THE ROLE OF THE GENITIVE SUFFIX
IN RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TURKISH: A REPLY TO DEDE*

Laura Knecht
M.I.T.

1. Introduction and Background

Turkish is an SOV language with a right-headed relative clause construction. The rule of relativization operates unboundedly leftward, effecting deletion of the NP in the relative clause (RC) which is coreferential with the head noun.

There are two morphologically distinct types of RC's in Turkish. Compare the form of the RC in (1), where the target is a direct object, with (2), where the target is a subject. The morphemes of interest are underlined.¹

(1) Direct object relativized

kadın-ın ∅ al-d~~i~~-ğ-ı halı
woman-GEN buy-PART-POSS rug
'the rug which the woman bought'

(2) Subject relativized

∅ halı-yı al-an kadın
 rug-ACC buy-PART woman
'the woman who bought the rug'

In both cases, the verb of the RC appears in a participial form; the participle suffixes -DIK and -(y)En both encode non-future tense.² The additional morphology in (1) consists of the genitive and possessive suffixes. The former is affixed to the subject of the RC, the latter to the participle. The possessive agrees with the subject in person and number. (1) exemplifies what I shall call an "object participle" (OP) RC; (2) exemplifies a "subject participle" (SP) RC.³ (-DIK is thus an OP suffix and -(y)En a SP suffix.)

The first generative account of RC participles to appear in the literature was that of Underhill (1972). He makes the following observations. In the simple cases like (1) and (2), the subject of a RC relativizes with the SP construction, non-subjects with the OP construction. There are two circumstances, however, in which relativization of something other than the subject of the RC requires the SP: when the target is (i) a genitive NP attached to the subject of the RC or (ii) a genitive NP attached to an oblique object--provided that the subject appears in immediate pre-verbal position and is interpreted as indefinite. Underhill notes that in these cases and in the simple case, the SP is used for relativization of a clause-initial target. By assuming that the genitive suffix is assigned by a transformational rule that applies sometime after relativization, Underhill could claim that the SP is assigned just when a clause-initial, caseless NP is the relative target.

Otherwise, the OP is chosen. The relativization transformation could thus be written entirely within the framework of Standard Theory.

Hankamer and Knecht (1976)--henceforth HK--argue that the linear position and casemarking of a relative target are irrelevant to participle choice. Rather, the primary principle governing selection is that the subject of the RC relativizes with the SP and non-subjects relativize with the OP.

HK show that, contrary to Underhill's claim, relativization of a casemarked, clause-medial NP contained in a sentential subject requires the SP construction. In fact, everything in a sentential subject, regardless of its case or position, relativizes with the SP and everything in a sentential non-subject relativizes with the OP. HK propose the Mother Node Principle.

- (3) Mother Node Principle (MNP): If a subconstituent of a major constituent of the RC is relativized, the participle is chosen which would be appropriate for relativization of the major constituent itself. [That is, for the simple cases, if the mother node dominating the target is the subject of the RC, the SP is chosen; otherwise, the OP is chosen.]⁴

The MNP and Underhill's proposal make the same predictions about relativization of subparts of phrasal constituents: the SP is chosen when a genitive NP attached to the subject of the RC is the target; otherwise, the OP is chosen. Both correctly predict the OP when subconstituents of sentential objects are relativized. What distinguishes the two proposals is relativization of NP's in sentential subjects. For instance, the direct object in the sentential subject of a RC relativizes with the SP. This is in accordance with the MNP and in violation of Underhill's proposal.

HK propose a second principle to account for relativization of NP's in impersonal passives. Breckenridge (1975) has argued that there is no NP in an impersonal passive which functions as a subject.⁵ HK observe that no matter what is relativized in an impersonal passive, only the SP is possible. They propose the No Subject Principle.

- (4) No Subject Principle (NSP): If there is no subject in the RC at the time of RC formation, the OP construction is impossible and only the SP construction is chosen.

Recall what Underhill discovered about relativization into a sentence with an indefinite, immediately pre-verbal subject: a genitive NP attached to a non-subject relativizes with the SP. HK show that no matter what the relative target is in such a sentence, the OP is impossible. The principle that determines participle selection here looks suspiciously like the NSP. HK claim that it is in fact the NSP and that indefinite-subject sentences, like impersonal passives, are subjectless at the time of RC formation. They propose a rule of Subject Demotion which strips indefinite NP's of their subject-hood.

