

Should Turkish be categorized as a high or low applicative language?

Pylkkänen (2002) has proposed that cross-linguistically languages exhibit two types of applicative constructions: i. *Low* applicatives which denote a relation between two individuals necessarily implying a transfer of *to* or *from the possession of* and ii. *High* applicatives which denote a relation between an individual and an event, being introduced above VP. However, the low applicative account has been challenged in the literature (Lee-Schoenfeld, 2005, Folli, R & H. Harely, 2006, Georgala, E. et al. 2008, Grashchenkov, P& V. G. Markman, 2008, Boneh & Nash, 2011). The aim of this paper is to investigate the potential applicative constructions in Turkish by looking at non-core datives comprehensively for the very first time in the literature, and to argue that a low applicative analysis is problematic for Turkish where non-core datives can only be accounted for via high applicative constructions.

Pylkkänen presents certain diagnostics for distinguishing between high and low applicatives: a. In low applicatives transfer of possession is an entailment b. Only high applicatives can combine with unergatives c. Only high applicatives can combine with stative verbs. Georgala (2012), on the other hand, proposes a uniform account of low and high applicatives with two subtypes, *Thematic* and *Raising* applicatives, whereby a single applicative construction positioned above the lexical VP fulfils a dual function.

In Turkish, at first look, double object constructions (DOC) which denote *a transfer of possession* between a dative goal/recipient and an accusative theme appear as good candidates for low applicatives as in (1a) and (1b). However, the *recipient/goal* originates lower than the direct object, *theme* and clearly, the indirect object does not c-command the direct object unlike predicted by the low applicative hypothesis. In (1a) the direct object (DO) (theme) binds the indirect object (IO) (goal/recipient). In (1b) we can maintain the same binding relationship although the *goal* has scrambled over the *theme*. This implies that the goal can reconstruct and be bound by the theme which c-commands it. With regards to scope facts, both IO and DO can take inverse scope as in (2). While in an English DOC, where the indirect object asymmetrically c-commands the direct object, scope is frozen, in Turkish we get scope ambiguity. This implies that in Turkish the DO and IO must be part of the same minimal domain as opposed to an English DOC (Bruening, 2001). In a frozen scope environment, the hierarchical order of the raised object quantifiers cannot change, which are introduced in different verbal projections. In contrast, in a ditransitive construction, where two quantified arguments are equidistant to a head, scope is not frozen but free. Therefore, given the scope and binding facts, Turkish DOCs, where the theme c-commands the goal, can only be analyzed as prototypical ditransitive constructions, hence would be miscategorized by receiving a low applicative analysis.

When we turn to non-core dative arguments in Turkish, we see that they can be added to transitive verbs as well as stative verbs and unergatives. (3a-b) show that a non-core dative can be added to the stative verb *hold*. In (3b) there is an obvious interpretation of *transfer of possession*, because the child's holding the sweets is to result in a possessive relationship between the *recipients* and the *theme*, which undermines the core diagnostics of the high/low distinction. Non-core dative arguments also can combine with unergatives as shown in (4), where the applied argument is introduced as a beneficiary to the event VP. While in (4b-c) a benefactive argument has been added to a reflexive verb, in (5a) the reflexive combines with a malefactive non-core argument. Thus, I propose that non-core datives in Turkish should semantically be analyzed mainly as benefactives or malefactives (affectee), where a recipient or possessor meaning is only secondary. These constructions are compatible with Georgala's *Thematic* applicative hypothesis, where the extra argument is base generated in [Spec, ApplP] above VP. In high applicatives, both the IO and DO can undergo passive movement. The DO is attracted by the EPP feature on Appl to its specifier position and thus can move over the IO via the availability of an 'escape hatch' (McGinnis, 2001). However, in Turkish only asymmetric theme passivization is attested as in (6a-b), therefore Georgala's approach, where the asymmetries or symmetries regarding passivization stem from the free ordering of Merge and Move, contingent on parametrization, can account for Turkish. As seen in (6c), when Move precedes Merge, the DO (theme) is attracted by the EPP feature on Appl to its specifier position and then the dative argument is merged by tucking in below the DO and is licensed by Appl. Consequently, since DO with an unchecked Case feature is closer to v, it enters into Agree with v. When undergoing passivization, the theme being the nearest goal to T, can Agree with T and move up to its specifier position to check its EPP feature (Georgala, 2012:71). Thus, I show how in terms of syntactic licensing a *Thematic* applicative hypothesis can be adopted for a scrambling language such as Turkish, whereby Turkish could parametrize Move before Merge and thereby account for the DO moving over the dative argument as well as asymmetric theme passivization.

