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1. Introduction
The Turkish dialects of the province of Erzurum belong, according to Karahan’s (1996) classification of the Anatolian Turkish dialects, to the subgroups 2 and 3 of the Eastern Anatolian dialects and exhibit some transitional features to Azerbaidjanian. One of the features shared by most Eastern Anatolian Turkish dialects as listed by Karahan (1996: 57) is that “the sequence of mood and personal ending in words like ‘sorarsamse, bıraχırsınsa, baciysaχısa’ in the dialects of Erzurum, Van, Muş, Ağrı, Diyarbakır und Urfa is drawing attention [translation mine]”.

In what follows I will first dwell on the morphological peculiarities of the conditional forms in these dialects I will then go on to illustrate the use of conditional forms in these dialects and mention some semantically conditional constructions that do not employ conditional forms. Finally, I will illustrate a special use of the conjunction eger ‘if’ in the dialects of the region.

1.1. The text material
The material I used for this investigation consists of the texts published in Caferoğlu (1942), Olcay (1995) and Gemalmaz (1995), as well as three unpublished theses. In regard to these texts I want to draw attention to the following points (see also Menz 2002: 200-202):

(i) All texts were recorded between the early 40s and the early 80s of the last century. In this period mass media had not yet reached all remote regions of Turkey, especially not the small villages of Eastern Turkey. Even radio broadcasting was not available in every village as can be learned from some texts in Gemalmaz (1995). From the same work it becomes clear that not all villages

---

1 Erzurum is a province in north-eastern Turkey.
2 See Karahan (1996: 56-57). I have listed some of the important features in Menz (2002). On one of these features concerning us here, the wide vowels in agreement suffixes, see below.
3 Erçikli (1974), Doğan (1978), and Arslan (1980). All theses are from the Department for Turkic Languages and Cultures of the University of Istanbul. In the examples given in what follows I have simplified the various transcriptions for the sake of consistency.
had their own school, which means that not all children in these villages received primary education.\textsuperscript{4} The influence of standard Turkish can thus be regarded as comparatively low.

(ii) Furthermore, all investigators tended to work with older informants, a method very common in dialectological works in Turkey. That means that many informants acquired their language at a time when radio and television were not available at all in Turkey.\textsuperscript{5} As a consequence, the material reflects a linguistic situation which might be quite different from the situation today.

(iii) Another common fact is that the majority of informants are male. Erzurum is a relatively conservative region where everyday life is determined to a great extent by tradition and religion. Access to female speakers is therefore difficult for male researchers. As a consequence Gemalmaz and his co-workers collected texts mainly from male speakers. Only in the theses do we find a majority of female speakers probably due to the fact that the students went to their own villages and collected the material from family members. Nevertheless from altogether 105 texts not more than ten are from female speakers.\textsuperscript{6}

2. Conditional forms
The conditional suffix in the dialects of Erzurum follows, as in the standard language, the verbal stem in its palatal-harmonic variable (-se/-sa). The conditional copula \textit{ise} follows nouns and aspecto-temporal suffixes and is subject to palatal-harmony, too. According to Gemalmaz (1995\textsuperscript{2/I}: 374) it combines with present, aorist, past, perfect/indirective, future and the necessitative in -\textit{meli}.

In some varieties the amalgamation after aspecto-temporal markers is less than in the standard language, so one finds forms like \textit{alacağısam} [< \textit{alacak} + \textit{isem}] instead of \textit{alacaksam}, \textit{almışsə} [< \textit{almış} + \textit{ise}] instead of \textit{almışsa} and so on. In other varieties the degree of amalgamation is higher and leads even to regressive assimilation of the last consonant of the perfect/indirective, resulting in forms like \textit{almışsa} < \textit{almışsə} or regressive assimilation and ultimately loss of the final -\textit{z} of the negative aorist, resulting in forms like \textit{almasa} < \textit{almassa} < \textit{almazsa}. The loss of final -\textit{z} of the negative aorist makes it sometimes hard to decide whether one is dealing with negative conditional proper or negative aorist-conditional, especially because stress is rarely marked in the text samples. Only in Çaferoğlu (1942) do we find stress marking in some instances, as in \textit{olmasıam} (p. 183). The stress on the second syllable

\textsuperscript{4} Arslan (1980) in her thesis on the dialect of Aşkale reports that in the villages only 15-30% of inhabitants over the age of 30 could read and write. At the time she made her investigation electricity was not yet available in these villages.

