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I. BACKGROUND

The term “bare object” (BO) refers to a nominal that functions as the object of the verb, but is not overtly marked by an accusative ending, as in (1).

   Ali.NOM book read.PRES.PROG.3SG
   ‘Ali is doing book-reading.’


2. a) Ali kitap okuyor.
    Ali.NOM book read.PRES.PROG.3SG
    ‘Ali is doing book-reading.’

   b) Ali kitabı okuyor.
    Ali.NOM book.ACC read.PRES.PROG.3SG
    ‘Ali is reading a specific book.’

BOs do not establish discourse reference for pronouns, in contrast to the accusative marked objects:

    Ali.NOM book read.PAST.3SG color.POSS red-was
    ‘Ali did book-reading. Its color was red.’

    Ali.NOM book.ACC read.PAST.3SG color.POSS red-was
    ‘Ali read a book. Its color was red.’
    (Öztürk, 2005: EX: 25, pg. 27)

   yesterday moviei watch.PAST.1SG it.ACC/their.ACC you.NOM also watch-must.2SG
   ‘Yesterday I saw a movie, you should see it/them, too.’
   (Aydemir, 2004: 468)

Passivized, BOs give rise to impersonal passive constructions, shown in (5a), indicating that they do not undergo A-movement for case. This contrasts with specific objects, which in an active sentence appear with accusative case-marker. These, when passivized, give rise to personal passive, as shown in (5b).
   room-in book read.PASS.PAST.3SG
   ‘There was book-reading in the room.’                           (Öztürk, 2009: EX: 19b)

   book.NOM room-in read.PASS.PAST.3SG
   ‘The book was read in the room.’                  (Öztürk, 2009: EX: 18b)

All of these properties of BOs seem to indicate that their status differs from that of their case-marked counterparts. In particular, it seems that BOs cannot serve as syntactic arguments on their own (Aydemir 2004, Öztürk 2005, 2009).

In this talk, we attempt to account for the fact that BOs, although invisible to syntax with respect to binding and passivization (A-movement), still seem to be able to undergo movement. This is illustrated by (6) through (9) below:

   I.NOM eat.NEG.PAST.1SG cake
   ‘I didn’t eat cake.’                           (Öztürk, 2009: EX: 15b)

   book Ali.NOM read.PAST.3SG

   coffee Ali.NOM also want.EVID.PAST
   ‘Ali too wanted coffee.’                 (Uygun, 2006)

9. Elmaı (ben) çok tı yedim bugün.
   Apple (I.NOM) a-lot eat.PAST.1SG today
   ‘I ate apples a lot today.’     (İşsever, 2008: EX. 10)

For concreteness, following Issever (2006, 2008), we propose that the movement of a BO from its canonical, pre-verbal position is motivated by its need to check a discourse-related topic feature. However, since a BO is ‘invisible’ to syntax, it cannot undergo a movement operation on its own.

Given this, we propose that the BO, when it moves, pied-pipes the whole VP to its derived position.

By the time the BO undergoes the topic-driven movement, the verb has already vacated the VP in order to move to a higher functional head (v0) on its way to T0 (Ince, 2006). Thus, the movement in question is in
fact the movement of the *remnant VP*, which contains only the BO, giving rise to the illusion that the BO moved on its own.

We show that the proposal correctly derives the grammatical sentences in which the BO occupies some non-canonical position, and it correctly excludes the ungrammatical ones.

II. ROADMAP OF THE TALK

1. Empirical observations
   a. BOs sometimes occupy positions other than the canonical pre-verbal position, yielding ‘scrambled’ word orders.
   b. However, not every logically possible position is available: there are word orders which are unacceptable.

2. The proposal: Movement of BOs as the remnant-VP movement
   a. Evidence that VP movement in Turkish is possible.
   b. Evidence that the movement in question is remnant movement → the verb in finite sentences in Turkish occupies a high (T^0) position.

3. Predictions
   a. The proposal predicts correct distribution of BOs in matrix and embedded sentences.
      i. Evidence that in nominalized embedded clauses the verb remains low.

