problemin ne olduğunu bilse, muhtemelen herşey açıklığa kavuşacak.

Another interesting use of *muhtemelen* is with the possibility marker *-EbIl*. While *galiba* and *herhalde* are incompatible with this suffix, *muhtemelen* and *belki* indicate levels of possibility respectively.

(211)   Hastamızın gözü mikrop kapmış. <u>Muhtemelen/</u> Belki/ *Herhalde/

*Galiba lens kullanırken hijyenik koşullara uymamış olabilir.

In (211) *belki* introduces a reason which has a low possibility for the infection whereas *muhtemelen* indicates the most probable reason. In other words, while *belki* completes the possibility meaning of –*EbIl*, *muhtemelen* modifies the level to a higher degree by stating the most probable option achieved logically.

In summary, the modal adverb *muhtemelen*, which has an Arabic origin, (i.e. *muhtemel*), can choose defining relative clauses as in (173) to (182) and reason clauses in (183), (184) as the syntactic domain when used non-sententially. As a sentential modal adverb, it is used only in the sentence initial position unless some syntactic obligations are in concern as in (185), (186). Whether used sententially or non-sententially, it indicates inference made based on shared background information or knowledge, but not belief, of the speaker. When the tense/aspect marker of the sentence which *muhtemelen* takes into scope has a parallel function, i.e. indicating inference, the so-called modal adverb gives prominence to its reading of probability instead of inference (202 to 205). With conditionals, *muhtemelen* indicates a logical result of the conditional clause (206 to 210).

II. 2. 5. *Kesinlikle*

The most interesting information that our data showed about *kesinlikle* is that 40 out of 50 sentences in which the modal adverb is used were negative. The supposition that *kesinlikle* is the only one reflecting a subjective sense among the modal adverbs expressing confidence (*mutlaka, elbette*) may provide us a good reason for this frequent negative use. Of course, there is more evidence to support that *kesinlikle* has a marked

subjectivity. For example, unlike the adverbs indicating objective modality (i.e. *belki, herhalde, mutlaka*), *kesinlikle* can be used to express self-judgments.

(212) Futbol konusunda kesinlikle fanatiğim.

(213) İşin içine yemek girince kesinlikle iddialıyımdır.

(214) Kesinlikle bir temizlik hastasıyım. Günde beş kere toz alınır mı? Ben alırım.

What is more, *kesinlikle* is compatible with the adjectives whose inherent meaning reflect a subjective sense.

(215) Babamın bird aha eve dönmeyeceğinden kesinlikle eminim.

(216) Evlenme konusunda kesinlikle ciddiyim.

The example statements (212) to (216) also prove that *kesinlikle* expresses a very high level of confidence based on belief, but not knowledge. This becomes most obvious in its interaction with Ø.

(217) Sevgilimin ailesi kesinlikle benim ailem gibi değil. Eğitimsiz ve biraz da basitler.

(218) Fettullahçılar kamuoyunda düşünülenden farklılar. Bir kere kesinlikle tarikat değiller. "Nurcu" yakıştırmasından da hiç hoşlanmazlar.

(219) Köle rumuzlu bayanın gözünün sulanıp kanlanması kesinlikle lensinin suçu değil.

(220)   Sevgilimi çok seviyorum ve <u>kesinlikle</u> aldatmaya karşıyım.

(221)   Aramızda aile baskısıyla kapananlar ya da politize olup radikalleşen

bazı kişiler hoş olmayan bazı görüntüler veriyor olabilir, ama iddia

ediyorum, bunlar <u>kesinlikle</u> azınlıkta olanlar.

The statements above declare factive propositions regardless of *kesinlikle*. Using the modal adverb, the speakers obviously express the strong belief they have in the truth value of the propositions of their sentences. In other words, *kesinlikle* enables the speaker to state a very high degree of confidence in his/her utterances based on belief. As the speaker grounds his/her confidence upon his/her belief, and reflects this via the use of *kesinlikle*, the listener does not need to question the source of information that the sentence expresses. For example, in statement (221), as listeners, we do not feel the need to question upon what the speaker bases her definite claim because she uses *kesinlikle* in order to communicate that the source of her claim is her belief and/or opinion. This observation is also true for the factive-kind referring sentences (Subaşı Uzun & Erk Emeksiz, 2002) whose predicate is marked with -*DIr*.

(222)   Eşcinsellik <u>kesinlikle</u> sapıklık ya da anormallik değildir.

(223)   Çağımızda, cep telefonu bir lüks değil, <u>kesinlikle</u> bir ihtiyaçtır.

Another important point that the example statements (212) to (223) demonstrate is that, syntactically, *kesinlikle* tends to appear in the pre-verbal position. This tendency is also true for sentences with verbal predicates, as the example sentences in the rest of this section exhibits. The main reasons for this tendency may be its belief-based

meaning and frequent use in negative sentences. That is, by placing *kesinlikle* in pre-verbal position, the speaker may be trying to put more emphasis on the message that he/she has confidence in what he/she is saying because this confidence is not based on facts or knowledge. If *kesinlikle* were knowledge-based, it would be easier to use it in sentence-initial of final positions because the confidence it declares would have more certain evidence, i.e. facts or knowledge. In negative sentences on the other hand, it is safer to stay close to the negation if syntactically unacceptable sentences are not desired. In addition, *kesinlikle* has non-sentential uses in which it takes defining relative clauses into its scope, similar to *muhtemelen*. Occurring in the pre-verbal position may be a strategy to distinguish between sentential and non-sentential uses of the adverb.

(224) Bu amaçla edinilmiş olan ve [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ kesinlikle betimleyemeyeceğim] araçlar] yardımıyla son derece karmaşık bir iş çıkarıldı.

(225) Sonunda, [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$ kesinlikle bir gemi kazasından kalmış olan] gazyağı şişeleri] buldum tesadüfen.

(226) [$_{NP}$ [$_{AP}$Parlak tenleri diğerleriyle kesinlikle çelişen] birkaç küçük çocuk] dışında hepsi cüzzamlıydı.

