

TURKISH INDEFINITES AND ACCUSATIVE MARKING*

UMUT ÖZGE

Middle East Technical University

1 Introduction

The paper addresses the issue of the effects of overt accusative (Acc) vs. zero (\emptyset) marking on the interpretation of indefinite direct objects in Turkish.¹ Previous attacks on the issue came up with various associations of the overt accusative case with certain semantic and pragmatic categories. A representative list goes as follows: Discourse-linking (Nilsson 1985; Enç 1991; Zidani-Eroğlu 1997), “specificity” (von Heusinger 2002; von Heusinger and Kornfilt 2005), presuppositionality (Kennelly 1997; Kelepir 2001), individuation/particularization (Nilsson 1985; Taylan and Zimmer 1994; Bolgün 2005; Kılıçaslan 2006), and totality/delimitedness (Nilsson 1985; Nakipoğlu 2009). In Section 2 we review the claims concerning D-linking, “specificity” and presuppositionality. On the basis of data from intensional constructions, we argue that these claims are not empirically well supported. In Section 3 we discuss a proposal concerning the semantics of Acc-indefinites and show how it captures the reviewed data. In

* I am grateful to the audiences in the WAFL 7 held at the University of Southern California in October 2010, and the Specificity Workshop held at the University of Stuttgart in August 2010, to Varol Akman, Cem Bozşahin, Aslı Göksel, Cem Keskin, Duygu Özge, Mark Steedman, Ümit Deniz Turan, and Deniz Zeyrek for comments and discussion.

¹ We will take ‘indefinite noun phrase’ to cover determiner phrases headed by the so called indefinite determiner bir (‘a/one’).

Section 4 we return to the relation between Acc-marking and D-linking in order to shed some light on why the two are correlated in certain cases but not in others. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Data and Previous Proposals

2.1 Nominal Quantifier Scope

In this section we look at scope taking abilities of indefinite direct objects with and without Acc-marking. Consider the minimal pair in (1), where the only difference between the examples is the presence vs. absence of the accusative marker on the NP *önemli bir problem* ('an important problem').

- (1) a. Çoğu dilbilimci önemli bir problem-i çöz-en her makale-yi
 most linguist important a problem-Acc solve-Rel every article-Acc
 oku-mus, -tur.
 read-Ev.Cop-Aor
 'Most linguists have read every article that solves an important problem'
- b. Çoğu dilbilimci önemli bir problem çöz-en her makale-yi
 most linguist important a problem solve-Rel every article-Acc
 oku-mus, -tur.
 read-Ev.Cop-Aor
 'Most linguists have read every article that solves an important problem'

While the case marked version (1a) is ambiguous between all the readings in (2), the \emptyset -marked version (1b) has only the reading in (2a).

- (2) a. Most linguists are such that if an article solves some important problem they read it ($most\forall\exists$).
 b. For most linguists it is the case that there exists an important problem p , such that s/he has read every article that solves p ($most\exists\forall$).
 c. There is a problem p such that most linguists have read every article that solves p ($9mo\exists most\forall$).

The relevant observation is that while the relative scope of *çoğu* ('most') and the universal *her* ('every') stays constant throughout the readings, the Acc-indefinite *önemli bir problem-i* ('an important problem-Acc') enjoys all the scope possibilities.² This suggests that while \emptyset -marked indefinite objects obligatorily have the narrowest possible scope with respect to commanding nominal quantifiers, Acc-marked indefinites are flexible in their scope possibilities.³

² The reading where the indefinite takes scope between the others is usually called "intermediate scope", and the phenomenon has been at the center of the discussion on the scope of indefinites since Fodor and Sag 1982. See Abusch 1994 for discussion.

³ One significance of this state of affairs is that \emptyset -marked indefinites cannot be considered as "referential" in the sense of Fodor and Sag 1982, contrary to what is claimed by Arslan-Kechioritis 2009. The reason is that being "referential" in Fodor and Sag's (1982) sense is to be like a demonstrative pronoun, which is a type of expression

2.2 Acc and “Specificity”

There are a number of characterizations of the notion “specificity” (see Farkas 2002 for a review). In this paper we will consider three varieties: “specificity” as discourse-linking, as functional dependence, and as an epistemic notion. We will argue that none of these categories can be directly associated with Acc-marking in Turkish.

