Extractability and the nominative case feature on tense [1]

Gülşat Aygen
Harvard University

In this study, adjunct/complement and subject/object asymmetry in Turkish scrambling is discussed. A uniform account of Turkish facts are given within an approach unifying the claims in Miyagawa (1999) and Pesetsky and Torrego (2000). The presence/absence of subject/object asymmetry in subordinate clauses in Turkish (non-finite, finite and finite ECM) are accounted by feature driven phrasal movement, T-to-C, and DPs whose case feature are deleted by the end of the phase and are thus inactive for external syntactic operations.

1. Turkish Facts : Extractable Subject and Unextractable Object

Turkish subordinate clauses are regularly (argued to be) non-finite yet a few verbs select finite clauses as complements and the very same verbs select ECM constructions.[2] In the terms I use to distinguish various types of subordinate clauses, 'Finiteness' refers to the availability of any morpheme of the tense paradigm on the predicate of the clause. Data below illustrates interesting observations concerning the subject/object asymmetry. (1&2) are constructions with non-finite embedded clauses , which are CPs, yet they do not allow a full tense paradigm and their subjects appear with overt genitive case morphology:

(1) Ercan-in$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-I acele ye-dig-i]ni soyle-di. ✔ subject
-gen cake-acc in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc tell-past
'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'

(2) Kek-I$_i$ Hasan [Ercan-in t_i acele ye-dig-]ni soyle-di. ✔ object
cake-acc -gen in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc tell-past
'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'

These non-finite constructions do not exhibit the predicted subject/object asymmetry, whereas finite ones do exhibit it as may be observed below:

(3)*Ercan$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-I ye-di] san-iyor. *subject
cake-acc eat-past think-prog
'Ercan thinks Hasan ate the cake'
*in the intended reading
√ as matrix subject

(4) Kek-i$_i$ Hasan [Ercan t_i ye-di] san-iyor. ✔ object
cake-acc eat-past think-prog
'Hasan thinks Ercan ate the cake'

---

[1] I'd like to thank Shigeru Miyagawa, Norvin Richards, David Pesetsky and Lynn Nichols for their valuable comments throughout this study.

[2] Kural (1993) regards the so called non-finite subordinate clauses as finite as well. This in fact would make the question whether "finiteness" is the parameter that "blocks" extraction more valid: For further discussion see Aygen-Tosun 1999a.

If we argue that it is the finiteness of the clause that makes it a blocking category, we cannot account for the observation on ECM constructions in Turkish below, which are finite, yet pattern like non-finite embedded clauses in terms of allowing subject to be extracted. Compare (5) and (6) in terms of finiteness:

(5) Ahmet [ben-I git-ti(-m)] san-iyor. ECM
I-acc go-past-(agr) think-prog
'Ahmet thinks that I went "

(6) Ahmet [ben git-ti-m] san-iyor. Finite
I go-past-agr think-prog
'Ahmet thinks that I went'

It is important to note two peculiarities of ECM in Turkish:

(i) ECM predicates exhibit a full paradigm of tense morphology just like their finite counterparts;
(ii) subject agreement morphology is optional on ECM predicates.

The former forces us to group ECM under finite constructions, yet, the latter implies some sort of "deficiency/lack of a feature" on T/and or C.

(7&8) below illustrate the observation that ECM constructions do not exhibit subject/object asymmetry in the expected way: it allows subject extraction yet not object extraction!

(7)Ben-i_i Ahmet [t_i kek-I ye-di(m)] san-iyor.
I-acc cake-acc eat-past-1sg think-prog
'Ahmet thinks I ate the cake'

(8)*Kek-$_i$i Ahmet [ben-I t_i ye-di(m)] san-iyor.
cake-acc I-acc eat-past-(1sg) think-prog.

.

