1 Introduction

This study investigates the morpho-syntactic properties of the subordinator diye in Turkish, which is mentioned in a limited number of studies in the literature but not studied in a comprehensive way. An exhaustive analysis of the TS Corpus and the METU Corpus reveals that diye not only is a very frequent word in Turkish but also has various functions; (i) it occurs in adverbial clauses denoting manner, reason, purpose / result, assumption, understanding, precaution, and agreement as well as in adverbial clauses of verbs of communication (except for de- ‘say’\(^1\)), perception, cognition, and emotion; (iii) it creates constructions that can be likened to relative clauses. In this study, I focus only on the adverbial clauses of verbs of communication (except for de- ‘say’) and I call them content adverbials.\(^2\)

This study is organized as follows: In section 2, I will discuss subordination strategies of finite and non-finite clauses in Turkish. Following this, I will present the subordinate clauses with diye in section 3. Later in section 4, I will test the subordinate clauses of verbs of communication marked by diye to see whether they are complements

\(^1\) I actually make a distinction between the verb de- ‘say’ and verbs like anlat- ‘tell’, konuş- ‘talk’, etc. I define the former as a verb of quotation and the latter as verbs of communication.

\(^2\) For a complete analysis of all types of examples with diye, see Yıldırım-Gündoğdu (2017).
or not. Section 5 presents an analysis and section 6 concludes this study.

2 Subordination strategies in Turkish

There are two types of subordination strategies in Turkish. Non-finite verb forms are subordinated via suffixation and they are of the following three types; (i) verbal nouns (non-finite verbs of noun clauses), as in (1), (ii) participles (non-finite verbs of relative clauses), as in (2), (iii) converbs (non-finite verbs of adverbial clauses), as in (3) (see Kornfilt, 1997; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005 i.a.).

(1)  Jale-nin³ iş-ten çıkart-ılg-ı doğru değil-miş.⁴
    Ali-GEN job-ABL dismiss-PASS-PastNom-3SG.NOM true NegPrt-NAR.3SG
    ‘Apparently it’s not true that Jale has been dismissed from her job.’
    (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, p. 116)

(2)  geçen hafta bitir-diğ-im roman
    last week finish-PastPart-1SG novel
    ‘the novel I finished last week’
    (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, p. 391)

(3)  Çalışır-ken radyo-yu hep açık tut-ar-im.
    work-AOR-WHILE radio-ACC always on keep-AOR-1SG
    ‘I always keep the radio on while/when I’m working.’
    (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, p. 407)

Finite subordinate clauses, on the other hand, are either simply inserted within the superordinate clause, as in (4), or linked to their superordinate clause by diye, gibi

³ Note that the embedded subject receives genitive case.
⁴ The abbreviations used in this study are the following: 1SG, 2SG, 3SG: 1st, 2nd, 3rd Person Singular Agreement Marker; 1PL, 2PL, 3PL: 1st, 2nd, 3rd Person Plural Agreement Marker; ABLE: Ability Modal Marker; ACC: Accusative Case; AOR: Aorist; CAU: Causative; DAT: Dative Case; FUT: Future; FutNom: Future Nominalizer; GEN: Genitive Case; GenCop: Generalizing Copula; IMP: Imperative; NAR: Narrative; NEG: Negation; NegPrt: Negation Particle; NOM: Nominal Case Marker; PASS: Passive; PAST: Past Tense; PastNom: Past Nominalizer; PastPart: Past Participle; PL: Plural; POSS: Possibility Modal Marker; PROG: Progressive; QPrt: Question Particle; WHILE: Verb-to-Convert Derivational Morpheme.
‘like’, or *şeklinde* ‘in the shape’, as in (5), or two root clauses are coordinated by *ki*\(^5\) as in (6).

Ali.NOM Oya.NOM Ankara-DAT go-PAST.3SG think-PAST.3SG  
‘Ali thought that Oya went to Ankara.’

Ali.NOM Oya.NOM Ankara-DAT go-PAST.3SG diye/gibi/şeklinde tell-PAST.3SG  
‘Ali told that Oya went to Ankara.

Ali.NOM think-PROG.3SG ki Oya.NOM Ankara-DAT go-PAST.3SG  
‘Ali thinks that Oya went to Ankara.’

