SYNTAX OF NOMINALS IN TURKISH

1. Aim

to understand the internal syntactic structure of N-N-sIn Compounds (NNC), Genitive Phrases (GP) and (s)I(n)-Free Genitive Phrases (SFG) in Turkish

2. The relevant structures

In (1)–(3), there are examples of N-N-sIn Compounds (NNC), Genitive Phrases (GP) and (s)I(n)-Free Genitive Phrases (SFG), respectively.

(1) Çocuk kitab-ı
   child  book-(s)I(n)
   ‘Children’s book’

(2) Çocuğ-un kitab-ı
   child-3SgGen  book-(s)I(n)
   ‘the book of the child’

(3) Çocuğ-un kitap
   child-3SgGen  book
   ‘the book of the child’

3. Background Assumptions

i. NNCs are nP level structures and GPs and SFGs are DPs

ii. The head in all is phrasal: nP in NNCs and DP?-nP? in GPs and SFGs

iii. The non-head in all is phrasal: nP in NNCs and DP?-nP? In GPs and SFGs

iv. I will refer to –(s)I(n) as –(s)I(n) because its status is not very clear to me yet. The reason for this is that it appears both in NNCs and in 3rd person genitive structures (in where we would expect 3rd person possessive). But Kunduraci (2013) shows that it behaves differently from 1st and 2nd person possessive markers.

v. Based on (iv), I will assume that –(s)I(n) may never be a possessive marker, even in genitive structures. Given the null marking of 3rd person elsewhere in Turkish, that is not too weird.

vi. I will assume that nouns come with the nP layer in Turkish, and only if they do so, they can be nouns. This is because nouns can be productively used as adjectives, depending on their position:
3.1. Genitive and Possessive Markers in a Genitive Phrase are Independent of each other

- In most cases in GPs, the genitive marker and the possessive marker are realized together, which leads to the conclusion that they are generated in the same node.
- But:
  i. Genitive can exist without the possessive: In PFGs, there is a genitive marker but no possessive.
  ii. Possessive can exist without the genitive: Inverse vocatives (Akkus 2016):

(5) (The elder brother addresses his little female sibling)

a. Abi-si, ayakkab-lar-im-1 getir-ir-mi-sin?
   brother-(s)I(n) shoe-Pl-1SgPoss-Acc fetch-Aor-Q-2Sg
   ‘Her brother, can you fetch my shoes? (from Intihar)

b. *O-nun abi-si, ayakkab-lar-im-1 getir-ir-mi-sin?
   She-3Gen brother-(s)I(n) shoe-Pl-1SgPoss-Acc fetch-Aor-Q-2Sg

- Note that in (4), overt realization of a genitive marked noun is not allowed (4b).
- Except in very rare cases, where the genitive-marked noun has to come after the head noun. Also, this is possible only with the first and second persons.
- Also note that the noun abi ‘brother’ refers to the speaker himself while –(s)I(n) refers to the hearer.

PART 1: nP

4. -(s)I(n) as a Linker between two nPs

(6) a. Kadın doktor-u
    woman doctor-(s)I(n)
    ‘gynecologist’

b. Kadın doktor
    woman doctor
    ‘female doctor’

- -(s)I(n) appears only if there are two nPs
Can it just be just a morphological support to stick two nouns together?  
No, because we do not get –(s)I(n) every time we have two nPs: there are dvandva compounds such as ana kız ‘mother daughter’, made up with two nPs and lack –(s)I(n).

But notice that in dvandva compounds, notice that two nouns are not hierarchically organized and there is no -(s)I(n).

Given this and examples in (6), I assume that wherever there is –(s)I(n), there is a nominal hierarchy.

### 4.1. Complementary Distribution between –(s)I(n) and Possessive Markers

The first relevant fact is the complementary distribution between –(s)I(n) and the pure possession markers. The relevant examples are below:

(7) a. yemek oda-si  
    eating  room-(s)I(n)  
    ‘dining room’

b. ben-im    yemek oda-m  
    I-1SgGen eating  room-1SgPoss  
    ‘my dining room’

c. *ben-im    yemek oda-si-m  
    I-1SgGen eating  room-(s)I(n)-1SgPoss  
    ‘Intended: my dining room’

**SIDE NOTE 1:**

- Tat (2010) argues that this problem can be solved if we assume multiple specifiers in the DP, which hosts the whole structure.
- These multiple specifiers are equidistant to the possessee but agreement has to occur between the possessee and one of the specifiers.
- Agreement can occur only with the highest specifier, but since these specifiers are all in the same distance to the possessee, there is no way to decide.
- It is possible to choose a target for agreement only after linearization in morphology: the highest (the leftmost).
- Once agreement occurs once, it does not happen again, explaining why –(s)I(n) cannot surface: no agreement can reach to the level of the embedded NNC when there is a higher potential.
- For Kunduraci (2013), who assumes a mapping operation between different forms of rules such as semantic rules and form rules, this complementary distribution occurs because both the possessive is a mapping structure over the
4.2. Starting with nP

