Lexical and Syntactical Analysis of Passives Ergatives and Middles in Türkish, Russian and English

Doç. Dr. Ayşe Pamir Dietrich

Bu makalede Türkçe, Rusça ve ingilizce'de Özişlevsel ve Şahıssız Genel yapıların, Keyser ve Raeper'in savundukları gibi, sözcüksel değil, sözdizimsel olduğu tezi öne sürülmektedir. Tezi desteklemek amacıyla her üç dilde Özne Yükselten Edilgen, Uyumsuz Çift Edilgen ve Mastar sal Çift Edilgen yapılar incelenmiştir.

This article demonstrates that Passives, Ergatives and Middles in Tıırkish and Russian are syntactical rather than le.vical as Keyser and Roeper clainı. To support our clainı we enıploy Subject-Raising Passive, Non-Finite Doıuble Passive and Infinitival Doıuble Passive construetions in all three languages.

Keyser and Roeper (1984) in their article "On the Middle and Ergative Construetions in English" discuss the diffeıence between Ergatives (ER) and Middles (MD) in English. They state that MDs have a generic quality; therefore they do not deseribe particular events in time.

(1) a- ? Yesterday, the mayor bribed easily, according to the newspaper.
    b- ? At yesterday's house party, the kitehen wall painted easily.

(Keyser& Roeper, 1984:384)

ERs, however, can deseribe specific events in time as illustrated in the following:

(2) a- Yesterday, the boat sank according to the newspaper.

    b- At yesterday's house party the back door elosed with a bang.

Keyser and Roeper also discuss the non-eventive character of MDs. They indicate that MDs cannot occur in Imperative and Progressive constructions, whereas ERs can.

(3) ERs

a- Close,door!

b-Sink,boat!

MDs

c- *Paint easily, wall!

d- *Read easily, book!

(4) ERs

a- The door is closing.

b- The boat is sinking.

MDs

c- *The wall is painting easily.

d- *The book is reading easily.

in that sense, MD verbs behave like stative verbs as neither of these verbs appears in Imperative and Progressive constructions because these constructions imply a situation in which something happens; that is they describe events.

Since MDs are stative they cannot be used as the complement of a small clause because small clauses require an eventive or temporary state reading.

(5) *I saw the floor wax easily.

Further, Keyser and Roeper argue that MDs are derived in the syntax like Passives in the sense that the surface subject of MDs is generated in the object position and it is moved to the subject position to receive case. ERs, in contrast, are generated in the lexicon, and the same lexical rule applies to ERs not in the syntax, but in the lexicon. They provide some tests to support their argument. Here I will only demonstrate the First Sister argument and Out Prefixation tests.

First let us consider the argument structure of MDs and ERs in English.

The difference between MD verbs and ER verbs is that ER verbs lack an external argument, that is they take one argument which is internal, and ERs project their internal argument in the subject position at D-structure as illustrated in (7a) for English (see Haegeman 1991:310):

(6) a- The boat sank.

    b- The book reads easily.
    c- The boat was sunk.

(7) a- [s the boat i [VP sank]

    b- [s the book i [VP reads [NP tj] [AP easily]]]]
    c- [s the boat i [s' was] [VP sunk [NP ti]]]

The schematized argument structures given below by Haegeman for English clarify this viewpoint.

The argument structure for the English ER sentence in (6a) is:

(8) sank = 1

    Theme

       j

The argument structure for the English MD sentence in (6b) is:

(9) read = 2

    Theme

      j

And the argument structure for the English Passive (P) sentence in (6c) is (according to Haegeman, 1991:307-310):

(10) sunk = 2

     Theme

      j

As noticed, in terms of argument structure MDs behave like Ps in English. However, they differ from Ps in that they do not have passive morphology and they are used only with adverbials.

Let us now consider the following sentences from Turkish:

(11)TURKISH

   a- Ben suyu yere dök - tüm.

