I. Introduction

Turkish has two strategies\(^1\) for forming relative clauses, the choice of which depends on grammatical relations in the relative clause and the location of the relative clause gap. Specifically, the choice of strategy depends on the structural relationship between the gap and the subject of the relative clause. This phenomenon was first examined in generative terms by Underhill (1972), who proposed an analysis in terms of linear order of constituents and role ordering. Underhill’s analysis was in the framework of “Standard Theory” as defined in Chomsky (1965), in which the notions subject and direct object are derivative from constituent structure if referred to at all, and indeed Underhill’s analysis makes no use of these notions. Hankamer and Knecht (1976) showed that the strategy choice depends on grammatical relations rather than linear order, and argued that an adequate description of the phenomenon requires direct reference to the grammatical relation subject. Csató (1985) proposes a re-analysis of the phenomenon in GB terms. In this analysis, the notion subject is still crucial, but this time it is the abstract SUBJECT of Chomsky (1981). She rejects the Hankamer and Knecht analysis on empirical grounds, citing examples which appear to violate Hankamer and Knecht’s principles.

In this paper we show that there are two dialects with regard to the distribution of one of the strategies, and that Csató’s empirical challenge to the Hankamer and Knecht analysis is based on examples that are acceptable only in the dialect which Hankamer and Knecht were not aware of. We also show that in both dialects the choice of the relativization strategy depends only on the position of the relative clause gap in relation to the subject of the relative clause. Csató’s analysis is shown to be inadequate, because it attempts to account for the distribution of the relativization strategies in terms of the binding theory, and thus is sensitive only to conditions local to the gap. We show, in fact, that the environment local to the relative clause gap has no bearing on the choice of relative clause strategy in Turkish for either dialect (except, of course, where the gap is at the top level of the relative clause).

We propose that the choice of strategy depends on the accessibility\(^2\) of the relative clause subject to the gap.

Chung & Georgopoulos (1985) show that Chamorro and Paluan have morphologically distinguished relative clause strategies, where the marking on the relative clause verb is sensitive to grammatical relations at the top of the relative clause but not to the environment local to the gap site.\(^3\) These results suggest a research program focussing on other languages in which relative clause formation exhibits a sensitivity to grammatical relations in order to determine whether they, too, care about grammatical relations only at the top level of the relative clause. Our hypothesis will be that where two relativization “strategies” in a given language involve morphological marking of the relative clause verb conditioned by the position or grammatical role of the gap, that marking will always depend on grammatical relations at the top level of the relative clause, and never on the local grammatical relation of the gap, except where the two coincide.

---

\(^1\) We use the term “relativization strategy” in the sense established by Kemeny & Comrie (1977).

\(^2\) See, e.g., Chomsky (1991, 212 ff.) for a discussion of accessibility. We give a definition for the sake of explicitness in section 4 below.

\(^3\) Actually, the Chung & Georgopoulos data indicate that there may be complementizer-gap agreement phenomena at any level in a complex structure, but the agreement is always local: the complementizer shows agreement with the gap host, rather than with the gap, when the two are distant.
2. Two relativization strategies

Turkish has two ways of forming a relative clause. In both cases, the head nominal is preceded by a clause in which some noun phrase, which we shall call the relative clause gap, is missing. In addition, the highest verb in the relative clause takes a suffix, which we will call a "complementizer", chosen from one of two sets of suffixes, the choice depending (in ways to be elaborated on below) on the position of the gap. The complementizer suffix renders the verb nonfinite, and the resulting form is traditionally called a participle. For one set of participles, nothing else happens. For the other set, the subject of the relative clause appears in the genitive case, and the participle itself acquires a possessive suffix agreeing in person and number with the subject.

The following examples illustrate the simplest cases.

1. Yilan kebağ-1 ye-di. 
   snake squash-ACC eat-PAST
   'The snake ate the squash.'

If we attempt to make a relative clause based on the sentence given in (1), the form of the relative clause will depend on which noun phrase we target as the relativization gap. If the gap occurs in subject position, we get (2).

2. kebağ-1 yi-yen yilan 
   snake ACC eat-wa snake
   'the snake that ate the squash'.

We use an underbar to indicate the (unmarked word order) position of the gap. Here the relative clause verb takes the suffix -An (in the surface form -yen), and nothing else happens. We will call this relativization strategy the wa strategy.

If we target the direct object, on the other hand, we get (3).

