Q-Particle in Azari Turkish

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics
International Campus of
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

Turkish (Türkçe or Türkiye Türkçesi) is one of the languages of the southwest branch or a group of Oghuz Turkic languages and is the official language of Republic of Turkey. Azerbaijani (Azari Turkic and the Latin script (Azərbaycan Türkcəsi or Azərbaycan dili) is a language branch of the family of Turkic languages, and the language of Azari people in southwestern Asia, primarily in Azerbaijan and Azerbaijan of Iran and in Republic of Azerbaijan which is the official language there.

In this paper, I adopt Hagstrom (1998) and Aygen (1999) to account for Turkish facts about the Q-particle. Evidence is presented from of Turkish and Azari Turkish and these are compared. It is a parameter. Turkish is a wh-in-situ language. It means Wh- is not forced to move in them. There is a null-Q in it which appears as a morpheme in yes/no and echo questions. The distribution of the Q-Particle will be given in (I); the problem of analyzing embedded questions in these two languages (II); similarities and differences of Q-Movement and wh- questions in them.

Key words: Turkish, Azerbaijani Turkish, Q-particle, echo question and wh-questions.

Introduction

Turkish language or Turkish descent is a language family consisting of thirty-five languages and is recognized as a member of the family of Altaic languages. These languages are used in a large area of North Asia, North and West China to West Asia, parts of the Middle East and the Mediterranean coast, Central Asia, and Eastern Europe. The speakers of Turkish languages are about 165 million. Turkish is an agglutinative language. It means the words and verbs get at a different meaning or tense by adding the suffix.

One of the characteristics features of Turkish languages is vowel harmony. There is a null-Q in it which appears as a morpheme in yes/no and echo questions. There is some evidence in support of this claim that wh movement is a parameter. Turkish is a wh-in-situ language. It does not appear in wh-questions unless the structure is an echo of a wh-question.

Background research

There has been less discussion which deals with the cases where the question particle in Turkish is used. Here I just write some of related works done.

Kamali Beste (2010) has argued about "The Question Particle in Turkish". He states the default Q particle placement in Turkish parallels sentential main accent exactly because it relies on the same syntactic configuration spelling out the sentence accent. This analysis has the advantage of deriving default Q placement, along with accompanying accent, in one domain only, without evoking division of

labor problems. It was suggested that narrow focus occurrences do not pose an empirical challenge to this claim if these do not operate under the same syntactic conditions but are rather base-generated.

Given this analysis,

1. -mI is not a "pre-stressing" particle any more. Neither do we need to ascribe a "focusing" function to account for the accent seemingly enforced by it. The causality is reverse.

2. Accent is assigned by the syntactic frame, Q duly follows.

3. Finally, he provided cross-linguistic support to the claim by Kahnemuyipour and Megerdoomian that Wackernagel clitics are also found in the other phrasal domain, VP, which has interesting parametric and theoretical consequences.

"On the Sentence-Final Position of the So-called Question Particle mI in Turkish: A Word Grammar Account" paper, Yoshimura Taiki (2008) explains the relative order of the personal suffix and the question particle **mI**, using Word Grammar (WG). He states that thanks to new concepts (i.e. 'Clitic' and 'Host-form'), the relative order of the personal endings and the question clitics is well analyzed in WG.

He concludes that 1.The formal difference between the two paradigms comes from the difference of each form: affixes vs. clitics. The forms found in the z-paradigm should be called the 'personal clitics', while the forms in the k-paradigm are the 'personal suffixes'.

2. mI is also an instance of clitics. Accordingly when mI combines with the main verb, there is at least one host word.

3. On the basis of rules shown in his paper, complex verbal forms including clitics are analyzed within the morphotactics of the host-form.

