ASPECT AND MODALITY IN NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF TURKISH AND JAPANESE

Olumsuz Yapılarda Görünüş ve Kiplik: Türkçe ve Japoncanın Karşılaştırmalı Bir İncelemesi

Aydın Özbek[1]

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi

Abstract : The existence of perfect aspect of the Trans-Eurasian languages is among the most controversial issues of altaistics and linguistic typology. A major problem is the distinction between temporal and aspectual interpretation on the affirmative constructions. It is a well known fact that most of the Trans-Eurasian languages lack of an overt perfect aspect marking in affirmative constructions. Nevertheless, this does not mean that these languages completely lack an overt perfect aspect marking. The present article studies two temporal and aspect markers relating Japanese to Turkic in negative constructions and tries to attempt to show their modal functions under negation which can not be observed in the affirmative counterparts. In the comparative part of this study, the shared properties of temporal suffix *-ta* (Japanese), *-di* (Turkish) and progressive marker *–tei* (Japanese), *-yor* (Turkish) are assessed in terms of form, function. The article concludes that it is negation that effects the role of temporal and aspectual suffixes and gives modal interpretation to the constructions which has a completely different behaviour than the affirmative counterparts.

Keywords: *Negation, aspect, perfect, interchangeability, principle of contrast, Turkish, Japanese.*

[1] aydinozbek@gmail.com

Özet: Transavrasya dillerinde bitmişlik görünüşünün varlığı hem Altayistik alanında hem de dilbilim sınıflandırması alanlarında en çok tartışılan konulardan biri olmuştur. Özellikle, olumlu tümce yapılarındaki zaman ve görünüş ifadelerinin ayrımı konusu tartışılagelmiştir. Transavrasya dillerinde olumlu yapılarda belirgin bir bitmişlik görünüşü ekinin bulunmadığı bilinse de, bu durumun olumsuz tümce yapıları için geçerli olduğu söylenemez. Bu çalışmada, Transavrasya dillerinden olduğu kabul edilen Türkçe ve Japoncada bulunan zaman eklerinin olumlu tümce yapılarının aksine olumsuz tümce yapılarında gösterdikleri farklı kipsel görevlerinin yanı sıra görünüş ve zaman görevleri belirtilecektir. Ayrıca, çalışmanın karşılaştırmalı dilbilgisel yönünde ise, Japoncadaki geçmiş zaman eki –*ta* ile Türkçe –*di* ile, Japonca şimdiki zaman eki olan –*tei* ile Türkçe –*yor* ekleri değerlendirilecektir. Çalışma, olumsuzluğun zaman ve görünüş ifade eden ekler üzerindeki görev değişimine yol açan görevi ile birlikte, olumlu tümcelerde görülmeyen tümceye yeni bir kipsel anlam getirmesinin belirtilmesi ile sonuçlandırılacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Olumsuz yapılar, görünüş, bitmişlik, görev takası, karşıtlık ilkesi, Türkçe, Japonca.*

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-known that the distinction between the perfective aspect and past tense are grammatical in Slavic languages such as Russian and are overtly marked. Other European languages such as English also have grammatical aspect and tense distinction. This paper will attempt to show that Trans-Eurasian languages also have grammatical aspect under certain pragmatic factors, especially in negative constructions, by focusing on Turkish and Japanese. First of all, it the reason that the term "Trans-Eurasian" was chosen instead of "Altaic" languages to make a contrastive analysis between Turkish and Japanese should be clarified. According to Robbeets (2007), the Trans-Eurasian label covers five linguistic families: Japanese, Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic, and Turkic. It constitutes a single linguistic family in itself. The genealogical relationship of Trans-Eurasian languages is one of the most disputed issues of linguistic history and debate continues. Ignoring the matter of historical linguistics or common ancestor theories, Trans-Eurasian languages have proven linguistic similarities and common typological issues that should be considered. Therefore, the term "Trans-Eurasian" rather than the arguable "Altaic" languages family has been used in this paper.

