

## Partitive constructions in Turkish and some other Turkic languages

### I. Turkish:

Turkish has basically two kinds of partitive constructions: one, where the superset is marked with the ablative, and one where it is marked with the genitive. The ablative construction has a wider distribution, for two main reasons:

1. In Turkish, the genitive case on a specifier is licensed by overt agreement on the local head in general, e.g. in possessive phrases, *Agr* is placed on the possessee, and in nominalized clauses it is placed on the nominalized predicate. In genitive partitive phrases, *Agr* shows up on the subset expression. This means that the genitive partitive must include an *Agr* element; the ablative partitive may include it (I shall return to the question of when and why the ablative exhibits *Agr*), but it doesn't have to. Thus, the ablative partitive is used in additional circumstances than the genitive partitive.

2. The ablative partitive allows for the subset expression to be overtly expressed as not only being the superset's subset in terms of number or size, but also as having properties that are themselves a subset of the superset's properties, without having to be identical to them; e.g. a subset of apples out of a superset of fruit; a subset of women out of a superset of students. In contrast, the genitive partitive allows only a subset expression which has properties that are identical to those of the superset, e.g. five of the apples, two of the students etc. (These are allowed by the ablative partitives, as well.) We shall ask ourselves why this should be the case, and to what extent similar constraints hold in the other languages, too.

Let's start by illustrating partitives with subset expressions that are headed by lexical nouns and consider ablative and genitive partitives in turn.

Ablative partitives:

- (1) a. Öğrenci-ler-den      üç kız      gör-dü-m  
student-PL-ABL      three girl      see-PST-1.SG  
'I saw three girls of the (group of) students'
- b. Öğrenci-ler-den      üç kız-ı      gör-dü-m  
student-PL-ABL      three girl-ACC      see-PST-1.SG  
'I saw three (specific) girls of the (group of) students'

In both examples, the subset of three girls is linked to the larger set of students; the three girls are a subset of the students both with respect to size and with respect of properties

(i.e. [+female] is a subset of [+human], for example). (For arguments that the subset and the superset expressions together form a syntactic constituent, see Kornfilt 1984.)

The two examples differ only with respect to the accusative marker in (1b). As is widely known from traditional, typological, and theoretical studies, the accusative marker expresses not only Case, but also specificity, i.e. vaguely speaking, referentiality. Here, the speaker would have certain three girls in mind (among the group of students), and would probably also assume that the reference of those girls is or will be relevant to the hearer. In contrast, in (1a), the reference of the three girls is not salient in the discourse, and thus the accusative marker is missing.<sup>1</sup> (Sensitivity of the case marker to specificity is a property of structural case in Turkish; thus, the accusative shares this property with the genitive as a subject marker, and possibly also with the ablative, when it is used as a structural, rather than lexical, case marker. For discussion, cf. Kornfilt 1984.)

Let's turn to genitive partitives.

Genitive partitives:

(2) a. \*Öğrenci-ler-in üç kız gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-GEN three girl see-PST-1.SG

Intended reading: 'I saw three girls of the (group of) students'

b. \*Öğrenci-ler-in üç kız-ı gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-GEN three girl-ACC see-PST-1.SG

Intended reading: 'I saw three (specific) girls of the (group of) students'

Both examples are ill-formed. We may think that the reason is trivial: we know that in Turkish, as mentioned above, the genitive is licensed by local *Agr*, and neither of the examples has that element. But as the following examples show, even supplying the *Agr* does not lead to well-formedness:

(3) a. \*Öğrenci-ler-in üç kız -ı<sup>2</sup> gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-GEN three girl -3.AGR see-PST-1.SG

Intended reading: 'I saw three girls of the (group of) students'

b. \*Öğrenci-ler-in üç kız -ın -ı gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-GEN three girl- 3.AGR -ACC see-PST-1.SG

Intended reading: 'I saw three (specific) girls of the (group of) students'

<sup>1</sup> Note that the existence of examples such as (1a) challenges the widely accepted view, proposed by Enç (1991), that specificity is intimately and definitionally linked to partitivity, and that expressions that are explicitly or implicitly subsets of larger sets must be specific. For discussion, cf. v. Heusinger & Kornfilt (2005) and Kornfilt (2007).

<sup>2</sup> The third person singular (nominal) agreement marker and the accusative case marker can, under certain phonological circumstances (i.e. after a consonant and when in word-final position) surface as identical forms, as is the case here. Note that in (3b), the *Agr* marker has a final *n*, which gets deleted in word-final position, as in (3a).

The ill-formedness of (3a) can be predicted on general grounds, too: As we shall see later in this paper, the agreement marker requires overt accusative to follow it; since the accusative is missing in (3a), the result is ill-formed. Thus, the crucial example for our purposes is (3b): why is it ill-formed?

Actually, this example is ill-formed only under the partitive reading. It is acceptable under a (pragmatically perhaps improbable) possessive reading: ‘I saw three (specific) daughters of the students’.

It appears, then, that the possessive meaning expressed by the genitive case on the specifier and the agreement morphology on the head, i.e. a meaning expressed by these forms in general, is primary in the language and blocks the partitive reading.<sup>3</sup>

It may be of some interest to note at this point that the form with agreement (and, given the requirement just mentioned that *Agr* necessitates an accusative marker to follow, with the accusative) is ill-formed in the ablative partitive construction, as well:

(4) \*Öğrenci-ler-den üç kız -in -i gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-ABL three girl -3.AGR -ACC see-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: ‘I saw three (specific) girls of the (group of) students’<sup>4</sup>

I propose that the reason for this is simply that the ablative is not a licensed Case, i.e. it does not need the presence of overt *Agr*, in order to be licensed; it contrasts with the genitive in this respect. The well-formed ablative partitive examples in (1) illustrate this analysis. Thus, the presence of *Agr* in (4) is unmotivated; as we shall see later, an ablative superset in a partitive construction can co-occur with *Agr*, but only when the presence of *Agr* is motivated systematically.

All our examples so far involved human supersets and subsets. Similar observations can be made concerning non-humans, such as the inanimates in the following examples:

Ablative partitives with inanimates:

---

<sup>3</sup> It has been said in the literature that the agreement and the Genitive in Turkish, and other corresponding markers in other languages, such as the genitive in IE languages, the ‘s in English etc. do not assign a particular possessive interpretation, but rather only a more general, vague sense of “relatedness”, and that the possessive reading, where obtained, is a pragmatically determined narrowing of that general relatedness. To my mind, the unavailability of the partitive reading in these lexically headed genitive constructions argues against such a claim, at least for Turkish possessives, and strongly suggests that at least in Turkish, the combination of genitive and overt agreement does represent the semantics of possession.

<sup>4</sup> The example is fine under the (for us irrelevant) reading: ‘I saw his/her three daughters (out of the group of students)’. Not surprisingly, when the *Agr* is interpreted as a head which is involved in a *possessive* thematic role, the utterance is well-formed.

- (5) a. Meyva-lar-dan üç elma ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-ABL three apple eat-PST-1.SG  
‘I ate three apples of the (set of) fruits’
- b. Meyva-lar-dan üç elma -y1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-ABL three apple -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
‘I ate three (specific) apples of the (set of) fruits’

Just as with the human expressions, the ablative partitive allows for a subset expression with a lexical head, and can thus express a subset which represents properties that are a subset of those that the superset has.

