

Turkic Languages

Edited by
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with
Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,
Éva Á. Csató, Peter B. Golden, Tooru Hayasi, Astrid Menz,
Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Irina Nevskaya, Sumru A. Özsoy

14 (2010) 2

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

The journal *TURKIC LANGUAGES* is devoted to linguistic Turcology. It addresses descriptive, comparative, synchronic, diachronic, theoretical and methodological problems of the study of Turkic languages including questions of genealogical, typological and areal relations, linguistic variation and language acquisition. The journal aims at presenting work of current interest on a variety of subjects and thus welcomes contributions on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. It contains articles, review articles, reviews, discussions, reports, and surveys of publications. It is published in one volume of two issues per year with approximately 300 pages.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. The e-mail address johanson@uni-mainz.de may also be used for communication.

Books will be reviewed as circumstances permit. No publication received can be returned.

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information, please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; Fax: 49-611-530999; e-mail: verlag@harrassowitz.de.

Publication of this journal was supported
by a grant of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2011

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by Memminger MedienCentrum AG

Printed on permanent/durable paper.

Printed in Germany

www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

ISSN 1431-4983

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 14, 2010, Number 2

Editorial note by Lars Johanson	151
---------------------------------------	-----

Articles

Memet Aktürk-Drake: Phonological and sociolinguistic factors in the integration of /l/ in Turkish in borrowings from Arabic and Swedish	153
Didem Koban: Linguistic and cultural innovations in the Turkish spoken in New York City: Language and cultural contact	192
Gerjan van Schaaijk: Place nouns as compound heads: A short story of fake postpositions	206
Vitaly Voinov: A corpus-based examination of double plural pronouns in Tuvan	239

Report

Éva Á. Csató: Report on an Uppsala workshop on Karaim studies	261
---	-----

Reviews

Balázs Danka & Szonja Schmidt: Review of Hendrik Boeschoten & Julian Rentzsch (eds.), <i>Turcology in Mainz / Turkologie in Mainz</i>	283
László Károly: Review of Leland Liu Rogers, <i>The Golden Summary of Činggis Qayan. Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči</i>	294
Ludwig Paul: Review of Lars Johanson & Christiane Bulut (eds.), <i>Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects</i>	297

Place nouns as compound heads: A short story of fake postpositions

Gerjan van Schaaik

van Schaaik, Gerjan 2010. Place nouns as compound heads: A short story of fake postpositions. *Turkic Languages* 14, 206–238.

In grammars of Turkish, including those written in that language, almost no attention is ever paid to paired constructions which form, as it were, a kind of pseudo-opposition in that they differ in one grammatical suffix only, being the genitive, as in *masanın üstünde* versus *masa üstünde*. This paper shows that the latter construction can be analyzed in terms of the derivational process known as nominal compounding. Words such as *üst* belong to the lexical group of Place Nouns, and they occur in constructions which have developed into postposition-like elements, based on a compositional structure with locative or ablative case marking and being applied as adverbials.

Gerjan van Schaaik, School of Middle Eastern Studies, Leiden University, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands. E-mail: g.j.van.schaaik@hum.leidenuniv.nl

1. The problem

The aim of this paper is to present an account of a construction which is widespread in the Turkish literature¹ (and possibly even more widespread in spoken language), but which is not, on the other hand, described in a satisfactory way in the literature on Turkish grammar. Consider the following opposition:

- | | | | |
|-------|-------|------------|----------|
| (1)a. | (bir) | masa-nın | üstünde |
| | a | table-GEN | ‘on’ |
| | | | |
| b. | (bir) | masa-Ø | üstünde |
| | a | table-ZERO | ‘on’ / ? |

The linguistic facts are as follows. The construction of (1a) contains a noun in the genitive (*masa-nın* ‘table-GEN’), whereas this noun occurs in the nominative in example (1b). Both nouns are followed by the construct *üstünde*, which is usually translated in several ways: simply as ‘on’, and in a somewhat more detailed fashion

¹ The majority of the data in this paper have been extracted from a computerized Turkish Text Corpus, of which the register of spoken language is unfortunately underrepresented. Hence the examples given here represent the literary usage of this construction.

as ‘on top of’. In both constructions the noun can be preceded by the indefinite article *bir*.

The analysis of these constructions is not always unproblematic. Firstly, these and similar constructions are often analyzed in relation to each other. For constructions similar to (1a) but without the indefinite article *bir*, it is often advanced that the notion of definiteness would account for the occurrence of the genitive, and accordingly, where a genitive does not occur, the noun is said to be indefinite. However, constructions in which the indefinite article *bir* does occur are usually left out of the discussion, and including them would probably jeopardize the analyses proposed. And it is not difficult to see why this would be so. If definiteness would be taken as the crucial factor for the opposition genitive-zero (Condition A), and at the same time, indefiniteness as a property marked by the presence of the indefinite article *bir* (Condition B), the opposition between (2a–b) and (3a–b) would be rather contradictory, for Condition B would hold for (2) and (3) as a whole and condition A for (2a) and (3a).

- (2)a. *Küçük masa-nın üstüne tabak-lar-la çatal bıçak yerleştir-il-di.*
 small table-GEN ‘on’ plate-PLUR-‘and’ fork knife place-PASS-PAST2
 ‘On the small table plates, forks and knives had been placed.’
- b. *Masa-Ø üstünde, rakı şişe-si ve bir kadeh, bir bıçak var-dı.*
 table ‘on’ rakı bottle-CM and a glass a knife exist-PROJ1
 ‘On the table there was a rakı bottle, a liqueur glass, and a knife.’
- (3)a. *Küçük birmasa-nın üstüne tabak-lar-la çatal bıçak yerleştir-il-di.*
 small a table-GEN ‘on’ plate-PLUR-‘and’ fork knife place-PASS-PAST2
 ‘On a small table plates, forks and knives had been placed.’
- b. *Ayşe, uzağ-ı daha iyi gör-ebil-mek için bir masa-Ø üstüne*
 A. distance-ACC better see-POT-INF for a table ‘on’
çık-mış.
 climb-PAST1
 ‘Ayşe climbed on a table to be better able to see in the distance.’

Secondly, the status of *üstünde* is dubious. Although this word is often analyzed as being based on the noun *üst* ‘upper side, surface, top’, quite a number of grammarians are apt to treat *üstünde* as a postposition.²

² Johanson (1974, 1991) analyzes forms such as *ev içinde* in terms of a noun plus a postposition, the latter being the result of “a grammaticalization process that reverses the syntactic relation” between the two elements. However, as will be pointed out in section 6, the status of (fake or pseudo-) postposition can only be attributed to forms that do not have a genitive counterpart: *panik içinde* versus **paniğ-in iç-in-de*.

In brief, the problem with current analyses of (1a–b) is many-sided and can be summarized as follows: 1) How is the opposition between definite and indefinite related to the aforementioned constructions, and does this opposition provide a satisfactory explanation for the opposition genitive-zero? 2) How can the presence or absence of the indefinite article be explained? 3) What can be said about the status of words like *üstünde*—are they to be indiscriminately regarded as postpositions or are they rather nouns?

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 evaluates the analysis in terms of the notions definite-indefinite and examines what type of terminology relevant for the present discussion is available in the literature. Section 3 presents an analysis of (1b) in terms of compound formation, an approach which is compatible with the presence or absence of the indefinite article *bir*. Section 4 presents more detailed information about Place Nouns, together with an overview of their most common derivational products. Section 5 goes into the question as to how certain terminology applicable to the analysis of (1a–b) is handled by several authors on Turkish grammar, and what is more, examines to what extent the relationship between (1b) and compounding has been recognized. In section 6 more data are presented in corroboration of the claim that constructions such as (1b) can best be analyzed as compounds which have, at least in a number of cases, led to compound-based postpositions as an intermediary stage in the development of real or full postpositions. Furthermore, a classification is proposed as an alternative for what is known in the literature as “fake postpositions”, a group of constructions comprising not only those like (1b) but also structures such as *hükümet tarafından* ‘by the government’ and *akşam yemeği sırasında* ‘during dinner’. Section 7 deals with postpositions: this is a necessary evil since the tradition in grammatical description seems to be that Place Nouns are to be considered a fully-fledged equivalent for the notion of preposition, a lexical category so indispensable in the language of description. In section 8 the conclusions are presented.

2. A related problem

In traditional approaches to grammar, constructions such as *misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of the guest’ and *misafir-Ø oda-sı* ‘guest room’ are often compared to one another because of the similarities in structure owing to a minimal difference in the number of inflectional morphemes: the first construction contains a genitive case marker after *misafir* ‘guest’, which is lacking (as indicated by -Ø) in the second construction. The (incorrect) analysis of these constructions usually runs as follows: In the first example the noun *misafir* makes reference to a ‘specific, particular or certain’ guest, and thus from a grammatical point of view that noun is definite, a fact which, *ergo*, neatly correlates with the occurrence of the genitive marker. At the same time, and this does the trick, the second example is not about a concrete or particular but rather about an ‘arbitrary’ guest, which then must of course be indefinite. And this corresponds to the absence of any suffix (indicated by -Ø) after *mi-*

şafir in the second example. Accordingly, in various publications the terminology used to characterize these constructions is phrased in terms of an opposition, for instance: *definite izafet* versus *indefinite izafet* (cf. Lewis 1967 2000), *tainlı izafet* versus *tayinsiz izafet* (cf. Dereli 1971), *belirli adtakımı* versus *belirsiz adtakımı* (cf. Banguoğlu 1990), *belirtili tamlama* versus *belirtisiz tamlama* (cf. Aksan et alii 1976), and *belirli isim tamlaması* versus *belirsiz isim tamlaması* (cf. Ergin 1980).

I have shown elsewhere that this type of reasoning provides no solution for a thorough analysis of these constructions (cf. Van Schaaik 1992, 1996, 1999, 2001, 2002). The main points can be summarized as follows.

The structural similarity between both constructions is sheer co-incidental. Most pairs formed in an analogous fashion yield at least one structure that makes no sense. Contrary to *çay bahçe-si* ‘tea garden’, the construct **çay-in bahçe-si* is meaningless. Conversely, *komşu-nun araba-sı* ‘the car of the neighbor’ is grammatical, whereas forms like **komşu araba-sı* will most probably cause most native speakers of Turkish to raise their eyebrows and make discrete inquiries about the meaning intended.

As a matter of fact we are dealing here with a pseudo-opposition, and the most important point is that there are two entirely different types of formation at the foundation of these constructions. The construction *misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of the guest’ is known as the *genitive construction* (cf. Van Schaaik 1992, 1996; Hayasi 1996), *possessive construction* (cf. Swift 1963), and is sometimes called *genitive-possessive construction*³ (cf. Göksel & Kerslake 2005), a word group in which the semantic relation ‘possession’ (in a broad grammatical sense)⁴ links *misafir* ‘guest’ to *oda* ‘room’ by means of the genitive case marker and in which grammatical agreement in person and number between possessor and possessed is expressed by a possessive suffix. However, the distinction definite-indefinite has nothing to do with the occurrence of the genitive: the factor indefiniteness is usually expressed as such by means of the article *bir*, for we can say: *bir misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of a guest’, *misafir-in bir oda-sı* ‘a room of the guest’, as well as *bir misafir-in bir oda-sı* ‘a room of a guest’.

