

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DERIVATION AND INFLECTION IN TURKISH AND ITS APPLICATION TO REDUPLICATION

Oktay ÇINAR

Arş. Gör. Dr., İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Dilbilimi Bölümü, oktay.cinar@medeniyet.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9822-7574

Çınar, Oktay. "The Difference between Derivation and Inflection in Turkish and its Application to Reduplication". idil, 92 (2022 Nisan): s. 553-563. doi: 10.7816/idil-11-92-08

ABSTRACT

Considerations of derivation and inflection as morphological processes have long been a point of interest in morphological theorizing and generativist approach to the internal structure of words. From the typological perspective, languages employ these means to create new lexemes or change the morphological paradigm of a particular lexeme. This raises the question of how derivation and inflection work to form words: If there is any difference between derivation and inflection, what makes them different from each other? Considering this, the current study aims to question how traditional definitions apply to derivational and inflectional morphology in Turkish. Further, reduplication processes in Turkish are discussed in order to understand to what extent they apply to the distinguishing criteria offered to differentiate derivation from inflection. By doing so, the question of to what extent reduplication is represented derivationally is also raised. The results of the study suggest that not all instances of derivational and inflectional morphology can be treated equally. The analysis on the derived forms for reduplication also favor an approach which claims that difference among the morphological processes cannot be clear cut.

Key Words: Derivational morphology, inflectional morphology, reduplication, morphological typology

Makale Bilgisi:

Geliş: 2 Şubat 2022

Düzeltilme: 27 Şubat 2022

Kabul: 18 Mart 2022

Introduction

Derivational and inflectional morphology are considered as the two types of morphological processes accounting for the phenomena of prefixation, suffixation, infixation and reduplication among languages of the world (e.g. Aronoff, 1993; Beard, 2001; Stump, 2001; Haspelmath, 2002). The word inflection is used to mean that a word is inflected to express a grammatical category such as tense, mood, aspect, case and number according to the morphosyntactic properties of the language. On the other hand, with the process of derivation a word with a new lexical meaning is derived from a particular lexeme. However, the definitions hint that there is a clear-cut distinction between derivation and inflection; that is, all derivational processes have to be fully involved with deriving lexemes whereas inflectional processes have to be related to changing word-forms in accordance with the morphosyntactic properties. However, as Beard (2001: 44) asserted, these traditional definitions 'have failed to secure a distinction between derivation and inflection'. In other words, it is not always easy to fully demarcate derivation from inflection and vice versa. Taking this into account, the current study aims to discuss derivation and inflection in order to understand how traditional definitions apply to derived and inflected forms in Turkish. Bearing this on mind, the aim of this paper is to demonstrate how problematic it is to make a clear-cut distinction between derivation and inflection in Turkish.

In what follows, questions are raised whether there are any empirical criteria to make a difference between derivation and inflection and to what extent the criteria help us to distinguish these two morphological processes. Second, by leaving the distinguishing criteria aside, a number of theories seeking to distinguish derivation from inflection are reviewed. Finally, the phenomenon of reduplication, which seems to be a derivational process, is discussed with examples by focusing on the distinguishing criteria offered.

Criteria for the Difference Between Derivation and Inflection

Turkish employs suffixation to create new words and inflect word-forms. Since Turkish morphology is rich in derivations, a new word can be productively derived from a particular lexeme (Kornfilt, 1997: 445). The morphology of Turkish is also rich in inflections to indicate grammatical relations such as tense, person, aspect etc. considering the agglutinative nature of Turkish.

In order to make a difference between derivation and inflection, a number of criteria are commonly employed. Haspelmath (2002: 71) offered a number of most widely adapted criteria for distinguishing the processes of derivation and inflection from each other, which is given in Table 1 below

Table 1. *A list of properties of inflection and derivation (Haspelmath, 2002: 71)*

	Inflection	Derivation
(i)	Relevant to syntax	Not relevant to the syntax
(ii)	Obligatory	Optional
(iii)	Not replaceable by simple word	Replaceable by simple word
(iv)	Same concepts as base	New concept
(v)	Relatively abstract meaning	Relatively concrete meaning
(vi)	Semantically regular	Possibly semantically irregular
(vii)	Less relevant to base meaning	Very relevant to base meaning
(viii)	Unlimited applicability	Limited applicability
(ix)	Expression at word periphery	Expression close to the base
(x)	Less base allomorphy	More base allomorphy
(xi)	Cumulative expression possible	No cumulative expression
(xii)	Productive	Not productive

Each of the criteria offered is empirically tested and discussed in Turkish below.