Also, just as with [+human] partitives, the ablative partitive does not permit overt *Agr* when it has a lexical head:

- (6) \*Meyva-lar-dan üç elma sin -1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-ABL three apple -3.AGR-ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
Intended reading: ‘I ate three apples of the (set of) fruits’<sup>5</sup>

Genitive counterparts to these examples are ill-formed, just as with [+human] partitives. I will not bother with *Agr*-less examples; as we know by now, genitives are ill-formed when *Agr* is absent. Further, we also know that the *Agr* requires overt *Acc*. The only relevant example to consider here is therefore one where we have both *Agr* and *Acc*:

- (7) \*Meyva-lar-in üç elma sin -1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-GEN three apple -3.AGR-ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
Intended reading: ‘I ate three apples of the (set of) fruits’

Just as with [+human] expressions, this construction is ill-formed. Since it is more difficult to establish a possessivity relationship between the genitive-marked potential superset *meyvaların* ‘fruits, gen’ and the potential subset *üç elma* ‘three apples’, the example is quite bad under the irrelevant reading we had noticed in the [+human] counterpart, as well.

I now turn to partitive expressions whose subset expression consists not of a genuine lexical nominal, but of a classifier.

Turkish doesn’t have a general system of classifiers, such as some African languages. However, perhaps similarly to a language such as English, it does have certain expressions that are used in certain contexts in a similar way in which regular classifiers are. Perhaps the most widely used classifier in Turkish is *tane* ‘item’, which historically

---

<sup>5</sup> Just as its counterpart with [+human] partitives, this example is well-formed under the *possessive* reading: ‘I ate his/her three apples out of the (set of) fruits’. Here, too, *Agr* is involved in a possessive interpretation, not a partitive one.

derives from a word for ‘grain’. It is typically used for countable inanimate nouns; however, in colloquial styles, it can also be used with [+human] nouns:

- (8) Dün üç tane elma ye-di-m  
 yesterday three ‘item’ apple eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I ate three apples’

It is hard to characterize the function of this classifier; in (8), it is certainly optional. Using the classifier seems to focus on the individuality of the noun and on the count—the latter made clear by the fact that this classifier cannot show up without numerals:

- (9) a. Dün kırmızı (\*tane) elma ye-di-m  
 yesterday red ‘item’ apple eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I ate red apples’
- b. Dün kırmızı (\*tane) elma -lar ye-di-m  
 yesterday red ‘item’ apple -PL eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I ate red apples’
- c. Dün kırmızı (\*tane) elma -yı ye-di-m  
 yesterday red ‘item’ apple -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I ate the red apple’
- d. Dün kırmızı (\*tane) elma -lar -ı ye-di-m  
 yesterday red ‘item’ apple -PL -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I ate the red apples’

We see that irrespective of whether the noun phrase is marked with plural or not, or whether it is marked with a case marker or not, this classifier is ill-formed in the absence of a numeral.

The same generalization holds when this classifier shows up with a human noun phrase in colloquial styles. I shall present a well-formed example for illustration:

- (10) Dün üç tane öğrenci gör-dü-m  
 yesterday three ‘item’ student see-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I saw three students’

Having now illustrated the use and distribution of the classifier *tane*, let us turn to its use in partitive constructions, starting with ablative partitives. First of all, it is possible to use this classifier so as to modify the subset expression:

- (11) Meyva-lar-dan üç tane elma ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL three ‘item’ apple eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I ate three apples out of (the set of) fruits’

More interestingly, it is possible to leave out the head noun of the subset expression, thus apparently using the classifier as though it were the head noun instead:

- (12) Meyva-lar-dan üç tane ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL three item eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I ate three (pieces of) fruit’ (lit.: ‘Of the fruits, I ate three “items” ’)

There are certain differences, however, between the distribution of the classifier in its use as the head of a partitive subset expression, and the distribution of a regular lexical noun in the same function. One difference is that the classifier cannot be marked with the overt accusative:

- (13) \*/?? Meyva-lar-dan üç tane -yi ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL three item -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: ‘I ate three *specific* (pieces of) fruit’ (lit.: ‘Of the fruits, I ate three *specific* “items” ’)

Speakers judge utterances such as (13) as either completely ill-formed, or as borderline-to-bad. In order to express the intended reading, with a specific interpretation of the subset, and to make the attachment of overt accusative possible, a “dummy” agreement marker (for third person singular) must be inserted, I claim, into the head noun position:

- (14) Meyva-lar-dan üç tane **-sin** -i ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL three item **-3.SG.** -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I ate three *specific* (pieces of) fruit’ (lit.: ‘Of the fruits, I ate three *specific* “items” ’)<sup>6</sup>

Note that the classifier *tane*, in its function as a partitive subset expression, seems to be in (partial) complementary distribution with a lexical noun in the same function; this can be seen clearly by comparing (13) and (14) with (5b) and (6), respectively: the subset expressed as a lexical noun can be successfully suffixed with the accusative, while the subset expressed as classifier (without a lexical nominal head) cannot; on the other hand, a lexical noun as a subset expression cannot be suffixed with the “dummy” agreement marker, while the classifier *tane*, in the same function, can be so suffixed. It is only when the subset expression is not followed by either the agreement suffix or by the accusative suffix that both types of subset expression are well-formed.

---

<sup>6</sup> Note that this example also has a second, non-specific reading, despite the fact that the accusative marker shows up here. We shall revisit this point in the text of the paper. Briefly, the explanation for this surprising second interpretation is that the accusative is necessitated by the occurrence of the dummy *Agr* element and its formally (rather than semantically) specific pronominal features. Therefore, the subset expression can be semantically non-specific, despite the occurrence of the accusative marker. This, then, is another instance where we can have a non-specific subset expression in a partitive phrase, i.e. another problematic instance for the claim in Enç (1991) that partitives must be specific.

How is the difference to be explained between the classifier *tane*, when used as a nominal head for the partitive subset, and any lexical noun used in the same function?

I propose that this is due to the interplay of two factors: 1. When a lexical noun is missing as the head of an NP (and this is true of any NP, not just of partitives), the N-position must be overtly filled, due to a general principle that we shall return to. This can be done either by raising the head of a local, immediately preceding modifier to the N-position, if the raised item's category features are compatible with [+N], or by inserting an appropriate element, again with compatible category features, into the N-position. Examples (12) and (14) illustrate these two options, respectively. In (12), the classifier, which is the head of a Number Phrase, has moved up to the head-N position; in (14), the classifier is in-situ, and a "dummy" Agr element with the constant phi-features of third person singular takes up the N-head position. Either way, the N-head position is filled.

Why does the language have two distinct ways of respecting the constraint about a filled N-head? In other words, how do (12) and (14) differ?

In (12), the classifier has risen to N. The classifier *tane* has lost its original meaning of 'grain' in its function as classifier (it can still have its original meaning in other contexts, where it is used as a clear-cut noun). When it appears as a clear-cut classifier, together with the numeral, its semantics are only that of 'countable item'. Therefore, it cannot contribute referential specificity. This is why, when it raises and becomes the head of the subset expression, it cannot be followed by the accusative—a structural case marker which, as stated earlier, is sensitive to the feature of specificity. This explains why (13) is ill-formed.

In (14), on the other hand, the classifier is in-situ, and the "dummy" Agr occupies the position of N. I propose here that even though this Agr element has no independent semantic content, it has formal features which explain its distributional properties. In addition to its category features, namely [+N]<sup>7</sup>, I suggest that this element has pronominal features, as well. This is an idea which has been proposed in the literature, especially for Null Subject Languages; Turkish is an NSL language. Pronominals are specific from a referential point of view; in approaches that are based on hierarchies, they are placed very high, typically right after personal names (e.g. Aissen xxxx). I thus propose that the dummy Agr element inserted into N is formally specific, due to its pronominal feature specification, even though that element is not semantically specific (given that it is not a

---

<sup>7</sup> As mentioned earlier, this agreement marker belongs to the so-called nominal (rather than verbal) agreement paradigm (cf., for example, Kornfilt 1997 for a number of different agreement paradigms in Turkish), i.e. the paradigm that supplies the forms to possessive phrases, genitive partitive phrases, and nominalized embedded clauses. This is in contrast to the verbal agreement paradigm, which supplies the agreement forms for verbal predicates. In both instances, the phi-features expressed by the agreement forms are those of the specifier of the domain in question, i.e. of subjects in clauses, possessors in possessive phrases, and the superset expressions in genitive partitive phrases.

referential element).<sup>8</sup> In many contexts, this dummy *Agr* element corresponds to the English pronouns *one* or *ones*, which are pronouns with very little or no referentiality, and which are also, just as the Turkish dummy *Agr*, used as “placeholders” for a nominal head.

