One of the remarkable proposals on the ‘optionality’ problem of scrambling in recent literature is the ‘options without optionality’ approach by Miyagawa (1997, 2003), which suggests the EPP-feature on T₀ as the driving force for local scrambling. Miyagawa proposes that, in an OSV sentence in a SOV language like Japanese, either the subject or the object must satisfy the EPP-feature on T₀ by undergoing A-scrambling to [Spec,TP]. However, considering the fact that scopal interactions of quantifiers as well as the binding facts of Turkish exhibit explicit reconstruction effects, this study reveals that Turkish local scrambling has the characteristics of A'-movement, which is inconsistent with the EPP-driven approach. It is argued that, since [Spec,TP] does not need to be filled in Turkish (Öztürk, 2004), the EPP-feature has nothing to do with the local scrambling of arguments in this language. This study also argues against the relationship between Case-marking and scrambling, showing that non-specific bare NPs can scramble to various positions in Turkish.
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1. Introduction

Since Ross (1967), scrambling has generally been taken as a stylistic rule, which is optionally applied in the grammar. Some researchers such as Saïto (1985), Kuroda (1988), and Fukui (1993), among others, pursue the idea of optionality, claiming that scrambling is a vacuous operation that is undone at the Logical Form (LF), a process known as reconstruction. However, the description of scrambling as an optional movement operation has become a central issue with the introduction of the Minimalist Program.

*I would like to thank the audience at the “Ambiguity in Linguistic Analysis” symposium held at ILCAA, TUFS in December 17-18, 2005 in Japan. This paper is a slightly revised version of the talk presented at the symposium.*
(MP), since, within this theory, movement has been considered an obligatory operation driven by morphological factors such as Case or by lexical features like the wh-feature, focus-topic features etc. Thus, within the MP, optional movement has no longer been an option.\(^1\)

One of the remarkable proposals seeking to dispense with optionality is Miyagawa’s (1997, 2003)\(^2\) “options without optionality” approach, which suggests the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) as a driving force for scrambled elements. According to this approach, the so called EPP-feature on T\(^0\) obligatorily requires movement of one of the arguments to [Spec,TP]. Thus, what is optional is the selection of the argument to be moved, but not the movement operation itself.

This study examines the application of this proposal to Turkish, a scrambling language with SOV word order. It will be shown that Turkish scrambling has the characteristics of ‘A’-movement and, so, [Spec,TP] - an A-position - does not obligatorily need to be filled in Turkish, implying that EPP-driven scrambling of the arguments to [Spec,TP] does not hold in this language.

Section 2 introduces the EPP-driven scrambling approach of Miyagawa (2003). Section 3 aims at examining the applicability of this approach to Turkish by discussing the problems posed by Turkish data for the approach under scrutiny. The discussion in this section reveals that Turkish scrambling has the properties of A’-movement and the EPP-feature on T\(^0\) has nothing to do with scrambling in this language. This section also discusses the role of Case-marking in scrambling, arguing against the view that only Case-marked items can scramble. Section 4 concludes the study.


Miyagawa (2003) considers the local scrambling facts of Japanese exemplified in (1), where one of the arguments, i.e. either the subject or the object, undergoes movement to the head of the sentence:

\[
(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
S & O & V \\
\text{a.} & \text{Taroo-ga} & \text{pizza-o} & \text{tabeta} \\
& \text{Taro-NOM} & \text{pizza-ACC} & \text{ate} \\
\text{b.} & \text{Pizza-o} & \text{Taroo-ga} & \text{tabeta} \\
& \text{Pizza-ACC} & \text{Taro-NOM} & \text{ate} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Taro ate pizza’

Some languages allow word order permutations akin to those given in (1), while some others do not. Starting with Hale (1980), languages of the former type have been called non-configurational (e.g. Japanese), and the others configurational (e.g. English). Following Hale’s original proposal, Miyagawa supports the idea that what differentiates the so-called non-configurational languages from the configurational ones is that in the former there are rules which apply to generate alternative word orders. In the literature, these alternative orders are generally taken as being produced ‘optionally’. However, Miyagawa states that there is no optionality in rule application. Namely, in non-configurational languages there is an ‘obligatory’ rule that moves one of the elements, be it the subject, object, or another item, to the head of the sentence as in (1). Thus, he suggests that what is optional is the selection of the item that undergoes movement, but not the movement rule itself. Miyagawa calls this alternative view “options without optionality”. Following Saito and Hoji (1983), he assumes that ‘every’ language is configurational and combines these two proposals to form his ‘options without optionality’ approach. As stated by Miyagawa (2003:180), there are two main points of this approach:

\[
(2) \quad \text{Point One: Both the SOV and the OSV word orders result from a single obligatory movement. This movement is triggered by the Extended Projection Principle (EPP).}
\]

---

\(^1\) Due to space limitations, the literature is not reviewed here. For a detailed literature review, I refer the interested reader to Karimi (2005).

