Kitap Tanıtımı / Book Review

Exploring the Turkish Linguistic Landscape: Essays in honor of Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan. Edited by Mine Güven, Didar Akar, Balkız Öztürk and Meltem Kelepir, 2016. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 202 pages. ISBN 978 90 272 5940 0

Ceyda Arslan Kechriotis

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, 34342 Bebek İstambul
arslance@boun.edu.tr

(Received 11 April 2017; accepted 15 June 2017)

1 Introduction

This volume consists of 11 papers with 16 contributors. The papers fall into four categories. There are 2 papers in the phonology part, 4 papers on morphology and syntax, 2 papers on discourse, and 3 on language acquisition. As the title indicates, the original articles reflecting the most recent developments in Turkish linguistics are published as a volume to honor the work of Professor Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan, who has not only influenced the field of linguistics worldwide but also touched the authors' lives as well as the editors' in varying degrees as a teacher, mentor, or colleague. The author of this review also considers herself lucky to have been a student of Prof. Erguvanlı-Taylan since 1992.

2 Papers on Phonology

The part on phonology consists of two papers, one by Yavaş & Altan and the other by Pöchtrager. Yavaş & Altan's paper, entitled "Vowel epenthesis in the acquisition of English /s/-clusters by Turkish speakers", has the objective of examining the production of the English sC clusters in the interphonology of Turkish L1 speakers. They report the result of the study they conducted with 25 speakers of L1 Turkish where the informants were asked to produce the English #sC clusters. The L1 speakers of Turkish are expected to resolve the unacceptable consonant cluster via epenthesis, i.e. vowel insertion between the consonants in the initial cluster. They base their analysis on the Sonority Sequencing Principle (SSP), which states that the nucleus of the syllable is to be preceded and/or followed by a sequence of segments with progressively decreasing sonority (Clements 1990). They point out that /sT/ i.e. s+stop

Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2017/1, 79-92.
© 2017 Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, İstanbul.

clusters violate the SSP because /s/ is a voiceless fricative (has a higher sonority value than the following segment /p, t, k/; and /sN/ i.e. s+nasal, /sl/, i.e. s+lateral, and /sw/ all follow SSP. When comparing the productions of different #sC clusters, the authors paid special attention to the durational pattern of the epenthetic vowel, if there was any. The prediction based on the sonority framework was that the duration of the epenthetic vowel would increase as one moves from /sw/ > /sl/ > /sN/ and /sT/. The results of the study indicated that this prediction was not borne out. The duration of the epenthetic vowel was highest in the /sw/ cluster going down in /sT/, /sl/ and finally /sN/. The authors take out the /sw/ cluster from the analysis based on the fact that Turkish does not have /w/ in its phonemic inventory. They argue that the difficulty of production of sT can be explained due to its negative sonority but SSP cannot explain the less troublesome property of /sN/ over /sl/. Thus SSP failing, they take into account the OCP (Obligatory Contour Principle) for continuance (Yip 1988) for an explanation of the results where OCP is a principle that disfavors identical sequences. The sequences /sl/ and /sw/ are more marked as they violate OCP for continuance, whereas s+stop and s+nasal sequences obey OCP in that respect. Surprisingly, the OCP for continuance does not account for the results of their study. Even though /sT/ sequences have identical structures to /sN/ sequences with respect to the OCP for continuance, /sT/ sequences show up as causing more difficulties for Turkish L1 speakers as opposed to /sN/. To be specific, the epenthetic vowel duration in /st/ is significantly shorter than /sp/ and than /sk/. As for the /sN/ category, they found out that the epenthetic vowel duration is shorter in /sn/ than in /sm/. The clusters causing the least trouble for L1 Turkish speakers have been found to be /st/ and /sn/. Interestingly, what both /st/ and /sn/ have in common is that the second consonant of the cluster have the features [-continuant, +coronal], the first consonant of the cluster /s/ also being [+coronal]. They conclude that homorganicity is highly important when the second consonant in the cluster was a [-continuant] (/st/ and /sn/), but not when it was a [+continuant] (/sl/). To sum up, the most successful combination for Turkish L1 speakers was /st/ and /sn/, followed by /sm/, /sl/, and lastly by /sp/ and /sk/.

