

Werk

Titel: Contact-induced effects in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish

Autor: Kappler , Matthias

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2008

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0012 | LOG_0035

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Contact-induced effects in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish

Matthias Kappler

Kappler, Matthias 2008. Contact-induced effects in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 12, 196-213.

The present paper focuses on syntactic features in Cypriot Turkish varieties which are apparently contact-induced, but have not yet been analyzed, or have not been analyzed sufficiently from that point of view in previous research. In the main section of the paper an attempt is made to analyze object and relative clauses introduced by complementizers in relation to similar Greek Cypriot constructions, arguing that these constructs have an underlying cleft strategy. The other sections treat Cypriot Turkish “subjunctive” clauses, the modal marker *hazır* and the dissociative marker *imiş* in the light of language contact. According to this paper, a comparative approach is considered to be indispensable for the analysis of Cypriot Turkish varieties and its main distinctive features from Standard Turkish and mainland varieties, which belong especially to the domain of syntax.

Matthias Kappler, University of Cyprus, Department of Turkish and Middle Eastern Studies, P.O. Box 20537, CY-1678 Nicosia, Cyprus. E-mail: mkappler@ucy.ac.cy

0. Introduction

The issue of language contacts in Cyprus, which concerns mainly Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek, but also other languages, such as English, Armenian and Cypriot Maronite Arabic, has been discussed in various studies, though not thematically, but only as a means of exemplification in descriptions of purportedly contact-induced linguistic phenomena.* The only exception is Peeters (1997), who however approaches the issue from a sociolinguistic point of view, whereas other publications of this kind (such as the two special issues of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* on “The Sociolinguistics of Cyprus” [168/2004 “Studies from the Greek Sphere”; 181/2006 “Studies from the Turkish Sphere”]) do consider language contact only marginally (cf. Vancı-Osam 2006, or the introduction by Goutsos & Karyolemou 2004), or as a phenomenon between dialects or dialect-standard varieties (such as Demir & Johanson 2006).¹ Thus, as far as the contact between Cypriot Turkish

* I wish to thank my colleague Stavroula Tsiplakou / Nicosia, for her support and advice on important matters of this article.

¹ It should be added that Vancı-Osam (2006), although she presents interesting material to be studied under the aspect of koineization of Cypriot Turkish, is often inaccurate from the Turkological point of view. To give an example, she insists, in spite of respective critical

and Greek varieties is concerned, previous studies hint at the role of the second language and its effects on the first language, be that Greek or Turkish, but usually without providing data of the “other” language; nor do they analyze the phenomena within a language contact framework. Whereas older studies underline the close relation of Cypriot Turkish to the Anatolian dialects (e.g. Eren 1973, but also Duman 1999), more recent works focus on particular features. The most remarkable of those are the valuable contributions by Nurettin Demir, which provide interesting data for undoubtedly contact-induced syntactic structures, and make the assumption that behind these structures “there must be the role of Greek” without embarking on an in-depth analysis and without providing Greek data.² Although the role of English as a contact language is also underlined sometimes, again no concrete data are given (Demir 2007: 161, 170). One of the latter author’s works (Demir 2007) has the significant title “Language contact in Northern Cyprus?”, although the data are not analyzed within the framework of language contact. I will therefore interpret the question mark in Demir’s title as an invitation for more in-depth research.

remarks from Georgiou-Scharlipp & Scharlipp (1997: 141-142), on the anachronistic “consonant change” $n > \eta$ (Vancı-Osam 2006: 28 and 40, footnote 1) in possessive suffixes, the dative form of the pronoun *banı* and other words where the nasal η is old (such as *deniz* and *öñ*).

- ² E.g. Demir 2007: 169-170 [in his conclusive remarks]: “Die Frage, was hinter den Entwicklungen in den Zyperndialekten stehen kann, ist auf den ersten Blick leicht zu beantworten: es muß wohl das Griechische sein – auch wenn es im Rahmen dieses Beitrags nicht ausführlich begründet werden kann–, denn nur mit dieser Sprache hat das Türkische in Zypern langandauernden, intensiven Kontakt”. Other hints of this kind are Duman (1999: 115), who underlines the ties with the Anatolian dialects: “Bazı bakımlardan Rumca’nın da etkisinin olduğu bilinen Kıbrıs ağızı tabii olarak Anadolu ağızlarının izlerini taşımaktadır”. See also Vancı (1990: 244): “Kıbrıs ağızının söz dağarcığında ve bazı sözcükleri özelliklerinde, uzun yıllar içiçe yaşamış olduğu Rum toplumunun konuştuğu dilin, yani Rumca’nın etkisi oldukça büyüktür.”, and p. 249 (syntax) with some (quite erroneous) Greek examples. Recently again Vancı-Osam (2006: 26): “The dialect of Turkish spoken in Cyprus differs from ST [Standard Turkish] in some ways, with respect to pronunciation, lexicon, and syntax. Demirci and Kleiner (1999) report that these deviations from ST are attributed to the Turkish Cypriots’ long history of coexistence with Greek Cypriots. From a sociolinguistic point of view, this explanation sounds acceptable, as borrowing is the result of language contact”. Subsequently, Vancı-Osam (2006: 27) refers to an unpublished MA thesis (Savoğlu 2001) in order to conclude: “Yet, Savoğlu’s (2001) findings conclude that the origins of the variations in CT [Cypriot Turkish] are not confined to the influence of the Greek language, as the variations in CT show remarkable resemblance to the variations in the other dialects of Turkish”. Although this assertion is partly true (see below), this is a further example of overstressing the ties between Cypriot Turkish and Anatolian dialects and the complete neglect of contact-induced analysis.

