

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, parasessions, 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 works 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.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Aissen, Judith. 1974a. *The Syntax of Causative Constructions*. Harvard U. Ph. D. dissertation. Revised version available from Garland Publishing, Inc., New York (1979). On the syntax of what the author calls Predicate Raising causatives in Turkish, French, Spanish and some other languages. This was written after Aissen 1974b and mostly goes over the same ground with a number of additional arguments, but partially withdraws the claim that Predicate Raising (Verb Raising) is precyclic.
- . 1974b. "Verb Raising." *LI* 5:3.325-366.
- 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.
- Aissen, Judith, and Jorge Hankamer, 1980. "Lexical extension and grammatical transformations." *BLS* 6:238-249.
- Develops a lexical, rather than transformational, analysis of Turkish causative verbs, with particular reference to relational grammar.
- Aksu, Ayhan A. 1978a. *Aspect and Modality in the Child's Acquisition of the Turkish Past Tense*. UC Berkeley Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 40:427B; UM 7914525.
- A study of the acquisition of *-DI* and *-miş* past tenses. *-DI* appears first and contrasts with *-iyor* as punctual vs. durational aspect. *-DI* later becomes a general past tense. *-miş* emerges later and is first used for stative aspect, then past tense, then acquires inferential modality, with hearsay modality being acquired last.
- . 1978b. "The acquisition of causal connectives in Turkish." *P* and *RCLD* 15:129-139.
- 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 *işte* or *DE*, followed by syntactic mechanisms of conjunction or subordination. *Çünkü* is apparently acquired last.
- Ammon, Mary Sue, and Dan I. Slobin. 1979. "A cross-linguistic study of the processing of causative sentences." *Cognition* 7:1.3-17. Earlier version in *P* and *RCLD* 15 (1978).
- 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.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1974. *The Organization of Phonology*. pp. 209-218. New York: Academic Press.
- 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 unrounding of vowels before palatal consonants: *üşüyüş* — [üşiyiş], *üşümeyiş* — [üşümiyış].
- Babby, Leonard H. 1981. "A compositional analysis of voice in Turkish: passive, derived intransitive, impersonal, and causative." Cornell WPL 2.
- 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. *kapı açıldı*), 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 transitive verbs are built up by two rules that add an extra NP, interpreted as the agent, to a verb phrase.

———. 1983. "The relation between causative and voice: Russian vs. Turkish." *Wiener Slawistischer 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.

Balıncı, Zülâl. 1981. *Turkish Passives: Morphosemantic and Syntactic Considerations*. U. of Florida Ph. D. dissertation.

DAI 42:3877A; IUM RTA82-03652.

Bechhofer, Robin. 1975. "WHO said WHAT to WHOM?... in Turkish." *Harvard S and S* 1:349-403.

An examination of the syntax of questions in Turkish in the light of a number of the current universal theories about question formation.

Busnel, R. G. et al. 1970. "Etudes sur la langue sifflée de Kusköy en Turquie." *Revue de Phonétique Appliquée* 14-15. Also in Thomas A. Sebeok and Donna Jean Umiker-Sebeok, eds., *Speech Surrogates: Drum and Whistle Systems*, pt. II, pp 1023-1173. The Hague: 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 purposes; and on the spectrographic correlation of the whistled with the spoken language.

Clancy, Patricia, Terry Jacobsen, and Marilyn Silva. 1976. "The acquisition of conjunction: a cross-linguistic study." *P and RCLD* 12:71-80.

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 Autosegmental 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 phonological 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 Sezer 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 Representations (Part II)*, pp. 213-255. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

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).

Cochrane, Nancy. 1975. "Studies in Turkish complementation." *Texas Linguistic Forum* 2:34-52.

A collection of facts on the use of complements in impersonal passive sentences.

Comrie, Bernard. 1974. "Causatives and universal grammar." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1974:1-32, esp. 4-9.

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).

Crothers, John, and Masayoshi Shibatani. 1980. "Issues in the description of Turkish vowel harmony." In Robert M. Vago, ed., *Issues in Vowel Harmony: Proceedings of the CUNY Linguistics Conference on Vowel Harmony*, pp. 63-88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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.

Cüceloğlu, Doğan, and Dan I. Slobin. 1976. *Effects of the Turkish Language Reform on Person Perception*. Working Paper 47, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, UC Berkeley. Also in *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 11:3.297-326 (1980).

