

# UC Berkeley

## Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society

### Title

Raising in Turkish

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/31r0t9v1>

### Journal

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 2(2)

### ISSN

2377-1666

### Author

Mulder, Jean

### Publication Date

1976

Peer reviewed

Raising in Turkish

Author(s): Jean Mulder

*Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (1976), pp. 298-307

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

---

*The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

RAISING IN TURKISH  
Jean Mulder  
University of California, San Diego

0. Introduction

The rule of Raising was first proposed by Rosenbaum (1967) to account for (1) the promotion of the subject of a subject complement to the main clause subject: [[Mary succeeded] happened] = [Mary happened [to succeed]; and (2) the promotion of the subject of an object complement to a main clause object: [John believed [the snake was poisonous]] = [John believed the snake [to be poisonous]].

Turkish will be used, in this paper, to refute this and other misconceptions about the rule of Raising.

1. The Impersonal Construction

This section will show that the rule of Subject-to-Subject Raising (SSR) serves to personalize the impersonal (=subjectless) passive in Turkish and Malagasy by allowing a nominal to raise and become the subject of a subjectless predicate.

1.1 Turkish

1.1a Nominalization

When sentences are embedded in Turkish, they are generally nominalized, as exemplified in (1).

- (1) Bu adam ban-a [Ayse-nin kitab-ı o adam-a  
this man I -dat -gen book -acc that man -dat  
ver -diğ-i] -ni söyle-di.  
give-nom-3Sposs-acc tell -3Spast  
'This man told me (that) Ayse gave the book to than man.'

which has the following sentence embedded in it:

- (2) Ayşe kitab-ı o adam-a ver -di.  
book -acc that man -dat give-3Spast  
'Ayşe gave the book to that man.'

Here it appears that the tense is replaced by the participle suffix, -DIK, the subject is marked with the genitive marking -(n)In (the initial n occurs after vowels), and the nominalized predicate is marked with a possessive suffix which agrees with the subject in person and in number. Furthermore, if such an embedded clause is the direct object of a verb, the embedded verb shows the accusative marking -(n)I (the n appears after vowels). The remaining constituents (kitab-ı, adam-a) retain their case-markings as in the 'finite' clause, (2).

1.1b The Passive

The passive construction, in Turkish, is a fully productive process. Corresponding to an active S like;

- (3) Hırsız-lar ev -i yak -tılar.  
 thief -plural house-acc burn-3Ppast  
 'The thieves burned the house.'

we find the passive S, with the verb marked by the passive suffix -Il and the underlying subject followed by tarafından 'by' (as in (4) or deleted (as in (5)):

- (4) Ev hırsızlar tarafından yak -ıl -dı.  
 house thieves by burn-pass-3Spast  
 'The house was burned by the thieves.'
- (5) Ev yak-ıl-dı.  
 'The house was burned.'

Usually under the passive,<sup>1</sup> only the accusative of an active may become the derived subject. In the absence of an accusative, none of the other constituents become the subject, and the passive is then an impersonal (=subjectless) construction based on a third singular predicate.

- (6)a. Çocuk adam-a vur-du.  
 child man -dat hit-3Spast  
 'The child hit the man.'
- b. Çocuk adam-lar -a vur-du.  
 man -plural-dat  
 'The child hit the men.'
- (7)a. Adam-a çocuk tarafından vur-ul-du.  
 b. Adamlar-a çocuk tarafından vur-ul-du.  
 c. \* Adamlar-a çocuk tarafından vur-ul-dular.  
 d. \* Adamlar çocuk tarafından vur-ul-dular.

Sentences (c) and (d) show the verb vur-ul-du marked for the third person plural by -lar as if adamlar 'men' was intended as the subject. Sentence (d) is grammatical, not in the sense of 'hit', which governs the dative, but in the sense of 'shoot', which governs the accusative.

What is noteworthy about this impersonal construction - and is directly relevant to the topic of this paper - is its form when it contains an embedded sentence. A sentence like Biz masum idik 'We were innocent.' can be the dative complement of a verb like inanmak 'to believe':

- (8) (Onlar) [(biz-im) masum ol-duğ-umuz] -a inan -dılar.  
 they we -gen innocent be-nom-1Pposs-dat believe-3Ppast  
 'They believed we were innocent.'