The question that the grammaticality of (7) raises is the location of the lower subject to make sure it launches from inside the lower clause. The answer to this question is, yes, it launches from the lower clause as the adverb test in (9) indicates:

(9) Ahmet [Hasan-i her zaman icki ic-iyor] san-iyor.
-acc always (alcoholic)drink drink-prog think-prog
'Ahmet thinks that Hasan always drinks'

The adverb has scope in the lower clause and takes the ECM subject under its clause.

The questions the observations on data raise are:

Q1: Why is subject/object asymmetry not observed in extraction out of non-finite embedded clauses and it is observed in extraction out of finite embedded clauses?

Q2: If finiteness is the phenomenon, how come finite ECM constructions allow extraction of the subject and exhibit the contrast in the opposite direction ?

(10) summarizes the observations:

(10) (i)NF clauses (-dik/-ecek): ✔ sbj ✔ obj ; sbj+gen; obj+acc.
(ii)F clauses : * sbj ✔ obj ; sbj+nom; obj+acc.
(iii)ECM : ✔ sbj * obj; sbj+acc; obj+acc.

2. Analysis of the data in terms of T-to-C and EPP[3]

In this section, I will give an analysis for the lack of subject/object asymmetry in non-finite clauses based on Miyagawa (1999) as an answer to Q1 above. Miyagawa argues that scrambling is an EPP driven movement and T-to-C allows subject and object to be equidistant in terms of meeting the EPP requirement on T.

2.1. V-to-T-to-C in Turkish

Major arguments supporting V-to-T-to-C in Turkish are based on availability of post-verbal scrambling as an adjunction to CP[4], licensing of subject NPIs by negation on the verb in both main and subordinate contexts (Kural 1993).

Consider the structures below where post-verbal scrambling is allowed in a root clause (11) and but not in a non-finite embedded clause (12):

(11)Ahmet-Ø t_i git-ti-Ø okul-a_i
-nom go-past-agr school-dat
'Ahmet went to school'

(12) *Hasan-Ø [[Ahmet-in t_i git-tig-i]ni okul-a] duy-du-Ø
-nom -gen go-nom-agr-acc school-dat hear-past-agr
'Hasan heard that Ahmet went to school'

Considering that postverbal constituents are CP-adjoined in Turkish , Kural (1993, 1997) argues that only if the verb is at the highest head would force post-posed elements to adjoin the highest projection. Theoretically, this argument could as well support the opposite claim: that the availability of post-verbal scrambling is an indication of the lack of T-to-C. V-to-T-to-C derives a structure where post-verbal scrambling of the internal arguments of the verb would result in "adjunction to their own maximal projection" since the CP they adjoin is in fact has complex head including their own head. Consequently, adjunction of a phrase to its own maximal projection renders such structures ungrammatical. Availability of post-verbal scrambling, therefore, might as well indicate lack of T-to-C in root clauses and finite embedded structures.

Secondly, Kural argues that T-to-C is a regular process and the ungrammaticality of adjunction to the embedded non-finite CP in (12) is accounted for by the general prohibition against adjunction to arguments (Chomsky 1986).This would also account for the grammaticality of (13&14) which indicate that finite clauses allow post-verbal scrambling:

(13) Ahmet-Ø [t_i t_j ye-di] Hasan-$Ø_i$ elma-yi_j san-di-Ø
-nom eat-past -nom apple-acc think-past-agr
'Ahmet thought Hasan ate the apple'

(14) Ahmet-Ø [t_i t_j ye-di] elma-yi_j Hasan-$Ø_i$ san-di-Ø
-nom eat-past apple-acc -nom think-past-agr
'Ahmet thought Hasan ate the apple'

Along the lines of Kural's analysis, data in (11-14) would imply that finite clauses must be adjuncts, whereas NF ones are complements and the contrast is expected. If so, we would expect both ECM and finite embedded clauses to be adjuncts rather than complements, which is not the case as will be

[3] EPP (Extended Projection principle) is a principle that requires Infl (T) to have a specifier (Chomsky 1981). In Chomsky (1995, 1998), an uninterpretable feature F on head X requires an Agree relation with F on Y and the material in Y is copied into X locally. This property of F is called an EPP property.