Discourse-linking (or D-linking) is a notion due to Pesetsky (1987) that is best exemplified as the difference between *which* vs. *who* or *what*. It is basically a discourse-level familiarity effect (Heim 1982). Enç (1991) claimed that there exists a bidirectional implication between Acc-marking and D-linking (“specificity” in her terms) in Turkish.⁴ Given the minimal pair in (3), Enç (1991) predicts that in both⁵ the wide and narrow scope indefinite readings of (3a), the method or methods mentioned in the sentence are drawn from a contextually available set of methods, which needs to be accommodated if not already there prior to the utterance. In (3b) on the other hand the prediction is the absence of such anchoring to preceding discourse.

- (3) a. Her öğrenci bir metod-u izleyecek.
 every student a method-Acc will follow
 ‘Every student will follow a method.’
- b. Her öğrenci birmetod izleyecek.
 every student a method-/0 will follow
 ‘Every student will follow a method.’

It has been observed that Enç’s (1991) D-linking-Acc association breaks in both directions (Zidani-Eroğlu 1997; Keleşir 2001; von Heusinger and Kornfilt 2005; Kılıçaslan 2006). As the discourse in (4) shows, there are D-linked \emptyset -indefinites. Under its most natural reading, the speaker of (4b) is offering to take two of the students mentioned in the previous utterance, which Enç (1991) predicts to be impossible without the Acc-marker.

- (4) a. Okula götürülecek bir grup öğrenci var.
 ‘There is a group of students to be taken to school.’
- b. Ben iki çocuk al-abil-ir-im.
 I two child take-Abil-Aor-1sg
 ‘I can take two kids.’

Non-D-linked Acc-indefinites are also possible. The utterances in (5) are natural discourse initiators, showing that Acc-marking does not necessarily induce D-linking.

that is immune to all scoping effects. The case for /0-marked indefinites in Turkish appears to be quite the opposite: they cannot escape the influence of any commanding operators.

⁴ Nilsson (1985:48–9) makes a similar observation under the name of “reference domain specification”.

⁵ Enç (1991) takes “specificity” to be a phenomenon independent of scope.

- (5) a. John bir işadamin-ı kaçırmış.
 J. a businessman-Acckidnapped
 ‘John has kidnapped a businessman’
- b. John biravukat-ı dolandırmış.
 J. a lawyer-Accswindle
 ‘John has swindled a lawyer.’

Zidani-Eroğlu (1997) claims that out-of-the-blue Acc-indefinites like those in (5) can still be kept within Enç’s (1991) generalization on the grounds that D-links triggered by Acc-marking are accommodated in such examples. However, a question arises as to what sort of a D-link needs to be accommodated upon hearing such utterances. The businessman talked about in (5a) can be from any business, nationality, age, or anything that does not contradict with being a businessman. The hearer simply has no basis—nor need—for thinking that the speaker is talking about a businessman picked from a previously established set of people or businessmen. In this regard, (5) and similar examples seem to constitute uncontroversial counterevidence to Enç’s (1991) proposal. We return to why Enç’s (1991) predictions do not hold generally in Section 4.

von Heusinger (2002) proposes an analysis of the notion “specificity” different from that of Enç’s (1991). von Heusinger’s (2002) characterization of “specificity” is as follows (his ex. 64):

- (6) a. The interpretation of a specific NP does not depend on the interpretation of the matrix predicate or semantic operators such as modal verbs.
 b. The referent of a specific NP is functionally linked to the speaker of the sentence or to another referential expression in the sentence such as the subject or object.

In their investigation of the grammar and interpretation of the Acc-marker in Turkish, von Heusinger and Kornfilt (2005) propose that Acc-marking indicates “specificity” in von Heusinger’s (2002) sense, when the NP is immediately preverbal and the Acc-marking is optional for the NP.⁶ The authors predict that (3a), repeated as (7), implies a functional dependence between students and methods.

- (7) Her öğrenci bir metod-u izleyecek.
 every student a method-Acc will follow
 ‘Every student will follow a method.’

It is crucial to observe that the predicted functional dependence is not an accidental dependence but a systematic one. For instance in (8), (8c) but not (8b) counts as a continuation involving a functional dependence between men and dates in the present sense.

- (8) a. Every man has forgotten a certain date.
 b. #John April 4th, Jack July 21st...
 c. His wife’s birthday.

So, as far as von Heusinger and Kornfilt’s (2005) proposal goes, (7) must imply a systematic dependence like “his favorite method”, “the method suggested by her teacher”, and the like

⁶ Certain NP’s obligatorily receive Acc-marking in Turkish.

between students and the methods they will follow. However, this prediction is not met. (7) can be uttered without implying the existence of any functional dependence that involves the referent of the Acc-indefinite. In Section 3 we discuss in detail various such interpretations that (7) might receive.

It turns out that Acc-marked indefinite direct objects do not have to be free from the influence of modal operators, which is another type of counterevidence to Acc-marking-“specificity” association. We look at such examples in the next section.

