On the Turkish Controllee

Cem Bozşahin
Middle East Technical University (ODTÜ), Ankara
bozsahin@metu.edu.tr

1   Introduction

In this paper we claim that Turkish controls the syntactic subject, like English, Icelandic, Dyirbal and German, although not all languages control the syntactic subject, e.g. Basque, Inuit and Tagalog, which control the maximally LF-commanding argument (which we shall call the *semantic subject*, following Bozsahin and Steedman (in submission)). At least in some of these languages, the semantic subject and the syntactic subject are not the same argument. Hence control cross-cuts accusativity/ergativity.

The claim for Turkish might seem obvious but we think it requires justification in the face of facts from other languages: Although it is common to assume that control requires a VP complement therefore what is "missing" from the controlled clause is the syntactic subject, what appears to be controlled in *some* ergative languages is the syntactic subject, but not all. Majority of ergative languages control the ergative argument, which can be shown in many of them not to be the syntactic subject. Moreover, although accusative languages by and large conflate syntactic subjecthood and semantic subjecthood in their surface grammar, thereby allowing a (local) semantic relation like control to be read off from syntactic structure *or* argument structure without confusion, not all of them do. For example, Zaenen (1993) claims that control of unaccusatives in Dutch is not felicitous if not ungrammatical, unlike English, e.g. *the window tries to open*, but Dutch makes no case distinction in the single argument of unergatives, the single argument of unaccusatives and the primary argument of transitives (i.e. the syntactic subject), and unergatives can be controlled. Hence the choices for the controllee must be examined for each language.[1]

We do this for Turkish in this paper. First we look at control as a lexical property (§2). Then we consider accusativity and ergativity, i.e. ways of organising grammatical relations, and their effect on control (§3). We attempt to identify the Turkish controllee in §4, before concluding in §5.

2   Control and the lexicon

We take a narrow view on control, and consider only unique obligatory control (1), rather than arbitrary, partial or split control. This is the only kind of control that is mediated by the control verb *alone*.[2]

(1) a. *John promised Mary* [*to study*].

   b. *John persuaded Mary* [*to study*].

   c. *Ben*   [*git-mek*] *ist-iyor-um*
      I.NOM go-INF   want-PROG-1SG
      'I want to go.'

[1]We note that we tackle the problem of control from the perspective of the controllee, not the controller. As a recent study shows (Jackendoff and Culicover, 2003), determining the controller even for a single language might require a semantic structure which is much deeper than what most linguistic theories assume, i.e. the conceptual structure. Moreover, it remains to be seen whether the same predictions for the controller apply to all languages. Bozsahin and Steedman (in submission) show that the choices for the controllee are much narrower.

[2]Our concern is *constructions* involving control, instigated by control verbs with infinitive complements, which control an argument of the complement phrase by one of their arguments. This is different than control as a property of event structure denoted by predicates, e.g. *break* being a controllable event and *fall* being less controllable, or lexical semantics of entities, such as humans being more likely to control events compared to inanimates, as conceived by Haig (1998).

Other kinds of control are not lexical properties of the control verb alone, for example, (2a–c) are related to anaphora and pragmatic implicature; cf. (2b–c):

(2) a. *How about [taking a swim together]?*
   controller is speaker/hearer jointly (Jackendoff and Culicover, 2003, ex.3c)

   b. [Ø *Burada dur-mak*] *tehlikeli*
   here-LOC stop-INF dangerous
   'It is dangerous to stop here.' (Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1990, ex.5)

   c. [*Burada   dur-mak*] *araba için tehlikeli.*
   here-LOC stop-INF car   for dangerous
   'It is dangerous for the car to stop here.' ARBITRARY CONTROL
   ambiguos as to whether the car stops or something else/somebody stops

Purpose clauses are also different from control; they are not lexically restricted:

(3) a. *I swim to win the championship.*

   b. *Ben* [Ø *ders-e   başla-mak*] *için sen-i   bekl-iyor-du-m*
   I   lesson-DAT start-INF   for you-ACC wait-PROG-PAST-1SG
   'I was waiting for you in order to start the lesson.' (Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1990, ex.6)

Raising and ECM-verbs do not relate a semantic argument of the matrix verb and the embedded clause as control does:

(4) a. *Pat believes Chris (to be) a spy.* (Pollard and Sag, 1994, p.112)

   b. *Biz* [*sen-i   taşın-dı-n*]   *san-dı-k*
   We you-ACC move-PAST-2SG consider-PAST-1PL
   'We considered you to have moved.'   (Özsoy, 2001, ex.1b)

Gerunds as syntactic constructions are not lexically restricted either (5).[3] As syntactic constructions, the missing NP can only be the syntactic subject. But as we show later, agent NPs in ergative languages are not syntactic subjects, *and* they can be controlled (as in Basque, Inuit and Tagalog).

