

Nonspecific External Arguments in Turkish

Sarah D. Kennelly*
Rutgers University

I. Introduction

The proposal that nonspecific arguments obligatorily remain within VP has long been a topic of discussion (Enç 1991; Diesing 1992 among others). In Turkish I propose that the constraint is even stronger: nonspecific arguments are contained in VP (Kennelly to appear) as an internal argument¹, never as an external argument in a Specifier position. Hence they are never subjects. By means of a study of Turkish Relative Clauses (RCs) it will be shown that nonspecific logical subjects of Unaccusatives (including Existentials and Passives) remain as internal arguments with Weak Case. This analysis then predicts that Transitive and Unergative verbs in Turkish will never have a nonspecific subject because they are base generated as external arguments in Spec,VP. In Section II the problematic data is introduced and the analysis proposed. The asymmetry of RCs is presented in Section III, which is then applied to the data in Section IV. When the internal argument of an Unaccusative verb is nonspecific, it must remain contained within VP and verb adjacent. Therefore, to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle (Chomsky 1991) which states that all sentences must have a subject, the Locative occurs as the external argument under Locative Inversion. Section V discusses presuppositional subjects and Section VI summarizes the issues.

Some DPs presuppose the existence of a set of individuals while others assert the existence of a set of individuals, and the two are incompatible (Stalnaker 1978:284; Enç 1991:14). In her study of specificity Enç (1991:7) popularized that term, equating it with Pesetsky's (1987) Discourse-linking (D-linking), while Diesing (1992:80) has equated specificity with presuppositionality. In this paper I refer to specificity or presupposition of a DP with the meaning that the set denoted by NP (previously referred to as N') is not empty. Thus a specific or presuppositional DP implies the partitive, e.g. one/two/some/all/each of the NP.² In contrast, a

* This paper was written during the Fall of 1992 at MIT, and subsequently presented at the Tercer Coloquio de Gramática Generativa, Madrid, in April, 1993 and then again at Université Paris 8, in May 1993. Thanks to L. Bayer, P. Csur, C. Dobrovie-Sorin, S. Firat, R. Kayne, S. Kurmuş, H. Lasnik, M.R. Manzini, D. Pesetsky, P. Tanır, E. Sezer, R. Stalnaker, W.

¹ Data using the distinctions in truth conditions between sentences that have the Turkish equivalents of 'fish-catching' *balık tutmak* and 'catching a fish' *bir balık tutmak* show that the nonspecific object is not an incorporated argument when it is a DP. (see Kennelly to appear)

² This directly contradicts Belletti's (1988) and Lasnik's (1992:398) use of the term partitive as nonspecific. De Hoop (1992: 62-65) demonstrates that the partitive is independent of $[\pm \text{def}]$, confirming that Belletti's use of partitive in terms of $\pm \text{definite}$ cannot be maintained.

nonspecific or existential DP (Keenan 1987) asserts the existence of the individuals denoted by the NP.³

II. The Problem

In Turkish all arguments are morphologically marked for Case except the Nominative, a zero morpheme 'Ø', and the nonspecific object (NODP), which has Weak Case (de Hoop 1992); the specific object has an Accusative marker. There is no morphological difference for a \pm presuppositional subject as there is for the object. Turkish is a scrambling language (Kural 1992) whereby the Nominative argument may occur in any position in the sentence.

- (1) a. Doktor-Ø genç bir hastayı tedavi etti.
 doctor-Nom young a patient-Acc cared.for
 'The doctor cared for a (+Specific) young patient.'
- b. Genç bir hastayı doktor-Ø tedavi etti.

There is a one-to-one mapping between the discourse function interface and the linear position in Turkish, with the immediately preverbal position reserved for Focus (Erkü 1982) or 'new information', i.e. nonpresuppositional arguments. Thus the NODP, in sharp contrast with the Nominative, only appears immediately preverbally in the written language due to its discourse function⁴, i.e. it is dependent on the linear position for its interpretation.

- (2) a. Doktor-Ø genç bir hasta tedavi etti.
 doctor-Nom young a patient-Weak cared.for
 'The doctor cared for a (-Specific) young patient.'
- b. *Genç bir hasta doktor-Ø tedavi etti.

In (1) the Nominative subject may occur in either argument position while in (2) the NODP is constrained to the preverbal position. However the morphology and word order of the Nominative in (1b) is identical to that of the NODP in (2a). That is, there is no discernible difference between a Nominative DP in Spec,VP/Spec,AgrP⁵ and a NODP when they occur in the immediately preverbal

³ Keenan (1987:291) defines an existential determiner as a function f from properties to sets of properties such that for all properties p, q : $p \in f(q)$ iff $1 \in f(q \dot{\vee} p)$.

⁴ In conversational Turkish, the NODP may occur postverbally (Göksel 1995) iff it is a DP (see Kennelly to appear for a discussion). This is evidence to rule out Case licensing as the motivation for the constraint on the position of the NODP.

