

Werk

Titel: On Uyghur relative clauses

Autor: Csató, Éva Á.; Uchturpani, Muzappar Abdursul

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2010

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0014 | LOG_0016

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

On Uyghur relative clauses

Éva Á. Csató & Muzappar Abdurusul Uchturpani

Csató, Éva Á. & Uchturpani, Muzappar Abdurusul 2010. On Uyghur relative clauses. *Turkic Languages* 14, 69-93.

Two types of relative clauses are used in modern Uyghur: one in which the subject is in the Nominative and the other in which the subject is in the Genitive and the head noun bears possessive agreement. The article gives a concise account of the main characteristics of these and some functionally related constructions. The aim is to pave the way for more research on the issues involved.

*Éva Á. Csató & Muzappar Abdurusul Uchturpani, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden.
E-mail: eva.csato@lingfil.uu.se and muzappar@gmail.com*

Turkic relative constructions

Turkic relative clauses are typically non-finite clauses based on a participle. The dominating type of relative clause is not marked for subject-predicate agreement (Csató 1996 and references given there). See Ex. 1.

Ex. 1
Karachay-Balkar
Non-marked relative clause
konaχ kel-üčü ity
guest come-PART room
'a room where guests stay' > 'guestroom'

Some Turkic languages have developed relative constructions in which subject-predicate agreement is marked by a possessive suffix on the participle. In such constructions the Genitive can be assigned to the subject. See the following examples.

Ex. 2
Turkish
Genitive relative clause with subject-predicate agreement
kız-in_i uyı-duğ-u_i oda
girl-GEN sleep-DIK.PART room
'a /the room where the girl sleeps'

Certain languages, for instance Turkmen, have a type of relative construction in which agreement between the Genitive subject of the relative clause and the head noun is marked; see Ex. 3.

Ex. 3

Turkmen

Genitive relative clause with subject and head noun agreement

<i>Atalov-ı</i>	<i>oturan</i>	<i>oturğıǵı-ı</i>
Atalov-GEN	sit-AN.PART	chair-3POSS

‘the chair on which Atalov sits’

The aim of this article is to describe the typology of relative clauses in modern Uyghur.

Previous descriptions of Uyghur relative clauses

In Uyghur grammars the properties of participial constructions are mostly discussed under morphology. Participles which may function as non-finite predicates in relative clauses are in Uyghur referred to as *süpätdeş* and are described together with the other non-finite verb forms, *isimdeş* ‘verbal noun’ and *räwişdeş* ‘adverbial form of the verb’.

Tömür (1987) and Cheng et al. (1996) distinguish between four participles: (i) the past participle in *-GAN*, (ii) the present continuous participle in *-(i)watqan*, (iii) the present future participle in *-Idiyan*, and (iv) the Aorist participle, e.g. *käl-gän* ‘one who has come / came’, *kel-iwatqan* ‘one who is /was coming’, *aqla-ydiyan* ‘one who listens’, and *yaz-ar* ‘one who writes’. See more about the morphosyntactic variations below. Concerning the use of these participles, the grammars mention that they behave like adjectives and can function as modifiers of nominal categories. Moreover, they can also be used as nouns, in which case they are inflected. Syntactic properties of Uyghur are discussed in Cheng et al. (1996), but this work does not give any account of relative clauses. Unfortunately, we have not had any access to Niyaz (1982), Qasim (1982) and Ma Deyuan’s studies on the syntax of Uyghur.¹

Grammars written in English or German, Friedrich 2002 and de Jong 2007, do not present the syntactic properties of relative clauses but discuss the morphological features of the participles as do the Chinese grammars mentioned above. De Jong (2007) does not even make any clear differentiation between finite and non-finite usages of the participles.

The Uyghur scholar Litip Tohti studied the semantic and word order properties of relative clauses (Tohti 1995). He described relative clauses built with participles in *-GAN* and *-GUDÄK*. He also mentioned a third type, which is formed without a participle. See his examples here as Ex. 4, Ex. 5 and Ex. 6.

¹ We thank professor Abdurishid Yakup for reference to these works and further valuable comments on this article.

Ex. 4

Män oqu-yan kitab qiziq i-kän.
 I read-GAN.PART book interesting is-COP.GAN
 ‘The book which I have read is, as I find, interesting.’

Ex. 5

Üç kün-gä yät-küdäk un qal-di.
 Three day-DAT reach-GUDÄK.PART flour leave-PST3SG
 ‘There is some flour left, which can suffice for three days.’

Ex. 6

Gulja mänziri-si_i güzäl šähär_r.
 Ghulja landscape-3POSS beautiful city
 ‘Ghulja is a city with a beautiful panorama.’

In a later work written in the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995), Tohti applied the term ‘adjectivalized phrase’ instead of ‘relative clause’ (2004). He explained this terminological preference by referring to the fact that such constructions cannot be treated as sentences because they lack tense and subject agreement morphology. Uchurpani (2009a and 2009b) adopted Tohti’s approach and described some additional syntactic features of relative clauses in the Minimalist framework. These will be included in this paper.

Rentzsch’s study (2005) presents some basic syntactic properties of relative clauses and gives a detailed analysis of the aspectual meaning of the participles; see more about his analysis below.

Notation of suffixes

Table 1 and Table 2 contain the variants of the participle suffixes that we are going to deal with. In the notation of the suffixes, *G* stands for *γ*, *g*, *k*, or *q*; *A* for *a* or *ä*; *U* for *u* or *ü*; *I* for *i* or *y*; *K* for *k* or *q*. The use of brackets in *-(i)watqan* indicates that the *i* sound is optional, i.e. it is not realized after a vowel stem. See the following examples.