The second paper on phonology is by Pöchtrager and is entitled "Is there phonological vowel reduction in Turkish?" where the author aims to discuss whether Turkish instantiates vowel reduction as a phonological process from the point of view of Government Phonology. His two main results is that first, what is called vowel reduction in Turkish is not a process as there is no phonological link between reduced and unreduced forms, and second, that a successful theory of phonology should not only describe the rules but tell us what would be a phonological process in a given language.

Pöchtrager starts by giving Turkish facts about vowel reduction. He discusses Lewis' (1967) description of vowel reduction, where a suffix

beginning with *y* [j] narrows the stem final *e* [e] and *a* [a] to *i* [i] and *ı* [ɯ] as in *bekle-yecek* - *bekli-yecek* 's/he will wait' (Lewis 1967:20). Pöchtrager mentions that the so called vowel reduction is also encountered before *c* [ʤ] as pointed out in Vural (2006) as in the example *gel-ecek* - *gel-icek* 's/he will come' (p.23). Pöchtrager points out that vowel reduction observed before *y* [j] behaves differently than the one before *c* [ʤ] in the sense that the former produces forms that block rounding harmony:

(1) ol-ma-yan *ol-mu-yan ol-mı-yan ol-mi-yan
'(the one) not being' (p. 23)

Pöchtrager analyzes Turkish vowel reduction as the loss of the element A within the framework of Government Phonology, but also questions the non-arbitrariness of the connection between the target and the trigger. The consonants in front of which vowel reduction occurs are *y* [j] and *c* [ʤ], which are palatal and share the element I. Pöchtrager asks why an A element is lost (why vowel reduction occurs) if the following consonant contains the I element. This signals, he claims, that the process of vowel reduction cannot be phonological from the point of view of GP. He also criticizes Vural's (2006) rule-based account of the phenomenon in that she posits a phonological rule to account for vowel reduction caused by the future suffix –(y)AcAK and lack the generality expected of a phonological rule within the GP framework.

Pöchtrager also points out that the so-called vowel reduction is also sensitive to a syntactic difference in an otherwise identical structure. He contrasts structures like the following where in the first there is a nominalization of an entire phrase (VP or even TP), and the latter in which we have a nominalized verb only:

(2) a. Geleceğimi söyledi. Geliceğimi söyledi.
come-fut-1poss-acc say-past
'S/he said I would come.'
b. Geleceğimi söyledi. *Geliceğimi söyledi
future-1poss-acc say-past
'S/he told me my future.' (p. 33, ex. 13 a-b)

These examples illustrate that vowel reduction may occur in phrase-level nominalizations but not in cases of a nominalization of a head, which makes a so-called phonological process sensitive to syntactic environment.

To sum up, Pöchtrager argues that vowel reduction in Turkish cannot be considered a phonological process as it is limited to a particular morphological type of a base (i.e. verbals) in a particular kind of a syntactic

context (phrasal nominalizations). As an answer to the question of the link between the reduced and unreduced forms, he offers an account along the lines of Gussmann's (2007) replacement rules which he summarizes by quoting Gussmann (2007:122) "… morphophonological operations constitute replacements of segments, and whatever semblance to phonology they may have is nothing but synchronic accident." (p.37).

3 Papers on Morphology and Syntax

Part II in the volume is dedicated to morphology and syntax and consists of four papers.

