Turkic Languages

Edited by
Lars Johanson

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

21 (2017) 1

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 21, 2017, Number 1

Editorial note

This issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES presents a collection of papers on widely different topics.

In "Transeurasian core structures in Turkic", Martine Robbeets examines to what extent proto-typical features of Turkic might go back to Proto-Transeurasian structures. After looking into a number of core structures of Japonic, Koreanic, Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic, the author asks how these languages may have come to share the features in question. Areal diffusion, universal tendencies, genealogical relationships, and combinations of these factors are considered as possible explanations.

In "On the phonetic unpredictability denoted by some Old Turkic texts written in Syriac script", Delio Vania Proverbio deals with the encoding ambiguity intrinsic to the Aramaic writing system. The paper starts with an examination of an East Old Turkic manuscript in Syriac script and describes a number of graphotactic regularities found in the text. The author concludes that a rigorous formal account of the graphotactic constraints is only possible to a very limited extent because of the low complexity of the graphemic set in this offshoot of the Aramaic alphabet.

Klára Agyagási presents a paper on "Kazan Tatar as a dominant language of the Volga-Kama region" as a case study of lexical intermediation. After an overview of the emergence of the political, cultural, and linguistic dominance of Kazan Tatar in the region, the role of Islam in the Tatar culture is discussed. The main part of the paper is a historical areal study of the Arabic word *ṣabi* 'boy, male child' with a discussion of how this lexical element spread among the languages of the Kazan Tatar khanate: Arabic ⟹ Kazan Tatar ⟹ Viryal Chuvash ⟹ Mari dialects.

In "Some remarks on viewpoint operators in Turkmen", Sema Aslan Demir discusses Turkmen postterminal markers. Although Turkmen is an Oghuz language, it shares some areal features with the Kipchak and Karluk branches of Turkic, which can be observed in the inventory of postterminal markers and interpreted as a deviation from the Oghuz typology. The study focuses on the postterminal markers {-An} vs. {-(I)pdIr} and their negative counterparts {-An däldir} vs. {-mAndIr}.

In "Two questionable candidates for subordinatorship: *-mIşlIK* and *-mAzlIK* in Turkish", Annette Herkenrath and Birsel Karakoç investigate a number of morphosyntactic, semantic, and functional features of two infrequently used complex verb forms in modern Turkish. On the basis of corpus-linguistic methods, the potential of these markers to serve as subordinators is discussed. It is concluded that they have the capacity to expand into clause-like structures, even though some contradictory patterns are found.

In "Place nouns heading relative clauses with focal subjects", Gerjan van Schaaik directs the attention to a construction that has puzzled many linguists: the

distribution of the so-called subject participle and the object participle in Turkish relative clauses. The author provides a pragmatic analysis of the object participle construction. He concludes that the subject of the relative clause is a non-referential noun phrase placed in preverbal focus position and that the head noun of the relative clause can without exception be interpreted as a noun denoting location. Such structures are presentative constructions providing new information, and they are related to existential constructions since they express "places where things happen".

In the report "Turkic linguistics: The state of the art", Éva Á. Csató gives an account of an international workshop organized at the University of Mainz in March 2016 on the occasion of the incorporation of the Department of Oriental Studies (Seminar für Orientkunde) into the newly established Department of Slavistics, Turcology, and Circum-Baltic Studies. All of the more than fifty participants had some relation to the Mainz chair of Turcology, as former doctoral students, research fellows, or project participants.

Lars Johanson

Place nouns heading relative clauses with focal subjects

Gerjan van Schaaik

Many grammars of Turkish give little attention to a type of construction which has puzzled quite a number of linguists trying to formalize the distribution of the so-called subject participle (SP) and the object participle (OP), the latter also known as the non-subject participle. A subject participle is used in three cases: when its subject is (i) the head of the RC; (ii) a constituent in a possessive relation with the head; and (iii) a non-referential noun phrase. In all other cases the object participle applies.

The present contribution provides a pragmatic analysis of the latter type of construction and proposes the name *Focus-Locus Construction*, showing that the subject is a non-referential noun phrase that is always placed in preverbal (focus) position and that the head noun of the relative clause can without exception be interpreted as a noun denoting location (locus). Such structures are presentative constructions providing new information, and they are related to existential constructions because they express "places where things happen".

Gerjan van Schaaik, Leiden University. E-mail: g.j.van.schaaik@hum.leidenuniv.nl

1. Introduction

As is widely recognized, modern Turkish has several participles.[1] For the sake of convenience we shall confine ourselves to the participle forms that are said to have non-future and non-remote past time reference: the subject participle in *-(y)En* (subject form, henceforth: SF), and the object participle in *-TIK* (object form, henceforth, OF). They form the core of the equivalents of relative clauses (RCs), as can be exemplified by (1).

(1) a. *fabrika-da   çalış-an   kardeş-im*
      factory-LOC   work-SF   brother-POSS1S
      'my brother who works at the factory'

---

1   The distribution of participles in relative clauses has been studied intensively over the past decades and attracts a great deal of interest to this day. Some general examples are: Underhill (1972); Hovdhaugen (1975); Hankamer & Knecht (1976); Dede (1978), Knecht (1979); Erdal (1981); Csató (1985, 1996); Zimmer (1987, 1996); Barker, Hankamer & Moore (1990); Özsoy (1994); Erkman-Akerson & Özil (1996); Kornfilt (2000); Öztürk (2008); Özçelik (2014).

    b.   *kardeş-im-in*   *çalış-tığ-ı*   *fabrika*
        brother-POSS1S-GEN   work-of-POSS3S   factory
        'the factory where my brother works'

In (1a) the RC *fabrika-da çalış-an* 'who works in a factory' contains the SP[2] but no subject and "modifies" the head *kardeş-im* 'my brother', which is understood to be the subject of *çalış-* 'work'. In (1b), on the other hand, the RC *kardeş-im-in çalış-tığ-ı* contains the OP and a subject, and modifies the head *fabrika* 'factory', which is not the subject of *çalış-* 'work'. This subject is *kardeş-im* 'my brother', the subject-hood of which is signaled by the genitive case marker. The OF is followed by a possessive marker which agrees in person and number with the subject of the embedded verb. This opposition between SP and OP has been regarded as a strict divide with only a few exceptions.

    Firstly, in a *başıbozuk*-construction[3], a head noun is modified by a "minimal clause" consisting of at least two constituents: a *subject* and a *predicate*. The subject is a noun plus possessive suffix third person singular (the so-called *anticipatory possessive*) in agreement with the head noun, and the predicate is a noun phrase (*topal* 'lame' in (3a)) or an SP (*tüt-en* 'smoking, steaming' in (3b)).

(3) a. <u>*Ayağ-ı*</u>   <u>*topal*</u> *bir*   *sandalye-ye*   *otur-du-m.*
      foot-POSS3S   lame   a   chair-DAT   sit.down-PAST1-1S
      'I sat down on a wobbly chair.'

    b. *Henüz* <u>*duman-ı*</u>   <u>*tüt-en*</u>   *sıcak* *bir ekmek-le* *geri*   *dön-dü.*
        still   smoke-POSS3S steam-SF   hot   a   bread-**INS**   back   return-PAST1
        'She returned with a warm loaf of bread [its "vapor"] still steaming.'

For (3a) an alternative can be formed by the auxiliary *ol-an*, and its negative counterpart *ol-ma-yan* is obligatory in case of a negation. Compare:

(4) a. <u>*Ayağ-ı*</u>   <u>*topal*</u> *ol-an* *bir sandalye-ye*   *otur-du-m.*
      foot-pOSS3S   lame   be-SF a chair-DAT   sit.down-PAST-1S
      'I sat down on a chair which has a wobbly ['lame'] leg.'

---

2   The subject participle for the remote past takes the form *-mIş*, for the future *-(y)EcEk*, and there are a few fossilized forms in *-(I/E)r* (also known as aorist participles). These will not be discussed here, since they are not relevant for the gist of the argument to be made in section 4.

3   This name derives from: *baş-ı bozuk adam* [head-his deranged man] 'the man whose head is deranged' and is coined by Lewis (1967: 259).

b. <u>*Ayağ-ı*</u>   <u>*topal*</u> *ol-ma-yan*   *bir*   *sandalye-ye*   *otur-du-m.*
foot-pOSS3S   lame   be-NEG-SF   a   chair-DAT   sit.down-PAST1-1S
'I sat down on a chair which has no lame leg.'

The "minimal" subjects *ayağ-ı* 'its leg' in (3a) and *duman-ı* 'its steam' in (3b) both contain an anticipatory possessive, but this in itself is not the reason why the SP occurs. When the constituent containing the anticipatory possessive is in the nominative, it qualifies for subjecthood (5a), otherwise it must be some object of the participle; in (5b) the OP in *-TIK* shows by means of its possessive marker (possessive first person singular) who the subject really is: *ben* 'I'.

(5) a. *Karı-sı*   *fabrika-da*   *çalış-an*   *kardeş-im ...*
wife-POSS3S   factory-LOC   work-SF   brother-POSS1S
'My brother, whose wife works at the factory ...'

b. *Karı-sın-ı*   *fabrika-da*   *gör-düğ-üm*   *kardeş-im ...*
wife-POSS3S-ACC   factory-LOC   see-OF-POSS1S   brother-POSS1S
'My brother, whose wife I saw at the factory ...'

