

## Werk

**Titel:** Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish

**Autor:** Bulut , Christiane

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 1998

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0002](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002) | LOG\_0026

## Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.  
SUB Göttingen  
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1  
37073 Göttingen

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

# **Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish**

**Christiane Bulut**

Bulut, Christiane 1998. Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 2, 171-197.

This paper is based on data from the supposed autograph of the *Seyahatname*, a seventeenth-century travelbook written by the famous Turkish globetrotter Evliya Çelebi. An overall review of the syntactic features of the *Seyahatname* reveals that most of the morphosyntactic strategies forming subordinate clauses in present-day Turkish have already been applied in Middle Ottoman. Strikingly enough, genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas seem to compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages.

The claim presented in this paper is that the competing strategies of relativization are employed as a means of functional differentiation: Turkic non-finite relative clauses are used to render restrictive relative clauses, whereas constructions with a finite verb form introduced by the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* are confined to the appositive type of relative clauses.

*Christiane Bulut, Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany, e-mail: bulut@mail.uni-mainz.de*

## **General remarks, sources, etc.**

Up to the present, very few studies have focused on a description of the syntactic features of Ottoman Turkish. Especially the language in Middle Ottoman texts has so far been characterized as somewhat “corrupted” by loan elements of mostly Persian or Arabic origin, which invaded the lexical, morphological and syntactic layers of a basically Oghuz idiom. Yet, keeping the ongoing discussion of language contact phenomena in mind, it might also be interesting to have a closer—and, hopefully, unprejudiced—look at some aspects of cross-linguistic interaction as represented in Ottoman Turkish.

This paper is based on a very limited choice of data, as we will discuss strategies of relativization in a single Middle Ottoman prose text. Our source is the supposed autograph of the *Seyahatname*, a travel book written by the famous Turkish globetrotter Evliya Çelebi in the second half of the 17th century. Being one of the highlights of Ottoman literature, several copies and popular editions of this text are available. Portions of a scientific edition, which have started to appear only recently, are based on the generally agreed upon archetype Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 304 to 308. Examples relevant for our paper have been taken from a passage comprising roughly 120 pages in print of the archetype Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305, 236b to 259b.

It goes without saying that a broader corpus of different texts is necessary to arrive at more general conclusions concerning the function of similar phenomena in Ottoman Turkish.

An overall review of the syntactic features of the *Seyahatname* shows that most of the morphosyntactic strategies forming subordinate clauses in present day Turkish were already applied in Middle Ottoman. Strikingly enough, genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas seem to compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages.

In the field of relativization, for instance, we find the presumably Iranian syntactic type, combining two clauses with a finite verb by means of a conjunction *kim / kih*, alongside the Turkic type of embedding the non-finite verb form preceding the head of the relative clause into a main clause.

The following points will be discussed in this survey:

- How can the characteristics of “Iranian” and Turkic strategies of relativization be described, which subtypes are represented within the material?
- Do specialized subtypes correlate with specific functions?
- Can a certain distribution of these coexisting patterns be traced?
- How do the copied syntactic patterns function in Ottoman Turkish, are they confined to functions more narrow or specialized than in the languages they were borrowed from?
- Do the two coexisting types complement each other in forming a functional system of relativization?

It should be noted that we will restrict our discussion to examples of attributive or adnominal (in contrast to absolutive or free) relative clauses, only.

### 1. A general definition of relative clauses

It is a well-known fact that relative clauses differ quite considerably in their syntactic structures across languages. Yet, setting out from purely semantic characteristics, we could attempt the following general definition for the attributive relative constructions in our material:

Relative clauses (henceforth RC) are dependent, adnominal constructions which contain either defining or additional comments referring to a certain element within the embedding clause. This central element, which will be called head (= basic segment), may consist of a nominal, a nominal clause or a pronoun.

As already mentioned, two opposite strategies of relativization are at work in our material: We find the presumably Indo-European syntactic type, combining two clauses with a finite verb by means of the relator *kim / kih*, alongside the Turkic type of embedding the non-finite verb form preceding the head of the relative clause into a main clause. In contemporary Turkish, the Indo-European type for the most has been given up. Where it still appears, its function is restricted to the rendering of plot-advancing relative clauses. This topic has been dealt with at length in Johanson (1975).

### 2. The “Turkic” strategy of relativization

The “Turkic” RC contains a non-finite verb form (a participle or verbal noun with or without a personal marker). According to the principle that defining elements precede the defined entities, this type of RC is pre-positive; it always precedes its *head*:

- (1) Bu      kuh-ı              Sübḥandà      otlayan  
      DEM   mountain:EZ   Süphan:LOC   graze:PART

devabatuñ çoğı ikişer quzular.<sup>1</sup> (243a28)  
 cattle:GEN most:POSS two:DSTR lamb:AOR:PL  
 'Most of the sheep which graze / grazing on this mountain of  
 Süphan lamb twice a year.'

The subject position of the main clause is taken by the genitive construction *devabatuñ çoğı* 'most of the cattle', followed by an adverbial expression and a finite verb form.

At the same time, this genitive construction forms the head of a pre-positive "nominalized" relative clause based on the embedded subjunctive *otlayan* 'grazing'. As in this case the head correlates with the agent of the relative clause, in the prevailing time / aspect constellation of the relative construction the so-called present participle in *-(y)An* is obligatory as the nonfinite verb form of the embedded clause.

### 2.1. Subtypes of the Turkic relative construction

To characterize the Turkic strategy of relativization, we chose the most simple type of relative construction: In our example 1, the head correlates with the agent of the RC.

