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Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 20, 2016, Number 1

In 2016, TURKIC LANGUAGES celebrates its 20th anniversary. The journal was founded on 25 April 1996, when Dr Michael Langfeld, director of the publishing house Harrassowitz, and Professor Lars Johanson, editor of the new journal signed a contract.

In the first issue, in 1997, Lars Johanson set forth his editorial programme in the article “An anchorage for Turkic language studies”. Some of the main points are cited below.

The journal TURKIC LANGUAGES, introduced with this issue, aims to be an international scientific periodical devoted to Turkic language studies in a broad sense. Its goal is to meet the rapidly increasing scientific interest in Turkish and other languages of the extensive Turkic family.

TURKIC LANGUAGES will be concerned with the languages of the entire Turkic-speaking world and cover descriptive, historical, comparative, areal, social, typological, acquisitional as well as other aspects. The scope of interest will not be restricted to linguistic issues in a narrow sense; however, Turkic language data must play a central role in all contributions. Discussions on questions of philology, literature, oral texts, history, etc. are most welcome provided they are based on language data. Contributions basically dealing with theoretical issues but referring to Turkic data will also have a natural place in the journal. Attention will be paid to genetic, typological, and contact relations with other languages, in particular Altaic (Mongolic, Tungusic, etc.), Paleoasiatic, Indo-European (Iranian, Slavic, Germanic, Greek, etc.), Uralic, Chinese.

We also invite representatives of neighbouring disciplines to submit articles on topics of common interest. In order to set and maintain high theoretical and methodological standards, linguistic Turcology needs stimulation “from outside” as well.

It is hoped that the journal will promote the development of Turkic linguistics by bringing together scholars dealing with Turkic data under different perspectives. The journal is meant to be an anchorage for all kinds of serious Turkic language studies, a platform where scholars of different traditions and orientations may come together to talk and listen to each other, to establish contacts and interconnections. This should provide for innovation and contribute to the broadening of the perspectives in a field where there is still so much more to discover.

Prominent representatives of the Turcological and linguistic communities welcomed the new journal in the first issue.

In his welcoming address to the new journal, “Der neuen Zeitschrift Turkic Languages zum Geleit”, Karl Heinrich Menges gave a short sketch of the development
of Turkic studies and the concomitant attempts to create an appropriate periodical for Turkic studies.

Bernard Comrie contributed the article “Turkic languages and linguistic typology” and remarked: “At first sight it might seem strange to make a plea, as I shall, for greater cooperation between the fields of Turkic linguistics and linguistic typology, because already many features of Turkic languages play an important illustrative role in language typology”.

The other articles, authored by Geoffrey L. Lewis, Hendrik Boeschoten, Ad Backus, Marcel Erdal, Rémy Dor, and Claus Schönig, illustrated the broad range of topics to which the new journal was devoted according to its editorial programme.

Over the last twenty years, TURKIC LANGUAGES, the only scientific journal devoted exclusively to Turkic linguistics, has played an important role in this field of study. The nineteen volumes published so far cover all fields of study within Turkic and other relevant languages. Here we wish to thank the many authors who have more or less regularly contributed valuable articles. Let us remember our dear colleagues who have passed away during the course of these two decades: Árpád Berta, Gunnar Jarring, Sergej G. Kljaštornyj, Roy Andrew Miller, Vladimir P. Ndjalkov, Jurij V. Ščeka, Masahiro Shōgaito, Talat Tekin, Marc Vandamme, and Stephen Wurm.

The journal has published obituaries commemorating scholars such as Kaare Thomsen Hansen, Gerhard Doerfer, Andreas Tietze, Árpád Berta, György Hazai, and others. These are significant records for the history of our field of research.

TURKIC LANGUAGES has also published reports on interesting ongoing scholarly activities (projects, research groups, conferences, etc.), making it possible for readers to keep up to date with research initiatives. The ultimate aim of the journal has been to clear a path of communication through the landscape of Turkic language studies.

In order to document the rich material published so far, we present a list of the contents of the nineteen volumes on our website http://www.turkiclanguages.com.

One year after they appear in print, all volumes are published with free access online http://www.digizeitschriften.de/. For more information, see the website of the Harrassowitz publishing house.

