Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları | Journal of Language and Literature Studies
Sayı/Issue: 33 - Spring 2026, 327-344
DOI: 10.30767/diledeara.1823575 | **ISSN:** 1308-5069 **E-ISSN:** 2149-0651 Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Testing the Binding Hierarchy on Turkish Complement Clauses: A Cognitive Grammar Approach

Bağlama Hiyerarşisinin Türkçe Tümleç Yantümceleri üzerinde Sınanması: Bilişsel Dilbilgisi Yaklaşımı

Taylan AKAL*

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dilbilimi Bölümü, Ankara, Türkiye.
e-posta: takal@hacettepe.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-8740-7908
ROR ID: ror.org/04kwvgz42

Gönderilme Tarihi / *Received Date*
14.11. 25
Kabul Tarihi / *Accepted Date*
17.03.26
Yayım Tarihi / *Publication Date*
21.03.2026

Atıf/Citation: Akal, T., Testing the Binding Hierarchy on Turkish Complement Clauses: A Cognitive Grammar Approach
Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları, 33, 327-344
doi.org/10.30767/diledeara.1823575

Hakem Değerlendirmesi:
İki Dış Hakem / Çift Taraflı Körleme.
Çıkar Çatışması:
Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.
Finansal Destek:
Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.
Peer-review:
Externally peer-reviewed.
Conflict of Interest:
The author has no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support:
The author declared that this study has received no financial support

Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları
Dergimizde yayımlanan makaleler CC-BY-NC-ND lisansı altında açık erişim olarak yayımlanmaktadır.

Language and Literature Studies
The articles published in our journal are published as open access under the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
tded.org.tr | 2025

Abstract

Cognitive linguistics formularizes grammar by the semantic characterizations of symbolic structures. Sentential complexity is studied through forming a resemblance between the structures of noun phrases and clauses. A clause is considered to reflect a layering of semantic functions. The embedded clause plays a subordinate role determined by the main clause. In that respect, complementation is among the study areas of cognitive grammar perspective. Givón (1980)'s "Binding Hierarchy" classifies verbs into main categories and determines a scale the top level of which is composed of verbs specifying dependent complements, while the verbs at the bottom specifying higher independence. The present study analyzes the universality of Givón's "Binding Hierarchy" by testing Turkish verbs in complex sentences with complement clauses. For that aim, Kornfilt (2007)'s evaluation on -mA and -DIK markers in constructing complex sentences is taken as the indicator of dependence/independence of complementation in Turkish. At the end of the study, it is observed that Givón's "Binding Hierarchy" is also functional in Turkish. The verbs on top of the scale form less independent complementation while the ones at the bottom form higher independency from the main verb. This outcome may be considered as a support for the validity of the "Binding Hierarchy" cross-linguistically.

Keywords: cognitive linguistics, binding hierarchy, complement clauses, cognitive grammar, embedded structures

Özet

Bilişsel dilbilim dilbilgisini sembolik yapıların anlambilimsel nitelemeleriyle formülleştirir. Karmaşık tümceler ad öbeği ve tümcecik yapısı arasında benzerlik kurularak çalışılır. Tümceciğin anlambilimsel işlevlerin bir eşdüzeylemesini yansıttığı düşünülür. İçeyerleşik tümceciğin, ana tümce tarafından belirlenmiş yan bir işlevi vardır. Bu bağlamda tümleç yantümcesi kurulumu bilişsel dilbilimin çalışma alanları arasındadır. Givón (1980)'in "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi" eylemleri ana kategorilere ayırır ve en üst seviyesini oluşturan eylemlerin bağımlı tümleçler seçerken, en alt seviyesini oluşturan eylemlerin de serbestliğe sahip tümleçler seçtiğini öne süren bir ölçek belirlemiştir. Mevcut çalışma, Givón'un "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"nin evrenselliğini Türkçe eylemleri tümleç yantümceleri içeren karmaşık tümce yapılarında sınayarak incelemektedir. Bu amaçla, Kornfilt (2007)'nin karmaşık tümce kurulumunda -mA ve -DIK ekleri üzerine olan değerlendirmesi Türkçe tümleç yantümcelerinin bağımlı/bağımsız olma durumunun belirleyicisi olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışma sonunda, Givón'un "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"nin Türkçe için de işlevsel olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Ölçeğin en üst seviyesinde bulunan eylemler daha bağımlı tümleç yantümceleri kurarken, en alt seviyedekiler ana eylemden daha fazla bağımsız tümleç yantümceleri kurmaktadır. Bu sonuç, "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"nin farklı diller bağlamında geçerli olabileceğini destekleyici niteliktedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: bilişsel dilbilim, bağlama hiyerarşisi, tümleç yantümceleri, bilişsel dilbilgisi, yantümce yapıları

Introduction

Cognitive grammar is part of the broader domain of cognitive linguistics, which belongs to functionalist tradition. Cognitive grammar approach is strongly functional stating that the two basic functions of language are symbolic and communicative/interactive. It is commonly accepted that cognitive grammar is derived from functionalist tradition in understanding language. Croft and Cruse (2004) indicate that syntax is studied under the title "construction grammar" in cognitive linguistic approach. Grammatical constructions in the mentioned grammar model are composed of form and meaning pairings, which are partially arbitrary. Syntactic constructions have corresponding general rules of semantic representations; thus, those constructions are in essence symbolic units. It is further stated that the symbolic link between form and conventional meaning in construction grammar is internal to a construction.

Langacker (2007) states that in the approach of cognitive linguistics towards grammar noun and verb are the most elemental categories. At both prototype and schematic levels, they stand for two opposites in terms of their semantic characterizations. This means that a noun profiles a thing, and a verb profiles a process. In that respect, the grammar is composed of combinatory patterns to assemble symbolically complex expressions out of simpler ones. It is further indicated by Langacker (2007) that cognitive grammar utilizes the traditional descriptions related to semantic and grammatical composition as a matter of categorization. The term constituency is not regarded as essential and fundamental. Through the cognitive grammar perspective, the important information attested to grammar is not formulized in constituency, but it is represented in the semantic characterizations of symbolic structures and how these structures are interconnected.

As closing up the introduction section on how grammar is evaluated through cognitive linguistics perspective, it will be beneficial to refer to Nesset (2009)'s brief summary. It is stated in Nesset (2009) that both Chomskyan generative linguistics and cognitive grammar are mentalist in orientation regarding language as a cognitive phenomenon although they differ in many respects. The major point of variation is that, in Chomskyan tradition, language is an autonomous module of the mind, while cognitive linguistics tries to define language as an integral component of cognition.

