Subject case and *Agr* in two types of Turkic RCs*

Jaklin Kornfilt
Syracuse University

Locality holds between the subject agreement marker and the subject, albeit in different ways, in two types of Turkic RCs. In one type (e.g. Turkish), the modifying clause is a CP, and in the other, it's a bare TAM-phrase (e.g. Sakha, Uighur). In both types, *Agr* appears on the phase head: in Turkish, on C, and in Sakha/Uighur, on N/D. The local domain for licensing the subject's Case (via a probe-goal relation between *Agr* and subject) is CP for Turkish RCs, and DP for Sakha/Uighur RCs. Two phenomena offer independent motivation: 1. Turkish-type RCs display Complementizer Agreement effects, while Sakha/Uighur type RCs don't; 2. In both types, generalized binding precludes locally bound resumptive pronouns, with CP as the local domain for the ban in Turkish RCs, and the entire DP in Sakha/Uighur RCs.

1. Introduction and Summary

The main topic of this paper is locality. More specifically, I claim that in Turkic RCs, the agreement marker that expresses the phi-features of the modifier clause's subject determines the case of that subject under strict locality. This is not a surprising claim, but to defend it turns out to be surprisingly challenging, when facts of certain RCs in some Turkic (and some other) languages are considered, where the agreement element and the subject appear to have a non-local relationship: phi-feature *Agr* is marked on the head of the RC, rather than on the clause's predicate. It turns out that the head of the RC construction and the subject of the modifier clause are, against all appearances, in a local relationship in those languages. Such a relationship could conceivably be derived via raising of the subject to the specifier position of the RC-head. I argue against

such a derivation and claim that at least in two Turkic languages, Sakha and Modern Uighur, the head of the RC and the subject of the modifying clause enter a local relationship with the subject *in-situ*. Additional facts from two other Turkic languages, Kirghiz and Kazakh, also point in the same direction.[1]

For this account to be plausible, I make the following central typological claim:

(1)   The modifier clauses in some of the Turkic languages
         are more reduced than in others.[2]

I claim that the non-reduced clauses in the RCs of languages (such as Turkish) that have the full-blown type are CPs, while the reduced ones are bare Tense/Aspect/Mood [TAM] phrases. This makes it possible for the clause-external RC-head (and the phi-feature probe that is merged on it) to enter a local relationship with the clause-internal subject, when that clause is a bare TAM-phrase. (See Miyagawa, this volume, for a very similar approach, arrived at independently, based on different syntactic facts, mainly from Japanese.)

This difference gives rise to typological correlations across Turkic languages that have not been described previously in philological or typological literature: While the RCs that host modifier clauses with CP status show *Complementizer Agreement* (CA) effects, RCs with reduced, non-CP clauses don't. This contrast goes along with the placement of subject Agreement morphology: In RCs with CP-modifier clauses, the *Agr* element is placed on the predicate of the modifier clauses; in RCs with reduced, non-CP modifier clauses, the *Agr* is placed on the RC-head. I claim that in both types of RC, the common denominator is locality; in both types, the phi-feature probe is merged on a phase head: either the head of the CP (if the RC does have a CP), or the head of the DP (if no CP is available). Thus, the phi-feature probe, and its goal, i.e. the subject, are in a local relationship in both instances.

The surface realizations, and thus observations, of these analyses are as follows: Languages whose (non-subject) RCs bear subject Agreement on the RC-head (i.e. on D) don't exhibit a special predicate form on the modifier clause in subject RCs (because the modifier clauses, being bare TAM-clauses, have no C

---

[1] A number of additional Turkic languages (e.g. Uzbek, Turkmen), other non-Turkic, but Altaic languages (e.g. Dagur, a Mongolian language), and some non-Altaic languages spoken in the same geographic region (e.g. Western Armenian, an Indo-European language, and Northern Ostyak, a Ugro-Finnic language) have RCs of the same type. (For a discussion of such RCs in the last two, non-Altaic, languages, cf. Ackerman & Nikolaeva (1997).) Whether all of these RCs are amenable to the same analysis as proposed here for Sakha, Uighur, Kirghiz, and Kazakh, is left for future research.

[2] Krause (2001) claims that the modifying clauses in Turkish RCs are reduced. If this were the case, the corresponding clauses in these other Turkic languages would have to be characterized in yet another fashion, since reduction in and of itself wouldn't draw the necessary distinctions, yet it is clear that in these other Turkic languages, the clauses in question cannot be smaller than TAM-phrases. However, there are empirical reasons, quite independent from the issues discussed here, against Krause's reduction analysis for Turkish RCs, but a discussion of this point would transcend our purposes here and cannot be undertaken, due to space considerations. Based on the empirical support discussed in the text, as well as the typological considerations just mentioned, the CP-analysis for Turkish clauses in RCs is maintained.

and thus can't exhibit CA effects; I interpret the special predicate form of subject RCs as a CA-effect); languages with RCs whose phi-feature *Agr* appears on the predicate of the modifier clause in *non-subject* RCs exhibit a special predicate form for *subject* RCs—a CA-effect (which is obviously possible only if the clause is a CP).[3]

On the other hand, both types of these languages conform to a larger generalization: Subject RCs never display overt *Agr* with the subject, while non-subject RCs do.[4]

I propose to explain this asymmetry, common to all Turkic languages (which have RCs that exhibit subject *Agr*, irrespective of its position), via generalized binding, i.e. via a ban (for which there is independent evidence) against locally A′-bound pronominals (i.e. locally A′-bound resumptive pronouns), and the claim that *pro*, locally licensed and identified by overt *Agr*, is a regular pronominal that obeys that ban, just as overt pronominals do.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses Turkish RCs, argues that their modifying clauses are CPs, and proposes separate, but interrelated, accounts for the two main differences between Turkish subject and non-subject RCs; Section 3 discusses the RC construction with the *Agr* placed on the RC head. Subsections 3.1 through 3.5 illustrate that construction in Sakha, argue against subject raising (to Spec, DP) in their derivation, and propose the present account, based on a reduced, bare TAM-phrase analysis. In 3.6, the Uighur RCs are discussed, the same account is extended to them, and additional arguments against raising of the subject are advanced; examples from Kirghiz and Kazakh are introduced for further support. Section 4 offers conclusions.

2. Turkish Relative Clauses

Turkish is a language with RCs whose modifying clauses have, I claim, CP status. According to the typological remarks in the introduction, we would expect two (correlated) properties: 1. the *Agr* marker should be on the predicate of the modifying clause, i.e. clearly local to the subject, whose Case it determines (since the CP-status of the clause would make the CP-external, and thus phase-external, RC-head and the RC-D non-local with respect to the clause-internal subject, due to the Phase Impenetrability Condition [PIC]—cf. Chomsky (2008)), and 2. CA-effects should be possible, i.e. subject RCs should be able to exhibit visibly different predicate morphology from the predicate morphology found on non-subject RCs (assuming, as I do, that Turkish exhibits CA-effects,

---

[3] In this paper, I remain neutral with respect to the question of whether phi-feature *Agr* originates as merged with T (obviously realized on the predicate) and raises to C (possibly via AGR°, if a separate projection of AGR[s]P is assumed—a proposal made for Turkish in Kornfilt (1984) and whose theoretical and empirical status has recently been defended in Dalmi 2005), or whether *Agr* is merged in C and is inherited by T, where it is realized—cf. Chomsky (2008), Miyagawa (this volume)).

