# Werk

**Titel:** Types of copular clauses following ki on Old Ottoman Turkish

**Autor:** Karakoç, Birsel

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2013

**PURL:** https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0017|LOG_0011

## Kontakt/Contact

# Types of copular clauses following *ki*
# in Old Ottoman Turkish

## Birsel Karakoç

The present paper aims to analyse the syntactic and semantic properties of the copular clauses that follow the element *ki*—known to be copied from Persian—in Old Ottoman Turkish. The clauses studied are based on the finite copular markers *-dUr, olur* or ola. The data comes from two medical texts written around the 14th century in Anatolia. The following questions will be addressed: (i) What syntactic peculiarities do the various copular clauses exhibit? (ii) In what respects do the clauses based on the markers *-dUr, olur* and *ola* respectively differ from one another? With respect to certain syntactic positions, it will be argued that the semantic opposition between the present tense (*-dUr/olur* in copular clauses) and the optative mood (*ola* in copular clauses) in Turkish is utilized to mark the distinction between non-restrictive and restrictive relative clauses, a distinction which is important in Persian. Thus, the Turkish optative will be argued to have acquired a further function (subjunctive) in copied restrictive relative clauses.

*Birsel Karakoç, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-751 26, Sweden. E-mail: birsel.karakoc@lingfil.uu.se*

## 1. Introduction

The present article aims to analyse the syntactic and semantic properties of the copular clauses that occur after the junctor *ki*—known to be copied from Persian—and contain the finite copular markers *-dUr, olur* or *ola* in Old Ottoman Turkish. Example (1) illustrates the kinds of clauses under investigation:

(1) *Eftīmūn*     *ki*     *dükeli*     *dil-de*     *maʿrūf-dur,*
      epithimum    JUNCT    all     language-LOC    well-known-DUR.COP
      *issü-dür,*     *ḳuru-dur.*
      hot-DUR.COP    dry-DUR.COP
      '*Cuscuta epithimum*, which is well-known in all languages, is hot and dry.' (EM 21)

The data comes from two medical texts written around the 14th century in Anatolia, and displays strong syntactic influence from New Persian. The goal of this study is to analyse the syntactic properties of these kinds of copular clauses, and to find out how the functional opposition between the clauses based on *-dUr, olur* and *ola* is operationalized.

The following questions will be addressed: (i) What syntactic peculiarities do the various copular clauses exhibit? (ii) In what respects do the clauses based on the markers *-dUr, olur* and *ola* respectively differ from one another? With respect to certain syntactic positions, the copular markers *-dUr* and *olur* are preferably found in non-restrictive, descriptive relative clauses while the copular word *ola*, based on the optative mood, typically occurs in restrictive clauses. Thus, the paper will argue that the semantic opposition between the present tense (*-dUr/olur* in copular clauses) and the optative mood (*ola* in copular clauses) in Turkish is utilized to mark a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses, a distinction which is crucial in Persian. Thus, Turkish optative will be argued to have acquired an additional function (subjunctive) in copied restrictive relative clauses.

## 2. Background, data, transcription and notation

During the rule of the Seljuks in the 13th century in Asia minor, Oghuz Turkic began to develop in its Old Anatolian Turkish variety. After the establishment of the Ottoman state in 1307, it continued as a literary medium in its Old Ottoman Turkish variety until the 16th century. Oghuz Turkic subsequently developed into Middle and Late Ottoman stages until Ottoman was replaced by Modern Turkish in the 20th century (see Johanson 2006).

At the beginning of its establishment as a written literary medium, Oghuz Turkic was subjected to enormous influence from New Persian, after Arabic the second prestigious language of Islam. When adopting and incorporating Persian linguistic structures into their new developing variety, Turkish writers—usually biliterates also capable in New Persian—tried to remain as true to the original as possible (see Johanson 2013a).

The data for the analysis comes from two Old Ottoman Turkish manuscripts written in Arabic script. The first has the title *Edviye-i müfrede* and was written by İsḥāḳ bin Murād in 792 (1397) in Gerede. *Edviye-i müfrede* (hence EM) is one of the first Turkish books treating a medical subject. It was edited in 2007 by M. Canpolat and Z. Önler. The examples in the paper are taken from this edition. The other medical book investigated is *Müntahab-ï šifā* (hence MŠ), written by J̌elālüddin Hïzïr (Haǰï Paša) around the second half of the 14th century. The famous scholar J̌elālüddin Hïzïr wrote his most important medical books in Arabic. *Müntahab-ï šifā* is probably a résumé compiled by the author himself from his own Arabic books (cf. Önler 1990: 3–4). Z. Önler edited *Müntahab-ï šifā* 1990.[1] Examples are taken from Önler's edition. The reason for choosing these texts is that due to their descriptive contents they are especially rich in copular clauses and provide scores of examples of various native and foreign syntactic patterns. Even if the data only comes from

---

1 For more information on medical books written in Old Ottoman Turkish, see İhsanoğlu (2008), Károly (2014).

these two manuscripts, the results obtained can probably be viewed as significant for similar stylistic genres in the Old Ottoman Turkish period.

In the transcription of Old Ottoman Turkish examples, the system of the text editions is largely retained, though with the following exceptions: the letters *ş, ç, c* and *ı* in the edited sources are rendered by the letters *š, č, j* and *ï*, respectively. Modern Turkish examples are given in Standard Turkish orthography. In the transcription of Persian examples, the system used by Dahlén (2010) is applied. Numbers after the abbreviations EM and MŠ indicate the numbers of the pages in the respective text editions.

A dash in front of a morpheme indicates a suffix, e.g. *-(y)A*. Capital letters within suffixes show morphophonemes, while bracketed segments denote the phonemes that are only realized in certain environments. Thus, e.g., the suffix *-(y)A* exhibits four possible allomorphs, *-a, -e, -ya* and *-ye*, the choice of which depends on the phonemic givens of the previous element. A dash after a lexeme denotes a verbal stem, e.g. *bil-* 'know'. Asterisks (*) at the beginning of examples indicate that the given example is ungrammatical. Hyphens mark morpheme boundaries.

## 3. Turkish non-finite subordination and the role of the copied junctor *ki*

The Turkish strategy for clause subordination is nominalization. Turkish relative and complement clauses employ non-finite bound morphemes: participles or infinitives. They are typically prepositive constructions, i.e. are formed according to the left-recursive Turkish syntax, e.g. *öğrenci ol-an kız* [student be-PART girl] 'the girl who was/is a student' or *kız-ın öğrenci ol-duğ-un-u bil-iyor-um* [girl-GEN student be-PART-POSS3-ACC know-PRES-1SG] 'I know that the girl was/is a student' in Modern Turkish. Functionally, these nominalized clauses in Turkish correspond to the post-positive clauses with finite predicates and free subjunctors—relativizers or comple-mentizers—in some other languages, such as *who, which* or *that* in English (see Johanson 1975).

The copular clauses outlined in this paper are formed according to non-Turkic patterns. They follow the copied element *ki* and contain finite copular markers. Below, for practical reasons, I will cautiously refer to them as '*ki*-clauses'. The use of this label, however, should in no way be interpreted as meaning the copied *ki* is analysed a priori as a subordinator introducing a clause forming a syntactic unit with it. We have to keep in mind that the status of the clauses inserted by the copied *ki* (i.e. whether or not they are syntactically subordinated to the clauses they follow) is controversial; see Johanson (1975, 1990) on arguments for not assigning a subordinator function to *ki* in Turkish (see also Rehbein 2006). To sum up, the denotation '*ki*-clause' is used in this paper for a clause that follows the copied junctor *ki* without necessarily being a syntactic part of it.

The focus of investigation will be on the syntactic and semantic characteristics of those *ki*-clauses that seem to be similar to relative or complement clauses. Those clauses employing complex junctors, such as *kačan ki* 'when', *tā ki* 'until' or *meger*

*ki* 'if', fulfil adverbial or conditional functions. They are outside the topic of this survey.

As previously remarked, our texts are characterized by extensive syntactic copies from New Persian, a characteristic which can be attributed to most other early products in Oghuz Turkic. The biliterate writers took advantage of the possibilities available in both languages. With their growing confidence to write in their own literary language, however, some of the copies, which can be characterized as slavish imitations of foreign patterns, disappeared (see e.g. Römer 1981). In this context, one of the goals is to tentatively compare some features of copies with the features of corresponding structures in Persian (Section 10). Another goal is to pursue the question which types of the copied *ki*-clauses found in the data have vanished and which have survived and are still encountered as living linguistic devices in some stylistic registers/genres in the contemporary language.

Alongside the copied *ki*-clauses, the data provides subordinate clauses formed by Turkish devices (non-finite bound morphemes). Although the main focus will be on the *ki*-clauses, the paper will to a certain extent go into the matter of the complex relation between the copied *ki*-clauses and the non-finite subordinate clauses, as found in the data (Section 11).

