Past in Turkish Conditionals[1]

Bergül Soykan

International Conference on Tense and Aspect in Conditionals

INALCO, Paris, November 4, 2022

1 Introduction

I will concentrate on three types of conditional structures in Turkish:

(1) Neşe bilet bul-ur-sa,   Artvin-e   gid-er.
    Neşe ticket find-AOR-COND   Artvin-Dat   go-AOR[2]
    'If Neşe finds a ticket, she will go to Artvin.'

(2) Neşe bilet bul-sa,   Artvin-e   gid-er.
    Neşe ticket find-COND   Artvin-Dat   go-AOR
    'If Neşe found a ticket, she would go to Artvin.'

(3) Neşe bilet bul-sa-(ydı),   Artvin-e   gid-er-di.
    Neşe ticket find-COND-PAST   Artvin-Dat   go-AOR-PAST
    'If Neşe had found a ticket, she would have gone to Artvin.'

The basic structure and the intended meaning of these 3 types can be outlined as follows[3]:

(4)

	Antecedent		Consequent		Meaning for Antecedent
Type 1	V	Tense/Modal Cond (-*(y)sA*)	V	Modal/Tense[4]	Possible
Type 2	V	Cond (-*sA*)	V	Modal[5]	Less likely
Type 3	V	Cond (-*sA*) (Past)	V	Modal Past	Unlikely

---

[1] I am grateful to Sabine Iatridou, Kai von Fintel and Ömer Demirok for their help in the process of forming my ideas.

[2] The aorist suffix -*Ar* in Turkish has the charactering interpretation similar to the Simple Present Tense in English (Kornfilt, 1997) and also the future-oriented interpretation similar to *will* in English (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005).

[3] It is possible to have nominal predicates in Turkish, but I do not focus on them here. The only difference is that in Type 1 structure, as there is no verb, the conditional marker directly attaches to the nominal. However, in Type 2 and 3, the auxiliary verb *ol-* 'be' is inserted.
   (i) Tuna   öğrenci-yse,   müze-ye   bedava-ya   gir-er.
       Tuna   student-COND   museum-Dat   free-Dat   enter-AOR
       'If Tuna is a student, he will enter the museum for free.'
   (ii) Tuna   öğrenci ol-sa,   müze-ye   bedava-ya   gir-er-(di).
        Tuna   student be-COND   museum-Dat   free-Dat   enter-AOR-(PAST)
        'If Tuna were a student, he would enter the museum for free.'

[4] It is possible to have a tense marker like PAST without any apparent modality interpretation even though the structure of conditionals can still be argued to be a restrictor of the modal domain as Kratzer (1986, 1991) proposes.

[5] It is not possible to have PAST without any apparent modal operator in the consequent.

Following von Fintel and Iatridou (2022), I argue that Type 1 conditionals are O-marked (ordinary marked) while Type 2 and 3 are X-marked (extra marked) conditionals.[6]

However, I assume that the conditional marker per se is responsible for distinguishing X-marked from O-marked conditionals in Turkish.

- If the conditional marker -(y)sA attaches to the tensed/inflected verb → O-marked Cond
- If the conditional marker -sA attaches to the verb root → X-marked Cond

Henceforth, I label the conditional marker in O-marked structures like (1) as O.COND and the one in X-marked cases like (2) and (3) as X.COND.

I will argue that PAST behaves differently in O.COND and X.COND.

2   Past in O-marked Conditionals

PAST in the antecedent of O-marked conditionals is not different from its counterpart in English.

- It does not require the use of PAST in the consequent (but it is possible).

(5)   Esra   ev-e   git-ti-yse,   Esma   bakkal-a   git-ti.
       Esra   home-Dat   go-PAST-O.COND   Esma   market-Dat   go-PAST
       'If Esra went home, Esma went to the market.'

(6)   Esra   ev-e   git-ti-yse,   kek   yap-ar.
       Esra   home-Dat   go-PAST-O.COND   cake   make-AOR
       'If Esra went home, she will make a cake.'

- It only allows past time adverbials in the antecedent.

(7)   Toplantı-ya   dün /*yarın   katıl-dı-ysa,   bugün gel-me-z.
       meeting-Dat   yesterday/tomorrow   join-PAST-O.COND   today   come-NEG-AOR
       'If s/he joined the meeting yesterday/*tomorrow, s/he won't come today.'

The use of PAST with the consequent modal Aorist gives the Past-Habitual interpretation.