Like in contemporary Turkish, various subtypes of the Turkic embedded RC can be found in our material, too. We will not give a detailed description of every pattern applied to form "Turkic" subordinative RCs in our text. Instead, the distribution of certain categories of relative clauses in our text will be presented according to the systematic classification for contemporary Turkish elaborated by Johanson (1989). In his article *Subjektlose Sätze im Türkischen* (1989), Johanson showed that the choice of a nominalized subjunctive basically depends on the correlation of the head (as part of the main clause) with the agent, the direct or indirect affectee or another, mostly adverbial, element of the RC. As the inventory of our Ottoman materials largely agrees with the types

<sup>1</sup> The system used here to transcribe the Ottoman examples deviates from the alphabet of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft mainly with regard to the rendering of vowels: Basically, vowels written *plene* are given in normal type, *hareke* is indicated by ' (apostrophe), vowels which do not appear in the Arabic script are given in italics. For a more detailed explanation of this interpretative transcription see Bulut (1997).

described by Johanson (1989), it will be sufficient to mention the basic constellations and to give one example for each subtype.

Table 1: Constellations of coreference between the head and the agents of prepositive RCs

<b>Constellation I</b>	<b>Constellation II</b>	<b>Constellation III</b>
coreference head → (a) agent of the RC or (b) its possessor	coreference head → (a) direct affectee (accusative object) or (b) its possessor	coreference head → (a) indirect affectee / adverbial term of place, time or manner {or (b) its possessor}
subjunctors without personal markers: participles in <i>-(y)En</i> , <i>-mİş</i> , <i>{-(y)EcEk}</i> or aorist participle	subjunctors with personal markers: verb noun + POSS = <i>-dİGI</i> , *{participle + POSS = <i>-(y)EcEgİ</i> }	subjunctors with or without personal markers: = <i>-dİGI</i> , <i>-(y)EcEk</i>

Note: The inventory of infinite subjunctors forming relative clauses is based on contemporary Turkish; braces {...} mean that the respective form rarely ever occurs in the Ottoman materials checked, \*{...} that no examples at all could be found.

The following examples of prepositive relative clauses from the *Seyahatname* illustrate the basic constellations of coreference between head and agent of the RC; numbers in parentheses refer to the respective pages of the autograph Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305.

### 2.1.1. Constellation I

In constellation I, the head is corefential with (a) the agent of the RC or (b) its possessor. In this constellation, subjunctors without personal markers appear, e.g. the participles in *-(y)En*, *-mİş*, *{-(y)EcEk}* or aorist participle.

### 2.1.1.1. -(y)En

For constellation Ia, coreference of the head with the agent of the RC, see example 1 above. Example 2 represents constellation Ib, coreference of the head with the possessor of the agent of the RC:

- (2) *Ve i'tıbarı 'olmayan nesneleriñ*  
and worth:POSS be:PART thing:PL:GEN

*medh-i kelimında melalet vardır.* (240b22f)  
praise:EZ rhetoric boredom exist: PRS 3SG  
'And in the wordy praise of things that are not subject  
of common interest lies boredom.' Literally: "things  
whose common interest does not exist"

### 2.1.1.2. -miş

Example 3 shows a relative construction with the participle in *-miş* as an infinite subjunctive in constellation Ia. Yet, for constellation Ib, no convincing construction could be found:

- (3) *Bir yalçın divar gibi qayaya*  
a steep wall like rock:DAT

*d'ay'an°m'ış ağac nerd-ban ilè çıkılır.* (246a18)  
lean:PART tree ladder with POSP go up:PASS:AOR 3SG  
'People climb up there on a wooden ladder that leans against a rock as  
steep as a wall.'

### 2.1.1.3. Aorist

With the aorist participle, both positions of constellation I can be realized; example 4 represents constellation Ia, while in example 5 constellation Ib is relativized:

- (4) *Semm-i helahilden nişan verir bir şudur.* (243b20)  
deadly poison:ABL sign give:PART a water: COP  
'It is a water which equals deathly poison.'

- (5) *Ve q'ol kemikleri yedişer s'ekizer arşın*  
and arm bone:PL:POSS seven:DSTR eight:DSTR yard

g'el'ir            qalın    ve    t'avil    kemikler    dir. (238a20)  
 come:PART    thick    and    long    bone:PL    COP  
 'They are long, strong bones whose [...] ulnas are about  
 seven to eight yards long.'

#### 2.1.1.4. {-(y)EcEk}: Diathetic indifference

More difficult to group are relative constructions with the infinite subordinator in {-(y)EcEk}, as this entity typically yields constellations of diathetic indifference. Formally, they correspond to constellation I, thus implying coreference between the head and the agent. Semantically, they behave like constellation II, coreference with the direct affectee (cf. *yiyecek bir şey* 'something which will be eaten / to eat' and not 'something which will eat') or constellation III, coreference with the indirect affectee or an adverbial term of place, time or manner, corresponding to relative adverbs both in German and English, e.g. the place where, the time when (cf. example 6: *gidecek yolları* 'paths on which one can walk' and not 'paths which can walk').

In general, passivation would be a means to avoid expressing an agent. In terms of relative clauses, passivation on the embedded subjunctive yields coreference of the head with the direct or indirect affectee of the relative clause. Yet, in connection with heads semantically referring to place / location, cases of diathetic indifference (Johanson 1989: 209) occur: The subjunctive sometimes lacks diathetic marking. Although the context obviously implies coreference of the head with a direct or indirect affectee, the surface structure of this type of relative constructions shows coreference of the head with the agent of the relative clause.

- (6) *Ve her birinden birbirinè qayalar*  
 and each one:POSS:ABL one:POSS:DAT rock:PL  
  
*içrè imdadà gidècek yolları vardır. (252b11f)*  
 inside:POSP help:DAT go:PART path:PL:POSS exist  
 'And (the towers) have paths on which one can get from one  
 to the other within the rocks for assistance {'if help is needed'}.'