[4] There are Turkic languages where non-subject RCs don't have overt *Agr* at all, not even for non-subject RCs; this paper considers only those languages that do have overt *Agr* for their non-subject RCs.

and that the special predicate form found on subject RCs is a realization of CA-effects). Both properties are displayed, as seen below.[5]

2.1 Syntactic and morphological properties of Turkish RCs

Illustration of subject RCs:

(2) a. [[e$_i$ dün   bölüm   -de ben-i   destekle -**yen**
        yesterday department-LOC I -ACC support-**(y)An**
    arkadaş -lar$_i$]
    friend -PL
    'The friends/colleagues who supported me in the department
    yesterday' (No phi-feature morphology; special nominalization
    form on predicate)

Illustration of non-subject RCs (traditionally so-called "object relativization"):

(2) b. [[*pro* dün   bölüm   -de e$_i$ destekle-**diğ-im**] arkadaş-lar$_i$]
        yesterday department-LOC   support-**FN-1.SG** friend -PL
    'The friends/colleagues who(m) I supported in the department
    yesterday' (Phi-feature morphology and general indicative
    nominalization form on predicate)

I claim that the apparent "non-subject RC construction" is the "unmarked case" of general nominalization, with -*DIK* for indicative, and *Agr* as subject Case licenser. (For arguments supporting the claim that subject Case, and especially the Genitive as the nominal subject Case, is licensed by local overt *Agr*, cf. Kornfilt (1984; 2003; 2006); counterarguments against some claims that the Genitive is independent from *Agr* are advanced in Kornfilt (2003a), especially section 8, and (2006).) The -*DIK* + *Agr* sequence marks *all* (argument and adjunct) indicative embeddings; e.g. an embedded nominalized indicative clause with argument status has the same morphology, which is thus shown to be not limited to RCs:

(3)   [arkadaş-lar-ın   dün   bölüm   -de ben-i
         friend -PL -GEN yesterday department -LOC I   -ACC
        destekle-**dik** -lerin]-i   duy -du -m
        support -**FN** -3.PL -ACC hear -PAST-1.S
    'I heard that the friends/colleagues supported me
    in the department yesterday'

The modifying clause in on-subject RCs is thus best characterized as a regular embedded clausal nominalization (with the additional property of being an operator-variable construction adjoined to the nominal head that this clause is

---

[5] For detailed descriptions of Turkish RCs in general, cf. Hankamer & Knecht (1976), Kornfilt (2000), and Underhill (1972), among others. Note that CA doesn't appear to be a universal phenomenon, even for languages with clear-cut CPs in their RCs; however, when CA-effects *are* displayed, this should be taken as evidence for CP-status of the clause.

predicated of). I claim that there is no "object relativization" or "non-subject relativization" morphology. The morphological shape of the nominalized predicates in non-subject RCs is not a special form; it is the same as that found on non-RCs indicative embeddings, and this is not a coincidence. If this is right, then this account should be extendable to other related languages—which it is, as perusal of basic grammars of many other Turkic languages shows.

In contrast, subject RCs in Turkish look different, and we must ask why their predicates show up in shapes different from their counterparts in most other embeddings, and why no overt agreement with the (targeted) subject is possible. I claim that the different shape on the predicate is a Complementizer Agreement (CA) effect, while the missing *Agr* marker on the predicate is due to an A′-disjointness requirement. I start with a discussion of the latter.

2.2 The A′-disjointness requirement in Turkish RCs

I claim here that the ban against overt *Agr* on the predicate with the local subject "gap" is linked to a prohibition in Turkish against locally A′-bound pronominal variables, i.e. against locally bound resumptive pronouns. I start with some arguments to support my claim that Turkish RCs are indeed operator-variable constructions, and that therefore resumptive pronouns are indeed A′-bound pronominal variables. The support I shall discuss here comes from the island-sensitivity of Turkish RCs.

Relative clauses in Turkish exhibit island effects, at least where relativization out of relative clauses is concerned:[6]

(4)   *[Hasan -ın   [[e$_i$ dün   ben-i   destekle-**yen**]
         Hasan -GEN   yesterday I   -ACC support -**(y)An**
         arkadaş-lar$_i$]-ı   e$_j$ tanı -**dığ** -ı   ] bölüm$_j$
         friend -PL -ACC   know -**FN** -3.SG department
         Intended reading: 'The department (such that) Hasan knows
         the friends who supported me (in it) yesterday'

Turkish does not tolerate locally A′-bound pronominal variables—at least those for high terms in the Keenan-Comrie hierarchy, such as subjects and direct objects. This is illustrated below via overt resumptive pronouns.
An overt *subject* resumptive pronoun:

(5)   a.   [$_{C[N]P}$ **Op**$_i$ [$_{AGR[N]P}$ (*$*o_i$/*$kendisi_i$) bölüm   -de   ben-i
                                    he /himself   department-LOC I   -ACC
           destekle-**yen**   ]] arkadaş$_i$
           support -**(y)An**   friend
           'The friend$_i$ who$_i$ (*he$_i$) supported me in the department'

An overt *direct object* resumptive pronoun:

---

6 Relativization out of coordinate structures is ill-formed, as well. Here, I limit myself to illustrating islandhood effects via relativization out of relative clauses. Note that I have claimed elsewhere that the Sentential Subject Constraint, also usually explained via subjacency, holds in Turkish (cf. Kornfilt (2003b)), and can thus be used as an additional islandhood effect.

(5) b. $[_{C|N|P}$ **Op$_i$**$[_{AGR|N|P}$ *pro* bölüm   -de (***on-u$_i$**/*****kendisin-i$_i$**)
                         [*1.SG*] department-LOC **he-ACC**/**himself -ACC**
          destekle-**diğ** -im]] arkadaş$_i$
          see   -**FN** -1.SG friend
          'The friend$_i$ whom I supported (*him$_i$) in the department'

I conclude that overt resumptive pronouns are ill-formed in both subject- and (at least some) non-subject RCs, where the pronoun is locally A′-bound. Note that stressing *locality* in this prohibition against A′-binding of the resumptive pronoun is important, because such pronouns are relatively well-formed when they are long-distance bound, e.g. in "repairs" of island violations.[7]

(6)   The A′-Disjointness Requirement:
          A pronoun must be (A′-) free in the smallest Complete Functional Complex (CFC) which contains it.[8]

This requirement leads to ungrammaticality for *overt* resumptive pronouns (at least those for high terms in the Keenan-Comrie hierarchy) when they are locally bound. This is borne out by the examples we just saw. The same explanation carries over to resumptive *pro* in subject position, given that its syntactic status is the same as that of its overt counterparts.

The assumption that overt agreement morphology is needed to license *pro* is argued for in Kornfilt (1988; 1991) and related work; the assumption that if *pro* is licensed in a given syntactic structure, the empty category thus licensed *must* be *pro* is taken over from Jaeggli (1984). Given that *pro* is, syntactically, a regular pronominal in Turkish with respect to A-binding conditions, it is to be expected that it should also obey A′-binding conditions. Thus, the resulting effect of a prohibition against overt agreement in subject RCs (with subject "gaps") falls out naturally from generalized binding.[9]

---

[7] There is at least one native speaker of Turkish who claims to accept locally A′-bound resumptive pronouns; however, he appears to accept locally A′-bound *logophoric* resumptive pronouns, rather than *regular personal pronouns* in this capacity. In the examples in (5) in the text, the resumptive pronouns glossed as reflexives are such logophors. (For a discussion of logophoric pronouns in Turkish, as distinct from either personal pronouns or genuine reflexives, cf. Kornfilt (2000)) This speaker's judgments on locally A′-bound resumptive pronouns are reported in Meral (2006). It appears, then, that even for this "dialect", assuming that this speaker represents other speakers with similar idiolects, regular pronouns cannot function as locally bound resumptive pronouns. Idiolects such as Meral's don't challenge my analysis, because *pro* is a regular personal pronoun, rather than a logophor (a silent element such as *pro* can obviously not be used as an emphatic, and empathetic, pronoun), and thus should be ill-formed as a locally bound resumptive pronoun in RCs, even for Meral's idiolect with respect to locally A′-bound resumptive pronouns. (For discussion of the view that *pro* is a regular pronominal with respect to binding, cf. Kornfilt (1988) and related work.)