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.

Dede, Müşerref. 1978a. *A Syntactic and Semantic Analysis of Turkish Nominal Compounds*, U. of Michigan Ph. D. dissertation.

DAI 39:849A; UM 7813635.

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).

———. 1978b. "Why should Turkish relativization distinguish between subject and non-subject head?" *BLS* 4:67-77.

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.

Dobrovolsky, Michael. 1976. "Is Turkish an agglutinating language?" *NELS VI*. Montreal WPL 6:87-101.

Argues that the unstressable suffixes are actually separate words in underlying structure, so that *getirmeyeceksin* would be *-getir-mi-yecek-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.

———. 1982. "Some thoughts on Turkish voicing assimilation." Calgary WPL 7-1:5.

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.

Dundes, Alan, Jerry W. Leach, and Bora Özkök. 1972. "The strategy of Turkish boy's verbal dueling rhymes." In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds., *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, pp. 130-160. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

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.

Ekmekçi, Özden Fatma. 1979. *Acquisition of Turkish: A Longitudinal Study on the Early Language Development of a Turkish Child..* U. of Texas Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 40:4000A; UM 7928282.

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.

Erguvanlı, Eser. 1979a. *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar.* UCLA Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 40:4001A; UM 8002477.

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.

———. 1979b. "An odd case in the causative construction of Turkish." CLS 15:92-99.

Looks at verbs which take obligatory 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 ata bindirdim*; in others the old dative is promoted to objective, and the old subject becomes dative: *Dişlerimi ona bakturdım*; and some allow both possibilities: *Çocuğu derse başlattık/Dersi çocuğa başlattık*. 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 IO and the result corresponds to an English passive: *Dişlerimi ona bakturdım* "I had my teeth taken care of by him."

Erkü, Feride. 1982. "Topic, comment and word order in Turkish." *Minnesota Papers in Linguistics and Philosophy of Language* 8:30-38.

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

———. 1983. *Discourse Pragmatics and Word Order in Turkish.* U. of Minnesota Ph. D. dissertation.

Foster, Joseph F. 1969. *On Some Phonological Rules of Turkish.* U. of Illinois Ph. D+ dissertation. DAI 31:742A; UM 70-13314.

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.

———. 1970. "Rule ordering and apparent irregularities in the Turkish aorist verb." In Sadock and Vanek, eds. *Studies Presented to Robert B. Lees by his Students*, pp. 61-77. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.

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

- Friedman, Victor A. 1978. "On the semantic and morphological influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic." *CLS* 14:108-118.
 Argues that the *DI*-past is "marked" for affirmation in contrast with the *-mİş*-past which is unmarked and normally non-affirmative. The *-Dir* ending which can be added to *-mİş* (*yazmıştır*) is an emphatic particle which cancels the non-affirmative meaning of *-mİş*. 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 *-mİş* as opposed to *-DI* see Slobin and Aksu 1982.
- . 1980. "The study of Balkan admirativity: its history and development." *Balkanistica* 6:7-30.
 Admirativity is defined as the use of a special verb form to indicate surprise. Surveys the expression of admirativity in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish.
- . 1981. "Admirativity and confirmativity." *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 17:1.12-28.
 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 admirative. In Albanian on the other hand the admirative is marked. Also discusses the relationship between admiratives and past or perfect.
- Gallagher, Charles F. 1971. "Language reform and social modernization in Turkey." In Joan Rubin and Björn H. Jernudd, eds., *Can Language Be Planned?*, pp. 159-178. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
 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.
- George, Leland M., and Jaklin Kornfilt. "Infinitival double passives in Turkish." *NEIS* 7 (1976), pp. 65-79.
 Studies the derivation of constructions like *Yazarlar alkışlanmak isteniyorlar*, showing that they are derived by the interaction of Passive and Equi Noun Phrase Deletion.
- . 1981. "Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish." In Frank Heny, ed., *Binding and Filtering*, pp. 105-127. Cambridge: MIT Press.
 An analysis in the framework of Chomsky's Conditions on Transformations. Complements are divided into two types: Direct Complements (e.g. *Herkes biz viski içeceğiz sanıyor*) 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.
- Gibson, Jeanne, and İnci Özkaragöz. 1981. "The syntactic nature of the Turkish causative construction." *CLS* 17:83-98.
 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.
- Gilson, Erika H. 1981. "Computers and Turkish." *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 5:2.5-7.
 Brief description of two approaches to using a computer to process Turkish texts.