### 2.1.2. Constellation II

In constellation II, the head is coreferential with (a) the direct affectee (accusative object) of the RC {or (b) its possessor}. In this case, sub-junctors with personal markers appear; in most instances, position IIa is taken by possessive forms of the verb noun in *-dIK* [= *-dIGI* etc.]; for position IIb, our material did not yield any attributive construction. There are also no examples where the entity  $\{-(y)EcEgI\}$ , consisting of the so-called future participle and a possessive marker, forms adnominal relative clauses.

- (7) Bunlar ma-beynindè cem' etdikleri  
 they between:POSS:LOC collect:VN  
  
 beyzàlarà nişan qomamışlar idi. (238b21f)  
 egg:PL:DAT sign put:NEG:PF INFR 3PL  
 'They had not marked the eggs they had collected between them.'

### 2.1.3. Constellation III

In constellation III, the head is coreferential with (a) the indirect affectee of the RC or an adverbial term of place, time or manner {or (b) its possessor}. In this case, sub-junctors with personal markers appear, e.g. entities in *-dIK* with possessive suffixes as in example 8, or without personal marker, namely the future participle in  $-(y)EcEk$  as in example 9,. Position IIIb is not represented at all.

Interestingly, no coreference of the head with a dative of the RC (cf. Turkish: *verdiğim adam* 'the man whom / to whom I gave') could be traced; in all cases checked, the head is an expression referring to time or location. Thus, the relative clause would need an introducing relative adverb both in German and English, e.g. 'the place where / the time (when)':

- (8) Hicretten bu üstühanları temaşa etdigimiz  
 Hegira:ABL this bone:PL:ACC see:VN:POSS 1PL  
  
 maḥaldè 1065 senè idi. (238a29)  
 time:LOC 1065 year was  
 'The time we saw these bones was the year 1065 after the Hegira.'

## 2.2. Summary: The inventory of prepositive RCs

The main difference between the Ottoman and the contemporary Turkish inventory of prepositive relative clauses obviously lies in the forms of the so-called future participle. In our material, combinations of *-(y)EcEk* with personal marker *>-(y)EcEgI*, etc. do exist; yet, they only appear in absolutive position, where their function is restricted to the rendering of complement clauses.<sup>2</sup>

Judging from the fact that—with one exception—virtually every possible main type of the Turkic strategies of embedding relativization is represented in the text, “gaps” in the area of function can not be made responsible for the existence of a second pattern of relative constructions in our material. There must be another functional differentiation at work.

## 3. The “Indo-European” strategy of relativization

In contrast to the “Turkic” strategy of relativization, RCs of the Indo-European type contain a finite verb form. With regard to the matrix clause, their position is different as well: They never precede their heads and only very rarely immediately follow it. In most cases, the RC follows the main clause, as in example 9 below:

- (9) Amma bu nehr-i Hoşaf haqqakih h'oş abdır  
 Yet DEM river:EZ Hoşaf really nice water:COP
- kim ab-ı zülalden nişan verir. (237a32)  
 CONJ water: EZ delicious sign give:AOR:3SG  
 ‘Yet, this Hoşaf river is really a nice water, which equals  
 the waters of paradise.’

Formally, two independent clauses, each containing a finite verb form, are connected. In theory, each of these clauses could lead a life of its own. Co-ordination here is only indicated by the free relator *kim*: Thus,

<sup>2</sup> The functions of the unit *-(y)EcEk* in present-day Turkish constitute a rather new development anyway. Adamović (1985: 92ff.) explains that since the 14th century a modal verb noun in *-(y)EcEk*—in most cases of verbs that denote movement or dwelling—is attributed to *nomina loci*. The action expressed in these forms was generally impersonal, without designation of an agent.

before going on with an analysis of this type of relative construction, we should have a closer look at the connecting element.

### 3.1. The relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim*

In our material, we find three similar relators, namely *kih*, *kî* and *kim*. In all probability, the relators *kih* and *kî* are copies of Persian *ke*, whereas *kim* may be derived from the Turkish interrogative pronoun *kim* ‘who’.<sup>3</sup>

The relator *kih* (or its presumed variant *kî*) either functions as a disjunctive entity, especially after *verba sentiendi* and *dicendi*, or, in sentence-final position, as a kind of emphatic marker in the sense of ‘indeed / certainly not’. Besides its disjunctive functions, which it shares with *kî* and *kih*, *kim*—though far from being a relative pronoun—is the only one of these relators that appears in relative constructions.

The conjunctive entity *kim* is not subordinative: It is thus impossible to co-ordinate two phrases introduced by *kim* with the conjunction *ve*; Turkish subordinative subjunctors, on the other hand, may be co-ordinated. Thus, very much like Persian *kè*, the conjunctive *kim* itself may function as a co-ordinative relator.

### 3.2. *Kim* as a polyfunctional relator

As already mentioned, the applicability of *kim* is not restricted to relative clauses. Basically, *kim* appears in two functions, which are not explicitly marked on the sentence surface. As early as 1680, Meninski described the different roles this relator can play.<sup>4</sup>

These two functionally different types of *kim* can be defined as follows:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> As it is not essential for our topic, taking up the discussion about the origin of the three relators would go too far; for basic information on the etymological background see Clauson (1972: 720-721).

<sup>4</sup> In his grammatical concept, *ki* and *kim* pass for a “relativum”. Obviously, intonation is not seen as a means of functional differentiation, cf. Meninski (1756, I: 94): “Ubi nota relativum hoc ki, etiam quando significat quod vel ut, legi semper debere immediate & indissolubiliter cum præcedenti verbo vel nomine, cui postponitur ...”.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Johanson (1993: 254) concerning the relator *ki* in Modern Turkish. In our material, there is a tendency to attach *kim* in disjunctive function directly to the

1. In all probability, the first type—which we will call “disjunctive *kim*”—was set off by an intonational stop after the relator. *Kim* in this case belongs to the first of the connected clauses (as already noted by Meninski), functioning like a clause-final colon. An overall translation of *kim* in this position would be ‘that is:’ (= “und zwar:”). In this constellation, only contextual criteria indicate how the following clause shall be interpreted. Thus, disjunctive *kim* yields causal, temporal or consecutive interpretations at the same time.
2. With the second type—which could be called “conjunctive *kim*”—the intonational stop would be before the relator. In this constellation, *kim* is part of the second clause, which necessarily has to be interpreted as a relative clause.

