Functions of the So-called Passive Morpheme–(I)l-in Kazakh

Dr. Fatma ŞAHAN GÜNEY*

Abstract: As it is the case for other Turkic languages, the so-called passive morpheme -(I)l- in Kazakh has two different functions. One function of it is to make a verb passive and the other function is to mark a transitive verb as intransitive. Some sporadic verb forms in Kazakh marked with two passive morphemes, namely -l and –n, and also the morpheme cluster –lXn utilized to derive passive and intransitive verb stems in Old Turkic and Middle Turkic (Middle Turkic is represented here with Divan ü Lügati't Türk) suggest that once existed two separate morphemes, namely -(I)l- and -(I)n- (which can be argued that it is represented by -lXn in OT and MT) for passivizing and intransitivizing verbs. In later stages of the language, however, as we find in Kazakh (and also in Turkish and other Turkic languages) these two separate functions have been collapsed into one and carried out by a single morpheme, i.e., the so called passive morpheme -(I)l-.

Key Words: Kazakh, passive, intransitivity, Old Turkic, Middle Turkic.

1. Introduction

The voice in general affects the verb valency which connects the nominal structures and the verb. According to the Projection Principle in Generative Grammar, the argument structure of a verb is determined at the level of lexicon. Later on, they are projected on to d-structure (i.e., deep structure) by the theta criterion where they acquire their first syntactic realization (Sezer, 1991). In this respect, the voice is a syntactic process whether or not it accompanies the morphological projections in individual languages[1].

There are different views regarding how passives are derived at surface structure. According to the theory developed in Relational Grammar, it is done by 2-to-1 advancement rule which moves object to subject position[2]. This movement is constrained by the rule that only one argument can advance to this position.

Another hypothesis is that since the predicates are not strictly subcategorized for the external arguments as opposed to internal ones the external

* Muğla University, Faculty of Science and Letter / MUĞLA

bilig ✦ Winter / 2006 ✦ Number 36: 125-137

argument position, i.e., the subject position may have no theta role. Thus, passive structures are explained by absorption of the external theta role by the passive morphology (The original idea belongs to O. A. Jaeggli as stated in Taneri's work) (Taneri, 1993:14).

As it is the case for the other Turkic languages, in Kazakh, the voice is implemented through verbal inflection. For this purpose, deverbal derivational morphemes are used. The true passive voice in Kazakh is marked on a verb as *-(I)l* (*-(I)n* after the consonant *l*) and original object of the sentence at deep structure becomes the surface subject.

example: Khat zhaz -ıl -dı
letter write PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The letter was written.'

Birzhan khat -tı zhaz -dı
B. letter ACC write Past T
'Birzhan wrote the letter.'

The agentive subject which is suppressed by the passive structure rarely surface in ablative (and in some cases in) instrumental case as in:

Aqın Birzhan -nan zheng -il -di
A. B. ABL defeat PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'Aqın was defeated by Birzhan.'

In this paper, we are going to suggest that although the deverbal morpheme *-(I)l-* is addressed as passive voice marker in a substantial part of the linguistic literature related to Kazakh language (see Isqaqov 1991 and Khasenova 1959 for instance), passivizing sentences is not the only function it carries out. First we will demonstrate that, in addition to its passivizing function, the so called passive morpheme -(i)l- used in contemporary Kazakh is also utilized in intransitivizing transitive verbs. Then we will suggest that this double function of the so-called Kazakh passive is the result of the unification of the morphemes -l and –n, once carried out different functions in the earlier stages of this language.