Now if this proposal is on the right track, we would expect that the *Agr* head, where it heads a DP which is a direct object, would be followed by the accusative marker. This is indeed the case, as illustrated in (14). Crucially, in these instances of ablative partitives that are missing a lexical nominal head, the *Agr* element functions as the nominal head. Here, *Agr* is *not* a functional category which is higher than the N-head; the latter is the case in (6), i.e. in instances where the N-position is occupied by a lexical noun, and where *Agr* is therefore a functional head which is higher than N in the phrasal architecture. We said that in those latter instances, there is no motivation for the *Agr* (as a *functional* head) in ablative partitives, and that therefore the *Agr* leads to ill-formedness. In contrast, in instances such as (14), the *Agr* shows up due to a general principle that requires a formal nominal *head*; thus, *Agr* is motivated, and in turn requires the placement of the accusative marker after it, as we see, due to its formal pronominal, and thus formally specific, phi-features.

We mentioned earlier that in colloquial styles, the classifier *tane* can also be used for human partitives; similar observations with respect to the function of the dummy *Agr* as the nominal head in ablative partitives hold for that usage, as well:

- (15)            Öğrenci-ler-den        üç    tane    -**sin**    -i        gör-dü-m  
                   student-PL-ABL        three    item    -**3.SG.**    -ACC    see-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I saw three (“units” of) the students’ (lit.: ‘Of the students, I saw three “units” ’; colloq.)

Just as we saw in (14), this utterance is ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading. The specific reading is just as expected on the basis of the overt accusative. The surprising availability of the non-specific reading, despite the accusative, is explained in the same way as for (14), i.e. based on the formal, rather than semantic, specificity of the dummy *Agr*, and the resulting obligatoriness of the accusative. The accusative marker thus stops being a reliable indicator of *semantic* specificity in these instances where it shows up due to *formal* specificity (cf. v. Heusinger & Kornfilt 2005, Kornfilt 2007).

Before turning to genitive partitives with classifiers, I want to mention another semantically bleached noun which is often used for human partitives: *kişi* ‘person, individual’. At first glance, this looks like a [+human] counterpart of the classifier *tane*: the subset expression headed by *kişi* is best when it is bare, i.e. not followed by overt accusative; when the accusative does follow, the result sounds strange:

---

<sup>8</sup> This is reminiscent of expletive subjects, which are inserted “dummy” elements, too; they are devoid of thematic roles, but do qualify as DPs and, under certain approaches, as arguments.



(16) a. Öğrenci-ler-den üç kişi gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-ABL three person see-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I saw three individuals of the students’ (lit.: ‘Of the students, I saw three individuals’)

(16) b. ??Öğrenci-ler-den üç kişi -yi gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-ABL three person -ACC see-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I saw three specific individuals of the students’ (lit.: ‘Of the students, I saw three specific individuals’)

However, when suffixed with a “dummy” 3. Person nominal agreement marker, the result is ill-formed, clearly contrasting with the corresponding situation when *tane*, the “count” classifier, is used:

(17) \*Öğrenci-ler-den üç kişi -sin -i gör-dü-m  
 student-PL-ABL three person -3.AGR -ACC see-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: ‘I saw three specific individuals of the students’ (lit.: ‘Of the students, I saw three specific individuals’)

I propose the following explanation: Despite the semantic and, at first glance, distributional similarities between *kişi* and *tane*, *kişi* is not a classifier; rather, it is a regular lexical noun, albeit semantically rather bleached. This is why it has the basic distributional properties of a lexical noun when expressing the partitive subset, and not those of a classifier. Let us review why a lexical noun as a subset expression rejects the *Agr* in the ablative partitive construction:

There are two kinds of *Agr* in partitives: 1. The head of a functional projection (let us not take a stand here on whether this is DP or AgrP); as such, it licenses the genitive case on the specifier of the construction in genitive partitives (and, of course, in possessives, as well); 2. The “dummy” *Agr*, which is inserted into the N-head of an NP, when no lexical N-head is available.

We had said that the first type of *Agr* is not available in ablative partitives, because it is unmotivated; it is available only in genitive partitives.

The second type of *Agr* is, as we saw, available in ablative partitives (and, as we shall see, in genitive partitives, as well), but only when there is no lexical N-head. If however there is a lexical N-head, then there is no room for the dummy *Agr* to be inserted (and of course no motivation to insert it, either). If it is true that *kişi* is not a classifier, but a lexical N, then it would be base-generated in N, thus blocking insertion of *Agr*. This is what we find.

Supporting evidence comes from the fact that *kişi* cannot be used as a classifier with an overt lexical N-head, thus contrasting with *tane*:

(18) a. üç tane öğrenci  
 three ‘item’ student  
 ‘Three students’ (colloq.)

b. \**üç kişi öğrenci*  
 three ‘individual’ student  
 Intended reading: ‘Three students’

We have now ruled out either type of *Agr* in ablative partitives, when the subset is expressed by a lexical noun, with *kişi* analyzed as a lexical noun.

But if *kişi* is a lexical noun rather than a classifier, why doesn’t it tolerate suffixation with overt accusative better than it does?

I propose that the reason for this is semantic, rather than purely formal in a narrowly syntactic sense. Given that *kişi* is bleached semantically, it is difficult to impute referential specificity to it. But if such specificity is contributed to it externally, e.g. via a relative clause and other additional modification, *kişi* does tolerate suffixation with the accusative, while *tane* never does; for it to be followed by overt accusative, it must first be followed by the dummy *Agr*, thus clearly showing its true nature as a classifier:

(19) a. *Öğrenci-ler-den sınav-ı geç-en üç kişi -yi öv -dü-m*  
 student-PL-ABL exam-ACC pass-REL.Pthree person -ACC praise-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Of the students, I praised three specific individuals who passed the exam’

b. \**Öğrenci-ler-den sınav-ı geç-en üç tane -yi öv -dü-m*  
 student-PL-ABL exam-ACC pass-REL.Pthree item -ACC praise-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: ‘Of the students, I praised three specific individuals (lit. ‘units’) who passed the exam’

We had seen earlier that the classifier *tane* can be used, in colloquial style, with human heads; however, we see that this combination does not work, even with further modification, when there is no lexical nominal head. In other words, even when *tane* does move up to head N position, it still retains its basic semantics as classifier, and it is devoid of semantic reference to such an extent that even modification with a relative clause cannot enable it to take on specificity; hence, its rejection of overt accusative, in contrast to *kişi*, which is not a classifier, as we said, but a lexical noun, albeit a semantically bleached one.

In order for *tane* to be able to co-occur with overt accusative, the dummy *Agr* is necessary, as we saw before in (15), repeated here for convenience:

(15) *Öğrenci-ler-den üç tane -sin -i gör-dü-m*  
 student-PL-ABL three item -3.SG. -ACC see-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I saw three (“units” of) the students’ (lit.: ‘Of the students, I saw three “units” ’; colloq.)

Now let us turn to genitive partitives with classifiers, i.e. with *tane*. We shall also consider *kişi*, just as we did for ablative partitives, so as to highlight any contrasts.

