1.0. This paper is concerned with the status of subordinate clauses and it will offer empirical support for Abney's (1987) claim that in the structure of the noun phrase the determiner is a head of the noun phrase.

In his analysis of English noun phrases, Abney proposes a functional category, namely DP (Determiner Phrase). According to this analysis, the main properties of functional categories are that they are generally clitics of affixes; they are stressless; they allow only one complement; they lack descriptive content. He focuses on the functional element D which is the head of the noun phrase. His DP hypothesis also introduces parallels between the structure of noun phrases and the structure of gerunds in terms of their Genitive case assignment. In light of this analysis I will concentrate on the claim that gerunds are noun phrases, rather than sentences. In this paper, I will deal with three verbal complements in Turkish, namely, Action Nominals (verbal nouns), Factive Nominals (nominalization) and Direct Complements.¹

1.1. ACTION NOMINALS (VERBAL NOUNS)

Action Nominals are constructed by adding -mA² to the verbal stem. The subject of the clause, the possessor, takes the Genitive case and a possessive suffix is added to the verbal noun.

(1) Ali-nin gel-me-si
    Ali-Gen. come-Ger-3sg-Poss.
    'Ali's coming'

Action Nominals do not indicate tense. They usually appear as (a) the object of verbs and (b) the subject of adjectives that deal with actions.

(2) a - Ali-nin gel-me-si-ni iste-di-m.
    Ali-Gen. come-Ger-3sg Poss-Acc want-past-lsg
    'I want Ali to come.'

¹ In this study I will adopt Kornfilt's terminology.
² -İş, as in (i), is another type of Action Nominal marker with which we will not be concerned. Refer to Kural (1993) for a discussion of this suffix.
(i) Ali-nin gül-üş-ü
    'Ali's laughing'
An object of a transitive V (verb) is assigned Accusative case in Turkish. In (2a) above given sentence Ali'nin gelmesi is the DO (direct object) of the Vistemek. Subject always appears in Nominative case in Turkish sentences. In (2b) Ali'nin gelmesi is the subject of the sentence which is marked Nominative.

In Action Nominals the same word order is kept as in the corresponding simple sentences.

(3) a - Ali geldi.
   S  V
   'Ali came.'

b - Ali'nin gelmesi
   S  V
   'Ali's coming'

(4) a - Ali ev aldi.
   S  O  V
   'Ali bought a house.'

b - Ali'nin ev alması
   S  O  V
   'Ali's buying a house'

1.2. FACTIVE NOMINALS (NOMINALIZATION)

Factive Nominals, like Action Nominals, behave like Noun Phrases. They can be (a) the object of the main verbs (factuals) and (b) the subject of the adjectives that deal with facts.

(5) a - Ali-nin gel-diğ-i ni duy-du-m.
       Ali-Gen come-Ger-3sg.Poss-Acc hear-past-1sg
   'I heard Ali's coming.'

b - Ali-nin gel-diğ-i doğru.
       Ali-Gen come-Ger-3sg.Poss true
   'That Ali came is true.'

Factive Nominals cannot exhibit all tenses. They only distinguish between future and non-future actions. The suffix -AcAk is used for the future; the suffix -dlk is used in all other cases.

(6) Ali-nin otel-de kal-diğ-1 -i-nı bil-iyor-um.
   'I know that Ali is staying in a hotel.'
   or 'Ali stayed in a hotel.'

   'I know that Ali will stay in a hotel.'

1 In Turkish final -k becomes -ğ when it is followed by a vowel.
Like Action Nominals the same word order is kept in the Factive Nominals as shown in the corresponding simple sentences.

(8) a - Ali geldi.
   S    V
   'Ali came.'

b - Ali’nin geldiğini
   S    V
   'Ali’s coming'

The difference between the Action Nominals and the Factive Nominals is that Action Nominals are dependent on the tense of the higher clause.

(9) a - Ali-nin gel-me-si-ni iste-di-m.
       3sg.Poss-Acc
   'I wanted Ali to come.'

b - Ali-nin gel-diğ-i-ni duy-du-m.
       past-3sg.Poss-Acc
   'I heard that Ali came.'

c - Ali-nin gel-eceğ-i-ni duy-du-m.
       fut-3sg.Poss-Acc
   'I heard that Ali will come.'

In (9a) the Deverbal Noun does not have a tense. The suffix -mA is, here, a gerund suffix which is timeless, whereas the -dlk and -AcAk in (9b,c) are gerund markers which describe a present or past action in (b) and a future action in (c).