How is sentential complexity defined in cognitive grammar?: In Langacker (1991) it is proposed that there are resemblances between the internal structure of a noun phrase and a clause. Just like a noun phrase, a clause also shows a layering of semantic functions. In terms of clausal structure, main clauses are fully grounded while complement clauses show kinds of semantic elaboration. It is further described by Langacker (1991) that while the main clause is the head, which provides its profile to the holistic organization of a multiclausal expression, the profile of the embedded clause is suppressed by the main clause. For instance, in sentence 1 below, the designated process is "*knowing*" not "*leaving*" due to the fact that the main clause is determining the profile:

1. I know she left.

This means that the role of the embedded clause is to fulfill the subordinate relationship expressed by the main clause rather than presenting an independent object of thought by itself. Achard (2007) states that the study of the complex structures formed with complementation in a cognitive linguistic framework aims at putting forward the relationship between the main verbs and the distribution of particular complement forms. This may be interpreted as follows: a cognitive grammar model on complementation puts the semantic properties attested to the main verb into a major

position in determining the distribution of complementation types in a complex sentence structure. Garcia-Miguel (2007) further explains how grammatical categories are examined through cognitive linguistic perspective stating that grammatical structures have conceptual and experiential basis, and the conceptual basis of clauses is represented in the conceptualizations of actions and events. This is also strongly supported by Givón (1995), which proposes that the semantic features of the main verb are effective in determining the distribution of complementation. In the following section, Givón's proposals and the classification of verbs in determining the complementation they take are given.

Givón's binding hierarchy: Givón (1980) states that there are systematic interdependencies between the syntactic structure of the complements and the semantic structure of complement-taking verbs. Givón (1980:338) specifies three parameters in order to designate the degree of independence of the subordinate event relating to the main event:

i. The degree to which the agent/subject/topic marking of the embedded clause reflects the markings in independent/main clauses;

ii. The degree to which independent-clause tense-aspect modality marking of the verb is preserved in the embedded clause;

iii. The presence or degree-of-presence of predicate raising of the complement clause verb onto the main verb, i.e., the degree to which the complement verb is lexicalized as one word with the main verb.

Elaborating Givón's parameters, Achard (2007) implements the following items 2 and 3:

2. I know that she came.

3. She wants me to come back.

It is stated by Achard (2007) that in item 2, the subject of "come" is nominatively marked and the verb retains tense-aspect-modality (TAM) markers just like in an independent clause. However, in item 3, the subject is in accusative and the embedded verb lacks TAM markers. These signal the fact that the event has a lesser degree of independence in comparison to the main verb "want". It is concluded by Achard (2007) that the lacking verbal markings on the subordinate verb reflects the increasing dependence on the main verb, and further indicated that this is in harmony with the syntactic nominalization of complementation cross-linguistically.

Achard (2007) states that Givón (1980, 1990)'s binding hierarchy proposes an isomorphism between the semantics of the verbs, which take complements and the syntax of the verb+complement constructions. The binding force of the main verb is equated with the form of the complement; and further organizes the scale as the *manipulative verbs such as "cause, make,* and *force" located at the top, while at the bottom there are cognition utterance verbs such as "know". One important factor that is presented is the "emotional factor" involved in certain verbs. It is indicated that the emotional factor provides an additional dimension to the hierarchy, and may have the potential of manipulating the scale in the reverse direction. With the addition of the emotional factor, Achard (2007) defines the scale as follows: the manipulative implicative verbs "make, have, cause" occupy the top. This stage is followed by the non-implicative and increasingly emotion-encoding verbs such as "tell, ask, want".* After that *emotion-encoding cognition verbs such as "regret" occupy a lower position; and finally, at the lowest point of the scale there exist non-emotive cognition verbs such as "know". It is stated by Givón (1980:37) that the* syntactic coding of

the complement clauses of verbs is largely predictable from their position on the scale. The higher a verb is on the binding scale; the less would its complement tend to be syntactically coded as an independent/main clause. For instance:

4. Chris made Pat cry.

The main verb in sentence 4 is *"made" which is at the top of the scale. It occurs with the logical subject of the subordinate* verb raised in the position of object of the main verbs. The subordinate verb is in *infinitive form. It can*not occur with a finite complement since the subordinate event lacks the independence required to be coded that way. When a finite complement follows the same main verb, the structure renders ungrammatical as shown in 5 below:

5. *Chris made that Pat cried.

On the contrary, when a verb such as *"know",* which is at a lower position on the scale is followed by a finite complement, it is not problematic *as shown in item 6:*

6. I know that she came yesterday.

In accordance with the above-mentioned classification of verbs into a binding hierarchy, the aim of the present study is to test if the given scale classifying main verbs in terms of determining the dependency/independency of the complement they take will also work for Turkish. In the previous literature, the topic of complementation has widely been studied in Turkish. However, the present study will try to develop a different perspective, which has not been implemented beforehand, i.e., it will aim at adopting a cognitive grammar perspective to observe whether Givón's hierarchy of binding centering the main verbs in determining the structural features of the following complementation will operate in Turkish, or not. For that aim, the above-mentioned classification of verbs will be analyzed in Turkish complex sentence structure. But before the analysis section, a brief overlook on the structural features of complementation in Turkish will be given in the following section.

Complementation in Turkish: Göksel and Kerslake (2005) examine the complementation issue in Turkish under the heading "noun clauses". Referring these structures as noun clauses is widely adopted in the literature since they are observed in NP positions (Aarts, 2006). Göksel and Kerslake (2005) define noun clauses as subordinate clauses that function within a larger sentence and having the same functions with noun phrases realized in two types as finite and non-finite. Finite version is defined as having a structure identical to a full sentence, while non-finite one is formed with either of the following subordinating suffixes *-mAk, -mA, -DIK, -(y)AcAk, or -(y) Iş*. Item 7 is an example of the structure with a finite complement clause, while item 8 is with a non-finite one:

7. Üniversite-ye gid-e-yim isti-yor.
   university-Dat go-Opt-1sg want-Impf
   S/he wants [me to go to university].

8. Konu-yu iyice anla-mak gerek.
   topic-Acc thoroughly understand-Vn necessary
   "One has to understand the topic thoroughly."

(*Adopted from Göksel and Kerslake, 2005*)

In relation to what is proposed by Göksel and Kerslake (2005) on finite and non-finite realizations of the embedded clauses, it may be stated that in item 7, the complement clause may stand as an independent sentence on its own, but in item 8 the complement clause cannot stand as an independent sentence.