The subjective sense of *kesinlikle* is also obvious when it is used with the suffix –*EcEk*. With first person singular subjects, *kesinlikle* enables the speaker to express personal decisiveness as the sentences stated below.

(227) Bayanlara tavsiyem, hemen evlenin! Ben mi? Kararlıyım. 2002'yi kesinlikle boş kapatmayacağım.

(228)   Kesin karar verdim. Elimde kalan uyuşturucuyu çöpe atacağım. Bir

daha da bu işlere <u>kesinlikle</u> bulaşmayacağım.

(229)   Bu markadan hiç memnun kalmadım. Bir daha <u>kesinlikle</u>

almayacağım.

The speakers of (227) to (229) are certain about their decisions and emphasize

this determination via the use of *kesinlikle*. In negative sentences with third person singular

subjects, *kesinlikle* completes the prohibition sense of *–EcEk*.

(230)   Kapıdaki görevliye de talimat verdim. Görevli personelden başkası

<u>kesinlikle</u> içeri girmeyecek.

When *–EcEk* expresses future prediction, *kesinlikle* reflects that the speaker has

a strong belief in that prediction.

(231)   Birkaç ay içinde <u>kesinlikle</u> herşey değişecek. Bak, söylemişti dersin.

(232)   Göreceksin, bu kış <u>kesinlikle</u> geçen yıllardan çetin geçecek.

As the example statements (231), (232) show, *kesinlikle* enables the speaker to

express that he/she definitely believes in the proposition of his/her utterance. That is, using

kesinlikle, the speaker enhances the certainty level of his/her prediction about a future

event and states a strong belief in what he/she is saying.

As with its interaction with the past tense marker *–DI* or *–IDI*, the modal

adverb *kesinlikle* allows the speaker to introduce his/her own warranty about a past event.

(233)   Şimdiye kadar <u>kesinlikle</u> aramızda böyle bir konuşma geçmedi.

(234)   Çocuğun gururunu kıracak hiçbir şey yapmadık. <u>Kesinlikle</u> dalga geçmedik.

(235)   Küçükken konuşma sorunlarım vardı ama <u>kesinlikle</u> kekeme değildim.

The example statements above show that, the use of *kesinlikle* adds the personal warranty of the speaker, but no other evidence, about the truth value of the sentence. That is, the speaker gives a message which can be paraphrased as 'be sure that …' and the only source of this warranty is his/her words.

When used with the evidential *–mIş/-ImIş*, *kesinlikle* transforms the reportive and/or inference reading of the sentence into a sense of subjective certainty.

(236)   Bu olayı biraz araştırdım. Halıdaki izler <u>kesinlikle</u> idrar değilmiş.

(237)   Maktul <u>kesinlikle</u> boğulmamış. Boynuna el sürülmeden nasıl boğulabilir ki insan?

Without *kesinlikle*, the sentences above reflect either reportive (236) or inferential (237) readings. The modal adverb indicates the speaker's high degree of confidence, which transforms the meaning into certainty, in the information achieved from either reportive or inferential sources.

Kesinlikle interacts with *–Iyor* in a similar way, i.e. it enables the speaker to reflect his/her confidence in the judgment that his/her utterance expresses.

(238) Dört yıldır evliyim ama <u>kesinlikle</u> çocuk yapmak istemiyorum.

(239) Bokser şort gibi değil, kalçayı müthiş sarıyor. Üstelik <u>kesinlikle</u> iz yapmıyor.

(240) Evdeyken sinirlenince kapıları tekmeleyen ben, erkek arkadaşımın yanında uslu, terbiyeli, kuzu gibi bir kız oluyorum. Ama <u>kesinlikle</u> rol yapmıyorum.

(241) Ona yardım etmek istiyorum ama o kadar gururlu ki <u>kesinlikle</u> kabul etmiyor.

(242) Yeni eşinden çocuk yapmayı <u>kesinlikle</u> düşünmüyor.

(243) Bebeğimi <u>kesinlikle</u> istiyorum. Onun yaşama şansını elinden alamam.

In the example statements above, the suffix *–Iyor* expresses an imperfective aspect. Unlike its progressive use in which it refers to a point in time, i.e. the moment of speaking, the non-progressive/imperfective *–Iyor* places the event or action in an interval of time. The speakers of (238) to (243) express judgments, about themselves or other people, which belong to that interval and they use *kesinlikle* to express that these judgments are totally based on their own experiences or beliefs, but not on an information-based evidence, and they have high confidence in what they state.

Kesinlikle exhibits similar senses when the sentence which is in its scope is marked with the aorist *–Ir*.

(244) Aile terbiyem evli bir adama o gözle bakmama <u>kesinlikle</u> izin vermez.

(245)   Muhabbct önce iyi başlar, birkaç kadehten sonra ortam yavaş yavaş

gerginleşir. Gecenin sonu <u>kesinlikle</u> karakolda biter.

In both of the sentences above, -*Ir* reflects a permanent characteristics of the

subject regardless of a certain point or interval in time and *kesinlikle* states that these

characteristics are established by experience and the listener can take the judgments in the

sentences for sure.

The experience and/or belief based confidence that *kesinlikle* expresses can

also be observed in negative statements marked with the modal suffix -*Ebil* denoting

incapability.

(246)   Karım çocuk yetiştirme konusunda <u>kesinlikle</u> pozitif düşünemiyor.

(247)   Sevdiğim adamı aileme <u>kesinlikle</u> kabul ettiremedim.

(248)   O iğrenç görüntüleri izlemeye <u>kesinlikle</u> dayanamıyorum.

In statements like (246) to (248) the speaker expresses his/her subjective

confidence in the proposition of his/her utterance. *Kesinlikle* also puts more emphasis on

the incapability sense that the negative -*Ebil* denotes. That is, it allows a reading of 'by no

means'.

Kesinlikle is also compatible with the contexts including performative verbs

like *tavsiye et-* in which the speaker states advice based on his/her own experiences or

beliefs.

(249)   Bulaşık makinasında yıkamaya kalkınca, ıspanaklar küçücük parçalara

ayrıldı. <u>Kesinlikle</u> tavsiye etmem.