2.3 Acc and Intensionality

The discussion concerning the interpretive effects of the Acc-marker in intensional contexts has largely been confined to the so called “referentially opaque verbs” like *seek*. Dede (1986) observes that Acc-marked indefinite objects of *ara* (‘seek’) obligatorily receive a transparent reading. She also observes that \emptyset -marked indefinite inanimate objects are transparent/opaque ambiguous, while \emptyset -marked animate indefinite objects are obligatorily opaque. The relevant examples are as follows.

- (9) a. Bir sekreter ar-ıyör-um.
 a secretary- \emptyset seek-Prog-1sg
 ‘I am looking for a secretary.’ (opaque)
- b. Bir sekreter-I ar-ıyör-um.
 a secretary-Acc seek-Prog-1sg
 ‘I am looking for a secretary.’ (transparent)
- (10) a. Bir kitap ar-ıyör-um.
 a book- \emptyset seek-Prog-1sg
 ‘I am looking for a book.’ (opaque/transparent)
- b. Bir kitab-ı ar-ıyör-um.
 a book-Acc seek-Prog-1sg
 ‘I am looking for a book.’ (transparent)

These observations presumably have led some authors to think that Acc-marking makes an NP immune to the effects of intensional contexts in general (e.g. Kelepir 2001; von Heusinger and Kornfilt 2005; Hedberg et al. 2009). However upon consideration of different types of intensional contexts, it is revealed that Acc-marked indefinites can fall within the scope of intensional operators.⁷ Take the following utterance for instance.

⁷ The difference between “referentially opaque verbs” and other intensional contexts vis-a-vis the behaviour of Acc-indefinites is expected once one entertains, following Zimmermann (1993); van Geenhoven and McNally (2005), the possibility that the mechanics of transparent/opaque distinction is to be based not on scope but semantic types involved in the construction. A detailed discussion of this point has to be left for another occasion, though.

- (11) Bu kredi kartı reklamın-da ünlü bir yıldız-ı oynat-abilirdik. . .
 this creditcard commercial-Loc famous a star-Acc give a role-Hyp.Pst
 Ama yapmadık.
 but we didn't.
 'For this credit card commercial, we could have hired a famous star; but we didn't.'

(11), taken from a recent commercial, does not have to be—and apparently is not intended to be—about a particular famous star. This shows that the Acc-marked indefinite can be bound by the intensional operator contributed by the hypothetical past. Similar facts hold for propositional attitude verbs as well. In (12) the Acc-marked direct object *bir profesör-ü* ('a professor-Acc') can receive a *de re* or a *de dicto* reading, showing once again that Acc-indefinites can fall under the influence of intensional operators.

- (12) Dekan bu pozisyon-a birprofesör-ü ata-ma-yı düşün-üyor.
 dean this post-Dat a professor-Acc to appoint-Acc consider-Prg.3sg
 'The dean is considering to appoint a professor for this post.' (*think*∃ / ∃*think*)

Remember that von Heusinger and Kornfilt (2005) claimed that “specificity” marking function of the Acc-marker is realized only for those cases where the marker is optional. Therefore, it is crucial to note that in all the examples we presented above Acc-marking is optional. Another noteworthy observation is that ∅-marked variants are no longer ambiguous in their scope with respect to intensional operators. As in the case of nominal quantification, ∅-indefinites take the narrowest possible scope with respect to commanding intensional operators.

Finally, these examples illustrate that Acc-marking is also not an indicator of “epistemic specificity” in the sense of speaker's having a certain individual in mind when using the NP.

2.4 Acc and Presuppositionality

A number of authors have related the Acc-marker to existence presupposition (Diesing 1992; Kennelly 1997; Kelepir 2001; Ketrez 2005). Although these accounts differ in some finer details, their predictions concerning Acc-marked indefinites of the variety considered here are identical, that is, Acc-marker triggers an existence presupposition.⁸

As a counterexample to the presuppositionality claim consider the following sentence.

- (13) Bu film-de Türkçe bil-en İzlandalı biraktör-ü oynat-mak ist-iyorum.
 this film-LocTurkish know-Rel Icelandic actor-Acc give a role-Nom want-Prog.1sg
 'In this film I want to give a role to a Turkish speaking Icelandic actor.'

The speaker of (13) can quite naturally continue the discourse with (14), which shows that she does not commit herself to the existence of any Turkish speaking Icelandic actors by uttering (13).

⁸ Predictions are slightly altered for genitive-possessive NP's.

- (14) ...fakat böyle bir aktör var mıdır, on-dan emin değilim.
 ...but such a actor exist Qpart, that-Abl sure NegPart.1sg
 ‘...but I’m not sure whether there is such an actor.’

