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1. Introduction: Turkish *ki*

   (1) Abim, [ki ödevini daima zamanında yapar], bu sefer geciktirmiş.
   ‘My brother, *ki* always does his homework on time, handed it in late.’ 
   
   (2) Adem, [ki en yakın arkadaşım], beni partiye davet etmedi.
   ‘Adem, *ki* my best friend, did not invite me to the party.’ 
   
   (3) [Adem sanıyor *ki*] Havva elmayı yedi.
   ‘Adem believes *ki* Havva ate the apple.’
   
   (4) O kadar güldük *ki*! ‘We laughed so much *ki*!’
   
   (5) [Güneş batmıştı *ki*] garip sesler duymaya başladık.
   ‘The sun had set *ki* we started to hear weird noises.’
   
   (6) Kemalnine *ki* okumadım.
   ‘I didn’t read the *ki* by Kemal.’

   We will focus on (1), (2) and (3).
   In (1) and (2), *ki* is pronounced as contained within the prosodic domain of the structure that follows it.
   o We call this **proclitic-ki**. (PK-clause, PK-XP)
   In (3), *ki* is pronounced as contained within the prosodic domain of the structure that precedes it.
   o We call this **enclitic-ki**. (EK-clause)

1.1. Background on Turkish

   - Turkish is a head-final language.
   - Subordination is derived via nominalizing the subordinated clause.
   - Matrix verb is always finite.

1.2. Prosody

   - Root clauses are parsed as Intonational Phrases (ι), which are right prominent
   - ιs are composed of Phonological Phrases (Φ), which are left prominent

   *Prominence is conveyed via phrasing:*
   The most prominent part of ι is called *nucleus*, and it is the head of the rightmost Φ (final-Φ)
   We call any pre-nuclear Φ, non-final-Φ.
   - There is one and only one nucleus in each ι.
   - Only syntactic XPs base-generated in root clause α can appear in the final-Φ of ια.
   - Verb must occur in the final-Φ of its ι.
   - Any prosodic excursion observed in post-nuclear area marks the start of a new ι.

   The ι of Turkish declarative root clauses with accentless ωs:

   ![Diagram](diagram.png)
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Road Map

2. PK-clauses = proclitic-ki as a coordinator
3. PK-XP s = PK-XP s as reduced PK-clauses (and a comparison to Germanic appositions)
4. Ek-clauses = enclitic-ki as a clausal adjunct head (and a comparison with Germanic I think)

2. PK-clauses: Introduction

1. Ki-clause:
Abi-m. [ki ödev-i-ni daima zaman-i-nda yap-ar], bu sefer geciktir-miş.
brother-1p ki homework-2POSS-ACC always time-POSS-LOC do-AOR this time delay-EVD
‘My brother, ki always does his homework on time, handed it in late.’

(7) Nom-clause:
[Ödev-i-ni daima zaman-i-nda yap-an] abi-m bu sefer geciktir-miş.
homework-2POSS-ACC always time-POSS-LOC do-NOM brother-1P this time delay-EVD
‘My always-on-time-homework,-doing brother handed it, in late.’
‘My brother, who always does his homework on time, handed it in late.’

Hypothesis #1: PK-clauses are the Indo-European (i.e. head initial) version of Nom-clauses
They are adjoined to NPs.
Proclitic-ki is an appositive relative pronoun.

(Vaughan 1709, Underhill 1976, Erguvanlı 1981, Lehmann 1984,

Hypothesis #1 seems unlikely

Ev #1: Head directionality
— Adjunction is left-branching in Turkish (Potts 2005:107)
— Nom-clauses branch leftwards
— PK-clauses branch rightwards

Ev #2: Linear adjacency
— Linear adjacency required between Nom-clause and its anchor.
— Linear adjacency not required between PK-clause and its anchor.

Mine-ACC married a man be-NOM Ali Mr. harassment make-PST
‘Married-man-being Mr. Ali harassed Mine.’


b) [Ali Bey] [ki evil bir adam-dir] Mine-yi taciz et-ti.
Ali Mr. ki married a man-COP Mine-ACC harassment make-PST
‘Mr. Ali, ki (he) is a married man, harassed Mine.’


Ev #3: Sentence level prosodic prominence
— Nom-clauses can be utilized as the nucleus or post-nucleus of the utterance’s 1
(like arguments, central adjuncts, VP-adverbs, etc.)
— PK-clauses make for unsuitable nuclei and post-nuclei.

