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Some Remarks on Turkic "Hypotaxis"

Speech normally proceeds in series of propositions, taken here rather generally as predicative relationships, whether in the shape of sentences, clauses or other predicate-centered patterns. Thus, in much of modern linguistics the nexus is the primordial syntactic construction, and the generativists have made the simple sentences the basis for all operations. Although grammar is concerned with meaningful combinations in language, the devices for combination of propositions have been little investigated. As far as the internal structure of so-called complex sentences is concerned, there is, indeed, a long and elaborate grammatical tradition which has changed its character only with the appearance of generative embeddings techniques. At a supra-sentence level, however, the interest of the descriptive linguists normally ceases. Since sentences are defined as unlimitedly combinable, any distributional analysis of them would appear absurd.

In Turkology, the situation is both particularly interesting and particularly unsatisfactory. It is interesting, because here we are confronted with a complexity beyond the traditional Indo-European bi-partition hypotaxis: parataxis, viz. grammatical devices for catenation of propositions, bursting the narrow classificatory schemes hitherto presented. It is unsatisfactory, because even recent contributions to the topic stick to criteria which have proved insufficient also in Indo-European syntax. The permanent need for a proper classification of clauses appears to have led competent Turkologists into infelicitous attempts to provide one, even at the cost of the valuable principle that formal (morphological, distributional) and semantic criteria should be kept apart.

In these brief notes on a highly complex matter we will have to confine our attention to just a few aspects of a theoretical order. Is there at all a hypotaxis in the Turkic languages? Very correctly K. H. Menges points out that subordination in its Indo-European form is totally alien to Turkic syntax. With the same justification K. Grönbech considers the use of

2 Bazell, C. E.: Linguistic Form. Istanbul 1953, p. 81: /.../ at the level of the sentence, all units are potentially commutable with the others. Compare, however, the recent developments in "textual" linguistics ("discourse analysis" etc.).
subordinative conjunctions a violation of Turkic linguistic structure. It might well be argued that there is some kind of replica hypotaxis on the Indo-European model in languages like Uighur, Chaghatai and Osman, but it is interesting to observe how these foreign bodies, inadmissible as they are to the basic structure, are rejected or remodelled in modern languages, e.g. standard Turkish of to-day. Although propositions, introduced by ki, çünkü, zira etc. or even ama, fakat etc. are often labelled ‘subordinate clauses’ in handbooks of Turkish, there is strong evidence that they do not, as a rule, merit this designation.

In support of the assumption that the Turkish propositions in question are not ‘subordinated’ in the common Indo-European sense and of the suspicion that, in most cases, they are not grammatically subordinated at all, at least half a dozen arguments might be put forward.

1. Much like Indo-European coordinate clauses introduced by denn, for, ty etc., Turkish clauses containing çünkü etc. do occur in isolation without conveying the impression of a grammatical ellipsis, e.g., çünkü gitti ‘for he has gone’.

2. The clauses are not always introduced by the conjunctions in question. First, the juncture between two propositions connected by ama, ki etc., often falls on the position after the conjunction, being marked, in speech, by a pause or, in orthography, by a comma. Moreover, in the autonomous use of the allegedly subordinate proposition, the conjunction colloquially tends to occupy the position of an adverbial constituent: gitti ama ‘he has, however, gone’, gitti çünkü ‘er ist nämlich gegangen’.

3. While Indo-European subordinate clauses also may precede their main clauses, this is normally impossible for the allegedly subordinate clauses of Turkish, nota bene in spite of the dominant virectum-regens rule of Turkish syntax. Why should a foreign element be maintained and used in a way exactly opposite to domestic syntactic conventions if already in the replica languages the reverse order is possible ??

4. Consider further the peculiar classificatory difficulties caused by ki, which is regarded by one grammarian as exclusively a conjunction, whereas another grammarian stresses the difference between the relative pronoun and the conjunction ki. This problem will be touched upon again later. If the ki-introduced proposition is complete, i.e. really shows all the properties of a main clause, as in ... bir erkek çocuk indi ki bunun biraderi Şefik öldüyünü söylemeye hicet yoku »... спустился ... МАЛЬЧИК ..., В КОТОРОМ СРАЗУ МОЖНО БЫЛО УЗНАТЬ БРАТА ШЕФИКА«, it is often simply asserted, as in a recent article by S. A. Sokolov, that ki is ‘completed’ («дополняется»)

6 Cf. MENGES: op. cit., p. 185 sq.
7 Note, however, the ‘analytical’ conditional periods (without -sä in the protasis) in Azər: Ağar bu deyiləndir düzür, niyə bizə asíyət verirən Ç (See SIHALIYEV, M. Ş.: Problema slozno founding predloženija [= Voprosy grammatiki ..., pp. 79-90], p. 89). This phenomenon seems to be relatively independent of the typological structure of languages; cf. GREENBERG, J. H.: Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements = Universals of Language. Cambridge, Mass., and London 1963, pp. 73-113), p. 84: */* the conditional clause precedes the conclusion as the normal order in all languages.
by a "lexical correlate" in the shape of a demonstrative pronoun. Ideas like this arise, of course, from equating *ki* with a relative pronoun of the common Indo-European type and disregarding its very general connective nature. The fact that the Turkish proposition following *ki* is, on the surface, more similar to an independent sentence than, say, the Russian translation equivalent is certainly no proof of its being a 'main clause'—but then it is in any case still less an evidence for the contrary.

