

□ *Birsel Karakoç*  
Uppsala University

ON OBLIGATORY CONTROL  
IN TURKISH AND NOGHAY COMPLEMENT CLAUSES  
TÜRKÇE VE NOGAYCADA TÜMLEÇ YAN CÜMLELERİNDE  
ZORUNLU DENETİM

**Abstract**

The present paper is concerned with 'obligatory' control in non-finite complement clauses in Turkish and Noghay. Control in complement clauses implies an 'obligatory' co-reference between the subject of a complement clause and the subject or object of its matrix clause. The unexpressed, implicit subject of the embedded predicate is thus specified by the overt argument of the matrix clause. Following questions are taken into consideration: (1) Which matrix predicates appear as heads of complement clauses implying subject/ object controls? (2) Which properties do the argument structures of these verbs exhibit? (3) Which morpho-syntactic restrictions are found in complement clauses implying control relations? (4) Which bound morphemes are used in such complement clauses? (5) Are there any restrictions in the use of the bound morphemes? One of the main results is that the bound morphemes used in control constructions differ in Turkish and Noghay. In Noghay, there are two bound morphemes: *-MAGA* and *-(U)w*. The former has apparently developed from the infinitive in the dative case and occurs in grammaticalized constructions. The latter can be combined with different case markers and possessive suffixes. In Noghay, the participial morpheme *-GAN* and the converbial morpheme *-(I)p* can also be found with some matrix predicates in control constructions.

**Key Words**

Turkish, Noghay, obligatory control, complement clause, infinitive

## Özet

Bu makale Türkçe ve Nogaycada tümleş yan cümlelerindeki zorunlu denetim ilişkilerini ele almaktadır. Tümleş yan cümlelerinde denetim, yan cümlenin öznesi ile ana cümlenin öznesi ya da bir nesnesi arasındaki zorunlu bir eşgönderimi içermektedir. Bu durumda, yan cümlenin ifade edilmemiş öznesi ana cümlenin sentaktik bir ögesi tarafından belirlenir. Makale şu sorulara cevap aramaktadır: (1) Özne/ nesne denetimi içeren yan cümlelerin bağlı olduğu ana cümle yüklemeleri hangileridir? (2) Bu ana cümle yüklemeleri sentaktik öğeleri açısından ne gibi özellikler göstermektedir? (3) Denetim ilişkisi gösteren yan cümlelerde hangi morfo-sentaktik sınırlamalar sözkonusudur? (4) Bu tür yan cümlelerde hangi ad-fiil ekleri kullanılmaktadır? (5) Bu eklerin kullanımında ne gibi sınırlamalar söz konusudur? Ulaşılan önemli sonuçlardan biri Türkçe ve Nogaycada denetim yapılarında kullanılan eklerin dağılımının farklılık gösterdiğidir. Nogaycada *-MAGA* ve *-(U)w* olmak üzere iki ek kullanılmaktadır. Bunlardan ilkinin, ad-fiil ekinin dikronik olarak yönelme durumu ekiyle birlikte dilbilgisel işlevde gelişmesi sonucu oluştuğu görülmektedir. İkincisi hem durum hem de iyelik ekleriyle birleşebilmektedir. Ayrıca Nogaycada sıfat-fiil eki *-GAn* ile zarf-fiil eki *-(I)p'*ın da bazı yüklemeler ile birlikte denetim yapılarında ortaya çıktığı görülmektedir.

## AnahtarKelimeler

Türkçe, Nogayca, zorunlu denetim, tümleş yan cümlesi, ad-fiil

## 0. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The present paper is concerned with control relations in Turkish and Noghay complement clauses. Turkish and Noghay are genetically related languages. Turkish is a Southwestern—Oghuz—Turkic language, whereas Noghay belongs to the Northwestern—Kipchak—branch of Turkic languages. In Turkish and Noghay, the most essential characteristics of clausal complementation are left-branching non-finite structures involving various bound morphemes. These non-finite bound morphemes have alternating allomorphs in complementary distribution.<sup>2</sup> Possessive suffixes denoting the subject of the complement clause, and case suffixes marking the syntactic role of the complement clause within its higher clause can be attached to the bound morphemes (Karakoç & Herkenrath [submitted]).

Complement control implies an ‘obligatory’ co-reference between the subject of a complement clause and the subject or object of its matrix clause. The unexpressed, implicit subject of the embedded predicate, which is called ‘controllee’, is thus specified by the overt argument of the matrix clause. This matrix argument providing the reference has the status of ‘controller’ (Haig & Słodowicz 2006; Słodowicz 2007; Yücel 2007).

Control relations in Turkish clausal complementation have primarily been discussed as a syntactic phenomenon (e.g. Kornfilt 1991 and 1996, Özsoy 2001). Erguvanlı Taylan (1996), Haig & Słodowicz (2006) and Yücel (2007) have treated complement control in Turkish from semantic points of view. Słodowicz (2007) demonstrates that control in Turkish is a ‘mixed’ phenomenon that may arise lexically and syntactically. Bozşahin (2006) discusses control by focusing on the status of the controlled element.

Regarding the choice of ‘controller’, the following cases are distinguished:<sup>3</sup>

(1) In a ‘subject’ control relation, the understood subject of the complement clause is controlled by the matrix subject. In example (1a), the implicit subject of the embedded clause (*oyun oynamaya* ‘to play a game’) and the matrix subject (*Aynur*) have the same referent.

(2) In an ‘object’ control relation, co-reference arises between the subject of complement clause and an object of higher clause. Example (1b) shows that the implicit subject in the complement clause (*oyun oynamaya* ‘to play a game’) takes its reference from the dative-marked object (*kardeşi* ‘her sibling’) in the higher clause.

(3) Variable control implies no inherent preference with regard to the choice of the controller. Depending on the context, either the matrix subject or the matrix object can function as controllers (Erguvanlı Taylan 1996; Haig & Słodowicz 2006; Słodowicz 2007). In example (1c) the covert subject of the complement clause can be specified either by the matrix subject *Tolga* or the matrix object *Orhan*.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Éva Á. Csató for her comments on a previous version of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters in the suffixes show morphophonemes.

<sup>3</sup> For categorisation of control types, see Landau (1999) and Culicover & Jackendoff (2005). For categorisation of Turkish control constructions, see Słodowicz 2007.

(1) [tur]

a. Aynur kardeşine [oyun oynamaya] söz verdi.

A. sibling-PSS3SG-DAT game play-INF-DAT promise-PST3  
'Aynur promised her sibling to play a game.'

b. Aynur kardeşine [oyun oynamaya] izin verdi.

A. sibling-PSS3SG-DAT game play-INF-DAT allow-PST3  
'Aynur allowed her sibling to play a game.'

c. Tolga Orhan'a [o binayı satın almağı] önerdi. (Erguvanlı Taylan 1996: 52-53)

T. O.-DAT that building-ACC buy-INF-ACC propose-PST3  
'Tolga proposed to Orhan to buy that building.'

When describing control phenomena in complementation, the following questions are to be taken into consideration: (1) Which matrix predicates appear as heads of complement clauses implying subject/ object controls? (2) Which properties do the argument structures of these verbs exhibit? (3) Which morpho-syntactic restrictions are found in complement clauses implying control relations? (4) Which bound morphemes are used in such complement clauses? (5) Are there any restrictions in the use of these morphemes? In what follows, I will be dealing with these questions.

