BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN LINGUISTIC WORK ON TURKISH

ROBERT UNDERHILL

The intention of this bibliography, which has been some years in the making, was to pull together all the modern linguistic work which has been done on Turkish, where by modern linguistic is meant work in the generative-transformational paradigm, and its offshoots and extensions. The idea was to include not only the formal publications, but the working papers, para sessions, and other informal publications in which much of the business of American linguistics is transacted. The impressive thing about this work, once it is collected, is how much there is. I suspect that most people working on Turkish will not have realized how much work has been done, in almost every area, and in almost all the major theories.

This bibliography might more precisely have been titled something like “Modern descriptive work in English in the American linguistic tradition,” for a more accurate definition of this coverage. Modern linguistics is assumed to have begun with Chomsky in 1957 (for Turkish, with Lees in 1961). Structuralist writers have generally been omitted, although a few are included which are particularly important, or which fit in closely with later work. All work in the philological or historical traditions has been omitted, since there are several other places where this work is listed.

The American linguistic tradition is not, of course, restricted to Americans; there is a substantial body of work in Europe, and by Turkish linguists trained in America. For publications in America, I have tried to catch everything, although given the spotty nature of graduate reading rooms and the casual nature of many of these publications, some references have undoubtedly been missed. For European publications, I have not tried to be complete, mainly because of problems of availability; I have simply listed those which I came across. Publications in Turkey have been systematically omitted, partly because of availability problems, and because these ought eventually to be subject of a separate bibliography. There is only one Turkish publication included, an article by Lees which is part of Lees’ total oeuvre.

The listing has also been restricted to publications which make a substantial contribution to Turkish linguistics, so that if the bibliography seems
to be long, it is not because all the junk is included; the junk has been omitted. For example, there are many articles which mention Turkish briefly in the course of a discussion of something else, or where the discussion of Turkish does not go beyond things already well known by anyone who works on Turkish. The criterion for inclusion was that an article had to make a substantial contribution, either to our knowledge of Turkish, or to the linguistic analysis of Turkish; it had to be interest to Turkish specialists, not just to general linguists.

The listing has also been furnished with abstracts, which meant that I not only collected these things, but also read them. The intention of the abstracts was to give an idea of the coverage of each item, so that someone working in a particular area might know whether an article might be useful before trying to find it. For some items, there is no abstract, which means that the item was unobtainable; this happened particularly in the case of dissertations. Most dissertations, in any case, are abstracted in DAI, and often summarized subsequently by their authors in more accessible publications.

Corrections and additions to this bibliography are still encouraged: there is the possibility of future revised versions, or of supplements. The address is: Robert Underhill, Department of Linguistics, San Diego State University, San Diego, California 92182.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Constructs an analysis for causative sentences in Turkish, French and several other languages by which they are derived by Verb Raising from underlying complex, with CAUSE as a higher verb. Shows that Passive, Reflexive (two types), and Reciprocal cannot apply on the lower cycle, and concludes that Verb Raising must be precyclic.


Develops a lexical, rather than transformational, analysis of Turkish causative verbs, with particular reference to relational grammar.


A study of the acquisition of -DI and -mış past tenses. -DI appears first and contrasts with -iyor as punctual vs. durational aspect. -DI later becomes a general past tense. -mış emerges later and is first used for stative aspect, then past tense, the acquires inferential modality, with hearsay modality being acquired last.


On the acquisition by children of devices for connecting or conjoining two sentences to express cause or reason. The first stage is conjoining without an explicit marker, followed by connectives such as içe or DE, followed by syntactic mechanisms of conjunction or subordination. Çünkü is apparently acquired last.


A portion of the Berkeley Cross-Linguistic Acquisition Project, studying the development of causative sentences. Turkish and Serbo-Croatian speaking children develop the ability to process causative sentences more rapidly than do English or Italian speaking children. The authors suggest that languages which use “local cues” (causative morphology or particles) are easier to process than those that use word order strategies, where the entire sentence must be held in mind for processing.


On the formulation of the rules of consonant harmony and vowel harmony. Particular attention to the dialect described by Lees (1966b), where there is raising and surrounding of vowels before palatal consonants: üsüyüş — [uşşıyış], üsümeyiş — [uşümeyış].


An analysis of passives and causatives by a compositional model which is an offshoot of Montague grammar. Both are derived directly, that is, with minimal use of transfor-
mations. Passives of transitive verbs, derived, intransitives (e. g. *kupi ağladi*), and impersonal passives are built up by different routes, but share the property that one NP argument is missing. Derived transitives (e.g. *kediyi yedirdim*) and causatives of tran-
transitive verbs are built up by two rules that add an extra NP, interpreted as the agent,
to a verb phrase.

