

Placement of Agreement and subject licensing in Turkic Relative Clauses
Jaklin Kornfilt
Syracuse University

This paper is about a typology of subject Case, particularly in embedded nominalized clauses, and in particular in the modifying clauses of RCs. I am assuming a general approach as the one laid out in Borsley & Kornfilt (2000), where verbal or nominal functional projections dominate lexical (verbal) projections of a clause. Whether a subject shows up in the Genitive or Nominative has to do with how high in the phrasal architecture it is placed: if it is in the specifier position of a nominal functional projection, it will be in the Genitive, since the Genitive is viewed as a nominal subject Case. If the subject is lower, i.e. in the specifier position of a verbal lexical or functional projection, it will be in the Nominative, since the Nominative is viewed as a verbal subject Case. B&K (2000) propose that nominal functional projections must dominate verbal functional projections and can't be themselves dominated by verbal functional projections. While adhering to the idea that once the level of nominal projections is reached, nominal category features must ideally be maintained for categorical homogeneity, I assume here a more permissive system, where verbal functional projections may be higher than nominal functional projections, and where some "repair" process must take place so as to reinstate nominal homogeneity.

The particular case study which this presentation focuses on has to do with the agreement element in head-final RCs as the licenser of the subject (and of subject Case) in those constructions where the target of the RC is a non-subject. As mentioned in one of the other abstracts for this panel (i.e. S. Özsoy's), as well as in Kornfilt (2005), among others, there are Turkic and Mongolian languages where the Agr element is local to the subject whose Case it licenses, i.e. it is placed on the predicate of the modifier clause; Turkish exemplifies this type. There are others, however, where the Agr element appears to be non-local with respect to the subject whose Case it licenses; more specifically, it appears on the head of the RC. How can it license, non-locally, the subject, which is (crucially) not in the specifier position of the higher DP, and is thus not in a local relationship with the head of the RC? (I advance arguments against an analysis previously offered for Dagur, by K. Hale, which claims the existence of such a local relationship as the result of raising of the subject to the specifier position of the DP.)

The answer lies, I claim, in a correlation which has been, to my knowledge, not observed before, let alone used for any insights concerning the overall phenomenon of Altaic (or at least Turkic) nominalized RCs. This correlation is as follows: Those languages which have a local subject—Agr correlation also have different nominalization morpheme on the predicate, depending on whether the target is a subject or a non-subject. More specifically, when the target is a non-subject, the nominalization morpheme on the local predicate is the same one which is usually found on any nominalized indicative embedded clause; when the target is a subject, a special morpheme is found on the local predicate instead. (There is yet another distinction: in this type of language, the morpheme found with non-subject targets is followed by overt Agr [with the subject], while the morpheme found with subject targets cannot exhibit Agr; I argue here that this has to do with locality of binding, the properties of null subjects, and the interplay of the latter with overt Agr, and I further argue that this latter distinction is independent from

the former distinction between the nominalization markers; properties of RCs in the second type of language furnish additional evidence for this posited independence of these distinctions from each other.)

I claim that the special form of nominalization morphology found with subject RCs in languages such as Turkish is a reflex of complementizer agreement (with the subject), a phenomenon familiar from studies on languages such as German, Flemish, and French. There has to be a complementizer in a clause for it to agree with the subject. It is the presence of this complementizer which contributes to the formation of a CP as a local domain in this type of language and thus makes it impossible for the subject-licensing Agr to be placed on the head of the RC, due to a violation of locality; instead, the Agr shows up on the local predicate.

In languages such as Sakha, Modern Uighur, Uzbek (Turkic) and Dagur (Mongolian), where the Agr (with the subject) in a non-subject RC shows up on the head of the RC (rather than on the local predicate in the modifier clause), I claim that the clause does not have a C, and is thus not a CP; instead, it is a Mood- and/or Aspect Phrase. (Rich, differentiated morphological expression of Mood and Aspect in such clauses corroborates this view.)

Two consequences follow: 1. The Agr element can show up on the RC-head and still be in a local, licensing relationship with the subject of the modifying clause;
2. Because there is no C, there also cannot be complementizer-subject agreement. One type of strong evidence for property #1 is the fact that the correlation between overt Agr and the target of the RC we saw in languages such as Turkish is found in this second type of language, as well, but with respect to Agr placed on the head of the RC rather than on the predicate of the modifier clause: when the target is a subject, no Agr is found on the head of the RC; when the target is a non-subject, then Agr with the subject is found on the head.

If we assume, as I do here, that in these languages (as opposed to languages such as Turkish) the relation between the RC-head and the embedded subject is local, then this is just as expected: the binding violation found in the presence of overt Agr and a subject *pro* (which, if it is the RC target, would be a locally A'-bound variable, i.e. a locally bound resumptive pronoun, which we can show must be ruled out in general), local to Agr and licensed by that Agr, rules out such an Agr element in these languages—as long as we indeed view this relationship as local. The same type of violation rules out local Agr in Turkish RCs with subject targets, with the only difference that the local domain consists of the modifier clause (rather than the higher DP), and therefore no Agr can be found locally when the subject is targeted; again, this would be a subject *pro* which is locally (but here, within the clause) A'-bound, i.e. is a locally A'-bound resumptive pronoun.

Thus, by observing and analyzing this new correlation, we shed light on both of the correlated properties; a third, independent correlation is shown to furnish evidence for the correlation and its posited relevance.

kornfilt@syr.edu