\textsuperscript{5} Gemalmaz (\textsuperscript{2}1995) indicates the age of 73 of altogether 92 speakers: 53 are over 50, 11 over 40, 8 over 30 and one is 18 years old. The average age is 56.

\textsuperscript{6} Erçikli (1974) reports neither the age nor the gender of her informant(s).
points to the fact that the last syllable is the unstressed conditional copula and the form is therefore contracted for < olmázsam. The conditional proper would have had stress on the last syllable, thus olmasám.

As I have mentioned above, Karahan (1996) lists as one of the features of the eastern Turkish dialects what she calls a change in order of the person marker and the conditional mood. Her examples are all forms with the conditional copula, and as those examples reveal, what in fact taking place is not a change in order but rather a doubling of the conditional copula, with the first one marked for person: sor-ar-sam-se [ask-AOR-COND1SG-CC]. While this is not quite clear in the 2. sg. because the dialects of Erzurum employ a low vowel in the person marker of the aorist (the form sor-ar-san-sa could be analyzed as either ask-AOR-2SG-CC or ask-AOR-COND2SG-CC), it is quite obvious in the 1. persons and in the 2. pl. because of the suffix initial s-. If we were dealing with a simple switch-over of person marker and conditional copula, this form would be *sor-ar-am-sa.8

Forms like this actually do occur in Azerbaijanian. Tietze (1989) has shown that in Azerbaijanian one finds quite frequently forms of the 2. sg. with the conditional copula after the person marker resulting in forms like sev-ir-san-sa [love-AOR-2SG-CC] (p. 31). According to Tietze (1989), this change in the order of suffixes in the 2. sg. eventually led to a change in suffix order in the 2. pl. and the 1. persons, too. Thus we find forms like ed-ir-äm-sä [do-AOR-1SG-CC] in Azerbaijanian (Tietze 1989: 33). However, the forms with changed order are much less frequent in the 1. persons and in the 2. pl. than in the 2. sg., see Tietze (1989: 33).

Tietze (1989) explains this change in order with the fact that the person marker and the conditional copula after nouns and verb are homonymous in the 2. sg. This homonymy led, according to Tietze, to a “disturbing fuzziness” (p. 30). To avoid this fuzziness the order of suffixes has changed, firstly in the 2. sg. and by analogy subsequently also in the other persons.

For the dialects of Erzurum, Olcay (1966: 53) reports that the copula combines with the aspecto-temporal suffixes and in most cases a second copula added after the person marker. Gemalmaz (1995/II: 374) gives examples for the combination with aspecto-temporal forms, all of them with twofold conditional copula. He does not comment on the conditions of their occurrence or the frequency of these forms as opposed to the simple form. For the conditional copula after nouns, he states that it is repeated after the person marker of the first copula in all persons except the 3. sg.

---

7 A comparable form can be found in the South-Siberian Turkic languages Tuvan and Tofa that have forms like bar-zı-m-za [go-COND-1SG-CC] ‘if I go,’ which possibly consist of a conditional suffix with raised vowel and an additional conditional copula following the person marker. The etymology of this form however is not clear; see Menz (in print). Note also that in Tuvan and Tofa double marking occurs after the conditional proper.

8 In Gemalmaz’s text there is actually one instance of a conditional copula after the aorist suffix ed-er-ig-se [do-AOR-1PL-CC] Gemalmaz 1995/II: 31, an example which is quite parallel to what Tietze (1989) has shown for Azerbaijanian.
e.g. gardaş-isam-sa [brother-CC1S-CC] ‘if I am a brother’ but gardaş-isa [brother-
CC3S] ‘if he is a brother’. According to Gemalmaz (1995: 331) the twofold forms
mainly occur in the Yukarı Karasu/Yukarı Aras dialects (Karahan 1996’s group 2 of
the Eastern Anatolian dialects) whereas in the Çoruhboyu dialects, which are geo-
graphically closer to the Black Sea dialects (Karahan 1996’s group 3 of the Eastern
Anatolian dialects), these forms occur extremely rarely.

The occurrence of a second copula in the text material is virtually restricted to
the copula after aorist forms and after nouns. There are no instances of a second
copula after the conditional proper, i.e. forms like *git-sem-se do not occur. Despite
the fact that Gemalmaz (1995) in his description of the morphology gives examples
for a doubled conditional copula after past, perfect, future, etc. forms, such forms do
not occur in over 300 pages of texts. Conditional forms of present, past, perfect and,
future tense are however quite rare in the texts anyway. Gemalmaz (1995) cites as
conditional of the past tense the form al-di-ysa-m-sa [take-PST-CC-1SG-CC] ‘if I
In the texts, however, all forms of the past have only one conditional copula, and this
comes last, i.e. we find only forms like eşit-du-ğ-usa [hear-PST-1PL-CC] ‘if we
heard’, gel-me-di-m-se [come-NEG-PST-1SG-CC] ‘if I didn’t come’, yap-ma-di-n-sa
[do-NEG-PST-2SG-CC] ‘if you didn’t do’, etc. As the copula follows the person
marker, a second copula form is not necessary and even not possible, because it
never appears after a copula without person marker, i.e. a form like *-sa-sa is not
possible.

