TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN NEGATION

PETER KAHREL
RENÉ VAN DEN BERG

Offprint

Turkish

Gerjan van Schaalk

0 The language

Turkish is the official language of *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti* 'Republic of Turkey' and of *Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti* 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus'. Apart from at least 50 million inhabitants of these countries, the language is spoken by several millions of people living outside of these countries. First of all, since the fall of the Ottoman Empire it is still in use by its descendants scattered over vast territories in Southeast Europe. Secondly, since the nineteen sixties, Turkish is widely spoken in Western-Europe by immigrants and their children.

According to Ruhlen (1987), Turkish is classified as Altaic\Altaic Proper\ Turkic\Common Turkic\Southern. Sister languages of Turkish are Azeri or Azerbaijani (Soviet Azerbaijan and northwest Persia), Khalaj and Qashqai (south Persia) and Turkmen (Soviet Turkmenistan). In the remainder of this section, I will sketch the major characteristics of the language.

Turkish shares with other languages of the Turkic family, as well as with languages of the Uralic family, the interesting phonological feature of vowel harmony. Vowel harmony means that the vowel quality of a suffix depends on the quality of its preceding vowel. This can be exemplified by the following, where a possessive marker precedes the locative marker: *ev-imiz-de* 'in our house'; *at-ımız-da* 'near our horse'; *ot-umuz-da* 'in our grass'; *göl-ümüz-de* 'in our lake'. Compare: *ev-de; at-ta; ot-ta; gül-de*. We will return to this in section 1.

From a morphological point of view, Turkish is an agglutinative language *par excellence*. Both the derivational and the inflectional systems apply the principle of adding suffix to suffix. This may result in huge words which may be the equivalent of a whole phrase, clause, or sentence in nonagglutinative languages. Clear examples are (1) and the well known specimen (2):

(1)   Ev-de-ki-ler-in-miş.
       house-Loc-Rel-Plur-Gen-Rep
       'It seems to be of those who are in the house.'

(2)   Avrupa-lı-laş-tır-ıl-ama-yacak-lar-dan-mı-sınız.
       europe-Der-Der-Caus-Pass-NegPot-Fut-Plur-Abl-QM-Cop=2p[1]
       'Are you one of those who will not be able to be Europeanized?'

compatible with the observation that questioned constituents are placed in pre-verbal position:

(6) a. Ali, kardeşine kitap mı verdi?
         'Did Ali give a *book* to his brother?'

     b. Ali, kitabı kardeşine mi verdi?
         'Did Ali give the book *to his brother?*'

     c. Kitabı Ali mi verdi, kardeşine?
         'Did *Ali* give the book, to his brother?'

     d. Ali, kardeşine mi verdi, kitabı?
         'Did Ali give (it) *to his brother*, the book?'

Of course, when the proposition as such is questioned, the question particle follows the predicate, as in for instance:

(7) Ali, kardeşine kitabı verdi mi?
     '*Did* Ali give the book to his brother (or didn't he)?'

A similar placement of the question particle is found in sentences based on a nominal predicate. Compare (8a) with (8b):

(8) a. Hasan hasta mı?
         'Is Hasan ill?'

     b. Hasan mı hasta?
         'Is it Hasan who is ill?'

Within the domain of the noun phrase, however, the ordering principles are far less complicated. As a rule, the modifier precedes the modified, e.g.

(9) Güzel bir   bahçe.
     nice   a   garden
     'A nice garden.'

Compare (9) with (10), where *bir* functions as the numeral *one:*

(10) Bir güzel bahçe.
     'One beautiful garden.'

Also (11 a-e) show that the modifier precedes the modified:

(11) a. Bu güzel bahçe.
         'This beautiful garden'

     b. Bu üç güzel bahçe.
         'These three beautiful gardens.'

Further, apart from case markers for nominal inflection, Turkish has a series of postpositions at its disposal, some of which govern one or more case markers. Prepositions do not occur in Turkish.

The syntax of Turkish is, at first glance, very straightforward. With respect to constituent ordering in a sentence, the general tendency is to place the verb at the end of the sentence, all verbal complements preceding it. Thus, in what is traditionally called an 'unmarked sentence', the Subject comes first and is followed by the Indirect and Direct Object, e.g.