- Haiman, John. 1972. "Phonological targets and unmarked structures." Lg. 48:2.365-377. Observes that Turkish has three formally unrelated phonological conditions that collectively ensure that /o ö/ 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 /a i u/ is considered to be basic in phonological theory.
- . 1977. "Reinterpretation". Lg. 53:2.312-328, esp. 321-2. 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*, *geldimdi*. Makes an interesting suggestion that the origin of such pairs lies in the ambiguity of the 3rd sg.: *geldiydi* may be *gel+di+di*— or *gel+di+di+—+di*.
- Halle, Morris. 1978. "Formal vs. functional considerations in phonology." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 8:2.123-134. Also in Bela Brogyanyi, ed., *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, vol. 11, pp. 325-341. Amsterdam: John Benjamins (1979). Briefly discusses the issue raised by Zimmer (1975), whether cases like *ayak/ayağı* should be handled with underlying /g/ or /k/, and points out that classical phonological theory supports Zimmer's conclusion.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1971. *Constraints on Deletion in Syntax*. Yale U. Ph. D dissertation. Available under the title *Deletion in Coordinate Structures* from Garland Publishing, Inc., New York (1979). A lengthy study of processes such as conjunction reduction and gapping (*Hasan yumurtayı yedi, Ahmet patlıcanı*) 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.
- . 1972. "Analogical rules in syntax." CLS 8:111-123. On the derivation of adverbial constructions of the form *Hasan geldiği zaman, çay içtik*. In these the subject of the embedded sentence has no genitive suffix (compare *Hasanın geldiği zaman, çay içiyorduk*) 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 içtik*. 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 S and S* 2:197-219. Also in NELS VI, Montreal WPL 6:123-135. 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 çıkılan kapı*), or when the subject has been moved by indefinite movement (*kızını arı sokan adam*).
- Heyd, Uriel. 1954. *Language Reform in Modern Turkey*. Oriental Notes and Studies = 5. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society. While this is not generative in any way, it is the indispensable source on language reform.
- Johnston, Judith R., and Dan I. Slobin. 1977. "The development of locative expressions 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 backs 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.

Kardestuncer, Aino E. 1982a. "On the role of transition duration in the discrimination of velar stop consonants in Turkish." *Word* 33:3.243-352.

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

———. 1982b. "A three-boundary system for Turkish." *Linguistic Analysis* 10:2.95-117.

Finds evidence of differential treatment of compounds with respect to various phonological rules, e.g. *harbetmek* 'make war' vs. *harbertesi* 'post-war'; *hakketmek* 'engrave' vs. *haketmek* 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:

———. 1982c. Theoretical Implications of Turkish Vowel Harmony. U. of Connecticut Ph. D dissertation. DAI 43:08A.2652; UM PRI83-02071.

Knecht, Laura. 1976. "Turkish comparatives." *Harvard S and S* 2:279-358.

A thorough study of the syntax of comparative constructions. "Clausal" comparatives such as *Orhan Ayşenin aldığından fazla kabak aldı* are derived by a rule of Comparative Deletion from deep structures such as *Orhan Ayşenin kabak aldığından fazla kabak aldı*. In turn, these may be turned into "phrasal" comparatives like *Orhan Ayşeden 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.

———. 1979. "The role of the genitive suffix in relative clauses in Turkish: a reply to Dede." *BLS* 5:180-197.

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.

Konrot, A. K. 1981a. "A new phoneme or 'voiced velar stop erosion'? — Phonetic explanation for the phonological status of the so-called 'Soft q' in Turkish." *U. of Essex, Dept. of Language and Linguistics, Occasional Paper* ≠ 24, pp. 12-24.

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 "ğ".

Insert following Knecht 1979 and preceding Konrot 1981a:

Kononov, A. N. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo turetskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademiji Nauk SSSR.

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

———. 1981b. "Physical correlates of linguistic stress in Turkish." *U. of Essex, Dept. of Language and Linguistics, Occasional Paper* ≠ 24, pp. 26-51.

