

Offprint from

The Mainz Meeting

Proceedings
of the Seventh International Conference
on Turkish Linguistics
August 3–6, 1994

Edited by Lars Johanson
in cooperation with
Éva Ágnes Csató, Vanessa Locke, Astrid Menz
and Dorothea Winterling

1998

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

On the usage of *gibi*

Gerjan van Schaaik

0 Introduction

This paper¹ treats similarity constructions of Turkish. Similarity is expressed by *gibi*, a word which is usually classified as a postposition by grammarians such as Lewis (1978: 85f) and Wendt (1979: 257), and by lexicographers such as Baskakov (1977: 337). Only in the dictionary of Alderson & İz (1984: 193) do the authors distinguish between the categories *noun* ('the similar, the like'), *postposition* ('similar to, like'), and *conjunction* ('as; as soon as; just as; as though').

In this paper it will be shown that *gibi* can be regarded as a *predicate*, due to the fact that it can be used both predicatively as well as attributively. On the basis of the analysis to be presented it will become clear that all other usages of *gibi* can be considered as special applications of this predicate. It will furthermore be shown that in order to construe a similarity expression, *gibi* can be applied at all levels (or layers) of the underlying clause structure, as distinguished within the theoretical framework of Functional Grammar (henceforth: FG).

The idea of layered structures can be schematized thus (cf. Dik 1989; Hengeveld 1989):

(1)	Structure	Type of entity	Order	Variable
	Clause	speech act	4	E
	Proposition	possible fact	3	X
	Predication	state of affairs	2	e
	Term	entity	1	x
	Predicate	property/relation	Ø	f

¹ This paper is based on chapter 8 of van Schaaik (1996), which presents a more in-depth analysis of similative constructions within the framework of Functional Grammar (cf. Dik 1989). As for the linguistic data used in this paper, the bulk of the examples was selected by means of the PC-program FLEXX, operating on a data collection based on spoken language.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 deals with the general properties of *gibi*, and it will be shown that a two-place predicate structure can be assumed. Also its typical usage in Exemplifying Phrases, which are based on second order nominal predicates ('things like that'), will be discussed together with its usage in Headless Relative Constructions ('someone like you'). In the remainder I will discuss how *gibi* can be applied on all levels in the clause structure of (1).

Section 2 is about so-called *Factual Similarity*, that is the expression of similarity proper ('X is like Y'), where the predicate *gibi* is used in constructing an adverbial satellite, occurring on several levels. In 2.1 I will discuss the use of *gibi* within a predication, in which it expresses the Manner in which some action is performed or process takes place ('do it like me'). Section 2.2 will go into the application of *gibi* on the predication level, which leads to a Similitive Expression. In such a construction the similarity between two States of Affairs is expressed ('do what you like, like me'). In 2.3 satellites on the propositional level are discussed, and section 2.4 treats the application of *gibi* on the clausal level. The latter application expresses the similarity between two Speech Acts, yielding a Confirmative Expression ('like I told you').

Finally, section 3 deals with *Non-factual Similarity*, constructions in which some similarity with Reason, Purpose, or Result is expressed ('you read *as if* you are interested'), and furthermore, in this section some light will be shed on how *gibi* is used in expressions of *pretending* something ('pretend that you have understood all this').

1 The lexical status of *gibi*

As has been indicated in the introduction, *gibi* is usually regarded as a post-position. Obviously, this term is syntactically motivated because primarily the syntactic position of *gibi* is taken into consideration. For its placement, consider the following examples:

- (2) a. Aylin *sen-in* *gibi* bir kadın-dı.
 A. you-gen like a woman-ant
 'Aylin was a woman (who looked) like you.'
- b. Gazete-yi *aç* *kurt* *gibi* el-in-den kap-tı-m.
 paper-acc hungry wolf like hand-p3s-abl grab-pst1-1s
 'Like a hungry wolf I grabbed the newspaper out of his hand.'

- c. Hasan *ayı gibi*.
 Hasan bear like
 'Hasan is like a bear'

The Turkish equivalent of 'like you' is expressed in (2a) as *senin gibi*, and this clearly shows that *gibi* is placed after the (pro)noun it is related to. Similarly, in (2b) *gibi* follows the noun phrase *aç kurt* 'hungry wolf', and in (2c) *gibi* is placed after *ayı* 'bear'.

Confining ourselves to the latter example, the question may be posed which part of *ayı gibi* 'like a bear' constitutes the predicate of the sentence. According to Dik (1989: 111), who follows Searle (1969), predicating means "assigning properties and relations to entities". With respect to (2c) it is fully clear, I think, that it is not the property designated by *ayı* 'bear' as such that is assigned to *Hasan*, but merely 'the similarity with a bear'. It follows, then, that 'similarity' (with whatever thing or being) can be conceived of as a property itself. Hence, for (2c) we could say that it is 'similarity with something' as a whole that has been assigned as a property to Hasan. The property 'similarity' as such is expressed by *gibi*, since *ayı* 'bear' is a variable. This can be shown by (3):

- (3) Ama sen *eşek gibi*-sin.
 but you donkey like-2s
 'But you are like a donkey.'

As for the function of postpositions, Lewis (1978: 87) states that "The functions of some English prepositions are performed in Turkish by the case-suffixes. Those of the rest are performed by postpositions, which follow the word they govern". Following Lewis, linguistic material such as *gibi* 'like', *kadar* 'as much as', *ile* 'with', and *için* 'for' can of course be taken together as a group of postpositions governing the absolute or genitive case,² but what is more, such a grouping is based on syntactic phenomena

² Personal pronouns and demonstratives (except the forms *bunlar* and *onlar*) functioning as Standard in a *gibi*-phrase always require the genitive case marker, whereas nouns do not. Compare: *bun-un gibi* 'like this (one)' to *bun-lar gibi* 'like these (ones)' and to *ben-im gibi* 'like me'. Note that the constructions containing a genitive clearly might reflect the possible historical development of *gibi*. Sir Gerald Clauson (1972: 686) mentions the archaic form *ki:b* 'mould, model', for which he states: "In Oğuz it early acquired the metaphorical meaning 'likeness, resemblance' and with the possessive suffix *-i*: *kibi (gibi)* came to be used as a postposition meaning 'like'." Räsänen (1969: 244), on the other hand, lists *kä:p* 'model, resemblance' (German: 'Muster, Bild'). Now, assuming an abstract form *kip* 'model, resemblance' (to bridge

only and it does not take into account the fact that *gibi* 'like' as well as *kadar* 'as much as' can be used both predicatively and attributively. This is impossible, however, for the majority of the postpositions in Turkish, among which we find: *doğru* 'towards', *rağmen* 'in spite of' (both governing the dative), or *dolayı* 'because of', *sonra* 'after' (both governing the ablative). Thus, with respect to their functions, the observations of Lewis do not bring us any further than a superficial comparison of *some* prepositions of English with *some* postpositions of Turkish. Indeed, the English preposition *with* can be compared to the postposition *ile* of Turkish, both expressing the semantic function Instrument or Company, and the case marker *-DA* can be regarded as expressing approximately the same as the preposition *in*, but it nevertheless remains unclear why *gibi* 'like' can be used predicatively (as in (2c) and (3)) and attributively (as in (2 a-b)).

A possible solution to this problem is to assume a *predicate structure* for *gibi* when it is used in similarity-constructions like (2) and (3), and to explore possible constraints on such an assumption. To be more precise, a two-place predicate frame should be assumed, since two participants are involved as follows from the examples given so far. In this way, *gibi* denotes the relation 'similarity' between two entities, that is, the properties that can be assigned to the one entity (for instance, the properties defined by *ayı* 'bear') are partially (not entirely) ascribed to the second entity (for instance, *Hasan*). In other words, with (2c) it is expressed that some (but not all) properties of *ayı* can be assigned to *Hasan*. Therefore, the predicate *ayı* functions as it were as the Standard in such an evaluation, in which *Hasan* is the entity which is compared: the Comparee. Such a two-place structure very much resembles that of Comparative Predicates (cf. Dik 1989: 185). A Comparative Predicate takes a term denoting the Comparee (*primum comparationis*) and a term denoting the Standard (*secundum comparationis*). Compare the predicate structure of *daha zengin* 'richer' (4) with that of *gibi* (5):

(4) a. *daha zengin* (Hasan)_{Standard} (Ayşe)_{Comparee}

b. Ayşe [Hasan-dan daha zengin].

A. Hasan-abl more rich

'Ayşe is (richer than Hasan).'

the gap between Clauson's *ki:b* and Räsänen's *kä:p*) and disregarding any phonological changes, the evolution of *kip* into *gibi* can be thought of as follows: 1) an 'ordinary' possessive construction: noun-gen *kip*-p3s (→ *kip-i*); 2) loss of the genitive case marker, except for highly frequent words such as personal pronouns and demonstratives; 3) semantic dissolution of the suffix *p3s* (*kip-i* → *kipi* = *gibi*).

(5) a. *gibi* (ayı) _{Standard} (Hasan) _{Comparee}

b. Hasan [ayı *gibi*].
 Hasan bear like
 'Hasan is (like a bear).'

The predicate of (4), *daha zengin*, is a derivational product of a Predicate Formation Rule (for comparative adjectives). The argument structure of the (already existing) one-place predicate *zengin* 'rich' is expanded by such a rule: the result is the (new) two-place predicate *daha zengin* 'richer'.

