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Abstract

The paper discusses the morphological make-up of the converbial ending –mAdAn in adverbial clauses denoting temporal antecedence (before-clauses) and negative manner (without-clauses). In clauses denoting temporal antecedence, the converbial ending is optionally followed by the postposition önce ‘before’. The argument presented in the paper is that the converbial ending –mAdAn contains a negative marker –mA only in clauses where it is not followed by önce, while when the postposition follows, it contains the homophonous nominalizing suffix instead. Evidence for the claim comes on the one hand, from the fact that –mAdAn önce clauses do not license negative polarity items (but –mAdAn clauses do), and on the other, from the fact that –mAdAn önce clauses allow an addition of a negation marker to the verb (but –mAdAn clauses do not).

1. Introduction

The topic of this paper is the morphological structure of the Turkish converbial ending –mAdAn.\textsuperscript{2} This ending is found in two types of adverbial clauses. On the one hand, it appears in

\textsuperscript{1} Acknowledgements to be added.

\textsuperscript{2} Throughout the paper, I refer to the form in question as converbial ending rather than as converbial suffix or simply verb. This is motivated by the intuition that the term verb refers to the form that contains both the ending and
adverbial clauses denoting temporal antecedence, which correspond in meaning to English clauses headed by the preposition before. In such clauses, the converb is optionally followed by the postposition önce ‘before’. An example of such an adverbial clause is given in (1).

1) Müdür tatil -e çıkm-a-dan (önce) ev -in -i ara -d1 -m
director vacation-DAT go -NEG-ABL before home-3.SG.-ACC seek-PAST-1.SG.
‘Before the director went on vacation, I called his home.’ Kornfilt (1997: 70)

The second type of adverbial clauses in which –mAdAn appears denote negative manner. Such clauses are parallel in meaning to English clauses headed by without (Göksel and Kerslake 2005) and they disallow the presence of the postposition önce. An adverbial clause denoting negative manner is given in (2).

2) Ayşey-i ziyaret et-me -den (*önce) ev -e git-ti -m.
Ayşe -ACC visit do-NEG-ABL before home-DAT go -PAST-1SG
‘I went home without visiting Ayşe.’

The ending –mAdAn is morphologically complex: it consists of the ablative case marker –dAn, and the morpheme –mA. As is obvious from the glosses in the examples (1) and (2), the latter is, in the literature on Turkish, classified as the negative suffix –mA, rather than the nominalization marker, which has the same form (Göksel and Kerslake 2005: 412, Kornfilt 1997: 70; Lewis 1967: 182). The most convincing evidence that the –mA in –mAdAn is indeed the negation marker, rather than the homophonous nominalization suffix, comes from the stress pattern of words (converbs) containing –mAdAn. Although the word stress in Turkish by-and-large (although not exclusively) falls on the word-final syllable, converbs containing the ending –mAdAn receive stress on the syllable preceding the ending, as the capitalization in examples in (3) indicates. In these examples, as well as in (1) and (2), the main stress falls on the syllable the verb to which it is attached, while the term suffix appears inadequate given that –mAdAn is morphologically complex.
preceding \(-mAdAn\), rather than on the word-final syllable \((-dAn)\), regardless of whether the converbial ending \(-mAdAn\) is followed by \(önce\), as in (3)a, or not, as in (3)b.

   ‘The problems seem to have started before I came.’

   b. Sorun -lar ben GEL -me -den başla -miş, problem-PL.I come-NEG-ABL begin-EVID
   ‘The problems seem to have started before I came.’

The irregular stress pattern observed in (1) through (3) is typical of the negative suffix \(-mA\). This suffix is exceptional with respect to stress in any environment in which it appears: first, it cannot receive stress even when it is word-final, as shown by the contrast in (4).

4) a. Ora -ya GIT-me!
   there-DAT go -NEG
   ‘Don’t go there!’

   b. *Ora-ya git-ME!

Next, when the negative marker \(-mA\) is not in the word-final position, it prevents stress from being assigned to the final syllable. Instead, the word stress falls on the syllable immediately preceding \(-mA\). This is shown in (5).

   meeting-LOC Ayşe at-all talk -NEG -PAST.3SG
   ‘At the meeting, Ayşe didn’t talk at all.’

   b. *Toplantı-da Ayşe hiç konuş-ma-DI.