3. yilan-in ye-diğ-1 kebağ 
   snake-GEN eat-CA-POSS squash
   'the squash that the snake ate'.

Here the relative clause verb takes the -Diğ suffix (in the surface form -diğ), the relative clause subject appears in the genitive case, the verb also takes a possessive suffix, and there is agreement in person and number between the relative clause subject and the possessive suffix on the verb. We will call this relativization strategy the ga strategy.

All of our examples will involve either -An (representing the wa strategy) or -Diğ (representing the ga strategy); there are other suffixes of both types. Although we will not in general give explicit examples, attempts to use the other relativization strategy usually result in ungrammaticality. For instance, it is ungrammatical to form the relative clause in (2) using the ga strategy, and it is similarly ungrammatical to form the relative clause in (3) using the wa strategy.

Later we will discuss cases where the two strategies are in free variation for one dialect, but otherwise our examples should be interpreted as claiming that the relativization strategy chosen is the only possibility for the situation in question.

The distribution of strategies in what appears from our studies to be the majority dialect is characterized by Hankamer and Knecht (1976) as follows:

   i. When the gap is the relative clause subject, or a subconstituent of the relative clause subject, use the wa strategy.
   ii. When there is no relative clause subject, use the wa strategy.
   iii. Otherwise, use the ga strategy.

Clearly the relative clauses in (2) and (3) conform to (4). The gap in (2) is the relative clause subject, and the wa strategy is indeed grammatical (and the ga strategy is ungrammatical). As for (3), the gap is not the subject of the relative clause, nor is it a subconstituent of the relative clause subject, and the clause has a subject, so the ga strategy is correctly predicted to be the only choice.

Temporarily ignoring clause (4i), the rule in (4) claims that the choice of relativization strategy is determined entirely by the position of the gap in relation to the subject of the relative clause. In cases where the gap is more deeply embedded, the grammatical role of the gap itself is irrelevant. One consequence of this is that possessor NPs relativize with the strategy determined by the grammatical relation of their hosts: 

   kiz-1 kitab-1 getir-en adam 
   girl-POSS.3s book-ACC bring-wa man
   'the man whose daughter brought the book'.

   Gap: genitive of the RC subject

   kiz-1-ni sev-diğ-im adam 
   girl-POSS.3s-ACC love-ga-POSS.1s man
   'the man whose daughter I love.'

   Gap: genitive of the RC direct object

(5) the gap is within the relative clause subject, and the wa strategy is the only possible choice for forming a relative clause. In (6) the gap is within the relative clause direct object, and the ga strategy must be used. The grammatical relation of the gap with respect to its host clause phrase is irrelevant, and it is the grammatical relation of the host with respect to the top level of the relative clause which determines the choice of strategy, in accord with (4). Henceforth, we will use the term gap host to refer to the highest nominal in the relative clause dominating the gap. In the simplest cases, the gap host and the gap will coincide.

Now consider a relative clause whose subject is itself a clause. If the gap is anywhere within the embedded clause, (4) predicts that only the wa strategy will be grammatical, regardless of the local grammatical relation of the gap, and this is correct.

Possessor NPs in Turkish are marked with the Genitive case, and the possessed NP is marked with a Possessive prefix agreeing in person and number with the possessor NP.

adam-in kiz-1 man-GEN daughter-POSS.3s
'the man's daughter'

It might be tempting, looking at examples (5)-(6) alone, to hypothesize that possessor ascension is at work; there is, however, evidence from agreement, case, or possibility to support the existence of possessor ascension in Turkish. Further examples (7)-(10) below would remain to be accounted for.

We assume that the relation "dominates" is reflexive: every node in a tree dominates itself as well as all the nodes beneath it.
7. **biz-e güven-eceğ-i** şu-pheli ol-an adam
   Ip-DAT trust-COMP-POSS.3s doubtfull be-wa man
   'the man that it is doubtful will trust us'
   Gap: the subject of the relative clause subject

8. **(biz-im)** güven-eceğ-imiz şu-pheli ol-an adam
   (we-GEN) trust-COMP-POSS.ip doubtfull be-wa man
   'the man that it is doubtful we will trust'
   Gap: the dative object of the relative clause subject

In (7) and (8), it does not matter whether the gap is a subject or a direct object; all that matters is that the clause which contains it functions as the subject of the relative clause, and therefore the wa strategy is the only grammatical choice for relativization.

Similarly, if the relative clause contains a direct object which is itself a clause, only the go strategy will be appropriate, regardless of the grammatical relation of the gap in its minimal clause.