Hagstrom, Paul (2009) has a research paper "Intervention effects and the flavors of Q" that discusses about two aspects of his project where open questions remain. The first concerns the identification of Q morphemes across languages: many languages seem to make finer morphological distinctions than Japanese does, suggesting more than one "flavor" of Q. The second concerns the analysis of the intervention effect itself, in response to several recent proposals attributing them to semantic, pragmatic, or prosodic causes, rather than to syntactic causes. He states that in Japanese, questions are formed with the help of a "question particle" ka ("Q"), a morpheme that can also be used to signal disjunction or combine with a wh-word like dare 'who' to form dareka 'someone' and Q particle undergoes syntactic movement in questions.

2-1.Theoretical Framework:

I adopt Hagstrom (1998), and Aygen (1999) to account for Turkish facts. It is about Q-particle and I use many Azari examples in it. I agree with them and I just add some Azari evidence and examples to indicate the similarities and difference of these two languages. In this paper I name Turkish for the Turkish language of Turkey and Azari for the Turkish language of Iran.

2-1-1. Turkish is a wh-in-situ language. Q-particle -mI appears in Yes/No questions either at the clause periphery or at a clause internal position with the constituent it focuses. A property of the Q-particle in Turkish is that it does not

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics

receive word final stress but rather causes the preceding syllable to be stressed; although it is written as a separate word in orthography, it undergoes vowel harmony, which indicates that it should be regarded as part of the word it follows. It does not appear in wh-questions unless the structure is an echo of a wh-question.

In Turkish, the co-occurrence of the Q particle and the wh- word is restricted to echo questions. In echo questions, the Q particle remains clause internal, and can occur clause-finally but with different interpretation. (1a) is an echo question of a wh-question, whereas, (1b) is an echo question of a Yes/No question:

a. Hasan ne mi aldi?

Hasan what Q bought   (echo question)

b. Hasan ne aldi mı?   (yes/no echo question)

Hasan what aldi Q

 'Did Hasan buy what'?

Clause final position seems to be the domain for Yes/No questions..In Azari Turkish,only it is used wh-question and we can expect the null Q particle. Q particle is either a clause-final particle or attached to a focused constituent in in Turkish:

3 a. Hasan o kitab-i oku-du mu ?

Did Hasan read that book?

b. Hasan mi o kitabi okudu ?

Did Hasan read that book?

In Azari Turkish, the null Q exists in the clause final position in Yes/No questions.

4a. Hasan   o kitab-i oxu-de **e**?

Hasan that book read   **e**?

Did Hasan read that book?

2-1-2. THE FUNCTION OF Q-PARTICLE

Now we consider the function of Q-particle in these two languages and state the similarities and differences between them.

(i) Q appears in Yes/No questions.

(ii) "as half of an indefinite formed on a wh-word meaning "one or other".

   (difference)

10) Kitap **mi** ne almiŝ.

   book Q what took

   'He took a book or something'

   Null Q-particle is used in Azari Turkish in these kinds of structures.

11) Kitab **e**   aldi ya namnane (aldi)

    Book **e**   took or what (took)

   He took a book or something

(iii) used in disjunctive capacity:

12) pasta **mi** pıtza **mi**   iste-r-sin?

   cake Q pizza Q   want-AOR-2 Pr Sg

   'Would you like cake or pizza?

Null Q is used in Azari Turkish.

13) keyk **e**   istisan ya pıtza   e ?

cake want   e or pizza -AOR-2 Pr Sg   e

'Would you like cake or pizza?

(iv) has a quantificational force:

14) Hasan gel-di **mi** ,harkes-i gul-dur-ur.

   Hasan come-PAST Q everybody-ACC laugh-CAUS-IMP-Ø

3Pr Sg Agr

   'Whenever Hasan comes, he makes everybody laugh.'

Q-particle behaves as a universal quantifier in this structure, unlike its Azari Turkish counterpart.

In Azari Turkish, there is no quantificational force but a null one and present tense is used instead of past tense in this structure.

15) Hasan galanda   **e**   harkas-i gul-dur-rur.

Hasan come-PRESENT **e**   everybody-ACC laugh-CAUS-IMP-Ø

3Pr Sg Agr

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics
Q-Particle in Azari Turkish   111

'Whenever Hasan comes, he makes everybody laugh'.