## 4. Form inventory

The data represents a specific stylistic genre and, notwithstanding the richness of the syntactic types, it provides a limited inventory of morphological elements. For instance, with few exceptions, clauses with first and second person subjects do not occur. That means, the copular clauses typically consist of third person subjects and corresponding copular markers. The zero-realization of a copula in the third person singular does not occur either. The verbal clauses are based on predicates taking the suffixes *-(V)r* (the older present form, the so-called aorist) or *-(y)A* (the optative). Figure 1 shows the finite forms used in copular or verbal clauses in the data. Although my main intention is to investigate the opposition between different copular markers in the *ki*-clauses, the relations between these copular markers and the markers used in the main clauses will also be taken into consideration.

| Copular clauses | Verbal clauses |
|---|---|
| *ola* | *-(y)A* |
| *-dUr* | *-(V)r* |
| *olur* | |

Figure 1: Morphemes found in finite copular or verbal clauses in the data

The enclitic copular *-dUr* comes from the East Old Turkic *turur*, which consists of the copular verb *tur-* 'to be' and the present form *-(V)r* (abbreviated as R.PRES). The older Oghuz Turkic variant *durur* is not found in the data. The negation is formed by *degüldür* [not-DUR.COP]. The copular word *olur* consists of the verb *ol-* 'to

be(come)' plus the present form -*(V)r*, while the form *ola* is the optative form of the same copular verb. The negated form *olmaya* [OL.COP-NEG-OPT], and the plural form *olalar* [OL.COP-OPT-3PL], used with third person plural subjects, are attested in the *ki*-clauses as well. Since the copular form *olur* is not often found in the *ki*-clauses, the semantic opposition is mostly denoted by -*dUr* and *ola*. The copular verb *olur* often occurs in compound verbs with its dynamic meaning, as for instance in *ża'īf olur*, *żarūret olur*, *mütevellid olur*, *żāhir olur*, etc. (see Section 9). In addition to its dynamic and static copular functions, the verb *ol-* as a rule occurs in various lexical meanings, such as 'to come into existence', 'to happen', etc. Furthermore, the complex forms -*mīš ola* and -*(V)r ola* are also used in the texts. These will be discussed in Section 8.

## 5. Syntactic configurations

To analyse the functional distribution of the copular markers, we first need to take account of the syntactic appearance of the *ki*-clauses. The following syntactic configurations are found:

(i)    The *ki*-clause occurs within the subject or the object constituent of a clause.
(ii)   The *ki*-clause follows the nominal or verbal predicate of a clause.

The following section deals with the former syntactic configuration and with the functional distribution of the copular markers in its different patterns. Section 7 analyses the roles of the copular markers in the *ki*-clauses that are placed after predicates of initial clauses.

## 6. The *ki*-clauses within the subject or object constituents of clauses

The *ki*-clauses occurring within the subject or object constituents (S or O) of main clauses are mostly based on the copular marker -*dUr* or *ola*. That is why I first of all will focus on the opposition between these copular forms. The role of the copular word *olur* will be analysed separately in Section 9. The main clause containing the *ki*-clause can consist of a nominal predicate (predicate noun or adjective) (N.PRE) taking one of the copular forms -*dUr*, *olur* or *ola*. It can also consist of a verbal predicate (V.PRE). Figure 2 illustrates the general structure of this configuration.

$$\text{S/O} = \left\{ \text{NP} + ki \,\ldots\ldots\, \text{-}dUr \text{ or } ola + (\text{NP}) \right\} + \text{N.PRE} + \text{-}dUr \text{ or } olur \text{ or } ola$$

$$\text{S/O} = \left\{ \text{NP} + ki \,\ldots\ldots\, \text{-}dUr \text{ or } ola + (\text{NP}) \right\} + \text{V.PRE} + \text{-}(V)r \text{ or } \text{-}(y)A$$

Figure 2: The general structure of the *ki*-clauses occurring within the subject or object constituents

In this syntactic configuration, the *ki*-clauses based on the copular marker -*dUr* or *ola* function differently. The analysis of the data reveals that the clauses based on the

marker -*dUr* (as well as on *olur*) are often descriptive/non-restrictive relative claus-
es. They represent appositive clauses, giving additional information about the refer-
ent of the head noun. As for the clauses based on the verb *ola*, the optative mood,
they are typically restrictive relative clauses. They restrict the extension of the refer-
ents of the head nouns and denote selections out of a unit. In other words, the se-
mantic opposition between the present tense (-*dUr*/*olur* in copular clauses) and the
optative mood (*ola* in copular clauses) in Turkish ('basic code') is utilized to mark a
distinction between non-restrictive and restrictive relative clauses, a distinction
which is important in the 'model code' (Persian) (for the terminology, see Johanson
2002, cf. Johanson 2013a). Thus, we observe that the Turkish optative acquired a
further function, as a subjunctive in copied relative clauses.[2]

Syntactic patterns often found in the data can be classified as follows.

### 6.1. Pattern 1

In this pattern, the subject of the main copular clause consists of a head noun plus a
*ki*-clause that has a nominal predicate taking one of the copular markers -*dUr* or *ola*.
This pattern can be formulated as follows:

$$S = \left\{ NP + ki + \text{N.PRE} + \text{-}dUr \text{ or } ola \right\} + \text{N.PRE} + \text{-}dUr$$

Figure 3: The *ki*-clause within the subject constituent (Pattern 1)

In example (2), which is already presented above, the *ki*-clause contains the nominal
predicate *dükeli dilde ma'rūf* [all language-LOC well-known] 'well-known in all
languages' and the copular marker -*dUr*. This *ki*-clause provides parenthetical infor-
mation about the definite head noun *eftīmūn* 'cuscuta epithimum'. In example (3) the
subject of the main copular clause consists of an indefinite head noun, *her ḳārūre*
'each urine cup', plus a *ki*-clause, which contains the predicate noun, *aḳ ya ṣaru ya
ḳizïl* 'white or yellow or red', and the copular marker *olmaya*, the negated form of
*ola*. This *ki*-clause is restrictive. We can paraphrase the sentence as: 'each urine cup
that is not white, yellow or red is ill. The white, yellow and red ones are thus not ill'.
The difference between the *ki*-clauses in (2) and (3) is of a semantic nature.

(2)  *Eftīmūn*      *ki*      *dükeli*   *dil-de*        *ma'rūf-dur*,         *issü-dür*,
     epithimum   JUNCT    all       language-LOC   well-known-DUR.COP   hot-DUR.COP

---

2   The subjunctive use of volitional markers is similar in Indo-European languages (Latin
    and the Romance languages). The main difference, however, is that the *ki*-based subjunc-
    tive constructions in Turkic are syntactically not subordinated (Johanson 2012: 202).

*ḳuru-dur.*
dry-DUR.COP
'*Cuscuta epithimum*, which is well-known in all languages, is hot and dry.' (EM 21)

(3)  *Her    ḳārūre     ki       aḳ      ya     ṣaru     ya      ḳizïl    ol-ma-ya*
     each  urine cup  JUNCT  white   or    yellow   or     red      OL.COP-NEG-OPT
     *yavuz-dur,  helāklig-e    delīl-dür.*
     ill-DUR.COP  death-DAT   indication-DUR.COP
     'Each urine cup that is not white, yellow or red is ill and is an indication of death.'
     (MŠ 11)

## 6.2. Pattern 2

This pattern is characterized by a possessive relationship between the head noun of the *ki*-clause and the noun following the *ki*-clause. It can be formulated as follows:

$$S = \left\{ NP^{POSSESSOR} + ki + \text{N.PRE} + \text{-}dUr \text{ or } ola + NP^{POSSESSUM} \right\} + \text{N.PRE} + \text{-}dUr \text{ or } olur$$

Figure 4: The *ki*-clause within the subject constituent (Pattern 2)

Examples (4–7) illustrate this pattern. In (4) the predicate noun *bahār* 'spring', which takes the copular marker *-dUr* in the *ki*-clause, describes the head noun *evvelki faṣïl* 'the first season'. The noun *evvelki faṣïl*, described by the *ki*-clause, and the noun *ṭabī'atï* [nature-POSS3SG] 'its nature' stand in a possessive relationship. The complex subject, which consists of the possessor element *evvelki faṣïl ki bahār-dur* and the possessed element (possessum) *ṭabī'atï*, is a cleft construction in which the *ki*-clause is a supplement to the possessor noun. To sum up, the subject of the main copular clause is: *evvelki faṣïl ki bahārdur ṭabī'atï* 'the nature of the first season of the year, which is spring' [lit. 'the first season of the year, which is spring, its nature']. The predicate of this main clause is: *hārï raṭbdur ī'tidāl iledür* 'is hot and humid and is moderate'. Consider examples (5–6), which are structurally similar. In (5) the predicate noun *ḳiš* 'winter', taking the copular marker *-dUr* in the *ki*-clause, specifies the referent of the nominal phrase *dördünji faṣïl* 'the fourth season'. In (6) the predicate noun *būstānīdür* 'is cultivated' specifies the pronominal head *ol*. The cleft construction, consisting of the possessor element *ol ki būstānīdür* and the possessum *ġïdāsï*, functions as the subject of the main copular clause.

(4)  *Evvelki   faṣïl      ki        bahār-dur          ṭabī'at-ï          hārï*
     first      season   JUNCT   spring-DUR.COP   nature-POSS3     hot
     *raṭb-dur            ī'tidāl     ile-dür.*
     humid-DUR.COP    moderate   with-DUR.COP
     'The nature of the first season of the year, which is spring, is hot and humid and is moderate.' (MŠ 9)

(5) *Dördünji* *faṣïl* *ki* *ḳïš-dur* *ṭabï'at-ï* *bārid* *ü*
fourth season JUNCT winter-DUR.COP nature-POSS3 cold and
*raṭb-dur* *an-da* *balġam* *ve* *balġamī* *maraż-lar*
humid-DUR.COP it-LOC phlegm and phlegmy illness-PL
*čoġal-ur.*
increase-R.PRES
'The nature of the fourth season of the year, which is winter, is cold and humid.
Phlegm and phlegmy illnesses increase during it.' (MŠ 10)

(6) *Nohūd: ol* *ki* *būstānī-dür* *ġïdā-sï*
chickpea that JUNCT cultivated-DUR.COP nutritional value-POSS3
*yegrek-dür,* *issü-dür.*
better-DUR.COP hot-DUR.COP
'The chickpea: that is cultivated, has a better nutritional value and is hot.' (EM 51)

The *ki*-clause in (7), which is syntactically similar to the previous ones, is based on the copular marker *ola*. This *ki*-clause restricts the extension of the head noun *šol maražlar* 'those illnesses', which at the same time is the possessor of the noun *buḥrānï* [peak-POSS3SG] 'its peak'. The complex subject *šol maražlar ki ḳatï tīz ve ïssï ola buḥrānï* 'the peak of those illnesses that are persistent and painful' [lit. 'those illnesses, that are persistent and painful, their peak'] is a cleft construction. The predicate of the main copular clause is *dördünji gün olur* 'are (occur) on the fourth day'.