(9) a) [ (Emine)NF-∅ (Havva-yi)NF-∅ (yanak-t-ndanNF_NOM enf-en çocuk-u gör-du)EVD ]

a’) [ (EmineNF Havva-yi yanağı-t-ndanNF_NOM enf-en çocuk-u gör-du)EVD ]
Emine Havva-ACC cheek-3S.POSS-ABL kiss-NOM kid-ACC see-PST

b) * [ (EmineNF çocuk-u)NF-∅ (ki Havva-yi)NF-∅ (yanak-t-ndanNF_NOM enf-tü gör-du)EVD ]

b’) * [ (EmineNF çocuk-u ki Havva-yi yanağı-t-ndanNF_NOM enf-tü gör-du)EVD ]
Ev#2: **our approach**

- PK-clauses are independent root clauses
- Proclitic-\( ki \) is a coordinator

2.1. PK-clauses as independent root clauses

**Ev#1:** PK-clauses may display independent illocutionary force

(10) Mine [\( ki \) kasaba-mm en iyi doktor-u-dur] hala bekar mı?
Mine \( ki \) town-GEN most good doctor-3S.POSS-COP still single Q
‘Is Mine – she is the best doctor in town – still single?’

**Ev#2:** PK-clauses may host speaker-oriented adverbs

Hasan \( ki \) unfortunately terrible food make-AOR we-ACC dinner-DAT invite make-PST
‘Hasan – unfortunately he cooks terribly – invited us to dinner.’

**Ev#3:** Scope of negation

Ali-GEN car-3S.POSS never be-NEG-EVD. window-3S.POSS broken-EVD
‘Ali has never had a car. (It’s) window was broken.’

b) # Ali-nin araba-sı [\( ki \) pencere-sı kırık-mış] hiç ol-ma-mış.
Ali-GEN car-3S.POSS \( ki \) window-3S.POSS broken-EVD never be-NEG-EVD
‘Ali has never had a car – (it’s) window was broken.’

Ali car-3S.POSS-GEN red-DAT colour-NOM-POSS-ACC think-PROG.
Araba-sı yeşil-e boyan-di.
car-3S.POSS green-DAT colour-PST
‘Ali thinks that his car has been painted red. His car has been painted green.’

‘Ali thinks that his car has been painted red – it has been painted green.’

**Interpretation for both a) and b):**
(i) John thinks that his car has been painted red but in reality it has been painted green.
(ii) * John thinks that his car has been painted red and John thinks that his car has been painted green.

2.2. The proclitic-\( ki \) as a coordinator

If PK-clauses are root clauses, what is proclitic-\( ki \)?
Is proclitic-ki a complementizer?
- No: Root clauses don’t display complementizers.

Is proclitic-ki the relative pronoun of an appositive relative clause?
- No: PK-clauses may reduplicate their anchor internal to the PK-clause – appositive relative clauses do not permit this:

(14) a) Ahmet [ki öğrenc-i-l*er o-nu çok sever-l*er] okul-dan attı-mış.
    Ahmet student-PL he-ACC very love-3PL school-ABL fired-EVD
    ‘Ahmet, ki the students love him very much, has been fired.’

b) * Ahmet, whom the students loved him, has been fired.

** Proclitic-ki is a coordinator **

Immediate (and rather trivial) support: regular coordinators in Turkish are pronounced as contained within the prosodic domain that follows them

(15) a) Ahmet ekmek al-di [ve Ali peynir al-di].
    Ahmet bread buy-PST and Ali cheese buy-PST
    ‘Ahmet bought bread and Ali bought cheese.’


The syntax of PK-clauses:

(16) Abi-m, [ki ödev-i-ni daima zaman-i-nda yap-ar], bu sefer geciktir-miş.
    brother-1P ki homework-2S.POSS-ACC always time-POSS-LOC do-AOR this time delay-EVD
    ‘My brother, ki always does his homework on time, handed it in late.’

(17) a) Before spell-out to LF

   b) After spell-out to LF

(17) accounts for all the properties of PK-clauses discussed so far:

(i) PK-clauses exceptionally follow their anchor
(ii) Linear adjacency between PK-clauses and their anchors is not required
(iii) PK-clauses cannot be utilized in the t-formation of their host
(iv) PK-clauses display speaker oriented adverbs, thus independent illocutionary force
(v) PK-clauses escape the scope of sentential negation and attitudinal verbs

(17) provides the possibility that proclitic-ki may coordinate phrases of other semantic types (such as entities and properties), as well as root clauses.