Slavistischer Almanach 11-61-88 (Mel'chuk Festschrift).
On the question whether causative in Turkish and Russian should be considered to be a
grammatical voice. Concludes that it should in Turkish, but not in Russian; both causative
and passive in Turkish signal the use of either one NP argument more or less than the
verb is lexically subcategorized for. Most of the discussion is on Russian, and as far as
Turkish is concerned, the argument is a summary of Babby 1981.

DAI 42:3877A; IUM RTA82-03652.

1:349-403.
An examination of the syntax of questions in Turkish in the light of a number of then-
current universal theories about question formation.

Phonétique Appliquée 14-15. Also in Thomas A. Sebeok and Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok,
Mouton, 1976.
A series of articles by members of an expedition that in 1966 studies the whistle language
of the Kusköy area (Giresun vilayeti). The most interesting articles are the two by C.
Leroy, on the ecology of the language: where it is used, who uses it, and for what pur-
poses; and on the spectrographic correlation of the whistled with the spoken language.

Clancy, Patricia, Terry Jacobsen, and Marilyn Silva. 1976. "The acquisition of con-
Sketches the development of conjunction in English, German, Italian, and Turkish,
showing that the semantic notions expressed by conjunction are acquired in the same
order crosslinguistically.

Clements, George N. 1980. Vowel Harmony in Nonlinear Generative Phonology: An Auto-
segmental Model. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
Written in 1976, this paper develops a general theory of vowel harmony, based on Turkish
and several other languages, in terms of the autosegmental model: certain phonological
features, such as Front/Back in Turkish, are treated on an independent level of phonologi-
cal structure, concurrent with and associated with the segmental phonemes. Argues
that exceptions to vowel harmony can be treated in a natural way by this approach,
which also captures the generalization that vowel harmony applies within roots as well
as between root and suffix. (The analysis is substantially modified in Clements and Se-
zer 1982).

Clements, George N., and Engin Sezer. 1982. "Vowel and consonant disharmony in
Turkish." In Harry van der Hulst and Norval Smith, eds., The Structure of Phonological
An important, comprehensive study of vowel and consonant harmony according to the
autosegmental model, treating both in the same framework, and introducing some new
factual evidence. Partly because of the theoretical framework, partly because of the new
data, many of the traditional generalizations about vowel harmony are given up (hence
"disharmony" in the title).
A collection of facts on the use of complements in impersonal passive sentences.

As part of a general typology of causatives, uses Turkish as the ‘paradigm case’. While this is often cited, there is not much here that is new to Turkish studies. There is similar discussion in later Comrie publications, particularly his Language Universals and Linguistic Typology (1981).

Reviews the disadvantages of the various standard approaches to a formal account of vowel harmony, with particular concern for unifying the description of vowel harmony in stems and in suffixes. Suggests the use of a Surface Phonetic Constraint (SPC). Stems will have vowels fully specified, while suffixes will act as a filter to select well-formed stems, and will specify the suffix vowels.

A sociolinguistic study demonstrating that Turkish speakers ascribe social and political attitudes to individuals on the basis of the style of Turkish, on a scale from traditional to reformed (Öztürkçe), which they use.

An analysis of N+N+ possessive compounds, with special attention to the purposes for which these compounds are made, and the semantic relations between modifier and held nouns. There is a summary in Journal of Human Sciences/İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, 1:1 (1982).

Returns to the problem of the “subject participle” -(y)En and “object participle” –DIk, discussed in Underhill 1972 and Hankamer and Knecht 1976, and discusses it from a functionalist point of view. The problem is then addressed again in Knecht 1979.

———. 1981. “Grammatical relations and surface cases in Turkish.” BLS 7:40:49.
Argues that some nouns in dative and ablative cases are grammatical direct objects, while others reflect deep cases other than direct object.

Argues that the unstressable suffixes are actually separate words un underlying structure, so that getirmeyecekisin would be —getir—mi-yeecek—i-sin. Stress would be assigned to the last syllable of each word, and then all stresses to the right of the first stress would be reduced. There are a number of weaknesses in the argument.

Brief note suggesting that stem-final and suffix-initial voicing assimilation in stops (cepte vs. köyde) can be handled by a general constraint that a cluster of two stops medially is always unvoiced. It’s not clear how much this saves.

Description and analysis of obscene rhymes used by boys for verbal duelling, and the structure of exchanges. Analysis of verbal duelling behaviour in social and psychological contexts.


