Research Square

Preprints are preliminary reports that have not undergone peer review.
They should not be considered conclusive, used to inform clinical practice,
or referenced by the media as validated information.

Turkish encodes Path at the main clause and Manner mainly in subordination: motion-event packaging in Turkish

Abdullah Topraksoy

abdullah.topraksoy@istanbul.edu.tr

Istanbul University

Article

Keywords: motion events, Turkish, path verbs, manner verbs, subordination, event packaging, motion typology

Posted Date: May 26th, 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-9389731/v1

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
Read Full License

Additional Declarations: No competing interests reported.

Abstract

Research on motion-event typology has long treated Turkish as a path-oriented, verb-framed language. That generalization is well supported at the level of the main clause, but it risks obscuring how speakers actually package richer motion scenes in discourse. This article revisits Turkish actual-motion descriptions through a structural lens, asking not only which motion verbs speakers select, but where in clause structure different semantic components are distributed. The analysis is based on two online production tasks completed by 60 native speakers of Turkish: a narration of The Pear Film and a description task using animated motion clips. Across both tasks, participants produced 5,999 clauses, 3,499 of which contained motion expressions. Main clauses accounted for 2,339 motion clauses (66.84%), while subordinate clauses accounted for 1,160 (33.15%). Motion in main clauses was clearly path-dominant, with 1,694 Path verbs and 645 Manner verbs. In subordinate clauses, however, the distribution was nearly balanced, with 577 Path verbs and 583 Manner verbs. Among subordinate clause types, adverbial clauses were by far the most frequent (789, 68.01%), followed by relative clauses (209, 18.01%) and complement clauses (162, 13.96%). This paper argues that Turkish remains path-strong at the clause core, but subordinate structures form a major locus for manner elaboration, figure and ground modification, sequencing, and event packaging. The findings support a graded, structurally enriched account of Turkish motion-event encoding and contribute to broader debates on how typological preferences interact with syntax in actual language use.

1. Introduction

How languages encode motion has been one of the central questions in cognitive and typological linguistics for several decades. Since Talmy's work on motion-event lexicalization, scholars have repeatedly returned to the contrast between languages that tend to encode Path in the verb and those that more readily encode Manner there, with other motion components distributed elsewhere in the clause. Turkish has usually been discussed as a strongly path-oriented case within this literature. That description is not wrong, but it is incomplete.

The problem is not whether Turkish shows a path bias. It does. The more interesting question is where the rest of the motion scene goes when speakers need to describe dynamic, temporally extended events in actual discourse. Once attention shifts from isolated clause templates to narrated events, the main verb no longer tells the whole story. Speakers do not simply select a Path verb and stop there. They elaborate, qualify, connect, and package events across clause boundaries. Subordination becomes crucial at exactly this point.

This article argues that Turkish actual-motion descriptions are best understood as structurally layered. The main clause remains the core site of path-dominant encoding, in line with the traditional characterization of Turkish as verb-framed or path-focused. Yet subordinate clauses, especially adverbial clauses, open a substantial structural space for manner elaboration and for more complex event packaging. Relative clauses and complement clauses contribute differently, often by modifying figures or

grounds, or by embedding motion into larger event structures. What emerges is not a challenge to the observation that Turkish is path-strong, but a refinement of it.

That refinement matters for at least three reasons. First, it bears directly on current debates about the limits of rigid lexicalization typologies. A growing literature has shown that language types are better treated as tendencies than as absolute templates, and that the distribution of motion components depends on available linguistic resources, discourse demands, and event structure (Beavers et al., 2010; Bohnemeyer et al., 2007). Second, it matters for Turkish itself. Although Turkish motion has been studied in acquisition, gesture, and boundary-crossing contexts, the role of subordination in adult actual-motion production has received much less focused attention. Third, it matters methodologically. Studies based on static picture books have been enormously productive, but dynamic elicitation tasks may reveal structural packaging strategies that become less visible in more reduced or less motion-dense stimuli.

