



BARE AND ACCUSATIVE MARKED DIRECT OBJECTS IN ASPECTUAL COMPOSITION OF TURKISH

Yeşim AKSAN
Mersin Üniversitesi

Özet: Bu çalışma, görünüş kuramlarındaki (Krifka, 1989; Dowty, 1991; Tenny, 1994) savların tersine Türkçede artımlı-konu yüklemelerinin (incremental theme predicates) nesnelere çıplak adöbekleri (bare noun phrases) olduğunda, yüklem-in anlattığı olayın hedefte-bitişli (telic) okunabileceğini; aynı tür yüklemelerin nesnelere durum ekli, sayılabilir adöbekleri olduğunda, yüklem-in anlattığı olayın hem hedefte-bitişli hem de hedefte-bitişsiz (atelic) yorumlanabileceğini göstermektedir. Ayrıca bu yazı, artımlı konu yüklemelerinin hedefte-bitişlilik yorumlarında sadece dilsel araçları kullanmanın yeterli olmadığını, kullanım-bilimsel, bağlam ve dünya bilgisine dayalı açıklamaların görünüş yorumlarındaki yerini de tartışmaktadır.

1. INTRODUCTION

The interaction between the verb and its arguments is the main concern of the compositional theories of aspect (Verkuyl, 1993). Aspectual feature of telicity, which describes terminativity or quantization of internal

temporal contour of an event is determined at the verb phrase level. Under the mereological account of Krifka (1989), telicity includes a mapping between the structure of an argument of a verb and the structure of the event indicated by that verb. In this sense, incremental event predicates (like eat an apple, write a letter, read a book) represent the basic idea of mereological approach successfully. As defined in Dowty (1991) these predicates denote events which involve a homomorphic relationship between their argument denotations and the temporal progress of the event indicated by the incremental theme verbs. In short, the semantic nature of the incremental theme argument has a direct effect on telicity or quantization of the predicate. Telic interpretation originates when the incremental theme argument is quantized as in (1a). Since 'a sandwich' is a singular countable noun which denotes a quantized amount of substance, a termination point for the described event in (1a) can be detected as the point at which all the substance in question is consumed. On the other hand, incremental theme predicates with mass or plural nouns yield atelic interpretation (1b).

- (1) a. Mary ate a sandwich in an hour.
 b. Mary ate sandwiches for half an hour.

However, it has been cross-linguistically attested (for Slavic languages, Filip, 2001; for Mari, Tatevosov, 2002; for Greek, Sioupi, 2002) that aspectual composition does not always obey Krifka's generalization. Turkish is one of these languages. In Turkish, undetermined count singular incremental theme arguments can be interpreted either as transnumeral (indefinite, referential) or incorporated (nondefinite, nonreferential) noun phrases (NPs) depending on the context in which they occur.

This paper primarily analyzes the effect of variable interpretations of the above-mentioned arguments on quantized/cumulative predicate interpretation. In other words, we shall show that incremental theme verbs involving bare countable singular object NPs in Turkish display

aspectual variability. Such verbs have either telic or atelic interpretations. Our study will also illustrate that singular countable accusative marked direct object arguments of incremental theme verbs in Turkish do not guarantee the quantization or telicity of the predicates.

2. THE DATA

Verbs of consumption/creation, performance verbs as the typical members of incremental theme verbs (2) constitute the data of the present paper. Examples of incremental themes are objects that are consumed, created, performed or destroyed over a period of time. Events denoted by these verbs progress gradually toward their completion, and they are assumed to be temporally bounded. For example, when we say John built a house it entails that the house is completely built. The temporal endpoint of these verbs is provided by the nature of the referent of the internal argument, that is, the object. In short, in verb of creation/consumption, and performance verbs theme is involved in determining the extent of the event.

(2) *Incremental Theme Verbs*

(a) Verbs of creation / consumption

bir sandöviç ye- ‘eat a sandwich’

bir bardak bira iç- ‘drink a glass of beer’

eski istasyonu yık- ‘demolish the old station’

bir ev inşaa et- ‘build a house’

bir kitap yaz- ‘write a book’

(b) Performance verbs

bir sonat çal- ‘play a sonata’,

bir şiir çevir- ‘translate a poem’

III. THE PROBLEM

(3) a. Deniz 10 dakikada arkadaş-in-a mektup yazdı. (Telic)
Deniz 10 minute-LOC friend-POSS-DAT letter write-PAST-3sg
'Deniz wrote a letter to her friend in ten minutes.'

b. Deniz 10 dakika boyunca mektup yazdı. (Atelic)
Deniz 10 minute long letter write-PAST-3sg
'Deniz was involved in the activity of letter-writing for ten minutes.'

