The dialects of Erzurum: Some remarks on adverbial clauses

Astrid Menz


This article aims to describe some types of adverbial clauses in the dialects of Erzurum. For this purpose I have investigated published and unpublished material collected in the region between 1966 and 1980. I concentrated on converb forms and clause patterns that are unusual from the viewpoint of Standard Turkish. The converb forms are either archaic, like the one in -diχliyin, or regarded as a feature of Azerbaijanian, like -ende. The clause patterns to be discussed are right-branching clauses based on finite predicates, some obviously copies of Iranian models.

Astrid Menz, Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Susam sok. 16-18 / D. 8, 80060 Cihangir – Istanbul, Turkey.

Introduction

Descriptions of the Turkish dialects in most cases dismiss the syntactic features with just a few words and often bear statements suggesting that the syntax of the dialect in question is more or less the same as that of the standard language. However, as Csató (2000: 81) pointed out, some dialects show syntactic deviations from the standard language. Among these are the dialects of Erzurum in north-eastern Turkey.

The dialects of the Erzurum district belong to the Eastern Anatolian dialect group of Turkish. Karahan (1996: 56-57), in her classification of the dialects of Turkey, lists the distinctive features of this group.¹ The most important ones among them are:

1. Shortening of long vowels in loanwords
2. Fronting of back vowels under the influence of neighbouring vowels or consonants (progressive and regressive), e.g. Eχmed²
3. -k > -χ

¹ It should be mentioned here that a lot of the distinctive features of this dialect group link it with Azerbaijanian, see the classification of Kral cited after Boeschoten (1991).
² But compare Brendemøen’s (2000: 136-137) remarks on this phenomenon.
4. \( \eta \) > \( n, g, \emptyset \)
5. Preservation of -\( g \)- and -\( g \)
6. Metathesis is very frequent
7. Unusual dative case forms of the personal pronouns bah\( n \), ba\( a \), ba\( a \), sa\( h \), sa\( a \), o\( h \)an, etc.
8. Second plural personal ending in -\( sIz \)
9. First plural possessive ending in -\( z \)
10. Present tense in -\( iy \), -\( e\ge r \), -\( i \)
11. Optative in -\( E \) has a full paradigm
12. The copula of the conditional is doubled: sorarsamsa, aldysansa; dutarsinsa.

In his detailed work on the dialects of the Erzurum district, Gemalmaz (1995, first published in 1978), shows that they can be divided into two main groups. He makes this distinction on the basis of the representation of vowels as labial or illabial in suffixes with high vowel such as -\( LIK \), and -\( DIK \). According to this division the subdistricts Ispir, Tortum, O\( l \)ur, the eastern part of the subdistrict enk\( a \), the western two-thirds of the subdistrict O\( lt \), and the northern parts of the subdistricts Narman and Erzurum Merkez belong to one group, the suffixes in question having labial vowels. This group belongs, together with Ardahan, Posof, Artvin Merkez, Şavsat, Yusufeli and Ardanuç, to the third subgroup of the Eastern Anatolian group according to Karahan’s 1996 classification.

The subdistricts H\( in \), Çat, Karayazi, Hor\( \a \), Pasinler, A\( sk \)ale, the southern part of the subdistrict Narman and the major part of the subdistrict Erzurum Merkez have illabial vowels in these suffixes. According to Karahan (1996), this group belongs to the second subgroup together with Kars, Karayazi, Erzincan Merkez, Tercan, Çayr\( l \), Kemah, Refahiye and Gümüşhane (see the map at the end of this article).

The consulted studies and text collections

For this article I investigated the material presented in the monographs of Olcay (1966) and Gemalmaz (1995), as well as three unpublished theses written at the University of Istanbul in the years 1974, 1978 and 1980. One of these theses (Arslan 1980) is about the dialect of A\( sk \)ale (37 pp. text), one (Doğan 1978) on the dialect of Erzurum Merkez (60 pp. text), the third (Erçikli 1974, 45 pp. text) makes no clear

---

3 He further divides this main groups in smaller subgroups using phonological criteria, see particularly his table 1 (1995: 25)
4 Note that I drew the border between the two main dialect groups after Gemalmaz (1995).
statement on the origin of the data, but the title of this thesis implies that it is the dialect of Erzurum Merkez.

