

# The semantics of the Turkish accusative marked definites and the relation between prosodic structure and information structure<sup>☆</sup>

Mine Nakipoğlu

*Boğaziçi University, Linguistics Program, Department of Western Languages and Literatures, Bebek 34342, Istanbul, Turkey*

Received 27 November 2007; received in revised form 23 February 2009; accepted 23 February 2009

---

## Abstract

This paper introduces a new semantic effect induced by the Turkish accusative and argues that accusative marked definites serving as the arguments of verbs of motion, incremental theme verbs and verbs of location yield a delimited reading. This delimited reading is further observed to arise when the accusative definite is unaccented suggesting that the semantic effects stemming from the presence of the accusative objects are intricately related to focus facts. Elaborating this view, the present study argues that an accented accusative definite triggers existential presupposition rendering a hearer-inferable and discourse-new information status whereas an unaccented one triggers pragmatic presupposition which gives rise to a hearer-status which is old and a discourse status rendered old through evaluation of the accepted commonground between interlocutors.

© 2009 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* Turkish accusative; Delimitedness; Hearer-inferable; Pragmatic presupposition; Commonground

---

## 1. Introduction

Although the study of Turkish accusative has received a great deal of attention in Turkish linguistics, the semantics of it, in particular, the semantic effects that the presence of an accusative gives rise to is far from being completely uncovered yet. This paper introduces further semantic effects of the Turkish accusative which have gone unnoticed in the previous works. Specifically it aims to show that an accusative marked definite object serving as the argument of a verb of motion, an incremental theme verb or a location verb measures out the event and contributes a holistic sense to the sentence. This holistic sense arising in the presence of certain groups of verbs will be further argued to indicate how in general the reading the accusative marked NP conveys is tightly correlated with the verb that the accusative marked NP occurs with, leading to the conclusion that the Turkish accusative also serves as a marker of measuring and delimiting which can be subsumed under the presuppositional reading.

A further issue this paper seeks to bring light on is how the semantic effects, arising from the presence of an accusative marked definite, encapsulated in the notion of presupposition are related to focus structure. In essence I argue that an accented accusative marked definite triggers existential presupposition while an unaccented one pragmatic presupposition. Furthermore equating the presuppositionality that arises from the presence of accusative marked definites with information structure, I propose that a proper treatment of accusative marked DPs is only possible by assuming a two dimensional information structure which is in close collaboration with prosodic structure.

---

<sup>☆</sup> The present paper is an extended and revised version of part of a manuscript first circulated in May 2004.

*E-mail address:* [nakipogl@boun.edu.tr](mailto:nakipogl@boun.edu.tr).

Elaborating this view, I argue that an accented accusative definite triggering existential presupposition renders the definite to be interpreted as hearer-inferable and discourse-new whereas an unaccented one triggering pragmatic presupposition necessitates a hearer-status which is old and a discourse status rendered old through evaluation of the accepted commonground between interlocutors.

This paper proceeds as follows: section 2 gives an outline of the readings induced by the Turkish accusative. Section 3 and its subsections introduce the contexts where delimitedness as an attribute of the Turkish accusative arises. Section 4 is built around two tasks; first it offers a two-dimensional information structure model for a treatment of the Turkish accusative where accusative definites are categorized with respect to their hearer and discourse statuses, which is mostly determined by focus facts, then the information coming from the hearer and discourse statuses of definites is conflated under the notions of existential and pragmatic presupposition. The major conclusions are summarized in section 5.

## 2. Readings induced by the Turkish accusative revisited

The semantic contribution of the presence or lack of accusative case on a DP in Turkish has been a topic of considerable interest in Turkish linguistics. Nonetheless no particular account has managed to capture all the intricacies of the accusative in Turkish. A quick look at the analyses offered on the issue immediately shows that two questions have been at the heart of investigation about the Turkish accusative: i. in what respects an accusative marked DP differs from a null marked one and how specifically the reading of an indefinite is influenced by the presence of an accusative (Taylan and Zimmer, 1994; Aygen, 1999; Kelepir, 2001; İşsever, 2003; Kennelly, 1994, 2003; Kılıçaslan, 2006, among others). Enç (1991) has provided one of the most insightful accounts of the Turkish accusative by treating the accusative in Turkish as a specificity inducer. Having observed the tight correlation between specificity and discourse-linking (D-linking), Enç argues that specificity in fact follows from the accusative's potential to link an entity to a referent introduced in the prior discourse.<sup>1</sup> In the analysis pursued in this paper, I provide a new look at the so-called definites by taking into account the stress bearing properties of the definites. As the proposal to be made requires a full understanding of what Enç proposes, I will first lay out Enç's account.<sup>2</sup>

Enç elaborating Heim's (1982) theory of definiteness to accommodate specificity proposes an index-based account where definites and indefinites differ from each other with respect to the features they bear. Under this account, every NP has two indices, *i* and *j* with binary valued definiteness features: *i index* is a referential index and corresponds to the discourse referent, *j index*, on the other hand, relates and thereby constrains the relation of the referents to other discourse referents. According to this model, a definite DP in Turkish can be specified as having [+definite] features both on the *i* and the *j* indices as in (1). Indefinites however, differ from definites in having a [–definite] feature on the *i index*, and from each other with respect to their values on the *j index*, i.e., an accusative marked definite has a [+definite] feature on the *j* index whereas a null marked indefinite has a [–definite] feature. Consider (1) for a quick summary of the model entertained in Enç.

(1)

Definites:	Indefinites:
kedi-yi 'the cat' cat-ACC [ <sub>i</sub> + def, <sub>j</sub> + def]	bir kedi-yi 'a cat' a cat-ACC [ <sub>i</sub> - def, <sub>j</sub> + def]
	bir kedi 'a cat' a cat [ <sub>i</sub> - def, <sub>j</sub> - def]

In Enç's account accusative marked definites are assumed to obtain their definite reading under an *identity* relation. In (2) the NP that bear the accusative morpheme *-(y)I* is definite both on the *i* and *j indices*, hence is specific, i.e., its referent is linked to a previously established discourse referent.

<sup>1</sup> The specific interpretation of the accusative marked objects has been first noted in Erguvanlı (1984).

<sup>2</sup> As is well known Turkish lacks a definite determiner and the accusative marker attached to a bare noun renders the noun definite.

- (2) Emre kutu-yu taşı-dı.  
 box-ACC carry-PAST.3sg  
 ‘Emre carried the box.’

As for how an accusative marked indefinite is linked to discourse, Enç suggests two possible ways: The accusative marked indefinite can either be in a *subset relation* or in a *recoverable relation* to a familiar entity. What lies behind the *subset relation* is in fact partitivity. A partitive essentially implies the presence of a superset of discourse referents out of which one is deemed to correspond to the DP in question, yielding specificity as in (3b).<sup>3</sup> The accusative marked indefinite *bir kutu-yu* in (3b) refers to a subset of the superset hence renders the subset specific by inducing partitivity.

- (3) a. Araba-da üç kutu var-dı.  
 car-LOC three box exist-PAST.3sg  
 ‘There were three boxes in the car.’  
 b. Emre bir kutu-yu taşı-dı.  
 a box -ACC carry-PAST.3sg  
 ‘Emre carried a box.’ (Emre carried one of the boxes.)

Partitivity, however, appears not to be a property that arises due to the presence of the accusative morpheme on the objects. As I spell out below, in Turkish, dative, locative, ablative and comitative-marked DPs can also induce a partitive reading in the *indefinite determiner/Numeral Noun-CASE* construction. Consider the following examples:

- (4) a. Bahçe-de beş ağaç var-dı.  
 garden-LOC five tree exist-PAST.3sg  
 ‘There were five trees in the garden.’  
 b. Çocuk-lar bir ağac-a tırman-mış-tı.  
 child-PL one tree-DAT climb-EVI.PAST.3pl  
 ‘Children had climbed one of the trees.’  
 c. Kuş-lar iki ağaç-ta yuva yap-mış-tı.  
 bird-PL two tree-LOC nest make-EVI.PAST.3pl  
 ‘Birds had made their nests on two of the trees.’  
 (5) a. Gezi-de beş çocuk kaybol-du.  
 excursion-LOC five child get.lost-PAST  
 ‘Five children got lost during the excursion.’  
 İki çocuk-tan hala haber al-ın-a-ma-dı.  
 two child-ABL still news receive-PASS-ABIL-NEG-PAST.3pl  
 ‘Two of the children are still unaccounted for.’  
 (6) a. Tatil-de üç çocuk-la tanış-tı-m.  
 vacation-LOC three child-COM meet-PAST-1sg  
 ‘I met three children on vacation.’  
 b. Bir çocuk-la çok iyi anlaştı-m.  
 one child-COM very well get.along-PAST-1sg  
 ‘I got along very well with one of the children.’

It appears that partitivity does not arise from the presence of the accusative *per se*, but it arises whenever the indefinite *bir Noun* or the *Numeral Noun* construction is attached any of the case morphemes of Turkish. Thus what appears to be

<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting that Enç’s (1991) main goal is not to analyze the semantic contribution of the accusative case in Turkish but to show that a proper account of the notion of specificity should be free of any mention of truth conditions or scope relations. To this aim, she introduces the Turkish data and argues that it is morphological marking that induces specificity in Turkish.

a more plausible observation about partitivity is while a *bir Noun* construction cannot render partitivity in the object position, *a/Numeral Noun-Case* (i.e., accusative, dative, locative, ablative and comitative) construction can induce partitivity. Enç's notion of 'partitivity' appears to be a property of all the case marked DPs occurring in the object position, hence cannot be viewed as an intrinsic property of the Turkish accusative.

In the second linking relation that Enç (1991) alludes to, the NP stands in some *recoverable relation* to a familiar entity which is contextually relevant for both the speaker and the addressee. The nature of this recoverable relation though left somewhat vague by Enç receives some clarity under the elaboration of Kennelly (2003) where both the *subset relation* and *recoverable relation* are conflated under the name of *indirect binding*. According to Kennelly there can be several Discourse-linking (D-linking) mechanisms that could be considered under Enç's proposal of *recoverable relation*.<sup>4</sup> Occupational nouns, for instance can trigger D-linking. In (7a) the presence of the occupational noun *doctor* and the type of encyclopedic knowledge that comes with it, i.e., doctors treat patients is argued to trigger a local binding and render the sentence felicitous, while the impossibility of a recoverable relation, i.e., a local binding between *a car* and *a doctor* in (7b) results in an infelicitous sentence.

- (7) a. Her doktor ihtiyar bir hasta-yı tedavi etti.  
Every doctor.NOM elderly a patient-ACC has.treated  
'Every doctor has treated an elderly (specific) patient.'
- b. \*Her doktor eski bir araba-yı aldı.  
Every doctor.NOM old a car-ACC has.bought  
'Every doctor has bought an old (specific) car.'

(adapted from Kennelly (2003))

Though the term employed by Enç (1991) to capture the essence of the semantics of the Turkish accusative is specificity as a D-linking phenomenon, a somewhat similar semantic relation has been referred to as presuppositionality by Diesing who argues that the semantic relation that lies behind specificity is in fact presuppositionality (1990:136–139).<sup>5</sup> In the discussion of the indefinites in Turkish, Diesing maintains that the accusative marker *-(y)I* induces a presupposition of the existence of the entity that it is applied to, while a null marked indefinite merely asserts the existence of the entity to which it is applied. As the ensuing paragraphs will reveal the discussion of presuppositionality will play a crucial role in the analysis pursued in this study. I will argue that the presupposition at issue is presupposition of existence for accented accusative-marked objects yielding an inferrable hearer-status and pragmatic presupposition for unaccented accusative marked objects yielding a hearer-status which is old.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> In line with Enç (1991) Kennelly maintains that discourse linking of definites take place under the relation of identity which she calls direct-binding. Specific indefinites, on the other hand, are assumed to receive their reading via indirect-binding. Kennelly, suggesting that there can in fact be many more relations that constitute D-linking, lists the following relations as D-linking triggers: i. A (covert) subset relation (Enç, 1991), ii. Relations defined by relational nouns such as *brother* or *mother*, iii. Relations cued by occupational nouns, iv. A *have-in-mind* relation as proposed by Fodor and Sag (1982); v. A locational relation. For example Kennelly argues that *locational relation* is crucial for a proper account of multiple definites. Kennelly draws attention to how the definites in (1a) and (1b) differ in respect of how they get discourse-bound.

- (1) a. Each child opened the box.  
b. Each child<sub>i</sub> opened the box in front of her<sub>i</sub>.  
(adapted from Kennelly (2003))

The definite in (1a) points out to the presence of a single box which is opened. The same definite in (1b), however, picks up a reading depending on the number of the children engaged in the process, i.e., if there are three children, three boxes are construed to be opened. According to Kennelly the D-linking relation forces the definite determiner to a local resolution of anaphoricity in (b).

<sup>5</sup> Diesing (1990) follows Milsark's (1974) definition of presuppositionality who used the term in the interpretation of DPs as a tool to disambiguate the meaning of the so-called weak determiners such as *a*, *some*, *a few*, *many* from that of strong determiners such as *'the, every, all, each'*. Strong determiners always induce a presuppositional reading whereby the existence of the individuals or entities the determiners apply to are presupposed. Weak determiners, however, are claimed to be ambiguous between a presuppositional or an existential reading the latter of which is merely taken to indicate the assertion of the existence of an individual or an entity.