The first paper in this part of the volume is by Karl Zimmer and is entitled "A note on the compatibility of reflexive and causative in the Turkish verb". Zimmer revisits the compatibility problem of a reflexive and a causative suffix on a Turkish verbal stem. Zimmer (1976) argued that a verbal stem containing both reflexive and causative is ungrammatical, whereas Underhill (1976) argued that it was possible to make reflexive verbs causative. Zimmer presents a very small pilot study he conducted via e-mail asking native speakers of Turkish to give their grammaticality judments for the following structure:

(3) Bu çocuğu bir türlü yıka-n-dır-amı-yor-um.
this child-acc no way wash-refl-caus-abil+neg-pres-1sg
'There's no way I can get this child to wash himself.' (p. 44, ex. 1)

Zimmer reports that four out of five native speakers marked this sentence as acceptable and one marked it as unacceptable. He points out that this difference (four to one) cannot be considered a dialectal difference and argues that speakers make up grammars ("mini-grammars" in his words) of verbal morphology when they need to and this causes the different judgments of the speakers in the case of his mini-experiment. He also indicates that the rarity of reflexive+causative sequence (given that some speakers do accept that sequence) may depend on the fact that reflexivization using the reflexive suffix is not a productive process in Turkish morphology.

The second paper in this part is by A. Sumru Özsoy and is entitled "Negative or not – the case of *–(y)AlI beri* in Turkish". Özsoy examines an irregularity in Turkish in the licensing of the negative (NEG) projection in the temporal adjunct clauses bearing *–(y)AlI beri* expressing duration. Focusing on structures like the following, Özsoy points out first that the postposition *beri* is unacceptable in the negative counterpart and semantically both *–(y)AlI* and *–mA-yAlI* mark the inception time of the event of the matrix clause:

(4) a. Ben onu göreli (beri) çok büyümüş.
I 3sg-acc see-*(y)AlI* since very grow-evi
'S/he has grown a lot since I saw him/her.'
b. Ben onu görmeyeli (*beri) çok büyümüş.
I 3sg-acc see-neg-*(y)AlI* since very grow-evi
'S/he has grown a lot since I saw him/her.' (p. 46, ex. 1 a-b)

Özsoy, furthermore, demonstrates that the NEG projection in the *–(y)AlI* is not licensed in all cases:

(5) *Biz buraya gelmeyeli yağmur yağıyor. (p. 46, ex. 2b)
we here come-neg-(y)AlI rain rain-prog
Intended: 'It has been raining continuously since we have come here.'

For the infelicity of the NEG projection in the previous structure and the possibility of both *–(y)AlI* and the negated *–mA-yAlI* in (1a-b), Arslan-Kechriotis (2006) has proposed that the *–(y)AlI* clause has an existential presupposition and a uniqueness property whereas its negated counterpart (i.e. *–mAyAlI*) has a plurality implication. Özsoy argues that this approach only partially accounts for the distinction between the distribution of the two structures (-*(y)AlI* vs. *–mAyAlI*) and claims that these structures focus on different phases of the event which is expressed by the verb in the adverbial clause. She proposes that -*mAyAlI* focuses on the last occurrence of the event expressed by the verb phrase in the adverbial clause. Özsoy here fails to take into account Arslan-Kechriotis' (2006) discussion about the acceptability of the following example (6b) for some speakers. Given a context where Aylin has been to England in 1996, 1999 and 2002 (and the moment of utterance being in 2004):

(6) a. Aylin İngiltere'ye 1996'da, 1999'da ve 2002'de gitti. (Şimdi 2004'teyiz.)
Aylin went to England in 1996, 1999 and 2002. (We are now in the year 2004.)
b. (#) Aylin İngiltere'ye gid-eli iki sene oldu.
Aylin England-DAT go-(y)AlI two year be-PERF
'It's been two years since Aylin had been to England.'
(Arslan-Kechriotis 2006:71 ex. 15)

Arslan-Kechriotis states that the sentence in (b) is acceptable for some speakers and this felicity of the affirmative form of *–(y)AlI* clause in a context where the event lacks the uniqueness property, i.e. where it is known to have taken place more than once, depends on the interpretation focusing on the last occurrence

of the event. She supports her claim by the contrasting infelicity of the following sentences given the same context (6a):