Secondly, there is a type of construction which to the best of my knowledge has no "official" appellation, but which we will here term the *bülbül*-type of construction and for which I will suggest the name the *Focus-Locus Construction* in section 4. This construction too is in fact a relative clause; the minimal inventory is again a nominal head preceded by a subject plus SP. Its simplest form can be exemplified by *bülbül öten yer,*[4] 'the place where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)', a specimen much quoted in the literature on this type of Turkish relative clauses. Such constructions occur in several degrees of complexity. Here are a few other simple examples:

(6) a. *Meşe*   *bit-en*   *toprak-ta,* *hemen hemen* *hiç başka* *ağaç*
oak   grow-SF   land-LOC   almost   no other   tree
gözük-me-z.
to.be.seen-NEG-PRES2
'On the land where oaks are standing, there are almost no other trees visible.'

b. *Yıldırım*   *düş-en* *deliğ-e*   *bak-ar-ken*   *ikisi*   *de*   *konuş-ma-dı.*
lightning   fall-SF   hole-DAT   look-PRES2-CONV   two   too   speak-NEG-PAST1
'Both said nothing when looking at the hole where the lightning struck.'

4 This construction is built up as follows: *bülbül öt-en yer* [nightingale sing-SF place] 'the place where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)'.

c. *Bu   bakteri   de ışık   ol-ma-yan yer-ler-de*
   this   bacteria   too light be-NEG-SF place-PLUR-LOC
   kemosentez   yap-ıyor.
   chemosynthesis   do-PRES1
   'This bacteria too does chemosynthesis in places where there is no light.'

d. *Güneş gir-me-yen   ev-e   doktor gir-er.*
   sun   enter-NEG-SF house-DAT   doctor enter-PRES2
   'In a house where no sunlight comes in, the doctor will enter.'

In all these examples (6 a-d) the subject stands bare before the verb. However, subjects can occur in their plural form (7a), can be preceded by adjectives (7b) and adverbial expressions (7c), and may pop up as two coordinated nouns (7d).

(7) a. *Su-<u>lar</u>   ak-an,   kuş-<u>lar</u> öt-en   toprak ...*
       water-PLUR   flow-SF   bird-PLUR sing-SF   land
       'A piece of land where water runs everywhere and birds sing ...'

   b. *<u>Sıcak</u>   su   bulun-ma-yan   otel ...*
      hot   water   be.found-NEG-SF hotel
      'The hotel where there is no hot water ...'

   c. *Bu yerleşme alan-lar-ı,   <u>bugün</u> insan yaşa-yan bölge-ler-le   aynı-dır.*
      this settlement field-PLUR-CM today   man   live-SF   area-PLUR-INS same-EMPH
      'These fields of settlement are the same as the areas where people live nowadays.'

   d. *<u>Elektrik</u>   <u>ve</u> <u>su</u> bul=un-ma-yan   kent-te ...*
      electricity   and water be.found-NEG-SF   city-LOC
      'In the city where there is no electricity ... '

This type of construction can be based on passive[5] and impersonal passive verbs as well. In both variants the subject of the SP can be compared to the direct object of their active counterparts. Examples are:

(8) a. *Demirel, pasta üret=il-en   mutfak-ta   öğrenci-ler-le sohbet et-ti.*
       Demirel   pastry produce-PAS-SF kitchen-LOC pupil-PLUR-INS chat-PAST1
       'Demirel had a chat with pupils in the kitchen where pastries are made.'

---

5   The passive suffix is separated from the stem by the equals sign (=).

b. *Kâğıt oyna=n-an, sigara iç=il-en oda-nın açık*
    card   play-PAS-SF   cigarette   smoke-PAS-SF room-GEN open
    kapı-sın-a git!
    door-POSS3S-DAT   go
    'Go to the open door of the room where one is smoking and playing cards.'

Quite frequently constructions are found that open with a constituent containing an anticipatory possessive plus a case marker. These constituents are in fact adverbial phrases, the cores of which are linked to the head of the RC by the possessive third person. Here are some typical examples:

(9) a. *İç-in-de mantar yetiş-en orman ...*
    inside-POSS3S-LOC mushroom grow-SF   wood
    'A wood where mushrooms grow ...'

b. *İç-in-e atık su karış-an kanal ...*
    inside-POSS3S-DAT sewage   water   flow-SF   canal
    'The canal that sewage water flows into ...'

c. *Arka-sın-dan / ard-ın-dan güneş doğ-an bir dağ ...*
    backside-POSS3S-ABL   sun   rise-SF a   mountain
    'A mountain behind which the sun comes up ...'

d. *Üzer-lerin-den buz-lar sark-an ağaç-lar-la kaplı orman ...*
    surface-POSS3P-ABL   icicle-PLUR hang-SF   tree-PLUR-INS covered   wood
    'A forest covered with trees from which icicles were hanging ...'

e. *Hüseyin ben-i orta-sın-da çeşme ol-an bir küçük*
    Hüseyin   I-ACC middle-POSS3S-LOC   well   ol-SF   a   small
    meydan-a getir-di.
    square-DAT   take-PAST1
    'Hüseyin took me to a small square with a well in the middle.'

2. The main problem(s) in previous work

The main problem in the plethora of linguistic writings on Turkish relative clauses is undoubtedly how to account for the exceptions to the apparently well-established distinction between the subject participle and the non-subject participle. Rather than going into all possible approaches and solutions brought up since the first time the phenomenon of the "deviant" occurrence of the subject participle was addressed, I would prefer to pick out three works which clearly mark certain insights relevant for the analysis to be presented in section 4.

2.1. Ciopiński (1969: 59) mentions that the *bülbül*-type of construction received some attention in the larger grammars of Turkish, or in his words "*les grammaires monumentales*" [comprehensive grammars] (referring to Deny 1921 and Kononov 1956), but also that they are mostly neglected in textbooks and manuals (referring to Jansky (1943) and Lewis (1965)), a fact which he attributes to their low frequency of use, stating: "*probablement à cause de leur emploi, relativement rare*" [probably because of their relatively low usage].

Ciopiński sketches the structure of this construction in terms of lexical categories. A noun in the nominative is followed by a verb (intransitive or passive) in the form of a present participle (= SP), and this group (*groupe déterminatif* [modifying word group]) modifies a third element N. Furthermore, he states that the first noun is the logical subject of the participle and that there are no other formal indications about the syntactic relations between the nouns. Interestingly, a practical problem for Ciopiński is how to formulate a strategy that facilitates easy learning of this grammatical structure. In other words, when can a noun in the nominative plus an SP be used to modify a second noun? His solution is both bafflingly easy and elegant: it can be done by deriving logical inferences and offering them as paraphrases. Hence, *bülbül öten yer* is remodeled into *Bu yerde bülbül ötüyor* 'At this place (here) the nightingale sings/nightingales sing' and *Bülbül bu yerde ötüyor* 'The nightingale sings at this place (here)'. We will return to this matter in section 4. Ciopiński (1969: 63), however, devotes only a few words on how the *bülbül*-type relates to constructions based on an OP. He states that this type of construction, with a genitive marked subject and a participle containing a possessive suffix, gives a more exact meaning, while the first type of construction, giving a vaguer meaning, are much lighter ("*Ces constructions donnent un sens plus exact, tandis que les premières, en donnant un sens plus vague, sont beaucoup légères.*"). The choice between the two types of participle, then, is made accordingly: the SP is preferred when the logical subject lacks individuality ("*Les constructions du type* bülbül öten yer *sont employées de préférence quand le sujet logique du déterminant n'a pas d'individualité*").

2.2. Erdal (1981) adopts an analysis based on the "status" of the head in relation to the participle. He uses notions such as place, destination, and origin. These are usually associated with semantic roles or functions that are expressed as case markers or in terms of syntactic positions.[6] His examples include:

(10)   a.   *Yangın çık-an*   *bir Amerikan uçak*   *gemi-sin-de ...*
            fire   break.out-SF   a   American   airplane   ship-CM-LOC
            'On an American aircraft carrier where a fire broke out ...'

6   In Erdal's analysis, clause initial adverbial phrases, as in (9 a-e), are termed "possessor of X", and X is the presumed semantic role of the head. Thus, example (9a) opens with a "possessor of place" (*içinde*) and (9b) with a "possessor of destination" (*içine*).

b. *Duman   kaç-an   göz-ün-ü   ovuştur-arak ...*
smoke   get.into-SF eye-POSS3S-ACC   rub-CONV
'While rubbing his eye(s), into which smoke had gone ...'

c. *Kan   sız-an yer-ler-e   toprak ekele-me-ye   başla-dı.*
blood   leak-SF place-PLUR-DAT   earth   sprinkle-INF-DAT begin-PAST1
'He began to sprinkle earth on the places that blood was leaking from.'