(250)   Kesinlikle sohbetinden çok hoşlandığınız kişiyle evlenin.

(251)   Bu kitap bana müthiş bir keyif verdi. Kesinlikle tavsiye ederim.

In the example statements above, *kesinlikle* indicates that these advice is totally personal That is, they are the results of the speakers' own experiences but have no professional value as a doctor would give to his/her patients. As the next section will show, the speakers tend to use *mutlaka* for such professional advice.

To sum up, *kesinlikle* reflects a subjective sense which allows it to occur frequently in negative sentences. It enables the speaker to express a high degree of confidence based on belief and/or personal experiences. The modal adverb is most frequently used in pre-verbal position for semantic or syntactic reasons (212 to 221). It has non-sentential uses in which it chooses defining relative clauses as the syntactic domain (224 to 226). In its interaction with tense/aspect markers, it foregrounds the certainty readings of those markers and confirms the listener(s) with the truth value of the speaker's utterance by expressing the strong belief and/or decisiveness of the speaker.

II. 2. 6. *Mutlaka*

This sentential adverb, which is borrowed from Arabic, operates as a marker of the speaker's high degree of commitment to the proposition of what is being said. Unlike *kesinlikle*, it reflects an objective modality which is based on information shared by both participants, i.e. the listener and the speaker, or general truth known by everyone. The main support to the idea comes from the fact that *mutlaka* is incompatible with negative statements.

(252)   * Aradıklarım bu raflarda <u>mutlaka</u> yok.

(253)   * <u>Mutlaka</u> gidemeyiz.

(254)   * Kapıyı çalan o değil <u>mutlaka</u>.

In addition, *mutlaka* cannot co-occur with *–mlş* and Ø because the objective

sense it reflects contradicts with the subjective modality that both suffixes denote.

(255)   * <u>Mutlaka</u> iyi bir eğitim görmüş.

(256)   * Bu <u>mutlaka</u> senin uydurman.

(257)   <u>Mutlaka</u> iyi bir eğitim görmüş ki işe hemen alındı.

(258)   Bu <u>mutlaka</u> senin uydurmandır.

The statement (255), (256) become acceptable as the antecedent of a

proposition which conveys a certain deduction (257) or with the addition of the suffix *–Dır*

as in (258) which allows *mutlaka* to reflect its reading of probability. Thus, the modality

reflected by *mutlaka* has a high sense of objectivity.

Another basic difference between the two confidence, and thus epistemic

modality markers (i.e. *mutlaka* and *kesinlikle*) is that, because of its objective sense,

mutlaka is more convenient for professional advice.

(259)   Sabahları <u>mutlaka</u> kahvaltı yapın. Kahvaltı ağız içini temizler, salya

         akımını güçlendirir.

(260)   Kokulu ve yüksek proteinli yiyecek ve içeceklerden sonra <u>mutlaka</u>

         ağzınızı yıkayın.

(261)   Islak ayakla dolaşmayın. Kuru ortama girdiğinizde mutlaka ayaklarınızı ısıtın.

The example statements above show that *mutlaka* foregrounds the strong advice reading of imperatives. The use of *mutlaka* instead of *kesinlikle* in such contexts is related with the source of advice. That is, if this piece of advice is a result of the speaker's own experiences or beliefs, the speaker tends to use *kesinlikle*. However, when the advice needs a kind of professional support, *mutlaka* is selected in order to indicate that the advice is knowledge based and thus more scientific. When the piece of advice is more related with subjects other than scientific facts as in (262), *mutlaka* makes the advice stronger putting more emphasis on the undesired consequences.

(262)   Mutlaka çocuklarınız ve eşiniz adına tasarruf yapın.

The semantic anomaly that *mutlaka* causes when it co-occurs with performative verbs which are used to give advice (e.g. *tavsiye etmek, salık vermek*) may be counted as another evidence of its knowledge based sense in contrary to *kesinlikle*.

(263)   * Mutlaka tavsiye ederim.

(264)   Kesinlikle tavsiye ederim.

Sentence (263) is semantically anomalous if the aim is to give advice because *mutlaka* contradicts with the inherent meaning of the verb *tavsiye et-* which has an experience-based sense.

Mutlaka also disambiguates the request meaning of imperatives in appropriate contexts.

(265) Denemeye değer bir yöntem. Eğer deneyenleriniz olursa sonucu <u>mutlaka</u> bildirin.

The speech act value of *mutlaka* in communicating strong advice can also be observed in its interaction with the obligation marker *–mElI.*

(266) Taslaklarıma yazdıkları yorumlarda "yazar mısınız?", "<u>mutlaka</u> yazmalısınız" diyerek beni cesaretlendiren tüm arkadaşlara teşekkürü borç bilirim.

(267) Bu kitabı <u>mutlaka</u> okumalısın.

Emphasizing the reading of giving advice, *mutlaka* strengthens the effect of the statements like (266), (267). In the same way, when *–mElI* denotes condition-based necessity, *mutlaka* operates as a modifier and makes the proposition of the sentences stand closer to obligation.

(268) Evet, evleneceğim adam <u>mutlaka</u> zengin olmalı. Bu konudaki maddiyatçılığımı inkar etmiyorum.

(269) Tatilde ya da misafirlikte uyurken <u>mutlaka</u> yanımda biri olmalı.

(270) Ama bu iş <u>mutlaka</u> arabada, babamın koltuğunun arka kısmına saklanmış olarak yapılmalıydı. Yoksa zevki çıkmazdı.

When it co-occurs with lexical necessity markers (*gerek, lazım*) *mutlaka* transforms the necessity readings to obligation.

(271) Tatile gitmeden önce mutlaka kilo vermem lazım.

(272) Aklıma kötü bir düşünce geldiğinde mutlaka tahta birşeye dokunmam gerekiyor.

(273) İşi hafta sonundan önce mutlaka bitirmek zorundayım.

As the above sentences indicate, *mutlaka* either transforms the necessity readings to obligation as in (271), (272) or modifies the obligation meaning as in (273) denoting a sense of 'no other alternation'.