(5) a. *John$_i$ talked to Sarah$_j$ about [$_{i/j/i+j/gen}$dancing with Jeff]* (Jackendoff and Culicover, 2003, ex.1c)

   b. *Çocuk$_i$* [Ø *koşup*] *kapıyı   açtı*
   child   run-GER   door-ACC open-PAST
   'Running, the child opened the door.' (Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1990, ex.8)

The following examples, from Jackendoff and Culicover (2003), are free (nonobligatory) control (6a), nearly free control (6b–c), partial control (6d), and nonobviative control (6f). None of these are lexical restrictions imposed by the control verb. For example, partial control reading of (6d) is introduced by the *controlled* verb 'meet'; cf. (6e).

(6) a. *Amy$_i$ thinks that $_{i/j/i+j/gen}$dancing with Dan intrigues Tom$_j$*

---

[3]I will use in some of my own examples the Jackendoff-Culicover convention of coindexing an overt NP with the argument-taking element in the embedded clause, rather than introduce empty categories in surface forms. This is not merely a stylistic choice; for example psycholinguistic studies show that filler-gap dependencies can be conceived as filler-verb dependencies from the perspective of human sentence processing (see Pickering and Barry 1991 and ensuing discussion in the same journal). It is not a theoretical necessity to have empty categories either, as recent work in Categorial Grammar and Dependency Grammar indicates.

    b. *John$_i$ mentioned/discussed $_{i/gen}$taking care of himself/oneself.*

    c. *John mentioned/discussed Sally's taking care of herself.*

    d. *John wanted to meet at six.*

    e. **John met at six.*

    f. *Nelda$_i$ discussed $_i$leaving early.*   *Nelda$_i$ discussed her $_i$leaving early.*

    (*her* can corefer with Nelda, but not necessarily)

Subject pro-drop in Turkish is distinguishable from control (Kornfilt, 1984). Embedded clauses without agreement cannot have a lexical subject NP (7a), whereas "within the same root context, an embedded -ma complement *with* agr[eement] and with either pro or an overt subject is possible" (7b; Kornfilt 1984, p.131).

(7) a. *Asker-ler   dün-den   beri*
       soldier-PLU yesterday-ABL since

       [*PRO/*onlar/*onların/*birbirleri/*birbirlerinin/*kendileri/ *kendilerinin/*polisler/*polislerin*
         3PL/3PL-GEN/e.o./e.o.-GEN/ t.selves/t.selves-GEN/police-PLU/police-PLU-GEN

       üniversite-yi   işgal   et-meğ-e]   *çalış-ıyor-lar*
       university-ACC occupy LV-INF-DAT try-PROG-3PL
       'The soldiers have been trying since yesterday to occupy the university.'

   b. *Asker-ler   dün-den   beri*
       soldier-PLU yesterday-ABL since

       [*pro/onların/polislerin*
         3PL-GEN/police-PLU-GEN

       üniversite-yi   işgal   et-me-leri-ne]   *çalışıyorlar*
       university-ACC occupy LV-ma-3PL-DAT try-PROG-3PL
       'The soldiers have been trying since yesterday for them/for the police to occupy the university.'

Haig and Słodowicz (2004) report the following examples in (8), which they classify as "quirky possive marking" because they involve overt possessives and obligatory coreference (glosses are theirs, and the judgments are their informants'):

(8) a. *Ahmet$_i$ [_$_i$ bisiklet-i tamir et-me-sin*]-*i*   *becer-di*
     A   bicycle-ACC fixing do-INF-POSS.3SG-ACC manage-PAST
     (a) 'Ahmet managed to fix the bike.' [accepted by all but one informant]
     (b) '*Ahmet managed (someone else's) fixing the bike.'

   b. **Ben$_i$ [_$_i$ bisiklet-i tamir et-me-m*]-*i*   *becer-di-m*
     I   bicycle-ACC fixing do-INF-POSS.1SG-ACC manage-PAST-1SG
     Intended reading: 'I managed to fix the bike.' [rejected by all informants]

It seems to me that the coreference in (8a) is not due to the control of the finite embedded clause, because a similar example (9a) shows a contrast: One of the Wright brothers might be flying in case of the finite verb *uç-ma-sı-nı*, but no such ambiguity arises with the infinitival form *uç-mağ-ı*. Moreover, (9b) is questionable with the finite form of *koş* (run), although unergatives can easily be controlled; cf *koş-mağ-ı*.