In Erdal's view, the relation in example (10a) between the participle *çık-an* 'broke out' and the head of the RC *uçak gemisi* 'aircraft carrier' is one of location, in example (10b) the relation between the participle *kaç-an* 'getting into' and the head of the RC *göz-ü* 'his eye' is one of destination, and finally, what underlies the relation between *sız-an* 'leaking' and the head of the RC *yer-ler* 'places' in (10c) is origin. Indeed, following Ciopiński, one could say things along the lines of *Bir Amerikan uçak gemi-sin-de yangın çık-tı* 'A fire broke out on an American aircraft carrier', *Göz-ün-e duman kaç-tı* 'Smoke has gone into his eye(s)', and *Bu yer-ler-den kan sız-ıyor* 'Blood was/is leaking from these places'. In my opinion these "roles" are only relevant for the description of the paraphrases in terms of what type of adverbial constituents can be expected. They are not a part of the verbal semantics; adverbial constituents are satellites and not arguments. Furthermore, certain verbs may be accompanied by adverbial phrases with different case markings, possibly in the same clause at the same time. It was assumed that *kan sız-an yer-ler* correlates with *Bu yer-ler-den kan sız-ıyor*, but since *sız-* with a ablative complement means 'to trickle out of, to leak from', and with a dative complement 'to trickle into, to leak into', the intended meaning of, for instance, *su sız-an duvar-lar* 'walls onto/from which water leaks' can only be inferred from the context or situation and I think a detail such as 'onto' or 'from' is in many a case not even relevant. What is more important is the general image generated of such a wall: damp, wet or soaked with water. What the reader or hearer makes of such structures may also depend on available case recovery strategies (see Haig 1998b).

The above observations lead to the conclusion that the relation between head and verb is irrelevant for the form of the participle; all heads of the RCs in (6)–(10) are not the subject of the participle, although it is the SP that occurs. This is in contrast with Erdal's line of thought. It is understandable because in many cases (but probably not all) two types of constructions can be contrasted which are apparently built up with the same lexical material but differ in grammatical elements. In this way, (11a) can be opposed to (11b):

(11) a. *Yangın çık-an   Amerikan uçak   gemi-sin-de ...*
fire   break.out-SF American   airplane   ship-CM-LOC
'On the American aircraft carrier where a fire / fires broke out ...'

b. *Yangın-ın   çık-tığ-ı*   *Amerikan   uçak   gemi-sin-de ...*
  fire-GEN   break.out-OF-POSS3S   American   airplane   ship-CM-LOC
  'On the American aircraft carrier where the fire broke out ...'

Quite often the choice (and hence, its form) of the participle is thought to be related
to the type of subject involved, and the problem is reformulated in terms of what
type of subjects might be excluded from the *bülbül*-type of construction. Semantic
features such as "human being" and "animate being", as well as pragmatic notions
such as definiteness, specificity, and individuation are presented as possible factors
and even a link with oppositions such as *bir kadın şapka-sı* 'a lady's hat' and *bir
kadın-ın şapka-sı* 'the hat of a lady' is mentioned.

   In order to get a more solid grip on the construction under scrutiny, Erdal (1981:
29–45) directs his attention to a great variety of authors (from 1895 to 1975) who
have all commented on this type of construction. The following points in his evalua-
tion are significant. First, demonstratives, pronouns and proper names are excluded
as subjects in the *bülbül*-type of construction. Second, the subjects are all non-refer-
ential. Third, this type of construction is productive, and not a mere remnant of an
archaic type of construction that lives on in the form of proverbs (cf. (6d)), as for
instance advanced by Underhill 1972 (quoted by Erdal (1981: 36)). Some literary
examples contra Underhill are:

(12) a. *Et   gir-me-yen   yemek-te   tat   ol-ur   mu?*
        meat   enter-NEG-SF   food-LOC   taste   occur-PRES2   Q
        'Is there [any] taste in food where no meat went in?'

   b. *Rüzgar gir-en   bir pencere   aralığ-ın-ı   kağıt-la   tıka-dı.*
      wind   enter-SF   a window   crack-CM-ACC   paper-INS   stuff-PAST1
      'He stuffed with paper a window crack where wind came in.'

Fourth, there are several allusions in Erdal's article to the fact that the construction
with the SP (the participle ending in *-(y)En*, that is) is ancient, and that the OP (par-
ticiple in *-TIK*), according to Deny (1921), is a "relatively recent Ottoman innova-
tion". We will return to this matter in section 5.

2.3. Haig (1998a), in his monumental study on Turkish relative clauses, ventures to
develop a systematic and exhaustive account of the circumstances under which sub-
ject and object clauses are formed. As for the *bülbül*-type of construction, he claims
that the structure of the noun phrase representing the *bülbül*-part (the subject) cannot
sufficiently be explained in terms of definiteness, specificity, or referentiality alone,
and tries to show that an adequate account should be based on three interacting param-
eters: control, individuation, and the conditions determining the occurrence of the an-
ticipatory possessive. The work is amply illustrated by examples that were also pub-
lished by Erdal (1981), and by further examples drawn from a corpus. The main prob-

lem is the nature of the subject in this type of construction, and Haig's account dispenses with the notion of subject incorporation, though on other grounds than does Cagri (2009), who in turn rejects the claims by Öztürk (2009) which are in favor of incorporation.

Haig (1998a: 184) gives the following summary of his findings:

1. Subjects[7] are overwhelmingly the subjects of low control combinations, i.e. the non-human subjects of low-activity intransitives.

2. Precisely quantified subjects, e.g. with *bir,* never occur as subjects, unless the relative clause contains an anticipatory possessive.

3. Personal pronouns, nouns with normal possessive morphology, demonstratives, nouns modified by adjectives created from the adjectival suffix -*ki* are never subjects.

4. Subjects occur with only two transitive predicates: *sok-* 'sting', and *bas-* 'overgrow'. Even here, their occurrence is bound to extremely specific conditions: They are minimally individuated, the relative clause contains an accusative-marked anticipatory possessive, and the subject is [-human].

Before I present some comments on these four points, I would like to give some more data relevant for the evaluation in section 4.

3. More Data

Recall Ciopiński's remark about the frequency of use: "relatively low". Now, take into consideration that at the time of writing, in order to find and copy a suitable exemplar of this type of construction he probably had no other means to tap literary sources than the manual perusal of huge piles of books and newspapers. Modern computer applications for searching through massive corpora reveal however that the *bülbül*-type of construction is very productive and that it occurs much more frequently than would be expected on the basis of such a statement. Also, frequency alone shouldn't be the standard for judging whether a construction should be included in a manual or textbook. The guiding principle is usefulness. But apart from that, the construction has never suffered from a lack of interest in linguistic circles, particularly because it seems extremely hard to point out a sufficient number of factors to exhaustively account for its make-up. Perhaps this justifies just another modest attempt.

A crucial clue for an alternative characterization of the *bülbül*-type of construction was introduced in Ciopiński (1969: 60). What he did was to remodel a sequence of N1+SP+N2 into a logical inference that forms, as it were, an appropriate answer to the question 'What is going on at N2?'. In this way, *bülbül öten yer* can be paraphrased as *Bu yerde bülbül ötüyor* 'At this place (here) the nightingale sings / nightingales sing' and as *Bülbül bu yerde ötüyor* 'The nightingale sings at this place

---

7   In the original text Haig prefers the term "semi-subject" over "genitiveless subject" for subjects of the *bülbül*-type of construction.

(here)'. Now, for educational purposes, one could say that when either of the derived propositions is true, the *bülbül*-type of construction may be employed. This seemingly simple trick for determining if the construction matches the concept to be expressed is solely based on one particular feature of the head of the construction: its position in relation to the event described.

The answer is that the head of the construction denotes a place, a location.[8] This is indeed the case with *toprak* 'land' in (6a, 7a), *delik* 'hole' in (6b), *yer* 'place' in (6c, 10c), *ev* 'house' in (6d), *otel* 'hotel' in (7b), *alan* 'field' in (7c), *kent* 'city' in (7d), *mutfak* 'kitchen' in (8a), *oda* 'room' in (8b), *orman* 'wood, forest' in (9a), *kanal* 'canal' in (9b), *dağ* 'mountain' in (9c), *ağaç* 'tree' in (9d), *meydan* 'square' in (9e), *gemi* 'ship' in (10a), *göz* 'eye' in (10b). With the exception of *gemi* 'ship' in (10a) and *göz* 'eye' in (10b), all these nouns can be conceived of as denoting a *place* rather than a *thing*.[9] This interpretation in terms of a location is typical of immovable goods (land, forest, canal, house, etc.), but words for movable goods ("things") can also to a great extent be used to indicate a place, that is, the place where something happens.

The constructions exemplified in (6)–(9) all show a minimal inventory: they are all based on the pattern N-V-SF-N in which the head is a place noun. In case the head of the relative clause is primarily to be regarded as a noun denoting a thing, an adverbial phrase is likely to occur. Such adverbial phrases always occur in the form of a noun[10] which is "linked" to the head via the anticipatory possessive (third person). This can be exemplified by:

(13) a. *Alt-ın-a*   /   *üst-ün-e*   *toz*   *düş-en masa-lar ...*
          underside-POSS3S-DAT /   top-POSS3S-DAT   dust   fall-SF desk-PLUR
          'The desks under/on top of which dust drifts down ... '

      b. *Alt-ın-dan*   *duman*   *çık-an*   *kapı ...*
          underside-POSS3S-ABL   smoke   come.out-SF   door
          'The door from under which smoke is coming out ... '

---

8 Erdal (1981: 33) rejects Kononov's idea (cited as Kononov 1956: 452–453) of an "attributive phrase expressing circumstances of *time* and *place*", because of transitive verbs and other exceptions.