A parallel example in (6) shows that it is indeed the presence of the negation in (5) that is responsible for the exceptional stress. In (6), which does not contain \(-mA\), the stress falls on the word-final syllable of the verb.

3 The negative marker is therefore one of Turkish prestressing suffixes (see, for example, Kabak and Vogel (2001) and Kahnemuyipor and Kornfilt (2006) for the discussion of the syntax of prestressing suffixes in Turkish).
6) Toplantı-da Ayşe çok konuş-TU.
   meeting-LOC Ayşe a-lot talk -PAST.3SG
   ‘At the meeting, Ayşe talked a lot.’

The nominalizing suffix –mA,⁴ on the other hand, behaves regularly with respect to stress, i.e. not
only can it bear stress, as shown in (7)a), where it is found in the nominalized verb, but also
when non-final, allows the stress to shift “across” it to the final syllable, as shown in (7)b), where
it is found in an embedded nominalized clause.⁵

7) a. Ne güzel konuş-MA!
   what beautiful talk -N
   ‘What a beautiful talk!’

   Ali Ayşe-GEN talk -N -3SG-ACC want-PAST.3SG
   ‘Ali wanted Ayşe to talk.’

Given that in examples containing the converbial ending –mAdAn the stress invariably falls on
the syllable preceding –mA, we have a strong indicator that this converbial ending contains the
negation suffix, rather than the nominalizer.

Support for this claim also comes from the fact, pointed out by Göksel and Kerslake
(2005: 417) and Kornfilt (1997: 70), that the subject in adverbial clauses such as (3)a) and (3)b)
does not carry the genitive case marker, and the verb itself does not appear with agreement
morphology (Kornfilt 1997). The absence of these two properties, normally associated with the
nominalizing –mA (in embedded nominalized clauses), suggests that we are dealing here with the
negative marker instead. When the subject of an adverbial clause containing –mAdAn is marked
genitive and the verb appears with an agreement marker, as in (8) below, the irregular stress

---

⁴ Kornfilt (1997) calls the nominalizing suffix –mA an action nominal and glosses it as A.Nom. For the purposes of
this paper, I refer to it simply as the nominalizer/nominalizing suffix –mA and gloss it as N.

⁵ The following pairs of words, from Sezer (1981), show a clear contrast between the behavior of the nominalizer
and that of the negative marker with respect to stress:

   (i) gelmé ‘coming’ sinamá ‘testing’
       gélme ‘don’t come’ sinámá ‘don’t test’
pattern is replaced by a regular one. In this case, the stress falls on the word-final syllable \( -dAn \), as expected, suggesting that this time, the \( -mA \) in the converbial ending is in fact the nominalization marker.

8) \[ \text{Ali [Hasan-} \text{ın o -nu uyar-} \text{ma-} \text{sun -DAN önce ] oday -1 topla -di.} \]
\[ \text{Ali Has} \text{an -GEN he-ACC warn -N -POSS.3SG-ABL before room-ACC tidy.up- PAST} \]
\[ \text{‘Ali tidied up the room before Hasan warned him.’} \]

It is, however, interesting to note that in examples like (8), where the subject of the adverbial clause is marked genitive and the converbial ending features the agreement marker, the postposition önce is obligatory, as shown by the ill-formedness of (9). Perhaps not surprisingly, (8) can only denote temporal antecedence, but not negative manner.\(^6\)

9) \[ \ast \text{Ali [Hasan-} \text{ın o -nu uyar-} \text{ma-} \text{sun -DAN] oday -1 topla -di.} \]
\[ \text{Ali Has} \text{an -GEN he-ACC warn -N -POSS.3SG-ABL room-ACC tidy.up- PAST} \]
\[ \text{Intended: ‘Ali tidied up the room without Hasan warning him.’} \]

The fact that the postposition önce is obligatory exactly in the environment where the suffix \( -mA \) is unambiguously a nominalizing suffix (as indicated by the case marking on the subject, agreement marking on the converbial ending, and regular stress) makes it plausible to ask whether this morpheme is in fact a nominalizer in all cases when the postposition is present, despite the identical stress pattern in clauses that contain \( -mAdAn \) followed by önce and those in which önce is absent. This is the question that I address here.

