

Grammaire & Cognition
n^{os} 4 et 5

Combat pour les langues du monde

Fighting for the world's languages

Hommage à Claude Hagège

Sous la direction de

M.M.Jocelyne FERNANDEZ-VEST

L'Harmattan

Sommaire*

Avant-propos

« Je t'aime, les langues ! » par M.M.Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest	17
--	----

I. Bibliographie des travaux de Claude Hagège

Livres, articles, rapports de conférences, comptes rendus.... divers linguistiques et paralinguistiques	27
--	----

II. La Leçon : Des Langues et de l'Humain

Luce Ibañez et Anne Nefussy

Le Tour du Monde en 80 langues	57
--	----

Hélène Albagnac et Frank Javourez

Enseigner une linguistique hédoniste	67
--	----

III. Des langues, du langage, de la traduction

Claire Blanche-Benveniste

L'obligation de complément, le lexique et la catégorie grammaticale . . .	81
---	----

* N.d.E. La ponctuation des articles n'est pas homogène – les guillemets en particulier, dont l'usage diffère entre communautés et écoles linguistiques.

<i>Jacques Brès et Gérard Joan Barceló</i>	
La grammaticalisation de la forme <i>itive</i> comme <i>prospectif</i> dans les langues romanes	91
<i>Tatiana V. Chernigovskaya</i>	
Language origins and Theory of Mind	105
<i>Bernard Comrie</i>	
Quelques remarques sur les constructions bitransitives	115
<i>Marcel Courthiade</i>	
La particule <i>lo/li/le</i> à travers les variétés de la langue rromani	127
<i>Scott DeLancey</i>	
The semantic structure of Klamath bipartite stems	139
<i>Fanny De Sivers</i>	
La peur pour prendre la fuite. Un exemple d'archéologie ethnogrammaticale dans les langues finno-ougriennes	149
<i>Dan Thành Do-Hurinville</i>	
Du verbe au coverbe d'aspect <i>đang</i> . Comparaison avec <i>être en train de</i> , <i>être en cours de</i> , <i>être en voie de</i> , <i>en plein</i>	153
<i>Anaid Donabédian-Demopoulos</i>	
À la recherche de la logophoricité en arménien moderne	165
<i>Marcel Erdal</i>	
Group inflexion, morphological ellipsis, affix suspension, clitic sharing	177
<i>Tiiu Grünthal-Robert et Daniel Le Bris</i>	
L'influence de l'environnement extra-scolaire et linguistique sur l'apprentissage du breton dans un milieu scolaire	191

<i>Paul J. Hopper</i>	
Verb serialization with <i>to take</i> in English, with a note on French and German	199
<i>Anne-Marie Houdebine-Gravaud</i>	
Linguistique et sémiologie : « des signes de la vie sociale »	211
<i>Larry M. Hyman</i>	
Phonological theory and field work: Is the gap widening ?	223
<i>Irina Ivanova</i>	
L'Homme de paroles dans l'histoire de la linguistique russe	235
<i>François Jacquesson</i>	
Langue et langage dans la Bible et autour	247
<i>Marie-Ange Julia</i>	
Evolution des formes dans une linguistique de l'allocutaire : le témoignage du latin	259
<i>Pablo Kirtchuk-Halevi</i>	
LUIT : Language – a Unified and Integrative Theory	271
<i>Yordanka Kozareva</i>	
Version à l'envers : possibilités et limites d'une démarche non conforme à la tradition des traductologues	283
<i>Johanna Laakso</i>	
Literary multilingualism in the Finno-Ugric world	295
<i>Pierre-Yves Lambert</i>	
Emprunts et xénismes dans une épigraphie latine périphérique : les désinences gauloises dans les inscriptions latines gallo-romaines . . .	305

Jacques Le Rider

Malwida von Meysenbug et Friedrich Nietzsche en dialogue
à propos de l'apprentissage précoce des langues étrangères
et de l'éducation polyglotte 317

John Lindow

Folklore's debt to the study of language : Documenting folklore
and documenting language and dialect in the Nordic countries 327

Györgyi Máté

La parole abandonnée, entre langue et culture 339

Martine Mazaudon et Boyd Michailovsky

La Phonologie Panchronique aujourd'hui : quelques repères 351

Helle Metslang

Predicates in Estonian sentences : contact-induced developments ? 363

Salikoko Mufwene

How languages die 377

Takuya Nishimura

De l'agent au possesseur : études de « cas » en japonais méridional 389

Marie-Claude Paris

Nouveau regard sur « Le problème linguistique des prépositions
et la solution chinoise » 401

Bernard Pottier

Concepts et catégories linguistiques 411

François Rastier

Les langues sont-elles des instruments de communication ? 421

Nicole Revel

Stratégies cognitives et orientations spatio-temporelles en palawan.