In the present contribution I will focus on relative and object clauses, since these have not been treated from a cross-linguistic point of view in previous research³. I will argue that the comparison with the main contact language, Cypriot Greek, clearly shows that both object and relative clauses introduced by complementizers can be traced back to cleft constructions. Subsequently, I will attempt to delineate other contact-induced phenomena in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish varieties presented in previous research, supplying data from the contact language, Cypriot Greek, as well as new phenomena not yet examined. Finally, I will try to argue for the necessity of more comparative research in this field, underlining the possibility of a “comparative grammar of contact-induced language phenomena” for the various languages spoken in Cyprus.

According to most researchers, the main features distinguishing Cypriot Turkish varieties from mainland Anatolian dialects are in the domain of syntax (Demir 2007: 160). The most striking syntactic patterns copied⁴ from Greek (and perhaps partly also from English) occur in embedded clauses, especially in object clauses, relative clauses, and “subjunctive” clauses. Object and relative clauses will be discussed together in the following section, since in the specific case of Cypriot Turkish they present overlapping structures and are, in my view, a product of contact-induced convergence between Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish.

1. Object and relative clauses

1.1. Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek embedded finite clauses introduced by complementizers

Object and relative clauses expressed by participial constructions, (the expected pattern in Turkic languages) do exist in Cypriot Turkish varieties (Demir 2007: 162), though sometimes these clauses are postposed, occurring after the matrix verb. However, we often encounter right-branched embedded clauses as finite constructions introduced by the complementizers *ki*, *şu*, *hani* and the composite form *o şu*. To these forms *şu ki* (not included in published data so far) will be added because, as we will see, it plays an important role in our proposal of how these constructions have developed.

³ An exception is Petrou 2007, which is the first study to compare Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek relative clauses using previously published Cypriot Turkish data. Also Scharlipp 1999 attempted a comparative approach to Cypriot Turkish syntactic structures; however, his paper does not include an in-depth analysis of the presented phenomena.

⁴ Here the terminology of Lars Johanson’s code-copying model is used. The phenomenon in question would be termed “selective copying”, i.e. a copying of selected structural properties, and not of the element as a whole together with its structural properties (“global copying”); see Johanson 2002: 13-18.

It has been observed that the complementizers *ki* (< Persian, also used, though rather restrictedly, in Standard Modern Turkish, see Göksel & Kerslake 2005: 111-112, 457-459), as well as *şu*, *hani* and *o şü* can introduce Cypriot Turkish embedded clauses, as we can see from the following examples, taken from Demir (2007):

- (1) *o gelin ki aldın hiş yaramaz*
 this bride which take.PAST.2S nothing is worth.NEG.PRES.3S
 ‘The bride you married is not worth anything.’ [Demir 2007: 163]
- (2) *benim arkadaşım şu beraberdik onu gördüm*
 my friend.POSS.1S which together.were.1P him/her see.PAST.1S
 ‘I saw my friend with whom I was together.’ [Demir 2007: 164]
- (3) *ha, söyle, şu aradım gendini*
 well tell.IMP.2S that call.PAST.1S him/her
 ‘Well, tell him/her that I called him/her.’ [Demir 2007: 164]
- (4) *annatdı hani gitdi okula*
 say.PAST.3S that go.PAST.3S school.DAT
 ‘(S)he said that (s)he went to school.’ [Demir 2007: 166]
- (5) *anne hatırlaş o şu gitdiydik?*
 mother remember.PRES.2S that go.PLUPF.1P
 ‘Mother, do you remember that we had gone?’ [Demir 2007: 165]

Examples such as (6) and (7) below come from my own naturalistically-collected data, and they show that in Cypriot Turkish there is another frequently-occurring composite complementizer, *şu ki*.⁵

- (6) *aha biş defa derim saa yemeyesin*
 well a thousand times say.PRES.1S you.DAT eat.NEG.SUBJ.2S
o guduz şeyleri şu ki bilmeş ne
 that same thing.P.ACC that know.NEG.PRES.2S what
yapacag mideşe
 do.FUT.3S stomach.POSS.2S.DAT
 ‘Hey, I told you a thousand times not to eat those things that you don’t know what they do to your stomach.’
- (7) *anladım şu ki güneydesin*
 understand.PAST.1S that south.LOC.COP.2S
 ‘I understood that you were in the south.’

⁵ The following examples come from my own data, unless otherwise indicated.

In the presentation of (1)-(5) above and of other data, Demir (2007: 162) characterizes the function of the embedded clauses introduced by these complementizers as “Attribut zu einem Nomen” (= relative clauses) or “Gliedsatz zu einer übergeordneten Prädikation” (= object clauses), and he states that they “resemble Indo-European bound clauses”. The question is: What aspect of the syntax of Indo-European “bound clauses” do they resemble and how?

To answer this question we will first have to look at the suggested contact language, Cypriot Greek, and then to analyze further other subordinate constructions. With the aid of informants, we reconstructed the Cypriot Greek translations of the above examples as follows:

- (1a) *tuti i niffi pu epcases en aksizi*
 this the bride which take.PAST.2S NEG is worth.PRES.3S
- (2a) *iða toffilon mu pu imastan mazzi*
 see.PAST.1S the.friend.ACC my which were.1P together
- (3a) *pe tu/tis oti/?pu ton/tin epcasa*
 tell.IMP.2S him/her that him/her call.PAST.1S
- (4a) *ipe oti/pu pie sxolio*
 say.PAST.3S that go.PAST.3S school.ACC
- (5a) *mitera, θimase oti/pu epiame?*
 mother remember.PRES.2S that go.PAST.1P
- (6a) *ppe! filies fores lalo su na*
 hey a thousand times say.PRES.1S you to
men trois (etsi) pramata pu
 NEG eat.SUBJ.IPF.2S such things that
en ikseris ti enna kamnun sto stomafi su
 NEG know.PRES.2S what FUT do.PRES.3P to stomach.POSS.2S
- (7a) *ekatalava oti/pu isun {*ise} ston noto*
 understand.PAST.1S that were.2S in the south.ACC

