DISTINCTNESS, CASE, AND SCRAMBLING IN TURKISH

ATAKAN İNCE
inceatakan@gmail.com

0. Introduction
The aim of this study is (a) to reduce certain restrictions on scrambling in Turkish to Distinctness and (b) to show that the adjunction site for rightward scrambling in Turkish is CP (a. la. Kural (1997)).

1. Distinctness (Richards, 2010)
For Richards (2010), Distinctness requires that more than one node of the same functional element cannot occur in an asymmetric c-command relation in the same Spell-Out domain (SOD):

1. *Distinctness*
> If a linearization statement <, >is generated, the derivation crashes.

(Richards, 2010:5)

Violations of Distinctness are observed in multiple exceptives, multiple sluicing and DP-internal arguments, among others, in English:

2. a. *Every man admired every woman, except [John] [Mary] (Richards' ex. (7a), p. 8)
   b. *I know everyone insulted someone, but I don't know [who] [whom]

(Richards ex. (7b), p. 8)

   c. *the singing [of songs] [of the children] (Richards ex. (9a), p. 9)

Richards contends that Distinctness violations are avoided in three ways:

3. a. Adding structure (ex. 4): add a phase such as K/P to keep identical functional elements in separate SODs
   b. Deleting structure (ex. 5): Delete one of the identical functional elements
   c. Movement suppression(ex. 6): Avoid any movement operation that would cause a Distinctness violation

4. a. * the destruction the city
    b. the destruction **of** the city

(Richards, 2010: 54 (ex. 114a-b))

5. Construct state in Hebrew
   a. beyt   ha-mora
      house   the-teacher
      'the teacher's house'
   b. *ha-beyt   ha-mora

6. a. ??Kojem   je čovjeku kojem   dječaku pomoči? (Croatian)
    which.DAT AUX man.DAT which.DAT boy.DAT help.INF
    'Which man is to help which boy?'
  b. Kojem   je čovjeku pomoči kojem   dječaku?
    which.DAT AUX man.DAT help.INF which.DAT boy.DAT
    'Which man is to help which boy?'

2. Distinctness in Turkish

As Richards also cites, the Case facts in causativization in Turkish support Distinctness. When an intransitive verb is causativized, the causee bears Accusative Case in Turkish:

7. Mehmet **Hasan-ı**   öl-dür-dü
  Mehmet Hasan-ACC die-CAUS-PAST
  'Mehmet caused Hasan to die'

8. Tolga **bebeğ-i**   yürü-t-tü
  Tolga baby-ACC walk-CAUS-PAST
  'Tolga had the baby walk'

However, when the causativized verb is transitive with an Acc DO, the causee cannot bear Acc Case; it has to have Dative Case:

9. a. Hasan kasab-a   et-i   kes-tir-di
    Hasan butcher-DAT meat-ACC cut-CAUS-PAST
    'Hasan had the butcher cut the meat'

  b. *Hasan **kasab-ı**   et-i   kes-tir-di
    Hasan butcher-ACC meat-ACC cut-CAUS-PAST

3. Scrambling in Turkish

A phrase can be scrambled to pre-Subject position, post-verbal position as well as a clause-internal position in simplex clauses in Turkish, as the following data from Kural (1992) shows:[1]

10. a. Ahmet bu kitab-ı   Berna-ya vermiş. S DO IO V
        this book-ACC   -DAT gave
    'Ahmet gave this book to Berna.'
  b. Ahmet Berna-ya bu kitab-ı vermiş. S IO DO V

---

[1] For scrambling in Turkish, see Erkü (1983), Erguvanlı (1984), Kural (1992, 1993, 1997), Aygen (2003), Kornfilt (2005), İşsever (2007), among others. Some studies assume that leftward scrambling targets a Specifier position, say, of TopicP, whereas rightward scrambling is adjunction.