\(^2\) Miyagawa (1997) is an earlier version of Miyagawa (2003). In this paper, we will be dealing only with the latter.
**Point Two:** The option to move the object into [Spec,TP] (OSV) to meet the EPP requirement is made possible by V raising to T.

Taken together, these points state that the EPP requirement on T⁰ obligatorily attracts a phrase to the head of the sentence. Unlike English-type languages, where the attracted phrase must be the subject, scrambling languages have the option to move any phrase, e.g. the object, to [Spec,TP] (point 1) and this is possible only by V-raising to T (point 2). However, V-raising to T by itself does not guarantee the occurrence of the object in [Spec,TP]. For instance, V-to-T is well attested in Romance, but the EPP-driven movement of the object does not occur in Romance languages. This is where the generally observed fact that in scrambling languages DPs carry morphological Case markings comes into play. As opposed to scrambling languages, Romance languages do not exhibit morphological Case marking of the type found in the former group. Considering this, Miyagawa suggests, as a third point, that all morphological Case markings agree with, and are licensed by, T⁰. According to Miyagawa, this explains the parametric variation between scrambling and non-scrambling languages.

Turning to the analysis, Miyagawa (2003: 183-84) gives the following examples as crucial data where the subject *zen’in* ‘all’ takes scope above or below negation.

(3) a. `Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
   all-NOM that test-ACC take-NEG-PAST
   “All did not take that test”
   *not >> all, all >> not

b. Sono tesuto-o `zen’in-ga t_i uke-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
   that test-ACC all-NOM take-NEG-PAST
   “That test, all didn’t take”
   not >> all, (all >> not)

According to the analysis given, the subject is claimed to be in the [Spec,TP] position in (3a) since it must be construed outside the scope of negation, i.e. higher than NegP, which is assumed to be located between TP and vP (cf. (4a)). In this position, the subject gets a total-negation interpretation. On the contrary, the subject can reside in its original [Spec,vP] position in (3b), where it receives the partial-negation interpretation, and the object is attracted to [Spec,TP] to satisfy the EPP-feature on T⁰ (cf. (4b)). Thus, Miyagawa claims that local scrambling of the object in (3b) is EPP-driven A-scrambling.

(4) a. b.
Miyagawa also sets up an adverb test to disambiguate the possible interpretations of the subject zen’in ‘all’ in (3b). Following Cinque (1999), he assumes that the ‘high’ adverb saiwaini ‘fortunately’ occurs higher than [Spec,vP], while the manner adverb isoide ‘quickly’ occurs in the projection of V. Thus, the occurrence of zen’in before the high adverb (cf. (5)) would mean that it is higher than NegP, where only total-negation is possible, while its occurrence before a manner adverb would result in the same ambiguity observed in (3b) (cf. (6)):

(5) High adverb saiwaini ‘fortunately’ (A’-scrambling of the object)
\[
\text{[}$\text{XP Sono tesuto-o}_{\text{obj}} \text{[TP zen’in-ga}_{\text{sub}} \text{[XP saiwaini [vP uke-nakat-ta,]]}$ \text{yo/to omou}]
\]

\[
\text{that test-ACC all-NOM fortunately take-NEG-PAST}
\]

“That test, all didn’t take fortunately”
*not >> all, all >> not

(adapted from Miyagawa, 2003: 186)

(6) VP manner adverb isoide ‘quickly’ (A-/A’-scrambling of the object)
\[
\text{[}$\text{TP Sono tesuto-o}_{\text{obj}} \text{[vP zen’in-ga}_{\text{sub}} \text{[vP isoide [vP uke-nakat-ta,]]}$ \text{yo/to omou}]
\]

\[
\text{that test-ACC all-NOM quickly take-NEG-PAST}
\]

“That test, all didn’t take quickly”
not >> all, all >> not

(adapted from Miyagawa, 2003: 186)

In (5), the object undergoes A’-scrambling to a position higher than [Spec,TP], since [Spec,TP] is occupied by the subject. On the other hand, there are two possible derivations in (6). In the primary partial-negation reading, the subject stays in situ at [Spec,vP] while the object undergoes A-movement to [Spec,TP] to satisfy the EPP-feature on T\text{0}. In the secondary total-negation reading, the EPP-feature is satisfied by the movement of the subject to [Spec,TP] while the object undergoes A’-scrambling to a higher position than the subject as in (5).