HK, then, argue that the SP is chosen in a disjunction of cir-

cumstances, i.e., when the target is the subject of the RC or part of it or when the RC is subjectless at the time of RC formation. The two principles that they propose have the effect of requiring the grammar to look at the grammatical relations of the least deeply embedded constituents in the RC. What must be determined is whether any of these constituents bears the subject relation and if so, whether the relative target is the subject or part of it.

2. Dede's Proposal

Dede (1978) claims that HK's proposal "obscures what is really happening during relativization" (p. 68): HK failed to notice that the central problem in participle assignment is discovery of the conditions under which the genitive is suffixed to the subject of the RC. When assignment of the genitive is determined, it is a simple matter to choose the appropriate participle suffix and decide whether or not to attach the possessive. Dede argues that the Genitive Suffix Attachment Rule (GSAR) is governed by a single functional principle which ensures that the genitive is assigned if and only if it is needed to prevent the subject of the RC from being misconstrued. Thus, contrary to HK's claims, a disjunction of principles is not required to account for participle assignment in Turkish.

Dede orders the GSAR before the rules that attach the participle and possessive suffixes and after Coreferential NP Deletion (p. 69):

- I. Coreferential NP Deletion: Delete the NP which is coreferential with the head noun.
- II. GSAR: If the deleted NP is not the subject, add the GEN-S to the subject of the clause. Conditions for the application of this rule will be given later.
- III. Participle Suffix Attachment Rule (PSAR): If the GSAR applies, then obligatorily choose the PS -Dik; otherwise, choose the PS -(y)En.
- IV. Possessive Suffix Attachment Rule (Poss-SAR): If the PSAR chooses -Dik, then obligatorily add a Poss-S to the participial verb which agrees in number of person with the subject of the RC.

Notice that Dede can automatically account for the choice of the SP construction when the RC is subjectless at the time of RC formation (e.g., it is an impersonal passive) as well as when the subject of the relative clause is the relative target. In both cases, by the time the GSAR has a chance to apply, there is no subject in the RC to which the genitive can be attached. So, PSAR chooses the SP suffix and Poss-SAR does not attach the possessive. This is an attractive result.

However, assignment of the SP when part of the subject of a RC undergoes relativization is not automatic. When a subconstituent

of the subject is deleted, there is something left over for the GSAR to attach the genitive to; nevertheless, the genitive must not be suffixed. It was this fact that led HK to propose a disjunction of principles to account for participle choice.

Dede claims to be able to explain why the GSAR does not apply in this circumstance; the explanation makes reference to the "functions" that the genitive serves in relativization. Dede states (p. 70):

[The genitive] has two important functions in relativization: to distinguish the subject which remains in the RC from the subject of the sentence in which the RC appears; to prevent any change in the function and definite and indefinite feature (sic) which might be caused by deletion of the coreferential NP in the process of relativization. In order to fulfill these two functions the GSAR applies obligatorily

- A. to the subject of a transitive verb regardless of the definite or indefinite feature of the subject
- B. to the definite subject of an intransitive verb and to the indefinite subject when it does not occupy the [immediate] preverbal position.

In subsequent sections, the two functions mentioned here will be examined in some detail. For now, it suffices to say that Dede's claim apparently is that the genitive suffix picks out the subject of a RC and prevents it from being confused with other nominals, e.g., with the subject of a higher clause or with other NP's in the RC.

Notice that it is not clear from the above passage exactly what the relationship is supposed to be between the two functions of the genitive and the two conditions on the application of the GSAR. Dede simply says that the GSAR applies in A and B "in order to fulfill" the functions. This would appear to rule out assigning the genitive in some RC's in accordance with the conditions and in others in accordance with the functions. So, suppose that the genitive is always assigned in compliance with conditions A and B. Is the result that the genitive is assigned just when it is functionally required in RC's? Or is the result that it is assigned in some cases where it has a function to serve and in others where it does not?

It turns out that under conditions A and B, the genitive will be suffixed to the subject of a RC when it is not required to serve the functions which Dede ascribes to it. Moreover, assignment in accordance with these conditions leads to the wrong result in some cases. Similarly, an analysis of genitive assignment that makes reference to the two functions the suffix serves in RC's can be shown to be inadequate.

