



## A Typological Study of Case in Two Dialects of Turkish Language in Iran (Azeri and Khalaji)

Tara Mokhtari<sup>1</sup>, Seyed Mehdi Samaee\*<sup>2</sup>, Bahram Modaresi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Linguistics, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

<sup>2</sup>Iranian Research Institute for Information Science and Technology (IranDoc), Tehran, Iran.

<sup>3</sup>Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail: samai@irandoc.ac.ir

E-mail: Bah.modarresi@iauctb.ac.ir

\*Corresponding Author's Email: tara.mokhtari@gmail.com

Received: 24-01-2023, Accepted: 07-03-2023

### ABSTRACT

*The present study is specific to the typology of the category of case in two dialects of the Turkish language; Azeri and Khalaji Turkish. Case Marking is one of the practical methods in order to show the syntactic relationship between sentence elements so that it shows the syntactic relationship between the noun phrase and the verb. The main theoretical approach of the present research is Bernard Comrie's (1989) Case marking system, which introduced five language categories. The present study also deals with the Case Theory, which is the approach of Chomsky (1981) and is considered among the sub-theories of the Government and binding theory. The selected data of the research is from literary and fictional texts and the collected sentences are extracted from these texts. According to the collected data, there are six types of Case Marking in the Turkish language and its dialects, which are: nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, ablative, and locative Cases. In the present study, the effect of some factors such as transitivity, animacy, Gender, and Definiteness, on case marking has also been investigated. Since these two dialects are two branches of the Turkish language, they have similarities and differences, which are analyzed typologically here in this article.*

**KEYWORDS:** Agreement; Animacy; Case Marking; Definiteness; Gender; Inflection; Turkish Languages

### INTRODUCTION

Besides the Persian language, there are many languages and dialects spoken in Iran and Turkish is one of them. This language ( Turkish) also has different dialects whose speakers are scattered in Iran and other parts of the world. The Turkish language is one of the branches of Altaic languages and it consists of different dialects. All dialects of that have different and sometimes similar characteristics and via a typologic analysis, it is possible to study the structural characteristics of these dialects. In typological research, the patterns governing these linguistic differences are also described and explained. Also following the search to find a basis in the classification of languages, linguistic commonalities are revealed.

Linguistics is the scientific study of language. Morphology studies how words are formed and varied. It is merely studied in two levels inflection and word formation. At the level of inflection, the syntactic role of the word is addressed and at the level of word formation, the word construction is studied free from its syntactic role (Liber, 2009; Shopen, 2007). Inflection is the change in the grammatical shape of a word in a way that takes over the syntactic role



of a specific sentence. By using inflection, the lexical features of a lexical morpheme can be shown morphologically, which leads to the creation of different forms of that morpheme, and each of them is called a grammatical unit (Booij, 2005). The inflection covers different grammatical concepts such as number, person, gender, case, grammatical tense and aspect, voice, and mood (Liber, 2009; Von Schaaik, 2020). Between these grammatical concepts, This research discusses the typology of the case system (an inflectional category) in two dialects of the Turkish language: Azeri and Khalaji. In the present study, among the approaches of different linguists, two approaches were selected. First Comrie's (1989) approach and second Chomsky's (1981) approach in the Case theory.

One of the main purposes of the present research is to typologically investigate the case marking in some dialects of the Turkish language, which has been discussed in linguistic theories; the second purpose is to discover the linguistic differences and similarities of the Turkish language dialects that most spoken of that live in Iran; The third purpose was to research the characteristics of the connection between the Turkish language and the Persian language, which has a distinct structure from the Persian language and the diversity of its dialects in Iran and the world is very large; And finally, one of the other goals of this article is to compile detailed research preparations about each of these dialects to compile a dialect atlas of this language.

There has been a lot of research in Iran in the field of Azeri Turkish grammar and its categories of case marking, but there has not been much linguistic research in Iran regarding Khalaji Turkish which is one of the endangered languages. In the present study, the typologic analysis of the khalaji Turkish case marking as a part of Turkish grammar and its comparison with Azeri Turkish is discussed. These two selected dialects are from two independent language branches whose similarities and differences are noteworthy and this process requires more research.

Finally, in this research, in addition to some details, we can find the answer to these main questions:

1. Which parts of the speech give case to the noun phrases?
2. Which types of case marking occur in these dialects of the Turkish language?
3. What kind of case marking occurs in Turkish dialects According to Comrie's theory, which type of case system occurs in Azeri and Khalaji Turkish?
4. Does the transitivity factor affect case marking?
5. Does the animacy factor affect case marking?
6. Does the t gender factor have an effect on case marking?
7. Does the definiteness factor affect case marking?
8. What are the differences in the case marking of these language dialects?
9. What are the similarities in the case-marking?

### **REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE**

There are several approaches to case marking that achieved by Iranian researchers:

1. typological research about the case: According to the typological theories and approaches, there is much research in this field of study and one of them is extensive studies of Comeri. He was the chief editor of a collection whose perspective was typological. The books of this collection have been compiled to provide unique and systematic data for theoretical linguistics researchers. In this collection, descriptive and taxonomic grammar has been compiled in English for several languages, which have a uniform structure. The Persian grammar book of the collection was written



by Mahoutian (1996) and translated by Samai (1999). For this purpose, several sixty languages have been studied so far. It should be mentioned that Jaklin Kornfilt (1997) compiled the Turkish book of this collection.

2. Typological research about the Azeri Turkish: In Iran, in the field of the Persian language and other common dialects and languages in Iran, there has been typologic research, the description of which is not included in this brief, and only a few researches that have been done about the Turkish language will be discussed here. we can see old studies. Farzaneh (1996) was the first one who started linguistical research about Azeri. These days a lot of books and essays have been published about the grammar of this dialect. but study about the case isn't more and here I only bring the name of some academical researches about that.