From the beginning, the journal has been produced in collaboration with an international board whose members have changed over the years. Those who have been involved during the entire period are Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen, Éva Á. Csató, Dmitrij Nasilov, and Sumru Özsoy. Later, Tooru Hayasi, Peter B. Golden, Irina Nevskaya, and Astrid Menz have joined the group. Most recently, László Károly and Abdurishid Yakup have been included. We wish to thank all the members for their support over the years.

The work of our peer reviewers has ensured the high quality of the publications. Their careful comments and suggestions have been most helpful for the authors, who have thankfully acknowledged the value of this support.
We would like to express our gratitude to Dr Barbara Krauss, the present director of the Publishing House Harrassowitz, and her highly competent team for their strong support in bringing out the journal.

This jubilee issue includes contributions from the international board of editors.

Bernt Brendemoen examines the value of Karamanlidic literature for the study of spoken Turkish in the 18th and 19th centuries. He concludes that some dialectal features can be observed in the texts. He also examines the syntactic influence of Greek.

Peter B. Golden deals with the accounts of the “Great King of the Türks”, called Şâba, in the Iranian, Arabic and Transcaucasian sources, and points out that the name is not of Turkic origin.

Tooru Hayasi studies variability in linguistic judgments on examples of the usage of Turkish demonstratives bu, şu and o. Participants were Turkish monolingual high school students in Istanbul, and Turkish-German bilingual peers in Berlin. University students learning Turkish as a foreign language in Tokyo were used as a control group.

László Károly discusses 36 basic Turkic adjectives belonging to the universal semantic types of age, colour, dimension, human propensities, physical properties, speed, and value. He analyses the lexemes in terms of their semantic and morphological properties and their diachronic stability in seven modern Turkic languages: Turkish, Turkmen, Tatar, Kazakh, Uyghur, Khakas, and Yakut.

Astrid Menz investigates a type of conditional sentence in Turkish where the predicate of the embedded clause is based on a hypothetical form followed by the particle de or sometimes bile and establishes for Turkish the category of concessive conditionals.

Sumru A. Özoşoy investigates the grammaticalization of the cause-time relation in Turkish sonra clauses, and comes to the interesting conclusion that while constructions in which the embedded verb is based on -DIktAn express the temporal relation between the two events, constructions in which the verb of the embedded clause is based on -mAsIndAn encode a causal relation between the event of the matrix clause and that of the embedded clause.

Abdurishid Yakup reports on preliminary results of a project at Minzu University of China on information structure in Turkic languages that are spoken and written in Central Asia. He contrasts the properties of focus constituents in Turkish with those of some Central Asian languages, in particular Uyghur, and describes some shared and divergent features.

A paper in German concludes the issue, Ingeborg Hauenschild’s comments on Teleut plant and animal names according to an 18th century source.

_Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató_
Concessive conditionals in Turkish

Astrid Menz


The present article investigates a type of complex sentence in Turkish where the predicate of the embedded clause is based on a conditional form followed by the particle de or sometimes bile. The syntactic and semantic peculiarities of this construction in Turkish are outlined according to the exhaustive description of concessive conditionals for European languages by Haspelmath & König (1998).

Astrid Menz, Orient-Institut Istanbul, Susam Sokak 16 D. 8, TR-34433 Cihangir, Istanbul, Turkey. E-mail: menz@oidmg.org

Introduction

The type of complex sentence dealt with here has a conditional form as the predicate of the embedded clause. It does not, however, convey any conditional semantics in the sense that a situation B is brought about only under the condition that a situation A takes place. König (1994: 86) describes the semantic equivalents of this Turkish construction for German and other Germanic languages. He claims that this sentence type stands between conditional and concessive clauses in terms of its semantic and syntactic properties, and labels it Concessive Conditional. In the following, I will examine in detail this sentence type in Turkish in light of the observations made by König (1994) and Haspelmath & König (1998).

Concessive clauses

Haspelmath & König (1998: 566) give a definition of the semantic properties of concessive clauses as follows: “Concessive constructions, [...], are used to assert two propositions against the background assumption that the relevant situations do not normally go together”. The implied connection between the two clauses has, as König explains “the status of a presupposition [...] with roughly the content that there is a general incompatibility between the two propositions in question” (1988: 146).