At this point it might be argued that the existence presupposition contributed by the Acc marking in (13) might have been filtered out by the intensional verb *iste* (‘want’). In order to rule this possibility out we provide an example which shows that run-of-the-mill presuppositions do not get filtered out in the same context as of the Acc-marked indefinite in (13). The speaker of (15) commits herself to the proposition that she has an aunt. Therefore the absence of an existence presupposition in (13) cannot be due to a filtering effect induced by the intensional verb.

- (15) Bu film-de teyzem-i oynat-mak ist-iyorum.
 this film-Loc my aunt-Acc give a role-Nom want-Prog.1sg
 ‘In this film I want to give a role to my aunt.’

The examples discussed in this section aim to refute a direct correlation⁹ between the Acc-marker and existence presupposition in the sense of existence in actual world. Our earlier examples in (5) discussed in Section 2.2 as counterevidence to Enç’s (1991) Acc-marking-D-linking correlation show that Acc-marking cannot be an indicator of existence presupposition in the sense of existence in previous discourse either.

Let us summarize what we have seen thus far.

- (16) a. \emptyset -indefinites take the narrowest scope with respect to nominal and modal quantification, while Acc-indefinites are flexible in their scope taking possibilities.
 b. Acc-indefinites do not necessarily induce functional dependencies in the sense of von Stechow (2002).
 c. Acc-indefinites may induce D-linking under certain conditions.
 d. Acc-marker is not an existential presupposition trigger.
 e. \emptyset -indefinites are opaque for animate, opaque or transparent for inanimate head nouns; Acc-indefinites are always transparent.

In the rest of the paper we will not be concerned with point (16e); an account is proposed in Özge 2010 for seek-type verbs along the lines of Zimmermann 1993; van Geenhoven and McNally 2005. In the next two sections we discuss some possible explanations for the rest of the items in (16).

⁹ There are environments where Acc vs. \emptyset -marking is in correlation with presence vs. absence of existence presuppositions. One such environment is the object slot of “referentially opaque verbs” (see note 7 above). The present argument is that such a correlation cannot be stemming solely from the grammar and/or semantics of the Acc marker. I am grateful to Jaklin Kornfilt and Nilüfer Şener, whose comments during WAFL 7 have led to some clarification in my discussion of the issue.

3 Scope and “Specificity” Revisited

This section will argue that an Acc-marked indefinite in Turkish contributes a discourse marker and a restrictor predicate, as standard in Discourse Representation Theory. We assume along with Farkas (1997), Steedman (2010) and others that the model-theoretic extension of such markers potentially depends on operators that command them in some logical form. We will also assume along with Bende-Farkas and Kamp (2001), Schwarzschild (2002) and others that the restrictor predicates of such discourse markers are susceptible to implicit contextual narrowing. We will show that these assumptions concerning Acc-indefinites capture both their scope behavior and their association with various analyses of “specificity” discussed in Section 2.2 above.¹⁰

As we saw in Section 2.2, \emptyset -indefinites, in contrast with Acc-marked ones, are tightly constrained in their scope with respect to both nominal and intensional operators. There are several ways through which their rigidly narrow scope behaviour can be accounted for (e.g. “semantic incorporation” of van Geenhoven 1998, kind oriented existential quantification of Chierchia 1998 among others). Due to space concerns, we will not be able to discuss any specific proposal concerning \emptyset -indefinites in this paper.¹¹

A generalized Skolem term (Steedman 2010), which we take as the model of Acc-indefinites, is a structured representation of the form sk_r^P , where r is a restrictor predicate, and P is the parameter of the Skolem term. The parameter P can either be null or be one of the variables that is contributed by an operator that the Skolem term falls within the scope of in the logical form.¹² As we will see shortly below, this nondeterminism regarding the parameter of the Skolem term affords us a way to capture the scopal flexibility of an Acc-indefinite with respect to nominal quantification. Before that, let us illustrate the use of generalized Skolem terms over a simple example.

(17) gives a so called scope ambiguous sentence and the representation of the ambiguity as a relative scope difference between ordinary quantifiers.¹³

¹⁰ Readers who are familiar with the works cited above and can see how their present application would go could skip to the conclusion of this section.

¹¹ Özge (2010) provides evidence and argumentation for an analysis of \emptyset -indefinites along the lines of Chierchia 1998.