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. *kázma* vs *kazmá*), 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 against 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," IJL 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." IJL 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 sanılıyor*. 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.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin, Susumu Kuno, and Engin Sezer. 1980. "A note on crisscrossing double dislocation." Harvard S and S 3:185-242, esp. 202-242.
Studies Japanese and Turkish relative clauses from the point of view of what constituents can be extracted from doubly nested relative clauses. Shows that certain universal claims do not hold for either language. Shows that relative clauses are governed by the Thematic Constraint on Relativization: a relative clause must be a statement about its head noun.
- Kral, Thomas J. 1975. *Sociolinguistic Patterns in Turkish Address*. U. of Illinois Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 36:5894A; UM 76-6826.
Uses Labov's concept of the variable rule to describe patterns of address in a Turkish community.
- Kumbaracı, Türkân E. 1966. "Consonantly conditioned alternation of vocalic morphemes in Turkish." AL 8:1.11-24.
Describes the raising and sometimes unrounding of vowels that occurs before /y/ in suffixes, e.g. *sakla + yan* — [saklyan], *üşü + yün* — [üşüyün] (in some dialects). The description is not generative but served as a point of departure for Lees 1966a.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1971. "The position of locatives in existential sentences." IJL 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.
- . 1980a. "Discourse deletion." Harvard S and S 3:1-44, esp. 52-53, 88-97.
Contains a brief discussion of Turkish as part of an extensive study of the conditions under which constituents under which constituents of a sentence can be deleted in a discourse. Argument is based primarily on English and Japanese.
- . 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.
- Kuruoğlu, Ayşe Güiliz. 1976. "On word order in Turkish." U. of Washington WPL 2:58-73.
On leftward (*Çocuk kitabı aldı — kitabı çocuk aldı*) and rightward (*Ahmet sinemaya gitti — Ahmet gitti sinemaya*) word order transformations in connection with the concepts of assertion and presupposition.

- . 1980. *Sentence Synonymy in Turkic Languages: A Functional Approach*. U. of Washington Ph. D. dissertation DAI 40:6257:A UM RTA 80-13552.
Based on Brame's functional interpretive approach.
- Lee, Gregory. 1976. "Natural phonological descriptions (Part II)." U. of Hawaii WPL 8:3. 45-54.
Brief discussion of Turkish vowel and consonant harmony in the light of the theory of natural phonology. Based on Lees (1961, 1966b) and Lightner (1972).
- Lees, Robert B. 1961. *The Phonology of Modern Standard Turkish*. IUUAS \neq 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.
- . 1962. "A compact analysis for the Turkish personal morphemes." In Nicholas Poppe, ed., *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics*, pp. 141-176. IUUAS \neq 13. Bloomington: Indiana U. and The Hague: Mouton.
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 \neq 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 olgusu*, *Adamın vergi vermesi hareketi*.
- . 1966a. "On the interpretation of a Turkish vowel alternation." AL 8:9.32-39.
A response to Kumbaracı 1966, on the raising and unrounding of vowels before suffix-initial /y/ and sometimes other palatal consonants: ye+yecek — [yiyecek], gümüş+tür — [gümiş+tir] (in some dialects). Corrects Kumbaracı's analysis and formalizes four rules for vowel harmony and palatal assimilation.
- . 1966b. "Turkish harmony and the phonological description of assimilation." *Türk Dili: Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*, pp. 279-297 TDK Yayınları \neq 255. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
Explores 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.
- . 1970a. "A morphophonemic problem in Turkish." In Johnnye Akin et al., eds, *Language Behavior, A Book of Readings in Communication*. Janua Linguarum, Series Maior, \neq 41. The Hague: Mouton.
On the morphophonemic rules required to handle the phoneme /ğ/, and some discussion of whether this phoneme can be identified with /g/.
- . 1970b. Review of G. L. Lewis, *Turkish Grammar* (Lewis 1967). FL 6:1.122-137.
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.
- . 1972. "The Turkish copula." In J. Verhaar, ed., *The Verb 'Be' and its Synonyms, Part V*, pp. 64-73. FL Supplementary Series, vol. 14. Dordrecht: D. Reidel. Shortened version in Maurice Gross et al., eds., *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, pp. 175-179. The Hague: Mouton (1973).

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

———. 1973. "Turkish voice." In Braj B. Kachru et al., eds., *Issues in Linguistics, Papers in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, pp. 504-514. Urbana: U. of Illinois Press.

Discussion of the four "voice" suffixes, passive *-Il*, reflexive *-In*, reciprocal *-İş*, and causative *-Dir*, and their possible combinations.

Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford U. Press.

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

Lightner, Theodore M. 1965. "On the description of vowel and consonant harmony" *Word*. 21:244-250.

