On Single Argument Verbs in Turkish*

Semra Baturay Meral**
Hasan Mesut Meral***

Abstract

The article discusses how split intransitivity phenomenon is observed in Turkish in terms of aspectual notions such as agentivity and telicity; different grammatical constructions such as impersonal passives and adjectival passives, and derivational morphology. It observes that agentivity is the key factor affecting split intransitivity in Turkish alongside telicity and these determine the unaccusative-unergative distinction of verbs of manner of motion, verbs of emission and reflexive verbs in Turkish. The article proposes that verbs of emission seem to be unaccusative while reflexives behave more like unergatives. Our findings imply that variable behavior of intransitive verbs can be handled under an event structure analysis where different functional heads give theta role to a NP merged in their domain. Thus, there is no need for a lexical derivation or rule for accounting the facts on unaccusativity.

Keywords

split intransitivity, unaccusative, unergative, telicity, agentivity, impersonal passives.

Introduction

This article discusses how split intransitivity phenomenon is observed in Turkish in terms of agentivity, telicity, impersonal passive structures, adjectival passives and X's way constructions. We observe that agentivity and telicity are two crucial phenomena which determine the unaccusative-unergative distinction of verbs of manner of motion, verbs of emission and reflexive verbs in Turkish. Contra Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000) who argue that telicity is the key factor for determining split intransitivity, and agentivity does not matter unless the verb has an atelic interpretation; we propose that agentivity is the key factor affecting split intransitivity in Turkish. We also propose (contra Nakipoğlu-Demiralp 1998, 2001) that verbs of emission seem to be unaccusative rather than unergative in Turkish. As for the reflexive verbs, we argue that they behave more like unergatives due to their agentivity.

Our findings imply that the variable behavior of intransitive verbs can be handled under an event structure analysis where different functional heads are present in the structure and give theta role to a NP merged in their domain (cf. Öztürk 2005). Thus, a NP is merged in the domain of the relevant functional projection to get its *Theme* theta role, or it is merged in another suitable position to get its *Agent* theta role. This implies that there is no need for a lexical derivation or rule for accounting the facts on unaccusativity.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief discussion of split intransitivity phenomenon in language. The third section deals with the issue of split intransitivity in Turkish in terms of agentivity, telicity, impersonal passives and adjectival passives constructions. Conclusion part summarizes the points made in the article and their implications on event structure.

Split Intransitivity

The issue of single argument verbs has been on the research agenda of linguistics for a long time. Perlmutter's (1978) influential distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs is the topic which drew a great amount of attention in the past literature. This distinction is called *split intransitivity* and based on the semantics of verbs: the syntactic expression of the arguments is predictable from the meaning of the verb (Perlmutter 1978: 161). In other words, it is the verb's meaning which determines whether the single argument of an intransitive verb will be interpreted as

the subject of the verb (unergative) or the object of the verb (unaccusative).

One the one side, Perlmutter's (1978) claim has been challenged cross-linguistically, and on the other side, it has been supported by studies which focus on the semantic notions such as telicity, agentivity, control and volitionality which are argued to be responsible for the distinction between unaccusatives and unergatives. Accordingly, the compatibility of a verb with telic interpretation, i.e., the delimitedness of event, goes with unaccusative verbs while the presence of an agent subject is important for unergatives, and other notions such as volitionality and control are associated with agentivity in the literature (Rosen 1984, Dowty 1991, Nakipoğlu-Demiralp 1998, Rappaport-Hovav and Levin 2000).

According to Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000), verbs are defined aspectually and divided into different classes as Lexical Semantic Representation which is linked to the argument structure via some operations called linking rules. The classification of intransitive verbs as unergative vs. unaccusative is based on the inherent aspectual properties of these verbs: telicity, agentivity and stativity. These aspectual notions are not directly engaged in the classification. Agentivity is subsumed under the notion *immediate cause* and telicity is subsumed under the notion *direct change*. Stativity is totally irrelevant for the verb classification.

Discussions on the split intransitivity in Turkish mainly focus on how intransitive verbs are interpreted in different structural environments such as impersonal passives, adjectival passives, double causatives, stativization, etc. Özkaragöz (1986) proposes that in *-(y)ArAk* constructions, both target and control verbs must either be unergative or unaccusative. It is not allowed that the target verb is unergative and control verb is unaccusative or vice versa. She also notes that when the loan words in Turkish are used with *ol-* 'be', the result is an unaccusative verb (*hasta ol-* 'get sick'). However, when they are used with *et-* 'make', the result is an unergative verb (*dans et-* 'dance'). With respect to double causatives, she states that unaccusative verbs allow double causatives while unergatives do not. In another study, Taneri (1993: 149-50) observes that impersonal passivization as an indication of unergativity is problematic given that some unaccusative verbs are compatible with impersonal passivization in Turkish. According to her, what is important in impersonal passivization is that the single argument must bear the feature +*human* (Taneri 1993: 159).