(9) a. *Wright kardeş-ler   uç-ma-sın-ı/uç-mağ-ı   becer-di*
    W   brother-PLU fly-mA-POSS.3SG-ACC/fly-INF-ACC manage-PAST
    'The Wright brothers managed flying/to fly.'

    b. *Ahmet$_i$ [$_i$koş-mağ-ı/?$_i$koş-ma-sın-ı]   becer-di*
    A   run-INF-ACC/?run-ma-POSS.3SG-ACC manage-PAST
    'Ahmet managed to run/?running.'

Kornfilt (1984, p.56) argues that agreement is the head of possessive NPs, parallel to INFL (I) being the head of S (IP), in effect giving IP status to both Ss and possessive NPs. Thus whether we assume a nominalisation analysis of *-me* clauses or consider them to be Ss, they will project an NP (AgrP) or an S because of agreement (or more generally, an IP), not a VP that is required by control. We conclude that example (8a) does not have an infinitival of the kind required by control.[4] Baker's (1996, p.384) claim that semantics of true control require VP complements corroborates this conclusion.

    In summary, we differ from Erguvanlı-Taylan (1990), Jackendoff and Culicover (2003) and Haig and Słodowicz (2004) in taking control as a lexical property of the control verb alone, as in Bozsahin and Steedman (in submission); we do not consider all coreferential readings of matrix and embedded arguments to be instances of control. Lexically specified control implies coreference, but coreference does not—in fact, cannot—imply control as an *intrinsic* property of the verb.

    Control via the lexically specified predicate-argument structure requires an infinitive residue on the syntactic side. But the "missing" subject (the residue) is not always the syntactic subject cross-linguistically. We witness such cases mostly in ergative languages, to which we now turn.

3   Control and ergativity

Morphological ergativity/accusativity is alignment of morphological resources, e.g. case (see Dixon 1994 and Manning 1996 for an overview of ergativity):[5]

(10) a. *Arnaq   yurar-tuq*
    woman-ABS dance-IND.3SG
       $\mathcal{S}$
    'The woman dances.' Yup'ik (Bok-Bennema, 1991)

    b. *Angutem tangrr-aa   arnaq*
    man-ERG see-IND.3SG.3SG woman-ABS
       $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{P}$
    'The man sees the woman.'

Syntactic ergativity is the operation of this alignment in syntax, as $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{P}$ (11). In contrast, accusative languages align $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ ($\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{A}$), hence (11) would mean the doctor fell down.

(11) [*bayi   burrbula baŋgul   gubi-ŋgu   bara-n*]   [__ *baji-gu*]
    I.ABS.TH B.ABS   I.ERG.TH doctor-ERG punch-NFUT   fall.down-PURP
       $\mathcal{P}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{S}$
    'The doctor punched Burrbula$_i$ and __$_i$ fell down.' Dyirbal (Manning, 1996)

    Syntactically ergative languages such as Dyirbal have syntactic subject control; what is missing from the controlled clause in (12b) is the logical object, which is the syntactic subject in Dyirbal.[6]

---

(12) a. *Bayi yara   walŋgarra [ŋaba-ygu]*
I.ABS.TH man.ABS want-NFUT bathe-PURP
'The man wanted [to bathe].' (Manning, 1996)

b. *Naja   bayi yara   giga-n   [gubi-ŋgu mawa-li]*
I.NOM I.ABS.TH man.ABS tell-NFUT doctor-ERG examine-PURP
'I told the man to be examined by the doctor.'
lit. 'I told the man$_i$ [doctor $_i$examine].'
NB. lack of passive or anti-passive morphology

In contrast, Inuit, another morphologically ergative language, cannot control *some* syntactic subjects, namely, patients of transitives (13a–b). But, Inuit is syntactically ergative; all and only absolutive NPs (i.e. s of intransitives and p of transitives) can be relativised (13c).