Kornfilt (1997) also uses the term noun clause in order to isolate the clauses, which act differently from relative and adverbial clauses. It is indicated by Kornfilt (1997) that nominalization markers alongside with nominal agreement and case markers mark noun clauses in Turkish. Apart from the syntactic placement of the noun clauses as subject and object, they are classified according to the embedded verb suffixes, which are called by Kornfilt as "factive nominal" realized with -DIK", and "action nominal" realized with "-mA" as shown below in items 9 and 10 respectively[1]:

9. (ben) Ahmed-in öl-düğ-ün -ü duy-du-m
I Ahmed-Gen die-FNom-3sg -Acc hear-Past-1sg
"I heard that Ahmet died."

10. (ben) Ahmed-in öl-me-sin -i iste-me-z-di-m
I Ahmed-Gen die-ANom-3sg -Acc want-Neg-Aor-Past-1sg
"I wouldn't have wanted for Ahmet to die."

(*Adopted from Kornfilt, 1997*)

Kornfilt (1997) also states that semantics play an important role in the choice of factive and action morphology on the embedded verb. Due to the contextual variation, infinitive, which is a variant of the action nominal can be in variation also with the factive nominal. See 11 and 12 below:

11. lütfen pencere-yi aç -mağ -ı unut-ma!
please window-Acc open-Inf-Acc forget-Neg
"Please, don't forget to open the window!"

12. lütfen pencere-yi aç -tığ -ın -ı unut-ma!
please window-Acc open-FNom-2sg-Acc forget-Neg
"Please, don't forget that you opened the window!"

(*Adopted from Kornfilt, 1997*)

Csato (2009) analyzes complement clauses in Turkish through two markers as -mA and -DIK, although indicating that subjunctors in Turkish are not just these two suffixes (-yAcAk, and -yIş are also applied in complement clause formation). In her study, while specifying morphosyntactic properties of Turkish complement clause, Csato refers to Stassen (1985)'s typology of complement clauses. It is stated that Stassen (1985, in Csato, 2009) introduces the notions de-ranking and ba-

1 In Kornfilt (2001), factive nominalized clause is also labelled as *indicative, while action nominal is marked as non-factive subjunctive*.

lancing. While de-ranked verb, which may lack some or all of the following features - *tense, mood* or *agreement*; a balanced verb form is inflected for *tense, mood* and *agreement*. So, a balanced form can exist in an independent declarative clause because it is an indicative verb form, but a de-ranked verb form cannot exist in independent declarative clauses. Csato (2009) further refers to Cristofaro (2005)'s classification of complement clauses of utterance predicates as: balanced: s-like construction (the predicate resembles main clause predicate); de-ranked: clause-like forms (the verb form is non-finite); and third, balanced/de-ranked mixed type. It is indicated that Cristofaro (2005) defines Turkish as belonging to the balanced/de-ranked mixed type of classification. However, Csato (2009) proposes that Turkish does not fit into this categorization, but fits into a typical de-ranking type. Csato (2009) states that in selecting the subjunctors (-DIK and -mA), semantics of the main predicate plays a major role, and tries to reveal the nature of these semantic factors. At the center of the mentioned semantic explanation, Csato evaluates Kiparsky and Kiparsky's factive vs. non-factive predicate analysis and asserts that it is not compatible with Turkish predicates. For instance, the following mismatch between the type of the subjunctor and the verb is given by Csato as the non-factive predicate *tahmin et* "suppose" may select -DIK (factive), but does not select -mA (non-factive) as shown in 13 and 14 below (*see Csato (2009) for further examples*):

13. Herkes-in hoşlan-dığ-ı-nı tahmin ed-iyor-um.
everybody-Gen enjoy-Part-Poss3Sg-Acc suppose-Pres-1Sg
"And I suppose that everybody enjoyed it."

14. Herkes-in hoşlan-ma-sı-nı tahmin ed-iyor-um.
everybody-Gen enjoy-Inf-Poss3Sg-Acc suppose-Pres-1Sg
"And I suppose that everybody enjoyed it."

(Adopted from Csato, 2009)

So, Csato (2009) proposes that it is not possible to define the English factive/non-factive predicates and the divergence formed by -DIK and -mA suffixes in Turkish in a similar way further indicating that Turkish -DIK complement clauses express a proposition with possible truth value, while complement clauses formed with -mA relate a predication without any possible truth value, and presents two lists of predicates each of which is mostly compatible with one of these two complement clause markers noting that the lists suggest tendencies based on frequency patters, not imposing any rules of use (*See, Csato (2009) for the detailed list*).

The dependency of complementation and the issue of finiteness in Turkish: Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2009) states that through a generative perspective finiteness is considered to be a feature of a functional category, which independently projects, and the manifestation of finiteness is only a subordinately reflected on the verb. Bianchi (2003) discusses the issue through the perspective of temporal interpretation proposing that while in nonfinite clauses the temporal interpretation and the logophoric center are determined by another clause, finite clauses are independent on this respect. For the same matter, Kornfilt (2007) states that "finiteness" as a term has been used in morphological, syntactic and semantic senses in studying languages through generative framework; and the term is a way of defining clauses displaying propositional independence. Further, as it is indicated, still the issue of finiteness attested to an embedded clause is a question of a challenging inquiry.

In the mentioned study, Kornfilt mainly concentrates on two morphemes; factive (indicative) nominalizations with -DIK, and non-factive (subjunctive) nominalizations with -mA. Some common features of these two markers are specified as; the subjects of the embedded clauses formed with these markers are in genitive case, the embedded verbs have possessive agreement morphology, and tense, aspect, and modality markers on the embedded verbs are replaced by nominalization morpheme. More importantly, both of these two types are shown to be finite in relation to binding and NPI (negative polarity item) licensing criteria. At this point, Kornfilt (2007) proposes that -mA differs from -DIK in terms of opaqueness in relation to the temporal independence from the main clause, and indicates that while -mA nominalizations are dependent on the main clause temporally, -DIK nominalizations are independent of the main clause; further adding that the issue of finiteness may be labelled via temporal marking as a secondary marking along with agreement morphology. However, it should be noted that the implication put forward by Kornfilt (2007) as complement clauses based on -DIK are finite, and the ones with -mA are non-finite is criticized by Csato (2009) as being non-convincing. As given above, the issue of finiteness of embedding has been analyzed through various perspectives and defined adopting a variety of approaches in the literature. In relation to the aims of the present study, Kornfilt (2007)'s perspective in correlating the temporal dependence/independence of the embedded clause with the complement clause marker will be adopted. As it has also been stated in the above-given sections, the present study aims at analyzing the complementation in Turkish through a different perspective, i.e., a cognitive linguistic approach, which will basically test Givón's binding hierarchy of verbs. With that aim, the present study tries to understand if the mentioned hierarchy would also work for Turkish, and as a result will contribute to the crosslinguistic literature on cognitive linguistic description of complementation.