(4) a. Deniz elma-yı on dakika boyunca yedi (Atelic)
Deniz apple-ACC 10 minute long eat-PAST-3sg
'Deniz ate the apple for ten minutes.'

b. Deniz elma-yı on dakika-da yedi (Telic)
Deniz apple-ACC 10 minute-LOC eat-PAST-3sg
'Deniz ate the apple in ten minutes.'

In sentences (3a) and (3b), we have incremental theme verb with bare object nouns (mektup *yaz-*, 'write letter', 'do letter-writing'). In (4a) and (4b) accusative marked (*elmayı ye-* 'eat the apple') object noun is the argument of incremental theme verb 'eat'.

What is assumed by aspectual composition theories is that bare object nouns yield atelic and the accusative marked—individuated—ones give rise to telic interpretations. However, this is not the case in Turkish. We observe the hybrid behavior of incremental theme verbs through the application of the temporal modification test. Verb of creation (*yaz-* 'write') involving the bare object and verb of consumption (*ye-* 'eat') involving the accusative marked object are compatible with both time span and durative adverbials.

First, we will briefly focus on bare object NPs, particularly their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic behaviors, and their aspectual interpretations in incremental theme verbs.

IV. DIRECT OBJECT MARKING IN TURKISH

Turkish distinguishes the semantic status (definiteness and indefiniteness) of object nouns by means of morphological marking, and also by word order, stress, and discourse pragmatic features[1]. This means that there is no one-to-one correspondence between morphological marking and semantic interpretations of direct object in Turkish. There are 4 occurrences of object NPs:

- (i) The first one is the “absolute indefinite” or “nondefinite” existence of direct object as in *kitap oku-* ‘read book’ ‘do book-reading’. The noun occurs bare without carrying any case marking or number marking. Such use of nouns points out either the class-membership without any number distinction or the reference to a discrete entity.

- (5) Deniz kitap oku-du (Nondefinite)
Deniz book read-PAST-3sg.

‘Deniz read a /one book or books.’

- (ii) Turkish does not have a definite article corresponding to “the” in English. Accusative case assigns definite and specific reading to object noun.

- (6) Deniz kitap-ı oku-du (Definite)
Deniz book-ACC read-PAST-3sg.

‘Deniz read the book.’

- (iii) The numeral *bir* ‘one’ functions as indefinite article when it is not stressed, as in *bir kitap oku-* ‘read a book’.

- (7) Deniz bir kitap oku-du (Indefinite)
Deniz a/one book read-PAST-3sg.

‘Deniz read a / one book.’

- (iv) Indefinite-specific noun phrases, as in *bir kitabı oku-* ‘read a specific book’ is construed by the combination of accusative marked direct object with the indefinite article *bir*. Such NPs express partial or complete familiarity of either the speaker or the subject of the utterance or both with the referent of the NP.

- (7) Deniz bir kitap-ı oku-du (Indefinite Spec)
Deniz a/one book-ACC read-PAST-3sg.
‘Deniz read a (specific) book.’

V. BARE OBJECT NPS IN TURKISH

Bare nouns combine with verbs in Turkish, and this is a very productive process. In terms of semantic relationship between direct object and verb, we can identify two types of object-verb combination. One of them is nonidiomatized noun-verb combinations, in which full literal meanings of the members of the noun-verb compound are preserved, as in (9):

- (9) *mektup yaz-* ‘write a letter / letters’ ‘do letter-writing’
kitap oku- ‘read a book / books’ ‘do book-reading’
elma ye- ‘eat an apple / apples’ ‘do apple-eating’
otel yap- ‘build a hotel / hotels’ ‘do hotel-bulding’

In this paper, we analyze the effect of nonidiomatized object-verb combinations in aspectual composition of Turkish.

In idiomatized object-verb combination, literal meanings of the members of the compound are lost. For example, in *balık tutmak* ‘to catch fish, to fish’ the verb *tutmak* ‘to hold, grab, to seize’ undergoes a

“semantic specialization” in that it denotes a semantic sub-concept of its general meaning. In the further stages of idiomatization, the meaning of compound is metaphoric, as in *omuz silkmek* ‘to pretend not to know/ not care’ (Nilsson, 1986).