9 A motivation for the distinction between place and thing readings for nouns is given in Mackenzie (1992). The relevance for Turkish is set forth in Van Schaaik (2002: 242f) and application of these concepts to an analysis of postpositions is presented in Van Schaaik (2011).

10 These nouns often denote a side, area or space and can lexically be categorized as Relative Place Nouns, e.g. *alt* 'underside', *üst* 'top', *ön* 'front', *arka* 'back', *yan* 'side' etc. For details, see Van Schaaik (2011).

Although at first glance the head in these examples denotes a thing (a physical object), the purport of these statements is to indicate that the <u>tables</u> in (13a) are the places where <u>dust comes/came down</u> and that the <u>door</u> in (13b) is the place from which <u>smoke emerges</u>. This is, of course, strongly supported by the introductory adverbial phrases based on a noun indicating the exact spot relative to the larger object (*in casu,* the thing referred to by the head).

Sometimes it takes a bit of imagination to see that a noun such as 'tea', which may primarily be associated with a hot liquid, can also be used to refer to a shrub of the botanical genus tea, a sort of tea, a business or trade (e.g. *My brother in law is in tea*) or even a region where tea is grown. This is the case in (14).

(14) *Üzer-in-e*   *kar   yağ-an tek   çay   Türk   çay-ı-dır.*
       top-POSS3S-DAT   snow   fall-SF sole   tea   Turk   tea-CM-EMPH
       'The only tea [variety] on which snow falls is Turkish tea.'

In the following examples too it is apparently expedient to specify some exact spot in relation to the head as a whole. Such a specification is usually a Relative Place Noun, as in (15 a–b), but nouns denoting some part or component of the head are also not uncommon, as in (15c).

(15) a. *Üst-ün-den*   *tren   geç-en köprü-nün alt-ın-dan*   *geç-ti-m.*
          top-POSS3S-ABL   train   pass-SF bridge-GEN under-POSS3S-ABL pass-PAST1-1S
          'I went under a bridge on which trains pass.'

      b. *Tam   orta-sın-da*   *kapı   bulun-an   dümdüz,*
          right   middle-POSS3S-LOC   door   be-SF   straight
          yalın   bir duvar   var-dı.
          clear   a   wall   exist-PROJ1
          'There was a straight clear wall where there was a door right in the middle.'

      c. *Namlu-ların-dan   hafifçe duman çık-an*   *top-lar...*
          barrel-POSS3P-ABL   lightly smoke come.out-SF   cannon-PLUR
          'Cannons where some smoke was spiraling up from their barrels ...'

Shorter variants of (15a) and (15b), for instance *tren geç-en köprü* and *kapı bulun-an duvar*, are mostly judged by native speakers as ungrammatical, especially when they occur without context. A possible reason is that such chunks do not give enough information to create a mental picture of what is happening: What is what doing to what? For the shorter *köprü*-variant, there are two factors that might explain why there is friction. Firstly, the verb *geç-* is used with different case markers, depending on the shade of meaning to be expressed. In its (transitive) sense of "to cross, to span" its object requires the accusative, as exemplified in (16 a–b):

(16) a. *Bu   köprü Boğaz-ı   Ortaköy-de   geç-ecek.*
          this   bridge Bosporus-ACC Ortaköy-LOC   cross-FUT
          'This bridge will cross the Bosporus in Ortaköy.'

      b. *İstanbul   Boğaz-ı'nı   geç-en   köprü-ler ...*
          Istanbul   strait-CM-ACC cross-SF   bridge-PLUR
          '(The) bridges crossing / spanning the Bosporus ...'

But in the sense of 'to pass', *geç-* takes a so-called oblique object with typical ablative marking, thereby indicating the path along which the passing takes place. It should come as no surprise then that 'cross the bridge' is rendered by the Internet dictionary tureng.com as *köprüden geçmek* and *köprüyü geçmek*.

Secondly, we can say that the role of *köprü* 'bridge' is ambiguous in relation to *tren* 'train' (in 15a), since some bridges are built to cross a railroad so that the train passes under the bridge, while other bridges prioritize trains by having them pass on top. Now, using an adverbial phrase of "the right format" (relative place noun linked to the head through the anticipatory possessive third person plus the appropriate case marker), it is indicated beforehand that the hearer should be prepared for a non-standard interpretation of the participle.

A similar strategy of avoiding ambiguity can be shown to be at work in other constructions as well. In (17 a–b) the head (*yer* 'place') of the relative clause is clearly a place noun, but in (17c) the head (*baca* 'chimney, funnel') is not, and as a matter of consequence, "locational" specification is provided for by the adverbial phrase *deliğ-in-den* 'from its opening'.

(17) a. *Duman   çık-an bir yer-i   göster-iyor-lar-dı.*
          smoke   rise-SF a place-ACC show-PRES1-3P-PROJ1
          'They showed [him] a place from which smoke was rising.'

      b. *Ama   tam   orta-da   duman   çık-an*
          but   right middle-LOC   smoke   rise-SF
          büyük çıplak bir yer   var-dı.
          vast   bare   a   place   exist-PROJ1
          'But right in the middle there was a vast bare place from which smoke rose up.'

      c. *Deliğ-in-den   daha duman çık-an   baca-yı   gör-dü-ler.*
          hole-POSS3S-ABL   still   smoke come.out-SF chimney   see-PAST1-3P
          'They saw the chimney from whose opening smoke was still coming out.'

Of course, in parsing a sentence, the occurrence of an adverbial phrase is not in itself a signal that some constituent with "irregular" or "deviant" morphology should be expected. Compare the next two examples, of which the first is a relative clause with ordering "SP-subject" and the second is of the *bülbül*-type of construction.

(18)   a. *Otoban-ın   üst-ün-den   geç-en köprü-de   vedalaş-tı-k.*
            motorway-GEN top-POSS3S-ABL   pass-SF bridge-LOC say.goodbye-PAST1-1P
            'We said goodbye on the bridge that crosses the motorway.'

        b. *Belki   Prens-le   Prenses   gid-ip   iç-in-den   derin   bir ırmak*
            maybe prince-INS princess   go-CONV inside-POSS3S-ABL deep   a   river
            geç-en   ülke-ler-in   bir-in-de   otur-ur-lar.
            pass-SF   land-PLUR-GEN one-POSS3S-LOC   live-PRES2-3P
            'Maybe the prince and the princess have gone to live in one of those lands
            where a deep river flows.'

It seems that transitivity as such is not necessarily the sole factor which determines whether an ordering "subject-SP" is grammatical or not. With bare constructions such as *tren geç-en köprü* 'train passing bridge', confusion might arise about what crosses what, since *tren* 'train' can be taken as the direct object.

    Most constructions of this type are based on an intransitive verb, and hence confusion is out of the question, because any preverbal noun will be interpreted as the subject as long as the head stands for some location or other. But, as was the case with *geç-*, transitive verbs do have one or more objects. The verb *gir-* 'to enter' in the examples below usually goes with a dative object (compare Erdal's 'destination'): *ev* 'house' in (19a), *bir köy* 'a village' in (19b), and *bir orman* 'a forest' in (19c).

(19)   a. *Güneş gir-me-yen   ev-e   doktor gir-er.*
            sun   enter-NEG-SF house-DAT doctor enter-PRES2
            'In a house where no sunlight comes in, the doctor will enter.'

        b. *Hiç   öğretmen gir-me-miş   bir köy-de   okuryazar*
            no   teacher   enter-NEG-SF a village-LOC   literate
            çocuk-lar   bul-du-lar.
            child-PLUR   find-PAST1-3P
            'In a village where never a teacher had entered they found literate children.'

        c. *Balta gir-me-miş   bir   orman-da* ...[11]
            axe   enter-NEG-SF a   forest-LOC
            'In a virgin forest [a forest that had never seen an axe] ...'

The lack of confusion about what does what can be attributed to the fact that (19a) is a proverb (a first-time reader or hearer might need some explanation, though), but

---

11 Although this is a set phrase, the subject can be replaced by for instance *insan* 'human being', as in: *insan gir-me-miş bir orman* 'forest where no human has gone into'.

the correct interpretation of (19 b–c) is warranted by the knowledge that teachers and axes enter villages and forests, and that the reverse is unthinkable.

Only a few literary examples are known which are based on verbs with a direct object. So, in addition to dative, locative and ablative, accusative case markings also occur for the object of the verb, on the proviso that the object contains a possessive marker. Such structures are in fact a rarity, mainly because of the ambiguities they can entail. In (20a) for instance *bakkal* should be interpreted as a place 'grocer's shop' and not as a person, and furthermore, I assume that for most people there is a stronger association between *peynir* 'cheese' and *fare* 'mouse' when it comes to 'eating' than between mice and grocers (imagine: 'mouse eats grocer' or 'grocer eats mouse'). Therefore I reckon that such structures are fully acceptable under similar conditions. For (20b) it is difficult if not impossible to maintain that *kız* 'girl' stands for a place and not for a person. Yet, this example is fully acceptable, possibly owing to the sequence 'nose-mosquito-sting'.[12] The word *masa* 'table' in example (20c) should not be interpreted as an object but rather as the location of some *cam* 'glass pane'. Also in (20d) and (20e) certain 'areas' or 'spots' are meant, rather than objects. Leaving out the direct objects of (20 a–e)[13] would predictably lead to ungrammatical structures.