The first longitudinal study of a Turkish-speaking child, from ages 1:2 to 2:4. Finds that because of the OV structure, inflections are more important than word order in distinguishing grammatical relations, and the child consequently focusses early on inflections. Tabulates the order of acquisition of verbal and nominal suffixes and their relative frequency. Provides a considerable amount of developmental data.


An important work on the pragmatic functions of word order variation. Identifies three significant syntactic positions: sentence-initial, immediately preverbal, and postpredicate. Sentence-initial is the topic position, immediately preverbal is the focus, and postpredicate is for backgrounded material.


Looks at verbs which take obligatroy dative objects to see what happens to the embedded subject when the sentence is made causative. In some cases the embedded object stays dative and the subject becomes DO (objective): *(Ben) Aliyi atı bindirdim*; in others the old dative is promoted to objective, and the old subject becomes dative: *Diğerimi ona baktırdım*; and some allow both possibilities: *Çocuğunu derse başladı/ Derisi çocuğa başladı*. Shows that whichever noun is the topic in the embedded sentences goes into the objective and is placed first. In some cases this results in the embedded subject being demoted to 10 and the result corresponds to an English passive: *Diğerimi ona baktırdım*

“I had my teeth taken care of by him.”


Points out some of the basic correlations between word order and discourse pragmatic functions such as topichood.


Somewhat diffusely written, and some of the solutions are farfetched, but this is a good survey of the basic Turkish phonological rules, with thorough collection of the facts, and discussion of how these relate to the kinds of theoretical issues that were important in the 1960's.


On the rules needed to predict the variants /Er/, /Er/, /Ir/ of the aorist morpheme. Shows that if /Er/ is taken as the lexical representation, a Vowel Ellipsis rule is needed to derive /Ir/ and an Aorist Vowel Raising rule changes /Er/ to /Ir/ after polysyllabic stems. Various methods for dealing with exceptions.

Argues that the DI—past is “marked” for affirmation in contrast with the -mIs—past which is unmarked and normally non-affirmative. The —DIr ending which can be added to —mIs (yazmıştır) is an emphatic particle which cancels the non-affirmative meaning of —mIs. Furthermore the apparent parallels between these tenses and Bulgarian and Macedonian past definite and indefinite tenses are deceptive. For a different view on the semantics of —mIs as opposed to —DI see Slobin and Aksu 1982.


Admirativity is defined as the use of a special verb from to indicate surprise. Surveys the expression of admirativity in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish.


Continues the discussion in Friedman 1980. Argues that in Balkan Slavic and Turkish the definite past is marked for confirmativity, while the indefinite past is unmarked and has a variety of functions including admired. In Albanian on the other hand the admired is marked. Also discusses the relationship between admiratives and past or perfect.


A review of the history of planned and unplanned language reform in Turkey from the point of view of language planning. The Turkish experience shows that language planning is most successful when it goes along with other kinds of social change. Points out the difficulties posed by the competing social trends of nationalism and internationalism, particularly Europeanism, and the consequences in the language as Arabic and Persian terms are removed while there is an influx of European terms.


Studies the derivation of constructions like Yazarlar alışlanmak istiyorlar, showing that they are derived by the interaction of Passive and Equi Nnom Phrase Deletion.


An analysis in the framework of Chomsky’s Conditions on Transformations. Complements are divided into two types: Direct Complements (e.g. Herkes biz viki içeceğiz saniyor) and Gerunds (the normal —DIk and —mE complements). Gerunds pattern like noun phrases and are dominated by NP, while Direct Complements are purely sentential. Both types can be finite or non-finite, where finiteness is defined as the presence vs. absence of subject agreement on the verb. Finite complements are subject to the Finite Phrase Condition, a restatement of the Tensed-S Condition; that is, they are inaccessible to the various rules that are not supposed to apply into finite phrases.


Argues, contra Aissen and Hankamer 1980, that the causative is a syntactic rule of clause union rather than a lexical rule. Carries the relational grammar analysis of Turkish forward in a number of respects.


Brief description of two approaches to using a computer to process Turkish texts.
Observes that Turkish has three formally unrelated phonological conditions that
collectively ensure that /o ə/ do not occur in non-initial syllables. Claims that the purpose is
to produce a three-vowel system of archiphonemes A I U in non-initial syllables (before
the application of vowel harmony). The three-vowel system /ai u/ is considered to be
basic in phonological theory.

