

1992

Scrambling and Mixed Positions in Turkish

Murat Kural
UCLA

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kural, Murat (1992) "Scrambling and Mixed Positions in Turkish," *North East Linguistics Society*. Vol. 22 : Iss. 1 , Article 18.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels/vol22/iss1/18>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Linguistics Students Association (GLSA) at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in North East Linguistics Society by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

SCRAMBLING AND MIXED POSITIONS IN TURKISH*

Murat Kural

UCLA

Introduction:

By the criteria established in the recent literature on scrambling, clause-bound object preposing in Turkish appears to be movement to some non-A, non-Operator position, as in Webelhuth (1989) and Saito (1991), or an A-position, as in Mahajan (1990):

i) it licenses parasitic gaps.

ii) a preposed object anaphor cannot reconstruct at LF.

iii) a preposed QP marginally binds a pronoun inside the subject. I will argue here however, that object preposing actually involves movement to an A'-position in this language, and properties (ii) and (iii) above are due to the way scrambling and reconstruction interact with the representation of focus at LF. I will not be concerned about property (i) because Turkish seems to regularly license parasitic gaps without any apparent A'-movement:

- 1) pro [bu sözleşmeyi]_i [PRO e_i okumadan] imzalamışsın
2.sg this contract-acc read-neg-abl sign-pst-agr

'You have signed this contract without reading'

This may be related to the way Turkish licenses empty objects whose reference is recoverable from the discourse context:

- 2) Q: pro [bu filmi] gördün mü?
2.sg this film-acc see-pst-agr Q

'Did you see this movie?'

* I would like to thank Julia Horvath, Hilda Koopman, Tim Stowell, and Anna Szabolcsi for their comments and suggestions throughout this study.

260

MURAT KURAL

A: pro e gördüm
1.sg see-pst-agr

'I saw'

Since I will ultimately claim that object preposing is movement to an A'-position in Turkish, the absence of parasitic gaps from the discussion will not undermine the arguments provided below.

The position of preposed objects:

Unlike postverbal objects, which are CP-adjoined, preposed objects are not excluded from embedded contexts:

3) Ahmet [[bu kitabı] benim okuduğum]u biliyor
(nom) this book-acc I-gen read-pst-agr-acc know-prs-agr

'Ahmet knows that I read this book'

This would place preposed objects to a position lower than the CP in the structure, where it does not interact with the higher verb.

This language is different from Hindi (Mahajan, 1990) in that it has no object agreement or ergative Case, and the verb agrees only with the subject. Also observe in (4) below that preposed objects are higher than subjects:

4) a. [Üç kişi] [her arabaya] binmiş
three person-nom every car-dat get.in-pst-agr

'Three people got in every car'

=Three people were such that they got in every car

b. [Her arabaya] [üç kişi] binmiş
to every car three person got.in

=Every car was such that three people got in it

Thus it seems that preposed objects are IP-adjoined. The scope readings in (4.a) and (4.b) are unambiguous, indicating that surface c-command relations determine the scope of QPs in Turkish.

The A-position properties of object preposing:

Object preposing in simple cases behaves as though it were movement to an A-position according to the two remaining tests, (ii) and (iii) above. Sentences (5.b) and (6.b) below show that a preposed object anaphor cannot reconstruct at LF (a referential noun phrase object that is specific would have been acceptable in both (5.b) and (6.b)):

- 5) a. [Adamlar birbirlerini görmüş]
man-pl-nom eachother-acc see-pst-acc
'The men saw each other'
- b. *Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i görmüş]
eachother-acc men-nom saw
- 6) a. [Ahmet adamları birbirleriyle tanıştırmış]
(nom) man-pl-acc eachother-acc-with introduce-pst-acc
'Ahmet introduced the men to each other'
- b. *Birbirleriyle_i [Ahmet adamları t_i tanıştırmış]
eachother-with (nom) men-acc introduced

Note that regardless of the type of position the preposed object anaphors occupy, Condition A violation would be obtained in both cases by the absence of LF reconstruction. In this respect, this particular test shows only the unavailability of reconstruction, and this does not automatically imply that the movement is to an A-position. It is well-known that reconstruction is possible for A'-moved complements, but not adjuncts. On the other hand, the treatment of psych-verbs in Belletti and Rizzi (1988) would be compatible with reconstruction from an A-position, although they do not necessarily make this claim.