(i) *Syntactic relevance*: Syntactic relevance is often given as a sole criterion for the dichotomy between derivation and inflection. This criterion suggests that inflectional categories are determined by the syntactic categories of a language. In other words, any affix which serves a syntactic function is claimed to be inflectional; those which are used to create new lexical items are derivational. Thus, syntax is characterized as the principle property in defining inflection:

- (1) Öğret-men kitap-ı Ege'-(y)e ver-di.
 teach-er book-ACC Ege-DAT give-PAST
 'The teacher gave the book to Ege'.

In (1), the accusative and dative case markers are characterized with the syntactic context of the sentence. Any other case marker other than the accusative case attached to word *kitap* 'book' would render the sentence ungrammatical. The same is also valid for the dative case marker *-e* attached to the proper noun *Ege*.

One can argue that if the difference between derivation and inflection has yet to be made, inflectional suffixes are syntactically determined compared with the derivational morphology. However, the syntactic position of words with the same meaning might be different in some cases:

- (2) a. Cem'in kitap-ı eleştir-me-si
 Cem-GEN book-ACC criticize-NOM-3rdSING
 'Cem's criticism of the book'.
 b. Cem kitab-ı eleştir-di
 Cem book-ACC criticize-PAST
 'Cem criticized the book'.

Although, the syntactic behavior of the derived words *eleştirme* 'criticize-NOM' and *eleştirmek* 'to criticize' would differ, these words seem to have almost the same meaning. This hints that derivational morphology can have a syntactic relevance as well.

(ii) *Obligatoriness*: In fact, this criterion was proposed by Greenberg (1960) so as to define morphological typologies in a quantitative approach where a given category obligates a relevant category so that the sentence becomes grammatical. Accordingly, inflectional suffixes are obligatory whereas derivational suffixes are optional. This seems to be the case; however, the criterion of obligatoriness seems to not work for Turkish in some cases:

- (3) Ege ve Faruk okul - dan gel-di-ler
 Ege and Faruk school - ABL come-PAST-3rdPL
 'Ege and Faruk came from the school'.

In (3), the verb is overtly marked by the plural morpheme *-lar*. However, the use of plural inflectional suffix is optional which is not compatible with the criteria (ii). Turkish also displays a phenomenon where inflectional affixes are optionally omitted in non-final conjuncts known as the suspended affixation (see Kabak, 2007 for further discussions). It is beyond question that not all of the phenomena in inflectional morphology are optional. For example, verbs have to take agreement markers from the subject-agreement paradigm and this is fully obligatory. However, this still raises the question of to what extent inflectional suffixes are obligatory.

(iii) *Replaceability by simple word*. The criterion asserts that inflected words cannot be replaced by simple words whereas derived words can be replaced by simple words. At first glance, the criterion seems to work as demonstrated in (i) where syntactic relevance determines the type of inflected markers. However, in some cases, an inflected word can be easily replaced by other words in the same construction within a paradigmatic

relation. For example, the words with plural inflectional morphemes can be replaced by their singular counterpart in Turkish, which suggests that the criterion of replaceability by simple word does not fully apply to inflectional morphology:

- (4) Ege oyuncak-lar-la / oyuncak-la oyna-dı
 Ege toy-PL-CL / toy-CL play-PAST
 'Ege played with the toys'.

(iv) *Expressing new concept.* It argues that inflected forms express the same concept as the base, whereas derived forms express a new concept. The criterion seems to be in line with the criteria (i), (ii), and (iii) where inflected word-forms express grammatical meaning, thus expressing the same concept with the inflectional markers and derived lexemes express new concepts. However, this criterion is somewhat blurred for derivational morphology. For example, the word *duygu* 'emotion' is different from the word *duygu-sal* 'emotional' but it is not easy to discern the semantic difference between the words *duygu-sal-lik* 'emotiveness' and *duygu* 'emotion'.

