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1 Introduction

The focus of this paper is on two types of nominalized embedded clauses, namely clauses constructed with the suffix -mA and those constructed with the suffix -DIK/-AcAK. Both of these suffixes are attached to verbs and create nominalizations in embedded contexts. Thus, -mA and -DIK/-AcAK are standardly referred to as nominalizing suffixes. Below are examples of such nominalized clauses, which are also the most frequently occurring types of embedded clauses in Turkish:

Nominalized Clause, -DIK and -AcAK

(1) Tuğçe-Ø [ biz-im Ankara-ya git-tiğ-imiz ]-i
Tuğçe-Nom [ we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc
san-iyor-Ø.
believe-Prog-3Sg
‘Tuğçe believes that we went to Ankara.’

(2) Tuğçe-Ø [ biz-im Ankara-ya gid-eceğ-imiz ]-i
Tuğçe-Nom [ we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Acc
san-iyor-Ø.
believe-Prog-3Sg
‘Tuğçe believes that we will go to Ankara.’
Nominalized Clause, -mA

(3) Tuğçe-Ø [ biz-im Ankara-ya git-me-miz ]-i iste-di-Ø.
    Tuğçe-Nom [ we-Gen Ankara-Dat go-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
    ‘Tuğçe wanted for us to go to Ankara.’

A brief look at table 1.1 shows that -mA and -DIK/-AcAK have received many different labels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Labels of -DIK/-AcAK and -mA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lees (1965)</td>
<td>-DIK/-AcAK is factive nominal; -mA is an action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underhill (1976)</td>
<td>-DIK/-AcAK and -mA are gerundives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornfilt (1984)</td>
<td>-DIK and -mA are participial forms; -DIK is a factive nominal and -mA an action nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennelly (1996)</td>
<td>-DIK/-AcAK are aspectual markers that are distinct from main clause tenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kural (1993)</td>
<td>-DI is the past tense marker; -AcAK is the future marker; -mA is an infinitive; -mA is an infinitive; -K is a complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aygen (2002, 2007)</td>
<td>-DIK is a perfect aspect morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornfilt (2003, 2007)</td>
<td>-DIK: factive (=indicative) nominalized embedding; -AcAK: future factive (=indicative) nominalized embedding; -mA: non-factive (=subjunctive) nominalized embedding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keskin (2009)</td>
<td>-DIK is factive nominalizer; -mA is an action nominal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Labels of -DIK/-AcAK and -mA Suffixes

While the exact classification of the so-called nominalizers -DIK/-AcAK and -mA is under debate, the following properties of clauses formed with these nominalizers is acknowledged:

- The subject of nominalized clauses bears genitive Case
- The subject-verb agreement is nominal rather than verbal
- All nominalized clauses are Case-marked

These properties of nominalized clauses are examplified from (1) to (3). This set of properties is also found in regular NPs in Turkish. As example (4) shows, the possessor
biz ‘we’ is marked with the genitive case and the agreement on the “possessee” kitap ‘book’ is from the nominal paradigm. Furthermore, this NP receives Case (in this case the accusative):

**Noun Phrase**

(4) Tolga biz-im kitab-muz-ı al-di-Ø
Tolga we-Gen book-1PlPoss-Acc take-Past-3Sg
‘Tolga took our book.’

1.1 Aims of the paper

The aim of this paper is to provide evidence that clauses constructed with -mA are subjunctive clauses and that clauses in which the -DIK/-AcAK nominalizer is used are indicative clauses. Seemingly puzzling semantic and syntactic properties of such clauses are shown to follow from this analysis. Section 2 lists the reason for this classification of -mA and -DIK/-AcAK. Section 3 shows that factivity (or the lack thereof) is not what determines the choice between -mA and -DIK/-AcAK clauses. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2 -mA and -DIK/-AcAK as Markers of Mood

In this section various pieces of evidence are given to show that nominalizers -mA and -DIK/-AcAK are in fact markers of mood, and that mood is what determines the choice between using a -mA or -DIK/-AcAK nominalizer in embedded contexts.