To conclude, Turkish appears to challenge the low applicative structure proposed by Pylkkänen in that the diagnostics for identifying a low vs. high applicative construction cannot provide a clear distinction for Turkish, therefore a hypothesis that unifies applicative structures under a high applicative construction should be adopted for Turkish.

Examples:

- (1) a. Hükümet kaçak çalış-an-lar-ı ; ülke-ler-in-e ; yolla-dı DO>IO
 govern.NOM illegal work.NOML.PL.ACC country.PL.3PS.DAT send- PAST.3PS
 ‘The government sent the people who work illegally to their countries’
 b. Ülke-ler-in-e ; kaçak çalış-an-lar-ı ; hükümet yolla-dı. IO>DO
 country.PL.3PS.DAT illegal work.NOML.PL.ACC send-PAST.3PS
 ‘The government sent the people who work illegally to their countries.’
- (2) Her çocuğ-a bir oyun-u göster-di-m. $\forall > \exists, \exists > \forall$
 each child.DAT a game.ACC show-PAST.1PS
 ‘I showed each/every child a game’ (different or a specific game)
- (3) a. Ahmet kadın-a ; palto-sun-u ; tut-tu.
 Ahmet.NOM woman.DAT coat.3PS.ACC hold-PAST.3PS
 ‘Ahmet held the woman’s coat for her so that she could put it on.’
 b. Çocuk misafir-ler-e şeker-ler-i/çikolata-lar-ı tut-tu.
 child.NOM guest.PL.DAT sweet.PL/chocolate.PL.ACC hold.PAST.3PS
 ‘The child held (meaning offer) the sweets/chocolates for the guests.’
- (4) a. On-a çalış-ıyor-um.
 I.DAT work-PROG.1PS
 ‘I work for him/for his benefit.’
 b. Betül sevgili-sin-e süsle-n-iyor.
 Betül lover.3PS.DAT makeup.REFL.PROG.3PS
 ‘Betül is dressing/making up for her boyfriend.’
 c. Kim-e giy-in-di-n böyle?
 who.DAT dress.REFL.PAST.2PS so/such a way
 ‘Who did you dress up for or who are you trying to affect by dressing up like this?’
- (5) a. Hep biz-e (parası yok diye) ağla-n-ıyor.
 always we.DAT cry.REFL.PROG.3PS
 ‘He/she is always whining at us (that he/she doesn’t have any money).’
 b. Ban-a hayat-ı zindan et-ti-n.
 I.DAT. life.ACC dungeon do/make.PAST.2PS.
 Literally: ‘You have caused life to become a dungeon (affecting me)’
 ‘You have destroyed my life or made life very unpleasant for me’
 c. Sen-i ban-a düşman et-ti-ler.
 you.ACC I.DAT enemy do/make.PAST.3PL.
 ‘They/people antagonised you against me.’
 (the affected argument is the non-core dative because the enmity is one sided, not mutual)
- (6) a. Şeker-ler misafir-ler-e tut-ul-du.
 sweet.PL.NOM guest.PL.DAT hold.PASS.PAST.3PS
 ‘The sweets were held for the guests.’
 b. *Misafir-ler şeker-ler-(i) tut-ul-du.
 guest.PL.NOM sweet.PL.(ACC) hold.PASS.PAST.3PS
 ‘The guests were held the sweets’

(6c)