[4] Postverbal adjunction of constituents to CP is also consistent with subject NPI being licensed by negative in the verbal complex, post-verbal QPs escaping the scope of subject QPs or preverbal adverbs (Kural 1997).

discussed below. ECM pattern with non-finite embedded clauses in terms of postverbal scrambling and cannot be complements under Kural's analysis, which is refuted by the case-dependency of ECM subjects.

Note that the verbs that select F clauses also select ECM complements. Consider the grammaticality of (13&14) above with a finite embedded clause and those of the ones with ECM (15&16). ECM complements which are finite in Turkish behave like non-finite embedded clauses in not allowing postverbal adjunction to CP:

(15) *Ahmet-Ø [t_i tj ye-di-Ø] Hasan-i_i elma-yi_j san-di-Ø
-nom eat-past-agr -acc apple-acc think-past-agr
intended reading: 'Ahmet thought that Hasan ate the apple'

(16) *Ahmet-Ø [t_i tj ye-di-Ø] elma-yi_j Hasan-i_i san-di-Ø
-nom eat-past-agr apple –acc -acc think-past-agr

If Kural's analysis is correct, we would expect post-verbal scrambling in ECM constructions to be grammatical since, being finite, they must be adjuncts as well. However, the data does not attest Kural's analysis.

Another argument given in favour of the V-to-T-to-C in Turkish (Kural 1993) is subject NPIs being licensed by negation on the verb in both main and subordinate contexts. Consider (17a&b) and (18a&b) below:

(17)a. Kimse-Ø gel-me-di-Ø
noone-nom come-neg-past-agr
"Noone came'

b.*Kimse-Ø gel-di-Ø
noone-nom come-past-agr

(18)a. *Hasan-Ø [kimse-nin gel-dig[5]-i]ni san-iyor-Ø
-nom noone-gen come-nom-pos-acc think-prog-agr
'Hasan thinks noone came'

b. Hasan-Ø [kimse-nin gel-me-dig-i]ni san-iyor-Ø
-nom noone-gen come-neg-nom-pos-acc think-prog-agr
'Hasan thinks noone came'

The NPI *kimse* 'noone' in (17b) and (18a) is argued to be licensed by negation on verb at C where it c-commands the subject (at Spec TP) (Kural 1993). (17&18), however, only shows that the NPI *kimse/*noone needs negation, It does not show that it must be c-commanded by the negative morpheme at C, i.e.that V+T is at C.

To conclude: Based on the discussion and evidence above, I propose the opposite analysis: post-verbal scrambling is allowed in constructions where there is no T-to-C; in root clauses and finite embedded clauses V is at T not at C.

2.2. T-to-C and EPP analysis

Miyagawa (1999) argues that there is a V-to-T movement in Japanese which allows both subject and object to be equidistant from T and that EPP is on T. Movement of either one of the arguments accounts for A-scrambling in Japanese. I would like to argue that V-to-T-to-C movement in Turkish NF constructions allows both the subject and the object to satisfy EPP. The location of EPP in Turkish is difficult to test since employment of tests proposed by Miyagawa (1999) are not applicable in Turkish due to frozen scope

[5] The –DIK nominalizer is analyzed as DI-K by Kural (1993) where he assumes –K to be a Complementizer in subordinate predicates in Turkish. For a discussion of his arguments see Aygen-Tosun 1999. This issue is irrelevant to the discussion of T-to-C here since the verbal complex bearing the-K moves to C.

of quantifiers. For the time being, I will assume it to be on T for two reason: if EPP were on C, local A-scrambling would be to the Spec CP, to an A' position. Secondly, I will stipulate that V-to-T-C is what allows extraction from Spec TP rather than the actual periphery of the clause , which is Spec CP in Long Distance Scrambling.