As can be seen from the above Cypriot Greek examples, in all cases the use of the complementizer *pu* is possible, whereas the object clauses (3a-5a, 7a) can also be introduced by the complementizer *oti*.⁶

How did the Turkish Cypriot constructions develop and where do they come from? As far as the etymology of the complementizers is concerned, it has been

⁶ In Standard Modern Greek, however, the use of *oti* is preferred by most speakers.

stated that, except *ki*, a global copy from Indo-European (Persian), they derive from demonstrative and interrogative pronominal forms (Demir 2007: 162-163), namely *o* ‘this (here)’, *şu* ‘that (there)’, and *hani* ‘where’ (< Old Turkic **qani*, **qa(:)ni* in Kāšgarī, cf. Schönig 1995: 181). Correspondingly, the Cypriot Greek complementizer *pu* can be traced back to the interrogative word *pu* ‘where’, whereas *oti* is originally a correlative pronoun (still used in free relative clauses as indefinite pronoun, and spelled *o,ti* in modern orthography in order to distinguish it from the complementizer), the form *o,ti* consisting of the pronominal part *o* ‘which’ and the wh-word *ti* ‘what’, which is also used in interrogative sentences (cf. Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 2004: 100). The functional shift from interrogatives to complementizers introducing subordinate clauses is a universal development in historical syntax of numerous Indo-European languages (e.g. English *who*, *which*, etc.), termed ‘reanalysis’ (Harris & Campbell 1995: 50; 61-96). As far as Turkic languages are concerned, the phenomenon occurs in Old Turkic *kim* ‘who’ and *qayu* ‘which’ (von Gabain 1974: 189), in many modern Turkic languages (such as Krymchak *angisi ki* [see below], Karaim *kaysi* or Khakas *xayzi* < ‘which’, cf. Erdal 2002: 130), and, in Turkish varieties of South-Eastern Europe, in Macedonian Turkish (relativizer *ne* < ‘what’, cf. Matras 2006: 53) and Gagauz (*ani* < ‘where’, corresponding to Cypriot Turkish *hani*, cf. Menz 2001; and *angi(su)* < ‘which’, cf. Menz 1999: 91-95). Usually the reanalysis of question words into relativizers in Turkic languages is cross-linguistically interpreted as a “foreign influence”, which is undoubtedly the case, but as Slobin (1986: 280) records, the use of *hani...ya* is frequently used in colloquial Turkish child and adult speech to paraphrase relative clauses, which are acquired relatively late and are difficult to process (see below 1.3.). For this reason an internal development might also have played a role. From a cross-linguistic point of view, though, it seems at first blush that Greek serves as a contact language in the case of *hani* / *pu* (< ‘where’) and English in the case of *şu–o şu* / *that* (as suggested by Petrou 2007: 68), but this hypothesis, to which I also until recently subscribed, will have to be revised in light of a more detailed analysis.

Rather than the English pronoun *that*, the original function of Greek *o-ti* as a correlative pronoun can be more easily compared to the Cypriot Turkish *o şu*-constructions in (5), where the complementizer is composed of two pronominal elements (*o* and *şu*), *şu* probably having undergone a functional shift towards a relativizer (see below). Let us keep as a hypothesis that these types of Cypriot Turkish object clauses have an underlying relative construction. To show this, we shall examine cleft strategies in Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek.

1.2. Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish cleft constructions and their relation to object and relative clauses

First of all we will see that Cypriot Greek uses clefts⁷ in *wh*-questions (see Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006); clefting is coded in the expressions *embu* and *mbu*, both meaning ‘is-(it)-that’, but used in different syntactic contexts (*mbu* obligatorily with *inda* ‘what’, *embu* optionally in all other contexts):

- (8) *pcos {embu} efaen tes kunnes?*
 who.NOM is.3S-that eat.PAST.3S the.ACC nuts.ACC
 ‘Who is it that ate the nuts?’ [Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006: 85]
- (9) *pote {embu} faes tes kunnes?*
 when is.3S-that eat.PAST.2S the.ACC nuts.ACC
 ‘When is it that you ate the nuts?’ [Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006: 85]
- (10) a. *inda mbu kamnis?*
 what.ACC is-that do.PRES.2S
 ‘What is it that you are doing?’
- b. **inda kamnis?*
 what.ACC do.PRES.2S
 ‘What are you doing?’ [Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006: 86]

In contrast with Standard Modern Turkish, where such constructions are completely unknown, Cypriot Turkish also has similar cleft constructions in *wh*-questions, using all the above-mentioned complementizers available for both object and relative clauses:

- (11) *kim{dir} şu ki / şu / o şu / ki / hani geldi?*
 who-is.3S that come.PAST.3S
 ‘Who is it that came?’
- (12) *ne zaman{dır} şu ki / şu / o şu / ki / hani gördün genni?*
 when-is.3S that see.PAST.2S her/him
 ‘When is it that you saw her/him?’
- (13) *ma ne{dir} şu ki / şu / o şu / ki / hani isdeñ?*
 but what-is3S that want.PRES.2S
 ‘But what it is what you want?’

⁷ So-called “clefts” are well known from Romance languages, namely French (*qu’est-ce que...*) and some Northern Italian dialects (*cos’è che...*); cf. the observations and references in Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou (2006: 87-90).