(3)   Ali,   kardeş-i-ne   bir   kitap ver-di.
       Ali brother-his-Dat   a   book give-Past
       'Ali gave a book to his brother.'

Therefore, in a typical typological sense, Turkish is an SOV language[2]. This pattern, however, is related to what Lewis (1967:240) calls a *literary* sentence. As the typical order of constituents, he gives: (1) Subject, (2) expression of time, (3) expression of place, (4) Indirect Object, (5) Direct Object, (6) modifier of the verb, and (7) Verb. Sentences based on a noun have a similar ordering pattern, the nominal or adjectival predicate is sentence final. This can be exemplified by:

(4)   Ndisi-nin meşhur oluş-u   devlet-in kuruluş-u-ndan   sonra-dır.
       itself-En famous becoming-Agr state-Gen foundation-Agr-Abl   after-Cop
       Lit: 'its-becoming-famous state's-foundation after-is.'
       'It is after the foundation of the state that it became famous.'

In this example, the predicate *sonra* 'after' is placed in sentence-final position. In colloquial Turkish, however, much of the constituent ordering is primarily determined by pragmatic factors instead of by syntactic notions. Taking this into account, orderings such as (5) seem to be the rule rather than the exception.

(5)   a. Kardeşine kitap verdi, Ali   (IO-DO-V-S)
       b. Ali kitap verdi, kardeşine   (S-DO-V-IO)
       c. Kardeşine verdi, kitabı   (IO-V-DO)

In terms of 'informational value' of the several constituents that make up a sentence, one could say that a sencence develops according to the principle of increasing information value. Thus, it starts with 'low-grade' information ('Topic', 'Given') and it ends in 'high-grade' information ('Focus', 'New'), directly followed by the verb. Finally, constituents that do not belong to the predication proper are placed in post-verbal position. Note that this is

c. Sokak-ta   gid-en   kadın.
street-loc   go-part   woman
'The woman walking in the street.'

d. Fransa   kralı kadar   kabak   kafa-lı   bir   adam.
France   king as   bold   head-Adj   a   man
'A man as bold as the king of France.'

e. Merkez-i   ol-duğ-u   devlet-e   ism-i-ni   ver-en   Gazne   şehr-i.
centre-3Sg   be-PP-Agr state-Dat name-3Sg-Acc give-PP   G.   city-CM
'The city of Gazne that gave its name to the state because it was its centre.'

As for the lexicon, during centuries of contact with the Islamic world, the lexicon has been enriched by several thousands of words from Arabic. Another source for thousands of borrowings in the fields of administration and literary culture was Persian, since, under the Seljuk dynasty, Persia was overrun by the Turks in the eleventh century.

1 Verbal negation

Standard negation in Turkish verbs is expressed with a suffix that comes immediately after the verb stem, e.g.

(12)   a. Gel-me-yecek.
come-Neg-Fut
'(S)he will not come.'

b. Çalış-ma-yacak.
work-Neg-Fut
'(S)he will not work.'

All other verb stems of Turkish are negated likewise. The suffix contains a vowel that is subject to the rules of vowel harmony. Hence, the suffix is often represented as *-mE*, where the *E* stands for a two-fold vowel: *e* or *a*. Vowels of Turkish can be classified in three groups according to their articulatory properties. A first distinction is between *front* and *back*, according to the position of the tongue during pronunciation: front vowels belong to the set (e, i, ö, ü) and back vowels are (a, ı, o, u). The second criterion is the position of the lips. Vowels are *rounded* (o, ö, u, ü) or *unrounded* (a, e, ı, i). The third factor that determines the quality of a vowel is the amount of space left between palate and tongue. Accordingly, vowels are *open* ('low') or *close* ('high'), e.g. the sets (a, e, o, ö) and (ı, i, u, ü) respectively. The para-

meter front versus back determines the form of the negation suffix. If the last vowel in a verb stem is a front vowel the suffix is *-me*, otherwise it is *-ma*.

