

Properties of Verbal Idioms in Turkish

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Linguistics

by
Mine Güven

Bogazici University Library



Boğaziçi University
1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis supervisor Professor A. Sumru Özsoy for her guidance and invaluable contribution. I feel indebted to her for her generosity in sharing her time as well as for her understanding and the saintly patience she has shown in dealing with my impatience and lack of linguistic discipline.

I am deeply grateful to Professor Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan for sharing her time and experience with me and for her constructive criticism and sound advice. I would also like to thank Dr. Aslı Göksel who not only devoted her time to read numerous versions of my thesis but also made many helpful comments to improve the study.

Special thanks go to my dearest friend A. Pınar Besen whom I constantly bombarded with an infinite number of examples asking for her native intuitive judgments. Had it not been for her support and warm friendship, I could not possibly have made it. I would also like to thank my colleagues at the Linguistic Circle for their support and encouragement.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for their support and caring and especially my mother who has always been a sun shining upon me in the midst of bleak winter.

ABSTRACT

PROPERTIES OF VERBAL IDIOMS IN TURKISH

by

MİNE GÜVEN

This study investigates the notion *syntactic frozenness* with respect to Turkish idioms headed by verbs within the framework of generative grammar. The data consist of randomly chosen 725 idioms gathered from the TDK 1988 *Türkçe Sözlük*. These verbal idioms contain at least one NP constituent and are freely marked with various tense and aspect markers. Based on the number of non-head NPs in an idiom, the nature of the case marker that appears on the non-heads and their argument structures, verbal idioms in Turkish are categorized into eleven subcategories and it is examined whether this categorization is predictive of the syntactic behavior of the data. The syntactic properties considered are argument structure, passivization, relativization, wh-question formation, clefting/pseudo-clefting, pronominalization, and scrambling. A thorough analysis of the morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties of the data reveals that the presence vs. absence of phonologically overt case markers on idiomatic NPs plays a major role in the acceptability of syntactic operations. Moreover, it is observed that the grammatical relation of the idiomatic non-head to the head, i.e. the subject vs non-subject distinction is also of consequence. Syntactic frozenness in Turkish verbal idioms is thus defined in terms of the number of obligatory constituents, frozen inflectional endings and the syntactic structure which must be preserved even when the lexical items have been substituted for by other items, and it is claimed that a verbal idiom in Turkish consists of a certain “frame” with pre-specified structural features.

KISA ÖZET

TÜRKÇE'DE EYLEMSEL DEYİMLERİN BAZI ÖZELLİKLERİ

MİNE GÜVEN

Bu çalışmada, *yapısal kalıplaşma* kavramı Türkçe'de eylemsel deyimler açısından Üretici Dilbilgisi kuramı çerçevesinde incelenmektedir. Çalışmanın veri tabanını TDK 1988 *Türkçe Sözlük*'ten toplanarak rastgele seçilen 725 eylemsel deyim oluşturmaktadır. Bu eylemsel deyimler en az bir Ad Öbeği içermekte ve çeşitli zaman ve durum ekleriyle yer alabilmektedir. Deyimin içerdiği Ad Öbeği sayısına, Ad Öbeği üzerinde yer alan durum ekinin niteliğine ve A-yapısına dayanarak, Türkçe'deki eylemsel deyimler on bir sınıfa ayrılarak bu sınıflandırma yoluyla verilerin sözdizimsel davranışının tahmin edilip edilemeyeceği araştırılmaktadır. Veri tabanının ayrıntılı incelemesi sonucu, deyimsel Ad Öbekleri üzerinde yer alan durum eklerinin veya soyut durumun sözdizimsel özelliklerin kabul edilebilirliği üzerinde önemli ölçüde etkili olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun yanısıra, deyimsel Ad Öbeğinin başla olan dilbilgisel ilişkisi, bir başka deyişle, özne olup olmasının da önem taşıdığı gözlenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmada, Türkçe'de eylemsel deyimlerde yapısal kalıplaşma zorunlu tümleçlerin sayısı, kalıplaşmış durum ekleri ve deyimde yer alan sözcüksel birimlerin başkalarıyla değiştirildiklerinde dahi korunan yapısı cinsinden tanımlanmakta ve Türkçe'deki eylemsel deyimlerin daha önceden belirlenmiş yapısal özelliklere sahip bir “çerçeve”den oluştuğu iddia edilmektedir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Aim..... 1

1.2. Theoretical Framework 2

1.2.1. Idioms as *Transformationally Deficient Structures* 3

1.2.1.1. Degree of Frozenness.....5

1.2.1.2. Degree of Idiomaticity 6

1.2.2. Semantic Compositionality 7

CHAPTER TWO: STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES OF TURKISH IDIOMS ...10

2.1. Structural Categories..... 10

2.1.1. Introduction 10

2.1.2. Description of Categories 11

2.2. Syntactic Properties..... 15

2.2.1. Argument Structure and θ -Roles 15

2.2.2. Passivization 19

2.2.3. Relativization 25

2.2.4. Wh-question Formation..... 28

2.2.5. Clefting/Pseudo-clefting 30

2.2.6. Pronominalization 31

2.2.7. Scrambling..... 32

CHAPTER THREE: SEMANTIC CRITERIA FOR IDIOMATICITY 42

3.1 Lexical Substitution..... 42

3.1.1. Synonym Tests and Modification..... 43

3.1.1.1. Idiom Families 44

3.1.1.2. Errors 46

3.1.1.3. Substitution by the Dummy Filler *Şey* 49

3.2. Selectional Restrictions..... 50

3.3. Humor and Punning 51

3.4. (Un)translatability..... 53

3.5. Semantic Change 55

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION 57

APPENDIX I: THE DATA.....58

APPENDIX II: DEFINITIONS OF IDIOM 82

BIBLIOGRAPHY 84

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Aim

The aim of this study is to investigate the notion *syntactic frozenness* with respect to Turkish idioms headed by verbs, in an attempt to define the notion on the basis of behavior illustrated by the data. It is also the purpose of this study to categorize Turkish verbal idioms structurally to provide a thorough analysis of their morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties.

The data of this study is gathered from the TDK 1988 *Türkçe Sözlük* in comparison with the *Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü* v.2 (Aksoy 1995). The idiomatic expressions included in the data are those which are headed by verbs and which consist of at least one NP constituent as exemplified in (1). These can further be distinguished by their ability to occur in imperative or optative structures and be freely marked with various tense and aspect markers.

- (1) a. *yer yer-i-nden oyna-*
place/earthØ place3sgPOSS-ABL move
'to cause much chaos (of an event)'
- b. *bin dere-den su getir-*
thousand streamABL water bring
'to make all sorts of excuses'

As opposed to the idioms with non-verbal non-heads in (1), those idioms with verbal non-heads such the ones in (2) have been excluded from the data although these can also occur in imperative or optative structures and are freely marked with tense and agreement markers. As can be noted, the non-heads constitute embedded clauses in the idioms given in (2).

- (2) a. *gül-üp geç-*
laugh-3p pass
'not to take something seriously'
- b. *bana mı-sın de-me-*
1sgDAT mI-2sg sayNEG
'not to be affected at all by any change'

Also excluded are idioms which are nominal in nature such as those in (3), and those “sentential” idioms which bear fixed tense/aspect/modality markers such as the ones in (4):

- (3) a. *kulağ-ı delik*
 ear3sPOSS pierced
 ‘one who is quick to pick up the news’
- b. *iç-li dış-lı*
 inside-with outside-with
 ‘very familiar or intimate’
- (4) a. *Tut kel-in perçem-i-nden.*
 HoldØ bald (person)GEN lock of hair3sgPOSS-ABL
 ‘What on earth can one do in such an impossible situation?’
- b. *Çoğ-u git-ti/*gid-iyor/*gid-er az-ı kal-dı.*
 Most3sgPOSS goPAST/*PROG/*AOR little3sgPOSS leavePAST/*PROG/*AOR
 ‘Most of it is over, the end is near.’

Those structures in (1) are further predicted to reflect more diverse structural differences than those which may be exhibited by idioms forming a single constituent as in (3) or those virtually frozen in structure as in (4).

1.2. Theoretical Framework

Within the framework of generative grammar, two different approaches have been adopted to account for the status of idioms in the lexicon, namely the unit and the non-unit treatments (cf. Newmeyer (1972), Weinreich (1969)). The unit treatment considers idioms as single lexical items (a single phonological word) whereas the non-unit treatment allows idioms to be taken as a group of words with unitary meaning. However, since each treatment with its respective advantages and disadvantages has proved to be unsatisfactory to account for the facts, other approaches have been proposed in the literature: Weinreich (1969) proposes an *idiom comparison rule* to account for the idiosyncratic properties of idioms; Chafe (1970) suggests a *postsemantic structure*, an intermediary level, within the framework of generative semantics. It is also mentioned that idioms have constituted a problem in generative linguistics as far as their mental representation is concerned. Within this framework, Newmeyer (1972) proposes a *transderivational constraint* in an attempt to explain the discrepancy observed in the meanings of lexical items in idiomatic and

non-idiomatic contexts; Jackendoff (1975) suggests that phrase structure rules be used as *morphological redundancy rules* and finally Fillmore et al. (1988) propose *Construction Grammar* where complex lexical structures like idioms are allowed to be associated with semantic and pragmatic information.

In addition, there have also been attempts to explain the so-called “many-to-one correspondence” between syntactic units and the unitary sense observed in idioms. These accounts seem to center around three main aspects of idioms: (i) idiom formation processes, (ii) the behavior of idioms with respect to syntactic operations and (iii) semantic compositionality. In this study, we will mainly focus on the latter two aspects and employ syntactic and semantic tests to classify the data. Accordingly, the observation that idioms are “transformationally deficient” structures will be considered first, and the views that idioms exhibit varying degrees of idiomaticity and syntactic frozenness will be focused on. Further, we will summarize the different views on the apparent discrepancy in idioms between their “compositional” senses and the unitary idiomatic senses which do not seem to be “computable” from the senses of the elements involved in idioms by simply using the general semantic interpretation principles.

1.2.1. Idioms as *Transformationally Deficient Structures*

With respect to their syntactic properties, idioms are noted to be “transformationally deficient,” i.e. idioms do not allow normally applicable transformations such as passivization, relative clause formation, clefting, etc. (cf. (Newmeyer (1972), Nunberg et al. (1994), Weinreich (1969)). The literature on English idioms highlight a number of their properties:

(i) idioms are subject to certain morphological restrictions: only some idioms allow nominalization and retain their idiomaticity (cf. Weinreich (1969), Makkai (1978)); they typically resist variation in the number and definiteness of the NPs involved (cf. Weinreich (1969), Chafe (1970), Cruse (1986), Jackson (1988)),

(ii) idioms are “idiosyncratic” expressions: they may violate semantic co-occurrence restrictions or require certain semantic features in the non-idiomatic constituents

which occur within the same structures; some may not be negated; some are pragmatically restricted, and the lexical items involved in idioms cannot be substituted for by synonymous lexical items (cf. Weinreich (1969)),

(iii) the NPs involved in idioms are not “proper” semantic units able to show semantic contrast: idiomatic constituents are not allowed to occur with adverbial or adjectival modifiers or quantifiers (cf. Weinreich (1969), Cruse (1986), Newmeyer (1972), Nunberg et al. (1994)); idiomatic NPs cannot be focused or pronominalized (cf. Quang (1971), Chafe (1970)); such NPs are similar in behavior to non-referential NPs such as the weather *it* and existential *there* (cf. Postal (1974), Chomsky (1981)); although idiomatic NPs occupy obligatory argument positions, they are not allowed to be assigned proper θ -roles (cf. Chomsky (1981)); idiomatic constituents are also not allowed to form wh-questions (cf. Newmeyer (1972), Bolinger (1975)),

(iv) idioms are syntactically frozen sequences of words: the relative order of idiomatic constituents cannot be changed in any way (cf. Weinreich (1969)), thus idioms are not allowed to undergo those syntactic operations which require the movement or omission of constituents such as passivization, clefting/pseudo-clefting, relativization, gapping, conjunction reduction, VP-ellipsis and wh-question formation (Weinreich (1969), Chafe (1970), Newmeyer (1972), Nunberg et al. (1994), Sinha (1973), Quang (1971)). Note that some operations such as wh-question formation, clefting/pseudo-clefting and relativization require not only the movement of constituents but also the semantic focusing of a single constituent and referentiality.

However, it should also be noted that not all idioms seem to resist the application of the above mentioned operations, i.e. idioms vary in the extent to which they are “transformationally deficient”. In other words, while some idioms freely undergo transformations and still retain their idiomatic status, some become “literalized” as a result of such operations. This variability has been attributed to two major properties of scalar nature: syntactic frozenness and idiomaticity. The former property is a structural one, such that idioms typically resist insertion of new lexical items into the sequence that constitutes the idioms or reordering of their constituents. The latter is more of a semantic property, which derives from the unique organization of lexical items to form idioms.

1.2.1.1. Degree of Frozenness

Cutler (1982) mentions that Fraser (1970)¹, in an attempt to explain the difference in the extent to which idioms may allow syntactic operations and retain their idiomatic reading, distinguishes six levels of syntactic “frozenness,”

Similarly, Bolinger (1975) mentions that idioms may vary widely in their degree of “tightness” and differ from collocations which seem to be “looser” groupings of words. The grammaticality judgments in (5a) through (5c) illustrate that an increasing degree of tightness can be observed in the three idioms formed with the same head verb (p.102).

- (5) a. *[The fright that he took] was indicative of his timidity.*
 b. *?[The courage that he took] was indicative of his inner resources.*
 c. **[The heart that he took] was indicative of his optimism.*

Cutler (1982), on the other hand, claims that syntactic frozenness correlates with the length of time the idioms have been present in the language. In addition, she mentions that syntactic frozenness may also occur when the meaning of the idiom is no longer obvious and the literal reference has gradually been obscured, a point which implies that structural rigidity and semantic opacity are closely related.

In sum, although different terms (e.g. Fraser (1970) “frozenness,” Bolinger (1975) “tightness,” Cruse (1986) “internal cohesion,” Jackson (1988) “fixity,” Nunberg et al. (1994) “inflexibility,” Aksan (1982, 1987), Uzun (1991) and Aksoy (1995) “kalıplaşma”) are used to express the fact that idioms can only appear in a limited number of syntactic constructions. Further, linguists distinguish different levels of syntactic frozenness (cf. (Fraser (1970) vs. Bolinger (1975))). What is consistent in all approaches is the view that idioms vary in the extent to which they may undergo syntactic operations and also retain their idiomaticity.

¹ “Idioms within a Transformational Grammar,” *Foundations of Language* 6, pp.22-42.

1.2.1.2. Degree of Idiomaticity

Makkai (1978) points out that idioms “come on a scale of metaphorical gradation from completely metaphorically translucent form to entirely opaque ones” (p.445), i.e. idioms differ in the degree of idiomatic opacity. Hence, semantic transparency versus opacity of lexical items causes idioms to appear on a continuum of varying degrees of idiomaticity.

In reference to Turkish idioms, Uzun (1991) attempts to construct a scale of idiomaticity where a three-way distinction is proposed. She takes as a criterion “the meaning values of signs within the semantic structuring of idiomaticity” (cf. Uzun 1991:34). The “meaning value” of a sign refers to the referential meaning or connotative meaning which may be assigned to that sign. The idioms included in the first level of the scale have the highest degree of idiomaticity where each sign in the idiom carries an idiomatic meaning different from its literal meaning. There is no relation between the meanings of the parts and the meaning of the whole. For example, there is one such idiom in (6a).

- (6) a. *aba alt-ı-ndan değnek göster-*
 coatØ bottomPOSS-ABL stickØ show
 ‘to try to scare someone implicitly’
- b. *ağız değiştir-*
 mouthØ change
 ‘to say the opposite of what was said before’
- c. *adam-dan say-*
 manABL consider
 ‘to consider someone worth respect’

The second level includes idioms whose NP constituents carry connotative meanings, such that one can “recover” the idiomatic sense when both the signs with referential meaning and those connotative ones are considered. An idiom belonging to the second level is exemplified in (6b). The retention of the referential meanings of the signs within the idiom decreases the degree of idiomaticity and the idiomatic sense disappears as the degree of idiomaticity decreases. The lowest level of the idiomaticity scale is characterized by semantic compositionality, in other words, the idiomatic meaning is equal to the sum of the connotative meanings of the signs in the

semantic structuring of the idiom. Note that both constituents of the idiom in (6c) carry their secondary senses. In this study, we will make reference to these levels of idiomaticity proposed in Uzun (1991), often in an attempt to disclose correlations, if any, between levels of idiomaticity and syntactic frozenness.

To conclude, idioms appear on a continuum ranging from the lowest degree of idiomaticity to the highest, and a similar relation holds as far as syntactic frozenness is concerned. Thus, the applicability of transformations is claimed to correlate with the relative position of idioms both on the continuum of idiomaticity and syntactic frozenness.

1.2.2. Semantic Compositionality

Semantic compositionality, in very general terms, means that the overall sense of an expression or a sentence can be computed from the sum of the senses of the elements involved. This implies that each element in a given expression is meaningful and capable of contributing to the overall sense, and that there is a one-to-one correspondence between each form and sense. However, idioms are generally defined as “non-compositional” expressions where there is a many-to-one relationship between parts of an idiom and its sense which is not “divisible/decomposable” into the individual senses of the parts². In other words, scholars generally argue in favor of an analysis of idioms as lexically complex but semantically unitary expressions, i.e. expressions whose parts are lexical items but not semantic units, and whose meanings are not the compositional function of the meanings of their parts when they are used in non-idiomatic contexts (cf. Cruse (1986)).

Similarly, Fillmore et al. (1988) emphasize that the ordinary principles of semantic interpretation do not seem to account for idiomatic structures. In other words, merely knowing the grammar and the vocabulary of a language is not sufficient for a speaker to know how to generate an idiom, to understand the meaning

²A chronologically ordered inventory of various different definitions of idiom is given in Appendix II. Within the framework of the present study, the views that idioms are composed of independent lexical units with a unitary sense and that the degree of semantic compositionality correlates with the degree of idiomaticity are adopted.

of an idiom uttered by another speaker, or recognize an idiom as a conventional manner of speaking or locution.

The claim that semantic compositionality is inapplicable to idioms is challenged in Nunberg et al. (1994) who claim that most idioms are in fact semantically compositional. They offer the following example: *John was able to pull strings to get the job, since he had a lot of contacts in the industry.* They propose that the hearer of such a sentence may predict correctly that *pull strings* means something like ‘exploit personal connections’ even though s/he may not have predicted it if s/he had heard it out of its context. Thus, the hearer starts establishing correspondence between the meaning and the constituents of the idiom (viz. *pull* ‘exploit’ and *strings* ‘personal connections’); where each constituent is metaphorically tied to a denotation. In this way, an arbitrary but compositional interpretation is assigned to this idiom. However, this does not mean that speakers can entirely recover the rationale behind the figuration, or that the idiom is transparent. On the other hand, idioms like *kick the bucket* and *saw logs* (idiomatic phrases) are different from the above mentioned expressions (idiomatically combining expressions) in that they are entered in the lexicon as complete phrases since their idiomatic interpretations cannot be “distributed” over their parts. In brief, Nunberg et al. (1994) claim that idioms have identifiable, meaningful parts in idiomatic combinations as opposed to the generally accepted view that idioms are non-compositional by definition.