With written sources, of course, the differentiation of the two basic functions of *kim* by intonation is missing. Thus, an interpretation of the role the polyfunctional relator *kim* plays greatly depends on contextual criteria.

Table 2 sums up the basic functional differentiation of the three relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim* as represented in our material.

Table 2: The polyfunctional relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim*

<i>kih</i> (~ <i>kî</i> )	
(1) Disjunctive	(2) Emphatic
‘that’ or ‘colon’	(in sentence-final position)
(after verbs of perception / <i>verba sentiendi</i> and <i>dicendi</i> )	

preceding element; this is of course only possible with Arabic letters which can be connected to the left. Yet, in its conjunctive function the relator is, for the most part, written separately.

- kim*
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) Disjunctive<br>'that' or 'colon' → <i>kim</i> :<br>(the connected clause may be<br>interpreted as causal, tempo-<br>ral or consecutive) | (2) Conjunctive<br>connecting relative clauses<br>containing a finite verb form |
|---|---|
- Presumably differentiated through intonation:  
intonational stop (1) after disjunctive *kim*  
(2) before co-ordinative relator *kim*

### 3.3. Subtypes of relative clauses co-ordinated by *kim*

As the following survey demonstrates, postpositive relative clauses can appear in all of the basic constellations of coreference between the head and the agent of the RC defined in Table 1.

#### 3.3.1. Constellation I

For constellation Ia cf. example 9. Example 10 represents constellation Ib; the head, *qal'è-'i qavi*, corefers with the possessor of the agent of the relative clause. This is formally indicated by the possessive suffix *+i* attached to the agent, *taş*.

The strategy applied here for the rendering of constellation Ib, which would require the use of a relative pronoun in the genitive in German or English, is typical of languages which either have no relative pronoun at all (as e.g. Modern Persian) or whose relative pronouns cannot be marked for case (as is the case with the relative pronouns *'alladî*, *man* and *mâ* in Arabic). In Arabic and Persian, resumptive enclitic pronouns may function as case markers in the constellations discussed here. An enclitic pronoun (congruent with the head) is attached to the entity of the relative clause this head corefers with. Turkish uses a possessive suffix for positions which correspond to the genitive of the relative pronoun. In constellations II and III, anaphoric pronouns may appear; yet, as will be demonstrated below, they are in fact rarely used in our material.

- (10) *Bir qal'è-'i qavidir kim her*  
a castle:EZ strong:COP CONJ every

taş1                fil                c'üssəsi                qadar vardır. (245a10f)  
 stone:POSS elephant body:POSS POSP exist  
 'It is a strong castle, whose every stone has the size of the body  
 of an elephant.'

### 3.3.2. Constellation II

The material yields no example for constellation IIb; predictably the agent in constellation IIa, which is easy to relativize, is not taken up by an anaphoric pronoun:

- (11) Şehr-i      Tebriz-i      dîl-avizdir      kim      senè  
 city:EZ      Tabris:EZ      charming:COP      CONJ      year  
 991      tarihîndè [...]      Şah-ı 'Acem      istila êdüp ... (238b8f)  
 991      date:POSS:ABL      king of Persia      occupy:GER  
 'It is the charming city of Tabris, which the king of Persia  
 occupied in 991 ...'

### 3.3.3. Constellation III

As constellation III is more difficult to relativize, one would expect the indirect affectee coreferring with the head of the RC to be taken up by an anaphoric pronoun. Interestingly, in example 12, which shows relativization of the dative in constellation IIIa, no resumptive pronoun (e.g. *aña*) is used. Example 13 may illustrate constellation IIIb; yet, the syntactical structure allows various interpretations:

- (12) Bir      ılıcà                vardır      kim  
 a      hot spring      exists      CONJ  
 her senè [...]      niçè biñ                adamlar [...]      gel'üp ... (245a35f)  
 every year      so many thousand      man:PL      come:GER  
 'There is a hot spring, which is visited every year by  
 thousands of people [...].'  
 (13) Qırq yıldà                bir      sedd-i Nemrud      êder                kim  
 forty year:LOC      a      ziggurat                make:AOR 3SG      CONJ

ta esasından zirvè-'i a'lasınà yedi  
 very bottom:POSS:ABL top:EZ highest:POSS:DAT seven

gündè 'ummallar seng-i ħara° [...] çıkarırlarmış. (237a6)  
 day:LOC worker:PL granite stones bring up:INFR 3PL  
 'Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat, literally: "from whose very bottom to its top it is said the builders had to bring up granite stones (enumeration of other materials left out here) in seven days."'6 [the builders, it is said, had to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top in seven days.]

Examples like 13 are to some extent equivocal, as in this context the function of the relator is by no means clear. If it has to be interpreted as conjunctive *kim*, the construction can be understood as a syntactically complex relative clause: The basic segment *sedd-i Nemrud*<sup>7</sup> corefers with the possessor of the indirect affectee ('place') of the relative clause, which is in the ablative or dative case, respectively. Interestingly, this complex sentence can easily be translated into a Persian relative construction: The (presumably anaphoric) Turkish possessive markers *+i* on *esas* and *zirvè-i a'lasınà* will be rendered by a clitic pronoun 3SG *+aš*, the ablative and dative markers have to be transformed into the prepositions *az* ('from') and *tâ* ('to'):

- (14) *Dâr çehel ruz borc-i sâxt ke az*  
 within forty day tower:REL MARK built CONJ from  
  
*pâye ta ğolle-aš kârgarân senghâ-râ dâr*  
 foot to peak:CLT 3SG worker:PL stone:PL:ACC in  
  
*haft ruz bâlâ bordand / kešidand.*  
 seven day up bring:PST 3PL

<sup>6</sup> Note that relativization of this position is not possible in standard English, where pronoun retention in this case would be rather unusual.

