

## Werk

**Titel:** Place nouns heading relative clauses with focal subjects

**Autor:** Schaaik, Gerjan van

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2017

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0021](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021) | LOG\_0012

## Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

# Place nouns heading relative clauses with focal subjects

Gerjan van Schaaik

Schaaik, Gerjan van 2017. Place nouns heading relative clauses with focal subjects. *Turkic Languages* 21, 79–106.

Many grammars of Turkish give little attention to a type of construction which has puzzled quite a number of linguists trying to formalize the distribution of the so-called subject participle (SP) and the object participle (OP), the latter also known as the non-subject participle. A subject participle is used in three cases: when its subject is (i) the head of the RC; (ii) a constituent in a possessive relation with the head; and (iii) a non-referential noun phrase. In all other cases the object participle applies.

The present contribution provides a pragmatic analysis of the latter type of construction and proposes the name *Focus-Locus Construction*, showing that the subject is a non-referential noun phrase that is always placed in preverbal (focus) position and that the head noun of the relative clause can without exception be interpreted as a noun denoting location (locus). Such structures are presentative constructions providing new information, and they are related to existential constructions because they express “places where things happen”.

Gerjan van Schaaik, Leiden University. E-mail: [g.j.van.schaaik@hum.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:g.j.van.schaaik@hum.leidenuniv.nl)

## 1. Introduction

As is widely recognized, modern Turkish has several participles.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of convenience we shall confine ourselves to the participle forms that are said to have non-future and non-remote past time reference: the subject participle in *-(y)En* (subject form, henceforth: SF), and the object participle in *-TIK* (object form, henceforth, OF). They form the core of the equivalents of relative clauses (RCs), as can be exemplified by (1).

- (1) a. *fabrika-da çalış-an kardeş-im*  
factory-LOC work-SF brother-POSS1S  
'my brother who works at the factory'

1 The distribution of participles in relative clauses has been studied intensively over the past decades and attracts a great deal of interest to this day. Some general examples are: Underhill (1972); Hovdhaugen (1975); Hankamer & Knecht (1976); Dede (1978), Knecht (1979); Erdal (1981); Csató (1985, 1996); Zimmer (1987, 1996); Barker, Hankamer & Moore (1990); Özsoy (1994); Erkman-Akerson & Özil (1996); Kornfilt (2000); Öztürk (2008); Özçelik (2014).

- b. *kardeş-im-in*      *çalış-tığ-ı*      *fabrika*  
 brother-POSS1S-GEN    work-of-POSS3S    factory  
 ‘the factory where my brother works’

In (1a) the RC *fabrika-da çalış-an* ‘who works in a factory’ contains the SP<sup>2</sup> but no subject and “modifies” the head *kardeş-im* ‘my brother’, which is understood to be the subject of *çalış-* ‘work’. In (1b), on the other hand, the RC *kardeş-im-in çalış-tığ-ı* contains the OP and a subject, and modifies the head *fabrika* ‘factory’, which is not the subject of *çalış-* ‘work’. This subject is *kardeş-im* ‘my brother’, the subject-hood of which is signaled by the genitive case marker. The OF is followed by a possessive marker which agrees in person and number with the subject of the embedded verb. This opposition between SP and OP has been regarded as a strict divide with only a few exceptions.

Firstly, in a *başbozuk*-construction<sup>3</sup>, a head noun is modified by a “minimal clause” consisting of at least two constituents: a *subject* and a *predicate*. The subject is a noun plus possessive suffix third person singular (the so-called *anticipatory possessive*) in agreement with the head noun, and the predicate is a noun phrase (*topal* ‘lame’ in (3a)) or an SP (*tüt-en* ‘smoking, steaming’ in (3b)).

- (3) a. *Ayağ-ı*      *topal*    *bir*    *sandalye-ye*    *otur-du-m.*  
 foot-POSS3S    lame    a    chair-DAT    sit.down-PAST1-1S  
 ‘I sat down on a wobbly chair.’
- b. *Henüz duman-ı*      *tüt-en*      *sıcak*    *bir ekmek-le*    *geri*    *dön-dü.*  
 still    smoke-POSS3S    steam-SF    hot    a    bread-INS    back    return-PAST1  
 ‘She returned with a warm loaf of bread [its “vapor”] still steaming.’

For (3a) an alternative can be formed by the auxiliary *ol-an*, and its negative counterpart *ol-ma-yan* is obligatory in case of a negation. Compare:

- (4) a. *Ayağ-ı*      *topal*    *ol-an*    *bir sandalye-ye*    *otur-du-m.*  
 foot-POSS3S    lame    be-SF    a    chair-DAT    sit.down-PAST-1S  
 ‘I sat down on a chair which has a wobbly [‘lame’] leg.’

- 2 The subject participle for the remote past takes the form *-mİş*, for the future *-(y)EcEk*, and there are a few fossilized forms in *-(I/E)r* (also known as aorist participles). These will not be discussed here, since they are not relevant for the gist of the argument to be made in section 4.
- 3 This name derives from: *baş-ı bozuk adam* [head-his deranged man] ‘the man whose head is deranged’ and is coined by Lewis (1967: 259).

- b. *Ayağ-ı topal ol-ma-yan bir sandalye-ye otur-du-m.*  
 foot-POSS3S lame be-NEG-SF a chair-DAT sit.down-PAST1-1S  
 ‘I sat down on a chair which has no lame leg.’

The “minimal” subjects *ayağ-ı* ‘its leg’ in (3a) and *duman-ı* ‘its steam’ in (3b) both contain an anticipatory possessive, but this in itself is not the reason why the SP occurs. When the constituent containing the anticipatory possessive is in the nominative, it qualifies for subjecthood (5a), otherwise it must be some object of the participle; in (5b) the OP in *-TIK* shows by means of its possessive marker (possessive first person singular) who the subject really is: *ben* ‘I’.

- (5) a. *Karı-sı fabrika-da çalış-an kardeş-im ...*  
 wife-POSS3S factory-LOC work-SF brother-POSS1S  
 ‘My brother, whose wife works at the factory ...’
- b. *Karı-sın-ı fabrika-da gör-düğ-üm kardeş-im ...*  
 wife-POSS3S-ACC factory-LOC see-OF-POSS1S brother-POSS1S  
 ‘My brother, whose wife I saw at the factory ...’

Secondly, there is a type of construction which to the best of my knowledge has no “official” appellation, but which we will here term the *bülbül*-type of construction and for which I will suggest the name the *Focus-Locus Construction* in section 4. This construction too is in fact a relative clause; the minimal inventory is again a nominal head preceded by a subject plus SP. Its simplest form can be exemplified by *bülbül öten yer*,<sup>4</sup> ‘the place where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)’, a specimen much quoted in the literature on this type of Turkish relative clauses. Such constructions occur in several degrees of complexity. Here are a few other simple examples:

- (6) a. *Meşe bit-en toprak-ta, hemen hemen hiç başka ağaç*  
 oak grow-SF land-LOC almost no other tree  
*gözük-me-z.*  
 to.be.seen-NEG-PRES2  
 ‘On the land where oaks are standing, there are almost no other trees visible.’
- b. *Yıldırım düş-en deliğ-e bak-ar-ken ikisi de konuş-ma-dı.*  
 lightning fall-SF hole-DAT look-PRES2-CONV two too speak-NEG-PAST1  
 ‘Both said nothing when looking at the hole where the lightning struck.’

4 This construction is built up as follows: *bülbül öt-en yer* [nightingale sing-SF place] ‘the place where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)’.

- c. *Bu bakteri de ışık ol-ma-yan yer-ler-de*  
 this bacteria too light be-NEG-SF place-PLUR-LOC  
*kemosentez yap-ıyor.*  
 chemosynthesis do-PRES1  
 ‘This bacteria too does chemosynthesis in places where there is no light.’
- d. *Güneş gir-me-yen ev-e doktor gir-er.*  
 sun enter-NEG-SF house-DAT doctor enter-PRES2  
 ‘In a house where no sunlight comes in, the doctor will enter.’

In all these examples (6 a-d) the subject stands bare before the verb. However, subjects can occur in their plural form (7a), can be preceded by adjectives (7b) and adverbial expressions (7c), and may pop up as two coordinated nouns (7d).

- (7) a. *Su-lar ak-an, kuş-lar öt-en toprak ...*  
 water-PLUR flow-SF bird-PLUR sing-SF land  
 ‘A piece of land where water runs everywhere and birds sing ...’
- b. *Sıcak su bulun-ma-yan otel ...*  
 hot water be.found-NEG-SF hotel  
 ‘The hotel where there is no hot water ...’
- c. *Bu yerleşme alan-lar-ı, bugün insan yaşa-yan bölge-ler-le aynı-dır.*  
 this settlement field-PLUR-CM today man live-SF area-PLUR-INS same-EMPH  
 ‘These fields of settlement are the same as the areas where people live nowadays.’
- d. *Elektrik ve su bul=un-ma-yan kent-te ...*  
 electricity and water be.found-NEG-SF city-LOC  
 ‘In the city where there is no electricity ...’