In modern spoken Turkish for conditional after past the order of suffixes with
the person marker at the conditional copula is more widespread, see Lewis
are employed to mark semantic differences. The order past – person marker – condi-
tional copula is used according to Ersen-Rasch (2001:180) to express a fulfilled
condition whereas the order past – conditional copula – person marker is employed
to express an open condition. While this might be true for the modern spoken stan-
dard, I doubt that this holds also for the dialect of Erzurum. Instead the texts attest
that only one order (past – person marker – conditional copula) is used. The forms
given in paradigms by Olcay (1995) and Gemalmaz (1995) might derive from an
elicitation of analogous paradigms.

---

9 The fact that most conditional forms are either conditional proper or aorist conditional is
by no means restricted to these dialect texts but is valid for Turkish in general.

10 Note that also Tuvan and Tofa have only one conditional marker –sa in the 3. person, see

11 Adamović (1985: 293-294) states that this order is the original one in Ottoman Turkish
which changed in some dialects and thus also in the standard language through conformity
(“Systemzwang”), i.e. analogical to the other conditionals based on aspecto-temporal
forms.
In the first and second person plural the low vowel of the first copula is sometimes raised, e.g. *başla-r-sız-sa* ‘begin-AOR-COND1PL-CC’ Gemalmaz (1995²/I: 334). In all the examples I have found, the vowel of the first copula was raised when a second copula was present; in the rare cases without a second copula the vowel of the conditional copula stayed low. Thus, one finds forms like *kes-mes-se-k* [cut-NEGAOR-CC-1PL] ‘if we don’t cut’, Gemalmaz (1995²/II: 158), as opposed to the more frequent forms of the type *diüşer-si-k-se* [fall-AOR-CC-1PL-CC] ‘if we fall’, Gemalmaz (1995²/II: 187). The same holds also for the 2. pl., e.g. *dawran-ur-sa-z* [act-AOR-CC-2PL] ‘if you act’, Gemalmaz (1995²/II: 41), but *verir-si-z-se* [conduct-AOR-CC-2PL-CC] ‘if you give’, Erçikli (1974: 17).¹²

The fact that the occurrence of the doubled copula is restricted to the aorist and nouns makes Tietze’s explanation of the cause for this phenomenon quite plausible. It started with homonymous second person singular forms like *gözäl-sä(-)n* [beautiful-2SG] and *gözäl-ıχ(-)n* [beautiful-CC2-SG] (Tietze 1989: 30) or *al-ır-sa(-)n* [take-AOR-2SG] and *al-ır-ıχ(-)n* [take-AOR-CC-2SG] and spread to the 2. pl. and the first persons. But whereas in Azerbaijani we can observe an inversion of the suffixes, in the dialects of Erzurum the conditional copula appears twice. Both processes can be interpreted as a change in the paradigm through analogy: the conditional copula of the 2. sg. could not be distinguished from the person marker for the 2. person because of its low vowel. Therefore in Azerbaijani the order of suffixes was changed while in Erzurum an additional copula was added to make the form unambiguous. Probably in a second step, the whole paradigm was adapted to this, see Menz 2004.

The following table shows the analog and the different forms in the dialects of Erzurum and in Azerbaijani:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Erzurum aorist</th>
<th>Erzurum aorist+cc</th>
<th>Erzurum aorist + cc2</th>
<th>Azerbaijan. aorist</th>
<th>Azerbaijan. aorist+cc1</th>
<th>Azerbaijan. aorist + cc2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sg.</td>
<td><em>al-ır-am</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sam</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-m-sa</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-am</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-m</em></td>
<td><em>ahr-ır-am</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sg.</td>
<td><em>al-ır-san</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-n</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-n-sa</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-san</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-n</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-n-sa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pl.</td>
<td><em>al-ır-ıχ</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-ıχ</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-si-ıχ-sa</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-ıχ</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-ıχ</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-ıχ</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pl.</td>
<td><em>al-ır-sız</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sa-ız</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sız-sa</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sız</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sız-sa</em></td>
<td><em>al-ır-sız-sa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tietze (1989: 33) mentions the lesser frequency of forms with changed order in the 1. persons and the 2. pl. An explanation for this might be the fact that these person markers are less frequently employed in narrative texts than those for the 3. and 2. sg. I have counted the aorist + conditional copula forms on more than 300 pages and found 65 instances for 2. and 3. sg. as opposed to altogether 21 instances for all the

¹² Gemalmaz (¹⁹⁹⁵/I: 334 and 336) also gives examples for vowel raising in the conditional copula after nouns. In the texts there is no evidence for this.

