

# The selection of complement clauses in Turkish and negation

Hatice Coşkun\*

## 1. Introduction\*\*

This paper investigates the conditions that determine the negation scope of certain matrix predicates such as *san-* ‘think, believe’, *inan-* ‘believe’, *pişman ol-* ‘regret’ over their complement clauses. In this paper I will focus on sentential negation realized with the morpheme *-mA-*, as in (1–3). (1) and (2) illustrate the negated matrix predicate *san-* ‘think, believe’ which can select a non-finite (1) and a finite (2) complement clause. However, there are cases in which this negated matrix predicate cannot embed a finite complement clause, as in (3).

- (1) *[Ali'nin evden ayrıldığı]ı sanmam.*  
Ali:GEN house:ABL leave:PART.3SG.ACC think:NEG.AOR.1SG  
'I don't think/believe that Ali left the house.'
- (2) *Sanmam [ki Ali evden ayrılmış olsun.]*  
believe:NEG.AOR.1SG COMPAli house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF  
*olsun.*  
be:OPT.3SG  
'I don't think/believe that Ali has left the house.'
- (3) *\*[Ali evden ayrılmış] sanmam.*  
Ali house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF believe:NEG.AOR.1SG  
Intended: 'I don't think/believe that Ali has left the house.' (Coşkun 2010: 52, 53)

The above restriction raises the following questions: i. What are the conditions which license a finite complement clause to appear with a negated matrix predicate like *san-* ‘believe, think’? ii. To what extent can selectional constraints of embedding predicates be changed by negation?

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a summary of properties of complement clauses and negation scope in Turkish, and mentions some earlier approaches relating to them. Section 3 discusses the data relating to negation scope and

\* Frankfurt University.

\*\* I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Marcel Erdal, Prof. Dr. Éva Csató and Prof. Dr. Mustafa S. Kaçalın for their constructive comments and feedback on first drafts of this contribution. I am also very grateful to Prof. Dr. Lars Johanson for allowing me to refer to his as yet unpublished article entitled ‘Mood meets mood’. Thanks also go to the Turkish native speakers Abdulkadir Coşkun, Zeynep Bayır, Ahmet Bayır, E. Elif Gönüllü, Abdullah Gönüllü, Büşra Kotan, Hilal Yavuz, and Bünyamin Akdemir for their judgments via the questionnaire they answered, supplying the data upon which this paper is based. Some of data are based on Google searches from Turkish websites.

certain matrix predicates with respect to their selectional ability. Section 3 further argues that recent approaches to the discussed issue appear to show some shortcomings. At the end of this section, I bring some proposals with a functional perspective. A conclusion is presented in section 4.

## 2. Properties

### 2.1. Complement clauses

The term *complement clause* refers to clauses which function as subject or object argument of matrix predicates (cf. Noonan 2007: 52). There are basically two types of complement clauses in Turkish: i. Finite complement clauses ii. Non-finite complement clauses.

Non-finite complement clauses are embedded with the verbal noun suffixes *-mA*/*-mA* or *-(y)Iş* or with the participle suffixes *-DİK* or *-(y)AcAK*. Except in the case of *-mA*, all of these forms are marked by possessive and case suffixes, showing their nominal character (cf. Erguvanlı-Taylan 1984, 1998b).

Finite complement clauses are embedded with the complementizers *diye* or *ki* or show no complementizer. Finiteness is determined by the ability of a clause to serve as an independent sentence; nor do such clauses get case marking (cf. Erguvanlı-Taylan 1984, Schroeder 2000).

Recent studies have shown that the complementizing means are determined to a great extent by the lexical semantics of the matrix predicate, and that complementizing morphemes also have some inherent semantic value (cf. Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a; Csató 1999; Özsoy 1999; Van Schaaik 2001, Keleşir 2001). As a consequence, matrix predicates have been classified according to their selectional ability. For instance, the matrix predicate *inan-* 'believe' has been suggested to occur only with complement clauses with *-DİK* and not with *-mA* as in (4b) (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a; Csató 1999).

(4a) [Bu mektubu Ali'nin yazdığı]a inanıyorum.  
 this letter:ACC A.:GEN write:PART.3SG.DAT believe:PRES.1SG  
 'I believe that Ali wrote this letter.' (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a).

