

The semantics of the auxiliary verb ‘qoy-’ in Modern Spoken Kazakh

Yerkebulan Alibek

Nazarbayev University, School of Sciences and Humanities

WLL 499: Capstone II

Instructor: Pr. Eva-Marie Dubuisson

Academic Advisor: Wulidanayi Jumabay

May 4, 2025

Abstract

In this undergraduate thesis, I investigate the semantics of the auxiliary verb construction *qoy-* in its combination with four grammatical categories – the animacy of the subject, the transformativity of the main verb, the polarity of the verb complex, and the mood – in Modern Spoken Kazakh (MSK). This paper provides a thorough semantic analysis of one out of 28 Kazakh auxiliary verbs to understand the underlying principles of the native intuition in navigating between non-complex and complex (the one incorporating the auxiliary *qoy-*) equivalents. Two main research questions here were “What semantic meanings does the incorporation of the auxiliary verb *qoy-* contribute to the created verb complex in MSK?” and “What linguistic factors need to be present along with the auxiliary verb *qoy-* to express a particular semantic meaning?” In this work, I propose morphosyntactic and semantic frameworks, through which we can understand the similarities and differences between the two counterparts of verb complexes: the *qoy-*-less ones opposed to their equivalents with *qoy-*. Towards achieving this goal, four hours of audio recordings from Multimedia Corpus of Spoken Kazakh Language were analysed to create a database of verb complexes with the auxiliary verb *qoy-* that are different by subject animacy, lexical verb transformativity, polarity, and mood. Then, a comparative analysis was conducted to elicit semantic contributions of *qoy-*, which were systematised into five categories: unexpected completion, deliberate refusal, unnatural non-action, undesirable reiteration, and expected non-completion.

	2
I. Introduction.	2
II. Literature Review.	7
Auxiliary Verbs in World and Turkic Languages	7
Converb	8
The auxiliary verb <i>qoy-</i> in MSK	11
Subject Animacy	12
Transformativity	14
III. Methodology.	17
IV. Results.	19
V. Discussion.	27
VI. Conclusion.	29

I. Introduction.

Worldwide, verbs use various grammatical means of expressing such categories as person, number, gender, and tense as well as such semantically complex meanings as aspect and mood. As an instance, Turkic languages have highly developed a system of verb complexes comprised of a lexical verb marked by a converbial suffix and followed by an auxiliary verb of a restricted class, hence, also termed as *postverbial constructions* by Johanson (2021). In these complexes, converbial suffixes act as a link between the main verb and the auxiliary and are reported to be found in two forms: type <a> (with a vowel ending) and (with a bilabial stop as the coda). As for the auxiliary verbs, they have appeared as a result of grammaticalisation of a limited set of lexical verbs and are the ones marked for tense and agreement. In detail, the use of postverbial constructions in this family of languages is reported to express actionality, which can further specify the manner in which the action has been performed (i.e. rapid completion or suddenness). Overall, Johanson (2021) notes that the postverbial complexes formed via converbs are *a genuinely Turkic feature* (p. 616). These structures survived in Kazakh, a language from the Kipchak branch of the whole family, preserving the same fixed order with the lexical verb preceding the auxiliary with nothing in between to intervene (Györfi, 2022). In his thesis on Kazakh auxiliary verb constructions (AVCs), Györfi (2022) has identified 18 verb lexemes and, considering their combinations with the two converbial suffixes, 28 distinct AVCs in Modern Spoken Kazakh (MSK). In Kazakh, these auxiliaries fully retain their lexical meanings and can function as independent, lexical verbs (with an exception for the auxiliary *jazda-*, which has been fully grammaticalised). Both Györfi (2022) and Muhamedowa (2016), who has written a comprehensive grammar book for Kazakh, state that AVCs in Kazakh express various Tense-Aspect-Mood (TAM) categories and can be grouped into six groups as in Table 1.

Category of AVC	TAM	Auxiliaries	Example
Imperfective	ongoing or habitual actions or states	<i>jat-</i> (“to lie”), <i>otir-</i> (“to sit”), <i>tur-</i> (“to stand”), and <i>jür-</i> (“to walk”)	<i>CVB.B + jat- => the progressive aspect</i>
Perfective	actions or states as completed units	<i>bol-</i> (“to be”), <i>šiq-</i> (“to go out, to come out”), <i>qoy-</i> (“to place, to put”), <i>ket-</i> (“to leave”), <i>jiber-</i> (“to send”), <i>qal-</i> (“to stay”), and <i>jazda-</i> (no equivalent)	<i>CVB.B + bol- => the English present perfect</i>
Interval	specific temporal intervals related to the action	<i>kel-</i> (“to come”), <i>tüs-</i> (“to fall”), and <i>qal-</i> (“to stay”)	<i>CVB.B + kel- => intensification of an action over time</i> <i>CVB.A + qal- => the brevity of an action</i>
Manner	the manner in which an action is performed	<i>sal-</i> (“to put”)	<i>CVB.A + sal- => performed quickly and without effort</i>

Modal	the speaker's attitude or judgment regarding the likelihood or possibility of an action	<i>kör-</i> ("to see"), <i>ber-</i> ("to give"), and <i>al-</i> ("to get, to take")	<i>CVB.B + kör- => attemptive modality</i>
Voice	a beneficiary or an action's impact on the subject	<i>ber-</i> ("to give") and <i>al-</i> ("to get, to take")	<i>CVB.B + ber- => the benefactive voice</i>

Table 1. Categories of AVCs according to *Kazakh: A Comprehensive Grammar* by Muhamedowa, 2016, and *Auxiliary Verb Constructions in Modern Spoken Kazakh* by Györfi, 2022.

