

GRAMMATICAL STUDIES / ГРАМАТИЧНІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

UDC 811.512.14

DOI: 10.2478/lccc-2024-0009

Oksana Tyshchenko-Monastyrska



PERFECTIVE NEGATION IN CRIMEAN TATAR

This paper investigates perfective negation in Crimean Tatar, focusing on the interplay between verbal and nominative features of participial constructions formed with -GAn. The study examines how these constructions interact with negation, aspects, and nominalization, highlighting their dual grammatical nature. The paper underscores the dual nature of -GAn participles, bridging verbal and nominal domains. Their flexibility enables their use in various syntactic positions, from predicates to noun phrases.

Keywords: finite verb, non-finite verb, negation, perfect, Crimean Tatar.

Introduction

Perfective negation in Crimean Tatar is formed through a set of devices, among which non-nominalized and nominalized -GAn-type phrases hold significant position. This article examines the verbal and nominative features of negation constructions in Crimean Tatar, such as *Bizni körgeñiz yoq* («You did not see us»). These features provide insight into the linguistic status of such phrases. Crimean Tatar exhibits finite/non-finite clause alternations. In finite clauses, negation is formed by a suffix, while in non-finite clauses, negation follows the verb form. Negation in finite / non-finite clauses has been frequently discussed from a typological perspective (Pollock, 1989), reliable for the Turkic languages as well. Studying the variable position of negation enhances our understanding of verbal behaviour in the SOV (subject-object-verb) language. The participle in Crimean Tatar is a non-finite verb form that combines verb semantics and grammatical properties of a noun, albeit differently from a verbal noun. The syntactic position of non-finite clauses has been explored in Kornfilt (1997, p. 49-77), Johanson & Csató (1998), Göksel & Kerslake (2005, p. 404-485). Óttot-Kovács (2015, p. 203) demonstrated, using Kazakh non-finite -GAn forms with the suffix -Llq, that agreement marking is restricted to nominalized non-finites. Perfect forms in -GAn are analyzed as part of post-terminal system by Johanson (1998, p. 44), who refers to them as “indirective” (Johanson, 1998, p. 45). Kornfilt (2000, p. 337-338) describes the corresponding Turkish forms in -mlş as “reported tense”. Kavitskaya analyzes -GAn forms as “evidential past” (Kavitskaya, 2010, p. 66-67). Jankowski (2010, p. 167) analyzes Crimean Tatar perfect forms in -GAn as “reported-resultative”, noting the difficulty of defining this linguistic phenomenon. Memetov (2003, p. 240) highlights shared features between Crimean Tatar verbal nouns and

participles in semantics (action nomination) and grammatical forms (nominal). Attributive semantics formally aligns participles more closely with adjectives, as seen in Example (1):

- (1) Bizni körgen adamlar
 Biz-ni kör-gen adam-lar
 we-Acc see-PRTC man-Pl
 “People seeing us”.

When used substantively, participles resemble nouns and can take number markers, as in Example (2):

- (2) Bizni körgenler ne aytalar?
 Biz-ni kör-gen-ler ne ayt-a-lar?
 we-Acc see-PRTC.Pl what say-Pres.3Pl
 “What are saying those who see / saw us”

Participles also display predicative behavior, which appears secondary and parallels the model of verbal nouns. Semantically, participles and verbal nouns share common features, such as denoting the result of an action or perfective semantics, as illustrated in Examples (3a) and (3b):

- (3a) Vay, anay-çığ-ım, men-im kör-gen-im ne-dir? (Yusuf Bolat)
 INT mum-Dim.Poss.1Sing I-Gen see-PRTC.Poss1Sing what-COP
 “Oh, mummy, what have I seen?”
 (3b) ...menim arapça oqup - yazuvım ne derecede olğanını bilmek için... (Idris Asanin)

Men-im arapça oqu-p – yazuv-ım ne derece-de
 I-Gen Arabic read-CONV write-VN.Poss1Sing Q level-Loc
 “To know the level of my Arabic reading and writing”.