This type of construction can be based on passive<sup>5</sup> and impersonal passive verbs as well. In both variants the subject of the SP can be compared to the direct object of their active counterparts. Examples are:

- (8) a. *Demirel, pasta üret=il-en mutfak-ta öğrenci-ler-le sohbet et-ti.*  
 Demirel pastry produce-PAS-SF kitchen-LOC pupil-PLUR-INS chat-PAST1  
 ‘Demirel had a chat with pupils in the kitchen where pastries are made.’

5 The passive suffix is separated from the stem by the equals sign (=).

- b. *Kâğıt oyna=n-an, sigara iç=il-en oda-nın açık*  
 card play-PAS-SF cigarette smoke-PAS-SF room-GEN open  
*kapı-sın-a git!*  
 door-POSS3S-DAT go  
 ‘Go to the open door of the room where one is smoking and playing cards.’

Quite frequently constructions are found that open with a constituent containing an anticipatory possessive plus a case marker. These constituents are in fact adverbial phrases, the cores of which are linked to the head of the RC by the possessive third person. Here are some typical examples:

- (9) a. *İç-in-de mantar yetiş-en orman ...*  
 inside-POSS3S-LOC mushroom grow-SF wood  
 ‘A wood where mushrooms grow ...’
- b. *İç-in-e atık su karış-an kanal ...*  
 inside-POSS3S-DAT sewage water flow-SF canal  
 ‘The canal that sewage water flows into ...’
- c. *Arka-sın-dan / ard-ın-dan güneş doğ-an bir dağ ...*  
 backside-POSS3S-ABL sun rise-SF a mountain  
 ‘A mountain behind which the sun comes up ...’
- d. *Üzer-lerin-den buz-lar sark-an ağaç-lar-la kaplı orman ...*  
 surface-POSS3P-ABL icicle-PLUR hang-SF tree-PLUR-INS covered wood  
 ‘A forest covered with trees from which icicles were hanging ...’
- e. *Hüseyin ben-i orta-sın-da çeşme ol-an bir küçük*  
 Hüseyin I-ACC middle-POSS3S-LOC well ol-SF a small  
*meşdan-a getir-di.*  
 square-DAT take-PAST1  
 ‘Hüseyin took me to a small square with a well in the middle.’

## 2. The main problem(s) in previous work

The main problem in the plethora of linguistic writings on Turkish relative clauses is undoubtedly how to account for the exceptions to the apparently well-established distinction between the subject participle and the non-subject participle. Rather than going into all possible approaches and solutions brought up since the first time the phenomenon of the “deviant” occurrence of the subject participle was addressed, I would prefer to pick out three works which clearly mark certain insights relevant for the analysis to be presented in section 4.

2.1. Ciopiński (1969: 59) mentions that the *bülbül*-type of construction received some attention in the larger grammars of Turkish, or in his words “*les grammaires monumentales*” [comprehensive grammars] (referring to Deny 1921 and Kononov 1956), but also that they are mostly neglected in textbooks and manuals (referring to Jansky (1943) and Lewis (1965)), a fact which he attributes to their low frequency of use, stating: “*probablement à cause de leur emploi, relativement rare*” [probably because of their relatively low usage].

Ciopiński sketches the structure of this construction in terms of lexical categories. A noun in the nominative is followed by a verb (intransitive or passive) in the form of a present participle (= SP), and this group (*groupe déterminatif* [modifying word group]) modifies a third element N. Furthermore, he states that the first noun is the logical subject of the participle and that there are no other formal indications about the syntactic relations between the nouns. Interestingly, a practical problem for Ciopiński is how to formulate a strategy that facilitates easy learning of this grammatical structure. In other words, when can a noun in the nominative plus an SP be used to modify a second noun? His solution is both bafflingly easy and elegant: it can be done by deriving logical inferences and offering them as paraphrases. Hence, *bülbül öten yer* is remodeled into *Bu yerde bülbül ötüyor* ‘At this place (here) the nightingale sings/nightingales sing’ and *Bülbül bu yerde ötüyor* ‘The nightingale sings at this place (here)’. We will return to this matter in section 4. Ciopiński (1969: 63), however, devotes only a few words on how the *bülbül*-type relates to constructions based on an OP. He states that this type of construction, with a genitive marked subject and a participle containing a possessive suffix, gives a more exact meaning, while the first type of construction, giving a vaguer meaning, are much lighter (“*Ces constructions donnent un sens plus exact, tandis que les premières, en donnant un sens plus vague, sont beaucoup légères.*”). The choice between the two types of participle, then, is made accordingly: the SP is preferred when the logical subject lacks individuality (“*Les constructions du type bülbül öten yer sont employées de préférence quand le sujet logique du déterminant n’a pas d’individualité*”).

2.2. Erdal (1981) adopts an analysis based on the “status” of the head in relation to the participle. He uses notions such as place, destination, and origin. These are usually associated with semantic roles or functions that are expressed as case markers or in terms of syntactic positions.<sup>6</sup> His examples include:

- (10) a. *Yangın çık-an bir Amerikan uçak gemi-sin-de ...*  
           fire break.out-SF a American airplane ship-CM-LOC  
           ‘On an American aircraft carrier where a fire broke out ...’

6 In Erdal’s analysis, clause initial adverbial phrases, as in (9 a-e), are termed “possessor of X”, and X is the presumed semantic role of the head. Thus, example (9a) opens with a “possessor of place” (*içinde*) and (9b) with a “possessor of destination” (*içine*).

- b. *Duman kaç-an göz-ün-ü ovuştur-arak ...*  
 smoke get.into-SF eye-POSS3S-ACC rub-CONV  
 ‘While rubbing his eye(s), into which smoke had gone ...’
- c. *Kan sız-an yer-ler-e toprak ekele-me-ye başla-dı.*  
 blood leak-SF place-PLUR-DAT earth sprinkle-INF-DAT begin-PAST1  
 ‘He began to sprinkle earth on the places that blood was leaking from.’

In Erdal’s view, the relation in example (10a) between the participle *çık-an* ‘broke out’ and the head of the RC *uçak gemisi* ‘aircraft carrier’ is one of location, in example (10b) the relation between the participle *kaç-an* ‘getting into’ and the head of the RC *göz-ü* ‘his eye’ is one of destination, and finally, what underlies the relation between *sız-an* ‘leaking’ and the head of the RC *yer-ler* ‘places’ in (10c) is origin. Indeed, following Ciopiński, one could say things along the lines of *Bir Amerikan uçak gemi-sin-de yangın çık-tı* ‘A fire broke out on an American aircraft carrier’, *Göz-ün-e duman kaç-tı* ‘Smoke has gone into his eye(s)’, and *Bu yer-ler-den kan sız-ıyor* ‘Blood was/is leaking from these places’. In my opinion these “roles” are only relevant for the description of the paraphrases in terms of what type of adverbial constituents can be expected. They are not a part of the verbal semantics; adverbial constituents are satellites and not arguments. Furthermore, certain verbs may be accompanied by adverbial phrases with different case markings, possibly in the same clause at the same time. It was assumed that *kan sız-an yer-ler* correlates with *Bu yer-ler-den kan sız-ıyor*, but since *sız-* with a ablative complement means ‘to trickle out of, to leak from’, and with a dative complement ‘to trickle into, to leak into’, the intended meaning of, for instance, *su sız-an duvar-lar* ‘walls onto/from which water leaks’ can only be inferred from the context or situation and I think a detail such as ‘onto’ or ‘from’ is in many a case not even relevant. What is more important is the general image generated of such a wall: damp, wet or soaked with water. What the reader or hearer makes of such structures may also depend on available case recovery strategies (see Haig 1998b).

The above observations lead to the conclusion that the relation between head and verb is irrelevant for the form of the participle; all heads of the RCs in (6)–(10) are not the subject of the participle, although it is the SP that occurs. This is in contrast with Erdal’s line of thought. It is understandable because in many cases (but probably not all) two types of constructions can be contrasted which are apparently built up with the same lexical material but differ in grammatical elements. In this way, (11a) can be opposed to (11b):

- (11) a. *Yangın çık-an Amerikan uçak gemi-sin-de ...*  
 fire break.out-SF American airplane ship-CM-LOC  
 ‘On the American aircraft carrier where a fire / fires broke out ...’



- b. *Yangın-ın çık-tığ-ı*                      *Amerikan uçak*                      *gemi-sin-de ...*  
 fire-GEN break.out-OF-POSS3S American airplane ship-CM-LOC  
 ‘On the American aircraft carrier where the fire broke out ...’

Quite often the choice (and hence, its form) of the participle is thought to be related to the type of subject involved, and the problem is reformulated in terms of what type of subjects might be excluded from the *bülbül*-type of construction. Semantic features such as “human being” and “animate being”, as well as pragmatic notions such as definiteness, specificity, and individuation are presented as possible factors and even a link with oppositions such as *bir kadın şapka-sı* ‘a lady’s hat’ and *bir kadın-ın şapka-sı* ‘the hat of a lady’ is mentioned.