<sup>6</sup> Kelepir (2001) investigating whether the semantic relations of partitivity and presuppositionality can be equated with specificity in the case of Turkish indefinites and quantifiers, concludes contra Enç (1991) that accusative indefinites do not have to be partitive at all times. She argues that one semantic property that captures all the related readings is presuppositionality which assumes a non-empty denotation of the head noun of the indefinite phrase.

A further set of counterexamples to Enç's claim regarding specificity as partitivity, in particular the claim that explicitly partitive constructions must be always specific hence precluding the grammaticality of examples such as (1) comes from von Heusinger and Kornfilt (2005) and Kornfilt (2008) where it is shown that in explicit partitive constructions such as (2), the subset can be non-specific, whether bare or accusative marked.

Though Enç's work has provided a depth of insight into the study of the Turkish accusative, it is argued to make false predictions in several respects. According to one line of criticism accusative marked indefinites cannot always be interpreted as specific. For instance, İşsever (2003:1040) claims that the accusative marked indefinites *bir fakir-i* 'a poor person' and *bir çocuğ-u* 'a child' in (8) cannot be interpreted as specific, i.e., discourse-linked.

- (8) Yalın üniversiteyi kazanırsa ne yapacak?  
 'What will Yalın do if he is accepted to the university?'
- a. *Bir fakir-i yemeğ-e götür-ecek-miş.*  
 a poor-ACC meal-DAT take-FUT-HEAR.3sg  
 'He will take a poor person out for dinner.'
- b. *Bir çocuğ-u tepe-den trnağ-a giydir-ecek-miş.*  
 a child-ACC head-ABL nail-DAT clothe-FUT-HEAR.3sg  
 'He will clothe a child from head to foot.'

These examples, however, can receive a plausible account under the analysis provided in this paper. To give a hint of what to expect, I will look into what an addressee presupposes with the question uttered and I will refer to this as the presupposition carried by the question under discussion (QUD).<sup>7</sup> Being successful at an exam and getting into a desired program at a university is something to be celebrated across cultures. In the Turkish culture, however, there is an additional aspect to it whereby prior to the exam, the persons may make a vow to help poverty stricken people by clothing and/or feeding them upon succeeding in the exam. To put succinctly, I will argue that questions come loaded with presuppositions, that is, in every question that is under discussion there is a proposition that is presupposed by the addressee. The presupposed proposition of the question in (8) appears to be P: *Yalın, in the event that he is successful will help out people who live on charity.* I argue that it is this presupposed proposition of the question which renders the indefinite accusative marked object in the answer of the addressee, discourse-linked, hence specific, giving rise to a felicitous interpretation of the accusative marked indefinite. As Enç's intention to equate specificity with D-linking is somewhat blurred in her discussion, the objections such as the one İşsever raises inevitably occur. Nonetheless, it is likely that Enç may consider the indefinite in this example as discourse-linked via some recoverable relation. The nature of this recoverable relation which is left unresolved in Enç's work is attempted to be uncovered in this work.<sup>8</sup>

(1) \*Ali kadın-lar-dan iki-si tanı-yor-du.  
 woman-PL-ABL two-AGR[3] know-PROG-PAST  
 'Ali knew two of the women.'

(Enç, 1991:ex. 29)

(2) Ali büro-ya çocuk-lar-dan iki kız/iki kız-ı al-acak.  
 office-DAT child-PL-ABL two-girl/two girl-ACC take-FUT  
 'Ali will hire, for the office, two girls of the children/two (specific, particular) girls of the children.'

(von Heusinger and Kornfilt, 2005:ex. 58)

von Heusinger and Kornfilt (2005) and Kornfilt (2008) argue that with its focus on partitivity Enç's model is too restricted and must be extended to a model of specificity in terms of referentially anchored indefinites.

<sup>7</sup> According to Roberts (2006:208) the goal of discourse is to conduct inquiry and questions must be taken as to be the formal objects that reflect interlocutors' intentions in conducting discourse. Ginzburg (1996) and Roberts (1996) independently propose that the discourse goals and intentions of interlocutors are encoded as the set of questions under discussion (QUD) in the discourse, thereby allowing an expansion of the discourse context which initially was argued to only include the propositions in the interlocutors' CommonGround. The answers the interlocutors provide to the QUDs reduce the context set rendering a felicitous discourse.

<sup>8</sup> On a closer look, it is also possible to observe how these sentences can also give rise to partitivity whereby one child or poor person from a set of children or poverty-stricken people respectively, are construed as being referred to. To glean the partitive reading, we need to take a closer look at the so-called indefinite determiner *bir* 'a' which is ambiguous between a weak determiner and a numeral quantifier (cf. Aygen, 2002). When *bir* is not stressed in an NP it is interpreted as a weak determiner, when it is stressed, however, it functions as a numeral. It appears that when *bir* is used as a weak determiner in (8b), i.e., unstressed, the indefinite induces a presuppositional reading whereby not every child imaginable but only the set of poor children who need a helping hand is presupposed. When *bir* is stressed, however, in (8b) a numeral sense arises, rendering a partitive, hence a specific reading. In particular, the reading induced is that one specific child from a set of children with whom both the speaker and the hearer are familiar will be clothed. As a result in the partitive reading, the set of individuals or entities in question is more restricted than the set evoked in the case of a presuppositional reading. In effect, I propose that *bir* as a weak determiner induces presuppositionality, as a numeral it induces partitivity, hence specificity. Thus specificity by necessarily and inevitably following from presuppositionality is in an entailment relation with presupposition. When (8) is reconsidered with these observations in mind it is apparent that the examples induce both a presuppositional and a partitive/specific reading.

Prior to presenting a focus based account of the Turkish accusative where I propose to account for the semantic effects stemming from the presence of the accusative by teasing out how information structure interacts with prosodic structure, in the next section, I introduce a further reading induced by the Turkish accusative, namely, measuring out and delimiting. Thus, the following section discusses this new sense of accusative and provides an account of the environments in which we observe measuring out and delimiting.

### 3. Turkish accusative as a marker of measuring out/delimiting

One of the goals of this paper is to show that an accusative marked object functions as a measuring scale when it is in the object position of (i) verbs of motion; (ii) incremental theme verbs and (iii) location verbs. There is an inherent connection between the properties of these verbs and the presence of an accusative marked direct object. These verbs constitute a group on their own since they all require the activity that they denote to be measured out. Measuring-out as defined by Tenny (1994) is a change along a single gradable parameter to a definite endpoint and it contains two ingredients: a measuring scale associated with an argument and delimitedness. In *verbs of motion*, *incremental theme verbs* and *location verbs*, the measuring scale corresponds to a direct object serving as the internal argument of these verbs and when the entire object is scaled by the verb, an endpoint is reached thereby inducing a delimited reading.

As will be seen shortly accusative marked objects to be examined in sections 3.1–3.3 convey delimitedness either by being construed as a spatially delimited path as the objects of verbs of motion (i); physically delimited container or surface as the objects of location verbs (ii); or conceptually delimited as the objects of incremental theme verbs (iii).

#### *i. Verbs of motion: Spatially delimited path objects*

- a. okyanus-u uç-mak  
ocean-ACC fly-INF  
'to fly over the ocean (from one end to the other)'
- b. dağ-ı tırman-mak  
mountain-ACC climb-INF  
'to climb up the mountain'

#### *ii. Location verbs/physically delimited container-surface object*

- a. kamyon-u saman-la yükle-mek  
truck-ACC hay-INST load-INF  
'to load the truck with hay' (the truck is completely loaded)
- b. duvar-ı kağıt-la kapla-mak  
wall-ACC paper-INST cover-INF  
'to cover the wall with wallpaper' (the wall is entirely covered)

#### *iii. Incremental theme verbs: conceptually delimited object*

- a. Türkçe-yi öğret-mek  
Turkish-ACC teach-INF  
'to teach Turkish thoroughly'
- b. gazete-yi oku-mak  
newspaper-ACC read-INF  
'to read the newspaper inside out'

#### 3.1. Verbs of motion

The first set of verbs with which accusative marked direct objects can be viewed as measuring and hence delimiting the event is the so-called motion verbs which are in fact activity denoting verbs requiring the mention of a certain path. In verbs of motion, the scale along which the event is measured corresponds to a *path* object marked by the accusative case. To illustrate this measuring and delimiting sense of accusative marked objects consider the examples in (9) where (9a) has an accusative marked and (9b) a dative marked object.

- (9) a. Emre dağ-ı tırman-dı.  
 mountain-ACC climb-PAST.3sg  
 ‘Emre climbed up the mountain.’
- b. Emre dağ-a tırman-dı.  
 mountain-DAT  
 ‘Emre climbed the mountain.’

What differentiates (9a) from (9b) is that in (9a) the entire mountain is deemed to have been climbed, the peak has been reached, in (9b), however, this bounded interpretation is lacking and what the sentence implies is just that some mountain climbing has been done. What gives rise to the delimited interpretation of (9a) is the accusative marked path-object, *dağ* ‘mountain’ viewed as measured out by the verb *tırman* ‘climb’ over time. Therefore I propose that the difference between (9a) and (9b) is best accounted for by considering the fact that there is measuring out and delimiting encoded in the accusative marker in Turkish, specifically in a context in which the accusative-marked DP is the complement of a *verb of motion* as in (9a). Similarly the verb *çık* ‘ascend/climb’ in (10) can have accusative and dative marked complements both of which can be interpreted as referring to a specific ladder. However, only in (10a) we get the interpretation that the entire ladder has been climbed up.<sup>9</sup>

- (10) a. Çocuk-lar merdiven-i çık-tı.  
 child-PL ladder-ACC climb-PAST.3sg  
 ‘The children climbed up the (entire) the ladder.’
- b. Çocuk-lar merdiven-e çık-tı.  
 ladder-DAT  
 ‘The children climbed the ladder.’

The objects *mountain* and *ladder* in the examples above by having clear-cut boundaries are spatially delimited. Only when the objects are accusative marked, however, they are construed as paths to be traversed.

<sup>9</sup> In this section I restrict myself to delineating the semantic effect of delimitedness induced by the accusative. Thus I refrain from a thorough discussion of how accusative and non-accusative marked DPs differ from each other with respect to specificity, definiteness and/or presupposition that they convey which is an issue I hope to study in detail in future work. Yet in what follows, I will briefly touch upon the issue. In 9(a&b) the accusative and non-accusative marked DPs may also be considered to differ from each other in terms of specificity/definiteness, in particular while in (a) the mountain in question is a specific one that the speaker knows that the addressee is familiar with, in (b) the mountain does not have to be a specific one. A quick conclusion that one may draw is that an accusative always induces specificity, however a non-accusative may be ambiguous between a specific or non-specific reading. This, however, appears not to be a valid conclusion. Consider the examples in (1):

- (1) a. Can sinema-yı sev-er.  
 movie-ACC like-AOR.3sg.  
 ‘Can likes movies.’
- b. Can sinema-yı sev-di.  
 movie-ACC like-PAST.3sg.  
 ‘Can liked the movie.’

In both (1a) and (1b) the object is accusative marked but in (a) *sinema-yı* has a non-definite, non-specific interpretation as opposed to (b). This effect appears to be arising from the presence of the aorist in (a) which triggers a generic reading while the use of the past tense in (b) locates the event in time, hence induces a more definite, specific reading. Thus accusative-marked DPs like non-accusative marked DPs can also be interpreted non-specifically, non-definitely. The role that the TAM marker plays in the specific or non-specific reading of the non-accusative DPs is also evident in the examples in (2). These examples further illustrate how the verb of a sentence may contribute to a definite or non-definite reading of the DP. For instance, in (2a) the verb *git-* ‘go’ renders the dative-marked nouns *dağ-a* ‘mountain-DAT’ or *sinema-ya* ‘movie-DAT’ non-definite as opposed to the verb *tırman-* ‘climb’ in (9b) which tends to force a more specific, definite reading.

- (2) a. Haftasonu dağ-a/sinema-ya git-ti-k.  
 weekend mountain-DAT/movie-DAT go-PAST-1PL.  
 ‘We went out mountaineering./We went to the movies over the weekend.’
- b. Sinema-ya bayıl-dı-k.  
 movie-DAT enjoy-PAST-1PL.  
 ‘We enjoyed the movie.’

In (2b), however, the dative marked object *sinema-ya* used with the verb *bayıl-* ‘enjoy’ gets a specific interpretation suggesting that the speaker presupposes that her/his addressee is familiar with the movie that s/he is talking about.

The picture that has emerged so far shows that neither the accusative on the object nor the verb *per se* induces delimitedness. This particular property does not follow from the tense morpheme either.<sup>10</sup> Emergence of a terminative reading owes largely to the VP which contains an accusative marked object and a verb that can measure out its internal argument. The use of the verb *çık* ‘climb’ for example with a dative-marked object cannot render the object delimited as already illustrated in (10b), neither can the use of an accusative-marked object with a verb that is not a verb of motion, an incremental theme verb or a location verb render it delimited.<sup>11</sup> A further piece of evidence justifying the delimiting role of the accusative with motion verbs follows from their behavior in the *in x time/for x time* test. Verbs of motion with an accusative marked path object are compatible only with the *in x time* adverbial as exemplified below<sup>12</sup>:

<sup>10</sup> A crucial question that needs to be addressed as regards what induces delimitedness is whether there is any correlation between delimitedness and tense, specifically past tense. As past events always imply a completed event there is an inherent boundedness encoded in the past tense. The following examples, however, looking into the use of accusative objects with the Turkish aorist *-Ir* and the future tense marker *-yAcAk* show the independence of delimitedness from tense, i.e., the Turkish accusative gives rise to a delimited reading in other temporal and aspectual frames as well:

- (1) a. Dağcı-lar her hafta bu tepe-yi tırman-ır.  
mountainer-PLU every week this hill-ACC climb-AOR.3S  
‘Mountaineers climb up this hill every week.’

