

Right Adjunction in the Right Peripheries

Nominalized Complement Clauses (NCCs) differ from Finite Complement Clauses (FCCs) in Turkish in terms of whether an internal constituent of them can appear between the embedded and the matrix predicate. The sentences in (1) illustrate this fact for NCCs and FCCs, respectively:

- (1) a. *Pelin [Cem-in t_i git-tiğ-in-i okul-a_i] duy-muş.
 Pelin-NOM Cem-GEN go-NOML-3sg.poss-ACC school-DAT hear-Evid.Past
 ‘Pelin heard that Cem went to school.’
 b. ✓Pelin [Cem t_i git-ti okul-a_i] san-mış.
 Pelin-NOM Cem-NOM go-past school-DAT think-Evid.Past
 ‘Pelin believed that Cem went to school.’

The grammaticality contrast between (1a) and (1b) is surprising for a number of reasons. First of all, it is only the FCCs that in fact must be absolutely adjacent to matrix predicate while NCCs do not have to be (as shown by the fact that the latter can be scrambled to the right of the matrix predicate, but not the former, see George and Kornfilt (1981)):

- (2) a. ✓Pelin t_i duy-muş [Cem-in okul-a git-tiğ-in-i]_i
 Pelin-NOM hear-Evid.Past Cem-GEN school-DAT go-NOML-3sg.poss-ACC
 ‘Pelin heard that Cem went to school.’
 b. *Pelin t_i san-mış [Cem okul-a git-ti]_i.
 Pelin-NOM think-Evid.Past Cem-NOM school-DAT go-past
 ‘Pelin believed that Cem went to school.’

Secondly, although NCCs do not permit any of their internal constituents to appear between the nominalized predicate and the matrix predicate (cf. 1a), they permit an internal constituent of them to appear in the right periphery when the NCC itself is postverbally scrambled:

- (3) ✓Pelin t_i duy-muş [Cem-in t_k git-tiğ-in-i okul-a_k]_i
 Pelin-NOM hear-Evid.Past Cem-GEN go-NOML-3sg.poss-ACC school-DAT
 ‘Pelin heard that Cem went to school.’

I assume that NCCs project up to KPs (henceforth, K_{NCC}), whose head, K , takes a DP as its complement. K is identified under identity with the probe ν (cf. Chomsky 2000, and also Rezac 2003). Once the Agree relation between ν and K is established, K is valued and as a result it is spelled out as Case morphology on the DP. The crucial point here is that in sentences like (1a) valuation of K by the probe ν is blocked by the presence of another intervening KP, assuming that the postposed KP is adjoined to the KP_{NCC} , as shown in (4):

- (4) [_{VP}... [_{KP-NCC} [_{KP-NCC} [_{DP} Cem-in t_i git-tiğ-in] $K(-i)$]] [_{KP} okul-a_i]... ν]...

The present study suggests that right-adjunction to a KP_{NCC} is a possible option in the grammar, though it may be blocked exactly in cases where it disrupts an Agree relation between a category that is adjoined to and a higher probe. Assuming, as standard, that scrambling operations follow obligatory formal feature checking operations (but also see Boskovic and Takahashi 1998, for an alternative approach), we may also account for the grammaticality of (3), where the KP_{NCC} itself is scrambled to the right periphery. I suggest that the adjunction of the dative KP *okul-a* ‘to school’ to the higher KP_{NCC} takes place after the scrambling of the KP_{NCC} to the right of the matrix predicate, which I assume is right-adjunction to CP following Kural (1997). Since this does not induce the kind of disruption (1a) does, the grammaticality of the sentence is rightly predicted. Finally, we need to answer the question of why (1b) is grammatical. The solution is in fact quite obvious: FCCs are not KPs, but CPs, and accordingly they are not Case marked. Given that right-adjunction to CP is in principle possible in Turkish, the grammaticality of (1b) is trivially accounted for. This analysis makes a number of other predictions concerning leftward scrambling of NCCs, and they will be addressed in the talk as time permits.

References

- Boskovic, Z. and D.Takahashi. 1998. Scrambling and Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:347-366.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalism in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass.
- George, L. M., & J. Kornfilt. 1981. Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish. In *Binding and filtering*, ed. F. Heny, 105-127. MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass.
- Kural, Murat. 1997. Postverbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:498-519.
- Rezac, M. 2003. The fine structure of cyclic Agree. *Syntax* 6:156-182.