

Hossep Dolatian (Stony Brook University)

Introduction: Persian (PS), Turkish (TU), and Western Armenian (WA) share many features in their syntax and prosody. I show that their differences in nuclear stress placement in broad focus contexts are a) due to common universals in prosody, *and* b) language-specific constraints rankings:

- Undominated
 - HEAD-COMP: Stress the complement of the head instead of the head
 - ARG-ZONE: Stress doesn't go outside the verb (V) and its argument into the subject (S)
- Variably ranked
 - *SPEC-DO: PS bans stressing definite direct objects, the others do not
 - L/R-ARG: PS stresses the leftmost, TU+WA the rightmost argument in ditransitives
 - MADV and SADV: PS stresses any manner adverb (MADV) while TU+WA only stress morphologically simple manner adverbs (SADV). Their location varies across the lects.

The differences can't be reduced to simple syntactic factors like phase position but are cross-modular and/or arbitrary. Data is collected from multiple sources coupled with personal elicitations. PS: (Mahjani, 2003; Sadat-Tehrani, 2007; Kahnemuyipour, 2009; Hosseini, 2014); TU: (Üntak-Tarhan, 2006; Kamali, 2011; Günes, 2015; Nakipoğlu, 2019); WA (Sigler, 1997; Khanjian, 2013):

Transitive Vs: The 3 lects have SOV order. The direct object (DO) can be a bare noun (1). It is stressed, pseudo-incorporated, and interpreted as a generic noun. Non-specific indefinite DOs behave the same (2). All 3 lects have subject-drop and object-drop. Without an DO, stress retracts to the V (3). I analyze these facts with the *descriptive* constraints: HEAD-COMP and ARG-ZONE.

	1	2	3	4	5
	S DO V	Indf DO V	S V	Def DO V	Indf Spec DO V
PS	Ali <u>ketâb</u> xund	ye <u>k</u> ketâb xund	Ali <u>xund</u>	ketâb-râ <u>xund</u>	ye <u>k</u> ketâb-râ <u>xund</u>
WA	Ali-n <u>kirk</u> gartat̂s	<u>kirk m̂ə</u> gartat̂s	Ali-n <u>gartat̂s</u>	<u>kirk-ə</u> gartat̂s	<u>kirk m̂ə</u> gartat̂s
TU	Ali <u>kitab</u> okudu	<u>bir kitab</u> okudu	Ali <u>okudu</u>	<u>kitab-ı</u> okudu	<u>bir kitab-ı</u> okudu
	'Ali read books'	'Ali read a book'	'Ali read (books)'	'Ali read the book'	'Ali read a (certain) book'

The lects vary with definite DO (4). In PS, the DO is *unstressed*. Stress is instead on the V. But in TU+WA, the Def DO keeps stress. Specific indefinites behave the same (5). This difference is not due to different semantics, pragmatics, or syntax. Semantically, proper nouns are marked as definite in DO position (6). They are stressed in TU+WA, but not PS. Pragmatically, if a Def DO is contextually new, it is stressed in TU+WA but not PS (7). Syntactically, Def DOs are have been argued to be structurally higher than bare DOs in all 3 lects based on common heuristics like binding, reference, scrambling, coordination, etc.¹ The difference between the lects is thus arbitrary and due a variably ranked constraint *SPEC-DO. Further evidence for the arbitrariness comes from morphology. Certain verbs assign quirky case to their complements, marked by a dative case suffix a dative-assigning preposition. Quirky definite objects are stressed in all 3 lects.

	6	7, adapted from Nakipoğlu (2009)	8
	S Name V	S New Def DO V	Quirky-O V
PS	Ali Mariam-râ <u>did</u>	Shahrdari dare rah-râ <u>tamiz</u> mikone	Ali <u>be ketâb</u> negah kard
WA	Ali-n <u>Mariam-i-n</u> desav	garavarutjun-ə <u>poyot̂s-ə</u> gə-makre-gor	Ali-n <u>kirk-ə</u> najetsav
TU	Ali <u>Mariam-ı</u> gördü	Belediye <u>yol-u</u> aç-ıyor	Ali <u>kitab-a</u> baktı
	'Ali saw Mariam'	'The government is plowing the road'	'Ali looked at the book'

Ditransitive Vs: Ditransitives show more arbitrary difference. Stress is leftmost in PS, rightmost in TU+WA. In all 3 lects, the default order is S-IO-DO-V when the DO is bare and the IO is indefinite (9). Stress is on DO in WA+TU, but IO in PS. The IO's (in)-definiteness doesn't matter when the DO is bare (10). If the DO is definite or even specific indefinite, then word-order can vary between S-IO-DO-V (11) and S-DO-IO-V (12). In TU+WA, both orders are fine but stress is on the rightmost argument (11,12). In PS, the order must be DO+IO (11) and the Def IO is stressed.

