

(CONTINUATIVE, INCEPTIVE), -Ayaz (PROSPECTIVE), and -İver (CELERATIVE, non-CONATIVE). The PERFECT marker is exemplified in (6):

6. Şirket-imiz müşteri-ler-i-ne başarı-yla hizmet ver-egel-di-Ø.
 company-POSS.1PL client-PL-POSS.3SG-DAT success-INST service provide-PRF-PFV-3SG
 'Our company has provided services to its clients with success (so far).'

The perfect marker, which is of the universal type (McCawley, 1971), can be combined with the null present marker as well as the past marker, but it cannot be combined with the future marker -AcAk, which has been treated as a tense or aspect marker in the literature. Another thing to note is that the future marker cannot follow the copula *i-* as expected from a T head and requires the presence of the auxiliary as a host:

7. a. hasta-y-dı b. hasta-y-mış c. *hasta-y-acak d. hasta ol-acak
 sick-COP-PST sick-COP-EVID sick-COP-FUT sick AUX-FUT
 '(S)he was sick.' '(S)he is (evid.) sick.' '(S)he will be sick.' '(S)he will be sick.'

Based on the distributional data given above and the intuitions first put forth by Yavaş (1982), I further claim that the future is exclusively a modality in Turkish.

Several accounts (including Cinque (2002)) treat -miş as a perfect marker in cases where it precedes the copula. I claim, however, that it is exclusively a perfective marker in a pre-copula position, which only gives experiential or resultative perfect readings in certain contexts.

8. Tabanca patla-yiver-di. O an katil ol-muş-tu-m.
 gun go.off-N-CON-PFV that moment murderer become-PFV-PST-1SG
 'The gun just went off. At that moment I became a murderer.'

In cases of -miş stacking, the result is a dual reading in complimentary distribution:

9. a. gel-miş-miş b. çal-mış-miş
 come-PFV-EVID steal-PFV-DUB
 '(S)he has evidently come.' 'Purportedly (s)he stole (it).'

Cinque (2002) treats the perfectives -miş and -DI as completives and assumes that they are base-generated in projection #29 or #35. He also assumes that non-past (hence pre-copula) -DI is an Anterior Tense (#8) marker. I will show that pre-copula -miş and -DI are exclusively perfective markers, which is further supported by the fact that T heads are unable to bear sentential stress. Based on (10), I propose that the base-generation site for the perfective is located between 8. TP_{anterior} and 9. ModP_{alethic}. This proposal also accounts for (4) and (5) and shows that the auxiliary initiates a new hierarchical cycle, which is clearly observed in (4b).

10. yap-a-ma-yabil-di-y-di-Ø.
 do-ABIL-NEG-ALET-PFV-COP-PST-3SG (Impossible to faithfully replicate in English)
 'It was possible for her/him not to have done it.'

I further claim that the language frequently employs present perfective constructions, even in cases where an event that may have occurred long ago is being referred to:

11. a. On yıl önce adam öldür-dü-m. b. On yıl önce adam öldür-dü-y-dü-m.
 ten year ago man kill-PFV-1SG ten year ago man kill-PFV-COP-PST-1SG
 'I killed a man ten years ago.' 'I killed a man ten years ago.'

I propose that Turkish's way of dealing with the present perfective paradox (Malchukov, 2009) is the following: There is a covert operator occupying the T_{anterior} (#8) head, which gives the construction an anterior (that is, past) reading. T_{past} and T_{future} projections would still be empty, resulting in present tense. The same operator is also used for other markers that occur without a tense marker, including but not limited to the evidential -miş.

Finally, I claim that the copula *i-* is located inside the MoodP_{irrealis} (#7). I propose splitting the projection and recategorizing its content depending on the ability to follow the copula (which is the case for conditionals or dubitatives, but not for counterfactuals or optatives).

I will also briefly touch upon the topics of the Progressive-to-Imperfective Shift (Deo, 2015) and the hierarchy's success in accounting for the variation between speakers.