The analysis is based on two dynamic narration tasks completed online by 60 native speakers of Turkish: a narration of The Pear Film and a description task using animated motion clips. Across the two tasks, participants produced 3,499 clauses containing motion expressions. The quantitative pattern is striking. Motion expressions in main clauses were predominantly path-based. In subordinate clauses, by contrast, Path and Manner were almost perfectly balanced. This distribution suggests that Turkish does not merely tolerate additional manner material at the periphery. Rather, it recruits subordinate structure as a recurring and productive device for elaborating motion beyond the main clause core.

The article proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature on motion typology, event segmentation, and Turkish motion-event research, with special attention to the theoretical importance of subordination. Section 3 defines the present study and its contribution. Section 4 outlines the methods. Section 5 presents the results. Section 6 discusses the implications for Turkish motion typology and for broader debates on event packaging. Finally, the conclusion is provided.

2. Motion typology, event packaging, and the place of subordination

2.1 Talmyan typology and its legacy

Talmy's account of motion events remains the point of departure for most work in the field. In his framework, a motion event minimally involves a Figure moving or located with respect to a Ground, while semantic components such as Path and Manner may be distributed differently across linguistic forms (Talmy, 2000). The well-known typological contrast between verb-framed and satellite-framed languages concerns where Path is typically encoded. In verb-framed languages, Path tends to appear in the verb, while Manner is often omitted, backgrounded, or expressed elsewhere. In satellite-framed languages, the verb more readily hosts Manner and Path is frequently expressed in satellites or other associated elements.

This model has been immensely influential, not least because it generated clear, testable predictions. Yet its strength has also sometimes encouraged overly categorical readings. Once languages are treated as

members of stable types, there is a risk of overlooking distributional variation across constructions, discourse conditions, and task demands. What counts as verb-framed at the level of a canonical clause may look different once speakers narrate complex visual events.

2.2 Critiques of rigid typology

Much subsequent work has therefore complicated the original binary. Beavers et al. (2010) are especially important here because they shift the focus from lexicalized semantic components alone to the broader inventory of linguistic resources available in a language. On their account, languages differ not simply in whether Path or Manner is encoded in the verb, but in how additional resources, including morphology, syntax, adverbials, and subordinate constructions, contribute to event expression. This move is highly relevant for Turkish. If a language typically places Path in the verb, Manner need not disappear. It may instead be expressed through subordinate clauses, adverbials, or other structurally peripheral devices.

Bohnemeyer et al. (2007) make a related contribution by emphasizing event segmentation. The clause is not merely a container for motion semantics. It is also a unit through which speakers partition and package perceived events. Once event segmentation becomes part of the discussion, clause-combining strategies become theoretically central rather than marginal. In other words, if motion descriptions involve deciding how many subevents to linguistically isolate, then subordination is not a decorative add-on. It is part of how event structure becomes discourse structure.

This broader perspective has encouraged scholars to treat typological preferences as graded and construction-sensitive. The question is no longer only whether a language is path-oriented or manner-oriented. It is also whether that orientation holds equally across main clauses, subordinate clauses, adjunct structures, and more extended stretches of discourse. That is precisely the issue at stake in the present study.

2.3 Turkish in motion-event research

Turkish has usually been described as a verb-framed or path-focused language, and a substantial body of work supports that description. In developmental work, Allen et al. (2007) showed that Turkish differs from English and Japanese in the syntactic packaging of Path and Manner, reinforcing the view that children acquire language-specific event-packaging habits. Özçalışkan's work has repeatedly documented Turkish speakers' strong preference for path-centered encoding, particularly in contrast with English, and has highlighted the importance of boundary-crossing and other event properties in shaping expression (Özçalışkan, 2015). In the Turkish literature more specifically, earlier research has also found that Turkish narratives contain fewer manner verbs than English narratives and rely more heavily on path verbs in the main verbal slot.