(7) a. #Aylin İngiltere'ye gid-eli sekiz sene oldu.
Aylin England-DAT go-(y)AlI eight year be-PERF
'#It's been eight years since Aylin had been to England.'
(p.72 ex. 16b)

b. #Aylin İngiltere'ye gid-eli beş sene oldu.
Aylin England-DAT go-(y)AlI five year be-PERF
'#It's been five years since Aylin had been to England.'
(p.72 ex. 16c)

Özsoy looks at the possibility of *–(y)AlI* and *–mAyAlI* adverbial clauses where the main predicate does not only express a temporal amount (as in Arslan-Kechriotis's examples) but also an event or a state as in (4 a-b) above and concludes that the affirmative *–(y)AlI* focuses on the last occurrence of the event expressed by the verb in the adverbial clause whereas the negative form, i.e. *–mAyAlI* focuses on the time elapsed since the last occurrence of that event and the moment of speech. She also claims that the distribution of *–(y)AlI* and *–mAyAlI* is licensed by the semantic category of the verb in the adverbial clause and also by the Tense/Aspect/Modality operator in the main clause.

Before going on to the next paper, I would like to point out that both Arslan-Kechriotis (2006) and Özsoy in her paper in this volume fail to account for the occurrence of NEG operator in the *–mAyAlI* adverbial clause where it literally carries the negation meaning as exemplified below:

(8) O tedaviyi kabul etmeyeli iki ay oldu. (=tedaviyi reddedeli)
3sg treatment-acc accept-neg-*(y)AlI* two month be-past (… reject-*(y)AlI*)
'It's been two months since s/he didn't accept the treatment/rejected the treatment.'

Note that the matrix clause expresses a temporal amount and such a construction is not very common. One needs to account first for the felicity of the NEG with the negation meaning in such a sentence and secondly discuss if NEG with its literal meaning is also felicitous in structures where the predicate in the matrix clause expresses an event or a state and not a temporal amount only.

The third paper in the section on morphology and syntax is "Greek and Turkish influences in the clausal complements of Cunda Turkish" by Bağrıaçık and Göksel. This paper analyzes the clausal complementation structure in Cunda Turkish by first and second generation refugees who had been relocated from Crete (Greece) to Western Turkey during the population

exchange of 1923 and later. The data come from the recordings of 10 informants (4 male and 6 female) speaking about personal and historical narratives in Cunda Turkish in 2009. The analysis of this data shows that Cunda Turkish incorporates strategies both from Cretan Greek and from Turkish and creates its own system of clausal complementation. The Cunda Turkish presents a dichotomy between factive and non-factive complementation, i.e. between complements of factive and non-factive predicates. Factive predicates employ finite indicative clauses as complements both preverbally and postverbally and these complements are mostly headed by the complementizer *diye*. The use of *diye* is a strategy adopted from Turkish where it is used to form indicative factive adverbial clauses. Non-factive predicates, on the other hand, employ two different strategies for their complements: The complement of a non-factive predicate is either a preverbal non-finite clause (headed by *–mA/-mAK*) or a postverbal finite subjunctive clause with optative marking. Bağrıaçık and Göksel point out that the choice between these two strategies depends on the veridicality of the predicate, veridical predicates choosing the former whereas non-veridical ones the latter. The data and the findings have shown some parallelisms between Cunda Turkish and West Rumelian Turkish in the Balkans. The authors point out that these parallelisms focus not around non-finite complementation but around the use of the optative marking affected by the use of the subjunctive in Greek, which is understandable as Greek is a central member of the Balkan Sprachbund.

