

Interaction between Internal and External Syntax: Evidence from DOM in Tatar dialects

Ekaterina Lyutikova¹

Moscow State University / Institute for Modern Linguistic Research MPSU

Asya Pereltsvaig

Stanford University

Introduction. This paper investigates micro-variation between two dialects of Tatar (a Turkic language spoken in Russia) from the perspective of the interaction between the internal and external syntax of noun phrases. In particular, we argue that in both dialects the external syntax of direct objects (visibility to Probes for Agree and Move, and case assignment) correlates with their internal structure, namely whether they contain the functional projections of DP and/or NumP, or are bare NPs. Furthermore, we show that the two dialects under consideration differ as to how much functional structure is needed for a noun phrase to be visible to Probes.

Proposal: interaction of external and internal syntax. We make a case for a feature-driven account of syntactic behavior of linguistic items by investigating the Differential Object Marking (DOM) phenomenon in Tatar (1a-b). Contrary to earlier analyses of DOM in Turkic languages (e.g. Enç 1991, Baker & Vinokurova 2010, Baker 2013, 2015; Levin & Preminger 2015; Kornfilt & Preminger 2015), we argue that the distribution and the interpretation of the direct object is derivable not from its semantic features like specificity (2) or its position in the clause (3), but from its feature specification, which, in its turn, corresponds to the degree of its structural complexity. Thus, noun phrases in Tatar come in different size: DPs, which are phi-complete; NumPs, which are specified for Number but not for Person; and NPs, which lack phi-features altogether. We claim that case marking, movement options and scope possibilities of Tatar direct objects can be construed as a feature-driven Probe-Goal interaction. DPs are obligatorily case-marked (4) and undergo overt or covert movement acquiring wide scope (2). In contrast, NPs are caseless and frozen *in situ* in the immediately preverbal position (i.e. they can not scramble and have only surface scope).

Proposal: microvariation. We also argue that although the locus of variation can be indeed contained in the feature specifications of elements, the operations like Move or Agree also allow for a parametrization that specifies what element counts as a Goal and in this way influences the external syntax of this element. Specifically, we examine two dialects of Tatar that differ as to the properties of Agree and Move (see Table 1). In the first dialect, Agree/Move is ‘all or nothing’, in the sense that only phi-complete Goals (that is, Goals specified for both Person and Number features) are visible for a Probe that looks for valued phi-features. As a consequence, only DP direct objects are visible for Probes, and this is why the class of direct objects that can move and can take a wide scope coincides with the class of case-marked objects. In the second dialect, Agree/Move can attract a Goal whose feature matrix is only a subset of the set of unvalued features of the Goal. Thus, the head H [*u*Pers], [*u*Num] would attract not only phi-complete DPs, but also a NumP which possesses a valued Number feature but no Person feature. As a result, three classes of noun phrases arise: DPs can move and are case-marked (as they can make a probe phi-complete, and this is a prerequisite for case assignment, see Chomsky 2000, 2001); NPs cannot be attracted and are caseless; NumPs can be attracted but remain caseless (see ex. (5)-(6)).

In addition to providing a coherent account of DOM in Tatar dialects, our proposal extends to other differentially-case-marked noun phrases, such as possessors in different types of *ezafe* constructions and complements of attributivizers.

Examples

(1) Direct objects can be accusative or unmarked

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----|----------------------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|
| a. | Marat | mašina- m | sat- <i>ip</i> | al- <i>dı</i> . | b. | Marat | mašina | sat- <i>ip</i> | al- <i>dı</i> . |
| | M. | car-ACC | sell-CONV | take-PST | | M. | car | sell-CONV | take-PST |
| | ‘Marat bought the car.’ | | | | | ‘Marat bought a car/cars.’ | | | |

(2) Accusative DO can be non-specific

Marat Alsu-nıñ ber fotografija-se-*(n) dä kür-mä-de.
 Marat Alsu-GEN one picture-3-ACC EMPH see-NEG-PST
 ‘Marat didn’t see a(ny) picture of Alsu’. (Neg > ∃; ∃ > Neg)

(3) DO need not move out of VP to get case

Bajras [vp kat-kat xat-nı ukı]-dı.
 Bayras again-again letter-ACC read-PST
 ‘Bayras read the letter again and again.’

(4) DPs (e.g. pronouns and noun phrases with genitive possessors) are obligatorily case-marked

a. Marat a-lar-*(nı) kür-de. b. Marat Ramil-neñ mašina-sı-*(n) al-dı.
 Marat this-PL-ACC see-PST Marat Ramil-GEN car-3-ACC take-PST
 ‘Marat saw them.’ ‘Marat took Ramil’s car.’

Table 1. Parametrization of Agree/Move: visible noun phrases outlined

	Dialect 1			Dialect 2		
	DP	NumP	NP	DP	NumP	NP
Case	+	–	–	+	–	–
scrambling (overt movement)	+	–	–	+	+	–
wide scope (LF movement)	+	–	–	+	+	–

(5) Dialect 2: no number neutrality of scrambled nominals (=NPs do not scramble)

Marat kitap anarga bir-de.
 Marat kitap this.DAT give-PST
 Marat gave him a book / *books.

(6) Dialect 2: no number neutrality with wide scope (=NPs do not move covertly)

Här ukuči awır mäsälä ešlä-de.
 every student difficult problem do-PST
 ‘Every student solved a difficult problem/difficult problems.’

(i) $\forall > \exists$, one problem: NumP or NP

(ii) $\forall > \exists$, several problems: NP

(iii) $\exists > \forall$, one problem: NumP

(iv) * $\exists > \forall$, several problems

References:

- Baker, M. (2013) On Alignment Types and Types of Differential Object Marking. Paper presented at the Tromsø Conference on Differential Object Marking. Tromsø, May 2013.
- Baker, M. (2015) *Case. Its principles and its parameters*. Cambridge: CUP, 2015.
- Baker, M. & N. Vinokurova (2010) Two modalities of Case assignment: Case in Sakha. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28: 593–642.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka (eds.). *Step by Step*. (pp. 89–155). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.). *Ken Hale: A life in language*. (pp. 1–52). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Enç, M. (1991). The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:1–25.
- Kornfilt, J. & O. Preminger (2015) Nominative as no case at all: an argument from raising-to-accusative in Sakha. In: Joseph & Predolac (eds.) *Proceedings of WAFL 9*. Pp. 109-120.
- Levin, T. & Preminger, O. (2015). Case in Sakha: Are two modalities really necessary? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33(1): 231–250.

¹ Ekaterina Lyutikova’s work is supported by Russian Scientific Foundation, project # 14-18-03270 “Word order typology, communicative-syntactic interface and information structure in the world’s languages”.