To summarize, Miyagawa proposes a promising analysis to overcome the optionality problem. In Miyagawa (2004), although he does not discuss this in detail, he suggests that his approach readily covers Turkish as well. Now let us look at Turkish in detail to see if this analysis is applicable to this language as Miyagawa suggests.

### 3. Problems for the EPP-driven Approach: Scrambling in Turkish

This section will discuss whether the EPP-driven scrambling approach of Miyagawa (2003) can be applied to Turkish. Section 3.1. shows that the crucial data given by Miyagawa to account for local scrambling in Japanese do not give the same results in Turkish. Section 3.2. will focus on movement properties of Turkish in terms of A-/A’-scrambling. By discussing quantifier and binding data, it will be shown that Turkish scrambling has characteristics of A’-movement, a fact which is inconsistent with the EPP-driven analysis. Finally, section 3.3. will briefly discuss the role of Case-marking in scrambling, showing that the general belief, also supported in Miyagawa (2003), that morphological Case-marking plays a crucial role in scrambling is wrong.

#### 3.1. Examining the ‘crucial data’ in Turkish

In section 2. we saw that scopal interactions between the universal quantifier zenin-ga ‘all’ and negation can result in either total or partial-negation. Recall that, according to Miyagawa, total-negation reading obtains when the universal subject is in [Spec,TP], while partial-negation reading is a result of universal subject being kept in [Spec,vP]. However, Turkish scopal facts in the same line are very different from those of Japanese. As Kelepir (2003) points out, inherent scope properties of the universal quantifier herkes ‘all, everybody’ in Turkish require that it should be interpreted inside the scope of negation. Thus, the Turkish equivalent of the ‘crucial data’ (cf. (3)) given below reveals that the universal subject does not undergo A-movement to [Spec,TP] -- neither in (7a) nor in (7b):
(7) a. *Herkes o sınav-a gir-me-di.
    all.NOM that test-DAT take-NEG-PAST.3SG
    “All did not take that test”
    not >> all, *all >> not  
    (Japanese: *not >> all, all >> not (cf. (3a)))

b. [O sınav-a] herkes t1 gir-me-di.
    that test-DAT all-NOM take-NEG-PAST.3SG
    “All did not take that test”
    not >> all, *all >> not  
    (Japanese: not >> all (all >> not) (cf.(3b)))

Obviously, the universal subject is below NegP in (7a-b), implying that Turkish has quite different properties with respect to the role of the EPP in such cases. For one thing, (7a) explicitly reveals that [Spec,TP] does not necessarily need to be filled in Turkish. Contrary to Japanese, Turkish has subject agreement on the verb, which must obligatorily raise to T0. Considering this, Öztürk (2004)\(^3\), following Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), suggests that the EPP-feature on T0 is satisfied by head movement of the verb to T0, hence [Spec,TP] may be unoccupied in this language. This seems to be the main reason of the difference at hand between Japanese and Turkish. If the EPP on T0 is satisfied by head movement, at least we can say that the scrambling of the object in (7b) is not triggered by the EPP on T0. The question, then, is whether the object in this sentence is in [Spec,TP] at all. Miyagawa’s analysis predicts that it is, while the EPP-related facts of Turkish just mentioned imply that it does not have to. To answer the question we have to know whether the object stays in an A- or an A’-position. If this is an A-movement, [Spec,TP] is still a reasonable target. However, if it turns out that this movement is of the A’-type, then we have further reason not to believe that scrambling is EPP-driven in Turkish, at least in the sense of Miyagawa (2003). This question will be discussed in the next section.

(7a-b) imply that local scrambling creates quite a different structure in Turkish as indicated below. Compare (8a-b) with its Japanese counterpart (4a-b):

\(^3\) I am grateful to Yuu Kuribayashi for pointing out this study to me.
Turning to the evaluation of the ‘crucial data’, the following examples show that the quantifier test employed in Miyagawa (2003) gives different results in Turkish, too.