This analysis predicts two observations on Scrambling: it predicts both SOV and OSV orders in the embedded clauses. SOV has been illustrated in the former data and the availability of OSV is illustrated below:

(19)Hasan [kek-I_i Ercan-in t_i ye-dig-i]ni soyle-di.
cake-acc -gen eat-nom-pos-acc tell-past
'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake'

The second prediction this analysis makes is on the observation on adjunct scrambling. Since adjuncts cannot satisfy EPP, they cannot undergo A-movement triggered by EPP feature on T; hence their unextractability. The contrast in the data (20&21) below attests this prediction:

(20)Hasan [[Nafe-nin$_i$ keki]$_j$ni o_i-nun t_j ye-dig-i]ni] san-di. A-mvmt
-gen cake-acc she-gen eat-nom-acc think-past
'Hasan thought that Nafe ate her cake'

(21) *Hasan [[Nafe'nin ev-i]$_i$nde o_i-nun t_i dans et-tig-I]ni san-di. A'-mvmt
-gen house-pos-loc she-gen dance do-nom-pos-acc think-past
'Hasan thought that at Nafe$_i$'s house she$_i$ danced.'

(20) is an A-scrambling of a complement whereas, (21) is that of an adjunct. The ungrammaticality of (21) indicates that adjuncts cannot satisfy EPP.

In Turkish , then, local scrambling is an EPP driven movement. Since both arguments are equidistant to Spec TP due to verb movement, either one of them can move there. As for further movement, we might argue that V-to-T-to-C eliminates the distance between Spec TP and Spec CP in terms of what we call the "periphery" of the clause. This analysis accounts for the lack of subject/object asymmetry in non-finite clauses , and adjunct/argument asymmetry in general, without making resort to ECP.

Next task is to account for the subject/object asymmetry observed in finite clauses.

2.3. Subject/Adjunct and Object asymmetry in Turkish scrambling

The EPP analysis proposed above predicts the Argument/Adjunct asymmetry.Under the ECP account of the subject/adjunct and object asymmetry complements, being lexically selected and governed categories can be extracted whereas subjects and adjuncts not being L-governed need to be antecedent governed to be extracted. The argument/adjunct is observed in all clauses in Turkish; yet the subject/object asymmetry is observed only in finite embedded clauses in Turkish, not in non-finite embedded clauses. Moreover, finite ECM constructions exhibit the opposite asymmetry between the subject and the object: subject is extractable but the object is not. These Turkish facts cannot be accounted by ECP.

Turkish exhibits the adjunct/argument asymmetry in extraction out of both finite and non-finite embedded clauses. (22) is an instance of argument scrambling below, whereas (23) is an instance of adjunct LS:

(22)a. [Nafe-nin$_i$ keki]$_j$ni Hasan [t_j o_i-nun t_j ye-dig-i]ni] san-di. NON-FINITE
-gen cake-acc she-gen eat-nom-acc think-past
'Nafe's cake, Hasan thought that she ate'

b. [Nafe-nin$_i$ keki]$_j$ni Hasan [t_j o_i t_j ye-di] san-di. FINITE
-gen cake-acc she eat-past think-past
'Nafe's cake, Hasan thought that she ate'

(23)a. *[Nafe'nin ev-i]$_i$nde Hasan [t_i o_i-nun t_i dans et-tig-i]ni san-di .NON-FINITE
-gen house-pos-acc she-gen dance do-nom-pos-acc think-past

b. *[Nafe'nin ev-i]$_i$nde Hasan [t_i o_i t_i dans et-ti] san-di .FINITE
-gen house-pos-acc she dance do-past think-past

Although reconstruction to the intermediary landing site (A position) is allowed in (22), (23) is still ungrammatical. Under the ECP analysis, adjuncts, not being L-marked, are not allowed to extract in (23). I will give an EPP analysis for the contrast following Miyagawa (1999) after discussing the subject/object asymmetry in Turkish.

