Selection of Subjunctors in Turkic Non-Finite Complement Clauses

Lars Johanson[*]

Abstract

The topic of the paper is Turkic clausal complementation: the syntactic and semantic behavior of complement clauses, the subjunctors that mark them, and the roles of various predicate types in selecting them. Two main types of bound complementizers serve as subjunctors in complement clauses: a participial and an infinitival type, both usually corresponding to the English complimentizer *that*.

Traditionally, the semantic behavior of the complement clauses has been thought to depend on a distinction between factive and non-factive verbs. Complement clauses provided with participial subjunctors have been described as factive in contrast to non-factive complement clauses provided with infinitival subjunctors.

Csató (2010) shows that the distinction fact vs. non-fact does not explain the distribution in Turkish. She concludes that the distinction made in Functional Grammar between embedded propositions and embedded predications can be applied to account for the differences between Turkish clauses with participial and infinitival subjunctors. Only clauses with a participial subjunctor can have illocutionary force and a truth value.

It is suggested in the present paper that this situation follows from a specific distribution of oppositional values. Clauses carrying participial subjunctors do not refer directly to events as such, but explicitly to some knowledge about events. The concept 'knowledge of a possible fact' is grammaticalized in most Turkic languages. Clauses provided with participial sub-

_____

[*] Prof. Dr., Johannes Gutenberg University, Department of Turkology – Mainz / Germany
johanson@uni-mainz.de

junctors signal this concept. Those provided with inifinitival subjunctors do not share it. They are the non-marked members of several oppositions, thus highly ambiguous, open to diverse (e.g. modal) interpretations suggested by the predicate of the higher clause.

Traditional classifications of predicates do not solve the problems of subjunctor selection. The semantic value of the participial subjunctor is decisive. Predicates that normally occur with an infinitival subjunctor can also occur with a participial subjunctor if the semantic value 'knowledge of a possible fact' is intended. The participial subjunctor plays a prominent selecting role: both the higher and the lower predicate must be semantically compatible with the concept it signals.

Keywords
Turkic languages, syntax, clause combining, complement clauses

1. Turkic Complement Clauses

Turkic non-finite complement clauses, non-main clauses functioning as arguments of predicates in higher clauses, matrix clauses, are joined to these higher clauses by bound complementizers, subjunctors. The present paper will deal with the possible roles of various predicate types of the matrix clauses in selecting the possible subjunctors. The examples will be taken from Turkish, though the regularities observed are actually shared by most Turkic languages.

Turkic non-finite complement clauses correspond functionally to English non-main clauses with finite predicates, mostly *that*-clauses. They are constructed according to the normal left-recursive Turkic syntax, which means that the matrix clause may be a main clause or a non-main clause; for example:

• complement clause 2
• complement clause 1
• main clause

The number of complementations in a sentence is of course restricted by the memory capacity of the addresser and the addressee to produce and comprehend the structures.

The predicates of complement clauses - verbs, nouns, adjectives - are marked by participial and infinitival subjunctors. The normal complementation technique is nominalization. The clauses are possessive constructions in which the subject, mostly in the genitive, represents the possessor

and the predicate represents the possessum. Possessive personal markers signal person and number agreement. Two examples:

(1) *Ahmet* [[*Ali'nin gel-diğ-in-i*] *bil-diğ-in-i*] *söyle-di.*
    Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.part-poss-acc know-sj.part-poss-acc say-past
    'Ahmet said he knew that Ali had come.'

(2) *Ahmet* [[*Ali'nin gel-me-sin-i*] *iste-diğ-in-i*] *söyle-di.*
    Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss-acc want-sj.part-poss-acc say-past
    'Ahmet said that he wanted Ali to come.'

The subject can also be in the nominative. Where both cases are possible, the genitive subject tends to express specificity.

(3) [*Para gel-diğ-in-i*] *bil-iyor-um*
    money come-sj.part-poss-acc know-pres-1sg
    'I know that money comes/came/has come.'

(4) [*Para'nın gel-diğ-in-i*] *bil-iyor-um*.
    money-gen come-sj.part-poss-acc know-pres-1sg
    'I know that the money comes/came/has come.'