4. Implications
   b. Overt case morphology is a prerequisite for syntactic movement (scrambling) (Kornfilt, 2003).

III. THE DATA

Although BOs are most frequently found in the immediately preverbal position, in appropriate contexts, they can appear in other preverbal as well as post verbal positions:

10. a. Ali’yı **cin** çarptı.
    Ali.ACC genie hit.PAST.3SG
    ‘Ali has been possessed by a genie.’
b. **Cin** Ayşe’yı çarpı, Ali’yi değil.
   genie Ayşe.ACC hit.PAST.3SG Ali.ACC not
   ‘It was Ayşe who has been possessed by a genie, not Ali.’

   Ayşe.ACC hit.PAST.3SG genie Ali.ACC not
   ‘It was Ayşe who has been possessed by a genie, not Ali.’

11. a. **Ali** çok mu **su** içti?
   Ali.NOM a-lot Q water drink.PAST.3SG
   ‘Did Ali drink a lot of water?’

       water (in fact) Ayşe.NOM drink.PAST.3SG. Ali.NOM coke drink.PAST.3SG
       ‘It was Ayşe who drank water. Ali drank coke.’

12. a. **Ali** çok **kitap** okuyor.
    Ali.NOM a-lot book read.PRES.PROG.3SG
    ‘Ali reads books a lot / Ali does a lot of book-reading.’

    b. Hayır, **kitap** Ayşe çok okuyor.
       no book Ayşe.NOM a-lot read.PRES.PROG.3SG
       ‘No, it is Ayşe who reads a lot of books.’

     Hasan.NOM yesterday cake eat.PAST.3SG
     ‘Hasan ate cake yesterday.’

    b. Dün **BEN** yedim **pasta**, Hasan değil.
       yesterday I.NOM eat.PAST.1SG cake Hasan.NOM not.
       ‘It was me who ate cake yesterday, not Hasan.’

The distribution of BOs in examples (10) through (13) suggests that they have undergone movement.

BOs that originate in embedded clauses can also occupy non-canonical positions:

     Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN book read.N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG
     ‘Ali wanted Ayşe to read a book/books.’

       book read.N.POSS.ACC Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN want.PAST.3SG

    c. **Ali** [**kitap** okumasını Ayşe’nin __ ] istedi.
       Ali.NOM book read.N.POSS.ACC Ayşe.GEN want.PAST.3SG
   Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN book read.DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG
   ‘Ali knows that Ayşe read a book/books.’

      book read.DIK.POSS.ACC Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN know.PRES.PROG.3SG

      Ali.NOM book read.DIK.POSS.ACC Ayşe.GEN know.PRES.PROG.3SG

However, it is not the case that any word order is acceptable:

    Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG

      book Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG

    Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG

      book Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG

In this talk we will try to provide answers to the following questions:

i. How can a BO, being invisible to operations such as binding or A-movement, undergo movement at all?

ii. How to restrict the distribution of BOs so that the analysis does not overgenerate (how to exclude examples in (16) and (17))?  

### IV. THE PROPOSAL: REMNANT VP MOVEMENT

In the literature, it has been widely noticed that non-case-marked nominals resist movement.

Kornfilt (2003), Aydemir (2004), and Çağrı (2005, 2009) among others state that BOs must occupy the pre-verbal position.

Kornfilt (2003, fn.4) notes that BOs can only appear in a non-canonical position under specific discourse conditions, in which case they are most likely left dislocated, i.e. base-generated in the surface position.
Öztürk (2005) states that BOs cannot leave the pre-verbal position, but Öztürk (2009) allows for the movement of BOs (as in example 6 above). Sezer (1996), İşsever (2003, 2006, 2008), Uygun (2006) also report examples where a BO has moved as grammatical (we reported the relevant examples in (7)-(9) above).

We agree with the claim that non-case-marked nominals indeed cannot move (on their own).

On the other hand, we also agree with Öztürk (2009) and others, who claim that sometimes BOs are found in non-canonical positions.

In order to explain this discrepancy, we propose that when a BO occupies a non-canonical position, it did not undergo movement on its own. Rather, it is the entire VP that has moved to the position where the BO surfaces.

We follow Ince (2006) in assuming that the verb in Turkish finite clauses occupies a high position (T0).

The illusion that the BO moved on its own obtains due to the fact that the VP which moves contains only the BO, but not the verb, which by the time the VP moves, has already vacated it on its way to T0.