If this were true, we could extend the coordination approach in (17) to PK-XPs and say that ki can coordinate subclausal constituents?

3. PK-XPs

(18) Adem, [ki en yakın arkadaşım], beni partiye davet etmedi.
    ‘Adem, ki my best friend, did not invite me to the party.’

---

1 The third person pronoun (o) is not a resumptive in (14a) – the only resumptive pronoun in Turkish is ‘kendisi’.
3.1. Pk-XPs vs. yani-XPs

Distribution of yani-XPs

(19) a) [Altügen, yani altı kenarlı şekil], Roma tanrı-sı Satürn-ü simgele-r. hexagon yani six sided shape Roma god-3S.POSS Saturn-ACC symbolize-AOR ‘A hexagon, yani a shape with six sides, symbolises the Roman god Saturn.’

b) [Büyük elma, yani New York], beş ilçe-den oluș-ur. big apple yani New York five borough-ABL consist.of-AOR ‘The Big Apple, yani New York, consists of five boroughs.’

- On the surface, like Pk-XPs, yani-XPs are subclausal constituents preceded by yani.
- Like Pk-XPs, yani is pronounced as part of the phonological phrase that contains the XP that follows it.
- Yani provides an identification (Heringa’s 2012) or reformulation (Rahi’s 2009) of the constituent it immediately linearly follows.
- Yani’s English equivalent is that is or namely.

The properties of yani

P#1: ☑ Yani-XPs and their anchors must be of same semantic type


c) * [[](4) Adem] yani [i4 komşu-m-dur], ban-a kek getir-di. Adem yani neighbour-1S.POSS-COP I-DAT cake bring-PST ‘Adem – yani (he) is my neighbour – brought me cake.’

P#2: ☑ Yani-XPs and their anchors must display the same Case (if arguments)

(21) Adem Havva-yı, yani kari-si-[m/*Ø], düğün-de öp-me-di. Adem Havva-ACC, yani wife-POSS-ACC wedding-LOC kiss-NEG-PST ‘Adem did not kiss Havva, yani his wife, at the wedding.’

P#3: ☑ A yani-XP and its anchor must maintain linear adjacency.

(22) * Demir Leydi bu yıl yani Thatcher aramız-dan ayrıldı. Iron Lady this year yani Thatcher among.us-ABL depart-PST ‘The Iron Lady, yani Thatcher, this year departed from among us.’ (intended)

P#4: ☑ yani-XPs cannot host speaker-oriented adverbs.

(23) * Adem Havva-yı, yani maalesef kari-si-ni, düğün-de öp-me-di. Adem Havva-ACC yani unfortunately wife-POSS-ACC wedding-LOC kiss-NEG-PST ‘Adem did not kiss Havva, yani unfortunately his wife, at the wedding.’
3.2. The syntax of *yani* as a coordinator

(24)  
\[ \text{Havva, } \text{*yani* karı-m, ABBA dinle-r.} \]  
\[ \text{Havva, } \text{*yani* wife-POSSESS ABBA listen-AOR} \]  
\[ \text{‘Havva, } \text{*yani* my wife, listens to ABBA.’} \]

Advantages of (24):
- accounts for why *yani* is pronounced as part of the prosodic domain of the XP that follows it
- accounts for (20): Law of Coordination of Likes
- accounts for (21): conjuncts typically receive the same Case
- accounts for (22): adjacency is a typical requirement of coordination
- accounts for (23): no independent force = not a root clause

What about proclitic-*ki*?

- If proclitic-*ki* could coordinate subclausal constituents (and hence display the syntax in (24)), we would expect PK-XPs to display similar properties to *yani*-XPs. They do not.

**Ev #1:**
- Unlike *yani*-XPs, PK-XPs and their anchors need not be of the same semantic type

(25)  
\[ ([e] Adem) \text{ ki [e,0 sarhoş]} ev-e gel-me-yecek. \]  
\[ \text{Adem ki} \text{ drunk home-DAT come-NEG-FUT} \]  
\[ \text{‘Adem – ki drunk – will not come home.’} \]

**Ev #2:**
- Unlike *yani*-XPs, PK-XPs need not display the same Case
  - If the PK-XP is not assigned lexical or inherent Case, it must be assigned NOM Case.