(9) High adverb “iyi ki” (‘fortunately’)

O soruyu herkes *iyi ki* yanıtladı.

‘That question, all didn’t answer fortunately.’

not >> all, *all >> not

(10) VP manner adverb “çabuk” (‘quickly’)

O soruyu herkes *çabuk* yanıtladı.

‘That question, all didn’t answer quickly.’

not >> all, *all >> not

As we saw in (7), the subject herkes ‘all, everybody’ can only be negated partially, and what (9) and (10) show is that this is true no matter which adverb it precedes. Thus, although the Japanese counterpart of the subject in (9) stays in [Spec,TP] (cf. (5)), an A-position, it must be interpreted below NegP in Turkish to get the obligatory partial-negation reading, indicating that it undergoes reconstruction to its base position below NegP. Hence, the position of the subject in (9) must be an A’-position. Considering what is said above about the EPP in Turkish, it is reasonable to assume that it stays in an A’-position above [Spec,TP], from where it can reconstruct. If this is true, like its Japanese counterpart (cf. (5)) the scrambling site of the object in (9) should also be an A’-position.

The adverb test applied for Japanese in section 2. showed that (6) is string vacuous; namely, the subject stays below NegP in the partial-negation reading, while it is in [Spec,TP] in the total-negation reading. The subject in (10), on the other hand, has only the partial reading, indicating its in situ position below NegP. Now we have to face the same question that we asked above for the position of the object in (7b): Is the scrambling site of the object in (10) an A- or an A’-position? Comparing it with its Japanese counterpart where the primary partial reading of the subject obtains, one can expect that it undergoes A-scrambling to [Spec,TP], since this position is available. However, this is not so obvious, since, as mentioned above, the EPP on T₀ is satisfied by head movement in Turkish; namely, as far as the EPP is considered there is no need in (10) for the object to move to [Spec,TP]. Therefore, it is quite possible for the object to scramble to an A’-position possibly above [Spec,TP]. Indeed, this is the more reasonable alternative. We will discuss the A-/A’-properties of local scrambling in Turkish in the next section but for now let us consider the following example:

(11) [Bütün soruları], herkes *çabuk* yanıtladı.

‘(Lit.) All questions, all did not answer quickly.’

object ‘bütün soruları’ : not >> all, *all >> not
subject ‘herkes’ : not >> all, *all >> not

Here, the scrambled object must be interpreted under the scope of negation, as it includes a universal quantifier (i.e. bütün ‘all’), as well. This implies that the scrambling site of the object is an A’-position, as it must reconstruct to its base position under NegP to get the partial-negation reading needed. Once again, (11) reveals that, in Turkish, [Spec,TP] does not necessarily need to be filled by a full category and that local scrambling is into an A’-position.

Having seen that the ‘crucial data’ given as evidence by Miyagawa (2003) for EPP-driven scrambling calls for a quite different analysis in Turkish, let us see in the following section whether quantifier scope and binding facts of Turkish support A-scrambling or A’-scrambling in cases of local scrambling such as discussed in this section.
3.2. A-scrambling vs. A'-scrambling

Movement of arguments to the clause-initial position in Turkish has been considered both A- and A'-movement. Merchant (1995), Aygen (2003), and Temürcü (2005) suggest that clause-initial scrambling is into an A-position, while Kural (1992) claims that it can best be analyzed as A'-movement. Öztürk (2004), on the other hand, follows Miyagawa (2003) and argues that clause-initial scrambling in Turkish can be into either an A-position or an A'-position.

A-movement is considered to be semantically ‘contentful’, while A'-movement is ‘vacuous’ (e.g. Saito & Fukui, 1998). This is to say, A-movement is for interpretation purposes and thus cannot be withdrawn, whereas A'-movement does not have any effect on the interpretation of the element undergoing movement. Therefore, at LF, A'-movement, but not A-movement, has to reconstruct.

In fact, there is evidence for both A-movement and A'-movement of (clause-initial) local scrambling in Turkish. For instance, according to Temürcü (2005), who argues for an A-scrambling analysis, the universally quantified expression herkes ‘everyone’ in (12a) is normally interpreted as taking scope over the numerically quantified expression üç kişi ‘three people’. The reverse scope reading is also possible, which is presumably obtained by ‘quantifier raising’ (May 1977). (12b) implies a single logical form where the numerically quantified subject takes scope over the universally quantified object. (By default, the immediately preverbal slot is the position for sentential stress and focus in Turkish. This will be indicated by small capitals in the examples.)