We propose that the remnant VP, containing a BO, moves to the specifier position of a functional head (X0), which takes vP or TP as its complement. X0 attracts the BO in order to check the uninterpretable topic feature. However, since the BO (which carries the interpretable topic feature) does not function as a syntactic argument, it cannot move on its own. Consequently, the entire remnant VP is pied-piped to [Spec, XP] (as a Last Resort operation).

   book Ali.NOM a-lot read.PRES.PROG.3SG
   ‘Ali reads books a lot.’
   ‘Ali does a lot of book reading.’

   b. TP
      XP T0
      okuyor READS/IS READING
      VP X’
      vP X0
      Ali v’
      v0
      vP VP
      çok A-LOT
      kitap BOOK ti
   Ali.NOM book a-lot read.PRES.PROG.3SG
   ‘Ali reads books a lot.’
   ‘Ali does a lot of book reading.’

   b. TP
      Ali T’
      XP T’
      okuyor READS/IS READING
      VP X’
      kitap BOOK t
      VP vP X’
      v v0
      çok A-LOT VP
      kitap BOOK t

**a. INGREDIENTS OF THE PROPOSAL: VP MOVEMENT**

If our proposal is on the right track, then VP movement in Turkish must be independently possible.

We take sentences such as the one in (20a), which contains an accusative case-marked object kitabı ‘book’, as evidence that VP movement is indeed possible in Turkish.

    book.ACC read.N.POSS.ACC Ali.NOM Ayşen.GEN want.PRES.PROG.3SG
    ‘Ali wants Ayşe to read a book/books.’

       ^__________________

**b. INGREDIENTS OF THE PROPOSAL: THE VERB RAISES TO T⁰**

Another necessary ingredient of our proposal is the requirement that the verb in Turkish finite clauses moves to T⁰ (in order to vacate the VP before the movement).

Ince (2006) provides evidence to this effect which comes from sluicing. He shows that in sluicing examples the sluiced wh-phrase may appear with the tense marker:

   yesterday you.ACC someone.NOM call.PAST.3SG but who-PAST.3SG know.NOT.PROG.1SG

   ‘Yesterday someone called you, but I don’t know who.’

Ince proposes that in Turkish, sluicing deletes the AspP, the complement of T⁰. The tense affix, which is generated under T⁰ is thus stranded by the deletion, and attaches to the only phonologically realized constituent, the wh-phrase (Ince’s work is also evidence for the proposal that deletion bleeds verb movement. For additional evidence for this claim, see Craenenbroeck and Liptak, 2008)

22. 

   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{CP} \\
   \text{kim\_WHOi} \\
   \text{C’} \\
   \text{TP} \\
   \text{T’} \\
   \text{ellipses} \\
   \text{AspP} \\
   \text{T⁰} \\
   \text{-d_iPAST.3SG} \\
   \text{ti\_seni\_YOU\_ara\_CALL} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

Together with Ince, we take this fact as evidence that tense morphology is base generated in T⁰. Consequently, when the verb appears with tense morphology in a finite clause, it must have moved to T⁰.

V. PREDICTIONS

Our proposal makes the following predictions:

- It will be possible for a BO to be separated from the verb only in clauses where the verb undergoes head movement to T⁰.
- However, if we have evidence that in a particular environment the verb remains within the VP, in such an environment a BO should not be able to appear separated from the verb.

As we will see below, these predictions are borne out.

In finite clauses, the BO may appear separated from the verb. This is shown, for example, by our example (18a), repeated here as (23).


   book Ali.NOM a-lot read.PRES.PROG.3SG

   ‘Ali reads books a lot.’
   ‘Ali does a lot of book reading.’
In (23), the BO and the verb appear on the opposite sides of the subject, which we predict to be possible.

However, as we noted in section III above, a BO cannot be separated from the verb in non-finite embedded clauses. The relevant examples are repeated here as (24) and (25).

   Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN read.N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG
   book Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN read.N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG

   Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN read.DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG
   book Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN read.DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG

We argue that this is so because in these environments the verb remains VP-internal. Therefore, the only way for the BO to appear separated from the verb is to undergo movement out of the VP. This, however, is impossible.

Evidence for this claim comes from the fact that sluicing in embedded clauses behaves very differently from the sluicing in matrix clauses. In particular, the sluiced wh-phrase in the embedded clause cannot surface affixed with the verbal morphology. This is shown in (26).

   yesterday you.ACC someone.GEN call.DİK.POSS.ACC know.1SG but who-GEN.DİK.ACC not-know.1sg
   ‘I know that someone called you yesterday, but I don’t know who.’

