SQUATITIVE NEGATION IN TURKISH

EGE BARAN DALMAZ

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2023

SQUATITIVE NEGATION IN TURKISH

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Social Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Linguistics

by

Ege Baran Dalmaz

Boğaziçi University

July 2023

Squatitive Negation in Turkish

The thesis of Ege Baran Dalmaz

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Didar Akar _____
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Işıl Erduyan _____

Prof. Dr.Çiler Hatipoğlu _____
(External Member)

July 2023

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Ege Baran Dalmaz, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature .....

Date .....

ABSTRACT

Squatitive Negation in Turkish

This thesis examines the squatitive negation forms (Horn, 2001) in Turkish in order to provide a linguistic description and an explanation of their discourse functions. Squatitives are negation forms that are non-canonical with distinctive interactional properties. Turkish has three grammatical negation forms: i. substantive predicate 'değil', ii. verbal suffix '/-mA/', iii. existential predicate 'yok'. Given the existence of these exhaustively productive negation forms, why there is a need for another form of negation is a question that has to be discussed. The answer lies in the interactional nature of language. Squatitive negation forms typically include a taboo or swear word such as *nah* and *b*k* inserted into a sentence and this taboo word changes the polarity of the sentence. Structurally, squatitives display certain constraints: i. they cannot be embedded, ii. they cannot occur in questions, and iii. they cannot license NPIs, which raises questions about their status as polarity items.Interactionally, squatitives require an antecedent utterance (usually by another speaker) which they repeat and change its polarity. While doing that, they function to display the speaker's stance with purposes such as challenging or refuting the interlocutor's preceding utterance. Following Berman's (2005) discourse stance framework, I claim that squatitive forms most frequently mark attitude stance, in particular, affective stance based on 84 tokens collected from Turkish National Corpus and TS Corpus.

ÖZET

Türkçe’de Argo-olumsuzOlumsuzlama

Bu tez, dilbilimselbirbetimlemesunmakvesöylemişlevlerininbiraçıklamakamacıylaTürkçe'de kiargo-olumsuzolumsuzlamabiçimlerini (Horn, 2001) incelemektedir. Argo-olumsuzlar, ayırtedicietkileşimselözellikleresahiptanınmamışolumsuzlamabiçimleridir.Türkçenin üçolumsuzlamabiçimivardır: i. isimyüklemi 'değil', ii. Eylemeki '/-mA/', iii. varoluşsalyüklem 'yok'. Bu tümyüklemlerikapsayanüretkenolumsuzlamabiçimlerininvarlığıgözönünealındığında, başkabirolumsuzlamabiçiminenedenihtiyaçduyulduğutartışılmasıgerekenbirsorudur. Cevap, dilinetkileşimseldoğasındayatmaktadır.Argo-olumsuzolumsuzlamabiçimleritipikolarakbircümleyeeklenen nah ve b*k gibibir tabu veyaküfürkelimesiiçerirvebu tabu kelimecümleninolumsuzveyaolumluolmaözelliğinideğiştirir. Yapısalolarak, argo-olumsuzlarınkullanımındabelirlikısıtlamalargözlemlenmektedir: i. yan tümcedeyeralamazlar, ii. sorulardakullanılamazlarve iii. Olumsuzkutupöğelerininkullanımınaizinveremezler, bu da olumsuzlukbetimleyenbiröğeolmadurumlarıhakkındasorulardoğurur.Etkileşimselolarak, argo-olumsuzlar, (genelliklebaşkabirkonuşmacıya ait) tümceyiveyasözceyiargo-olumsuzuekleyerektekrarlamayıgerektirir. Bunuyaparken de muhatabınöncekisözlerinemeydanokumakveyaonuçürütmekgibiamaçlarlakonuşmacının duruşunusergilemeişlevigörürler. Berman'ın (2005)

söylemduruşuçerçevesinitakipederek, Türk UlusalDerlemive TS Derlemi'ndentoplanan 84 simgeyedayalıolarak, squatitivebiçimlerinensıktutumduruşunu, özellikle de etkiselduruşuişaretlediğiniiddiaediyorum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge TUBITAK for their charitable financial support with their 2210-A Scholarship for graduate students. My studies could not have been concluded without their contribution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION……1

1.1 Introduction to the Squatitive expressions 5

1.2 Aim of this study..... 10

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND..... 12

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY 21

3.1 Data collection ……21

3.2 Data analysis ……...22

CHAPTER 4: CONSTRAINTS OF SQUATITIVE NEGATION…….24

4.1 Interrogatives and wh-questions……...…24

4.2 NPI licensing……30

4.3 Embedded clauses…….32

CHAPTER 5: STANCE PROPERTIES OF SQUATITIVES 42

4.1 Attitude stance and squatitives..... 44

4.2 Orientation stance and squatitives..... 62

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION..... 67

REFERENCES..... 70

ABBREVIATIONS

1PPL	1st person plural
1PSG	1st person singular
2PPL	2nd person plural
2PSG	2nd person singular
3PL	3rd person plural
3PSG	3rd person singular
ABIL	Abilitative
ABL	Ablative
ACC	Accusative
ADD	Additive
AOR	Aorist
CAU	Causative
COMP	Compound
COND/CON	Conditional
COP	Copula
DAT	Dative
DET	Determiner
EX	Existential
GEN	Genitive

GER	Gerundial
IMP	Imperative
NEG	Negation
NOM	Nominative
PASS	Passive
PAST/PST	Past
PERF	Perfective
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive
PROG	Progressive
Q	Question particle
REL	Relativizer
SQT	Squatitive
TAM	Tense Aspect Modality
TNC	Turkish National Corpus

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Negation is a linguistic universal that has been found inevery human language regardless of typology (i.e. across language families) or modality (i.e. in both spoken and sign languages). It is the way in which languages reverse the truth conditions of utterances (Miestamo, 2007). Negation is defined as the partial or complete denial of propositions that are affirmative(Emeksiz, 2010).

There are three ways in which Turkish implements negation. The first is the affixalnegation/*-mA/*, which is mainly used in negation of subordinate clauses and verbal sentences (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(1) Affixalnegation in Turkish

a. Ben-imders-im-ianla-ma-dı-n. (verbal)

1psg.GENlesson.POSS.CMPunderstand.NEG.PAST.2psg

'You did not understand my lesson.'

b. Ben-imders-i-mi anla-ma-ma-n biz-işaşır-t-tı. (nominal)

1psg.GEN lesson.POSS.CMP understand.NEG.NOM.2psg 1ppl.ACC surprise.CAU.PST.3psg

'That you did not understand my lesson surprised us.'

The second way that is marking negation in Turkish is by the free morpheme negation *değil* defined by Göksel& Kerslake (2011) as the foremost way of negating a nominal predicate.

(2) Free morpheme ‘değil’ negation in Turkish

a. Ahmet kimyagerol-abil-mişdeğil. (verbal)

Ahmet chemist be.ABIL.EVID.NOT

‘It is not the case that Ahmet was able to become a chemist.’

b. Ahmetbirkimyagerdeğil.

Ahmet a chemist not

‘Ahmet is not a chemist.’

The third and final way of marking negation in Turkish is the existential negation *yok* ‘non-existent’ which is defined as the negated form of *var* ‘existent’ (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(3) Existential negation in Turkish

Ahmet-inabla-sı yok.

Ahmet.GEN older sister.POSSNEG.EX

‘Ahmet does not have an older sister.’

Another way to convey negation in Turkish is to use Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) such as *hiç* ‘never’, ‘ever’, ‘at all’, *kimse* ‘no one’, ‘anyone’ under Negative Concord and ne…*ne*… negative connective (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(4) NPIs in Negative Concordin Turkish

Ahmetbuhaftasonuhiçtezyaz-ma-dı.

Ahmet this week end never thesis write.NEG.PAST

‘Ahmet never wrote thesis this weekend.’

All of the forms of negation that have been listed above express negation with no other pragmatic connotation on negation other than the intrinsic denotations and connotations of negation itself. However, squatitive negationcarries additional pragmatic information regarding the speaker's stance within the conversational space (Horn, 2001).

Compare the following examples:

a. Sophie did not see squat.
b. Sophie did not see anything. Horn (2001)

Squatitives are present in Turkish as forms of verbal, nominal and existential negation as *çok* 'many', *b*k* 'excretion', *nah*[1] 'an interjection usually accompanied by a hand gesture like the middle finger', and as NPIs in combination with *bir*or *bi* 'one' indefinite determiner as *bir b*k* 'one excretion, *'birsi***'* 'onemy-male-genitalia, *bircacık*'one tzatziki' etc.

This study sets out to define this form of negation placed on the peripheries of Turkish language, mostly in vulgar speech, and show how it pragmatically operates in terms of stancetaking implementations. The negation provided by squatitives has a pragmatic function on top of its -probably easier to accept- semantic function for the following reasons:

a. Its discursive properties differentiate it from other types of negation in Turkish. Squatitives in Turkish need to have at least one prior utterance preceding them. The predicate in the scope of the squatitive is the predicate

[1] In non-vulgar expressions, the word 'nah' in Turkish is used with the meaning 'here', specifically when pointing to something. The vulgar meaning of 'nah' comes from a hand gesture that usually accompanies the word. This hand gesture is executed by inserting the thumb between the index and middle finger and is considered obscene. People commonly tend to execute this hand gesture while using the word 'nah' with the intention of obscene/vulgar meaning.

of the matrix sentence that is being responded. The matrix predicate of the preceding utterance and the predicate of the squatitive structure have to be identical in order to be felicitous. This requirement of 'predicate-sharing'indicates the existence of pragmatic functions of the squatitive structure.

b. Squatitives do not solely negate a predicate. On top of negation, they reflect the speaker's evaluation of the object of conversation, their positioning in accordance with the other subjects present in the conversation, and their alignment with the other subjects. The stance displayedwith the use of squatitive forms in Turkish has the purpose of challenging the subject of the previous utterance salient in the conversation, usually given in context of a confrontation, when there is tension between the subjects participating in the social act that has been conveyed.

The significance of a study ofthesquatitive expressions stems from the fact that pragmatically peripheralexpressions that are considered vulgar or merely informal are not formally analyzed as often their more formal and socially acceptable counterparts. Negation in Turkish has been widely studied within many subfields of linguistics such as semantics (Görgülü, 2018), syntax (Şener &İşsever, 2003), phonology (Kamali, 2008), however, the current literature does not have any formal pragmatic, semantic, or syntactic analysis of squatitive negation. Therefore, this study aims to describe the syntactic properties of squatitivenegation, andanalyze its pragmatic nuance in comparison to canonical expressions of negation.

1.1 Introduction to the Squatitive expressions

Squatitiveshave been described as a type of vulgar minimizers (Postal, 2004) and quasi-NPIs(Horn, 2001).

Postal (2004) defines a minimizer as determiner phrases that encode a minimal amount according to a scale and vulgar minimizers are a subset of minimizers. Some examples for minimizers could be *a drop, a word, a red cent, a finger*as illustrated in the following sentences.

a. Ronald did not drink a drop. (minimum amount of liquid)
b. Richard did not have a word. (minimum amount of linguistic utterance)
c. George did not have a red cent. (minimum amount of money)
d. Donald did not lift a finger. (minimum amount of effort)

The syntactic structure of the squatitive form in English is very similar to the vulgar minimizers. You can see in (6) that squatitives can also exist in licensing under negation as a DP. However, the denotation of squatitives is more similar to NPIs, getting closer to Horn's (2001) description.

(5) a. Sophie did not see squat.
b. Sophie did not discover dick.

Although squatitives are usually occurring under NPI-licensing, they can exist similarly to negated quantifiers in English (nothing, nobody, no one) (cf. Postal, 2004).

Squatitives can exist either with licensing by a negation marker, or unlicensed on their own. They are mostly represented by taboo words in different languages and have a connection with semantic negation.

In Turkish, the words *çok, nah,*and *b*k* could be considered examples of squatitives.