(v) *Meaning of derived and inflected words.* This criterion claims that the inflected forms are abstract whereas the derived forms are concrete in meaning. Likewise, it has some problems when applied to the Turkish morphology. Suffixes belonging to an inflectional category such as person, tense, and number seem to express abstract meaning. When the derived forms are taken into consideration, they can be claimed to express concrete meaning. For example, the agent nominalization suffix *-mAn* derives a concrete word when attached to a verb base. However, some derivational morphemes can derive abstract forms as well: the derivational suffix *-lik* derives an abstract word: *insan-lik* 'man-hood', *kardeş-lik* 'brother-hood'.

(vi) *Semantic relevance.* The criterion of semantic relevance is another point in differentiating derivation from inflection. Considering this, Bybee (1985) gives semantics a major role in defining derivation and inflection. She argues that where the same suffix is used both for derivational and inflectional functions, inflected forms tend to be regular semantically, and derived lexemes are more idiosyncratically expressed. This is explained by the principle of generality in Bybee's terms.

This principle seems to apply to Turkish morphology as well. For example, the past tense evidential modality in Turkish is expressed by the verbal suffix *-mİş* (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005). The suffix *-mİş* is inflectional since it is conjugated to main verbs to indicate a syntactic function:

- (5) Faruk okul - a git-miş
 Faruk school - DAT go-EVID
 '(I heard that) Faruk had gone to the school'.

Bybee (1985) argues that inflected forms can be attached to any word-forms without exception. Such that, *-mİş* suffix can also be attached to an unlimited number of verbs such as *gel-miş* 'come-EVID', *oku-muş* 'read-EVID', *sev-miş* 'love-EVID', *ye-miş* 'eat-EVID' etc.

However, when the same suffix is used with the function of a participial adjective, the suffix *-mİş* becomes derivational, deriving adjectives from verbs. In that case, according to Bybee's (1985) generality principle *-mİş* has to behave irregularly:

- (6) oku - müş adam
 read - PART man
 'educated man'

In (6), the participial adjective suffix *-mİş* has been attached to the infinitive base *oku-* (to read). This suffix can be added to the base *git-* (to go) with the function of evidential mood in as illustrated in (5). However, if it is attached to the same base with the function of a participial adjective, an illicit NP occurs:

- (7) *git - miş adam
 go - PART man
 '*gone man' (Intended Meaning: A man who has gone)

In the same way, the plural marker *-lAr* in Turkish can be invariably attached to any base. However, the agent nominalizer *-mAn* can merely be attached to the specific bases such as *öğret-* 'to teach', *yaz-* 'to write' *oku(t)* 'to read-CAUS'. If the suffix is attached to the base *dinle-* 'to listen' to derive the intended meaning 'listener', an illicit form would occur.

The examples demonstrate that semantic regularity plays an important role to differentiate derivation from inflection.

(vii) *Relevance to base meaning.* This criterion states that inflected word-forms are less relevant to base meaning whereas derived lexemes are very relevant to base meaning. As a result of this, derived lexical items tend to be expressed either lexically or morphologically since the derived and base forms are relevant to each other. However, in some cases, derived lexemes might be idiosyncratic to their base meaning. For instance, when *-lama*ⁱ is attached to the noun *balık* 'fish', the resulting word does not carry any resemblance with the base *balık*, which is *balıklama* 'head-first'. Thus, despite giving insights into the difference between derivation and inflection, the criterion of relevance to base meaning is vague in this sense.

(viii) *Applicability.* This criterion is in line with the criterion of semantic relevance. As the inflected word forms tend to have a regular behavior semantically, they tend to apply to a given category in every situation whereas since the derived lexemes have idiosyncratic properties, they cannot be applied to every instance of a category X as illustrated in (5), (6) and (7).