However, this resemblance in structures does not imply that one and the same mechanism is responsible for the production of both the predicates *gibi* and *daha zengin*. For the latter is clearly a derived predicate, whereas *gibi* should be regarded as a basic predicate, which is comparable with other basic two-place predicates, as for instance *baba* 'father'. One might argue, of course, that the predicate *ay* 'bear' could be regarded as being "modified" by a rule that outputs *ay gibi* in the sense of 'bear-like', but on the other hand, it will be difficult to define what kind of input such a rule would take. We do not only have to analyse relatively simple expressions such as (5b), but also those of (6a-b), and as we will see later on, much more complex expressions too. Consider:

(6) a. Hasan was *like* a bear that smells the honey.

'Hasan balı koklayan bir ayı *gibiydi*.'

b. Hasan acted *like* that bear we saw in Salt Lake City.

'Hasan, Salt Lake City'de gördüğümüz ayı *gibi* hareket etti.'

Thus, on purely semantic grounds *gibi* can be regarded as a predicate. But from a syntactic and morphological angle too there are some arguments in favour of this view. An expression based on *gibi* can be interrogated and/or negated, and in this respect, such an expression runs completely parallel to 'normal' non-verbal sentences. Compare (7 a-c) with (7 a'-c'):

(7) a. Hasan ayı *gibi* mi?
 Hasan bear like Q
 'Is Hasan like a bear?'

a'. Hasan Türk mü?
 Hasan Turk Q
 'Is Hasan a Turk?'

- | | |
|--|---|
| b. Hasan ayı gibi değil.
Hasan bear like NEG
'Hasan is not like a bear.' | b'. Hasan Türk değil.
Hasan Turk NEG
'Hasan is not a Turk.' |
| c. Hasan ayı gibi değil mi?
Hasan bear like NEG Q
'Isn't Hasan like a bear?' | c'. Hasan Türk değil mi?
Hasan Turk NEG Q
'Isn't Hasan a Turk?' |

Note that the negation particle *değil* is the typical marker for non-verbal negation. Furthermore, all kinds of morphological material can be attached to *gibi* in predicate position, contrary to all other "postpositions" (except *kadar* 'as much as') mentioned above. Examples (8 a-c) reveal that agreement markers for person can be applied, and the examples (9 a-b) show that a variety of predication operators (such as for tense and mood) can be combined with *gibi*.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (8) a. Sen de ayı gibi-sin.
you too bear like-2s
'You too are like a bear.' | a'. Türk-sün.
Turk-2s
'You are a Turk.' |
| b. Ayı gibi mi-yim?
bear like Q-1s
'Am I like a bear?' | b'. Türk mü-yüm?
Turk Q-1s
'Am I a Turk?' |
| c. O balıkçı-lar gibi-yiz
that fisherman-pl like-1p
'We are like those fishermen.' | c'. Türk-üz
Turk-1p
'We are Turks.' |
| (9) a. Hasan ayı gibi-ydi.
Hasan bear like-ant
'Hasan was like a bear.' | a'. Türk-tü.
Turk-ant
'He was a Turk.' |
| b. Hasan ayı gibi-ymiş.
Hasan bear like-inf
'Hasan seems to be like a bear' | b'. Türk-müş.
Turk-inf
'He seems to be a Turk.' |
| c. Hasan ayı gibi-yse
Hasan bear like-cond
'If Hasan is like a bear' | c'. Türk-se
Turk-cond
'If he is a Turk' |
-

Finally, it seems that together with the question word *ne* 'what' two other question words can be derived on the basis of *gibi*: the singular *ne gibi* 'like what' as in (10), and the plural *neler gibi* as in (11).³

- (10) "O ne gibi?" diye sor-du-n. Di-yor-um ki, ayı gibi.
 he what like saying ask-pst1-2s say-prs2-1s that bear like
 'You asked "What is he like?" I'm telling you (he's) like a bear.'

- (11) 1/Problem-ler-i var. 2/Ne-ler gibi?
 problem-pl-ps3 exist what-pl like
 '1/ He has problems. 2/ (They are) like what (all)?'

Within the framework of FG, however, there is no need to assume that there are two separate question words based on *gibi*, since differences in expression of the grammatical notion Number (*ne gibi* versus *neler gibi*) are accounted for by different values for a corresponding term operator. The question word *ne* too is thought of as being the formal expression of an 'interrogative' term operator.⁴

1.1 The predicative usage of *gibi*

The predicative use of *gibi* is of course not restricted to (relatively) simple constructions as presented above. They were merely introduced as exemplifying the general idea of how similarity constructions are shaped. In texts, however, *gibi*-constructions are predominantly of a more complex character. For instance, in (12), 'the way of life of the women in slums' is compared to 'that of the women living in towns':

- (12) Gecekondu kadın-ları-nın yaşam-ı da
 slum woman-CM-gen way-of-life-p3s and
 A
 kasaba-lar-da yaşa-yan kadın-lar-ın-ki gibi-dir.
 town-pl-loc live-pp woman-pl-gen-re like-emph
 B
 'And the way of life of the women in slums is like that of the women living in towns.'

³ 1/ and 2/ symbolize that the corresponding utterances are produced by two different speakers.

⁴ For details, see Dik (1989: 160) and van Schaaik (1996: 215).

In (12), both Comparee (A) and Standard (B) (see also (5)) are based on nouns. The noun phrase that forms the Standard contains a marker (*-ki*) which I assume expresses anaphoric reference to *yaşam* 'life', as mentioned in the phrase that constitutes the Comparee. Given the structure of (5), the structures of A and B in (12) can be represented as (13). For the sake of simplicity these terms are represented by their actual linguistic expressions instead of their underlying structure.

(13) a. *gibi* (Standard = B) (Comparee = A)

b. A = *gecekondu kadınlarının yaşamı*
 B = *kasabalarda yaşayan kadınların-ki*

Other examples show that (at least) the Standard can be based on a verbal complex, for instance (14):

(14) *Siz bil-mi-yor gibi-siniz.*
 you know-neg-prs3 like-2pl
 'You are like *not knowing*.'

The Comparee of (13) is *siz* 'you', whereas the Standard (*bilmiyor*) is of a verbal nature. I will return to this type of construction in section 3.2.

1.2 The attributive usage of *gibi*

Gibi can also be used attributively. The syntactic position of *gibi* and its complement is equal to that of adjectival modifiers: it is placed before the nominal head of the phrase, as can be exemplified by the following:

(15) [*Ayı gibi*] *bir köpeğ-i var-dı.*
 bear like a dog-p3s exist-ant
 'He had a dog like a bear.'

The "modifier" *ayı gibi* 'like a bear' occupies the normal adjectival position. Replacing *ayı gibi* 'like a bear' by the adjective *kocaman* 'enormous' (if for instance *ayı gibi* 'like a bear' would have been used here to metaphorically express something about the size of a dog), we get in principle the same constituent ordering:

(16) *Kocaman bir köpeğ-i var-dı.*
 enormous a dog-p3s exist-ant
 'He had an enormous/huge dog.'

Under the assumption that *gibi* is a two-place predicate, the underlying structure of the possessed NP in (15) can, according to FG, be represented as (17), where *gibi* occupies the position of an adjectival restrictor.

- (17) $(\lambda x_1 \lambda x_2 : köpek(x_2) : gibi(ay1)(x_1))$

A typical attributive usage of *gibi* is found in what could be termed Exemplifying Constructions. The head of such a construction is a second, third or even fourth order nominal predicate, and this predicate is modified by a *gibi*-phrase which itself is based on a second, third, or fourth order noun that forms an *instantiation* (or example) of the concept or idea the first noun refers to. In the following two examples, second order nominals function as the Comparee and infinitival phrases as the Standard:

Second order entities:

- (18) *kişisel eşyaları-na sahip ol-mak gibi hak-lar*
 personal goods-dat possess-infin like right-pl
 'rights such as / like *possessing personal property*'

- (19) *geleneksel giysiler-i giy-mek gibi adet-ler*
 traditional clothes-acc dress-infin like habit-pl
 'habits such as / like *dressing in traditional clothes*'

The next series of examples clearly shows that finite verb forms may occur in the expression that forms the Standard. The head of the entire noun phrase is coreferential with the Comparee and it expresses a 'feeling', 'sensation', 'impression' and the like.⁵

Third order entities:

- (20) *ben-i küçümse-yecek-miş gibi bir duygu*
 I-acc look down-fut-inf like a impression
 'an impression *that* he will look down on me'

⁵ Note that *gibi* is translated as 'that', rather than as 'like' or 'such as'.

- (21) Kız-lar özellikle ilk ay-lar-da Türkiye-de-ki toplumsal yaşam-a
 girl-pl especially first month-pl-loc Turkey-loc-rel social life-dat
 hiçbir zaman alış-ama-yacak-lar-mış gibi bir hiss-e kapıl-ır-lar.
 never get used-negpot-fut-3p-inf like a feeling-dat seize-prs1-3p
 'Especially in the first months, the girls get the idea *that* they will never be able
 to get used to social life in Turkey.'