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998, 2001) provides comprehensive studies on the split intransitivity in Turkish from an aspectual point of view and following Perlmutter (1978), she argues that unaccusativity is syntactically represented but semantically determined in Turkish. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) argues that impersonal passivization in past tense is a reliable test for unaccusativity in that verbs allowing impersonal passivization are unergative while those which do not allow it are unaccusative. This distinction is based on the idea that intransitive verbs aspectually fall into two broad classes as *internally instigated* and *externally instigated*. In internally instigated verbs, the argument instigates the action denoted by the verb (unergative). In externally instigated verbs, however, the argument has not an instigation role on the action (unaccusative).

According to Nakipoğlu-Demiralp, adjectival passive constructions formed via the participle suffix –*mIş* singles out unaccusatives. Likewise, -*Ik* stativization is only compatible with unaccusative verbs in that unergative verbs cannot take –*Ik* suffix. Finally, –*tI* nominalization is compatible only with unergatives. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (2001) offers a continuum whose one end corresponds to unaccusatives and the other end to unergatives.

(1) Nakipoğlu-Demiralp's (2001) continuum

Internally instigated   *Externally instigated*

1	2	3	4	5

atla 'jump'	ağla 'cry'	öl 'die'	büyü 'grow'	bat 'sink'
çalış 'work'	gül 'laugh'	boğul 'drawn'	yaşlan 'age'	çürü 'decay'
düşün 'think'	hapşır 'sneeze'	bayıl 'faint'	buna 'get senile'	don 'freeze'
koş 'run'	hıçkır 'hiccup'	doğ 'be born'		eri 'melt'
konuş 'talk'	horla 'snore'			karar 'blacken'
oyna 'play'	kızar 'blush'			kırıl 'break'
yürü 'walk'	öksür 'cough'			patla 'explode'
yüz 'swim'	uyu 'sleep'			sol 'wilt'

Unergative   *Unaccusative*

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (2001: 144)

According to the continuum above, the verbs are placed in accordance with their compatibility with impersonal passivization. The left end of the continuum hosts pure unergative verbs whose arguments internally instigate the action. The right end of the continuum corresponds to unaccusatives whose argument has no role of instigation. These results are supported by computer aided tests provided in Acartürk (2005) where unergative and unaccusative verbs are tested in adjectival passive and impersonal passive constructions on grammaticality judgments of native speakers. The results show that unergative-unaccusative distinction in Turkish shows gradience: While change-of-state verbs in Turkish are closer to the unaccusative end than change-of-location verbs which are inherently telic, controlled motion verbs and non-controlled motion verbs are close to the unergative end.

Studies based on testing unaccusativity with computer aided software programs are not limited to Acartürk (2005). Acartürk and Zeyrek (2010) and Gürer et. al. (2012) are other studies in this respect. The results of both works support the split behavior of intransitives in Turkish and find correlations between semantic and syntactic determinants of unaccusativity.

Split Intransitivity in Turkish

Our discussion on split intransitivity focuses on different behaviors of verbs of manner of motion, verbs of emission and reflexive verbs. Verbs of manner of motion are verbs which denote the characteristics of an action such as *koş-* 'run', *yürü-* 'walk', etc. Verbs of emission are verbs which express emission of a physical object such as light and sound (*parılda-* 'glisten', *kişne-* 'neigh'). Reflexive verbs are verbs which denote an action whose doer is also its patient such as *sevin-* 'be pleased', *giyin-* 'dress'. In the following, we will discuss different behaviors of these verbs in different structural environments with respect to the unaccusative-unergative distinction.

Verbs of Manner of Motion

According to Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000), verbs of manner of motion show variable behavior: they are basically unergative but due to their derived meaning (directed motion meaning), they are also considered unaccusative. They propose that if such verb has telic interpretation, it is unaccusative even if it has an agent argument. Agentivity is important for only atelic verbs in that when the verb is atelic, it is unergative with animate subject, unaccusative with inanimate subject. We propose that Turkish does

not seem to employ such a strategy. Instead, telic verbs in Turkish seem to be unergative when they are interpreted agentive.

Verbs of manner of motion such as *koş-* 'run', *yürü-* 'walk', *yüz-* 'swim' in Turkish show atelic behavior in terms of telicity, i.e., there is not an end point for the action described by the verb. Moreover, they have agentive interpretations in various contexts. Thus, these verbs should be classified as unergative in Rappaport-Hovav and Levin's (2000) system. Let us observe their atelic status in (2a-c).

(2)   a.   Adam *iki saat içinde/iki saat boyunca yürüdü.
           man   in.two.hours/for.two.hours   walked
           "The man walked for two hours/*in two hours."

      b.   Adam *beş dakika içinde/beş dakika boyunca koştu.
           man   in.five.minutes/for.five.minutes   ran
           "The man ran for five minutes/*in five minutes."

      c.   Adam *iki dakika içinde/iki dakika boyunca yüzdü.
           man   in.two.minutes/for.two.minutes   swam
           "The man swam for two minutes/*in two minutes."

In (2a-c) all verbs are compatible with "for x time" modification, but not with "in x time" modification. This shows that these verbs have atelic interpretation (no end point) and should be treated as unergative. Moreover, we observe that the verbs have agentive interpretation, hence should be classified as unergative.