5. *ki*-introduced clauses are—quite apart from their eventually diminishing frequency in the modern language in general—subject to serious distributional restrictions in that the complex sentences in which they are supposed to take part as conjuncts cannot, in their turn, be subordinated in their entirety in the genuine Turkish manner. The lack of this recursive faculty thus isolates these complex sentencees structurally, separating, e.g., *bir kaza aşk oldum ki [onun] babasi fabrikada çalışyor* 'I have fallen in love with a girl; her father works at the factory' from *babasi fabrikada çalıșan bir kaza aşk oldum* 'I have fallen in love with a girl whose father works at the factory'. Only the second version could possibly be subordinated by nominalization (*oldum* → *olduğumuz*) to, for example, *sana anlattım mı?* 'have I told you?'. It would certainly be more appropriate to consider such *ki*-propositions a kind of relative connection similar to the Latin *coniunctio relativa*.

6. On the other hand, clauses introduced by allegedly subordinative conjunctions can be subordinated in the genuine Turkish way, yet preserve their 'conjunctions'—which would undoubtedly be an unexplainable redundancy, were these elements really subordinators. We meet examples like *Orhan, Ankara'ya gideceğim, zira annesinin orada oturduğunu, üç gün kalmak istediyini ve yakında belki tekrar gideceğimi anlattı* 'Orhan reported that he was going to Ankara, that [the reason was that] his mother lives there, that he wanted to stay for three days and that perhaps he would go there again soon'. In comparable cases, neither subordinative *weil* nor coordinative *denn* could be used in German, but only the sentence adverb *nämlich*. Is there any reason why *zira, günkü, ama, fakat* etc., should not be regarded, too, as mere adverbs with anaphoric tasks?

7. Whereas Indo-European subordinate clauses can be coordinated mutually (*because* [weil, parce que] ... *and because* [und weil, et parce que] ...), Turkish propositions introduced by *ki, günkü* etc., do not allow for this and, thus, in this respect show a syntactic behavior similar to that of Indo-European propositions introduced by coordinators (*for, denn, ear* etc.).

Among other—less important—differences, the absence of certain co-occurrence restrictions of the Indo-European kind might be mentioned: there is no developed *consecutio aspectuum ac temporum* to be observed after

---

6 K voprosu o klassifikacii složnych predloženiy v sovremennom literaturnom tureckom jazyke (= Struktura i istorija tureckikh jazykov. Moskva 1971, pp. 156-164), p. 158.

9 This obviously does not hold for, e.g., Azeri, where the literary language, since the 30's, makes extensive use of the Persian type of 'subordinated' clauses again. This tendency seems to influence the approach of many Azerbaijan Turkologists to the problem in general; cf. Şiralić, op. cit.
these Turkish conjunctions 10. After *ki* the inventory of aspecto-temporal units may be limited, but the restrictions prescribed in R. H. MESKILL's transformational analysis are exaggerated 11. Elements like *eğer* and *şayet* 'if' are followed by conditional forms but are, themselves, facultative and, thus, dispensable for the very subordination.

Peculiarly enough, even in recent attempts at classification this very dubious *Subordinierung nach indogermanischem Muster* is never really questioned as such. N. Z. GADŽIEVA cites as an example (*...*) bankada param *var* fakat *mekvuf* olduğu *için* *alamiyorum* 'I have got money at the bank but I cannot get it out because I am in prison' 12, and Ş. A. SOKOLOV mentions the same sort of connections first of all *skeptische* types in his survey of complex sentences in Turkish 13. But as we have shown, this variety cannot be *subordinatives* in a sense that corresponds tolerably well to the Indo-European concept.

What, then, is left? If we deny that these are genuine Turkic methods of subordination, the matter might seem to be settled once and for all. But to many Turkologists it is perfectly clear that there are grammatically dependent propositions in almost the same sentence-hierarchic sense as there are Indo-European subordinate clauses. To reveal such common characteristics it is, of course, necessary to penetrate the superficial structure and to descend to underlying functional patterns. In the Turkological literature, however, these affinities have been claimed or disclaimed without proper theoretical discussion. Some scholars, like the late K. GRÖNEBACH, recognize gerunds and verbal nomina as nuclei of a real *Satz* but admit that these verbal forms do not make the sentence *vollständig abgeschlossen* 14. According to the general sprogressive structure of the Turkic sentence, such clauses are, in GRÖNEBACH's view, subordinated, since they precede the *sman* clause. No real objections have been presented to this assumption. A. VON GABAIN, e.g., rejects the term *Nebensätze* for *ip* constructions because of their *svagueness* ("wegen ihrer grundsätzlichen Unbestimmtheit") 15), which is, however, a semantic and not a syntactic consideration.

