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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 1997 and references given there). See Ex. 1.

Ex. 1
Karachay-Balkar
Non-marked relative clause
konaçı, keu-ü bü
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
kiz-ini, uyu-duğ-u, 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-head noun agreement
Atalov-ŋiŋ oturan oturğigiğ-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 süpätdaš and are described together with the other non-finite verb forms, issimdaš ‘verbal noun’ and räwișdaš ‘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 -Idiγan, and (iv) the Aorist participle, e.g. käl-gän ‘one who has come / came’, kel-iwatqan ‘one who is / was coming’, anla-ydiγan ‘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-γ an 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
Üč 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
Γulja mänziri-si i güzäl šähär i.
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. Uchturpani (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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participle Suffixes</th>
<th>-(i)watqan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yaz- ‘write’</td>
<td>yaz-γan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>käł- ‘come’</td>
<td>käł-gän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>käł- ‘go’</td>
<td>käł-gän</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oylat- ‘let sb think’</td>
<td>oylat-γan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oylat- ‘think’</td>
<td>oylat-γan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tüzä- ‘correct, modify’</td>
<td>tüzä-γän</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Table 2

Table 2
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-un-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-ii öy-gä kir-gän yigit
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.
Friedrich (2002: 143) mentions that the suffix -\textit{lIK} can optionally be attached to participles. The meaning of the participle with and without -\textit{lIK} is the same; see Ex 11.

Rentzsch (2005: 143) remarks that a participle cannot be combined with -\textit{lIK} in relative clauses. Thus, the possibility to attach the suffix -\textit{lIK} to a participle in -\textit{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.

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 \textit{qiz} ‘girl’, is in the Nominative; see Ex. 15.
Ex. 15
Nominative relative clause
qiz yaz-γan xät
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-niŋi yaz-γan xet-i₃
‘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 -GUdäk, -mAKči bolγan, and the Aorist participle.

Ex. 17
Genitive relative construction
qiz-niŋi yaz-yudäk xet-i₃
‘a/the letter which the girl can write’

Ex. 18
Genitive relative construction
qiz-niŋi yaz-maŋči bol-γan xet-i₃
‘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-gän 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 čaqir!
sleep-IWATQAN.PART-PL-ACC call.2SG.IMP
‘Call those who are sleeping!’

Ex. 21
Headless relative clause
Tät-il-dä öy-gän qayt-ma-ydiyan-lar göl kōtūr-sünlär.
vacation-LOC home-DAT go back-NEG-IDIFAN.PART-PL hand raise-2PL.IMP
‘Those who don’t go home during the vacation, raise your hands.’

Ex. 22
Headless relative clause
Hazir de-gin-i-ŋ 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-IDIFAN.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’, seviğim kadın ‘the woman I love(d)’” (Johanson 1998: 50). The same analysis can be applied to Uyghur headed relative clauses.

Ex. 24
baya öy-gän 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 šundaq bala gäp ayli-ma-ydiyan.
you such boy word listen-NEG-IDIAN.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-yän bala
book-ACC read-GAN.PART boy
‘the boy who has read / read the book’

Ex. 27
Direct object
u-niğ al-yän kitab-lir-i
(s)he-GEN buy-GAN.PART book-PL-3POSS
‘the books that (s)he has bought /bought’
Ex. 28
Indirect object
qrt 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 ček-iš 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-niŋ kelišim-gä qol qoy-γan qälim-i₉
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-niŋ *bilän kelišim-gä qol qoy-γan qälim-i₉
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-idıyan 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-ıdu.
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-ii  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-ii  tügä-p  kät-kän  qošni-miz i
wife-3POSS finish-CONV AUX-PART neighbor-1PL.Poss
'our neighbor whose wife passed away'

Ex. 37
Possessor of the subject

aγriq-ii  kün-din  kün-gä  e γirla-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-nii  börä  ye-gän  padići-lari
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

Padići-lar-niŋ, qoy-lir-i-ni  börä  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-dini  bir näččä  kićik  xiš  parći-si  čuš-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.
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. .

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 sârgârdan 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
mân maktûb-dâ 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 sârgäröndan bol-di.
‘The orphan has been a vagabond for ten years.’