It will become relevant in due course that the preposed anaphors *birbirlerini* 'each other-acc' and *birbirleriyle* 'with each other' are supposed to reconstruct to a position lower than the focused constituents *adamlar* 'the men' and *adamları* 'the men-acc' in (5.b) and (6.b) respectively.

Another A-like property of the preposed position appears in the context of the test (iii) above. As seen in (7.b), a preposed object QP can marginally bind a pronoun inside the subject:

- 7) a. *[[pro_i sekreteri]_i herkesi_i aradı]
3.sg secretary-acc-nom everyone-acc call-pst-acc
'His_i secretary called everyone_i'
- b. ?Herkesi_i [[pro_i sekreteri] t_i aradı]
everyone-acc his secretary-nom called

The validity of this test however, depends on one's theory of pronominal binding and Weak Crossover. It is commonly held in the literature that pronominal binding obtains only under A-binding. It has also been argued however, that a pronoun can be bound from an A'-position, and that Weak Crossover result from some other

262
MURAT KURAL

principle; the Bijection Principle of Koopman and Sportiche (1982), as well as the Parallelism Condition of Safir (1984), and Condition C of Stowell (1987), both of whom use the slash-indexing mechanism of Haik (1984). If pronouns can in fact be bound by an A'-position, the availability of pronominal binding in (7.b) can no longer be an indication that object preposing is movement to an A-position.

Interaction between focus and reconstruction:

In neutral intonation, the immediately preverbal position receives the focus interpretation in Turkish. This is also true in the sentences discussed above: the antecedent/binder is the default focus in (5.b) and (6.b). Compare these cases with (8.b) and (9.b) respectively, where something other than the antecedent/binder is focused:

- 8) a. [Adamlar birbirlerini dün görmüş]
man-pl-nom eachother-agr-acc yesterday see-pst-agr
'The men saw each other yesterday'
- b. Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i dün görmüş]
eachother-acc men-nom yesterday saw
- 9) a. [Adamlar birbirlerini Ahmet'le tanıştırmış]
man-pl-nom eachother-agr-acc (with) introduce-pst-agr
'The men introduced each other to Ahmet'
- b. Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i Ahmet'le tanıştırmış]
eachother-acc men-nom (with) introduced

As it can be seen above, reconstruction becomes available when the focus is not on the binder.

In light of (8.b) and (9.b), the observation with respect to (5.b) and (6.b) seems to be that a focused antecedent cannot bind a preposed anaphor. This may be interpreted as to mean that focus simply creates an island to reconstruction, although I will try to derive this later on by the way focus is represented in Turkish.

The contrast between (7.b) above and (10.b) below indicates that pronominal binding by a preposed object QP seizes to be available when something other than the constituent containing the pronoun is focused:

- 10) a. *[[pro_i sekreteri] herkesi_i dün aramış]
3.sg secretary-agr-nom everyone-acc y.day call-pst-agr
'His_i secretary called everyone_i yesterday'

b.* Herkes_i [[pro_i sekreteri] t_i dün aramış]
 everyone-acc his secretary-nom yesterday called

This conforms the generalization that the A-position properties of preposed objects interact with at S-structure focus in Turkish.

