

AGAINST RECURSION & LEXICAL PRESPECIFICATION IN TURKISH STRESS

In a Nutshell. Turkish has default rightmost word stress with a few exceptional patterns. I focus on the verbal domain based on novel data and claim that i) agreement phrase (AgrP) projections in syntax constitute right edges of prosodic domains of stress assignment due to syntax-phonology correspondence, and stress in Turkish single-word clauses is still rightmost within the lowest domain; ii) bisyllabic aspectual markers with initial stress behave as such due to being uniquely deverbal; and iii) a unique pattern involving a "non-stressable" and focus-neutralizing modal is the result of fusion that results in a merger of prosodic domains. **Puzzles. I.** The PL marker that is used optionally on predicates to indicate agreement with 3PL subjects results in optionality in stress (1).

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|--|----|---|
| (1) | a. | jɛl.dí.lér gel-DI-lAr come-PFV-3.PL ‘They have come.’ | b. | je.lír.lér gel-Ir-lAr come-HAB-3.PL ‘They come.’ |
|-----|----|--|----|---|

II. Several bisyllabic markers are stress-initial (2a), while others have final (2b) or no (2c) stress.

- | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| (2) | a. je.lí.jör.duk gel-Ijör-DI-k come-IPFV-PST-1PL ‘We were coming.’ | b. je.le.džéc.t ^h ic gel-AdžAk-DI-k come-PROS-PST-1PL ‘We were going to come.’ | c. je.le.bił.díc gel-Abil-DI-k come-ABIL-PFV-1PL ‘We have been able to come.’ |
|-----|---|--|--|

III. When a low and a high aspect are combined, stress falls on the low one (3a). When the modal *-Abil* intervenes, stress shifts onto the higher aspect (3b).

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| (3) | a. je.lí.ve.ri.jör gel-Iver-Ijör-Ø come-CEL-IPFV-3 ‘(S)he comes quickly.’ | b. je.li.ve.re.bi.lí.jör gel-Iver-Abil-Ijör-Ø come-CEL-POSSIB-IPFV-3 ‘It is possible for her/him to come quickly.’ |
|-----|--|---|

Previous Works. Kabak & Vogel (2001) offer a Prosodic Word (PW) building analysis, where certain morphemes stop the recursive PW-building operation. This approach cannot capture the optionality in (1), nor the shift in (3). In Newell’s (2008, 2015) phase-based approach, the pre-clitic zone is assumed to be a phasal domain, which can potentially account for (1), but not (3). Inkelas & Orgun (2003) assume lexical prespecification for stress-initial morphemes and claim that the innermost stressed morpheme would always win, which accounts for (3a), but not (3b). **Assumptions.** I assume syntactic structure is mapped onto phonology and syntactic spell-out domains correspond to prosodic domains of stress assignment (Newell 2008, 2015). I further assume that the functional heads are strictly ordered (Cinque 1999, 2002 et seq.), for which a simplified hierarchy is given in (4).

- (4) *Simplified hierarchy of functional heads in Turkish:*
- $$\begin{aligned}
 & V < \text{Voice}_1 < \text{Low Aspects} < \text{ABIL} < \text{NEG} < \text{POSSIB} < \text{Voice}_2 < \text{Agr}_{\text{OPT}} \Big) < \text{NMLZ}_1 < \text{T}_{\text{anterior}} \\
 & < \text{Agr}_{\text{K}} \Big) < \text{NMLZ}_2 < \text{OBLIG} < \text{High Aspects} < \text{Agr}_{\text{POSS}} \Big) < \boxed{\text{Cliticization Boundary}} < \text{Q} < \\
 & \text{COP} < \text{T} < \text{High Modals} < \text{Agr}_{\text{Z}} \Big)
 \end{aligned}$$

The NEG marker *-mA* and the focus clitic *=DA* have inherent focus, attracting the stress onto their immediately preceding syllable and even overriding sentential stress. Hence they are not subject to this focus-neutral stress assignment pattern (Göksel & Özsoy 2000). Verbal and nominal predicates

in Turkish select different paradigms of agreement exponents depending on the final suffix (Good & Yu 2005). The finite stems ending with *-DI* and *-sA* select k-exponents, while z-paradigm is selected elsewhere. Introduction of the question clitic =*mI* shows that k-exponents use a pre-clitic (5a) AgrP projection, while z-exponents must use a post-clitic (5b) projection.