The following section includes the analysis of Givón's binding hierarchy on Turkish. The verbs that will be analyzed are scaled adopting Givón's hierarchy and classification of verbs.

Analysis of Givón's binding hierarchy on Turkish complementation: Givón's "Binding Hierarchy" proposes that the form of the complement is affected by the binding force of the main verb. The organizational structure of the hierarchy is as follows: the manipulative implicative verbs like *make, have* and *cause* is at the top; in the second place come the non-implicative and increasingly emotion-encoding verbs like *tell, ask* and *want*; the third place is occupied by emotion-encoding cognition verbs such as *regret*, and finally non-emotive cognition verbs, such as *know* are located at the bottom. Givón (1980) states that it is possible to predict the syntactic nature of the complement clauses out of the scale that is specified in the mentioned binding hierarchy. The syntactic nature is formulized in the appearance of the embedded clause as an independent one. The higher a verb is on the scale, the less likely it would appear as an independent clause as given in Table 1 below:

Table 1. *The Binding Hierarchy of Verbs*

least likely to appear as an independent clause
1. manipulative implicative verbs
2. non-implicative and increasingly emotion-encoding verbs
3. emotion-encoding cognition verbs
4. non-emotive cognition verbs
most likely to appear as an independent clause

Since the main aim of the present study is to find out whether Givón's binding hierarchy works for Turkish complementation, the scale will be analyzed via the application of various verbs in Turkish fitting into the classification of the verbs in the above-given classification. In specifying the dependence and independence of the complement clauses in Turkish, Kornfilt (2007: 314-316)'s dependence/independence distinction of the embedded clauses through the use of different embedded clause markers will be adopted. Turkish complex sentences will be formed with the main verbs belonging to every category in Givón's binding hierarchy, and each main verb will be tested with implementing both -DIK and -mA clause markers in the embedded clause to observe whether they form acceptable sentences or not. In analyzing Givón's binding hierarchy in Turkish, the main verbs that are implemented in the present study are selected from the classifications of Givón (1980) and Lawal (1990)[2].

The sentence structures that will be implemented in the study are as follow:

NP1 - NP2 - NP3 - Embedded Verb - Main Verb

NP1: main clause subjec

NP2: embedded clause subject

NP3: object of the embedded clause

Embedded Verb: marked with either -DIK or -mA

Main Verb: selected in harmony with Givón's binding hierarchy classification

In order to provide coherence, in each of the sentences that is analyzed, NP2 is formed as the subject of the embedded clause, and it is followed by an NP object (NP3) in the embedded clause. Since Givón's binding hierarchy puts the correlation between the semantic properties of verbs (subcategorization features and argument selection) and the grammatical formation of complementation in the center of the proposal, the sentences that are analyzed in the present study follow a similar pattern in terms of the distributions of argument structures of the main and embedded verbs as detailed above.

2 Lawal (1990)'s semantic classification of verbs are as follow: *cognition verbs: know, see, forget, remember utterance verbs: say, promise, announce, ask; propositional attitude verbs: believe, think, be certain, agree; comment verbs: regret, be important, be good, be necessary; desire/emotion verbs: want/like, expect, hope, be afraid, be happy; manipulation verbs: make, let, order, persuade, request; aspect/modality verbs: begin, finish, stop/cease, leave/stop; immediate perception verbs: see, hear, watch*

Manipulative implicative verbs: Manipulative implicative verbs occupy the first place in Givón's binding hierarchy. Verbs like mak*e*, *have* and *cause* belong to this classification. In order to observe the formation of complex structures formed with these types of main verbs in Turkish, item 15, which is formed with the main verb *sebep olmak* (to cause) may be examined[3]:

15. Kaleci takım-**ı**-nın gol ye-me-si-ne sebep oldu.
Goalkeeper team-3Sg.Poss-Gen concede-Inf-Poss-Dat cause-Past-3Sg
"The goalkeeper caused his team to concede."

As it is seen above, when the complex structure is formed with the subjunctor *-mA*, which is labelled as non-finite by Kornfilt (2007), the sentence is well-formed. This is in harmony with Givón's proposal. A higher a verb on the scale, the less likely it is to be realized with a finite complement. If the same main verb is tested with finite *-DIK* as given in 16 below, it is seen that the structure is ill-formed:

16. *Kaleci takım-ı-nın gol ye-diğ-i-ne sebep oldu.
Goalkeeper team-3Sg.Poss-Gen concede-Part-Poss-Dat cause-Past-3Sg
"*The goalkeeper caused his team to concede."

To enhance the analysis, another verb that will be tested belonging to the manipulative class is *to persuade*. In Lawal (1990)'s semantic classification of verbs, to persuade is stated to be a kind of manipulation verb. In items 17 and 18, the main verb "*ikna etmek*" (to persuade) in Turkish is tested with complementation formed with *-mA* and *-DIK* consecutively:

17. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-ni ders çalış-ma-ya ikna etti.
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Acc lesson study-Inf-Dat persuade-Past-3Sg
"The teacher persuaded her/his student to study."

18. [4]*Öğretmen öğrenci-si-ni ders çalış-tığ-ı-na ikna etti.
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Acc lesson study-Part-Poss-Dat persuade-Past-3Sg
"* The teacher persuaded her/his student to study."

Item 17, which is formed with -mA is well-formed while 18, that is constructed with -DIK is ill-formed. As it has previously been mentioned, in specifying the dependence/independence of the complement clause structure, Kornfilt (2007)'s assumption on the dependence of complementation formed with *-mA* to the main verb, and the independence of complementation constructed with *-DIK* from the main clause is adopted in the present study. So, when items 15 and 17 are compared to items 16 and 18, it seems like the first grouping of Givón's proposal seems to be com-

3 Since the correspondences of the English verbs like "may" and "have" are implemented morphologically via the causative *-DIr, and -t (Kornfilt, 1997) suffixes in Turkish, the structure that is tested in the main study is formed with the nominal predicate sebep olmak (to cause)*.

4 For some speakers of Turkish, item 18 may sound grammatical. However, when it is considered acceptable, the interpretation that is obtained is totally different, meaning "*make someone believe*."

patible with the manipulative implicative verbs like "*sebep olmak*" (to cause) and "*ikna etmek*" (to persuade) in Turkish. These types of verbs fit into the topmost level in Givón's binding hierarchy, which states that the higher the verbs in the hierarchy, the less independent the complement structure becomes.