10 Note, however, some restrictions affecting perceptional clauses preceded by *gördü* *ki* 'he saw [that] etc. (Aspekt im Türkischen. Uppsala 1971, pp. 72 sqq.).
15 Charakteristik der Türkischen (= Handbuch der Orientalistik, pp. 3-26), p. 25. Elsewhere, the standing argument is the lack of a finite verb in these dependent propositions. A. V. GABAIN has maintained that gerundial constructions cannot be *Nebensätze* since the gerunds cannot contain any temporal or personal indicators ("Die Natur des Prädikats in den
Besides repeating Grönbech’s typological argument, based on the well-known srectum-regens rule of Turkic syntax, N. Z. Gadžieva even claims to demonstrate that the exact criteria wanted for the synchronic classification of Gliedsätze can be furnished by historical facts 16. Whereas many Soviet Turkologists regard most types of complex sentences as developed from inside by expansion of the constituents of the simple sentence, Gadžieva’s point is that one of the main courses of development of the Turkic complex sentence has been the combination of autonomous sentences (daß einer der grundlegenden und für den Bau der Türkischen sprachen charakteristischen Entwicklungswegen der Satzgefüge nicht über ihre Entfaltung von innen her, sondern über die Verbindung zweier ursprünglich selbständiger Sätze verlief) 17. Yet, this ‘transformation of autonomous sentences’ is, of course, impossible to prove as a historical fact. Gadžieva herself admits that it dates back to hoary antiquity (die abhängigen Transorme, die aus Kontamination selbständiger Sätze resultieren, datieren aus dem tiefen Altertums) 18. As for the other type of complex sentence, viz. the kind resulting from the alleged endogene expansions of adverbial constituents of the simple sentence, E. V. Sevortjan handles this type, too—with much of the same astonishing certainty—in terms of historical development 19. How could we, however, with Sevortjan, speak about a gradual development of this type from simple gerundial constructions, if we meet it fully developed already in the oldest Turkic texts (e.g., Orchon üzü kūk täyri asra yarîz yîr qîlîn̄tuqda ikin ara kišî oylî qîlîn̄miš ‘when the blue sky above and the brown earth below were created; the human beings were created between them’)?

Allegedly historical arguments of that kind are not likely to solve the problems of classification. But, if we agree to the designation constituent clauses (Gliedsatz) 20 for syntactically dependent propositions—i.e. for nominalizations, gerundial and participial phrases etc.—in Turkic languages, we must certainly know in what sense we use the word. Do these clauses replace anything, and if so, what? If they expand anything, then what do they expand? Every evolutionary definition of the type mentioned becomes preposterous in view of the sometimes very extensive catenations of gerundial phrases which hardly have any ‘unexpanded’ counterparts.

Türksprachen, KCaA 3.84-94). In Soviet Turkology, N. Z. Gadžieva, E. V. Sevortjan and others have successfully proved such arguments to be irrelevant.


20 See the survey presented by N. Z. Gadžieva: op. cit., p. 69, including foot-notes 1-3 (partially identical with the survey in Voprosy grammatiki ..., pp. 91 sqq.). — Cf. N. A. Basakov’s treatment of Qaraqalpaq material in Predloženija s razvennym slenami v karakalpaskom jazyke (= Issledovanija po sravnitel’noj grammatike ..., pp. 111-121).
in the simple sentence. But from a purely descriptive point of view we might, of course, claim that the clauses in question are constituents, or say, with the generativists—and still not pretend any diachronic process—that they are representations of constituents in a more abstract sense. There may be other criteria for subordination of propositions. This is not the right place for a critical evaluation of them or for a survey of the types of complex sentences in Turkic languages. Suffice it to say that if the internal syntactic (surface) structure of propositions is chosen as the ground for this classification, the result will obviously be highly heterogeneous and confusing because of their many different shapes. If the criterion is dependence in the sense that a proposition refers to some element in a neighboring proposition and is not felt to be incomplete without this referential supplement, even propositions beyond the sentence limits—propositions containing anaphoric pronouns, adverbs etc.—will have to be included in the class of grammatically dependent propositions. It should also be emphasized that the syntactic function of the proposition as a whole is not an unproblematic criterion. We might state if one of two connected propositions is dependent upon the other in the sense that it modifies it distributionally, i.e. that the clause fulfills the syntactic function of the whole complex. But how to classify, then, the propositions contained in such complexes as istedid ğim, gelmesi ‘what I want is that he come’, let alone in ‘asynthetic’ types, where there is no grammatical dependence of the kind between the propositions (ne yaptın da polis seni arıyor? ‘what did you commit to be wanted by the police?’, nası kurtuldum, bilmiyor ‘how I was saved, I don’t know’) ? The constituent clause criteria obviously do not hold for the latter type, either, and they also leave certain kinds of ki- introduced propositions (as, e.g., the plot-advancing type, see below) and some cases of formal dependence through suffix deletions (ölmüş gitmiştir → ölmüş ve gitmiştir) unexplained. In other words: one simple over-all dichotomy such as hypotaxis vs. parataxis is not likely to solve the important descriptive problems involved in the matter of the devices for connecting proposition in Turkic. Methods must be elaborated which take into account other types of composition and admit a functional and stylistical comparison between them. But once we have chosen—as is the case in all of the recent classificatory attempts—to draw the main boundary-line between subordinations and coordinations of propositions, we must certainly apply the grammatical criteria consistently and not allow translations into other languages to decide the classification. In any case it must be stated in detail on what conditions propositions can be connected grammatically in such a manner that the result could be called, say, a hypotactic relationship. After all sweeping descriptions and inaccurate definitions, Turkic syntax finally calls for faithful, unbiased analysis.

