## Functional Structure in the Nominal Domain: A View from Tatar

Do languages that lack articles have an extended functional structure in the nominal domain, including a DP projection? This question has been a topic of a long-lasting debate in the linguistic literature. Previous studies focused on Slavic languages (but see Bošković and Sener 2012 on Turkish); some scholars (cf. Progovac 1998, Rutkowski 2002, inter alia) argued in favor of the DP projection, while Bošković (2005 and later work; Bošković and Şener 2012) argued against it. Pereltsvaig (2006, 2007) proposed that while some nominals in Russian are DPs, others are Small Nominals (SNs) of different sizes. In this paper, we provide novel evidence for the latter position based on another Turkic language, Tatar (spoken by over 5 million in Tatarstan, Russia). Drawing on our fieldwork on one subdialect of Tatar (spoken in the village of Kutlushkino), we show that different syntactic constructions call for nominals of different sizes. Moreover, we argue that Differential Object Marking (DOM) in Tatar—unlike in other Turkic languages such as Turkish or Sakha-can only be explained in terms of the amount of functional architecture in the object: DP objects receive structural (accusative) Case, as in (1a), while SNs (i.e. NPs or NumPs) remain Caseless, as in (1b). Thus, we rule out alternative analyses based on distinct positions of accusative and unmarked objects or on the semantic interpretation of the object. More generally, we propose that only DPs must receive structural case while SNs are not subject to such Case licensing requirements and may remain morphologically caseless. We further buttress this analysis by showing that DPs and SNs differ in their Case marking not only in the object position but inside nominals as well.

(1)	a.	Marat [ <sub>DP</sub> mašina <b>-nı</b> ]	sat-1p	al-dı.
		Marat car-ACC	buy-CONV	take-PST
		'Marat bought a/the car.'		
	b.	Marat [ <sub>NP/NumP</sub> mašina]	sat-1p	al-dı.
		Marat car	buy-CONV	take-PST
		'Marat bought a car/cars.'		

Our first argument in favor of the structural analysis of DOM in Tatar comes from the fact that ACC-marked and unmarked objects cannot be coordinated. Second, we show that objects which contain DP-level elements (demonstratives, strong quantifiers, pronouns, proper names, etc.) must be ACC-marked, regardless of interpretation. Third, unmarked objects fit the profile of a SN, described by Pereltsvaig (2006): not only are they unable to have an individuated, specific, partitive, or anaphoric interpretation or wide scope with respect to negation or other quantifiers, but they also cannot serve as controllers or antecedents of reflexives/reciprocals.

We buttress our argument that DOM correlates with the DP/SN distinction by showing that the full range of Tatar data cannot be explained by the semantic features of the nominal (e.g. specificity), as has been proposed for Turkish (Enç 1991) and Hebrew (Danon 2006). In particular, nominals involving the so-called ezafe-3 construction, which we independently show to be DPs, must be ACC-marked but may simultaneously have a non-specific interpretation and take narrow scope in relation to other quantifiers/negation.

(2)		Marat [DP Alsu-nıŋ	fotografia-se-*(n)]	kür-me-de.		
		Marat Alsu-GEN	photo-3-ACC	see-NEG-PST		
		'Marat didn't see a photo of Alsu.'				
	$\sim$ Neg > $\exists$ (= it is not the case that Marat saw a photo of Alsu					
	$\exists > Neg$ (= there is a photo of Alsu that Marat didn't see)					

Furthermore, we argue against the positional analysis which treats unmarked objects as pseudoincorporated into the verb and ACC-marked objects as appearing outside the *v*P, as has been proposed for Sakha by Baker & Vinokurova (2010). We show that in Tatar accusative objects can appear inside VP boundary marked by VP-level adverbs (e.g. *tiz* 'quickly'), unlike in Sakha.

(3) a.	Marat <b>tiz</b> Marat quickly 'Marat ate porridge q	<i>botka-<b>nı</b></i> porridge-ACC uickly.'	aša-dı. C eat-PST	[Tatar]
b.	Masha <b>türgennik</b> Masha quickly	<i>salamaat</i> -( <b>#y</b> ) porridge-ACC	sie-te. Ceat-PAST.3sS	[Sakha]

'Masha ate porridge quickly.' (ACC on 'porridge' only if it has contrastive focus)

Moreover, we propose that in Tatar pseudo-incorporation is the correct analysis for the nominal component in complex predicate constructions (CPCs) (e.g. *büläk it-* 'gift do'). The nominal component in CPCs must be bare, cannot be focused, and cannot serve as an antecedent for discourse anaphora; in contrast, unmarked objects may contain certain modifiers and complements, may be focused, and support discourse anaphora. Also, in causative structures based on CPCs, the causee is marked accusative, whereas with caseless objects (as with accusative ones), the causee is ablative.

We conclude that the lack of the DP in SN in Tatar makes them invisible to Probes searching for [+D] feature, immune to Case licensing violations, and "semantically deficient" in certain ways. However, we argue that although DPs and SNs differ in their mobility in a clause, case marking (or lack thereof), and semantics, the functional architecture is the key component that explains the others and cannot be dispensed with, as was done by the advocates of the parameterized DP view.

## **References:**

- Baker, M. and N. Vinokurova (2010) Two Modalities of Case Assignment: Case in Sakha. *NLLT* 28: 593-642.
- Bošković, Ž. (2005) On the locality of left branch extraction and the Structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59(1): 1–45.
- Bošković, Ž. and S. Şener (2012) *Turkish NP*. Ms., University of Connecticut. http://web2.uconn.edu/boskovic/papers/Boskovic&SenerTurkishNPSubmissionFinal.pdf
- Danon, G. (2006) Caseless Nominals and the Projection of DP. NLLT 24: 977-1008.

Enç, M. (1991) The Semantics of Specificity. Linguistic Inquiry 22: 1-26.

- Pereltsvaig, A. (2001) On the Nature of Intra-Clausal Relations: A Study of Copular Sentences in Russian and Italian. Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2006) Small nominals. NLLT. 24(2): 433-500.
- Pereltsvaig, A. (2007) On the Universality of DP: A View from Russian. *Studia Linguistica* 61(1): 59-94.
- Progovac, L. (1998) Determiner phrase in a language without determiners. *Journal of Linguistics* 34: 165-179.
- Rutkowski, P. (2002) Noun/pronoun asymmetries: evidence in support of the DP hypothesis in Polish. *Jezikoslovlje* 3(1-2): 159-170.