As far as semantic compositionality and idioms are concerned, Weinreich (1966, 1969) proposes a view quite different from those mentioned above. Simply put, Weinreich argues that each morpheme/word is associated with all of the possible “subsenses” which are determined/specialized only in context. In Weinreich (1966), the possible effects of sign combination on the meanings of signs are discussed and the difficulties in identifying grammatical and semantic units are emphasized. In this respect, the combination of the constituent signs involved in idioms does not yield the exact sum of their designata (meanings)³. This discrepancy between the parts and the

³ Weinreich (1966) adopts the scheme of semantics developed by Morris (1938) *Foundations of a Theory of Signs*, Chicago. Within that framework, language is a repertory of signs; grammar consists of the rules of sign combination and grammatical classes are the classes of signs. A sign is

whole is considered to be the defining property of idiomatic expressions in Weinreich (1969). In sum, Weinreich (1969) claims that meaning is decomposable into components and that each subsense is contextually specialized.

The above discussion of the theoretical aspects of idioms highlights a number of properties to be tested and discussed for Turkish. The first issue to be raised in the second chapter will be the syntactic criteria which may be employed to categorize the data structurally. Assuming that the lexical items involved in idioms are phonologically and grammatically independent words which may appear with the inflectional endings compatible with their respective categories, we will focus on the nature of constituency in idioms. The next issue to be raised and discussed will be whether the structural categorization of the data is predictive of their syntactic behavior, which will be considered within three major areas of interest, namely argument structure and thematic roles born by idiomatic constituents, linear order of idiomatic constituents, and the movement and focusing of idiomatic constituents. Further, semantic compositionality will be the main subject matter of the third chapter. If idioms consist of independent grammatical units, then it should be investigated whether meaning is “divisible” into parts of the whole. The levels of idiomaticity proposed in Uzun (1991), which also imply semantic compositionality especially in the second and third levels, will also be examined to see if they exhibit parallels with the syntactic behavior of the data.

CHAPTER TWO

STRUCTURAL PROPERTIES OF TURKISH IDIOMS

This chapter discusses a number of syntactic criteria employed to categorize the data with respect to structure, and examines whether this categorization is predictive of the syntactic behavior of the data. The syntactic properties to be considered are argument structure, passivization, relativization, wh-question formation, clefting/pseudo-clefting, pronominalization, and scrambling, respectively.

2.1. Structural Categories

2.1.1. Introduction

Based on the number of non-heads in an idiom, the nature of the case marker that appears on the non-heads and their argument structures, verbal idioms in Turkish can be categorized as follows:

	STRUCTURE	CATEGORY	role of non-head NP	obligatory argument positions
I.	/N V/			
I.1.	/N + $\emptyset$ V/			
I.1.1.		I-i-1	subject	none
I.1.2.		I-i-2	subject	a non-sbj arg.
I.1.3.		I-i-3	non-subject	sbj
I.1.4.		I-i-4	non-subject	sbj + a non-sbj arg.
I.2.	/N + Case V/			
I.2.1.		I-ii-1	non-subject	sbj
I.2.2.		I-ii-2	non-subject	sbj + a non-sbj arg.
II.	/N N V/			
II.1.	/N + $\emptyset$ N + $\emptyset$ V/	II-i	sbj/non-sbj	none
II.2.	/N + $\emptyset$ N + Case V/	II-ii	sbj/non-sbj	none
II.3.	/N + Case N + $\emptyset$ V/			
II.3.1.		II-iii-1	non-sbj/sbj	none
II.3.2.		II-iii-2	non-sbj/non-sbj	sbj
II.4.	/N + Case N + Case V/	II-iv	non-sbj/non-sbj	sbj

Table 1: TABLE OF STRUCTURE

As can be noted in the above categorization, *Category I* consists of those idioms with only a single NP as the non-head, while *Category II* includes those idioms

2.1.2.2. Category I-i-2

/N + Ø

V/

- (2) *Masa-ya göz-üm iliş-ti.*
 tableDAT eye1sgPOSS appendPAST
 IND.OBJ SBJ V
 'I noticed the table.'

Category I-i-2 structures are similar to *Category I-i-1* structures with their single preverbal idiomatic NP constituents functioning as the grammatical subject. Unlike *Category I-i-1* structures, however, there is an obligatory argument position to be filled by a non-idiomatic NP. The idiomatic subject NP is generally marked with POSS. The most frequent verb classes occurring in this pattern seem to be the unaccusative and the transitive, as in (2) where the head is unaccusative.

2.1.2.3. Category I-i-3

/N + Ø

V/

- (3) *Zavallı hayvan can çek-iş-iyor.*
 poor animalØ lifeØ pullRECIP-PROG
 SBJ D.OBJ V
 'The poor animal is dying in agony.'

Unlike *Category I-i-1* and *I-i-2* structures, however, the only idiomatic NP constituent in this category is not the subject but the internal argument. The frequently observed verb class is transitive, which predicts the grammatical role of the idiomatic NP. In these constructions, the obligatory subject position is filled by a non-idiomatic NP, as in (3).

2.1.2.4. Category I-i-4

/N + Ø

V/

- (4) *Adam kitab-a göz at-ti.*
 manØ bookDAT eyeØ throwPAST
 SBJ IND.OBJ D.OBJ V
 'The man took a look at the book.'

Unlike *Category I-i-1* and *I-i-2* structures, and similar to those structures of *Category I-i-3*, the only idiomatic NP constituent in this subcategory does not occupy the subject position but often the internal argument position. In addition to an obligatory subject position to be filled by a non-idiomatic NP, these structures also have an obligatory adjunct position. In this respect, *Category I-i-4* structures are different from the rest of the structures of *Category I-i* in the number of obligatory argument positions to be satisfied by non-idiomatic NPs.

2.1.2.5. Category I-ii-1

/N + Case V/

- (5) *Bu hata göz-den kaç-mış.*
 this mistakeØ eyeABL runawayPERF
 SBJ V
 ‘This mistake has been overlooked.’

Unlike *Category I-i* structures, those idiomatic constituents of *Category I-ii-1* structures bear phonologically overt case markers. The structurally assigned ACC case seems to be the most frequently observed case along with adjunct cases. The idiomatic NP constituent does not occupy the subject position but the internal argument position in structures headed by transitive or ditransitive verbs and adjuncts in structures with unaccusative heads. These structures have an obligatory subject position to be filled by a non-idiomatic NP. It should also be mentioned that this subcategory seems to be by far the most productive one looking at the large number of structures which belong to this subcategory.

2.1.2.6. Category I-ii-2

/N + Case V/

- (6) *Casus ortağ-ı-nı el-e ver-di.*
 spyØ partnerPOSS-ACC handDAT givePAST
 SBJ D.OBJ IND.OBJ V
 ‘The spy told on his partner.’

Category I-ii-2 is characterized by a single preverbal idiomatic NP constituent which is overtly case-marked. This idiomatic NP is generally headed by a transitive or a ditransitive verb. In addition to this idiomatic constituent which frequently assumes the thematic roles Theme or Goal, there are two obligatory argument positions in the structure, i.e. both an external argument and an internal argument or an adjunct position filled by non-idiomatic NPs. The existence of two obligatory argument positions to be filled by non-idiomatic NPs is the distinctive property of this subcategory, which allows us to distinguish it from *Category I-ii-1* structures. On the other hand, *Category I-ii-2* is similar to *Category I-i-4* structures with respect to this property.

2.1.2.7. Category II-i

/N + Ø N + Ø V/

- (7) *Burn-u-nun yel-i harman savur-uyor.*
 nose3sgPOSS-GEN windPOSS harvestØ hurl-PROG
 SBJ D.OBJ V
 ‘The wind from his nose could winnow wheat. (lit.)/He is very conceited.’

Category II-i structures typically involve two preverbal idiomatic NP constituents neither of which is overtly case-marked. The grammatical subject NP occurs as the outermost constituent, with the other obligatory constituent following it. This class does not seem to be very productive as there are only eight idioms which belong to this subcategory.

2.1.2.8. Category II-ii

/ N + Ø

N + Case

V /

- (8)
- | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Ok</i> | <i>yay-dan</i> | <i>çık-tı.</i> |
| arrowØ | bowABL | go outPAST |
| SBJ | | V |
- ‘What’s done is done; there’s no turning back.’

Category II-ii is characterized by two preverbal idiomatic NP constituents only one of which is overtly case-marked. The constituent bearing the phonologically overt case marker occupies the immediately preverbal position. The NP with zero case marker is the grammatical subject. The linear order of the two idiomatic non-heads, i.e. the subject as the outermost constituent and the non-subject in the immediately preverbal position, is the common property of *Category II-i* and *Category II-ii*. The head verbs belong mainly to the unaccusative verb class.

2.1.2.9. Category II-iii-1

/ N + Case

N + Ø

V /

- (9)
- | | | |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Yer-i-nde</i> | <i>yel-ler</i> | <i>es-iyor.</i> |
| placePOSS-LOC | windPL | blowPROG |
| | SBJ | V |
- ‘It’s gone with the wind’

Category II-iii-1 is characterized by two idiomatic NP constituents with the outermost NP being overtly case-marked. In addition, there are no other obligatory argument positions to be filled by non-idiomatic constituents. The grammatical subject occurs in the immediately preverbal position. Moreover, *Category II-iii-1* is similar to *Category II-ii* in that the non-overtly marked NP constituent is the subject. What distinguishes between these subcategories is the relative position of the two idiomatic NP constituents.

2.1.2.10. Category II-iii-2

/ N + Case

N + Ø

V /

- (10)
- | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------|------------------|
| <i>Nermin</i> | <i>bulut-tan</i> | <i>nem</i> | <i>kap-ıyor.</i> |
| | cloudABL | moistureØ | catchPROG |
| SBJ | | D.OBJ | V |
- ‘Nermin is very suspicious/touchy.’

- (12) a. **Orta-dan sır-ra kadem bas-* // *orta-dan kayb-ol-*
 middleABL secretDAT footØ tread // middleABL be lost
 ‘to disappear’ (idiomatic sense)
- b. **Haber-e etek-ler-i zil çal-* // *haber-e sevin-*
 newsDAT skirtPL-POSS bellØ ring // newsDAT rejoice
 ‘to become very happy’ (idiomatic sense)
- c. **Onu şifa-yı kap-tı.* (Kartal’s 2d, p.14)
 3sgACC healthACC catchPAST
 ‘to become ill’ (idiomatic sense)

Moreover, the following example in (13) below will clearly illustrate that argument structure is of utmost significance in the interpretation of idioms. In (13) there may be two distinct readings and ambiguity arises due to two different argument structures:

- (13) *Güzelliğ-in bul-duğ-u vücut* swimsuit commercial
 beautyGEN find-DIK-POSS bodyØ
- a. [*Güzellik*] *bu vücut-u [bul]-muş.*
 ‘The body (that) beauty has found.’ (non-idiomatic)
- b. [*Güzellik*] *bu mayo-da [vücut bul]-muş.*
 ‘The shape (that) beauty has found (in this swim suit)’ (idiomatic)

In the non-idiomatic reading in (13a), the head verb is a transitive verb as in (14) which subcategorizes for an internal argument. In the second reading, however, it is proposed that the idiomatic compound involves the incorporation of the Theme argument *vücut*, resulting in an unaccusative structure as in (15).

- (14) Transitive agentive: (x (y))
bul- Agent Theme
- (15) Unaccusative: ((x))
vücut bul- Theme (Location)

The relative clause formation in (13) is claimed to be ungrammatical in the idiomatic reading since it causes the idiomatic NP *vücut*, which is the incorporated direct object constituent, to move away from its immediately preverbal position. Thus, the slightly awkward nature of the example may be explained.

With respect to the variety of thematic roles which can be born by idiomatic constituents, it is observed that there are no apparent constraints² except for the role Agent which never occurs in idiomatic non-heads.

Consider the following example in (16a), which belongs to *Category I-i-1* where the heads are almost always unaccusative verbs. In (16a), there is an optional Locative argument and the immediately preverbal idiomatic NP which is the grammatical subject bears the role Theme of the unaccusative (passive) head. Note that the same lexical items can also occur with a DAT marked argument, as illustrated in (16b). In this case, there is a semantic difference, however. This in fact means that the expression in (16b) belongs to *Category I-i-2*.

- (16) a. / *(ev-de)* *can-ı* *sık-ıl-* /
 homeLOC soulPOSS be bored
 (Locative) Theme
 ‘to be bored (at home)’
- b. / *birşey-e* *can-ı* *sık-ıl-* /
 sthDAT soulPOSS be bored
 Goal Theme
 ‘to get into a bad mood due to something’

(17) and (18) (*Category II-ii* and *II-iii-1* respectively) are similar in their idiomatic subject constituents and unaccusative heads. These structures are different from those with non-idiomatic subjects in that their subject NPs are generally animals, objects or bodyparts and thus non-agentive. Thus, the fact that the head verbs of such idiomatic expressions are often unaccusatives or in the passive form is explained. This also explains why the subject NPs in (17) and (18) bear the thematic role Theme accompanied by another adjunct argument.

- (17) / *lokma-sı* *ağz-ı-nda* *büyü-* /
 bite (of food)POSS mouthPOSS-LOC grow
 Theme Location
 ‘not to have any appetite at all’

² In order to provide evidence for a hierarchy of thematic roles descending from Agent through Beneficiary, Recipient/Experiencer, Instrument, Patient/Theme to Location, Bresnan & Kanerva (1992:75) mention that Kiparsky (1987) finds evidence for the hierarchy in the patterns of idioms and lexicalized expressions. On the assumption that semantically “inner” arguments of a verb tend to become lexicalized before outer arguments, Kiparsky is reported to note that Verb + Locative idioms are common (*put someone to shame, take someone to task*, etc.) as are Verb + Theme expressions (*give someone a hand, the roof caved in*, etc.) and Verb + Theme + Locative idioms (*let the cat out of the bag, carry coals to Newcastle*, etc.). It is also mentioned that idiomatic combinations become scarce as the arguments ascend that hierarchy.

- (18) / **iç-i-ne** **kurt** **düş-** /
 insidePOSS-DAT wormØ fall
 Goal Theme
 ‘to become suspicious’

As for structures with transitive or ditransitive heads, the nature of the thematic roles born by idiomatic non-heads follows from the nature of the heads. For example, *Category I-ii-1* and *I-ii-2* structures differ in the number of their obligatory arguments in that *Category I-ii-2* structures possess ditransitive heads as opposed to the transitive or occasionally unaccusative heads of *Category I-ii-1* structures. In (19), the non-head bears the role Theme where the head is transitive whereas in (20) the idiomatic non-head NP is the Goal argument and there is an obligatory internal (Theme) argument position filled by a non-idiomatic NP since the head is ditransitive.

- (19) / **gün-ü-nü** **bekle-** /
 dayPOSS-ACC wait
 Theme
 ‘to wait for the best time to come to do sth.’
- (20) / **bir şey-i** **hesab-a** **kat-** /
 somethingACC accountDAT add
 Theme Goal
 ‘to take sth. into consideration’

Looking at the structures and the thematic roles born by obligatory idiomatic/non-idiomatic arguments in (16-20) above, it is observed that the role Agent does not occur in idiomatic non-heads. Further, it is observed that idiomatic constituents occupy obligatory argument positions and argument satisfaction is a prerequisite for grammaticality (see ex.12). It was mentioned earlier that English idiomatic NPs were considered to be similar in behavior to non-referential NPs (Postal (1974), Chomsky (1981)) and that they were not allowed to be assigned proper θ -roles although they occupied obligatory argument positions (cf. Chomsky (1981)). With respect to Turkish, however, we observe that idiomatic NPs not only satisfy obligatory positions but also are allowed to be assigned θ -roles. This may also be considered to be an evidence for the claims in Nunberg et al. (1994) and Uzun (1991) to the effect that some idiomatic expressions are semantically compositional to a certain extent, in correlation with their degree of idiomaticity.

2.2.2. Passivization

Passivization is one of the major syntactic operations which have been considered to test the “transformational deficiency” of English idioms (cf. Weinreich (1969), Chafe (1970), Newmeyer (1972), Nunberg et al. (1994), Sinha (1973), Quang (1971)). With respect to Turkish, Kartal (1995) mentions that root compounds in the sense of Grimshaw (1992) do not passivize whereas in synthetic compounds passivization is allowed. In other words, structures whose grammatical subjects are idiomatic are not allowed to passivize. Recall that in the present study a number of subcategories which contain structures with idiomatic subjects have been proposed. These, in a sense, are comparable to the “root compounds,” mentioned in Grimshaw (1992), which are shown to be non-passivizable. It is therefore predicted that structures which belong to these subcategories, namely *Category I-i-1*, *I-i-2*, *II-i*, *II-ii*, and *II-iii-1*, will produce ungrammatical results with respect to passivization. Observe the following:

- (21) **İman-ımız* *tarafından* *gevre-n-di*. (*Category I-i-1*)
 faith1pIPOSS by become crispPASS-PAST
 ‘We felt very tired.’ (active reading)

In (21), the structure whose non-head is the grammatical subject headed by an ergative verb is shown to be ungrammatical with respect to passivization. This seems to be further proof of the observations in Kartal (1995) and the claim mentioned above.

- (22) a. **O çocuk göz-ümüz* *tarafından* *tut-ul-ma-di*. (*Category I-i-2*)
 that childØ eye1pIPOSS by holdPASS-NEG-PAST
 ‘We didn’t find the boy very reliable.’ (active reading)
- b. **İş göz-ü* *tarafından* *kes-il-mi-yor*.
 jobØ eyePOSS by cutPASS-NEG-PROG
 ‘to find something too difficult to try’ (active reading)

Similarly, *Category I-i-2* structures in (22a-b) result in ungrammaticality when they undergo passivization even though both the head verbs in (22a) and (22b) are transitive as opposed to the generally unaccusative heads in *Category I-i-1*. Thus, the grammatical role the idiomatic non-head bears seems to be crucial in the acceptability of this operation.

- (23) **Ciğer-i beş para ed-il-me-z*. (*Category II-i*)
 liver3sgPOSS five moneyØ doPASS-NEG-AOR
 ‘He is useless.’ (active reading)

- (24) *Baş-ı tarafından göğ-e değ-il-di. (Category II-ii)
 headPOSS by skyDAT touchPASS-PAST
 ‘to be overjoyed’ (active reading)
- (25) *Ayak-lar-ımız-a kara su-lar tarafından in-il-di. (Category II-iii-1)
 footPL-1plPOSS-DAT black waterPLØ by descendPASS-PAST
 ‘We felt very tired.’ (active reading)

In (23-25), passivization is ungrammatical as was predicted above since the structures involve idiomatic grammatical subjects. The verb class to which the heads belong is also a factor in the unacceptability of this operation, i.e. the heads in (24) and (25) are intransitives. If we were to compare these two factors, i.e. the idiomatic non-head as the subject and the intransitive, unaccusative or ergative heads, the grammatical role born by the non-head would prove to be more significant. As far as the three verb classes are concerned, no differences were observed among them with respect to passivization in the above categories. With idiomatic subjects, however, even those constructions with transitive heads are illustrated to be unacceptable with respect to passivization, as in (22-23).