In the rest of the paper, I show that for a subset of speakers, the two constructions in fact show different properties. For these speakers, the verb \( -mAdAn \) that precedes önce does not display properties normally associated with a negative element, while the verb \( -mAdAn \) that is not followed by önce does. In particular, the relevant speakers do not allow adverbial clauses

\(^6\) Thus, (8) differs from (i) below in that (i) is ambiguous between the before-reading and the without-reading:

(i) \[ \text{Ali [Hasan o -nu uyar-} \text{ma-DAN] oday -1 topla -di.} \]
\[ \text{Ali Has} \text{an he-ACC warn -N -ABL room-ACC tidy.up-PAST} \]
\[ \text{‘Ali tidied up the room before Hasan warned him / Ali tidied up the room without Hasan warning him.’} \]
with –mAdAn önce to contain Negative Polarity Items (NPI’s), while no such restriction exists on adverbial clauses that contain –mAdAn, but do not contain önce. Furthermore, the –mAdAn önce marginally allows an addition of a negation marker, whereas this is completely impossible when –mAdAn is not followed by the postposition. I take these judgments to mean that in the grammar of the relevant speakers, the suffix –mA found in the converbial construction –mAdAn önce is not (or is no longer) analyzed as a negative marker, but is rather re-interpreted as the nominalizer –mA, regardless of the stress pattern. This re-analysis is not entirely unexpected, given that the verb in question, when followed by önce, looks like a nominal element based on two properties: (i) it is the complement of a postposition and postpositions take nominal complements, and (ii) it is case-marked, another salient property of nominals. However, since the same verb when not followed by önce is still interpreted as containing a negative suffix rather than the nominalizer despite the fact that it also contains a case marker, it seems that being the complement of a postposition is the crucial cue that drives the re-analysis from the negation marker –mA to the nominalizer –mA in the converbial construction –mAdAn önce.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2, I present the data which show diverging behavior of the converbial ending –mAdAn in environments where it is and is not followed by the postposition önce. The data involve the compatibility of –mAdAn with NPIs on the one hand, and with an addition of a negative marker on the other. The discussion leads to the conclusion that the –mA in –mAdAn önce is not a negative marker, while the one in the converbial ending –mAdAn that is not followed by önce is. This in turn points to the conclusion that the former morpheme is the nominalizer –mA. Section 3 is the conclusion.
2. –mAdAn vs. –mAdAn önce

Before we start reviewing the evidence for the claim that –mAdAn and –mAdAn önce do not involve the same morphological make-up of the converbial ending, it has to be stated that the judgments reported by native speakers on the two constructions vary dramatically, not only across speakers, but often also within an individual speaker. While such variability obviously stands in the way of making categorical claims about the structure of the ending in question, it is nevertheless the case that a subset of speakers consistently report judgments on which the present analysis is based. If I am correct that for this subset of speakers there is a shift from analyzing the –mA in –mAdAn önce as a negation marker to analyzing it as a nominalizer, perhaps it can be claimed that the variability found across and within speakers is due to the fact that this part of Turkish grammar is more generally unstable and that this shift may be gradually spreading. With this much in mind, let us proceed with the investigation of the two constructions.

2.1. Negative Polarity Items

Kelepir (2001) shows that NPI’s in Turkish are licensed in environments containing a negative operator and in yes/no questions, as illustrated by (10) and (11) respectively.

   John anybody -ACC see -NEG -PAST.3SG
   ‘John didn’t see anybody.’

   John anybody -ACC see -PAST.3SG

   Hasan ever America-DAT come-PAST.3SG Q
   ‘Has Hasan ever come to America?’