However, telic interpretation is available when these verbs of manner of motion are used with a directional postpositional phrase or an accusative marked non-theme object. These verbs are *yürü-* 'walk', *koş-* 'ran', *yüz-* 'swim', *tırman-* 'climb', *uç-* 'fly', *yuvarlan-* 'roll', *gez-* 'wander', *dolaş-* 'go along', *dolan-* 'walk', *turla-* 'tour around', *adımla-* 'step'. Consider (3a-c) for the telic interpretation of these verbs.

(3)   a.   Adam yol-u   iki saat içinde/iki saat boyunca yürüdü.
           man   road-ACC in.two.hours/for.two.hours   walked
           "The man walked the entire road for two hours/in two hours."

      b.   Adam parkur-u   beş dakika içinde/beş dakika boyunca koştu.
           man   track-ACC in.five.minutes/for.five.minutes   ran
           "The man ran the entire track for five minutes/in five minutes."

c. Adam iki dakika içinde/iki dakika boyunca karşı kıyıya yüzdü.
    man in.two.minutes/for.two.minutes   across   swam
    "The man swam across (the river) for two minutes/in two minutes."

The compatibility of "in x time" modification with these verbs shows that these verbs have telic interpretation (end point denotation) and hence should be classified as unaccusative when they are used with directed change and delimitation. Directed change comes with a directional postpositional phrase, *karşı kıyıya* 'across the river' and delimitation comes with the accusative marked non-theme object, *yolu* 'road'.

Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000) discuss a similar set of examples and conclude that verbs of manner of motion are unaccusative if they have telic interpretation. The evidence for their claim comes with the auxiliary selection in Italian and Dutch according to which telic and atelic verbs select different auxiliaries. We propose that this is not the case in Turkish. Verbs of manner of motion are unergative if they have an agentive argument. The telicity of these verbs is only a property of the syntactic configuration in which they occur. Now, let us try to support our claim by applying other unaccusativity diagnostics used in Turkish.

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) proposes that Perlmutter's (1978) impersonal passivization is a valid diagnostic for split intransitivity in that only unergatives can occur in impersonal passivization. The availability of impersonal passivization examples indicates that these verbs should be classified as unergative.

(4) a. Yol iki saat içinde yüründü.
         road in.two.hours walked
         "*The road was walked in two hours."

     b. Parkur beş dakika içinde koşuldu.
         track in.five.minutes   run
         "*The track was run in five minutes."

     c. İki dakika içinde karşı kıyıya yüzüldü.
         in.two.minutes   across   swum
         "*It was swum across in two minutes."

(4a-c) show that the verbs which have telic interpretation due to delimitedness coming with the presence of end point or directed motion can occur in

impersonal passivization. Thus, according to impersonal passivization, verbs of manner of motion should be classified as unergative.

The second test for the unergativity comes with agent indicating words such as *gönüllü olarak* 'voluntarily', *kendi yöntemiyle* 'his/her own way', *kendi çabasıyla* 'by him/herself'. The compatibility of verbs with these words speaks for an unergative classification according to Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000). Consider (5a-c).

(5) a. Adam yol-u   iki saat içinde kendi çabasıyla yürüdü.
         man   road-ACC   in.two.hours by.himself   walked
         "The man walked the entire road by himself in two hours."

     b. Adam parkur-u   beş dakika içinde kendi yöntemiyle koştu.
         man   track-ACC   in.five.minutes   his.own.way   ran
         "The man ran the entire track in his own way in five minutes."

     c. Adam gönüllü olarak iki dakika içinde   karşı kıyıya yüzdü.
         man   voluntarily in.two.minutes   across   swam
         "The man voluntarily swam across (the river) in two minutes."

(5a-c) have agent oriented expressions *kendi çabasıyla* 'by him/herself', *kendi yöntemiyle* 'his own way', *gönüllü olarak* 'voluntarily' respectively. The grammaticality of these examples shows that these verbs should be classified as unergative in spite of their compatibility with the telic interpretation.

Another test offered in Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) is *–Ik* stativization by which a verb becomes adjective indicating the state of the sole argument of an intransitive verb. Note that *–Ik* suffix can attach to unaccusatives, but not unergatives.

(6) a. *koş-uk   b. *gez-ik   c. *yüz-ük   d. *tırman-ık
         *run   *walked   *swum   *climbed
     e. bat-ık   f. eri-yik
         sunk   melted

In (6a-d) unergative verbs attached by *–Ik* are ungrammatical whereas those unaccusative verbs in (6e-f) are grammatical. Another morphological support for the idea that verbs of manner of motion are unergatives comes with the agent indicating derivational suffix *–(y)IcI*. This suffix attaches to verb roots and derives nouns/adjectives. Observe the difference between (7a-d) and (7e-f).