(7) *Šol* *maraż-lar* *ki* *ḳatï* *tīz* *ve* *ïssï* *ol-a*
that illness-PL JUNCT hard acute and hot OL.COP-OPT
*buḥrān-ï* *dördünji* *gün* *ol-ur.*
peak-POSS3 fourth day OL.COP-R.PRES
'Those illnesses that are persistent, acute and hot will reach their peak on the fourth day.' (MŠ 23)

## 6.3. Pattern 3

The *ki*-clause follows the possessor noun of a possessive construction, and contains the possessum plus a predicate noun. The possessum is the syntactic subject within the *ki*-clause. This pattern can be formulated as follows:

$$S = \left\{ NP^{POSSESSOR} + ki + NP^{POSSESSUM} + N.PRE + \text{-}dUr \text{ or } ola \right\} + N.PRE + \text{-}dUr$$

Figure 5: The *ki*-clause within the subject constituent (Pattern 3)

Consider examples (8–10), which illustrate this pattern. In (8), the subject noun of the *ki*-clause, *'arabja adï* [Arabic name-POSS3SG] 'its Arabic name', is at the same

time the possessum of a possessive construction. The possessor noun of this construction is the head of the *ki*-clause, *yüzerlik* 'peganum harmala'. The predicate noun *harmel* in the *ki*-clause takes the copular form *-dUr*. The whole complex subject in the main clause is: *yüzerlik ki 'arabja adï harmeldür* 'peganum harmala, whose Arabic name is *harmel*' [lit. 'peganum harmala, which its Arabic name is *harmel*']. The adjectives *issü* 'hot' and *ḳuru* 'dry' are the predicate adjectives in the main clause. Consider also examples (9–10), which are structurally similar.

(8)  *Yüzerlik*              *ki*         *'arabja ad-ï*        *harmel-dür,*
     peganum harmala    JUNCT     Arabic   name-POSS3   *harmel*-DUR.COP
     *issü-dür,*              *ḳuru-dur.*
     hot-DUR.COP       dry-DUR.COP
     '*Peganum harmala*, which is called *harmel* in Arabic, is hot and dry.' (EM 20)

(9)  *Dilkü üzümi,*        *ki*      *pārsīje ad-ï*       *engūr-ï rūbāh*      *ve*
     solanum nigrum   JUNCT   Persian   name-POSS3   *engūr-ï rūbāh*     and
     *'arabja*   *'ïnebu 's-ṣa 'leb-dür,*
     Arabic   *'ïnebu 's-ṣa 'leb*-DUR.COP
     *ṣovuḳ-dur,*      *ḳuru-dur*         *ve*      *ol*      *iki*      *dürlü-dür.*
     cold-DUR.COP   dry-DUR.COP   and   that   two   kind-DUR.COP
     '*Solanum nigrum*, which is called *engūr-ï rūbāh* in Persian and *'ïnebu 's-ṣa 'leb* in Arabic, is cold and dry. It is found in two different species.' (EM 17)

(10) *Uruz otï*            *ki*      *pārsīje ad-ï*       *būstān-efrūz-dur,*      *ve*
     plantago major   JUNCT   Persian   name-POSS3   *būstān-efrūz*-DUR.COP and
     *ḥayyü 'l-'ālem daḫï*      *dè-r-ler,*              *ṣovuḳ-dur,*        *ḳuru-dur.*
     *ḥayyü 'l-'ālem* also      say-R.PRES-3PL   cold.DUR.COP   dry-DUR.COP
     '*Plantago major*, which is called *būstān-efrūz* in Persian, and is also called *ḥayyü 'l-'ālem*, is cold and dry.' (EM 19)

In the following example, we observe a combination of patterns 2 and 3. The pronominal head noun *ol* is the possessor of the possessive noun *sebebi*, which is the syntactic subject of the *ki*-clause. The *ki*-clause, *ki sebebi ṣafrādur*, provides appositive information about the pronominal head *ol*. The second possessive noun, *'alāmeti*, which follows the *ki*-clause, is within the scope of the entire previous constituent. In other words, the possessive noun *'alāmeti* is syntactically the possessum of the complex possessor noun *ol ki sebebi ṣafrādur*.

(11) *Ol*     *ki*     *sebeb-i*         *ṣafrā-dur*       *'alāmet-i*            *ol-dur*          *ki /.../.*
     that   JUNCT reason-POSS3   gall-DUR.COP   symptom-POSS3 that-DUR.COP   JUNCT
     'The disease, which arises from the gall, its symptoms are /.../.' (EM 57)

## 6.4. Pattern 4

This pattern contains a dative-marked constituent in a main copular clause. The *ki*-clause immediately follows the dative constituent. As is known, in addition to the two obligatory constituents, subject and predicate, a copular clause may include a further argument that expresses the 'experiencer' (E) (Karakoç 2011). This argument is often marked in the dative. The pattern can be formulated as follows:

$$\text{S + E} = \left\{ \text{NP + DAT} + ki + \text{N.PRE} + \textit{-dUr or ola} \right\} + \text{N.PRE} + \textit{-dUr or olur}$$

Figure 6: The *ki*-clause within the dative-marked constituent in a copular clause (Pattern 4)

Consider example (12), which illustrates the use of the copular form *-dUr*, and examples (13–14), which illustrate the use of the form *ola*. The complex constituent *šol bedene ki yaramaz ḫïlt čoḳdur* in (12) is the dative-marked constituent within the main copular clause. In (13) the dative constituent, which contains a *ki*-clause, is: *jiger aġrïsïna ki ruṭūbetden ola*. Examples (12–14) illustrate syntactically similar structures. In all cases the dative suffix is appended to the head nouns preceding the *ki*-clauses.

(12)    *Geyik eti /.../*    *šol*    *beden-e*    *ki*    *yaramaz*    *ḫïlt*
       deer meat    that   body-DAT   JUNCT   bad        body fluids
       *čoḳ-dur*       *ṣāliḥ-dür.*
       many-DUR.COP beneficial-DUR.COP
       'Deer meat is beneficial to the body, which has a lot of bad body fluids.' (MŠ 26)

(13)    *Fïstuḳ*       *jiger aġrïsïn-a ki*      *ruṭūbet-den*    *ol-a*
       pistachios   lung pain-DAT JUNCT   humidity-ABL   OL.COP-OPT
       *müfīd-dür.*
       helpful-DUR.COP
       'Pistachios are helpful against the lung disease that develops due to humidity.'
       (MŠ 85)

(14)    *Durraj eti*     *nāḳih-ler-e*               *ki*    *ża'īf*    *ol-a-lar*
       francolin meat   the one in recovery-PL-DAT JUNCT   weak    OL.COP-OPT-3PL
       *münāsib-dür.*
       suitable-DUR.COP
       'The francolin meat is suitable to the ones in recovery who are weak. (MŠ 25–26)

## 6.5. Pattern 5

The main clause in this pattern contains a verbal predicate. The constituent containing the *ki*-clause is an object within the main verbal clause. The following formula can illustrate the structure of this pattern:

$$O = \left\{ \text{NP} + \text{CASE} + ki + \text{N.PRE} + \textit{-dUr} \text{ or } \textit{ola} \right\} + \text{V.PRE} + \textit{-(y)A} \text{ or } \textit{-(V)r}$$

Figure 7: The *ki*-clause within the object constituent in a verbal clause (Pattern 5)

Examples (15–17) show the use of *-dUr*. In (15) the nominal phrase *ïrḳun-nisā*, which is the head of the *ki*-clause, takes the accusative marker, since the whole constituent *ïrḳun-nisāyï ki ayaḳ aġrïsïdur* functions as the direct object of the verbal predication *gidere* 'it may cure'. Example (16) has a similar pattern. The constituent *a 'żā-yï re 'īseyi ki dimāġdur ve yürekdür ve jigerdür* is the direct object of the verbal predication *taḳviyet èdeler* 'they may strengthen'. That is why the head noun *a 'żā-yï re 'īse* 'the main organs' carries the accusative marker. In both examples the verbal predicates of the main clauses (*gidere* and *taḳviyet èdeler*) are placed after the *ki*-clauses. In example (17), the head noun of the *ki*-clause is the dative object within the main verbal clause. Moreover, the *ki*-clause in this example contains a pronominal subject which directly refers to the head noun.