Concessive clauses in Turkish

The main types of concessive clauses1 in Turkish are based on converb constructions in -mesine rağmen/karşın7 or -diği halde3 and, to a somewhat lesser extent, in -mekle beraber/birlikte.4

1 For a list of other possibilities see Banguoğlu (1974: 432).
2 Member of König’s group (i), (1988: 152).
For a demonstration of the definition given above on a simple Turkish example, see (1) below: despite the fact that he is ill—and that one normally would stay at home when one is ill—Ali went to work.\(^5\) In other words, the situation expressed in the subordinate clause is irrelevant for the situation expressed in the main clause.

(1) Ali hasta ol-masına rağmen iş-e git-ti.

A. ill be-CONV work-DAT go-PST3SG

Ali hasta ol-duğu halde işe gitti.

be-CONV

Ali hasta ol-makla beraber işe gitti.

be-CONV

factual factual

‘Although Ali was ill, he went to work.’

In concessive clauses, both parts of the construction, main and subordinate clause, are factual, and a speaker is normally confident of the truth of both clauses (König 1988: 146). In Turkish, the interpretation as concessive is strongest in the construction with -mesine rağmen/karşın\(^6\) and weakest with -mekle beraber. The concessive semantics in constructions with the converbs -diği halde and -mekle beraber arise from the contrast between the situations narrated in the two clauses. Depending on the context, for instance, if the contrast between the two situations in question is not very strong, constructions with olduğu halde and -mekle beraber can be interpreted simply as temporal co-occurrence, like ‘in the state of being...’ and ‘together with being ...’. Thus, example (2) could be interpreted as: tafrasına kizarım aynı zamanda kendisini severim ‘I am annoyed by his boastings (but) at the same time I do like him’ as well as tafrasına kzmama rağmen kendisini severim ‘Despite being annoyed by his boastings, I do like him’.

(2) Tafra-sın-a kız-makla beraber on-u sev-er-im.

boasting-POS3-DAT get_annoyed-CONV he-ACC like-AOR-1SG

‘Although his boastings annoy me, I do like him.’ (Banguoğlu 1974: 432)

Constructions with rağmen ‘despite’ are always concessive because of the unambiguous semantics of the postposition. The concessive interpretation of the other two constructions thus stems from the contrast between the two situations described in the clauses together with a certain degree of conventionalization rather than from the semantics of the respective postpositions.

2 Member of König’s group (i), (1988: 152).
5 After König’s (1994: 90) example “Obwohl Paul krank ist, geht er zur Arbeit”.
6 The postposition karşın ‘despite, in spite of’ is mostly encountered in formal language.
Besides these constructions for concessive clauses proper, in grammar books on Turkish we find a further construction that is ascribed the semantic value of concession. In this construction, the embedded clause has the predicate in a conditional form followed by one of the particles de or bile. This construction is one of the possibilities for expressing concessive conditionals in Turkish.

**Concessive conditionals**

In their article on “Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe” Haspelmath & König (1998) argue that the three types of constructions exhibited in example (3) are each specific subtypes of a construction that König (1988) has labeled Concessive Conditional. Whereas these subtypes do not share formal properties in most European languages, they are obviously formally connected with each other in Turkish. If one compares the Turkish translations with the English examples taken from Haspelmath & König’s (1998) article, the formal similarity becomes clear: in all three Turkish the predicate of the subordinated clause versions is marked with a conditional form:

(3) a. Scalar concessive conditionals/extreme value
   Even if we do not get any financial support, we will go ahead with our project.
   Maddi yardı́m alma-sak da/bile proje-yı́ devam et-tire-ceğ-ı́z.
   financial support get-NEG-COND-1PL PTCL project-ACC
   continuation AUX-CAUS-FUT-1PL

b. Alternative concessive conditionals/disjunction
   Whether we get any financial support or not, we will go ahead with our project.
   Maddi yardı́m al-sak da alma-sak da proje-yı́ devam ettireceğiz.7
   get- COND-1PL PTCL get-NEG-COND-1PL PTCL

c. Universal concessive conditionals/quantification
   No matter how much/(However much) financial support we get, we will go ahead with our project.
   Ne kadar maddi yardı́m al-sak da (alı́rsak alalım) proje-yı́ devam ettireceğiz.
   get- COND-1PL PTCL

According to Haspelmath & König (1998), these three subtypes are semantically and/or formally connected to:
1. conditionals
2. concessives

