

## One modality of case assignment: genitive case in Turkic

Deniz Satik, Harvard University

**Overview.** Baker (2015) argues that there are two main ways in which genitive case is assigned. It can be assigned as Marantz (1991)'s unmarked case, assigned to any DP/NP inside an NP. Following Bobaljik (2008), agreement is parasitic on case already assigned. For Baker, such a language would be Japanese, which allows multiple genitive-marked DP/NPs in an NP. It can also be assigned via agreement with a designated functional head. For Baker, this is instantiated in Turkish or Sakha, which only allow one genitive-marked DP/NP in an NP, whose  $\phi$ -features are represented by a possessive suffix on a noun, or sometimes via nominal agreement on a verb.

Based on novel data obtained from fieldwork on the Turkic languages Turkish, Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Sakha and Altai, I provide 3 arguments for genitive as an unmarked case, in the spirit of Levin & Preminger (2015). (i) Partitive subjects and adnominal pronouns may get assigned genitive case despite default agreement. (ii) Both nominative and genitive-marked subject NPs are permitted with the same possessive suffix in some Turkic RCs; for Baker, only genitive-marking should be permitted. (iii) Turkish adjunct DPs may be assigned genitive case without agreement. I conclude that genitive case precedes agreement in these Turkic languages, providing an independent argument to allow multiple DPs in Japanese NPs and an account of default agreement.

**Data. (i):** In Turkish, possessive structures (PS), relative clauses (RC) and complement clauses bear default agreement (3SG) with partitive subjects such as 'ikimizin' *two of us* and 'hepimizin' *all of us*, in addition to adnominal pronouns such as 'biz Türkler' *we Turks*. However, default agreement is merely optional in Turkic languages such as Kyrgyz, Sakha, Uyghur, Kazakh and Altai, and banned in Uzbek. I provide examples of PSes with default agreement from Turkish in (1)-(2) and Altai in (3)-(4), in addition to a Turkish RC in (5) and Sakha RC in (6).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (1) Iki-miz-in kedi-si<br>two-1PL-GEN cat-3SG<br>'The two of us's cat'                         | (2) *Iki-miz-in kedi-miz<br>two-1PL-GEN cat-1PL<br>'The two of us's cat'                          |
| (3) Eki-le-bis-tiñ bichig-i<br>two-NUM-1PL-GEN book-3SG<br>'The two of us's book'              | (4) Eki-le-bis-tiñ bichig-is<br>two-NUM-1PL-GEN book-1PL<br>'The two of us's book (same meaning)' |
| (5) Iki-miz-in ye-diğ-i döner<br>two-1PL-GEN eat-FN-3SG döner<br>'the döner the two of us ate' | (6) Ikki-em-mit sie-bit at-a<br>two-NUM-1PL eat-PTPL horse-3SG<br>'the horse the two of us ate'   |

It could be argued that default agreement arises due to partitives being deficient in  $\phi$ -features. But we see that default agreement is not possible in the finite clauses of these languages, as seen in the simple clauses (7)-(10) meaning "the two of us came" from Turkish and Altai. This set of data therefore indicates that genitive case is assigned independently of agreement.

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| (7) Iki-miz gel-di-k (1PL agreement)  | (9) Eki-le-bis kel-di-s (1PL agreement)   |
| (8) *Iki-miz gel-di-∅ (3SG agreement) | (10) *Eki-le-bis kel-di-∅ (3SG agreement) |

**(ii):** Though Kornfilt (2005) points out that genitive case marking goes together with agreement on either the predicate or head noun in Turkic RCs, there are a few Turkic languages where it does not, such as Uzbek (in (11)), Altai (in (12)) and Sakha ((13)). Both nominative and genitive case are permitted on the subject of an RC with the same possessive suffix:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (11) Men(-ing) kör-gan kitob-im<br>1SG see-PTPL book-1SG<br>'the book I saw' | (12) Men-(iñ) jurap koy-go-m juruk<br>I-1SG draw AUX-PTPL-1SG picture<br>Uzbek 'the picture I drew' Altai |
|--|---|