The final paper in this section is entitled "Clause combining in Turkish as a minority language in Germany" by Schroeder. This paper aims to provide a theoretical basis for the distinction between oral and written language in Turkish and to use this basis to analyze the language shift in Turkish spoken in Germany focusing on the domain of clause combining. Turkish in Germany is a minority language that has developed in the last fifty years in Germany. The focus of the paper is on clause combining which is realized predominantly as non-finite subordination in Turkish with a variety of finite clause combining. The differences between a finite and non-finite structures are considered to be register differences, non-finite clause combining strategies belonging to the written register, whereas finite clause combining strategies to the spoken register. An analysis of clause combining in Turkish in Germany and the Netherlands reveals that when compared to the monolingual setting, finite clause combining is more frequent in bilingual Turkish-German and Turkish-Dutch speech and written text production. Schroeder argues that the fact that sociolinguistic setting of Turkish in Germany has a limited access to the formal register of Turkish results in the less frequent use of strongly literate forms. He then focuses on the use of

çünkü 'because' in order to show that the difference is not only of frequency of use, but a shift in the relation of form and function. Schroeder analyzes three text collections (composing of 400,000; 67,000; and 10,150 words) checking both the frequency of use of *çünkü* and its position, and finds out that it is used least frequently in the written Turkish in Turkey and there is an increase in frequency in spoken Turkish in Turkey and even a larger increase in its use in the Turkish in Germany. Another difference comes up as to the position of *çünkü*. Even though in spoken Turkish in Turkey the clause initial position is stronger than the clause final position (73.6% vs 19.1%), the distribution of the clause-final *çünkü* remains at 3.5%. Schroeder brings an explanation of this preference of *çünkü* in clause-initial position from the language contact point of view. He argues that the use of only clause-initial *çünkü* in Turkish in Germany is because of the contact of German in which clause combining is realized predominantly in finite structures and clause-initial connectors are used.

To sum up, this paper argues that the frequent use of non-finite clause combining strategy in Turkish in Germany is linked to the limited access to the structures of the formal register in Turkish. Moreover, the predominant use of the clause-initial *çünkü* has the highest degree of correspondence with the contact language, in this case German.

4 Papers on Discourse

The third section of the volume is dedicated to discourse and consists of two papers.

The first paper is "Thinking for speaking and the construction of evidentiality in language contact" by Slobin. Slobin studies the changes induced by long-term contact between two languages in the realm of the speakers' habits of "thinking for speaking" using evidentiality as an example. He argues that speakers with long-term bilingualism or multilingualism exhibit changes in one language they use, while they accommodate thinking for speaking in the other language. He explains that in the process of learning and using a language, the speaker needs to pay attention to the language-specific modes of thinking, which he labels as "thinking for speaking". The bilingual speaker in communicating in his/her second language changes it when s/he accommodates thinking for speaking in the first language.

In this paper, he analyzes the interaction of Turkish and the indigenous languages of the Ottoman Empire on the one hand, and the interaction between Spanish and the indigenous languages of the Andes of South America on the other. His analysis rests upon the use of evidential marking in Turkish and Andean contact areas and he shows that languages that lacked evidential marking created grammatical means to express evidentiality

without borrowing any explicit forms but by means of the emergence of new uses of parallel structures in the contact languages. In the case of Turkish, the administrative language of the Ottoman Empire acts as the model language providing evidentiality and Slavic languages such as Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian; Romance languages like Romanian, Aromanian and Judeo-Spanish; Albanian; Greek and the Indo-Iranian language Romani act as replica languages where evidentiality has been documented as past participles and forms of the Perfect. In the Andean case, Spanish acts as the replica language whereas the indigenous languages Quechua and Aymara are the model languages providing the concept of evidentiality. Slobin notes that the system of evidential marking in these languages bears close similarity to the one in Turkish. Moreover, as in the Turkish case, forms of the Perfect are used in the replica language Spanish in order to express evidentiality. Slobin concludes his paper by emphasizing that sociolinguistic factors such as linguistic attitudes and values play an important role in contact-induced change. He gives the example of Greek, which did not replicate the pattern of evidentiality of Turkish with which it has been in constant contact. He follows Joseph (2003) who suggested that the determining factor in the lack of evidentials in Greek is the language attitude the speakers have. In the case of Greek communities in isolated areas throughout Anatolia, on the other hand, the Greek variety replicated not only evidential marking but also agglutinative morphology. Slobin sums up by stating that what the linguists see as contact-induced change are the results of the process of thinking for speaking which go hand in hand with language attitudes and values.