¹² Although we will not be concerned in this paper with the way by which the logical forms we discuss below are compositionally derived from lexical assignments, a couple of notes are in order. The present exposition assumes a mechanism that differs from Steedman’s (2010) system in certain aspects (see Özge 2010 for argumentation). The present system most significantly diverges from Steedman 2010 in its more liberal stance on how the parameters of Skolem terms are specified. The picture is roughly as follows. When a generalized Skolem term comes to life, its parameter is a meta-variable over variables of the semantic representation language. This meta-variable is nondeterministically specified at any point in a compositional derivation of a logical form by being assigned either one of the variables that are contributed by the operators that the Skolem term falls within the scope of at the current state of the derivation, or else a null value, if the Skolem term is not within the scope of any operator at the point of specification.

¹³ Notes on notation: Juxtaposition of terms represents functional application, where functions are “Curried” and parentheses are omitted under a left associative convention; $(\alpha\beta)$ is written as $\alpha\beta$, $((\alpha\beta)\gamma)$ as $\alpha\beta\gamma$, $(\alpha(\beta\gamma))$ as $\alpha(\beta\gamma)$ and so on. Logical forms respect the argument order of “Curried” predicates; a transitive verb applies first to the object, forming a verb phrase denotation, which applies next to the subject. Constants are distinguished from variables via primes ‘’. Under these conventions what would be *loves’(john’,mary’)* in a more standard notation becomes *loves’mary’john’*.

- (17) Every farmer owns a donkey.
 a. $\forall x.farmer'x \rightarrow \exists y.donkey'y \wedge own'yx$
 b. $\exists y.donkey'y \wedge \forall x.farmer'x \rightarrow own'yx$

The same ambiguity can be captured via generalized Skolem terms. The so called narrow and wide scope indefinite readings are respectively given in (18a) and (18b).

- (18) a. $\forall x.farmer'x \rightarrow own'sk_{\lambda z.donkey'z}^{(x)}x$
 b. $\forall x.farmer'x \rightarrow own'sk_{\lambda z.donkey'z}x$

In verifying logical forms like those in (18), one tries to find a variable assignment that satisfies the logical form as usual.¹⁴ Variable assignments, besides covering ordinary variables, are extended to Skolem terms that are “ready for extension” (see below) during model-theoretic evaluation. A Skolem term sk_r^P in an expression ϕ is “ready” (for extension) with respect to a variable assignment g , if its parameter P is not a variable bound in ϕ , and it is not already covered by g .

Let us illustrate over (18b). We start with an initial assignment g . As the model theory goes, an assignment g satisfies a formula ϕ if and only if there exists an extension g' of g to all the “ready” Skolem terms in ϕ such that g' satisfies ϕ . In the case of (18b) there is a “ready” Skolem term, namely ‘ $sk_{\lambda z.donkey'z}$ ’, which g needs to be extended to cover, before we start iterating through the domain to evaluate the universal. If one can find an extension of g to the “ready” Skolem term such that the universal formula is satisfied, then (18b) gets verified. This procedure gives the same truth conditions as (17b) above, with the difference that the existential quantification which is explicit in the logical form in (17b) is moved to model-theoretic evaluation in (18b).

The evaluation of (18a) differs from (18b) in that the initial assignment function is not extended to the Skolem term ‘ $sk_{\lambda z.donkey'z}^{(x)}$ ’ before we start iterating the universal quantifier, given that the term is not “ready” for extension in (18a) as its parameter x is a variable bound by the universal. Instead, each iteration of the universal asks for a “fresh” extension to the Skolem term that would satisfy the scope of the universal. This dependency between the universal and when to extend the Skolem term gives the so called narrow scope reading (represented in standard form in (17a)) of the indefinite a donkey.

Now we can return to the “intermediate scope” example we discussed above.¹⁵ All the three scope possibilities of the Acc-marked indefinite can be captured as variations on the parameter of the Skolem term that interprets the Acc-indefinite *önemli bir problem-i* (‘an important problem-Acc’).

¹⁴ We cover here only those aspects of the model theory relevant for present purposes. See Steedman 2010 for a complete formulation.

¹⁵ The quantifier *çoğu* (‘most’) is replaced with *her* (‘every’) for simplicity. Nothing important hinges on this replacement.

- (19) a. Her dilbilimci önemli bir problem-i çöz-en her makale-yi
 every linguist important a problem-Acc solve-Rel every article-Acc
 oku-muş-tur.
 read-Ev.Cop-Aor

‘Every linguist has read every article that solves an important problem.’