As far as those idiomatic structures whose non-heads are non-subjects, i.e. their subjects are filled by non-idiomatic NPs, which are termed “synthetic compounds” in Grimshaw (1992), passivization is predicted to be subject to individual constraints, if any, imposed by the subcategories. Note that in (26a-b) below, there are two structures of *Category I-i-3* which do not seem to be consistent with each other with respect to syntactic behavior, i.e. (26a) is grammatical whereas (26b) is not. The cause of such inconsistency may be attributed to a high degree of coalescence between the head and the non-head such that the internal argument NP in (26b) seems to constitute an intransitive “compound” with the head in a manner similar to the behavior of the expression in (13b) above.

- (26) a. *Yaygara kopar-il-di.* (Category I-i-3)
 howlØ tearPASS-PAST
 ‘There was an uproar.’
- b. ??*Su koyuver-il-di.*
 waterØ let goPASS-PAST
 ‘to overstep the mark’ (active reading)

Also note that passivization is grammatical in *Category I-i-4*, as illustrated in (27a-b). This is predicted from the fact that the heads are transitive or ditransitive.

The internal argument NPs which are not marked with phonologically overt case markers also seem to be favorable for the application of this operation. The behavior of (27a-b), however, contrasts with that of (26b). Here, the discrepancy is claimed to be due to the cohesion in (26b) mentioned above.

- (27) a. *Ona pusu kur-ul-muş.*
 3sgDAT ambush setPASS-PERF
 'He was ambushed.'
- b. *Eski gün-ler-den dem vur-ul-du.*
 old dayPL-ABL breathØ hitPASS-PAST
 'Old days were mentioned about.'

Further, (28a-b) exemplify structures which belong to *Category I-ii-2*. Note that (28a) is ungrammatical whereas (28b) is not. The reason for this discrepancy seems to lie in the fact that (28a) involves the loss of the "frozen" phonologically overt ACC marker on the *idiomatic* direct object NP of the idiomatic structure in the active form. In the case of (28b), however, the NP *o* is non-idiomatic and satisfies the obligatory internal argument position of the active head.

- (28) a. **Oraya kapak at-ıl-malı.*
 there lidØ throwPASS-NECESS
 'One should escape there.' (active reading)
- b. *O bir kaşık suda boğ-ul-malı.*
 3sg one spoonful waterØ drownPASS-NECESS
 'He should be drowned in one spoonful of water.'

If we were to compare Turkish passivization with English, we would observe that Turkish does not involve the movement of the internal argument to subject position but the addition of the suffix *-(I)l* or *-(I)n* to the head verb, and the loss of overt ACC marker on the direct object NP. Accordingly, as far as idioms of *Category II-iv* are concerned, it is predicted that overt ACC marking on the direct object constituent will be a factor in the acceptability of passivization.

Observe the data below in (29) which all contain ACC marked direct objects, and yet they vary in their acceptability. Looking at (29) we may conclude that idioms with non-idiomatic subjects differ in their behavior with respect to passivization and that it may not be predicted which idioms allow passivization and which do not. Also

note that overt ACC marking seems to be the main source of such an inconsistent behavioral pattern since passivization seems to be applicable for some other structures of the same subcategory. The varying grammaticality judgments may also be related to the generic nature of the non-heads, such that the two non-heads in (29a) clearly refer to concepts and not to any specific entity in the universe of discourse. Furthermore, the ungrammaticality of (29c) may also have a phonetically based reason, looking at the rhyming of the two non-heads.

- (29) a. *Atla arpa dalaş-tır-il-iyor.* (Category II-iv)
 horseCOM barleyØ fightCAUS-PASS-PROG
 ‘to sow discord among friends’ (active reading)
- b. *??Sermaye kedi-ye yükle-n-iyor.*
 capitalØ catDAT loadPASS- PROG
 ‘to go bankrupt’ (active reading)
- c. **Kaz koz anla-ş-il-iyor.*
 gooseØ trumpØ understandRECIP-PASS-PROG
 ‘A lot of misunderstanding occurs.’ (active reading)

(30) below is also interesting in that the unaccusative head verb allows impersonal passivization.

- (30) *Yangın-a körük-le gid-il-me-z;*
 fireDAT bellowsINST goPASS-NEG-AOR
 ‘You shouldn’t aggravate the situation.’ (active reading)

In sum, the data suggests that there may occur variation among the members of the same category whereas idioms with idiomatic subjects are illustrated to be absolutely ungrammatical in all cases. Note also that the overt inflectional endings of idiomatic NPs seem to be preserved and changes are disallowed to a certain extent as illustrated by the inconsistent behavior in (29), a point which needs to be further investigated. Observe the following:

- (31) *Yaşlı boksör sonunda havlu/*havlu-yu/havlu-lar-ı/havlu-su-nu at-tı.*
 Old boxerØ at last towelØ/*~ACC/~PL-ACC/~POSS-ACC throwPAST
 ‘The old boxer gave up/surrendered at last.’
- (32) *Hırsız kırı-ş-i/*kırı-ş-i-ni/kırı-ş-ler-i/kırı-ş-ler-i-ni kır-mış.*
 beamACC/*~Ø/~3sgPOSS-ACC/~PL-ACC/~PL-3sgPOSS-ACC breakPERF
 ‘The burglar has run away.’
- (33) *Koşucu pergel-ler-i/*pergel/pergel-i-ni/pergel-i/pergel-ler-i-ni aç-tı.*
 RunnerØcompassPL-ACC/*~Ø/~3sgPOSS-ACC/~PL-3sgPOSS-ACC openPAST
 ‘The runner has started walking fast (with long steps).’

- (34) *Ali bu iş-ten yol-u-nu/*yol/yol-lar-ı/yol-lar-ı-nı bulmuş.*
 thisjobABLway3sgPOSS-ACC/*~Ø/~PL-ACC/~PL-3sgPOSS-ACC findPAST
 ‘Ali is said to have made a lot of money out of this (job).’
- (35) *Cenk parti-de kurt-lar-ı-nı/*kurt/*kurd-u dök-müş.*
 Cenk partyLOC wormPL-3sgPOSS-ACC/*~Ø/~ACC spillPERF
 ‘Cenk had a lot fun at the party.’

In the above examples in (31-35), which belong to the following categories respectively: *Category I-i-3, I-ii-1, I-ii-1, I-ii-2, and I-ii-1*, we observe that the idiomatic structures, all of which involve non-overt/overt ACC marked direct object NPs, are rendered ungrammatical or lose their idiomatic readings as in (31) when these NPs appear with all the logically possible combinations³ of nominal endings but one. This behavior is curious since these endings merely result in a change in the grammatical definiteness, number or possession of non-idiomatic NPs whereas here, within idiomatic contexts, they do not seem to bear these grammatical functions. In other words, it is obvious that there are constraints on the number and definiteness of idiomatic direct object NPs as illustrated by the data in (31-35). Here, any changes on the morphology of the NPs in question seem to cause the idiom to lose its idiomatic reading whereas for non-idiomatic expressions such changes would only cause a change in the definiteness and referentiality of the NP involved.

Moreover, the unmarked position for direct objects is the position immediately before the verb, and direct objects are assigned the ACC ending *-(y)ı* by the head verb under government (Erguvanlı (1984a), Nilsson (1985), Dede (1986)). Although non-idiomatic NPs may appear with non-overt case marking in immediately preverbal position, they are obligatorily marked with the overt case ending in any other position than the preverbal one. This variability results only in a change in the definite/referential readings of the NPs. However, we observe that the pairs in (36a-b) illustrate a meaning distinguishing function of the ACC and/or POSS marking on idiomatic direct objects. In (36), when the direct object NP *el* of the idiomatic

³

I.	[NP _Ø V]
IIa.	[NP _{ACC} V]
IIb.	[NP _{PL+ACC} V]
IIc.	[NP _{POSS+ACC} V]
IIId.	[NP _{PL+POSS+ACC} V]

The symbol “Ø” here is used to show non-overt case marking: NOM in subject position and ACC in (direct object) preverbal position.

structure which belongs to *Category I-i-4*, is marked with overt ACC as in (36b) or moved from the immediately preverbal position as in (36c), the idiomatic sense is lost and the noun is interpreted to take on its primary sense.

- (48) a. *Masa-ya el koy-dum.*
 TableDAT handØ putPAST1sg.
 ‘I seized/laid hands on the table.’
- b. *Masa-ya el-i /el-im-i koy-dum.*
 TableDAT handACC /hand1sgPOSS-ACC putPAST1sg
 ‘I put the (artificial!)hand/my hand on the table.’
- c. *El-im-i/maket el-i masa-ya koy-dum.*

Furthermore, there are also a number of structures where the ACC case ending does have a meaning distinguishing function as in (37a) and (37b) below where there are two semantically distinct expressions, distinguished on the basis of overt ACC marking. Transitivity also seems to be a means to distinguish the two: the idiom in (37b) constitutes a single intransitive verb whereas the expression *kafa bul-* in (37a) allows for an NP which bears the role “Theme” but is marked with the Instrumental ending. However, it should also be noted that such examples are rare.

- (37) a. *İnsanlar-la kafa bulmak hiç hoş değil.*
 peopleCOM headØ findINF at all pleasant not
 ‘It’s not nice to make fun of people.’
- b. *Dün gece hepimiz kafa-yı bul-du-k.*
 Yesterday night all of us headACC findPAST-1pl
 ‘We all got drunk last night.’

To sum up, idiomatic direct object NPs differ from non-idiomatic direct object NPs in the following respect. As the data above in (37) illustrates, case marking serves to distinguish meaning in idiomatic NPs. Therefore, we can claim that NP constituents within idioms tend to preserve their “fixed” case marking irrespective of their position in the sentence. In other words, the behavior of the data above in (31-37) is clearly illustrative of the significance of fixed case marking on idiomatic NPs and provides evidence for syntactic frozenness in Turkish idioms.

2.2.3. Relativization

Relativization is predicted to be acceptable as long as the relative linear order of the idiomatic constituents is preserved and only non-idiomatic NP constituents which satisfy obligatory argument positions required by the heads become the target of relativization. Relativization is hence predicted to be unacceptable in structures where idiomatic NP constituents are focused and moved away from their “fixed” positions in surface structure. Let us try to provide evidence for this claim:

- (38) a. [*göz-ler-i süzül*]-en çocuk (Category I-i-1)
 eyePL-POSS filterPASS-An child
 ‘the child whose eyes are about to close’
- b. **süz-en*/**süz-diğ-ü göz-ler*
 filterPASS-An/DIK eyePL
 ‘the eyes that filter/the eyes that he filtered’ (lit.)
- (39) a. [*dana-nın kuyruğ-u-nun kop*]-tuğ-u an
 cowGEN tailPOSS-GEN tear-DIK-POSS moment
 ‘the moment when everything became clear’
- b. **dana-nın kop-an/kopar-diğ-ımız kuyruğ-u*
 cowGEN get torn-An/tear-DIK-1plPOSS tail3sgPOSS
 ‘the tail of the cow that got torn/that we tore off’

In (38a) and (39a), relativization is grammatical as opposed to the unacceptable structures in (38b) and (39b). The grammaticality in (38a) and (39a) seems to be due to the fact that the targets of relativization are non-idiomatic NPs which remain strictly outside the idiomatic sequence. In other words, the relative linear order of idiomatic constituents or their grammatical roles within the idiomatic structure have not been changed in (38a) and (39a) whereas in (38b) and (39b) the idiomatic subject is the target of relativization both with the *-(y)An* and *-DIK* strategies.

Similarly, relativization is shown to be unacceptable in (40) where the non-idiomatic adjunct argument marked with the LOC in the idiom *biri-nde şafak at-* is relativized both with the *-(y)An* and *-DIK* strategies. Although this NP is non-idiomatic, the operation causes it to move away from its “frozen” position in surface structure and also to lose its “frozen” LOC marker.

- (40) **şafak at-an adam*/**şafağ-in at-tığ-ı adam* (Category I-i-2)
 dawnØ throw-An manØ/dawnGEN throw-DIK-3sgPOSS manØ
 ‘(for sth) to dawn on smø.’

In (41), we observe that there is variability among structures of the same subcategory such that (41a) is acceptable when the head verb is marked with *-DIK*, when the intransitive counterpart *kop-* of the CAUS marked head *kop-ar-* is marked with *-(y)An*, and when the passive form of the head verb is marked with *-(y)An*, all of which share the relativized idiomatic direct object NP constituent *yaygara*. The relative order of the idiomatic constituents which was claimed to be significant in the applicability of this operation does not seem to be very important with respect to (41a), either. In (41b), however, relativization is unacceptable although the NP *su* has the same grammatical relation with the head as the non-head NP in (41a). The difference seems to lie in the fact that the sequence *su koyuver-* constitutes an unaccusative “synthetic compound” similar to the behavior of the expression in (13b).

- (41) a. *kop-ar-diğ-ı yaygara/kop-an /kop-ar-ıl-an yaygara*(Category I-i-3)
 tear-CAUS-DIK-POSS howlØ/tear-An/tearCAUS-PASS-PAST-An
 ‘the fuss he has made/the fuss which has been made’
 b. **adam-ın koyuver-diğ-i su*/**koyuver-il-en su*
 manGEN let go-DIK-3sgPOSS waterØ/ let goPASS-PAST-An waterØ
 ‘to overstep the mark’

The behavior of (42) provides further proof of the claims above. The grammaticality of (42a) is predicted since the idiomatic sequence is kept intact whereas the ungrammaticality of (42b) arises from the addition of the GEN marker on the direct object NP constituent and the POSS marker on the head verb marked with the *-DIK*.

- (42) a. [*Ağz-ı-nda bakla isla-n-ma*]-yan adam (Category II-iii-1)
 mouthPOSS-LOC beanØ become wetNEG-An manØ
 ‘The man who is unable to keep secrets’
 b. **Ağz-ı-nda bakla-nın islan-ma-diğ-ı adam*
 mouthPOSS-LOC beanGEN become wetNEG-DIK-POSS manØ

The behavior of (43a-c) where a *Category II-iii-2* idiom appears is quite interesting from the following respects: In (43a) *adam* occupies the external argument position of the head verb reserved for a non-idiomatic NP and the linear sequence of

the idiom is preserved. Interestingly enough, in (43b), the external argument position is filled by the first person plural and the NP *adam* is the “possessor” of the POSS marked idiomatic adjunct NP *baş-t-na*. In this structure, the grammatical subject of the head is understood not to be coreferential with the target of relativization as opposed to (43a). Moreover, in (43c) it is observed that the non-overtly marked idiomatic direct object NP of the head is allowed to become the target of relativization without resulting in ungrammaticality.

- (43) a. [*Baş-t-na*_i *iş* *aç*]-*an*_i *adam*_i
 headPOSS-DAT matterØ open-An/open-DIK manØ
 ‘the man who got himself into trouble’
- b. [*Baş-t-na*_i *iş* *aç*]-*tiğ-imiz*_j *adam*_i
 headPOSS-DAT matterØ open-An/open-DIK-1plPOSS manØ
 ‘the man whom we caused to get into trouble’
- c. *Adam-in baş-t-na aç-tiğ-i iş*
 manGEN head3sgPOSS-DAT open-DIK-3sgPOSS trouble
 ‘the trouble that the man got himself into’

A similar behavior is observed as far as the structures in (44a-b) are concerned. In (44c), however, the idiomatic direct object NP which is overtly marked with ACC is not allowed to be relativized since the operation involves the loss of this fixed marker.

- (44) a. [*ekmeğ-i-ni*_i *kan-a* *doğra*]-*yan*_i *adam*_i
 breadPOSS-ACC bloodDAT slice-yAn manØ
 ‘the man who goes through much hardship’
- b. [*ekmeğ-i-ni*_i *kan-a* *doğra*]-*dığ-imiz*_j *adam*_i
 breadPOSS-ACC bloodDAT slice-DIK-1plPOSS manØ
 ‘the man whom we cause to go through much hardship’
- c. **adam-in*_i *kan-a* *doğra-dığ-i*_i *ekmeğ-i*_i
 manGEN bloodDAT slice-DIK-3sgPOSS bread3sgPOSS
 ‘the (his) bread that the man sliced into blood’ (lit.)

To summarize, relativization with idiomatic structures seems to be acceptable as long as the fixed linear order of the idiomatic constituents is preserved and only non-idiomatic NP constituents which satisfy obligatory argument positions required by the heads are allowed to become the target of relativization. The focusing and movement of idiomatic NP constituents from their “fixed” positions in surface

structure and especially the loss of frozen inflectional endings or the addition of such endings seem to constitute the constraints on the application of this operation.

2.2.4. WH-Question Formation

Newmeyer (1972) claims that non-idiomatic material within idioms can be questioned. With respect to the data of the present study, it is claimed that those subcategories which involve non-idiomatic NPs in obligatory argument positions, i.e. Category *I-i-2*, *I-i-3*, *I-i-4*, *I-ii-1*, *I-ii-2*, *II-iii-2*, and *II-iv*, will allow the application of this operation whereas structures which only consist of idiomatic NPs and which do not have any obligatory argument positions to be filled by non-idiomatic NPs such as those of Category *I-i-1*, *II-i*, *II-ii*, and *II-iii-1*, will be ungrammatical. Let us test this claim against data:

- (45) *Kim ne-yin kök-ü-nü/*ne-yi kuru-t-malı?* (Category *I-ii-1*)
 whoØ whatGEN rootPOSS-ACC/*what-ACC dryCAUS-NECESS
 ‘Who must wipe out what?’

As can be noted in the example (45), the idiomatic non-head is not allowed to be questioned whereas the obligatory non-idiomatic NP arguments are, i.e. the subject and the GEN marked possessor are allowed to be questioned as opposed to the ungrammaticality of the idiomatic internal argument NP.

- (46) *Her kafa-dan/*ne-den *ne çık-ıyor?* (ANSWER: *bir ses*)(Category *II-iii-1*)
 each headABL/*whatABL *what come outPROG
 ‘What comes out of each head?’

The behavior of the example in (46) provides further evidence for the claim presented above. Only non-idiomatic constituents are allowed to appear in wh-questions whereas the application of this operation with idiomatic NPs results in ungrammaticality. Evidently, wh-question formation is ungrammatical in (46) with the idiomatic subject and the adjunct.

The examples (47-48) are further proof of the general behavior discussed above: idiomatic NPs are not allowed to be questioned whereas non-idiomatic NPs are, i.e. the non-idiomatic subject NPs as opposed to the idiomatic adjunct arguments in (47-48).

- (47) **Kim *ne-den süt çıkar-ıyor?** (ANSWER: *tekeden*)(Category II-iii-2)
 whatABL milkØ take outPROG
 'Who takes out milk from what?' (lit.)
- (48) **Kim leyleğ-i hava-da/*nerede gör-müş?** (Category II-iv)
 who storkACC airLOC/*where seePERF
 'Who is travelling constantly?'