(15)  Eger   bir    direm    a-nuŋ   yèmiš-i   şuy-ïn-dan    huḳne èt-se-ler,
      if     one    drachma  that-GEN fruit-POSS3 juice-POSS3-ABL inject-COND-3PL
      *ïrḳun-nisā-yï*   ki    ayaḳ    aġrïsï-dur    gider-e.
      *ïrḳun-nisā*-ACC  JUNCT foot    pain-DUR.COP  cure-OPT
      'If they inject one drachma from its fruit juice, it can cure *ïrḳun-nisā*, which is a foot pain.' (EM 20)

(16)  A 'żā-yï   re 'īse-yi   ki     dimāġ-dur    ve    yürek-dür    ve
      organ-EZF  main-ACC    JUNCT  brain-DUR.COP and   heart-DUR.COP and
      jiger-dür        taḳviyet èd-e-ler.
      lung-DUR.COP     strengthen-OPT-3PL
      'One may strive to strengthen the main organs, which are the brain, the heart and the lungs.' (MŠ 22)

(17)  Eger   an-ï /.../   *ïrḳun-nisā* renjin-e   ki     ol     bir   aġrï-dur /.../
      if     that-ACC    *ïrḳun-nisā* illness-DAT JUNCT  that   a     pain-DUR.COP
      huḳne èd-e-ler.
      inject-OPT-3PL
      'If they inject it against the disease *ïrḳun-nisā*, which is a pain /.../.' (EM 32)

Examples (18–19) illustrate the use of the copular marker *ola* in the given pattern. In (18) the constituent containing the *ki*-clause is the direct object within a verbal clause. Thus, the head noun of the *ki*-clause takes the accusative marker: *ishāli* [diarrhoea-ACC]. The main clause has a verbal predicate based on the present form *-(V)r*. In (19), the head noun, *šol ţatlu nesnelerden*, is the last element of a coordination which involves the conjunctor *ve* 'and' after each element: *fistuḳdan ve ḳozdan ve finduḳdan ve šol ţatlu nesnelerden*. Each element of this coordination takes the abla-

tive marker since the verb *saḳïn-* 'avoid' governs ablative case. The *ki*-clause only restricts the extension of the last element: *šol ṭatlu nesnelerden.*

(18) *Ishāl-i           ki        müzmīn      ol-a               gider-ür.*
     diarrhoea-ACC   JUNCT    chronic      OL.COP-OPT      cure-R.PRES
     'It cures chronic diarrhoea.' (EM 49)

(19) *Fïstuḳ-dan      ve       ḳoz-dan      ve      fïnduḳ-dan     ve       šol      ṭatlu*
     pistachios-ABL  and    walnut-ABL   and    hazelnut-ABL   and     that     sweet
     *nesne-ler-den   ki       nišestelü    ol-a              ḥelvā-lar    ve       pālūde-ler*
     food-PL-ABL     JUNCT   with starch  OL.COP-OPT     halvah-PL   and      jelly-PL
     *gibi      saḳïn-a-lar.*
     like      avoid-OPT-3PL
     'One may avoid pistachios, walnuts, hazelnuts and sweet foods such as halvah and jelly that are made from starch.' (MŠ 16)


## 6.6. Pattern 6

This syntactic pattern is characterized by the use of a resumptive pronoun. Instead of attaching the case marker to the head noun (as I have presented in the patterns 4 and 5 above) a resumptive pronoun is used. This pronoun takes the case marker, and thus denotes the syntactic role of the previous constituent within the main verbal clause. It can be illustrated as follows:

$$O = \left\{ \text{NP} + ki + \text{N.PRE} + \textit{-dUr} \text{ or } \textit{ola} \right\} + \text{R.PRO} + \text{CASE} + \text{V.PRE} + \textit{-(y)A} \text{ or } \textit{-(V)r}$$

Figure 8: The *ki*-clause within the object constituent in a verbal clause (Pattern 6)

In example (20) the pronominal head noun *ol* does not carry any case suffix, although its constituent functions as the direct object of the verbal main clause. The pronoun *anï* in accusative, which immediately follows the *ki*-clause, refers to the whole previous constituent. The *ki*-clause is based on the marker *-dUr* and has a descriptive role.

(20) *Ol      ki        öldür-iǰi-dür        an-ï            yė-me-ye-ler.*
     that    JUNCT    kill-DER-DUR.COP    that-ACC      eat-NEG-OPT-3PL
     'One should not eat that one, which is poisonous.' (EM 17)

The following example illustrates the use of the copular marker *ola* in this pattern. The *ki*-clause implies a restriction and selects the one sort of the generic unit of *et-mek* 'bread'. We can paraphrase the construction as: 'Only the bread that is made from laundered wheat is colder than other bread.' The head noun does not take a case marker. Instead, the syntactic role of the constituent *etmek ki yunmïš buġday-dan ola* is indicated by the dative-marked resumptive pronoun *aŋa.*

(21) *Etmek      ki       yu-n-miš        buġday-dan    ola         aŋ-a*
bread      JUNCT    wash-PASS-PART  wheat-ABL     OL.COP-OPT  that-DAT
*ḫubz-ï maġsūl      de-r-ler.*
*ḫubz-ï maġsūl*      say-R.PRES-3PL

*Ḳalan          etmek-ler-den   ṣovuḳ-dur   ve   ġïda-sï*
remain-PART    bread-PL-ABL    cold-DUR.COP  and  nutritional value-POSS3
*az    ol-ur.*
less   OL.COP-R.PRES
'The bread that is made from laundered wheat is called *ḫubz-ï maġsūl*. It is cold
compared to other bread and its nutritional value is less.' (EM 19)

## 7. *ki*-clauses following predicates of initial clauses

In the second configuration, the *ki*-clauses follow the nominal or verbal predicates of
other clauses. In this context, the syntactic functions of the inserted *ki*-clauses are
rather vaguely marked. Patterns often found in the data are analysed below.

### 7.1. Pattern 1

In one pattern, the *ki*-clause follows the nominal predicate of an initial copular
clause based on the marker *-dUr*. It can be illustrated as follows:

NP + N.PRE + *-dUr* + *ki* + NP + N.PRE + *-dUr* or *ola*

Figure 9: The *ki*-clause after a copular clause (Pattern 1)

The *ki*-clause based on the copular form *-dUr* provides additional information about
the statement in the previous copular clause. Consider example (22), where two
statements are connected to one another by means of the junctor *ki*. The role of *ki*
can be conceived of as a colon or a pause: 'cirrhosis is a disease and this is caused
by coldness of the liver'.

(22) *Istisḳā       bir    ḫastalïḳ-dur        ki      sebeb-i        baġïr*
cirrhosis    a      disease-DUR.COP   JUNCT   reason-POSS3   liver
*ṣovuḳlïġï-dur       ve    ol     üč    dürlü-dür.*
coldness-DUR.COP   and   that  three  type-DUR.COP
'Cirrhosis is a disease, which is caused by coldness of the liver, and it has three
different types.' (EM 66)

The relation between the *ki*-clause with the form *ola* and the previous copular clause
can be conceived of as a complement-like relation. In such examples, the initial
clause is typically a specificational copular clause, its predicate being a pronoun.
(For the characteristics of specificational copular clauses, see Karakoç 2011.) Con-

sider the use of different types of *ki*-clauses in (23). The first part, *ol ki sebebi ṣafrādur*, illustrates a pattern discussed above for example (11) in Section 6.3. The rest, '*alāmeti oldur ki beŋzi ṣaru ve aġzï ajï ola*, has the copular marker *ola*. The possessive noun *beŋzi* in the *ki*-clause refers to the 'patient'.[3] Examples (24–25) illustrate the same kind of complement-like relations between the respective clauses.

(23)  *Ol        ki      sebeb-i       ṣafrā-dur        'alāmet-i          ol-dur*
       that  JUNCT  reason-POSS3  gall-DUR.COP  symptom-POSS3   that-DUR.COP
       *ki        beŋz-i     ṣaru   ve    aġz-ï          ajï      ol-a.*
       JUNCT  face-POSS3  brass  and  mouth-POSS3  bitter   OL.COP-OPT
       'The symptoms of that (disease), which arises from the gall, are that the patient has a brass complexion and a bitter taste in the mouth.' (EM 57)

(24)  *Ve     ammā     ol      ki       balġam     ġālib         ol-mak-dan     ol-a,*
       and   but     that  JUNCT  phlegm   superfluous  be-INF-ABL    OL.COP-OPT
       *'alāmet-i          ol-dur           ki        uyku-sï      čok     ol-a*
       symptom-POSS3   that-DUR.COP  JUNCT  sleep-poss3   much   OL.COP-OPT
       *ve     baš-ï        aġrï-r          ol-a.*
       and   head-POSS3  pain-R.PRES   OL.COP-OPT
       'The symptoms of that one that is due to the superfluous phlegm are that the patient sleeps a lot and has a headache.' (EM 57)

(25)  *Ol        ki      sevdā-dan-dur        'alāmet-i          ol-dur           ki*
       that  JUNCT  black bile-ABL-DUR.COP  symptom-POSS3   that-DUR.COP  JUNCT
       *yüz-i-nüŋ          reng-i           karasaġu     ol-a          ve*
       face-POSS3-GEN   colour-POSS3   blackish     OL.COP-OPT   and
       *göz-ler-i        ičerü     bat-mïš        ol-a          ve     nabz-ï*
       eye-PL-POSS3   inside   sink-P.TER   OL.COP-OPT   and   pulse-POSS3
       *ża'ïf   ol-a           ve     aġz-ï          dad-ï           ekši   ol-a.*
       weak  OL.COP-OPT   and   mouth-POSS3  taste-POSS3   sour   OL.COP-OPT
       'The symptoms of the one which arises from the black bile are that the patient's face is blackish, his eyes are sunken, his pulse is weak and he has a bitter taste in his mouth.' (EM 57)

---

3   If we transformed the given clause into a subordinate clause in Modern Turkish, the result would be a subject complement clause based on the infinitive in *-mA*: *Benz-in sarı ol-ma-sı ve ağz-ın acı ol-ma-sı (bu-nun) işareti-dir* [face-GEN brass be-INF-POSS3SG and mouth-GEN bitter be-INF-POSS3SG (this-GEN) symptom-POSS3SG-DIR.COP]. Note that the *ki*-clause in our example and the subordinate complement clause in Modern Turkish are thus not argued to be functionally equal. As already pointed out, the inserted *ki*-clause rather marks vague syntactic relations.

