

LEARNING PROBLEMS WITH -DİK AND -YEN

by
Glen Garner

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Masters of Arts in Linguistics

Bogazici University Library



39001100317562

14

Temel Bilimler
Dil ve Ebediyat

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi

1981

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend special thanks to
Dr. Doçent Hikmet Sebüktekin and Dr. Eser Ergüvanlı,
who supplied advice and guidance in the preparation
of this paper.

Abstract

The paper begins with a description of relative clause formation in Turkish and English. Possible rules governing the Turkish forms are then discussed with special attention to formations that seem unexplained by the rules. An analysis is then done on these exceptions.

Finally the remaining undiscussed examples are analyzed on the basis of the preceding discussion.

The final section consists of possible approaches to teaching these problems to English speaking students learning Turkish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	II
Abstract	III
Abbreviations	V
Introduction	1
Description of Relative Clause Formation	4
Relative Clause Formation in Turkish	8
Function of Word Order	11
Twin Use of Np and Sp	13
Final analysis of the Twin Use of Np and Sp	22
Analysis of Initial Examples	27
Two Other Noteworthy Examples	38
Evaluation	40
Teaching Approaches	41
Bibliography	45

ABBREVIATIONS

1st	-----	first person
2nd	-----	second person
3rd	-----	third person
abil	-----	abiliate
acc	-----	accusative
caus	-----	causative
cont	-----	continuous
dat	-----	dative
gen	-----	genitive
loc	-----	locative
neg	-----	negative
nom	-----	nominative
part	-----	participle
pass	-----	passive
plu	-----	plural
poss	-----	possessive
sing	-----	singular
V	-----	verb

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a study in contrastive linguistics with a special view to learning problems associated with the elements of grammar under examination. The particular elements of Turkish grammar chosen for study are related to learning problems encountered by the author while learning Turkish.

The elements of Turkish structure under discussion here are related to the formation, of what in English are called relative clauses. That is, the transformation of a sentence like; "The man went to the bank", to clauses like; "The man who went to the bank..." or "The bank that the man went to...". Turkish, as would be expected, has a means of expressing this same semantic change with a different linguistic mechanism. While English makes use of the introduction of pronouns like who, that, and which plus changes in word order, Turkish in keeping with its general linguistic character relies mostly on morphological changes. This is accomplished through the use of two participle morphemes -dik and -y n. It is the use of these two in the formation of relative clauses that will be under discussion in this paper.

The following discussion is not an attempt to put the data into an existing theoretical framework nor to provide a theoretical linguistic analysis. The analysis is done to uncover the reasons for perceived learning problems and finally to give some insight into possible teaching approaches.

The data was collected by regular reading of newspapers, periodicals, and books. Sentences containing the desired learning problems were extracted and finally grouped according to morphological

pattern. These groupings with a representative example are listed below. Each one represents dozens of other such examples and therefore a particular sentence pattern in Turkish. Each will be examined in turn and discussed both in terms of the final results of the analysis and in terms of each other.

A) noun + poss V + pass + -dik V + -yên

Bacağ-ı kes-il-diğ-i açıkla-n-an Tito....
 leg/poss cut/pass/part/poss announce/pass/part Tito
 Tito whose leg was announced as being amputated....

B) V + nom + poss V + pass + -yên

O-nun-la gel-me-si kararlaş-tır-il-an
 he/gen/with come/nom/poss decision/caus/pass/part
 fotoğrafçı....
 photopgrapher

The photographer of whom it was decided he would come with him/her....

C) V + -dik noun

Tehlike-yi atla-t-tığ-ı görüş-ü ağır
 danger/acc jump/caus/part/poss view/poss heavy
 bas-ıyor.
 prevail/cont-3rd sing

The view that he has avoided the danger is prevailing.

D) V + pass + nom + poss V + pass + -dik pass verb

Dur-ul-ma-sı bekle-n-diğ-i ön-e
 stop/pass/nom/poss wait/pass/part/poss front/dat
 sür-ül-üyor
 push/pass)cont

It is being claimed that its cessation is expected.

E) noun pass ... olmak -yen

Gece hayat-ı ol-ma-yan şehir....
 night life/poss be/neg/part city

The city without night life....

Gece hayat-ı-nın ol-ma-dığı-ı şehir
 night life/poss/gen be/neg/part/poss city

the city without night life....

F) noun acc V -dik....

Tabancı-sı-nı al-dık-lar-ı adam-ı
 pistol/poss/acc take/part/poss 3rd plu man/acc

döv-dü-ler

beat/past/3rd plu

They beat the man from whom they took the pistol.

G) V -yen V -dik tense marker

Bil-in-en sadece tüm Alevi köy-ler-i-nin
 know/pass/part simply all Shiite village/plu/poss/gen

savun-ma durum-un-da ol-duk-lar-ı-ydı
 defend/nom situation/poss/loc be/part/plur/poss/past

What was known was simply that the Shiite villages were
 in a defensive situation.

H) V pass -dik headnoun

Balkan şampiyona-sın-da geç-il-diğ-im
 Balkan championship/poss/loc pass/pass/part/poss 1st sing

Kuzis-ten bir al-acağ-ım var
 Kuzis/from one take/future/poss 1st sing there is

I have a debt to collect from Kuzis whom I passed by in
 the Balkan championship.

I) V -dik ler

Söyle-dik-ler-in-i unut-tu
 say/part/plural/poss 1st sing/acc forget/past

He forgot the things I said.

A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RELATIVE CLAUSE FORMATION

A quick glance at the Turkish items under examination is enough to see that one particular type of grammatical construction is dominant. That is the construction referred to in English as relative clauses. Although, it will be evident in this paper that formation of this type of clause in Turkish differs a great deal from the English, the terms "relative clause" will be used in this paper for the sake of convenience.

Just what is meant by the term relative clause in English? It is formed in the following manner; a complete sentence such as "The man went to the bank", becomes the base for the formation of a nominal clause in another sentence. This clause, (perhaps, "The man who went to the bank....") then functions as a subject or non-subject nominal. Now what is necessary in any language is a system of linguistic cues which inform the reader or listener of the presence of this type of clause and its relationship to other parts of the sentence. The information communicated is the same, however different languages use different cues to provide this critical information. Many avenues of doing this are available within the scope of human language, the important point being that the cues do communicate clearly the relationships between different elements of a particular language pattern.