Complement clauses occur in various syntactic functions, mostly as core arguments. They may serve as subjects, accusative-marked direct objects, dative-marked indirect objects, and oblique objects marked by other cases (locative, ablative, instrumental) or postpositions. Three-place verbs typically take an indirect object in the dative and a complement clause as a direct object in the accusative, for instance:

(5) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'ye*] [*gel-me-sin-i*] *emret-ti.*
    Ahmet Ali-dat come-sj.inf-poss-acc order-past
    'Ahmet ordered Ali to come.'

Subject control constructions, in which the subject of the complement clause must be coreferential with that of the matrix clause, will not be dealt with here. In cases such as (6), the predicate of the complement clause does not carry any person or case marker.

(6) *Ali* [*gel-mek*] *ist-iyor.*
    Ali come-sj want-pres
    'Ali wants to come.'

Main clauses may carry markers expressing viewpoint aspect, mood, tense, person, and number. Complement clauses are deranked in the sense that they lack some categorial distinctions relevant to main clauses. For instance, many are interpretable as both non-past and past. *Ali'nin gel-diğ-i* ‹Ali-gen come-

sj.part-poss› can thus be translated by English present, past, perfect, or pluperfect forms: 'that Ali comes / came / has come / had come.'

Two main types of bound complementizers serve as subjunctors in complement clauses: participial and infinitival subjunctors. In Turkish, the participial type is mainly represented by {-DIG} + possessive markers. The participial subjunctor {-(y)AcAK} is a modal item mostly used for future reference. The infinitival type is represented by {-mA} + possessive markers. Both usually correspond to the English complimentizer *that*. The subjunctor {-(y)Iş}, which may correspond to the complimentizer *how*, will not be discussed in this paper. The discussion will focus on the distinctions between the types {-DIG} and {-mA}.

Complement clauses based on the infinitival type must be distinguished from lexicalized deverbal nouns derived with infinitive markers, e.g. {-mA} in *konuş-ma-* 'talk', *araştır-ma* 'research' (Johanson 1975). Complement clauses of the participial type should not be confused with headless relative clauses such as (7).

(7) *Ahmet, [Ali'nin söyle-dik-ler-in-i] anla-dı.*
    Ahmet Ali-gen say-sj.part-pl-poss-acc understand-past
    'Ahmet understood what Ali said.'

When the predicate of the complement clause is a non-verb, it is provided with a copula verb 'to be', e.g. 'to be sick' or 'to be a doctor' as in *hasta / doktor ol-duğ-u* ‹sick / doctor be-sj.part-poss› *hasta / doktor ol-ma-sı* ‹sick/doctor be-sj.inf-poss›. This is also valid for expanded stems forming complex aspect-tense items, e.g. postterminals expressing 'to have done' such as *-mIş ol-duğ-u* ‹post be-sj.part-poss›/ *-mIş ol-ma-sı* ‹post be-sj.inf-poss›.

In other Turkic languages, subjunctors of the participial type are mostly based on {-GAn}, e.g. Kazakh *kel-gen-i* ‹come-sj.part-poss›. Subjunctors of the infinitival type are based on {-(I)š} or {-(I)w}, e.g. Uzbek *ket-iš-i,* Kumyk *get-iw-i* ‹go-sj.inf-poss›.

2. Factive vs. Non-Factive

What principles govern the choice of participial and infinitival subjunctors? How do the two types of complement clauses differ semantically?

As far as Turkish is concerned, these questions have been discussed for decades. The general assumption is that the type of predicate of the matrix clause determines the choice of the subjunctor. Traditionally, the semantic

behavior of complement clauses has been thought to depend on a distinction between factive and non-factive verbs.

Along the lines of Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970), it is possible to distinguish "factive" verbs such as *to regret* and "non-factive" verbs such as *to believe*. Turkish complement clauses provided with the participial subjunctor {-DIG} have been described as factive in contradistinction to non-factive complement clauses provided with the infinitival subjunctor {-mA}. Lees' distinction (1965: 113-114) between "general participle factive nominalizations", based on {-DIG}, and "light-infinitive nominalizations", based on {-mA}, has been adopted by numerous linguists describing Turkish. It has become usual to claim that complement clauses provided with {-DIG} refer to "facts", whereas those provided with {-mA} refer to "actions". In syntax-based approaches inspired by Lees, "fact complements" are based on {-DIG} (with non-future reference) and {-(y)AcAK} (with future reference). "Act complements" are based on {-mA} and lack tense reference.