In many previous studies, it was considered that tense and aspect do

not have a clear distinction and that they are not overtly marked in the terms of verb morphology in Turkish (Johanson, 1994; Kornfilt, 1994). Johanson (1994) proposed a new category he called "aspekto-tempora" which merges the two categories. The assumption is that both categories use the same verbal morphology and that ambiguity will only disappear under pragmatic conditions or with a temporal or aspectual adverbial. As in Turkish, many Trans-Eurasian languages lack an independent verbal morphology for the perfective aspect. For instance, in Mongolian the perfect is formed by combining the plain past of the main verb with the auxiliary verb *bai* 'to be' (Svantesson, 1991:194). Turkish also uses the same method to construct aspectual clauses using the auxiliary verb *ol* 'to be' (van Schaaik, 2001).

In this study, some of the complexities in terminology that regularly appear in theoretical analyses of perfect and modal properties in two Trans-Eurasian languages, Turkish and Japanese, will be demonstrated and discussed. As noted above, these two languages do not have overt marking of the grammatical perfect aspect in affirmative constructions. However, the question here is why we should consider only affirmative clauses and assume that "there is no grammatical aspect in Trans-Eurasian languages. This study will try to analyse negative constructions and consider whether they show different consumptions from their affirmative counterparts.

2. THE PROBLEM

From the philosophical and linguistic perspective, the term "negation" and its implications have been argued over since Aristotle to answer the question of "Why human languages have negation?" In actuality, all human languages contain negation.

> *All human systems of communication contain a representation of negation. No animal communication system includes negative utterances, and consequently none possesses a means for assigning truth value, for lying, for irony, or for coping with false or contradictory statements (cf. Altmann 1967). The distinction between the largely digital nature of linguistic representation in human language and the purely analog mechanisms of animal communication (Sebeok 1962) can be argued to result directly from the essential use humans make of negation and opposition. If we are by definition the animals that talk, we are ipso facto the animals that deny, for as Spinoza and Hegel argue, any linguistic determination directly or indirectly involves a negation* (Horn, 1989: xii).

Not all negative constructions have affirmative oppositions, and some should be considered as individual structures independent from so-called affirmative counterparts, which have their own syntactic and semantic properties. For instance, in impersonal passives in Turkish, affirmative and negative constructions have no semantic relation, as shown in examples (1) and (2).

(1)   Fotokopi   çek-il-ir
        Photocopy   pull-PASS-AOR
        '(We are) at your service for taking photocopies.'
(2)   Fotokopi   çek-il-mez
        Photocopy   pull-PASS-NEG (AOR)
        'It is forbidden to photocopy (here).'

Let us consider these two constructions. In the affirmative sentence (1), the predicate has the passive morpheme and the aorist tense *-ır*. This sentence can be interpreted as "taking a photocopy is provided as a service of the store" or "all the conditions are suitable to take a xerox". However, in the negative example (2), there is a strong imperative interpretation which forbids taking a photocopy. The distinction between affirmatives and negatives can here be clearly understood. From this evidence, affirmatives and negatives having independent syntactic and semantic structures under pragmatic conditions will be considered. Section 2 will show how tense and progressive markers play a differing role in negative constructions.

2.1. PERFECT ASPECT IN JAPANESE NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The choice between the Japanese past tense marker *-ta* and progressive aspect marker *-teiru* in negative answers in response to questions about the past which end with the *-ta* form was first argued in Szatrowski (1983) and Teramura (1984). They discuss the distinction between perfect and past marking, especially negative answer constructions showing different interpretations from affirmatives. Traditional textbooks illustrate that Answer sentences should have the same temporal or aspectual marking as that of Question sentences. However, Teramura noticed that, in sentences such as (3), this simple method fails.