Table 1

	<i>-GAn</i>	<i>-Idiyan</i>	<i>-(i)watqan</i>
<i>yaz-</i> ‘write’	<i>yaz-yan</i>	<i>yaz-idiyan</i>	<i>yez-iwatqan</i>
<i>käl-</i> ‘come’	<i>käl-gän</i>	<i>kel-idiyan</i>	<i>kel-iwatqan</i>
<i>kät-</i> ‘go’	<i>kät-kän</i>	<i>ket-idiyan</i>	<i>ket-iwatqan</i>
<i>oylat-</i> ‘let sb think’	<i>oylat-qan</i>	<i>oylit-idiyan</i>	<i>oylit-iwatqan</i>
<i>oyla-</i> ‘think’	<i>oyli-yan</i>	<i>oyla-ydiyan</i>	<i>oyla-watqan</i>
<i>tüzä-</i> ‘correct, modify’	<i>tüzi-gän</i>	<i>tüzä-ydiyan</i>	<i>tüzä-watqan</i>

Table 2

	<i>-mAKči bolyan</i>	<i>-GUdäk</i>	<i>-GUčilik</i>
yaz- 'write'	yaz-maqči bolyan	yaz-γudäk	yaz-γučilik
käl- 'come'	käl-mäkči bolyan	käl- güdäk	käl-güčilik
kät- 'go'	kät- mäkči bolyan	kät- küdäk	kät-küčilik
oyla- 'think'	oyli-maqči bolyan	oyli- γudäk	oyli-γučilik
oylat- 'let sb think'	oylat-maqči bolyan	oylat-qudäk	oylat-qučilik
tüzä- 'correct, modify'	tüzi- mäkči bolyan	tüzi- güdäk	tüzi-güčilik

Typological properties of relative clauses in Uyghur

Participial clauses are defined here as non-finite clauses based on a participle. The predicate core in such constructions can be expanded to contain a subject and predicate complements. Thus, participial clauses can render full propositional contents. Relative clauses are participial clauses in which a constituent is relativized. Relative clauses are either headless or headed by a nominal head; see Ex. 7 and Ex. 8 respectively. In these examples, the first actant of the predicate *kirgän* 'who has entered / entered' is relativized. If the relativized constituent denotes a person, a resumptive pronoun, *özi* 'himself, herself' or *özliri* can be present in the relative clause.

Ex. 7

Headless relative clause

Öy-gä kir-gän dost-um-dur.
house-DAT enter-GAN.PART friend-1SG.POSS-COP
'The one who has entered / entered the house is my friend.'

Ex. 8

Headed relative clause

Öy-gä kir-gän yigit
house-DAT enter-GAN.PART boy
'the boy who has entered / entered the house'

Ex. 9

öz-i_i öy-gä kir-gän yigit_i
self-3POSS house-DAT enter-GAN.PART boy
'the boy who has entered / entered the house'

Participial clauses can also function as non-finite complement clauses. The difference between the two types of participial clauses is that in non-finite complement clauses no relativization takes place. Another difference is that in non-finite complement clauses, the participle is marked for agreement with the subject. The agreement marker is a possessive suffix. There is no subject agreement morphology on the participle in relative clauses. Ex. 10 illustrates a complement clause based on a participle in *-GAN*.

Ex. 10

Complement clause

Men-in_i öy-gä kir-gin-im_i yaxşı boldi.
 I-GEN house-DAT enter- GAN.PART-1SGPOSS good become/be-PAST3SG
 ‘It was good that I entered the house.’

Friedrich (2002: 143) mentions that the suffix *-LIK* can optionally be attached to participles. The meaning of the participle with and without *-LIK* is the same; see Ex. 11.

Ex. 11

Complement clause

men-in_i öy-gä kir-gän-lig-im_i yaxşı bol-di.
 I-GEN house-DAT enter-GAN.PART-LIK-1SGPOSS good become/be-PAST3SG
 ‘It was good that I entered the house.’

Rentzsch (2005: 143) remarks that a participle cannot be combined with *-LIK* in relative clauses. Thus, the possibility to attach the suffix *-LIK* to a participle in *-GAN* can be used as a diagnostic test to distinguish between complement and relative clauses.

The overt complementizers of relative clauses are the bound morphemes that build participles. Turkic relative clauses are left-branching, i.e. they precede the head noun. See, e.g. Ex. 12, Ex. 13 and Ex. 14.

Ex. 12

oyunçuq-lir-i-ni buz-yan qizçaq
 toy-PL-3POSS-ACC break-GAN.PART little girl
 ‘the little girl who has broken / broke her toys’

Ex. 13

män daim bar-idiyan kinoxana
 I often go-IDIPAN.PART cinema
 ‘the cinema where I often go’

Ex. 14

quliq-i-ya gül qis-qan qiz
 ear-3POSS-DAT flower stick-GAN.PART girl
 ‘the girl who has stuck / stuck a flower to her ear’

With respect to the case marking of the subject constituent, we distinguish between two types of relative clauses in Uyghur. The first type is based on a participle and the subject of the relative clause, here *qiz* ‘girl’, is in the Nominative; see Ex. 15.

Ex. 15

Nominative relative clause

qiz yaz-γan xāt
 girl write-GAN.PART letter
 ‘a letter which the girl has written / wrote’

In the second type, the subject of the relative clause is in the Genitive, here *qiz-niŋ* ‘girl’s’, and a possessive agreement suffix is attached to the head noun. We refer to these constructions as Genitive relative constructions.

Ex. 16

Genitive relative construction

qiz-niŋ_i yaz-γan xet-i_i
 girl-GEN write-GAN.PART letter-3POSS
 ‘the letter which the girl has written/wrote’

Genitive relative constructions, just as the Nominative ones, can be based on any participle form. See, for instance, examples with the participle in *-GUDāk* and *-mAKči bolγan*.

Ex. 17

Genitive relative construction

qiz-niŋ_i yaz-γudāk xet-i_i
 girl-GEN write-GUDāk.PART letter-3POSS
 ‘a /the letter which the girl can write’

Ex. 18

Genitive relative construction

qiz-niŋ_i yaz-maqči bol-γan xet-i_i
 girl-GEN write-MAKČI bol-GAN.PART letter-3POSS
 ‘the letter which the girl will write’

The specific syntactic properties of the Genitive relative constructions will be treated later.

Turkic clauses based on participles are syntactically independent and can be used as noun phrases. In such a case, they are inflected as other nominal categories depending on their syntactic function. Relative clauses without a nominal head are called headless relative clauses, a term suggesting that something is missing in such constructions. However, in Turkic languages, such ‘headless’ constructions are not elliptic since there is no syntactic or semantic need to add a nominal head. See the following examples in which the participle clauses are translated as ‘one who entered the room’ Ex. 19, ‘those who are sleeping’ Ex. 20, ‘those who do not go home during the vacation’ Ex. 21, ‘what you have just said’ Ex. 22, ‘what I know’ Ex. 23.