2. The Morpheme *-(I)l-* as passive and intransitive marker: Evidence from Modern Kazakh

The fact that the so-called passive morpheme in Kazakh is not a passive morpheme only but has additional function(s) should be obvious at first glance of the following sample sentences:

asıl- a Et as -ıl -ıp zhat -ır
meat hang PASS Pres. Ger. Aux. (progress.) Aorist
'The meat is hanging.'

b Bul köterilis -te köp adam as -ıl -dı
this revolt DAT many man hang PASS Past T
'Many men were hanged in this revolt.'

buwıl- a Tamagı buw -ıl -ıp söyle -y al
throat strangle PASS Pres. Ger. Speak Pres. Ger. manage
ma -dı
Neg Past T
'Something got stuck into his throat (i.e., He choked), and he couldn't speak.'

b Zhük -ter buw -ıl -ıp bit-ti
load Plur tie PASS Pres. Ger end Past T
'The load was tied completely.'

zhazıl- a Biz "Pravda" gazet -i -ne zha -ıl -dı - k
we paper 3rd Per Poss DAT write PASS Past T 1st prs Plur
'We subscribed to the newspaper 'Pravda'.'

b Khat zhaz -ıl -dı
letter write PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The letter was written.'

zhayıl- a Kir zhay -ıl -dı
stain spread PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The stain spread.'

b Tösek zhay -ıl -dı
bed spread PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The bed was unfolded/made.'

zharıl- a Shölmek eki -ge zhar -ıl -dı
container two DAT split PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The container split in two.'

Otın zhar -ıl -dı
wood chop PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The wood was chopped.'

zhinal- a Munda zholdas -tar zhina -l -dı
here fellow Plur gather PASS Past T
'The fellows gathered here.'

b Astıq zhıyna -l -dı
grain gather PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The grain/crop was gathered.'

Looking at the examples above, one can see that sentences of type **a** are different than type **b**. The significant difference is that type **a** sentences are non-passives whereas type **b** sentences have true passive meaning with implied agents. However, one thing common between the two types of sentences is the fact that they are all intransitives. Now, let us look at another group of sentences which have more than one reading.

a Yesik ash -ıl -dı
door open PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
1. The door opened.'
2. 'The door was opened (by somebody).'

b Alma -nıng tileg -i orında -l -dı
Alma GEN wish 3rd prs. Poss place PASS Past T (3rd prs)
1. 'Alma's wish came true/took place.'
2. 'Alma's wish was made true.'

c Bir ay -dan zhumıs ayaqta -l -a -dı
one month ABL work finish PASS Present T 3rd prs sing
1. 'The work will end in a month.'
2. 'The work will be finished in a month.'

d Un shash -ıl -dı
flour spill PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
1. 'The flour spilt.'
2. 'The flour was spilt by somebody.'

e Tereze zhab -ıl -dı
window close PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
1. 'The window closed.'
2. 'The window was closed (by somebody).'

The second group of sentences is ambiguous. We can get two readings one being the intransitive reading. This function of the so-called passive morpheme, i.e., intransitivizing the transitive verbs is called "non-passive" by Babby[3], and "derived intransitive" by Sezer[4]. The other reading is the passive

one. That is because the so-called passive morpheme is a bi-functional one in Kazakh.

According to Babby the morpheme *-(I)l-* in Turkish and in many other languages are used to reduce the basic valency of the verb by leaving the agent out which follows a similar pattern as the intransitivizing *-sja* suffix in Russian (see note 3.) In a way, this is a plausible suggestion for the function of Kazakh passive as well since both readings of the second group of sentences are derived from the transitive verbs by reducing their valency.

The bi-functionality of the passive morpheme in Kazakh, as displayed here, may suggest the possible existence of collapsing or merging of two separate morphemes, namely morphemes of intransitivity and passive.

Tietze states that "Turkish does not usually allow the shift from transitive to intransitive function of a single verb form, which so often occurs in English (e.g., *I broke the glass* / *The glass broke*)". Unlike English, intransitive verb forms in Turkish derived from transitive verbs are marked by the morpheme *-(I)l-* whereas there is no such a need for the derived intransitives in English. Thus, *I broke the glass* / *The glass broke* translates into Turkish as *Camı kırdım* / *Cam kırıldı*, where the passive/ intransitive form of the verb *kır-* "to brake" is marked with the suffix *-(I)l-* in Turkish. Let us look at a few examples from Turkish in order to see whether Turkish has the similar case of ambiguous sentences as Kazakh does:

Yara aç -ıl -dı
wound open PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
1 'The wound opened.'
2 'The wound was opened (by the doctor).'