2-1-3. SIMILARITIES IN THE FUNCTION OF WH-WORD

"kim" and "kimi(leri) "in Turkish and "bire"/bir kes(ler) in Azari Turkish means who in English. The first ones are singular and the second ones are plural forms.

16) Kimi(leri) geldi.

17) Bir kesler/ bire galde.

   Who-ACC(PLU) came

   'Someone came.

      Kimse (who) in Turkish and Hesh kas in Azari, are negative sentences and are interpreted as a universal quantifier :

18) Kimse ye-me-de.

   Who-COND eat-NEG-PAST

19) Hesh kas ye-me-de.

   ' Noone eat'.

2-1-4. Q MOVEMENT

      In a Turkish echo question, wh-word and Q particle occur in a CNP island and the occurrence of the Q particle outside the island is ungrammatical except when the wh-word is the complement of the CNP. In (20), wh-word is the subject of the CNP.

20a) Ben [kim-in   **mi** pısırdıg-ı yem eg-ı   ]   yedım?

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics

I   who-GEN Q cook-NOM-POS food-ACC eat-PAST-

I eat the food that who cook?

b.* Ben [kim-in   pısırdıg-ı yemeg-ı   ] **mi**   yedım?

I   who-GEN cook-NOM-POS yemegı-ACC Q eat-PAST-

Null Q-particle is used in Azari Turkish:

c. Man [kim-in   e   pısırdıg-e   gazane]   yedım?

I   who-GEN   **e**   cook-NOM-POS food-ACC eat-PAST

I eat the food that who cook

In (21), the wh-word is the complement of the embedded clause:

21 a) Ali [Ipek-in ne mi de-digini] duydu?

        (Echo question of a wh-question)

Ali Ipek-GEN what Q say-NOM-POS hear-PAST

Ali heard that Ipek say what?

b. Ali [Ipek-in ne de-digin-i] mı duydu?

                        (Ambiguous)

Ali Ipek-GEN what say-NOM-POS Q hear-

PAST

i) Is it sth that Ipek said what that Ali heard?

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics

(Echo)

ii) Is sth(about) what ipek said that Ali heard?

(Yes/No)

21b), where the Q-Particle appears outside the island is ambiguous. It is either a Yes/No question or it is an echo question where the Q has scope over the island. Data (20-21), indicates that overt movement of Q-particle is subject to Island conditions in echo questions, Q particle occurs with the wh-word it focuses. It cannot move overtly out of a CNP island unless the wh-word it focuses is the complement of the CNP. In the grammatical (21b) the Q-particle appears outside the embedded clause and the sentence is ambiguous: it is either a Yes/No question which has the complement of the matrix clause under its scope, that is the CNP under its scope; or it is an echo question focusing the complement of the matrix verb. In the second interpretation, it must have undergone over movement from an island to its surface position, which Hagstrom calls "the launching site". He notes that this movement of Q-particle is focus driven in Turkish.

Null Q exists in Azari Turkish in these two cases. In (20a), the wh-word particle remains in the adjunct island; Q-particle can occur within or at the edge of the embedded clause or at the matrix periphery:

22.a.1) Ayŝe [Hasan ne mi ye-dig-i zaman] ŝaŝır-dı?

(echo of an embedded wh-question)

Ayŝe Hasan what **Q** eat –NOM-POS time surprise-PAST

Ayŝe was surprised Domuz eti   .(pig meat)

a.2). Ayŝe [Hasan namna yiyan zaman taajob elade?

Ayŝe Hasan what **e** eat –NOM-POS time surprise-PAST

b. Ayŝe [Hasan ne ye-dig-i zaman] mi ŝaŝır-dı?

   (echo of an embedded wh-question)

Ayŝe Hasan what eat –NOM-POS time V- Q surprise-PAST

Ayŝe was surprised when Hasan ate what?