While most aspects of this complex of problems must be left out of account here, attention will be focused for a while on one very widespread prejudice.

22 Sokolov, op. cit., p. 158, n. 3.
as far as certain types of nominalizations are concerned. As for the independent transforms, viz. adjectivized or substantivized clauses in Turkic, N. Z. Gadjiev claims that these do not rank equally with Indo-European subordinate clauses: »Man kann sie nicht gleichsetzen mit den vollwertigen (sic) Nebensätzen des indo-germanischen Typs /.../«. What, then, makes a subordinate clause svollwertigs? The subordination of one proposition to another does not proceed without considerable modifications of the surface shape in Indo-European languages either. In most cases the syntactically dependent Turkic proposition is very close to the shape of a simple sentence, the only transformation necessary being the infinitization of the predicate. Much of the confusion regarding the nature of certain clauses seems to originate in a misinterpretation of the specifically Turkic way of nominalizing propositions. Some examples from Turkish—by far the most Westernized Turkic language—will show certain basic differences between Turkic and standard Indo-European nominalization of propositions:

1. Grammarians of Western origin tend to equate nominalizations like adamin geldiğii with, say, the man’s arrival or das Kommen des Mannes. The first difference is, of course, that the diğii nominalization is applicable to every verb, whereas, at least in the English case, the devices for nominalization are limited and less systematic.

2. In Indo-European languages, e.g., German and English, nominalizations of propositions demand greater sacrifices as to tense-signals than they do in Turkic. Whereas Gekommen sein or Kommen werden are stilted, pedantic forms, -diği, -ceşiği, -miş olduğu etc., form a perfectly living paradigm. Aspectual distinctions are, however, normally given up in Turkish, too.

3. Genera verbi are marked in Turkish nominalizations. Thus, ambiguity as to subjective or objective interpretation (amor Dei, die Beanstandung des Kunden, the shooting of the hunters, etc.) is, in principle, eliminated—to mention just one result. Besides, the choice between such nominalizers as -diğii, -meşi and -işii allows for modifications of content which cannot be expressed so systematically in Indo-European languages.

4. The predicative core of the proposition preserves its section even if it is a transitive verb. Whereas *the capture of the police the thief or *die Festnahme der Polizei den Dieb are impossible as nominalizations of the police captured the thief and die Polizei nahm den Dieb fest, there are no such restrictions in Turkish: polis hırsız yakaladı → polisin hırsızı yakaladığı.

5. All the facts mentioned are, of course, well-known—though not explicitly stated in current grammars of Turkish or other Turkic languages. Could they simply be dismissed by quasi-explanations such as that there is more ‘verbal power’ preserved in the Turkic nominalizations? The decisive point is that there are clear surface indications of these nominalizations being operations with the whole proposition and not merely with verbs (though the predicative cores are technically more affected than other elements of the proposition). There is a sharp difference in syntactic behavior between verbal nuclei of nominalized propositions and nouns like hareket

24 This formulation does not mean that the present writer agrees with the generativists’ view that grammatically dependent propositions are, in some sense, derived from underlying propositions which have the shape of finite sentences.
'departure', seyahat 'journey' or konuşma 'talk', which are nomina actionis lacking predicative potency in the surface structure. Modifiers of the latter may or must take an adnominal form (bugünki hareket 'today's departure', Ankara'ya yapılan seyahat 'the journey to Ankara' or bakan ile vakti konuşma 'the talk with the minister'), while no such adaptation is necessary or possible for the modifiers of the former (cf. bugün Ankara'ya trenle gittim and bugün Ankara'ya trenle gittiğim 'my going to Ankara to-day by train'). When K. Grönbech states that the Turkic verb may take nominal shape, $\overline{\text{sum}}$ dann mit allem, was davorsteht, als ein Nomen weiter behandelt zu werden, it would seem important to add that the preceding elements (was davorsteht) are not treated like normal adnominal qualifiers.

Even, if both kinds of nominal expressions might be taken to represent propositions in a more abstract sense at some deeper level—a possibility which will not be discussed here—there is certainly—as far as surface and next-to-surface syntax is concerned—a great gulf fixed between the two kinds of nominalization, and we must oppose every linguistic doctrine which obscures or obliterates it. From a semantic point of view, there is no evidence that Turkic nominalized propositions really bear the weight of abstractness laid to their charge by Westerners. The alleged nominal character of Turkic linguistic structure is, quite generally, a highly questionable postulate. It will not be discussed here, but we must finally, in the light of the points considered above, ask why a segment like Başkanın bugün öldürüldüğü 'the President's being killed to-day'—which differs essentially from the normal type of Indo-European nominalizations and exhibits none of the distortions, e.g., as to word order, that Indo-European clauses generally undergo in subordinate position—should really be below standard for a 'Nebensatz'.