(7)   a. koş-ucu   b. gez-ici   c. yüz-ücü   d. tırman-ıcı
          runner   walker   swimmer   climber

       e. *bat-ıcı   f. *eri-yici
          *sinker   *melter

We observe that verbs of manner of motion in (7a-d) are compatible with –(y)IcI suffix while unaccusatives in (7e-f) are not, given that they are true unaccusatives. The only unaccusative verb which can take –(y) IcI suffix is *patla-* 'to explode'. Another diagnostic offered by Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) for unaccusativity is the use of –*mIş* in adjectival passives. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998: 139-40) points out that the compatibility with an adjectival passive is a property of unaccusatives, but not unergatives.

(8)   a. *koş-muş   adam   d. bat-mış gemi
          *run   man   sunk   ship

       b. *yürü-müş   adam   e. eri-miş dondurma
          *walked   man   melted icecream

       c. *yüz-müş   adam
          *swum   man

While unergatives (8a-c) are not compatible with adjectival passive constructions, unaccusatives in (8d-e) are. The important point however is related to telicity again. When these verbs are used alone, they have atelic interpretation as expected. However, when the verbs are used with directed motion interpretation or delimitedness, they become compatible with adjectival passives (Nakipoğlu-Demiralp 1998: 130).

(9)   a. maraton koş-muş atlet
          'The athlete who has run a marathon'

                        Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998: 130) Example (43b)

       b. Kuzey Denizi'nde yüz-müş adam
          In.North.Sea   swum   man
          "The man who has swum in North Sea"

To sum up, we can say that verbs of manner of motion show conflicting properties and this indicates their variable behavior as already pointed out by Acartürk and Zeyrek (2010: 115). Contra Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000), we argue that verbs of manner of motion in Turkish behave similar to unergatives despite the availability of delimitedness. This suggests that

Turkish does not seem to take telicity before agentivity into the account in the classification of intransitives as unergative or unaccusative. While telicity is considered as the key factor in Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000) for determining unaccusativity, Turkish data seem to present evidence to the contrary. In other words, both agentivity and telicity seem to have the key role in determining unaccusativity.

So far, we have discussed agentive telic and agentive atelic verbs. What happens when the single argument of verbs of manner of motion is inanimate, i.e., not agentive? This question is valid since the interaction between agentivity and telicity can have different combinations. Let us examine the following examples where the verbs of manner of motion take an inanimate subject.

(10)   a. Kamyon dağ-ı   beş dakikada   tırmandı.
           truck   hill-ACC in.five.minutes climbed
        "The truck has climbed up the entire hill in five minutes."

        b. Top karşı kaldırıma on saniyede   yuvarlandı.
           ball across   in.ten.seconds rolled
        "The ball rolled across the street in ten seconds."

        c. Uçak Istanbul-Berlin arasını iki saatte   uçtu.
           plane Istanbul-Berlin-ACC in.two.hours flied
        "The plane flied Istanbul-Berlin in two hours."

In these examples, verbs of manner of motion take inanimate subjects. We observe that telic reading is available in these cases as well as cases where an animate subject is present. The crucial point here is that the impersonal passivization of these examples is not interpreted. In other words, these examples do not have agentive interpretation. Thus, in the absence of agentivity, we consider these examples as unaccusative.

In order to check the effect of agentivity, let us examine another set of example. In Turkish, the verb deriving suffix –*lAş* derives unaccusatives out of adjectives as also pointed out by Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998: 85).

(11)   a. katı-laş   c. başka-laş   b. bronz-laş   d. güzel-leş
           solidify   be different   suntan   be beautiful

In (11a-d) the adjective roots take *–lAş* and become unaccusative verbs denoting change-of-state processes. Thus, the compatibility of these verbs with "in x time" modification and adjectival passive construction is not a surprise, as exemplified in (12a-b) respectively.

(12)   a. Hamur iki dakikada   katılaş-tı.
              dough in.two.minutes solidified
          "The dough solidified in two minutes."

          b. Bronzlaş-mış cilt
              suntanned   skin

The two diagnostics, telicity and adjectival passivization prove that these verbs are unaccusative. However, when we change the inanimate subject of these verbs into an animate subject, we observe that the impersonal passivization of these examples is available as also noted by Özsoy (2009) and Gürer et. al. (2012). Consider (13a-b).

(13)   a. Solaryum sayesinde iki dakikada   bronzlaş-ıl-dı.
              solarium   thanks.to in.two.minutes suntanned
          "*Thanks to solarium, it was suntanned in two minutes."

          b. İğneler   sayesinde iki günde   iyileş-il-di.
              injections thanks.to in.two.days got well
          "*Thanks to the injections, it was got well in two days."

Thus, these examples suggest that agentivity is an important factor in determining the split intransitivity in Turkish. Specifically, what is important seems to be the semantics of the single argument of the verb. When this argument is a human being, the verb allows impersonal passivization and this speaks for the unergative classification. However, this does not mean that telicity is not active in determining split intransitivity.

Verbs of Emission

In this section, we discuss verbs of emission with respect to the unaccusativity tests and try to see how they behave in Turkish. Contra Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000), who argue that verbs of emission are unergative, we will argue that verbs of emission seem to behave similar to unaccusatives in Turkish (cf. Perlmutter 1978).