9. **kitab-i getir-eceğ-i-ni san-dağ-im** gocuk
   book-ACC bring-COMP-POSS.3s believe-ga-POSS.1s child
   'the child that I thought would bring the book'
   Gap: the subject of the relative clause direct object

10. **gocuk-un getir-eceğ-i-ni san-dağ-am** kitap
    child-GEN bring-COMP-POSS.3s-ACC believe-ga-POSS.1s book
    'the book that I thought the child would bring'
    Gap: the direct object of the relative clause dir. object

In (9) the gap is the subject of its host clause, and in (10) the gap is the direct object of its host clause; but since the host is itself the direct object of the relative clause, the go strategy is the only choice for relativization.

We do not include the relevant examples here for lack of space, but the generalization holds for further levels of embedding. In each case, it is the grammatical relation of the gap host at the top level of the relative clause which is important, and not that of the gap itself.

We now turn to clause (4ii). Accepting the analysis of Hankamer and Knecht, we assume for now that impersonal passives and sentences in which the subject has been incorporated into the verb form relative clauses which have no subject for the purposes of (4). It is possible that in such cases there is a silent pronominal, or even that some other nominal advances to occupy subject position; a trivial reformulation of (4ii) will accommodate such assumptions.

2.1. Impersonal Passives

Turkish allows passives for any verbal predicate, as long as the agent can be interpreted as human.  In particular, intransitives such as (11) may passive.

    children-PL park-GEN middle-POSS.3s-LOC play-PST
    'The children played in the middle of the park'
    No relativization, no impersonal passive

Knecht (1985, pp. 55-63) presents evidence that Impersonal Passive depends on the human-nature of the agent. She argues against the position, argued in Perlmuter (1978), that intransitives may not form impersonal passives.
The impersonal passive of (22) is (23):

inan-il-diz.
believe-PASS-

"It is believed that you said that the butcher cut the meat."

When the gap is contained within the oblique clause, relativization of such structures invariably requires the wa strategy:

24. eti kestigini sylediginize inanilan kasp et-i kes-tig-i-ni syle-dig-iniz-e
meat-ACC cut-ga-POSS-ACC say-ga-POSS2PL-DAT
inan-il-an kasp
believe-PASS-wa butcher

25. eti kestigini sylediginize inanildi di kasp et-i kes-tig-i-ni syle-dig-iniz-e
meat-ACC cut-ga-POSS-ACC say-ga-POSS2PL-DAT
inan-il-dig-i kasp
believe-PASS-ga-POSS butcher

"The butcher whom it is believed that you said cut the meat."

(gap is embedded clause subject; wa good, ga bad)

26. kasabin kestigini sylediginize inanilan et kasab-in et-i kes-tig-i-ni syle-dig-iniz-e
butcher-GEN meat-ACC cut-ga-POSS-ACC say-ga-POSS2PL-DAT
inan-il-an et
believe-PASS-wa meat

27. kasabin kestigini sylediginize inanildi et kasab-in et-i kes-tig-i-ni syle-dig-iniz-e
butcher-GEN meat-ACC cut-ga-POSS-ACC say-ga-POSS2PL-DAT
inan-il-dig-i et
believe-PASS-ga-POSS meat

"The meat that it is believed that you said the butcher cut."

(gap is embedded clause object; wa good, ga bad)

Facts like these can be produced to show that the same holds of subject-incorporation constructions. In short, when the relative clause lacks a subject, the wa strategy is allowed and the ga strategy is impossible, no matter where the gap is located.

2.4. Two dialects

Csató (1985) cites (28) as a counterexample to the Hankamer and Knocht characterization given in (4).

28. biz-im guven-cereg-imiz-in gubelli ol-dug-u adam
ip-GEN trust-COMP-POSS.1p-GEN doubtfull be-ga-POSS.3s man

'the man that it is doubtful we will trust'
According to the generalization in (4), relativizing a proper subconstituent of the relative clause subject should require the wa strategy (cf. (7)-(9)); but in (28) the ga strategy has been applied when the gap is a dative object within the sentential subject of the relative clause.

Our investigation led to the discovery that there are two quite consistent dialects, differing on the grammaticality of (28) and other examples like it. We found that all speakers consulted accept the wa strategy for gaps properly contained within the relative clause subject (examples like (7)-(9)); speakers divide on whether in addition the ga strategy is available for those cases. The majority appear to exhibit the pattern described in (4), where the two strategies are in complementary distribution; but a significant minority accept both strategies when the gap is a proper subconstituent of the relative clause subject.