3. Conditions A and B of the GSAR

Under condition A, the GSAR incorrectly assigns the genitive suffix when the target of relativization is in an indefinite-subject

sentence. Under condition B, it incorrectly genitivizes the subject of a RC when relativization has applied to a subconstituent of the subject.

3.1 Dede states that under condition A, the GSAR is obligatory for the subject of a transitive verb, regardless of whether it is definite or indefinite. Consider the following sentences:

- (5)a. Köpek adamın kızın**ı** **ı**sırd**ı**.
 dog man-GEN daughter-POSS-ACC bite-PAST
 'The dog bit the man's daughter.'
 b. Adamın kızın**ı** köpek **ı**sırd**ı**.
 'A dog/dogs bit the man's daughter.'

Assume that the target of relativization in both (5a) and (5b) is adamın. The GSAR will genitivize the definite subject of the transitive verb in the first case and the indefinite subject of the transitive verb in the second case; the PSAR will then attach the OP suffix to the verbs and the Poss-SAR will add the possessive. The result in both cases should be an OP RC. But in fact, adamın relativizes with the OP in (5a) and the SP in (5b).

- (6)a. köpeğ**in** kızın**ı** **ı**sırd**ı**ğ**ı** adam
 dog-GEN daughter-POSS-ACC bite-OP-POSS man
 'the man whose daughter the dog bit'
 b. kızın**ı** köpek **ı**sıran adam
 SP
 'the man whose daughter a dog/dogs bit'

HK can account for the SP relativization of adamın in (b): the sentence is subjectless at the time of RC formation due to the application of Subject Demotion. According to the NSP, the SP must be assigned. Dede does not analyze (b) as a subjectless sentence; nothing prevents the GSAR from genitivizing the indefinite subject.

3.2 The GSAR under condition B applies obligatorily to the definite subject of an intransitive verb and to the indefinite subject when it does not appear in immediate pre-verbal position. This leads to the wrong result in some cases.

The following sentences are intransitive; the subject of (a) is a clause while the subject of (b) is a possessive phrase. Both subjects are definite.

- (7)a. Yılan**ın** kabağ**ı** yediğ**i** şüpheli.
 snake-GEN squash-ACC eat-PART-POSS doubtful
 'That the snake ate the squash is doubtful.'
 b. Kad**ın**ın arkadaş**ı** plâja gitti.
 woman-GEN friend-POSS beach-DAT go-PAST
 'The woman's friend went to the beach.'

As we know, subparts of the subject of a RC relativize with the SP. For instance,

(8)a. kabağ~~ı~~ yediğ~~i~~ şüpheli olan y~~i~~lan

SP

'the snake which it's doubtful that (it) ate the squash'

b. arkadaş~~ı~~ plâja giden kad~~ın~~

SP

'the woman whose friend went to the beach'

But the GSAR under condition B requires that the definite subject of an intransitive verb be genitivized. As a consequence, OP RC's are predicted in (8a) and (8b).

Finally, consider the intransitive sentence in (9); the subject NP is indefinite and it does not occupy immediate pre-verbal position.

(9) Adam~~ın~~ bir keçisi benden kaç~~tı~~.

man-GEN a goat-POSS 1s-ABL run away-PAST

'One of the man's goats ran away from me.'

In accordance with the GSAR, the genitive will be suffixed to the subject NP when adam~~ın~~ is relativized; the PSAR and Poss-SAR will attach the OP suffix and the possessive, respectively. The result, of course, is an OP RC. However, adam~~ın~~ relativizes with the SP.

(10) bir keçisi benden kaçan adam

SP

'the man, one of whose goats ran away from me'

I conclude that the genitive suffix is not in fact assigned to the subject of a RC in accordance with conditions A and B. In the next two sections, I investigate accounts of genitive assignment that make reference to the "functions" served by the genitive in RC's. I argue that these accounts are no more successful in predicting the distribution of the genitive in RC's than conditions A and B are.

4. The First Function of the Genitive Suffix

Dede states that one of the functions of the genitive is to distinguish the subject of the RC from the subject of the sentence in which the RC appears. It is not clear what this means; I therefore assume that Dede has sentences like the following in mind. The subject of the RC is marked genitive and the higher subject is caseless.

