The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology

Klaus von Heusinger & Jaklin Kornfilt

In this paper, we investigate the interaction between semantic parameters and morphological constraints in determining the distribution of the accusative case marker-*(y)I* in Turkish. This marker is often discussed as an instance of differentiated object marking (DOM). The account of accusative marking based on a functional interpretation of DOM assumes that the case suffix marks a direct object if it is too similar to an archetypical subject. Other approaches to accusative marking in Turkish have been based on the observation that the accusative marker is closely related to the direct object's specificity as such, rather than to the similarity of the direct object to a typical subject—and there is general agreement that typical subjects are specific. These approaches predict that specific subjects are also overtly case-marked; this is confirmed by the data. Enç (1991) explains specificity in terms of partitivity and argues that the accusative case marker indicates a partitive construction (or at least an implied partitive relation), and thus marks a specific direct object. In this paper we show that the conditions for the distribution of this case marker are quite complex and cannot be explained within the functional view of DOM. In particular, we argue that the suffix indicates specificity under certain morpho-syntactic conditions, rather than indicating just a contrast to the subject. This view is vindicated by the assignment of (genitive) case to the embedded subject that is determined by very similar morpho-syntactic and semantic conditions: the embedded subject receives genitive case if it is specific and no genitive case if it is non-specific. Furthermore we show that Enç's definition of specificity in terms of partitivity must be modified for semantic as well as morphological reasons. We develop a more flexible notion of specificity in terms of referentially anchored indefinite NPs. We give additional evidence, based on the detailed analysis of the morphological conditions for partitives, which shows that partitives are not necessarily specific. In conclusion, we show that the accusative case marker can indicate the referential property of the direct object (such as specificity) in clearly defined morphological environments in a reliable fashion; in other contexts, it is not a reliable indicator of properties like specificity.

Klaus von Heusinger, Institut für Linguistik / Germanistik, Universität Stuttgart, Keplerstr. 17, DE-70174 Stuttgart, Germany. Jaklin Kornfilt, Syracuse University, Department of Languages, Literatures and Linguistics, 340 HBC Syracuse, NY 13244-1160, U.S.A. E-mail: kornfilt@syr.edu

1. Introduction

Turkish exhibits a morphosyntactic contrast between instances of the direct object with the case marker *-(y)I* and those without it. The accusative case suffix *-(y)I* indicates the specificity (in some sense to be defined later) of its noun phrase. (The *-(y)I* represents the set of accusative suffixes which differ according to phonological rules.) Turkish does not have a definite article, but an indefinite article *bir*, which is related to the numeral *bir* 'one', but which differs from it in distribution. The direct object can be realized as a bare noun (or noun phrase) without a case ending or as a noun (phrase) with the accusative case suffix *-(y)I*. In (1a) the bare noun *kitap* expresses a reading that comes close to an incorporated reading.[1] The demonstrative *bu* 'this' enforces the case suffix on the head of the nominal phrase in (1b). The form *kitabı* with the case suffix in (1c) is generally translated as a definite NP,[2] while the form *bir kitap* in (1d) with the indefinite article and without the case suffix is translated as an indefinite NP. However, (1e) shows that the case suffix expresses

---

[1] Erguvanlı (1984: 23) calls the bare NP in (1a) *non-referential* and distinguishes it from the indefinite NP *bir kitap* in (1d) by "the ability of the latter, but not the former, to pronominalize".

> (63) *Ali kaç gündür*   **bir** *resim*   *yap-ıyor-du,*
>   Ali how-many day   one picture   make-PROG-PAST
>   *nihayet bugün*   *{on-u/Ø}*   *bitir-di.*
>   finally today   it-ACC   finish-PAST
>   'Ali was painting (picture-making) for days, finally he finished (it) today.'

> (64) *Ali kaç gündür*   *resim*   *yap-ıyor-du,*
>   Ali how-many day   picture   make-PROG-PAST
>   *nihayet bugün*   **{on-u/Ø}*   *bitir-di.*
>   finally today   it-ACC   finish-PAST
>   'Ali was painting (picture-making) for days, finally he finished (it) today.'

On-u 'it' (referring to *a picture*) can alternate with zero pronominalization in (63), but (64) where *it* refers to the non-referential DO [= direct object] *resim* 'picture', is unacceptable. Thus, the bare NP without an article is different from the bare NP with the indefinite article. However, Erguvanlı (1984: 24-29) also provides arguments against an incorporation-analysis for the bare NP, as does Kornfilt (1984), while Aydemir (2004) does argue in favor of an incorporation(-like) analysis.

[2] In more recent terminology, a distinction is made between NP and DP, using functional projections for the latter. In this paper, we use the terms DP and NP interchangeably, although it might be possible, in a fully articulated phrasal architecture, to distinguish specific and non-specific nominal phrases by attributing DP versus NP-status to them, respectively. For our present purposes, however, this issue is not immediately relevant.

specificity rather than definiteness, since it can be combined with the indefinite article (see Lewis 1967, Johanson 1977, Erguvanlı 1984, Dede 1986, Kornfilt 1997, Sezer 1972, Enç 1991, Aydemir 2004 among others):

(1)　　　Referential options for the direct object in preverbal position

　　a.　*(Ben)*　*kitap*　*oku-du-m.*　　　　　　　"incorporated"
　　　　I　　　book　　read-past-1SG
　　　　'I was book-reading.'

　　b.　*(Ben)*　*bu*　*kitab-ı*　*oku-du-m.*　　　　demonstrative
　　　　I　　this　book-**ACC**　read-past-1SG
　　　　'I read **this** book.'

　　c.　*(Ben)*　*kitab-ı*　*oku-du-m.*　　　　　　definite
　　　　I　　book-**ACC**　read-PAST-1SG
　　　　'I read **the** book.'

　　d.　*(Ben)*　***bir** kitap*　*oku-du-m.*　　　non-specific indefinite
　　　　I　　**a**　book　　read-PAST-1SG
　　　　'I read **a** book.'

　　e.　*(Ben)*　***bir** kitab-ı*　*oku-du-m.*　　indefinite specific
　　　　I　　**a**　book-**ACC**　read-PAST-1SG
　　　　'I read **a certain** book.'

In this paper we want to investigate the semantic and morphological parameters that determine the presence or absence of the accusative case marker. In section 2, we discuss this case marker in the context of the functional model of "differentiated object marking". This theory attempts to explain object marking in various languages in terms of distance from or similarity to the subject. According to this approach, if the object is too similar to the subject, a language may mark the object by a distinct marker like the Turkish accusative case or the particle *a* in Spanish. We argue that the accusative in Turkish expresses clearly defined semantic and morphological features of the object itself, rather than distance or similarity to the subject. This is shown by the semantic and morphological conditions of case marking on the subject in embedded sentences. These conditions are similar to the conditions for the direct object rather than being their mirror image—a situation which is contrary to the predictions of DOM. In section 3, we discuss different aspects of specificity and then Enç's theory of specificity as partitivity. Here we show that her view is too restricted and must be extended to a model of specificity in terms of "referentially anchored indefinites". In section 4, we show that her observation that certain bare partitives (i.e. without accusative case) are ungrammatical has nothing to do with the semantic dimension of specificity, but rather is due to morphological and syntactic conditions imposed on nominal phrases without overt nominal heads, as we shall see shortly.

Crucially, we also see examples showing that bare, i.e. case-less partitive direct objects with non-specific interpretation *are* possible, which in turn shows that non-specific partitives do exist. In section 5, we summarize our findings by saying that the accusative case suffix in Turkish marks specificity under clearly defined morphosyntactic conditions, but that this suffix can also attach to non-specific expressions under certain other morphosyntactic conditions. In conclusion, we define a specific indefinite NP as a "referentially anchored indefinite expression".

2. Accusative case marking in Turkish and DOM

The marking of the direct object in Turkish is often discussed in connection with the functional model of "differentiated object marking" (DOM) (Comrie 1975, Bossong 1985, Aissen 2003 and others). In this section we will give a short overview of the ideas behind DOM, discuss the referential parameters generally linked to DOM and show that DOM cannot explain all the conditions for case marking of the direct object. We present additional evidence from the conditions on case marking of subjects in embedded sentences, which are contrary to the prediction of DOM. Therefore, we conclude that case markings (in these two cases) clearly indicate the referential parameter of specificity.

2.1. Differentiated Object Marking (DOM)

Bossong (1985) coins the concept of "differentiated object marking" ("differentielle Objektmarkierung") or DOM for the observation that the direct object in various languages may be morphologically marked or not. Cross-linguistically, there are at least three parameters that determine if the direct object is marked or not (Bossong 1985: 3-8, who refers to Thomson 1912): (i) animacy, (ii) referential categories, and (iii) information structure ("topicality"). In this section we will primarily discuss two referential categories, namely definiteness and specificity.

Languages differ in the way they can mark the direct object. Spanish, for example, exhibits DOM via the "prepositional accusative", as in (2a) and (2b), and via clitic doubling, as in (3a) and (3b).

(2) a. *Vi*   **(a)*   *la / una*   *mujer*.   (Standard Spanish)
       see-PAST-1SG   to   the / a   woman
       'I saw the / a woman.'

    b. *Vi*   *(*a)*   *la / una*   *mesa*.   (Standard Spanish)
       see-PAST-1SG   to   the / a   table
       'I saw the / a table.'

(3) a. *La*   *veo*   *a*   *ella.*   (Standard Spanish)
       CL-ACC   see-1SG   to   her

b. *Veo* ***a*** ***ella.*** (Standard Spanish)
see-1SG to her
'I see her.'

In (2a) the marker *a* is obligatory to mark the specific human direct object, independent of definiteness, while in (2b) the marker must not appear with a non-human object. In (3a) and (3b), clitic doubling indicates a pronominal direct object in Standard Spanish (see Brugè & Brugger 1996, Torrego Salcedo 1999, Leonetti 1999, 2003 for details and von Heusinger & Kaiser 2003 for the description in terms of DOM). Bossong (1985) observes that there are at least 300 (presently known) languages around the earth that exhibit some version of DOM (see Aissen 2003 for more references).

The functional explanation for DOM is that in languages that do not overtly distinguish between subjects and direct objects, direct objects may be morphologically marked if they become too "similar" to subjects. This should help prevent confusion between subjects and objects. However, languages may differ with respect to the parameters or the dimensions according to which they compare subjects and objects and according to which they determine an (additional) marker for the direct object or not. As mentioned above, besides information structure (see sections 2.3.2-2.3.3), animacy and definiteness are the two relevant dimensions. For the purposes of DOM, these dimensions are expressed as scales:

(4) Animacy Scale
human > animate > inanimate

(5) Definiteness Scale
personal pronoun > proper noun > definite NP > indefinite NP

According to Bossong (1985: 177) DOM in Russian is determined by the Animacy Scale, while DOM in Persian and Turkish (among other languages) is determined by the Definiteness Scale. DOM in Spanish, Rumanian, Hindi and other languages are determined by a combination of the two scales. In the next subsections we will discuss the parameters for DOM in Turkish.

2.2. DOM in Turkish

For Turkish, the contrast between (1c) and (1d), repeated as (6a) and (6b), seems to be a contrast between a definite and indefinite NP. However, (1e), repeated as (6c) shows that we can combine the indefinite article *bir* with the case marker. Thus this shows that the accusative case marker indicates specificity, rather than definiteness.

(6) a. *(Ben)* *kitab-ı* *oku-du-m.* definite
I book-**ACC** read-PAST-1SG
'I read **the** book.'