Also note below that an anaphor inside the subject does not yield a bound anaphor interpretation comparable to the bound pronoun in (7.b):

11) a. Herkes_i [birbirinin_i sekreterini] aramış
 everyone-nom eachother-gen secretary-agr-acc call-pst-agr

'Everyone_i called each other's secretary'

b. *Herkes_i [[birbirinin_i sekreteri] t_i aramış]
 everyone-acc eachother-gen secretary-agr-nom call-pst-agr

'Each other_i's secretary called everyone_i'

Binding into the subject:

The absence of anaphor binding in (11) above is a very general property of Turkish. It can be seen in (12) that a preposed object cannot bind an anaphor inside the subject:

12) a. *[[Birbirlerinin sekreterleri] adamları aramış]
 eachother-agr-gen secretary-pl-agr-nom men-acc call-pst-agr

'Each other's secretaries called the men'

b. *Adamları_i [[birbirlerinin sekreterleri] t_i aramış]
 men-acc eachother's secretaries-nom called

c. *Adamları_i [[birbirlerinin sekreterleri] t_i dün aramış]
 men-acc eachother's secretaries-nom yesterday called

Also observe that anaphors are not subject oriented in Turkish:

13) Ahmet adamları birbirleriyle tanıştırmış
 (nom) man-pl-acc eachother-agr-with introduce-pst-agr

'Ahmet introduced the men to each other'

Example (14) shows that anaphors are not excluded from the subject position in Turkish:

14)

Adamlar [birbirlerinin Ahmet'i aradığını] sanıyor
 man-pl-nom eachother-agr-gen (acc) call-pst-agr-acc think-prs-agr

'The men thought each other called Ahmet'

The inability of a preposed object to bind an anaphor inside the subject would be very unusual if object preposing were movement to an A-position (or to the non-A, non-operator position of Webelhuth (1989) and Saito (1991)). The difference between anaphors and pronouns with respect to binding by a preposed object (including a QP) is problematic for any theory of scrambling. What it shows though, is that pronominal binding cannot be directly from the preposed position in (7.b) even if we assumed the A-binding line of analysis for bound pronouns.

Object postposing and pronominal binding:

As mentioned above, postposed objects must be CP-adjoined since they are excluded from embedded contexts. They also behave like they are in an A'-position with respect to reconstruction, so forth. Observe now that pronominal binding by a postposed object QP is just as acceptable as instances of pronominal binding by a preposed object QP:

15) a. ?[[pro_i sekreteri] t_i aramış] herkesi_j
 3.sg secretary-agr-nom call-pst-agr everyone-acc

'His secretary called everyone'

b. *[[pro_i sekreteri] t_i dün aramış] herkesi_j
 his secretary yesterday called everyone-acc

The implication here is that an object QP in what is already known to be an A'-position can also marginally bind a pronoun inside a subject. This further supports the claim that the pronominal binding in (7.b) is not really a property of the preposed position itself.

The position of focus at S-structure:

Before moving on to the analyses, a few things about focus needs to be noted. First, it seems that a focused constituent is not in some derived position at S-structure in Turkish, but rather it remains in its base position:

16) *Ahmet birbirleriyle adamları tanıştırdı
 (nom) eachother-agr-with man-pl-acc introduce-pst-agr

'Ahmet introduced the men to each other'

- 17) a. *Ahmet [_{VP} t_i birbirleriyle t_j] adamları_i tanıştırdı
 (nom) with eachother men-acc introduced
- b. *Ahmet birbirleriyle_i [_{VP} adamları t_i tanıştırdı]
 (nom) with eachother men-pl introduced

If (16) were derived by moving the focused antecedent *adamları* 'the men-acc' to some focus position, as in (17.a), its trace inside the VP would have A-bound the anaphor *birbirleriyle* 'with each other'. This however, is clearly not the case. If on the other hand, the antecedent *adamları* 'the men-acc' remained in its base position and anaphor *birbirleriyle* 'with each other' moved to some VP-adjoined position, (16) would be just another instance of reconstruction being blocked by a focused constituent.

Consider now the material that needs to appear in the focus position in Turkish: Wh-phrases, non-specifics, idiomatic objects, resultative clauses, ECM-clauses, etc. These are not the type of things that would have to move anywhere at S-structure. At first, having Wh-phrases in this list may make this conclusion seem a bit suspect. However, the impossibility of the Object-Subject word order in multiple Wh-questions, as in (19.b) below, indicates that they must actually remain in their base positions in Turkish:

- 18) Ahmet kimi nerede görmüş?
 (nom) who-acc where-loc see-pst-agr

'Where did Ahmet see who?'