(11) Mustafa Ersin'in öptüğü kız~~ı~~ tanıyor.
GEN kiss-OP-POSS girl-ACC know-PRES
'M knows the girl who E kissed.'

Here it looks like the genitive suffix helps to sort out the clause-membership of subject NP's by establishing a morphological distinction between them.

But Dede's description of this "function" is hard to interpret as an empirical claim about assignment of the genitive. In this section, I attempt to extract an empirical claim from the description. A number of possibilities are considered and each is shown to be wrong.

4.1 The first claim to be investigated is given in (12).

- (12) The genitive is assigned to the subject of a RC if and only if suffixation would morphologically distinguish this subject NP from the subject of the clause which contains the RC.

For an immediate counterexample to (12), consider (13).

- (13) Rahmi kızın Mahmut'un tan~~d~~iğ~~i~~ adam~~i~~
 girl-GEN GEN know-OP-POSS man-ACC
 sevdiğini söyledi.
 like-PART-POSS-ACC say-PAST
 'R said that the girl likes the man who M knows.'

The subject of the RC (Mahmut) is marked genitive--and so is the subject of the clause which contains the RC (kızın). No speaker of Turkish is confused about the clause-membership of these two NP's. (13) clearly shows that the genitive is assigned to a RC subject when the function of morphologically distinguishing it from the next higher subject is not served by assigning it the genitive.

4.2 Let us restate the claim. Perhaps Dede intends the genitive to be understood as the morpheme which signals that the NP to which it is attached is an embedded subject.

- (14) The genitive is assigned to the subject of a RC if and only if suffixation would morphologically distinguish this subject NP from the subject of the matrix clause.

Now (13) is no problem: genitivizing Mahmut does indeed morphologically distinguish it from Rahmi. But (14) makes the wrong prediction about the following sentence.

- (15) Ahmet Murat'ın öptüğü şüpheli olan
 GEN kiss-PART-POSS doubtful be-SP
 kız~~i~~ gördü.
 girl-ACC see-PAST
 'A saw the girl who that M kissed (her) is doubtful.'

The subject of the RC (underlined) is sentential; one of its subconstituents has been relativized--not with the OP as (14) predicts, but with the SP. That is, the genitive should have been assigned to Murat'ın öptüğü to distinguish it from Ahmet, the subject of the matrix. (15) shows that there are circumstances in which the genitive is not assigned even though it has a function to serve.⁶

Perhaps the sentence in (15) has some special feature that makes it unnecessary to assign the genitive to the subject of the RC. Notice that the clause-membership of the two subject NP's is readily determinable: the verb gör- ('see') is not subcategorized for sentential subjects so its subject must be Ahmet; on the other hand, the predicate şüpheli ol- ('be doubtful') is incompatible with Ahmet so its subject must be the sentential subject. Let us append to (14) the following statement: the genitive is not assigned if the subcategorization features of the verbs make it possible to determine what their subjects are.

But this will not work either. Consider (16) below; a genitive NP attached to the subject of the RC has been relativized with the SP construction.

- (16) Demet kardeşi kaçan kız~~i~~ gördü.
 sibling-POSS run away-SP girl-ACC see-PAST
 'Demet saw the girl whose sibling ran away.'

The subcategorization features of the two verbs tell us nothing: both kaç- ('run away') and gör- are compatible with Demet and kardeşi. The genitive should have been suffixed to the subject of the RC to morphologically distinguish it from the matrix subject. But an OP RC in (16) is impossible.

4.3 Finally, consider the following sentence. The matrix clause is an impersonal passive; embedded in it is an OP RC.

- (17) Sinan'ın bina ettiği camiye gidilirdi.
 GEN build-OP-POSS mosque-DAT go-PASS-AOR-PAST
 lit: 'To the mosque that Sinan built used to be gone.'

The genitivization of Sinan is mysterious: the matrix clause does not contain a subject, so what is there for Sinan to be distinguished from?

In sum, if we take Dede's description of the "distinguishing" function of the genitive seriously, that description fails as an account of the distribution of the genitive in RC's. In any event, Dede does not put this function to much use in her paper; most of the burden of explanation falls on the second function which the genitive is claimed to serve. Hence I will say no more about the "distinguishing" function and proceed to discuss the other function.