Fourth order entities such as "thoughts", "quotes", etc. may function as the Standard as well. Witness constructions such as:

Fourth order entities:

- (22) 'Deniz sıcak mı soğuk mu?' gibi şey-ler-den söz et-ti-k.
 sea warm Q cold Q like thing-pl-abl talk-pst1-1p
 'We talked about things *like* "Is the sea warm or cold?"'
- (23) 'Eğer bun-u böyle yap-sa-ydı-k' gibi düşünce-ler
 if this-acc so do-irr-ant-1p like thought-pl
 'thoughts *like* "If we would have done it this way"'

In some cases it seems that not the nominal head but the adjectival modifier of a noun phrase is modified by a *gibi*-phrase. For instance, in the attested version of (22) the object of conversation was described as:

- (24) 'Deniz sıcak mı soğuk mu?' gibi [aptalca şey-ler]
 'Stupid things like "Is the sea warm or cold?"'

However, not *aptalca* 'stupid' is modified by the *gibi*-phrase, but *aptalca şeyler* as a whole, since *aptalca şeyler* 'stupid things' is a subclass of *şeyler* 'things'. The ordering of (24) can be explained under the general observation that the "last modifier in the underlying structure is expressed first". Example (25) too can be understood in terms of this principle.

- (25) Fakat kadın-erkek ayrılığı şehir-ler-de-ki gibi katı bir şekil-de
 however woman-man distinction city-pl-loc-rel like rigid a way-loc
 uygulan-mı-yor-du.
 impose-neg-prog-ant
 'But the distinction male-female was not imposed in such a rigid way as in the
 cities.'

In (25) an already adjectivally modified noun is modified again by a *gibi*-phrase: underlyingly, *katı bir şekil* 'a rigid way' is restricted by the predicate

gibi which has the anaphoric *şehirlerdeki* 'that (rigid way) of the cities' as the Standard-argument. Clearly, the underlying semantic complexity of a term that functions as the Standard seems to play no role in the applicability of *gibi*.

A special application of *gibi* is found in (26), where the *gibi*-phrase is used as the "target"-argument of the verb *denil-* 'it is said'. The *gibi*-phrase is structured as Headless Relative: it refers to an unmentioned (human) entity, represented below as the term variable *x* in (27), which is "modified" by the predicate *gibi*. Consider:

- (26) Ben-im gibi-ler-e inek de-nil-diğ-in-i bil-ir-im.
 I-gen like-pl-dat cow say-pass-prt1-p3s-acc know-prs1-1s
 'I know that they say 'cow' to people like me.'

The underlying structure of *benim gibiler* can be thought of as (27a), which parallels an "ordinary" Headless Relative (27b) or a Headless NP (27c):

- (27) a. (i 1 x_i : gibi (ben) (x_i)) → 'someone like me'
 b. (i 1 x_i : [konuş_v (x_i)]) → 'someone who talks'
 c. (i 1 x_i : zengin_A (x_i)) → 'someone who is ill'

In terms of FG, (27a) can literally be read as "a singular entity, x , such that the property '*gibi(ben)*' applies to x_i ", and which may be interpreted as 'someone like me'. Hence, application of the number operator *m* for plural instead of the operator '1' for singular (compare (10) and (11)) will yield 'people like me'.

Summarizing this section, we saw that the predicative character of *gibi* was demonstrated on the basis of (2c), (3), (7)-(9), (12) and (14), and furthermore, it was shown that *gibi* is placed in sentence final position when it is used as the head of a predication. In its attributive use *gibi* is placed in the typical adjectival position, that is, before the noun it modifies (cf. (15), (18)-(25)).

2 Factual similarity

In this section we will show how various similarity constructions are related to the schema of (1). For Manner Expressions (2.1) and for verbal Similitative expressions it will be shown how such constructions could be analysed in terms of underlying structures, according to the principles of FG. In order to keep this paper within reasonable limits with respect to its size, the remainder of this section will, however, be of a more exploratory nature.

2.1 Level 1: Manner Expressions

Manner Expressions⁶ are adverbial phrases which express the way (Manner) in which some action takes place. Let us first of all present some relevant examples of the material under investigation. Consider the following:

- (28) Hasan *çabukça* yaz-ıyor.
 Hasan quickly write-prs2
 'Hasan writes quickly.'

In (28) it is expressed how 'Hasan writes', namely 'quickly'. The Manner adverb *çabukça* 'quickly' is said to add a certain feature to the activity 'writing': *writing quickly* is different from *writing* (cf. Dik 1989: 192ff). Now, suppose that a second person, say *Ali*, is writing in the same way or manner. This State of Affairs can of course be expressed independently from the utterance of (28), for instance by *Ali çabukça yazıyor* 'Ali writes quickly' or, more emphatically, by *Ali de çabukça yazıyor* 'Ali too writes quickly', but as a logical consequence, one also might compare the manner in which 'Ali writes' to the manner in which 'Hasan writes', since both 'manners in which is (being) written' are described by *çabukça* 'quickly'. This is, to my opinion, what happens when Manner Expressions are used: the actual manner is not expressed, but the way some action is performed is related to the way some *other* action is carried out. As an illustration, consider (29), where 'Ali's way of writing' is evaluated on the basis of 'Hasan's way of writing':

- (29) Ali Hasan *gibi* yaz-ıyor.
 Ali Hasan like write-prs2
 'Ali writes like Hasan.'

It is clear that the phrase *Hasan gibi* can be considered as an adverbial satellite in the domain of the predication defined by *yaz-* 'write', but it is also evident, I think, that the way *Ali* writes is not determined by *Hasan* as such. In other words, the Manner satellite cannot be based only on the term of

⁶ Analogous to the case of English for instance, Manner Expressions in Turkish are clearly distinct from so-called Role Phrases. As in English, a sentence expressing similarity of Manner (a) requires a different "postposition" than a sentence that expresses some "quality" or "role" (b):

a. He talks <i>like</i> a lawyer.	=	Avukat <i>gibi</i> konuşuyor.
b. He talks <i>as</i> a lawyer.	=	Avukat <i>olarak</i> konuşuyor.

which *Hasan* is the head. In order to arrive at a structural description of sentences like (29), let us take a more complex type of sentence.

Contrary to (29), in (30) the similarity between the way in which two *different* actions are performed is expressed.

- (30) Ali, Hasan-ın konuş-tuğ-u gibi yaz-ar. (Anlaşılamaz)
 Ali Hasan-gen speak-prt1-p3s like write-prs1
 'Ali writes like Hasan talks.' (Incomprehensibly)

Since it is implied by verbs such as *konus-* (having the features [+ control] and/or [+ dynamic]) that the action is performed in a certain manner, there is always a slot in the structure that allows for expansion with a Manner phrase. Thus, departing from for instance *Hasan konuşuyor* 'Hasan talks', an appropriate complement, as in *Hasan çabukça konuşuyor* 'Hasan talks quickly', should always be possible because *yaz-* 'write' is an action verb. This possibility of expansion by a Manner-term can be represented as the following:

- (31) $\text{konuş}_V [\text{Hasan}] (x_i)_{\text{Man}}$

Now, representing 'the way Hasan talks' by M_H , and assuming that this structure is underlyingly equal to a Headless Relative (cf. (26)), M_H can be represented as (32a), and similarly, 'the way Ali writes' (M_A) can be represented by (32b):

- (32) a. $M_H = (x_i : [\text{konuş}_V (\text{Hasan})] (x_i)_{\text{Man}})$
 b. $M_A = (x_j : [\text{yaz}_V (\text{Ali})] (x_j)_{\text{Man}})$

As follows from (30), M_A (= 'the way Ali writes') is related to M_H (= 'the way Hasan talks') by means of *gibi*. The structure of (32a), then, can be taken as the Standard-term of this predicate. This gives:

- (33) $M_A = (x_j : [\text{gibi} (M_H)] (x_j)_{\text{Man}})$

Substituting M with its corresponding structure (32a), then, leads to a new structure which represents the relation between both manners: 'the way Ali writes' is modified by 'the way Hasan talks' via the predicate *gibi*. This results in:

- (34) $M_A = (x_j : [\text{gibi} (x_i : [\text{konuş} (\text{Hasan})] (x_i)_{\text{Man}}]) (x_j)_{\text{Man}}$

Thus, we get a complex structure: a headless relative in x_j , denoting 'the way Ali writes'. This headless relative is modified by the similarity predicate *gibi*, in which another headless relative, denoting 'the way Hasan writes', has been inserted. In a simplified fashion the entire structure of (30) can be represented as (35a), and in a more elaborate version by (35b):

- (35) a. [yaz (Ali)] (M_A)_{Man}
 b. [yaz (Ali)] (x_j; (*gibi* (x_i : [Hasan konuş])_{Man})_{Man}

Other instances of Manner satellites can be explained in much the same way. Consider the following example, where the referent of the Agent-term of 'writing' is identical with the one of 'talking'.

- (36) Hasan konuş-tuğ-u gibi yaz-ıyor.
 Hasan speak-prt1-p3s like write-prs2
 'Hasan writes like he talks.'

In principle, a structure like (35) can be assumed for (36), being that the Agent of the embedded predication is to be represented by a co-indexed term variable, since both Agents are identical.

Similarity constructions can be considered highly frequent expressions, since they provide a means to express a Manner not in terms of intrinsic properties or in terms of "exact equality", but rather in terms of "derived" or "borrowed" properties. The "popularity" of Manner Expressions especially comes to the fore in metaphoric usage, witness more or less standard comparisons like *Bülbül gibi şarkı söylüyor* '(S)he sings like a nightingale' (implying a certain degree of "niceness") and *Aç kurt gibi yiyor* '(S)he eats like a hungry wolf' (implying a certain degree of "greediness"). Especially the final example of this section provides a good illustration of how a general picture of some event can be created on the basis of comparison.

