Are there "Non-Restrictive" Prerelatives in Turkish?
Gulsat Aygen
Harvard University
(to appear in Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics)

Almost all languages have some equivalent to restrictive clauses on a definite head; such a construction is regarded as the core relative clause by Andrews (1975:9). Some languages have postrelatives (English, Hungarian, Papago), some have prerelatives (Japanese, Turkish, Navajo) and some have both (Quechua, Turkish, Papago). With respect to non-restrictives, , Portuguese lacks non-restrictives that modify an S; Navajo lacks non-restrictives entirely. Andrews argues that Japanese and Turkish make no syntactic distinction between restrictives and non-restrictives . In this paper I will argue that non-restrictive prerelatives in Turkish are in fact free adjuncts when they occur with stage-level predicates. In sectin 1, I will present general fact about Relative Clauses in Turkish; in section 2, the structure of prerelatives and the distinction between restrictive and nonrestrictive prerelatives will be discussed; in section 3, evidence from Stump tests will be presented to argue that NR prerelatives are in fact adjuncts in Turkish; section 4 addresses the question whether they are Free Adjuncts or Absolutes; section 5 addresses the question where they are adjoined; section 6 gives a brief introduction to postrelative nonrestrictives; section 7 presents extra evidence by contrasting the properties of non-restrictive prerelatives in general and the behaviour of NR-prerelatives in Turkish.

1.Relativization in Turkish

Turkish has been described as having both prerelative and postrelative constructions (Underhill 1974, Andrews 1985 among others). Turkish predominantely has prerelative constructions. The only postrelative construction available is the one which employs a Complementizer *ki*, an equivalent of the relative pronoun *that* in English, whic was borrowed from Persian. Postrelatives are distinct from prerelatives not only in position but also in other syntactically relevant aspects:

Prerelatives
    (i)   have a nominalized predicate with a special morphology;
    (ii)   don't have a Complementizer[1]
    (iii)   are non-finite

Postrelatives
    (i)   have fully inflected verbal predicates;
    (ii)   have a Complementizer;
    (iii)   are finite

2. Prerelatives

Turkish prerelatives are participial constructions where the verb of the relative clause appears in a non-finite form. The predicate of the relative clause is marked either with a specific "subject relativizer" morpheme, *-yAn*, or the "object relativizer" *–DIK* or *–ECEK*. (Underhill

---

[1] In fact, it has been claimed that the morphology of the so called " object nominalizer"-*DIK* morpheme consists of Tense *-DI* and a complementizer *-k* (Kural 1993). Recent study on extraction possibilities and consequences of T-to-C in Turkish (Tosun 1999) indicate that there is no overt Complementizer in such structures nor is there overt Tense.

1970, Hankamer&Knecht 1976, Kornfilt 1996). (1) below is an instance of subject relativization where no agreement morphology appears on the subject; (2) is an instance of object relativization where the subject is in the genitive case and the predicate agrees in person and number with the subject of the RC:

    (1) [Ankara-ya gid-en] cocuk …………..
               -dat go-rel child
    'The child who goes/went to Ankara'

    (2) [Hasan-in   gor-dug-u] cocuk
           -gen see-rel-agr child
    'The child Hasan saw'

Although subject and object relativization have formerly been distinguished by the appearance of the above mentioned morphology, Ozsoy (1994) argues that this generalization does not cover the distribution of the morphemes *–yAn* and *–DIK*. In (3-4) below –yAn appears when the head of the RC is not necessarily the subject:

    (3) [kopeg-I havla-yan] cocuk
       dog-pos bark-rel   child
    'The child whose dog barks/is barking'
    (4) [yan-I-nda gokdelen yuksel-en] bina
       side-pos-loc skyscraper rise-rel building
    'The building next to which rises a skyscraper'

Ozsoy (1994) accounts for the distribution by claiming that AgrP heads both *–yAn* and *–DIK* constructions; Agreement is (+) in *–DIK* relativization, and (-) in *–yAN* relativizations where the subject need nor raise to Spec AGR.

2.1. Restictive /Nonrestrictive prerelatives in Turkish

With respect to morphology and surface form, restrictive and nonrestrictive prerelatives do not exhibit any differences, which seems to conform to the claim that Turkish does not make any formal distinctions between the two. (5) below is a restrictive prerelative and (6) is what has always been claimed to be a "nonrestrictive prerelative":

    (5) Irak-tan don-en   adam,   ulus-a   seslen-ecek   R(estrictive)
         -abl return-rel man   nation-dat address-fut
     'The man who has returned from Iraq, will address the nation'

    (6) Irak-tan don-en Ecevit, ulus-a   seslen-ecek
    N(on)R(estictive)
         -abl return-rel   nation-dat address-fut
     'Ecevit, who has returned from Iraq, will address the nation'
    'Having returned from Iraq, Ecevit will address the nation'

Note that (6) has a reading where the subordinate clause has a causal relation to the matrix.