                              spill-past-lsg.
      'I spilled the water on the floor'

   b- Su dök - ül - dü.

          spill-pass-past
       'The water was spilled'

   c- Su dök - ül - dü.

          spill-pass-past
       'The water spilled'

   d- Su kolay dök ül ür.

                 spill-pass-aorist
       'The water spills easily'

   in (1 lb) the sentences contain the passive form of the verb. Comparing
(11b) with their active counterparts (İla) we see that the subject of the
passive sentences in Turkish corresponds to the internal argument of the
active verb. The D-structure representations of the sentences in (1 la,b) are
as follows. Notice that the unpromoted objects are unacceptable in Turkish
(see 12c).

   (12) TURKISH

      a- [s Ben [S' [VP [NP suyu][y dök-tüm]]]]].

           I   water-acc spill-past-lsg.

          I spilled the water'

      b- [S Sui [s' [VP [NP U][v dök - ül - dü]]]]].

           Water   spill-pass-past
          'The water was spilled'

      c- *Suy-u   dök - ül - dü.

          Water-Acc. spill-Pass-Past
          'The water was spilled'

   In (12b) the subject of the passive sentences originates within the VP as
the internal argument of the active verb. This argument cannot be assigned
case by the passive verb, therefore it moves from its original position (VP) to

the subject position to receive case. Now we shall observe the following D-structures for ERs and MDs. Notice that, as in Ps, unpromoted objects are not acceptable in both ERs and MDs.

(13) TURKISH

a- [S Sui [S' [VP [V döküldü][NP ti]]]].

'The water spilled'

b- [S Sui [s^1 [VP [ADVP kolay][NP U][V dökülür]]]].

'The water spills easily'

c- *Suy-u döküldü.

Water-Acc.

d- *Suy-u kolay dökülür.

Water-Acc.

Unlike English, in Turkish ER and MD sentences the morphology on the verb -// (or -*In)* is the same as in Ps. As in Ps, because the verb cannot assign case to its DO, the DO is caseless. This violates the Case Filter, which requires every NP to be assigned case, therefore it must move to subject position where it can receive Nom. case. What I claim here is that ERs and MDs in Turkish are a type of P. MDs resemble Impersonal Passives (IPP). Like IPPs the verb in MDs has the -// (or -*In*) morphology and the verbs are used in 3sg. or 3pl. ERs in Turkish, on the other hand, have the same structure as Agentless Passives (AP) in the sense that they have the same morphology (-// or -*In),* and they do not appear with an agent on the surface structure, yet in APs there is always an implied agent.

(14) TURKISH

a- Kapı adam tarafından aç - ıl - dı.

'The door was opened by the man'

b- Kapı kolay aç - ıl - ır.

'The door opens easily'

c- Kapı aç - ıl - dı.

'The door opened'

Let us now observe the First Sister Argument and Out Prefixation tests.

Following Roeper and Siegel (1978), Keyser and Roeper claim that the compound formation is sensitive to the order of constituents in subcategorization frames. "The Compound Rule of English that governs verbal compounds takes the first sister of the verb as represented in its lexical entry and preposes it to form a compound, with the relevant morphology applying".

(15) a- The boat sinks fast -> the fast-sinking boat

   b- The pill acts fast -> the fast-acting pill
                                        (Keyser&Roeper 1984,391)

(16) a- Bureaucrats bribe easily -> * easily-bribing

      bureaucrats
   b- The wall paints easily -> * easily-painting wall

In (15) *fast-sinking* and *fast-acting* are well-formed compounds because the preposed constituent fast is a first sister of the verb. In (1.6), however, *easily-bribing* and *easily-painting* are ill-formed compounds because the preposed *easily* is not a first sister of the verb. Thus, the underlying structure of the sentences in (16) is as follows:

(17) a- bribe bureaucrats easily.

   b- paints the wall easily.

In light of the assumption that the MD verbs in (17) contain an object as a first sister, they claim that MDs are syntactically transitive and ERs are syntactically intransitive.