Tel bük -ül -dü
wire bend PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
1. 'The wire twisted.'
2. 'The wire was bent.'

Pencere aç -ıl -ma -dı
window open PASS Neg Past T (3rd prs sing)
1. 'The window didn't open.'
2. 'The window wasn't opened.'

Again we have the similar ambiguity in Turkish examples that we had in Kazakh. Once the transitive verbs of the sample sentences are affixed with morpheme *-(I)l-* they acquire both passive and intransitive meaning. According to Tietze, this ambiguity is limited to some verbs and can be removed by providing a context for them. He calls the non-passive function

of the passive suffix as "medio-reflexive" and ascribes the non-passive 2nd readings of the sentences above to the sentences with non-human subjects (Tietze, 1989:286). Defining whether those certain group of verbs in Turkish and in Kazakh also is *unaccusative* requires further analysis which is not going to be pursued here.

Normally Kazakh does not allow doubly marked passives in personal passives. Nevertheless, sporadically, some verbs may carry double passive morphemes, even though the second so called passive morpheme does not bring any change to the meaning of the passive sentence:

bayqa- "to notice, be aware" > bayqa-l- "to be noticed"
zertte- "to make a search" > zertte-l- "to be searched, to be examined"
zhe- "to eat" > zhe-y-il- "to be eaten"
de - "to say" > de-y-il- "to be said"
bayla- "to tie" > bayla-n- "to be tied"

When those verb stems take double passive suffixes, they become:

zhe-l-in-: Et zhe -l -in -ip sorpa ish -il -di
meat eat PASS PASS Past GER soup drink PASS Past T
'The meat was eaten, and the soup was drunk.' (literally)
'People ate meat and drank soup.'

de-l-in-: Ot zhag -ıl -sın de -l -in -di
fire burn PASS 3rd prs imp say PASS PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'It was told to set the fire.'

bayqa-l-ın- Osı zhaz -gan barsha söz -den bayqa -l
that write Past Participle all word ABL notice PASS
-ın -ar bar shın -ım
PASS Aorist whole truth 1st prs poss.
'My all truth is to be noticed from all my writings.'

bayla-n-ıl- At bayla -n -ıl- dı
horse tie PASS PASS Past T (3rd prs sing)
'The horse was tied.'

Those verbs carrying double passive morpheme seem to be the frozen forms which are not very productive in Kazakh for the time being. Although we find two passive morphemes attached to the verb stems in the sentences above, the second passive does not have any syntactic projection, nor does it have any semantic significance. The verb valency changes only once.

3. Historical Evidence

Erdal (1991) draws attention to some vocative forms in Old Turkic, *Dīvān Lügāti't Türk* and *Kutadgu Bilig,* which, probably are relevant to the frozen forms in Kazakh and Turkish, but are more productive in Old Turkic[5]. He states that, in Old Turkic, two formatives, namely *-(I)l* and *-(I)n* combine together as *-lXn-* dropping the vowel of the first one. He makes no comment regarding the isolated functions of those two morphemes combining into one, however he categorizes it together with the passive morpheme *-l* and, as he calls, medial, reflexive and anti-transitive *-n* of Old Turkic. He further argues that this suffix can not be treated as a sequence but as the combination of the two. *-lXn* combines only with transitive verb stems, and the verbs marked with it become intransitive. The following examples exhibit some of the *-lXn* forms (indicated bold) from OT and DLT:

in Old Turkic:

suq- > suq-lun- "to get stuck in something"

küfänçlig suv küznäki□a ***suklunmuşlarka*** *kü[...lüg] köprügüg körkitti□iz*

'To those stuck in the water-hole pride you have shown the bridge of [...]' (Erdal 1991:642)

tik- > tik-lin- "to be placed, place oneself vertically"