⁵ Pollock's (1989) proposal of a blown up INFL is adopted here, as is Belletti's (1990) proposal of an AspP. Distinct scope construals for a \pm quantified subject with respect to a NODP indicate that the subject in Turkish may occur in either Spec,VP (nonquantificational) or Spec,AgrP (quantificational). See Kennelly (to appear) for the data.

position in a matrix clause.⁶

Embedded clauses take the form of nominalized propositions and the embedded subject takes the Genitive marker. Strangely, the Genitive is absent from the nonspecific subject of embedded Unaccusatives, Existentials, and Passives, as long as the subject remains in the immediately preverbal Focus position.

Embedded Unaccusative:

- (3) Deniz [bostana danalar girdiđin]i söyledi.
 garden-Dat calves having.entered-Acc said
 'Deniz said that there were calves entering the garden.'
 *'Deniz said that the calves had entered/were entering the garden.'⁷

Embedded Existential:

- (4) Deniz [bostanda danalar olduđun]u söyledi.
 garden-Loc calves having.been-Acc said
 'Deniz said that there are/were calves in the garden.'
 *'Deniz said that the calves were in the garden.'

Embedded Passive:

- (5) Deniz [hastanede kan verildiđin]i söyledi.
 hospital-Loc blood having.been.given-Acc said
 'Deniz said that there was blood given at the hospital.'
 *'Deniz said that the blood was given at the hospital.'

If the subject occurs elsewhere, the Genitive marker is obligatory and the DP has a specific interpretation.

Unaccusative:

- (6) Deniz [danalar*(-ın) bostana girdiđin]i söyledi.⁸
 calves-Gen garden-Dat having.entered-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there were) the calves had entered/were entering the garden.'

Existential:

- (7) Deniz [danalar*(-ın) bostanda olduđun]u söyledi.
 calves-Gen garden-Loc having.been-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there were) the calves are/were in the garden.'

6 In Dutch the existential object may not undergo scrambling but remains in its pre-verbal 'D-structure' position, though a PP may occur between the argument and the verb (Reuland 1988; de Hoop 1992:80).

7 This is contrary to what occurs in Dutch where an existential DP may not occur in the subject position of an unaccusative verb (Reuland 1988:375).

8 Even when the subject is 3 p. plural, the agreement on the verb is normally 3 p. singular.

Passive:

- (8) Deniz [kan*(-**m**) hastanede verildiğ*in*]i söyledi.
 blood-Gen hospital-Loc having.been.given-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there was) the blood was given at the hospital.'

The Genitive marker is also grammatical on the subject in (3)/(4)/(5) when it occurs immediately preverbally; however then the subject loses its nonspecific interpretation that is available only in the Focus position.

Unaccusative:

- (9) Deniz [bostana danalar-**m** girdiğ*in*]i söyledi.
 garden-Dat calves-Gen having.entered-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there were) the calves had entered/were entering the garden.'

Existential:

- (10) Deniz [bostanda danalar-**m** olduğ*un*]u söyledi.
 garden-Loc calves-Gen having.been-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there were) the calves are/were in the garden.'

Passive:

- (11) Deniz [hastanede kanlar-**m** verildiğ*in*]i söyledi.
 hospital-Loc blood-Gen having.been.given-Acc said
 'Deniz said that (*there was) the blood was given at the hospital.'

In order to retain the nonspecific interpretation the embedded subject must morphologically resemble and position-wise behave exactly as a NODP. Furthermore, the subjects of embedded Transitive and Uncergative verbs obligatorily take the Genitive marker, whatever their position.

Embedded Transitives:

- (12) Deniz [kitabevinde kitabı bir adam*(-**m**) seçtiğ*in*]i söyledi.
 bookshop-Loc book-Acc a man-Gen having.chosen-Acc said
 'Deniz said that a man [+Spec] chose the book at the bookshop.'

Embedded Unergatives:

- (13) Deniz [bahçede bir çocuđ*(-un) gülümsediđin]i söyledi.⁹
 garden-Loc a child-Gen having.smiled-Acc said
 'Deniz said that a child [+Spec] was smiling/smiled in the garden.'

I propose that the nonspecific subjects in (3)/(4)/(5) are in fact NODPs that are the unique subcategorized argument of the verb, hence the logical subject; however they remain the internal argument, and thus the structural object. The line of investigation that will be pursued makes use of the fact that Turkish has two RC strategies, one for subject relativization and another for nonsubjects (Hankamer and Knecht 1976). If the logical subjects in (3)/(4)/(5) have moved into a Spec position so that they are also the structural subjects, they should relativize using the appropriate strategy, but they do not.