The subjects of finite subordinate clauses are either nominative case marked, as in (4-6) above, or accusative case marked when the matrix predicate is a verb of communication, cognition, perception, or emotion (Emre, 1945; Underhill, 1976; Lewis, 1978; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; Kornfilt, 2013, i.a), as in (7).

Ali.NOM Ayşe.ACC Ankara-DAT go-PAST.2SG think-PAST.3SG  
‘Ali thought that Oya went to Ankara.’

In this study, we focus on subordinate clauses with *diye* (cf. example (5)).

3 *Diye* as a subordinator

In many studies, *diye* is treated as a subordinator, a marker that links to a subordinate clause to a main clause (Hatipoğlu, 1972; Kornfilt, 1997; Karahan, 1997; Lewis, 2001; Delice, 2003; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; İnce, 2006; Erkman, Delikgöz and Görür, 2006; Göksel, 2014 among many others). More specifically, it has been stated that a

\(^5\) See Griffiths and Güneş (2014) for the analysis of *ki*. 
subordinate clause with *diye* is an adverbial phrase headed by a converb (Karahan, 1997, p. 144, own translation).\(^6\) In many works, *diye* is assumed to be the -(y)A converbial form of the verb *de-* ‘say’ (Emre, 1945, p. 388; Underhill, 1976, p. 431; Lewis, 1978, p. 174; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, p. 462), although, rarely, it has been stated that *diye* ‘saying, so that’ is the optative participle of the verb *de-* ‘(to) say’ (Sebüktekin, 1971, p. 72). This relation is presented in (8) and (9).

   Ali.NOM Oya.NOM Ankara-DAT go-PAST.3SG say-PAST.3SG
   ‘Ali said that Oya went to Ankara.’

   Ali.NOM Oya.NOM Ankara-DAT go-PAST.3SG *diye* tell-PAST.3SG
   ‘Ali told that Oya went to Ankara.

The cognates of *diye* does not only occur in other Turkic languages, e.g. Sakha (Baker, 2011), and other languages from the Altaic language family, e.g. Kalmyk (Knyazev, 2015; Baranova, 2010) but it also occurs in geographically and genetically widespread languages such as Bengali (cf. Chisarik and van der Wurff, 2003), Uzbek, Akan, Ga, Makah, Hungarian (Rancador, 1988; Saxena, 1995, both cited in Chisarik and van der Wurff, 2003), Japanese,\(^7\) etc. The data is retrieved from the TS Corpus\(^8\) and the METU Corpus\(^9\) in order to observe as many instances of *diye* as possible in a list view to

---

\(^6\) In addition to that, *diye* that occurs with Noun Phrases (NPs) is listed among postpositions such as *gibi* ‘as, like’, *kadar* ‘till, until’, *dek* ‘till, until’, *ile* ‘with’, *icin* ‘for’, *gore* ‘according to’, *ragmen* ‘despite’, etc. These postpositions are stated to “allow the nouns to function as adverbs, adjectives, or conjunctions” (Karahan, 1997, p. 22, own translation). However, we do not focus on this in this study. For an exhaustive analysis of other relations with *diye*, see Yıldırım-Gündoğdu (2017).

\(^7\) I would like to thank Savaş Çetin for pointing out that Japanese uses a subordinator derived from ‘to say’.

\(^8\) *Taner (S)ezer Corpus* is a large dataset of over 500 million tokens derived from various sources including online newspapers, forums, social media, academic papers, etc.

\(^9\) *Middle (E)ast (T)echnical (U)niversity Turkish Corpus* is a collection of 2 million words of post-1990 written Turkish samples. The words of METU Turkish Corpus are taken from 10 different genres.
see different functions of *diye*. This subordinator tends to occur very frequently both in formal language and colloquial language. It is so common that it is not unusual to find it more than once in a sentence, as shown in (10) and (11) below.

(10) Yenilik ol-sun *diye* senatör pipi-si *diye* tatlı mı
originality be-IMP.3SG *diye* senator dick-3SG *diye* dessert QPrt

uydur-acağ-ız şimdi?
make.up-FUT-1PL now

‘Are we going to make up a dessert *called* “senator’s dick” *to* be original?’