### 1. Matrix predicates triggering subject/ object controls

The lexical semantics and argument structures of higher predicates are, as well known, an important matter when classifying the control relations:

(1) Verbs triggering subject control in Turkish are such as *başla-* 'begin', *becer-* 'be successful in, manage', *dene-* 'attempt, try (out)', *unut-* 'forget', *bitir-* 'complete', *vazgeç-* 'give up, cease, abandon', *iste-* 'want', *kork-* 'be afraid', *kalkış-* 'set out to', *reddet-* 'refuse', *hatırla-* 'remember', *sağla-* 'ensure', *uğraş-* 'make an effort at', *düşün-* 'think about, plan', *ısrar et-* 'insist', *başar-* 'achieve, accomplish', *çalış-* 'try', *alış-* 'get accustomed to', *utan-* 'be/ feel ashamed', *bık-* 'be bored', *diren-* 'insist', *heveslen-* 'desire, long', *bırak-* 'stop', *başla-* 'neglect', *çabala-* 'try', *çekin-* 'refrain', *arzula-* 'wish', *arzu et-* 'wish', *dile-* 'wish', *hedefle-* 'aim', *tasarla-* 'plan', *hoşlan-* 'like', *öğren-* 'learn', *sev-* 'love', *ümit et-* 'hope', *um-* 'hope', *tercih et-* 'prefer', *inat et-* 'be obstinate, persist', *ihmal et-* 'neglect', *nefret et-* 'hate', *ikna ol-* 'be convinced', *cesaret et-* 'dare', *anlaş-* 'agree', *mecbur ol-/ kal-* 'be forced', *zorunda ol-/ kal-* 'be forced', *karar ver-* 'decide', *göze al-* 'risk, venture', *söz ver-* 'promise'.

(2) Verbs that can trigger object control are such as *emret-* 'command', *ikna et-* 'convince', *kurtar-* 'save', *tavsiye et-* 'advise, recommend', *suçla-* 'accuse', *izin ver-* 'give permission', *yasakla-* 'forbid', *zorla-* 'force', *yönlendir-* 'direct, guide, canalize', *mecbur et-/ bırak-* 'force', *zorunda bırak-* 'force', *menet-* 'prohibit', *ikna et-* 'convince', *razı et-* 'convince', *kandır-* 'convince, persuade', *alıştır-* 'accustom, let acquire a habit', *davet et-* 'request', *teşvik et-* 'encourage', *yardım et-* 'help', *tembih et-* 'warn', *vazgeçir-* 'dissuade', *heveslendir-* 'arouse desire in somebody', *rica et-* 'request', *talep et-* 'request, ask for', *mahrum et-* 'deprive', *söyle-* 'say', *iste-* 'want, ask' (see Haig & Słodowicz 2006: 168, Słodowicz 2007).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See also Yücel 2007, 2009 for a semantic classification of predicate types.

(3) Control verbs that exhibit variable control are such as *öner-* 'propose' and *tehdit et-* 'threaten' (Erguvanlı Taylan 1996; Słodowicz 2007).

A closer look at the nature of these verbs reveals:

(1) Subject control verbs are two-place verbs that, next to the subject, require an object marked with accusative (in the majority), dative, ablative, locative or instrumental (less).<sup>5</sup> Object control verbs are, on the other hand, three-place-verbs, i.e. they exhibit next to the subject, the following object combinations: accusative-dative (e.g. *birisini birşeye ikna et-* 'convince/ persuade someone of something'), dative-accusative (e.g. *birisine birşeyi yasakla-* 'forbid someone to do something'), ablative-accusative (e.g. *birisinden birşeyi talep et-* 'request something of someone'), accusative-ablative (e.g. *birisini birşeyden mahrum et-* 'deprive someone of something'), accusative-instrumental (e.g. *birisini birşeyle tehdit et-* 'threaten someone with something'), dative-locative (e.g. *birisine birşeyde yardım et-* 'help someone with something'). The majority of the object control verbs are transitive. Having a three-place-verb (requiring two object positions) is a precondition for object control constructions, since one of the object arguments functions as controller while the other object position is provided for the complement clause whose subject (controllee) is controlled.

(2) In some lexical pairs, intransitive subject control verbs consist of the auxiliary verb *ol-* 'become/ be' while the corresponding transitive object control verbs consist of *et-* 'make', e.g. *birşeye ikna ol-* 'be convinced of something' (subject control) (example 2a) versus *birisini birşeye ikna et-* 'convince/ persuade someone of something' (object control) (example 2b); *birşeye mecbur ol-* 'be forced to do something, must do something' (subject control) versus *birisini birşeye mecbur et-* 'force someone into something' (object control).

(3) In some lexical pairs, causative suffixes change the intransitive/ transitive subject control verb to a transitive, three-place object control verb, e.g. *birşeyden vazgeç-* 'give up on something' (subject control) (example 3a) versus *birisini birşeyden vazgeçir-* 'dissuade someone from something' (object control) (example 3b); *birisine/ birşeye alış-* 'get accustomed to someone/ something' (subject control) versus *birisini birşeye alıştır-* 'accustom someone to something, let acquire a habit' (object control), *birşeye heveslen-* 'desire something, long for something' (subject control) versus *birisini birşeye heveslendir-* 'arouse desire in somebody' (object control), *birşeyi bırak-* 'cease something' (subject control) versus *birisine birşeyi bıraktır-* 'make someone stop something' (object control).

(2) [tur]

a. Annem [buraya gelmeye] ikna oldu.  
 mother-PSS1SG here-DAT come-INF-DAT agree-PST3  
 'My mother agreed to come here.'

b. Annem kardeşimi [buraya gelmeye] ikna etti.  
 mother-PSS1SG sibling-PSS1SG-ACC here-DAT come-INF-DAT convince-PST3  
 'My mother convinced my sibling to come here.'

<sup>5</sup> The matrix verb *iste-* 'want' may include a clausal complement based on an infinitive in the nominative or accusative (see below).

(3) [tur]

a. Annem [buraya gelmekten] vazgeçti.  
 mother-PSS1SG here-DAT come-INF-ABL change the mind-PST3  
 'My mother changed her mind on coming here.'

b. Annem kardeşimi [buraya gelmekten] vazgeçirdi.  
 mother-PSS1SG sibling-PSS1SG-ACC here-DAT come-INF-ABL dissuade-PST3  
 'My mother dissuaded my sibling to come here.'