2.1 Parallels with Embedded Root Clauses

In a few works by Kornfilt (2003, 2007) -DIK/-AcAK and -mA have been referred to as indicative and subjunctive nominalizers respectively. This section shows that the descriptions of -DIK/-AcAK as an indicative marker and -mA as a subjunctive
marker are correct, but for many more reasons than previously given.

The reason why Kornfilt (2003, 2007) uses the term indicative for -DIK/-AcAK and subjunctive for -mA is based on the parallelism that the -mA clause has with its embedded root clause counterpart. Turkish has a predicate form that appears in root clauses that is called the subjunctive (also the optative):

\[(5) \text{Ben-Ø bugün yemek pişir-e-yim} \]
\[\text{I-Nom today food cook-Sbjnctv-1Sg} \]
\[\text{‘I should/ought to cook food today; Let me cook food today.’} \]

(Kornfilt, 2003)

Such subjunctive clauses can also be embedded as root clauses by the matrix verb iste-mek ‘to want’:

\[(6) [\text{Ben-Ø bugün yemek pişir-e-yim}] \text{isti-yor-um} \]
\[\text{I-Nom today food cook-Sbjnctv-1Sg want-Prog-1Sg} \]
\[\text{‘I want to cook [that I should cook] food today; I want for myself to cook food today.’} \]

(Kornfilt, 2003)

Besides a root clause, the verb iste-mek ‘to want’ may take a nominalized clause. In such cases the nominalizer that shows up in the embedded nominalized clause is -mA (7). The -DIK/-AcAK nominalizer cannot occur in such contexts (8).

\[(7) [\text{Sen-in yarın ev-de yemek pişir-me-n}]\text{-i} \]
\[\text{You-Gen tomorrow home-Loc food cook-mA-2SgPoss Acc} \]
\[\text{isti-yor-um want-Prog-1Sg} \]
\[\text{‘I want for you to cook food at home tomorrow; I want that you should cook food at home tomorrow.’} \]

(Kornfilt, 2003)

\[(8) *[\text{Sen-in yarın ev-de yemek pişir-eceğ-in}]\text{-i} \]
\[\text{You-Gen tomorrow home-Loc food cook-AcAK-2SgPoss Acc} \]
\[\text{isti-yor-um want-Prog-1Sg} \]
Kornfilt (2003) states that because *iste-mek* ‘to want’ selects for an embedded root clause that is in the subjunctive, the embedded nominalized clause selected by *iste-mek* ‘to want’ must be in the subjunctive as well.

### 2.2 Temporal Relations

It is well-known that indicative clauses have tense properties that are independent of that of the matrix clause, whereas subjunctive clauses do not encode tense and solely rely on the matrix clause for tense specifications (see Picallo (1985), among others).

For example, in the Spanish examples in (9), the embedded indicative clause is not affected by the temporal specification in the main clause and thus, any combination of tenses in the complex construction is allowed. For example, (9a) shows that even though the main clause verb is in the present, the embedded verb may be in the past. Similarly, if the main clause verb is in the past, as in (9b), the embedded verb may be in the present or future:

(9) **Indicative Clauses, Spanish**

a. Platón dice \[CP C \text{ que Aristóteles } \{\text{lee/leía/leerá}\}\] a
   Plato say.3Sg \[ \text{ that Aristotle read.}\{\text{Pres/Past/Fut}\}.3Sg \text{ to }\]
   Sócrates]
   ‘Plato says that Aristotle \{reads/ read/ will read\} Socrates.’

b. Platón dijo \[CP C \text{ que Aristóteles } \{\text{lee/leía/leerá}\}\] a
   Plato say.Past.3Sg \[ \text{ that Aristotle read.}\{\text{Pres/Past/Fut}\}.3Sg \text{ to }\]
   Sócrates]
   ‘Plato said that Aristotle \{reads/ read\} Socrates.’