(4b) \*Bu mektubu Ali'nin yazmasına inanıyorum.

To our knowledge, only the affirmative use of matrix predicates has so far been considered in such classifications. However, the negative use of these embedding predicates still needs to be paid attention to.

### 2.2. Negation scope

In a prosodically unmarked simple verbal sentence, the scope of negation covers the whole proposition as in (5); depending on the intonation the scope can, however, be limited to specific constituents as well (6) (cf. Erguvanlı-Taylan 1984: 81):

- (5) *Ben bu soruyu anlamadım.*  
 I this question:ACC understand:NEG.PRET.1SG  
 'I didn't understand this question.'
- (6) *Ben BU soruyu anlamadım.*  
 I this question:ACC understand:NEG.PRET.1SG  
 'I didn't understand THIS question (but I did understand the others).'

In relation to complex sentences with complement clauses, the scope of negation in the matrix domain has been discussed in previous studies from two points of view, a syntactic and a semantic one. According to the syntactic account, the complementizing means determines whether the negation in the matrix domain takes scope over the embedded clause (cf. Kornfilt 1997: 127).

In (7), e.g., only the matrix predicate is negated. However, the predicate of the complement clause is still affirmative, although the negative polarity item *kimse* 'anybody' which occurs in the complement clause needs a negated predicate (Kornfilt 1997: 128, Keleşir 2001: 169).<sup>1</sup>

In (7), the second paraphrasing of the example shows that the embedded structure also can be covered by the negation of the matrix predicate.

- (7) *Hasan [kimsenin maça gitmesin]i istemedi.*  
 Hasan NPI.GEN match.DAT go:VN.3SG.ACC want:NEG.PRET  
 'Hasan didn't want anybody to go to the game.'  
 ('Hasan wanted nobody to go to the game.')(Kornfilt 1997: 127)

According to the syntactic view, the complement clauses with *-mA* are, in the sense of being negated by the negation in the matrix clause, more transparent than the complement clauses with *-DİK*. However, the distribution is not so clear. A complement clause with *-mA* is, within this approach, considered as an "act complement" and the one with *-DİK* as "fact complement" regardless of the semantics of the matrix predicate (cf. Lees 1965, Kornfilt 1997).

Against this syntactic approach, Keleşir (2001: 170) has shown that the semantics of the matrix predicate determines whether complement clauses are under the negation scope of the matrix clause. I will use the term "factive" in the sense of Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971) from a semantic point of view, i.e. matrix predicates which presuppose the truth of the proposition expressed in their complement clause are considered factive, while predicates which do not have such presuppositions are considered non-factive.<sup>2</sup> In this respect, they showed that factive predicates do not allow their presuppositions to be negated (cf. Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1971). For instance, in (8b) the presupposition remains constant despite the negation in the matrix predicate.

1 This relationship between the negative polarity item in embedded clauses and the matrix predicate has been called "long distance licensing". For more details of that phenomenon in Turkish, see Kornfilt (1997: 128) and Keleşir (2001: 169).

2 For a detailed discussion of factivity relating to complement clauses in Turkish, see Erguvanlı-Taylan (1998a), Van Schaik (2001), Keleşir (2001), Csató (2010).

- (8a) [*Arabamı sattığım*]a *pişman oldum.*  
 car:1SG.ACC sell:PART.1SG-DAT regret:PRET.1SG  
 'I have regretted that I sold my car.'  
 Presup.: *Arabamı sattım.* 'I sold my car.'
- (8b) [*Arabamı sattığım*]a *pişman olmadım.*  
 car:1SG.ACC sell:PART.1SG-DAT regret:NEG.PRET.1SG  
 'I haven't regretted that I sold my car.'  
 Presup.: *Arabamı sattım.* 'I sold my car.'

### 2.2.1. Negation raising predicates

Horn (2001: 323) has described a class of certain non-factive predicates and labelled them "negation raising verbs" since they allow their presuppositions to be in their negation scope. Keleşir (2001: 170) follows Horn and observes that in Turkish also certain negated non-factive predicates can have scope over their complement clauses, regardless of the complementizing morphemes.