Now consider the passives;

- (9)a. [(Biz-im) masum ol-duğ-umuz] -a inan -ıl -dı.  
 we -gen innocent be-nom-1Pposs-dat believe-pass-3Spast

- 'It was believed that we were innocent.'
- b. \* (Biz) masum ol-duğ-umuz-a inan-ı1-dık.  
 c. \* (Biz-im) masum ol-duğ-umuz-a inan-ı1-dık.

Construction (9.a) is simply the passive of (8), without the agentive phrase, onlar tarafından 'by them'. Sentences (b) and (c) show the verb inan-ı1-dı marked for the first person plural agreement as if biz or biz-im were the subject. So we see that the passive verb cannot agree with biz, the subject of the embedded S.

However, (9.a) may be further embedded, as in (10);

- (10) (Sen) [(biz-im) [masum ol-duğ-umuz] -a inan -ı1  
 you we -gen innocent be-nom-1Pposs-dat believe-pass  
 -dığ-ımız] -ı bil -iyorsun.  
 nom-1Pposs-acc know-2Spres  
 'You know we were believed to be innocent.'

where biz-im shows a double relation to ol-duğ-umuz-a and inan-ı1-dığ-ımız-ı. So in (10), the subject of the deepest S, biz-im, has been raised to provide a subject for the embedded impersonal predicate, inanmak. What we see here for inanmak is perfectly regular in Turkish and also holds for predicates which do not govern the dative.

The generalization is thus: In an embedded impersonal passive, the subject nominal of the governed clause may raise to become the subject of the embedded impersonal predicate.

Though it seems strange that the passive is required to be embedded for SSR to occur, upon closer examination we see that if it were not embedded a genitive would be left dangling without something to possess. In (9.a), the embedded subject biz is marked with the genitive marking, since it occurs in a nominalization. But if biz were raised, it would have to move into a non-embedded sentence where the predicate isn't marked possessive and so it could not appear with a genitive ending. In contrast, in (10), the sentence into which biz is raised is embedded and nominalized, so that the impersonal predicate is marked possessive and biz is able to retain its genitive marking when moving from one embedded sentence to another. So, the restriction may be stated thus: If the embedded subject is marked for genitive then it may raise and become the subject of an impersonal passive predicate if the predicate is marked possessive (i.e. nominalized).

## 1.2 Malagasy

Keenan (forth coming) describes a process of Subject-to-Subject Raising in Malagasy, which applies only to subjects of sentential subjects as illustrated in (11).

- (11)a. Nantenain-dRabe [<sub>S</sub>fa nanasa lamba Rasoas].  
 +pass +act  
 hoped by -Rabe that washed clothes Rasoas

- 'It was hoped by Rabe that Rasoa washed clothes.'  
 [Keenan (115.a)]  
 b. Nantenain-dRabe [<sub>S</sub>fa nanasa lambag] Rasoa.  
 'Rasoa was hoped by Rabe to have washed clothes.'  
 [Keenan (115.b)]

To justify this reorganization of the constituent structure, Keenan shows that Rasoa in (11.b) behaves as the subject of the matrix verb. For example, it can be clefted, take a question particle, or even raise to object.

As Keenan points out, the problem is that SSR only operates when the clause is a derived subject as it is via Passive in (11.a). When it is an underlying subject as in;

- (12) Tsara [<sub>S</sub>fa efa lasa ny mpianatra]<sub>S</sub>.  
 good that already left the students  
 'It's good that the students have already gone.'  
 [Keenan (120.a)]

SSR cannot apply since nu mpianatra 'the students' cannot relativize, cleft, question, or raise to object, as a subject of an entire sentence should.

Keenan suggests that maybe the embedded sentence in (12) is in fact a subordinate clause introduced by fa in its meaning of 'for, because'. Then the clause would not be in a subject relation, and SSR would not apply to it.

However, there is an interpretation of Keenan's data which explains why SSR applies to derived sentential subjects but not to underlying ones; Sentential objects don't fully become derived subjects and thereby give an impersonal character to the Passive in Malagasy. SSR then occurs to personalize this impersonal construction.

Keenan states that the clause marked S in (11.a) does satisfy some of the requirements of subjecthood in that (1) it occurs in sentence final position; (2) it can be questioned, whereas the active counterpart of (11.a) cannot have its object clause questioned; and (3) it undergoes what-clause formation. He further notes, though, that many of the subject tests either do not apply when the subject is sentential or else give new results. For example, sentential subjects cannot be relativized, cleft, or raised to object, and the PRO-forms for sentential subjects (izany 'that') are not marked for case and occur equally well as subjects or objects.