(12) Relative scope designations for the SOV form:

a. Herkes ÜÇ KİŞİYI suçladı.
   everyone.NOM three people-ACC accuse-PAST.3SG
   ‘Everyone accused three people.’
   all > 3 (Distributed reading: ‘Everyone accused any three people.’)
   3 > all (Collective reading: ‘There are three people such that everyone accused them.’)

b. Üç kişi HERKESI suçladı.
   three people.NOM everyone-ACC accuse-PAST.3SG
   ‘Three people accused everyone.’
   3 > all (Collective reading: ‘There are three people such that they accused everyone.’)

(Temürcü, 2005: 136)

In (13a), on the other hand, the existential quantifier takes scope over the universal quantifier. In (13b), both directions in scope-taking are possible. Comparing (13) with (12), Temürcü concludes that OSV (‘object preposing’ in his terms) displays an asymmetric scope pattern compared to SOV, which implies that object preposing reverses the c-command relations between the subject and the object. This means that object preposing is contentful, since it changes the relative scope interactions between the subject and the verb.

(13) Relative scope designations for the OSV form:

a. Üç kişişi HERKES suçladı.
   three people-ACC everyone.NOM accuse-PAST.3SG
   ‘Everyone accused three people.’
   3 > all (Collective reading: ‘There are three people such that everyone accused them.’)

b. Herkesi ÜÇ KİŞİ suçladı.
   everyone-ACC three people.NOM accuse-PAST.3SG
   ‘Three people accused everyone.’
   all > 3 (Distributed reading: ‘Everyone was accused by any three people.’)
   3 > all (Collective reading: ‘There are three people such that they accused everyone.’)

(TEMÜRCÜ, 2005: 137)
Pronominal and anaphora binding data, too, include examples of A-scrambling. For instance, in (14b), scrambling of the object anaphor birbirlerini ‘each other’ in front of its antecedent adamlar ‘the men’ creates ungrammaticality, violating both the A and C principles of Binding Theory (BT) (Chomsky, 1981). This is considered evidence of A-movement since, due to lack of reconstruction at LF, the A-moved item in such cases c-commands and therefore binds its antecedent that is a referential noun (violation of Principle C) as well as getting unbound by it (violation of Principle A). Consider the examples below:

(14) a. Adamlar\textsubscript{i} birbirlerini\textsubscript{i} görmüş.  
\text{man-PL.NOM each other-PL-POSS-ACC see-PAST.3SG}  
‘The men saw each other.’

b. *Birbirlerini\textsubscript{i} adamlar\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j} görmüş.  
(Kural, 1992:30)

(15a) further shows that when the base position of an anaphor inside a larger DP is not c-commanded by its antecedent, it cannot be bound by it. Here, according to Temürcü (2005), the anaphor kendi ‘self’ inside the subject is locally bound by the silent pronominal, i.e. pro, confronting the Principle A of BT; but since the pro fails to be bound by its antecedent adam ‘man’, due to lack of c-commanding, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. As seen in (15b), the object antecedent can be a syntactic binder for the pro, and in turn for the anaphor as well, when it scrambles to a c-commanding position where binding is possible, i.e. an A-position, to save the sentence (the Possessive Phrase (PossP) analysis is from Temürcü, 2005):

(15) a. *[PossP pro\textsubscript{i} kendi komşusu] adam\textsubscript{i} görüdü.  
\text{self neighbor-POSS.NOM man-ACC see-PAST.3SG}  
(Temürcü, 2005:137)

b. Adam\textsubscript{i} [PossP pro\textsubscript{i} KENDI KOMŞUSU] t\textsubscript{j} görüdü.  
\text{man-ACC self neighbor-POSS.NOM see-PAST.3SG}  
‘(Lit.) The man\textsubscript{i}, his\textsubscript{i} own neighbor saw him\textsubscript{j}.’  
(Temürcü, 2005:138)

On the other hand, there is evidence for A’-scrambling as well. As pointed out by Kural (1992), focusing effects can alter binding relations in Turkish. According to Kural, (16b) shows that a pronominal inside a preposed object cannot be bound by its subject antecedent when the subject is focused. Note that this is similar to the ungrammatical (15a) where the focused antecedent adam ‘man’ cannot bind the anaphor inside the subject. On the other hand, as opposed to (15a), (17b) indicates that binding is possible if the subject antecedent is defocused, which is evidenced in the examples in (17) by inserting an adverbial in the immediately preverbal focus position.