Existentials fall within the larger verbal category of Unaccusatives (including Passives). According to contemporary theories, stemming from the work of Perlmutter (1978) and Burzio (1986), Unaccusative verbs are generated with a unique internal argument. Due to the fact that they lack an external argument it has been proposed by Burzio that they cannot 'assign' Accusative Case and therefore cannot Theta-mark an external argument. To obtain Case the internal argument must undergo movement to the Specifier position where it is marked for Nominative. Within the Minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995), it would have to be proposed that the internal argument of an Unaccusative verb is base-generated with Nominative Case which must then be checked in a Specifier position, Spec,VP under government (Koopman and Sportiche 1991) or Spec, AgrP in a Spec-head relation. (See ft. #5)

III. Relative Clauses

Like Indo-European Armenian (Sigler 1992), Altaic Turkish demonstrates a subject-object asymmetry for RCs. One strategy is used when any non-subject argument is extracted and another when the subject (or any part of it) is (Hankamer & Knecht 1976). The Relative or 'wh' Operator mitigates the two Theta-roles of the coindexed relativized DP or 'head noun' and the empty category which is either base generated in the clause internal argument position or is the trace that results from the movement undergone by the head noun. (See Kennelly (1995; to appear) for arguments for and against a movement analysis of RCs in Turkish.)

The morphology that appears on a subordinate clause is precisely that which appears on a complex DP: the Genitive marker appears on the 'possessor' subject while the Possessive morpheme appears on the noun or [verb+aspect]. Since both

⁹ Among my informants I found a variation in the verbs that require the genitive marker on the embedded subject, but there was always a group of classical Unergative verbs that maintained the pattern seen in (13) for all informants.

the Genitive and the Possessive have *f* features which agree with the subject in number and person, I have labelled the Possessive AgrN. There is no gender in Turkish.

- (14) Ali [_{DP} adamj-in; [_{AspP} [_{VP} t_j kitabı seç-]-tiğ-]-in; -]i söyledi.
 man-Gen3s book-Acc choose-ASP-AgrN3S-Acc said
 'Ali said that the man (had) chose(n) choose the book.'
 (lit:Ali [the man's the book chosen-his] said.)

In view of the fact that the possessive is one of the two non-quantificational determiners (Larson 1991), it qualifies as D° (Keenan and Stavi 1986), supporting the application of the DP hypothesis to Turkish subordination (Kennelly 1990; 1993; 1994).¹⁰ A Case marker always occurs immediately after AgrN on a subordinate clause, providing further evidence for the nominalization analysis. The subordinate INFL is the aspectual marker *-DIK-*, with morphophonemic variations such as *-tiğ-*.¹¹ It indicates all temporal reference that is not future, and is found in complementary distribution with the future morpheme *-EcEK-*. These two morphemes have been analyzed as aspectual (Kennelly 1993), following Higginbotham (1992) who claims that tense and nominalizations are contradictory. The subject + Genitive marker is checked off in Spec,DP while the possessive, AgrN, equals D° . In an embedded clause, DP dominates IP (here AspP) which in turn dominates VP. Thus there is only an AgrP in matrix clauses, replaced by DP in embedded constructions.

The RC strategy that patterns with the subordinate structure is that used for object relativization. If the head noun is **other** than the subject of the RC the strategy seen in (15) is used. The head noun appears to the right in a clause final position, where it takes whatever Case marker is required by the matrix verb. This strategy for RCs is referred to as the Object Participle (OP) strategy (Underhill 1972), and the aspectual morpheme is glossed as OP. The form parallel to this RC strategy in English and Romance is the past participle, 'chosen', *scelto* in Italian, which also always refers to the object.

¹⁰ See Kennelly (1995) for a semantic analysis of the DP hypothesis as applied to a proposition in Turkish, which draws on Kayne's (1993) analysis of past participles in English and Romance as DPs.

¹¹ In the base form of a Turkish morpheme, as is common in the literature, letters subject to rules of vowel harmony and de-voicing are indicated with capitals.

- (15) Deniz [_{DP} [_{XP} Op_i [_{DP} adam'ın [_{AspP} [_{VP} e_i seç]-tiğ/eceğ-]-i]] kitab_i]-ı gördü.
 man-Gen3 choose-OP-AgrN3 book-Acc saw
 'Deniz saw the book that the man had chosen/would choose.'
 'Deniz saw the man's chosen book.' = the English participle equivalent
 (lit: Deniz the [man's having chosen-his/will have chosen(?)-his] book
 aw.)

A different strategy is used when the head noun is the subject of the RC, or any part of it. As usual, the head noun appears to the right of the clause. The aspectual marker found on the verb is *-En* for the non-future, *-EcEK* for the future, and *-mİş* for the 'evidential'. There is no AgrN on this strategy (Sezer 1991), which I have interpreted as an indication that there is no subordinating DP dominated by the Operator's XP. This strategy is referred to as the Subject Participle (SP) strategy, and the aspectual morpheme is glossed SP. It can be translated by the English or Romance present participle, 'choosing', which is also subject sensitive, or by the English verbal noun made with the *-er* suffix, 'singer', which is translated by the present participle in Italian *cantante*.