(26)  
a)  
\[ \text{Adem [Havva-yı, ki karı-si-[Ø/*ni]], düğün-de öp-me-di.} \]  
\[ \text{Adem Havva-ACC ki wife-POSSESS-[NOM/*ACC] wedding-LOC kiss-NEG-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Adem did not kiss Havva, } \text{ki his wife, at the wedding.’} \]

b)  
\[ \text{Adem [bu saat-i, ki Tiffany’s-deni], karı-sı-na al-di.} \]  
\[ \text{Adem this watch-ACC ki Tiffany’s-ABL wife-POSSESS-DAT buy-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Adem bought this watch, } \text{ki from Tiffany’s, for his wife.’} \]

**Ev #3:**
- Unlike *yani*-XPs, linear adjacency need not be maintained between a PK-XP and its anchor

(27)  
a)  
\[ \text{Adem Bey, [ki evili bir adam], Havva-yı taciz et-ti.} \]  
\[ \text{Adem Mr. } \text{ki married a man Havva-ACC harassment make-PST} \]

b)  
\[ \text{Adem Bey Havva-yı, [ki evili bir adam], taciz et-ti.} \]  
\[ \text{Adem Mr. Havva-ACC ki married a man harassment make-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Mr. Adem, } \text{ki a married man, harassed Havva.} \]

**Ev #4:**
- Unlike *yani*-XPs, PK-XPs may host speaker-oriented adverbs

(28)  
\[ \text{Adem Bey [ki maalesef evili bir adam], Havva-yı taciz et-ti.} \]  
\[ \text{Adem Mr. } \text{ki unfortunately married a man Havva-ACC harassment make-PST} \]  
\[ \text{‘Mr. Adem, } \text{ki unfortunately a married man, sexually harassed Havva.’} \]
Advantages of (31):

- accounts for why PK-XPs and their anchors may be of dissimilar semantic types
- explains why linear adjacency need not be maintained
- explains why PK-XPs always display NOM Case
- explains ability of PK-XPs to host speaker-oriented adverbs
- accounts for the dissimilarity in prosodic distribution between yani-XPs and PK-XPs
- unifies both proclitic-ki forms in one syntactic representation
3.3. Pk-XP, yani-XP, and Germanic appositions

(i) Identificational: alternative description of their anchor

(ii) Attributive: denote the set of which their anchor is a member

(iii) Predicative: ascribe a stage-level property to their anchor

(32a) a) Jo drew an icosahedron, {Ø/namely/that is} a shape with twenty faces, in her maths class.
   b) Tim’s bike, Ø a racer, was stolen from outside his house last week.
   c) Donna’s idiotic boyfriend, Ø steaming drunk, fell asleep on the doorstep

Identificational appositions share a number of properties with yani-XPs

Ev#1: ☑ Case-marking

(33) Ich habe eben mit Herrn Müller, {unserem / * unseren} Chef, gesprochen.
I have just with Mr.-DAT Müller our-DAT our-ACC manager spoken
‘I just spoke to Mr. Müller, our manager.’

Ev#2: ☑ Law of Coordination of Likes

(34) * [(_e) John], namely [(_e,t) drunk], fell asleep on the doorstep.

Ev#3: ☑ Linear adjacency

(35) * A planet has, Saturn, entered the constellation of Libra.

Ev#4: ☑ Speaker-oriented adverbs

(36) * My guitar instructor, namely (fortunately) Jimmy Paige (fortunately), taught me my scales.

• The evidence suggests that identificational appositions, like yani-XPs, are directly coordinated with their anchor

(37) The
   president
   namely Obama
   &
   smokes Marlboro Reds
   &P
   VP
   TP
   CP

Attributive and predicational appositions share a number of properties with PK-XPs

Ev#1: ☑ Case-marking

(38) a) Man pflichtete dem jungen Atomphysiker, {Student / * Studenten} one agreed the-DAT young nuclear.physicist student-NOM student-DAT
    an einer Renommieruniversität, begeistert bei.
    at a renowned.university enthusiastically with
    ‘They enthusiastically agreed with the young nuclear physicist, a student at a renowned university.’

Ev#2: ☑ Speaker-oriented adverbs

(39) My instructor, (fortunately) the guitarist from Led Zeppelin (fortunately), taught me my scales.

Dissimilarity: attributive/predicative appositions & linear adjacency

• Unlike PK-XPs, attributive and predicative appositions, in Germanic, must appear linearly adjacent to their anchor.

(40) a) Tim’s bike, Ø a racer, was stolen from outside his house last week.
    a’) * Tim’s bike was stolen, Ø a racer, from outside his house last week.
   b) Donna’s boyfriend, Ø a witty bloke, works for the Home Office.
   b’) * Donna’s boyfriend works, Ø a witty bloke, for the Home Office.
How should this discrepancy be accounted for?