In linguistic theories working with ideas of a layered structure of the clause, a distinction originally proposed by Vendler (1967) is made between embedded propositions and embedded predications. In Lyons' terminology, predications are second-order entities and propositions are third-order entities (1977: 793). The idea of layering developed by Foley and Van Valin (1984) has been elaborated by Dik and Hengeveld in their version of Functional Grammar (Dik 1989, 1997). As a representative of this kind of Functional Grammar, van Schaaik (2001) distinguishes "fact" and "act" according to temporal differences, but also deals with the semantics of matrix predicates and classes of the embedded predicates according to Vendler (1972).

In his layered analysis of the underlying clause structure, Dik claims that embedded propositions convey possible facts, whereas embedded predications convey states of affairs. One reason for preferring the term "possible fact" is that these clauses can also be used in contexts where it is denied that they represent facts, e.g. *It is not true that Ali has come.* It is claimed that a classification of matrix verbs can be based on this distinction: verbs taking propositional complements versus verbs taking predicational complements.

Items to which illocutionary forces apply are propositions rather than predications. Only possible facts may be evaluated as being true or not. In propositional structures, potential or possible facts are specified, i.e. some-

thing that can be known, believed, mentioned, remembered, etc. Factive predicates allow the insertion of the noun *fact* in the complement clause, e.g. *Ahmet regrets [the fact] that Ali went.*

According to Csató, the distinction made in Functional Grammar between embedded propositions and embedded predications can be applied to account for the differences between Turkish clauses with participial and infinitival subjunctors (2010: 117-118). But this does not mean a simple dichotomy 'fact' vs. 'act'. {-DIG} complement clauses are indicative, whereas {-mA} clauses are non-indicative (Csató 1999). Only complement clauses headed by the participial subjunctor have illocutionary force and a truth value. Clauses with the infinitival subjunctor lack these properties.

Example (8) may be compared to (9), where the complement clause is not a proposition and has no truth value.

(8) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin gel-diğ-in-i*] *iste-me-di.*
   Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.part-poss-acc want-neg-past⟩
   'Ahmet did not like that Ali came.'

(9) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin gel-me-sin-i*] *iste-me-di.*
   Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss-acc want-neg-past⟩
   'Ahmet did not want Ali to come.'

3. Participial and Infinitival Subjunctors

Complement clauses taking participial subjunctors are typically headed by predicates of knowledge, perception, utterance, and evaluation. Csató (1990) lists, according to Noonan's classification (1985: 11–133), the following types of matrix predicates heading {-DIG} clauses:

– Utterance predicates, e.g. *söyle-* 'to say', *sor-* 'to ask', *anlat-* 'to tell', *bildir-* 'to make known'.

– Predicates expressing knowledge, acquisition, perception, e.g. *anla-* 'to understand', *bil-* 'to know', *farket-* 'to notice', *hatırla-* 'to remember', *kabul et-* 'to accept', *seç-* 'to perceive', *gör-* 'to see', *duy-* 'to hear'.

– Predicates expressing an attitude towards the possible fact described by the complement clause: *doğru ol-* 'to be true', *yanlış ol-* 'to be false', *emin ol-* 'to be sure', *inan-* 'to believe'.

– Complement clauses taking the infinitival subjunctor lack illocutionary force. They are typically headed by predicates such as the following:

– Predicates of practical manipulation, e.g. *emret-* 'to order', *zorla-* 'to oblige', *engelle-* 'to prevent', *izin ver-* 'to allow', *öğütle-* 'to advise'.

– Volitional predicates, e.g. *iste-* 'to want', *rica et-* 'to request', *arzu et-* 'to desire', *um-* 'to hope', *talep et-* 'to request', *bekle-* 'to expect'.

