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Introduction
Lars Johanson’s turcological oeuvre manifests an exceptional coherence. Views presented in his early writings are elaborated, broadened and completed but not contradicted in later works. Together with his students, who adopted his theoretical frameworks for the description of Turkic and non-Turkic languages, he has established a vital and successful tradition in Turkic linguistics with unchallenged validity in the flux of competing linguistic trends. The Mainzer school is based on Johanson’s creative insight into the nature of the Turkic linguistic type and its historical development, and his broad knowledge and innovative talent in general linguistics. This study aims at illustrating the validity of his approach for the description of complement clauses in Turkish.

Complement clauses in Turkish

Definition
First, the morphosyntactic and semantic properties of two types of complement clauses (CC) in Turkish: CCs based on the participle DİK on the one hand and CCs based on the infinitive MA on the other hand, will be contrasted. The findings of this comparison may contribute to a cross-linguistic typology of complementation.

Using syntactic criteria, CCs are cross-linguistically defined as embedded/subordinated clauses functioning as arguments of a matrix predicate. They assume functions such as subject, object, or complement of an adposition. Because they often occur in NP positions, they are also called nominal clauses (Aarts 2006). In English, embedding of CCs is usually marked through a free subjunctor such as that. Examples of English CCs:

1. That she comes is plausible.
2. He knows that she comes.
3. He convinced me that she is good.

The same criteria will be applied here for defining CCs in Turkish. Thus, Turkish CCs are also associated with the following properties:
- CCs have full predicative potential to include a predicate and an overt subject different from the subject of the matrix clause.
- CCs function as arguments of a predicate.

In Turkish, CCs are typically subordinated by bound subordinators. The predicate is, usually but not always, based on a non-finite verbal category such as a participle, an infinitive or another type of verbal noun. The bound morphemes building these non-finite verb forms function as subordinators assuming a function similar to the one of a free subordinator such as that in English; see the following examples.

(4) Gelmesi büyük bir ihtimal.
   come-INF.MA-POSS3SG great a probability
   ‘That (s)he comes is highly plausible.’
   (Subjunctor: INF.MA-POSS)

(5) Geldiğini biliyor.
   come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC know-PRES.IYOR.3SG
   ‘(S)he knows that (s)he has come.’
   (Subjunctor: PART.DIK-POSS)

(6) İyi olduğuna beni ikna etti.
   good be-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-DAT I-ACC convince-PAST.3SG
   ‘(S)he convinced me that (s)he is good.’
   (Subjunctor: PART.DIK-POSS)

It has to be pointed out that, in addition to these two types of subordinators, i.e. DİK and MA, to be studied here, Turkish also employs other non-finite verb forms in CCs, e.g. the prospective participle in YACAK and the verbal noun in YİŞ. These will, however, not be discussed in this article. We will just shortly comment on the meaning of YACAK in the last part of the article. Neither will we treat here the free subjunctor, the so-called quotation particle diye [say-CONV.YA] ‘saying’, employed to embed direct quotations.

(7) Gelir-im diye cevap ver-di-m.
   come-AOR-1SG say-CONV.YA answer give-PAST-1SG
   ‘I answered: ‘I will come’.’
   (Subjunctor: diye)

Subordination
Johanson has in several studies emphasized the importance of making a clear distinction between morphosyntactic and semantic criteria in the description of Turkic syntax. Only by keeping syntax and semantics apart can we describe possible interrelations between them. In his article on Turkic hypotaxis (1975a, see also Johanson 1990), he pointed out that subordination in Turkic languages does not necessarily imply semantic dependency and that semantic dependency is not necessarily marked by subordination. Thus, although convert clauses based on a convert in YİP are
always syntactically subordinated, they can either function as adverbial modifiers of a predicate or also convey a proposition which is at equal level with the proposition expressed in the matrix clause, i.e. the semantic relation between the two propositions corresponds to an English S and S-relation.

(8)  *Yarın Berlin'e gidip bir seminere katılacağım.*

tomorrow Berlin-DAT go-CONV.YIP a seminar-DAT

take part-FUT1SG

‘Tomorrow I will go to Berlin and take part in a seminar.’ (Johanson 1991 [1975a]: 221)

Johanson, in the same article, also demonstrated that copies of Persian junctors such as *ki* ‘that’ and *çünkü* ‘because’ may convey the same meanings as the corresponding English subjunctors *that* and *because*, without being subjunctors (Johanson 1975a).