As maintained by Schroeder (1999: 80), there are two types of bare direct objects in Turkish: (indefinite and referential) transnumeral direct objects and (non-definite and non-referential) incorporated direct objects. Now, we briefly mention the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic tests that highlight the differences between 2 types of bare object NPs in Turkish.

The first criterion is scope of modification. “Modifiers preceding incorporated objects qualify the whole verbal predicate whereas modifiers preceding transnumeral objects qualify the noun” (Schroeder 1999: 80).

- (10) [43] bunlar şimdi beş yıldızlı otel yap-ıyor-lar.
they now five star hotel make-PROG-3pl.
‘Now they build five star hotels / a five star hotel.’

Otel ‘hotel’ in (10) is conceived as a transnumeral object, and not as incorporated noun. *Beş yıldızlı* ‘five star’ qualifies the noun, not the verb phrase. In (11), *tavır* ‘position’ is interpreted as incorporated noun because *daha ciddi* ‘more serious’ does not qualify the noun but the whole verb phrase.

- (11) [44] daha ciddi tavır takın-abil-me-ler-i gerek-ir.
more serious position gird-ABIL-NOM-PL-POSS-3sg. be necessary-AOR
‘It is necessary for them to be more seriously able to show a position.’

Syntactic position, which is the immediate preverbal position of bare object NPs, is the second criterion. Incorporated NPs — especially idiomatized object nouns — only allow focus particles (*de-* ‘too-also’, *bile*

‘even’) or question clitics (*mI* ‘yes-no question marker’) to intervene between them and the verb, as in (12).

- (12) Ali yüzmek-ten zevk de / bile / mI al-ır.
Ali swim-ABL fun too / even / QUE take-AOR-3sg
‘Ali has fun from swimming, too.’ ‘Ali has fun even from swimming.’
‘Does Ali have fun from swimming?’

On the other hand, transnumeral objects may leave their position immediately in front of the predicate. In sentence (13), in between kitap oku- ‘read book; do book reading’, kütüphanede ‘in the library’ can easily be inserted. This points to the syntactic referentiality of the object argument kitap ‘the book /books’ [2]. But such an insertion is hardly possible with incorporated nouns as (14) below illustrates.

- (13) Kitap en iyi kütüphane-de oku-n-ur.
The book / Books best library-LOC read-PASS-AOR-3sg
‘The book / Books is/ are read in the library best.’

- (14) ?? Zevk en iyi yüzmek-ten al-ın-ır.
Fun best swim-ABL take-PASS-AOR-3sg
‘One can have fun in swimming.’

The final criterion used to identify the difference between the types bare direct objects is their abilities to establish discourse referents. Transnumeral direct objects can function as the antecedent of a zero anaphora. With incorporated objects this is not possible at all.

- (15) [18]1: şiir yaz-dı mı?
poem write-PAST-3sg QUE
2: Ø yaz-ma-dı.
write-NEG-PAST-3sg
1: “Has she written poetry?”

2: “ She hasn’t written any.” (Schroeder 1999: 64)

When we track the reference to transnumeral noun *şiiir* ‘poetry’, we identify that ‘poetry’ appears as an individuated argument of the verb ‘write’. Speaker 2 uses the same verb, which is ‘write’, but the object argument is referred to by means of zero anaphora[3]. As is stated before, it is impossible to employ zero anaphora as a referring device with idiomatized noun-verb combinations:

- (16) *zevk al-* ‘have fun of something’
nasıl zevk al-ıyor-sun?
how fun take-PROG-2sg
*ne yaparken Ø alıyorsun / ne yaparken zevk alıyorsun?
‘How do you fun? What do you do to have fun?’

Through linguistic (syntactic, semantic, pragmatic) evidence, we have displayed that Turkish has two different types of bare object NPs. (17) summarizes their basic properties.

- (17) (a) Transnumeral direct objects
can be modified
allow zero anaphora
are syntactically referential
are semantically indefinite
(nonidiomatized noun-verb combination)
- (b) Incorporated direct objects
are dependent parts of verbal phrase
(idiomatized and nonidiomatized noun-verb combinations)

Now, we will explicate how transnumeral and incorporated direct objects affect aspectual composition in incremental theme verbs. Our claim here is that: while transnumeral bare object NPs yield telic interpretations of incremental theme verbs; incorporated object NPs induce atelic reading with these verbs.