Some negation raising predicates that Keleşir has described are *san-* 'think', *tahmin et-* 'assume', *iste-* 'want'; the perception predicates *duy-* 'hear' and *gör-* 'see' and the attitude predicates *izin ver-* 'allow', *bekle-* 'expect', and *tavsiye et-* 'recommend'. As shown in (9), these kinds of matrix predicates trigger two readings related to negation: one of them concerns the matrix clause, the other the complement clause. In (9), the occurrence of the negative polarity item in the complement clause with an affirmative predicate is well formed:

- (9) [*Hiçbir şeyin onu bu kadar*  
 NPI thing:GEN him/her that so  
*üzebileceğin*]i *tahmin etmezdim.*  
 worry:POSB.PART.3SG.ACC guess:NEG.AOR.PRET.COP.1SG  
 'I wouldn't guess anything would worry him/make him unhappy so much.'  
 'I would guess nothing would worry him/make him unhappy so much.'

Keleşir (2001:171) claims that the complement clauses with factive matrix predicates seem to disallow long-distance licensing, again regardless of the nominalizer. In this respect, she does not consider (10) to be well formed. Formally, the negation of the matrix predicate would here be insufficient for licensing the negative polarity item *kimseyi* in the complement clause with a positive predicate, since, according to the semantics based approach of factivity, the negated factive matrix predicate should not have any scope on the presupposed proposition expressed in the complement clause.

- (10) ??[*Hasan'ın kimseyi aramasın*]a *üzülmedim.*  
 Hasan:GEN NPI.ACC call:VN.3SG.DAT be sad:NEG.PRET.1SG  
 'Intended: I wasn't sad that Hasan called anybody.' (Keleşir 2001: 173)

### 2.2.2. Negation raising predicates and finite complement clauses

It has been argued that finite complement clauses are not allowed to be under the negation scope of a matrix predicate as in (11) (cf. Kornfilt 1997: 127; Keleşir 2001: 174):

- (11) \**[Kimse geç geldi] sanmıyorlar.*  
 NPI late come:PRET believe:NEG.PRES.3PL  
 Intended: 'They don't think anybody came late.'
- (12) *[Kimse geç gelmedi] sanıyorlar.*  
 NPI late come:NEG.PRET believe:PRES.3PL  
 'They think nobody came late.' (Keleşir 2001: 174)

However, "small clauses" or embeddings with "object-raising" are allowed to occur with negated matrix predicates, as in (13) (cf. Zidani-Eroğlu 1997: 226, Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 310, 311).

- (13) *[Zeki'yi Fransızca konuşuyor] addetmiyorlar.*  
 Z.:ACC French speak:PRES consider:NEG.PRES.3PL  
 'They don't consider Zeki a speaker of French.' (Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 311)

## 3. Proposals

### 3.1. Semantic change

Let us now look again at the issue of non-finite complement clauses. As mentioned, previous studies have classified the predicate *inan-* 'believe' as one which can select only complement clauses with *-DİK*, as in (14a) (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a, 1998b, Csató 1999). This generalization is based on the affirmative use of *inan-* 'believe'. However, the negated verb *inan-* 'believe' occurs also with complement clauses with *-mA*, as shown in (15).<sup>3</sup> Here, the semantics of the matrix predicate has changed and its negated abilitive use with the meaning 'cannot believe' conveys the contextual meaning 'wondering'. The matrix predicate *hayret et-* 'to wonder', which has a similar meaning, can select both *-mA* and *-DİK* complements, as in (16a-b). (15) shows that the negation can influence the embedding abilities of a matrix predicate by changing its semantics.

- (14a) *[Bu mektubu Ali'nin yazdığına] inanıyorum.*  
 this letter:ACC Ali:GEN write:PART.3SG.DAT believe:PRES.1SG  
 'I believe that Ali wrote this letter.' (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a).
- (14b) \**Bu mektubu Ali'nin yazmasına inanıyorum.*

3 For a detailed discussion of the difference between complement clauses with *-mA* and with *-DİK*, not to be dealt with here, see Erguvanlı-Taylan 1998a, Kural 1993, 1998, Van Schaaijk 2001, Csató 1999, 2010.