³ Undoubtedly, the most accurate designations are *genitive-possessive construction* and *possessor-possessed construction*, occurring in three shapes; two shorter forms, e.g. *ev-in* (house-POSS2s) and *sen-in ev-Ø* (you-GEN house-NOM), and one full form, all meaning ‘your house’. The shorter forms can be expanded by a complement in the genitive (possessor) and a possessive suffix respectively, yielding the full form: *sen-in ev-in* (you-GEN house-POSS2s).

⁴ The semantic role of *Ali* in for instance *Ali-nin kitap-lar-ı* ‘Ali’s books’ is grammatically speaking that of *possessor*, but “in real life” the relation between *Ali* and *the books* can be understood as a variety of capacities: that of proprietor, author, publisher, designer, user, retailer, wholesaler, and the like.

The second type of construction, *misafir oda-sı* ‘guest room’, is the result of the extremely productive word formation process known as compounding: given a set of rules, two nouns are “fused” into a new word with an independent meaning, in many cases providing a typification or subcategorization of the class of objects as designated by the head noun. An analysis in favor of this view has been presented by Swift (1963), Van Schaaik (1992, 1996, 2002), Hayasi (1996), Yüксеker (1998), Kornfilt (1997) and Göksel & Kerslake (2005).⁵ This type of construction is often called *possessive compound*. The indefinite article *bir* preceding a compound takes the whole construction (the head, that is) in its scope, rather than the noun immediately following *bir*. So we get: *bir (misafir odası)*.

The difference in the respective ways of formation has great consequences for the way both constructions can be modified by an adjective. *Misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of the guest’ can be modified in two ways, for example: *yeni misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of the new guest’, *misafir-in yeni oda-sı* ‘the new room of the guest’, and also combined modification is possible, as in: *yeni misafir-in yeni oda-sı* ‘the new room of the new guest’. However, the elements in the construction *misafir oda-sı* ‘guest room’ are, as it were, tightly tied into an inseparable unit and therefore it can be modified by one adjective only. This adjective modifies the unit as a whole, so individual elements cannot be in the scope of the modifier: *yeni misafir oda-sı* ‘new guest room’ is grammatically correct but **misafir yeni oda-sı* is not.

3. A synthesis

In Turkish there are other construction pairs which structurally share almost everything with *misafir-in oda-sı* and *misafir-Ø oda-sı* in the previous section. The type of opposition under scrutiny follows the same structure and consists of two nouns, the second of which is a so-called Place Noun designating a place, area or space. The fragments in bold print in (4) can be compared to the aforementioned opposition.

- (4)a. *Küçük **masa-nın** **üstüne** tabak-lar-la çatal bıçak yerleştir-il-di.*
 small table-GEN ‘on’ plate-PLUR-‘and’ fork knife place-PASS-PAST2.
 ‘On the small table plates, forks and knives had been placed.’
- b. ***Masa-Ø** **üstünde**, rakı şişe-si, bir kadeh ve birbıçak var-dı.*
 table ‘on’ rakı bottle-CM a glass and a knife exist-PROJ1
 ‘On the table there was a *rakı* bottle, a liqueur glass, and a knife.’

Again it might be tempting to explain the presence or absence of the genitive suffix in terms of the factors definite and indefinite. However, taking more data into account it will be clear that such an approach is out of the question. But let me first

⁵ For a concise overview of similar constructions in Turkic languages, see Johanson (1998: 49f).

present an alternative explanation in connection to the question why in English in certain contexts the definite article must change while in others it is left out. Consider the following examples.

- (5)a. He must go back **to the sea**.
 b. Can it be our farm lad that went away **to Ø sea** years past?

The expression *to the sea* in (5a) can be interpreted as making reference to a more or less *concrete* sea, for instance the one which plays a role in the given context or situation, whereas *to sea* in (5b) is meant as the expression of the more *abstract* idea of “where one can go and eke out a living”. Linguistically speaking, ‘sea’ in (5a) is referential and in (5b) non-referential.

In Turkish things are not very different, if at all. In the first example (4a), *Küçük masa-nın üstüne* ‘on the small table’, the referent of *masa* ‘table’ is definite. This is neither shown nor proven by the occurrence of the genitive, but can be inferred from the absence of the indefinite article *bir*. Moreover, in most such cases ‘definiteness’ is given by the context, which is not shown here. In other words, with *masa-nın üstüne* in the first example, the word *masa* must be taken literally, as referring to a concrete ‘table’, whereas in the second example we are dealing with a non-literal (abstract) sense of the general concept of ‘table’. Thus, *masa* ‘table’ is referential in (4a) and non-referential in (4b).

Now, the introduction of more relevant data will corroborate the thesis that the occurrence of the genitive case marker is *not* related to the factor definiteness. The fact is that the fragments in bold print in (4) also occur as indefinite noun phrases. With (4a–b) we find side by side:

- (6)a. *Küçük **bir masa-nın** üstüne tabak-lar-la çatal bıçak*
 small a table-GEN ‘on’ plate-PLUR-‘and’ fork knife
yerleştir-il-di.
 place-PASS-PAST2
 ‘On a small table plates, forks and knives had been placed.’
- b. *Ayşe, **uzak-ı** daha iyi gör-ebil-mek için **bir masa-Ø** üstüne*
 A. distance-ACC better see-POT-INF for a table ‘on’
çık-mış.
 climb-PAST1
 ‘Ayşe climbed on a table to be better able to see in the distance.’

In case the somewhat naive explanation for the differences between (4a) and (4b) were valid (that is to say, “definiteness requires the genitive and indefiniteness does not”), (6a) would then be contradictory to this claim. Such an explanation can be discarded in favor of the alternative analysis proposed in section 2. Perhaps it is useful at this stage to point out that both definite and indefinite noun phrases may have a referential function in many cases: in a communicative situation the marked defi-

niteness of a noun phrase helps to identify its referent, and marked indefiniteness contributes to the mental construction of a (possible) referent.

Be this as it may, the attentive reader might well raise the burning question “If *masa üstünde* in (4b) is used in a figurative (abstract) sense, what is the use of “adding” the indefinite article *bir*, yielding *bir masa üstüne* in (6b)?” This would be an astute remark, indeed, for haven’t we claimed that *masa üstünde* in (4b) is a non-referential expression and, just a while ago, that indefinite noun phrases are referential too, so that we apparently have uncovered another inconsistency here?

The answer is yes and no. Yes, because there is no other conclusion possible on the basis of the linguistic facts advanced so far. The final answer, however, is negative, because not all relevant facts have been presented yet. In linguistic analysis this danger is always lurking and often leads, for obvious reasons by the way, to incomplete, incorrect and naive explanations of the facts. In order to head off the possibility of any ungrammatical example, we could present the following sentence (from a text corpus):

- (7) *Bir masa üst-ün-e konul-muş ayakkabı-lar-da da kan*
 a table top-CM-DAT put-PRT3 shoe-PLUR-LOC and blood
leke-ler-i var-dı.
 stain-PLUR-CM exist-PROJ1
 ‘On the shoes put on a tabletop there were blood stains.’

As appears from the translation, *bir masa üstüne* can also be interpreted as ‘on a tabletop’. As a fact of matter, this interpretation is applicable for (6b) as well.

- (8) *Ayşe, uzağ-ı daha iyi gör-ebil-mek için bir masa-Ø*
 A. distance-ACC better see-POT-INF for a table
üst-ün-e çık-mış.
 top-CM-DAT climb-PAST1
 ‘Ayşe climbed on a tabletop to be better able to see in the distance.’

This implies that we should take a closer look at the fragment *bir masa üstüne*. First of all we need to analyze *üstüne*. The noun *üst* means ‘upper side, top’ and can be combined with for instance *masa* ‘table’ in a genitive construction: *masa-nın üst-ü(n)* ‘on the upper side of the table’ → ‘on the table’. Adding a dative suffix, which is required when used with verbs such as *yerleştir-* ‘to put (on)’, *çık-* ‘to climb (on)’ and *konul-* ‘to be put (on)’, we get *masa-nın üst-ün-e*. As the first member of a genitive construction we can of course take an ‘indefinite’ table and the result is, predictably, *(bir masa)-nın üst-ün-e*.

For the final analysis of *bir masa üst-ün-e*, however, the crux of the matter is to be found in the placement of the parenthesis. After all, *masa üst-ün-e* can also be analyzed as *(masa üst-ün)-e*, that is to say, as a nominal compound to which in this case a dative suffix has been attached. The meaning of *masa üst-ü(n)* is simply ‘ta-

ble surface’ or, in common parlance, ‘tabletop’. In this approach also the indefinite article *bir* finds its niche: *bir (masa üst-ü)* simply means ‘a tabletop’.

In order to elucidate the relation between referentiality and definiteness in this type of construction (compounds whose head is a Place Noun), we move on to a scenario derived and adapted from the first chapter of *Sessiz Ev* by Orhan Pamuk. In this story, a grandmother with bad eyesight runs the fingers of one hand over a bowl of apples in order to check the quality of the fruit. She says:

- (9) *Çürük hepsi! Nereden bul-du-n sen bun-lar-ı,*
 rotten all where.from find-PAST2-2S you this-PLUR-ACC
ağaç alt-lar-ın-dan mı topla-dı-n?
 tree underside-PLUR-CM-ABL Q gather-PAST2-S2
 ‘All rotten! Where have you got them from, gathered from under trees?’

For the sake of simplicity we will pretend that the grandmother only asked: *Nereden bul-du-n sen bun-lar-ı?* ‘Where did you find these?’, and at the same time we will try to think up possible answers to this question. In principle, there are three grammatical answers relevant for our argumentation.

First, if the answer were *Ağac-ın alt-ın-dan topla-dı-m* ‘I gathered them from under the tree’, then *ağaç* ‘tree’ is to be interpreted as a referential expression (definite) because of the absence of the indefinite article *bir*. The tree involved is concrete and hence identifiable by Speaker and Hearer (after all, it could be a/the tree, say, in the backyard).

Second, in case of the answer *Bir ağac-ın alt-ın-dan topla-dı-m* ‘I gathered them from under a tree’, the *ağaç* ‘tree’ (being marked as indefinite by *bir*) is also concrete (and not abstract), because its referent is known by the Speaker but not by the Hearer. Also in this case *ağaç* ‘tree’ is referential, because the grandmother, not knowing its referent—she must construe one, could ask: “Which tree?”. The referent of *ağaç* ‘tree’ in the second answer can be called (indefinite) specific.⁶ This is not because *ağaç* ‘tree’ is just referential (this is the case in both answers), but it has to do with the fact that the Speaker knows which tree he is talking about, for he is the one who gathered the apples there. The difference between specific indefinite and non-specific indefinite can also nicely be demonstrated with *In the backyard I have planted a big tree* (specific, for one could ask: *What kind of tree?*) versus *If you plant a big tree in your backyard...* (non-specific, because any arbitrary tree could be meant, as long as it is big, and hence it would be odd to ask: *Which tree?* or *What kind of tree?*).

