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1. Introduction**

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

(1) [Ali’nin evden ayrıldığı]ı sanmam.
Ali:GEN house:ABL leave:PART.3SG.ACC think:NEG.AOR.1SG
‘I don’t think/believe that Ali left the house.’

(2) Sanmam [ki Ali evden ayrılmış olsun.]
be:OPT.3SG
‘I don’t think/believe that Ali has left the house.’

(3) "[Ali evden ayrılmış] sanmam.
Ali house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF believe:NEG.AOR.1SG
Intended: ‘I don’t think/believe that Ali has left the house.’ (Coşkun 2010: 52, 53)

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

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a summary of properties of complement clauses and negation scope in Turkish, and mentions some earlier approaches relating to them. Section 3 discusses the data relating to negation scope and
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certain matrix predicates with respect to their selectional ability. Section 3 further argues that recent approaches to the discussed issue appear to show some shortcomings. At the end of this section, I bring some proposals with a functional perspective. A conclusion is presented in section 4.

2. Properties

2.1. Complement clauses

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

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

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

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

(4a) [Bu mektubu Ali’nin yazdıgina] inaniyorum.

this letter:ACC A.:GEN write:PART.3SG.DAT believe:PRES.1SG

‘I believe that Ali wrote this letter.’ (Erguvanli-Taylan 1998a).

(4b) *Bu mektubu Ali’nin yazmasina inaniyorum.

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

2.2. Negation scope

In a prosodically unmarked simple verbal sentence, the scope of negation covers the whole proposition as in (5); depending on the intonation the scope can, however, be limited to specific constituents as well (6) (cf. Erguvanli-Taylan 1984: 81):
In relation to complex sentences with complement clauses, the scope of negation in the matrix domain has been discussed in previous studies from two points of view, a syntactic and a semantic one. According to the syntactic account, the complementizing means determines whether the negation in the matrix domain takes scope over the embedded clause (cf. Kornfilt 1997: 127).

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

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

(7) *Hasan [kimsenin maça gitmesin]i istemedi.*
Hasan NPL:GEN match.DAT go:VN.3SG.ACC want:NEG.PRET
'Hasan didn't want anybody to go to the game.' (Kornfilt 1997: 127)

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

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

---

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

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

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

(9) [Hicbir şeyin onu bu kadar üzebileceginji tahmin etmezdim.  
NPI thing:GEN him/her that so worry:POSB.PART.3SG.ACC guess:NEG.AOR.PRET.COP.1SG  
‘I wouldn’t guess anything would worry him/make him unhappy so much.’  
‘I would guess nothing would worry him/make him unhappy so much.’

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

(10) ??[Hasan’ın kimseyi aramasın)a üzülmedim.  
Hasan:GEN NPI.ACC call:VN.3SG.DAT be sad:NEG.PRET.1SG  
‘Intended: I wasn’t sad that Hasan called anybody.’ (Kelepir 2001: 173)
2.2.2. Negation raising predicates and finite complement clauses

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

(11) *[Kimse geç geldi] sanmiyorlar.
NPI late come:PRET believe:NEG.PRES.3PL
Intended: ‘They don’t think anybody came late.’

(12) [Kimse geç gelmedi] sanyorlar.
NPI late come:NEG.PRET believe:PRES.3PL
‘They think nobody came late.’ (Kelepir 2001: 174)

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

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

3. Proposals

3.1. Semantic change

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

(14a) [Bu mektubu Ali’nin yazdıguna] inaniyorum.
this letter:ACC Ali:GEN write:PART.3SG.DAT believe:PRES.1SG

(14b) *[Bu mektubu Ali’nin yazmasına inaniyorum.

192

(Tüm o güzelliklerin yok olup gitmesin]e
all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:VN.3SG.DAT
inanamıyorum.
believe:NEG.POSB.PRES.1SG
'I cannot believe that all that beauty has come to naught.'
Göz göre göre her şey yok oldu. 'Everything disappeared before our eyes.'
yorum.milliyet.com.tr/Yorumlar.aspx?SayfaNo=2&HaberKod=S_974486 - 63

(16a) ([Tüm o güzelliklerin yok olup gitmesin]e
all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:VN.3SG
hayret ediyorum.
wonder:PRES.1SG
'I wonder that all that beauty has come to naught.'

(16b) [Tüm o güzelliklerin yok olup gittiğin]e
all that beauty:PL.GEN disappear:CONV leave:PART.3SG.DAT
hayret ediyorum.
wonder:PRES.1SG
'I wonder that all that beauty has come to naught.'

3.2. Negation scope

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

www.kadinlarkulubu.com/.../367953-yengec-erkegi-capkin-midir.html

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

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

(18b) [Bir aydır tanındaki birinin seni sevdiğini] söylediğin]e inanma!
'Don't believe that somebody whom you have known for one month said that he loves you.'
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(19a) [Şimdiye kadar kimseyi sevmedim; bir tek seni sevdim] demesin]e inanma!