- (15) [Tüm o güzelliğinin yok olup gitmesin]e  
 all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:VN.3SG.DAT  
*inanamıyorum.*  
 believe:NEG.POSB.PRES.1SG  
 'I cannot believe that all that beauty has come to naught.'  
*Göz göre göre her şey yok oldu.* 'Everything disappeared before our eyes.'  
 yorum.milliyet.com.tr/Yorumlar.aspx?SayfaNo=2&HaberKod=S\_974486 – 63
- (16a) ([Tüm o güzelliğinin yok olup gitmesin]e  
 all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:VN.3SG  
*hayret ediyorum.*  
 wonder:PRES.1SG  
 'I wonder that all that beauty has come to naught.'
- (16b) [Tüm o güzelliğinin yok olup gittiğin]e  
 all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:PART.3SG.DAT  
*hayret ediyorum.*  
 wonder:PRES.1SG  
 'I wonder that all that beauty has come to naught.'

### 3.2. Negation scope

Here I observe the matrix predicate *inan-* 'believe' from the point of view of negation scope. In (17) it has two complement clauses with *-mA* which are linked with the conjunction *ve* 'and'. The predicate of the first complement clause with *-mA* has a non-finite complement clause with *-DIK* within it, the second two finite ones.

- (17) [[*Bir aydır tanıdığın birinin seni sevdiğin*]*i söylemesin*]*e ve* [[*hatta şimdiye kadar kimseyi sevmedim; bir tek seni sevdim*] *demesin*]*e inanma.*  
 www.kadınlarkulubu.com/.../367953-yengec-erkegi-capkin-midir.html

In (18) and (19), I split (17) into two parts. The significant point to notice here is that the predications *söyle-* 'tell' and *de-* 'say' with the verbal noun morpheme *-mA* are not in the negation scope of the matrix predicate *inan-* 'believe'. However, if the predicates *söyle-* 'say' and *de-* 'say' are embedded with the morpheme *-DIK*, then the negation of *inan-* 'believe' takes scope over them.

- (18a) [[*Bir aydır tanıdığın birinin seni sevdiğin*]*i söylemesin*]*e inan-ma!*  
 One month:COP know:PART.2SG someone:GEN  
*seni sevdiğin**i söylemesin*  
 you:ACC love:PART.3SG.ACC say:VN.DAT believe:NEG.IMP  
 'Don't believe anybody whom you have known (only) for one month when he says/if he said that he loves you.'
- (18b) [[*Bir aydır tanıdığın birinin seni sevdiğin*]*i söylediğin*]*e inanma!*  
 'Don't believe that somebody whom you have known for one month said that he loves you.'

- (19a) [[*Şimdiye kadar kimseyi sevmedim; bir tek seni sevdim*] *demessin*]e *inanma!*  
 now:DAT till NPI.ACC love:NEG.PRET one only  
 you:ACC love:PRET.1SG say:VN.3SG.DAT believe:NEG.IMP  
 ‘Don’t believe somebody (anybody) who says that he has not, until now, loved anybody but only you.’
- (19b) [[*Şimdiye kadar kimseyi sevmedim; bir tek seni sevdim*] *dediğin*]e *inanma!*  
 ‘Don’t believe that he said that he loved anybody (else) until now, that you are the only person that he has (ever) loved.’

### 3.3. Factive predicates

Another point to be paid attention to relates to factive matrix predicates and their negation scope. Keleşir (2001: 173) has claimed that factive predicates should disallow the long-distance licensing of negative polarity items like *kimse* ‘anybody’ in complement clauses, as e.g. in (20a), as negated factive matrix predicates cannot take scope over propositions in their complement clauses:

- (20a) ?? [*Hasan’ın kimseyi aramasın*]a *üzülmedim.*  
 Hasan:GEN NPI.ACC call:VN.3SG.DAT be.sad:NEG.PRET.1SG  
 ‘Intended: I wasn’t sad that Hasan called anybody.’ (Keleşir 2001: 173)<sup>4</sup>

However, the occurrence of *kimse* in (20b) is well formed. Here, the negative polarity item *kimse* is licensed by the negation of the matrix predicate. On the other hand, the presupposition that the speaker has borrowed something is not negated as expected by the negation of a factive matrix predicate. Additionally, *kimse* has the reading ‘someone / somebody’ in the presupposition. The variable character of *kimse* with the meaning ‘someone’ seems to allow such a reading. Notice that the affirmative use of the factive predicate *pişman ol-* ‘regret’ in (20b) would not be well formed either.<sup>5</sup>

- (20b) *Şimdiye kadar [kimseden borç aldığım]a pişman olmadım / \*pişman oldum.*  
 now:DAT till NPI.ABL borrow:PART.1SG.DAT  
 regret:NEG.PRET.1SG/ regret:PRET.1SG  
 ‘I haven’t regretted till now having borrowed anything from anybody.’  
 Presup.: *Birinden borç aldım.* ‘I have borrowed something from somebody.’