(11) Yeteneğ-im var *diye* her şey-i
talent-1SG.NOM exist.GenCoP.3SG *diye* every thing-ACC

yap-abil-ir-im *diye* düşünmek kadar kötü bir şey
do-ABLE-AOR-1SG *diye* think-INF as bad a thing.NOM

ol-a-ma-z.
be-POSS-NEG-AOR.3SG

‘There cannot be anything as bad as thinking *that* “I can do everything *because* I have the talent.”’

Based on an exhaustive analysis of the TS Corpus and the METU Corpus, we observe that *diye* does not only form various relations between verbs and their modifiers (manner, reason, purpose / result, assumption, understanding, precaution, and agreement), but it also introduces the contents of verbs of communication.\(^\text{10}\) Below you will see a list of these verbs in Table.1.\(^\text{11}\) *De-* ‘say’ cannot occur with *diye* when *diye* introduces the content (not reason) of this verb. Therefore, it is not included in this list.

---

\(^{10}\) *Diye* also presents the contents of verbs of perception, verbs of cognition, and verbs of emotion; however, we will not focus on them in this study, see Yıldırım-Gündoğdu (2017) for their analysis.

\(^{11}\) This list is composed of the verbs listed in reference grammars of Turkish (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005, i.a.) and the verbs collected from TS Corpus and METU Corpus.
Table 1 Verbs of communication that occur with subordinate clauses headed by *diye*\(^\text{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs of manner of speaking</th>
<th>Verbs of transfer of a message, <em>Talk</em> verbs, <em>Say</em> verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>bağır</strong> ‘shout’</td>
<td><strong>açılak</strong> ‘explain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kükre</strong> ‘roar’</td>
<td><strong>konuş</strong> ‘talk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylen</strong> ‘murmur’</td>
<td><strong>yanıtlaga</strong> ‘answer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylent</strong> ‘mumble’</td>
<td><strong>cevaplama</strong> ‘answer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylent</strong> ‘mumble’</td>
<td><strong>itiraz et</strong> ‘object’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inle</strong> ‘groan’</td>
<td><strong>teszahürat et</strong> ‘shout slogans’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fısıldak</strong> ‘whisper’</td>
<td><strong>oku</strong> ‘read’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>okesen</strong> ‘hiss’</td>
<td><strong>dile getir</strong> ‘utter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>haykir</strong> ‘shout out’</td>
<td><strong>özetle</strong> ‘summarize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylen</strong> ‘murmur’</td>
<td><strong>dua et</strong> ‘pray’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inle</strong> ‘groan’</td>
<td><strong>itiraz et</strong> ‘object’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>seslen</strong> ‘call’</td>
<td><strong>tekrar et</strong> ‘repeat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylen</strong> ‘murmur’</td>
<td><strong>belirt</strong> ‘express’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anlat</strong> ‘tell’</td>
<td><strong>sor</strong> ‘ask’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anlat</strong> ‘tell’</td>
<td><strong>itiraf et</strong> ‘confess’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>söylen</strong> ‘murmur’</td>
<td><strong>bahset</strong> ‘mention’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verbs in Table 1 occur with *diye*. You can see the examples (12) and (13) below.

(12) [[On-u ye-me] *diye* bağır-dı. 
it-ACC eat-NEG.IMP.2SG *diye* shout-PAST.3SG
‘(S)He shouted “Don’t eat it!”’.

(13) [[Vicdanî ret konuşunda siz ne düşün-uyor-sunuz] *diye*
conscientious objection about you(PL) what think-PROG-2PL

*diye* sor-du.

*diye* ask-PAST.3SG

‘(S)He asked “What do you think of conscientious objection?”’

In example (12) and (13), there are verbs of communication as matrix verbs. In this study, I discuss why subordinate clauses that are marked by *diye*, as in (12) and (13), cannot be complement clauses contrary to expectation since their nominalized clause counterparts introduce the same content that *diye* clauses present. At first glance, it may

\(^{12}\) Göksel and Kerslake (2005, p. 408) list these verbs as verbs of communication other than *de- ‘say’*. I prefer calling *de- ‘say’* as a verb of quotation but the rest of the verbs that has been titled verbs of quotation as verbs of communication. These verbs of communication need *diye* to mark the quotations for grammaticality.
seem that the subordinate clauses with *diye* in square brackets are the complements of the (transitive) verbs listed in Table.1 since their nominal clausal counterparts are the complements of these verbs. The subordinate clause in (14a) can be paraphrased as the following example in (14b).