Additionally, Györfi (2022) highlights several crucial aspects of AVCs in MSK. First, the choice between the two types of converb is often determined by the auxiliary verb itself and always affects the aspectual interpretation. Second, the resultant semantic meaning of the AVC is not a semantic composition of its constituents (*noncompositionality* described on p. 58). Third, Kazakh AVCs are periphrastic by nature, which means their grammatical function is performed by a combination of multiple words rather than a single inflectional morpheme. Fourth, AVCs can be further enriched by combining with independent TAM suffixes. Fifth, AVCs have experienced diachronic changes, implying that some constructions are more grammaticalised and specialised than others. Hence, it is still hard to ascertain a certain core meaning to each auxiliary; their synonymy is, therefore, inaccurate although they can be found in the same category as in Table 1. There is also a verb-external factor that Muhamedowa (2016) identifies

and that can govern the choice of an AVC in Kazakh. It concerns its subject: whether it is (in)animate and whether it is concrete or abstract (p. 98). She also lists the restrictions in the use of AVCs:

- Verbs that govern subjects of different animacy are incompatible: as the auxiliaries *sal-* (“to put”) appears with an animate subject and the lexical verb *jaw-* (“to rain”) an inanimate, it is erroneous to say **qar jaw-a sal-dī* (“it snowed”).
- Some verbs of feeling cannot combine with auxiliary verbs: the lexical verb *qizyan-* (“to be envious”) cannot occur with the auxiliary *sal-* to say **qizyan-a sal-* (“to be envious”).
- The combination of several auxiliaries is highly restricted, and only the auxiliary *jazda-* (no equivalent) is compatible with many auxiliaries: **mina qayaz-dī laqtir-a sal-a otir-mīn* (“I threw this paper”) (pp. 151-152).

As it has been mentioned earlier by Györfi (2022), the semantic meaning of each the AVCs is unique; therefore, the auxiliaries within the same category in Table 1 are not necessarily synonymous. Hence, it is important to conduct independent studies on each of the auxiliaries to highlight their differences from the other members of the same group. Therefore, the focus of this paper narrows down to perfective AVCs as the largest group of the given six, and, from the list of seven perfective auxiliaries, my interest is on the verb *qoy-*, one of the two most frequently identified auxiliaries along with *qal-* according to Karakoç & Jumabay (2023). This verb holds the lexical meanings of “putting” and “placing,” while Muhamedowa (2016) also notes the presence of such translations as “to put or lead in vertical position,” “to give up,” and “to evaluate” (p. 103). As an auxiliary, the verb is only productive with the converbial suffix of type . In this AVC, Györfi (2022) concludes the following, mutually exclusive meanings: the imitative *flavour* of perfectivity (equivalent to the meaning of the adverb “already”) and

non-intentionality, also called accidentality (pp. 192-200). Muhamedowa (2016) furthers this by adding the meaning of unwillingness in negated AVCs of *qoy-*. Karakoç & Jumabay's (2023) contribution brings the observation that the auxiliary allows both animate and inanimate subjects and mostly combines with transformative verbs (67% of the data) (p. 180). Interestingly, the auxiliary can also occur with the type <a> of the converbial suffix but is not productive in spoken Kazakh anymore, but its past use found in written texts align with the meaning of suddenness (Gyórfi, 2022). Considering the multidirectionality of findings in the given three sources – that each author has focused on a particular category that the other has not – this paper aims to synthesise a research on the cross section of the three mentioned categories (subject animacy, transformativity, and polarity) along with the fourth, unincorporated category (mood) to bridge the gap. Therefore, this paper aims to provide qualitative evidence to answer the next two questions:

- (1) What semantic meanings does the incorporation of the auxiliary verb *qoy-* contribute to the created verb complex in MSK?
- (2) What linguistic factors of the given four – subject animacy, transformativity, polarity, and mood – govern these semantic meanings?

To actualise the research, the data will be collected from the Mutlimedia Corpus of Spoken Kazakh Languages (MultiCorSKL) at Nazarbayev University. The remaining methodology will be explained in Section III while Section II will provide a theoretical framework needed to interpret the results described in Section IV and discussed in Section V.

II. Literature Review.

Auxiliary Verbs in World and Turkic Languages

The use of auxiliary verbs is not a novelty or rarity in world languages as they have been naturally developed across typologically different linguas throughout the millennia of human language history. In short, they can be defined as grammaticalised forms of lexical verbs the meanings of which were abstracted to perform a particular grammatical function to express such categories like tense, aspect, mood, voice, version, orientation, adverbial notions, and negative polarity. According to Anderson's typological overview of AVCs, verbs prone to grammaticalisation usually include the ones whose lexical meaning revolve around such concepts as existence (*to be*), possession (*to have, to take*), movement (*to come, to go*), creation/destruction (*to do, to hit*), desire (*to want*), vision (*to see*), and so on, and their resultant grammatical function is always related to its original lexical meaning. For example, one of the common grammaticalisation patterns is the abstraction of positional or postural verbs like *to stand, to sit, or to lie* into a progressive and/or present tense marker (2011, p. 815). However, this development does not halt with the emergence of an auxiliary given they may grammaticalise further into affixes (Anderson, 2011).

In English, as an example, auxiliaries are considered as a distinct class of words, with such behaviours as negation, inversion, ellipsis, emphasis, clitic forms, adverb position, and non-occurrence after periphrastic *do*. Within the class, they are further divided into a core, with modal verbs *can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, and would*, and a periphery, which consists of the rest such as *be, have, and do*. Auxiliaries are often perceived as the heads (the main words) of verb phrases in English, which accept the person suffix (except for the core) and negation. The biggest difference from full verbs, is in their semantics as they are mostly

subjective, indicating the judgment or will of the speakers. Another difference is in the absence of their non-finite forms (i.e. the *-ing* form) (except for the periphery) (Warner, 2010).

When it comes to Turkic languages, Johanson (2021) adds another function of auxiliary verbs within this language family, which can analytically derive new verb units from nominal/adjectival meanings via verbs of such semantic meanings as *to give*, *to come*, or *to see*. For example, in Middle Kipchak, the ancestral language of the MSK, the syntactic unit *ayır kel-* “to be heavy,” is derived from the adjectival *ayır* “heavy” and the verb *kel-* “to come.” There is also a list of auxiliary verbs that both Johanson (2021) and Anderson (2011) call *light verbs*, which contribute little to nothing to the predicate on their own and are often used in Turkic languages to incorporate loan words, with such representatives like *et-*, *kil-*, and *gün-* meaning “to do” and/or “to make.” For instance, in Kazakh, the verb *to phone* is the incorporation of the Russian *zvonitj* through the fully grammaticalised form of the verb *et-* the suffix *-ta* (*zvanit-ta-*) (Johanson, 2021, p. 581). Next, auxiliary verbs also participate in the formation of AVCs, which add up to the *actional structure* of the predicate, the same way as the auxiliary *ı:δ-* “to send” or “to release” modifies the lexical verb *biti-* to form the postverbal *biti-p ı:δ-* meaning “to write down” (Johanson, 2021, p. 599). Finally and most importantly, auxiliary verbs are found to express terminal meanings of the predicate perspectives with a great example found in Johanson (2021) that involves the postverbal *yaz-a tur-ur*, literally meaning *X stands writing*, as an intraterminal marker meaning *X is writing* and *yaz-ıb tur-ur*, literally meaning *X stands having written*, in the role of a postterminal marker meaning *X has written* (p. 626).