Squatitives in Turkish could possibly be categorized asadverbial, and in the hierarchical representation of the grammatical forms, they correspond to the Neg^0 head.

a. A - Hem doğayıkorumak hem de kalkınmakmümkündür.
   B - "Nah mümkün-dür!
   SQT possible.COP
   'It is possible to both protect the nature and develop. Like hell it is possible'
b. Evsahibi, Tamam, jeneratörşimdidevreyegirerdedi. "Nah girer!" dediğimiçok iyi hatırlıyorum.
   … jeneratörşimdidevre-ye gir-er de-di. Nah gir-er!
   Generator now function.DAT enter.AOR say.PST. SQT enter.AOR
   'Landlord said okay, generator will now go into function. "Like hell it will go into function" I remember saying very well.'

1.1.1 NPI Squatitives

The first type of squatitives that are the ones that behave similarly to NPIs.

(6) Yalnızcanumarayısöylemekyeterliolmuyor, bir araba şeysoruyorSantıralcı Abla, birbokanlamıyorsun, sonunda: Tenkyu! diyerekkapatıyorsun.
… birbokanla-mı-yor-sun,

DET SQT(shit) understand.NEG.PROG.2psg

'It is not enough to just say the number, switchboard operator sister asks a bunch of things, you do not understand shit, at the end: you say "tenkyu!" and hang up.'

This kind of squatitive formation is usually paired with the indefinite determiner *bir* in Turkish, while also being licensed by the morphological negation (or existential/nominal negation in other possible examples). The squatitive expression here is closer to the categorization of a noun in terms of syntactic category. They behave similarly to vulgar minimizers Postal (2004), and NPIs Horn (2001) has suggested.Some possible examples for NPI-Squatitives could be with the nouns *bok*'shit',*zırnık*'arsenic', *cacık* 'tzatziki'. Their function is really close to the noun NPI structures in Turkish. Their structure seems to be more in line with the existing strategies languages have with NPIs and they do not seem to depict pragmatic properties as well as the other types of squatitives. The focus of my thesis will be at the more unknown type of squatitives, the nah-squatitives..

1.1.2 Nah-Squatitives

The other type of squatitive formation in Turkish is used with a predicate, oftentimes negating the predicate semantically. This kind of squatitives consists of but are not limited to: *nah* 'hand-gesture', *bok*'shit', *etc.* They are often prosodically marked in the utterance they are used, i.e. they have the sentential stress. They usually copy the predicate of the preceding utterance in dialogue.

They are usually observed with predicates in Turkish: be it verbal, nominal or existential.

(6) Nah-Squatitive with a verbal predicate

Türkiye'deyapılmışendüzgünişlerdenbiri de olsabuevleriyıkacağız. Neden yıkacağız? Çünkübürokratikoligarşiyebiatetmiyor, o yüzdenyıkacağız. Ben de diyorum ki: Nah yıkarsın!

'We will destroy these houses even if they are the best-made jobs in Turkey. Why are we going to do that? Because it does not obey bureaucratic oligarchy, that is why we will destroy them. And I say: Like hell you would destroy them!'

Nah yık-ar-sın.

SQT destroy-AOR-2psg

'Like hell you would destroy.'

The squatitive*nah* precedes the verbal predicate in (6), negating the predicate's meaning. This pairing of nah-squatitive with the affirmative aorist in Turkish also leads to a negative abilitative reading in the utterance.

(7) Nah-Squatitive with a nominal predicate

Hem doğayıkorumak hem de kalkınmakmümkündür." Nah mümkündür!

'It is possible to both protect the nature and develop.'

Nah mümkün-dür.

SQT possible.COP

'It is not possible.'

In (7), the nah-squatitive is immediately preceding the nominal predicate. This makes it behave similarly to the *değil* nominal negation in Turkish.

(8) Nah-Squatitive with an existential predicate

Şimdikihomongoloskoalisyonununvizyonu var mı? Nah var! Yok tabii. Bir de 83-91 döneminebak.

'Does the current homunculus coalition have any vision? Like hell it has! Of course not. And look at the period between '83-'91.'

Nah var.

SQT exist

'(The vision) doesn't exist.'

The nah-squatitive in (8) negates the existential predicate *var* and makes meaning of the combination to be very similar to *yok.* However, in the extracted utterance, the existential negative predicate *yok* is uttered right after the predicate negated by the squatitive. This sequential appearance strongly suggests the existence of stance-taking function of the nah-squatitive forms in Turkish.

When it is paired with a negated predicate, it reverses the truth conditions of the negated predicate and makes its polarity affirmative.

(9) Çarşambagünüsınavgörev-inah ver-me-z-ler.

Wednesday day examduty.COMP SQT give.NEG.AOR.3PL

'Like hell they won't give exam duty on Wednesday.' = 'They will give exam duty on Wednesday.'

The utterance given above, although marked with the morphological negation, has its polarity as affirmative in meaning. This is due to existence of the nah-squatitive*nah* in the utterance, which causes the predicate to be reversed in terms of truth conditions.

1.2 Aimof this study

In this study, I am aiming to set light on the function of the nah-Squatitive constructions in Turkish. Their function is not only limited to negate a predicate. They are also used to display the speaker's stance within the conversation they are uttered.

Discourse stance is defined as a way of marking the speaker or writer's attitude, orientation and generality through the means of speech and/or text in interaction (Berman, 2005).

Nah-squatitives co-exist with the other means of negation provided in Turkish. This coexistence implies that nah-squatitives have something more than just negation to add into language. This suggests the linguistic implementation of Stancetaking strategies, worth studying especially in comparison with the other means of negation such as morphological negation (/-mA/), existential negation (yok) and nominal negation (değil).

This thesis sets out to answer the following questions regarding Squatitive expressions in Turkish:

- What are the syntactic constraintsonsquatitives as a non-canonical negation form in Turkish?

- What are the pragmatic functions of squatitives?

There will be six chapters l in this thesis: Introduction, Theoretical Background, Methodology, Constraints on Squatitives, Stance Properties of Squatitives, and Conclusion. The theoretical background chapter will show the extensive literature review conducted. The next chapter, methodology is going to focus on the methods by which the analyses have been developed. Constraints on Squatitives chapter is going to focus on the syntactic constraints of the squatitive forms by giving native-speaker-generated data. Stance properties of squatitives chapter is about application of Berman's (2005) discourse stance to the corpus data. Finally, the conclusion chapter is going to wrap up the discussion held throughout the thesis and make closing remarks.

All the examples used throughout the thesis are nah-squatitives, although the data include other forms as well. The reason for this choice is that the other squatitive forms in the data are simply toooffensive or obscene to be used as examples.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Squatitives have been defined and explained in the previous chapter. The pragmatic focus of the thesis, discourse stance has also been stated in the introduction chapter. The framework behind discourse stance and the discourse analysis school of thought this thesis will follow will be explained in this chapter, in detail.

Stance has to do with the -mainly linguistic- methods that interactants form relationships with the utterances they perform and with the other subjects they interact with (Johnstone, 2009).Biber & Finegan (1989) have also focused on evidentiality and affect while they examined written tokens that may signal the source of the knowledge of the speaker and how certain they are about their utterances, with their attitudes about their uttered content. In a more recent endeavour, Hunston & Thompson (2000) have worked on the linguistics of "evaluation". According to Hunston & Thompson (2000), evaluation can be defined as:

> The broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance toward, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about. That attitude may be related to certainty or obligation or desirability or any of a number of other sets of values. (p. 5)

Evaluation has the following functions according to Hunston & Thompson (2000): speaker/writer's expression of their opinions in relation with the propositions uttered, manipulating the hearer/reader's attitude in relation with these propositions, and organization of the discourse e.g. by showing boundaries, or emphasizing important parts (Johnstone, 2009). Moreover, as with the attitudes of the speakers, evaluation of an utterance or an idea usually has to do with comparison of the said

utterance or idea to a norm, some linguistic features that evaluation is associated with involve use of the forms such as comparative adjectives, negation, and adverbs of degree (Johnstone, 2009). This proposal makes it possible that utterances marking negation deem useful with the perspective of evaluation in mind. Squatitives are a form of negation and they are used to evaluate the propositions in the salient context and in interaction. When squatitives are uttered, they are used to compare the two speaker's beliefs and form a contradiction, giving place to acts such as challenging the previous speaker.

Stance is on the crossroads of grammatical, interactional, and culturalresearch. It brings together all these research areas with a focus on the point of view of a speaker, while also dealing with the evaluation of utterances, objects, and interlocutors. Stance influences the course of interaction as when stancetaking occurs, a social act is performed in speaking (Irvine, 2009).

The following stance types ascommonly discussed in the literature: epistemic stance, affective stance, and self-positioning stance(Irvine, 2009). All of these stance types featured in one way or another in the discussion of squatitives.

Epistemic stance deals with the truth-value of a proposition and how a speaker is committed to this truth value. The squatitive expression in Turkish directly represents the truth value of a proposition being affirmative or negative, solely giving out information about the epistemic stance of the speaker.

Affective stance is based on the feelings of a speaker about a proposition. Based on my claim that the squatitive form is present in interactions occurring during conflict, or when a speaker challenges another, feelings of a speaker are definitely involved in the framework.

And finally, the third type of stance is the self-positioning one. Self-positioning kind of stance is related to the speaker's positioning in relation to an interlocutor such as situations where social dimensions are involved(Irvine, 2009).Speaker's familiarity with the interlocutor could be considered as an example to this. To illustrate, when a speaker is in a close relationship with the interlocutor where they can be more direct in their speech, or the opposite where the speaker needs to show deference to the interlocutor due to reasons such as the interlocutor being a superior of the speaker in a social hierarchy, the self-positioning stance is at the spotlight. With squatitives, the speaker needs to breach some social norms, where they could base this breach on their a) closeness in relationship to the interlocutor where being positioned against the interlocutor would be acceptable, or b) where they take the risk of breaching these norms and positioning themselves against the interlocutor. In both cases squatitives being implemented with swear words take a great role here. The breaching of the social norms could be heavily influenced by the speaker's choice of word when using a squatitive construction. The squatitive*nah* is more acceptable in formal contexts (although still holding a breach of the social norms, but in a lighter fashion). Other forms, such as *bok*or even more forms that I will not be able to present to you due to their sheer obscenity, are breaching social norms more intensely. Thus, positioning self at a more adversary position.

On top of the positioning of the speaker, subjectivity comes into play when stance is concerned. Du Bois (2007) suggests that when the stance subject positions themselves in relation to the stance object, they also show their orientation to the said object. Subjectivity is the perception of this positioning against the stance object by the stance subject and how it is cognitively internalized. When stance subjects align

or disalign themselves to each other, they are also establishing intersubjectivity, or lack of it.

Du Bois (2007) explains the interactional pattern of conversation through interactional stance in The Stance Triangle. Du Bois models stance as a triangle where two subjects are (dis)aligned to each other, while establishing subjectivity on their individual parts, and where they position themselves on the object of the conversation while simultaneously evaluating it, establishing subjectivity.

DuBois' account of Stance requires interlocutors to partake in spoken interaction. However, because of the vulgar nature of the grammatical form squatitives, it is rather difficult to gather spoken data. Therefore, another account will be used in this study which is not limited to naturally occurring conversational data, i.e. 'discourse stance' (Berman, 2005).

Berman's (2005) discourse stance first emerged in a project based on oral presentations. The discussion around the concept initially focused on uses of slightly different methods of elicitation of linguistic data between similar populations and age-groups based on data. The primary focus was on the linguistic forms which have the purpose of differentiating between direct, immediate and highly personalized perspectives of personal narratives and the more impersonal and distanced rhetoric of expository discourse in order to define a continuum of means for rhetorical distancing and de-personalization.

Berman (2005) proposes a three-dimensional approach to the components of discourse stance. These dimensions are: Orientation (Sender, Text, Recipient), Attitude (Epistemic, Deontic, Affective) and Generality (of reference and quantification).

This conceptualization suggests that every text produced and interpreted has one of the three orientations: sender (speaker or writer), text (narration or exposition), and recipient (hearer or reader). Sender orientation involves subjectivity and tends to be affective. Recipient orientation has communicative motivations, and addresses the reader or hearer directly. Text orientation, centralizes the message carried out and utilizes it as a point of reference where the rest of the message is revolved around.