(Torrego and Uriagereka, 1992)

Subjunctive clauses, however, are not autonomous in their tense marking. In the case

---

1Picallo (1985) specifies subjunctives as \[-\text{Tense}, +\text{Agreement}\]. She further states that the relation between the [tense] specification of a subjunctive [CP] and that of its main clause may be compared to the relation between an anaphor and its antecedent.
of Spanish, although subjunctive forms can be expressed in two tenses (corresponding to [-past] and [+past]), it is argued that subjunctive morphology indicates an unrealized tense as subjunctive clauses do not possess a reference of their own in their time-frame (cf. Picallo (1985), Bresnan (1972), Bouchard (1982)). The specification of a subjunctive clause as either [-past] or [+past] is dependent on the specification on the tense in the main clause:

(10)    Subjunctive Clauses, Spanish

a. Platón quiere [CP C que Aristóteles {lea/*leyera/*leyere}
    Plato want.3Sg that Aristotle read.Subj.{Pres/Past/Fut}.3Sg a Sócrates].
to Socrates
    ‘Plato wants Aristotle to \{read/ read/ will read\} Socrates.’

b. Platón quiere [CP C que Aristóteles
    Plato want.Past.3Sg that Aristotle
    {*lea/leyera/*leyere} a Sócrates].
    read.Subj.{Pres/Past/Fut}.3Sg to Socrates
    ‘Plato wanted Aristotle to \{read/read/will read\} Socrates.’

    (Torrego and Uriagereka, 1992)

In Turkish, the nominalizers -DIK and -AcAK encode tense: -DIK marks [-Fut] events, and -AcAK is the marker of [+Fut]. Clauses formed with the -DIK/-AcAK nominalizers have tense properties that are independent of the matrix clause. As shown in example (11), the complement of duy- ‘hear’ can be either past, present, or future relative to the time of hearing (11):

(11)    Embedded Nominalized Clause with -DIK [-Fut] and -AcAK [+Fut] Nominalizers

a. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-diğ-m ı-1 duy-acak-Ø.
    Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc hear-Fut-3Sg
    ‘Asu will hear that Ece writes/ is writing/ wrote/ has written/ had
    written/ has been writing a book.’
b. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-acaŋ-m ]-1 duy-acak-Ø.
   Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Acc hear-Fut-3Sg
   ‘Asu will hear that Ece will write a book.’

c. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-diŋ-m ]-1 duy-du-Ø.
   Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Acc hear-Past-3Sg
   ‘Asu heard that Ece writes/ is writing/ wrote/ has written/ had written/ has been writing a book.’

d. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-acak-m ]-1 duy-du-Ø.
   Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Acc hear-Past-3Sg
   ‘Asu heard that Ece will write a book.’

On the other hand, clauses formed with the nominalizer -mA have a more restricted
temporal interpretation than indicative clauses. The nominalizer -mA does not
encode any tense, nor can it be used in conjunction with any tense/aspect marker.
Since the -mA clause does not determine where its event should be put, it is fully
dependent on the matrix clause for tense specification. For example, the complement
of iste- ‘want’ must be interpreted as present or future relative to the time of wanting
in (12), regardless of whether the main clause verb is in the past, as in (12a), or
present, as in (12b),

(12) Embedded Nominalized Clauses with the -mA Nominalizer

   a. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-ma-sın ]-1 iste-di-Ø.
      Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
      ‘Asu wanted Ece to write a book.’

   b. Asu [ Ece-nin kitap yaz-ma-sın ]-1 isti-yor-Ø.
      Asu [ Ece-Gen book write-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Prog-3Sg
      ‘Asu wants Ece to write a book.’