- (16) Deniz [_{DP} [_{XP} Op_i [_{AspP} [_{VP} e_i kitab_i seç]-en/ecek/miş]] adam_i]-ı gördü.
 book-Acc choose-SP man-Acc saw
 'Deniz saw the man who chooses/would choose/had chosen the book.'
 'Deniz saw the book choosing man.' = the English participle equivalent
 (lit: Deniz saw the [book chooser/will chooser/had chooser] man.)

If we assume that the external object is generated in Spec,VP, then that is the position of the empty category in a structure like (16). There is no DP level where the external argument can have the Genitive Case checked off, and there are no *f* features for AgrN to realize. Thus there is no D°, and no evidence for a DP category. I have posited an XP to host the Relative Operator which mediates the two Theta roles of the co-indexed empty category and head noun for both strategies.

We can thus understand if an argument is the external argument, i.e. the structural subject, since the SP strategy must be used when it is relativized. This is the test that will be used to ascertain if the logical subject in the form of an existential argument is in fact the structural subject of Unaccusatives, or if there is some other argument that undergoes movement to the Specifier subject position. If there is another argument that fills this position, the next step is to ask what the driving force behind such movement might be.

IV. Locative Subjects

For existential sentences Sezer (1991) has posited an expletive *pro* in Spec,AgrP.

Then at LF the VP contained existential DP would obligatorily raise to the expletive *pro* in Spec,AgrP to provide the *f* features for the verb to agree with (Chomsky 1986). However, if that were the case we would expect a wide scope reading of the existential 'subject' under its LF interpretation over other arguments. This is not the case:

- (17) Her bostanda bir dana var.
 every garden-Loc a cow there was
 'There was a cow in every garden.'
 (for each garden there was a cow in it)
 *(there was one cow such that it was in each garden)

(17) is a problem not only for Sezer's analysis of Turkish but also for Chomsky's analysis of English. It is difficult to imagine that the existential argument must occur in Spec,AgrP at LF for the interpretation of *f* features and *in situ* for scope construals. That is it must be in two positions within the same interface. I will conclude that it remains contained in VP, in keeping with the scope construals in (17). The alternate proposal (hinted at by Poole (1992)) is that the VP contained DP is in fact the object DP, and that Spec,AgrP is filled by the Locative DP which has undergone 'Locative Inversion' following the analysis put forth by Bresnan and Kanerva (1989; 1994).¹² This hypothesis can be examined by applying the RC strategies considered above. If the Locative DP is in fact the structural subject we would expect the SP strategy to be used when the Locative DP is relativized. If the Locative is an oblique argument we would expect the OP strategy.

Consider the existential sentence (18) and the relativization of the Locative DP:

Existentials:

- (18) Bostanda danalar var.
 garden-Loc calves there are
 'There are calves in the garden.'

(19) **SP Strategy:**

- a. Op_i e_i danalar olan bostan;
 calves bc-SP garden
 'the garden where there are calves'

OP Strategy:

- b. Op_i danalar*(-in) e_i olduđu bostan; ...
 calves-Gen be-OP-AgrN3 garden
 'the garden where the calves are/were'

¹² D.Pestevsky proposed Locative Inversion to account for the data, confirming my previous thinking. This proposal was then passed on to G.Poole in an e-mail discussion of the draft of his work cited here.

In (19a) we see that the Locative DP is relativized using the SP strategy, indicating that it is the structural subject; the existential argument remains unmarked for Case. It cannot be the Nominative since the subject has been extracted. The only other possibility is that it has Weak Case. However, if *danalar* is base generated as the external argument in Spec,VP it has a Genitive marker (to be checked in Spec,DP), forcing the presuppositional interpretation, and the Locative DP is relativized as an oblique argument using the OP strategy in (19b).

Let us attempt at this point to be more precise about what occurs in the process of what is known as 'Locative Inversion'. I propose that the Locative DP is base generated in Spec,VP with Locative (or locational Dative) Case iff an Unaccusative verb has a nonspecific internal argument which, because its discourse function is encoded in its linear position, cannot undergo movement to a Specifier position and become the external argument. Following the claim of de Hoop (1992:128) that in similar structures in Dutch the proposition is about the Location rather than about the existential argument, the Locative argument in (18)/(20)/(22) then raises to Spec, AgrP to have its Case checked as well as to contribute its *f* features for agreement. Consequently we see that the checking system for subjects includes not only the Nominative and Genitive Cases, but also the Locative and locational Dative. When the Locative argument is *pro*, we can say that the existential sentence is a predication of the domain of discourse.¹³ The data are exactly the same for Unaccusatives and Passives (20) - (23)¹⁴:

Unaccusatives:

- (20) Bostana danalar giriyor.
garden-Loc calves are.entering
'There are calves entering the garden.'