(ix) *Being close to the base.* This criterion seems to be in line with the principles of Lexical Morphology Theory (Kiparsky, 1982). It states that the inflected word forms occur at word periphery whereas derived lexical forms is closer to the base. As Büyükkantarcıoğlu (2003: 30) stated, derivational suffixes are closer to the base occurring at stratum 1, while inflectional suffixes occur at stratum 2 in Turkish. Therefore, if both a derivational suffix and an inflectional suffix are to be attached to a base, the base would take the derivational suffix first. Any other change in the order of the suffixes would result in an illicit form:

- (8) a. kitap - ı - dan
book - NOM - ABL
- b. *kitap - dan - ı
book - ABL - NOM
'from the book seller'

(x) *Base allomorphy.* This criterion claims that the derived forms trigger base allomorphy more than the inflected forms. This criterion does not seem to apply to Turkish morphology. Cumulative and separative property of languages constitute the most important parameter of agglutination-flexion typology where cumulative property is observed in fusional languages whereas separative property is abound in agglutinative languages (Plank, Thomas & Tikaram, 2009). Turkish has a parameter of separative property and it is an agglutinative language where affixes are juxtaposed to each other within a hierarchical order. Hence, in most cases, each suffix carrying its own grammatical function or meaning can be separated from each other. Turkish has phonologically conditioned allomorphy due to the vowel harmony. Depending on the preceding sound, the suffix or the ultimate sound of the base is phonologically modified, whether it is a derivational or inflectional suffix. Therefore, allomorphy does not seem to change the root of the vowel except for the diminutives: *küçük* 'small' becomes *küçü-cük* 'very small' when the diminutive suffix *-cık* is attached. In the same vein, when the dative case marker is attached to the first and second-person singular pronoun, the vowel of the root changes: *sen* 'you' becomes *san-a* 'to you'.

(xi) *Cumulative expression.* Considering the agglutinative nature of Turkish where each suffix carries a single function, the criterion of expressing more than one function within a single affix does not seem to apply to Turkish as discussed in (x).

(xii) *Productivity.* The last criterion is related with the productive nature of morphology. It has been widely accepted that inflected forms are more productive since they all apply to a given paradigm freely; hence, they are automatic. On the other hand, derivational affixes are not productive as discussed in (vi). For example, not all verbs can take the agent nominalizer *-mAn*. However, some derivational processes apply automatically and seem to be rule-governed (see reduplication in Turkish below).

Having applied to criteria proposed by Haspelmath (2002) to Turkish morphology, it can be argued that a clear-cut distinction between derivation and inflection is not always easy to make. Although it is true that inflection is relevant to syntax, obligatory and the inflected forms are not to be replaced by a simple word, there are cases where inflection does not behave in this way. In the same way, the basic tenets of derivational processes can be problematic in some cases as displayed above. At this juncture, it would be relevant to ask the question 'Does a theory of morphology incorporate the distinction between derivation and inflection?'

In theory, lexeme-morpheme base morphological theory (Aronoff 1993, Beard 1995) seems to incorporate a number of hypotheses regarding the distinction between derivation and inflection. Accordingly, this theory distinguishes lexemes from grammatical morphemes where lexemes are stored in the lexicon. The Separation Hypothesis offered by Beard (1995) incorporated a number of criteria to distinguish lexemes from grammatical morphemes:

1. Lexemes belong to open classes; morphemes belong to closed classes.
2. Lexemes do not allow zero or empty forms; morphemes do.
3. Lexemes have extra-grammatical referents; morphemes have grammatical functions.
4. Lexemes may undergo lexical derivation; morphemes may not.
5. Lexemes are not paradigmatic; morphemes are.

The criteria listed above seem to be in parallel with what Haspelmath (2002) proposed regarding the distinction between derivation and inflection. Considering the distinguishing features of lexemes, which apply to derivational morphology from the grammatical morphemes, the difference lies in the fact that lexemes (nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives) can undergo the process of derivation whereas grammatical morphemes are determined by the rules of syntax. Aronoff (1993; cited in Stump, 2001: 19) also suggested that 'derivation and inflection are not kinds of morphology but rather uses of morphology: Inflection is the morphological realization of syntax, while derivation is the morphological realization of lexeme formation'. This point is also relevant to what the Separation Hypothesis claims: Derivational morphology takes place in the lexicon to create new lexemes. On the other hand, inflectional morphology is handled by the rules of syntax since these rules can apply to every instance of a given category limitlessly.