English employs a syntactical cue system by making use of a group of words called relative pronouns. In the example stated above, if "man" were to be targeted as the head noun of the relative clause "who" then would be chosen as the relative pronoun. In the example below our example sentence has become the subject of sentence 2;

- 1) The man went to the bank.
- 2) The man who went to the bank is my father.

Notice that there is a word order restriction in this cue system also. The relative pronoun, in this case "who", immediately follows the noun that was chosen as the head noun. Further rules which govern agreement between the chosen head noun and the relative pronoun also are a part of this cue system for English relative clauses. For example, the choice of "bank" as the head noun in sentence 1 necessitates the use of "that" or "which" as the relative pronoun.

- 3) The bank (that) the man went to was big.
(which)

Again the relative pronoun immediately follows the noun chosen as the head noun.

Turkish, as would be expected, makes use of different linguistic cues to mark this relative clause type relationship. Below are some examples representing Turkish relative clauses derived from base sentence 4.

- 4) Adam banka-ya git-ti
man bank/dat go/past 3rd sing

The man went to the bank.

Choosing "adam" as the head noun produces example 5.

- 5) Banka-ya gid-en adam baba-m
bank/dat go/part man father/poss 1st sing

The man who went to the bank is my father.

If "banka" is chosen as the head noun example 6 results.

- 6) Adam-ın git-tiğ-i banka büyük-tü
man/gen go/part/poss 3rd sing bank big/past 3rd sing

The bank that the man went to was big.

It can be quickly seen that Turkish uses a morphologically based

The use of -yen in this respect is not wholly limited to relative clause construction. It also produces nouns like "bakan"¹ (minister) from the verbal elements. It, however, has no other role in Turkish. Clause formation with -yen is limited to relative clauses.

¹ From "bakmak", to look after.

RELATIVE CLAUSE FORMATION IN TURKISH

A discussion of relative clause formation in Turkish is not virgin ground. Various articles have been written by Robert Underhill¹, Jorge Hankamer with Laura Knecht², and Müşerrefi Dede³. Each in turn have tried to provide a complete linguistic description governing the use of -yen and -dik in relative clause formation. In general Hankamer and Knecht⁴ are most successful in describing the variations in use of these two morphemes. The general usage can be summarized as follows; head nouns that were a part of the subject of the base sentence form relative clauses with -yen, the subject participle (Sp throughout this paper). Those nouns not a part of the subject of the base sentence form relative clauses with -dik, the non-subject (Np throughout this paper). To illustrate note that "Adam" in sentence 4 is the subject of the sentence. This is the root sentence of the relative clause in sentence 5. Therefore "Adam" forms a relative clause with Sp. In 6, however, since "banka" was not a part of the subject of 4 it forms with Np. This rule is sufficient to deal with most forms that are encountered in Turkish.

¹ Underhill, Robert, "Turkish Participles," Linguistic Inquiry, Vol. III, winter 1972, p. 87.

² Hankamer, Jorge and Knecht, Laura, "The role of Subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of Relative Clause Participle in Turkish," Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 2, 1976, p. 179.

³ Dede, Müşerref, "Why should Turkish relativization distinguish between subject and non-subject head nouns?," Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, BLS Vol. 4, February 1978, pp. 67-77.

⁴ Hankamer, Jorge and Knecht, Laura, *Ibid* of 2.

However, the description does not take into account cases where the same head noun of a sentence seems to form clauses with both Np and Sp.

- 10) Yangın çık-an uçak-ta kimse yok-tu
 fire breakout/part plane/loc person neg/past
 3rd sing

There was no one on the plane in which a fire broke out.

- 11) Yangın-ın çık-tiğ-i uçak-ta kimse yok-tu
 fire/gen breakout/part plane/loc person neg/past
 3rd sing

There was no one on the plane in which the fire broke out.

- 12) Üst-ün-de şarap dur-an masa....
 top/poss/3rd sing/loc wine remain/part table

The table with wine on it....

- 13) Üst-ün-de şarab-ın dur-duğ-u masa....
 top/poss/3rd sing/loc wine/gen remain/part/ table
 poss 3rd sing

The table with the wine on it....

- 14) Gece hayat-ı ol-ma-yan şehir
 night life/poss/3rd sing be/neg/part city

The city without night life....

- 15) Gece hayat-ın-ın ol-ma-diğ-i şehir
 night life/poss/3rd sing/gen be/neg/part/ city
 poss 3rd sing

The city without night life....

Obviously the general subject/non-subject distinction being suggested fails to explain these formations.

Underhill¹ in his analysis attempts to explain the use of the two participles in terms of certain elements of word order and in relation

¹ Underhill, Robert, "Turkish Participles," *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. III, winter 1972, p. 87.

to the presence of definite and indefinite subjects in the base sentence. Hankamer and Knecht¹ clearly show his analysis to be to predict every occurrence of the two participles. It would not be profitable here to reconstruct Underhill's arguments nor the counterarguments of Hankamer and Knecht. However, Underhill does make a point that will help illuminate the situation we see here in examples 10-15. He notes that word order plays a role in identifying definite and non-definite subjects in Turkish.

¹ Hankamer and Knecht, "The role of Subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of Relative Clause Participle in Turkish," Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 2, 1976, p. 179.

THE FUNCTION OF WORD ORDER IN TURKISH
REGARDING DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE SUBJECTS

Turkish is a language that regularly marks indirect and direct objects morphologically. This marking allows for very liberal word order in sentences in which the subject and object are marked. These changes in word order¹ are not without meaning and are used as a means of emphasis.

- 16) Kız taş-ı adam-a at-tı
girl stone/acc man/dat throw/past 3rd sing

The girl threw the stone at the man

- 17) Taş-ı kız at-tı adam-a
stone/acc girl throw/past 3rd sing man/dat

The girl threw the stone at the man

- 18) Adam-a kız at-tı taş-ı
man/dat girl throw/past 3rd sing stone/acc

The girl threw the stone at the man

- 19) Kız taş-ı at-tı adam-a
girl stone/acc throw/past 3rd sing man-dat

The girl threw the stone at the man

Now as Underhill² points out in his article, when the object is unmarked, as in 20, the object must remain in the position immediately before the verb.