Fagan (1988), in contrast, supports Allen's (1978) argument claiming that the adverbs cannot be used in adjectival compounding, therefore the forms in (16) are ungrammatical. According to Ailen, there are two types of compound adjectives in English:

(18) a- Adjective + adjective (best-selling, nice-looking,

      grey-green)
   b- Noun + adjective (water-sohıble, color-blind,
      eagle-eyed)

He argues that the compounds in (16) *'easily-bribing* and "*easily-painting* cannot be classified as compounds, because *easily* is an adverb, and *adverb + adjective* compounds do not exist in English. In contrast, I will claim that there exist *adverb+adjective* compounds in English. For example,

MD verbs which are used with the suffix *-ed (or -en)* can form well-formed compounds, such as *easily-painted wall, easily-bribed bureaucrats, easily-cleaned dress, easily-broken glass* etc. The compounds in (16) are ill-formed because the MD verbs *bribe* and *paint* require an agent. The presence of the adverb *easily* enhances this requirement for an agent. In general, the suffix-*ing* is used with verbs which imply an action accomplished on its own. For example, in *fast-sinking boat* the adverb *fast* is not agent-oriented and the compound means that the boat sinks fast of its own accord. On the other hand, the suffix *-ed* (or *-en)* is used with the verbs which imply that the action is performed by someone else [1]. For example, in *easily-painted wall* there must be an agent performing the action; the wall cannot do the action by itself. It has also been pointed out (Fagan 1988) that *quick, slow* and *long* in *quick-thinking, slow-moving* and *long-playing* are not adverbs, rather they are adjectives. If they were adverbs, the following sentence in (19a) would be grammatical:

(19) a-(*) He thinks quick[2].

  slow.

  b- He thinks quickly,

  slowly.

Adverbials in English require the suffix *-ly*[3]. *Quick* and *slow* in (19a) do not carry this suffix, therefore ungrammaticality arises. This proves that *easily* in *easily-painted wall* is an adverb, and the compound it forms with the adjective *painted* is an *adverb+adjective* compounding contrary to Fagan and Allen's claim.

Keyser and Roeper's second argument is *Out Prefixation.* Following Bresnan's (1981) argument which states that *Out Prefixation* is a lexical rule and it creates transitives from intransitives, and because MDs do not undergo *Out Prefixation,* they claim that MDs are transitive and MD formation is syntactic. Since ERs undergo *Out Prefixation,* they must be intransitive and ER formation must be lexical.

---

[1] Notice that these verbs are used with the adverb *easily.* The addition of the suffix *-ed {or -en)* to the verb without the adverb *easily* neutralizes the requirement for an agent.
  (i) a- the broken glass
    b- the opened door
  The interest in (i) is in the resultant state, not in how that state is arrived at..
[2] The brackets show that this sentence is grammatical in colloquial speech.
[3] *Fast* exceptionally does not take the suffix *-ly* ,that is, there is no morphological distinction between the adjectival and adverbial form of this word (see Fagan 1988 footnote 4).

(20) a- Trees plant easily.

    b- *Trees outplant flowers easily.
    c- The ball bounced.
    d- The basketball outbounced the baseball.
                (Keyser & Roeper, 1984:395)

Now let us consider the following verbs used with the prefix *out* in (21):

(21) a- *John outknew him.

    b- *He outappeared sick,
    c- *Roger outlooked at me.

The verbs in (21) are stative verbs. The sentences in (21) are ill-formed, because stative verbs do not undergo *Out Prefixation*. On the other hand, the ER in (20c) undergoes *Out Prefixation* because it is eventive.

It appears that neither the *First Sister* nor *Out Prefixation* tests demonstrate that MDs are syntactic and ERs are lexical.

Below I will show evidence from Turkish and Russian that demonstrates that Passives, ERs and MDs are syntactical.