As is well known the aorist in Turkish as regards its function lies on the boundary of tense, aspect and modality (Yavaş, 1982). In (a) *tırman* does not locate the activity at the present moment but refers to a characteristic situation that holds every week, hence it is viewed as completed. The Turkish aorist *-Ir* can also serve as the marker of epistemic modality as in (b).

- b. Dağcı-lar bu tepe-yi kolayca tırman-ır.  
mountainer-PLU this hill-ACC easily climb-AOR.3S  
‘Mountaineers climb up this hill easily.’

What (b) conveys is not that a group of mountaineers climb a specific hill but that it is possible for them to climb up the hill in question easily. As for the compatibility of the future tense with a delimited reading, we can construe that an event’s completion will take place in the future thereby yielding a delimited reading as in (c):

- c. Mahruki yaz-ın Everest-i tırman-acak.  
summer-GEN -ACC climb-FUT.3sg  
‘Mahruki will climb up Everest this summer.’

While a delimited reading is available with the aorist and the future tense marker it is incompatible with the progressive aspect marker as in (d). As progressive marks an ongoing event one cannot talk about the entire hill’s being scaled thereby *tepe-yi* ‘hill-ACC’ can only be interpreted as referring to a specific hill in (d).

- d. Dağcı-lar bu tepe-yi tırman-ıyor.  
mountaineer-PLU this hill-ACC climb-PROG.3sg  
‘Mountaineers are climbing this hill.’

<sup>11</sup> Just as a verb of motion such as *çık* ‘climb’ cannot render a dative-marked object delimited as in (10b), accusative-marked objects serving as arguments of verbs other than verbs of motion, incremental theme verbs and location verbs are unable to measure and delimit an event. In the examples below neither the accusative on the object nor the verb can render the object to be construed as delimited.

- (1) a. Çocuk-lar dondurma-yı sev-di/adam-ı gördü.  
child-PL icecream-ACC like-PAST.3p/man-ACC see-PAST.3p  
‘The children liked the icecream/saw the man.’

<sup>12</sup> Tenny (1994:72) points out that *path-object* verbs in English are ambiguous between a delimited and a nondelimited reading. Thus in English a *path object* verb is compatible both with the adverbial expressions *in x time* indicating delimitedness and *for x time* indicating nondelimitedness as in (1a). To enforce a delimited reading, in Tenny’s words, a goal or some sort of an endpoint has to be introduced as illustrated in (1b).

- (1) a. walk the trail for an hour/in an hour  
climb the ladder for an hour/in an hour  
b. walk the trail to its end \*for an hour/in an hour  
climb the ladder to the top \*for an hour/in an hour

Let us see whether path objects of verbs of motion are ambiguous as regards delimitedness in Turkish. Consider the examples in (2) below.

- (2) a. Emre dağ-ı beş saat içinde/??boyunca tırman-dı.  
mountain-ACC five hour in/for  
‘Emre climbed up the mountain in two hours/??for two hours.’  
b. Emre dağ-a beş saat boyunca/\*içinde tırman-dı.  
mountain-DAT  
‘Emre climbed the mountain for five hours/\*in two hours.’

(2a) is infelicitous with *boyunca* ‘for x time’ since if the speaker’s intention is to convey that some climbing has been done but the peak has not been reached then to convey that sense it is more appropriate to utter (2b), i.e., to use a dative marked object and the adverbial *boyunca* ‘for x time’. In Turkish the fact that the verb *tırman* ‘climb’ allows both an accusative marked and a dative marked complement, in my view, prevents ambiguity and while the former induces a delimited reading the latter gives rise to a nondelimited one. Let me also note that the sentence (2b) *Emre dağ-a beş saat içinde tırman-dı* is in fact felicitous only in the sense that *Emre started climbing a mountain five hours after he decided he would climb*. This reading, however, does not involve delimitedness.



- (11) a. Milli yüzücü Boğaz-ı yarım saat içinde/\*boyunca yüz-dü.  
national swimmer Bosphorus-ACC half hour in/\*for swim-PAST.3sg  
'The national swimmer swam the Bosphorus in/\*for half an hour.'
- b. Atlet 800 metre-yi iki dakika içinde/\*boyunca koş-tu.  
athlete meter-ACC two minute in /\* for run-PAST.3sg  
'The athlete ran the 800 meters in/\*for two minutes.'

The verbs of motion requiring a certain path in Turkish are listed in (12). All these verbs require a spatially contained path and this paper argues that containment is achieved by the accusative morpheme in Turkish.

- |      |               |                 |                |          |             |             |
|------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| (12) | <i>adımla</i> | 'pace out'      | <i>atla</i>    | 'jump'   | <i>aş</i>   | 'pass over' |
|      | <i>çık</i>    | 'climb; ascend' | <i>dolaş</i>   | 'stroll' | <i>geç</i>  | 'cross'     |
|      | <i>gez</i>    | 'stroll'        | <i>karişla</i> | 'span'   | <i>koş</i>  | 'run'       |
|      | <i>tırman</i> | 'climb'         | <i>uç</i>      | 'fly'    | <i>yürü</i> | 'walk'      |
|      | <i>yüz</i>    | 'swim'          |                |          |             |             |

Below are listed further examples of verbs of motion with spatially bounded objects where the accusative marking on the objects renders them construed as paths that are scaled by the verbs. A comparison of the behavior of accusative-marked and locative-marked objects below clearly shows the semantic contribution of the accusative. Where in both (13) and (14) the different manifestations of case render the objects definite, only in the accusative marked objects, however, it is possible to view *ada* 'island' and *Boğaz* 'Bosphorus' as paths traversed from one end to the other.

- (13) a. Araştırmacı *ada-yı* yürü-dü/dolaş-tı.  
researcher island-ACC walk/stroll-PAST.3sg  
'The researcher walked/strolled the island (from one end to the other).'
- b. Araştırmacı *ada-da* yürüdü.  
island-LOC  
'The researcher walked in (some parts of) the island.'
- (14) a. Milli yüzücü *Boğaz-ı* yüz-dü.  
national swimmer Bosphorus-ACC swim-PAST.3sg  
'The national swimmer swam the Bosphorus (from one end to the other).'
- b. Milli yüzücü *Boğaz-da* yüz-dü.  
Bosphorus-LOC  
'The national swimmer swam in (some parts of) the Bosphorus.'

The last two sets of examples I wish to consider as regards motion verbs are those which allow only an accusative marked object as in (15) and those that take both accusative and a null marked objects as in (16).

- (15) a. Atlet-ler parkur-u/\*parkur koş-tu.  
athlete-PL track-ACC run-PAST.3sg  
'The athletes ran the track.'
- b. Göçmen kuş-lar her yaz Pasifik Okyanusu-n-u/\*okyanus uç-ar-lar.  
migrant bird-PL every summer pacific ocean-ACC fly-AOR.3pl  
'Migrant birds fly the Pacific Ocean every summer.'
- c. Gezgin çöl-ü/\*çöl geç-ti.  
explorer desert-ACC cross-PAST.3sg  
'The explorer crossed the desert.'

As regards the examples in (15) I argue that accusative marking on the objects leads to a path construal with a definite starting and an endpoint. The null marked objects, however, result in ungrammaticality as they are not designated as

specific paths. Thus a path construal is only possible via accusative marking. The final sets of examples to be discussed are those that allow both an accusative marked and a null marked path object as in (16).<sup>13</sup>

- (16) a. Atlet-ler 2000 metre koş-tu.  
 athlete-PL meter run-PAST.3sg  
 ‘The athletes ran 2000 meters.’
- b. Atlet-ler 2000 metre-yi koş-tu.  
 meter-ACC  
 ‘The athletes ran the 2000 meters.’

In (16a) the athletes are understood to have run a path without specific starting and end points. In other words, it is as if the athletes happened to run 2000 m, i.e., when they were done, the end of running marked the end of a path which was not specified in advance. We can construe an indefinite number of 2000 meters in the universe. Though at first sight 2000 m seem bounded, unless it is specified with a starting and an endpoint, as in (16a) it is not construed as a bounded path. In (16b), however, 2000 meters is designated in advance as a path to be traversed via the accusative marker and the speaker presupposes that the hearer is familiar with the specified path.<sup>14</sup>

Having introduced one class of verbs where accusative marked objects can delimit an event let us now turn to a further set of verbs where we see the role of accusative as providing a measuring scale and an endpoint.

### 3.2. Location verbs

The next set of verbs with which accusative marked objects are construed as providing a gradient scale in Turkish are the so-called *location* verbs. Location verbs are defined as verbs consisting of an agent causing an entity, also referred to as *figure*, to move to a *location/ground* (Gropen et al., 1992; Dowty, 1991; Tenny, 1994).<sup>15</sup> In English, if the figure entity is mapped onto a direct object we get a *figure-object* verb such as *pour* as in (17a) if, however, the *ground-object* is mapped onto the direct object as in (17b) we obtain a verb like *fill*. As (17a’) indicates, a ground-entity cannot be mapped onto the direct object position in *pour*, nor a figure-entity can occupy the position of a direct-object in *fill* as in (17b’).

- (17) a. Pour water into the glass a’. \*Pour the glass with water  
 b. Fill the glass with water b’. \*Fill water into the glass

<sup>13</sup> Kural (1997) also draws attention to a difference between verbs of motion (‘change of place’ verbs in his terms) which allow both an accusative marked and a null marked object as in (a) below and change of state verbs which do not take an accusative marked object as in (b).

- (1) a. Ahmet 400 metre/ metre-yi koş-tu.  
 meter meter-ACC run-PAST.3sg  
 ‘Ahmet ran 400 meters/the 400 meters.’
- b. Gemi 400 metre/\*metre-yi bat-tı.  
 sink-PAST.3sg  
 ‘The ship sank 400 meters/\*the 400 meters.’

Kural intends to show that intransitives which look alike on the surface behave differently due to their semantic properties. As discussed in Nakipoğlu (1998, 2000) a plausible account of the variant behavior of the verbs is possible by considering that intransitive change of state verbs are in fact unaccusatives and are already delimited, thereby disallowing the presence of a delimiter in the form of an accusative marked object. Verbs of motion, however, are unergatives, hence are nondelimited. It is possible, however, to delimit the event that is described by a motion verb by introducing an accusative marked path argument. (1a) above thus shows that an unergative can yield a delimited reading when a path introduced is bounded via the accusative morpheme.

<sup>14</sup> The different prosodic patterns of (16a) and (16b) also reflect this meaning difference. In (16a) the null marked object is new information and carries neutral focus. In (16b), however, the accusative marked object being a previously designated path lacks the potential for bearing neutral focus, thereby stress moves onto the verb reinforcing a delimited reading.

<sup>15</sup> Gropen et al. (1992) refer to this particular group of verbs as *figure-ground* verbs in which an agent is viewed as causing the figure argument, usually analyzed as theme, to move to a ground argument, usually analyzed as location or goal. Tenny (1994:52) underscores the fact that in the case of location verbs the so-called figure argument must have material like properties and the so-called ground argument must be a flat surface or container that can be filled up with the material over time.

As is widely known there is also a set of verbs called the *locative alternation* verbs in which either the figure or the ground argument can be mapped onto the direct object as in (18). Hence in verbs that enter into locative alternation either of the internal arguments can be the direct object.

- (18) a. brush butter onto the pan/brush the pan with butter  
b. spray paint onto the wall/spray the wall with paint

The Turkish verb *dök/koy* ‘pour’ behaves just like its English counterpart, i.e., it does not allow a ground in the object position as in (19a’). The verb *doldur* ‘fill’ however, permits both a figure and a ground object as in (19b’) thereby undergoing locative change:

- (19) a. bardağ-a su dök-mek/koy-mak  
glass-DAT water pour-INF  
‘Pour water into the glass’  
a’. \*bardağ-ı su-yla dök-mek/koy-mak  
glass-ACC water-INST pour-INF  
‘\*Pour the glass with water’  
b. bardağ-a su doldur-mak  
glass-DAT water fill-INF  
‘Fill water into the glass’  
b’. bardağ-ı su-yla doldur-mak  
glass-ACC water-INST fill-INF  
‘Fill the glass with water’

What appears to be crucial for a verb to undergo locative alternation is that both the figure and the ground arguments must be able to measure out the event. More specifically, the figure argument must be construed as used up incrementally over time and the ground argument as filled up or covered accordingly.

Let us turn to a discussion of the locative alternation verbs in Turkish and the role the accusative marker assumes on the direct object. The verbs that allow for both a figure and a ground entity and thereby undergo locative alternation are listed in (20) and examples with these verbs are given in (21–24) below.