(20)   a.   *Peynir-in-i*   *fare   yi-yen bakkal* ...
             cheese-POSS3S-ACC   mouse eat-SF   grocer
             'The grocer's at which / where mice have eaten the cheese ... '

       b.   *Cam-ın-ı*   *maymun   kır-an   masa* ...
             glass-POSS3S-ACC   monkey   break-SF   table
             'The table whose glass pane monkeys have broken ...'

       c.   *Burn-un-u*   *sivrisinek   sok-an   kız* ...
             nose-POSS3S-ACC   mosquito   sting-SF   girl
             'The girl who was stung in the nose by mosquitoes ...'

---

12 Haig (1998: 183) points out that *sok-* in the sense of 'to sting' occurs only in combination with *arı* 'bee', *akrep* 'scorpion', and *yılan* 'snake', and for that reason (20b) might count as a type of highly conventionalized type of expression, coming close to a "fixed" way of speaking. Another such type of verb is *bas-* in combinations such as *su bas-* 'to flood' and *ot bas-* 'to overgrow with weeds'. On the other hand, in the sense of 'break out' we find (20d) and (20e), as well as *sis bas-* 'to fog up' in (29b).

13 Examples (20a) and (20b) are taken from Cagri (2009: 370–371), who translates *bakkal* by 'shop' in (20a) and who uses *goril* 'gorilla' instead of *maymun* 'monkey(s)' in (20b). Example (20c) is an adaptation of the often quoted *bacağ-ın-ı arı sok-an kız* 'the girl whose leg a bee/ some bees stung', a muster which probably goes back as far as Underhill (1972).

d. *Diz-ler-i   titre-yip   aln-ın-ı   ter*
   knees-POSS3S   tremble-CV   forehead-POSS3S-ACC   sweat
   bas-an   genç   adam.
   break.out-SF   young   man
   'The young man with trembling knees, and on whose forehead sweat broke out.'

e. *Her   yan-ın-ı   ateş bas-an   kadın kaç-ma-ya   çalış-tı.*
   all   side-POSS3S-ACC   go.hot-SF   woman escape-INF-DAT   try-PAST1
   'The woman whose face was glowing tried to escape.'

4. An alternative characterization

The relevant data have now been presented in such a way that some conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the *bülbül*-type of construction could be given an appropriate name. What makes this type of construction special and interesting are that the subject precedes the so-called subject participle instead of following it, and objects and adverbial phrases always precede the subject. For the constructions represented in (6)–(20), I would suggest the name *Focus-Locus Construction*, because this appellation does justice to what is most characteristic for the construction. The part *Locus* reflects the fact that the head of the relative construction signifies a location, a *locus in quo* 'place at which', or more precisely, a *locus actus* 'place of the act'.[14] The *Focus* part reflects the special position of the subject; it is placed in the immediate preverbal position, a syntactic position associated with the pragmatic notion of Focus.[15] Secondly, the *Focus-Locus Construction* can be characterized as a *presentative expression*. Such constructions are used to introduce new information (Dik 1989) to the hearer in the form of noun phrases. Simple examples in English[16] are: *There are dark clouds on the horizon*, and *There's a white bird in this blizzard*. Such statements take the form of an existential construction, but the intended illocutionary effect is not to point out that something exists but rather, to indicate the presence or availability of something at the moment of speaking. A typical feature of such constructions is a locative phrase, which is understandable if one considers the idea that "to say that something exists is to say that it is located somewhere" (cf. Dik, 1989: 177, referring to Lyons 1967). In this way, existence and location can be said to be logically interrelated. The expression (specification) of the locative part is not necessary; when a statement is solely meant to present the thing(s) at hand, then statements like *There are some beers in the fridge* and *There's beer, if you'd like some!* are more or less equivalent from a practical point of view.

14 The term *Locus Actus* is described on the web site Oxfordreference.com as follows: "Place of the act: The place where an act occurred; the place where a contract was performed".
15 Dik (1989: 263–287) presents a comprehensive analysis of pragmatic functions. For Focus in Turkish, see Van Schaaik (1983, 1998, 2001), and Göksel & Özsoy (2003).
16 Hannay (1985) goes into the relation between presentatives and existentials in English.

It is the combination of existence and location that underlies the relative clauses modeled after *bülbül öt-en orman* 'forest where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)'. The head of the construction represents the location and the fragment *bülbül öt-*SF describes, concisely and to the point, what specifies its referent: "there are nightingales singing". And this latter type of expression is the presentative line of approach mentioned above. With this observation in mind the constructions analyzed in the present paper can be understood as being about "places where things happen".

Of course, a number of similar constructions can be put forward in which, strictly speaking, not the head is a location proper, e.g. (13a–b) and (20b), but it cannot be denied that the precise whereabouts of the things denoted by both the adverbial phrase and by the head must coincide, given the part-whole relationship as formalized by the anticipatory possessive in these constructions. Although *Ali* in the following example is clearly not a place in the strict sense, it is still obvious in (21a) where some dog or another relieved itself. And similarly, in (21b), it is not too hard to determine the position of a whole pack of dogs relative to the single wolf.

(21)   a.   *Entari-sin-e*   *köpek*   *işe-yen*   *ve*   *yeğen-i*   *tarafından*
            robe-POSS3S-DAT   dog   pee-SF   and   niece-POSS3S   by
            tartakla=n-an Ali ...
            push-PAS-SF   Ali
            'Ali, against whose robe a dog peed, and who was pushed by his niece ...'

       b.   *Ard-ın-da*   *yüz*   *köpek*   *havla-ma-yan*   *kurt,*   *kurt*
            rear-POSS3S-LOC   100   dog   bark-NEG-SF   wolf   wolf
            say=ıl-ma-z.
            consider-PAS-NEG-PRES2
            'A wolf behind whose back 100 dogs don't bark is not considered a wolf.'

Lastly, the internal constituent order of the *Focus-Locus Construction* must be explained. The order can easily be determined on the basis of the following observations. In its simplest form this construction comprises three constituents only: (subject participle) head. The first two together tell us something about the third one. In other words, the relative clause made up of subject and participle is an attribute of the head. Thus:

(22)   *Bülbül*   *öt-en*   *orman ...*
           nightingale   sing-SF   forest
           'The forest where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s) ...'

Secondly, the overall complexity can be varied by adding all kinds of extra information. For instance, the subject may be plural and can be modified for quantity:

(23) a. *Üçüncü   kat-ın-dan   duman-lar   çık-an   bina ...*
          third   floor-POSS3S-ABL   smoke-PLUR   come.out-SF   building
          'The building where a lot of smoke came out from the third floor ...'

      b. *Su-lar-ın-dan   bol   balık   çık-an   göl-ler ...*
          water-PLUR-POSS3S-ABL   much   fish   come.out-SF   lake-PLUR
          'Lakes where an abundance of fish come out [from their waters] ...'

      c. *Göz-ün-den   bir damla yaş   ak-ma-yan   bu kadın ...*
          eye-POSS3S-ABL   a drop   tear   flow-NEG-SF   this woman
          'This woman from whose eyes there flows not a single teardrop ...'

      d. *Yüz-ü   kapalı   ve   ağz-ın-dan   tek*
          face-'her' covered   and   mouth-POSS3S-ABL   single
          söz   çık-ma-yan   bir genç   kız ...
          word   come.out-SF   a   young   girl
          'A veiled young girl from whose mouth not a single word comes out ...'

      e. *İç-in-den   bir baş, iki   kol   ve   iki   ayak*
          inside-POSS3S-ABL a head, two   arm   and   two   foot
          çık-an   uç-ma-ya   hazır bir   balon ...
          come.out-SF   fly-INF-DAT   ready a   balloon
          'A balloon ready to fly, out of which a head, two arms and two legs are
          sticking ...'

Thirdly, adverbials are not unwelcome either:

(24) a. *Bütün gece göz-ün-e   uyku   gir-me-yen   arkadaş-ı ...*
          whole night eye-POSS3S-DAT   sleep enter-NEG-SF   friend-POSS3S
          'His friend, who could not sleep all night, ...'

      b. *Motor-un-dan   birden   alev   çık-an   kargo uçağ-ı*
          engine-POSS3S-ABL suddenly   flame come.out-SF   cargo plane-CM
          biz-i   korkut-tu.
          us-ACC   frighten-PAST1
          'The cargo plane from whose engine flames suddenly came out frightened us.'

Fourthly, adjectives modifying the subject are rather common as well:

(25) a. *Kolon-lar-ın-dan   paslı   demir-ler çık-an   yarım kalmış*
          column-PLUR-POSS3S-ABL   rusty   iron-PLUR come.out-SF   half-finished

> *beton   yapı-lar-ı ...*
> concrete   structure-PLUR-CM
> 'Half-finished concrete structures where rusty iron sticks out of the columns ...'

    b. *Sürekli   isli   bir   yağmur   yağ-an   kapkara   gökyüzün-de ...*
       incessantly sooty   a   rain   precipitate-SF pitch black sky-LOC
       'In a pitch black sky from which incessantly a sooty rain falls ...'

    c. *Ağz-ın-dan   asla   yanlış bir sözcük çık-ma-yan*
       mouth-POSS3S-ABL never wrong a   word   come.out-NEG-SF
       gezgin   bir yargıç ...
       touring   a   judge
       'A touring judge out of whose mouth never a bad word comes ...'

