Non-Canonical Case Licensing is Canonical: Accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish

Serkan Şener, University of Connecticut

CONTEXT: Under certain conditions φ-agreement can reach into a finite CP in some languages (Polinsky and Potsdam 2001 for Tsez; Branigan and Mackenzie 2002 for Innu-Aimûn, a.o). This is particularly the case when an agreement *controller* gets sufficiently close to the *controllee* through a movement operation. Case licensing across clausal domains appears to be more restricted, however. The canonical cases of cross clausal Case licensing has generally been argued to be possible especially when lower clauses have a truncated structure, as it is typically the case with restructuring infinitives (see Bhatt 2004 for Hindi, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005 for German and Itelmen, a.o.). Bruening (2001), drawing on data from Passamaquoddy and Japanese, points out to an alternative where licensing of Case into a lower clause is possible even when a lower clause does not involve a truncated structure. This happens when an NP from the lower clause undergoes A'-movement to the clause edge, getting sufficiently close to the Case licensor, like in the instances of cross-clausal φ-agreement. The present study aims to provide an analysis of cross clausal Accusative Case assignment to the subjects of certain complement clauses (*Finite Complement Clauses*/FCCs, to be exact) along lines similar to Bruening (2001).

ISSUE #1: 'Standard' FCCs in Turkish (henceforth, *null*-FCCs) investigated in the previous literature display no lexical *C* (1). It is, however, unclear whether *null*-FCCs have a truncated structure or have a full CP structure. One of the major claims of this paper is that *null*-FCCs have a null *C* in their structure and thus project a CP. I provide support for this claim through a comparison with a second type of FCC in Turkish (henceforth, *overt*-FCCs), which has not been investigated previously in the literature. Importantly, *overt*-FCCs allow a lexical *C* and their subjects may bear Accusative Case like that of *null*-FCCs (cf. (2)). Based on the similarities of *null*-FCCs to *overt*-FCCs, I conclude that the two types of FCCs are structurally identical and that they both project full CPs. An important affinity of the two types of FCCs is that they both allow optionality regarding the availability of morphological agreement on the embedded predicate when the subject bears Accusative Case ((1b) vs. (1c))-((2b) vs. (2c)) (Aygen 2001, Kornfilt 1984, Moore 1998). This is addressed as part of the analysis proposed in this study.

ISSUE #2: Previous literature on *null*-FCCs claims that Accusative subjects of *null*-FCCs undergo raising to the matrix clause (Zidani-Eroğlu 1997, Moore 1998, Özsoy 2001). A critical look at some of the examples discussed in the literature suggests that while raising of subjects is an option in Turkish, evidence for the obligatory raising analysis is not compelling. As a matter of fact, evidence can be found to indicate that raising is not obligatory (cf. (3) and ((4) vs. (5)). An immediate consequence of this finding is that instances of raising to matrix clause, when available, cannot be Case driven A-movement. Significantly, while raising to the matrix clause is only optional, I demonstrate that Accusative subjects of FCCs in Turkish must hold an A'-position at the edge of the clause they are base generated in (via topicalization), from which they may optionally move to the domain of the matrix clause.

PROPOSAL: An analysis of the observed phenomena is developed under Chomsky's (2001) theory of Agree and Phases, where locality of syntactic operations such as Agree and Move is subject to the *Phase Impenetrability Condition* (PIC). Under the PIC, a Probe can in principle have access to a Goal that is at the edge/Spec of the lower phase, while the complement of the lower phase is forced to Spell-Out. Being located at the edge of their clause via A'-movement, Accusative Case of the subjects of FCCs can be licensed from above by the matrix v°, it being visible to the PIC. An important support for the edge requirement comes from sentences where null *wh*-operators in Turkish block licensing of Accusative Case on the subject (under the assumption that the former occupies a higher position in the structure than the highest position of subjects (6)). In order to provide an account for the optionality of morphological agreement when the subject of FCCs is Accusative, I adopt a suggestion in Chomsky (2001), which is that *T* comes in two varieties as Agreeing-*T* and Non-Agreeing-*T*, and a proposal made in Béjar and Massam (1999), which allows multiple Case checking operations as a parametric option. The derivation of (1b/2b), where the subject is Accusative and the embedded verb exhibits agreement morphology, is given in (7) as an illustration. In conclusion, this paper defends, extending a proposal by Polinsky (2003), which argue that the edge effect constitutes the maximal span for φ-Agreement across languages, that the edge effect constitutes the maximal span for Case in certain well-defined contexts in Turkish.