The complementizer in Cypriot Turkish clefted *wh*-questions can be both sentence-initial and sentence-final:

(14) *şu ki isdeñ nedir?*
that want.PRES.2S what-is3S

(15) *nedir isdeñ şu ki?*
what-is3S want.PRES.2S that

As for Cypriot Greek *inda* ‘what’ in embedded clauses, we again have exactly the same construction in Cypriot Turkish:

(16) *arotisa inda mbu kamnis*
ask.PAST.1S what.ACC is-that do.PRES.2S
‘I asked what it is that you are doing.’ [Grohmann & Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006: 16]

(17) *sordum ne{dir} şu ki / şu / o şu / ki / ?hani yapañ*
ask.PAST.1S what-is that do.PRES.2S
‘I asked what it is that you are doing.’

From these examples, we can see that the Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish constructions are strikingly similar. Furthermore, there are cleft constructions in both dialects, where the verb is different from ‘is’, and where we analyze the same complementizers *şu ki* and *o şu* as composite elements indicating an underlying structure that is akin to that of relative clauses:

(18) a. *biliñ {şu} ki yapacak saña?*
know.PRES.2S that.PRON that.REL make.FUT.3S you.DAT
b. *biliñ {o} şu yapacak saña?*
know.PRES.2S that.PRO that.REL make.FUT.3S you.DAT
c. *kseris inda mbu na su kami*
know.PRES.2S what is-thatFUT you.DAT. make.3S
‘Do you know what (‘that which’) (s)he will do to you?’

(19) a. *zannedeñ anlayacaklar {şu} ki yazañ?*
think.PRES.2S understand.FUT.3P PRO REL write.PRES.2S
b. *zannedeñ anlayacaklar {o} şu yazañ?*
think.PRES.2S understand.FUT.3P PRO REL write.PRES.2S
c. *efis tin entiposi oti enna katalavun inda mbu grafis*
reckon.PRES.2S that is-FUT understand.3P what is-that write.PRES.2S
‘Do you think that they’ll understand what (‘that which’) you are writing?’

It can be seen that the complementizers in these examples are made up of a pronominal form (*şu / o*) and a relativizer (*ki / şu*) and that, subsequently, *şu* shifted in 18b and 19b to the function of a relativizer. This latter development becomes even more

obvious when we consider that the above sentences are perfectly grammatical with the omission of the first part of the complementizer, namely *şu* (in 18a/19a) and *o* (in 18b/19b).

This holds even in cases of sentence-initial complementizers:

(20) *{şu} ki aran bilmeñ ki Türk tarafıdır burası?*
 that call.PRES.2S know.NEG.PRES.2S that Turkish side.POSS.IS.3S here
 ‘Don’t you know that it is the Turkish side you are calling here?’

(21) a. *{şu} ki aldın hormonludur*
 that buy.PAST.2S hormone.with.is
 b. *{o} şu aldın hormonludur*
 that buy.PAST.2S hormone.with.is
 ‘What you bought is with (contains) hormones.’

(22) *çino pu yorases en me ormones*
 that which buy.PAST.2S is with hormones
 ‘What you bought is with (contains) hormones.’

It is obvious that *şu ki* and *o şu* in 20 and 21 function as a correlative pronoun just like Cypriot Greek *çino pu* (22), and that the same composite item, or its shortened forms *ki* and *şu*, (1, 2, 6, 18-19) serve as a relative pronoun in a further stage.

Moreover, we can see that in some cases, as in (2) above, an additional pronominal element (here: *onu*) is required for reference, which is coreferential with the extrapolated (and therefore unmarked in case) head noun [benim arkadaşım], since the matrix verb [gördüm] occurs after the embedded clause [şu beraberdik], as is typical of Turkic. These cases of verb-final sentences are quite rare in Cypriot Turkish (as they are in Ottoman and Standard Modern Turkish *ki*-type sentences influenced by Persian syntax), but occur more frequently in other Turkish varieties with contact-induced finite embedded (or rather “adjoined”, see below) clauses, namely in Macedonian Turkish, where the inclusion (of pronominal or adverbial elements) is necessary since, contrary to Cypriot Turkish, the Turkic verb-final order of the matrix clause seems to be more regularly retained and the relative clause is, thus, not embedded, but adjoined to the matrix clause (Matras 2006: 53). The included element in the following Macedonian Turkish example refers to the extrapolated adverb *bura*:

(23) *şu araba kimindir bura ne duruyor?*
 that car who.GEN.COP here what stop.PROG
 ‘Whose car is that which is parked here?’ [Matras 2006: 52]

In similar cases in our Cypriot Turkish examples, pronominal elements, usually demonstratives, can enforce the occurrence of the head noun in order to make clearer the correlative character of the construction (no. 1 (*o [gelin]*) and no. 6 (*o guduz*) above). Comparing with other Turkic languages, we may observe similar construc-

tions in Krymchak, where one of the complementizers used for relativization (*angisi ki*) is also composed of a pronominal (*angisi*) and a relativizing element (*ki*) (Erdal 2002: 128-139), exactly like Cypriot Turkish *şu ki*.

The link between relative clauses and cleft constructions (cf. also the sentence-initial cleft in 14, 20-21) is evident and probably universal (see Grohmann & Papaniotidis & Tsiplakou 2006: 96-98 and references therein). What makes the Cypriot Turkish case so interesting is the generalized use of the available relativizers, partly reanalyzed from other languages, as complementizers for other types of embedded clauses besides relatives. Arguably a further development is the expansion of the use of the complementizer *şu*, along with its other variants, to object clauses, as can be seen in (3)-(5) and (7). In fact, all the available complementizers can be used in object clauses, as demonstrated in the following expanded version of (7) above:⁸

- (24) *anladım* *şu ki / şu / o şu / ki / hani* *güneydesin*
 understand.PAST.1S that south.LOC.COP.2S
 ‘I understood that you were in the south.’