The ungrammaticality of wh-questions with idiomatic constituents might be due to the fact that questions which are used to elicit information require the presence of a unit with semantic content, and referentiality properties. For the questions involving idiomatic constituents to be considered acceptable, they have to be produced with a special intonation required by echo-questions (e.g. Suppose two people are speaking on the phone and there is too much interference for the hearer to hear the words properly, then the hearer could produce echo-questions and ask for the repetition of unclear words.). Echo-questions seem to allow even non-semantic constituents to be questioned. In (49) below, the reporter asks the villager who knits socks for a living to comment on the issue and the man, unable to hear the word, or understand the foreign word, produces an echo-question keeping the foreign suffix familiar from words like *mak-in-ist*, *komün-ist*, *art-ist*, *terör-ist*, etc., and replacing the unknown sequence *fem-* by the question word *ne*.

- (49) S: *Sizin için fem-in-ist demişler!* Kanal D
 'They said you were a feminist.'
- H: *Ne-y-in-ist demişler?*
 'They said what?'

There is another highly restricted context where questions with idiomatic NPs may be acceptable. For example, in a classroom situation where the subject matter is idioms, the teacher might ask the students to recover the missing lexical items using the questions in (50). In such a context, the idiom becomes an object of instruction, a fixed group of words, and the phonetic sequence is not paired with its regular semantic/pragmatic functions⁴. The passive and the aorist tense also seem to reduce the markedness of the questions and provide a generic/non-specific context.

⁴ There are even multiple choice tests like the examples in (i-ii) below which require the students to fill in the missing information. In (i), there is an actually observed question concerning a proverb. And in (ii) there is a question constructed to elicit the specific lexical items appearing in idioms. The possibility of constructing such examples seems to suggest that Turkish idioms are considered to be special constructions whose constituents have to be learned by heart.

(i) *Kel öl-ür ... ol-ur, kör öl-ür ... ol-ur.* (ANSWER: *sırma saçlı-badem gözlü*)

- (50) a. *Akıntı-ya ne çek-il-ir?* (ANSWER: *kürek*)
 currentDAT what pullPASS-AOR
 ‘What is pulled against the current?’
- b. *Yumurta-ya ne tak-ıl-maz?* (ANSWER: *kulp*)
 eggDAT what attachPASS-NEG-AOR
 ‘What is not attached to an egg?’

In sum, wh-question formation is freely allowed for non-idiomatic/unspecified constituents whereas there are certain pragmatic constraints on the application of this operation on idiomatic constituents. As was predicted, wh-question formation is unacceptable with respect to the structures with no non-idiomatic constituents, i.e. those structures which belong to the following categories: *Category I-i-1, II-i, II-ii and II-iii-1*.

2.2.5. Clefting/Pseudo-clefting

In Turkish, the clefting/pseudo-clefting operation marks the head verb with the *-DIK* morpheme if the target is the direct object as in (51a) and the *-(y)An* morpheme if the target is the subject as illustrated in (51b). Here, the head verb is “shared” and the NPs are used as the focus of contrast.

- (51) a.. *[*Senin yumurta-ya tak*]-tığ-ın [*kulp*]-tu; [*başka bir şey*] değil.
 2sgGEN eggDAT attachDIK-2sg handlePAST; not anything else
 ‘It was a handle that you attached to the egg and nothing else.’
- b. *[*Yer-i-nden oyna*]-yan [*yer*]-di; [*başka bir şey*] değil.
 place3sgPOSS-ABL move-yAn earthPAST; not anything else
 ‘It was the ground that moved and nothing else.’

Since clefting and pseudo-clefting presuppose a constituent with a semantic/referential content in order to present “contrast,” idioms composed of constituents with no referentiality properties are not predicted to be grammatical in cleft/pseudo-cleft constructions. This prediction was tested against examples from each of the subcategories proposed in this study. It was observed that Turkish idioms

-
- bald dieAOR ... becomeAOR, blind dieAOR ... becomeAOR
 ‘The bald become golden-haired when they die, and the blind, almond-eyed’ (lit.)
- (ii) ... *ekip* ... *biçmek* (ANSWER: *rüzgar-fırtına*)
 ... saw-IP ... reapINF
 a. *buğday-tahıl* b. *rüzgar-fırtına* c. *fırtına-rüzgar*
 wheat-crop wind-storm storm-wind

in cleft sentences are ungrammatical as predicted. The sentence below in (52), on the other hand, is different from the structures in (51) in that the idiomatic expression is taken as a “single grammatical constituent” and the internal organization or “unity” is not hindered by the movement of a constituent away from its fixed position, and this is the main reason why the structure is grammatical.

- (52) *Senin yap-tığ-ın [yumurta-ya kulp tak]-mak.*
 2sgGEN makeDIK-2sg eggDAT handle attachINF
 ‘What you did was to make an excuse’

Therefore, Turkish idioms just like English ones typically resist clefting/pseudo-clefting transformations which involve the movement and focusing of a constituent. And this seems to highlight the importance of referentiality, or rather lack of referentiality in idiomatic constituents. Therefore, syntactic frozenness should be associated with this major factor also, which seems to provide evidence in favor of the claims by Cutler (1982) that structural rigidity and semantic opacity are closely related or those by Nunberg et al. (1994) that semantic compositionality correlates with transformational productivity.

2.2.6. Pronominalization

It was mentioned in the introductory chapter that pronominalization in English idioms was proved to be ungrammatical. A similar behavior is expected for Turkish idioms, i.e. none of the idiomatic NP constituents should be allowed to undergo pronominalization since this would completely destroy the unique lexical organization of the idiom. In addition, no differences in behavior among idiomatic expressions are predicted since the operation does not involve grammatical structure but referentiality. It was observed that pronominalization is ungrammatical for all categories proposed in this study with no exceptions. Consider the following representative examples:

- (53) *Vazo-ya/ona paha/*o biç-ti.*
 vaseDAT/3sg valueØ/*3sg cutPAST
 ‘He determined the value of the vase.’
- (54) *Göz-ler-i-nde/*onlar-da şimşek-ler/*onlar çak-ıyor.*
 eyePL-POSS-LOC/*3pLOC lightningPLØ/*3PL flashPROG
 ‘Lightnings flash in his eyes.’

In (53) where a *Category I-i-4* idiom appears the idiomatic non-head NP is not allowed to be substituted by a definite pronoun whereas the non-idiomatic DAT marked adjunct argument is grammatical. Similarly, in (54) a *Category II-iii-1* idiom is illustrated to yield an ungrammatical structure when one or both of the idiomatic non-heads are pronominalized.

When it comes to indefinite pronominalization in Turkish, it is not as frequently used as in English, and (55) illustrates that it is ungrammatical with idiomatic NPs.

- (55) **Sen onun üstüne bir bardak soğuk su iç; bir tane de arkadaşın içsin*
 2sg 3sgGEN topPOSS-DAT one glass cold water drinkIMP; one dA friend2sg drink2sgIMP
 ‘You drink a glass of cold water over that and your friend should drink one, too.’ (lit.)

To sum up, pronominalization, and especially definite anaphora are ungrammatical in idioms because definite pronominalization requires a referential/definite status of the NP in question and idiomatic NPs are considered to have no referential properties since they do not refer to any specific entities.

2.2.7. Scrambling

Syntactic frozenness generally refers to that property of idioms by which they typically resist insertion of new lexical items into the sequence that constitutes the idioms or reordering of their constituents. It has been proposed that Turkish has a relatively free word order due to overt case marking (cf. Erguvanlı 1984a). Accordingly, the behavior of the idiomatic constituents of the structures which belong to each subcategory with respect to scrambling deserves to be discussed within the framework of this study.

With respect to structures with idiomatic subjects such as those of *Category I-i-1*, there seem to be no restrictions on postposing of the subject whereas preposing is not applicable since the only NP constituent is the grammatical subject and thus VP-external. In (56) we see that postposing of the subject NP is freely allowed.

- (56) *Gene tut-muş damar-ı*
 again holdPERF1sg vein3sgPOSS
 ‘He is furious again.’

Interestingly enough, for structures which belong to *Category I-i-2*, the relative order of the two NP constituents does not seem to be important; the non-idiomatic internal argument NP may either precede as in (57a) or follow the idiomatic subject as in (57b) below. Moreover, the idiomatic subject is allowed to be postposed as in (57c).

- (57) a. *O çocuğ-u göz-ümüz tut-ma-dı.*
 that childØ eye1plPOSS holdNEG-PAST
 ‘We didn’t think much of that child.’
 b. *Göz-ümüz o çocuğ-u tut-ma-dı.*
 c. *O çocuğ-u tut-ma-dı göz-ümüz.*

As far as *Category I-i-3* structures are concerned, postposing of the idiomatic NP does not seem to be acceptable as illustrated in (58). Preposing of the idiomatic NP is ungrammatical as illustrated by (59b) where the adverb appears between the idiomatic direct object and the head as opposed to the grammaticality of (59a) where the adverb is allowed to remain strictly outside the sequence of the idiomatic constituents.

- (58) ??*O zaman ed-eceğ-iz düğün bayram.*
 that timeØ doFUT-1pl wedding bayramØ
 ‘Then we will rejoice.’
 (59) a. *Sanatçı yine göz dol-dur-du.*
 artistØ again eyeØ fill-CAUS-PAST
 ‘The artist looked surprisingly good again.’
 b. **Sanatçı göz/gözü/gözleri yine doldurdu.*

Similar to *Category I-i-3* structures, *Category I-i-4* structures do not seem to freely allow postposing of the idiomatic NP, which may be claimed to be due to the lack of a phonologically overt case marker. Kartal (1995) also emphasizes that overt case marking is required and that non-heads which are assigned abstract structural case are not allowed to be moved as in (60):

- (60) **Ahmet bana dök-tü dil.* (Kartal’s 3b, p.74)
 1sgDAT pourPAST tongueØ
 ‘Ahmet tried to persuade me.’ (intended reading)

With respect to *Category I-ii-1* structures, (61a) is quite interesting in that the GEN marked non-idiomatic constituent, which is a part of the possessive construction, can be postposed, leaving the POSS marked idiomatic constituent behind whereas preposing results in ungrammaticality as illustrated in (61b).

- (61) a. [*Ana-sı-nı*] *ağla-t-ıyor-dur* [*o araba-nın*]. Turkish drama
 mother3sgPOSS-ACC cryCAUS-PROG-DIR that carGEN
 ‘He must be using the car very badly.’
 b. **Ana-sı-nı o araba-nın ağla-t-ıyor-dur*
 mother3sgPOSS-ACC that carGEN cryCAUS-PROG-DIR

As opposed to (60), in (62) the ACC marked direct object is allowed to be postposed. With respect to similar structures, Kural (1992) observes that immediately preverbal idiomatic objects can be postposed although preposing is not possible, looking at the behavior of the idiomatic object in (63a-b).

- (62) *Bil-me-se-n de [dil-i-ni], [turist-e] uzat [el-in-i]* publicity
 knowNEG-COND-2sg dA languagePOSS-ACC touristDAT extend hand2sgPOSS-ACC
 ‘Even if you don’t know his/her language, help the tourist.’ (idiomatic)
 (63) a. **Ahmet gözden [o arabayı] çıkardı.*
 b. ? [*Ahmet [o arabayı] çıkarmış*] *gözden.* (Kural’s 95b, 100, pp.59-60)
 (nom) that car-acc take out-pst-agr eye-abl
 ‘Ahmet gave up on that car.’

As far as *Category II-i* is concerned, it is observed that preposing is ungrammatical as illustrated in (64a) whereas postposing of the grammatical subject if not the internal argument seems to be acceptable in (64b).

- (64) a. **Yağ iç-i bağla-mış.*
 oilØ insidePOSS coverPERF
 ‘to be filled with joy’
 b. ??*İç-i bağla-mış yağ* ??*Yağ bağla-mış iç-i.*
 insidePOSS coverPERF oilØ ??oilØ coverPERF insidePOSS

As opposed to the behavior of *Category I-i-2* structures, the frozen relative position of the idiomatic constituents, especially the position of the subject seems to be extremely important for other structures such as those of *Category II-ii* and *II-iii-1*. In fact, the relative position of the subject NP and the non-subject seems to be a

means to distinguish structures of these two subcategories. As can be observed in (65b) and (66b), preposing is ungrammatical for these two subcategories whereas the (65-66c) examples which involve postposing are only marginally acceptable in pragmatically restricted (e.g. poetry, jokes, etc.) contexts.

- (65) a. *Ok yaydan çık-*
 arrowØ bowABL go outPAST

b. **Yaydan ok çık-*

c. *Yay-dan çık-mış bir kere ok!*
 bowABL go outPERF once arrowØ
 'The arrow has once left the bow.' (lit.)

- (66) a. *Dilinde tüy bit-*
 tongue1sgPOSS-LOC hairØ growAOR

b. **Tüy dilinde bit-*

c. ?*Ona derdimi anlatana kadar dilimde bitti tüy!*
 'To make him/her understand what I meant was a tiring job.'

Similar to *Category I-i-4* structures, *Category II-iii-2* structures do not seem to favor preposing of the direct object idiomatic NP as in (67a), which is claimed to arise from the lack of a phonologically overt case marker. Similarly, postposing of this NP with a phonologically null case marker does not seem to be acceptable whereas the adjunct argument with an overt case marker is allowed to be postposed as in (67b).

- (67) a. **Çorap baş-ı-na ör-dü.*
 sockØ headPOSS-DAT knitPAST
 'to get sm. into trouble'

b. ?*Baş-ı-na ör-dü çorap//Çorap ör-dü baş-ına.*
 headPOSS-DAT knitPAST sockØ//sockØ knitPAST headPOSS-DAT

With respect to *Category II-iv*, it is observed that postposing of both of the idiomatic constituents is freely allowed as illustrated in (68a) where not one but two idiomatic constituents, one of which is marked with ACC and the other with DAT, have been postposed. A similar behavior is observed in (69a) where the head verb inflected for imperative is followed by a filler word and both the idiomatic direct and indirect objects are postposed. As for preposing, it does not seem to be acceptable looking at (68b) and (69b).

- (68) a. *Sakın at-ma [bu sözü-m-ü] [yaban-a]*
 never throwNEG-IMP this word1sgPOSS-ACC awayDAT
 ‘Pay heed to my advice’ (idiomatic)
- b. **Yaban-a bu sözü-m-ü at-ma.*
 awayDAT this word1sgPOSS-ACC throwNEG-IMP
- (69) a. *Koy-un bakayım [el-ler-i] [vicdan-lar-a]!* Savaş Ay (journalist)
 put2plIMP let me see handPL-ACC consciencePL-DAT
 ‘We should all listen to our conscience.’ (idiomatic)
- b. **Vicdan-lar-a el-ler-i koy-un.*
 consciencePL-DAT handPL-ACC put2plIMP

In conclusion, the data seem to support the views presented above: Overt case marking seems to be the major factor in determining the possibility of scrambling. Moreover, postposing seems to be freely allowed except for *Category I-i-3* and *I-i-4* as opposed to preposing which seems to be ungrammatical for almost all subcategories.

In sum, note the following observations as to the behavior of each subcategory with respect to the syntactic operations:

Category I-i-1

/N + Ø V/

For Category I-i-1 structures, passivization is inapplicable due to the fact that the preverbal NP is the grammatical subject with an unaccusative head. Relativization is applicable only when the idiomatic subject is not involved. The absence of any other obligatory non-idiomatic constituents disallows the formation of wh-questions. Postposing is grammatical whereas preposing is inapplicable due to the grammatical relation of the non-head to the head. However, as far as clefting/pseudo-clefting and pronominalization are concerned, the structures produce ungrammatical results due to the fact that these operations involve the focusing of constituents with referentiality. In fact, all idiomatic structures are ungrammatical under these two operations.

Category I-i-2

/N + Ø V/

Passivization is ungrammatical due to the fact that the preverbal NP is the grammatical subject. Similar to the *Category I-i-1* structures, relativization is possible as long as the the target of relativization is not the subject. Unlike *Category*

I-i-1 structures, the presence of a non-idiomatic constituent allows the formation of wh-questions. Preposing and postposing are grammatical due to the grammatical relation of the non-head to the head.

Category I-i-3

/N + Ø V/

The phonologically null case marking of the internal argument NP and its immediately preverbal position bears certain consequences as to the linear order of the constituents. Thus, preposing and postposing of the idiomatic constituent are unacceptable. The fact that the preverbal NP is the grammatical direct object results in the grammaticality of passivization. Passivization is freely applicable since it does not result in any change in the fixed inflectional ending of this already not overtly marked NP. With respect to relativization, grammaticality judgments vary. Unlike *Category I-i-1* structures, the presence of a non-idiomatic subject constituent allows the formation of wh-questions.

Category I-i-4

/N + Ø V/

The additional argument seems to be favorable as far as passivization is concerned. In addition, wh-question formation is freely allowed both for the non-idiomatic subject and non-subject NPs. With respect to the linear order of the constituents, preposing and postposing of the idiomatic constituent are unacceptable since the idiomatic NP is not overtly case-marked and confined to the immediately preverbal position. The application of relativization is possible when the target of relativization is not the idiomatic NP but the non-idiomatic arguments.

Category I-ii-1

/N + Case V/

Passivization results in varying grammaticality judgments. Wh-question formation with the non-idiomatic subject is possible. Postposing is acceptable since the idiomatic NP is overtly case-marked although it seems to be confined to the immediately preverbal position. The application of relativization with both the *-(y)An* and *-DIK* strategies is possible when the target of relativization is not the idiomatic NP but the non-idiomatic arguments.

Category I-ii-2/ *N + Case* *V* /

There seem to be a number of restrictions on the applicability of passivization. Wh-question formation not only with the non-idiomatic subject but also with the other non-idiomatic NP is possible. Since all the arguments are overtly marked, postposing is freely applicable as opposed to the ungrammaticality of preposing. The idiomatic NP is disallowed as the target of relativization.

Category II-i/ *N + Ø* *N + Ø* *V* /

This subcategory does not seem to allow any of the syntactic operations discussed except for postposing. Therefore, the expressions which belong to this subcategory are claimed to be more structurally frozen than those structures mentioned above.

Category II-ii/ *N + Ø* *N + Case* *V* /

Since there is no other argument position to be satisfied by non-idiomatic NPs, the structure does not seem to favor the application of many syntactic operations. Passivization is ungrammatical since the verbal heads mostly belong to the unaccusatives. Similarly, the absence of non-idiomatic NPs results in the unacceptability of wh-question formation. The structures of this subcategory are more structurally frozen than those with obligatory argument positions satisfied by non-idiomatic NPs.

Category II-iii-1/ *N + Case* *N + Ø* *V* /

The existence of an idiomatic subject and the fact that the majority of the head verbs are unaccusatives causes passivization, relativization and wh-question formation to be unacceptable. On the other hand, an overtly marked internal or adjunct argument results in the acceptability of postposing.

Category II-iii-2/ *N + Case* *N + Ø* *V* /

The existence of an idiomatic internal argument and transitive heads causes passivization, wh-question formation and relativization with the non-idiomatic subject

as the target to be grammatical. In addition, the overtly marked adjunct argument allows postposing but not preposing.

Category II-iv

/ N + Case N + Case V /

Passivization which involves the deletion of overt ACC ending on direct objects is unacceptable since this results in a change in the frozen nature of the expression. On the other hand, overtly marked internal or adjunct arguments cause postposing to be grammatical. Moreover, since there is a non-idiomatic subject, wh-question formation and relativization where the subject is the target are acceptable.

