

---

Turkish Participles

Author(s): Robert Underhill

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Winter, 1972), pp. 87-99

Published by: [The MIT Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177687>

Accessed: 22/03/2012 14:12

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*.

There are two different types of relative clause construction in Turkish. One of these is the type exhibited in (1):

- (1) mekteb-e gid-en oğlan  
 school -*dat* go -*part* boy  
 'the boy who goes to school'

which is derived from the underlying sentence:

- (2) oğlan mekteb-e gid-er  
 boy school -*dat* go -*pres*  
 'The boy goes to school.'

Here it appears that the participle suffix (-*en*) replaces the tense suffix (-*er*) of the underlying sentence. In addition, the "head noun" of the construction, *oğlan*, which appears to the right of the relative clause in the higher sentence, is deleted in the lower sentence.<sup>1</sup>

There are four suffixes which may be used in constructions of this type, but the unmarked member of the set is -*En* (having the phonetic forms -*en*, -*an*, -*yen*, -*yan*),<sup>2</sup> which we will use in our further examples.

The other type of construction, also from (2), is exhibited in (3):

- (3) oğlan-in git-tiğ -i mektep  
 boy -*gen* go -*part-3s* school  
 'the school which the boy goes to'

\* Earlier versions of this paper were read at the Winter Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, December 1970, and at the Harvard Linguistics Group, October 1970. I am indebted to Stephen R. Anderson, Susumu Kuno, Omeljan Pritsak, and Engin Sezer for discussion and suggestions, and to Sezer, Şinasi Tekin, and Aysegül Underhill for native judgments on the data.

<sup>1</sup> Because the match between tenses and participles is not exact, it is not always possible, given a participle construction, to determine the tense of the underlying sentence. We will not be concerned with this issue here.

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with standard Turcological practice, we use the symbols /D E I/ to represent segments which are not fully specified until after the rules of vowel harmony and consonant assimilation. Also in accordance with standard practice, we write "ğ" for postvocalic /g/, although we believe that these segments are not phonologically distinct. For discussion of this issue and explanation of the rules referred to, see Lees (1961) and Zimmer (1965).

Again it appears that the participle suffix (*-tiğ*) replaces the tense and that the head noun is deleted in the lower sentence. In addition, the subject of the embedded sentence is put into the genitive case, and a possessive suffix agreeing in person and number with the subject is attached to the participle. The result is something which looks like a nominalization: 'the school related to the boy's going'. There are two suffixes which may be used in constructions of this type, and the unmarked member of the opposition is *-DIğ* (having sixteen phonetic forms according to context), which we will use in our further examples.

Most traditional descriptions of Turkish do not attempt to formulate the conditions under which these two constructions are used; and for each formulation which has been attempted, there is a regular set of counterexamples.<sup>3</sup>

The most obvious generalization is that when the head noun is the subject of the underlying sentence, a construction of the *-En* type appears, while if the head noun is not the subject, a construction of the *-DIğ* type appears. Thus in the derivation of (1) from (2), the head noun *oğlan* is the subject of the underlying sentence, while in the derivation of (3) from (2), the head noun *mekteb* is in a dative relation to the main verb. This generalization accounts for a sufficient number of cases so that henceforth we will use the term "subject participle" (SP) for the *-En* type, and, by way of contrast, "object participle" (OP) for the *-DIğ* type.

The head noun of an object participle construction may be the object of the underlying sentence, or it may be in a variety of adverbial relations to the verb. For example, it may be a directional dative (as in (1)), a directional ablative, a dative with a verb which "takes the dative", an ablative with a verb which "takes the ablative", a noun in a locative or time adverbial phrase, or a noun related to the verb with the postposition *ile* 'with' (in its comitative, but not instrumental, sense).

The first set of counterexamples involves cases where the head noun is genitive in the underlying sentence, cases where English regularly uses the relative pronoun *whose*.

- (4) oğl-u mekteb-e gid-en adam  
 son-3s school -dat go -SP man  
 'the man whose son goes to school'

This comes from:

- (5) adam-in oğl-u mekteb-e gid-er  
 man -gen son-3s school -dat go -pres  
 'The man's son goes to school.'