The second paper in this part is entitled "Conditionals in Turkish: a classification based on function" by Oktar and Can. The aim of this paper is to find answers to the research questions as to what the positions of the if-subordinate clause (protasis) and the main clause (apodosis) are in Turkish conditional clauses and what the functions of the conditional clauses are depending on the position of the protasis and apodosis. The authors adopt Declerck and Reed's (2001) approach to the conditional clauses and they use a database consisting of eight novels. Declerck and Reed (2001) propose "case-specifying conditionals" and "rhetorical conditionals" that determine the relation between the protasis (if-subordinate clause) and apodosis (main clause). "[A] case-specifying conditional implies that whether or not Q is the case depends […] on whether P is or is not the case." (Declerck & Reed 2001:47 as quoted in Oktar & Can p. 126). Declerck and Reed introduce the term rhetorical conditionals in order to explain the conditional structures in which the protases are used for rhetorical purposes, which do not have a case-specifying function.

Analyzing the conditionals in the database of eight detective novels, this paper classifies them using a functional perspective as opposed to the traditional formal approach ignoring the context in which the conditionals are used. The authors have found out that in the database of eight detective novels, the order of protasis + apodosis constitutes 98.1% of the occurrences of conditional structures. As for the function of the conditional clauses, they have displayed that 15 different conditional types take on a case-specifying function the most common being 'PCSC Specifying the Circumstances under which the Q-situation Actualizes' with a distribution of 27%, followed by 'the function of inferentials' with 19% and 'the function of actualization' with 11%. They have also found out that 21 different conditional types serve a rhetorical function the most common being the commenting conditionals with a distribution of 19.8%, utterance conditionals with 12.3%, comparing conditionals with 8.9%, pleonastic conditionals with 0.38% and pseudo-implicative conditionals with 0.15%.

5 Papers on Language Acquisition

The last part in the volume is about language acquisition and consists of three papers, the first of which deals with evidentiality in Turkish and the latter two deal with the acquisition of morphophonemic alternation in Turkish.

The first paper in this section is by Aksu-Koç and is entitled "The interface of evidentials and epistemics in Turkish: perspectives from acquisition". The aim of this paper is to address the nature of evidentiality as a modal category in Turkish where evidentiality marking is grammaticized. The functions of the evidential suffix *–mIş/-(y)mIş* are explored and compared to the neutral past tense marker *–DI* and the epistemic suffix *–DIr* with evidence from language acquisition research.

Aksu-Koç first discusses the two opposing views in the literature where evidentiality is seen as a category of epistemic modality or is considered to be an independent grammatical category. Within the first view, evidentials, by conveying the source of information, necessarily express the reliability of the source, and thus belong to the realm of epistemic modality. The second view, where evidentiality is considered a grammatical category on its own, on the other hand, argues that evidential markers do not imply lack of reliability, or doubt with regard to the truth of the information conveyed, but they just assert the evidence for the utterance of the speaker. Aksu-Koç revisits the Turkish system and discusses the functions of the neutral (*-DI/-(y)DI*), evidential (*-mIş/-(y)mIş*) and the epistemic categories (*-DIr*) as observed in the acquisition data and argues that Turkish evidentials indicate the type of evidence an assertion is based on and thus mark the perspective of the speaker

with respect to the assertion rather than its reliability. In other words, the evidential in Turkish marks speaker stance and not the reliability of the source.