The above mentioned observations about the behavior of the eleven subcategories can be schematized in **Table 2** presented below:

CATEGORY	VC	PASS	REL	WHQ	PRE	POST	CLE	PRO
I-i-1	UA	X	X- _{poss}	X	--	✓	X	X
I-i-2	UA/TR	X	X	✓	X	✓	X	X
I-i-3	TR/DT	?	?	✓	X	?	X	X
I-i-4	TR/DT	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X
I-ii-1	TR/UA	?	X- (S)	✓	X	✓	X	X
I-ii-2	TR/DT	?	X- _{poss}	✓	X	✓	X	X
II-i	TR	X	X- _{poss}	X	X	✓	X	X
II-ii	UA	X	X	X	X	✓	X	X
II-iii-1	UA	X	X- _{poss}	X	X	✓	X	X
II-iii-2	TR/DT	✓	X- (S)	✓	X	✓	X	X
II-iv	DT	?	X- (S)	✓	X	✓	X	X

Table 2: TABLE SHOWING THE ACCEPTABILITY OF SYNTACTIC OPERATIONS

A comparison among syntactic operations in their applicability to idiomatic expressions reveals that those operations that involve the movement of idiomatic constituents produce acceptable results only with NPs with overt case endings. Those operations which involve not only the movement but also the focusing of constituents are observed to be inapplicable. If we were to make a three-way distinction among syntactic operations as in **Table 3**, we could say that some operations are absolutely inapplicable such as the ones in the first column, whereas some are subject to some restrictions in their applicability. These restricted ones, however, may still be acceptable in creative use of language. No operations were observed to be completely unrestricted except for the tense/aspect/modality marking on the head verbs.

INAPPLICABLE	APPLICATION RESTRICTED	APPLICATION UNRESTRICTED
• Clefting/pseudo-clefting • Definite/indefinite pronominalization • Preposing • Synonym tests • Change in overt case endings • Change in number and definiteness	• Passivization • Relativization • Wh-question formation • Lexical substitution • Postposing	• Tense/aspect/modality markers • Imperative

Table 3: THE APPLICABILITY OF SYNTACTIC OPERATIONS

To sum up the foregoing discussion, in the introductory chapter, syntactic frozenness was noted to be one of the two main properties of scalar nature behind the variability observed in idioms in their availability to grammatical transformations. Syntactic frozenness is generally defined as the property of idioms by which they typically resist insertion of new lexical items into the sequence that constitutes the idioms or reordering of their constituents. The resistance of idiomatic sequences against the insertion of new lexical items is suggestive of the number of idiomatic constituents and the argument positions to be satisfied by non-idiomatic NPs, which served to distinguish among the subcategories proposed in this study. Thus, we may claim that the more idiomatic NPs a structure has and the fewer obligatory argument positions the heads require, the more syntactically frozen the structure is. In other words, in structures where all the sentence constituents are idiomatic, in order to make a sentence, all that remains to be done is to supply the relevant tense/aspect/modality endings.

In contrast, in those structures where there are empty argument positions, non-idiomatic NPs may be inserted into the idiomatic sequence. Consequently, it is predicted that the former structures are more syntactically frozen than the latter mentioned. Observe the following table where the categories have been reclassified in the light of the above mentioned claims. There seems to be three general classes of structures with respect to their number of obligatory idiomatic and non-idiomatic constituents from the more frozen to the least respectively.

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>no of idiomatic NPs</i>	<i>obligatory argument positions</i>
<i>II-i</i>	2	none
<i>II-ii</i>	2	none
<i>II-iii-1</i>	2	none
<i>I-i-1</i>	1	none
<i>II-iii-2</i>	2	subject
<i>II-iv</i>	2	subject
<i>I-i-3</i>	1	subject
<i>I-ii-1</i>	1	subject
<i>I-i-2</i>	1	a non-subject argument
<i>I-i-4</i>	1	subject + a non-subject argument
<i>I-ii-2</i>	1	subject + a non-subject argument

Table 4: SYNTACTIC FROZENNESS IN TERMS OF NUMBER OF ARGUMENTS

Another important aspect to be mentioned about syntactic frozenness is the significance of the presence vs. absence of phonologically overt case markers on idiomatic NPs, which was observed to play a major role in the acceptability of operations like passivization and scrambling. It was also observed that idiomatic NPs were rendered ungrammatical not only when they lost their frozen case markers but also when they appeared with other inflectional markers which were not part of their frozen forms. Thus, we can also define syntactic frozenness as the tendency of idiomatic NPs to preserve their frozen forms and it is of equal consequence whether they are overtly case-marked or not.

CHAPTER THREE

SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF TURKISH IDIOMS

This chapter discusses a number of semantic properties of Turkish verbal idioms, namely lexical substitution, selectional restrictions, humor and punning, translatability and semantic change, all of which may bear consequences as to the nature of semantic compositionality with respect to idioms (cf. (Weinreich (1969), Newmeyer (1972), Fillmore et al. (1988), Nunberg et al. (1994) and Uzun (1991)). The analysis of a number of syntactic properties of Turkish verbal idioms in the previous chapter revealed two contradictory pieces of evidence about the semantic nature of lexical items involved in idioms. The first piece of evidence comes from the fact that a variety of the thematic roles which may be assigned to idiomatic NPs, which implies that these NPs are semantic units with respect to referentiality. On the other hand, the unacceptability of syntactic operations which involve focusing of NPs such as pronominalization and clefting/pseudo-clefting implies that idiomatic NP constituents are non-semantic units unable to refer to any entity from the universe of discourse. This chapter, then, aims to find further evidence either in favor of or against the semantic nature of idiomatic NPs. Further, the data will be discussed without making explicit reference to the subcategories proposed in this study since this categorization is mainly based on morphological and syntactic criteria. Therefore, it is predicted that the subcategory to which an idiom belongs will bear no consequences as to its behavior with respect to the semantic properties to be discussed here.

3.1. Lexical Substitution

In the following sections we will investigate whether lexical items involved in idioms can be substituted for by other items. Since idioms are considered to be frozen and idiosyncratic expressions, and since they are noted to be unique in both the selection of the particular lexical items and their linear ordering, it is predicted that none of the elements involved in idioms may be changed. If idiomatic elements can be replaced by other non-idiomatic elements, it implies that those idiomatic elements are semantic units themselves. And if they are not allowed to be replaced by other words, then one may conclude that idiomatic elements are not semantic units with

referential properties but idiosyncratic items with idiosyncratic properties within the idiomatic context.

3.1.1. Synonym Tests and Modification

In (1) we have an idiom whose head verb has been replaced by a synonymous verb with exactly the same grammatical properties like the number of arguments, case marking and thematic relations, however, this does not prevent ungrammaticality.

- (1) *dam-dan çardağ-a atla-/*zıpla-*
 roofABL arborDAT jump/*jump
 ‘to jump from one subject to another’

The important thing in the lexical composition of an idiom seems to be the existence of specific lexical items/phonetic sequence and not a specific entity. Even different words which refer to the same entity are ungrammatical as illustrated in (2). As can be seen in (2), Turkish data seem to support the generalization that the lexical items involved in idioms are unique and no synonymous counterparts are allowed.

- (2) *mavi boncuk/*nazar boncuğ-u dağıt-*
 blue bead/nazar beadPOSS distribute
 ‘to tell everyone that they are the apple of one’s eye’

As far as adjectival modifiers are concerned, the NPs in idioms are noted to be inadmissible with adjectival modifiers in English. Turkish illustrates a similar behavior as in (3) as far as an idiom with two idiomatic NP constituents is concerned.

- (3) **çorba-da taze maydanoz-u ol-*
 soupLOC fresh parsley3sgPOSS be
 ‘to have some contribution to sth.’

When it comes to the behavior of quantifiers, the frozen nature of idioms is predicted to disallow any change in the quantifiers involved in idioms as illustrated in (4a-c). In (5) we have an idiom with three different variants where only the numbers have changed, but the use of another number incompatible with the overall sense such as *iki* is ungrammatical.

- (4) *bir kaşık/*yarım bardak suda boğ-*
 one spoonØ/*half glassØ waterLOC drown
 ‘to want to destroy sm.’

- (5) *doksan/seksen/kırk/çok/*iki kapı-nın ip-i-ni çek-*
 90/80/40/a lot of/*two doorGEN stringPOSS-ACC pull
 ‘to pop into many houses’

In the following examples in (6a-b) the numbers involved in the idioms are not arbitrary, as was the case for the above examples, but “motivated,” therefore it would not be logical to change them.

- (6) a. *keci gibi dört ayak üstüne düş-*
 cat like four footØ over fall
 ‘to save oneself unharmed even from the most dangerous situations’
- b. *ahret-te on parmağ-ı yaka-sı-nda ol-*
 other worldLOC ten fingerPOSS collarPOSS-LOC be
 ‘to hold a grudge against smoe. at the Last Judgment’

In sum, the behavior of idioms illustrated above seems to prove that idiomatic constituents are unique both in their selection and use and that are not allowed to occur with adjectival modifiers or quantifiers, which implies that they are not semantic units. The behavior of idioms to be discussed in the following section, however, may provide some counter-evidence.

3.1.1.1. Idiom Families

The term “idiom family” refers to groups of idioms where the same verb in different environments can form distinct but semantically related expressions such as *stand on one’s own two feet//legs*, *hit the hay//sack*, etc., or where the same NP with a single idiomatic sense occurs with more than one verb such as *keep//start//get//have//set the ball going*, *search//hunt//look for NP high and low*, etc. (Nunberg et al. 1994:504). The existence of any such idioms seems to challenge the standard view of idioms where idioms are considered to undergo individual rules and assigned idiosyncratic senses, i.e. they are idiosyncratic lexical units, independent from other non-idiomatic expressions and essentially “unproductive”. Let us now see whether Turkish idioms behave similarly. Consider the following data in (7-8):

- (7) a. *söz-ü-nü //lakırdı-sı-nı// laf-ı-nı et-*
 speech//conversation//word 3sgPOSS-ACC do
 ‘to mention something’
- b. *söz-e//laf-a//*lakırdı-ya at-ıl-*
 word//conversationDAT throwPASS
 ‘to jump into conversation’

- (8) a. *iç-i-ne//yüreğ-i-ne//ciğer-i-ne işle-*
 inside//heart//liver(lung)3sgPOSS-DAT carve
 ‘(for something) to become encarved into one’s heart’
- b. *iç-i-ni//ruh-u-mu//hayat-ı-nı//gönl-ü-nü//kalb-i-ni kara-r-t-*
 inside//soul//life//heart3sgPOSS-ACC blacken-CAUS
 ‘to ruin one’s life, to demoralize someone’

In (7) and (8) various idiomatic expressions formed with semantically similar or synonymous non-head NPs are given. In (9-12) synonymous head verbs appear with the same non-head elements:

- (9) *can-ı-ndan usan-//bez-//*bık-*
 soul3sgPOSS-ABL to become bored//to be fed up with
 ‘to be fed up with living’
- (10) a. *ağz-ı-nı ara-//yokla-*
 mouth3sgPOSS-ACC search//feel (with fingers)
 ‘to sound out someone’
- b. *baş-ı-nı yak-//ye-*
 headPOSS-ACC burn//eat
 ‘to cause someone to get into trouble’

As can be seen, variants appear only when the replacing words are from the same semantic field; only semantically close NPs or verbs with similar meanings and similar grammatical properties like case marking may appear as variants. Note the following similarities; POSS-ACC marking in (7a), (8b), (10a-b) and (12a-b); DAT marking in (7b), POSS-DAT marking in (8a), or subcategorization features, and (passive) voice as in (11a-b), or causative inflection as in (12a-b), etc.

- (11) a. *dil-i aç-il-//çöz-ül-*
 tongue3sgPOSS openPASS//unfastenPASS
 ‘to start talking’
- b. *iç-i ez-il-//bayıl-*
 insidePOSS crushPASS//faint
 ‘to feel hungry’
- (12) a. *akl-ı-nı kaç-ır-//oyna-t-*
 mind3sgPOSS-ACC run awayCAUS//playCAUS
 ‘to go insane’
- b. *yüz-ü-nü ekşi-t-//buruş-tur-*
 facePOSS-ACC sourCAUS//become wrinkledCAUS
 ‘to have a sour look on one’s face’

It seems worth mentioning that the subcategory to which the idiom belongs does not seem to be important as far as such an operation is involved. However, note also that the data in (7), (8), (9), (10) and (12) belong to *Category I-ii-I*, which is by far the largest subcategory in the corpus whereas those in (11) belong to *Category I-i-I*. The common property of the two subcategories is that they only have a single idiomatic constituent. They differ, however, in the grammatical relation of the non-head to the head: in *Category I-i-I*, the non-head is the subject whereas in *Category I-ii-I*, the non-head is the non-subject. Nevertheless, both the structures in (12) and those in (11) seem to behave in exactly the same manner in this respect.

Looking at the examples in (7-12), we might conclude that Turkish idioms behave as predicted. Even the simple existence of five distinct but synonymous variants formed with the same head verb as in (8b) seems to support the view that idiom families are expected to be found in language. Productive though this process of forming synonymous variants may seem, it can still be claimed that idioms are lexically idiosyncratic units, and the choice of the particular nouns and verbs are arbitrary. Looking at (7a) one might predict that *lakırdı* would also be an acceptable variant and yet it is not as in (7b). Moreover (9) is again illustrative of the fact that the choice of specific lexical items is by and large arbitrary and only to a limited extent predictable.

3.1.1.2. Errors

If we were to assume that lexical items involved in idioms are arbitrary and the properties of each idiom have to be learned “by heart,” we might expect that speakers would make mistakes in using idioms and remembering the specific words in idioms. These words are predicted to be synonymous words which are grammatically “compatible” looking at the behavior of variants discussed in § 3.1.1.1. Let us test this against data collected from various TV channels.

The error in (13) involves the choice of a synonymous but semantically restricted variant, where *acı-* usually refers to physical pain and *yan-* implies a metaphorical pain/agony used in the context of *can*.

- (13) *Ona söyledin mi T. meselesinde ne kadar canının *acıdığını(yandığını)* interstar
 ‘Did you tell her how much you got hurt in the T. affair?’

In (14) the two synonymous words referring to the same bodypart are confused since which variant is used in which idiom is not predictable and there are quite a large number of idioms formed with these two words. Essentially the same thing is true for (15) where the original lexical item *baş* is replaced by another “physically close” bodypart.

- (14) ?*Kafamı(başımı) dik tuttum.* Show TV
‘I held my head high up.’
- (15) ?*Beyninden (başından) aşağı kaynar sular döküldü.* Can Dündar ShowTV
‘She had a terrible shock.’

The examples in (16) and (17) involve the overuse of the auxiliary *yap-* which seems to be replacing *et-* which is generally used to derive new expressions from foreign origin words. Newly borrowed terms like *repo*, *leasing*, *aerobik*, *step*, *trekking*, *zapping*, *sortie*, *reklam*, *promosyon*, *şov*, *stres*, and some words which have already been attested with *et-* like *fark et-/yap-*, *etki et-/şok etkisi yap-*, *muhabbet et-/geyik muhabbeti yap-*, etc. all seem to be acceptable with *yap-*.

- (16) *Tebdili kıyafet ?yapıp (edip)...* Nurseli İdiz theatre actress
‘to be in disguise’
- (17) *Her İstanbullu’nun ?efor yapması (çaba göster-// efor sarfet-)lazım.* DJ
‘Each inhabitant of Istanbul should make an effort.’

The following data in (18-20) concerns those idioms which involve the introduction of a new expression as a result of the combination of two distinct idioms, perhaps due to the similarities in their senses or because they contain lexical items which are hard to keep in mind.

- (18) *Devlet bize destek çık-malı.* a taxi driver
‘The government must support us.’

arka çık-
backØ go out
‘to support’

destek ol--
supportØ be
‘to support’

- (19) *Kes çeneni!* interstar
‘Shut up!’

Kapa çene-n-i!
Close jaw2sgPOSS-ACC
‘Shut up!’

Kes ses-in-i!
Cut voice2sgPOSS-ACC
‘Shut up!’

- (20) **gurur-um kirlen-di kem göz-den kem dil-den.* Pop song
 ‘My pride got dirty due to evil eye and tongue.’

<i>gurur-u kırıl-</i>	<i>namus-u kirlen-</i>
pridePOSS breakPASS	chastityPOSS become dirty
‘for one’s pride to be hurt’	‘for one’s chastity to be sullied’

In (18) and (19) the two original idioms are synonymous and the new expression retains the same idiomatic sense. (20) is awkward and rather nonsensical. It is also interesting that the overuse of *kem* with *dil* results in a new expression *kem gözden kem dilden*; moreover, the context in which the expression appears and the rather low degree of idiomaticity of the original expression imply that the original expression is deliberately altered. The existence of such “portmanteau” expressions may be attributed to the confusion of semantically related idioms which are composed of different lexical items.

The examples above mainly focused on errors in monolingual contexts. Next we consider whether a similar situation occurs in translated (dubbing) texts.

- (21) *O vampirler *hayatımı (kanımı) emiyorlar benim.* ShowTV
 ‘Those vampires are sucking my life.’
- (22) **Boynuna (boğazına) kadar belaya battı.* interstar
 ‘He is deep into trouble.’

The examples (21-22) involve lexical substitution by a “physically close” bodypart which preserves the same metaphorical image in (22), however, replacement seems to be unmotivated and unacceptable in (21).

- (23) *Merakımı daha da kabarttın.* atv
 ‘You aroused my curiosity even more.’

<i>iştah-ı-nı kabar-t-</i>	<i>merak uyan-dır-</i>
appetitePOSS-ACC swell upCAUS	curiosityØ wake upCAUS
‘to increase one’s appetite’	‘to arouse curiosity’

The blending of two idioms observed in (18-20) in monolingual context is exemplified for dubbing texts in (23). It is also important to note that the morphological peculiarities such as case and possessive endings of the lexical items involved are observed.

To summarize, modern Turkish seems to be undergoing a rapid change causing the substitution of the items involved in idioms by others. Although the structures in (13-23) are considered as “errors” or deviations from the standard, it is significant to note that the changes always remain merely at the lexical level, and all the syntactic peculiarities of the original idiom are retained. The items replacing the original ones are usually synonymous or share the general semantic “concept” at least, but differ in the manner and contexts they are generally used. This very fact seems to bear significant implications as to syntactic frozenness. Thus, we can define syntactic frozenness in terms of the structural properties of idioms which never change as opposed to those which are allowed to change. In other words, although the lexical composition of an idiom is allowed to be changed to a certain extent, the case endings borne by the NP constituents and the number of the obligatory arguments together with any syntactic/grammatical constraints they may impose typically resist change, which seems to be the major criterion for a definition of syntactic frozenness.