The ungrammaticality of (26) indicates that in embedded nominalized clauses, the morphology that in non-sluicing context appears on the verb cannot appear on the sluiced wh-phrase. We take this to mean that this is due to the fact that the verbal morphology is not local enough to the wh-phrase. We conclude that the relevant morphology is generated on the verb, and is checked by long-distance Agree with higher functional heads. This in turn means that the verb in such contexts does not move to T0, in contrast to finite clauses.

If this conclusion is on the right track, we correctly predict the ungrammaticality of (24) and (25). For these sentences to be generated, the BO would have to undergo movement on its own.

   Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN read.N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG
   book Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN read.N.POSS.ACC want.PAST.3SG

   Ali.NOM book Ayşe.GEN read.DIK.POSS.ACC know.PRES.PROG.3SG
On the other hand, we predict that whenever a BO generated in the embedded clause appears in a non-canonical position, the embedded verb appears immediately to its right (since the pied-piped VP contains both the BO and the verb). This is indeed what we find, as shown by (14) and (15), repeated below as (29) and (30).

   Ali.NOM book read.N.POSS.ACC Ayşe.GEN want.PAST.3SG
   ‘Ali wanted Ayşe to read a book/books.’
   
   book read.N.POSS.ACC Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN want.PAST.3SG

   Ali.NOM book read.DIK.POSS.ACC Ayşe.GEN know.PRES.PROG.3SG
   ‘Ali knows that Ayşe read a book/books.’
    
   book read.DIK.POSS.ACC Ali.NOM Ayşe.GEN know.PRES.PROG.3SG

VI. IMPLICATIONS

Our analysis has several implications for the controversial status of BOs in Turkish.

In particular, if we are correct, then BOs in Turkish are phrasal elements (Erguvanlı 1984, Öztürk 2005, 2009, Arslan Kechriotis 2006), and not incorporated head nouns, as has been argued by Kornfilt (2003) and Aydemir (2004). Any account that analyzes BOs as incorporated nouns fails to predict the possibility that they can surface separated from the verb (in any environment).

Similarly, our discussion seems to corroborate the idea that in Turkish overt case marking is a prerequisite for syntactic movement, as noted by Kornfilt (2003). If an element is not overtly case-marked, then if it is to surface in a position different from the one where it was originally merged, a Last Resort operation of pied-piping is required to sanction the movement.

VII. A NOTE ON CASE AND SPECIFICITY

If we are correct in arguing that BOs are phrasal, a question arises as to how they are different from case-marked objects. We assume, following Erguvanlı 1984, Öztürk 2005, 2009, and Arslan Kechriotis 2006 that BOs are NPs, and that they lack the higher functional structure, namely the DP and the KP layers.1

1 For arguments in favor of KP, see Bittner and Hale (1996), among others.
Thus, BOs cannot be case-marked. Not being case-marked, BOs are precluded from movement (on their own). This forces them to remain within the VP, where they are interpreted as indefinites, and receive non-specific interpretation due to being bound by existential closure (Diesing, 1992).

Thus, although for an object to be bare entails that it is also non-specific, this relationship is mediated by the impossibility of BOs to move independently. However, there is no direct relationship between case-marking and specificity. In particular, an object may appear with case morphology, but still receive non-specific interpretation.

   Ali spite did no spite.ACC Hasan did Ali not
   ‘Ali behaved spitefully. No, it was Hasan who behaved spitefully, not Ali.’

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this talk we attempted to account for the fact that BOs, which do not seem to be visible to syntax with respect to passivization and binding, still seem to undergo movement. We proposed that when a BO surfaces in non-canonical positions, what is moved to this position is the entire VP, which by that moment in the derivation contains only the BO. The movement is motivated by need of the BO to check a discourse-related topic feature, which we conjectured is checked in the specifier position of the XP (headed by a functional head which takes vP or TP as its complement).

Our proposal relies on the availability of several syntactic phenomena in Turkish:

- Possibility of VP movement,
- Verb raising in finite clauses,
- Verb remaining VP-internal in embedded non-finite clauses.

We showed evidence that each of these phenomena is independently motivated.

Our proposal presents a principled explanation for the distribution of BOs in Turkish, and argues against the claim that such nominals are N₀’s incorporated into the verb.
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