At the same time, this literature also contains signals that a simple path-only characterization is too coarse. Even in Turkish, Manner is not absent. The issue is distribution. Manner may be encoded outside the main verb, or in constructions that are not foregrounded when analysis stops at canonical clause types. This matters because many motion events in discourse are complex enough to invite elaboration.

Speakers describe beginnings, continuations, endpoints, collisions, accompanying actions, and figure or ground properties. A language may therefore preserve a path-focused main clause while still making systematic use of subordinate structures to elaborate how the motion unfolded.

Recent work continues to support a more nuanced picture. Aktan-Erciyes et al. (2022), for instance, treat Turkish as path-focused, but their broader framing also reminds us that motion-event representation involves more than lexical choice in a single clause. Ünal et al. (2024), in a multimodal perspective, further underline that motion-event encoding is distributed across modalities and representational layers, which again cautions against overly narrow lexical typologies. Tusun and Hendriks (2022), working on Modern Uyghur, likewise illustrate the value of Turkic data for refining motion typology rather than merely slotting languages into inherited categories. Lewandowski and Özçalışkan (2023), though focused on physical and metaphorical motion, also reinforce the point that motion encoding patterns are best understood as structured tendencies rather than fixed absolutes.

2.4 Why subordination deserves focused analysis

Subordination deserves focused attention for both empirical and theoretical reasons. Empirically, subordinate clauses are where speakers often place information that would overload the main clause if expressed there. This includes accompanying manner, temporally overlapping actions, motion sequencing, and figure or ground modification. The dissertation data on which this article is based show exactly this pattern: a substantial share of motion expressions appeared in subordinate clauses, and subordinate clauses contained almost as many Manner verbs as Path verbs.

Theoretically, subordination provides a meeting point between motion typology and event segmentation. A speaker describing a dynamic scene must decide not only which verb to choose, but how many event units to linguistically project and how to relate them. Adverbial subordination can mark overlap, succession, or means. Relative clauses can identify moving figures or relevant grounds through embedded motion. Complement clauses can place motion under verbs such as try, start, or help, thereby embedding motion inside larger action frames. These are not random by-products of syntax. They are packaging strategies.

For Turkish, this matters especially because the language's path orientation at the main clause level may encourage rather than suppress such structural distribution. If Path is robustly anchored in the main verb, subordinate constructions become a natural site for encoding additional manner or for building multi-event scenes without abandoning the path-centered core. Beavers et al. (2010) explicitly anticipate this possibility, noting that in languages that encode Path in the verb, manner may be expressed through resources such as subordinate clauses and adverbials. The present analysis shows how well that observation fits Turkish production data.

3. The present study

This article revisits Turkish actual-motion descriptions with a specific analytical aim: to show that subordination is a major structural resource in the distribution of Path and Manner. Rather than treating Turkish merely as a representative verb-framed language, the article asks how speakers package motion across clause types when describing dynamic scenes.

The contribution is threefold. First, the article re-centers clause structure. Much motion-event work still privileges the main clause as the principal window onto typology. Here, the contrast between main and subordinate motion clauses is itself the key finding. Turkish shows a clear path bias in main clauses, but subordinate clauses display a markedly different distribution. Second, the article offers a more differentiated account of subordinate motion encoding. It does not treat all subordination alike. Instead, it distinguishes adverbial, relative, and complement clauses and interprets their functions differently. Adverbial clauses dominate numerically and appear central to manner elaboration and event sequencing. Relative clauses often modify moving figures or relevant grounds. Complement clauses embed motion into larger action frames. Third, the article argues for a graded, structurally enriched understanding of Turkish motion typology. The point is not to deny Turkish's path-focused profile. It is to show that typological characterization should not stop at the main clause. Turkish remains path-strong at the clause core, but it is not structurally impoverished with respect to Manner. Subordination supplies a recurrent locus for that elaboration.