Answer: ii. Domuz eti ye-dig-i   zaman .(when (he) ate pig meat)

c.1) Ayŝe [Hasan ne ye-dig-i zaman] ŝaŝir-di mi?

       (echo of a Yes/No question)

Ayŝe Hasan what eat –NOM-POS time V surprise-PAST Q

Ayŝe was surprised when Hasan ate what?

Answer: iii. DOmuz eti. (pig meat)

c.2) Ayŝe [Hasan namna yiyan zaman] taajob elade **e** ?

All parts of (22) are echo questions, but of different questions. (22a&b) are echo
questions of a wh-question. Q must have moved overtly to its launching site. These
two sentences are evidence to existence a null element in these languages. (22c) is
the echo of a Yes/No question, focus is still on the question word, which might
arguably an indication of its base position. Basically, these are the three positions
Q can appear in Turkish. The same distribution holds for Yes/No questions. The
difference between (22a) and (22b) is that Q focuses the question word in the

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozghghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics

adjunct in (22a), whereas it focuses the adjunct clause in (22b). The wh-word in the adjunct is the complement of the embedded verb.(22a.2),(22.c.2), are the examples that there are no overt Q-particle in them.

2-1-4. NULL Q MOVEMENT IN TURKISH

In Turkish echo questions, Q can appear next to the wh-word, remaining clause internal. According to Hagstrom (1998), Q moves to the clause periphery from a clause internal position.

The path of Q from its launching site to its clause peripheral position is forbidden to cross a certain class of elements. This kind of intervention effect is expected if the class of interveners share with Q the feature that is being attracted. The quantifier adverb yalnızca "only" is indeed such an intervener:

*29). a Yalnizca Hasan ne-yi oku-muŝ?

Only   Hasan what-ACC read-Reportive

Intended reading is an echo question: 'Only Hasan read what, [they say]?'

In Azari Turkish, that sentence is ungrammatical as in Turkish.

b. *faqat Hasan namnane oku-muŝde?

Only   Hasan what-ACC read-Reportive

30) a. **Yalnizca** Hasan kitab-I   oku-muŝ

Only   Hasan what-ACC read-Reportive

'Only   Hasan read the book [they say].

It is the same in Azari Turkish:

b. **faqat** Hasan kitab-I   oxu-muŝde

Only Hasan   what-ACC   read-Reportive

Only Hasan   read the book [they say]

31) a. Ne-yi **yalnizca** Hasan oku-muŝ?

   What-ACC only Hasan read-Reportive

   'What did only Hasan read'?

Again it is the same in Azari Turkish:

b. Namnane **faqat** Hasan oku-muŝde?

   What-ACC only Hasan read-Reportive

   'What did only Hasan read'?

In (29) the quantifier "only" seems to block a possible covert wh or a null Q movement to the clause periphery, hence the ungrammaticality.

32)***Yalnizca** Hasan ne-yi oku-muŝ?   Vs   **Yalnizca** Hasan kitab-I   oku-muŝ

   Only   Hasan what-ACC read-Reportive

   'Only Hasan read the book'

   In (30), however, scrambling the wh-word along with the null Q saves the structure since the null Q can launch from the scrambled position to the clause periphery.

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics
Q-Particle in Azari Turkish   117

Same judgments hold for overt occurrence of the Q-particle in echo questions:

33). ***Yalnizca** Hasan ne-yi   **mi** oku-muŝ?

   Only   Hasan what-ACC Q read-Reportive

34). Ne-yi **mi**   yalnizca Hasan oku-muŝ?

   What-ACC   Q only Hasan read-Reportive

   'only Hasan read what?'

Certain quantificational elements cannot intervene between the in situ material and the clause at which the wh-word takes scope Beck effect .

Kimse("noone") Is such an intervenor. In (31,32),we have a Yes/No question where the NPI kimse "no one" - which is morphologically made up of the question word "who" and the conditional morpheme"-(I)se- blocks the movement of Q.

35). *kimse pizza-yi mi ye-me-di?

   Nobody pizza-ACC Q eat-NEG-PAST

   'Did nobody eat pizza?'