Ex. 19

Headless relative clause

Baya öy-gä kir-gän kim?
 a little earlier house-DAT enter-GAN.PART who
 ‘Who is the one who entered the house a little earlier?’

Ex. 20

Headless relative clause

Uxla-watqan-lar-ni çağır!
 sleep-IWATQAN.PART-PL-ACC call.2SG.IMP
 ‘Call those who are sleeping!’

Ex. 21

Headless relative clause

Tätıl-dä öy-gä qayt-ma-ydıyan-lar qol kötür-üñlär.
 vacation-LOC home-DAT go back-NEG-IDİTAN.PART-PL hand raise-2PL.IMP
 ‘Those who don’t go home during the vacation, raise your hands.’

Ex. 22

Headless relative clause

Hazır de-gin-iñ-ni yänä bir de-gin-ä.
 now say-GAN.PART-2SG.POSS-ACC again one say-IMP-PRT
 ‘Say again what you have just said.’

Ex. 23

Headless relative clause

Bu häq-tä bil-idiyan-lir-im yoq.
 this respect-LOC know-IDİTAN.PART-PL-1SG.POSS non-existing
 ‘I don’t have any knowledge about this matter.’

If we regard these relative clauses to be nominals, their syntactic status in prenominal position can be analysed differently from that of relative clauses, e.g. in English. Johanson (1998: 50) describes identity attribution as a construction of two nouns referring to the same entity and juxtaposed asyndetically as qualifying attribute + head, e.g. Turkish *kadın öğretmen* ‘woman teacher’. He adds: “The attribute may also be a participle with predicative force, that is the basis of a relative clause, e.g. Turkish *konuşan adam* ‘the man who speaks / spoke’, *sevdiğim kadın* ‘the woman I love(d)’” (Johanson 1998: 50). The same analysis can be applied to Uyghur headed relative clauses.

Ex. 24

baya öy-gä kir-gän bala
 a little earlier house-DAT enter-GAN.PART boy
 ‘one having just entered the house’ ‘boy’
 ‘the boy who has just entered the house’

The headless relative can participate in different syntactic constructions; see, for instance the following:

Ex. 25

Sän şundaq bala gäp aŋli-ma-ydiyan.
 you such boy word listen-NEG-IDIFAN.PART
 ‘You are such a boy, one who doesn’t listen to advices.’

Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy

One parameter applied in the classification of relative clauses is related to the syntactic status of the relativized noun within the relative clause. Keenan and Comrie (1977) formulated the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy, which defines universal principles of relativization strategies. According to this hierarchy the most accessible category for relativization is the subject. The other categories having a lower status in the hierarchy are direct object, indirect object, oblique argument, possessor and object of comparison, in this order. The hierarchy predicts that if a category of lower level is relativizable in a given language the categories of higher level are also relativizable. Thus, if direct objects can be relativized then subjects can also be relativized. If indirect objects can be relativized then both subjects and direct objects are relativizable. See Table 3 in which the sign > means ‘is more accessible to relativization’.

Table 3

subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique argument > possessor >
 object of comparison

This hierarchy is observed also in Uyghur. In Uyghur, subjects, direct objects, indirect objects, oblique objects, and possessors can be relativized but not objects of comparison. See the following examples representing relativization of different categories.

Ex. 26

Subject
kitab-ni oqu-γan bala
 book-ACC read-GAN.PART boy
 ‘the boy who has read / read the book’

Ex. 27

Direct object
u-niγ al-γan kitab-lir-i
 (s)he-GEN buy-GAN.PART book-PL-3POSS
 ‘the books that (s)he has bought /bought’

Ex. 28

Indirect object

qiz kitab-ni bär-gän ayal
 girl book-ACC give-GAN.PART woman
 ‘the woman to whom the girl has given / gave the book’

Ex. 29

Oblique argument

toxtam imzala-n-yan yär
 contract sign-PASS-GAN.PART place
 ‘the place where the contract was signed’

Ex. 30

Oblique argument

tamaka çek-iş čäklä-n-gän orun
 cigarette smoke-VERBAL NOUN forbid-PASS-GAN.PART place
 ‘a place where smoking cigarettes is / has been / was banned’

Ex. 31

Complement of a postposition

prezident-niñi kelişim-gä qol qoy-yan qälim-i
 president-GEN contract-DAT sign-GAN.PART pen-3POSS
 ‘the pen with which the president has signed / signed the contract’

Observe that the postposition *bilän* ‘with’ cannot be used without a complement; thus it cannot be stranded in the relative clause; see Ex. 32.

Ex. 32

*prezident-niñi *bilän kelişim-gä qol qoy-yan qälim-i*
 president-GEN with contract-DAT sign-GAN.PART pen-3POSS

Possessive marked, so-called secondary postpositions are syntactically free; thus they can be stranded in the relative clause; see Ex. 33.

Ex. 33

Complement of a postposition marked with a possessive suffix

ast-i-da su-lar eq-ip tur-idiyan aramgah
 below-3POSS-LOC water-PL flow-CONV AUX-IDIGAN.PART garden house
 ‘a garden house under which waters are flowing’

A possible finite sentence corresponding to Ex. 33 is Ex. 34.

Ex. 34

Aramgah ast-i-da su-lar eq-ip tur-idu.
 garden house under-3POSS-LOC water-PL flow-CONV AUX-PRES
 ‘Waters are flowing under the garden house.’

The following examples illustrate relativization of the genitive possessor. In Ex. 35, Ex. 36, and Ex. 37, the head noun is coreferential with the possessor of the subject, in Ex. 38, with the possessor of the direct object noun phrase, and in Ex. 40, with the possessor in an adverbial expression.