## 2. The status of possessive-marked complements

The most crucial morpho-syntactic restriction in control constructions is that the embedded clause does not possess an overt deictic or lexical subject. In other words, an overt subject in clausal complement immediately overrides a control relation. The issue whether control phenomena are allowed to occur in possessive-marked complements is controversially discussed in the literature. In my opinion, this point needs to be discussed for subject and object control relations separately. First, 'subject' control relations occur in complement clauses not exhibiting possessive morphology. This may not, however, imply that all complement clauses without possessive-marking *per se* denote an inherent control. Non-possessive *-mAK* and *-mA* complements, although they are mainly attested in control relations, might also have non-control inducing interpretations. Such interpretations are possible with some matrix predicates. Erguvanlı Taylan (1996) mentions the following predicates: *karşı ol-* 'be against', *destekle-* 'support', *doğru bul-* 'find something right', *yanlış bul-* 'find something wrong', *günah* 'consider something immoral', *bayıl-* 'love', *alış-* 'get accustomed to', *bahset-* 'talk about', *tartış-* 'discuss'. Example (4) contains a non-possessive complement clause and does not have a control-inducing reading.

(4) [tur]

Ben [Çin'le ticari ilişkilere girmeği] destekliyorum.  
 I China-INS trade relation-PL-DAT enter-INF-ACC support-PRS-1SG  
 'I support entering into trade relations with China.' (Erguvanlı Taylan 1996: 51)

A phenomenon called 'quirky possessive marking' by Haig & Słodowicz (2006: 174) pertains to the possessive-marking in subject control constructions. This phenomenon only appears with the third person possessive suffix *-(s)I* and with a small number of matrix verbs such as *becer-* 'manage, succeed in', *başar-* 'achieve, succeed in, accomplish', *bitir-* 'complete', *dene-* 'try (out)' and *öğren-* 'learn'. These transitive 'achievement' verbs may optionally contain complements based on a possessive-marked *-mA*. Example (5) illustrates the use of *becer-* 'manage' in such a subject control relation. Even the first and second person subjects may occur with a complement having third person possessive, i.e. there is no agreement (6a-b). Further, the same sentences may also occur without possessive marking, i.e. possessive morphology is not an obligatory, rather an optional feature (7a-b) (see Haig & Słodowicz 2006: 175). The possessive suffix in such complement clauses has a weak impersonal reference in the meaning of 'how one can make, how to make' etc.

(5) [tur]

Ahmet [bisikleti tamir etmesini] becerdi.  
 A. bike-ACC fix-INF-PSS3SG-ACC manage-PST3  
 'Ahmet managed to fix the bike.' (Haig & Słodowicz 2006: 175)

(6) [tur]

a. Ben [kek yapmasını] öğrendim.  
I cake make-INF-PSS3SG-ACC learn-PST-1SG  
'I have learned to bake a cake.'

b. \*Ben [kek yapmamı] öğrendim.  
I cake make-INF-PSS1SG-AC learn-PST-1SG

(7) [tur]

a. Kızım [kek yapmasını] öğrendi.  
daughter-PSS1SGcake make-INF-PSS3SG-ACC learn-PST3  
'My daughter has learned to bake a cake (how to bake a cake).'

b. Kızım [kek yapmayı] öğrendi.  
daughter-PSS1SGcake make-INF-ACC learn-PST3  
'My daughter has learned to bake a cake.'

As to the relation of 'object' control phenomenon and possessive marking in embedded clauses, I make the following observations:

(1) A big number of matrix predicates triggering object control exclusively requires a non-possessive complement clause (8a-9a). Thus, the use of a possessive marker results in an ungrammatical sentence (8b-9b).

(8) [tur]

a. Aynur arkadaşını [kitap okumaya] ikna etti.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-ACC book read-INF-DAT convince-PST3  
'Aynur convinced her friend to read a book.'

b. \*Aynur arkadaşını [kitap okumasına] ikna etti.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-ACC book read-INF-PSS3SG-DAT convince-PST3

(9) [tur]

a. Aynur arkadaşını [kitap okumaya] mecbur etti.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-ACC book read-INF-DAT force-PST3  
'Aynur forced her friend to read a book.'

b. \*Aynur arkadaşını [kitap okumasına] mecbur etti.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-ACC book read-INF-PSS3SG-DAT force-PST3

(2) Some object control verbs may optionally occur with complement clauses containing possessive morphology (10a-b). This phenomenon apparently occurs with predicates, which allow variable control, e.g. *öner-* 'propose', *tavsiye et-* 'propose, recommend'. In example (10a) without a possessive marking, the controller of the unexpressed subject is not clear. It can be specified by the subject *Aynur* or by the object *arkadaşı* 'her friend', i.e. 'that *Aynur* should read books' or 'that *her friend* should read books'. It can also refer to both of them, i.e. 'that *they* should read books together'. In example (10b), on the other hand, the use of the possessive suffix makes it clear that the matrix object *arkadaşı* 'her friend' is the implicit subject of the complement clause. But, even if it is the first natural interpretation, the use of the possessive suffix may cause ambiguous readings, since this element can indicate another reference. It may refer, e.g. anaphorically, to another entity

which is not identical with the matrix object. As a matter of consequence, it would be possible to include an overt/ independent subject into such complement clauses (10c).

(10) [tur]

- a. Aynur arkadaşına [kitap okumayı] önerdi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT book read-INF-ACC suggest-PST3  
'Aynur suggested to her friend to read a book.'
- b. Aynur arkadaşına [kitap okumasını] önerdi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT book read-INF-PSS3SG-ACC suggest-PST3  
'Aynur suggested to her friend that (s)he should read a book.'
- c. Aynur arkadaşına [kardeşinin kitap okumasını] önerdi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT sibling-PSS3SG-GEN book read-INF-PSS3SG-ACC suggest-PST3  
'Aynur suggested to her friend that her sibling should read.'

(3) A small amount of three-place verbs are only in accordance with complement clauses based on possessive-marked *-mA* (11a-b, 12a-b, 13a-b). These are particularly 'volitional' verbs such as *rica et-* 'ask, request', *talep et-* 'ask, request', *söyle-* 'say, ask', *bekle-* 'expect'. Examples (11a-b) taken from Haig & Słodowicz (2006: 170) show a clear case of co-reference between the first person singular deixis as object of the matrix clause and first person singular possessive in the complement clause. But, with third person matrix object and third person possessive in the complement, the reading would be ambiguous. In examples (12b-13b) *-(s)I* may refer respectively to the matrix objects *öğretmen* or *arkadaş*, or to someone else who was mentioned previously in the discourses. Thus, it is possible to integrate an overt/ independent subject into the structure of such complement clauses (12c-13c). As a matter of consequence, it would be problematic to analyse constructions exhibiting possessive morphology as cases of 'obligatory' control. In my opinion, what is expressed in such cases is co-reference between two arguments in the respective matrix and complement clauses, but this co-reference might not be understood as an 'obligatory' control.

(11) [tur]

- a. \*Benden [bu bilgisayara bir göz atmayı] rica etti. (Haig & Słodowicz 2006: 170)  
I-ABL this computer-DAT once take a look-INF-ACC  
ask-PST3
- b. Benden [bu bilgisayara bir göz atmamı] rica etti. (Haig & Słodowicz 2006: 170)  
I-ABL this computer-DAT once take a took-INF-PSS1SG-ACC  
ask-PST3  
'(S)he asked me to take a look at this computer.'