In order to get a more solid grip on the construction under scrutiny, Erdal (1981: 29–45) directs his attention to a great variety of authors (from 1895 to 1975) who have all commented on this type of construction. The following points in his evaluation are significant. First, demonstratives, pronouns and proper names are excluded as subjects in the *bülbül*-type of construction. Second, the subjects are all non-referential. Third, this type of construction is productive, and not a mere remnant of an archaic type of construction that lives on in the form of proverbs (cf. (6d)), as for instance advanced by Underhill 1972 (quoted by Erdal (1981: 36)). Some literary examples contra Underhill are:

- (12) a. *Et gir-me-yen yemek-te tat ol-ur mu?*  
 meat enter-NEG-SF food-LOC taste occur-PRES2 Q  
 ‘Is there [any] taste in food where no meat went in?’  
 b. *Rüzgar gir-en bir pencere aralığ-ın-ı kağıt-la tıka-di.*  
 wind enter-SF a window crack-CM-ACC paper-INS stuff-PAST1  
 ‘He stuffed with paper a window crack where wind came in.’

Fourth, there are several allusions in Erdal’s article to the fact that the construction with the SP (the participle ending in *-(y)En*, that is) is ancient, and that the OP (participle in *-TIK*), according to Deny (1921), is a “relatively recent Ottoman innovation”. We will return to this matter in section 5.

2.3. Haig (1998a), in his monumental study on Turkish relative clauses, ventures to develop a systematic and exhaustive account of the circumstances under which subject and object clauses are formed. As for the *bülbül*-type of construction, he claims that the structure of the noun phrase representing the *bülbül*-part (the subject) cannot sufficiently be explained in terms of definiteness, specificity, or referentiality alone, and tries to show that an adequate account should be based on three interacting parameters: control, individuation, and the conditions determining the occurrence of the anticipatory possessive. The work is amply illustrated by examples that were also published by Erdal (1981), and by further examples drawn from a corpus. The main prob-

lem is the nature of the subject in this type of construction, and Haig's account dispenses with the notion of subject incorporation, though on other grounds than does Cagri (2009), who in turn rejects the claims by Öztürk (2009) which are in favor of incorporation.

Haig (1998a: 184) gives the following summary of his findings:

1. Subjects<sup>7</sup> are overwhelmingly the subjects of low control combinations, i.e. the non-human subjects of low-activity intransitives.
2. Precisely quantified subjects, e.g. with *bir*, never occur as subjects, unless the relative clause contains an anticipatory possessive.
3. Personal pronouns, nouns with normal possessive morphology, demonstratives, nouns modified by adjectives created from the adjectival suffix *-ki* are never subjects.
4. Subjects occur with only two transitive predicates: *sok-* 'sting', and *bas-* 'overgrow'. Even here, their occurrence is bound to extremely specific conditions: They are minimally individuated, the relative clause contains an accusative-marked anticipatory possessive, and the subject is [-human].

Before I present some comments on these four points, I would like to give some more data relevant for the evaluation in section 4.

### 3. More Data

Recall Ciopiński's remark about the frequency of use: "relatively low". Now, take into consideration that at the time of writing, in order to find and copy a suitable exemplar of this type of construction he probably had no other means to tap literary sources than the manual perusal of huge piles of books and newspapers. Modern computer applications for searching through massive corpora reveal however that the *bülbül*-type of construction is very productive and that it occurs much more frequently than would be expected on the basis of such a statement. Also, frequency alone shouldn't be the standard for judging whether a construction should be included in a manual or textbook. The guiding principle is usefulness. But apart from that, the construction has never suffered from a lack of interest in linguistic circles, particularly because it seems extremely hard to point out a sufficient number of factors to exhaustively account for its make-up. Perhaps this justifies just another modest attempt.

A crucial clue for an alternative characterization of the *bülbül*-type of construction was introduced in Ciopiński (1969: 60). What he did was to remodel a sequence of N1+SP+N2 into a logical inference that forms, as it were, an appropriate answer to the question 'What is going on at N2?'. In this way, *bülbül öten yer* can be paraphrased as *Bu yerde bülbül ötüyor* 'At this place (here) the nightingale sings / nightingales sing' and as *Bülbül bu yerde ötüyor* 'The nightingale sings at this place

7 In the original text Haig prefers the term "semi-subject" over "genitiveless subject" for subjects of the *bülbül*-type of construction.

(here)’. Now, for educational purposes, one could say that when either of the derived propositions is true, the *bülkül*-type of construction may be employed. This seemingly simple trick for determining if the construction matches the concept to be expressed is solely based on one particular feature of the head of the construction: its position in relation to the event described.

The answer is that the head of the construction denotes a place, a location.<sup>8</sup> This is indeed the case with *toprak* ‘land’ in (6a, 7a), *delik* ‘hole’ in (6b), *yer* ‘place’ in (6c, 10c), *ev* ‘house’ in (6d), *otel* ‘hotel’ in (7b), *alan* ‘field’ in (7c), *kent* ‘city’ in (7d), *mutfak* ‘kitchen’ in (8a), *oda* ‘room’ in (8b), *orman* ‘wood, forest’ in (9a), *kanal* ‘canal’ in (9b), *dağ* ‘mountain’ in (9c), *ağaç* ‘tree’ in (9d), *meydan* ‘square’ in (9e), *gemi* ‘ship’ in (10a), *göz* ‘eye’ in (10b). With the exception of *gemi* ‘ship’ in (10a) and *göz* ‘eye’ in (10b), all these nouns can be conceived of as denoting a *place* rather than a *thing*.<sup>9</sup> This interpretation in terms of a location is typical of immovable goods (land, forest, canal, house, etc.), but words for movable goods (“things”) can also to a great extent be used to indicate a place, that is, the place where something happens.

The constructions exemplified in (6)–(9) all show a minimal inventory: they are all based on the pattern N-V-SF-N in which the head is a place noun. In case the head of the relative clause is primarily to be regarded as a noun denoting a thing, an adverbial phrase is likely to occur. Such adverbial phrases always occur in the form of a noun<sup>10</sup> which is “linked” to the head via the anticipatory possessive (third person). This can be exemplified by:

- (13) a. *Alt-in-a* / *üst-ün-e* *toz* *düş-en masa-lar* ...  
underside-POSS3S-DAT / top-POSS3S-DAT dust fall-SF desk-PLUR  
‘The desks under/on top of which dust drifts down ...’
- b. *Alt-in-dan* *duman* *çık-an* *kapt* ...  
underside-POSS3S-ABL smoke come.out-SF door  
‘The door from under which smoke is coming out ...’

8 Erdal (1981: 33) rejects Kononov’s idea (cited as Kononov 1956: 452–453) of an “attributive phrase expressing circumstances of *time* and *place*”, because of transitive verbs and other exceptions.

9 A motivation for the distinction between place and thing readings for nouns is given in Mackenzie (1992). The relevance for Turkish is set forth in Van Schaaik (2002: 242f) and application of these concepts to an analysis of postpositions is presented in Van Schaaik (2011).

10 These nouns often denote a side, area or space and can lexically be categorized as Relative Place Nouns, e.g. *alt* ‘underside’, *üst* ‘top’, *ön* ‘front’, *arka* ‘back’, *yan* ‘side’ etc. For details, see Van Schaaik (2011).

Although at first glance the head in these examples denotes a thing (a physical object), the purport of these statements is to indicate that the tables in (13a) are the places where dust comes/came down and that the door in (13b) is the place from which smoke emerges. This is, of course, strongly supported by the introductory adverbial phrases based on a noun indicating the exact spot relative to the larger object (*in casu*, the thing referred to by the head).

Sometimes it takes a bit of imagination to see that a noun such as ‘tea’, which may primarily be associated with a hot liquid, can also be used to refer to a shrub of the botanical genus tea, a sort of tea, a business or trade (e.g. *My brother in law is in tea*) or even a region where tea is grown. This is the case in (14).

- (14)      *Üzer-in-e*              *kar*    *yağ-an tek*    *çay*    *Türk*    *çay-ı-dir.*  
top-POSS3S-DAT    snow    fall-SF    sole    tea    Turk    tea-CM-EMPH  
‘The only tea [variety] on which snow falls is Turkish tea.’

In the following examples too it is apparently expedient to specify some exact spot in relation to the head as a whole. Such a specification is usually a Relative Place Noun, as in (15 a–b), but nouns denoting some part or component of the head are also not uncommon, as in (15c).

- (15) a. *Üst-ün-den*              *tren*    *geç-en köprü-nün alt-ın-dan*              *geç-ti-m.*  
top-POSS3S-ABL    train    pass-SF    bridge-GEN under-POSS3S-ABL    pass-PAST1-1S  
‘I went under a bridge on which trains pass.’
- b. *Tam*    *orta-sın-da*              *kapı*    *bulun-an dümdüz,*  
right    middle-POSS3S-LOC    door    be-SF    straight  
*yalın*    *bir duvar*    *var-dı.*  
clear    a    wall    exist-PROJ1  
‘There was a straight clear wall where there was a door right in the middle.’
- c. *Namlu-ların-dan*    *hafifçe duman çık-an*              *top-lar...*  
barrel-POSS3P-ABL    lightly smoke come.out-SF    cannon-PLUR  
‘Cannons where some smoke was spiraling up from their barrels ...’