Shirzad (2009) examines the structural analysis of the Turkish-Azeri language from the point of view of language typology and using Comrie approaches. He showed that the Turkish-Azeri language morphology is comparable with the Persian language, and this language is an Agglutinative language, morphologically.

Safaei Asl (2016) in his Ph.D. The thesis entitled " Meta-Functional Case of the Persian, Turkish, Azeri and English Language Grammar, a Typologic Study", has studied the typological meta-functional systems in these three languages and based on Matthiessen's (2004) generalizations, both divergent generalizations and convergent generalizations. The systematic functional typology is based on systematic functional grammar.

Razmdideh and Yelchi (2019) in an article, studied the typological causative construction, as a universal category, in Azeri Turkish. They have based their work on Comrie's typologic model. The language type investigated in this research is spoken in Ardabil, East and West Azerbaijan provinces ( North West of Iran).

3. Typological research about the Khalaji Turkish: One important scientist who studied Khalaji is Gerhard Doerfer (German linguist). He was a Turkologist, Altaictic, and philologist best known for his studies of Turkish languages, especially khalaji. His book about that is *Khalaj Materials* (1971). between Iranian linguists, Mohammad Moghaddam studied that and wrote a valuable work about that. He published his article (dialects of Vafs, Ashtiyan, and Tafresh, (1939) in Irane kodeh. between recent researchers, Ali Asghar Cemrasi and Abdollah Vasheghani Farahani have worked on this dialect and published several valuable books and articles about that. But there aren't more grammatical works about that and also special works about cases and related subjects.

4. Case marking studies in Iran: Many studies have been done on the case marking system in various languages and dialects common in Iran, including Persian, Turkish, Kurdish, and Bakhtiari. Sometimes other languages such as English, Russian, and French have been the subject of research. Of course, sometimes the reviews have been done comparatively. Among these researches, only a brief study about the Turkish language is mentioned here:

Najibzadeh (2011) in his thesis, after examining the grammatical features of the Tabrizian dialect of Turkish (phonetics, phonological construction, and phonology), discussed the syntactic features of this dialect. He discussed tense and mood and spoke about word order and the three syntactic roles of subject, object, and verb. Then he discussed the nominal case and the characteristic case according to the opinions of traditional grammarians and the opinions of new linguistics researchers.

Farahmand Aghdam (2012) In his thesis, examined the topic structure and the way of assigning grammatical cases to their nominal structures in the Turkish language. First, he briefly discussed the structural arrangement and thematic construction and the mode of assigning mood in Turkish-Azeri declarative sentences. Then, he talked about case marking in this language and the phenomenon of multiple case marking.

Tafarroji Yeganeh and Ahmadi (2014) said that the languages of the world use three ways word sequence, agreement, and grammatical relationships. The Turkish language is subject to the case marking system in which noun phrases are marked in some way and that mark can show their being subject and object. In their research, they have listed seven cases of Azeri Turkish.



Mollavali et al. (2020) have investigated the article case and agreement in Azeri Turkish. They have argued that the agreement and case are derived from a single process.

## **METHODOLOGY**

In the present study, among the approaches of different linguists, two approaches were selected. First Comrie's (1989) approach and second Chomsky's (1981) approach in the Case theory, which is a sub-theory of the theory of Government and binding. According to these approaches, we can find some similarities and differences between Azeri and Khalaj, that we only have to focus on case marking.

Comrie has introduced five linguistic categories to refer to noun phrases. According to this division, the Turkish language belongs to the group of Nominative-Accusative languages, and the noun phrases are marked in some way. In the case theory, the necessity of case marking is emphasized and the issue of determining the syntactic cases in noun phrases is investigated. Also, the general topics of case marking and the factors affecting it will be mentioned.

The present research is synchronic. The research method is library and descriptive-analytical. To analyze the research topic the written texts in each of the dialects have been used. Since the standard language in Iran is Farsi, these two dialects (Azeri and Khalaji) do not have a form of language in this country. There are a lot of dialects of Turkish, but in this study, only two dialects in Iran were studied. The data was collected from the literary and fictional texts of the mentioned dialects and in this way, the most common type has been used as much as possible. In the context of Azeri Turkish, which is also common in Iran, the Tabriz dialect was chosen. In Khalji Turkish, due to its low voice, the common form is not chosen.

The selected sources (books) for extracting data are *Talanchilar* (meaning rebels), in Azeri Turkish. This book is a collection of anecdotes and notes from Habib Saher (1989), a modern Iranian poet and writer. Saher was born in Tabriz and grew up there; and *Gol Senobar Dastani* (The Story of the Gol Senobar) is a book in Khalaji Turkish, which is a translation of a story from the collection "Uyghur Khalq Dastani". The Uighur collection was published in 2006 and Ali Asghar Cemrasi translated his selected story into Khalji Turkish in 2015. This is a translation of Khalji's Turkish prose and poetry (Cemrasi, 2015 b).

## **THE CLASSIFICATION OF LANGUAGES**

Due to the remarkable diversity of the world's languages, whenever similarities are observed between two or more languages, linguists think of placing them in the same linguistic category or class. The criteria for placing a language in any language class are also different (Arlotto, 1994). In the classification of languages, there are two methods Genealogical and Typological methods.

### **GENEALOGICAL CLASSIFICATION**

this type of classification is to provide raw materials that are valid in terms of the history of languages. This method of classification is not based solely on the discovery of similar features within one or more languages, but rather based on the similarities between non-universal elements of languages. The observed similarities and connections between languages are interpreted by putting forward the hypothesis of the collision of languages at some point in time in the past (Arlotto, 1994).

### **TYPOLICAL CLASSIFICATION**

In this method of classification, languages are examined according to their structural characteristics. One of the common ways to categorize languages, which has been widely used since the early 19th century, is the typological method. Languages are placed in a language group according to common or important and valid features or grammatical similarities, and the history or geographical location of languages is not considered (Arlotto, 1994).



