On mood in Cypriot Turkish, Greek induced and non-turkic?

The present contribution focuses on the grammatical form in Cypriot Turkish [hereafter as CT], which composes of the Voluntary markers -(y)AyIn/-AyIm for the first person singular or -sIn for the third person singular and of the copula -idi [hereafter referred to as <Vol+-(i)di>]. It is very vital and actively used in CT to express different modal semantics such as (irreal) wish, intention, necessity etc., for instance:

(1) ister gid-eyimdi / git-sindi
  want-s(h)e  go-Vol1SG-idi  go-Vol3SG-idi
  ‘s(h)e wants (that) I (would/should) go’ / s(h)e wants (that) s(h)e (would/should) go’

(2) al-ayîm-dî  o zaman?
  take-Vol1SG-idi  then
  ‘should I take (it) then?’

Previous scholars such as Abdurrazak (2012), Demir (2002a, 2002b, 2007a, 2007b), Demir&Johanson (2006), Gülle (2011), Kappler&Tsiplakou (2015), Kappler (2008) have already analysed and compared syntactical properties of the <Vol+-i(di)> constructions in CT with analogies in Standard Turkish [ST] or in Turkish varieties in Turkey and beyond as well as in Cypriot Greek [CG], for instance:

CT (1) ister gideyimdi/gitsindi

ST (1) git-mem-i / git-me-sini istiyor
  go-VNPOSS-ACC  go-VN-POSS3SG  wants s(h)e
  ‘s(h)e wants (that) I (would/should) go home’ / s(h)e wants (that) s(h)e (would/should) go’

While the CT speaker uses <Vol+-i(di)> to express possibility, wish etc., the ST speaker achieves the same purposes by other distinctive grammatical means, such as nominalised verbs [above abbreviated as VN]. This kind of morphological differences in expressing modality between CT and ST have arguably led previous scholars to consider that the morphologic paradigm <Vol+-i(di)> in CT might to be a contact-induced phenomenon, resulting from language contacts between Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish, since this morphological mean in CT is alien not only to the Standard Turkish in particular, but also to the Turkic verbal system in common. The non-turkic origin of <Vol+-i(di)> remains thus, a generally accepted view in the research praxis on Cypriot Turkish syntax features. However, this assumption needs a scrutiny. I would like to demonstrate results of my research, in which I investigated the origin of the paradigm in discussion, expanding the frames of languages and compared mood and modality specifics in Cypriot Turkish with those equivalents in different other relative Turkic languages [cf. Sakhatova 2019, 2018, 2016]. I will further, portray the form <Vol+-i(di)> with references to the Common Turkic, discussing examples from Old and Middle Turkic texts together with numerous examples from the own CT language bank that
date back to both the city-koine [Turkish variety in Nicosia] and village vernaculars. Furthermore, for equivalent semantics in Cypriot Turkish, which have moreover, different possible readings and interpretations, there are remarkable similar morphological markers found in Turkic languages such as in (colloquial) Turkish as well as Turkmen in Turkmenistan or Turkic in Iran. Further, the issue about the origin of the marker -(i)di in <Vol+-(i)di> remains a controversial one. I will end my presentation with findings and discussion, after having shortly introduced some representative viewpoints and hypotheses on -(i)di in <Vol+-(i)di> also in the context of the issue category interactions <voluntary mood + tense copula (?) or nominal split(?)> [cf. Kononov 1980; Starostov 1971].
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1 The own CT language data bank is collected during my residences in 2014 and 2016 in Cyprus. Informants with CT were at the age of 50 and 70 residing in Nicosia, Pila, Lepta, Potamia/Dereliköy, and Karpaz.