36) Pizza-yi mi kimse ye-me-di?

   Pizza-ACC no one eat-NEG-PAST

   'Did nobody eat the pizza?'

Intervener "nobody" seems to block Q movement of -mi. Let's see whether a long distance movement is blocked similarly.

37)*kimse [Ayŝe-nin mi gel-eceg-i] ni   duŝun-me-di?

   Noone Aysh-GEN Q   come-NOM-POS-ACC think-NEG-PAST

   'Did nobody think that Ayshe would come?'

NPI blocks the covert movement of Q in long distance movement as well.

38)*kimse kim-I mi gor-ma-miŝ?

   Noone who-ACC Q see-NEG-Reportive

   To sum up, evidence from interveners blocking the movement of overt Q-mi, and a possible null Q , supports Hagstrom (1998).

2-1-5. QUANTIFIERS AND SYNTAX: (Miyagawa 1998)

   The scopal interaction of wh-words and quantifiers allows us to detect covert movement of Q-particle:

39) Kim herŝeyi gordu?   single answer

   Who everything-ACC saw

   'Who saw everything?'

40) Herkes ne gordu?   ambigious

   Everybody what saw

   'What did everybody see?'

41) Herkes ne mi gordu?   Single answer

   Everybody what Q saw

'Everybody saw what?'

The ambiguity of (40) is due to two possible LF structures given in(42) below:

(42) a. Q...herkes.....ne.... .single answer

b. herkes...   list answer

The fact that (41) has only a single answer such as "Everybody saw a cat" indicates that Q undergoes covert movement to clause periphery as given in (42a).

CONCLUSION

The basic proposal of Hagstrom (1998) is that in wh-questions of wh-in situ languages, there is a morpheme Q which is base generated as a sister to a wh- word and moves to clause periphery by feature attraction. Evidence for the covert movement of the question particle -mI in Yes/no questions and echo questions and a similar movement of a null counterpart in Turkish comes from the following facts in Turkish:

1. Interveners: which block the movement of -mI or its null counterpart by such as quantifiers (i.e only) and NPIs (nobody).

2. Quantifiers & Wh-words: Ambiguity of structures with a quantifier and Wh-word indicates the covert movement of a null Q to the clause-periphery.

There are some similarities and differences between Azari and Turkish languages. The evidence given in Azari language indicates that there is a null Q in it most of the time in the comparison of Turkish.

===

Language in India www.languageinindia.com **ISSN 1930-2940 13:8 August 2013**
Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics
Q-Particle in Azari Turkish   120

References

1. Aygen, Gülşat.(2007)."Q-particle", Northern Illinois University.Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi/Journal of Linguistics and Literature 4:1, 01-30, 2007.

2. Aygen-Tosun, Gülşat. (1999). "**Specificity and Subject/Object Positions in Turkish**".

3. Besler, Dilek. (1999). **"The question particle and movement in Turkish".** MA thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

4. Hagstrom, Paul. (1998).**"Decomposing Questions. Ph.D. dissertation".** MIT, Cambridge, MA.

5. Hagstrom, Paul.(2009).**" Intervention effects and the flavors of Q".**

6. Kamali Beste.(2010)." **The Question Particle in Turkish: Consequences For the Interfaces".**

7. Kahnemuyipor, Arsalan and Karine Megerdoomian. This volume. **"On the domain of second position clitics"**. In Proceedings of WCCFL 28**.**

8. Miyagawa, Shigeru. (1998). **"EPP, Scrambling and wh-in-situ. ms. MIT".**

9. Yoshimura ,Taiki. (2008).**"On the Sentence-Final Position of the So-called Question Particle mI in Turkish: A Word Grammar Accont**".

==

Mohammad Reza Pahlavan Nezhad, Ph.D. in Linguistics
Associate Professor
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Rezapahlavan5@yahoo.com

Mozhghan Habibi, Ph.D. Student in Linguistics
International Campus of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
m.habibi78@yahoo.com