The languages of the world have been classified based on different points of view, i.e. word construction and arrangement of structures. Throughout the 19th century and until some time from the 20th century, the dominant theory in typology was based on the assumption that the only criterion, or at least the most important criterion in structural classification is the process of word construction. This method of classification is called typologic classification (Samareh, 1990; Song, 2001). Languages systematically differ from each other in the way they use inflection in word formation. One of the effective strategies for the study of world languages is to examine the diversity that can be seen in different languages of the world. Typology is one of the sub-sections of linguistics, which studies languages based on their structural features of the language (Golfam, 2000). The history of typology based on word construction dates back to the 19th century and the works of Humboldt (1839). He divided the languages into three classes "Morphemic", "Agglutinative", and "Synthetic". As it is known, the basis of this typological division is the construction of the word form in the grammatical unit (Robbins, 1991). Sapir included Analytic/Isolating, Agglutinative, Inflectional/ Fussional, and Poly Synthetic languages in his category (Comrie, 1989; Liber, 2009). Among the mentioned categories, only the description of Agglutinative languages is discussed, because Turkish is one of the Agglutinative languages. In these languages, in addition to the root, which consists of one or more syllables, there are agglutinative morphemes. These agglutinative have two tasks in the language: one group of them joins to the beginning or end of roots to create new words with independent and separate meanings and add to the number of words stored in the language, and the other group, while connecting to the end or the beginning of words and expressions, enable their interpretation and case marking in speech. As a result, these languages may be prefixed or suffixed. With the addition of any new concept to the original meaning of the word, another component representing that concept is added to the original word, and its words can be easily divided into constituent morphemes. In Turkish, which is an agglutinative language, in 20% of the words, the lowest syllable reaches five syllables. In Turkish verbs, the number of affixes can reach ten or more (Haghparast Ghara Maleki, 2006; Haspelmath & Sims, 2010; Katamba & Stonham, 2006).

### **TURKISH LANGUAGE AND ITS DIALECTS**

Turkish is a family of Altaic languages. Turkish belongs to a family of languages whose main centers of prevalence are northwest China, southern Siberia, Central Asian republics, Iran, Caucasus, Turkey, and the Balkan Peninsula. From this family, only one language called Yakut language is prevalent outside of this route, in northern Siberia (Comrie, 1992). In the present article, beyond these divisions, dialects are considered for the Turkish language, which has some speakers. Among them, Azeri Turkish and Khalaji are common Turkish dialects in Iran. Of course, Khalaji Turkish is special to Iran.

1. Altaic language family and Turkish language. Turkish speakers are scattered in areas such as southern Siberia, western Mongolia, and China Kashgar, to the northeast and then northwest of the Caspian Sea and from there toward the north of the Black Sea (Javadi, 2018). The languages of Altai are Turkish, Mongolian, and Tungusic language (Heyat, 2001).

2. Division of Turkish languages. The division process of the Turkish language family has been one of the difficulties of Turkish linguistics. The variety of Turkish dialects and accents is so much that it is impossible to determine their exact number and cannot be classified easily. Until now, there have been different divisions of Turkish languages, some of the researchers of which are: Gerhard Doerfer (1967), Karl Menges (1968), and Lars Johanson (1998). Doerfer, who discovered Khalaji Turkish in 1968, proved that Khalaji Turkish is not a dialect of Azerbaijani/Azeri Turkish and it's an independent dialect from the Arghu branch. These two dialects belong to the Turkish language family. Menges has presented a detailed and complex classification. Doerfer divided the Turkish languages into seven main languages: Chuvash, Khalaji, Yakut, South Siberian, Kipchak, Uighur, and Oghuz. According to his belief, other Turkish languages have different dialects and accents in this language (quoted from



Rezai (Rezai Baqbidi, 2008). Lars Johanson has also divided the Turkish language into six main branches based on typologic characteristics (Johanson, 1998).

### **SELECTED DIALECTS**

Two selected dialects of the Turkish language in Iran are:

1. Azeri Turkish. This dialect belongs to the western branch of the Oghuz language group or the southwestern language group (Menges, 1968). Currently, Azeri Turkish is the most common Turkish language in Iran, and its varieties are popular in most provinces of Iran, especially in Eastern Azerbaijan Province, Western Azerbaijan Province, Ardabil Province, and Zanjan Province (Heyat, 2001). This language is the official language of the Republic of Azerbaijan and has speakers in Armenia, Georgia, and Iraq.

2. Khalaji Turkish. The Khalaji Turkish is the only member of the Arghu family and the oldest Turkish dialect (Kashghari, 1996). It is a continuation of the ancient Turkish dialect. Ancient Turkish is the Göktürks, Uyghur Turks, and Kyrgyz people's language, which is more than 1500 years old and its written works are Orkhon and Yenisei inscriptions (Heyat, 2001; Menges, 1968). According to the division by Doerfer, the Turkish language is divided into seven branches, and the Turkish Khalaji is one of the independent languages belonging to this group (Cemrasi, 2014). Turkish Khalaji is the language of the Khalaj Turks who live in central Iran (Khalajstan), an area between Saveh, Qom, and Arak. The other part of the Khalajs live in the villages of Ashtian, Tafresh, and Farahan, Markazi Province. The Khalaji dialect is unique to Iran and has attracted the attention of world scientists and Turkish Linguists. According to an estimate in 2000, there are about fifty thousand Khalaj Turks in the Markazi province, Iran with little dispersion in some areas of Qom province and Chaharmahal Bakhtiari province, Fars province, and Azerbaijan province (Amir Hosseini & Amir Hosseini, 2015).