## 7.2. Pattern 2

In this pattern, the initial copular clause, which contains a pronominal predicate, is a specificational copular clause based on *-dUr*. The *ki*-clause placed after the predicate of this clause consists solely of a predicate noun and takes the copular marker *ola*. It does not contain a subject, and the relation between the two clauses cannot be conceived of as a complement-like relation. See the following figure:

NP + N.PRE + *-dUr* + *ki* + N.PRE + *ola*

Figure 10: The *ki*-clause after a copular clause (Pattern 2)

In example (26) the initial specificational copular clause is: *şunuŋ eyüsi oldur* [water-GEN good-POSS3 that-DUR.COP] 'the best water is that'. The predicate of this clause is a pronoun, *ol*, which is the referent of the *ki*-clause, *ki revān ola, tatlu ve şāfī ola*. The *ki*-clause denotes a restriction.[4] Consider examples (27–29) as well. In (29) the initial specificational copular clause includes a complex subject noun, *havā eyü olmak*, which is itself a complement clause based on the infinitive in *-mAK*.

(26)  *Şu-nuŋ      eyü-si      ol-dur        ki       revān    ol-a*
      water-GEN   good-POSS3  that-DUR.COP  JUNCT    flowing  OL.COP-OPT
      *tatlu       ve    şāfī    ol-a.*
      sweet       and   clear   OL.COP-OPT
      'The best water is that which flows and is sweet and clear. (MŠ 12)

(27)  *Eyü      uyku  ol-dur        ki       muttasïl       ol-a        kuşkulu*
      good     sleep that-DUR.COP  JUNCT    uninterrupted  OL.COP-OPT  uneasy
      *ol-ma-ya.*
      OL.COP-NEG-OPT
      'Good sleep is that which is uninterrupted and is not uneasy.' (MŠ 13)

(28)  *Tavuk    eyü-si      ol-dur        ki       yumurtla-ma-duk*
      chicken  good-POSS3  that-DUR.COP  JUNCT    lay eggs-NEG-PART
      *bülüj             ol-a.*
      young chicken     OL.COP-OPT
      'A good chicken is one that is young and has not laid eggs.' (MŠ 25)

---

4   If we were to render the meaning of this clause in a subordinate clause the result would be a headless relative clause based on the participle *-(y)An*, e.g. *Su-yun iyi-si tatlı ve berrak ol-an-ı-dır* [water-GEN good-POSS3SG sweet and clear be-PART-POSS3SG-DIR.COP]. Observe the use of the third person possessive suffix, which is attached to the participle: *ol-an-ı* [be-PART-POSS3SG]. This possessive suffix seems to correspond to the anaphoric pronominal predicate *ol*, which is the head of the *ki*-clause.

(29) *Havā    eyü  ol-maḳ    ol-dur     ki      muʿtedil  ol-a.*
weather good be-INF   that-DUR.COP  JUNCT  moderate  OL.COP-OPT
'For weather to be good means that it is moderate.' (MŠ 11)


## 7.3. Pattern 3

In this pattern the initial clause contains a verbal predicate based either on the present form *-(V)r* or on the optative in *-(y)A*. The subsequent *ki*-clause is based on the copular form *-dUr* or *ola*. See Figure (11). The verbal predicate of the previous clause is usually placed before the *ki*-clause. However, even if the *ki*-clause follows the verbal predicate and is not immediately placed after the nominal argument of the initial clause, it is the nominal argument that is in the scope of the *ki*-clause. That is why this pattern can best be analysed as a variant of the pattern presented above in Section 6.5. The main distinction between them is the verbal predicate's placement before or after the *ki*-clause.


S/O + V.PRE + *-(V)r* or *-(y)A* + *ki* + (NP) + N.PRE + *-dUr* or *ola*

Figure 11: The *ki*-clause after a verbal clause (Pattern 3)


In examples (30–32), the *ki*-clauses follow the nominal arguments (*šol kiši* in both cases) and the verbal predicates *gire* 'may go' and *iče* 'may drink', respectively. The *ki*-clauses based on *ola* refer to the arguments (*šol kiši*) and restrict their extension. That means: 'Only that person who is healthy and young' (example 30) and 'only that person whose nature is rather hot' (example 31). In both examples, the *ki*-clause restricts the extension of the head noun *šol kiši* 'that person'. In example (32), the *ki*-clause characterizes the sort of 'headache'. It is important to point out that the copular marker *ola* in this pattern typically implies a static meaning 'to be'.


(30) *Şovuḳ     şu-ya       šol   kiši    gir-e      ki      tendürüst*
cold      water-DAT   that  person  go in-OPT  JUNCT  healthy
*ol-a        ya yigit    ol-a              ḳoja kiši  ya     oġlan*
OL.COP-OPT  or young   OL.COP-OPT        old  man   or     child
*gir-me-ye.*
go in-NEG-OPT
'Only a person who is healthy and young may go into cold water. An old person or a child should not go in.' (MŠ 14)


(31) *Meger   šol   kiši    ič-e       ki      ṭabīʿat-ï      ġāyet   ïssï*
unless  that  person  drink-OPT  JUNCT  nature-POSS3   very    hot
*ol-a        ol    daḫï   ič-se         čoḳ     ič-me-ye.*
OL.COP-OPT  that  also   drink-COND    much    drink-NEG-OPT
'Only the person whose body temperature is very hot may drink (this water). But, even if he drinks it, he should not drink too much.' (MŠ 13)

(32) *Baš*    *aġrï-sï-n*       *gider-ür*      *ki*      *issi-den ol-miš*
     head    pain-POSS3-ACC   cure-R.PRES    JUNCT    heat-ABL arise-P.TER
     *ol-a.*
     OL.COP-OPT
     'It cures the headache that is due to the heat.' (EM 49)

In example (33) the *ki*-clause, based on *-dUr*, has a parenthetical function. We observe that the verbal predicate (*yarar*) is placed before the *ki*-clause. The *ki*-clause refers to the dative-marked constituent (*anlara*) and provides a description of it.

(33) *Ḳuzï eti*    *ve*     *emer*        *oġlaḳ eti /.../*   *an-lar-a*     *yara-r*
     lamb meat    and     suck-PART    kid meat           that-PL-DAT   be beneficial-R.PRES
     *ki*       *aruḳ*    *ve*     *za 'ïf-dür.*
     JUNCT    thin     and     weak-DUR.COP
     'Lamb meat and meat of a kid that is still drinking mother's milk are beneficial to people who are thin and weak.' (MŠ 25)

### 7.4. Pattern 4

This pattern is syntactically similar to the previous one. The main peculiarity of this type, however, is that both the initial clause and the *ki*-clause are only based on optative forms. That is, the copular marker exclusively selected in this type is *ola*. Moreover, the copular verb *ola* mainly appears in a dynamic reading 'to become', which represents an important difference between patterns 3 and 4. The *ki*-clause in this pattern can best be characterized as a purposive clause. See the following figure:

S/O + V.PRE + -(*y*)*A* + *ki* + (NP) + N.PRE + *ola*

Figure 12: The *ki*-clause after a verbal clause (Pattern 4)

The clauses in (34–36) all imply purposive readings that can be rendered in English by 'so that' or 'in order to'. The first part of example (34) (*a 'żā-yï re 'ïseyi ki dimāġ-dur ve yürekdür ve jigerdür*) has already been analysed above (example 16 in Section 6.5). The rest of this example (*taḳviyet ėdeler ki za 'ïf olmaya*) illustrates a purposive clause. Observe that the initial verbal predicates of these examples typically contain a third person plural subject marker (i.e. *taḳviyet ėdeler*, *ḳaynadalar*, *ḳatalar*), implying an impersonal reference. It needs to be remarked that alongside the subjunctor *ke*, the subjunctor *tā* can exhibit a similar use in purposive clauses in Persian (Lazard 1957: 236; Dahlén 2010: 361); on the use of optative in purposive clauses in Ottoman Turkish see Prokosch (1980: 74–83).

(34) *A 'żā-yï*    *re 'ïse-yi*    *ki*      *dimāġ-dur*      *ve*    *yürek-dür*      *ve*
     organ-EZF   main-ACC      JUNCT    brain-DUR.COP    and    heart-DUR.COP   and

> *jiger-dür      takviyet èd-e-ler      ki      ża'īf      ol-ma-ya.*
> lung-DUR.COP   strengthen-OPT-3PL   JUNCT   weak   become-NEG-OPT
> 'One may strive to strengthen the main organs, which are the brain, the heart and
> the lungs, in order not to weaken ones health.' (MŠ 22)

(35)    *Šol      kadar      kaynad-a-lar      ki      müherrā ol-a.*
     that   much   boil-OPT-3PL   JUNCT   properly boil-OPT
     'One should boil it much so that it is properly boiled.' (EM 51)

(36)    *Süd-i      kaynad-a-lar      biraz      sirke      kat-a-lar      ki      süd*
     milk-ACC   boil-OPT-3PL   a bit   vinegar   add-OPT-3PL   JUNCT   milk
     *kesil-e      peynīr      ol-a.*
     curdle-OPT   cheese   become-OPT
     'One should boil the milk and add a bit of vinegar so that the milk curdles and
     becomes cheese.' (EM 20)

These kinds of *ki*-clauses are still encountered in the modern language: *Bu organı
öyle güçlendirmeli ki zayıf düşmesin* [this organ so strengthen-NEC JUNCT weak fall-
NEG-OPT], 'One may strive to strengthen this organ, in order not to weaken it', *Sütü
kaynatıp biraz sirke katmalı ki kesilip peynir olsun* [milk-ACC boil-CONV a bit vine-
gar add-NEC JUNCT curdle-CONV cheese become-OPT] 'One should boil the milk and
add a bit of vinegar so that it curdles and becomes cheese.' Note that the optative
form *-(y)A* in the initial clause is rendered in the modern construction by the neces-
sitative in *-mAlI*, which has an impersonal reading. The optative *-(y)A* in the *ki*-
clause, on the other hand, is rendered by the optative form *-sIn*. (For the develop-
ment of the Turkish optative, see Johanson 2013b.)

