Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Özsoy, Sumru A.

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001|LOG_0042

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Sumru A. Özsoy: Review of Gerjan van Schaaik. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1996. 277 pages. ISBN 3-447-03806-3.

Sumru A. Özsoy, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, P.K. 2 Bebek, TR-80815 İstanbul, Turkey.

Studies in Turkish grammar by Gerjan van Schaaik aims at offering a formal analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of Turkish within the framework of Functional Grammar (FG) proposed by Dik (1989). It addresses some of the problematic areas of Turkish morphosyntax that have hitherto been only partially treated in approaches such as Köksal (1975), Hankamer (1986, 1988) and Solak & Oflazer (1991). Nevertheless, the impact of the book should be sought more in the extent of its contribution to the linguistic analysis of the language than in its attempt at formalism. *Studies in Turkish grammar* contains extensive discussion on a wide range of linguistic phenomena and, for some, provides novel approaches and analyses. As such, the book is a source for scholarly investigation into the morphosyntactic properties of Turkish, with insightful observations about the structure of the language that suggest topics for further research.

As pointed out by the author in the introductory chapter, the book is divided into two main sections: "Fundamentals" in Chapters 2-5 and "applications" discussed in Chapters 6-8.

Chapter 1 introduces the basic concepts of Functional Grammar, in particular the notion *term*, and surveys some of the more salient features of Turkish grammar "which are relevant for a minimal understanding of the data which are discussed in the remainder of the book" (p. 2). The discussion of Functional Grammar in Chapter 1 is concise, intending more to give an overall view of the theory and mention its basic constructs relevant to the discussion than to define them in detail. The constructs are more comprehensively explained in the ensuing chapters as they are called upon in relation to Turkish facts.

The outline of the Turkish grammar in the second half of the chapter is necessary only for those who are not already familiar with the language. It touches upon the most basic linguistic phenomena, i.e. the prototypical features of the language, with

no apparent intent to fully describe them at this point. The phenomena mentioned—Vowel Harmony and Consonant Assimilation in phonology, nominal and verbal inflectional paradigms in morphology, and noun phrase (NP) and clausal structures in syntax, the latter focusing mainly on some facts of word order and negation—are all treated more extensively in the pertinent parts of the book in later chapters.

The "fundamentals" chapters deal with various aspects of nominal terms; Chapter 2 morphology, Chapter 3 syntax, Chapter 4 lexical representation and Chapter 5 generation. Chapter 2, "The morphology of Noun Phrases", focuses on the much debated issues of definiteness, referentiality, and specificity in Turkish in terms of morphological marking on PATIENT noun phrases in the canonical VP-internal object position. The chapter comprises mainly two sections (2.1) dealing with *term operators* and (2.2) with *term agreement,* the former predictably constituting the main thrust of the chapter.

On the subject of definiteness, van Schaaik's main claim is that the element *bir,* generally analysed as indefinite article in structures such as *Ayşe bir kitap arıyor* (Lewis 1967, Johanson 1977, Nilsson 1985), is in fact a marker for NUMBER. The analysis is based on the distribution and co-occurrence patterns of the element *bir,* the accusative marker *-(y)I* and the overt plurality marker *-lAr* on the noun. Van Schaaik opposes the traditional account of *bir* as indefinite article by showing that the distinction between definiteness and indefiniteness holds for plural as well as singular noun phrases marked with the accusative suffix *-(y)I* and argues that it is therefore the presence and absence of the accusative marker *-(y)I*, not of *bir,* which needs to be correlated with (in)definiteness. The latter he considers to "express a 'hidden' value for Number" (p. 32).

Consequently, pairs such as *Mehmet Ø kitap arıyor* and *Mehmet bir kitap arıyor* (van Schaaik's 6 and 7 respectively) provide no motivation for him to correlate the presence of *bir* in the second sentence with indefiniteness, but rather with the category Number signalling singularity. To incorporate this analysis into the Functional Grammar framework, van Schaaik proposes to leave the values for the two term operators, i.e. ±definite operator and the number operator, unmarked. Thus, van Schaaik's representation of a (partial) noun phrase structure in Turkish is [*bir*/ØN-pl/Ø-acc/Ø] where *bir*/Ø represents number, pl/Ø plurality, and acc/Ø (in)definiteness.