Chomsky's (1970) Lexicalist Hypothesis can be argued to pave the way for a generative morphological theory distinguishing the derivational processes from the inflectional morphology. It argues that words with the derivational affixes are already listed in the lexicon to which syntactic operations cannot have an access. On the other hand, inflected forms are attached to the words by means of a number of transformational rules in the syntactic component. Thus, the hypothesis suggests that inflection is relevant to syntax and there is a clear-cut distinction between derivation and inflection.

However, it seems that these theories have also some problems with the nature of morphology. The idea that derivational morphology is already captured in the lexicon seems unclear. There are fully productive derivational processes which do not seem to be listed in the lexicon. For example, words with the diminutive suffix *-cik* cannot be listed in the lexicon since they can apply to all animate nouns and proper nouns productively (e.g. Faruk-cuğ-um 'my dear little Faruk').

The second suggestion is that the difference between derivation and inflection can be explained with a continuum approach where the inflectional past tense suffix, say, *-di*, can carry the characteristics of an inflection more than the plural suffix *-lar*, or a derivational suffix, say, agentive *-mAn*, can carry the characteristics of a derivation more than the other suffixes, say, the diminutive suffix *-cik*. Therefore, one can understand that some affixes behave more inflectional than the other inflectional suffixes, and some derivational suffixes are more derivational than the other affixes. Furthermore, all the criteria listed above do not work altogether. For example, there are both productive and non-productive derivational processes. Considering this, Turkish morphology can also be considered from the continuum perspective. The advantage of this perspective is that one can avoid making clear-cut distinction between derivation and inflection.

Thirdly, some researchers (Lieber, 1980: 70; Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987: 69; Bochner, 1992: 12; cited in Stump, 2001: 19) argued that the distinction between derivation and inflection does not have an empirical motivation. Therefore, this distinction cannot have a place in morphological theory. Rather, they argued that all types of affixation incorporate formal operations such as prefixation, suffixation, infixation and reduplication which have both derivational and inflectional uses in languages.

Cross-linguistic work on derivation and inflection also displayed that it is not easy to demarcate them. A recent work by Pertsova (2009) argued that there are few universals in morphology. Although the claim

that there are few universals regarding the morphology of languages seem challenging and delusive to make - since one cannot simply overlook the fact that morphological universal do exist - cross-linguistic analysis of derivation and inflection is somehow indicative of Pertsova's point. For instance, an inflectional category in one language might be derivational in another language (Katamba, 1993). Thus, cross-linguistic comparisons render the criteria above irrelevant. Regarding this, Bauer (2012) demonstrated that the terms derivation and inflection in Maori (Eastern Polynesian, New Zealand) do not fully match with the traditional definitions. Although the criteria for differentiating derivation and inflection can be applied to European languages such as English, the same criteria do not work in Maori.

Reduplication in Turkish

In this part, each process and type of reduplication in Turkish is discussed in order to understand to what extent reduplication applies to the criteria offered by Haspelmath (2002).

Katamba (1993: 180) defines reduplication 'as a process whereby an affix is realized by phonological material borrowed from the base'. Accordingly, reduplication might serve many purposes among languages of the world. However, reduplication here will be discussed as a word-formation process. Regarding this, Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 90) argued that there are three types of reduplicative processes in Turkish, each of them is discussed below:

- (i) emphatic reduplication
- (ii) m-reduplication
- (iii) doubling

(i) *Emphatic reduplication*. It is a type of affixation process where the meaning of an adjective is intensified by copying the first syllable of the base:

- (9) a. *uzun* 'long' > *up-uzun* 'very long'
- b. *tamam* 'complete' > *tas-tamam* 'quite complete'
- c. *temiz* 'clear' > *ter-temiz* 'very clear'
- d. *beyaz* 'white' > *bem-beyaz* 'quite white'

The emphatic reduplication in Turkish is made by copying the first syllable of the base which is followed by one of the sounds *p*, *s*, *t*, *r* in accordance with the phonological constraints.

Not all of the criteria can be applied to the emphatic reduplication, yet a number of criteria make it explicit that the process fully serves a derivational function. It can be argued that the repeated part of the words functions derivationally since the copied forms do not serve any grammatical function, which obeys the criterion of syntactic relevance. Further, as the criterion of productivity suggests, though the process of reduplication is highly productive in Turkish, not all adjectives can be reduplicated. There seems to be a constraint that reduplicating an already derived adjective cannot be reduplicated.