The following examples will serve to illustrate the difference.

29.  kiz-a kitab-ı getir-en adam
girl-POSS.3s book-ACC bring-va man
‘the man whose daughter brought the book’
Gap: genitive of the RC subject

30.  biz-e güven-eceğ-i şüpheli ol-an adam
lp-DAT trust-COMP-POSS.3s doubtful be-wa man
‘the man that it is doubtful will trust us’
Gap: the subject of the relative clause subject

31.  kiz-a-nın kitab-ı getir-dig-i adam
girl-POSS.3s-GEN book-ACC bring-ga-POSS.3s man
‘the man whose daughter brought the book’
Gap: genitive of the RC subject

32.  biz-e güven-eceğ-i nin şüpheli ol-dugü u adam
lp-DAT trust-COMP-POSS.3s-GEN doubtful be-ga-POSS.3s man
‘the man that it is doubtful will trust us’
Gap: subject of the RC subject

Examples (29) and (31), with the gap internal to the relative clause subject and the wa strategy employed, are grammatical for all speakers. Examples (31) and (32), with subject-internal gap and the ga strategy employed, are ungrammatical for the majority dialect (dialect A) but grammatical for the minority dialect (dialect B). The two dialects agree completely, then, on the distribution of the wa strategy. For the minority dialect, the ga strategy has a slightly less restrictive distribution.

33. Dialect A

As described by Hankamer and Knecht (1976).

Dialect B

differs from Dialect A in that subconstituents of the RC subject can be relativized with ga strategy.

(8) (29) (30) grammatical
(28) (31) (32) ungrammatical

We will give an analysis which characterizes the dialect split, but first we discuss the proposal in Csató (1985).

3. Csató’s Proposal

Csató (1985) proposes a Binding Theory account of Turkish relativization strategies. In this section we will review her account, and show that it does not cover the full range of facts. We propose that the fundamental flaw in such a Binding Theory approach is the assumption that the choice of relativization strategy depends on the local grammatical relation (or synactic position) of the relative clause gap, and not the relation borne by the “top-level” constituent which hosts the gap. As demonstrated above, the choice of relativization strategies depends crucially on this latter, top-level relation.

Csató proposes that wa versus ga complementation results in different governing categories for embedded constituents. Her proposal involves the following assumptions:

34. Csató (1985, pp.46-47):

i. A relative clause in Turkish is a projection of AGR.

ii. AGR may be -POSS (wa) or +POSS (ga).

iii. AGR, when +POSS, is analyzed as a SUBJECT w.r.t. the Binding Theory.

iv. Relativization gaps are variables and must be free in their governing category.

To see how this works, consider a simple case. Recall that wa relativization is allowed when the gap is the matrix subject (35); in such a case ga relativization is disallowed (36):

35.  kabağ -i yi-yen yilan
squash-ACC eat-wa snake
‘the snake that ate the squash’

* kabağ -i ye-dig-i yilan
squash-ACC eat-ga-POSS snake
‘the snake that ate the squash’

Under Csató’s account, (35) and (36) would differ in whether the AGR element is [-POSS] (37) or [+POSS] (38).

Csató did not assume the Barrier (Chomsky 1986) projection of INFL as the sentential category. Nevertheless, assigning relative clauses as “projections of AGR” would be consistent with this approach, where the relative clause is a projection of an AGR containing INFL.
In (37), the [-POSS] AGR under INFL counts as a SUBJECT for purposes of the Binding Theory. Therefore, the gap's governing category is the relative clause (IP). Since the nearest binder for this gap is the head NP, which is outside of the relative clause, the gap is free in its governing category in accord with (34). In (38), the AGR is [+POSS], and does not count as a SUBJECT. Since there is no other subject that is accessible to the relative gap (since the relative gap itself is in subject position), the relevant governing category is the lowest matrix clause that contains both the head NP and the relative clause. Hence, the gap is bound by the head NP in its governing category, and the structure is correctly ruled out.

However, one does not have to look far to find cases that are problematic for this account. Consider a simple case of object relativization. As the contrast between (39) and (40) shows, the ga strategy is required when there is a non-incorporated subject, and the relativization gap is inside the VP:

39. yılan-in ye -diğ-i kabak
snake-GEN eat-ga-POSS squash
The squash that the snake ate.