1.1 Peculiarities

As a rule all verb stems and expressions based on verbal roots are negated by the suffix *-mE*. Apart from the examples given above, we can illustrate this by:

(13) a. Gel-me-di.
          come-Neg-Past
          '(S)he didn-t come.'

      b. Çalış-ma-yacak-tı.
          work-Neg-Fut-Past
          '(S)he wouldn't work.'

      c. İnan-ıl-ma-z.
          believe-Pass-Neg-Aor
          'Unbelievable.'

      d. Türk-leş-tir-il-me-miş-ler-den-siniz.
          turk-become-Caus-Pass-Neg-Partpast-Plur-Abl-Cop=2p
          'You are of those who didn't have themselves been Turkified.'

Although the orthography of Turkish is very straightforward, in some cases it deviates from the pronunciation. The vowel of the negation suffix shifts from open to close (high to low) when followed by the suffix fut(ure), as in *çalış-ma-yacak* /*çalış-mı-yacak*/ and *gel-me-yecek* /*gel-mi-yecek*/.

A similar phenomenon occurs in the negative of the Present Continuous where it is reflected in the spelling. Since we primarily deal with orthographic representations of the Turkish negator, we will go into this matter in a special section, see 1.1.1.

1.1.1 Negation of the Present Continuous

As has been indicated in 1, the choice between *e* and *a* is determined by the opposition front-back. However, this doesn't hold for the negation of the Present Continuous. Instead, we find the vowels *ı, i, u, ü*, as a part of the negational suffix[3]. In abstracto, the Present Continuous is negated by a suffix that has a four-fold *(-mI)* vowel, whereas the 'standard' negation suffix *(-mE)* contains a two-fold vowel. The vowel of *-mI* is determined by two parameters: front-back and rounded-unrounded.

A stem ending in a back unrounded vowel *(a, ı)* triggers *-mı;* after a front unrounded stem vowel *(e, i)* we get *-mi;* after back rounded *(o, u)* comes *-mu;*

and finally, the suffix *-mü* occurs after a front rounded stem vowel *(ö, ü)*. This can be illustrated by the following forms:

(14)   *Back unrounded*   *Front unrounded*

    a. al-mı-yor   gel-mi-yor
       'isn't taking'   'isn't coming'

    b. çık-mı-yor   iç-mi-yor
       'isn't going out'   'isn't drinking'

       Back rounded   *Front rounded*

    c. koş-mu-yor   dön-mü-yor
       'isn't running'   'isn't returning'

    d. dur-mu-yor   gül-mü-yor
       'isn't stopping'   'isn't laughing'

1.1.2 Negation of Possibility

Possibility or potential[4] is expressed in Turkish by the suffix *-(y)Ebil*, as in the following examples:

(15)   a. Gel-ebil-di-m.
       come-Pot-Past-3Sg
       'I was able (could) to come.'

     b. Anla-yabil-ecek.
       understand-Pot-Fut
       '(S)he will be able to understand (it).'

For the negative potential, the suffix *-(y)EmE* is attached to the stem:

(16)   a. Gel-eme-di-m.
       come-NegPot-Past-3Sg
       'I was not able (couldn't) come.'

     b. Anla-yama-yacak.
       understand-NegPot-Fut
       '(S)he will not be able to understand (it).'

The suffix *-(y)Ebil* may be combined with both the 'regular' negation suffix *-mE* as with the 'impotential' suffix *-(y)EmE*. Negation is always expressed first. Compare (17a) with (17b):

(17)   a. Ev-de   ol-ma-yabil-ir.
       house-Loc be-Neg-Pot-Aor
       '(S)he may not be home.'

b. Ev-de ol-ama-z.
house-Loc 'be'-NegPot-Aor
'(S)he can't be home.'

(18) a. Adres-in-i bildir-me-yebil-ir.
adres-Poss3Sg-Acc know-Caus-Neg-Pot-Aor
'(S)he may not need to give his/her address.'

b. Adres-in-i bildir-eme-z.
adres-Poss3Sg-Acc know-Caus-Negpot-Aor
'(S)he is not able to give his/her address.'

(19) a. Toplanti-ya gel-me-yebil-ir.
meeting-Dat come-Neg-Pot-Aor
'(S)he may be able not to come to the meeting.'

b. Toplantı-ya gel-eme-yebil-ir.
meeting-Dat come-NegPot-Pot-Aor
'(S)he may not be able to come to the meeting.'

c. Toplantı-ya gel-eme-z.
meeting-Dat come-NegPot-Pot-Aor
'(S)he is not able to come to the meeting.'

