

An Asymmetric Negation Marker in Turkmen: *-Anok*

Sema Aslan Demir

Introduction

Turkmen belongs to the Oghuz branch of Turkic languages and is mostly spoken in Turkmenistan. It has also speakers in neighboring countries such as Iran, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. Turkmen also has diaspora speakers, who have immigrated from Mangyshlak to the Caucasian area in the 18th century. Caucasian Turkmen live in Stavropol Krai and Astrakhan. Because of being in the easternmost region of the Oghuz zone, the Turkmen language has interesting linguistic features from the view of intra-family language typology, by comprising both Oghuz and non-Oghuz materials in its linguistic inventory. It has some common areal features with the Northwestern and the Southeastern branches of the Turkic languages. In this paper, I will deal with the negative predicator *-Anok* /*Ano:q*/, which is one of the asymmetric negation markers of the Turkmen negation system. *-Anok* hasn't got any affirmative counterpart that grammatically originated in the same cognate or semantically corresponds with *-Anok*. This situation brings out a kind of asymmetry in negation.

Before focusing on the *-Anok*, I will give brief information on symmetric and asymmetric negation as the different realizations of standard negation. Secondly, I will introduce the verbal negation system of Turkmen, by focusing on the *-Anok* which is a morphological negative predicator. I will also focus on the grammaticalization process of *-Anok*, with regard to Croft's Cycle. In the article, the examples will be given both in the standard orthography and in transcription, because of the fact that some of the typical phonological features of Turkmen are not represented in the standard orthography. The orthographic forms will be given in italics and the spoken forms in slashes. Vowel length is indicated with a colon.

-Anok in the Turkmen verbal paradigm

One of the main concepts in negation studies is standard negation. Standard negation is sentential or clausal negation which can be defined as the basic way that a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses (Miestamo 2013: 2005). Standard negation can also be defined as the negation in simple indicative sentences with a

verbal predicate (Dahl 1979). Negative constructions that fall outside standard negation include the negation of existential, copular, or non-verbal clauses, the negation of subordinate clauses, and the negation of non-declarative clauses (Miestamo 2013). Because of occurring in verbal main clauses, *-Anok* is a part of the standard negation system in Turkmen.

In terms of the status of negative markers, three major types of negation are identified: (i) morphological or affixal negation (ii) negative particles (iii) negative verbs (Dahl 1979, 2010). The common affixal negation marker of the Turkmen is *-mA*. It shares the functional domain of verbal negation with *däl* /dä:l/ ‘not’. *Däl* is an unbounded negation particle, which can be used to negate both copular sentences with noun predicates and, conjugated verbs. In Turkmen, *däl* is the only way to negate the future tense with *-jAk* (*ol geljek* /ol geljek/ ‘he will come’: *ol geljek däl* /ol geljekgä:l/ ‘he won’t come’), the necessity/obligation mood *-mAlI* (*men barmaly däl* ‘/men barmalı däl/ ‘I don’t need to go’), the intention mood *-mAçI* (*ol taşlamakçy däl* /ol taşlamakçi dä:l/ ‘he doesn’t intend to throw’), and the past perfect tense with *-An* (*ol ýazan* /ol yaðan/ ‘he has written’: *ol ýazan däl* /ol yaðan dä:l/ ‘he hasn’t written’). Both *-mA* and *däl* are symmetric negation markers, because of the fact that there isn’t any structural difference between affirmative and negative sentence structure except the addition of negators.

- (1.a) *Maral geldi*
 /maral geldi/
 Maral come: PST.3SG
 ‘Maral came’
- (1.b) *Maral gelmedi*
 /maral gelmedi/
 Maral come:NEG-PST.3SG
 ‘Maral didn’t come’

In 1.b, the structure of the negative sentence is identical to the structure of the affirmative, except for the presence of the negator *-mA*. In asymmetric negation, the structure of the negative differs from the structure of the affirmative in other ways (Miestamo 2013, 2005). The status of *-Anok* is asymmetric. Nevertheless, the reason of asymmetry is not structural. Asymmetry arises from the fact that there isn’t any specific affirmative counterpart that morphologically or semantically corresponds with *-Anok*. *-Anok* appears only in negative verbal conjugation, without having a specific affirmative opposition in the Turkmen verbal paradigm.