    Q; Is it true that Turkish makes no formal distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive prerelatives? Are they adjuncts?

3. Adjuncts and NR-prerelatives:

Quirk et al (1972) attribute a "semantic quality of adapting to context" to free adjuncts and absolutes, nonrestrictive clauses and clauses introduced by the conjunction "and".Kruisinga (cited in Quirk et al 1972) argues that all free adjuncts and absolutes express attendant circumstances. According to Stump (1985), "It's not clear that inferences regarding the logical role of a nonrestrictive relative clause or a coordinate clause have precisely the same status as those pertaining to the role played by a free adjunct or absolute". Stump proposes a test for the nature of causal connection to determine whether the "inferences regarding the logical role of a nonrestrictive relative clause or a coordinate clause have the same status as those pertaining to the role played by a free adjunct or absolute". He argues that anyone uttering (7-9) below might be trying to establish some causal connection between the fact that John is an Englishman and the fact that he is brave.

(7) John, who is an Englishman, is brave.

(8) John is an Englishman, and he is brave.

(9) John, being an Englishman, is brave.

In (7&8) the causal connection is merely suggested-one could reply to either of sentences with (10) but hardly with (11):

(10) Are you implying that John is brave **because** he is an Englishman?

(11) No, that's not why he's brave.

The utterance in (9) asserts the causal connection. (9) is different from (7&8) in that "what is inferred in (9) is actually felt to be part of what is asserted" (Stump 1985:22).
(12-16) is an illustration of the same test in Turkish. (12) is the so called "nonrestrictive prerelative", (13) an instance of coordination and (13) bears a typical "reason clause", an adjunct:

(12)Ankara'da otur-an Hasan Basbakan-la   gorus-tu.
     Ankara-loc live-rel   Prime Minister-ins meet-past
   'Hasan, who lives in Ankara, met the Prime Minister'

(13)Hasan Ankara'da otur-uyor ve Basbakan-la   gorus-tu.
              -loc live-prog and Prime Minister-ins meet-past
   'Hasan lives in Ankara and he met the Prime Minister'

(14)Ankara'da oturdugundan, Hasan Basbakan'la gorustu.
         Loc live-nom-agr-abl   Prime Minister-ins meet-past
'Because he lives in Ankara, Hasan met the Prime Minister'

If a causal connection is suggested, the answer would be (15) but not (16):

(15)Hasan'in Ankara'da oldugu icin mi Basbakan'la gorustugunu ima ediyorsun?
        'Are you implying that Hasan met the Prime Minister because he lives in Ankara?'

If a causal connection is asserted, (16) would be a better answer than (15):

(16)Hayir, Basbakan'la gorusmesinin nedeni bu degil.
'No, that's not the reason why Hasan met the Prime Minister'

When there is a modal in the superordinate clause (16) is a possible answer for (12 and 14), given as (17-8) below:

(17)Ankara'da otur-an Hasan Basbakan'la gorus-ebil-di.   "NR"prerelative
      Ankara-loc live-rel   Prime Minister-ins meet-mod-past
   'Hasan, who lives in Ankara, could meet the Prime Minister'

(18)Ankara'da oturdugundan, Hasan Basbakan'la gorus-ebil-di.   Reason clause
        Loc live-nom-agr-abl   Prime Minister-ins meet-mod-past
     'Because he lives in Ankara, Hasan could meet the Prime Minister'

Stump argues that a F(ree) A(djunct) or an absolute serves as the argument of an expression whose interpretation either fully determines its logical role or greatly limits the range of logical roles which it may play. He particularly notes that modals and frequency adverbs are such operators. "Pseudo-prerelatives " in Turkish must be either FAs or absolutes since they behave exactly like the adjunct (reason clause) in its behaviour as the argument of modals.

Q: Are "pseudo-NR prerelatives" in Turkish FA's or absolutes?

4.Free Adjuncts and Absolutes

4.1. NR-prerelatives as FAs

In modal sentences weak FAs function as "if" clauses, with stage-level predicates. The "NR-prerelatives" in Turkish behave similarly:

(19) Yurtdisi-ndan gel-en   Ecevit ulus-a   seslen-ir-di[2].   "if" clause reading available.
        Abroad-abl   come-rel   nation-dat address-aor-past
(i)'Ecevit, used to address the nation (when) he came from abroad'
(ii)'If he came from abroad he would address the nation'

Stump (1985) shows that free adjuncts, like time adverbs, can be used to restrict the interpretation of an adverb of frequency. Turkish "NR-prerelatives" behave similarly FAs with frequency adverbs as well. In (20) below, the "NR-prerelative) specifies the sort of interval quantified by *cogunlukla/ usually*:

(20)Yurtdisi-ndan gel-en Ecevit, cogunlukla ulus-a seslen-ir.
Abroad-abl come-rel   usually nation-dat address-aor
'Ecevit, who comes from abroad, usually addresses the nation'

---

[2] Note that the morphological make up of the matrix predicate is identical to that of a consequent clause in a conditional.