In the next examples, the possessive suffix indicates the owner, consistent with the nominative paradigm:

- (4a) Men-im tata-m bar.
 I-Gen sister-Poss1Sing EXIST
 “I have a sister”.
 (4b) Men-im tata-m yoq.
 I-Gen sister-Poss1Sing EXIST.NEG
 “I have no sister”.

When participles in -GAn take possessive suffixes, sentences can express the result of an action or a process occurring at the moment of speech, often involving relative subordination (e.g., “something that a specific person does / did”). See Example (5):

- (5) Aşa-ğan-ım, iç-ken-im üst-üm-e yuq-ma-y (İbrahim Paşı).
 Eat-PRTC.Poss1Sing drink-PRTC.Poss1Sing up-Poss1Sing.Dat
 “What I ate and drank does not remain on me (lit. eating, drinking)”.

Morphosyntactic pattern

In finite clauses, the subject can often be omitted if contextually clear, but subject agreement on the predicate is obligatory. In Example (6), finite subject agreement appears on *körirsiñ* (“you will see”), while non-finite subject agreement appears on *körgeniñ* (“something that you have seen”):

- (6) Çoq şey-ler-ni kör-gen-iñ yoq. Daa kör-ir-siñ (Abduraman İsa)
 many thing-Pl.Acc see-PRTC.Poss2Sing EXIST.NEG more see-AOR.2Sing

“You have not seen a lot of things. You will see them”.

Agreement in finite clauses follows these patterns:

<i>Singular</i>	
1	-Im
2	-sİñ
3	-Ø
<i>Plural</i>	
1	-mIz
2	-sIz
3	-(IAr) ¹

Fig. 1. Subject agreement in finite clauses

In non-finite clauses, agreement follows the possessive paradigm:

<i>Singular</i>	
1	-Im
2	-İñ
3	-I
<i>Plural</i>	
1	-ImIz
2	-İñIz
3	-IArI

Fig. 2. Subject agreement in non-finite clauses

In non-finite clauses, variations occur in subject agreement and case marking. The participle’s agreement with the subject remains obligatory, but the head noun or pronoun typically appears unmarked in the nominative case. Examples with genitive case-marked subjects are notably common in interrogative sentences, as in Examples (3a) and (12).

This distinction raises the **questions**: a) why agreement differs between finite and non-finite phrases b) why non-finite verb form can be nominalized c) what role subject agreement plays in the nominalization process d) why similar constructions mark different verbal aspects. We will try to address these questions.

Perfective participles in -GAn interact with negation in interesting ways. In past-tense negation, personal forms of the participle -GAn combine with the existential predicate *yoq* (“no”), as in Example (7):

(7) Biz-ni kör-gen-iñiz yoq
we-Acc see.PRTC.2Pl EXIST.NEG
“You did not see us”.

Unmarked subject agreement on participle in -GAn denotes an impersonal and indefinite meaning:

(8) Saba-ğa qadar bu barak-ta ne ol-dı, ne qal-dı bil-gen
yoq (İdris Asanin).

Morning-Dat POST DET barrack-Loc Q be-PRF Q stand-PRF know-PRTC EXIST.NEG

“It was unknown what happened in this barrack till morning” (nobody knows).

¹ Not obligatory.

The most frequent negation in past tense in Crimean Tatar involves the suffix *-mA* attached to the verb stem, followed by a tense marker (+DI ~11K entries in the corpus; +GAn ~8K entries). Participial phrases represent a peripheral negation strategy (~250 entries in Corpus I). In finite sentences, the subject always appears in the nominative (default/unmarked) case. Examples (9) and (9a) illustrate acceptable forms, while (9b) demonstrates an ungrammatical construction:

- (9) Men olar-nı kör-me-gen-im.
I they-Acc see-NEG.PRF.1Sing
“I did not see them”.
- (9a) Men olar-nı kör-me-di-m.
I they-Acc see-NEG.PRF.1Sing
“I did not see them”.
- (9b) *Men olar-nı kör-di-m yoq.
I they-Acc see-PRF.1Sing EXIST.NEG
“*I did not see them”.
- (10) Men olar-nı kör-gen-im yoq.
I they-Acc see-PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG
“I did not see them”.