⁶ Scholarly work on definiteness and specificity in Turkish is published in regular intervals, e.g. Johanson (1977), Dede (1986), Tura (1986), Enç (1991), Van Schaaijk (1996), Kılıçaslan (2006), Nakipoğlu (2009).

Third, let us now return to the original answer, as provided in Pamuk's novel. The second part of the question is: [...] *ağaç alt-lar-in-dan mı topladı-n?* '[...] have you gathered them from under "tree"?' The actual answer was, after some squabbling about their quality, *Manav-dan al-dı-m* 'I bought them from the green-grocer's', but this answer is not relevant for the present analysis. In her question the grandmother uses the fragment *ağaç alt-ların-dan*, without an article and without the genitive case marker. The word *alt* is a noun designating a place (area or space) and can in most cases be translated as 'under side' or 'space under'. This noun can, just like *üst* 'upper side, top' in the examples based on *masa üst-ü(n)*, figure as head of a nominal compound: *ağaç alt-ı(n)*.

This construction can be interpreted as "the space or area under a tree", or, with a bit of poetic license, "the sub-arboreal space or area". Of course, in the present setting "sub-arboreal area" would be more appropriate, since "the ground under the tree" is the place where (fallen) apples are gathered.

Because *alt* is a Place Noun, the compound *ağaç alt-ı(n)* counts as a Place Noun as well, and its plural form *ağaç alt-ları(n)* leads to the interpretation 'all (kind of) places under a tree' in the sense of 'under whatever tree'. As said before, for the given situation this makes reference to the place where "overripe or rotten apples" are landing. The word *ağaç* 'tree' is (like every first member in a nominal compound) non-referential, let alone definite or indefinite, because these (pragmatic) values are only applicable to noun phrases being used referentially.

4. On spatial relations

For Place Nouns, I elsewhere (Van Schaaik 2002: 242f) made the distinction between nouns denoting *Absolute Place* and *Relative Place*. The former type of nouns comprises place names (e.g. İstanbul, Paramaribo, Lahore), denotations for spaces and areas (all immovable "objects"), such as *mutfak* 'kitchen', *plaj* 'beach', and *bahçe* 'garden', and includes a small set of deictic expressions, as in *Burası neresi?* (literally: "this place (is) what place") 'Where are we here?' and *Banyo burası* 'The bathroom is (this place) here'.

The second type of noun relevant for the discussion comprises nouns by means of which Relative Place can be expressed. The basic set of these nouns comprises: *üst* 'superior; upper side, top, surface', *üzer* 'superior; space above', *alt* 'inferior; space under, underside', *ön* 'anterior; front (side)', *arka* 'posterior; back part, rear, hind, reverse', *iç* 'interior; inside, the inner part or surface', *dış* 'exterior; outside, external, outer', *karşı* 'citerior; the place opposite', *orta* 'middle, middle part, central part', *ara* 'medial; space / time between; relation (between people)', *art* 'back, behind, rear, hind, space, behind, sequel', *yan* 'lateral; (a) side; flank; neighborhood, vicinity', *peş* 'space behind, the back, the rear', *taraf* 'side; part; area, region'. In the majority of grammatical descriptions of Place Nouns their number is more or less limited to the set represented above. On the basis of shared grammatical properties, however, the following nouns should also be included: *etraf* 'sides, surroundings,

area around or near', *çevre* 'surroundings', *yön* 'direction; quarter; side, aspect; angle', *beri* 'near, this side', *öte* 'the other side, beyond', *baş* 'head', *uç* (c-) 'tip, (far) end', *dip* (b-) 'bottom; foot, lowest part; far end, back'.

In themselves they denote a space or an area, but always in relation to some other (mostly physical) object. In this way *üst* 'surface, upper part' and *alt* 'space under, underside' only have meaning if reference is made to something else.⁷ This is usually achieved by forming a genitive construction, the head of which is such a Place Noun, and by attaching a case marker appropriate in the given syntactic setting, e.g. *masa-nın üst-ün-de* 'on (top of) the table' and *masa-nın alt-in-da* 'under the table, at the underside of the table'.

In many a work on Turkish grammar the right hand part of this genitive construction is categorized as "secondary postposition" (cf. Lewis 1967, 2000), as "fake postposition" (cf. Kornfilt 1997), or simply as "postposition" (cf. Göksel & Kerslake 2005). Yet, there are many arguments in favor of their classification as pure nouns.

First, structures such as *masa-nın üst-ü* (table-GEN surface-POSS3S) can be identified as genitive constructions. In the literature on this subject matter there seems to be a tendency to discuss this type of construction only in connection to the most common case markers they can take, those being locative, dative, and ablative, e.g. *masa-nın alt-in-da* 'under the table', *masa-nın alt-in-a* '(motion) towards under the table', *masa-nın alt-in-dan* '(motion) from under the table'. It should be noted, however, that this type of "bare" structure is also widely used in the nominative, as can be shown by:

- (10) a. *Suy-un üst-ü yeşil bir ayna-ya benzi-yor-du.*
 water-GEN top-POSS3S green a mirror-DAT resemble-PRES1-PROJ1
 'The surface of the water resembled a green mirror.'
- b. *Ev-in ön-ü ve arka-sı aynı şekil-de yap-il-mıştı.*
 house-GEN front-POSS3S and back-POSS3S same form-LOC
 make-PASS-PAST3
 'The front and back side of the house were made the same way.'
- c. *Orada ne yaylı-lar, ne araba-lar yok-tu!*
 there what carriage-PLUR what wagon-PLUR not-exist-PROJ1
Birin-in arka-sı geniş ön-ü daracık,
 some-GEN back-POSS3S wide front-POSS3S rather narrow

⁷ In this respect the distinction between *alienable* possession (e.g. *Ali-nin araba-sı* 'Ali's car') and *inalienable* possession (e.g. *Ali-nin baba-sı* 'Ali's father') is relevant. The grammatical possessor of the second construction can be thought of as an argument of *Ali*, and that of the first construction as a satellite. For more details, see Van Schaaijk (2002: 151f).

ötekin-in arka-sı daracık ön-ü geniş-ti.
 other-GEN back-POSS3S rather narrow front-POSS3S wide-PROJ1
 ‘What spring-carriages and wagons there were!
 The back of some were wide and the front rather narrow,
 others’ back part were narrow and their front wide.’

Second, they can take possessive markers plus a case marker, e.g. *karşı-nız-da* ‘opposite of you’, *ön-üm-e* ‘(motion) in front of me, before me’, *Arka-n-dan kapı-yı kapat!* ‘Close the door behind you!’, but they are also used independently, e.g. *Arka-mız, ön-ümüz, her yan-ımız süngü!* [back side-POSS1P front side-POSS1P every side-POSS1P bayonet] ‘Behind us, in front of us, on all sides of us—(it was / there were) bayonets!’.

Third, nouns denoting relative place can be used as adjectives⁸ (whereas nouns denoting absolute place cannot), e.g. *üst kat* ‘top floor’, *alt çene* ‘lower jaw’, *ön sıra* ‘front row’, *arka koltuk* ‘back seat’, *yan kapı* ‘side door’, *iç deniz* ‘inner sea’, *dış duvar* ‘outer wall’, *karşı teklif* ‘counter-proposal’, *karşı yaka* ‘the opposite shore’, *ara tatil* ‘a non-planned holiday’, *ara istasyon* ‘a station in between’, *orta öğretim* ‘secondary education’, *Orta Asya* ‘Central Asia’. Used as an adjective, these nouns can be part of a genitive construction, e.g. *ev-in (dış duvar)-ı* ‘the outer wall of the house’.

Fourth, they can function as the head of a compound, e.g. *perde arka-sı* [curtain back side-CM] ‘the hidden side of the matter’, *kızıl öte-si* [red other side-CM] ‘infra-red’. The result of compounding in these cases is of course a noun denoting a place itself. Such newly formed nouns can easily be made part of another compound (11a–c) or of a genitive construction (11d–e):

- (11) a. (*göz alt-ı*) *krem-i*
 eye lower.part-CM cream-CM
 ‘cream for under the eyes’
- b. ((*Deniz dib-i dünya-sı*) *göz-ler-in-in* *ön-ün-e*
 sea bottom-CM world-CM eye-PLUR-POSS2S-GEN front-POSS3S-DAT
 seril-ecek.
 spread-FUT
 ‘The sea-bottom-world will be spread out before your eyes.’

⁸ Braun & Haig (2000) discuss the noun-adjective distinction in terms of a continuum from prototypical noun to prototypical adjective, whereas Van Schaaik (2002: 55, 101) proposes a conversion rule for certain classes of nouns. This rule would be applicable to a number of adjectival formations in the present section as well.

- c. ((*Şişe dib-i*) *gözlük*)-l_ü *bir adam gir-iyor-du* *oda-ya*.
 bottle bottom-CM glasses-ADJ a man enter-PRES1-PROJ1 room-DAT
 ‘A man in spectacles as thick as bottle glass entered the room.’
- d. *Ankara plân-in-da da Yenışehir-in (ana cadde arka-lar)-ı*
 A. map-CM-LOC and Y.-GEN main road back-PLUR-POSS3S
bahçe-li ev-ler semt-i, Çankaya ve Kavaklıdere daha
 garden-ADJ house-PLUR quarter-CM Ç. and K. more
geniş bahçe-li villa-lar semt-i-ydi.
 spacious garden-ADJ villa-PLUR quarter-PROJ1
 ‘On the map of Ankara, the areas behind the main road in Yenışehir were the quarter of houses with gardens, and Çankaya and Kavaklıdere were the neighborhoods with villas with bigger gardens.’
- e. *Hafifçe morar-mış, {on-un} göz alt-lar-ı.*
 slightly turn.purple-PAST1 {s/he-GEN} eye lower part-PLUR-POSS3S
 ‘They had turned slightly black-and-blue, the areas under his/her eyes.’

Fifth, through compounding some of these nouns can form a temporal adverbial expression, e.g. *öğle üst-ü* ‘around noon’ and *akşam üst-ü* ‘(late) afternoon’, and these also occur in the plural: *akşam üst-ler-i* ‘(always) in the afternoon’.

Sixth, through compounding some of these nouns can form adverbials expressing some position of the human body, e.g. *tepe üstü* ‘headfirst, headlong; upside down’, *sırt üstü / arka üstü* ‘flat on one’s back’, *ayak üstü* ‘on one’s feet; hastily, in a rush’, *yüz üstü* (also *yüzüstü*) ‘(lying / falling) facedown’, *kıç üstü / popo üstü* ‘on one’s rear end’. This can further be exemplified by:

- (12)a. *Yatağ-in üst-ün-e yüz üst-ü uzan-mış,*
 bed-GEN top-POSS3S-DAT facedown stretch.out-PAST1
(dirsek-ler-i üst-ün)-de dikilmiş olan Yeşim ban-a
 elbow-PLUR-POSS3S top-CM-LOC leaning Y. I-DAT
gülümsü-yor-du.
 smile-PRES1-PROJ1
 ‘Yeşim, who lay facedown stretched out on the bed,
 leaning on her elbows, was smiling at me.’
- b. *Bütün gün kıç üst-ü oturan bir terzi için çok önemli-dir*
 all day on.the.rear sitting a tailor for very imp.-EMPH
böyle bir minder.
 such a cushion
 ‘For a tailor sitting on his bottom the whole day, such a cushion is very important.’
- c. *Sandal-in kıç alt-ın-da-ki votka-yı getir-ecēğ-in-i*
 boat-GEN rear underside-CM-LOC-ki vodka-ACC bring-PRT2-POSS3S-ACC

söyle-di.

say-PAST2

‘S/he said that s/he should get the vodka lying under the stern of the boat.’