- (37) Kemikli, ince el-i şeftali-ler-in üzer-in-de yorgun bir örümcek gibi
 bony fine hand-p3s peach-pl-gen surface-p3s-loc tired a spider l ike
 gezin-me-ye başla-dı.
 walk-nom-dat start-pst1
 'Her small bony hand started to walk over the peaches like a tired spider.'

This sentence, taken from Orhan Pamuk's novel *Sessiz Ev*, is not meant to inform the reader about an old and short-sighted lady's hand, moving around in "the way in which a tired spider would walk over (a fruit-bowl filled with) peaches", but is meant to evoke associations with the (low)

speed of a touching and feeling hand, the *form* of which resembles a tired spider.

2.2 Level 2: Similative Expressions

By means of Similative Expressions two States of Affairs are compared to one another by means of *gibi*. The typical linguistic structure that describes a State of Affairs is the predication, and the types of predication which are relevant for our discussion are: verbal and existential predications. The data will be presented in this order.

2.2.1 Verbal constructions

When two different States of Affairs (hereafter SoA's) are defined by the same verbal predicate, the latter SoA can be expressed in several ways. Suppose that the first SoA is designated by 'Hasan went to Izmir' and that a second SoA is described by 'Ali went to Izmir'. Presenting both SoA's independently could be done along the lines of:

- (38) a. SoA_H: Hasan İzmir-e git-ti
 Hasan İzmir-dat go-pst1
- b. SoA_A: Ali İzmir-e git-ti
 Ali İzmir-dat go-pst1

Another way of expressing that 'go to Izmir' applies to *Ali* as well is achieved by anaphoric reference: *Ali de* 'Ali too' or '(And) So did Ali'. A sentence with two coordinated clauses, such as *Hasan İzmir'e gitti, Ali de* 'Hasan went to Izmir, and so did Ali', can be understood in terms of a sequence of two predications.

Contrary to this type of expressions, Similative Expressions do not express the relation between two SoA's sequentially, but rather, the similarity between two SoA's is expressed "in one breath", that is, by means of comparing them via *gibi*. The corresponding Similative Expression for (38 a-b) is:

- (39) Hasan gibi Ali de İzmir-e git-ti.
 Hasan like Ali too İzmir-dat go-pst1
 'Like Hasan, Ali also went to Izmir.'

Before we go into the question as to how such expressions are structured, let me present an example of a Similative Expression which overtly reveals that entirely different States of Affairs may be involved as well. Consider:

- (40) Hasan-ın şiir yaz-dığ-ı gibi Ali de resam olarak çalış-ıyor.
 Hasan-gen poem write-prt1-p3s like Ali too painter as work-prs2
 'Just as / like Hasan writes poems, Ali works as a painter.'

When we apply an analysis similar to that of Manner Expressions, the SoA symbolized by *Hasan-ın şiir yaz-dığ-ı* 'Hasan's-poem-writing' (SoA_H) can be represented by the predication variable e , as in (41). For *Ali resam olarak çalışıyor* 'Ali's-working-as-a-painter' (SoA_A) a similar structure can be set up, as represented in (43):

- (41) SoA_H = (e_i : [yaz_V (Hasan)_{Ag} (şiir)_{Go}] (e_i))
 (42) SoA_A = (e_j : [çalış_V (Ali)_{Ag} (resam)_{Qual}] (e_j))

The next step is to link both SoA's in such a way that the relationship "SoA_H is similar to SoA_A" is represented. This can be achieved by assuming that SoA_H functions as the Standard in the predicate *gibi*, and by assuming that this predicate functions as a restrictor on SoA_A. If these assumptions are right, the following picture emerges:

- (43) (e_j : [çalış (Ali) (resam)] (e_j) : gibi [e_i : [yaz_V (Hasan)_{Ag} (şiir)_{Go}] (e_i)] (e_j))

An argument in favour of this view is found in the fact that two "events" are compared or opposed to one another. These events, possibly entirely different in nature (which is obviously the case for (40)), are described by the nuclear predication based on *yaz*- 'write' and *çalış*- 'work' respectively. As a matter of fact, it does not matter what kind of correspondence or other similarity between these events *really* exists. It is only expressed by utterances such as (40) that two events are indeed compared.

Now, let us return to the analysis of (39). Since it has been established that (40) constitutes a kind of expression in which all variables have different values (different verbs, Agents, and Goal-terms), we may consider (39) as a construction with a shared verbal predicate and a shared Direction-term, because the *gibi*-phrase of (39) can only be interpreted as 'Hasan went to Izmir (too)'. We then arrive at the conclusion that anaphora cover these shared values.

2.2.2 Existential constructions

So far we have discussed and analysed constructions expressing the similarity between SoA's which are based on verbal predication. In this sub-

section we will introduce some other types of similarity expressions, namely those which are based on existential⁷ predications.

We shall first examine Existential Similitives. An illustration of this type of expressions is represented in (44). A statement such as (44) may lead to a variety of logical inferences. One of them, 'there are many cows in Holland', provides us with a clue for further analysis.

- (44) Hollanda'da ol-duğ-u gibi Türkiye'de de çok inek var.
 Holland-loc be-pt1-p3s like Turkey-loc too many cow exist.
 'Like (it is) in Holland, there are many cows in Turkey.'

As is the case for verbal Similitive Expressions, two SoA's form the basis of expressions such as (44). First, we have an SoA defined by 'there are many cows in Turkey'. Second, this SoA is compared with a second SoA which is defined by 'there are many cows in Holland'. Underlyingly, however, the cow-term is left unspecified, and hence, it is not expressed.

On the basis of (45) too it is evident that although an underlying term position is left unspecified, some inferences can be made:

- (45) Avrupa-da ol-duğ-u gibi çok ağır ceza-lar var.
 Europe-loc be-pt1-p3s like very severe penalty-plur exist
 'Like in Europe, there are very severe penalties (here).'

In (45) two underlying terms are left unspecified. Firstly, similar to the case of (44), it can be inferred that 'there are severe penalties in Europe'. Secondly, whereas the existential expression which functions as the Standard contains a locative term (e.g. *Avrupa-da* 'in Europe'), the locative term of the second SoA is not overtly expressed, leading to the default interpretation 'here' with respect to location.

2.2.3 Predicational satellites

Now that it has been established that the predicate *gibi* is indeed able to relate two verbal or existential predications, I will discuss predicational satellites for Location and Time, together with a satellite for Reference. By way of an introduction, consider the following sentence:

⁷ For a more elaborate discussion of existential constructions in Turkish, see van Schaaik (1996: 185-192, 229-233).

- (46) Her iş-te ol-duğ-u gibi burada da dikkatli olmak gerek-iyor.
 every job-loc be-pt1-p3s like here too careful be be required-prs2
 'Like in every job, here too it is required to be careful.'

In (46) we find a *gibi*-phrase containing a locative expression. Contrary to the examples discussed previously, the Comparee is not based on an existential construction, but on a verbal predicate, i.e. *gerek* 'be necessary'. Although the similarity of (46) with Existential Similatives is striking, it is not difficult to show that existence does not play a role here. If the locative term is regarded as a satellite on a co-referential predication (including its arguments), then (46) can correctly be analysed in terms of a comparison between two SoA's, as expressed by *gibi*, and it can be shown that the claim with respect to the possibility of either "specifying a satellite" or "leaving it open" is a realistic one.

In exactly the same way, Similitive Expressions with a Temporal satellite can be analysed. Consider the following statement, recorded from a TV-program.

- (47) Her zaman ol-duğ-u gibi bu akşam da en güzel dilek-ler-imiz-i
 always be-pt1-p3s like tonight too nicest wish-pl-p1p-acc
 sun-uyor-uz.
 present-prs2-1p
 'As always, also tonight we present our nicest request-songs.'

Structurally speaking, the sentence in (47) is almost like that of (46), the difference being that it contains a satellite "Time" instead of "Location".

2.3 Level 3: Propositional satellites

Things people can be said to know, believe, mention, think about, deny, reject, remember and the like, are propositions rather than SoA's, and they can be reason for doubt or surprise. In addition to this, a proposition can be said to be true or false (cf. Dik 1989: 48).

When applied to (linguistic) propositions, however, one should be careful with the notions "true" and "false". They must not be understood in terms of "propositions are always either true or false", but rather in the sense of "certain circumstances being given, a proposition is true or false". That people, as language users, are aware of this relationship can be inferred from the fact that the limited validity of some propositions can be expressed by adding a satellite that pertains to its (possible) truth-values. Consider the following example, in which the truth-value of a statement (proposition) made earlier in the discourse is commented upon:

- (48) *Bunu, Hollanda'da oturan Türk-ler için di-yebil-iyor-uz.*
 this Holland-loc living Turk-pl for say-pot-prs2-1p
 'We can say this of the Turks who live in the Netherlands.'

By (48) it is asserted that 'what has been said before' is true, but by means of the satellite *Hollanda'da oturan Türkler için* it is expressed that what the proposition *bunu* refers to, is true 'for the Turks who live in the Netherlands' only. Thus, the presence of *Hollanda'da oturan Türkler için* tells us something about the validity of the proposition referred to by *bunu* 'this', namely, that it is only true in relation to what is specified by this satellite phrase, whereas that proposition must be taken to be false in all other circumstances.