The study addresses four questions: how Path and Manner are distributed across main and subordinate clauses in Turkish actual-motion descriptions; which subordinate clause types are most frequently used in motion-event encoding; what these distributions suggest about the role of subordination in Turkish event packaging; and how these findings should reshape the typological characterization of Turkish actual-motion encoding.

4. Methods

4.1 Participants

The dataset comes from 60 native speakers of Turkish who participated voluntarily in the study. They were adults between 18 and 30 years of age and were university students or recent graduates located in Istanbul and Ankara at the time of data collection. The study was conducted online due to pandemic conditions.

4.2 Materials and tasks

The actual-motion portion of the dataset consists of two production tasks.

The first was a movie narration task based on The Pear Film (Chafe, 1980), a widely used wordless film designed to elicit narrative language samples across languages. The film contains rich, naturally unfolding motion scenes and is especially suitable for eliciting temporally extended event descriptions.

The second was a video description task using animated clips adapted from the Motion Verb Stimulus set developed for crosslinguistic motion research (Levinson, 2001). The full set contains 86 short clips; 35 clips were selected for the dissertation study, with the order randomized. The clips represented motion-relevant contrasts such as come/go, manner, path, enter/exit, and figure/ground relations. Three warm-up videos were shown before the main task.

Both tasks were dynamic in nature. This point is methodologically important because the study was designed to elicit motion-rich descriptions rather than reduced static descriptions via still pictures or books.

4.3 Procedure

All sessions were conducted online via Zoom. In the first task, each participant watched The Pear Film individually and was then asked to describe the story in their own way. Beyond that general instruction, participants were not tightly constrained in how they narrated the events.

After completing the film narration, the same participants moved on to the animation task. Following the warm-up items, they watched each short clip and described what they saw. They were allowed to replay clips if needed, though this was reportedly seldom necessary given the brevity of the animations.

Sessions were recorded, and each participant's productions were transcribed for analysis.

4.4 Transcription and unit of analysis

Narrations relevant to target motion events were transcribed by the researcher. For analytical purposes, productions were segmented into sentences, defined as a main or matrix clause together with any subordinate clauses associated with it. The actual-motion analysis focused on clauses containing motion expressions.

This produced a corpus of 5,999 clauses across both tasks, of which 3,499 were coded as containing motion expressions.

4.5 Coding of motion verbs

The analysis followed the theoretical orientation of Beavers et al. (2010). Motion predicates were coded according to whether the verb primarily lexicalized Path or Manner. In practical terms, verbs that chiefly encoded trajectory, directionality, or boundary-relevant change of location were treated as Path verbs, while verbs that specified how the motion was carried out were treated as Manner verbs.

4.6 Coding of clause type and subordination

Clauses containing motion expressions were first classified as main or subordinate. Subordinate clauses were then divided into three categories used: adverbial clauses, relative clauses, and complement clauses. This classification was consistent with standard descriptions of Turkish subordination (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 1997).

These categories were selected because they capture structurally distinct ways of packaging motion. Adverbial clauses often express overlap, sequence, means, or accompanying action. Relative clauses modify participants or settings. Complement clauses embed motion inside another verbal frame.

4.7 Analytical approach

The present article emphasizes transparent descriptive analysis: counts, percentages, and distribution across clause types. Because the study also reported inferential analyses, those statistics are cited where relevant, but the central claim of this article does not depend on new statistical modelling.

The most important contrast is distributional: Path strongly dominates in main clauses, whereas subordinate clauses show an almost even Path-Manner split. The article interprets this contrast as evidence that Turkish motion-event encoding is structurally differentiated.

5. Results

5.1 Corpus composition

Across the two dynamic actual-motion tasks, the 60 participants produced a total of 5,999 clauses. Of these, 3,499 clauses, or 58.32%, contained motion expressions, as given in Table 1 below. This alone is worth noting. The tasks yielded a motion-dense corpus, which is one reason the dataset is particularly suitable for examining how motion semantics are distributed across clause structure.