Shorter variants of (15a) and (15b), for instance *tren geç-en köprü* and *kapı bulun-an duvar*, are mostly judged by native speakers as ungrammatical, especially when they occur without context. A possible reason is that such chunks do not give enough information to create a mental picture of what is happening: What is what doing to what? For the shorter *köprü*-variant, there are two factors that might explain why there is friction. Firstly, the verb *geç-* is used with different case markers, depending on the shade of meaning to be expressed. In its (transitive) sense of ‘to cross, to span’ its object requires the accusative, as exemplified in (16 a–b):

- (16) a. *Bu köprü Boğaz-ı Ortaköy-de geç-ecek.*  
 this bridge Bosphorus-ACC Ortaköy-LOC cross-FUT  
 ‘This bridge will cross the Bosphorus in Ortaköy.’

- b. *İstanbul Boğaz-ı’nı geç-en köprü-ler ...*  
 Istanbul strait-CM-ACC cross-SF bridge-PLUR  
 ‘(The) bridges crossing / spanning the Bosphorus ...’

But in the sense of ‘to pass’, *geç-* takes a so-called oblique object with typical ablative marking, thereby indicating the path along which the passing takes place. It should come as no surprise then that ‘cross the bridge’ is rendered by the Internet dictionary *tureng.com* as *köprüden geçmek* and *köprüyü geçmek*.

Secondly, we can say that the role of *köprü* ‘bridge’ is ambiguous in relation to *tren* ‘train’ (in 15a), since some bridges are built to cross a railroad so that the train passes under the bridge, while other bridges prioritize trains by having them pass on top. Now, using an adverbial phrase of “the right format” (relative place noun linked to the head through the anticipatory possessive third person plus the appropriate case marker), it is indicated beforehand that the hearer should be prepared for a non-standard interpretation of the participle.

A similar strategy of avoiding ambiguity can be shown to be at work in other constructions as well. In (17 a–b) the head (*yer* ‘place’) of the relative clause is clearly a place noun, but in (17c) the head (*baca* ‘chimney, funnel’) is not, and as a matter of consequence, “locational” specification is provided for by the adverbial phrase *deliğ-in-den* ‘from its opening’.

- (17) a. *Duman çık-an bir yer-i göster-iyor-lar-dı.*  
 smoke rise-SF a place-ACC show-PRES1-3P-PROJ1  
 ‘They showed [him] a place from which smoke was rising.’

- b. *Ama tam orta-da duman çık-an büyük çıplak bir yer var-dı.*  
 but right middle-LOC smoke rise-SF  
 vast bare a place exist-PROJ1  
 ‘But right in the middle there was a vast bare place from which smoke rose up.’

- c. *Delik-in-den daha duman çık-an baca-yı gör-dü-ler.*  
 hole-POSS3S-ABL still smoke come.out-SF chimney see-PAST1-3P  
 ‘They saw the chimney from whose opening smoke was still coming out.’

Of course, in parsing a sentence, the occurrence of an adverbial phrase is not in itself a signal that some constituent with “irregular” or “deviant” morphology should be expected. Compare the next two examples, of which the first is a relative clause with ordering “SP-subject” and the second is of the *bülbül*-type of construction.

- (18) a. *Otoban-ın üst-ün-den geç-en köprü-de vedalaş-tı-k.*  
 motorway-GEN top-POSS3S-ABL pass-SF bridge-LOC say.goodbye-PAST1-1P  
 ‘We said goodbye on the bridge that crosses the motorway.’
- b. *Belki Prens-le Prenses gid-ip iç-in-den derin bir ırmak*  
 maybe prince-INS princess go-CONV inside-POSS3S-ABL deep a river  
*geç-en ülke-ler-in bir-in-de otur-ur-lar.*  
 pass-SF land-PLUR-GEN one-POSS3S-LOC live-PRES2-3P  
 ‘Maybe the prince and the princess have gone to live in one of those lands  
 where a deep river flows.’

It seems that transitivity as such is not necessarily the sole factor which determines whether an ordering “subject-SP” is grammatical or not. With bare constructions such as *tren geç-en köprü* ‘train passing bridge’, confusion might arise about what crosses what, since *tren* ‘train’ can be taken as the direct object.

Most constructions of this type are based on an intransitive verb, and hence confusion is out of the question, because any preverbal noun will be interpreted as the subject as long as the head stands for some location or other. But, as was the case with *geç-*, transitive verbs do have one or more objects. The verb *gir-* ‘to enter’ in the examples below usually goes with a dative object (compare Erdal’s ‘destination’): *ev* ‘house’ in (19a), *bir köy* ‘a village’ in (19b), and *bir orman* ‘a forest’ in (19c).

- (19) a. *Güneş gir-me-yen ev-e doktor gir-er.*  
 sun enter-NEG-SF house-DAT doctor enter-PRES2  
 ‘In a house where no sunlight comes in, the doctor will enter.’
- b. *Hiç öğretmen gir-me-miş bir köy-de okuryazar*  
 no teacher enter-NEG-SF a village-LOC literate  
*çocuk-lar bul-du-lar.*  
 child-PLUR find-PAST1-3P  
 ‘In a village where never a teacher had entered they found literate children.’
- c. *Balta gir-me-miş bir orman-da ...*<sup>11</sup>  
 axe enter-NEG-SF a forest-LOC  
 ‘In a virgin forest [a forest that had never seen an axe] ...’

The lack of confusion about what does what can be attributed to the fact that (19a) is a proverb (a first-time reader or hearer might need some explanation, though), but

11 Although this is a set phrase, the subject can be replaced by for instance *insan* ‘human being’, as in: *insan gir-me-miş bir orman* ‘forest where no human has gone into’.

the correct interpretation of (19 b–c) is warranted by the knowledge that teachers and axes enter villages and forests, and that the reverse is unthinkable.

Only a few literary examples are known which are based on verbs with a direct object. So, in addition to dative, locative and ablative, accusative case markings also occur for the object of the verb, on the proviso that the object contains a possessive marker. Such structures are in fact a rarity, mainly because of the ambiguities they can entail. In (20a) for instance *bakkal* should be interpreted as a place ‘grocer’s shop’ and not as a person, and furthermore, I assume that for most people there is a stronger association between *peynir* ‘cheese’ and *fare* ‘mouse’ when it comes to ‘eating’ than between mice and grocers (imagine: ‘mouse eats grocer’ or ‘grocer eats mouse’). Therefore I reckon that such structures are fully acceptable under similar conditions. For (20b) it is difficult if not impossible to maintain that *kız* ‘girl’ stands for a place and not for a person. Yet, this example is fully acceptable, possibly owing to the sequence ‘nose-mosquito-sting’.<sup>12</sup> The word *masa* ‘table’ in example (20c) should not be interpreted as an object but rather as the location of some *cam* ‘glass pane’. Also in (20d) and (20e) certain ‘areas’ or ‘spots’ are meant, rather than objects. Leaving out the direct objects of (20 a–e)<sup>13</sup> would predictably lead to ungrammatical structures.

- (20) a. *Peynir-in-i*                      *fare*    *yi-yen*    *bakkal* ...  
          cheese-POSS3S-ACC    mouse   eat-SF   grocer  
          ‘The grocer’s at which / where mice have eaten the cheese ...’
- b. *Cam-in-i*                      *maymun*    *kır-an*            *masa* ...  
          glass-POSS3S-ACC    monkey    break-SF    table  
          ‘The table whose glass pane monkeys have broken ...’
- c. *Burn-un-u*                      *sivrisinek*    *sok-an*            *kız* ...  
          nose-POSS3S-ACC    mosquito    sting-SF    girl  
          ‘The girl who was stung in the nose by mosquitoes ...’

12 Haig (1998: 183) points out that *sok-* in the sense of ‘to sting’ occurs only in combination with *arı* ‘bee’, *akrep* ‘scorpion’, and *yılan* ‘snake’, and for that reason (20b) might count as a type of highly conventionalized type of expression, coming close to a “fixed” way of speaking. Another such type of verb is *bas-* in combinations such as *su bas-* ‘to flood’ and *ot bas-* ‘to overgrow with weeds’. On the other hand, in the sense of ‘break out’ we find (20d) and (20e), as well as *sis bas-* ‘to fog up’ in (29b).

13 Examples (20a) and (20b) are taken from Cagri (2009: 370–371), who translates *bakkal* by ‘shop’ in (20a) and who uses *goril* ‘gorilla’ instead of *maymun* ‘monkey(s)’ in (20b). Example (20c) is an adaptation of the often quoted *bacağ-m-i arı sok-an kız* ‘the girl whose leg a bee/ some bees stung’, a muster which probably goes back as far as Underhill (1972).