> b. *(Ben)* **bir** *kitap*   *oku-du-m.*   indefinite non-specific
>   I   **a**   book   read-PAST-1SG
>   'I read **a** book.'
>
> c. *(Ben)* **bir** *kitab-ı*   *oku-du-m.*   indefinite specific
>   I   **a**   book-**ACC** read-PAST-1SG
>   'I read **a certain** book.'

It has often been observed that the "combination" of the case marker and the indefinite article is possible, as in the important grammar of Lewis (1967: 248):

> The accusative with **bir**. Although the accusative suffix shows that the word to which it is attached is definite, the use of it is not precluded by the presence of **bir**, since this, as well as being the 'indefinite article', is the numeral 'one'. Nevertheless, even in such contexts, 'a' and not 'one' may often be the better translation. Compare **her gün bir gazete okuyorum** with **her gün bir gazeteyi okuyorum**. Both may be translated 'every day I read a newspaper', but the second, unlike the first, implies that I always read one particular newspaper.

At the time of writing his grammar, the concept of specificity was not available; this would explain why Lewis paraphrases the specific indefinite with "a particular". The concept of specificity was only introduced at the end of the sixties (see section 3.1).

Johanson (1977), however, makes use of the concept of specificity and states that the accusative case suffix indicates specificity,[3] rather than definiteness.[4] A more recent study that also distinguishes "specificity" from "definiteness" and which relates the occurrence of the accusative marker on direct objects to the former rather than the latter is Enç (1991).

The situation is very similar in Persian (Windfuhr 1979, Lazard 1984, Bossong 1985, Karimi 1996). The following observation is from Ghomeshi (1997: 134):

> The Persian morpheme *-râ* presents a puzzle both semantically and syntactically, and the search for possible explanations has implications for much current research. Looking at the semantics briefly first, we can note that the morpheme *-râ* seems to act like a

---

[3] Johanson (1977: 1187): "In bezug auf die vom Akkusativsuffix getragene Idee, die hier tentativ als 'Spezifizität' bezeichnet werden soll".

[4] Johanson (1977: 1188): "Enthält nun die Nominalphrase dagegen den unbestimmten Artikel *bir*, so entsteht durch die Hinzufügung des Akkusativsuffixes eine Kombination *bir~i*, die logisch widersprüchlich anmuten mag, wenn die durch den Akkusativ ausgedrückte 'Spezifizität' kategorisch als 'Bestimmtheit' etwa im Sinne des deutschen bestimmten Artikels definiert wird". Early mention of this phenomenon can be found in Erdal (1981) and Sezer (1972).

definiteness marker (compare (7a) and (7b)). However, it can occur with the in-definite marker -*i* (compare (7c) and (7d)) which should be impossible if it really marks definiteness.

(7) a.   *Ketâb   xarid-am.*   (Persian)
             book   bought-1SG.S [S: subject agreement]
             'I bought books.'

      b.   *Ketâb-o   xarid-am.*   (Persian)
             book-râ   bought-1SG.S
             'I bought the book.'

      c.   *Ketâb-i   xarid-am.*   (Persian)
             book-INDEF   bought-1SG.S
             'I bought a book.'

      d.   *Ketâb-i-ro   xarid-am.*   (Persian)
             book-INDEF-RÂ   bought-1SG.S
             'I bought a (certain/particular) book.'

Specificity is often understood as secondary referential property of NPs that applies only to indefinite NPs and it is included in Aissen's Definiteness Scale, in the form stated in Aissen (2003: 437):[5]

(8) a.   Definiteness Scale
             proper noun > definite NP > specific indef. NP > non specific indef. NP

To sum up, the Turkish case suffix *-(y)I* indicates the specificity of the indefinite direct object—at least in the position directly preceding the main verb. Thus we can align the case marking of the direct object with the Definiteness Scale in (8b):

      b.   Definiteness Scale and accusative case marking

proper noun >	definite NP >	spec. indef. NP >	non-spec indef. NP
Hasan-ı	*kitab-ı*	*bir kitab-ı*	*bir kitap*

It seems that only indefinite direct objects are sensitive to this contrast, while definite direct objects always take the case suffix (other than in the Spanish case, see example (2)).[6]

---

[5]   For a different view see von Heusinger (2002) and von Heusinger & Kaiser (2003). There, specificity is assumed to crossclassify with definiteness yielding non-specific (= non-referential) definite NPs; this cannot be described by the Definiteness Scale.

2.3. Additional conditions for the case suffix

In the last subsection we have seen that the accusative case suffix indicates specificity. However, this is so only unless there are other reasons for its occurrence that makes its usage obligatory on independent grounds. Some of these other parameters will be presented and discussed in this section: (i) the generic use of direct objects, (ii) word order, (iii) information structure in general, and (iv) animacy in certain contexts.

2.3.1. Generic readings

According to Dede (1986: 156-159) the case suffix may optionally mark a generic direct object, as illustrated in (9a) and (9b):

(9)   a.   *Çocuk-lar*   *çikolata*   *sev-er.*
           child-PL   chocolate   like-AOR
           'Children like chocolate.'

      b.   *Çocuk-lar*   *çikolata-yı*   *sev-er.*
           child-PL   chocolate-ACC   like-AOR
           'Children like chocolate.'[7]

This usage is quite limited, and having mentioned its existence, we shall not discuss it further.

---

[6]   Non-referential readings of definite NPs in Turkish also receive an accusative case since there is no other way to mark definiteness of such non-referential terms, see (i) and (ii):

   (i)   *Hasan*   *dekan-ı*   *arı-yor,*   *yani*   *Profesör Yanılmaz-ı.*
         Hasan   dean-ACC   seek-PR.PROG   that is   professor Yanılmaz-ACC
         'Hasan is looking for the Dean—that is, for Professor Yanılmaz.' (referential)

   (ii) *Hasan*   *dekan-ı*   *arı-yor,*
         Hasan   dean-ACC   seek-PR.PROG
         dekan   *kim*   *olursa*   *olsun.*
         dean   who   be-AOR-COND   be-OPT
         'Hasan is looking for the Dean—whoever the Dean may be.' (non-referential)

[7]   This example is ambiguous between a generic reading for the direct object and a definite one, although, due to the aorist on the verb, the generic reading for the direct object is stronger. The direct object is formally definite here. The possibility of such definite, generic NPs is quite restricted; we leave a formulation of relevant conditions on their distribution to future research.

2.3.2. Word order

The case suffix is a reliable indicator of specificity only if the direct object stands in the immediately preverbal position. In any other position, the direct object has to take the case suffix, thus either obligatorily having a specific reading or, in some limited circumstances, having a generic (and thus non-specific) reading (despite the overt accusative marker; see the previous subsection, and Johanson 1977, Erguvanlı 1984, Dede 1986, Kornfilt 1997).

(10) a. *Bizim   ev-de   çay-ı   her zaman   Aytül   yap-ar.*
        our   house-LOC   tea-ACC   always   Aytül   make-AOR
        'Aytül always makes the tea in our family.'

    b. **Bizim   ev-de   çay   her zaman   Aytül   yap-ar.*
        our   house-LOC   tea   always   Aytül   make-AOR
        Intended reading: 'Aytül always makes the tea in our family.'

As a matter of fact, non-specific direct objects are not always well-formed in positions other than the immediately preverbal one, even when they bear overt accusative marking. Thus, while (10a) is fine, (10c) and (10d) are not (under a non-specific reading for the direct object):

    c. *??/* Biz-im   ev-de   kitab-ı*
        our   home-LOC   book-ACC [NON-SPECIFIC]
        her zaman   Aytül   ok-ur.
        always   Aytül   read-AOR
        Intended reading: 'Aytül always reads books in our family.'

    d. *??/* Biz-im   ev-de   köpeğ-i*
        our   home-LOC   dog-ACC [NON-SPECIFIC]
        en fazla   Aytül   sev-er.
        most   Aytül   love-AOR
        Intended reading: 'In our family, Aytül loves dogs most.'

These examples are fine with direct objects having definite readings, but they are ill-formed for generic, non-referential readings for the direct objects. A treatment of the conditions under which non-referential direct objects with overt accusative markings can show up, preserving their non-specificity, goes beyond our present concerns, and we leave it to future work.

2.3.3. Information structure and specificity

While the accusative case suffix does not reliably indicate specificity of direct objects that are not in the immediately preverbal position, the specificity of such objects is still relevant for certain positions such as the topic position. While the non-specific indefinite direct object in the topic position[8] in (11a) is ill-formed for many speakers (even though it is case marked), the semantically determined specific indefinite direct object in (11b) is well-formed (Erguvanlı 1984: 17; her examples [75] and [76]):

(11)   a.   *Bir   kitab-ı   Murat   aceleyle   oku-yor.
             a   book-ACC   Murat   hurriedly   read-PR.PROG
             Intended reading: 'Murat is hurriedly reading a / some book.'

       b.   Mavi   kaplı   bir kitab-ı   Murat   aceleyle   oku-yor.
             blue   covered   book-ACC   Murat   hurriedly   read-PR.PROG
             'Murat is hurriedly reading a (certain) blue-covered book.'

The reason for the difference is the following: The indefinite direct object is illformed under a non-specific reading in both examples, since it can't be a topic. Under a specific reading, however, (11b) is well-formed, due to the overt modification, while for many speakers the accusative marker alone does not suffice to make the direct object specific enough so that it would qualify as a topic in (11a).[9]

Erguvanlı (1984: 27) summarizes her findings concerning possible positions for non-specific direct objects as follows:

> We conclude that the position of the non-referential and the indefinite but non-specific DOs is fixed; that is, they can only occur immediately before the verb and they cannot be moved from that position in any way. It is only when the direct object is definite, or indefinite but specific (given the appropriate context) that it may vary its position. The sentence initial position, as the topic position, has its own restriction: only overt specific indefinite DOs are allowed to occur in this position. The general constraint on the ordering of the direct object NPs can then be stated as:

[8]   We make the generally accepted assumption that the topic in Turkish is sentence-initial. In particular, we assume that any constituent preceding an otherwise sentence-initial, specific and not focalized subject in Turkish is a topic. The modifications made here concerning the subject are necessary, because non-specific subjects as well as focalized subjects are typically in an immediately pre-verbal position. We have in mind a subject which is either topicalized itself or is in its canonical sentence-initial position.

[9]   For inanimate direct objects the insufficiency of the accusative marker alone as an expression of specificity holds, at least as a strong tendency, even if the direct object is not a topic. This will be touched upon briefly in the next section.

When the object NP has no case marking, it must occur in the position immediately preceding the verb.

2.3.4. Animacy

DOM is governed by referential parameters (definiteness and specificity), animacy and information structure (word order and topicality). Turkish is said to be sensitive only to referential parameters and information structure, while animacy does not restrict the use of the case suffix (Bossong 1985: 177).