(16) a. Herkes\textsubscript{i} [pro\textsubscript{i} SEKRETERINI] aramış.  
\text{everyone.NOM secretary-POSS-ACC call-PAST.3SG}  
‘Everybody\textsubscript{i} called his\textsubscript{i} secretary’

b. *[pro\textsubscript{i} sekreterini] HERKES\textsubscript{i} t\textsubscript{j} aramış.  
\text{secretary-POSS-ACC everyone.NOM call-PAST.3SG}  
(Kural, 1992: 32)
Everyone-NOM secretary-POSS-ACC yesterday call-PAST.3SG

‘Everybody called his secretary yesterday’

b. [proi sekreterini], herkesi, ti DÜN aramış.  
secretary-POSS-ACC everyone yesterday call-PAST.3SG

(Kural, 1992: 45)

(18) further shows that (15a) can be saved by defocusing the object antecedent:

(18) a. [proi kendisi komşusu] adamı GÖRDÜ.  
self neighbor-POSS.NOM man-ACC see-PAST.3SG

‘(Lit.) His own neighbor saw the man.’

b. [proi kendisi komşusu] adamı DÜN gördü.  
self neighbor-POSS.NOM man-ACC yesterday see-PAST.3SG

‘(Lit.) His own neighbor saw the man yesterday.’

What (18) reveals is that (15a) is bad not because the pro inside the subject is unbound but because the object antecedent is focused. In fact, no principle of the BT is violated in (15a). Firstly, according to the PossP analysis of Temürçü (2005), the anaphor kendisi ‘self’ is locally bound by the pro, so the Principle A is met. Secondly, in Turkish, as a pro-drop language, the pro can be in a co-indexed relation with its antecedent that follows it. This conforms to the binding Principle B, which states that a pronominal must not be bound in its local domain, which is PossP in (15a). The following examples show that, in Turkish, pro can actually be co-indexed with any antecedent, which does not bind it in its local domain, explicating that the issue in (15a) has nothing to do with c-commanding from an A-position:

mother-POSS.NOM Ali-ACC call-PRES.3SG

‘(Lit.) His mother calls Ali.’

b. [proi,j Arkadaş] [TP Ali’nin hasta olmadığını] BILIYOR.  
friend-POSS.NOM Ali-GEN ill be-NEG-NOM-POSS-ACC know-PRES.3SG

‘(Lit.) His friend knows that Ali is not ill.’

The anaphora binding data given below exhibit the same focusing effects. In each example we see that an anaphor, i.e. birbirleri ‘each other’ in (20)-(21) and kendî ‘himself’ in (22)-(23), can move in front of its antecedent, if the antecedent does not receive the focus accent:

(20) a. Ahmet adamlarıi BIİRBIİRLEIYEi tanıştırmış.  
Ahmet.NOM man-PL-ACC eachother-PL-POSS-with introduce-PAST.3SG

‘Ahmet introduced the men to each other.’

b. *Birbirleriyle, Ahmet ADAMLARI tı tanıtırımsız.  
(Kural, 1992: 30)
The discussion around (16)-(23) reveals that the examples (12)-(15) that seem to contain A-scrambling can in fact be analyzed so as to include focusing effects. As reconstruction is and must be possible in these cases, we conclude that Turkish local scrambling has A'-properties, supporting Kural (1992). Namely, scrambled elements have to be interpreted in their base positions at LF. This means that, Turkish scrambling is vacuous instead of being contentful.

Now let us turn to the quantifier scope data given above in (12)-(13), repeated below for convenience:

(24) a. Herkes ÜÇ KIŞIYI suçladı. (= (12a) all > 3, 3 > all

b. ÜÇ KIŞIYI HERKES suçladı. (= (13a) 3 > all

---

4 By #, Kural indicates comma intonation, a short pause between linguistic items, which is required when the focus is on the verb.
Recall that Temürçü (2005) interprets the data as indicating a contentful scrambling, since scrambling changes scopal interactions between quantifiers. However, it is important to note that, although scopal interactions between quantifiers do change, scrambling does not give birth a new reading in (24b), which is absent before its application. Namely, the “3 > all” reading is already available in (24a). It can be said that this reading is due to QR in (24a), while it is obtained by scrambling in (24b). However, the problem is that this leads us to accept that the movement of the object is optional here, which is untenable under minimalist assumptions. Whatever the reason is, as far as I can see, this movement is ‘vacuous’ by the very definition of the term.