- d. *Diz-ler-i titre-yip aln-in-i ter*  
 knees-POSS3S tremble-CV forehead-POSS3S-ACC sweat  
*bas-an genç adam.*  
 break.out-SF young man  
 ‘The young man with trembling knees, and on whose forehead sweat broke out.’
- e. *Her yan-in-i ateş bas-an kadın kaç-ma-ya çalış-tı.*  
 all side-POSS3S-ACC go.hot-SF woman escape-INF-DAT try-PAST1  
 ‘The woman whose face was glowing tried to escape.’

#### 4. An alternative characterization

The relevant data have now been presented in such a way that some conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, the *bülül*-type of construction could be given an appropriate name. What makes this type of construction special and interesting are that the subject precedes the so-called subject participle instead of following it, and objects and adverbial phrases always precede the subject. For the constructions represented in (6)–(20), I would suggest the name *Focus-Locus Construction*, because this appellation does justice to what is most characteristic for the construction. The part *Locus* reflects the fact that the head of the relative construction signifies a location, a *locus in quo* ‘place at which’, or more precisely, a *locus actus* ‘place of the act’.<sup>14</sup> The *Focus* part reflects the special position of the subject; it is placed in the immediate preverbal position, a syntactic position associated with the pragmatic notion of Focus.<sup>15</sup> Secondly, the *Focus-Locus Construction* can be characterized as a *presentative expression*. Such constructions are used to introduce new information (Dik 1989) to the hearer in the form of noun phrases. Simple examples in English<sup>16</sup> are: *There are dark clouds on the horizon*, and *There’s a white bird in this blizzard*. Such statements take the form of an existential construction, but the intended illocutionary effect is not to point out that something exists but rather, to indicate the presence or availability of something at the moment of speaking. A typical feature of such constructions is a locative phrase, which is understandable if one considers the idea that “to say that something exists is to say that it is located somewhere” (cf. Dik, 1989: 177, referring to Lyons 1967). In this way, existence and location can be said to be logically interrelated. The expression (specification) of the locative part is not necessary; when a statement is solely meant to present the thing(s) at hand, then statements like *There are some beers in the fridge* and *There’s beer, if you’d like some!* are more or less equivalent from a practical point of view.

14 The term *Locus Actus* is described on the web site Oxfordreference.com as follows: “Place of the act: The place where an act occurred; the place where a contract was performed”.

15 Dik (1989: 263–287) presents a comprehensive analysis of pragmatic functions. For Focus in Turkish, see Van Schaik (1983, 1998, 2001), and Göksel & Özsoy (2003).

16 Hannay (1985) goes into the relation between presentatives and existentials in English.



It is the combination of existence and location that underlies the relative clauses modeled after *bülbül öt-en orman* ‘forest where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s)’. The head of the construction represents the location and the fragment *bülbül öt-SF* describes, concisely and to the point, what specifies its referent: “there are nightingales singing”. And this latter type of expression is the presentative line of approach mentioned above. With this observation in mind the constructions analyzed in the present paper can be understood as being about “places where things happen”.

Of course, a number of similar constructions can be put forward in which, strictly speaking, not the head is a location proper, e.g. (13a–b) and (20b), but it cannot be denied that the precise whereabouts of the things denoted by both the adverbial phrase and by the head must coincide, given the part-whole relationship as formalized by the anticipatory possessive in these constructions. Although *Ali* in the following example is clearly not a place in the strict sense, it is still obvious in (21a) where some dog or another relieved itself. And similarly, in (21b), it is not too hard to determine the position of a whole pack of dogs relative to the single wolf.

- (21) a. *Entari-sin-e köpek işe-yen ve yeğen-i tarafından*  
 robe-POSS3S-DAT dog pee-SF and niece-POSS3S by  
*tartakla=n-an Ali ...*  
 push-PAS-SF Ali  
 ‘Ali, against whose robe a dog peed, and who was pushed by his niece ...’
- b. *Ard-ın-da yüz köpek havla-ma-yan kurt, kurt*  
 rear-POSS3S-LOC 100 dog bark-NEG-SF wolf wolf  
*say=ıl-ma-z.*  
 consider-PAS-NEG-PRES2  
 ‘A wolf behind whose back 100 dogs don’t bark is not considered a wolf.’

Lastly, the internal constituent order of the *Focus-Locus Construction* must be explained. The order can easily be determined on the basis of the following observations. In its simplest form this construction comprises three constituents only: (subject participle) head. The first two together tell us something about the third one. In other words, the relative clause made up of subject and participle is an attribute of the head. Thus:

- (22) *Bülbül öt-en orman ...*  
 nightingale sing-SF forest  
 ‘The forest where (a) nightingale(s) sing(s) ...’

Secondly, the overall complexity can be varied by adding all kinds of extra information. For instance, the subject may be plural and can be modified for quantity:

- (23) a. *Üçüncü kat-in-dan duman-lar çık-an bina ...*  
 third floor-POSS3S-ABL smoke-PLUR come.out-SF building  
 ‘The building where a lot of smoke came out from the third floor ...’
- b. *Su-lar-in-dan bol balık çık-an göl-ler ...*  
 water-PLUR-POSS3S-ABL much fish come.out-SF lake-PLUR  
 ‘Lakes where an abundance of fish come out [from their waters] ...’
- c. *Göz-ün-den bir damla yaş ak-ma-yan bu kadın ...*  
 eye-POSS3S-ABL a drop tear flow-NEG-SF this woman  
 ‘This woman from whose eyes there flows not a single teardrop ...’
- d. *Yüz-ü kapalı ve ağız-in-dan tek*  
 face-’her’ covered and mouth-POSS3S-ABL single  
*söz çık-ma-yan bir genç kız ...*  
 word come.out-SF a young girl  
 ‘A veiled young girl from whose mouth not a single word comes out ...’
- e. *İç-in-den bir baş, iki kol ve iki ayak*  
 inside-POSS3S-ABL a head, two arm and two foot  
*çık-an uç-ma-ya hazır bir balon ...*  
 come.out-SF fly-INF-DAT ready a balloon  
 ‘A balloon ready to fly, out of which a head, two arms and two legs are sticking ...’

Thirdly, adverbials are not unwelcome either:

- (24) a. *Bütün gece göz-ün-e uyku gir-me-yen arkadaş-ı ...*  
 whole night eye-POSS3S-DAT sleep enter-NEG-SF friend-POSS3S  
 ‘His friend, who could not sleep all night, ...’
- b. *Motor-un-dan birden alev çık-an kargo uçağ-ı*  
 engine-POSS3S-ABL suddenly flame come.out-SF cargo plane-CM  
*biz-i korkut-tu.*  
 us-ACC frighten-PAST1  
 ‘The cargo plane from whose engine flames suddenly came out frightened us.’

Fourthly, adjectives modifying the subject are rather common as well:

- (25) a. *Kolon-lar-in-dan paslı demir-ler çık-an yarım kalmış*  
 column-PLUR-POSS3S-ABL rusty iron-PLUR come.out-SF half-finished

*beton yapı-lar-ı ...*

concrete structure-PLUR-CM

‘Half-finished concrete structures where rusty iron sticks out of the columns ...’

- b. *Sürekli isli bir yağmur yağ-an kapkara gökyüzün-de ...*  
 incessantly sooty a rain precipitate-SF pitch black sky-LOC

‘In a pitch black sky from which incessantly a sooty rain falls ...’

- c. *Ağz-ın-dan asla yanlış bir sözcük çık-ma-yan*  
 mouth-POSS3S-ABL never wrong a word come.out-NEG-SF  
*gezgin bir yargıç ...*  
 touring a judge

‘A touring judge out of whose mouth never a bad word comes ...’

Fifthly, this type of construction occurs most frequently with a participle based on an intransitive verb, and hence, an object is not to be expected. Objects are only possible, or rather obligatory, with transitive verbs, as in (20a), the example with mice devouring the cheese at the grocer’s (place).

A few more remarks regarding the examples in (20 a–e) might be in place. The verbs are all transitive, given the accusative markings of the constituents containing the anticipatory possessive. Leaving these constituents out would render these constructions ungrammatical. Furthermore, the head of (20a) can be interpreted as “person” and as “place”, that of (20b) as place only, whereas all other heads are clearly ‘human’ and do not qualify for a classification as place noun. Apparently, the Focus-Locus approach does not work in these examples for locus-part of the equation. On the other hand, such constructions based on a transitive verb are extremely rare. The examples (20 a–b) were found once and the original form of (20c) is repeated over and over again without variation in the *linguistic* literature. Examples based on collocations with *bas-* (see footnote 13) occur much more frequently in texts of a *bel-letristic* nature. All in all, the number of limitations of the proposal embodied in the pragmatic analysis presented here may be rather limited in itself; setting aside (20a–c) because of possible doubts regarding their quality or frequency, one could say that in constructions with a ‘human’ head, as in (20d–e), the transitive verb is based on a collocation of *bas-*, and that the locus-part is expressed by a direct object.