-Anok diachronically originated in existential negation marker *ýok* /yo:q/ ‘not existing’. In the grammaticalization process of *-Anok*, the unbounded existential negator *ýok* contracted with the preceding suffixes by fusion: past participle *An* + possessive suffix + *ýok*. *alanym ýok* /alanım yo:q/ (take:PSTP-POSS.1SG not-existing) > *alamok* /alamo:q/ (take:NEG.PRED.1SG) ‘I’m not taking/I haven’t been

taking'. At the end of the grammaticalization process, a new member of Turkmen verbal negation system emerges, with full paradigm. Meanwhile, intermediate stages of grammaticalization process can be observed in various Turkmen dialects from full form such as *alanym ýok* /alanim yo:q/ (take:PSTP-POSS.1SG not-existing) to more reduced form, *alam ýok* /alam yo:q/ and, a further grammaticalized form which can be also assimilated for palatal harmony, *alamak* /alama:q/ (< alamo:q) 'I'm not taking/I haven't been taking' (take:NEG.PRED.1SG) (Amansariyev 1970: 360; Berdiyev et al 1970: 322). In standard Turkmen, which is based on the Teke dialect, the conjugation paradigm of the *-Anok* is as the following:

gel-emok /gelemo:q/ (come:NEG.PRED.1SG) 'I'm not coming (nowadays)/I haven't been coming/I didn't come yet.
gel-eňok /geleŋo:q/ (come:NEG.PRED.2SG)
gel-enok /geleno:q/ (come:NEG.PRED.3SG)
gel-emizok /gelemðo:q/ (come:NEG.PRED.1PL)
gel-eňizok /geleŋðo:q/ (come:NEG.PRED.2PL)
gel-enoklar /geleno:qlor/ (come:NEG.PRED.3PL)

Diachronic development of *-Anok* due to the Croft's Cycle

"Recently, linguists have discovered (or, more accurately, rediscovered) the role that historical linguistics can legitimately play in providing explanations for the facts of synchronic language types" (Croft 1991). In Croft's work *The Evolution of Negation*, three attested synchronic typology of verbal negators and negative existential forms are identified: In type A, the negation of the existential predicate is performed by the verbal negator. Verbal negator is used for both tasks. In type B, there is a special negative existential predicate, distinct from the verbal negator. In type C, there is a special negative existential predicate which is identical to verbal negator. In addition, he finds three attested synchronic variation types: A~B, B~C, C~A. These synchronic variations also imply the grammaticalization pathway of standard negation by hinting a diachronic development in a cyclic way such as A>B, B>C and C>A (Croft 1991: 6). Croft has shown that there is a cyclical development (Croft's Cycle) whereby existential negators extend their functions as the verbal negator, and the original verbal negator has been lost. In negative existential cycle, in stage A, a verbal negator, in addition to negate verbal predicates, can perform like an existential negator. In stage A>B special negative existential form arises, B>C negative existential form replaces the verbal negator and extent its function into verbal negator, in stage C>A the negator has lost its existential function and negates like any other verbal predicate (Miestamo 2005: 221). If we investigate Turkmen *-Anok* from the point of Croft's Cycle, we can situate *-Anok* in type B~C. In type B~C, the negative existential is used for the negation of some verbal predications (Veselinova 2016: 143). Croft's Cycle shows that negative existential constructions are a common source for standard negation

constructions (Miestamo 2005: 221). *-Anok* diachronically developed from existential negation to verbal negation. However, it didn't become prevalent in all domains of standard negation. It became an alternative verbal negator, which is semantically more marked than *-mA*. In this sense, one of the important questions is that can *-Anok* generalize all domain of standard negation and replace other verbal negators as a further development? As Veselinova states, the full completion of the negation cycle appears to occur very rarely within a period for reasonable reconstruction. Although *yok* interact with verbal negation a great degree, it is far from ousting the verbal negator in any modern Turkic languages. On the other hand, stages where the negative existential is used for specific sub-domain in the negation of the verb are very frequent and tend to last for very long periods of time (Veselinova 2016: 141, 163). In actual language, *-Anok* is used for specific sub-domain of Turkmen verbal negation. But its increasingly use pointed out also in some early monographs on the Turkmen language (Çaryýarow 1969: 56)

What kind of asymmetry?