Seventh, through compounding some of these nouns can form adjectival and adverbial expressions, e.g. *doğa üstü* ‘supernatural’, *tabiat üstü* (also *tabiatüstü*) ‘supernatural’, *olağan üstü* (also *olağanüstü*) ‘extraordinary; unheard-of, unusual; wonderful, stunning’, *partiler üstü* ‘above the parties’, *lisans üstü* ‘postgraduate (studies, course, etc.)’, *duyular üstü* ‘extrasensory’, *olağandışı* ‘unusual, exceptional; abnormal, strange’, *gerçek dışı* (also *gerçekdışı*) ‘unreal’, *gündem dışı* ‘outside the agenda’, *kanun dışı* ‘illegal’, *yasadışı* ‘illegal, unlawful’, *doğadışı* ‘unnatural’, *ahlâkdışı* ‘immoral / amoral, non-moral (word, act)’, *töredışı* ‘amoral, non-moral; immoral’, *kuraldışı* ‘exceptional, not covered by a rule’, *yurtdışı hatlar* ‘international lines’, *akıldışı* ‘irrational’, *bilinçdışı* ‘the unconscious’, *şuurdışı* ‘(the) unconscious’, *çağdışı* ‘out of fashion, old-fashioned, outmoded’, *çevrimdışı* ‘off-line’, *evlilikdışı* ‘illegitimate, unlawful, out of wedlock’, *iradedışı* ‘involuntary, not under the control of the will’, *istençdışı* ‘involuntary, unwilling’, *mantıkdışı* ‘illogical’, *toplumdışı* ‘extrasocial, not related to society’, *mor ötesi* ‘ultraviolet’, *doğa ötesi* ‘metaphysics, metaphysical’, *sınır ötesi* ‘across the border’, *kıta-lar öte-si keşif-ler* ‘transcontinental discoveries’. Example (13) illustrates the textual usage of this type of formation:

- (13) *Başka ne al-dı-n? Ses ton-u neredeyse doğa üstü, şeytansı.*
 other what buy-PAST2-2S voice tone-POSS3S almost supernatural/devilish
 ‘What else did you buy? His/her tone of voice was almost supernatural, devilish.’

The set of Place Nouns under discussion is not homogenous in the sense that they share their properties all equally well. On the one hand, the semantics of each individual noun plays a crucial role, and on the other, certain other factors are determinative as well, for these nouns can be classified into certain subgroups or according to the way they can be applied in derivative formations. To mention two extreme cases, *üst* ‘upper side’, *alt* ‘underside’, *ön* ‘front side’, *arka* ‘back side’, and *yan* ‘side’ are often depicted as the faces of a cube, together with *iç* ‘inside’ and *dış* ‘outside’, in which there is no room for others, and yet other formations can be made only with a small set of particular nouns. For example, only with *yan*, *art* and *peş* in combination with *sıra* an adverbial construction can be formed expressing *immediate vicinity* (as related to some other physical object).

- (14)a. *Bereket versin ki biz-im oğlan {ben-im} yan-ım sıra*
 thank.goodness that we-GEN boy {I-GEN} side-POSS1S sıra
yürü-yor-du.
 walk-PRES1-PROJ1
 ‘Thank goodness that our boy was walking right next to me.’

- b. *Ard-im sıra gel-ir-ken, "Nereye gid-iyor-sunuz?"*
 back-POSS1S sıra come-PRES2-ken where go-PRES1-2S
diye sor-du.
 'saying' ask-PAST2
 'Coming up right behind me, she asked *Where are you going?*'
- c. *Asker-ler hemen peş-im sıra koş-ma-ya başla-dı-lar.*
 soldier-PLUR direct back-POSS1S sıra run-INF-DAT begin-PAST2-3P
 'The soldiers began running right behind me.'
- d. *Arabacı yol-da at-lar-ın-ın yan-ı sıra yürü-yor-du.*
 coachman road-LOC horse-PLUR-POSS3S-GEN side-POSS3S sıra
 walk-PRES1-PROJ1
 'The coachman was walking on the road, right alongside his horses.'
- e. *Candide, yaşlı kadın-ın ard-ı sıra yürü-dü.*
 C. aged woman-GEN back-POSS3S sıra walk-PAST2
 'Candide walked right after the old woman.'
- f. *Hemen kız-ın peş-i sıra git-ti.*
 directly girl-GEN back-POSS3S sıra go-PAST2
 'Immediately he went right behind / after the girl.'

In the paragraph preceding our argumentation that words such as *alt*, *üst* and the like should be regarded as nouns rather than something else, it was stated that making a referential expression is achieved by forming a genitive construction. Yet, there is another possibility: the one that has been proposed in section 3—non-referential expressions are based on another type of formation (that of compounding), leading to oppositions such as *ev-in dış-ı* 'the exterior of the house' versus *evdışı* 'outdoors, out of doors'.

In summarizing the foregoing, we can say that Place Nouns can be applied in two domains: inflection and derivation. *Inflectionally* these nouns can be used in two ways: 1) to form the head of a bare genitive construction applicable as subject or object (e.g. *suy-un üst-ü* 'the surface of the water'); and 2) expanded with a case marker these genitive constructions are used as object or as an adverbial (e.g. *masa-nın üst-ün-X*). Constructions like *üst-üm-X* are merely a variant hereof, since the possessor (i.e. *ben-im* [I-GEN] 'my') has not been specified. *Derivationally* there are two possibilities: 3) conversion from noun to adjective (e.g. *üst kat* 'top floor'); and 4) compounding, resulting in a) nominal expressions (e.g. *perde arkası* 'the hidden side of the matter'); b) several predicates to be used adverbially and/or adjectivally, e.g. *akşam üstü* '(in the) afternoon', *yüz üstü* 'face down', *doğa üstü* 'supernatural';

and c) the material for a second type of derivation, being recursive compounding, e.g. (*deniz dib-i dünya-sı* ‘the world of the sea bottom’, or adjective formation,⁹ (e.g. (*şişe dib-i gözlük-lü* ‘in spectacles thick as a bottle (bottom)’).

5. Evaluating the common practice

In the present section I will briefly examine how the notions of definiteness and indefiniteness are used in the literature to account for constructions such as *misafir-in oda-sı* ‘room of the guest’ versus *misafir oda-sı* ‘guest room’. In fact, there are three types of treatment of these constructions: 1) an analysis in which the sole instrument is definiteness (cf. Banguoğlu 1990, Lewis 1967, 2000, Rühl 1975); 2) an analysis that is based on the distinction between “full” and “incomplete” genitive constructions (cf. Peters 1947, Wendt 1979, Venter & Kurt 1985); 3) an analysis in which no relation is suggested between *misafir-in oda-sı* ‘room of the guest’ and *misafir oda-sı* ‘guest room’, the former structure being analyzed in terms of the genitive-possessive construction and the latter type being regarded as nominal compounds (cf. Thomas 1986, Kornfilt 1997, Koopman 2004, Göksel & Kerslake 2005).

Secondly, given these divisions, it is interesting to see how these insights are incorporated in the analysis of Place Nouns. The tendency is that only a few scholars have observed that oppositions such as *masanın üstüne* and *masa üstüne* exist, let alone that an exhaustive analysis is available. The authors who mention the shorter form - mostly marginally, e.g. Banguoğlu (1990), Rühl (1975), Venter & Kurt (1985), and in somewhat more detail, e.g. Koopman (2004), Göksel & Kerslake (2005), have however never shown that there is a relationship with compounding. In the remainder of this section, these works will be discussed in more detail one by one.

Banguoğlu (1990) takes a rather traditional stance with regard to the terminology of word groups, and he distinguishes between definite and indefinite groups, or in his own words: *belirli adtakımı* (*annexion déterminée*) and *belirsiz adtakımı* (*annexion indéterminée*) (332–333). In other works of Turkish origin these terms can be identified as *belirli* (also *belirtili*) *isim tamlaması* (or *tayinli izafet*) and *belirsiz* (also *belirtisiz*) *isim tamlaması* (or *tayinsiz izafet*) respectively (cf. Korkmaz 1992: 21–23). As can be expected, the former type of construction can be exemplified by constructions such as *gemi-nin direği-i* ‘the mast of the ship’ and the latter one by *at kuyruğu-u* ‘horsetail’. An interesting observation in Banguoğlu is phrased as follows: “Nihayet belirsiz adtakımının bir çeşidi daha vardır ki bir tür takı öbeklerini meydana getirir. Bunlar aslında yer, yön, çağ, ilişki adlarının katkı alması ile oluşmuş belirsiz adtakımlarıdır. [Lastly, there is one more type of indefinite word group, such that it brings forth a kind of postpositional (word) groups. These are in fact

⁹ For this type of adjectival formation as related to compounding, see Van Schaaiik (2002: 86).

indefinite word groups formed by modification of nouns denoting place, direction, time and relation(s).]" (p. 336) Banguoğlu illustrates this by formations such as the one represented in (11), e.g. *masa üstü*, *deniz dibi*, *şehir içi*, *dağ ardı* et cetera.

Lewis (2000) considers word groups such as *babaanne* 'paternal grandmother' and *başbakan* 'prime minister' *compound nouns* in his chapter on word formation (p. 230), and categorizes (lexicalized) word groups such as *hanımeli* 'honeysuckle', *yılbaşı* 'New Year', and *samanyolu* 'the Milky Way' as *izafet groups* (p. 231). The term *izafet* 'annexation' plays a central role in his treatment of constructions like *üniversite-nin profesör-ler-i* (of-the-university its-professors) 'the professors of the university' and *üniversite profesör-ler-i* 'university professors'. The former type of construction is called *definite izafet* and "is employed when the first element is a definite person or thing to which or within which the second belongs", and accordingly, the latter one is known as *indefinite izafet* and "is used when the relationship between the two elements is merely qualificatory and not so intimate or possessive as that indicated by the definite izafet" (p. 41). Place Nouns are treated by Lewis as "*secondary postpositions*" and he states that "they are all nouns and may be used in any case and with any personal suffix", e.g. *arka-nız-dan* 'from behind you', and formulates an important constraint on the usage of the term postposition: "It is only when they are used in izafet with another noun and in the dative, locative, or ablative that they correspond in function to English prepositions and are called postpositions" (Lewis 2000: 87). This implies that structures such as *üstünde* should be regarded as postpositions throughout, no matter what kind of complement precedes, e.g. *masanın üstünde* versus *masa üstünde*. About the latter type of construction, nothing can be found in Lewis.