- 20) Kız adam-a taş at-tı
girl man/dat stone throw/past 3rd sing

The girl threw a stone at the man

¹ An examination of this aspect of Turkish is outside the scope of this paper.

² Underhill, Robert, "Turkish Participles," *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. III, winter, 1972, p. 87.

Notice that the English makes a similar distinction using the articles "the" and "a"¹.

Now in Turkish the subject is not morphologically marked. Yet it can be shown that there are definite and indefinite subjects in Turkish. Again word order is one of the linguistic cues that marks indefinite subjects. The definite subject takes the initial position in the sentence whereas the indefinite is moved to a preverbal position.

22) Su kapı-nın alt-ın-dan ak-ıyor
 water door/gen- under/poss 3rd sing/from run/cont

The water is running under the door

23) Kapı-nın alt-ın-dan su ak-ıyor
 door/gen under/poss 3rd sing from water run/cont

Water is running under the door

It will be contented below that it is this quality of definite or indefinite subject that is being maintained in our examples 10-15. The definite subject forms relative clauses with Np whereas the indefinite subject forms it with Sp.

24) Su-yun alt-ın-dan ak-tığ-ı kapı....
 water/gen under/poss run/part/poss door
 3rd sing/from 3rd sing

The door with the water running under it....

25) Alt-ın-dan su ak-an kapı....
 under/poss water run/part door
 3rd sing/from

The door with water running under it....

Number 24 represents the definite subject of 22 in a relative clause and number 25 represents the indefinite subject in relative clause from 23.

¹ The use of articles is only a part of the system of cues used by English to communicate what is accomplished by word order in Turkish. Stress is also used.

EXPLANATION OF THE TWIN USE OF Np AND Sp

The Hankamer-Knecht principle does not predict this twin use of Np and Sp. Their rule simply states that when the head noun of a relative clause comes from the subject of the base sentence it forms clauses with Sp, all other nouns form with Np. We have seen, however, in examples 24 and 25 that some words seem to be able to be used with both Np and Sp. We will now examine some further examples of this twin usage.

- 26) Uçak-ta yangın çık-tı
plane/loc fire break out/past 3rd sing

A fire broke out in the plane

- 27) Yangın uçak-ta çık-tı
fire plane/loc break out/past 3rd sing

The fire broke out in the plane

We have already seen the relative clauses derived from these two similar sentences in examples 10 and 11.

- 10) Yangın çık-an uçak-ta kimse yok-tu
fire break out/part plane/loc someone neg/past
3rd sing

There was no one on the plane in which a fire broke out.

- 11) Yangın'ın çık-tığı-ı uçak-ta kimse yok-tu
fire/gen break out/part plane/loc someone neg/past
poss 3rd sing 3rd sing

There was no one on the plane in which the fire broke out.

In both these sentences the word chosen for the head noun "uçak" is not a part of the subject of the base sentence. Therefore it should, according to the rule, form a relative clause with Np, as it does in example 11. This, however, does not explain the use of Sp in 10. Notice that in examples 26 and 27 the position of "yangın" is different.

Bringing the subject "yangın" to the head of the sentence in Turkish serves to emphasize and make specific. Example 11 can not be speaking of anything but a specific fire since the genitive is used. Example 10, however, makes a more general reference to "a fire". The conclusion to be made from these examples like 10 and 11 and 24 and 25 is that this twin use of Np and Sp is being used to maintain the status of definite and indefinite subjects in relative clause formation. This distinction of definite and indefinite subject, as has been mentioned, is a function of word order in Turkish since the subject has no morphological markings. The word order marking is sometimes then, continued in relative clause formations. Np being used for definite and Sp for indefinite. The limits of this use however must be explored further. Not all Turkish sentences will allow this twin usage of Sp and Np. Note the examples below.

28)	Oğlan-a	bir	adam	taş	at-tı	
	boy/dat	one	man	stone	throw/past 3rd sing	
	A man threw a stone at the boy					

29)	Oğlan-a	adam	at-an	taş....
	boy/dat	man	throw/part	stone

Although the subject in 28 is "adam" and is clearly indefinite because of the use of "bir", the use of Sp to maintain an indefinite subject is not permitted in Turkish, because ambiguity results. In 29 it is not clear whether the man is throwing the stone or the stone is throwing the man. Semantic factors would probably answer the question here but this semantic clue is not always present.

30)	Ev-de	köpek	havl-ıyor
	house/loc	dog	bark/cont
	A dog is barking in the house		

- 31) Bina-da adam öl-üyor
house/loc man die/cont

A man is dying in the building

These two examples are similar to example 26. There is a locative suffix "de" with a subject and a verb. The verb has no object. These sentences were presented to a series of 10 or 12 informants who were asked to judge upon the acceptability of each sentence. Sentences were presented in which "ev" and "bina" were chosen as the head noun. Both Sp and Np were used to form the relative clause and informants were asked to judge the acceptability of each. The Hankamer-Knecht principle predicts the use of Np since the head noun is in the non-subject.

- 32) köpeğ-in havla-dığ-ı ev-den duman
dog/gen bark/part/poss house/from smoke
çık-ıyor
come out/cont

Smoke is coming from the house in which the dog is barking.

This form is readily acceptable to all informants.

- 33) Köpek havla-yan ev-den duman çık-ıyor
dog bark/part house/from smoke come out/cont

Smoke is coming from the house with the barking dog.

- 34) Adam öl-en bina-dan bir doktor çık-ıyor
man die/part house/from one doctor come out/cont

A doctor is coming out of the house where a man died.

- (from 10) 35) Yangın çık-an uçak parçala-n-ıyor
fire breakout/part plane break-up/pass/cont

The plane with the fire in it is breaking up

Sentences like 33 and 34, though they are at times received with some hesitation, are considered acceptable structures. Slight changes, as

seen in 36 and 37, produce an even more positive response from informants.

- 36) İç-in-de köpek havla-yan ev-den
 inside/poss 3rd sing/loc dog bark/part house/from
 duman çık-ıyor
 smoke comeout/cont

Smoke is coming out of the house with the dog barking in it.