Ex. 48
Män u kün-i mäktäb-dä bol-i-män.
‘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
iç-i-dä üç top bar qap
inside-3SG.POSS-LOC three ball existing container

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

İç-i-dä üç top bar bol-gan 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
čaçqan 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’, kisılär ‘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.
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.

| +INTRA +FOC | IWFATQAN |
| -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-gan.
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
Män oltur-γan.
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 oltur- 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 olturγan 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 oturdum ve hala oturuyorum ‘I have sat down and am still sitting’. Such an expression is meaningless with finitransformatives öldüm ve hala öldürüyorum *‘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
Mükātāb-dā kitab set-il-γan.
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 finitransformative actional phrase, Ex. 57, an initialtransformative one, and Ex. 58, a nontransformative one.

Ex. 56
öl-gān adām
die-GAN.PART man
‘the man who has died’
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
şwetsiyä-din uč-ğan ayruplan
Sweden-ABL fly-GAN.PART plane
‘the plane which comes/ has come from Sweden’

Ex. 60
muzikant bol-ğan äskär
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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAN</th>
<th>[+POST]</th>
<th>[-INTRA]</th>
<th>[-POST]</th>
<th>[+INTRA+FOM]</th>
<th>IDI</th>
<th>GAN</th>
<th>[-POST]</th>
<th>[+INTRA+FOM]</th>
<th>IWATQAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Participles in -Idiyan, and -(i)watqan
The participle in -Idiyan ( < -a durğan) 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 bilän iċ-idiyan dora
‘a pill which is taken with water

Ex. 62
U sen-i čašin-ālā-ydiyan yaš-ta āmās.
(s)he you-ACC understand-POT-IDIAN.PART age-LOC COP-NEG.3SG
‘(s)he is not of an age where (s)he can understand you.’

Ex. 63
män ātā bar-idiyan kutubxana
I tomorrow go-IDIFAN.PART library
‘the library where I will go to tomorrow’

Ex. 64
gül tik-il-idiyan taštāk
flower plant-PASS-IDIAN.PART flowerpot
‘the flowerpot into which the flower will be planted’

Ex. 65
män bil-idiyan bir sayahāt širkti
I know-IDIFAN.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
siŋl-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-dā ket-iwatqan adām-lār
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 müqsūd 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 -mAKči bolyan,
but not in Ex. 70 because in this example -idiyan cannot be interpreted intentionally.

Ex. 68
män ātä bar-maƣči bol-γan kutubxana
I tomorrow go-INTENT.PART library
‘the library to which I intend to go tomorrow’

Ex. 69
gül tik-il-mākči bol-γan taʃtāk
flower plant-PASS-INTENT.PART flowerpot
‘the flowerpot into which the flower has to be planted’

Ex. 70
biz nāprātlin-idiyān kīʃ-lār
we hate-IDIFAN.PART people-PL
‘the people whom we hate’

Observe that in Ex. 69 the participle is a passive form tikil- ‘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-maƣči bol-γan xāt
I write-INTENT.PART letter
‘the letter which I will write’

Ex. 72
sawaqdiʃ-im-niŋ al-maƣči bol-γan kitab-i
classmate-1SG.POSS-GEN buy-INTENT.PART book-3SG.POSS
‘the book which my classmate wants to buy’

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

Ex. 73
uʃ kün-gā yāt-kūdāk un
three day-DAT suffice-GUDĀK.PART flour
‘the flour which may suffice for three days’
Ex. 74
kök-kā taqaş-qudāk egiz imarāt
sky-DAT touch-GUDĀK.PART high building
‘a high building which can touch the sky’

Ex. 75
put qoy-qudāk yār
foot put-GUDĀK.PART place
‘a place where the foot can stand’

Ex. 76
mān hal-im-ni eyt-qudāk birār adām
I situation-1SG.POSS-ACC tell-GUDĀK.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 / bol yan qāwm-lär
Hun descendant-3SG.POSS-ABL be-MIš.PART / GAN.PART tribe-PL
‘the tribes who descended from the Huns’

Ex. 79
ziyali aili-si-din kel-ip čiqt-miš / čiqtan dehqan
intellectual family-3SG.POSS come-CONV AUX-MIš.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’, učar at ‘flying horse’, učar tāxsā ‘UFO’, tügimās bayliq ‘infinite treasure’, yeğilmās armiyā ‘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.
In Ex. 80, the relative clause *sän sundurγan* ‘you have broken’ has its own subject *sän* ‘you’. The Genitive noun *mašini-niŋ* ‘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: *mašini-niŋ* *sol äynik-i* ‘the left mirror of the car’, and the intervening relative clause *sän sundurγan* ‘which you have broken / broke’, which modifies the head noun *sol äynik-i* ‘its left mirror’. Ex. 81 has an analogous structure.