4 In the following context, the occurrence of the NPI in such a complement clause is well formed: *Hasan’ın kimseyi aramasına üzülmedim. Sadece başkaları yüzünden beni germesine üzuldüm.* ‘I wasn’t sad that Hasan called somebody. I was just sad that he made me stressed because of others.’

5 Giannakidou (2009) discusses such unexpected occurrences of negative polarity items with emotive factive predicates in Greek and from a cross-linguistic view. Von Stechow deals with this behaviour of emotive factive predicates in English (1999: 110). For a comprehensive discussion, see Von Stechow 1999 and Giannakidou 2009. I hope to deal with this issue in Turkish in the future.

### 3.4. The negation raising predicates *san-* ‘believe, think’ and *iste-* ‘want’

Additional observations concern the matrix predicates *san-* ‘believe, think’ and *iste-* ‘want’ with finite complement clauses. As mentioned, previous studies claimed that the negation of the matrix predicate *san-* ‘believe, think’ does not allow finite complement clauses (21):

- (21) \**[Ali evden ayrılmış] sanmam.*  
 Ali house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF believe:NEG.AOR.1SG  
 (Coşkun 2010: 52, 53)

However, the following data show that *san-* ‘believe, think’ and *iste-* ‘want’ can, when negated, embed finite complement clauses to a certain extent:

i. The negated matrix predicate *san-* ‘think’ can occur with complementizer *ki* by having an optative-marked finite complement clause in its negation scope, as in (22) and (23):

- (22) *Sanmam [ki Ali evden ayrılmış olsun.]*  
 believe:NEG.AOR.1SG COMP Ali house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF be:OPT.3SG  
 ‘I don’t think/believe that Ali left the house.’

- (23) *Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın].*  
 think:NEG.AOR.1SG COMP NPI this lie:PL.DAT believe:OPT.3SG  
*Hepsi çok mantıklı düşünür.*  
 ‘I don’t think that anybody believes these lies. All of them are quite reasonable persons.’

ii. The imperative *san-* ‘believe, think’ can also have a finite complement clause with *ki* or without complementizer in its negation scope, as in (24–26):

- (24) *Sanma [ki kimse sana inanır!]*  
 think:NEG.IMP COMP NPI you:DAT believe:AOR  
*Sen o adamları daha tanıyamamışsın.*  
 ‘Don’t think that anybody would believe you! You obviously still don’t know those people.’

- (25) *Sanma [ki olanları unuttum.]*  
 think:NEG.IMP COMP be:PART.PL.ACC forget:PRET.1SG  
*Sadece hatırlamak istemiyorum.*  
 ‘Don’t think that I have forgotten what happened. I just don’t want to remember.’

- (26) *Bitti, unuttum demişsin. Sanma [kimse inanır].*  
 think:NEG.IMP NPI believe:AOR  
 ‘(As I have heard) you said “it’s finished; I have forgotten”. Don’t think that anybody believes (that).’

Another predicate which takes an optative-marked finite complement clause in its negation scope is *iste-* ‘want’. The complementation may be without a complementizer or with *ki*:



- (27) [*Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsın*] *istemem.*  
 children NPI job:LOK work:OPT.3SG want:NEG.AOR.1SG  
*Bu konuda gereken önlemler alınmıyor maalesef.*  
 ‘I wouldn’t want children to work in any job. Unfortunately, necessary measures are not taken in this matter.’
- (28) *İstemem* [*ki kimse zarar görsün*].  
 want:NEG.AOR.1SG COMP NPI harm:OPT.3SG  
*Gereken bütün sigortaları yaptırırım.*  
 ‘I wouldn’t want anybody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.’