## 8. The complex forms *-mIš ola* and *-(V)r ola*

The data includes examples of *ki*-clauses that have verbal predicates taking the post-
terminal form *-mIš* plus the copular form *ola*. There are also a few examples in
which the verbal predicate takes the intraterminal form *-(V)r* and the copular marker
*ola*. The complex form *-mIš ola* expresses the postterminal viewpoint. These com-
plex forms can be found in different patterns discussed above. In example (37) the
first copular verb in the predicate (*olmiš*) has a dynamic meaning, 'become'. The *ki*-
clause in this example illustrates the pattern presented in Section 6.4. Example (38)
illustrates the use of *-mIš ola* in the pattern analysed in Section 7.3. Example (39)
illustrates the complex form *-mIš ola* in the pattern analysed in 7.2. Example (40)
shows the use of *-mIš ola* within the syntactic pattern presented in 6.3.

(37)    *Ve      kebāb /.../      kiši-ler-e      ki      kuvvet-leri      sākit*
     and   roasted meat   person-PL-DAT   JUNCT   power-POSS3PL   weakened

ol-mïš          ol-a          muvāfiḳ-dur.
become-P.TER   OL.COP-OPT   appropriate-DUR.COP
'And, roasted meat is appropriate for persons whose strength has weakened.'
(EM 36)


(38)  Ol    kiši-ye      ič-ür-e-ler         ki    aġulu       nesne yè-miš
      that  person-DAT  drink-CAUS-OPT-3PL  JUNCT poisonous   thing eat-P.TER
      ol-a.
      OL.COP-OPT
      'They should let the person who has eaten a poisonous food drink it.' (EM18)


(39)  Yègreg-i    ol-dur        ki      eyü    biš-miš     ol-a.
      better-POSS3  that-DUR.COP  JUNCT  good   cook-P.TER  OL.COP-OPT
      'The best is the one that has been well cooked.' (EM 19)


(40)  Eski süji  ki       ič-in-e         issi   ot-lar   ve    gökček  ḳoḳu-lar
      old  wine JUNCT     inside-POSS3-DAT hot    herb-PL  and   pleasant scent-PL
      ḳat-ïl-mïš         ol-a       /.../  tavuḳ eti   ki      üzer-in-e
      add-PASS-P.TER    OL.COP-OPT         chicken     JUNCT   above-POSS3-DAT
      dārčīnī     ve    ḳaranful ve    besbāse              ve    za'firān
      cinnamon   and   clove    and   myristica fragrance  and   saffron
      ekil-miš    ol-a.
      sprinkle-P.TER  OL.COP-OPT
      'The old wine to which spices and pleasant scents have been added /.../ the chicken
      on which cinnamon, clove, myristica fragrance and saffron have been sprinkled.'
      (EM 63)


In example (41) the verbal predicate in the *ki*-clause is based on the form *-(V)r ola*.
This example shows the use of *-(V)r ola* in a pattern analysed in Section 7.1. The
relation between the initial clause, '*alāmeti oldur*, and the *ki*-clause, *ki uyḳusï čoḳ
ola ve bašï aġrïr ola*, can best be characterized as a complement-like relation.[5]


(41)  'Alāmet-i     ol-dur        ki      uyḳu-sï    čoḳ    ol-a       ve
      symptom-POSS3  that-DUR.COP  JUNCT sleep-POSS3 much  OL.COP-OPT  and
      baš-ï    aġrï-r       ol-a.
      head-POSS3 pain-R.PRES  OL.COP-OPT
      'Its symptoms are that the patient sleeps a lot and has a headache.' (EM 57)


5   This example may be rendered by using non-finite subordinating devices as follows:
    *uyku-nun çok ol-ma-sı ve baş-ın ağrı-yor ol-ma-sı (bu-nun) işaret-i-dir* [sleep-GEN much
    be-INF-POSS3SG and head-GEN pain-PRES be-INF-POSS3SG (this-GEN) symptom-POSS3SG-
    DIR.COP).

## 9. The use of *olur*

The verb *olur* is often found as a dynamic copular verb in compound words, for instance *ḥāṣïl olur*, *vāḳi' olur*, *ża'īf olur*, *haẓm olur*, *żarūret olur*, *mütevellid olur*, *müherrā olur*, *ẓāhir olur*, etc. Furthermore, it appears in its different static and dynamic readings, such as 'it tends to be(come)', 'it tends to have/ acquire', 'it tends to exist/ be found/ come into existence', 'it tends to happen', etc. It sometimes occurs in the modal readings 'it will/ would/ can be(come)', 'it will/ would/ can happen' as well (Karakoç, in print). Example (42) illustrates the use of *olur* within a main clause. There are also examples where *olur* occurs as a modal element conveying 'it is possible, probable', see (43).

(42) *Furun-da     biš-en          etmek    ter      ol-ur.*
     oven-LOC     be baked-PART   bread    moist    OL.COP-R.PRES
     'Bread baked in an oven tends to be moist.' (EM 19)

(43) *Ol-ur           ki       mefājā'    ölümi-n      getür-ür.*
     OL.COP-R.PRES   JUNCT    palsy      death-ACC    bring-R.PRES
     'It is probable that it causes palsy.' (EM 34)

Though not frequently, the copular verb *olur* is also found in different syntactic types of the *ki*-clauses presented above. Within these clauses it conveys the meanings given above. It should be pointed out that in all its readings it typically appears in descriptive, parenthetical clauses. In this respect its use resembles that of the copular form *-dUr*. Consider the examples (44–46).

(44) *Bil-gil      ki         ïsïtma    var-dur          ki       zamān-ï      uzun*
     know-IMP     JUNCT      malaria   exist-DUR.COP    JUNCT    time-POSS3   long
     *ol-ur,       gej      geč-er.*
     OL.COP-R.PRES  late    be over-R.PRES
     'Know that that there is a malaria: it tends to last long and its healing process is slow.' (EM 70)

(45) *Serv aġajïn-dan   bir    nev'-dür          ki       ḳara arduj      yẹmiši*
     cypress-ABL      a      sort-DUR.COP      JUNCT    black juniper   fruit-POSS3
     *gibi  yẹmiš-i        ol-ur            ammā     bu     ḳïzïlja    ol-ur.*
     like   fruit-POSS3    OL.COP-R.PRES    but      this   reddish    OL.COP-R-PRES
     It is a sort of cypress tree, which tends to have fruit like the fruit of a black juniper. However, it tends to be more reddish.' (EM 43)

(46) *Šiḳāḳa     ki        maḳ'ad-da    olur           aṣṣï-dur.*
     šiḳāḳa     JUNCT     anus-LOC     OL.COP-R.PRES  useful-DUR.COP
     '*Šiḳāḳa*, which tends to be found in the anus, is useful.' (EM 32)

## 10. Corresponding structures in Modern Persian

Even if Modern Persian is not the language that served as a model code for the kind of syntactic copies in our data, it could be fruitful to briefly compare the patterns found with the corresponding structures in this language. Leaving aside the complex theoretical issue of the syntactic status of the corresponding *ke*-clauses in Persian, I will look at the realization of restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in this language. Restrictive relative clauses differ from non-restrictive ones by the use of an enclitic *-i*. The enclitic *-i* is only added to the head noun of restrictive relative clauses. The head nouns of non-restrictive relative clauses are not marked by *-i* (Thackston 1993: 85–88; see also Jahani 2000). The Persian examples in (47a–b) are taken from Thackston (1993: 88):

> (47)  (a) *Ahmad, ke diruz āmad, injā-st.*
>           'Ahmad, who came yesterday, is here.'
>
>        (b) *Ahmad-i-ke diruz āmad, injā-st.*
>           'The Ahmad who came yesterday is here.'

The subjunctive in Persian is used in relative clauses if the head noun is indefinite. Examples in (48a–b) are due to Thackston (1993: 141).

> (48)  (a) *Dombāl-e kas-i migardam ke fārsi balad bāshad.*
>           'I'm looking for someone who knows Persian.'
>
>        (b) *Dombāl-e ān mard-i migardam ke fārsi balad-ast.*
>           'I'm looking for the man who knows Persian.'

To sum up, the distinction between the restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses is denoted by means of a clitical *-i* on the head noun, and subjunctive is used if the head noun of the relative clause is indefinite. The situation in our Old Ottoman Turkish data is comparable. The heads of the restrictive *ki*-clauses based on the optative mood are typically indefinite nouns, whereas the head nouns of the non-restrictive, appositive *ki*-clauses based on the present markers are definite, and include names of plants, diseases, etc. The optative mood in Old Ottoman Turkish texts fulfils a subjunctive function to express restrictive relative clauses.

The following clauses are the translations of some of our examples into Modern Persian.[6] The numbers before the translated examples refer to the numbers of our Old Ottoman Turkish examples given above. Consider the use of different copular markers in the *ke*-clauses:

---

6   I would like to thank my colleagues, Esmat Esmaeili for translating these examples into Persian, and Forogh Hashabeiky for a critical reading.