1.3. DIRECT COMPLEMENTS

Contrary to gerundive constructions, Direct Complements behave like simple sentences as illustrated in the following examples:

(10) a - SIMPLE SENTENCE
   Ben kitab-ı oku-du-m.
   I book-Acc read-past-1sg
   'I read the book.'

b - DIRECT COMPLEMENT
   Ali [(ben) kitab-ı oku-du-m] san-iyor.
   Ali I book-Acc read-past-1sg think-prog-3sg
   'Ali thinks I read the book.'

In (10a) the tense marker is -dl. The same tense marker is used in the embedded sentences in (10b). Both the subject of the sentence in (10a) and the embedded sentence in (10b) are assigned Nom. case and the agreement marker on the verb in (10a) is used also on the embedded verb in (11b). As noticed, unlike gerundives Direct Complements are not assigned case.

    Ali I book-Acc read-past-1sg-Acc think-prog-3sg
Also, unlike gerundives, Direct Complements are not restricted to specific persons\(^1\) and tenses.

(12) a - Ali [(ben) kitab-ı oku-du-m] san-iyor.
   1sg       past-1sg
   1pl       Aorist-1pl
   2sg       future-2sg

After this brief discussion we shall first observe the Opacity Condition on Direct Complements and then we shall determine what the finiteness must be in Turkish.

1.4. OPACITY CONDITION ON DIRECT COMPLEMENTS

In their article "Finiteness and Boundedness" (1981) George and Kornfilt point out that although Direct Complements are tensed, they do not show opacity. However, according to Chomsky's Tensed S-Condition they must be opaque.

(13) TENSED S-CONDITION

No rule can involve X, Y in the structure ...X... [α...Y...].

where α is a tensed sentence.

Let us observe the following tensed sentence which does not show opacity.

(14) Bizj birbir-imiz - i\(_i\) viski-yi iç-ti
   we each other-our Acc Acc drink-past (no Agr)
san-ıyor-uz
   believe-pres-1pl.

'We believe each other to have drunk the whisky'

( George & Kornfilt 1981)

According to Principle A of Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981) an anaphor must be bound in its Governing Category (GC) where GC is the minimal domain containing the reciprocal, its governor and an accessible subject/SUBJECT. In this sentence there is no accessible SUBJECT for the subject of the lower clause. The higher clause provides an accessible SUBJECT for the reciprocal. Moreover, in the higher clause the verb is the governor of the reciprocal birbir- and it is bound in its GC which is the higher clause. Thus, the grammaticality of the sentence.

In fact, opacity is created by the presence of Agreement (Agr) element as we shall see in the following Direct Complement construction.

(15) *Bizj birbir-imizj viski-yi iç-ti-k
    we each other -our Acc Acc drink-past-1pl
   san-ıyor-uz
   believe-pres-1pl.

'We believe each other drank the whisky'

( George & Kornfilt 1981)

---

\(^1\) See section 1.6., part 2.
In (15) the embedded clause is tensed, but the sentence is opaque not because of the Tense, but because of the Agr element attached to the verb.

Consider the following sentences where the reflexive *kendi* is used as the subject of the embedded clause. Notice that the sentence in (17) is also opaque because of Agr.

(16) **Ali kendin-i kitab-ı oku-du san-iyor.**
    Ali himself-Acc book-Acc read-past believe-prog-3sg
    'Ali believes himself to have read the book.'

(17) **Ali kendî kitab-ı oku-du san-iyor.**
    Ali himself-Acc book-Acc read-past 3sg believe-prog-3sg
    'Ali believes himself to have read the book.'

Like the reciprocal *birbir-*, the reflexive *kendi* in a non-finite Direct Complement is bound in its GC. The finite form of the Direct Complement in (17) is the violation of Principle A, since the reflexive *kendi* is not bound in its GC.

### 1.5. FINITENESS AND NON-FINITENESS OF GERUNDS AND DIRECT COMPLEMENTS

George and Kornfilt point out that Direct Complements and Gerunds share one similarity: they both can be finite and non-finite.¹

Finiteness is defined as Agreement, rather than tense in Turkish. Thus, for example in (17) the embedded sentence has an Agreement marker, which is 3sg, hence it is finite.

In the following we shall see finite and non-finite forms of Action Nominals and Direct Complements.