This mixed pattern of finite and non-finite strategies reveals how negation operates in Crimean Tatar.

Positive forms and interrogative context

While positive forms of *-GAn* bar are rare in modern Crimean Tatar, they are more evident in corpus data involving direct questions. In such contexts, the object may be unmarked (11), and the subject often appears in the genitive case, similar to possessive *bar/yoq* constructions (12):

- (11) Böyle eser eşit-ken-iñ bar-mı? – de-di (İdris Asanin).
such poem hear-PRTC.2Sing EXIST.INTER say-PRF.3Sing
“Have you heard such a poem? he said”.
- (12) Sıdırsalar, seniñ teri-ñ-ni sıdır-ır-lar, benim ne et-ken-im bar? (folklore)
skin-COND.3Pl your skin-Poss2Sing.Acc skin-AOR.3Pl I-Gen Q do-PRTC.1Sing EXIST
“If they skin, they will do it, what did I do?”
- Interrogative pronouns like *ne* (“what?”) can replace syntactic elements like *bar*:
- (13) Unutqanıñ ne?
forget-PRTC.1Sing Q
“What did I forget?”

Semantic features of predicate *yoq*

The negation system in Crimean Tatar includes several devices: the suffix *-mA*, the predicate *yoq*, the particle *degil*, and the paired clausal particle *ne...ne*. This article focuses on the existential predicate *yoq*, which conveys meanings related to absence: “to have–not to have” and “to be–not to be”. In contrast, *degil* negates existence or identity, while *-mA* expresses the negation of action. Examples (9) and (30) demonstrate that non-finite forms in *-GAn* can be negated using all these devices, reflecting both nominal and verbal negation.

In the negation phrases under investigation, *-GAn* forms behave as noun phrases, although the *-GAn* marker itself is not a nominalizer. This duality raises questions about the constructions’ nominal and verbal characteristics.

Double-marked negation involving nominal phrases (e.g., *bir kere*, *bir şey*) and particles (*iç*, *ne*) can amplify negative polarity, as illustrated in Examples (14–16):

(14) Öz peyğamber-i-ne ber-gen şey-ler içün siz ne at ve ne deve çap-tır-ğan-ıñız yoq (Yıldız magazine, 1993).

siz ne at ve ne deve çap-tır-ğan-ıñız yoq
PRON NEG horse CONJ NEG camel run-CAU.PRTC.2Pl EXIST.NEG
“You did not ride a horse or a camel for things given to your prophet”.

(15) İç öyle şey kör-gen-im yoq (Ümer Ipçi).
NEG such thing see-PRTC.Poss1Sing EXIST.NEG

“I have not seen such things at all”.

(16) Onı ev-leri-nde bir kere bile kör-gen-i
yoq (Üriye Edemova).

he-Acc house-Poss3Pl.Loc NUM period even see-PRTC.Poss1Sing
EXIST.NEG

“(S)he never even saw him at home”.

In some cases, negative polarity is reinforced by the existential verb combined with negative pronoun *kimse* “nobody”:

(17) Netice-de kimse-ge, bir şey-ge muhtac-ı
ol-ğan-ı yoq.
result-Loc smbd-Dat ART thing-Dat need-Poss3Sing
be-PRTC.3Sing EXIST.NEG

“As a result, he needed nobody and nothing”.

Nominal features of -GAn

Examining nominalization properties in Crimean Tatar supports the theory of nominalization (Alexiadou 2001), which identifies features like plural marking, determiners, and case. Data suggests that *-GAn* has a nominal layer, enabling modification with markers of number, determiners, and case. Similar processes are noted in other Turkic languages, such as Kazakh (Óttot-Kovács, 2015, p. 179).