### **TERMINOLOGY**

In this study explanation of some related terms is necessary and there are morphology, case, case marking system, and case theory:

1. Morphology, is the part of the grammar where the word building is examined. It is merely studied in two levels inflection and word formation. At the level of inflection, the syntactic role of the word is addressed and at the level of word formation, the word construction is studied free from its syntactic role (Liber, 2009; Shopen, 2007). Inflection is the change in the grammatical shape of a word in a way that takes over the syntactic role of a specific sentence. By using inflection, the lexical features of a lexical morpheme can be shown morphologically, which leads to the creation of different forms of that morpheme, and each of them is called a grammatical unit (Booij, 2005). The inflection covers different grammatical concepts such as number, person, gender, case, grammatical tense and aspect, voice, and mood (Liber, 2009; Von Schaaik, 2020).

2. Case. The case is a grammatical category in word class analysis that is used to show the syntactic role of the noun group. Noun and pronoun groups are marked in a way and that mark shows their syntactic role. Many linguistic phenomena reflect the interaction of the morphological and syntactic parts of grammar (Comrie, 1989; Liber, 2009). The case is the changing of the form of a noun or a pronoun in different grammatical applications such as nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, vocative, ablative, and locative (Crystal, 1992). The grammatical case refers to the marking system of dependent nouns for the type of relationship they have with the verb. Dependents consist of a verb or several categories of cases, which are related to the verb. The cases appear as a preposition, a signed letter (like "ra" in the Persian Language), or an affix. In addition to the main dependents of the verb, which are subject and object, the verb may have other dependents that indicate time and place, for example. The locative case indicates "place", as:



in İstanbul-dâ (in Istanbul). The ablative case indicates "from", as in Ânkârâ-dân (from Ankara). This case is used in expressions like ?âdâm-in ev-i (man's house) to show ownership (Blake, 2004).

3. Case marking system. Different languages use different methods for the case marking of noun phrases. In some languages, the main responsibility of case marking rests with the syntax of the language, while in some other languages, the process of lexical construction is used (Golfam, 2006).

In the languages of the world, the syntactic relationship between the verb (head or predicate) and noun groups (dependent or argument) is shown in different ways: Agreement patterns that arise as a result of syntactic relations between the verb and its groups and appear on the governing verb; The position of the noun group within the clause and sentence or sequence of words; and Case marking. The last item refers to the noun phrases in the two intransitive and transitive clauses, some terms have been used in typology, which are of general use and simplify the explanation of the five systems. According to Comrie's classification, Turkish is one of the Nominative-Accusative languages (for more explanation about Comrie's five-fold system and Agreement → Comrie, 1989; Dabir Moghaddam, 2013). Case marking, along with agreement and word sequence, are the three methods that languages use to show the dependents of verbs (Rasekh Mahand et al., 2014).

4. case theory. In the Government and binding theory, the concept of governance is the most basic. In this theory, the general principles have replaced the partial and miscellaneous rules of the previous transformational forms. Also, some parameters have been predicted to explain the differences between different languages. In this theory, the relationship between referents, pronouns, and their referential expressions is discussed as their occurrence and distribution according to the ruling category (Cook & Newson, 2007; Dabir Moghaddam, 2016).

The case theory is a sub-theory of this approach. In it, the case marking of noun phrases (Nominative, Genitive, and Accusative) is discussed. Among the four main categories of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and prepositions, only verbs and prepositions are considered case markers. This theory is related to the abstract state of noun phrases. According to case filters, noun groups with phonetic aspects must have cases that do not necessarily have phonetic aspects. This noun group with phonetic content does not include rejection of the noun group and abstract pronoun. If a noun group is caseless in the sentence structure, it would be ungrammatical. In this theory, instead of Deep Structure, the term D-Structure is used, and instead of Surface Structure, the term S-Structure is used, which are more abstract. In them, unpronounceable syntactic categories such as rejection of movements and null categories are hidden. The case is defined either structurally (grammatically) and under the rule of a case giver, or inherently and based on the semantic relationship between the case marker and the noun phrases receiving the case. It should be mentioned that the inherent case works at the level of D-structure and the structural case at the level of S-structure (Cook & Newson, 2007; Dabir Moghaddam, 2016).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The case marking in Turkish is not as complicated as in Finnish (with sixteen cases). And also, in terms of simplicity, it is not at the level of a language like Romanian (with two cases). Of course, the Ibero-Caucasian language or Dagistani language (which are common in Dagestan) are known due to their rich case system and are therefore worthy of attention. In this sense, the Tabarsarani language (of the Lezgi languages) is the most famous. The maximum number of cases in this language is 48 cases and it has a complex system. Among other Dagestani languages with a complex case system is the Tsezi language, which has 126 cases (Siewierska & Song 1998). Case affixes refer to both plural and singular nouns (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005).

According to Kornfilt (1997), there were five cases for nouns in Old Turkish, which were; nominative, accusative, dative, ablative, and locative. Then grammarians recognized the genitive case that shows the possessive role of the noun. In general, nowadays in the Turkish language, there are six cases; nominative, accusative, genitive, dative, locative, and ablative (Blake, 2004). Some (e.g. Ahmadi Givi, 2004) have listed ten roles or cases for nouns, which



are: nominative, predicative, accusative, complement, genitive, interjection, adverbial, adjective, numeral, and ambiguity. Some of the researchers have considered other cases for Turkish, such as instrumental case, equality case, and directional case (Ergin, 2004; Tafarroji Yeganeh & Ahmadi, 2014).

Here, only the reason for the incorrectness of the instrumental case is discussed. For example, in Azeri Turkish, the affix *-nân* (autobus-*nân*: by bus) and in Khalaji the affix *-la, -le* (*siz-la*: with you) and different forms of it have been considered. According to the research, this case does not exist and researchers like Kornfilt (1997) have considered it as a clitic that has the same role as a case, and its origin is the word *?ile-*, which is an affix and is considered as an affix. This is the process of grammaticalization, through which lexical components acquire a grammatical role, or components that have grammatical characteristics themselves become more grammatical (Naghzgooye Kohan, 2010).