Converb

Nedjaklov (1995, as in Creissels, 2010) defines the term *converb* as a non-autonomous verb form incapable of functioning as a head of an independent clause and incompatible with

complement and relative clauses, distinguished into two types: contextual (with a broad range of functions and no specific adverbial meaning) and specialised (that expresses particular types of adverbial subordination) converbs. Creissels (2010), on the example of Akhvakh, a North-East Caucasian language, however, identifies three types of converbs: general (similar to Nedjaklov's contextual), progressive (used for progressive meanings), and specialised (the same as in Nedjaklov (1995) and fulfils such functions as locative, temporal, conditional, concessive, similitive, gradual, explicative, and purposive) converbs. There are several characteristics of converbs. First, arguments (subjects, objects, and the alike) are expressed in converbal clauses in the same way as in independent clauses. Second, in case of a missing argument in converbal clauses, it can always be pragmatically traced back with the arguments of the verb in independent clauses, speech act participants (speakers and their listeners), or other salient features. Finally, converbal clauses usually come before the main clause, but can follow it as well. Furthermore, Creissels (2010) emphasises the continuity of the converbs' life cycle into more grammaticalised constructions like the Akhvakh purposive converb that has emerged from the frequent use of a converbal form of *to say*.

In order to interact with auxiliaries in the majority of Turkic languages, the lexical verb has to stay as a converb, which Johanson (2021), alike to Nedjaklov (1995, as in Creissels, 2010) and Creissels (2010), define as a non-finite verb forms expressing a spectrum of relational concepts in aspectual, modal, and temporal domains (p. 750). Agreeing with Creissels (2010) characteristics above, in a verb complex with an auxiliary, the converb is syntactically subordinate and functions as a modifier. They are frequently employed in adverbial clauses to establish a relationship between two events or states. Johanson (2010) differentiates between *primary/canonical* and *secondary* converbs. The former is further divided into converbs A and B

based on the phonetic composition of the respectively involved suffixes. The converb A involves a vowel suffix and originally expresses intraterminality (as in *yaz-a tur-ur* in the section above). The allomorphy of the suffix is historically developed due to the last phoneme of the root – whether it is a consonant or vowel. The converb B, in its turn, is marked by suffixes that end in a bilabial stop (hence, the name) and is meant to express postterminality. They perform a plethora of functions from adverbially modifying the subsequent verb to forming complex verb phrases. The negation, however, follows no straightforward one-to-one pattern between affirmative and negative forms, presenting a complex picture with specific usage for each negative marker. On its path towards grammaticalisation, the frequent use of converbs emerged into the appearance of some postpositions and other elements. For example, in Uzbek, the verb *kara-* “to look” along with the converb B suffix *-b* was abstracted into the postposition *karab* equivalent to English “according to,” while the converbs derived from the verbs of speech (*to say*) has become postpositive quotation particles, introducing direct reported speech and thoughts (Johanson, 2021, pp. 754-755).

Another important and relevant phenomenon is a language contact that often features the interplay between the languages of Turkic and Indo-European heritage. As an instance, Turan et al. (2020) features a contact-induced language change in Turkish as a result of German influence among the Turkish minorities in Germany on an example of the use of two converbs: *-Ip* (links consecutive actions) and *-IncA* (conveys causality). According to the authors, the Turkish converbs may have been exposed to German influence, as this dominant language lacks converbs and rather relies on participles to fulfil the same function as its Turkish verb counterparts. It was said that Turkish-German bilinguals use the Turkish converbs less frequently than their monolingual peers, supporting the notion of potential language change, and sometimes

ungrammatically or unconventionally (especially the converb *-Ip*). Another finding concerned the preference of some bilingual participants towards the use of two finite clauses sequentially rather than employing the converbs *-Ip* and *-IncA*, further consolidating the potential of a shift (Turan et al., 2020). Overall, for the case of Kazakh, this might signify the potential presence of Russian influence on the use of converbs.

The auxiliary verb qoy- in MSK

The auxiliary verb *qoy-* originates from a transitive lexical verb that means “to put” and “to place” with Muhamedowa (2016) extending this list to such meanings as “to put or lead in vertical position,” “to give up,” and “to evaluate” (p. 103). She says that the verb is often used to create noun-based compounds by following the noun in nominative case to derive new lexical meanings as in *at qoy-* “to name,” *könjil qoy-* “to pay attention,” *qol qoy-* “to sign,” and *ot qoy-* “to set fire.” When *qoy-* is the auxiliary of a postverbal construction, it primarily comes with the converbial suffix of type (*-ip/-ip/-p qoy-*) to express the general meaning of completion (perfectivity). In detail, the auxiliary can also bring about such nuanced meanings as iamitive perfectivity (the one that roughly corresponds to the English adverb “already”) and non-intention (or accidentality), which are considered mutually exclusive (Muhamedowa, 2016; Györfi, 2022). Although the category of intention logically entails the animacy of the actor, Györfi (2021) and Karakoç & Jumabay (2023) also report the possibility of an inanimate subject, which, as he believes, differentiates the auxiliary from the other six members of the perfective group in Table 1. The effect of polarity is stated in Muhamedowa (2016), who asserts that the AVC expresses the subject's unwillingness to perform the action. As for collocations, the auxiliary *qoy-* seems to co-occur with telic verbs (the verbs that have a certain endpoint in their internal temporal structure) and punctual verbs (the ones finish right after they begin), while atelic verbs and verbs

of feelings are not found in positive AVCs of *qoy-*, but can certainly be negated (Muhamedowa, 2016). When it comes to transformativity, Karakoç & Jumabay (2023) found out that two thirds of their data with the auxiliary *qoy-* involved transformative verbs (which will be explained in the subsection “Transformativity” below). Therefore, the consideration of actionality is crucial for this research. In terms of the transitivity of the lexical verb, the auxiliary *qoy-* seems to show a tendency towards transitive verbs (Györfi, 2022; Karakoç & Jumabay, 2023). Finally, although it has been said that the auxiliary is productive only with the type converbial suffix, its combination with the type <a> is recorded in written language, where, as Györfi (2022) and Muhamedowa (2016) both report, this AVC stands for unexpected actions.