Here *adam*, the head noun, is not the subject of the underlying sentence although it is part of the subject noun phrase; the subject is *oğul* 'son'. However, a subject par-

<sup>3</sup> The most adequate discussion is in Lewis (1967, 260-263) and Lees's review (1970, 132-135). Kissling (1960, 177-178) and Kononov (1956, 444-446 and 452-453) give a number of useful examples.

ticiples is used, and the corresponding object participle construction would be ungrammatical:

- (6) \*oğl-un-un mekteb-e git-tiğ-i adam  
son-3s -gen school -dat go-OP-3s man

For an example from a literary text, consider (7):

- (7) ana -si dağ -lar-da gez -en bir yılan yavru-su  
mother-3s mountain -pl -loc wander-SP a snake child -3s  
'A snake's child whose mother wanders in the mountains'

derived from:

- (8) yılan yavru-sun-un ana -si dağ -lar-da gez -er  
snake child -3s -gen mother-3s mountain-pl -loc wander-pres  
'The snake's child's mother wanders in the mountains.'

where a subject participle is used although the head noun *yılan yavrusu* is not the subject.

Another example is (2):

- (9) alt -i jam ol-an kayik  
bottom-3s glass be-SP boat  
'glass-bottom boat'

derived by the Turkish equivalent of *Wh-Be Deletion* from:

- (10) alt -i jam ol-an kayik  
bottom-3s glass be-SP boat  
'boat whose bottom is glass'

for which the underlying sentence is:

- (11) kayığ-in alt -i jam (-dir)  
boat -gen bottom-3s glass -decl  
'The boat's bottom is glass.'

It will be clear that in all these examples the head noun, while it is not itself the subject, is the possessor of the subject. Compare the case where the head noun is the possessor of some noun other than the subject:

- (12) oğlan-in mekteb-in-e git-tiğ-i adam  
boy -gen school -3s-dat go-pres man  
'the man whose school the boy goes to'

This comes from:

- (13) oğlan adam-in mekteb-in-e gid-er  
boy man -gen school -3s-dat go-pres  
'the boy goes to the man's school'

Here an object participle is required; the corresponding subject participle construction would be ungrammatical, at least in the same sense as (12):

- (14) \*oğlan mekteb-in-e gid-en adam  
 boy school -3s-dat go -SP man

It turns out, then, that when the head noun is genitive in the underlying sentence, a subject participle is used if the head noun is in the subject noun phrase, an object participle if the head noun is in some other noun phrase. We could therefore extend our initial generalization in a relatively minor way to cover these cases.

But now consider cases like (15):

- (15) üst-ün-de şarap dur -an masa  
 top-3s -loc wine stand-SP table  
 'the table that wine is standing on'

Compare the phrase:

- (16) masa-nin üst-ün-de  
 table-gen top-3s -loc  
 'at the top of the table = on the table'

In (15) the head noun, *masa*, is neither the subject nor part of the subject noun phrase in underlying structure; it is deleted from a locative adverbial expression, and the subject of the underlying sentence is *şarap*. Yet a subject participle is used. Consider also:

- (17) alt -in-dan su ak -an kapi  
 bottom-3s-abl water flow-SP door  
 'the door that water is flowing out from under'
- (18) üzer-in-de bir kuş otur-an ağaç  
 top -3s-loc a bird sit -SP tree  
 'the tree that a bird is sitting on'

That the use of a subject participle here is not somehow connected with the idiomatic constructions *üstünde*, *altından*, or *üzerinde*, is shown by (19):

- (19) oda -sin-da bir lamba yan -an adam  
 room-3s -loc a light burn-SP man  
 'the man in whose room a light is burning'

(Compare the phrase:

- (20) adam-in oda -sin-da  
 man -gen room-3s -loc  
 'in the man's room')

where *odasında* is not used in any idiomatic function.