[8] In addition to Aoun (1986), see also Borer (1984), Ouhalla (1993), and Kornfilt (1984; 1991), among others.

[9] This is in contrast to the Anti-agreement effect proposed in Ouhalla (1993), where the observation is made that in some languages which otherwise do have overt agreement, such agreement is prohibited in subject-targeting syntactic phenomena. That observation is labeled "the Anti-agreement effect", without an attempt to tie in this observation with binding.

Extensive discussion of examples and evidence for *pro* in Turkish and its syntactic properties and distribution can be found in Kornfilt (1984; 1991; 2003).

2.3 CA-effects

Let us now ask why the language bothers with different predicate markings, in addition to contrasts between the presence versus absence of overt agreement morphology.

I suggest here that this is due to C(omplementizer) A(greement). Two pieces of evidence argue in favor of this analysis: 1. The "subject nominalization" form shows up (productively) only in RCs, i.e. in operator-variable constructions, thus arguing in favor of such an operator, and thus also in favor of the position of such an operator, usually assumed to be the specifier of CP. Thus, we could view CA as an instantiation of the general agreement between a head and its specifier.[10] 2. This is a form different from subject-predicate agreement. Since regular phi-feature agreement would violate the "A′-disjointness condition", a form is needed without such agreement. But since, according to the proposal, the language does have CA, this CA must be expressed, and it is, via the special (agreement-less) morphology. (This would be similar to **que** → **qui** in French.)

Since an operator is involved, this special CA form must be due to a process taking place at the level of CP (cf. Carstens (2003)), i.e. at the CP-phase. This supports the proposal that phi-feature *Agr* is located on the head of that phase, i.e. is in C.

3. Sakha: A′-Disjointness Without CA

We have now divorced the issue of the special shape of the predicate in Turkish subject RCs from the issue of the missing overt subject agreement form in such RCs. We thus predict the possibility that some languages might exhibit the constraint in (6) against locally bound resumptive pronouns without, however, also showing evidence of CA. This prediction is correct.

In some Turkic languages, presence versus absence of agreement is the only difference between the two main types of RCs (i.e. subject and non-subject RCs) and is determined similarly to Turkish (cf. Csató (1996)): the same nominalization morpheme on the predicate is used in the modifier clause,

---

[10] In much of earlier generative literature, complementizer-subject agreement was motivated largely by the necessity to avoid ECP-effects (or "complementizer-trace effects", depending on the model used). The status of the ECP is rather unclear now, and the question of whether CA is primarily based on a probe-goal relationship between the complementizer and the subject is peripheral to our concerns here; I will therefore not discuss it further. At any rate, I assume that in CA-effects, the morphological realization of the agreement between C and the subject variable can be either expressed in terms of ph-feature agreement, or in special morphology without phi-feature agreement, the latter in French and Turkish subject RCs. As argued previously, overt phi-feature agreement in Turkish RCs would lead to a violation of the principle in (6). This treatment is in line with recent work by Miyagawa (cf. Miyagawa (2001; 2005; 2006; and this volume), where agreement is assumed to be in C.

irrespective of the RC target, but overt subject agreement (albeit on the RC head, not on the predicate of the modifier clause) is possible only in non-subject RCs and leads to ill-formedness in subject RCs. In the terms of the approach I have proposed for Turkish RCs, the generalized binding condition (6) holds for these languages, too (pace a somewhat different computation of locality, mentioned in the introduction and to be addressed later in this paper); however, these languages do not have CA effects. As just mentioned, the RCs in such languages exhibit overt agreement with the subject on the head of the (non-subject) RC, rather than on the predicate; they can differ, however, with respect to the case of the subject: in Sakha (often also called Yakut), a language spoken in northern Siberia, the genitive has largely disappeared from the language. Therefore, in most non-subject RCs (which do exhibit the usual Turkic nominalized modifier clause), as well as in nominalized embedded clauses, the subject shows up in the nominative, i.e. in the bare form, rather than in the expected genitive. On the other hand, in many other languages that have RCs with agreement on the head (rather than on the predicate), such as Uighur, the subject is in the genitive. As in Turkish, too, the agreement form in question is the "nominal" agreement found on nominalized predicates as well as on the possessee, i.e. on the head of possessive DPs. I start the discussion with Sakha RCs.

3.1 Sakha (Yakut) RCs: the apparent long-distance subject—*Agr* relation

(7) a. [**ït**   **e¡** ih   -iex -teex] üüt¡ **-e**
        dog (NOM)   drink -FUT -MOOD milk **-3.SG**
        'the milk the dog should drink' (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

(7) b. [[**kini   aqa   -ta**]   **e¡** öl -ör   -büt] oquh¡ **-a**
        he(NOM) father -3.SG(NOM)   die-CAUS -P   ox   **-3.SG**
        'The ox which his father killed' (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

In (7a.), the agreement element, reflecting the phi-features of the subject in the modifier clause, i.e. third person singular, is morphologically attached to the head of the RC, *üüt* 'milk', and not to the predicate *ihiexteex* 'should drink', as it would have been in Turkish. In (7b.), the subject is more complex; it consists of a possessive phrase. The agreement element that agrees with its phi-features is attached to the head of the RC, as well. (The difference in the two agreement elements is due to vowel harmony.)

The subject—agreement relationship appears to violate locality. Because such relations are assumed to be local universally, the Turkish situation is expected, while the situation in Sakha is surprising.

A second question is linked to locality, as well. If the lack of overt agreement in subject RCs in Sakha (illustrated later—see [15]) is to be explained in the same way as in Turkish, i.e. via generalized binding (and the principle in [6]), then the relationship between overt agreement and the subject of the embedded clause must be local, so that the overt agreement can license and identify the empty subject as a pronominal, i.e. as *pro*. Yet, this relationship does not appear to be local syntactically.

In order to create such a local relationship in similar constructions in other languages (e.g. Hale (2002) and Hale & Ning (1996) for Dagur, a Mongolian language, and Aygen (2006) for Tuvan, Kazakh, and Kazan Tatar, Turkic languages), raising to the specifier of the higher DP has been proposed. In this paper (and related work), I show that this analysis cannot hold for Sakha, nor can it hold for Modern Uighur, to which I will turn later. The question of whether this raising analysis indeed holds for Dagur, Tuvan, Kazakh and Kazan Tatar will therefore have to be addressed and reexamined carefully; I leave such examination to future research[11] and turn now to arguments that show why the raising analysis does not hold for Sakha RCs.

An important basic question is whether both the specifier position of the higher DP and the subject position of the modifier clause in RCs can be both filled at the same time, and if they can, how they differ from each other. It turns out that this is possible, with the higher DP-specifier interpreted as a possessor of the RC-head, and the lower subject being interpreted as a genuine subject. Further, the higher DP-specifier is marked with the genitive (i.e. a relic genitive which has survived and is limited in ways to be discussed), while the subject is marked with the nominative. These facts strongly support an analysis where the subject remains in-situ.

Another question is about the *Agr* element on the RC-head in such constructions, more specifically, whether there can be two or only one, and if the latter, which one survives.