(12) [tur]

- a. \*Müdür öğretmenden [törene katılmayı] rica etti.  
principal teacher-ABL ceremony-DAT join-INF-ACC ask-PST3
- b. Müdür öğretmenden [törene katılmasını] rica etti.  
principal teacher-ABL ceremony-DAT join-INF-PSS3SG-ACCask-PST3  
'The principal asked the teacher to join the ceremony.'

- c. Müdür öğretmen [öğrencisinin törene katılmasını] rica etti.  
principal teacher-ABL student-PSS3SG-GEN ceremony-DAT join-INF-PSS1SG-ACCask-PST3  
'The principal asked the teacher that his/ her student joins the ceremony.'

(13) [tur]

- a. \*Aynur arkadaşına [kitap okumayı] söyledi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT book read-INF-ACC say-PST3
- b. Aynur arkadaşına [kitap okumasını] söyledi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT book read-INF-PSS3SG-ACC say-PST3  
'Aynur told her friend to read a book.'
- c. Aynur arkadaşına [kardeşinin kitap okumasını] söyledi.  
A. friend-PSS3SG-DAT sibling-PSS3SG-GEN book read-INF-PSS3SG-ACC say-PST3  
'Aynur told her friend that her sibling should read a book.'

### 3. Bound morphemes used in Turkish control constructions

Turkish complement clauses implying obligatory control are based on the verbal nominal forms *-mAK* or *-mA*. Depending on the syntactic roles of complement clauses within their higher predicates, these forms take different case markers and are complementary distributed. The genitive marker is only attached to *-mA*. The combinations of *-mAK* with accusative and dative (i.e. *mAğ-I* and *mAğ-A*) have disappeared in the Standard language, so that the form *-mA* seems to have taken over the role of *-mAK* in combinations with these cases.<sup>6</sup> Further, only the form *-mA* is capable of taking a possessive suffix that refers to the subject of the complement clause. Thus it can occur in those clauses implying control or in those having their own subjects. As a matter of consequence, *-mA*, without possessive marking, competes with *-mAK* in control constructions, while it, in its combinations with possessive suffixes, is in semantic oppositions to the verbal noun on *-(y)Iş* or the participles on *-DIK* or *-(y)AcAK* (see Karakoç & Herkenrath [submitted]). In modern Standard Turkish, the infinitive on *-mAK* is exclusively found in control constructions.<sup>7</sup> Table 1 shows the distribution of *-mAK* and *-mA* with regard to their combinations with case and possessive markers in Standard Turkish.

<sup>6</sup> Göksel & Kerlake (2005: 94) write: "Note that when *-mAK* combines with a suffix beginning with a vowel, as in the case of the accusative and dative suffixes, the resulting form is spelt and pronounced more commonly nowadays as *-mayı*, *-meyi* (ACC) and *-maya*, *-meye* (DAT), rather than *-mağı*, *-meği* (ACC) and *-mağa*, *-meğe* (DAT). Since a case marker can also attach to *-mA* directly without an intervening possessive marker */.../*, it may not always be clear whether the accusative or dative case marker has attached to *-mA* or to *-mAK*." Göksel & Kerlake consider *-mayı*, *-meyi* and *-maya*, *-meye* "as a combination of *-mAK* + ACC/DAT" (2005: 94).

<sup>7</sup> For the use of *-mAK* and *-mA* in Ottoman Turkish, see e.g. Prokosch 1980, Brendemoen [in print].

		-mA	-mAK
+ CASE	Nominative	-mA	-mAK
	Accusative	-mA-yl	(-mAğ-l)
	Dative	-mA-yA	(-mAğ-A) <sup>8</sup>
	Locative	-mA-dA	-mAk-tA <sup>9</sup>
	Ablative	-mA-dAn <sup>10</sup>	-mAk-tAn
	Genitive	-mA-nIn	-
+ POSSESSIVE	1SG	-mA-m	-
	2SG	-mA-n	-
	3SG	-mA-sl	-
	1PL	-mA-mIz	-
	2PL	-mA-nIz	-
	3PL	-mA-lArI	-

**Table 1:** Combinations of Turkish infinitives with case and possessive suffixes

A complement clause based on the infinitive on *-mAK* (in the nominative) can appear as a subject of a verbal predicate (14a) or of a copular clause (14b). Such clauses have impersonal readings. The experiencer can be expressed by means of a direct or indirect object in a verbal matrix clause (14c) or by means of postpositional phrases such as *benim için*, *bana göre* etc. in a copular clause (14d). Complement clauses based on the infinitive *-mAK* in the nominative case are also encountered as predicates of copular clauses (14e).

(14) [tur]

- a. [Kitap okumak] (insanı) mutlu ediyor.  
book read-INF people-ACC happy make-PRS3SG  
'Reading a book makes people happy.'
- b. [Kitap okumak] çok eğlenceli.  
book read-INF very fun  
'Reading a book is very fun.'
- c. [Kitap okumak] beni mutlu ediyor.  
book read-INF I-ACC happy make- PRS3SG  
'Reading a book makes me happy.'
- d. [Kitap okumak] benim için (bana göre) çok eğlenceli.  
book read-INF I-GEN for very fun  
'Reading a book is very fun for me.'

<sup>8</sup> The forms in parentheses (i.e. *-mAğI* and *-mAğA*) are, as already mentioned, obsolete in modern Standard language.

<sup>9</sup> The locative marker can attach both to *-mA* and *-mAK* (*-mA-dA*, *-mAk-tA*), even if the form *-mAktA* seems to be more widespread (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 94). Note that the locative form of *-mAK* can also convey progressive present in finite clauses.

<sup>10</sup> The ablative form of *-mA* does not occur in complement clauses. It is used in adverbial clauses with the meaning of 'without doing'.

- e. Sorun [burada kalmak].  
 problem here stay-INF  
 'The problem is to stay here.'

Further, the subject control verb *iste-* 'want' in Turkish takes a complement clause based on *-mAK* in the nominative (15a). This verb can also contain a complement based on accusative-marked *-mA-yl* (15b). The accusative-marked complement clause is obligatory if another word stands between the complement and the higher predicate (15c) (Brendemoen & Hovdhaugen 1992: 123). If the subjects in higher and complement clauses are not co-referential, the matrix verb *iste-* occurs with a complement clause based on the infinitive on *-mA*, which takes a possessive (denoting the subject of the complement clause) and an accusative suffix (15d).

(15) [tur]

- a. [Kitap okumak] istiyorum.  
 book read-INF want-PRES-1SG  
 'I want to read a book (books).'
- b. [Burada kalmayı] istiyorum.  
 here stay-INF-ACC want-PRES-1SG  
 'I want to stay here.'
- c. Aynur [bugün yemek yapmayı] hiç istemiyor.  
 A. today cook-INF-ACC never want-PRES3  
 'Aynur really does not want to cook today.'
- d. Aynur [kardeşinin yemek yapmasını] istiyor.  
 A. sibling-PSS3SG-GEN cook-INF-PSS3SG-ACC want-PRES3  
 'Aynur wants her sibling to cook.'