Notice that in (15) and in (17)–(19), the subject of the embedded sentence is either clearly indefinite (as *bir kuş* ‘a bird’, *bir lamba* ‘a light’) or must be interpreted as indefinite (as *şarap* ‘wine’ or *su* ‘water’).<sup>4</sup> It turns out that if the subject of the embedded sentence is definite, an object participle is required:

- (21) üst-ün-de şarab-in dur -duğ-u masa  
top-3s -loc wine -gen stand-OP -3s table  
‘the table that the wine is standing on’
- (22) alt -in-dan suyun -un ak -tiğ-i kapi  
bottom-3s-abl water-gen flow-OP-3s door  
‘the door that the water is flowing out from under’
- (23) üzer-in-de kuş -un otur-duğ-u ağaç  
top -3s-loc bird-gen sit -OP -3s tree  
‘the tree that the bird is sitting on’
- (24) oda -sin-da lamba-nin yan -diğ-i adam  
room-3s -loc light -gen burn-OP-3s man  
‘the man in whose room the light is burning’

So we have a regular and interesting opposition: where the head noun is the genitive member of a locative expression, we find a subject participle if the subject of the embedded sentence is indefinite, an object participle if the subject of the embedded sentence is definite.<sup>5</sup> This seems like an unusual fact and leads us to investigate further to see whether indefinite subjects have any other syntactic peculiarities. It turns out that there is a corresponding contrast of word order in simple sentences: while the subject normally comes first in a Turkish sentence, an indefinite subject is regularly shifted to the position next to the verb. So we find contrasts such as:

- (25) su kapi-nin alt -in-dan ak -iyor  
water door-gen bottom-3s-abl flow-prog  
‘The water is flowing out from under the door.’
- (26) kapi-nin alt-in-dan su ak-iyor  
‘Water is flowing out from under the door.’
- (27) lamba adam-in oda -sin-da yan -iyor  
light man -gen room-3s -loc burn-prog  
‘The light is burning in the man’s room.’
- (28) adam-in oda-sin-da bir lamba yan-iyor  
‘A light is burning in the man’s room.’

We therefore have to recognize, at what we will show must be a fairly deep level

<sup>4</sup> The article *bir* ‘a, one’ marks a noun as indefinite, but a noun without this article may be definite or indefinite (and singular or plural); thus *üzerinde kuş oturan ağaç* ‘the tree that a bird/birds is/are sitting on’ (cf. (18)).

<sup>5</sup> The subject of the embedded sentence comes out genitive if it is definite, nominative if it is indefinite, since the object participle construction requires a genitive suffix on the subject, while the subject participle does not.

in the grammar, a rule of Indefinite Noun Phrase Movement. The unmarked order of constituents in a Turkish sentence is: subject, direct object, indirect object, verb, as in (29):<sup>6</sup>

- (29) adam taş -i oğlan-a at -ti  
 man stone-*obj* boy -*dat* throw-*past*  
 'The man threw the stone at the boy.'

We will assume that the rules of the base component will provide this order.<sup>7</sup> Now, if the direct object is indefinite, it moves to the position immediately to the left of the verb; in addition it lacks the objective suffix:

- (30) adam oğlan-a taş at-ti  
 man boy stone throw  
 'The man threw a stone/stones at the boy.'

If the subject is indefinite, it moves to the left of the verb:

- (31) taş-i oğlan-a bir adam at-ti  
 stone boy a man throw  
 'A man threw the stone at the boy.'

If both subject and direct object are indefinite, both move and the object is put closer to the verb; presumably the ordering of the clauses of the movement rule will accomplish this.

- (32) oğlan-a bir adam taş at-ti  
 boy a man stone throw  
 'A man threw a stone at the boy.'

An intransitive verb may be accompanied by an adverbial phrase, normally dative, locative, or ablative. The unmarked order is then: subject, adverbial phrase, verb, as in (33):

- (33) dana-lar bostan -a gir -iyor  
 calf -*pl* garden-*dat* enter-*prog*  
 'The calves are entering the garden.'