- 37) İç-in-de adam öl-en bina-dan
 inside/poss 3rd sing/loc man die/part house/from
 bir doktor çık-ıyor
 one doctor come out/cont

A doctor is coming out of the house where a man died.

The importance of this addition and the role it plays in relative clause formation will be examined later. We note now, only that it seems to increase acceptability in this type of sentence.

Sentences in which the subject was in the genitive form were rejected if a relative clause was produced with Np.

- 38) Kadın-ın koca-sı kaç-tı
 woman/gen husband/poss 3rd sing escape/past 3rd sing

The woman's husband escaped

For this sentence the Hankamer-Knecht principle correctly predicts Sp for the subject.

- 39) Koca-sı kaç-an kadın korku-dan
 husband/poss 3rd sing escape/part woman fear/from
 öl-dü
 die/past 3rd sing

The woman whose husband escaped, died from fear

- 40) Koca-sın-ın kaç-tıg-ı kadın korku-dan öl-dü
 husband/poss escape/part/ woman fear/from die/past
 3rd sing/gen poss 3rd sing 3rd sing

This same example 40, however, when in a similar manner to 36 and 37 received a 50% positive response from the informants.

- 41) Cezaev-in-den koca-sın-ın kaç-tıg-ı
 prison/poss 3rd sing/ husband/poss escape/part/poss
 from 3rd sing/gen
 kadın korku-dan öl-dü
 woman fear/from die/past 3rd sing

The woman whose husband escaped from prison died from fear

A sentence like 42 could not be made acceptable despite modification of many kinds.

- 42) kapı-nın kol-u kop-tu
 door/gen handle/poss 3rd sing break off/past 3rd sing

The door's handle broke off

- 43) Kol-un-un kop-tuğ-u
 handle/poss 3rd sing gen break off/part/poss 3rd sing

kapı-yı aç-a-m-iyor-du
 door/acc open/abil/neg/cont/past 3rd sing

- 44) Araba-nın kol-un-un kop-tuğ-u
 car/gen handle/poss 3rd sing/gen break off/part/
 poss 3rd sing

kapı-sın-ı aç-a-m-iyor-du
 door/poss 3rd sing/acc open/abil/neg/cont/past 3rd sing

- 45) Araba-nın iç-in-den kol-un-un
 car/gen inside/poss handle/poss 3rd sing/gen
 3rd sing/from

kop-tuğ-u kapı-yı aç-a-m-iyor-du
 break off/part/ door/acc open/abil/neg/cont/past 3rd sing
 poss 3rd sing

- 46) The acceptable form is;

- 46) Kol-u kop-an kapı-yı aç-a-m-iyor-du
 handle/poss break off/part door/acc open/abil/neg/
 cont/past 3rd sing

Sentences with "ile" were shown to be unavailable to this twin use of Sp and Np.

- 47) Adam Ankara'ya tren-le git-ti
 man Ankara/dat train/with go/past 3rd sing

The man went to Ankara by train

- 48) Ankara'ya adam gid-en tren
 Ankara/dat man go/part train

- 49) Tren-le adam gid-en Ankara
 train/with man go/part Ankara

Obviously the use of Sp on a noun in the non-subject confuses the subject-object relation in the relative clause and is considered unacceptable. For this same reason sentences with a verb with an object are completely rejected by the informants if Sp is employed in any manner besides that described by the Hankamer-Knecht rule.

- 50) Adam duvar-a taş at-tı
 man wall/dat stone throw/past 3rd sing

The man threw a stone at the wall

- 51) Duvar-a adam at-an taş
 wall/dat man throw/part stone

Twin use of Sp and Np occurs very frequently in relative clauses that are formed from base sentences employing "olmak" (be) as the main verb or where no verb was present.

- 52) Şehr-in gece hayat-ı yok
 city/gen night life/poss 3rd sing neg

The city has no night life

Lack of a verbal root in this structure demands the use of "olmak" in relative clause formation. Notice that the subject in 52 is in a similar genitive form as in example 38.

- 14) Gece hayat-ı ol-ma-yan şehir....
 night life/poss 3rd sing be/neg/part city

A city without night life....

- 15) Gece hayat-ın-ın ol-ma-dığ-ı şehir
 night life/poss be/neg/part/
 3rd sing/gen poss 3rd sing city

The city without night life....

This same type of structure can be seen with "bulunmak" (be found or have).

- 53) Hisar-da top saha-sı var
 Hisar/loc ball field/poss 3rd sing there is

There is a football field in Hisar....

- 54) Top saha-sı bulun-an Hisar....
 ball field/poss 3rd sing have/part Hisar

Hisar which has a football field....

- 55) Top saha-sın-ın bulun-duğ-u Hisar....
 ball field/poss 3rd sing/gen have/part/poss
 3rd sing

The Hisar with the football field....

There remains another group of structures where this twin use of Np and Sp occurs.

- 56) Hastahane-nin kapa-t-ıl-ma-sı iste-n-iyor
 hospital/gen close/caus/pass/
 nom/ poss 3rd sing want/pass/cont

The hospital is being requested to be closed

Here in this example there is a passive nominal in the subject with a passive verb. The relative clause formation for the subject as predicted by Hankamer-Knecht rule is seen below in example 57.

- 57) kapa-t-ıl-ma-sı iste-n-en hastahane....
 close/caus/pass/nom/
 poss 3rd sing want/pass/part/
 poss 3rd sing hospital

The hospital that was requested to be closed....

63) 48,759 geçer-li oy-un kullan-ıl-dığ-ı
 valid/with vote/gen use/pass/part/poss 3rd sing

geleneksel anket-imiz-de....

traditional poll/poss 1st plu/loc

Our traditional poll in which 48,759 valid votes

were used....

64) 48,759 geçer-li oy kullan-ıl-an geleneksel
 valid/with vote use/pass/part traditional

anket-imiz-de....¹

poll/poss 1st plu/loc

Our traditional poll in which 48,759 valid votes used....

The choice of Np here is in keeping with the Hankamer-Knecht principle.

¹ Sentence 64 was taken from the sports page of Milliyet, a daily Turkish newspaper.

FINAL ANALYSIS OF TWIN USE OF Sp AND Np

We have seen how the Hankamer-Kuech principle predicts the use of Sp when any noun from the subject Np of the base sentence is chosen as the head noun and Np is predicted when the head noun is from the non-subject of the base sentence. The sole exceptions encountered in the data were some head nouns that formed relative clauses with both Np and Sp.

