THE ENDOSKELETON OF THE PREDICATE IN TURKISH

In a Nutshell In this talk, a) I claim that Turkish predicative markers are strictly ordered and contribute a single function at any given time, while the function may change depending on the position of the marker; b) I argue for the existence of a class of aspectual markers that are very low in the hierarchy; and c) I propose that the auxiliary *ol* has multiple functions, one of which is to reinitiate the hierarchical cycle by introducing another CP domain. **Setting the Stage**. Predicative markers in Turkish are strictly ordered, which can be accounted for by positing a functional head hierarchy in the sense of Cinque (1999, 2002 et seq.). The strongest evidence comes from the copula *i* (Kornfilt 1996), which realizes as =*y* (1a) or =*Ø* (2a) when it cliticizes onto the preceding stem. Otherwise it hosts the markers that follow it (1b/2b).

(1) a. Gel-meli=**y**-di-Ø.
     come-OBL=**COP**-PST-3

   b. Gel-meli **i**-di-Ø.
     come-OBL **COP**-PST-3
     '(S)he was supposed to come.'

(2) a. Gel-miş=**Ø**-ti-Ø.
     come-PFV=**COP**-PST-3

   b. Gel-miş **i**-di-Ø.
     come-PFV **COP**-PST-3
     '(S)he came.'

The copula can only be followed by a limited number of markers, which assume different functions in pre-copula positions:

(3) a. Gel-**se**=y-**di**-Ø
     come-**CNTF**=COP-**PST**-3
     'If (s)he had come, (it would have been different.)'

   b. Gel-**di**=y-**se**-Ø
     come-**PFV**=COP-**COND**-3
     'If (s)he has come, (we should visit her/him.)'

The pre-copula markers (4a) cannot be hosted by nominal predicates (4b), unless hosted by the auxiliary *ol* (4d). This suggests that the copula marks an affixation border that verbal and nominal predicates share, in that the nominals can only host the copula and the higher (Baker 1985) markers that follow it (4c).

(4) a. Gel-**ecek**=Ø-ti-m.
     come-**PROS**=COP-PST-1SG
     'I was going to come.'

   b. *Hasta-**(y)acak**=Ø-ım.
     sick-**PROS**=COP-1SG
     Int: 'I will be sick.'

   c. Hasta=y-**dı**-m.
     sick=COP-**PST**-1SG
     'I was sick.'

   d. Hasta ol-**acağ**-ım.
     sick AUX-**PROS**-1SG
     'I will be sick.'

I claim that the following inflectional markers are in fact aspectual markers, which are among the lowest markers in the hierarchy: *-Adur* (continuative, inceptive), *-Agel* (perfect), *-Agör* (continuative), *-Akal* (durative), *-Akoy* (continuative, inceptive), *-Ayaz* (prospective), and *-İver* (celerative, non-CONATIVE) (Cinque 1999). (5) shows the PRF marker:

(5) Şirket-imiz   müşteri-ler-i-ne   başarı-yla   hizmet ver-egel-di-Ø.
    company-POSS.1PL client-PL-POSS.3-DAT success-INST service give-PRF-PFV-3
    'Our company has provided services to its clients with success (so far).'

I therefore assume the following simplified hierarchy for current purposes:

(6) *Simplified hierarchy for the predicate in Turkish*:
    V < Voice$_1$ < Low Aspects < ABIL < NEG < POSSIB < Voice$_2$ < Agr$_L$ < T$_{anterior}$ < Agr$_K$ < NMLZ < OBLIG < High Aspects < Agr$_{POSS}$ < $\boxed{\text{Clitic Boundary}}$ < Q < COP < T < High Modals < Agr$_Z$

Proposal. I claim that the auxiliary *ol* is inserted in order to repair hierarchical violations (7) due to its ability to reinitiate the hierarchical cycle by introducing another CP domain. This allows even the lowest heads on the hierarchy to linearly follow the higher heads after auxiliary insertion.

(7) a. *Git-miş-meli-yim.
     go-PFV-OBL-1SG
     Int: 'I must have gone.'

   b. Git-miş **ol**-malı-yım.
     go-PFV **AUX**-OBL-1SG
     'I must have gone.'

This is not only used as a repair, but also strategically to reveal more TAM possibilities:

(8) a. Koş-ar-dı-m.   b. Koş-ar   ol-du-m.
       run-HAB-PST-1SG   run-INCEP AUX-PFV-1SG
       'I used to run.'   '(After that) I have taken up running.'

What AUX insertion does in (8) is to allow access to the PFV, a lower marker in the hierarchy, which makes it possible for the structure to give an inceptive reading, marking the beginning (but, crucially, not anymore the ending) of an event. The event in (8a) has certainly ended, while this is not necessarily the case for (8b). It should also be noted that, based on the accounts which consider *-DI* and *-sA* as "true tense" markers (Kornfilt 1996, Sezer 2002) and following Cinque's (2002) proposal, I assume the pre-copula *-DI* and *-sA* to occupy a T head, specifically the $T_{anterior}$ head in Cinque's (1999) system. This assumption posits two different spots for the T layer (Rizzi & Cinque 2016: 149), namely one that is occupied by the pre-copula *-DI* and *-sA* and one that hosts the post-copula ones. **Analysis**. I assume the $T_{anterior}$ head to be defective, which is why the higher T head must value the tense features of the lower defective T head via Agree (Weisser 2013). This feature valuation results in past readings with constructions involving the pre-copula PFV that occupies this position, resolving what is called the "present perfective paradox" (Malchukov 2009, De Wit 2017). As for the introduction of a new CP domain, I assume that the auxiliary is immediately dominated by a silent v head, which allows Merge with the lower functional heads in the hierarchy. I diverge from Kornfilt (1996) and Kelepir (2001) on a crucial aspect, namely the claim that the copula is base-generated in T, since the CopP projection would be lower than the higher T layer in the current system.

Conclusion. I have argued that the predicative domain in Turkish is subject to strict ordering in the form a hierarchical cycle, which can be reinitiated via auxiliary insertion. This insertion operation repairs hierarchy violations and makes it possible for the lower markers such as the new aspectual class I claim to exist to linearly follow markers that are higher in the hierarchy.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Baker, Mark (1985). The Mirror Principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *LI*, 16, 373-415.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. New York City, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo (2002). A note on mood, modality, tense and aspect affixes in Turkish. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (Ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (pp. 47-59). Amsterdam, Holland: John Benjamins.

Cinque, Guglielmo (2017). On the status of functional categories (heads and phrases). *Language and Linguistics, 18*(4), 521-576.

De Wit, Astrid (2017). *The present perfect paradox across languages*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kelepir, Meltem (2001). *Topics in Turkish syntax: clausal structure and scope*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1996). On some copular clitics in Turkish. In A. Alexiadou, N. Fuhrhop, P. Law, & S. Loehken (Eds.), *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* (pp. 96-114). Berlin, Germany: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.

Malchukov, Andrej L. (2009). Incompatible categories: resolving the "present perfective paradox". In L. Hogeweg, H. de Hoop, & A. L. Malchukov (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic semantics of tense, aspect, and modality* (pp. 13-32). Amsterdam, Holland: John Benjamins.

Rizzi, Luigi, Guglielmo Cinque (2016). Functional categories and syntactic theory. *The Annual Review of Linguistics*, 2, 139-163.

Sezer, Engin (2002). Finite inflection in Turkish. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (Ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (pp. 1-46). Amsterdam, Holland: John Benjamins.

Weisser, Philipp (2013). Dissecting clause-chaining constructions. Talk presented at ConSOLE XXI, Potsdam, Germany.