

# Obviation Problem In Turkish



Utku Turk · UMD

utkukurk.com  
utkukurk@umd.edu

**BACKGROUND:** Hornstein and Martín's (2001) argues that obligatory disjoint reference is in complementary distribution to control.

- **Control sentences:** Subject of the matrix and the embedded sentence are **obligatorily coreferential**.

(1) Nik<sub>i</sub> [  $\emptyset$  /<sub>i/\*k</sub> / \*John joan] nahi dut.  
I.ERG go want 3ABS.3ERG  
"I want to go."

- **Non-control sentences:** Subject of the matrix and the embedded sentence are **obligatorily non-coreferential**.

(2) Nik<sub>i</sub> [  $\emptyset$  /<sub>\*i/k</sub> / hura /<sub>\*i/k</sub> joatea] nahi dut.  
I.ERG 3ABS go.NMLZ.DET.ABS want 3ABS.3ERG  
"I want somebody else to go."

**Analysis:** Syntax ignores morphology in the computation, so that (1) and (2) competes with the same enumeration as in (3).

(3) NUM = {Ni<sub>1</sub>, joan<sub>1</sub>, nahi<sub>1</sub>}

Move First results in (1), obligatory control. Not moving as in (2), needs to be rescued. Basque does this with a structural case, that license lexical DP Subjects.

**Essence:** Avoid Pronoun (Chomsky 1981) with economy principle.

**PUZZLE#1:** How to account for cross-linguistic variety without stipulating a mechanism for different ways of integrating lexical DP Subjects

**SPOILER:** Allow morphology to interact with syntactic computation, Do not leave everything to economy principle. OR...

## LONG-TERM GOAL: a theory of parameters for rescuing sentences that violate Move First.

**AKAN:** No difference between obviation and non-obviation cases.

**TASHELIYT:** Obviation and non-obviation cases are differentiated by different C<sup>0</sup>.

**ITALIAN:** Obviation and non-obviation cases are differentiated by MOOD and T<sup>0</sup>.

**BASQUE:** Obviation and non-obviation cases are differentiated by CASE.

**TURKISH:** Unlike Basque, where structural cases do the heavy work, Turkish obviation and non-obviation sentences both have structural case and different nominalizations.

**TURKISH<sub>finite</sub>:** Coreference is allowed with finite embedded sentences with optative mood marking.

	VP <sub>external</sub> >	(KP) >	(DP) >	[ CP >	TP >	MOODP >	AGRP >	VP <sub>internal</sub> ]
Akan	✗	N/A	N/A	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Basque	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Tasheliyt	✗	N/A	N/A	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
Italian	✗	N/A	N/A	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Turkish <sub>finite</sub>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
Turkish <sub>non-finite</sub>	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗

**TURKISH DATA** (i) provides new data point for obviation typography and (ii) challenges established nominal syntax theories.

(4) Arif<sub>i</sub> [  $\emptyset$  /<sub>i/\*k</sub> gel-me-k] iste-di. No Obviation/Control  
Arif come-INF-C<sup>0</sup> want-PST.3SG  
Intended: "Arif wanted to come."

(5) Arif<sub>i</sub> [  $\emptyset$  /<sub>i/\*k</sub> gel-me-[\*sin/k]-i] iste-di. No Obviation/Control  
Arif come-NMLZ-[\*3POSS/C<sup>0</sup>-ACC] want-PST.3SG  
Intended: "Arif wanted to come."

(6) Arif<sub>i</sub> [  $\emptyset$  /<sub>\*i/k</sub> gel-me-[\*sin/\*k]-i] iste-di. Obviation/Anti-Control  
Arif come-NMLZ-3POSS/\*C<sup>0</sup>-ACC want-PST.3SG  
Intended: "Arif wanted somebody else to come."

- Control sentences (4/5):
  - Obligatory coreference.
  - Optional case marking.
  - No possessive marking.
  - -K Marking
- Anti-control sentences (6):
  - Obligatory non-coreference.
  - Obligatory case marking.
  - Obligatory possessive marking.
  - No -K marking

Obviation and control is in complementary distribution as Hornstein and Martín's (2001) predicted. However, the parameter that allows licensed subjects is different: **person marking (AGRP)**. This challenges non-agreement possessive account of Öztürk & Taylan (2016).

**PUZZLE#2:** Öztürk & Taylan (2016) argues against agreement account of possessive marking.

Öztürk and Taylan (2016) argues that POSS "is a valency marker that signals introduction of an argument" in DPs. Even though they do not discuss embedded structures and nominalization strategies, it is extremely common to think GEN-POSS structures and sentential embeddings analogous.

Moreover, previously POSS was argued to be ambiguous between a compound marker and a person agreement (Göksel 2009).

> Obviation in Turkish points towards an agreement-based account of possessive marking, at least for nominalizations.

### SOLUTIONS:

- ditch economy, have lexically specified referentiality opaque barriers, aka go back in time and re-live LGB.
- ditch valency-analysis of nP and have two functionally distinct but form-wise ambiguous POSS markings

**Chomsky 1981.** Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa lectures.  
**Göksel 2009.** Compounds in Turkish. *Lingue e Linguaggio*.  
**Hornstein and Martín 2001.** Obviation as Anti-Control. *Anuario del Seminario de Filología Vasca "Julio de Urquijo"*.  
**Öztürk & Taylan 2016.** Possessive Constructions in Turkish. *Lingua*.

Data collected through in-person/virtual elicitation and email. Special thanks to Imane Bou-Saboun (Tasheliyt) and Nana Kwame (Akan).  
Poster template: Bryant and Satık. Forthcoming. *A Minimalist Account of Balinese Binding*. WCCFL 39.