Subject Animacy

Subject animacy, as a grammatical category, can be defined as the fact whether the subject is an alive or sentient being (de Swart & van Bergen, 2019). Across various studies, this category has been highlighted as a vital feature that can directly affect how utterances are processed. This importance is especially highlighted in Dahl & Fraurud (1996), who said that animacy is “so pervasive in the grammars of human languages that it tends to be taken for granted and become invisible” (p. 47 as quoted in de Swart & van Bergen, 2019, p. 630). For example, in such languages like Navajo and Mam-Maya, the degree of animacy identifies which argument must appear first in a sentence, the hierarchy that stretches from the most animate to the least entities with animals and plants in-between. Grammatically, in Mam-Maya, passive voice must be employed if a more animate patient is paired with a less animate agent (Paczynski & Kuperberg, 2011; de Swart & van Bergen, 2019). The animacy hierarchy is also important for the pronoun systems in such languages as Santiago Laxopa Zapotec, where there is a four-way distinction: elder humans, other humans, animals, and inanimates and the object simply has to be

lower in animacy than the subject (Toosarvandani, 2023). However, the language need not grammaticalise these distinctions to exhibit a preference towards a more or less animate argument, as it is observed in Dutch or English, the speakers of which process sentences easier when the subject or the agent is animate (de Swart & van Bergen, 2019; Kiryaki et al., 2021). For instance, according to some processing studies that implemented eye-tracking and event-related potentials, listeners and readers prefer animate subjects and agents. This is termed as *inherent animacy bias*, when the interlocutors already anticipate animate entities, who are simply more salient than inanimates, even before the arguments of an utterance-to-be are confirmed (de Swart & van Bergen, 2019, p. 643). Nelson (2021) also adds that listeners and readers automatically assign a causative role to animate nouns as well. However, one must not exclude the importance of the verb in sentence processing as it imposes certain *selectional restrictions* and argument structures upon the clause. For instance, if the core of the sentence is a lexical verb that usually opts for an inanimate subject, listeners' and readers' expectation of an animate entity to be present decreases. Nevertheless, the animacy bias might still override the effect of the verb (de Swart & van Bergen, 2019). As it might have been observed already from the examples above, there is a strong link between subject animacy and thematic roles as well, which can facilitate sentence processing by inherently signalling what argument performs what role. However, this is not the only force acting upon the dynamics between the arguments of different degrees of animacy. Therefore, both the thematic roles and the positions of arguments in the sentence together affect the sentence processing (Paczynski & Kuperberg, 2023). In terms of specific verb types, the subject animacy is dependent on various types of intransitive verbs. For instance, unaccusative verbs tend to have themes or inanimate subjects while unergative ones prefer agents or animate entities. Otherwise, this might cause an animacy-thematic mismatch, which increases

the costs of sentence processing (Nelson, 2021). Therefore, there might be a difference in interpretations of the auxiliary verb *qoy-* with an animate subject and with an inanimate.

Animacy is also considered a fundamental morphological property in Kazakh nouns that has a binary distinction: animate as opposed to inanimate (Yergesh et al., 2014; Kalman et al., 2023; Bekmanova et al., n.d.).

Transformativity

Bertinetto & Delfitto (2000) provide a description of actionality and aspect in their chapter on ‘Why they should be kept apart.’ According to them, actionality refers to inherent temporal properties of a verb or verb phrase, which encompasses such features like durativity (whether an action is ongoing or instantaneous: *to run* vs *to arrive*), telicity (whether an action is directed towards a specific goal or endpoint: *to build a house* vs *to walk*), and dynamicity (whether an action involves change or remains static: *to jump* vs *to exist*); meanwhile, aspect is *the specific perspective adopted by the speaker/writer* concerning the event, which can be perfective/terminative (the event as a whole) or imperfective/nonterminative (the internal structure of an event) (p. 190). These two are emphasised as distinct categories regardless of their frequent interplay because the former is primarily lexical (the inherent meaning of verbs) and the latter is primarily grammatical (conveyed via inflection and other constructions). To support this, Bertinetto & Delfitto (2000) analyse temporal adverbials, which present different *sensitivities* to actionality and aspect. For example, adverbials like *for X time* are atelic but perfective/terminative, while the ones meaning *gradually* are telic but indifferent to aspect (pp. 199-203 and p. 205), which shows that actional and aspectual values exist independently. Nevertheless, these categories can interact, and their relationship manifests differently across languages. For instance, in Romance languages, actionality is typically grammatically unmarked,

while aspect is expressed morphologically, and, in Slavic languages, like Russian, actionality is grammaticalised through the bounded-unbounded distinction often replacing explicit aspectual marking, while both are maintained in others like Bulgarian (Bertinetto & Delfitto, 2000, pp. 209-211).

Five years later after this paper, Johanson (2004) wrote more on transformativity, as the fourth category of actionality, in Turkic languages, where the term now basically refers to the presence/absence of a *natural evolutionary turning point* in the lexical meaning encoded in the verb. For instance, the lexical codes of the verbs *to die* and *to hide* implies the change of the state (alive > dead AND visible > hidden), while the verb *to walk* does not have such a notion of change (one can walk and suddenly stop and walk again, which means there is no *limit* of change). This is naturally one of the core semantic components of any verb that sets verbs that imply a change of state or location apart from those that simply imply a state or activity without a change. In other words, transformativity can also be interpreted as an aspectual or actional class of accomplishments (with a culminating result as having *built, destroyed, or dried* something) and achievements (with a punctual transition as in *dying* and *finding* something). In order to understand a transformative verb, one needs to break down its internal structure into simple components like *before* and *after*, which is designed into the approach named *event structure templates*. Because of their resemblance, transformativity is also often linked to telicity; however, there are transformative verbs than can be interpreted as atelic based on the discourse around it. As for the external structure of a transformative verb, its transformativity can determine the position and thematic role of its arguments, which echoes back to the discussion about subject animacy as well. Interestingly, transformativity can be achieved via a composition of verbs rather than inherently (Abusch, 1986; Pustejovsky, 1991; Hovav & Levin, 1998; Hay &