Ex. 35

Possessor of the subject

dost-i_i öy-gä käl-gän qiz_i
 friend-3POSS home-DAT come-GAN.PART girl
 ‘the girl whose friend has come home’

Ex. 36

Possessor of the subject

ayal-i_i tügä-p kät-kän qoşni-miz_i
 wife-3POSS finish-CONV AUX-PART neighbor-1PL.POSS
 ‘our neighbor whose wife passed away’

Ex. 37

Possessor of the subject

ayriq-i_i kün-din kün-gä eyirla-p kät-kän kesäl_i
 illness-3POSS day-ABL day-DAT get worse-CONV AUX-GAN.PART patient
 ‘a patient whose illness is getting more serious from day to day’

Ex. 38

Possessor of the object

qoy-lir-i-ni_i bōrā ye-gän padiči-lar_i
 sheep-PL-3POSS-ACC wolf eat-GAN.PART shepherd-PL
 ‘the shepherds whose sheep were eaten by the wolf’

A possible corresponding finite sentence is Ex. 39.

Ex. 39

Padiči-lar-ni_i qoy-lir-i-ni_i bōrā ye-di.
 shepherd-PL-GEN sheep-PL-3POSS-ACC wolf eat-PAST
 ‘The wolf has eaten / ate the shepherd’s sheep.’

Ex. 40

Possessor in an NP functioning as adverbial

ögzi-si-din_i bir nāččā kičik xiš parči-si čüş-kän öy_i
 roof-3POSS-ABL several small brick piece-3POSS fall-GAN.PART house
 ‘the house from the roof of which several small pieces of bricks fell’

A possible corresponding finite sentence is Ex. 41.

Ex. 41

Öy-niñ_i ögzi-si-din_i bir näččä kičik xiš parči-si čüş-ti.
 house roof-3POSS-ABL several small brick piece-3POSS fall-PAST
 'From the roof of the house several pieces of bricks fell down.'

As pointed out above, objects of comparison cannot be relativized. The insertion of a resumptive pronoun representing the head noun in the relative clause is not acceptable for all speakers.

Ex. 42

Object of comparison without any resumptive pronoun

*Ärkin tez-räk yügür-gän bala
 Erkin quick-COMP run-GAN.PART boy
 Intended meaning: 'the boy who Erkin has run / ran faster than'

The possible corresponding finite sentence is Ex. 43.

Ex. 43

Ärkin bali-din tez-räk yügür-di.
 Erkin boy-ABL quick-COMP run-PAST
 'Erkin ran faster than the boy.'

Ex. 44

Object of comparison with a resumptive pronoun

*?Ärkin özi-din tez-räk yügür-gän bala
 Erkin himself-ABL quick-COMP run-GAN.PART boy
 Intended meaning: 'the boy compared to whom Erkin runs / has run / ran faster'

If the predicate of the relative clause is a nominal category, the participle of the copula verb *bol-* is used.

Ex. 45

Relative clause based on the copula

on yil-din beri särgärdan bol-yan yetim
 ten year-ABL since vagabond be-GAN.PART orphan
 'an orphan who has been a vagabond for ten years'

Ex. 46

Relative clause based on the copula

män mäktäb-dä bol-idiyan kün
 I school-LOC be-IDITAN.PART day
 'the day when I will be at school'

See the possible corresponding finite sentences Ex. 47 and Ex. 48.

Ex. 47

Yetim on yil-din beri särgärdan bol-di.
 orphan ten year-ABL since vagabond be-PAST
 ‘The orphan has been a vagabond for ten years.’

Ex. 48

Män u kün-i mäktäb-dä bol-i-män.
 I that day-3POSS school-LOC be-PRES-1SG
 ‘I will be at school that day.’

Constituents of existential clauses based on *bar* ‘existing’ and *yoq* ‘non-existing’ can also be relativized. There are three possible variants. The last one is regarded to be redundant in written language.

Ex. 49

Existential clause

ič-i-dä üç top bar qap
 inside-3SG.POSS-LOC three ball existing container

ič-i-dä üç top bol-yan qap
 inside-3SG.POSS-LOC three ball be-GAN.PART container

ič-i-dä üç top bar bol-yan qap
 inside-3SG.POSS-LOC three ball existing be-GAN.PART container
 ‘a container in which there are three balls’

Ambiguity in relative clauses

The semantic relation between the head and the relative clause is not marked in Uyghur. This is typical for Turkic relative clauses. For instance, the nominal head *müšük* ‘cat’ can be interpreted both as a subject and a non-specific object in Ex. 50. Interpretation relies on semantic, pragmatic and contextual clues.

Ex. 50

čačqan yä-gän müšük
 mouse eat-GAN.PART cat
 ‘a cat which has eaten / ate mice’
 ‘a mouse which has eaten / ate cats’

In certain cases resumptive pronouns can dissolve the ambiguity. The resumptive pronouns *özi* ‘himself/herself’ and *özliri* ‘themselves’ can represent a head referring to human beings, such as *biri* ‘someone’, *kişilär* ‘people’; see Ex. 51 and Ex. 52. The resumptive pronouns carry the case marker or the postposition that the relativized constituent would be associated with in a corresponding finite clause. Constructions with resumptive pronouns are, however, not acceptable to all speakers.

Ex. 51

Män öz-i bilän sözliş-älä-ydiyan biri-ni izdä-watimän.
 I self-3SG.POSS with talk-POT-IDIFAN.PART someone look for-IWAT.PRES1SG
 ‘I am looking for somebody with whom I can talk.’

Ex. 52

Biz öz-lir-i-din näprätlin-idiyan kişi-lär-ni yaxşı kör-mä-y-miz.
 we self-PL-3SG.POSS hate-IDIFAN.PART people-PL like-NEG-PRES-1PL
 ‘We do not like people who hate themselves.’

The semantics of the participle suffixes

Viewpoint markers

The suffix GEN

In the description of the viewpoint meanings of participles, Johanson’s theoretical framework will be employed (2000). The functions of the Uyghur forms could also be compared with the system of the Noghay participles, which have been thoroughly studied by Karakoç (2005 and 2007). Because of the limited scope of this paper, we will restrict our study to the Uyghur system. Our description corresponds in several respects to the one given in Rentzsch (2005: 162), who defines the following viewpoint oppositions in relative clauses as in Table 4.