- Let us assume that there are two LinkerPhrases (LPs) in Turkish (for lack of a better term for now), weak and strong, associated with the Association (ASN) function and Possession (POSS) function (in broad sense), respectively.
- And these functions correspond to NNCs and GPs, respectively.
- LPs take nPs as a complement.
- If the LP is weak (LP_{weak}), the relation between the two nPs is Association, giving us an NNC.
- If the LP is strong (LP_{strong}), the relation is possession, giving us a GP.
- This translates into syntax as the following (çocuk ‘child’, oda ‘room’):

(8)
In a weak LP, everything stays where they are generated.
In a strong LP, the noun in Spec NP moves to Spec nP, then to Spec LP.
I assume that this movement occurs because LP\textsubscript{strong} requires a possessor because it indicates a possession relation.
The structures in (8) and (9) explain two additional properties of NNCs and GPs:

(i) {-(s)I(n)} and possessive markers cannot co-occur because they are both in LPs.
(ii) the impossibility of two nouns that compete for the same slot as shown in the examples below:

(10) Ali-nin manzara resm-i  
     Ali-3Gen scenery picture-(s)I(n)  
     ‘Ali’s picture of the scenery’

(11) *Ali-nin Merve resm-i  
     Ali-3Gen Merve picture-(s)I(n)  
     ‘Intended: Ali’s picture of Merve’

Example (10) and (11) look like the following in the syntactic structure:

(12)
In (13), ‘Merve’ is a proper name and needs to move up to Spec nPstrong (and then to DP) but it is already occupied.
Therefore, it cannot check its features and the derivation crashes.
But this is not a problem in the first tree because manzara ‘scenery’ does not have features to check.
If we make manzara ‘scenery’ specific by adding a genitive, we get ungrammaticality, possibly due to the same reason as in (11):

(14) *Ali-nin manzara-nin resm-i
    Ali-3Gen scenery-3Gen scenery-(s)I(n)
    ‘Intended: ?????’
• **Note 1:** One could think that Merve cannot be generated in Spec NP. But see the following examples, where the proper name Obama is either interpreted as non-specific (as in the NNC in (15a)) or specific as in GPs (as in (15b). This shows that even proper names start lower:

(15)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Obama tarz-ı} \\
  & \quad \text{Obama style-(s)I(n)} \\
  & \quad \text{‘Obama style’}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
b. & \quad \text{Obama-nın tarz-ı} \\
  & \quad \text{Obama-3SgGen style-(s)I(n)} \\
  & \quad \text{The style of Obama’}
\end{align*}

• **Note 2:** Note that I assumed LPs behave like an NP, being a complement of n. This is because syntactically they behave like NPs (occupying subject positions etc.). This is not surprising given that LP expresses a relation between two nPs. No categorical change.

**PART 2: DP**

• In NNCs, no noun needs to move to DP because they have nothing to check. So, they are nPs (or LPs), which explains their smaller structure and lack of flexibility in scrambling.
• But in a GP, the non-head is a possessor, therefore it needs to be referential and thus has some features to check (to be clarified).
• What could be these features?
• Let us see what happens in existentials.
• If a GP is used in an existential, it primarily has a possession reading (note: existentials also require genitive in Turkish):

(16) \begin{align*}
& \quad \text{Çocuğ-un kitab-ı var} \\
& \quad \text{child-3SgGen book-(s)I(n) exist} \\
& \quad \text{‘The child has a book’} \\
& \quad \text{‘(in restricted contexts) There is the child’s book’}
\end{align*}

• If I make either the head into an indefinite, the pattern does not seem to change:

(17) \begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Çocuğ-un bir kitab-ı var} \\
  & \quad \text{child-3SgGen one book-(s)I(n) exist} \\
  & \quad \text{‘The child has a book’} \\
  & \quad \text{‘(in restricted contexts) There is a book of the child’}
\end{align*}

• But if the non-head is indefinite, the structure can occur in an existential structure with an existential meaning:
(18)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Bir çocuk-un kitab-ı var} \quad \text{one child-3SgGen book-(s)I(n) exist} \\
& \text{There is a book of the child} \\
& \text{‘(in restricted contexts) A child has a book’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Bir çocuk-un bir kitab-ı var} \quad \text{one child-3SgGen one book-(s)I(n) exist} \\
& \text{There is a book of the child} \\
& \text{‘(in restricted contexts) A child has a book’}
\end{align*}
\]

- This indicates that the (in)definiteness of the non-head is decisive in the definiteness of the whole DP.
- The structure would be like the following:

(19)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessor’} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessor’} \\
\text{Lstrong} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessor’} \\
\text{nP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessor’} \\
\text{Lstrong} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessor’} \\
\text{Lstrong} \\
\text{D’ '+/− definite'} \\
\text{D’ '+/− definite'} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{‘Possessee’}
\end{align*}
\]