Similar to *kesinlikle, mutlaka* is compatible with the non-progressive use of *-Iyor*

(274) 'Türkiye'de az kitap okunuyor' iddiası doğru değildir. Çünkü benim bildiğim 60.000 kişi ayda mutlaka bir kitap okuyor.

(275) Müthiş kin tutuyorum. Birinin bana bilinçli ya da bilinçsiz bir zararı olduğunda mutlaka karşılık veriyorum.

(276) Bu karabasanları önlemek için yatmadan mutlaka Felak ve Nas surelerini okuyorum.

In the example statements above, *-Iyor* indicates a non-progressive and thus a non-permanent sense. It has a value of [+interval]. That is, instead of stating a permanent characteristics as the aorist - *Ir* does, *-Iyor* extends the event into a period of time including 'the moment of speaking'. The use of *mutlaka* increases the level of certainty that *-Iyor*

indicates. Due to the objective sense denoted by *mutlaka* and [+interval] value of *-Iyor*, the sentences exhibit explanations about when or why the event is taking place. In other words, *mutlaka* states a certainty based on set conditions. These conditions may be stated via different ways such as clauses indicating time as in (275), reason as in (276) or directly in conditionals as in (277), (278).

(277)   Arabam Polo. Bir yerde aynı modelini park etmiş olarak görürsem mutlaka inceliyorum.

(278)   Eğer annemlerden sonra yatmam gerekirse, koridoru geçerken mutlaka koşuyorum.

Thus, when co-occurs with *-Iyor*, *mutlaka* expresses definite result(s) of a condition stated in different ways.

Unlike *-Iyor*, the aorist does not need to set conditions because it expresses a permanent characteristic which does not have a definite time or period reference.

(279)   Haftada bir mutlaka mobilyaların yerini değiştiririm.

(280)   Yataktan mutlaka sağ tarafımdan kalkarım.

In sentences like (279), (280), *mutlaka* expresses a high degree of certainty operating like a frequency adverb which allows no exceptions. Thus, *mutlaka* transforms the non-certain sense of *-Ir* to a certainty reading in which any exceptions are not allowed as in (281).

(281) Şoför, mağaza sahipleri, hizmetçiler size ne kadar hürmet etseler de, içlerinden ve arkanızdan mutlaka (adım gibi biliyorum) "Hanzo işte, ne olacak" gibi şeyler söylerler.

Mutlaka also transforms the inference and thus non-certain meaning of the suffix –DIr to a certain sense.

(282) Eğer sokakta eli fermuarının üstünde birini görürseniz o mutlaka benimdir.

(283) Birlikte olduğunuz kişi yaşça sizden çok büyükse ve devamlı iş toplantılarına (!) katılmak zorunda kalıyorsa, mutlaka sizi aldatıyordur.

The above sentences reflect logical deductions of certain conditions. The use of mutlaka transforms the non-certain inference meaning of –DIr to a logical certainty informing the speaker's commitment in the proposition based on facts.

A similar transformation process can be observed when the future modality marker –EcEk is in concern. Sentences (284) and (285) prove that mutlaka provides –EcEk with such a certainty that the unplanned reading of the suffix turns into a planned activity in spite of the indefinite time and/or place adverbs such as bir gün, bir yerde (some day, somewhere).

(284) O insan müsveddesiyle mutlaka bir gün, bir yerde görüşeceğiz.

(285) Bir gün mutlaka sen de yatacaksın bu musalla taşına.

Stating the high, knowledge-based commitment of the speaker in the proposition of the sentence, *mutlaka* also indicates personal decisiveness with 1ˢᵗ person singular subjects.

(286)   Bir kızım var zaten ama bu bebeği de <u>mutlaka</u> doğuracağım.

The certainty sense which also indicates a reading of 'without exception' may be observed in sentences marked with the suffix *–DI/-IDI*. The example statements below show past certainty which can be paraphrased as "there weren't any exceptions of this event".

(287)   Bugüne dek çıktığım erkekleri <u>mutlaka</u> aldattım.

(288)   Küçükken annem yere terliksiz bastığımda ayaklarımın büyüyeceğini söylerdi. Palyaço ayaklı olmamak için <u>mutlaka</u> terlik giyerdim.

In summary, *mutlaka* enables the speaker to state a high degree of confidence in the proposition of the sentence. This confidence of the speaker is based on facts or knowledge instead of belief or personal experiences as in the case of *kesinlikle*. Thus, *mutlaka* denotes an objective kind of epistemic modality as in (252) to (258). This modal adverb has only sentential uses in which it takes the whole sentence into its scope whether or not it occurs in sentence-initial, sentence-final or preverbal positions. The speech act value it exhibits can be observed both in imperative as in (259) to (263) and obligation stating (i.e. marked with *–mElI*) sentences like (266), (267). The objective sense it states does not allow a co-occurrence with subjective modality markers such as *–mIş* or Ø as in

(255) to (258). With all other tense/aspect and/or modality markers, *mutlaka* either disambiguates or transforms the different readings to a sense of extreme certainty allowing no other exceptions.

II. 2. 7. *Elbette*

Elbette is a sentential modal adverb borrowed from Arabic. Among the other epistemic modality markers indicating certainty i.e. *kesinlikle, mutlaka* it expresses a different kind of subjectivity as the following examples prove.

(289)   Bu duygu ölümden korkmak değil elbette.

(290)   Bütün bir yaz böyle geçmez elbette.

(291)   Elbette çok mutluyum. Yaptıklarımdan gurur duyuyorum.

(292)   -Annem nasıl?

        -Yorgun elbette. Bütün gün hem hasta bakmak hem çocuk oyalamak kolay mı?