According to the case theory, case markers are assigned mostly based on grammatical relations or semantic criteria, so that cases are either structural or intrinsic. The structural cases operate in S-structure and the inherent cases in D-structure. These two are dependent on the semantic or grammatical role of the subjects to which the case is assigned. In Turkish, affixes are responsible for giving cases, so that subjects are marked. The cases are marked and not abstract. Of course, the nominative case is unmarked. As it can be seen, the intrinsic cases are opposite to the structural ones. Among the Turkish cases, the nominative cases, accusative cases, and dative cases are structural, and the genitive cases, locative cases, and ablative cases are inherent.

Another distinguishing aspect of the Turkish language is the principle of the logical sequence of compounds. In the Turkish language, there are areas where by adding them, the word syntactic role and category will change. In Turkish, in addition to the case suffix, other affixes appear in a certain order after the word. In other words, the Turkish language is based on adding an affix to the original word. The case affixes come after derivational affixes (Haghparast Qarameliki, 2006; Haspelmath & Sims, 2010; Shopen, 2007). Dependent affixes, specifically case affixes, are generative methods for showing the syntactic role of noun groups (Kornfilt, 1997).

1. Nominative. The nominative case is the first class of noun cases (Shopen, 2007). This unmarked case is the most used and has no affix (unmarked). It is in opposition to other cases which are called non-nominative cases. The nominative case is structural. The subject plays the main role in many languages, and depending on the language, it can be shown from the inflection, its position in the sentence or its structure, or it can be recognized from the context (Rasekhmohand et al., 2014; Sjöberg, 1963). The nominative case is a mode in which the noun plays the role of the agent. Therefore, there is no need to depend on other words. A noun or a pronoun in the nominative case (singular or plural) does not take an affix and is unmarked (Cemrasi, 2015 a; Farzaneh, 1998).

2. Accusative. A noun placed in the role of a direct object, its case is accusative. This case is sometimes shown with or without a case marker (affix), it is influenced by the verb and shows the dependence of the noun on the verb. This is a structural case. Of course, the direct object comes without a case marker when it expresses gender (Ahmadi Givi, 2004; Ergin, 2004). This case, answers the questions of "whom?" and "what?" (Hengirman, 1998). This case is used to show the direct object; showing an object with a special affix; and the expression of time duration (Blake, 2004, 19, 20). It is a case that shows the noun in the position of acceptance of the action. The verbs that create a connection with the noun in this case are necessarily transitive (Cemrasi, 2014 b; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Sjöberg, 1963).

3. Dative. The dative case is a noun that is affected by the situation or action which is defined by the verb. This structural case is usually used to indicate the indirect object. (Crystal, 1992). This case also shows dependence on the verb and always has an affix (Ergin, 2004). This case answers the questions "to where" and "to what" (Hengirman, 1998).

4. Genitive. This case shows the dependence of a noun on another noun and sometimes the dependence of a noun on a verb. The inherent (semantic) case of the genitive represents the possessive case, and the genitive affix must be accompanied by the possessive affix. This case is one of the forms that a noun or a pronoun takes. That is, the noun



or pronoun in some languages shows grammatical relations with inflection. The main role of this case is to assign ownership to the noun. In this case, nouns are sometimes without affixes and in most with affixes). This case answers the questions "to what" and "to whom" (Crystal, 1992; Ergin, 2004; Hengirman, 1998; Sjöberg, 1963; Von Schaak, 2020).

5. Locative. This case represents the state of physical and intrinsic location. A word in a sentence that complements verbs is a locative complement. This case is equivalent to the additional letter "in" in the Persian language. This case shows the relationship between the noun and the verb, and nouns in this case marking always have an affix. This case answers the questions "Where?" and "When?" (Crystal, 1992, 48; Ergin, 2004; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Hengirman, 1998).

6. Ablative. This case is the group of nouns that usually conveys adverbial relations such as state, distance, and tense and is inherent (Crystal, 1992). The ablative case answers the question "from where?" (Hengirman, 1998). This case shows the dependence of the noun on the verb. Nouns in this case always have affixes (Ergin, 2004).

### SELECTED DATA AND THEIR EXPLANATION

In this part, based on what was discussed earlier, the data are reviewed and analyzed. According to the classification of Johanson (1998), two Turkish dialects have been selected (Azeri and Khalaji dialects). These two dialects are from two main branches of the Turkish language. The Turkish language has six cases that have differences in different dialects. In the following, the data extracted from the two dialects (including 12 sentences) are mentioned in order. Then the analysis and review of the typology of the case marking them by mentioning the differences and similarities is discussed.

Table 1

Nominative case

---

Azeri Turkish:

Derviş-ø-NOM bir bâxış-dâ-**LOC** qârâ toprâq-ı kimiyâ eder.

(Darvish alchemizes black soil with one look.)

---

Khalaji Turkish:

Yigit-ler-ø-NOM şâhzâda-in-**GEN** sözler-i-**ACC** qulâq hâsmış.

(The young men listened to the words of the prince).

---

In both dialects the nominative case affixes are unmarked. According to the data of the mentioned dialects, in both dialects, this case is unmarked.

Transitivity, gender, animacy, and definiteness can't have effects on the nominative case.



Table 2

Accusative case

---

Azeri Turkish:

habıb- $\emptyset$ -**NOM** sâbâh gelende Gülistân kitâb-i-ACC getir.

(Habib! When you come tomorrow, bring the Golestan book.)

---

Khalaji Turkish:

heç kim-i-ACC sen- $\emptyset$ -**Nom** heyrân etme.

(Don't surprise anyone.)

---

In Azeri and Khalji Turkish, the accusative case marker is -i or -i. In Azeri and Khalji Turkish, the direct subject is -i or -i. In both dialects, if there are two vowels next to each other, the intermediate sound can come and the rule of vowel coordination is observed. But in khalaji this mediating vowel omit and one nosal vowel ( ɨ ) will be replaced on it. An example of that is âlmâḡ-**DAT** gâzlâdı (bit the apple).