(14) a. 


conscientious objection about you(PL) what think-PROG-2PL

*diye*] sor-du.

*diye* ask-PAST.3SG

‘(S)He asked “What do you think of conscientious objection?”’

b. 


conscientious objection about you(PL)-GEN what


think-PastNom-2PL-ACC ask-PAST.3SG

‘(S)He thought that Saturday will be busy again.’

The subordinate clauses under investigation are the subordinate clauses of verbs of communication. Throughout this study, we will examine the instances of *diye*. I will present tests to better understand the syntactic relationship with the matrix clause and the subordinate clause. The morpho-syntactic structure of the clauses with *diye* will be analyzed in the light of the following question:

What syntactic function does *diye* have and what is its syntactic position?

In the following sections, I will test the subordinate clauses with *diye* to see whether these clauses are in fact complement clauses of the main clauses or whether they are rather adverbial clauses.
Tests for “complementhood”: Tests to see if 

In this section, we will focus on the relationship between a subordinate clause with 
and the matrix clause. Van Valin (1984: 544-545) defines the relation between a main 
clause and its subordinate clause as [± dependent] and [± embedded]. Moreover, 
according to him, an embedded clause is an argument (in our case, complement) of the 
matrix verb and a subordinate clause is modifier of the matrix predicate.

[-dependent, - embedded] is the class of coordinate sentences. For the 
subordinate clauses with 
, this value is ruled out; the tests to distinguish coordinate 
sentences and subordinate clauses listed in Diessel (2001, pp. 437-8) indicate that they 
are not coordinate sentences.

[-dependent, +embedded] defines a potential relation in which a clause functions 
as part of another clause but is fully independent of it. Parentheticals (McCawley, 1982 
as cited in Van Valin, 1984, p. 547) and direct discourse complements are given as 
possible candidates for that combination. The examples with 
that are subordinate to 
verbs of communication, (as in (12) and (13) above) cannot reflect this relation since a 
clause with 
cannot stand on its own.

[+dependent, +embedded], on the other hand, is the relation between an 
independent clause and a dependent clause that is dependent upon the independent 
clause for its occurrence. Göksel and Kelepir (2015) state that “the most obvious 
indication of clausal complementation one would look for in a sequence of clauses is the 
presence of complementizers” (p. 67). We observe an element, i.e. 
that seems to 
serve as a complementizer which possibly governs a reported utterance. This value 
might reflect the relation between a subordinate clause with 
and the matrix clause.
However, I doubt whether the subordinate clauses in (12) and (13) are complement clauses. Kelepir and Göksel (2013) state the following:

Structures with reported speech involve two logically related but syntactically independent clauses. ... Clauses with SAY contain semantic complementation but not syntactic complementation. ... unlike verbs which take sentential complements, the relation between SAY and its complement may be of a semantic nature and not a syntactic one. (p. 207)

Finally, [+dependent, -embedded] is a relation between a matrix clause and an adverbial clause. If *diye* clauses are not complements, they will be a member of this group.

My aim in this section is to test the subordinate clauses of verbs of communication to see if these subordinate clauses are Van Valin’s (1984) [+dependent, +embedded] type of complement clauses or they are just instances of adverbials. In order to answer this, I will make use of passivization and causativization tests. There are two possibilities:

(i) If the subordinate clauses pass the tests, they are complements (the internal arguments of the matrix verbs), and this gives them the value [+dependent, +embedded].

(ii) If the subordinate clauses fail the standard tests of argumenthood, they are not complements, and this gives them the [+dependent, -embedded] which is the relation between a matrix clause and an adverbial clause.

4.1 Passivization

One of the implications of Burzio’s generalization (1986) is that direct object of an active clause is the subject of a passive clause.
Bearing in mind the relation between a verb and its complement (15-18) or its adverbial (19-20), we will have a look at verbs and the clauses with *diye* that occur with
these verbs. We will observe their behavior under the passivization test. Now, let’s consider bağır- ‘shout’, a verb of communication, and the subordinate clause with diye.

    Mehmet Ali diye shout-PAST.3SG
    ‘Ali shouted “Mehmet Ali”.’