Kennedy, 2001; Hovav & Levin, 2002; Wright, 2002; Hovav, 2005; Kearns, 2007; Levin, 2009a; Levin 2009b; Levin & Havoc, 2011; Koontz-Garboden & Beavers, 2017; Levin, n.d.; McNally, 2024). For example, in Kazakh, a verb can be derived from an adjective via the suffixation of *-(A)r*, which creates a verb of change into the state denoted by the original adjectives, as in *bozar-* “to turn pale” and *qisqar-* “to become short,” which derive from the adjectives *boz* “light grey” and *qisqa* “short” respectively. Another way is via the causatives suffixes (*-Giz*, *-Dir*, and *-set*) (Muhamedowa, 2016). There are also analytical predicates – such AVCs as any member of the perfective group (as in Table 1) – which can express transformativity by typically involving a gerund and an auxiliary (Kakzhanova, 2019; Kakzhanova, 2023). It is reported that, historically, converbial suffixes used to perform aspectual differences like t-boundedness (as in transformative events) through the type and t-unboundedness (as in non-transformative events) through the type <a>. However, in MSK, this has faded leaving only idiosyncratic interpretations and changing transformativity into the property of the entire AVC (Györfi, 2022). Györfi (2022) also asserts that the inherent transformativity of the lexical verb in the complex inevitably interacts with the aspectual interpretation of the whole AVC.

III. Methodology.

In order to find to capture utterances that include *qoy-* AVCs and different subject animacies, verb transformativities, clause polarities, and moods, I conducted a corpus study of the MultiCorSKL, that captures the everyday life speech of the speakers of the MSK, the actual spoken variety of the language. The overall data is in the form of audio recordings of naturally occurring conversations between two or among more people on a variety of topics and in different contexts. The total size of the included data is comprised of nine recordings with the overall length of four hours, and 50 tokens of the *koy-* AVCs were identified.

The tokens are further explored in terms of the subject animacy (animate or inanimate), transformativity of the lexical verb (transformative or non-transformative), sentence polarity (positive or negative), and mood (realis or irrealis). The principal approach to the analysis entails the contrastive comparison method, juxtaposing the equivalents of the same token that differ only in one of the four categories. Before that, it is important to contrast the AVC to its non-auxiliary pair to extract the semantic meaning contributed by the auxiliary verb *qoy-*.

Therefore, the procedure follows the next steps:

- contrast the auxiliary construction to its non-auxiliary pair and note the semantic meaning that adds up with the addition of the auxiliary *qoy-*;
- contrast the subject's animacy to its counterpart to note any difference in the semantic meaning in order to test whether the subject's animacy contribute to the semantic meaning;
- contrast the transformativity of the main verb to its counterpart to note any difference in the semantic meaning in order to test whether the transformativity contribute to the semantic meaning;
- contrast the polarity of the verb complex to its counterpart to note any difference in the semantic meaning in order to test whether the polarity contribute to the semantic meaning;
- contrast the mood of the verb construction to its realis-irrealis counterpart to note any difference in the semantic meaning in order to test whether the mood contribute to the semantic meaning;
- categorise all differences into a group of recurring semantic meanings to extract the contribution of the auxiliary verb *qoy-* to verb complexes;

- and assign the unchanged categories among the main four across all examples within the same semantic group to elicit the syntactic requirements of the *qoy-* AVC to express a certain semantic meanings.

There are certain limitations to this approach as the size of 50 tokens for a database might not capture all uses of the auxiliary verb *qoy-* or might lead to wrongful assumptions about the frequency of certain structures. Moreover, lack of visual content might lead to the lack of information for correct interpretation of certain utterances. Finally, the bias of native intuition, as I am a native speaker of Kazakh, might accidentally end up in the exclusion of certain observations due to habitual imperception.

IV. Results.

During the data collection, it was identified that negation as a marker can be expressed either on the lexical verb or the auxiliary verb; therefore, the category of polarity has been further broken down into two, leading to the expansion of cases at hand from 16 to 24. For the brevity of the overview of the results, only the half with animate subjects was illustrated.

1. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Positive Polarity (+), and Realis (R) – AT+R

Бала-лар алма-ны же-п қой-ды-{∅}.

Bala-lar alma-nĩ je-p qoy-dĩ-{∅}.

child-PL apple-ACC eat-CONV.B AUX:put-PST-3

“The children have eaten the apples.”

This is equivalent to *balalar almanĩ jedi* “the children have eaten the apples,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ the children have completely eaten all the apples

+ it had not been children’s intention to eat all the apples, so it might have been unexpected to them as it is to me

+ the action is final and cannot be reversed

2. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Positive Polarity (+), and Irrealis (I) –

AT+I

Ата-м	жылқы-ның ет-і-н	же-п
Ata-m	jilqı-nıñ et-i-n	je-p
grandfather-POSS.1SG	horse-GEN meat-PX.3-ACC	eat-CV.B

қой-ар **е-ді-{ø}.**

qoy-ar **e-di-{ø}.**

AUX:put-AOR COP-PST-3

“*My grandfather would have eaten the horse meat.*”

This is equivalent to *atam jilqiniñ etin jer* “my grandfather would have eaten the horse meat,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ my grandfather would finish all the meat completely

+ maybe, he would unintentionally eat it completely, without leaving any for others

+ there is now an implication of an effect/finality/consequence

3. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Negative Lexical Verb (-L)), and Realis

(R) – AT-(L)R

Балақай **қияр-ды** **же-ме-й** **қой-ды-{ø}.**

Balaqay **qıyar-dı** **je-me-y** **qoy-dı-{ø}.**

kiddo cucumber-ACC eat-NEG-CV.A AUX:put-PST-3

“*The kiddo hasn’t eaten the cucumber.*”

This is equivalent to *balaqay qiyardi jemedi* “the kiddo hasn’t eaten the cucumber,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + the child has deliberately refused even to take a bite
- + I have tried my best to force the child to eat the cucumber

4. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Negative Auxiliary Verb (- (A)), and

Realis (R) – AT-(A)R

Балақай	қияр-ды	же-п	қой-ма-ды-{\emptyset}.
Balaqay	qiyar-di	je-p	qoy-ma-di-{\emptyset}.
kiddo	cucumber-ACC	eat-CV.B	AUX:put-NEG-PST-3

“*The kiddo hasn’t finished eating the cucumber.*”

This is equivalent to *balaqay qiyardi jedi* “the kiddo ate the cucumber,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + the child has begun but not finished eating
- + the child might have also kept taking bites off the cucumber over and over again with some intervals in between but never finished the whole cucumber
- + this is an undesirable reiteration of the action (I found it annoying how child kept taking bites)

5. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Negative Lexical Verb (- (L)), and Irrealis

(I) – AT-(L)I

Дос-тар-ым	балмүздақ	же-ме-й	қой-ар-{\emptyset}.
Dos-tar-ım	balmuzdaq	je-me-y	qoy-ar-{\emptyset}.
friend-PL-PX.1SG	ice.cream	eat-NEG-CV.A	AUX:put-AOR-3

“*My friends wouldn’t eat ice-cream.*”

This is equivalent to *dostarim balmuzdaq jemes* “my friends wouldn’t eat ice-cream,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ the auxiliary emphasises that this is not only a non-action, but a deliberate refusal to do the action

6. Animate Subject (A), Transformative Verb (T), Negative Auxiliary Verb (-(A)), and Irrealis (I) – AT-(A)I

Дос-тар-ым	балмүздак	же-п	қой-ма-с-{\emptyset} .
Dos-tar-ïm	balmuzdaq	je-p	qoy-ma-s-{\emptyset} .
friend-PL-PX.1SG	ice.cream	eat-CV.B	AUX:put-NEG-AOR-3

“*My friends wouldn’t finish ice-cream.*”

This is equivalent to *dostarim balmuzdaq jemes* “my friends wouldn’t eat ice-cream,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ I know/expect my friends would never finish all the ice-cream (at least, that is what I want to believe)

+ they still might end up eating some

7. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (N), Positive Polarity (+), and Realis (R) – AN+R

Бала-лар	орын-дар-ы-нан	түр-ып	қой-ды-{\emptyset} .
Bala-lar	orïn-dar-ï-nan	tur-ïp	qoy-dï-{\emptyset} .
child-PL	seat-PL-PX.3-ABL	stand-CV.B	AUX:put-PST-3

“*The children have stood up from their seats.*”

This is equivalent to *balalar orındarınan turdı* “the children have stood up from their seats,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + the children have fully got up from their seats
- + I have not expected children to get up this soon/quickly
- + the children have not got up for no reason, but most likely with a sense of resolution

8. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (T), Positive Polarity (+), and Irrealis (I)

– AN+I

Ата-м	төсег-і-нен	тұр-ып	қой-ар	е-ді-{Ø}.
Ata-m	tösege-i-nen	tur-ıp	qoy-ar	e-di-{Ø}.
grandfather-PX.1SG	bed-PX.3-ABL	stand-CV.B	AUX:put-AOR	COP-PST-3

“*My grandfather would have stood up from his bed.*”

This is equivalent to *atam töseginen turar edi* “my grandfather would have stood up from his beds,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + my grandfather would get up and remain up for some time
- + emphasises the completion/finality of the action rather than the process
- + he got up with a sense of resolution

9. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (N), Negative Lexical Verb (-L), and

Realis (R) – AN-(L)R

Балақай	орн-ы-нан	тұр-ма-й	қой-ды-{Ø}.
Balaqay	orn-ı-nan	tur-ma-y	qoy-dı-{Ø}.
kiddo	seat-PX.3-ABL	stand-NEG-CV.A	AUX:put-PST-3

“*The kiddo hasn’t stood up from his seat.*”

This is equivalent to *balaqay orninan turmadi* “the children have not stood up from their seats,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + the child intentionally refused to stand up
- + his refusal was final
- + the child had been given a chance to stand up or expected to do so

10. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (N), Negative Auxiliary Verb (-(A)), and
Realis (I) – AN-(A)R

Балақай	орн-ы-нан	тұр-ып	қой-ма-ды-{Ø}.
Balaqay	orn-ï-nan	tur-ïp	qoy-ma-dï-{Ø}.
kiddo	seat-PX-3-ABL	stand-CV.B	AUX:put-NEG-PST-3

“*The kiddo kept standing up from his seat.*”

This is equivalent to *balaqay orninan turdi* “the children have stood up from their seats,” but with the next semantic implications:

- + the child kept standing
- + this was an unfavourable action

11. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (N), Negative Lexical Verb (-(L)), and
Irrealis (I) – AN-(L)I

Дос-тар-ым	диван-нан	тұр-ма-й	қой-ар-{Ø}.
Dos-tar-ïm	divan-nan	tur-ma-y	qoy-ar-{Ø}.
friend-PL-PX.1SG	sofa-ABL	stand-NEG-CV.B	AUX:put-AOR-3

“*My friends wouldn’t stand up from the sofa.*”

This is equivalent to *dostarim divannan turmas* “my friends wouldn’t stand up from the sofa,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ my friends would intentionally or decisively refuse to stand up

12. Animate Subject (A), Non-transformative Verb (N), Negative Auxiliary Verb (-(A)), and

Irrealis (I) – AN-(A)I

Дос-тар-ым **диван-нан** **тұр-ып** **кой-ма-с-{\emptyset}**.

Dos-tar-ïm **divan-nan** **tur-ïp** **qoy-mas-s-{\emptyset}**.

friend-PL-PX.1SG sofa-ABL stand-CV.B AUX:put-NEG-AOR-3

“*My friends are rather not stand up from the sofa.*”

This is equivalent to *dostarïm divannan turmas* “my friends wouldn’t stand up from the sofa,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ I don’t expect my friends stand up from the sofa

All 24 cases can be grouped into five semantic categories:

1. unexpected completion (AT+R, AT+I, AN+R, AN+I, IT+R, IT+I, IN+R, IN+I), where inanimate subject as in

Қант су-да **ері-п** **кой-ды-{\emptyset}**.

