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Introduction

- Sign languages: TİD, DGS, LCS, ASL.
- SOV vs SVO
- Manual marking vs non-manual marking:
  - değil, nicht, no, not
  - Head tilt, brow raising...
Manual vs Non Manual Marking
Literature Review

- Pfau and Quer (2002) --> ASL/DGS/LSC Comparative Negation
- TİD/ASL/DGS Comparative negation to test:
  - V-to-Neg Parameters (spreading/adjunct ban/neg positioning)
Methodology

- 23 sentences (3 dummy, 10 for spreading, 10 for adjunct ban)
- 4 bilingual TİD signers (at least 5+ yrs of background)
- Major procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>background information of the participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>make appointments with the participants individually and instruct them face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>while collecting data, highlight the non-manual markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>analyze and interpret the data (Pfau and Quer’s (2002) suggested trees were used as the basis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interlude-V to Neg Raising in TİD
Data Analysis

Dummy Sentences

(1) a. *Ali ev  al  değil
   Ali house buy  not
   ‘Ali does not buy a house’

b. *Ali ev  al  
   Ali house buy hs
   ‘Ali buy a house’

c. ??Ali ev  al  
   Ali house buy
   ‘Ali buy a house’

d. *Ali ev  al  değil
   Ali house buy  hs  not
   ‘Ali does not buy a house’

e. *Ali ev  al  değil
   Ali house buy  not
   ‘Ali does not buy a house’

(2) a. Annem araba al  lazım  değil
    Mom.my car buy should not
    ‘My mom should not buy a car’

b. *Annem araba al  lazım  değil
    *Mom.my car buy should not
    ‘My mom should not buy a car’

c. Annem araba al  lazım
    Mom.my car buy should
    ‘My mom should buy a car’

d. Annem araba al  lazım  değil
    Mom.my car buy should not
    ‘My mom should not buy a car’
Data Analysis Cont.

- Spreading Constraints

(4) a. *Mutter blume kaufen nicht
   *Mom flower buy not
   *‘Mom does not buy flowers’

b. John not buy house

c. Annem hiç çiçek al değil
   Mom my never flower buy not
   ‘My mom never buys flowers’

d. Annem hiç çiçek al ___
   Mom my never flower buy
   ‘My mom never buys flowers’

e. *Annem hiç çiçek al ___ değil
   *Mom my never flower buy
   *‘My mom never does not buy flowers’

f. Annem hiç çiçek al değil
   Mom my never flower buy not
   ‘My mom never buys flowers’
Data Analysis Cont.

- Adjunct Ban

(1) a. *Index fumar mai no  
   *I smoke never not  

b. *Roland bier trink nicht nie  
   *Roland beer drink not never

c. *John never not eat fish

a. Ali otobüs bin hiç (imkansız)  
   'Ali bus take never impossible  

b. Annem hiç çiçek al (değil)  
   'Mom.my never|flower buy not  
   'My mom never hs buys flowers"
Data Analysis Cont.

- Neg Positioning

(2) a. *Mutter blume kaufen nicht
   *Mom flower buy not
   *‘Mom does not buy flowers’

b. *Mutter blume kaufen nicht
   Mom flower buy not
   ‘Mom does not buy flowers’

c. *Mutter blume kaufen
   Mom flower buy
   ‘Mom buy flowers’

(3) a. *Ali çiçek al değil
   *Ali flower buy not
   *‘Ali does not buy flowers’

b. Annem çiçek al 
   Mom.my flower buy hs
   ‘My mom buy flowers’

c. ??Annem çiçek al 
   Mom.my flower buy hs
   ‘My mom buy flowers’

d. *Annem çiçek al 
   Mom.my flower buy hs
   ‘My mom buy flowers’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>V-to-Neg Raising</th>
<th>T-to-Neg Raising</th>
<th>NegP Ban</th>
<th>Adjunct Positioning</th>
<th>[+neg]&lt;sub&gt;aff&lt;/sub&gt; Positioning</th>
<th>[+neg]&lt;sub&gt;aff&lt;/sub&gt; Constraints</th>
<th>Spreading Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASL (American Sign Language)</td>
<td>Disallowed</td>
<td>Disallowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Either remain on NOT or spread over the entire VP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSG (Deutsche Gebärden sprache)</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Disallowed</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a verb raise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TİD (Türk İşaret Dili)</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>SpecNeg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Either have lexically negative items or have a verb raise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications/Assumptions

- Practically, these findings have nothing more than educational purposes for the teachers of TSL when it comes to teaching the differences between manual and non-manual marking types.

For us linguists, it increases the probability of a (already existing) parameter (NegP adjunction ban), provides us with other research questions to deal with;

- (i) do all SOV sign languages have V-to-Neg raising enabled? Or is this just a coincidence?
- (ii) is there a correspondence between the NegP Adjunction Ban parameter and [+neg]$_{aff}$ spreading constraints?
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