The PROblem of Subject Licensing in Turkish *-(y)Ip* Constructions

Alper Kesici
Middle East Technical University
akesici@metu.edu.tr

This study focuses on the **nature of subjects in Turkish *-(y)Ip* constructions**. The marker *-(y)Ip* is used to string two or more verbs together. A *-(y)Ip* construction typically contains a single subject, interpreted the same for *-(y)Ip*-marked verb ($V_{-(y)Ip}$) and the finite verb (V_{FIN}). The obligatory coreference suggests that the null subject in (1 is PRO (Göksel & Öztürk, 2019), not *pro* (Kuram, 2015). However, (2) shows that $V_{-(y)Ip}$ and V_{FIN} may have different overt subjects. Ironically, this argues for a *pro* analysis, which cannot explain the obligatory coreference between the two subjects in (1).

1) a.**Ali** gir-**ip** çık-tı.
Ali enter-IP leave-PST
'Ali entered and left.'

2) **Ali** gir-**ip** **Ayşe** çık-tı.
Ali enter-IP Ayşe leave-PST
'Ali entered and Ayşe left.'

b. [**Ali**$_i$ [**PRO**$_{i/*j}$ gir**ip**] çıktı].

Thus, neither the *pro-* nor the PRO-analysis can explain subject behavior in *-(y)Ip* constructions. I propose a novel account that combines three components: (i) **different adjunction sites of the *-(y)Ip* constituent** (*-(y)Ip*P) (see also Kuram, 2015), (ii) **Pesetsky and Torrego's (2007) Feature Sharing (FS) mechanism,** under which **nominative Case** is seen as an ***uninterpretable* Tense (*u*T) feature on D**, and (iii) **Form Copy (FC) mechanism (Chomsky, 2021)**. Viewing *pro* as a feature bundle on finite T (e.g., Platzack, 2003), I argue that the subject of $V_{-(y)Ip}$ ($Subj_{-(y)Ip}$) is always a DP (never *pro*) because *-(y)Ip* lacks features that license *pro*. If $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ is identical to the subject of V_{FIN} ($Subj_{FIN}$), it is deleted under FC, deriving the obligatory coreference in single subject environments as in (1). If the subjects are different as in (2), FC does not apply and $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ is licensed via FS: **Agree** links the unvalued *u*T features on $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ and $Subj_{FIN}$ to unvalued ***interpretable* Tense feature on** matrix T and the value is assigned through Agree with the valued ***u*T** features on matrix *v*. Supporting evidence for the analysis comes from the interaction of NPI licensing with the height of *-(y)Ip*P relative to negation. I will show that overt $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ is only possible when *-(y)Ip*P originates high enough for matrix T to agree with $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ first, guaranteeing the same Case for $Subj_{FIN}$ and $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$. This also predicts the unexpected behavior of subjects in embedded *-(y)Ip* constructions, in (3), where $Subj_{-(y)Ip}$ receives genitive Case, like $Subj_{FIN}$.

3) Hasan*(-m) iş-e work-DAT gid-ip **Ali-nin** ev-e home-DAT dön-düğ-ün-ü POSS-ACC duy-du-m SG
'I heard that Hasan went to work and Ali returned home.'

Keywords: subject licensing, *-(y)Ip* constructions, Form Copy, Feature Sharing

References

Chomsky, N. (2021). Minimalism: Where are we now, and where can we hope to go. *Gengo Kenkyu, 160*, 1-41.

Göksel, A., & Öztürk, B. (2019). Conditions on prominent internal possessors in Turkish. In A. Bárány, O. Bond, & I. Nikolaeva (Eds.), *Prominent internal possessors* (pp. 163-195). Oxford University Press.

Kuram, K. (2015). *The organization of functional heads and tense aspect mood interpretation in Turkish* [Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University].

Pesetsky, D. & Torrego, E. (2007). The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of features. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian, & W. K. Wilkins (Eds.), *Phrasal and clausal architecture: Syntactic derivation and interpretation. In honor of Joseph E. Emonds* (pp. 262-294). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Platzack, C. (2003) Agreement and null subjects. In A. Dahl, K. Bentzen, & P. Svenonius. (Eds.). *19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguists Nordlyd 31.2* (pp. 255-326). Tromsø, Norway.