5. The Second Function of the Genitive Suffix

The second function which Dede claims the genitive serves in RC's

is that of preventing misconstrual of the relational status or the definiteness of the NP which is the subject of the RC. Actually, this is not one function, but two. There is no reason to think that prevention of misconstrual of grammatical relations is related to prevention of misconstrual of definiteness.

5.1 Transitive Relative Clauses

5.1.1 Dede claims that the subject of a transitive RC is susceptible to misconstrual due to the fact that neither subject NP's nor indefinite direct objects are casemarked in Turkish.

- (18) Çocuk köpek kovalıyor.
 child dog chase-PRES
 'The child is chasing dogs.'

Actually, indefinite direct objects may be casemarked accusative. Consider (19) below (and Dede's (11)).

- (19) Ben bir adamı arıyorum.
 ls a man-ACC look for-PRES-ls
 'I am looking for a man.'

Here I have a particular man in mind; in (20) below, where the direct object is caseless, I do not.

- (20) Ben bir adam arıyorum.

It is not indefinite NP's which fail to be casemarked accusative when they function as direct objects, but NP's which are non-specific in reference.

Notice that caseless direct objects are restricted to appearing in immediate pre-verbal position.

- (21) İsmail {dün } kitap *{dün } okudu.
 {bahçede} {bahçede}
 'Ismail read books yesterday/in the garden.'

Casemarked direct objects are not.

- (22) İsmail kitabı {dün } okudu.
 ACC {bahçede}
 'Ismail read the book yesterday/in the garden.'

Certain NP's are inherently specific: proper nouns (Ahmet), pronouns (ben: I), possessed NP's (Ahmet'in kedisi: Ahmet's cat), and NP's which occur with demonstratives (o kedi: that cat). Such NP's must be casemarked accusative when they function as direct objects.⁷

- (23) Ahmet Pınar/*Pınar kovalıyor.
 'Ahmet is chasing Pınar.'

5.1.2 When the direct object of the following sentence undergoes relativization,

- (24) *Çocuk kızı seviyor.*
 child girl-ACC like-PRES
 'The child likes the girl.'

one of the side-effects of deletion is that the subject NP appears in immediate pre-verbal position.

- (25) [*çocuk sev-*] [*kız*]

According to Dede, *çocuk* runs the risk of being interpreted as the non-specific direct object of *sev-*, not as its subject. Such mis-construal is not permitted in accordance with "the generally accepted rule that transformations should not decrease or change meaning." (fn. 4) To block the object reading of *çocuk*, the genitive suffix is attached to it. Why does the genitive succeed in unambiguously indentifying *çocuk* as the subject of the RC? The reason is that, in general, only subject NP's in Turkish are genitivized.⁸

Suffixation of the genitive is accompanied by assignment of the OP suffix and the possessive. The result is an OP RC.

- (26) *çocuğun sevdiği kız*
 child-GEN like-OP-POSS
 'the girl who the child likes'

Now, it is not at all clear why Dede claims that *çocuk* in (25) would certainly be misconstrued as a direct object were the genitive not suffixed to it. It is more likely that the string would be ambiguous, with *çocuk* interpreted either as the subject of the RC or as the direct object. Dede's proposal could have been that such ambiguity is not permitted to arise in Turkish.⁹

In any case, compare (24) with the following sentence.

- (27) *Adamın kızının köpek kovalıyor.*
 man-GEN girl-POSS-ACC dog chase-PRES
 'A dog/dogs is/are chasing the man's daughter.'

A subpart of the direct object, i.e., *adamın*, is relativized.

- (28) [*kızının köpek koval-*] [*adam*]

As in the previous example, the subject of the RC is in immediate pre-verbal position. But unlike the previous example, this RC contains an accusative casemarked NP (*kızının*). *Köpek*, then, cannot be misconstrued as the direct object of the clause and there is no need for it to be genitivized; (28) surfaces as a SP RC.

- (29) *kızının köpek kovalayan adam*
 SP
 'the man whose daughter a dog/dogs is/are chasing'

Dede comments:

It follows that the process of relativization and the assignment of the GEN case are based on whether or not it is possible to identify the subject and the DO. In other words, the GSAR operates whenever the relations of the subject and the DO are not indicated by means such as other case suffixes, word order, semantic properties of the members of the sentence, etc.¹⁰ (p. 73)

In conclusion, Dede's claim is that the function of the genitive in transitive RC's is to prevent misconstrual of the grammatical relations of the subject NP. Crucially, the genitive is assigned as a last resort: the GSAR operates if and only if everything else has failed to indicate the relations of the subject.