The co-occurrence of *elbette* in negative sentences as in (289), (290) and its agreement with subjective modality marker Ø as in (291), (292) show that *elbette* states subjectivity. Also, its being compatible with adjectives (i.e. *mutlu, yorgun*) that does not involve volition of the experiencer (i.e. the subject of the sentence) provides us with another support to the subjective sense it conveys. However, the subjectivity of elbette is somewhat different from the subjectivity stated by *kesinlikle*, another sentential modal adverb indicating certainty. *Kesinlikle* is said to express subjective modality because it states the speaker's confidence based on belief or personal experience, but not factual

information which forms an objective sense as in the case of *mutlaka*. *Elbette* allows the speaker to confirm the information stated in his/her utterance based on his/her world-knowledge. The world-knowledge of a person includes both factual information and experiences or beliefs. Thus, using *elbette*, the speaker states his/her confidence in the proposition of the sentence based on his/her world knowledge. In addition, it does not matter that this confidence is grounded on belief or facts. Otherwise, it would not be possible for *elbette* to occur in proverbs which are thought to state factual information based on world knowledge.

(293)   Beş parmağın beşi de bir değil elbette.

(294)   Elbette her koyun kendi bacağından asılır.

In the examples above the speaker uses *elbette* to state that he/she agrees with and thus has confidence in the proposition of the sentences. Whether he/she grounds this confidence on belief or knowledge is not important.

The meaning which may be paraphrased as 'I agree with the idea/fact that ...' is clearly observed when *elbette* co-occurs with 'there is/are' either in affirmative or negative sentences.

(295)   Doktorların çoğu yukarıda açıkladığım gibi davranıyor. Elbette istisnalar da var.

(296)   Bu hale gelmende toplumun bireyleri olarak elbette bizim de payımız var, buna inanıyorum.

(297)   Burada kolejli kızlar yok elbette.

A similar observation can be made with Ø marked statements.

(298)   Elbette en kötüsü herşeyin zorunluluk haline gelmesi.

(299)   Milyonların gözü önünde olmak kolay değil elbette.

Another conclusion that we can draw from the example statements stated so far is that, syntactically, *elbette* tends to occur in sentence-final position when negative statements are in concern. The certainty sense of negative statements, which are more powerful than any modal adverb can express, may form a good reason for this tendency. The speakers may choose sentence-final position in order to foreground the certainty reading which is more precise in negative statements and add *elbette* at the end to state their agreement.

Elbette can also occur in sentences whose predicate is marked with *-DIr* when the suffix expresses propositions which are non-factive.

(300)   Benimle bu yolda elele yürüyebilecek, asla ihanet etmeyecek biri elbette vardır.

(301)   Bu kadar ilgi ve ikram elbette onları da memnun etmiştir.

In the examples stated above, the speakers state their predictions (300) or inferences (301) which are non-certain without the use of *elbette*. *Elbette* transforms the non-certain meaning to a high level of certainty, although not as much as *kesinlikle* or *mutlaka* can do. Here, the main function of *elbette* is to convey the sense that what the speaker expects overlaps with the proposition of the sentence. That is, via the use of

elbette, the speaker gives the message that he/she expects or thinks it is likely that the proposition of the sentence is true.

In terms of pragmatics, *elbette* seems to have an implication which conveys that the proposition of the sentence which is in the scope of *elbette* does not contradict with the information in the previous context or the shared knowledge of the participants. That is, the information that the sentence with *elbette* reflects is an 'expected' or a predictable one based on the context and/or the background knowledge of the speaker and the listener. This is implicated most obviously in sentences whose predicates are marked with *–Iyor, -DI/-IDI* and *–EcEk.*

(302) İlk başta laflarınızda ezmeye çalıştığınız biriyle daha sonra sağlıklı bir iletişim kurmak elbette mümkün olmuyor.

(303) Erkek arkadaşımla görüşme olasılığının olmadığı günlerde spor giysileri tercih ediyorum. Erkek arkadaşımla olacaksam durum hemen değişiyor elbette.

(304) Bunları ona söylemedim elbette. Sıkar biraz.

(305) Çok mutlu olduğuna inandığımız arkadaşımızın bu acı sonu elbette herkesi şok etti.

(306) Ayrılık sebebimizi soranlara bir yalan uyduruyorum, inanıyorlar. Ama birgün inanmayanı da çıkacak elbette.

(307) Olanları duyunca çok sinirlenecek elbette.

The example statements (302) to (307) clearly show that *elbette* introduces propositions which are in harmony, i.e. which do not contradict, with the world knowledge

of the participants because it has a sense of 'as expected'. Whether these propositions belong to present as in (302), (303), past as in (304) (305) or future as in (306), (307) is not important. In addition, regarding *–EcEk,* the modal adverb transforms the future prediction reading of *–EcEk* to a sense of certainty.

Elbette functions in a similar way in its interaction with the aorist *–Ir.* It introduces propositions which are in harmony with the 'expected'. Our data provided us with a significant number of examples in which *elbette* occurs in the antecedent clause of a co-ordinate sentence expressing contradiction.

(308)   Bir anne mecbur olmazsa çocuğunu kimselere vermez elbette ama yine de onu affedemiyorum.

(309)   Elbette site sahibi bunu hemen daha iyi yapar ama ben yine de gözlemlerimi aktarmak istiyorum.

In sentences like (308), (309), the contradictory clause conveys an information which contradicts with the information that is normally expected. The use of *elbette* enables the speaker to state his/her awareness of the proposition in the antecedent clause. In short, the speaker tries to convey a message that can be paraphrased as 'I know and agree with the fact that ... but ...'.

Elbette can also co-occur with the possibility marker *–Ebil* in both affirmative and negative statements.

(310)   Bir dil bu kadar kısa zamanda öğrenilemez elbette.

(311) Kalabalıktan bir alkış tufanı patladı. <u>Elbette</u> herşey bununla da kalabilirdi. Ama bir şey daha oldu.

(312) <u>Elbette</u> bir katolik papazı ya da keşiş gibi siyahlara bürünebilirim ama bundan ne sağlarım?

The use of *elbette* enables the speaker to state that he/she agrees with the possibility as in (311), (312) or impossibility (310) of the proposition in his/her utterance. In other words , the speaker approves that the event in the sentence is a possible/impossible one. *Elbette* does not transform the possibility reading to certainty. The meaning that *elbette* reflects can be paraphrased as 'I agree that there is such a possibility/impossibility under normal conditions'.