Option #1:
(i) PK-XPs and attributive/predicative appositions display the same syntax
(ii) An extraneous restriction operative in Germanic but not in Turkish constrains movement to ensure that linear adjacency pertains between the anchor and the apposition

(41) a) Before spell-out to LF

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{PP} \\
\hline
\text{Donna’s BF} \\
\text{works for the Home office}
\end{aligned}
\]

(He is) a witty bloke

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Ø} \\
\text{CP} \\
\hline
\text{Donna’s BF} \\
\text{\textit{t}_1} \\
\text{\textit{(He is) a witty bloke}}
\end{aligned}
\]

b) After spell-out to LF

Q: What’s this extraneous constraint? Why does it hold in Germanic and not Turkish?

Option #2:
(i) Attributive and predicative appositions, in Germanic, are underlyingly relativized copula clauses (i.e. DPs)
(ii) They coordinate directly with the anchor (thus satisfying the LoCoL)

(42)

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Ø} \\
\text{VP} \\
\hline
\text{Donna’s BF} \\
\text{\textit{(he who is) a witty bloke}}
\end{aligned}
\]

Q: Why is the high coordination option, which is available (and utilized) in Turkish, unavailable in Germanic?

3.3. Proclitic-\textit{ki} and \textit{yani}: semantics

- Like PK-clauses (see (12) and (13) above), \textit{yani}-XPs display scopelessness

(43) # Ali-nin erkek kardeşi [\textit{yani Adem} hiç ol-ma-mış. \\
\text{Ali-GEN male brother-3S.POSS \textit{yani Adem} never be-NEG-EVD.} \\
\text{‘Ali has never had a brother, \textit{yani Adem}.’}

\text{Ali Adem-GEN [New York-LOC \textit{yani Big Apple-LOC]} live-NOM-POSS-ACC think-PROG.} \\
\text{‘Ali thinks that Adem lives in New York, \textit{yani the Big Apple}.’}

- The same ‘scopelessness’ is observed with appositives of all types (i.e. identificational, attributive and predicative) in Germanic.

(for recent accounts, see Potts 2005, De Vries 2007, Arnold 2007)

- If \textit{yani}-XPs and Germanic appositions (assuming (42)) are coordinated at the subclausal level, how can scopelessness be accounted for?
**Possible method:** Arnold (2007)

(45) John, thinks a bloke, who I hate will win.  

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
J \\
\hline
John(j) & B \\
\hline
\text{thinks(j,} & \text{bloke(b)} \\
\text{I-hate(b)} & \text{will-win(b)} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

*Regular restrictive relative*

(46) John, thinks Pete, (a bloke) who I hate, will win.  

\[
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
j \ p \ b \\
\hline
John(j) & \text{bloke(b)} \\
\text{Pete(p)} & \text{thinks(j,} \\
\text{I-hate(b)} & \text{will-win(b)} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\(b = p\)

*Appositive relative clause*

- Arnold himself does not provide a syntactic trigger for this ‘top-boxing’ of appositive material
- We could provide one; and suggest that (in Turkish) yani’s lexical semantics triggers ‘top-boxing’ of its complement

**However:** ‘top-boxing’ is a general mechanism: it’s what happens when DRSs are updated

(47) John thinks Lucy will lose. He hates her.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
J & x \ y \\
\hline
John(j) & \text{hate}(x, y) \\
\hline
\end{array} \quad \sim \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
j \ l \ x \ y & \text{UPDATE} \\
\hline\text{thinks(j,}} & \text{will-lose(l)} \\
\text{hate(x, y)} & \text{\text{\(j = y\)}} \\
\text{\text{\(l = x\)}} & \text{\text{\(l = x\)}} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

- Instead of ‘top-boxing’ being *triggered*, one might say that ‘top-boxing’ is the by-product of the fact that the complement of yani is represented in the syntax as an XP that demands its own DRS.

What XPs require their own DRSs? = *inter alia*, syntactically *undominated* XPs.

