## **Turkish Verbal Suspended Affixation**

Heather Yawney, University of Toronto

My current research investigates Turkish verbal suspended affixation. Lewis (1967) first characterised suspended affixation as when "one grammatical ending serves two or more parallel words." This interesting phenomenon concerns some coordinate constructions, but not all. Though we expect some suffixes to show on all conjuncts, some suffixes can optionally be omitted from all conjuncts except the last while having semantic scope over the whole coordinate construction. I examine the syntactic structure, as well as the phonological form, of verbal coordination structures using ve "and" constructions. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon (Good & Yu 2005, Kornfilt 1996). Agreement suffixes are boldfaced, and primary word-level stress is marked with an accent sign.

- (1) gel -tí -m ve git-tí -m come-PST-1SG and go-PST-1SG "I came and I went."
- vs. \*gel -tí ve git-tí -m come-PST and go-PST-1SG Intended meaning: "I came and went."
- (2) gel -ecéğ-im ve gid-ecéğ-im come-FUT-1SG and go-FUT-1SG "I will come and I will go"
- vs. gel -ecék ve gid-ecéğ**-im**come-FUT and go -FUT**-1SG**"I will come and go."

(modified from Kornfilt 1996)

In (1), suspended affixation is illicit and word-level stress is on the last syllable (this is the location of regular main stress). In (2), suspended affixation is licit and word-level stress is never final.

Following Kornfilt's (1996) analysis, the Turkish verb can be segmented into two domains; the low participial domain and the high copular domain. Two agreement suffix paradigms, A and B, of the four (leaving out the optative and the imperative) are involved here with regards to the Turkish verbal inflection system (Good & Yu, 1999, 2005, Kornfilt 1996, 1997). Group A agreement suffixes attach directly to the verb stem while Group B agreement suffixes attach to the verb stem via an intermediate verbal copula. Copular constructions (complex verbs) are characterised as spanning two stress domains with main stress falling on the final syllable of the participial (pre-copula) domain, while non-copular constructions (simple verbs) span one stress domain with main stress following the regular main stress rule placing stress on the final syllable of the word. The following examples illustrates this phenomenon.

(3) Group A vs. Group B gid-ecék-Ø -sin go-PST-2SG go -FUT-COP-2SG "I went" "I will go."

(Kornfilt 1996)

Newell (2008) argues that what seems to be an irregular stress pattern on Group B Turkish verbs is actually the result of the phonological phase. Her explanations are consistence with a cyclic spell-out analysis. The verbal copula, which has been analysed previously as 'pre-stressing' (Inkelas & Orgun 2003), 'prosodic word adjoining' (Kabak & Vogel 2003) or 'unstressable' (Hulst & van de Weijer 1991), falls on the vP phase head which triggers Spell-out of the first stress domain. Since complex verbs implicate more than one stress domain, the lowest and leftmost (participial) domain receives main stress while simple verbs implicates only one stress domain.

Newell (2008) argues that the two domains appeal to different selectional restrictions of affixes. She stipulates that the low participial morphemes have selectional restrictions that may only attach to a bare root or to another AspP in participial domain and the high Tense morphology may only select for vP or TP. I make slight modifications, following Kahnemuyipour & Kornfilt (2011), in favour of T/AgrP, equivalent to TP/IP in the CP domain.

Turkish verbal suspended affixation is only licit with Group B verb whose agreement is not attached directly to the verb stem (Kabak 2007, Kornfilt 1996). These verbs demonstrate that suspended affixation is optional. My research goal is to introduce a possible solution that accounts for the different verb Group's syntactic structure and their distinct stress behaviour. Using a cyclic phase-bases analysis

and the selectional restrictions of each domain, the phonological facts motivates my analysis by proposing that the SPELLEE of vP and CP phase heads are coordinated during Spell-out.

## **Bibliography:**

Good, J. & Yu, A. (1999). Suffix ordering variability in Turkish. BLS 25: 63-74.

**Good, J. & Yu, A.** (2005). Morphosyntax of two Turkish subject pronominal paradigms. In *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, ed. L. Heggie, & F. Ordòñez: Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins B. V., 315-342.

**Hulst** (van der), H. & van de Weijer, J. (1991). Topics in Turkish phonology. In *Turkish linguistics today*, eds. H. Boeschoten & L. Verhoeven. Leiden: Brill, 11-59.

Inkelas, S. & Orgun, C.O. (2003). Turkish stress: a review. Phonology 20(1), 139-161.

Kabak, B. (2007). Turkish suspended affixation. Linguistics 45 (2), 311-347.

**Kabak, B. & Vogel, I.** (2001). The phonological word and stress assignment in Turkish. *Phonology* 18, 315-360.

**Kahnemuyipour, A & Kornfilt, J.** (2011). The Syntax and Prosody of Turkish 'Prestressing' Verbs. In *Interfaces in Linguistics New Research Perspectives*, eds. R. Rolli & C. Ulbrich, New York, Oxford University Press, 204-221.

**Kornfilt, J.** (1996). On some copular clitics in Turkish. Dans ZAS Papers in Linguistics: Papers on the conference 'The word as a phonetic unit', eds. A. Alexiadou, N. Fuhrop, P. Law & S. Lohken, Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, 96-114.

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

Lewis, G. (1967). Turkish Grammar. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

**Newell, H.** (2008). *Aspects of the morphology and phonology of phases*. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University.