özlärini□ tillärintin y(a)rok ünüp balıka ***tiklinip***

'a ray of light goes vertically towards the *bali* offering' (Erdal 1991:640)

yet- > yet-lin- "to disappear"

agazımtakı tataglar barça ***yetlinip*** *artokrak açıg bolup kün t(ä)□ri yarokı közümtä arıtı közünmäz*

'The tastes in my mouth all **disappear** and there comes an extreme bitterness, and the light of sun no longer is

visible to me.' (Erdal 1991:642)

yuq- > yuq-lun- "to be polluted; of filth, to adhere"

nızvanıka yuklunmasar,... tayansar kkirsiz arıg orunka, ...

'If one dos not get polluted by passion, ... if one has undirtied clean place as base, then...' (Erdal 1991:641)

in DLT:

aç- > aç-lın- "to open (int.)"
Kapug açlındı (DLT I: 256)

'The door opened.'

bog- > bog-lun- "to choke"
At boglundı. (DLT II: 239)
'The horse choked.'

büg- > büg-lün- "to gather, to accumulate; of water, to be stagnant"
Sü büglündi. (DLT II: 239)
'The armed forces gathered.'

He states, on the other hand, that the passive suffix in Old Turkic is *-(I)l-*, and this suffix often has "anti-transitive" meaning (Erdal 1991:651) as it is evident in the English translations of the following *-(I)l- forms*:

passive

biti-l- "to be written"
buz-ul- "to be spoiled"
bil-il- "to be known"
çöz-ü-l- "to fall apart, to be dispersed"

anti-transitive

aç-ıl- "to open" (intr)
es-il- "to diminish" (intr)
ävri-l "to turn, revolve, turn back" (intr)

4. Conclusion

In addition to the sporadically encountered verb stems carrying double passive morphemes in modern Kazakh, as discussed above, the data from Old Turkic may suggest that the double functions, namely the passivizing and intransitivizing functions of the so-called passive morpheme *-(I)l-* have existed in the older stages of the Turkic languages. However, the existence of a separate morpheme cluster, namely *-lXn-* which is mostly used as anti-transitive leads us to think that two separate forms of anti-transitive, supposedly *-(I)n-*, and passive *-(I)l-* collapsed or even merged into one form in time yielding the passive suffix undertake both functions.

We may further conclude that the Old Turkic and the contemporary Turkic languages like Kazakh and Turkish represent the continuing stages of that development. The sporadic concrete forms like *zhelin-* and *delin-* and others in Kazakh and Turkish should be taken as evidence to confirm the existence of such a distinction of passive and anti-transitive in older stages.

As known very well, transitivity and passive are two distinct grammatical categories which manifest themselves in syntax. Whether or not these two categories find their expression in morphology as well varies from language to

language. In the case of English, a single verb form switches from transitive to intransitive without having any changes introduced to the morphological structure of that verb. In the case of Kazakh and other Turkic languages, however, almost any syntactic change affecting a given verb form triggers morphological changes as well, which requires marking of that verb form with certain suffixes. It is also known that there is not always one-to-one correspondence between a syntactic category and a morphological marker. That is to say, a single morpheme may carry out more than a single syntactic function. In our case, we argued that the so-called passive morpheme *–(I)l-* is not a passive morpheme alone, but is ambiguous between intransitive and passive, which we suggested to be acquired over time by merging of the functions of historically two separate morphemes, namely *–(I)l-* and *–(I)n-*. Knowing that the so-called passive morpheme in Kazakh has two functions one being transitive and the other passive may be important for two reasons: For practical reasons, it would be useful for the learners of Kazakh as a second language to know that, unlike what is said in average grammar books, this specific suffix has two syntactic manifestations which result in different semantic interpretations and may even correspond to different grammatical structures in their own language. From theoretical point of view, it points out to the fact that transitivity and passive are closely related syntactic categories, perhaps the latter deriving from the former. In understanding how grammar works in general, it would be an interesting research made towards understanding why intransitive, once marked independently in the history of a given language (which is Kazakh in our case) ceased being reflected as a separate category and began being represented under passive.