40. * yılan yi -yen kabak
snake eat-wa squash

As the representation of these relative clauses in (41) shows, there is always a subject (whether the relative clause subject or the SUBJECT provided by the wa suffix) separating the binding head NP from the relative gap. Thus, this gap is always free in its governing category. Csató's account seems to predict that both (39) and (40) should be grammatical.

---

8 We assume that Csató assumes a definition of accessibility akin to the one in Chomsky (1981); this definition differs from the one presented in the next section in ways that are not relevant to the issues at hand.
simplified for the sake of clarity, but it coincides with the definition in Chomsky (1981) for the set of cases we are interested in.

46. Accessibility

For two nodes x, y:

i. x commands y iff x’s mother dominates y.\footnote{This is the AGR-command of Pullum (1986), Barker & Pullum (1990). Note, however, that since we will only be interested in what the relative clause subject comprises, and the relative clause subject is always immediately dominated by a branching maximal projection (namely, an S node), we would arrive at the same predictions if we had used Taggacher’s (1999) command, c-command, or m-command. It is crucial, however, that we regard “dominates” as a derivational relation. See Barker and Pullum (1990) for discussion and references.}

ii. x is accessible to y iff x commands y and x does not dominate y. Chomsky introduced the notion of accessibility in connection with the determinatization of the governing category of a nominal – a nominal must have an accessible SUBJECT within its governing category (p. 211). The governing category of a nominal, however, is a function of the environment local to the nominal in question. We have shown that the context local to the gap is irrelevant to the choice of relativization strategy in Turkish. What we propose here is that the distribution of relativization strategies in dialect A can be straightforwardly stated in terms of accessibility relations between the relative clause gap and the relative clause subject.

47. Dialect A

WA

RC subject not accessible to gap

GA

RC subject accessible to gap

For dialect A, the wa strategy is possible just in case the relative clause subject is not accessible to the gap, and the ga strategy is possible just in case the relative clause subject is accessible to the gap. If the relative clause has a subject, that subject will be accessible to gaps located within the VP, but not to gaps contained within or coinciding with the subject. If the relative clause subject has been suppressed by incorporation or impersonal passive, then there is no relative clause subject accessible to a gap in any location.\footnote{In any framework which requires every clause to have a subject at every stage of derivation, the subject of the relativized clause in these cases would presumably be a silent pronominal. It would be necessary to stipulate that such silent pronouns are inherently inaccessible, or that the distribution of wa and ga strategies depends on the accessibility of a non-sentential subject at the top level of the relative clause. We know of no empirical reasons to believe that there are pronouns in Turkish that are silent. In fact, there are experiments which would be consistent with the assumption that all clauses always have subjects.}

Recall now that dialect B differs from dialect A in that ga relativization is permitted when the gap is properly contained within the relative clause subject. A straightforward characterization of dialect B, then, is as follows:

48. Dialect B

WA

RC subject not accessible to gap

GA

RC has a subject distinct from gap

Notice that normal subordination involves a possessive construction; thus, the sentential subject may not have a [-POSS] AGR to provide it with a SUBJECT.

\footnote{Not that normal subordination involves a possessive construction; thus, the sentential subject may not have a [-POSS] AGR to provide it with a SUBJECT.}
Dialect B has the same distribution for the wa strategy as dialect A. For the ga strategy, rather than requiring that the relative clause subject be accessible to the gap, dialect B merely requires that there be a relative clause subject distinct from the gap. Dialect B, then, has generalized the distribution of the ga strategy.

49. Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Dialect B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>RC subject accessible to gap (both dialects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few examples should suffice to show that these characterizations are correct. First consider a case in which the subject of the relative clause coincides with the relativization gap.\(^{12}\)

50. kabuğ-ı yı-yen yalan
   squash-ACC eat-WA snake
   'the snake that ate the squash'

Gap: RC subject

Here NP1 is the RC subject and NP2 is the gap. Although NP1 does not dominate NP2, NP1 also dominates NP2, therefore NP1 is not accessible to NP2 and the wa strategy is correctly permitted in both dialects. For this example, the ga strategy will also be permitted in dialect B, since the RC subject is distinct from the gap.