Recall that none of the examples we saw for illustration of genitive partitives with lexical noun heads was well-formed; one may even wonder whether genitive partitives are even an option in Turkish. We ask the reader for patience, as we are about to see a first illustration of a well-formed genitive partitive construction. Given that *kişi*, as just argued, is a lexical noun, it behaves just like other lexical nouns: it cannot show up in genitive partitives. On the other hand, *tane*, as a different type of item, i.e. by virtue of being a classifier, does behave differently and does show up in one type of well-formed genitive partitive: we shall see that this is same type that's well-formed as an ablative partitive, as well, namely when the classifier is in-situ and the nominal head is filled with a dummy *Agr* element:

(20)            Meyva-lar-in            üç    tane    **-sin**    -i       ye-di-m  
                   student-PL-GEN        three   item    **-3.SG.**   -ACC   eat-PST-1.SG  
 'I ate three ("items" of) the fruits (lit.: 'Of the fruits, I ate three "items" '; colloq.)

(21)            Öğrenci-ler-in            üç    tane    **-sin**    -i       gör-dü-m  
                   student-PL-GEN        three   item    **-3.SG.**   -ACC   see-PST-1.SG  
 'I saw three ("units" of) the students' (lit.: 'Of the students, I saw three "units" '; colloq.)

On the one hand, the well-formedness of these genitive partitives is expected; but at the same time, this is also somewhat surprising. We may expect for these examples to be well-formed, due to two reasons: 1. The genitive specifier, i.e. the superset expression, needs to be licensed by agreement; there is agreement here. 2. We had argued that in genitive partitives, the subset can't be expressed by a lexical item that reflects a non-identical subset of the superset's properties, because if it does, the interpretation of possessivity overrides and blocks that of partitivity. Here, we don't have a lexical head; instead, we have a dummy *Agr* with pronominal features in head position. These pronominal features agree with those of the genitive specifier and thus express identical properties rather than a subset of properties; the blocking effect of a possessive interpretation therefore doesn't arise.

The surprising aspect of these examples' the well-formedness centers around the question of the *Agr* element: is this an instance of the dummy *Agr*, or of the *Agr* which is the head of a functional projection? In principle, both types should have been realized: the *Agr* as a functional head so as to license the genitive, as well as dummy *Agr*, so as to satisfy the requirement that there be a filled N-head position.

But we know that two agreement elements cannot form an immediate sequence in Turkish, even if they are not phonologically identical; Kornfilt (1996) describes this phenomenon and labels it "Stuttering Prohibition". There, based on somewhat different facts in Turkish, it is proposed that a genuine phi-feature agreement element wins over a "dummy" *Agr* with constant feature values that do not range over a number of possible combinations, and that the winner takes over the functions of the loser. If this is really the case, then we conclude that in these genitive partitives with in-situ classifiers, the *Agr* element is the functional element (i.e. the genuine agreement), because this is what's needed to license the genitive; the dummy *Agr* loses out, but its function as a provider of

a nominal head for the entire phrase is taken over by the *Agr* as a functional head. These considerations take care of the surprise in seeing that these genitive partitives are well-formed examples, enabling us to treat them as constructions whose existence is expected.

This analysis makes the following prediction: If the N-head position is taken up by a genuine *Agr* element instead of a dummy *Agr*, then the functional *Agr* element won't be realized, due to the Stuttering Prohibition. But if the functional *Agr* element is missing, then the genitive can't be licensed on the superset expression. On the other hand, given that the ablative partitive doesn't need the functional *Agr* element to be licensed, it should be possible for a genuine *Agr* element to show up with an ablative partitive, while being ruled out for the genitive partitive. This is what we find:

- (22) a.      Öğrenci-ler-den      sadece üç      -ünüz      -ü      öv      -düş      -m  
                  student-PL-ABL      only three      -2.PL      -ACC      praise      -PST      -1.SG  
                  ‘Of the students, I praised only you three’
- b.      \*Öğrenci-ler-in      sadece üç      -ünüz      -ü      öv      -düş      -m  
                  student-PL-GEN      only three      -2.PL      -ACC      praise      -PST      -1.SG  
                  Intended reading: ‘Of the students, I praised only you three’

In these examples, we have, instead of the classifier *tane*, numeral modifiers in the subset expressions. As we are about to see, numerals as well as certain quantifiers are similar to *tane* in their ability to stay in-situ; thus they, too, trigger insertion of *Agr* into the N-head position of the subset expression in partitives. (They are different from *tane*, however, in not being able to raise to N—a second option which *tane* does allow, as we saw earlier.)

We shall look at instances of dummy *Agr* with numerals and quantifiers in a moment; in the examples just given, we have genuine *Agr*, i.e. *Agr* with phi-features that do not consist of the constant, “unmarked” combination of third person singular, but can range over a number of value combinations, depending on reference; in our examples, the features happen to be second person and plural.

In the ablative partitive, all should be well in this set-up, and it is; the requirement that a nominal phrase should have a filled nominal head is satisfied, as well as the Stuttering Prohibition. Furthermore, the satisfaction of the Stuttering Prohibition, i.e. the lack of a *functional Agr* as a Case licenser, does not have any ill effects, because the ablative of the superset expression is not a licensed Case.

In contrast, the genitive partitive is problematic under the same conditions. While the requirement for a filled nominal head is satisfied as well as the Stuttering Prohibition, the latter principle leads to a missing functional *Agr*; as a consequence, the genitive Case remains unlicensed, leading to ill-formedness. Note that the phi-features of the existing *Agr* cannot move up to the functional *Agr*-head, and those phi-features cannot do double duty as both a filler of the N-head and as a licenser of the Genitive—something we had allowed to happen (albeit in the reverse direction) in the genitive partitive with the

classifier. This is because there would be a conflict of phi-features; the superset here has the features of third person plural, while the *Agr* has the features of second person plural.

This account makes the further prediction that genitive partitives should be well-formed with genuine (rather than dummy) *Agr* heads and numeral (or quantifier)-based modifiers of the subset, just in case the superset has the same phi-features as the *Agr* on the subset. This prediction is fulfilled:

- (23) a. Siz (-ler) -den            sadece üç        -ünüz -ü        öv        -dü        -m  
 you[pl]-PL-ABL            only three        -2.PL -ACC        praise -PST        -1.SG  
 ‘Of you (all), I praised only you three’
- b. ?Siz (-ler) -in            sadece üç        -ünüz -ü        öv        -dü        -m  
 student-PL-GEN            only three        -2.PL -ACC        praise -PST        -1.SG  
 ‘Of you (all), I praised only you three’

While the ablative partitive sounds somewhat better, the genitive partitive is fine, as well. Most importantly, (23b) is much better than (22b), which is completely ill-formed. The difference between these two genitive partitives is very robust.

We have seen how our analyses made very detailed, fine-grained predictions that were all fulfilled. Let us now look further at partitives with subset expressions that consist of numerals or other quantifiers, thus being in need of a filled N-head.

We have seen previously that numerals are quite similar to the classifier *tane* with respect to partitives, with the exception of the fact that they cannot raise to N, which means that they cannot show up as the head of the subset expression; in other words, they cannot show up in “bare” form, without the dummy *Agr* (which, in turn, gets suffixed with the accusative, as we saw and motivated earlier). Some other quantifiers share this property. Let us illustrate these generalizations:

- (24) a. \*meyva-lar-dan            altı                ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL            six                eat-PST-1.SG  
 b. \*meyva-lar-dan            altı-yı            ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL            six -ACC            eat-PST-1.SG  
 c. \*meyva-lar-dan            altı-sı            ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL            six -3.SG            eat-PST-1.SG

Intended reading for a.-c.: I ate six of the fruits’

- d. meyva-lar-dan            altı-sın -ı        ye-di-m  
 fruit -PL-ABL            six -3.SG-ACC        eat-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I ate six of the fruits’

Only the last example, with both dummy *Agr* and the accusative marker, is well-formed. The reason for the ill-formedness of (24c) is familiar: the agreement marker, due to its pronominal features, is formally, rather than semantically, specific and thus requires the accusative. The reason for the ill-formedness of a. and b. is, at this point, more

interesting: as mentioned in passing, numerals (and some other quantifiers) cannot raise to the N-head position; their category features don't qualify them as fillers of N. Therefore, a nominal dummy *Agr* is needed as a filler. This explains the contrast between numerals and the classifier *tane*, whose nominal features do qualify it as an N-filler; as a consequence, *tane* can show up as a bare subset expression in examples corresponding to a.