Table 4

[+INTRA ^{-FOC}]	IDIFAN
[+INTRA ^{+FOC}]	IWATQAN
[-INTRA]	GAN

It is well-known that in finite sentences, the verb in *-GAN* denotes an action that has already been carried out, i.e. it has a postterminal meaning. We refer to Johanson (2000) for definitions of the viewpoint operators.

Ex. 53

Bu xät-ni män yaz-yan.
 this letter-ACC I write-GAN
 ‘I have written this letter.’

The actional phrase in Ex. 53 is finitransformative, i.e. the event is regarded to have been carried out when it has been completed. The relevant *terminus* is the end of the event. The postterminal viewpoint operator directs the view to the event after this *terminus* has been reached, i.e. after the action has been completed. The following example illustrates an initialtransformative actional phase.

Ex. 54

Mân otur-yan.

I sit down / sit-GAN

'I have sat down.'

Ex. 54 can be said in a situation when the speaker is sitting.

With initialtransformative actional phrases, the relevant terminus is defined as the point when the first dynamic phase of the verb has been carried out. The postterminal view directs the attention to a point after the transgression of this terminus. An initialtransformative verb such as *otur-* defines a dynamic phase 'sit down' and a following static phase 'sit'. The action is regarded to be carried out when the dynamic phase is completed. The postterminal viewpoint directs the attention to the achievement of this point, i.e. when the action of 'having sat down' is completed. It does not specify whether the event of 'sitting' is ongoing or already finished. Thus, the participle *otur-yan* can refer to a situation where the subject is still sitting. A test to identify initialtransformative verbs is by means of a sentence such as Turkish *oturduğum ve hala oturuyorum* 'I have sat down and am still sitting'. Such an expression is meaningless with finittransformatives *öldüm ve hala ölüyorum* *'I have died and am still dying'.

With nontransformative actional phrases, which do not define any natural turning point when the event is regarded to have been carried out, the relevant terminus to which a postterminal operator can refer is the starting point of the event. Thus, the reading of the following nontransformative actional phase is that the event has at least started and may still be ongoing.

Ex. 55

Mâktâb-dâ kitab set-il-yan.

school-LOC book sell-PASS- GAN

'Books have been sold in the school.'

Rentzsch claims, see Table 4, that in relative clauses, the participle in *-GAN* marks [-INTRA] but not [+POST] viewpoint. According to our understanding of the interplay between the actional characteristics of the respective phrase and the postterminal operators, participles in *-GAN* mark a postterminal viewpoint also in relative clauses. The readings vary depending on the phase structure of the actional phrases. Ex. 56 illustrates a finittransformative actional phrase, Ex. 57, an initialtransformative one, and Ex. 58, a nontransformative one.

Ex. 56

öl-gân adâm

die-GAN.PART man

'the man who has died'

Ex. 57

oltur-yan *adām*
 sit down / sit-GAN.PART man
 ‘the man who sat down [and can still be sitting]’

Ex. 58

mäktäb-dä *set-il-yan* *kitab-lar*
 school-LOC sell-PASS-GAN.PART book-PL
 ‘the books which are / have been / were sold at school’

Observe that in spite of the fact that both Ex. 57 and Ex. 58 can refer to a still ongoing event, this does not make them [-POST] and quasi-intraterminal, as suggested by Rentzsch (2005: 143-162). Thus, such relative expressions can be translated into English using different aspectotemporal forms depending on the context. However, the interpretations are customarily related to a postterminal viewpoint.

Ex. 59

šwetsiyä-din *uç-qan* *ayruplan*
 Sweden-ABL fly-GAN.PART plane
 ‘the plane which comes/ has come from Sweden’

Ex. 60

muzikant *bol-yan* *askār*
 musician be-GAN.PART soldier
 ‘a soldier who is / has been / was a musician’

This is not in any way contradictory to the fact that the participle in *-GAN* is the unmarked member of the viewpoint oppositions in relative clauses and as such its viewpoint value can be blended out.

Table 5

GAN	[+POST][−INTRA]	[−POST][+INTRA ^{−FOC}]	IDIʔAN
		[−POST][+INTRA ^{+FOC}]	IWATQAN

The two other participles in *-(i)watqan* and *-Idiyan* mark intraterminality.

Participles in *-Idiyan*, and *-(i)watqan*

The participle in *-Idiyan* (< *-a duryan*) has a non-focal intraterminal meaning and depending on the context can be interpreted as referring to an ongoing or prospective event, e. g. *yaz-idiyan* ‘who writes / will write’.

Ex. 61

su bilān ič-idiyan dora
 water with drink-IDITAN.PART pill
 ‘a pill which is taken with water’

Ex. 62

U sen-i čüšin-älä-ydiyan yaš-ta ämäs.
 (s)he you-ACC understand-POT-IDITAN.PART age-LOC COP-NEG.3SG
 ‘(S)he is not of an age where (s)he can understand you.’

Ex. 63

mān ätä bar-idiyan kutubxana
 I tomorrow go-IDITAN.PART library
 ‘the library where I will go to tomorrow’

Ex. 64

gül tik-il-idiyan taštāk
 flower plant-PASS-IDITAN.PART flowerpot
 ‘the flowerpot into which the flower will be planted’

Ex. 65

mān bil-idiyan bir sayahät širkiti
 I know-IDITAN.PART one travel agency
 ‘a travel agency which I know’

The participle in *-(i)watqan*, on the other hand, denotes focal intraterminality and mainly refers to actually ongoing situations or events.

Ex. 66

siñl-im oqu-watqan kitab
 younger sister-1SG.POSS read-IWATQAN.PART book
 ‘the book that my younger sister is (just now) reading’

Ex. 67

yol-da ket-iwatqan adäm-lär
 road-LOC walk-IWATQAN.PART man-PL
 ‘the people who are (just now) walking on the road’

Modality markers

The participle in *-mAKči bolyan*

The participle in *-mAKči bolyan* (in Uyghur *mäqsäd peili*) conveys a modal meaning denoting the intention or will of the first actant. *-mAKči bolyan* and *-Idiyan* can often be used interchangeably when the speaker refers to a prospective event. However *-mAKči bolyan* cannot be used when the speaker doesn’t want to convey

intentionality or will. In Ex. 63 and Ex. 64 we can replace *-Idiyan* by *-mAKçi bol-yan*, but not in Ex. 70 because in this example *-idiyan* cannot be interpreted intentionally.