(2') *Eftimūn ke dar hame-ye zabānhā ma'rūf ast garm va xošk ast.*

(3') *Har qārūrei ke sefid yā zard yā sorx nabāsad xub nist va bāes̱-e marg ast.*

(4') *Fasl-e avval ke bahār ast tabi'ataš garm va marṭūb ast.*

(7') *Ān maraẕhā-i ke ba sor'at va tabālūd bāšad bohrānešān roz-e čahārom xāhad būd.*

(9') *Dilkü üzümi ke fārsiaš angor-e rūbāh va 'arabiaš 'enabe's-s̱aleb ast xošk va sard mibāšad.*

(13') *Peste barā-ye darde jegari ke az roṭūbat bāšad mofid ast.*

(16') *A'zā-ye aṣli-ye badan ke qalb va jegar ast ānhārā taqviyat mikonad.*

(18') *Eshāli rā ke mozmen bāšad az beyn mibarad.*

(20') *Ān ke moẕer ast ānrā nabāyad bexorand.*

(22') *Estesqā marazi ast ke sababaš sarma xordegi-ye jegar ast ...*

(23') *Ān ke sababaš safra ast 'alāmataš in ast ke rangaš zard va dehānaš talx bāšad.*

(26') *Ābe xub ān ast ke ravān bāšad.*

(34') *Taqviyat mikonad ke (tā) ẕa'eif našavand (nabāšand).*

As can be seen from these translations, our Old Ottoman Turkish clauses including -*dUr* correspond to the clauses based on the copular form *ast*. In contrast to this, examples illustrating the use of the optative form *ola* are typically rendered by the copular form *bāšad*, which is the subjunctive copular form in Persian. In example 34, illustrating a purposive clause, both the subjunctor *ke* and *tā* can be used. Further, the form used in this purposive clause is also the subjunctive.

It is interesting to note that the use of different copular forms is also found in Azeri as spoken in Iran. The clauses having -*dUr* in our Old Ottoman Turkish texts (and *ast* in their Modern Persian translations) are best rendered in Azeri by using the copular marker -*dI*. The *ki*-clauses, on the other hand, based on the optative *ola* in the Old Ottoman Turkish texts (and on the subjunctive form *bāšad* in their Modern Persian translations) are rendered in Azeri by the optative-marked copular form *ol-sun* (Esmat Esmaeili, p.c.).

## 11. Non-finite subordinate copular clauses in the data

Alongside the overwhelming use of *ki*-clauses—which seem to appear as clausal insertions—our data provides scores of examples of copular clauses based on the non-finite subordinating devices such as *olan* [be(come)-PART], *olmïš* [be(come)-PART] and *olmaḳ* [be(come)-INF].

The non-finite subordinate relative clauses display the following properties among others: 1) They often contain locative predicates: *ḳarïn-da ol-an ḳurt-lar* 'worms in the stomach' (EM 52), *ičegü-de ol-an südde-ler* 'interior flatulence' (EM 52), *maḳ'ad-da ol-an baš* 'sore in the anus' (EM 50), *baġarsuḳ-lar-da ol-an baš* 'ulceration in the intestine' (MŠ 126), *baġarsuḳ-da ol-an saḥjï* 'infection in the intestine' (EM 46), *öyken-de ol-an ḳarḥa* 'abscess in the lung' (EM 45), *böbrek-de*

*olan taš* 'stones in the kidney' (MŠ 126), etc.; 2) They often consist of ablative predicates: *şovuḳ-dan ol-an aġrï* 'pain arising from cold' (EM 50), *ḳan-dan ol-an sïtma* 'malaria arising from blood' (EM 71), *balġam-dan ol-an ḳulunǰ* 'colic arising from phlegm' (EM 52), *şafra-dan ol-an baš aġrïsï* 'headache arising from gall' (EM 51), *sevdā-dan ol-miš šiš-ler* 'tumour arising from black bile' (EM 43), *şovuḳ-dan ol-an bėl aġrïsï* 'lumbago arising from the cold' (MŠ 127), etc.; 3) They are often found in possessive constructions meaning 'to have': *ḳuluǰ-ï ol-an kiši* 'the person who has colic' (EM 38), *böbreg-in-de ṭaš ol-an* 'the one who has stones in his/her kidney' (MŠ 126), *şarulïġ-ï ol-an* 'the one who has icterus' (EM 28), *mesָāne-sin-de ṭaš ol-an* 'the one who has stones in his/her urinary bladder' (EM 19), *tešennüǰ-i ol-an* 'the one who has spasms' (EM 53)

The non-finite complement clauses make use of the bound infinitive in *-mAK*; consider examples (49–51).

(49)  *'Alāmet-i        der-le-mek   ve   ḥasta-nuŋ      bevl-i        ḳizïl    ve*
      symptom-POSS3    sweat-INF    and   patient-GEN    urine-POSS3   red      and
      *ḳoyu   ol-maḳ-dur.*
      dark   be-INF-DUR.COP
      'Its symptoms are abnormal sweating and the patient's urine colour being red and dark.' (EM 63)

(50)  *Ol      ki       ïssï-dan  ol-a            'alāmet-i      ïssï     ḳatï    ol-maḳ*
      that    JUNCT    heat-ABL  OL.COP-OPT      symptom-POSS3  hot      acute   be-INF
      *ve      čoḳ      şuşa-maḳ  ve     iki     yaġr-ïn                orta-sï*
      and     much     thirst-INF  and    two     shoulder blade-GEN     middle-POSS
      *aġrï-maḳ-dur.*
      pain-INF-DUR.COP
      'The symptoms of the one that is caused by the heat are being hot, excessively thirsty and having pain between the shoulder blades.' (MŠ 77)

(51)  *'Alāmet-i,       ḥasta-nuŋ     mizāǰ-ï              issi     ol-maḳ   ve*
      symptom-POSS3    patient-GEN   disposition-POSS3    hot      be-INF   and
      *bevl-i      od       renglü   ol-maḳ   ve     ič-i             yalïŋlan-maḳ   ve*
      urine-POSS3  fire     colour   be-INF   and    inside-POSS3     blaze-INF      and
      *ḳatï       susa-maḳ   ve     aġz-ï            aǰï     ve     beŋz-i       şaru*
      very       thirst-INF   and    mouth-POSS3      bitter  and    face-POSS3   brass
      *ol-maḳ-dur.*
      be-INF-DUR.COP
      'Its symptoms are that the patient's disposition is hot, his urine has an orange reddish tone, he will have a burning sensation in his chest, have excessive thirst and a bitter taste in his mouth as well as a brass facial complexion.' (EM 63)

Turkish non-finite subordinate relative clauses are typically used in a restrictive way. They restrict the extension of the referents of their head nouns. Accordingly,

the copied *ki*-clauses based on the optative form *ola* can be considered as stylistic variants of subordinate relative clauses. As already pointed out, the main difference between the non-finite and copied strategies is the *ki*-clauses are syntactically not subordinated. Examples (52–54) aim to illustrate the interesting symbiosis of the native and foreign strategies of clause combining in our data, i.e. a side-by-side occurrence of the syntactically vague insertions by means of the copied *ki*, and the non-finite subordinate clauses.

(52)  *Şadefüŋ   tohmï /.../   bèl aġrïsï-n   ki      ṣovuḳ-dan      ol-a*
       rue-GEN   seed-POSS3   lumbago-ACC   JUNCT   coldness-ABL   OL.COP-OPT
       *dürtijek      gider-ür /.../   ve   ṣovuḳ-dan      ol-an            bèl aġrïsïn-a*
       rub-CONV   cure-R.PRES   and   coldness-ABL   OL.COP-PART   lumbago-DAT
       *müfïd-dür.*
       useful-DUR.COP
       'The seed of rue, if rubbed, cures the lumbago that is caused by cold /.../ and it is beneficial to the lumbago caused by cold.' (EM 39)

(53)  *Ol    kiši-ye       ki      ma'de-sin-de        šiš       var-dur,*
       that   person-DAT   JUNCT   stomach-POSS3-LOC   tumour   exist-DUR.COP
       *ič-ür-e-ler /.../   ve   bavāsïri         ol-an-a              ve*
       drink-CAUS-OPT-3PL   and   haemorrhoids   OL.COP-PART-DAT   and
       *ič-in-den         ḳan      gid-en-e        yavlaḳ   eyü-dür.*
       inside-POSS3-ABL   blood   run-PART-DAT   very      good-DUR.COP
       'One should let the person who has a tumour in his stomach drink it /.../ and it is very good for the one who has haemorrhoids and internal bleeding.' (EM 17)

(54)  *Šiš-ler-e       ki      balġam-dan    ol-a          yaḳu èd-e-ler*
       tumour-PL-DAT   JUNCT   phlegm-ABL   OL.COP-OPT   apply a cautery-OPT-3PL
       *ṭaġïd-ur,          ḫāṣṣa        ki      ḳulaḳ      dib-in-de*
       dissolve-R.PRES   especially   JUNCT   ear-LOC   bottom-POSS3-LOC
       *ol-an         šiš-ler-e        vur-a-lar.*
       OL.COP-PART   tumour-PL-DAT   apply-OPT-3PL
       'If one applies it to the tumour that is caused by phlegm, it dissolves it; one should especially apply it to the tumours on the bottom of the ear.' (EM 30)

Bulut (1998) observes that the copied *ki*-clauses in *Seyahatname*, a Middle Ottoman Turkish text from the 17th century, are only used as non-restrictive relative clauses, whereas the Turkish strategy with participles is employed to express restrictive relative clauses. Bulut's examples of *ki*-clauses do not contain verbal forms in optative. In other words, there is no opposition between the present tense and the optative in the *ki*-clauses Bulut investigates. As described, however, the data analysed in the present survey contain different types of copied *ki*-clauses taking either the present or the optative form, and thus indicating a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive. As a result, the linguistic characteristics of our Old Ottoman Turkish

texts and of the Middle Ottoman Turkish text *Seyahatname* are different. Bulut (2006) investigates relativization strategies in Turkic varieties from a diachronic point of view; she does not, however, go into the matter of the operationalization of the semantic opposition between the present and the optative in *ki*-clauses.