Very briefly cites Turkish in the course of a larger discussion of Perlmutter's proposed
constraint that the order of morphemes within a word is fixed. Cites Turkish examples
such as geliyordular, geliyorlardı, geldiydim, geldirdi.
Makes an interesting suggestion that the origin of such pairs lies in the ambiguity of the
3rd sg.: geldiydim may be gel+di+di—or gel+di+di+—+di.

Linguistic Sciences 8:2.123-134. Also in Bela Brogyanyi, ed., Current Issues in Linguistic
Briefly discusses the issue raised by Zimmer (1975), whether cases like ayak/ayag should
be handled with underlying /g/ or /k/, and points out that classical phonological theory
supports Zimmer's conclusion.

Available under the title Deletion in Coordinate Structures from Garland Publishing, Inc.,
A lengthy study of porcesses such as conjunction reduction and gapping (Hasan yumurtayı
yedi, Ahmet patlçan) which occur in conjoined sentences, and their interaction with
scrambling and other word-order changing rules. Evidence is drawn primarily from English,
secondarily from Turkish, and also from other languages; the discussion of Turkish is
tightly interwoven with that of English. Attempts to construct a theory of the universal
processes that apply in conjoined structures.

On the derivation of adverbial constructions of the form Hasan geldiği zaman, çay içtiğ.
In these the subject of the embedded sentence has no genitive suffix (compare Hasann
geldiği zaman, çay içiyordu) and the main verb is "inceptive", that is, indicates that the
action begins at the indicated time. Suggests that the absence of the genitive is accounted
for by analogy with adverbial constructions of the form Hasan gelince, çay içtiğ. Concludes
that analogy between sentences can play a role in derivations.

Hankamer, Jorge, and Laura Knecht. 1976. "The role of the subject/non-subject
distinction in determining the choice of relative clause participle in Turkish." Harvard
Returns to the problem discussed in Underhill 1972, the choice between the subject participle
-(y) En and the object participle -DIk. Finds that the choice is not determined
by linear order, but by a principle that if the relativized noun is within the subject constituent
of the relative clause the participle -(y) En is chosen. Also finds that -(y) En is
used whenever the relative clause lacks a subject, either in the case of impersonal passives
(sokağa çıkıyor kapı), or when the subject has been moved by indefinite movement
(kizını arı sakan adam).

Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society.
While this is not generative in any way, it is the indispensable source on language reform.

in English, Italian, Serbo-Croatian, and Turkish." P and RCLD 13. Also in J. Child
Lg. 6:3.529-545 (1979).
One of the tests in the Berkeley Cross-Linguistic Acquisition Project measured the acquisition of locative expressions. The authors find that in all four languages, locatives are learned in the order: (1) 'in', 'on', 'under', 'beside'; (2) 'between', and 'back' and 'front' with objects having inherent nacks and front; (3) 'back' and 'front' with other objects. Italian and Turkish children learn these more quickly than English and Serbo-Croatian-speaking children. Discussion of linguistic and conceptual factors accounting for these differences.


Experiment to determine the perceptual cues used by speakers to distinguish /k/ from /k'/ before /i/; that is, /k/ from /k'/-. The potential usefulness of such an experiment is not explained.


Finds evidence of differential treatment of compounds with respect to various phonological rules, e.g. harbetmek 'make war' vs. harpertesi 'post-war'; hakketmek 'engrave' vs. hakbetmek vs. 'deserve'. Suggests a solution using two different internal boundaries in compounds. There are a number of errors in the data.

Insert following Kardestuncer 1982b:


A thorough study of the syntax of comparative constructions. "Clausal" comparatives such as Orhan Ayşinin aldığından fazla kabak aldı are derived by a rule of Comparative Deletion from deep structures such as Orhan Ayşinin kabak aldığın fazla kabak aldı. In turn, these may be turned into "phrasal" comparatives like Orhan Ayşenden fazla kabak aldı by a rule of Comparative Ellipsis. Extensive discussion of the ways in which these rules operate, and their interrelationship with other syntactic constructions such as impersonal passives and relative clauses.


A reply to Dede 1978b on the use of the genitive suffix in relative clauses. Demonstrates with thoroughness that Dede's rules for the genitive fail to produce correct results.


Argues in a jumbled fashion and very sketchy evidence, that there is some spectrographic evidence for a velar consonant in some cases where Turkish uses the letter "g".

Insert following Knecat 1979 and preceding Konrot 1981a:


For those who can handle the Russian, this is the best data source, particularly for syntax.