For van Schaaik, the three-way contrast between the structures *Mehmet bir kitap-Ø arıyor, Mehmet bir kitab-ı arıyor,* and *Mehmet kitab-ı arıyor* (van Schaaik's 23a-c) involves the interplay of discourse-bound constructs of indefiniteness, specificity and definiteness respectively. Specificity is defined as signalling the identifiability of the referent of the term by the speaker while the hearer is expected to "construct" a referent in the sense of Dik (1987).

Van Schaaik's major contribution to the semantic issues related with reference is to contrast "specificity" with "genericity", where specific is taken to mean non-generic and also discourse-referential. Claiming that "not all generic terms are non-referential in an absolute sense", the author distinguishes between two types of generic constructions, i.e. "strong" vs. "weak", where it is claimed that a reverse correlation holds between the type of the generic construction and its degree of referential force. Strong generics are assumed to have weak referential force, while weak generics possess strong referential force. In Turkish, these categories possess morphosyntactic correlates, with the terms in strong generic statements being "zero-marked for subject NPs and /.../ with the accusative for object NPs" (p. 76). Noun phrases in weak generic statements, on the other hand, contain the element *bir* both in singular subjects and objects.

Reserving a more extensive discussion of some of the theoretical as well as analytical issues inherent in van Schaaik's analysis of specificity and genericness to other contexts, we will confine ourselves here to observe that the definition given for specificity, i.e. that which is intended by the speaker, at least for Turkish, should also be extended to include not only what is in the mind of the speaker but also of the subject. Thus, the structure *bir N+acc* in *Mehmet bir kitab-ı arıyor* may, in some discourse context, express reference to what is identifiable by the subject of the sentence, not necessarily merely by the speaker; the speaker, by virtue of this belief / knowledge on the part of the subject, conveys the fact that there exists a book identifiable by someone who is known to him / her as well as the hearer.

Van Schaaik's discussion on definiteness in Turkish, on the other hand, will be commented upon in a slightly more detailed manner. Van Schaaik, having made the claim that "*bir* is the formal expression of singularity" (p. 33), then proceeds to draw upon contextualized evidence to show that *bir* is indeed an inherent indicator of number. A number of arguments can be raised against his claim, however. One very obvious argument, which is also noted by the author himself in a footnote (p. 33), is the fact that Turkish distinguishes between stressed and unstressed *bir* in structures such as *Mehmet BİR kitap yazdı* vs *Mehmet bir kitap yazdı*. The distinction is correlated with the readings assigned to the two structures; while the former unambiguously receives the number reading, the latter is assigned the indefinite reading. Voiding *bir* of its [-definite] feature fails to capture the difference in these two otherwise similar structures. Note that further evidence to the fact that *bir* is not totally devoid of inherent indefiniteness is provided by the fact that one of the indefinite pronouns in Turkish is *biri(si)*.

Furthermore, van Schaaik's claim that the prenominal position is only for Number, raises the question of why Turkish should have two slots for number, both of which, in accordance with the argument presented in the chapter, would be filled

contemporarily. As is well-known, in those cases in which the prenominal number position is filled in a Turkish NP, the affixal slot is obligatorily empty; *iki kitap/*lar*. Thus, the atypical nature of those structures in which both slots are filled, i.e. the constructions with the number adjunct *bir* in prenominal position in which the affixal number slot would be analyzed as being occupied with the null singular marker, is rendered possible by the placement of stress on the prenominal number adjunct. Hence, van Schaaik's analysis, which merely assigns category Number to the prenominal adjunct position, falls short of explaining the difference between these structures.

Moreover, one possible analysis of noun phrase terms not containing *bir* and not marked with the accusative suffix, i.e. the incorporation argument, is left out of the discussion totally. Van Schaaik in fact acknowledges this in a footnote, noting duly that there are counter-arguments to the incorporation analysis of these structures. These are instances of nouns referring to 'unique' entities, such as *Türkçe* and *Kuran*, which, in contrast to predictions based on their semantic properties, are not marked with the accusative marker *-yI* , as in structures such as *Türkçe/*yi konuş-* and *Kuran/*ı oku-*. However, in the reading available to these noun phrases, they refer to an undefined, i.e. indefinite, portion of the entity they identify, not its entirety, and, as such, behave in a manner not different from indefinite nouns. The predications in these cases contrast with structures such as *İngilizce konuş-* and *roman oku-* respectively. As such, these structures do not posit counter-examples to the incorporation argument.