Perception, action, catégorisation, composition 433

Karmele Rotaetxe

Le basque, langue de demain ? 447

Maria Sheveleva-Chopin

Les contes littéraires : analyse des relations causales

dans la structure sémantico-syntaxique de l'énoncé 459

Anne Szulmajster-Celnikier

Expression interlinguistique d'un affect : la peur 471

Anna Wierzbicka

Do all languages have the same expressive power ? An « NSM »

perspective on semantic variation and universals 483

Tabula Gratulatoria 497

Résumés – Abstracts 505

Group inflexion, morphological ellipsis, affix suspension, clitic sharing

Marcel ERDAL

Introduction

One of the neglected domains of universal grammar is that covered by the four terms appearing in the title of this paper. Although we will deal only with Turkish, the issues raised by the topic have, I think, important implications for language typology as well as for the theories of morphology and syntax. It is therefore a great pleasure to make this into a small contribution honouring Claude Hagège – one of the most original thinkers in these domains of linguistic science.

The first three terms of our title have been used for referring to expressions such as *Jack, Jim and Jill's trip*, where the *scope* of the single genitive suffix also covers the first two names. The three proper names can be thought of collectively as a '*group*' NP, or two genitive suffixes can be thought of as having gone missing through *ellipsis* or as having gotten *suspended* till the appearance of the last element in a row of coordinated but fused structures. A diachronic explanation would point towards the *sharing* of the *cliticised* pronoun *his*, said to be the source of the 'genitive *s*' in English: According to this explanation, *Jack, Jim and Jill* started out as topicalised nominatives moved to the left periphery, subsequently to be integrated into the sentence structure by a resumptive pronoun. Synchronically, however, *Jack* and *Jim* are not – contrary to appearances – nominatives, but rather truncated genitives whose 'real' morphological shape gets recuperated further on in the string of words. The option of group inflexion – a special case of 'phrase marking' – exists only if *Jack, Jim and Jill* form a 'natural' or pre-established group.

Languages appear to differ considerably as to the degree to which they allow parts of words to be shared by parallel syntactic structures. In some Western European languages the phenomenon could be termed '*ellipsis*': The shared suffixes in (1) and (2) (both created secondarily from downgraded Latin nouns) or the lexical stem plus the infinitive suffix in (3) do not belong to the inflectional system:

- (1) This stuff is neither eat—¹ nor drinkable,²

¹ '—' appears in places where there could have been a meaningful language unit if the syntactic structure within which the word appears had not been in parallelism with another such structure.

(2) *completa— y perfecta-mente* (Spanish)

complete.FEM and perfect.FEM-ADV

‘completely and perfectly’.

(3) *Be— und Ent-lad-en verboten!* (German)

‘It is forbidden to load or unload (vehicles here)’.

In Turkish, on the other hand, suffix suspension and clitic sharing are a central structural feature of morphosyntax, probably because all of its morphology consists of suffixes.³

Turkish NP coordination

In languages I have come across, suspension behaves differently in inflection and derivation. As with the Western European languages referred to, the suspension of Turkish derivational elements applies only to fully productive and phonologically as well as semantically perfectly regular ones; still, it is exceedingly rare, the exception rather than the rule. The following examples show adjective-forming *-lI*,⁴ abstract-forming *-lIK* and *-cI*, which forms names for professions:

(4) *sarı—, kırmızı— ve siyah-lı bayrak*

yellow red and black-DERIV flag

‘the (German) flag with yellow, red and black’.

(5) *Kum— ve çakıl - cı gel - di*

sand and gravel-PROF come-PST

‘The supplier of sand and gravel has arrived.’⁵

(6) *Meslektaş— ve de arkadaş - lığ - ımız sık sık gör - üş - me - miz - e sebep ol - uyor.*

² The example is from Frans Plank, who organized Affix Suspension Day on June 24th 2006. An earlier version of this paper was presented at that meeting, and other work presented on that occasion has influenced my thought on this matter. Some of my examples come from Kabak 2007, who deals with the same topic but takes a different view of it. Kornfilt 1996 is the first serious attempt to solve the problems involved.

³ On the other extreme we find Arabic and Hebrew, which appear to bar the phenomenon completely: Their morphology is word-pattern oriented and involves prefixes and suffixes as well as infixes.

⁴ When quoting affixes, *I* stands for *i*, *ı*, *u* and *ü*, *A* for *a* and *e* alternating according to vowel harmony. Letters in parentheses, as in *-(y)Ip* or *-(I)m*, are dropped according to phonotactic rules, vowels when preceded by vowels, consonants when preceded by consonants. Consonants appear in capital letters to indicate alternation between voiceless and voiced phonemes. ‘-’ shows morphological juncture; we have placed ‘+’ before clitics.