Table 1
Corpus composition

Measure	n	%
Participants	60	—
Total clauses	5,999	—
Clauses with motion expressions	3,499	58.32 of all clauses
Main-clause motion expressions	2,339	66.84 of motion clauses
Subordinate-clause motion expressions	1,160	33.15 of motion clauses

5.2 Path and Manner across the whole corpus

Across all 3,499 motion clauses, 2,271 were coded as Path and 1,228 as Manner. Turkish in this dataset is therefore unmistakably path-leaning overall. Yet the aggregate numbers already suggest that Manner is far from negligible. More than one third of all motion clauses were manner-coded. Relevant figures are presented in Table 2 below.

This becomes analytically sharper once clause type is introduced.

5.3 Path and Manner by clause type

The main finding of the study appears in the contrast between main and subordinate clauses.

Table 2
Path and Manner by clause type

Clause type	Path (n)	Path (%)	Manner (n)	Manner (%)	Total
Main clauses	1,694	72.42	645	27.57	2,339
Subordinate clauses	577	49.74	583	50.25	1,160
Total	2,271	64.90	1,228	35.09	3,499

The main-clause distribution closely matches the traditional picture of Turkish as path-focused. Nearly three quarters of main-clause motion verbs encoded Path. The dissertation reports that this asymmetry was statistically significant.

As given in Table 2, subordinate clauses show a very different picture. Path and Manner were almost perfectly balanced, with a slight numerical edge for Manner: 583 Manner clauses versus 577 Path clauses. The dissertation reports that this difference was not statistically significant ($p = .462$), which reinforces the descriptive conclusion that subordinate clauses do not replicate the strong main-clause path bias.

This contrast is the central empirical basis for the article's argument. Turkish is path-dominant at the main-clause core, but subordinate structure is a major site for manner encoding.

5.4 Distribution of subordinate clause types

The 1,160 subordinate motion clauses were not evenly distributed across subordinate types.

Table 3
Distribution of subordinate clauses with motion

Subordinate clause type	n	% of subordinate motion clauses
Adverbial clauses	789	68.01
Relative clauses	209	18.01
Complement clauses	162	13.96
Total	1,160	100

As observed in Table 3, adverbial clauses accounted for more than two thirds of all subordinate motion clauses. Relative clauses and complement clauses were considerably less frequent, though both were recurrent enough to matter analytically. The dissertation reports a statistically significant difference across subordinate clause types, confirming that adverbial clauses were the dominant subtype in the corpus.

5.5 Functional interpretation of subordinate types

Adverbial clauses were especially common when speakers added accompanying motion, encoded overlap between subevents, or sequenced one motion phase against another. In many cases, a Path verb appeared in the main clause while an adverbial subordinate clause added manner-rich detail. In this sense, adverbial clauses often elaborated how the motion happened, extended the event temporally, or linked one motion phase to another.

Relative clauses tended to modify figures or grounds. Instead of advancing the main motion trajectory, they commonly identified a moving entity, a relevant landmark, or a participant defined through motion. Their contribution was therefore often referential and descriptive, but still integral to event packaging.

Complement clauses were less frequent, but they embedded motion into larger action frames, especially with matrix predicates such as try, start, or help. These clauses did not simply add another motion segment. They restructured motion as part of a higher-order event.

5.6 Summary of the results

Three results stand out. First, Turkish actual-motion descriptions in this corpus were heavily motion-rich and structurally complex. A full third of motion clauses were subordinate. Second, Turkish main clauses displayed robust path dominance, exactly as a path-focused analysis would predict. Third, subordinate clauses sharply changed the distributional picture. Once speakers moved beyond the clause core, Manner became just as available as Path.

Taken together, these findings suggest that a typological description based only on main-clause verb choice misses an important part of Turkish motion-event encoding.

6. Discussion

6.1 Path dominance at the clause core

The main-clause findings confirm the established characterization of Turkish as path-focused. In the present corpus, 72.42% of main-clause motion verbs encoded Path. This aligns with a long line of work describing Turkish as a language in which the verb is the default locus for path information, especially in contrast with English and other manner-prominent systems (Allen et al., 2007; Özçalışkan, 2015; Özçalışkan & Slobin, 2003).