Note that the distinction becomes clearer in the contrast presented by a question such as *Türkçe-yi/*Ø söktün mü artık?* in which the reference is unquestionably to the whole linguistic system of Turkish, hence the ungrammaticality of the structure in which there is no accusative marker on the noun. Similarly, *Kuran-ı oku-*, with the noun phrase marked with the accusative suffix, refers to the action of reading the whole book rather than part of it and contrasts with the structure in which the noun phrase is not marked with the accusative marker, i.e. *Kuran/*ı oku-* as already exemplified above.

Chapter 3 deals with the syntax of noun phrases wherein all noun phrase structures that contain more than one noun with its one or more adjectival restrictors are treated as COMPLEX TERMS "based on a noun plus one or more embedded terms". Discussed in this category are possessive, locative, directional and source embeddings as well as quantification structures. The main aim of the chapter is to propose a set of expression rules for the various noun phrase structures within the Functional Grammar framework, where the economy of the rules proposed constitutes a point of theoretical significance for Functional Grammar. One significant proposal here is the distinction made between the suffix *-SIn* in ablative partitives and the third person

singular possessive suffix, noting that "the suffix *-SIN* in the sequence 'Noun-TEn Card-SIN' (expressing the partitive as a whole) cannot be regarded as a formal element expressing Possessive Concord" (p. 86). He assumes it to be "a *tier* or *linker* connecting two nominal word groups, quite similar to the case of compound nominals" (p. 86). Also left out of the account in the discussion on locative embeddings in which the restrictor is taken to be marked with the locative suffix *-DE* and the relator *-ki*, are those constructions in which the restrictor is marked with the relator *-ki* but not the locative suffix, as in the temporal expression *bugünkü haberler*.

Lexical representations of nominal predicates constitute the theme of Chapter 4. Bound by the tenets of Functional Grammar which rejects transformations, van Schaaik represents the morphophonemic variation in Turkish stems in the form of archiphonemes. The discussion includes Final Stop Devoicing, K/Ø Alternation, Vowel Insertion/Deletion, Degemination and Glottal Stop and Disharmonic Roots. While still superior to the traditional approach of listing roots in their nominative form, the approach nevertheless faces the shortcoming common to archiphoneme analyses—that of assigning dual function to the archiphoneme, i.e. marking the sound unit that either undergoes or triggers change.

Chapter 5 deals with lexical generation. A Phonological Module with two possible models as opposed to a Morphological Module is considered for the process of lexical generation in Turkish. On the basis of psycholinguistic relevance, van Schaaik concludes that a Morphological Module which assumes parametrization of the function STEM into relevant morphological categories such as Number Agreement, Possessive Concord, Case, each related to a certain phonological form, is more appropriate for Turkish. Within the phonological model that operates on fully specified morphological units produced as output of the Morphological Module, a series of rewrite rules which make the necessary phonological adjustments to both root and affixes maps abstract morphological structures onto corresponding phonological forms. An alternate phonological model, on the other hand, assumes partially specified units as input, as opposed to the fully specified ones of the former approach, wherein the phonological and morphological processes are serialized, the phonological output being yielded "as soon as a morphological structure is *sufficiently* specified" (p. 134). Van Schaaik appropriately raises the psycholinguistic relevance of a Phonological Module, both models of which operate on a stem form.

The three "applications" chapters, 6-8, discuss compounding, embedding and similarity constructions respectively. In Chapter 6, van Schaaik proposes a reformulation of the compounding process wherein the *-SI* morpheme that appears on the rightmost element in a compound and is homophonous with the third person possessive marker (and which, as such, has been traditionally analyzed as the third possessor suffix) is claimed to be a distinct morpheme, i.e. compound marker (CM). The

crux of van Schaaik's argumentation lies in determining the level at which the compound marker is attached to the compound. Compounding is analyzed as an output of a Predicate Formation Rule which "produces a compound predicate *without* a Compound Marker" (p. 148). A late (terminal?) expression rule attaches the compound marker to the compound predicate only in those cases where the latter functions as a term. This formulation allows van Schaaik to account for the constraint that prohibits the occurrence of two *-SI* morphemes, the third person possessive marker and the compound marker (in his analysis) in those constructions where both are predicted to occur. See Kornfilt (1986) for an alternate analysis of the phenomenon in a framework which assumes the two forms to be the same, i.e. third person singular possessive marker. In those cases in which the compound is restricted by a possessor, it is the possessive marker, not the compound marker, that is attached to the rightmost element.