Looks at duration, vowel quality, amplitude and fundamental frequency as possible correlates of stress in disyllabic words. Finds that when stress is contrastive, i.e. non-final (e.g. kāma vs kazmā), the first syllable has significantly higher amplitude and pitch than the second. Unstressed final syllables have falling frequency contours while stressed final syllables have level frequency contours.
Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1976. “The cycle again free rule application (evidence from Turkish).” Harvard S and S 2:359-444. Compares cyclical rule application with various forms of free rule application, using evidence from Turkish to see which theory works better. Considers the interactions between Passive, Reflexive, and Subject-to-Object Raising, as well as Equi-NP-Deletion, Relativization, and Subject Incorporation. A good paper to see how these rules work in Turkish.

———. 1977a. “Against the universal relevance of the shadow pronoun hypothesis,” LI 8:2:412-418. Brief note on Perlmutter 1972, showing that some of Perlmutter’s claims are incorrect based on evidence from Turkish.

———. 1977b. “A note on subject raising in Turkish.” LI 8:4:736-742. Disagrees with Pullum (1975). The argument is over whether a rule Subject-to-Object Raising applies in the derivation of sentences like Kız vuruldu sanction. Shows that Turkish speakers disagree on some of the facts connected with this argument, so that for some speakers there is no rule of Subject-to-Object Raising, while for others there is.


Kumbaraci, Türkân E. 1966. “Consonantally conditioned alternation of vocalic morphophonemes in Turkish.” AL 8:1:11-24. Describes the raising and sometimes unrounding of vowels that occurs before /y/ in suffixes, e.g. sakla(y) yan — [sakhyan], üsü(y) yün — [üşiyün] (in some dialects). The description is not generative but served as a point of departure for Lees 1966a.

Kuno, Susumu. 1971. “The location of locatives in existential sentences.” LI 2:3:333-378. Studies existential sentences (e.g. Ayda adam var) in Japanese, English, Turkish, and other languages, and shows that on an underlying syntactic level the locative element in these sentences always precedes the subject.


———. 1980b. “The scope of the question and negation in some verb-final languages.” CLC 16:155-169, esp. 164-167. Shows that the scope of the verbal negative particle in Japanese, Korean, and Turkish is restricted to the immediately preceding verb. Thus in an exchange like Siz Türkiye’de mi doğdunuz? Hayır, ben Türkiye’de doğmadım, the response is anomalous because the scope of the negative extends only to the verb doğmadım, not to Türkiye’de as is the intention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN LINGUISTIC


Lees, Robert B. 1961. The Phonology of Modern Standard Turkish. IUUAS ≠ 6. Bloomington : Indiana U. and The Hague : Mouton. One of the earliest works written within the framework of generative phonology. Although the theory is considerably outdated and there are numerous errors, this is still one of the basic sources on Turkish phonology. See Zimmer 1965 for a number of important corrections.


Another very early paper in generative grammar, illustrating the use of syntactic, lexical, and phonological rules to generate Turkish sentences containing personal endings. Should be read with caution since the theory and analysis are considerably outdated.

1963. The Grammar of English Nominalizations. pp. 195-201. Indiana U. Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, publication ≠ 12. The Hague : Mouton. The very first application of generative syntactic theory to Turkish. At the back of this pioneering work in transformational syntax is an appendix giving a crude analysis of Turkish nominal, participial, and noun compound constructions.

1965. "Turkish nominalizations and a problem of ellipsis." FL 1:2.112-121.

On the syntactic treatment of nominalizations such as Adamın vergi verdiği or Adamın vergi vermesi. Derives these from nominal compounds having head nouns indicating either fact or action : Adamın vergi verdiği olgu, Adamın vergi vermesi hareketi.


A response to Kumberaci 1966, on the raising and unrounding of vowels before suffix-initial /y/ and sometimes other palatal consonants : ye+yecek — [yiyecek], gümüş₃+tür — [gümi₃+tir] (in some dialects). Corrects Kumberaci’s analysis and formalizes four rules for vowel harmony and palatal assimilation.


Exploring and compares in detail a number of different ways of formulating the rules for vowel harmony and consonant harmony and consonant harmony, as well as labial attraction and palatal assimilation.


On the morphophonemic rules required to handle the phoneme /g/, and some discussion of whether this phoneme can be identified with /g/.


Lewis’ grammar is one of the best, perhaps the best, comprehensive grammar of Turkish. Lees' generally favorable review points out some areas where a more modern approach can solve certain problems in phonology and syntax.

Phrase structure and transformational rules to account for the copula. In this analysis the copula has two forms, i– and ol–, and every sentence underlingly contains one or the other, thus every verbal sentence is analyzed as participle plus copula.

