

### Abstract

In Turkish there are some verbs such as *utan* 'to be ashamed', *kork* 'to fear', *çekin* 'to refrain', and *ürk* 'to have a fright' whose complements nominalized with *-mAK* are compatible with both Dative and Ablative cases (Göksel & Kerslake, 2014) as shown in (1). These verbs can also have regular DP complements which are only assigned Ablative as in (2). This type of verbs is classified as lexical case assigning verbs (Woolford, 2006). We will show that the case alternation is not random, and the reading differences between the two cases are associated with Aspect. This way the paper would argue that proposed Tense and Case relation by Pesetsky and Torrego (2004)(P&T henceforth) for English manifests itself between Aspect and Case in Turkish.

- (1) *Ev-e git-meğ-e/ten kork-tu-m.*  
Home-DAT go-NMLZ-DAT/ABL fear-PAST-1.SG  
'I was scared of going home.'
- (2) *Köpek-ten kork-tu-m.*  
Dog-ABL fear-PAST-1.SG  
'I was scared of the dog.'

The case alternation in the verb has a semantic effect (3). Dative reflects the event denoted by the nominalized clause have not taken place, and Ablative reflects that the event have in fact taken place.

- (3) a. *Para iste-meğ-e utan-dı-m.*  
Money ask-NMLZ-DAT be\_ashamed-PAST-1.SG  
'I was ashamed to ask for money.'  
Reading: 'I have not asked for money.'
- b. *Para iste-mek-ten utan-dı-m.*  
Money ask-NMLZ-ABL be\_ashamed-PAST-1.SG  
'I was ashamed that I asked for money.'  
Reading: 'I have asked for money before.'

There are two supporting configurations for the semantic readings, in which case alternation is blocked, one is nominalized complex predications (4) and the other is nominalized negated clauses (5). Firstly, according to Cinque (2001), the suffix *-miş* can be used for both *Aspect<sub>Perfect</sub>* and *Aspect<sub>Resultative</sub>*, and the suffix *-(y)AcAK* is ambiguous between *Tense<sub>Future</sub>* and *Aspect<sub>Prospective</sub>*. Examples in (4) reflect the effect of having overt Aspectual information within nominalized complements on case selection. It is clear that *Aspect<sub>Resultative</sub>* favors Ablative (4a) and *Aspect<sub>Prospective</sub>* favors Dative (4b) for its nominalized complement.

- (4) a. *Para iste-miş ol-mak-\*a/ten utan-dı-m.*  
Money ask-PERF be-NMLZ-\*DAT/ABL be\_ashamed-PAST-1.SG  
'I was ashamed to have asked for money.'
- b. *Para iste-yecek ol-may-a/?tan utan-dı-m.*  
Money ask-IMPERF be-NMLZ-DAT/\*ABL be\_ashamed-PAST-1.SG  
'I was ashamed to ask for money.'

Secondly, by Cinque's analysis, Negation in Turkish operates just above Aspect<sub>Resultative</sub>. As negation can operate above Aspect<sub>Resultative</sub> and not above Aspect<sub>Prospective</sub>, the Dative case is blocked in (5).

- (5) *Ev-e git-me-mek-\*/e/ten utan-dı-m.*  
 Home-DAT go-NEG-NMLZ-\*/DAT/ABL be\_ashamed-PAST-1.SG  
 'I was ashamed of not going home.'

In the paper we argue that for the Aspect and Case relation to occur feature match of outer and inner aspect is required. Examples in (6) reflect the alignment of embedded nominalized clauses and the matrix clause in Aspectual readings.

- (6) a. *Ev-e gel-mek ben-i üz-müş.*  
 Home-DAT come-NMLZ[NOM] 1.SG-ACC upset-PERF[3.SG]  
 'Coming home upset me.'  
 Reading: 'I came home, that upset me.'
- b. *Ev-e gel-mek ben-i üz-er.*  
 Home-DAT come-NMLZ[NOM] 1.SG-ACC upset-AOR[3.SG]  
 'Coming home upsets me.'  
 Reading: 'Coming home in general upsets me.'

This alignment however is not that prominent or even missing if the embedded nominalized clause has accusative case (7).

- (7) a. *Ev-e gel-mey-i iste-r-im.*  
 Home-DAT come-NMLZ-ACC want-AOR-1.SG  
 'I would like to come home.'
- b. *Ev-e gel-mey-i iste-miş-ti-m.*  
 Home-DAT come-NMLZ-ACC want-PERF-PAST-1.SG  
 'I wanted to come home.'

In P&T Accusative and Nominative cases are evaluated under a relation of  $T_o$  on V and  $T_s$  on T where the agreement relation affects the case selection on D and feature deletion. Sentences in (6) and (7) are in line with the predictions of P&T. This paper, although the overt examples are few in number, argue the relation to be extended to Aspect and Case. In that in the absence of  $T_o$  on V the feature Aspect is used for agreement and case on D. Thereby we entertain a structural case interpretation for nominalized complements where Aspect determines Dative or Ablative as opposed to a non-structural case interpretation in regular DP complements.

## References

- Cinque, G. (2001). A note on mood, modality, tense and aspect affixes in Turkish. *The verb in Turkish*, 44, 47–59.
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2014). *Turkish: An essential grammar*. Routledge.
- Pesetsky, D., & Torrego, E. (2004). *Tense, case, and the nature of syntactic categories*. na.
- Woolford, E. (2006). Lexical case, inherent case, and argument structure. *Linguistic inquiry*, 37(1), 111–130.