### 3.4.1 Restrictions

The just mentioned use of *san-* ‘believe, think’ does, however, show some restrictions. If, for instance, the negation marker is moved from the domain of the matrix clause into the following or preceding embedded clause, the sentences are no longer grammatical (29b):

- (29a) *Sanmam* [*ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın*]. *Hepsi çok mantıklı düşünür.*  
 ‘I don’t think that anybody believes these lies. All of them are quite reasonable persons.’
- (29b) \**Sanırım* [*ki kimse bu yalanlara inanmasın*].

There are other restrictions with respect to tense/aspect and person marking. Erguvanlı-Taylan (1998b) also mentioned that the matrix predicate *san-* ‘believe, think’ with finite complement clauses occurs mostly with aorist or present tense and the person marker of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular. It conveys the speaker’s attitude to a following or to a preceding proposition. This observation also holds for the negated use of *san-* ‘believe, think’ with the aorist.

The restriction relating to the position of the negation morpheme occurs also with the imperative use of *san-* ‘believe, think’ when it embeds a finite complement clause. In this case, the finite clauses do not get an optative marker but they can occur with several tense/aspect markers such as the preterit, aorist, present or future suffixes.

- (30a) *Sanma* [*ki olanları unuttum*]. *Sadece hatırlamak istemiyorum.*  
 ‘Don’t think that I have forgotten what happened. I just don’t want to remember.’
- (30b) \**San* [*ki olanları unutmadım*].

In contrast, the verb *iste-* ‘want’ does not have any of the mentioned restrictions; i.e. the occurrence of the negative marker *-mA-* is possible both in the matrix domain as well as in the domain of embedding:

- (31a) *İstemem* [*ki kimse zarar görsün*]. *Gereken bütün sigortaları yaptırırım.*  
 ‘I wouldn’t want anybody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.’

- (31b) *İsterim [ki kimse zarar görmesin]. Gereken bütün sigortaları yaptırırım.*  
 'I (would) want nobody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.'

After having discussed these aspects of such structures let us look at some of their common properties.

### 3.4.2. Approaches to *san-/iste-* + (*ki*) + [complement clause-OPT]

Johanson (2009, to appear) indicates that this kind of constructions has been present for a millennium in certain Turkic varieties. It emerged through contact with Indo-European languages going back to the middle and late period of Old Uyghur. In Central Asia it was copied from Iranian languages, in Siberia from Russian, in Turkish varieties from Greek, Slavic and Albanian.<sup>6</sup>

Stein (2010: 245, 250) points out that optative-marked sentential structures refer in Old Ottoman and Iran Turkish to unrealized acts which are desired, expected or probable.<sup>7</sup> (32) and (33) show that Stein's observation concerning semantics still holds for modern Turkish.

- (32) *Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın].* : probability  
 'I don't think that anybody believes these lies.'
- (33) *[Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsın] istemem.* : desire  
 'I wouldn't want children to work in any job.'

Johanson describes this construction with optative-marked complement clause as "non-canonical periphrastic modal construction". It has a matrix predicate with an inherent modal content and a finite clause. He calls this kind of finite clause, whose predicate is marked with a mood marker corresponding to the predicate with modal content "subjunctive clause", as in (34). He does not consider these structures to be syntactically subordinative constructions in the sense of embedding. Hence, he calls them "non-canonical periphrastic modal constructions" (cf. Johanson, to appear). For instance, the canonical correspondence of (34) would be (35):

- (34) *[Gitsin] istedim*  
 go:OPT.3SG want:PRET.1SG  
 'I wanted him/her to go.'
- (35) *[Gitmesin]i istedim.*  
 go:VN.3SG.ACC want:PRET.1SG  
 'I wanted him/her to go.'

The modal content of the aorist or present matrix predicates of the verb *san-* 'believe, think' in the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular has been discussed also by Erguvanlı-Taylan (1998b: 159).