    Mehmet Ali diye shout-PASS-PAST.3SG
    ‘It was shouted “Mehmet Ali”.’

Based on the grammaticality of (22), we can say that there is no change in the shape of the subordinate clause and it is similar to (18a); however, we would never be able to observe Acc-Nom alternation through case marking, since the subordinate clause is not a nominalized clause and cannot bear an overt case-marker.13 Therefore, we cannot conclude whether the embedded clause is a complement as in (18a) or an adverbial as in (20). However, an interesting fact is that the sentence in (22) is an instance of impersonal passive which indicates that either bağır- ‘shout’ does not have an argument (Öztürk, 2005, p. 47) or it has a complement with inherent case (Kornfilt, personal communication). Since a diye clause cannot bear case, we can eliminate the second option. This leaves us the only possibility that the diye clause is not the complement of the intransitive verb bağır- ‘shout’. This verb actually behaves in two ways. It is an intransitive verb, as in (23), or a transitive verb, as in (24). A subordinate

---

13 Baker (2011) contrasts English that clauses to Sakha dien clauses and based on the fact that “English that is cognate with the demonstrative pronoun that [and] Sakha dien is historically derived from the verb die ‘to say’” (Baker, 2011, p. 1171); he concludes that English that-clauses are more or less nominal in origin and therefore can stand in positions where an NP can stand such as the subject position whereas Sakha dien clauses cannot stand in e.g. subject positions. Baker (2011) concludes that “although there is ample reason synchronically to say that the complementizers are not identical to their historical sources in either language, it is plausible to assume that some vestiges of these origins remain” (p. 1171). Turkish diye is very similar to Sakha dien in that it is derived from the verb ‘to say’. However, whether a diye clause appears in NP positions or not is controversial.
clause with *diye* can present extra information, as in (25), or a DP in the object position and the subordinate clause with *diye* can occur together, as in (26).

(23)    Mehmet bağır-dı.  
Mehmet.NOM shout-PAST.3SG  
‘Mehmet shouted.’

Mehmet.NOM name-3SG-ACC shout-PAST.3SG  
‘Mehmet shouted his name.’

Mehmet.NOM Mehmet Ali diye shout-PAST.3SG  
‘Mehmet shouted “Mehmet Ali”.’

Mehmet.NOM name-3SG-ACC Mehmet Ali diye shout-PAST.3SG  
‘Mehmet shouted his name as “Mehmet Ali”.’

*Bağır-* ‘shout’ and a group of verbs such as *haykar-* ‘shout out’, *mırıldan-* ‘mumble’, *fısılda-* ‘whisper’, *söylen-* ‘murmur,’ *inle-* ‘groan’, *seslen-* ‘call’, *kükre-* ‘roar’, etc.\(^{14}\) presuppose their contents, i.e. ‘Mehmet Ali’ above in (25) and (26). The reported utterance is extra information about this presupposed content.

We will now consider another verb of communication.

(27)    Ahmet *(bu soru-yu) ([[bil-m-iyor-um] diye])*  
Ahmet.NOM this question-ACC know-NEG-PROG-1SG diye  
yanıtlâ-dı.  
answer-PAST.3SG  

‘Ahmet answered that question as “I don’t know”.’

\(^{14}\) Levin (1993) characterizes these verbs in English as verbs of manner of speaking.
Based on the accusative-nominative alternation and non-optionality of a DP (bu soru ‘this question’) in (27) and (28), we know that this DP is the internal argument of the root verb yanıtl-a- ‘answer’ and we can therefore say that the subordinate clause is not the internal argument of the matrix verb as in (18a); rather it is an adverbial as in (20). This is also supported by the fact that the subordinate clause with diye can be omitted without yielding ungrammaticality.  

It seems that verbs of communication take the subordinate clauses with diye as adverbials not as complements. In the following section, we will test these verbs by the causativization test to see if we can support our claim.

4.2 Causativization

The standard analysis for causativization is that “if the verb is intransitive, the subject becomes an accusative object” (Çetinoğlu and Butt, 2008, p. 222, i.a.), as in (29-30).

(29)  Kedi uyu-du.
     cat.NOM sleep-PAST.3SG
     ‘The cat slept.’

