

RELATIVIZATION OF (NON-)SUBJECTS IN TURKISH
Martina Gračanin-Yukseş
Middle East Technical University

BACKGROUND. Turkish relative clauses are pre-nominal and are marked either by the suffix *–(yan*, if the relativized constituent is the subject (1), or by the suffix *–DIK*, if the relativized constituent is a non-subject (2) (Çağrı 2005, 2009; Göksel and Kerslake 2005; Kornfilt 1997, among others). The two suffixes are in complementary distribution.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>(1) a. Adam koştı.
man.NOM ran
'A/the man ran.'</p> | <p>b. koş<u>an</u> adam
run.<i>An</i> man
'a/the man who runs/ran'</p> | <p>c. *koş<u>tuğ</u>u adam
run.<i>DIK</i> man</p> |
| <p>(2) a. Adam kadını gördü.
man.NOM woman.ACC saw
'A/the man saw the woman.'</p> | <p>b. görd<u>üğü</u> kadın
see.<i>DIK</i> woman
'the woman whom he sees/saw'</p> | <p>c. *gö<u>ren</u> kadın
see.<i>An</i> woman</p> |

PUZZLE. In many configurations, however, relativization of *non-subjects* requires the appearance of the *subject* suffix *–(yan*. One such configuration is relativization out of impersonal passives, which do not seem to have a (thematic) subject. The impersonal passive in (4a) is the passivized version of (3) is. In (4a), the phrase *ata* 'horse.DAT' does not have the properties of a subject: It does not appear in the nominative case and does not agree with the verb. Instead, it retains its original dative case (and cannot bear nominative, as (4b) shows) and the verb appears with the default 3.SG. morphology. Nevertheless, when relativized, the phrase *ata* 'horse.DAT' induces the subject suffix *–(yan* on the relative clause, instead of the expected non-subject suffix *–DIK*, as shown in (5).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(3) İnsan ata biner.
person horse.DAT rides
'People ride horses.'</p> | |
| <p>(4) a. Ata binilir.
horse.DAT ride.PASS.PRES.3SG
'A/the horse is ridden. / Horses are ridden.'</p> | <p>b. *At binilir.
horse ride.PASS.PRES.3SG
<i>Int.</i> 'A/the horse is ridden. / Horses are ridden.'</p> |
| <p>(5) a. binil<u>en</u> at
ride.PASS.<i>An</i> horse
'The horse that is/was ridden.'</p> | <p>b. *binil<u>diği</u> at
ride.PASS.<i>DIK</i> horse</p> |

Another problematic configuration is relativization out of a sentential subject, as in (6) and (7).

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(6) balığı yemesi bizi şaşırtan adam
fish.ACC eat.N.3SG us surprise.<i>An</i> man
'the man that we were surprised that he ate fish'</p> | <p>(adapted from Kornfilt 1997: 58)</p> |
|--|---|

(7) *adamin yemesi bizi şaşırtan balık*
 man.GEN eat.N.3SG us surprise.An fish
 ‘the fish that we were surprised that the man ate it’ (adapted from Kornfilt 1997: 58)

Neither in (6) nor in (7) is the relativized constituent the subject; rather, it is *a constituent of the sentential subject*: in (6), it is the subject of the embedded verb *ye* ‘eat’ and in (7), it is the object. Nevertheless, in both cases we find that the relative clause is unexpectedly marked with *–(yan*.

PROPOSAL. I propose that the suffixes *–DIK* and *–(yan* are forms of the relativizing C (realized as suffixes on the complement of C). I assume that C possesses not only Operator (Op)-features, but also ϕ -features (Bayer 1984; Haegeman 1992, 2000, among others). I argue that the choice between the two suffixes (*–DIK* and *–(yan*) is determined by whether features on C (ϕ -features and Op-features) undergo agreement with distinct goals: if they do, C surfaces as *–DIK*; if they do not, it surfaces as *–(yan* (see also Takahashi and Gračanin-Yukseş (2008)). In both configurations illustrated above C enters agreement only with a single goal; only the Op-features on C enter a successful *Agree* relation; ϕ -agreement fails in both cases. In impersonal passives, the subject is absent, and whatever phrases are present (*at* ‘horse’ in (5a) above), are not legitimate goals for ϕ -agreement (perhaps because they do not occupy A positions, or because they are syntactically PPs). C thus only agrees with a non-subject (*at* ‘horse’) in Op-features. ϕ -agreement also fails in cases of relativization out of the sentential subject: since clauses do not possess ϕ -features, C does not agree with the subject. It only undergoes Op-agreement with the relativized constituent. Thus, in both cases C fails to agree with anything in ϕ -features (and as a result, default values are inserted) and only its Op-features are valued via *Agree*. Since in these configurations, C did not agree with distinct goals (rather, one kind of features failed to agree), C surfaces as *–(yan*.

The same result obtains in the situation where the relativized constituent is the subject, as in (1b). In (1b), both ϕ -features and Op-features on C agree with the subject. Thus, since C did not agree with distinct goals, but rather with a single one, it is again spelled out as *–(yan*. By contrast, if the relativized constituent is a non-subject in a configuration where there exists a thematic subject, as in (2b), for example, then the ϕ -features on C agree with the subject, and the Op-features agree with the non-subject. As a result, C surfaces as *–DIK*. The analysis carries over to other configurations where non-subjects are relativized, but subject morphology obtains.

References

- Bayer, J. (1984). COMP in Bavarian syntax. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 209-274.
- Cagri, I., 2005. Minimality and Turkish Relative Clauses. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Cagri, I., 2009. Arguing against subject incorporation in Turkish relative clauses. *Lingua* 119: 359-373.
- Göksel, A., and Kerslake, C., 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge, New York.
- Kornfilt, J., 1997. *Turkish*. Routledge, New York.
- Haegeman, L., 1992. *Theory and Description in Generative Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takahashi, S., and Gračanin-Yukseş, M., 2008. Morphosyntax of Movement Dependencies in Haitian Creole. *Syntax* 11:2, 223-250.