- (20) *doldur* ‘fill’                      *döşe* ‘spread; carpet’      *ek* ‘plant’  
*kapla* ‘cover, envelope’      *ört* ‘cover’                      *sar* ‘wrap’  
*yükle* ‘load’

- (21) a. Küvet-e su-yu/su-∅ doldur-mak  
bathtub-DAT water-ACC/water fill-INF  
‘To pour the water/water into the bathtub’  
b. Küvet-i su-yla doldur-mak  
bathtub-ACC water-INS  
‘To fill the bathtub with water’  
(22) a. Kamyon-a saman-ı/saman-∅ yükle-mek  
truck-DAT hay-ACC/hay load-INF  
‘To load the hay/hay onto the truck’  
b. Kamyon-u saman-la yükle-mek  
truck-ACC hay-INS  
‘To load the truck with hay’

In the (a) examples the accusative marked figure objects *su-yu* ‘the water’ and *saman-ı* ‘the hay’ are interpreted as entirely loaded on to the container objects. Similarly in the (b) examples what appears to be completely filled are the

container objects, *küvet-i* ‘the bathtub’ and *kamyon-u* ‘the truck’ which are again accusative marked. Examples (23–26) provide further examples for locative alternation verbs in Turkish.<sup>16</sup>

- (23) a. Duvar-a kağıt-ı/kağıt-Ø kapla-mak  
wall-DAT wallpaper-ACC cover-INF  
‘To spread the wallpaper/wallpaper onto the wall’
- b. Duvar-ı kağıt-la kapla-mak  
wall-ACC wallpaper-INS  
‘To cover the wall with wallpaper’
- (24) a. Yer-e halı-yi/halı-Ø döşe-mek  
floor-DAT carpet-ACC carpet-INF  
‘To spread the carpet/carpet onto the floor’
- b. Yer-i halı-yla döşe-mek  
floor-ACC carpet-INS  
‘To carpet the floor with carpet’
- (25) a. Çocuğ-a battaniye-yi/battaniye-Ø ört-mek  
child-DAT blanket-ACC cover-INF  
‘To spread the blanket/blanket onto the child’
- b. Çocuğ-u battaniye-yle ört-mek  
child-ACC blanket-INS  
‘To cover the child with a blanket’
- (26) a. Parmağ-a sargı bezi-ni/sargı bezi-Ø sar-mak  
finger-DAT bandage-ACC wrap-INF  
‘To wrap the bandage/bandage around the finger’
- b. Parmağ-ı sargı beziyle sarmak  
finger-ACC bandage-INS  
‘To wrap the finger with (a) bandage’

What is interesting about these verbs is that when the complement which corresponds to a ground such as a container like *küvet* ‘bathtub’, *kamyon* ‘truck’ as in (21–22) or a flat surface like *duvar* ‘wall’, *yer* ‘floor’ as in (23–24) is in the direct object position hence marked with the accusative, it gets a delimited interpretation due to the fact that the container/surface argument is measured out. Because of the inherent spatial delimitedness of these arguments measuring out cannot continue forever and the endpoint reached renders a delimited reading. Even *çocuk* ‘child’ in (25) and *parmak* ‘finger’ in (26) refer to physically delimited surfaces yielding a reading in which the child is construed as completely covered with the blanket. This construal arises as a result of the ground/container arguments’ being bounded in space. Similarly when the figure argument is in the direct object position hence accusative-marked, such as *saman-ı* ‘the hay’, *su-yu* ‘the water’, etc., it is interpreted as completely used up. Hence in the case of locative alternation verbs whatever is mapped on to the accusative marked direct object determines whether it is the figure that is used up or the ground that is covered, filled, etc. This brings us to the discussion of the last environment where an accusative marked object gives rise to a holistic interpretation.

<sup>16</sup> The null marked direct objects in (21)–(26), however, can only be interpreted as nouns incorporated into verbs yielding a nondelimited reading. In the examples below, e.g., neither the *bathtub* nor the *truck* can be construed as filled. Similarly *water* and *hay* cannot be construed as entirely consumed.

- (1) a. Küvet-e su-Ø doldur-mak  
bathtub-DAT water fill-INF  
‘water filling to the bathtub’
- b. Kamyon-a saman-Ø yükle-mek  
truck-DAT hay load-INF  
‘hay loading onto the truck’

### 3.3. Incremental-theme verbs

I refer to the final set of verbs which exhibit a delimited reading when occurring with an accusative marked object in Turkish as *incremental theme* verbs following the terminology of Dowty (1991) and Tenny (1994).<sup>17</sup>

A possible set of incremental theme verbs in Turkish include verbs such as *anla* ‘understand’, *bil* ‘know’, *çal* ‘play’, *oku* ‘read’, *öğret* ‘teach’, *öğren* ‘learn’, *sev* ‘love’. These verbs are referred to as incremental themes since increments of the direct objects are learned, read and mastered, etc., over time and this corresponds to the temporal progress of the event. Moreover, there is a final increment which marks the temporal end of the event. The semantic contribution of the accusative marker is apparent in the examples below where the direct object is a generic noun.

- (27) a. Biz yabancı-lar-a Türkçe öğret-ti-k.  
we foreigner-PL-DAT Turkish-Ø teach-PAST-1p  
‘We taught Turkish to the foreigners.’
- b. Biz yabancı-lar-a Türkçe-yi öğret-ti-k.  
Turkish-ACC  
‘We taught the foreigners Turkish.’

While (27b) suggests that the foreigners in question have mastered Turkish, have learned the minute details, subtleties of the language, (27a) does not have such an implication, that is, it simply points out that the language that was taught was Turkish. Let us consider some further examples:

- (28) a. Can her gün gazete oku-r.  
I every day newspaper-Ø read-AOR.3sg  
‘Every day Can does newspaper reading.’
- b. Can her gün gazete-yi oku-r.  
newspaper-ACC  
‘Every day Can reads the newspaper inside out.’

In (28a) the paper is skimmed through but not read entirely.<sup>18</sup> (28b), however, suggests that a specific paper is being read in its entirety.<sup>19</sup> The examples below further illustrate the role accusative marking plays in the bounded construal of the events, and the holistic interpretation of the object. In the (b) sentences in (29) and (30) the accusative marker indicates a profound knowledge of physics and that of how to play the violin, respectively. Study of physics or violin playing is viewed here as metaphorical paths measured out.

- (29) a. Öğrenci-ler fizik bil-iyor.  
Student-pl physics-Ø know-PROG.3sg  
‘The students know physics.’
- b. Öğrenci-ler fiziğ-i bil-iyor.  
physics-ACC  
‘The students know physics inside out.’

<sup>17</sup> Tenny (1994:18) defines an *incremental theme* verb as one in which the internal argument is created and consumed over time such as verbs of consumption: *eat an apple*, verbs of creation: *build a house*, etc. The class of verbs that I label as *incremental theme* verbs in Turkish differs from that of Tenny’s, the only property they have in common is that the events that the verbs refer to progress in increments.

<sup>18</sup> An anonymous referee suggests that the object in (28a) can best be interpreted categorially and the sentence does not necessarily convey that the paper in question is skimmed, rather the speaker is understood not to make a commitment as to whether he or she skimmed the paper or read it thoroughly. I agree with the referee that the bare noun can be interpreted categorially. Nonetheless considering the fact that the native speakers I have consulted, reported their inability to interpret the sentence as indicating a newspaper which is thoroughly read, I have reservations in admitting that the speaker does not make a commitment along the lines as suggested by the referee. Nevertheless what is crucial for the analysis is the observation that the accusative marker on the object renders the newspaper to be viewed as measuring and delimited.

<sup>19</sup> It has recently come to the attention of the author that Taylan and Zimmer (1994) in a paper where they argue that the primary factor for appearance of the accusative suffix is ‘individuation’ give a similar example and hint that in one of the readings of the sentence the newspaper is understood as being read from beginning to end. Nonetheless there is no further discussion of this delimited sense conveyed by the Turkish accusative.

- (30) a. Çocuk keman çal-ıyor.  
 child violin-Ø play-PROG.3sg  
 ‘The child plays the violin.’
- b. Çocuk keman-ı çal-ıyor.  
 violin-ACC  
 ‘The child plays the violin well.’ = (The child knows how to play the violin.)

The delimited reading that the accusative marked objects convey when they are arguments of verbs of motion, location verbs and incremental theme verbs appears to be closely correlated with focus facts. In essence, a bounded construal of the events and the holistic interpretation of the objects appear to emerge when the pitch accent is not on the object but the verb. Let us consider (31) for a discussion of how focus facts come into play. (The bold and italicized constituents below are accented, the # symbol indicates infelicity.)

- (31) A: Aslı bu yaz hangi dil-i öğren-di?  
 this summer which language-ACC learn-PAST.3sg  
 ‘Which language has Aslı learned over the summer?’
- B: **Fransızca-yı** öğren-di.  
 French-ACC learn-PAST.3sg
- B’: #Fransızca-yı **öğren-di**.  
 ‘She has learned French.’

In (31) the *which N* question brings about an evocation of a superset of languages. An accented accusative marked object as an answer to such a question narrows down the superset with one language, that is, French. Thus among the entire spectrum of human languages to be learned, Aslı is understood to have learned French and the accusative marked generic noun appears to induce partitivity. I would like to argue that the *which N* question, is the QUD and it forms a context set which is reduced with the assertion made in B’s answer.<sup>20</sup> Hence B’s answer is a choice among alternatives which are proffered by the type of the question. Unlike (31) where only a stressed accusative marked definite renders a felicitous reading, in (32) what renders the answer to A’s question felicitous is an unaccented accusative DP.

- (32) A: Aslı bu makale-yi çevir-ebil-ir mi?  
 this article-ACC translate-ABIL-AOR.3sg Q  
 ‘Can Aslı translate this article?’
- B: Fransızca-yı **öğren-di**, çevir-ebil-ir.  
 French-ACC learn-PAST.3sg translate-ABIL-AOR3s  
 #Fransızca-yı öğrendi, çevirebilir.  
 She has mastered French, she can translate (it).’

Though there is no mention of French in A’s question, the proposition presupposed by the QUD appears to be P: *Aslı has knowledge of French*. I argue that it is on this presupposed proposition that Interlocutor B produces his sentence where of course the generic French is rendered given. A given status of the object forces it to undergo deaccentuation hence the pitch accent falls on the verb giving rise to a delimited reading where Aslı is construed to have learned increments of the language over time until an endpoint is reached. Furthermore the accusative on the path indicates a virtual endpoint which suggests that mastery in French is achieved.

In this section I have presented some possible verb classes which when used with the Turkish accusative render a holistic reading. The focus related interpretation of accusative marked definites which has revealed itself in the context of both referential and generic nouns used with these verbs calls for a thorough discussion of how focus facts may induce various readings which is a topic I venture into in the next section.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> I follow Ginzburg (1996) and Roberts (1996) in referring to a question as question under discussion. The details of the analysis that I offer will be laid out in section 4.2.

<sup>21</sup> The present study isolated verbs of motion, location verbs and incremental theme verbs as the environments rendering accusative marked objects delimited. There may be further verb classes giving rise to a delimited reading of the accusative. In future work I hope to provide a more detailed study of the environments triggering a delimited reading.

#### 4. A focus related account of the Turkish accusative

As discussed in section 4 most work on the Turkish accusative has dealt with the meaning differences between accusative marked and null marked indefinites. In this study I will primarily focus on the readings induced by the accusative marked definites and endeavour to correlate the various readings that definites induce with focus facts. A crucial observation of this study will be that both accented and unaccented accusative marked definites are presuppositional where presuppositionality will be viewed as intricately tied to the hearer and discourse-statuses of definites. I will further argue that they differ from each other with respect to the presupposition they trigger. While an unaccented accusative will be shown to trigger pragmatic presupposition, an accented accusative will be argued to trigger only existential presupposition.<sup>22</sup>

In accounting for the presuppositional nature of the Turkish accusative marked definites, I will assume, in the spirit of Prince (1992) a two dimensional model of information structure based on the hearer-status and the discourse-status of accusative marked DPs. Prince proposes to assess the familiarity or givenness of an entity not only from the point of view of the hearer's perspective but also from the point of view of the discourse model being constructed during sentence processing. According to this model, in structuring information in discourse, a speaker makes a distinction between the *hearer-status* of the information, i.e., whether the speaker believes that an entity is known or unknown to the hearer at the time of reference and the *discourse status* of information, i.e., whether an NP refers to an entity that has already been evoked in the prior discourse, or it evokes an entity which has not previously occurred in the prior discourse. Based on these distinctions, a four-way taxonomy has been offered; if an entity is believed to be known to the hearer at the time of the reference, it is *hearer-old*, otherwise it is *hearer-new*. If an entity has been explicitly evoked in the prior discourse, it is *discourse-old*, otherwise it is *discourse-new*. This taxonomy provides a plausible ground for a discussion of the Turkish definites as it will be clear in the following paragraphs a one dimensional approach where the accusative marked definites are considered only with respect to whether they are familiar to the hearer or not or an account which attempts to uncover whether they are discourse-linked or not do not suffice in capturing the entire story behind the Turkish accusative. Therefore a comprehensive analysis of the issue will be pursued by refining the information structure model of Prince to accommodate the linguistic phenomenon of presupposition, in particular the notion of commonground which is based on the view that what constitutes contexts for presuppositions is in fact the actual commonground of discourse participants.<sup>23</sup>

In postulating that an accusative marked DP is presuppositional, I depart from previous work on several respects. I suggest that the notion of presupposition that arises in the use of an accusative marked DP varies according to whether an accusative definite is accented or unaccented. Therefore any account which studies the semantics of definites without taking focus facts into consideration can be viewed as providing only part of the story. At the core of the proposal that I put forward in this paper is the view that presupposition is intricately tied with focus facts. To put it succinctly, I will argue that accented and unaccented accusative marked DPs trigger different types of presupposition. An accent on the accusative marked DP gives rise to existential presupposition which requires the existence of the entity to be inferred at the time of the reference, hence giving rise to a hearer-status which is inferrable and a discourse status which is new. The discourse-new status arises due to the fact that the entity in question has not been introduced in the prior discourse hence the speaker in uttering a sentence with an accented accusative marked definite does not expect his addressee to have certain beliefs or assumptions about the entity in question other than what the nonlinguistic stimuli in the immediate context make available. When the accusative marked definite is unaccented, however, the presupposition at issue turns out to be pragmatic which suggests that the speaker expects his addressee to recognize that s/he evaluated the accusative marked definite and the utterance in which it occurs on the basis of a commonground shaped by shared assumptions and beliefs. That is what renders both the hearer and the discourse statuses of unaccented accusative marked definites old.