---

7 Another construction with the same semantics is built with ister ‘wants’ preceding each of both of the alternatives that are marked by the optative. Eg. İster hoşumuzu gitse ister gitmesin markalar, [...] birçok işlev üstlenir. (TUD WI22F1D-4721) ‘Whether we like it or not, brands […] fulfil a lot of functions’. Similar constructions are also found in Hungarian, Ossetic, Georgian and Basque; see Haspelmath & König (1998: 599–601).
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3. in the case of universal concessive conditionals, to free relative clauses
4. in the case of alternative concessive conditionals, to embedded interrogative clauses

In what follows I will focus on this type of adverbial clauses in Turkish based on the findings made by König (1994) and Haspelmath & König (1998). Note that all general findings on concessive conditionals in the following are taken from these articles and compared to the situation in Turkish. I will therefore refrain from repeatedly referencing Haspelmath & König’s (1998) article and will mention it only when referring to a specific paragraph.

Concessive conditionals in Turkish

For Turkish, all three subtypes are generally regarded as a subtype of a conditional clause for formal reasons: in all of them the embedded clause has the predicate marked with a conditional suffix or copula. Subtype (a) is sometimes regarded simply as a concessive clause; see Kornfilt (1997: 76) and Lewis (1985: 269). As for conditional clauses the association with concessive conditionals is obvious in Turkish, for all three types are formally conditional clauses with some additional element (the particle de or sometimes bile; a question/indefinite pronoun or coordinated alternative predicates). Compare the conditional construction in example (4a) with the concessive conditional in (4b) the ostensible formal difference being the use of the particle dE.

(4) a. Murat sinema-ya gid-er-se Ayşe kiz-ar.
   M. cinema-DAT go-AOR-COND.COP3SG A. be_angry-AOR3SG
   ‘If Murat goes to the movies, Ayşe will be angry.’

b. Murat sinema-ya git-se de Ayşe kiz-maz.
   M. cinema-DAT go-COND3SG PTCL A. be_angry-NEG.AOR3SG
   Even if Murat goes to the movies, Ayşe won’t be angry.’

Furthermore, there are also common semantic features that connect concessive conditionals to conditional clauses.

First, simple conditional clauses can be understood as concessive (conditionals) when the two situations in question are interpreted as contrastive. This interpretation of conditional clauses as concessive seems to work better in Turkish with either the contrasting adverb yine ‘again, still, yet’ in the apodosis or if the contrast is stressed by e.g. an overt subject in the main clause different from the subordinate clause subject. Compare the examples given in (5), where a. has an overt subject in

8 On Turkish free relative clauses based on a question word and a predicate marked with the conditional (copula) see Ozil (1993) and Erkman-Akerson (1993).
9 “Sentences, on the other hand, that are explicitly marked as concessive can never be reinterpreted in the sense of any other adverbial relation, however suitable the context might be.” (König 1988: 150)
the both clauses, b. contains the adverb yine ‘anew, still’ in the main clause and c. is a “canonical” (scalar) concessive conditional construction.

(5)  
a. Herkes git-se ben git-mem. (Kononov 1956: 534)  
   everyone go-COND3SG I go-NEG.AOR1SG  
   ‘If everyone goes, I won’t go.’ and ‘Even if everyone goes, I won’t.’
b. Herkes gitse yine gitmem/ yine de gitmem.  
   ‘Even if everyone goes, I won’t.’
c. Herkes gitse de (ben) gitmem.  
   ‘Even if everyone goes, I won’t.’

Example (6a) is a conditional clause with a possible concessive nuance. The difference between the semantics of (6a) and b. is that the expectation with a. is that Murat indeed would follow Ayşe, while in b. the expectation is that Murat will eventually leave Ayşe, which he surprisingly does not do.

(6)  
a. Ayşe Amerika’ya git-se Murat on-u bırak-maz.  
   America-DAT go-COND3SG M. she-ACC leave-NEG.AOR3SG  
   Murat will not leave Ayşe, if she goes to America.
b. Ayşe Amerika’ya gitse de Murat onu bırakmaz.  
   ‘Even if Ayşe goes to America, Murat won’t leave her.’

Secondly, type B/alternative concessive conditional, can be paraphrased as two coordinated conditional constructions: one assertive, the other a negative version of the first. See (7); a paraphrase of (3b).