Rühl (1975) distinguishes between definite and indefinite possessive constructions, e.g. *saray-ın kapı-sı* 'the gate of the palace' versus *saray kapı-sı* 'palace gate' (p. 32f). On the other hand, he takes a stance quite different from the usual in his discussion on postpositions (as a subgroup of *Verhältniswörter* 'relators'). He explains that an equivalent for prepositions or postpositions, for instance "behind", is lacking in Turkish and that this gap is filled by a construction based on the noun *arka* (p. 47f). So, instead of "*behind the house*" [hinter dem Haus] we find in Turkish *ev-in arka-sın-da* 'at the back of the house' [an der Hinterseite des Hauses] or "*in an indefinite possessive construction*" [in unbestimmter Possessivverbindung]: *ev arka-sın-da*. Remarkably enough, he then continues by presenting more than ten examples based on the latter model, the translations of which in German all include a definite article: *masa alt-ın-da* 'under the table' [unter dem Tisch], *ev üst-ün-de* 'on the house' [auf dem Haus], *duvar arka-sın-da* 'behind the wall' [hinter der Mauer], *dükkân ön-ün-de* 'in front of the store' [vor dem Laden], *asker yan-ın-da* 'next to the soldier' [neben dem Soldaten] et cetera. The sole other instance of a genitive construction based on a Place Noun found in his work is *bu asker-in yan-ın-da* 'next to this soldier' [neben diesem Soldaten], to which Rühl comments that "Ist das voranstehende Ergänzungswort (Bestimmungswort) genauer bestimmt, so erhält es die

Genitivendung [if the preceding noun governed¹⁰ is more precisely modified (definite), it gets the genitive ending]” (Rühl 1975: 48).

Peters (1947) treats the notions of possessive construction and nominal compound in a rather precise way, using several designations. The former type is referred to as “die suffigierte Genitivgruppe (vollständige Genitivverbindung, vollständiger status constructus) [suffixed genitive (word) group (synonymous with full genitive collocation, full status constructus)]” and in Turkish by *birinci nevi izafet* or *tainli izafet*. Nominal compounds are presented under the heading of “die suffigierte Absolutgruppe (unvollständige Genitivverbindung, unvollständiger status constructus) [suffixed absolute (word) group (synonymous with incomplete genitive construction, incomplete status constructus)]” and in Turkish by *ikinci nevi izafet* or *tainisiz izafet* (p. 31f). “Place Nouns” [Ortsnomina] are considered to be involved in postpositional formations and represented in tabular form but are not discussed at length. Unfortunately, although a promising statement can be found on the shorter type, “Die Gruppe kann vollständig oder unvollständig sein [the group can be complete or incomplete]”, not a trace is found of an example illustrating this observation (Peters 1947: 39).

Venter & Kurt (1985) recognize the nominal nature of words such as *alt*, *üst* et cetera, but at the same time state that they express spatial relations when used as postpositions and that they require the genitive (p. 89f). Interestingly, the authors observe that “Wenn die Ortsbezeichnung sehr allgemein gehalten ist, kann der Genitiv entfallen. [when the place or space designated is very general, the genitive case marker may drop.]” This is demonstrated by *Oturma odasının deniz-Ø tarafında bir de balkon vardı* ‘At the seaside of the living room there was a balcony too’, with *deniz tarafın(da)* ‘(at) the seaside’.

Wendt (1979) distinguishes two types of genitive construction: “the loose genitive construction” [die lose Genitivverbindung] and its counterpart, “the fixed genitive construction” [die feste Genitivverbindung] (p. 257f). These are exemplified by *tren-in hareket-i* ‘the departure of the train’ and *şehir plan-ı* ‘city map’ respectively. He recognizes that the former type can be “split” [getrennt] by other words and word groups, whereas this is impossible for the latter type. The second type of construction is depicted as the main means of building new words. Furthermore, in this work a distinction is made between postpositions and postpositional expressions. As for the latter type of expression, it is stated that they are based on nouns occurring in the dative, locative or ablative. Also, a general characterization is presented in terms of “Das Wort vor dem postpositionalen Ausdruck steht, wenn es bestimmt ist, im Genitiv, wenn es unbestimmt ist, in der Grundform [the word preceding the postpo-

¹⁰ In his appendix on linguistic terminology, the equivalents of Ottoman-based *izafet terkibi mütemmimi* are given as “Bestimmungswort, Ergänzungswort” and “regiertes Nomen”.

sitional expression gets the genitive if definite, and occurs in its bare form if indefinite]” (Wendt 1979: 258).

Thomas (1986) distinguishes two types of *possessive construction*: Type I corresponds to what we have presented here as the genitive expression and Type II to nominal compounds (64–65). In his view, too, “In Type I the first member is always definite” and “In a Type II possessive construction the first member is not definite”. Spatial expressions (the “full” list, including *yukarı* ‘up, space that is higher, upstairs’ and *dışarı* ‘outside, space that is out’, together with their respective antonyms *aşağı* and *içeri*) are treated together with postpositions, obviously because “Much of the work of English prepositions is done in Turkish by nouns of place used in possessive constructions”. No mention is made, however, of “bare” nouns combined with a Place Noun in his Type II construction.

Kornfilt (1997) discusses Place Nouns at various places in her work in terms of “secondary” or “fake” postpositions, stating however that “these are actually nouns which are used as postpositions; they do not assign case to their respective arguments” (p. 100–102). Furthermore, one of the assets of this work is that a clear distinction is made between *genitive constructions* and *compounds*, witness statements such as “The possessive noun phrase places the possessor in the genitive case, and the possessed element as the head of the construction. Suffixed to the head is the possessive agreement suffix, agreeing with the possessor in person and number” (p. 185) and the fact that nominal compounds such as *okul kitabı* ‘school book’ are treated (p. 474) under the heading of derivational morphology. In that respect there is at any rate no fuss about the notion of definiteness underlying structural and semantic differences and similarities between entirely different constructions (i.e. genitive constructions and compounds). However, one central idea or, in the case of postpositions, perhaps the sole criterion in Kornfilt’s approach to classifying lexical categories on the basis of inflectional and/or syntactic properties is obviously the question whether a word can assign case to its complement. She states: “Most postpositions are independent morphemes that assign case to their nominal complement and most postpositions can easily be distinguished from adjectives, since the latter do not assign case”¹¹. Those postpositions that do not assign case are nevertheless distinguishable from adjectives by their semantics” (p. 100), and apart from the description about “fake” postpositions quoted above, Kornfilt discerns furthermore (p. 423) that there are two subtypes of postpositions, namely those “that do not bear agreement morphology with their objects” (e.g. *gibi* ‘like’, *ile* ‘with’, *kadar* ‘as

¹¹ In connection with this criterion, one might wonder how certain adjectives requiring the dative, instrumental, or ablative for their argument or satellite would be classified, e.g. *ait* ‘belonging (to)’, *aşık* ‘in love (with)’, *aykırı* ‘contrary (to)’, *eşit* ‘equal (to)’, *hazır* ‘ready (to)’, *sadık* ‘faithful (to)’, *uygun* ‘suited (for)’, *yönelik* ‘directed (to)’, *ilişkin* ‘related (to)’ (all plus dative), *çevrili* ‘surrounded (by)’ (plus instrumental), and *memnun* ‘content (with)’ (plus ablative).

much as', *için* 'for'), and those "that do exhibit (possessive) agreement morphology with their objects and can thus be analyzed as nouns rather than genuine postpositions" (e.g. *üst* 'top', *alt* 'underside', etc.). Unfortunately, the main point of her description is in each case geared to the question which postpositional properties can be attributed to Place Nouns, and this might explain why no attention is paid to such nouns when they are preceded by a bare noun (e.g. *masa üstü*).

Koopman (2004) labels constructions of the type *otel oda-sı* 'hotel room' as *possessive construction* (p. 121) and expressions of the type *ev-ler-in sahib-i* 'the owner of the houses'¹² as *genitive construction* (p. 134). These two notions are used to explain differences between formations like *masa-nın üstünde* and *masa-Ø üstünde* as well. He states that the two aforementioned construction types are applicable to Place Nouns yielding "locative specifications", according to the following general rule: a literal meaning (of the left hand member) is expressed through a *genitive construction* and a figurative, metaphorical meaning is expressed by means of a *possessive construction* (p. 161). This is illustrated by *Rehber-in peş-in-de iki turist yürüyor* 'Behind the guide two tourists are walking' and *Ahmet hep kitap peş-in-de koşuyor* 'Ahmet is all the time after books'.

Göksel & Kerslake (2005) include the treatment of Place Nouns in their chapter on postpositions and they make a number of interesting distinctions. Firstly, *possessive-marked postpositions* are said to have derived from nouns with the form noun+POSS+OBL, in which OBL stands for the dative, locative or ablative case marker. Within this group of postpositions there is a subgroup expressing *spatial relations* and one expressing *abstract relations*. Secondly, the first subgroup is further divided into two other sets: *possessive-marked postpositions* with 1) genitive complements and 2) with non-case-marked complements. With respect to the latter category, "possessive-marked postpositions with non-case-marked complements", the authors present a number of contexts and conditions in terms of meaning and usage: a) 'in', e.g. *ter içinde* 'in sweat'; b) metaphorical usage, e.g. *Bütün okullar Bakanlık'ın denetimi altına alındı* 'All schools were brought under the control of the Ministry'; c) non-specific complement, e.g. *Bu hesapları bir kağıt üstünde yapmak daha kolay olacak* 'It will be easier to do these calculations on a piece of paper'; d) categorical complement, e.g. *Sanık ne zaman yargıç önüne çıkar acaba?* 'I wonder when the accused person will appear before a judge?'; and e) generic complement, e.g. *Genellikle kardeşler arasında kuvvetli bir dayanışma olur* 'There is usually a strong solidarity between siblings' (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 251-252).

Be all this as it may, this approach is at best a description of the outward appearance, and the point of departure is obviously a postposition to which some complement can be added having this or that shape. However, it does not account for the

¹² Lewis (2000: 41) rightly points out that "in *ev-in sahib-i* 'the house's owner' the first element, though legally and logically the property of the second, is grammatically its possessor."

structure of the expressions under discussion or, more particularly, this approach does not lead to a correct analysis of oppositions such as *masa-nın üstünde* versus *masa üstünde*. Another case in point is the following. Although it is correctly stated that expressions such as *ter içinde* ‘in sweat’ and *korku içinde* ‘in fear’ provide an example of “contexts where the postposition is used in a non-physical sense or with a metaphorical meaning”, a detail Göksel & Kerslake pass over is the fact that in certain cases the aforementioned type of opposition does not exist. For *ter içinde* one might theoretically expect a genitive-marked counterpart that strictly speaking has a physical sense, for instance, in talking about the chemical salts that can be found in the liquid sweat, thus: *ter-in içinde*. But for structures such as *korku içinde* ‘in fear’ and *stres altında* ‘under stress’ no such genitive-marked counterpart exists. In this case it is imaginable and perhaps even plausible to consider forms such as *içinde* and *altında* postpositions, but on the other hand, the way to a unified treatment (as nouns and denominal products) is more or less blocked when *içinde* and the like should be taken literally (as ‘at the inside (of)’) in one case and as a postposition (‘in’) in another. And what to do with oppositions like *ev-in dış-ı* ‘the exterior of the house’ and the adjectival formation in *(ev dış-ı) faaliyetler* ‘outdoor activities’?