⁵ Non-suspension (*Kum-cu ve çakıl-cı gel-di*) would generally be understood to imply that ‘the supplier of sand’ and ‘the supplier of gravel’ were two different persons (note the repetition vs. the non-repetition of *the supplier* in English) making suspension referentially significant in such cases.

Colleague and also friend-ABSTR-1PL close close see-COOP-NMNL-1PL-DAT cause become-PROGR

'Since we are both colleagues and friends, we see each other quite often.'

Turkish nominal inflection, to which we now turn, never marks words but merely the heads of phrases. Phrase marking applies to hierarchical or subordinative structures; non-marking of satellites⁶ is obligatory. Affix suspension, on the other hand, applies to structures coordinated either by conjunction or by disjunction; this is mostly an optional process. Turkish NPs inflect for number, possession and case; the locative and genitive suffixes can be followed by a converter *-ki*; (7) shows *-ki* converting a local expression into a satellite. NP sequences can share chains of inflectional affixes by suspension; in (7), e.g., all four possible nominal suffixes:

- (7a) *kapı— ve pencere - ler - imiz - de - ki kilit-ler*
 door and window-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV lock-PL
 'the locks on our doors and windows'

The full form and some partial suspensions are just as acceptable; all are synonymous with (7a):

- (7b) *kapı - lar - imiz - da - ki ve pencere - ler - imiz - de - ki kilit-ler*
 door-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV and window-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV lock-PL

- (7c) *kapı - lar - imiz— ve pencere - ler - imiz - de - ki kilit-ler*
 door-PL-1PL and window-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV lock-PL

- (7d) *kapı - lar - imiz - da— ve pencere - ler - imiz - de - ki kilit-ler*
 door-PL-1PL-LOC and window-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV lock-PL

It does not, however, seem possible to leave the plural suffix standing by itself; one possible reason for the unacceptability of (7e) could be the preclusion of ambiguity:

- (7e) **kapı - lar— ve pencere - ler - imiz - de - ki kilit-ler*
 door - PL and window-PL-1PL-LOC-CONV lock-PL
 i. 'the locks on our doors and windows' or
 ii. 'the doors and the locks on our windows'

Economy is not the only motive for suspension: Suspension also signals cognitive affinity among the referents of the coordinated NPs. This may be why (8a) sounds more acceptable than (8b):

⁶ e.g. adjectives, nouns, numerals or relative clauses which qualify the head.

(8a) *Komşu— ve arkadaş-lar - in - a kitab - ı ver - di - n +mi?*
 neighbour and friend-PL-3SG-DAT book-ACC give-PST-2SG Q
 ‘Did you give the book to your neighbours and friends?’

(8b) ??*Komşu— ve arkadaş - in - a kitab - ı ver - di - n +mi?*
 neighbour and friend-3SG-DAT book-ACC give-PST-2SG Q
 ‘Did you give the book to your neighbour and friend?’

The utterer of (8a) presumably feels neighbours and friends in general to be the natural recipients of the book; if (8b) is to refer to a single neighbour and a single friend (not co-referent with the neighbour), there would be no reason to bracket them together by making them share morphology.

Economy also has its price; (9a) can only signify ‘I’ve brought some food for my cats and dogs’ but (9b) is ambiguous between that and ‘I’ve brought some food for my *cat* and my dogs’:

(9a) *Kedi-ler— ve köpek-ler-im-e yem getir - di - m*
 cat-PL and dog-PL-1SG-DAT food bring-PST-1SG

(9b) *Kedi— ve köpek-ler-im-e yem getir - di - m*
 cat and dog-PL-1SG-DAT food bring-PST-1SG

The shape of the suspended sound sequence and of the target form enabling its reconstruction need not be identical, though their difference follows phonological rules; the first word in (10) can be reconstructed as *dün-kü*:

(10) *dün— ve bu sabah - ki fırtına-lar*
 yesterday and this morning-CONV.storm-PL
 ‘the storms of yesterday and this morning’

Summing up this section one might say that *all* of nominal morphology is suspendable, under conditions determined by phonology, pragmatics, text organisation and world knowledge.

Turkish clause coordination

Studying the coordination of clauses and sentences we will not look only at *ve* ‘and’ but also at other conjunction and disjunction operators, e.g. *hem ... hem ...* ‘both ... and’, *ne ... ne ...* ‘neither ... nor’, *ya ... ya ...* ‘either ... or’, *ya da*, *veya* and *yoksa* all roughly signifying ‘or’, *ve de* ‘and, moreover’ or *da ... da ...* ‘both ... and’; repeated interrogation with the clitic particle *mi* can, further, be applied to all of these.