Children first use the direct experience marker *–DI* around 2 years of age and the *–mIş/-(y)mIş* is used a few months later with the mirative meaning (i.e. in contexts of direct evidence expressing new information). The narrative, inferential and hearsay functions of the evidential are observed in the given order later than the mirative function. Aksu-Koç summarizes the findings of the acquisition research and states that *–mIş/-(y)mIş* indicates evidentiality as opposed to *–DI* which indicates a modally neutral perspective. In the mirative use of *–mIş/-(y)mIş*, it shows speaker stance (new/unexpected information) as opposed to *–DI* which indicates a neutral attitude. As for the contrast of *–mIş/-(y)mIş* and *–DIr*, the research shows that (i) *–mIş/-(y)mIş* indicates the source of the information whereas *-DIr* is epistemic indicating the degree of the reliability of the source, (ii) *-mIş/-(y)mIş* indicates inference via sensory evidence as opposed to *–DIr* indicating inference via reasoning from general knowledge, (iii) *–mIş/-(y)mIş* is used as a reported speech marker introducing the perspective of a third party. *–DIr*, on the other hand, is used to emphasize the perspective of the speaker himself, and (iv) the use of *–mIş/-(y)mIş* marks the fact that the inference is applicable to a particular instant and can be interpreted as generic only in contexts of new information whereas a factive *–DIr* statement can be interpreted as generic or specific.

Aksu-Koç concludes that the Turkish evidential category marked by *–mIş/-(y)mIş* indicates 'speaker stance' and not an evaluation of reliability and thus should be considered as a separate modal category and not as part of epistemic modality.

The second paper is by Nakipoğlu, Üntak and Furman with the title "Acquisition of morphophonemic alternations and the role of frequency". The authors look at acquisition data of Turkish stems that undergo morphophonemic alternation in order to better understand the nature of mental representations of children. The data they use contain stems in which the final voiceless bilabial plosive [p], dental plosive [t] and the alveopalatal [ʧ] undergo voicing, and the final voiceless velar plosive [k] undergoes deletion when followed by a vowel. Keeping in mind that not all stems ending in [p], [t], [ʧ] exhibit voicing and not all stems ending in [k] exhibit deletion, they predict that (i) Turkish children may treat alternating words as non-alternating, and words that undergo [k]-deletion as non-deleting when rendered intervocalic, and (ii) the children may make mistakes and treat stems that do not undergo alternation/deleting as final plosive alternating and deleting stems. The prediction that the Turkish children will demonstrate alternation errors argues for the fact that there is a phonological rule involved. Apart from stems undergoing final voicing alternation and [k]-deletion, they

also investigate the acquisition of stems ending in 'ğ', which does not involve a consonantal sound as opposed to its treatment as a consonant in the adult language.

The data come from 60 children from three age groups ranging from 3;2 to 8;11. The test items contain 17 [k]-ending alternating words as opposed to 2 [k]-ending non-alternating words, 7 [p]-ending alternating words as opposed to 3 [p]-ending non-alternating words, 7 [ʧ]-ending alternating words as opposed to 3 [ʧ]-ending non-alternating words, 5 [t]-ending alternating words as opposed to 4 [t]-ending non-alternating words, and 5 'ğ' ending words. The findings demonstrate that children in all three age groups made errors with alternating stems and words ending in 'ğ. Both age and sound type seem to affect the number of errors made by the children.

The study shows that children had an error rate of 15% with [k]-ending words in the youngest age group and that rate leveled off to 2% in the third age group. The error rate observed in [p] and [t]-ending words also leveled off with age. The error rate in [ʧ]-ending words, on the other hand, is as high as 40% in the first age group and remains to be 27% in both the second and the third age group.

In terms of the acquisition of words with 'ğ', the study showed that children's performance differed greatly from the adult language. The error rate (*örümcek ağ-sı) in the youngest group is 90% , in the second group 65% and in the oldest age group 50% showing huge difference from the adult form.

In order to address the question as to why children make few errors in words ending in [k], why they make a low number of errors with words ending in [p] and [t] as opposed to the high rate of mistakes they make in [ʧ]-ending words, the authors run a thorough analysis of type and token frequency. The main conclusion of this paper is that the errors children exhibit argue for a decomposed route and application of phonological rules. As for the different behavior of [ʧ], the authors point out that a fine-grained phonetic analysis of [ʧ] is needed to account for the different behavior of error rates in words ending in [ʧ].

