

LIGHT VERB CONSTRUCTIONS IN TURKISH DICTIONARIES: ARE THEY SUBMEANINGS OF POLYSEMOUS VERBS? *

Türkçe Sözlüklerde Katkısız Eylem Yapıları:
Bunlar Çokanlamlı Eylemlerin Altanamları mıdır?

Aygül Uçar

Mersin Üniversitesi

Özet: Farklı ancak birbirleriyle bağlantılı anlamlara sahip olma şeklinde kısaca tanımlanabilecek olan çokanlamlılık olgusu (Cruse, 1986; Lyons, 1977; Panman, 1982; Taylor, 2003), bu durumdaki eylemlerin sözlükte nasıl sunulması gerektiğine yönelik ölçütlerin oluşturulmasını gerektirmektedir. Söz konusu ölçütler öntip anlamının saptanması, eylemlerin çokanlamlı, eşadlı ve bileşik eylem olma bakımından ayrımı ve sunumu, temel anlam ile yan anlamlarının anlam maddesi olarak sıralanması ve anlamları sıralayan maddelerin sayıları açısından belirleyici olmak zorundadır (Uçar, 2009). Özellikle katkısız eylemler (light verbs) sözlük sunumu açısından giderek daha çok tartışılan bir gözlem konusu haline gelmiştir (Hanks, Urbschat & Gehweiler, 2006). Bu durum, doğal olarak, katkısız eylem tanımının hangi ölçütler kullanılarak yapılacağı tartışmasını da beraberinde getirmiştir. Çünkü aynı eylemin hem sözlüksel hem de katkısız eylem olarak doğal dillerde kullanımı söz konusudur. Bu çalışmada, sözlüklerden taranarak elde edilen çokanlamlı kök eylemler ile sözlüklerde yer almayan, katkısız eylem yapılarını içeren doğal dil kullanımını veri tabanı incelenerek, Türkçedeki katkısız eylemlerin kullanım ayrımı yapıp yapılamadığı çokanlamlı eylemler açısından gözlemlenmiştir. Bu gözlem sonrasında ulaşılan katkısız eylem betimlemeleri sunulmuştur. Ardından, bir sözlük girdisi olarak Türkçedeki *at-* eyleminin sözlükte nasıl yer alacağı konusunda bir sunum önerisi geliştirilmiştir.

* This paper is a revised version of the paper presented at the 1st Mediterranean Graduate Students' Meeting in Linguistics, at Mersin University, on 25-26 October 2007.

Anahtar sözcükler: Katkısız eylemler, çokanlamlılık, sözlük.

Abstract: The concept of polysemy can be roughly defined as having different but related meanings (Cruse, 1986; Lyons, 1977; Panman, 1982; Taylor, 2003). This requires forming the criteria for representing the polysemous verbs in the dictionary. These criteria must be decisive for determining the prototype meaning, demarcating the polysemous verbs from homonyms and compound verbs, representing them in the dictionary, listing the prototype meaning and its sub-meanings as definition lines (Uçar, 2009). Especially light verbs have received special treatments in their representation in the dictionaries recently (Hanks, Urbschat & Gehweiler, 2006). Naturally, this gives rise to the discussion on the criteria by which light verbs will be defined; because, a verb may have both light and full uses in natural languages. In this study, the data which includes polysemous verbs compiled from Turkish dictionaries and light verb constructions found both in dictionaries and in naturally occurring data are analyzed. Then, whether the distinction of light verb usages is represented or not is observed and the definition of light verb constructions is represented. Finally, for the light verb *at-* ‘throw’ in Turkish, representations as dictionary entries are proposed.

Key words: Light verbs, polysemy, dictionary.

1. INTRODUCTION

‘Lexical ambiguity’ is very common in natural languages. A single sentence or an utterance may be interpreted in different ways simply because one of the words has more than one meaning. As one of the lexical ambiguity types, polysemy is defined as having different but related meanings (Aksan, 1999, 2000; Cruse, 1986; Lyons, 1977; Panman, 1982; Taylor, 1995). Although it seems unproblematic, this definition raises a number of conceptual and methodological problems (Taylor, 2003: 638).