Here are a couple of examples to show that other quantifiers behave just as numerals in this respect:

- (25) a. \*meyva-lar-dan      bazı-lar      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL-ABL      some-PL      eat-PST-1.SG  
       b. \*meyva-lar-dan      bazı-lar -1      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL-ABL      some-PL -ACC      eat-PST-1.SG  
       c. \*meyva-lar-dan      bazı-lar -1      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL-ABL      some- PL -3.AGR      eat-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading for a.-c.: I ate some of the fruits'  
       d. meyva-lar-dan      bazı-lar -in -1      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL-ABL      SOME-PL-3.AGR-ACC      eat-PST-1.SG  
          'I ate some of the fruits'

We see that the quantifier *bazı* 'some' is well-formed as a subset expression only when it is not an N-head, i.e. when a nominal agreement element occupies the N-head position (and, as explained earlier, is followed by overt accusative, due to formal specificity), as in d. All other morpheme combinations are ill-formed.

Turning to genitive partitives, we saw our first well-formed construction of this sort when we considered the combination of the count classifier *tane* with the dummy *Agr*, and the overt accusative; subset expressions with lexical nouns were ill-formed with any morpheme combinations. Considering subset expressions with numerals and quantifiers, we find that they are well-formed under the same conditions that *tane* is, i.e. they must be followed by both a nominal *Agr* element and the accusative:

- (26) a. \*meyva-lar-in      altı      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL-GEN      six      eat-PST-1.SG  
       b. \*meyva-lar-in      altı-yı      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL- GEN      six -ACC      eat-PST-1.SG  
       c. \*meyva-lar-in      altı-sı      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL- GEN      six -3.SG      eat-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading for a.-c.: I ate six of the fruits'  
       d. meyva-lar-in      altı-sın -1      ye-di-m  
          fruit -PL- GEN      six -3.SG-ACC      eat-PST-1.SG  
          'I ate six of the fruits'

Similar considerations hold here as those that we had discussed with respect to genitive partitives with *tane*; briefly, the *Agr* element does double duty as the occupier of the N-

head, and as the licenser of the genitive case on the superset expression. Not surprisingly, the same facts are found with respect to quantifiers such as *bazı* ‘some’:

- (27) a. \*meyva-lar-in bazı-lar ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-GEN some-PL eat-PST-1.SG  
b. \*meyva-lar-in bazı-lar -1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-GEN some-PL -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
c. \*meyva-lar-in bazı-lar -1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-GEN some-PL -3.AGR eat-PST-1.SG  
Intended reading for a.-c.: ‘I ate some of the fruits’  
d. meyva-lar-in bazı-lar -in -1 ye-di-m  
fruit -PL-GEN some-PL-3.AGR-ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
‘I ate some of the fruits’

As the last category to be studied in this context, let us look at adjectives used as a subset expression in partitives.

It turns out that speakers of Turkish differ as to how readily they allow for adjectives to raise into the N-head position; some speakers are very lenient in this respect, some are not. What is interesting, however, is that even for the permissive speakers, this is a constrained process, because once the adjective has risen, it has to be followed by the accusative and cannot show up completely bare; when a non-specific reading needs to be expressed, some sort of different nominal head is necessary, even if it is just the classifier *tane*:

- (28) a. \*elma-lar-dan kırmızı ye-di-m  
apple -PL-ABL red eat-PST-1.SG  
Intended reading: ‘I ate a (non-specific) red (one) of the apples’  
b. ?elma-lar-dan kırmızı-yı ye-di-m  
apple -PL-ABL red -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
‘I read the red (one) of the apples’  
c. \*elma-lar-dan kırmızı-sı ye-di-m  
apple -PL-ABL red -3.SG eat-PST-1.SG  
Intended reading: ‘I ate the red (one) of the apples’  
d. elma-lar-dan kırmızı-sın -1 ye-di-m  
apple -PL-ABL red -3.SG-ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
‘I ate the red (one) of the apples’

The ill-formedness of c. is due to the familiar requirement that the agreement element is formally specific, due to its pronominal features, and therefore needs to be followed by overt accusative, as in d. The well-formedness of b. for a number of speakers is due to the ability of adjectives to raise to the N-head position of a nominal phrase. (Note that all speakers accept d., with dummy *Agr* in N-head position, as stellar. In other words, even those speakers who do allow their adjectives to freely raise to N-position accept the insertion of dummy nominal *Agr* to N-position and may even prefer it.)

It is rather mysterious to note that even those speakers who do allow the raising of adjectives to N do not seem to allow this, when the reading of the subset is supposed to be non-specific, i.e. with the adjective not followed by the accusative marker. I leave the solution of this puzzle to the future; this is tangential to our purposes, and in any case, even the better version with the overt accusative is not perfect and is not accepted by all speakers. What's important for us is that d. is well-formed.

Not surprisingly, the genitive partitive version of adjectives as subsets allows only the combination with the agreement (and, of course, the overt accusative):

- (29) a. \*elma-lar-ın kırmızı ye-di-m  
 apple -PL-GEN red eat-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: 'I ate a (non-specific) red (one) of the apples'
- b. \*elma-lar-ın kırmızı-yı ye-di-m  
 apple -PL-GEN red -ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 'I read the red (one) of the apples'  
 Intended reading: 'I ate the red (one) of the apples'
- c. \*elma-lar-ın kırmızı-sı ye-di-m  
 apple -PL-GEN red -3.SG eat-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: 'I ate the red (one) of the apples'
- d. elma-lar-ın kırmızı-sın -ı ye-di-m  
 apple -PL-GEN red -3.SG-ACC eat-PST-1.SG  
 'I ate the red (one) of the apples'

After this survey of the two main partitive types in Turkish and their interplay with different kinds of subset expressions, let us turn to some other Turkic languages. Let us first look at Azeri, a language genetically very close to (and typologically very similar to) Turkish.

## II. Azeri:

For all practical purposes, it is very similar to Turkish with respect to the properties we have looked at: **1. the genitive partitive requires an agreement to show up on the subset expression; the ablative partitive doesn't.**

- (30) a. \*Kitab-lar-ın iki dənə al -dı -m  
 book-PL-GEN two 'item' take-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: 'I took two 'units' of the books'

- (30) b. Kitab-lar-dan iki dənə al-dı-m  
 book-PL-GEN two 'item' take-PST-1.SG  
 'I took two 'units' of the books'

**2. The requirement that there be a nominal head** appears to exist and to play a similar role: in absence of a lexical nominal head, usually a dummy *Agr* element is inserted into the head, and that element makes the presence of overt Acc obligatory. We also see that adjectives can't raise to N-head position:



- (31) a. \*Maşın-lar-dan ən yeni al-dı-m  
 car -PL-ABL most new buy-PST-1.SG.  
 Intended reading: ‘I bought the newest (one) of the cars’
- (31) b. \*Maşın-lar-dan ən yeni-**ni** al-dı-m  
 car -PL-ABL most new-ACC buy-PST-1.SG.
- (31) c. \*Maşın-lar-dan ən yeni-**si** al-dı-m  
 car -PL-ABL most new-3. buy-PST-1.SG.
- (31) d. Maşın-lar-dan ən yeni-sin-i al-dı-m  
 car -PL-ABL most new-3.- ACC buy-PST-1.SG.

Only the form with both the dummy *Agr* and the accusative is well-formed.