<sup>7</sup> Due to the possessive suffix on *esas*, there is some evidence for *sedd-i Nemrud* being the head of the relative clause. One could of course also think of an adverbial RC with *qırq yılda* as the head.

Judging from the fact that a nearly one-to-one translation into a Persian RC is possible, example 13 may of course be interpreted as an Ottoman relative construction which is either formed according to Persian models or may even be a translation from a Persian text. Yet, with intonational patterns or punctuation missing, some ambiguity remains. In the given constellation, one might also understand the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* as a disjunctive entity: ‘Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat: [It is said that] the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

The vague relation between these two propositions may also allow a temporal interpretation: ‘Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat: [it is said that] meanwhile the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

Presuming that the indefinite pronoun *bir* was stressed, a consecutive interpretation seems possible as well: ‘Within 40 years, he built [such] a ziggurat that [as they tell] the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

Thus, example 13 is interesting in two respects: It demonstrates that complex (relative?) constructions use syntactical means very close to those found in New Persian. At the same time, it shows how ambiguous some of these Ottoman patterns are, where clause combining is only indicated by the polyfunctional relator *kim*. The same ambiguity arises for instance with patterns where *kim* combines with a *nomen loci*, as e.g. *üzer-* in ex. 15 +POSS+case (LOC):

- (15) Amma gayet ‘ariz divarlardır  
       but quite broad wall:PL:COP 3SG
- kim ‘üzèrindè atlı  
       CONJ upper side:POSS:LOC horse:INST
- c’èrid° ‘oynas’à m’ümkindir. (245a13)  
       polo play:COND possible:COP 3SG

In all probability, example 15 should be interpreted as a relative construction, which also has a parallel in the respective Persian patterns. Furthermore, the analytic pattern is another factor displaying Iranian structural features: In Turkish, possibility can be rendered synthetically by the suffix *-Ebil* attached to the verb stem. Iranian languages may



combine an impersonal modal expression (e.g. *momken ast* ‘it is possible’ in Persian) with the subjunctive of the following verb. Many of the modal constructions in Ottoman Turkish reflect Iranian patterns, the optative or imperative holding a position similar to that of the subjunctive in the respective Iranian constructions.

With *kim* as a conjunctive relator, example 15 can be translated as a relative construction: ‘They are really thick walls, on which it would be possible to play polo.’

Yet, supposing that *kim* here has to be understood as a disjunctive relator, the sense would change to a consecutive meaning: ‘They are really thick walls, so that it would be possible to play polo on them.’

### 3.4. Pronoun retention

Basically, our material provides two types of right-branching RCs: Those connected only by the polyfunctional relator *kim* and others, which contain an additional resumptive pronoun.

Meninski’s grammar (1756: I, 93-94) offers a whole paradigm of so-called “relative pronouns”, which in fact are combinations of the free relators *kih* / *kim* with the oblique forms of the anaphoric pronoun *ol* (*kih anuñ, añā, anı, andan, anlaruñ, anlara, anları, anlardan*). Compared to our material, where oblique forms of *bu* also appear, as well as to common place language universals this paradigm looks a bit too schematic.<sup>8</sup>

Only in combination with an anaphoric pronoun, would clauses introduced by the polyfunctional relator *kim* be marked explicitly as RCs. Yet, in simple relations of coreference between head and agent of the RC—as e.g. in our constellations I and II—resumptive pronouns are in general rarely used across languages. In fact, pronoun retention is a rather marginal phenomenon, restricted to the more complicated relations of head and correlate as represented in constellation III. Here, the relativized position is taken up again by an anaphoric pronoun within the RC, which may consist of an oblique form of *ol* or *bu*.

<sup>8</sup> Pronoun retention, for instance, would be possible but quite unusual with relativization of the accusative; in cases of relativization of the position of the genitive, a Turkish possessive marker is obviously preferred to the analytic pronoun *anuñ*, cf. example 11: *kim her taşı ...* ‘every stone of which’.

Interestingly, constellations with pronoun retention are extremely rare in our material; combinations of *kim* with the respective oblique forms of *bu*, namely *kim ... bunlaruñ*, *ki ... bunlardà* and *kim bundan* appear only once throughout our material. In altogether five instances, the dative is relativized by means of the resumptive pronoun *aña*, which immediately follows the relator *kim*. Yet, the sentence structure in all five cases is exactly the same as in examples 16 and 21, below: “... is the place (X), which (Y) calls (Z)”:

- (16) 'Ol derè nehr-'i D'önd'irm'è d'ir° kim  
 that river river:EZ Döndirme COP 3SG CONJ  
  
*aña* B'en°d-'i M'ah'i der°ler. (245b18)  
 Prn:DAT dam:EZ fish say:AOR3PL  
 ‘It is the river Döndirme, which they call Bend-i Mahi (‘fish-dam’).’

Only in RCs introduced by *kim aña*, is the formal markedness of the syntactic function explicit and no other interpretation possible. Constellations with oblique forms of *bu* behave differently: Especially in one instance (*kim ... bunlaruñ* in 241a24f), where the resumptive pronoun does not immediately follow *kim*, a disjunctive reading of the relator would be possible as well.

- (17) Cümlè hayrat -u hasanat şahibleridir  
 all charitable act and good deeds owner:PL:POSS:COP 3SG  
  
*kim (...)* Altun Hâqâhî cisri  
 CONJ Altun Hâqâhî bridge:POSS  
  
 ve Çoban köprüsi bunlaruñ binasıdır (241a24f)  
 and Çoban bridge:POSS Prn:PL:GEN building:POSS COP

A conjunctive interpretation of the relator *kim* yields the following translation: ‘They are all beneficent and charitable men, whose buildings are the Altun Hâqâhî and the Çoban Bridge.’