The definition of having different but related meanings requires forming the criteria for representing the polysemous words, especially verbs, in the dictionary. These criteria must be decisive for determining the prototype meaning, demarcating the polysemous verbs from homonyms and compound verbs, formed both with full and light verbs, representing them in the dictionary, listing the prototype meaning and its sub-meanings as definition lines (Uçar, 2009). Especially light verbs have received special treatments in their representation in the dictionaries recently (Hanks, Urbschat & Gehweiler, 2006). Naturally, this gives rise to the discussion of by which criteria light verbs will be defined,

because a verb may have both light and full uses in natural languages. However, there are some problems regarding the representations of light verb constructions in Turkish Dictionaries.

1.1 Light verbs

Light verbs are the verbs that cannot stand in the sentence on their own but can occur with another verb or a nominal (Butt, 2004; Göksel & Kerslake, 2005; Karimi-Doostan, 2005; Kearns, 2002; Kornfilt, 1997). There are three types of auxiliary verbs in Turkish:

- Bound auxiliaries: suffixes such as *-(y)Abil*, *-(y)Iver*, *-(y)Ayaz*, *-(y)Adur*, *-(y)Akal*.

- Free auxiliaries: verbs such as *ol-*, *et- gel-*, *dur-*, *kal-*, *düş-*, *bulun-*, *eyle-*, *buyur-*.

- *i-* / *-(y)*: copula (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005:157).

Light verb constructions in Turkish are the complex predicates formed by a nominal and a free auxiliary. Light verb constructions are found in many of the world's languages such as Japanese, Korean, Persian, English, French and German and they are generally formed with borrowed words. Turkish also borrowed nominals from Arabic, Persian, English and French.

For sentences containing such a verb, to determine the semantic contribution of the verb to the sentence is hard or almost impossible. Because the meaning of a light verb is inextricably bound up with its complementation; the verb itself makes a comparatively 'light' contribution to the meaning or it has no contribution (Butt, 2004; Karimi-Doostan, 2005; Kearns, 2002; Miyamoto, 2000).

A light verb is not necessarily light in all uses. In (1), (2) and (3) *take* functions semantically as a lexically free verb, not a light verb. In these sentences, it characterizes quite precisely the kind of action that took place. In Turkish, for example, in (4) and (5) *ver-* 'to give' is used as a lexical verb not a light verb. But in (6) and (7), it is used as a light verb. Thus, a verb may have both light and full uses.

(1) Ali took a book off the shelf.

(2) Ali took his umbrella.

(3) Ali took his umbrella with him.

(4) Ali Ahmet-e bir hediye ver-di.
 Ali Ahmet-DAT one present give-PAST
 ‘Ali gave Ahmet a present.’

(5) Ali Ahmet-e bir kitap ver-di.
 Ali Ahmet-DAT one book give-PAST
 ‘Ali gave Ahmet a book.’

(6) Ali Ahmet-e *taktik* ver-di.
 Ali Ahmet-DAT tactics give-PAST
 ‘Ali gave Ahmet tactics.’

(7) Ali Ahmet-e *destek* ver-di.
 Ali Ahmet-DAT support give-PAST
 ‘Ali supported Ahmet.’

Furthermore, lightness is a matter of degree. Some uses are lighter than others. Thus, the verb *take* in the expression *take place* (8), or *et-* ‘to do’ in the expression *teşekkür et-* ‘to thank’ (9) is very light indeed: *take* and *et-* ‘to do’ make no independent contribution to the meaning of this expression, which is tantamount to a fixed phrase or idiom.

(8) The game *took place* on the coldest day of the year.

(9) Ali Ahmet-e *teşekkür* et-ti.
 Ali Ahmet-DAT thank do-PAST
 ‘Ali thanked Ahmet.’

Even, some light verb constructions are confused with idioms

and take part in the dictionaries of idioms. In idioms, one or some of the components of the construction have connotative meanings and the dominant component for the idiomatic meaning has changed its meaning in the idiomatic expression. They are semantically and often syntactically restricted and so they function as a single unit. But in Turkish, although the expressions like *fiyat kır-* ‘to discount’, *haklı çık-* ‘to be justified’, *dikkat çek-* ‘to draw attention’ have connotative and referential meanings and they are fixed phrases in their usages, they have different structural properties from idioms. Subaşı Uzun (1991:37) states that the construction *fiyat ver-* ‘to bid’ conveys the meaning *fiyat bildir-* ‘to present a price’ by means of the sign *fiyat* ‘price’ which has referential meaning and the sign *ver-* ‘to give’ which has connotative meaning. The sign *fiyat* ‘price’ primarily contributes to the meaning of the construction. Due to this feature, unlike idioms such constructions cannot transfer meaning and cannot show the feature of indirect expressions (Subaşı, 1988; Subaşı Uzun, 1991). For this reason, these constructions must be considered as light verb constructions just like the ones *teşekkür et-* ‘to thank’, *banyo yap-* ‘to have a bath’ and *tifo ol-* ‘become typhoid’ formed by the verbs as *et-* ‘to do’, *yap-* ‘to do’, *ol-* ‘to be’.