Dede (1986: 157), however, notes that in certain contexts animacy may interact with the referential parameters. Certain verbs of propositional attitudes, such as *aramak* 'look for', and *istemek* 'want' induce ambiguity between a specific and a non-specific reading in direct objects that are bare of overt accusative marking.[10] Furthermore, Dede states that the case suffix is not permitted with inanimate objects that are indefinite (the ungrammaticality judgments in this block of examples are Dede's (1986: 157)):

(12) a. *Bir öğrenci   arı-yor-um.   Bul-a-mı-yorum.*
    a student   look+for-PR.PROG-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
    'I am looking for a student. I can't find him.'   [specific]
    'I am looking for a student. I can't find one.'   [non-specific]

   b. *Bir öğrenci-yi   arı-yor-um.   Bul-a-mı-yorum.*
    a   student:ACC look+for-PR.PROG-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
    'I am looking for a student. I can't find him.'   [specific]
    'I am looking for a student. (*I can't find one.')   [non-specific]

(13) a. *Bir kitap   arı-yor-um   Bul-a-mı-yorum.*
    a   book   look+for-PR.PROG-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
    'I am looking for a book. I can't find it.'   [specific]
    'I am looking for a student. I can't find one.'   [non-specific]

   b. **Bir kitab-ı   arı-yor-um.   Bul-a-mı-yorum.*
    a   book:ACC look+for-PR.PROG-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
    Intended reading: 'I am looking for a book. I can't find it'   [specific]

---

[10] In other words, with such verbs, many speakers do allow a secondary reading of [+specific] for a bare direct object immediately left of the verb.

While for us the difference between (12b) and (13b) is not as robust as for Dede, we agree with her that a difference does exist between those examples.[11] We suggest that the explanation for the ill-formedness of (13b) is akin to the explanation we gave for the difference beween (11a) and (11b): indefinite direct objects, when inanimate, need overt modification when marked accusative, even when they are not topic-alized. Animate, especially human, indefinite specific direct objects need such modification less stringently, as the accusative direct object in (12b) shows.

To sum up, the accusative case marker is a reliable indicator of specificity only for indefinite direct objects in a position directly before the verb. Animacy may interact in a way that renders animate direct objects more likely to exhibit this contrast. Finally, one can note that the case marker unambiguously indicates specifi-city (in the aforementioned context, i.e. to the immediate left of the verb), while the lack of the case marker can be ambiguous with respect to specificity when certain verbs are present; typically, these verbs express propositional attitudes.[12]

2.4. Case marking of subjects

Aissen (2003: 473) discusses *differential subject marking* (DSM) as the mirror image of DOM. If DOM marks objects if they are similar to subjects, then DSM should mark subjects that are not typical subjects, i.e. if they are non-animate, indefinite, non-specific. The prediction is that if we find DSM then it should enforce (morpho-logical) marking of indefinite non-specific inanimate subjects. Interestingly, Turkish allows for subject marking in clearly defined contexts. However, specific subjects are marked, while non-specific ones usually are not.

The subject in a matrix sentence cannot be case marked (which is another way of stating that in Turkish, the nominative case is morphologically null), but the subject of an embedded clause can be case marked by the genitive suffix. Johanson (1977: 1196) and Kornfilt (1984 and 1997: 215) notice that if the subject is not in a position directly before the verb, it must get case, as in (14). Here the contrast between

---

[11] For us, (13b) with its inanimate object marked accusative is, while awkward and close to borderline, still grammatical with a modifier, e.g. a relative clause. Such a direct object then becomes grammatical, despite being inanimate.

[12] However, by pragmatic inferences the contrast between occurrence the suffix and the ab-sence of the suffix is quite robust. In contrast to Turkish, a direct object in Spanish with *a* can be ambiguous, while an animate direct object without *a* can only interpreted as non-specific (Leonetti 1999: 864):

(i)   *contrar un especialista* 'to look for a specialist'   [non-specific]
       ver un guerrillero armado 'to see an armed guerilla'   [non-specific]
       buscar una asistenta   'to look for an asistent'   [non-specific]

specific and non-specific is neutralized for many speakers. If the subject takes the position directly preceding the verb, genitive case marking strongly indicates specificity, as illustrated by (15).[13]

(14)　　*[**Bir haydut-un**　　köy-ü　　　bas-tığ-ın]-ı　　　duy-du-m.*
　　　　　a　　robber-GEN　　village-ACC　　raid-FNOM-3SG-ACC　　hear-PAST-1SG
　　　　　'I heard that a [certain] robber raided the village.'

(15)　a.　*[Köy-ü　　　bir **haydut-un**　　bas-tığ-ın]-ı　　　duy-du-m.*
　　　　　village-ACC　　**a**　robber-GEN　　raid-FNOM-3SG-ACC　　hear-PAST-1SG
　　　　　'I heard that [a certain] robber raided the village.'

　　　b.　*[Köy-ü　　　**haydut**　　bas-tığ-ın]-ı　　　duy-du-m.*
　　　　　village-ACC　　robber　　raid-FNOM-3SG-ACC　　hear-PAST-1SG
　　　　　'I heard that robbers raided the village.'

The following examples behave similarly; we see here that a non-specific subject which is positioned immediately before the verb does not bear overt genitive (16a). If it does exhibit genitive case marking in this position, it gets interpreted as specific (16b). Further, we see that such a subject, when it is separated from the verb, can be interpreted as non-specific even when it bears genitive marking (16c). Finally, such a subject cannot show up without the genitive marking in a position removed from the verb (16d):

(16)　a.　*[Yol-dan　　bir araba　　geç-tiğ-in]-i　　　gör-dü-m.*
　　　　　road-ABL　　a　car　　pass-FNOM-3SG-ACC　　see-PAST-1SG
　　　　　'I saw that *a car* [non-specific, non-referential] went by on the road.'
　　　　　(The subject may be focussed, but it does not have to be.)

　　　b.　*[Yol-dan　　bir araba-nın　　geç-tiğ-in]-i　　　gör-dü-m.*
　　　　　road-ABL　　a　car-GEN　　pass-FNOM-3SG-ACC　　see-PAST-1SG
　　　　　'I saw that *a car* [indefinite, but specific] went by on the road.'

---

[13]　Johanson (1977: 1195) refers to the Russian S. S. Majzel', who has observed this fact in his book *Izafet v tureckom jazyke* (Moskva, Leningrad 1957) and described the use of the genitive as a marker of definiteness while its absence as a marker of indefiniteness. ("Der russische Turkologe S. S. Majzel', der in seinen Bestrebungen nach exakter Deskription der türkeitürkischen Syntax seiner Zeit weit voraus war, machte u.a. geltend, daß bei *dik*-Infinitisierungen eine Genitivmarkierung des Erstaktanten einen bestimmten Gegenstand, die unmarkierte Form dagegen einen unbestimmten Gegenstand bezeichne (1957: 152).")

    c.   *[Bir araba-nın   yol-dan   geç-tiğ-in]-i   gör-dü-m.*
         a   car-GEN   road-ABL   pass-FNOM-3SG-ACC   see-PAST-1SG
         'I saw that *a car* [indefinite, and specific *or* non-specific] went by on the road.'

    d.   **[Bir araba   yol-dan   geç-tiğ-in]-i   gör-dü-m.*
         a   car   road-ABL   pass-FNOM-3SG-ACC   see-PAST-1SG
         Intended reading: 'I saw that *a car* [indefinite and non-specific, non-referential] went by on the road.'

Similar facts hold in existentials—this is expected, as the "semantic" subjects are non-specific:

   (17) a.   *[Garaj-da   beş araba   ol-duğ-un]-u   bil-iyor-um.*
            garage-LOC   five car   be-FNOM-3SG-ACC   know-PR.PROG-1SG
            'I know that there are five cars in the garage.'

       b.   **[Beş araba   garaj-da   ol-duğ-un]-u   bil-iyor-um.*
            five car   garage-LOC   be-FNOM-3SG-ACC   know-PR.PROG-1SG
            Intended reading: Same as in (17a).

The restrictions for case marking are very similar between the accusative case suffix and the genitive case suffix in embedded sentences. The case suffix is obligatory if the NP is not to the immediate left of the verb, while in a position left-adjacent to the verb the case suffix signals specificity, and its absence non-specificity.

This observation contradicts the prediction of a functional approach to DOM / DSM. In that theory the respective markers of structural (i.e. non-lexical) case indicate two types of differences:

1. A difference between the morphologically marked direct object or subject and their respective kinds, i.e. the respective classes of archetypical direct objects and subjects.

2. A difference between the morphologically marked object and the subject, or between the morphologically (un)marked subject and the direct object rather than a particular grammatical category or feature.

Comrie (1975) argues that morphological structural case markers just indicate that the object or subject on which they appear is different from what is expected. These markers do not reflect a grammatical category. The dependency of accusative case marking on the Definiteness Scale was illustrated in (8b), repeated here as (18). The prediction of DSM would be something like (19), while the findings are as in (20) (in the appropriate positions):

(18)   Definiteness Scale and accusative case marking

proper noun > definite NP > specific indefinite NP > non-specific NP
marked   marked   unmarked
Hasan -ı   kitab-ı   bir kitab-ı   bir kitap

(19)   Prediction of DSM with respect to the Definiteness Scale and genitive case marking in embedded sentences as the mirror images of the specifications in (18)

non-specific indef. NP   > specific indefinite NP   definite NP >   proper noun
marked   unmarked   unmarked
bir kitab-ın   bir kitap   kitap   Hasan

(20)   Findings about genitive case marking of subjects in embedded sentences

proper noun >   definite NP >   specific indefinite NP >   non-specific
                                                               indefinite NP
marked   marked   unmarked
Hasan-ın   kitab-ın   bir kitab-ın   bir kitap

In contrast with the predictions made by the approach based on DOM and DSM, the observations from Turkish strongly suggest that the structural case markers (i.e. accusative and genitive) indicate specificity; they do not reflect a semantic difference from the expected form. Getting back to Turkish direct objects, the accusative case suffix *-(y)I* is a specificity marker in Turkish—but what is specificity?

3. Specificity and partitivity

Enç (1991) assumes that specificity can be explained in terms of partitivity, a semantic concept which in turn is closely related to the morpho-syntactic construction with the same name. In this section, we first present 4 different types or aspects of specificity, and we also present Enç's proposal which focuses on one type. Finally we argue that Enç's proposal has to be modified to a more flexible notion of specificity, which we formulate as "referentially anchored" expression (a concept which was implicitly mentioned by Enç, but not worked out).

3.1. The concept of specificity

The concept of specificity was introduced in the late 60s by transferring the *de re—de dicto* distinction between definite NPs under verbs of propositional attitudes, as in (21), to indefinite NPs, as in (22):

(21)   a.   *Joan wants to present the prize to **the winner**—but he doesn't want to receive it from her.*   [definite—referential]

(21)   b.   *Joan wants to present the prize to **the winner**—so she'll have to wait around till the race finishes.*   [definite—non-referential]

(22)   a.   *Peter intends to marry **a merchant banker**—even though he doesn't get
              on at all with her.*   [indefinite—specific]
(22)   b.   *Peter intends to marry **a merchant banker**—though he hasn't met one
              yet.*   [indefinite—non-specific]

The Turkish equivalents of these examples are (23) and (24). While English marks
only definiteness, but not specificity, Turkish marks indefiniteness and specificity,
but the latter notion only for indefinite NPs.

(23)   a.   *Dekan-ı   ödüllendir-eceğ-iz,   fakat*
              dean-ACC   give+prize-FUT-1PL   but
              kendisin-i   bul-a-mı-yor-uz.
              he-ACC   find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG.-1PL
              'We will give a prize to the dean, but we are unable to find him.'
                                                                  [definite—ref.]

        b.   *Dekan-ı   ödüllendir-eceğ-iz,   fakat   yeni dekan*
              dean-ACC   give+prize-FUT-1PL   but   new dean
              seç-il-ince-ye   kadar   bekle-me-miz   gerek.
              elect-PASS-WHEN-DAT   until   wait-NFN-1PL   necessary
              'We will give a prize to the dean, but we have to wait until a new dean
              will have been elected.'   [definite—non-ref.]