- Hence, the DP is introduced into the derivation and the non-head moves to its Spec, acquiring the genitive case.
- In the meantime, the head also gets on the agreement available in D.
- **How? Movement up to D or percolation? How can we decide? Or is it possible to get person agreement in LP?**
- **Related Problem:** The head in GPs also show phrasal properties (almost DP-like). So, is head-movement possible?
- After this agreement takes place, the full pronominal in Spec DP is not overtly realized since the possessor is already encoded on the D head.
- This is indeed the case because in most GPs, the possessor is not overtly realized if it is already obvious from the agreement on D (especially, first and second persons).
- It is overtly realized only if it is topicalized or focused.
- So, let us assume that there is a CP above DP in GPs:

(20)
What happens in SFGs?
• Point 1: note that SFGs require the head to be contextually/presuppositionally known.
• This was indicated by Taylan & Ozturk (2016) with the following example:

(20) Context: You do not know your roommate has ordered a pizza. The doorbell rings and you open the door and see the delivery. Then you call at your roommate:
   a. Sen-in pizza-n gel-di galiba.
      You-GEN pizza-2ps.POSS come-past l.think
      I think your pizza came.
   b. # Sen-in pizza gel-di galiba.
      You-GEN pizza come-past l.think
      I think your pizza came.

• Point 2: Also see the following examples, showing that SFGs are not acceptable in existentials (if we can accept (21a)-(21d) in heavy contextualization, the possession reading seems to be more prominent):

(21) a. *Çocuğ-un kitap var
   child-Gen book exist
   ‘Intended 1: The child has a book’
   ‘Intended 2: There is the book of the child’

   b. ?Çocuğ-un bir kitap var
      child-Gen bir book exist
      ‘Intended 1: The child has a book’
      ‘Intended 2: There is a book of the child’

   c. ?Bir çocuğ-un kitap var
      child-Gen book exist
      ‘Intended 1: A child has (a) book’
      ‘Intended 2: There is a book of a child’
d.  "*Bir çocuğun bir kitap var
    child-Gen bir book exist
    'Intended 1: A child has a book'
    'Intended 2: There is a book of a child'

- **Point 3:** Also note that GPs and SFGs have to occur with the accusative, marking
specificity in Turkish, indicating that they have a DP layer (as opposed to NNCs).
- So, I will assume the SFGs are DPs too. But there is another DP that comes just above the
head in SFGs:

(22)

```
    Spec  |      Spec
       |      ('Possessor')
    'DPi'  |    Dhead
    Spec  |      Spec
          |      ('Possessor')
    Dhead |      nP
          |      n
    Dhead |      D Pi
       |      'Di' '+/- definite'

    Spec  |      Spec
       |      ('Possessor')
    'DPi'  |    D head
    Spec  |      Spec
          |      ('Possessor')
    Dhead |      np
          |      n
    Dhead |      D head
       |      'Di'

    Spec  |      Spec
       |      ('Possessor')
    'DPi'  |    D head
    Spec  |      Spec
          |      ('Possessor')
    Dhead |      np
          |      n
    Dhead |      D head
       |      'Di'
```

- The lack of LP (in numeration?) causes the two nouns to be unrelated.
- At the end of the derivation, we have a DP whose two nouns are not yet related.
- Therefore, we need to rely on context to define the relation between these two nouns (i.e.
context strictly defines the relation since syntax cannot do so).
- This is achieved in CP, which is why the whole DP, including the head and the non-head,
moves into the CP layer. This is unlike GPs, where the possessor moves into CP.
- Thus, the parts of the DP are more tightly together, even when in CP, which explains the
fact that SFGs do not allow scrambling while GPs do. That is why we have to overtly
realize the genitive marked possessor.
- **Question:** Pronoun possessors makes SFGs grammatical in existential and in indefinite
contexts:

(23)  ben-im bir akraba var
    I-1SgGen one relative exist
    'There is a relative of mine'

- This could be because of the inert contextual referentiality of pronouns. **But I do not
know how this idea would translate into the structure I proposed.**
SIDE NOTE 4

**Complementary Distribution with Other Derivational Markers**

- Coming back to other derivational suffixes that are seemingly in complementary distribution with –(s)I(n), such as –ll ‘with’, I suggest that these are postpositions, corresponding to prepositions in English.
- See the translation in the example below, where –ll is translated as ‘with’:
  
  `oda-lı ev`
  
  ‘(a) house with room(s)’

- Also notice that –ll comes between two nouns, differently from –(s)I(n) in NNCs and GPs.
- This suggests a structure like the following, where I assume that the PP is adjunction because it only modifies the noun:

```
NP
  Spec
  NP
  PP 'odali'
  N'
  N
  'ev'
```

- But then we run into problems with examples like the following:
  
  - a. yemek oda-sı
    
    eating room-(s)I(n)
    
    ‘dining room’
  
  - b. yemek oda-lı ev
    
    eating room-with house
    
    ‘(a) house with (a) dining room’
  
  - c. *yemek oda-sı-lı ev
    
    eating room-with house
    
    ‘Intended: (a) house with (a) dining room’

- So, when the PP takes an NNC as its complement rather than a bare N, -(s)I(n) cannot be overtly realized.
- Note that this follows from the structure I proposed for NNCs.
- Assuming that P takes an nP as its complement, the only nP in this structure is just before

---