(7)  
Maddi yardım al-sak proje-yi devam et-tir-eceğiz ve  
   financial support get-COND-1PL project-ACC continuationAUX-CAUS-FUT-1PL and  
   maddi yardım al-ma-sa-k proje-yi devam ettireceğiz.  
   financial support get-NEG-COND-1PL  
   = Maddi yardım alsak da almasak da proje-yi devam ettireceğiz.

Type C/universal concessive conditionals can be paraphrased by type B, alternative ones:

(8)  
Hesap ne kadar gel-se de öd-er-im.  
   bill how much come-COND3SG PTCL pay-AOR-1SG  
   = Hesap az gel-se de çok gel-se de ödér-im.  
   bill low come-COND3SG PTCL much come-COND3SG PTCL pay-AOR-1SG  
   ‘I will pay the bill, however much it is. = Whether it is high or low I will pay the bill.’

10 The same meaning as in a. can also be expressed by Ayşe nereye giderse gitsin Murat onu bırakmaz.
According to Haspelmath & König (1998: 565) ordinary conditionals as well as concessive conditionals express a conditional relationship between a protasis and an apodosis. The main semantic difference between the two types is that in concessive conditionals a set of conditions for the consequent is established in the protasis, whereas in conditional constructions usually only one condition is related to a consequent; see König (1994: 88). This set of conditions can contain a qualification over a variable (universal), be a disjunction between a protasis and its negation (alternative) or is an extreme value for the relevant condition (scalar).

An even more important semantic difference in my opinion, however, is that the situations expressed in the protasis are not a condition for the situation expressed in the apodosis to unfold but just background information for it. The situation in the apodosis is expressed as factual and as unfolding regardless of the fulfillment of the set of events expressed in the protasis.

A major formal difference between Turkish conditionals on the one hand and concessive conditionals on the other, besides the use of the particles de or bile, is that the conditional conjunctions eğer ‘if’ or şayet ‘if’ cannot occur in concessive conditionals.

In Turkish, in scalar concessive conditionals, the predicates theoretically can take the same aspecto-temporal suffixes as in ordinary conditional constructions; compare example (9).

(9) Ali ev-e git-se / gid-er-se / gid-ecek-se / git-ti-yse /
   A. house-DAT go-COND/-AOR-COND.COP3SG/-FUT-COND.COP3SG/-PST-COND.COP3SG
   git-miş-se de ben kal-ar-im/kal-açağ-im/kal-di-m.
   go-PERF-COND.COP3SG PTCL I stay-AOR-1SG/-FUT-1SG/-PST-1SG
   ‘Even if Ali goes/will go/went home I stay/will stay/stayed.’

However, the bare conditional is far more frequent in scalar concessive conditionals than are forms with aspect-temporal affixes. Examples (10) and (11) thus exhibit the typical sequence of predicators for non-past and past.

(10) Dikkat et-se-m de bir fayda-su ol-maz ki!
   caution AUX-COND-1SG PTCL one benefit-POSS3SG AUX-NEG.AOR3SG
   ‘Even if I am careful, it won’t help anyway!’ TUD11 VA14B1A-1602

(11) Söyle-sem de gel-mez-di-n sen.
   say-COND-1SG PTCL come-NEG.AOR-PST.COP-2SG you
   TUD PA16B4A-1247
   ‘Even if I had told you, you wouldn’t have come.’

11 Examples marked by the abbreviation TUD are all taken from the Turkish National Corpus (http://www.tnc.org.tr/index.php/en/), established by Mustafa Aksan, Yeşim Akşan and others. See also Aksan et al. (2012).
In scalar concessive conditionals where the particle *bile* follows the predicate of the embedded clause, the examples I have seen so far invariably have the predicate in the bare conditional, as in example (12). When the lexical verb carries an aspecto-temporal suffix it is followed by the auxiliary *ol-*, which then carries the bare conditional, as in example (13).

(12) *ikram* ed-il-se *bile* Coca Cola iç-il-mez,

... offering AUX-PASS-COND3SG PTCL CC drink-pass-NEG.AOR3SG

*A. ice-cream eat-PASS-NEG.AOR3SG TUD SH43C4A-1885*

‘...even if it is offered, Coca-Cola and Algida ice-cream are refused.’