Three kinds of forces come into play when attitude is the point of discussion: epistemic, deontic and affective attitudes. To start with, epistemic attitude is concerned with the possibility, certainty, or evidence for the person's truth of a given topic or object of text. The deontic attitude deals with the judgemental or evaluative viewpoint an individual takes. Finally, the affective attitude is related to the feelings writer/speaker has with regards to the topic or object of text such as desire, anger, or grief. The notion of challenging someone's proposition, which is heavily conveyed in squatitive expressions in Turkish, deals with all three types of attitudes: the message conveyor first proposes the wrongness of the topic put forth, then they judge and/or evaluate this topic with regards to their own viewpoint; and finally, they express their feelings by showing their feelings about the subject, i.e. mocking the other participant, or challenging them.

Generality is related to the reference points of the messages conveyed in a stance object. Three different kinds of instruments come into play when generality is at the spotlight. First of those instruments, is personal or specific, when the speaker or writer directly involves one of the objects of communication within the message: e.g. "I think…", "I believe…". Second one is when the speaker generalizes the message and involves more generic roles in their message: "People tend to think…".

And finally, when the speaker involves no person in the message conveyed: “It is well known…”, “There is a need for…” etc. The squatitive expressions in Turkish tend to take a more personal/specific type of generality in stance.

In the literature, there have been analyses of certain grammatical forms and functions and the ways they utilize discourse stance. I aim this study to be aligned with such other studies and give a framework of how squatitive expressions and discourse stance are intertwined.

Myers & Lampropoulou (2012) have worked on uses of impersonal you and its discourse stance function, in the genre of academic social science interviews.They argue that impersonal “you” is related to discourse stance in terms of specificity and generality. The shifts between personal and impersonal uses of the pronouns match with the specific and general experiences of speakers. When impersonal “you” is in use, the speaker is being general in meaning. Personal uses of the pronoun would result in specific meanings. To illustrate, if a woman is asked “Why do you want to kill yourself?” and she responds “Well, you just want to see if anybody cares.” This use of you refers to her, but her with a membership to “anybody” (Kitigawa & Lehrer, 1990). This is in line with generality vs. specificity dimension of discourse stance (Berman, 2005).

Berman’s (2005) framework is chosenbecause it captures the fine-grained details of interactive function of the squatitive form, specifically through the attitude stance. Moreover, Berman’s (2005) framework focuses on written discourse. Spoken data is not easily availabledue to the vulgar nature of most squatitive forms. Therefore, usinga framework involving written discourse seems more appropriate.

There has also been on addressing the generic pronouns in Icelandic and Swedish in expository discourse and how these pronouns have handled discourse stance(Ragnarsdóttir & Strömqvist, 2005). The pronoun *man* in Swedish and *maður* in Icelandic and their conditions of use are described most comprehensibly in light of discourse stance. The Swedish pronoun is marked for both Generality and Orientation.

When Orientation is marked in the utterances: it could be used in conditions where Sender and Recipient are both involved, Recipient excluded (cf. exclusive *we* in English "ingroup *we* vs outgroup *we*"), excluding Sender and including Recipient, and finally excluding both Sender and Recipient orientations of the discourse (cf. English *they*).

When Generality is of concern in usage of *man* and discourse stance, its flexibility is highly context-sensitive, and can be used to mark a generic stance, as well as specific stance.

When it comes to the Icelandic pronoun *maður,* a more constrained distribution is observed. It is more restricted in terms of Orientation dimension, and forces its speaker to utter it in a Sender orientation setting. Along with this, it is used to mark generic discourse stance.

The notion of stance in persuasive writingsof high school students has also been investigated (Uccelli, Dobbs, & Scott, 2013). Stance taking has been the main issue of discussion with epistemic markers that convey the writer's belief about the level of truth, reliability or possibility of a message (it is possible, might be), and deontic markers which focus on the attitude a judgment and categorical perception of the writer (should not, it is wrong).Moreover, discourse organization is integrated

into this analysis of stance. This work has been working on concepts such as temporal markers, along with adjectives that convey certain emotions, such as sadness or fear as tools of stance marking.

Narrative and expository texts, which differ and contrast in terms of discourse stance, also have an influence on discourse(Ragnarsdóttir, Aparici, Cahana-Amitay, van Hell, & Viguié-Simon, 2002). Personal narratives are usually more internalized and subjective in Orientation, and specific in Reference. Whereas, texts belonging in the expository genre are more frequently distanced and metatextual in Orientation, cognitive or epistemic in Attitude, and more generic in Reference.

Rhee (2016) has studied intensifiers (a specific kind of adverbs in English), and their stance-marking function.Dunn (2010) has worked on the information structure and discourse stance in a monologic register of Japanese.

There have been a series of analyses on the notion of discourse stance and certain forms and functions of language in the literature. Most studies were based on discourse types such as narrative and expository. I have gathered the tools put forward by such scholars and aimed to implement them in a corpus study of squatitives and discourse stance.

On a final note, the vulgar nature of the squatitive form brings forth a question regarding the instances in which they are used. Vulgar language is closely tied to the notion of politeness. Politeness is expressed through both communicative and non-communicative acts(Félix-Brasdefer, 2006). Polite forms are sensitive to social equality and inequality, intimacy and distance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). These factors are also relevant to the environments where squatitive forms are

acceptable. If these sensitivities are breached, the squatitive form could indeed be considered as an exemplification of impoliteness.

Certain speech acts come into play when politeness and impoliteness is considered in the context of squatitives: refusals and reprimands. The first of these, refusals, are responses to a prior request where the responder does not engage in the requested action proposed by the interlocutor (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006).

The second speech act in question is reprimanding. Reprimands are a type of speech act where the speaker voices negative judgments about the interlocutor in the conversation (Al-Shemmery, Zbar, & AlMummar, 2020). The reprimand speech act could be associated with especially the squatitive forms where deontic stance is present, for they give out an external obligation and their judgment in relation to the action or topic presented in the conversation.

In Turkish cultural context, the act of refusal occursfor the following reasons: providing an explicit rationale for the rejection, adopting a direct and unequivocal refusal, emphasizing an alternative priority, presenting an alternative proposition, indicating the nonessential nature of the offer(Bayat, 2013). The act of refusing someone might be considered to be similar to challenging the interlocutor.

The act of reprimanding a speaker often surfaces in situations involving a power dynamic between the speaker and the interlocutor (Harris, Ayçiçeği, & Gleason, 2003). Consequently, the presence of reprimands employing the squatitive form indicates that factors of (in)equality, intimacy, and distance play a significant role in the form's utilization.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This thesis is written to investigate a specific type of non-canonical negation called squatitive negation (which exists cross-linguistically) in Turkish language. Due to the vulgar nature of this form, although the most fruitful study would be from naturally occurring conversational data, corpus data has been used in this thesis to investigate the form in focus.

3.1 Data collection

Corpora collect texts from languages to show language variety (Sinclair, 2004). Corpus studies allow the discourse analysts to understand linguistic constructions and pattern combinations throughout the discourse domains (Friginal & Hardy, 2020). Combining corpus linguistics and discourse analysis is one of the solutions to the problem of working with vulgar expressions. The frequency of the squatitive negation in Turkish is fairly limited, often in the margins of spoken interaction. The possibility of reaching data to analyze the discourse stance function was only possible (although with limitations) in a medium-scale study with collated language data of Turkish written texts.

There are two main corpora that I used to draw my data from: TS Corpus(Sezer & Sezer, 2013) and Turkish National Corpus (Aksan et al., 2012).

Turkish National Corpus is a project which contains 50 million words in Turkish language across a variety of genres. TNC contains words from the years

between 1989 and 2013. The composition of the domains of the corpus includes the following: imaginative (19%), social science (16%), art (7%), commerce/finance (8%), belief and thought (4%), world affairs (20%), applied science (8%), natural science (4%), and leisure (14%). The mediums from which the words are extracted consist of the following ones: books (58%), periodicals (32%), miscellaneous published (5%), miscellaneous unpublished (3%), and to-be-spoken (2%). It has both a spoken and a written component, however; for the purposes of this thesis, because the squatitive form is not very common across spoken mediums, the written corpus has been used (Aksan et al., 2012).

The other corpus used in this study, TS Corpus, contains 14 different versions, out of which only the TS Corpus v2 has been used. The 14 different versions, combined altogether contain 1.3 billion tokens from the Turkish language. The tokens have been derived from various sources; online newspapers, forums, social media, academic papers, etc (Sezer & Sezer, 2013).

The main reason why I chose these two corpora is straightforward, they are the corpora with the broadest range of data, along with the ease of access. They contain words from a variety of genres, mediums and domains, making it helpful to compensate for the lack of spoken data with the squatitive forms.

3.2 Data analysis

Following steps have been executed to conduct the analysis for the pragmatics portion of this thesis. Initially, relevant tokens were collected from the chosen corpora. Subsequently, to allow a comprehensive and orderly examination of the data, the tokens were compiled into a spreadsheet format. Following a thorough

comprehension of the concepts of discourse stance, in order to identify the indicators of the types of discourse stance involved, the data has been carefully examined.For the next step, I have consulted another graduate student and trained them on the topic of discourse stance, then engaged them to perform a secondary analysis to ensure interrater reliability. This secondary analysis has been conducted with 26 out of the 84 tokens, (30.95% of the data).There was a 96.15% match, 25 out of 26 tokens between the two coding.

The analysis for the syntactic portion of the thesis was conducted with constructeddata..Grammaticality judgements were gathered from three other native speakers of Turkish.

There are 84 tokens of the squatitives that were used in the analysis of stance properties in this thesis. These tokens have been extracted out of roughly 1.35 billion tokens in the whole scope of the corpora used. These tokens are from fictional works, news articles, forum posts on the internet. All of them are in written interaction.

It would have been most favourable to include the formality, gender, age differences,familiaritybetween the people in conversation, and other pragmatic variables in the data . However, due to the lacking specifications of the corpora, token-specific information was not r available, making it impossible to gather information regarding the pragmatic variables in mind.

CHAPTER 4

CONSTRAINTS OF SQUATITIVE NEGATION

In this chapter, the grammatical constraints on the use of squatitiveswill be discussed in detail. There are three main grammatical constraints that govern the usage of the squatitive form:

i. Interrogative/wh-question constraint, squatitives cannot take place in questions;
ii. NPI licensing constraint, squatitives cannot license NPIs in Turkish;
iii. Embedded clauses constraint, squatitives cannot be used in complex sentences and embedded clauses.

4.1 Interrogatives and wh-questions

4.1.1 Yes/no questions

The interrogative in Turkish occurs with the/-mI/ clitic inserted into the sentence (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011). The clitic is placed in sentence-final position when it questions the entire proposition, and after other phrases when it wants to attract focus on said phrases.In example (10) the entire proposition is questioned.

(10) Ahmet iddia-yıkazan-abil-ir mi?
bet.ACCwin.ABIL.AOR Q
'Can Ahmet win the bet?'

In (10), the question clitic is right after the main predicate of the matrix clause.

Interrogative forms of predicates, unlike the canonical negation, are incompatible with the squatitive constructions. This incompatibility is in place when polarity questions are considered.

(11) Ahmet iddia-yıkazan-a-mazmı?

Ahmet bet.ACC win.ABIL.NEG.3psg Q

'Can Ahmet not win the bet?'

It is, of course, possible to negate the predicate within the interrogative sentence.

The sentence (11) questions the entire proposition, and when squatitive form is added into the sentence, the result is ungrammatical.

(12) A – Ahmet iddiayıkazanamazabi. Sabırlıdeğil.

'Ahmet cannot win the bet. He is not patient.'

B – *Ahmet iddiayı nah kazan-abil-ir mi?

SQTwin.ABIL.AOR Q

Intended meaning: 'Can Ahmet not win the bet?'

/-mI/ clitic can also be attached to a constituent in focus in the sentence (Kamali, 2011). It is also possible to scramble the question clitic for focus on different constituents in the sentence. Other positions are also available for the clitic as can be seen in the following.

a. Ahmet iddia-yımıkazan-dı?