Another verb which takes a complement clause based on *-mAK* in the nominative is *gerek-* 'be necessary' (or the adjective *lazım* 'necessary'). Example (16a) has an impersonal reading. This verb may not take a subject marker, e.g. *\*gerekliyorum*.<sup>11</sup> The subject is denoted by means of a possessive suffix in the complement clause. In example (16b) the underlying structure in English would be: [*for me to clean the house*] is necessary. The constructions, *-mAK iste-* and *-mAK gerek-*, correspond to the modal verbs 'want to do' and 'must do' respectively, in English. Other matrix predicates usually require case-marked complement clauses. Some examples are given in 17a-e.<sup>12</sup>

(16) [tur]

- a. [Evi temizlemek] gerekiyor (lazım).  
 house-ACC clean-INF be necessary-PRS3SG  
 'The house has to be cleaned.'

<sup>11</sup> For a different use of *gerek* in Ottoman Turkish, see Prokosch 1980.

<sup>12</sup> On the use of the verb *bil-* Erguvanlı (1984: 115) gives the following explanation: "When *bil-* is used in the idiomatic expression /.../, the infinitival object complement it takes does not require any case-marking: *Yağmur durmak bilmedi*. 'The rain wouldn't stop' (lit. The rains didn't know how to stop). *\*Yağmur durmağı bilmedi*. However, *bil-* when used in its usual sense of 'know' requires the infinitive object complement to be case marked: *Yemek yapmağı bilmiyorum*. 'I don't know how to cook. *\*Yemek yapmak bilmiyorum*."

- b. [Evi temizlemem] gerekiyor (lazım).  
house-ACC clean-INF-PSS1SG be necessary-PRS3SG  
'I have to clean the house.'

(17) [tur]

- a. [Yemek yapmayı] seviyorum.  
cook-INF-ACC like-PRES-1SG  
'I like to cook.'
- b. [Yemek yapmaya] çalışıyorum.  
cook-INF-DAT try-PRES-1SG  
'I try to cook.'
- d. [Burada kalmakta] ısrar etmiyorum.  
here stay-INF-LOC insist-NEG-PRES-1SG  
'I do not insist on staying here.'
- e. [Burada kalmaktan] korkuyorum.  
here stay-INF-ABL be afraid-PRES-1SG  
'I am afraid of staying here.'

#### 4. Control relations in Noghay complement clauses

In Noghay, control constructions are based on the infinitives on *-MAGA* or *-(U)w*.<sup>13</sup> Next to these forms, the participial morpheme *-GAN* and the converbial morpheme *-(I)p* can also be found with some matrix predicates in control constructions.<sup>14</sup> Diachronically seen, the marker *-MAGA* has apparently developed from the combination of the infinitive on *-MA* with the dative suffix *-GA*.<sup>15</sup>

The infinitive on *-(U)w* is capable of taking different case markers and possessive suffixes, see Table 2. Thus, the marker *-(U)w* occurs in those clauses implying control or in clauses that have their own subjects. The form *-(U)w* in combination with possessive markers can appear in semantic oppositions to the participles on *-GAN*, *-Atayan*, *-(A)yatқан*, *(A)yatıryan* or *-(A)yAG* (see Karakoç & Herkenrath [submitted]).

<sup>13</sup> The Noghay forms *-(I)s* and *-(I)ş* as well as *-MAK* and *-MA*, which are the cognates of the Turkish forms *-(y)İş*, *-mAK* and *-mA* respectively, are only employed as derivational suffixes, e.g. *koķis* 'smell', *süyiniş* 'delight, joy', *batpaķ* 'swamp, marsh', *bölme* 'room'. The suffix *-(U)w* can also occur as a derivational suffix, e.g. *yazuw* 'script', *süyüw* 'love, affection'.

<sup>14</sup> There are no previous works systematically investigating control relations in Noghay complement clauses. Karakoç (2002) and Karakoç & Herkenrath [submitted] only analyze possessive-marked complement clauses in Noghay.

<sup>15</sup> Note that the infinitive often contains a dative case in other Turkic languages as well, e.g. Karachay *aytpaya bilmeydi* [say-MAGA know-neg-PRES-3SG] 'he cannot say that' (Pritsak 1959: 362), Kumyk *yazmaya gerekmen* [write-MAGA necessary-1SG] 'I must write' (Benzing 1959: 403). In this context it is important to refer to Haspelmath (1989) who shows that the infinitives and similar complement forms of various languages have historically developed from the purposive forms containing verbal nouns in dative, locative or other case. Haspelmath (1989: 292) also gives examples from Turkic languages in which infinitives contain a dative ending.

		-(U)w
+ CASE	Nominative	-(U)w
	Accusative	-(U)w-dI
	Dative	-(U)w-GA
	Locative	-(U)w-dA <sup>16</sup>
	Ablative	-(U)w-dAn
	Genitive	-(U)w-nIŋ
+ POSSESSIVE	1SG	-(U)w-lm
	2SG	-(U)w-lŋ
	3SG	-(U)w-l
	1PL	-(U)w-lmlz
	2PL	-(U)w-lŋlz
	3PL	-(U)w-lArI

**Table 2:** Combinations of Noghay infinitive on -(U)w with case and possessive suffixes

The suffix *-MAGA* often occurs in grammaticalized modal constructions: *-MAGA kerek* [MAGA necessary] ‘must do, have to do’, *-MAGA tiyisli* [MAGA necessary] ‘must do, have to do’, *-MAGA bol-* [MAGA become/ be] ‘can do, be able to do’, *-MAGA süy-* [MAGA like/ love] ‘want to do’. *-MAGA kerek* expresses an impersonal necessity (18a) or indicates a third person subject (18b). The Noghay word *kerek*, in contrast to *gerek-* in modern Standard Turkish, directly takes personal endings (18c-d). Example (19) illustrates the use of *-MAGA bol-* ‘can do, be able to do’. Examples (20a-b) show the use of *-MAGA süy-* ‘want to do’.

(18) [nog]

- a. Men kimge tıŋlamaya kerek ekenin  
I who-DAT listen-MAGA.INF necessary be-PAR-PSS3SG-ACC  
de bilmeymen. (Kurmangulova et alii 1991: 12)  
also know-NEG-PRS-1SG  
‘I do not know whom to listen to.’
- b. Ol asiya edi. Keše kırya pišen äkelmege  
he hurry up-CV P.COP night field-DAT hay bring-MAGA.INF  
ketpege kerek edi. (Ajbazova 1996: 37)  
go-MAGA.INF necessary P.COP  
‘He hurried up. He had to go to the field at night to bring hay.’
- c. Sen olarya tıŋlamaya kereksin.  
you they-DAT listen-MAGA.INF necessary-2SG  
Olar sennen üyken. (Ajbazova 1996: 38)  
they you-ABL big  
‘You have to listen to them. They are older than you.’
- d. Men ketpege kerekpen. (Ajbazova 1996: 93)  
I go-MAGA.INF necessary-1SG  
‘I have to go.’

<sup>16</sup> The locative form of -(U)w can seldomly express progressive present in finite clauses.