c. Bu kitab-ı Ahmet Berna-ya vermiş.   DO S IO V
d. Berna-ya Ahmet bu kitab-ı vermiş.   IO S DO V
e. Bu kitab-ı Berna-ya Ahmet vermiş.   DO IO S V
f. Berna-ya bu kitab-ı Ahmet vermiş.   IO DO S V
g. Ahmet bu kitab-ı vermiş Berna-ya.   S DO V IO
h. Bu kitab-ı Ahmet vermiş Berna-ya.   DO S V IO
i. Ahmet Berna-ya vermiş bu kitab-ı.   S IO V DO
j. Berna-ya Ahmet vermiş bu kitab-ı.   IO S V DO
k. Bu kitab-ı Berna-ya vermiş Ahmet.   DO IO V S
l. Berna-ya bu kitab-ı vermiş Ahmet.   IO DO V S
m. Ahmet vermiş bu kitab-ı Berna-ya.   S V DO IO
n. Ahmet vermiş Berna-ya bu kitab-ı.   S V IO DO
o. Bu kitab-ı vermiş Ahmet Berna-ya.   DO V S IO
p. Bu kitab-ı vermiş Berna-ya Ahmet.   DO V IO S
r. Berna-ya vermiş Ahmet bu kitab-ı.   IO V S DO
s. Berna-ya vermiş bu kitab-ı Ahmet.   IO V DO S

<div align="right">(Kural 1992: 1-2)</div>

Scrambling from a complement clause is also possible to the left and right periphery of a matrix clause:

11. a. Ercan-ın$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   acele   ye-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di.
            -gen   cake-acc in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc   tell-past
       'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'
   b. Kek-i$_i$ Hasan [Ercan-ın t_i acele   yediğ-i]-ni   söyledi.
      cake-acc   -gen   in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc   tell-past

<div align="right">(Aygen 2003: 81)</div>

4. Some restrictions on Scrambling in Turkish and Distinctness
In this section, I will describe a restriction on scrambling in Turkish given in previous works (Aygen (2003), Kural (1992, 1993)) and give a Distinctness-based account of the restriction. This restriction is restricted to Finite Complement Clauses (FCC) in Turkish. The Nominative Subject of an FCC cannot be scrambled to the left periphery of the matrix clause (12):

12. *Ercan$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   ye-di]   san-ıyor.
                        cake-acc eat-past think-prog
     'Ercan thinks Hasan ate the cake'
     *in the intended reading
     √ as matrix subject

<div align="right">(Aygen 2003: 81)</div>

A pause between *Ercan* and *Hasan* does not ameliorate (12), either.[2]
Ulutaş (2008) claims that FCCs are full CP and that's why they do not allow scrambling of their

---

[2] Ivan Ortega-Santos (p.c.) remarks that a pause alleviates the Spanish version of (12), about which I have nothing to say.

Subjects in contrast to nominalized complement clauses which have a defective CP and therefore allow scrambling of their Subjects:

13. a. Ercan-ın$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   acele   ye-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di.
             -gen   cake-acc in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc   tell-past
      'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'

(Aygen 2003: 81)

    b. Hasan [t_i kek-i   acele   ye-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di Ercan-ın$_i$.
            cake-ACC in a hurry eat-NOM-AGR-ACC tell-PAST   -GEN
      'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'

First, it is not clear why a full C head does not allow extraction of a Subject. In both phase-based systems and non-phase-based systems, CP always has an escape hatch.

Second, a DO within a FCC can be scrambled in contrast to the Subject of a FCC, which is predicted not to occur under Ulutaş's account, as Aygen (2003) has already questioned:

14. Kek-i$_i$ Hasan [Ercan t_i ye-di]   san-ıyor.
    cake-acc   eat-past   think-prog
      'Hasan thinks Ercan ate the cake'

(Aygen 2003: 81)

Third, there are cases where the Subject of a nominalized complement clause cannot be scrambled, unlike Ulutaş' expectation. The Subject of a complement clause cannot be scrambled to a higher complement clause (15b), as Aygen (2003: 88) has already noticed:

15. a. Ahmet [Mehmet-in [Nafe-nin kek-i   ye-diğ-i]-ni   bil-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-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'
    b. *Ahmet [Nafe-nin$_i$ Mehmet-in [t_i kek-i   ye-diğ-i]-ni   bil-diğ-i]-ni   söyledi.
                -gen   -gen   cake-acc eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-pos-acc tell-past