<sup>22</sup> As indicated in Roberts (2006:218) the exact character of the presupposition associated with definite descriptions is disputed. Heim (1982) assumes that use of a definite NP presupposes that there is a corresponding discourse referent already in the context and Roberts (2004) equates this property of definites with strong familiarity where an explicit previous mention of the entity is in question. As opposed to Heim's notion of strong familiarity Roberts (2004) proposes a notion of weak familiarity wherein the existence of entity in question need only be entailed by the local context.

<sup>23</sup> Eng's index-based model discussed in (1) can also be considered as a two dimensional model as it attempts to differentiate between definites and indefinites on the basis of the definiteness features they are assumed to bear on referential and discourse related indices. The model proposed here attempts to be more comprehensive in accommodating various readings that the accusative marked definites induce and also to account for the focus related variation that they exhibit.

The commonground view that I adopt for an explanation of the discourse status of unaccented accusatives differs from Prince's discourse-old view or any account of discourse-linking in one crucial respect. The commonground view encapsulates discourse evocation not solely based on actual prior discourse. It argues for an evaluation of propositions in the interlocutors' commonground which are propositions presupposed by the topics or the questions under discussion.

So far I have alluded to the view that an accusative marked definite can have two hearer-statuses, inferrable or old, depending on whether it is accented or unaccented rendering the definite discourse-new or discourse-old respectively. Let me turn to the details of this view in what follows. I conjecture that an analysis of the difference in the hearer-statuses can be best pursued by taking into account the different activation states that Chafe (1996) postulates for different degrees of givenness. According to Chafe, givenness has to be considered in terms of activation cost that has to be invested in the transfer of a referent from a previous state into an active, i.e., conscious state. Under this account, there are three activation states *given*, *accessible* and *new*. The hearer-old status of the Turkish accusative marked definite can be equated with a *given activation status*, when it is unaccented, that is, the referent is already active in the listener's consciousness at the moment when a particular sentence is being processed. The hearer-status of an accented accusative, however, can best be considered as having an *accessible/inferrable status*, meaning that the referent is in a person's peripheral consciousness and gets activated from a previously semi-active state. Finally a referent can only be interpreted as hearer-new when it gets activated from a previously inactive state corresponding to the hearer-status of an indefinite. The chart in (33) summarizes the statuses of accented and unaccented accusative DPs in Turkish.<sup>24</sup>

As stated in Prince (1992) while an entity's status as hearer-new necessitates its discourse status to be new as well, yielding an inapplicable relation between hearer-new and discourse-old statuses, discourse newness does not necessarily render an entity hearer-new. Turning to Turkish facts, as the chart in (33) reveals, if an entity is both hearer-new and discourse-new, it has to correspond to a null marked indefinite object in Turkish. When the entity is new to the discourse, however, it does not necessarily have to be hearer-new. It can be hearer-inferrable which is a hearer-status that accommodates accented accusative marked definites and indefinites in Turkish. Finally, when the entity is old to the discourse, its hearer-status is also old, corresponding to unaccented accusative marked definites and indefinites in Turkish, where the latter also renders partitivity.

(33)

	<b>Discourse-old P of the sentence is commonground</b>	<b>Discourse-new P of the sentence is not commonground</b>
<b>Hearer-old</b>	Noun-ACC (unaccented) Bir (a) N-ACC (unaccented) <i>Activation status: active</i>	n/a
<b>Hearer-inferrable</b>	n/a	Noun-ACC (accented) Bir Noun-ACC (accented) <i>Activation status: semi-active</i>
<b>Hearer-new</b>	n/a <sup>25</sup>	Bir (a) Noun <i>Activation status: inactive</i>

The Turkish facts indicate that the discourse statuses of both accusative marked definites and indefinites appear to be correlated with their hearer-statuses: unaccented accusative marked definites and indefinites are discourse-old and hearer-old, whereas accented accusative marked definites and indefinites are discourse-new and hearer-inferrable. Furthermore as revealed by the Turkish facts neither the accusative marked definites nor indefinites give us an

<sup>24</sup> The categorization offered here can in fact be extended to accommodate other case morphemes as well, a topic I intend to elaborate on in future work. Though I have continued to employ the terminology offered by Prince and many others in referring to the discourse status of an entity as being new or old, the discussion in the ensuing sections will reveal that there is more to discourse-oldness than the term encompasses.

<sup>25</sup> As an entity already introduced into the discourse is assumed to be known to the hearer from that point on, it cannot be hearer-new, hence a hearer-new and discourse-old status is not applicable.



appropriate marking of hearer-status. To the contrary, their discourse status, that is, whether they are unaccented or accented show us whether they are hearer-old or hearer-inferable. This paper is primarily committed to an understanding of hearer and discourse statuses of accusative marked definites. A thorough investigation of accusative marked indefinites awaits future research.

In the following section, I will first lay out the properties of hearer-inferable and discourse-new accusative marked definites and then move on to a discussion of hearer-old and discourse-old accusative marked definites.

#### 4.1. Hearer-inferable and discourse-new accusative marked definites

Recall that under Enç's account, a definite is anchored to its antecedent via an *identity relation*, that is, there is a corresponding discourse referent with which the definite NP is identified. The antecedent of a definite in Enç's terms is a strong antecedent, since it involves the strongest possible linking relation.<sup>26</sup> Contra Enç I maintain that only in cases where there is an overt linguistic antecedent one can talk about an *identity relation* and a strong link. There are, however, many examples of accusative marked definites in Turkish where the definites in question do not get their interpretation anaphorically due to the absence of an overt linguistic referent. Consider the following set of examples which constitutes a narrative where the accented accusative marked definites appear to get their readings through a relation established between the accusative marked DP and an implicit referent which is part of the event schema. The sentence in (34a) sets the scene for the following narrative. (The bold and italicized accusative marked DPs are accented):

- (34)
- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| a. | Can ev-e gel-di.<br>house-DAT come  | [Can came home.]   |
| b. | Çanta-sın-dan <b>anahtar-ı</b> çık-ar-dı.<br>bag-POSS-ABL key-ACC take-CAUS-PAST.3s                   | [He took <i>the key</i> out of his bag.]                             |
| c. | <b>Kapı-yı</b> açtı.<br>door-ACC unlock-PAST.3s   | [(He) unlocked <i>the door</i> .]                                    |
| d. | İçeri-si soğuk-tu/ <b>Pencere-yi</b> kapat-tı.<br>inside-POSS cold-PAST.3s/window-ACC close-PAST.3s   | [It was cold inside/(He) closed <i>the window</i> .]                 |
| e. | <b>Perde-yi</b> çek-ti.<br>curtain-ACC draw-PAST.3s   | [(He) drew <i>the curtain</i> .]                                     |
| f. | Banyo-ya yönel-di/ <b>Işığ-ı</b> aç-tı.<br>bathroom-DAT move.towards-PAST.3s/light-ACC turnon-PAST.3s | [(He) moved towards the bathroom/(He) turned on <i>the lights</i> .] |
| g. | <b>Sabun-u</b> ara-dı.<br>soap-ACC look.for-PAST.3s   | [(He) looked for <i>the soap</i> .]                                  |
| h. | <b>El-in-i</b> yıka-dı.<br>Hand-POSS-ACC wash-PAST.3s   | [(He) washed <i>his hands</i> .]                                     |
| i. | Banyo yap-mak için <b>küvet-i</b> dol-dur-du.<br>bath do-INF for bathtub-ACC fill-CAUS-PAST.3s        | [(He) filled <i>the bathtub</i> to take a bath.]                     |

What anchors the accusative marked DPs in the narrative above is an (*entering*)-home schema that seems to be activated with the sentence *Can came home* in (34a). The referents of the accusative marked DPs above do not have an explicit antecedent in the discourse. With the activation of the schema, however, the definites to be introduced in the discourse become semi-active as far as their hearer-status goes. Hence contextual assumptions made with the introduction of each sentence give rise to the inference of a relation between the newly introduced definite and an

<sup>26</sup> Specificity, however, is assumed to involve a weaker, looser relation to already established referents than definiteness.

entity introduced earlier and this renders the hearer-status of the accusative marked objects inferrable. Thus what *anahtar-ı* ‘the key’ in the narrative above refers to is inferred from the relation between *the key* and *kapı-yı* ‘the door’, similarly the relation between *the curtain* and *the window* or the relation between *the light, the soap, the bathtub and the bathroom*, etc., render all the newly introduced entities hearer-inferrable.<sup>27</sup> Evidently, in such use of the accusative marked definites, the definite obtains an interpretation not through an *identity relation* but through an *inferred relation* between the accusative marked DP and another entity in the schema.<sup>28</sup> As all the accusative-marked definites in (34) are newly introduced into the discourse they have a discourse status which is new, hence they are accented.

Consider the exchange below as a further example where the accusative marked object is hearer-inferrable as far as its hearer-status goes and discourse-new as it is newly introduced into the context. (Accented constituents are italicized and bold and the symbol # indicates that the sentence is infelicitous with an unaccented accusative DP):

- (35) A: Ne ol-uyor? Bu güürültü de ne?  
 what be-PROG/this noise FOC what  
 ‘What is happening? What is this noise?’
- B: (Dün akşam çok kar yağ-mış). Belediye *yol-u* aç-ıyor.  
 last night a lot snow fall-EVI/municipality road-ACC open-PROG.3sg  
 ‘(Last night it snowed a lot). The municipality is plowing the road.’
- B’: # (Dün akşam çok kar yağ-mış). Belediye yol-u *aç-ıyor*.

Though the definite *yol-u* ‘the road’ has not been introduced earlier in the exchange, A’s question about the noise and B’s reply about heavy snowfall immediately give rise to the construal of snow covered roads and a snowplow pushing snow off a certain road. The activation of such a construal relates the definite object with a specific road; hence the referent of the road becomes identifiable to the hearer during this brief exchange. Even in the absence of information about the heavy snowfall, the interlocutor A, making inferences about the noise and B’s utterance, would be able to compute the relationship between the situation and the definite road.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.2. Hearer-old and discourse-old accusative marked definites

Let us now turn to a discussion of how accented and unaccented accusative definites differ in what they convey. Consider the following exchange:

- (36) A: Duy-du-n mu?  
 Hear-PAST-2sg Q  
 ‘Have you heard?’
- B: Ne ol-du?  
 what happen-PAST.3sg  
 ‘What happened?’
- A: i. Orhan Pamuk *Nobel-i* al-dı.  
 Nobel-ACC receive-PAST.3sg  
 ii. Orhan Pamuk Nobel-i *al-di*.  
 ‘O. Pamuk received the Nobel Prize.’

I argue that B’s question in (36) above can have two potential answers which have distinct prosodic patterns reflecting A’s assumptions and beliefs about B’s assumptions on the proposition *Pamuk received the Nobel Prize*. If as widely

<sup>27</sup> What the Turkish accusative marked definites exhibit in the examples in (34) resembles what Clark (1978), Lewis (1979) and Heim (1982) refer to as *bridging inferences*, Prince (1981, 1992) as *inferrables* and Fraurud (1992, 1996) as *first mention definites*.

<sup>28</sup> The relation that I propose resembles the alleged recoverable relation that Enç mentions for the discussion of accusative marked indefinites. Enç’s analysis with respect to the nature of this relation, however, is rather vague and does not say anything specific about accusative marked definites.

