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).

\[ [[\text{agent - nominalization}]]_{vt,et} = \lambda P_{vt}. \land \lambda x. \text{Gen} e P(e) \land AG(e, x) \]

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

\[ (2) \]

\( a. \) sat-ıcı
sell-(y)IcI
‘seller of something’
\[ [X]_V -(y)IcI_N; \text{The N that} Xs \]

\( b. \) kitap-çı
book-ÇI
‘book-seller’
\[ [X]_N -CI_N; \text{The N with SEM} \]

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).

\[ \]

\[ (3) \]

\[ \]

\[ [\text{kitap-çı} / \text{book-ÇI}]_{vt,et} = \lambda P_{vt}. \land \lambda x. \text{Gen} e P(e) \land AG(e, x) \]

\[ y_c(i) = [[\text{sell}]] \]
1 = \( \lambda e. \lambda e. \text{sell}(x)(e) \land \text{book}(x) \) by Restrict
2 = \( \lambda e. \exists y s.t. \text{sell}(y)(e) \land \text{book}(y) \) by E-Closure
\[ [[\text{kitapçı}]] = \lambda x. \text{Gen} e [2](e) \land AG(e, x) \]

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.
(4)  a. John’s brother  
    b. John’s planet

In (4a) the relation between ‘John’ and ‘brother’ is inherent, which comes from within. Whereas in (4b) the relation between ‘John’ and ‘planet’ is context dependent (The planet that John is working on, the planet that John likes, etc.). The context dependency of (3) is easily attestable by (5).

    1.SG[NOM] magazine[ACC] read-NMLZ-ACC like-PROG-1.SG
    ‘I like to read magazines.’
    b. Ben kitap-çi-yım
    1.SG[NOM] book-CI-COP.1.SG

(5) shows that a speaker B (5b) can convey the meaning ‘book-lover’ out of the word kitapçı when a speaker A (5a) talks about liking what to read. This context dependency does not exist in -(y)IcI.

I further propose that the E-closure that is carried out in -CI derivations is also carried out in -(y)IcI derivations. Following Kratzer (1996) I assume that all verb are type λf,vt. I claim that the existence of E-closure is what satisfies the first argument in the verb’s denotation, and the inability of unaccussatives with the denotation stems from the inability to combine with AG function. This way the denotation no longer needs Chierchia (1985)’s ¬ operator. An updated denotation of -(y)IcI is given in (6).

(6)  \[ [-(y)IcI]_{<e,et>},et> = \lambda f.\lambda x.\exists y\ Gen\ e\ f(e)(y) \land AG(e,x) \]

After this update a way of compacting the denotation of -CI might be to merge all the operations of contextual relation, E-closure and agent nominalization under one denotation as in (7).

(7)  \[ [-(CI)]_{<e,et>} = \lambda f.\lambda x.Gen\ e\ \exists y\ f(y) \land g(e)(i)(e)(y) \land AG(e,x) \]

However this denotation comes across a problem, namely -CI’s ability to derive nouns from proper nouns (8).

(8)  Ben fenerbahçe-li değil-im ben Alex-çi-yım
    1.SG fenerbahçe-with NEG-1.SG 1.SG Alex-CI-1.SG
    Literal: ‘I am not with Fenerbahçe, I am Alex-CI’
    Meaning: ‘I do not root for Fenerbahçe, I root for Alex’

I consider this instance as a spreading of the -CI’s productivity, and as a type shifting since there are instances where we can consider proper nouns as denoting type λf,et as in (9).

(9)  Alex ol-mak zor-dur.
    Alex be-NMLZ hard-COP[AOR.3.SG]
    Literal: ‘Being Alex is hard’
    Meaning: ‘Being the things that Alex entails is hard’

To summarise, this paper updates the denotation of Baker and Vinokurova (2009)’s agent-nominalizer. This paper takes agent nominalization as a set of operations which can operate on verb or noun bases. The importance of this paper comes from the fact that a lexical process interacts with the assignment function, because it makes use of indices from the context to relations at a very low level. It can be considered as another addition to Vikner and Jensen (2002)’s explanation of the interaction of lexical and formal semantics. For further consideration, although the examples are few, this paper’s analysis can be extended to interpret nouns like "jeweller" and back-formations like "donor, donate" in English, since in both cases the base seem to be either nominal or treated as a nominal rather than a verbal one.
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