

## What Turkish conditionals can teach us about the question particle\*

Sabine Laszakovits

University of Connecticut, Storrs

### 1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with an asymmetry between two instantiations of the defective copula verb *i-* in Modern Turkish: the past form *i-di* and the conditional form *i-se*. The suffixes *-di* and *-se* attach to *i-* as to any other verbal stem, and they also take the same pronominal suffixes, cf. (1) and (2).

- |     |    |            |            |           |     |    |              |                    |           |
|-----|----|------------|------------|-----------|-----|----|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
| (1) | a. | <i>i</i>   | <i>-di</i> | <i>-k</i> | (2) | a. | <i>i</i>     | <i>-se</i>         | <i>-k</i> |
|     |    | COP        | -PST       | -1PL      |     |    | COP          | -COND <sup>1</sup> | -1PL      |
|     |    | “we were”  |            |           |     |    | “if we were” |                    |           |
|     | b. | <i>gel</i> | <i>-di</i> | <i>-k</i> |     | b. | <i>gel</i>   | <i>-se</i>         | <i>-k</i> |
|     |    | come       | -PST       | -1PL      |     |    | come         | -COND              | -1PL      |
|     |    | “we came”  |            |           |     |    | “if we came” |                    |           |

They furthermore share the property that they like to attach to their host as clitics, in which case the initial [i] disappears after consonants, (3b), but remains visible as [j] after vowels, (4b).

- |     |    |                 |             |            |           |    |                |                 |            |           |
|-----|----|-----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|----|----------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| (3) | a. | <i>yorgun i</i> | <i>-di</i>  | <i>-m</i>  | (4)       | a. | <i>hasta i</i> | <i>-di</i>      | <i>-m</i>  |           |
|     |    | tired           | COP         | -PST       | -1SG      |    | sick           | COP             | -PST       | -1SG      |
|     | b. | <i>yorgun</i>   | $\emptyset$ | <i>-du</i> | <i>-m</i> |    | b.             | <i>hasta -y</i> | <i>-di</i> | <i>-m</i> |
|     |    | tired           | -COP        | -PST       | -1SG      |    | sick           | -COP            | -PST       | -1SG      |
|     |    | “I was tired”   |             |            |           |    | “I was sick”   |                 |            |           |

---

\*I thank my informants for their valuable judgments and patience; Kadir Gökgöz, Susi Wurmbrand, and the audiences of TU+1 at UMass and a LingLunch at UConn for their feedback and comments; and Deniz and Faruk for their commitment and excellent organization of this workshop.

<sup>1</sup>See Iatridou (2013) for arguments that *-sA* is not a conditional suffix but a correlative. I will gloss it as COND for simplicity and because I am not concerned about its semantics.

When  $-DI^2$  and  $-sA$  attach to the verb stem, they seem to take the same morphological slot as participial tense/aspect/mood (TAM) suffixes, such as  $-Iyor$  PROG,  $-(y)AcAG$  FUT,  $-(I/A)r$  AOR,  $-mİş$  PERF, a.o. (Göksel & Kerslake's (2005, §8.2.3) position 3). As TAM suffixes, they cannot be separated from the verb stem by the polar question particle, (5), but as copular clitics, the question particle can intervene between V+TAM and  $i-di$ , (6a). Interestingly, this intervention is not possible when followed by  $i-se$ , (6b).

- (5) a. \**gel* -mi *-di* *-k*  
 come -Q -PST -1PL
- b. *gel* *-di* *-k* -mi  
 come -PST -1PL -Q  
 "Did we come?"
- (6) a. *gel* *-ecek* -mi *-y* -di *-k*  
 come -FUT -Q -COP -PST -1PL  
 "Were we going to come?"
- b. \**gel* *-ecek* -mi *-y* -se *-k*  
 come -FUT -Q -COP -COND -1PL

One might think that the reason for the unacceptability of (6) is that conditionals are islands and do not allow embedding of question elements. However, this is easily shown to not be the right analysis. In (7), a conditional clause contains a wh-word, and in (8),  $-mI$  is inside a conditional but attaches to a different host.