Notes

1. Whether the passive structures are the products of syntactic or lexical level in Kazakh is not the focus of this paper. We should note, however, that this question has been addressed by some scholars for some other Turkic languages and the older stages of Turkic. For instance, in her article titled "A case for Emerging Functional Categories", Kornfilt compares Old Turkic of 8th century to Modern Turkish in order to see if those languages have syntactic passives structures or passives at all. She suggests that OT does not have passives but only "middles", since the functional categories (such as IP's) are not fully developed in OT period. According to her conclusion, Modern Turkish which she sees not as a direct descendent but a closely related dialect of Old Turkic has developed those categories over the time and possessed syntactic passives accordingly (Kornfilt, 1991:30).
2. Sezer suggests that passive verbs are derived in lexicon by suppressing the external argument of a verb. They also lose their ability to assign accusative case to their internal arguments. He also takes Burzio's generalization as the base

according to which "a verb which lacks an external argument fails to assign accusative case" as the syntactic motivation of passives (Sezer, 1991:55).

3. Babby regards the external argument position as the "empty" position and filled by the transformation that moves the contents of the direct object NP into the subject NP. This is a syntactic operation, and in the case of Turkish, the suffix *–(i)l-* is added to the basic transitive stem to mark its syntactically derived intransitivity. Both the passive formations and derived intransitives are acquired by the same syntactic means that were explained above.

   It follows that passive is a derived intransitive too, but apart from the plain derived intransitives, passives have passive agents with adverbial morphology which surfaces optionally, crucially, by "lexical insertion" and not by "transformation" (Babby, 1981:4).

4. The parallel sentences in Turkish are examined by Sezer.

   e.g. a) Ali kapı -yı aç- tı
   A. door Acc. open PAST T (3 prs sing)
   "Ali opened the door."

   b) Kapı aç- ıl- dı
   door open PASS PAST T (3 prs sing)
   "The door opened."

   According to those examples, Sezer states that the sentences are ambiguous between passive and intransitive. In the first sentence "open" is transitive and selects an external argument, whereas in the second one, the verb intransitive and selects only an internal argument, that is object.

   For passive reading, there is an agent as the external argument but it is suppressed by the passive structure. The agent may optionally surface as adjunct (that is, as "by phrase") in the surface structure, or does not surface at all. For derived intransitive reading, there is an external argument, but it is not "agent" this time but a "cause" as in the example:

   a) Rüzgar kapı- yı aç- tı
   wind door ACC open PAST T (3 prs sing)
   'The wind opened the door.'

   b) Kapı rüzgar- dan ac- ıl- dı
   door wind ABL open PASS PAST T (3 prs sing)
   'The door was opened by the wind.'

   In a way, the contrast between the passive and the derived intransitive readings is explained by the sort of the theta role that is assigned to the external argument and the suppression of the external argument in both structures. In both readings, the verb is unable to assign accusative case to its internal argument and thus the internal argument has to move to subject position in order to acquire a case.

5. In Turkish the *-l* form of the passive suffix is not allowed after vowels and the consonant *n*.

   That is the reason why we do not have the *-(I)l +(I)n* sequence, but the reverse order of what we have in Kazakh.

Abbreviations

ABL: ablative
ACC: accusative
Aux: auxiliary
DAT: dative
DLT: Divan ü Lügati't Türk
imp: imperative
intr: intransitive
IP: Inflectional Phrase
MT: Middle Turkic
Neg: negative
OT: Old Turkic
PASS: passive
prs: person
Plur: plural
poss: possessive
Pres. Ger: present gerund
sing: singular
T: tense
tr: transitive

Bibliography

Babby, L. (1981), A transformational Analysis of Voice in Turkish: Passive, Derived Intransitive, Impersonal, and Causative. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 2*, 2-31.

Erdal, M. (1991), *Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. Vol.2. Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Isqaqov, A. (1991), *Qazirgi Qazaq Tili*. Ana Tili, Almatı.