(24)   a.   *Bir öğrenci-yi   arı-yor-um.   Bul-a-mı-yor-um.*
              a   student-ACC   look+for-PR.PROG.-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
              'I am looking for a student. I can't find him.'   [indefinite—specific]

        b.   *Bir öğrenci   arı-yor-um.   Bul-a-mı-yor-um.*
              a   student   look+for-PR.PROG.-1SG find-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PR.PROG-1SG
              'I am looking for a student. I can't find one.'   [indefinite—non-specific][14]

Specificity is often divided into different classes: (i) scopal specificity, (ii) epistemic
specificity, (iii) partitive specificity, and (iv) relative specificity (Farkas (1995) for
(i)-(iii) and von Heusinger (2002) for (iv), which in Farkas & von Heusinger (2003)
is called "anchored specificity"). It is still controversial if there is one single concept
of specificity with these four subclasses or if these are different, though related, con-
cepts.

---

[14]   We saw earlier (see examples 12 which have been repeated here as 24) that without the
       accusative marking, the animate direct object can also express a specific reading, when it
       is found in certain contexts. In this section, we are interested in the non-specific reading,
       which is the stronger one in any case. The specific reading is expressed clearly by the
       accusative marking on the corresponding direct object in the previous example.

3.1.1. Scopal specificity

Classically, the contrast between a specific and a non-specific reading of an indefinite is configurationally represented by scope interaction between the indefinite and some other operator, such as verbs of propositional attitude, negation or universal quantifiers as in (25)-(26) below.

(25)   *Bill didn't see **a misprint**.*   (Karttunen 1976)

This example is ambiguous between the following readings:

(25)   a.   There is a misprint which Bill didn't see.
        b.   Bill saw no misprints.

Likewise, the following example is ambiguous along similar lines:

(26)   *Bill intends to visit **a museum** every day.*   (Karttunen 1976)
        a.   There is a certain museum which Bill intends to visit every day.
        b.   Every day, Bill intends to visit some museum or another.

Note the following Turkish example which corresponds to the English one in (26) in terms of scope ambiguity:

(27)   *Hasan   her gün   bir arkadaş-ın-ı   ziyaret et-mek   isti-yor.*
        Hasan   every day   a friend-3SG-ACC   visit do-INF   want-PR.PROG
        'Hasan wants to visit a friend of his every day.'

This example is ambiguous between a specific reading of the direct object, under which there is one single friend of his whom Hasan wants to visit every day, and a non-specific reading, under which Hasan wants to visit a (presumably different) friend of his every day, whereby the identity of the friend does not matter.

3.1.2. Epistemic specificity

There are examples that show the same (intuitive) contrast, but do not contain operators. For the specific reading of (28), we can continue with (28a), while the non-specific reading can be continued by (28b). This contrast is also often described as *referential* vs. *non-referential*. The specific indefinite refers to its referent directly, while the non-specific indefinite depends on the interpretation of other expressions in the context.

(28)   *A **student** in syntax 1 cheated on the exam.*   (Fodor & Sag 1982)
        a.   His name is John.
        b.   We are all trying to figure out who it was.

Similar examples can be found in Turkish, too:

(29) a. *Sınıf liste-sin-e*   *bak-ıl-ır-sa*   [indefinite, specific]
          class list-CMPM-DAT   look-PASS-AOR-COND
          bir   öğrenci-yi   *kaybet-miş-iz.*
          a/one student-ACC   lose-EV.PAST-1PL

          Bu öğrenci Ali-den başka   hiç kimse   ol-a-ma-z.
          this student   Ali-ABL other   nobody   be-NEG.ABIL-NEG.-NEG.AOR
          'Looking at/according to the class list, it looks like we lost a student. This
            student can't be anyone else but Ali.'

      b. *Sınıf liste-sin-e*   *bak-ıl-ır-sa*   [indefinite, non-specific]
          class list-CMPM-DAT   look-PASS-AOR-COND
          bir öğrenci   *kaybet-miş-iz.*
          a/one student   lose-EV.PAST-1PL

          Kim   ol-duğ-un-u   anlı-ya-ma-dı-k.
          who   be-FN-3SG-ACC   understand-NEG.ABIL-NEG-PAST-1PL
          'Looking at/according to the class list, it looks like we lost a student. We
          haven't been able to find out who this was/is.'

As we saw earlier, the indefinite, but specific direct object is typically marked with
the accusative, and the indefinite, non-specific direct object is typically bare of any
case marking. However, there are instances where, as mentioned earlier, the bare di-
rect object can express a specific indefinite, as well as instances where the accusative
marked indefinite can express a non-specific indefinite (especially if it is not immed-
iately left of the verb); nonetheless, the primary correlations are between overt accu-
sative and a specific reading, and between lack of accusative and a non-specific read-
ing, as illustrated by this last pair of examples.

3.1.3. Partitive specificity

Milsark (1974) argues that indefinite NPs can either receive a weak (or existential)
interpretation or a strong (or presuppositional) interpretation. In (30a) the indefinite
some ghosts receives a weak interpretation, but it gets a strong interpretation in
(30b), i.e. it presupposes that there are other groups of ghosts. The reading in (30b) is
generally called "partitive".

(30) a. *There are **some ghosts** in this house.*
      b. ***Some ghosts** live in the pantry; others live in the kitchen.*

Enç (1991) develops this idea of specificity as partitivity and argues, based on exam-
ples like (31), that the accusative in Turkish marks exactly this type of specificity:

(31) a. *Oda-m-a* *birkaç* *çocuk* *gir-di.*
      room-1SG-DAT several   child   enter-PAST
      'Several children entered my room.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 16)

    b. *İki* *kız-ı* *tanı-yor-du-m.*
      two   girl-ACC know-PROG-PAST-1SG
      'I knew two girls.' ((Enç 1991:ex. 17); Enç's translation, our glosses)

In the first sentence a set of children are introduced and the accusative case in the second sentence indicates that the two girls are part of that set of children. Thus the expression *two girls* shows wide scope. Enç takes this as a strong indicator for such an expression as being specific and develops her theory of specificity as partitivity (see section 3.2).

3.1.4. Relative specificity or referentially anchored specificity

There are indefinite NPs that neither have wide scope nor are referential, but are still 'specific'. Higginbotham (1987: 64) illustrates this with the help of the examples (32) and (33):

> In typical cases specific uses are said to involve a referent that the speaker 'has in mind.' But this condition seems much too strong. Suppose my friend George says to me, 'I met with a certain student of mine today.' Then I can report the encounter to a third party by saying, 'George said that he met with a certain student of his today,' and the 'specificity' effect is felt, although I am in no position to say which student George met with.

> (32) George: "I met a certain student of mine."
> (33) James: "George met a certain student of his."

We find the case suffix in the Turkish equivalents of the two examples. This indicates that specificity cannot be understood as "the speaker knows the referent" or "the speaker has the referent in mind", but rather in a more abstract way: "the referent is referentially anchored to some other expression" (see section 3.3 for a more detailed description of this concept). In (34) the specific indefinite *bir öğrencimi* is licensed by *Ali*, while in (35) it can be licensed by either *Ali* or by *Osman*.

(34) *Ali: "Kütüphane-de* *çok başarılı* *bir öğrenci-m-i* *gör-dü-m."*
    Ali library-LOC   very successful a student-1SG-ACC see-PAST-1SG
    'Ali: "I saw in the library a very successful student of mine."'

(35) *Osman:*   *"Ali*   *kütüphane-de*   *çok başarılı*   *bir öğrenci-sin-i*
      Osman   Ali   library-LOC   very successful   a student-3SG-ACC
      gör-müş.
      see-REP.PAST
      'Osman: "Ali (reportedly) saw a very successful student of his in the library."'

Much the same distinction is found in sentences which attribute propositional attitudes to each of a range of different protagonists, as in (36), and its potential continuation (37a) or (37b), and their Turkish equivalents (this example is due to Hans Kamp, p.c.):

(36) *Every politician had decided that a certain institute had to be closed.*

(37) a. With such unanimity of opinion it was clear that the institute could not be saved.
      b. But since they couldn't agree which institute should be closed down, everything remained the way it had been.

(38) *Her politikacı*   *öğrenci-siz*   *kal-an*   *bir enstitü-yü*
      every politician   student-without   remain-REL.P   an institute-ACC
      kapat-mağ-a   *karar ver-miş.*
      close-INF-DAT   decision give-REP.PAST
      'Every politician decided to close an institute that remains/remained without students.'

(38) a. *Böylesine*   *bir karar birliğ-i*   *karşısında*   *enstitü-yü*
          such   a decision unity-CMPM   across   institute-ACC
          kurtar-mak   *olanak-sız-dı.*
          save-INF   possibility-WITHOUT-PAST
          'Faced with such a unanimity of decision, it was impossible to save the institute.'

      b. *Fakat*   *hangi enstitü-yü*   *kapat-mak*   *gerek-tiğ-i*
          but   which institute-ACC   close-INF   necessary-FN-3SG
          konu-sun-da   *anla-ş-a-ma-dık-ları*   *için*
          topic-CMPM-LOC   understand-REC-NEG.ABIL-NEG.-FN-3PL   because
          eninde sonunda   *herşey*   *ol-duğ-u*   *gibi*   *kal-dı.*
          "in the end"   everything   be-FN-3SG   like   stay-PAST
          'But because they were unable to agree on the issue of which institute it was necessary to close, everything stayed the way it was.'

It is clear that in the case of (37b) and (38b) the specific indefinite does not have maximal scope. This shows that there is at least one kind of specificity which does

not entail maximal scope as a matter of course. Scopal behavior of indefinite NPs and questions of specificity must thus be distinguished.

Enç (1991: 18) illustrates such relative specificity with the following example (39):

(39)		*Her antrenör*	*belli*	*bir atlet-i /*atlet*	*çalış-tır-acak.*
		every trainer	certain	one athlete-ACC	work-CAUS-FUT

    'Every trainer will train a certain athlete.'
    a.   all trainers the same athlete   (specific wide scope)
    b.   each trainer a different athlete   (specific narrow scope)

Note that Enç uses here the modifier *belli* '(a) certain'. This contributes to the specificity of the indefinite expression and thus to the well-formedness of the accusative marker, in a fashion similar to other modification we saw previously. We shall return to this issue.

It is interesting to note that if we move the indefinite to sentence initial position (which, as we mentioned earlier, is a topic position), then we receive only the wide-scope specific reading, as in (40):

(40)		*Belli*	*bir atlet-i*	*her*	*antrenör*	*çalış- tır-acak.*
		certain	one athlete-ACC	every	trainer	work-CAUS-FUT

    'Every trainer will train a certain athlete.'
    a.   all trainers the same athlete   (specific wide scope)
    b.   *each trainer a different athlete   (specific narrow scope)

We will come back to this observation in section (3.3), where we return to this type of specificity within the larger context of setting up a typology of specificity.

3.2. Enç's proposal

Enç (1991) suggests two theories of specificity, based on observations having to do with accusative marking in Turkish and on semantic considerations: (i) specificity as partitivity, and (ii) specificity as "relating novel objects to familiar objects". She is most often quoted for the former theory, while we think that the latter one is more adequate for semantic reasons and for the Turkish data which we will discuss.