**De Vries (2012)**

- De Vries adds a new MERGE operation to structure-building primitives. This is *par-Merge*.
- The output of *par-Merge* does not syntactically dominate its input.
- *Par-Merge* is permitted only when one of the inputs for *par-Merge* is the functional head *Par*.
- *Par-Merge* can be bivalent or monovalent.
- When *par-Merge* is bivalent, *Par* is a *coordinator*. 
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(48)  
\[ 
\text{CP}_{\text{host}}  
\downarrow  
\text{TP}  
\downarrow  
\text{ParP}  
\text{drives}  
\downarrow  
\text{DP}_{\text{par0}}  
\text{a bus}  
\text{John}  
\leftarrow  
\text{Par}^{-}  
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{my neighbour} \\
\end{array}  
\]

- par-Merge is clearly required for *yani*-XPs, but what about PK-XP/clauses, where scopelessness is provided by high-coordination?
- Do we need to say that proclitic-*ki* and its complement par-Merge too?

**Regular coordination and PK-clause constructions do NOT pattern alike**

(49)  
a) Ali [**ki** iyi bir koca-**dir**] her gün eş-i için kahvaltı hazırla-r.  
Ali [**ki** good a husband-COP] every day wife-ACC for breakfast prepare-AOR  
‘Ali – he is a good husband – makes breakfast for his wife every day.’

b) *Iyi bir koca [**ki** Ali] her gün eş-i için kahvaltı hazırlar.*

(50) PK-clauses (revised from (17))

\[ 
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{CP}  
\downarrow  
\text{TP}  
\downarrow  
\text{VP}  
\end{array}  
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{Abim}  
\text{ödevini daima zamanında yapar}  
\text{bu sefer geciktirmiş}  
\text{yapar}  
\end{array}  
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{Abim}  
\text{ödevini daima zamanında yapar}  
\text{t1 geciktirmiş}  
\text{yapar}  
\end{array}  
\]

\[ 
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{CP}  
\downarrow  
\text{TP}  
\downarrow  
\text{VP}  
\end{array}  
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{Abim}  
\text{ödevini daima zamanında yapar}  
\text{bu sefer geciktirmiş}  
\text{yapar}  
\end{array}  
\begin{array}{c} 
\text{Abim}  
\text{ödevini daima zamanında yapar}  
\text{t1 geciktirmiş}  
\text{yapar}  
\end{array}  
\]  

**NB:** something similar might be required for the so-called ‘plot-advancing’ *and*:

(i) John cheated on Lucy(.) and that’s not very nice.
(ii) *That’s not very nice(.) and John cheated on Lucy.*

3.4. **PK-clauses (reduced or not): summary**

- Proclitic-*ki* is not a relative pronoun: it’s a **coordinator**
- Proclitic-*ki* only coordinates clauses
- Coordination with proclitic-*ki* is **specificational**; it’s an asymmetric coordination that treats its conjuncts as separate utterances in the discourse (and not as coordinated propositions that comprise a single utterance).
- Proclitic-*ki* and its complement are *par*-Merged.
- PK-XPs are the Turkish equivalent of Germanic predicative and attributive appositives. Thus, the presence of proclitic-*ki* provides indirect evidence for De Vries’ (2006, 2012) idea that:
  (i) Appositions and their anchors are coordinated
  (ii) This coordination is *specificational* (i.e. it involves *par*-Merge)

**Conclusion being hinted at:**

- Proclitic-*ki* is the morphological realization of De Vries’ *Par*\(^0\) in Turkish.

**Looking ahead…**

- “*Par*\(^0\) is bivalent or monovalent” (De Vries, 2009)
- Proclitic-*ki* is bivalent = it selects for a complement and a specifier.
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(51) a) Bivalent Par°

```
...[\gamma
Par°

^ _ _ _ _ _ _

ParP YP

Anchor
```

b) Monovalent Par°

```
...[\gamma
Par°

^ ^ ^ ^ ^ ^

ParP XP

```

Prediction: There is also a monovalent form of Par° in Turkish.
Our claim: this is the enclitic-ki of EK-clauses.

4. EK-clauses

➤ Ki is pronounced as contained within the prosodic domain the precedes it: enclitic-ki

(52) [Hasan san-iyor ki], Ahmet okul-a git-ti.

Hasan believe-PROG ki Ahmet school-DAT go-PST

‘Hasan believes ki Ahmet went to school.’

4.1. EK-clauses as subordination

Hypothesis #1: Enclitic-ki is an Indo-European style complementizer
The finite clause that follows ki in (52) is subordinated.