6. On postpositional constructions

In this paper the main discussion was centered around two almost parallel nominal construction types which differ minimally in form but maximally in meaning. These can be represented as:

- (15) a. N₁-GEN N₂-POSS3S
 b. N₁-ZERO N₂-CM¹³

The difference in form concerns the presence of the genitive in (15a) and the absence of this suffix in (15b). In terms of meaning, the former construction is an ‘ordinary’ genitive construction, equivalent to ‘the X of Y’, whereas the latter one is a compound construction. Classical examples illustrating this opposition are:

- (16) a. *misafir-in oda-sı* ‘the room of the guest’
 b. *misafir-Ø oda-sı* ‘guest room’

However, oppositions like (16) which contain the same lexical material in (a-b), are as a matter of fact a rare phenomenon; witness the ungrammaticality of (17a) and (18b).

¹³ The Compound Marker (CM) is identical in form with the suffix POSS3S but not in function.

- (17) a. **çay-in* *bardağ-ı* –
 b. *çay-Ø* *bardağ-ı* ‘tea glass’
- (18) a. *komşu-nun* *araba-sı* ‘the car of the neighbor’
 b. **komşu-Ø* *araba-sı* –

On the other hand, as has been demonstrated amply in sections 3 and 4, for Place Nouns we find oppositions both members of which are perfectly grammatical.

- (19) a. *şehir-in* *dış-in-da* ‘outside the city’
 b. *şehir-Ø* *dış-in-da* ‘out-of-town’
- (20) a. *masa-nın* *üst-ün-de* ‘on the top of (a/the) table’
 b. *masa-Ø* *üst-ün-de* ‘on (a/the) table top’

In order to provide an explanation for the combinatorial possibilities of certain nouns, one might suggest that oppositions such as (16), (19) and (20) can only be formed if and only if the right hand member of the construction is a Place Noun.

Indeed, there are some other nouns as well which may qualify as a kind of Place Noun and for which similar oppositions are possible. On the other hand, in a number of cases some semantic shift is involved between the heads of such oppositions, despite the fact that they are (apparently) based on the same lexical noun. Consider:

- (21) a. *Aslan-lar kervan-lar-in* *yol-un-da* *bekleş-ip*
 lion-PLUR caravan-PLUR-GEN road-POSS3S-LOC wait-CONV
 deve-ler-in *üstüne atlı-yor.*
 camel-PLUR-GEN attack-PRES1
 ‘The lions all wait on the road the caravans take and attack the camels.’
- b. *kervan* *yol-un-da*
 caravan route-CM-LOC
 ‘on a/the caravan route’

For (21 a–b) we can safely say that *yol* ‘road’ can be taken literally and that *yolunda* in (21b) should not be regarded as a postposition, although such a future development should not be excluded *a priori*. Yet there are examples of similar oppositions for which one could claim that the “shorter form has become something resembling a postposition” and nouns such as *sıra*, *taraf* and *uğur* are good examples.

Although the word *sırasında* is derivationally to be associated with *sıra* ‘row; turn’, a number of divergent meanings have been formed over time. In its literal meaning it only occurs in a genitive construction rendering the meaning ‘row’ or ‘rank’, as exemplified in (22a). At the same time *sırasında* has the appearance of having developed into a postposition the complement of which is zero-marked. Its overall meaning has shifted to ‘during’, as shown by (22b).

- (22) a. *Öncü-ler-in sıra-sın-da-ki kahraman Komutan Ramaz*
 scout-PLUR-GEN rank-POSS3S-LOC-ki heroic commander R.
öldür-ül-müş.
 kill-PASS-PAST1
 ‘The heroic commander R., (fighting) in the ranks of the vanguard, was killed.’
- b. *Bu dünya-da-ki yaşam-ın sırasında san-a yararlı*
 this world-LOC-ki life-POSS2S during you-DAT useful
ol-ma-sın-ı dile-r-im.
 be-INF-POSS3S-ACC wish-PRES2-1S
 ‘I wish that it will be of use to you during your life in this world’.

Next, *taraf* is a noun copied from Arabic, and it means ‘side’. Mostly it occurs as a real postposition¹⁴ meaning ‘by’ / ‘on behalf of’, as exemplified in (23b), but preceded by a noun phrase ending in a genitive, *taraf* should of course be taken literally (23a).

- (23) a. *Orman-ın koku-su köy-ün her taraf-ın-dan*
 forest-GEN scent-POSS3S village-GEN every side-POSS3S-ABL
hissed-il-ir.
 perceive-PASS-PRES2
 ‘The scent of the forest is perceived from every corner of the village.’
- b. *hükümet tarafından*
 ‘by the government’

Whereas for *sıra* and *taraf* some association with Place Nouns can be imagined, for *uğur* ‘fortune, good luck’ this is much harder. Also this noun has developed into a postpositional expression: *uğrunda* ‘for the sake of’. This construct has a frame similar to that of *taraf* (cf. footnote 14) and it requires the genitive for pronominal and zero-marking for other complements. Compare (24a) and (24b)—both with genitive and possessive marking—with (24c) being based on a postpositional expression.

- (24) a. *Sen-in uğr-un-da yok ol-ayım - sen ben-i unut-acak-sın.*
 you-GEN sake-POSS2S-LOC go.away-OPT1S you I-ACC forget-FUT-2S
 ‘For your sake, let me disappear - you will forget me.’

¹⁴ Actually, the frame of this postposition can be represented by *taraf-POSS-ABL*, in which the possessive slot can be occupied by all grammatical persons.

- b. *Ben-im uğr-um-da kendi-n-i feda et-me-yecek-sin.*
 I-GEN sake-POSS1S-LOC self-POSS2S-ACC sacrifice-NEG-FUT-2S
 ‘You are not going to sacrifice yourself because of me.’
- c. *Vatan uğrunda şehit düş-en evlat-lar-ımız-ın ruh-ları*
 fatherland for fall-PRT1 son-PLUR-POSS1P-GEN spirit-POSS3P
rahat uyu-sun.
 peaceful sleep-OPT3S
 ‘May our sons who fell for the country rest in peace.’

Opposition with non-pronominal complements that are genitive-marked does not occur, that is, constructions of the form *N-GEN uğrunda* do not exist. This kind of opposition does exist for the shorter variant *uğruna* ‘for / for the sake of’. Compare the first line of the seventh verse of the *İstiklâl Marşı* (25a) with a postpositional expression (25b).

- (25) a. *Kim bu cennet vatan-ın uğr-un-a ol-ma-z ki*
 who this paradise fatherland-GEN sake-POSS3S-DAT be-NEG-PRES2 ki
feda?
 sacrifice
 ‘Who wouldn’t sacrifice himself for this heavenly country?’
- b. *Vatan uğruna can-ların-ı feda et-ti-ler.*
 fatherland for life-POSS3P-ACC sacrifice-PAST2-3P
 ‘They have sacrificed their lives for the country.’

Now, three types of construction have been distinguished so far: 1) genitive-possessive constructions; 2) compound constructions; 3) postposition-like constructions. Their properties will be discussed in more detail below.

ad 1. The lexical status of the inflected forms which are the head of a genitive construction (cf. 15a) is non-problematic: they are nouns that can be subcategorized as Place Noun. Although in many cases such heads (occurring mostly with a dative, locative or ablative suffix) are called ‘fake postpositions’, their pure nominal character is well expressed by examples (10), (11) and (12). Their status is that of *real nouns*.

ad 2. The head of compound constructions (cf. 15b, 19b, 20b, 21b) based on a Place Noun presents no problem either. These heads (occurring mostly with a dative, locative or ablative suffix) are also called ‘fake postpositions’, but they are still pure nominal constructs since the first inflectional suffix in the head can be identified as the Compound Marker (cf. footnote 13). Compounding explains the absence of the genitive case marker. In terms of overall semantics, the opposition between constructions such as (15a) versus (15b) is often advanced in the literature as leading to a difference in interpretation between *concrete* versus *abstract*. On the other hand, pragmatically speaking, the difference between referential for (15a) and non-refer-

ential for (15b) provides a sufficient explanation for the differences in form. Thinking of a lexical classification for the heads of the type of construction represented in (15b) and exemplified by (19b), (20b) and (21b), the term that would fit best is indeed *fake postposition*, *pseudo-postposition* or *compound based postposition*.

ad 3. In the third type of construction exhibiting an opposition between a genitive-marked and a zero-marked form another factor is relevant. In the genitive-marked construction type the head is compositional: the head can be considered as a noun followed by a series of inflectional morphemes. In the zero-marked variant the head of the construction can only be regarded as a frozen form since parsing the word in terms of inflectional morphemes is to a high degree pointless, for instance, LOC no longer makes reference to “location” and ABL can no longer be associated with the concept of “source” or “starting point”. The effect is that the head in its entirety has obtained a meaning quite deviant from its inflectional counterparts. Examples are: *sıra-sın-da* ‘in the rank (of)’ versus *sırasında* ‘during’ (cf. 22a–b), *taraf-ın-dan* ‘from the side (of)’ versus *tarafından* ‘by’ (cf. 23a–b) and also *uğr-un-da* ‘for the good (of)’ versus *uğrunda* ‘for’ (cf. 24a–b). For these non-decompositional forms, the view can be defended that they have developed into *real postpositions*.

In addition to this, there are more constructions that can be classified as *postposition-like constructions* (e.g. Lewis 1967, Wendt 1979, Van Schaaijk 2002). All in all they form a relatively small group of petrified words (in my opinion to be regarded as real postpositions as well) whose complement never occurs with the genitive case marker. In this way they resemble the constructions of (17b), (19b) and (20b). Examples based on a Place Noun are:

- | | | | | |
|------|----|--------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| (26) | a. | <i>panik</i> | <i>içinde</i> | ‘in panic’ |
| | b. | <i>stres</i> | <i>altında</i> | ‘under stress’ |
| | c. | <i>kanun</i> | <i>önünde</i> | ‘before the law’ |
| | d. | <i>sahne</i> | <i>arkasında</i> | ‘backstage / behind the scenes’ |

Thanks to the absence of a genitive-marked opposition for the constructions in (26), the words *içinde* ‘in’, *altında* ‘under’, *önünde* ‘before’ and *arkasında* ‘behind’ can be considered the result of a process that yields real postpositions. Their complement is non-referential and their overall meaning is metaphorical in relation to the literal meaning of the noun they derive from – contrary to structures in which the “locative” meaning of the head is maintained, as in *masa üst-ün-de* ‘on the/a table top’ and *ağaç alt-ların-dan* ‘from under Ø/the trees’.