The situation is similar with numerals, i.e. they can’t raise to N-position:

- (32) a. (Baxmadan) kitab-lar-dan iki-sin-i al-dı-m  
 without looking book-PL-ABL two-3.-ACC buy-PST-1.SG.  
 ‘(Without looking), I bought two of the books’

The manner adverbial *baxmadan* ‘without looking’ enforces a non-specific reading for the partitive direct object. Yet, the subset expression is marked with the accusative. This is due to the fact that the numeral cannot raise to N-head position; the dummy *Agr* is inserted instead, making overt accusative necessary. Forms without both *Agr* and *Acc* are ill-formed:

- (32)b. \*Kitablardan ikisi al  
 (32)c. \*Kitablardan iki al  
 (32)d. \*Kitablardan ikini al

This results in overt *Acc* not expressing specificity any longer in such instances, just as in Turkish.

The same is true for the non-specific pronoun *biri* ‘somebody, someone’, also just as in Turkish. This pronoun is morphologically complex:

- (33) bir -i(n)  
 one -3.

Presumably, the reason for the complexity is that the numeral by itself cannot be an N and therefore needs a dummy *Agr* element. This *Agr* element makes the *Acc* obligatory, just as it does elsewhere:

- (34) Bu xüsusiyyət-lər-ə malik ol-an bir-in-i axtar-ır-am

This characteristic-PL-DAT owner be-RelPart one-3.ACC search-AOR-1.SG  
'I am looking for someone who has these properties'

This example could be part of a job ad. The speaker or writer is looking for *anybody* who has a particular set of characteristics.

Thus, the strongest reading is that of a non-specific person; the accusative shows up not due to semantic specificity, but due to the *Agr -in*. This example is similar in shape to example (36) below with *Acc*, but in meaning it is similar to example (35) with a bare head (i.e. no ACC), because of its non-specific reading.

(35) Bu xüsusiyyət -lər-ə malik olan bir insan / bir kitabxanaçı axtar-ır-am  
This characteristic-PL-DAT owner be-RelPart a person/a librarian search-AOR-1.SG  
'I am looking for a person/a librarian who has these characteristics'

Just as (34) this can be a job ad. Only properties important, not reference.

The next example differs only in having overt accusative on the direct object:

(36) Bu xüsusiyyətlərə malik olan bir insan-ı / bir kitabxanaçı-nı axtarıram

Here, the speaker is looking for a specific person/librarian.

The next pair of examples makes a similar point:

(37) \* Eli qadın-lar-dan iki-si çağır-dı

(38) Eli qadın-lar-dan iki-sin-i çağır-dı  
Ali woman-PL-ABL two-3.-ACC call-PST  
'Ali called two of the women'

This pair illustrates that *Agr* requires presence of *Acc*; (37) is therefore ill-formed. Also, because of this, (38) is ambiguous between a specific and non-specific reading; the latter important for us: once again, this shows that in such instances, ACC doesn't necessarily signal a specific reading; also, this further shows that there can be a non-specific subset in partitives.

We saw earlier that the count classifier *dənə* can raise to head-N position in appropriate contexts, just as its Turkish cognate *tane* in Turkish. We repeat our first Azeri example:

(39) (Baxmadan) kitablardan iki dənə aldım  
'I took two 'units' of the books without looking'

Also, similarly to Turkish, it is possible to suffix this classifier-head with *Agr* (with concomitant further suffixation by the *Acc*), as illustrated by the next example:

- (40) Kitab-lar-dan iki dənə-sin -i al -dı -m  
 book-PL-ABL two item-3.SG-ACC buy-PST-1.SG  
 ‘I bought two (‘units’) of the books’

We shall thus use the same analysis proposed for Turkish, i.e. we shall say that the classifier has the option to either raise to N-head position, in which case it is bare as in (39), or it has the option of staying in-situ, in which case *Agr* is inserted into the N-head position, as in (40).

Also, just as in Turkish, it is not possible to have the following combinations (i.e. the classifier followed only by *Acc*, and the classifier followed only by *Agr*):

- (41) \* Kitab-lar-dan iki dənə-ni al -dı -m  
 book-PL-ABL two item-ACC buy-PST-1.SG  
 Intended reading: ‘I bought two ‘units’ of the books’

- (42) \* Kitab-lar-dan iki dənə-si al-dı-m  
 book-PL-ABL two item-3. buy-PST-1.SG  
 Same intended reading.

(42) is ill-formed for reasons familiar by now: when the *Agr* is in N-head position, it has pronominal features, and those necessitate the presence of overt *Acc*, due to formal reasons, i.e. pronominal features are formally specific.

The ill-formedness of the example with *Acc* but without *Agr* must be due to the same reasons we had proposed for the corresponding example in Turkish: when the classifier is in N-head position, its semantic emptiness as a nominal and its nature as a classifier rather than as a true lexical noun preclude the possibility of overt *Acc*.

In ablative partitives (but not in genitive partitives) it is possible to have a subset expressed by a lexical noun, which further makes it possible for the subset to have properties which are a subset of those of the superset. (This isn’t always the case in all of the other Turkic languages.)

- (43) Äli büro-ya uşaq-lar-dan iki qız al-acaq  
 Ali office-DAT child-PL-ABL two girl hire-FUT  
 ‘Ali will hire for the office two girls of the children’ (any two girls)

- (44) Äli büro -ya uşaq-lar-dan iki qız-ı al-acaq  
 Ali office-DAT child-PL-ABL two girl-ACC hire-FUT  
 ‘Ali will hire for the office two girls of the children’ (certain two girls)

The info in parentheses was provided by the informant, Vügar Sultanzade.

(43) as well as its inanimate counterpart with the count classifier offer additional illustration for non-specific partitives.

Azeri, in addition to all its similarities to Turkish, has an interesting difference: it has a [+human] classifier: *nəfər*. This item means something like 'person', but in contrast to *kişi* in Turkish, it can modify a noun within an NP, as we shall see later. When this item raises to N-position, due to lack of a lexical nominal head, it can be followed by the accusative; its inanimate counterpart *dənə* cannot, as we saw earlier.

(45) *Əli qadın-lar-dan iki nəfər çağır-dı*  
 Ali woman-PL-ABL two person call-PST  
 'Ali called two (persons) of the women'

(46) *Əli qadın -lar-dan iki nəfər -i çağır-dı.*  
 Ali woman-PL-ABL two person-ACC call-PST  
 'Ali called two [specific] (persons) of the women'

Our native Azeri consultant feels that the version with the accusative is ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific reading (while the version without the accusative is non-specific, just as in Turkish); however, this may be due to the [+human] feature, see below. At any rate, the existence of examples such as (45) shows that in Azeri, too, there clearly are instances of non-specific partitive subsets.

The hypothesis that the *Acc* in Azeri, in addition to representing specificity, also signals the feature [+human], is based on the following observations:

*nəfər*, just like *dənə*, is a classifier in a regular DP:

(47) *iki dənə kitab*  
 two item book  
 'two books'

is fine, just as are the following two examples with *nəfər*:

(48) a. *iki nəfər telebe*  
 two person student  
 'two students'

(48) b. *iki nəfər qadın*  
 two person woman  
 'two women'

Our informant as well as textbooks state that both *dənə* and *nəfər* are classifiers, with *dənə* for inanimates, and *nəfər* for humans.

In this respect, *nəfər* is different from *kişi* in Turkish, because we saw earlier that *kişi* cannot be used as a modifier within a DP; thus, the following is ill-formed:

(49) \*iki kişi kadın  
 two person woman  
 Intended reading: ‘two women’

We see that the two classifiers in Azeri are quite parallel. Nonetheless, they seem to be somewhat differentiated when they are placed in N-head position in partitives, so as to satisfy our “overt N-head” principle: we saw that *dənə* can’t be suffixed with the *Acc*; the example is repeated below:

(50) \*Kitab-lar-dan iki dənə-ni al-dı-m

but *nəfər* can, as we saw above.