Fifthly, this type of construction occurs most frequently with a participle based on an intransitive verb, and hence, an object is not to be expected. Objects are only possible, or rather obligatory, with transitive verbs, as in (20a), the example with mice devouring the cheese at the grocer's (place).

A few more remarks regarding the examples in (20 a–e) might be in place. The verbs are all transitive, given the accusative markings of the constituents containing the anticipatory possessive. Leaving these constituents out would render these constructions ungrammatical. Furthermore, the head of (20a) can be interpreted as "person" and as "place", that of (20b) as place only, whereas all other heads are clearly 'human' and do not qualify for a classification as place noun. Apparently, the Focus-Locus approach does not work in these examples for locus-part of the equation. On the other hand, such constructions based on a transitive verb are extremely rare. The examples (20 a-b) were found once and the original form of (20c) is repeated over and over again without variation in the *linguistic* literature. Examples based on collocations with *bas-* (see footnote 13) occur much more frequently in texts of a *belletristic* nature. All in all, the number of limitations of the proposal embodied in the pragmatic analysis presented here may be rather limited in itself; setting aside (20a-c) because of possible doubts regarding their quality or frequency, one could say that in constructions with a 'human' head, as in (20d-e), the transitive verb is based on a collocation of *bas-*, and that the locus-part is expressed by a direct object.

Summarizing, we can say that the *Focus-Locus Construction* is in fact a relative clause which has a lot in common with a regular finite clause. It has a verbal part in the form of a participle, a subject, and other constituents, such as objects and adverbial phrases. What makes it special and interesting are that the subject precedes the so-called subject participle instead of following it, and objects and adverbial phrases always precede the subject. However, the make-up of that type of subject is conspicuous.

The type of noun phrase that qualifies as the subject of *Focus-Locus Constructions* is in fact an almost full-blown noun phrase; the only restriction is that it be

non-referential. Its form may range from *bir + noun* for singularity (e.g. *bir lamba yanıyor* 'a [single] lamp is on') to *noun + -lEr* for plurality (e.g. *lamba-lar yanıyor* 'lamps are on') and *noun + Ø* (e.g. *lamba yanıyor* which can be interpreted as 'there is light').[17]

Being non-referential entails that definiteness is excluded, but at the same time the core of a non-referential noun phrase may occur in the plural (as in (23a)); it may be quantified (as in (23b–e)); and it may be qualified by adjectives (as in (25a–b)). The notion of a non-referential noun phrase is completely adequate; the occurrence of *bir* however does not imply 'indefiniteness' in the sense of 'intended to construe a possible referent' (cf. Dik, 1989: 139), but rather it is only meant to help create a *general image* of some singular individual, whereas the absence of *bir* would be sufficient to create an image of a vaguer nature and an undefined quantity.

As was pointed out in section 2, it has been suggested that these constructions could be explained in terms of subject incorporation, but the mere fact that such subjects can occur in plural form and that they can be accompanied by adjectives, expressions of quantity and adverbial phrases, argues against this idea. Moreover, the structure of a non-referential noun phrase giving shape to the subject is always identical with the 'lean' type of noun phrase,[18] which qualifies as a possible left-hand member in a nominal compound.

As for the position of the subject relative to other constituents, it is well-known that there is a relationship between the information structure[19] of a sentence and the places that some constituent may occupy. Generally speaking, the determining factors can be sought with regard not only to definiteness, but also pragmatic salience. To give a simple example, with *Kitap masada duruyor* the main point is to give information about the whereabouts of some previously mentioned book, and it could be the answer to a question like 'Where is the book?' With *Masada kitap duruyor*, however, this message can be understood as the answer to a question about what lies on the table. The latter example is meant to draw the hearer's attention to the quality 'book' and not its quantity; there may be one or more books, because the singular word *kitap* does not give decisive information.

Now, the non-referential subject in the *Focus-Locus Construction* is always placed immediately before the verb (participle) and this is the main position used to draw attention to a constituent by putting it in focus, because it is indefinite, emphasized or because it contains "new" information.[20] These constructions are applied to make a statement about what is going on at a certain place (locus, location)—such

---

17 In this respect I follow Johanson (1991: 229). The notion of "individuality" is relevant for *bir + noun* and *noun + -lEr*, but not for *noun + Ø*.

18 This is the type of noun phrase unspecified for definiteness and which can be used to form nominal compounds, see Van Schaaik (1992, 2002).

19 Johanson (1991) uses the term "mitteilungsperspektiv", which is more or less equivalent with the functional perspective from which language "chunks" are presented.

20 For constituent ordering in the sentence, see Van Schaaik (1983, 1998, 2001).

statements are presentative—and put the emphasis (focus) on the quality of the sub-
ject of the event; the attention is drawn for instance to 'land where WATER flows
and BIRDS sing' in (7a), to a 'kitchen where PASTRIES are made' in (8a), and to
'concrete buildings where all sorts of RUSTY IRON sticks out of their columns' in
(25b).[21]

Interestingly, temporal expressions make full use of this type of construction by
applying what are known as locational metaphors. A location metaphor obtains
when an event noun is used to denote "location in time and space". In this way, in
(26a) *carousal* can refer to both the *place where* and *time when* certain things hap-
pen, and *school* in (26b) may stand for a place (as in: *at school*) and for a period of
time (as in: *during school*) where certain events take place. Particularly in combina-
tion with impersonal passives, Turkish makes extensive use of this possibility. Some
examples:

(26)   a. *Aynı   mekân-da   ye=nil-en,   iç=il-en,   müzik   dinle=n-en, dans ed=il-en*
           same   space-LOC   eat-PAS-SF   drink-PAS-SF   music listen-PAS-SF dance-PAS-SF
           ve   kanepe-ler-e   uzan=ıl-ıp   felsefe   tartış=ıl-an
           and   canapé-PLUR-DAT   lie.down-PAS-CONV   philosophy discuss-PAS-SF
           son Roma   sempozyum-lar-ın-dan bu yana   2000   küsur
           last Roman carousal-PLUR-ABL   since   2000   odd
           yıl   geç-ti.
           year   pass-PAST1
           'Since the last Roman carousel where people ate, drank, listened to music and dis-
           cussed philosophy, having lied down on canapés, an odd 2000 years have passed.'

       b. *Var   mı,   yabancı   dil-le   eğitim   yap=ıl-an*
           exist   Q   foreign   language-INS   teaching   do-PAS-SF
           okul-lar-ımız-da?
           school-PLUR-POSS1S-LOC
           'Is there [any], in our schools where teaching is done in a foreign language?'

       c. *En   önemli   şey-in   barış   ol-duğ-u   belirt=il-en*
           most   important   thing-GEN   peace   be-OF-POSS3S   state-PAS-SF
           açıklama-da ...
           commentary-LOC
           'In the commentary, in which it was stated that the most important thing is
           peace ...'

21 Özçelik (2014) goes into the relation between prosody and focality in Turkish relative
   clauses. He analyses focused constituents in terms of "movement" which occurs mostly
   on prosodic and not on syntactic grounds. Similarly, the words in this paragraph that have
   strong emphasis are capitalized.

Hence it is not surprising that temporal nouns too have a strong correlation with the notion of place. Note that in English the relative connector can take different shapes: *when*, *in/on which*, and *that*. Compare:

(27) a. *Bir hevenk muz   ve   dört   kasa   şampanya tüket=il-en   gece ...*
          a   bunch banana and   four   crate champagne consume-PAS-SF   night
          'The night <u>when</u> a bunch of bananas and four crates of champagne were used up ...'

    b. *Kabile-yle yaşa=n-an gün-ler-in   arasında   hiç   bir   ayrım*
          tribe-INS   live-PAS-SF day-PLUR-GEN between   at all   a   difference
          yok-tu.
          not.exist-PROJ1
          'There was no difference between the days <u>during which</u> one lived with the tribe.'

    c. *Çık-ma-mız-a   izin ver=il-en hafta-nın   ikinci   gün-ü-ydü.*
          go.out-NOM-POSS1P-DAT   allow-PAS-SF week-GEN second day-POSS3S-PROJ1
          'It was the second day of the week <u>in which</u>/<u>that</u> permission was given to go out.'

5. Evaluation

The leading question in this section is how the characterization presented above relates to the findings of Haig (1998:184). His main points are as follows.

1. The first generalization is that the verbs in his data are overwhelmingly low-activity intransitives, denoting events in which the subject has minimal control over that event. A second category of verbs is that of passivized transitive predicates, where the grammatical subject also has no control over the event (cf. Haig 1998a: 174). This he summarized by saying that: *Subjects are overwhelmingly the subjects of low control combinations, i.e. the non-human subjects of low-activity intransitives!*

From this formulation it is not quite clear to me how exactly we should understand "low CONTROL combinations" and "low-activity intransitives". To begin with the latter qualification, intransitives are of course verbs with one argument only, and in all examples the majority of subjects in my own data are indeed formed by nouns denoting non-humans. Apart from a feature such as HUMAN (e.g. *insan* 'human, man' and *öğretmen* 'teacher'), we find features such as ANIMAL (e.g. *bülbül* 'nightingale', *kuş* 'bird', *köpek* 'dog', *balık* 'fish', *fare* 'mouse', *sivrisinek* 'mosquito', *maymun* 'monkey'); PLANT (e.g. *meşe* 'oak', *mantar* 'mushroom', *çay* 'tea'); (*natural) phenomena* (e.g. *güneş* 'sunlight', *rüzgar* 'wind', *ışık* 'light', *ateş* 'fire, fever'); SUBSTANCE (e.g. *su* 'water', *duman* 'smoke, vapour', *alev* 'flame', *yangın* 'fire', *kan* 'blood', *ter* 'sweat', *toz* 'dust', *et* 'meat', *buz* 'ice', *demir* 'iron', *yaş* 'tear', *yağmur* 'rain'); THING (e.g. *kapı* 'door', *çeşme* 'well', *tren* 'train', *balta* 'axe', *pasta* 'pastry, cream-cake, pie') and ABSTRACT (e.g. *söz* 'speech', *sozcük* 'word', *uyku* 'sleep').