VI. TRANSDUMERAL AND INCORPORATED OBJECT NPS AND INCREMENTAL THEME VERBS

Bare nouns in nonidiomatized noun-verb combinations, such as *mektup yaz-* ‘write letter’, *kitap oku-*, ‘read book’ can be employed either as transnumeral or incorporated objects. When a bare object noun is identified as a discrete entity, it is conceived as indefinite, referential and mostly a singular noun. In other words, it is a transnumeral object NP.

In (18), bare object noun *mektup* ‘letter’ is treated as a discrete entity by the language user because the sentence in which it occurs specifies all semantic roles inherent in the case frame of the relevant verb, i.e., ‘write x to y’. One can identify to whom the letter is written and so letter is individualized in this way. In short, ‘letter’ in the predicate *mektup yaz-* ‘write letter’ is interpreted as indefinite, singular NP as ‘a letter’, which entails that the act of writing a letter is completed. Its co-occurrence with a durative adverbial confirms this reading (18a). Furthermore, (18b) illustrates that the telic interpretation of (*arkadaşına*) *mektup yaz-* ‘write a letter to her friend’ is validated by its compatibility with an assertion expressing that the event of writing is completed.

(18) (a) Deniz 10 dakikada arkadaş-in-a mektup yazdı. (Telic)
Deniz 10 minute-LOC friend-POSS-DAT letter write-PAST-Ø
‘Deniz wrote a letter to her friend in ten minutes.’

(b) Deniz 10 dakikada arkadaşına mektup yaz-dı ve on-u
yolla-dı. (Telic)

Deniz 10 minute-LOC friend-POSS-DAT letter write-PAST-3sg and it-ACC send-PAST-3sg

‘Deniz wrote a letter to her friend in ten minutes and she sent it.’

When a nonidiomatized noun-verb combination forms an incorporated unit, it becomes nonreferential and number neutral. Naturally, interpretation of an incremental theme predicate involving incorporated noun is atelic, as seen in (19a, b)[4].

(19) (a) Deniz 10 dakika boyunca mektup yaz-dı. (Atelic)
Deniz 10 minute long letter write-PAST-3sg

(i) ‘She was involved in the activity of letter-writing for ten minutes.’

(ii) ‘She wrote a letter for ten minutes.’

(iii) ‘She wrote letters for ten minutes.’

(b) * Deniz 10 dakika boyunca mektup yaz-dı ve on-u yolla-dı.
(Atelic)

Deniz 10 minute long letter write-PST-3sg and it-ACC send-PST-3sg

‘* She was involved in the activity of letter-writing for ten minutes and she sent it.’

In (19a), we see that *mektup yaz-* ‘write a letter/letters; do letter-writing’ is compatible with a time span adverbial which indicates that it can be interpreted as a cumulative predicate. In this case, (19i) is the canonical interpretation of this predicate. The noun ‘letter’ is cumulative or atelic and categorial which refers to a collection of the parts of an entity. It is related to concept of ‘letter’ and categorizes the activity of writing as one of “letter-writing”. The agent in (19i) is involved in “letter-writing activity” for a certain period of time without giving any implication of the completion of the letter in the process of writing. (19ii) and (19iii)

are two other possible interpretations which also emphasize that the event does not attain its result state. The agent wrote a letter for ten minutes but she could not complete it. In its third version, she was engaged in writing more than one letter for ten minutes. The event is terminated after ten minutes but again there is no hint on the completion of the letters in the process of writing.

We observe that the (a)telicity interpretation posited above holds true with verbs of consumption (20) and performance verbs (21) which consist of transnumeral and incorporated object NPs.

(20) a. Deniz beş dakika-da peynir-li sandöviç ye-di.
Deniz five minute-LOC chesse-with sandwich eat-PAST-3sg
'Deniz ate a cheese sandwich in five minutes.'

b. Deniz beş dakika boyunca sandöviç ye-di.
Deniz five minute long sandwich eat-PAST-3sg

(i) 'Deniz was involved in the activity of sandwich-eating for five minutes.'
(ii) 'Deniz ate sandwiches for five minutes.'

(21) a. Deniz bir saat-te Beethoven'dan sonat çal-dı.
Deniz one hour-LOC Beethoven-ABL sonata play-PAST-3sg
'Deniz played a sonata by Beethoven in one hour.'

b. Deniz bir saat boyunca sonat çal-dı.
Deniz one hour long sonata play-PAST-3sg
'Deniz was involved in the activity of sonata-playing for one hour.'