SP Strategy:

- (21) a. Op_i c_j danalar giren bostan_i ...
calves enter-SP garden
'the garden calves enter'

¹³ Time expressions do not function as a 'Locative' argument in terms of relativization using the SP strategy. **Adam-Ø gelen gün*. 'The day when a man came.'

¹⁴ It isn't only existential arguments that permit Locative subjects. It is clear that a subcategorized oblique object does not become the subject of the passive form of the verb since the Locative argument is relativized using the SP strategy: *garsonlara kızılan otel* 'the hotel where waiters are gotten angry at'; *adamlardan korkulan sokak* 'the street where men are feared'. Impersonal passives of intransitives always use the SP strategy when the Locative is relativized: *Denizde yüzülmez* 'In.the.sea one.doesn't.swim.' *Yüzülmeyen deniz* 'the sea where one doesn't swim'. The same is true of a few transitive verbs which appear to have undergone noun incorporation: e.g. *bee sting, dog bite*. See Özsoy (1994) for an alternate analysis of unergatives and transitives.

OP Strategy:

- b. Op_i danalar*(-in) e_j girdiği bostan; ...
 calves-Gen enter-OP-AgrN3 garden
 'the garden that the calves are entering/entered'

Passives:

- (22) Hastanede kan verildi.
 hospital-Loc blood was.given
 'There was blood given at the hospital.'

SP Strategy:

- (23) a. Op_i e_j kan verilen hastane;
 blood be.given-SP hospital
 'the hospital where there is blood given'

OP Strategy:

- b. Op_i kan*(-in) e_j verildiği hastane;
 blood-Gen be.given-OP-AgrN3 hospital
 'the hospital where the blood is/was given'

To ascertain if the appearance of the Locative argument in subject position is in reality a phenomenon that permits nonspecific DPs to remain contained within VP and thus maintain their existential interpretation, let us compare the above data with the relativization strategies used for Transitives and Unergatives, which do not accept an existential argument as a logical subject, seen in (12) & (13).

Transitives

- (24) Adam-Ø kitabevinde kitabı seçti.
 man-Nom bookshop-Loc book-Acc chose
 'The man chose the book at the bookshop.'
 *'There was a man who chose the book at the bookshop'

SP Strategy:

- (25) a. *Op_i e_j adam-Ø kitabı seçen kitabevi; ...
 man-Nom book-Acc choose-SP bookshop
 'the bookshop that chooses the book the man'

OP Strategy:

- b. Op_i adam*(-in) e_j kitabı seçtiği kitabevi; ...
 man-Gen book-Acc choose-OP-Agr3 bookshop
 'the bookshop where the man is choosing/chose the book'

The Locative argument may not be relativized 'from' (or with) a transitive verb using the SP strategy in (25a), indicating that it does not occur as the external argument. The conclusion is then it is not generated in Spec,VP in (24) which would permit the logical subject to remain contained in VP and have an existential interpretation. The Locative may only be relativized as an oblique argument using

the OP strategy (25b), whereby the subject has the Genitive marker and a presuppositional interpretation. The data are parallel for Unergatives:

Unergatives:

- (26) Bahçede çocuklar-Ø gülümser.
garden-Loc children-Nom smile
'Children smile in the garden.'

SP Strategy:

- (27) a. *Op_i e_i Çocuklar-Ø gülümsen bahçe_i ...
children smile-SP garden
'the garden where there are children who smile'

OP Strategy:

- b. Op_i Çocuklar*(-ın) e_i gülümsediği bahçe_i ...
children-Gen3 smile-OP-Agr3 garden
'the garden where the children smile(d)'

The Locative DP may only be relativized 'from' (or with) a sentence with an Unergative verb using the OP strategy.

Previously unexplained RC strategies can then be seen to line up precisely in terms of subject-object asymmetry. The Locative DP is the external argument in the event that an existential argument appears as the internal argument of an Unaccusative verb. It does not occur with Transitive or Unergative verbs. So to test for Unaccusativity in Turkish, it is enough to understand if relativization of the Locative DP using the SP strategy is possible with that particular verb or not. If a sentence with an existential DP has no Locative argument, then presumably a *pro* occurs in Spec,AgrP following Sezer (1991), however rather than an expletive *pro* I propose that it is a Locative *pro* following the proposal of Comorovski (1991:92) and Freeze (1992:564).

The Turkish data on existential DPs pose a challenge for the analysis of Unaccusatives which says that the internal object must move into the subject position. An existential argument in Turkish is generated in a VP internal position without morphological Case. If it is the logical subject of an Unaccusative verb it does not undergo movement to Spec,AgrP to check off Nominative Case in a Spec-head relation. If it is the object of a transitive verb it does not undergo movement to a possible Spec,Agr-oP to check off Accusative Case in a Spec-head relation. It remains contained within VP where it is licensed by Weak structural default Case (de Hoop 1992). For Unaccusatives, the Locative (or locational Dative) DP is the structural subject which is generated in the external argument position in Spec,VP

with Locative or Dative Case. In a matrix sentence it then undergoes movement to Spec,AgrP so that its Case may be checked and it may enter an agreement relation with the verb.