Khasenova, A. 1959. *Qazaq Tilindegi Tuvındı Tübir Etistikter*. Qazaq SSSR Gılım Akademiyası, Almatı.

Kornfilt, J. (1991), A Case for Emerging Functional Categories. *Syntax and Semantics* 25, 11-35.

Perlmutter, David M. (1978), "Impersonal Passives and Unaccusative Hypothesis." BLS 4, 157-189.

Sezer, E. (1991), *Issues in Syntax*. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Taneri, M. (1993), *The Morpheme -Il/(I)n: The syntax of Personal Passives, Impersonal Passives and Middles in Turkish*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas.

Tietze, A. (1989), "Observations on the Convergence of Passive and Medio-reflexive Verb Forms: The Case of Modern *Turkish*". *Studia Linguistica et Orientalia Memoriae Haim Blanc Dedicata (*P. Wexler, A. Borg, S. Somekh, eds*.)*. 283-88.

Kazak Türkçesinde Pasiflik Eki Olarak Adlandırılan -(I)l- Ekinin İşlevleri

Dr. Fatma ŞAHAN GÜNEY*

Özet: Diğer Türk dillerinde olduğu gibi, -(I)l- edilgenlik eki Kazak Türkçesinde de iki farklı işleve sahiptir. Bunlardan birincisi eylemi edilgen yapmak diğeri ise geçişli eylemlere geçişsizlik özelliği katmaktır. Kazak Türkçesinde ender olarak bazı eylemlerin -(I)l- ve –(I)n- olmak üzere birden fazla edilgenlik eki taşımasının yanında Eski Türkçe ve Orta Türkçede–lXn birleşik morfeminin, eylemlerin edilgen ve geçişsiz şekillerini elde etmede kullanılmış olması, bir zamanlar edilgenlik ve geçişsizlik için -(I)l- ve -(I)n- (ki bu iki ekin Eski ve Orta Türkçede bulunan –lXn birleşik morfemiyle temsil edilmiş olduğu ileri sürülebilir) olarak iki ayrı ekin bulunduğuna işaret etmektedir. Ancak Türkçenin daha sonraki dönemlerinde, Kazak Türkçesinde gördüğümüz gibi bu iki işlev (yani edilgenlik ve geçişsizlik işlevleri) birleşerek tek bir ek, yani -(I)l- eki tarafından yerine getirilmeye başlanmış olmalıdır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kazak Türkçesi, edilgenlik, geçişsizlik, Eski Türkçe, Orta Türkçe.

* Muğla Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat, Fakültesi. Çağdaş Türk Lehçeleri Bölümü / MUĞLA

bilig ✦ Kış / 2006 ✦ sayı 36: 125-137

Функции -(İ)Л-, именуемого в казахском языке как пассивный суффикс

Доцент Фатма Шахан Гюней*

Резюме: Как и в других тюркских языках в казахском языке суффикс страдательного залога -(İ)Л-имеет две различные функции. Первая из них- перевести глагол в страдательную форму, другая же- передать переходному глаголу особенность непереходного. В казахском языке некоторые действия очень редко, наряду с более чем одного суффиксами типа -(İ)Л- и -(İ)Н-, в древнетюркском и среднетюркском использование объединённой морфемы -лХн- для получения страдательного залога и переходной формы действия указывает на наличие двух отдельных суффиксов(можно сказать что эти суффиксы были представлены объединённой морфемой -лХн-, имеющейся в древне- и среднетюркском языках). Однако в последующие периоды развития тюркского языка, как мы видим в казахском, эти две функции(т.е. страдательный залог и непереходность) объединяются в единый суффикс, т.е. выполняются суффиксом -(İ)Л-.

Ключевые слова: Казахский язык, страдательный залог, непереходность, древнетюркский, среднетюркский.

* Университет Мугла, Факультет Естествознания и Литературы, Отделение Тюркские наречия

билиг ✦ Зима 2006 ✦ выпуск: 36: 125-137