1.2. Types of Light Verb Constructions

In a light verb construction, because of the syntactic and semantic properties of the complement, there may be different types of constructions. Kearns (2002) proposes that there are at least two quite distinct types within the traditional class of LVCs. What she calls True Light Verbs (TLVs) occurs in *give the floor a sweep*, *give a groan*, and *have a lick of this ice-cream*. What she calls Vague Action Verbs (VAVs) occurs in *make an inspection*, *give a demonstration* and *do the ironing*. Although TLVs and VAVs both fall within the traditional light verb class, Kearns (2002) states that they differ in properties like passivization, Wh-movement, pronominalization, definiteness and the complement NP. For example, the construction *give a groan* cannot be definite as in (10a), passive as in (11a) and Wh- movement cannot be applied as in (12a).

(10) a. The man gave a groan.

- * Who gave the groan just now?
 b. The representative gave a demonstration.
 The representative who gave the demonstration left his card.
- (11) a. * A groan was given by the man on the right.
 b. A demonstration of the new equipment will be given on Monday.
- (12) a. * Which groan did the man give?
 b. Which offer did the finance company make?

In Turkish, contrary to VAVs (e.g. *cevap ver-* ‘to answer’, *bilgi ver-* ‘to inform’ etc.), TLVs (e.g. *tebessüm et-* ‘to smile’, *inkar etmek* ‘to deny’, *tifo olmak* ‘to become typhoid’ etc.) cannot be definite as seen in (13), cannot be the subject of a passive as in (14), cannot be the focus of a wh- question as in (15), and cannot be substituted by the synonym of the nominal as in (16). However, VAVs allow the definite, passivization, Wh-question, and the substitution by the synonym of the nominal.

- | | | | |
|---------|------|-----------------|-----------|
| (13) a. | Ali | tebessüm | etti. |
| | *Ali | tebessüm-ü | et-ti. |
| | Ali | smile-ACC | do-PAST |
| | *Ali | inkar-ı | et-ti. |
| | Ali | denial-ACC | do-PAST |
| b. | Ali | cevab-ı | ver-di. |
| | Ali | answer-ACC | give-PAST |
| | Ali | bilgi-yi | ver-di. |
| | Ali | information-ACC | give-PAST |
-
- | | | | | |
|---------|------------|-----|------------|----------------|
| (14) a. | * Tebessüm | Ali | tarafından | ed-il-di. |
| | Smile | Ali | by | do-PASS-PAST |
| | * İnkâr | Ali | tarafından | ed-il-di. |
| | Denial | Ali | by | do-PASS-PAST |
| b. | Cevap | Ali | tarafından | ver-il-di. |
| | Answer | Ali | by | give-PASS-PAST |
| | Bilgi | Ali | tarafından | ver-il-di. |

	Information	Ali	by	give-PASS-PAST
(15) a.	* Ali	hangi	tebessüm-ü	et-ti?
	Ali	which	smile-ACC	do-PAST
	* Ali	hangi	inkar-ı	et-ti?
	Ali	which	denial-ACC	do-PAST
b.	Ali	hangi	cevab-ı	ver-di?
	Ali	which	answer-ACC	give-PAST
	Ali	hangi	bilgi-yi	ver-di?
	Ali	which	information-ACC	give-PAST
(16) a.	* Ali	gülümseme		et-ti.
	Ali	smile		do-PAST
	* Ali	yadsıma		et-ti.
	Ali	denial		do-PAST
b.	Ali	yanıt		ver-di.
	Ali	answer		give-PAST
	Ali	izahat		ver-di.
	Ali	explanation		give-PAST

Also, TLVs do not allow adverb insertions as in (17a) and gapping cannot be applied to a part of the compound word as in (18a). Although these syntactic restrictions, focus particles can also be inserted between the bare noun and the light verbs as in (19a). Coordination of the bare noun with another noun is also possible as in (19b).