- (7) *Ali* [*Merve* NE *oku* *-r*  $-\emptyset$  -sa ] *mutlu ol* *-acak*?  
 A M what read -AOR -COP -COND happy be -FUT  
 "What is such that Ali will be happy if Merve reads it?"
- (8) [ *BU KİTAB* *-ı* -mi *oku* *-r*  $-\emptyset$  -sa *-m* ] *mutlu ol* *-acak* *-sın*?  
 this book -ACC -Q read -AOR -COP -COND -1SG happy be -FUT -2SG  
 "Is it this book that you will be happy if I read it?"<sup>3</sup>

This paper is structured as follows: In section 2, I will present evidence for a movement analysis of the question particle  $-mI$ , according to which  $-mI$  can only attach to constituents that can independently undergo syntactic movement. In section 3, I use this movement test to account for (6b), whereby I try to account for a substantial amount of speaker variation. I will weaken the claims made in section 2 for certain properties of the verbal complex.

<sup>2</sup>Capital letters indicate phonological variation: A=[a], [ɛ] or [e], D=[d] or [t], G=[j] ⟨ğ⟩, [ɣ] ⟨ğ⟩ or [k], I=[i], [ɯ] ⟨ı⟩, [u] or [y] ⟨ü⟩. Sounds in brackets indicate insertion/deletion in order to avoid hiatuses. All other transcriptions follow Turkish orthography, except that I will treat the question particle  $-mI$  as a suffix because it forms a prosodic unit with its host, rather than as a separate word as in standard orthography.

<sup>3</sup>I use clefts in the translation to disambiguate which constituent is being questioned, rather than adding prosodic information to the English translation. I do not mean to imply that  $-mI$ -questions are syntactically underlying clefts.

Section 4 concludes. In section 5, I briefly present two further differences between *i-di* and *i-se*, but leave their analysis open for future work.

## 2. The diagnostic: *-mI* as a trigger for movement

*-mI* can be roughly described as attaching to the constituent whose focus alternatives it introduces (Kamali 2015). In (9a), it attaches to the subject, in (9b) to a direct object, and in (9c) to an adjunct.

- (9) a. *Ali* -mi *dün* *yemek yap* *-tı?*  
 A -Q yesterday dinner make -PST  
 “Was it Ali who made dinner yesterday?”  
 Focus alternatives: {Ali, Markus, Merve, ... }
- b. *Feyza Derya* *-yı* -mI *öp* *-tü.*  
 F D -ACC kiss -PST  
 “Was is Derya who Feyza kissed?”  
 Focus alternatives: {Derya, Ömer, Ahmet, ... }
- c. *Ali* *dün* -mü *yemek yap* *-tı?*  
 A yesterday -Q dinner make -PST  
 “Was it yesterday that Ali made dinner?”  
 Focus alternatives: {yesterday, today, last monday, ... }

Apart from subjects and adjuncts, possible hosts for *-mI* include predicates (10a), possessors (10b), and for some speakers numerals (10c).

- (10) a. *Ali hasta* -mI?  
 A sick -Q  
 “Is Ali sick?”
- b. *Emre* [ *Ali* *-nin* -mI *araba* *-sın* *-ı* ] *al* *-dı?*  
 E A -GEN -Q car -3SG -ACC buy -PST  
 “Was it Ali whose car Emre bought?”
- c. *%Emre* [ *üç* -mü *araba* ] *al* *-dı?*  
 E three -Q car buy -PST  
 “Is three how many cars Emre bought?”

However, *-mI* cannot directly attach to demonstratives (11a), attributive adjectives (11b), and complements of postpositions (11c).

- (11) a. \**Emre* [ *bu* -mu *araba* *-yı* ] *al* *-dı?*  
 E this -Q car -ACC buy -PST  
 intended: “Was it THIS car that Emre bought?”
- b. \**Emre* [ *beyaz* -mI *araba* *-yı* ] *al* *-dı?*  
 E white -Q car -ACC buy -PST  
 intended: “Was white the color that Emre bought a car of?”

- c. \**Emre* [ *Merve* -mi *için* ] *araba al -dı?*  
 E M -Q for car buy -PST  
 intended: “Was it Merve who Emre bought a car for?”

Instead, *-mI* has to attach distantly at a phrase that is able to host it, and must indicate its scope by prosodic means.