## 12. Summary and conclusion

This paper has analysed the copied *ki*-clauses based on finite copular markers, *-dUr*, *olur* or *ola*, in two Old Ottoman Turkish texts from syntactic and semantic points of view. The so-called *ki*-clauses appear either within the subject or object constituents of main clauses (first syntactic configuration) or after predicates of previous clauses (second syntactic configuration). Within each configuration the *ki*-clauses occur as clausal insertions in a number of different syntactic patterns.

As for the first syntactic configuration, we have seen that the semantic opposition between the present and the optative is used to express a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses. This distinction is crucial for the relative clauses in Persian, the language that served as a model code for numerous copies in the data. In our texts, the copied restrictive relative clauses—which restrict and select the extension of the indefinite head nouns—are based on the optative mood (*ola*, as well as the complex forms *-mIš ola* and *-(V)r ola* in copular clauses). Thus, the Turkish optative has acquired a subjunctive function in copied restrictive relative clauses. The non-restrictive (descriptive, supplementary) relative clauses, on the other hand, have definite head nouns such as names of plants, diseases, etc., and are based on the present form (*-dUr* or *olur* in copular clauses).

As for the development of the copied patterns in this syntactic configuration, we observe that the clauses with *-dUr* or *olur*, i.e. the descriptive, non-restrictive ones, are not alien to Modern Turkish. Expressions such as the following can still be found in certain stylistic registers in Modern Turkish: *Birinci mevsim ki bahardır tabiatı yeşildir* 'The nature of the first season of the year, which is spring, is green' (cf. example 4); *Eftimun ki bütün dillerde meşhurdur şifalıdır* '*Cuscuta epithimum*, which is well-known in all languages, is wholesome' (cf. example 2).[7] The restrictive *ki*-clauses based on optative *ola*, however, are no longer used in Modern Turkish, having probably disappeared very early; cf. Bulut's (1998) conclusion regarding *Seyahatname* that relative *ki*-clauses are only non-restrictive, and stand in contrast to restrictive non-finite Turkish relative clauses.

In the second configuration—where the syntactic relations of *ki*-clauses are expressed more vaguely—the distribution of the present tense (*-dUr/olur* in copular clauses) and the optative (*ola* in copular clauses) is mainly dependent on the given

---

7    It is interesting to observe that the use of the copular marker *-DIr* in such *ki*-constructions is still obligatory in Modern Turkish. The zero-copula (*-Ø*) would not be appropriate in this kind of *ki*-clauses, e.g. *\*Birinci mevsim ki bahar-Ø tabiat-ı yeşildir, \*Eftimun ki bütün dillerde meşhur-Ø şifalıdır.*

syntactic pattern. For instance, the main copular form found in the complement-like *ki*-clauses is *ola* (Section 7.1). There does not seem to be a semantic opposition between *-dUr* and *ola* in this type. The same is true for the purposive *ki*-clauses, in which *ola* is the only choice; i.e. the optative fulfils a subjunctive function in purposive *ki*-clauses (Section 7.4). The development of individual patterns in the second configuration is also interesting because not only the *-dUr*-marked *ki*-clauses, but also some of the constructions based on the optative can still be found in the modern language. Even if the optative form in *-(y)A* has widely vanished, the *ki*-clauses based on the optative *-sIn* are still in use, e.g. *Suyun iyisi odur ki berrak olsun*[8] 'The best water is that which is clear' (cf. example 26); *Sütü kaynatıp biraz sirke katmalı ki kesilip peynir olsun* 'One should boil the milk and add a bit of vinegar so that it curdles and becomes cheese' (cf. example 36). These modern *ki*-clauses are based on the optative form *olsun*.

My focus in this paper has mainly been on the *ki*-clauses based on copular markers. Of course, the syntactic patterns and the semantic distinction found between the present and optative are not only crucial for copular clauses. The same distribution of functional patterns is also important for the *ki*-clauses consisting of verbal predicates.

---

8   It can again be observed that the use of the copular form *-DIr* in the initial clause of such modern patterns is obligatory. That is, the copular form *-DIr* cannot be omitted: \**Suyun iyisi o-Ø ki berrak olsun.*

# References

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

Bulut, Christiane 2006. Syntactic traces of Turkic-Iranian contiguity. An areal survey of contact-induced shift in patterns of relativization. In: Johanson, Lars & Bulut, Christiane (eds.) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects.* (Turcologica 62.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 165–208.

Canpolat, Mustafa & Önler, Zafer 2007. *İshâk bin Murâd. Edviye-yi müfrede.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları.

Dahlén, Ashk 2010. *Modern persisk grammatik.* Stockholm: Ferdosi.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin (ed.) 2008. *Osmanlı tıbbi bilimler literatürü tarihi* 1–4. (İlim tarihi kaynakları ve araştırmaları serisi 14, Osmanlı bilim tarihi literatürü serisi 7.) İstanbul: IRCICA.

Jahani, Carina 2000. Restrictive relative clauses in classical and modern New Persian and the marking of the antecedent. *Orientalia Suecana* 49, 33–56.

Johanson, Lars 1975. Some remarks on Turkic "Hypotaxis". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47. 104–118. Reprinted in: Johanson, Lars 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 37.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 210–224.

Johanson, Lars 1990. Die "problematischen" türkischen Nebensätze. *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* 28, 201–209.

Johanson Lars 2002. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts.* London: Curzon.

Johanson, Lars 2006. The history of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages.* London, New York: Routledge. 81–125.

Johanson, Lars 2012. Mood meets mood: Turkic versus Indo-European. In: Vanhove, Martine & Stolz, Thomas & Urdze, Aina & Otsuka, Hitomi (eds.) *Morphologies in contact.* Berlin: Akademie Verlag. 195–206.

Johanson, Lars 2013a. Written language intertwining. In: Bakker, Peter & Matras, Yaron (eds.) *Contact languages. A comprehensive guide.* (Language contact and bilingualism 6.) Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 273–331.

Johanson, Lars 2013b. The decline of the Ottoman optative. In: Demir, Nurettin & Karakoç, Birsel & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift.* Ankara: Hacettepe University publications. 253–260.

Karakoç, Birsel 2011. A new analysis of non-past copular markers and corresponding copular clauses in Karakhanid Turkic. *Turkic Languages* 15, 171–193.

Karakoç, Birsel [in print]. Non-past copular markers in Turkish. In: Suihkonen, Pirkko & Whaley, Lindsay J. (eds.) *On diversity and complexity of languages spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia.* (Studies in Language Companion Series.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Károly, László 2014. Türkçe yazılmış İslam tıp eserlerindeki şifalı dualar. In: Demir, Nurettin & Karakoç, Birsel & Menz, Astrid (eds.) *Turcology and linguistics. Éva Ágnes Csató Festschrift.* Ankara: Hacettepe University publications. 279–290.

Lazard, Gilbert 1957. *Grammaire du persan contemporain.* Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

Önler, Zafer 1990. *Celâlüddin Hızır (Hacı Paşa). Müntahab-ı şifâ 1. Giriş. Metin.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları.

Önler, Zafer 1999. *Celâlüddin Hızır (Hacı Paşa). Müntahab-ı şifâ 2. Sözlük.* İstanbul: Simurg.

Prokosch, Erich 1980. *Studien zur Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen*. Freiburg, Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag.

Rehbein, Jochen 2006. *Ki*—Form and function of a Turkish particle and its contact-induced reinterpretation by bilingual children. Paper presented at The 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 16–20, 2006, Uppsala, Sweden.

Römer, Claudia 1981. Der Einfluß der Übersetzungen aus dem Persischen auf die Entwicklung des Osmanischen im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 73, 89–114.

Thackston, Wheeler M. 1993. *An introduction to Persian*. Bethesda: Ibex Publishers.

## Abbreviations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | First person | NEC | Necessitative in *-mAlI* |
| 2 | Second person | NP | Nominal phrase |
| 3 | Third person | O | Object |
| ABL | Ablative | Ø | Zero-copula |
| ACC | Accusative | OL.COP | Copular verb in *ol-* 'to |
| CASE | Case marker | | be(come)' |
| CONV | Converb | OPT | Optative |
| DAT | Dative | PART | Participle |
| DIR.COP | Copular marker in *-D²I⁴r* (*-dır,* | PAST | Past tense |
| | *-dir, -dur, -dür, tır, -tir, -tur,* | PL | Plural |
| | *-tür*) in modern Turkish | POSS | Possessive |
| DUR.COP | Copular marker *-dU²r* (*-dur,* | PRO | Pronoun |
| | *-dür*) in Old Ottoman Turkish | P.TER | Postterminal in *-mIš* |
| E | Experiencer in copular clauses | R.PRES | The present form in *-(V)r* |
| EZA | Ezafe | R.PRO | Resumptive pronoun |
| GEN | Genitive | S | Subject |
| IMP | Imperative | SG | Singular |
| INF | Infinitive | V.PRE | Verbal predicate |
| JUNCT | Junctor | VP | Verbal phrase |
| N.PRE | Nominal predicate | | |