(17) a.	* Ali	tifo	dün		ol-du.
	Ali	typhoid	yesterday		be-PAST
		'Ali became typhoid yesterday.'			
	b. Ali	dün	tifo		ol-du.
	Ali	yesterday	typhoid		be-PAST
(18) a.	* Ali	dün	tifo	_, Mine de	bugün tifo ol-du.
					Ø=oldu
	Ali	yesterday	typhoid	Mine today	typhoid be-PAST
				and	

- b. Ali dün __, Mine de bugün tifo ol-du. Ø= tifo oldu
 Ali yesterday Mine today typhoid be-PAST
 and

(Kuribayashi, 1997: 90-91).

- (19) Ali suç-u-nu inkar et-ti.
 Ali crime-3.sg-ACC denial do-PAST
 a. Ali suç-u-nu inkar mı et-ti?
 Ali crime-3.sg-ACC denial Q do-PAST
 b. Ali suç-u-nu hem kabul hem inkar et-ti.
 Ali crime-3.sg-ACC as well as acceptance as well as denial do-PAST
 (Öztürk, 2004: 179)

VAVs like *fotokopi çek-* ‘to photocopy’ are more flexible syntactically and they are also regarded as LVCs. Contrary to TLVs, these constructions can be passive as in (20), and gapping can be applied to as in (21).

- (20) Fotokopi Ali tarafından çek-il-di.
 Photocopy Ali by pull-PASS-PAST
- (21) a. Ali bugün __ çek-ti, Veli ise
 Ali yesterday photocopy pull-PAST Veli as for
 today
 b. Ali dün __, Veli ise bugün fotokopi
 çek-ti.
 Ali yesterday Veli but today photocopy
 pull-PAST
 c. * Ali bugün __ çek-ti, Veli ise
 Ali yesterday photocopy pull-PAST Veli as for

	today	pull-PAST			
d.	* Ali	dün	_____	çek-ti,	Veli ise
	bugün	fotokopi	çek-ti.		
	Ali	yesterday		pull-PAST	Veli as for
	today	photocopy	pull-PAST		

(Özbek, 2006)

Despite the weakness of the syntactic criteria, the verb in these expressions is classified as “light” for semantic reasons: like many light verbs, it focuses attention on a particular event (in (21) the event of photocopying something), but does not otherwise make a clearly identifiable semantic contribution. Thus, the syntactic criteria that have been proposed are not sufficient for the identification of all and only LVC. Rather, they are characterizations of syntactic phenomena which are associated with some but not all light verbs (Hanks et al. 2006). In this study, the data which includes polysemous root verbs compiled from Turkish dictionaries and light verb constructions obtained from both dictionaries and naturally occurring data will be analyzed. Then, whether the distinction of light verb usages is done or not will be observed and the definition of light verb constructions will be presented. Finally, for the light verb *at-* ‘to throw’ in Turkish, representations as dictionary entries will be proposed.

1.3. Data and Restrictions

In this study, the data which includes polysemous root verbs compiled from two Turkish dictionaries and light verb constructions found both in dictionaries and naturally occurring data will be analyzed. The dictionaries are the 10th edition of Turkish Dictionary published by Turkish Language Association and the 2nd edition of Turkish Dictionary published by Language Association.

2. LIGHT VERBS IN TURKISH DICTIONARIES

The light verbs in Turkish have received similar treatment in the traditional grammars and dictionaries of Turkish. While it has been recognized that these verbs hold some sort of special status in the

Turkish lexicon, it is not easy to find a satisfactory description in the existing grammars and especially in dictionaries, except for verbs like *et-* ‘to do’, *ol-* ‘to be’, *yap-* ‘to do’, whose light verb usages are more precise. In the Turkish dictionaries both published by Turkish Language Association and Language Association, the verbs which are part of LVCs have been represented as sub-meaning of their polysemous full (heavy) counterparts. Furthermore, the constructions formed by the same light verb and have similar meanings have been represented in different definition lines or the constructions formed by different light verbs have been represented in the same definition lines.

2.1. *At-* ‘to throw’ as a light verb

The Turkish verb *at-* ‘to throw’ is one of the typical examples of polysemous verbs, with over 30 definition lines in dictionaries. Dictionary entries of *at-* ‘to throw’, its etymology and native speakers’ intuitions all suggest that the prototype meaning of *at-* ‘to throw’ corresponds to the definition “to propel through the air by a forward motion of the hand and arm”. The prototypical meaning of *at-* ‘to throw’ can be exemplified as in (22).

