Turkish has a number of negative sensitive elements like *kimse / hiç kimse* 'no one / anyone', *hicbir şey* ‘nothing / anything’, *hic* ‘never’ as well as *katiyyen* ‘in any way’ and *asla* ‘never’. Since these elements require the presence of sentential negation or the negative suffix –*siz* ‘without’, they were generally treated as negative polarity items (NPIs) in previous work (Aygen 1998; Kelepir 2001, 2003). On the other hand, it has been shown in more recent work that some of these elements are behaving more like negative concord items (NCIs) in the language (Şener 2007; Kamali 2017). However, none of these studies has provided an analysis in which the distributional, syntactic and semantic characteristics of these elements have been thoroughly analyzed. In this work, I investigate these elements by utilizing a set of diagnostic tests proposed in prior work. The findings show that these elements pair with NCIs rather than NPIs in Turkish. Also, the behavior of NCIs displays close similarities to that of universal quantifiers in terms of locality and some other criteria.

Vallduví (1994) and, in a recent paper, Giannakidou (2000) argue that certain properties of NCIs are different from that of NPIs cross-linguistically in the sense that the former:

1. are able to occur in isolation as fragment answers,
2. can be modified by such elements as *almost* and *absolutely*,
3. do not need to be c-commanded by a licenser (i.e. can occur in the subject position),
4. cannot appear in non-negative contexts,
5. cannot be long-distance bound.

The question that should be addressed here is how negative sensitive elements in Turkish behave with respect to these criteria. Consider the following data in (2)-(6).

(2) A: Kim gel-di?
    who came
B: Hiçkimse.
   No one (√ fragment answers)

(3) Neredeyse hiç kimse uyu-ma-dı.
    almost no one sleep-NEG-PAST (√ modifiability)
   ‘Almost no one slept.’

(4) Hiçkimse gel-me-di.
    no one come-NEG-PAST
   ‘No one came.’ (√ pre-negative)

(5) * Hiçkimse var mı?
    no one exist Q
   ‘Is there no one?’ (√ no non-negative context)

(6) * Ahmet [ hiç kimse-nin gel-diğ-i-ni] söyle-me-di.
    Ahmet no one-GEN come-NMN-POSS-ACC tell-NEG-PAST
   ‘Ahmet didn’t tell that anyone came.’ (√ clause-boundedness)

Based on these five diagnostic tests, the above data show that the negative element *hiçkimse* ‘no one’ displays all the characteristics of a typical NCI observed across languages. In fact, this is true of other negative sensitive elements in Turkish, as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative element</th>
<th>Diagnostic 1 (fragment answer)</th>
<th>Diagnostic 2 (modifiability)</th>
<th>Diagnostic 3 (pre-negative)</th>
<th>Diagnostic 4 (non-negative)</th>
<th>Diagnostic 5 (clause-boundedness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiçkimse</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimse</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiçbir şey</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asla</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katiyyen</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakin</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In that sense, the negative sensitive elements in Turkish should be considered to be NCIs and not NPIs. Note that the data also have some counterexamples in that *kimse* and *hic* can appear in non-negative environments. However, this is accounted for by arguing that the element *kimse* also has an indefinite use in the language and this is how it is interpreted in non-negative contexts. Similarly, *hic* is shown to be polysemous in the sense that it is interpreted as ‘never’ in negative contexts, as a true NCI, and as ‘ever’ in non-negative environments. The data also indicate that Turkish NCIs display the properties of universal quantifiers rather than indefinites or the existential. For instance, even though long-distance is not allowed, this is possible through transparent domains, as shown in (7).

   Ahmet no one-with talk-INF want-NEG-PROG
   ‘Ahmet does not want to talk to anyone.’

The sentence in (7) shows that NCIs are licensed in infinitival domains, just like universal quantifiers. Similarly, NCIs in Turkish, just like universals, cannot be used as predicative nominals. Consider the contrast between (8a) and (8b).

   s/he one pilot NEG.COP     s/he not one pilot NEG.COP
   ‘S/he is not a pilot.’          ‘S/he is no pilot.’

In conclusion, I have shown in this paper that negative sensitive elements in Turkish have been re-analyzed as NCIs and it was shown that they exhibit the characteristics of universals.
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