This result should not be downplayed. The present article does not propose that Turkish is somehow no longer path-oriented. On the contrary, the main-clause figures show that the traditional generalization remains descriptively strong at the clause core. If one asks what Turkish speakers most often do in the main verb when describing actual motion, the answer remains clear: they preferentially encode Path.

That said, the clause core is not the whole system.

6.2 Why subordinate clauses matter

The crucial finding is that subordinate clauses reorganize the distribution of motion semantics. In subordinate motion clauses, Path and Manner are nearly balanced. This is not a trivial detail or a peripheral exception. It means that one third of the motion corpus behaves differently from the main clause with respect to the Path-Manner distribution.

The typological significance of this pattern becomes clearer in light of Beavers et al. (2010). Their framework predicts that in languages where Path is encoded in the verb, manner may be expressed through other resources, including subordinate clauses. Turkish fits that prediction strikingly well. The main clause carries the path-oriented core, while subordinate structures repeatedly host manner elaboration and associated event detail.

This helps explain why a rigid lexicalization typology can feel simultaneously right and insufficient. It is right because Turkish does show a clear main-clause path bias. It is insufficient because motion-event descriptions are not exhausted by the main clause. Speakers distribute semantic work across a larger syntactic architecture.

6.3 Adverbial clauses as the main site of manner elaboration

The dominance of adverbial clauses within the subordinate dataset is especially revealing. At 68.01% of subordinate motion clauses, adverbials were by far the most common subordinate type. This is not surprising once one considers what adverbial subordination is well suited to do in motion descriptions. It can mark simultaneity, sequence, means, overlap, transition, and accompanying action. All of these are natural pressure points for manner elaboration.

In a path-focused language, a speaker can preserve a path verb in the main clause while adding a subordinate adverbial clause that specifies how the motion unfolded. This allows Turkish speakers to maintain the path-centered clause core without sacrificing descriptive richness. In effect, adverbial subordination helps reconcile typological preference with discourse need.

This observation also links Turkish to broader crosslinguistic discussions of manner expression outside the main verbal root. The present findings resonate with work showing that languages may use non-finite verbal adjuncts, converbs, and other subordinate devices to encode Manner even when the main clause remains path-centered. Turkish appears to make precisely this move.

6.4 Relative and complement clauses are different, not merely lesser

The quantitative dominance of adverbials should not obscure the contribution of relative and complement clauses. Their lower frequency does not make them functionally trivial.

Relative clauses appear to support motion-event packaging by modifying figures and grounds. This matters because motion descriptions often depend on identifying not just movement, but moving

entities and relevant landmarks. A relative clause can build these participants into the event representation without forcing the main clause to absorb too much descriptive work. In that sense, relative clauses contribute to the referential architecture of motion scenes.

Complement clauses, meanwhile, place motion under the scope of another event frame. When motion occurs in the complement of verbs such as try, start, or help, it is no longer only being described as a standalone movement. It is embedded within a larger action or intention structure. This is another form of event packaging, one that links motion to agency, assistance, effort, or inception.

Taken together, the subordinate types do not all do the same job. Adverbials elaborate and sequence, relatives identify and modify, complements embed and reframe. What unites them is that all three expand the structural means by which Turkish speakers encode motion beyond the main clause.

6.5 Event segmentation and discourse packaging

The results also speak directly to Bohnemeyer et al.'s (2007) emphasis on event segmentation. Motion descriptions are not simply mappings from observed motion to verb choice. They involve decisions about how many event units to linguistically isolate and how to relate them. The moment a speaker chooses subordination, that speaker is already segmenting the scene into hierarchically related parts.

