

Floating Quantifiers and Possessor Raising: Case Copying Phenomenon in Tatar and Korean

Quantifiers in Tatar may be used similar to adjectives, in this case they precede other modifiers except genitives and do not agree with the head noun (1). Another way to use quantifiers is to put quantified noun phrase in genitive and to make quantifier the head of noun phrase, (2). I will call this construction Inverted Genitive (IG). The third type of constructions with quantifiers consists of the quantified and the quantifier, both bearing the case marker, (3). This latter type will be addressed to as Double Case (DC) constructions.

The main properties of DC noun phrases are following: DC head always bears the person affix; (pro)nominal part of this construction obligatory precedes quantifier (4); two parts can be detached by the subject or an adverb, (5).

In IGs, quantifiers with person marker must also follow genitive marked noun phrase (6). Insertion of subjects or other material is less grammatical, than in DCs, (7).

“Adjectival” quantifiers can have generic interpretation. Syntactically they are DP adjuncts. On the contrary, IG and DC constructions must be referential. I will argue that the latter two types of quantifier constructions are (subsequently) derived from this “adjectival” quantification that results in such a narrowing in interpretation. To explain the derivation of IG and DC, let me consider Korean possessor raising.

Possessors in Korean can copy the case of the possessum, see (8) for accusative (the same is possible with other cases). To my views, this is due to possessor raising in Spec, KP (see [Cho, 2005] among others for similar approach). Unlike Turkic, Korean noun phrases are KPs. Moreover, case in Korean is expressed by particles, which may not only take DP complement but also project Spec position.

Possessors are originated in Spec, NP (9.a). To get genitive case, possessive KPs must raise to Spec, DP where they agree with D and receive genitive if D is ϕ -complete (9.b). If not, possessors will move further and seek for another probe, which will be the “matrix” K, (9.c).

Concerning Tatar floating quantifiers, one of the strangest things with both DC and IG constructions is that instead of one, they have two 3rd person possessive markers on the head. The same holds for substantivized quantifiers, which also have -ysy complex instead of -y. This complex morpheme has the restrictive (‘of them’) and not the possessive (‘his / her / theirs’) meaning. In the same time, quantifiers can never receive 1-2 person markers, (10). On these grounds one can conclude that the complex morpheme -ysy is not an agreement or possessive affixes, but soon a 3rd person plural pronoun coreferential with the quantified DP.

Tatar DC constructions are derived in the following manner: first, a quantifier is merged as DP adjunct, (11.a). Then quantified DP moves higher in Spec, DP, leaving -ysy pronoun. Then, DP in Spec, DP position may or may not receive genitive. If it does, the derivation stops and we thus have the IG construction (11.b). If not, quantified DP moves further into adjunct position to the main noun phrase. Thus, when the whole DP is construed, quantified phrase occurs without case and outside the genitive assignment domain of the “matrix” DP. Here both DPs get the same case value from the case assigner dominating them (11.c).

Once occurring in Spec, DP quantified noun phrases receive specific reading. Moreover, either marked with genitive or copying the case of the head, they have to establish anaphoric relations with the -ysy marker on the quantifier, this is why the whole construction must be referential.

As was argued for Korean double case possessive constructions, the main reason for possessor raising in them is topicalization. The same holds for Tatar DC constructions, in which the quantified DP is usually interpreted as a topic: (*As for the sheep, Zufar feed all of them*). In the same time IG constructions have definite restrictive interpretation (*Zufar feed every one of the sheep*).

In the rest of the paper I will consider in more detail other properties of Tatar IG and DC constructions (both of which are not restricted to quantifiers) as well as the syntax of floating quantifiers in Tatar and Korean (in the latter quantificational noun phrases also display DC marking).

(1) Tatar

(a-nyŋ) beten awyr kasta-lar bet-ä-r.
(he-Gen) every hard disease-Pl finish-St-Pot

Every (his) hard disease will go away.

(2) Tatar

zufär bärän-**neŋ** beten-**e-se-nä** rizyk bir-de
Zufar sheep-Pl-**Gen** every-**3-3-Dat** feed give-Pst

Zufar gave fodder to all sheep.

(3) Tatar

zufär bärän-**gä** beten-**e-se-nä** rizyk bir-de
Zufar sheep-Pl-**Dat** every-**3-3-Dat** feed give-Pst

Zufar gave fodder to all sheep.

(4) Tatar

*zufär bar-**y-sy-n-da** a-lar-**ny** üter-de
Zufar all-**3-3-Acc-DA** he-Pl-**Acc** kill-Pst

Zufar kill all (of) them.

(5) Tatar

kičä zufär a-lar-ny (?zufär, ?kičä) bar-y-sy-n-da üter-de
yesterday Zufar he-Pl-Acc **Zufar yesterday** all-3-3-Acc-DA kill-Pst

Yesterday Zufar kill all (of) them.

(6) Tatar

*zufär bar-**y-sy-ny-da** a-lar-**nyŋ** üter-de
Zufar all-**3-3-Acc-DA** he-Pl-**Gen** kill-Pst

Zufar kill all (of) them.

(7) Tatar

kičä zufär a-lar-nyŋ (??zufär, ??kičä) bar-y-sy-n-da üter-de
yesterday Zufar he-Pl-Acc **Zufar yesterday** all-3-3-Acc-DA kill-Pst

Yesterday Zufar kill all (of) them.

(8) Korean (Kim 1990)

Chelwu-ka Yenghi-**uy** / Yenghi-**lul** son-**ul** cap-ess-ta
C.-Nom Y.-**Gen** / Y.-**Acc** hand-**Acc** catch-Pst-Dec

Chelsoo caught Yenghi on the hand.

(9) Korean

a. [NP [Yenghi] son]
b. [DP [KP Yenghi-uy]_t [NP t] son] D]
Yenghi-Gen hand
c. [KP [Yenghi-ul]_t [DP t] [NP t] son] D] ul]
Yenghi-Acc hand Acc

Yenghi's hand

(10) Tatar

minem at-lar-ym matur ä beten-**e-se** / *beten-**eŋ** juk
I.Gen horse-Pl-1Sg beautiful but every-**3-3** / every-**2.Sg** not

*My horses are beautiful and all (the others / *his, *theirs, *yours) are not.*

(11) Tatar

a. [Spec, DP bar [DP at]]
all horse
b. [Spec, DP [DP at]-nyŋ_i bar [DP -ysy_i]]-na
horse-Gen all **they-Dat**
c. [DP at]-ka_i bar [DP -ysy_i]]-na
horse-Dat all **they-Dat**

to all (of) the horses

References

- Cho, S. 2005. The Structural Asymmetry between Possessors and Possessums, in Y. Kim, Y. Lander, B. Partee. (eds.), *Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax*. UMass, OPL, v. 29, 295-306.
- Chomsky, N. 1999. *Derivation by Phase*. MIT OPL, v. 18, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1).
- Kim, Y. 1990. *The Syntax and Semantics of Korean Case: The Interaction between Lexical and Syntactic Level of Representation*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Sportiche, D. 1988. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 425-449.