(13) *bu sonuç-lar siyasal istikrar-la çeliş-yiyor olsa bile,*

this result-PL political stability-PP contradict-PRES3SG AUX-COND3SG PTCL

sonuç-lar-dan tatmin ol-ma-ya devam ed-er-ler.

result-PL-ABL satisfaction AUX-VN-DAT continuation AUX-AOR-3PL

‘...even if those results conflict with political stability, they continue to be satisfied with the results.’ IC05A2A-1770

Lewis (1985: 269) claims in his Turkish grammar that a constraint for subtype B (alternative) is that only the simple conditional form can appear in alternative protases, while tensed forms were not possible. He maintains that “Pairs of alternative protases are expressed in the remote form (because the two conditions, being mutually exclusive, are not open)”. Thus, only constructions like examples (14) and (15) should be possible.

(14) *Ali git-se de git-me-se de ben kal-ırm.*

A. go-COND3SG PTCL go-NEG-COND3SG PTCL I stay-AOR-1SG

‘Whether Ali goes or not, I will stay.’

(15) *Ali git-se-ydi de git-me-sey-di de ben kal-ırm.*

A. go-COND-PST.COP3SG PTCL go-NEG-COND-PST.COP3SG PTCL I stay-AOR-PST.COP1SG

‘Whether Ali had gone or not, I would have stayed.’

That seems however not to be a rule but rather the statistically most frequent case. In principle, native speakers judge sentences like (16) and (17) as grammatical.


A. go-PRES-COND.COP3SG PTCL go-NEG-PRES-COND.COP3SG PTCL I stay-AOR-1SG

‘Whether Ali is going or not, I will stay.’

© Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2017
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(17) Ali git-miş-se de git-me-miş-se de ben kal-di-m.
A. go-perf.COND.COP3SG PTCL go-NEG-PERF-CONDCOP3SG PTCL I stay-PST-1SG
‘Whether Ali had gone or not, I did stay.’

Nevertheless, even though it is possible to have either bare or tensed conditional forms as the protasis predicator, the bare form is overwhelmingly more frequent than forms also bearing aspect-temporal markers. I will return to this below. At this point I would just like to mention that this statistical relation of bare to marked forms is reversed in canonical conditional constructions in Turkish, see Menz (2010: 597).

In scalar concessive conditionals, the particles de and bile are attached to the predicate or alternatively to another constituent. The particle bile does not appear in the other two (alternative and universal) types of concessive conditional constructions. When the particle precedes the predicate, the focus shifts to the element preceding de; compare example (18) a. with (18) b. The particle in the protasis serves to mark the contrast between the situation in the apodosis and the situation in the protasis. If it is placed adjacent to an argument of the embedded clause rather than to the predicate, it serves additionally to emphasize the element it is adjacent to.12

A. letter write-COND3SG PTCL forgive-NEG.AOR1SG
‘Even if Ali writes a letter, I won’t forgive him.’
‘Even if Ali writes a letter, I won’t forgive him.’

In universal concessive conditionals, the particle can follow either the predicate or the question word. Compare example (19) a. and b. below:

how much search-COND3SG PTCL find-IMPOSSIB-FUT-1PL
b. Ne kadar da arasak bulamayacağiz.
‘However much we look for (her), we will not find (her).’

De and bile thus exhibit a different behavior than focus particles in concessive clauses in languages that utilize finite subordinated clauses where the position of the additional focus particle is fixed and normally sentence initial preceding the subordinating conjunction (e.g. German auch wenn, English even if).

One of the predicates in alternative concessive conditionals can follow the main clause, see the below example taken from Deny (1921: 846):

12 On the function of dA in Turkish see Göksel & Özsoy (2003).
“que je me charge de l’affaire ou que je ne m’en charge point, on la finira”

As for the properties that concessive conditionals share with concessives, first, both constructions share the factuality of the main clause. Typically, concessive conditionals are semifactual; i.e. their apodosis is factual or, if the event has not occurred at the time of speaking, the speaker is nevertheless convinced that it will inevitably do so in the future. All main clauses of alternative concessive conditionals are factual, as are all those of scalar concessive conditionals if they are linked on the epistemic level. In universal concessive conditionals, the main clause is also typically factual, but there are exceptions to this; see Haspelmath & König (1998: 567).