So we see the realization of the Extended Projection Principle (Chomsky 1981) which says that every sentence must have a subject, here an external argument. In the absence of an external argument with Unaccusative verbs, and since the existential argument must remain contained within VP to maintain its nonspecific interpretation, the Locative, possibly *pro*, takes on that role by filling the Specifier position.

V. Presuppositional Subjects

The discussion of presupposition of the subject dates from Strawson's observation (1952:VI.III.7) that Aristotle's famous examples of contradiction, similar to (28), and tautology, similar to (29), do not necessarily hold up as such under scrutiny.

- (28) Every student did well and no student did well.
(29) Somebody in this room smokes or somebody in this room doesn't smoke.

(28) is not a contradiction if there are no students and (29) is not a tautology if there is nobody in the room. Thus he concluded that a sentence of the form Q NP VP presupposes a non-empty set of individuals named by the NP.

However (30), (31), & (32) constitute counterexamples to Strawson's proposal:

- (30) 2 UFOs landed in my backyard.
(31) At most 20 local calls from this number were recorded.
(32) No phonologists with psych degrees applied for a job at our office.

Since sentences of the type indicated by these examples do not necessarily presuppose a non-empty set of individuals named by the NP, Strawson's analysis must be incorrect.

Milsark (1974; 1977) noted that some quantifiers can be ambiguous. He classified quantifiers into two groups: *strong* quantifiers such as 'every, all, each, most' which force a presuppositional interpretation and *weak* quantifiers such as 'no, two, some, a, at most, at least' which may have two different interpretations, presuppositional or existential.¹⁵ (30), (31), & (32) are examples of weak quantifiers that permit a non-presuppositional reading. When they occur with a DP in subject position their existential interpretation constitutes a counterexample to Strawson's

¹⁵ 'There is DP' in English may take a strong quantifier if it takes on a 'presentational' or list reading rather than an existential interpretation.

proposal.

The ambiguity of weak quantifiers becomes even more transparent when different predicates are considered with the same DP; some predicates permit an existential interpretation while others do not. Note:

(33) No phonologists with psych degrees are empiricists/available.

A subject DP with a weak quantifier and an individual-level predicate in (33) maintains the Strawsonian presupposition while the same DP with a stage-level predicate in (32) does not. This paper considers the structures within which the stage-level vs. individual-level distinction may apply in Turkish. In a revision of Strawson's analysis Diesing (1992) draws on German and English data to analyze existential DPs as being located within VP, either at Spell-out or at LF. The Turkish data supply striking evidence in support of both Diesing's analysis and of Strawson's original proposal that a subject DP is always presuppositional.

Let's return to the counterexamples to Strawson's (1952) proposal that Q NP VP is always presuppositional. Under the analysis presented here, to obtain the existential interpretation the 'subject' DP in each of these counterexamples should be contained in VP in Turkish while the Locative argument should be in Spec,AgrP and hence a candidate for relativization with the SP strategy. And that is precisely what occurs. In (30) we can use the relativization of the Locative DP as a test for the Unaccusativity of the verb *in-* 'to land/descend'. In (30'b) we see that relativization of the Locative may use the SP strategy, indicating that the existential DP is **not** the subject, but the internal argument of an Unaccusative verb.

(30) 2 UFOs landed in my backyard.

(30') a. Bahçeme [iki UFO] inmiş.
my.garden-Dat two landed
'2 UFOs landed in my backyard.'

Relativization of Locative with SP:

(30') b. Op_i e_j [iki UFO] inen bahçe_j
two land-SP garden
'the garden where 2 UFOs landed'

The second counterexample to Strawson's proposal is a passive sentence (31). In terms of the Turkish data, it is no surprise that it too permits the Locative DP to occur as the external argument. This is demonstrated by the use of the SP strategy when the Locative DP is relativized in (31'b), indicating the presence of an existential argument in a VP contained position.

- (31) At most 20 local calls from this number were recorded.
 (31') a. Bu numaradan [en fazla yirmi tane şehirçi görüşme] kaydoldu.
 from.this.number at.most twenty local calls were recorded
 'At most 20 local calls from this number were recorded.'

Relativization of Locative with SP:

- (31') b. Opı eı [En fazla yirmi tane şehirçi görüşme] kaydolan numara; ...
 at.most twenty local calls were recorded-SP number
 'the number from which at most 20 local calls were recorded'

The other counterexample, (32), is an Unergative verb, so we would expect that in Turkish the subject DP would be presuppositional rather than existential and that the Locative DP could not be relativized with the SP strategy. The data maintain these predictions.