Summarizing, we can say that the *Focus-Locus Construction* is in fact a relative clause which has a lot in common with a regular finite clause. It has a verbal part in the form of a participle, a subject, and other constituents, such as objects and adverbial phrases. What makes it special and interesting are that the subject precedes the so-called subject participle instead of following it, and objects and adverbial phrases always precede the subject. However, the make-up of that type of subject is conspicuous.

The type of noun phrase that qualifies as the subject of *Focus-Locus Constructions* is in fact an almost full-blown noun phrase; the only restriction is that it be

non-referential. Its form may range from *bir* + *noun* for singularity (e.g. *bir lamba yanyor* ‘a [single] lamp is on’) to *noun* + *-lEr* for plurality (e.g. *lamba-lar yanyor* ‘lamps are on’) and *noun* +  $\emptyset$  (e.g. *lamba yanyor* which can be interpreted as ‘there is light’).<sup>17</sup>

Being non-referential entails that definiteness is excluded, but at the same time the core of a non-referential noun phrase may occur in the plural (as in (23a)); it may be quantified (as in (23b–e)); and it may be qualified by adjectives (as in (25a–b)). The notion of a non-referential noun phrase is completely adequate; the occurrence of *bir* however does not imply ‘indefiniteness’ in the sense of ‘intended to construe a possible referent’ (cf. Dik, 1989: 139), but rather it is only meant to help create a *general image* of some singular individual, whereas the absence of *bir* would be sufficient to create an image of a vaguer nature and an undefined quantity.

As was pointed out in section 2, it has been suggested that these constructions could be explained in terms of subject incorporation, but the mere fact that such subjects can occur in plural form and that they can be accompanied by adjectives, expressions of quantity and adverbial phrases, argues against this idea. Moreover, the structure of a non-referential noun phrase giving shape to the subject is always identical with the ‘lean’ type of noun phrase,<sup>18</sup> which qualifies as a possible left-hand member in a nominal compound.

As for the position of the subject relative to other constituents, it is well-known that there is a relationship between the information structure<sup>19</sup> of a sentence and the places that some constituent may occupy. Generally speaking, the determining factors can be sought with regard not only to definiteness, but also pragmatic salience. To give a simple example, with *Kitap masada duruyor* the main point is to give information about the whereabouts of some previously mentioned book, and it could be the answer to a question like ‘Where is the book?’ With *Masada kitap duruyor*, however, this message can be understood as the answer to a question about what lies on the table. The latter example is meant to draw the hearer’s attention to the quality ‘book’ and not its quantity; there may be one or more books, because the singular word *kitap* does not give decisive information.

Now, the non-referential subject in the *Focus-Locus Construction* is always placed immediately before the verb (participle) and this is the main position used to draw attention to a constituent by putting it in focus, because it is indefinite, emphasized or because it contains “new” information.<sup>20</sup> These constructions are applied to make a statement about what is going on at a certain place (locus, location)—such

17 In this respect I follow Johanson (1991: 229). The notion of “individuality” is relevant for *bir* + *noun* and *noun* + *-lEr*, but not for *noun* +  $\emptyset$ .

18 This is the type of noun phrase unspecified for definiteness and which can be used to form nominal compounds, see Van Schaaijk (1992, 2002).

19 Johanson (1991) uses the term “mitteilungsperspektiv”, which is more or less equivalent with the functional perspective from which language “chunks” are presented.

20 For constituent ordering in the sentence, see Van Schaaijk (1983, 1998, 2001).

statements are presentative—and put the emphasis (focus) on the quality of the subject of the event; the attention is drawn for instance to ‘land where WATER flows and BIRDS sing’ in (7a), to a ‘kitchen where PASTRIES are made’ in (8a), and to ‘concrete buildings where all sorts of RUSTY IRON sticks out of their columns’ in (25b).<sup>21</sup>

Interestingly, temporal expressions make full use of this type of construction by applying what are known as locational metaphors. A location metaphor obtains when an event noun is used to denote “location in time and space”. In this way, in (26a) *carousal* can refer to both the *place where* and *time when* certain things happen, and *school* in (26b) may stand for a place (as in: *at school*) and for a period of time (as in: *during school*) where certain events take place. Particularly in combination with impersonal passives, Turkish makes extensive use of this possibility. Some examples:

- (26) a. *Aynı mekân-da ye=nil-en, iç=il-en, müzik dinle=n-en, dans ed=il-en*  
 same space-LOC eat-PAS-SF drink-PAS-SF music listen-PAS-SF dance-PAS-SF  
*ve kanepeler-e uzan=ıl-ıp felsefe tartış=ıl-an*  
 and canapé-PLUR-DAT lie.down-PAS-CONV philosophy discuss-PAS-SF  
*son Roma sempozyum-lar-ın-dan bu yana 2000 küsur*  
 last Roman carousal-PLUR-ABL since 2000 odd  
*yıl geç-ti.*  
 year pass-PAST1  
 ‘Since the last Roman carousel where people ate, drank, listened to music and discussed philosophy, having lied down on canapés, an odd 2000 years have passed.’
- b. *Var mı, yabancı dil-le eğitim yap=ıl-an*  
 exist Q foreign language-INS teaching do-PAS-SF  
*okul-lar-ımız-da?*  
 school-PLUR-POSS1S-LOC  
 ‘Is there [any], in our schools where teaching is done in a foreign language?’
- c. *En önemli şey-in barış ol-duğ-u belirt=il-en*  
 most important thing-GEN peace be-OF-POSS3S state-PAS-SF  
*açıklama-da ...*  
 commentary-LOC  
 ‘In the commentary, in which it was stated that the most important thing is peace ...’

21 Özçelik (2014) goes into the relation between prosody and focality in Turkish relative clauses. He analyses focused constituents in terms of “movement” which occurs mostly on prosodic and not on syntactic grounds. Similarly, the words in this paragraph that have strong emphasis are capitalized.

Hence it is not surprising that temporal nouns too have a strong correlation with the notion of place. Note that in English the relative connector can take different shapes: *when*, *in/on which*, and *that*. Compare:

- (27) a. *Bir hevenk muz ve dört kasa şampanya tüket=il-en gece ...*  
 a bunch banana and four crate champagne consume-PAS-SF night  
 ‘The night when a bunch of bananas and four crates of champagne were used up ...’
- b. *Kabile-yle yaşa=n-an gün-ler-in arasında hiç bir ayırım*  
 tribe-INS live-PAS-SF day-PLUR-GEN between at all a difference  
*yok-tu.*  
 not.exist-PROJ1  
 ‘There was no difference between the days during which one lived with the tribe.’
- c. *Çık-ma-mız-a izin ver=il-en hafta-nın ikinci gün-ü-ydü.*  
 go.out-NOM-POSS1P-DAT allow-PAS-SF week-GEN second day-POSS3S-PROJ1  
 ‘It was the second day of the week in which/that permission was given to go out.’

## 5. Evaluation

The leading question in this section is how the characterization presented above relates to the findings of Haig (1998:184). His main points are as follows.

1. The first generalization is that the verbs in his data are overwhelmingly low-activity intransitives, denoting events in which the subject has minimal control over that event. A second category of verbs is that of passivized transitive predicates, where the grammatical subject also has no control over the event (cf. Haig 1998a: 174). This he summarized by saying that: *Subjects are overwhelmingly the subjects of low control combinations, i.e. the non-human subjects of low-activity intransitives!*

From this formulation it is not quite clear to me how exactly we should understand “low CONTROL combinations” and “low-activity intransitives”. To begin with the latter qualification, intransitives are of course verbs with one argument only, and in all examples the majority of subjects in my own data are indeed formed by nouns denoting non-humans. Apart from a feature such as HUMAN (e.g. *insan* ‘human, man’ and *öğretmen* ‘teacher’), we find features such as ANIMAL (e.g. *bülbül* ‘nightingale’, *kuş* ‘bird’, *köpek* ‘dog’, *balık* ‘fish’, *fare* ‘mouse’, *sivrisinek* ‘mosquito’, *maymun* ‘monkey’); PLANT (e.g. *meşe* ‘oak’, *mantar* ‘mushroom’, *çay* ‘tea’); (natural) phenomena (e.g. *güneş* ‘sunlight’, *rüzgar* ‘wind’, *ışık* ‘light’, *ateş* ‘fire, fever’); SUBSTANCE (e.g. *su* ‘water’, *duman* ‘smoke, vapour’, *alev* ‘flame’, *yangın* ‘fire’, *kan* ‘blood’, *ter* ‘sweat’, *toz* ‘dust’, *et* ‘meat’, *buz* ‘ice’, *demir* ‘iron’, *yaş* ‘tear’, *yağmur* ‘rain’); THING (e.g. *kapı* ‘door’, *çeşme* ‘well’, *tren* ‘train’, *balta* ‘axe’, *pasta* ‘pastry, cream-cake, pie’) and ABSTRACT (e.g. *söz* ‘speech’, *sozcük* ‘word’, *uyku* ‘sleep’).