Hypothesis #1 is unlikely to be correct

Ev#1: \( \neg \) quantifier binding

(53) a) Herkes\( _i \) [pro\( _{h_t} \) geç gel-eceğ-in]-i söyle-di.\(^2\)

Everyone pro late come-FUT.NOM-POSS-ACC say-PST

‘Everyone said that (they\( _{ki} \)) will be late.’

b) [Herkes\( _i \) dedi ki] [o/pro\( _{1,2} \) geç gel-ecek everyone, said ki he/pro late come-FUT
everyone said ki (they\( _{1,2} \)) will be late.’

Ev#2: \( \neg \) scope of wh-phrases

(54) a) Ahmet-in [kim-i öp-tüğ-ü-n]-ü san-iyor-sun?

Ahmet-GEN who-ACC kiss-NOM-POSS-ACC believe-PROG-2S

‘Whom\( _i \) do you believe Ahmet kissed \( t_i \)?’

b) *[San-iyor-sun ki] Ahmet kim-i öp-tü?

believe-PROG-2S ki Ahmet who-ACC kiss-PST

‘Whom\( _i \) do you believe \( ki \) Ahmet kissed \( t_i \)?’ (intended)

Ev#3: \( \neg \) Exceptional Case Marking


Merve-NOM I-NOM/ACC plaj-DAT go-PST-1S believe-PROG

‘Merve believes that I went to the beach.’

b) *[Merve san-iyor ki] ben-ö/i plaj-a git-ti-m.

Merve believe-PROG ki I-NOM/ACC plaj-DAT go-PST-1S

‘Merve believes \( ki \) I went to the beach.’

Ev#4: \( \neg \) finiteness

(56) a) Hasan Ahmet-in okul-a git-tığ-i-ni san-iyor.

Hasan Ahmet-GEN school-DAT go-NOM-POSS-ACC believe-PROG

‘Hasan believes that Ahmet went to school.’

---

\(^2\) Only pro or the reflexive kendî can be bound by universal quantifiers in Turkish.
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b) Hasan san-yor *ki* Ahmet okul-a git-ti.  
Hasan believe-PROG *ki* Ahmet school-DAT go-PST 
‘Hasan believes *ki* Ahmet went to school.’

**Ev#5:** □ speaker-oriented adverbs

(57) a) * Ahmet-in maalesef okul-a git-ti-g-i-ni san-yor-um.  
Ahmet-GEN unfortunately school-DAT go-NOM-POSN-ACC believe-PROG-1SG 
‘I believe that Ahmet, unfortunately, went to school.’

b) San-yor-um *ki* Ahmet maalesef okul-a git-ti.  
believe-PROG-1SG *ki* Ahmet unfortunately school-DAT go-PST 
‘I believe *ki* Ahmet, unfortunately, went to school.’

**Ev#6:** □ No pitch excursion after the main verb (i.e. no other Φ-formation, the verb has to be in the final-Φ)

---

= *this suggests that the consequent clause is not prosodically dependent on *ki*-clause verb:*

4.2. Paratactic analyses

**Hypothesis #2:** Enclitic-*ki* as PK-clause coordinator (i.e. bivalent *Par*) (cf. Kesici 2010)

(58)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Hasan Ø, samyör

---

Advantages of (58):

- Predicts the lack of quantifier binding, wh-scope, lack of ECM
- Predicts that the root clause properties of the consequence clause

**Requirement:** *samyör* ‘believes’ selects for a null object whose content is provided by the second conjunct.

**Hypothesis #2 is unlikely to be correct:**

**Reason #1:** □ discrepancy in interpretation

- PK-clauses: [At-issue assertion] *kí* [aside]  
- Ek-clauses: [aside] *kí* [At-issue assertion]

Under the *par*-Merge approach, the first conjunct cannot be undominated as it is not the complement of *kí*.

**Reason #2:** □ prosody

- Coordinators are usually parsed as contained within their second conjunct’s prosodic domain. But enclitic-*kí* is contained within its apparent first conjunct’s prosodic domain.

**Reason #3:** □ interpolating Ek-clauses

- Like PK-clauses, Ek-clauses can interpolate into their consequent clause
- An example like (59) is impossible to derive using movement, as it requires movement that target non-constituents.
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(59) Ali Ayşe-ACC [Hasan san-iyor *ki* nazikçe öp-tü.
Ali Ayşe-ACC Hasan believe-PROG *ki* gently kiss-PST
‘Ali, Hasan believes, kissed Ayşe gently.’

**Our proposal:** enclitic-*ki* is an instantiation of De Vries’ monovalent *Par* **

- Enclitic-*ki* and its complement *par*-Merge to create ‘*KiP*’
- *KiP* adjoins to any maximal projection of the host clause.