In (25b), on the other hand, scrambling creates a new reading, namely “all > 3”. Although it is not clear why QR does not take place in (25a) to give the “all > 3” reading, we clearly see that the “3 > all” reading in (25a) survives in (25b), too. Obviously, this implies that the object in (25b) can reconstruct. Therefore, we have two surprising cases where scrambling is a) clearly vacuous without a reconstruction effect, i.e. (24b), and b) semi-contentful with a reconstruction effect, i.e. (25b). Although I have no answer to the issue at this stage, what is clear, in my opinion, is that the data in (24)-(25) is highly inconclusive and cannot suggest that local scrambling is contentful in Turkish. It may be that focus plays a crucial role here, too, but I leave this for future research. Yet, before moving on, it should be noted that if the focus structure of the sentences are kept unchanged as seen below, no difference between the scopal interactions of the quantifiers obtains:

(26)  

(27)  

Thus, when we take the focus structure into account, relative scope readings remain the same in object preposing. This implies that the traces (or ‘copies’ to use the current terminology) left by preposed objects are visible at LF, meaning that reconstruction is possible for these items.
To conclude, based on binding and quantifier scope data, it has been shown in this section that local scrambling in Turkish has most of the characteristics of A'-movement. This conclusion is inconsistent with the findings of Miyagawa (2003) for scrambling in Japanese, where the A-movement properties of scrambling are considered as evidence for the triggering function of the EPP.

3.3. The Role of Case-marking

As mentioned in section 2., Miyagawa (2003) considers Case-marking to have a crucial role in scrambling since in scrambling languages, as opposed to non-scrambling ones, DPs are marked for Case, which is a fact, according to him, explaining the parametric variation between the two.

However, it has been noted in the literature that even in a scrambling language with Case morphology not all items undergoing scrambling need to be marked for Case. For instance, Karimi (2003, 2005) shows that non-specific bare NPs in Persian can scramble when they have contrastive stress:

(28) Kimea [(ye) _ketâb], barâ-sh _ ti _ xarid.
    Kimea (a) book for-her _ bought

‘Kimea bought a BOOK for her.’

(Karimi, 2003: 109)

The sensitivity for contrastive stress is even more apparent in Hindi, another well-known scrambling language. Dayal (2003) states that non-specific bare NPs in this language can scramble if they (cf. 29b) or the items next to them (cf. 29c) carry contrastive stress:

(29) a. anu kitaab paRh rahii _ hai (Dayal’s (22c))
    Anu book _ read-PROG-PR

‘Anu is reading a book.’

b. KITaab, anu _ ti _ paRh rahii hai (akhbaar nahiiN) (Dayal’s (40a))

‘Anu is reading a BOOK (not a newspaper).’

c. kitaab, ANU _ ti _ paRh rahii hai (ravi nahiiN) (Dayal’s (42))

‘ANU is reading a book (not Ravi).’

Apparently, information structure plays a pivotal role in the scrambling of sentential elements in general. In other words, it is information structure, not morphological Case-marking, that dictates scrambling. In the Persian and Hindi examples given above, it is the [focus]-feature which is responsible for the scrambling of the bare NPs.

Turkish data further show that the possibility of the scrambling of bare NPs is not limited to cases where they carry contrastive stress, i.e. contrastive focus. A bare NP without contrastive stress can optionally undergo scrambling in Turkish if it is recoverable from the context (Erkü, 1983; Erguvanlı, 1984, Hoffman, 1995, among others). One clear example of this is rightward movement of bare NPs to the post-verbal position. In Turkish, any stressed element is banned in the post-verbal position (Erguvanlı, 1984; Göksel, 1998; Göksel and Ozsoy, 2000; Kural, 1992), which is reserved for recoverable elements, and any sentential element of this type, including bare NPs, can scramble to this position. Consider the examples below:

---

5 This seems to be a problem for Kairimi (2005), who suggests that “… nonspecific objects move only when they are contrastively focused” (2005: 159).
Bare NPs can scramble into pre-verbal positions as well, if they meet the same recoverability condition. For instance, they can be topics by scrambling to the sentence initial topic position:

    A.NOM book read-PAST.3SG

b. Kitap, Ali tı OKUDU.
   ‘Ali read books.’
   ‘(Lit.) Ali did book-reading.’
   (adapted from Sezer, 1996: 238)