When it comes to the notion of control, not only humans can be controllers; depending on the type of verb, animals, too, to a certain extent, can have the power to determine whether or not some action will occur. Is there really a great difference in control between the singing nightingale(s) in (22) and the eating mouse/mice in (20a)? Is it this really a relevant factor? Does not the type of verb involved also play a role? When we look at the verbs that form the subject participle, the majority denote a process, in other words, a non-controlled event.<sup>22</sup> These include: *bit-* ‘to grow’, *sac-* ‘to strew, scatter’, *ak-* ‘to flow’, *yaşa-* ‘to live’, *yetiş-* ‘to grow’, *karış-* ‘to mix’, *doğ-* ‘to be born; to rise’, *sız-* ‘to trickle, leak’; *düş-* ‘to fall’, *yağ-* ‘to precipitate’. The verbs *öt-* ‘to sing’, *gir-* ‘to go in’, *çık-* ‘to come out’, *kaç-* ‘to enter’, and *geç-* ‘to cross’ can also be included as denoting a non-controlled event, but only on the proviso that the subject is non-human. With a human subject they denote a controlled action, and often undergo a shift in meaning. Furthermore, typical “control verbs”, verbs the first argument of which is a controller, are transitive verbs. And they do exist, albeit only under certain conditions.

None of this brings us any closer to answering the question of what is meant by low-activity. I believe the main point is that we are dealing with a construction which is solely meant to bring some phenomenon or event to the attention of the hearer. And control does not add much to the description of the type of verbs and subjects. In other words, it does not have enough explanatory power for a full account of the linguistic facts.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, it is hard to imagine how control and low-activity would relate to all those instances where people are involved, but not explicitly expressed, as with the impersonal passives in (8b), (25 a–c) and (27 a,b).

Another factor which is not taken into account is the way the head-noun of the subjects can be interpreted and what consequences any possible differences might have for the final analysis. Take for instance *güneş* ‘sun’, which in (9a) can be assumed to mean ‘the sun’ in the sense of ‘celestial body’, but in (6d) refers to the sun’s radiation in the form of ‘sunlight’. For words such as *demir* ‘iron’ and *buz* ‘ice’ the first sense (interpretation) that springs to mind is probably some ‘matter’, some uncountable ‘stuff’. In their plural forms these words obtain a more concrete interpretation. *Demir-ler* in (24a) becomes ‘pieces of iron (as used in construction)’ or, more precisely, ‘reinforcing iron bars’, and *buz-lar* in (9d) can be understood as ‘ice chunks’ or ‘icicles’. What we see here is a kind of ‘conversion’, shifting the interpretation from ‘matter’ or ‘substance’ to ‘object’.<sup>24</sup> This can also occur the other way around. Although *balık* ‘fish’ is an animal and hence a potential controller, in (23b) it is not some ‘individual’ or ‘animal’ that is

22 I use notions such as control, process, and action in accordance with the typology of states of affairs by Dik (1989: 89–109).

23 A domain where the notion of “control” is indispensable is subordination. See for instance Haig & Slodowicz (2006) and Van Schaaijk (2014).

24 A detailed analysis of the interplay between meaning and interpretation can be found in Ebeling (2005: 97–107).

the pivot of the statement, but instead *balık* ‘fish’ here means ‘what you catch’, or a ‘substance’ to be used as food or merchandise.

2. Another parameter that Haig brings forward for a characterization of subjects is individuation, a notion which refers to the extent an NP signifies a specific quantity or amount. In his view, a noun with *bir* or with a numeral counts as “precisely quantified”, a noun in the plural as “not precisely quantified” and a bare noun as “not quantified”. The values “precisely quantified” and “not quantified” correspond to the extremes “high” and “low” on his scale of individuation (cf. Haig 1998: 176). The conditions under which precisely quantified subjects occur is specified as: *Precisely quantified subjects, e.g. with bir, never occur as subjects, unless the relative clause contains an anticipatory possessive.*

There are counterexamples to this claim, for instance (25b). Moreover, sole the fact that combinations such as *bir* + N and N + *-Ier* do occur makes it clear that individuation is indeed something observable. On the other hand, this is not directly related to definiteness, but rather with “individual singularity” and “individual plurality”, as described by Johanson (1991: 226). Such combinations are not primarily intended as means for establishing reference, but also can be used to convey a general picture or image of quantity: one, more, or unspecified.

Conversely, Haig might have thought that the possibility to make reference is correlated to the intention of doing so. This is what he shows on the basis of example (28), taken from Haig (1998a: 185).<sup>25</sup>

- (28) [Ağz-ın-a                      bardak daya-n-an] çocuk şaşır-mış,                      kork-muş-tu.  
mouth-POSS3S-DAT glass rest-PAS-SF child be.confused be.afraid-PAST2- PROJ  
‘The child [with the glass resting against his mouth] was confused and afraid.’

Haig’s comment on the translation of this example is:

I translated *bardak*, even though it is a semi-subject, with *the glass*, and I see no other option: The glass concerned has been unequivocally identified, indeed it has been a co-topic of much of the preceding text. Note however that there is no further mention of the glass beyond this point in the text.

In my opinion Haig’s assertion that there is “no other option” is correct, but the reason advanced is incorrect. The choice in English is between ‘a glass’ and ‘the glass’, and choosing the former option would possibly lead to confusion. But it is not true that reference for the purpose of identification plays a role here. What is expressed in Turkish by (28) is no more than ‘That child with *some glass* against his mouth was confused and afraid’. The core of the argument here is the general image:

25 During a ceremony an entertainer takes a sip from a glass of water and then holds the glass to a young boy’s mouth, saying that he too will now drink from it. The boy’s mother, horrified at the thought of her son drinking from the same glass, protests loudly. Example (28) describes the situation at this point.



“child-with-glass-on-mouth”, and the fact that the particular glass happens to be one and the same as the one that the conjurer has been drinking from is true, but irrelevant for the creation of the image. It is most likely very relevant for the mother of the child, but that has nothing to do with the image created by *bardak dayanan* ‘glass resting’. The *purpose* of the latter fragment (in Turkish) is not one of *identification*, but rather, of creating an image. This is corroborated by the lack of further mention in the original text, as quoted above.

A possible cause of the confusion is that the relation *definiteness* and *identification* should apparently be taken as a one-to-one relationship that always holds. Obviously this is not so. In English one can say for instance ‘John plays the piano very well’, and in such a statement *the piano* denotes nothing more than a certain type of musical instrument, and is not meant to refer to some particular piano. Even if one finds an old friend performing a piece of music by Satie, one could say with unfeigned surprise: “Gosh, I never knew that Bill played the piano!”, and *the piano* would not refer to the instrument he is actually playing, but to his particular skill: (I never knew that Bill) ‘knows how to play an instrument called piano’. Similarly, in mentioning the means of transportation one utilizes, a definite article is quite often required in Dutch, whereas in English there is no article: *Gaan jullie met de trein, de bus, of met de auto?*—*We gaan met de fiets en te voet* ‘Will you travel by train, bus or car?—We’ll go on bicycle and on foot’. Also (9a) contains a fragment, *güneş* ‘sun’ which is duly translated by ‘the sun’, and indeed, there is no other possibility than to do so, for this word stands for a celestial body with unique reference; their referent is inherently identifiable and such words take the definite article. But to say for that reason that *güneş* ‘sun’ in (9a) is definite as well would be pedantic.

3. *Personal pronouns, nouns with normal possessive morphology, demonstratives, nouns modified by adjectives created from the adjectival suffix -ki are never subjects.*

These observations are correct and bearing in mind the idea of non-referential subjects they should not be surprising. The referents of all the categories mentioned here are intrinsically identifiable and hence definite. This makes phrases the head of which is based on such nouns and pronoun referential, and thus, they are to be excluded from subjecthood in *Focus-Locus Constructions*.

4. *Subjects occur with only two transitive predicates: sok- ‘sting’ and bas- ‘overgrow’. Even here, their occurrence is bound to extremely specific conditions: They are minimally INDIVIDUATED, the relative clause contains an accusative-marked constituent with an anticipatory possessive, and the subject is non-human.*

It is absolutely true that the majority of verbs in the *Focus-Locus Construction* are intransitive, but there are nevertheless hardly any reasons why in principle only *sok-* ‘sting’ and *bas-* ‘overgrow’ would qualify. In (20a) we find *ye-* ‘to eat’, and in (20c) *kır* ‘to break’, while *bas-* occurs in several transitive collocations: *ot bas-* ‘to overgrow with weeds’, *su bas-* ‘to flood’, *ter bas-* ‘for sweat to break out’ as in (20d), *ateş bas-* ‘to be hot all over; to glow’ in (20e), *sel bas-* ‘to flood’ in (29a), *sis bas-* ‘to fog up’ in (29b).