Now, we have to answer the question that how language users can treat the incremental theme predicates lacking any lexically realized determiner or quantifier — exemplified in (18), (20a), (21a) above — as telic predicates. Following the views of Hay, Kennedy & Levin (1999), Rot-

hstein (2004) and Smollett (2005) on telicity, we can propose a context-dependent explanation for this question. Language users assign either telic or atelic readings to incremental theme predicates involving bare direct objects on the basis of linguistic and pragmatic contexts.

As maintained before, pragmatic factors specify the discrete, single entity interpretation of a transnumeral bare object, and this yields telic reading of incremental theme predicate including this bare object. Modification such as *arkadaşına* ‘to her friend’ or *Beethoven’dan* ‘by Beethoven’ are the linguistic means employed to individualize a transnumeral bare object. Modification of this kind enforces the discrete status of transnumeral object, and it becomes a discourse referent[5].

We also observe effect of linguistic context in sentences with time span adverbial. In-x time adverbial highlights the natural endpoint inherent in the incremental theme predicates containing individualized, transnumeral objects. Basing on this fact, we ascribe telic reading to these predicates. In (18), (20a) and (21a) above, the agent has an intention to reach the endpoint for the completion of the event. Completion of a letter, or a sonata is the built-in endpoint for writing and playing events illustrated in these sentences.

In the following section, we will deal with variable aspectual interpretation of incremental theme verbs involving accusative marked countable objects in Turkish.

VII. ACCUSATIVE MARKED OBJECT NPS AND INCREMENTAL THEME VERBS

Krifka’s mereological approach, Tenny’s ‘measuring-out verbs’ or Verkuyl’s compositional aspect theory claim that quantized incremental theme itself determines the telicity of the verb. In other words, there is a homomorphism between the properties of direct object NP and the event depicted by incremental theme predicate. The physical extent of the entity the object refers to puts a limit on the event. For example, take

the predicate eat a sandwich, the theme or object is a sandwich and the event is eating a sandwich. The extent of the event of eating a sandwich can be determined by looking at what happens to the sandwich. So the event of eating a sandwich can continue only there is some sandwich to be eaten. The endpoint for the event of eating a sandwich is determined when the relevant sandwich is fully eaten. However, we will argue that the relation between incremental theme argument and telic judgment of the event is not always straightforward as is suggested [6].

Consider the sentences in (22) which belong to three different languages, all of them display the variable aspectual interpretation of a verb of consumption which has a quantized direct object. To put it differently, it is cross-linguistically attested that quantized direct objects serving as incremental theme allow both telic and atelic judgments.

(22) (a) Deniz tost-u 5 dakika-da / 5 dakika boyunca ye-di. (Turkish)

Deniz toast-ACC 5 minute-LOC / 5 minute long eat-PAST-3sg
 ‘Deniz ate the toast in five minutes / for five minutes.’

(b) Deniz-ka tosutu-lul 5 bun-e / 5 bun tongan meg-ess-ta. (Korean)

Deniz-NOM toast-ACC 5 minute-LOC / 5 minute long eat-PAST-DEC
 ‘Deniz ate the toast in five minutes / for five minutes.’ (Aksan 2004)

(c) jivan lu minut-este / lu minut tide seres-em voz-en. (Mari)

jivan ten minute -INESS / ten minute this letter-ACC write-PAST
 ‘Ivan wrote this letter in ten minutes.’

‘Ivan was engaged in writing this letter for ten minutes.’ (Tatevosov 2002:355)

In Turkish and Korean, accusative case marks definiteness and individuation of direct objects. Quantization of a direct object (i.e., incremental theme argument) by accusative case is claimed to give rise to a telic interpretation of a verb phrase, since accusative case ascribes a

holistic or totality meaning to the predicate[7]. As (23a) displays, the event described by the predicate *ye-* ‘eat’ affects the entire object, *elma* ‘the apple’.

- (23) (a) *Deniz elma-yı ye-di.*
Deniz apple-ACC eat-PAST-3sg
‘Deniz ate (up) the apple.’
(b) *Deniz elma ye-di.*
Deniz apple eat-PAST-3sg
‘Deniz ate an apple / some apples.’