- (32) No phonologists with psych degrees applied for a job at our office.
 (32') a. İş için ofisimize [psikolojiden mezun olan hiç bir fonolog] baş vurmadı.
 work for to.our.office psychology-Abl degree.holding no one phonologist
 [applied-Neg
 'Not one of the phonologists with a psych degree applied for a job at our office.'
 *'There are no phonologists with psych degrees who applied for a job at our office.'

Relativization of Locative with SP:

- b. *Opı İş için eı [psikolojiden mezun olan hiç bir fonolog] baş vurmayan ofis; ...
 work for psychology-Abl degree.holding no one phonologist apply-Neg-SP office
 'The office where no phonologists with psych degrees applied for a job'

Thus the proposed counterexamples (30) & (31) to Strawson's hypothesis are not Ss of the form Q NP VP in Turkish but rather of the form Loc [VP [V' [Q NP] V]] and therefore do not constitute counterexamples to his proposal. The Turkish translation of (32) does not have the existential interpretation that the English sentence has. Thus the Turkish data overwhelmingly support Strawson's proposal that subjects are in fact presuppositional as well as Diesing's (1992) proposal that existential arguments are VP internal.

VI. Conclusions

But why can't a VP contained existential argument function as the subject in Turkish? Why must there be an external argument in Spec,VP/Spec,AgrP? The following tentative explanation could be proposed. If all Case marking is specific in Turkish, and we know that all subordinate sentences are Case marked then they are [+Spec]. If one assumes that the specificity of a sentence depends on the specificity

of the subject (Csuri, p.c.), then it follows that the subject of all subordinate clauses must also be [+Spec]. Erguvanlı-Taylan (p.c.) has proposed that Turkish is an aspectual language in the matrix as well as in the subordinate clause.¹⁶ If this assessment of Turkish is correct, then the matrix clause also lacks the temporal element that Enç (1987) considers the point of reference or anchor for a proposition. The matrix clause has no clausal determiner AgrN, nor Case marking to give it its referentiality. I propose that in a language without tense some other strategy must be employed to anchor the proposition. In Turkish this anchor is supplied by the specificity of the matrix subject which is thus a requirement for the sentence to be interpreted. Since specificity renders an expression referential, then the fact that an argument in Spec,VP/Spec,AgrP is obligatorily presuppositional is only natural for a language lacking tense. Thus, in aspectual languages of the same type as Turkish, only structures which permit a logical subject DP contained in VP may have an existential 'subject' together with a Locative DP (possibly *pro*) which has moved into Spec,AgrP.

The analysis presented here which seeks to demonstrate the importance of presuppositionality (D-linking) in an aspectual language is in keeping with Tsai's (1992) statement that Chinese, another aspectual language, is a "D-linked oriented language". He bases this conclusion on the fact that *wh*-Operators in Chinese, a *wh* 'in situ' language, may be licensed by D-linking. How far this parallel can be drawn to Turkish awaits further research. However Turkish also seems to rely on D-linking or presuppositionality as a licensing factor in a way that English and Romance do not.

So what then is the striking difference between English and Turkish? As was seen in (32), the strategies for altering the set of presupposed beliefs shared by the speaker and the listener are different in the two languages. In English it is possible to state: *I believe a Republican will win the election*, thereby asserting the existence of a Republican by that statement. In other words the English sentence may have either the interpretation *I believe one of the Republicans will win the election* or *I believe there is a Republican who will win the election*, thus asserting the existence of a Republican. However this assertive capacity does not exist in the parallel Turkish sentence. Using the normal subordination strategy, a Turkish speaker may not make the same assertion and thus may not affect the set of presupposed beliefs as an English speaker may. S/he may only discuss as the subject of a sentence the pre-established sets of individuals in the world of discourse when using a Transitive

16 The analysis of tense on the matrix S is based on the interpretation of the past tense morpheme, *-dı*. However this morpheme can also appear immediately affixed to a DP *Kadın-ıdı* lit. 'Woman-was'. Since *[tense+nominal] (Higgenbotham 1992) *-(ı)dı* cannot be tense. It has been argued that a proposition without a tense morpheme can still demonstrate tense effects in some Creole languages. However this is not the case for Turkish since all propositions, including RCs, are transparent, supporting the proposal that there is no tense argument.

or Unergative verb as seen in (34).

(34) a. [Bir cumhuriyetci*(nin) seçimi kazanacağını]ı sanıyorum.
one/a Republican-Gen election-Acc will.win-Acc I.believe
'I believe a Republican (i.e. one of the Republicans) will win the election.'

*I believe there is a Republican who will win the election.'

b. [Seçimi bir cumhuriyetci*(nin) kazanacağını]ı sanıyorum.
election-Acc one/a Republican-Gen will.win-Acc I.believe
'I believe a Republican (i.e. one of the Republicans) will win the election.'

*I believe there is a Republican who will win the election.'

The immediately preverbal position is where new information is presented, i.e. the Focus position. It makes sense then that it is a VP contained position that is used to introduce a new element into the world of discourse.