**FINITE (ACTION NOMINALS)**

(18) **(Ben) Ali-nin bu kitab-ı oku-ma-si-ni iste-di-m.**
    I Ali-Gen this book-Acc read-Ger-3sg.Poss-Acc want-past 1sg
    'I wanted Ali to read this book.'

**NON-FINITENESS (ACTION NOMINALS)²**

(19) **(Ben) bu kitab-ı oku-ma-yi iste-di-m.**
    I this book-Acc read-Ger-Acc want-past 1sg
    'I wanted to read this book.'

**FINITE (DIRECT COMPLEMENTS)**

(20) **Ali (ben) kitab-ı oku-du-m san-iyor.**
    Ali I book-Acc read-past 1sg believe-prog-3sg
    'Ali believes I read the book.'

---

¹ It would be appropriate, however, if we can be more specific about the type of gerunds George and Kornfilt are dealing with. They are Action Nominals, not Factive Nominals, because Factive Nominals can only have finite form.

² However, this happens only when subjects of the main and the embedded clauses are the same.
NON-FINITE (DIRECT COMPLEMENTS)

(21) a- Ali ben-i kitab-ı oku-du san-iyor.
   Ali I-Acc book-Acc read-past believe-prog-3sg
   'Ali believes me to have read the book.'

   Ali I-nom book-Acc read-past believe-prog-3sg

As noticed, in (18) when the Agr marker is present the sentence is finite, the subject of the Action Nominal is assigned Genitive case by Agr. Agr marker is deleted when the main and the embedded subjects are the same, as in (19). The sentence in (20) is finite because there is an Agr marker on the verb. Here the subject is marked Nominative case when Agr marker is present. It is, however, Accusative case marked when the Agr is absent as in (21). The Accusative case, here, is assigned by the transitive verb *sanmak*. This case is referred to as Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) in the literature.1

In the following section we will now move to the main area of concern, the claim that gerunds share common traits with noun phrases.

1.6. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN POSSESSIVE NOUN PHRASES AND GERUNDS

1. In possessive noun phrases and gerunds head nouns exhibit agreement with the possessor and this possessor can be dropped.

(22) (Ben-im) okul-um
    lsg-Gen school-ls
   'My school'

(23) (Biz-im) ev-imiz
    lpl-Gen house-lpl
   'Our house'

FACTIVE NOMINAL

(24) (Ben-im) sen-i gör-düğ-ümü bil-iyor.
    lsg-Gen you-Acc see-Ger-lsg-Acc know-prog-3sg
   'He knows that I saw you.'

ACTION NOMINAL

(25) (Ben-im) süt al-ma-m-ı ist-iyor.
    lsg-Gen milk buy-Ger-1sg-Acc want-prog-3sg
   'He wants me to buy milk.'

2. Both in possessive noun phrases and gerunds, in those cases in which the 3rd person plural subject is phonologically realized, the number agreement of the head is optional.

POSSESSIVE NOUN PHRASES

(26) a - Öğrenci-ler-in kitap-lar-ı
    Student-pl-Gen book-3pl-Poss

or

---

1 For example in the sentence *John believes [IP him to be a liar]*. the transitive verb *believe* takes an IP (= S) as a complement. It governs into the maximal projection IP and assigns case to its subject NP.
b - Öğrenci-ler-in kitab-ı
Student-pl-Gen book-3sg.Poss
'The students' book'

**ACTION NOMINALS**

(27) a - Öğrenci-ler-in kitab-ı oku-ma-lar-ı-na sevin-di-m.
Student-pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-3pl-Poss-Dat happy-past-1sg
or
b - Öğrenci-ler-in kitab-ı oku-ma-sı-na sevin-di-m.
Student-pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-3sg.Poss-Dat happy-past-1sg
'I am happy that the students read the book.'

**FACTIVE NOMINALS**

(28) a - Öğrenci-ler-in kitab-ı oku-duk-lar-ı-na sevin-di-m.
Student-pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-3pl-poss-Dat happy-past-1sg
or
b - Öğrenci-ler-in kitab-ı oku-duğ-u-na sevin-di-m.
Student-pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-3sg.poss-Dat happy-past-1sg
'I am happy that the students read the book.'

On the other hand, when the plural subject is not phonologically realized, 3rd person plural agreement marker is obligatory.

(29) a - Ø kitab-ı oku-duk-lar-ı-na sevin-di-m.
b - Ø kitab-ı oku-ma-lar-ı-na sevin-di-m.
'I am happy that they read the book.'
c - *Ø kitab-ı oku-ma-sı-na sevin-di-m.
'I am happy that they read the book.'