Acceptability will depend, among other things, on a felicitous combination of lexeme and operator semantics.⁷

Turkish *ve* is of rather limited use in the actual language of Turkey. Idiomatic Turkish prefers mere juxtaposition, non-terminal conjuncts being characterised by *rising*, terminal ones by *falling* intonation, or the 'continuative': When the conjoined predicates are verb forms, all except the last one in a series are so-called contextual converbs with the suffix *-(y)Ip*, which corresponds to the Japanese 'continuative' morpheme. The function of *-(y)Ip* is to indicate that a verb stem to which it is added is to be understood together with all the categories expressed by the inflexional morphology of the last verb in the series of coordinated verbs.

The use and acceptability of suspended affixation differs from operator to operator; testing all of them in context we will reach a very simple rule – to be demonstrated below:

- (11) a. Verbal suffixes are suspended only through the 'continuative' / 'contextual converb' strategy;
- b. Any bound elements suspended by simple deletion in coordinated predicative structures are clitics.
- c. Clitics as listed below can be suspended in any type of coordination of morphologically identical forms, semantics and pragmatics permitting.

The subject pronouns *(y)Im* 'I', *sIn* 'you (sg.)', *(y)Iz* 'we' and *sInIz* 'you (pl. or polite)',⁸ the interrogative particle *mI* for yes/no questions, the copula forms *(y)mIş* (indirective), *(y)dI-* (past) and *(y)sA-* (conditional),⁹ the epistemic particle *dIr* and the temporal and logical conjunction *(y)ken* 'while' are clitics¹⁰ on the grounds listed under (12):

- (12) a. *Affixes* are joined to *stems* of *specific* word classes, often represent the grammatical categories defining these classes or help them get embedded into syntactic constructions;

⁷ The fact that suspension at all takes place under disjunction also speaks against the 'group inflexion' approach.

⁸ Turkish, like e.g. French, has two sets of subject pronouns, a clitic set which is obligatory and a prosodically free set used for topicalization: *sIn* 'you (sg.)' corresponds to French *tu*, *sen* 'you (sg.)' to French *toi*; *ylz* 'we' (*yUz* in early Anatolian Turkish) corresponds to clitic *nous*, *biz* 'we' to free *nous*. As in French, the Turkish clitic pronouns evolved from the free ones. Because Turkish sentences with nominal predicates (unlike French) need no copula if they are in the present indicative, many scholars have wrongly thought that the clitic pronouns *are* the copula. Modern Greek has a similar doubling of personal pronouns serving topicalization, though not for the subject. *Iar* 'they' is presumably distinct from the homophonous plural suffix, which shows the same distribution but is stressed by most speakers.

⁹ *(y)dI-* and *(y)sA-* inflect for reference to the subject. Forms of the copula are clitic also in Khaladj, an archaic Turkic language where the copula has retained its original phonic size. Clitic copulas are known also from early Indo-European.

¹⁰ This is only a partial list; the matter is dealt with in greater detail in Erdal 2000. Some scholars have been misled into thinking that some Turkish clitics are affixes because some of them are spelled together with their hosts and because most of them follow vowel harmony. This paper will depart from standard Turkish orthography in spelling clitics separately.

clitics are hosted by *words* belonging to a *variety* of word classes and have little to do with the grammatical profile of these words.

- b. No word gaps are possible between stems and *suffixes*; certain words can intervene between hosts and *clitics*, bearing stress and affecting the *clitics*' vowel harmony
- c. *Suffix* juncture and *clitic* juncture differ in various details
- d. *Suffixes* often bear normal word stress while *clitics* never do. Most Turkish words are stressed on the last syllable, also when this is a *suffix* or part of a *suffix*, but stress does not carry on to the *clitic* (one possible exception, *LAr*, is mentioned in footn. 10).
- e. *Clitics* always follow *suffixes*;
- f. *Suffixes* have fixed places while *clitics* can sometimes switch places
- g. *Clitics* can be assigned to word classes, as just mentioned.

Coordination of clauses without verbal lexemes as predicates

There follow some examples for clitic suspension (13a-20a) and for non-suspension (13b-20b). The only inflecting verb is here the clitic copula, whose stem is *y-* if preceded by a vowel but *Ø* if the preceding word ends in a consonant; it only has an indicative past, an indirective and a conditional:

(13a) *Ne zengin —, ne ünlü' +sün*

Neither rich neither famous +you (sg.)

(13b) *Ne zengin' +sin, ne ünlü' +sün*

Neither rich +you (sg.) neither famous +you (sg.)