– Commentative predicates, e.g. *önemli ol-* 'to be important', *iyi ol-* 'to be good', *kötü ol-* 'to be bad', *doğru ol-* 'to be right (morally good)', *kız-* 'to be angry', *memnun ol-* 'to be pleased', *sevin-* 'to be glad', *şaşır-* 'to be surprised', *üzül-* 'to be sorry', *kork-* 'to fear'.

Typical predicates also include *bağışla-* 'to forgive', *ikna et-* 'to persuade', *kolaylaştır-* 'to facilitate', *onayla-* 'to approve', *sağla-* 'to ensure', *teklif et-* 'to suggest', *tembih et-* 'to admonish', *ümit et-* 'to hope', *yasakla-* 'to forbid'.

It has been discussed what modal meanings are expressed by Turkish complement clauses provided with participial and infinitival subjunctors. Erguvanlı-Taylan (1998) adopts Kiparsky and Kiparsky's approach to the semantics of matrix predicates. She argues that the selection of higher predicates is determined by epistemic and deontic modality, a distinction based on Palmer's modality theory (1986: 97).

4. Subjunctor Choice

It is important to investigate the semantic roles of matrix predicates and to classify them according to these roles and their possible selection behavior. The links between predicates and subjunctors are, however, still far from clear. It is uncertain in what sense and to what extent the predicates select the subjunctors and how they affect the truth content of the complement clause. The interaction must be studied further.

Linguists have, as we have seen, attempted to classify matrix predicates according to their occurrence with the possible subjunctor types.

(A) Predicates that only occur with {-DIG} and {-(y)AcAK} are said to be cognitive predicates such as *emin ol-* 'to be sure', *fark et-* 'to notice', *iddia et-* 'to claim', *inan-* 'to believe', *itiraf et-* 'to confess', *öğren-* 'to learn', *pişman ol-* 'to regret', *reddet-* 'to deny', *san-* 'to suppose'. They express epistemic modality, i.e. can be used to evaluate the truth value of the embedded proposition.

(B) Matrix predicates that only occur with {-mA} are said to express deontic modality, the addresser's attitude towards the action described by the complement clause. Some are said to express command, request, wish, will, hope, and expectation, e.g. *arzu et-*, *dile-* 'to wish', *bekle-* 'to expect',

emret- 'to order', *iste-* 'to want'. Others express obligation, necessity, premission, or possibility, e.g. *izin ver-*, *müsaade et-* 'to permit', *lazım (ol-)* 'to be necessary', *mecbur ol-* '(to be) obliged', *mümkün (ol-)* '(to be) possible', *önle-* 'to prevent', *şart (ol)-* '(to be) obligatory', *yasakla-* 'to forbid'. One subgroup expresses emotional attitudes, e.g. *affet-* 'to forgive', *beğen-*, *hoşlan-*, *sev-* 'to like', *kız-* 'to get angry', *kork-* 'to be scared', *nefret et-* 'to hate', *öv-* 'to praise', *şikayet et-* 'to complain', *utan-* 'to be ashamed'.

(C) One group of predicates is said to occur with both subjunctor types. Some of them are cognitive predicates, e.g. *anla-* 'to understand', *bil-* 'to know', *hatırla-* 'to remember'. Some are emotional predicates, e.g. *bozul-* 'to resent', *içerle-* 'to resent', *sevin-* 'to be pleased', *memnun ol-* 'to be pleased', *kabul et-* 'to accept', *şaş-*, *şaşır-* 'to be surprised'.

5. Possible Facts

{-DIG} complement clauses express propositions with a possible truth value. The participial subjunctor {-DIG} is required by matrix predicates capable of assessing the factual truth of embedded proposition, e.g. non-factive predicates such as *san-* 'to think, to believe' and *tahmin et-* 'to suppose':

(10) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *san-dı.*
    Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc believe-past
    'Ahmet believed that Ali went / had gone.'

(11) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *tahmin et-ti*
    Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc suppose-past
    'Ahmet supposed that Ali had gone.'

The participial subjunctor in the examples above cannot be replaced by the infinitival subjunctor, e.g. **git-me-sin-i* ⟨go-sj.inf-poss-acc⟩.