3.1.1.3. Substitution by the Dummy Filler *Şey*

The word *şey* is widely used as an “all-purpose” substantive. Erguvanlı (1984a) also mentions that *şey* is substituted for the word which is remembered after the sentence has been finished and it bears the inflectional endings carried by the lexical item it replaces. However, it also seems to replace only contextually recoverable “semantic” units, thus it is predicted that it cannot be substituted for idiomatic elements. Observe the following:

- (24) a. *Şu yazı-ya bir [göz at]-ar mısın?*
 that textDAT one eyeØ throwAOR q-clt
 ‘Will you take a look at this text?’
- b. *Şu yazıya bir *[şey] at-ar mısın-yani- bir [göz at]-ar mısın diyecektim.*
- c. *Şu yazıya bir [şey yap]-ar mısın-yani-bir [göz at]-ar mısın diyecektim.*

In (24a), the NP *göz* is not allowed to be replaced by the empty filler in (24b). The only way to make substitution by *şey* acceptable is to replace the whole idiom by the expression *şey yap-* (to do what-do-you-call-it) as in (24c).

Thus, the behavior of the idiom illustrated above seems to provide support for the view that the idioms form unitary semantic units and are not composed of

separate, independent semantic elements as illustrated in (27b). Nevertheless, perhaps *göz at-* is an extreme case since it is expected to become lexicalized into a single verb. It should also be mentioned it has already undergone resyllabification and is predicted to behave similarly to *başvur-* which is now a lexicalized former idiomatic expression with two distinct senses and even a nominal counterpart *başvuru*.

3.2. Selectional Restrictions

It is predicted that idioms with non-idiomatic subjects will impose semantic restrictions on the selection of the NPs to become their subjects. Let us now consider the behavior of Turkish idioms in this respect. The examples below in (25a-c) are ambiguous merely due to the introduction of subjects compatible not with the semantic requirements of the idiomatic meaning but with the literal sense deriving from the semantic composition of the given words:

- (25) a. *Arı-lar bal al-acak çiçeğ-i bil-ir.*
 beePL honeyØ obtain-AcAK flowerACC knowAOR
 ‘Bees know which flower to obtain honey from’ (lit.)
 ‘to find the person from whom to profit’ (idiomatic sense)
- b. *Ayı-lar kolay kolay post-u del-dir-me-z.*
 bearPL easy easy hideACC pierceCAUS-NEG-AOR
 ‘Bears don’t get their hides pierced easily’ (lit.)
 ‘to be shot and get killed’ (idiomatic sense)
- c. *Hangi bülbül gül üst-ü-ne gül kokla-r?*
 Which nightingale rose over rose smellAOR?
 ‘Which nightingale would smell a rose after another rose? (lit.)
 ‘to be disloyal to one’s lover by loving another woman’ (idiomatic sense)

Since the subject “bees” is totally compatible with “honey” and “flower” in a non-idiomatic context, (25a) is ambiguous probably due to the cognitive ability expressed in the verb *bil-*. In (25b), “hide” and “bear” are considered to be semantically compatible in a non-idiomatic context, they form an ambiguous pair (unless the subject is interpreted to be “crude” men having characteristics similar to those of bears!). Similarly, in (25c), *bülbül* would not even be ambiguous if the sentence were interpreted to be highly poetic and to make explicit reference to the lover *bülbül* and the beloved *gül* in Divan poetry. In sum, the ambiguity in (25) above seems to arise from the fact that these idioms require subjects with the [+human] feature.

- (26) a. *Ahmet Bey'in etek-ler-i zil çal-ıyor şu sıralar.*
 Ahmet BeyGEN skirtPL-POSS bellØ ringPROG nowadays.
 'Ahmet Bey is overjoyed nowadays.'
- b. *Ferit Bey durum-u öğren-ince etek-ler-i tutuş-tu baksana.*
 Ferit Bey situationACC learn-IncA skirtPL-POSS catch firePAST
 'Ferit Bey became alarmed.'

On the other hand, some idioms do not have any specific requirements on the subjects they occur with except for the feature [+ human]. For example, in (26) we have two idioms in which the NP *etek* [+ feminine] appears but the [+ masculine] subjects are totally compatible since the word does not carry its literal meaning any more.

The context is also significant in the interpretation of an idiom. Observe the example below:

- (27) *Bu çoraplar ağız-ım-ı sulan-dır-ıyor.* Aytuğ socks TV commercial
 this sockPLØ mouth1sgPOSS-ACC waterCAUS-PROG
 'These socks make my mouth water.'

Normally, the idiom *ağzımı sulandır-* requires a [+ human] possessor and an edible subject. Socks are not edible therefore the sentence in (27) should be ungrammatical. However, the sentence is "uttered" by a cat looking at a pair of socks with fish figures on them in the commercial, thus the sentence is grammatical within the given context.

3.3. Humor and Punning

It is claimed that idioms develop from the more complex configurations historically and that speakers "know" the idiom is derived from the homophonous literal expressions. Indeed, Chafe (1970) mentions "a kind of semantic leakage" in the literalization of idioms. This property is intentionally made use of especially in punning and jokes (e.g. *Just now he's sitting on a cloud, but it may not support him very long* (p.70)).

Turkish seems to provide evidence for the view mentioned above. Let us now observe the data below collected from a comedy series on TV¹. It was already noted

¹ *Bir Demet Tiyatro* (text by Yılmaz Erdoğan), Interstar.

that synonym tests prove to be ungrammatical for idiomatic constituents. However, in (28) we see that the comic effect is achieved through the substitution of a synonymous word referring to the same entity.

- (28) *Kuru gürültü-ye ayakkabı-mız-ı(pabuç) bırakmayacağız herhalde*
 dry noiseDAT shoe1plACC (shoe) leaveNEG-FUT1pl of course
 ‘We’re not going to leave our shoes to unnecessary excitement of course.’ (lit.)

The joke in (29) depends on a play of words. In the first sentence the idiomatic sense is attempted and yet the second sentence presupposes a literal reading of the same sequence of words.

- (29) *Kusur-a bak-ma diyoruz, senin göz-ün hâlâ kusur-da.*
 faultDAT lookNEG sayPROG1pl 2sgGEN eye2sg still faultLOC
 ‘(Beg your pardon), you are still looking at the fault.’ (lit.)

Relativization of idiomatic NPs was shown to be generally unacceptable but we see that the jokes in (30) and (31) include relativized idiomatic NP constituents, which proves that even inapplicable operations may be made use of for certain pragmatic purposes, which in fact implies that syntactic frozenness or any other grammatical constraints may be violated intentionally to produce a striking expression.

- (30) *Sen ona kulak as-ma. Kulağ-ın-ı as-acağ-ın en son yer orası olsun.*
 2sg 3sgDAT earØ hangNEG ear2sgPOSSACC hang-AcAk-2sg last place there beOPT
 ‘Don’t listen to her. It/she? should be the last place you hang your ear on.’ (lit.)
- (31) *Senin uğr-u-na yorgan yak-tığ-ın pire bu işte.*
 2sgPOSS sakePOSSDAT quiltØ burn-DIK-2sg flea this
 ‘This is the flea you burnt the quilt for.’ (lit.)

When it comes to the pragmatics of idioms, the example in (32) would illustrate the incompatibility of the semantics of idioms and the pragmatic function of the context they appear. In (32) the idiom involves an action with negative connotations; the action of burdening someone with some unpleasant and difficult job, and yet the speaker asks the hearer if she could do that. That is the reason why the sentence is pragmatically awkward, i.e. if you are intentionally doing something which would harm others, then you probably would not ask for permission.

- (32) *S: Seyfi Bey problemlı bir grubumuz var.*
 Seyfi Bey, we have a group of people here causing problems.

Baş-ınız-a sar-mak istiyorum, mümkün mü?
 ‘I want to burden you with this, is that possible?’

Similarly, in (33) there is a frequently used and thus very familiar idiom most of whose parts can be replaced by non-idiomatic constituents as illustrated by the acceptability of (33b). Since everybody knows such idioms well, one can easily allude to them and achieve a more powerful and witty expression, (e.g. (33b)). This example also illustrates that even when the lexical items involved in idioms are replaced by others, the syntactic properties such as case and the number of obligatory arguments are preserved, which is further proof of our claims about the nature of syntactic frozenness with respect to Turkish verbal idioms.

- (33) a. [*Yağmur*]-*dan kaç-ar-ken [dolu]-ya tut-ul-du-k*.
 rainABL run awayAOR-ken hailDAT catchPASS-PAST1pl
 ‘While we were running away from the rain we got caught by the hail.’ (lit.)
 ‘to hurry from the frying pan into the fire’
- b. [*Dedikoducu Pervin Hanım*]-*dan kaçarken [çenebaz Münevver Hanım]’a tutulduk*.
 ‘While we were running away from Pervin Hanım the Gossip, we got caught
by Münevver Hanım the Chatterbox.’

Finally, here is an example in (35) where there is an allusion to a well-known idiom (from a Turkish drama on TV). The idiom itself is not pronounced in its frozen form but the words which appear in the idiom are used to make for the comic element. The original idiom is given in (34).

- (34) *Öd-üm patla-dı*.
 gall1sgPOSS explodePAST
 ‘I was scared.’
- (35) *Öd-üm-e kast-ın varsa bir kerede çıkar al, patla-r-sa işine yaramaz*.
 ‘If you mean any harm against my gall, take it out at once, it will be no good if it explodes.’

To conclude, the “frozen” nature of idioms and the possibility of both literal and idiomatic readings allows us to use them as the basis for jokey comments. Also note that the context and the pragmatic purposes which an expression serves are of crucial significance since expressions such as those in (30-31) or (28) which are considered to be ungrammatical in canonical examples may prove to be acceptable in context.

3.4. (Un)translatability

Aksoy (1995) states that idioms whose parts carry non-literal meanings cannot be translated by using the literal equivalents of those words and retaining the same

grammatical structure whereas idioms containing parts which retain their primary senses can.

- (36) *akl-ı* *sıra*
 mind3sgPOSS rowØ
 ‘according to what s/he thinks, in his/her opinion’

- (37) *Dana-nın kuyruğ-u* *kop-*
 cowGEN tail3sgPOSS tear off
 ‘(for) a cow’s tail to be torn off’
 ‘to happen as feared’

Aksoy (1995) divides idioms into three groups with respect to translatability (p.518-520): a. Those which cannot be subjected to *mot-à-mot* translation due to their special forms as in (36) above or which would not express the concept in Turkish when translated literally as in (37) above; b. those which can be translated if their non-literal senses and metaphoric nature are preserved as in (38) below ; c. those which can be translated literally since they still retain their literal senses as in (39) below:

- (38) *Balık kavağ-a* *çık-mca*
 fishØ poplarDAT climb-IncA
 ‘When fish climb poplar trees’
 ‘Never’

- (39) *Yük-te* *hafif* *paha-da* *ağır*
 loadLOC light valueLOC heavy
 ‘sth. light and valuable (e.g. jewellery)’

Aksan (1987), on the other hand, maintains that it is often impossible to translate collocations and idioms since finding exact equivalents in the target language is rather difficult. When idioms such as the one in (40) are translated literally, the translations often sound odd and incomprehensible to people from different cultures who know nothing about Turkish culture.

- (40) *Sultanahmet-te* *dilen-ip, Ayasofya-da* *sadaka* *ver-*
 SultanahmetLOC beg-IP AyasofyaLOC almsØ give
 ‘to beg in Sultanahmet and give alms in Ayasofya’

Aksan offers two solutions to this problem. We may either find an equivalent idiom carrying the same sense as in (41c), or paraphrase the idiomatic expression to render only the overall sense as in (41b) (Aksan 1987:74-6).

- (41) *Bakla-yı* *ağz-t-ndan* *çık-ar-*
 Broad beanACC mouth3sgPOSS-ABL take out

- a. 'to take the broad bean out of one's mouth' (lit.)
- b. 'to disclose a secret' (idiomatic sense)
- c. 'to spill the beans' (idiomatic equivalent)

The practical solutions offered in Aksan (1987) are similar to those theoretical ones proposed in Bar-Hillel (1970) who considers idioms to be one of the major linguistic problems with which machine translation is confronted. He offers three solutions to this problem: listing idioms as separate, independent lexical items in the dictionary; adding a phrase-dictionary specifying those phrases which have unsatisfactory word-by-word translations; and telling the reader to replace certain target language phrases with other phrases.

3.5. Semantic Change

Language change can result in a shift in the meaning or a change in the lexical composition of already existent idioms. For example, Chafe (1970:48) mentions the idiom *eat humble pie* which underwent such a change. The word *umbles*, "the inferior parts of deer," dropped from the language and (in the context of this idiom) was replaced by *humble* which was still meaningful in the language and also semantically compatible with the overall sense of the idiom. Observe the following examples from Turkish which illustrate the same behavior:

- (42) *Eski çam-lar bardak ol-du.*
 old pine treePL wooden jugØ becomePAST
 'What were once pine trees have now become wooden jugs.' (lit.)
 'Things have changed.' (idiomatic sense)

- (43) *Eski cam-lar bardak ol-du.*
 old glassPL glassØ becomePAST
 'old (pieces of) glass have now become glasses.' (lit.)
 'Things have changed.' (idiomatic sense)

The meaning shift in *bardak* resulted in a phonetic change in (43). The idiom was reinterpreted in such a way as to assign a new compositional/literal meaning compatible with the modern notion of recycling. Consider the following where a similar behavior is observed:

- (44) *Biz at-tık sümük diye, âlem kap-tı ilik diye.*
 1pl throwPAST boneØ because, others catchPAST bone marrow because
 'We threw the bone away, others caught it as if it were bone marrow.' (lit.)
 'We threw it away because it was useless, others kept it considering it valuable.'

(45) *Biz at-tık sümük diye, âlem kap-tı ilik diye.*
mucusØ

(46) *Biz at-tık kemik diye, el kap-tı ilik diye.*
boneØ

In the case of (44), two different changes can be observed: When the word *sümük* was no longer meaningful in the language, it was replaced by *sümük* which was phonetically similar and compatible with the general idea of uselessness as in (45). The second change was that the word *sümük* was replaced by its modern counterpart in order to retain the analogy between “bone” and “bone marrow” as in (46).

Looking at the consequences of semantic change illustrated above, we can draw the following conclusions: (i) Idioms are historically derived from their literal counterparts and essentially ambiguous between the idiomatic and literal senses; (ii) the semantic units which appear in idioms may gradually drop from language as in (44) or undergo a shift in meaning as in (42); (iii) sometimes obsolete units may be reinterpreted as if they were semantic units and replaced by other meaningful units; (iv) the replacing units are generally both phonetically similar and semantically close to the sense of the idiom; and (v) the tendency to assign meaning to idiom parts which are no longer meaningful in an attempt to retain the original compositional sense seems to provide evidence that speakers are aware of the ambiguity between the literal and idiomatic readings and want to preserve it to some extent.

In sum, the following facts were observed in this chapter with respect to the semantic properties of Turkish verbal idioms and syntactic frozenness:

(i) Lexical substitution by synonymous items, adjectival modification and quantifiers are observed to be unacceptable for idiomatic expressions (ex. 1-6) whereas lexical substitution prove to be grammatical as long as the inflectional endings and argument structure is preserved (ex. 7-12). Similar evidence comes from the nature of errors (ex. 13-23). In other words, only lexical items are substituted for idiomatic NPs but the syntactic structure is preserved.

(ii) Pragmatic and contextual features may cause syntactic frozenness to be violated for certain purposes: relativization (ex. 30-31), substitution by synonymous item (ex. 28). Even the virtual decomposition of the lexical structure is possible (ex. 33, 35).

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study has been to investigate the notion *syntactic frozenness* with respect to Turkish idioms headed by verbs, in an attempt to define that notion on the basis of behavior illustrated by the data. In brief, it was the purpose of this study to categorize Turkish verbal idioms with respect to structure and to provide a thorough analysis of their morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties.

There are two major points to be mentioned with respect to the behavior of Turkish verbal idioms and syntactic frozenness. The first one involves the grammatical relation of the non-head NP to the head. Whether the non-head is the subject or not was observed to be predictive of the behavior of an idiom with respect to certain syntactic operations such as passivization and wh-question formation. In other words, the distinction between “root” and “synthetic” compounds proposed in Grimshaw (1992) seems to be of consequence in Turkish. Secondly, it was claimed that the presence vs. absence of phonologically overt case markers on idiomatic NPs played a major role in the acceptability of syntactic operations. It was also observed that idiomatic NPs were rendered ungrammatical not only when they lost their frozen case markers but also when they appeared with other inflectional markers which were not part of their frozen forms. Consequently, syntactic frozenness was claimed to be the tendency of idiomatic NPs to preserve their frozen forms.

In the light of the facts mentioned above, syntactic frozenness can be defined in terms of the number of obligatory constituents, frozen inflectional endings and the syntactic structure which must be preserved even when the lexical items have been substituted for by other items. Accordingly, a verbal idiom in Turkish is claimed to consist of a certain “frame” with pre-specified structural features. The following theoretical “frame” of an idiomatic expression in Turkish serves to illustrate this claim.