(3)   Question:
      Moo hirumesi wo   tabe-ta-ka?
      Already lunch ACC   eat-PAST-Q
      "Did you eat (your) lunch?"
      Answer:
a)   Iya, (mada)   tabe-tei-nai.
      No,   yet   eat-ASP-NEG
      "No, I haven't eaten yet."
b)   *Iya,   tabe-nakat-ta.
      No,   eat-NEG-PAST
(4)   Question:
      Kinoo, hirumesi   wo tabe-ta-ka.
      Yesterday lunch   ACC eat-PAST-Q
      "Did you eat (your) lunch yesterday?"
      Answer:
a)   Iya,   tabe-nakat-ta.
      No   eat-NEG-PAST
      "No, I didn't eat it"
b)   *Iya,   tabe-tei-nai.
      No,   eat-ASP-NEG

                  Teramura (1984:321-322)

By using the negation test, Teramura (1984) proposed that the past tense suffix –*ta* has a perfective meaning, as exemplified in (3). On the other hand, the same suffix plays its original role as a temporal past tense marker in example (4). That is why (a) should be chosen as the answer for the question sentence (3), which has an aspectual adverb *moo* 'already'. Pragmatically ill-formed (b) should not be chosen because it expresses only past tense interpretation.

As with Japanese, the verbs in main clauses in Turkish are made up of a verb stem followed by a tense or aspectual suffix. Turkish also has a past tense marker –*di* and a progressive marker –*yor*. Although they share syntactic and semantic similarities with their Japanese simple affirmative counterparts, they show clear pragmatic differences in negative constructions. In the following sections, the structures and pragmatic properties of negative answer sentences in Turkish are investigated using the contrastive analysis method.

3. PERFECT ASPECT IN TURKISH

Kornfilt (1997) and Göksel and Kerslake (2005) argue that Turkish does not have special suffixes which function only for aspectual situations in all morphological contexts. This does not mean that Turkish lacks an aspectual system. For instance, the perfect aspect, which indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation (Comrie, 1976:52), is usually expressed by the past tense morpheme –*di*.

(5) Hasan   balığ-ı   ye-di.
     Hasan   fish-ACC   eat-PAST
     'Hasan ate the fish.'   Past tense interpretation
     'Hasan has eaten the fish.'   Perfect aspect interpretation
                                                  (Kornfilt 1997: 349)

As shown in Kornfilt's example (5), the past tense morpheme has ambiguous interpretations. This ambiguity can be removed by using temporal or aspectual adverbs such as *saat ikide* (at two o'clock) or *çoktan* (already).

(6) Hasan   balığ-ı   saat ikide   ye-di. (Past)
     Hasan   fish-ACC   hour two-LOC   eat-PAST
     'Hasan ate the fish at two o'clock.'
(7) Hasan   balığ-ı   çoktan   ye-di. (Perfect)
     Hasan   fish-ACC   already   eat-PAST
     'Hasan has already eaten the fish.'

As already mentioned, Turkish has a progressive marker[2] –*yor*. This suffix is used not only for the progressives but also, due to verb classification[3], used for several aspectual situations. For instance, when it is attached to a stative verb, -*yor* gives a resultative perfect meaning; but with a non-stative verb it gives a progressive

---

[2] Traditionally the verbal suffix -*yor* is classified as progressive marker (Lewis, 1967; Ergin, 2000). However, some scholars such as Erguvanlı-Taylan (2002) assume that this suffix should be considered as an imperfective marker.

[3] In this paper, we have preferred Vendler's (1957) verb classification in place of Kindaichi's (1950) pioneering study on verb classification. Kindaichi's (1950) classification was a leading study on verb classification very similar to Vendler's work, however, it was based mostly on Japanese verbs.

interpretation. In this sense, *-yor* is also a polysemic suffix as is the past tense marker *–di*.

(8)   Continuous aspect of a stative verb
      Ali   Ayşe-yi   tan-ıyor.
      Ali   Ayşe-ACC   know-PROG
      'Ali knows Ayşe.'
(9)   Continuous aspect of a non-stative verb
      Ali   televizyon   izli-yor.
      Ali   television   watch-PROG
      'Ali is watching television.'
(10) Ingressive aspect
      Ali   yat-ıyor.
      Ali   lie down-PROG
      'Ali is going to bed (now).'