	9	10	11	12
	S Indf IO DO V	Def IO DO V	Def DO Def IO V	Def IO Def DO V
PS	Ali <u>be yek madrase</u> ketâb dâd	<u>be madrase</u> ketâb dâd	ketâb-râ <u>be madrase</u> dâd	Def IO Def DO V
WA	Ali-n <u>təbrots-i mə</u> <u>kirk</u> dāvav	<u>təbrots-i-n</u> <u>kirk</u> dāvav	kirk-ə <u>təbrots-i-n</u> dāvav	t@brots-i-n <u>kirk-ə</u> dāvav
TU	Ali bir okul-a <u>kitap</u> verdi	okul-a <u>kitap</u> verdi	kitab-ı <u>okul-a</u> verdi	okul-a <u>kitab-ı</u> verdi
	'Ali gave books to a school'	'Ali gave books to the school'	'Ali gave the book to the school'	

Complex Predicates: Complex predicates (CPrs) CPrs consist of a non-verb (NV) and light verb (LV); they select a DO. If the DO is bare, it's stressed (13). If definite, stress retracts in PS to the NV **not** the V (14). With a dropped DO, stress retracts to the NV in all 3 lects (15). This shifting is not due to the directionality parameter in ditrasitives. It is because the non-verb is the complement of the verb, while the DO is the complement of the NV+LV.

	13	14	15
	S DO NV LV	S Def DO NV LV	S NV LV
PS	Ali <u>miz</u> tamiz kard	Ali miz-râ <u>tamiz</u> kard	Ali <u>tamiz</u> kard
TU	Ali <u>hasta</u> muayene etti	Ali <u>hasta-yı</u> muayene etti	Ali <u>muayene</u> etti
WA	Ali-n <u>jerk</u> mädig ərav	Ali-n <u>jerk-ə</u> mädig ərav	Ali-n mädig ərav

Manner adverbs: MAdvS show signs of construction-specific phonology. In PS, MAdvS are stressed and placed after Def DOs (17), but before IOs and bare or indefinite DOs (16). In contrast, TU+WA differentiate between morphologically simplex vs complex adverbs. Complex adverbs pattern like high adverbs (I don't show them); SAdvS are stressed. SAdvS can be preverbal in TU+WA (18), pre-bare object in TU but not WA (19). SAdv's can't break a V from a bare DO in TU+WA (19), or from a non-specific indefinite DO in TU but can in WA (20). They can break a V from a definite DO (21). These *arbitrary* placement restrictions form a cline across the 3 lects.

	16	17		
	S Adv IO DO V	S Def DO Adv Def IO V		
PS	Ali <u>sari</u> be madrase ketâb dâd	ketâb-râ <u>sari</u> be madrase dâd		
	'Ali gave books to the school fast	'Ali gave the book to the school fast		
	18	19	20	21
	S Adv V Adv O Adv V	Adv Indf O Adv V	Def O Adv V	
TU	Ali <u>hızlı</u> okudu	<u>hızlı</u> kitap <u>*hızlı</u> okudu	<u>*hızlı</u> bir kitap <u>*hızlı</u> okudu	kitab-ı <u>hızlı</u> okudu
WA	Ali-n <u>arak</u> gartatâs	<u>*arak</u> kirk <u>*arak</u> gartatâs	<u>*arak</u> kirk mə <u>arak</u> gartatâs	girk-ə <u>arak</u> gartatâs
	'Ali read fast'	'Ali read nooksfast'	'Ali read a book fast'	'Ali read the book fast'

Further generalizations, similarities, and differences are found in sentential adverbs, intransitives, and passivization. In a larger study, I include Eastern Armenian which patterns between WA+PS.

I do not include it here for space. References: [1] Günes, G. (2015). *Deriving prosodic structures*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Groningen. [2] Hosseini, S. A. (2014). *The phonology and phonetics of prosodic prominence in Persian*. Ph. D. thesis, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. [3] Kahnemuyipour, A. (2009). *The syntax of sentential stress*. Number 25 in Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [4] Kamali, B. (2011). *Topics at the PF interface of Turkish*. Ph. D. thesis, Harvard University. [5] Khanjian, H. (2013). *(Negative) concord and head directionality in Western Armenian*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [6] Mahjani, B. (2003). *An instrumental study of prosodic features and intonation in modern farsi*. Master's thesis, University of Edinburgh. [7] Nakipoğlu, M. (2009). *The semantics of the Turkish accusative marked definites and the relation between prosodic structure and information structure*. *Lingua* 119(9), 1253–1280. [8] Nakipoğlu, M. (2019). *Towards a model of the relation between prosodic structure and object displacement in Turkish*. In *Word Order in Turkish*, pp. 261–284. Springer. [9] Sadat-Tehrani, N. (2007). *The intonational grammar of Persian*. Ph. D. thesis. [10] Sigler, M. (1997). *Specificity and agreement in standard Western Armenian*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [11] Üntak-Tarhan, A. (2006). *Topics in syntax-phonology interface in Turkish: Sentential stress and phases*.

¹Üntak-Tarhan (2006) speculates that PS raises Def DOs to spec-vP while TU raise to a lower position like spec-AspP. But Nakipoğlu (2019) shows that this difference is syntactically unmotivated.