Online Resource 2 — Fine-grained functional categories by subcorpus (primary function), any-function counts, and formal-type inventory

Source: negation_annotation.tsv (adjudicated), analyse.py. Counts are of analytical instances (CTRL-SUPP excluded).

Table S1. Primary function by subcorpus (adjudicated codes)

Code	Category	IG	YT	YZ	Horoscope	CTRL
DIR	Negative directive	29	82	87	198	3
ASCR	Backgrounded ascription	19	67	86	172	26
PROB	Asserted unfavourable state	7	28	29	64	2
REAS	Reassurance	9	15	25	49	2
NPRED	Neutral negative assertion/prediction	5	19	25	49	1
COR	Corrective contrast	5	13	10	28	2
PART	Audience/case partition	3	12	12	27	7
NONEX	Neutral absence/non-occurrence	3	7	8	18	21
HEDG	Commitment reduction	3	7	6	16	2
REJ	Rejectio	0	12	2	14	9

Code	Category	IG	YT	YZ	Horoscope	CTRL
	n/refusal					
ALT	Alternative pole	1	9	2	12	1
ADD	Additive expansion	1	3	7	11	7
CONC	Concessive	1	5	4	10	2
INT	Interactional (tag, rhetorical question)	8	0	0	8	0
DI	Implicit denial (residual)	4	4	0	8	4
DE	Explicit denial	1	1	3	5	2
IDM	Idiom	2	2	0	4	1
UNCL	Unclassified	1	0	0	1	0
	Total	102	286	306	694	92

Table S2. Any-function counts (an instance counted once for each function it carries)

Horoscope: DIR 204, ASCR 177, REAS 73, PROB 65, HEDG 49, NPRED 49, COR 33, DI 27, PART 27, NONEX 19, REJ 14, CONC 13, ALT 12, ADD 11, INT 10, DE 5, IDM 4, UNCL 1. Control: ASCR 26, NONEX 21, DI 11, REJ 9, PART 7, ADD 7, DIR 3, REAS 3, PROB 2, COR 2, CONC 2, HEDG 2, DE 2, NPRED 1, IDM 1, ALT 1.

Multifunctional instances: horoscope 98/694 (14.1%), control 8/92 (8.7%). Commonest pairs (horoscope): DIR–REAS 20; HEDG–NPRED 10; HEDG–PROB 9; COR–REAS 8; HEDG–REAS 7; DI–HEDG 6.

Table S3. Formal types (field formal_type) — horoscope / control

VERB (finite -mA) 182 / 13; PTCP/NMLZ 101 / 10; NMLZ 67 / 8; SIZ 89 / 17 (+ 1 / 7 formerly lexicalised -sIz forms adjudicated as instances); DEGIL 73 / 9; LEX 40 / 8; CVB 33 / 5; MOD-NEC (-mAmAlI) 20 / 0; YOK 18 / 3 (+1 YOK-PART); MOD-POSS (-mAyAbilir) 15 / 0; +ABIL feature: VERB+ABIL 18 / 7, PTCP/NMLZ+ABIL 27 / 4, NMLZ+ABIL 5, MOD-POSS+ABIL 3, CVB+ABIL 1; NENE 0 / 1. In Table 5 of the article, PTCP/NMLZ and NMLZ

(with their +ABIL variants) are pooled as “participle/nominalisation”; VERB and VERB+ABIL as “finite verbal -mA”; MOD-POSS and MOD-POSS+ABIL as “-mAyAbilir”; SIZ and LEXZ(SIZ)-instances as “-sIz”.

Table S4. Per-text rate comparisons within the horoscope genre (Mann–Whitney, two-sided)

IG vs YT: U = 415, p = .61, r = .08. IG vs YZ: U = 243, p = .0037 (Holm .011), r = .44. YT vs YZ: U = 284, p = .022 (Holm .045), r = .35. Kruskal–Wallis H(2) = 9.32, p = .009.

Table S5. Lexicalised forms (status = lexicalised; not function-coded; n = 103)

beklenmedik 24 (IG 4, YT 11, YZ 9; CTRL 0); olumsuz 11; sonsuz 8; taşınmaz 7; rahatsız 6; inanılmaz 6; sessiz 5; bağımsız(lık) 6; anlaşmazlık 4; others ≤ 2. At adjudication the author counted sahipsiz, işsizlik, düzensiz, itibarsızlaştırmak and one instance of sessiz as transparent privatives (instances).

Table S6. Excluded candidates (status = excluded; n = 78)

Retrieval false positives 41; verbatim copy of AST-YZ-02 inside AST-YZ-05 17; repeated block inside AST-YZ-23 3; enumerative/quotative yok 5; temporal -mAdAn önce 2 and -Ar -mAz 2; conjunction yoksa 2; non-negation/anomalous 4; transcriber note 1; garbled token 1.