(30)  Çocuk kedi-yi uyu-t-tu.
     child.NOM cat-ACC sleep-CAU-PAST.3SG
     ‘The child made the cat sleep.’

---

15 This study focuses on verbs of communication. Other verbs involving verbs of perception, cognition, and emotion are addressed in Yıldırım-Gündoğdu (2017).
The nominative subject *kedi* in (29) becomes the accusative case marked object *kedi-yi* ‘cat-ACC’ under causativization, as shown in (30). With transitive verbs, “the canonical nominative/accusative object preserves its case and function when the verb is causativized. The causee (former nominative subject) is marked with the dative” (Çetinoğlu and Butt, 2008, p. 222, among many others), as in example (31-32).

(31) Köpek kedi-yi kovala-di.
    dog.NOM cat-ACC chase-PAST-3SG
    ‘The dog chased the cat.’

(32) Çocuk köpeğ-e kedi-yi kovala-t-tı.
    child.NOM dog-DAT cat-ACC chase-CAU-PAST.3SG
    ‘The dog made the dog chase the cat.’
    (from Çetinoğlu and Butt, 2008, pp. 18-23)

The accusative case marked object *kedi-yi* ‘cat-ACC’ in (31) preserves its case under causativization, as shown in (32). The causee that is in the nominative case in (31), on the other hand, is dative case marked now, as in (32).

As Öztürk (2007, p. 312) notes “if there is an inherent dative as in [(33)] then the agent can get only accusative as the second argument to be marked for structural case”, as in (34).

    Ayşe.NOM Ali-DAT laugh-PAST.3SG
    ‘Ayşe laughed at Ali.’

    Ahmet.NOM Ayşe.ACC/DAT Ali-DAT laugh-CAU-PAST.3SG
    ‘Ahmet made Ayşe laugh at Ali.’
    (Öztürk, 2007, p. 312)

An adverbial does not bear case and does not change under causativization.
(35) Ali ben-i dün kovala-di.  
Ali.NOM I-ACC yesterday chase-PAST.3SG  
‘(S)he chased me yesterday.’

Ahmet. NOM Ali-ACC/DAT I-ACC yesterday chase-CAU-PAST.3SG  
‘Ahmet made Ali chase me yesterday.’

We will test the verbs of communication to have a better insight into their argument structure and determine whether the clauses with *diye* are their complements or whether they are just adverbials. Let’s begin with *bağır-* ‘shout’.

Ahmet.NOM Ayşe.NOM faint-PAST.3SG *diye* shout-PROG.3SG  
‘Ahmet is shouting that Ayşe fainted.’

Mehmet.NOM Ahmet-ACC/DAT Ayşe.NOM faint-PAST.3SG *diye*  
shout-CAU-PAST.3SG  
‘Mehmet made Ahmet shout that “Ayşe fainted”.’

(39) Ahmet ad-in-1 bağır-di.  
Ahmet.NOM name-3SG-ACC shout-PAST.3SG  
‘Ahmet is shouting that Ayşe fainted.’

(40) Mehmet Ahmet-*i/e ad-in-1 bağır-t-ti.  
Mehmet.NOM Ahmet-ACC/DAT name-3SG-ACC shout-CAU-PAST.3SG  
‘Ahmet is shouting that Ayşe fainted.’

(38) is similar to (30) in that the causee, i.e. Ahmet, is acceptable with accusative case marker on it. According to this, we can say that *bağır-* ‘shout’ is an intransitive verb. (38) is not similar to (32) with respect to the case marking on the causee; therefore,
we can say that *bağır*-‘shout’ is not a transitive verb. (38) is also similar to (34) in terms of the case marking on the causee; therefore, we might have concluded that *bağır*-‘shout’ is a transitive verb which assigns dative case on its internal argument but we know that a *diye* clause cannot bear case. (38) is not similar to (36) in terms of the causee; therefore, *bağır*-‘shout’ is not a transitive verb but the *diye* clause is similar to *dün* ‘yesterday’ because it does not change its shape because it does not require case.

(40), on the other hand, is similar to (32) in terms of the case marker on its internal argument and causee, and the subordinate clause is similar to *dün* ‘yesterday’ in (36). This shows that *bağır* -‘shout’ behaves like a transitive verb and an intransitive verb just like ‘eat’ in *John ate* and *John ate an apple*. This has nothing to with an adverbial.