<sup>29</sup> Nonlinguistic stimuli such as some noise, some scent, some tactile sensation or even the facial expression of the hearer may have the potential to make the referent of the accusative marked DP semi-active, that is, the referent comes to the peripheral consciousness of the speaker.

assumed, a question such as *What happened* can only elicit replies which reflect neutral focus, that is, an accented entity in the preverbal position in Turkish, (Aii) should be considered infelicitous. Nonetheless (Aii) is perfectly felicitous and the felicity can be explained as follows.<sup>30</sup>

In both (Ai) and (Aii) *Nobel-ACC* ‘the Nobel Prize’, being accusative marked is *hearer-nonnew*, that is, what it refers to is hearer-inferable in (i) and hearer-old in (ii). The stress on the accusative marked DP in (Ai), however, renders the entity discourse-new suggesting that A and B had not talked about Orhan Pamuk’s nomination to the Nobel Literature Prize, or his potential to receive the prize before. An unaccented accusative marked DP in (Aii), however, renders not only the definite but the proposition presupposed by the sentence evoked and puts it in the commonground. Hence with an unaccented accusative marked DP and pitch accent on the verb what the sentence conveys is that Interlocutors A and B had already talked about Pamuk’s nomination to the Prize, his status among the other nominees, etc. Furthermore, it implies A’s assumption that B recognizes A’s comments made earlier about Pamuk’s being the strongest nominee to receive the prize, and his belief that Pamuk would be the laureate. I equate the type of discourse-oldness that is exhibited in the speaker’s reply in (Aii) with *pragmatic presupposition* and argue that an unaccented accusative DP triggers pragmatic presupposition. The claim of crucial interest in this paper is that there is a difference between the presupposition triggered with the accented and unaccented accusative marked objects. While what seems to be triggered with an accented accusative DP is presupposition of existence, an unaccented accusative DP gives rise to pragmatic presupposition, yielding the proposition of the sentence to be implicitly supposed. To get clear on the various types of presupposition some background is in order. Thus in what follows, I will briefly review the principal arguments on types and sources of presuppositions.

There are various views regarding what triggers presuppositions, i.e., where presuppositions come from. I will first spell out the traditional, semantic account, then move on to a discussion of more current views on presupposition triggers. The discussion on the source of presuppositions appears to have crucially revolved around the issue of whether presuppositions are rooted in conventional, lexical content, hence suggesting a semantic property or they can be explained in terms of conversational inference, thereby suggesting that the source is pragmatics rather than semantics (as discussed in Atlas, 2006; Roberts, 2006). Under the traditional account, it is mostly assumed that presuppositions are built into the meanings of particular words or constructions hence are treated as conventional properties of lexical items. Definite NPs along with factive verbs, change of state verbs, cleft constructions in English, aspectual markers, demonstratives have been generally treated as conventional presupposition triggers. Definites, for instance, are standardly assumed to carry existential presupposition where the existence of an entity is taken for granted rather than asserted. Nonetheless what prevails in the recent literature is a reconsideration of the conventional status of presuppositions and an attempt to explain presuppositions in pragmatic terms, i.e., with conversational inferences (Stalnaker, 1973, 1974, 2002; Simons, 2003).

Under the pragmatic account, presupposition is viewed as a property of the speakers, not of sentences or lexical items. The following quotation from Stalnaker (1974:200) elucidates the notion of pragmatic presupposition<sup>31</sup>:

‘A proposition *P* is a pragmatic presupposition of a speaker in a given context just in case the speaker assumes or believes that *P*, assumes or believes that his addressee assumes or believes that *P*, and assumes or believes that his addressee recognizes that he is making these assumptions or has these beliefs.’

In the transaction between Interlocutor B and (Aii) in (36) then, (Aii) takes the speech that s/he has made about Orhan Pamuk earlier and Pamuk’s nomination to the Nobel Prize to be commonground for Interlocutor B and by deaccenting the accusative marked DP indicates that she is expecting B to recognize her assumptions about the topic under discussion.

I adopt this pragmatic view of presuppositions in accounting for the focus properties of definite objects and attempt to tease out what gives the speaker grounds to presuppose something. According to Stalnaker (1972) one has

<sup>30</sup> It is commonly held that the canonical position for neutral focus in Turkish is the immediately preverbal position (Erk, 1983; Erguvanlı, 1984; Kural, 1992; Kennelly, 1997, among others). Contrary to this view, Gksel and zsoy (2000, 2003) hold that there is a focus field rather than a focus position in Turkish and this field is assumed to cover the entire preverbal area including the verb. In their view, the reason that the immediately preverbal area is generally associated with a focus position has to do with the structural properties of the preverbal position, particularly that this position allows percolation of stress, hence allows a neutral focus reading.

<sup>31</sup> In earlier definitions of pragmatic presupposition, as Simons (2003) indicates, there is more emphasis on truth conditionality which is based on Stalnaker’s view that to presuppose a proposition in the pragmatic sense, is to take its truth for granted and to presume others involved in the context do the same. Less emphasis is placed on truth conditionality in later work and a speaker’s presuppositions are argued to be propositions that she believes to constitute the accepted background information for the conversation in which she is engaged.

presuppositions in virtue of the statements he makes, the questions he asks, the commands he issues, hence presuppositions are propositions implicitly supposed before the relevant business is transacted. It is to the details of such a view that I turn in what follows.

Drawing on the insightful observations made by Ginzburg (1996) and Roberts (1996, 2006), I propose that a question under discussion or a topic under discussion (TUD) by encoding interlocutors' assumptions and beliefs about the current discourse determine the discourse status of the definites.<sup>32</sup> I propose that if the QUDs are in the form of wh-questions or TUDs that entail wh-questions, they evoke an alternative set and require the alternative set to be reduced with one. This reduction of alternatives correlates with where pitch accent falls and necessitates the pitch accent to appear in the preverbal position in Turkish. Nonetheless, these QUDs are not the only type of QUDs. I conjecture that there are two distinct kinds of QUDs; those that evoke alternatives, i.e., wh-questions and those that evoke the entire proposition and checks on the truth or falsity of the proposition, i.e., yes-no questions.<sup>33</sup> QUDs or TUDs that evoke alternatives always necessitate the restriction of alternatives with one, hence requiring focus placement on the entity which refers to the restricted alternative. If evocation of alternatives is not at issue but only the truth or falsity of a proposition is at issue then the verb is accented. The views sketched here are somewhat immature; a full-fledged model of the issue awaits further research.

To recapitulate the key points of the proposal made above, we have seen that the discourse status of accusative marked definites, as a matter of fact any definite in Turkish, is determined by their stress bearing properties. In essence

<sup>32</sup> Following Stalnaker (1978), Roberts (1996, 2006) assumes that the primary goal of discourse is communal inquiry and linguistic counterpart of an inquiry is a question, hence suggests that questions must be taken as to be the formal objects that reflect interlocutors' intentions in conducting discourse. Thus Ginzburg (1996) and Roberts (1996) propose that interlocutors' discourse goals and intentions be encoded as the set of questions under discussion in the discourse. Roberts (2006) attempts to develop a characterization of the notion of discourse context in order to formulate a theoretical account of how context influences interpretation and argues that an adequate discourse context is a four-tuple, consisting of the set of discourse referents known by the interlocutors, the set of recognized domain goals, the set of QUDs, i.e., the accepted discourse goals, and the interlocutors' CommonGround (CG), a set of propositions. I will attempt to illustrate how the model offered works for an account of discourse context by adapting an example from Asher and Lascarides (1998) (as cited in Roberts, 2006). Consider the following exchange:

- (i) a. A: I need to catch the 1:20 to Philadelphia.  
 b. Where is it leaving from?  
 c. B: Platform 7.

For the brief exchange in (i) the input context is characterized as in (ii) where at the outset only the CG is assumed to consist of some general world knowledge.

- (ii) Input Context  
 Discourse referents: empty  
 Domain goals: empty  
 QUD: empty (nothing under discussion)  
 CG: empty except for general world knowledge among strangers, including the information that to catch a train one needs to know where it leaves from.

With A's utterance of (ia) the train becomes a familiar discourse entity, hence is added as a discourse referent to the context and the domain goals, QUD and CG are updated as in (iii).

- (iii) Discourse referents: {x=1:20 train to Philadelphia}  
 Domain goals: {A catches x}  
 QUD: < how does one catch x?>  
 CG: general world knowledge among strangers + {A needs to catch x}

Furthermore when (ib) is added to (iii), the discourse context is updated as in (iv).

- (iv) Discourse referents: {x = 1:20 train to Philadelphia}  
 Domain goals: {A catches x}  
 QUD: < how does one catch x?, where is x leaving from?>  
 CG: general world knowledge among strangers + {A needs to catch x, A inquired about where x is leaving from}

In this model of discourse context, as the example above illustrates, with every question asked new propositions enter into the CG. Nonetheless, new propositions can be brought into discussion not only through explicit questions but also through implicit ones, bringing forth the notion of Topic Under Discussion (TUD). The example in (v) below from Roberts (2006) (which is adapted from Mann and Thompson (1986)) illustrates the notion of TUD where though the brief exchange between A&B does not involve an explicit question, B's answer is considered as addressing the implicit question of 'Shall we go out and eat?'

- (v) A: I'm hungry.  
 B: Let's go to the Fuji Gardens.

The purpose of this paper has not been to propose an exhaustive model of a discourse context for the Turkish data under discussion, rather to show that questions and topics under discussion encode propositions which reflect how interlocutors keep track of each others' beliefs.

<sup>33</sup> The status of why-questions is somewhat special and will be teased out in the ensuing pages.

accented accusative marked DPs differ from unaccented ones in triggering existential presupposition only which is intricately tied with sentence presupposition. Unaccented ones, however trigger pragmatic presupposition also known as speaker presupposition, which arises as a result of the assumptions and beliefs that an interlocutor has about the context and which she thinks is also shared with other interlocutor(s), that is commonground.<sup>34</sup> In spelling out the discourse status of definites, I have thus departed from the view of discourse-linking or discourse-old link which is solely based on the assumption that an entity is rendered discourse-old or linked if it is already evoked explicitly in the actual prior discourse. The notion of commonground as advocated here does not require an explicit mention of the discourse entities, rather the assumptions or beliefs not necessarily stated verbally appear to operate during the evaluation of utterances.

Let us consider further examples where accented and unaccented DPs reveal an interesting contrast to observe how the model proposed unfolds. In (37) the interlocutor A, noticing that it snowed throughout the night wonders whether he would be able to go to work by car.

- (37) A: Dün akşam çok kar yağ-mış. İş-e araba-yla gid-e-me-m herhalde.  
last night much snow fall-EVI/work-DAT car-INST go-ABIL-NEG.1sg perhaps  
'Last night it snowed a lot. Probably I will not be able to go to work by car.'
- B: Belediye yol-u aç-ıyor. Araba-yla gidebilirsin.  
municipality road-ACC open-PROG.3sg/Car-INST go-ABIL-AOR-2sg  
# Belediye **yol-u** aç-ıyor.  
'The municipality is plowing the road. You can go by car.'

Unlike the accented accusative marked object *yol-u* 'the road' in (34), in (37) *yol-u* is unaccented. This suggests that B assumes or believes that the TUD, i.e., A's sentence presupposes the proposition P: *Roads may be snow covered due to the heavy snowfall*. Interlocutor A, in uttering a presupposing sentence expects the other participant to take P to be commonground at the point at which the sentence is evaluated. Recognizing this proposition, B in her utterance deaccents the accusative marked DP 'yol-u'. The proposition renders the accusative-marked DP hearer-old, i.e., the interlocutors both know which specific road or roads are at issue here, and common ground through B's recognition of the proposition that A's utterance presupposes. Furthermore A's statement can also be treated as entailing the QUD 'Do you think I can go to work by car given that it snowed a lot and the roads may be impassable?' rendering again *yol-u* 'the road' in B's reply unaccented, hence hearer-old and discourse-old.

Having spelled out the crucial differences between accented and unaccented accusative DPs regarding the presupposition they carry, that is, unaccented accusative marked DPs trigger pragmatic presupposition which indicates an implicitly supposed proposition, accented accusative marked DPs lack pragmatic presupposition but simply trigger presupposition of existence which renders the entity under discussion inferrable, I will turn below to a discussion of QUDs or TUDs which evoke alternatives rendering the accusative marked objects interpreted as discourse-new and hearer-inferrable, thus accented. Consider the following examples where in (38a) the accusative marked generic noun *sigara-yı* 'the cigarette' is accented whereas in 38(b) it is unaccented.

- (38) a. A: Artık hiç öksür-mü-yor-sun!/?  
more any cough-NEG-PROG-2sg  
'You do not cough any more!'
- B: **Sigara-yı** bırak-tı-m! #Sigara-yı bıraktım!<sup>35</sup>  
cigarette-ACC quit-PAST-1sg  
'I quit smoking.'

<sup>34</sup> The fact that there is a commonground consisting of the interlocutors' assumptions and beliefs in the evaluation of the unaccented accusative marked definites render them existentially presupposed as well.

<sup>35</sup> As an anonymous referee rightly observes if the fact that Interlocutor B has been trying to quit smoking is commonground, i.e., is known by Interlocutor A, the accented entity of course has to be the verb indicating that quitting is finally achieved (rendering the # example in (B) acceptable). Thus the answers given to a particular question appear to indicate whether the addressee considers the issue commonground or not.

- b. A: Bu ev-de neden kültablası yok?  
 this house-LOC why ashtray nonexistent  
 ‘Why is there no ashtray in this house?’
- B: Sigara-yı bıraktım./#Sigara-yı bırak-tı-m!  
 cigarette-ACC quit-PAST-1sg  
 ‘I quit smoking.’