An adequate description of complement clauses requires this scrutiny in distinguishing morphosyntactic and semantic criteria. Only by doing so can we show the full typology of possible syntactic and semantic relations between clauses. It will be demonstrated here that complement clauses sharing basic structural properties may significantly differ with respect to their semantic properties.

CCs are, according to the definition given above, subordinated clauses. The term subordination is applied here in a purely syntactic sense following Johanson’s (1975a) definition for subordination or hypotaxis in Turkish. According to this definition subordinated clauses are syntactic constituents of the matrix predication. The matrix structure in its turn can be subordinated to another matrix predication. In (5) the complement clause *geldiğini* ‘that (s)he has come’ is subordinated to the matrix clause. In (9) this matrix clause including its complement clause is subordinated to another matrix clause.

(9)  *Geldiğini bildiğini*  
come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC know-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC

söyledi.
say-PAST.3SG

‘(S)he said that (s)he knew that (s)he had come.’

Clauses based on an infinitive in MA fulfil the same requirements and are thus regarded as complement clauses.

(10)  *Gelmesini istediğini*  
come-INF.MA-POSS3SG-ACC want-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC
	söyledi.
say-PAST.DI.3SG

‘(S)he said that (s)he wanted her/him to come.’
These syntactic criteria will serve here to distinguish between complement clauses, i.e. clause-like subordinated arguments, on the one hand, and non-subordinated clauses assuming argument-like semantic relations to a matrix predicate, on the other hand. See, for instance, the following example in which the clause geldi ‘(s)he has come’ is syntactically not subordinated to the clause biliyor ‘(s)he knows’, although (11) can get the same reading as (5).

(11) Biliyor ki geldi.
know-PRES.IVOR.3SG that come-PAST.DI.3SG
‘(S)he knows that (s)he has come.’

As Johanson (1975a) pointed out, (11) cannot be subordinated to another matrix clause, and thus geldi ‘(s)he has come’ should not be treated as a CC of the predicate bildi ‘(s)he knew’. Note that (12) is not a well-formed structure.

(12) *Bildiğini ki geldi
know-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC that come-PAST.DI.3SG
söyledi.
say-PAST.DI.3SG

Thus, we conclude that clauses based on DİK and MA share the property that they both can function as subordinated clause-like arguments, i.e. as CCs. This view contradicts Underhill’s position presented in his grammar (1976). Underhill regards CCs to be nominalizations and claims that only DİK and YACAK can be employed for nominalizations, i.e. CCs, whereas the verbal noun in MA can build only nominal phrases. Johanson (1975b) convincingly argued that there is a difference between nominal phrases and clause-like structures based on MA. In NPs based on MA, the verbal noun may be modified by an adjective, while in CCs MA builds a non-finite verb form which can be modified by adverbial forms. Hence the difference between (13) and (14).

(13) Lars’ in bugünkü konuşması ilginç.
Lars-GEN today-DER.KI speech-POSS3SG interesting
‘Lars’ speech today is interesting.’

(14) Lars’ in bugün konuşması ilginç.
Lars-GEN today speak-INF.MA-POSS3SG interesting
‘It is interesting that Lars speaks today.’

In order to make a clear distinction between a nominalization as in (13) and a clause-like construction having both verbal and nominal morphological properties as in (14), Johanson calls the deranked complement clauses infinitized clauses. Thus, the subject constituent in (13) is an NP and an infinitized clause in (14). The next issue to study is how the morphosyntactic properties of CCs based on DİK and those based on MA are to be described in typological perspectives.
Morphosyntactic properties
Stassen (1985) proposed a typology of CCs. He classified CCs on the basis of their morphosyntactic properties and introduced the notions of deranking and balancing in the following sense. A balanced verb form is one that can occur in an independent declarative clause, e.g. an indicative verb form. The verb is inflected for the same categories as the forms used in independent declarative clauses, for instance, tense, viewpoint, mood and person, and these categories are expressed in the same way as in independent declarative clauses. A deranked verb form is one that cannot be used in independent declarative clauses. It may lack some or all of the categorial distinctions relevant to verbs in the language (such as tense, viewpoint, mood or person agreement distinctions), or display special markers not used in independent declarative clauses, e.g. special tense, viewpoint, mood or person markers, nominalizers, case markers, or adpositions. In the World Atlas of Language Structures, a comprehensive typological study, Cristofaro (2005a) distinguishes between three types of complement clauses of utterance predicates:

- balanced: s-like construction in which the predicate is like in main clauses
- deranked: clause-like constructions based on non-finite verb forms
- balanced/deranked (mixed)

The two types of Turkish CCs studied in this paper, i.e. CCs based on DIK and MA, are both deranked clause-like CCs having the structure: (subject) + deranked predicate. The two non-finite verb forms in DIK and MA are not used to build a predicate in independent declarative clauses. The clause-like constructions have the possibility to include an overt subject constituent.