(33) Kahve ALı de tı istemişti.
    coffee A.NOM too want-PAST-PAST.3SG
   ‘Ali would have liked coffee, too.’
   (Uygun, 2006)

In addition to post-verbal and sentence-initial positions, Turkish non-specific bare NPs can also be in the intermediate positions in the pre-verbal area. In the following examples, the bare NPs are scrambled in front of VP-adverbs çok ‘too much’ (cf. 34), iyı ‘well’ (cf. 35), and kesin ‘to be sure, surely’ (cf. 36):

(34) A- Elma ister misin?  ‘Would you like to eat apples?’
B- Bugün elma, çok tı yedim.  Sağol.
    today apple much eat-PAST-1SG thanks
   ‘No, thanks. I ate too much apples today.’

(35) A- Niçin dinlemiyorsun? İyi şiir okuyamıyor muyum?
    ‘Why don’t you listen to me? Can’t I read poems well?’
B- Sen şiir, iyi tı okuyorsun (ama ben şiir sevmem).
    you poem well read-PRES-2SG
   ‘No, you read poems well (but I don’t like poems at all).’
A- Burcu ödül alacak mı sence?
   ‘Do you think that Burcu will be awarded a prize?’

B- Burcu ödül kesin alacak (ama Allah bilir ne zaman).
   B.NOM prize sure take-FUT.3SG
   ‘Yes, she’ll be awarded a prize for sure (but god knows when).’

All the scrambled bare NPs in examples (30)-(36) save their non-specific interpretations that they had before movement. This reveals that specificity is not a strictly defining factor in scrambling, either.

The possibility of scrambling of bare NPs implies that the EPP-feature has nothing to do with their movement, since they lack D-features altogether. Therefore, a bare NP undergoing local scrambling to the sentence-initial position in cases similar to the ‘crucial data’ given by Miyagawa would support our claim that the EPP-feature is not the driving force for scrambling, at least in the sense of Miyagawa (2003). Consider the example below:

A- Herkes şiir okudu mu?
   all.NOM poem read-PAST.3SG Q
   ‘Did all read a poem/poems?’

B- Şiir herkes okumadı (ama herkes roman okudu).
   poem all.NOM read-NEG-PAST.3SG
   ‘All did not read a poem/poems (but all read a novel/novels)’

    not >> all, *all >> not

In B’s response in (37), the non-specific bare NP şiir ‘poem’ is scrambled to the sentence-initial position and the partial-negation reading is the only possibility for the universal subject, indicating that it is below NegP. Therefore, [Spec,TP] is available for movement. However, as bare NPs do not have D-features, which are required for checking the EPP on T₀, the local scrambling of the bare NP in (37) apparently cannot be triggered by the EPP-feature.

4. Conclusion

Aiming at discussing the applicability of the EPP-driven obligatory scrambling approach by Miyagawa (2003) to Turkish, this study has revealed that Turkish data cast serious doubt on the approach. Although the approach predicts that in an OSV sentence either the subject or the object undergoes obligatory A-scrambling to [Spec,TP] to satisfy the EPP-feature on T₀, it has shown that [Spec,TP] can be unoccupied in Turkish. This is so, since in Turkish a) universal quantifiers always take scope under negation (Kelepir, 2003), and b) EPP is satisfied by the agreement morphology on the verb that undergoes obligatory head-movement to T₀ (Öztürk, 2004). Therefore, there is no need for the EPP-feature on T₀ as the driving force in local scrambling in Turkish. If this is true, it is reasonable to expect that Turkish local scrambling has characteristics of A’-scrambling. The discussion in section 3.2 on scopal interactions of quantifiers, as well as the binding facts of Turkish has revealed that this is the case. It has shown in this section that the object in an OSV sentence has to reconstruct to its base position, supporting the possibility of the A’-scrambling of the object, possibly to a position in the discourse domain, i.e. above [Spec,TP]. Finally, considering scrambling of bare NPs, section 3.3 has revealed that, as opposed to another argument in Miyagawa (2003), there is no obligatory interaction between Case-marking and scrambling.

To sum up, this study has revealed that Turkish scrambling is not EPP-driven, at least in the sense of Miyagawa (2003). However, as pointed out by Karimi (2005), this does not mean that scrambling is ‘optional’ since, as discussed in 3.3, scrambling of sentential elements is driven by the information structural features topic and focus, which are syntactic features as well.
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