2 Nominal negation

The (invariant) particle *değil* '(is) not' is the negator for non-verbal predicative expressions. It functions as an auxiliary: various suffixes for tense and mood, and personal endings can be attached, as is exemplified by:

(20) a. Hasta-yım. Hasta değil-im.
ill-1Sg ill Not-1Sg
'I am ill.' 'I am not ill.'

b. Ev-de-ydi-k. Ev-de değil-di-k.
house-Loc-past-2Sg house-Loc Not-past-2Sg
'We were at home.' 'We were not at home.'

Compare these also with the following examples:

(21) a. Bu kalem Hasan-ın değil-miş.
this pen Hasan-Gen Not-Rep
'This pen seems not to be Hasan's.'

b. Bu kalem Hasan-ın-mış.
'This pen seems to be Hasan's.'

(22) a. Ali zengin değil-se.
'If Ali is not rich.'

b. Postacı değil-dir.
   'He certainly is not a postman.'

c. Ayşe İzmir-de   değil mi-ydi?
   Ayşe Izmir-Loc Not QM-Past
   'Was Ayşe not in Izmir?'

The particle *değil* cannot be used whenever 'future' is to be expressed. The negative is then formed by means of the auxiliary verb *ol* (compare 'be'). To say that *Ali bir öğretmen değil* 'Ali is not a teacher' pertains to the future, one must say: *Ali bir öğretmen ol-ma-yacak* (*ol*-Neg-fut).

2.1 Contrastive negation

The scope of *değil* can be a predication, but also a noun phrase. It thus allows for contrastive negation. This can be exemplified by the following:

(23) a. Ali   değil,   Hasan geldi.
        A.   NOT   H.   come-Past
        'Not Ali, (but) Hasan came.'

     b. Ankara'ya   değil,   İzmir'e   gittik.
        Ankara-Dat   NOT   Izmir-Dat go-Past-2Sg
        'We didn't go to Ankara, but to Izmir.'

     c. A: –Türkiye'de   mi   doğ-du-nuz?
           Turkey-Loc   Q   born-Past-2Sg
        A: 'Were you born in Turkey?'

        B: –Türkiye'de   değil,   Kıbrıs'ta.
           Turkey-Loc   NOT   Cyprus-Loc
        B: 'Not in Turkey, but on Cyprus'

Contrastive negation of this type is of course not restricted to third person subjects:

(24) a. Ben   değil,   sen   bunu   yaptın.
        1Sg   NOT   1Sg   arrange-Aor-1Sg this-Acc
        'Not I, but you did it.'

     b. Sen   değil,   ben   hallederim   bunu.
        2Sg   NOT   1Sg   arrange-Aor-1Sg this-Acc
        'It is not you, but me who is going to arrange that.'

2.2 Negation of nominalized verbs by *değil*

As was outlined above, the primary function of the particle *değil* is that of a negation marker, having a predicate or a noun phrase in its scope. This particle is further used in so-called periphrastic constructions (cf. Mixajlov, 1965). This type of construction consists of a nominalized verb form (that may contain a negational suffix itself) plus the negative particle, e.g.

(25) a. Ben de on-u pek anla-mış   değil-im.
          1Sg too 3Sg-Acc very understand-PartPast Not-1Sg
          'I *really* didn't understand him either.'

      b. Oraya git-me-yecek değil-sin.
          there go-Neg-Fut Not-2Sg
          'You *certainly* will go there.'

As Tura (1981:320) states, these constructions 'may occur in discourse as contradiction, rejection or refutations of prior utterances, assumptions or beliefs'. As opposed to (normal) verbal negation, they thus express epistemic modality: it reflects the attitude of the speaker with respect to the truth value of the proposition. This can be exemplified by contrasting the neutral negative sentence of (26a) with the modal sentence of (26b):

(26) a. Ali gel-me-miş.
          Ali come-Neg-Rep
          'It seems/appears that Ali didn't come.'

      b. Ali gel-miş   değil.
          Ali come-PartPast Not
          'Ali really didn't come.'

In Van Schaaik (1986) it was argued that the verb forms in periphrastic constructions of this type are based on nominalized verbs rather than participles. Hence, *gel-miş* and *git-me-yecek* in the examples (25b) and (26b) are to be interpreted as 'someone who has come' and 'someone who will not go' respectively.