¹³ As Tietze could not find an example for this form in the texts he used, I have constructed this form parallel to the other persons.
other persons. Of those, the majority—with the exception of the 3. pl.—had double conditional copula. Besides, in the 2. sg. we observe almost twice as many forms with doubled copula. For the textual distribution of the two possibilities, see below.

3. Functions of the conditional

In what follows I will deal with the various functions of the conditional forms. While some of these functions are quite parallel to what we find in modern spoken standard Turkish, some functions are particular for the dialects of Erzurum.  

3.1. Conditional as main clause predicator

As main clause predicator the conditional proper is employed for open wishes, in the same way as in modern standard Turkish, see example (1).

(1) imkan-ı ol-sa da, get-sa-χ gör-se-z göz-öz-le.
possibility-POSS3SG aux-COND3SG PTCL go-COND-1PL see-COND-2PL
‘If only there was a possibility and we could go and you could see it with your own eyes.’ G 75

I did not encounter counterfactual wishes with the conditional proper and past copula in either of the texts. Gemalmaz (1995²/l: 374) and Olcay (1995: 52) merely mention the existence of the form with an example and a paradigm respectively.

3.2. Conditional as dependent clause predicator

Far more frequent than the finite use is of course the use of the various conditional forms as predicator in dependent clauses. Besides conditional clauses with various semantic shades, the conditional forms are employed as predicator in conditional concessive clauses, a type of relative clause, and a type of temporal adverbial clause.

3.2.1. Conditional constructions

Among the dependent clause types the conditional construction is, not unexpectedly, the most prominent one. As in the spoken standard language, in most cases the protasis comes first in these constructions, and its predicate is marked either by a bare conditional or by a combination of an aspecto-temporal suffix and the conditional copula. In combination with the aspecto-temporal suffixes, with the exception of the past tense, the copula bears the person marker. The apodosis predicate is a finite one. The protasis can be introduced by the conjunction eger (< prs. agar, eger in standard

---

14 It is, however, possible that these particular constructions are also employed in other East Anatolian dialects.
Turkish), but this conjunction is not obligatory and also not very frequently employed, see below.

The various possible combinations of conditional or aspecto-temporal form plus conditional copula in combination with the apodosis predicator serve to express different semantic types of condition. Among these different types the construction expressing real (open) condition is by far the most frequent one. This fact is probably true for all languages, but in any case also for standard Turkish.

### 3.2.1.1. Open condition

Open conditional constructions in most cases have a protasis predicate in the aorist + the conditional copula, whereas the main clause predicate is either aorist or sometimes future tense. There is thus no difference in construction to modern spoken standard Turkish. As in Turkish in general, these constructions serve to express a neutral causal link in that the occurrence of the event in the main clause depends on the occurrence of the one in the conditional clause, see Kerslake 2003. In examples (3) and (4) the fact that the condition expressed in the protasis is really a neutral, open condition is quite obvious because in each example the first conditional construction is followed by a second one, expressing the possible alternative consequence if the condition or the first sentence is not fulfilled.

(2) rus hükümet-i şindi-ye gadar siz-i besle-miş-dir
Russian government-POSS3SG now-DAT until you-ACC feed-PF3SG-COP
amma, siz on-a kurşun at-ma-ya dawran-ur-sa-z,
but you it-DAT bullet shoot-INF-DAT act-AOR-COND-2PL
gerü gel-duğunda siz-i gırlış-dan geçür-ür.
back come-CONV you-ACC sword-ABL let.pass-AOR3SG
‘Until now the Russian government fed you, but if you start to shoot at it, it will dispose of you at the retreat.’ G 41

(3) Ben-e oğul ol-ur-san-sa gal-ır-am,
me-DAT son AUX-AOR-COND2SG-CC stay-AOR-1SG
olma-san-sa gid-er-em.
aux-NEG.[AOR]-COND2SG-CC go-AOR-1SG
‘If you will be a son to me, I’ll stay, if not, I’ll go away.’ D 49