The interval quantified by the adverb is specified as: most of the times Ecevit comes from abroad, he addresses the nation. Set of time intervals are expressed by the free adjunct. When a free adjunct serves as an argument of an adverb, its nature is expected to be temporal (Stump 1985). The so called NR-prerelative in Turkish , in fact , is a FA serving like a "when" type temporal clause with stage-level predicates.

4.2. NR-prerelatives as Absolutes

From a semantic view, absolutes are similar to Fas; they serve as arguments to adverbs and modals. Their semantic behaviour depend on the nature of their predicate as well. In Turkish, the "NR-prerelatives" behave as strong absolutes with individual-level predicates:

(21) Anne-si   doktor ol-an Hasan, hastane-nin yol-u-nu   bil-ebil-ir.
        Mother-pos doctor be-rel   hospital-gen road-pos-acc know –mod-aor
    'Hasan, whose mother is a doctor, may know the directions to the hospital'

The " NR-prerelative" in (21) behaves as a genuine absolute, since it entails the truth of its absolute.

To conclude, according to Stump Tests, "NR-prerelatives" in Turkish behave as Free Adjuncts with stage level predicates and as *absolutes* with individual-level predicates.

5. Why can't we have NR prerelatives in Turkish?

Note that the head of NR-relative clauses are Referentials. Referentials are NPs whereas nonreferential heads are DPs in that they allow quantifiers[3]. Referential expressions do *not* denote what they denote through a variable with a predicative restriction, but directly through lexical reference of the head noun. Longobardi (1999) argues that the strategy of a language to assign object and kind reference to nominal structures is crosslinguistically parametrized: in English, referential status can be assigned to nominals without overtly realized determiners, in Romance, it necessarily depends on a D position overtly occupied either by the noun itself (N-to-D) or by an expletive article. Under this approach, Turkish, being a language with no articles, is expected to require an N-to-D movement to fill the D position.

A possible answer to the question posed in this section is that non-restrictive prerelatives are adjunctions to an NP whereas restrictive prerelatives are instances of adjunction to a DP. N-to-D movement of referential nouns in Turkish is what blocks the adjoined CP to serve as a restrictor. Although the semantics of this structure requires further study, we may detect the adjunction site of the adjuncts –the so called " non-restrictive prerelatives", which is an NP.

First of all , this construction has the participial suffix –yAn/-Dik which requires it to adjoin to a noun. A structure where it adjoins CP/IP is not even possible. Secondly nothing can intervene between this "NR-prerelative and its head Noun:

(22)[On sira-da   otur-an][Hasan]]Tarkan-I   op-tu.
        Front row-loc sit-par   -acc kiss-past
    'Sitting in the front row, Hasan kissed Tarkan.'[4]

---

[3] There are no determiners in Turkish.
[4] Tarkan is a famous Turkish pop singer!

(23)* [On sira-da   otur-an] dun[Hasan]]Tarkan-I op-tu.
        Front row-loc sit-par   yesterday   -acc kiss-past

Another property of these constructions is that they can pick up nominal wh-words as their heads:

(24)[On sira-da   otur-an][kim]]Tarkan-I   op-tu?
        Front row-loc sit-par   who   -acc kiss-past
        '*Who who was sitting in the front row kissed Tarkan?' (Intended reading)

The typical adjunction site tests, such as variable binding, WCO instances, ellipsis tests are not helpful.
        Bound variables are allowed only if the head noun is interpreted as a non- referential-as :

(25) Herkes   [takdir ettigi basbakan]-I   ziyaret etti
        Everybody admire-rel-agr   Prime Minister-acc visit-past
'Everybody visited the Prime Minister he admired'

Ellipsis test in (26) fails to help because of the accusative case morphology on the object:

(26) Maraton   kos-an Hasan-I gordum,   Ahmet-I de.
        Marathon run-par   -acc see-past-agr   -acc too
 "I saw Hasan who ran the marathon and Ahmet too(=and Ahmet who ran the marathon).'

New tests are required to be positive about the adjunction site of "NR-prerelatives" in Turkish. Interestingly, they are adjoined to NPs in a strictly local relation, yet they behave as free adjuncts/absolutes.