In (45), without the accusative, and with *nəfər* as the subset expression, the two individuals are non-specific; in (46), with the accusative, the same classifier used as the subset expression is said to be either specific or non-specific. We hypothesize that in Azeri, the *Acc.* marker may be an expression of not only (semantic or formal) specificity, but also of the [+human] feature. Thus, in (46), even under a non-specific reading, the accusative is preferred by some speakers, because the classifier-cum-nominal head is human. The fact that the same classifier-as-nominal head can (and must) be suffixed by accusative for a semantically specific reading requires no explanation: just as in Turkish, semantic, referential specificity requires overt *Acc*; if the head, albeit a classifier and thus not a true nominal, is [+human], this makes the *Acc* marker possible. If the same classifier is referential as well, then the *Acc* marker becomes obligatory—of course only if its occurrence is formally possible, as it is here.

In contrast, the classifier *dənə*, due to its [-human] specification, cannot override its shortcomings as a “fake” nominal when it is in N-head position and as a semantically empty nominal, at that. Therefore, utterances with this item and overt *Acc* are ill-formed, as their counterparts are in Turkish.

These considerations show the importance of the feature [human] in Azeri for differential object marking, and the difference between this language and Turkish—two languages otherwise very similar.

Let us now look at our general properties in three languages which are more distantly related to Turkish.

### 3. Kazakh:

We start with the following property: The genitive partitive requires *Agr*, the ablative doesn’t (the latter requires it only for the purposes of filling the head-N position).

(51) a. Qaramay            kitap-tar-dan eke-ü            al-dı-m.  
 without.looking        book-PL-ABL two-‘set’        take-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Without looking, I took (a set of) two from the (set of) books’

b. Qaramay                    kitap-tar-dıñ eke -ü -i -n                    al-dı-m  
 without.looking            book-PL-GEN two-‘set’-3.-ACC            take-PST-1.SG  
 ‘Without looking, I took (a set of) two from the (set of) books’

These examples are synonymous. The ablative partitive lacks agreement; it also lacks accusative, given that the subset is non-specific; these are any two books out of the larger set of books. (Thus this example illustrates that non-specific subsets of partitives are possible in Kazakh, as well.)

In the genitive partitive, the 3. Person agreement form is obligatory (it licenses the genitive, as its counterpart in Turkish and Azeri), and that form makes the following accusative marker obligatory.

4. In **Uighur**, the following two examples illustrate the same correlation between genitive and agreement, and lack thereof in ablative partitives:

(52) Äli u                    xotun-lar-**din**    ikki-ni /ikki-sin-i    tonu-ydu.  
 Ali those            women-PL-ABL two-ACC/two-3.-ACC know-PST  
 ‘Ali knew two of those women’

(53) Äli u                    xotun-lar-**niñ**    \*ikki-ni /ikki-**si**-ni    tonu-ydu.  
 Ali those women-PL-GEN \*two-ACC/two-**3**.-ACC know-PST  
 ‘Ali knew two of those women’

In the ablative, both the form with and without the 3. Person agreement is fine; in the genitive partitive, the form with the agreement is obligatory; the form with only the accusative is ill-formed. (With respect to the two possible forms in the ablative partitive, we shall say in essence what we had said for the classifier *tane* in Turkish: the numeral may raise to N in Uighur, or it may stay in-situ. (In Turkish, it cannot raise.) If it stays in-situ, *Agr* will occupy the N-head position, and be followed by *Acc*. If the numeral raises, no *Agr* can show up. The only difference between the situation concerning *tane* in Turkish and the numeral in Uighur is that *tane*, even after raising, cannot be followed by *Acc*, because its features are not specific in any sense. (As an aside, in Turkish, the numeral can’t raise at all, and *Agr* must always be inserted.) In Uighur, the numeral is followed by *Acc* after raising. Whether this means that the numeral in Uighur is similar to *Agr* in having formal specificity features, or whether *Acc* in Uighur doesn’t have the property of representing specificity has to be investigated.

Uighur thus behaves in general terms just like Turkish, Azeri, and Kazakh. It is different from either Turkish and Azeri only in that the numeral can apparently raise to the nominal head position (obviously a possibility only in the ablative partitive, since in the genitive version, the agreement is obligatory, thus blocking the raising of the numeral). We saw that the numeral can be followed by *Acc*, even in the absence of *Agr*. It is interesting to note, though, that when the numeral raises, it *must* be followed by the accusative; the bare form is not possible:

(54) \*Äli u xotun-lar-din ikki tonu-ydu

More needs to be known about the accusative in Uighur before drawing any conclusions.

Another property in which Uighur is just like the other languages is that once the *Agr* does appear, the Acc marker is obligatory:

(55) \*Äli u xotun-lar-din ikki-si tonu-ydu

Another way in which Uighur differs from its cognates is that some lexical nouns can be used as subset expressions in partitives whose supersets include the same noun (this is possible but marked in Turkish):

(56) Äli u xotun-lar-**din** ikki xotun-ni tanu-ydu. (Abl.) (w. Acc.)  
Ali those woman-PL-ABL two woman-ACC know-PST  
'Ali knew two women of those women'

This is ambiguous between:

1. any 2 women in this group,
2. 2 particular women in this group.

It is not possible to leave out the Acc. for an unspecific reading:

(57) \*Äli u xotunlardin ikki xotun tanuydu. (Abl.) (without Acc.)

Thus, (56) can also have a non-specific reading for the partitive subset, despite the presence of the accusative marker.

This construction is not possible with the Genitive partitive construction::

(58) \*Äli u xotun-lar-**niŋ** ikki xotun-ni tanu-ydu. (Gen.) (with Acc.)  
Ali those woman-PL-GEN two woman-ACC know-PST

Intended reading: Same as for (56), with which this example should be compared.

Presumably, the ill-formedness of (58) is because Genitive requires an Agreement element.

But this example is not good with *Agr*, either:

(59) \*Äli u xotun -lar-**niŋ** ikki xotun-**in-i** tanu-ydu. (Gen.)  
Ali those woman-PL-GEN two woman-**3.-ACC** know-PST

Intended reading: Same as for (56) and (58), with which this example should be compared.

(59) is bad under a partitive reading; this example is acceptable only under the meaning that *xotunlarniŋ* is the **possessor** of *ikki xotun*, rather than the larger set of the partitive.

We see that the accusative can reflect specific as well as non-specific interpretations; this is so here in constructions where the accusative can't be left out. What needs to be investigated is whether the accusative can **ever** be left out.

5. Similar properties, as well as similar questions, are presented by **Kirghiz**, as well:

- (60) a. \*Ali ayal -dar-dan eki kiŋi taanu-ču.  
Ali woman-PL-ABL two person know-PRES.  
Intended reading: Same as the next example: 'Ali knows two of the women'
- b. Ali ayal-dar-dan eki kiŋi -ni taanu-ču.  
Ali woman-PL-ABL two person-ACC know-PRES.  
'Ali knows two of the women'

We see that the ablative partitive is OK with the Accusative on the subset expression, and is bad without. This seems to be similar to what we saw in Uighur. The next pair of examples is similar:

- (61) \*Ali ofis-ke bal-dar-dan eki kiŋi algana žatat  
Ali office-DAT child-PL-ABL two person take-will  
Intended reading: 'Ali will hire two of the children for the office'

- (62) Ali ofis-ke bal-dar-dan eki kiŋi -ni algana žatat  
Ali office-DAT child-PL-ABL two person-ACC take-will  
'Ali will hire two of the children for the office'

Similar to the previous pair: bad without Acc., good with.

For whatever reason (to be investigated), it is not possible to leave out the accusative. It is possible that [+human] heads need to be marked with the accusative, even for non-specific readings. Thus, what's a possibility in Azeri, may be a necessity in Uighur and Kirghiz. Indeed, the well-formed constructions with the accusative are ambiguous between specific and non-specific readings, probably due to the fact that the "bare" form is not possible and thus there is no dedicated, separate form for non-specific DOs.