'You are neither rich nor famous'

(14a) *ev - de —, sokak-ta — veya bahçe-de' +y - se - n - iz*

house-LOC street-LOC or garden-LOC +COP-COND-2-PL

(14b) *ev - de' +y - se - n - iz, sokak - ta' +y - sa - nız veya bahçe-de' +y - se - n - iz*

house-LOC +COP-COND-2-PL street-LOC +COP-COND-2PL or garden-LOC +COP-COND-2-PL

'if you are at home, on the road or in the garden'

(15a) *Ya üzgün —, ya da yorgun' +sun +dur*

either sad either also tired +you +EPIST

(15b) *Ya üzgün' +sün +dur ya da yorgun' +sun +dur*

either sad +you +EPIST either also tired +you +EPIST

'You must be (= I presume you are) either sad or tired.'

(16a) *Hem gündüz — hem gece' +yken*

both daytime both night +while

(16b) *Hem gündüz' ken hem gece' +yken*

both daytime +while both night +while

'both during the day and at night'

(17a) *Zengin — ve ünlü' değil +Ø - miş + iz*

rich and famous not (COP)-INDIR +we

(17b) *Zengin' değil +Ø - miş +iz ve ünlü' değil +Ø - miş +iz*
 rich not +(COP)-INDIR +we and famous not +(COP)-INDIR +we
 'They are saying that we are not rich and famous.'

(18a) *Zengin — ya da ünlü' +y - dü*
 rich or also famous +COP-PST

(18b) *Zengin' +Ø-di ya da ünlü' +y-dü*
 rich +(COP)-PST or also famous +COP-PST
 '(S)he was either rich or famous.'

(19a) *Ameri'kalı gibi +mi — yoksa Fransız' gibi +mi +yim?*
 American like +Q or French like +Q +I

(19b) *Ameri'kalı gibi +mi +yim yoksa Fransız' gibi +mi +yim?*
 American like +Q +I or French like +Q +I
 'Am I like an American or a Frenchman?'

The clitic elements are like suffixes in showing alternation in vowel harmony: *+sin ~ +sün ~ +sun* 'you' in (13) and (15), *+y-se-n-iz ~ +y-sa-n-ız* 'if you are' in (14), *+dur ~ +dür* 'presumably' in (15), *+y-dü ~ +du* 'was' in (18). They are unlike suffixes in being unstressed¹¹ and in getting separated from their scope by various words which become their hosts: In (17a) *+(y)mış*, the indirective form of the copula, is separated from *ünlü*, the last word in its scope, by the negative copula *değil*, which is a full word and determines the shape in which *+(y)mış* is realized: as *+ymüş* after *ünlü*, but as *+miş*, syncopated and in a different harmony class, after *değil*. Similarly in 19a, where the harmony class of *+mi* and *+yim* is determined by the postposition *gibi* 'like' and not by the nouns *Fransız* 'Frenchman' and *Ameri'kalı* 'American'. They are unlike suffixes also in having the ability to switch places, e.g. the pronoun *+sIn* and the epistemic particle *+dlr* in (15a):

(15c) *Ya üzgün —, ya da yorgun' +dur +sun*
 either sad either also tired EPIST you (sg.)

involves the additional epistemic notion of having caught a bit of information hidden by the addressee (linked to a particular intonation). Turkish *suffixes* never switch places.

Instances of coordination including forms of verbal lexemes

When verb forms are coordinated, verbal affixes are not suspended, in accordance with the rule formulated in (11); note the suspension of the interrogative particle after *oku-sun*:¹²

¹¹ Stress has been marked in the relevant prosodic units.

¹² Not all clitics can, in any case, be added to all verb forms: *+dlr*, a marker of epistemic modality, e.g., is incompatible with markers of deontic modality such as the imperative forms or *-mAll* 'must'.

- (20a) *Kitap oku - sun — ya da film seyret - sin mi?*
 Book read-IMP.3SG or also film watch-IMP.3SG +Q
 ‘Should (s)he read books or watch movies?’¹³

If *-sIn*, the suffix of the 3rd person imperative in (20), could have gotten suspended, the remnant would not just have been a stem but, in fact, the 2nd person imperative; it would not even have been the 3rd person singular, which is the default person:

- (20b) **Kitap oku — ya da film seyret - sin mi?*
 Book read or also film watch-IMP.3SG +Q
 Intended meaning: ‘Should (s)he read books or watch movies?’

Nor is morphological suspension possible when the remnant refers to the (otherwise default) unmarked 3rd person, whether from a lexical verb (21a) or from a clitic (22a):

- (21a) **Ev-imiz - i sat - sa— ve bir dükkân al - sa y - dı - k iyi ol - ur du*
 house-1PL-ACC sell-COND and one shop buy-COND COP-PST-1PL good become-AOR (COP-)PST
 Intended meaning: ‘It would be good if we sold our house and bought a shop.’