Given these licensing conditions on NPI’s in Turkish, we can form the following prediction about whether NPI’s will or will not be licensed in adverbial clauses containing –mAdAn: if the –
ma in the converbial ending is invariably a negative marker, then such clauses should be fine with NPI’s regardless of whether they do or do not also contain the postposition önce. If, on the other hand, we find that NPI’s are licensed only in a subset of the clauses containing –mAdAn, then we are well advised to analyze the –ma in those clauses from which NPI’s are banned not as a negative marker, but as something else, most plausibly as the nominalizer –ma. While the judgments are highly heterogeneous both across and within individual speakers, there is a group of speakers who consistently confirm the latter prediction: for these speakers, NPI’s are banned whenever the converb containing –mAdAn is followed by önce, and are allowed whenever this is not the case. The relevant examples are given in (12) through (14). The embedded adverbial clause in (12) contains an NPI subject, the one in (13) an NPI object, while in (14), the NPI is an adverb. All of the examples are judged as ungrammatical when –mAdAn is followed by önce (examples in a). However, when the postposition is not present, they become well-formed (examples in b).7, 8

12) a. *(Hiç)kimse fark -et -meden önce hata -m -t dürzel -t -ti -m. anybody notice-do-MADAN before error-POSS.1SG-ACC correct-CAUS-PAST-1SG Intended: ‘I corrected my error before anybody noticed it.’

    b. (Hiç)kimse fark -et -meden hata -m -t dürzel -t -ti -m. anybody notice-do-MADAN error-POSS.1SG-ACC correct-CAUS-PAST-1SG ‘I corrected my error before anybody noticed it / without anybody noticing it.’


7 In these examples, I gloss the converbial ending simply as –mAdAn, without committing myself to analyzing the suffix –mA either as a negation marker or as a nominalizer.

8 Recall from the Introduction that the present analysis is based on the judgments of a subset of native speakers of Turkish; so, not all the speakers report the contrast in (12) and (13). Interestingly, however, all of them do report the contrast in (14). The fact that all native speakers I consulted find (14)a ungrammatical lends support to the analysis I am proposing. I have no explanation, however, for why some of the speakers who find (14)a ill-formed also report that (12)a and (13)a are well-formed, regardless of whether the NPI in these examples do or do not contain hiç.
b. (Hıç)kimsey-i ziyaret et -meden bura-ya gel -di -m.
anybody -ACC visit do-MADAN here-DAT come-PAST-1SG
‘Before I visited anybody, I came here / I came here without visiting anybody.’

14) a. *Ayşe’-yle hiç konuş-madan önce toplantı -dan çıkm -ti -m.
Ayşe -with at-all talk -MADAN before meeting-ABL exit-PAST-1SG
*Intended: ‘I left the meeting before talking to Ayşe at all.’

b. Ayşe’-yle hiç konuş-madan toplantı -dan çıkm -ti -m.
Ayşe -with at-all talk -MADAN meeting-ABL exit-PAST-1SG
‘I left the meeting before talking to Ayşe at all / I left the meeting without talking to
Ayşe at all.’

If the suffix –mA in the converbial ending –mAdAn were a negative marker across-the-board, we
would not expect the contrast that we observe in (12)-(14). The fact that the contrast exists
suggests that –mA is a negative marker only in (12)b)-(14)b), but not in (12)a)-(14)a). In light of
these data, I would like to propose that in (12)a)-(14)a), the –mA in –mAdAn önce is a
nominalizing suffix, rather than a negation marker. This proposal receives support from the fact
that, with respect to NPI’s, these examples are parallel to adverbial clauses in which the subject
is marked genitive, and the converbial ending –mAdAn contains an agreement marker. The latter
also disallow NPI’s, as (15) shows.

15) *(Hıç)kimse-nin fark et -me-sin -den önce
anybody -GEN notice-do-MA-POSS.3SG-ABL before
hata -m -1 düzelt -t -ti -m.
error-POSS.1SG-ACC correct-CAUS-PAST-1SG
*Intended: ‘I corrected my error before anybody noticed it.’

Recall from (8) above that the presence of both genitive marking on the subject of the adverbial
clause and the agreement morphology on the embedded verb clearly indicates that the –mA in the
converbial ending of such clauses is the nominalizer.9 The fact that (12)a) displays the same
incompatibility with NPI’s as (15) does makes it plausible to explain this behavior by the
absence of the a negative marker in both examples.