- (12) a. *Emre* [ *BU araba -y1* ] -mI *al -dı?*  
 E this car -ACC -Q buy -PST  
 b. *Emre* [ *BEYAZ araba -y1* ] -mI *al -dı?*  
 E white car -ACC -Q buy -PST  
 c. *Emre* [ *MERVE için* ] -mI *araba al -dı?*  
 E M for -Q car buy -PST

The observation is that those constituents that *-mI* cannot attach to are the same ones that are not able to undergo movement, while the constituents that *-mI* does attach to, can undergo movement. As an exemplification for syntactic movement to the left edge, I will use topicalization.

Topicalization is possible for subjects (13a), objects (13b), adverbials (13c), possessors (13d), and for some speakers numerals (13e). Crucially, the speakers who like topicalization for numerals are the same ones that allow *-mI* attaching to numerals. Topics are separated by a small pause from the rest of the clause, which is indicated by a comma.

- (13) a. *Ali, dün yemek yap -tı.*  
 A yesterday dinner make -PST  
 “Ali, he made dinner yesterday.”<sup>4</sup>  
 b. *Dün, Ali yemek yap -tı.*  
 yesterday A dinner make -PST  
 “Yesterday, Ali made dinner then.”  
 c. *Derya -y1, Feyza öp -tü.*  
 D -ACC F kiss -PST  
 “Derya, Feyza kissed her.”  
 d. *Ali -nin, Emre [ t araba -sın -ı ] al -dı.*  
 A -GEN E car -3SG -ACC buy -PST  
 “Ali, Emre bought his car.”  
 e. *%Üç, Emre [ t araba ] al -dı.*  
 three E car buy -PST  
 “Three, Emre bought this many cars.”

Topicalization is not possible for demonstratives (14a), attributive adjectives (14b), and the complements of postpositions (14c).

<sup>4</sup>I use hanging topics for the translation without meaning to imply that fronted topics in Turkish are hanging topics.

*What Turkish conditionals can teach us about the question particle*

- (14) a. \**Bu, Ali [ t araba -y1 ] al -dı.*  
           this A     car   -ACC buy -PST  
       b. \**Beyaz, Ali [ t araba -y1 ] al -dı.*  
           white A     car   -ACC buy -PST  
       c. \**Merve, Ali [ t için ] araba al -dı.*  
           M     A     for car buy -PST  
           intended: “Merve, Ali bought a car for her.”

I propose to interpret this correlation between hosting *-mI* and being able to topicalize as an underlying causal connection. See also Özyıldız (to appear) for a similar conclusion.

### 3. On lexical focus in conditionals

This section is concerned with the difference between *-DI* and *-sA* described in section 1: *-mI* can separate the copula from V+TAM, but *-sA* cannot. A minimal pair exemplifying this is repeated below:

- (15) *balğ -1 HAŞLA -r* *-mI* -y *-dı* -m =(6a)  
       fish -ACC boil -AOR -Q -COP -PST -1SG  
       “Is it boil what I would (do to) the fish?”

- (16) \**balğ -1 HAŞLA -r* *-mI* -y *-sa* -m =(6b)  
       fish -ACC boil -AOR -Q -COP -COND -1SG  
       int’d: “(So you don’t like fried fish, but) if I BOILED it, (would you eat it?)”

Given the flexibility of *-mI* to attach to the constituent that it modifies, one might expect (16) to be felicitous at least in those contexts where what is questioned is the lexical content of the verb. The intended meaning of (16) indicates that even then, (16) is unacceptable. Instead, *-mI* must attach distantly and indicate its scope by prosody, (17). This is parallel to the distant attachment seen with demonstratives, attributive adjectives, and complements of postpositions, (12).

- (17) *balğ -1 HAŞLA -r* -Ø *-sa* -m *-mI*  
       fish -ACC boil -AOR -COP -COND -1SG -Q  
       “Is it if I BOIL the fish that ...”

Some speakers accept another repair, namely replacing the defective copula *i-* with the non-defective copula *ol-* that also carries the meaning “become”. With *ol-*, *-mI* can attach below *-sA*, (18).