Non-implicative and increasingly emotion encoding verbs: In Givón's binding hierarchy, the *non-implicative and increasingly emotion encoding* verbs come in the second place. Since the scale is a continuum, this level is expected to be consisted of main verbs, which are majorly considered to form complementation closer to the less independent end of the scale, however not as rigid as the top level. The verbs *ask, want,* and *tell* are stated to be in this category. These verbs are represented with the following Turkish counterparts respectively; *talep etmek (to ask), istemek (to want), and söylemek (to tell)*. In item 19, the nominal main predicate *talep etmek (ask)* is tested:

19. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-n-den ödev-i ver-me-si-ni talep et-ti
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Abl homework-Acc submit-Inf-Poss-Acc ask-Past-3Sg
"The teacher asked her/his student to submit her/his homework."

In item 19, the main predicate *talep etmek* (to ask) is compatible with the marker -mA, which is classified by Kornfilt (2007) as forming a dependent structure to the main clause. When the same main predicate is used with the -DIK marker, it is not an acceptable sentence in Turkish as given in 20:

20. * Öğretmen öğrenci-si-n-den ödev-i ver-diğ-i-ni talep et-ti
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Abl homework-Acc submit-Part-Poss-Acc ask-Past-3Sg
"*The teacher asked her/his student to submit her/his homework."

The same observation can also be obtained through the application of another verb *istemek* (to want). When it is used with -mA, the outcome is grammatical, however when it is used with -DIK, it is ungrammatical as shown in 21, and 22 respectively:

21. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-n-den ödev-i ver-me-si-ni iste-di
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Abl homework-Acc submit-Inf-Poss-Acc want-Past-3Sg
"The teacher asked her/his student to submit her/his homework."

22. * Öğretmen öğrenci-si-n-den ödev-i ver-diğ-i-ni iste-di
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Abl homework-Acc submit-Part-Poss-Acc want-Past-3Sg
"*The teacher asked her/his student to submit her/his homework."

So far, the first two main predicates that are tested seem to be in harmony with the properties of the verbs fit into the second level of the scale, which are closer to the less-independent complementation formation. The following verb that will be analyzed is *söylemek* (to tell).

23. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i ver-diğ-i-ni söyle-di
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc submit-Part-Poss-Acc tell-Past-3Sg
"The teacher told that her/his student submit the homework."

In item 23, it is seen that the non-implicative and increasingly emotion-encoding main verb *söylemek* (to tell) is compatible with the marker -DIK, which is considered to form independent complementation from the main clause. This observation is an apparent divergence from the first two main verbs tested for the second stage in the scale. Although it seems like to pose a differentiation, it actually does not create an exception. On the contrary, it supports the proposal pointing to the fact that the binding scale of Givón is a scale of a continuum. So, the second stage of the continuum is already expected not to be as rigid as the first stage because the direction of the scale is heading towards the more independent formation of complementation. In line with this, the grammatical use of the marker -DIK provides a support for the tendency approaching towards the bottom end of the hierarchy.

Moreover, there is also an interesting observation obtained when the same verb *söylemek* (to tell) is used with -mA as given in 24 below:

24. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i ver-me-si-ni söyle-di
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc submit-Inf-Poss-Acc tell-Past-3Sg
"The teacher told her/his student to submit the homework."

As it is seen, when the main verb *söylemek* (to tell) is formed with the complement clause marker -mA, the sentence that is derived is also grammatical. However, when the interpretation of the sentence is examined thoroughly, it is clear that the meaning that is obtained is not the same with the meaning when the same main verb *söylemek* (to tell) is implemented with the marker -DIK. When it is used with -DIK, the derived interpretation is "giving information about some event, i.e., telling, or saying", however, when it is used with -mA, the interpretation is "giving orders, or instructing something to be done". Since the mentioned interpretation is a feature compatible with the first level of the binding hierarchy, which is the class of manipulative verbs[5], it seems coherent that the main verb *söylemek* (to tell) with the related meaning can be constructed with -mA. It has been shown above that the manipulative verbs are compatible with -mA marker in Turkish.

So far, for the second level of the binding hierarchy, the specified verbs seem like to pose an outcome in harmony with the distributions in the hierarchy. When *talep etmek (ask),* and *istemek* (to want) are compatible with -mA, which is an indication of dependence to the main verb, *söylemek* (to tell) is compatible with -DIK. Additionally, the verb *söylemek* (to tell) is also compatible with -mA, however, this usage of the verb creates a different interpretation. Overall, as the binding hierarchy of Givón is a continuum, the observations gathered so far seem like to be in harmony with the dependency/independency proposal for Turkish.

Emotion-encoding cognitive verbs: The third level in the hierarchy is *emotion-encoding cognitive* verbs. According to Achard (2007), the verb "regret" is a major example of this level in Givón's hierarchy. So, the verb *pişman olmak* (to regret) in Turkish will be tested followingly[6]:

5 According to Lawal (1990)'s semantic classification, the manipulation verbs are " make, let, order, persuade, and request".

6 Sentences 25 and 26 are formed without an embedded clause subject (NP2) following one of the reviewers' suggestions proposing that the subject of the main and embedded clauses of the verb pişmak olmak (to regret) should be

25. Öğretmen pro ödev-i ver-diğ-i-ne pişman ol-du
Teacher Ø homework-Acc assign-Part-Poss-Dat regret be-Past-3Sg
"The teacher regretted that s/he assigned the homework."

The main verb *pişman olmak* (to regret) is used with -DIK marker in 25 and the sentence is well-formed. In item 26 below, the same main verb is formed with the marker -mA and the derived structure is not acceptable in Turkish:

26. *Öğretmen pro ödev-i ver-me-si-ne pişman ol-du.
Teacher Ø homework-Acc assign-Inf-Poss-Dat regret be-Past-3Sg
"*The teacher regretted that s/he assigned the homework."

As it is seen above, the main verb *pişman olmak* (to regret), which belongs to the third level of the binding hierarchy, is compatible with -DIK marker, while it is not with marker -mA. The third level, labelled as *emotion-encoding cognitive* verbs, is closer to the bottom level of the hierarchy, which indicates a tendency towards a greater dependency of the complement clause structure. The observation on the Turkish main verb *pişman olmak* (to regret) gathered through 25 and 26 seems to be compatible with the hierarchical order since the -mA marker indicates dependency on the main verb while -DIK is a signature of the independency. Although the only verb that is defined as an *emotion-encoding cognitive* verb is "regret" by Achard (2007), it would be beneficial to expand the analysis by testing another verb. In that respect, Rhee (2001)'s description on the development of cognitive verbs into desiderative markers will be implemented. According to Rhee (2001) humans tend to think about the thing they want. In the same study, it is shown that in the language of Lahu (Matisoff, 1991 in Rhee, 2001), the verbs of cognition are grammaticalized into a desiderative marker relating the wishes. Moreover, it is also stated that in Korean, nominal expressions formed with "thinking" like *ka-l sayngkak* (go-Adn thought) are synonymous with "a desire to go". In accordance with this, in the present study the verb *to think (düşünmek*), which is originally classified as a cognition verb will be analyzed under the third level *emotion-encoding cognitive* verbs in the following examples:

27. ?Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i ver-me-si-ni düşün-dü
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc submit-Inf-Poss-Acc think-Past-3Sg
"?The teacher thought about her/his student's submitting the homework."