3.1. ASPECT IN NEGATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN TURKISH

There has been up to now little investigation of the expression of the continuative aspect of Turkish negative constructions. Kornfilt (1997) states that in Turkish, *–den beri* constructions are used to convey a situation which began in the past and is still continuing, as expressed by "have been –ing" in English. It is also proposed that to convey this meaning, a present progressive marker *–(i)yor* is needed.

(11) Beş saat-ten   beri   sen-i   bekl-iyor-um.
      Five hours-ABL   after   you-ACC   wait-PROG-1SNG
      'I have been waiting for you for five hours.'

This statement should be considered as accurate in expressing the present perfect aspect in Turkish. However, not only the set of an ablative marker *–den*, a postpositional *-beri* (after) and a progressive tense marker *–(i)yor* gives us this interpretation, but also a past tense marker *–di* can be used with the *–den beri* set only in negative constructions as shown in (12b). An interesting fact about the semantics of negative constructions in Turkish is that the past form *–di*[4] can also be inflected to a stative verb to refer to continuing

---

[4] As mentioned briefly in Sugahara (2010), interchangeability between the past tense and the progressive marker is seen in Turkish, as shown below. These forms are, however, considered to be highly informal and are rejected by many scholars. Here we

situations. Let us consider the following examples:

(12)   a. Sabah-tan   beri   hiçbir şey   ye-mi-yor-um.
            morning-ABL   after   any thing   eat-NEG-PROG-1SNG
         'I have not eaten anything since this morning.' (Speaker is
         still hungry)
         b. Sabah-tan   beri   hiçbir şey   ye-me-di-m.
            morning-ABL   after   any thing   eat-NEG-PAST-1SNG
         'I have not eaten anything since this morning.' (Speaker is
         still hungry)

In (12a) and its counterpart (12b), despite the past tense marker in the
construction, the speaker's situation has not changed, which suggests
that it began in the past and is still continuing. Yet, past tense
interpretation of (12b) will exhibit an ill-formed situation. Negative
polarity items (*hiçbir şey*/nothing) give a higher negation modality to
the constructions. However, the affirmative counterpart of (12b) with
a past tense marker would be ill-formed, as exemplified in (13b)[5].

---

assume that the past tense marker *–di* gives the construction a past in the future
interpretation under special conditions. For instance, in the examples below, (i) and
(iii) also have a hidden "suggest me I've already appreciated you" or "suggest me I've
already gone" meaning, which is rarely found among adults but is widely seen in the
language of young people.

  i.   Teşekkür   et-ti-m.   ii.   Teşekkür   ed-iyor-um.
       thank   do-PAST-1stSNG   thank   do-PROG-1stSNG
       'I thank you.'   'I thank you.'
Or,
  iii. Ben   git-ti-m.   iv.   Ben   gid-iyor-um.
       I   go-PAST-1stSNG   I   go-PROG-1stSNG
       'I am going (now).'   'I am going (now).'

[5]   i.   * Sabah-tan   beri   ye-di-m.
               morning-ABL   after   eat-PAST-1stSNG
The example given here is ungrammatical even with an object such as *elma* (apple).
However, if we put a noun phrase with a quantifier such as *sadece bir elma* (only one
apple), the construction will be grammatical, as shown below in (ii).
  ii. Sabah-tan   beri   sadece   bir   tane   elma   ye-di-m.
       Morning-ABL   after   only   one   piece   apple   eat-PAST-1stSNG
       'I have eaten only one apple since this morning.'
It must be assumed that this grammatical reading comes from the properties of *sadece
bir tane elma* (only one apple). McCawley (1981) proposes that in English quantifiers,
"only a" has a semantic negation. The example *sadece bir tane* can also be considered
to have semantic negation and turns the sentence into a negative one giving the hidden
meaning "I have only eaten one apple but nothing at all".