- (10) a. *sinir-li* 'angry' > **sip-sinir-li* (Intended Meaning: quite angry)
- b. *ak-ıçl* 'fluent' > **ap-ak-ıçl* (Intended Meaning: quite fluent)

Considering the examples, it becomes clear that there are some idiosyncratic constraints which block the derived adjectives to be reduplicated. Moreover, the reduplicated form cannot take any derivational morphemes as well:

- (11) a. *bütün* 'entire' > *bütün-cül* 'integrative'
- b. *bütün* 'entire' > *büs-bütün* 'entirely'
- c. *büs-bütün* 'entirely' > **büs-bütün-cül* (Intended Meaning: quite integrative)

Although the reduplicated adjective *büsbütün* 'entirely' is totally grammatical, this prohibits for further derivation. This phenomenon can be explained by the word-formation rule called blocking: "the application of an earlier rule may thwart the application of a later one" (Katamba 1993: 126-127). Therefore, although the word *bütüncül* 'integrative' is possible, the reduplicated form of the word **büsbütüncül* cannot be derived.

The constraint explained above seems not to be the only constraint which governs the application of

reduplication. Reduplicating some underived adjectives would sound nonsensical as well:

- (12) a. *mutlu* ‘happy’ > **mus-mutlu* (Intended Meaning: quite happy)
 b. *küçük* ‘small’ > **küp-küçük* (Intended Meaning: quite small)
 c. *fakir* ‘poor’ > **fas-fakir* (Intended Meaning: quite poor)
 d. *deli* ‘crazy’ > **dep-deli* (Intended Meaning: quite crazy)

As the examples demonstrate, reduplicating some adjectives does not sound acceptable. Even though the antonym of *küçük* ‘small’, can be reduplicated which is *büs-büyük* ‘very big’, *küçük* ‘small’ cannot be reduplicated. On the other hand, the reduplicated form of the adjective *deli* ‘crazy’ is idiosyncratic, which becomes *zır-deli* ‘quite crazy’, not predictable by the rules for deriving adjectives according to the constraints of emphatic reduplication.

It can be inferred from the whole set of examples that emphatic reduplication only applies to underived word forms governed by the blocking principle and even though some adjectives are underived in nature, reduplicating those adjectives does not seem to be acceptable. This suggests that emphatic reduplication in Turkish represents the features of derivational morphology since the rules can be idiosyncratically applied to some adjectives unlike in the case of inflectional morphology. As the reduplicated part carries the meaning of ‘very’ in English, if reduplication was applied to whole set of adjectives, every reduplicated adjective would have the meaning of ‘very’, with this property it would share the functions of inflectional morphology.

The fact that why some underived adjectives can be reduplicated whereas a number of underived adjectives cannot be reduplicated can partly be explained by phonological constraints (see Dhillon, 2009 for an Optimality theoretical accounts for reduplication). Further study might examine the various ways of phonological constraints governing the acceptability of reduplicated adjectives. Since the aim of this paper is not to discuss the phonological constraints, I will leave the discussion here.

(ii) *m-reduplication*. The second type reduplication process is called m-reduplication. This process is made by copying the whole word. As for the copied form, if the first sound of a word is a consonant, it is replaced by the sound *m*. If the first sound is a vowel, the vowel is not omitted; rather the word is copied and *m* is inserted at the beginning of a word.

- (13) a. *keçi* ‘goat’ > *keçi meçi* ‘goat or something like that’
 b. *güzel* ‘beautiful’ > *güzel müzel* ‘beautiful or something like that’
 c. *delice* ‘madly’ > *delice melice* ‘madly or something like that’
 d. *gitmek* ‘to go’ > *gitmek mitmek* ‘to go or something like that’

As can be seen from the examples, m-reduplication can be applied to nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. This process is a derivational, not serving any grammatical function. However, it seems that m-reduplication tends to apply automatically to whole classes except for the words starting with the *m* sound (**masa masa* (Intended Meaning: table or something like that). Therefore, one can argue that this process is totally productive as in the case of inflectional morphology. In other words, it doesn’t have a limited applicability; it could be applied to every X of category noun, verb, adjective and adverb. Second, the reduplicated forms do not result in a new concept; the meaning is semantically close to the base as in the case of inflection. Further, the derived words are not semantically irregular; all words would result in meaning of “X or something like X”. Considering this, all of these thwart the status of m-reduplication as a representative process of derivation.