(19) [nog]

Yatlaw kelistirüwde, köbinşe, dört sidiñradan tüzilgen  
 poem arrange-CAU-INF-LOC mostly four line-ABL form-PAS-PAR  
 šuwmaqtı kullanadılar, ama onıñ sanı onnan köp  
 composition-ACC use-PRS-3PL but that-GEN number-PSS3 that-ABL more  
 bolmaya da boladı. (Ajbazova 1996: 65)  
 be-MAGA.INFPTC be-PRS-3SG

'In creating a poem a composition consisting of four lines is usually used, but it can also be longer.'

(20) [nog]

a. ayday kömek keregin bilmege süyip,  
 how help necessary-PSS3SG-ACC know-MAGA.INF like-CV  
 mirtazaqlar onıñ asına keldiler. (Ajbazova 1996: 104)  
 police-PL he-GEN towards-PSS3SG-DAT come-PST-3PL

'The police wanted to inquire how they could help him and thus came to him.'

b. Olar bay orıs alaların basıp  
 they rich Russian city-PL-PSS3SG-ACC raid-CV  
 almaya süygenler. (Danibekov 1961: 318)  
 take-MAGA.INF like-POST-3PL

'They wanted to raid the rich Russian cities and invade them.'

Some of the predicates appearing in grammatical constructions with *-MAGA* can also take a clause based on a possessive-marked *-(U)w*. Thus, there are pairs such as *-MAGA süy-* versus *-(U)w+PSS+ACC süy-*.<sup>17</sup> The distribution of these forms has a morpho-syntactic motivation. Complement clauses based on *-MAGA* do not have their own subjects (examples 20a-b). A complement clause based on *-(U)w+PSS+ACC*, has, on the other hand, its own subject (expressed by the possessive suffix), which is not co-referential with the subject of the matrix clause (21). Consider Table 3 for a comparison of such pairs in Turkish and Noghay.

(21) [nog]

Yilki üyiri akında seniñ oyıñ maya  
 horse herd-PSS3SG about-PSS3SG-LOC you-GEN thought-PSS2SG I-DAT  
 yaraydı em men sol ümitiñniñ toluwin  
 like-PRS-3SG and I that hope-PSS2SG-GEN come to true-(U)w.INF-PSS3SG-ACC  
 süye edim. (Ajbazova 1996: 109)  
 like-PRS P.COP

'I liked your thoughts on the horse herd and I wanted your hopes to come to true.'

<sup>17</sup> Note that the verb *süy-* 'like, love' is a transitive verb, which assigns accusative case. Accordingly, when the predicate *süy-* heads a clause based on *-(U)w* (+ a possessive marker) this clause is in accusative case.

	Turkish	Noghay
Subject control	-mAK iste-	-MAGA süy-
Subject difference	-mA+PSS+ACC iste-	-(U)w+PSS+ACC süy-

**Table 3:** Turkish-Noghay counterparts in control and non-control constructions

The combination of *-MAGA* with the verb *tur-* ‘stand up/ stand’ also has a special function. *-MAGA tur-* [*MAGA* stand up/ stand] ‘be just about to do’ is a grammatical marker that denotes ‘proximativity’ in the sense that something is conceived of as impending, imminent or as being on the verge of occurring (for the use of ‘proximativity’, see Johanson 2013). Example (22) illustrates the use of the Noghay proximative marker *-MAGA tur-*.

(22) [nog]

Eki aydan soñ sosı töbediñ bawırında, Kütlibaydıñ  
two month-ABL after that hill-GEN slope-PSS3SG-LOC K.-GEN  
mıñ koyınnan birewin aştan ölmege turyan  
thousand sheep-ABL one-PSS3SG-ACC hunger-ABL die-MAGA-INF stand-PAR  
böriğe berip, kuwıldı. (Ajbazova 1996: 61)  
wolf-DAT give-CV fire-PAS-PST3

‘After two months he gave one of the thousand sheep, which belong to Kütlibay, to a starving wolf at this hill’s slope and was fired.’

The complex form *-MAGA šalıs-* [*MAGA* work] means ‘try to do’ (23).

(23) [nog]

Bu zatti oficerge añlatpaya  
this thing-ACC officer-DAT tell-MAGA-INF  
Ramazan bosına şalistı. (Kurmangulova et alii 1991: 7)  
R. to no avail try-PST3  
‘Ramazan tried to no avail to tell to the officer about it.’

In my Noghay data, clauses based on *-MAGA* often occur with predicates such as *yardam et-* ‘help’, *şakır-* ‘call, invite’, *kiris-* ‘attempt’, *kiyın bol-* ‘be/ become difficult’, *amal ber-* ‘show the way, guide’, *oylan-* ‘think, reflect’, *razi bol-* ‘agree’, *täwekelle-* ‘take/ run a risk’, *toqtas-* ‘decide’, *telez-* ‘get het up over’, *äzir bol-* ‘be/ get ready’, *uyal-* ‘be ashamed’, *mağul bol-* ‘approve’, *asıq-* ‘hurry up, rush’, *ümitlen-*, *ümit et-* ‘hope’, *borışli bol-* ‘owe’, *yara-* ‘suit’, *mut-* ‘forget’, *awes bol-* ‘be interested’, *yet-* ‘reach’. Example (24a) illustrates the use of *-MAGA* with the predicate *şakır-* ‘call, invite’, which is a three-place-verb (accusative-dative arguments), and exhibits an object control relation. The three-place matrix verb *yardam et-* ‘to help’ also triggers an object control relation (dative-dative arguments), see example (24b).

(24) [nog]

a. Ädemge bek usaydı, dep berip, üy iyesi Mirzabekti  
human being-DAT lot look like-PRS-3SG say-CV PV-CV house owner-PSS3 M.-ACC  
sıpıra yanına oltırmaya şakırdı. (Ajbazova 1996: 112)  
dining table side-PSS3SG-DAT sit down-MAGA-INF invite-PST3  
‘The host thought of Mirzabek as a good man and invited him to sit at the dining table.’

- b. *Ƙayday yarasıƙlaw-süwretlew amallar poetke*  
 which adorn-(U)w.INF describe-(U)w.INF method-PL poet-DAT  
*öz oyin aytpaya yardım etediler?* (Ajbazova 1996: 65)  
 self thought-PSS3SG-ACC tell-MAGA.INF help-PRS-3PL  
 ‘Which stylistic-descriptive methods help the poet to explain his thoughts?’

The infinitive on *-(U)w* is found in control constructions, if the matrix predicate assigns a case other than dative. Example (25) consists of several complement clauses that are based on *-(U)w* or *-MAGA*. The first embedded clause *sosı awılyı kel-üw-i-n* is based on *-(U)w* (+ possessive and accusative suffixes). This clause has its own subject denoted by the possessive suffix and does not imply a control relation. In the following clause, the matrix verb *ƙork-* assigning an ablative case takes a clause based on *-(U)w*: *üylen-üw-den ƙorkadı*. This clause implies a control relation. The subsequent embedded clauses are based on *-MAGA*, respectively: *ber-me-ge täwekellenmedi* and *ƙaşıp ket-pe-ge toƙtasadılar*.