2.3 Mood Distribution

To account for the distribution of the subjunctive and indicative moods across languages
is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, it has been acknowledged that
mood distribution is not completely random (cf. Farkas, 1992, among others). For example, the groups of verbs that govern subjunctive complements have been given the following semantic labels:\(^2\)

- desideratives: *want, wish, desire, ...*
- directives: *order, ask, request, ...*
- permissives and interdirectives: *allow, forbid, ...*
- factive emotives: *regret, be sad, ...* \(^{(Farkas, 1992)}\)

Verbs governing the indicative can be grouped under various semantic labels as well:

- declaritives: verbs of saying, ...
- predicates of certainty: *know, be sure, ...*
- fiction verbs: *dream, imagine, lie, ...*
- commissives: *promise, ...* \(^{(Farkas, 1992)}\)

Crucially, verbs that govern *-mA* clauses overlap with the verbs that govern the subjunctive in other languages. Likewise, verbs that govern *-DIK/-AcAK* clauses in Turkish govern the indicative mood: \(^3\)

(13) *-mA Clause with verbs that govern the subjunctive*

```
(a) Hakan [Timur-un git-me-sin ]-i ist-iyor-Ø/
    Hakan [Timur-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Prog-3Sg/
    emred-iyor-Ø. 
    order-Prog-3Sg
   ‘Hakan wants/ orders for Timur to go.’
```

\(^2\)Despite the overlap of indicative and subjunctive governors across languages, there are some well-known cross-linguistic differences. For example, epistemic predicates select for a subjunctive proposition in Italian, but an indicative one in French and Romanian. Likewise, factive-emotives (true factives) select for the indicative in Romanian, but select for either the indicative or subjunctive in French. Moreover, control predicates select for the infinitive in French, but for the subjunctive in Romanian. In Turkish, epistemic predicates select for the indicative, factive-emotives (true factives) can select for either the indicative or subjunctive, and control predicates select for the infinitive.

\(^3\)Due to limitations of space, a list of verbs/predicates with their mood preferences cannot be given here.
b. Hakan [ Timur-un git-me-sin ]-e izin ver-di-Ø /
   Hakan [ Timur-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss ]-Dat permission give-Past-3Sg/
   üzül-dü-Ø.
   be.sad-Past-3Sg
   ‘Hakan allowed/ was sad for Timur to go.’

(14) -DIK/-AcAK Clause with verbs that govern the indicative

a. Hakan [ Timur-un git-tiğ-in ]-i söyle-di-Ø/
   Hakan [ Timur-Gen go-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc say-Past/
   bil-iyor-Ø/
   hayal et-ti-Ø.
   know-Prog-3Sg/ imagine do-Past-3Sg
   ‘Hakan said/ knows/ imagined that Timur went/ left.’

b. Hakan [ Timur-un gid-eceğ-in ]-e söz ver-di-Ø.
   Hakan [ Timur-Gen go-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Dat word give-Past-3Sg
   ‘Hakan promised that Timur will go.’

Note that there are instances where the same verb may take both a subjunctive
and an indicative clause, in which case the meaning of the verb changes depending
on the mood of the complement:

(15) Catalan verb dir ‘to say’ governing both the subjunctive and the indicative

a. Diu que t-enyora.
   say.3Sg that you-miss.3Sg.IND
   ‘She says that she misses you.’

b. Diu que li escriguis.
   say.3Sg that her/him write.Pres.2Sg.SUB.
   ‘She tells you to write to her/him.’

(Quer, 1998)
(16) Romanian verb a spune ‘to say’ governing both the subjunctive and the indicative

a. Ion a spus [ că Maria a plecat ].
   Ion has said [ that.IND Maria has.IND. left ]
   ‘Ion has said that Maria left.’ (translation mine)

b. Ion a spus [ ca Maria să plece imediat ].
   Ion has said [ that.SUB Maria SUB leave immediately ].
   ‘Ion told Maria to leave immediately.’ (translation mine)

(Farkas, 1984)

In (15a) and (16a) the verb is a declarative as it conveys an assertion made by she and Ion respectively. In (15b) and (16b), however, the verb is a directive since it reports a directive of she and Ion respectively. The same observation is made in Turkish. The verb söyle- ‘to say’ can be used with both -DIK/-AcAK and -mA clauses, but the meaning of the verb changes with the mood of the complement, in the same way it does in the Romanian and Catalan cases:

(17) Söyle- ‘to say’ with -mA and -DIK/-AcAK

a. Hakan [Timur’un git-tiğ-in ]-i söyle-di-Ø.
   Hakan [Timur-Gen go-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc say-Past-3Sg
   ‘Hakan said that Timur went away/ left.’ Declarative

b. Hakan [Timur’un git-me-sin ]-i söyle-di-Ø.
   Hakan [Timur-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc say-Past-3Sg
   ‘Hakan told Timur to go.’ Directive

With a -DIK/-AcAK nominalized clause the verb söyle- ‘to say’ is a declarative (17a), while with the -mA nominalized clause söyle- is a directive (17b). That -mA clauses occur with verbs that govern the subjunctive cross-linguistically, as well as the overlap of verbs that take a -DIK/-AcAK clause with the verbs that typically govern the indicative provides another piece of evidence that -mA clauses are subjunctive clauses and -DIK/-AcAK clauses are indicative clauses.
2.4 Types of Adjunct Clauses: Reason and Purpose Clauses

The types of adjunct clauses that occur with -mA on the one hand and -DIK/-AcAK on the other also demonstrate that the -mA clauses are subjunctive clauses, whereas -DIK/-AcAK clauses are indicative clauses. Purpose clauses are uniformly in the subjunctive mood across languages, whereas reason clauses uniformly govern the indicative:

(18) Sono uscita di casa affinché lei studi/*studia in
I am exited of house so that she study.3Sg.Subj./ study.3Sg.Ind. in
pace.
peace
‘I left the house so that she studies in quiet.’

(19) Yo me fuí de la casa para que ella
I Refl. go.1Sg.Preterit of the house for that she
estudiara/*estudiaba en paz.
study.3Sg.Imperf.Subj./ study.3Sg.Imperf.Ind. in peace
‘I left the house so that she studies in quiet.’

As predicted, the nominalizer that shows up in purpose clauses in Turkish is -mA :

(20) [[ Ezgi-nin rahatça ders çalısması ] için ] ev-den
[[ Ezgi-Gen comfortably lesson study-mA-3SgPoss ] for ] house-Abl
çık-ti-m.
leave-Past-1Sg
‘I left the house so that Ezgi studies comfortably’

As the following examples from Spanish and Italian show, reason clauses uniformly govern the indicative.

(21) Sono uscita di casa perché Ø ha/*abbia
I am exited of house because she/he have.3Sg.Ind./ have.3Sg.Subj.
bisogno di carta.
need of paper.
‘I left the house because she needs paper.’
Consistent with the Italian and Spanish data, reason clauses in Turkish are constructed with -DIK/-AcAK:

(23) \[
\text{Ezgi-Ø acık-tı˘g-ı } \quad \text{\textbf{için}} \quad \text{yemek yap-tı-m.}
\]
\[
\text{Ezgi-Nom get.hungry-DIK-3SgPoss because/as food do-Past-1Sg}
\]
‘I prepared food because Ezgi got hungry.’

Turkish

Data on adjunct clauses, too, give us proof that -mA clauses are subjunctive clauses and -DIK/-AcAK clauses are indicative clauses.

2.5 Subjunctive Obviation

It is well-known that the implicit subject of a subjunctive clause does not allow coindexation with the matrix subject, whereas the implicit subject of an indicative clause does. This requirement that a pronominal subject of a subjunctive clause be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject is known as Subjunctive Obviation.

For example, in Italian the null (or clitic) subject of a subordinate clause cannot be coindexed with the subject of the related matrix clause if the embedded clause has a subjunctive verb:

*Italian, Subjunctive*

(24) Gianni vuole che \_ legga \_ un libro a settimana.
Gianni wants that \_ reads(SUB) one book to week
‘Gianni want him/her to read one book every week’.

*[
\_ ] = [Gianni], [\_ ] \neq Gianni
**Italian, Indicative**

(25) Gianni ha ditto che legge un libro a settimana.
Gianni has said that reads(IND) one book to week
‘Gianni said he reads one book every week’.

\[ \_ \] = [Gianni] , \[ \_ \] \( \neq \) Gianni (Constantini, 2005)

The exact pattern is observed in other languages as well.