(4) bu gece ingiliş-ler-len garagol-ları-ni kes-er-si-χ-sa
DET night English-PL-WITH guard-POSS3PL-ACC cut-AOR-COND-1PL-CC
gaç-ar-χ, kes-em-e-siy-χ-sa bu kafir bizi
flee-AOR-1PL cut-NEG.POSSIB-[AOR]COND1PL-CC DET infidel we-ACC
‘[He said]: If we kill the English and their guards tonight, we can escape, if we can’t kill them, the infidels will checkmate us.’ G 131

In most cases the order of clauses is protasis – apodosis; until now I could only find the following two examples for an inverted order of main clause and dependent clause in the texts:

(5) e, ekin bol olmaz, eger gurağ- ol-ur-sa.

PTCL harvest substantial AUX-NEG.AOR3SG if’ drought AUX-AOR.3SG-CC

‘Yes, the harvest isn’t substantial if there is a drought.’ G 147

(6) get de daha gelme, beni dos

go-IMP2SG PTCL again come-NEG-IMP2SG I-ACC friend

bül-ür-sün-se.

know-AOR-COND2SG-CC

‘Go and don’t come here again if you regard me as a friend.’ G 17

Other tense forms in open conditional constructions are possible but not very frequent. What we encounter in the texts are mostly past tense forms. Examples with future tense are extremely rare. Present tense does not appear in conditional clauses but rather is restricted to temporal clauses, see below. In example (7) with a perfect form + conditional copula in the protasis, we again have two alternative conditions and their consequences. The bride is going to see her groom for the first time, and the judgment based on this first look (beğenmiş ‘she did approve of him, i.e. she likes him’ or beğenmemiş ‘she didn’t approve of him, i.e. she doesn’t like him’) is the condition for her subsequent behavior:

(7) Gelin e ger oğlani beğenmis se üz i gü lir; yog

bride if boy-ACC like-PRF3SG-CC face-POSS3SG laugh-AOR3SG no

e ger beğenmemis se suratına bir pire düşse

if like-NEG-PRF3SG-CC face-POSS3SG-DAT one flea fall-COND3SG

bim-bölüg olur.

thousand-piece AUX-AOR3SG

‘If the bride likes [after she has seen him for the first time on her wedding day] the boy, she will smile, but if she does not, if only as much as a flea falls on her face it will break into a thousand pieces.’ D 16
This example also exhibits the use of the conditional conjunction *eger*. It is, however, not a typical example because *eger* normally is in clause initial position. In the first conditional clause of example (7) the subject is topicalized and therefore precedes the conjunction; the combination *yog eger* introduces the second conditional clause as a kind of alternative conditional conjunction ‘if not’.

*Eger* can also follow the conditional clause, as in the following example (8). This is also quite rare; I have found only this sole example in the texts:

(8) içine yalan gat-al-lar-sa eger çok sür-er.
inside-POSS3SG-DAT lie add-AOR-3PL-CC if very last-AOR3SG
‘(But) if they add lies to it, (then the story) lasts long.’ G 168

The following two examples exhibit the use of past tense + conditional copula in open conditional constructions. In example (9) the context is that the speaker asks a person to bring back his goods. If he does, he will get a reward and if he doesn’t he will have to pay a fine.\(^{15}\) We are thus not dealing with a condition in the past but rather with an open condition for the occurrence of the consequence. Note that this form with conditional copula after the person marker is used in the standard language, according to Ersen-Rasch (2001: 180), to convey fulfilled conditions, which is not the case in these examples. The condition is not yet fulfilled but rather depicted as a completed event that might happen in the future.

(9) ahan getir-me-din-se, bu mal-im-in üç gatlı
PTCL bring-NEG-PRET2SG-CC DET goods-POSS1SG.GEN triple
piyasa-sı-nı ver-ecek-sin.
market-POSS3SG.ACC give-FUT2SG
‘But if you don’t bring it [lit.: haven’t brought it], you must pay me the triple market value of my goods.’ G 180

(10) onnar-in semt-in-e git-di-ysa o yaralı davar,
they-GEN location-POSS3SG-DAT go-PST3SG-CC that wounded wild goat
onnar-at-ar, onnar vur-ur-lar.
they shut-AOR3SG they shoot-AOR-3PL
‘If it went into their area, that wounded wild goat, they will shoot it.’ G 47

\(^{15}\) Furthermore, the first alternative is not expressed with a conditional form but with past tense forms. For this special type of conditional construction, see below.
3.2.1.2. Hypothetic condition

Hypothetic conditional constructions allow the speaker to express her (negative) stance towards the likeliness of the event in the conditional clause to take place. In Turkish in general and in the dialects of Erzurum, in these constructions the predicate of the protasis is marked by the conditional suffix, the apodosis again bearing aorist or future tense. This semantic type has two subtypes, one being weakly hypothetical, the other counterfactual. In the counterfactual construction both predicates, of the protasis and of the apodosis, are additionally marked by the past copula *idi*.