I argue that in (38a) above the accented accusative marked definite is used as an answer to a TUD which entails an information question, i.e., a *wh*-question which evokes alternative sets. In particular, in (38a) I conjecture that A’s inquisitive comment uttered out-of-the-blue presupposes that B used to cough a lot and as he does not cough anymore, his current state must be related with something he has done, which could be having gone to a doctor and being treated for pneumonia or having figured out what he is allergic to, etc. In this case B’s answer in (38a) suggests an inferential relation between coughing and cigarette smoking and restricts the alternatives with one. In (38b), however, B’s answer to A’s why-question suggests that A takes the fact that B smokes to be commonground, and looks for an ashtray as the presence of an ashtray in a smoker’s house is inevitable. B’s answer with an unaccented accusative DP suggests that he takes the proposition presupposed by A’s utterance as P: *Don’t you smoke anymore?* which implies that that B has been a smoker is well known by A. In (38a), unlike the use of an unaccented accusative DP which renders an infelicitous use, an accented accusative constricts the set of remedies with one entity, i.e., quitting smoking hence it is accented, yielding felicity. In (38b), however, within the proposition of the QUD the entity *sigara* ‘cigarette’ is already presupposed and B’s answer is constructed against this background.

Evocation of alternatives is also at issue in the discussion of the following examples. Uttered out-of-the-blue again, a comment such as the one in (39) immediately gives rise to a construal of regimes that one might follow in order to lose weight which triggers a semi-active status in the mind of the hearer. The topic under discussion presupposes, hence implies the proposition that B must have done something to lose weight or something must have happened to B resulting in his loss of weight. I conjecture that the TUD in A’s statement entails the question of ‘What have you done to lose weight?’. The evocation of a context set with the TUD forces B to restrict the set with a singleton, giving rise to an accented object.

- (39) A: Ne kadar kilo ver-miş-sin!?  
 what weight lose-EVI-2sg  
 ‘You have lost quite some weight!’
- B: **Ekmeğ-i** kes-ti-m!  
 bread-ACC cut-PAST-1SG  
 ‘I cut down on bread’
- B’: #Ekmeğ-i **kestim!**<sup>36</sup>
- C: **Spor-a** başla-dım.  
 sport-DAT start-PAST-1sg  
 ‘I have started working out.’
- C’: #Spor-a **başla-dım.**

B’s answer, with an accented accusative highlights that among the things to be done to lose weight what B has done is to follow a certain diet where bread intake is reduced. Similarly in C, the dative marked object hosts stress indicating that the context set is not necessarily restricted with an accusative marked object, but can be restricted with any definite. In (40), however, the interlocutor B takes the presupposition of QUD to already entail certain things such as reduction of bread intake hence deaccents the constituent in the preverbal position forcing the verb to bear stress.

<sup>36</sup> If that the Interlocutor B is dieting commonground, if especially his/her intention to cut down on bread is commonground, the # sentence *ekmeğ-i kestim* is fine. As inquired by one of the referees, with the addition of the adverb *nihayet* ‘finally’ the # sentence appears to get better as not only the interlocutor’s intention to cut down on bread is commonground but also that s/he has been trying to achieve that goal for a while is also rendered ‘shared information’ yielding less marginality.

- (40) A: Kilo ver-mek için doktor-un öneri-ler-in-e uy-uyor mu-sun?  
weight lose-INF for doktor-GEN suggestion-PL-POSS-DATfollow Q-2s  
'Do you follow the doctor's suggestions to lose weight?'
- B: Tabi. Ekmeğ-i **kestim**, mesela.  
of course bread-ACC cut-PAST-1SG for instance  
'Of course! I cut down on bread, for instance.'

We have seen so far that the stress bearing properties of the case marked objects are tightly correlated with the presupposition associated with the QUD or TUD. Thus the question or topic under discussion presuppose the proposition and constitute a background against which we consider the rest of the discourse. In sum, in the model I have been proposing, interlocutors keep track of each other's assumptions and their beliefs about these assumptions render an entity commonground requiring the definite to undergo deaccentuation.

Before closing this section I would like to briefly touch upon a recent analysis made by Üntak-Tarhan (2006) which offers to examine the properties of the accusative marked objects by also bringing into discussion their stress bearing properties and how stress interacts with the discourse-linking relations accusative marked definites trigger. Akin to the analyses of Enç (1991) and Kennelly (2003), Üntak-Tarhan implements the notion coreferential linking corresponding to the identity relation of Enç and direct-linking of Kennelly and the notion non-coreferential linking corresponding to Enç's recoverable relation and Kennelly's indirect-binding. She further argues that not all accusative marked DPs are d-linked contra Enç and Kennelly. The non-d-linked ones differ from the d-linked ones in bearing stress. In explaining what renders an accusative marked DP discourse-linked, Üntak-Tarhan adopts the model offered in Birner and Ward (2001, 2004) where an item is assumed to be linked to previously evoked information via a partially ordered set, i.e., a poset. Under this view, items can be discourse-linked when they exhibit a range of relations such as type/subtype, part/whole, set/subset, entity/attribute and identity. In what follows, I attempt to first lay out how Üntak-Tarhan thinks items are discourse-linked and on the basis of her examples I will show how such a view of discourse-linking, falls short of providing an exhaustive account of the issue. Consider (41) where Üntak-Tarhan (2006) argues that the indefinite *kahve* 'coffee' in Speaker B's reply is discourse-linked due to being a member of the set of {hot drinks} of which *çay* 'tea' in Speaker A's question is also a member.<sup>37</sup>

- (41) A: Çay-ımız var mı? (Üntak-Tarhan's (43) p. 109)  
tea-POSS cop q-particle  
'Have you got tea?'
- B: Maalesef hayır. Ama *kahve* ver-ebil-ir-im.  
unfortunately no but coffee give-ABİL-AOR-1sg  
'Unfortunately no. But I can offer coffee.'

If being a member of the same set can give rise to discourse-linking and trigger deaccentuation, one expects not to encounter examples whereby 'member of the same set' relation is evoked and the indefinite is stressed. Nonetheless, there is evidence to the contrary. In (42), for instance, for a felicitous reading *kahve* 'coffee' in Interlocutor B's reply has to be accented though it is linked to discourse through the antecedent *çay* 'tea', another type of hot drink. Furthermore unlike (41) which, provided the context, is felicitous both with an accented and an unaccented indefinite object, (42) is only felicitous with an accented object.

- (42) A: Çay iç-er mi-siniz?  
tea drink-AOR Q-2pl  
'Would you like to drink tea?'
- B: Hayır, teşekkürler! Biraz önce **kahve** iç-ti-m.  
no thanks while ago coffee drink-PAST-1sg  
'No, thanks! I have had coffee a while ago.'
- B: # Hayır, teşekkürler! Biraz önce kahve **içtim**.

<sup>37</sup> In Üntak-Tarhan's examples items that stand in a linking relation are indicated in italic.

Though Üntak-Tarhan (2006) does not comment on the stress bearing properties of (41), I presume that she would treat the indefinite as unaccented due to the discourse-linking relation that she believes to be at work. One can, however, easily construe a context which requires the indefinite *kahve* ‘coffee’ to be stressed in (41). In particular, if B assumes or believes that A’s question has the proposition P: ‘Do you have tea or any other hot drink?’, being a cooperative speaker/addressee, in his answer he may feel obliged to provide information about what he has and what he does not. Thus the proposition of B’s utterance is in fact P: *I don’t have tea but I have coffee*. This contrast is in fact what renders the indefinite *kahve* ‘coffee’ accented. With an unaccented indefinite in (41), however, what B intends his addressee to recognize is that he regrets the fact that they have run out of tea, hence will not be able to serve it. Furthermore, that inability is contrasted with his ability to serve other types of hot drinks. It is due to this implicit contrast, which is in fact what B intends his addressee to recognize that the verb is accented. To put it in simple terms, B’s utterance has the proposition *I cannot serve tea but I can serve coffee*.

To bear on the question of what renders the indefinite in Interlocutor B’s reply accented in (42), a similar strategy can be pursued whereby both the propositions of A’s question and B’s reply are examined. In particular, in this instance what appears to attract stress on the object *kahve* ‘coffee’ is in fact the proposition presupposed by the elided part of B’s reply. I argue that B’s utterance has the proposition P: *I will not be drinking tea, as I have already consumed coffee*. I postulate that the indefinite object *kahve* ‘coffee’ bears stress due to the presence of *çay* ‘tea’ in the first clause with which it is contrasted. Thus B, turning down A’s offer intends A to recognize that his current state of having consumed another type of hot drink, prevents him from drinking tea.

The examples in (41) and (42) and the ones to be discussed below cast doubt on an analysis which aims to explain discourse-linking via a set of poset relations, disregarding the role presupposition plays. In the ensuing paragraphs I will challenge such a view of discourse-linking and with the background already provided in sections 4.1 and 4.2 will show that what appears to lie at the heart of discourse-linking or discourse-old link is in fact pragmatic presupposition.

As for accusative-marked direct objects, in most of Üntak-Tarhan’s examples, discourse-linking is maintained through identity relation, i.e., coreferential linking where overt mention of the entity is in question as in (43).<sup>38</sup>

- (43) A: Neden yemek ye-mi-yor-uz? (Üntak-Tarhan’s (56a) p. 125)  
 why food eat-neg-prog-1pl  
 ‘Why aren’t we eating food?’
- B: Çünkü Ayşe yemeğ-i yak-mış.  
 because Ayşe food-ACC burn-EVI  
 ‘Because Ayşe burnt the food.’
- B: #Çünkü Ayşe yemeğ-i yak-mış.

I argue that the marginality of B’s reply where stress is on the accusative-marked definite is questionable. In Turkish *yemek yemek* is in fact a bare nominal compound meaning ‘to eat/to have lunch/dinner’. When Interlocutor B considers Interlocutor A’s question as having the proposition P: *Why don’t we have dinner/lunch?* then the accusative-marked definite *yemeğ-i* ‘the food’ has to be accented as it is new to the discourse and hence it attains an inferrable status in that particular context.

Üntak-Tarhan (2006) in illustrating discourse-linking with accusative marked DPs tend to use why-questions requiring the use of because-sentences in which part of the sentence is elided. Even if the linking achieved in (43) can be a case of coreferential linking, in contrast to what Üntak-Tarhan argues, I claim that linking is not necessarily achieved via the presence of the antecedent in the question. A linking can also be obtained via the elided part of the because-sentence. The proposition of B’s utterance in (43) above can in fact be P: *We cannot eat food, because Ayşe burned the food*. Therefore what appears to render the accusative marked DP unaccented is the presence of the antecedent in the elided part of the sentence.

One of the rare examples of discourse-linking exhibited by accusative marked direct objects which is argued not to be a case of coreferential linking, but non-coreferential linking in Üntak-Tarhan’s work is the example discussed in (44).

<sup>38</sup> Accented items in Üntak-Tarhan’s examples are indicated by underlining.



- (44) A: Ankara-ya neden uçak-la git-ti-niz? (Üntak-Tarhan's (56b) p. 125)  
 Ankara-DAT why plane-INST go-PAST-2pl  
 'Why did you go to Ankara by plane?'  
 B: Çünkü Ali araba-yı çarp-mış-tı.  
 because Ali car-ACC crash- PERF-PAST  
 'Because Ali had crashed the car.'  
 B': # Çünkü Ali arabayı çarpmıştı.<sup>39</sup>

Üntak-Tarhan argues that the definite *araba-yı* 'the car' in B's reply is rendered discourse-linked, hence deaccented, due to being in a membership relation with another {transportation vehicle}, i.e., *uçak* 'plane' evoked in the prior discourse. Nonetheless, I illustrate below that this view of non-coreferential discourse-linking is problematic due to the fact that one can easily construct contexts where the definite object is required to be accented though it stands in a linking relation with an antecedent evoked in the prior discourse as the examples in (45) below illustrate. Let us first spell out what renders (44) felicitous in the model proposed here. I argue that B's answer with an unaccented accusative marked object in (44) is felicitous due to two reasons: To start with, B assumes that A's question has the pragmatic presupposition: *Why did not you go to Ankara by car, as for instance you usually do?* Such a proposition automatically renders the accusative marked entity shared hence puts it in the commonground. Interlocutor B, deaccenting the accusative-marked definite intends to convey that he has recognized what the proposition of A's utterance is. What is more, one can further this line of thinking and argue that even B's utterance can be considered as being part of an elided sentence, the proposition of which is P: *In fact, we were going to go to Ankara by car as you imply, but we could not because Ali crashed the car.* Thus the definite can be argued to undergo deaccentuation due to the fact that it can be considered to have been evoked in the proposition of the elided sentence.

Finally consider the exchange in (45) as one last example to challenge the view that discourse-linking is achieved via poset relations as proposed by Birner and Ward and implemented by Üntak-Tarhan.

- (45) A: Ankara'ya neden uçak-la git-ti-niz?  
 Ankara-DAT why plane-INST go-PAST-2pl  
 'Why did you go to Ankara by plane?'  
 B: Çünkü **tren-i** kaçır-dı-k.  
 because Ali car-ACC miss-PAST-1pl  
 'Because we missed the train.'  
 C: Ben aslında **treni** tercih ed-er-dim ama Ali **uçag-ı** seç-ti.  
 I in fact train-ACC prefer-AOR-PAST-1sg but Ali plane-ACC choose-PAST  
 'In fact, I would prefer the train but Ali chose the plane.'