- (18) %*balğ -1 HAŞLA -r* *-mI* *ol* *-sa* -m  
       fish -ACC boil -AOR -Q COP -COND -1SG

The meanings of (18) and (17) are not completely identical. Using the auxiliary *ol-* with an aorist gives rise to a somewhat habitual reading (Ersen-Rasch 2012, §15.3). One consultant also describes an ‘ironic’ flavor.

In light-verb (LV) constructions, *-mI* can attach to the nominal part under a lexical focus interpretation instead of joining the verbal complex, (19).

- (19) *Ali Merve -yi DAVET -mi et -ti?*  
 A M -ACC invitation -Q do -PST  
 “Is it invite that Ali did Merve?”

This is not excluded in conditionals:

- (20) *Ali Merve -yi DAVET -mi ed -er -∅ -se*  
 A M -ACC invitation -Q do -AOR -COP -COND  
 “If it is invite that Ali does Merve, ...”

(18) and (20) are another indication that in principle *-mI* is not blocked in the scope of *-sA*, but that the impossibility of (6b) and (16) must be due to a combination of idiosyncracies of *-mI*, *-sA*, and *i-*.

Given the diagnostic established in section 2, we make clear predictions about topicalizations of V+TAM when *-mI* can attach directly to this complex, resp. about topicalizations of the nominal part of LVCs. Speakers pattern into (at least) two groups with respect to this prediction. What I will label ‘dialect A’ conforms to this prediction, cf. section 3.1. The majority of speakers that I have consulted, however, do not speak dialect A. I will label their grammar ‘dialect B’ and discuss properties of their *-mI* in section 3.2.<sup>5</sup>

### 3.1 Dialect A: *-mI* as a trigger for movement

Given that *-mI* can attach to V+TAM in (15), where it is followed by *i-di*, the diagnostic in section 2 predicts that V+TAM should be able to undergo topicalization. This is not perfectly acceptable, but not deemed unacceptable by speakers of dialect A.

- (21) *??oku -r, kitab -ı t i -di -m*  
 read -AOR book -ACC COP -PST -1SG

Given that *-mI* cannot attach to V+TAM in (16), where it is followed by *i-se*, we predict that V+TAM should not be able to undergo topicalization if it strands *i-se*. This is borne out for dialect A.

<sup>5</sup>My informants are 10 speakers of Turkish who have grown up in different areas of Turkey. Out of those 10, 2 were speakers of dialect A. I am not aware of any geographic or social factors that distinguish dialect A from dialect B. I have encountered much micro-variation in both dialects as indicated at various occasions throughout this paper. A detailed investigation about the extent of the variation and its factors remains to be undertaken.

*What Turkish conditionals can teach us about the question particle*

(22) \**oku -r, kitab -ı t i* -se *-m*  
 read -AOR book -ACC COP -COND -1SG

Replacing the copula *i-* with the copula *ol-* makes V+TAM topicalization better. Compare (23) with (22).

(23) ???*oku -r, kitab -ı t* ol -sa *-m*  
 read -AOR book -ACC COP -COND -1SG

Regarding LVCs, we predict that the nominal part should be able to undergo topicalization given that it can host *-mI*. For some speakers, this holds, but others reject this construction.

(24) %*davet, ablam Cihan -ı t et -ti*  
 invitation my.aunt C -ACC do -PST

Speakers who find (24) acceptable fall within our predictions. For those speakers of dialect A who don't, I propose to extend Kamali's (2011) account of *-mI* as a second-position clitic from VPs to Vs.

Kamali (2011) argues that *-mI* attaches to the constituent carrying the sentential main accent. In wide focus sentences, the main accent sits on the left-most element inside the VP, i.e. low adverbs and internal arguments, including subjects of unaccusatives, but not high adverbs or subjects of unergatives. When *-mI* modifies a VP, Kamali takes *mIP* to attract the left-most constituent inside the VP into its specifier position so that *-mI* becomes a second-position clitic seemingly inside the VP.

I propose to extend this second-position-cliticness to Vs, and I take LVCs to be complex V heads. Predicate focus in LVCs will then appear as *-mI* attaching to the nominal element, (25).

(25) *Ali Bahar -ı davet* -mi *et -ti?*  
 A B -ACC invitation -Q do -PST  
 "Is it invite that Ali did Bahar?"