1.3. Conclusion

In view of the proposed analysis of the Cypriot Turkish complementizers in embedded clauses, I suggest that the Greek cleft construction was copied into Cypriot Turkish with the correlative pronoun *şu ki*, which is composed of a pronominal *şu* and a relativizing *ki*; that *şu* took over the function of the relativizer, leaving vacant the place of the pronominal element, which was occupied by the pronoun *o*, thus merging it into *o şu*; and that, in a further development, *şu* was used alone assuming both pronominal and relativizing functions (ex. 2).

I further assume that this type of Cypriot Turkish object clause has an underlying relative clause and that both object and relative clauses in Cypriot Turkish can be traced back to cleft constructions, which were originally copied from the Cypriot Greek syntactic model. Thus, the English origin of *şu*, as attractive as such a hypothesis might be, has to be rejected. In the same way, the presumed derivation of *hani* from Greek *pu* (both meaning originally ‘where’) cannot be maintained, since reanalysis is a universal feature in the diachronic development of the syntax in each language, and not necessarily a matter of copying.⁹ On the other hand, it is clear that aspects of syntax such as relative and object clauses belong to those parts of the

⁸ This would support a hypothesis explaining the grey area between *pu*- and *oti*-clauses as underlying structure rather than relative clauses in Cypriot Greek cleft constructions, expressed in an extended version of the above-mentioned paper (Tsiplakou & Panagiotidis & Grohmann [in press]).

⁹ Cf. the multifunctional role of the same item (*ami*) in Gagauz, which is modelled not only on Bulgarian (*g)deto* (< *k'de* ‘where’), but also on Russian *čto* ‘what’ (see Menz 2001: 238).

Turkish grammar which, according to Slobin (1986: 273, 288), are most susceptible to change under the influence of other languages since they are also acquired later and are more difficult to process (and thus do not fit into the restriction Matras [2006: 55] inaccurately concludes from Slobin's assertion).¹⁰ The syntactic reorganization of Cypriot Turkish relative and object clauses as subordination undoubtedly remains a contact-induced phenomenon, but this issue seems to go beyond the procedure of "selective copying" of a complementizer and of structural features, such as right-branching syntax. Rather, it seems that the copying of relative structures from Greek into Cypriot Turkish is basically different from copying occurring in other varieties of Turkish, where we do not have the above-mentioned functional shift of various reanalyzed composite complementizers, assuming the validity of our hypothesis that cleft constructions are the underlying structures of *both* relative and object clauses.

2. "Subjunctive" clauses

Embedded modal clauses of the type "isterim gideyim / I want to go" have been dealt with in Demir 2002a, where again he assumes language contact though admitting that his presentation will not analyze this.¹¹ An analysis within a language contact framework has been undertaken by Kappler & Tsiplakou (forthcoming, an extended version of which is in progress); for this reason I will keep the description of this section very short. In the aforementioned paper these "modal clauses" have been named "subjunctive clauses", according to their assumed Cypriot Greek blueprint,¹² –because they include many other common subjunctive structures such as necessity (*lazım gideyim / prepi na pao*), final clauses (*gittim alayım / epia na pjaso*; also available in Standard Modern Turkish), negative imperatives (*yok unudasın / men ksiannis*) and many other cases where in Cypriot Greek the subjunctive is used in lieu of the infinitive, which is no longer available in Modern Greek at large. As in other embedded clauses such as those discussed above, modal clauses are well known in other Turkic varieties that have been in contact with (Indo-European) languages characterized by infinitive loss and extensive use of the subjunctive (Macedonian Turkish, Gagauz, Azeri and others; cf. Matras 2006: 47-50, Menz 1999: 47-62). These constructions, which allow for co-reference between the subject of the matrix and the embedded clause and are usually right-branching, are very obviously different from the Standard Modern Turkish constructions. Assuming that Greek is the main contact language for Cypriot Turkish, we can easily see that the Cypriot Greek

¹⁰ Cf. Johanson (2002: 37-43), who discusses, justifiably with certain reservations, scales of "stability" and "attractiveness" in copy processes; cf. also Harris & Campbell (1995: 131-132).

¹¹ Demir (2002a: 9): "Hier gibt es mehrere syntaktische Neuerungen ... ohne daß näher auf den kontaktlinguistischen Hintergrund eingegangen werden soll."

¹² The term "subjunctive" is not new for Turkic constructions either; see Lewis (1967: 132-137) and (restrictively) Kornfilt (1997: 372).

(and Standard Modern Greek) subjunctive clauses have the same structure as those in Cypriot Turkish, albeit using the complementizer (elsewhere analyzed as “infinitivizer”, since it substitutes for the ancient infinitive) *na* to introduce the subjunctive clause, which further shows a grammaticalized aspectual variation not available in Cypriot Turkish. In Cypriot Turkish this subjunctive construction, a well-known “Balkanism” present in all the South-European languages, is copied into the “imperative-optative” paradigm and substitutes for Standard Turkish infinitival constructions, both with (25a/26a) and without (25b/26b) co-reference:

- (25) a. *θelo na γrafo / γραφο*
 want.PRES.1S to write.SUBJ.IPF./PF.1S
 ‘I want to be writing/ to write.’
 b. *θelo na γραφis / γραφis*
 want.PRES.1S to write.SUBJ.IPF./PF.2S
 ‘I want you to be writing/ to write.’
- (26) a. *isterim yazayım*
 want.PRES.1S write.SUBJ.1S
 ‘I want to write.’
 b. *isterim yazasıñ*
 want.PRES.1S write.SUBJ.2S
 ‘I want you to write.’