When it comes to the notion of control, not only humans can be controllers; depending on the type of verb, animals, too, to a certain extent, can have the power to determine whether or not some action will occur. Is there really a great difference in control between the singing nightingale(s) in (22) and the eating mouse/mice in (20a)? Is it this really a relevant factor? Does not the type of verb involved also play a role? When we look at the verbs that form the subject participle, the majority denote a process, in other words, a non-controlled event.[22] These include: *bit-* 'to grow', *sac-* 'to strew, scatter', *ak-* 'to flow', *yaşa-* 'to live', *yetiş-* 'to grow', *karış-* 'to mix', *doğ-* 'to be born; to rise', *sız-* 'to trickle, leak'; *düş-* 'to fall', *yağ-* 'to precipitate'. The verbs *öt-* 'to sing', *gir-* 'to go in', *çık-* 'to come out', *kaç-* 'to enter', and *geç-* 'to cross' can also be included as denoting a non-controlled event, but only on the proviso that the subject is non-human. With a human subject they denote a controlled action, and often undergo a shift in meaning. Furthermore, typical "control verbs", verbs the first argument of which is a controller, are transitive verbs. And they do exist, albeit only under certain conditions.

None of this brings us any closer to answering the question of what is meant by low-activity. I believe the main point is that we are dealing with a construction which is solely meant to bring some phenomenon or event to the attention of the hearer. And control does not add much to the description of the type of verbs and subjects. In other words, it does not have enough explanatory power for a full account of the linguistic facts.[23] Moreover, it is hard to imagine how control and low-activity would relate to all those instances where people are involved, but not explicitly expressed, as with the impersonal passives in (8b), (25 a–c) and (27 a,b).

Another factor which is not taken into account is the way the head-noun of the subjects can be interpreted and what consequences any possible differences might have for the final analysis. Take for instance *güneş* 'sun', which in (9a) can be assumed to mean 'the sun' in the sense of 'celestial body', but in (6d) refers to the sun's radiation in the form of 'sunlight'. For words such as *demir* 'iron' and *buz* 'ice' the first sense (interpretation) that springs to mind is probably some 'matter', some uncountable 'stuff'. In their plural forms these words obtain a more concrete interpretation. *Demir-ler* in (24a) becomes 'pieces of iron (as used in construction)' or, more precisely, 'reinforcing iron bars', and *buz-lar* in (9d) can be understood as 'ice chunks' or 'icicles'. What we see here is a kind of 'conversion', shifting the interpretation from 'matter' or 'substance' to 'object'.[24] This can also occur the other way around. Although *balık* 'fish' is an animal and hence a potential controller, in (23b) it is not some 'individual' or 'animal' that is

---

22 I use notions such as control, process, and action in accordance with the typology of states of affairs by Dik (1989: 89–109).
23 A domain where the notion of "control" is indispensable is subordination. See for instance Haig & Slodowicz (2006) and Van Schaaik (2014).
24 A detailed analysis of the interplay between meaning and interpretation can be found in Ebeling (2005: 97–107).

the pivot of the statement, but instead *balık* 'fish' here means 'what you catch', or a 'substance' to be used as food or merchandise.

2. Another parameter that Haig brings forward for a characterization of subjects is individuation, a notion which refers to the extent an NP signifies a specific quantity or amount. In his view, a noun with *bir* or with a numeral counts as "precisely quantified", a noun in the plural as "not precisely quantified" and a bare noun as "not quantified". The values "precisely quantified" and "not quantified" correspond to the extremes "high" and "low" on his scale of individuation (cf. Haig 1998: 176). The conditions under which precisely quantified subjects occur is specified as: *Precisely quantified subjects, e.g. with* bir, *never occur as subjects, unless the relative clause contains an anticipatory possessive.*

There are counterexamples to this claim, for instance (25b). Moreover, sole the fact that combinations such as *bir* + N and N + *-lEr* do occur makes it clear that individuation is indeed something observable. On the other hand, this is not directly related to definiteness, but rather with "individual singularity" and "individual plurality", as described by Johanson (1991: 226). Such combinations are not primarily intended as means for establishing reference, but also can be used to convey a general picture or image of quantity: one, more, or unspecified.

Conversely, Haig might have thought that the possibility to make reference is correlated to the intention of doing so. This is what he shows on the basis of example (28), taken from Haig (1998a: 185).[25]

(28) [*Ağz-ın-a*   *bardak daya-n-an*] *çocuk   şaşır-mış,   kork-muş-tu.*
      mouth-POSS3S-DAT glass   rest-PAS-SF child   be.confused   be.afraid-PAST2- PROJ1
      'The child [with the glass resting against his mouth] was confused and afraid.'

Haig's comment on the translation of this example is:

> I translated *bardak,* even though it is a semi-subject, with *the glass,* and I see no other option: The glass concerned has been unequivocally identified, indeed it has been a co-topic of much of the preceding text. Note however that there is no further mention of the glass beyond this point in the text.

In my opinion Haig's assertion that there is "no other option" is correct, but the reason advanced is incorrect. The choice in English is between 'a glass' and 'the glass', and choosing the former option would possibly lead to confusion. But it is not true that reference for the purpose of identification plays a role here. What is expressed in Turkish by (28) is no more than 'That child with *some glass* against his mouth was confused and afraid'. The core of the argument here is the general image:

25 During a ceremony an entertainer takes a sip from a glass of water and then holds the glass to a young boy's mouth, saying that he too will now drink from it. The boy's mother, horrified at the thought of her son drinking from the same glass, protests loudly. Example (28) describes the situation at this point.

"child-with-glass-on-mouth", and the fact that the particular glass happens to be one and the same as the one that the conjurer has been drinking from is true, but irrelevant for the creation of the image. It is most likely very relevant for the mother of the child, but that has nothing to do with the image created by *bardak dayanan* 'glass resting'. The *purpose* of the latter fragment (in Turkish) is not one of *identification*, but rather, of creating an image. This is corroborated by the lack of further mention in the original text, as quoted above.

A possible cause of the confusion is that the relation *definiteness* and *identification* should apparently be taken as a one-to-one relationship that always holds. Obviously this is not so. In English one can say for instance 'John plays the piano very well', and in such a statement *the piano* denotes nothing more than a certain type of musical instrument, and is not meant to refer to some particular piano. Even if one finds an old friend performing a piece of music by Satie, one could say with unfeigned surprise: "Gosh, I never knew that Bill played the piano!", and *the piano* would not refer to the instrument he is actually playing, but to his particular skill: (I never knew that Bill) 'knows how to play an instrument called piano'. Similarly, in mentioning the means of transportation one utilizes, a definite article is quite often required in Dutch, whereas in English there is no article: *Gaan jullie met de trein, de bus, of met de auto?—We gaan met de fiets en te voet* 'Will you travel by train, bus or car?—We'll go on bicycle and on foot'. Also (9a) contains a fragment, *güneş* 'sun' which is duly translated by 'the sun', and indeed, there is no other possibility than to do so, for this word stands for a celestial body with unique reference; their referent is inherently identifiable and such words take the definite article. But to say for that reason that *güneş* 'sun' in (9a) is definite as well would be pedantic.

3. Personal pronouns, nouns with normal possessive morphology, demonstratives, nouns modified by adjectives created from the adjectival suffix -ki *are never subjects.*

These observations are correct and bearing in mind the idea of non-referential subjects they should not be surprising. The referents of all the categories mentioned here are intrinsically identifiable and hence definite. This makes phrases the head of which is based on such nouns and pronoun referential, and thus, they are to be excluded from subjecthood in *Focus-Locus Constructions*.

4. Subjects occur with only two transitive predicates: sok- *'sting' and* bas- *'overgrow'. Even here, their occurrence is bound to extremely specific conditions: They are minimally* INDIVIDUATED, *the relative clause contains an accusative-marked constituent with an anticipatory possessive, and the subject is non-human.*

It is absolutely true that the majority of verbs in the *Focus-Locus Construction* are intransitive, but there are nevertheless hardly any reasons why in principle only *sok-* 'sting' and *bas-* 'overgrow' would qualify. In (20a) we find *ye-* 'to eat', and in (20c) *kır* 'to break', while *bas-* occurs in several transitive collocations: *ot bas-* 'to overgrow with weeds', *su bas-* 'to flood', *ter bas-* 'for sweat to break out' as in (20d), *ateş bas-* 'to be hot all over; to glow' in (20e), *sel bas-* 'to flood' in (29a), *sis bas-* 'to fog up' in (29b).