Similar rules apply to the subjunctor corresponding to English *whether* in interrogative complement clauses. These request information and are therefore provided with a participial subjunctor, for instance:

(12) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin gel-ip gel-me-diğ-in-i*] *sor-du.*
    Ahmet Ali-gen come-conv come-neg-sj.part-acc ask-past
    'Ahmet asked whether (or not) Ali had come.'

The dichotomy factive vs. non-factive does not, however, provide a satisfactory explanation of the distinction {-DIG} vs. {-mA}. Clauses with the infinitival type can actually also refer to possible facts, e.g. with matrix

predicates of emotion such as *sevin-* 'to be pleased', *sevin-dir-* 'to please', *kız-* 'to be angry', *üzül-* 'to regret, to be sorry':

(13) [*Ali'nin gel-me-si*] *Ahmed'i sevin-dir-di.*
Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss Ahmet-acc be.pleased-caus-past
'Ali's coming [the fact that Ali came] pleased Ahmet.'

(14) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-me-sin-e*] *üzül-dü.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.inf. poss-dat regret-past
'Ahmet regretted Ali's departure'
(= that Ali went, has gone, had gone, goes away, will go).

Matrix predicates are factive if they presuppose the factual truth of the embedded proposition. The predicates mentioned satisfy this condition. The truth value remains constant with varying negated, interrogated, and modal forms of the matrix predicate, e.g. *üzül-me-di* ⟨regret-neg-past⟩ 'did not regret'. Non-factive matrix predicates such as *iste-* 'to want' may occur with {-mA} clauses:

(15) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-me-sin-i*] *iste-di.*
Ahmet, Ali-gen go-sj.inf. poss-acc want-past
'Ahmet wanted Ali to go.'

No truth value of the complement clause is presupposed. The content can thus be contradicted, e.g. *Ama Ali git-me-di* ⟨But Ali go-neg-past⟩ 'But Ali did not go'.

It is obvious that complement clauses provided with infinitival subjunctors can refer not only to potential actions but also to facts:

(16) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin iç-me-sin-den*] *bık-tı.*
Ahmet Ali-gen drink-sj.inf-poss-abl tire-past
'Ahmet was fed up with Ali's drinking [the fact that Ali drank].'

(17) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin gel-me-sin-den*] *hoşlan-dı.*
Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss-abl enjoy-past
'Ahmet was pleased with Ali's coming [that Ali came / had come / would come].'

6. Content of Knowledge

The traditional classifications of predicates do not solve the problems of subjunctor selection. The semantic value of the participial subjunctor {-DIG} is decisive. The subjunctor {-DIG} indicates 'possible facts', but this can also be the case with {-mA}. The participial subjunctor has a distinctive element of meaning, a cognitive element that can be referred to as 'knowledge of a possi-

ble fact'. Constituent clauses provided with {-DIG} signal 'knowledge (that)', a cognitive content that implies knowledge, learning, understanding, consciousness, awareness, belief, intuition, insight, etc. The participial subjunctor signals a content of knowledge aquired through thought, experience, intuition, perception, etc., a content that can be judged, estimated, assessed, believed, and doubted. The use of {-DIG} frames the cognitive content as true, whether or not there is proof for this.

The linguistic oppositions in which the subjunctors participate reveal the reasons for the differences. The subjunctor {-DIG} forms an opposition with the subjunctor {-mA}, in which it is the marked member, signaling content of knowledge. The subjunctor {-mA} does not signal or share this concept. The subjunctor {-DIG} is also the unmarked member of an opposition with the subjunctor {-(y)AcAK}, a modal item mostly used for future reference. The subjunctor {-DIG} does not signal or share its semantics. The subjunctor {-mA} is also the unmarked member of an opposition with {-(y)AcAK}, whose modal values it does not signal or share.

The unmarked member of these oppositions, {-mA}, is the least qualified subjunctor. It does not signal any concept of its own and is thus highly ambiguous, open to diverse interpretations suggested by the predicate of the matrix clause. This insight has been formulated by Turcologists in more or less vague ways. According to Bazin (1968), {-DIG} clauses refer to real acts in present or past, whereas {-mA} clauses refer to virtual acts related to will, wish, and fear. According to Erdal, {-mA} verbal nouns "actually do not refer to events at all, but to mental projections" (1998: 56).