Having the compound marker introduced by a late expression rule rather than the syntactic rule of compounding provides van Schaaik the further advantage of generalizing the analysis to some derivational processes as well as accounting for some properties of Turkish compounds in general, such as coordination of either of the terms of a compound.

Chapter 7 deals with non-finite embedded predications in the syntactic frame of a non-verbal negator. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of the morphology of verbal embeddings in Turkish. Although some of the examples illustrating the properties may not be agreed upon by all the speakers of the standard dialect (cf. (10c) with *olan* in parentheses and (11a) on p. 182) and forms other than *-DIK* (as participle and nominalizer) and *-yAn* are not treated (i.e. no mention is made of *-mA* or *-yIş*), the discussion is nevertheless to the point. In the analysis of existential structures based on *var/yok*, van Schaaik, in conformity with the tenets of Functional Grammar, assumes these to be realizations of a predicate operator in a structure in which "a locative predicate is applied to an indefinite term" (p. 185). Structures such as *Nereden gelip nereye gittiğimi bildiğim var mı?* are analyzed as instances of closed predicational terms and the relative clauses *Ali'nin yazdığı kitap* vs. *kitap yazan adam* are analyzed as open predicational terms.

Van Schaaik's innovative approach in this chapter is to view the periphrastic constructions that occur in nominal negated structures, i.e. those embedded under *değil*, as open predicational terms. Focusing on the interpretation of these verbal embeddings as being distinct from the propositional content of those cases in which the verb is used predicatively, van Schaaik claims the former to be "attributive" in function; "the fact that *-mIş* in such PCs does not express 'inferential past' is a clear indication that the verbal complex is a participle, the first argument of which is relativised" (p. 199). Generalizing the implications of this analysis to other predicative

suffixes, van Schaaik derives all verbal forms embedded under *değil* from participle constructions. This leads to the analysis in which the *-yAn* participle is claimed to be the expression of the operator 'prs2' in relative clauses and *-Iyor* in predicative function. A further consequence of the analysis is the proposal that structures such as *İlk önce ben de geri dönmeği ister değilim* (van Schaaik's 69a) are derived from headless relative clauses in which the verbal complex *geri dönmeği ister* predicates over the pronominal term *ben*. Though an ingenious proposal, the likelihood of the analysis needs to be considered. For one thing, note that not all the predicational suffixes in Turkish inherently possess the semantic variation that is neutralized in embedded clauses as in the case of *-mIş*. Thus, generalizing from the particular case of one suffix to all the others lacks the support of independent evidence. Note further that, semantically, what is negated in the *değil* structures is not the actual state of affairs but the assumptions, beliefs or claims about it as presented to the speaker in the previous discourse (cf. Tura 1981). Hence, paraphrasing these structures as open predicational structures, i.e. relative clauses, falls contrary to the function of the structures. What is significant is that all participles with the exception of *-DI* behave similarly with respect to having the person agreement appear on the operator *değil*. *-DI*, on the other hand, exhibits this property only optionally.

Similarity constructions are the topic of Chapter 8. Van Schaaik analyzes *gibi* as a predicate that functions both predicatively and attributively, with the functions being encoded in the position in which *gibi* occurs in the sentence; predicative *gibi* occurs clause finally, attributive *gibi* in prehead position.

With respect to the range of facts it covers as well as the extent of argumentation and analyses it contains, *Studies in Turkish grammar* is a major contribution to the field of Turkish linguistics. Presenting much food for thought for further research on the topics discussed, as well as those not discussed, is much to the credit of any book in linguistics, and van Schaaik's *Studies in Turkish grammar* does just that. The occasional editing flaws in no way interfere with the readability of the text nor deter from its content, although their elimination prior to reprinting will undoubtedly enhance the next edition.

References:

Dik, S. 1989. *The theory of Functional Grammar* (Part 1: The structure of the clause). Dordrecht: Foris.

Hankamer, J. 1986. Finite state morphology and left to right parsing. [Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Tilburg, The Netherlands.]