In the literature on Turkic complex sentences, such terms as hypotaxis and subordination are still used in a non-syntactic sense.

For every connection a connective medium is necessary. Much of the so-called asyndetic types are, in reality, connected by supra-segmental features, mainly intonation. Mere enumerative intonation, however, does not signal grammatical subordination. Just as English get some sleep, you'll be fine!, a Turkish sentence like çay iç, açılır mı may correspond, intentionally, to a conditional period (if you get some sleep, you'll be fine; çay içersen, açılır mı) but it certainly isn't none. Such sentences can be, admittedly, complex—but without any specified, explicit relation signaled. N. A. Bas-

26 Cf. the comments in Orientalia Suecana 27, pp. 177 sq. and in Aspekt im Türkischen, p. 17.
27 Tjurskie jazyki (Obačie svedenija i tipologičeskaja charakteristika) (= Jazyki narodov SSSR 2, Moskva 1966, pp. 7-42). Cf. Kononov, A. N., O složnopodčinennom bessojuznom predloženii v tureckom jazyke (= Kratkije svedenija Instituta Vostokovedeniya AN SSSR 22, 1956, pp. 13-18) and the chapter Asyndetic Subordinations in Lewis, G. L., Turkish Grammar, Oxford 1967, pp. 274 sq. There are, of course, several types of asyndetics subordination, if
nections where the clauses die Rolle eines Haupt- und Gliedsatzes einnehmen, e.g., Azeri at oleh, mäydan ýalar, iyid ÿlar, ad-san ýalar (‘Stirbt ein Pferd, bleibt eine leere Stelle. Stirbt ein Kunstreiter, bleibt Ruhm’) and Turkmen hemmäsi geçer, diye haqiqat ýalar (‘Alles vergeht, allein die Wahrheit wird bleiben.’) 28. There are not the slightest vestiges of subordination in these examples, and it goes without saying that it is meaningless to speak of complex sentences in which the hypotaxis is expressed only logically (zusammengesetzte Sätze, in denen die Hypotaxe nur logisch ausgedrückt wird) 29. There are no expressions of merely logical nature, and there is no constant correlation between grammatical subordination and logical subordinations, whatever may be understood by that term. We might speak—in accordance with the discussion of linearity below—of an asyndeton enumerativum, but certainly not of an asyndeton explicativum, causale, conclusivum and so forth. Where no formal signal exists, such shades of meaning are left to contextual interpretation.

When N. Z. GADŽIEVA, in her afore-mentioned contribution, obviously equates attribution with logical subordinations (Jeder abhängige Gedanke wird als ein entfaltetes Attribut gewertet) 30, she seems to confuse—to use H. SEILER’s excellent terminology—the relation satellites vs. nucleus with the relation selectores vs. classis. N. A. BASKAKOV denies that expanded constituents of Turkic sentences are really clauses but admits that they may correspond logically to subordinate clauses. This is a doubtful statement. The two types of propositions in question do correspond to each other distributionally, i.e. sentence-hierarchically, but they have no constant semantic property in common that could be used for the purpose of characterizing them linguistically. Even É. V. SEVORTJAN, however, fails to repudiate the traditional view that subordinate clauses express auxiliary ideas and claims to demonstrate—by stating that äz. gördüm ki kayizi itirmişm ‘I saw that I had lost the paper’ could not be rendered as gördüm vâ kayizi itirmişm—that the contents of main and subordinate clauses belong, in principle, to different strata (πλοκοστίκα). Numerous counter-examples could, no doubt, be cited against the general validity of this hypothesis. Moreover, the impossibility of inserting the conjunction vâ ‘and’ between the propositions does not necessarily prove the logical inequality of the statements expressed. Note, incidentally, that if there were any general syllogics restriction operative against a grammatically coordinate ‘and’ in this environment, the Modern Greek version έιδα καὶ

this term is taken to cover cases with no conjunctions or with no visible subordinating links (LEWIS, op. cit., p. 274). The hypotactic constructions which S. KARUK treats in ‘Constructions hypotactiques dans le dialecte Ture de la Bulgarie Occidentale (= Acta Orient. Hung. 11, pp. 249–257) are almost exclusively of this sasyndetico type, for the treatment of which the vague traditional hypotaxis concepts prove poor criteria.

33 See op. cit., pp. 121 and 125, including n. 2. Notice that ki may be omitted and the two propositions juxtaposed (non-hypotactically) without any discernible change in meaning.
elixa xασει το χαρτί (lit. 'I saw and I had lost the paper') could hardly be explained.