In item 27, the main verb *düşünmek* (to think) is formed with the marker -mA in the embedded clause verb and the structure sounds odd even though it may be not be marked as totally ungrammatical unlike item 26. Nevertheless, the same marker caused either ungrammaticality or oddness when it is used with the main verbs that belong to the third level (emotion-encoding cognitive verbs) in Givón's binding hierarchy. It is also necessary to observe the outcome when the same main verb is constructed with marker -DIK as given in item 28 below:

28. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i ver-diğ-i-ni düşün-dü
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc submit-Part-Poss-Acc think-Past-3Sg

the same.

"The teacher thought that her/his student submitted the homework."

As it is seen, the sentence is also grammatical when the *emotion-encoding cognitive* verb *düşünmek* (to think) is formed with the marker -DIK in Turkish. Overall, when the emotion-encoding cognitive verbs *pişman olmak* (to regret), and *düşünmek* (to think) are examined together, it is seen that the first verb is compatible with -DIK marker (see item 25), while it is not with -mA (see item 26). -DIK marker is evaluated to form more independent structures from the main verb and the observation supports this assumption since it is a verb that belongs to the third level of the continuum, which shows a direction towards a greater independence from the first to the fourth level. However, when the second verb *düşünmek* (to think) belonging to the same level is examined, it is observed that it is compatible with both of the markers as seen in items 27 and 28. Even though, this may seem like to pose a problem for the hierarchy of binding, it may be explained in the framework of the binding hierarchy assumption since the hierarchy is actually a continuum, which is essentially a matter of degree beginning with the first level (higher dependency) ending with the fourth level (higher independency). So, it is certainly understandable that one of the verbs in the third level to form grammatical sentences with both of the markers since the third level is not expected to show signs of an absolute strictness in terms of the compatibility of the verbs and the markers. A further supportive outcome is that the findings of the analysis on the third level verbs show a pattern favoring the use of marker -DIK in both of the verbs, on the other hand for the marker -mA, only one of the verbs forms a well-formed structure. This is a clear indication of the fact that continuum works for Turkish.

Non-emotive cognition verbs: At the fourth level of Givón's binding hierarchy, *non-emotive cognition* verbs are located. These verbs are expected to form the end of the scale signaling the formation of complement clauses that are potentially more independent from the main verb. Achard (2007) states that the verb "to know" belongs to this class in Givón's binding hierarchy. So, the counterpart of the same verb in Turkish bilmek (to know) is going to be tested in the following lines beginning with sentence 29:

29. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i yap-tığ-ı-nı bil-iyor
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc do-Part-Poss-Acc know-Prog-3Sg
"The teacher knows that her/his student has done the homework."

As it is seen in 29, the sentence is well-formed when the main verb *bilmek* (to know) is used with the complement clause marker -DIK. However, when the same construction is formed with -mA, the outcome is not acceptable as shown in item 30:

30. *Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i yap-ma-sı-nı bil-iyor
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc do-Inf-Poss-Acc know-Prog-3Sg
"*The teacher knows that her/his student has done the homework."

These observations are in accordance with what is expected from the direction of the binding hierarchy, as towards the lower end of the scale, the independence of the complement clause increases, which is understandable with the availability of the marker -DIK and the unavailability of the marker -mA with the main verb bilmek (to know) that belongs to the fourth category of the binding hierarchy of Givón. To test this observation further, another cognition verb hatırlamak

(to remember) from Lawal (1990)'s semantic classification will be implemented in Turkish in the following items:

31. Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i yap-tığ-ı-nı hatırlı-yor
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc do-Part-Poss-Acc remember-Prog-3Sg
"The teacher remembers that her/his student has done the homework."

In item 31 it is seen that the cognitive main verb hatırlamak (to remember) is compatible with the embedded clause formed with the marker -DIK. However, when the same main verb is formed with the marker -mA attached on the embedded verb the structure is not acceptable as shown in 32 below:

32. *Öğretmen öğrenci-si-nin ödev-i yap-ma-sı-nı hatırlı-yor
Teacher student-3Sg.Poss-Gen homework-Acc do-Inf-Poss-Acc remember-Prog-3Sg
"*The teacher remembers that her/his student doing the homework."

The compatibility pattern for the cognitive main verb *hatırlamak* (to remember) is the same as the formerly given cognitive verb *bilmek* (to know), both of which belonging to the fourth degree of Givón's binding hierarchy, that is considered to be at the bottom of the scale showing the highest degree of independence.

As the above-presented analysis shows, Givón's binding hierarchy, which proposes that the main verb may determine the dependence/independence of the complementation, also works for Turkish complementation. In the hierarchy, manipulative implicative verbs form the topmost level, which marks the dependency of the complementation. The verbs *sebep olmak* (to cause), and *ikna etmek* (to persuade) are examined in the related level and it is observed that they are compatible with the -mA marker attached on the embedded verb, while they are not with the marker -DIK. The -mA marker is considered to be forming dependent complementation on the main verb temporally (Kornfilt, 2007). At the second level (non-implicative and increasingly emotion encoding verbs), *talep etmek* (to ask), *istemek* (to want), and *söylemek* (to tell) are examined. The analyses of these verbs show that both *talep etmek* (to ask) and *istemek* (to want) form well-formed structures with marker -mA on the embedded verb, while they cause ill-formed ones with -DIK. However, the third verb *söylemek* (to tell), which is in the same group is compatible with -DIK. This seems like to create a contrast, but in fact this outcome is in harmony with the property of the hierarchy since it indicates a continuum from top to the bottom level. Due to the fact that this level comes in the second place, it is well expected to observe such variation. But still the tendency is towards the dependency level with the outnumbered compatibility with marker -mA in comparison to -DIK. When the verbs *pişman olmak* (to regret) and *düşünmek* (to think), which belong to the third level in the hierarchy (emotion-encoding cognitive verbs), are examined, it is observed that both of the verbs are compatible with the marker -DIK. This outcome poses a contradictory finding with the analysis gathered out of the previous two levels. This is an expected outcome since the continuum is towards the tendency for the complementation being independent from the main verb. As mentioned beforehand, the clause marker -DIK is proposed to form independent embedded clauses from the main verb temporally (Kornfilt, 2007). It is also observed that when the verb *düşünmek* (to think) is used with the marker -mA, even though it did not cause ungrammaticality (see item 27), the derived structure sounds odd. The verb *pişman olmak* (to regret), which is also at the

same level, formed a totally unacceptable structure with the marker -mA as expected. The fourth level of the hierarchy is composed of non-emotive cognitive verbs. The verbs *bilmek* (to know) and *hatırlamak* (to remember) are analyzed in relation to this level. It is observed that both of these verbs are compatible with complementation that are formed with marker -DIK, while they are not compatible with marker -mA. This observation is totally in harmony with Givón's binding hierarchy since the bottom level of the hierarchy signals the highest level of independency of the complement clause. As mentioned earlier, in the present study, the embedded clauses formed with -DIK marker are considered to be independent from the main verb temporally following Kornfilt (2007), while the opposite is valid for complementation formed with -mA.