2.3 Tag questions

Together with the question marker mi the negative particle *değil* forms yet a new particle *değil mi?* 'isn't it'. It functions as a trigger for confirmation or refutation of the previous utterance, as for instance in:

(27) a. Hasan Ankara'da çalışır, değil mi?
          · 'Hasan works in Ankara, isn't it?'

      b. Ali hasta, değil mi?
          'Ali is ill, isn't he.'

Compare these constructions with:

(28) Ali hasta değil mi?
      'Isn't Ali ill?'

As follows from the last examples, in written form it sometimes is hard to distinguish both types, especially when a comma lacks. Whereas *Ali hasta, değil mi?* is an assertion ('Ali is ill') for which a reaction is requested ('Say so, if not true') by means of *değil mi?*, the particle *değil* in *Ali hasta değil mi?* is the negator over *Ali hasta* 'Ali (is) ill'. The proposition *Ali hasta değil* 'Ali NOT ill', then, is finally questioned by the marker *mi*. The ambiguity 'negator plus question marker' versus 'the particle *değil mi*' may arise only when a third person singular is involved, since the category grammatical person (other than the one mentioned here) is overtly expressed on various chunks of grammatical material. Compare (29a) with (29b), which clearly show the difference in placement of the personal suffix *-sIn* 'you':

(29) a. Sen hasta-sın, değil mi?
          'You are ill, isn't it?'

      b. Sen hasta değil mi-sin?
          'Aren't you ill?'

In speech, however, there is no chance for ambiguity at all, since the particle *değil mi* is pronounced as /demi/, with stress on the first syllable.

3 Existential negation

Existence in Turkish is expressed by the particle *var* and non-existence by *yok*. Compare the positive existentials in the left hand column with the negative existentials of the right hand column:

(30) a. Su   var.   Su   yok.
          water   EX   water   NegEX
          'There is water'   'There's no water.'

      b. Su   var   mı?   Su   yok   mu?
          water   EX   QM   water   NegEX QM
          'Is there water?'   'Is there no water?'

Apart from the question marker *mI*, the particles for existence and nonexistence may take a suffix for past (31a), conditional (31b), and reportative (31c):

(31) a. Su var-dı.
water EX-past
'There was water.'

Su yok-tu.
water NegEX-past
'There was no water.'

b. Su var-sa.
water EX-cond
'If there is water.'

Su yok-sa.
water NegEX-cond
'If there is no water.'

c. Su var-mış.
water EX-rep
'There seems to be water.'

Su yok-muş.
water NegEX-rep
'There seems to be no water.'

In special cases the particles may carry a personal (copula) marker. For instance, when talking about some holiday pictures one might use (32a), and when talking about a party or so (32b) may be used:

(32) a. Ama sen yok-sun.
but you NegEX-2Sg
'But you are absent.'

b. O zaman ben yok-tu-m.
then I NegEX-1Sg
'Then I wasn't (there).'

Turkish has no equivalent of 'to have'. Its functions are performed by the existential particles *var* and *yok* applied to a possessive noun phrase:

(33) Güzel bir araba-m var-dı ama, şimdi yok artık.
nice a car-1Sg EX-Past but now NegEX anymore
'I had a nice car, but now I don't have (it/one) anymore.'

3.1 The use of *yok* in prohibitions

When combined with an infinitive verb form (and complements), the particle *yok* expresses prohibitions, as often found in official inscriptions and the like. This usage can be exemplified by:

(34) a. Avuç aç-mak yok.
hand open-Inf 'yok'
'Begging prohibited.'

b. Orta salla-mak yok.
fishing-rod swing-Inf 'yok'
'No fishing.'

    c. Burada şapka   çıkar-mak yok.
        here   hat   take-off 'yok'
        'It is not allowed here to take your hat off.'

3.2 Negation of nominalized verbs by *yok*

As was indicated in 2.2, the negative particle *değil* can be combined with a nominalized verb, denoting the agent of the action. *Yok* can occur in similar constructions:

(35) a. Bu-nu   bil-me-yen   yok.
           this-Acc   know-Neg-PartPres NegEX
           'There is nobody who doesn't know this.'

        b. Bu-na   kabul ed-ecek   yok.
           this-Dat   accept-PartFut   NegEX
           'There is no one who will agree with that.'