As stated above, *-Anok* appears only in negative verbal conjugation, without having a specific affirmative counterpart in Turkmen verbal paradigm. The critical issue is that whether the lacking of an affirmative counterpart in any grammatical means or any affirmative paradigm make it possible to count *-Anok* in the frame of asymmetric negation? Negative constructions can be symmetric or asymmetric due to the structural differences between negative and affirmative. Miestamo states that when no structural differences are found between the affirmative and the negative in addition to the negative marker, the structures are symmetric. When there are structural differences between the affirmative and the negative in addition to the negative marker, the structures are asymmetric (Miestamo 2005: 49). Asymmetry can be found either between the affirmative and negative constructions or between the paradigms that the affirmative and negative constructions form (Miestamo 2013). The situation is different for *-Anok*. The asymmetry of *-Anok* arises from the absence of corresponding affirmative paradigm. As it is developed from existential negator *yok*, a proper affirmative counterpart doesn't exist in Turkmen verbal paradigm. But in the Salar, spoken in western China which seems go back to an early Turkmen variety (Johanson 2009), an affirmative counterpart developed from affirmative existential particle *bar* 'exist' can be identified. In Salar, affirmative existential particle *bar* 'exist' developed as a marker of present tense like *-ba/-pa* (< *bar*) and its negative form is being marked with *yok* 'not existent': *ma vaba* (I go:PRS) 'I'm going', *šiba* (eat:PRS.3SG) 's/he is eating', *yaγmur yaγba* (rain rain:PRS.3SG) 'it is raining', *yü yoxtir* (wash:NEG.PRED.3SG) 's/he is not washing' *varoxtir* (go:NEG.PRED.3SG) 's/he is not going' (Mehmet 2014). Mehmet compares two different assumptions about the origin of *-ba/-pa*. The first assumption is that they were originated in the affirmative existential particle *bar* 'exist', and the second is that they had developed

from the auxiliary verb *bar-* (to go). Because of the existence of a corresponding negative form which developed from negative existential particle *yok*, Mehmet finds the former assumption more reasonable (Mehmet 2014:115).

Semantic scope of *-Anok*: what kind of negation?

Although *-Anok* appears only in negative verbal conjugation without having an affirmative counterpart, there are some attempts to find it a proper affirmative counterpart in the Turkmen verbal paradigm. For example, it is asserted that *-Anok* is the negative counterpart of concrete present continuous tense forms *-(I)p du:r*, *-(I)p otı:r* *-(I)p yö:r* and *-(I)p yati:r* (Azymow 2011; Gurdov 1983; from Clark 1998). Clark didn't approve this claim, and by referring to Baskakov (1970), he states that *-(I)p du:r*, *-(I)p otı:r* *-(I)p yö:r* and *-(I)p yati:r* haven't got any corresponding negative form in Turkmen language (Clark 1998: 231). These arguments make it necessary to think about the semantic scope of *-Anok*. In other words, what is rejected or disagreed by *-Anok*? If we consider this question with regard to the time interval, we can identify three main slots which the negated event/state covers. In examples 2a-c, *-Anok*'s semantic scope includes negative events/states which started in the past and still continue in speech time. In examples 3 a-b, it covers a relatively wide time interval surrounding the speech time (and negated event seems to be valid at least for a while). In example 4.a-b, negation scope is narrower and very near of the speech time by also covering it. Soyegow pointed out that *-Anok* can also be used in accordance with past tense: *Sen bize bardıñmy?* /θen biðe bardıñmı/ 'Did you go to us?' *Ýok, baramok* /yo:q, baramo:q/ 'No, I didn't' (Soyegow 2000).

- (2.a) *Dört-bäş gündür şähere baramok* (Y, 103)
 /dö:rt-vä:ş günnür şähere baramo:q/
 four-five day:COP city:DAT go:NEG.PRED.1SG
 'I haven't been going home for four or five days'
- (2.b) *Ol heniz gelenok*
 /ol heni:ð geleno:q/
 he yet come:NEG.PRED.3SG
 'He hasn't come yet'
- (2.c) *Henize çenli senden yaman zat eşidemok* (Y, 309)
 /heni:ðe çenli sennen yaman ða:t eşdemo:q/
 yet:DAT you:ABL bad thing hear:NEG.PRED.1SG
 'I haven't heard a bad word from you until now'
- (3.a) *Her dört-bäş aydan gelyärler. Çalt-çalt gelenoklar.*
 /her dö:rt-vä:ş aydan gelyä:rlar. Çalt çalt geleno:qlor/
 very four-five month:ABL come:PRS.3PL. quick quick
 come:NEG.PRED.3PL
 'They come every four to five months. They don't come frequently'