Ölcay’s monograph contains 16 pages of prose text. Gemalmaz’s three-volume work is very extensive, containing about 235 pages text material alone. The theses are especially interesting because of the collected material they contain. The various texts consist of

1. Fairy tales
3. Descriptions of weddings and the rituals and customs related to them.
4. Accounts of agricultural activities in various seasons, listing of agricultural products, methods of cultivation (which are especially of lexicographic interest) and problems related to the development of the villages.
5. Accounts of events in the informant’s life.
6. Ölcay’s monograph also contains riddles, poetry and songs.

What makes the texts in these works particularly interesting is, among other things, that they contain material collected from informants who grew up before the spread of modern mass media and nation-wide communication. This, together with the fact that informants from the old generation are favoured in dialectological research in general as well as in these particular studies, gives us an insight into a relatively remote stage of the dialect. Still, Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 11-13) reports that the influence of internal migration, education and the radio on the local dialects was evident although his text collection was made between 1969 and 1971.

A difficulty of judging the material, however, is that basic information about the speakers and their linguistic background is not always given. Only Gemalmaz (1995) generally gives information on the age and sex of his informants and usually asks them about their formal education, etc. Ölcay (1966) does not give any information about his informants, not even their names. Doğan gives information concerning his informants’ age and formal education, and the other two theses only give the names of the informants.

The ratio of male to female informants in Gemalmaz (1995) is 87 : 5, which is a result of the strict segregation of the sexes practiced in Erzurum. Parts of his recordings were made in coffee houses or other public places, which are off limits to Erzurumian women. As he reports, the traditional shyness expected of the women of Erzurum was a further obstacle to tape recordings. The students, on the other hand, obviously had access to female informants, either because they themselves were female or because of family relations.

The emphasis of all the aforementioned studies lies on phonetics, phonology, and morphology. In addition, all of these studies contain a glossary of characteristic items. In Gemalmaz’s study this glossary constitutes a whole volume, containing
much etymological information. He also gives an overview of the various sources for
According to Gemalmaz these are followed by global copies from Russian, global
copies of Armenian origin being only a few. He cites only 15 instances of the latter
and goes on to say that “Even if we assign a few words of unknown origin to Arme-
nian, we do not reach a relevant amount (Menşenin tesbit edemediğimiz az saydaki
kelimeyi bile Ermeniceye maletsek yine de önemli bir toplam elde edemiyoruz).” In
the glossary, however, many words of unknown etymology can now be identified as
Armenian with the help of the works of Bläsing (1992) and Dankoff (1995). A large
number of these words are, not surprisingly, agricultural terms.

Olcay (1966: 11) expresses explicitly in his foreword that “Problems of the syn-
tax were left untouched (Cümlebilgisi meselelerine hiç dokunulmadı).” He further
remarks that, apart from the widespread usage of the particle *ki*, which entered the
dialect through Persian influence, the syntax of the Erzurum dialect does not differ
from the other (Turkish) dialects. Connected to this, however, he states that the
Erzurum dialect makes no use of postverbal phrases of the type *-ver* and *-ayaz*,-
instead using sentence adverbs (p. 11). In the chapter on converbs he gives some
examples of constructions typical for the dialect together with their translations into
Standard Turkish.

In the theses syntax is not a topic at all, and morphology is restricted to case and
finite verb forms.

Gemalmaz’s substantial work contains 2.5 pages with comments on the syntax
(1995: 1, 375-377). He claims that in general the syntax of the dialect of Erzurum is
the same as the Turkish of the educated (Türkiye Türkçesi aydın konuşması). He goes
on, however, to describe a tendency to use finite predicates in favour of adverb
clauses with *-ip* and *-erek*.

Another distinctive syntactic feature is the frequent usage
of clauses introduced by *ki*. In the chapters on morphology he gives only very few
example sentences.

**Adverbial clauses in the dialects of Erzurum**

In what follows I will focus on some converbs and adverbial clauses that either do
not exist in or deviate in one aspect or the other from Standard Turkish.
First, I will
discuss temporal clauses based either on converbs or on finite predicates. Second, I
will review types of purpose clauses.