- (13) Julius aqa-t-(m) sie-bit at-a  
 Julius father-3SG-GEN eat-PTPL horse-3SG  
 ‘the horse Julius’s father ate’ Sakha

Based on similar patterns in Uzbek nominalized clauses, Gribanova (2019) builds a hybrid account in which structural unmarked case, either nominative or genitive, is assigned by agreement. This is environment-sensitive to prevent bare-marked possessors in Uzbek PSes. This approach acknowledges that case assignment and agreement do not always target the same nominal. One argument is from person hierarchy effects in Uzbek copular clauses with multiple DPs, in which genitive-marking and agreement target distinct nominals; this is derived via agreement with a relativized probe. But default agreement in RCs raises a novel problem for this account, as in (14):

- (14) ekö-ö-büz-dün jazgan kiteb-i  
 two-NUM-1PL-GEN wrote-PTPL book-3SG  
 ‘the book the two of us wrote’ Kyrgyz

(iii): In Turkish, agreement may be dropped from most PSes. Öztürk & Taylan (2015) argue this is constrained based on whether the genitive-marked DP is an argument or an adjunct; when agreement is not present it must be an adjunct. This is based on tests from prior work by Partee and Borschev (2003) in Russian, which establish that, among other examples, genitive-marked DPs cannot be an adjunct to head nouns in cases of kinship and inherent relations, as in (15)-(17):

- |                  |                       |                      |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| (15) Biz-im kedi | (16) *Makale-nin isim | (17) *Anne-m-in hala |
| 1PL-GEN cat      | article-GEN name      | Mother-1SG-GEN aunt  |
| ‘our cat’        | ‘the article’s name’  | ‘My mother’s aunt’   |

This gives reason to think that genitive case marking can be assigned to adjuncts in Turkish without agreement taking place. Further, dropping default agreement from possessive constructions such as (1) is impossible (\**ikimizin kedi*), indicating that partitive subjects cannot be adjuncts.

**Proposal.** Following Bobaljik (2008), I assume a configurational approach to case assignment in which agreement arises by virtue of certain case-markings. I remain agnostic on whether agreement is in the narrow syntax or a postsyntactic operation, and whether Turkish has DPs. Case is assigned to the subject of RCs after which agreement is determined on the RC predicate or head noun, with the exception of Uzbek, Altai and Sakha, in which nominative case may as well. The subject of RCs in these languages remain bare if they do not move to Spec of NP.

A difference between Turkic and Japanese genitive case assignment is that Turkic XPs only allow one specifier position while Japanese allow multiple; independent evidence of this is that Turkish finite clauses only allow one nominative-marked subject while Japanese ones allow more than one. I also provide a tentative account of default agreement in which genitive case projects a KP while nominative case does not because it is caselessness, following Kornfilt & Preminger (2015). The KP layer blocks feature percolation of the φ-features of the pronoun, deriving the necessity of full agreement in finite clauses but not with genitive case. To conclude, this paper contributes novel data to an ongoing debate concerning case assignment and agreement.

Baker, Mark. 2015. *Case: Its principles and its parameters* Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107295186.

Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2008. Where’s Phi? Agreement as a postsyntactic operation. In Daniel Harbour, David Adger & Susana Béjar (eds.), *Phi theory*, 295–328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gribanova, Vera. 2019. Case, agreement and differential subject marking across Uzbek nonfinite clause types. In *Conference on Central Asian Languages and Linguistics 3*, Indiana University Bloomington.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2005. Agreement and its placement in Turkic nonsubject relative clauses. In Guglielmo Cinque & Richard S. Kayne (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*, 513–541. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levin, Theodore & Omer Preminger. 2015. Case in Sakha: Are two modalities really necessary? *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(1). 231–250. doi:10.1007/s11049-014-9250-z.

Öztürk, Balkız & Emine Eser Taylan. 2015. Possessive constructions in Turkish. *Lingua* 182. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2015.08.008.