Ahmet bet.ACC Q win.PST.3psg

‘Was it the bet that Ahmet won?’

b. Ahmet mi iddia-yıkazan-dı?

Ahmet Q bet.ACC win.PST.3psg

‘Was it Ahmet who won the bet?’

It is also grammatical where the interrogative combines with the negation.

(13) Ahmet mi iddia-yıkazan-ma-dı?

Ahmet Q bet.ACC win.NEG.PST.3psg

‘Was it Ahmet who did not win the bet?’

However, squatitives are not allowed in interrogatives as can be seen in the following example.

(14) A – Ahmet iddia-yıkazandı. Çokmutlugözüküyor.

‘Ahmet won the bet. He looks very happy.’

B – Kazan-ma-dı. Başkabirşeyesevinmiş.

Win.NEG.PST

‘He did not win the bet. He got happy for something else.’

A – *Ahmet mi iddia-yı nah kazan-dı?

Ahmet Qbet.ACC SQT win.PST

Intended meaning: ‘Was it Ahmet who did not win the bet?’

The squatitive negation cannot be used with the yes/no question of both proposition level questions, and narrow or broad focus questions.

One possibility of yes/no questions being acceptable with the squatitives is when it is in an echo question, which is a way of repeating the preceding utterance (Noh, 1998) in a similar fashion to squatitive negation.

(15) A – Nisan ayında 50 cm karyağmıştıgeçensene, inanılmazdı.

‘It snowed 50 cms in April, it was unbelievable.’

B – Nah yağ-mış-tı. 20 cm bile yoktu.

SQT fall.PERF.PST

‘Like hell it snowed. It wasn’t even 20 cm.’

A – Nah yağmıştımı? Benden iyi mi hatırlayacaksın?

‘Like hell it snowed? You would remember better than me?’

In (15), squatitive negation in a question is acceptable because the nature of this question is that it is an echo question. Echo questions typically do not add new linguistic input and repeat previous utterances (Kornfilt, 2013).

4.1.2 Alternative questions

Alternative questions present multiple alternatives in the question form, using the /-mI/ particle (which is normally used with yes/no questions) after all the alternatives that are given (Gračanin-Yuksek, 2016). There is also the possibility of constructing them with the negation particle which is presented in (16).

(16) Ayşe kek mi kurabiye mi ye-di?

cake Q cookie Q eat.PST.3psg

‘Did Ayşe eat cake or cookie?’

There is also the possibility of constructing them with the negation particle which is presented in (17).

(17) Ayşe kek mi kurabiye mi ye-me-di?

cake Q cookie Q eat.PST.3psg

'Which one did Ayşe not eat; cake or cookie?'

However, when one attempts to use the squatitives, as in (18), the result is ungrammatical.

(18) *Ayşe kek mi kurabiye mi nah ye-di?

cake Q cookie Q SQT eat.PST.3psg

Intended meaning: 'Which one did Ayşe not eat; cake or cookie?'

The example (18)further gives room for proof of squatitives being unable to be used with question forms in Turkish.

4.1.3 Information (wh-) questions

Wh-questions in Turkish are posited by introducing a wh-phrase such as *kim* 'who, or *ne* 'what' etc. in-situ, meaning movement is not required to form them (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(19) İddia-yıkimkazan-dı?

Bet.ACC who win.PST.3psg

'Who won the bet?'

As can be seen on (19), a wh-element is introduced: in this case, *kim*. This wh-element is placed in its unmarked position, preverbally. It is also possible to scramble the sentence and place the wh-element in places other than the unmarked place, except the post-verbal position (İşsever, 2019).

(20) Kim iddia-yıkazan-dı?

Who bet.ACCwin.PAST.3psg

‘Who won the bet?’

It is also possible to form wh-questions in a negated form like (21), with the canonical types of negation in Turkish.

(21) İddia-yıkimkazan-ma-dı?

Bet.ACC who win.NEG.PST.3psg

‘Who did not win the bet?’

The squatitive form cannot be integrated into a wh-question unless it is an echo question.

(22) A – Ayşe iddiayıkazandı.

‘Ayşe won the bet.’

B – Kazan-ma-dı. Yaklaş-a-ma-dı bile.

Win.NEG.PST get-close.ABIL.NEG.PST

‘She did not win the bet. She was not even close.’

A – *İddia-yıkim nah kazan-dı?

Bet.ACC who SQT win.PST.3psg

Intended meaning: ‘Who did not win the bet?’

The sentence (22B) is in negative form. The utterance following (22B) cannot be grammatical despite both potentially denoting a negated utterance, former with /-mA/ and latter with squatitive negation.

(23) A – Ayşe iddiayıkazandı.

‘Ayşe won the bet.’

B – Nah kazan-dı. Yaklaş-a-ma-dı bile.

SQT win.PST get-close.ABIL.NEG.PST

‘She did not win the bet. She was not even close.’

A – İddia-yıkim nah kazan-dı?

Bet.ACC who SQT win.PST.3psg

‘Who did not win the bet?’

The squatitive form in (23) is grammatical, only because the question is a complete mimic of the preceding utterance in terms of information. It is an echo question that, in essence, repeats the preceding utterance.

Yes/no questions, alternative questions and wh-questions in Turkish are all incompatible with the squatitive negation except for when they are in an echo question setting, where they copy the preceding squatitive form that is grammatical to begin with.

4.2 NPI licensing

Negative Polarity Items (NPI) need a negated form in the same clause to be licensed for their usage (Kornfilt, 2013). They require overt negation in order to be acceptable in a sentence(Kelepir, 2001). Some examples of NPIs in Turkish would include: *hiç, hiçbir, hiçbirşey, hiçbiryer, kimse, hiçkimse, asla*etc. NPIs are also acceptable in yes/no questions (Kelepir, 2001), but for the purpose of this thesis, I will work only with the negative environments.

(24) Hakan hiçkimse-yigör-me-di.

Hakan any body.ACC see.NEG.PST.3psg

‘Hakan did not see anybody.’

The negative polarity item *hiçkimse* is in the same clause as the negation /-*mA/* in (24). This allows the NPI to be licensed and yield a grammatical sentence.

Then, if overt negation is needed to license NPIs, and squatitive negation is considered to be a type of negation, they should be able to license NPIs just as the other types of negation.

(25) *Arda hiçkimse-yi nah gör-dü.

Arda any body.ACC SQT see.PST.3psg

Intended meaning: ‘Arda did not see anybody.’

The sentence in (25) is awkward and unacceptable. Even thoughthere is a type of negation in the sentence due to the presence of *nah*, the NPI is still not acceptable. This raises some questions on the nature of the squatitive negation. Do they simply reverse the truth conditions of the clause they are in, and are not a full-fledged negation?

Thanks to the example on (25), it is clearly visible that squatitives cannot license NPIs. NPIs are still licensed when the truth condition is changed into affirmative with canonical negation and squatitive interacting with each other. This is probably thanks to the presence of overt negation in the clause.

(26) Arda hiçkimse-yinah gör-me-di.

Arda any body.ACC SQT see.NEG.PST.3psg

‘Like hell Arda did not see anybody.’ = ‘Arda saw somebody.’

On top of the squatitive, the sentence in (26) also bears the verbal negation /-mA/. The presence of this verbal negation licenses the NPI *hiçkimse*. The squatitive, then imposes the truth condition of the negated predicate and the clause to be reversed. This yields in a sentence that is in negative polarity in form, and affirmative polarity in meaning.

All in all, the squatitive form is unable to perform the function of licensing NPIs by itself. This notion brings up the question about the nature of squatitive forms: are they truly a type of negation? Or do they simply share the ability to affect the truth conditions of an affirmative sentence? The discussion related to these questions will be held out at the end of the chapter.

4.3 Embedded clauses

The domain of squatitive negation concerns the predicate of the sentence it is attached to; however, predicates of the embedded clauses are out of this equation. The third type of constraint I propose involves three types of embedded structures in Turkish: relative clauses, adverbial clauses, and conditionals. These structures cannot occur with the squatitive negation. The proof of their incompatibility with the squatitive negation will be given in the following subsections.

4.3.1 Relative clauses

Relative clauses are structures that behave similarly to adjectives and modify nouns. In Turkish, the non-finite version of relative clauses is formed with the participle suffixes /-(y)An/, /-DIK/, /-mIş/, or /-(y)AcAk/ attached to the embedded verb. Non-

finite relative clauses precede the noun phrases they modify in Turkish just like how adjectives behave. However, there is also the finite variant with the subordinator *ki*[2]. Unlike non-finite clauses, this type of relative clauses follows the noun phrase it modifies (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(27) Konuş-tuğ-um adamgülümse-di.
Talk.REL.1psg man smile.PST.3psg
'The man (who) I talked to smiled.'

The relative clause modifies the noun *adam*'man' in (27). The verb gets relativized by preceding the noun with the participle form /-DIK/, forming an embedded relative clause under the head noun. (30) demonstrates an example of a relative clause preceding the head noun in the sentence.

(28) Ders-ten başarılıol-ankız-ı tanı-yor-um
Lesson.ABLsuccessful be.RELgirl.ACCknow.PROG.1psg
'I know the girl who is successful the class.'

The example (28) is an example for a substantive predicate in the relative clause. This is established by using a copular *ol-* in the verb position of the relative clause.

(29) İçindetatlandırıcı var ol-antatlıları ye-mi-yor-um.
Inside sweetener exist be.REL desserts eat.NEG.PROG.1psg
'I do not eat desserts that have sweeteners in them.'

When the existential predicate is used in a relative clause construction like in (29), it follows a similar pattern to the substantives and is paired with the copular verb *ol-* when it is relativized by the relativizing participles.

[2] This type of relative clause is rather limited in distribution and usually not preferred by speakers.

(30) İçinde palm yağıol-ma-yan gıda al-dı-m.

Inside palm oil be.NEG.REL food buy.PST.1psg

'I bought food that does not have palm oil inside.'

In light of the example (30), the negated existential predicate *yok* simply is incapable of occurring with relative clause constructions, and leaves its presence to the copular verb *ol*-'s negated version when a meaning with the negation of existence is wanted to be conveyed in a sentence.

It is perfectly possible to negate the verb of the embedded clause with all types of relative clauses, regardless of structural differences.

(31) Al-ma-dığ-ımgömlekindirim-e gir-miş.

Buy.NEG.REL.POSS shirt discount.DAT enter.PERF

'The shirt I did not buy went into discount.'

The negation suffix /-mA/ attaches to the relativized embedded verb*al*- and causes it to become negated while modifying the object head noun of the embedded clause in (31).

(32) Kahverengiol-ma-yan elma-yı al-dı-m.

Brown be.NEG.RELapple.ACC buy.PST.1psg

'I bought the apple that was not brown.'

In (32), the negation suffix /-mA/ concatenates with the embedded copular verb *ol*-bearing the relativizing participle suffix /-(y)An/ and results in a negated modification of head noun.

If it is possible to negate the verb with an overt negation morpheme, the logical conclusion would be that it is also possible to use the squatitive negation in the same embedded clause structure. However, this is not the case.

(33) *Nah yeni taşın-ankiracı-lar heyecanlı-ydı.
SQT newmove.REL tenant.PL excited.PST.3psg
Intended meaning: 'The tenants who did not move newly were excited.'

It is not grammatical to combine the squatitive negation in (33) with the embedded verb of the sentence. When it is combined in such a way, the sentence crashes. The reading where the squatitive is paired with the verb of the embedded clause is not acceptable.

(34) *Nah Berlin-e git-me-yen adamuçağ-ı kaçır-dı.
SQT Berlin.DAT go.PST.REL man plane.ACC miss.PST.3psg
Intended meaning: 'The man who goes to Berlin missed the plane.'

The sentence (34) intends to pair the squatitive negation with the morphological negation /-mA/ in the relative clause and yield in an affirmative polarity in the relative clause verb. This also fails to result in a grammatical utterance due to the sheer nature of squatitives being incompatible with embedded structures. Another reading where the squatitive matches with the matrix verb *kaçır*- is possible, but the main aim is to demonstrate the embedded clause incompatibilities.