The next examples illustrate how *gibi* can be used in expressions containing a propositional satellite. Consider (49), in which the two constituents compared are "centered" around *gibi*.

- (49) *Gönüllü görevli-ler için ol-duğ-u gibi profesyonel görevli-ler için de*
 volunteer employee-pl for be-prt1-p3s like professional employee-pl for too
 en büyük sorun bilgisizlik-ten kaynaklan-ıyor.
 biggest problem ignorance-abl originate-prs2
 'As for volunteers, for professional employees too the biggest problem arises from ignorance.'

It is clear what (49) is about. Apparently, there is a 'problem' which 'arises from ignorance'. This 'biggest-problem-arises-from-ignorance' is a possible fact, since it can be believed, rejected etc., and because it may be true or false. With respect to the latter notions, from (49) it can be inferred that this (possible) fact obtains with both 'professional employees' and 'volunteers': it is stated as such. When we split up the whole in terms of what obtains, we might say that 'the-biggest-problem-arises-from-ignorance holds for *professionals*' and that 'the-biggest-problem-arises-from-ignorance holds for *volunteers*'. And thus, what is compared or opposed in (49) by means of *gibi* are two propositions. The usage of *gibi* in expressions that emphasize that some fact, the propositional content, is supposed to be known is very frequent as well. Compare (50) with (51), which are based on the active verb stem *bil-* 'know' and on its passive counterpart *bil-in-* 'be known':

- (50) *Bil-diğ-imiz gibi bizim klasik müziğ-imiz-de ...*
 know-prt1-plp like our classical music-plp-loc
 'As we know, in our classical music...'

- (51) Bilin-diğ-i gibi bizim klasik müziğ-imiz-de ...
 be known-prtl-p3s like our classical music-plp-loc
 'As is known, in our classical music...'

The first step towards a complete analysis is to observe that the propositional content, X, of 'in our classical music...' is modified by *bildiğimiz gibi* 'as we know' in (50) and by *bilindiği gibi* in (51). These satellites can be regarded as a relative clause in X. As a matter of fact, what is actually said by *bildiğimiz gibi* or *bilindiği gibi* cannot be anything else than a proposition itself, because these "possible facts" can be denied: for one could say to believe, deny or (not) remember that "we know X" or that "X is known".

2.4 Level 4: Confirmative Expressions

By means of verbs like say, tell, ask, order, announce, deny, inform etc. reference can be made to an illocution. Within the framework of FG, illocutionary matters are scaled on level 4. It is not very surprising that on this level too *gibi* can be applied. It is widely used in comparing or opposing speech acts. Consider the following statements, taken from a TV-programme (52, 53), from a text book (54), and a text fragment recorded from a radio-interview (55) respectively:

- (52) Daha önce belirt-tiğ-imiz gibi, yakınma-lar ...
 earlier state-prtl-plp as complaint-pl
 'As we have stated earlier, the complaints ...'
- (53) Daha önce belirt-il-diğ-i gibi ...
 earlier be stated-prtl-p3s like
 'As (has been/was) stated earlier...'
- (54) Demin de söyle-diğ-im gibi ...
 just before too say-prtl-pls like
 'As I (have) said a second ago ...'
- (55) Kapıcı Cafer tip-i bir hayal mahsul-ü, dediğiniz gibi.
 doorkeeper Cafer type-CM a imagination product-CM 'as you said'
 'The type 'doorkeeper Cafer' is a product of the imagination, as you said.'

The passive form of *belirt-* 'to state', *belirtil-* 'to be stated', was recorded elsewhere. Although (52) and (53) are underlyingly structured in different ways (an active verb versus a passive verb), they can be regarded as pure

stylistic means to achieve one and the same goal: to compare an utterance with one expressed earlier.

As for the placement of the *gibi*-phrase, all examples presented so far (including those used to exemplify Manner Expressions and Similitive Expressions) clearly demonstrate that the *gibi*-phrase is syntactically treated as if it were an ordinary adjectival restrictor. The syntactic pattern is arranged according to the principle "modifier precedes modified", but (55) constitutes a possible exception since *dediğiniz gibi* '(it is) as you (have) said' is placed in clause final position.

It should be noted, however, that Confirmative Expressions very often have no other function than bridging a gap in the continuous production of utterances, rather than that their usage is based on the intention to add information to the Hearer's knowledge. Most likely, an attentive Hearer (who listens carefully) will more or less be able to recall what has been said before. Thus, a multitude of Confirmative Expressions in a certain discourse will tell us probably more about the strategies of the Speaker to achieve his communicative goals, than that it is informative with respect to "what has been said before".

This typical "bridging the gap"-strategy is especially apparent in the following example (also taken from an interview) where it is difficult to determine what the Speaker actually "has said in the beginning". This strategy is also signalled by the twofold use of the interjection *ih* 'uh' in the direct environment of the *gibi*-phrase.

- (56) a. Ekonomik durum-u-nun çok iyi ol-ma-sı lazım, ih,
 economic situation-p3s-gen verygood be-nom-p3s necessary uh
 baş-ta da anlat-tığ-ım gibi, ih,
 beginning-loc too tell-prt1-pls like uh

- b. ekonomik durum hayat standard-ın-ı belirli-yor.
 economic situation life standard-CM-acc determine-prs2
 'Its economic situation should be very good, uh, as I (have) said in the
 beginning, uh, the economic situation determines the standard of life.'

If necessary at all, it is left to the Hearer to choose between (56 a-b) in order to establish what the intermediate *gibi*-phrase relates to.

Concluding this section, we can say that by means of Similitive Expressions two SoA's (relations, possible facts) are compared or opposed to one another. This can be done on the basis of the type of predication they have in common. In 2.2.1 predications based on a verb were discussed, and in 2.2.2 we saw that existential predications were the shared property of two SoA's. As was shown in 2.2.3, it is also possible to compare two SoA's

with respect to *place* ("like everywhere") and *time* ("like always"), which are relevant for their "validity". In these constructions, notably, one of the locational or temporal satellites is not expressed: the (unspecified) default values "here" and "now" relevant for one SoA are compared or opposed to other points in space and time, being relevant for another SoA defined by the *same* nuclear predication. The similarity of satellites for *place* and *time* was exemplified by (46) and (47) respectively. In 2.3 satellites were compared which specify the validity of some propositional content (cf. (48) and (49)). Finally, in section 2.4 it was shown that entities on level 4 (clausal structures) can also be compared (cf. (52)-(56)).

3 Non-factual similarity

3.0 Introduction

In the last section we will discuss and exemplify constructions which are structurally comparable with those treated so far, but for which on the other hand a separate treatment is justifiable since they all are used to express SoA's in a hypothetical rather than a realistic fashion. In order to illustrate this statement compare the examples below:

- (57) a. He laughed *because* he was happy.
 b. He laughed *as if* he was happy.
 c. You don't understand it.
 d. *As if* you don't understand it.

We could say that in (57a) a *factual* reason ('he was happy') is provided for 'he laughed'. As such, 'he was happy' is a fact which can be "believed, known, mentioned, thought about, denied, remembered, etc." and it can be true or false, all being the typical properties of facts (cf. 2.3). In (57b), on the other hand, the relationship between 'he was happy' and 'he laughed' is presented in a non-factual fashion. The connective *as if* introduces a quasi-reason: the person talked about was probably not happy at all. The relation between (57a) and (57b) will be treated in 3.1. Similarly, (57c) describes a factual and (57d) a non-factual SoA. This opposition will be discussed in 3.2. Constructions like (57b) and (57d) will be referred to as Quasi Expressions.

3.1 Quasi Expressions

Level 2-satellites specify for the SoA (as defined in the nuclear predication) how it can be related to spatial, temporal, and cognitive dimensions. In this domain we find, among others, satellites for the expression of Location,

Time, Circumstance, Result, Purpose, Reason, and Cause. The possibilities to apply such satellites are determined by the nature of the nuclear predicate. For instance, a predication based on a verb like *slice* can be further specified for Reason, as in the following example:

- (58) Bill sliced the bread *because he was hungry*. (= Reason)

Obviously, the Reason for 'Bill's-bread-slicing' is that 'he is hungry', and this relationship is presented by means of the connective *because*. The second predication ('he was hungry') thus forms the core of the satellite. In a similar way, satellites for Circumstance (59a), Result (59b), Purpose (59c), and Cause (59d) are built up, which can be exemplified as follows:

- (59) a. Bill sliced the bread while he was singing. (= Circumstance)
 b. Bill sliced the bread so that we could make sandwiches. (= Result)
 c. Bill sliced the bread in order to make breakfast. (= Purpose)
 d. Bill sliced the bread because his wife was ill. (= Cause)

In any of these cases it is *asserted* that the main predication obtains in relation to the cognitive dimension (spatial, temporal, etc.) as specified by a corresponding satellite. Thus, it should be taken for "true" that 'Bill's slicing the bread' is indeed concurrent with the Circumstance 'he was singing' (59a); and that the Result hereof can adequately be defined by 'we could make sandwiches' (59b). Furthermore, for (59c) it should be taken for granted (true) that 'to make sandwiches' indeed reflects the Purpose of Bill's activities, as described by the main predication; and in (59d) 'his-wife's-being-ill' is advanced as the Reason for this SoA.