(60) a) TP

    Ali

    XP

    KiP

    CP

    Hasan Ø sanıyor *ki* nazikçe t₁ öptü

b) TP

    Ali

    XP

    KiP

    VP

    Hasan Ø sanıyor *ki* nazikçe t₁ öptü

Advantages of our proposal:

- Predicts the lack of quantifier binding, wh-scope, lack of ECM
- Predicts that the root clause properties of the consequence clause
- Accounts for why enclitic-*ki* is pronounced as contained within the prosodic domain of the clause that precedes it.
- Accounts for why enclitic-*ki* linearly follows its complements (i.e. head-finality)

(61) a) [(Ali)ₐ (Ayşe-yi)ₐ (nazikçe)ₐ öp-tü ise)ₐ], [Ayşe-nin hoş-u-na git-miş-tir].
Ali Ayşe-ACC gently kiss-PST CON Ayşe-GEN nice-POS-DAT go-EVD-COP
‘If Ali gently kissed Ayşe, then Ayşe must have liked it.’

b) [(Ali)ₐ (Ayşe-yi)ₐ (öp-me-den)ₐ önce)ₐ], [diş-i-ni firçala-dı].
Ali Ayşe-ACC kiss-NEG-ABL before tooth-POSS-ACC brush-PST
‘Ali brushed his teeth before he kissed Ayşe.’

4.3. The adjunction analysis of *EK*-clauses: further predictions

- No factive verbs permitted within the *EK*-clause
  Why? The host clause is an assertion, but the object of factive verbs must be presupposed
- No negation permitted within the *EK*-clause
  Why? The speaker shouldn’t be able to assert something he doesn’t think/believe/guess to be true

It’s more complicated than this…

- Constructions in which the *EK*-clause takes an initial or medial position have two possible interpretations: either *quotative* or *non-quotative*
On a quotative reading, (62) is acceptable (but pragmatically bizarre)
On a non-quotative reading (62) is unacceptable.


b) [Havva inan-m-iyor ki] Ali bir hırsız-dir. Havva believe-NEG-PROG ki Ali a thief-COP ‘Havva doesn’t believe ki Ali is a thief.’

Interestingly: if the EK-clause linearly follows its host, only a non-quotative reading is permitted

(We don’t yet have an explanation for this)

- Only first-person permitted
- Only present tense permitted

(63) a) Ali bir hırsız-dir, [{san-iyor-um/ * san-iyor-Ø} ki]. Ali a thief-COP believe-PROG-1S/ believe-PROG-3S ki ‘Ali is a thief, [I/ he] believe(s) ki.’


In constructions where the EK-clause follows its host, factive verbs and negation are completely unacceptable (person and tense does not change the unacceptable judgement).

(64) a) * Ali bir hırsız-dir, Havva inkar ed-iyor ki. Ali a thief-COP Havva deny make-PROG ki ‘Ali is a thief, Havva denies ki.’


4.4. EK-clauses and reduced parenthetical clauses

- EK-clauses are the Turkish equivalent to reduced parenthetical clauses (RPCs) in English

(65) a) John will, I think, be late.

b) John will be late, I think.

- Like EK-clauses, RPCs have a quotative and non-quotative reading:

(66) “I will,” I think (to myself), “be late.”

- Like EK-clauses, RPCs do not permit factive verbs or negation on a non-quotative reading:

(67) a) * John will, I [deny/regret], be late.

b) * John will, I don’t think, be late.

De Vries (2009) and Griffiths (2013) adopt a ‘ParP adunction approach’ to RPCs (i.e. (60) above)

Par is not morphologically realized in English, Dutch or German

However

- Turkish EK-clauses provide indirect evidence for this ParP adunction approach, as Par is morphologically realized as enclitic-ki.

5. Conclusion

- Although ki appears to display myriad functions (see (1) to (6)), in PK- and EK-clauses at least, ki’s function is identical: ki is the morphological realization of Parₚ: the functional projection that concatenates with its sister via par-Merge.

- Differences in prosody and linear order arise because proclitic-ki is a bivalent head (i.e. coordinating its spec. and comp.), while enclitic-ki is a monovalent head (i.e. the head of a clausal adjunct).
Whether other uses of *ki* are realizations of *Par* is a matter for future investigation.

At the very least, proclitic-*ki* is **not** an appositive relative pronoun, and enclitic-*ki* is **not** a complementizer. Whatever the correct analysis is, it should involve *parataxis*.
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