- (22a) **Ev - in - i sat-mış + Ø - sa— ve Türkiye -ye dön-müş + Ø - se - n*
 house-2SG-ACC sell-PF +(COP)-COND and Turkey-DAT return-PF +(COP)-COND-2SG
 Intended meaning: ‘if you have sold your house and returned to Turkey’

In (21a), the intended subject of *sat-sa*□ is the 1st pers. pl., whose conditional form is *sat-sa-k*; in (22a) the intended subject of *+Ø-sa*□ is the 1st pers. sg., which would, in this context, be *sa-n*.

The aorist suffix in (23a) cannot get suspended although there is, of course, no problem in suspending the subject reference which, in this case, is clitic:

- (23a) **git—, gör— ve al - ır' +sin - ız*
 go see and take-AOR +you-PL
 Intended meaning: ‘You (pl. or polite) can go (there), see (it) and take (it).’

- (23b) *gid-er —, gör-ür — ve al - ır' +sin - ız*
 go-AOR see-AOR and take-AOR +you-PL
 ‘You (pl. or polite) can go (there), see (it) and take (it).’

¹³ No alternative question; the expected answers are ‘Yes’ or ‘No’. It could refer to a patient who had undergone eye surgery. Alternative questions need the double use of the interrogative particle *mi*, as in (19).

The allomorph of the aorist suffix after the verbal negation suffix *-mA-* is *-z*:

- (23c) *git - me - z —, gör - me - z — ve al - ma - z' +sin - ız*
 go-NEG-AOR see-NEG-AOR and take-NEG-AOR +you-PL
 'You (pl. or polite) needn't go (there), see (it) or take (it).'

The distinction between affixes and clitics is not a matter of paradigms but of specific word forms; no suspension is possible in the negated 1st person singular, whose expression is morphological, unlike the other negated persons of the aorist:

- (24) **git - me - Ø —, gör - me - Ø — ve al - ma - Ø - m*
 go-NEG-(AOR) see-NEG-(AOR) and take-NEG-(AOR)-1SG
 Intended meaning: 'I will not go (there), see (it) or take (it).'
- ¹⁴

When two different verb forms are conjoined, no clitics can be suspended:

- (25) **Diş-ler - in - i bugün de fırçalı - yor, yarın da fırçalı-yacak - sın*
 tooth-PL-2SG-ACC today also brush-PROGR tomorrow also brush-FUT +you (sg.)
 Intended: You are brushing your teeth today and will also brush them tomorrow (with shared 'you').

If a suspended clitic inflects for person, the subject is allowed to appear only in the clitic verb but not adjacent to the conjoined verbs; this is a 'conspiracy', as the subject inflection of *+(y)dl* and *+(y)sA* is obligatory:

- (26) *Hem çalış-acak — hem eğlen-ecek +Ø - ti - k*
 Also work-FUT also have.fun-FUT +(COP)-PST-1PL
 'We were going both to work and to have fun.'

If both a suspended clitic verb form and the conjoined verbs express person by clitic pronoun, person reference is not obligatorily suspended (27b); an inversion among the clitics (27c) added to the second conjoint is acceptable with some doubt:

- (27a) *Ne yemek ye - meli — ne bir şey iç - meli +y - miş +ler*
 Neither food eat-MUST neither one thing drink-MUST +COP-INDIR +they
 (27b) *Ne yemek ye -meli +ler — ne bir şey iç - meli +ler +Ø - miş*
 Neither food eat-MUST +they neither one thing drink-MUST +they +(COP)-INDIR
 (27c) *? Ne yemek ye -meli — ne bir şey iç - meli +ler +Ø - miş*
 Neither food eat-MUST neither one thing drink-MUST +they +(COP)-INDIR
 'I have been told they must neither eat nor drink anything.'

¹⁴ The difference between the 1st person singular and the other persons affects also the placing of the interrogative particle: 'Won't you take (it)?' is *al-ma-z +mı +sin?* (take-NEG-AOR +? +you), 'Won't I take (it)?' *al-ma-Ø-m +mı?* (take-NEG-(AOR)-1SG +?); *mı* stands before the person marker in 2nd person singular but after it in the 1st person singular. *mı* is also after the person marker e.g. in *al-ma-dı-m mı?* (the 2nd person singular of the past tense, which also has a morphological paradigm).

In view of (27d), suspension *could* (at least in this case) even function from right to left:

(27d) ? *Ne yemek ye - meli +ler +Ø - miş, ne bir şey iç - meli +ler —*

Neither food eat-MUST +they +(COP)-INDIR neither one thing drink-MUST +they

‘I have been told they must neither eat nor drink anything.’