(8)   Şeyma   sıkıl-dı-ysa,   yürüyüş-e   çık-ar-dı.
       Şeyma   be.bored-PAST-O.COND   walk-Dat   leave-AOR-PAST
       If Şeyma felt bored, she used to go out for a walk.'

Hence, PAST with O.COND is the actual past that denotes a time prior to the utterance time.

---

[6] They (von Fintel & Iatridou, 2022, p. 12) define these two conditional types as follows:
- O-marked conditionals: f is constrained to find a p-world within the context set
- X-marked conditionals: f may reach outside the context set.

3 Past in X-marked Conditionals

The use of PAST in the antecedent requires the use of PAST in the consequent but the past marker cannot surface without the modal operator, as it is the case in English.

(9) * Esra ev-e git-se-ydi, Esma bakkal-a git-ti.
    Esra home-Dat go-X.COND-PAST Esma market-Dat go-PAST
    Lit: 'If Esra had gone home, Esma had gone to the market.'

However, PAST in the antecedent can be dropped as long as we have PAST in the consequent, which might be considered evidence for the fact that PAST scopes over the whole conditional.

(10) Esra ev-e git- se-(ydi), kek yap-ar-dı.
    Esra home-Dat go-X.COND-(PAST) cake make-AOR-PAST
    'If Esra had gone home, she would have made a cake.'

X.COND-PAST structure allows both past and non-past time adverbials as expected.

(11) Toplantı-ya dün katıl-sa-ydı, bugün gel-me-z-di.
    meeting-Dat yesterday join-X.COND-PAST today come-NEG-AOR-PAST
    'If s/he had joined the meeting yesterday, s/he wouldn't have come today.'

(12) Toplantı-ya yarın katıl-sa-ydı, Emre'yi gör-ür-dü.
    meeting-Dat tomorrow join-X.COND-PAST Emre-Acc see-AOR-PAST
    'If s/he had joined the meeting tomorrow, s/he would see Emre.'

However, without an overt PAST morpheme, Type 2 version can also license past time adverbials as long as it scopes over the perfective marker *-mIş,* with the insertion of an auxiliary verb *ol-* 'be'.

(13) Toplantı-ya dün katıl-mış ol-sa bugün gel-me-z.
    meeting-Dat yesterday join-PERF be-X.COND today come-NEG-AOR
    'If it were the case that she joined the meeting yesterday, s/he wouldn't come today.'

X.COND can scope over two other tense/aspect markers in Turkish like progressive *-(I)yor* and future *-AcAk* as well, but it cannot scope over PAST.[7]

(14) Toplantı-ya yarın katıl-acak ol-sa bugün gel-me-z.
    meeting-Dat tomorrow join-FUT be-X.COND today come-NEG-AOR
    'If s/he were to join the meeting tomorrow, s/he wouldn't come today.'

(15) Toplantı-ya şu an katıl-ıyor ol-sa ofis-te ol-ur.
    meeting-Dat right now join-PROG be-X.COND office-Loc be-AOR
    'If s/he were joining the meeting right now, s/he would be in the office.'

---

[7] X.COND also cannot scope over the aorist marker probably because the aorist is always interpreted above the modal operator. However, I do not focus on the details of this phenomenon here. For further discussion on how aorist behaves in Turkish conditionals, see Soykan (2021).

(16) * Toplantı-ya   dün   katıl-dı   ol-sa   bugün gel-me-z.
     meeting-Dat   yesterday   join-PAST   be-X.COND   today come-NEG-AOR
     Intended meaning: 'If s/he had joined the meeting yesterday, s/he wouldn't come today.'

So, we can argue that PAST always scopes over X.COND and hence it seems like it is interpreted above the modal operator. However, what kind of interpretation it denotes in this context does not seem so easy to detect. Therefore, it might be better to understand how X.COND behaves in two other contexts that are discussed by von Fintel and Iatridou (2022).

4   Other uses of X-marking

4.1   X-marking (with PAST) on Desire Constructions

Conditional/Wish pattern in von Fintel & Iatridou's (2022) proposal:

-   X-marked conditionals: if p_{ant}, q_{cons}
-   Wishes: I want$_{cons}$ that p_{ant}

Although Turkish is not a "transparent wish" language, i.e., it does not show this pattern in its wish sentences fully, we see both consequent and antecedent marking separately to express wishes.

