

**Agreement patterns in the Turkish NP**  
Lefteris Paparounas and Faruk Akkuş, *University of Pennsylvania*

We describe and discuss the distribution of full and default agreement in Turkish embedded nominalized clauses, highlighting the difficulty that these facts pose for theories that collapse binding and agreement into a single operation. All data reported below reflect the authors' judgments and have been corroborated by 12 linguists and non-linguists.

**Observation 1: Default agreement** We focus on a class of DPs that trigger third-singular default agreement in nominalized embedded clauses. This class includes the inflected reflexive *kendi-* and the reciprocal *birbir-* (Kornfilt 2007); so-called 'partitive' NPs such as *ikimiz* 'the two of us' (Ince 2008); and the inflected pronoun *biz-ler* 'we-PL'. These DPs obligatorily trigger full agreement in matrix clauses (1). However, in nominalized embedded clauses, these DPs obligatorily trigger default third singular agreement on the nominalized verb (2). In this respect, they contrast with pronominal subjects, which trigger full agreement in both matrix and embedded clauses (3). These facts obtain not only in nominalized clauses, but also in possessive NPs (Özyıldız 2014).

- (1) a. *İkimiz araba-yi sev-iyor-* { *uz* / *\*Ø* }  
two.of.us car-ACC like-PROG- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS }  
'The two of us like the car.'
- b. *İkimiz gel-di-* { *k* / *\*Ø* }  
two.of.us come-PST- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS }  
'The two of us came.'
- (2) a. *Cocuk [ ikimiz-in gel-dig- { \*imiz / in } ]-i söyle-di.*  
child two.of.us-GEN come-NMLZ- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS } -ACC say-PST  
'The child said that the two of us came.'
- b. *Cocuk [ ikimiz-in kitab-i sev-dig- { \*imiz / in } ]-i söyle-di.*  
child two.of.us-GEN book-ACC like-NMLZ- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS } -ACC say-PST  
'The child said that the two of us like the book.'
- (3) a. *(Biz) gel-di-* { *k* / *\*Ø* }  
we come-PST- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS }  
'We came.'
- b. *Cocuk [ biz-im gel-dig- { imiz / \*in } ]-i söyle-di.*  
child we-GEN come-NMLZ- { 1PL.POSS / 3SG.POSS } -ACC say-PST  
'The child said that we came.'

**Observation 2: Object-conditioned agreement** We then investigate the role of internal arguments in determining the agreement found on nominalized verbs. In particular, we examine the agreement patterns found with full NP objects versus reciprocal objects. In matrix clauses, the type of internal argument does not change the agreement possibilities: in both (2b) and (4), full agreement on the verb is obligatory.

- (4) a. *İkimiz birbir-imiz-i sev-iyor-uz.*  
two.of.us each.other-1PL.POSS-ACC like-PROG-1PL  
'The two of us like each other.' [rec: 1PL, V: 1PL]
- b. *\*İkimiz birbir-imiz-i sev-iyor-Ø.*  
two.of.us each.other-1PL.POSS-ACC like-PROG-3SG  
'The two of us like each other.' \*[rec: 1PL, V: 3SG]
- c. *\*İkimiz birbir-in-i sev-iyor-Ø.*  
two.of.us each.other-3SG.POSS-ACC like-PROG-3SG  
'The two of us like each other.' \*[rec: 3SG, V: 3SG]
- d. *\*İkimiz birbir-in-i sev-iyor-uz.*  
two.of.us each.other-3SG.POSS-ACC like-PROG-1PL  
'The two of us like each other.' \*[rec: 3SG, V: 1PL]

But in nominalized clauses, the possibility of full agreement depends on whether the object is a full NP or a reciprocal. With full NP objects of nominalized clauses, full agreement is impossible (2b). However, a reciprocal object makes full agreement possible in a nominalized clause ((5) versus (4)). Interestingly, the possibility of default agreement on the nominalized verb is still available: both (5a) and (5b) are grammatical.