5 For converb clauses based on *-ip*, see below.
6 I am aware of the fact that the term Standard Turkish is problematic in many respects,
especially when dealing with spoken language. I am using it here for practical reasons
denoting the Turkish of educated native speakers without dialect background.
7 For a complete list of the converbial forms, see Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 339-343).
Temporal clauses

Many of the adverb clauses in Standard Turkish as well as in the dialect of Erzurum are based on predicates indicating a relationship between the events in the main clause and the subordinate clause that can be interpreted in terms of temporality. Most of these predicates are non-finite converbs.

In what follows I will deal with converbs that are lacking in Standard Turkish, such as the converb -ende, a form common in Azerbaijanian, and the archaic form in -d lýi n. Furthermore, I will discuss converb forms common in Standard Turkish that show differences in usage or frequency in the dialect. Thirdly, I will examine a type of temporal clause with finite predicates.

-ende

The converbial ending in -ende, which can often be interpreted as connoting contemporaneity, is very frequent. The first actant of a converb clause with -ende can be refentially different from that of its matrix clause, as in example (1). In Standard Turkish this form does not exist. It is, however, a well known form in Azerbaijanian, both in the standard language and in most dialects, see Caferoğlu & Doerfer (1959: 303). The form in -ende is, according to Caferoğlu (1959: 258), also frequent in the dialects of Van and Kars and is, therefore, one of the features that underline the transitional character of the East Anatolian dialects between Turkish and Azerbaijani, see Boeschoten (1991: 160).

(1) O sîrada, ergišileri topliyanda ben hand: POSS3PL.DAT pass: PLUP.1SG woman: PL.ACC
ellerine gešemišdim; esgeteyhleri gather:CONV I
ellerine
gešemišdim. esgeteyhleri
gather:CONV I hand: POSS3PL.DAT pass: PLUP.1SG
‘At that time, when they gathered the men, I hadn’t fallen into their hands; I had fallen into their hands when they gathered the women.’

In her work on Iranian Azerbaijanian, Kural (2001: 118) states that in converb clauses with -ende the common Turkic word order is strictly kept. Whereas in finite clauses the word order is relatively free and directive arguments especially follow their predicate in most cases, this is not true in this type of converbial clause. This observation also applies to the converb clauses in -ende in the dialect of Erzurum, where, al-

Note that I have simplified Gemalmaz’s very narrow transcription in all examples taken from his work.
though the word order patterns do not deviate from the common Turkic pattern as much as they do in Iranian Azerbaijani, directive arguments tend to follow their predicate in finite clauses.

-điğliyin

Another converb form which is currently unknown in Standard Turkish is the one in -điğliyin. This form is present in Old Anatolian Turkish, see Mansuroğlu (1959: 174). In Old Anatolian Turkish, subject reference for all but the third person was marked on the participle. This is not the case in the dialects of Erzurum, where the converb is consistent. Compared with -ende, the frequency of this converb is quite low. In all instances I have found that it connotes a temporal relationship between the main and subordinate clauses, whereas in Old Anatolian Turkish it could be interpreted either as temporal or as comparative, as noted by Deny (1921: 597-598) and Turan (2000: 68), who cites examples marked with the possessive for subject reference of a third person singular subject and consequently gives the form as -düginleyin. Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 340) states that this form connotes rapidity of the event (çabukluk bildiren zarf-fiiller yapar). Although that connotation could apply to -điğliyin in example (2), this is obviously not valid for all cases, compare example (3).

(2) Toplan clear:IMP2SG  surfam table:POSS1SG  dediğliyin say:CONV
dendi gendi gendine toplanır. (E 36)
‘When one says: ‘Clear, my table’ the table clears itself.’

(3) Memmed ağa befat etdiğhiyin ebmed aga galır. (G 178)
dead aux:CONV  remain:PRS3SG
‘When Mehmet Ağa passed away, Ahmet Ağa remained.’

-dičlen so(n)ra

In all texts we frequently find the usage of the converb in -diçlen sora. In most of these instances the predicate of the immediate preceding clause is taken up again as the core of this converb construction. The “adverbial clause” consists only of the predicate and functions in a similar way as ondan sonra in Standard Turkish. It therefore seems to be a device to link and advance the narration, rather than an expandable “real” adverbial clause.