The sentence in (29) c is ungrammatical in the intended reading, because it does not indicate plurality.

3. In possessive noun phrases and gerundives Genitive case assignment to the subject comes from Agr under government. However, there is another type of noun phrase (compound) which has the same structure as possessive noun phrases, except that the subject of the noun phrase does not carry genitive case. The difference between the possessive noun phrases and compounds is that the former is referential and the latter is non-referential. In compounds Agr is missing and therefore Genitive cannot be realized on the subject.

(30) a - Öğrenci-nın kitab-ı
Student-Gen book-3sg.Poss
'The student's book'
b - Öğrenci kitab-ı
Student book-3sg
'The student book'

George and Kornfilt argue that the possessive -(s)l in (30a) is not an agreement marker in possessive noun phrases, but is just a compound marker as in (30b). They came to this conclusion by applying the reciprocal test to the lexical noun phrases.
In (31) although there is an Agreement marker the reciprocal *birbir*- is bound by the subject of the matrix clause, and the sentence is grammatical. Thus, they claim that lexical noun phrases and gerundives are identical in their morphological structure, yet they differ in their syntactic properties in the sense that the -(s)I is an Agreement marker in gerundives, but a compound marker in lexical noun phrases.

Now let us consider the following gerundive whose subject is a reciprocal.

(32) (Biz)i *birbir-imizi-in* kitab-ı oku-duğ-u-nu san-iyor-uz.
     We each other-1pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-3sg-Acc think-prog-1pl
     'We think that each other read the book.'

As we have noticed, the reciprocal in gerundive is bound with the subject of the higher clause like the reciprocal in noun phrase even if the lower clause has an Agr marker on the verb. Whenever a reciprocal is a possessor the Agr element does not show agreement with its person and number as we can see in (31) and (32). It does not behave as an accessible SUBJECT to the reciprocal, therefore it is weak. However, it still assigns Genitive case. When the Agr behaves as a strong accessible SUBJECT reciprocal is ungrammatical.

(33) a - *(Biz)i *birbir-imizi-in* tabla-mız-ı yıka-dı-k.
     We each other-1pl-Gen ashtray-1pl-Acc wash-past-1pl

b - *(Biz)i *birbir-imizi-in* kitab-ı oku-duğ-umuz-u san-iyor-uz.
     We each other-1pl-Gen book-Acc read-Ger-1pl-Acc think-prog-1pl

One might argue that since the -(s)I is not an Agreement marker in possessive noun phrases, it may also not be an Agreement marker in gerunds. Based on the previously presented facts I will claim that the -(s)I is an Agreement marker in both possessive noun phrases and gerunds. Possessive noun phrases and gerunds both share the same morphology and the same syntactic structure, and the -(s)I in compounds is realized as a compounding marker. The problem here is that Principle A says nothing about the case we are observing.

1.7. PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF POSSESSIVE NOUN PHRASES AND GERUNDS IN TURKISH

In Abney's analysis of English noun phrases, DP is considered as a functional category. The specifier position of the DP is the position in which Genitive case is assigned to the possessor. Abney's proposed structure for the English noun phrases is shown in (34):

1 See also Kornfilt (1987).
2 For a similar argument see S. Özsoy, (1988)
3 Under DP analysis, the noun phrase is DP, not NP
I know that Ali came.'

As noted, the gerund is constructed by adding the nominalizer -diğ to the verb stem. Naturally, one would expect -diğ base-generated within VP as in (37).

(37)  

However, the structure shown above would violate the DP phrase structure since D selects an NP, rather than a VP. Then, what could be the scope of the

---

1 Here NP means the maximal projection (c-projection) of N.
2 See (36).
nominalizer -dlk? The -dlk is not an independent syntactic head. It affixes to a verbal projection (VP), then it converts it into a nominal category (DP) by transferring its [+N] feature into the VP. I will adopt Abney's proposed structure for gerunds in Turkish and Poss-ing in English.

\[(38) \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{D'} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{NP} \]

\[
\text{Ali'nin} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{-diğ} \\
\text{John's} \quad \text{-ing} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Ø} \quad \text{gel-} \quad \text{come}
\]

In this structure Ali is Genitive case assigned by the nominal Agr -(s)İ, and the -dlk affixes to VP without violating DP's selectional property.