One of the diagnostics for the syntactic passives in Turkish is Subject-Raising Passives (SRP). Turkish, like English, allows a rule of S'-deletion for the complements of the verbs of the type *sanmak* 'believe' (See Chomsky 1981). This rule permits the verb to govern the subject of the embedded clause.

(22) a- Herkes [Ali kitabi oku - du] san - ıyor.

          or Aliyi
   'Everybody believes that Ali has read the book'
   b- Ali$_i$ PRO$_i$ kitabi oku - du] san - ıl - ıyor.

     3sg.   3sg.   3sg.
    'Ali is believed to have read the book'
   c- Herkes bizi viskiyi iç - ti] san - lyor.
     or
    Herkes [biz viskiyi iç - tiki sanıyor.
    'Everybody believes that we have drunk the whisky'
   d- Biz$_i$ [PRO$_i$ viskiyi 19 - ti] san - ıl - lyoruz.

    lpl.   3sg.   lpl.
    'We are believed to have drunk the whisky'

e-* Biz$_i$ [PRO$_i$ viskiyi iç - ti - k) san - ıl - lyoruz,

lpl.   lpl.   lpl.

'We are believed to have drunk the whisky'

The verb *sanmak* 'believe' in Turkish is an Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) verb. Unlike English, ECM verbs in Turkish do not take an infinitival clause as their internal argument. The embedded clause in (22) is called a Non-finite[4] Direct Complement in Turkish. The verb of the Direct Complement in (22) is tensed, but has no Agreement (AGR) marker. As noticed from (22b,d), the 3sg. form is used in both embedded sentences regardless of the form of the subject of the matrix clause. Since there is no accessible subject for the PRO of the lower clause, the higher clause provides an accessible subject for it. Thus, the sentence in (22e) is ill-formed because the verb in the embedded clause has an AGR marker attached to the verb.

Another piece of evidence in favor of the syntactic treatment of passives in Turkish is Non-finite Double Passive (NFDP) constructions. The externalization of a non-thematic argument is also allowed in these constructions. Notice that both the matrix and embedded clauses must have passive morphology:

(23)   Kitaplar$_i$ [t$_i$ ogrenciler tarafından oku - n - du]

book-pl-Nom.   students   by   read-Pass-Past
san - ıl -ıyor.
believe-Pass-Prog.
'The books are believed to have been read by the students'

In (23) although the NP *kitaplar* 'books' is not the thematic object of the verb *sanmak* 'believe', it is externalized and is the subject of the matrix clause. Now let us go back to the Subject-Raising Passives in (22). Here also, as noticed, the non-thematic arguments *Ali* and *Biz* 'we' are externalized. If the passive is lexical in Turkish the non-thematic argument *kitaplar* 'books' in (23) and *Ali* and *Biz* 'we' in (22) could not be externalized because lexical passives externalize only the internal thematic object of the verb.

Finally, there are also Infinitival Double Passive (IDP) constructions (See Kornfilt 1988) which support the claim that the Passive in Turkish is syntactic. The main properties of these constructions are:

---

[4] Finiteness is marked with the subject agreement in Turkish, but not with tense. (See also George&Kornfilt 1981)

(24) a- The embedded and the matrix verb must have passive
         morphology.
    b- The verb in the embedded clause is in the infinitive form.
    c- The embedded verb is non-finite.
    d- The DO of the embedded clause is the subject of the ma-
       trix clause.
    e- The embedded clause is not tensed and has no AGR.

Now let us look at the sentence in (25):

(25) Kitaplar$_i$ [$_s$ t$_i$ (ögrenciler tarafindan) t$_i$ oku-n-ma-y-a]
    Books-Nom.   students   by   read-Pass.-Inf.-'y'-Dat.
    başla- n - dı.
    begin-Pass.-Past.
    'The books began to be read by the students'
    '*The books were begun to be read by the students[6]'

In (25) because the case assignment is blocked by the passive
morphology the DO of the embedded clause is caseless, therefore it must
move to the subject position to receive case. The DO moving to the subject
position cannot receive case there either, because, as mentioned, the verb
does not carry AGR. As a result the DO has to move out of the embedded
clause to the subject of the matrix clause and there it receives case from the
AGR of the matrix verb.