As a matter of fact, certain criteria can be applied for a further division into several subgroups. Two relevant factors are 1) referentiality of the complement and 2) their frame structure, leading to two groups with a partial overlap. One group is clearly based on a compound structure to which the derivational suffix *-CE*, forming adverbs, is attached (Group A). The complements these structures take are both referential as well as non-referential. As for the other frames, three types of case-marked structures can be distinguished, noun-CM-LOC, noun-CM-ABL and noun-CM-

INS. Within the group with frame noun-CM-LOC two complement types occur: referential (Group B) and non-referential complements (Group C). Structures with frames noun-CM-ABL and noun-CM-INS never take referential complements and can be classed in Group D and Group E respectively. This can be represented as:

(27)	<i>Complement</i>	<i>Head</i>	
	Group A:	+ Ref	noun-CM-ADV
	Group B:	+ Ref	noun-CM-LOC
	Group C:	- Ref	noun-CM-LOC
	Group D:	- Ref	noun-CM-ABL
	Group E:	- Ref	noun-CM-INS

Group A. This group comprises a small number of lexicalized postpositions, probably all neologisms since the 1930s, e.g. *X boyunca* ‘in the course (of) / during / alongside’; *X devamınca* ‘in the course (of) / following / ensuing’, *X gereğince* ‘by virtue (of) / on grounds (of)’; *X süresince* ‘during’. The latter items can further be exemplified by: (*uzun bir çocukluk dönem-i*) *süresince* [(long a childhood period-CM) during] ‘during a long childhood-period’.

Group B. This is a small group of *temporal expressions* having in common with (26) that the head is contained in a locative frame (i.e. noun-CM-LOC). The complement of these constructions is a bare (zero-marked) but *referential* noun phrase. Taking *X sırasında* ‘during X’ as a model, these temporal compounds used as postposition can be exemplified as follows: *yemek sırasında* ‘during dinner’; *ameliyat sırasında* ‘during the operation’; *deprem sırasında* ‘during the earthquake’; *seçim kampanya-sı sırasında* ‘during the election campaign’. Although definiteness as such is not marked by a definite article, their status of a referential NP becomes clear when we compare them with another series of examples which all contain one of the following elements: 1) An expression for indefiniteness (*bir*) is possible in the complement, also preceded by an adjective, e.g. *bir kavga sırasında* ‘during a fight’; *romantik bir dans sırasında* ‘during a romantic dance’; 2) A demonstrative pronoun (inherently definite) may precede the complement proper, e.g. *bu son görüşme sırasında* ‘during this last talk/meeting’; *gördüğü bu düşünce sırasında* ‘during this dream s/he had’; 3) A plural marker may be attached to the complement, e.g. *olaylar sırasında* ‘during the events’; *daha önceki kontrol-ler sırasında* ‘during the previous check-ups’; 4) The complement may end in a marker expressing Possessive Agreement, being inherently definite as well, e.g. *düş-ü sırasında* ‘during her/his dream’; *konuşma-sı sırasında* ‘during his/her talk’; *zina ilişkisi-miz sırasında* ‘during our adulterous relation’; *evliliği-in sırasında* ‘during your marriage’; 5) The complement may be a compound based on a proper noun (with ‘unique reference’ and hence inherently definite), e.g. 2. *Dünya Savaşı sırasında* ‘during World War II’, and *Paris konferansı sırasında* ‘during the conference in Paris’. Similar constructions with a referential complement can be expected with *X esnasında* ‘during; in the course of; at some point during (non-continuous)’; *X süresinde* ‘at some

(point/moment/stage) in the period X' / 'in the course of the period X'; *X öncesinde* 'in the period preceding X'; *X sonrasında* 'in the period following X'; *X zamanında* 'in the time of X' (e.g. *Kraliçe Viktorya zamanında* 'in Queen Victoria's time'; *Tito zamanında* 'in the Tito era'; *X döneminde* 'in the period/era X' (e.g. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu döneminde* 'in the era of the Ottoman Empire'; *Soğuk Savaş döneminde* 'in the Cold War era').

Group C. The head of the constructions in this group is also formed by the frame noun-CM-LOC. Complements are non-referential and, hence, they occur as zero-marked noun phrases. Given the rigid structure of the heads, these can be considered compound-based postpositions. Some common examples are: *X durumunda* 'in the state/position of X', *X halinde* 'in the state/position of X', *X amacıyla* 'aiming at X', *X niyetinde* 'planning to X', *X kararında* 'decided to (do) X', *X inancında* 'believing that X', *X görüşünde* 'in the view that X', *X iddiasında* 'claiming that X', *X düşüncesinde* 'thinking that X', *X kanısında* 'of the opinion that X', *X kanaatinde* 'convinced that X', *X sonucunda* 'as a result of X', *X sayesinde* 'thanks to / due to X'. Of course, the constructions listed under (26) should be included as well: *panik içinde* 'in panic', *stres altında* 'under stress', *kanun önünde* 'before the law', *sahne arkasında* 'backstage / behind the scenes'.

Group D. The head of the constructions in group D takes the frame noun-CM-ABL. Complements are non-referential and, hence, they occur as zero-marked noun phrases. These postpositions can be exemplified as follows: *X açısından* 'from the viewpoint of X', *X bakımından* 'from the viewpoint of X', *X suçundan* 'on charge of X'.

Group E. The head of the constructions in this group takes the frame noun-CM-INS. Complements are non-referential and, hence, they occur as zero-marked noun phrases. These postpositions can be exemplified as follows: *X nedeniyle* 'because of X', *X sebebiyle* 'for reason of X', *X dolay(ı)siyle* 'for reason of X', *X kadariyle* 'as many/ much as X', *X şartıyla* 'provided that X', *X koşuluyla* 'on the condition that X'.

7. On postpositions

In many a grammar book of Turkish it is customary to classify postpositions in terms of the case markers they govern. In this way three groups can be distinguished: postpositions the complement of which 1) is zero-marked, unless it is a personal or demonstrative pronoun (then it gets the genitive); 2) is marked with the dative suffix; 3) is marked with the ablative suffix. Complements never take the accusative suffix, except in the case of two postpositions copied from Arabic, i.e. *takiben* 'following' (e.g. *bun-u takiben* 'after this') and *müteakip* 'following' (e.g. *Kuru bir soğuk-u müteakip kar yağdı* 'It snowed after a dry cold spell'). Complements in the genitive, locative or instrumental do not occur either.

Another viewpoint from which a classification could be approached is by looking at the syntactic function postpositional phrases can fulfill. A relatively small

group of postpositional phrases can be used attributively (as an adjective, that is, e.g. *sana göre bir iş* ‘a job suitable for you’) or predicatively (e.g. *kitap sen-in için-di* ‘the book was for you’). The greater bulk of postpositional phrases, however, is syntactically deployed as adverbial phrases. In a recent publication (Li 2004: 803–804) this circumstance was reflected in a kind of definition of postpositions:

“A word with a lesser degree of meaning of its own, placed after a substantive or pronoun and giving this noun an adverbial function is a postposition.”¹⁵

Whereas the criterion advanced by Kornfilt (1997: 100) hinges on the observation that “Most postpositions are independent morphemes that assign case to their nominal complement and most postpositions can easily be distinguished from adjectives, since the latter do not assign case”, Li’s statement shows that placement and adverbial function are taken as more important factors. One objection to Kornfilt’s view has been passed over without further comment: the question raised in footnote 11. If case assignment were the main criterion, then a considerable number of adjectives would be included too, since, contrary to what Kornfilt claims, certain adjectives do need a complement to which a certain case marker must be attached. In addition to the examples given in footnote 11, we have predicates such as *-(y)E yakın* ‘close (to)’, *-(y)E bağlı* ‘connected (to)’ and also *-TEn uzak* ‘far (away) (from)’. Not only on the basis of case assignment, but also because the expressions based on such predicates can be used in attributive and predicative position—a trait that can be attributed to some postpositions as well. As if this did not suffice, even the quantificational modifiers (adjectives) *-TEn fazla* ‘more (than)’ and *-TEn az* ‘less (than)’ can be used attributively and predicatively:

- (28) a. *Milyon yıl-dan fazla bir süre önce ...*
 million year-ABL more a period ago
 ‘(A period) More than a million years ago ...’
- b. *Bu rakam, AB bütçe-sin-in yarı-sın-dan fazla-dır.*
 this figure EU budget-CM-GEN half-POSS3S-ABL more-EMPH
 ‘This figure is more than half the budget of the European Union.’

The main point, however, is whether such predicates can be used as the head of an adverbial phrase—attributive and predicative usage is as a matter of fact of secondary interest.

¹⁵ Originally: “Ein dem Substantiv oder Pronomen nachgestelltes Wort von geringer Eigenbedeutung, das diesem Nomen die Funktion einer Adverbialen Bestimmung verleiht, ist eine Postposition.”

A further point Li makes in assessing the way(s) postpositions have come into existence, is the following: “In as far as postpositions are analyzable anyway, they have either a verbal or a nominal origin”.¹⁶

Postpositions with a verbal history originate mostly through a converb, which is used as an adverbial expression. Examples are *karşı* ‘opposite’ < *karış-* ‘to fight, to become hostile’ [kavga etmek, düşmanlaşmak] (Li 2004: 275); *doğru* ‘towards’ < *toğ-* ‘to surmount, to pass’ [aşmak, geçmek] (Li 2004: 490); *göre* < *kör-* ‘to see, to look’ [görmek, bakmak] (Li 2004: 318). Taking into consideration that the temporal expressions based on *kala* (*kal-a* < *kal-* ‘to stay, to remain’) and *geçe* (*geç-e* < *geç-* ‘to pass’) are adverbials derived from converbs in a similar way as described here, these expressions could also be included in the class of postpositions proper. Their usage can be demonstrated by:

- (29) a. *Tren iki-ye beş (dakika) kal-a gel-iyor.*
 train two-DAT five (minutes) remaining come-PRES1
 ‘The train comes at five (minutes) to two.’
- b. *Samsun’a tam on beş kilometre kal-a otobüs-ümüz bozul-du.*
 S.-DAT exactly fifteen km before bus-POSS1P break.down-PAST2
 ‘Exactly 15 km before Samsun our bus broke down.’
- c. *Gece yarısının-ı çeyrek geç-e yeniden başla-n-dı.*
 midnight-ACC quarter past anew begin-PASS-PAST2
 ‘It started again at a quarter past midnight.’
- d. *Tren iki-yi beş geç-e gel-iyor.*
 train two-ACC five past come-pres1
 ‘The train comes at five past two.’

As for nouns, the case of *gibi* ‘like’ could serve as the classical example of how a noun might end up as a postposition. Clauson (1972: 686) mentions the archaic form *ki*: *b* ‘mould, model’, whereas others advance a devoiced final consonant. Assuming the abstract form *kip* ‘model, resemblance’ and disregarding any phonological changes, the evolution of *kip* into *gibi* can be thought of as follows: 1) the head of a regular possessive construction (i.e. noun-GEN *kip*-POSS3S) was expressed as *kip-i*; 2) over time the full-fledged construction eroded through the loss of the genitive case marker, except for highly frequent words such as personal pronouns and de-

¹⁶ Originally stated as: “Soweit Postpositionen überhaupt analysierbar sind, haben sie entweder einen verbalen oder einen nominalen Ursprung.”

monstratives; 3) referential properties of the suffix POSS3s vanished though semantic dissolution and *p* fell subject to intervocalic voicing: *kip-i* → *kipi* = *gibi*.