5.1.3 In fact, the genitive is assigned when other casemarkers, word order, semantic properties, etc. make it possible to identify the subject of the RC with ease.

Consider the following post-deletion form:

- (30) [çocuk evde kovala-] [kız]
 child house-LOC chase girl

Although çocuk is not casemarked, its position in the RC unambiguously identifies it as a subject. (Recall that unmarked direct objects must occupy immediate pre-verbal position.) The genitive suffix thus has no function to serve in the RC and the GSAR should not apply. Nevertheless it must.¹¹

- (31) çocuğun evde kovaladığ~~i~~ kız
 child-GEN house-LOC chase-OP-POSS girl
 'the girl who the child chased in the house'

The underlined NP's in the following post-deletion RC's also admit of only one interpretation: they must be subjects.

- (32)a. [Pınar kovala-] [kız]
 b. [o köpek kovala-] [kız]

If these inherently specific NP's were direct objects, they would have to be marked accusative. Again, the genitive is not required to prevent the subjects from being misconstrued. But the GSAR must in fact apply obligatorily.

- (33)a. Pınarın kovaladığ~~i~~ kız
 b. o köpeğin kovaladığ~~i~~ kız
 'the girl who Pınar/ that dog chased'

And consider the following intermediate form; the subject of a sentential object (underlined) has undergone relative deletion.

- (34) [sen çiçekleri yediğini söyle-] [keçi]
 2s flower-PLU-ACC eat-PART-POSS-ACC say goat

There are no less than three reasons why the subject of the RC, the pronoun sen, could not be interpreted as an object: (i) pronominal objects cannot be unmarked for case, and sen is; (ii) sen does not occupy immediate pre-verbal position; and (iii) the relative clause already contains a direct object (i.e., the accusative casemarked sentential object). Thus (34) should surface as a genitiveless, SP RC. This expectation is not borne out.

- (35) senin çiçekleri yediğini söylediğini keçi
 GEN OP-POSS
 'the goat which you said ate the flowers'

Finally, if semantic properties (and extra-linguistic knowledge) enter into the decision to assign the genitive, the GSAR will not apply in (36).

- (36) [adam yaz-] [mektup]
 man write letter

Men write letters; letters cannot write men. A SP RC is predicted because the semantic properties of yaz- pick out adam as its subject.

- (37) adam yazan mektup
 SP

But if (37) is grammatical at all, it only has the anomalous reading: 'the letter which wrote men.' Speakers cannot interpret adam as the subject even though that is the only sensible interpretation of it.

5.2 Intransitive Relative Clauses

The function of the genitive in intransitive RC's is, according to Dede, somewhat different from its function in transitive RC's. Since intransitive verbs are not subcategorized for direct objects, there can be no question of mistaking a subject for an unmarked object. Rather, Dede says that the problem in intransitive RC's is maintaining the definiteness of the subject NP.

5.2.1 In the unmarked case, the definite subject of an intransitive verb is clause-initial. An indefinite subject appears in immediate pre-verbal position. (Dede's (30a) and (31a))

- (38) Çocuk odada uyuyor.
 child room-LOC sleep-PRES
 'The child is sleeping in the room.'

(39) Odada çocuk uyuyor.

'A child/children is/are sleeping in the room.'¹²

Relative deletion of odada in (38) has the effect of positioning çocuk immediately before the verb. Dedé claims that this "changes the subject from a definite NP to an indefinite NP. Therefore, the GSAR is needed to retain the properties of the subject."¹³ (p. 75) In fact, relativization of the oblique object in (38) does require the OP construction, while relativization of the same NP in (39) requires the SP construction.

(40) çocuğun uyuduğu oda
GEN OP-POSS

'the room which the child is sleeping in'

(41) çocuk uyuyan oda
SP

'the room which a child/children is/are sleeping in'

Consider also the following SP RC.

(42) altından su akan kapı
underneath-POSS-ABL water flow-SP door

'the door that water is flowing out from under'

Although the subject, su, appears in immediate pre-verbal position, it is not marked genitive. Su is indefinite: only definite NP's in danger of being misconstrued as indefinite are genitivized.