Hypothetic conditional constructions are much less frequently used than open ones. The semantic difference between this type and the type described in the previous section is said to be one of the stance of the speaker towards the likeliness of the fulfillment of the condition. This is especially clear in some of the examples, especially where the speaker relates an event of his previous life, i.e. he knows whether the condition is fulfilled or not; like in example (11), which depends on the speaker’s knowledge that he and his friends did not get crushed in the end. In example (12), on the other hand, the speaker contemplates the remote possibility of a gunman’s coming round the corner just to emphasize their helplessness against armed foes during their flight from Russian captivity:

(11)

yani ellerinden gel-se bizi çeyni-yeceyh-ler.
i.e.  hand-POSS3PL-ABL come-COND3SG us-ACC crush-FUT-3PL
‘So, if they got a hold (over us), they will crush us.’ G 31

(12)
aor-dan, şindi bir beşli-yi\(^{16}\) doldur-sa, aor-da
that place-ABL now one weapon-ACC load-COND3SG that place-LOC
dur-sa, ney-edeceyh-siz burda?
stand-COND3SG what-do-FUT-2PL here
‘From there, if someone now loads a rifle and stands right there, what can we do here?’ G 27

Counterfactual conditional clauses bear an additional past copula on both the protasis and the apodosis predicate. The past copula serves to express what James (1982: 375) called ‘distance from present reality’, which in conditional constructions is interpreted as counterfactuality.

(13)
gör-se-ydi-m tebi iy ol-ur-du.
see-COND-PC-1SG of course good AUX-AOR-PC3SG
‘If I had seen it, it would of course have been good.’ G 81

\(^{16}\) *Beşli* is a rifle or a gun with 5 rounds.
Due to the Turkish feature of avoiding redundant morphological marking, the past copula can be missing at the protasis predicate because counterfactuality is sufficiently marked by the past copula at the main clause predicate, see e.g. example (14):

(14)
ornar orda ol-ma-sa biz-i bi daha dönüp de they there be-NEG-COND3SG we-ACC one more turn-CONV PTCL ikimizi orya gömeceyidi. two-1PL-ACC there bury-FUT3SG-PC
‘If they hadn’t been there, he would have turned around once again and buried us both.’ G 90

3.2.2. Concessive conditionals
As in the standard language, we find concessive conditional constructions in the dialects based on a conditional form plus an additional element in the protasis. In the case of scalar concessive conditionals this additional element is the particle de following the predicate of the dependent clause as in example (15).\(^{17}\) Bile, a particle that can be used instead of de in concessive conditional clauses in the standard language, does not occur in the dialect texts.

(15)
bacı-m, biraz sürükle-meg- isde-dim-se de sister-POSS1SG a little carry-INF want-PST-CC PTCL götür-eme-dim.
carry away-NEG.ABIL-PST3SG
‘As for my sister, even though I wanted to carry her a little, I could not carry her away.’ G 156

Besides this type of concessive conditionals we also find universal concessive conditionals that are introduced by question adverbs like nekadar ‘however much’ or the indefinite pronoun her ne ‘whatever’. In this type of concessive conditional construction there is always a grammatically expressed polarity between the event in the dependent clause and the one in the main clause; one of the predicates is affirmative while the other is negated. In the examples I have found so far the predicate of the dependent clause is affirmative while the main clause predicate is negated, but I assume that it could also be the other way round.

\(^{17}\) For a definition of concessive conditionals and their semantic subtypes see Haspelmath & König 1998.
This type of concessive conditional clause has a strong formal resemblance to the special type of construction described below under 3.2.3.

Note that with only one exception in all concessive conditional constructions of the text material the dependent clause predicate is in the past tense and both dependent and main clause are factual.

3.2.3. Relative clause-like constructions

Conditional clauses that are introduced by a question word serve as a clause constituent. Their function resembles that of headless relative clauses in that both constructions are used, according to Ozil 1993, to express ad-hoc concepts for indefinite non-specific items. ¹⁸

The difference between this type of relative clause and the universal concessive clause described above is the fact that the latter is not a complement of the main clause predicate.