- b. $\forall x.ling'x \rightarrow \forall y.article'y \wedge solve'sk_{\lambda z.imp-problem'z}^{(x)}y \rightarrow read'yx$
 c. $\forall x.ling'x \rightarrow \forall y.article'y \wedge solve'sk_{\lambda z.imp-problem'z}^{(y)}y \rightarrow read'yx$
 d. $\forall x.ling'x \rightarrow \forall y.article'y \wedge solve'sk_{\lambda z.imp-problem'z}y \rightarrow read'yx$

Now we turn to intensional constructions. Following Farkas 1997 and others, we introduce another source of nondeterminism to the system, which concerns the specification of the evaluation indices¹⁶ of the restrictor predicates of Skolem terms and nominal quantifiers. The evaluation index of a restrictor predicate can nondeterministically be bound by commanding intensional operators or contextually available situational antecedents. This provides a straightforward way to capture the interpretive flexibility of Acc-indefinites with respect to intensional operators. Let us return to an example we discussed in Section 2.2.

- (20) Her öğrenci bir metod-u izle-yecek.
 every student a method-Acc follow-will
 ‘Every student will follow a method.’

The suffix we gloss as ‘will’ in (20) can be one of a number of semantic categories. A prominent one is obligation. Let us assume that the speaker of (20) talks about a newly established regulation that students are required to obey. We will represent the semantics of obligation with a three place modal relation M , where $M(s_1, s_2, a)$ holds between situations s_1 , s_2 and individual a if and only if s_1 is in conformance with what a believes to be the relevant rules in s_2 . Now let us look at some of the logical forms that might get assigned to (20) under the assumptions thus far. Consider (21).

- (21) $\forall s.M(s, s'_0, spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0}x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'z}^{(x)}$

What (21) basically says is that in every situation that is in conformance with what the speaker of this utterance holds to be the rule (or regulation) in the speech situation s'_0 , for every individual who is a student in the same speech situation s'_0 , there is a method that s/he follows, where this method is selected among what are considered as methods in the speech situation s'_0 .

Now with a modification in the situation index of the Skolem term restrictor ‘ $\lambda z.method'z$ ’, we can arrive at a slightly different interpretation represented as follows.

- (22) $\forall s.M(s, s'_0, spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0}x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'z}^{(x)}$

¹⁶ The evaluation index of a predicate is the situation or the world that the predicate is to be checked for satisfaction.

The difference between (21) and (22) is that in the latter the set of methods from which each student is required to pick one is not determined in the speech situation. In this regard, (21) can be thought as a D-linked reading in the sense of Enç (1991), while (22) is not picky about the set of methods; it is satisfied as long as each student follows some method or other.

Here is another variant which differs from (21) in that the Skolem term is bound by the situation operator, rather than by the universal nominal quantifier.

$$(23) \quad \forall s.M(s,s'_0,spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'_{s'_0} z}^{(s)} x$$

(23) says that in every situation that conforms to the current regulations there is a method that every student follows. This is simply to say that all the students should follow the same method. Another subtlety here is that the particular method that will be followed by all the students is picked from among what are considered to be methods in the speech situation, for the Skolem restrictor's situation index is s'_0 .

A move similar to that taken when shifting from (21) to (22) can be taken here as well. Changing the situation index of the Skolem restrictor from s'_0 to s yields the following.

$$(24) \quad \forall s.M(s,s'_0,spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'_s z}^{(s)} x$$

Here again all the students are required to follow the same method, but this method does not have to be picked from among the current methods, hence can be any method whatsoever.

The so called wide scope reading of the indefinite is obtained with a null parameter on the Skolem term. The logical form is given in (25):

$$(25) \quad \forall s.M(s,s'_0,spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'_{s'_0} z} x$$

This logical form is verified if a method can be found among the set of currently available methods such that every student is required to follow this method.¹⁷

Finally we show how “functional readings” we discussed in Section 2.2 can be captured by allowing for implicit domain restriction along the lines of Bende-Farkas and Kamp 2001, Schwarzschild 2002 and others. A “functional reading” for our running example can be realized as follows:

$$(26) \quad \forall s.M(s,s'_0,spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'_{s'_0} z \wedge C z}^{(x)} x$$

Here C is a contextually bound variable over predicates, which serves the purpose of further restricting the lexically specified restrictor of the Skolem term. Implicit domain restrictors are

¹⁷ Incidentally, it needs to be noted that a reading where the restrictor of an independent Skolem term is bound to the situation operator, given in (i) below, is not available thanks to the mechanics of Skolem term specification, which we will not be able to discuss here due to space concerns. See Özge 2010 for discussion.