The scope of the negator in these constructions is typical: in *ben de on-u pek anlamış değil-im* 'I really didn't understand him either' the fragment *on-u pek anlamış*, which functions as a complex predicate, is negated, and in *bu-nu bil-me-yen yok* 'there is nobody who doesn't know this' it is the entity *bu-nu bil-me-yen* which is not existant. In the latter example the entity referred to is based on a nominalized verb, as is the case in the *değil*-constructions, discussed in 2.2. The particle *yok*, however, may be used as a negator of an entire state of affairs expressed by a verbal complex. Again, a kind of epistemic modality is reflected. Compare the neutral (36a) with the modal (36b):

(36) a. Kadın   Ali-ye   bak-ma-dı.
           woman Ali-Dat look-Neg-Past
           'The woman didn't look at Ali.'

        b. Kadın-ın   Aliye   bak-tığ-ı   yok-tu.
           woman-Gen Ali-Dat look-PartPast-Agr 'yok'-Past
           'The woman didn't look at Ali at all.'

Such a construction can be paraphrased by 'There was no "woman's-to-Ali-looking"', compare the Dutch equivalent *Het bestaat niet dat de vrouw naar Ali keek*, literally 'It doesn't exist that the woman looked at Ali'.

4 Other negative elements

4.1 Emphatic negation

In contemporary Turkish, the originally Persian noun *hiç* 'nothing' has several functions. First, in negative sentences (with a verb containing the Neg-suffix) it is used as an intensifier of the negation in the sense of *none whatever, none at all; never, never at all, not the least*. Examples are:

(37) a. Hiç   bira   bul-ama-dı-m.
      hiç   beer   find-NegPot-Past-1Sg
      'I couldn't find any beer at all.'

     b. Oraya   hiç   git-me-di-k.
      there   hiç   go-Neg-Past-1Pl
      'We have never gone there.'

     c. Ankara-ya   git-ti-n   mi?   —Hiç.
      Ankara-Dat   go-Past-2Sg   QM   hiç
      'Did you go to Ankara? —Not at all.'

Secondly, in interrogative sentences *hiç* can be translated as 'ever', in responses as 'never':

(38) Türkiye'ye hiç gittin mi?   —Hiç.
      'Did you ever go to Turkey?' —'Never.'

Thirdly, the Turkish equivalent of an indefinite pronoun is often synthetic. In principle, it is based on a noun: *bir kim-se* = a who (ever it is), 'someone'; *bir yer-de* = a place-loc, 'somewhere'; *bir vakit* = a time, 'sometime'; *bir şey* = a thing, 'something'. The negative counterparts are formed with *hiç*, as in: *hiç bir kim-se* 'no one, nobody'; *hiç bir yer-de* 'nowhere'; *hiç bir vakit* 'never'; *hiç bir şey* 'nothing'. Further, we find such negations in a partitive sense: *bir-i* means 'one of them', and hence, *hiç biri* is 'none of them, not one of them'. The word *hiç* frequently implies a negative answer, as is shown with (39b) as a response to (39a):

(39) a. Bugün   ne   yap-tı-n?
      today   what   do-Past-2Sg
      'What did you do today?'

     b. 'Hiç.' (omitting yap-ma-dı-m 'do-Neg-Past-1Sg)
      'Nothing'.

4.2 Negational Intensifiers

Apart from the synthetic *hiç bir vakit* and *hiç bir zaman*, both meaning 'never', there are two borrowings from Arabic with a related meaning: *asla* 'never' and *katiyen* 'by no means, never; categorically, absolutely, definitely'. As is the case with *hiç* in negative sentences, these words function as an intensifier. They too are used in combination with a negative verb as can be shown by the following examples:

(40) a. Asla   yap-ma-z-dı-m.
          never   do-Neg-Aor-Past-1Sg
          'I never would do (so).'

      b. Katiyen   yanıl-ma-dı-m.
          absolutely   Err-Neg-Past-1Sg
          'I am absolutely not mistaken.'