Cristofaro (2005a) defines CCs of utterance clauses functionally: "... utterance complements will be defined here in functional, rather than syntactic, terms. A complement construction is regarded as one expressing a particular relation between events, such that one event (the one coded by the main clause, or the main event) entails that another event (the one coded by the complement clause, or the dependent event) is referred to...". Thus, she regards all clause-like structures assuming an argument-like relation to a predicate as CCs. Turkish non-subordinated clauses, such as geldi ‘(s)he came’ in (11) are, thus, presumably included in her typology of utterance CCs. Direct speech is, however, excluded from her typology: “direct speech clauses are regarded as utterance complements here, unless the language also has some indirect speech construction” (Cristofaro 2005a). Thus, complement clauses based on balanced verb forms and subordinated by diye ‘saying’ as in (7) are not regarded by her to be CCs in Turkish.

In Cristofaro’s cross-typological comparison of utterance complement clauses, Turkish is characterized as a balanced/deranked, i.e. mixed type. In our opinion, this description does not reflect the real typological nature of Turkish complementation. It is a consensus that CCs, when defined by using both syntactic and semantic criteria, i.e. when defined as subordinate clauses with argument function, are typically
deranked in Turkish. Cristofaro’s typology uses only functional criteria and ignores the difference between subordinated and non-subordinated clause-like structures assuming argument-like relations to predicates: “the proposed functional definition of utterance complements is independent of any particular structural feature of the relevant clauses, and only refers to the conceptual relation between the linked events”. The neutralization of the structural differences leads to the result that the deranking type of utterance CCs is shown as much less represented in the languages of the world than the balanced type. Cristofaro’s map shows 114 languages of the balanced type of utterance CCs, 18 balanced/deranked and only 11 deranked. She employs the same purely functional definition also for when-, purpose and reason clauses (Cristofaro 2005b, 2005c). For instance, Turkish reason clauses are characterized by her as balanced/deranked, whereas purpose clauses are deranked. As a matter of fact, both subordinated deranked clauses and non-subordinated balanced clauses can be used in Turkish in order to express both types of semantic relations; see, for instance, Johanson (1993).

Thus, we wonder whether the purely functional typology gives the right insight into significant typological similarities and differences. Turkish, for instance, represents in our opinion a typically deranking type and not a mixed type as on Cristofaro’s map. It might be the case that the purely functional definition is often employed in typology as a last resort when the linguist cannot deal with an appropriate syntactic analysis of all languages included in the description. Functionality is in such a case to be understood as translational equivalence.

Semantic properties

Our two types of Turkish CCs share, as we have shown, syntactic and morphological properties. They differ from declarative main clauses as they are based on special non-finite verb forms, i.e. deranked verb forms in Stassen’s and Cristofaro’s terminology. Cristofaro (2005a) tries to establish a semantic relation between the form of CCs and their semantic properties: “The occurrence of deranked verb forms is also related to the ability of the dependent event to be conceptualized as a thing rather than as a process [...]. Conceptualization of the dependent event as a thing rather than as a process leads to the presence of nominal properties on the verb, such as case markers or adpositions, as well as the absence of typical verbal properties such as tense, viewpoint and mood distinctions. All of these phenomena are characteristic of deranking”. Moreover, she claims that this semantic property of deranked CCs explains why there are more languages in the world employing balanced CCs than deranked CCs of utterance predicates: “However, utterance complements do not seem to easily allow conceptualization of the dependent event as a thing, and this disfavours the occurrence of verb forms displaying nominal properties, or lacking verbal properties” (Cristofaro 2005a). Linguists dealing with Turkic grammar have many times refused such speculations about any necessary semantic relation between deranking and conceptualization of an event as a ‘thing’. The example (5) containing a deranked CC and the sentence (11) have both the meaning ‘(S)he
knows that (s)he has come.’ There is no conceptualization of the event as a ‘thing’ as presented in the CC in (5). It is really unfortunate that this outdated idea is used uncritically in a recent typological work.