(i) * $\forall s.M(s,s'_0,spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk_{\lambda z.method'_{s'_0} z} x$

assumed to possibly contain further pronominal elements. In a particular context, C may get bound to a predicate like $\lambda z.favors-most'zx$, which itself involves a free variable x . Under standard assumptions this free variable, like a pronoun, can either get bound by a contextually salient referent or by a commanding operator. Having it bound by the nominal quantifier in our example gives the following logical form:

$$(27) \quad \forall s.M(s, s'_0, spk') \rightarrow \forall x.stu_{s'_0} x \rightarrow follow'_s sk^{(x)}_{\lambda z.method'_{s'_0} z \wedge favors-most'_{s'_0} zx}$$

This gives a functional reading where each student is mapped to his/her favorite method, given that the restrictor will be a singleton for each choice of x due to the semantics of *most*. It is also possible that the free variable gets bound to a contextually available referent, say *harry'*. This is again a functional reading where the function in question is a constant function that maps each student to Harry's favorite method. Epistemically specific readings can be captured in a similar fashion.

The point of the above exercise is to argue that each of the various interpretive categories attributed to the Acc-marker in the literature is only one among a number of available possibilities. We suggest that this space of possibilities is provided through the interaction of the generalized Skolem term semantics of Acc-indefinites and extra-grammatical sources of information like discourse anaphora and contextually driven implicit domain restriction.

4 D-linking Revisited

As we saw in Section 2.2 above, Enç's (1991) correlation between Acc-marking and D-linking fails to hold in certain cases. This section aims to provide an explanation for this observation. Consider the sentences in (28):

- (28) a. Dün bir doktor-u arabasını-ı yıkar-ken gördüm.
 yesterday a doctor-Acc his car-Acc washing-while saw.1sg
 'Yesterday, I saw a doctor washing his car.'
- b. Dün bir doktor-u hastasını-na sigara ikrameder-ken gördüm.
 yesterday a doctor-Acc his patient-Dat cigarette offering-while saw.1sg
 'Yesterday, I saw a doctor offering a cigarette to his patient.'

The crucial observation here is that (28a) is very likely to lead the hearer to think that the speaker is assuming that they have a specific set of doctors in their common ground prior to the utterance, hence D-linking will be induced. The same cannot be said for (28b) though. (28b) is perfectly acceptable as a discourse initiator. Why is there such a difference between these two sentences? Or, if Acc-marker implies D-linking, as Enç (1991) claims it to be, then why the hearer of (28b) can get away without linking the doctor to previous discourse? Our explanation, which needs to remain somewhat sketchy, is as follows.

We suggest that the Acc-marker has no direct role in indicating D-linking. An Acc-indefinite contributes a generalized Skolem term, which is a referential device that denotes a discourse referent in some real or possible situation. It comes with a descriptive content for the hearer to add an appropriate discourse referent to his or her discourse model. This can be considered as a

kind of accommodation, but it should be observed that what is accommodated is the discourse referent itself, not a discourse-linking relation to a previously established discourse object. In this setting, there is no difference between what goes on in (28a) and (28b), as far as the syntax and interpretation of the Acc-marker is concerned. The reason why the hearer of (28a) is led to get a discourse-linked reading is simply that s/he cannot make sense of the utterance without doing so. The speaker of (28a) asks the hearer to create a doctor referent in her discourse model and tells something about this doctor. However under standard assumptions about the world there is nothing interesting about a doctor washing his car, unless this doctor is a familiar one.¹⁸

In (29b) on the other hand, it is enough that some doctor referent is introduced to the discourse model for the utterance to make sense, since given any doctor it is note-worthy that s/he is offering a cigarette to her/his patient, under the standard assumptions that doctors are for curing their patients and smoking is bad for health.

We believe that similar scenarios may be devised for other examples that are put forward to motivate the claim that Acc-marker is a trigger for D-linking. For further illustration let us take an example from Enç 1991:ex 12.

- (29) Ali bir piyano-yu kirala-mak ist-iyor.
 A. a piano-Acc rent-Inf want-Prg.3sg
 ‘Ali wants to rent a piano.’

Enç (1991) observes that (29) induces a conversational background that Ali’s intentions concern a familiar set of pianos. In our judgement this D-linking effect is cancelled when the predicate *kiralamak* (‘hire’), which is highly predictable given a piano as the topic of the sentence, is replaced with a more “interesting” one, as in (30).

- (31) Ali bir piyano-yu yemek masası-na dönüştür-mek ist-iyor.
 A. a piano-Acc dining table-Dat turn into-Inf want-Prg.3sg
 ‘Ali wants to turn a piano into a dining table.’