The verbs of (25)-(27) do not themselves inflect for person; what refers to their subject – clitic pronouns in (25) and (27) and an inflected clitic copula form in (26) – can therefore get suspended.

Some speakers accept the structure of (21a) if the conjunction is replaced by a disjunction:

(28) ? (*Artık hiç paramız kalmamıştı.*)

Ev-im-iz - i sat - sa— veya (~ ya da) başka bir ev - e

house-1-PL-ACC sell-COND or (~ or also) different one house-DAT

taşın - sa +y - dı - k belki idare ed - er +Ø - di - k

move.intr-COND COP-PST-1PL perhaps arrangement do-AOR (COP-)PST-1PL

‘(Finally we had no money left at all.) If we were to sell our house or move to a different one, we would perhaps manage.’

If, however, we have an analytical verb phrase with a suspendable clitic verb inflecting for person (29a), the subject *may* also be expressed by the auxiliary copula instead of the lexical verb (29b):

(29a) *ye - di - k —, iç - ti - k — veya uyu - du - k +Ø - sa*

eat-PST-1PL drink-PST-1PL or sleep-PST-1PL +(COP)-COND

‘if we ate, drank or slept’

(29b) ??*ye-di —, iç-ti — veya uyu-du +y - sa - k*

eat-PST drink-PST or sleep-PST +COP-COND-1PL

‘if we ate, drank or slept’

(29) becomes impossible, at any rate, when *ve* ‘and’ is used as conjunction:

(30a) **ye - di —, iç - ti — ve uyu - du +y - sa - k*

eat-PST drink-PST and sleep-PST +COP-COND-1PL

Intended meaning: ‘if we ate, drank and slept’

The continuative

There is a typical Turkish way to suspend shared verbal categories under coordination, which is to add the converb suffix *-(y)Ip* to all non-final conjuncts; everything

expressed by the inflectional morphology of the final conjunct is then understood to hold for preceding verbs as well:

- (21b) *Ev-imiz - i sat - ıp bir dükkân al - sa y - dı - k iyi ol - ur +Ø du*
 house-1PL-ACC sell-CONT one shop buy-COND COP-PST-1PL good
 become-AOR (COP-)PST

‘It would be good if we sold our house and bought a shop.’

- (22b) *Ev - in - i sat- ıp Türkiye-ye dön-müş + Ø- se-n*
 house-2SG-ACC sell-CONT Turkey-DAT return-PF +(COP)-COND-2SG
 ‘If you have sold your house and returned to Turkey’

- (30b) *yi - yip iç - ıp uyu - du +y - sa - k*
 eat-CONT drink-CONT sleep-PST +COP-COND-1PL
 Intended meaning: ‘if we ate, drank and slept’

CONT stands for ‘continuative’, one of the terms for the Japanese suffix we see in (31b):¹⁵

- (31a) *Taroo-ga uta-ta sosite Hanako-ga odot-ta*
 T.-NOM sing-PST and H.-NOM dance-PST
 ‘Taroo sang and Hanako danced.’

- (31b) *Taroo-ga uta - i (sosite) Hanako-ga odot-ta*
 T.-NOM sing-CONT (and) H.-NOM dance-PST
 ‘Taroo sang and Hanako danced.’

Fukushima gives further examples, e.g. one in which contents glossed by BEGIN-APPEAR PAST MIGHT-Q and translated as “might N. have appeared to begin to V?” (with the interrogative particle *ka* equivalent to Turkish *mi*) are shared by using the suffix *-i*. One important difference between the two languages is that the Japanese morpheme is used also when the subjects of the two verbs are different, whereas the subject of a Turkish *-(y)Ip* form is generally identical with that of its target.¹⁶ Unlike other Turkish converb suffixes, *-(y)Ip* is, itself, completely void of meaning, and can be used with any series of verbs under conjunction though not under disjunction. In cases where both suspended affixation and the continuative are possible options, the continuative may signal the closer juncture of the two; (23a), e.g., can become (23d), where *-ip* stands for *-er +sin-iz* (which is indeed an option even when the suffix of the second verb is suspended):

¹⁵ Quoted from Fukushima 1999, who deals with the matter exhaustively; in this paper he actually calls it ‘conjunctive’, and another term which has been used is *renyookei* ‘gerundive’.

¹⁶ This limitation had only a weak existence in Ottoman Turkish. In modern Turkish *-(y)Ip* subjects can be different from the main subject if they are not agentive (e.g. if they refer to weather conditions).

- (23d) *gid - ip gör-ür — ve al - ır' +sin-iz*
 go-CONT see-AOR and take-AOR +you-PL
 'You (pl. or polite) can go and see (it) and (then) take (it).'