Now, besides *asserting* that a certain SoA is related to the SoA as defined by the main predication, one has a possibility of *suggesting* such a relationship. Certain satellites can be linguistically presented in such a way that they suggest a *possible* (but sometimes not a *probable*) Circumstance or Motivation (as Reason, Purpose, and Cause can be named), rather than that such a relationship is asserted or presented as a fact. This can be done by comparing (in the sense as used here throughout) two SoA's, one of which is a Circumstance or Motivation satellite. For an illustration of this mechanism compare the following sentences of Turkish:

- (60) Konuş-mak-tan yorul-duğ-u için sus-tu.
 speak-infin-abl get tired-prt1-p3s because be silent-pst1
 'He was silent *because* he was tired of speaking.'

- (61) Konuş-mak-tan yorul-muΣ-Ø gibi sus-tu.
 speak-infin-abl get tired-pst2-3s like be silent-pst1
 'He was silent *as if* he was tired of speaking.'

Whereas the satellite of (60) provides a reason which is beyond doubt for the speaker, from (61) it is clear that the speaker has a different attitude towards the propositional content of what he conveys as a (possible) reason for *sustu* 'he was silent'. This type of Subjective Modality (possibly a 'personal opinion') is reflected in the morpheme *-mİş*. One direction for further analysis of (61) is to examine if a propositional operator can be assumed. The idea for such an assumption is based on the observation that the suffix *-mİş* is also used for the expression of Evidential Modalities such as experiential, inferential and quotative / reportative. Consider the following interpretations of (62):

- (62) Hasan konuş-mak-tan yorul-muş.
 Hasan speak-infin-abl be tired-pst2
 'Hasan is tired of speaking (as I see)'. Experiential
 'Hasan is tired of speaking (as I infer)'. Inferential
 'Hasan is tired of speaking (as I was told)'. Quotative

I think an operator alone is not sufficient to account for the entire "reason phrase" of (61), since the value "Possible" (reflecting the Speaker's opinion) will evoke the suffix *-mİş* only, thereby mitigating the possible fact expressed by this phrase. There is more, so to speak, because the occurrence of *gibi* strongly suggests that such an expression is based on the comparison between an abstract reason with a possible reason. Therefore we can assume a structure for the *gibi*-phrase proper, which is very much like those of Manner Expressions (cf. (30)-(35) in section 2).

Before we derive the structures of (60) and (61), let us first take a closer look at the structure of Reason and Cause satellites. Reason and Cause are expressed in Turkish in similar ways, and hence, there is not always a clear-cut morphological or syntactic difference between both types of Motivational Expressions. In a rough approximation, one could say that in asking for a Reason or Cause the word *neden* is used, which is related to a second order nominal denoting "the reason *for*" or "the cause *of*" some SoA, and that, in answering such a question, the SoA that forms the reason or cause (being asked for) is based on an embedded verbal predication.

As has been said above, Reason or Cause can be expressed by means of the lexical word *neden*. This word is from an etymological point of view quite interesting. It can be decomposed into the question word *ne* 'what' and the ablative suffix *-den*, which expresses Source. Thus, *neden* can be used

as a question word: 'why', but also as a noun in the meaning of 'a/the reason' or 'a/the cause'. It is obvious that semantic specialization is responsible for the transition from 'why' to 'the why'.⁸ Thus, as a (lexicalized) noun it can be considered as a second order two-place predicate, since "a reason is always a reason *for* something", and because "a cause is always a cause *of* something". Compare the usage of *neden* as a question word in (63a) to its usage as a nominal predicate in (63b):

- (63) a. *Neden iş-siz-sin?*
 why job-without-2s
 'Why are you unemployed?'
 b. *Bu düşüş-ün neden-i ne?*
 this decrease-gen reason-p3s what
 'What is the reason of this decrease?'

The argument position with the semantic function *Reference* may be left unspecified in the two-place predicate *neden* 'reason', as can be inferred from sayings like *bu nedenle* 'for this reason', *bu nedenlerle* 'for these reasons', and *çeşitli nedenlerle* 'for different / a variety of reasons'.

The type of term to be inserted as a Reference-term is typically based on second order entities. This can be illustrated by the following.

- (64) *bir hafta de-me-m-in neden-i*
 a week say-nom-pls-gen reason-p3s
 'the reason of my saying "one week"'

In (64), the nominalized form *deme* of *de-* 'to say' constitutes the core of the embedded predication. The Agent is expressed by means of a possessive suffix (*-m* 'my'). Similarly, the third person Agent of *gelme-yiş* 'the act of not coming' in (65) is expressed by a third person possessive suffix:

- (65) *Gel-me-yiş-i-nin neden-in-i diğer bir gün açıkla-r.*
 come-neg-nom-p3s-gen reason-p3s-acc other a day explain-prsI
 'She explains the reason for her not coming another day.'

Now, in answering such questions based on *neden* (as in (63 a-b)) or in specifying some reason or cause, referred to by *neden* (as in (64) and (65)), an *için*-construction provides the necessary information. Consider:

⁸ This is comparable with the Dutch way of saying: *Het hoe en het waarom weet ik niet* 'I don't know "the how and the why"'.

- (66) Bunun neden-i ise, evli bir kadın-in evliliğ-in-de-ki
 this-gen reason-p3s as for married a woman-gen marriage-p3s-loc-rel
 kötülük-ler-i kına-yla gelin-e geçir-ebil-eceğ-in-e inan-ıl-dığ-ı
 badness-plur-acc henna-ins bride-dat pass-pot-fut-p3s-dat believe-pass-prt1-p3s
için-dir.
 because-emph
 'As for its reason, (it is) *because* it is believed that the bad things in the marriage
 of a married woman can pass to the bride via the henna.'
- (67) Fakat kanama-lar-a neden ol-duğ-u için ...
 but bleeding-pl-dat reason be-prt1-p3s because
 'But *because* it was the reason (cause) for the bleedings...'
 'But since it caused the bleedings ...'

In both (66) and (67), the reason or cause referred to by *neden* is specified by and *için*-phrase: *inanıldığı için* 'because it is believed' in (66), and *olduğu için* 'because it is' in (67).

As for the semantic difference between Reason and Cause satellites, Dik (1989: 207) distinguishes between a "causal ground ascribed to the controller of an SoA" (Reason) and a "motivation which is not ascribed to any of the participants in the SoA" (Cause). In Turkish this difference is not morphologically expressed. As we have seen, *için* is used for both Reason and Cause.⁹ The next example is presented to show that analysing the form *hisset-* as a [- control] verb stem justifies the conclusion that (68) is about a Cause, rather than a Reason.

- (68) Hastane personel-in-den kork-tuk-ları-nı hisset-tik-leri için böyle
 hospital personnel-CM-abl fear-prt1-p3p-acc feel-prt1-p3p since such
 yer-ler-de rahat ed-eme-z-ler.
 place-pl-loc rest-negpot-prs1-3p
 'Because they feel that they fear the hospital personnel, they cannot feel at ease in
 such places.'

Now, returning to the question as to how (60) (= *Konuşmaktan yorulduğu için sustu*) is underlyingly structured, we may conclude that a Reason or Cause satellite is based on an SoA that modifies the SoA defined by the main predication. The final step in arriving at a structural description for

⁹ In fact, we can say that all Motivational satellites in Turkish are expressed by means of *için*. Compare for instance the expression of Purpose in: *biraz para kazan-mak için* (little money earn-infin for) 'in order to earn some money'.

(62) is the introduction of a third SoA that is expressed *as if* it were some Reason or Cause. This “anonymous” SoA is not the Reason or Cause actually expressed, but functions underlyingly as a dummy Comparee. It is compared or opposed with the SoA that is eventually expressed as the *suggested* Reason or Cause, which itself functions as the Standard of comparison.

In the final paragraphs of this subsection I will demonstrate that the analysis as presented here for expressions of Reason and Cause is consistent with respect to other level 2 satellites, too (Circumstance, Result or Consequence). In the examples below, the *as if* constituents of Turkish are italicized. Furthermore, they show that the verbal predications are fully specified for *negation*, *tense*, and for *agreement* in grammatical person (see also 3.4).

a) *Reason and Cause*. All SoA's of (69) are based on verbal predications. Note that the verbs of (69b) and (69c) contain a suffix that agrees (see also section 3.4) in person with the Agent.

(69) a. *Sigara-sız yap-ama-yacak-mış-Ø gibi bir sigara yak-tı.*
cigarette-pr do-negpot-fut-inf-3s like a cigarette light-pst1
'He lit a cigarette as if he couldn't do without (one).'

b. *At araba-sın-a bin-miş-im gibi heyecanlan-dı-m.*
horse cart-CM-dat mount-pst2-1s like get excited-pst1-1s
'I was excited as if I had mounted a horsecart.'

c. *Beni hiç gör-me-miş-sin gibi dur-up bak-ma.*
I-acc emph see-neg-pst2-2s like stand-sim look-neg-imp
'Don't stand there looking at me as if you'd never seen me.'

Along the lines of what has been said in 3.1.1, we could assume for (69a) that the suggested Reason to light a cigarette is provided by *sigarasız yapamayacak* 'he can not do (it) without a cigarette'. In (69b) the feeling of excitement is compared to the feeling caused by (the apparently joyful event of) *At arabasına binmişim* 'I mounted a horsecart', and (69c) connects a possible (but obviously invalid, refuted, or unacceptable) Reason for some kind of 'standing and looking'.

b) *Circumstance*. The SoA's in (70a) and (70b) define a Circumstance, which is based on a verbal predication, whereas in (70c) it is based on an existential predication.