3. Analysis for subject-object asymmetry in Finite embedded clauses

Since we have already argued that there is no T-to-C in finite clause, we expect to observe a subject/object asymmetry in these clauses which indeed is the case. We have already disregarded the finiteness parameter by observing subject extraction out of finite ECM constructions. Except for finiteness, non-finite and finite embedded clauses differ in one more aspect: subjects of finite embedded clauses are in the nominative case whereas subjects of non-finite clauses are in the genitive. Since Chomsky (1973) proposed Tensed S Condition and NIC (1980), the significance of nominative subject has been studied. A recent proposal by Pesetsky and Torrego (2000) is relevant on the issue. P&T suggest that nominative case feature is in fact Tense and occurs as an uninterpretable Tense feature (*u*T) on nominative DPs and functional heads T and C. Under the Chomsky (1999) framework, uninterpretable features need to be deleted by a PROBE/AGREE or/and MOVE operation before the phase closes off or the derivation crashes at LF. P&T argue that the *u*T on C can be deleted either by head movement of T to C or by the phrasal movement of nominative DP (subject) to Spec CP.

P&T (2000:29) argue that the Aux inversion asymmetry observed (24&25) corresponds to the T-to-C accompanied by an object wh-movement (24) and lack of T-to-C when subject wh-movement satisfies *u*T on C:

(24) What did John buy?
(25) Who bought a car?

What differs in finite clauses is that since there is no T-to-C movement to delete the *u*T on C , the nominative subject has to serve this function and delete its *u*T at Spec TP.Once it does so, it is inactive for further extra-clausal operations, whereas, the non-nominative object is still active for further movement (specifically A' movement to the higher clause). This account poses various options for the location of the subject and the object in finite embedded clauses since both SOV and OSV orders are possible in Turkish.

Our analysis predicts that in OSV order subject is frozen *in situ* and deletes its *u*T via AGREE with T and object moves to Spec TP to satisfy EPP and thus is allowed to move further. Consider the following data where a scopal element *ancak/only ,* which has a strictly local scope takes the subject under its scope:

(26) Bu soru-nu ancak Ayse coz-er.
This problem-acc only solve-aor
'Only Ayse can solve this problem'

A theory internal evidence is a parallel issue in ECM constructions where the accusative marked internal argument of the lower verb is *in situ* and inactive for even clause internal movement.

4. The ECM puzzle

In the sections above, it has been argued that A scrambling within embedded contexts and the absence and presence of a subject/ object asymmetry in Turkish can be accounted by the theory posited by Miyagawa (1999) and the *u*T analysis of P&T. Under this analysis, scrambling is not an optional operation but an obligatory feature driven process. The asymmetry between subject and object is not dependent on the finiteness of the clause *per se* but to the presence or lack of *u*T on C. Non-finite embedded clauses are headed by a *–uT C* whereas finite ones are headed by a *+u*T head.

The ECM puzzle where the subject and object asymmetry is observed in the opposite direction may be accounted for along with the EPP analysis in terms of subject extractability and parallel with subject-object asymmetry in finite clauses in terms of unavailability of object extractability . Remember that ECM constructions are tensed/finite yet they *lack* *u*T as apparent from the lack of a nominative subject, and optionally, they also lack phi features like agreement since there is an optionality (or dialectal variation) in the usage of the agreement morphology. Considering that lack of tense has been posited as an argument in favour of a CP-deletion analysis for English ECM, I analyze ECMs in Turkish as XPs since there is no motivation to delete CP in tensed Turkish ECMs.

If CPs how come they are selected by +acc verbs unlike other tensed CPs? Not the name of but the features on the head are important. In fact, in the long run I will propose a neutral head which is defined by its feature; such an approach would eliminate the discussion over the nature of subordinate clauses. In any case, the head of ECM XPs lacks *u*T and agreement features[6]. T-to-C and EPP analysis presented for other subordinate clauses applies to ECM subjects, too; hence their extractability.