When the gap is within the VP of the relative clause, the two dialects do not differ. If there is a relative clause subject, it will be accessible to the gap (since it will command but not dominate the gap) and thus the wa strategy will be ruled out for both dialects. The ga strategy will be permitted for both dialects, in dialect A because the RC subject is accessible to the gap and in dialect B because the RC subject is distinct from the gap. If, on the other hand, the relative clause subject has been suppressed, there will be no RC subject accessible to or distinct from the gap, and only the wa strategy will be permitted, in either dialect.

5. An Oblique Subject Analysis

The analysis presented in the previous section provides a tidy characterization of the distribution of the two relativization strategies in the two dialects. It does not, however, provide an intuitively satisfying answer to the question of why the wa strategy is distributed as it is. Why should relativization involving a gap contained in the VP adopt the same strategy as subject-gap relativization, as soon as the subject is missing?

In this section we contemplate an analysis according to which the suppression of a subject allows the movement of VP constituents to subject position. From this subject position, former VP constituents may host WA relativization. Although this approach allows a VP constituent to move to subject position, the moved constituent retains its case marking. Hence, this approach entails what is essentially an oblique subject analysis for Turkish (cf. discussions of oblique subjects in Icelandic in Thordarson 1980, Andrews 1982, and Zaanen, Maling, and Thordarson 1983).

Knech (1985) proposes that Turkish has oblique subjects in a small number of cases. Our analysis extends this to a wider range of constructions. We will make use of the fact that oblique subjects retain their oblique case marking to explain the lack of ga relativization from suppressed subject constructions.

The Analysis

Chomsky (1976) suggested that universally in impersonal passive constructions some NP takes on role of subject. We consider in this section the hypothesis that in both impersonal passive

\[^{12}\text{Unlike Cañó, we treat the wa and ga suffixes as complementsizers.}\]
constructions and subject incorporation constructions the vacated subject position (or role) is taken over by some other nominal, which then hosts wa relativization. We will refer to this hypothesis as the oblique subject hypothesis, since in most cases the nominal taking over the subject role will be an oblique (but cf. examples (20-21)).

The oblique subject hypothesis has been argued against, specifically for Turkish impersonal passives, by Breckenridge (1975). Breckenridge argues that oblique nominals in impersonal passives in Turkish do not exhibit any behavior indicative of subjecthood, citing constituent order, case marking, agreement, control, and reflexivization properties. Knecht (1985) recapitulates most of these arguments with more thorough exemplification.

We will not analyze all of Breckenridge's arguments here. Several of them are irrelevant to the hypothesis we are considering, since they assume that for a nominal to advance to subjecthood, that nominal would have to have some special status before advancement. We do not assume that. Other arguments involve the assumption that overt case marking must coincide with grammatical role at certain stages. We do not assume that either. When the arguments irrelevant to our hypothesis are set aside, there remain those which must be dealt with.

The first of these is the observation that in simple cases oblique nominals do not control agreement, even in impersonal passives:

52. **ben-den kork-ulür**
    
    me-ABL fear-PASS-AOR
    
    'I am feared'

53. *ben-den kork-ulür-um
    
    me-ABL fear-PASS-AOR-1.sg

The second is that subjects in Turkish can be Equi victims, but oblique nominals in impersonal passives cannot:

54. *Ali Ayşe tarafından sev-ilmek isti-yor
    
    Ali Ayşe by love-PASS-INF want-PROG
    
    'All wants to be loved by Ayşe'

55. *Ali kork-ul-mak isti-yor
    
    Ali fear-PASS-INF want-PROG
    
    'All wants to be feared'

And the third is that oblique nominals in Turkish cannot undergo subject-to-object raising. The evidence is that in an SOR structure where the embedded clause is an impersonal passive, an oblique nominal that clause cannot undergo first-person reflexivization, which was shown in Aisien (1974) to be clause-bounded:

56. **ben kendi-ı-i aile-tri san-iyor-um**
    
    I self-POSS.1s-ACC deceive-PAST think-PROG-1.sg
    
    'I believe myself to have been deceived'

57. *ben kendi-n-den kork-ulür san-iyor-um
    
    I self-POSS.1s-ABL deceive-AOR think-PROG-1.sg
    
    'I believe myself to be feared'

We do not contest any of these arguments. Nevertheless, we have discovered some evidence that indicates, despite the evidence to the contrary, that oblique nominals in subject-absent constructions can take on at least some properties typically reserved for subjects.

In the analysis to be considered we assume that both impersonal passive and subject incorporation leave an "empty" subject position, allowing a VP-constituent to move into subject position. Although any VP constituent may move to the external subject position, this movement is not forced for any particular constituent: we assume that each VP constituent receives its morphological case in the usual way. Thus, the constituent that ends up in subject position will receive its case based on its position/role within the VP.