Ex. 68

män ätä bar-maqçi bol-yan kutubxana
I tomorrow go-INTENT.PART library
'the library to which I intend to go tomorrow'

Ex. 69

gül tik-il-mäkçi bol-yan taštäk
flower plant-PASS-INTENT.PART flowerpot
'the flowerpot into which the flower has to be planted'

Ex. 70

biz näprätlin-idiyan kiši-lär
we hate-IDIFAN.PART people-PL
'the people whom we hate'

Observe that in Ex. 69 the participle is a passive form *tiki-* 'be planted'. Thus, the subject *gül* 'flower' is not an Agent. The volitional meaning is therefore impersonal. In Ex. 71 and Ex. 72 the subjects in the relative clauses are Agents; thus the modal participle expresses their will or intention.

Ex. 71

män yaz-maqçi bol-yan xät
I write-INTENT.PART letter
'the letter which I will write'

Ex. 72

sawaqdiš-im-niñ al-maqçi bol-yan kitab-i
classmate-1SG.POSS-GEN buy-INTENT.PART book-3SG.POSS
'the book which my classmate wants to buy'

The participles in *-GUDäk* / *-GUčilik*

This participle is formed by a combination of the voluntative / necessitative participle *-GU* and the Equative marker *-DAK* or the derivative suffix *-ČILIK*. When these are employed in relative clauses, they express ability, probability or potentiality.

Ex. 73

üč kün-gä yät-küdäk un
three day-DAT suffice-GUDÄK.PART flour
'the flour which may suffice for three days'

Ex. 74

kök-kä taqaš-qudäk egiz imarät
 sky-DAT touch-GUDÄK.PART high building
 ‘a high building which can touch the sky’

Ex. 75

put qoy-γudäk yär
 foot put-GUDÄK.PART place
 ‘a place where the foot can stand’

Ex. 76

män hal-im-ni eyt-qudäk birär adäm
 I situation-1SG.POSS-ACC tell-GUDÄK.PART some man
 ‘a man to whom I will tell my situation / my sorrows’

Ex. 77

ussuzluq-ni qandur-γučilik su
 thirst-ACC quench-ΓUČILIK.PART water
 ‘water which can quench thirst’

The participle in *-miš*

The participle in *-miš* is mostly used to build finite verb forms. Its use as a participle is very restricted. It denotes a postterminal viewpoint and can be used interchangeably with *-GAN*. The use of *-miš* marks a poetic or literary style.

Ex. 78

Hun näsl-i-din bol-miš / bolγan qäwm-lär
 Hun descendant-3SG.POSS-ABL be-MİŞ.PART / GAN.PART tribe-PL
 ‘the tribes who descended from the Huns’

Ex. 79

ziyali aili-si-din kel-ip čiq-miš / čiqqan dehqan
 intellectual family-3SG.POSS come-CONV AUX-MİŞ.PART / GAN.PART peasant
 ‘the peasant who descended from an intellectual family’

The aorist participle and its negated form

The aorist participle is used almost exclusively in lexicalised forms, such as *aqar yultuz* ‘shooting star’, *uçar at* ‘flying horse’, *uçar täxsä* ‘UFO’, *tügimäs bayliq* ‘infinite treasure’, *yeñilmäs armiyä* ‘undefeatable army’. In relative clauses, the participle in *-Idiyan* is used.

The use of Genitive relative constructions

A Genitive possessor of the head noun can precede a relative clause. A possessive suffix on the head noun marks agreement with the Genitive possessor.

Table 6

$$[NP_1^{GEN} [_{REL.S} SUBJ(X) PART] N^{POSSi}]$$

In Ex. 80, the relative clause *sän sunduryan* ‘you have broken’ has its own subject *sän* ‘you’. The Genitive noun *maşini-niñ* ‘of the car’ is semantically not related to the relative clause, i.e. it is not interpreted as a constituent of the relative clause. The Genitive NP designates the owner of the head noun *sol äynik-i* ‘its left mirror’. The noun phrase is consequently composed of the Genitive possessor and the possessed noun: *maşini-niñ sol äynik-i* ‘the left mirror of the car’, and the intervening relative clause *sän sunduryan* ‘which you have broken / broke’, which modifies the head noun *sol äynik-i* ‘its left mirror’. Ex. 81 has an analogous structure.

Ex. 80

maşini-niñ_i sän sun-dur-yan sol äynik-i_i
 car-GEN you break-CAUS-GAN.PART left mirror-3SG.POSS
 ‘the left mirror of the car which you have broken / broke’

Ex. 81

öy igi-si-niñ_i män qorq-idiyan it-i_i
 house owner-3SG.POSS-GEN I afraid-IDIFAN.PART dog-3SG.POSS
 ‘the landlord’s dog which I am afraid of’

Genitive relative clauses, introduced above, have seemingly the same syntactic structure except for the coreference between the Genitive noun and the first actant of the relative clause.

Table 7

$$[NP_1^{GEN} [_{REL.S} \emptyset_i (X) PART] N^{POSSi}] \text{ where } \emptyset \text{ is the syntactically unrealized first actant}$$

Ex. 82

Genitive relative construction

qiz-niñ_i söy-gän yigit-i_i
 girl-GEN love-GAN.PART boy-3POSS
 ‘the boy whom the girl has loved / loved’

The interpretation of such constructions relies on syntactic and semantic clues. In the next example, the subject of the passive verb *oyurla-n-yan* is relativized; thus the Genitive NP *dost-um-niñ* ‘of my friend’ cannot be interpreted as the subject of the relative clause.

Table 8

$$[NP_1^{GEN} [_{REL.S} \emptyset_j (X) PART] N_j^{POSSi}]$$

Ex. 83

dost-um-ni_i *o_yurla-n-_{yan}* *hâmyan-i_i*
 friend-1SGPOSS-GEN steal-PASS-GAN.PART wallet-3POSS
 ‘my friend’s wallet, which has been / was stolen’

In Ex. 84 the subject of the predicate *muhim bolmiyan* ‘not having been / being important’ is relativized; thus, again, the Genitive NP *artist-ni_i* ‘of the actor’ cannot be the first actant of the relative clause.