The conjunction *ve* (taken over from Arabic) is excluded from appearing after *-(y)Ip*, but the (originally Turkish) *da* (which has a similar meaning in certain contexts) can well be added after it:

- (32a) *Çalış - ip da mı para kazan-acak +sin-iz?*
 Work-CONT +PRT +Q money earn-FUT you-PL
 (32b) *Çalış-acak +sin-iz da mı para kazan-acak +sin-iz?*
 Work-FUT you-PL +PRT +Q money earn-FUT you-PL
 (32b) *Çalış-acak — da mı para kazan-acak +sin-iz?*
 Work-FUT +PRT +Q money earn-FUT you-PL
 'Is it by working that you will earn money?'

The scope of the verbal negation suffix *-mA-* of a terminal verb *can* include *-(y)Ip* forms preceding it; when the continuative is followed by the particle *da*, this shows non-inclusion. *-(y)Ip* will even allow for suspension of the causative suffix, which is derivational though quite regular:

- (33) *Kapı - yı aç - ip kapat - ır - dı - m*
 door-ACC open-CONV close(tr.)-CAUS-PST-1SG
 'I had the door opened and closed'
 (34) *Oda - m - ı sil - ip süpür - t - tü - m / süpür - t - tür - dü - m*
 room-1SG-ACC clean-CONV sweep-CAUS-PST-1SG / sweep-CAUS -CAUS-PST-1SG
 'I had my room thoroughly cleaned'.

Recourse to the continuative cannot be called morphological ellipsis, as this regular morphological means is no truncation; nor is there group inflection of the series of verbs, as there is no \emptyset in the non-final member(s) of the series. *-(y)Ip* is, however, a means for the over-the-board sharing of both affixes and clitics, and therefore equivalent to affix suspension as we find it in the nominal domain. Conjunction with *ve* 'and' is *unidiomatic* for most verb forms; *this* way of conjoining is. *-(y)Ip* is a suffix and clitic suspender for both finite and infinite verb forms. The logic behind this must be the fact that the bare verb stem is identical to the singular imperative.

Conclusion

Turkish thus gives speakers all possibilities for suspending any affixes and clitics and getting them shared by parallel syntactic and morphological structures, if they so wish, and if not prevented by semantic and pragmatic constraints. There are two salient motives for doing so: One is economy; the other, not less important one, is the organization of information by stronger or weaker juncture.

- Non-final noun phrases in coordination can suspend any suffix or clitic or any suffix or clitic series, unless the retention of an element serves a particular non-grammatical purpose.

- Coordinated predicative structures showing full morphological parallelism can share clitic elements but not affixes.

- In any series of morphologically identical predicative verb forms conjoined by ‘and’, all non-final conjuncts can take the continuative converb suffix *-(y)Ip*, which then stands for any inflectional or clitic clusters of elements uttered in the last conjunct; ‘inflectional’ includes all TAM suffixes, all suffixes serving transposition of the verb into the nominal, adjectival or adverbial functional domains, normally the suffix of verbal negation *-mA-* and even, under certain conditions, the causative suffixes, which are classified as derivational.

The noun / verb distinction in suspension strategies has just been explained by the fact that the non-inflected verbal stem (including the causative or passive suffixes and the negative suffix *-mA-*) is identical with the imperative, to which the primordial addressee is expected to react immediately and absolutely. It also seems to be the case, on the other hand, that juncture is looser in nominal than in verbal morphology at least in Altaic languages; this is one of the points made by Kabak & Plank on Turkish and Korean, and some Mongolic evidence points in the same direction.

References

- ERDAL Marcel, 2000, ‘Clitics in Turkish’, in Göksel, Aslı & Celia Kerslake (eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Oxford ... 1998. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, *Turcologica* 46, 41-48.
- FUKUSHIMA K., 1999, ‘Bound morphemes, coordination and bracketing paradox’. *Journal of Linguistics*, 35, 297-320.
- KABAK Barış, to appear, Turkish suspended affixation, *Linguistics*, 45; also presented at Affix Suspension Day (see footn.2).
- KABAK Barış & Frans PLANK, ‘Where flexion encroaches on agglutination in Turkish and Korean’, 30p., Available on the internet under http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/a20_11/plank/KabakPlank-TurkishKorean.pdf ; unpublished.
- KORNFILT Jaklin, 1996, On some copular clitics in Turkish, *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 6, 96-114.
- POUNDER Amanda, 2006, ‘Brachylogical reflections in diachronic dimensions’, paper presented at Affix Suspension Day (see footn.2).

Marcel ERDAL
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität
Frankfurt am Main
erdal@em.uni-frankfurt.de