**French, Subjunctive**

(26) Pierre veut qu’il*\(i/j\) parte.
Pierre wants that-he leave(SUB)
‘Pierre wants him *\(i/j\) to leave.’

**French, Indicative**

(27) Pierre a promis qu’il*\(i/j\) partira
Pierre has promised that-he will-leaves(IND)
‘Pierre promised that he*\(i/j\) to leave.’ (Farkas, 1992)

**Catalan, Subjunctive**

(28) [En Jordi]\(i\) espera que pro*\(i/j\) vingui.
[The Jordi] hopes that pro comes(SUB)
‘Jordi hopes that he*\(i/j\) she will come’

**Catalan, Indicative**

(29) [En Joan]\(i\) ha decidit que pro*\(i/j\) telefonarà al Pere.
[The Joan] has decided that pro call(IND,Fut) to-the Pere
‘Jordi has decided that he*\(i/j\) she will call Pere’ (Picallo, 1985)
Portuguese, Subjunctive

(30) [O Manel]i deseja que pro>i/j leia mais livros.
[The Manel] wishes that pro reads(SUB) more books
‘Maneli wishes that he+i/j /she read more books’

Portuguese, Indicative

(31) [O Manel]i pensa que pro>i/j lê bastanetes livros.
[The Manel] thinks that pro reads(IND) enough books
‘Maneli thinks that he+i/j /she reads more books’ (Raposo, 1985)

As the next example shows, -mA and -DIK/-AcAK also differ in how their implicit subjects are interpreted with respect to the subject in the matrix clause: the null subject of a -mA clause cannot be coindexed with the subject of the matrix clause, but no such restriction in the case of -DIK/-AcAK clauses exists:

-mA Clause

(32) Arasi [Ø*i/j kazan-ma-sün ]-1 istiyor.
Aras [Ø win-mA-3Sg.Poss ]-Acc wants
‘Arasi wants that he+i/j wins.’

-DIK/-AcAK Clause

(33) Arasi [Øi/j kazan-diğ-m ]-1 söyledi.
Aras [Ø win-DIK-3Sg.Poss ]-Acc said
‘Arasi said that hei/j won.’

The fact that -mA clauses, but not -DIK/-AcAK clauses exhibit subjunctive obviation is yet another piece of evidence that -mA clauses are subjunctive clauses, whereas -DIK/-AcAK clauses are indicatives.
2.6 No Narrow Wh-scope in Subjunctive Clauses

As frequently noted in the literature, narrow wh-scope is possible with -DIK/-AcAK clauses (35), but not with -mA clauses (34):

(34) a. [ yeme˘ g-i Ali-nin pi¸ sir-me-sin ]-i söyle-di-m.
    [ food-ACC Ali-GEN cook-NFN-3.Sg ]-ACC tell-PAST-1.SG
    ‘I said that Ali should cook the food.’

b. *[ yeme˘ g-i kim-in pi¸ sir-me-sin ]-i söyle-di-m.
    [ food-ACC who-GEN cook-NFN-3.Sg ]-ACC tell-PAST-1.SG
    Intended reading: ‘I said who should cook the food.’ (Kornfilt, 2003)

(35) [ yeme˘ g-i kim-in pi¸ sir-dı˘ g-in ]-i sor-du-m/
    [ food-ACC who-GEN cook-FN-3.Sg ]-ACC ask-PAST-1.Sg/
    duy-du-m/    söyle-di-m.
    hear-PAST-1.SG/ tell-PAST-1.SG
    ‘I asked/ heard/told who had cook the food.’ (Kornfilt, 2003)

Interestingly, it appears that it is a property of subjunctive clauses in general not to allow narrow wh-scope. The following examples illustrate this point:4

_Lack of narrow wh-scope in Italian subjunctive clauses_

(36) Bill vuole che Sally prepari la cena.
    Bill wants.3Sg.Pres.Ind. that Sally prepare.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
    ‘Bill wants that Sally cooks dinner.’