Despite telic judgment of the accusative case marked incremental theme argument, an atelic reading is readily available (see (22) above). Overall, direct object argument itself, even if it is quantized by accusative case [8], does not determine the telicity of the event. This observation paves the way to a question of how to explain such an aspectual variability depicted in verbs of consumption/creation and performance verbs. We extend the pragmatic (context-base) explanation employed for aspectual nature of bare object NPs to account for the aspectual variability detected with the accusative marked incremental theme arguments.

Jackendoff (1996), Hay, Kennedy & Levin (1999), Smollett (2005) among others explain the gradual change inherent in incremental theme verbs through a scale structure. Accordingly, Jackendoff maintains that quantized direct objects in incremental theme verbs establish a scale and an endpoint of that scale may or may not be entailed. Smollett (2005: 46) posits a more stronger claim for the aspectual variability of incremental theme verbs, namely that “while a scale is established in all cases, an endpoint is never entailed. Rather, where we favour a delimited reading, the endpoint has been established by world knowledge.”

Turkish data provide support to Smollett’s claim. Contrary to the standard explanation of aspectual composition, it is not the physical extent of the object that imposes a limit on the event in verbs of con-

sumption/creation and performance verbs. (24) below illustrates that these events can be conceptualized as open-ended and such uses are possible in adequate contexts:

(24) (a) Deniz bir kaç dakika boyunca elmayı yedi, ve ardından ders çalışmaya başladı.

‘Deniz ate the apple for a couple of minutes, and then she started to study.’

(b) Deniz sonatı yarım saat boyunca çaldı, ve onu konserinde çalmaya karar verdi.

‘Deniz played the sonata for an hour, and she decided to play it in her concert.’

(c) Televizyon izlerken, Deniz on dakika boyunca mektubu yazdı.

‘While watching television, Deniz wrote the letter for ten minutes.’

Changing the referents of subject and object noun phrases makes atelic interpretation of the same events more accessible (Smollett 2005:50), as displayed in (25).

(25) (a) Karınca bir hafta boyunca elmayı yedi.

‘The ant ate the apple for a week.’

(b) ??Deniz bir hafta boyunca elmayı yedi.

‘??Deniz ate the apple for a week.’

Our world knowledge tells us that a human being does not spend a week engaged in the activity of eating a specific apple, but an ant does. We do not expect an ant to finish its apple as quickly as a human being finish it. In this respect, (25a) becomes an appropriate statement.

Following Smollett (2005), telic and atelic readings of incremental theme verbs involving a quantized direct object is schematized as in Figures (1-3). The scale established by the direct object is represented by an arrow. The endpoint of the event is represented by a dotted line. [9].

atelic reading of verbs of consumption/creation and performance verbs with quantized direct objects is anticipated rather than exceptional.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We have illustrated that both bare and quantized uses of countable object noun phrases in Turkish give rise to aspectual variability in incremental theme predicates. This does not fit in the mainstream generalizations of aspectual composition which is based on object-event homomorphism. Incremental theme predicates are potentially telic. Telicity of such predicates is not strictly determined by linguistic means. We have illustrated that pragmatic factors, that is, contextual cues and world knowledge supply information for the conceptualization of the event under concern as (a)telic. Overall, the data in this study indicate that approaches in aspectual composition which consider context-dependent telicity provide a cross-linguistic account for cases as those observed in Turkish. Telicity is a complex semantic notion. A separate semantic theory is required to provide a fine-grained account for the semantic-pragmatic interface implied by the concept telicity.

REFERENCES

- Aksan, Y. 2004. Event structure, scale structure and the representation of selected accomplishment verbs in Turkish and Korean. S.O. Lee et.al. (Eds.) *Inquiries into Korean Linguistics I*. Seoul: Thaeaksa, 261-280.
- Aydemir, Y. 2004. Are preverbal bare Ns syntactic arguments? *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (1): 465-474.
- Dede, M. 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish verbal sentences. D.I. Slobin & K. Zimmer (Eds.) *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 147-164.
- Dowty, D. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67: 547-619.
- Erguvanli, E. 1984. The function of word order in Turkish grammar. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erguvanli-Taylan, E. & K. Zimmer 1994. Case marking in Turkish: Indefinite object constructions. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 20, 547-552.