(iii) *Doubling*. Another type of reduplication is doubling in which the word is repeated. Doubling is a highly productive process as in the case of m-reduplication:

- (14) a. *güzel güzel uyu* ‘sleep well’
 b. *sıra sıra odalar* ‘many rooms in a row’
 c. *uzun uzun kavaklar* ‘many long poplar trees’

Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 92) stated that “the particle *-mI* can be inserted between two occurrences of an adjective intensify the meaning”:

(15) *güzel mi güzel ev* ‘a remarkably beautiful house’

The reduplicated form in (15) is different from the ones in (14). It is known that the participle *-ml* behaves like a clitic in Turkish (Kornfilt, 1997). It can only be applied to words at the post-lexical level. Accordingly, it cannot be placed in the middle of a derivational process. That’s why, the question arises as to whether to treat this particle as a part of the derivational process or not.

From this small piece of evidence, one can argue that languages have different means of affixation processes. Reduplication in Turkish is highly productive. Of the three types of reduplication processes, the emphatic reduplication represents the criteria offered to differentiate derivation from inflection. On the other hand, m-reduplication and doubling less represent the features of derivational morphology. Further, since the reduplicated forms in doubling can be infixed by a clitic-like particle, this thwarts its status as a derivational process. Considering the process of reduplication, a neat definition for the derivational morphology would not be easy to make. As the reduplicated forms demonstrated, some derived forms seem to be a typical example of derivation, some simply not. Hence, as Katamba (1993) argued, derivation and inflection can be approached from the continuum perspective rather than being dichotomous since the reduplicated forms suggested that not all three types of reduplication processes display the features of derivation equally.

Conclusion

Overall, languages have different means of deriving new words and inflect word-forms. One cannot simply ignore the dichotomy between derivational and inflectional morphology. However, this study suggested that not all of the distinguishing criteria apply to the derivational and inflectional morphology equally. In Turkish morphology, derivation and inflection seem to form a continuum. As the study displayed, not all inflectional suffixes are equally relevant to the features of the inflectional morphology. Therefore, within this continuum, suffixes which are totally relevant to the features of inflectional morphology form the extreme point of inflection, whereas suffixes which are less relevant to these features are still part of the inflectional morphology but less representative of it. The same arguments can be put forward for the derivational morphology as well. By considering the reduplication process, emphatic reduplication can be considered to form the extreme point of derivation being the most typical example of it, whereas m-reduplication and doubling seem to be less derivational process and situated in the lower of point of derivation continuum.

Considering the limited amount of data, it is impossible to give whole features of derivation and inflectional processes in Turkish. Therefore, this study should cover data that are more extensive. However, the study seems to trigger future works regarding how derivations and inflections are represented in Turkish morphology.

References

- Aronoff, Mark. *Morphology by Itself*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993.
- Bauer, Laurie. The Distinction between Derivation and Inflection in Maaori and its Implications, 15th Internationally Morphology Meeting, Vienna University of Economics and Business, February 9- 12, 2012.
- Beard, R. *Lexeme-Morpheme Base Morphology*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Beard, Robert. “Derivation.” *The Handbook of Morphology*. Spencer, Andrew and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds). Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- Bochner, Harry. *Simplicity in Generative Morphology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.
- Bybee, Joan. *Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1985.
- Büyükkantarçioğlu, Nalan. Analyzing Turkish Word Formation with Insights from Lexical Morphology, AATT (American Association of Teachers of Turkic Languages) Bulletin, Issue 29-30, Portland State University, (2002), pp. 26-34.