**Ex. 80**

*mašini-niŋ* *i sän sun-durγan* *sol äynik-i*

‘the left mirror of the car which you have broken / broke’

**Ex. 81**

*öy i gi-si-nThe 3 SG.POSS-GEN  män qorq-idıγan* *it-i*

‘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<sub>1</sub><sup>GEN</sup>[](rel.<sub>1</sub>.SUBJ (X) PART) N<sup>POSS</sup>]<sup>2</sup> where Ø is the syntactically unrealized first actant

**Ex. 82**

*qiz-niŋ* *söy-gän* *yigit-i*

‘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 *oγurla-n-γan* is relativized; thus the Genitive NP *dost-um-niŋ* ‘of my friend’ cannot be interpreted as the subject of the relative clause.

**Table 8**

[**NP<sub>1</sub><sup>GEN</sup>[](rel.<sub>1</sub>.Ø (X) PART) N<sup>POSS</sup>]<sup>2</sup>
Ex. 83
dost-um-niŋ ᵇoyrla-n-γan hāmyan-iŋ
friend-1SG.POSS-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 bolmiŋan ‘not having been / being important’ is relativized; thus, again, the Genitive NP artist-niŋ ‘of the actor’ cannot be the first actant of the relative clause.

Ex. 84
artist-niŋ muhim bol-miŋan rol-iŋ
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-niŋ ‘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 kitabliri ‘his / her books’.

Ex. 85
Direct object
u-niŋ al-γan kitab-lir-iŋ
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
qız-niŋi kitab-ni bär-gän dost-iŋ
girl-GEN book-ACC give-GAN.PART friend-3POSS
‘the friend of the girl to whom she gave the book’

Ex. 87
men-iŋ häk kün ald-i-din öt-idiyan öy-iŋm
I-GEN every day front-3POSS-LOC pass-IDI.GAN.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, muällim ‘teacher’, is interpreted as the subject of the relative clause and the Genitive noun, as its possessor.
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Ex. 88
*dost-i*ni  öy-gä   käl-gän    muällim–
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–nin* ŋ
friend-3POSS-GEN
*öy–gä*   käl-gän    muällim–i
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–ni*ŋ  imzala–γan   yer–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–ni*ŋ  maça   al–γan    kitab–lir–i
she-GEN 1-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*  sóy–gän    yigit
that girl love-GAN.PART boy
‘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-禹îgän yigit
nobody love-NEG-IDFAN.PART boy
‘the boy whom nobody loves’

Ex. 95
*hič kim-niŋ i söy-mä-禹îgän yigit-i
nobody-GEN love-NEG-IDFAN.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
sunshine-GEN enter-GAN.PART house-3POSS
Intended meaning: ‘the house into which the sunshine does not enter’

Animacity 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 yiql-γan yer-im-i
I-GEN fall down-GAN.PART place-1SG.POSS
‘the place where I fell down’

Ex. 99
däräxt-niŋ yiql-γan yer-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:
On Uyghur relative clauses

Ex. 100
mən  oqu-γan  kitab
I  read-GAN.PART  book
‘a book I read / have read / read’

Ex. 101
men-iŋ  oqu-γan  kitab-im,
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
mənziri-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-niŋ  sōz-i-gā    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 hickim-niŋ söz-i-gä pärwa qil-ma-ydiŋ ajayip bala.

Alim anybody-GEN word-3POSS-DAT care-NEG-IDIAN.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.
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List of abbreviations

2PL second person plural  IDIFAN.PART participle in -Idi\'An
2SG second person singular IMP imperative
3POSS third person possessive INTENT.PART participle in -mAk\'i bol\'yan
3SG third person singular IWAT.PRES present in -(i)wat
ABL ablative IWATQAN.PART participle in -(i)watqan
ACC accusative LOC locative
AUX auxiliary MAQ\'I.PART participle in -mA\'k\'i
CAUS causative MI\'S.PART participle in -mi\'s
COMP comparative NEG negative
CONV converb PASS passive
COP copula PAST past
DAT dative PL plural
DIK.PART participle in -DIK POT potential
GAN.PART participle in -GA\'n PRES present
GEN genitive PST past
GU\'CILIK participle in -GU\'cilik EQU similitude marker (-d\'ak)
GUD\'AK.PART participle in -GUD\'AK
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