Ex. 84

artist-ni_i *muhim* *bol-mi-_{yan}* *rol-i_i*
 actor-GEN important be-NEG-GAN.PART role-3SG.POSS
 ‘the actor’s part, which is / has not been / was not important’

In the following example, the direct object *kitablar* ‘books’ is relativized. The Genitive pronoun *u-ni_i* ‘his / her’ can be coreferential with the first actant of the relative clause because no subject is present in the construction. At the same time, it can also be interpreted as the possessor of the head noun *kitableri* ‘his / her books’.

Ex. 85

Direct object

u-ni_i *al-_{yan}* *kitab-lir-i_i*
 she-GEN buy-GAN.PART book-PL-3SG.3POSS
 ‘the books that (s)he has bought / bought’

The head noun can also be an indirect object as in Ex. 86, or the complement of a postposition as in Ex. 87.

Ex. 86

qiz-ni_i *kitab-ni* *bâr-gân* *dost-i_i*
 girl-GEN book-ACC give-GAN.PART friend-3POSS
 ‘the friend of the girl to whom she gave the book’

Ex. 87

men-i_i *hâr kûn* *ald-i-din* *öt-idiyan* *öy-üm_i*
 I-GEN every day front-3POSS-LOC pass-IDIFAN.PART house-1SG.POSS
 ‘the house which I pass by every day’

The possessor of the subject of the relative clause cannot be relativized with the Genitive construction. The relative clause in Ex. 88 cannot be converted to a Genitive relative construction. Thus, Ex. 89 has a different meaning according to which the head, *muâllim* ‘teacher’, is interpreted as the subject of the relative clause and the Genitive noun, as its possessor.

Ex. 88

dost-i_i öy-gä käl-gän muällim-i_i
 friend-3POSS home-DAT come-GAN.PART teacher
 ‘the teacher whose friend has come / came home’

Ex. 89

Genitive possessor of the subject

dost-i-niñ-i_i öy-gä käl-gän muällim-i_i
 friend-3POSS-GEN home-DAT come-GAN.PART teacher-3POSS
 ‘his friend’s teacher who has come home’
 It cannot mean: ‘the teacher whose friend has come / came home’

An adverbial constituent of the Genitive relative clause can also be relativized.

Ex. 90

toxtam-niñ-i_i imzala-n-yan yer-i_i
 contract-GEN sign-PASS-GAN.PART place-3POSS
 ‘the place in the contract where it has been signed’

We assume that this construction, which is also found in other Turkic languages, for instance in Turkmen and Karachay-Balkar, is the result of a grammaticalization process. Observe also that Ex. 85 can be rewritten so that it becomes clear that the Genitive noun is not the possessor of the books.

Ex. 91

Direct object

u-niñ-i_i maña al-yan kitab-lir-i_i
 she-GEN I-DAT buy-GAN.PART book-PL-3POSS
 ‘the books that (s)he has bought / bought for me’

The question to be addressed is what the special function of this Genitive relative construction is. What is the motivation for using a Genitive relative clause instead of a Nominative one? An obvious assumption is that a Genitive subject is syntactically more prominent than a Nominative subject and can play a marked role with respect to semantic features such as specificity, or information structure features such as focus, topic. These assumptions have to be studied. Here we mention some observations.

Both the Nominative and the Genitive relative clause types can be used if the subject is specific.

Ex. 92

u qiz sôy-gän yigit
 that girl love-GAN.PART boy
 ‘the boy whom that girl loves / has loved / loved’

Ex. 93

u qiz-niŋ_i söy-gän yigit-i_i
 that girl-GEN love-GAN.PART boy-3POSS
 ‘the boy whom that girl loves / has loved / loved’

However, the Genitive relative cannot be used when the subject is non-specific, as in Ex. 94, Ex. 96 and Ex. 98.

Ex. 94

hič kim söy-mä-ydigän yigit
 nobody love-NEG-IDITAN.PART boy
 ‘the boy whom nobody loves’

Ex. 95

**hič kim-niŋ_i söy-mä-ydigän yigit-i_i*
 nobody-GEN love-NEG-IDITAN.PART boy-3POSS
 Intended meaning: ‘the boy whom nobody loves’

Ex. 96

kün nuri kirmi-gän öy
 sunshine enter-GAN.PART house
 ‘the house into which the sunshine does not enter’

Ex. 97

**kün nuri-niŋ_i kirmi-gän öy-i_i*
 sunshine-GEN enter-GAN.PART house-3POSS
 Intended meaning: ‘the house into which the sunshine does not enter’

Animacy or agentivity do not play any role. Thus, both Agentive and Non-Agentive subjects can occur in Genitive relatives.

Ex. 98

Non-agentive subject

men-iŋ_i yiqil-yan yer-im_i
 I-GEN fall down-GAN.PART place-1SG.POSS
 ‘the place where I fell down’

Ex. 99

däräxt-niŋ_i yiqil-yan yer-i_i
 tree-GEN fall down-GAN.PART place-3POSS
 ‘the place where the tree has fallen / fell down’

Possessive-marked heads of relative clauses also get a [+specific] reading. Compare the following examples:

Ex. 100

män oqu-yan kitab
 I read-GAN.PART book
 ‘a book I read / have read / read’

Ex. 101

men-in_i oqu-yan kitab-im_i
 I read-GAN.PART book-1SG.POSS
 ‘a (certain) / the book I read / have read / read’

Functionally relevant constructions

Null-participle relative clause

These are so-called *bahuvrihi* constructions describing the possessor of something that is characterized by, for instance, an adjective. It is a small clause without any verbal predicate.

Ex. 102

mänziri-si güzäl šähär
 landscape-3POSS beautiful city
 ‘a city, the landscape of which is beautiful’

Ex. 103

saqal-lir-i kümüş-täk ap’aq boway
 beard-PL-3POSS silver-EQU pure white old man
 ‘an old man whose beard is as pure white as silver’

Ex. 104

muqawi-si yirtiq kitab
 cover-3POSS torn book
 ‘a book the cover of which is torn up’

Constructions introduced by *ki*

There are also some finite postpositioned clauses following a junctor *ki* that are functionally similar to relative clauses.