<sup>39</sup> The choice of the tense morpheme *-mıştı* 'had Verb-ed' in B's reply in (44) also suggests that B has already recognized what A implies. This proposition evoked in the context of (44), however, does not appear to be at work when the tense of the sentence is made simple past rather than past perfect as in the examples in (i) below. Apparently, this simple modification in tense changes the propositions presupposed by the sentence and requires the definite to be accented. The use of simple past in the examples below suggests that the proposition evoked is not *Why did not you go to Ankara by car/by train?* but may simply be *Why did you fly to Ankara?* without implying the reason as to why the interlocutors B and C did not take the car or ride on the train, respectively.

- (i) B: Çünkü Ali **araba-yı** çarp-tı.  
 because Ali car-ACC crash-PAST.3sg  
 'Because Ali crashed the car.'  
 # Çünkü Ali arabayı **çarptı**.  
 C: Çünkü **tren-i** kaçır-dı-k.  
 because train-ACC miss-PAST-1pl  
 'Because we missed the train.'  
 # Çünkü tren-i **kaçırdık**.

An anonymous referee also suggests that in addition to the presuppositional differences that stem from the use of simple past vs. past perfect, the fact that when attached the past perfect morpheme, the verb becomes a complex form consisting of a participle (the perfect) and an inflected copula may force accent placement on the participle as proposed in Kornfilt (1996, 1997). In the case of the simple past, however, the absence of a copula may force phrasal stress to be placed on the first part of the VP, i.e., the direct object.

The question raised in (44) is answered in (45) in two different ways. I propose that the interlocutor B assumes that the proposition presupposed by A's utterance is P: *I did not know that you were going to Ankara by plane. What happened?* It is this proposition presupposed, I believe, is what renders the accusative marked definite accented. The implicit *what happened* question triggers a context set and further requires the set to be reduced with one. Recall that in the event a context set is evoked the reduction of the set with a singleton demands accent on the accusative marked definite, rendering (45B) felicitous.<sup>40</sup> As for the utterance of Interlocutor C, however, I assume that the proposition presupposed is P: *Why did you prefer to fly to Ankara? Why did not you prefer a vehicle other than a plane?* Though any transportation vehicle mentioned in B's reply would be considered discourse-linked in Üntak-Tarhan's account, yielding deaccentuation, felicity is only possible with accented definite objects, a fact that runs counter to the claims made in Üntak-Tarhan (2006). The proposition presupposed in C's reply appears to be P: *We went to Ankara by plane but in fact I would have preferred the train.* In this instance, in addition to the contrast invoked in the elided part of the sentence, a further contrast is invoked with the but-sentence requiring the vehicle *uçak* 'plane' to be accented as well.

The upshot of all this is that discourse-linking that Üntak-Tarhan (2006) argues to arise, in (44) which is a case of coreferential linking does not arise due to the definite object's being in a certain poset relation with another object introduced earlier.<sup>41</sup> The poset relations Birner and Ward offers and Üntak Tarhan conjectures to operate fall short of accounting for the real nature of the issue at hand. I have postulated rather that all the phenomena about the interaction with focus and discourse status is insightfully explained with the notion pragmatic presupposition which is concerned with shared assumptions and beliefs, i.e., commonground and the flow of discourse on the basis of shared assumptions.

To conclude this section, I have so far argued that the accusative marked definites reveal an interesting array of properties with respect to their stress bearing properties. Any accented definite yields existential presupposition whereby the entity is just presumed to exist without giving rise to the entertainment of commonground built around shared assumptions or beliefs among the interlocutors. In contrast, an unaccented definite immediately gives rise to a view of a commonground which is construed on the basis of shared assumptions and beliefs.

## 5. Concluding remarks

The present paper has sought to contribute to the study of the semantics of the Turkish accusative primarily by introducing a new semantic effect induced by the Turkish accusative. A crucial observation laid out in the paper has been that an accusative object serving as the argument of verbs of motion, incremental theme verbs and verbs of location yields a delimited reading. As laid out in the paper the semantic properties such as partitivity or definiteness which the Turkish accusative is argued to give rise to in previous work do not appear to be inherent meaning components of the Turkish accusative as the same semantic effects can be obtained with other case morphemes in Turkish. Nonetheless the delimited reading stemming from the presence of an accusative definite appears to be a more integral part of the accusative. This delimited reading has been further observed to arise when the accusative marked definite is unaccented suggesting that the surface semantic effects stemming from the presence of the accusative marked objects are closely related to interactions between prosodic structure and information structure. With the key

<sup>40</sup> (45B) and further instances where some unintended event has taken place, such as 'We missed the train', 'Ali crashed the car' (as suggested in ft. 34) or the Turkish counterpart of the sentence 'We had our car stolen' *Arabamız-ı çaldırdık*, etc., all require the accusative marked definite to be accented rather than the verb unlike what English facts reveal where accent appears to be on the verb. Due to space limitations, I will not be able to analyze the issue here, nonetheless I suggest that Turkish focus facts correlate with intentionality as also revealed with the examples in (i) below. I hope to elaborate on this insight in future work.

(i) A: Ne oldu?  
 'What happened?'  
 B. **Bina** yık-ıl-dı.  
 building demolish-REF-PAST.3sg  
 'The building collapsed. (unintended)  
 B'. **Bina** yık-ıl-dı.  
 building demolish-PASS-PAST.3sg  
 'The building was demolished.' (intended)

<sup>41</sup> Üntak-Tarhan (2006) correctly points out in a footnote (fn. 43, p. 112) that the linking relation exhibited in (44) can in fact be a case of identity due to a conversational implicature where the meaning of A's question in (44) is understood to be *Why did not you go to Ankara by car?* She, however, considers this as an idiosyncratic case and misses, in my view, what appears to lie at the heart of a discourse-old link.

insights gained by the study of the delimited behavior of accusative marked definites, the intricate interaction that information structure has with prosodic structure in the interpretation of accusative marked definites has been brought to light. Though an accusative marker on an object has been argued to render the object presuppositional in previous work, this study is the first of its kind in proposing that different types of presupposition, i.e., existential and pragmatic presuppositions arise in the interpretation of accusative marked definites. Furthermore equating presuppositionality with a two-dimensional information structure model, I have argued that what renders an entity hearer-inferable and discourse-new is existential presupposition and hearer-old and discourse-old, is pragmatic presupposition. Although some aspects of discourse-linking properties of the accusative marked indefinites have been examined in previous work by Enç (1990) and Kennelly (2003) and that of definites by Üntak-Tarhan (2006), a reexamination of the issue which Enç has referred to as recoverable relation, Kennelly as indirect binding and Üntak-Tarhan as noncoreferential linking has proven deeply instructive whereby I have shown that what lies at the heart of this kind of linking is in fact pragmatic presupposition which requires the evaluation of the propositions presupposed by the QUDs, TUDs and even the elided parts of sentences which constitute the accepted background for discourse participants.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Aslı Göksel for comments on a previous version and Eser Taylan and the two anonymous *Lingua* reviewers for helpful comments on the final version of this paper.

### References

- Asher, N., Lascarides, A., 1998. Questions in dialogue. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21, 237–309.
- Atlas, J.D., 2006. Presupposition. In: Horn, L.R., Ward, G. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishers, pp. 29–52.
- Aygen, G., 1999. Specificity and subject-object positions/scope interactions in Turkish. Paper presented at the First Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Manchester University.
- Aygen, G., 2002. Finiteness, case and clausal structure. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Birner, B., Ward, G., 2001. Discourse and information structure. In: Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., Hamilton, H.E. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 119–137.
- Birner, B., Ward, G., 2004. Information structure and non-canonical syntax. In: Horn, L.R., Ward, G. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 153–174.
- Chafe, W., 1996. Inferring identifiability and accessibility. In: Fretheim, T., Gundel, J.K. (Eds.), *Reference and Referent Accessibility*. John Benjamins, pp. 37–46.
- Clark, H.H., 1978. Inferring what is meant. In: Levelt, W.J.M., Flores diArcais, G.B. (Eds.), *Studies in the perception of language*. Wiley, London, pp. 295–321.
- Diesing, M., 1990. *The Syntactic Roots of Semantic Partition*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Dowty, D.R., 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Enç, M., 1990. The semantics of specificity, ms.
- Enç, M., 1991. The semantics of specificity. *LI* 22, 1–25.
- Erguvanli, E.E., 1984. *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar*. University of California Press.
- Erkü, F., 1983. *Discourse Pragmatics and Word Order in Turkish*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Fraurud, K., 1992. *Processing Noun Phrases in Natural Discourse*. Ph.D. thesis, Department of Linguistics, Stockholm University.
- Fraurud, K., 1996. Cognitive ontology and NP form. In: Fretheim, T., Gundel, J.K. (Eds.), *Reference and Referent Accessibility*. John Benjamins, pp. 65–87.
- Ginzburg, J., 1996. Interrogatives: questions, facts and dialogue. In: Lappin, S. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 385–422.
- Göksel, A., Özsoy, S., 2000. Is there a focus position in Turkish? In: Göksel, A., Kerslake, C. (Eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, Harrassowitz Graphics, pp. 219–228.
- Göksel, A., Özsoy, S., 2003. dA as a focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1143–1167.
- Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., Goldberg, R., 1992. Affectedness and direct objects. In: Levin, B., Pinker, S. (Eds.), *Lexical and Conceptual Semantics*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 153–196.
- Heim, I., 1982. *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- İşsever, S., 2003. Information structure in Turkish: the word order-prosody interface. *Lingua* 113, 1025–1053.
- Keleşir, M., 2001. *Topics in Turkish Syntax: Clausal Structure and Scope*. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT Press, MA.
- Kennelly, S.D., 1994. Caseless existential DPs in Turkish. In: Nash, L., Tsoulas, G. (Eds.), *Paris-8 Working Papers in Linguistics*, p. 158.
- Kennelly, S.D., 1997. Presentational focus position in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları, Kebikeç Yayınları*. Ankara, pp. 58–75.
- Kennelly, S.D., 2003. The implications of quantification for the role of focus in discourse structure. *Lingua* 113, 1055–1088.
- Kılıçaslan, Y., 2006. A situation-theoretic approach to case marking semantics in Turkish. *Lingua* 116, 112–144.

- Kornfilt, J., 1996. On copular clitic forms in Turkish. In: Alexiadou, A., Fuhrhop, N., Law, P., Löhken, S. (Eds.), *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, #6. ZAS, Berlin, pp. 96–114.
- Kornfilt, J., 1997. *Turkish*. Routledge, London.
- Kornfilt, J., 2008. DOM and two types of DSM in Turkish. In: deHoop, H., deSwart, P. (Eds.), *Differential Subject Marking*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 79–111.
- Kural, M., 1992. Properties of scrambling in Turkish, ms. UCLA.
- Kural, M., 1997. Ölçüm öbekleri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları, Kebikeç Yayınları*, Ankara, pp. 52–57.
- Lewis, D., 1979. Scorekeeping in a language game. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 8, 339–359.
- Mann, W., Thompson, S., 1986. Relational propositions in discourse. *Discourse Processes* 9, 57–90.
- Milsark, G., 1974. *Existential Sentences in English*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Nakipoğlu, M., 1998. Split Intransitivity and the Syntax-Semantics Interface in Turkish. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Nakipoğlu, M., 2000. On the aspectual properties of unaccusatives. In: Göksel, A., Kerslake, C. (Eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages: Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Harrassowitz Graphics*, pp. 67–74.
- Prince, E.F., 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In: Cole, P. (Ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 223–256.
- Prince, E.F., 1992. The ZPG letter: subjects, definiteness, and information-status. In: Thompson, S.A., Mann, W.C. (Eds.), *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fundraising Text*. Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 295–325.
- Roberts, C., 1996. Information structure: Towards an integrated theory of formal pragmatics. *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 49, pp. 91–136.
- Roberts, C., 2004. Uniqueness in definite noun phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26 (3), 287–350.
- Roberts, C., 2006. Context in dynamic interpretation. In: Horn, L.R., Ward, G. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishers, pp. 197–220.
- Simons, M., 2003. Presupposition and accommodation: understanding the Stalnakerian picture. *Philosophical Studies* 112, 251–278.
- Stalnaker, R., 1972. Pragmatics. In: Davison, D., Harman, G. (Eds.), *Semantics of the Natural Language*. Reidel, Dordrecht, pp. 389–408.
- Stalnaker, R., 1973. Presuppositions. *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 2, 447–457.
- Stalnaker, R., 1974. Pragmatic presuppositions. In: Munitz, M.K., Unger, P.K. (Eds.), *Semantics and Philosophy*. New York University, New York, pp. 197–214.
- Stalnaker, R., 1978. Assertion. In: Cole, P. (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 9: *Pragmatics*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 315–322.
- Stalnaker, R., 2002. Commonground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25 (5–6), 701–721.
- Taylan, E., Zimmer, K., 1994. Case Marking in Turkish Indefinite Object Constructions. In: *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistic Society*, pp. 547–552.
- Tenny, C., 1994. *Aspectual Role and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Üntak-Tarhan, A., 2006. Topics in Syntax-Phonology Interface in Turkish: Sentential Stress and Phases. Unpublished MA thesis, Boğaziçi University.
- von Stechow, K., & Kornfilt, J., 2005. The case of the direct object in Turkish: semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 3–44.
- Yavaş, F., 1982. The Turkish aorist. *Glossa* 16 (1), 40–53.