It seems, then, that in Malagasy sentential objects acquire a few subject properties when they undergo the Passive, but fewer properties than might otherwise be expected for the derived subject of a passive. This lack of a well-defined subject in these constructions implies that they could be recognized as typologically distinct from a canonical passive and that they are impersonal. So when the clause is an underlying subject as in (12), it is really a subject, and precludes SSR. Whereas in (11.a),

Object Raising.

#### 4. Another Impersonal Construction in Turkish

Finally, it will be shown that in Turkish, the personalizing of an impersonal passive by SSR is not an isolated instance, but characteristic of Turkish impersonals generally. To do this, let's consider the construction involving the postposition gibi 'as if/like'. For example

- (20) Ban-a [bütün develer su iç -erler] gibi görün -üyör.  
 I -dat all camels water drink-3Ppres like appear-3Spres  
 'It appears to me like all the camels drink water.'

Turkish postpositions - suffixes and independent words - follow noun phrases and govern them much as English prepositions govern the noun phrases which they precede. Among the postpositions, gibi belongs to the class which allows no suffix on any preceding noun phrase except for tense and subject-verb agreement. So in (20), the clause which precedes gibi, is not nominalized, but shows only tense and subject-verb agreement as in the 'finite' clause Bütün develer su iç-erler. 'All camels drink water.'

##### 4.1 The Non-Subjecthood of the Gibi-Clause

When a noun phrase + gibi appears in a sentence where there is no overt subject (as in (20)), it can be shown that it does not act as the subject and further that the subject nominal of the clause governed by gibi may raise to become the subject of the impersonal predicate.

First, it should be noted that the subject is always unmarked (as opposed to, for example, the accusative which is unmarked only when indefinite: 'Mehmet made money.' Mehmet para kazandı; 'Mehmet made the money' Mehmet para-yı kazandı.) Thus if the clause marked by gibi were the subject, then it would be an exception to the rule that the subject is always unmarked.

Turkish interrogative particles provide further evidence of this. For example, ne is a particle that may be used to question subjects. Sentence (21.b) is an acceptable answer to the question (21.a):

- (21)a. Ne doğru?  
 what be true  
 'What is true?'  
 b. [Hasan-ın Mehmet-i vur -duğ-u] doğru -dur.  
 -gen -acc shoot-nom-3Spos be true-3Spres  
 'It is true that Hasan shot Mehmet.'

However, ne may not be used to question a clause governed by gibi. So (22.a) is not an answer to question like (22.c) but is rather an answer to a question like (22.b):

- (22)a. Ban-a (sen) pasta-y# kes-tin gibi görün -üyör.  
 I -dat you cake -acc cut-2Spast like appear-3Spres  
 'It appears to me like you cut the cake.'  
 b. San-a nas#l görün -üyör?  
 you-dat how appear-3Spres  
 'How does it appear to you?'  
 c. \* San-a ne görünüyör?

The interrogative particle ne provides another demonstration that the clause governed by gibi is not the subject in (20).

As a last piece of evidence, let's consider a process in Turkish whereby a Nominalization + Verb may become a Verb + ki-clause. For example, when the nominalization is marked for the accusative, or for the dative (as in (23.a)), it can occur un-nominalized in a ki-clause (23.b):

- (23)a. (Ben) (sen-in) masum ol-duğ-un -a inan -iyorum.  
 I you-gen innocent be-nom-2Sposs-dat believe-1Spres  
 'I believe in your innocence.'  
 b. (Ben) inan -iyorum ki (sen) masum idin.  
 I believe-1Spres that you innocent be-2Spast  
 'I believe that you were innocent.'

A clause governed by gibi may also occur in a ki-clause, with the pronoun öyle 'so/thus' left in its place:

- (24)a. Ban-a Hasan Mehmet-e vur-du gibi görün -üyör.  
 I -dat hit-3Spast like appear-1Spres  
 'It appears to me like Hasan hit Mehmet.'  
 b. Ban-a öyle görün-üyör ki Hasan Mehmet-e vur-du.  
 so/thus  
 'It appears to me that Hasan Hit Mehmet.'

However, this alternation of Nominalization + Verb and Verb + ki-clause is not allowed when the clause is a subject:

- (25)a. Hasan-in Mehmet-e vur-duğ-u doğru -dur.  
 -gen -dat hit-nom-3Sposs be true-3Spres  
 'It is true that Hasan hit Mehmet.'  
 b. \* Doğru-dur ki Hasan Mehmet-e vur-du.