Before investigating these questions, let us first look at simple possessive phrases in Sakha.

3.2 Possessive DPs in Sakha

These are similar to their counterparts in Turkish, in that the head of the possessor phrase, i.e. the possessee, agrees in phi-features with the specifier of the possessive phrase, i.e. with the possessor. The only difference is that the possessor is not in the genitive in Sakha; this is not surprising, due to the general demise of the overt genitive in that language:

(8)   a.   kïïs   oquh-a
                  girl(NOM) ox   -3.SG
                  'The girl's ox'

(8)   b.   kini   aqa -ta
                  he (NOM) father -3.SG
                  'His father'

---

[11] Miyagawa (this volume) proposes an analysis for Dagur RCs (as well as for Japanese RCs) which is very similar to the one I propose here for Sakha and Uighur, i.e. an analysis that leaves the subject in-situ and which posits non-CP, "bare" AspP status for the modifying clause. As for Kazakh, my fieldwork with Raihan Mohamedowa strongly suggests that raising of the subject is not a viable option in that language, either; see discussion in conjunction with Uighur.

(8) c.   min   oquh -um
          I(NOM) ox   -1.SG
          'My ox'

When the possessor is itself complex, e.g. if it is a possessive phrase, then the complex possessor does get marked with a morpheme which is a relic of a previously productive genitive case; the possessor within that complex possessor is, as expected, in the nominative:

(9) a.   [kini   aqa   -tï] -**n**   oquh-**a**
          he (NOM) father -3.SG -**GEN** ox   -**3.SG**
          'His father's ox'

(9) b.   [kïïs   oquh-u   ] -**n**   kuturug -**a**
          girl(NOM) ox   -3.SG -**GEN** tail   -**3.SG**
          'The girl's ox's tail'

This relic genitive is limited to third person possessives, i.e. it does not show up after first or second person possessives.[12]

3.3 First empirical argument against subject raising in RCs: Sakha RCs with complex possessive subjects

The relic genitive just mentioned does not show up on the subject of an embedded clause, even if that clause is nominalized, and even if the subject is a third person complex possessive phrase:

(10) a.   [[Kini aqa   -ta   üüt -ü
            He   father -3.SG (**NOM**) milk-ACC
            ih -iex -teek -i] -n   bil -e -bin
            drink-FUT-MOD -3.SG-ACC know-AOR-1.SG
            'I know that his father should drink the milk'

(10) b.   *[[Kini aqa   -tï   -**n**] üüt -ü
            He   father -3.SG -**GEN** milk-ACC
            ih -iex -teek -i   ] -n   bil -e -bin
            drink-FUT-MOD-3.SG -ACC know -AOR-1.SG
            Intended reading: The same as for (10a).

I conclude that the relic genitive can show up only on (complex, third person) specifiers of bona fide DPs, enforcing the interpretation of such specifiers as possessives; subjects don't qualify.

If the raising analysis is correct for the subject of Sakha non-subject RCs, we would expect for such a complex subject, if it is a third person, to be marked with the relic genitive. We see, however, that this is not possible, and

---

[12] The observation that Sakha still has a relic of the genitive has been made in the Turkological literature; cf. Stachowski & Menz (1998: 428).

that the subject surfaces in the nominative, just as it does in a regular embedding such as in (10a):

(11) a.　[[kini　　aqa -ta　　　] öl -ör　-büt] oquh-**a**
　　　　 he (NOM) father-3.SG (**NOM**) die -CAUS-P　ox　 **-3.SG**
　　　　 'The ox which his father killed' (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

(11) b.　*[[kini　　aqa -tï　] -**n**　öl -ör　-büt] oquh -**a**
　　　　 he(NOM) father-3.SG -**GEN** die-CAUS-P　ox　 **-3.SG**
　　　　 Intended reading: 'The ox which his father killed'
　　　　 (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

　　　　The grammatical (11a) is a repetition of the previous (7b). We now see the importance of the boldfaced nominative gloss for the subject (and, of course, of the ill-formedness of (11b), with the genitive-marked subject). If the complex subject, *kini aqata* 'his father', had risen to the specifier position of the higher DP, it would have been obligatorily marked with the genitive; however, (11b) shows that genitive marking in such RCs is ill-formed.[13] We thus see that the subject of the modifier clause in this RC is still within that clause, and the question of the apparent violation of locality between the subject and the agreement marker on the RC-head, rather than on the predicate, still needs to be addressed. But before discussing this question of locality, I would like to turn to an additional empirical argument against subject raising.

3.4 Second empirical argument against subject raising in RCs: Sakha RCs embedded in possessive DPs

Let us consider instances of RCs within higher possessive phrases, where the phi-features of the possessor and those of the subject differ:

(12)　　 [[aqa -n　]　　　 öl -ör　-büt] (min)　　 oquh -**um**
　　　　 father-2.SG(NOM) die -CAUS -P　 (I[NOM]) ox　　 **-1.SG**
　　　　 'My ox which your father killed' (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

Note that the RC-head bears the agreement marker for the possessor, i.e. for the specifier of the higher DP, and not the marker for the subject, which would have been third person singular. This is not an issue of a hierarchy between different persons, with, for example, the first person winning over the third, as the next example shows:

---

[13] The subject of the modifier clause in such RCs can, actually, be sometimes marked with the relic genitive, but is then interpreted as the possessor of the RC-head, just as it would in Turkish, when the agreement is on the RC head. I would analyze such constructions with the genitive possessor base-generated in the higher specifier position, just as its Turkish counterpart, and have it co-indexed with an empty subject, which I analyze as *pro*. The validity of this analysis is further supported by the possibility of embedding such RCs within possessive phrases, where the possessors differ in phi-features from the subject, and which agree with the RC-head. This is illustrated in the text, in the next section, and shows that in Sakha, just as in Turkish, the specifier of the higher DP and the subject position of the modifier clause can be filled with distinct DPs, each with its own theta-role, arguing further against a raising analysis.

(13)   [min   öl -ör   -büt] (kini)   oquh **-a**
            I(NOM) die -CAUS -P   he (NOM) ox **-3.SG**
            'His ox which I killed' (Kornfilt & Vinokurova 2001)

Here, the (syntactically) higher "possessive agreement" wins over the (syntactically) lower "subject agreement", although the winner is the third person agreement marker, usually classified as lower on person hierarchies than the first person, over which it has obviously won in this example.

      The fact that not both agreement morphemes, i.e. one for the subject, and one for the possessor, can be displayed on the head *oquh* 'ox', is due to a constraint against immediate sequences of the same type of morpheme (cf. Kornfilt (1986), where the constraint is labeled "the Stuttering Prohibition", and Göksel (1997)). As is usually the case in such instances, at least in Turkish, the morpheme which corresponds to the position higher in the phrase-structural architecture wins. One interesting question that arises is how the subject and its case are licensed, when the agreement devoted to the subject's phi-features is not overtly expressed. Interesting as this question is, I shall not address it here; this issue is peripheral to our present concerns.[14]

      What's important for us, however, is that in Sakha, just as in Turkish, the specifier position of the higher DP can be filled independently from the subject position of the modifier clause in a RC; the two positions receive separate and distinct thematic roles, as in (12) and (13), and can be filled simultaneously by independent DPs. This clearly argues against a raising analysis, under which the subject of the modifying clause in the RC would raise to Spec, DP of the RC—in the examples under scrutiny, that position is already filled.