6 For related data and discussions with respect to language contact see Johanson 2009, to appear.

7 For a comprehensive discussion and data from Ottoman Turkish and Iran Turkish see Stein 2010.

She describes the matrix predicates relating to desire, as *iste-* ‘want’, and *umut et-* ‘hope’ in connection with dynamic modality, matrix predicates such as *san-* ‘believe, think’ referring to an assumption or a probability in connection with epistemic modality. Kocaman’s (1988: 466) observations on modality are also parallel to Erguvanlı-Taylan’s. He points out that the matrix predicates *san-* ‘believe, think’, *tahmin et-* ‘guess’, *um-* ‘hope’ with aorist and 1<sup>st</sup> person singular preceding or following a finite complement clause have certain illocutionary values apart from expressing indicative mood.<sup>8</sup> Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 219) consider *sanırım* ‘I believe, I think’ to be modal adverbial.

### 3.4.3. Analyses

If the mentioned finite complements in the negation scope of matrix predicates are observed from the point of view of modality, one sees the following. In (36), the optative-marked complement clause with negated *san-* ‘believe, think’ conveys the assumption of the speaker concerning the improbability of the case that someone would believe the lies. So, the modal content of the matrix predicate *san-* ‘believe, think’ is here epistemic and notice that the contribution of the optative marker of the finite complement clause does not denote to desire, but probability.

- (36) *Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın]. Hepsi çok mantıklı düşünür.*  
 ‘I don’t think that anybody believes these lies. All of them are quite reasonable persons.’

In (37), on the other hand, the optative-marked complement clause expresses an undesirable action.

- (37) *[Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsın] istemem. Bu konuda gereken önlemler alınmıyor maalesef.*  
 ‘I wouldn’t want children to work in any job. Unfortunately, the necessary measures are not taken in this matter.’

Furthermore, with the negated imperative use of *san-* ‘believe, think’, the speaker denies the probability of the event or act in the finite complement which can be supposed or expected by the hearer.

- (38) *Sanma [ki kimse sana inanır]! Sen o adamları daha tanıyamamışsın.*  
 ‘Don’t think that anybody would believe you! You obviously still don’t know those people.’

<sup>8</sup> Hooper (1975: 96) and Noonan (2007: 97) describe matrix predicates like ‘I think’, ‘I suppose’, ‘it seems’ as “parenthetical predicates” which inform the hearer in what way the speaker modifies his/her attitude to the truth of the proposition in the complement clause.

#### 4. Conclusion

As consequence I claim the following. The interaction of semantics or pragmatics with syntax can have an effect on the selectional constraints of matrix predicates (e.g. the occurrence of complement clauses with *-mA* in connection with the negation of *inan-* 'believe').

The negation scope of the complement clause cannot be determined only by the semantics of matrix predicate or by the complementizing means. In this respect, the discussed data has brought forward evidence for the interaction of syntax with semantics. For instance, same matrix predicates like *inan-* 'believe' can have different negation scope with different complementizing means.

An additional piece of evidence displays a syntax-pragmatics interaction. Against previous approaches (Kornfilt 1997, Zidani-Eroğlu 1997, Kelepir 2001), I have tried to show that certain complement clauses can appear with finite syntactic means in the negation scope of the matrix domain (e.g. *san-* 'believe, think' with optative-marked finite complement clause). I have also shown that emotive factive predicates like *pişman ol-* 'regret' or *üzül-* 'be sorry' can license the negative polarity item *kimse* 'anybody/somebody' in positive non-finite complement clauses only when they are negated. This shows that the negation scope of matrix predicates seem to license negative polarity items in complement clauses. The same restriction appears with the non-factive predicate *san-* 'believe, think' when it embeds a positive finite complement clause with the negative polarity item *kimse* 'anybody/somebody'. The variable character of *kimse* seems to give rise to such cases.

The discussed data showed that characteristics of the Turkish complementation system cannot be well understood without considering the interaction between negated matrix predicates and the morpho-syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of complementizing means and the complement clauses as a whole.