Note that the second half of the ECM puzzle, which is the unavailability of extracting/scrambling the ECM objects, patterns with the behaviour of nominative subject of finite clauses. An account in line with the uT feature of P&T (2000) in some respect, for the presence of subject/object asymmetry in finite embedded clauses applies to presence of the asymmetry in ECMs. Remember that nominative subject in finite embedded clauses (+*u*T CPs) is inactive for further operations once its *u*T is deleted and therefore cannot undergo LDS. Nominative case feature, that is *u*T is the crucial feature on the head of these phrases, and the argument that bears the same feature is *inactive* once it is deleted (either by T-to-C or by AGREE with T; in Turkish, the latter would apply). Similarly, in ECM type constructions, the only structural case assigned and checked/deleted within the clause is the accusative case on the internal argument; the head *v* of the construction (within the PHASE) bears a feature referring to another structural case, namely Accusative. The argument which bears the feature on the head of its phase and deletes it within the clause (by AGREE with *v*) is inactive for further syntactic operations, unless motivated by an A' feature (focus-right dislocation such as " Ahmet Ercan'I yedi keki sandi/Ahmet thought Ercan ate the cake (in the English word order-SVO)" hence the unextractability of the accusative object.[7]

It might as well be the case that *u*T is the structural case (nominative) on C whereas a parallel feature on *v* is what de-activates the accusative object in ECMs; this parallelism would be supported by further research if we have evidence that ECMs are in fact smaller structures than CPs with deficient Ts that lack *u*T and phi features. It is very likely that the only phase within ECM is at *v* .This possible account is worth pursuing since the parallel nature of *v* and C has been suggested in terms of bearing an EPP feature and being phases (Chomsky 1999).

5. On the Condition on LDS (Karimi 1999)

The observations on the presence or absence of subject/object asymmetry in Turkish scrambling *seems* to be accountable by Karimi's condition on LDS; however, I will argue that although her account predicts that of the two elements bearing the same feature in terms of grammatical function only the higher of the two may scramble, this prediction is not attested in terms of *grammatical function* in Turkish. Constituents can scramble over elements with the same grammatical function (subject of non-finite clauses) and elements with different grammatical function may –seem to- block scrambling (subject of ECM superficially blocks object of ECM) in Turkish. I will argue that restating her condition on LDS by its relevance to *case* rather than *grammatical function* resolves the two contradictory Turkish data but such a re-statement of the Condition on LDS, in fact, supports the analysis presented in this paper.

---

[7] This approach is also supported by the observations and analysis on the semantic properties of case, and scope independency of DPs with overt case morphology to any scopal element higher in the structure in Turkish (Aygen-Tosun 1999 April on Specifity and scope interactions of Subjects and Objects in Turkish). If *v*P is a phase where the object deletes its case feature and is interpreted then its immunity to a scope bearing subject which deletes its feature at a higher location and is interpreted at a later phase (CP), the observation and analysis in Aygen-Tosun (1999) follows naturally.
As for the availability of right-dislocation trigerred by a focus feature in contrast with the unavailability of a left-dislocation, it suffices to say that the former differs from the latter in terms of locality.

Karimi (1999) argues that, although scrambling is not subject to M(inimal)L(ink)C(ondition) of Chomsky (1995) –as has been discussed in Saito and Fukumi 1998- it becomes relevant when there is more than one element bearing the same feature and competing for the same landing site. She proposes a condition on LDS (given in (27)) . She suggests a discourse feature D on C that triggers LDS; D on C is sensitive to certain properties of YP in that if there is an XP identical in grammatical function to YP in a position closer to C, it blocks the movement of YP

(27) Condition on LDS (Karimi 1999)
LDS is blocked if
* YP_i α XPα [t_i]
where α represents a specific grammatical function.