A similar interaction can be observed between *elbette* and obligation/necessity markers, either inflectional (*-mEll*) or lexical (*gerek, lazım, zorunda* etc.). *Elbette* does not perform a transformation in such an interaction. It only introduces the speaker's approval for the obligation or necessity stated in the sentence.

(313) Bir erkek <u>elbette</u> gözüpek olmalı.

(314) Elini biraz hızlı tutmak zorundasın <u>elbette</u>.

(315) Onlara yetişebilmem için <u>elbette</u> daha çok çalışmam gerekiyordu.

As the above sentences show, *elbette* introduces that the obligation as in (314) or necessity as in (313), (315) is an expected one under normal conditions and the speaker agrees that such a necessity/obligation exists.

To sum up, *elbette* expresses a subjective certainty conveying the speaker's confirmation for the information stated in his/her utterance based on his/her world knowledge. It can occur in sentence-initial, sentence-final or pre-verbal positions in affirmative sentences. This alternation seems to be only a matter of emphasis in affirmatives. However, in negative sentences there is a tendency to occur in sentence-final position which may be explained as a choice of the speaker, but not a syntactic obligation (297, 299). In its interactions with tense/aspect (302 to 309) or other inflectional or lexical modality markers (310 to 315) it allows the speaker to convey the message that he/she confirms and thus has confidence in the truth value of the proposition of his/her utterance instead of performing transformations as *kesinlikle* and *mutlaka* do. In other words, it mainly has the function of modification in its interaction with tense, aspect and modal markers.

CONCLUSION

Modal adverbs form an important component of the modality system in many languages including Turkish. They do not serve as the synonyms of modal markers such as modal auxiliaries in English or inflectional morphemes in Turkish. Instead, they form a syntactically and semantically consistent group of words denoting different kinds of modality, i.e. epistemic or deontic. Traditional studies on the subject do not present concepts or generalizations which should be comprehensive enough to exhibit the semantic and syntactic functions of Turkish modal adverbs. Contemporary studies, on the other hand, make us aware of the fact that modal adverbs have important functions in the system of modality. However, they only emphasize a limited scope of the issue informing that further studies are needed in order to present a complete account of Turkish modality system.

Adverbs form the most problematic word category because of the diversity of their functions reflected in traditional studies (Gencan, 1979; Ergin, 1986; Vardar, 1988; Banguoğlu, 1990; Ediskun, 1992).

These studies cannot present clear-cut classifications exhibiting the semantic and syntactic functions of adverbs. In his study which suggests a generative point of view towards the distinctions between different parts of speech, Emonds (1987) tries to draw more clear-cut borderlines between the adverbs and other open class members of parts of speech. According to this study, the category of adjectives involve the greatest number of what traditional grammar calls adverbs and deictic adverbs indicating time share the same properties of proper nouns analogous to the days of the week. Using the overall approach of bar notation and open/closed class pairings, Emonds eliminates the irrelevant content that the traditional grammar attributes to the category of adverbs.

In many languages certain adverbs convey modal notions like certainty or necessity. In order to comprehend the issue of modal adverbs more precisely, we have presented the fundamental concepts which forms the system of modality based on Palmer's classification (1986). In his analysis of modality, Palmer classifies three types, i.e. epistemic, deontic and dynamic. Epistemic modality which reflects the speaker's attitude to the factuality of his/her statements is sub-divided into two: evidentials and judgments. The modal notions confidence which conveys the speaker's commitment in the truth of his/her sentence and inference which reflects the logical deduction of the speaker are the two sub-branches of judgments. In addition, Lyons (1977) determines two types of epistemic modality, i.objective modality which denotes the speaker's knowledge about the proposition of his/her utterance, and ii. Subjective modality in which the speaker bases his/her confidence on his/her own beliefs and thoughts instead of knowledge-based information.

Hoye (1997) points out the important role that modal adverbs play in the modality system of English. He analyses the co-occurrence of modal adverbs with certain modal auxiliaries and argues that the basic modal meaning conveyed by the auxiliary may be modified, completed, or event transformed through the use of modal adverbs.

Studies on Turkish modal adverbs (Taylan & Özsoy, 1993; Ruhi et. al., 1997; Tosun, 1998) clearly inform us that they form a crucial component of the whole modality system and it would leave the study of modality incomplete if this issue is neglected.

This study is meant to examine the syntactic and semantic functions of Turkish modal adverbs in the modality system of Turkish. In order to achieve our aim, we have studied through a comprehensive naturally occurring data which enabled us the present the following issues:

i.   Basically, sentential modal adverbs may be used in sentence initial, sentence final or preverbal positions just as a matter of emphasis. However, they may present tendencies or even constraints in respect with the word order according to the type of the sentence in which they occur, the syntactic domain or their inherent meanings as in the use of *muhtemelen.*

ii.   They may have non-sentential uses in which they choose particular syntactic domains (*belki, muhtemelen*)

iii.   The selected adverbs convey either objective, i.e. neutral in sense of subjectivity, (*belki, herhalde, muhtemelen, mutlaka*) or subjective epistemic modality (*galiba, kesinlikle, elbette*).

iv.   They may reflect deontic modality as in the uses of *herhalde* as well as epistemic modality in concern with their speech act values.