This helps explain why dynamic elicitation tasks may be especially revealing. The Pear Film and the animation clips presented participants with motion-rich, unfolding scenes that naturally invited multi-event packaging. Speakers were not only naming movements. They were organizing event phases, overlapping actions, and participant configurations. In that context, subordinate constructions become a natural and perhaps unavoidable resource.

The findings therefore support a broader view of motion-event typology: not as a classification of isolated lexical templates, but as an account of how languages distribute event information across available structural resources.

6.6 Relation to earlier Turkish findings

The present results are broadly compatible with earlier findings that Turkish is path-dominant, especially in main-clause production (Allen et al., 2007; Özçalışkan, 2015; Özçalışkan & Slobin, 2003). At the same time, the present dataset shows a higher rate of subordinated Manner than one might expect from a simplified reading of earlier work. This result may partly be attributed to the dynamic nature of the elicitation tasks.

This comparison should be handled carefully. Task differences matter. A motion-rich film narration and a dense set of animated motion clips do not create exactly the same production conditions as a picture-book narrative or literary text analysis. The point is therefore not that earlier studies were wrong, but that they illuminated a different slice of the system. The current data suggest that when Turkish speakers are placed in situations that invite temporally extended event packaging, subordinate Manner becomes much more visible.

6.7 A graded account of Turkish motion typology

The theoretical upshot is a graded account of Turkish motion-event encoding. Turkish remains path-strong. But path strength is not the same as path exclusivity, and typological characterization should reflect that distinction.

A graded account means at least three things here. First, typological tendencies are construction-sensitive. The Path-Manner distribution in main clauses is not the same as the distribution in subordinate clauses. Second, typological tendencies are packaging-sensitive. The more complex the discourse representation of motion, the more likely speakers are to recruit additional structural resources. Third, typological tendencies are best understood as patterned preferences across a system, not as a rigid stereotype attached to a language as a whole.

This position is fully compatible with Beavers et al. (2010) and with later work that treats motion typology as a matter of distributed resources rather than absolute lexical templates. It is also a useful refinement for Turkish specifically. Turkish should not be redescribed as a manner language. Nor should its main-clause path dominance be minimized. But neither should its motion system be reduced to the main clause alone.

7. Conclusion

This article has argued that Turkish actual-motion encoding is best described as structurally differentiated rather than rigidly uniform. The main clause remains clearly path-dominant, confirming the established view of Turkish as a path-focused language. Yet the same dataset shows that subordinate clauses form a substantial part of motion-event expression, and within those subordinate clauses Path and Manner are nearly balanced.

That pattern matters since it shows that Turkish does not simply encode Path in the verb and leave the rest unspecified. Instead, it uses subordination, especially adverbial subordination, to elaborate how motion unfolds, to package multiple subevents, and to modify key participants and settings. Relative and complement clauses contribute differently but systematically to the same broader architecture of event packaging.

The article therefore proposes a modest but important revision to how Turkish is discussed in motion typology. Turkish should still be recognized as path-strong at the clause core. At the same time, its motion-event encoding should be understood as a graded structural system in which subordinate clauses are a major locus of manner elaboration and discourse organization. This view fits contemporary critiques of rigid typology and reinforces the importance of looking beyond the main clause when analysing motion in language.

For motion typology more broadly, the implication is equally clear. Language types become more informative when they are connected to clause structure, event segmentation, and discourse packaging.

Turkish offers a compelling case of that principle in action.

8. Limitations

A few limits should be acknowledged. The participant pool was limited to young adult native speakers, mostly university students and recent graduates. The study was conducted online, which shaped practical conditions of data collection. The article also focuses on actual motion only and does not include any other parts of motion such as separate fictive-motion component, or metaphorical motions.

However, these limits are given here just to clarify the scope of the study, and do not weaken the main claim of this work. The claim is not that Turkish always and everywhere distributes Manner in this exact way. It is that in adult actual-motion descriptions of dynamic scenes, subordinate structure is a major and systematic site of manner elaboration and event packaging.