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).

———. 1972. *Problems in the Theory of Phonology, Vol. I: Russian Phonology and Turkish Phonology*. Pp. 343-365, 379-390. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.

Touches 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.

———. 1978. "The main stress rule in Turkish." In Zajaryer, Polome, and Winter, eds., *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, Vol. II, Descriptive Linguistics*, pp. 267-270.

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

Malone, Joseph L. 1982. "Generative phonology and Turkish rhyme." *LI* 13:3.550-553.

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

Meskill, Robert H. 1970. *A Transformational Analysis of Turkish Syntax*. *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, ≠ 51. The Hague: Mouton. Review: Hankamer, *Linguistics* 157:119-125 (1975).

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.

Mulder Jean, 1976. "Raising in Turkish." *BLS* 2:298-307.

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

Nash, Rose. 1973. *Turkish Intonation, An Instrumental Study*. *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, ≠ 114. The Hague: Mouton.

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.

- Nilsson, Birgit. 1978. "Speaker, text, and the Turkish reflexive *kendisi*." In Kirsten Gregersen, ed., *Papers from the Fourth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, pp. 255-261. Odense U. Press.
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.
- . 1978-9. "Definiteness and reference in relation to the Turkish accusative." *Orientalia Suecana* 27-28:118-131.
Uppsala.
- . 1979. "Casemarking in Turkish and Fillmore's deep case theory." In T. Pettersson, ed., *Papers from the Fifth Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, Vol. I, pp. 209-220. Stockholm.
- . 1983? *The Semantics of Case Marking: Accusative and Genitive in Turkish*. U. of Stockholm Ph. D. dissertation.
- Özkaragöz, İnci. 1980a. "Evidence from Turkish for the unaccusative hypothesis." *BLS* 6:411-422.
Some additional work on the hypothesis of Perlmutter (1978), finding some evidence both for and against the hypothesis.
- . 1980b. "Transitivity and the syntax of middle clauses in Turkish." *Working Papers in Relational Grammar*, UC San Diego.
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.
- Özsoy, Ayşe S. 1983. *Kendi-Reflexivization in Turkish: A Syntactic, Semantic, and Discourse Analysis*. U. of Michigan Ph. D. dissertation.
The primary interest of this somewhat flawed thesis is the collection of facts, both syntactic and discourse, relating to conditions on *kendi(si)*.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1972. "Evidence for shadow pronouns in French relativization." *The Chicago Which Hunt: Papers from the Relative Clause Festival*, pp. 73-105. Chicago: CLC.
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.
- . 1978. "Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis." *BLS* 4:157-189..
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 hapishaneden 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").

- Peuser, Günter, and Maren Fittschen. 1977. "On the universality of language dissolution: the case of a Turkish aphasic." *Brain and Language* 4:2.196-207.
- A study of a Turkish aphasic to see whether the patterns of language 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.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1975. "On a nonargument for the cycle in Turkish." *LI* 6:3.494-500.
- Disagrees with a portion of Aissen 1974b. Argues that Aissen has failed to prove that there is a transformational cycle in Turkish.
- Ringen, Catherine O. 1974. *Vowel Harmony: Theoretical Implications*. Indiana U. Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 36A : 5264A: UM 76-2884.
- 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.
- . 1980. "Uralic and Altaic vowel harmony: a problem for natural generative phonology." *JL* 16:37-44.
- 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.
- Robson, Barbara. 1971. "Historical notes on the single vowel conspiracy in Turkish." *General Linguistics* 11:3.145-150.
- On the two rules, Y-Epenthesis and Vowel Deletion, which together function to prevent vowel clusters in surface forms. Evidence that this conspiracy goes back to Orkhon Turkic.
- Sapitmaz, Musa. 1976. *A Contrastive Analysis between English and Turkish Question Transformations*. Rutgers U. Ed. D. dissertation. DAI 37:7727A; UM 77-13287.
- Sebüktekin, Hikmet İ. 1971. *Turkish-English Contrastive Analysis: Turkish Morphology and Corresponding English Structures*. *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, ≠ 84. The Hague: Mouton. Review: Zimmer, *JAOS*, 95.486 (1975).
- The chief value of this thesis (which is not actually generative) is the listing of Turkish suffixes and their English equivalents.
- Sezer, Engin. 1980. "On reflexiviation in Turkish". In *Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students*. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* vol. III/IV, pt. 2, pp. 748-759.
- 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.
- . 1981. "The k/ø alternation in Turkish." In Clements, ed., *Harvard Studies in Phonology*, vol. II. Indiana University Linguistic Club.
- Supports the claim of Zimmer (1975) that a k-Deletion rule is preferable to g-Deletion for cases like *ayak/ayağı* ([ayak]/[ayaɰ]) and presents additional evidence.
- . 1983. "On non-final stress in Turkish." *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 5:61-69. Harvard U., Center for Middle Eastern Studies.
- Finds several cases where non-final stress 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* (*esasen* vs. *nisbeten*); place names (*Kavaklı* vs. *Sirkeci*); many foreign words (*lokanta* vs. *tencere*). Stress based on syllable weight are well-known in Indo-European languages but not previously in Turkish.
- Slobin, Dan I. 1975. *Language Change in Childhood and in History*. Working Paper ≠ 41, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, UC Berkeley. Also in J. Macnamara, ed., *Language Learning and Thought*, pp. 185-214 New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- 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.