If the subject is indefinite, it again moves:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Those grammars that have discussed word order (Lewis 1970, 239–241; Kissling 1960, 113–114) claim that in the basic order, indirect object precedes direct object. But my informants consistently claim that the reverse order is "more neutral", i.e. unmarked. It may be that having the indirect object closer to the verb than the direct object seems counterintuitive to speakers of Germanic languages.

<sup>7</sup> Since we have no evidence to the contrary. The order exemplified in (29) must be given either by the base, or by rules applying before any of the rules discussed here, since any other variation in word order is given by Scrambling (see below).

<sup>8</sup> It seems that the indefinite subject shifts only over an adverbial phrase for which the intransitive verb is subcategorized, that is, when the adverbial phrase is part of the verb phrase in some strict sense. If we try adding a locative adverbial to (29), producing:

- (i) adam sokağ-in orta-sin-da taş-i oğlan-a at-ti  
 man street middle stone boy threw  
 'The man threw the stone at the boy in the middle of the street.'

- (34) bostan-a dana-lar gir-iyor  
 garden calves enter  
 'Calves are entering the garden.'

Compare also the derivation of (26) from a structure similar to that of (25), or the derivation of (28) from a structure similar to that of (27).

The rule moving indefinite objects has been familiar for some time, probably because of the accompanying overt morphological difference (the presence vs. absence of the objective suffix).<sup>9</sup> But the literature contains no clear statement of the rule regarding indefinite subjects. The reason may be that this rule is easily confused with the more general process of scrambling which takes place at a lower level in Turkish. There is considerable fluidity of word order in the surface form of Turkish sentences, especially in the colloquial language. Thus, starting again with (29), we can have the following variants, among others:<sup>10</sup>

- (35) adam taşı oğlana attı  
 (= 29) adam oğlana taşı attı  
 taşı adam oğlana attı  
 taşı oğlana adam attı  
 taşı adam attı oğlana  
 taşı attı adam oğlana  
 oğlana adam taşı attı  
 oğlana taşı adam attı  
 oğlana attı adam taşı

It is therefore possible that the alternations exhibited by (25)–(26) or (27)–(28) have been mistaken for simply another manifestation of the scrambling process exhibited in (35). But in fact there are a number of significant differences. The nearly

the corresponding sentence with an indefinite subject would be:

- (ii) bir adam sokağ-in orta-sin-da taş-i oğlan-a at-tı

where *bir adam* is not subject to movement by the rule we have been discussing, although it is subject to scrambling by the rule we are about to discuss. Similarly, for 'a man is watering the flowers in the garden', the possibilities, with informant's judgments, are:

- (iii) bir adam bahçe -de çiçek -ler-i su -lu-yor ("best")  
 a man garden-loc flower-pl -obj water-prog  
 (iv) bahçe-de bir adam çiçek-ler-i su-lu-yor ("good")  
 (v) bahçe-de çiçek-ler-i bir adam su-lu-yor ("least good")

It seems that the relations between transitive verb and adverbial element in these examples is not the same as the relation between intransitive verb and adverbial in (34), (26), and (28). We hope that this explains why constructions of the type of (15) and (17)–(19) are found only with intransitive verbs.

<sup>9</sup> For example, this contrast is discussed at length in Grønbech (1936).

<sup>10</sup> There are other variants which are not permitted, including:

- \*attı adam taşı oğlana  
 \*attı taşı adam oğlana

For this example at least, there is a restriction that the verb may not come first. Scrambling in Turkish is thus not entirely free.



free scrambling of (35) is only possible if all the noun phrases are definite. But if the object, for example, is indefinite, it must remain in its position in front of the verb. Thus, starting with (30), we can get:

- (36) adam oğlana taş attı  
 (= 30) oğlana adam taş attı  
           oğlana taş attı adam  
           taş attı adam oğlana

among other variants, but not:

- (37) \*adam taş oğlana attı  
       \*taş adam oğlana attı  
       \*adam oğlana attı tas  
       \*adam attı taş oğlana

There are similar restrictions with respect to indefinite subjects and adverbial noun phrases.