The difference between the NFDP constructions in (23) and the IDP in
(25) is that the main verb in (23) is a ECM verb and the main verb in (25) is

---

[5] y is a glide inserted between the infinitive and Dat. suffixes, y is inserted when a suffix
starting with a vowel attaches to a suffix ending in a vowel.
[6] The second reading in English is not possible, because English does not have double passive
construction. In Turkish there is a tendency to reduplicate the constituents in sentences. This
is done sometimes for emphasis, sometimes for intensification For example:
    (ii) a- Ali koşa   koşa   geldi.
            running running
         'Ali came running'
      b- Sabah sabah nereye gidiyorsun?
       morning morning
        'Where are you going early in the morning?'
      c- kıpkırmızı 'very red'.bembeyaz, 'very white'
      d- Toplantıda raporlar oku -n - ul - du.
                             Pass. Pass.
         'The reports were read at the meeting'
English do not reduplicate, therefore double passive constructions do not exist in this
language.

a control verb. The main verb in (25) takes an infinitival complement as its internal argument and marks it with the Dative case. In (23), on the other hand, the complement clause is not infinitival, it is tensed and it can only be assigned Accusative case by the verb. Consider the following English sentence which takes an Infinitival Passive clause as a complement:

(26) *The universities$_i$ were wanted/begun/tried t$_i$ to be
　　　surrounded t$_i$ (by the police).

(Kornfilt, 1988:188)

The result is ungrammatical because in English these main verbs are not ECM verbs, they do not trigger S'-Deletion and the trace in the subject position of the embedded clause violates ECP. How, then, is the trace in (25) saved from the ECP? The verb in (25) is a control verb and S' -Deletion cannot occur. Kornfilt's proposal offers a solution to this problem. She claims that the IDP verbs trigger the deletion of the maximal projection of N, instead of S'. She arrives at this conclusion by assuming that the infinitivals are NPs. Thus, in order to save the trace in the embedded subject position from violating ECP, the N^{max} Deletion applies and the main verb properly governs the trace in the embedded subject position.

Up to now we have seen evidence that Turkish passives have NP movements and this movement is purely syntactical. Below we shall observe that MDs and ERs in Turkish also involve NP movement and they are syntactical. Consider the following Double Passive constructions which take MD and ER sentences as their complements as in (27):

(27) a- Bu　kapı$_i$　[t$_i$ kendiliginden　kapa - n - dı]
　　　　This door　on its own　　　close-Pass.-Past,
　　　　san - ıl - ıyor.
　　　　believe-Pass .-Prog.
　　　　'This door is believed to have closed on its own'
　　b- Bu　kapı$_i$　[t$_i$ kolay　　kapa - n - ır]
　　　　This door　easily　　　close-Pass.-Aor.
　　　　san - ıl - ıyor.
　　　　believe-Pass .-Prog.
　　　　'This door is believed to close easily'
　　c- Bu kapı$_i$ [t$_i$(çocuk tarafindan) kapa - n - dı]
　　　　This door　by the child　　close-Pass .-Past.
　　　　san - ıl - ıyor.
　　　　believe-Pass .-Prog.
　　　　'The door is believed to have been closed by the child'

The embedded sentence in (27a) is an ER sentence, in (27b) it is a MD sentence, and in (27c) it is a Passive sentence. In all three instances there is an externalization of a non-thematic internal argument. The embedded objects in all three examples are caseless because the passive morphology blocks the case assignment, therefore they have to move to embedded subject position to receive case, yet this is impossible because the embedded verbs have tense, but no AGR. The only position for the DOs to receive case is the subject position of the matrix clause. The matrix verbs have AGR, and the DOs receive case from the matrix verbs' agreement.