The condition on LDS predicts a subject/object asymmetry in non-finite clauses in Turkish since (27) would rule out scrambling of a lower subject over a higher subject yet such a movement is perfectly grammatical in Turkish (see data and discussion in section 2). Furthermore, this condition does not account for the unextractability of ECM objects since there is no XP with the same grammatical function (that of object) intervening; yet , there is an XP, the lower subject which case marked accusative just like the ECM object. Considering the Condition on LDS in terms of *Case* rather than *grammatical function* would describe the puzzle[8]. If a condition where *case* is relevant rather than grammatical function *per se* is employed, the presence of subject-object asymmetry in finite embedded clauses and lack of it in non-finite clauses is also accountable since the higher subject is nominative in the data and the lower subject is in the Genitive case in the non-finite clauses and accusative in the ECMs whereas it is nominative in finite embedded clause. The genitive subject carries the same grammatical function as the higher subject yet differs in case and does not violate the Condition on LDS rephrased in terms of case. Consider the cases of scrambling out of deeply embedded constructions below:

(28) Ahmet [Mehmet-in [Nafe-nin kek-I ye-dig-i]ni bil-dig-i]ni soyle-di.
-gen -gen cake-acc eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-poss-acc tell-past
'Ahmet told that Mehmet knows that Nafe ate the cake'
(29)*Ahmet [$Nafe\text{-}nin_i$ Mehmet-in [t_i kek-I ye-dig-i]ni bil-dig-i]ni soyle-di.
-gen -gen cake-acc eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-pos-acc tell-past

Although there is no subject/object asymmetry in non-finite clauses in Turkish, the ungrammaticality of (29) appears to conform to the rephrased version of Karimi's condition on LDS by banning subject scrambling over another subject. However, the ungrammaticality of (29) might as well be due to a processing problem rather than a syntactic one. Moreover, claiming that *case* rather than *grammatical function* is relevant for Condition on LDS to account for the Turkish data supports the analysis presented in this paper. The "restated version of the Condition on LSD, that is the claim that scrambling over a constituent with the same case is forbidden is simply a description of the facts. This description is more properly explained theory internally in terms of P&T's (2000) inactive nominative DP in finite embedded clauses[9] and the inactive accusative DP in ECM is case is some tense feature on DPs.Therefore, Karimi's condition does not necessarily undermine the EPP analysis and the account for DPs inactive for clause external operations presented in this paper. Our analysis accounts for both local A-scrambling and presence or absence of subject/object asymmetry in subordinate clauses in Turkish. It predicts the peculiar behavior of ECM objects as well as structures Karimi accounts for by her Condition on LDS.

[8] Karimi (1999:footnote 16) suggests that her condition on LDS interacts with case.
[9] Note that P&T's account for inactive nominative DPs complies with Karimi's MLC requirements. In P&T's account, T-to-C rather than the movement of the nominative DP is what deletes *u*T in some constructions in English and the nominative DP is inactivated by deleting its feature at Spec TP. In Turkish, however, in structures with V-to-T-to-C, nominative DP is inactive for clause external syntactic operations and the preference of head movement over phrasal movement is not an issue and the closeness of T to C (ACX in P&T and MLC in Karimi) is irrelevant.

6. Conclusion

I have given a unified account for the nature of movement in Turkish scrambling and the subject/object/adjunct symmetry.

(i) Scrambling is a feature driven obligatory process EPP driven in instances of A-movement and Focus driven in instances of A'-movement;

(ii) (i) accounts for argument/adjunct asymmetry observed subordinate contexts;

(iii) (i) accounts for the absence of subject/object asymmetry in non-finite subordinate clauses;

(iv) the DP which bears the same feature with the highest head within the phase is inactive for extraclausal syntactic processes;

(v) the unextractability of nominative subject in finite embedded clauses and the unextractability of accusative object of ECM constructions are accounted for by (iv).

The analysis presented in this paper poses further questions: why is acc obj not inactive in non-ECM constructions? They are active in terms of Focus/Topic movement (A') since they can A-move to satisfy EPP before A' move. It follows that ECM *v* is also deficient in that its internal argument cannot satisfy EPP;hence cannot move further as well.