Moreover, there are significant distributional differences between the two types of Turkish CCs. Compare the following examples. CCs based on DIK in (15) and those based on MA in (16) and (17) have different readings. This semantic difference is marked exclusively by the bound subjunctions DIK and MA. Moreover, the subjunctions are selected by the matrix predicates. The predicate büyük bir ihtimal ‘very likely’ selects MA (17) but not DIK (18). The predicate ikna etti ‘convinced’, on the other hand, selects DIK (19) but, normally, not MA (20).

(15) (O-nun) gel-diğ-i-ni söyle-di. DIK
    (s)he-GEN come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC say-PAST.DI.3SG
    ‘He said that (s)he had come.’

(16) (O-nun) gel-me-si-ni söyle-di. MA
    (s)he-GEN come-INF.MA-POSS3SG-ACC say-PAST.DI.3SG
    ‘(S)he said that (s)he should come.’

(17) Gelmesi büyük bir ihtimal. MA
    come-INF.MA-POSS3SG great a likelihood
    ‘It is likely that (s)he comes / that (s)he will come.’

(18) *Geldiği büyük bir ihtimal. DIK
    come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG great a likelihood

(19) Geldiğine beni ikna etti. DIK
    come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-DAT I-ACC convince-PAST.DI.3SG
    ‘(S)he convinced me that (s)he has come.’

(20) *Gelmesine beni ikna etti. MA
    come-INF.MA-POSS3SG-DAT I-ACC convince-PAST.DI.3SG

The differences between the two types of CCs are clearly semantic. The bound subjunctions DIK and MA are selected according to the semantics of the matrix predicate. The question is what is the nature of these semantic differences.

Choice of CCs: Semantic types of matrix predicates

Lees treated Turkish CCs in the framework of early transformational grammar; see Lees (1963) and (1965). Lees labeled DIK-complement clauses “general participle factive nominalizations” whereas those based on the action noun (infinitive) MA “light-infinitive nominalizations” (1965: 113). He observed that “… the clause in -dik, the General Participle, selects those adjectives which refer to ‘facts’, while that in -me the Action Noun, selects those which refer to ‘actions’” (1965: 114). This distinction is used by several linguists describing Turkish, for instance Kornfilt (2007), who, however adds: “The reader should bear in mind, however, that these
terms are somewhat misleading. While in many, probably most, instances, these nominalization morphemes indeed do head factive vs. non-factive domains and are thus selected by appropriate matrix verbs, there are numerous exceptions to these generalizations—a situation which leads to the difficulty of a satisfactory characterization” (Kornfilt 2007: 315).

The notion of factiveness was studied in more detail by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970). This study distinguished between factive and non-factive predicates which take CCs as their subjects or objects. They give a list of factive and non-factive predicates. For instance, English, significant, odd, regret, comprehend are factive predicates, whereas, likely, sure, suppose, assume are non-factives. Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) observed the following syntactic differences between factive and non-factive predicates in English. Factive predicates allow the noun fact with a sentential complement and a matrix factive predicate. Non-factive predicates do not license this.

(21) The fact that the dog barked is significant / *likely.

(22) I want to make clear / *assume the fact that I don’t intend to participate.

Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) furthermore correlated the distinction with other semantic differences. Factivity according to their definition depends on presupposition and not on assertion. True is a non-factive predicate. The speaker using (23) asserts that the proposition ‘John is ill’ is a true proposition but does not presuppose that it is a true proposition.

(23) It is true that John is ill.

In sentence (24) based on the factive predicate ‘regret’ the speaker presupposes that the proposition expressed in the complement clause that the door is closed is true.

(24) I regret that the door is closed.

Thus, the difference between factive predicates and non-factive predicates is that factive predicates imply that the speaker presupposes the truth of the proposition conveyed by the complement clause.

Turkish CCs based on DIK have been described as factive in contrast to non-factive CCs based on MA. It has been suggested that this distinction explains the semantic differences between the two subjunctors. We will here argue against this position.