Enç formulates her analysis in a discourse theory that assumes that NPs are associated with discourse referents or discourse items at an additional level of discourse representation (see Heim 1982, Kamp 1981). The discourse referent is indicated by the index *i* of the NP. Such theories further assume that every (argumental) NP introduces such a discourse referent—only incorporated nouns do not. Definiteness, specificity or partitivity signal certain properties of the discourse referents at the level of discourse representation. The classical contrast between a definite and an indefinite NP is that a definite NP signals that the discourse referent was already introduced into the discourse representation, while indefiniteness indicates that the

discourse referent is new. The contrast between specific and non-specific indefinite NPs is more subtle. Partitive indefinite NPs signal that the discourse referent is new, but linked to a set of already established discourse referents. Non-partitive indefinite NPs introduce new discourse referents that are not linked to the established discourse. Thus partitive indefinites are similar to definite NPs in that they tend to have wide scope (they are discourse linked), while non-partitive indefinites tend to have narrow scope. Since Enç equals partitivity with specificity, she formulates the condition for specific NPs in general.

3.2.1. Specificity as partitivity

Enç (1991) proposes that what makes a NP specific is essentially that its referential index stands for a subset of the referential indices of NPs previously mentioned, or else of NPs whose referents are contextually salient. This inclusion, she proposes, amounts to a partitivity relationship, an idea which forms the basis for her proposal for a formal definition of specificity, based on partitivity. This definition of specificity states that the referential index of a specific expression must be in an inclusive relationship to the set of corresponding indices of an established set (established in the discourse or made otherwise salient).

A non-specific expression must have a referential index which is not included in the index set of previously mentioned or otherwise established entities. It must be completely new in some sense.

Enç thus claims that implicitly as well as, of course, explicitly partitive constructions in natural languages must be specific and, where a language expresses specificity syntactically and/or morphologically, partitive expressions are always treated as specific expressions. This can be seen in (41a) versus (41b), as well as in (42a) versus (42b)—the partitive phrase in direct object position bears overt accusative marking in the well-formed examples (marked as a): without the Accusative marking—which we follow Enç in viewing as not only a marker of case, but also of specificity—the examples become ungrammatical, as seen in the ill-formed examples (marked as b.).

(41) a. *Ali*   *kadın-lar-ın*   *iki-sin-i*   *tanı-yor-du.*
          Ali   woman-PL-GEN   two-AGR[3]-ACC   know-PROG-PAST
          'Ali knew two of the women.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 28)

      b. **Ali*   *kadın-lar-ın*   *iki-si*   *tanı-yor-du.*
          Ali   woman-PL-GEN   two-AGR[3]   know-PROG-PAST

(42) a. *Ali*   *kadın-lar-dan*   *iki-sin-i*   *tanı-yor-du.*
          Ali   woman-PL-ABL   two-AGR[3]-ACC   know-PROG-PAST
          'Ali knew two of the women.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 29)

b. *Ali   kadın-lar-dan   iki-si   tanı-yor-du.
    Ali   woman-PL-ABL   two-AGR[3]   know-PROG-PAST

These examples illustrate *explicitly* partitive constructions—they differ in whether they use a genitive or an ablative case for the partitive. An example of an *implicitly* partitive relationship is found below, where example (43) establishes an expression—*several children*—as the potential superset for expressions to appear later in the discourse:

(43)   Oda-m-a   birkaç   çocuk   gir-di.
       room-1SG-DAT   several   child   enter-PAST
       'Several children entered my room.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 16)

The referents of the expressions that might appear later in the discourse and which are, according to Enç, a subset of the referents established previously as in (43), can be illustrated as in (44), where the direct object bears overt accusative (i.e. the specificity marker):

(44)   İki   kız-ı   tanı-yor-du-m.
       two   girl-ACC   know-PROG-PAST-1SG
       'I knew two girls.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 17, Enç's translation, our glosses)

Indeed, this example is fine in this discourse, with the direct object interpreted as two individuals out of the previously established set of children. Enç is also right in stating that (45), whose direct object is bare, is not a felicitous continuation of the discourse after (43), because it wouldn't be naturally interpreted as having a direct object whose referents are included in the previously established set:

(45)   İki   kız   tanı-yor-du-m.
       two   girl   know-PROG-PAST-1SG
       'I knew two girls.'   (Enç 1991: ex. 18, Enç's translation, our glosses)

Enç further states that (44), with its direct object marked overtly as specific and with its implicitly partitive semantics is equivalent to (46), where the direct object is *explicitly* partitive (and where the translation of the direct object is: 'two of the girls'), and where the overt accusative marks the direct object as specific:

(46)   Kız-lar-dan   iki-sin-i   tanı-yor-du-m.
       girl-PL-ABL   two-AGR-ACC   know-PROG-PAST-1SG
       'I knew two of the girls.' (Enç 1991: ex. 19) (Enç's translation; glosses: Enç's for the partitive, ours for the verb)

(46) is thus similar to the examples we saw previously—i.e. (41) and (42) *a.* versus *b.*; we find here partitive direct objects which are claimed to be necessarily specific,

given that their accusative marking is obligatory. We will discuss the semantics of this approach in section 3.3 and the morphological predictions in section 4.

3.2.2. Specificity as "relational specificity"

After having introduced the equivalence between specificity and partitivity as semantic concepts via illustrative semantic and morphological properties of relevant constructions, Enç (1991: 18) introduces a second type of specificity, which is closely related to the concept of "referentially anchored specificity" or "relative specificity" which we mentioned in section 3.1.4. She discusses this kind of specificity in reference to example (47) (her (56)), mentioned previously as (39) and (40):

(47)   *Her antrenör*   *belli*   *bir atlet-i /*atlet*   *çalış-tır-acak.*
          every trainer   certain   one athlete-ACC   work-CAUS-FUT
          'Every trainer will train a certain athlete.'
       a.   all trainers the same athlete   (specific wide scope)
       b.   each trainer a different athlete   (specific narrow scope)

Enç (1991: 19) accounts for the use of the accusative case by assuming that the direct object is "somehow distinguished. It is distinguished because it stands in the contextually salient relevant relation to some other object". She sketches a formalization of this idea by using Skolem functions (or what she calls "assignment functions") for the specific indefinite, following a proposal by Hintikka (1986).

     Enç (1991: 21) combines the two views on specificity by stating that

> specificity involves linking objects to the domain of discourse in some manner or other. One acceptable way of linking is through this assignment function, by relating objects to familiar objects. Another acceptable way of linking is the subset relation, which we have observed in covert and overt partitives.

However, at the same time (1991: 21), she also states distinct properties of the two types of specificity: "Relational specifics such as a *certain N* do not presuppose existence, whereas partitives do." We might add that a second—and more clear-cut—distinction is that partitives can be non-specific under all the views discussed in section 3.2, as we will show below. Before we discuss the morphological implications of Enç's proposed equivalence between the semantic concept of specificity with the morpho-syntactic expressions for partitivity, we first reconstruct her two views on specificity within a formal theory.

3.3. A formal theory of specificity

Enç formalizes her view of specificity in terms of Heim's (1982) familiarity approach to discourse structure. Heim defines definiteness in terms of familiarity, or more formally, in terms of identity of the indices of file cards (denotation) for NPs, as defined in (48), and illustrated by (49)-(50):

(48)   Heim's Familiarity Condition
       An NP$_i$ in a sentence φ with respect to a file F and the Domain of filenames
       Dom(F) is
       (i)   [+definite] if $i \in$ Dom(F), and it is
       (ii)   [-definite] if $i \notin$ Dom(F)

Heim (1982) reconstructs definiteness with respect to the already established discourse. Every NP comes with an index *i*, which represents the discourse referent (or Heim's "file card") associated with that NP. If the discourse referent *i* is already introduced in the discourse—or more formally if the index *i* is element of the set of all established discourse referents *Dom(F),* then the NP must be definite; if, however, the discourse referent *i* is not among the already established discourse referents, i.e. if $i \notin$ *Dom(F),* then the NP must be indefinite. Definiteness signals the familiarity of the discourse referent associated with the NP.

(49)   a.   *A man$_1$ meets a woman$_2$*   Dom(F) = {1,2}
       b.   *The man$_1$ talks to her$_2$* $1, 2 \in$ Dom(F)

(50)   a.   *A man$_1$ meets a woman$_2$*   Dom(F) = {1,2}
       b.   *A man$_3$ talks to a woman$_4$* $3, 4 \notin$ Dom(F)

In (49a) the two indefinite NPs introduce new file cards or discourse items, which we indicate by the two indices *1* and *2*. These indices form the domain of filenames (*Dom(F)*) and they are accessible for the evaluation of the NPs in (49b). The two indices in (49b) can be linked to the already established indices in the domain for indices (or the domain of established discourse items), which licenses the definiteness of the two NPs. In contrast, in (50b) the two NPs are indefinite, which means their indices cannot be linked to already established indices or discourse items. Therefore, the indefinite NPs introduce new discourse items.

   Enç modifies the familiarity condition of definite vs. indefinite NP to the partitivity condition for the contrast between specific / partitive vs. non-specific/ non-partitive indefinite NPs. Like definite NPs, specific NPs signal that the associated discourse referent is linked to the already established discourse. Other than with definites, this link is not direct but licensed by the "part of" relation or the partitive relation. Here she has to distinguish between the plural case (51i) and the singular (51ii). In the plural case (*several children ... two of the girls*) the formal reconstruction (i) says that the partitivity is licensed by the fact that the index *i* (standing for a group of entities, such as *two of the girls*) is part of (subset relation $\subseteq$) an index *j* that stands for an already established group of entities (*several children*). In the singular case (ii), the partitivity of the NP is licensed by the fact that the group con-

sisting of that one discourse referent (therefore a set with just one index: {i}) is part of the already established group *j*.

(51) is a reconstruction of Enç's (1991: 7 ex. 22) condition for partitive NPs. [15]

> (51)   Enç's Specificity / Partitivity Condition (adapted version)
> An NP_i in a sentence ϕ with respect to a file F and the Domain of filenames Dom(F) is
> (i)   for NP_i plural: [+specific] if there is a j such that $i \subseteq j$ and $j \in$ Dom(F)
> or
> (ii)   for NP_i singular: [+specific] if there is a j such that $\{i\} \subseteq j$ and $j \in$ Dom(F)

Sentence (52a) introduces a new index (or discourse item), a set of several children. The (implicit) partitive *two girl(s)* in (52b) is related to this set by the subset relation. This means that the index or discourse item *3*, i.e. a set of two girls, is a subset of index *1* standing for the set of several girls already established. Since this set of two girls is new it is indefinite, but because of its relation to an already established set it is partitive (and specific, according to Enç). It is also obvious that the partitive has wider scope with respect to other operators in the sentence, since it is related to an established set.

> (52)   a.   *Several children₁ entered my room₂*
> Dom(F) = {1, 2} (with 1 denoting a set)
> b.   I knew two girls₃. $3 \subseteq 1$ and $1 \in$ Dom(F)

In order to account for specificity in terms of a relational specificity or referentially anchored specificity, we formulate the condition (53) in similar terms. An NP is specific if its index (or filename) can be linked to an already established index. This relation or link to another already established discourse referent is formally expressed by the function *f*. This means that the discourse referent for the specific indefinite NP is fixed by the discourse referent to which the specific one is linked.