Thus, Turkish shows both the Hindi/English pattern (a lexicalized wish operator with antecedent X-marking on the complement) and the French pattern (consequent marking on want and a specific selected mood on the complement.[8]

(17)   *Wish with Antecedent X-Marking*

   a.   Keşke   Ela   parti-ye   gel-se.
        I wish   Ela   party-Dat   come-X.COND
        'I wish Ela came to the party.'

   b.   Keşke   Ela   parti-ye   gel-se-ydi
        I wish   Ela   party-Dat   come-X.COND-PAST
        'I wish Ela had come to the party.'

(18)   *Wish with Consequent X-Marking / Counterfactual Desire*

   a.   Ela   parti-ye   gel-sin   iste-r-di-m.
        Ela   party-Dat   come-OPT[9]   want-AOR-PAST-1SG
        'I {wish Ela came} / {would want Ela to come} to the party.'

---

[8] I thank Kai von Fintel for pointing this out.
[9] "In colloquial contexts *-sA* can be replaced by the optative suffix *-(y)A* when followed by a copular marker: *arasaydın/arayaydın* 'if (only) you had rung', 'you should have rung'." (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, p. 75), which could suggest that the X-marking surfaces as optative instead of conditional marker here but there is not enough evidence to suggest such a claim here. Yet again, it might be an idea to consider for future studies.

b. Ela'nın   parti-ye   gel-me-si-ni   iste-r-di-m. [10]
    Ela-Gen   party-Dat   come-Nom-Poss-Acc   want-AOR-PAST-1SG
    'I {wish Ela came} / {would want Ela to come} to the party.'

c.* Ela   parti-ye   gel-se   iste-r-di-m.
    Ela   party-Dat   come-X.COND   want-AOR-PAST-1SG
    'I {wish Ela came} / {would want Ela to come} to the party.'

Consequent X-marking of counterfactual (Type 3) conditionals on *iste-* 'want' creates an ambiguity between a wish in the actual world and a desire in the counterfactual world as in (18).

However, the constructions with antecedent X-marking (X.COND) as in (17) do not seem to posit such an ambiguity.

We can realize this distinction better when we try to use these two different desire constructions as the consequent of counterfactual conditionals.

(19)   * Burda   ol-sa,   (keşke)   Ela   parti-ye   gel-se-ydi.
        Here   be-X.COND   (I wish)   Ela   party-Dat   come-X.COND-PAST
        Lit: 'If she were here, I wish Ela came to the party.'

(20)   Burda   ol-sa,   Ela   parti-ye   gel-sin   iste-r-di-m.
        here   be-X.COND   Ela   party-Dat   come-OPT   want-AOR-PAST-1SG
        'If she were here, I would want Ela to come to the party.'

Interestingly though, both of these desire constructions can appear in the consequent of O-marked conditionals, which proves that they both can refer to a desire in the actual world.

(21)   Ela bura-ya   gel-di-yse,   (keşke)   parti-ye.   gel-se-ydi.
        Ela here-Dat   come-PAST-O.COND   (I wish).   party-Dat.   come-X.COND-PAST
        'If Ela came here, I wish she came/had come to the party.'

(22)   Ela bura-ya   gel-di-yse,   parti-ye   gel-sin   iste-r-di-m.
        Ela here-Dat   come-PAST-O.COND   party-Dat   come-OPT   want-AOR-PAST-1SG
        'If Ela came here, I wish she came to the party.'

---

[10] Note that the consequent form (AOR) of the non-past X-marked conditionals (Type 2) in this context is ambiguous between an intuition that my desire is not likely to come true in the actual world and it is what I desire to happen in the actual world. On the other hand, the desire predicate without the aorist does not bear such an ambiguity; the unlikelihood intuition does not seem to arise in (iv).

    (iii)   Ela   parti-ye   gel-sin   iste-r-im.
             Ela   party-Dat   come-IMP   want-AOR-1SG
             'I want/would want Ela to come to the party.
    (iv)   Ela   parti-ye   gel-sin   isti-yor -um.
             Ela   party-Dat   come-IMP   want-PROG-1SG
             'I (really) want Ela to come to the party.

As we have seen so far, X-marking in Turkish conditionals and desire structures seem to be in line with most of the related discussions of von Fintel and Iatridou (2022) Nevertheless, X-marking on necessity constructions appear to be distinct from their account, even though it still generates the weak necessity reading.

4.2 X-marking (with PAST) on Necessity Constructions

In their account, von Fintel and Iatridou (2022) argues that in "transparent ought" languages, the use of consequent X-marking on the strong necessity modal generates an ambiguity between the weak necessity (ought to) and the counterfactual strong necessity (would have to) readings.

