

Cornell – Syracuse Workshop on Suspended Affixation and Lexical Integrity

October 26, 2012

Jaklin Kornfilt
Syracuse University
kornfilt@syr.edu

Discussant's comments

1. Some basic facts of SA:

Nominal morphology: e.g. plural

- (1) limon ve portakal **-lar**
lemon and orange **-pl**
'Lemons and oranges'

Person – number (possessive/nominal) agreement:

- (2) defter ve kalem **-im**
notebook and pencil **-1.sg**
'My notebook and pencil'

Verbal morphology: e.g. person – number agreement (predicate – subject agreement)

- (3) Her akşam kendi-m -e çay yap -ar ve iç-er-**im**
every evening self -1.sg.-dat tea make-aor and drink-aor-**1.sg**
'Every evening I make tea for myself and drink (it)'

2. Some constraints:

A. In verbal coordination, the morphemes expressing tense, mood or aspect cannot be “suspended”, when the coordination marker *ve*, a borrowing from Arabic, is used; but the Turkic suffix *-(y)Ip* makes “suspension” of these morphemes, along with the agreement morpheme, possible/necessary:

- (4) Her akşam kendi-m -e çay yap **-İp** iç **-er-im**
every evening self -1.sg.-dat tea make-and drink **-aor-1.sg**
'Every evening I make tea for myself and drink (it)'

B. Suspendability of (similar/same/homophonous) affixes (different depending on depth/height in phrase structure? Category features? Syntax versus lexicon?)

- (5) [[[Ali-nin ördeğ-i kızar-t] -İp [krema-yı don -dur]]-ma-sın]-ı
Ali-gen duck-acc roast-caus-and cream-acc freeze-caus-NFN-3.sg-acc

söyle-di-m
tell-pst-1.sg

'I said for Ali to roast the duck and freeze the cream'

B1: *ve* cannot replace *-(y)Ip* here, i.e. it has to follow TAM morphology (see A. above), thus making their "suspension" impossible.

B2: *-(y)Ip* itself doesn't always make the suspension of *-mA* (perhaps a different *-mA*) possible: "Lexical" *-mA*, a resultative:

(6) a. don -dur -ma
freeze-caus -result
'ice cream'

b. kızar -t -ma
roast -caus -result
'fried/roasted food'

(7) *don -dur -up kızar -t -ma
freeze-caus -and roast -caus -result
(ill-formed under the intended reading: 'Ice cream and roast meat' but good under the reading 'freezing and roasting')

Similar observations regarding *-miş*: It undergoes SA successfully as the marker for the reported past (on an abstract copula—cf. Kornfilt 1996), i.e. as a copular tense and evidential mood marker (8), but not as a perfective participle marker (9):

(8) Ali her gün [[havyar ye-r] ve [şampanya iç-er]] -∅ -miş
Ali every day caviar eat-aor and champagne drink-aor-COP-rep.pst
'Ali reportedly eats/used to eat caviar and (reportedly) drinks/used to drink champagne every day'

(9) *[[kok] ve [çürü]]-müş balık
smell and rot -pst.participle fish
Intended reading: 'Smelly and rotten fish'

The source of (9) is perfectly fine:

(10) [[kok-muş] ve [çürü-müş]] balık
smell-pst.participle and rot -pst.participle fish
Intended reading: 'Smelly and rotten fish'

Some distinction necessary between the two types of *-mA*, i.e. two types of nominalization morphemes (and, similarly between types of *-miş*). Other clearly lexical/derivational morphemes cannot undergo SA, either:

(11) limon ve tuz **-luk**
 lemon and salt -container

OK: 'lemon and salt shaker' (Non-SA reading)

* 'lemon squeezer and salt shaker' (SA-reading not available)

Bresnan (1997:10) argues that lexically as well as syntactically derived words are similarly opaque with respect to syntax and morphology: "The putative syntactically derived words are subject to the same morphological principles of structural formation as lexically derived words, and they both share properties of syntactic structural opacity referred to as 'lexical integrity' " (1997:7). Also: "... syntactic categories can be omitted by ellipsis or extraction gaps, which depend for their meaning on the wider syntactic context; why then do nominalizations never include such empty categories? It is unexplained why the putative syntactically derived words should behave exactly like lexically derived words in these respects. These and other properties are explained by modern lexicalist theories of syntax, ... rather than phrase structure to capture generalizations across morphology and syntax." (Bresnan, 1997:7).