With *kim* in disjunctive function, e.g. a causal meaning can be interpreted: ‘They are all beneficent and charitable men, as the Altun Hâqâhî and the Çoban Bridge are their buildings.’

Thus, the role of conjunctive *kim* as co-ordinative relator with relative clauses can be described as follows: Without additional distinguishing features such as intonation or punctuation, most postpositive RCs coordinated by the polyfunctional relator *kim* display a vague markedness of their syntactic function. The only position where this function finds an explicit formal expression is a combination of *kim* with the resumptive pronoun immediately following.

Table 3: Conjunctive *kim* as co-ordinative relator /  
conjunctive with relative clauses

	<i>kim</i>	<i>kim</i> + anaphoric pronoun
Formal markedness of	vague	explicit: <i>kim aña / bunlardà / bundan</i>
syntactic function		vague: <i>kim ... bunlaruñ</i>
Frequency	high	marginal

#### 4. Frequency of the subtypes of prepositive and postpositive relative clauses

Finally, we may compare the distribution of the representatives of the two opposed strategies of relativization in our material. As roughly two thirds of the relative clauses are prepositive, the Turkic left-branching type is altogether predominant.

With both types of relative clauses, constellation I—coreference of the head of the main clause with the first agent of the relative clause—is the most frequent subtype in our material. In constellation Ia, the prepositive type is clearly predominant, making up two thirds of the total, whereas with Ib, the postpositive RC clearly dominates. Thus, the right-branching pattern ..., *kim filan şeyi var* is preferred to the left-branching *filan şeyi olan* ..., by a ratio of approximately 6 to 1.

With constellation II, the Turkic type of RC dominates.

In constellation III, which is the most difficult to relativize, the right-branching type, including subtypes with pronoun retention, is slightly pre-eminent.

Leaving aside the preponderance of certain subtypes in different constellations, the overall impression is that both strategies—in theory—can appear in all three possible constellations. As the two patterns are not applied complementarily, they are most obviously competing in certain areas of relativization. Table 4 presents the inventory of pre- and postpositive RCs in Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305, 236b to 246b:

Table 4: Distribution of pre- and postpositive RCs

	Prepositive		Postpositive
Constellation I	-POSS	Total: 72	Total: 36
coreference head	participles in -		
→ (a) agent of the RC	(y)En	(a) 37	(a) 24
or (b) its possessor		(b) 2	(b) 12
	-mİş	(a) 20	
		(b) 1 (?)	
	{-(y)EcEk}	(a) 1 (?)	{+ optative: 2}
	aorist	11	
		(a) 10	
		(b) 1	
Constellation II: corefer-	+POSS		
ence head	-dİGI	(a) 13	(a) 1
→ (a) direct affectee	*{-(y)EcEgI}		
(accusative object) or (b)			
its possessor			
Constellation III:	+ ~ -POSS	(a) Total: 12	(a) + (b) Total: 17
coreference head	-dİGI	6	head → place: 5
→ (a) indirect affectee /	-(y)EcEk	5	head → means: 3
adverbial term of place,	aorist	1	kim aña: 6
time or manner {or (b)}			kim bunlaruñ: 1
its possessor}			kim bunlardâ: 1
			kim bundan: 1

If in certain constellations the choice between a pre- or a postpositive RC exists, we have to ask which criteria are involved in the decision for one or the other type. Traditionally, three explanations have been given for the application of a right-branching RC in favour of the left-branching Turkic type:

1. As postpositive RCs contain a finite verb form, they can be employed to render complex verb forms—which otherwise could not be done by the infinite subjunctive of the Turkic RC.

2. The postpositive RC is less grammaticalized than the nominalized Turkic type—it thus allows focusing by means of changing the word order. (Not true for pronoun retention.)
3. As the relation between the tenses used within the main clause and the relative clause is free, the Indo-European pattern may be employed to render plot-advancing RCs. (This is clearly the case in contemporary Turkish.)<sup>9</sup>

We have carefully checked all these arguments. Yet, as far as the postpositive RCs in our material are concerned, there are 1) neither very complex verb forms within the RCs, nor 2) convincing examples of focusing by variation of word order. 3) Plot-propulsing postpositive RCs do appear, but they make up much too little a share to offer an explanation for the application of the right-branching RCs in general.

## **5. State of definiteness of the head**

As far as we can judge from a very limited data base of a single text, the choice of a prepositive or a postpositive RC mainly depends on the state of definiteness of the head.

### **5.1. Left-branching RCs**

The Turkish prepositive type of RCs always combines with indefinite heads. In this case, the relative clause contains information which is necessary in order to understand the construction as a whole. It can be identified, in other words, with the well-known type of restrictive or defining relative clause.

In the following example, it would not be possible to omit the RC without changing the meaning of the whole sentence. The prepositive RC refers to the head “men”, in this case the genitive object of the embedding clause. If we omitted the relative clause, the remaining sentence would mean that “(the / all) men’s hair falls out”. Yet, only by way of the information contained in the relative clause does it become clear that this statement is restricted to a certain group of men—those, namely, who have bathed in a certain well.

<sup>9</sup> For an extensive discussion of these arguments see Johanson (1975) and Lehmann (1984: 272-274)

- (18) Her bar giren adamlarun  
every time go:PART man:PL:GEN

saç1 ve şaqalı d'ökülür. (243b28)  
hair:POSS and beard:POSS fall out:AOR 3SG  
'The hair and beard of the men who go into (the  
water of this well) falls out.'

