Olga Kharytonava (Western University)
Lexical Integrity: Suspended Affixation in Turkish Nominals

Lexical integrity as in the work of (Lapointe 1980, Selkirk 1982, DiSciullo & Williams 1987) refers to the property of words to behave as impenetrable atoms that syntactic operations cannot manipulate or have access to, and it has for long been considered as a fundamental characteristic of words. Such impenetrability of words has been debated with a range of data laying at the morphology-syntax interface (e.g. Harley 2011, Bosque 2012): e.g. phrasal compounds (e.g. *"syntax-all-the-way down"* approach), anaphoric references ([*Oprah Winfrey*]$_i$ *fans love her*$_i$ *spirit*). In this study, I look at the phenomenon of Suspended Affixation (SA) in Turkish nominals to investigate whether words are indeed syntactic atoms. SA refers to a coordinated construction, where an affix/affixes attach(es) only to the final conjunct while maintaining scope over the non-final conjunct(s), as shown in (1).

> (1) iyi   ve   kötü-lüğ-ü
>   good   and   bad-nom-Poss.3sg
>   'his good and evil character'

Two major analyses of SA include seeing affix suspension as either a process of affix deletion under coordination following affixation (affixation → coordination → affix deletion), or (ii) as a process of group affixation following coordination with no deletion (coordination → group affixation). Each of these views violates the principle of lexical integrity: (i) the deletion of affixes in syntax should not be allowed once the words are fully formed; (ii) the coordination of words should not be allowed before the process of affixation.

In this talk, I analyze the principle of lexical integrity in the context of SA in Turkish nominals within the framework of Distributed Morphology (DM), and conclude that Turkish nominals can indeed be considered as atoms if we assume that coordination happens at any level: above and below the word level. On the basis of the Turkish compounding data (sample shown in 2), I argue that the coordination analysis of SA is preferable to the deletion approach, and the notion of *minimal word* is taken into account.

> (2) a. [biyoloji [kurs]-*(**u**)   ve   [seminer]-**i**]
>   biology   course-(s)I   and   seminar-(s)I
>   'biology course and (biology) seminar'
>   b. araba   [ithalat]-(**ı**)   ve   [ihracat]-**ı**
>   car   import-(s)I   and   export-(s)I
>   'car import and export'

Following the assumptions of DM (Halle & Marantz 1993, Embick & Noyer 2006) that a word is made of an acategorial root and a categorizing node, I propose that the first categorial node creates a *minimal word*. Within a minimal word domain, a coordination must be tight and is semantically and pragmatically restricted; above the minimal word domain, a coordination is loose and, consequently, is more common. I discuss the cases of suspension of several inflectional and derivational affixes (e.g. adjectival *-lI*, nominalizing *-lIk*) which can appear inside and/or outside the minimal word domain and show that the derivational suffixes appearing inside the minimal word domain can attach only to semantically-tight conjoined roots, whereas the suffixes (derivational and inflectional) above the minimal word domain attach to semantically more loose phrases. The main conclusion here is that what appears to be SA and a violation of lexical integrity is in fact the case of constraints on coordination, which can occur at any level.

References:

Bosque, I. (2012). On the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis and its (In)accurate Predictions. In Iberia: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics 4(1): 140-173.

Di Sciullo, A.M. and E. Williams (1987), On the Definition of Word, Cambridge (MA), MIT Press.

Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 2006. Distributed Morphology and the Syntax/Morphology Interface. In Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces, ed. Gillian Ramchand and Charles Reiss, 289-325. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In The View from Building 20, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2011. Compounding in Distributed Morphology. In *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, ed. Rochelle Lieber and Pavol Stekauer, 129-144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lapointe, S. (1980). A Theory of Grammatical Agreement, PhD. diss., Amherst, University of Massachusetts.

Selkirk, E. (1982), The Syntax of Words, Cambridge (MA), MIT Press.