Qant suw-da **eri-p** **qoy-dï-{\emptyset}**.

sugar water-LOC melt-CV.B AUX:put-PST-3

“*The sugar has molten in the water.*”

This is equivalent to *qant suwda eridi* “the sugar has molten in the water,” but with the next semantic implications:

+ the sugar has completely molten

+ I have not expected sugar to melt this soon/quickly

+ the action is done at last; hence is irreversible

2. deliberate refusal (AT-(L)R, AT-(L)I, AN-(L)R, AN-(L)I)
3. unnatural non-action (IT-(L)R, IT-(L)I, IN-(L)R, IN-(L)I) as in

Ағаш қура-ма-й қой-ды-{ø}.

Ағаш қура-ма-у қой-дi-{ø}.

Tree wither-NEG-CV.A AUX:put-PST-3

“*The tree hasn't withered.*”

This is equivalent to *ағаш қурамadi* “the tree hasn't withered” but with the next semantic implications:

+ I had expected based on the nature of this tree (or trees in general) that it had to wither soon

+ The tree has stayed green against my expectation

4. undesirable reiteration (AT-(A)R, AN-(A)R, IT-(A)R, IN-(A)R)
5. expected non-completion (AT-(A)I, AN-(A)I, IT-(A)I, IN-(A)I)

All these semantic meanings can be mapped out in the following scheme:

AT+R	AN+R	IT+R	IN+R
AT+I	AN+I	IT+I	IN+I
AT-(L)R	AN-(L)R	IT-(L)R	IN-(L)R
AT-(A)R	AN-(A)R	IT-(A)R	IN-(A)R
AT-(L)I	AN-(L)I	IT-(L)I	IN-(L)I
AT-(A)I	AN-(A)I	IT-(A)I	IN-(A)I

Image 1. The schematic mapping of all 24 combinations by their semantic meaning, where green stands for unexpected completion, red for deliberate refusal, white for unnatural non-action, yellow for undesirable reiteration, and purple for expected non-completion.

V. Discussion.

Animacy:

It has been confirmed that the AVCs with *qoy-* can incorporate both animate and inanimate subjects in their interpretations in positive polarity, which aligns perfectly with the semantic reading of unexpected completion. Here, the unexpectedness seems to imply the feeling of the speaker, who is not necessarily the one performing the action. Therefore, the subject animacy naturally does not affect the semantic meaning here. However, animacy does play a crucial role in interpretations of negative clauses, where the further distinction is drawn based on the position of the negative suffix, which can be marked either on the lexical or auxiliary verbs. As the interpretations with negatively marked lexical verb depend are described in a relation to the subject, the animacy defines whether the action has not been done by choice (of the animate subject) or simply unnaturally (against the nature of the inanimate subject). Therefore, I conclude that subject animacy is not a crucial category in defining semantic meanings of the auxiliary verb *qoy-*.

Transformativity:

Transformativity has drawn a subtle difference in the interpretations of the AVCs with the overall semantic meanings of unexpected completion, where one of the contributions (+) highlighted in the analysis was the reversibility of the whole action. Therefore, the conclusion is that transformativity does not play any role in the semantics of the auxiliary *qoy-*.

Polarity:

Polarity seems to be the baseline division of all 24 cases into two equal halves: the upper one in Image 1, where we find all interpretations of unexpected completion, and the more diverse lower half, where the rest of categories are located. It can be noted that polarity, especially the negative one, is a highly interactive category as its semantic meanings depend on the surrounding categories. I reckon that this is due to the fact that this is the broadest category among the four considered as it can be broken down into two subcategories: negated lexical and negated auxiliary verbs. Both of these subtypes were also a dividing line between animate versus inanimate and realis versus irrealis oppositions, which would not have been possible if not for the negative polarity. This is most possibly due to the fact that polarity dictates whether the action is to happen at all, from the point of which further interpretations are possible.

Mood:

Mood is a category that could be further divided into various types of suffixes as irrealis in itself already groups together conditional, subjunctive, or optative. However, surprisingly, it seems to bring a difference only in its negative interpretations where realis comes with the connotation of irritation and irrealis appears with the optative flavour of it. However, I doubt that this can be purely attributed to the contribution of the auxiliary *qoy-* and not to the inherent properties of mood as an independent category. Therefore, further research needs to be conducted on other auxiliaries to confirm the link between mood and *qoy-*.

VI. Conclusion.

The auxiliary verb *qoy-* was analysed in terms of 16 combinations at the cross section of four categories: subject animacy, verb transformativity, complex polarity, and mood. This has been further expanded to 24 cases due to the broadness of negative polarity, which can be marked both on lexical and auxiliary verbs. Overall, these were grouped into five semantic

categories, which appear distinct from each other and come rather as a result of the interaction between the considered four categories. It was concluded that, regardless of the subject animacy and mood, any AVC in positive polarity must be interpreted as unexpectedly complete, where verb transformativity only defines whether it is also reversible. Next, when the lexical verb is negated, animate subject brings about the concept of choice resulting in the semantic meaning of deliberate refusal, by which it was the subject's choice not to perform the action. In the same environment, the inanimate subject only gives an impression of unnatural non-action, which has happened against the speaker's expectations that are based on the very nature of the inanimate subject. However, when the auxiliary verb is negated, the further division is drawn upon the mood: realis expresses an undesirable reiteration, when the speaker is irritated by the subject's repetition of the action, and irrealis equals expected non-completion.

As the main limitation of the research is, first, in its database size, the future research will incorporate expanding the amount of tokens to a considerable extent (i.e. 500 tokens). This would be done to capture the least frequent uses of the AVCs with *qoy-*. Next, another restriction was in the absence of cross-comparison between other auxiliary verbs within the perfective group due to the time limitations as this research was designed to be conducted only for one year; hence, another potential expansion lies in incorporating more auxiliary verbs to resolve some ambiguities. For example, as it has been mentioned earlier, whether the semantic contributions of mood, especially that of irrealis, come from the interaction with the auxiliary verb *qoy-* or from its inherent, independent properties.