(13)   a. Sabah-tan   beri   yi-yor-um.
            morning-ABL   after   eat-PROG-1SNG
        'I have been eating since morning.'
        b.??Sabah-tan   beri   ye-di-m.
            morning-ABL   after   eat-PAST-1SNG
        'I have been eating since morning.'

Let us now return and focus on the acceptability of (12b). The first observation to be made is that there is a clear pragmatic difference between the meaning of (12a) and past tense marked (12b). In both constructions the situation of "not eating" is still continuing, and the speaker is still hungry at the time of speaking. Informants for this study found both sentences fully acceptable. Yet, while (12a) gives us a modal meaning that the "not eating" situation is achieved by the speaker's own will, in (12b) the "not eating" situation is only expressed as a topic. This distinction comes from the fact that the aspectual *–yor* bears a volitional modality role, and its genuine aspectual role is shifted to the temporal marker *–di*. As seen in the previous section, interchangeability between temporal and aspectual markers allows this kind of process.

Note that both the progressive marker and past tense marker share the notion of "continuative aspect" in Turkish negative structures, even though both structures *prima facie* have the same aspectual formations. However, they are naturally distinguished depending on whether the speaker has a strong will or not. The next section explains why this notion is possible in Turkish.

4. MODAL PROPERTIES IN TURKISH

This section aims to discuss the syntactic and semantic properties of clauses formed by the suffix *–yor*. In SOV languages such as Japanese and Turkish, there is a person (subject) restriction in modality forms. This phenomenon has been observed by Inoue (1976), Nitta (1989), Tanimori (1999), and Tenny (2005), among others. Especially in declarative modality which covers volitional, optative and others, the experiencer subject of the clause must be in the First Person. For instance, in Japanese the volitional modality marker *–tai* can only be used with the 1st Person, as shown in (14a). Usage of 2nd or 3rd Person with a volitional modality marker would give us an ungrammatical formation (14b).

(14)   a.Watashi wa   asa   made   asobi-tai
          I TOP   morning   until   enjoy-VOL.MOD
       'I want to have fun until morning.'
       b. *Kanojo wo   asa   made   asobi-tai
          She TOP   morning   until   enjoy-VOL.MOD
       'She wants to have fun until morning.'

This phenomenon is also valid for Turkish. However, because Turkish has overt subject verb agreement, even in volitional or optative modality structures the verbal predicate should be marked with a person marker although the structure itself still expresses the 1st Person's will or wish pragmatically, as shown in example (15).

(15)   a.Ben   Taipei-e   git-**se**-m.
          I   Taipei-DAT   go-VOL-1stPERSON
       '**I wish** I could go to Taipei.'
       b. Sen   Taipei-e   git-**se**-n.
          You   Taipei-DAT   go-VOL-2ndPERSON
       '**I wish** you could go to Taipei.'
       c. Ali   Taipei-e   git-**se.**
          Ali   Taipei-DAT   go-VOL-3rdPERSON
       '**I wish** Ali could go to Taipei.'

The subject of the *–se* (volitional/optative) clause can be any person yet the actual subject (or the experiencer) must be in the 1st Person.

Now, let us return to negative *–yor* clauses. It is assumed that negative *–yor* clauses give us a volitional interpretation. The subject of the clause can only be the 1st Person because of the nature of the volitional modality, that only the 1st Person's "will" or "wish" can be expressed. Let us examine actual examples taken from newspapers.

(16)   Çok   iştahlıyım   ama   hiçbir şey
       Lot   have appetite-1stPERS   but   anything
       yemiyorum.
       eat-NEG-YOR-1stPERS
       'I have a good appetite but I am not eating anything (because I don't want to eat).'

                                          Hürriyet Newspaper 08.03.2009

(17) Oğlumun   maçlarını   izlemiyorum.
      Son-POSS1ST game-PLR-POSS-ACC   watch-NEG-YOR-1stPERS
      'I don't watch my son's games, because I don't want to.'