- . 1982. "Universal and particular in the acquisition of language." In Eric Wanner and Lila Gleiman, eds., *Language Acquisition: The State of the Art*, pp. 128-1970. Cambridge U. Press.

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."

- Slobin, Dan I., and Ayhan A. Aksu. 1982. "Tense, aspect, and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential." In Paul J. Hopper, ed., *Tense-aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, pp. 185-200. Amsterdam : John Benjamins.

On the semantics of the evidential particle *-mİş*. Examines the uses of *-mİş* 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 *-mİş* from perfect participle through past tense. Outlines children's acquisition of *-mİş* in contrast with *-DI*.

- . 1983. "Acquisition of Turkish." In Dan I. Slobin, ed., *The Crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

- Slobin, Dan I., and Thomas G. Bever. Forthcoming. "Children use canonical sentence schemas : a cross-linguistic study of word order and inflections."

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.

- Swift, Lloyd B. 1962. "Some aspects of stress and pitch in Turkish syntactic patterns." In Nicholas Poppe, ed., *American Studies in Altaic Linguistics*, pp. 331-341. IUUAS ≠ 13. Bloomington : Indiana U. and The Hague : Mouton.

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.

- . 1963. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Turkish*. IUUAS ≠ 19. Bloomington : Indiana U. and The Hague : Mouton.

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

- Tannen, Deborah, and Piyale Öztek. 1977. "Health to our mouths. Formulaic expressions in Turkish and Greek." BLS 3:516-534. Also in Florian Coulmas, ed., *Conversational Routine Explorations : in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech*, pp. 37-54. Janua Linguarum, Series Maior, ≠ 96. The Hague : Mouton (1981).

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

- Terbeek, Dale. 1977. A cross-language multidimensional scaling study of vowel perception. UCLA WP in Phonetics ≠ 37.

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.

Tura, Sabahat. 1973. *A Study on the Articles in English and their Counterparts in Turkish*. U. of Michigan Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 35:436A; UM 74-15877.

———. 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.

Underhill, Robert. 1972. "Turkish participles." LI 3:1.87-99.

The first of a series of papers studying the conditions under which the "subject participle" $-(y)En$ and "object participle" $-Dik$ 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).

———. 1976. *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press. Review: Zimmer, Lg. 56:3.700-701 (1980).

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.

West, Stephen L., and Eser Erguvanli. 1981. "An evaluation of Robert Underhill's *Turkish Grammar*, with a supplement on the teaching of Turkish participles." *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 2:1.148-174.

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.

Yavaş, Feryal. 1980. *On the Meaning of the Tense and Aspect Markers in Turkish*. U. of Kansas Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 41:5086A; UM RTA 81-11763.

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

———. 1982a. "Future reference in Turkish". *Linguistics* 20:5/6.-411-429. Earlier version in Kansas WPL 5:1.139-149 (1980).

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: *Ahmet şimdi 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 $-Iyor$ in the degree of certainty of the prediction, and with $-Ir$ in the kinds of evidence used for the prediction. The argument is that $-(y)EcEk$ expresses as much modal functions as temporal functions.