We have seen that Turkish and English [7]allow SRPs with the verbs which trigger S'- Deletion and this was strong support for the claim that the passives Turkish are syntactical. Now we shall see whether Russian allows SRPs and whether Russian passives are syntactical or lexical. Consider the following sentences:

(28) a-* Oni   scita-li   menya idti domoy.
          They consider-Past   I-Ace .to go home
          'They consider me to go home'
     b-*   Ya$_i$ şcitayu-s'   [t$_i$ idti domoy].
          I-Nom. consider-Pass.to go home
          I am considered to go home'
     c- * Oni duma-li   menya bıt' krasivim.
          They think-Past I-Acc. to be beautiful
           They thought me to be beautiful'
     d-*   Ya$_i$ dumaet-sya [t$_i$ bit'krasivim].
          I-Nom. think-Pass.   to be beautiful
          'I am thought to be beautiful'

As noticed, unlike Turkish, Russian does not allow SRPs with the verbs in (28). The sentences in (28) are ill-formed because Russian, unlike Turkish, does not allow S'-Deletion in infinitival complement clauses used with these verbs, because in Russian a complement clause cannot be infinitival. However, in Russian a complement clause can be a verbless small clause, and these verbs can be used in verbless small clauses. Now consider the sentences given in (29a):

(29) a- On şçita -1   menya umnim.
          He consider-Past   I-Acc. clever-Instrumental.
          'He considered me clever'

---

[7] From looking at the translations in (22) and (23) we can make a claim that Subject-Raising Passives are allowed in English, too.

b- Ya$_i$ şçitalas'   [t$_i$ umnım]
   I consider-Passive clever-Instr.
   'I am considered clever'

it appears that Subject-Raising applies to verbless small clauses in Russian and this shows that passives in Russian, like Turkish and English, can be syntactical. We mentioned that the S'-Deletion is a necessary condition for SRPs, yet it appears that this condition does not apply to the sentences in (28). This, however, will not affect our statement that passives are syntactical in Russian. it is clear that Russian SRPs are more restricted than English and Turkish SRPs.

CONCLUSION

in this study we have presented sonıe evidence from Turkish and Russian to support our claim that passivization in Turkish, in Russian and even in English has a syntactic NP-movement and passives in ali three İanguages are syntactical. in Turkish we showed that SRP, NFDP and IDP constructions allow S'-deletion for the complements of the verbs like *sanmak* 'to believe' and *başlamak* 'to begin', and the externalization of a non-thematic argument is permitted in these constructions. in Russian, on the other hand, we observed that Subject-Raising is more restricted than Turkish and only applies to verbless small clauses.

REFERENCES

1- Ailen, M.A. (1978) *Morphological Investigations.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

2- Chomsky, N.(1984) *Lectures on Government & Binding.* Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

3- Dietrich, A.P. (1987) *Toward a Syntactic Characterization of Passives, Ergatives and Middles in Russian and Turkish.* Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

4- Fagan, Sarah. (1988) "The English Middle," *Linguistic bıcjuiry* 19, no. 2, 181-203.

5- George, L. & J. Kornfilt, (1977) "Infinitival Double Passives in Turkish," in K. Leffel and D. Bouchard (eds.) *North Eastern Linguistic Society,* vol. 7, 65-79.

6-   Haegeman, L. *Introduction to Government & Binding Theory. Cambridge: Blackweü, Ltd., 1991.*

7-   Keyser, S.& T.Roeper (1984) "On the Middle and Ergative Constructions in English, *"Linguistic Inquiry,* vol. 15. no. 3, 381-416.

8-   Kornfilt, Jacklin.(1998)"NP-Deletion and Case Marking in Turkish", *Studies on Turkish Lingıtistics,* METU, Ankara.

9-   Roeper, T. and M.E.A. Siegel. "A Lexical Transformation for Verbal Compounds," *Linguistic Inguiry 9* (1978) 199-260.