As discussed in this subsection, squatitive negation fails to adhere to the relative clause verbs and switch their polarity to the opposite. This differentiates it from other kinds of negation and poses the following question:Can they behave truly in the same manner as other types of negation?

4.3.2 Adverbial clauses

Adverbial clauses are another type of embedded clauses that have similar functions to an adverbial phrase or an adverb in a sentence. They are subordinated under the matrix clause with a nominalized verb through the uses of /-DIK/ and /-mA/ nominalizers with a postpositionafterwards, with other gerundive suffixes (/-(y)IncA/, /-dIkçA/, /-(y)ken/, /-(y)ArAk/, /-mAdAn/), or simply with case marking to denote an adverbial function (Kornfilt, 2013).

(35) Müşteri gel-diğ-in-den dolayıyemeğ-e çık-a-ma-dı-k.
Customer come.NOM.3psg.ABL because lunch.DAT go.ABIL.NEG.PST.1ppl
'We could not go to lunch because a customer came.'

As depicted in (35) this is an example of adverbial clause, the verb of which is nominalized with /-DIK/ and the case marking and postposition are present. The adverbial clause denotes the cause of the matrix verb.

(36) Bina yüksekol-dukçagürültükirliliği art-ar.
Building tall be.GER noise pollution increase.AOR.3psg
'The noise pollution increases as the building is taller.'

The sentence (36) is an example of gerundial being used to create an adverbial clause, again to describe a cause of the matrix verb.

(37) Elektrikkes-il-me-sin-den konsantreol-a-ma-dı-m.
Power cut.PASS.NOM.3psg.ABL concentrate be.ABIL.NEG.PST.1psg
'I could not concentrate because of the power cut.'

And in (37), another adverbial clause example which is done with the nominalizer and the case marking to denote cause.

These constructions, namely adverbial clauses, cannot operate with the squatitive negation paired with their embedded verbs. The evidence for this inability of squatitives to function in yet another embedded clause is demonstrated below in several examples.

(38) *Öğretmenöğrenci-yi nah geç kal-ma-sı-narağmen yok yaz-dı.

Teacher student.ACC SQT late stay.NOM.3psg.DAT despite absent write.PST

Intended meaning: ‘The teacher wrote the student as absent despite (the student) not coming late.

The sentence (38) attempts to use the squatitive negation with the verb of the embedded adverbial clause. This sentence is unacceptable in all possible readings, because the subjects of the embedded clause and the matrix clause are different. The squatitive negation simply cannot function in an adverbial clause. It fails to negate the adverbial verb and result in a grammatical sentence.

(39) *Yemeğ-i nah gel-me-yince kap-ıyakoş-tu.

Food.ACCSQT come.NEG.GER door.DAT run.PST.3psg

Intended meaning: ‘They ran to the door when the food arrived.’

The embedded adverbial clause in (39) attempts to use the gerundial /-(y)IncA/ to denote the time of the action in the matrix verb. However, because of the incompatibility of the squatitive negation with the embedded verb, the sentence crashes and yields an ungrammatical result.

Squatitive negation cannot function with adverbial clauses just like how they cannot function with relative clauses. This nature of squatitives clashes with the nature of other types of negation in Turkish. The other types of negation function perfectly well under a matrix clause within an embedded clause. This begs the

question, what can we say about the nature of squatitives? Are they simply incapable of working with embedded structures? The evidence seems to point us in the direction of their inability to work with embedded structures.

4.3.3 Conditionals

Conditional clauses are a type of adverbial clauses cross-linguistically. However, they are different from other adverbial clauses because they are closer to finite verbs in Turkish, unlike how most adverbial clauses have non-finite tendencies. Conditionals are formed with the verbal suffix /-sA/ and copular suffix /-(y)sA/ attached to the embedded verb under a matrix clause (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011).

(40) Ders çalış-sa-m başarılıol-ur-um.
Lesson study.COND.1psg successful become.AOR.1psg
'I would be successful if I study.'

In the example in (40) given to demonstrate the verbal conditional, the conditional suffix /-sA/ attaches to the embedded verb and introduces a condition for the sentence. The conditional form also takes agreement with the subject of the sentence.

(41) Neşeli-yse-m gülümse-r-im.
Cheerful.COND.1psg smile.AOR.1psg
'I would smile if I am cheerful.'

The sentence in (41) demonstrates the conditional clause with a copular suffix attached to the nominal predicate of the embedded clause. The embedded predicate also takes agreement with the subject.

Conditional clauses in Turkish are also perfectly capable of combining with canonical negations and result in grammatical sentences.

(42) Anons-u dinle-me-z-sentren-ikaçır-ır-sın.
Announcement.ACClisten.NEG.ABIL.CONDtrain.ACC miss.AOR.2psg
'You will miss the train if you do not listen to the announcement.'

Sentence (42) demonstrates the capability of combining with verbal negation in a verbal conditional embedded clause.

(43) Engelliasansör-üdeğil-se bin-er-sin.
Disabled lift.COMPnot.COND board.AOR.2psg
'You could board it if it is not a disabled lift.'

The instance where the nominal negation *değil* combines with the copular conditional is provided in (43).

Nominal and verbal predicates of the embedded clause in conditional structures can both function with negation. However, squatitive negation, which is also considered to be a type of negation, cannot operate with the reading of negating the embedded predicate.

(44) *Kargo erkenden nah gel-me-se eve dön-mekzorunda kal-ma-z-dı-m.
Delivery earlier SQTcome.NEG.COND home.DAT obligated be.NEG.ABIL.PST.1psg
Intended meaning: 'I wouldn't have had to come back home early if the delivery came.'

The sentence above attempts to form a conditional structure where the embedded verb is negated through the means of squatitive negation. This combination of squatitive negation and conditional structure results in an ungrammatical construction. Again, linking the behavior of squatitive negation with

embedded structures to be unacceptable. The example in (44) provides further evidence for the constraint of squatitives to function under embedded structures.

(45) *Ayşe nah haklı-ysaözürdile-sin.
Ayşe SQT right.COND forgiveness wish.IMP
Intended meaning: 'Ayşe should apologize if she is not right.'

Another instance where the squatitive is attempted to be paired with a conditional structure is given above. This time, the conditional clause is with the copular suffix. The ungrammaticality of (45) is yet again evidence that squatitives cannot operate with the reading of negating the embedded predicate.

All in all, the behavior of squatitive negation with embedded structures surfacing as ungrammatical is definitive evidence for the incompatibility of the two grammatical constructions. To summarize the evidence for grammatical constraints governing squatitives, three structures were investigated in this chapter: question forms, NPIs, and embedded clauses. The fact that squatitives, although considered to be a form of negation, fail to result in grammatical utterances in combination with these three structures brings forward the question of whether they are truly in the same manner with other negation types.

The constraints governing the squatitives are detailed in this chapter. The presence of these constraints do not fully give an explanation of the nature of squatitives. They simply differentiate them from the canonical negation types. Squatitive negation might as well be a type of negation that has different specificities for their distribution in the language. The existential negation *yok* 'does not exist' has a constraint governing its usage with relative clauses, disallowing it from being used in such structures. Nevertheless, this does not take away *yok*'s property of being a

type of negation. Squatitive negation simply has different requirements for its usage. It wants to be a in an environment where it is not paired with questions and embedded clauses.

The fact that squatitives do not license NPIs, however, raises another question about their status as a type of negation. The ability to license NPIs is one of the primary properties of negation (Kelepir, 2001). Lack of this property might have some negative implications for squatitive's status as negation. However, according to Miestamo's (2007) definition, negation has the ability to reverse the truth conditions of the propositions they occur in. Squatitives fulfil this requirement. They are not completely unrelated to the notion of negation, for sure. Postal's (2004) proposal for them to be vulgar minimizers and Horn's (2001) proposal for them to be quasi-NPIs seems to make some sense in this occasion, showing their relation to negation without completely abandoning it.

CHAPTER 5

STANCE PROPERTIES OF SQUATITIVES

Before continuing with the stance properties, it would be best to describe the different kinds of squatitive forms that are availableinTurkish language. in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Different Kinds of Squatitive Forms in Turkish

Squatitive Form	Gloss and/or Translation	Vulgarity
Nah	Hand gesture	XX
B*k	Excretion	XX
Çok	A lot	X
Ih	Exclamation	X
Ya****	Male genitalia	XXXXX
Ya***ğımı	Male-genitalia.ACC.POSS	XXXXX
Babayı	Father.ACC	XXXX
Anca	Barely	X

The table above represents the 8 kinds of squatitives that are prevalent in Turkish language, and rates them in terms of their vulgarity. Because all of these forms are vulgar in nature, their usage, even for the ones that are least vulgar, are considered awkward in formal settings. The most obscene ones, 'ya****', 'ya***ğımı' and 'babayı' are not favorable in contexts where formality is more dominant. 'Ih', 'çok', and 'anca' are -in comparison- more acceptable than the other forms, although still awkward in formal situations.The basic forms that are 'nah' and

‘b*k’ are are mid-level in terms of vulgarity. All squatitive forms must be used with caution in formal settings and especially when there is no closeness between the parties in the conversation.

For the purposes of this thesis, I am presenting data only from ‘nah’ and ‘b*k’. This is because these forms are the most common ones across data

The most important factor to keep in mind with squatitive forms in Turkish is that they all display the affective stance of the discourse stance dimensions. The biggest difference between canonical negations (mentioned in the introduction chapter as “morphological”, “nominal”, and “existential” negations) and squatitive is that they function as a way of showing discourse stance in action in conversation. The one that is most visible in the corpora is the affective stance. Accordingly, this chapter will focus and expand the discussion on the stance properties of squatitives.

Squatitive expressions have an extra function that differentiates them from other types of negation. This is made apparent by their inability to be replaced by canonical negation. I propose that this function which is additional compared to expressions uttered with canonical negation could be explained by utilizing the notion of discourse stance.Squatitive negation marks stance in conversation by several categories I have described below.Canonical negation and squatitives cannot be used interchangeably because of this additional function. Expressions formed with canonical negation are lacking in their stance functions which makes them unable to replace squatitive expressions.

There are three dimensions of discourse stance; Attitude, Orientation, and Generalityaccording to Berman (2005) which will be discussed in separate sections below. Attitude stance is investigated in three subtypes; Affective, Deontic and

Epistemic. Then, Orientation stance will be discussed focusing on two subtypes; specifically Recipient and Sender. The Generality stance is not applicable to the squatitive negation, hence will not be discussed in this study.

4.1 Attitude stance and squatitives

In this section, I am analyzing the attitude stance of discourse stance (Berman, 2005). As previously mentioned, the attitude stance is examined in three categories: affective stance, deontic stance, and epistemic stance. The context is taken into consideration when looking at squatitives through the perspective of attitude stance. The preceding and following utterances contribute to the meaning of the squatitive form and influence the type of discourse stance attributed to the expression.

4.1.1 Affective stance and squatitives

The squatitive expressions have a notion of challenging the preceding utterance(s) in the conversation. On top of challenging, they are further able to denote abilitative reading when they are concatenated together with the aorist in Turkish. The aorist is the TAM marker that is most frequently combined with the squatitive expression in Turkish. 70 out of 84 tokens of squatitive expressions extracted from two Turkish corpora further supports this claim of frequency.These readings of challenging the preceding utterance withabilitativeimplications strengthen the claim that all squatitive expressions have affective stance in play when analyzed in interaction.

This first excerpt taken from the Turkish National Corpus illustrates the affective stance displayed in squatitive expressions.

(46) Sen Ne Antika Komşumuzdun Ayşenur Abla?..
‘How curious of a neighbor were you Ayşenur sister?’

Ayşenur: Yakalarımama

Catch.AOR.1psg but

‘I’ll catch you’

Sadullah: Nah yakalarsın

SQT catch.AOR.2psg

‘Like hell you can catch me’

Ayşenur: Yakalarsam ne yapacağımıbiliyorum ama?