      Having thus shown that in Sakha non-subject RCs, the subject is in its clause-internal position and has not risen to the specifier of the higher DP, we have to face our original question of how the subject can agree with overt agreement on the RC-head, i.e. with an element which appears not to be syntactically local to it.

---

[14] In Kirghiz, Kazakh, and Uighur, examples corresponding to the Sakha examples in (12) and (13) are ill-formed when the RC has a genitive subject and thus would exhibit, if it were not embedded within a possessive phrase, an overt *Agr* morpheme on the RC-head. This is so even when the possessor is not overtly expressed. (I am indebted to Kenjegül Kalieva, Raihan Mohamedowa, and Raziye Nuri, respectively, for having discussed relevant examples with me; due to space constraints, I don't illustrate this generalization here.) I hypothesize that in these three languages, just as in Sakha and Turkish, the "Stuttering Prohibition" holds. This is why, just as in Sakha, non-subject RCs embedded in a possessive phrase cannot exhibit two agreement morphemes on the head. The surviving agreement morpheme would be, I hypothesize, the higher one, as well. I propose that due to the lack of the unrealized subject agreement, the genitive subject cannot be licensed, thus leading to ill-formedness. In Sakha, even where the subject agreement is not realized due to the same Stuttering Prohibition, the nominative can be licensed, since this case is morphologically not marked and is a default case, at least in all the Turkic languages I am familiar with, including Turkish (cf. Kornfilt (2003a)). It is suggestive to observe that in Uighur, Kirghiz, and Kazakh, which are similar to each other in also allowing non-subject RCs with nominative subjects and no overt Agr at all, that alternative construction *can* be embedded in a possessive phrase. Clearly, in such constructions, the nominative is treated as a default case, which doesn't need licensing by an *Agr*-probe.

Our strategy will have to be towards finding a way to make this apparently non-local relationship into a local one.

I propose to achieve this, by analyzing the modifying clauses of RCs in languages such as Sakha as further reduced from their counterparts in Turkish, and to impute the category of TAM[Tense/Aspect/Mood]-P to them, rather than that of CP.[15]

As mentioned in the introduction, one independent piece of support for this analysis the fact that in languages such as Sakha, non-subject RCs do not exhibit subject agreement on the modifier clause; this can be interpreted as lack of a CP-layer on the clause, under the assumption we have made here that the agreement is located on C (whether via raising or external Merge), as discussed earlier in this paper, following work by Miyagawa. *If there is no CP, there is no C for the agreement to raise to or merge with.* If the structure is such that the RC-head is local to the subject, i.e. if the RC-head and its D are in the same phase as the subject, then it would make sense for the agreement to raise to or merge with the D instead. Given that CP and DP are phases (in the approach I advocate here), this would mean that the subject and the RC-D can be affected in the same phase, given that in the analysis proposed here, the RC has no CP in Sakha but does have a DP. In other words, in both Turkish and Sakha RCs, *Agr* is on a phase head; however, in Turkish, the relevant phase head is C, while in Sakha, it is N/D, i.e. the head of the RC.

3.5 The A′-disjointness requirement in Sakha:
In support of locality for *Agr* (on D) and the in-situ subject

Yet another piece of evidence in support of my proposal is the fact that Csató's generalization holds in Sakha RCs just as it holds in Turkish RCs: subject RCs cannot exhibit local subject agreement—an observation which I explained by resorting to the principle in (6), i.e. the A′-binding restriction. However, the Sakha facts can be explained via this principle only if the RC-head and its agreement marker are in a local relationship to the subject of the modifying clause. If they are not (and they would not be, if that clause were a CP and therefore the subject in a different phase than the RC-head), then an explanation for the "anti-agreement effects" would need to be devised for Sakha-type RCs that is completely independent from the explanation for Turkish-type RCs, clearly missing a generalization that holds across these languages.

The following examples illustrate subject RCs in Sakha, showing the lack of agreement morphology with the subject, thus contrasting with non-subject RCs:

(14)   [e$_i$ üüt ih -iex -teex] ït$_i$
              milk drink-FUT -MOD dog
              'The dog which should drink the milk'

There is no overt agreement with the subject here—neither on the predicate of the modifier clause, not on the RC-head. In this respect, the subject RC in Sakha is similar to its Turkish counterpart.

Note also the contrast with a Sakha non-subject RC (of the kind we have seen previously):

(15)   [ït e_i ih   -iex -teex] üüt$_i$ **-e**
              dog (NOM)   drink-FUT -MOD milk **-3.SG**
              'The milk which the dog should drink'

In (14), then, the variable in subject position and the RC-head are in a local relationship, because they are in the same phase, by virtue of the embedded clause not being a CP. Agreement on the RC-head would therefore have violated the principle in (6), i.e. the generalized binding principle against *locally* bound resumptive pronouns.

This last pair of examples also illustrates yet another piece of support for my analysis denying CP-status to the modifier clause in Sakha RCs. Note that the predicates of the embedded clauses are identical, even though (14) is a subject RC, and (15) is a non-subject RC. The subject—non-subject asymmetry we have observed and discussed for Turkish RCs holds only with respect to the absence versus presence of overt agreement, but not with respect to different predicate shapes.

For Turkish RCs, I have attributed the asymmetry with respect to predicate shape to a complementizer—subject agreement (CA) effect. CA is not a universal; it may be possible that Sakha has simply made the parametric choice of not having CA, while Turkish has made the choice to have it.

While possible, this avenue of describing one difference between Turkish and Sakha RCs is less satisfactory than an explanatory account which would *predict* that Sakha RCs *cannot* possibly have CA effects. If such an account found independent support, it should clearly be the preferred explanation of the data.

I believe that such an account is possible within the approach I have suggested here, namely in conjunction with the proposal I made about modifying clauses in Sakha RCs not being CPs. If a clause is not a CP, it has no position for C, nor for Spec, CP, and thus will not be able to exhibit CA-effects. The pair in (14) and (15), representative for their respective kinds, illustrates clearly that no CA-effects are shown in Sakha RCs at all.[16] Therefore, this fact provides independent evidence for my analysis for a reduced structure of the modifying clause in Sakha RCs.

I now turn to Modern Uighur, a language that has RCs similar to those in Sakha, but which has not lost the genitive as a subject case. While discussing Uighur examples, I shall also mention their Kirghiz and Kazakh counterparts, albeit in passing.

---

[16] Not all subject versus non-subject RCs in Sakha are as clear-cut as the pair (14) versus (15); it is possible to have different predicate forms. However, those differences are due to differences in mood and aspect—the relevant morphology is very rich. No distinctions are determined by the *target* of the RCs in Sakha and in languages with similar RC systems.

3.6 Modern Uighur RCs

I start with non-subject RCs that exhibit overt *Agr* and a genitive subject. Just as in Turkish and most other Turkic languages, these pre-nominal RCs in Uighur have nominalized modifying clauses with genitive subjects. They exhibit a "nominal" subject agreement morpheme, which is the same morpheme found on the head of possessive phrases, just as the genitive found on the subject of nominalized clauses is the same case as the one found on the possessor in a possessive phrase; these are additional, general Turkic properties (and which we had seen illustrated earlier in this paper, for example in Turkish). In Uighur, this morpheme is placed on the RC-head, similar to Sakha non-subject RCs.