---

[15]   Enç's (1991: 7) own reconstruction is even more difficult to read: "All NPs carry a pair of indices, the first of which represents the referent of the NP. The indices themselves bear a definiteness feature. The feature on the first index determines the definiteness of the NP, as usual. The definiteness feature on the second index determines the specificity of the NP by constraining the relation of the referent of the NP to other discourse referents.

> (i)   Every $[_{NP} a]_{<i,j>}$ is interpreted as a(x_i) and
> $x_i \subseteq x_j$ if $NP_{<i,j>}$ is plural
> $\{x_i\} \subseteq x_j$ if $NP_{<i,j>}$ is singular

Often the specific indefinite is linked to the speaker of the sentence (who also counts as an index or available discourse referent), but the specific indefinite can also be linked to other discourse referents or indices. An additional restriction is that the index must be from the current sentence, rather than from the previous discourse. In this sense, specificity is sentence bound, while definiteness is discourse bound.[16]

The formal reconstruction of this view of specificity states that a specific NP_i signals that the associated index i is linked by a salient function (or relation) to another index j from the same sentence:

> (53)   Relational / Anchored Specificity Condition
>   An NP_i in a sentence ϕ with respect to a file F and the Domain of filenames
> $Dom(\phi)$ is [+ specific] if there is a contextual salient function f such that i =
>   f(j) and j $\in Dom(\phi)$

Let us illustrate the definition on our examples (32) and (33), repeated as (54a) and (54b). The embedded sentence in direct speech in (54a) introduces a new index *1*, such that the index *2* of the specific indefinite can be linked to it by a contextually salient function *f*. This function could be spelled out by saying that George can identify that student or that there was a temporal point at which both individuals were at the same location etc. The function only indicates that once we have fixed the identity of the anchor (George) we can also identify the identity of the anchored indefinite. In (54b), we have two potential anchors such that we can relate the index of the specific indefinite to either one of them, yielding the two representations (i) and (ii) standing for the two accessible readings: in (i) George is the anchor and "responsible" for the specific indefinite, while in (ii) James is the anchor:

---

[16]   Note that the following condition allows only for functions between indices (denotations) inside the actual sentence. If one wants to expand the domain of accessible indices, one can extend the domain to the whole discourse: Dom (f $\cup$ F). Additionally we might also want to add to the domain the speaker at the context *c* of the sentence: Dom (f $\cup$ ||speaker||$_c$). Furthermore we might want to add that the index may not be dependent on itself (i $\neq$ j).

While specificity could be claimed to be discourse-bound, as well (i.e. similar to definiteness—and is claimed to be thus bound by Enç), this is true for partitive NPs only. Partitives, in turn, are, we claim, best analyzed as a combination of definite and indefinite operations. Genuine specific NPs are purely sentence-bound. A full discussion of this point, which is tangential to our concerns, would take us too far afield, but see von Heusinger (2002).

(54) a. *George: "I$_1$ met [a certain student of mine]$_2$."*
          2 = f (1) and 1 ∈ Dom (φ)
      b. *James₃: "George$_1$ met [a certain student of his]$_2$."*
          reading (i) 2 = f (1) and 1 ∈ Dom (φ)
          reading (ii) 2 = f (3) and 3 ∈ Dom (φ)

In (55) the universal quantifier introduces an index *1* and a new domain for each value for *1*, such that inside that domain the index *2* for the specific indefinite is functionally dependent on the index for *every trainer*.[17] Again the contextually salient function could be spelled out by *his favorite athlete*, or *the athlete who pays the most money* etc.

(55)   (Speaker$_i$:) *Every trainer$_1$ will train a certain athlete$_2$.*
      a. all trainers the same athlete   (specific wide scope)
          2= f (i) and i ∈ Dom(φ) (if i stands for the speaker)
      b. each trainer a different athlete   (specific narrow scope)
          2= f (1) and 1 ∈ Dom(φ) (if 1 stands for the trainer)

With this theory of "referentially anchored indefinites" we can account for the observation made above that the Turkish variant (56) (previously mentioned as (40)) of (55), with the indefinite direct object scrambled over the subject, can only receive the reading with wide scope. Here, we could argue that the referential index of the indefinite (specific) object, cannot be anchored by *her antrenör*, the universally quantified subject, for configurational (binding-theoretical) reasons:[18]

(56)   *[Belli bir atlet -i]$_2$ [her antrenör]$_1$ çalış-tır-acak.*
         certain one athlete-ACC   every trainer   work-CAUS-FUT
         'Every trainer$_1$ will train a certain athlete$_2$.'
      a. all trainers the same athlete   (specific wide scope)
          2= f(i) and i ∈ Dom (φ) (if i stands for the speaker)
      b. *each trainer a different athlete   (specific narrow scope)
          2= f (1) ist not possible

The topicalized indefinite cannot reconstruct, and given that, as we assume, the anchor has to c-command the indefinite, the absence of specific narrow scope of the indefinite with respect to the anchor is explained. Another way of putting the matter is

---

[17] The conditions for a universal quantifier are somewhat more complex (see Heim 1982: 352.)

[18] The exact configurational conditions must be formulated in more detail; one likely possibility is that the anchor has to c-command the indefinite—a condition violated in (56). Chierchia (2001) gives such conditions for similar observations in Italian.

that the narrow scope reading for the indefinite object is impossible, because the index of the object can't be bound (see discussion of (55)). Only the wide scope reading is possible for the object, whereby the index may be bound (e.g. by the speaker).

If we compare the definition of partitivity in (51) with the one of relational / anchored specificity in (53), we can observe the following points of difference between those definitions:

(i)   they differ in that partitivity is discourse bound but anchored specificity is sentence bound

(ii)   they differ in that partitivity expresses a relation (subset-relation), while anchored specificity expresses a function

(iii)   they differ (as Enç noted) in that partitives are always presuppositional (since discourse linked), but anchored specifics are not necessarily presuppositional.

Superficially, the two definitions define similar properties of partitive and specific indefinites: they both assign wide scope. The two definitions cooperate in that we often find a partitive construction with a specific indefinite. While the partitive construction delimits the set, the specificity of the indefinite NP signals that we make a "specific" choice. The better we know the set the easier we can make the specific choice.

Summary of this section: A partitive construction often induces a specific reading (i.e. it goes along with a specific interpretation). However, this is not necessary: we also find partitives without a specific interpretation. Therefore, it is not partitivity that covers specificity, it is rather the explanation in terms of referential anchoring that explains specificity. It seems that specificity and partitivity are not equal concepts: partitivity is a complex referential property that consists of a definite part and an indefinite part. The definite part is the relation to an already introduced set, while the indefinite part is the choice out of this set. This choice can be specific or non-specific. In the latter case we would get non-specific partitives.

We now turn to a discussion of non-specific partitives.

4. The morphology of Turkish partitives

What we are primarily interested in showing in this paper is that examples like those in (41) and (42) are misleading. The ungrammaticality of the examples in b. (in both pairs) with *bare* partitive direct objects has nothing to do with specificity but rather is due to morphological and syntactic conditions imposed on nominal phrases without overt nominal heads, as we shall see shortly. Crucially, we see examples showing that bare, i.e. case-less partitive direct objects *are* possible, which in turn shows that non-specific partitives do exist.

Furthermore, even in some examples where, as in (41) and (42), the overt accusative case on the partitive direct object appears to be obligatory, non-specific readings are possible, thus contributing to the number of construction types where

partitives can be non-specific, and at the same time raising the question of how reliable morphological expressions of specificity (like the accusative marker in Turkish) are in general.

4.1. "Bare" partitive direct objects

We now turn to examples of partitive DOs without any accusative marking which are non-specific. Note that identification of such bare DOs as non-specific is in accordance with Enç's criterion of viewing overt accusative as an expression of specificity:

(57)	*Ali*	*kadın-lar-dan*	***iki kişi***	*tanı-yor-du.*
	Ali	woman-PL-ABL	**two individual**	know- PROG-PAST

'Ali knew two individuals of the women.'

(58)	*Ali*	*büro-ya*	*çocuk-lar-dan*	***iki kız***	*al-acak.*
	Ali	office-DAT	child-PL-ABL	**two girl**	take-FUT

'Ali will hire, for the office, two girls of the children.'

The direct objects here are similar to their counterparts in (46), as well as to (41) and (42); we find ablative partitive direct objects here, just as in (42a) and (46). Given that the direct objects are explicit partitive constructions, we would expect to find obligatory overt accusative marking. Indeed, (57) and (58) *could* carry accusative:

(57')	*Ali*	*kadın-lar-dan*	***iki kişi-yi***	*tanı-yor-du.*
	Ali	woman-PL-ABL	**two individual-ACC**	know-PROG-PAST

'Ali knew two (specific, particular) individuals of the women.'

(58')	*Ali*	*büro-ya*	*çocuk-lar-dan*	***iki kız-ı***	*al-acak.*
	Ali	office-DAT	child-PL-ABL	**two girl-ACC**	take-FUT

'Ali will hire, for the office, two (specific, particular) girls of the children.'

The examples (57') and (58') with the overt accusative marking on their direct objects are unsurprising. What's interesting and surprising here is that the accusative marking *can* be left off in (57) and (58). The interpretation of these "bare" direct objects is just as that of any non-specific direct objects: in (57), the speaker probably doesn't know the identity of the two people Ali knows, but does know that they were among the women previously talked about. Similarly, in (58), Ali will hire two girls whose specific identity is not known, or not committed to by the speaker; however, their referents are to be found among those of the children whose reference has been previously established.

We see that partitives without accusative marking—hence non-specific partitives—do exist.

A similar point is made by "bare" ablative partitives with phonologically unrealized heads (see Kornfilt 1996). These, too, lack overt accusative marking in direct object position (which is not surprising, as there is no phonological host to which the

accusative marker could be attached—a fact which may explain why this "headless partitive" can only be interpreted as having a non-specific subset), and they are understood in the same way in which non-specific NPs are generally interpreted, as expressed in the italicized parts of the translations of (59) and (60), i.e. as 'non-specific amount':

(59) *Ali   şarap-**tan**   iç-ti.*
      Ali   wine-**ABL**   drink-PAST
      'Ali drank (*an unspecified amount*) of the wine.'

(60) *Ali   balık-**tan**   ye-di.*
      Ali   fish-**ABL**   eat-PAST
      'Ali ate (*an unspecified amount*) of the fish.'

Similar observations hold of subjects of certain existential verbs, where the phonologically unrealized head is interpreted as 'non-specific amount or number':

(61) *Biz-de   bu   kitap-**tan**   var / yok   /kal-ma-dı.*
      we-LOC   this   book-**ABL**   existing /NEG+existing   /remain-NEG-PAST
      'We have/don't have *any* (copies) of this book; we don't have *any* (copies) of this book left.'[19]

All of these examples have in common the property that, although they are partitive constructions, and their heads are interpreted as referring to a subset of an overt superset, these heads are non-specific. Partitivity, then, is obviously not sufficient to impose interpretation of specificity.

4.2. Reasons for the ungrammaticality of ill-formed "bare" partitives

Why, then, are (41b) and (42b) ill-formed? Is this because the partitive is (illegitimately) marked as non-specific, as claimed by Enç, or is this indeed due to lack of overt accusative marking, but independently of specificity?