‘I know what I would do if I catch you though’

Sadullah: Sıkı-ysayakala

Firm-COND catch

‘Catch me if you can’

Sosyeteninünlüdullarından
Ayşenur Ender hanımile Mali şubeninünlü
isimlerinden Sadullah Düngörarasındayaklaşık
iki ay öncetelevizyondakibircanlıyayınsırasında
aşağıyukarıbenzersözlersarfediliyorken ben buişin
sonununburayavaracağınıanlamıştım.

‘While Ayşenur Ender, one of the famous widows of the high society, and Sadullah Düngör, one of the famous names of the department for fiscal crimes, were making more or less similar statements during a live broadcast on television about two months ago, I understood that this would end here.’

This excerpt is taken from a work of fiction. Ayşenur who is mentioned both before and after the squatitive is a famous woman with hints of lewdness. She is seen with a well-known member of the police department of fiscal crimes. She is quoredflirtatiously challenging the well-known police officer.In this excerpt, Ayşenur challenges Sadullah by using a threatening expression signaling that she

would catch him. In a way, Ayşenur challenges Sadullah with the expression “I’ll catch you”..Sadullah accepts the challenge of Ayşenur, and challenges her back by saying that she would be unable to catch him, using an expression which roughly translates to “Like hell you can catch me”. Sadullah questions Ayşenur’s ability to catch them, which is added by the combination of squatitive particle with the aorist particle. This questioning nature in the conversation is further strengthened when at the end, Sadullah utters “sıkıysayakala” (i.e. catch me if you can) to Ayşenur, augmenting the questioning and challenging perception wafting throughout the conversation. In summary, the pairing of squatitive particle with aorist results in a questioning and challenging the preceding utterance(s) and speaker(s), which I predict to be a form of affective stance applied.

The following token taken from Turkish National Corpus, added here to further strengthen the claim of affective stance being a function of squatitive expressions.

(47) A: "Kendinitanımanınenkestirmeyolu, biriyleberaberolmak. Neyi ne kadaryapabileceğinien iyi böylekeşfedersin."

‘The quickest way to know yourself is to be with someone. That's how you discover what you can do and how much you can do.’

B: "Evet. Anlıyorum..."

Yes. Understand-PROG-1psg

‘Yes, I understand’

A: "Nah anlıyorsun! Yüzünden belli. Kimsebirşeyanlatmıyor mu sana?"

SQT understand-PROG-2psg

‘Like hell you understand! I can see it from your face. Doesn’t anybody tell you something?’

Ben kıpkırmızıkesilmişdurumunasılkurtaracağımıdüşünürkenapartmankapısıbirdahaaçıldı.

‘While I was blushing and thinking about how to salvage the situation, the apartment door opened again.’

This quotation is taken from a context where speaker A is giving some insight to speaker B regarding how to “know oneself”. The speaker A seems to be more experienced than speaker B, possibly being older in age. Speaker B does not pay enough attention to what speaker A tells them. Speaker A does not take it that speaker B understands them, and challenges their statement specifying “I understand” with the squatitive expression. This utterance with the squatitive that corresponds to ‘Like hell you understand!’ causes the speaker B to blush. This reaction indicates that there is affective stance involved in their exchange, because of this reaction typically aligned with affective domain being involved. The speaker A completely objects to speaker B’s claim with the mental verb ‘anla’ and makes a claim regarding this mental process of understanding being incomplete by them.

I put forth the following token from Turkish National Corpus to dive deeper into the affective stance portion of the squatitive expressions.

(48) CEMAL: Senden özürdiliyorum, gel şurolüokuhaydi.

‘I’m apologizing to you, please come and read this role.’

CEVRİYE: Okursamnamussuzum.

‘I would be honorless if I read it.’

CEMAL: Onu biliyoruzcanım.

‘We already know that.’

EBRU: Babaaa.

‘Daaaad’

CEVRİYE: Bak nasılüstümegeliyor, nah okurum. (Gider.)

SQT read-AOR-1psg

‘Look at how he bears down on me, like hell I would read it’ (‘Leaves’)

EBRU: Kaldıkmıbaşbaşa?

‘We are left alone now, aren’t we?’

This quotation is from a setting where a father has a sit-down with his two daughters. He (Cemal) apologizes to one daughter or wife (Cevriye), and asks her to read the role mentioned in the conversation. The daughter then refuses and tells him that she would not read the role by saying that she would be ‘honorless’ to read it. The father then jokes with his daughter by saying ‘we already know’, meaning they already know that she is honorless. The other daughter, Ebru, then cries ‘Dad!’ and shows that she wants Cevriye to read the role. Cevriye then gets even more agitated and complains about Ebru pressing down on her. She says ‘Like hell I would read the role’ and leaves the room. Cevriye’s stubbornness in not reading the role despite Cemal apologizing is a show of strong emotions. This is even further shown by Cevriye reacting to Ebru pressing down on her to read the role. Finally, Cevriye has an outburst by using the squatitive expression and tells them that she would not read the role and even publicly challenges them with her emotions by using the squatitive expression ‘Nah okurum’ (Like hell I would read the role). This outburst, by challenging Ebru and Cemal, places Cevriye in a face-threatening position. By physically removing herself from where the conversation is taking place, she

terminates the interaction. This utterance could be considered as an example for the speech act of refusing if there were a request in the prior utterances. These indicators that I mentioned before depict the affective stance function of squatitive expressions rather clearly.

The following token of squatitive expressions is taken from Turkish National Corpus and it demonstrates the affective stance's existence with squatitive expressions.

(49) CEMAL: Karşımdakininasılduyacağımpeki?

'How will I hear the person opposite me?'

HAMDİ: Dudak okuyacaksın.

'You will read lips.'

CEMAL: Gözlerimgörmüyor ki.

'My eyes do not see well.'

HANDAN: BuncayılınkocaCemal'iyapar Cemal Abi.

'Great Cemal of all these years can do it, Brother Cemal.'

CEMAL: (Ağlayarak) Bok yapar.

SQT do-AOR-3psg

'Like hell he would do it.'

ZEKİ: Senin yapamayacağınış, oynayamayacağınrolyoktur Cemal Usta.

'There is no job, or no role you cannot do Master Cemal.'

This excerpt is taken from a setting where Cemal, Hamdi, Handan and Zeki get together to encourage Cemal to play a role. Cemal lacks confidence in himself. He has his doubts about whether he would be able to hear the other person speaking to him. Hamdi reassures him by saying he would be reading lips of the person

speaking. Cemal gives off an excuse by saying that his eyes do not see very well. Handan further empowers Cemal by calling him the great Cemal and says that he would be able to do it (play the role). However, Cemal is very discouraged and tells them that he cannot do it by using the squatitive expression. The way he phrases it with squatitive and aorist combination ‘Bok yapar’ ‘Like hell he would do it’ causes the utterance to have a prediction based on it, given by the aorist’s functions as a marker of predictions and assumptions. Moreover, the extra information given in parentheses ‘crying’ also signifies his emotions being apparent when this line is uttered. The presence of the third person singular as the agreement morpheme, even though Cemal is talking about himself, is another aspect of taking a more emotional turn in this conversation. These indications suggest that there is the affective stance function of squatitive expressions involved in this excerpt. Additionally, this token has deontic features which will be investigated further in the upcoming subsection.

Throughout the examples I have illustrated, there is a pattern clearly visible. The utterances with the squatitives and surrounding them all are involved with some kind of emotional display one way or another. They are one of many: challenging, questioning one’s ability, discouragement, flirtatious talk, proving or disproving facts, agreeing or disagreeing with other speakers, giving permissions, enforcing obligations (or specifically in the squatitive’s case, enforcing negated obligations). Affective stance is marked through the connection of the utterance with the emotions of the sender and recipient of the message. This pattern is visible at most of the squatitive forms in Turkish. Most of the squatitive expressions have at least the affective attitudinal stance associated with them as well as other types of stance marked directly in the speech such as deontic and epistemic attitude.

4.1.2 Deontic stance and squatitives

The second common type of attitude stance that can be observed with squatitive expressions is the deontic stance. As affective stance is observable in almost every utterance containing the squatitive expressions, deontic stance cooccurs with some of them. Deonticity is the state of having external conditions invoked by the speaker of an utterance on the individual that is the addressee of the message(Palmer, 2001). Deontic stance, therefore, consists of the occasions in which the speaker utilizes the squatitive expression with the purpose of laying an obligation or allowing something to happen by giving permission. It has functions related to the evaluative side of the speech involved.

The following example displays the deontic stance features of squatitive expressions:

(50) Oooöğleolmuş, haydibakalım eve! Hanım ne yapmış, ne pişirmiş, acabayemeğinyanındacacık var mı? Ufcanım da öylebircacıkistedi ki. Bir yerden de burnumapatlıcankokusugelmiştiya. Şöylesarmısaklıyoğurtlubir, patlıcankızartması...

‘Oh, it is noon, let's go home! What did the lady make, what did she cook, is there any tzatziki with the meal? UfI want tzatziki so bad. I smelled eggplant from somewhere. A fried eggplant with garlic yoghurt.’

Nah yersin, çünkü Naciye yedirmez:

SQT eat-AOR-2psg, because Naciye eat-CAU-AOR-NEG

‘Like hell you would eat, because Naciye would not let you eat (it).’

"ÜlserinpatlarSelâmi..." Şuülser on dokuzyıldırpatlamadı, ben de kurtulamadım. Hiçpatlamaz, ama ne zaman canımbirazcıkkızartmaistese, turşuistese, ülseriminpatlayacağıtutarNaciye'yegöre.

‘Your ulcer will burst, Selami..." That ulcer hasn't burst for nineteen years, and I couldn't get rid of it. It never bursts, but every time I want a little fried food or pickles, my ulcer will burst, according to Naciye.’

Selâmi is the narrator in this excerpt. He is going home on his lunch break and is curious as to what his wife, Naciye, has prepared for lunch. He wonders whether there is tzatziki along with the dish Naciye had cooked. Then, he mentions having smelled eggplants on the way home, and desires his wish to eat fried eggplants drenched on garlic yoghurt sauce. However, Selâmi has a digestive condition, ulcer and Naciye is afraid that he would get an ulcer attack by eating what he desired previously.

After passing the thought of his want to eat eggplants with yoghurt, in his train of thought, he talks to himself and says how Naciye would not let him eat the desired dish. He uses the squatitive expression “Nah yersin.” ‘Like hell you would eat’ Followed by “Naciye yedirmez.” ‘Naciye would not let me eat it.’ The squatitive expression negates a prediction put forth by the aorist marker.

The aorist marker in Turkish has a function of making assumptions and predictions (Göksel & Kerslake, 2011). Selâmi is combining the predictive function of the aorist with the squatitive expression in order to make a negative prediction about the behaviour he expects from Naciye. The deontic function here is further strengthened by the use of causative and negation in the following utterance. There is a negated permission giving, or not giving per se, given in the following utterance of

the squatitive expression. Selâmi states an external obligation enforced by his wife Naciye by using the squatitive expression with the verb "-ye" 'eat'. This negated permission depicts the deontic function of the squatitive expression in this utterance. The external obligation enforced by Selâmi's wife, Naciye, is even further shown in the following parts of the token. There is an unwanted consequence of Selâmi getting an ulcer attack. Naciye forbids him from eating fried eggplants with yoghurt because of these unwanted consequences in Selâmi's narration.

Furthermore, thesquatitive negation, in this utterance, co-occurs with the following utterance in negation as well. As you can see in the next example and this one, this could suggest that there is a possibility of squatitive negation performing beyond the boundaries of the sentence-level negation. As previously stated in the earlier chapters, squatitive negation tends to occur in dialogic settings, often copying the predicate of the preceding utterance. However, with (48) and (49) at hand, it could imply that this conversational function of the squatitive negation is not limited only to the preceding utterance and also the following utterance. This placement of the squatitive in interaction with the preceding and following utterances could imply a pragmatic function as signaling the negation beyond the phrase- or sentence-level structures. The discourse stance function of deontic attitude stance has also mostly stemmed from the utterance following the squatitive-bearing structure. The causative-bearing negated structure 'Naciye yedirmez.' 'Naciye would not let me eat (it)' makes the context have the deontic stance marking when investigated through the discourse stance.