Declarations

Ethics approval and informed consent

Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Hacettepe University Senate Ethics Commission on 8 January 2019. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to their inclusion in the study. All research was conducted in accordance with the relevant institutional guidelines and regulations for research involving human participants. A copy of the ethics approval has been included as a supplementary file for editorial and peer review purposes.

Competing interests

The author declares no competing interests.

Author Contribution

A. T. conceived the study, collected the data, transcribed and coded the dataset, carried out the analysis, and wrote the manuscript.

Acknowledgement

This article is derived from doctoral research completed at Hacettepe University. The author thanks to the supervisor, committee members and anyone taking part in this work. The broader doctoral study was supported by TÜBİTAK 2211 National Scholarship Programme for PhD Students.

Data Availability

The data underlying this study consist of online narration recordings, transcriptions, and coding materials generated for a doctoral research project. Because the dataset contains identifiable voice recordings and participant-derived language production, the full raw audio data are not publicly posted. An anonymized subset of transcripts and coding materials is available to editors and reviewers during peer review via this link on OSF: https://osf.io/jnh2d/overview?view_only=3da4e41e1a4747a683d7dc53328017cd Link to the stimuli set used in the experiments: https://osf.io/4asqu/overview (links under “Wiki” title)

References

1. Aktan-Erciyes A, Akbuğa E, Dik EH, Göksun T (2022) Linguistic and nonlinguistic evaluation of motion events in a path-focused language. Appl Psycholinguist 43(4):829–865. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716422000169
2. Allen SEM, Özçalışkan Ş, Kita S, Brown A, Furman R, Ishizuka T, Fujii M (2007) Language-specific and universal influences in children’s syntactic packaging of manner and path: A comparison of English, Japanese, and Turkish. Cognition 102(1):16–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2005.12.006
3. Beavers J, Levin B, Tham SW (2010) The typology of motion expressions revisited. J Linguist 46(2):331–377. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226709990272
4. Bohnemeyer J, Enfield NJ, Essegbey J, Ibarretxe-Antuñano I, Kita S, Lüpke F, Ameka FK (2007) Principles of event segmentation in language: The case of motion events. Language 83(3):495–532. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2007.0116
5. Chafe WL (ed) (1980) The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production. Ablex
6. Göksel A, Kerslake C (2005) Turkish: A comprehensive grammar. Routledge
7. Kornfilt J (1997) Turkish. Routledge
8. Levinson SC (2001) Motion verb stimulus (Moverb), version 2. In S. C. Levinson & N. J. Enfield (Eds.), Manual for the field season 2001 (pp. 9–13). Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. https://doi.org/10.17617/2.3513706
9. Lewandowski W, Özçalışkan Ş (2023) Running across the mind or across the park: Does speech about physical and metaphorical motion go hand in hand? Cogn Linguistics 34(3):411–444. https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2022-0077
10. Özçalışkan Ş (2015) Ways of crossing a spatial boundary in typologically distinct languages. Appl Psycholinguist 36(2):485–508. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716413000325
11. Özçalışkan Ş, Slobin DI (2003) Codability effects on the expression of manner of motion in Turkish and English. In: Özsoy AS, Akar D, Nakipoğlu-Demiralp M, Erguvanlı-Taylan E, Aksu-Koç A (eds) Studies in Turkish linguistics. Boğaziçi University, pp 259–270
12. Slobin DI (2004) The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In: Strömqvist S, Verhoeven L (eds) Relating events in narrative: Vol. 2. Typological

and contextual perspectives. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp 219–257

13. Talmy L (2000) Toward a cognitive semantics: Vol. 2. Typology and process in concept structuring. MIT Press
14. Tusun J, Hendriks H (2022) Caused motion events in Modern Uyghur: A typological perspective. Linguistics 60(5):1663–1705. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0098
15. Ünal E, Mamus E, Özyürek A (2024) Multimodal encoding of motion events in speech, gesture, and cognition. Lang Cognition 16(4):785–804. https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2023.61

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- supplementarymaterials.pdf