

Compositional analysis of Turkish agent nominalizers

Furkan Atmaca
Boğaziçi University

This paper proposes an updated analysis to the Sakha agent nominalizer *-AAccI* provided in Baker and Vinokurova (2009). I propose a new analysis that still covers the Turkish agent nominalizer *-(y)IcI* that operates on the same bases as Sakha *-AAccI*. My analysis additionally captures the Turkish agentive derivation *-CI* that operates on noun bases. An adapted version of the Sakha *-AAccI* denotation is given in (1).

$$(1) \quad [[agent - nominalization]]_{\langle vt, et \rangle} = \lambda P_{\langle vt \rangle} . \hat{\ } \lambda x . Gen e P(e) \wedge AG(e, x)$$

However Turkish employs two agent nominalizers, one is *-(y)IcI*, and the other *-CI*. These two suffixes take verb and noun bases respectively (2).¹

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(2) a. <i>sat-ıcı</i>
sell-(y)IcI
'seller of something'
[[X]_V -(y)IcI]_N; The N that Xs</p> | <p>b. <i>kitap-çı</i>
book-CI
'book-seller'
[[X]_N -CI]_N; The N with SEM_i to X</p> |
|---|--|

While the denotation given in (1) is perfectly capable of working with (2a), it would have problems with (2b), because of type mismatch. The analysis here provides a solution such that in (2b), the relation for *P* is provided from the context. Additionally, I make use of the operations, Restrict (Chung & Ladusaw, 2003) and E-Closure as in Dayal (2003) since *kitap* 'book' in *kitapçı* 'book-seller' is non-referential, and such a case of having a non-referential object is treated as pseudo-incorporation in Turkish (Öztürk, 2009). A simple syntactico-semantic representation for (2b) is given in (3)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(3)</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <pre> graph TD Root["kitap-çı / book-CI"] --- N2["2"] Root --- NCI["-CI"] N2 --- N1["1"] N2 --- EC["E-Closure"] N1 --- kitap["kitap"] N1 --- Ri["R_i"] </pre> </div> | $[[-CI]]_{\langle vt, et \rangle} = \lambda P_{\langle vt \rangle} . \hat{\ } \lambda x . Gen e P(e) \wedge AG(e, x)$ $g_c(i) = [[sell]]$ $1 = \lambda x . \lambda e . sell(x)(e) \wedge book(x) \text{ by Restrict}$ $2 = \lambda e . \exists y s.t. sell(y)(e) \wedge book(y) \text{ by E-Closure}$ $[[kitapçı]] = \hat{\ } \lambda x . Gen e [2](e) \wedge AG(e, x)$ |
|---|---|

The context based relation in this paper's analysis is similar to the analysis given in Vikner and Jensen (2002) as cited in Barker (2011) for prenominal possessives. Mainly there are two types of prenominal possessives (4), one that has the relation within, and the other that has the relation provided from the context.

¹ 1 = first person, 3 = third person, ACC = accusative, AOR = aorist, CI = agent nominalizer, COP = copula, NMLZ = nominalizer, NOM = nominative, PROG = progressive, SG = singular.

References

- Baker, M. C., & Vinokurova, N. (2009). On agent nominalizations and why they are not like event nominalizations. *Language*, 85(3), 517–556.
- Barker, C. (2011). *Possessives and relational nouns*. in von heusinger, maienborn, and portner (eds). *semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*. hsk 33.2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chierchia, G. (1985). Formal semantics and the grammar of predication. *Linguistic inquiry*, 16(3), 417–443.
- Chung, S., & Ladusaw, W. A. (2003). *Restriction and saturation* (Vol. 42). MIT press.
- Dayal, V. (2003). A semantics for pseudo-incorporation. *Ms., Rutgers University*.
- Kratzer, A. (1996). Severing the external argument from its verb. In *Phrase structure and the lexicon* (pp. 109–137). Springer.
- Öztürk, B. (2009). Incorporating agents. *Lingua*, 119(2), 334–358.
- Vikner, C., & Jensen, P. A. (2002). A semantic analysis of the english genitive. interaction of lexical and formal semantics. *Studia Linguistica*, 56(2), 191–226.