

**Adjunct clauses headed by postpositive markers in Turkish**  
**Baris Kabak**  
**(University of Konstanz)**

Turkish employs a number of postpositive elements to convey various syntagmatic relations. Prototypical postpositional phrases consist of a postposition that normally assigns case to the nominal phrase that it follows (1). Several postpositions can also function as clause-combiners and become the heads of adjunct clauses (2, 3). Closer examination on such adjunct clauses reveals that their subjects can be either in the Genitive (2) or in the Nominative case (3).

- (1) [Binnaz-**a göre**] bir elbise  
 [Binnaz-**DAT P**] a dress  
 "a dress suitable for Binnaz"
- (2) [[Ayşe-**nin anlat-dığ-ın]-a göre], Osman epey üzgün ol-malı**  
 [[Ayşe-**GEN tell-FNom-3sg]-**DAT P**] Osman very sad be-must  
 "According to what Ayşe says, Osman must be very sad"**
- (3) [[Ayşe-**Ø var-dığ-ın]-a göre] biz gid-ebil-ir-iz**  
 [[Ayşe-**NOM arrive-FNom-3sg]-**DAT P**] we go-able-Aor-1pl.  
 "Since Ayşe has arrived, we can go"**

While the Genitive on the subject of the embedded clause comes from the possessive agreement marker on the verb in (2), the Nominative appears in (3) despite the presence of the same possessive agreement morphology. Interestingly, the same postposition can carry different meanings. For instance, while “göre” in (2) means “according to”, the same postposition in (3) conveys causality, expressing a conjunctive meaning.

Furthermore, certain postpositional phrases (e.g., (3)) exhibit interesting similarities to adverbial clauses that carry case markers (4), and adjunct converb clauses (5).

- (4) [Ayşe-**Ø ev-e gel-diğ-in-de], ben-i ara**  
 [Ayşe-**NOM house-DAT come-FNom-3sg-**LOC I-ACC call****  
 "When Ayşe comes home, call me"
- (5) [Ali-**Ø ev-e gel-ince/-meden], ben-i ara**  
 [Ali-**NOM house-DAT come-**"when"/ "without having" I-ACC call****  
 "When/ before Ali comes home, call me"

The adjunct clauses in (4, 5) also have subjects in the Nominative and carry meanings that are typically associated with conjunctive constructions, expressing temporal relations, sequentiality, contrastiveness, causality, etc.

It seems that Turkish imposes restrictions on postpositive markers as to what kinds of syntactic hosts they can select. The differences in the kinds of meaning they express may depend on the kind of host they attach to. The empirical question, thus, remains as to whether the various functions of Turkish postpositive markers can be classified systematically.

In this paper, I will first provide a detailed examination of various syntactic and semantic functions of such adjunct clauses. Second, I will propose an analysis that classifies postpositive markers into (at least) two groups: (i) those that select nominal complements (e.g., *göre*<sub>(1)</sub> in (2)), (ii) those that select only clausal complements (e.g.,

*göre*<sub>(2)</sub> in (3); Locative in (4)). While in (i), sentential complements are genuinely nominal through a syntactic requirement, those in (ii) acquire noun-hood due to a morphological condition that requires the host of case-markers to be nominal. This account correctly predicts the nominal morphology on the subordinate predicates in (2, 3, and 4) since these complements serve as the hosts of case markers, which come from postpositions (e.g., Dative in (2, 3)), or are case-markers themselves that function as adverbials (e.g., Locative in (4)). The subject is in the Genitive in (2) since the embedded clause is genuinely nominal, as is required by the postposition *göre*<sub>(1)</sub>. The nominative on the subject in (3) and (4), however, appears as a default case since the Genitive case assignment fails to apply in “semi”-nominal clauses.

Third, I will discuss possible explanations for the similarities between postpositions of type (ii) and other postpositive markers illustrated in (4) and (5). I will suggest that these postpositive elements have acquired converbial functions, multiplying their meaning to include conjunctive/ discursive expressions.