- (22) a. Ali taş-ı su-ya at-tı.
 Ali stone-ACC water-DAT throw-PAST
 ‘Ali threw the stone to the water.’

In Turkish, *at-* ‘to throw’ is used as light verb in constructions like *dayak at-* ‘to beat’, *tekme at-* ‘to give a kick’, *çığlık at-* ‘to scream’, *laf at-* ‘to tease’, *yalan at-* ‘to lie’. Some of these light verb constructions take place in Turkish dictionaries as seen in (23). The numbers of the definition lines are given as they are in the dictionary.

(23) **Atmak,**

8. Sille, tokat vurmak. ‘to slap, to cuff’
9. Top, tüfek gibi silahları patlatmak. ‘to fire a rifle’
10. Kurşun, gülle, ok gibi şeyleri hedefe iletmek. ‘to shoot a gun’,
 ‘to put the shot’, ‘to shoot arrows’
14. Sözle sataşmak. ‘to tease’, ‘to annoy’

30. Söylemek. ‘to tell’

32. Haykırmak, bağırarak. ‘to scream’

As discussed previously, the tests which are related to determine whether a verb is a light verb or not, also differentiate the light verb constructions formed by the verb *at-* ‘to throw’ as TLV and VAV. For example, when we consider the light verb constructions formed by the true light verb *at-* ‘to throw’, such as *laf at-* ‘to tease’, *boy at-* ‘to grow tall’, *çığlık at-* ‘to scream’, we can see that these constructions cannot be definite (24b and 25b) and cannot be the subject of the passive (24c and 25c). Also, they cannot be the focus of a question word (24d and 25d) and cannot be substituted by the synonym of the nominal (24e and 25e).

- (24) a. Adam kadın-a laf at-ti.
 Man woman-DAT word throw-PAST
 ‘The man teased the woman.’
- b. *Adam kadın-a laf-ı at-ti.
 Man woman-DAT word-ACC throw-PAST
- c. *Laf adam tarafından at-ıl-dı.
 Word man by throw- PASS-PAST
- d. *Adam kadın-a hangi laf-ı at-tı?
 Man woman-DAT which word-ACC throw-PAST
- e. *Adam kadın-a söz at-ti.
 Man woman-DAT word throw-PAST
- (25) a. Çocuk boy at-ti.
 Child length throw-PAST
 ‘The child grew tall.’
- b. *Çocuk boy-u at-ti.
 Child length-ACC throw-PAST
- c. *Boy çocuk tarafından at-ıl-dı.
 Length child by throw- PASS-PAST
- d. *Çocuk hangi boy-u at-tı?

Child	which	length-ACC	throw-PAST
e. *Çocuk	uzunluk	at-ti.	
Child	length	throw-PAST	

But in (26) and (27), in the light verb constructions formed by VAVs such as *tokat at-* ‘to slap’, *başlık at-* ‘to write a title’, these tests seem to be valid.

(26) a.	Ali	kardeş-i-ne	tokat	at-ti.
	Ali	brother-3.SG-DAT	slap	throw-PAST
	‘Ali slapped his brother.’			
b.	Ali	kardeş-i-ne	tokad-ı	at-ti.
	Ali	brother-3.SG-DAT	slap-ACC	throw-PAST
c.	Tokat	Ali	tarafından	at-ıl-dı.
	Slap	Ali	by	throw-PASS-PAST
d.	Ali	hangi	tokad-ı	at-ti?
	Ali	which	slap-ACC	throw-PAST
e.	Ali	kardeş-i-ne	şamar / şaplak	at-ti
	Ali	brother-3.SG-DAT	slap	throw-PAST
(27) a.	Ali	gazete-ye	başlık	at-ti.
	Ali	newspaper-DAT	title	throw-PAST
	‘Ali wrote a title for his article.’			
b.	Ali	gazete-ye	başlığ-ı	at-ti.
	Ali	newspaper-DAT	title-ACC	throw-PAST
c.	Başlık	Ali	tarafından	at-ıl-dı.
	Title	Ali	by	throw-PASS-PAST
d.	Ali	hangi	başlığ-ı	at-ti?
	Ali	which	title-ACC	throw-PAST
e.	Ali	gazete-ye	manşet	at-ti
	Ali	newspaper-DAT	caption	throw-PAST

The LVCs do not always have to satisfy all these tests. For example, the construction, *omuz at-* ‘to shoulder’ or *dirsek at-* ‘to elbow’, can be definite and passive but cannot be the focus of question word.