This use of the subjunctive is not restricted to complements of the verb *iste-* ‘want’:

- (27) *beş dakika galdı filim başlasın*
 five minute remain.PAST.3S film begin.SUBJ.3S
 ‘There are five minutes left before the film begins.’
- (28) *unutdum garajı gapadayım*
 forget.PAST.1S garage.ACC close.SUBJ.1S
 ‘I forgot to close the garage.’
- (29) *arçisa na γrafo/γραφo*
 begin.PAST.1S to write.PRES.IPF.1S/writePRES.PF.1S
 ‘I began writing/to write.’

The analysis by Kappler & Tsiplakou (forthcoming) argues that the subjunctive in Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish is used much more productively than in the respective standard languages, and that the contact between the two dialects has probably also played a role in the shaping of the Cypriot Turkish “intensifier” *Idl/(y)dI*, which may be attached to any subjunctive form in order to emphasize the utterance:

- (30) *söyledim genne gelsindi, da gelmedi*
 tell.PAST.1S (s)he.DAT come.SUBJ.3S.COP but come.NEG.PAST.3S
 ‘I persistently told her/him to come, but (s)he didn’t.’

The copula *Idl/(y)dI* is comparable, though not semantically identical, to the Cypriot Greek copula *en / itan / ifen* (not available in Standard Modern Greek), attached to the subjunctive just like the Cypriot Turkish *Idl/(y)dI*:

- (31) *en/itan/ifen na 'rto/'rkumun*
 COP (PRES/PAST/PAST) to come.PERF.1S/PAST.IPF.1S
 ‘I will/would (have) come.’

For the time being, the semantic difference between the two copulae raises some problems, but further research and more in-depth analysis of this phenomenon is underway.

3. The “modal marker” *hazır* + subjunctive

The eventual non-realization of an expected event, expressed in English by ‘almost, nearly, about to’ and in Standard Modern Turkish by lexical entities like *neredeysel*, *az kalsın* and others, or by the verbal suffix *-Ayar-*, is expressed in Cypriot Turkish with the word *hazır* ‘ready’, which introduces a subjunctive clause. Demir (2002b: 107) confirms that this construction is unknown to both Standard Modern Turkish and other Turkish dialects, but he does not mention language contact as a possible reason for its development. Let’s have a look at the Cypriot Turkish example quoted by Demir (2002b: 107) and compare it to possible Cypriot Greek versions:

- (32) *hazır düşeyim*
 ready fall.SUBJ.1S
 ‘I almost fell down’

- (33) *imun etimos na p^heso*
 was.1S ready to fall.SUBJ.PF.1S
 ‘I was about to fall down’

It can be easily seen that the expression is the same in both Cypriot Greek and Cypriot Turkish. Arguably, the Cypriot Turkish marker becomes a lexical copy in Cypriot Greek, with exactly the same syntax and semantics:

- (34) *xaziri na p^heso*
 MOD to fall.SUBJ.PF.1S
 ‘I almost fell down’ [Petrou 2007: 61]

The same sentence would, however be ungrammatical with the copular verb, as in (33), in spite of the transparent etymological relation *hazır* > *etimos* ‘ready’:

- (35) **imun xaziri na peso*
 was.1s MOD to fall.SUBJ.PF.1s

In Cypriot Turkish the past copular verb is possible, though not obligatory, as we have seen above in (32):

- (36) *hazır{ıdım} düşeyim*
 ready{was.1s} fall.SUBJ.1s

It seems that the Cypriot Turkish word *hazır*, a selective copy (calque) from Cypriot Greek *etimos*, is re-copied into Cypriot Greek, where it loses its original adjectival features, and functions as an indeclinable modality marker introducing *na* + subjunctive-clauses, just as other modality markers, such as *prepi* ‘must’, *bori* ‘may’, etc. From the grammatical point of view, it could thus be considered as a case of grammaticalization with a reanalyzed element transforming from a lexeme to a modality marker, due to language contact.

4. The dissociative marker *imiş*

Again it is Demir (2003) who carefully analyzes syntactical and functional issues of the dissociative marker *miş / imiş / mİş*, which he calls evidential marker, but without any hint at the impact of contact languages. We have here a case of global copying (lexical borrowing) from Cypriot Turkish to Cypriot Greek, i.e. the Cypriot Turkish marker, which has different semantics than the Standard Modern Turkish inferential suffix (*y*)*mİş*, has been copied into Cypriot Greek as a lexeme (*imif / mifimu* and other variants), replacing the Standard Modern Greek dissociative markers *taxa / diθen*. In both dialects the syntactic position of the marker is free; this is particularly evident in c. in the following examples. (sentence-initial position of the marker):

- (37) a. *Hüseyinmiş diyetde*
 Hüseyin.EVID diet.LOC
 b. *Hüseyin diyetde imiş*
 Hüseyin diet.LOC.EVID
 c. *miş Hüseyin diyetde*
 EVID Hüseyin diet.LOC
 ‘Hüseyin pretends to be on diet (but I doubt that he really is on a diet).’

- (38) a. *o jannis kamni dieta mifimu*
 Yannis make.PRES.3s diet EVID
 b. *o jannis mifimu kamni dieta / o jannis kamni mifimu dieta*
 c. *mifimu o jannis kamni dieta*
 ‘Yannis pretends to be on diet (but I doubt that he really is on a diet).’

Interestingly, Cypriot Turkish *miş* as a previously bound grammatical morpheme now assumes independent syntactic status. This is a very rare counterexample to

grammaticalization theory (as set out by e.g. Givón 1971, cf. also Haspelmath 2003; Harris & Campbell 1995: 20), which states that ‘today’s morphology is yesterday’s syntax’, i.e. that processes of grammaticalization usually (possibly universally) led to the ‘demotion’ of syntactically autonomous elements (e.g. pronouns or verbs) to grammatical morphemes, clitics, affixes, etc. Cross-linguistic analysis is lacking for this interesting phenomenon. Another issue which has yet to be investigated is the semantic aspect, since probably the meaning of *miş / mişimu* changes according to its syntactic position (as Petrou 2007: 63–64 convincingly argues for Cypriot Greek).