<div align="right">Star Newspaper 27.12.2008</div>

Almost identical syntactic structures with a 2nd or 3rd person subject will be interpreted as an aspectual sentence which expresses the state of the event, not the experiencers own will.

Note that, in the case of 2nd Person marked predicates, some clauses semantically or pragmatically can bear a pseudo-imperative modality reading. However, this state is not valid for all clauses that have a 2nd Person suffix.

(18) Biz   partiye   gidiyoruz   ama   sen
      We   party-DAT   go-YOR-1stPLR   but   you
      gel-mi-yor-sun!
      come-NEG-YOR-2nd
      'We are going to the party but you are not coming (don't come!)'
      (imperative reading)

(19) Bugün   hiç   konuş-mu-yor-sun.
      Today   any   talk-NEG-YOR-2ndPERS
      'You are not talking today (so what's the matter?)'
      (no modality reading)

As expected, related to the lack of a modality interpretation in sentences such as (20), inanimated experiencers can also be the subject. In the following examples, it is clear that only the continuum of the negative state is expressed.

(20) Yumurta   kolestrol   yap-mı-yor
       Egg   cholesterol   do-NEG-YOR-3rdPERS
      'Eggs do not cause cholesterol.'

<div align="right">NTV news 12.02.2009</div>

4.1. VERBAL RESTRICTIONS IN TURKISH

It should be noted that transitive verbs without exception give us a denial interpretation. However, there appears to be a restriction in intransitive verbs. This section will analyze which kind of intransitives allow negative volition meaning and which do not. In the examples shown below, the subjects of the negative sentences are animated experiencers, however, they lack the negative volitional modality reading.

(21)   10 yıldır   yaşlan-mı-yor-um.
       10 years(for)   age-NEG-YOR-1stPERS
       'I have not aged for 10 years.'

(22)   İlaçlardan   sonra   hiç   bayıl-mı-yor-um.
       Medicines-ABL   after   never   faint-NEG-YOR-1stPERS
       'I have never fainted since I started using this medicine.'

Examples (21) and (22) share a common characteristic in that the verb is intransitive. However, even when we consider (21), which is also an intransitive sentence, (23) has a clear negative volitional modality interpretation.

(23)   Artık   sen-in-le   konuş-mu-yor-um.
       Anymore   You-GEN-with   talk-NEG-YOR-1stPERS
       'I don't want to talk to you anymore.'

These three examples give us a clue as to the restriction of the verb. Examples (21) and (22) have an unaccusative predicate; while the predicate of (23) is an unergative one. Departing from Perlmutter's (1978) "Unaccusative Hypothesis", Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (2001) proposed a new solution for Turkish intransitive classifications, namely, that intransitive verbs can be thought of as being distributed on a scale of instigation which on one hand refer to activities that are internally instigated (II), and on the other hand are externally instigated (EI) (Table 1).

Table 1. Intransitive verbs classification according to Nakipoğlu-Demiralp (2001).

II   EI

1	2	3	4	5
atla "jump"	ağla "cry"	öl "die"	büyü "grow"	bat "sink"
çalış "work"	gül "laugh"	boğul "drown"	yaşlan "age"	çürü "decay"
düşün "think"	hapşır "sneeze"	bayıl "faint"	buna "get senile"	don "freeze"
koş "run"	hıçkır "hiccup"	doğ "be born"		eri "melt"
konuş "talk"	horla "snore"			karar "blacken"
oyna "play"	kızar "blush"			kırıl "break"
yürü "walk"	öksür "cough"			patla "explode"
yüz "swim"	uyu "sleep"			sol "wilt"
Unergative				Unaccusative

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp's proposal on intransitive verbs classification appears to be correct. The verbs given in Table 1 can easily be described as being instigated by a volitional entity. Internally instigated verbs are definitively unergatives and the subject of the predicate has its own will. However, looking at columns 3, 4, and 5 of Table 1, the subject's volition disappears and the verb becomes externally instigated or unaccusative, which has no volitional modality meaning in the negative forms but contains a resultative aspect meaning.