v.   Their interaction with tense, aspect and modal markers is realized in the frame of three semantic functions: disambiguation, in which the modal adverb disambiguates one of the possible readings of the marker; transformation, in which the modal adverb transforms the modal meaning of a particular marker to another reading; and modification in which the modal adverb modifies, i.e. enhances or diminishes the modal meaning conveyed by the marker.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın ana hedefi Türkçe'de kiplik gösteren belirteçleri sözdizimsel ve anlambilimsel açıdan kapsamlı şekilde inceleyerek bu belirteçlerin işlevsel ve anlamsal özelliklerini saptamaktır. Bu amaca ulaşılmak için bilgisellik kipliğini yansıttığı düşünülen yedi kiplik belirteci (*belki, herhalde, galiba, muhtemelen, kesinlikle, elbette*) çoğunlukla doğal ortamlarda saptanmış geniş bir veritabanı çerçevesinde tek tek ele alınmış ve hem sözdizimsel hem de anlambilimsel açıdan detaylı olarak incelenmiştir. Geleneksel Türk dilbilgisi bakış açısıyla yapılan çalışmaların yeterli derecede açıklayıcı olamaması göz önünde bulundurularak bu detaylı incelemede mümkün olduğunca açıklayıcı ve kapsayıcı kavramlar oluşturulmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu kavramların oluşturulmasında son dönemde çağdaş dilbilim yöntemiyle yapılan ancak kapsayıcı olmaktan çok sınırlı sayıda belirtecin işlevsel özellikleri üzerine yoğunlaşan çalışmalardan yola çıkılmıştır. Tüm dillerde gerek anlamları ve yapıları gerekse işlevleri ve tümcedeki kullanım yerleri açısından çeşitlilik gösteren bu dilbilgisel ulam için yapılabilecek kapsayıcı açıklamalar hem Türkçe dilbilgisine katkıda bulunacak hem de Türkçe'nin kendine özgü kiplik, görünüş ve zaman dizgelerinin bütünüyle betimlenmesinde tamamlayıcı bir unsur olacaktır. Ayrıntılı ve açıklayıcı bu çeşit betimlemelerin dil öğretimine katkıları kaçınılmazdır.

Çalışmanın giriş bölümünde araştırma problemi tanıtılmış, veri toplama yöntemi, çalışmanın amaçları ve sınırlamaları belirtilmiştir.

I. bölümde belirteçler sözcük türleri çerçevesinde genel olarak sunulmuş ve konuyla ilgili hem geleneksel hem de çağdaş bakış açıları özetlenmiştir. Daha sonra dilbilgisel bir ulam olan kiplik kavramı ve bu kavramın belirteçlerle ilişkisinden bahsedilmiştir. Bölümün sonunda kiplik belirteçlerinin İngilizce ve Türkçe üzerine yapılmış çalışmalardaki yeri belirtilmiştir.

II. Bölüm Türkçe zaman, görünüş ve kiplik eklerinin genel özelliklerinin bir özetiyle başlamaktadır. Daha sonra, veritabanının incelenmesine geçilmiş ve seçilen kiplik belirteçlerinin bu veritabanı çerçevesinde yansıttığı sözdizimsel ve anlambilimsel özellikler saptanmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu saptamalar yapılırken belirteçlerin içsel anlamları, cümle içindeki yerleri ve diğer zaman, görünüş ve kiplik ekleriyle ilişkileri göz önünde tutulmuştur.

Her ne kadar detaylı bir çalışma amaçlanmış olsa da bu yeni ve gerçekten ilgi çekici konunun her yönüyle tek bir çalışmada ele alınması imkansızdır. Kiplik belirteçlerinin özellikle olumsuzlama gibi dilbilgisel operatörlerle ve şart tümcesi gibi değişik tümce türleriyle olan ilişkisi araştırmaya değer konular içermektedir.

SUMMARY

The aim of this study is to provide a comprehensive account of the syntactic and semantic functions of Turkish modal adverbs. We performed such a task due to the fact that the analyses of the Turkish modality system would be incomplete without a detailed evaluation of the modal adverbs. Such an evaluation would also allow a comparison between the modality systems of Turkish and other languages such as English or French and provide language learners and/or teachers with valuable information.

Introduction presents the problems and the hypotheses of this research. This section of the study also answers the questions about the aims of the study, data collection and the limitations.

In Chapter I we have dealt with adverbs as a component of parts of speech system in the first hand. Next, the notion of modality and its fundamental concepts are argued in the frame of Palmer's classification (1986). Finally, the concept of modal adverb is presented by restating the studies done on the subject both in English and Turkish.

Chapter II is concerned with the representation of the data regarding the syntactic and semantic functions of our selected modal adverbs (*belki, herhalde, galiba, muhtemelen, kesinlikle, mutlaka, elbette*) after introducing a detailed representation of Turkish tense, aspect and modal markers for the sake of the analysis of the ways they interact with modal adverbs.

It is really noteworthy that further studies should be carried out especially on the interaction between the modal adverbs and grammatical operators such as negation or different clause types such as conditional clauses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words.* London: Oxford University Press.

Banguoğlu, T. 1990. *Türkçenin grameri.* Ankara. TDK.

Carlson, G. N. 1989. The semantic composition of English generic sentences. In G.

Chierchia, B. Partee & R. Turner (eds.), *Properties, types and meanings* Vol. 2.

Dodrecht: Kluwer.

Chomsky, N. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In R. Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum (eds.),

Readings in English transformational grammar(184-221). New York: Ginn.

Coates, J. 1983. *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries.* London and Canberra: Croom

Helm.

Csato, E. 2000. Turkish –Mİş and –Imİş items. Dimensions of a functional analysis. In L.

Johanson N & B. Utaş (eds.), *Evidentials* (29-43). Berlin: Moutan de Gruyter.

Curme, G. 1935. *Parts of speech and accidence* Vol. 2. Boston: D.C. Heath and Co.

Doğan, G.& Kocaman,A. 1999. Sözcede kişisel tutum ve belirteçler. *Dilbilim*

araştırmaları 1999,65-78.

Ediskun, H. 1992. *Türk dilbilgisi.* İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Emonds, J. 1987. Parts of speech in generative grammar. *Linguistic analyses* 17, 3-42.

Ergin, M. 1986. *Türk dili.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.

Erguvanlı, E. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Erguvanlı Taylan, E. 1986. Some aspects of negation in Turkish. In Aksu-Koç and E. Erguvanlı Taylan (eds.), *Proceedings of Turkish linguistics conference* (159-178). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. 1996. The parameter of aspect in Turkish.In A. Konrad (ed.), *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 6th international conference on Turkish linguistics* (153-167). Eskişehir: Anadolu University Press.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. 2000. Semi-grammaticalized modality in Turkish. In A. Göksel & C. Kerslake (eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages* (133-142). Weisbaden: Harrowitz Verlag.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. & Özsoy, A. S. 1993. Türkçe'de bazı kiplik biçimlerinin öğretimi üzerine. In K. İmer N. E. Uzun (eds.), *7. Dilbilim kurultayı bildirileri* 13-14 Mayıs 1993 (1-9). Ankara:Dil Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi.