4.3 The negative suffix *-sIz*

Besides negative particles and the negation suffix for verbs, Turkish has a privative suffix, *-sIz*, that is attached to nouns thereby yielding an adjective[5]. Hence, *su-suz (bir memleket)* is '(a region) without water'; *süt-süz (bir kahve)* is '(a coffee) without milk'; *et-siz (bir yemek)* '(a meal) without meat'; *tat-sız* 'tasteless'; *merhamet-siz* 'merciless'.

5 Negators in speech

Finally, now that we have seen how the various negators of Turkish are to be classified morphologically and how their syntactic properties can be described, it seems useful to pay at least some attention to the way they are used in conversation. In well educated speech, generally speaking, the answer to a so-called yes-no question contains mostly (if not always) a fragment of the question. Thus, if someone asks *Hasan geldi mi?* 'Did Hasan come', the appropriate answers are *Geldi* 'yes' and *Gelmedi* 'no'; for *Hasan hasta mı?* 'Is Hasan ill' both *Hasta* 'yes' and *Hasta değil* 'no' are 'good' answers; and on a question pertaining to existence, e.g. *Bira var mı?* 'Is there beer' both *var* 'yes' and *yok* 'no' can be expected. In colloquial speech, however, much of the work is done by *yok* in a negative reply, often pronounced with a long vowel. So one may hear *yoook* as an answer to *üalış-tı mı?* 'Did he work?'; *Zengin mi?* 'Is (s)he rich?'; and *Para-nız var mı?* 'Do you have (some) money?'. Apart from the devices

described here there are the words *evet* 'yes; indeed' and *hayır* 'no; on the contrary' as the means for influencing the course of a conversation.

Notes

1. The derivative ('der') suffix *-li* denotes here 'inhabitant of x', for instance, *avrupa-lı* 'a european'. The derivative suffix *-lEş* means 'to become x', and combined with *avrupa-lı* it yields 'to become (as) a european': 'europeanize'.

2. For an extensive treatment of Turkish word order, see Erguvanlı (1979).

3. The Present Continuous is formed by *-yor* when a verb stem ends in a vowel and by *-Iyor* after a consonant stem. Thus, *gel-me-yor* underlies *gel-mi-yor*. For a full account of this problem, see Van Schaaik (1988:52-55).

4. Cf. Kerslake (1990).

5. The 'positive' counterpart of such adjectives is formed by the noun plus the four-fold suffix *-lI*, as in *süt-lü (bir çay)* 'a tea with milk'; *et-li yemek* 'meal(s) with meat (in it)'; *tat-lı* 'tasteful; nice'; *merhamet-li* 'merciful, kind'.

Abbreviations

Abl	ablative	Loc	locative
Acc	accusative	Neg	verbal negator
Agr	agreement	NegEX	non-existential particle
Aor	aorist	Negpot	impotential
Caus	causative	NOT	nominal negator
CM	compound marker	PartFut	future participle
Cond	conditional	PartPres	present participle
Cop	copula	Pass	passive
Dat	dative	Plur	plural
Der	derivative (nominal).	Pot	potential
EX	existential particle	Pp, PartPast	past participle
Fut	future	QM	question marker
Gen	genitive	Rel	relativizer
Inf	infinitive	Rep	reportative

References

Erguvanlı, E. (1979). *The function of word order in Turkish grammar.* (UCLA dissertation), University of California Publications in Linguistics, vol 106. Berkeley and Los Angeles, UCP 1984.
Kerslake, C. (1990). 'The semantics of possibility', Paper read at the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 15-17 August 1990, London.

Lewis, G.L. (1967). *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Mixajlov, M.S. (1965). *Issledovanija po grammatike Tureckogo jazyka (perifrastieskie formy Tureckogo glagola)*. Moskva, Izdatel'stvo Nauka.

Ruhlen, M. (1987. *A guide to the world's languages*. Vol. I. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Schaaik, G.J. van, (1986). 'Verb based terms and modality in Turkish', Paper, Institute for General Linguistics, University of Amsterdam.

Schaaik, G.J. van, (1988). *Basiscursus Turks (A basic course in Turkish)*. Muiderberg, Coutinho.

Tura, S.S. (1981). '"Yes, he hasn't" and a few other not's in Turkish'. *Proceedings of the 7th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, (317-327), Berkeley, BLS.

TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES
IN NEGATION

PETER KAHREL
RENÉ VAN DEN BERG

Offprint