- X-marked conditionals: if p_{ant}, q_{cons}
- Weak necessity: MUST+$_{cons}$

Although Turkish is not a "transparent ought" language, the antecedent X-marking followed by a phrase like *iyi olur* 'be good-AOR' generates the weak necessity construction.

(23) Toplantı-ya   gel-se-n   iyi   ol-ur.[11]
      meeting-Dat   come-X.COND-2SG   good   be-AOR
      Lit: 'It would be good if you came to the meeting.' ≈ 'You ought to come'

This weak necessity construction in (23) morphologically looks like a Type 2 conditional sentence. Therefore, this structure is ambiguous between 'less likely' and 'weak necessity' readings. [12]

When it comes to strong necessity, Turkish has different ways to indicate this meaning, but the following two options will be sufficient to consider for the purposes of our discussion.

(24) Toplantı-ya   gel-meli-sin.
      meeting-Dat   come-MUST-2SG
      'You must come to the meeting.'

(25) Toplantı-ya   gel-me-n   gerek-iyor.
      meeting-Dat   come-Nom-Poss   be.necessary-PROG
      Lit: 'It is necessary for you to come to the meeting.' ≈ 'You need to come'

In line with the meanings of weak vs. strong necessity modals, (23) can occur with the negation of a strong necessity modal without contradiction while (24) and (25) cannot, as seen below:

---

[11] Kai von Fintel brought to my attention that such constructions exist in Japanese as well. For further discussions on this see Kaufmann (2018).

[12] In interrogatives, the weak necessity reading surfaces without the insertion of another phrase other than the X-marking on the verb; thus, this ambiguity does not arise. Nevertheless, Göksel and Kerslake (2005) argues that the reading here is actually a suggestion instead of weak necessity. What needs to be noted here is that there is such a possible construction in Turkish.
   (v)   Toplantı   için   ne   giy-se-m?
          meeting   for   what   wear-X.COND-1SG
          'What should I wear for the meeting?'

(26) Toplantı-ya   gel-se-n   iyi   ol-ur   ama zorunda   değil-sin.[13]
      meeting-Dat   come-X.COND-2SG   good be-AOR but   obliged   NEG-2SG
      'You ought to come to the meeting, but you are not obliged to.'

(27) # Toplantı-ya   gel-meli-sin   ama   zorunda   değil-sin.
      meeting-Dat   come-MUST-2SG   but   obliged   NEG-2SG
      #'You must come to the meeting, but you are not obliged to.'

(28) # Toplantı-ya   gel-me-n   gerek-iyor   ama   zorunda   değil-sin.
      meeting-Dat   come-Nom-Poss. be.necessary-PROG. but   obliged   NEG-2SG
      #'You need to come to the meeting, but you are not obliged to.'

Interestingly though, the use of PAST or AOR-PAST (consequent X-marking of Type 3) with the strong necessity modals results in a counterfactual necessity reading like 'should have done' not the counterfactual strong necessity reading 'would have to'.

(29) Toplantı-ya   gel-meli-ydi-n.
      meeting-Dat   come-MUST-PAST-2SG
      'You should have come to the meeting.'

(30) Toplantı-ya   gel-me-n   gerek-ir-di.
      meeting-Dat   come-Nom-Poss   be.necessary-AOR-PAST
      'You should have come to the meeting.'

Similarly, it might be argued that X.COND-PAST structure on a matrix verb can also generate the 'should have done' reading (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005) with a certain intonation.

(31) Merak et-ti-yse-n,   toplantı-ya   gel-se-ydi-n.
      be.curious-PAST-O.COND-2SG   meeting-Dat   come-X.COND-PAST-2SG
      'If you were curious (about something), you should have come to the meeting.'

5   Summary of X-Marking with PAST

- I suggest the following structure for X-marked conditionals:

  - Antecedent X-marking: p-sA
  - Consequent X-marking: q-AOR

- With this structure in mind, we can summarize the different uses of X-marking in Turkish as in (32).

---

[13] Another version of saying this sentence would be as follows:
  (vi) Toplantı-ya   gel-se-n   iyi   ol-ur.   ama. gel-me-se-n   de ol-ur.
       meeting-Dat   come-X.COND-2SG.   good be-AOR but   come-NEG-X.COND-2SG. too be-AOR
       Lit: 'It would be nice if you came to the meeting, but it would be okay if you did not come too.' ≈
       'You ought to come to the meeting, but you don't have to.'