- (70) a. Ben, *Hasan* birşey gör-me-miş gibi devam et-ti-m.
 I Hasan something see-neg-pst2 like continue-pst1-ls
 'I continued as if Hasan didn't see anything.'
- b. Az sonra birşey ol-ma-mış gibi gir-di.
 a little later a thing happen-neg-pst2 like enter-pst1
 'He entered as if nothing had happened.'
- c. *Dünya-da* başka bir kadın yok-muş gibi onu düşün-üyor.
 world-loc other a woman negex-inf like her think-prs2
 'He thinks of her as if there were no other woman in the world.'

As indicated before, an SoA can be linked to another SoA not only by *asserting* but also by *suggesting* that they relate one to another. In (70a) the (italicized) complement of *gibi* denotes an SoA which is possible, but not probable, and in terms of propositional content, it is (most probably or perhaps almost surely) not true that *Hasan birşey görmemiş* 'Hasan has not seen anything'. This can be inferred on the basis of the following.

The SoA described by *Hasan birşey görmemiş* 'Hasan hasn't seen anything' is a circumstance under which it is self-evident that the referent of *ben* 'I' of the main clause might have continued his activities undisturbed. In other words, there is a circumstance, described by SoA₁, which does not interfere with a second circumstance, SoA₂. To my opinion, if this were self-evident, the fact of non-interference would not be worth mentioning at all.

However, a possible (or suggested) interference of two SoA's can be expressed by means of *gibi*. By connecting the SoA *Hasan birşey görmemiş* with the SoA of the main clause through *gibi*, the picture emerges that it is not self-evident that both SoA's do not interfere. What is more, it is strongly suggested that *Hasan birşey görmemiş* is not true, i.e. there is a circumstance, namely "Hasan did really see something", which normally speaking would have effected the course of activities expressed by the main clause. And quite similarly, on the basis of (70b) it is, contrary to what is actually being said – 'nothing happened' –, safe to assume that something *did* happen, and that this particular fact or circumstance would or could have effected the way of entering. From (70c) it follows clearly that the opposite of *Dünya-da başka bir kadın yok* 'There is no other woman in the world' is true, but if this would not have been the case, this circumstance would provide an excellent explanation for thinking of just this particular woman referred to by *onu* 'her'.

c) *Result or Consequence*. The following example, also taken from a novel, clearly shows that the SoA 'will-crash-onto-the-pier' is a suggested and not an actual Result of the SoA 'approach-with-high-speed'.

- (71) Motor-u büyük bir hızla rıhtım-a çarp-acak-mış gibi yaklaştı.
 boat-p3s big a speed pier-dat crash-fut-inf like approach-pst1
 'His boat approached rapidly, as if it would crash onto the pier.'

Whereas in (70 a-c) and (69 a/c) the embedded verb is negative, in (70b) and (71) the verb is not negated. Yet, the truth-value of *çarpacak* must be inverted. If this were not the case, that is, if 'a crash' were a *real* result, it would have been worthwhile to mention that fact as such.

3.2 Periphrastic non-factuality¹⁰

As has been argued in section 1, *gibi* can be considered as a non-verbal (two-place) predicate. Two arguments have been advanced so far. First, negation is expressed by the nominal negation marker *değil*, and second, agreement markers for person are attached to *gibi*, as well as suffixes for the expression of predication operators (cf. (7) and (8)).

In (69b) and (69c) we saw that the grammatical person of the Agent is expressed on the verbal complex in a *gibi*-phrase. A third indication in favour of our view that *gibi* is a (non-verbal) predicate can be derived from the fact that in certain constructions such a placement of personal suffixes is impossible. Consider (72 a-b), in which person-agreement must be expressed on *gibi* or on *değil* 'is not' which has *gibi* in its scope:

- (72) a. Nefes al-ama-yacak gibi-yim.
 breath take-negpot-fut like-1s
 'It is as if I will not be able to breathe.'
- b. Yürü-yebil-ecek gibi değil-im.
 walk-pot-fut like neg-1s
 'I am not comparable to someone who will be able to walk.'

These examples strongly suggest that the Comparee (here: *ben* 'I') is an argument of *gibi*, rather than of the verbal predication. If the reverse were true, one would expect the expression of agreement to take place on the verb. Doing so leads to unpredictable results with respect to the interpreta-

¹⁰ For periphrastic constructions, see Chapter 7 of van Schaaiik (1996).

tion. Even if (73) is at best grammatical, its meaning would be incomprehensible. Consider:

- (73) *nefes al-ama-yacağ-ım gibi
 ?'The breath is like I won't be able to take (it)'

Now, if the conclusion is right that the pronoun (*ben* 'I') is an argument of *gibi*, we may further stipulate that the Standard-term of *gibi* is a headless relative clause based on *nefes al-* 'to breathe'. The structure of the verbal construction of (72a), then, roughly must have the following shape:

- (74) $(x_i : [e_j : [\text{nefes al } (x_i)] (e_j)])$

According to this structure, the Standard-term must be interpreted as "an *x* such that *negpot fut nefes al* applies to *x*", or in other words, "someone who will not be able to breathe". And in a quite similar way, we arrive at an interpretation in terms of "someone who..." for the following series of examples, which simultaneously show that predication operators for tense (75 a-b) and modality (*inf* in (75c)) can be applied freely.

- (75) a. (Sanki) (siz) bil-mi-yor gibi-siniz.
 "think" you know-neg-prs2 like-2p
 'You are like someone who doesn't know.' 'It is as if you don't know.'
- b. (Sanki) onlar hiç bir yer-e git-me-miş gibi-ler.
 "think" they emph a place-dat go-neg-inf like-3p
 'They are like someone who has never gone anywhere.' 'It is as if they have never been anywhere.'
- c. (Sanki) bir başka asır-da yaş-ıyor-muş gibi-ydi-m.
 "think" a other century-loc live-prs2-inf like-ant-1s
 'I was like someone living in another century.' 'It was as if I was living in another century.'

Again, note that the pronouns in (75 a-b) arise from the Comparee-term of the *gibi*-predicate, and not from the embedded verb. As for the word *sanki* 'imagine' (\rightarrow *as if*), it is often (but optionally) used to introduce a hypotheticalical SoA.

3.3 On pretending and imitating

In section 2 it was said that actions are always performed in a certain way by *implication*. This is particularly relevant for verbs denoting 'behaviour' [+dynamic]. Also in Turkish we find many ways of saying that "the manner in which someone behaves can be characterized" in terms of "the manner which is typical for some (other) behavioral act or action".

In (76) it is described how the predication based on *davran-* 'to behave' is specified for Manner.

- (76) A., *evli ve hamile bir kadın gibi davran-mı-yor-du.*
 A. married and pregnant a woman like behave-neg-prs2-ant
 'A. was not behaving like a married and pregnant woman.'

In (76) it is expressed that A. did not behave in way "a married and pregnant woman (usually) behaves", without suggesting that A. was not married or pregnant.

This is quite different in the following sentence, based on the second order (deverbal) nominal *davranma* 'behaviour' which is specified for Manner by a predication based on *bil-* 'to know'.

- (77) *Onlar-ın herşey-i kendileri bil-iyor-muş gibi davranma-ları...*
 they-gen all-acc themselves know-prs2-inf like behaviour-p3p
 'Their behaviour as if they knew everything themselves...'

A legitimate inference of sentence (77) is that *herşeyi kendileri biliyormuş* 'they know everything themselves' is (most probably) not true. Similar conclusions can be drawn for constructions with the verb *yap-* 'to do / to act' expanded by a Manner satellite in *gibi*. This combination is used to express how something is "pretended" (in the sense of making believe that some SoA is true or relevant). Consider:

- (78) a. *Artık farket-me-miş-im gibi yap-ama-m.*
 no more notice-neg-pst2-1s like do-negpot-1s
 'I can't pretend any longer that I haven't noticed (it).'
- b. *ama duy-ma-mış-Ø gibi yap-tı-m*
 but hear-neg-pst2-Ø like do-pst1-1s
 'but I pretended not to have heard (her)'

In (78a) the speaker indeed conveys the information that he cannot longer behave in a way that is typical for the behaviour appropriate in a SoA as

defined by *farketmemişim* 'I seem not to have noticed'. The same holds for (78b): the speaker acted in "a way that it is typical for the way in which someone who hasn't heard her would act", as is expressed by 'I acted *as if* I had not heard (her)'.

When we assume that the SoA *farketmemişim* 'I seem not to have noticed' provides a Circumstance in which one would act in one way or another, a structural description of Manner satellites for verbs like *davran-* 'to behave' and *X gibi yap-* 'to pretend' (where X is the complement of *gibi*) can adequately be derived as an analogon of (35). In other words, the way the Agent would act given a certain Circumstance, as defined by *farketmemiş* 'not to have noticed', determines the way in which he is *actually* acting. And that is exactly how (78a) can be interpreted.

As we have seen, "pretending something" is expressed by the verb *yap-* 'to do/act' plus a Manner satellite in *gibi*. However, the combination *gibi* plus *yap-* is also used to express how a general characteristic of some action or other can be imitated. The next example gives an illustration of such a usage.

- (79) *Yüz-üyor-muş gibi yap-tı-m.*
 swim-prs2-inf like act-pst1-1s
 'I acted in a way characteristic of swimming'
 'I acted as if (pretended that) I was swimming.'