The subordinate clauses of concessive conditionals are of course non-factual.

Secondly, in all concessive and concessive conditional sentences, the situation described in the subordinate clause contains an unfavorable circumstance or one that is unusual for the situation described in the main clause; i.e. the two situations would not normally go together. These circumstances are however presented as irrelevant for the occurrence of the event described in the main clause. Compare the concessive constructions in (21) a. and b. with the concessive conditional constructions in (21) c.–e. Note that the interpretation of concessive in (21) b. or concessive conditional in (21) c. depends on the marking of the verbs, and thus the factuality of the clauses, rather than on the use of the particle $dA$.

(21) a. Arama-lar-imiz-a rağmen bul-ama-mişti-k. TUD PI22E1B-2909
    search-PL-POSS1PL-DAT PP find-IMPOSSIB-PLUPERF-1PL
    ‘Although we looked for (her), we couldn’t find (her).’

b. Ara-di-ysak da bul-ama-mişti-k. 13
    search-PST-COND.COP-1SG PTCL find-IMPOSSIB-PLUPERF-1PL
    ‘Even though we looked for (her), we couldn’t find (her).’

    search-COND-1PL PTCL find-IMPOSSIB-FUT-1PL
    ‘Even if we look for (her) we will not find (her).’

d. Ara-sak da ara-ma-sak da bulamayacağız
    search-COND-1PL PTCL search-NEG-COND-1PL PTCL
    ‘Whether we look for (her) or not, we will not find (her).’

e. Ne kadar ara-sak da bul-ama-yacağı-iz.
    how much search-COND-1PL PTCL find-IMPOSSIB-FUT-1PL
    ‘However much we look for (her), we will not find (her).’

13 Arasak da bulamadik would also be possible with roughly the same meaning as (21) b.
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Linking levels

In concessive conditionals as well as in causal, conditional and concessive constructions, subordinate and main clause can be semantically linked on three different levels:

1. On the content level, one situation follows and/or is brought about by another one, or in the case of concessive conditionals, the set of situations established in the subordinate clause has no influence on the situation in the main clause. The situation in the main clause takes place despite the unfavorable or unusual condition that is expressed in the subordinate clause.

   (22) Mektup yaz-sa-m da ben-i affet-mez.
   letter write-COND-1SG PTCL I-ACC forgive-AOR3SG
   ‘Even if I write a letter, he won’t forgive me.’

   (23) Yağmur yağ-sa da havuz-a gid-er-iz.
   rain rain-COND3SG PTCL pool-DAT go-AOR-1PL
   ‘Even if it rains, we will go swimming.’

2. On the epistemic level two items of knowledge, a premise and a conclusion, are connected. In concessive conditionals, the premise is irrelevant for the unfolding of the event expressed in the main clause. The difference between examples (24) and (25) on the one hand and (26) on the other lies in the fact that in the former sentences the main clause is factual, but in the latter it is non-factual. Moreover, while (24) is a concessive conditional, with a hypothetical event in the subordinate clause, (25) is a concessive construction, both the main and embedded clauses being factual.

   (24) Mektub-u postala-sa da biz-e gel-me-di.
   letter-ACC mail-COND3SG PTCL we-DAT come-NEG-PST3SG
   ‘Even if he sent the letter, we didn’t receive it.’

   mail-PST-COND.COP3SG
   Although he had sent the letter, we didn’t receive it.

   (26) Mektubu postalasa da bize gel-mez-di.
   come-NEG.AOR-PST.COP3SG
   ‘Even if he had sent the letter, we wouldn’t have received it.’

3. On the illocutionary level, the facts established in the subordinate clause are only of potential relevance for the uttering of the main clause.
According to Haspelmath & König (1998), only linking on the content level leads to constraints on the sequence of tenses similar to those in conditional clauses (consecutio temporum).

In Turkish, conditional clauses with linking on the content level, i.e. when the event in the apodosis is a consequence of the event in the protasis, have the predicate of the conditional clause in either the aorist and the conditional copula in the case of real conditionals, or in the bare conditional form in hypothetical conditional clauses. All other theoretically possible combinations of aspect-temporal affixes and the conditional copula only appear in sentences with linking either on the epistemic or on the illocutionary level; see Kerslake (2003).