Consider how this movement can help explain the choice of relativization strategies. We saw above that both dialects disallowed wa relativization in suppressed subject constructions; in both dialects the VP constituents could only relativize with the wa strategy. This fact has generally required some sort of disjunction in the statement of wa relativization. Under the oblique subject analysis proposed here, the disjunction disappears. Consider the following subject incorporation example:

58. *kapi-nın alt-in-dan yer-in över-in-e su ak-yor
    
    door-GEN under-POSS-ABL floor-GEN over-POSS-DAT water flow-
    
    PROG
    
    'Water is flowing under the door onto the floor'

Assuming that incorporation leaves an underlying empty subject position, (58) might be represented as follows:

```
   NP
   V
   NP
   NP
   NP
   V
   NP
   NP
   V
   NP
   'water'
   'flow'
   'on'
   'under'

```

But of the VP-internal NPs may move to become oblique subjects:

```
   NP
   V
   NP
   NP
   NP
   V
   NP
   V
   'water'
   'flows'

```

Under the oblique subject analysis, the VP-internal NPs do not have to be relativized at all.
possible rule of ga relativization could be as follows:

63. The ga relativization strategy is possible if the relative clause subject is accessible to the gap (Dialect A) or is distinct from the gap (Dialect B) and does not bear an overt morphological case.

In a clause with no oblique subject, the subject receives nominative case. This case is not morphologically overt; hence, ga relativization is free to apply, attaching a genitive morpheme to the subject in the process. However, when the subject is already marked with an oblique, morphologically overt case, the ga relativization of a VP-internal constituent would entail that the subject receive two overt morphological cases: the case of the oblique subject, and the genitive case associated with ga relativization. We assume that such multiple case marking is universally disallowed; it is certainly disallowed in Turkish. Therefore, neither of the VP-internal NPs in (60) and (61) may host ga relativization. Thus, the fact that any VP constituent may potentially become an oblique subject accounts for the fact that we relativize is possible for all constituents in suppressed subject constructions. The fact that the moved constituent keeps its overt morphological case explains why ga relativization is impossible for any of the constituents.

The oblique subject account explains the lack of ga relativization in suppressed subject constructions by assuming that oblique subjects may not bear an additional genitive case marker. What about cases where the subject is nominative? ga relativization should be possible out of VP constituents in simple sentences (with nominative subjects) as well as out of VP constituents where the subject is the derived nominative subject of personal passives. This is in fact true:

64. a. yılan-in ye-dığ-i kabak snake-GEN eat-ga-POSS squash 'the squash that the snake ate'
   b. kitab-in oku-n -duy-u Çocuk-lar book-GEN read-PASS-ga-POSS child-PL 'the children to whom a book was read'

However, if ga relativization only cares about the case morphology of the subject, then we should expect ga relativization from subcategorizations of a subject, as long as the whole subject is nominative. This is exactly the area where there is a dialect split. The account of this split developed in section 4 can be carried over to the present account. In section 4 it was hypothesized that the dialect split represents the choice of accessibility or distinctness as the determining factor in ga relativization. For Dialect B an RC subject distant from the gap and capable of bearing the Genitive suffix is sufficient for ga relativization; for Dialect A the RC subject must be accessible to the gap, and in addition be capable of bearing the Genitive suffix.

2. Independent Motivation for Oblique Subjects in Turkish

While the oblique subject analysis provides a neat account of Turkish relativization, it does so by missing the movement of a case-marked VP constituent to subject position. This section will present some independent motivation for oblique subjects in Turkish.

Many treatments of impersonal passive assume that the subject position is filled with a pro-drop element - this element is silent in pro-drop languages and overt in non-pro-drop languages. Our approach is supported, in part, by the fact that the same pronoun element is used in impersonal passives as in other "subjectless" constructions, e.g., extraposition and weather verb sentences. In the case of pro-drop languages, this pronoun element is silent. Since Turkish is a pro-drop language, we would expect silent pronouns. Thus, impersonal passives like (65) might be analyzed as in (66):
69. a. Ban’a dans ad -il -di.
I -DAT dance make-PASS-PAST
'I was danced for.'
Imperative passive
b. Ban’a, [e, dans ad -il -di] san -il -iyor-un.
I -DAT, [e, dance make-PASS-PAST] believe-PASS-PROG-1sg
'I am believed to have been danced for.'
Imperative passive with raised oblique.