Discussion of the four “voice” suffixes, passive –I, reflexive –In, reciprocal –Iš, and causative –DIR, and their possible combinations.

This is not generative in any way, but is the best comprehensive data source, particularly for English speakers.

Although this paper deals with Mongolian rather than Turkish, it is the first of a series of papers that debate the correct way to formulate vowel harmony rules in Turkish and similar languages. Claims that roots are marked with a feature [+ Grave], and all vowels and velar consonants in a word are determined by this feature. The approach is argued against by Zimmer (1967) and Haiman (1972) and later abandoned by Lightner himself (1972).

Touche on a number of topics in Turkish phonology including vowel harmony, labial attraction, consonant harmony, accent, and epenthesis. Both the analysis and the presentation of the facts should be approached with extreme caution.

A very brief note on how to formalize the main stress rule.

Finds examples in 19th. century poetry of inexact rhymes, e.g. yazar/mazer, verildi/sureldig, halidir/doludur, which are taken as evidence for a rhyming convention based on underlying archisegment (neutralized in vowel harmony). The possible influence of Ottoman orthography is not considered.

One of the earliest studies of Turkish syntax in the theory of Syntactic Structures. The theory is now severely out-dated and there are serious shortcomings in the analysis.

Examines the process of Raising, by which the subject of a lower sentence may become the subject of the higher sentence: Sana [büz süt içtik] gibi göründü — Biz sana [süt içtik] gibi göründük. The analysis should be approached with caution since there are a number of errors.

An elaborate theory of Turkish intonation as “speech melody” based upon analogies with music. Some, but not much, instrumental data. While this is not generative, it is one of the very few studies of intonation.
Study of the pragmatic conditions on the non-reflexive uses of kendisi. Shows that the difference between kendisi and o depends on the speaker’s perspective towards the referent.


Uppsala.


Some additional work on the hypothesis of Perlmutter (1978), finding some evidence both for and against the hypothesis.

A relational grammar approach to clauses containing verbs which take the dative, e.g. Derse çalıştı, called “middle clauses.” Shows that for some of these verbs, the object displays properties of a direct object. Proposes a rule of “2-to-3 retreat” : the object starts out as a direct object, and is lowered to indirect object and comes out dative. The argument is supported by an extensive overall survey of the relational grammar analysis of Turkish.

———. 1981. “A boundary analysis of the exceptions to the finalstress rule in Turkish.” Linguistic Notes from La Jolla 8:89-112.
Suggests that the suffixes which do not accept primary stress can be marked with a special boundary. Claims that the suffixes marked with this boundary all constitute higher syntactic predicates.

The primary interest of this somewhat flawed thesis is the collection of facts, both syntactic and discourse, relating to conditions on kendisi(s).

Brief discussion of Turkish as part of a larger argument that relative clause formation leaves behind shadow pronouns in the relative clause which are subsequently deleted.

One of the earliest actual publications in relational grammar, analyzing impersonal passives in Dutch and Turkish. He shows that impersonal passives can be made when the actor is agentive, i.e. acts on its own volition (Bu hapishaneden sık sık kaçılır) but not when it acts unwittingly (*Bu hapishanedan sık sık kaybolunur). Concludes that clauses that allow impersonal passives start with an initial subject (“unergative”), while those that don’t allow impersonal passives start with an initial direct object but no subject (“unaccusative”).

A study of a Turkish aphas to see whether the patterns of languate dissolution resemble those found in European languages. The case study is interesting although the language data are not well handled, particularly the phonology, and the conclusions are vague.


Disagrees with a portion of Aissen 1974b. Argues that Aissen has failed to prove that there is a transformational cycle in Turkish.


Discusses vowel harmony in Turkish and four other languages in light of a phonological theory where rule ordering is determined by universal principles, and rules may apply to partially specified matrices.


A recital of some of the ways in which Turkish vowel harmony can’t be handled by Hooper’s natural generative phonology, pointing out that native speakers have a stronger internalized knowledge of vowel harmony than Hooper’s theory allows.


On the two rules, Y-Ephenthesis and Vowel Deletion, which together function to prevent vowel clusters in surface forms. Evidence that this conspiracy goes back to Orkhan Turkic.


The chief value of this thesis (which is not actually generative) is the listing of Turkish suffixes and their English equivalents.


On the difference between the reflexive pronouns kendi and kendisi. Shows that kendi is used in situations of “empathy”, as defined by Kuno, where the speaker identifies with a participant in the reported event.