(13) a. *Miiqqat   [Juuna ikiu-ssa-llu-gu]   niriursui-pp-u-t*
children.ABS J.ABS help-FUT-INF-3SG promise-IND-INTR-3PL
'The children promised [to help Juuna].' (Manning, 1996)

b. *Miiqqat   [qiti-ssa-llu-tik]   niriursui-pp-u-t*
children.ABS dance-FUT-INF-4PL promise-IND-INTR-3PL
'The children promised [to dance].'

c. **angut [aallaat   tigu-sima -sa-a]*
man   gun.ABS take-PRF -REL.TR-3SG.SG
*'the man who took the gun'

Similarly, Tagalog can only relativise the *ang*-marked NP, and only the *ang*-marked NP is obligatory in a clause (Schachter, 1976). But Schachter also reports that Tagalog can only control actor NPs, which are not *ang*-marked in voices other than the active voice AV, cf. (14a) and (14b). Kroeger (1993) shows that the *ang*-NP is indeed the syntactic subject—hence the syntactic subject is not missing from the controlled clause of (14b).

(14) a. *Nag-atubili   siya=ng   [h-um-iram ng=pera   sa=bangko]*
PERF.AV-hesitate 3SG.NOM=COMP AV-borrow GEN=money DAT=bank
'He hesitated to borrow money from a/the bank.'

b. *Nag-atubili   siya=ng   [hiram-an ng=pera   ang=bangko]*
PERF.AV-hesitate 3SG.NOM=COMP borrow-DV GEN=money NOM=bank
'He hesitated to borrow money from the bank.'

In summary, there is evidence independent of control that Dyirbal, Inuit and Tagalog have a syntactic subject. It so happens that neither Inuit nor Tagalog controls this subject. Thus it is not cross-linguistically true that only syntactic subjects can be controlled. Semantic subjects that are not necessarily syntactic subjects can be controlled as well.

4   Identifying the Turkish controllee

Our conclusion above suggests that determining the controllee in a particular language involves a closer look at the controlled argument with two distinct notions of subjecthood. In this section we examine whether Turkish controls the syntactic subject or the semantic subject.

ilarly sensitive to the syntactic subject. Example (11) might be considered as an instance of the "same case" restriction to across-the-board condition on extraction from coordinate structures (i.e. exceptions to conjuncts being islands to extraction, see Ross 1967 and ensuing discussion), rather than a syntactic subject-based asymmetry. But ergative NPs cannot be shared in Dyirbal coordination, which is realised as a topic chain without a coordinating particle (Dixon, 1972). Only the absolutive NPs, therefore the syntactic subject, can be shared in topic chains. We also note that Dyirbal's subject asymmetry is widespread in its surface syntax; only absolutive NPs can be relativised in Dyirbal.

Turkish as an accusative language can control the S NP (15a–b) and the A NP (15c–d). P NP can be controlled if the embedded transitive clause is passivised hence it becomes the S NP of the intransitive (15e).

(15) a. *Çocuk anne-si-ne*   [*uyu-mağ-a*]   *söz ver-di*
       child   mother-POSS.3SG-DAT sleep-INF-DAT promise-PAST
       'The child promised his/her mother to sleep.'

     b. *Çocuk anne-si-ni*   [*uyu-mağ-a*]   *ikna et-ti*
       child   mother-POSS.3SG-ACC sleep-INF-DAT persuade-PAST
       'The child persuaded his/her mother to sleep.'

     c. *Çocuk anne-si-ne*   [*masal kitab-ı*   *oku-mağ-a*]   *söz ver-di*
       child   mother-POSS.3SG-DAT story book-COMP read-INF-DAT promise-PAST
       'The child promised his/her mother to read a story book.'

     d. *Çocuk anne-si-ni*   [*masal kitab-ı*   *oku-mağ-a*]   *ikna et-ti*
       child   mother-POSS.3SG-ACC story book-COMP read-INF-DAT persuade-PAST
       'The child persuaded his/her mother to read a story book.'

     e. *Köpek* [*sev-il-mek*]   *ist-iyor*
       Dog   pet-PASS-INF want-PROG
       'The dog wants to be petted.'

An A NP that is not the syntactic subject cannot be controlled; an infinitive passive phrase with a controlled non-subject A is not possible (16a). Note that the illicit reading of (16a) is possible in pro-drop contexts (16b), but as we showed in §2, embedded clauses with agreement cannot be targets of control.