'Don't believe somebody (anybody) who says that he has not, until now, loved anybody but only you.'

(19b) [Şimdiye kadar kimseyi sevmedim; bir tek seni sevdim] dediğin]e inanma!

'Don’t believe that he said that he loved anybody (else) until now, that you are the only person that he has (ever) loved.'

3.3. Factive predicates

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

(20a) ?? [Hasan’in kimseyi aramasına üzülmedim.

Hasan:GEN NPI.ACC call:VN.3SG.DAT be.sad:NEG.PRET.1SG

'Intended: I wasn't sad that Hasan called anybody.' (Kelepir 2001: 173)

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

(20b) Şimdiye kadar [kimseden borç aldığım]a üzülmedim.

now:DAT till NPI.ABL borrow:PART.1SG.DAT

pişman olmadım / *pişman oldum.

regret:NEG.PRET.1SG/ regret:PRET.1SG

'I haven’t regretted till now having borrowed anything from anybody.'

Presup.: Birinden borç aldım. 'I have borrowed something from somebody.'

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

5 Giannakidou (2009) discusses such unexpected occurrences of negative polarity items with emotive factive predicates in Greek and from a cross-linguistic view. Von Fintel deals with this behaviour of emotive factive predicates in English (1999: 110). For a comprehensive discussion, see Von Fintel 1999 and Giannakidou 2009. I hope to deal with this issue in Turkish in the future.
3.4. The negation raising predicates san-‘believe, think’ and iste-‘want’

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

Ali house:ABL leave:INDR/PERF believe:NEG.AOR.1SG
(Coşkun 2010: 52, 53)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ber.’

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

Another predicate which takes an optative-marked finite complement clause in its negation scope is iste-‘want’. The complementation may be without a complementizer or with ki:
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(27) [Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsin] istemem.
children NPI job:LOK work:OPT.3SG want:NEG.AOR.1SG
Bu konuda gereken önlemler alınmıyor maalesef.
'I wouldn’t want children to work in any job. Unfortunately, necessary measures are not taken in this matter.'

(28) İstemem [ki kimse zarar görsün],
want:NEG.AOR.1SG COMP NPI harm:OPT.3SG
Gereken bütün sigortalari yaptırım.
'I wouldn’t want anybody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.'

3.4.1 Restrictions

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

(29a) Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansin]. Hepsi çok mantıklı düşünür.
'I don’t think that anybody believes these lies. All of them are quite reasonable persons.'

(29b) *Sanrim [ki kimse bu yalanlara inanmasin].

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

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

(30a) Sanma [ki olanları unuttum]. Sadece hatırlamak istemiyorum.
'Don’t think that I have forgotten what happened. I just don’t want to remember.'

(30b) *San [ki olanları unutmadım].

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

(31a) İstemem [ki kimse zarar görsün]. Gereken bütün sigortaları yaptırım.
'I wouldn’t want anybody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.'
(31b)  *İsterim [ki kimse zarar görmesin]. Gereken bütün sigortalari yaptırım.*

'I (would) want nobody to get harmed. I will initiate all the required insurances.'

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

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

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

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

(32)  *Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın].*  : probability

'I don't think that anybody believes these lies.'

(33)  *[Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsin] istemem.*  : desire

'I wouldn't want children to work in any job.'

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

(34)  *[Gitsin] istedim.*

*go:OPT.3SG  want:PRET.1SG*

'I wanted him/her to go.'

(35)  *[Gitmesini] istedim.*

*go:VN.3SG.ACC  want:PRET.1SG*

'I wanted him/her to go.'

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

---

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

7 For a comprehensive discussion and data from Ottoman Turkish and Iran Turkish see Stein 2010.
She describes the matrix predicates relating to desire, as *iste*-'want', and *umut et*-'hope' in connection with dynamic modality, matrix predicates such as *san*-'believe, think' referring to an assumption or a probability in connection with epistemic modality. Kocaman’s (1988: 466) observations on modality are also parallel to Erguvanlı-Taylan’s. He points out that the matrix predicates *san*-'believe, think', *tahmin et*-'guess', *um*-'hope' with aorist and 1st person singular preceding or following a finite complement clause have certain illocutionary values apart from expressing indicative mood. Gökşel & Kerslake (2005: 219) consider *sanırım* 'I believe, I think' to be modal adverbial.

3.4.3. Analyses

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

(36)  *Sanmam [ki kimse bu yalanlara inansın]. Hepsi çok mantıklı düşünür.*

'I don’t think that anybody believes these lies. All of them are quite reasonable persons.'

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

(37)  *[Çocuklar hiçbir işte çalışsun] istemem. Bu konuda gereken önlemler alınmıyor maalesef.*

'I wouldn’t want children to work in any job. Unfortunately, the necessary measures are not taken in this matter.'

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

(38)  *Sanma [ki kimse sana inanır]? Sen o adamları daha tanıyamamışsın.*

'Don’t think that anybody would believe you! You obviously still don’t know those people.'

---

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

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

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

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

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

Abbreviations

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