5. ‘Beyond syntax’: suggestions for future research

Apart from syntactic issues, there are also other fields to be considered for further investigation of language contacts in Cyprus, such as morphological aspects of the above phenomena (like the copula *idi* or the dissociative *miş*), and other morphological phenomena which are contact induced. One of them is the extensive use of Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek diminutives; an analysis of this phenomenon in Cypriot Turkish with reference to the Cypriot Greek use of the morpheme is planned by Ahmet Pehlivan (oral communication). Other morphological features which might have their origin in language contact are the use of *Dİr*, the lack of the interrogative suffix *mİ* and its substitution with interrogative intonation, the prevalent use of only one present tense (“geniş zaman”) and the semantic shift of the inferential mood (*y)mİş*.

Obviously an important aspect of language contact is the mutual borrowing of lexical entities, both in Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek. In contrast to the syntactical and morphological issues described above, lexical copying is a contact phenomenon with much less deep structural impact, and belongs to the framework of so-called “language maintenance” (in opposition to deeper contact issues such as language mixing or creolization). Lexical copying is, we might say, more superficial, but, or rather because of this, much more extended and frequent. Both dialects share a very large vocabulary in all semantic domains, and also common strategies in phraseology making wide use of “calques” can be observed. An important aspect here is the influence of English on both dialects, which share lexical units and meanings traceable back to English as a common contact language. Much has to be done in this field; one of the recent approaches is Ahmet Pehlivan’s study of Cypriot lexical car terminology (Pehlivan forthcoming); a diachronic analysis has been attempted for Turkish loanwords in Greek Cypriot Ottoman texts by Kappler (2005). Another possible approach in terms of cross-linguistic analysis in the research of lexical copies has been undertaken in the field of Arabic “loanwords” present in both dialects, but not available in the two respective Standard varieties (Kappler forthcoming).

Being such a large issue, lexical language borrowing has produced most of the bibliography about language contact in Cyprus generally; however, it is unfortunate that most of the research done so far on both sides lacks a scientific approach, contextualization and analysis. An important step forward for Cypriot Turkish is the new

etymological dictionary by Orhan Kabataş (2007), which provides for the first time valid and documented material for the lexical contact between the dialects and languages on the island.

Issues concerning phonetics have not been researched at all within a contact framework. At first blush there is no structural relation between Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek phonetics, but a deeper analysis done by experts will undoubtedly show contact phenomena (I am thinking about changes like $f > h$ [furun > hurun] in Cypriot Turkish related to $\theta > x$ [θoro > xoro] in Cypriot Greek). On the other hand, an important contribution on phonology is that of Nazmiye Çelebi (2002; cf. also İmer & Çelebi 2006) with her comparative analysis of Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek intonation in interrogative sentences. Of course, there remain a good number of both phonetic and phonological, as well as morphophonological features in Cypriot Turkish that are products of the relation of this dialect with Turkish varieties in Anatolia, and have nothing to do with contact linguistics (examples are the sonorization of consonants, such as $k > g$, or the non-harmony in some suffix vowels, such as *da*, etc.). This also goes for a number of morphological phenomena, such as 1P personal suffix *(y)lk*, which is well known from Central Anatolian dialects.

To conclude, I would like to underline how important a comparative approach is for the analysis of linguistic phenomena in Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek. I would go even further: a comparative approach is not only *important*, but *indispensable* for a true analysis, as can be seen especially in the research of common syntactical patterns, such as relative or subjunctive clauses, in other words, those phenomena which mainly distinguish Cypriot Turkish from Anatolian dialects and other Turkic varieties. A good number of studies have been published by now; the time has come to consider the material within the theoretical framework of language contact. Further analysis may also include other Cypriot languages and dialects, but the main axes for such a prospective comparative grammar would necessarily be the Turkish and Greek varieties spoken on this island.

Abbreviations of grammatical categories in glosses

ACC	accusative	NEG	negative	PRES	present tense (in Cypriot Turkish examples: <i>(A/I)r</i> -present tense)
COP	copula	NOM	nominative	PRO	pronoun
DAT	dative	P	plural	PROG	progressive <i>yor</i> -present tense
EVID	evidential marker	PAST	past tense (in Cypriot Turkish examples: <i>DI</i> -past tense)	REL	relativizer
FUT	future tense	PF	perfect aspect	S	singular
GEN	genitive	PLUPF	pluperfect	SUBJ	subjunctive
IMP	imperative	POSS	possessive		
IPF	imperfect				
LOC	locative				
MOD	modalizer				