(32)

X-marked …	Structure	Meaning
a. Conditionals	p_{ant}, q_{cons}	*antecedent less likely to happen in the actual world*
	p_{ant}, q_{cons} PAST	*antecedent in a counterfactual world*
b. Desires	I wish p_{ant} (PAST)	*desire in the actual world*
	I want$_{cons}$ PAST	*desire in the actual world / desire in a counterfactual world*
c. Necessities	p_{ant}, q_{cons} (if q= [[iyi ol-]])	*weak necessity in the actual world*
	MUST$_{cons}$ PAST	*necessity in a counterfactual world*
	p_{ant} PAST	*necessity in a counterfactual world*

- As it is apparent from (32), using PAST with X-marking makes it possible for us to reach counterfactual worlds, while the X-marking per se seems to be interpreted relative to the actual world (time of utterance), i.e., it widens the domain beyond the default world.

- Some questions to ask:
  - How do these different readings emerge?
  - What is the contribution of X-marking?
  - What is the contribution of PAST?
  - How do we get the counterfactual reading?

6   Past-as-Past vs. Pas-as-Modal

Two main approaches to the interpretation of PAST in so-called counterfactual conditionals:

1) Past-as-Past (e.g., Ippolito, 2003, 2013)

- Past refers to a time in the past where the proposition(s) still hold/can be judged as true.
- The domain widens because as we go back in time, we can reach many more possible worlds.

2) Past-as-Modal (e.g., von Fintel, 1998; Mackay, 2019)

- Past makes it possible to widen the domain of the modal operator so it can reach counterfactual scenarios while still including the actual world.
- The domain widens thanks to the domain widening property of the past (modal).

7   My Analysis: X-Marking as Modal Widening and Past-as-?

Since I assume that X-marking in Turkish is the conditional marker *-sA*, I agree with von Fintel and Iatridou (2022) that X-marking widens the domain of the modal from the actual world (default) to the worlds that are different from the actual world (p. 50):

- **conditionals** X marks widening of the domain beyond the default (= context/epistemic set)
- **desire** X marks widening of the domain beyond the default (= doxastic set)
- **necessity** X marks inclusion of priorities beyond the default (= non-negotiables)

However, the meaning of PAST is not so straightforward to decide.

If we assume Past-as-Modal, we could argue that

- PAST widens the domain further than the X-marking does
- The further we go beyond the default, the more counterfactual interpretation we get as we reach much more different worlds

If we assume Past-as-Past, we could argue that

- When PAST scopes over modal operators[14] (e.g., X-marked conditional, necessity or generic), it sets the modal time to a past reference point, when p could be true (or was true).
- Since we split p-worlds starting from a past reference point, this would not exclude the future and hence we could reach to future possibilities or possibilities in the actual world too.

However, one question remains open in both of these ideas: How do we get the counterfactuality?

- It is argued that counterfactuality reading is an implicature and it could be cancelled in conditionals (I am not sure if it could be cancelled in desire and necessity constructions)
- It could be argued that the competition between O-marked and X-marked constructions leads to such an implicature that the X-marked cases are counterfactual, not true in the actual world, as von Fintel and Iatridou (2022) suggests.
- HOWEVER, if my analysis for Turkish conditional structures is correct, how we get the counterfactuality with PAST constructions but a less likely reading with X.COND is still a question to think about for further research.

References

von Fintel, K. (1998). The presupposition of subjunctive conditionals. In U. Sauerland & O. Percus (Eds.), *The interpretive tract* (pp. 29–44). Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

von Fintel, K. & Iatridou, S. (2022). Prolegomena to a theory of X-marking.

Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ippolito, M. (2003). Presuppositions and implicatures in counterfactuals. *Natural Language Semantics, 11*(2). 145-186

Ippolito, M. (2013). *Subjunctive conditionals: A linguistic inquiry.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press

---

[14] There is syntactic evidence for the fact that PAST scopes over the modal operator (remember that PAST in the antecedent can be dropped but the one in the consequent cannot).

Kaufmann, M. (2018). What `may' and `must' may be in Japanese. In Funakoshi, Kenshi, Kawahara, Shigeto and Chris Tancredi (Eds.) *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 24*. CSLI.

Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mackay, J. (2019). Modal interpretation of tense in subjunctive conditionals. *Semantics and Pragmatics, 12*(2). 1–29. doi:10.3765/sp.12.2.

Soykan, B. (2021). On the aorist in conditional antecedents. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Turkic and Languages in Contact with Turkic* (Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 5046). doi:10.3765/ptu.v6i1.5046