(16)   [sïn **-ïŋ**   e¡ izdä   -ydïγan] adεm¡   **-ïŋ**
          you **-GEN**   search for -FUT   man, person-2.SG
          köč -üp   kät -ti
          move-Conv Aux-PAST
          'The person whom you will look for has moved away/left'
          (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

Also as in Sakha, the predicate of the modifier clause does not change its shape according to the target of the RC, while it can change its shape with respect to tense or aspect; in the following pair, the first example is a subject RC, and the second is a non-subject RC. Note that the shape of the predicate is the same, as long as the tense/aspect is the same:

(17)   [e¡ ürümči -dε   tur - **ïdïγan**   ] sïn¡ -ïn
           Ürümçi -LOC live-**FUT/PRES**   sister-2.SG
          'Your sister who lives in Ürümçi' (LeSourd 1989)

(18)   [(min **-ïŋ**   ) e¡ tut   - **ïdïγan**   ] at¡ **-ïm**
           I   **-GEN**   catch -**FUT/PRES**   horse-**1.SG**
          'The horse that I catch/will catch' (LeSourd 1989)

        As just mentioned, the shape of the predicate can change with a change in the tense/aspect, even where the target remains the same; thus, compare (18) with (19), which is a non-subject RC, as well, but where the predicate is in the past:

(19)   [min **-iŋ**   al   **-γan**   ] xotun-**um** dunya-da   bir
           I   **-GEN** take -**PAST/PERFECT** lady **-1.SG** world -LOC one
          'The lady I married is unique in the world'
          (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

Also similarly to Sakha, Csató's Generalization holds in Uighur, i.e. subject RCs cannot display agreement with the subject on the RC-head. In other words, the principle in (6) against locally A′-bound resumptive pronouns (and thus also against locally A′-bound resumptive *pro*) holds—and, again, just as in Sakha, it holds independently of CA-effects, which do not hold (as just illustrated above):

(20)   [e¡ kel   -**gen**   ] kiši¡
             come -**PAST/PERFECT**   person
         'A/The person who has come' (Johanson 1998: 61)

Note that the nominalization marker on the predicate is the same in (19), a non-subject RC, and (20), a subject RC, in contrast with the situation in Turkish. I had proposed to interpret the nominalization markers that differ according to the subject versus non-subject nature of the RC target as a CA-effect; thus, the pair of examples in (19) and (20) illustrate that Uighur RCs do not exhibit CA-effects, and I thus analyze the modifying clause in Uighur RCs as "bare" TAM-phrases rather than CPs.

  Because the genitive has survived in Uighur, we cannot find evidence against subject-to-"possessor" (i.e. specifier of DP) raising in non-subject RCs based on case differences, as we did in Sakha; this is because subjects in the (nominalized) modifier clause (in the RC construction that we are interested in, namely the construction with the overt *Agr*-probe on the RC-head) show up in the genitive case (rather than in the nominative, as they do in Sakha), and are thus similar in this respect to possessors, i.e. specifiers of possessive DPs. Given that the RC-head carries the subject-agreement element, the issue is whether the "agreeing" head is perhaps in a (clearly local) agreement relationship with a (raised) subject in "possessor" position, rather than with the subject in-situ, still in its clause-internal position. Our second empirical argument against subject raising that we discussed in Sakha, namely the argument based on simultaneously realized subjects and possessors in RCs, doesn't work in Uighur, either, due to the Stuttering Prohibition and the resulting lack of genitive licensing on the subject (cf. footnote 13). Therefore, we need to look for different kinds of arguments against the subject-raising analysis. (Note that the alternative non-subject RC construction with the nominative subject and no *Agr*-probe is irrelevant for our purposes, given that the possessor (in Spec, DP) is always in the genitive and always co-occurs with an *Agr*-probe on the head; therefore, a nominative subject in such an RC would not be a candidate for raising to Spec, DP anyway. The same is true for Kirghiz and Kazakh, as well.)

  First of all, we have to investigate whether the genitive on the subject is indeed dependent on the agreement morphology on the RC-head. The following examples illustrate that it is:

(21) a.   [(sïn -**ïŋ**   ) e¡ kör -**ïdïγan**]   adɛm¡ -**ïŋ**
             you -**GEN**   see -**FUT/PRES** man   -**2.SG**
             'The man you will see' (LeSourd 1989)

This non-subject RC has properties familiar by now: the subject of the modifier clause and the RC-head overtly agree, and, as is typical in Uighur, the subject is in the genitive.

  It is interesting to note, however, that Uighur has a second type of non-subject RC—a type which, in some other Turkic languages, is the only type available; that type does not have any overt subject agreement morphology at all—neither on the RC-head, nor on the predicate; crucially, the subject is bare, i.e. in the nominative:

(21) b. [sɛn **e¡** kör **-ïdïɣan**] adɛm¡
you see **-FUT/PRES** man
'The man you will see' (LeSourd 1989)

The two versions mean essentially the same; native speakers say that in the version with the genitive subject, that subject has the feel of a topic, and that it is stressed in some sense. It would be interesting to study the way in which the nominative case is licensed in the absence of overt agreement, and whether it is an instance of default case; however, this is not our concern here. For our purposes, it is important to show that in the version with the genitive subject, the genitive is clearly licensed by the overt agreement on the RC-head; a genitive subject leads to ill-formedness in the absence of overt agreement:

(21) c. *[sïn **-ïŋ** **e¡** kör **-ïdïɣan**] adɛm¡
you **-GEN** see **-FUT/PRES** man
Intended reading: Same as in (21)a. and b. (LeSourd 1989)

We have now seen two important factors about overt agreement in Uighur non-subject RCs[17]: 1. overt agreement expresses the phi-features of the apparently non-local subject; 2. this overt agreement licenses the genitive case on this seemingly non-local subject. Therefore, the question arises once again whether the subject is raised to the specifier position of the higher DP, i.e. to "possessor" position.

Modern Uighur does offer support for an in-situ analysis of the embedded subject, against a raising analysis; the evidence is of a sort which is different from what we had seen in Sakha, and is based on word order. I argue that if the subject could raise, out of its clause, to a higher position within the DP, then it should also be able to raise to other positions outside of its clause; however, this is not possible, as the following examples illustrate. The constituents used to check potentially possible positions will be, in addition to the subject, two different adverbs, and their construal possibilities with the embedded versus the matrix predicate.

(22) [[min-ïŋ ɛtɛ bar -ïdïɣan] yer -im]
I -GEN tomorrow arrive -FUT place -1.SG
enïgki nahayiti yïraq
obviously very far
'The place where I will arrive/go tomorrow is obviously very far'
(Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

The adverb of the modifier clause, *ɛtɛ* 'tomorrow', can freely scramble over the subject, as long as this is local scrambling, i.e. within the clause:

---

[17] Similar contrasts and possibilities are found in Kazakh and Kirghiz, too, as will be illustrated shortly.