(16) a. *Ben* [*kitap taraf-ın/*ım/-dan*   *oku-n-mak*]   *ist-iyor-um*
       child book   by-POSS.3SG/*.1SG-ABL read-PASS-INF want-PROG
       $\sqrt{}$ for 'I want to be read by the book.'
       * for 'I want [the book to be read by me].'

     b. *Ben* [*kitab-ın*   *taraf-ım/-dan*   *oku-n-ma-sı*]-*nı*   *ist-iyor-um*
       child book-GEN.3SG by-POSS.1SG-ABL read-PASS-ma-POSS.3SG-ACC want-PROG
       'I want [the book to be read by me].'

Kornfilt (1988) reports a subclass of subject control verbs, which seem to be able to control the oblique agent—hence the non-subject NP—after double passivisation, e.g. (17).[7]

(17) *Üniversite-ler* (*polis tarafından*) *kuşat-ıl-mağ-a*   *başla-n-dı*
       University-PLU police by   surround-PASS-INF-DAT begin-PASS-PAST
       'The universities were begun to be surrounded by the police.' (Kornfilt, 1988, ex.2)

Her claim is that "whether an agent phrase shows up or not, the agent of the matrix and of the embedded verb are understood as coreferential—just like in control contexts in general." (ibid. p.187), which might suggest that the controllee could be an oblique agent NP as well.[8] In the following example with the same control verb, there is no requirement that oblique agent of the matrix and the

---

[7]This subclass, which Kornfilt identifies as {*iste, başla, çalış*} (want, begin and try), consists of intransitive subject control verbs. Visser's generalisation (that transitive subject control verbs do not passivise) seems to hold for Turkish, e.g. **Çocuk/Çocuğa kitab-ı oku-mağ-a söz ver-il-di* (child/child-DAT book-ACC read-INF-DAT promise-PASS-PAST= *the child was promised to read the book); cf. the passivisation of object-control verbs, e.g. *Çocuk kitab-ı oku-mağ-a ikna ed-il-di* (the child was persuaded to read the book).

[8]We note that Kornfilt does not necessarily endorse a control analysis of such examples, but points out control-like coindexation. As we argued at the end of §2, coindexation does not imply control, hence non-control analysis of such examples is possible.

embedded clause be the same (18), hence this phenomenon is not related to coreference as specified in the *lexical* predicate-argument structure via control.[9]

(18) *Bina   yık-ıl-mağ-a   başla-n-dı   (belediye   tarafından)*
      Building demolish-PASS-INF-DAT begin-PASS-PAST municipality by
      'It was begun by the municipality for the building to be demolished.'
      'The building was begun to be demolished by the municipality.'

It may appear that the embedded $\mathcal{A}$ of the causative (i.e., the causee) cannot be controlled *because* it is not a nominative argument, i.e. not a syntactic subject; cf. (19a–b/c).[10]

(19) a. *Çocuk [adam-a kitab-ı   oku-t-mak]   ist-iyor*
         child   man-DAT book-ACC read-CAUS-INF want-PROG
         'The child wants to have the man read the book.'

      b. *Çocuk [kitab-ı   oku-t-mak]   ist-iyor*
         child   book-ACC read-CAUS-INF want-PROG
         'The child$_i$ wants to have someone$_{j/*i}$ read the book.'

      c. *Çocuk [uyu-t-mak]   ist-iyor*
         child   sleep-CAUS-INF want-PROG
         'The child$_i$ wants to have someone$_{j/*i}$ sleep.'

Another possible bracketing for (19a) is given in (20), in which the causative is conceived as a 3-place relation between the causer, the causee and the caused event, as in Alsina (1992), rather than a simplex predicate for *oku-t-mak* implicated in the bracketing of (19a). This bracketing reveals the control relation in (19a/20), which is between the child (who wants) and the causer (the child), both of which are semantic arguments (of want and cause, respectively).

(20) *Çocuk$_i$ [[$_{-i/*j}$ adam-a$_k$ [$_{-k/*i/*j}$ kitab-ı   oku]]-t-mak]   ist-iyor*
      child   man-DAT   book-ACC read-CAUS-INF want-PROG
      'The child wants to have the man read the book.'

We note that in this bracketing, the causer is nominative, hence is the subject of the causative, thus what is controlled in (19–20) is the nominative subject of cause. The causee cannot be controlled, not because it is not nominative, but because it is not locally available to the control verb (cf. the position of $_{k/*i/*j}$ index in 20), and control is a local lexical relation.