Another example of a squatitive expression and the idea of external obligations being enforced by the deontic stance function is entertained in the following corpus extract:

(51) GÜLDÜNYA: Gülsüm, içeride ne düşünüyordumbak.

Başkan'lakonuşayım da alt katıma da senioturtayım.

Altlıüstlüotururuzkardeşkardeş. Ne dersin?

'Gulsum, look what I was thinking inside. Let me talk to the President and I'll seat you downstairs. We sit on top of each other, sister and sister. What do you say?'

GÜLSÜM: Olurablacığım, olur.

'Of course, big sister, of course.

GÜLDÜNYA: Nah ol-ur!

SQT happen-AOR!

'Like hell it would happen.'

Alırmıyım ben seniapartmanımaçoluğunçombalağınla, pirinpisliğinle?

'Would I take you to the apartment building with your children and filth?'

Bulmuşbeleşevi, yamanmayakalkıyor.

'She found a free house, trying to get into it.'

This excerpt is from a conversation between two sisters on the subject of living arrangements that they could make. Güldünya is the older sister of Gülsüm and, follows an ironic way of inviting Gülsüm into the apartment downstairs from where she lives. Gülsüm accepts this invitation without hesitation, however; Güldünya backs away immediately. Gülsüm replies to Güldünya in a way that uses the quite literal phrase 'It would happen, older sister, it would happen'. This literally means 'of course'. The use of the verb ol- here in giving that meaning is crucial. The

squatitive expression takes that verb and duplicates it in the following utterance made by Güldünya.

Here, Güldünya, by giving her reasonings, says that she would not allow Gülsüm to move downstairs because she does not want children and the filth associated with her sister. This disallowing is further given by ‘alırmıyım ben seniapartmanıma…’, meaning ‘Would I take you to my apartment?’. This clearly shows a display of external obligation enforced by Güldünya on Gülsüm. Additionally, by not allowing her sister to move downstairs, Güldünya is also showing a negative judgment about her sister and her crowded family. This could be considered as an exemplification of the speech act of reprimanding.

The explicit uttering of the first person singular on the utterance following the squatitive expression takes it to an even more intense level of disallowing i.e. negated obligation by giving emphasis on Güldünya not allowing this arrangement to happen. The squatitive expression’s combination with the verb ol- and the aorist, “Nah olur” ‘Like hell it would happen.’ again gives a prediction and assumption reading, specifying that such permission would not be given, therefore signalling a deontic reading by external obligation on Gülsüm.

The negation in utterances holding a squatitive expression seem to be stretching towards the preceding and following sentences around the squatitive. In (51), the deontic stance is most apparently coming from the utterance following the squatitive expression. The negated meaning given by the sentence with the squatitive seems to have been extended into the text surrounding the squatitive bearing utterance. The sentence following the squatitive is a question form, partly a rhetorical question where the negated meaning is given despite no negative marker being in

use. The question, when uttered in a context surrounded by squatitive negation and such a context of visible desire not to perform the action in the sentence, gives off a negated meaning. Coinciding in such a way with other types of negation, it creates a context in which squatitive negation might be creating a type of chain of negation in the utterance. This could have implications that the squatitive negation might be functioning beyond the scope of just semantics and falling into the domain of pragmatics and be a type of pragmatic negation.

Another token is given below to show the deontic stance function of the squatitive expression.

(52) Aslındaseçimyatırımıkibarbirdeyiş, seçimrüşvetidemekgerekirdi Bana oy verirsenizalın size fabrika ,üniversite , iş , yol , okul , hastane ...

Vermezseniznah alırsınız !

Give.NEG.AOR.CON.2ppl SQT receive.AOR.2ppl

‘Election investment is actually a polite phrase. It should have been an election bribe. If you vote for me, you will receive a factory, university, job, road, school, hospital. If you don’t vote for me, like hell would you get these (amenities)!’

This excerpt is retrieved from a forum post where people rant about the upcoming elections. The writer of this message states that election investments should actually be named election bribes and then fabricate a hypothetical quote from the hypothetical election candidate. This quote is a conditional sentence with an unwanted consequence, signalling a negative external obligation on the part of the receiver of the message. They quote says that if voters vote for the candidate, they would receive public amenities such as factories, universities, jobs. Then they claim

that ‘if they don’t vote, like hell would they get the amenities.’ This is a negative external obligation enforced on the receiver of the message. The presence of squatitive negation in this utterance amplifies the obligation given in the message. When combined with the aorist particle and the second plural agreement morpheme, the message gets even harsher, and feels even like a threat. On the situation that this condition given by the hypothetical election candidate is not fulfilled (getting votes from the voters), the receivers of the message (voters) will not be getting their end of the bargain. This condition given by the candidate’s hypothetical message gives a deontic stance reading in the message that is strengthened by the presence of the squatitive expression.

To make a generalized remark about the squatitive expressions and their deontic stance function, two key concepts arise. First and foremost of these is that the deontic reading is always paired with the aorist marker in Turkish. This pairing combines the assumption and prediction function of the aorist marker with the obligation reading given by the squatitive particle. Second concept is the fact that in all of the excerpts given in this section, the unwanted consequence or reasoning of the enforced obligation is given right after (or before) the utterance with the squatitive expression. The negative external obligation is always given in a stronger form in the context.

4.1.3 Epistemic stance and squatitives

The third common type of attitude stance that is apparent with squatitive expressions in Turkish is the epistemic stance. Epistemic stance is derived from the epistemic modality present across languages. Being epistemic in nature stems from the

speakers expressing their perception of the proposition in terms of being factual or not, hence objectivity. Epistemic stance, therefore deals with the expressions that are objective in terms of their delivery of the knowledge.

I will now demonstrate several examples of squatitive expressions displaying the epistemic stance in this section.

Consider the excerpt taken from a fictional work in the TNC corpus:

(53) Vizyongetirenedikkat et. Şimdikihomongoloskoalisyonununvizyonu var mı? Nah var! Yok tabii.

SQT exist! Exist-NEG of-course.

'Beware of the visionary. Does the current homunculus coalition have a vision? Like hell it has (that vision)! Of course it does not.'

Bir de 83-91 döneminebak. Hakkatengenişufuklubiridaredir o tatbikatıyapan.

'Also, look at the 83-91 period. Indeed, it is a broad-minded administration that carries out that exercise.'

The narrator is talking about politics and specifically about the present political coalition. They take this coalition to be of 'homunculus' in nature, which means a small creature created in a laboratory in alchemy. They are clearly not approving of the political affairs at the time of the speech. They ask a rhetorical question that asks if the present homunculus coalition has a vision or not. Then they reply by themselves using the squatitive expression, saying "Nah var! Yok tabii." Meaning, 'like hell it has a vision. Of course it does not have it.' The speaker is questioning the presence of vision in the coalition according to his beliefs, and claims that such a vision is lacking. He takes it one step further by stating the same

expression in the squatitive without the squatitive with the negated existential marker ‘yok’ and ‘tabii’. His set of beliefs is making it almost objective in his mind that the proposition put forward is an objective reading. One thing that strikes more than the other types of stance functions is the use of the existential marker ‘var’ in the utterance containing the squatitive marker. In the previous sections, I tried to show how the squatitive usually paired with the aorist marker. Notwithstanding this, when epistemic stance is at play, the TAM markers and the particles shift towards types other than the aorist or contains extra bits on top of the aorist.

Observe the following excerpt taken from the TNC corpus in light of epistemic stance function of the squatitives:

(54) REMZİYE: Ölseydikkeşke.

‘I wish we died’

GÜLSÜM: Sus kız! O nasılsöz?

‘Shut up! How would you say that?’

REMZİYE: Aman, yalanmı be? Evvereceğiz, evvereceğizdediler. Nah verdiler! Üstünebir de oturduğuevdenettileranamı, garibim de

SQT give-PST-3ppl!

kafayıyedisonunda. Eh işte, ölüsüolanbirgünağlıyor, delisiolan her günağlıyor.

‘They told us that they will give us a house repeatedly, and they gave squat. On top of that, they evicted my mother, then she lost her mind. The one with a death cries for one day, the one with crazy cries everyday.’

In this excerpt, there are two speakers in a play, Remziye and Gülsüm. Remziye is very upset because a promise that was given to her is not upheld. As has been seen in the other excerpts I have taken from the corpus, she is again quoting someone and giving the quote a reply in the conversation. She mentions this promise of giving her a house given by someone probably in power. She then suggests that this house was not given with a squatitive expression. Although there is an affective aspect here, she is also sticking to the facts and the fact is that she was not given a house. She utters the token "Nah verdiler!" meaning 'Like hell did they give (the house)!' The utterance has an objective tone, which binds it to the epistemic stance more than the other types of attitude stances. The most striking part here is that, as I had said in the previous illustration given at (54), markers other than the aorist is used. She is using the past tense marker of Turkish in her utterance that has the squatitive expression. This connection of markers other than the aorist is more coincided with the epistemic stance. Markers such as the past tense or the existential is more commonly paired with the epistemic stance of squatitive expressions.

The excerpt below is taken from the TS Corpus:

(55) DOĞUM KONTROL YÖNTEMLERİ

'Contraception methods'

Hepiniz "Bunları biz de biliyoruz" diyedüşünedururken, ben de

These.ACC we ADD know.PROG.1ppl

içimden"Nah biliyorsunuz" diyegeçiriyorum. O sizinbildikleriniz

SQT know.PROG.2ppl

geçensenenindoğumkontrolyöntemleriabicim, buseneninmodasıbaşka.

> ‘While you all think that you know all this, I think to myself that you know squat. All that you know are last year’s contraception methods, brother, this year’s trend is different.’

This excerpt is taken from a forum post where contraceptive methods are discussed. The writer of this post creates a setting where they are addressing the other people on the topic of contraception. The writer quotes a hypothetical utterance they imagined the other people to say as “We know all of these (contraceptive methods) too”, then the writer responds, again in their imagination, with the squatitive expression, giving the meaning as follows: “Like hell you know them (these methods)”. In the context, there is a salient topic that is the contraceptive methods, and the writer is questioning the other people’s awareness of these methods. The writer uses the squatitive form to object to the others’ awareness of contraceptive methods. The writer uses the -iyor progressive marker in Turkish to object to the previous hypothetical utterance. This is in part due to the tendency of squatitives to replicate the previous utterance’s predicate. Also, as mentioned in the previous examples of epistemic stance, the preferred TAM marker is not the aorist unlike the other types of attitude stances (affective and deontic). There seems to be a correlation between epistemic stance and TAM markers other than the aorist in the data extracted from the corpora. Occurrences of epistemic stance tends to coincide with predicates such as the existential and with verbs, TAM markers of past and progressive.

As previously mentioned in the earlier chapters, the squatitives have the possibility of operating with all kinds of predicates in Turkish: existential, nominal and verbal/morphemic with the exception of the conditional marker. When epistemic stance and squatitivesinteract, there is a correlation of TAM morphemes other than

the aorist being more frequent. The aorist, previously much more common with the deontic and affective attitude stances, does not seem to be combining with the squatitives of epistemic attitude stance discourse stance functions.

4.2 Orientation stance and squatitives

Orientation stance is also affiliated with squatitive structures. Orientation stance has a three way distinction under discourse stance; sender, recipient and text orientation stances. The squatitives tend to be split in two when orientation stance is at the center of discussion. Most commonly, they are seen implementing the recipient stance when used with the purpose of negating preceding utterances. In other cases, they are also observed to be used with sender orientation, usually when the speaker or writer refers to themselves by pairing the squatitives with the first person markers. It is not the case that the squatitive expressions have been observed with text orientation functions, at least according to the data set that is used in this thesis.

Most squatitives have been observed with the discourse stance function of recipient orientation. This is due to the other attitude stance functions of squatitives coming to play as in enforcing obligations, having an affective connection in the conversation or text involved, and establishing objectivity. It is natural to think of an utterance to be oriented towards the recipient of the message when emotional works or obligation enforcing situations are involved. The former of these is when affective attitude stance is, and the latter is when deontic attitude stance is involved.