Selected references

Chomsky, Noam. 1998. *Minimalist Inquiries:the Framework*. MTWPL.

1999. *Derivation by Phase*. MITWPL.18.

1981.*Lectures on Government and Binding.*:*The Pisa Lectures.*,DordrechtForis.

Corver, N. and Henk van Riemsdijk(eds.). 1994. *Studies in Scrambling. Movement and Non-Movement Approaches to Free Word-Order Phenomena.*Mouton de Gruyter:Berlin.

Hoji, Hajime, and Saito Mamoru. 1983. Weak Crossover and Move-α in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1, 245-259.

Huang, C-T. James. 1982. *Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Karimi, S. 1999. Is Scrambling Strange?.*Papers on Morphology and Syntax Cycle One,*Arregi, Bruening, Krause and Lin (eds), MITWPL 33.

Mahajan, Anoop. 1990. The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory. MIT Doctoral Dissertation. MIT: Cambridge, Mass.

Kennelly, Sarah D. 1992. Turkish Subordination [-Tense, -CP, +Case],*Modern Studies in Turkish Linguistics,. Proceedings of the 6th intrnational conference on Turkish Linguistics ,* (ed) Ahmet Konrot. Anadolu University, Eskisehir, Turkey.

Kural, Murat. 1993. V-TO(-I-TO)-C in Turkish. *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics,v.11.*ed.Filippo Beghelli &Murat Kural. UCLA.

Kural, Murat. 1992. Properties of Scrambling in Turkish.ms UCLA.

Miyagawa, S. 1996. Word order Restrictions and Nonconfigurationality. *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics 2 MITWPL 29.*

Miyagawa, S. 1997. Against optional Scrambling. *LI* 28:1-25.

Miyagawa, S. 1998/99. *EPP, scrambling and wh-in-situ*. To appear in *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. ed. Michael Kenstowicz, MIT Press:Cambridge.

Pesetsky, David and Esther Torrego. 2000. *Tense to C:Causes and Consequences.* To appear in *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. ed. Michael Kenstowicz, MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. 1998. *Phrasal Movement and its Kin*. ms. MIT.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. "On Chain Formation," in H. Borer. (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 19. Academic Press: New York.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality.* Cambridge:MIT Press.

Saito, Mamoru. 1992. "Long-Distance Scrambling in Japanese," *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1: 69-118.

Saito, Mamoru. 1989. "Scrambling and Semantically Vacuous A' movement". *Alternative Conceptions Of Phrase Structure.* Eds. Mark Baltin and Anthony Kroch. 182-200. University of Chicago Press.

Aygen-Tosun G. 2000. Relative Clauses in Turkish:T-toC and N-to-D. (Paper for Intro to Ling theory at an Advanced Level course at MIT).

Aygen-Tosun, G. 1999a. Embedded Clauses in Turkish: Extraction Possibilities. Presented at Ford Foundation Fall Syntax Workshop at Harvard University.

Aygen-Tosun, G. 1999b. Specificity and Subject /Object Scope Interactions in Turkish. (to appear in*) Proceedings of the I International Conference in Turkic Linguistics*. Manchester University, April 1999.

Aygen-Tosun, G. 1999c. Fusion Functional Heads in Turkish. Ms. Harvard University.

Aygen-Tosun G. 1998a. Bir Gonderme Birimi olarak Zaman /Tense as a Referential Expression. *Proceedings of the XIIth National Conference in Turkish linguistics*, Mersin Universitesi yay.

Aygen-Tosun. G. 1998b. The Split INFL Hypothesis in Turkish. BA thesis. Bogazici University. Istanbul.

Aygen-Tosun. G. 1998c. The Adverb Positions and Functional Heads in Turkish. To appear in *Proceedings of the VI International Conference in Turkish Linguistics,* Oxford University Aug 1998.

Webelhuth, Gert. 1989. *Syntactic Saturation Phenomena and the Modern Germanic Languages*. Doctoral Diss. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.