Objects of transitives cannot be controlled either (21a–c). The first example manifests itself as *Mehmet was hoping to be seen by my mother* in accusative languages, i.e., with the passive. In Dyirbal, an ergative language, the expression is exactly as in (21a) *without* passive or anti-passive morphology, as was shown in (12b).

(21) a. **Mehmet$_i$ [anne-m $_{*i}$gör-meğ]-i $_i$um-uyor-du*
         M   mother-POSS.1SG see-INF-ACC hope-PROG-PAST
         Intended reading: 'Mehmet$_i$ was hoping [my mother $_i$see].'

---

[9]This is not to say that infinitival double passive of subject control verbs cannot be captured lexically. A lexical rule restricted to this subclass of verbs can achieve the desired effect. Kornfilt (1988, p.204) shows that similar phenomena "of apparently unbounded applications of otherwise bounded operations" are lexically triggered in other languages as well, which supports the cross-linguistic availability of the lexical rule. In fact, her choice of the morphosyntactic process for support, clitic climbing, preserves control properties, e.g. the Spanish clause union examples *Quiero [mostrártelos]* (I-want show-you.ACC-them= I want to show you them), **mostrártulos* and *Te/*Tú los quiero [mostrár]* (You.ACC/*NOM them I-want show).

[10]There is another reading of (19b), in which the child wants to sell the book. This reading is non-causative, hence it involves control of the simple embedded clause 'sell'.

b. *Mehmet_i [anne-m   kitab-ı   *_iver-meğ]-i   _ium-uyor-du
M   mother-POSS.1SG book-ACC give-INF-ACC hope-PROG-PAST
Intended reading: 'Mehmet_i was hoping [my mother _igive the book].'

c. Ayşe_i [gör-meğ]-i   _ium-uyor-du
A   see-INF-ACC hope-PROG-PAST
√ for 'Ayşe was hoping to see (someone).'
* for 'Ayşe_i was hoping for someone to see her_i.'

Our examination so far has indicated that Turkish is a syntactic subject control language. If this is the case, then in a language where there is no case-morphological distinction of unaccusatives and unergatives, we would expect their sole argument to be equally controllable. Controllability of unergatives in accusative languages is commonly accepted as uncontroversial. But Zaenen (1993) points out that unaccusatives cannot be controlled in Dutch whereas in English they can, e.g. *she forced him to burn*. But she also notes that these are not syntactically ill-formed. Baker (1996, p.383) claims that purpose clauses with unaccusatives are ill-formed in Mohawk, e.g. *Sak will go to fall*. Zaenen in effect equates control with volition (cf. fn 2), thus it is debatable whether these are grammaticality judgments, and whether control of unaccusatives in accusative languages and control of unergatives in ergative languages should be ruled out grammatically.

Similar problems arise in Turkish. For example, *var* 'arrive' is an unaccusative verb, and its control is quite non-felicitous (22a), but telic interpretation seems to fare better (22b), which might suggest that telicity and agency might interact in certain ways to engender controllability (cf. Zeyrek 2004 for more on telicity and agency in Turkish). Nevertheless, atelic change of state verbs (22c) and non-volitional unaccusatives can be controlled (22d); the controlled argument in (22d) is a patientive syntactic subject.

(22) a. ♯♯Polis-ler gösterici-ler-i   [var-mağ-a]   zorla-dı
Police-PLU demonstrator-PLU-ACC arrive-INF-DAT force-PAST
'The police forced the demonstrators to arrive.'

b. ♯Polis-ler gösterici-ler-i   [miting alan-ı-na   var-mağ-a]   zorla-dı
Police-PLU dem.-PLU-ACC meeting square-COMP-DAT arrive-INF-DAT force-PAST
'The police forced the demonstrators to arrive at the meeting place.'

c. ♯Çocuk bitki-yi   sula-yarak [büyü-meğ-e] zorla-dı
child   plant-ACC water-GER grow-INF-DAT force-PAST'
'The child forced the plant to grow by watering (it).'

d. Doktor-lar yara-yı   [kana-mağ-a] zorla-dı
doctor-PLU wound-ACC bleed-INF-DAT force-PAST'
'The doctors forced the wound to bleed.'