Indefinite Movement correlates with a clear semantic contrast between definite and indefinite noun phrases, and is obligatory. Scrambling is optional, or more accurately, correlates with differences in focus or emphasis of the noun phrases involved. In addition, Indefinite Movement must precede Relativization, because it provides the environment in terms of which we can define the use of subject participles.

Consider again the examples of the three types of construction where subject participles are used:

- (38) *oğlan* mektebe gider (cf. (2)) ⇒ mektebe giden *oğlan*  
       *adamın* oğlu mektebe gider (cf. (5)) ⇒ oğlu mektebe giden adam  
       *masanın* üstünde şarap duruyor (cf. (15)) ⇒ üstünde şarap duran masa

In each case the head noun (italicized above) is the first noun in the underlying sentence, after Indefinite Movement has applied.

If the head noun is placed first in the sentence by Scrambling, we do not get a subject participle. The simple sentence underlying (21) is:

- (39) şarap masa-nin üst-ün-de dur -uyor  
       wine table-*gen* top-3s -*loc* stand-*prog*  
       ‘The wine is standing on the table.’

from which Scrambling may produce (40):

- (40) masanın üstünde şarap duruyor  
       table on wine stand  
       ‘The wine is standing on the table.’

There are object participle constructions corresponding to each of these; (40) corresponds to (21) (and may *not* give (15)), while (39) gives the less acceptable (41):<sup>11</sup>

- (41) *şarab-in üst-ün-de dur -duğ-u masa*  
 wine -*gen* top-3*s* -*loc* stand-*OP* -3*s* table  
 'the table that the wine is standing on'

Therefore Relativization, which specifies the choice between subject and object participles, must follow Indefinite Movement but precede Scrambling.

The head noun must not only be first in the sentence, at the indicated point in the rules, but must be either nominative or genitive; a subject participle may not be used if the first noun is in any other case. Thus from (42) in which the head noun, although initial, is dative, we cannot derive (43) with a subject participle, but only the corresponding object participle construction (44):

- (42) *bostan -a dana-lar gir -iyor*  
 (= 34) garden-*dat* calf -*pl* enter-*prog*  
 'Calves are entering the garden.'  
 (43) \**dana-lar gir -en bostan*  
 calf -*pl* enter-*SP* garden  
 (44) *dana-lar-in gir -diğ-i bostan*  
 calf -*pl* -*gen* enter-*OP*-3*s* garden  
 'the garden which calves are entering'

Compare the semantically similar (45):

- (45) *bostan-in iç-in-e dana-lar gir -iyor*  
 garden-*gen* in-3*s*-*dat* calf -*pl* enter-*prog*  
 'Calves are entering into the garden.'

where *bostan* 'garden' is genitive, and consequently a subject participle construction is permitted:

- (46) *iç-in-e dana-lar gir -en bostan*  
 in-3*s*-*dat* calf -*pl* enter-*SP* garden  
 'the garden into which calves are entering'

Similar examples can be constructed to show that if the head noun is objective, locative, or ablative, a subject participle is not permitted.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> "Less acceptable" is the judgment of native speakers; a reason may be the potential ambiguity arising from the fact that the sequence *şarabın üstünde* may be read 'on top of the wine'; or the preposing of locative adverbials may be a favored form of Scrambling.

<sup>12</sup> A few proverbs seem to be counterexamples to this claim, e.g. the much-discussed (by Kononov, Lewis, and Lees) *Güneş girmiyen eve hekim girer* 'The doctor enters the house which sun does not enter', where the head noun (*ev*) must be dative in the underlying sentence; also *Ateş olmiyan yerden duman çıkmaz* 'Smoke does not come from the place where there is no fire', where the head noun (*yer*) must be locative. Since the *-DIg* construction is a relatively recent Turkish innovation, we may suppose that the retention of the more archaic *-En* construction in these sentences must be connected with the fact that they are proverbs.