The following excerpt from Turkish National Corpus demonstrates how the recipient orientation stance works:

(56) “Oğlumdebelenme. Sana diyorum, uyumadınmısenhâlâ?"

‘Do not thrash about. I am talking to you, haven’t you slept yet?’

“Uykubırakmışlar da.” Abdullah yataktadoğruldu.

‘ “As though they left any sleep” Abdullah got up in the bed.’

"Ne diyecekmişsinbakalım?" diyesordubabası.

‘What would you say?’

"Ben bilirimdiyeceğimi."

‘I know what to say.’

"Bok bilirsin."

‘Like hell you would know.’

"Hele birgöreyim, diyeceğim ki. Ne kalktın?"

‘I’ll say something when I see him. Why did you stand up?’

"Su içecem de" dedi Abdullah, terliklerinisürüyesürüyemusluğagitti.

‘I’ll drink water, said Abdullah. He went to the sink while dragging his slippers’

"Deli delikonuşup da büsbütünortalığıkarıştırma"

‘Do not make trouble by talking like a crazy person.’

In this excerpt, a father and his son are sleeping, and the father notices that his son has not fallen asleep yet. He asks his son what he would like to say and he replies that he would know (exactly) what to say. Then the father gives off an answer with the squatitive expression, saying ‘like hell you would know (what to say).’ This utterance is marked in terms of orientation stance as the recipient stance because the

father directs it towards his son. This directedness towards the recipient stems from the second person singular marker given on the predicate of the squatitive-bearing utterance. The person markers tend to signal the orientation stance of the squatitive-bearing expressions.

The next example from Turkish National Corpus is to describe the function of sender orientation stance with squatitive expressions.

(57) Ve de, son olarakenetkiliaçıklama:

Maaşımıarttırmazlarsayarınkiyazıyı da nah ver-ir-im!

SQT give.AOR.1psg

'Like hell I would give tomorrow's document if they do not raise my salary!'

This excerpt is from a news piece where a speaker complains about the economical situation. The speaker tells the news agent that they would give a certain document for the next day unless they get a salary bump. The important issue here is that the speaker uses the squatitive with a predicate that has the first person singular as its inflection. This usage of first person singular with a squatitive-bearing predicate is evidence for sender orientation discourse stance implementation. The speaker contradicts an action that they are supposed to do because of their duty. They signal this by having the orientation stance of the discourse directed towards themselves. As they are the sender of the message here in this discourse, the sender orientation stance is considered to be in function.

One more example of the orientation stance seen as sender recipient can be seen below from the Turkish National Corpus.

(58) İmtihankağıdınıboşbıraktım. İmtihançıkışıeniştemaldıbeni.

"İnşallahkazan-ır-sın" dediğinde, içimden

Win.AOR.2psg

‘I hope you become successful (in the exam).’

"Bok kazan-ır-ım" diyerekgüldüm.

SQT win-AOR-1psg

‘Like hell I would become successful (in the exam).’

Sınavsonuçlarıiçinyineenişteminyanındagittim.
Kazananlarlistesindeadımyoktu.

‘I went with my brother-in-law again for the exam results. My name was not on the list of successful people.

The narrator of this token took an exam but submitted a blank page. The narrator’s uncle took them from the exam venue, and expressed his good wishes saying‘I hope you become successful.’ The narrator, then, knowing that they had submitted a blank exam sheet, contradicted the uncle’s wishes in self-talk by using the squatitive marker with a first person marker, placing themselves as the recipient of the message. As they are also sender of that message, and they have placed themselves as the recipient, the narrator’s utterance had a discourse stance orientation of sender orientation discourse stance. The first person marker on the predicate is evidence for this kind of orientation marking.

The person marking of the predicates where squatitive markers are bound to are especially helpful in determining the orientation discourse stance of the utterance.

As illustrated in the prior examples, the second and third person marking usually tends to be of recipient orientation discourse stance, whereas first person marking could be of sender orientation discourse stance.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This thesis examined how squatitive forms in Turkish operate, and how their additional function of marking discourse stance surfaces in comparison with the other negation types: nominal ‘değil’, verbal/morphological /-mA/, and existential ‘yok’.

The syntactic constraints on the squatitive negation have been given in the fourth chapter.Three constraints have been discussedregarding the distribution of the squatitive form: (a) they cannot occur in questions, (b) they cannot license NPIs, (c) they cannot occur in embedded clauses. This constraints indicate that the account of squatitives as vulgar minimizers (Postal, 2004) and quasi-NPIs (Horn, 2001) seem to hold true. The fact that the squatitives cannot license NPIs rules out the possibility that they are a true type of negation. However, their attributes of truth condition reversal, and denial seem to link them with the concept of negation, based on Miestamo’s (2007) account for negation to be items that reverse truth conditions.

Berman’s (2005) discourse stance has been used to describe the squatitive forms. The tokens in the corpora have been analyzed through two of the three main categories of discourse stance: Attitude and Orientation (Berman, 2005). The Generality stance has been left out due to not showing any significance to the nature of the squatitive negation-bearing tokens from the corpora. The most prominent and richest analysis has been put forward in the Attitude Stance, focusing on the Affective, Deontic and Epistemic attitude stances of the squatitive forms and their discourse.

One key finding was that the squatitive forms in Turkish have coincided with the concatenation of the aorist marker in the predicate of the utterance they resided in. This co-occurrence is mostly visible in Affective and Deontic Attitude stances at play. The Epistemic Attitude Stance, however, is more prominent with more narrative TAM markers such as the past marker -DI, and the progressive marker -Iyor, on top of them, also with the existential predicate.

Another interesting finding of this thesis is that the squatitive forms in Turkish cannot co-occur with the NPIs and they cannot be embedded in the structure. They do not function in the exact manner as the other negations (nominal 'değil', verbal/morphological '-mA', and existential 'yok').

The purpose of this study was to position squatitives in Turkish grammar in terms of their categories and properties, and subsequently, describe the function that sets them apart from other canonical negations. Because there is a gap in the literature about this informal and vulgar form in terms of syntactic and er pragmatic viewpoints could contribute to typology of negation by contributing with the Turkish perspective.

The form in focus, the squatitive forms, have a vulgar nature in many languages where they are present. The most common Turkish counterparts of them, 'nah' and 'b*k', have this property as well. This makes it rather difficult to acquire naturally occurring conversational data to base analyses on. Due to this limitation, I have decided to work with the tokens from the two corpora I have mentioned, TS and TNC. The analysis could have benefited immensely from naturally occurring conversational data.

For future studies, the squatitive structures are abundant in possible implications they could have for the pragmatics of negation across different languages. Their pragmatic marking, at least in Turkish, provides an understanding that negation could exceed the boundaries of sentence-level structures. If their syntax isanalyzed, we could have better understanding of how coordination and focus could work for Turkish. One could also work on the semantics of squatitive negation to provide the literature with different perspectives on the mechanics of negation.

REFERENCES

Aksan et al., Y. (2012). Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC). Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012). İstanbul, Turkey.

Al-Shemmery, M. M., Zbar, A. A., &AlMummar, H. A. (2020). Responding to the Speech Act of Reprimand by Iraqi EFL University Students. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11(7), 695-710.

Bayat, N. (2013). A study on the use of speech acts. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70, 213-221.

Berman. (2005). Introduction: Developing discourse stance in different text types and languages. Journal of Pragmatics, 37(2), 105-124.

Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1989). Styles of stance in English: Lexical and grammatical marking of evidentiality and affect. Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 9(1), 93-124.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The Stance Triangle. In e. b. Englebretson, Stancetaking in discourse: subjectivity, evaluation, interaction (pp. 139-182). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Dunn, C. D. (2010). Information structure and discourse stance in a monologic "public speaking" register of Japanese. Journal of Pragmatics, 42(7), 1890-1911.

Emeksiz, Z. E. (2010). Negation in Turkish.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. Journal of Pragmatics, 38(12), 2158-2187.

Friginal, E., & Hardy, J. A. (2020). The Routledge handbook of corpus approaches to discourse analysis. Routledge.

Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2011). Turkish: A comprehensive grammar. New York: Routledge.

Görgülü, E. (2018). Negative polarity, scope of negation and negative phrases in Turkish. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14*(4), 136-149.

Gračanin-Yuksek, M. (2016). Alternative questions in Turkish. DilbilimArastirmalari 1, (pp. 39-68).

Harris, C. L., Ayçiçeği, A., & Gleason, J. B. (2003). Taboo words and reprimands elicit greater autonomic reactivity in a first language than second language. Applied Psycholinguistics, 24(4) 561-579.

Horn, L. R. (2001). Flaubert triggers, squatitive negation, and other quirks of grammar. Perspectives on negation and polarity items, 173-200.

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (2000). Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse. Oxford University Press, UK.

Irvine, J. T. (2009). Stance in a colonial encounter: How Mr. Taylor lost his footing. In Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives.

İşsever, S. (2019). On the Ban on Postverbal wh Phrases in Turkish: A Syntactic Account. In Word order in Turkish (pp. 67-90).

Jaffe, A. e. (2009). Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives. Oxford University Press. Retrieved 11 1, 2021

Johnstone, B. (2009). Stance, style, and the linguistic individual. In Stance: sociolinguistic perspectives (pp. 29-52).

Kamali, B. (2011). The question particle in Turkish: Consequences for the interfaces. Online Complement to Proceedings of WCCFL 28.

Kamali, B. (2008). Scope of negation and phonological phrasing in Turkish. In *Mediterranean Syntax Meeting II (MSM-II).*

Kelepir, M. (2001). Topics in Turkish syntax: Clausal structure and scope. [Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

Kitigawa, C., & Lehrer, A. (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. Journal of Pragmatics, 14(5), 739-759.

Kornfilt, J. (2013). Turkish. Routledge.

Kremlin, L. (2017). Sexist swearing and slurs. LingUU, 1(1), 18-26.

Miestamo, M. (2007). Negation-an overview of typological research. Language and LinguisticsCompass, 1(5), 552-570.

Myers, G., & Lampropoulou, S. (2012). Impersonal you and stance-taking in social research interviews. Journal of Pragmatics, 44(10), 1206-1218.

Noh, E. J. (1998). Echo questions: Metarepresentation and pragmatic enrichment.Linguistics and Philosophy (pp. 603-628).

Özbey, C. (2019). A Corpus Analysis of Multiple Negation in Turkish. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Boğaziçi University.

Palmer, F. (2001). Introduction. In F. Palmer, In Mood and Modality (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics) (pp. 1-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:doi:10.1017/CBO9781139167178.003

Postal, P. (2004). The Structure of one Type of American English Vulgar Minimizer. In P. Postal, Skeptical linguistic essays (pp. 159-172). Oxford University Press.

Ragnarsdóttir, H., &Strömqvist, S. (2005). The development of generic maður/man for the construction of discourse stance in Icelandic and Swedish. Journal of Pragmatics, 37(2), 143-155.

Ragnarsdóttir, H., Aparici, M., Cahana-Amitay, D., van Hell, J. G., &Viguié-Simon, A. (2002). Verbal structure and content in written discourse: Expository and narrative texts. Written Language & Literacy, 5(1), 95-126.

Rhee, S. (2016). On the emergence of the stance-marking function of English adverbs: A case of intensifiers. Linguistic Research, 33(3), 395-436.

Sezer, T., & Sezer, B. (2013). TS Corpus: herkesiçinTürkçederlem. Proceedings 27th National Linguistic Conference (pp. 217-225). Antalya, Kemer: Hacettepe University, English Linguistics Department.

Sinclair, J. (2004). Meaning in the framework of corpus linguistics. Lexicographica: International Annual for Lexicography, (20), 20-32.

Şener, S. &İşsever, S. (2003). The interaction of negation with focus: ne… ne… phrases in Turkish. *Lingua, 113*(11), 1089-1117.

Uccelli, P., Dobbs, C. L., & Scott, J. (2013). Mastering academic language: Organization and stance in the persuasive writing of high school students. Written Communication, 30(1), 36-62.