- (28) a. Ali kapı-ya omuz at-ti.
 Ali door-DAT shoulder throw-PAST
 ‘Ali shouldered the door.’
- b. Ali kapı-ya omuz-u at-ti.
 Ali door-DAT shoulder-ACC throw-PAST
- c. Kapı-ya omuz at-ıl-dı.
 Door-DAT shoulder throw-PASS-PAST
- d. *Ali kapı-ya hangi omuz-u at-ti?
 Ali door-DAT which shoulder-ACC throw-PAST

Or the construction *iftira at-* ‘to slander’ cannot be definite and the focus of the question word but can be the subject of a passive. Also it cannot be substituted by its synonym.

- (29) a. Ali adam-a iftira at-ti.
 Ali man-DAT slander throw-PAST
 ‘Ali slandered the man.’
- b. *Ali adam-a iftira-yı at-ti.
 Ali man-DAT slander-ACC throw-PAST
- c. İftira Ali tarafından at-ıl-dı.
 Slander Ali by throw-PASS-PAST
- d. *Ali adam-a hangi iftira-yı at-ti?
 Ali man-DAT which slander-ACC throw-PAST
- b. *Ali adam-a karalama at-ti.
 Ali man-DAT slander throw-PAST

All these examples show that the light verb constructions have (some) degree of lightness, i.e., some uses are lighter than others. This requires that there must be an order for the representations of the LVCs in dictionaries. That is, first TLVs must be presented in the definition lines of a light verb, and then VAVs must be given.

3. A PROPOSAL FOR REPRESENTING THE VERB *AT-* ‘THROW’

In our proposal, a new style of entry for light verbs is developed and significant collocations are presented in the examples. The definitions in Turkish dictionaries are kept because giving meanings and forming the content of the definition need further studies. Also, the usages of *at-* ‘to throw’ as lexical verb are not included in the proposal, but only the light verb usages of *at-* ‘to throw’ are shown. In the proposal, the constructions formed by TLV like *laf at-* ‘to tease’, *boy at-* ‘to grow tall’, and *çığlık at-* ‘to scream’ are represented in the first definition lines. These are followed by the constructions formed by VAV like *tokat at-* ‘to slap’, *yumruk at-* ‘to give a fist’.

Besides, in this proposal, the constructions that do not take place in the dictionaries but that we have encountered in the data such as *çizik at-* ‘to form line’ and *stres at-* ‘to shrug off stress’ are included.

(30) Atmak (katkısız eylem) (light verb)

1. Söyle sataşmak. (to tease)
Laf atmak.
2. Boyu uzamak, boylanmak. (to grow tall)
Boy atmak.
3. Yüksek sesle bağırarak, haykırmak. (to scream, to laugh)
Çığlık atmak. Slogan atmak.
Nara atmak. Kahkaha atmak.
4. Oynamak. (to play)
Tavla atmak. Okey atmak.
5. Dans etmek, oynamak. (to dance the belly dance)
Göbek atmak.
6. Oluşturmak. (to form, to do, to make)
Çizik atmak. Çentik atmak.
7. Dolaşmak, dolaşıp gelmek. (to take stroll)
Tur atmak.
8. Patlatmak. (to fire a rifle)
Top atmak. Silah atmak. Tüfek atmak.
9. Söylemek. (to tell)
Yalan atmak. Palavra atmak.
10. Vücudu rahatlatmak amacıyla aşırı derecede terlemek. (to

sweat)

Ter atmak.

11. Gerilimini azaltmak, yok etmek. (to shrug off stress)

Stres atmak.

12. Vücudun bir parçasıyla vurmak, itmek. (to shoulder, to elbow)

Omuz atmak. Dirsek atmak.

13. Yollamak. (to send)

Mektup atmak. Mesaj atmak. Mail atmak.

14. Vurmak. (to slap, to beat, to give a fist, to give a kick)

Tokat atmak. Dayak atmak. Yumruk atmak. Tekme atmak.

15. Takla, pende hareketini yapmak. (to turn a somersault)

Takla atmak. Pende atmak.

