

## Investigating raising structures in Turkish

Metehan Oguz (University of Calgary)

**Issue** Even though the Turkish predicate *gibi görün* “seem” is analysed as a raising predicate, there is a disagreement on the optionality of the agreement on the embedded verb (1a), leading to conflicts on the theoretical analyses (Moore; 1998, Öztürk; 2008). This study extends the discussion to include cases like (1b), which have not been discussed in existing literature.

1a) [Sen <sub>i</sub> [t <sub>i</sub> kazan-mış-(sın)] gibi görünüyor-sun]	1b) [Ali [sen kazan-mış-sın] gibi görünüyor]
you      win-PAST-(2S) like seem-2S	Ali you win-PAST-2S like seem
“You seem to win.”	Lit.: “Ali seems like you won.”

Sentences like (1b) violate Theta Theory, if *gibi görün* “seem” in Turkish is analysed as a predicate that does not assign an external theta role. While the embedded subject gets its theta role from the embedded verb, the matrix subject is left without any theta role. This study reports (i) that sentences like (1b) are accepted by some Turkish speakers and propose (ii) that a Copy-Raising analysis suggested by Landau (2011) is observed in (1b), where the predicate can assign an external theta role, and (iii) more than one type of raising operation is observed in Turkish.

**Background** Öztürk (2008) suggests that the embedded subject raises to the matrix subject position leaving behind a trace like English *seem* sentences. The embedded agreement becomes optional and the subject obligatorily agrees with the matrix predicate *gibi görün* (as in (1a)). Moore (1998) suggests that only some Turkish speakers (his Dialect B) accept sentences with embedded agreement after raising happens and proposes that these speakers have an additional type of raising in their language. Moore (1998) suggests that raised embedded subject leaves a *pro* with phi features, which accounts for the embedded verb agreement while the raised subject accounts for the matrix verb agreement.

**Methodology and results** To avoid debates over grammaticality judgements, an experiment with a Contextual Felicity Task was conducted. Participants (n=48) saw 24 *gibi görün* sentences appearing after a context description and rated these sentences between 1 and 7 in terms of acceptability. The experiment had 2 independent variables, *Main Subject* (3 levels: null, overt matching (like 1a), overt different (like 1b)) and *Embedded Verb Agreement* (2 levels: present (like 1b), or absent), leading to 6 different types of *gibi görün* sentences. The results indicate that sentences like (1b) are strongly accepted by some speakers, while strongly rejected by others (claim i). Also, (1a) sentences with embedded agreement are accepted by only some speakers.

**Discussion** Landau (2011) suggests that *seem* in English can assign an external “p-source” theta role in existence of preposition *like* in *seems like* sentences when the matrix subject is the perceptual source for the embedded action. To account for sentences like (1b), we adopt this suggestion and propose that Landau’s (2011) Copy-Raising is observed with some speakers of Turkish, pointing out that *gibi* “like” is obligatory in Turkish *gibi görün* (claim ii). Sentences like (1a) are problematic for this claim as *gibi* would be expected to block raising of the embedded subject. Strong acceptance of sentences like (1a) without the embedded agreement suggests that *gibi görün* is lexicalized for most speakers, while some speakers can decompose the predicate and access *gibi* “like”, which allows the main subject in (1b) to get the p-source theta role. (1a) and (1b) show different binding properties, the former allows binding into the embedded clause while the latter blocks it, which suggests that their embedded clauses are different. This supports the suggestion that *gibi görün* in (1a) is lexicalized. These findings show that there are at least

two varieties of raising operations in Turkish, standard raising with lexicalized *gibi görün* (Öztürk, 2008), and Copy-Raising of Landau (2011), using decomposition (claim iii).

## References

- Landau, Idan. 2011. Predication vs. aboutness in copy raising. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, Vol. 29, pp. 779-813
- Moore, John. 1998. 'Turkish Copy-Raising and A-Chain Locality', *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 149-189.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2008. 'Non-Configurationality: Free Word Order and Argument Drop in Turkish', *Linguistics Today*, Vol. 132, pp. 411-440.