Ex. 105

Alim ajayip bala ki hičkim-niñ söz-i-gä pärwa qil-ma-ydu.
 Alim strange boy JUNC anybody-GEN word-3POSS-DAT care-NEG-3SG.IMPF
 ‘Alim is a strange boy who never cares what others say.’

Functionally, Ex. 105 is an alternative way to express the same meaning as the relative clause in Ex. 106.

Ex. 106

Alim hičkim-niñ söz-i-gä pärwa qıl-ma-ydiyan ajayip bala.
 Alim anybody-GEN word-3POSS-DAT care-NEG- IDIT'AN.PART strange boy
 'Alim is a strange boy who never cares what others say.'

Conclusion

There are two main types of relative clauses in modern Uyghur. The unmarked construction is one in which no agreement morphology is used, i.e. the typical Turkic non-marked relative clause construction. The other type is like the Turkmen or Karachay–Balkar genitive relative clause with subject and head noun agreement. This latter is the marked construction with specific semantic properties.

List of abbreviations

2PL	second person plural	IDIT'AN.PART	participle in <i>-IdiyAn</i>
2SG	second person singular	IMP	imperative
3POSS	third person possessive	INTENT.PART	participle in <i>-mAkçi bolyan</i>
3SG	third person singular	IWAT.PRES	present in <i>-(i)wat</i>
ABL	ablative	IWATQAN.PART	participle in <i>-(i)watqan</i>
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
AUX	auxiliary	MAQČI.PART	participle in <i>-mAkči</i>
CAUS	causative	MIŠ.PART	participle in <i>-miš</i>
COMP	comparative	NEG	negative
CONV	converb	PASS	passive
COP	copula	PAST	past
DAT	dative	PL	plural
DIK.PART	participle in <i>-DIK</i>	POT	potential
GAN.PART	participle in <i>-GAn</i>	PRES	present
GEN	genitive	PST	past
GUČILIK	participle in <i>-GUčilik</i>	EQU	similitude marker (<i>-däk</i>)
GUDÄK.PART	participle in <i>-GUDÄK</i>		

References

- Cheng, Shiliang et al. (eds.) 1996. *Xiandai weiwuer yu yufa. Hazirqi zaman uyghur tili grammatikasi*. [Modern Uyghur grammar] (In Chinese and Uyghur). Ürümchi: Shinjang Xälq Nāshriyati.
- Chomsky, Noam 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Comrie, Bernard & Kuteva, Tania 2005. Relativization strategies. In: Haspelmath, Martin et al. (eds.) *World atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 122-123.
- Csató, Éva Á. 1996. A typological review of relative clause constructions in some Turkic languages. In: Rona, Bengisu (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 15.-17. August 1990, School of Oriental and African Studies*. Ankara: Hitit Yayinevi. 28-32.
- de Jong, Frederick 2007. *A grammar of Modern Uyghur*. Utrecht: Houtsma.
- Friedrich, Michael [in cooperation with Abdurishid Yakup] 2002. *Uyghurisch Lehrbuch*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- Hahn, Reinhard F. 1991. *Spoken Uyghur*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press.
- Johanson, Lars 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csátó, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London, New York: Routledge. 30-66.
- Johanson, Lars 2000. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27-187.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen*. (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Karakoç, Birsal 2007. Nogayca ve Türkiye Türkçesinde tümleç yan cümlelerinde kullanılan yüklemleştiricilerin bir karşılaştırması. In: Bakó-Nagy, Marianne & Berta, Árpád & Róna-Tas, András (eds.) *Turcology in Turkey. Selected papers* [Studia Uralo-Altaica 47.] Szeged: Altajisztikai Tanszék. 337-359.
- Keenan, Edward & Comrie, Bernard 1977. Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 63-99.
- Niyaz, Xaliq 1982. Hazirqi zaman Uyghur tilidiki addi jümlilärning jümlä nusxiliri (The types of simple sentences in modern Uyghur). In: Shinjang Til-yeziq Komiteti [Language and Script Committee of Xinjiang] (ed.) *Uyghur tili mäsililiri* [Some issues of the Uyghur Language]. Urumchi: Shinjang Xälq Näshriyati.
- Qasim, Muhäbbät 1982. Hazirqi zaman Uyghur tilidiki söz birikmiliri wä ularniñ jümlidiki roli [Phrases and their role in sentences in modern Uyghur]. In: Shinjang Til-yeziq Komiteti [Language and Script Committee of Xinjiang] Qasim, Muhäbbät (ed.) *Uyghur tili mäsililiri* [Some issues of the Uyghur language]. Urumchi: Shinjang Xälq Näshriyati.
- Rentzsch, Julian 2005. *Aspekt im Neuigurischen*. (Turcologica 65). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1960. *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Tohti, Litip 1995. Weiwuer yu de guanxi congju [Relative clauses in Uyghur]. *Minzu Yuwen Bimonthly* 6: 26-34.
- Tohti, Litip 2004. *Cong duanyu jieyou dao zui jian fang'an: Aertai yuyan de jufa jieyou* [From Phrase Structure to Minimalist Program: The syntactic structure of Altaic languages]. Beijing: The Publishing House of Central University for Nationalities.
- Tömür, Hämit 1987. *Hazirqi zaman uyghur tili grammatikisi. Morfologiya* [Modern Uyghur grammar: Morphology]. Beijing: Minzu Publishing House.
- Uchurpani, Muzappar Abdurusul 2009a. *Weiwuer yu de xingrongci hua duanyu: Shengcheng yufa kuangjia nei de yanjiu* [Adjectivalized phrase in Uyghur: A study in the framework of the Minimalist Program]. (Unpublished monograph.)
- Uchurpani, Muzappar Abdurusul 2009b. Weiwuer yu de guanxi duanyu [Adjectivalized phrase or relative clause in Uyghur]. *Manyu yanjiu* [Manchu studies] 2, 53-57. Heilongjiang University.