It also has been suggested that this twin use of Np and Sp is a means of maintaining the definite or indefinite status of the head noun, otherwise lost in the normal formation of a relative clause.

A look at the data concerning the twin use of Np and Sp and the limits of this use can provide a few useful conclusions.

This twin use of Np and Sp is restricted to non-subject head nouns, since the use of Np requires a genitive structure between the subject and the head noun. The only exception to this generalization is the relativization of one element of the subject which is in the genitive form (like example 38).

- 38) Kadın-ın koca-sı kaç-tı.
 woman/gen husband/poss escape/rest 3rd sing
 3rd sing

The woman's husband escaped

These type of sentences will be discussed separately. However, it should be noted that the use of Np here was considered acceptable, but marginally so.

This same structure, however, when "olmak" is used in the relative clause is acceptable both with Np and Sp. Refer to examples 14 and 15.

- 14) Gece hayat-ı ol-ma-yan şehir
 night life/poss 3rd sing be/bec/part city

A city without night life....

- 15) Gece hayat-in-in ol-ma-dıġ-ı ŝehir
night life/poss 3rd sing/gen be/neg/part/ city
poss 3rd sing

The city without night life....

Possible base sentences could be suggested as example 54 for 15
and 65 for 14.

- 54) Ŝehir-in gece hayat-ı yok
city/gen night life/poss 3rd sing neg

The city has no night life

- 65) Ŝehir-de gece hayat yok
city/loc night life neg

There is no night life in the city

It has been noted that no sentence containing a verb and its object
could be relativized with both Sp and Np. Note examples 29 and 51.

Returning to the sentences with subjects in the genitive form such
as example 41, it has been noted that all such formations, whether
passive or not, were met with some scepticism. In some cases they were
rejected out right, in some cases only a majority seemed to find them
acceptable (examples 58, 59, 60, 61). It should be noted further that no
such structure as these was ever encountered in a Turkish text. The
partly positive response to these forms may possibly be explained by
their similarity to forms, particularly in the passive, that are
acceptable.

- 63) 48,759 qeger-li oy-un kullan-ıġ-dıġ-ı
valid/with vote/gen use/pass/part/poss 3rd sing
geleneksel anket-ialız-de....
traditional poll/poss 1st plu/loc

Our traditional poll in which 48,759 votes were used....

Genitive formations are never indefinite and therefore no justification

can be found for the twin use of Np and Sp to maintain indefinite-definite status in sentences like 58,59,60. These types of structures then are probably best explained as an acceptance created by structural similarity rather than a linguistic need such as the maintenance of indefinite-definite status. Native speakers would never produce such forms, but approve of them due to similarity to some correct forms.

In the final analysis the twin use of Sp and Np is seen in a limited group of sentences to maintain the indefinite or definite status of the subject. This status is lost in cases where this twin use is not possible.

Returning to our original question of why the sentences represented by our examples pose problems in comprehension for native speakers of English. What possibility can be concluded from the data? A major factor is that the formation of relative clauses in Turkish seems simple, but deceptively so. This twin use of Sp and Np has escaped the notice of even careful linguistic analysis. Further more, the word order marking of definite and indefinite subjects is not a familiar linguistic tool to the native speaker of English. Emphasis as a function of word order is more apparent to him than definite-indefinite status. Marking, then, of this status, has no parallel structure in the two languages. This lack of parallelism hides the very real presence of definiteness and indefiniteness in Turkish from the English speaker.

Secondly, the rule uncovered by Hankamer and Knecht, which as we have seen is fairly complete, is not a simple rule to apply. In fact, application of this rule is a source of confusion since it changes the word order relation between the head noun of the clause and the verb that takes the relative participle.

4) Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam went to the bank to get money

Adam banka-ya ziti-ti

5) Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

Kati-ya qan-qa

6) Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

Kati-ya qan-qa

Kati went to the bank to get money

UNIVERSITÄT WÜRZBURG

It is my opinion that the greater sense of acceptability felt by native speakers regarding sentence 36 versus 35 is due to the presence of the genitive structure "içinde". This serves as a similar linguistic mark like "kocası" to indicate the relation between the head noun and the verbal base containing the relative participle. Though this clue is not absolutely necessary in sentences like 36, since semantics makes things apparent, it is critical in a sentence like 39.

The problem then in Turkish relative clause formation is complexity, a complexity not paralleled in the formation of English relative clauses.

ANALYSIS OF EXAMPLES IN LIGHT OF THE FINDINGS
IN PART ONE AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The remaining examples listed in the introduction will be examined. Much use of the findings related to the use of Sp and Np will be presented, along with other linguistic considerations, such as word order. The discussion will begin with the example given for example 5, since elements found in it open the way for discussion of the remaining examples.

dur-ul-ma-sı	bekle-n-diğ-i	ön-e	sür-ül-üyor
stop/pass/cont poss 3rd	wait/pass/part poss 3rd sing	front/ dat	spread/pass/cont

It is being claimed that its cessation is expected.

The dominant use of passive is immediately noticed in this example.

The nominal "durulması" is passive, the participle with -dik is in the passive, and the main verb is in the passive. A brief word must be said at this point about the use of passive in Turkish. Turkish allows for a much broader use of passive than English. Specifically, verbs that cannot be used in the passive form in English are readily seen in that form in Turkish. Below are a few examples.

6) sokak-a	bu	kapı-dan	çık-ıl-ır
street/dat	this	door/from	go out/pass pres 3rd sing

The street is gone to through this door

65) Beşiktaş-a	bu	yol-dan	gid-il-ir	mi?
Beşiktaş/dat	this	road/from	go/pass/pres 3rd sing	inter

Is Beşiktaş gone to this road?

69) Burada	sigara	iç-il-mez
here/loc	cigarette	drink/pass/pres neg 3rd sing

Cigarettes are not smoked here.

70)	Baba-n-a	böyle	konuş-ul-ur	mu?
	father/poss	like this	talk/pass/pres	inter
	2nd sing/with		3rd sing	

Is your father talked to like this?