The restriction that the head of a subject participle construction must be nominative or genitive leads us to see whether we can make a further generalization by finding what structural property these two cases have in common. We would like to suggest that there is a level at which nominative and genitive are not formally distinguished, namely before the application of a transformation which introduces the genitive marker.

An ordinary possessive construction like (47) has the same surface configuration as a verbal noun (gerundive nominal) construction like (43):

- (47) Ahmed-in šapka-si  
       Ahmed-*gen* hat -3s  
       ‘Ahmet’s hat’  
 (48) Ahmed-in gel -me-si  
       Ahmed-*gen* come-*VN*-3s  
       ‘Ahmet’s coming’

This configuration includes a genitive suffix on the possessor (or subject), and the appropriate possessive suffix on the possessed noun (or verbal noun); compare (49):

- (49) a. ben-im šapka-m  
       I -*gen* hat -1s  
       ‘my hat’  
       b. ben-im gel -me-m  
       I -*gen* come-*VN*-1s  
       ‘my coming’

We would like to capture this generalization by attaching the genitive marker and possessive suffix<sup>13</sup> to structures like (47) and those like (48) with a single rule. But (48) is clearly derived from a deep structure resembling a finite sentence, something like *Ahmet gel* + *Tense*. Genitive Marking would therefore have to be a transformation, and we would have to suppose that the nominalization transformation which creates (48) produces a surface structure identical to that of ordinary possessives, so that Genitive Marking could then apply to both structures.

We will not attempt to specify formally here how this is done<sup>14</sup> or for that matter,

---


For some speakers, (43) is grammatical and occurs in free variation with (44). For such speakers, a subject participle is obligatory if the head noun is nominative or genitive; either subject or object participle may appear if the head noun is dative, locative, or ablative; an object participle is obligatory if the head noun is objective (where the use of subject participle would produce ambiguity). Most speakers, however, judge (43) to be doubtful at best.

<sup>13</sup> We will operate here with the undoubtedly false assumption that the same rule attaches both genitive and possessive markers.

<sup>14</sup> It is worthwhile to undertake a brief investigation into the deep structural similarity between what (according to the above analysis) become nominative and genitive constructions.


## TURKISH PARTICIPLES

In an ordinary possessive construction, which is an NP, the possessor is also an NP, since it can be expanded to include any of the constituents of a noun phrase, including another possessor:



Ahmed-in baba -si -nin şapka-si  
 Ahmed-gen father-3s-gen hat -3s  
 'Ahmet's father's hat'

The possessed noun and its modifiers appear to form a constituent, but this is not NP, since it can be expanded to include any of the constituents of a noun phrase *except* another possessor. Thus there is no:



\*Ahmed-in Mehmet-in şapka-si  
 \*Ahmed-gen Mehmet-gen hat -3s

meaning '\*Ahmet's Mehmet's hat' in the sense that the hat is the property both of Ahmet and Mehmet.

The restriction that a possessed noun may have only one possessor NP is true for Turkish, English, and Thai and we suggest that it is universal. In this connection, note that examples in which the possessor NP includes a conjunction, as *Ahmedin ve Mehmedin şapkası* 'Ahmet's and Mehmet's hat', are not counterexamples, nor are examples in which the possessor has an NP in apposition (a reduced nonrestrictive relative), as *Ahmedin, babanın, şapkası* 'Ahmet's, the father's, hat', equivalent to *Ahmedin, yani babanın, şapkası*, 'Ahmet's, that is the father's, hat'. Also not counterexamples are phrases like *Ahmedin aşçısı şapkası* 'Ahmet's cook's hat' (where Ahmet possesses a distinctive hat worn by cooks). The phrase *aşçısı şapkası* 'cook's hat' is not a possessive in the same sense that (47) is, as shown by the fact that in Turkish it lacks the genitive suffix. In both Turkish and English, the phrases are accented differently: *aşçısı şapkası* vs. (47) *Ahmedin şapkası*. Also in both languages, adjectives and other modifiers may come between possessor and possessed: *Ahmedin beyaz şapkası* 'Ahmet's white hat', but may only precede phrases of the type under discussion: *beyaz aşçısı şapkası* 'white cook's hat', not \**aşçısı beyaz şapkası* 'cook's white hat'.

how the relativization transformation operates. But if there is a Genitive Marking rule, it must apply to at least some of the output of Relativization, namely object participles. The two object participle suffixes *-DIg* and *-EjEg* are also used as factive nominals, in constructions like (50):

- (50) Ahmed-in gel -diğ-i belli  
 Ahmed-*gen* come-*nom-3s* obvious  
 ‘(The fact of) Ahmet’s coming is obvious; it is obvious that Ahmet came.’