Apart from the historical development outlined here, there are two more ways of acquiring postpositions. One is by copying them from a foreign language and adopting an appropriate format (phonology, case marking), e.g. *-TEn evvel* ‘before’, *-(y)E rağmen* ‘despite of’, *-(y)E dair* ‘about’, *-(y)E mukabil* ‘in return to’, all items copied from Arabic. Another way to come by postpositions, fully in line with the practice of copying, is by creating or translating them, e.g. *-(y)E yönelik* ‘directed (to)’ (innovation) and *-(y)E rağmen* → *-(y)E karşın* ‘despite (of)’ and *buna mukabil* → *buna karşılık* ‘in return for this’ (translation). A condition for copying, translating and the introduction of “designer postpositions” is that these forms are supplemental, in the sense that they are added to the stock of already existing postpositions, and not innovative as a new class of lexical items.

And finally, in sections 1–6 another developmental path has been described. Seemingly inflected forms behave like postpositions in a number of ways: they are abstract in meaning and they are used adverbially. The “inflectional material” is clearly visible in this type of postposition, and it is impossible to predict what phonological changes they may undergo in the future. And to what extent they might fuse into a kind of case marker is completely unknown too, taking into account how difficult this seems to be for postpositions in general. This was extensively shown for *ile* ‘with’ and *için* ‘for’ by Kabak (2006). Also variation in lexical status may occur in due time, as is the case with, for instance, *sonra* and *önce*. For these predicates Erdal (1994) claims that they are postpositions, Kornfilt (2000) regards them as adverbs, whereas Van Schaaik (2004) points out that they have several nominal properties as well.

8. The benefits of hindsight

In section 1 of this paper it was argued that the opposition genitive-zero as exemplified in (1a-b), i.e. *masa-nın üst-ün-de* versus *masa-Ø üst-ün-de*, cannot be explained in terms of the distinction definite-indefinite, and what is more, the indefinite article can be added to both constructions: *bir masa-nın üst-ün-de* versus *bir masa-Ø üst-ün-de*. A similar type of problem was addressed in section 2, where apparent oppositions such as *misafir-in oda-sı* and *misafir oda-sı* are analyzed as a(n inflectional) *genitive-possessive* construction and a (derivational) *compound construction* respectively. Furthermore, in section 3 it was shown that this analysis can successfully be applied to the constructions of section 1. The correctness is corroborated by arguments advanced in section 4, which are based on the observation that the lexical subcategory of Place Nouns is very versatile and extremely suitable for a number of interesting formations. In the inflectional domain they occur as the head of genitive-possessive constructions (e.g. *ev-in ön-ü* ‘the facade of the house’), but also as stand-alone possessive constructions (e.g. *Arka-n-a bak-ma!* ‘Don’t look back!’). Place Nouns can be converted into an adjective (e.g. *iç deniz* ‘inner sea’) and applied

derivationally, they can figure as the head of a compound, which in turn may be used as the complement of another compound (e.g. [göz alt-ı] *krem-i* ‘cream for under the eye’) or as an adverbial construction (e.g. *akşam üst-ü* ‘late afternoon’, *sırt üst-ü* ‘flat on one’s back’, *kanun dış-ı* ‘illegal(ly)’). Section 5 summarizes a survey of the relevant linguistic literature with respect to the terminology applied to the constructions discussed in the first two sections of this paper. For these publications a larger time span (1947–2005) than the usual has been chosen intentionally, for the mere reason that certain notions, concepts and insights as formulated in the present paper appear to have developed rather early without, however, percolating into, let alone leaving a trace in, later publications. All in all ten publications in four languages have been examined. Section 6 goes into the relationship with constructions resembling a postposition, because there are structural, semantic and syntactic similarities between the head of a zero-marked construction based on a Place Noun on the one hand, and a postposition on the other. Firstly, the construction comprises a complement and a head which structurally resembles a postposition since it occurs in phrase-second position. Secondly, for the head there is a semantic shift from concrete to abstract, a trait that can be ascribed to postpositions in any case. And thirdly, syntactically speaking, the entire structure of this type can form an adverbial in all cases. Two types of development from a nominal to a postpositional structure can be distinguished. One type results in what I have called a *compound based postposition* or *pseudo-postposition*. These heads have a variable frame, i.e. noun-CM-CASE, in which dative, locative and ablative occur as a case marker. Opposition with genitive-marked complements does exist. As for the second type, the result is structurally similar but there is a strong semantic shift for heads that occur in one type of frame only (cf. 27). Oppositions with genitive-marked complements do not exist on account of the aforementioned semantic shift.

In section 7 postpositions proper are dealt with, albeit in a very minimalistic way. The main point in this section is the question as to what definition or description would formally be valid for postpositions. Li (2004) opts for placement and syntactic function (that of adverbial), whereas Kornfilt (1997) employs the criterion of placement and case assignment. In my opinion, the most important factor is a syntactic one: all postpositional phrases can be used as an adverbial phrase (some also as an adjectival phrase or as a sentential predicate). This is the reason to include the head of temporal expressions based on *kala* and *geçe* as well into the lexical class of postpositions. Apart from three well-known ways that postpositions come into existence (verbal and nominal origin or copying/designing), a fourth developmental path has been outlined: adverbial phrases based on a compound construction, resulting in several grades of grammaticalization. Pseudo-postpositions (or compound-based postpositions) requiring zero-marked complement can be opposed to a similar construction with a genitive-marked complement. One stage further in the development is represented by constructions for which there is no such opposition. They have reached the degree of real postposition.

References

- Aksan, D. & Atabay, N. & Kutluk, İ. & Özel, S. 1976. *Sözcük türleri 1. Ad, sıfat, ilgeç, adıl, belirteç* [Word classes 1. Noun, adjective, postposition, pronoun, adverb]. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 421, 1.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Banguoğlu, T. 1990³. *Türkçenin grameri* [Turkish grammar]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi.
- Braun, F. & Haig, G. 2000. The noun/adjective distinction in Turkish: An empirical approach. In: Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford (UK), 12–14 August 1998*. (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 85–92.
- Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dede, M. 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish verbal sentences. In: Slobin, D. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. (Typological Studies in Language 8.) 147–164.
- Dereli, A. B. 1971. Türkçe ve Fransızcadaki isimleştirici dönüşümler arasında bir karşılaştırma [A comparison between noun-forming transformations in Turkish and French]. *Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi* 2. Erzurum. 179–201.
- Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1–25.
- Erdal, M. 1994. Book review of Bernt Brendemoen and Even Hovdhaugen: *Tyrkisk grammatik* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1992). *Acta Orientalia* 55, 225–232.
- Ergin, M. 1980. *Türk dil bilgisi* [Turkish grammar]. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Hayasi, T. 1996. The dual status of possessive compounds in Modern Turkish. In: Berta, Á. & Brendemoen, B. & Schönig, C. (eds.) *Symbolae turcologicae*. (Transactions 6.) Uppsala: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul. 119–129.
- Johanson, L. 1974. Sprachbau und Inhaltssyntax am Beispiel des Türkischen. *Orientalia Suecana* 22, 82–106. Reprinted in: Johanson, L. 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamt-turkologie*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 37.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 1–26.
- Johanson, L. 1977. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement 3* (1977) 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag. 1186–1203. Reprinted in: Johanson, L. 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamt-turkologie*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 37.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 225–242.
- Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds.) 1998. *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 30–66.
- Kabak, B. 2006. An obstacle to the morphologization of postpositions. *Studies in Language* 30, 33–68.
- Kılıçaslan, Y. 2006. A situation-theoretic approach to case marking semantics in Turkish. *Lingua* 116, 112–144.
- Koopman, D. 2004. *Turks, een nieuwe leergrammatica*. Amsterdam: Bulaaq.
- Korkmaz, Z. 1992. *Gramer terimleri sözlüğü*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 575.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. London & New York: Routledge.

- Kornfilt, J. 2000. Postpositions and adverbs: A case study in syntactic categories. In: Balım-Harding, Ç. & Imber, C. (eds.) *The balance of truth. Essays in honour of Professor Geoffrey Lewis*. İstanbul: ISIS. 217–237.
- Lewis, G. 1967 [Edition 2000]. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Li, Y.-S. 2004. *Türk dillerinde sontakılar* [Postpositions in Turkic languages]. (Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 40.) İstanbul: Sanat Kitabevi.
- Nakipoğlu, M. 2009. The semantics of the Turkish accusative marked definites and the relation between prosodic structure and information structure. *Lingua* 119, 1253–1280.
- Peters, L. 1947. *Grammatik der türkischen Sprache*. Berlin: Axel Juncker Verlag.
- Rühl, Ph. 1975. *Türkische Sprachlehre*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Schaaik, G. van 1992. The treatment of Turkish nominal compounds in FG. In: Fortescue, M. & Harder, P. & Kristoffersen, L. (eds.) *Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 231–252.
- Schaaik, G. van 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaaik, G. van 2000. Higher order compounds in Turkish: Some observations. In: Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford (UK), 12–14 August 1998* (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 113–120.
- Schaaik, G. van 2001. *The Bosphorus papers. Studies in Turkish grammar 1996–1999*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press.
- Schaaik, G. van 2002. *The noun in Turkish. Its argument structure and the compounding straitjacket* (Turcologica 49.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaaik, G. van 2004. *On the position of sonra and önce*. *Turkic Languages* 8, 101–138.
- Swift, L. 1963. *A reference grammar of modern Turkish*. (Indiana University publications, Uralic and Altaic series 19.) The Hague: Mouton.
- Thomas, L. 1986 [Originally published in 1967]. *Elementary Turkish* [Revised and edited by Norman Itzkowitz]. New York: Dover Publications.
- Tura, S. S. 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish nonverbal sentences. In: Slobin, D. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics* (Typological Studies in Language 8.) 165–194.
- Venter, J. & Kurt, C. 1985⁵. *30 Stunden Türkisch für Anfänger*. Berlin: Langenscheidt.
- Wendt, H. 1979⁷. *Praktisches Lehrbuch Türkisch. Ein Standardwerk für Anfänger*. Berlin: Langenscheidt.
- Yükseker, H. 1998. Possessive constructions in Turkish. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. et al. (eds.) *The Mainz meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 458–477.

Abbreviations

1S	copula, 1st person singular	CM	compound marker
2S	copula, 2nd person singular	CONV	converb
3P	copula, 3rd person plural	DAT	dative case
ABL	ablative case	EMPH	emphatic suffix
ACC	accusative case	FUT	future tense
ADJ	adjective formans	GEN	genitive case
ADV	adverbial formans	INF	infinitive

INS	instrumentalcase	POSS3P	possessive 3rd person plural
LOC	locative case	POSS3S	possessive 3rd person sing
NEG	negation marker	POT	potential
OPT1S	optative 1st person singular	PRES1	present tense (1)
OPT3S	optative 3rd person singular	PRES2	present tense (2)
PASS	passive	PROJ1	projection suffix past
PAST1	past tense (1)	PRT1	participle 1
PAST2	past tense (2)	PRT2	participle 2
PLUR	plural	PRT3	participle 3
POSS1P	possessive 1st person plural	Q	question marker
POSS1S	possessive 1st person sing	ZERO	zero marker
POSS2S	possessive 2nd person sing		