1.8. IS -DLK A TENSE MARKER?

To answer this question let us first take a closer look at the internal structure of verbs in Turkish. Turkish is a head-final language. In a simple sentence Agr is always base-generated outside Tense (Tns) and Tns must follow the lexical verb as shown in (39).

\[(39) \quad \text{(Ben) dün iki kitap al-di-m.} \]

'I bought two books yesterday.'

The derivation of aldim is as follows:

\[(40) \quad \text{AGRP} \quad \text{AGR} \quad \text{TNSP} \quad \text{V} \]

\[
\text{VP} \quad \text{TNS} \quad \text{-m} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{di-} \quad \text{al-}
\]

In (40) the -dl is a tense marker, and it appears under Tns node. The -m is an agreement marker, and it is realized under Agr node.

Gerundive constructions keep the same order as corresponding simple sentences as can be seen in (41). Does this indicate that -dlk in gerundives is also a tense marker?

\[(41) \quad \text{(Ben-im) dün iki kitap al-diğ-im-i gör-dü.} \]

'I-Gen yesterday two book buy-Ger-1sg-Acc see-past-3sg' 'He saw that I bought two books yesterday.'

It seems that the -dlk in gerunds is ambiguous in contrast to the past tense marker -dl in simple sentences in that it can indicate either present or past actions. It also differs from the -dl in simple sentences in that it carries [+N] feature, and it appears under NP node.
Kural (1993) states that the morpheme -dik functions only as a past tense marker. According to him, the morpheme -dik is a tense marker, and it is composed of the matrix past -di and an additional -k which belong to the C° category. This -k occurs with the infinitival -mA in PRO control, and the past tense -di in subordinate context.

He proposes the following diagram for gerunds:

\[
\text{AgrP} \quad \text{Agr}^\circ \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{CP} \quad \text{C}^\circ \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{T}^\circ \\
\text{Spec} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{V}^\circ
\]

As Kural states, agreement is established under a specifier-head relationship. In his diagram the agreement marker appears outside the C° violating Head Movement Constraint (HMC) and Minimality Condition (MC) which are given in (43) and (44).²

(43) HEAD MOVEMENT CONSTRAINT (HMC)

Movement of a zero-level category \( \beta \) is restricted to the position of a head \( \alpha \) that governs the maximal projection \( \gamma \) of \( \beta \), where \( \alpha \) θ-governs or L-marks \( \gamma \) if \( \alpha \neq \text{Comp} \).

(Chomsky, 1986)

(44) MINIMALITY CONDITION (MC)

A antecedent governs B only if there is no C such that (i) C is a potential antecedent governor for B, and (ii) C c-commands B and does not c-command A.

(Rizzi, 1990)

Kural claims that Agr is an exception to HMC and MC, in other words, Agr is not an independent syntactic head in syntax; it is a syntactic feature, therefore, HMC and MC do not have to apply to it. Being a syntactic feature, Agr is picked

² Kural does not call -dlk, -EcEk, and -mEk constructions gerundives, rather he calls -lṣ constructions gerundives. I will not deal with the -lṣ constructions here. However, I do admit that like -dlk, -EcEk and -mEk, -lṣ is another type of gerundive suffix in Turkish.

(i) a - Why is John happy?
   b - *Why be John AGR/TNS happy?
   c - [CP why C(IP John [ I' AGR/TNS (VP be happy)]]

(Ouhalla, 1990)

In the (i) b is is derived by V-movement directly to C, therefore the verb is not influenced. V-movement directly to C is not consistent with HMC and, consequently, with ECP.
up at VP or TP via feature percolation, and from there it carried to C° by the verb through V-to-C movement.

Thus, according to Kural, a verbal complex in Turkish consists of Verb+Tense+Complement, and the verb receives agreement features when it reaches the final head to form this complex. It appears that his analysis is presented to avoid the violation HMC and MC. While Kural's claim that Agr is just a syntactic feature merits further study, I side with Pollock (1989), Chomsky (1991) and Ouhalla's (1990) proposals that Agr is an independent category heading its own maximal projection. Thus I will maintain the claim that like Tns (Tense), Agr is a functional head c-selecting Tns. Like Tns, Agr as a function head does not take argument, that is, it lacks the ability to assign a thematic role. Functional category Agr also has phi-features (person, number) like Tns (past, future). Both Tns and Agr elements are base-generated under the I node and their m-selectional (morphological selectional) properties are satisfied subsequent to V movement to I.

One question that might be asked is "What, then, is the status of the morpheme -AcAk?"