Modal interpretations, epistemic or deontic, depend on the semantics of the predicate of the matrix clause. Many matrix predicates that only occur with {-mA} signal a modal content. The realizations follow from the distribution of oppositional values just discussed. If the complement clause is provided with the infinitival subjunctor, an interpretation as 'knowledge of a possible fact' is excluded. On the other hand, the infinitival subjunctor does not signal modal meanings explicitly. It just refers to the action, leaving the further interpretation open. The complement clause gets its indicative or modal reading through the semantics of the matrix predicate. This is solely the task of the matrix predicate itself. The {-mA} subjunctor is not chosen in order to signal any modal notion.

Predicates that normally occur with an infinitival subjunctor can occur with a participial subjunctor if the semantic value 'knowledge of a possible fact' is intended:

(18) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-me-sin-i*] *iste-me-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.inf-poss-acc desire-neg-past
'Ali did not want Ali to go.'

(19) *Ahmet,* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *iste-me-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen leave-sj.part-poss-acc desire-neg-past
'Ali did not like the fact that Ali had gone.'

To understand the semantic value of {-DIG}, it is important to consider matrix predicates that can occur with both {-DIG} and {-mA}. With predicates such as *um-* 'to hope' or *kork-* 'to fear', {-DIG} clauses mean 'to hope / fear that something happens or has happened', whereas {-mA} clauses mean 'to hope / fear that something will, might happen'.

In certain other cases it might be claimed that the matrix predicate can occur with different subjunctors since it has two readings. For example, the predicate *söyle-* can mean a simple 'to say, to utter' or a volitional 'to tell', implying that the content of the complement is wished, wanted, asked for, requested, expected, ordered, etc.

(20) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *söyle-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc say-past
'Ahmed said that Ali had gone.'

(21) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-me-sin-i*] *söyle-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.inf-poss-acc say-past
'Ahmet said that Ali should go.'

The subjunctor {-mA} does not signal any modal reading. However, the only suitable interpretation in the context of an infinitival subjunctor is a modal one implying that the action in question shall or should be carried out. This lead to volitional clauses such as (23). The predicate *bildir-* 'to make known' behaves in the same way:

(22) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin gel-diğ-in-i*] *bildir-di*
Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.part-poss-acc announce-past
'Ali announced that Ali had come'.

(23) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin gel-me-sin-i*] *bildir-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss-acc announce-past›
'Ahmet announced that Ali should come.'

The predicate *doğru (ol-)* can mean '(to be) true, correct, right' or '(to be) appropriate, good, acceptable'. The first reading is found with {-DIG}, but {-mA} yields an evaluative reading (Csató 2010: 115):

(24) [*Ali'nin gel-diğ-i*] *doğru değil.*
Ali-gen come-sj.part-poss true not
'It is not true that Ali comes / came/ has come'.

(25) [*Ali'nin gel-me-si*] *doğru değil.*
Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss right not
'It is not appropriate that Ali comes /came/ has come.'

Also other predicates that can head complement clauses of both types may have more than one reading, e.g. *mümkün (ol-)* '(to be) possible'. The reading 'knowledge of a possible fact' is only found in (26).

(26) [*Ali'nin gel-diğ-i*] *mümkün.*
Ali-gen come-sj.part-poss possible
'It is possible that Ali comes/came/ has come.'

(27) [*Ali'nin gel-me-si*] *mümkün.*
Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss possible
'Ali's coming is possible.'

With {-DIG}, *anla-* 'to understand', *öğren-* 'to learn, to experience', *bil-* 'to know', etc., have normal interpretations of 'knowledge of a possible fact'.

(28) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *anla-dı.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc understand-past
'Ahmet understood that Ali went /had gone.'

(29) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *bil-iyor.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc know-pres
'Ahmet knows that Ali goes / has gone.'

(30) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-tiğ-in-i*] *öğren-di.*
Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.part-poss-acc learn-past
'Ahmet learned that Ali went / had gone.'