9 It resembles in this respect the two possible interpretations of the form -diği gibi in modern Standard Turkish.
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(4) O šádîrvani üš dafa dolandîrir. Dolandîrdîχdan sora... (D 3)
that fountain:ACC three times let go round:PRS3SG let go round:CONV
‘They let [lit.] go round the fountain three times. Then...’

In Aşkale both locative and ablative are marked by -DA; the converb in question is thus -diţe sora.

-memiş
The negative form of the participle in -miş can be used adverbially. As example (6) shows, different first actant reference in main and subordinated clauses is possible, and subject reference is not marked on -memiş.

(5) Garîsi diyir ki yuni almamîš wife:POSS3SG say:PRS3SG ki wool:ACC buy:NEG.PART
eve gelmiyesen. (O 74)
house:DAT come:NEG.OPT2SG
‘His wife says: Don’t come home without buying the wool.’

(6) Ben gelmemiš čocuγun adi goyulmiyacaχ. (A 25)
I come: NEG.PART child:GEN name:POSS3SG put:PASS.NEG.FUT3SG
‘Before I come the child’s name must not be given’.

This type of adverbial clause is, however, quite infrequent; instead, the converb in -mezden (+ possibly evvel or önce) is more frequently used.

A similar adverbial usage of a negative participle can be found in Gagauz, where the negative form of -dik is used very much like -memiş in the dialects of Erzurum, though only with passives, see Menz (1999: 122). According to Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 343), this very same form, also with the restriction to passive stems, can be used in the dialects of Erzurum.

The positive -miş-participle can, as Johanson (1995: 317-318) established, appear adverbially in modern Standard Turkish but does not in the material from the Erzurum dialects.

-diği gibi, kimi and -di mi
Two forms that do not deviate in function from that in Standard Turkish are the converb forms -diği gibi and -di mi. I have the impression, however, that they deviate in that they are more frequent in this dialect than in Standard Turkish. However, this is a tentative speculation as long as there are no studies on the frequency of forms available either for the spoken standard language or for any dialects.

Very frequent in the dialect are adverbial clauses constructed from the -di- past and the interrogative particle mi. Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 301) states that this form serves in
the dialect as an equivalent for -ince, thus implying that the form -di mi can be interpreted both temporally or conditionally. Lewis (1985: 267) treats the combination -di mi as an alternative form for the conditional. Gencan (2001: 437-438) does not include the form -di mi with the temporal converbs but rather treats it separately. Although he does not employ the term conditional, his notes on the usage imply that he thinks of it as a conditional form. In the dialect texts from Erzurum adverbial clauses built on -di mi can be interpreted either temporally as in example (7) or conditionally as in example (8). Examples that can be interpreted temporally are, however, much more numerous than examples showing conditional use. I have the impression that this is true of spoken Standard Turkish, too.

(7) Ben yum gözün¹⁰ dedimmi
gözlerin yum. (D 45)

'I as soon as I say: “Close your eyes,” you must close your eyes.'

¹⁰ This form exhibits an interesting feature of the dialects of Erzurum. Case marking after the 2. sg. possessive is very peculiar for the accusative and dative and, sometimes, the genitive. For the accusative (and genitive) the case marker seems to be Ø, i.e. gözün, apart from the nominative, can be ‘your eye:ACC’ or ‘your eye:GEN’ < gözün or gözünün, bacın ‘your sister:ACC’ or ‘your sister:GEN’ < bacini or bacının, gazun ‘your lamb:ACC’ or ‘your lamb:GEN’ < kuzun or kuzunun. For the dative after the 2. sg. possessive it seems that the functions of these two suffixes are merged into one suffix +En; if the lexeme ends in a vowel, the vowel is dropped, i.e. gılan ‘to your daughter’ < kızına, bacan ‘to your sister’ < bacını, gazan ‘to your lamb’ < kuzuna. The locative and ablative of the 2. sg. possessive do not deviate from Standard Turkish. The dative and accusative are always in this shortened form; the genitive can have either the short or the long form. Compare the following example:

Gel senin golan bu pazvandi baftime ata
bindirim, gîñçin da elen verim
get baban bul. E 4

‘Come, let me bind this armlet to your arm, I’ll make you mount a horse and give you your sword in your hand. Go and find your father.’
(8) Kirlendimmi yığanıram. (D 32)
get dirty: PST.1SG.Q wash:PRS.1SG
‘If I get dirty I wash myself.’