[Subject NPØ (NP + Case/Ø) (NP + Case/Ø) V]

APPENDIX I: THE DATA

ABBREVIATIONS

CLE	Clefting/Pseudo-clefting
DT	Ditransitive
ER	Ergative
IT	Intransitive
PAS	Passivization
POS	Postposing
PRE	Preposing
PRO	Pronominalization
REL	Relativization
TR	Transitive
UA	Unaccusative
VC	Verb Class
WH	Wh-question Formation
✓	Grammatical
x	Ungrammatical

CASE ENDINGS IN TURKISH

Ø	Nominative
-I	Accusative
-A	Dative
-DA	Locative
-DAn	Ablative
-(y)lA	Instrumental

CATEGORY I-i-1

/N + Ø

V/

CATEGORY I-i-1	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	1	Ø	subject	none

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
açıl-	ara-lar-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
ayrıl-	vol-lar-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
boşal-	zembereğ-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
çözül-	diz-ler-i-nin bağ-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
dürül-	-In defter-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
gel-	-In yer-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
gel-	arka-sı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
görün-	kese-nin dib-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kanlan-	bit-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kesil-	iştah-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kırıl-	burn-u-nun direğ-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
ol-	ad-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
ol-	hava-sı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
olma-	asl-ı astar-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
olma-	ayrı-sı gayrı-sı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
olma-	esas-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
olma-	hadd-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
tut-	damar-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
tut-	inad-ı	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
ısın-	su-yu	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
düş-	sıra-sı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
gevre-	iman-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
gevşe-	vida-lar-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kabar-	ayran-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kabar-	iştah-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kaç-	reng-i	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kayna-	kan-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kayna-	su-yu	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kop-	dana-nın kuyruğ-u	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
soğu-	-In ara-sı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
at-	tepe-si-nin tas-ı	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
vap-	kış	TR	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
açıl-	göz-ü gönl-ü	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
açıl-	göz-ü/göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
açıl-	yüz-ü göz-ü	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
bavıl-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
buğulan-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
bulan-	göz-ü	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
bulutlan-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
dumanlan-	göz-ü	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kanlan-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kapan-	göz-ü	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
sulan-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
süzül-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
yaşar-	göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
ak-	göz-ü	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
dol-	göz-ler-i	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
doy-	göz-ü	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kamaş-	göz-ler-i	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
karar-	göz-ler-i	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
karar-	göz-ü	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
parla-	göz-ler-i	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
sön-	göz-ü	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x

vıl-	göz-ü	ER	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
göl-	göz-ler-i-nin iç-i	IT	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x
kız-	göz-ü	IT	x	x	x	-	✓	x	x

CATEGORY I-i-2

/N + Ø V/

CATEGORY I-i-2	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	1	Ø	subject	1

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
kesil-	-DA hoşaf-ın yağ-ı	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ol-	-DA tuz-u	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ol-	-yİA zor-u	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	-DA şafak	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kes-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kesme-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tut-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tutma-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yeme-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ısr-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
görme-	-İ göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
alma-	-İ göz-ü	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dal-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
git-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
iliş-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaç-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kay-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
takıl-	-A göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
değ-	-A göz	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
alış-	-A göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kal-	-DA göz-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kork-	-DAn göz-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY I-i-3

/N+Ø

V/

CATEGORY I-i-3	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	1	Ø	non-subject	subject

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
aç-	ara	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ara-	belâ	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ara-	fırsat	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ara-	kaçacak delik	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
avla-	sinek	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
boz-	ara	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
çal-	yanlış kapı	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çatlat-	düşman	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çiğne-	bir çeki keçi boynuzu	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
çiğne-	kaldırım	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
cilala-	kafa	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
çürüt-	ömür	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
dağıt-	efkâr	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
dağıt-	mavi boncuk	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
dağıt-	uyku	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
devir-	çam	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
edin-	huy	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	düğün bavram	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
etme-	para	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
geç-	pas	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
giy-	karalar	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kap-	yer	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kes-	iştah	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kes-	yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kopar-	gürültü	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kopar-	yavgara	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
koyuver-	su	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kır-	dümen	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kır-	para	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
oku-	masal	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
oynat-	istediği gibi at	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
parala-	lugat	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
sav-	yasak	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
savur-	palavra	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
sür-	boy	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
tep-	yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
tut-	zar	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
tuttur-	bir yol	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ütüle-	kafa	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
yala-	çanak	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ye-	hak	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ye-	vurgun	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yeme-	gam	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
yumurtla-	cevher	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yut-	kül	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
bilme-	hatır gönül	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
bul-	yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
görme-	gün	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
yürü-	yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dinleme-	ferman	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
al-	hava	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	bakla	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	bir tek	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
bağla-	et	DT	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
bağla-	örümcek	DT	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

bas-	para	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çağırt-	tellal	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
çek-	ah	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çek-	gurbet	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
çek-	niyet	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çevir-	dolap	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çevir-	iş	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çıkar-	hırgür	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çıkar-	icat	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dök-	su	DT	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
dök-	yaş	DT	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kaldır-	kazan	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kaldır-	şaka	DT	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
koy-	aracı	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	açık	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
verme-	renk	DT	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
vur-	vurgun	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
git-	yol	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kesil-	dikkat	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kesil-	kulak	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	toprak	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
boya-	göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
doldur-	göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
doğur-	göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kamaştır-	göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
var-	kafa göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
yıldır-	göz	TR	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
kesil-	göz	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	baş göz	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	göz göz	UA	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x
al-	göz	DT	x	x	✓	x	x	x	x

CATEGORY I-i-4

/N + Ø

V/

CATEGORY I-i-4	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	1	Ø	non-subject	sbj + 1

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
bil-	-I borç	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
edin-	-I dert	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-I alt üst	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-I iç	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-I örtbas	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
san-	-I Karamürsel sepet-i	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
al-	-I esir	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
götür-	-I kir	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
aldırma-	-A soluk	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	-A çamur	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	-A hava	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	-A kazık	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	-A taş	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
bağla-	-A ümit	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
bırak-	-A açık kapı	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çek-	-A perde	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çek-	-A şişe	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çıkart-	-A iş	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çıkart-	-A taş	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
getir-	-A kuma	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
getir-	-A leke	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
getir-	-A uğur	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
göster-	-A yol	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
hazırla-	-A zemin	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
söktür-	-A kök	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
sür-	-A leke	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	-A hesap	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	-A koz	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	-A ödün	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	-A yön	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
aç-	-A yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
bak-	-A yan	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
biç-	-A paha	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çiz-	-A yol	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-A oyun	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-A usaklık	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kur-	-A pusu	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
oku-	-A belâ	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
oku-	-A meydan	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
püskür-	-A ateş	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
tut-	-A ışık	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
uçur-	-A haber	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yak-	-A yeşil ışık	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yan-	-A dert	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yap-	-A yağ	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
çık-	-A arka	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	-A ön ayak	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
aç-	-DA gedik	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
doku-	-DA mekik	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-DA yer	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
oynat-	-DA kalem	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
tutturama-	-DA dikiş	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
uçurma-	-DA kuş	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

bul-	-DA karar	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
aç-	-DAn kapı	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
biç-	-DAn pay	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dile-	-DAn aman	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
um-	-DAn medet	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ve-	-DAn kazık	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
al-	-DAn makas	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
vur-	-DAn dem	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	-DAn taraf	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
geç-	-ylA dalga	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-I baş göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-I göz ardı	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dik-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
et-	-A kaş göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
gezdir-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kırp-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
kırpma-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
süz-	-A göz	TR	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yum-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
yumma-	-A göz	TR	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
açtırma-	-A göz	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
at-	-A göz	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dök-	-A göz nur-u	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
dök-	-A sevinç göz-vaş-lar-ı	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
koy-	-A göz	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ver-	-A göz-dağı	DT	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
gıt-	-A göz aydın-a	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	-A göz kulak	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x
açama-	-DAn göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	x	x	x
ol-	-ylA yüz göz	UA	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x

CATEGORY I-II-1

/N + Case V/

CATEGORY I-II-1	no of NPs 1	case case	role of NP non-subject	other args. subject
-----------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------------	------------------------

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
aç-	ara-lar-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	ara-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	bayramlık ağz-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	kese-nin ağz-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	pergel-ler-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
arşınla-	kaldırım-lar-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aşındır-	-In kapı-sı-nı/ eşığ-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bekle-	gün-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bitir-	-In iş-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boz-	ara-lar-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boz-	moral-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boz-	yuva-sı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bozma-	istif-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çal-	-In kapı-sı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çöz-	ayağ-ı-nın bağ-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dağıt-	yuva-sı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
deldir-	post-u	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
devir-	dağ-lar-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
deş-	karanlık-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
deş-	vara-sı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dik-	kuyruğ-u	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doğrult-	bel-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doldur-	ceb-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doldur-	yer-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dür-	-In defter-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düz-	kılık kıyafet-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düşünme-	ön-ü-nü ard-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ez-	düşman-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
güldür-	yüz-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
hesaplama-	ileri-si-ni geri-si-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kap-	şifa-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kapa-	defter-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kazan-	hayat-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kazı-	kök-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kes-	posta-yı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kopar-	kıyamet-i	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kopar-	öd-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
körükle-	yangın-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kurtar-	görünüş-ü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kurut-	kök-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kır-	kiriş-i	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kır-	şeytan-ın bacağı-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kıs-	kemer-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kıvr-	yalan-lar-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
lekele-	ad-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
öde-	-In kefare-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
patlat-	öd-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
salıver-	dizgin-ler-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sav-	sıra-sı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
savsakla-	iş-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
savur-	para-lar-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
say-	-In lokma-sı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sav-	gün-ler-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ser-	post-u	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sev-	yer-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

söndür-	ocağ-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
temizle-	hesab-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
topla-	kel-i kör-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
topla-	pılı-vı pırtı-yı/ tas-ı tarağ-ı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tüket-	sıfır-ı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tut-	yük-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tuttur-	kıvam-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tıka-	gedik-ler-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tırmala-	ver-i göğ-ü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
uçur-	-In kelle-si-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
uyandır-	ateş-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
vağla-	taban-lar-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ve-	ayva-vı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yut-	hap-ı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yut-	zoka-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yırt-	kefen-i	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ısıt-	ver-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	arka-sı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	ateş-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	boy-u-nun ölçü-sü-nü	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	dua-sı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
as-	mekteb-i	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	top-u	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
atlat-	varıta-vı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla-	el-i-ni kol-u-nu	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla-	kısmet-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas-	kalıb-ı-nı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bırakma-	peş-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	90/80/40 kapı-nın ip-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	çizme-ler-i	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	su-yu-nu	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkar-	-In pestil-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dök-	-In lokma-sı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dök-	eteğ-i-nde-ki taş-ı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dök-	kurt-lar-ı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düşür-	fırsat-ı-nı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
getireme-	son-u-nu	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaçır-	doz-u-nu	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaçır-	kantar-ın top-u-nu	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaçır-	keçi-ler-i	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaçır-	ölçü-yü	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sor-	ıcağ-ı-nı cıcağ-ı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ver-	-In terbiye-si-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ver-	hakk-ı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
anla-	dünya-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aş-	hadd-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
beğen-	ver-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	bal alacak çiçeğ-i	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	hesab-ı-nı kitab-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	kadr-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	laf-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	vol-u-nu	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bil-	şeytanın yattığı ver-i	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bileme-	bastığı ver-i	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bilme-	ism-i-ni cism-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bilme-	sağ-ı-nı sol-u-nu	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	dil-i-nin ceza-sı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	hava-sı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	kıvam-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	tam adam-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	tav-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

bul-	şifa-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çekeme-	kahr-ı-nı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gör-	gün-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gör-	hesab-ı-nı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gör-	ileri-yi	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gözle-	vol-u-nu	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
şasur-	pusula-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boyla-	cehennem-i	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boyla-	tahtalı köy-ü	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çık-	adam iç-i-ne	UA	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	köşe-yi	UA	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bulaş-	vüz-ü-ne göz-ü-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bürün-	kuzu post-u-na	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çekil-	kendi kabuğ-u-na	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	Arap saç-ı-na	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	dut yemiş bülbül-e	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	eşekten düşmüş karpuz-a	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	iğne ipliğ-e	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	kömürcü çırağ-ı-na	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dön-	sudan çıkmış balığ-a	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düş-	kara sevda-ya	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düş-	su-ya	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gel-	vol-a	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
işle-	iliğ-i-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-In ağz-ı-nın iç-i-ne	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	ana baba el-i-ne	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bakma-	ön-ü-ne arka-sı-na	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas-	can damar-ı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas-	yaş tahta-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gel-	ön-de	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kal-	ara-da	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kal-	orta-da	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çık-	din-den iman-dan	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çık-	usta el-i-nden	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	kör şeytan-ı-ndan	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	-In göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	göz-ler-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ağart-	göz-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bayılt-	göz-ler-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
belert-	göz-ler-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doyur-	göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kapa-	göz-ler-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kapa-	göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
korkut-	göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
oy-	birbiri-nin göz-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
oy-	göz-ler-i-ni/göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yar-	baş-ı-nı göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yum-	göz-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yıldır-	göz-ü-nü	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla-	-In göz-ü-nü	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çık-	birbiri-nin göz-ü-nü	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çık-	göz-ü-nü	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bulaş-	vüz-ü-ne göz-ü-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gel-	göz-e	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gel-	göz-ü-nün ön-ü-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gir-	-In göz-ü-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

görün- göz-e	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
görünme- göz-e	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
iliş- göz-ü-ne	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bat- göz-e	IT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bat- göz-ü-ne	IT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çarp- göz-e	IT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak- göz-ü-ne	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak- -In göz-ü-nün iç-i-ne	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bakma- -In göz-ü-nün yaş-ı-na	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
inanama- göz-ler-i-ne	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
büyü- göz-ü-nde	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ol- göz-ü-nün ön-ü-nde	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
olma- -In göz-ü-nde	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tüt- göz-ü-nde	ER	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
düş- göz-den	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gitme- göz-ü-nün ön-ü-nden	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaç- göz-den	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaç- göz-ü-nden	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaçma- göz-ü-nden	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaybol- göz-den	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
geç- göz-ü-nün ön-ü-nden	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY I-ii-2

/N + Case V/

CATEGORY I-ii-2	no of NPs 1	case case	role of NP non-subject	other args. sbj + 1
-----------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------------	------------------------

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
al-	-I avuc-u-nun iç-i-ne	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I ayağ-ı-nın alt-ı-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I ayak-lar alt-ı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I dikkate	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I kanad-ı alt-ı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
batır-	-I yağ-a bal-a	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bırakma-	-I van-ı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	-I fena-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çevir-	-I komşu kapı-sı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çevir-	-I yaz boz tahta-sı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ver-	-I el-e	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kat-	-I hesap-a	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy-	-I mikrofon-a	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy-	-I orta-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy-	-I tef-e	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sür-	-I ön-e	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
boğ-	-I bir kaşık su-da	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bulaştır-	-I ağız-ı-na burn-u-na	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
döndür-	-I ırgat pazar-ı-na	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	-A kanca-yı	DT	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
at-	-A kapağ-ı	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
bağışla-	-A ad-ı-nı	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
bildir-	-A hadd-i-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
dava-	-A sırt-ı-nı	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
dava-	-A cevap-ı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göster-	-A gün-ü-nü	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göster-	-A Hanya'yı Konya'yı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göster-	-A kapı-yı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kaptır-	-A paça-yı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tak-	-A kanca-yı	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
vur-	-A damga-sı-nı	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yak-	-A aba-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bul-	-DAn yol-u-nu	TR	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
kurtar-	-DAn paça-yı	TR	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
sıvır-	-DAn yaka-yı	TR	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
çıkart-	-DAn öfke-si-ni	DT	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
çıkart-	-DAn rızk-ı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
et-	-yİA akşam-ı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
et-	-yİA sabah-ı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kes-	-yİA hesap-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kes-	-yİA selam-ı sabah-ı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
paylaş-	-yİA koz-u-nu	TR	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
bulundur-	-I göz önünde	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bekle-	-I dört göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
büyüt-	-I göz-ü-nde	TR	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
gör-	-I göz-ü-yle	TR	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
kestir-	-I göz-ü-ne	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
oku-	-I göz-ler-i-nden	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tut-	-I göz ön-ü-nde	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
uzaklaştır-	-I göz-ü-nden	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

ve-	-I göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I göz alt-ı-na	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I göz haps-i-ne	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-I göz-e	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkâr-	-I göz-den	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
geçir-	-I göz-den	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sok-	-I göz-ü-ne	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-A alıcı göz-ü-yle	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-A fena göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-A göz uc-u-yla	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-A kem göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bak-	-A yan göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bakma-	-A iyi göz-le	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
devir-	-A göz-ler-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
dik-	-A göz-ler-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
aç-	-DA göz-ü-nü	TR	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
alama-	-DAn göz-ler-i-ni	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
alama-	-DAn göz-ü-nü	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
ayırma-	-DAn göz-ü-nü	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x
kaçır-	-DAn göz-ler-i-ni	DT	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x

CATEGORY II-i

/N + Ø N + Ø V/

	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
CATEGORY II-i	2	Ø / Ø	sbj / nonsbj	none

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
----------------------	----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

et- ciğer-ler-i bayram	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
etme- ciğer-i beş para	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
oyna- in cin top	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
savur- burn-u-nun vel-i harman	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bağla- iç-i vağ	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kaldırma--In pirinc-i çok su	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ol- iş-i iş	UA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
görme- göz-ü hiçbir şey	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY II-ii

/N + Ø

N + Case

V/

CATEGORY II-ii	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	2	Ø / case	sbj / nonsbj	none

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
götür- kan gövde-vi	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
götür- sel sel-i	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
sar- ateş baca-vı	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
geç- boynuz kulağ-ı	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kapla- ün-ü cihan-ı	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
aş- borç bin-i	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çök- tavan baş-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- -In foya-sı meydan-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- ad-ı kötü-ye	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- borç gırtlak-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- ikisi bir kapı-ya	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- ipliğ-i pazar-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- öfke-si topuk-lar-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- ses-i ayuk-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
dön- boyn-u armut sap-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
dön- göz-ler-i kan çanağ-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
gel- yumurta kapı-ya	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
gelme- iki yaka-sı bir ara-ya	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kısıl- kuyruğ-u kapan-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
otur- -In gemi-si şap-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
toplan- cin-ler-i baş-ı-na	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
davan- bıçak kemiğ-e	IT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
davan- yumurta kapı-ya	IT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
sıkış- kuyruğ-u kapan-a	IT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ak- kan-ı iç-i-ne	ER	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
değ- baş-ı göğ-e	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
değme- ettiği hayır, ürktüğü kurbağa-va	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
değme- ayak-lar-ı yer-e	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
geç- yüz-ü ver-e	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
uyma- evde-ki hesap çarşı-ya	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bas- ayağ-ı düz-e	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
vur- afyon-u baş-ı-na	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
büvü- lokma-sı ağız-ı-nda	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal- el-i böğr-ü-nde	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal- güvendiği dal el-i-nde	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal- heves-i kursağ-ı-nda	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ol- burn-u Kaf dağ-ı-nda	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ol- heyhey-ler-i üst-ü-nde	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- akl-ı zıvana-dan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- iş çığır-ı-ndan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- ok yav-dan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
gel- ana-sı-ndan emdiği süt burn-u-ndan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
git- post el-den	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
görme- göz göz-ü	TR	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
gel- göz göz-e	UA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
kaç- göz-ler-i çukur-a	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bak- göz-ü toprağ-a	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal- göz-ler-i yol-lar-da	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x

kal-	göz-ü arka-da	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal-	göz-ü üst-ü-nde	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal-	göz-ü yol-da	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ol-	göz-ü yüksek-te	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
fırıl-	göz-ler-i yuva-lar-ı-ndan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
uğra-	göz-ler-i yuva-lar-ı-ndan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY II-iii-1

/ N + Case N + Ø

V/

CATEGORY II-iii-1	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	2	case / Ø	nonsbj/sbj	none

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
----------------------	----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----

açma- aźz-i-nı bıçak	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bas- loğusa-yı al	DT	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çök- iç-i-ne baygınlık-lar	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
döl- pabuc-u-na kum	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
düş- iç-i-ne kurt	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
düş- kazdığı çukur-a kendisi	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
gır- -In kılığ-ı-na kıran	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
gır- ara-lar-ı-na kara kedi	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
in- ayak-lar-ı-na kara su-lar	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kaç- kulağ-ı-na kar su-yu	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kal- Azrail'e bir can borc-u	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bit- dil-i-nde tüv	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
es- baş-ı-nda kavak yel-i	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
es- yer-i-nde yel-ler	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
olma- o tarak-ta bez-i	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ıslanma- aźz-i-nda bakla	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çak- beyn-i-nde şimşek-(ler)	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- alt-ı-ndan Çapanoğlu	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- el-i-nden kan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çık- her kafa-dan bir ses	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çıkma- el-i-nden bir kaza/sakatlık	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
damla- kalem-i-nden kan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
geç- ara-lar-ı-ndan kara kedi	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
kovala- ard-ı-ndan atlı	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bürü- göz-ler-i-ni kan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bürü- göz-ü-nü hurs	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
bürü- göz-ü-nü kan	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
tutma- (göz-ler-i-ni/göz-ü) uyku	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
görme- dünya-yı göz-ü	TR	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
girme- göz-ler-i-ne / göz-ü-ne uyku	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
görünme- göz-ü-ne hiçbir şey	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
in- göz-ü-ne kara su	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ol- göz-ü-ne diken	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
çak- göz-ler-i-nde şimşek-ler	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
ak- göz-ü-nden uyku	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
dön- açlık-tan göz-ü	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x
karar- açlık-tan göz-ler-i	UA	x	x	x	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY II-iii-2