Verbal features: -GAn yoq and Aspect of verb

Crimean Tatar grammars indicate that *-GAn* forms can convey both perfective and imperfective aspects (Memetov, 2006, p. 246-247; Jankowski, 2010; Seit-Celal, 2021, p. 399). In the perfective sense, they denote results or completed actions; in the imperfective sense, they indicate continuous or ongoing actions in the past or present. These forms are sometimes referred to as “indefinite past” due to their ability to mark vague or unspecified past events.

(18) Yapraq-lar quyu kenar-ı-na qon-ğan-lar (Ümer Ipçi).
leaf-Pl well edge-Poss3Sing.Dat sit-PRF.Pl

“Leaves fell down to the edge of well”.

Double-marked past negation combines participial negative constructions (perfective aspect) with the auxiliary *edi*:

(19) Evel şu yer-ge kel-gen-i yoq
e-di.
ADV DET place-Dat come-PRTC.Poss3Sing EXIST.NEG
AUX.PRF.3Sing

“He has not come here earlier”.

(20) Lâkin çift – çift olup oynağanlar arasında da, seyirciler arasında da onıñ arağanı yoq edi (Yusuf Bolat).

o-nıñ ara-ğan-ı yoq edi
 he-Gen look for-PRTC.Poss3Sing EXIST.NEG AUX.PRF.3Sing
 “But he did not look for her among dancing pairs and visitors”.

Durative aspect forms, such as those with the suffix -yat-, shift the meaning to the present:

(21) Bir kapig-i-ni masraf et-ken-im yoq (Abduraman Isa).

One coin-Poss3Sing.Acc spend do-PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG
 “I did not spend a single penny”.

(22) Men cinayet et-e-yat-qan-ım yoq (Abduraman Isa).
 I crime do-HAB.PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG

“I do not commit a crime”.

(23) Çünki daa çoq-lar-ımız ğaflet yuqu-sın-dan uyan-ğan-ımız
 yoq (from magazine).

CONJ yet a lot-Poss.1Pl unwatchful sleep-Poss3Sing wake up-PRTC.1Pl EXIST.NEG

“Because a lot of us do not wake up because of light sleep”.

Causality in non-finite verb forms

Causality in non-finite verb forms is marked by the suffix -Dır-. Examples (24-26) demonstrate the interplay between causality, non-finite forms, and negation.

(24) Men-i o-nıñ yaş-ı meraqlan-dır-ğan-ı
 yoq (Abduraman Isa).

I-Acc he-Gen age-POSS3Sing be interested-CAU.PRTC.3Sing EXIST.NEG

“I did not care about his age”

(25) Añla-ma-ğan-ıñız ne ya, ana-m! – Işan-dır-ğan-ım
 yoq! (Abduraman Isa)

understand-NEG.PRTC.2Pl what PRT mother-Poss1Sing believe-CAU.PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG

“What did you not understand, mother. I did not promise!”

(26) Maña inan-ıñız, Raşid Abduraşidoviç, cam-nı men sın-dır-ğan-ım
 yoq (İbrahim Çegertma).

I-Dat trust-IMP2Pl PN glass-Acc I break-CAU.PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG

“Trust me, Raşid Abduraşidoviç, I did not break the glass”.

Temporal framing

Temporal framing in negation can be achieved using particles like *daa* (“yet”) or *alâ daa* (“still”). These markers highlight actions completed in the past but still relevant at the moment of speech:

(27) Saba-dan daa bir daqqaçıq oturğanım yoq (Ayşe Akiyeva).

morning-Abl yet ART minute-DIM sit-PRTC.1Sing EXIST.NEG
 “Since the morning, I have not taken a seat for even a single minute”.

(28) Köterilgen qar dumanından qomşunıñ penceresinde yanğan çıraq ısıǵı bile körünmey. Ay daa doğğanı yoq (Subhi Vapiyev).

ay daa doğ-ğan-ı yoq
 moon yet be born-PRTC.Poss3Sing EXIST.NEG

“Due to the snow’s mist, even the neighbor’s window light cannot be seen. There has not been a moonrise yet”.