We certainly are well advised to avoid a terminology which would force us into extreme and confusing assertions about the existence of 'Nebensätze' mit Hauptsatz- und 'Hauptsätze' mit Nebensatzwerte, etc. There seems to be little difference in the logical structure between sequences like ich komme nicht, weil ich arbeite muss; ich komme nicht, denn ich muss arbeiten; ich komme nicht, ich muss nämlich arbeiten and ich komme nicht — ich muss arbeiten; yet, the sequences display quite different types of formal structure. S. A. Sokolov, who frankly declares his intention of enriching the formal classification with a semantic one, admits, on these grounds, the existence of complex sentences on the border-line between subjunctive and coordination. The results are not convincing. Why should the relationship between the propositions of the sentence bu kitap yüz sayfa olup fiyat iki liradir be classified as a paratactic one? There is no other evident reason for this than the non-hypotactic structure of the Russian translation itself: В этой книге 100 страниц, ею цена 2 лиры. Mixed criteria lead to chaos.

The connective devices very often add a certain idea to their connecting function, i.e. some kind of explicit relation between the conjuncts. It would seem perfectly feasible to treat these surface signals semantically, using a paradigmatic technique. This question will be discussed in greater detail in forthcoming articles. Here we will turn to connectors without—or with rather vague—additional relational ideas. These elements of a more purely connective nature are, indeed, sources of considerable misinterpretation. As we have seen, the subordinate character of -ip clauses has been questioned because of the vague relational content of -ip.

Two propositions can be put into such a mutual relationship that, semantically, one of them modifies or forms some kind of background to the other: their contents are not on a par with each other. This is perhaps what H. J. Kissling has in mind when he asserts that -erek does not describe an event (Geschehen) but a timeless situation (zeitlos zu denkende Situation), indispensable for the comprehension of the following verb. Öğreterek öğreniyoruz 'docendo discimus' would be a proper example. Nevertheless, it is important for the understanding of connectors like -erek to realize that two propositions can be on a par with each other—e.g., be presented as thematic 'foregrounds'—and still be leashed together by some kind of relation, instrumental, causal or the like. So, it would be possible to interpret our example as communicating two pieces of information, additionally

---

34 See, e.g., Τζάρτζανος, Α. Α., Νεοελληνική Σύνταξη (της Κουτσή Δημοτικής) 2, εν 'Αθήναις, 1963, p. 19.
37 Cf. Aspekt im Türkischen, esp. pp. 23 sqq.
38 See the aforementioned articles by V. GABAIN (Handb. d. Orient., p. 25) and SOKOLOV (op. cit., p. 164).
39 ZDMG 111, pp. 202 sqq.
connected by an instrumental tie, i.e. something like ‘We teach and thereby we learn’, or as with the technique of the coniunctio relativa: ‘We teach. Whereby we learn’. Grammatically, -erek is, no doubt, subordinative. Semantically, its use might invite all—or, at least, the first two—of the following interpretations:

1. One proposition, qualified by another (‘by’)
2. Two parallel propositions, connected relationally (‘and there-by’)
3. Two connected parallel propositions (‘and’)

A corresponding exegesis for -ip might include (1) ‘after’, (2) ‘and there-after’ and (3) ‘and’. As we will see, it is, however, possible to formulate the definitions of -ip and -erek more accurately.

Even, if it may be true that a given subordinative connector has been used—historically seen—exclusively or predominantly for the kinds of qualification stated under the heading (1), it may eventually have taken over the tasks of the remaining headings, too. It is generally agreed that -ip can fulfill the purely enumerative task under (3). It would seem that this holds also for a number of other connectors, e.g., -en and -diği[i], which, in addition to the semantic value signaled by their syntactic position, express no constant relation but are often rather devices of a stylistic order to loom propositions in a text together without the embarrassing monotony of an entirely coordinative technique. The ambition of making enumeration of seventies stylistically tolerable is certainly a very common reason for grammatical subordination. There is not necessarily a semantic difference involved. Thus, Sokolov’s example Cihan harbinden ewel Eregi havzası komürleri Türkiye’nin dahili ithalatını temin ettiği gibi, sahillerine gelen eenebi gemilerine de kómür verilirdi does not exhibit any grammatically paratactic use of -diği gibi but could rather be interpreted as containing two logically equal propositions, connected hypothetically and, consequently, translatable into Russian as Sokolov renders them: »До мировой войны угол Эрэглийского бассейна шел на удовлетворение внутренних потребностей страны, а также (этот угол) использовался для снабжения иностранных судов, подходивших к берегам Турции« 40. Here, the meaning of -diği gibi is a faint ‘and likewise’ or ‘and [also]’, thus a case under the headings (2) or (3).

Turning now to relative clauses, we must state first that these can be ‘satellites’ in H. Seiler’s sense and thereby play a truly attributive roll 41. There is a clear tendency for ki-introduced propositions to be avoided more in this restrictive use in modern Turkish. (E.g., bakanci ki onu gördüm would certainly be a very clumsy translation to-day of ‘the minister I saw’).