We have seen that: The individual languages differ according to what category can raise. But otherwise, the grammar is quite similar with respect to: 1. the raising itself, 2. the principle that requires the head N to be filled, 3. with respect to *Agr* being a possible filler of N in absence of raising, 4. with the requirement that after *Agr*, *Acc* is obligatory even if the semantics are non-specific, 5. with respect to *Acc* not signaling specificity when its presence is due to a formal requirement (such as *Agr*'s presence, or the presence of some other element that requires the presence of *Acc*), 6. with respect to *Gen* always requiring *Agr*, but not *Abl* (at least not for licensing purposes).



Just a brief illustration for the last property, still from **Kirghiz**, starting with a repetition of (62):

(62) Ali ofis -ke bal-dar **-dan** eki kiši -ni algana žatat.  
Ali office-DAT child-PL-ABL two person-ACC take-will  
'Ali will hire two of the children for the office'

(63)\*Ali ofis -ke bal-dar **-dın** eki kiši-ni algana žatat.  
Ali office-DAT child-PL-GEN two person-ACC take-will  
Intended reading: 'Ali will hire two of the children for the office'

The genitive partitive is ill-formed, because there is no agreement element on the subset expression. The accusative marker is not enough. The ablative partitive is well-formed. The informant gives the following expression for a genitive partitive, to express the same meaning:

(64) Ali ofis -ke bal-dar **-dın** ekö-ö-sü-n(ü) algana jatat.  
Ali office-DAT child-PL-GEN two-set-3.-ACC take-will

It appears that (63) can be saved only by using a numeral and a dummy *Agr*, rather than using (63) "as is", with *Agr*. The reason for this must be the same as in the Turkish examples with *kişi*: Although this item has certain resemblance with a classifier, it is a lexical noun, albeit semantically rather bleached (but still [+human]). No *Agr* can be inserted into the N-head position after *kişi*, because that position is occupied by *kişi* itself.

The following pair in Kirghiz is interesting, too:

(65) karabastan kitep-ter-den ekö-ö -nü al -dı -m.  
without looking book-PL-ABL two-set-ACC buy-PST-1.SG  
'I bought (a set of) two books out of the (set of) books, without looking'

The Kirghiz informant, Kenjegül Kalieva, stresses that here, the speaker took/bought *any* two books, i.e. that the subset is not specific.

(66) karabastan kitep-ter-den ekö-ö -sü -nü al -dı -m.  
without looking book-PL-ABL two-set-3. -ACC buy-PST-1.SG  
'I bought (a set of) two [specific] books out of the (set of) books, without looking'

KK stresses that in this example, the speaker took a set of two specific books.

In (65), the subset expression is non-specific, despite the accusative. Again, we see that a subset expression can be non-specific, even though it is a partitive. Also, we see that the accusative does not express specificity (although it does in general, with regular lexical nouns). Why? Here, the numeral has not risen to N. I hypothesize that the "set" suffix **-ö** is in N-position, and it requires overt *Acc*, just as *Agr* does in other Turkic languages. **-ö**, just as the *Agr*, requires presence of *Acc*; its meaning as 'set' gives it formally specific features, which require the *Acc*. Again, this is an instance where the presence of *Acc* is

enforced by formal requirements rather than semantic ones, and thus we have (can have) lack of specificity. Semantic specificity is enforced here by *Agr*; since its presence is not formally required, *Agr* here can have semantic function, i.e. its pronominal features are not just formally, but also semantically specific.

Another parameter along which these languages differ may be the optionality vs. obligatoriness of the raising to N by certain categories. We saw in Turkish, for example, that the classifier *tane* may raise to N, in which case it is bare, or else that it can stay in-situ, in which case dummy *Agr* occupies N (and thus follows the classifier). It appears that in certain languages, raising is obligatory, which means that in such instances, dummy *Agr* is not an option.

**6. Sakha** seems to be such a language. It is different from the other Turkic languages we have seen so far, in that in some contexts where *Agr* would be obligatory in those languages, this isn't even an option in Sakha. The following examples illustrate this point.

(67)a. Kinige-ler-ten ikki ustuuka ıl-lı-m.  
 book-PL-ABL two piece take-PST-1SG  
 'I took two 'items' of the books'

(67)b. ?\*Kinige-ler-ten ikki ustuuka-t(a)-ın ıl-lı-m.  
 book -PL-ABL two piece-3-ACC take-PAST-1SG

On the other hand, while numerals can raise (a property shared with with only some of the cognate languages, as we saw), they also have the option of staying in-situ; they do require the dummy *Agr* in those instances. Also, **the dummy *Agr* requires overt *Acc***:

(68)a. \*Ali hotun-nar-tan ikki bil-er-e.  
 Ali lady-PL-ABL two know-AOR-3  
 Intended reading: 'Ali knows two of the ladies'

b. ?Ali hotun-nar-tan ikki-ni bil-er e-te.  
 Ali lady-PL-ABL two-ACC know-AOR AUX-PAST.3  
 'Ali knows two of the ladies'

c. \*Ali hotun-nar-tan ikki-te bil-er e-te.  
 Ali lady -PL-ABL two-3 know-AOR AUX-PAST.3  
 Intended reading: 'Ali knows two of the ladies'

d. Ali hotun-nar-tan ikki-t(e)-ın bil-er-e.  
 Ali lady-PL-ABL two-3-ACC know-AOR-3

(68)b. with its obligatory (cf. the ill-formed a.-example) accusative is not a result of the [+human] feature of the subset expression here; this emerges from a consideration of the following examples.

The same two options, i.e. to raise or stay in-situ, but then requiring *Agr* (and *Acc*) for the in-situ option are also found with adjectives (in the absence of a lexical nominal head, of course):

(68)a. Araas model -ler-i teŋnee -ti -m uonna saŋa-tyn tal -ly-m.  
 various model-PL-ACC compare-PST-1SG and new-3.ACC choose-PST-1SG  
 ‘I compared various models and chose the new (one)’

b. \*Araas model-ler-i teŋnee -ti -m uonna saŋa-ta tal-ly-m.  
 various model-PL-ACC compare-PST-1SG and new-3 choose-PST-1SG  
 Intended reading: the same as for the previous example. Here, the subset expression with its 3. *Agr* element requires the overt accusative and is ill-formed in its absence.

c. Araas model -ler-i teŋnee -ti -m uonna saŋa-ny tal -ly-m.  
 various model-PL-ACC compare-PST-1SG and new-ACC choose-PST-1SG  
 ‘I compared various models and chose the new’

Here, although the subset expression is not human, the raised adjective in (68c) is marked with the accusative. The conditions on the accusative in Sakha need investigation.

*Acc* does seem to signal specificity in general:

(69) Xos-p -or xas da oqo kiir -de.  
 room-1SG-DAT several child enter-PAST.3  
 ‘Several children entered my room.’

a. ok as a possible continuation for the reading that the 2 girls are a subset of the children:

ikki kiŋh-ı bil -li-m.  
 two girl-ACC know-PST-1SG  
 ‘I knew two [+specific] girls’

b. impossible continuation for the reading that the 2 girls are a subset of the children:

ikki kiis bil-li-m.  
 two girl know- PST-1SG  
 ‘I knew two [-specific] girls’

The following pair illustrates the same point:

(70) a. Bu djoqur-dar-y bahylaa-byt biir bibliotekar bil-e(r)-bin.  
 this talent-PL-ACC master-PPART one librarian know-AOR-1SG  
 ‘I know a librarian who possesses these talents’ (non-specific)

b. Bu djoqur-dar-y bahylaa-byt biir bibliotekar-y bil-e(r)-bin.  
 this talent-PL-ACC master-PPART one librarian - ACC know- AOR-1SG  
 ‘I know a librarian who possesses these talents’ (specific)