Levin and Rappaport (1995) and Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000) divide emission verbs into four classes: light emission verbs such as *shine*,

smell emission verbs such as *stink*, sound emission verbs such as *moan* and substance emission verbs such as *bleed*. The puzzling behavior of verbs of emission is that these verbs lack an agentive subject, hence not similar to unergatives. Also, their single argument does not undergo a change-of-state, hence they are not similar to unaccusatives. Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000) take these verbs as unergative and support their claim with *–er* nominals in English and auxiliary selection in Dutch. Moreover, Levin and Rappaport (1995: 138-9) discuss X's way constructions in English as a diagnostic for their unergative status.

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998:138) observes the same puzzling behavior of verbs of emission in Turkish. Due to their incompatibility with impersonal passivization, they do not behave in the same way with unergatives and due to their incompatibility with adjectival passives and *–Ik* nominalizations; they do not behave similar to unaccusatives.

Aspectually speaking, these verbs are incompatible with "in x time" modification hence have atelic rather than telic interpretation. Thus, their atelic status speaks for the unergative classification.

(14)   a. Parfüm   iki saat boyunca/*iki saat içinde koktu.   (smell emission)
          perfume for.two.hours   / in.two.hours   smelled
          "The perfume smelled for two hours."

        b. At   iki saat boyunca / *iki saat içinde kişnedi.   (sound emission)
            horse for.two.hours   /   in.two.hours   neighed
          "The horse neighed for two hours."

        c. Ayakkabı iki saat boyunca / *iki saat içinde parıldadı.   (light emission)
          shoe   for.two.hours   / in.two.hours   glistened
          "The shoes glistened for two hours."

        d. Su   iki saat boyunca / *iki saat içinde köpürdü.   (substance emission)
            water for.two.hours   /   in.two.hours   bubbled
"The water bubbled for two hours."

(14a-d) show that verbs of emission are incompatible with end point interpretation, i.e., they are atelic. Thus, verbs of emission behave similar to unergatives in Turkish. With respect to impersonal passivization, we observe that verbs of emission do not undergo impersonal passivization unlike verbs of manner of motion. Consider (15a-d).

(15)   a. *Kokuldu.   c. *Parıldandı.
        "*It was smelled."   "*It was glistened."

        b. *Kişnendi.   d. *Köpürüldü.
        "*It was neighed."   "*It was bubbled."

The ungrammaticality of (15a-d) indicates that verbs of emission do not undergo impersonal passivization. As we have stated before, impersonal passivization is subject to animacy condition on the implicit subject as noted by Taneri (1993), Özsoy (2009), Acartürk and Zeyrek (2010) and Gürer et. al. (2012). Since the implicit subject of the impersonal passivization examples in (15a-d) is not animate, impersonal passivization is not possible.

Thus, telicity and impersonal passivization diagnostics do not work for verbs of emission in Turkish. How about other tests? Recall that Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) provides adjectival passives formed with –*mIş* as a test for unaccusativity in that only unaccusatives are compatible with adjectival passives. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998: 141-2) notes that substance emission verbs differ from the rest of verbs of emission in that they are compatible with adjectival passives. See (16a-d).

(16)   a. kanamış yara   c. *ışımış gün
           blooded   wound   shone day

        b. dökülmüş saç   d. *kişnemiş at
           fallen   hair   neighed horse

(16a-b) which include substance emission verbs are grammatical while (16c-d) which include light and sound emission verbs respectively are not. Thus, substance emission verbs are unaccusative while the rest of emission verbs are unergative.

However, there is one problem with Nakipoğlu-Demiralp's classification of smell, sound and light emission verbs as unergative. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998) proposes that smell, sound and light emission verbs are unergative since they are compatible with 'for x time' modification (atelic reading) and –*tI* nominalization. Substance emission verbs, on the other hand, are unaccusative due to their compatibility with adjectival passives. However, a closer examination of her data reveals that the compatibility with –*tI* nominalization does not seem to be the result of unergativity, but the fact

that these verbs are derived from onomatopoeic words. Verbs derived from onomatopoeic roots via the verb deriving suffix *–dA* take the suffixes '*–Il*' or '*-In*' before *–dA* suffix. The verb deriving suffix *–dA* is deleted if the word is attached by the noun deriving suffix *–tI*. Nakipoğlu-Demiralp's examples following this pattern are given below:

(17)   a. par-ıl-da   par-ıl-tı   d. gümbür-de   gümbür-tü
           verb   *noun*   'twinkle'   *verb*   *noun*   'rumble'

        b. ışı-l-da   ış-ıl-tı   e. vız-ıl-da   vız-ıl-tı
           verb   *noun*   'gleam'   *verb*   *noun*   'buzz'

        c. şır-ıl-da   şır-ıl-tı   f. çıt-ır-da   çıt-ır-tı
           verb   *noun*   'burble'   *verb*   *noun*   'crackle'

What these examples suggest is that onomatopoeic roots become noun via the noun deriving suffix *–tI*, but not that noun deriving suffix *–tI* derives nouns out of unergative verbs. Moreover, this *–tI* suffix cannot attach to a set of verbs derived from onomatopoeic roots via the verb deriving suffix *–lA*. Note that these verbs are among the light and sound emission verbs in Nakipoğlu-Demiralp's list.