Firstly, Kiparsky & Kiparsky’s list of factive versus non-factive predicates does not match the selectional properties of Turkish predicates. We give here some examples to illustrate differences between English and Turkish. The factive predicate pisman ol-‘regret’ selects CCs based on DIK as in (25). The CC based on MA in (26) is not well-formed. Moreover, the non-factive predicate tahmin et- ‘suppose’ in (27) also selects DIK and not MA as in (28).
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(25) Factive predicate + DIK

Aldığımı
pişman oldum.
buy-PART.DIK-POSS1SG-DAT regret-PAST.DI-1SG
‘I regret that I bought it.’

(26) *Almama
pişman oldum.
buy-INF.MA-POSS1SG-DAT regret-PAST-1SG

(27) Non-factive predicate + DIK

Herkesin hoşlandığını
tahmin ediyorum.
everybody-GEN enjoy-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC suppose-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘And I suppose that everybody enjoyed it.’

(28) *Herkesin hoşlanmasını
tahmin ediyorum.
everybody-GEN enjoy-INF.MA-POSS3SG-ACC suppose-PRES.IYOR-1SG

Önemli, the Turkish translation of the English factive predicate significant, selects MA, as in (29) and, as a rule, not DIK, as in (30). Doğru, the Turkish translation of the English non-factive predicate true, selects DIK, as in (31) and not MA. When the CC is based on MA an evaluative reading such as ‘good, acceptable’, as in (32).

(29) Türkiye’nin Avrupa oluşumunda
Turkey-GEN Europe formation-POSS3SG-LOC
yer alması
önelmi.
take place-INF.MA-POSS3SG significant
‘It is significant that Turkey participates in the formation of Europe.’

(30) ?Türkiye’nin Avrupa oluşumunda
Turkey-GEN Europe formation-POSS3SG-LOC
yer aldığı
önelmi.
take place-PART.DIK-POSS3SG significant

(31) Bugün geldiği
doğru / doğru değil.
today come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG true / true not
‘It is true / not true that he has come today.’

(32) Bugün gelmesi
doğru / doğru değil.
today come-INF.MA-POSS3SG good / good not
‘It is good / not good that he comes today.’

The examples (25)–(32) illustrate that the difference between English factive / non-factive predicates and the Turkish distinction conveyed by DIK and MA cannot be described in the same way. As Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) claim, English factives require that the speaker presupposes the truth of the proposition expressed in the complement clause. In Turkish, no such presupposition is required by DIK-comple-
ments. Thus, predicates expressing attitudes towards the truth of the proposition expressed in the complement can also select DIK-complements; see, for instance, (31).

Certain predicates such as pişman ol- ‘regret’, tahmin et- ‘suppose’ select DIK-complements and not MA-complements. As we have seen above, other predicates may select both subjunctors with different readings. The semantic differences between (31) and (32) can be explained by assuming that the CC based on DIK in (31) expresses an assertion whereas no assertion is expressed in the CC based on MA in (32). An assertion is defined here as a proposition with possible truth value. Thus, the CC based on DIK in (31) expresses an assertion the truth value of which can be judged by the predicate, here as ‘true’. The CC based on MA in (28) on the other hand conveys no assertion. Thus, the predicate doğru cannot evaluate its truth value and gets the reading ‘good’. We will describe this difference in more detail later.

To sum up, the semantic difference between DIK- and MA-complements compared with English as described by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) are the followings. English factive predicates require presupposition of the truth of the proposition expressed by the CC, whereas non-factive predicates do not require any presupposition concerning its truth. Turkish distinguishes between assertive (DIK) complement clauses expressing a proposition with possible truth value and non-assertive (MA) complement clauses, which convey a predication without any possible truth value.

The choice between the subjunctors DIK and MA is governed by semantic properties of the matrix predicate. Csató (1990) employed a semantic typology of predicates proposed by Noonan (1985) and demonstrated the following selectional tendencies:

DIK-complements are most common with the following types of matrix predicates:

- propositional attitudes specifying the attitude of a person in relation to the possible fact designated by the propositional complement: doğru ‘true’, yanlış ‘false’, -(y)A/-DA n emin ol- ‘be sure’, -(y)A inan- ‘believe that it is true’
- predications of mental perception: pişman ol- ‘regret, be sorry about’. 
MA-complements are most common with the following matrix predicates:

- objective modal predicates: bil- ‘know how to do, be able’
- pretence predicates: hayal et- ‘imagine’.