#### Abbreviations

ABL	: ablative	OPT	: optative
ACC	: accusative	PART	: participle
AOR	: aorist	PERF	: perfect
DAT	: dative	PL	: plural
FUT	: future	POSB	: possibility
GEN	: genitive	PRES	: present
INDR	: indirective	presup.	: presupposition
COMP	: complementizer	PRET	: preterit
CONV	: converb	SG	: singular
COP	: copula	VN	: verbal noun
NEG	: negation	[ ]	: complement clause
NPI	: negative polarity item		

## References

- Coşkun, H. 2010. Wie soll man es ergänzen? Türkische Ergänzungssätze. In: Brentel, H. & Siegel, T. (Hrsg.) *Nachwuchsforschung in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften. Dokumentation des FGS-Forschungstages 2009*. Frankfurt a. Main: Frankfurt Graduate School for the Humanities and Social Sciences. 52–53.
- Csató, É. Á. 1999. Modalität in türkischen Komplementsätzen und ihre Entsprechungen im Deutschen. In: Johanson, L. & Rehbein, J. (eds.) *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 23–32.
- Csató, É. Á. 2010. Two types of complement clauses in Turkish. In: Boeschoten, H. & Rentzsch, J. (eds.) *Turcology in Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 107–122.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. 1984. *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar*. Berkeley University: University of California Press.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. 1998a. What determines the choice of nominalizer in Turkish nominalized complement clauses? In: Caron, B. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. 1998b. Türkçede tümce yapısına sahip tümleş yantümceleri. In: İmer, K. & Subaşı-Uzun, L. (eds.) *Doğan Aksan Armağanı*. Ankara: DTCF Yayınları: 366. 155–164.
- von Stechow, P. 1999. NPI-Licensing, Strawson-Entailment, and Context-Dependency. *Journal of Semantics* 16:1, 97–148.
- Giannakidou, A. 2008. Negative and positive polarity items. Variation, licensing, and compositionality. Prepared for: Maienborn, Claudia, Heusinger, K. & Portner, P. (eds.) *Semantics. An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (<http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/WM0ZTVhZ/handbookpaper.pdf>), accessed 15.12.2010.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. 2005. *Turkish. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Hooper, J. 1975. On assertive predicates. In: Kimball, J. (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics*. Volume 4. New York: Academic Press. 91–124.
- Horn, L. R. 2001 [1989]. *A Natural History of Negation*. Stanford: CSLI publication.
- Johanson, L. 2009. Modal in Turkic. In: Hansen, B. & De Haan, F. (eds.) *Modals in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 487–510.
- Johanson, L. (to appear). Mood meets mood.
- Keleş, M. 2001. *Topics in Turkish Syntax. Clausal Structure and Scope*. PhD. dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.
- Kiparsky, C. & Kiparsky, P. 1971. Fact. In: Steinberg, D. & Jakobovits, L. (eds.) *Semantics*. Cambridge: University Press. 345–369.
- Kocaman, A. 1988. Modality in the Turkish discourse. In: Koç, S. (ed.) *Studies on Turkish Linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 17–19 August 1988*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University. 463–468.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- Kural, M. 1993. V-to(I-to)-C in Turkish. In: Beghelli, F. & Kural, M. (eds.) *Recent Papers in Syntax, Semantics and Computational Linguistics*. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics. Vol. 11. 17–54.

- Kural, M. 1998. Subordinate Infls and Comp in Turkish. In: Johanson, L. (ed.) *The Mainz Meeting*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 404–421.
- Lees, R. B. 1965. Turkish nominalizations and a problem of ellipsis. *Foundations of Language* 1, 112–121.
- Noonan, M. 2007 [1985]. Complementation. In: Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. 2: *Complex Constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52–150.
- Özsoy, A. S. 1999. *Türkçe*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi.
- Van Schaaik, G. 2001. The order of nominalizations in Turkish. In: Van Schaaik, G. (ed.) *The Bosphorus Papers. Studies in Turkish Grammar 1996–1999*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 114–143.
- Schroeder, C. 2000. Prädikation im Türkischen. In: Schroeder, C. Workshop on Predication, Bremen (PDF). [www.fb10.uni-bremen.de/iaas/workshop/paedi/schroeder.pdf](http://www.fb10.uni-bremen.de/iaas/workshop/paedi/schroeder.pdf), accessed 15.12.2010
- Stein, H. 2010. Optativ versus Voluntativ-Imperativ in irantürkischen Texten (15./16. Jh.). In: Boeschoten, H. & Rentzsch, J. (eds.) *Turcology in Mainz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 239–255.
- Zidani-Eroğlu, L. 1997. Exceptionally case-marked NPs as matrix objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 219–230.