The last paper of the volume is Ketrez's "Different paces (but not different paths) in language acquisition". Ketrez examines the acquisition patterns of irregular morphophonemic alternations as Nakipoğlu, et al. have done in the previous paper, i.e. final voicing alternation and final [k]-deletion. She, however, looks at the acquisition of these alternations by two different groups of Turkish speaking children, twins vs. singletons around the age of 3;0 in order to see if twins behave differently than singletons in the acquisition of irregular morphophonemic alternation. She tests twins (n=16) and singletons (n=16) with an elicited production test at a mean age of 3;0. The results indicate that more frequent and relatively regular cases of alternations are acquired earlier, and children, as in the case of adult language, are sensitive to

word length in their alternations. Twins as opposed to singletons follow the same path in acquisition but they display a slower pace, which is in line with the literature on twins. In the literature, the delay in the language development of twins is attributed to anatomical reasons such as low birth weight and psychosocial reasons such as divided attention of adults, less direct speech in the learning environment, difficulty in socializing with other children and preference to play with each other, and thus exposure to sibling language at home. Ketrez in this paper eliminates the factors of lower birthweight and smaller gestational age of twins by balancing the two groups of children in terms of these factors. The results attained indicate that twins follow a slower pace in acquiring irregular morphology as hypothesized but they follow the same path of acquisition the singletons do, and they are sensitive to word length in the alternations as singletons and adults do. As the possible disadvantage of twins caused by anatomical reasons (birthweight, gestational age) is eliminated, Ketrez points out that these results can be attributed to the language acquisition experience of the children at their home environment.

6 Conclusion

The current volume under discussion contributes to the field of theoretical linguistics with 11 original papers on Turkish by distinguished scholars. The papers fall into four categories: phonology, morphology and syntax, discourse, and language acquisition. Some of the papers offer new approaches to topics that have been widely discussed in the literature, while the others put forth analyses and discussion to puzzles that have not been previously addressed in Turkish linguistics. *Exploring the Turkish Linguistic Landscape* constitutes an important contribution to the field of theoretical linguistics by offering thorough analyses of a broad range of topics in Turkish linguistics. This volume of original articles honoring the work of Prof. Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan does not only encourage further research in the field of Turkish linguistics but also presents a great contribution to the cross-linguistic literature.

References

Arslan-Kechriotis, Ceyda. 2006. The pragmatic/semantic and syntactic properties of *–(y)AlI* clauses in Turkish. In *Advances in Turkish Linguistics,* Semiramis Yağcıoğlu & Ayşen Cem Değer (eds.), 65-78. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University Publications.

Clements, George N. 1990. The role of core syllabification. In *Papers in Laboratory Phonology, 1: Between Grammar and Physics of Speech*, John Kingston & Mary Beckman (eds.), 283-333. Cambridge: CUP.

Declerck, Renaat & Reed, Susan. 2001. *Conditionals: A Comphrehensive Empirical Analysis*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gussmann, Edmund. 2007. *The Phonology of Polish*. Oxford: OUP.

Joseph, Brian. 2003. Evidentials: Summation, questions, prospects. In *Studies in Evidentiality* [Typological Studies in Language 54], Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), 307-327. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lewis, Geoffrey. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.

Underhill, Robert. 1976. *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Vural, Özlem Albaş. 2006. Phonological variation in informal Turkish. In *Advances in Turkish Linguistics, Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. 11-13 August 2004.* Semiramis Yağcıoğlu & Ayşen Cem Değer (eds.), 3-14. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül University Publications.

Yip, Moira. 1988. The obligatory contour principle and phonological rules: A loss of identity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 65-100.

Zimmer, Karl. 1976. Some constraints on Turkish causativization. In *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, Masatoshi Shibatani (ed.), 399-412. New York: Academic Press.