References

- Çelebi, Nazmiye 2002. *Kıbrıs ağzında soru tümcelerinde ezgi*. [Unpublished Yüksek Lisans Thesis, East Mediterranean University, Magosa.]
- Demir, Nurettin 2002a. “Wollen” im Zyperntürkischen. *Mediterranean Language Review* 14, 9-20.
- Demir, Nurettin 2002b. Kıbrıs ağızları üzerine. In: Demir, N. & Turan, F. (eds.) 2002. *Scholarly depth and accuracy – Lars Johanson armağanı*. Ankara: Grafiker. 101-110.
- Demir, Nurettin 2003. On *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 7, 268-274.
- Demir, Nurettin 2007. Sprachkontakt in Nordzypem? Bemerkungen zu gebundenen Sätzen. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik & Stein, Heidi (eds.) 2007. *Einheit und Vielfalt in der türkischen Welt. Materialien der 5. Deutschen Turkologenkonferenz*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 160-170.
- Demir, Nurettin & Johanson, Lars 2006. Dialect contact in Northern Cyprus. In: Osam, Necdet (ed.) 2006. *The sociolinguistics of Cyprus II (Studies from the Turkish sphere)* [= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 181]. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter. 1-10.
- Duman, Musa 1999. Kıbrıs ağzı üzerine bazı notlar. *İlmî Araştırmalar* 8, 115-129.
- Eren, Hasan 1973. Origine du parler turc de Chypre. In: Papadopoulos, Th & Christodoulou, M. (eds.) *Πρακτικά του Πρώτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου*. 3:2. Lefkosia: Etaireia Kypriakon Spoudon. 131-141.
- Erdal, Marcel 2002. Relativisation in Krymchak. In: Demir, N. & Turan, F. (eds.) 2002. *Scholarly depth and accuracy – Lars Johanson armağanı*. Ankara: Grafiker. 117-136.
- Georgiou-Scharlipp, Kyriaki & Scharlipp, Wolfgang 1997. Some remarks on the Turkish dialect of the village of Potamya in Cyprus. In: Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara & Zieme, Peter (eds.) 1997. *Studia Ottomanica – Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 141-145.
- Givón, A. 1971. Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaeologist's field trip. *Papers from the 7th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society* 7, 394-415.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia 2005. *Turkish. A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Goutsos, Dionysis & Karyolemu, Marilena 2004. Introduction. In: Goutsos, D. & Kariolemou, M. (eds.) *The sociolinguistics of Cyprus I (Studies from the Greek sphere)* [= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 168]. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-18.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes & Panagiotidis, Phoivos & Tsiplakou, Stavroula 2006. Some properties of wh-question formation in Cypriot Greek. In: Janse, M. & Joseph, B. & Ralli, A. (eds.) 2006. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*. Patras: University of Patras. 83-98.
- Haspelmath, Martin 2003. Grammaticalization. In: Joseph, B. & Janda, R. (eds.) 2003. *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 602-623.
- Harris, Alice C. & Campbell, Lyle 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, David & Mackridge, Peter A. & Philippaki-Warbuton, Irimi 2004. *Greek: An essential grammar of the modern language*. London: Routledge.
- İmer, Kamile & Çelebi, Nazmiye 2006. The intonation of Turkish Cypriot dialect: A contrastive and sociolinguistic interpretation. In: Osam, Necdet (ed.) 2006. *The sociolinguistics of*

- Cyprus II (Studies from the Turkish sphere)* [= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 181]. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter. 69-82.
- Johanson, Lars 2002. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. London: Curzon.
- Kabataş, Orhan 2007. *Kıbrıs Türkçesinin etimolojik sözlüğü*. Lefkoşa: Öncü Basımevi.
- Kappler, Matthias 2005. Turzismen in griechisch-zypriotischen Quellen aus osmanischer Zeit (17.-19. Jahrhundert). In: Siemieniec-Gołaś, E. & Pomorska, M. (eds.) 2005. *Turks and non-Turks. Studies on the history of linguistic and cultural contacts* [= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 10; *Festschrift for Stanislaw Stachowski*.] Kraków. 137-158.
- Kappler, Matthias (forthcoming). De l'arabe au grec (et turc) chypriote: migration, voies de transmission, intermédiaires. In: Bozdemir, M. (ed.) *IIIe Colloque International "Emprunt linguistique dans l'espace arabo-turco-persan et méditerranéen", Damascus, December 18-19, 2005*.
- Kappler, Matthias & Tsiplakou, Stavroula (forthcoming). The subjunctive in Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek: A case of dialect contact? In: Csató, É. (ed.) *13th International Conference of Turkish Linguistics, Uppsala, August 16-20, 2006*.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin 1997. *Turkish*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lewis, Geoffrey 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Matras, Yaron 2006. Layers of convergent syntax in Macedonian Turkish. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik & Johanson, Lars (eds.) 2006. *Turkic languages in contact*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 46-62.
- Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Menz, Astrid 2001. Gagauz right-branching propositions introduced by the element *ani*. *Turkic Languages* 5, 234-244.
- Peeters, Y. J. D. 1997. Cyprus. In: Goebel, H. et al. (eds.) *Contact linguistics: An international handbook of contemporary research* 2. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter. 1525-1532.
- Pehlivan, Ahmet (forthcoming). *Sayings related with vehicles in Cypriot Turkish dialect*.
- Petrou, Maria 2007. The uniqueness of spoken Turkish in Cyprus. *Journal of Turkish Linguistics* 1, 56-73.
- Scharlipp, Wolfgang-E. 1999. Zur Syntax der türkischen Dialekte Zyperns. *Materialia Turcica* 20, 1-11.
- Schönig, Claus 1995. **qa:ño* und Konsorten. In: Erdal, M. & Tezcan, S. (eds.) *Beläk Bitig: Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 177-187.
- Slobin, Dan I. 1985 The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. In: Slobin, D.I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. 273-294.
- Tsiplakou, Stavroula & Ph. Panagiotidis, Phoivos & Grohmann, Kleantes (in press). Properties of Cypriot Greek wh-question formation. In: Tsoulas, G. (ed.) *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*.
- Vancı, Ülker 1990. Kıbrıs ağzının ses, yapı ve ifade özellikleri. In: Özsoy, A. Sumru & Sebüktekin, Hikmet (eds.) 1990. *IV. Dilbilim Sempozyumu Bildirileri, 17-18 Mayıs 1990*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları. 243-256.
- Vancı-Osam, Ülker 2006. The impact of oral language features in written language in Cypriot Turkish. In: Osam, Necdet (ed.) 2006. *The sociolinguistics of Cyprus II (Studies from the Turkish sphere)*. [= *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 181]. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter. 23-42.
- von Gabain, Annemarie 1974. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.