But as shown above, SA does distinguish between types of nominalization.

C. Phonological constraints:

(12) hastalan -acak ve doktor-a gid -ecek -Ø-sin
 get sick -fut and doctor-dat go -fut -COP-2.sg
 'You will get sick and (you will) go to the doctor'

(13) *hastalan -acak ve doktor-a gid -eceğ -Ø-im
 get sick -fut and doctor-dat go -fut -COP-1.sg
 Intended reading: 'I will get sick and (I will) go to the doctor'

3. Nature of SA

In verbal morphology: Inflected copula can be suspended (cf. Kornfilt 1996, Kahnemuyipour & Kornfilt 2011), whether the copula is overt (14a) or null (14b):

(14)a. [[yorgun] ve [hasta]] -y -dı -n
 tired and sick -COP -pst -2.sg
 'You were tired and sick'

b. [[yorgun] ve [hasta]] -Ø -sin
 tired and sick -COP -2.sg
 'You are tired and sick'

In parallel to this less controversial analysis involving an inflected (here, suspended) copula with adjectival predicates (as well as complex verb forms, where the main verb is a participle), Kornfilt (1996) assumes the presence of a null copula in some (so-called) simple verbal forms (the copula is null, but its inflection, i.e. verbal agreement with the subject, is overt):

(15) [[oku-yacak] ve [anla -yacak]] - Ø -sın
 read-fut and understand-fut -COP -2.sg
 'You will read and understand'

Proposal: What's suspended here is the inflected copula, and not just the agreement morpheme. The agreement morpheme by itself cannot be suspended:

(16) *[[oku-du] ve [anla -dı]] -n
 read-pst and understand-pst -2.sg

Intended reading: 'You read and understood'

Lees (1962): The simple past and the conditional are the only genuine verb inflections in Turkish; the other apparently simple verb forms marked for verb/aspect are participles.

But inflected copulas are only one type of suspendable affixes. Such affixes have to be phrasal.

If so, SA completely syntactic. Can we find anything like it in "non-morphological" syntax, i.e. involving obvious phrases (rather than phrases disguised as words or parts of words)? At least some of the observed constraints should be similar, too.

What about RNR (or else, coordination below some heads)?

Either way, apparent backward gapping requires strict identity of the "elided" right-peripheral item with the surviving item:

(17) *[[**sen** kaz -ı], [ben de hindi-yi]] [ye-di-**m**]
you goose-acc I and turkey-acc eat-pst-**1.sg**

Intended: 'You (ate) the goose and I ate the turkey'

(18) *[[kaz -ı **sen**], [hindi-yi de ben]] [ye-di-**m**]
 goose-acc **you** turkey-acc and I eat-pst-**1.sg**

Intended: 'YOU (ate) the goose and I ate the turkey'

But OK:

(19) [[kaz -ı profesör-ler], [hindi-yi de öğrenci-ler]] [ye-di (-ler)]
 goose-acc professor-pl turkey-acc and student-pl eat-pst (-3.pl)
 'THE PROFESSORS (ate) the goose and THE STUDENTS ate the turkey'

If SA is the same syntactic operation (and/or yields a similar structure) as RNR (or as coordination below a right-peripheral element—in Turkish, typically a verb), then it should have similar constraints. Here, we observe strict similarity, i.e. full identity, of the coordinated remnant conjuncts in apparent backward gapping. This goes along well with the observation above, where SA requires similar identity of the conjuncts; this requirement is so strict that it requires even phonological identity.