Notice the similarity between (50) and an object participle construction like (51):


- (51) Ahmed-in gel -diğ-i ev  
 Ahmed-*gen* come-*OP-3s* house  
 ‘the house that Ahmet came to’

(50) and (51) are clearly related and we claim that Genitive Marking has applied to both, as to (48).

It is therefore possible that nouns which would be genitive on the surface are not marked for case at the point where Relativization applies, although all other

---

For the internal structure of the noun phrase we may adapt the formalism suggested by Chomsky (1970), using  $\bar{N}$  for the traditional NP,  $\bar{N}$  for the remainder of the NP minus possessor. Thus:



Ahmed-in beyaz şapka-si  
 Ahmed-*gen* white hat -*3s*  
 ‘Ahmet’s white hat’

The point which we arrive at is that the possessor is identifiable as an initial  $\bar{N}$  in a structure dominated by  $\bar{N}$ . Now, the subject of a verbal noun construction is identifiable in the same terms. As the subject of a simple sentence, it is an  $\bar{N}$ ; the sentence, as a nominalization, is embedded under an  $\bar{N}$  node in some higher sentence.

The similarity between nominative and genitive for which we are looking seems to be related to the observation of Chomsky (1970, 211) that “the internal structure of the nominal mirrors that of the sentence”. The grammatical function of the possessor in a noun phrase is analogous to that of the subject in a sentence; this relationship is marked by the nominative in a sentence, by the genitive in a noun phrase. The difference between genitive and nominative then appears to be that the genitive marks nominal constructions as distinct from verbal constructions.

cases must be marked.<sup>15</sup> Relativization then supplies a subject participle if the head noun is initial in the clause and not marked for case, an object participle otherwise. It probably marks the head noun in the embedded sentence for eventual deletion, rather than deleting it at once, since otherwise possessives in examples like (4) (*oğlu*) would be hard to account for.<sup>16</sup> Genitive and Possessive Marking then apply to all surface possessive structures.

<sup>15</sup> They may have been marked in the base, or, as possibly in the case of the objective and some uses of the dative, by earlier transformations.

<sup>16</sup> That is, the *Doom* approach proposed by Postal (1970) may be needed here; Relativization would mark the head noun in the embedded sentence with the feature [+*Doom*], and nouns so marked would be deleted after Possessive Marking had applied. I am indebted to Susumu Kuno for this suggestion.

## References

- Chomsky, N. (1970) "Remarks on Nominalization," in R. A. Jacobs and P. S. Rosenbaum, eds., *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, Ginn and Co., Waltham, Mass.
- Grønbech, K. (1936) *Der Türkische Sprachbau*, Copenhagen.
- Kissling, H. J. (1960) *Osmanisch-Türkische Grammatik*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Kononov, A. N. (1956) *Grammatika sovremennogo turetskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moscow-Leningrad.
- Lees, R. B. (1961) *The Phonology of Modern Standard Turkish*, Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series 6, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Lees, R. B. (1970) "Review of Lewis (1967)," *Foundations of Language* 6, 122-137.
- Lewis, G. L. (1967) *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Postal, P. M. (1970) "On Coreferential Complement Subject Deletion," *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 439-500.
- Underhill, R. (1971) *Turkish Grammar*, mimeographed, Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University.
- Zimmer, K. E. (1965) "Review of Lees (1961)," *Word* 21, 123-136.

*Department of Linguistics*  
*Holyoke Center 851*  
*Harvard University*  
*Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138*