16. Bir yazıya ad olarak başlık bulmak, yazmak. (to write a title)

Başlık atmak. Manşet atmak.

17. İmzalamak. (to sign)

İmza atmak. Paraf atmak.

4. CONCLUSION

In Turkish Dictionaries which are expected to be descriptive sources for all levels of the language in the direction of criteria determined in the light of linguistic findings, there are some definition and representation problems especially for polysemous verbs. Defining the light verb constructions which are represented as the sub-meanings of their polysemous heavy verb counterparts in the dictionaries and by this way demarcating them from polysemous lexical verbs is necessary in terms of defining the concept of polysemy in the verbs. This distinction also brings along the necessity that light verbs must be represented as lexical entries in the dictionaries by a special arrangement.

In this study, it has been discussed that the verb *at-* ‘to throw’ in Turkish has also usages as a light verb and these usages must not be represented as sub-meanings of its polysemous heavy counterpart in the dictionaries. A proposal for the representations of the usages of *at-* ‘to throw’ as a light verb, aside from its heavy counterpart, has been developed. It has been suggested that light verbs have two different types of constructions (TLVs and VAVs) because they conform all or some of the syntactic criteria and they also have graded structure.

Because of this graded structure, light verb constructions with *at-* ‘to throw’ are sorted from TLVs to VAVs in the proposal of dictionary representation.

References

- Aksan, D. 1999. *Anlambilim: Anlambilim Konuları ve Türkçenin Anlambilimi*. Ankara: Engin Yayınevi.
- Aksan, D. 2000. *Her Yönüyle Dil: Anaçizgileriyle Dilbilim III*. Ankara: TDK.
- Banguoğlu, T. 1974. *Türkçenin Grameri*. İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.
- Butt, M. 2004. The Light Verb Jungle. In G. Aygen, C. Bowern & C. Quinn (Eds.), *Papers from the GSAS/Dudley House Workshop on Light Verbs*. Cambridge, Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics: 1-49.
- Cruse, D. A. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ediskun, H. 1985. *Türk Dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Ergin, M. 2003. *Türk Dil Bilgisi*. İstanbul: Bayrak Basım.
- Gencan, T. N. 2001. *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınevi.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge
- Hanks, P., Urbschat, A. & Gehweiler, E. 2006. German Light Verb Contructions in Corpora and Dictionaries. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 19 (4), 439-457.
- Karimi-Doostan, G. 2005. Light Verbs and Structural Case. *Lingua* 115, 1737-1756.
- Kearns, K. 2002. Light Verbs in English. Access date: 15 June 2006. http adresi: <http://www.ling.canterbury.ac.nz/kate/lightverbs.pdf>
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- Kuribayashi, Y. 1997. Complement Incorporation and Subject to Object Raising in Turkish. In K. İmer & N. E. Uzun (Eds.), *VIII. Uluslararası Türk Dilbilimi Konferansı Bildirileri 7-9 Ağustos 1996* (89-98). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Lewis, G. 2000. *Turkish Grammar*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Miyamoto, T. 2000. *The Light Verb Constructions in Japanese: The Role of the Verbal Noun*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Özbek, A. 2006. On Çek- as a Light Verb. *Paper presented at the 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, 16-20 August 2006,

- Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.
- Öztürk, B. 2004. Complex Predicates in Turkish. In G. Aygen, C. Bower & C. Quinn (Eds.), *Papers from the GSAS/Dudley House Workshop on Light Verbs*. Cambridge, Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics: 171–192.
- Panman, O. 1982. Homonymy and Polysemy. *Lingua* 58, 105-136.
- Subaşı, L. 1988. *Dilbilimi Açısından Deyim Kavramı ve Türkiye Türkçesindeki Örneklerin İncelenmesi*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Subaşı Uzun, L. 1991. Deyimleşme ve Türkçede Deyimleşme Dereceleri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları 1991*, 29-39.
- Taylor, J. R. 1995. *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, J. R. 2003. Polysemy's Paradoxes. *Language Sciences* 25, 637-655.
- Türkçe Sözlük*. 2005. 10th edition. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Türkçe Sözlük*. 2005. 2nd edition. Ankara: Dil Derneği Yayınları.
- Uçar, A. 2009. *Türkçe Eylemlerde Çokanlamlılık: Uygunluk Kuramı Çerçevesinde Bir Çözümleme*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Underhill, R. 1976. *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Pres.