(18)   a. par-la   b. *par-la-tı   c. çın-la   d. *çın-la-tı
           verb   *noun*   'shimmer'   *verb*   *noun*   'clang'

As the ungrammaticality of (18b and 18d) shows, *-tI* nominalization is not applied to whole set of emission verbs listed by Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998). We conclude from this discussion that light, smell and sound emission verbs are not unergative but are unaccusative. The reason behind this is that verbs of emission seem to be change-of-state verbs rather than 'true' verbs of emission which require some activity involved. Change-of-state verbs are among unaccusatives according to Sorace's (2000) Auxiliary selection hierarchy.

Do we have any evidence for the claim that the so called verbs of emission are unaccusative? We propose that being derived via *–lA* suffix can be considered as evidence in that *–lA* suffix usually derives unaccusative verbs. Consider the forms in (19a-d).

(19)   a. şişman-la   b. çat-la   c. geri-le   d. yavru-la
           'get.fat'   'crack'   'step back'   'calve'

The verbs listed in (19a-d) are all unaccusatives. The unaccusative status of these verbs can be supported by their compatibility with telic reading coming with "in x time" modification:

(20) a.   İnek on dakikada   yavrula-dı.
            cow in.ten.minutes calved
      "The cow calved in ten minutes."

      b.   Tavuk iki dakikada   yumurtla-dı.
            chicken in.two.minutes laid.eggs
      "The chicken laid eggs in two minutes."

The compatibility of these verbs with "in x time" adverbial suggests that they are indeed unaccusatives. One problem with the analysis provided here is the incompatibility of these verbs with the adjectival passive construction which is argued to be the diagnostic for unaccusatives (Nakipoğlu-Demiralp 2001). We suggest that not all unaccusatives are compatible with adjectival passive constructions and this is obvious for change of location verbs which constitute the core unaccusatives in Horace's (2000) hierarchy, as already pointed out by Zeyrek (2004). Consider the examples in (21a-b) where change of location verbs are incompatible with adjectival passives.

(21)   a. *gel-miş adam   b. *gir-miş adam
              '*come   man'   '*entered man'

In (21a-b) there are two change-of-location verbs which are necessarily unaccusatives due to their inherent telicity. However, as the ungrammaticality of the examples shows, these unaccusatives are not compatible with adjectival passives. Thus, the incompatibility with adjectival passives does not seem to be a problem for a verb which is unaccusative due to other tests.

Reflexive Verbs

Reflexive verbs have been discussed in the literature due to their paradoxical nature: Their single argument is interpreted as both the object and the subject of the verb. The null hypothesis is that reflexives behave similar to unaccusatives given that the sole argument, i.e., the subject of reflexives, is an underlying object (Reinhart and Siloni 2004). The unaccusative treatment of reflexives finds evidence from auxiliary selection in Italian (Burzio 1986). That reflexives do not trigger *ne*-cliticization unlike unaccusatives in Italian, however, supports the unergative treatment (Reinhart and Siloni 2004).

Reflexive verbs discussed here are formed with the suffix *–In*: *övün-* 'praise oneself', *dövün-* 'lament', *yıkan-* 'have bath', *taran-* 'comb', *giyin-* 'dress', *sevin-* 'be pleased', *süslen-* 'dress up', *avun-* 'consolidate oneself', *söylen-* 'grumble' *yakın-* 'complaint'. These verbs, similar to other verb types, show conflicting behavior with respect to split intransitivity. First, reflexives are available in impersonal passivization structures.

(22)   a. Hızlıca giyin-il-di.
            fast   dressed
         "*It was dressed fast."

         b. İyice yıkan-ıl-dı.
            well   had.shower
         "*It was had shower well."

(22a-b) involve grammatical instances of impersonal passivization with reflexive verbs, indicating that these verbs behave in the same with unergatives. Second, these verbs are also compatible with agent indicating words, hence have agentive interpretation. Consider (23a-b).

(23)   a. ?Ali bile isteye   kirlen-di.
            Ali on.purpose became.dirty
         "Ali got dirty on purpose."

         b. Adam kendi kendine alın-dı.
            man himself   offended
         "The man offended himself."

(23a-b) show that reflexive verbs are compatible with agent indicating words, hence behave in the same way with unergatives in Turkish. However, Turkish also provides evidence for the unaccusative treatment of the reflexive verbs. Consider the examples below where the reflexive verbs are checked for their compatibility with "in x time" modification.

(24)   a. Beş dakika boyunca / *Beş dakika içinde   övün-ül-dü.
            for.five.minutes   / in.five.minutes   it.was.praised
         "*It was praised for five minutes."

         b. Beş dakika boyunca / Beş dakika içinde giyin-il-di.
            for.five.minutes   / in.five.minutes   it.was.dressed
         "*It was dressed in five minutes."