In principle, there are at least two ways of interpreting appositive or non-restrictive clauses: as parenthetical insertions or as pure enumeration. Thus, three possibilities of interpreting a sentence like Ahmed’е mektup yazan adam, geleceğini bildirdi are offered:

41 In works of the generativist schools it is generally assumed that nonrerestrictive relative clauses in English must be derived from underlying «conjunctions. See THOMPSON, S. A.: The Deep Structure of Relative Clauses (= Studies in Linguistic Semantics, ed. by C. J. Fillmore and D. T. Langendoen. New York 1971, pp. 78-94), where arguments are advanced for an analogous analysis for restrictive clauses, too.
(1) The man who wrote to Ahmet has announced his arrival

(2) The man—[incidentally,] he [once] wrote to Ahmet—has announced his arrival

(3) The man has written to Ahmet and announced his arrival

These theoretically possible interpretations depend, of course, upon the contextual-situational conditions. In case (1), the subordinate clause functions as a satellite of the nucleus, which is represented by the head. In the cases (2) and (3), the subordinate constituent and the head, together, produce two parallel pieces of information, offered, maybe for stylistic reasons, in a hypotactic form. One example of this appositive type: Moskova'ya gidiceğini açıklayan bakan, çeşitli konuların görüşüleceğini ifade etmiştir 'The Minister, announcing he was going to Moscow, declared that various topics would be discussed'. As the relative clause does not specify the minister (among other ministers), its function is a purely appositive, or, more exactly stated, enumerative one, logically equivalent to Bakan, Moskova'ya gidiceğini açıklaması, çeşitli konuların görüşüleceğini ifade etmiştir (which is just a case of suffix deletion, i.e.Suffixabwurf, in H. J. Kissling's terminology) 42, to ... açıklıyorak ... ifade etmiştir or to some paratactic construction like ... açıkladı ve ... ifade etti. This is pure enumeration, clothed in different grammatical garbs.

One of the tasks of descriptive Turkology should be to determine if there are overt signals distinguishing the appositive from the attributive type, maybe an opposition of suprasegmental features as in /konuşan bakan/ 'the minister who spoke' (1) vs. /konuşan bakan/ 'the minister who [incidentally; also] spoke' (2-3), i.e. a matter of stress and juncture type.

In Aspekt im Türkischen a theory about the semantic differences between -erek and -ip (even, in a sense, as a parallel to the opposition -iyordu: -idi) was outlined 43. It was suggested that -erek, much like -iyordu, explicitly eliminates the effect of sucessionions, intimated by -ip and -idi, when it occurs in relevance position. This does not mean, of course, that there cannot be a time interval between the actions expressed by the -erek verb and the verb of the head. There are, as we have mentioned, cases where -erek seems to express an extremely vague relational idea, often translatable by 'and'. Mostly, it is possible to interpret this enumerative task as enriched by an additional nuance, which, in the monograph, was rendered as «instrument», «motivation» etc. Thus, the semantic difference between -ip and -erek is, potentially, deeper than, for instance, the following pair of sentences might suggest: Yarın Berlin'e giderek bir seminere katılıyım 'To-morrow I am going to Berlin where I will take part in a seminar' and Yarın Berlin'e gidip bir seminere katılıyım 'To-morrow I will go to Berlin and take part in a seminar'.

As has been stated by G. L. Lewis, the content of the unit -ip often seems to correspond to an 'and' relation 44. Now neither asyndetic enumeration nor enumeration by means of ve etc. signals explicitly an order relation between the events expressed by the propositions. As a consequence of the

43 Pp. 68 sq. and 261.
»linear successivity», however, an order may be implicated tacitly. This implicational order relation certainly does not hold for -ip. It would seem that -ip signals, explicitly, an order relation of a specific orientation. This irrevocative ‘and’ relation may—but does not necessarily have to—imply order in time. The assumption here is opposite to A. von Gabain’s assertion: »Nicht durch eine Funktion der Form, sondern nur durch den Gebrauch ist es dazu gekommen, daß das Konverb auf -p ~ -b meist eine Handlung ausdrückt, die kurz vor der des nächsten Verbs stattfand«. This seems as groundless as the contrary definition of -ip as ‘after’ in, e.g., R. H. Meskell’s analysis of Turkish syntax. The fact that -ip signals a unidirectional ‘and’ relation is demonstrated by the following instances of devrik ciimle, where the subordinated clauses are put after their heads: Sizinkileri görürüm şimdi gidip ‘I go now to see your family’ (= giderim ve görürüm) and ... kizıl yapraklar ve kavruk dallar düşerlerdi kopup ‘... the red leaves and the parched branches broke off and fell down’ (= koparlardı ve düşerlerdi). The unidirectionality is to be considered as a linguistic value of the ‘and’ relation expressed by -ip. By virtue of this value, the relation may be interpreted as a chronological one. As for the coordinative counterpart ... ve ..., its conjuncts are, however, subject to the natural rules of linear successivity.

The principle of linear successivity, which is free to operate unless any order relation is signaled, suggests that the linear succession of propositions parallels the order of the events thereby described. It is commonly ignored that this has ample consequences for the overt word order characteristic of Turkic structure. The relative embeddings of the common type ... dişen adam ... öldü ‘the man who fell ..., died ...’ (where no counteractive idea is signaled) easily lend themselves to interpretation according to this principle. Now, prepositive Turkic relative clauses normally correspond to Indo-European postpositive clauses, and it is generally believed that the left-branching embeddings are more or less functionally equivalent to the right-branching ones. This is not entirely the case. There are, due to the principle of linear successivity, important restrictions operative as regards the left-branching clauses of the Turkic type, whether restrictive or not. They do not—unless, of course, by explicit means—represent events posterior to the event of the head proposition. Since speech proceeds—sit ventia verbo—from the left to the right, left-branching embeddings are not plot-advancing.