With {-mA}, however, verbs of this kind may refer to *how* or *why* the action is realized:

(31) *Ali,* [*Ankara'da yaşa-ma-sın-ı*] *öğren-di.*
Ali Ankara-loc live-sj.inf-poss-acc learn-past
'Ali learned living [how to live] in Ankara.'

(32) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin gel-me-sin-i*] *anla-dı.*
Ahmet Ali-gen come-sj.inf-poss-acc understand-past
'Ahmet understood Ali's coming' [how Ali had come].'

Certain matrix predicates that only select {-mA} do not have a modal content, e.g. *izle-* 'to watch, to follow':

(33) *Ahmet* [*Ali'nin git-me-sin-i*] *izle-di.*
     Ahmet Ali-gen go-sj.inf-poss-acc watch-past
     'Ahmet watched Ali go [how he went]'.

In many cases, predicates such as *bil-* 'to know', *öğren-* 'to learn' or *anlat-* 'to explain' do not express propositional knowledge ("knowledge that"), but procedural knowledge, ("knowledge how"), knowledge of how to perform some task, e.g. the skill involved in riding a horse or a bicycle. Thus, *araba kullan-ma-sın-ı anlat-* may mean 'to explain how to drive a car', *ata bin-me-si-ni bil-* 'to know how to ride' with a composite noun *ata bin-me-si* designating the ability to ride (Csató 1999: 29), *yemek pisir-me-sin-i bil-* 'to know how to cook' (Csató 1999: 26-27).

The concept 'knowledge of a possible fact' is grammaticalized in Turkic. Languages such as English use undifferentiated complementizers, e.g. *that*, and the meaning of the complement clause largely depends on the meaning of the matrix predicate. The situation in Turkic is different. The participial subjunctor explicitly signals a certain semantic value that is lacking with the infinitival subjunctor. The situation is thus reverse: the participial subjunctor plays a prominent selecting role. Both the higher (matrix) predicate and the lower (embedded) predicate must be compatible with the concept it signals.

Glosses

abl ablative
acc accusative
caus causative
conv converb
gen genitive
neg negation
loc locative
past past
pl plural
poss possessive
pres present
sj subjunctor
sj.inf infinitival subjunctor
sj.part participial subjunctor
1sg first-person singular

References

Bazin, Louis (1968). *Introduction à l'étude pratique de la langue turque*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Csató, Éva Á (1990). "Non-finite verbal constructions in Turkish". In Bernt Brendemoen (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 75-88.

_____, (1999). "Modalität in türkischen Komplementsätzen und ihre Entsprechungen im Deutschen". Lars Johanson & Jochen Rehbein (eds*.*) *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich* (Turcologica 39). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 23-32.

_____, (2010). "Two types of complement clauses in Turkish". Hendrik Boeschoten & Julian Rentzsch (eds.) *Turcology in Mainz/Turkologie in Mainz* (Turcologica 82). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 107-122.

Dik, Simon C. (1989). *The theory of Functional Grammar 1. The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

_____, (1997). *The theory of Functional Grammar 2. Complex and derived constructions.* [Edited by Kees Hengeveld.] Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Erdal, Marcel (1998). "On the verbal noun in *-(y)Iş*". Kâmile İmer & Leyla Uzun Subaşı (eds.) *Doğan Aksan armağanı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi. 53-68.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser (1998). "What determines the choice of nominalizer in Turkish nominalied complement clauses?". Bernard Caron (ed.) *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguistics,* paper no. 220 (CD Rom). Oxford: Pergamon.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (1984). *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johanson, Lars (1975). "Some remarks on Turkic 'hypotaxis'". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47. 104-118.

Kiparsky, Paul & Kiparsky, Carol (1970). "Fact". Manfred Bierwisch & Karl Erich Heidolf (eds.) *Progress in linguistics. A collection of papers* (Janua Linguarum, series minor 43). The Hague & Paris: Mouton. 143-173.

Lees, Robert B. (1965). "Turkish nominalizations and a problem of ellipsis". *Foundations of Language* 1. 112-121.

Lyons, John (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noonan, Michael (1985). "Complementation". Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 50-150.