Dedé clearly intends the following: there will be suffixation of the genitive to the definite subject of an intransitive RC if and only if the definiteness of the subject could be misconstrued. The definiteness of the sentential subject of an intransitive verb cannot be misconstrued under any circumstance. Thus, the genitive is not needed "to retain the properties of the subject" when a subpart of the sentential subject is relativized. This accounts for SP relativization of yılan below.¹⁴

(43) kabağ± yediği şüpheli olan yılan
squash-ACC eat-PART-POSS doubtful be-SP snake

'the snake which it's doubtful that (it) ate the squash'

5.2.2 The problem is that in many cases, the definite subjects of intransitive RC's must be genitivized even though their definiteness would have been readily apparent were they not genitivized.

Consider an intransitive RC where deletion has not had the effect of positioning a definite subject immediately before the verb.

(44) [çocuk kedi ile dün akşam uyu-] [oda]
child cat with yesterday evening sleep room

Çocuk must be suffixed with the genitive in spite of the fact that

For instance, in accordance with condition A of the GSAR and in violation of the functional principle, the subjects of the follow-

ing RC's are genitivized:

- (31) çocuğun evde kovaladığı kız
(33a) Pınarın kovaladığı kız

In accordance with condition B and in violation of the functional principle, the genitive is suffixed to the subjects of the following RC's.

- (45) çocuğun kedi ile dün akşam uyuduğu oda
(46a) Demet'in uyuduğu oda

For the following RC, the absence of the genitive is in accord with the functional principle. Condition A of the GSAR incorrectly assigns the genitive here.

- (6b) kızın köpek isiran adam

The functional principle also accounts for the SP RC's below. Given condition B of the GSAR, these should have been OP RC's.

- (8a) kabağı yediği şüpheli olan yılan
(9) bir keçisi benden kaçan adam

The predictions converge for these two cases:

- (26) çocuğun sevdiği kız
(42) altından su akan kapı

In sum, a grammar of Turkish which contains just the GSAR with conditions A and B is inadequate. A grammar which contains just the functional principle is also inadequate. A grammar which contains both makes contradictory predictions in a large number of cases. There seems to be no principled basis for deciding which of the procedures to follow for a given RC. Moreover, even supposing that some such decision procedure could be devised, Dede's account cannot avoid stating the distribution of RC participles in terms of a disjunction of principles.

Footnotes

* I am indebted to Jorge Hankamer, Phil LeSourd, and Jonathan Pressler for many helpful suggestions.

¹Abbreviations used in the glosses are the following: ABL-ablative case; ACC-accusative case; AOR-aorist tense; DAT-dative case; FUT-future tense; GEN-genitive case; LOC-locative case; PART-participle suffix; PASS-passive suffix; PAST-past tense; POSS-possessive; PRES-

present tense; 1,2,3s/1,2,3p-first, second, third person singular or plural.

²Uppercase letters represent segments which have a number of phonetic realizations due to the operation of vowel harmony, final stop devoicing, and consonant assimilation.

³These terms are Underhill's (1972). Hankamer (1973) referred to (1) as a "possessed participle" RC and to (2) as a "free participle" RC. Hankamer's terminology has the virtue of focusing attention on the crucial difference between the two RC constructions: whether or not the genitive and the agreeing possessive are suffixed to the subject of the RC and the participle, respectively. In the non-future tense, the participle suffixes have different realizations; in the future tense, however, the morpheme -EcEK does double duty as the OP suffix and the SP suffix.

- (a) kadın-ın al-acak-ı halı
 woman-GEN buy-PART-POSS rug
 'the rug which the woman will buy'
- (b) halı-yı al-acak kadın
 rug-ACC buy-PART woman
 'the woman who will buy the rug'

Suffixation of the genitive and the possessive is the only thing that distinguishes (a) from (b).

Unfortunately, the terms 'possessed participle' and 'free participle' are not as well established in the literature as OP and SP. For this reason, I have adopted Underhill's terminology.

⁴In Dede's review of HK's proposals (which is discussed beginning in section 2), the following remark about the MNP appears: "Although this principle seems to work within the framework of transformational grammar, it is not necessary to include such a principle in the grammar of Turkish..." The major point of HK's paper was that the principles governing participle choice in Turkish make reference to notions like "subject" and "non-subject" and thus cannot be stated in the framework of a transformational grammar.