We cannot say, for instance, *bir otele indiţi bir kasabaya geldiim to render the English sentence I came to a town, where I put up at an hotel. We want the proposition ‘I put up ...’ to advance the ‘plot’, which is not possible by means of indiţi. There are, naturally, other devices at our disposal. If we recall that many of the subordinative techniques are used to preclude repetition of a monotonous connective pattern, we realize that quite different types of connectors may be used to correspond roughly to

\[45\] See Aspekt im Türkischen, pp. 241 sq.
\[46\] Handb. der Orient., p. 25.
\[48\] The examples are from SELİM İLERİ : Cumartesi Yalnızlığı. İstanbul 1968.
the type represented by *where* in English. To render the sentences *I stayed one day in Vienna, where I had a talk with the professor or the minister made a statement in which he said that the government would take new measures* we might resort to -er* ek constructions like *Viyana'da bir gün kalarak profesör ile bir görüşme yaptım and bakan bir beyanat vererek hükümetin yeni tedbirler alacağına söylemiştir.* Whereas, in the English versions, we find two logically equal propositions attached to each other in a formally subordinative construction, the Turkish versions, which are subordinative, too, suggest an additional shade (of instrumentality, causality, inference etc.) beyond mere enumeration, i.e. the content of one proposition qualifies or specifies the content of the other. Still, the two types cover each other reasonably well as translation-equivalents, i.e. from a pragmatic point of view. If the relationship between the contents of two propositions is rather loose and seems comparatively unessential, there are certainly relatively many ways of connecting them technically. But in the case of the linear successivity there are no margins and no room for compromises. It is a strong factor which necessitates reorganization on the surface where the overt order of elements is not in accordance with the order of events.

Thus, to maintain a *relatives* construction, Turkish must resort to Indo-European *ki*-introduced patterns. Since this type is right-branching, it is perfectly possible to say *bir kasabayı geldim ki orada bir otelde indim* 'I came to a town; there I put up at an hotel'. This type has, then, quite different structural properties. Not every *ki*-clause is plot-advancing, but it can be, while left-branching constructions cannot. So, to translate the French *Nous avons rendu visite à un ami de mon oncle chez qui nous avons vu des peintures merveilleuses* we might choose, with B. Öngel, the version *Amcaman bir ahabbım ziyarete gittik ki evinde fevkalade resimler gördük* 49. If, with this type, we want to prevent the 'plot' from advancing, we must even use an intraterminal aspect form, e.g., *iyordu: Il a paru à cette date une contre-facon de ce livre, laquelle contenait plus de détails que l’œuvre originale = O tarihte o kitabin bir sahlesi yayında ki bu sahte nüsha eser ciz sanara daha fazla tafsîlîn ihtiva ediyordu* 50. Here we meet with an aspect competition which is suspended in relative clauses of the left-branching type (but may be substituted for by makeshift specifications like *mekte olan, mekte olduğu, etc.*).

As was shown above, the status of the *ki*-introduced propositions is problematic. In many cases, it was suggested, this nondescript proposition type is comparable to the *conjectio relativa*. The grammars do not offer analyses of it but at least various comments on the word *ki*. G. L. Lewis asserts: *Grammatically, however, *ki* is purely a conjunction* and adds: *This is not a pedantic question of nomenclature but is of practical importance in translation, particularly of sentences like the following: *kiraz yedim* I ate the cherry, *ki şeker gibi, not which was like sugar* but *and found it was like sugar* 51. If *ki* is really a *conjunction*, then certainly it is not

49 Türkçe Kargülüklariyle Birlikte Fransızc'a Cümle Kuruluşu. İstanbul 1966, p. 72.
50 Ibidem, p. 77.
in a sense o p p o s i t e to a »relative word«. H. J. Kissing, however, draws a sharp dividing-line between the »conjunction kis« and the »relative pronoun kis«. It would seem, instead, that the word kis fulfills the general connective tasks common to »conjunctions« and »relatives« and that a further differentiation in traditional terms is impossible. How it acts its parts in different environments is a matter for investigation, particularly interesting because it forces us to transgress the conventional »sentence« concept and take up questions of propositional connections at a higher level. Whatever the level may be, the problems cursorily sketched out here call for patient description and should not be concealed by superficial classification and preconceived nomenclature.

52 Osmanisch-türkische Grammatik, pp. 215 sqq. and 145.
53 Cf. the short discussion in Aspekt im Türkischen, pp. 40 and 248 sqq. Aspect is one of the linguistic features that cannot be explained adequately at the sentence level only.
54 Since this article was written, in late 1971, several important contributions to the subject have been published, e.g. Gadžieva, N. Z.: Osnovnye puti razvitija sintaksičeskoi struktury tjurkiskih jazykov, Moskva 1973, and Ajlarov, S. S.: Razvurnutye členy predloženija v sovremennom tureckom jazyke, Moskva 1974.