(Aygen 2003: 88)

However, the DO *keki* can be scrambled to the higher complement clause:

16. Ahmet [kek-i$_i$ Mehmet-in [Nafe-nin t_i ye-diğ-i]-ni   bil-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di.
            cake-acc   -gen   -gen   eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-poss-acc tell-past
        'Ahmet told that Mehmet knows that Nafe ate the cake'

All in all, an analysis based on full/defective CPs cannot account for the data above.

In the following parts, I will contend a Distinctness-based account of the data above. The crux of the analysis is that co-occurrence of D's with the same Case feature cannot occur in the same Spell-out Domain in Turkish, as Richards (2010) contends for Japanese and Serbo-Croation among other languages.
Example (12), repeated as ex. (17) below, is bad because two D's with the same Case feature

occur in the same Spell-out Domain:

17. *Ercan$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   ye-di]   san-ıyor.
                          cake-acc eat-past think-prog
    'Ercan thinks Hasan ate the cake'
    *in the intended reading
    √ as matrix subject

<div align="right">(Aygen 2003: 81)</div>

18. a. *Ercan[+nominative], Hasan[+nominative]
    b. *<D[+nominative], D[+nominative]>

Notice that when the matrix Subject is different from the FCC Subject in person features (19a) or when it is a quantifier (19b), the structure is still ungrammatical:

19. a. * Ercan$_i$ ben [t_i kek-i   ye-di]   san-ıyor-um.
                      I   cake-acc eat-past think-prog-1s
        'I think Hasan ate the cake'
    b. * Ercan$_i$ herkes [t_i kek-i   ye-di]   san-ıyor.
                      everybody cake-acc eat-past   think-prog
    'Everybody thinks Hasan ate the cake'

In (19a), the agreement on the verbs are different (3s in the FCC and 1s in the matrix clause). The structures are still ungrammatical, which shows the ungrammaticality of these sentences are not due to processing load.[3]
I will follow Ulutaş (2008) and assume that a Nominative Subject occurs in Spec, FinP, who follows Rizzi (1997). I will also assume that a scrambled phrase occurs in Spec, TopP within the CP domain and that both TopP and FinP are in the same SOD. Therefore, both D's of the scrambled Subject of the FCC and the matrix Subject are SOD-mate, Distinctness is violated.

This also accounts for (13a), repeated as ex. (20) below, where the matrix Subject is Nominative and the scrambled Subject of the complement clause is Genitive:

20. Ercan-ın$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   acele   ye-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di.
         -gen   cake-acc in a hurry eat-nom-agr-acc   tell-past
    'Hasan told that Ercan ate the cake in a hurry'

<div align="right">(Aygen 2003: 81)</div>

21. a. sizin [+genitive], biz [+nominative]
    b. <D [+genitive], D [+nominative]>

As seen in (21b), although both D's are SOD-mate, they differ in Case; therefore, no violation of Distinctness occurs. In (13b), where the embedded Genitive Subject occurs in postverbal position in the matrix clause, no SOD violation occurs because the two Subjects bear different Cases, though later I will argue that postverbal Subjects occur in a different SOD than preverbal

---

[3] I am indebted to Ivan Ortega-Santos for pointing this out.

elements.

In (14), repeated as ex. (21) below, in the same way, the D's are in the same SOD but differ in their Case feature, so Distinctness is not violated:

21. Kek-i$_i$ Hasan [Ercan t_i ye-di]   san-ıyor.
    cake-acc   eat-past   think-prog
    'Hasan thinks Ercan ate the cake'

(Aygen 2003: 81)

22. a. Keki [+accusative], Ercan [+nominative]
    b. <D[+accusative], D[+nominative]>

In (15b), repeated as (23) below, both DPs are genitive and SOD-mate, and Distinctness is violated:

23. *Ahmet [Nafe-nin$_i$ Mehmet-in [t_i kek-i   ye-diğ-i]-ni   bil-diğ-i]-ni   söyledi.
               -gen   -gen   cake-acc eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-pos-acc tell-past
(Aygen 2003: 88)

24. a. Mehmetin [+genitive], Nafenin [+genitive]
    b. <D [+genitive], D [+genitive]>

In (16), repeated as ex. (25) below, on the other hand, the scrambled DO and the embedded Subject differ in Case, Accusative vs. Genitive, respectively:

25. Ahmet [kek-i$_i$ Mehmet-in [Nafe-nin t_i ye-diğ-i]-ni   bil-diğ-i]-ni   söyle-di.
          cake-acc   -gen   -gen   eat-nom-pos-acc know-nom-poss-acc tell-past
        'Ahmet told that Mehmet knows that Nafe ate the cake'

26. a. keki [+accusative], Mehmetin [+genitive]
    b. <D [+accusative], D [+genitive]>

Since the D's differ in Case feature in spite of being SOD-mate, Distinctness is not violated.

To sum, the grammatical and ungrammatical cases of scrambling in Turkish given above can be accounted for in terms of Distinctness. In Turkish, two D's with the same Case feature cannot occur in the same Spell-out Domain.
Aygen (2003) accounts for the ungrammatical instances of scrambling of a DP over another DP with the same Case as follows:

27. The DP which bears the same feature with the highest head within the phase is inactive for extra-clausal syntactic processes.

(Aygen 2003: 89)

However, her account does not account for the causative structures where no DP moves over

another (9a&b repeated as 28a&b):

28. a. Hasan   kasab-a   et-i   kes-tir-di
      Hasan   butcher-DAT   meat-ACC   cut-CAUS-PAST
      'Hasan had the butcher cut the meat'
    b. *Hasan **kasab-ı**   et-i   kes-tir-di
        Hasan   butcher-ACC   meat-ACC   cut-CAUS-PAST

Distinctness, on the other hand, accounts for both scrambling and causativization facts in Turkish.

5. A Note on Post-verbal Scrambling in Turkish
Kural (1997), giving arguments based on quantifier-scope interactions, contends that post-verbal constituents are higher than pre-verbal constituents (see also Kornfilt 2005). Assuming that V raises to C, he concludes that postverbal constituents (PVC) right-adjoin to CP since they linearly follow V:

29. a. Herkes   dün t_i aramış [üç   kişi-yi]$_i$.   (3y ∀x, *∀x 3y)
       everybody yesterday   called three person-acc
    b. t_i Üç   kişi-yi   dün   aramış herkes$_i$. (∀x 3y, *3y ∀x)
        three person-acc yesterday called   everybody
                                                     (Kural 1997: ex. 18a-b (traces and indexes mine))

However, Aygen (2002) (see also Ulutaş, 2006) argues that V raises to T in Turkish (matrix clauses), which makes it hard to argue that PVCs are right-adjoined to CP.
Kornfilt (2005), while remaining unclear about whether rightward adjunction targets CP or IP, raises doubts with regard to depending on scope relations between post-verbal and pre-verbal QPs. She states that whether a post-verbal QP scopes over a pre-verbal QP depends on whether the PVC QP is Subject, reporting her own and her consultants' judgements:

30. t_i Üç   kişi-ye   dün   akşam   yardım etmiş herkes$_i$.   (∀x 3y, *3y ∀x)
      three person-dat yesterday evening help   did   everybody
    'Everybody helped three people yesterday evening.'
                                           (Kornfilt 2005: ex. 21 (traces and indexes mine))

31. Herkes   bu yıl t_i kitap-lar-ın-ı   ithaf   etmiş [üç   kişi-ye]$_i$. (∀x 3y, *3y ∀x)
      everybody this year   book-plu-poss-acc dedication did   three person-dat
      'Everybody dedicated his book to three people this year.'
                                           (Kornfilt 2005: ex. 22 (traces and indexes mine))

32. Üç   kişi   dün   akşam t_i yardım etmiş herkes-e$_i$.   (3x ∀y, *∀y 3x)
      three person yesterday evening   help   did   everybody-dat
      'Three people helped everybody yesterday evening.'
                                           (Kornfilt 2005: ex. 23 (traces and indexes mine))

Kural (1997) does not state whether he checked the relevant data with any native speakers;

Kornfilt (2005), on the other hand, does not state that she has given any context/story to her consultants to get the relevant scopal judgments above.