4.2. THE CASE OF JAPANESE

Japanese shows many syntactic and semantic similarities with Turkish in affirmative constructions. Negative volitional reading can be interpreted only in temporal (past) marked sentences. The –*teiru* (aspectual) forms are used to indicate purely the aspectual event. On the other hand, temporal (past) forms may indicate volitional mood, and it may be noted that volitional interpretation comes under certain pragmatic factors.

(24)   Question:
         Hari- Potta- wo   mi-ta-ka?   (The movie is at the cinema
                                                  now)
         Harry Potter ACC   see-PAST-Q
         'Have you seen the film Harry Potter?'
         Answer:
  a)   Hari- Potta- wo   mi-tei-nai
         Harry Potter ACC   see-tei-NEG
         'I have not seen Harry Potter (yet)'
  b)   Hari- Potta- wo   mi-na-katta
         Harry Potter ACC   see-NEG-PAST
         intended meaning 1: 'I didn't see Harry Potter because I don't
         want to.'
         intended meaning 2: 'I didn't see Harry Potter.'

In the example (24), the question is in the past tense form yet it has a strong aspectual reading. Most of the Japanese informants for this study found answer (24a) more natural than (24b). However, in the case of a negative volition that the speaker did not see the movie of his own will and has no further plans to see it in the future, (24b) is also a grammatical answer. Even the second interpretation of (24b) has a neutral past tense reading. Most Japanese informants found this interpretation an impolite answer which is slighty unnatural.

The greatest difference between Japanese and Turkish in this phenomenon is that, while the Turkish progressive –*yor* gives a volitional interpretation under negation, in Japanese the past tense marker gives the same denial mood to the construction. This may come from pragmatic factors or could be considered as a parametric property. However, in Japanese, to have a volitional (denial) modality under negation, there are verbal restrictions as in Turkish that the predicate verb must be transitive (24b) or unergative (25b) and the subject must be in the 1st Person. In other cases, such as when the subject is the 2nd or 3rd Person or the verb is an unergative verb, there is no modality reading (26).

(25)   a.Watashi wa   kyou   hasit-tei-nai
            I-TOP   today   run-ASP-NEG
         'I haven't run today.'

     b. Watashi wa   kyou   hasir-ana-katta
       I-TOP   today   run-NEG-PAST
   'I didn't run today (because I don't want to).'

(26)   Hana wa   siore-na-katta
        Flower-TOP   wilt-NEG-PAST
      'The flowers did not wilt.'

4.3. PROPOSED SOLUTION

The distinction outlined in the previous section could be briefly explained by Clark (1987)'s "Principle of Contrast", namely: *Every two forms contrast in meaning.* According to Clark (1987), this principle states that "*any difference in form in a language marks a difference in meaning*".

Both the progressive marker and past tense marker share the notion of "continuative aspect" in Turkish negative structures, even though both structures *prima facie* have the same aspectual formations. However, as expressed in the Principle of Contrast, they are naturally distinguished depending on whether the speaker has a strong will or not. The next section will explain why this notion is possible in Turkish, and why Japanese has a different process.

This proposal also gives us another clue about negative constructions. It is not possible to consider a large number of examples here, but what is clear is that the *–yor* in negative constructions not only gives the construction a resultative perfect aspect meaning but also gives a modality interpretation which exhibits the speaker's "own will" or "strong denial".

It appears, therefore, that the inter-changeability process is a false approach that is contrary to the principle of contrasts. It is interesting to observe that the past tense marker always has a continuative aspectual interpretation, while the actual continuative marker *–yor* bears another role, to express the agent's will. Past tense markers in negative constructions are filling the slot which is emptied by the progressive *–yor*. However, in Japanese the progressive marker *–tei* has a resultative aspect role in affirmatives and retains its resultative aspect role in negative counterparts. For this reason, the past tense

marker *–ta* works both as a temporal marker or a volitional modal marker under certain conditions.