Palmer, Frank R. (1986). *Mood and modality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Schaaik, Gerjan (2001). "The order of nominalizations in Turkish". Gerjan van Schaaik (ed.) *The Bosphorus papers. Studies in Turkish grammar 1996–1999.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 114-143.

Vendler, Zeno (1967). *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____, (1972). "On saying something". Zeno Vendler (ed.) *Res cogitans, an essay in relational psychology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Türkçe Bitimsiz Öge Cümlelerde Bağlayıcıların Seçimi

Lars Johanson[*]

Öz

Türk dillerinde cümle tamlamaları; öge cümlelerin sözdizimsel ve anlamsal davranışları, bunları işaretleyen bağlayıcılar ve bunların seçiminde çeşitli yüklem tiplerinin rolü bu çalışmanın konusunu oluşturmaktadır.

Bağımlı yan cümlelerin iki ana tipi, öge cümlelerde bağlayıcı olarak işlev görür. Bunlar, her ikisi de İngilizce _that_ yan cümleleriyle eşdeğer olan sıfatfiilli ve isimfiilli öge cümle tiplerdir.

Geleneksel olarak, öge cümlelerin anlamsal davranışının olgusal olan ve olgusal olmayan fiiller arasındaki bir ayrıma bağlı olduğu düşünülmüştür. İsimfiil bağlayıcılarıyla kurulmuş olgusal olmayan öge cümlelere karşılık sıfatfiil bağlayıcılarıyla oluşturulan öge cümleler, olgusal olarak tanımlanmıştır.

Csató (2010), olgusal olan ve olgusal olmayan ayrımının Türkçedeki dağılımı açıklamak için yetersizliğini göstermiş ve işlevsel gramerlerde içe yerleşik önermelerle içe yerleşik yüklemler arasındaki farkın Türkçe sıfatfiil ve isimfiil bağlayıcılı cümleler arasındaki farklarda hesaba katılabileceği sonucuna ulaşmıştır. Sadece sıfatfiil bağlayıcılı cümleler eyleyici güce ve gerçek bir değere sahip olabilir.

Bu makalede, bu durumun karşıtlık değerliliğinin özel bir dağılımı sonucu ortaya çıktığı varsayılmaktadır. Sıfatffil bağlayıcılarına sahip olan cümleler, doğrudan bir olaya değil olay hakkında bazı bilgilere işaret eder. "Muhtemel olgu bilgisi" anlayışı Türk dillerinin çoğunda dilbilgiselleşmiştir. Sıfatfiil bağlayıcılarıyla kurulan cümleler bu anlayışa işaret ederken isimfiil bağlayıcılarıyla kurulanlar bu konuda bilgi vermez. Bunlar, bir dizi karşıtlığın işaretsiz ögesi, ileri derecede muğ-

---

[*] Prof. Dr., Johannes Gutenberg Üniversitesi, Türkoloji Bölümü – Mainz / Almanya
johanson@uni-mainz.de

lak, üst cümle durumundaki yükleme bağlı olarak değişen (örn. kiplik) yorumlara açıktır.

Yüklemlerin geleneksel sınıflandırılması bağlayıcı seçimi sorununu çözememiştir. Sıfatfiil bağlayıcısının anlamsal değeri bağlayıcı seçimi konusunda belirleyicidir. Normal olarak bir isimfiil bağlayıcısı ile ortaya çıkan yüklemler, eğer "muhtemel olgu bilgisi" kesin ise bir sıfatfiil bağlayıcısı ile de kurulabilir. Sıfatfiil bağlayıcıları üst yüklem ve bağımlı yüklemin anlamsal olarak işaret ettiği kavramla zorunlu uyumluluğu konusunda önemli ve seçici bir rol oynamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler
Türk dilleri, sözdizimi, cümle bağlama, öge cümleler

;

Аннотация

,

,

.

.

,

that.

,

.

,

.

(2010)

,

.

.

,

.

,

.

«   »

.

_____

*   .   .,   ,   –   /   ma w
johanson@uni-mainz.de

,

.

, ,

(,)

.

.

. ,

,

« »

.

,

.

Ключевые Слова

, , ,