---

9 This is also suggested by the regular stress pattern observed in examples like this.
If we wanted to defend the opposite stance, namely, if we wanted to argue that all of the examples in (12) through (14) in fact contain a negative marker (as indicated by the identical stress pattern displayed by all of them, compatible only with such an analysis), we could possibly attribute the contrast between the examples in (a) and those in (b) to the presence of the negative semantics in the former and the absence thereof in the latter. Kornfilt (1997), in her discussion of the example (1) in this paper, which I borrowed from her work, explicitly states that “the subordinate clause illustrated in [this example] not only lacks agreement, [but] exhibits an unusual morpheme on its predicate: the negative morpheme –mA (which, however, does not negate the predicate semantically in this usage [emphasis mine]).” (pg. 70). So, one could possibly say that examples in (12)b)-(14)b, those that do not contain önce, license NPI’s because the negative marker is not only syntactically present, but also contributes the semantic negativeness to the interpretation of the embedded clause (comparable to the negativeness of the parallel English clauses containing the preposition without). Note, however, that adverbial clauses which do not contain önce are semantically ambiguous: they can denote both temporal antecedence, as well as negative manner, as indicated by the translation of the example in (16) below, which is identical to (13)b), modulo the presence of the NPI object.

16) Ali’-yi ziyaret et -meden bura-ya gel -di -m.
   Ali -ACC visit do-MADAN here-DAT come-PAST-1SG

So, one of the possible interpretations of these examples is completely equivalent with the interpretation of examples that do contain önce. Crucially, this is also the case with the sentences that contain NPI elements: the grammatical cases (those that do not contain önce) remain ambiguous. So, if we were to say that (12)a)-(14)a are ungrammatical because the negative semantic is absent from adverbial clauses denoting temporal antecedence (and this is
the only possible interpretation of these examples, as indicated by the presence of önce), then we are hard pressed to explain how come that the absence of the negative semantics in clauses that also denote temporal antecedence but do not contain önce does not preclude the presence of NPI’s. I conclude, therefore, that the contrasts we observe in the licensing of NPI’s in clauses in which the converbial ending –mAdAn is and is not followed by önce argue against a uniform analysis of the morphological make-up of the converbial ending. In particular, when –mAdAn is not followed by önce, it contains a negative marker (which licenses the presence of NPI’s); on the other hand, when –mAdAn is followed by önce, it is best analyzed as containing a nominalizing suffix (which is not capable of licensing NPI’s).

In the following section, we will see some additional evidence for this claim, which comes from the marginal acceptability of an additional negation marker in adverbial clauses containing önce, and the absolute unacceptability of such a marker in adverbial clauses that do not contain the postposition.

2.2. Compatibility of –mAdAn with an additional negation

Adverbial clauses denoting both negative manner and temporal antecedence are normally not negated, as shown by (17) below.

17) a. ??I called him without not finishing dinner.

b. ??I called him before not finishing dinner.

Tsoulas (2013) argues that the reason why before-clauses are incompatible with negation is the presupposition failure that obtains in examples like (17)b. According to him, “a before-clause carries a presupposition that there exist a unique, contextually salient and identifiable time t such that the relevant event expressed by the before-clause took place at t.” If an event in the before-
clause is negated, no such unique and identifiable time exists. This leads to a presupposition failure. I believe that the same argument (with minor modifications) may be extended to explaining the impossibility of negation in clauses denoting negative manner. A *without*-clause may not carry a presupposition that there is a unique time associated with the event denoted by the clause, but it seems to carry at least the presupposition that there is an event (denoted by the *without*-clause) such that this event is unique, contextually salient, and identifiable. By adding negation to the proposition expressed in the *without*-clause, the event loses its “uniqueness”, and the presupposition fails. So, clauses denoting temporal antecedence and clauses denoting negative manner both seem to carry a presupposition of the uniqueness of the event that they express and both are incompatible with negation (i.e., when the event denoted by such clauses is negated, presupposition fails).