As can be seen from the English equivalents such passive structures are not permitted in English. The passive is often used as a notice or announcement device as in 69. An English way of saying the same thing would be "no smoking here". Verbs like "go", "enter", and "talk" are common in the passive form while not ever seen in passive in English.

Returning to our example in "E", sentence 66, we see the verb "stop" (durulmak) in the passive form. In English "stop" has both a transitive and an intransitive usage. In our example "E" the form would correspond to the intransitive similar to the stop in "The train stopped". This form would never be passive in English. The form, "The train was stopped" has a causative meaning. This unusual use of passive in Turkish is the first learning obstacle presented by the structure of example "E" and is a use of passive not paralleled in the learner's native language. This problem is compounded by three passive structures in the sentence. As seen in the English, such use of passive renders the English unpermissibly awkward.

Aside from this difficulty we see also that the continuous tense -iyor is being used in a broad sense rather than a temporary sense. This broad use of the continuous tense is not paralleled in English. This further contributes to learning problems.

Finally we see -dik our Np participle in a different role. It is no longer functioning as a marker for a relative clause, but is used in the formation of a different kind of clause. Note the example below;

The difficulty for learners is the syntactic relation between the verb that has taken the participle and the head noun of the relative clause. The participle "alibkara" is positioned between two nouns. The previous experience of these words would lead him to see "adam", the head noun, as the receiver of the action of the participle. This, however, is not the case. "Tabanca" is in the accusative form here and is the receiver of the action. The presence of the possessive suffix -sin and the accusative -yi is a linguistic cue that marks a change in syntactic function between the words in this sentence similar to the change in morphology. The head noun here "adam" though, which in most cases would be the object of the participle, in this form is not. "Tabanca" is the same as "taban" in pattern similar to 39 since in 39 the head noun, contrary to the normal pattern is not the doer of the action of the participle. Our only clue to this change is the presence of -sin in 39 and -sin and -yi in 73. This breaks a pattern that has been strongly reinforced by the learners' experience with the majority of relative clauses. The linguistic marking of the change, the possessive suffix -sin is too subtle to overcome the student's habit of reading all head noun-participle relations the same. This weakly marked change constitutes a serious learning problem.

EXAMPLE 1

175	Bir-ün-ün	sadece	tüm	Alevi	köy-ler-in-in
	one/part	only	all	Shiite	village/plu/poss/gen
	hala	savun-ma	durum-un-da		ol-duk-lar-ı-ydı
	still	defend/nom	situation/poss		be/part/poss 3rd plu/past
			3rd sing/loc		

what was known was only that all Shiite villages were still in a defense situation.

The base sentence is given below;

76)	Sadece	tüm	Alevi	köy-ler-in-in	hala
	only	all	Shiite	village/plu/poss/gen	still
	savun-ma	durum-un-da	ol-duk-ları	bil-in-iyor	
	defend/nom	situation/poss	be/part/poss	know/pass/cont	
		3rd sing/loc	3rd plu		

It is known that only all Shiite villages were still in a defensive situation.

What occurs is that the entire subject of 76 becomes the non-subject in 75. The main verb "bilinmek" takes the participle -yen and moves to the head of the sentence. This forms a clause without a head noun (although a head noun such as şey (thing) could be used here). This clause becomes the subject of the new sentence. Below are a few more examples of this type with their base sentences.

77)	Önem-li	ol-an	on-un	cevab-in-in
	important/with	be/part	3rd person/gen	answer/poss
				3rd sing/gen
	doğru	ol-up	ol-ma-dığ-ı-ydı	
	correct	be/cont/part	be/neg/part/poss	3rd sing/past

What was important was, whether or not his answer was correct.

78)	On-un	cevab-in-in	doğru	ol-up
	3rd person/gen	answer/poss	correct	be/cont/part
		3rd sing/gen		
	ol-ma-dığ-ı	önem-li-ydi		
	be/neg/part/poss	3rd sing	important/with/past	

Whether his answer was correct or not was important

79)	Ben-i	şaşır-t-an	on-un	hiç	bir
	I/acc	surprise/caus/past	3rd person/gen	neg	one
	şey	yap-ma-dığ-ı-ydı			
	thing	do/neg/part/poss	3rd sing/past		

10. (19) *It was known that*

11. (20) *It was known that*

12. (21) *It was known that*

13. (22) *It was known that*

14. (23) *It was known that*

15. (24) *It was known that*

16. (25) *It was known that*

17. (26) *It was known that*

18. (27) *It was known that*

19. (28) *It was known that*

20. (29) *It was known that*

21. (30) *It was known that*

22. (31) *It was known that*

23. (32) *It was known that*

24. (33) *It was known that*

25. (34) *It was known that*

26. (35) *It was known that*

27. (36) *It was known that*

28. (37) *It was known that*

29. (38) *It was known that*

30. (39) *It was known that*

31. (40) *It was known that*

32. (41) *It was known that*

33. (42) *It was known that*

34. (43) *It was known that*

35. (44) *It was known that*

36. (45) *It was known that*

participle -dik and not to another verb base. This produces an unusual structure.

EXAMPLE J

J 83)	Balkan	şampiyona-sın-da		geç-il-diğ-im	
	Balkan	championship/poss		pass/pass/part/poss	
		3rd sing		3rd sing	
	Yunan-lı	Kuzis-ten	bir	al-acağ-ım	var
	Greek/with	Kuzis/from	one	take/future /poss	there is
				1st sing	

I have a debt ^{to} collect from the Greek Kuzis, whom I was passed by in the Balkan championships.

This use of a passive structure is awkward in English, a more normal rendering would be example 84.

84) I have a debt to collect from the Greek Kuzis who passed me in the Balkan championships.

So first of all we conclude that the passive structure here, is itself a problem for the native English speaker. The base sentence for the clause would be;

85)	Balkan	şampiyona-sın-da	Yunan-lı	Kuzis
	Balkan	championships/poss	Greek/with	Kuzis
		3rd sing/loc		
	taraf-ın-dan	geç-il-dim		
	side/poss/from	pass/pass/past/1st sing		

I was passed in the Balkan championships by the Greek Kuzis.