As mentioned, the morpheme -AcAk in gerunds denotes future action Kural (1993) assumes that since the subordinate -AcAk has some future value it must be identical with the future tense morpheme in the matrix clauses.

Now consider the following sentences.

(46) a- pro gid - ecek - ti - k.
   go INFL past Agr 1pl.
   'We would have gone'

b - *Ahmet [pro gid - ecek - ti 2 - miz ] i söyle - di..
   'Ahmet said that we would have gone'

(Kennelly 1990)

If the -AcAk in (46b) is also the future tense marker, why, then, can it not appear with the past tense marker in the embedded sentence, as it appears in the matrix sentence (46a)?

1 A similar argument is also made by Kennelly (1990).
2 In fact in (47b) we would expect the suffix tlk rather than the past tense marker tl, because, as mentioned, the suffix tlk is only used in embedded sentences. The matrix sentences and the embedded sentences in Turkish cannot have the same structure.
3 Kural (1990) does not touch on this issue.
Kennelly (1990) answers this question by claiming that "inability of Tense to appear on an embedded verb where there is INFL is clear evidence that Tense and INFL cannot occur under a single XP" She argues that the future morpheme does not appear under Tns node, because it is not a tense marker, rather it is an aspectual marker, therefore it must appear under INFL node.

I agree with Kennelly that the -AcAk in (46b) is an aspectual marker, and the inability of the morpheme -AcAk to appear in embedded clauses with the morpheme -dlk is because the gerund marker -dlk cannot appear on the verb with the aspectual marker -AcAk in the embedded sentences. The gerund marker can only attach directly to the bare stem of the verb as in (41).

In the following section we shall present some evidence supporting the claim that Gerunds behave like possessive noun phrases, whereas Direct Complements act like simple sentences.

1.9. DIRECT COMPLEMENTS ARE SENTENCES - GERUNDS ARE NOUN PHRASES

Now we shall provide some evidence to the fact that Gerunds are noun phrases.

1. As mentioned before, Direct Complements cannot take case markers, while Gerunds can.

(47) a - GERUND
   Ali-Gen come-Ger-3sg.Poss-Acc know-prog-1sg
   I know that Ali came.'
   b - DIRECT COMPLEMENT
      * Ali gel-di-ni bil-iyor-um
      Ali come-past-Acc know-prog-1sg
      I know Ali came.'
   c - NOUN PHRASES
      Ali-nin voice-3sg.Poss-Acc hear-past-1sg
      'I heard Ali's voice.'

In (47a) and (47c) Accusative case marking is obligatory. The verb believe assigns Accusative case marking to its complement in (47a) and (47c), but not in (47b).

2. Direct Complements cannot be an object of postpositions.

(48) a - GERUND
   Ali-nin school-Dat go-able-Ger-3sg.Poss for money necessary
   'Money is necessary for Ali's being able to go to school.'
   b - DIRECT COMPLEMENT
      *Ali okul-a gid-ebil-eced için para lazım.
c - NOUN PHRASE
Ali-nin okul-u için para lazım.
Ali-Gen school-Poss for money necessary
'For Ali's school money is necessary.'

3. Backgrounding of a Direct Complement is not possible. Application of backgrounding to the sentence in (49) is as follows:
(49) a - Bil-iyor-um Ali-nin gel-diğ-i-ni.
   b - * Bil-iyor-um Ali gel-di.

Finally, gerunds can be a subject of a noun phrase.
       Ali-Gen late to be-Ger-Poss issue-Comp discuss-pass-past
       'The issue of Ali's being late was discussed.'
       Ali-Gen stinginess-Poss issue-Comp discuss-pass-past
       'The issue of Ali's stinginess was discussed.'

The sentences in (50) behave like compound noun phrases. The noun phrase (gerund) cannot have Genitive case assigned because the -(s)l is not an Agreement marker in compounds.

1.10. CONCLUSION

All the evidence we have given above show that Gerunds in Turkish are noun phrases, while Direct Complements are purely sentential. The embedded subject of the Gerunds is assigned Genitive case by the nominal Agr, as in noun phrases. The Agr is a functional element with some phi-features; it is the governor of the subject, hence it is the head of DP. An overt Agr element behaves as strong accessible SUBJECT, whereas a non-overt Agr element, which is weak, behaves as a weak accessible SUBJECT (for reciprocals). Finiteness is defined as Agreement in Turkish; the opacity is created by Agr, rather than by tense.
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