There is another type of evidence for the adverbial status of the subordinate clauses that are introduced by verbs of communication. When the embedded clause expresses the content of the matrix verb, as in (41), then *diye* can be replaced with *şeklinde* which literally means ‘in the shape’.

(41)  
\[
\text{Ali yemeği yi-ye-me-di-m şeklinde} \\
\text{Ali.NOM meal-ACC eat-ABLE-NEG-PAST-1SG in.the.shape.of} \\
\text{söylen-di.} \\
\text{murmur-PAST.3SG} \\
\text{Lit: ‘Ali murmured in the shape that he couldn’t eat the meal.’}
\]

Moreover, the subordinate clause can be replaced with *bu/şu şeikle* “in this/that shape” or *şöyle* and *böyle* “like that” and “like this” which are adverbials in Turkish (see (iii)).
Intended: ‘Ali murmured in this shape / in that shape / like this / like that.’

The grammaticality of (iii) supports our claim that the subordinate clauses that are presented in this chapter are not the internal arguments of the matrix verbs.

Now, we will move to another verb of communication yantla- ‘answer’ for which the subordinate clause with diye was actually shown to be an adverbial rather than a complement by the passivization test in 4.1. Now, let’s see how it behaves under the causativization test.

‘Ahmet answered that question like “I don’t know”.’

‘Mehmet made Ahmet answer that question like “I don’t know”.’

(43) and (44) suggest that the DP (bu soru ‘this question’) is the internal argument of the matrix verb and thus, the subordinate clause cannot be the internal argument of the matrix verb yantla- ‘answer’. Therefore, this example is similar to (32) in terms of the case marker on the internal argument and the causee and the subordinate clause is similar to diün ‘yesterday’ in (36). Other verbs of communication that behave

In this section, we applied passivization and causativization tests to determine whether the subordinate clauses with diye are complements or adverbial clauses of the verbs of communication. The results indicate that these subordinate clauses that express the contents of the actions denoted by these verbs are not their complements; contrary to expectation, they are adverbials.

4 Analysis

De- ‘say’ is a verb of quotation which causes a monster operator to shift indexicals, i.e. “expressions whose semantic values are contextually determined” (Sudo, 2010, p. 1).

16 Levin (1993) calls these verbs in English as verbs of transfer of a message, talk verbs, say verbs.

17 There are verbs that allow a dative case marked causee under causativization. They are verbs of cognition such as hayal et- ‘imagine’, kabul et- ‘accept’, fasöst- ‘assume’, tahmin et- ‘predict’ and verbs of communication such as itiraf et- ‘confess’, tehdit et- ‘threaten’, şıkayet et- ‘complain’, dua et- ‘pray’, itiraz et- ‘object’, tezahürat et- ‘shout slogans’, tekrar et- ‘repeat’, iddia et- ‘claim’, yalan söyle- ‘lie’, bahset- ‘mention’, ifade et- ‘express’. One might think that subordinate clauses with diye are complement clauses of these verbs as they allow dative case marked causes under causativization. However, there is something special about these verbs. These verbs are composed of a noun and the light verb et- ‘make’. Öztürk (2005) argues for the nouns in these constructions that “bare nouns are not syntactic heads but XP categories. […] bare nouns are still visible to syntactic processes like causativization” (p. 43). These verbs mentioned above are not like [hayal et-] ‘imagine’ but rather like [hayal] [et-] ‘make imagination’. In that sense, et- ‘make’ behaves like yanı́ťa- ‘answer’, a transitive verb, and hayal ‘imagination’ behaves like the internal argument of the verb et- ‘make’, leaving only the adverbial possibility for the subordinate clause. Some verbs of cognition, e.g. düşün- ‘think’, behave differently. The causee is accusative case marked under causativization. This indicates that such verbs behave like an intransitive verb which takes the diye clause as its modifier.
Indexicals are not limited to 1st and 2nd person pronouns but also include “temporal adverbials such as now and yesterday and locative adverbials such as here and there” (Sudo, 2010, p. 1). Therefore, the sentence in (45) below means ‘Ahmetᵢ said that heᵢ finished the homework.’ and can never mean #‘Ahmetᵢ said that Iᵢ finished the homework.’