The overall look on the analysis shows that Givón's binding hierarchy proposed for English main verbs determining the dependence/independence values of their complements also works for Turkish complementation. This may signal some sort of a support for the universality of a cognitive linguistic approach to complementation issue through the analysis of Turkish data.

Conclusion

The present study tests if Givón's binding hierarchy of verbs also works for Turkish. The mentioned hierarchy groups main verbs into four levels in terms of their semantics as *manipulative implicative* verbs at the top, followed by *non-implicative and increasingly emotion encoding* verbs in the second level, *emotion-encoding cognitive* verbs in the third place and finally *non-emotive cognitive* verbs occupying the bottom level. It is stated that this continuum reflects a structural trait (a potential dependence/independence of the embedded clause) of the complementation the verbs take. The higher a verb is in the binding hierarchy, the less independent its complement clause becomes; and the lower a verb is in the hierarchy, the more independent its complement clause is selected. In determining the dependence/independence of the complement clause structures in Turkish, Kornfilt (2007)'s classification on the temporal independence of the clauses formed with the clause markers -DIK, and -mA is adopted in the present study. According to this classification, the complement clauses formed with -mA are considered to be dependent on the main clause temporally, while with -DIK nominalizations are independent from the main clause in the same respect. The results of the analysis suggest that the verbs examined in the present study display a pattern that broadly resembles the tendencies predicted by Givón's binding hierachy as while the main verbs located at the upper levels of the hierarchy allow complementation with the marker -mA (indication of higher dependence onto the main verb) to a higher degree, towards the lower end of the scale the use of marker -mA turns into the stronger compatibility with the use of the marker -DIk (indication of higher independence from the main verb).

On the basis of these observations, it may be suggested that Givón's binding hierarchy, which correlates the semantic event integration of verbs and the grammar of complementation could also provide similar outcomes for Turkish case. This outcome may be interpreted as a support for the universality of Givón's binding hierarchy of verbs in the relation of complementation and may contribute to understanding the issue of complementation by implementing a cognitive linguistic approach.

As a final remark, it should be indicated that the findings reported here should be interpreted with caution. The dataset examined in the study is relatively limited and the sentence structures that are analyzed follow a constant pattern in order to provide the semantic integrity (the subca-

tegorization frames of the verbs, and the semantic relationships among the arguments selected by the verbs) among the tested items; so, it should be noted that the well/ill-formedness of the sentences analyzed may be challenged when they are formed with different structural organizations.

Genişletilmiş *ö*zet

Bu çalışma, Givón (1980)'in geliştirdiği "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"nin Türkçedeki tümleç yantümcelemesini açıklayıp açıklayamayacağını Bilişsel Dilbilgisi çerçevesinde incelemektedir. Bilişsel Dilbilgisi, tümce yapısının incelenmesinde işlevselci ve anlamsal bir yaklaşımı benimser. Bu bağlamda, Givón (1980)'in Bağlama Hiyerarşisi karmaşık tümcelerde ana eylemlerin anlamsal özelliklerinin aldıkları yan tümcelerin sözdizimsel olarak bağımlı ya da serbest yapıda olmasını belirlediğini öne sürer. Mevcut çalışma, bu hiyerarşinin Türkçe için de işlevsel olup olmadığını incelemektedir. Türkçede tümleç yantümcelerinin yapılandırılması betimleyici ve kuramsal açılardan sıklıkla çalışılmış olsa da konunun bilişsel dilbilimin dilbilgisi yaklaşımı bağlamında ele alınması Türkçe tümleç yantümcelerinin çalışılması üzerine yeni bir değerlendirme sunma potansiyeline sahiptir. Langacker (1991, 2007)'e göre Bilişsel Dilbilgisi yaklaşımında dilsel yapılar, biçim ve anlamın simgesel eşleşmeleridir; adlar varlıkları, eylemler ise süreçleri örnekler. Bu nedenle tümce yapısı, yalnızca sözdizimsel bir düzenlenmeden ziyade kavramsal organizasyonun bir yansımasıdır. Bilişsel dilbilgisinde tümce karmaşıklığı, ad öbeklerinde gözlemlenen anlamsal katmanlaşmaya benzer şekilde, olayların kavramsal bütünleşmesini yansıtır. Ana tümce, genel olayın profilini sunarken, yan tümce bu olayı ayrıntılandırır ya da genişletir. Bu nedenle yantümceleme, katı bir sözdizimsel iç içelikten ziyade anlamsal bütünleşme açısından değerlendirilir. Givón (1980, 1990), ana ve yan tümceler arasındaki anlamsal bütünleşme derecesini onların sözdizimsel gerçekleşme biçimleriyle ilişkilendiren evrensel bir "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi" öne sürmüştür. Üç ölçüt, yan tümcenin ana eyleme olan bağımlılığını belirler: (i) özne işaretlemesinin benzerliği, (ii) zaman–kip–görünüş biçimlerinin korunma derecesi ve (iii) yüklemin birleşme düzeyi. Bu ölçütlere göre, eylemler hiyerarşide şu şekilde sıralanır: en üstte *yönlendirici/sezdirici eylemler*, ikinci seviyede *sezdirici olmayan ve artan derecede duygu bildiren eylemler*, ardından *duygu-kodlayan biliş eylemleri* ve en alt seviyede ise *duygu belirtmeyen biliş eylemleri* bulunur. Hiyerarşide üstte yer alan eylemlerin, tümleç yantümcelerini daha bağımlı biçimlerde aldıkları ve hiyerarşinin üstten alta doğru derecelendirerek en altta yer alanların bağımsız yantümceleri tercih ettikleri öne sürülür. Türkçede tümleç yantümceleri, genellikle adlaşmış tümcecikler biçiminde karşımıza çıkar ve çekimli ya da çekimsiz olabilir (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). Bu yapılar genellikle -mA veya -DIK biçimbirimleriyle oluşturulur. Kornfilt (1997, 2007), bu iki türü sırasıyla eylem adları (-mA) ve olgusal adlar (-DIK) olarak ayırır ve hangi ekin kullanılacağının ana eylemin anlamsal özelliklerine bağlı olduğunu belirtir. Kornfilt'e göre -mA ekiyle kurulan yan tümceler zamansal olarak bağımlı, -DIK ekiyle kurulanlar ise bağımsız yapılardır. Bu ayrım, mevcut çalışmada Givón'un bağlama hiyerarşisinin Türkçede sınanabilmesi için ölçüt olarak kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada, Givón'un "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"ne göre gruplandırılan Türkçe ana eylemler, -mA (bağımlı) ve -DIK (bağımsız) biçimbirimlerinin eklendiği yantümcelerle karmaşık tümceler oluşturularak, bu tümcelerin Türkçe için kabul edilebilirliklerinin incelenmesi üzerinden "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"nin Türkçe için işlevsel olup olmadığı tartışılmıştır. Çalışmada birinci düzey *yönlendirici/sezdirici eylemler* için «*sebep olmak"* ve "*ikna etmek",* ikinci düzey *sezdirici olmayan ve artan derecede duygu bildiren eylemler* için *"talep etmek"*, "*istemek"* ve "*söylemek",* üçüncü düzey *duygu-kodlayan biliş eylemleri* grubu için *" pişman olmak"* ve "*düşünmek"* ve son olarak dördüncü düzey *duygu belirtmeyen biliş eylemleri* için de *" bilmek"* ve "*hatırlamak"* ana eylemle-