However, if the presupposition of the uniqueness of the event denoted by the adverbial clause can be preserved even in the presence of the negation in the clause, the result is acceptable. Consider the following scenario:

18) A student is accused of smoking in the lavatory of Hogwarts. He is interrogated by two staff members: Ms. McGonagall and Madam Pomfrey. Ms. McGonagall leads the interview:

   Ms. McGonagall: So, you were alone in the lavatory, weren’t you?
   Student: Well, yes, mostly. At one point somebody did come in, and then left, but I didn’t see who it was.
   Ms. McGonagall: Ok, well tell me: did you smoke in the lavatory?
   Student: — (doesn't say anything, just looks down at his lap)
   Ms. McGonagall: I see. Ok, off you go, we’ll talk again.

   Afterwards, McGonagall and Madam Pomfrey are talking to one another:

   Ms. McGonagall: I am certain we caught our smoker. We will punish him, so it will serve as an example for other kids not to do something like that.
   Madam Pomfrey: I am actually not sure that he was the one who smoked in the
lavatory.

Ms. McGonagall: What do you mean? When I asked him whether it was him, he didn’t deny it.

19) Madam Pomfrey: Yes, but **before not denying it**, he did say that someone else was there.

The last remark by Madam Pomfrey (numbered as example (19)) contains an acceptable negated before-clause (**before not denying it**). If the usual incompatibility of before-clauses with negation is due to a uniqueness presupposition failure, then the acceptability of this particular negated clause follows: the event in which the student did not deny the misconduct is unique and easily identifiable in the context causing the presupposition to go through.

What is of interest for our purposes is to see how (19) translates into Turkish. Given that adverbial clauses denoting temporal antecedence in Turkish may or may not contain the postposition **önce** following the converbial ending –*mAdAn* (without a change in meaning), it should be possible to render the meaning of the example in (19) equally with **önce**, as in (20)a), and without **önce**, as in (20)b). My informants, however, report that although neither of the two sentences in (20) is well-formed, there is a clear contrast between them: while (20)a) is degraded, (20)b) is completely impossible.

20) a. *Evet, ama inkar et-me -meden **önce,**
    yes but denial do-NEG-MADAN before
    tuvalet-te başka biri -nin ol-duğ-u -nu söyle-di.
    toilet -LOC other someone-GEN be-DIK -3SG-ACC say -PAST.3SG

b. *Evet, ama inkar et-me -meden,
    yes but denial do-NEG-MADAN
    tuvalet-te başka biri -nin ol-duğ-u -nu söyle-di.
    toilet -LOC other someone-GEN be-DIK -3SG-ACC say -PAST.3SG

Assuming that there is exactly one morphological slot for negation in the converbial ending –*mAdAn*, if this slot is already occupied, it is not surprising that another negation marker cannot
be added to it. Thus, (20)b is completely out.\(^10\) If, on the other hand, adding a negation marker to \(\texttt{mAdAn}\) results in a comparatively better sentence, as in (20)a, then, under the same assumption, we are lead to conclude that the suffix \(\texttt{m}\) in \(\texttt{mAdAn önce}\) does not fill the negation slot. This in turn suggests that the \(\texttt{m}\) which precedes the ablative ending \(\texttt{dAn}\) in (20)a is in fact not a negation marker, but rather a nominalizer, in line with the argument from NPI licensing presented in 2.1 above.

Of course, if I am correct in arguing that the relatively improved status of (20)a is due to the absence of the negative marker in \(\texttt{mAdAn önce}\), we need an explanation for why this example is not perfect even for those speakers who disallow NPI’s in the scope of the converbial ending followed by \(\texttt{önce}\). While at the moment I can offer no such explanation, I would like to note that an additional \(\texttt{m}\) in the converbial ending is not perfect even when the converb carries an agreement marker, which, as we saw in section 1 above, is an unambiguous indication that it contains a nominalizing, rather than the negation marker \(\texttt{m}\). This is shown by (21), which is judged as just marginally better than (20)a.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(21)} & \quad ?/? \quad \text{Evet, ama inkar et me-sin den önce,} \\
& \quad \text{yes but denial do-NEG-N POSS.3SG-ABL before} \\
& \quad \text{tuvalet-te başka biri -nin ol-duğ-u -nu söyle-di.} \\
& \quad \text{toilet -LOC other someone-GEN be-DIK -3SG-ACC say -PAST.3SG}
\end{align*}\]

