

Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics

January 2018

Editors

Yılmaz Köylü

Jaklin Kornfilt

PREFACE

The first workshop on Turkish, Turkic and the Languages of Turkey was held at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in November 2015. The articles in this thematic volume include a selection of papers presented at the *The 2nd Workshop on Turkish, Turkic and the Languages of Turkey (Tu+ 2)*, organized at Indiana University, Bloomington in November, 2016. The purpose of these workshops is to promote sharing of ideas, and collaboration among linguists from all subfields of linguistics with a particular interest in Turkish, Turkic, and languages spoken in Turkey.

We are thrilled that this volume is published by The Indiana University Linguistics Club Working Papers (IULCWP). We would like to particularly thank Phillip Weirich and other editors at IULCWP for their help and support in this endeavor. Without their generous offer for publication, this volume would have been impossible.

The selected articles for the current volume has each been reviewed by advanced graduate students and faculty at Indiana University as well as by notable scholars in the field from various universities across the US. Following the initial review and resubmission process, the authors were invited to further revise their manuscripts upon the suggestions of the volume editors. The nine reviewed articles in this volume, alphabetically ordered with respect to the last names of the authors, present novel and interesting puzzles, data, and hypotheses on the syntax and semantics of various topics in Turkish, and Turkic languages, ranging from adjective ordering restrictions to the licensing of the use of the evidential marker in various contexts in Turkish.

İsa Bayırlı, in his paper entitled “Does Turkish have adjective ordering restrictions?”, makes novel observations about adjective ordering in Turkish. He shows that, while this ordering is free as long as there are no determiners in a noun phrase with multiple adjectival modifiers, the ordering of adjectives follows a universal adjective ordering very rigidly, when they precede a

determiner or a numeral. For some speakers, the ordering after the determiner or numeral of adjectives is free, while for some other speakers, that ordering must follow the adjective ordering hierarchy, as well. Bayırlı ends up showing that these sets of subtle judgments about adjective ordering in Turkish can be explained if it is assumed that:

- a. variable adjective ordering is a consequence of NP coordination (plus ATB), and
- b. strict adjective ordering is a consequence of the c-command relation among adjectives.

Duygu Göksu's paper, entitled "Typology of Nominalizations Formed with $\{-DIK\}$, $\{-mA\}$, $\{-(y)Iş\}$, and $\{-Im\}$ in Turkish", studies four clausal nominalization patterns in Turkish within a model of clausal nominalizations which characterizes nominalized clauses as possessing verbal functional projections under nominal functional projections, with the possibility of the nominal functional projections starting at different heights of the clausal architecture (cf. Borsley & Kornfilt 2000, Kornfilt 2001, Baker 2011, Kornfilt & Whitman 2011 for details of such an approach, with particular application to Turkish clausal nominalizations). The four nominalizers of the title are shown to head nominalized embedded clauses, and to attach at different heights with respect to the functional projections of such clauses.

Jeretič proposes a uniform analysis to account for two different types of negative concord (NC) observed in Turkish. The first category of NC, which Jeretič refers to as existential n-words, includes words like *hiç kimse* (nobody), and *hiçbir şey* (nothing). These require strict NC. On the other hand, the second category is where *ne...ne* phrases (neither...nor) are used. Unlike the existential n-words, the latter category exhibits optional NC. Jeretič maintains that the hybridity and optionality in NC in Turkish stems from the different semantic types of the n-words. She claims that the NC in Turkish is a hybrid system due to the different semantic types associated with each NC category while the optionality in the licensing of the NC is the result of the type flexibility in the *ne...ne* phrases. Jeretič postulates an n-word operator, whose syntactic

configuration relative to the negation is determined by the semantic type of the n-word, which influences where NC appears in the language.

Major and Özkan discuss the distribution and licensing of anaphors in Turkish and Uyghur. The authors focus on *kendi-si* in Turkish and *öz-i* in Uyghur. They provide a systematic account, whereby the properties of both *kendi* and *öz* can be explained by appealing to the classical Condition A when the antecedent-anaphor relation is local (Chomsky 1986), and by maintaining that non-local antecedents must be logophoric. The authors also propose an interesting hypothesis, arguing that it is Uyghur that exhibits the underlying system for reflexives shared by Turkish and Uyghur. These underlying properties are local binding and co-reference with logophoric antecedents. The authors maintain that the differences in the distribution and licensing of anaphors between the two languages are due to some additional properties, such as focus and honorific uses that have arisen solely in Turkish.