- Chomsky, Noam. "Remarks on Nominalization". In R., Jacobs and P., Rosenbaum (eds), *Readings in Transformational Grammar*, Waltham, Mass.:Ginn and Co., (1970), 184-221.
- Dhillon, Rajdip. *Turkish Emphatic Reduplication: Balancing Productive and Lexicalized Forms*. *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 71, 2007.
- Di Sciullo, Anna-Maria, and Edwin Williams. *On the Definition of Word*. Vol. 14. Cambridge, MA: MIT press, 1987.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. A Quantitative Approach to the Morphological Typology of Language. *International journal of American linguistics* 26.3, (1960), pp. 178-194.
- Göksel, Aslı and Kerslake, Celia. (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Haspelmath, Martin. *Understanding Morphology*. London: Arnold, 2002.
- Katamba, Francis. *Morphology*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.
- Kiparsky, Paul. "Lexical Morphology and Phonology". In Yang, I. S. (Ed.). *Linguistics in Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin, 1982.
- Lieber, Rochelle. *On the Organization of the Lexicon*. Ph.D. Diss, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1980.
- Kabak, Barış. Turkish Suspended Affixation. *Linguistics* 45 (2), (2007), pp. 311-347
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. *Turkish*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Pertsova, Katya. "Matthew Baerman, Greville G. Corbett, Dunstan Brown & Andrew Hippisley (eds.), Deponency and Morphological Mismatches (Proceedings of the British Academy 145). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. xv+ 324." *Journal of Linguistics* 45.1, (2009), pp. 203-208.
- Plank, Frans, Mayer, Thomas and Poudel, Tikaram. Phonological Fusion is not the only, and Probably not Even the Main, Source of Morphological Cumulation. Paper Given at the 7th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting, Lefkosia, Cyprus, 2009.
- Stump, Gregory. "Inflection." *The Handbook of Morphology*. Spencer, Andrew and Arnold, 2001.

TÜRKÇEDE TÜRETİM VE ÇEKİM ARASINDAKİ FARKLILIKLAR VE YİNELEMeye UYGULANIŞI

Oktay ÇINAR

ÖZ

Türetim ve çekimin biçimbilimsel süreçler olarak ele alınması, biçimbilimsel kuram ve sözcüklerin iç yapısını çözümlenmeye yönelik sunulan üretici dilbilgisi yaklaşımının uzun yıllardır ilgi noktasını oluşturmaktadır. Tipolojik bakış açısıyla, diller bu araçları yeni sözlük birimleri oluşturmak veya belirli bir sözcüğün biçimbilimsel paradigmasını değiştirmek için kullanır. Bu, türetim ve çekimin yeni sözcük oluşturmak için nasıl çalıştığı sorusunu gündeme getirmektedir: Türetim ile çekimsel biçimbilim arasında herhangi bir fark varsa, bunları birbirinden farklı kılan özellikler nelerdir? Bunu göz önünde bulundurarak, bu çalışma, türetim ve çekim süreçleri doğrultusunda sunulan geleneksel tanımların Türkçeye nasıl uygulandığını sorgulamaktadır. Bunun dışında, türetimi çekimden farklılaştırmak için sunulan ayırt edici kriterlere ikilemenin ne ölçüde uyduğunu anlamak için Türkçedeki ikileme süreçleri tartışılmaktadır. Böylece, ikilemenin ne derece türetimsel olduğu sorusu da sorulmaktadır. Çalışmanın sonuçları ise türetim ve çekim süreçlerindeki tüm örneklerinin eşit olarak ele alınamayacağını göstermektedir. Türetilmiş ikileme sözcükleri üzerine yapılan çözümleme, biçimbilimsel süreçler arasındaki farkın kesin olarak belirlenemeyeceğini iddia eden bir yaklaşımı da desteklemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türetimsel biçimbilim, çekimsel biçimbilim, yineleme, biçimbilimsel tipoloji

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	: Ablative
ACC	: Accusative
CAUS	: Causitive
CL	: Clitic
DAT	: Dative
EVID	: Evidential
GEN	: Genitive
NOM	: Nominalization
PART	: Participle
PL	: Plural
3rdSING	: 3rd Person Singular
3rdPL	: 3rd Person Plural

ⁱ As there is no such derived word as ‘*balık-la’ in Turkish, the suffix supposedly attached to the base balık ‘fish’ is cumulatively considered to be *-lama*.