- (5) a. Onlar [ ikimiz-in birbir-imiz-i sev-dig-imiz ]-i söyledi-ler.  
 they two.of.us-GEN each.other-1PL.POSS-ACC like-NMLZ-1PL.POSS -ACC said-1PL  
 ‘They said that the two of us like each other.’ [rec: 1PL, V: 1PL]
- b. Onlar [ ikimiz-in birbir-imiz-i sev-dig-in ]-i söyledi-ler.  
 they two.of.us-GEN each.other-1PL.POSS-ACC like-NMLZ-3SG.POSS -ACC said-1PL  
 ‘They said that the two of us like each other.’ [rec: 1PL, V: 3SG]
- c. \* Onlar [ ikimiz-in birbir-in-i sev-dig-in ]-i söyledi-ler.  
 they two.of.us-GEN each.other-3SG.POSS-ACC like-NMLZ-3SG.POSS -ACC said-1PL  
 ‘They said that the two of us like each other.’ \*[rec: 3SG, V: 3SG]
- d. \* Onlar [ ikimiz-in birbir-in-i sev-dig-imiz ]-i söyledi-ler.  
 they two.of.us-GEN each.other-3SG.POSS-ACC like-NMLZ-1PL.POSS -ACC said-1PL  
 ‘They said that the two of us like each other.’ \*[rec: 3SG, V: 1PL]

Crucially, this observation holds for different types of internal arguments. For example, reciprocal objects of transitive (5), ditransitive and unaccusative predicates license full agreement on the nominalized verb. We illustrate unaccusatives in (6) (Turkish stative/dynamic unaccusatives can license applied arguments; see Tonyali 2015).

- (6) a. Öğretmen [ kura-da ikimiz-in birbir-imiz-e cik-tig-imiz ]-i söyle-di.  
 teacher draw-LOC two.of.us-GEN each.other-1PL.POSS-DAT appear-NMLZ-1PL.POSS  
 -ACC said-3SG  
 ‘The teacher said that the two of us matched with each other in the draw.’ [rec: 1PL, V: 1PL]
- b. Öğretmen [ kura-da ikimiz-in birbir-imiz-e cik-tig-in ]-i söyle-di.  
 teacher draw-LOC two.of.us-GEN each.other-1PL.POSS-DAT appear-NMLZ-3SG.POSS  
 -ACC said-3SG  
 ‘The teacher said that the two of us matched with each other in the draw.’ [rec: 1PL, V: 3SG]
- c. \* Öğretmen [ kura-da ikimiz-in birbir-in-e cik-tig-in ]-i söyle-di.  
 teacher draw-LOC two.of.us-GEN each.other-3SG.POSS-DAT appear-NMLZ-3SG.POSS  
 -ACC said-3SG  
 ‘The teacher said that the two of us matched with each other in the draw.’ \*[rec: 3SG, V: 3SG]
- d. \* Öğretmen [ kura-da ikimiz-in birbir-in-e cik-tig-imiz ]-i söyle-di.  
 teacher draw-LOC two.of.us-GEN each.other-3SG.POSS-DAT appear-NMLZ-1PL.POSS  
 -ACC said-3SG  
 ‘The teacher said that the two of us matched with each other in the draw.’ \*[rec: 3SG, V: 1PL]

Descriptively, it looks as if object reciprocals in nominalized clauses are able to transmit their features to the verb. We note that this pattern cannot be reduced to a surface-oriented effect of linear order. The agreement facts do not change if we scramble the reciprocal object out of the embedded clause; compare (5a) above with (7).

- (7) Birbir-imiz-<sub>i<sub>j</sub></sub> onlar [ ikimiz-in <sub>t<sub>j</sub></sub> sev-dig-imiz ]-i söyledi-ler.  
 each.other-1PL.POSS-ACC they two.of.us-GEN like-NMLZ-1PL.POSS -ACC said-1PL  
 ‘They said that the two of us like each other.’ [rec: 1PL, V: 1PL]

**Implications** The capacity of object reciprocals, but not full unbound NPs, to license full agreement on nominalized verbs speaks in favor of the postulation of two distinct dependencies. One operation, subject-verb agreement, results in default third-singular agreement; a separate operation of binding endows the reciprocal with the first-plural features of its antecedent. The mechanism that optionally transmits the features of the object reciprocal to the verb is parasitic to the binding operation. Unless binding is distinguished from agreement, it is unexpected that full agreement is present only with objects that need to be bound.

**Selected references** INCE, A. (2008), *On default agreement in Turkish*, ms, University of Maryland. KORNFILT, J. (2007), *Verbal and Nominalized Finite Clauses in Turkish*, in Nikolaeva, I. (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*. ÖZYILDIZ, D. (2014), *Not all possessors in Turkish are anti-subject oriented*, Proceedings of WAFL 10.