## 5.2. Right-branching RCs

In the case of postpositive RCs, on the other hand, we can discern two categories of definiteness of the head. Following Lehmann's (1984) classification, we will describe them as follows:

### 5.2.1. With inherently definite heads

Names and pronouns are inherently definite.<sup>10</sup> With heads belonging to one of these two categories, the relative clause does not function as a definition of the term in question (Lehmann 1982: 282: ≠ "Begriffsbildung"). It rather has the character of additional information or a comment on the head noun. In the following examples, dropping the appositive RC would not influence the meaning of the head, which—as a name or pronoun—is inherently definite:

- (19) Ve 'Er°t'uğrul pederi Süleyman Şahdır kim {...}  
and Ertuğrul father:POSS Süleyman Şah:COP 3SG CONJ

nehr-i Fırata ğarq olup andà medfundır. (241a7f)  
river:EZ Fırat:DAT drown:GER there buried:COP 3SG  
'And the father of Ertuğrul is Süleyman Şah, who drowned  
{...} in the river Fırat and was buried near there.'

- (20) Qal'è-'i Ves°tan y'olıdır kim  
fortress:EZ Vestan , road:POSS:COP 3SG CONJ

<sup>10</sup> There are of course cases where the uniqueness of the proper name can be neutralized, as, for instance, if there are several people with the same name: Are you the Mehmet (one of several persons with this name) who wants to marry my daughter?

Hakkari vilâyeti içrè (...) Vanà gider. (236b35ff)  
 Hakkari province:POSS POSP Van.DAT go:AOR 3SG  
 'It is the road to the fortress of Vestan, which leads through  
 the province of Hakkari (...) up to the city of Van.'

- (21) Erzen-Baycandır kim aña 'Acem m'üverrihleri  
 Erzen-Baycan CONJ Pm:DAT Persian historian:PL POSS

'Azerbaycan derler o kim  
 Azerbaijan say:AOR 3PL that CONJ

şehr-i Tebriz-i dil-avizdir. (238b8f)  
 city:EZ Tabris:EZ charming:COP 3SG  
 'It is Erzen-Baycan, which the Persian historians call Azerbaijan,  
 that one, which is the city of Tabris, the charming.'

### 5.2.2. Indefinite relative constructions → indefinite and specific heads

The head of postpositive RCs can also be indefinite and specific ("a certain", in contrast to indefinite and unspecific "someone, anything"). According to Lehmann (1984: 265), this state of definiteness of the head yields an indefinite relative construction. In such a constellation, the semantic difference between restrictive and appositive RCs with respect to term definition ("Begriffsbildung") is neutralized. As to the theoretical precepts of linguistic universals, the relevant position can be taken both by restrictive and appositive RCs. Yet, a careful analysis of our material reveals that in this constellation appositive relative clauses dominate.

- (22) Yinè bu maḥallè qarib bir  
 again this place:DAT near INDEF

'ayn-ı germa vardır kim qayadın şazrevan  
 spring:EZ hot exist:COP 3SG CONJ rock:ABL cascade

gibi kendüyi pertab êdüp aşağıdaki  
 like RFL:ACC plunge:GER below:LOC:particle

‘aştır<sup>en</sup> -fî-aştır    havz-ı    kebirè    rizan olur. (245b3f)  
 ten-by-ten    pool:EZ    big:DAT    flow:AOR 3SG  
 ‘Near this place is another hot spring, which—gushing down the rocks  
 like a cascade—flows into the big “ten-by-ten” pool below.’

### 5.2.3. With the cataphoric pronoun *ol* preceding the head

Heads combined with appositive RCs may sometimes be preceded by the anaphoric pronoun *bu* (‘this, the aforesaid’). The combination with the cataphoric pronoun *ol* as in 23, on the other hand, yields a restrictive RC.

In all probability, this pattern is a copy of a certain Persian RC type where “the demonstrative adjective *ân* is often used to denote the restrictive clause” (Thackston 1978: 126).<sup>11</sup> Interestingly, it also has parallels in present-day Turkic varieties that show syntactical influence from Iranian languages, as e.g. Iraqi Turkmen, cf. ex. 24.

- (23) Bend-i Mahi    ol    maḥaldır    kim  
 Bend-i Mahi    that    place:COP 3SG    CONJ  
  
 yıldà    bir kerrè [...]    Van    deryasınũ  
 year:LOC    once    Van    lake:POSS:GEN

balıqları    raygan olup (237b5f)  
 fish:POSS PL    gather:GER  
 ‘Bend-i Mahi is the place where once a year all the fish of the  
 lake of Van are gathered.’

- (24) Gètti    o    yerä  
 go:PST 3SG    that    place:DAT

ki    ayrındılar. (Hassan 1979: 10 / 147)  
 CONJ    part:PST 3PL  
 ‘He returned to the place where they had parted from each other.’

<sup>11</sup> If the position after the head of a Persian RC is already occupied by possessive pronouns or pronominal enclitics, the restrictive marker *+i*, which in other constellations introduces restrictive RCs, cannot be used. Instead, the complex noun phrase will be preceded by the cataphoric pronoun *ân*.



## 6. Summary

Thus, we may conclude that Middle Ottoman Turkish applies two opposite strategies of relativization, which are distributed according to their function.

The Turkic type represents the restrictive RC. It is strongly grammaticalized and shows a closer affinity to its head on a semantic level, too.

The Indo-European type, which represents the appositive type of RC, shows less grammaticalization. The relation to its head is less explicitly marked on the sentence surface, the semantic relation vague.

Characteristic features of the two competing relativization patterns can almost be described as antonyms. The following table presents the main oppositions in syntactic structure and the applied strategy of clause combining in a simplified and generalized way.