As mentioned above, we do in fact also find various tensed forms as well as the bare conditional in concessive conditionals. Nevertheless, if we take a closer look at scalar concessive conditionals that are conditional clauses simply expanded by a particle, we find that statistically the bare conditional is far more frequent than the tensed form in -(V)rsE, which in turn is the most frequent form in conditional clauses.

If we look at the two versions of example (28) we find that there is no semantic difference between them, but native speakers claimed that the first version is the more appropriate one. This is also reflected by the far more frequent occurrence of this type in Turkish texts as well as in grammar books. In a real conditional clause, however, we would expect the aspect-temporally marked conditional form gidersek rather than the bare conditional. The bare form in conditional clauses is used to express hypotheticality; see Menz (2010: 596–597).

With universal concessive conditionals the statistics are slightly different. Here forms bearing an aspect-temporal affix, as in examples (29) (for linking on the illocutionary level) and (30) (for linking at the epistemic level) are not infrequent. Again, however, with linking on the content level the bare conditional is used; see example (31).
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(29) Her nekadar Zuhal’ın ağabey-i nin bu olay-a ilmi̇h
however much Z-gen older brother-poss3sg-gen this event-dat mild
bak-part-poss3sg-acc öğren-di-yse de, bir sırı̇
look-pst-conv.cop3sg learn-pst-conv.pstcop3sg ptcl a bunch of
“acaba”-lar on-u rahatsızız ed-iyor-du. TUD, JA16B4A-0854
if-pl he-acc uncomfortable aux-pst-pst.cop3sg
‘However much he found out that Zuhal’s brother looked mildly on this incident, a bunch of “ifs” were bothering him.’

(30) Her nekadar sicaklık su-yun bütün özellik-ler-i,
however much heat water-gen all feature-pl-poss3sg-acc
etkile-r-se de bu etkileme bütün özellik-ler-i
influence-aor-conv.cop3sg ptcl this influence all feature-pl-poss3sg
için aynı oran-da değil-dir. TUD OB04A2A-1982
pp same rate-loc not-cop3sg
‘However much the temperature influences the features of water, this influence does not have the same rate for all features.’

(31) Ben de kendi-m-i ne kadar geri çek-i̇yormuş gibi
I ptcl self-poss1sg-acc however much back pull-conv
yap-sa-m da, neden-in-i anla-ma-di̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̇̅
Conclusion

All three types of concessive conditionals in Turkish share the use of a conditional verb form and the particle *dE* in the embedded clause. The use of the particle *bile* as an alternative to *dE* is restricted to scalar concessive conditionals. The conditional junctors *eğer* or *şayet* cannot appear in this type of adverbial clause. In concessive conditionals with a semantic linking on the content level, the bare conditional form is the rule. Marking of the embedded clause predicate with aspect-temporal affixes is restricted to linking on illocutionary or epistemic levels. Scalar concessive conditionals consist of a conditional construction extended by a focus particle in a variety of languages, while the other two types are often based on different adverbial constructions.

In Turkish, we thus do see a similar use of a conditional construction with an additional particle as concessive construction, as is the case in many European languages; see Haspelmath & König (1998). Whether we can speak of a diachronic development from conditional to concessive conditional construction in Turkish remains to be investigated. In many languages, concessive conditionals have further developed into concessive clauses (German, English, Norwegian), the development thus being conditional > concessive conditional > concessive.

In Turkish, however, concessive clause models did not develop from concessive conditional constructions.

Haspelmath & König’s (1998) claim that the three types should be analyzed as subtypes of one type on semantic and functional grounds is supported by the fact that in Turkish all three types are formally marked by a conditional affix or copula.

Abbreviations

| 1  | First person | INF | Infinitive |
| 2  | Second person | NEG | Negation |
| 3  | Third person | PART | Participle |
| ABL | Ablative | PASS | Passive |
| ACC | Accusative | PERF | Perfect |
| AOR | Aorist | PL | Plural |
| AUX | Auxiliary | PLUPERF | Plusquamperfect |
| CAUS | Causative | POSS | Possessive marker |
| COND | Conditional | PP | Postposition |
| CONV | Converb | PRES | Present |
| COP | Copula | PST | Past |
| DAT | Dative | PTCL | Particle |
| FUT | Future | SG | Singular |
| GEN | Genitive | VN | Verbal noun |
| IMPOSSIB | Impossibility | |
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