(29) a. *Kurkuru'nun   sel-ler   bas-an toprak-lar-ın-da   gece   korkutucu-dur.*
          K.GEN   flood-PLUR bas-SF land-PLUR-POSS3S-LOC night scary-EMPH
          'In the lands of Kurkuru where torrential floods occur, the night is really scary.'

 b. *Bahçe-ler-den   bir koku   yüksel-iyor,   nem,   yosun, ölmüş yaprak*
     garden-PLUR-ABL a   smell rise-PRES1,   moisture, moss, dead leave
     koku-su,   sonbahar başla-dığında hafif sis   bas-an
     smell-CM   autumn   start-TEMP   light mist   bas-SF
     akşam-lar-a   özgü.
     evening-PLUR-DAT characteristic
     'From the gardens rises a smell, moisture, moss and the smell of dead leaves;
     when the autumn starts, this is characteristic of evenings with a shallow fog
     coming up.'

6. Surviving innovations

By way of a conclusion, a few words can be said about the conditions for the use of
this construction. Erdal (1981: 30) quotes Deny (1921) who points out that relativi-
zation without possessive suffixes referring to the subject is the only "original" type
of relativization in Turkish. Erdal also quotes Underhill (1972: 87–99), who was of
the opinion that constructions with the OP (in *-DIK*) are a "relatively recent Turkish
innovation" and that "we may suppose that the retention of the more archaic *-En*
construction [...] must be connected with the fact that they are proverbs". Neither
Erdal nor Haig agree with this point of view, and indeed, the huge number of
"counterexamples" that easily can be gathered from electronic text corpora con-
vincingly show that the N1+SP+N2 type of structure is productive and viable.

The question is why? In other words, why is this type of construction the survi-
vor of an innovation that has led to the differentiation between SP and OP? I think
that the answer is quite simple: this type of construction has survived in its specific
shape because it fills a need. That is, it has specialized into a presentative statement
by narrowing down the type of noun phrases involved on either side of the partici-
ple.

Whereas in ancient times possible ambiguities in transitive verbs, as in *ot yiyen
at* 'grass eating horse' and *at yiyen ot* 'grass horses eat', could be resolved on the
basis of commonplace knowledge ('horses eat grass' and not the other way around),
because intransitives such ambiguities did not exist anyhow. A further specialization
by using place nouns for N2 and non-referential noun phrases for N1, and thereby
surpassing the level of a trivial construction, made it a very good candidate for sur-
vival.

Abbreviations

1S	copula, 1st person singular	PAS	passive
3P	copula, 3rd person plural	PAST1	past tense (1): *-TI*
ABL	ablative case	PAST2	past tense (2): *-mIş*
ACC	accusative case	PLUR	plural
CM	compound marker	POSS1P	possessive 1st person plural
CONV	converb	POSS1P	possessive 1st person plural
DAT	dative case	POSS1S	possessive 1st person sing
EMPH	emphatic suffix	POSS2S	possessive 2nd person sing
FUT	future tense	POSS3P	possessive 3rd person plural
GEN	genitive case	POSS3S	possessive 3rd person sing
INF	infinitive	PRES1	present tense (1)
INS	instrumental case	PRES2	present tense (2)
LOC	locative case	PROJ1	projection suffix past
NEG	negation marker	Q	question marker
OF	form of OP: *-TIK*	SF	form of SP: *-(y)En*
OP	object participle	TEMP	temporal suffix

References

Barker, C. & Hankamer, J. & Moore, J. 1990. *Wa* and *Ga* in Turkish. In: Dziwirek, K. & Farell, P. & Mejias-Bikandi, E. (eds.) *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*. Stanford (California): Center for Study of Language and Information. 21–43.

Cagri, I. M. 2009. Arguing against subject incorporation in Turkish relative clauses. *Lingua* 119, 359–373.

Ciopiński, J. 1969. Remarques sur les constructions syntactiques du type *bülbül öten yer* et leur réalisation dans la langue Turque. *Folia Orientalia* 10, 59–63.

Csató, É. Á. 1985. A syntactic analysis of participial constructions in modern Turkish. In: *Beşinci Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi, 23–28.09.1985. Tebliğler* 1: *Türk Dili* 1. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi. 39–56.

Csató, É. Á. 1996. A typological review of relative clause constructions in some Turkic languages. In: Rona, B. (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics*. *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. School of Oriental and African Studies*, 15-17 August, 1990.* Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 28–32.

Dede, M. 1978. Why should Turkish relativization distinguish between subject and non-subject head nouns? In: *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4. 67–78.

Deny, J. 1921. *Grammaire de la langue turque*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.

Dik, S. C. 1989. *The theory of functional grammar* 1*: The structure of the clause.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Ebeling, C. L. 2006. *Semiotaxis. Over theoretische en Nederlandse syntaxis.* [Semiotaxis. On theoretical and Dutch syntax]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Erdal, M. 1981. Turkish participles and the absence of reference. In: Young, D. W. (ed.) 1981. *Studies presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester, Mass.: Pirtle & Polson. 21–49.

Erkman-Akerson, F. & Özil, Ş. 1996. /en/ and /dığı/ crossings—Genitival NPs and sentential clauses as relative clause subjects. In: Konrot, A. (ed.) *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Eskişehir, 12-14 August, 1992*. Eskişehir: Anadolu University. 1–12.

Göksel, A. & Özsoy, A. 2003. *dA*: A focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1143–1167.

Haig, G. 1998a. *Relative Constructions in Turkish*. (Turcologica 33). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Haig, G. 1998b. On some strategies for case recovery in Turkish relativization. In: Johanson, L. (ed*.). The Mainz meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3–6, 1994*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 299–320.

Haig, G. & Slodowicz, S. 2006. Control in Turkish non-finite complements. In: Yağcıoğlu, S. & Değer, A. (eds.) *Advances in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 11–13th August 2004, Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir*. Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları. 165–177.

Hankamer J. & Knecht, L. 1976. The role of the subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of relative clause particle in Turkish. In: *Papers from the Sixth Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistics Society,* 31.10–2.11.1975. [Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics 6, May 1976] Mcgill University. 123–135. [Also published in: Aissen, J. & Hankamer, J. (eds). *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics 2.* (1976)].

Hannay, M. 1985. *English existentials in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hovdhaugen, E. 1975. Relative clauses in Turkish. In: *1. Türk Dili Bilimsel Kurultayına sunulan bildiriler* 1972. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 413). Ankara. 551–554.

Jansky, H. 1943. *Lehrbuch der Türkischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Johanson, L. 1991. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. In: Johanson, L. 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. 225–242.

Kononov, A. N. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Kornfilt, J. 2000. Some syntactic and morphological properties of relative clauses in Turkish. In: Artemis A. et al. (eds.) *The syntax of relative clauses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 121–159.

Knecht, L. 1979. The role of the genitive suffix in relative clauses: a reply to Dede. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley. 180–197.

Lewis, G. 1965. *Teach yourself Turkish*. London: English Universities Press.

Lewis, G. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lyons, J. 1967. A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3, 390–396.

Mackenzie, J. L. 1992. Places and things. In: Fortesque, M. & Harder, P. & Kristofferson, L. (eds.) 1992. *Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 218–231.

Özçelik, Ö. 2014. An antisymmetric analysis of Turkish relative clauses: Implications from prosody. *Turkic Languages* 18, 247–270.

Özsoy, S. 1994. Türkçede ortaç yapısı. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 21–30.

Öztürk, B. 2008. Relativization strategies in Turkish. In: Boeckx, C. & Ulutaş, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics* 4. (Harvard University, Cambridge, May 2007), MITWPL, MIT: Cambridge. 241–253.

Öztürk, B. 2009. Incorporating agents. *Lingua* 119, 334–358.

Schaaik, G. van 1983. A functional analysis of aspects of Turkish grammar. MA Thesis. General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam.

Schaaik, G. van 1992. The treatment of Turkish nominal compounds in FG. In: Fortescue, M. et al. (eds.) 1992. *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.1998. 'İşlevsel Dilbilgisi' nedir? [What is Functional Grammar?]. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları 1998.* Ankara. 9–25.

Schaaik, G. van 2001. What is Functional Grammar? In: Schaaik, G. van 2001. *The Bosphorus papers. Studies in Turkish grammar 1996–1999.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 37–56.

Schaaik, G. van 2002. *The noun in Turkish. Its argument structure and the compounding straitjacket* (Turcologica 49.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schaaik, G. van 2011. Place nouns as compound heads: a short story of fake postpositions. *Turkic Languages* 14, 206–238.

Schaaik, G. van 2014. Complications in Turkish complementation: for Eva. In: Demir, N. & Karakoç, B. & Menz, A. (eds.) 2014. *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift.* Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları. 401–416.

Schaaik, G. van (in progress) *Turkish grammar XXL.*

Underhill, R. 1972. Turkish participles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 87–99.

Zimmer, K. 1987. Turkish relativization revisited. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) 1987. *Studies on Modern Turkish. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Turkish Linguistics.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press. 57–61.

Zimmer, K. 1996. Overlapping strategies in Turkish relativization. In: Rona, B. (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Turkish Linguistics.* School of Oriental and African Studies*, 15–17 August, 1990.* Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 159–164.