It is important to emphasize here that these lists do not render any rules of usage. Rather they suggest tendencies, i.e. frequency patterns. Depending on the context, predicates selecting DİK may also be used with MA if a suitable interpretation is possible. The same type of predicate can take different types of complements.

(33) Kitap okuduğuna sevindi.
book read-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-DAT be glad-PAST.DI.3SG
‘He was glad that (s)he read books.’

(34) Kitap okumasına sevindi.
book read-INF.MA-POSS3SG-DAT be glad-PAST.DI.3SG
‘He was fond of (h)is/her reading books.’

The reading of the CC in (33) is propositional, i.e. refers to the proposition ‘that he said empty words’. The CC based on MA (34) is used when the speaker wants to refer to the state of affairs of ‘saying empty words’.

Illocutionary force

Complement clauses in DİK, as stated above, convey a proposition with a possible truth value. Interrogative complement clauses are also based on DİK-forms. Thus, DİK-complement clauses may moreover also express illocutionary force. Whereas the complement clause in (35) is declarative, the one in (36) has an interrogative illocutionary force.

(35) Geldiğini bilmiyorum.
come-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC know-NEG-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I don’t know that (s)he has come.’
(36) Gelip gelmediğimi
come-CONV.YIP come-NEG-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC
bilmiyorum.
know-NEG-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I don’t know whether (s)he has come or not.’

Complement clauses in MA cannot express illocutionary force. In the framework of functional grammar, Dik describes a typology of complement clauses that can be applied for giving a full account of the differences between Dik- and MA-complement clauses.

Dik’s semantic typology of embedded constructions
We apply here, with some modifications, Dik’s (1989 and 1997) distinction between embedded propositions and embedded predications. Embedded clauses convey a speech act, embedded propositions a possible fact and embedded predications a state of affairs. Predicates that can selectionally restrict their arguments to be a complex term are matrix predicates. Complements are embedded constructions in argument positions. Complements may be:

- clausal complements conveying a speech act, a proposition (possible fact) and a state of affairs
- propositional complements conveying a proposition (possible fact) and a state of affairs
- predicational complements conveying a state of affairs

Albeit Dik- and MA-complement clauses share morphosyntactic properties, i.e. they are typically deranked, they manifest different predicational potential in Dik’s typology.

Dik-clauses are clausal and propositional complements conveying illocutionary force, a proposition (possible fact) and a state of affairs.

Turkish MA-clauses are predicational complements conveying a state of affairs.

Finiteness and non-finiteness
In some recent papers, Kornfilt (2007; see also Kornfilt & Greenberg 2000) extends the use of the term finiteness for nominalized clauses. She uses the notion ‘nominalized’ for deranked clauses based on verbal nouns thus corresponding to Johanson’s term ‘infinitized’. Nevertheless, like Johanson, Kornfilt makes the necessary distinction between clause structures based on verbal nouns and NPs based on lexicalized nominal deverbal derivations. Thus, the difference is only terminological.

Kornfilt (2007) distinguishes between verbal and nominalized clauses; see (37), in which the clause Ali sinavi geçececek is verbal, on the one hand, and (38) and (39) in which the CCs are described as nominalized clauses.
(37) *Ali sınavı geçecek* sanıyorum.
Ali test-ACC pass-PROSP.3SG believe-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I believe Ali will pass the test.’

(38) *Senin sınavı geçtiğini* sanıyorum.
you-GEN test-ACC pass-PART.DIK-POSS2SG-ACC believe-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I believe (that) you passed the test.’

(39) *Senin sınavı geçmeni istiyorum.*
you-GEN test-ACC pass-INF.MA-POSS2SG-ACC want-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I want (that) you should pass the test.’