6. Postrelatives in Turkish

The postrelatives have a relative pronoun borrowed from Persian and they are regularly non-restrictive. They can adjoin to referential NPs or generic bare nouns (27) and CPs (28):

(27) Canan ki gunduzleri gel-mez, aksamlari hic gel-mez[5]
        Beloved RP daytime come-neg nighttime never come-neg
        'The beloved ,who does not come during the day, does not come at all in the evening'

(28) Hasan sinif-ta   kal-di   ki bu baba-si-ni   cok   uz-du.
                Class-loc stay-past RP this father-pos-acc   much upset-past
        'Hasan failed his class, which upset his father a lot'

Syntactic properties of these constructions need to be further investigated.

7.Properties of Non-Restrictives and behaviour of Turkish NR Prerelatives:

Following are the properties of non-restrictives and the behaviour of so called "non-restrictive prerelatives" in Turkish:

---

[5] Line from a poem by Orhan Veli Abasiyanik.

I. No dependency to Matrix

NR prerelatives in Turkish are relevant/dependent to matrix
    (29) Fizik oku-yan   Ayse odev-im-e   yardim et-ti
       Phyics study-rel   homework-pos-dat   help do-past
       'Being a Physics student, Ayse helped me with my homework'

II.No sctacking

Stacking is possible with NR-prerelatives as well as postrelative NRs in Tk:

    (30)Tenis oynayan , yuzen, yedigine dikkat eden Ahmet, kanser oldu! prerelative
       Ahmet, who plays tennis, swims and cares about what he eats, has cancer.

    (31) Ahmet ki tennis oynar, spor yapar, kanser oldu!   Postnominal NR
       Ahmet, who plays tennis, swims and cares about what he eats, has cancer.

III. In English, restrictives cannot follow non-restrictives-as expected:

  N   restr   non-rest
 *N non-rest   rest

  In Turkish, this is not testable because stacking is allowed to non-restrictives adjoined to a referential head noun

IV.No bound variables

    (32)Her profesor tam not   ver-dig-I ogrenci-yi   kutla-di.
       every prof   full mark give-rel-agr student-acc congratulate-past
    'Every professor congratulated the student he gave a full grade to'

    (33) Her professor tam not ver-dig-i Hasan'i kutla-di.
    every prof full mark give-rel-agr student-acc congratulate-past
    'Every professor congratulated Hasan, whom he gave a full grade to'

(32) is a restrictive prerelative. The head is a referential noun in (33) and both the bound variable reading and the restrictive reading are available. When e non-restrictive, bound variable reading is not possible. When a bound- variable reading is allowed , we presuppose the existence of more than one person named Hasan.

8. Conclusion and further questions

      In this study, I have argued that there are no non-restrictive prerelatives in Turkish. The construction which has a similar structure to prerelatives are in fact adjuncts. The evidence for this claim comes from Stump tests, which indicate that there is a causal connection between the so called "NR-prerelatives" and the matrix clause. These constructions behave as Free Adjuncts with stage-level predicates and as absolutes with individual-level predicates.
      Further evidence comes from the observation that stacking is available in these constructions and that dependency on the matrix clause is observed. These structures pick up nominal heads in a strictly local relation.

What need to be further investigated are the properties of non-restrictive postrelatives, the *–ki* constructions. Having done such a research, we can then compare them to non-restrictive prerelatives. New tests are required to determine the actual adjunction site of these structures and something has to be said about its semantics. Considering that object extraction is possible out of adjuncts in Turkish, extraction possibilities out of these constructions need to be tested and contrasted with other adjunct constructions.

References

Hankamer, Jorge and Laura Knecht. 1976. The Role of the Subject/Non-Subject Distinction in Determining the Choice of Relative Clause Participle in Turkish. *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics.* Ed. Jorge Hankamer and Judith Assen. Pp.197-219.

Keenan, E.L. 1985. Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol.2 CUP

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1996. On some infinitival wh-constructions in Turkish. *Dilbilim Arastirmalari*. Hitit. Ankara. Pp.192-215

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese language.*MIT Press.

Longobardi, Guiseppe 1999. *How Comparative is Semantics? A unified parametric theory of Bare nouns and proper names*. Ms. Universita di Trieste

Ozsoy, Sumru. 1994. Turkce'de Ortac Yapisi. *Dilbilim Arastirmalari*. Hitit. Ankara. pp21-31.

Stump, Gregory. 1985. *The Semantic Variability of Absolute Constructions*.Reidel.Boston.

Tosun, Gulsat. 1999. *Structure of embedded clauses in Turkish: T-to-C and its consequences*. Talk given at Harvard University , Ford Foundation Talks.

Underhill, Robert. 1974. Turkish Participles. *Linguistic Inquiry*. Pp.87-99.