- Filip, H. 2001. Nominal and verbal semantic structure: Analogies and interactions. *Language Science* 23: 453-501.
- Hay, J., C. Kennedy & B. Levin 1999. Scalar structure underlies telicity in 'degree achievements'. *SALT* 9: 124-144.
- Johanson, L. 1977. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 225-242.
- Jackendoff, R. 1996. The proper treatment of measuring out, telicity, and perhaps even quantification in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 305-351.
- Krifka, M. 1989. Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics. R. Bartsch et.al. (Eds.) *Semantics and contextual expression*. Dordrecht: Foris, 75-115.
- Nilsson, B. 1985. *Case marking semantics in Turkish*. Stockholm: Department of Linguistics.
- Nilsson, B. 1986. Object incorporation in Turkish. A. Aksu-Koç & E. Erguvanlı Taylan (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Turkish linguistics conference*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press, 113-128.
- Öztürk, B. 2005. Case, referentiality and phrase structure. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rothstein, S. 2004. *Structuring events*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schroeder, C. 1999. The Turkish nominal phrase in spoken discourse. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sioupi, A. 2002. (A)telicity and (non)-delimitedness with (bare)count nouns in Greek. Abstract of Chronos 5, Groningen.
- Smollett, R. 2005. Quantized direct objects don't delimit after all. H.J. Verkuyl, H. de Swart & A. van Hout (Eds.) *Perspectives on aspect*. Dordrecht: Springer, 41-59.
- Tura, S. 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish nonverbal sentences. D.I. Slobin & K. Zimmer (Eds.) *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 165-194.
- Turan, Ü. D. 1998. Zero object arguments and referentiality in Turkish. L. Johanson (Ed.) *The Mainz Meeting: Proceedings of the seventh international conference on Turkish linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 154-182.
- Tenny, C. 1994. *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Tatevosov, S. 2002. The parameter of actionality. *Linguistic Typology* 6 : 317-401.

Verkuyl, H. 1993. *A theory of aspectuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1. For a more detailed discussion of object marking and its syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analyses in Turkish see Johanson (1977); Erguvanlı (1984); Nilsson (1985, 1986); Tura (1986); Dede (1986); Erguvanlı & Zimmer (1994); Schroeder (1999); Öztürk (2005) among many others.

2. Since ‘kitap’ in the sentence *kitap kütüphanede okunur* ‘The book/books is/are read in the library.’ has a generic meaning, it has either definite singular or plural interpretation.

3. Schroeder (1999: 64) explicates all the possible restrictions of zero anaphora as a referring device for a transnumeral noun.

4. Aydemir (2004: 469) makes a similar observation for atelic nature of incorporated nouns in Turkish.

5. Turan (1996: 165/168) illustrates how bare and incorporated object noun phrases become discourse referents.

6. Rothstein (2004: 97-99) discusses the problems encountered in employing the homomorphism theory of Krifka in dealing with accomplishment verbs.

7. In Turkish with verbs of motion requiring a special path, the accusative marked path under concern denotes that the path is measured out from the beginning to the end, as observed in the contrast of *dağa tırman-* ‘climb the mountain’, and *dağı tırman-* ‘climb up the mountain.’

8. In Turkish with verbs of motion requiring a special path, the accusative marked path under concern denotes that the path is measured out from the beginning to the end, as observed in the contrast of *dağa tırman-* ‘climb the mountain’, and *dağı tırman-* ‘climb up the mountain.’

9. Quantized direct objects indirectly contribute to the telicity of incremental theme predicates. True delimiting expressions, for instance, goal phrases, can not be added to an expressions with a non-quantized direct object, as seen below. See Aksan (2004 : 276) for a more detailed discussion.

(i) *Ayşe elma çöpüne kadar yedi.
‘*Ayşe ate apple to its core.’

(ii) Ayşe elmayı / bir elmayı çöpüne kadar yedi.
‘Ayşe ate the apple / an apple to its core.’

True delimiters such as goal phrases or particles constitute an obligatory endpoint to the scale established by the quantized direct objects. In contrast to Figures (1-3), in Figure (4) endpoint is shown by “a solid line which indicates that explicit limit is enforced by the delimiting linguistic means” (Smollett 2005 : 52).

>

eating

extent of apple

core

Deniz elmayı çöpüne kadar yedi.

‘Deniz ate the apple to its core.’

Figure 4. Verb of consumption with a goal phrase

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative
ABL	ablative
ABIL	ability
AOR	orist
DAT	dative
DEC	declarative,
LOC	locative
INESS	inessive
NOM	nominalizer
NOMI	nominative
PASS	passive
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PROG	progressive
PST	past tense
QUE	question
SG	singular