Erkman-Akerson, F. & Ozil, Ş. 1998. *Türkçe'de niteleme sıfat işlevli yantümceler*. İstanbul: Simurg.

Gencan, T. N. 1979. *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: TDK.

Gödekli. O. 1979. A linguistic study of adverbs: with special reference to their usage in contemporary modern Turkish and English. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe University.

Hallyday, M. A. K. 1970. Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of language* 6, 322-61.

Hallyday, M. A. K. 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hoye, L. 1997. *Adverbs and modality in English*. London: Longman.

Jacobson, S. 1964. *Adverbial positions in English*. Stockholm: Studentbok.

Jacobson, S. 1975. *Factors influencing the placement of English adverbials in relation to auxiliaries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Jacobson, S. 1978. *On the use, meaning, and syntax of English preverbal adverbs*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Jacobson, S. 1981. *Preverbal adverbs and auxiliaries. A study of word order change.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Jespersen, O. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Johanson, L. 1971. *Aspect im Turkishen.* Uppsala: Asmqvist & Wiskel.

Johanson, L. 2000. Turkic indirectives. In Johanson, L. & B. Utas (eds.), *Evidentials* (61-87). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kerslake, C. 1990. The semantics of possibility in Turkish. In B. Rona (ed.), *Proceedings of the 5^h international conference on Turkish linguistics* 15-17 Ağustos 1990 (85-110).Ankara: Hitit.

Kocaman, A. 1988. Modality in the Turkish discourse. In S. Koç (ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th international conference on Turkish linguistics* 17-19 Ağustos 1988 (463-468). Ankara:METU.

Kocaman, A. 1990. The necessitative mood in Turkish. In B. Rona (ed.), *Proceedings of the 5^h international conference on Turkish linguistics* 15-17 Ağustos 1990 (104-111). Ankara:Hitit.

Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish.* London: Routledge.

Larson, R. 1985. Bare-NP adverbs. *Linguistic inquiry.* 16: 595-621.

Lewis, C. I. 1946. *An analysis of knowledge and evaluation.* La Salle, Ill.: The Open Court

Publishing Co.

Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish grammar.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lewis, G. L. 1976. *Turkish.* Teach yourself books. New York: David McKay.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics.* vol2.Cambridge:CUP.

Malinowski, B. 1923. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden & I.

A. Richards(eds.), *The meaning of meaning.* London: Kegon Paul.

Matthews, R. 1991. *Words and worlds: on the linguistic analysis of modality.* Frankfurt:

Peter Long.

Oktar, L. & Cem Değer, A. 1999. Gazete söyleminde kiplik ve işlevleri. *Dilbilim*

Araştırmaları 1999 (45-53). İstanbul: Simurg.

Palmer, F.R. 1986. *Mood and Modality.* Cambridge: CUP.

Perkins, M. R. 1983. *Modal expressions in English.* London: Frances Pinter.

Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; Startvik, J. 1972. *A grammar of contemporary English.* Longman: Essex.

Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; Startvik, J. 1985. *A comparative grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Robins, R. H. 1952. Noun and verb in universal grammar. *Language* 28: 289-98.

Ruhi, Ş.; Zeyrek, D.; Osam, N. 1997. Türkçe'de kiplik belirteçleri ve çekim ekleri ilişkisi üzerine bazı gözlemler. *Dilbilim araştırmaları 1997*, 105-111.

Ruhi, Ş.; Zeyrek, D.; Turan, Ü. D. 2000. Koşul tümcelerinde varsayımlılık ve gerçek karşıtlığı. In A. Sumru Özsoy, E. Erguvanlı Taylan (eds.), *XIII Dilbilim kurultayı bildirileri* (19-28). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Schachter, P. 1985. Parts of speech systems. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description: clause structure* vol.1 (3-61). Cambridge: CUP.

Slobin, Dan I.& Aksu-Koç, A. 1982. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In P. J. Hopper. (ed.), *Tense, aspect: between semantics and pragmatics* (185-200). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Steele, S.; Akmajian, A.; Demers, R.; Jelinek, E.; Kitagawa, C.; Oerle, R.; Wasow, T. 1981. *An encyclopedia of AUX: a study in cross-linguistic equivalence.* Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press.

Subaşı Uzun, L. & Erk Emeksiz, Z. 2002. Türkçe'de –Ar biçimbiriminin sözdizimsel ve anlamsal yapısı. Paper presented at XVI. Dilbilim Kurultayı, Hacettepe University.

Sweet, H. 1898. *A new English grammar.* Part II-Syntax. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylan, E. 1997. Türkçe'de görünüş, zaman ve kiplik ilişkisi: -DI biçimbirimi. In Ş. Ruhi & D. Zeyrek (eds.), *XI Dilbilim kurultayı bildirileri.* (1-13). Ankara: ODTU Eğ. Fak. YDE Bölümü.

Taylan, E. E. & Özsoy, S. A. 1994. Türkçe'deki belirtecimsilerin sözdizimsel özellikleri. *VIII. Dilbilim Kurultayı* (99-108). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İletişim Fak.

Tosun, G. A. 1998. The split INFL hypothesis in Turkish. Unpublished MA thesis. Boğaziçi University.

Tura Sansa, S. 1986 -Dır in modern Turkish. In A. Aksu Koç , E. Erguvanlı-Taylan (eds.), *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 2ⁿᵈ international conference on Turkish linguistics* (105-111). İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.

Underhill, R. 1976. *Turkish grammar.* Cambridge, Mass.:MIT.

Vardar, B. 1988 *Açıklamalı dilbilim terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: ABC.

von Wright, E. H. 1951. *An essay in modal logic*. Amsterdam: North Holland

Yavaş, F. 1980. On the meaning of tense and aspect markers in Turkish. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Kansas.

Yavaş, F. 1982. The Turkish aorist. *Glossa 16.*, 40-53.