- (29) a. *Kurkuru'nun sel-ler bas-an toprak-lar-ın-da gece korkutucu-dur.*  
 K.GEN flood-PLUR bas-SF land-PLUR-POSS3S-LOC night scary-EMPH  
 'In the lands of Kurkuru where torrential floods occur, the night is really scary.'
- b. *Bahçe-ler-den bir koku yüksel-iyor, nem, yosun, ölmüş yaprak*  
 garden-PLUR-ABL a smell rise-PRES1, moisture, moss, dead leave  
*koku-su, sonbahar başla-dığında hafif sis bas-an*  
 smell-CM autumn start-TEMP light mist bas-SF  
*akşam-lar-a özgü.*  
 evening-PLUR-DAT characteristic  
 'From the gardens rises a smell, moisture, moss and the smell of dead leaves;  
 when the autumn starts, this is characteristic of evenings with a shallow fog  
 coming up.'

## 6. Surviving innovations

By way of a conclusion, a few words can be said about the conditions for the use of this construction. Erdal (1981: 30) quotes Deny (1921) who points out that relativization without possessive suffixes referring to the subject is the only "original" type of relativization in Turkish. Erdal also quotes Underhill (1972: 87–99), who was of the opinion that constructions with the OP (in *-DIK*) are a "relatively recent Turkish innovation" and that "we may suppose that the retention of the more archaic *-En* construction [...] must be connected with the fact that they are proverbs". Neither Erdal nor Haig agree with this point of view, and indeed, the huge number of "counterexamples" that easily can be gathered from electronic text corpora convincingly show that the N1+SP+N2 type of structure is productive and viable.

The question is why? In other words, why is this type of construction the survivor of an innovation that has led to the differentiation between SP and OP? I think that the answer is quite simple: this type of construction has survived in its specific shape because it fills a need. That is, it has specialized into a presentative statement by narrowing down the type of noun phrases involved on either side of the participle.

Whereas in ancient times possible ambiguities in transitive verbs, as in *ot yiyen at* 'grass eating horse' and *at yiyen ot* 'grass horses eat', could be resolved on the basis of commonplace knowledge ('horses eat grass' and not the other way around), because intransitives such ambiguities did not exist anyhow. A further specialization by using place nouns for N2 and non-referential noun phrases for N1, and thereby surpassing the level of a trivial construction, made it a very good candidate for survival.

### Abbreviations

1S	copula, 1st person singular	PAS	passive
3P	copula, 3rd person plural	PAST1	past tense (1): <i>-TI</i>
ABL	ablative case	PAST2	past tense (2): <i>-mİş</i>
ACC	accusative case	PLUR	plural
CM	compound marker	POSS1P	possessive 1st person plural
CONV	converb	POSS1P	possessive 1st person plural
DAT	dative case	POSS1S	possessive 1st person sing
EMPH	emphatic suffix	POSS2S	possessive 2nd person sing
FUT	future tense	POSS3P	possessive 3rd person plural
GEN	genitive case	POSS3S	possessive 3rd person sing
INF	infinitive	PRES1	present tense (1)
INS	instrumental case	PRES2	present tense (2)
LOC	locative case	PROJ1	projection suffix past
NEG	negation marker	Q	question marker
OF	form of OP: <i>-TIK</i>	SF	form of SP: <i>-(y)En</i>
OP	object participle	TEMP	temporal suffix

### References

- Barker, C. & Hankamer, J. & Moore, J. 1990. *Wa and Ga in Turkish*. In: Dziwirek, K. & Farell, P. & Mejias-Bikandi, E. (eds.) *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*. Stanford (California): Center for Study of Language and Information. 21–43.
- Cagri, I. M. 2009. Arguing against subject incorporation in Turkish relative clauses. *Lingua* 119, 359–373.
- Ciopiński, J. 1969. Remarques sur les constructions syntactiques du type *bülbül öten yer* et leur réalisation dans la langue Turque. *Folia Orientalia* 10, 59–63.
- Csató, É. Á. 1985. A syntactic analysis of participial constructions in modern Turkish. In: *Beşinci Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi, 23–28.09.1985. Tebliğler 1: Türk Dili 1*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi. 39–56.
- Csató, É. Á. 1996. A typological review of relative clause constructions in some Turkic languages. In: Rona, B. (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. School of Oriental and African Studies, 15–17 August, 1990. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 28–32.
- Dede, M. 1978. Why should Turkish relativization distinguish between subject and non-subject head nouns? In: *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4. 67–78.
- Deny, J. 1921. *Grammaire de la langue turque*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Dik, S. C. 1989. *The theory of functional grammar 1: The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ebeling, C. L. 2006. *Semiotaxis. Over theoretische en Nederlandse syntaxis*. [Semiotaxis. On theoretical and Dutch syntax]. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Erdal, M. 1981. Turkish participles and the absence of reference. In: Young, D. W. (ed.) 1981. *Studies presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*. East Gloucester, Mass.: Pirtle & Polson. 21–49.

- Erkman-Akerson, F. & Özl, Ş. 1996. /en/ and /dıđı/ crossings—Genitival NPs and sentential clauses as relative clause subjects. In: Konrot, A. (ed.) *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Eskişehir, 12-14 August, 1992*. Eskişehir: Anadolu University. 1–12.
- Göksel, A. & Özsoy, A. 2003. *dA*: A focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1143–1167.
- Haig, G. 1998a. *Relative Constructions in Turkish*. (Turcologica 33). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Haig, G. 1998b. On some strategies for case recovery in Turkish relativization. In: Johanson, L. (ed.) *The Mainz meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3–6, 1994*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 299–320.
- Haig, G. & Slodowicz, S. 2006. Control in Turkish non-finite complements. In: Yağcıoğlu, S. & Değır, A. (eds.) *Advances in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 11–13th August 2004, Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir*. Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları. 165–177.
- Hankamer J. & Knecht, L. 1976. The role of the subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of relative clause particle in Turkish. In: *Papers from the Sixth Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistics Society*, 31.10–2.11.1975. [Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics 6, May 1976] McGill University. 123–135. [Also published in: Aissen, J. & Hankamer, J. (eds.) *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* 2. (1976)].
- Hannay, M. 1985. *English existentials in Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hovdhaugen, E. 1975. Relative clauses in Turkish. In: *1. Türk Dili Bilimsel Kurultayına sunulan bildiriler 1972*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 413). Ankara. 551–554.
- Jansky, H. 1943. *Lehrbuch der Türkischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Johanson, L. 1991. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. In: Johanson, L. 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó. 225–242.
- Kononov, A. N. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Kornfilt, J. 2000. Some syntactic and morphological properties of relative clauses in Turkish. In: Artemis A. et al. (eds.) *The syntax of relative clauses*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 121–159.
- Knecht, L. 1979. The role of the genitive suffix in relative clauses: a reply to Dede. In: *Proceedings of the 5th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley. 180–197.
- Lewis, G. 1965. *Teach yourself Turkish*. London: English Universities Press.
- Lewis, G. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lyons, J. 1967. A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3, 390–396.
- Mackenzie, J. L. 1992. Places and things. In: Fortesque, M. & Harder, P. & Kristofferson, L. (eds.) 1992. *Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 218–231.
- Özçelik, Ö. 2014. An antisymmetric analysis of Turkish relative clauses: Implications from prosody. *Turkic Languages* 18, 247–270.
- Özsoy, S. 1994. Türkçede ortağ yapısı. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 21–30.

- Öztürk, B. 2008. Relativization strategies in Turkish. In: Boeckx, C. & Ulutaş, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics 4*. (Harvard University, Cambridge, May 2007), MITWPL, MIT: Cambridge. 241–253.
- Öztürk, B. 2009. Incorporating agents. *Lingua* 119, 334–358.
- Schaaik, G. van 1983. A functional analysis of aspects of Turkish grammar. MA Thesis. General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam.
- Schaaik, G. van 1992. The treatment of Turkish nominal compounds in FG. In: Fortescue, M. et al. (eds.) 1992. *Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 231–252.
- Schaaik, G. van. 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaaik, G. van. 1998. ‘İşlevsel Dilbilgisi’ nedir? [What is Functional Grammar?]. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları 1998*. Ankara. 9–25.
- Schaaik, G. van 2001. What is Functional Grammar? In: Schaaik, G. van 2001. *The Bosphorus papers. Studies in Turkish grammar 1996–1999*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 37–56.
- Schaaik, G. van 2002. *The noun in Turkish. Its argument structure and the compounding straitjacket* (Turcologica 49.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaaik, G. van 2011. Place nouns as compound heads: a short story of fake postpositions. *Turkic Languages* 14, 206–238.
- Schaaik, G. van 2014. Complications in Turkish complementation: for Eva. In: Demir, N. & Karakoç, B. & Menz, A. (eds.) 2014. *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift*. Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Yayınları. 401–416.
- Schaaik, G. van (in progress) *Turkish grammar XXL*.
- Underhill, R. 1972. Turkish participles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3, 87–99.
- Zimmer, K. 1987. Turkish relativization revisited. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) 1987. *Studies on Modern Turkish. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press. 57–61.
- Zimmer, K. 1996. Overlapping strategies in Turkish relativization. In: Rona, B. (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. School of Oriental and African Studies, 15–17 August, 1990. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi. 159–164.