In this section, I will give evidence based on Distinctness that PVCs adjoin to CP.

As shown in the previous section, the Nominative Subject of a FCC cannot be scrambled to the matrix clause, preceding the matrix Subject (ex. (12) repeated as ex. (33)):

33. *Ercan$_i$ Hasan [t_i kek-i   ye-di]   san-ıyor.
                             cake-acc eat-past think-prog
    'Ercan thinks Hasan ate the cake'
    *in the intended reading
    √ as matrix subject

                                                                    (Aygen 2003: 81)

However, when the Subject of an FCC is scrambled to the post-verbal position in the matrix clause, the structure is much better. When asked to grade ex.s (34b-c) between 1-7 for grammaticality, all native speakers found ex. (34b) completely ungrammatical, two found ex. (34c) completely ungrammatical, and others gave a score of '4' or above to ex. (34c). The average of the score the nine native speakers who do not find ex. (34c) ungrammatical gave to it is five '5'. This shows that there is a clear contrast between ex. (34b) vs. ex. (34c).

34. a. Ben 'Ayşe Ankara-ya   gitti'   sanıyordum.
       I   -dat   went   thought
       I thought that Ayşe went to Ankara.'
    b. *Ayşe$_i$, ben 't_i Ankara-ya gitti' sanıyordum.
    c. ?Ben 't_i Ankara-ya gitti sanıyordum' Ayşe$_i$.

The grammaticality of ex. (34c) then shows that the Subject of the matrix clause *ben* 'I' and that of the FCC *Ayşe* are not in the same Spell-out Domain. Otherwise, both D's being [+nominative], a Distinctness violation would occur. However, if a post-verbal constituent is adjoined to CP, then that element and the matrix Subject in Spec, FinP cannot be SOD-mate, FinP being (within) the domain of the phase head C:

30. [CP [CP [FinP *biz. . .*]] *siz*]

All in all, Kural's claim that PVC adjoin to CP in Turkish still holds.

6. Conclusion
This study has shown that certain restrictions on scrambling in Turkish can be accounted for Richards' (2010) *Distinctness* and that postverbal elements in Turkish adjoin to CP, as Kural (1997) has claimed.

References

Aygen, Gülşat. 2003. Extractability and the nominative case feature on tense. In: Özsoy, Sumru & Akar, Didar. & Nakipoğlu-Demiralp, Mine & Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser E. & Aksu-Koç, Ayhan (eds.). *Studies in Turkish linguistics: proceedings of the 10th international conference in Turkish linguistics*, August 16-18, 2000. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 81-94.

Aygen, Gülşat. 2007. Syntax and Semantics of Genitive Subject-Case in Turkish. In *California Linguistic Notes*, Vol. 32/2:

Erguvanlı, Eser 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Erkü, Feride 1983. *Discourse pragmatics and word order in Turkish*. [Ph.D. dissertation. University of Minnesota.]

İşsever, Selçuk. 2007. Towards a Unified Account to Clause-initial Scrambling in Turkish: a Feature Analysis.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2005. Asymmetries between pre-verbal and post-verbal scrambling in Turkish. In J. Sabel and M. Saito (eds.), *The Free Word Order Phenomenon: Its Syntactic and Sources and Diversity*, pp. 163-179.

Kural, Murat. 1992. Properties of Scrambling in Turkish. Manuscript, UCI.

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

Kural, Murat. 1997. postverbal Constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 498-519.

Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering Trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ulutaş, Süleyman. 2006. *Verb Movement and Feature Percolation: Evidence from Turkish Relative Clauses*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University.

Ulutaş, Süleyman. 2007. Feature inheritance and subject case in Turkish. Unpublished paper presented at International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August, in Side, Turkey.