- . 1982b. "The Turkish aorist." *Glossa* 16:1.40-53.
 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.
- Yavaş, Mehmet S. 1980a. *Borrowing and its Implications for Turkish Phonology*. U. of Kansas Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 41:2093A; UM RTA80-26709.
- . 1980b. "Some pilot experiments on Turkish vowel harmony." *PIJL* 13:3.543-562.
 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.
- . 1980c. "Vowel and consonant harmony in Turkish." *Glossa* 14:2.189-211. Earlier version in *Kansas WPL* 3:34-44 (1978).
 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* — *sıpor*, *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* — *kredi*, *grev* — *grev*); (2) assimilation to palatal /i'/ (*plaj* — *pi'laj*); (3) vowel harmony.
- . 1982. "Natural phonology and borrowing assimilations." *Linguistics* 20:1/2.123-132.
 Earlier version in *Kansas WPL* 4:2.41-43 (1979).
 Further study, along the lines of Yavaş 1980c, of epenthetic vowels used to break up initial consonant clusters in loans, e.g. French *drame* — *dıram*, *greve* — *grev*. 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.
- Yıldırım, Çiğdem Balım. 1978. *A Functional Interpretative Approach to Turkish*. U of Washington Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 40:832A; UM 7917662.
 A survey of a number of aspects of Turkish according to Brame's lexicalist model, called Functional Interpretation.
- Zachariou, Andreas M. 1980. *A Survey of Attitudes of Greek Elementary and Secondary School Public Teachers of Cyprus on the Teaching of the Greek and Turkish Languages and Cultures and the Local Greek-Cyopriot Dialect and Culture*. Florida State U. Ph. D. dissertation. DAI 41:07A.2986; UM RTA81-01989.
- Zimmer, Karl E. 1965. Review of Lees 1961. *Word* 21:123-136.
 A highly useful guide to Lees' difficult book, making a number of sensible corrections and suggestions. Topics particularly discussed include vowel harmony, consonant harmony, and palatal assimilation.
- . 1967. "A note on vowel harmony." *IJAL* 33:2.166-171.
 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.
- . 1969a. "Markedness and the problem of indeterminacy of lexical representations". *IJAL* 35:3.264-266.
 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-

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'ın ne okuduğunu söyledi* ↑. This is evidence that the phonological component must have information on syntactic deep structure.

———. 1969c. "Psychological correlates of some Turkish morpheme structure conditions." Lg. 45:2.309-321.

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.

———. 1970a. "On the evaluation of alternative phonological descriptions." JL 6:1.89-98. 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.

———. 1970b. "Some observations on non-final stress in Turkish." JAOS 90:1.160-162. Examines some cases of non-final stress: reduplicated adjectives (*apaçık*), diminutive adjectives (*ufakık*), and vocatives (*Mehmet!*). Finds that in all cases the initial-stressed forms are emphatic in some way, and constitute syntactically or semantically marked categories.

———. 1975. "Some thoughts on likely phonologies for non-ideal speakers." *Papers from the Parasession on Functionalism*, pp. 556-567. Chicago: CLS.

Discusses the alternation between *k* and \emptyset in such examples as *ayak/ayağ*: ([*ayak*]/[*ayaɰ*]). Analyses such as Lees 1961 and Underhill 1976 postulate an underlying /*g*/ which becomes *k* by the final devoicing rule (/ayaq/ — *ayak* like /reng/ — *renk*) and which deletes (or becomes ξ) 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.

———. 1976. "Some constraints on Turkish causativization." In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Syntax and Semantics vol. 6, The Grammar of Causative Constructions*. pp. 399-412. New York: Academic Press.

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.

Zimmer, Karl E., and Barbara Abbott. 1978. "The *k*/ \emptyset alternation in Turkish: some experimental evidence for its productivity." *Journal of Psycho-Linguistic Research* 7:35-46.

Notes that in Turkish words ending in *k*, *k* normally deletes before a vowel-initial suffix in the word is a polysyllable (*inek/ineği* [ineɰ]) 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.

ABBREVIATIONS

AL	Anthropological Linguistics
BLS	Berkeley Linguistics Society
CLS	Chicago Linguistic Society
DAI	Dissertation Abstracts International
FL	Foundations of Language
Harvard S~S	Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics
IJAL	International Journal of American Linguistics
IUUAS	Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JL	Journal of Linguistics
Lg.	Language
LI	Linguistic Inquiry
NELS	North Eastern Linguistic Society
PIL	Papers in Linguistics
P~RCLD	Papers and Reports on Child Language Development
UM	University Microfilms (order number)
WPL	Working Papers in Linguistics (Various)