3.2.4. Temporal clauses

The conditional copula is also used in a type of temporal clause. It marks the predicate of the embedded clause, which is introduced by the element nasi (< nasi), see Menz (2002: 208-209). Nasi is a question adverb meaning ‘how’, that serves as a conjunction in this clause type. The predicate of the dependent clause can bear any aspecto-temporal suffix, but only in this type of temporal clause do we find a combination of the present tense with the conditional copula, see example (18). Twofold conditional markers as well as the bare conditional do not appear in this clause type.

¹⁸ In contrast to Ozil’s analysis, however, I think the use of an anaphoric [or rather resumptive] pronoun in the main clause is crucial for the interpretation of the conditional clause as a constituent of the main clause or a concessive conditional.
While in standard Turkish adverbial temporal clauses are based on non-finite con-
verbal items like –diği zaman, -diğinde, -(y)ince, etc. some dialects have also de-
veloped, probably always under the influence of some neighboring language, finite
adverbial clauses that are introduced by a conjunction-like element. In the case of
temporal clauses these are mainly temporal adverbs such as nezaman ‘when’ or (h)a-
çan ‘dto.’. The use of nasıl as a conjunction in combination with the conditional
(copula) is not as widespread, but its distribution is as yet not clear. I have come
across similar constructions in dialects from Elazığ (Buran 1997) and Artvin (Turan
2006), i.e. also from the East Anatolian dialect group.

4. Conditional constructions without conditional forms
One possibility to build conditional constructions without a conditional form is based
on the optative mood. In counterfactual conditional constructions the protasis predi-
cate can be in the optative bearing an additional past copula idi to mark counterfac-
tuality. The predicate of the apodosis has the same form as in a “normal” counter-
factual conditional construction, i.e. past or future tense + past copula. This type of
construction is not restricted to the dialects of Erzurum but found in a variety of
Turkish dialects.

(19)  
baχ, ayle ol-a-ydı benim elim yan-maz-di.
look family be-OPT3SG-PC my hand-POSS1SG burn-NEG.AOR3SG-PC
‘Look, if I had had a wife my hand would not have been burnt.’ G 132

The protasis can be introduced by the conditional conjunction eger, as in example
(20).

(20)  
başya şekilde al-ur-du-m... / egereben hillelug-ed-e-ydi-m
different form-LOC take-AOR-PC-1SG if I fraud AUX-OPT-PC-1SG
‘I could have taken it a different way, if I had cheated.’ G 81

Another way to express condition is a rather idiomatic use of past tense forms. De-
spite the use of past tense, the condition is an open one, and the past tense refers to
the future or rather describes an event as completed in the future. In this construction
a predicate in the past tense is uttered twice in affirmative form, the first being the
condition, the second the consequence. To express the alternative condition the same
verb is then repeated in the negative form in a second conditional clause with a dif-
ferent consequence. This second conditional construction can bear a facultative conditional copula, compare examples (21) and (22). The use of the conditional conjunction *eger* is likewise not obligatory.

(21)

`segiz sene-nin birinci gün-ün-de gel-di-m gel-di-m.`

eight year-GEN first day-POSS3SG-LOC come-PST-1SG come-PST-1SG
gel-me-di-m-se o vâx gendin-e bi hal come-neg-PST-1SG-CC that time yourself-DAT one situation bul-abül-ür-sin.
find-ABL-AOR-2SG
‘If I come back on the first day of the 8th year, I’m there anyway. If not, then you can find yourself a solution.’ G 225

(22)

`oni söyle-din söyle-din. söyle-me-din senin kelle-n kes-ecey-em.`

it-ACC say-PST-2SG say-PST-2SG say-NEG-PST-2SG your head-POSS2SG cut-FUT-1SG
‘If you say it, it is good. If you don’t I will cut your head off.’ G 182

Note that the first conditional construction in this type is quite formulaic, clauses are very short, actants of the verb are either not expressed at all or just pronominally. If the second conditional construction is not marked by a conditional copula on the protasis predicate, it can not be interpreted as conditional without the context of the preceding formulaic conditional. In fact it would not be interpreted as a dependent clause.

Adverbial clauses with the predicate in the past tense followed by the question particle *ml* can, in a favorable context, be interpreted as conditional, see example (23). In most cases, however, a temporal interpretation of this clause type is much more natural, see Menz 2002: 205-207.

