Chapter 1

NONTERMINAL CATEGORIES OF MORPHOLOGY

Aysun KUNDURACI[1]

1. COMPETING APPROACHES TO MORPHOLOGY

In linguistics, morphological operations have been mostly ascribed to the lexicon (the lexicalist view, e.g. Lieber, 1992), to the syntax (the syntactic view, e.g. Wunderlich, 1996), or to a syntactically distributed morphology (Distributed Morphology, e.g. Halle & Marantz, 1994). In such views, where morphology is considered a subsystem of the lexicon (the first view) or syntax (the second and third views), morphological rules/processes do not appear to have their own autonomy. The problem with such dependent morphologies is that they (lexicalist morphologies) either cannot provide accounts for phrasal derivations such as the Turkish expression *sarı gömlek-li* (yellow shirt-ORN)[2] 'with (a/the) yellow shirt', where a phrasal, but not lexical, structure, *sarı gömlek*, falls inside the scope of the derivational suffix *-lI*. Or they (syntactic morphologies) have difficulty in explaining various different characteristics between the outputs of syntax (phrases) and word formations. For instance, whereas Turkish pronouns with subject or object functions may be ordered to the right or left of the predicate based on information structure, as shown in *sen*

[2]   The following abbreviations are used throughout the study: ACC: accusative, AGT: agentive, AOR: aorist, CAUS: causative, CM: compound marker, GEN: genitive, NZ: nominalizer, ORN: ornative, POSS: possessive, PRIV: privative, PROG: progressive, RSL: resultative, RZ: relativizer, SG: singular.

zation clearly proves the lexicalist morphological views to be on the wrong track: A morphological process targets a syntactically driven element. Applying due solely to morphological requirements, i.e. base specifications, the *-I* nominalization refutes a syntactically manipulated morphology. A split morphology also seems to be unnecessary when morphology is let free working collaboratively with other components but autonomously with its own tenets, as argued for in this study.

REFERENCES

1.   Ackema, P. & Neeleman, A. (2007). Morphology ≠ syntax. In Gillian Ramchand & Charles Reiss (Eds.), *The handbook of linguistic interfaces* (pp. 325–352). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2.   Anderson, S. R. (1982). Where is morphology? *Linguistic Inquiry 13*, 571-612.
3.   Anderson, S. R. (1992). *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4.   Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word formation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
5.   Aronoff, M. (1994). *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
6.   Aygen, G. (2002). Finiteness, case and clausal architecture. (Ph.D Dissertation). Harvard University.
7.   Beard, R. (1995). *Lexeme-morpheme base morphology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
8.   Dede, M. (1978). A syntactic and semantic analysis of Turkish nominal compounds. (Ph.D Dissertation). University of Michigan.
9.   Erguvanlı Taylan, E. (1993). Türkçede *-DIK* ekinin yantümcelerdeki işlevi üzerine. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları, 1993*, 161–171.
10. Erguvanlı Taylan, E. (1998). What determines the choice of nominalizer in Turkish nominalized complement clauses? In Bernard Caron (Ed.), *Proceedings of the XVIth international congress of linguists*. New York: Elsevier (CD Rom).
11. Göksel, A. (1997). Morphological asymmetries between Turkish and Yakut. In Kâmile İmer & N. Engin Uzun (Eds.), *Proceedings of the VIII. International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (pp. 69–76). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
12. Gürer, A. (2014). Adjectival participles in Turkish. *Lingua 149*, 166–187.
13. Heim, I. & Kratzer, A. (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

14. Halle, M. & Marantz, A. (1994). Some key features of Distributed Morphology. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley & Tony Bures (Eds.), *Papers on phonology and morphology*, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MITWPL) 21*, 275–288.

15. Inkelas, S. (1993). Nimboran position class morphology. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory (NLLT) 11*, 559–624.

16. Kunduracı, A. (2013). Turkish noun-noun compounds: A process-based paradigmatic account. (Ph.D Dissertation). University of Calgary.

17. Kunduracı, A. (2015). Türkçede aitlik ulamı ve biçimsel ifadesi. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi [Journal of Linguistic Investigations] 26* (1), 43–62.

18. Kunduracı, A. & Göksel, A. (2016). Morphology: The base processor. In Jenny Audrig, Francesca Masini, & Wendy Sandler (Eds.), *Quo Vadis Morphology* (MMM Vol 10), Proceedings of the 10th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (pp. 88–97). Universities of Leiden, Bologna, and Haifa.

19. Kural, M. (1994). Yantümcelerde çekim ekleri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 1994, 80–111.

20. Lapointe, S. (1980). The theory of grammatical agreement. (Ph.D Dissertation). University of Massachusetts.

21. Lieber, R. (1992). *Deconstructing morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

22. Özsoy, A. S. (1994). Türkçede yantümce yapısı. 3. Bilim Kurultayı. Dil Derneği. Ankara.

23. Palmer, F. R. (2007). *Mood and modality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

24. Pounder, A. (2000). *Processes and paradigms in word-formation morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

25. Sadock, J. M. (1998). On the autonomy of compounding morphology. Steven G. Lapointe, Diane K. Brentari, & Patrick Farrell (Eds.), *Morphology and its relation to phonology and syntax* (pp. 161–187). Stanford: CSLI.

26. Schaaik, G. (1998). The order of nominalizations in Turkish. *Turkic Languages 3*, 87–120. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

27. Schaaik, G. van. (2002). *The noun in Turkish. Its argument structure and the compounding straitjacket.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

28. Stump, G. (2001). *Inflectional morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

29. Stump, G. (2016). *Inflectional paradigms: Content and form at the syntax–morphology interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

30. Underhill, R. (1976). *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

31. Wunderlich, D. (1996). Minimalist morphology: The role of paradigms. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1995* (pp. 93–114). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

32. Zwicky, A. M. (1984). Reduced words in highly modular theories: Yiddish anarthrous locatives reexamined. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics 29*, 117–126.