Supports the claim of Zimmer (1975) that a k-Deletion rule is preferable to g-Deletion for cases like ayak/ayaga ([ayak]/[ayaga]) and presents additional evidence.


Finds several cases where non-final stresses seems to be determined by syllable structure, with heavy syllables (CVC or CV) in penult or antepenultimate position tending to attract the stress. These include: adverbs in -en (esen vs. nisbeten); place names (Kavakli vs. Sirkeci); many foreign words (lokanta vs. tenere). Stress based on syllable weight are well-known in Indo-European languages but not previously in Turkish.


Some discussion of Turkish in comparison with several other languages, in a general
discussion of how child language and language change are guided by the same basic set of communicative principles.


An extensive overview of the Berkeley Cross-Linguistic Acquisition Project, which in 1972-73 studied the acquisition of English, Italian, Serbo-Croatian, and Turkish. Particular attention to the role of word order systems vs. inflectional systems in early acquisition. Claims that “Turkish is close to an ideal language for early acquisition.”


On the semantics of the evidential particle –mîs. Examines the uses of –mîs for hearsay, inference, and narrative, and its extensions to surprise, irony, and compliments. Concludes that the common feature is that the speaker’s mind is unprepared for the event. Traces the development of inferential –mîs from perfect participle through past tense. Outlines children’s acquisition of –mîs in contrast with –DI.


A comprehensive overview of what is known to date about the acquisition of Turkish, based on the results of the Berkeley Cross-Linguistic Acquisition Project, published and unpublished work of Aksu, and several others.


Studies the processing of simple transitive sentences in, again, English, Italian, Serbo-Croatian, and Turkish. Proposes that in the early stages of sentence processing children construct a schema for the canonical sentence in their language, using word-order and/or inflectional strategies as appropriate. While English-speaking children key on the SVO order of English, Turkish children key very early on objective case marking, and are undisturbed by permutations of word order.


A brief discussions of stress in Turkish words and phrases. While this is not generative, it was until recently one of the few discussions of stress from a linguistic point of view. The traditional approach to Turkish stress is also discussed at the end of Lees 1961.


Another comprehensive grammar, linguistic but not generative, which can serve as a good data source.


An analysis of the role of formulaic expressions in the structure of communication, with examples from Turkish and Modern Greek.


A study of the perception of vowels by speakers of five languages including Turkish. The goal was to determine the dimensions according to which listeners perceive vowels,
the acoustic correlates of these dimensions, and the extent to which these dimensions are universal or language-particular. There are some problems of detail with the Turkish, and the work is lengthy and somewhat difficult, but there are some interesting results on the psychological reality of Turkish phonological structure.


---. 1981. “Yes, he hasn’t” and a few other not’s in Turkish.” BLS 7:317-327.

A review of some cases where pragmatic considerations are needed for the interpretation of various kinds of negatives.

Tura, Sabahat, and Müşerref Dede. 1982. “Sentential and constituent questions in Turkish.” In Robinson Schneider et al., eds., *Papers from the Parasessions on Nondeclaratives*, pp. 228-236. Chicago : CLS.

A review of the syntax of yes-no and question word questions; the use of clefting in questions; and the interaction of word order with discourse functions such as given-new.


The first of a series of papers studying the conditions under which the “subject participle” –(y)En and “object participle” –Dlk are used points out that –(y)En is used in a number of cases where the relativized noun is not strictly the underlying subject of the relative clause. Also points out the existence of an Indefinite Movement rule, by which indefinite (actually, non-specific) subjects and objects are moved into the position next to the verb; this rule precedes the choice of participle. Concludes that –(y) En is used when the head noun is initial in the underlying sentence after Indefinite Movement. There are further contributions by Dede (1978b), Knecht (1979), and especially Hankamer and Knecht (1976).


Intended as a grammar for teaching Turkish to English speakers, but contains enough material so that it can also be used as a reference grammar or data source. Both phonology and syntax are analyzed within the framework of generative grammar, although the generative framework is covert rather than overt for the most part. The second and third printings (1979, 1980; identified on the reserve of the title page) contain a number of corrections over the first printing.


A detailed commentary on Underhill 1976, with a number of observations and corrections (some of which had been made in the second and third printings). A 5-page supplement suggests another way of organizing the teaching of participles.


An important study of the semantics of the tense and aspect suffixes, with a number of significant observations.