/ N + Case N + Ø

V /

CATEGORY II-iii-2	no of NPs 2	case case / Ø	role of NP nonsbj/nonsbj	other args. subject
-------------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION	VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
at- çirkef-e taş	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at- dalga-sı-na taş	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at- köpeğ-in ağz-ı-na kemik	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at- meteliğ-e kurşun	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
atlat- deve-ye hendek	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla- baş-ı-na kara-lar	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla- kuyruğ-u-na teneke	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas- bağır-ı-na taş	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas- kitab-a el	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bırakma- (kuru) gürültü-ye pabuç	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek- -In üzer-i-ne sünger	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek- akıntı-ya kürek	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkart- baş-ı-na iş	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkart- kendi-ne hisse	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göster- hırsız-a yol	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kat- pişmiş aş-a su	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ko- bir yol-a baş	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy- ayağ-ı-nın alt-ı-na karpuz kabuğ-u	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sat- tereci-ve tere	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tak- yumurta-ya kulp	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tıka- -In çan-ı-na ot	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ver- deli-nin el-i-ne değnek	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ısmarla- kedi-ve ciğer	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç- baş-ı-na iş	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çak- dünya-ya kazık	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çal- ağz-ı-na bir parmak bal	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çal- avı-ya kaval	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dik- -In ocağ-ı-na incir	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doğra- -In kan-ı-na ekmek	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dürt- arı-nın yuva-sı-na kazık/çöp	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ek- dib-i-ne darı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
et- akl-ı-na yelken	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
iç- üst-ü-ne bir bardak soğuk su	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
iste- ağz-ı-na kira	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kak- dünya-ya kazık	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koklama- gül üst-ü-ne gül	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kus- altın leğen-e kan	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
oku- baba-sı-na rahmet	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ör- baş-ı-na çorap	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sür- -In ekmeğ-i-ne yağ	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sür- eşığ-ı-ne yüz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kesil- biri-nin baş-ı-na kahya	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ol- ağz-ı-na sakız	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yap- pire-yi deve	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
atama- -In yan-ı-nda perende	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göster- -A aba alt-ı-ndan değnek	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dik- ekmeğine göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kırp- karanlık-ta göz	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek- -In göz-ler-i-ne mil	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY II-iv

/ N + Case

N + Case

V /

CATEGORY II-iv	no of NPs	case	role of NP	other args.
	2	case / case	nonsbj/nonsbj	subject

IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION		VC	PAS	REL	WH	PRE	POS	CLE	PRO
al-	bohça-sı-nı koltuğ-u-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	dalga-yı baş-a	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	dizgin-ler-i el-e	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	gem-i azı-ya	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	iş-i ciddi-ye	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	kelle-si-ni koltuğ-u-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
alma-	-In ad-i-mi ağz-ı-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	el-i-ni kulağ-ı-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	fes-i-ni hava-ya	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	kendi-ni ateş-e	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	külâh-ı-nı hava-ya	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
at-	para-sı-nı sokağ-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
atma-	laf-ı yaban-a	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla-	at-ı-nı sağlam kazığ-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bağla-	iş-i tatlı-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas-	acı-sı-nı bağır-ı-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bas-	parmağ-ı-nı yara-nın üzer-i-ne	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
bula-	el-i-ni kan-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	hırka-yı baş-ı-na	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	şimşek-ler-i üst-ü-ne	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çevir-	şaka-yı kaka-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkar-	deve-yi düz-e	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çıkar-	gönl-ü-nü pazar-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
doğra-	ekmeğ-i-ni kan-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dök-	-In kirli çamaşır-lar-ı-nı orta-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
getir-	-In sırt-ı-nı vere	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
getireme-	iki uc-u-nu bir ara-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
indir-	velken-ler-i su-ya	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy-	ağırlığ-ı-nı orta-ya	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
koy-	taş-ı gediğ-i-ne	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
okut-	kendi-ni pabuc-u büyüğ-e	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tak-	can-ı-nı dış-ı-ne	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
ver-	ağz-ı-nı kira-ya	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
vur-	balta-yı taş-a	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yükle-	sermaye-yi kedi-ye	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
aç-	ağz-ı-nı hava-ya	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
akıt-	kan-ı-nı iç-i-ne	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
giy-	ayağ-ı-nın pabuc-u-nu baş-ı-na	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
göm-	deve kuşu gibi baş-ı-nı kum-a	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
say-	para-yı avuc-u-na	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sür-	yorgun-u yokuş-a	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
anla-	bayram hafta-sı-nı mangal tahta-sı	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gör-	leyleğ-i hava-da	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kal-	iş-i Allah-a	UA	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
gör-	kendi-ni dev ayna-sı-nda	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	akl-ı-nı baş-ı-ndan	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	bir kız-ı leğen baş-ı-ndan	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	söz-ü ağz-ı-ndan	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çarp-	kafa-sı-nı taş-tan	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
vur-	pire-yi göz-ü-nden	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
fethet-	kale-yi iç-i-nden	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
tep-	kısmet-i ayağ-ı-yla	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

ye-	akl-ı-nı peynir ekmek-le	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yut-	deve-yi havud-u-yla	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	-In ağız-ı-ndan lokma-sı-nı	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
seç-	ak-la kara-yı	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
al-	ölüm-ü göz-e	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
çek-	sürme-yi göz-den	DT	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
esirgeme-	göz-ü-nü dal-dan budak-tan	DT	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sakın-	sağ göz-ü-nü sol göz-ü-nden	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
sakınma-	göz-ü-nü dal-dan budak-tan	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
dik-	göz-ü-nü göz-ü-ne	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kapa-	dünya-ya göz-ler-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
kapa-	hayat-a göz-ler-i-ni	TR	x	x	✓	x	✓	x	x
yum-	hayat-a/dünya-ya göz-ler-i-ni	TR	✓	x	✓	x	✓	x	x

CATEGORY I-i-1	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	0	1	1
DITRANSITIVE	0	0	0
UNACCUSATIVE	13	20	33
ERGATIVE	9	11	20
INTRANSITIVE	2	0	2
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>32</i>	<i>56</i>
CATEGORY I-i-2	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	10	0	10
DITRANSITIVE	1	0	1
UNACCUSATIVE	7	4	11
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>22</i>
CATEGORY I-i-3	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	6	50	56
DITRANSITIVE	1	22	23
UNACCUSATIVE	3	4	7
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>76</i>	<i>86</i>
CATEGORY I-i-4	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	12	35	47
DITRANSITIVE	6	26	32
UNACCUSATIVE	3	3	6
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>64</i>	<i>85</i>
CATEGORY I-ii-1	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	18	100	118
DITRANSITIVE	3	29	32
UNACCUSATIVE	17	22	39
ERGATIVE	1	0	1
INTRANSITIVE	3	0	3
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>193</i>
CATEGORY I-ii-2	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	18	12	30
DITRANSITIVE	10	30	40
UNACCUSATIVE	0	0	0
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>42</i>	<i>70</i>

CATEGORY II-i	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	1	4	5
DITRANSITIVE	0	2	2
UNACCUSATIVE	0	1	1
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>
CATEGORY II-ii	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	2	7	9
DITRANSITIVE	0	5	5
UNACCUSATIVE	9	27	36
ERGATIVE	0	1	1
INTRANSITIVE	0	3	3
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>54</i>
CATEGORY II-iii-1	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	2	3	5
DITRANSITIVE	0	1	1
UNACCUSATIVE	11	20	31
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>24</i>	<i>37</i>
CATEGORY II-iii-2	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	2	19	21
DITRANSITIVE	1	25	26
UNACCUSATIVE	0	2	2
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>49</i>
CATEGORY II-iv	GÖZ-IDIOMS	OTHERS	TOTAL
TRANSITIVE	6	14	20
DITRANSITIVE	3	41	44
UNACCUSATIVE	0	1	1
ERGATIVE	0	0	0
INTRANSITIVE	0	0	0
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>56</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>180</i>	<i>545</i>	<i>725</i>

CATEGORY	GÖZ-IDIOMS		OTHERS		TOTAL	
<i>I-i-1</i>	24	13.3 %	32	5.9 %	56	7.7 %
<i>I-i-2</i>	18	10 %	4	0.7 %	22	3 %
<i>I-i-3</i>	10	5.5 %	76	13.9 %	86	11.9 %
<i>I-i-4</i>	21	11.6 %	64	11.7 %	85	11.8 %
<i>I-ii-1</i>	42	23.3 %	151	27.7 %	193	26.7 %
<i>I-ii-2</i>	28	15.5 %	42	7.7 %	70	9.7 %
<i>II-i</i>	1	0.5 %	7	1.3 %	8	1.1 %
<i>II-ii</i>	11	6.1 %	43	7.9 %	54	7.4 %
<i>II-iii-1</i>	13	7.2 %	24	4.4 %	37	5.1 %
<i>II-iii-2</i>	3	1.6 %	46	8.4 %	49	6.8 %
<i>II-iv</i>	9	5 %	56	10.3 %	65	9 %
TOTAL	180	100 %	545	100 %	725	100 %
<i>TRANSITIVE</i>	77	42.7 %	245	45 %	322	44.1 %
<i>DITRANSITIVE</i>	25	13.9 %	181	33.2 %	206	28.4 %
<i>UNACCUSATIVE</i>	63	35 %	104	19.1 %	167	23 %
<i>ERGATIVE</i>	10	5.5 %	12	2.2 %	22	3 %
<i>INTRANSITIVE</i>	5	2.7 %	3	0.6 %	8	1.1 %
TOTAL	180	100 %	545	100 %	725	100 %

APPENDIX II: DEFINITIONS OF IDIOM

[an idiom's] full meaning ... is not a compositional function of the idiom's elementary grammatical parts. (Katz & Postal 1963:275)¹

... a grammatically complex expression $A + B$ whose designatum [meaning] is not completely expressible in terms of the designata of A and B , respectively. (Weinreich 1966:181)

... a complex expression whose meaning cannot be derived from the meanings of its elements. (Weinreich 1969:26)

... a constituent or a series of constituents for which the semantic interpretation is not a compositional function of the formatives of which it is composed. (Fraser 1970:22)² in (Nunberg et al 1994:498)

A semantic unit-one which does not have a direct symbolization of its own but which trades on the symbolization of another (or others)-... (Chafe 1970:44)

... any constituent's meaning is a compositional function of the meanings of its parts and thus, ultimately, its morphemes. Idioms are the exceptions that prove this rule. Locutions like "shoot the breeze," "stir up trouble," "give hell to" make no sense whatever if construed compositionally. (Katz 1972:35)

... a collocation of two or more lexical items whose meaning cannot be predicted from the meaning and structure of those elements contained in it. (Newmeyer 1972:294)

... fixed syntactic constructions which are made up of words already in the lexicon, but which carry meanings independent of the meanings of their constituents. (Jackendoff 1975:662)

¹ "Semantic Interpretation of Idioms and Sentences Containing Them," MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics, Quarterly Progress Report 70, pp.275-282, cited in (Weinreich 1969:36, f.11).

² Fraser, Bruce (1970) "Idioms within a transformational grammar," *Foundations of Language* 6, pp.22-42.

... groups of words with set meanings that cannot be calculated by adding up the separate meanings of its parts. (Bolinger 1975:100)

... arbitrary sign which occurs at a higher syntactic level than that of the word. ...generally ambiguous between its literal (sometimes nonsensical) sense and its arbitrary “idiomatic” sense. (Aronoff 1976:9, f. 6)

... a multiword unit which, if taken literally, can disinform the unprepared ill-decoder. (Makkai 1978:415)

... sequences of words whose meaning cannot be predicted from the meanings of the words themselves. (Palmer 1981:36)

... a phrase whose meaning is not completely predictable from the meaning of its parts. (Culicover 1982:192)

... an expression whose meaning cannot be accounted for as a compositional function of the meanings of its parts have when they are not parts of idioms. (Cruse 1986:37)

An idiomatic expression or construction is something a language user could fail to know while knowing everything else in the language. (Fillmore et al. 1988:504).

... phrases whose meaning is *not* the combination of the meanings of the individual words (Fromkin & Rodman 1988:239).

... a more or less fixed sequence of words with a unitary meaning. ... The essential feature of an idiom is its non-literal, metaphorical meaning. The meaning of an idiom is not the sum of the meaning of its parts, its constituent words. (Jackson 1988:14, 106)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aksan, Doğan (1982) *Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim* v.3, TDK Yayınları, Ankara.

_____ (1987) *Türkçenin Gücü (The Power of Turkish)*, Bilgi Yayınevi, İstanbul.

Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua (1970) "Some Linguistic Problems Connected with Machine Translation," in *Aspects of Language: Essays and Lectures on Philosophy of Language, Linguistic Philosophy and Methodology of Linguistics*, The Hebrew University, pp.308-316.

Bolinger, Dwight (1975) *Aspects of Language*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. (2nd edition).

Chafe, Wallace (1970) *Meaning and the Structure of Language*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

Cruse, D.A. (1986) *Lexical Semantics*, Cambridge University Press.

Cutler, Anne (1982) "Idioms: The Colder the Older," *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.2, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., pp.317-320.

Erguvanlı, Eser (1984a) *The Function of Word Order in Turkish*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Fillmore, C., Kay, P., and O'Connor, M.C. (1988) "Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone*" *Language* 64, pp.501-538.

Grimshaw, Jane (1992) *Argument Structure*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

- Jackendoff, Ray (1975) "Morphological and Semantic Regularities in the Lexicon," *Language* 51, pp.639-671.
- Jackson, Howard (1988) *Words and Their Meaning*, Longman, New York.
- Kartal, Günizi (1995) *Argument Structure and Idiomatic Compounds in Turkish*, Boğaziçi University, M.A. Thesis in Linguistics.
- Makkai, Adam (1978) "Idiomaticity as a Language Universal," in Greenberg, J.H.(ed.) *Universals of Human Language V.3 Word Structure*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, pp.401-448.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. (1972) "The Insertion of Idioms," *Papers from the Eighth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp.294-302.
- Nilsson, Birgit (1985) *Case Marking Semantics in Turkish*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Stockholm.
- Nunberg, G., Sag, I.A., Wasow, T. (1994) "Idioms," *Language* 70.3, pp.491-538.
- Postal, Paul M. (1974) *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Quang Phuc Dong (1971) "The Applicability of Transformations to Idioms," *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp.200-205.
- Sinha, Anjani K. (1973) "On Stative Passives and Treatment of Some Idioms," *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp.615-626.
- Uzun, Leyla Subaşı (1991) "Deyimleşme ve Türkçe'de Deyimleşme Dereceleri," *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, Hitit Yayınevi, Ankara, pp.28-39.

Weinreich, Uriel (1966) "On the Semantic Structure of Language" in Greenberg, J. H. (ed.) *Universals of Language*, MIT Press, Mass. (2nd edition). pp. 142-216.

_____ (1969) "Problems in the Analysis of Idioms" in Puhvel, J. (ed.) *Substance and Structure of Language*, University of California Press, L.A. pp. 23-81.

GENERAL LINGUISTIC REFERENCES

Aksan, Doğan (1977) *Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim (All Aspects of Language: An Outline of Linguistics) v.1*, TDK Yayınları (3rd edition: 1987), Ankara.

Aronoff, Mark (1976) *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Bresnan, J., Kanerva, J. M. (1992) "Locative Inversion in Chichewa: A Case Study of Factorization in Grammar," in *Syntax and Semantics: Syntax and the Lexicon*, ed. Tim Stowell and Eric Wehrli, v.26, Academic Press, Inc., pp.53-101.

Cattell, Ray (1984) *Composite Predicates in English: Syntax and Semantics v.17*, Academic Press, Inc., Australia.

Chafe, Wallace (1976) "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View," in Li, Ch.N. (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, Academic Press, New York, pp.27-55.

Chomsky, Noam (1970) "Remarks on Nominalization," in Jacobs, R. & Rosenbaum, P. (eds.) *Readings in English transformational grammar*, Ginn & Co. Waltham, pp.184-221.

Culicover, Peter W. (1982) *Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.

- Dede, Müşerref (1986) "Definiteness and Referentiality in Turkish Verbal Sentences," in Slobin, D. and K. Zimmer (eds.) *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, John Benjamins Press, Amsterdam, pp.147-163.
- Erguvanlı, Eser (1977) "Scope of Presupposition in Yes-No Questions in Turkish," (unpublished paper, University of California, Los Angeles).
- _____ (1984b) "Some Aspects of Negation in Turkish," *Türk Dilbilim Konferansı Bildirileri 1984 (Papers from the Turkish Linguistics Conference 1984)*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp.159-177.
- Fillmore, Charles (1968) "The Case for Case," in Bach & Harms (eds.) *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, Holt, Reinhart and Winston, pp.1-89.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. (1988) *An Introduction to Language*, (4th edition), Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.
- Göksel, Ashi (1996) "Passivization in Turkish," in Rona, Bengisu. (ed.) *Current Issues in Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (1990) v.1*, Hitit Yayınevi, Ankara, pp.61-74.
- Haegeman, Lillian (1991) *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*, Blackwell Publishers, UK.
- Hatiboğlu, Vecihe (1981) *Türk Dilinde İkileme*, TDK Yayınları (2nd edition), Ankara.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Katz, Jerrold J. (1972) *Semantic Theory*, Harper and Row Publishers, New York.
- Kuribayashi, Yuu (1990) "Syntactic Compoundings in Turkish," *Dilbilim Araştırmaları (The Journal of Linguistic Research)*, Hitit Yayınevi, Ankara, pp.41-49.

- Malkiel, Yakov (1968) "Studies in Irreversible Binomials," in *Essays on Linguistic Themes*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, pp.311-355.
- McCawley, James D. (1988) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Nilsson, Birgit (1984) "Object Incorporation in Turkish," *Türk Dilbilim Konferansı Bildirileri 1984 (Papers from the Turkish Linguistics Conference 1984)*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp.113-128.
- Palmer, F. R. (1981) *Semantics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ullmann, Stephen (1966) "Semantic Universals," in Greenberg, J. H. (ed.) *Universals of Language*, MIT Press, Mass. (2nd edition). pp. 217-262.
- _____ (1971) "Semantics," in Minnis, Noel (ed.) *Linguistics at Large*, The Viking Press, New York, pp. 75-87.
- Zimmer, Karl (1996) "The Case of the Errant Question Marker," (unpublished paper, University of California at Berkeley).

REFERENCE GRAMMARS AND DICTIONARIES

- Aksoy, Ömer Asım (1995) *Atasözleri ve Deyimler Sözlüğü v.2*, İnkılâp Kitabevi (7th edition), İstanbul.
- Banguoğlu, Tahsin (1974) *Türkçenin Grameri (The Grammar of Turkish)*, Baha Matbaası, İstanbul.
- Çağdaş Türkçe-İngilizce Redhouse Sözlüğü, Redhouse Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1989 (2nd edition).
- Longman Dictionary of English Idioms*, Longman, London, 1987.
- Türkçe Sözlük*, TDK Yayınları, Ankara, 1988.