- (5) a. $\text{ʃel.di.n}^{\text{I}}\text{.mi?}$
 gel-DI-**nIz**=mI?
 come-PFV-**2PL_K**=Q
 ‘Have you (pl) come/arrived?’
- b. $\text{ʃe.le.d}^{\text{I}}\text{ʒec.mi.si.niz?}$
 gel-Ad₃Ak=mI-**sInIz**?
 come-IPFV=Q-**2PL_Z**
 ‘Are you (pl) going to come?’

The PL marker, on the other hand, can uniquely appear in both positions (6).

- (6) a. $\text{ʃe.le.d}^{\text{I}}\text{ʒec.l}^{\text{r}}\text{.di}$
 gel-Ad₃Ak-**IAr**=Ø-DI
 come-PROS-**3.PL**=COP-PST
 ‘They were going to come’
- b. $\text{ʃe.le.d}^{\text{I}}\text{ʒec.t}^{\text{h}}\text{i.l}^{\text{r}}$
 gel-Ad₃Ak=Ø-DI-**IAr**
 come-PROS=COP-PST-**3.PL**
 ‘They were going to come.’

Proposals. I. Adopting a dynamic approach to phases, I define a phase as the extended projection of any AgrP projection. Due to the syntax-prosody correspondence, AgrP’s always occupy the right edge of prosodic domains of stress assignment, and stress is always rightmost within the lowest domain. Since the PL marker can use any AgrP projection without restrictions, stress is entirely dependent on which projection *-IAr* ends up occupying. The optionality in Puzzle 1 is the result of this flexibility. **II.** Table 1 shows that stress-initial and unstressable morphemes, which were once verbs (ver ‘give’, *jæry* ‘walk’, *bil* ‘know’), have non-harmonizing final vowels, while non-deverbal stress-final morphemes fully harmonize. I claim that deverbal markers retain their verbal properties to a degree, thereby constricting the stress to the first vowel. **III.** Intervention of *-Abil* can even neutralize (7c-d) the focus-attracting properties (7a-b) of the NEG marker, which never happens in the language except for one isolated case of fusion (8).

Table 1. Varying stress behavior of markers.

| Initial stress | Final stress | No stress |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| - <i>İ</i> ver, - <i>İ</i> jor | -Ad ₃ Ák, -mAİİ | -Abil |

- (7) a. $\text{ʃe.le.b}^{\text{I}}\text{.d}^{\text{I}}\text{m}$
 gel-**Abil**-dI-m
 come-**ABIL/POSSIB**-PFV-1SG
 ‘I have been **able** to come /
 It has been **possible** for me to come.’
- b. $\text{ʃe.l}^{\text{e}}\text{.me.d}^{\text{I}}\text{m}$
 gel-**Abil-mA**-DI-m.
 come-**ABIL-NEG**-PFV-1SG
 ‘I have **not** been **able** to come.’
- c. $\text{ʃel.me.ʃe.b}^{\text{I}}\text{.d}^{\text{I}}\text{m}$
 gel-**mA-Abil**-DI-m.
 come-**NEG-POSSIB**-PFV-1SG
 ‘It has been **possible** for me **not** to come.’
- d. $\text{ʃe.le.me.ʃe.b}^{\text{I}}\text{.d}^{\text{I}}\text{m}$
 gel-**Abil-mA-Abil**-DI-m.
 come-**ABIL-NEG-POSSIB**-PFV-1SG
 ‘It has been **possible** for me to be
unable to come.’
- (8) a. $\text{ʃe.l}^{\text{I}}\text{r.s}^{\text{I}}\text{n}$
 gel-**Ir**=sIn
 come-AOR=2SG
 ‘You come / would come.’
- b. $\text{ʃel.m}^{\text{e}}\text{z.s}^{\text{I}}\text{n}$
 gel-**mAz**=sIn
 come-AOR.NEG=2SG
 ‘You come / would come.’

I claim that the emergence of the position-dependent (4) POSSIB function of the *-Abil* triggers another fusion operation, which neutralizes the focal properties of the NEG marker. Since the fusion obligatorily includes the head of the domain, this results in the merger of the lowest two prosodic domains, shifting the stress onto the rightmost vowel inside the now-merged domain.

Conclusion. Based on the assumption of syntax-phonology correspondence and novel data, I have argued that Turkish word stress in single-word clauses depends entirely on morphosyntactic factors.