This observation once again suggests that D-linking function cannot be a direct contribution of the Acc-marker.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have revisited the data concerning the interaction of Acc-marked indefinite objects with nominal quantifiers and intensional operators. Our investigation has revealed that, contrary to some previous proposals (Keleşir 2001; von Heusinger and Kornfilt 2005; Hedberg et al. 2009 among others), Acc-marked indefinites can freely interact with intensional operators. This shows that claims associating the Acc-marker with “specificity” (in the sense of von Heusinger 2002), and existential presupposition (Diesing 1992; Kennelly 1997; Keleşir 2001; Ketrez 2005) cannot fully capture the interpretation of Acc-indefinites in Turkish. We argued

¹⁸ Aslı Göksel (p.c.) points out the possibility that (28a) may force the hearer to accommodate that washing his/her car is some unusual business for a doctor. This is another route for making sense of (28a), which does not involve D-link accommodation. This observation, we think, gives further support to our claim that D-linking largely relies on inference rather than being a morphosyntactically driven interpretive category.

that Enç's (1991) notion of D-linking does not uniformly apply to Acc-marked indefinites, but is highly contingent on contextual factors. We also showed that interpreting Acc-indefinites as generalized Skolem terms subject to implicit contextual domain restriction covers the observations reviewed in the paper.

References

- Abusch, D. (1994). The scope of indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics*, 2, 83–135.
- Arslan-Kechioritis, C. (2009). Referentiality in Turkish NP/DP. In S. Ay, Ö. Aydın, İ. Ergenç, S. Gökmen, S. İşsever, and D. Peçenek, editors, *Essays on Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 6–8 2008*, pages 83–92. Harrasowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Bende-Farkas, A. and Kamp, H. (2001). Indefinites and binding: From specificity to incorporation. *Lecture Notes, 13th European Summer School in Logic, Language, and Information*.
- Bolgün, A. (2005). *Accusative Marking in Turkish*. Ph.D. thesis, Ball State University.
- Chierchia, G. (1998). Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language & Theory*, 16, 339–405.
- Dede, M. (1986). Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish verbal sentences. In D. I. Slobin and K. Zimmer, editors, *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, pages 147–163. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Enç, M. (1991). The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 1–25.
- Farkas, D. (1997). Evaluation indices and scope. In A. Szabolcsi, editor, *Ways of Scope-Taking*, pages 183–215. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Farkas, D. (2002). Specificity distinctions. *Journal of Semantics*, 19, 213–243.
- Fodor, J. D. and Sag, I. (1982). Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 5, 355–398.
- van Geenhoven, V. (1998). *Semantic Incorporation and Indefinite Descriptions: Semantic and Syntactic Aspects of Noun Incorporation in West Greenlandic*. CSLI, Stanford, CA.
- van Geenhoven, V. and McNally, L. (2005). On the property analysis of opaque complements. *Lingua*, 115, 885–914.
- Hedberg, N., Görgülü, E., and Mamani, M. (2009). On definiteness and specificity in Turkish and Persian. In *Proceedings of the 2009 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association*.
- Heim, I. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases in English*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- von Heusinger, K. (2002). Specificity and definiteness in sentence and discourse structure. *Journal of Semantics*, 19, 245–274.
- von Heusinger, K. and Kornfilt, J. (2005). The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkish Linguistics*, 9, 3–44.
- Keleş, M. (2001). *Topics in Turkish Syntax: Clausal Structure and Scope*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.
- Kennelly, S. D. (1997). *Nonspecific external arguments in Turkish. In *Dilbilim Araştırmaları ('Research in Linguistics')* 7, pages 58–75. Kebikeç Yayınları, Ankara.
- Ketrez, F. N. (2005). *Children's Scope of Indefinite Objects*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Southern California.

- Kılıçaslan, Y. (2006). A situation-theoretic approach to case marking semantics in Turkish. *Lingua*, 116, 112–144.
- Nakipoğlu, M. (2009). The semantics of the Turkish accusative marked definites and the relation between prosodic structure and information structure. *Lingua*, 119, 1253–1280.
- Nilsson, B. (1985). Case Marking Semantics in Turkish. Ph.D. thesis, University of Stockholm.
- Özge, U. (2010). Grammar and Information: A Study of Turkish Indefinites. Ph.D. thesis, Middle East Technical University.
- Pesetsky, D. (1987). Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, editors, *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, pages 98–129. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Schwarzschild, R. (2002). Singleton indefinites. *Journal of Semantics*, 19, 289–314.
- Steedman, M. (2010). Natural semantics of scope. ms., University of Edinburgh.
- Taylan, E. E. and Zimmer, K. (1994). Case marking in Turkish indefinite object constructions. In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of BLS*, pages 547–553. Berkeley Linguistic Society.
- Zidani-Eroğlu, L. (1997). Indefinite Noun Phrases in Turkish. Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Zimmermann, T. E. (1993). On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1, 149–179.