This finds independent support from disambiguating the scope of predicate-final *-mI* in simplex Vs. (26), as reported by Kamali (2011, ex. (12)) has two readings, either predicate focus or verum focus.

(26) *Ali dün iskambil OYNA -DI -mı?*  
 A yesterday cards play -PST -Q  
 Predicate focus: "Did Ali PLAY this time?"  
 Verum focus: "Did Ali play cards yesterday, (as discussed before)?"

In LVCs we observe a different PF for predicate focus and verum focus. Predicate focus has *-mI* as a second-position clitic on V, thereby attaching to the nominal element as in (25).

Verum focus has *-mI* in a higher position (in the CP-domain, by assumption), thereby following the entire verbal complex. With simplex V, this is syncretic, but with complex V, we predict *-mI* to attach to the end of the verbal complex only. This is borne out, (27).

- (27) *Ali Bahar -i DAVET et -ti* -mi?  
 A B -ACC invitation do -PST -Q  
 Verum focus: “Did or didn’t Ali invite Bahar?”  
 #Predicate focus: “Is it invite that Ali did Bahar?”

Let’s return to example (20), repeated below as (28a). If *-mI* here does not attach to *davet* but to the complex V *davet et-*, we predict *davet ed-er* to be able to topicalize. Crucially, we predict it to be able to topicalize in contexts where simplex V cannot host *-mI* or topicalize, such as before *i-se*. This is borne out. In (28b), *davet ed-er* more or less successfully undergoes topicalization. (29) is the control with simplex V. (29a) shows that *-mI* cannot attach to simplex V, and (29b) that simplex V cannot undergo topicalization. (Recall that these data hold for a very small group of speakers, namely speakers of dialect A who do not allow topicalization of the nominal part of LVCs.)

- (28) a. *Ali Merve -yi DAVET* -mi *ed -er* -∅ -se = (20)  
 A M -ACC invitation -Q do -AOR -COP -COND  
 “If it is invite that Ali does Merve, ...”  
 b. ??[ *davet ed -er* ], *Ali Merve -yi t i -se*  
 invitation do -AOR A M -ACC COP -COND
- (29) a. *\*oku -r -mu -y -sa -m* = (6b)  
 read -AOR -Q -COP -COND -1SG  
 b. *\*oku -r, kitab -i t i -se -m* = (22)  
 read -AOR book -ACC COP -COND -1SG

Being unaware of further variation within dialect A, I hope to have thus shown that *-mI* does indeed only attach to elements that can move, but that when it attaches to VP and V, it is hosted by the first constituent inside the VP/V rather than by the entire phrase.

### 3.2 Dialect B: *-mI* as a second position clitic

Speakers of dialect B do not fulfill the prediction that V+TAM should be able to topicalize when it can host *-mI* — i.e., they accept (30a), but not (30b).

- (30) a. *kitab -i oku -r -mu -y -du -n* = (6a)  
 book -ACC read -AOR -Q -COP -PST -2SG  
 b. *\*oku -r, kitab -i t i -di -n* = (21)  
 read -AOR book -ACC COP -PST -2SG



What Turkish conditionals can teach us about the question particle

As established in section 1, there is a contrast between (30a) and (31), which only differ in the TAM suffix, *-DI* vs. *-sA*.

- (31) \**oku -r -mu -y* -sa *-n* = (6b)  
 read -AOR -Q -COP -COND -2SG

At this point, I have nothing further to say than to stipulate that *-DI* allows reordering of *-mI* to its left and that *-sA* doesn't — in Özyıldız's (to appear) framework, *i-di* allows movement of its complement but *i-se* doesn't. Interestingly, reduction of the copula to  $\emptyset/y$  also seems to play a role as (32) with the full copula *i-* does not allow this reordering.

- (32) \**oku -r -mu* i *-di -n*  
 read -AOR -Q COP -PST -2SG

Note that this seems to be consistent with *oku-r* not being able to topicalize in (30b) since it would have to strand *i-di*. However, (30b) would not be improved by stranding the cliticized copula *-y-di* instead, as shown in (33).