In 3.1 it was demonstrated that many *as if*-constructions of Turkish can be analysed in terms of a quasi-SoA (providing Circumstance, Reason, Cause, or Result) which is compared or opposed by means of *gibi* to an actual SoA. For a sentence like (70b), we could say that the SoA defined by 'he entered' took place under a Circumstance which is comparable with a circumstantial SoA, as defined by 'nothing has happened'. In this way (70b) can be analysed as a construction in which two Circumstance-satellites are compared, being two satellites of the *same type*.

For some cases, however, it is difficult to present an analysis in terms of "equal satellite types", especially when an action verb is involved that, in one way or another, can be considered a "behavioural verb". Consider:

- (80) *Her zaman ben birşey bil-me-z-miş-im gibi konuş-ur-sun*
 always I a thing know-neg-prs1-inf-1s like speak-prs1-2s
 'You always talk as if I didn't know a thing (about it).'

For (80) it seems difficult to maintain that 'the-way-of-your-talking' is comparable to 'the-way-of-my-knowing', or that 'the-way-of-your-talking' is sufficiently specified by 'my-not-knowing' alone. There is, I think, no

relation whatsoever between these two SoA's in that sense. It is clear, though, that the act of 'talking' proper specified by its Manner satellite forms an aspect of "behaviour". It is obvious that in the opinion of the Speaker of (80), his conversational partner "behaves in a Manner that might be appropriate in a Circumstance which is defined by (the Speaker's) 'I-do-not-know-a-thing'". In other words, (80) may be interpreted as "(according to S), A acts *as if* (pretends that) S is involved in an SoA defined by *bil*-".

3.4 A note on the expression of suffixes

The general suffix pattern for a verb is as follows:

(81) (verb stem)-neg-tense-predsfx-person

In (81) *tense* can be specified as past (*pst1*, *pst2*), present (*prs1*, *prs2*, *prs3*), or future (*fut*); *predicational suffixes* as *ant*, *inf*, or *cond*; and, where *person* can be specified, as *1s*, *2s*, \emptyset (=3s), *1p*, *2p*, and *3p*. As for "past", there are two "past tense" forms in Turkish: the "simple past" which is expressed as *-DI* (*pst1*), and the "inferential past" *-mİş* (*pst2*). These tense forms mutually exclude each other, which can be exemplified by *bekle-di* '(s)he has waited' and *bekle-miş* '(they say,) (s)he has waited' respectively. The latter suffix is distinct from the (non-past) predicational *-(y)mİş* (*inf*), as in *Türkiye'de-ymiş* '(s)he seems to be in Turkey'. For the *miş*-form in the expressions under consideration (cf. (83)-(85)), I assume that it reflects the application of the operator *inf*. Also tensed *-mİş* (*pst2*) and predicational *-(y)mİş* (*inf*) cannot be expressed at the same time.

At various places the symbol \emptyset is used to indicate that a "suffix slot" is not filled. In (82) for instance, the first zero indicates that a predicational suffix is not expressed, and the second one means that a personal suffix is left out. In (61) and (69) it stands for '3s'.

(82) yi-yecek- \emptyset - \emptyset gibi
eat-fut-'pred'-'person' like
 'as if he would eat'

All markers referred to above can in principle be expressed, and on these grounds, it was concluded that the embedded predication of *gibi* could be *fully* specified. This was shown in many of the examples from (69) onwards.

Yet, there seems to be a certain preference with respect to the actual expression of "person" markers. In the tables below, the different degrees of

suffixation are ranked according to decreasing preference, as based on the judgement of several native speakers of Turkish. Compare:

- (83) a. Kadın-a yi-yecek-miş gibi bak-ıyor-du-n. (1)
 b. Kadın-a yi-yecek-miş-sin gibi bak-ıyor-du-n. (2)
 c. Kadın-a yi-yecek-Ø-Ø gibi bak-ıyor-du-n. (3)
 woman-dat eat-fut-(inf)-(2s) like look-prs2-ant-2s
 ‘You were looking at the woman as if you would eat her.’

- (84) a. Sen herşeyi bil-ir-miş gibi konuş-ur-sun. (1)
 b. Sen herşeyi bil-ir-miş-sin gibi konuş-ur-sun. (2)
 c. Sen herşeyi bil-ir-Ø-Ø gibi konuş-ur-sun. (3)
 you all know-prs1-(inf)-(2s) like speak-prs1-2s
 ‘You speak as if you know everything.’

The verb form in *yiyecekmiş* (83a) was said to occur “more frequently” than the other forms, whereas *yiyecekmişsin* in (83b) was judged to be “grammatically complete”. These views were confirmed for (84) for *bilirmiş* and *bilirmişsin* respectively.

However, contrasting (84) with (85) shows that the competition in (85) is between the sentences of type a and b. The “complete” form scores higher than the “frequent” form, whereas the preference of the form which is morphologically speaking least complex (type c) is the lowest.

- (85) a. Sen ben birşey bil-me-z-miş-im gibi konuş-ur-sun. (1)
 b. Sen ben birşey bil-me-z-miş gibi konuş-ur-sun. (2)
 c. ?Sen ben birşey bil-me-z gibi konuş-ur-sun. (3)
 you I something know-neg-prs1s-(inf)-(1s) like speak-prs1-2s
 ‘You speak as if I do not know a thing.’

In (84), the Agents of *konus-* ‘to speak’ and *bil-* ‘to know’ are identical, but in (85) the Agent of *konus-* is different from the Agent of *bil-*: *sen* ‘you’ is opposed to *ben* ‘I’. On the one hand, we could say that the preference of (85a) over (85b) can be explained in terms of emphasizing the difference in agency, but on the other hand, one should perhaps consider the question as to what degree these preferences are indicative for differences in underlying structures with respect to the embedded verbal complex. For *herşeyi bilirmiş* in (84a) and *birşey bilmezmiş* in (85b) can alternatively be interpreted as ‘someone who knows everything’ and ‘someone who doesn’t know anything’ respectively, whereas the “full” forms of (84b) and (85a) might be an indication that we are dealing with predication fully specified for *modality*, *tense*, and *person*.

Recall that similar constructions, as discussed in 3.2, were analysed in terms of headless relative clauses. If the different preferences are indeed related to different underlying constructions, the actual usage of either one of the constructions reflects how the Speaker classifies the entities or SoA's surrounding him, and moreover, in practice most people indeed seem to know that saying *you do not always understand* is not the same as *you are someone who never understands*. Needless to say that by the latter construction not an SoA is described, but that the semantic relation between the *you* and *understand* is signalled in terms of "class inclusion". If this is correct, the overall structure of (83)-(85) is very similar to that of (79), only the structure of the Circumstance satellite is different: not a verbal but a term predication defines the SoA.

4 Summary and conclusions

By way of a summary, I will highlight the main points of this paper and present the conclusions per section.

Section 1: The "word" *gibi* is a predicate that can be used predicatively and attributively, and its syntactic placement follows this distinction. When used predicatively it comes clause final, and when used attributively, it is placed before the modified predicate. This was exemplified by *bu adam ayı gibi* 'this man is like a bear' versus *ayı gibi bir adam* 'a man like a bear'.

Attributively, *gibi* is also used in Exemplifying Expressions ("things like that"), in which first, second, third, and fourth order entities are compared or opposed.

Gibi may function as the head of a relative clause ("someone like you"), which is clearly term-based since it occurs in the plural too ("people like you").

Section 2: In Manner Expressions, *gibi* is the element that links two manners in which two actions are performed. In many cases, two SoA's based on the same verbal predicate are compared ("Do it like me"). Underlyingly, Manner satellites are to be represented at level 1.

In Similitive Expressions SoA's are compared or opposed on level 2. The predications that define the SoA's must be of the same type, namely, verbal or existential ("Do what you like, like me"). Satellites for Location and Time can be used as the basis of comparison as well.

Propositions ("As in linguistics...") are compared or opposed likewise (on level 3), and Confirmative Expressions (level 4) are used to compare or oppose speech acts ("As I have said before...").

Section 3: The third section of this paper discussed a group of constructions expressing non-factual similarity.

The term Quasi Expressions was introduced to designate those constructions by means of which a (possible) Circumstance, Reason, Cause, or Result is *suggested* rather than *asserted*.

An application *par excellence* of *gibi*, expressing non-factuality, is found in verbs of "pretending" and "imitating". A special kind of *gibi* construction expressing this type of similarity (*as if*) is based on relative clauses. This explains the difference between "it is as if you do not understand" and "you are like someone who does not understand" in terms of "predicating versus assigning a property by class-inclusion".

References

- Alderson, A. D. & İz, F. 1984. *The Oxford Turkish-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baskakov, A. N. 1977. *Türkçe-Rusça sözlük*. [Turkish-Russian Dictionary.] Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Russkij Jazyk".
- Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dik, S. C. 1989. *The theory of Functional Grammar (Part 1: The structure of the clause)*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hengeveld, K. 1989. Layers and Operators. *Journal of Linguistics* 25/1, 127-157.
- Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Räsänen, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk-sprachen*. (Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. Lexica Soc. Fenno Ugrica XVII, 1) Helsinki.
- Schaaik, G. J. van 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wendt, H. 1979. *Praktisches Lehrbuch Türkisch*. Berlin: Langenscheidt.
-