Gender and animacy can't have effects on case marking. With the transitive verb, we can have an accusative case, but in sentences with untransitive verbs, we can't use an accusative case. Effects of definiteness related to some conditions (→ LINGUISTIC FACTORS AFFECTING CASE MARKING).

Table 3

Dative case

---

Azeri Turkish:

indî, gel dâstân-â-DAT qulâq ver.

(now come and listen to the story.)

---

Khalaji Turkish:

xurşidşâh-**NOM** şâhzâde Senüber-ke-DAT hâydı .

(xurşidşâh said to şâhzâde Senüber.)

---

The affix of dative case in Azeri Turkish is -e, -â or -a. Of course, if they take an intermediate vowel, this vowel will be -y. Also, in Khalaji, the case is indicated by the affixes -ke or -qâ. These two dialects are independent from two language branches and the case affixes in them are completely different. Transitivity, gender, and animacy can't have effects on the dative case. Effects of definiteness related to some conditions (→ LINGUISTIC FACTORS AFFECTING CASE MARKING).



Table 4  
Genitive case

---

Azeri Turkish:

qış-in son gün-ler-i-GEN idi.  
(it was the last days of winter.)

---

Khalaji Turkish:

o zâmân zengi-ler-in şâh-ı-GEN emir etti.  
(At that time, the king of Zangis ordered.)

---

The genitive case consists of two parts, noun (attributed) and nonmodifier (attributed to it). In Turkish, the genitive affix has two parts. First is the additional continuous pronoun -in and its endings, which are added to the end of the affix. The second is the vowel -i, which is added at the end of the noun modifier. The genitive case is inflected with different pronouns (Ahmadi Givi, 2004). This combination can be seen in both dialects, there is only a slight difference in their inflection, which can be seen in some inflections. Four factors that are mentioned don't have an effect in the genitive case.

Transitivity, gender, and animacy can't have effects on the genitive case. The affix of dative case in Azeri Turkish is -e, -â or -a. Effects of definiteness related to some conditions (→ LINGUISTIC FACTORS AFFECTING CASE MARKING).

Table 5  
Locative case

---

Azeri Turkish:

qış-in son gün-ler-i-GEN idi.  
(it was the last days of winter.)

---

Khalaji Turkish:

Qâf tâq-ı-GEN üstü-çe-LOC o etmiş mâskân.  
(He has chosen a residence in Qaf mountain.)

---

According to the data, in the Azeri Turkish dialect, the locative case marker is -dâ, -da, or -de, but in Khalaji Turkish, which is very different from the Azeri Turkish dialect, this case marker is -ča or -çe.

Transitivity, gender, animacy, and definiteness can't have effects on the locative case.



Table 6  
Ablative case

<p>Azeri Turkish: ânâm-<math>\emptyset</math>-<b>NOM</b> men-i-<b>ACC</b> <u>tez-dan</u>-<b>ABL</b> <u>yuxu-dân</u>-<b>ABL</b> uyândırdı. (My mother woke me up early.)</p>
<p>Khalaji Turkish: heste jânum heç <u>belâ-dâ</u>-<b>ABL</b> <u>ğem-de</u>-<b>ABL</b> âzâd etmedi. (My tired soul was not freed from trouble and sadness.)</p>

In the Azeri Turkish dialect, the affix -den, -dan, -dân is used as the ablative case marker, but in Khalaji the affix de, -da, or dâ is used in this way, which is left over from ancient Turkish. As seen in this dialect, there are many footprints of ancient Turkish. Four factors that are mentioned don't have an effect in the ablative case.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

General features of the case markers based on dialectal data that the researcher seeks to find an answer to the questions or hypotheses raised, which is described below:

1. Turkish language is one of the languages that follow the nominative-accusative case marking system. In this system, the subject of the intransitive verb and the object of the transitive verb are indicated by the nominative case, and the object of the transitive verb receives an object marker (Blake, 2004). Both Nominative-Accusative and Ergative-Absolutive case marking systems are the most widely used among languages, and the nominative-accusative system is far less marked than the Ergative-Absolutive case marking system (Rasekh Mahand et al., 2014).
2. Both dialects of the Turkish language have six cases: nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, locative, and ablative.

Table 7

Case marking in Turkish dialects

Case-marking	Azeri Turkish	khalaji Turkish	English
<b>NOM</b>	ev- $\emptyset$	hev- $\emptyset$	home
<b>ACC</b>	ev - <b>i</b>	hev- <b>i</b>	home
<b>DAT</b>	ev - <b>e</b>	hev- <b>ke</b>	to home
<b>GEN</b>	men- <b>im</b> ev- <b>im</b>	men- <b>im</b> hev- <b>im</b>	my home
<b>LOC</b>	ev- <b>de</b>	hev- <b>çâ</b>	at home
<b>ABL</b>	ev- <b>den</b>	hev- <b>de</b>	from home



3. According to the case theory, in determining the case of noun phrases (nominative, genitive, and accusative), among the four main categories of noun, adjective, verb, and preposition, only verbs and prepositions are case markers.
4. Structural and inherent cases exist in all languages (Chomsky, 1989). Comrie (1989) also mentioned them with the expressions of syntactic roles, semantic criteria, and pragmatic criteria that are effective in granting status. Based on this, the cases are divided into two categories: semantic and grammatical. According to the data of the present article, among the cases of the Turkish language, the nominative, accusative, and dative are structural and the genitive, locative, and ablative are inherent.
5. The Turkish language uses case marking and dependent marking to show grammatical roles. case markers are always seen as affixes.
6. In Turkish, in addition to the case affix, other affixes appear in a certain order after the word. In other words, the Turkish language is based on adding an affix to the original word. Case affixes come after derivational affixes.
7. Case affixes in Azeri and Khalaji Turkish dialects have many differences. Azeri is from the southwest Turkic branch (Oghuz), but Khalaji Turkish is from an independent branch called Orghu. Arghu Turkish has no other branches and has the most similarities with ancient Turkish. In this dialect, the case affix is different from other dialects.