(25) [nog]

Yigit, ƙızdı körgisi kelip, sosı awılyı kelüwin  
 young boy girl-ACC see-PAR-PSS3 come-CV this village-DAT come-(U)w.INF-PSS3-ACC  
 yiyilatadı. Temir-ƙol yasirtınnan etikşidiñ ƙızın  
 increase-PRS-3SG T. secretly shoemaker-GEN girl-PSS3SG-ACC  
 ayttıradı, ama atası da teñlik bolmayan  
 ask for marriage-PRS-3SG but father-PSS3SG PTC well-matched be-NEG-PAR  
 sosı üylenüwden ƙorkadı /.../. Kötere yaƙtan ƙuwılıp  
 this marry-(U)w.INF-ABL be afraid-PRS-3SG all side-ABL throw out-PAS-CV  
 yürgen yigitke sıñar äwletin bermege täwekellenmedi.  
 PV-PAR young boy-DAT the only child-PSS3-ACC give-MAGA.INF risk-NEG-PST3  
 A bir keşeliklerdiñ birisinde yas ädemler yoliyısadılar da  
 PTC one night-PL-GEN one-PSS3-LOC young people-PL meet-PST-3PL PTC  
 em awıldan ƙaşıp ketpege toƙtasadılar. (Ajbazova 1996: 81)  
 and village-ABL run away-CV go-MAGA.INF decide-PST-3PL

‘The young boy wanted to see the girl and made his visits to the village more frequent. Temir-ƙol asked secretly the shoemaker to marry his daughter, but the shoemaker was hesitant to such a unmatched marriage. He did not want to risk giving his only child to this young man who was thrown out everywhere. However, the young couple met up one night and decided to run away together from the village.’

According to my observations so far, the dative form of the infinitive *-(U)w* mostly seems to serve to construct ‘purpose clauses’ (26a). The *-MAGA* form may also have a similar function in adverbial clauses (26b).

(26) [nog]

- a. *Meylek-xannıñ peşinde taxtamette Dželaldinniñ ömirallasın*  
 M.-GEN room-PSS3SG-LOC settee-loc D.-GEN mourning-PSS3SG-ACC  
*etüwge ƙışkayaklılar yiyiyan ediler.* (Ajbazova 1996: 121)  
 make-(U)w.INF-DAT woman-PL gather-POST P.COP-3PL  
 ‘The women gathered around in Meylek-xan’s room on the settee in order to mourn after Dželaldin who had died.’

b. Ädettegi salamasuwlarinnan soñ, bular özleriniñ  
usual greet-(U)w.INF-PSS3PL-ABL after they self-PSS3PL-GEN  
süyetayan oyınları bolatayan damke oynamaya  
like-PAR game-PSS3PL be-PAR damke play-MAGA.INF  
oltirdılar. (Kurmangulova et alii 1991: 8)  
sit down-PST-3PL

'After their usual greeting they sat down in order to play the game 'damke', which they all enjoy.'

The Noghay participle *-GAN* may occur, even not frequently, in non-possessive complement clauses denoting a subject control relation. What can be observed in the data is that *-GAN* in this function usually occurs with the matrix predicate *qoy-* 'stop, cease, give up, quit' and takes an accusative suffix (27a-b). The corresponding Kazak participle *-GAN* also exhibits the same usage (28).<sup>18</sup>

(27) [nog]

a. Buýindirip öltirgendi qoy.  
drown-CV kill-GAN.PAR-ACC stop  
'Stop drowning and killing it.'

b. işkendi qoydım. (Sikaliev 1968: 45)  
drink-GAN.PAR-ACC stop-PST-1SG  
'I have quit drinking.'

(28) [kaz]

Asan işkendi qoydı. / Asan işüwdi qoydı.  
A. drink-GAN.PAR-ACC stop-PST3 / A. drink-(U)w.INF-ACC stop-PST3  
'Asan has quit drinking.'

The matrix verb *qoy-* 'stop, cease, give up, quit' takes a clause based on *-(U)w*, if this clause has its own subject (in form of a possessive suffix). Example (29) includes *qoy-* twice. The first *qoy* (within *qaldıra qoy*) is used as a postverb. The postverb construction *-A qoy-* serves to transform the non-transformative lexeme into a finittransformative one and indicates the readings such as 'quickness', 'completion', 'to finish something completely' etc. (see Karakoç 2007). The second *qoy-* is a transitive matrix verb, which takes a complement clause based on *-(U)w+PSS+ACC*.

(29) [nog]

"Öziñe qaldıra qoy sol aqti!" dedi  
self-PSS2SG-DAT keep-A.CVPV that salary-ACC say-PST3  
yilawin qoyip Asantay. (Ajbazova 1996: 49)  
cry-(U)w.INF-PSS3SG-ACC cease-(I)p.CV A.  
'"Keep this salary for yourself", said Asantay, ceasing to cry.'

A further peculiarity of Noghay is that some 'achievement' and 'phasal' matrix verbs, e.g. *basla-* 'begin', *üyret-* 'teach, instruct, train in', include control constructions based on the converbial suffix *-(I)p* (cf. Akbaba 2009: 201). The combination *-(I)p basla-* (corresponds to Turkish *-mAya başlamak*) expresses a subject control relation, whereas *-(I)p üyret-* (corresponds to Turkish *-mAyl öğretmek*) indicates an object control relation (30a-c).

<sup>18</sup> I would like to thank Aynur Abish for providing me with examples in Kazak.

(30) [nog]

- a. Asantaydın yüregine buz kuyıldı em bu, bir bäle  
 A.-GEN heart-PSS3SG-DAT ice put-PAS-PST3 and he a balefulness  
 yuwiqlap keleyatıryanın sezip, kirpiklerin  
 approach-CV come-PAR-PSS3SG-ACC sense-CV eye lid-PL-PSS3-ACC  
 kayıp başladı. (Ajbazova 1996: 34)  
 wink-(I)p.CV begin-PST3  
 'Asantay suddenly felt ice-cold in his chest, sensed that a threat was approaching and began to wink his eye lids.'
- b. Maraz ädem esin yiyip başladı. (Sikaliev 1968: 6)  
 sick man regain consciousness-(I)p.CV begin-PST3  
 'The ill man began to regain consciousness.'
- c. Meni uşip üyretseñ, dep kübirtkeyli qarayustan tileydi. (Akbaba 2009: 201)  
 I-ACC fly-(I)p.CV teach-CON-2SG say-(I)p.CV turtle eagle-ABL wish-PRS-3SG  
 'The turtle asked the eagle if it could teach him to fly.'

In Kazak, the matrix verb *basta-* 'begin' can take a complement based on the converbial suffix *-A* (31a-b). The use of the converb on *-(I)p* would have another reading, e.g. *ñilap bastadı* 'start something with crying'. The matrix verb *üyret-* usually heads a clausal complement based on *-(U)w* (31c).

(31) [kaz]

- a. Asan okıy bastadı.  
 A. read-A.CV begin-PST3  
 'Asan began to cry.'
- b. Bala ñilay bastadı.  
 A. cry-A.CV begin-PST3  
 'The child began to cry.'
- c. Mañan uşuwdı üyret.  
 I-DAT fly-(U)w.INF-ACC teach  
 'Teach me how to fly.'