ri kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada analiz edilen tümceler örnekler arası uyumun sağlanması ve dilbilgisel uygunluk konusundaki yorumlamayı değiştirecek farklı bir etkinin söz konusu olmaması için aynı sözdizime sahip olacak şekilde kurgulanmıştır. Bu bağlamda her tümce *ana tümce öznesi (ad öbeği) - yantümce öznesi (ad öbeği) - yantümce nesnesi (ad öbeği) - yantümce eylemi - ana tümce eylemi* dizgisine sahiptir.

Analiz sonucunda gözlenmektedir ki, dört farklı gruba ayrılmış olan hiyerarşinin tüm düzeylerinde elde edilen Türkçe veriler, Givón'un "Bağlama Hiyerarşisi"yle örtüşmektedir. Hiyerarşinin üst basamaklarındaki eylemler ana eyleme daha bağımlı (-mA ekli) yantümceleri; alt basamaklardakiler ise tümcenin ana eyleminden daha bağımsız (-DIK ekli) bir yapıya sahip olan yantümceleri tercih eder. Bu durum, ana ve yan olaylar arasındaki anlamsal bütünleşmenin tümleç yantümcesinin biçimini belirlediğini göstermekte ve Givón'un İngilizce için önerdiği modeli Türkçede de doğrulamaktadır.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma, eylem–tümleyici ilişkilerini açıklamada Givón'un öne sürdüğü anlamsal–sözdizimsel bağlantıların Türkçe için de geçerli olabileceğini göstermektedir. Bulgular, insan bilişinin olayları kavramsallaştırma biçiminin, dillerin sözdizimsel yapılarında evrensel örüntüler oluşturduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Her ne kadar elde edilen sonuçlar tutarlı bir örüntü gösterse de belirtmek gerekir ki, mevcut çalışmada incelenen örnek sayısı sınırlı olduğu için bulgular ön sonuçlar olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Daha geniş veri kümeleriyle yapılacak araştırmalar, bu evrensel bilişsel ilkelerin Türkçe gibi eklemeli dillerde nasıl biçimlendiğini daha ayrıntılı biçimde açıklayabilir.

Yapay Zeka Kullanımı: Bu çalışmanın hazırlanma sürecinde yapay zeka tabanlı herhangi bir araç veya uygulama kullanılmamıştır. Çalışmanın tüm içeriği, yazar(lar) tarafından bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri ve akademik etik ilkelere uygun şekilde üretilmiştir.

Use of Artificial Intelligence: No artificial intelligence-based tools or applications were used in this research process. The entire content of this study was created by the author(s) in accordance with scientific research methods and academic ethical principles."

References

Aarts, B. (2006). Subordination. In Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. *Elsevier, 248-254*.

Achard, M. (2007). *Complementation*. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. ed. D. Geeraerts, and H. Cuyckens. New York. Oxford University Press, 139-169.

Bianchi, V. (2003). *On finiteness as logophoric anchoring*. *Temps et point de vue/Tense and point of view*. ed. J. Guéron and L. Tasmovski. Nanterre: Université Paris X, 213–245.

Croft, W. & Cruse, D.A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. *Cambridge*. *Cambridge University Press*.

Csató, É. Á. (2009). *Two types of complement clauses in Turkish*. Turcology in Mainz / Turkologie in Mainz Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 107-122.

Garcia-Miguel, J., M. (2007). *Clause Structure and Transitivity*. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics,* ed. D. Geeraerts, and H. Cuyckens. New York. Oxford University Press, 753-781.

Givón, T. (1980). The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements. *Studies in Language* 4 (3), 333-377. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.4.3.03giv

Givón, T. (1995). Functionalism and Grammar. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Göksel, A. and Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar. London, UK*. *Routledge*.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (2009). Review of the book *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*. ed. I. Nikolaeva. *Folia Linguistica*, 43(1), 213-249. doi: FLIN.2009.006

Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. *London and New York*. *Routledge*.

Kornfilt, J. (2001). *Functional projections and their subjects in Turkish clauses*. *The verb in Turkish*. ed. E. E. Taylan. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 183-212.

Kornfilt, J. (2007). *Verbal and nominalized finite clauses in Turkish*. *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations* ed. I. Nikolaeva, 305-332.

Langacker, R. W. (1991). Foundations of cognitive grammar. vol.2. Descriptive application.

Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2007). *Cognitive Grammar*. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. ed. D. Geeraerts, and H. Cuyckens. New York. Oxford University Press, 139-169.

Lawal, A. (1990). *Verb serialization in Yorùbá and Givón's binding hierarchy*. ed. J. Hutchison and V. Manfredi, 7. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. 209-218. Mouton.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884906.209

Matisoff, J. A. (1991). *Areal and universal dimensions of grammaticalization in Lahu*. ed. E. C. Traugott and B. Heine, 2. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 383-454.

Nesset, T. (2009). Ronald W. Langacker, Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Pp. x+562. *Journal of Linguistics*, *45*(2), 477–480. doi:10.1017/S0022226709005799

Rhee, S. (2001). Grammaticalization of verbs of cognition and perception. *Studies in Modern Grammar*, *24*, 111-135.

Stassen, L. (1985). *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.