(29) Lâkin bu mesele-de alâ daa soñki noqta qoy-ul-ğan-ı
yoq (Ablâziz Veliyev).

CCONJ DET issue-Loc yet last dot put-PASS.PRTC.3Sing
EXIST.NEG

“But the final point in this issue has not yet been made”.

Forms with the negation particle *degil* also occur, often modifying participial constructions, as it seen in the Example (30):

(30) Kök-ten en-gen degil-im (Abduraman Isa)
sky-Abl come down-PRTC not-1Sing

“I did not come down from the heaven”.

Non-finite forms like -GAn closely interact with tensed verbs, as shown in Example (31):

(31) Azizov kel-di, nevbet bekle-gen-i yoq, doğru kir-di
ket-ti (Ümer Ipçi).

PN come-PRF3Sing line wait-PRTC.3Sing NEG direct enter-PRF
go out-PRF

“Azizov came, did not wait in line, and went straight inside”.

In some communicative contexts, -GAn and -DI forms can appear interchangeably, as in (32):

(32) De-mek, sen daa şeer-ni kör-gen-iñ yoq, e? Alime.
Ayt-am da, kör-me-dim de-p (Ümer Ipçi).
say-INF you yet city-Acc see-PRTC.Poss2Sing EXIST.NEG Q PN
say-PRES.1Sing EMPH see-NEG.PRF.1Sing say-CONV

“That means you have not seen the city yet, right? Alime: I tell you, that I did not see”.

Predicative negation with *yoq* can also include copulative suffixes, as seen in Example (33):

(33) Men-dayın dohtur daa doğ-ğan-ı yoq-tır.
I-COMP doctor yet be born-PRTC.3Sing EXIST.NEG.COP

“A doctor like me was not yet born”.

Compound non-finite

In some cases, compound constructions combine converb and auxiliary verb that is a typical verbal feature:

(34) Özü uydur-ıp çıkar-ğan-ı yoq (Şamil Alâdin).
himself invent-CONV AUX.PRTC.Poss3Sing EXIST.NEG

“He did not invent it himself”.

Conclusion

Participles in -GAn exhibit verbal properties, functioning to denote both perfective and imperfective aspects. In the perfective sense, they highlight results or completed actions, while in the imperfective sense, they express continuity or ongoing processes. The interaction with negation reveals a nuanced system where participial constructions (-GAn *yoq*) coexist with finite negation strategies (-mA + tense markers). Crimean Tatar utilizes participles to convey vague or indefinite past events, often labeled as “indefinite past”. Participial constructions maintain subject agreement, either explicitly marked or implied by possessive suffixes. The co-occurrence of participles with auxiliary and existential predicates (*yoq*) demonstrates their adaptability in complex sentence structures. Crimean Tatar participial constructions embody a hybrid grammatical status. Their verbal roots are

evident in their aspectual and action-related semantics, while their nominal features enable syntactic versatility. This duality allows participles to function as predicates, modifiers, or standalone noun phrases, depending on context. The interaction between verbal and nominative features enriches the language's negation strategies. The presence of both finite (-mA) and non-finite (-GAn yoq) negation options provide flexibility and precision, reflecting the dynamic grammatical framework of Crimean Tatar.

Reference

- Alexiadou, Artemis. (2001). *Functional Structure in Nominals. Nominalization and ergativity*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia. (2005). *Turkish. A comprehensive grammar*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Jankowski, Henryk. (2010). *Język krymskotatarski*. Warszawa: Dialog [Crimean Tatar language].
- Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (1998). *The Turkic Languages*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Kavitskaya, Darya. (2010). *Crimean Tatar*. Languages of the world: Materials (Tom 477). München: Lincom Europa.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997). *Turkish*. London–New York: Psychology Press.
- Memetov, Ayder. (2003). *Krymtatarskij jazyk*. I. Obščije svedenija o jazyke. II. Morfologiya. Simferopol: Krymučpedgiz [Crimean Tatar language. I General notes about the language. II Morphology].
- Memetov, Ayder. (2006). *Zemaneviy qırımtatar tili*. Simferopol: Qırım devlet oquv pedagogika neşriyatı [Modern Crimean Tatar language].
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 3, 365-424.
- Seit-Celal, Abibulla. (2021). *Crimean Tatar language for foreigners*. Sumy: Universytets'ka knyha.
- Óttot-Kovács, Eszter. (2015). *The syntax of non-finite clauses in Kazakh*. PhD dissertation. University of Szeged. Szeged.