- (33) \**oku -r, kitab -ı t -y -di -n*  
 read -AOR book -ACC -COP -PST -2SG

Further evidence for the flexibility of *-mI* inside the verbal complex that is not connected to movement abilities of its host, comes from predicate focus under the ability suffix *-(y)Abil*. Historically, and cross-Turkically, *-(y)Abil* is a compound verb consisting of the converb *-(y)A* that still exists independently, and the main verb *bil-* “to know”. Turkish has lexicalized most of its other compound verbs, but *-(y)Abil* is to this day fully productive.

- (34) *oku -ya bil -ir -sin*  
 read -CONV know -AOR -2SG  
 “you can read”

Given this morphological split between *-(y)A* and *bil-*, we might expect this construction to also be an instance of complex V as discussed for dialect A. We then predict that *-mI* should be able to attach to only the first element under predicate focus. However, while *-mI* can appear in this position, it does not give rise to a predicate-focus reading. My informants describe (35) as ‘sarcastic’ and as expressing surprise at someone’s ability while mocking their previous inability. Note that in English, this context would be expressed in declarative form.

- (35) *oku -ya* -mI *bil -ir -sin*  
 read -CONV -Q know -AOR -2SG  
 “You can READ?” (I thought you only ever watched movies.)

But I will set aside sarcastic expressions and leave them for future research.

#### 4. Conclusions

In this paper, I have argued for a movement account of the polar question particle *-mI* resulting in that the constituent that it attaches to as an enclitic must be able to undergo movement. I tentatively assume that *mIP* is left-headed and that the hosting phrase needs to move to *Spec,mIP*, effectively making *-mI* a second-position clitic. This is an extension of Kamali (2011), who assumes this for predicate-focus questions, but not for narrow-focus questions targeting specific constituents other than VP, and of Özyıldız (to appear), who assumes a similar syntax of *-mI* in general but does not account for the attachment peculiarities of predicate focus.

I have furthermore used this account of *-mI* to explain an asymmetry between the two tense/aspect/mood (TAM) suffixes *-DI* (past tense) and *-sA*, which marks conditional clauses among other things. The asymmetry consists of *-mI* being able to attach below *-DI* in the verbal complex, but not below *-sA*. I have found that the speakers I consulted patterned into two major groups: group A fulfills the predictions made by this account alone, namely allowed other kinds of syntactic movement of the verbal complex that *-mI* attaches to. Group B did not allow this, but as I have argued, their grammar is compatible with a second-position clitic approach to *-mI*. An independent, currently unmotivated assumption is needed saying that *-sA* blocks the second-position cliticood of *-mI*.

#### 5. Appendix: More differences between *i-di* and *i-se*

Apart from the different behavior of *-mI* under *i-di* and *i-se* that was discussed in this paper, two other differences have come to my attention. I will briefly give the data here, but at this point I have no analysis to offer.

##### 5.1 No conditional of a conditional

The second asymmetry concerns double occurrences of *-DI* and *-sA* in a single verbal complex. If *-DI* attaches to the verbal stem, it can attach again as a copular clitic in order to form a past perfect, (36a). But *-sA* cannot attach to a verbal stem that already has *-sA* on it, (36b).

- (36) a. *gel -di -y -di -k*  
           come -PST -COP -PST -1PL  
           “we had come”
- b. \**gel -se -y -se -k*  
           come -COND -COP -COND -1PL

*-sA* can, however, attach to *-DI*, (37a), and *-DI* can attach to *-sA*, (37b).

*What Turkish conditionals can teach us about the question particle*

- (37) a. *gel -di -y -se -k*  
come -PST -COP -COND -1PL  
“if (as you imply) we have come”  
b. *gel -se -y -di -k*  
come -COND -COP -PST -1PL  
“if we had come” (counterfactual)

The same pattern is attested when the personal agreement attaches to the main verb instead of the copula:

- (38) a. *gel -di -k -∅ -ti*  
come -PST -1PL -COP -PST  
b. \**gel -se -k -∅ -se*  
come -COND -1PL -COP -COND
- (39) a. *gel -di -k -∅ -se*  
come -PST -1PL -COP -COND  
b. *gel -se -k -∅ -ti*  
come -COND -1PL -COP -PST

Grammarians report a slight difference in meaning between the two attachment sites of the agreement suffix: Ersen-Rasch (2012, p. 177, p. 209) reports that attachment to the main verb continues a previous discourse, while attachment to the copula does not. Göksel & Kerslake (2005, p. 88) also report these suffix ordering possibilities.

