

- (5) a. Putbol-ni siz oynighan yer-ge bard-im.
 soccer-ACC 2SG play-PTP.PST place-DAT go-PST-1SG
 ‘I went to the place where you played soccer.’
- b. *Putbolni siz-ning oynighan yer-ingiz-ge bardim.
 soccer-ACC 2SG-GEN play-PTP.PST place-2SGPOSS-DAT go-PST-1SG
 Intended: ‘I went to the place where you played soccer.’

(In the talk we make a proposal about how this observation can be resolved with seemingly contradictory observations regarding scrambled adverbs in Kornfilt 2008 and locatives and datives in Ottót-Kovacs 2023.) This data suggests that genitive licensing actually *requires* movement, and that in-situ licensing is not possible, again akin to what is observed for accusative subjects in Major (2024).

Taken together, these observations strongly support the A-raising approach to genitive subjects. The results from NCIs and idioms are in stark contrast what is attested for Kazakh by Ottót-Kovács (2023) and Bashkir (our data, omitted here), where the subject resists reconstruction for idiom and RC-internal NCI licensing. Although we don’t have a full account of why the languages differ, it is parallel once more to hyperraising to object, since languages differ in whether their hyperraised accusatives pass raising diagnostics (raising vs ‘prolepsis’), as well as what is seen with possessor raising (Deal 2017).

Evidence for head raising. We marshal similar arguments in favor of the possibility of a head-raising analysis for GSRs: the subject can contain a reciprocal bound within the RC, (6) (reciprocal binding is otherwise clausebound), and it can be an idiom chunk, (7).

- (6) Tursun ular-ning siz-ghan birbiri-ning resim-i-ni yaxshi#kör-i-du.
 Tursun 3PL-GEN draw-PTP.PST one.another-GEN picture-3POSS-ACC good#see-NONPST-3
 ‘Tursun likes the pictures of each other that they drew.’
- (7) Tursun-ing chiq-ar-ghan qanat#quyruq-i uz-ar-d-i.
 Tursun-GEN emerge-CAUS-PTPL.PST wing#tail-3POSS long-CAUS-PST-3
 ‘The skills that Tursun developed increased.’

The idiom diagnostic for raising in the derivation of the RC head can be crosscut with the NCI diagnostic for A-raising of the genitive subject (licensing by clause-external negation; (8) is * with a NOM subject).

- (8) **héchkim-ning** chiq-ar-ghan qanat#quyruq-i uz-ar-**mi**-d-i.
 no.who-GEN emerge-CAUS-PTPL.PST wing#tail-3POSS long-CAUS-NEG-PST-3
 ‘Nobody’s skills that developed increased (lit. nobody’s wings that emerged lengthened).’

Analysis. We propose that genitive subjects A-move from the relative clause, which we take (following Kornfilt 2008) to be a reduced participial clause (AspP), to the specifier of a PossP projection whose head agrees with it and expresses its features as the possessive suffix, which gets affixed onto the head noun. Genitive is licensed on the raised DP in this position. As for the RC syntax, we eschew a standard Kaynean analysis where the RC CP/AspP is a complement of D/Poss and the raised head is in CP’s specifier, for two reasons: (i) the RC’s position is difficult to derive, as to get the RC head NP in the final position we require either (typical antisymmetric) phrasal movement of C’s complement to a position above D/Poss, where that head would fail to c-command the genitive subject, or a rightward specifier analysis for the RC head which is otherwise incongruous in Turkic; (ii) even if we adopted a rightward specifier analysis, it’s unclear how the Poss head could come to form a complex head with the head noun in CP’s specifier without recourse to some sort of postsyntactic rebracketing mechanism. We instead propose an analysis of relativization as **projective movement** (Bhatt 1999, cf. Cecchetto & Donati 2015), where we merge an NP and some clausal constituent that contains it and the NP projects, taking the clause as a complement (and thus ordering it initially, deriving AspP-NP order). The reprojected NP merges with Poss, which probes its domain for an argument and attracts one from within the NP’s complement domain, i.e. the AspP’s external argument. N-to-Poss head movement to derive the N-Poss complex head is straightforward on this analysis, while it requires head movement from a specifier or postsyntactic lowering on alternative implementations of the raising analysis. Finally, the restriction against subject GSRs follows straightforwardly.

Selected references. Bhatt 1999, Penn diss. Cecchetto & Donati 2015, LI monograph. Major 2024, NLLT. Ottót-Kovács 2023, Cornell diss. Sauerland 1998, MIT diss. Sichel 2014, 2018, LI.