Accordingly, it is considered that in Turkish negative forms the progressive marker bears a role as a volitional modal marker and its actual aspectual role shifts to the temporal past tense marker *–di*. The evidence comes from the subject marker on the predicate that in volitional modal sentences with a progressive *–yor* suffix, the 2nd or 3rd Person cannot be allowed. All informants without exception accepted the fact that the [neg-yor - 1st Person] set shows a strong will of denial.

5. CONCLUSION

Negation, or so-called negative assertion, is briefly described in Givon (2001:302).

> *The proposition is strongly asserted to be false, most commonly in contradiction to the hearer's explicit or assumed beliefs. A challenge from the hearer is anticipated, and the speaker has evidence or other strong grounds for backing up their strong belief.*

In this paper, departing from the Japanese data, we tried to introduce a new phenomenon for the Turkish perfect aspect under negation. Affirmative constructions gives us more data to analyze, however, it is not possible to assume that negatives are lesser than affirmatives in natural human languages. From the data and the languages analyzed, it is proposed that negative constructions have different syntactic and semantic properties from affirmatives and are not simply negative modality marked affirmatives. Even though syntacticaly similar, Japanese and Turkish are different languages. It is interesting to observe that these SOV languages share a common feature in negation, in which perfectual aspect covertly appears. The biggest problem remaining therefore is the question, "Is there grammatical aspect in Trans-Eurasian languages". This problem must be be left to other scholars for the moment, especially typologists of Trans-Eurasian and Asian languages.

REFERENCES

Aksu-Koç, A. (1988). *The acquisition of aspect and modality*. CUP.

Clark, V. (1987). The principle of contrast: A constraint on language acquisition. In B. MacWhinney (ed), *Mechanisms of language acquisition* (1-33). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ergin, M. (1987). *Üniversiteler için Türk dili*. Bayrak Yayın.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (2001). On the relation between temporal/aspectual adverbs and the verb form in Turkish. In E. Erguvanlı-Taylan (ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (97-128). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givon, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction Volume I*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.

Horn, L. R. (1989). *A natural history of negation.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Johanson, L. (1994). Türkeitürkische Aspektotempora. In R.Thieroff and J.Ballweg (eds), *Tense systems in European languages* (247-266). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish* (Descriptive Grammars). London: Routledge.

Lewis, G. L. (1967). *Turkish language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCawley, J. (1981). *Everything that linguists have always wanted to know about logic: But were ashamed to ask*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nakipoğlu-Demiralp, M. (2001). The referential properties of the implicit arguments of impersonal passive constructions. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (129-150). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nitta, Y. (1991). Gendai nihongo bun no modaritii no taikei to koozoo. In Y. Nitta and T. Masuoka (eds.), *Nihongo no modaritii* (1-56). Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

Robbeets, M. (2007). The causative-passive in the Trans-Eurasian languages. *Turkic Languages* 11, 157-201.

van Schaaik, G. (2001). Periphrastic tense/aspect/mood. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (ed.), *The verb in Turkish* (61-95). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Slobin, I. and Aksu, A. (1982). Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In P. J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics & pragmatics* (185-201). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sugahara, M. (2010). "Turkish" Data. *Journal of the Institute of Language Research*, 15 TUFS, (330-337).

Svantesson, J. O. (1991). Tense, mood and aspect in Mongolian. *Lund University, Dept.of Linguistics Working Papers 38.* (189-204).

Szatrowski, P. (1983). A pragmatic analysis of Japanese negative verbal aspect forms. *Tsukuba working papers in linguistics* 2, (48-64).

Tanimori, M. (1999). Concerning the restriction on person imposed by modality (in Japanese) *Tottori University Journal of the Faculty of Education and Regional Sciences. Educational Science and the Humanities,*(285-292).

Tenny, C. (2005). Evidentiality, experiencers, and the syntax of sentience in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15 (3), (245-288).

Teramura, H. (1984). *Nihongo no sintakusu to imi II* (Japanese syntax and semantics II). Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.