4As is the case for Turkish, wide scope wh-readings of subjunctives in these languages are fine:

(i) Elçin-Ø [ kim-in yemek pi¸ sir-me-sin ]-i iste-di-Ø?
    Elçin-Nom [ who-Gen food cook-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Past-3Sg
    ‘Who did Elçin want to cook food?’

(ii) Chi é che Bill vuole che prepari la cena?
    Who is that Bill wants.3Sg.Pres.Ind. that prepare.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
    ‘Who does Bill want to cook dinner?’ Compare with (37)

(iii) ¿Quien quiere Bill que cocine la cena?
    who want.3Sg.Ind. Bill that cook.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
    ‘Who does Bill want to cook dinner?’ Compare with (39)
(37) *Bill vuole (che) chi prepari la cena.
Bill wants.3Sg.Pres. (that) who prepare.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
Intended reading: ‘Bill wants that/for whom to cook dinner.’

Lack of narrow wh-scope in Spanish subjunctive clauses

(38) Bill quiere que Sally cocine la cena.
Bill want.3Sg.Ind. that Sally cook.3Sg.Subj. the dinner
‘Bill wants that Sally to cook dinner.’

(39) *Bill quiere que quien cocine la cena.
Bill want.3Sg.Ind. that who cook.3Sg.Subj. the dinner.
Intended: ‘Bill want who cooks the food.’

Lack of narrow wh-scope in Romanian subjunctive clauses

(40) Bill vrea ca Sally să gătească cina.
Bill wants for Sally to cook dinner.

(41) *Bill vrea ca cine să gătească cina.
Bill wants for who to cook dinner.

For now, I simply assume that the reason why narrow wh-scope is not possible in such constructions is due to selection, i.e., none of the subjunctive-clause selecting verbs above select for a C [+wh]. The main point here is that the lack of narrow wh-scope in -mA clauses is observed in other subjunctive clauses across languages.

Based on the evidence listed above, we conclude that -mA nominalized clauses are subjunctives, whereas -DIK/-AcAK nominalized clauses are indicatives.

5Note that even in English such constructions are bad. While assuming that selection is responsible for the lack of narrow wh-constructions in such sentences, I will not rule out the possibility that the semantics of the subjunctives might be the underlying reason for this selectional restriction. I will leave this issue for future research.
3 Is Factivity Involved?

Factivity has frequently been claimed to be the reason behind the selection of -$mA$ vs. -$DIK/-AcAK$ (see Table 1.1). However, evidence from the types of verbs/predicates -$mA$ and -$DIK/-AcAK$ are used with as well as NPI-licensing show that factivity is not involved in the choice between -$mA$ vs. -$DIK/-AcAK$.

3.1 Types of Predicates

As shown below, factive and non-factive predicates may be used with both -$DIK/-AcAK$ and -$mA$ nominalizers.

-DIK/-AcAK Clause with Factive, Non-emotive Predicate unut ‘forget’

(42) Alp-Ø [ Gizem-in hasta ol-duğ-un ]-u unut-tu-Ø.
    Alp-Nom [ Gizem-Gen sick be-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc forget-Past-3Sg
    ‘Alp forgot that Gizem is sick.’

Further note that one class of predicates, true factives (a.k.a. factive, emotive predicates), can take both -$DIK/-AcAK$ and -$mA$ clauses:

(i) a. [ Gizem-in yarışma-yı kazan-ma-sın ]-a sevin-di-m.
    [ Gizem-Gen competition-Acc win-mA-3SgPoss ]-Dat be.happy-Past-1Sg
    ‘I’m happy that Gizem won the competition./ I’m happy for Gizem to win the competition’

b. [ Gizem-in yarışma-yı kazan-duğ-in ]-a sevin-di-m.
    [ Gizem-Gen competition-Acc win-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Dat be.happy-Past-1Sg
    ‘I’m happy that Gizem won the competition.’

When a nominalized clause occurs in the subject position of such factive-emotive predicates, the nominalized clause is necessarily a -$mA$ clause (cf. Kornfilt (2003)):

    [ Gizem-Gen win-mA-3SgPoss ]-Nom I-Acc be.happy-Caus-Past-3Sg
    ‘It made me happy that Gizem won.’ or ‘For Gizem to win made me happy.’