References:

- Belletti, A. (1988). "The Case of Unaccusatives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(1): 1-34.
- , (1990). *Generalized Verb Movement - Aspects of Verb Syntax*. Torino, Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Bresnan, J. (1994). "Locative Inversion and the Architecture of Universal Grammar." *Language* 70(1): 72-131.
- Bresnan, J. and J. M. Kanerva (1989). "Locative Inversion in Chichewa." *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(1): 1-50.
- Burzio, L. (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht, Reidel.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding - The Pisa Lectures*. Dordrecht, Foris.
- , (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- , (1989). "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation." In I. Laka and A. Mahajan, ed., *Functional Heads and Clause Structure*. Cambridge, MIT.
- , (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- Comorovski, I. (1991). *Partitives and the Definiteness Effect*. West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 10, Arizona State University, Tempe, Stanford Linguistics Association.
- de Hoop, H. (1992). *Case Configuration and Noun Phrase Interpretation*, Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Groningen.
- Diesing, M. (1992). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- Enç, M. (1987). "Anchoring Conditions for Tense." *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(4): 633-

- , (1991). "Specificity." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(1): 1-25.
- Erkü, F. (1982). Topic, Comment and Word Order in Turkish. *Minnesota Papers in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language*. 8: 30-38.
- Freeze, R. (1992). "Existentials and Other Locatives." *Language* 68(3): 553-595.
- Göksel, A. (1995). Linearity, Focus and the Postverbal Position in Turkish, Ms. SOAS, University of London.
- Hankamer, J. and L. Knecht (1976). *The Role of the Subject/Non-Subject Distinction in Determining the Choice of Relative Clause Participle in Turkish*. North East Linguistic Society, McGill University.
- Heim, I. and A. Kratzer (1992). *Introduction to Semantics*. Class Notes, Cambridge, MIT.
- Higginbotham, J. (1992). Class Notes, Fall, MIT.
- Kayne, R. S. (1993). "Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection." *Studia Linguistica*.
- Keenan, E. L. (1987). A Semantic Definition of "Indefinite NP". *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. in Reuland, E. J. and A. G. B. ter Meulen (eds). Cambridge, MIT Press: 286-317.
- , and J. Stavi (1986). "A Semantic Characterization of Natural Language Determiners." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9: 253-326.
- Kennelly, S. D. (1990). *Theta Government in Turkish*. talk presented at the GLOW Workshop, SOAS London.
- , (1993). *Turkish Subordination: [-Tense, -CP, +Case]*. Proceedings of the VIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Eskisehir, Turkey.
- , (1994). "Theta Government in Turkish: Effects on IP Dominated by DP." *Dilbilim Yazilari* 3.
- , (1995a). *The Syntax of Clausal Determiners: Subject/Object Asymmetry in Participles*. XX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Padova, Italy, Unipress.
- , (to appear). The Syntax of the P-Focus Position in Turkish. in Rebuschi, G. and L. Tuller (eds.), *Focus*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1991). "The Position of Subjects." *Lingua* 85: 211-258.
- Kural, M. (1992). Properties of Scrambling in Turkish, Ms. UCLA.
- Larson, R. (1991). Class Notes, LSA Summer Institute, UCSC.
- Lasnik, H. (1992). "Case and Expletives: Notes Toward a Parametric Account." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 23(3): 381-405.
- Milsark, G. L. (1974). Existential Sentences in English, Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT.
- , (1977). "Toward an Explanation of Certain Peculiarities of the Existential Construction in English." *Linguistic Analysis* 3(1): 29.

- Özsoy, A. S. (1994). "Locative Inversion and Turkish Relativization". Paper presented at the VIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Mainz University.
- Perlmutter, D. M. (1978). *Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis*. BLS.
- Pesetsky, D. (1987). "Wh-in-Situ: Movement and Unselective Binding." In E. J. Reuland and A. G. B. ter Meulen, ed., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. Cambridge, MIT Press. 98-129.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989). "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP." *Linguistic Inquiry*. 20(3): 365-424.
- Poole, G. (1992). Agreement in Turkish Relative Clauses, Ms. Harvard University.
- Reuland, E. (1988). *Indefinite Subjects*. NELS.
- Sezer, E. (1991). Issues in Turkish Syntax, Ph.D. Dissertation. Harvard University.
- Sigler, M. (1992). Possessive Relatives - Armenian. talk presented at MIT.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1978). Assertion. *Pragmatics*. S. Davis, Oxford University Press: 278-289.
- Strawson, P. F. (1952). *Introduction to Logical Theory*. London, Methuen.
- Tsai, W.-t. D. (1992). *On the Absence of Island Effects*. Ms. MIT.
- Underhill, R. (1972). "Turkish Participles." *Linguistic Inquiry* 3(1): 87-99.

Via Campo Rosso 4
52010 Ortignano-Raggiolo, Italy
e-mail: dodd@unisi.it