A number of points on the semantics of the verbal future marker –(y)EcEk. Shows that it can be used to express not future tense, but presumptive modality: *Ahhmet şimdii evde olacak* ‘presume that Ahmet is home now’; here –(y)EcEk is very similar in meaning to *mEli*. In future reference, –(y)EcEk contrasts with –Iyır in the degree of certainty of the prediction, and with –Ir in the kinds of edivence used for the prediction. The argument is that –(y)EcEk expresses as much modal functions as temporal functions.
Discussion of the meaning of the aorist in contrast with the progressive, arguing that the aorist characterizes an entity in terms of its normal or inherent characteristics, while the progressive reports its behavior. Extends this analysis to the use of the aorist in making future predictions.


Some experiments showing that Turkish speakers are able to productively apply rules of vowel harmony to epenthetic and suffix vowels in nonsense words and loanwords. Nonsense root words which violate vowel harmony are judged acceptable if their vowel patterns match those already common in the Turkish borrowed lexicon.

Returns to the much-discussed question of the relationship between vowel and consonant harmony, using as evidence the epenthetic high vowels inserted in initial clusters in European loans (e.g. spor — spor, tren — tiren). Argues that the nature of the epenthetic vowel is determined by a hierarchy of rules, including (1) assimilation of vowels to back velars (kredi — kuredi, grev — girev); (2) assimilation to palatal [1/] (plaj — plitaj); (3) vowel harmony.

Further study, along the lines of Yavaş 1980c, of epenthetic vowels used to break up initial consonant clusters in loans, e.g. French drame — diram, greve — girev. Some problems that these cause for the theory of Natural Phonology; in particular, whether vowel harmony in epenthetic vowels is a learned (language-specific) rule, or a natural (universal) process.

A survey of a number of aspects of Turkish according to Brame's lexicalist model, called Functional Interpretation.


A highly useful guide to Less' difficult book, making a number of sensible corrections and suggestions. Topics particularly discussed include vowel harmony, consonant harmony, and palatal assimilation.

Argues against both the approach of Lightner 1965 in treating vowel harmony with a lexical feature [Grave] attached to roots, and the approach of Lees 1961 in handling vowel and consonant harmony by the same rule. Shows that vowel harmony in Turkish is a left-to-right assimilation rule, and that after the vowels are determined, they in turn determine consonant harmony.

Sometimes there is no clear choice among several variants of morpheme as to which is to be the underlying, or lexical representation; for example, the choice between the vari-
ROBERT UNDERHILL

ants /lar/ and /ler/ of the Turkish plural. Here universal theories of phonological markedness might specify /lar/ as the lexical representation since /a/ is more unmarked than /e/.

———. 1969. “On specifying the input to the phonological component.” FL 5:3.342-8. Observes that Turkish questions normally end with a rising pitch (↑), e.g. Hasan ne okudu—, but may end with a falling pitch (↓) when there is contrastive stress on some word, e.g. Hasan ne okudu—. However, questions embedded within larger sentences must have rising pitch: Ahmet Hasan’in ne okuduğunu söyledi ↑. This is evidence that the phonological component must have information on syntactic deep structure.


Reports on an experiment designed to determine to what extent native speakers of Turkish are aware of vowel harmony constraints that apply within stems (as opposed to vowel harmony rules applying between stems and suffixes). Concludes that these morpheme structure conditions do not have complete psychological reality.


Examines two different ways of accounting for the morphophonemics of the progressive suffix –Iyor. Argues against the view that the choice between alternative phonological descriptions can be made simply by counting the number of features required to write the rules.


Examines some cases of non-final stress: reduplicated adjectives (apaçık), diminutive adjectives (uvaçık), and vocatives (Mehmet!) Finds that in all cases the initial-stressed forms are emphatic in some way, and constitute syntactically or semantically marked categories.


Discusses the alternation between k and o in such examples as ayak/ayğa (a yak)/a ya wa). Analyzes such as Lees 1961 and Underhill 1976 postulate an underlying /g/ which becomes k by the final devoicing rule (/yaq/ — ayak like /reng/ — renk) and which deletes (or becomes ğ) between vowels. Zimmer points out that these can also be handled with an underlying /k/ and a rule which deletes /k/ intervocally in polysyllables, and suggests that this may correspond more closely to the generalization made by an actual speaker/hearer.


The syntax of causative verbs, including interrelations between causative and reflexive, and causative and passive. Ways of marking the agent (doer of the action) in causative sentences.


Notes that in Turkish words ending in k, k normally deletes before a vowel-initial suffix in the word is a polysyllable (inek/ineği [i ne]) but is retained in a monosyllable (ok, oku). Conducts an experiment using nonsense words ending in k and shows that this regularity is psychologically real for Turkish speakers.
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