(45) Ahmetᵢ [proᵢ ödev-i bitir-di-m] de-di.
Ahmet.NOM homework-ACC finish-PAST-1SG say-PAST.3SG
‘Ahmetᵢ said that heᵢ finished the homework.’

The monster operator is triggered by de- ‘say’. The monster operator forces the embedded nominative subject to shift according to the reported context; the embedded subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject.

The structure of (45) is given below in (46). As a verb of quotation, de- ‘say’ triggers monster operator (cf. Sudo, 2010) which triggers indexical shift. Only the 1st and 2nd person indexicals shift\(^\text{18}\) but the 3rd person indexical does not shift since it is not relevant for conversation. In other words, it is not either the speaker or the listener.

\(^{18}\) In some dialects, the 2nd person indexical is optionally shifted while 1st person indexical obligatorily shifted.
Diye allows monsters and therefore indexical shift since it carries the features of the verb de- ‘say’.

(47) \[\text{Ahmet}_j \quad \text{[PRO} \_j \quad \text{o} \_\text{dev-i} \quad \text{b} \_\text{itir-di-m}] \quad \text{di} \_\text{ye}\]
\[
\text{Ahmet.NOM} \quad \text{homework-ACC} \quad \text{finish-PAST-1SG} \quad \text{diye}
\]

\[\text{anlat-ti.} \]
\[\text{tell-PAST.3SG}\]

‘Ahmet\(_j\) told that he finished the homework.’

In a subordinate clause marked by diye, as in (35) above, the monster operator forces the embedded pro to be shifted according to the subject of the verb de- ‘say’ hidden in diye, i.e. intermediate subject PRO. In other words, the monster operator

---

19 I consider φ features are checked within the domain of TP.
20 The subordinate clause that is embedded under di- ‘say’ is a CP since it allows an evaluative adverb iyi ki ‘luckily’ which is a CP level adverbial (cf. Cinque, 2001). The subordinate clause with diye is a VP-level adverbial since while it does not allow evaluative adverbs; it allows temporal adverbs which are VP-level adverbs to occur above the subordinate clause. This shows us that the subordinate clause is above this temporal adverb.
21 This sentence can be interpreted as ‘Ahmet told me that he finished the homework.’ In this interpretation, the embedded accusative case-marked subject is dropped. According to Shklovsky and Sudo (2014), the monster operator is below the accusative case marked subjects (and it is above the nominative case marked subjects). That is why accusative case marked subjects are not shifted since they are not in the scope of the monster operator.
enables the embedded subject to shift according to the context of the reported speech. Little pro in the quoted subordinate clause must be coindexed with PRO, i.e. the subject of de- ‘say’. In addition to that, the intermediate subject, i.e. PRO, is controlled by the matrix subject. The subordinate subjects in adverbial clauses of this type are always coindexed with the matrix subject, as in (48). PRO is coindexed with the matrix subject.

(48) Ahmet₁ PRO₁ koş-arak git-ti.
    Ahmet.NOM run-CVB go-PAST.3SG
`Ahmet went running.’

In sum, diye carries the features of de- ‘say’, i.e. marks quotations and forces the indexicals to shift via the monster operator, and forms a converbial phrase just like other converbials in Turkish. The structure of (47) is given in (49) below.
The subordinate clause presents the content of saying as *diye* still carries the semantics of *de*- ‘say’. When the matrix verb is a verb of communication, we get the idea that *diye* presents the content of these verbs.

5 Conclusion

In this study, I have discussed the closeness of the verbs of communication and the subordinate clauses that seem to be their complements at first since they look like they present the contents of these verbs and the nominal counterparts of these subordinate clauses are complements. With a set of examples, I observed the possible alternation scenarios (passivization and causativization) and they indicated that the subordinate clauses that are headed by *diye* are not complements but adverbials.

I have not tested the subordinate clauses that are marked by *diye* through island constraints, neg-raising, Exceptional Case Marking and interpretation of the embedded question (with matrix scope). They would provide more empirical support about the status of the subordinate clauses with *diye*. I am well aware that the analyses in this study are not conclusive. I hope a better analysis can be built in future works.

---

22 However, I can give you a hint: it is not optional, but rather a must for a wh- element to move out of the subordinate clause with *diye*, which supports our conclusion that *diye* clauses are adjuncts, not complements.
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