In our basic sentence J 83 the word Kuzis has been taken as the head noun of the relative clause. The subject of the base sentence 83, is suffixed to the main verb of the sentence and does not appear as separate from the verb. In a passive sentence, such as this, if we assume that the "agent" of the action is not the grammatical subject, the "Kuzis"

is in the non-subject. This being true it forms a relative clause with Np as seen in J 83.

Since this follows the rule for formation of relative clauses the major difficulty with this structure must be in the foreignness of the use of passive we encounter here. A native speaker of English would not choose a passive structure to express either of the ideas in 83 or 85. The choice of passive is available to the English speaker, however, it is not the preferred pattern. This use of passive could be discussed in terms of distribution just as one would discuss the distribution of a lexical item. No matter how closely equivalent in meaning or in use a lexical or grammatical item may be, a factor of choice affects the distribution of that item in a language. In example J then, we have a use of passive that is alien to English.

EXAMPLE K

K 86)	Söyle- <u>dik</u> -ler-im-i	unut-tu
	say/part/plu/poss 1st sing/acc	forget/past 3rd sing

a. He forgot the things that I said.

b. He forgot what I said.

Of the two English equivalents (a) best represents the plurality of the Turkish example. Here in 86 -dik does not signal the presence of a relative clause but a noun clause, similar to example "E". Lack of a head noun here prevents any confusion between these two roles of -dik here.

There is a similar form to 86 in Turkish yet with a different and sometimes ambiguous meaning.

87)	Söyle- <u>diğ</u> -im-i	unut-tu
	say/part/poss 1st sing/acc	forget/past 3rd sing

- a. He forgot what I said.
 b. He forgot that I said it.

Notice that (b) is a noun clause construction while "He forgot the things that I said" is definitely a relative clause. Here the Turkish use of the plural suffix -ler has eliminated the need for a relative clause to achieve the same results. Basically there is no parallel structure in English to 86 hence the difficulty of transferring the structure to a native speaker of English.

Discussion of EXAMPLE A

- A 88) Bacağ-ı kes-il-diğ-i
 leg/poss 3rd sing cut/pass/part/poss 3rd sing
 açıkla-n-an Tito hastahane-de yat-ıyor
 announce/pass/part Tito hospital/loc lie/cont 3rd sing
 Tito whose leg was announced as having been amputated
 is resting in a hospital.

The root sentence of this relative clause is;

- 89) Tito-nun bacağ-ı kes-il-diğ-i açıkla-n-dı
 Tito/gen leg/poss cut/pass/part/ announce/pass/
 3rd sing poss 3rd sing past/3rd sing
 Tito's leg was announced as having been amputated.

This single example combines aspects of every major learning problem we have examined thus far. First of all "Tito" is definitely a part of the subject of 89, the whole subject in the genitive form being, "Titonun bacağı kesildiği". In keeping with the rule for relative clause formation with elements of the subject Sp is expected and this occurs in 88. Again we see the change in word order relationship that occurred in our other examples of subjects in the genitive form. Although "Tito" is the head noun of the relative clause, "he" is not

the doer of the action, which is the normal case for head nouns when Sp is used. The cue for this change again is seen in the presence of the remanent of the genitive subject in "bacağı" and in "kesildiğı". This complicated marking system involved in this change is further complicated by the presence of -dik in its role in noun clause formation. It is positioned between "bacağı" and "Tito" which further clouds their relationship.

Added to this, the entire sentence (88) is in the passive, and as can be seen from the English, results in an awkward English structure. Another noteworthy example of this type of structure is 90.

90)	Değişik	yörünge-ler	ıç-in-de		
	different	trajectory/plu	inside/poss 3rd sing/loc		
	hareket	et-tiğ-i	ıçin hangi hedef-e		
	move	do/part/poss 3rd sing	for which target/dat		
	yönel-t-il-diğ-i		kesinlik-le		
	direct/caus/pass/part/poss 3rd sing		clearness/with		
	belli	ol-ma-yan	Cruise Füze-si....		
	clear	be/neg/part	Cruise missile/poss 3rd sing		

The Cruise missile about which, since it travels in varying trajectories, it is not clear which target it is directed toward....

This example differs from 88 only in that one more word "kesinlikle" intervenes between the head noun "Cruise Füzesi" and the cue marking its relationships with the base sentence genitive subject. The cue is hidden three words back in "yöneltildiğı". Added to this is a longer and more complex phrase that the relative clause is found in.

The English is possibly confusing, as can be seen from the example.

In short combination of these factors make this type of structure very difficult for native speakers of English even to comprehend.

Discussion of EXAMPLE C

C can be readily explained in terms of the other examples.

C 91) O-nun-la gel-me-si karar-laş-tır-il-an fotoğrafçı....
 3rd person come/nom/ decision/recip/caus/ photographer
 gen/with poss pass/part

The photographer of whom it was decided he would go with her....

92) Fotoğrafçı-nın o-nun-la gel-me-si
 photographer/gen 3rd/gen/with come/nom/poss
 karar-laş-tır-il-di
 decision/recip/caus/pass/past 3rd sing

It was decided that the photographer would go with her.

Again we see that the head noun is from a subject in the genitive form. This produces the previously discussed head noun relativized verb relationship confusion. Again intervening between the cued element "onun" and the head noun is a nominal construction "gelmesi" which in example "A" further adds to clouding the cued relationship.

AN EXAMINATION OF TWO OTHER NOTEWORTHY EXAMPLES

- 93) Londra-da otur-an ve atölye-si sanat
 London/loc live/part and shop/poss 3rd sing art
 çevre-leri-nin dikkat-ler-in-i
 circle/poss 3rd plu/gen attention/poss 3rd plu/acc
 topla-dık-ları bir yer ol-an Mine Sunar....
 gather/part/ one place be/part Mine Sunar....
 poss 3rd plu

Mine Sunar who lives in London and whose shop has become
 a center of attention for art circles....

In this sentence can be seen a great deal of interference that clouds the relationship between the relative clause and the rest of the words in the sentence. First of all it contains the genitive head noun described in 88, 90, and 38. Here again only the remaining element of the genitive structure "Atölyesi" provides a cue to the relationships of the relative participle -yen and the head noun "Mine Sunar". This cue is separated from the head noun by six words. Furthermore those intervening six words form another relative clause with Np further clouding the relationship between "Mine Sunar" and "atölyesi".