5   Conclusion

In summary, what seems to hold for Turkish is that

i) the controlled clause's nominative argument cannot be overtly realised, that is, we have an infinitival VP missing the syntactic subject (defined structurally as [spec,IP] in the Minimalist Program, but note the control requirement that there be no agreement morphology on the controlled complement). In contrast, Inuit's controlled infinitival VP is missing the semantic subject ([spec,VP]),

ii) the nominative argument can be the only controllee, although other arguments of the controlled VP may be missing as well, cf. no control of 1) the oblique agent NPs, and 2) the unexpressed direct object in (21c).

We therefore conclude that Turkish controls the syntactic subject, independent of its predicate-argument structural role. But this is not the only option, certainly not for ergative languages, but possibly for accusative languages such as Dutch and also for Mohawk.

Lexically specified unique obligatory control shows limited cross-linguistic diversity from the perspective of the controllee. Hence the choices for the controllee must be scrutinised, rather than assumed universally to be the syntactic subject (as for example in LFG, Bresnan 1982) or the semantic subject (as in LFG-inspired theory of Manning 1996). The early HPSG proposal (Sag and Pollard, 1991) captured the variation with an *ad hoc* feature, and it is not clear how this account would capture the uniform treatment of controlled clauses and infinitival VPs in a language. The later HPSG proposal (Pollard and Sag, 1994) is similar to (Jackendoff and Culicover, 2003) in that it is captured in the VP's subcategorisation list, i.e., the controllee can only be the syntactic subject. The Minimalist Program's [spec,VP] versus [spec,IP] distinction (hence two PRO positions, as in Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis 1992) is also not the theoretically simplest solution, see for example Bozsahin and Steedman (in submission), where the lexicalised syntactic category for the infinitival VP is shaped uniformly by a universal grammar without a phonologically empty element, to engender VP_{inf}-related phenomena including syntactic subject control and semantic subject control.

References

Alsina, Alex. 1992. "On the Argument Structure of Causatives." *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 4, 517–555.

Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford University Press.

Bok-Bennema, Reineke. 1991. *Case and Agreement in Inuit*. Berlin: Foris.

Bozsahin, Cem, and Mark Steedman. in submission. "Lexicalized Asymmetry and Syntactic Projection." ms., University of Edinburgh.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. "Control and Complementation." In Joan Bresnan, ed., *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge University Press.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser E. 1990. "Aspects of Control in Turkish." In *Proc. of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, vol.I*. SOAS, London. August.

George, L.M., and Jaklin Kornfilt. 1981. "Finiteness and Boundedness in Turkish." In F. Heny, ed., *Binding and Filtering*, 105–127. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung, and Lisa Travis. 1992. "Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two Subjects in Austronesian Languages." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 10, 375–414.

Haig, Geoffrey. 1998. *Relative Constructions in Turkish*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.

Haig, Geoffrey, and Szymon Słodowicz. 2004. "Control in Turkish Non-finite Complements." In *Proc. of 12th ICTL*. İzmir, Turkey.

Jackendoff, Ray, and Peter W. Culicover. 2003. "The Semantic Basis of Control in English." *Language*, 79, 517–556.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1984. *Case Marking, Agreement, and Empty Categories in Turkish*. Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1988. "NP-deletion and Case Marking in Turkish." In *Proc. of 4th ICTL*. METU, Ankara. Published as *Studies on Turkish Linguistics*.

Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Manning, Christopher D. 1996. *Ergativity: Argument structure and grammatical relations*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Özsoy, A.Sumru. 2001. "On 'small' clauses, other 'bare' verbal complements and feature checking in Turkish." In Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan, ed., *The Verb in Turkish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Palmer, F.R. 1994. *Grammatical Roles and Relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Pickering, Martin, and Guy D. Barry. 1991. "Sentence Processing without Empty Categories." *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 6, 229–259.

Pollard, Carl, and Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT. Published as *Infinite Syntax!*, Ablex, Norton, NJ, 1986.

Sag, Ivan A., and Carl Pollard. 1991. "An Integrated Theory of Complement Control." *Language*, 67, 63–113.

Schachter, Paul. 1976. "The Subject in Philippine Language: Topic, Actor-Topic or None of the Above." In C. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*. Academic Press.

Zaenen, Annie. 1993. "Unaccusativity in Dutch: Integrating Syntax and Lexical Semantics." In James Pustejovsky, ed., *Semantics and the Lexicon*. Kluwer.

Zeyrek, Deniz. 2004. "The Role of Lexical Semantics in Unaccusative-unergative Distinction in Turkish." In *Proc. of Second Int. Symp. on Languages Spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia (LENCA-2)*. Kazan. May.