    [ Gizem-Gen win-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Nom I-Acc be.happy-Caus-Past-3Sg
    Intended: ‘It made me happy that Gizem won/ That Gizem won made me happy.’
-DIK/-AcAK  *Clause with Non-Factive, Epistemic Predicate* düşün ‘think, assume’

(43) Alp-Ø [Gizem-in hasta ol-duğ-un ]-u düşün-iiyor-Ø. 
Alp-Nom [Gizem-Gen sick be-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc think-Prog-3Sg 
‘Alp thinks that Gizem is sick.’

-mA  *Clause with Non-factive, Emotive Predicate* imkansız ‘impossible’

(44) [Gizem-in iyileş-mesi ]-Ø imkansız. 
[Gizem-Gen heal/recover-mA-3SgPoss ]-Nom impossible 
‘For Gizem to recover is impossible/ It is impossible for Gizem to recover.’

-mA  *Clause with Factive, Emotive Predicate* üzücü ‘sad’

(45) [Gizem-in hasta ol-ma-si ]-Ø üzücü. 
[Gizem-Gen sick be-mA-3SgPoss ]-Nom sad 
‘For Gizem to be sick is sad/ It is sad that Gizem is sick.’

We thus see that factivity is not what determines the choice between -mA and -DIK/-AcAK.

3.2  NPI-Licensing

It is known that long-distance NPI-licensing in English is generally available in non-factive clausal complements but not in factives:

(46) It’s not likely that he will lift a finger until it’s too late.

(47) *It does not bother me that he will lift a finger until it’s too late.  
(Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970)

(48) I don’t believe [ (that) Jim slept a wink last night ].

(49) *I don’t regret [ that Jim slept a wink last night ].  
(de Cuba, 2007)
As shown below, both -DIK/-AcAK and -mA clauses can be used in contexts in which an NPI is licensed. However, factive clauses, whether formed with -DIK/-AcAK or -mA, do not license NPIs, whereas non-factives, regardless of whether they are formed with the -DIK/-AcAK or -mA nominalizer, generally do license NPIs.7

(50) **NPI-Licensing, Factive Clauses with -DIK/-AcAK and -mA**

a. *[Kimse-nin gel-diğ-in ]-i unut-ma-di-lar
   [Nobody-Gen come-DIK-3SgPoss ]-Acc forget-Neg-Past-3Pl
   Intended: ‘They did not forget that anybody came.’

b. *[Kimse-nin git-me-sin ]-e kız-ma-di-m
   [Nobody-Gen go-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc be.angry-Neg-Past-1Sg
   Intended: ‘I did not get angry that anybody went.’

(51) **NPI-Licensing, Non-factive Clauses with -DIK/-AcAK and -mA**

a. [Kimse-nin gel-eceğ-in ]-i san-mi-yor-um
   [Nobody-Gen come-AcAK-3SgPoss ]-Acc believe-Neg-Prg-1Sg
   ‘I don’t believe that anybody will come.’

b. [Kimse-nin gel-me-sin ]-i iste-mi-yor-um
   [Nobody-Gen come-mA-3SgPoss ]-Acc want-Neg-Prg-1Sg
   ‘I don’t want for anybody to come.’

Data from NPI-licensing further show that factivity does not determine the choice between -DIK/-AcAK and -mA.

4 Conclusion

I have provided evidence that mood, but not factivity, determines the choice between the -DIK/-AcAK and -mA: The -DIK/-AcAK nominalizer is shown here to be the indicative marker, whereas the -mA nominalizer is the subjunctive marker in Turkish.

7In fact, Kelepir (2001) already noted that it is the semantics of the predicates that determines whether or not long-distance NPIs are licensed. She lists the predicates that allow long-distance licensing, which are the so-called Neg-raising predicates, as san- ‘think’ and iste- ‘want’, perception predicates such as duy- ‘hear’, gör- ‘see’ and attitude predicates such as ızin ver- ‘allow’.
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