The net result is to give the untrained mind the impression that Mine Sunar is a place of some sort, not a person. The problem again is that there has been a change in the normal pattern (which has been discussed earlier) and the cue that marks that change is buried among other structures.

A further example of confusion of this type occurs in 94.

- 94) Cemil-in at-tiğ-i gol-den sonra
 Cemil/gen shoot/part/ goal/from later
 poss 3rd sing

durakla-yan	Bursaspor	ön-ün-de	Fenerbahçe
hesitate/part	Bursaspor	front/poss 3rd sing/loc	Fenerbahçe
en büyük	fırsat-ı	Raşit-in	
most great	opportunity/ poss 3rd sing	Raşit/gen	
ayağ-ın-dan		kaçır-dı	
foot/poss 3rd sing/from		loose/past 3rd sing	

Fenerbahçe, which hesitated after Ceuil's goal while facing Bursaspor,....

Again here placement of "Bursaspor önünde" between "Fenerbahçe" and "duraklayan" disrupts the normal relationship between the head noun and the relative participle of the relative clause. This structure leads the reader at first to believe that "Bursaspor" is the "hesitating" team until he encountered "Fenerbahçe" and is forced to reread in order to make sense of it. The normal pattern of the noun following a Sp relative participle, being identified as the doer of the action of that participle, is broken here by introducing a noun between the head noun and the Sp participle.

EVALUATION

These separate areas of difficulty have emerged from the examination of the data. One, the formation of relative clauses in Turkish is markedly different from English. Two, the formation of relative clauses in Turkish is not governed by a simple rule, but is quite complex. Three, the use of passive in Turkish does not always parallel the use of passive in English.

Two of these serve to emphasize an already well known fact. The problems encountered in language learning are most often a result of lack of parallel structures in the native language. Without presentation and teaching, these types of problems are not even easily perceived by the learner. His language mind-set prevents him from evaluating a new language in any radically new way. The third, that is the complexity of relative clause formation in Turkish, only complicates the already existing problems of the unfamiliar structures.

DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE TEACHING APPROACHES
TO THE PROBLEMS THAT HAVE BEEN EXAMINED

In the field of foreign language teaching, arguments still continue as to which approach is best or more natural. Some contend that the direct method of presenting material in a useable real context is most profitable. This approach is contrasted with the traditional grammar translation method which focuses only on structure in an analytical fashion. Furthermore there are the methods that see language as speech habits and attempt to build habits through drilling certain patters. More recently there have been those who have applied the theory of transformational grammar to language teaching. They contend that each structure can be explained in terms of certain changes that are ordered by rules. Their approach then focuses on these transformational rules.

Many of the structures that have been examined in this paper occur only in written Turkish. Applications of direct method seem misguided in a case like this since the method depends upon presentation of the material in appropriate speech context since the forms are generally written, some sort of teaching aimed at teaching recognition of the difficult patterns would seem more appropriate. Paragraphs chosen by the instructor could be presented for reading and comprehension until quick recognition and comprehension are achieved through familiarity with the pattern.

"Teaching the problems" is a recognized approach to language teaching. By isolating and pointing out difficulties you contribute to faster learning and comprehension. Since the student in most of these cases will be only trying to comprehend what he is reading, or

at the most learn to write these patterns, the best approach seems to be isolation and demonstration of the problem in hand.

There are, however, some significant elements that could be dealt with properly through the use of appropriate drills, be they pattern or transformation oriented drills. One pattern which has been so often mentioned (the pattern represented by example 93) is a common speech pattern that needs to be incorporated into the student's regular speech habits. Here I would suggest a drill in which the student takes the root sentence of the relative clause and produces relative clauses out of the nouns in the sentence. For example a sentence like 38 would be chosen.

38) Kadın-ın koca-sı kaç-tı
 woman/gen husband/poss escape/past

The woman's husband escaped.

The student would then produce a relative clause for either of the nouns found in the subject.

(from 39)

95) koca-sı kaç-an kadın....
 husband/poss 3rd sing escape/part woman

The woman whose husband escaped....

96) Kadın-ın kaç-an koca-sı....
 woman/gen escape/part husband/poss 3rd sing

The woman's husband who escaped....

This process could be repeated with similar sentences until the student is entirely familiar with the relative clause formations in sentences with a genitive subject. The drill could then expand to incorporate similar but more complicated patterns. The base sentence of structures like A 88 could be given. The student would then form relative clauses with any noun in the sentence.

- 97) Tito-nun bacağ-ı kes-il-diğ-i
 Tito/gen leg/poss cut/pass/part/
 3rd sing poss 3rd sing

açıkla-n-dı

announce/pass/past 3rd sing

It was announced that Tito's leg was amputated.

- 98) Tito-nun kes-il-diğ-i açıkla-n-an
 Tito/gen cut/pass/part/ announce/pass/part
 poss 3rd sing

bacağ-ı....

leg/poss 3rd sing

Tito's leg which was announced as being amputated....

This type of drill could be continued with the different patterns mentioned until the formation of relative clauses is firmly established in the student's mind.

Another type of drill is suggested by the transformation we see in example I 75. Almost all sentences can be transformed in the manner described in example I. That is, the final verb can be made into a relative clause with Sp. Note this transformation with D and E.

- (from D) 99) Tehlike-yi atla-t-tığ-ı görüş-ü
 danger/acc avoid/caus/part/ view/poss 3rd sing
 poss 3rd sing

ağır bas-ıyor
 heavy press/cont

The view that he has avoided the danger is prevailing

- 100) Ağır bas-an tehlike-yi
 heavy press/part danger/acc
 atla-t-tığ-ı görüş-ü-ydü
 avoid/caus/part/poss 3rd sing view/poss 3rd sing/past

That which was prevailing was the view that he had avoided danger

· BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dede, Müşerref, "Why should Turkish relativization distinguish between subject and non-subject head nouns?" - Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, BLS Vol. 4, February 1978, pp. 67-77.

Hankamer, Jorge and Knecht, Laura, "The role of Subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of relative clause participle in Turkish," Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 2, 1976, p. 197.

Milliyet Gazetesi, Milliyet newspaper, Istanbul.

Underhill, Robert, "Turkish Participles," Linguistic Inquiry, Vol. III, winter 1972, p. 87.