- 19) a. [Kim kimi görmüş]?
 who-nom who-acc see-pst-agr

'Who saw who?'

- b. *Kimi [kim görmüş]
 whom who saw

The status of focused constituents at LF:

The material that appears in the focus position in Turkish also makes it unlikely that these constituent should raise at LF by virtue of being focused. It is true that Wh-phrases, and under certain analyses, non-specifics have to raise at LF to take scope. Nevertheless, these are motivated for independent reasons. It would be hard to imagine why ECM clauses and resultatives and idiomatic objects should raise at LF via XP-movement.

There are other reasons to think that focused constituents do not raise at LF in Turkish. First, it is well-known in the literature that focus assignment is not sensitive to islands that

266
MURAT KURAL

would otherwise block movement at LF. Second, recall that surface c-command relations determine the scope of QPs in this language, cf. (4) above. This means that both Quantifier Raising (QR) and Focus Raising (FR) operations fail to raise a focused QP to a position where it would take scope over a higher QP at LF:

20)

Herkes [Ahmet'in [üç kişiyle] konuştuğunu] sanıyor
everyone-nom (gen) three friend-with talked-acc think-prs-agr

'Everybody thinks that Ahmet talked with three people'

= Every x was such that for three y, Ahmet talked with y

21) [[Her arabaya] [üç kişi] bindi]
every car-dat three person-nom get.in-pst-agr

'Three people got in every car'

= Every car was such that three people got in it

22) [Ahmet herkese [üç kişiden] söz etmiş]
(nom) everyone-dat three person-abl mention-pst-agr

'Ahmet talked to everyone about three people'

= Everyone was such that Ahmet mentioned three people to him

Thus it seems that FR does not apply in Turkish the way it is commonly assumed in the focus literature (Chomsky, 1971, 1976; Jackendoff, 1972; Rochemont, 1986, so on). In fact, this focus position seems more in line with Rooth's (1986) theory.

Relatively defined focus position at S-structure and LF:

If focus position is not a derived position in Turkish, this means that it cannot be defined as a structurally unique position. However, it can be defined in relational terms, i.e. with respect to the other constituents in the structure. Descriptively, focus is identified at S-structure as the immediately preverbal position in Turkish. 'Immediate precedence' is of course, a linear notion that must be expressed in configurational terms. Nonetheless, I will tentatively use the linear term for purposes of illustration.

In deriving the blocking effect of focus, I will assume the following: a) the relational definition of focus applies the same way at LF as it does at S-structure; and, b) there is some focus interpretation algorithm that takes the LF representation of focus as its input. Suppose now that we try to reconstruct the preposed anaphor in the bad case (5.b) and the good case (8.b) above as

(23) and (24) respectively (Boldface indicates focus, and '...' indicates the S-structure position of a reconstructed constituent at LF):

23) a. at S-structure:

***Birbirlerini**_i [adamlar t_i görmüş]
eachother-agr-acc man-pl-nom see-pst-agr

'The men saw each other'

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

*... [adamlar **birbirlerini** görmüş]
men-nom eachother-acc saw

24) a. at S-structure:

Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i dün görmüş]
eachother-agr-acc man-pl-nom yesterday see-pst-agr

'The men saw each other yesterday'

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

... [adamlar **birbirlerini** dün görmüş]
men-nom eachother-acc yesterday saw

As long as focus is identified the same way at both levels, a focus interpretation algorithm that takes the LF configuration as its input would compute the reconstructed anaphor *birbirlerini* 'each other-acc' as the focus of (23.b). When the reconstructed anaphor is interpreted as the focus of the clause, the S-structure focus relations are altered at LF. This cannot be allowed since (23.b) would then fail to appropriately interpret the antecedent *adamlar* 'the men' as the focus of the clause in (23.a). Focus on a constituent at S-structure can only be interpreted as such if it remains on that constituent at LF, where it will receive the focus interpretation. Note that this is not a problem in (24), where focus remains on the same constituent at LF.