- (3.b) *Köpümüz türkmen dilini gowy bilemizok*
 /köpümüð türkmön dilni göwu bilemðo:q/
 many:POSS.3PL Turkmen language:POSS.3SG-ACC well
 know:NEG.PRED.1PL
 ‘Most of us do not know Turkmen language well’
- (4.a) *Hiç yerim agyranok* (Y, 233)
 /hi:ç yerim a:γirano:q/
 none part:POSS.1SG pain:NEG.PRED.3SG
 ‘No parts of me hurts/I’m not in pain’
- (4.b) *Men senden günortany, miraby soramok* (Y, 27).
 /men sennen günorta:nĩ, mi:ra:bi θoromo:q/
 I you:ABL noon:ACC waterman:ACC ask:NEG.PRED.1SG
 ‘I’m not asking you anything about the noon, about the waterman’

A negative sentence involves the supposition of its affirmative counterpart. The corresponding affirmative is present in the context as backgrounded information (Clark 1974; Miestamo 2005). If we look at the examples, we can see that *-Anok* changes the truth value of the proposition both the originated in the past and valid/continue in the present (and can be continuing for a while). *-Anok*’s semantic nature is stative and situational because of developing from the structure including existential negator *yok* (< An-POSS *yok* ‘not existent’). Existential constructions are stative and because of general stativity, they can naturally be extended to the function of standard negation (Miestamo 2005: 222). The past participle *-An* seems to enable the *-Anok* a potential to adjust the negated time interval related to past and present due to the necessities of the context.

Conclusion

-Anok is not only a verbal negator, but also a negative predicator which consist of tense/aspect, person and number values together in its semantic core. Its temporal value and the nature of its components that it sourced from, gives it the ability to code various negative events/states that (i) started in the past and continue in speech time (ii) cover a relatively wide time interval surrounding the speech time (and negated event seems to be valid at least for a while) (iii) surround very near of the speech time by covering it. Lacking an affirmative counterpart in any grammatical means or any paradigm, make it more typical in marking of negation.

References

- Amansaryýew, J. 1970. *Türkmen Dialektologýasy*. Aşgabat: Türkmenistan Neşriyaty.
- Azymow, P. 2011. *Türkmen Dili*. Aşgabat: Türkmen Döwlet Neşriyat Gullugy.
- Berdiyew R. & Kürenow S. & Şamyradow K. & Arazkulyýew, S. 1970. *Türkmen Diliniň Dialektleriniň Oçerki*. Aşgabat: Türkmenistan SSR Ylymlar Akademiýasy.
- Çaryýarow, B. 1969. *Günorta-Günbatar Türki Dillerde İşlik Zamanlary*. Aşgabat: Ylym.
- Clark, H. 1974. Semantics and comprehension. In: Tomas. A. Sebeok (Ed.) *Current Trends in Linguistics: Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences* 12, 1291–1428. The Hague: Mouton.
- Clark, L. 1998. *Turkmen Reference Grammar* (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Croft, W. 1991. The evolution of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 1–27.
- Dahl, Ö. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17: 79–106.
- Dahl, Ö. 2010. Typology of negation. In: Laurence R. Hord (ed) *The expression of negation*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Johanson, L. 2006. Turkmen. In: Brown, K., Ogilvie, S. (eds) *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World*. Elseiver. 1116–1119.
- Miestamo, M. 2005. *Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin-New York,
- Miestamo, M. 2013. Symmetric and asymmetric standard negation. In: Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Mehmet, G. 2014. *Salar Türkçesinin Çekim Morfolojisi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları
- Söyegow, M. 2000. *Türkmen Diliniň Grammatikasy: Morfologiýa*. Aşgabat: Ruh Neşriyaty.
- Veselinova, N. L. 2016. The negative existential cycle viewed through the lens of comparative data. In: Gelderen, E.v. (ed.) *Linguistic Cycle II*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ykbal* (Y). [Novel] Hydyr Derýaýew, Birinji Tom. www.gollanma.com