Table 5. Some characteristics of the competing strategies of relativization

	Turkic type	Indo-European type
Syntactic structure:		
Position of relative clause in relation to head	prepositive, left-branching (rectum → regens)	postpositive, right-branching (regens → rectum)
Verb form within the relative clause	subjunctive: non-finite / nominalized verb forms	finite verb forms
Word order	rigid word order	variable word order (focusing is possible in subtypes without pronoun retention)
Pronoun retention	Ø	possible with certain subtypes
Strategy of clause combining:	embedding into main clause / subordination	co-ordination by polyfunctional conjunctive <i>kim</i>
Grammaticalization	high	low
Markedness / explicitness of syntactic function	explicit	vague
Function on the semantic level	restrictive / defining “Begriffsbildung”	appositive / commenting
State of definiteness of the head	indefinite	(1) inherently definite ~ (2) indefinite and specific
Frequency of the respective pattern	2 / 3	1 / 3
Frequency of the subtypes cf. Table 4		

## 7. Conclusions

The analysis of our rather limited data base shows that genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages:<sup>12</sup> Turkic non-finite clauses with subordinators—nominalized deverbal forms—may occur alongside clauses containing a finite verb form and an introducing conjunct. To exemplify the employment of these “Indo-European” strategies in clause combining, we chose relativization. Yet, relativization is by no means the only area where structurally different patterns fulfil a similar syntactic function. In our material, we found similar phenomena in the field of causal and final clauses, as well.<sup>13</sup>

The initial question was, why—at a given stage in language—these different strategies of clause combining are used parallel to one another. We can conclude now that they were employed as a means of functional differentiation: Turkic non-finite relative clauses are used to render restrictive relative clauses, whereas constructions with a finite verb form introduced by the polyfunctional conjunct *kim* are confined to the appositive type of relative clauses. The only exceptions to this rule are the rare examples where a cataphoric pronoun precedes the head of a restrictive—postpositive—relative clause.

Which conclusions do constellations—as reflected in the area of relativization—allow? Let us presuppose that relative clauses introduced by the polyfunctional conjunct *kim* are—in one way or another—copies of Indo-European patterns. In Indo-European languages, as for example contemporary Iranian languages, similar constructions with *ke / ku* are the only pattern in forming both restrictive and appositive relative clauses. Yet, their function within Ottoman Turkish (as the presumably copying language) is restricted to the appositive type of relative clauses, whereas the genuine Turkic strategy of relativization is confined to restrictive relative clauses. This situation mirrors one of the characteristic developments of copying processes: The copy never shows all the traces

<sup>12</sup> The Indo-European origin of the relative constructions connected by *kim* is generally accepted in Turcology. Yet, these structures must have been copied at quite an early stage of Turkic language history, as their appearance in AET and Middle Turkic texts demonstrates.

<sup>13</sup> See Bulut (1997).

of the original, but rather deviates in regard to form, function or combinational properties.

In code copying, strategies of clause combining are relatively easily copied: Clause combining takes place on a high level of syntactic organization, whereas the deeper layers of sentence structure and the level of morphology may remain unaffected. When we try to elaborate on the implications of copying strategies in clause combining, we should therefore keep in mind that a more thorough study would have to include all levels of copied elements in Ottoman Turkish.

Is Ottoman Turkish then a high copying variety? Compared to Turkic languages which are heavily influenced by Iranian languages, e.g. Southern Azerbaijanian and Khalaj, there are less fundamental changes in the sentence structure represented in our material. In the two languages mentioned above, important changes took place on the syntactic level, leading to heavy restrictions or even the abandonment of Turkic strategies of clause combining, for instance in the area of relativization.<sup>14</sup> A second characteristic development in Turkic languages of Iran (cf. Soper 1987) is the replacement of another subordinative pattern—the gerund constructions. Verb concatenation and adverbial subordination by the Turkic device of gerundialization are given up in favour of—again—Indo-European constructions with sentence initial conjunctions and finite verb forms. Thus, the most important change on the syntactic level of high copying varieties seems to be the substitution of Turkic subordinative structures by Indo-European strategies of clause combining.

<sup>14</sup> In certain high copying varieties such as Southern Azerbaijanian and Khalaj, the Turkic pattern is, for the most, replaced by the Iranian type of relative clauses. Similar conditions of language contact prevail in Gagauz spoken in Moldavia; especially in certain constellations in spoken Gagauz, the Indo-European relative constructions with the relator *ani* outnumber the genuine Turkic constructions with nominalized element, cf. the materials of Astrid Menz (forthcoming) for Gagauz. Iraqi Turkmen varieties, which have developed both under the influence of Iranian languages and Ottoman Turkish, display a mixed system: While in some constellations prepositive RCs with infinite subjunctors appear, the Iranian construction with a cataphoric pronoun introducing the postpositive restrictive RC is represented as well.

Yet, Ottoman Turkish—at least as represented in our limited choice of data—employs the copied structures only as an additional means of functional differentiation, while the genuine Turkic patterns of relativization and gerund constructions remain intact.

### References

- Adamović, Milan 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill
- Bulut, Christiane 1997. *Evliya Çelebis Reise von Bitlis nach Van. Ein Auszug aus dem Seyahatname. Interpretierende Transliteration, kommentierte Übersetzung und sprachwissenschaftliche Bemerkungen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hassan, Hussin Shahbaz 1979. *Kerkük ağzı*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Istanbul, Istanbul.]
- Johanson, Lars 1975 (1991). Some remarks on Turkic ‘hypotaxis’. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47, 104-118. [Reprinted in: Johanson, Lars 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 210-224.]
- Johanson, Lars 1989. Subjektlose Sätze im Türkischen. In: Brendemoen, Bernt (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 193-218.
- Lehmann, Christian 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen; Theorie seiner Funktionen; Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. (Language Universals Series 3.) Tübingen: Narr.
- Meninski, Franciszek 1680 (1756). *Linguarum orientalium, Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae institutiones* I-II. Wien.
- Menz, Astrid (forthcoming). *Kontaktbedingte Besonderheiten in der Syntax des Gagausischen*.
- Soper, John David 1987. *Loan syntax in Turkic and Iranian: The verb system of Tajik, Uzbek, and Qashqay*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.]
- Thackston, Wheeler McIntosh 1978. *An introduction to Persian*. Tehran: Soroush.