This also holds for (6.b) and (9.b) above as (25) and (26) below:

25) a. at S-structure:

***Birbirleriyle**_i [Ahmet adamları t_i tanıştırdı]
eachother-agr-with (nom) man-pl-acc introduce-pst-agr

'Ahmet introduced the men to each other'

268
MURAT KURAL

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

*... [Ahmet adamları birbirleriyle tanıştırdı]
(nom) men-acc with eachother introduced

26) a. at S-structure:

Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i Ahmet'le tanıştırdı]
eachother-agr-acc man-pl-nom (with) introduce-pst-agr

'The men introduced each other to Ahmet'

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

... [Adamlar birbirlerini Ahmet'le tanıştırdı]
men-nom eachother-acc (with) introduced

Thus, reconstruction would be blocked in these cases because it would shift the focus between S-structure and LF, making (23.b) and (25.b) the LF representation of the unscrambled (5.a) and (6.a), instead of the intended (5.b) and (6.b) above.

Configurational equivalent to immediate precedence:

If the conclusion made earlier is correct and focused constituents, remain in their base positions in Turkish, the antecedent *adamları* 'the men-acc' would be focused in (17.b) by moving the lower constituent to a higher position at S-structure:

17) b. *[Ahmet birbirleriyle_i adamları t_i tanıştırdı]
(nom) with eachother men-pl introduced

'Ahmet introduced the men to each other'

Also note that the case where reconstruction is blocked, i.e. (23) and (25), are the ones in which the preposed element has to end up in a position lower than the S-structure focus. Thus it seems that the lowest position in the clause is identified as the focus position in Turkish. That is, for a constituent x to be in the focus position, every constituent other than x must c-command x.

Suppose now that the focus algorithm interprets the lowest lexical element of a clause at LF as its focus. This would mean that and in the absence of an ablative object, the dative object; and in the absence of a dative object, the accusative object will be the default focus. In this system, a higher constituent would be focused only when lower constituents move to an even higher position. Once a constituent x moves out for a higher y to be focused, it would not be able to reconstruct at LF to any position lower than y. This is because if x reconstructs to a position

lower than the focus *y*, this would yield the interpretation where *x* is the focus of the clause instead of *y*.

At first, the position of adverbials seems to be problematic for the view that the lower position is the focus in a clause. The problem here is specifically the position of the trace with respect to the adverbial in (24.a):

24) a. at S-structure:

Birbirlerini_i [adamlar t_i dün görmüş]
 eachother-agr-acc man-pl-nom yesterday see-pst-agr

'The men saw each other yesterday'

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

... [adamlar birbirlerini dün görmüş]
 men-nom eachother-acc yesterday saw

The anaphor *birbirlerini* 'each other-acc' can reconstruct at LF in (24.b) without shifting the focus. If we are to assume that the lowest position is the focus in Turkish, it would be a legitimate question to ask whether the time adverbial *dün* 'yesterday' should be lower than the base position of the preposed accusative object.

The answer to this question is a yes and a no. It may very well be that adverbials are base-generated at a position lower than the direct and indirect objects, as argued for in Stroik (1991) based on the application of the Barss and Lasnik (1988) tests to adverbials. On the other hand though, this is not crucial for the system proposed here, since all that is needed in (24.b) is that the preposed anaphor *birbirlerini* 'each other-acc' reconstruct to a position that is lower than the antecedent subject *adamlar* 'the men', and higher than the focused adverbial:

27) a. at S-structure:

Birbirlerini [IP adamlar dün [vp t_S t_{DO} t_V] görmüş]
 eachother-agr-acc man-pl-nom yesterday see-pst-agr
 DO S Adv V

'The men saw each other yesterday'

b. at LF (after reconstruction):

.... [IP adamlar birbirlerini dün [vp t_S t_{DO} t_V] görmüş]
 men-nom eachother-acc yesterday saw
 S DO Adv V

270
MURAT KURAL

As long as *birbirlerini* 'each other-acc' has an intermediate position to reconstruct for binding purposes without interfering with the focus interpretation, it does not really matter where the time adverbial *dün* 'yesterday' might have been base-generated.