Bibliography

- Abusch, D. (1986). Verbs of Change, Causation, and Time. *Center for the Study of Language and Information*.
- Anderson, G. D. S. (2011). Auxiliary verb constructions (and other complex predicate types): A functional-constructional overview. *Language and Linguistic Compass*, 5(11), 795-828.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818x.2011.00311.x>
- Bernidetto, P. M., & Delfitto, D. (2000). In Ö. Dahl (Ed.) *Tense and Aspect in the Language of Europe* (pp. 189-225). Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197099>
- Creissels, D. (2010). Specialized converbs and adverbial subordination in Axaxdərə Akhvakh. In I. Brill (Ed.) *Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy: Syntax and Pragmatics* (pp. 105-140). John Benjamin Pub. Company.
- Christopher, N. (2021). Differential object marking in Kazakh: the Dynamic Syntax approach. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 30–30, 305–329.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10849-021-09332-z>
- De Swart, P., & Van Bergen, G. (2019). How Animacy and Verbal Information Influence V2 Sentence Processing: Evidence from Eye Movements. *Open Linguistics*, 5(1), 630–649.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2019-0035>
- De Wit, A., D., Brisard, F., & University of Antwerp. (2020). Aspect beyond time: Introduction. In *J. Linguistics* (Vol. 56, pp. 459–477). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222672000016X>
- Demirci, K. (2023). *Descriptive Verbs in Kazakh*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/305282395?pq-origsite=primo&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>

- Györfi, D. (2022). *Auxiliary Verb Constructions in Modern Spoken Kazakh* [Doctoral Dissertation, University of Surrey. ResearchGate:
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361774850>
- Hay, J., Kennedy, C., Levin, B., & Northwestern University. (2001). Scalar structure underlies telicity in “Degree Achievements.” *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 1–27.
<https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v0i0.2833>
- Hovav, M.R., & Levin, B. (1998). Building Verb Meanings. *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*.
- Hovav, M. R., & Levin, B. (2005). Change-of-State Verbs: Implications for Theories of Argument Projection. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 274–286).
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.003.0013>
- Hovav, M. R., & Levin, B. (2002). Change of State Verbs: Implications for theories of Argument projection. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 28(1), 269. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v28i1.3842>
- Johanson, L. (1999). Typological notes on aspect and actionality in Kipchak Turkic. In W. Abraham and L. Kulikov (Eds.), *Tense-Aspect, Transitivity, and Causativity* (pp. 171-184). Mainz.
- Johanson, L. (2004). On Turkic transformativizers and nontransformativizers. *Turkic Languages*, 8, 180-190.
- Johanson, L. (2021). *Turkic*. Cambridge.
- Jumabay, U., & Karakoç, B. (2023). Negation in Kazakh postverbal constructions. *Turkic Languages* 28, 186–216.

- Jumabay, U. (2024). Negation in clause combining in Kazakh. *ORIENTALIA SUECANA*, 73, 164–192. <https://doi.org/10.33063/os.v73.572>
- Kakzhanova, F. A. (2019). THE KAZAKH LANGUAGE HAS THE ASPECT CATEGORY IN ITS MATRIX. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies Semiotics and Semantics*, 10(2), 513–521. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2019-10-2-513-521>
- Kakzhanova, F. A. & Karaganda Buketov University. (2023). Syncretic Kazakh Language. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 15–21. <https://doi.org/10.12691/jll-6-1-3>
- Kalman, G., Zhumabay, Y., Nurgalieva, E., Kuanysheva, A., & Esmaganbet, M. (2023). ALGORITHM FOR SOLVING PRONOMINAL ANAPHORA IN THE KAZAKH LANGUAGE. In *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Information Technology*. Little Lion Scientific.
- Karakoç, B. & Jumabay, U. (2023). On the semantics of transformativizing post verbal constructions in Kazakh. *Turkic Languages*, 27, 162–185.
- Kearns, K. & Department of Linguistics, University of Canterbury. (2005). Telic senses of deadjectival verbs. In *Lingua* (Vol. 117, pp. 26–66) [Journal-article]. Elsevier B.V. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2005.09.002>
- Kyriaki, L., Schlesewsky, M., & Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I. (2021). Thematic role assignment in non-default verb classes: A cross-linguistic comparison of English and German. *Glossa a Journal of General Linguistics*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.5728>
- Levin, B. (2009). *Lexical Semantics of Verbs IV: Aspectual Approaches to Lexical Semantic Representation*.
- Levin, B. (n.d.). *Where do verb classes come from?*

- Levin, B. & Stanford University. (n.d.). Further explorations of the landscape of causation: Comments on Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou. *Stanford University*.
- Levin, B., & Hovav, M.R. (2011). *Conceptual Categories and Linguistic Categories IV: Part 2: The Causative Alternation: A First look*.
- Meral, H. M. (2012). *Kazakh complex verb structures: a Distributed Morphology analysis* [Journal-article]. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348677367>
- Muhamedowa, R. (2016). *Kazakh: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.
- Nelson, P. (2021). Animacy and intransitivity in sentence processing. In *Theses and Dissertations* [Thesis]. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6511>
- Pustejovsky, J. (1991). The syntax of event structure. In *Cognition*. Elsevier.
- Rentzsch, J. (2006). Actionality operators in Uyghur. *Turkic Languages* 10, 193-219.
- Schamiloglu, U. & Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia, University of Wisconsin-Madison. (1996). The problem of auxiliary verbs in the Turkic languages. In *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi* (pp. 153–168). Turk Dil Kurumu.
- Tatevosov, S. (2024). Event Structure and Non-Culminating Readings in Turkic. *Languages*, 9, 371. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9120371>
- Toosarvandani, M. (2023). THE INTERPRETATION AND GRAMMATICAL REPRESENTATION OF ANIMACY. In *University of California, Santa Cruz*.
- Turan, D., Antonova-Ünlü, E., Sağın-Şimşek, Ç., and Akkuş, M. (2020). Looking for contact-induced language change: Converbs in heritage Turkish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 24(5-6), 1035-1048.
<https://doi-org.ezproxy.nu.edu.kz/10.1177/1367006920926263>

- Warner, A. R. (1993). Basic properties of English auxiliaries. In *English Auxiliaries: Structure and History* (pp. 1–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Webster, J. J. (2009). Key terms in the SFL model. In *The Essential Halliday* (pp. 1–36). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316337936.005>
- Wright, S. K. (2002). Transitivity and change of state verbs. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 28(1), 339. <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v28i1.3849>