70. a. Ban’a köpek atla-da.
me -DAT dog jump-PAST
'A dog jumped at me.'
Subject incorporation
me -DAT, [e, dog jump-PAST] believe-PASS-PROG-1sg
'I am believed to have had dogs jump at me.'
Subject incorporation with raised oblique
c. Ban’a, [e, köpek atla-da] gibi göm’r-h-wun.
me -DAT, [e, dog jump-PAST] like appear-PASS-2sg
'I appear like I have had dogs jump at me.'
Subject incorporation with raised oblique

The first-person agreement on the matrix verb in (69b) and (70b-c) indicate that the oblique subjects are raised. Note also that although the raise still retains its oblique case, it is not able to control agreement. Since raising and control of agreement are features of subjects in Turkish, these data provide independent support for the oblique subject analysis in (68). 

We have seen that the oblique subject analysis provides for a non-disjunctive treatment of subject relativization. Furthermore, the analysis is independently supported by the general lack of pleonastic elements and the raizability of oblique subjects.

However, these putative oblique subjects do not seem to display other subject properties. They control agreement only when raised, not in simple clause structures (as noted in footnote 17), and they do not generally participate in EQU-type control structures (Breckenridge 1975, p. 52; Knoke 1985, pp. 43–46). The obliques in question seem to fall in the rather large area of subject-like in some respects, but not in other respects.

Conclusion
The problem of the distribution of relative clause strategies in Turkish reduces to the problem of specifying the set of relations between gap and relative clause subject correlating with each of the possible sets of participle suffixes serving as complementizers for relative clauses.

We have shown that, even though there are dialectal differences in the distribution of the gap strategy, the choice of strategy does not depend on the grammatical structure local to the gap except in the simplest cases; it always depends on the grammatical structure at the top level of the relative clause, and can be characterized in terms of the relation between the gap host and the relative clause subject. We have shown that this relation can be expressed explicitly in terms of the

---

16 An exception is the rather artificial language used on signs - e.g., exit signs ghale 'it is exists: here’s the way out'.

17 The SOV word order of Turkish makes it difficult to see the effects of raising if the raiser is third person (since it is unclear whether the third person agreement is with the raiser or with a sentential subject). This is further complicated by the factor that third person plural agreement is optional, and permitted only for human subjects. Hence, the clearest raising examples involve first or second person raisers.

---
The characterization of the distribution of the two strategies in terms of accessibility seems well established, and consequently our contention that that relation is properly appealed to in the analysis of those constructions is a firm result; but the above analysis leaves unanswered the same question as the Hasker and Knecht analysis: why should obliques in subject-absent clauses behave like subjects? Their investigation reveals that there is some evidence that obliques acquire some other subject-like properties in these constructions, but that their accession to subjecthood is rather half-hearted. This raises questions about the categorial nature of the notion "subject" (cf. papers in Li 1976).

While the grammatical conditions determining the choice of relative clause strategy are not local to the gap, they are local in the relative clause itself, given that the gap host is identified. The constraints on the distribution of the two classes of complementizers can be regarded as a kind of agreement between the gap host and the participial suffix (the complementizer). This leads us to the suggestion that the phenomenon is an instance of "WH-agreement", as described in Chung & Georganopulos (1988). Chung & Georganopulos (1988) describe a phenomenon of "WH-agreement" in Chonmor and Palauan, where a verb in a relative clause is morphologically marked in a way that depends on a participial role or position of the relative clause gap. Chung & Georganopulos note in passing that in general it is not the grammatical role of the gap itself that figures in the agreement, but the role of the major constituent in the relative clause that contains the gap; thus, just as in Turkish, the verb is agreeing with something in its own clause. This leads us to suggest that other cases of WH-agreement should be examined to see whether such agreement is always local in the relative clause. If so, this would bring WH-agreement in line with other agreement phenomena, which are typically local in nature; it would also further demonstrate the need for some version of a relation like accessibility to allow reference to the gap host in the statement of the agreement rule.

If our contention is correct, the common conception (since Kean & Connio 1977) of relative clause strategy choice will have to be modified. Kean & Connio assumed that when they found a relativization strategy choice sensitive to grammatical relations, it was the relation of the gap itself that mattered. We expect that it will turn out to be the grammatical role of the gap host that matters, and never the role of the gap itself (except in the simple case where the gap host is the gap).
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