We claim here that it is the latter. In order to back up our claim, we would like to make two interrelated points:

---

[19] For arguments that such "headless" ablative expressions are regular ablative partitives, as well as for arguments that ablative partitives are regular partitive phrases, i.e. constituents whose heads express the subset of a superset, the reader is referred to Kornfilt (1984) and (1996). Please note also that Enç (1991) views ablative partitives on a par with genitive partitives as a legitimate means of expressing the partitive relationship; this is shown in the pair (41) versus (42) (which exhibit the genitive versus ablative partitive construction, respectively), as well as in (46), which illustrates the ablative partitive. All of these examples are taken from Enç (1991).

A. It is possible to show that the accusative marking, while in general a reliable expression of specificity, may be misleading: it can conceal a non-specific expression. This is so when the appearance of the accusative marking is due to formal reasons, e.g. to morphological requirements: the nominal *agreement* marking on a nominal phrasal head has to be followed by the accusative in a transitive context. The agreement marking itself is an expression of specificity in general, but it can also conceal non-specificity when it appears in head-noun positions of nominal phrases—this is true in constructions when a nominal head is required but no *lexical* head is available:

(62) a. *Kitap-lar-ın*   **iki-sin-i**   *al,*
         book-PL-GEN   **two-AGR(3)-ACC**   buy
         geri-sin-i   *kutu-da*   *bırak.*
         remainder-AGR(3)-ACC   box-LOC   leave
         'Take (**any**) two of the books and leave the remainder [of the books] in the box.'

     b. *Kitap-lar-dan*   **iki-*sin-i***   *al,*
         book-PL-ABL   **two-AGR(3)-ACC**   buy
         geri-sin-i   *kutu-da*   *bırak.*
         remainder-AGR(3)-ACC box-LOC   leave
         Same reading as in (62a).

The accusative subset may be interpreted as specific or, crucially, as non-specific, as shown in the translation.

By now, the fact that we can have a non-specific partitive should not surprise us. But what is interesting is the fact that the non-specific interpretation is possible despite the overt accusative. Furthermore, it is also interesting to note that the accusative is *obligatory* (even under the non-specific reading), as illustrated by the two following examples, where lack of overt accusative on these examples leads to ill-formedness:

(62') a. **Kitap-lar-ın*   **iki-si**   *al,*
          book-PL-GEN   **two-AGR(3)**   buy
          geri-sin-i   *kutu-da*   *bırak.*
          remainder-AGR(3)-ACC box-LOC   leave

      b. **Kitap-lar-dan*   **iki-si**   *al,*
          book-PL-ABL   **two-AGR(3)**   buy
          geri-sin-i   *kutu-da*   *bırak.*
          remainder-AGR(3)-ACC box-LOC   leave

The agreement marker, usually found following a head noun in a possessive DP, can—in fact must—also appear in head-noun positions of nominal phrases when a modifier is present, but no lexical nominal head is.[20] This can be seen in (62) a. and b., which illustrate the genitive and ablative partitive constructions, respectively. It is in these instances, where an agreement marker (agreeing with the expression denoting the superset of the partitive phrase) shows up, that an accusative marker also shows up and is obligatory. This is the common denominator between the examples in (62) and those in (41) and (42) (the latter two being Enç's examples), where leaving off the accusative leads to ill-formedness, yet where this obli-gatoriness of overt accusative is not due to obligatory specificity. That the illformedness of these examples without overt accusative is not due to specificity is shown by the availability of non-specific readings for their grammatical counterparts with overt accusative, as we just saw in (62a and b).

Similar examples are seen in (63) with an adjectival modifier. Note (63a), where the third person agreement marker serves as the nominal head of the modified DP. The agreement marker itself requires overt accusative when it heads a phrase which is a direct object:

(63) a. *Çeşitli*   *model-ler-i*   *karşılaştır-dı-m*   *ve*
          various   model-PL-ACC   compare-PAST-1SG   and
          *yeni-**sin**-i*   *al-dı-m.*
          new-**AGR[3]**-ACC buy-PAST-1SG
          'I compared various models and bought the new (one).'

      b. **Çeşitli*   *model-ler-i*   *karşılaştır-dı-m*   *ve*
          various   model-PL-ACC   compare-PAST-1SG   and
          *yeni-**si***   *al-dı-m.*
          new-**AGR(3)**   buy-PAST-1SG
          Intended reading: 'I compared various models and bought the new (one).'

Furthermore, (63a) becomes ungrammatical, when the agreement morpheme is omitted—entirely comparable to the effect that omission of *one* has in the English translation; note that the ungrammaticality persists even when the accusative marker is present:

---

[20] It is important to include into this statement a reference to the presence of a modifier. Partitive constructions, especially ablative partitives, which lack a nominal lexical head are possible, as long as their (silent) head has no modifiers of any sort. We saw this in the course of our discussion of bare (or "naked") ablative partitives in the text; this construction is also mentioned in the previous footnote.

(63) c. *Çeşitli model-ler-i karşılaştır-dı-m ve
various model-PL-ACC compare-PAST-1SG and
*yeni-**yi** al-dı-m.*
new-**ACC** buy-PAST-1SG
Intended reading: 'I compared various models and bought the new (one).'

Compare this to the similar ill-formedness in English:

(64) *I compared various models and bought the new *(one).*

The same is true for the examples in (62). In other words, the agreement marker can't be omitted there, either—even if the accusative marker were retained, these examples would be ungrammatical in the absence of overt agreement.

In (63), the modifier is an adjective; in our previous examples, most importantly in (62), we had instead numeral quantifiers. In all of those examples, i.e. in utterances that are characterizable as having DPs where a "regular" nominal head is missing, an agreement morpheme that functions as such a head "saves" the construction, but it must be followed by overt accusative, as in (62a) and (62b) and in (63a). In all of these examples, where the presence of the accusative is due to a formal requirement (namely that the overt agreement marker requires its presence), a non-specific reading is possible. While the accusative marker does express specificity in many instances in the language (as we saw previously), it is unreliable as a specificity marker when it is needed due to formal reasons, as we just saw.

Note that in examples comparable to (63), but with the difference that the partitive phrase that constitutes the direct object does have a *lexical* nominal head, a non-specific reading obtains when the accusative is missing:

(65) a. *(Bak-ma-dan) kitap-lar-dan **iki tane** al-dı-m.*
look-NEG-ABL book-PL-ABL **two "item"** buy-PAST-1SG
'I bought/took two of the books (without looking).'

This example is entirely equivalent semantically to the *non-specific* reading of the following example which has no lexical head, but instead has an agreement marker and an *accusative marker*:

(65) b. *(Bak-ma-dan) kitap-lar-dan **iki-sin-i** al-dı-m.*
look-NEG-ABL book-PL-ABL **two-AGR(3)-ACC** buy-PAST-1SG
'I bought/took two of the books (without looking).'

This example is ambiguous between a reading where the subset is specific (not surprisingly, given the accusative marker), and a non-specific reading, again made possible by the lack of a lexical head and the consequently arising necessity of providing a nominal head via the agreement marker. Under the latter, non-specific reading,

(65b) is synonymous with (65a), whose lexical head *tane* 'item' functions elsewhere as a classifier-like element.

This pair of examples, then, provides us with two important conclusions, which we have mentioned as claims earlier:

1. Where the accusative marker is required for formal reasons, it is not a reliable marker for specificity; elsewhere, it is;
2. It is possible to have non-specific partitives—i.e. non-specific subsets that are clearly expressed as being related to just as clearly expressed supersets. This is illustrated by the well-formed (65a), where the lack of the accusative marker (on the "regular" nominal lexical head) signals lack of specificity, and by the contrasting possibility of a non-specific interpretation for (65b) (despite the overt accusative marker). The non-specific interpretation for (65b) is possible despite the presence of overt accusative, because the accusative is necessary due to formal reasons—i.e. due to the presence of the agreement marker which is, in turn, necessarily present due to the absence of a "regular", i.e. lexical, nominal head.

Many of our examples have illustrated *ablative* partitives. Let us look at *genitive* partitives, as well, as they are interesting in the context of formal reasons for the appearance of the accusative marker.

The genitive on a DP requires the presence of overt agreement on a related nominal head. This is so in possessive phrases,[21] as well as in (genitive) partitive phrases. One might even view the genitive and the agreement morphemes as a single discontinuous morpheme—a view that receives support from the following observation: not only does overt Agr have different shapes for different person and number combinations, but also the genitive itself, albeit in a much more limited

---

[21] With the exception of possessive phrases in an informal and/or rural style, where overt Agr is absent. The semantics of such Agr-less phrases are not so much one of possessivity (as is the case in regular possessive phrases with overt Agr), but rather one of relatedness and and familiarity between the (Agr-less) head and the genitive specifier:

(i) *biz-im*   *sınıf*
     we-GEN   class
     'our dear, old (familiar) class'

versus

(ii) *biz-im*   *sınıf-ımız*
     we-GEN   class-1PL
     'our class'

fashion: the first person singular and plural genitive is different from the genitive for the other person and number combinations.

Now, given that the genitive that marks the superset in a partitive phrase requires the presence of overt Agr on the subset expression of the partitive, the accusative marker is also (again formally) required, and the accusative-less alternatives (which, as we saw earlier, are possible in the ablative partitives) are unavailable:

(66)   a.   *Kitap-lar-ın   **iki   tane**   al-dı-m.
            book-PL-GEN   **two "item"**   buy-PAST-1SG
            Intended reading: 'I bought two of the books.'

For the genitive partitives, the accusative is obligatory (where the partitive is a direct object), because the overt agreement is obligatory (itself, as just stated, due to the genitive). This is so even when a lexical head is present:

(66)   b.   Kitap-lar-ın   **iki   tane-sin-i**   al-dı-m.
            book-PL-GEN   **two "item"-AGR[3]-ACC**   buy-PAST-1SG
            'I bought two of the books.'

Interestingly for our purposes, the accusative by itself is not enough to "save" (66a), without overt Agr:

(66)   c.   *Kitap-lar-ın   **iki   tane-yi**   al-dı-m.
            book-PL-GEN   **two "item"-ACC**   buy-PAST-1SG
            Intended reading: 'I bought two of the books.'

The accusative is not sufficient to make (66a) grammatical, because, as stated earlier, the genitive necessitates the presence of overt agreement.

A particularly telling pair of examples is provided by (67a) versus (67b):

(67)   a.   Bu vasıf-lar-a   sahip ol-an   **bir insan /**
            this property-PL-DAT   owner be-REL.P   **a person/**
            bir kütüphaneci   arı-yor-um.
            a librarian   seek-PR.PROG-1SG
            'I am looking for a(ny) person/a(ny) librarian who has these properties.'

As the translation makes clear, this example illustrates a non-specific direct object, lacking accusative marking. This is just as expected: Clearly, the bold-faced expression is non-specific; the speaker is looking for *any* person or *any* librarian who fulfills certain properties; it is obvious that the speaker does not have any particular person or librarian in mind. Not surprisingly, the non-specific direct object bears no overt accusative marker.

If the direct object *is* followed by the accusative, the interpretation is specific: the speaker is looking for a *particular* person or librarian who has the properties in question:

(67) b.   *Bu vasıf-lar-a*   *sahip ol-an*   **bir insan-ı /**
         this property-PL-DAT   owner be-REL.P   **a person-ACC**
         bir kütüphaneci-yi   *arı-yor-um.*
         a librarian-ACC   seek-PR.PROG-1SG
         'I am looking for a (particular) person/a (particular) librarian who has these properties.'