## 5.2 Double $\phi$ -agreement depending on *-mI*

A further difference between *-DI* and *-sA* has been reported to me by Kadir Gökgöz (p.c.) that I have not found discussed in the literature.

While the pronominal suffix can attach either to the main verb or to the auxiliary, it usually cannot attach to both at the same time. This is not unexpected. This pattern holds for the past perfect (40), and for the counterfactual (41).

- (40) a. *söyle -di ⟨-m⟩ -∅/y -di ⟨-m⟩*<sup>6</sup>  
say -PST -1SG -COP -PST -1SG  
b. \**söyle -di -m -∅ -di -m*  
say -PST -1SG -COP -PST -1SG
- (41) a. *söyle -se ⟨-m⟩ -∅/y -di ⟨-m⟩*  
say -COND -1SG -COP -PST -1SG

<sup>6</sup>Groups of angles brackets ⟨x⟩...⟨x⟩ indicate that the acceptability judgment applies if any single one of these occurrences is realized.

Laszakovits

- b. \*söyle -se -m -Ø -di -m  
 say -COND -1SG -COP -PST -1SG

However, under the realis past (42), double occurrence of  $\phi$ -agreement is not out for all speakers. ((43) is given for completeness but presumably ruled out by independent reasons as discussed above.)

- (42) a. söyle -di ⟨-m⟩ -Ø/y -se ⟨-m⟩  
 say -PST -1SG -COP -COND -1SG  
 b. %söyle -di -m -Ø -se -m  
 say -PST -1SG -COP -COND -1SG
- (43) a. \*söyle -se ⟨-m⟩ -Ø/y -se ⟨-m⟩  
 say -COND -1SG -COP -COND -1SG  
 b. \*söyle -se -m -Ø -se -m  
 say -COND -1SG -COP -COND -1SG

Returning to the past perfect and the counterfactual, we find a contrast between (40b) and (44) for the past perfect, and between (41b) and (45) for the counterfactual: insertion of *-mI* into the verbal complex seems to ameliorate double agreement.

- (44) a. \*söyle -di -m -Ø -di -m = (40b)  
 say -PST -1SG -COP -PST -1SG  
 b. ?söyle -di -m [-mi] -y -di -m  
 say -PST -1SG Q -COP -PST -1SG  
 “Had I said it?”
- (45) a. \*söyle -se -m -Ø -di -m = (41b)  
 say -COND -1SG -COP -PST -1SG  
 b. ?söyle -se -m [-mi] -y -di -m  
 say -COND -1SG -Q -COP -PST -1SG  
 “What if I said it?”

I leave open the question of whether and how these properties of *-mI*, *i-*, *-sA*, and *-DI* can be unified in more general terms.

Sabine Laszakovits  
 sabine.laszakovits@uconn.edu

## References

- Ersen-Rasch, Margarete. 2012. *Türkische Grammatik. Ausführlich und verständlich. Lernstufen A1 bis C2*. Harrassowitz.
- Göksel, Aslı, & Cecilia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish. A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge Comprehensive Grammars. Routledge.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 2013. Looking for free relatives in Turkish (and the unexpected places this leads to). In *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL8)*, ed. Umut Özge, number 67 in MITWPL, 129–152. MIT Press.
- Kamali, Beste. 2011. The question particle in Turkish: Consequences for the interfaces. In *WCCFL 28 Online Proceedings*, ed. Mary Byram Washburn, Sarah Ouwayda, Chuoying Ouyang, Bin Yin, Canan Ipek, Lisa Marston, & Aaron Walker. URL <https://sites.google.com/site/wccfl28pro/papers/kamali%202010.pdf>.
- Kamali, Beste. 2015. Clitic placement in Turkish yes/no questions: from pragmatics to morphosyntax. URL <https://www.academia.edu/14899076/>, ms, July 2015.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. Descriptive Grammars. Routledge.
- Özyıldız, Deniz. to appear. Move to mI, but only if you can. In *Proceedings of WAFL 11*.