(23)

`Kirlen-di-m-mi yıţan-ir-am.`

get dirty-PST-1SG-Q wash-AOR-1SG
‘If I get dirty, I wash myself.’ D 32

5. *Eger* without conditional

The conjunction *eger* is sometimes used in constructions that do not have conditional semantics. *Eger* introduces one of two or more possibilities and serves as copulative or disjunctive conjunction. The second possibility can likewise be introduced by *eger* or by a different conjunction with similar semantics, like *veyahut* ‘or’ and *acaba*
‘whether’, as can be seen in the examples below. In this function eger can coordinate nouns, as in example (26), or clauses, as in the other examples.

(24)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{saçlarıni} & \quad \text{eger} \quad \text{kes-di}, \\
\text{hair-PL.POSS3SG-ACC} & \quad \text{if} \quad \text{cut-PST3SG} \\
\text{ve ya} & \quad \text{or} \\
\text{yaçut da topla-di} & \quad \text{PTCL \ tie together-PST3SG} \\
\text{papağın} & \quad \text{goy-di}. \\
\text{hat-GEN} & \quad \text{in-POSS3SG-DAT} \\
\text{içeri-si-ne} & \quad \text{stick-PST3SG} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘She either had her hair cut or she tied it together and stuck it under a hat.’ G 14

(25)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{herif-in} & \quad \text{biri-si} \quad \text{bişey} \quad \text{söyl-er}, \\
\text{fellow-GEN} & \quad \text{one-POSS3SG} \quad \text{something} \\
\text{eceb} & \quad \text{say-AOR3SG} \\
\text{inan-alm} & \quad \text{whether} \quad \text{believe-OPT1PL} \\
\text{mi,} & \quad \text{Q} \\
\text{eger} & \quad \text{if} \\
\text{inan-mi-yal} & \quad \text{NEG-OPT1PL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘A certain fellow says something, shall we believe it, or not?’ G 137

(26)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Açur-da} & \quad \text{atmıştene} \quad \text{mal:} \quad \text{eger} \quad \text{inegh}, \\
\text{stable-LOC} & \quad \text{sixty piece} \quad \text{chattel if} \\
\text{eger} & \quad \text{if} \quad \text{cow if \ ox calf \ all} \\
\text{mozikh qozik} & \quad \text{if} \quad \text{if} \\
\text{bütün} & \quad \text{all} \\
\text{geril-miş,} & \quad \text{tütün-den.} \\
\text{trough-LOC} & \quad \text{spread-PERF3SG} \\
\text{gab-da} & \quad \text{smoke-ABL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘There are 60 piece of chattel in the stable: cows and oxen and calves, all are spread out (dead) at the trough, because of the smoke.’ G 27

Eger does not have a similar function in Persian, the language it was copied from. In Persian it serves only as a conjunction in conditional clauses, where it is the exclusive marker for conditionality because the predicators used in conditional clauses are also used in dependent clauses with various semantics.

A potential model for this use of the conditional conjunction as a copulative or disjunctive conjunction could be the Armenian conjunction t’e, which is used as conjunction in conditional clauses but also as a coordinative conjunction with copulative and disjunctive meaning, see Karapetean (1907: 334).19

Conclusion

In the East Anatolian Turkish dialect material from Erzurum, we find innovation on the morphological level in the sense that the paradigm of the conditional copula is changed after nouns and the aorist tense to avoid homonymy with the person suf-

---

19 According to a dictionary of (Kurmandji-)Kurdish, Rizgar (1993), a similar use of the conjunction eger also seems to be present at least in this Kurdish variety. This might also have developed under the influence of Armenian, the use of eger as coordinative conjunction being an areal development. This has to be further investigated.
fixes. The dialects of Erzurum share this feature with quite a number of East Anatolian dialects. The change in order in the Azerbaijanian conditional forms can be considered, on an abstract level, as the same innovation type.

On the syntactic level, the use of conditional forms in combination with the question adverb *nasıl* in a type of right-branching temporal clause is not present in spoken standard Turkish and also, to my knowledge, not in the majority of Turkish dialects. It can be found outside of the province of Erzurum, but its isogloss has yet to be established. The use of *eger* as a coordinative conjunction, its distribution in the area, and its possible source in non-Turkic languages also need further research.

The function of the conditional in conditional clauses and the distribution of the various forms to various semantic subtypes of condition, however, are quite parallel to what we find in spoken standard Turkish. Even the use of optative and past copula *idi* in counterfactual conditional constructions is quite widespread in spoken Turkish although it might be absent from or very rare in educated speech.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABIL</td>
<td>ability/possibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>conditional copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>past copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>verbal noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>