Sources

- Crimean Tatar corpus I <https://ctcorpus.org/index.php/en/>
- Crimean Tatar corpus II <http://korpus.juls.savba.sk/QIRIM/>

Резюме

Тищенко-Монастирська Оксана

ЗАПЕРЕЧНІ ФОРМИ МИНУЛОГО ЧАСУ У КРИМСЬКОТАТАРСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Постановка проблеми. Заперечні форми фінітних та нефінітних конструкцій на позначення минулого часу у кримськотатарській мові, як і загалом у тюркських мовах, формуються по-різному, демонструючи відмінність поведінки дієслова та нефінітних форм дієслова у реченні. Заперечні форми минулого часу у кримськотатарській мові утворюються, по-перше, за допомогою часових форм дієслова із додаванням заперечного суфікса -mA та, по-друге, за допомогою дієприкметникової конструкції -GAn у присвійній формі із заперечним словом yoq. Стаття присвячена морфологічним та синтаксичним особливостям другого типу заперечних конструкцій.

Мета. Метою нашого дослідження є 1) визначення дієслівних та іменникових особливостей дієприкметникових конструкцій кримськотатарської мови типу *Bizni körgeñiñiz yoq* «Ви нас не бачили», 2) з'ясування статусу зазначених конструкцій.

Методи. У дослідженні використано комбінований метод аналізу фінітних та нефінітних форм дієслова, описаний на матеріалі інших тюркських мов Корнфілт (1997), Йогансон, Чато (1998), Гьоксель, Керслейк (2005), Оттот-Ковач (2015), методологію дослідження заперечення у фінітних та нефінітних формах дієслова за Поллоком (1989) та метод аналізу номіналізації за Алексіаду (2001). Спираючись на зазначені дослідження, ми з'ясували а) морфолого-синтаксичну модель досліджуваних конструкцій, б) особливості функціонування їх компонентів не лише у заперечних, а й у стверджувальних та питальних реченнях, в) семантичну характеристику предиката *yoq* у порівнянні з іншими засобами заперечення, г) перевірили наявність іменних та дієслівних характеристик дієприкметника на -GAn.

Результати. Досі заперечні конструкції -GAn *yoq* не становили об'єкта дослідження. Хоча у граматиках ці конструкції посідають рівнозначне з суфіксальним способом місце (Меметов, 2006; Янковський, 2010; Сеїт-Джелал, 2021), здійснені нами корпусні дослідження продемонстрували їх периферійне місце (~11 000 одиниць суфіксального заперечення з формами -DI, 8 000 суфіксального заперечення з формами -GAn проти ~250 прикладів присвійної конструкції -GAn *yoq*). Наше дослідження показало, що у нефінітних заперечних конструкціях узгодження дієприкметника за особою іменникового типу є ключовою рисою, що наближає конструкцію до іменникових присвійних конструкцій на зразок *Menim tatam yoq* «Я не маю сестри». Необов'язковість маркування суб'єкта родовим відмінком у зазначених нефінітних конструкціях виявляє подібність до типових речень з фінітними формами дієслова. Заперечення за допомогою -GAn *yoq* є гібридною формою, яка поєднує в собі іменні та дієслівні ознаки.

Дискусія. Категорія присвійності (посесивності) характеризує іменні частини мови, здатність узгоджуватися за присвійністю відрізняє нефінітні форми дієслова від особових форм фінітних дієслів. Таким чином, узгодження за присвійністю відіграє ключову роль у процесі номіналізації нефінітних форм дієслова. Уживання кримськотатарського дієприкметника -GAn з маркерами присвійності, характерними для іменних частин мови, є особливістю номіналізації цієї дієслівної форми у кримськотатарській мові.