#### **LINGUISTIC FACTORS AFFECTING CASE MARKING**

In the introduction of this research, eight questions were discussed, and a description of some of them is mentioned in this part.

1. **Transitivity.** The verb is the main component constructing the sentence and therefore has a very diverse and complex relationship with other sentence components. An intransitive verb does not need an object and completes the meaning of the sentence with the subject, but the transitive verb passes from the subject toward the object, and in other words, it needs an object (Ahmadi Givi, 2004). Some verbs are twofold. That is, they are used in the sentence as transitive or intransitive. In principle, the intransitive verb is only related to the subject and usually does not need another structure, and the transitive verb, unlike the intransitive verb, requires the object based on the presence of the object in the sentence (Natel Khanlari, 1996). Since only transitive verbs and prepositions transfer their case, so the intransitive verbs do not transfer grammatical case. The nominative case comes with both Intransitive and transitive verbs, but the other cases do not depend on the structure of the sentence and the verb and receive an internal semantic role. In the Turkish language, intransitive verbs are limited to the subject. In these verbs, the direction of movement and action is directed towards the subject itself, and this is the reason why these verbs are called passive. Transitive verbs are not limited to the subject and require an object. In these verbs, the direction of movement or action towards someone or something is called the object or complement (Farzaneh, 1996).

2. **Animacy.** It is a semantic characteristic for nouns that often has a morphological-syntactic reflection. From a morphological-syntactic point of view, nouns that refer to animals often behave like inanimate nouns rather than animate nouns. The animacy is related to volition, rationality, and individuality (Luraghi & Parodi, 2008). In some languages, the continuum of animacy blends with philosophical preconceptions. A rank is also considered among living beings, and animals are placed between humans and things in terms of their liveliness. The consequences of this type of ranking are the same as the coding format of languages, for example, according to observations in the Turkish language, the animacy does not affect accusative case marking and so every noun (animate or inanimate) receives the same case marking. Of course, the animacy affects the agreement of the verb with the subject. If the subject is plural and human, the verb of the sentence is also plural, and if the subject is plural but non-human, the verb is both singular and plural (Ahmadi Givi, 2002).



3. Gender. Turkish languages are the type of languages without gender marking. In a group of languages, nouns are divided into two types, male and female, and in some of them, there is also a neutral state. In Turkish languages, there is no gender rule, and the gender of each noun is determined by its signifier. There is no gender in Turkish pronouns (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Haghparast Qarameliki, 2006). Gender has no role in the use of case suffixes.

4. Definiteness. The definite and indefinite are usually used to refer to noun phrases. The definite is a noun that is clear to the audience. The Turkish language has no defining word.

In Turkish, the word *bir* (one) is used before the noun for indefinite:

definite: *Yâşlı* (the old man)

Indefinite: *bir hâstâ* (a patient)

Also, the ambiguous adjective "her" (every) and its negative "heç" (nothing) are used in definiteness that comes before the noun (Ahmadi Givi, 2004; Kornfilt, 1997)

The effect of the noun being definite or indefinite is in taking the Turkish affix in which the definite nouns receive an obvious case marker, but indefinite nouns do not have an affix case marker.

*Ali bir kitâb âldi.* (Ali bought a book.)

*Ali bir kitâb-i-ACC âldi.* (Ali bought the book.)

The subject in Turkish does not receive a case affix. The position of the subject in the sentence is determined by its definiteness and indefiniteness.

*Dün âdâm geldi.* (A man came yesterday.)

*âdâm dün geldi.* (The man came yesterday.)

## CONCLUSION

The results of the typological analysis of the case category in Azeri and Khilji Turkish dialects data' mentioned in the introduction are:

1. Among the four main categories of nouns, adjectives, verbs, and prepositions, only verbs and prepositions are considered case markers.
2. There are six cases of nominative, accusative, dative, genitive, locative, and ablative in Turkish. Case-marking morphemes are presented through suffixes, But the nominative case is unmarked.
3. Case-marking in this language is a morphosyntactic form. Also, Comrie has introduced five linguistic categories to refer to noun phrases. According to this division, the Turkish language belongs to the group of Nominative-Accusative languages.
4. According to the grammatical rules, an intransitive verb does not need an object and completes the meaning of the sentence with the subject, but the transitive verb passes from the subject toward the object, and in other words, it needs an object.
5. According to observations in the Turkish language, animacy does not affect accusative case marking, but it is effective in the agreement of the verb with the subject.
6. In Turkish languages, there is no gender rule, and the gender of each noun is determined by its signifier.
7. The definite is a noun that is clear to the audience. The Turkish language has no defining word.
8. Azeri and Khalaji dialects belong to one language family (Altaic) and we can see more similarities between them in cases, like nominative, and accusative. These similarities are less because these dialects belong to



different branches of the Turkic language (Oghua and Arghu). The approach of case marking (Chomski) is around universals and similarities.

9. Since these dialects belong to different branches, we can see some differences in other cases like locative and dative. The Khalaji Turkish )An endangered dialect( in the category of case marking of ablative case affix is the same as ancient Turkish, which has changed to another affix in other dialects. In Khalaji, the works of ancient Turkish and even Mother Turkish have remained, which is linguistically important. Typological studies focused on finding differences.