## 5. Summary

In this paper I presented various aspects of subject and object control relations in complement clauses in Turkish and Noghay: (1) Matrix predicates that take subject control constructions are two-place verbs, which require a subject and an object argument. Matrix verbs that take object control constructions are, on the other hand, three-place-verbs. They have next to the subject, various object combinations. Having a three-place-verb is a precondition for object control constructions, since one of the objects functions as 'controller' while the other object position is provided for the complement clause whose subject ('controllee') is controlled. (2) In some pairs of matrix predicates In Turkish, the subject control verbs contain *ol-* 'become/ be' whereas the corresponding object control verbs consist of *et-* 'make'. Besides, in some lexical pairs, causative suffixes change the intransitive/ transitive subject control verbs to transitive, three-place object control verbs. (3) Turkish complement clauses implying control are based on the infinitives on *-mAK* or *-mA*. The marker *-mAK*

is only found in control constructions, while the so-called 'short infinitive' *-mA* can take a possessive suffix and occur in clauses having their own subjects. Thus, in control constructions, *-mA*, without possessive marking, is in opposition to *-mAK*, while it, with possessive suffixes, can semantically compete with the verbal noun on *-(y)Iş* or the participles on *-DIK* and *-(y)AcAK*. (4) In Noghay, there are two infinitive forms, *-MAGA* and *-(U)w*. The former apparently comes from the infinitive in the dative case. It often occurs in grammatical constructions expressing deontic modality or proximativity. The second form *-(U)w* can take possessive suffixes and thus appears in semantic oppositions to the participles on *-GAN*, *-Atayan*, *-(A)yatқан*, *(A)yatıryan* or *-(A)yAG*. Further, in Noghay, the participial suffix *-GAN* and the converbial suffix *-(I)p* can seldomly be found in complement clauses implying control relations.

### Abbreviations and symbols

1	First person	PAR	Participle
2	Second person	PAS	Passive
3	Third person	P.COP	Past copula
ABL	Ablative	PL	Plural
ACC	Accusative	PV	Postverb
CAU	Causative	PRS	Present
CON	Conditional	PSS	Possessive
COP	Copula	PST	Past
CV	Converb	PTC	Particle
DAT	Dative	POST	Postterminality
INF	Infinitive	SG	Singular
LOC	Locative	tur	Turkish
GEN	Genitive	nog	Noghay
NEG	Negation	*	ungrammatical

### References

- Ajbazova, E. S. (ed.) (1996). *Nogaj literaturasy. Učebnik-xrestomatija*. Čerkessk.
- Akbaba, D. E. (2009). *Nogay Türkçesi Grameri. Ses ve Şekil Bilgisi*. Ankara.
- Benzing, J. (1959). Das Kumükische. In: Deny, J. & Grønbech, K. & Scheel, H. & Togan, Z. V. (eds.) *Philologiae turcae fundamenta 1*. Aquis Mattiacis, 391-406.
- Bozşahin, C. (2006). On the Turkish controllee. In: Yağcıoğlu, S. & Değer, A. Cem (eds.) *Advances in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 12th ICTL*. İzmir, 121-136.
- Brendemoen, B. (2013). Some remarks on the infinitive in *-mA* in 17th century Ottoman Turkish. In: Demir, N. & Karakoç, B. & Menz, A. (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Festschrift Éva Ágnes Csató*. Ankara, 103-113.
- Brendemoen, B. & Hovdhaugen, E. (1992). *Tyrkisk grammatikk*. Oslo.
- Culicover, P. W. & Jackendoff, R. (2005). *Simpler syntax*. Oxford.
- Džanibekov, E. A. (ed.) (1961). *Tuvgan til. Baslangyş školadyň III. klassynda okuv knigasy*. Čerkessk.
- Erguvanli, E. E. (1984). *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley.

Erguvanlı Taylan, E. (1996). Aspects of control in Turkish. In: Rona, B. (ed.) *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 5th ICTL, London, 15-17 August 1990*. Ankara, 46-60.

Göksel, A. & Kerlake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London.

Haig, G. & Słodowicz, S. (2006). Control in Turkish non-finite complements. In: Yağcıoğlu, S. & Değer, A. Cem (eds.) *Advances in Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 12th ICTL*. İzmir, 165-177.

Haspelmath, M. (1989). From purposive to infinitive — a universal path of grammaticization. In: *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10/1-2, 287-310.

Johanson, L. (2013). Prospective and proximative. Talk given at “The International Symposium. The prospective as a grammatical category: Evidence from Turkic, Iranian and beyond”, Institut für Empirische Sprachwissenschaft, Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main, 23.-25. September 2013.

Karakoç, B. (2002). Nogayca ve Türkiye Türkçesinde Tümleç Yan Cümlelerinde Yüklemeleştiriciler. In: Demir, N. & Turan, F. (eds.) *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson. Lars Johanson Armağanı*. Ankara, 193-215. Republished in 2007 in: Károly, L. (ed.) *Turcology in Turkey. Selected papers*. (Studia uralo-altaica 47.) Papers selected by N. Demir & E. Yılmaz. Szeged, 337-359.

Karakoç, B. (2007). *Postverbal constructions in Noghay*. Talk given at “Conference on the Languages of the Caucasus”, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Leipzig, Germany), 7.-9. December 2007.

Karakoç, B. & Herkenrath, A. [submitted] Semantic functions of complementizers in Turkish and Noghay. In: Boye, K. & Kehayov, P. (eds.) *Semantic functions of complementizers in European languages*.

Kornfilt, J. (1991). Some current issues in Turkish syntax. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Turkish linguistics today*. Leiden et al., 60-92.

Kornfilt, J. (1996). Turkish and configurationality. In: Rona, B. (ed.) *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 5th ICTL, London, 15-17 August 1990*. Ankara, 111-125.

Kurmangulova, Š. A. & Daulova, N. A & Kireev, M. S. (eds.) (1991). *Nogaj literaturasy. Xrestomatija. Čerkessk*.

Landau, I. (1999). *Elements of control*. PhD. Dissertation. Cambridge.

Pritsak, O. (1959). Das Karatschaische und Balkarische. In: Deny, J. & Grønbech, K. & Scheel, H. & Togan, Z. V. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis. 340-368.

Prokosch, E. (1980). *Studien zur Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Vulgärosmanisch-Türkischen*. Freiburg.

Słodowicz, S. (2007). Complement control in Turkish. In: Stiebels, B. (ed.) *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 47, 125-157.

Özsoy, A. S. (2001). On 'small' clauses, other 'bare' verbal complements and feature checking in Turkish. In: Taylan, E. E. (ed.) *The verb in Turkish*. Amsterdam.

Sikaliev, A. (1968). *Jyltyn. Rasskazlar em novellalar*. Stavropol' Knigoizdatel'stvo synnyj Karaşaj-Şerkeş Bölügi.

Yücel, Ö. (2007). The semantic basis of control in Turkish. In: *The 1st Mediterranean graduate students meeting in linguistics*, 25-26 October 2007. Mersin University. Unpublished paper.

Yücel, Ö. (2009). Control relations in Turkish infinitival complements. In: Ay, S. et al. (eds.) *Essays on Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 14th international conference on Turkish linguistics*, 6-8 August 2008. (Turcologica 79.) Wiesbaden. 483-491.