⁵Perlmutter (1978) and Perlmutter and Postal (forthcoming) claim that there is an NP in impersonal passives that functions as subject, but that it is an inaudible dummy. This distinction is not relevant for my purposes here.

⁶(15) does not exemplify the only circumstance in which an embedded subject NP fails to be casemarked genitive. The subjects of clauses embedded under verbs like san- ('think') and bil- ('believe') may be uncasemarked:

- (a) Cengiz Yakut erken kalktı sandı.
 early rise-PAST think-PAST

'Cengiz thought that Yakut got up early.'

And the subjects of certain adverbial clauses are not suffixed with the genitive:

(b) Murat gelince Yasemin lokantaya gider.
 come-ADV restaurant-DAT go-AOR

'When Murat comes, Yasemin will go to the restaurant.'

Thus, there is no requirement that embedded subjects be marked genitive in Turkish.

⁷Additionally, oblique objects, regardless of their specificity, are obligatorily casemarked dative, locative, or ablative.

⁸I am of course ignoring the assignment of the genitive in, for example, possessive phrases.

⁹As Jorge Hankamer has reminded me, ambiguity avoidance of this type is not universal. McCloskey (1977) points out the existence of relative clauses in Modern Irish which contain an NP which may be interpreted either as a subject or as a direct object.

¹⁰Dede presents the following sentence to illustrate the role played by semantic properties and the extra-linguistic knowledge of the speaker in determining whether or not the GSAR applies.

(16) kız köpek ısırdı.
 girl-ACC dog bite-PAST
 'A dog/dogs bit the girl.'

The claim is that when the direct object (kız) is relativized, the subject (köpek) does not have to be marked genitive to prevent its being misconstrued as a direct object. The reason is that dogs usually bite girls and not vice versa. For Dede then, the SP RC below is grammatical and has the reading, 'the girl who a dog/dogs bit.'

(18) köpek ısıran kız
 SP

For all the speakers of Turkish I have consulted, (18) is marginal at best and the only possible interpretation of it is, 'the girl who bit dogs.'

¹¹With respect to examples (31) and (33), it might be tempting to claim that although the functional principle fails to assign the genitive, the subjects of the RC's will in any event be genitivized because they are embedded. Not so; see footnote 5.

¹²Gocuk in (39) is also interpretable as a definite NP. Constituents are moved into immediate pre-verbal position for emphasis;

on the definite reading, çocuk is therefore 'focused.'

¹³Dede does not explain why the derived position of the subject should have the effect of "changing it" from a definite NP to an indefinite NP.

¹⁴Dede's actual discussion of (43) is as follows: "...the GSAR is not needed here because the deletion of the NP in the sentential subject does not cause any change in the grammatical relation of the sentential subject to the main verb şüpheli 'doubtful' and its relation is indicated by the absence of a case suffix. That is, a sentential NP which is in the nominative case can only function as the subject." (p. 74) It is not true that uncase-marked sentential NP's must be subjects; see footnote 5. Furthermore, this discussion is confusing in light of Dede's analysis of other intransitive RC's, where misconstrual of definiteness, not grammatical relations, was said to be the problem the grammar faces.

References

- Breckenridge, Janet (1975) Rules Which Nothing Undergoes: An Investigation of Impersonal Passives and Object Raising Constructions in German, unpublished undergraduate thesis, Harvard University.
- Dede, Müşerref (1978) "Why Should Turkish Relativization Distinguish Between Subject and Non-Subject Head Nouns?" BLS, Volume 4.
- Hankamer, Jorge (1973) "Unacceptable Ambiguity," LI, 4.1.
- Hankamer, J. and Laura Knecht (1976) "The Role of the Subject/Non-Subject Distinction in Determining the Choice of Relative Clause Participle in Turkish," in Aissen and Hankamer, eds., Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics, Volume II.
- McCloskey, James (1977) "An Acceptable Ambiguity in Modern Irish," LI, 8.3.
- Perlmutter, David (1978) "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis," BLS, Volume 4.
- Perlmutter, D. and Paul Postal (forthcoming) "Impersonal Passives and Some Relational Laws."
- Underhill, Robert (1972) "Turkish Participles," LI, 3.1.