### References

- Ahmadi Givi, H. (2004). *Azerbaijani language Grammar: comparative-Persian*. Ghatreh.
- Arlotto, A. (1994). *An Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. (Translator Yahya Modrresi). Research Institute of Humanities and Culture. (Original work published 1994).
- Amir Hosseini, K. & Amir Hosseini, M. (2015). *Xələc Türkləri Tarix*. Raze Nahan.
- Blake, B. J. (2004). *Case*. Cambridge University Press.
- Booij, G. (2005). *The Grammar of words*. Oxford University Press (OUP).
- Cemrasi, A. (2014). Khalaj and Khalaj Studies in Turkey and Iran. *Varligh*. 2(172), 16-30.
- Cemrasi, A. (2015). *Goodbye, Khalaji*. Takderakht.
- Cemrasi, A. (2015). *Gul Seniüber Helec tili*. Takderakht.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universal and Linguistic Typology*. Blackwell.
- Comrie, B. (1992). Turkic languages. In William Bright (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (pp. 187-188). Oxford University Press.
- Cook, V.J & Newwson, M. (2007). *Chomsky's universal Grammar: an introduction*. Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (1992). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell.
- Dabir Moghaddam, M. (2013). *Typology of Iranian languages*. Samt.
- Dabir Moghaddam, M. (2016). *Theoretical Linguistics: Emergence and development of Generative Grammar*. Samt.
- Doerfer, G. (1992). Central Asia: Turkish –Iranian language contacts. In Elton Daniel (Eds.), *Encyclopedia Iranica* (pp. 226-237). Mazda Publishers.
- Ergin, M. (2004). *Türk Dil Bilgisi*. Fatih.
- Farzaneh, M. (1996-1998). *Mebaniye destur Zebane Türki Azerbaijan*. Farhang Publishing.
- Farahmand Aghdam, D. (2012). *The thematic structure and the mode of the case assignment in Turkish news sentences* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Birjand University.
- Golfam, A. (2000). Linguistic similarities and differences: worlds and typology. In *Journal of the faculty of letters and Humanities*.155, 171-190.
- Golfam, A. (2006). *principles of Grammar*. Samt.
- Göksel, A & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish*. Routledge.



- Haghparast Qarameliki, H. (2006). *Tehlile zabane Turki Azerbaycani be tariqe riyazi*. Andishe Arya.
- Haspelmath, M. & Sims, D. (2010). *Understanding Morphology*. Hodder Education and Hachette UK company.
- Hengirmen, M. (1998). *Türkçe Dilbilgisi*. Kızılay.
- Heyat, J. (2001). *Seyri der tarixi zaban ve lehcehaye türki*. Peykan.
- Javadi, A. (2018). *Azerbaijan and its languages in History*. Nebesht.
- Johanson, L. (1998). The History of Turkic. In Lars Johanson & Éva Ágnes Csató (Eds.). *The Turkic Languages* (pp. 81-125). Routledge.
- Kashghari, M. (1996). *Dictionary of Turkish words*. Research Institute of Human Sciences and Cultural Studies.
- Katamba, F. & Stonham, J. (2006). *Morphology*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. Routledge.
- Luraghi, S. & Parodi, C. (2018). *Syntax keywords and syntactic theories*. (translator Mahbubeh Naderi & Ifa Shafae). Nashre Nevis Parsi. (Original work published 2009).
- Liber, R. (2009). *Introducing Morphology*. Cambridge Press.
- Menges, K. (1968). *Turkik Language and People*. Otto Harrassowitz.
- Mahoutian, S. (1996). *Persian grammar from the point of view of typology*. (translated by Mehdi Samai). Nashr Markaz. (Original work published 1996).
- Mollavali, M., Gholami, V. & Karimidostan, Yadegar. (2020). Structural parallelism in TP and DP: case and agreement in Azeri Turkish. *Zabanpajuhi*. 41, 301- 324.
- Natel Khanlari, P. (1996). *Persian grammar*. Iran Foundation and Culture Publications.
- Najibzadeh, N. (2011). *Survey of case marking in the Turkish language of Tabriz* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Tehran.
- Naghzgoye Kohan, M. (2010). How to identify the instances of Grammaticalization. *Language-related research (comparative language and literature research)*.1(2), 149-165.
- Rasekh mahand, M., Moeen, M., & Mahmoodiradi Rad, M. (2014). *A descriptive dictionary of syntax*. Elmi Publication.
- Razmdideh, P., & Yelchi, V. (2019). Typological Study of Causative Constructions in Azeri Turkish based on Comrie's Typological Model. *Journal of Iranian Regional Languages and Literature*. 5(3), 91-112.
- Rezai Baqbid, H. (2008). Turkish, Languages. Mousavi Bojnordi, Kazem (Eds.), In *The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia* (pp. 193-197). the Center for Islamic Encyclopedia.
- Robins, R.H. (1990). *A Short History of Linguistics*. Translated by Hagh Shenaz, Ali Mohammad. ketabe Mad.
- Safaei Asl, E. (2016). *Ultrarole Case of the Grammar of Farsi, Azeri Turkish, and English*, [unpublished Ph.D. thesis]. Allameh Tabatabai University.
- Saher, H. (2013). *Talanâçılar*. Nokhbegan.
- Shirzad, S. (2009). *The study of Turkish-Azeri syntax from the point of view of typology* [unpublished master's thesis]. Payam Noor University.



Samareh, Y. (1990). An analysis of language typology: Persian language typologic features. *Linguistics*. 7(1), 61-80.

Song, J., & Siewierska, A. (1998). *case typology and grammar (festschrift of Barry Blake)*. Benjamins.

Song, J. (2001). *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. University of Cambridge.

Shopen, T. (2007). *Language Typology and Syntactic-Description*. Cambridge University Press.

Sjöberg, A. F. (1963). *Uzbek Structural Grammar*. The Netherlands.

Tafarroji Y., & Ahmadi, F. (2014). The Turkish Language Case Markers. *The second National Conference of Applied Research in English Language Studies*. University of Applied Science and Technology, 1-6.

Von Schaaik, G. (2020). *The Oxford Turkish Grammar*. Oxford University Press.