Ключові слова: фінітні форми дієслова, нефінітні форми дієслова, заперечення, минулий час, кримськотатарська мова.

Abstract

Tyshchenko-Monastyrsk Oksana

PERFECTIVE NEGATION IN CRIMEAN TATAR

Background. This paper examines perfective negation in Crimean Tatar, focusing on participial constructions with -GAn and their interaction with negation, aspect, and nominalization. It highlights the hybrid nature of -GAn participles, which exhibit both verbal features, such as aspect marking and predicate formation, and nominal characteristics, including case marking and possessive agreement. Through detailed syntactic and morphological analysis, the study demonstrates how Crimean

Tatar employs these constructions in negation strategies alongside finite forms marked by -mA. The findings reveal the flexibility of participial constructions, which can function as predicates, noun phrases, or modifiers, depending on context. This multifunctionality enriches the language's system of negation and aspect, offering insights into patterns across grammatical categories.

Purpose. The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to determine the verbal and nominal features of Crimean Tatar participial constructions like *Bizni körgeñiñiz yoq* “You did not see us”, 2) to clarify the grammatical status of these constructions.

Methods. This study employs a combined methodology, integrating analysis of finite and non-finite verb forms as described in prior works on Turkic languages by Kornfilt (1997), Johanson & Csató (1998), Göksel & Kerslake (2005), and Öttot-Kovács (2015). It also draws on Pollock's (1989) framework for negation in finite and non-finite verbs and Alexiadou's (2001) approach to nominalization patterns. Based on these methodologies, the research addresses: a) the morphological and syntactic models of the studied constructions; b) the functional peculiarities of these constructions in negated, affirmative, and interrogative contexts; c) the semantic characteristics and usage of the predicate *yoq* compared with other negation devices; d) the nominal and verbal characteristics of the -GAn participle.

Results. Until now, negative constructions with -GAn *yoq* have not been a central focus of study. Although grammars describe these constructions as equivalent to suffixed modes (Memetov, 2006; Jankowski, 2010; Seit-Celal, 2021), corpus studies indicate their peripheral role. For example, suffixed negation with -DI occurs ~11,000 times, suffixed negation with -GAn appears ~8,000 times, while possessive constructions with -GAn *yoq* are limited to ~250 examples. The study shows that in non-finite negation constructions, the participle's agreement with the subject's person, akin to possessive noun constructions (e.g., *Menim tatam yoq* “I have no sister”), is a key feature that aligns them closer to nominal possessive constructions. The optional genitive case marking of the subject in these constructions also highlights similarities with finite verb sentences. Overall, -GAn *yoq* negation emerges as a hybrid form combining nominal and verbal features.

Discussion. The category of possessiveness is a feature of nominal parts of speech, and the ability to agree in possessiveness distinguishes non-finite verb forms from finite verbs. In Crimean Tatar, the use of the participle -GAn with possessive markers – characteristic of nominal parts of speech – is a defining feature of its nominalization. Case agreement, in particular, plays a crucial role in this process. This analysis underscores the nominalization of the -GAn participle in Crimean Tatar and its role in the language's rich system of negation strategies.

Keywords: finite verb, non-finite verb, negation, perfect, Crimean Tatar.

Відомості про автора

Тищенко-Монастирська Оксана, кандидат філологічних наук, науковий співробітник Інституту мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України, доцент кафедри тюркології Інституту філології Київського національного університету Тараса Шевченка (Україна), e-mail: tyshcheo@knu.ua

Tyshchenko-Monastyrська Oksana, PhD in Philology, Research Fellow at the A. A. Potebnya Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Associate Professor of the Department of Turkology at the Institute of Philology of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine), e-mail: tyshcheo@knu.ua

ORCID 0000-0001-8515-1657

Надійшла до редакції 02 грудня 2024 року

Прийнято до друку 16 грудня 2024 року