(23)   [[ɛtɛ   min-ïŋ   bar   -ïdïɣan] yer -im   ]
         tomorrow I   -GEN arrive -FUT   place -1.SG
        enïgki   nahayiti yïraq
        obviously very   far
        Same meaning as (22) (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

Similarly, the root adverb *enïgki* 'obviously' can freely move within the root clause:

(24)   enïgki   [[ɛtɛ   min-ïŋ   bar -ïdïɣan] yer   -im   ]
        obviously   tomorrow I   -GEN arrive -FUT   place -1.SG
        nahayiti yïraq
        very   far
        Same meaning as (22) and (23) (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

However, neither the genitive subject, nor the adverb of the embedded clause can move into the root clause:

(25)   * min-ïŋ   enïgki   [[ɛtɛ   bar -ïdïɣan] yer   -im   ]
         I -GEN obviously   tomorrow arrive-FUT   place -1.SG
        nahayiti yïraq
        very   far
        Intended reading: Same as in (22), (23), and (24)
        (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)

(26)   *ɛtɛ   enïgki   [[min-ïŋ   bar -ïdïɣan] yer   -im   ]
         tomorrow obviously   I   -GEN arrive -FUT   place -1.SG
        nahayiti yïraq
        very   far
        Intended reading: Same as in (22), (23), and (24)
        (Abdurishid Yakup, p.c.)[18]

(Note that in (24), the immediate sequence of two adverbs is fine—as long as the root adverb is higher than the embedded adverb; the reversed order and thus hierarchy between the two adverbs leads to ill-formedness in (26).)
        While the ill-formedness of these last two examples might be explained by referring to subjacency effects, i.e. the unsuccessful attempt to move constituents out of a complex DP, this is actually a piece of evidence against a raising analysis of genitive subjects in Uighur non-subject RCs.
        The reason for this claim is as follows: in Uighur, as in other Turkic languages, possessors in possessive phrases with an agreement marker on the head scramble quite freely out of the possessive phrase. Thus, the fact that (25) with its topicalized subject is ill-formed despite the agreement marker on *yer* 'place', the RC-head, shows that the topicalization originated from the subject position, rather than from the position of the specifier of the higher DP, i.e. from

---

[18] These examples were constructed along similar ones in LeSourd (1989). I have followed here the guidance of Dr. Abdurishid Yakup, a native Uighur speaker and Turkologist, who helped me construct examples which he found to be more colloquial and acceptable.

the possessor position—and it is the possessor position which would have been the source of the topicalization, if the subject had undergone raising to Spec, DP. I thus conclude that the genitive subject in Uighur non-subject RCs remains in-situ.

Secondly, the well-formedness of (23), in conjunction with the preceding discussion, also argues against raising of the genitive subject to a higher Spec,DP position. Under the analysis given here, i.e. that the genitive subject is in-situ and has not risen, the grammaticality of (23) is just as expected; the adverb has locally scrambled to the left of the subject, and both the adverb and the subject are still within the modifier clause of the RC. But if we assume that the subject has risen to the specifier position of the higher DP, so as to enter a local relationship with the agreement element on the RC-head, then we also have to assume that the temporal adverb has risen to an even higher position than the subject (given that the adverb precedes the subject), presumably to some high topic position. But ill-formed examples such as (26) show that adverbs can scramble only locally; hence, we conclude that in (23), the adverb has scrambled to a clause-internal topic position; but if the adverb is still within the clause, then the genitive subject that follows that adverb is in-situ and has not undergone raising.[19]

Kazakh and Kirghiz, two Turkic languages with RCs very similar to those in Uighur, offer similar evidence. I first turn to Kazakh:

(27)   Erteŋ   men-iŋ   älbette bar   -atın žer -im   alïsta
          Tomorrow I   -GEN certainly arrive-FUT place-1.SG far
          '*The place where I will arrive tomorrow is certainly far.'
          'The place where I will certainly arrive tomorrow is far.'
          (Raihan Muhamedowa, p.c.)

Here, the temporal adverb of the embedded clause and the genitive subject precede the adverb which, in an "unscrambled" counterpart, is primarily construed with the matrix predicate:

(28)   Älbette erteŋ   men-iŋ   bar -atın žer -im   alïsta
          Certainly tomorrow I   -GEN arrive-FUT place-1.SG far
          'The place where I will arrive tomorrow is certainly far.'
          'The place where I will certainly arrive tomorrow is far.'
          (Raihan Muhamedowa, p.c.)

In (28), *älbette* 'certainly' can be construed with the embedded predicate, but crucially, it can also be construed with the matrix predicate 'be far'. This reading

---

[19] It may be claimed that all of these empirical arguments against subject raising to Spec, DP argue against such raising in narrow syntax, but not necessarily against raising at LF, as has been assumed to take place in Japanese RCs with genitive subjects (cf. Miyagawa (1993)). However, in Japanese studies, too, a more economic approach has been favored more recently that dispenses with LF-movement in such constructions (see discussion in Miyagawa, this volume). It is clear that an LF-based approach would need to posit that in the Turkic examples, in order to be successful, the LF-movement of the genitive subject would need to have properties different from those that the subject's and the adverbs' movements have in narrow syntax.

is not possible in (27), where the same adverb can only be construed with the embedded predicate 'arrive'. This shows that neither the embedded temporal adverb, nor the genitive subject of the embedded clause, are able to move out of that clause; if they had been able to, the second adverb *älbette* 'certainly' should have been able to act as a matrix constituent, which it is not.

Thus, just as in Uighur, the genitive subject cannot raise out of its clause into the matrix clause. Likewise, as in Uighur, if it had previously risen to Spec,DP of the RC, such movement into the matrix should have been possible, given that in Kazakh, too, true possessive genitives, i.e. true Spec,DP constituents, scramble freely out of their DP.

Similar facts are easily found in Kirghiz, as well. In the following example, just as in its counterpart in Kazakh, the sentence-initial adverb sözsüz 'doubtlessly, certainly' can be construed with either the embedded or the matrix predicate:

(29)   Sözsüz   Ali-nin erteŋ   bara tur -gan žer -i   uzak
         Certainly Ali-GEN tomorrow arrive Aux-P place-3.SG   far
         'The place where Ali will arrive tomorrow is certainly far'
         'The place where Ali will certainly arrive tomorrow is far'
         (Kenjegül Kalieva, p.c.)

In the following example, where the genitive subject precedes the adverb *sözsüz* 'certainly', that adverb can only be construed with the embedded predicate:

(30)   Men-in   sözsüz   erteŋ   bara tur -gan žer -im uzak.
         I   -GEN certainly tomorrow arrive Aux-P   place-1.SG far
         '*The place where I will arrive tomorrow is certainly far'
         'The place where I will certainly arrive tomorrow is far'
         (Kenjegül Kalieva, p.c.)

Similar considerations as in Uighur and Kazakh apply here, too; the genitive subject obviously cannot move out of its clause, into the matrix clause. If that subject had risen into Spec, DP of the RC, then such movement into the matrix should not have been problematic. I conclude that the genitive subject in Kirghiz non-subject RCs, just as its counterpart in Uighur and Kazakh, remains *in-situ*.

This, then, brings us back to the issue of the locality of the relationship between the genitive subject and the overt agreement on the RC-head. Both for the sake of phi-feature AGREE (cf., among others, Chomsky (1999)), and for the sake of genitive case licensing, this relationship should be local. If this can't be achieved via the raising of the subject to the specifier of the RC's head/D, as I have just argued, then it must be the case that the probe-goal relationship in question is indeed local, in spite of being established with the *in-situ* subject.

I propose that the same approach already proposed for Sakha can succeed for Uighur, as well as for Kazakh and Kirghiz: the modifier clause is not a CP, but just a bare TAM-phrase. Therefore, the subject and the RC-head/D are in the same phase (namely, the DP), and the relationship between the two is thus

local. The fact that Csató's Generalization holds, as well as the lack of any CA-effects, are two pieces of independent evidence that support this proposal.

4. Conclusions

The overt *Agr* morphology, expressing the phi-features with a local subject, differs in its placement in non-subject RCs exhibited by Turkic languages, as we saw: In some languages such as Turkish, it has to be on the predicate which is a clause-mate of the subject, and in some others, such as Sakha , Modern Uighur, Kazakh, and Kirghiz, it has to be on the RC-head.

This typology correlates with another difference, also having to do with agreement, but of a different sort, as I claim: RCs in languages such as Turkish display a special predicate morphology for subject RCs, different from that seen in non-subject RCs or in embeddings in general. I attribute this to Complementizer Agreement (CA) effects, similar to the so-called *que*-to-*qui* conversion in French. RCs in languages such as Sakha and Modern Uighur do not display CA-effects.