Meriçli gives a thorough explanation of the indirect evidential marker $\{-mIş\}$ in Turkish. He first elaborates on the nature of evidence that counts as indirect by considering declarative and interrogative sentences in both perceptual and non-perceptual uses. Proposing that it is the speaker that has access to indirect evidence in declaratives while it is the addressee that possesses such evidence in interrogatives, Meriçli discusses the reasons for the evidential shift, another term for which is the interrogative flip. His argument is that a Commitment Based Discourse Model (Gunlogson, 2001, Farkas & Bruce 2010) can account for such a shift. Meriçli proposes a formal semantic account for the perceptual and non-perceptual uses of the evidential marker, followed by the specifics of the Commitment Based Discourse Model, with the addition of his novel contribution to the model; namely projected discourse commitment.

Eszter Ótrott-Kovács, in her paper entitled “Kazakh non-finite clauses followed by $-LIQ$ as a case in favor of the clause-internal nominalization hypothesis”, contributes to the

debate about the phrase-structural position of the nominalization marker in certain nominalized clauses in Kazakh, namely in factive clauses where the nominalization suffix is *-LIQ*. Two main proposals have been made in the literature for clausal nominalization markers in languages other than Kazakh, in particular in Uyghur (which has a similar marker), and in Turkish (whose clausal nominalization markers are different): 1. The nominalization marker is clause-external; 2. The nominalization marker is clause-internal. Ótött-Kovács points out that agreement with the subject is possible only in those clauses which have been nominalized with *-LIQ*, and argues how this correlation supports the clause-internal nominalization proposal, as well as why the clause-external nominalization proposal cannot deal with that correlation.

Predolac discusses two types of nominalized embedded clauses in Turkish. The first one is constructed with the suffix *-mA* and the second one with the suffix *-DIK* or *-AcAK*. Predolac makes clear that she follows the proposal in Kornfilt (2003) and (2007) that clauses including *-mA* are subjunctive clauses and the ones that include *-DIK/ -AcAK* are indicative clauses, and offers additional observations and arguments for this dichotomy and this nomenclature. In addition to the evidence advanced in the cited works by Kornfilt, based on parallelism that the *-mA* versus the *-DIK/ -AcAK* clauses have with their embedded root clause counterparts, Predolac adds observations concerning the temporal relations those suffixes impose, their mood distribution, their selectional restrictions in terms of the types of adjunct clauses they allow, subjunctive obviation, and finally the lack of narrow wh-scope in subjunctive clauses. Predolac maintains that factivity or lack of factivity does not determine the choice between *-mA* and *-DIK/ -AcAK* clauses as both factive and non-factive predicates may be used with either *-mA* or *-DIK/ -AcAK*.

Tat and Kornfilt revisit the Stuttering Prohibition (SP) in Turkish, which they define as the ban on morphemes of the same category to co-occur within the domain of

M(orphosyntactic)-words in Turkic. Introducing the SP with data on the compound marker in Turkish, the authors extend this condition to the M(orphosyntactic)-words. They make a crucial distinction between haplology at the M-Word stage, which deals with morphemes and their features, and haplology at the P(honological)-Word stage, which relates to vocabulary items and their phonology. The dichotomy between the two stages manifests itself in the different repair strategies in features in the former stage and allomorphs in the latter stage. The authors maintain that what appears to be a counter-example to the SP in causative and passive structures in Turkish, since iteration of similar morphemes of the same category seems to be tolerated in those domains, is indeed ruled out as such because those examples are subject to haplological repairs at the P-Word stage but not at the M-Word stage.

Hilal Yıldırım-Gündoğdu's paper, entitled "Against *Diye* Clauses as Complements of Verbs of Communication", presents arguments, mostly based on passivization and causativization, that *diye*-clauses, despite appearances, are not complements of matrix verbs of communication, but rather are adverbial clauses.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that the publication of this volume has been possible thanks to our outstanding reviewers and their meticulous work. We want to express our gratitude for the reviewers, whose expertise in Turkish and Turkic linguistics made this publication a reality.

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mark C. 2011. Degrees of nominalization: Clause-like constituents in Sakha. *Lingua* 121(7). 1164-1193.
- Borsley, Robert D. & Jaklin Kornfilt. 2000. Mixed extended projections. In R. Borsley (ed.), *The Nature and Function of Syntactic Categories*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 101–131.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. Praeger, New York.
- Farkas, Donka & Kim Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27(1). 81–118.
- Gunlogson, Christine. 2008. A question of commitment. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 22(1). 101–136.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2001. Functional projections and their subjects in Turkish clauses. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (ed.), *The Verb in Turkish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 183–212.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2003. Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In *Syntactic structures and morphological information (=interface explorations)*, ed. U. Junghanns and L. Szucsich, 129-215. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2007. Verbal and nominalized finite clauses in Turkish. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. Irina Nikolaeva, 305-332. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin & John Whitman. 2011. Afterword: Nominalizations in linguistic theory. *Lingua* 121(7). 1297–1313.