It is possible that the degraded status of both (20)a and (21) is related to the presupposition introduced by \(\texttt{önce} \) ‘before’, discussed above. In other words, perhaps the context in (18) is not sufficient for Turkish native speakers to save the presupposition of the uniqueness of the event

\(^{10}\) This is not to say that a sentence cannot contain more than one negative element. The example in (i) below, from Kornfilt (1997), shows that such sentences are possible:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(i)} & \quad \text{(Ben) bugün mac -a git-me -yecek değil -im.} \\
& \quad \text{I today match-DAT go-NEG-FUT NEG.COP-1SG} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘It is not the case that I will not go to the game today.’

The well-formedness of (i) thus indicates that the problem with (20)b is not in the semantics, but rather in the morphology.
expressed by the proposition in the adverbial clause, given that the event is negated. In any case, what is important for our purposes is to observe that (20)a) and (21) are both judged as equally degraded, but crucially, as comparatively better than (20)b). This suggests that the converbial endings found in (20)a) and (21) have identical morphological make-up, different from the morphological make-up of the homophonous converbial ending in (20)b). At the moment, I have to leave the problem of why these examples are not perfect for future research.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, we saw evidence which suggests that the converbial ending in –mAdAn and –mAdAn önce adverbial clauses, although superficially identical, are not composed of identical morphemes: the former contains a negation marker, while the latter seems to contain a nominalizing suffix instead. This analysis was based on two observations: (i) that –mAdAn clauses do, but –mAdAn önce clauses do not license NPI’s and (ii) that –mAdAn önce clauses marginally allow an addition of a negation marker, but –mAdAn clauses resist it. As I mentioned in the Introduction to the paper, Turkish speakers do not all report the relevant judgments (those that support this analysis). Rather, this is true only of a subset of speakers. For these speakers –mAdAn önce clauses cannot contain NPI’s and they find such clauses relatively better than –mAdAn clauses with an additional negation marker. Let us call this group T(urkish)1 group. The other group of speakers report different judgments: they allow NPI’s in the scope of –mAdAn önce,11 which indicates that they invariably analyze the –mA in the converbial ending as a negative marker. With respect to the addition of negation, this group of speakers divides into two subgroups: one behaves like the T1 group, i.e. they judge the addition of a negation marker to –  

11 Except when the NPI is the adverb hic ‘at all’, a fact that remains mysterious.
\textit{mAdAn önce} clauses better than they judge such an addition to \textit{–mAdAn} clauses. I will refer to this group as \textit{T(ukish)2 group}. The remainder of speakers allow extra negation neither in \textit{–mAdAn önce} clauses nor in \textit{–mAdAn} clauses. For these speakers, call them \textit{T(ukish)2’}, both (20)a) and (20)b) are completely impossible and the only marginally allowed option is (21), where the converb contains an agreement marker. This distribution of judgments across different groups of speakers is summarized in the Table 1 below.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker group</th>
<th>NPI’s licensed in \textit{–mAdAn önce} clauses</th>
<th>Extra negation allowed in \textit{–mAdAn önce} clauses</th>
<th>Extra negation allowed in \textit{–mAdAn} clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I suggested above that the variability in judgments that we observe across and within speakers with respect to the phenomena in question may be an indication that the grammar is shifting towards reanalyzing the \textit{–mA} in the converbial ending \textit{–mAdAn} as a nominalizer in exactly those cases when the clause containing the converb is selected by the postposition \textit{önce}. The three groups in Table 1 then illustrate different degrees to which such a reanalysis is instantiated: T1 speakers show all the properties consistent with the “new” grammar, with the exception of the stress pattern. T2 speakers retain the stress pattern and also the licensing conditions on NPI’s in \textit{–mAdAn önce} clauses from the “original” grammar. Finally, the judgments of T2’ speakers indicate that they have not started to shift towards the “new” grammar at all.
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