Therefore, since gibi does allow a ki-clause alternative, the noun phrase governed by gibi can not be the subject in (20), and hence, (20) is an impersonal construction.

#### 4.2 Formulation of the SSR Constraint

Returning to the issue of personalizing an impersonal predicate by SSR, consider the following sentences:



- (26)a. San-a [biz süt iç -tik] gibi görün -dü.  
 you-dat we milk drink-1Ppast like appear-3Spast  
 'It appeared to you like we drank some milk.'
- b. Biz san-a [süt iç -tik] gibi görün -dük.  
 we you-dat milk drink-1Ppast like appear-1Ppast  
 'We appeared to you to have drunk some milk.'

In the previous section we showed that (26.a) is an impersonal construction. In (26.b), biz, the subject of the clause governed by gibi has raised to become the subject of the impersonal predicate.

This process, which holds for a considerable number of verbs, also occurs when (26.a) is nominalized and embedded.

- (27) O [biz-im san-a [süt iç -tik] gibi görün -düğ-  
 he we -gen you-dat milk drink-1Ppast like appear-nom  
 ümüz ]-ü bil -iyor.  
 1Pposs-acc know-3Spres  
 'He knows we appear to you to have drunk some milk.'

Here biz shows the genitive marking that corresponds to the possessive marking on göründüğümüzü.

From this discussion and what was observed in Section 1.1, the constraint on SSR may be stated as: The subject nominal of an embedded clause may become the subject of an impersonal predicate. But if the embedded subject is marked for the genitive, then it may only become the subject of an impersonal predicate which is marked possessive.

In Turkish, SSR is, very narrowly, the relinquishing of a nominal for the sake of a subjectless predicate. While there is nothing odd about a nominal that lacks a determiner, there is something odd about a predicate which lacks a subject. SSR corrects this irregularity.

#### 4.3 The Functional Succession Principle

Section 4.1 showed that the NP governed by the postposition gibi does not act as a subject in the absence of an overt subject, while in Section 4.2 it was shown that the subject nominal of the clause governed by the postposition may become the subject of the impersonal predicate. Thus, in this construction, an NP is being raised to a subject position from a clause which does not act as a subject.

This is a direct violation of the Functional Succession Principle (Perlmutter and Postal, 1974) which states that if one NP can be raised out of another then it assumes the grammatical relation previously borne by the other. The Turkish evidence shows that the Functional Succession Principle must be revised to account for constructions such as noun phrase + gibi.

Footnotes

I wish to thank Mr. Cemal Kemal, U.C. Santa Barbara, for providing the Turkish data.

<sup>1</sup>For a few verbs, some Turkish speakers also allow the dative to become the subject of a passive; e.g., San-a bak-tım. 'I looked at you.' alongside Sen bak-ı-l-din 'You were look at.'

<sup>2</sup>Subject-to-Object Raising only applies with a small class of matrix verbs; e.g. sanmak 'to believe', zannetmek 'to assume'.

<sup>3</sup>In arguing for the cycle in Turkish, Aissen claims that the rules Passive and SOR apply in the order Passive (on the lower S), SOR, Passive (on the higher S). Pullman (1975), though, shows that step is invalid. It seems that SOR can raise a subject that has been derived by Passive, but for some reason Passive may not then apply to the derived object to yield an ordering of Passive, SOR, Passive. However this is only evidence against the cycle and has no bearing on the fact that when SOR and Passive apply to the same S, SOR must precede Passive.

References

- Aissen, J. (1974) "Verb Raising", Linguistic Inquiry V, 325-366.
- Clark, D.R. (1973) "Aspects of Proto-Polynesian Syntax", unpublished doctoral dissertation, U.C. San Diego.
- Keenan, E.L. (forthcoming) "Remarkable Subjects in Malagasy", in Charles Li, ed., Subject and Topic, Academic Press.
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal (1974) unpublished notes "Relational Grammar".
- Postal, P.M. (1974) On Raising, The MIT Press.
- Pullman, G.K. (1975) "On a Nonargument for the Cycle in Turkish", Linguistic Inquiry VI, 494-501.
- Rosenbaum, P. (1967) The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions, The MIT Press.
- Szamosi, M. (1973) "On the Unity of Subject Raising", in C. Corum, T. Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser, eds., Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.