(24a) shows that reflexive verbs are not compatible with "in x time" modification, a fact which shows their atelic status, hence their unergative nature. However, (24b) allows "in x time" modification, hence reflexive verbs receive telic reading as well. What is the difference between (24a) and (24b)?

A closer examination of (24a) vs. (24b) reveals that the verb in (24b) is actually a change-of-state verb and change-of-state verbs are compatible with a telic reading. Moreover, the verb in (24b) is compatible with –*Ik* stativization, unlike the one in (24a). Consider (25a-d) below.

(25)   a. *sevinik   b. *övünük   c. süslenik   d. giyinik
            'pleased'   'praised'   'dressed up'   'dressed'

The grammaticality difference between the examples above can be explained with the fact that examples in (25a-b) are reflexive verbs while those in (25c-d) are change-of-state verbs. Thus, verbs in (25c-d) show unaccusative-like property while true reflexives in (25a-b) show unergative-like property.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that agentivity is as important factor as telicity in determining the split intransitivity phenomenon in Turkish. Discussing the aspectual notions such as telicity and agentivity, the paper argued that verbs of manner of motion in Turkish are unergative when they have an agentive interpretation. For verbs classified as verbs of emission in Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2000), the paper argued that these verbs are unaccusatives. Finally, reflexives in Turkish are more like to be unergatives.

The findings of the article imply that the variable behavior of intransitive verbs as unergative and unaccusative is problematic for any lexical account of the issue given that verb's semantics alone does not provide sufficient information for the successful classification. For example, many verbs are not inherently telic and they receive telic interpretation in different syntactic contexts. Thus, aspectual notions such as telicity are provided in the syntactic configuration in which the verbs occur rather than verb's internal semantics.

More importantly, the variable behavior of verbs in different contexts is problematic in terms of theta roles. First, which theta role, *Theme* or *Agent* will the single argument of an intransitive bear? Second, how many theta roles are there in the event structure of an intransitive? This question be-

comes important when we observe that an unergative verb can be used with an accusative marked object. For reflexives, the situation is more obscure given that the argument NP has a potential to bear both *Theme* and *Agent* theta roles. Obviously, this is not related to the lexical-semantic features of the verb, but the syntactic context in which the verb occurs.

One possibility is providing an event structure where functional projections which are responsible for different theta roles are present (Öztürk 2005). The related theta role is given to the NP in the structure by this head. In other words, a NP is merged in a position suitable for *Theme* theta role or in a different position suitable for *Agent* theta role.

Notes

¹   Impersonal passivization in Turkish is a debated issue in that some authors argue that it can apply to unaccusatives as well (Taneri 1993). Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (1998, 2001) admits that impersonal passivization applies to some unaccusative verbs, but only in the aorist form, as also pointed out by Sezer (1991) (cited in Acartürk 2005: 63). However, we show throughout the paper that impersonal passivization is compatible with unaccusative-like verbs when they are in past form too. Moreover, contra Özkaragöz (1986), Taneri (1993: 157-8) argues that impersonal passives in Turkish allow by-phrases unlike many other languages, as long as the subject has the feature *+human*.

²   The possibility of *patla-yıcı* 'explosive' weakens our assumption that *–(y)IcI* attaches to unergatives, but not to unaccusatives. However, we state that *–(y)IcI* in this case has *property of* interpretation instead of *agentive* interpretation which is present in more usual instances of the suffix *koş-ucu* 'runner', *yüz-ücü* 'swimmer' etc.

³   There are other participles in Turkish which can possibly single out unaccusatives (*-mAz* and *–AsI* are two candidates. These suffixes seem to attach to unaccusative verbs but not to unergatives. (i) shows adjectival participles derived by *–mAz* out of unaccusatives and (ii) shows derived participles which are used in curse words.

(i)   eski-mez çorap   paslan-maz çelik   bat-maz   gemi
          durable sock   rust-free   steel   unsinkable ship

(ii)   bat-ası ev   yıkıl-ası ocak   kahr ol-ası adam
          sink   house   collapse house   damn   man
          "damn house"   "damn house"   "damn man"

4   The derivational domain of this suffix is not limited to unaccusatives. See Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 56) for other forms derived by this suffix.

5   According to Taneri (1993), the reflexive suffix –*In* is a syntactic expression of the implicit argument referring to the internal argument in reflexive constructions. Taneri's proposal supports the idea that NP argument in reflexive constructions is actually subject, not the object. The object is expressed by the reflexive morpheme.

References

Acartürk, Cengiz (2005). *Gradient Characteristics of the Unaccusative/Unergative Distinction in Turkish: An Experimental Investigation*. M.A. Thesis. Ankara: METU.

Acartürk, Cengiz and Deniz Zeyrek (2010). "Unaccusative/Unergative Distinction in Turkish: A Connectionist Approach." *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Asian Language Resources.* 111-119.

Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Dowty, David (1991). "Thematic Proto-roles and Argument Selection." *Language* 67: 547- 619.

Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Gürer, Aslı et. al. (2012). "Dil Cambazı ve Türkçede Geçişsiz Eylemler". *26. Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı*. Isparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi.

Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp, Mine (1998). *Split Intransitivity and the Syntax-Semantics Interface In Turkish*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

_____(2001). "The Referential Properties of the Implicit Arguments of Impersonal Passives in Turkish". *The Verb in Turkish.* Ed. Eser Taylan. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129-150.

Özkaragöz, İnci (1986). *The Relational Structure of Turkish Syntax*. Ph.D. Dissertation. San Diego: University of California.

Özsoy, A. Sumru (2009). "Argument Structure, Animacy, Syntax and Semantics of Passivization in Turkish: A Corpus-based Approach". *Corpus Analysis and Variation in Linguistics.* Eds. Yuji Kawaguchi, Makoto Minegishi and Jacques Durand. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 259-279.

Öztürk, Balkız (2005). *Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Perlmutter, David (1978). "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis". *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. California: Berkeley Linguistics Society. 157-189.

Rappaport-Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin (2000). "Classifying Single Argument Verbs". *Lexical Specification and Insertion*. Eds. Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert and Jane Grimshaw. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 269-304.

Reinhart, Tanya and Tal Siloni (2004). "Against the Unaccusative Analysis of Reflexives". *Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax–Lexicon Interface*. Eds. Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou and Martin Everaert. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 159–180.

Rosen, Carol (1984). "The Interface between Semantic Roles and Initial Grammatical Relations". *Studies in Relational Grammar 2.* Eds. David Perlmutter and Carol Rosen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sorace, Antonella (2000). "Gradients in Auxiliary Selection with Intransitive Verbs". *Language* 76: 859-90.

Taneri, Mübeccel (1993). *Morpheme –(I)l(I)n: The Syntax of Personal Passives, Impersonal Passives and Middles in Turkish.* Ph.D. Dissertation. Kansas: University of Kansas.

Zeyrek, Deniz (2004). "The Role of Lexical Semantics in Unaccusative-Unergative Distinction in Turkish". *Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations: A Cross-linguistic Perspective.* Eds. Bernard Comrie, Valery Solovey and Pirkko Suihkonen. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 134-135.

Türkçede Geçişsiz Fiiller Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler*

Semra Baturay Meral**
Hasan Mesut Meral***

Öz

Bu makale Türkçede ayrık geçişsizlik konusunu bitmişlik ve kılıcılık gibi görünüş kavramları ışığında tartışmakta; edensiz-edilgen, sıfat fiil yapıları ve sözcük türetimi ile ayrık geçişsizlik arasındaki ilişkileri incelemektedir. Makale, bitmişlik kavramının yanı sıra kılıcılık kavramının, hareket doğası fiilleri, salınım fiilleri ve dönüşlü fiillerdeki ayrık geçişsizliği belirlemede önemli bir etken olduğunu gözlemlemektedir. Makale hareket doğası fiillerinde kılıcılığın önemli olduğunu, salınım fiillerinin öznesiz-geçişsiz, dönüşlü fiillerin ise özneli-geçişsiz olduğunu savunmaktadır. Makaledeki bulgular, geçişsiz fiillerin farklı yapılardaki farklı davranışlarında, işlevsel ulam baş öğelerinin geçişsiz fiillerin tek katılanına kılıcı ya da etkilenen rolünü verdiği olay yapısı temelli bir türetimin geçerli olduğunu işaret etmektedir. Bu fiillerin tek katılanının cümlede hangi anlamsal rolü üstleneceğinin zihinsel sözlükte ayrıca kodlanmasına gerek yoktur.

Anahtar Kelimeler

ayrık geçişsizlik, özneli geçişsiz, öznesiz geçişsiz, bitmişlik, kılıcılık, edensiz edilgen.

О непереходных глаголах в турецком языке[*]

Семра Батурай Мераль[**]
Хасан Месут Мераль[***]

Абстракт

Статья рассматривает феномен раздвоенной непереходности в турецком языке с точки зрения таких концептуальных понятий, как агентивность и предельность; разные грамматические конструкции, такие как безличные пассивы и адъективные пассивы, а также деривационная морфология. Наблюдается, что агентивность является ключевым фактором, влияющим на раздвоенную непереходность в турецком языке, наряду с предельностью. Эти два понятия определяют не-винительность и не-эргативность, которые отличают глаголы движения, глаголы излучения и рефлексивные глаголы в турецком языке. Статья предполагает, что глаголы излучения являются не-винительными, в то время как рефлексивные глаголы ведут себя как не-эргативы. Прослеживается, что в разных ролях непереходных глаголов, существует производная форма, в которой глаголам придается не-винительность или не-эргативность. В таком случае глаголам не нужно отдельное определение.

Ключевые слова

раздвоенная непереходность, не-винительность, не-эргативы, предельность, агентивность, безличные пассивные пассивы.

[**]   Научный сотр., Технический университет Йылдыз, Факультет естественных наук и филологии, отделение западных языков и литературы – Стамбул / Турция
semra_baturay@yahoo.com
[***] Д-р, преп., Технический университет Йылдыз, педагогический факультет, отделение турецкого языка и общественных дисциплин – Стамбул / Турция
hmeral@yildiz.edu.tr