Kornfilt adopts the definition of finiteness applied in a generative framework. Thus, finiteness is a feature characterizing a binding domain, i.e. a domain in which anaphors must be bound. Finiteness is conditioned by a combination of semantic, morphological and syntactic features. The semantic feature is propositional independence. The syntactic feature is that finite syntactic domains license an overt subject and are binding domains. Finiteness depends on the presence of an agreement morpheme attached to the predicates, as, for instance, in the CCs in (38) and (39). Furthermore, Kornfilt argues that subjects in finite domains cannot be anaphors, i.e. reflexives or reciprocals, because the finite clause is a binding domain. The main contribution of Kornfilt’s study is to define properties of finiteness for Turkish. She suggests that in Turkish both agreement and independent tense are necessary conditions for defining a domain as finite. With regard to agreement both CCs based on DİK and MA are finite domains. However, Kornfilt gives some rather vague syntactic examples illustrating differences between the binding properties of CCs based on DİK and MA. In order to explain these differences she introduces a further criterion and claims that the difference between the two types of CCs concerns the tense category. Whereas CCs based on DİK are temporally independent, those based on MA are not. However: “Tense ‘counts’ as a defining factor for a ‘finite’ domain only when overt agreement is present” (Kornfilt 2007: 332). Nevertheless, Kornfilt concludes, to the great surprise of the reader, that whereas CCs based on DİK are finite, those based on MA are not. The argumentation and the conclusions are not convincing.

Kornfilt describes CCs based on DİK as indicative propositions whereas those based on MA as subjunctive propositions.

Modality and viewpoint in CCs
In Csató (1999), we discussed the question which modal meanings are expressed by the subjunctors DİK and MA and concluded that the difference between DİK and MA is that DİK has an indicative meaning, i.e. expresses an assertion, whereas MA does not mark any modal meaning. The subjunctive meaning which Kornfilt associates with this form is a possible reading but not a necessary one. The interpretation of the form
is dependent on the context. Compare the following examples. First Kornfilt’s example with a ‘subjunctive’ reading will be repeated.

\[(39)\] Senin sınavı geçmeni istiyorum.

you-GEN test-ACC pass-INF.MA-POSS2SG-ACC want-PRES.IYOR-1SG

‘I want (that) you should pass the test.’

Other examples do not trigger such an interpretation.

\[(40)\] Buraya gelmenize çok sevindim.

here-DAT come-INF.MA-2PL-DAT very be glad-PAST.DI-1SG

‘I am glad that you (have) come.’ / ‘I am looking forward to your coming.’

As pointed out in Csató (1999: 31), the language-specific property of Turkish complementation is that the category marked for modality is selected by certain matrix predicates. Assume, as we have done above, that the relevant feature selected by the predicate is full propositional content, i.e. a clausal complement conveying an illocutionary force, a proposition (possible fact) and a state of affairs. These selectional properties also include both viewpoint and modality. Kornfilt includes tense, but this is first of all motivated by theory-internal expectations.

Two bound subjunctors can build full propositional CCs in Turkish: DİK and YACAK. The latter is a modal form used also to mark prospective viewpoint. Both DİK and YACAK can further build complex verb forms containing a lexical verb and an auxiliary, such as high focal intraterminal forms in MAKTA OLDUĞU ‘his/her just being doing’, postterminal forms in MIŞ OLDUĞU ‘his/her being having done’, high focal intraterminal prospective forms in MAKTA OLACAĞI ‘his/her coming to being doing’, postterminal prospective forms in MIŞ OLACAĞI ‘his/her coming to being having done’. See Karakoç (2007) about the richness of viewpoint meanings encoded in Noghay bound subjunctors. We have suggested in Csató (1999), that the difference between the two subjunctors is modality, DİK being indicative and YACAK non-indicative. The subjunctor DİK itself is neutral with respect to viewpoint distinctions. Consequently, the CC in (41) can be translated into English with present tense, present perfect or past tense. The speaker has the choice to express intraterminality by using MAKTA OLDUĞU (42) or postterminality by employing MIŞ OLDUĞU (43).

\[(41)\] Mektubu yazdımını biliyorum.

letter-ACC write-PART.DİK-POSS3SG-ACC know-PRES.IYOR-1SG

‘I know that (s)he writes the letter / has written the letter / wrote the letter.’

\[(42)\] Mektubu yazmakta oldugunu

letter-ACC write-INF-LOC be/become-PART.DİK-POSS3SG-ACC
biliyorum.
know-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I know that (s)he is writing the letter / has been writing the letter / was
writing the letter.’

(43) Mektubu yazmış olduğunu
letter-ACC write-PART.MİŞ be/become-PART.DIK-POSS3SG-ACC
biliyorum.
know-PRES.IYOR-1SG
‘I know that (s)he is writing the letter / has been writing the letter / was
writing the letter.’

Note that no tense is expressed by DİK. Johanson has in several studies
convincingly argued that viewpoint distinctions play an important role in Turkish
grammar. This is also relevant for Turkish complement clauses.
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