In contrast, the case marking properties of the following example, semantically very similar to (67 a), *are* surprising at first:

(68)   *Bu vasıf-lar-a*   *sahip ol-an*   ***bir-in-i***
         this property-PL-DAT   owner be-REL.P   **one-AGR(3)-ACC**
         arı-yor-um.
         seek-PR.PROG-1SG
         'I am looking for someone who has these properties (i.e. someone with these properties)'

This example means essentially the same as (67a) with the difference that it is ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading for the direct object. In other words, the distinction between (67a) and (67b) in terms of specificity, expressed in a one-to-one fashion by the absence versus presence of the accusative marker, is collapsed in (68), where the accusative marker is obligatory under either one of the two readings. Under the specific reading, the accusative marking in (68) is just as expected.

In contrast, under the non-specific reading, the use of accusative is, at first glance, surprising; however, this example falls into place, along with others that lack a lexical nominal head and instead only have a quantificational or adjectival modifier to express the subset. Here, too, the nominal agreement marker is used as a nominal head; consequently, use of the accusative becomes necessary, due to this formal reason. Given that the accusative is here necessitated because of formal reasons, it stops being a reliable marker of specificity, giving rise to the ambiguity between specific and non-specific readings. (As a matter of fact, the non-specific reading is the primary one here, despite the overt accusative.)

Enç's original examples, i.e. (46) as well as (41) and (42), are similar. The accusative marking on the partitive direct objects are due to morphological and syntactic requirements of these otherwise headless nominal (partitive) phrases—"headless" in the sense of lacking a lexical nominal head. Crucially, while the accusative is obligatory on the partitive direct objects in all of these examples, this obligatoriness is not due to the specificity of these partitives: We saw that non-specific readings are available in all of these instances. Rather, the obligatoriness of the

accusative markings in these examples is enforced due to formal reasons, i.e. here due to the agreement marker that precedes it; the agreement marker itself is obligatory, due to lack of a lexical nominal head of the partitive phrases. This is so in all partitive phrases. In addition, the overt agreement marker must be present in *genitive* partitive phrases even where there *is* a lexical nominal head, due to the requirement that the genitive be licensed by overt agreement. In such instances, too, the overt agreement marker necessitates overt accusative (where the whole partitive phrase is a direct object).[22]

4.3. Partitivity and specificity

As we have seen, additional data and closer scrutiny have shown that partitives *can* be non-specific. On the other hand, the semantics of specificity do seem to require that a specific expression must have its referential index checked against the referential indices of previously uttered expressions (or else contextually salient ones) and actually achieve success in that matching. This would then mean that the set of referential indices of the specific expression must be a subset of the set of referential indices, previously uttered, and that we have here partitive semantics. How, then, is it possible that a partitive construction is non-specific?

We suggest that partitivity is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for specificity. The presupposition necessary for specificity is made explicit in a partitive construction. However, this is not enough to make an expression specific. Rather, in addition, the speaker must be interested in stating that s/he has verified that the index-checking has been successful and that s/he knows which indices of the explicit or implied superset satisfy those of the specific expression, and that s/he conveys this knowledge of identification to the hearer. Without that second part, we have presupposed or explicit partitivity, but not specificity.

This view makes it possible to correctly predict the existence of non-specific partitives. Here, the superset merely narrows down the referential possibilities of the (non-specific) subset, but no uniquely identifying index-matchup is presupposed. Thus, when we say something like: "I saw two (persons) of the students" in Turkish without an accusative marker for the direct object, we are saying that we have narrowed down the set of all humans to a smaller set—that of students, and in fact a set of particular students (the latter expressed via an expression of definiteness on the superset). However, by saying that the two individuals we saw belong to that set, we

---

[22] We have not discussed the reasons for the formal requirement that an overt agreement marker heading a DP enforces an overt accusative marker, if this DP is a direct object. This issue, which has to do with the phrasal architecture of DPs and with the formal licensing of features, is tangential to the concerns of the present study and is too intricate to be dealt with in a brief fashion.

have not committed ourselves to claiming knowledge of which particular individuals among those constituting the superset we saw, or else that we want to share this knowledge if we do, or else that we presuppose interest in such sharing of knowledge on the part of the hearer. For example, we might be able to identify the two because they wear a certain uniform, or because they are injured etc., but without knowledge of their particular identities.

The superset expression in a partitive construction serves as a description of a certain type of the subset, just like other kinds of modifying expressions do—whereby "certain type" is intended to narrow down sets of possible candidates. But the superset does not identify the subset. If we have actually matched the referential indices of the subset against those of the superset and have found identity and do commit ourselves to conveying this, then we are dealing with a *specific* subset and the corresponding morphological markers are used: We saw two particular individuals—e.g. Joe and Mary—among the students.

This means that it is correct to characterize specific expressions as those whose referential indices are included in a larger set/file (see Heim 1982) of such indices, but such a characterization is insufficient. However, to say that the referential index of a non-specific expression cannot be included in a larger set of such indices is incorrect; it *can* be, as we saw, and this is amply exemplified in this study.

5. Summary

We have shown in this paper that case marking of the direct object in Turkish is conditioned by semantics, morphology and syntax. Accusative case marking in Turkish is an instance of the more general phenomenon of differentiated object marking, or DOM, in various languages. DOM depends on parameters like information structure, referential categories and animacy. In Turkish, DOM depends on information structure (typically expressed via word order) and on the referential category of specificity: If a direct object is topicalized (which, in most instances, is possible only if it is specific) or if it is specific in its preverbal position it must have overt case. Specificity, then, is the most important semantic property that determines overt objective, i.e. accusative, case marking in Turkish. Animacy, however, does only play a minor role.

The functional explanation of DOM assumes that direct objects are marked if they are too similar to typical subjects. For Turkish this would mean that topicalized or specific direct objects receive case in order to distinguish them from proper subjects. However, we have shown that this view cannot be correct since subjects receive (genitive) case under the same conditions. In other words, case marking of the direct object (and of the subject) depends on the absolute value of the parameters rather than on relative value with respect to another category.

We have also discussed Enç's concept of specificity in terms of partitivity—a concept that is closely related to accusative case marking. We have extended Enç's proposal to a broader concept of specificity as "referentially anchored expression".

With this concept we were able to account for non-partitive and narrow-scope specif-ic indefinites.

Finally, we have discussed the complex interaction between the agreement mark-er and the accusative case marker in Turkish on partitive constructions as direct ob-jects, where an agreement marker directly precedes the accusative marker. The data clearly show that direct object case marking is much more dependent on agreement marking than previously discussed in the literature. Thus this morpho-syntactic parameter is a crucial parameter for DOM in Turkish—and several of Enç's original examples thus receive a new analysis. The same interaction between agreement marking and accusative marking was also illustrated with respect to the different behavior of genitive partitives vs. ablative partitives. However, the close and subtle interaction between agreement and case marking needs additional investigation, and we are convinced that further research will yield an even better understanding of the fine interaction between referential categories, case, agreement and their morpho-ogical marking.

References

Aissen, Judith 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21, 435-483.

Aydemir, Yasemin 2004. Are Turkish preverbal bare nouns syntactic arguments? *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 465-474.

Bossong, Georg 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen*. (Ars linguistica 14.) Tübingen: Narr.

Brugè, Laura & Brugger, Gerhard 1996. On the accusative *a* in Spanish. *Probus* 8, 1-51.

Chierchia, Gennaro 2001. A puzzle about indefinites. In: Checchetto, C. & Chierchia, G. & Guasti, M.-T. (eds.) *Semantic interfaces. Reference, anaphora and aspect*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 51-89.

Comrie, Bernard 1975. Definite and animate direct objects: A natural class. *Linguistica Silesi-ona* 3, Katowice, 13-21.

Dede, Müşerref 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish verbal sentences. In: Slobin, D. I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 147-164.

Enç, Mürvet 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 1-25.

Erdal, M. (1981) Turkish participles and the absence of reference. In: Young, D. W. (ed.) *Stu-dies presented to Hans Jakob Polotsky*, East Gloucester, Mass.: Pirtle and Polson. 21-49.

Erguvanlı, Eser Emine 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.

Farkas, Donka 1995. Specificity and scope. In: Nash, L. & Tsoulas, G. (eds.) *Actes du Premier Colloque Langues & Grammaire*. Paris,119-137.

Farkas, Donka & von Heusinger, Klaus 2003. *The particle* pe *in Rumanian and referential stability*. Ms. University of Stuttgart.

Fodor, Janet & Sag, Ivan 1982. Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5, 355-398.

Ghomeshi, Jila 1997. Topics in Persian VPs. *Lingua* 102, 133-167.

Heim, Irene 1982. *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.] Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

von Heusinger, Klaus 2002. Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics* 19, 245-274.

von Heusinger, Klaus & Kaiser, Georg A. 2003. Animacy, specificity, and definiteness in Spanish. In: von Heusinger, K. Kaiser, G. A. (eds.). *Proceedings of the workshop "Semantic and syntactic aspects of specificity in Romance languages"*. Arbeitspapier 113. Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz. 67-101.

Higginbotham, James 1987. Indefinites and predication. In: Reuland, E. & Meulen, A. G. B. ter (eds.). *The representation of (in)definiteness*. Cambridge/Mass.: MIT Press. 43-70.

Hintikka, Jaakko 1986. The semantics of 'a certain'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 331-336.

Johanson, Lars 1977. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Suppl.* 3/2, 1186-1203.

Kamp, Hans 1981. A theory of truth and semantic interpretation. In: Groenendijk J. & Janssen, T. & Stokhof, M. (eds.) *Formal methods in the study of language*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Center. 277-322.

Karimi, Simin 1996. Case and specificity. Persian *râ* revisited. *Linguistic Analysis* 26, 174-194.

Karttunen, Lauri 1976. Discourse referents. In: McCawley, J. (ed.) *Syntax and semantics* 7, *Notes from the linguistic underground.* New York: Academic Press. 363-385.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 1984. *Case marking, agreement, and empty categories in Turkish*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University] Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 1996. Naked partitive phrases in Turkish. In: Hoeksema, J. (ed.) *Partitives. Studies on the syntax and semantics of partitive and related constructions*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 107-142.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 2001. Non-specific partitives and the unreliability of specificity markings. [Unpublished manuscript]. Syracuse University.

Lazard, G. 1984. Actance variations and categories of the object. In: Plank, F. (ed.) *Objects. Towards a theory of grammatical relations*. London: Academic Press. 269-292.

Leonetti Jungl, Manuel 1999. El artículo. In: Bosque, I. & Demonte, V. (eds.). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. (Colección Nebrija y Bello) Madrid: Espasa Calpe. 787-890.

Leonetti Jungl, Manuel 2003. Specificity and object marking: the case of Spanish *a*. In: von Heusinger; K.& Kaiser, G. A. (eds.). *Proceedings of the workshop "Semantic and syntactic aspects of specificity in Romance languages"*. Arbeitspapier 113 des Fachbereichs Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz. 67-102.

Lewis, Geoffrey 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Milsark, Gary 1974. *Existential sentences in English*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT] Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Sezer, Engin. 1972. *Some observations on the role of genitive in Turkish nominalizations*. [Unpublished ms.] Harvard University.

Thomson, Alexander 1912. Beiträge zur Kasuslehre IV. Über die Neubildung des Akkusativs. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 30, 65-79.

Torrego Salcedo, Esther 1999. El complemento directo preposicional. In: Bosque, I. & Demonte, V. (eds.) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. (Colección Nebrija y Bello) Madrid: Espasa Calpe. 1779-1805.

Windfuhr, Gernot L. 1979. *Persian grammar. History and state of its study*. The Hague et al.: Mouton.

Acknowledgement