DATA

(1) a. Pelin-ø [sen-**ø** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**n**] san-ıyor.
P-nom you-**nom** T-dat go-past-**2sg** believe-pres
'Pelin believes that you went to Timbuktu.'
b. Pelin-ø [sen-**i** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**n**] san-ıyor.
P-nom you-**acc** T-dat go-past-**2sg** believe-pres
'Pelin believes that you went to Timbuktu.'
c. Pelin-ø [sen-**i** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**ø**] san-ıyor.
P-nom you-**acc** T-dat go-past believe-pres
'Pelin believes that you went to Timbuktu.'

(2) a. Pelin-ø [sen-**ø** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**n** ***ðiye***] bil-iyor-muş / düşün-üyor-muş / duy-muş.
P-nom you-**nom** T-dat go-past-**2sg** C know-prog-evid/ think-prog-evid / hear-evid
'Pelin knew/thought/heard that you went to Timbuktu.'
b. Pelin-ø [sen-**i** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**n** ***ðiye***] bil-iyor-muş / düşün-üyor-muş / duy-muş.
P-nom you-**acc** T-dat go-past-**2sg** C know-prog-evid/ think-prog-evid / hear-evid
'Pelin knew/thought/heard that you went to Timbuktu.'
c. Pelin-ø [sen-**i** Timbuktu-ya git-ti-**ø** ***ðiye***] bil-iyor-muş / düşün-üyor-muş / duy-muş.
P-nom you-**acc** T-dat go-past C know-prog-evid/ think-prog-evid / hear-evid
'Pelin knew/thought/heard that you went to Timbuktu.'

(3) Pelin [**dün** Mert-**i** sınav-a gir-di ***ðiy***e] bil-iyor.
P-nom yesterday M-**acc** exam-dat enter-past C know-pres
'Pelin thinks that yesterday, Mert took an exam.'

(4) a. *Pelin-ø Mete-yi$_1$ t$_2$ duy-muş [t$_1$ sınıf-ta kal-dı ***ðiye***]$_2$
P-nom M-acc hear-ev.past class-loc fail-past C
'Pelin heard that Mete flunked.'
b. *Mete-yi$_1$ Pelin-ø t$_2$ duy-muş [t$_1$ sınıf-ta kal-dı ***ðiye***]$_2$
M-acc P-nom hear-ev.past class-loc fail-past C
'Pelin heard that Mete flunked.'

Overt movement of Accusative subjects to matrix clause induces a PBC effect.

(5) ?Pelin t$_2$ duy-muş [Mete-yi sınıf-ta kal-dı ***ðiye***]$_2$
P-nom hear-ev.past M-acc class-loc fail-past C
'Pelin heard that Mete flunked.'

Movement of Accusative subject with the FCC is OK. If raising of Accusative subject were obligatory, the grammaticality of (5) would be unexpected.

(6)
a. Pelin-ø [Mert-**ø** *kim*-e vur-du ***ðiye***] sor-du /merak et-ti.
P-nom M-**nom** who-dat hit-past C ask-past/wonder do-past
'Pelin asked/wondered who Mert hit.'
b. *Pelin [Mert-**i** *kim*-e vur-du ***ðiye***] sor-du /merak et-ti.
P-nom M-**acc** who-dat hit-past C ask-past/wonder do-past
'Pelin asked/wondered who Mert hit.'

(7)

Step 1

… [$_{CP}$ C° … [$_{TP}$ T°$_{[\ NOM]}$ [$_{\upsilon P}$ SU$_{[\ NOM\ ]}$ [$_{\upsilon'}$ υ° [$_{VP}$ … V°]]]]]]]
[1pl] [1pl]
AGREE

Step2

MOVE
… υ°$_{[ACC]}$ [$_{VP}$ V [$_{CP}$ SU$_{[ACC]}$ C° …[$_{TP}$ T°$_{[\ 1pl\ ]}$ [$_{\upsilon P}$ t$_{SU}$ [$_{\upsilon'}$ υ° [$_{VP}$ … V°]]]]]]]
[1pl] [1pl]
AGREE

T's $u\phi$ is valued as a result of Agree(T,SU) (hence the agreement morphology), and the subject NP gets Nom Case. When the subject moves, it undergoes Agree(υ,SU), and as a result, it receives Acc Case (á la Béjar and Massam's (1999).