Thus, placement of the overt *Agr* element that expresses the subject's phi-features correlates with CA-effects: RCs in languages with CA-effects display the *Agr* element on the predicate of the modifier clause; RCs in languages without CA-effects display the *Agr* element on the RC-head.

In both types of languages, there is a common RC-property (*pace* the difference in position) with respect to phi-feature *Agr*: The *Agr* marker shows up obligatorily in non-subject RCs (so as to license the genitive case on the subject), but it is obligatorily absent in subject RCs. I attributed this common property to an A′-disjointness requirement, valid for all of these languages, but whose syntactic domain of application is slightly different, due to the different category status of the modifier clause in the RCs, and thus the different computation of locality:

I conclude that the correlations between the two differences, as well as the common subject–non-subject asymmetry with respect to presence versus absence of phi-feature *Agr*, can be explained by one single parametric difference between these two types of Turkic languages: the modifier clause in the RC is a CP in Turkish-type languages, but it is not a CP, rather a smaller projection, such as a bare TAM-P in languages such as Sakha, Kirghiz, Kazakh, and Modern Uighur. All of the typological properties follow straightforwardly:

There cannot be CA-effects where there is no CP-projection; also, where there is no CP-projection, the subject and the RC-head/D are in a local relation with each other, as they are in Sakha and other languages similar to it in this respect—a relation which has to obey the A′-disjointness requirement, due to this locality. Where there is a CP, on the other hand, as in Turkish, there can be CA-effects; also, the CP delimits locality, because it determines a phase; *Agr* must be placed on the predicate; if it were on the RC-head instead, it would be non-local with respect to the subject of the modifier clause.

This approach succeeds in deriving the relevant typological distinctions among Turkic languages with respect to their RCs. Furthermore, it also shows that the RCs in one single language, namely Turkish, are best described, and

their properties explained, when the differences between subject- and non-subject RCs in that language are handled independently from each other, namely in terms of CA (with respect to the distinction in predicate shape) and the A′-Disjointness Requirement (with respect to the difference in presence versus absence of overt phi-feature *Agr*).

References

Ackerman, F. & I. Nikolaeva (1997). Identity in form, difference in function: The person/number paradigm in Western Armenian and Northern Ostyak. In M. Butt & T. Holloway King (eds.) *Proceedings of the LFG 97 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Online Publications.

Aoun, Y. (1986). *Generalized Binding, the Syntax and Logical Form of Wh-interrogatives*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Aygen, G. (2006). Case and agreement in reduced versus full relative clauses in Turkic languages. In S. Yağcıoğlu & A. C. Değer (eds.) *Advances in Turkish Linguistics*. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, pp. 643–653.

Borer, H. (1984). Restrictive relatives in modern Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 219–260.

Carstens, V. (2003) Rethinking complementizer agreement: Agree with a case-checked goal. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 393–412.

Chomsky, N. (1999). Derivation by phase. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 18.

Chomsky, N. (2008). On phases. In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Csató, É. (1996). A typological review of relative clause constructions in some Turkic languages. In B. Rona (ed.) *Current Issues in Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ankara: Hitit Yayınevi [copyright London: SOAS], pp. 28–32.

Dalmi, G. (2005). *The Role of Agreement in Non-Finite Predication*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Göksel, A. (1997). Morphological asymmetries between Turkish and Yakut. In K. İmer & N. E. Uzun (eds.) *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ankara: Ankara University publications, pp. 69–76.

Hale, K. (2002). On the Dagur Object Relative: Some Comparative Notes. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11 (2), 109–122.

Hale, K. & C. Ning. (1996). Raising in Dagur relative clauses. In B. Aghayani, K. Takeda, and S.-W. Tang (eds.) *UCI Working Papers in Linguistics* 1, pp. 35–38.

Hankamer, J. & L. Knecht. (1976). The role of the subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of relative clause participle in Turkish. In *Proceedings of NELS VI*, Montréal WPL 6, pp. 123–135.

Jaeggli, O. (1984). Subject extraction and the null subject parameter. In *Proceedings of NELS 14*, pp. 132–153.

Kornfilt, J. Forthcoming a. Subject–Agreement correlations and their syntactic effects in some Turkic relative clauses. In É. Csató (ed.) *The Uppsala Meeting: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kornfilt, J. Forthcoming b. Placement of Agreement and Subject licensing in Turkish/Turkic relative clauses. In A. Tatevosov (ed.) *Investigations into Altaic Formal Linguistics: Proceedings of WAFL 3*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo MGU (MSU Press).

Kornfilt, J. (1984) *Case Marking, Agreement, and Empty Categories in Turkish*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Kornfilt, J. (1986). The stuttering prohibition and morpheme deletion in Turkish. In A. Aksu Koç & E. Erguvanlı-Taylan (eds.) *Proceedings of the Second International Conference in Turkish Linguistics*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications #400, pp. 59–83.

Kornfilt, J. (1988). A typology of morphological agreement and its syntactic consequences. In D. Brentari, G. Larson and L. MacLeod (eds.) *Papers from the Parasession on Agreement in Grammatical Theory*: 24-II. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 117–134.

Kornfilt, J. (1991). Some current issues in Turkish syntax. In H. Boeschoten & L. Verhoeven (eds.) *Turkish Linguistics Today*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 60–92.

Kornfilt, J. (2000). Local and long distance reflexives in Turkish. In P. Cole, G. Hermon and J. Huang (eds.) *Long Distance Reflexives*. San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 197–226.

Kornfilt, J. (2003a). Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In U. Junghanns & L. Szucsich (eds.) *Syntactic Structures and Morphological Information*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 129–215.

Kornfilt, J. (2003b). Unmasking the sentential subject constraint. In S. Özsoy, D. Akar, M. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp, E. Erguvanlı-Taylan & A. Aksu-Koç (eds.) *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, pp. 121–130.

Kornfilt, J. (2006). Agreement: The (unique and local) syntactic and morphological licenser of subject Case. In J. Costa & M. C. Figueiredo Silva (eds.) *Studies on Agreement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 141–171.

Kornfilt, J. & N. Vinokurova. (2001). Transcriptions and notes of one field work session on Sakha. Ms., Syracuse University and Utrecht University.

Krause, C. (2001). *On reduced relatives with genitive subjects*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

LeSourd, P. (1989). Transcriptions of four informant sessions on Modern Uighur. Ms., Indiana University.

Meral, H. M. (2006). Resumptive pronouns in Turkish. In S. Yağcıoğlu & A. C. Değer (eds.) *Advances in Turkish Linguistics*. Izmir: Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, pp. 223–233.

Miyagawa, S. (this volume). Genitive subjects in Altaic.

Miyagawa, S. (1993). Case-checking and minimal link condition. In Phillips, C. (ed.) *Papers on Case and Agreement II*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 19; Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL; pp. 213–254.

Miyagawa, S. (2001). The EPP, Scrambling, and Wh-in-situ. In Kenstowicz, M. (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 293–338.

Miyagawa, S. (2005). On the EPP. In Richards, N. & M. McGinnis (eds.) *Perspective on Phases*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics; Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL; pp.201–236

Miyagawa, S. (2006). Genitive subject in Japanese and Turkish. Paper presented at the Nominalization Workshop, Syracuse University, March 2006.

Ouhalla, J. (1993). Subject-extraction, negation and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 477–518.

Stachowski, M. & A. Menz. (1998). Yakut. In L. Johanson & É. Csató (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. London: Routledge, pp. 417–433.

Underhill, R. (1972). Turkish participles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 87-99.