Pronominal Binding and focus:

As I have mentioned above, bound pronoun interpretation may not necessarily be an indication for A-binding. In what follows however, I will assume that it is, in order to show that there are other options available for the theory to derive the pronominal binding facts without taking the preposed position to be an A-position in Turkish.

Recall now that an object QP in the preposed position can bind a pronoun inside the subject, cf. (7.b), but not an anaphor, cf. (11.b). This seems to show that binding directly from the preposed position cannot be responsible for the pronominal binding in (7.b). Also recall that the binding does not obtain when the constituent that contains the target pronoun is not in the focus position, cf. (10.b). The possibility that I will entertain here is that the pronoun inside the subject is bound not directly from the preposed position, but rather, from an A-position that lies between the S-structure position of the subject [Spec, IP] and the base position of the subject [Spec, VP] that is coindexed with the preposed object QP. This would be possible if the focused subject can lower to its base position at LF to fall inside the c-command domain of this intermediate A-position coindexed with the preposed object QP. This lowering operation would not interfere with the focus relations since it would be a vacuous operation:

28) a. at S-structure:

?Herkesi _i	[_{IP} [pro _i sekreteri]	t _(A) DO	[_{VP} t _S t _{DO} t _V]	aradı
everyone-acc	3.sg secretary-agr-nom			call-pst-agr
DO	S			V

'His_i secretary called everyone_i'

b. at LF (after focus-lowering):

?Herkesi _i	[_{IP} ... t _(A) _i	[_{VP} [pro _i sekreteri]	t _{DO} t _V]	aradı
everyone-acc	3.sg secretary-nom	called		
DO	S	V		

The lowering operation is vacuous here because the constituent that is lowered starts out at S-structure as the lowest constituent in the first place. Also, given the possibility that [Spec, IP] is an A'-position, there seems to be no independent reason why lowering of the subject should be ruled out. This

account can be extended and modified to cover the postposed object QPs in the example (15).

What remains a mystery at this point is why this strategy is not available for anaphors inside subjects. I do not have any solution to this problem.

Conclusion:

The main point in this paper was that object preposing does not involve movement to an A-position, despite the initial results obtained under simple cases. A more in-depth look at the paradigm shows that the A-position properties of the preposed objects come from a complex interplay between the representation of focus and the process of LF reconstruction. This seems to indicate that notions like focus, topic and presupposition must be incorporated into the debate on the A- vs A'-status of scrambled positions.

REFERENCES:

- Barss, A. and H. Lasnik 1986. A Note on Anaphora and Double Objects. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 17, 2; pp. 347-354. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi. 1988. Psych-verbs and Theta Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 6, 291-352. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- Chomsky, N. 1971. Deep Structure, Surface Structure, and Semantic Interpretation. In *Semantics*. D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits eds. Cambridge Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, N. 1976. Conditions on Rules of Grammar. *Linguistic Analysis*. 2, 303-351.
- Jackendoff, R. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Haik, I. 1984. Indirect Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 15, 185-223. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche. 1982. Variables and the Bijection Principle. *The Linguistic Review*. Forris Publications. Dordrecht, Netherlands.

272
MURAT KURAL

- Mahajan, A. 1990. *The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory*. Doctoral Dissertation. MIT.
- Rochemont, M. 1986. *Focus in Generative Grammar*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Rooth, M. 1985. *Association with Focus*. PhD Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Safir, K. 1984. Multiple Variable Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 15, 603-638. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Saito, M. 1991. *Long Distance Scrambling in Japanese*. Ms. University of Connecticut.
- Stowell, T. 1987. *Adjuncts, Arguments, and Crossover*. Ms. UCLA.
- Stroik, T. 1990. Adverbs as V-sisters. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 21, 4; 654-661. MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Webelhuth, G. 1989. *Syntactic Saturation Phenomena and the Modern Germanic Languages*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.