It should be mentioned that if in both of the examples above the form in -di mi were replaced with -ince, their interpretation with regard to temporality or conditionality would not change.

**ki**

The frequent usage of *ki* is one of the syntactic features of the Erzurum dialects that Gemalmaz admits to be a major deviation from Standard Turkish. This again is somewhat problematic because *ki* can be found in various functions in the spoken language all over Turkey, too. Nevertheless, it might well deviate in frequency from the Standard Language and Western Turkish dialects, but this has yet to be proven. It is very common after *verba dicendi* and *sentiendi* (*başım ki, dedi ki* etc.) and as an emphasizing particle (*yok ki, olur mu ki* etc.), two functions common also in spoken Standard Turkish. Apart from these functions, *ki* can introduce clauses of purpose (see below) and can be used in a special type of temporal clause. These latter functions are not found in Standard Turkish. As a marker of temporal clauses, *ki* is not the first or the last element of the sentence but immediately precedes the predicate, see example (9). All other elements of the clause come before *ki*.

(9) Ruslar ki gelmiş bizim bu
Russian:PL ki come:PF3SG our this
yuğari peneskirt gašmeš tebe. (G 45)
upper P. flee:PF3SG naturally
‘When the Russians came, this our Upper Pesenskirt fled naturally.’

This very same clause pattern is reported by Kural (2001: 122) for Iranian Azerbaijani and described by her as a copy of a pattern common in spoken Persian, where it assigns an emphatic connotation to *ki* in this function.

**nasi**

One type of temporal clause is the one introduced by the question adverb *nasi* (< *nasıl* ‘how’). In most instances its predicate is a finite one and is in that case marked by the conditional copula *ise*. The temporal clause is always prepositive to its main clause.

(10) Nasi ehrammïni almišïsa
how scarf:POSS3SG.ACC take:PF3SG.COND
In most cases nasi comes first in the adverbial clause, as in example (10). A different word order is, however, possible in that subject and direct object can be extracted and put in the sentence-initial position as in examples (11) and (12).

(11) O’flan nasi duyerse a-flyer. (A 23)
boy how hear:PRS3SG.COND cry:PRS3SG
‘When the boy hears (this), he cries.’

(12) Gardašimi nasi gördümise
brother:POSS1SG.ACC how see:PST.1SG.COND
haman boynuna sarīldīm. (O 74)
at once neck:POSS3SG.DAT clutch:PST.1SG
‘As soon as I saw my brother I put my arms around his neck at once.’

This extraction resembles the word order possibilities in finite temporal clauses introduced with the question adverb açan ‘when’ in Gagauz, where the sentence-initial position is the topic position, see Menz (1999: 120). I believe that the sentence-initial position in this clause type in the dialects of Erzurum has the very same function.

The construction with nasi and the conditional copula exclusively serves as a temporal clause. It has no implication of a generalizing conditional clause of the type question adverb and conditional (see Adamović 1985: 295-296) that is found in the standard language. The only case where I found a generalizing conditional clause introduced by nasi has the predicate in a double conditional, see example (13):

(13) Bana nasi hizmet edirsinse
I:DAT how service AUX:AOR.COND2SG.COND
beni nasi izzet edirсине,
I:acc how honour AUX:AOR.COND2SG.COND

11 Finite temporal clauses in Gagauz can also be introduced by nasil and niği, see Gaydarži (1981: 69).
12 All other question adverbs combined with a conditional have the same function as in the standard language.
ömer ağa da ele hizmet edesin, .... (G 180)
Ô ağa:DAT PTCL so service AUX:OPT.2SG
‘However you serve me, however you honour me,
you must also serve Ömer Ağa that way...’

Instead of a finite predicate, in some cases a combination of nasi with a non-finite converb form as in example (14) is possible; this is, however, rather rare.

(13) Yağ a nasîl barmañtî so çðdu’tu sîra
oil:DAT how finger:POSS3SG.ACC stick:CONV
bele orda ruh teslim eder, ölir. (E 20)
like this there soul giving up AUX:AOR3SG die:PRS3SG
‘As soon as she puts her finger in the oil, the soul gives up (and) she dies.’

-ıp-clauses
Gemalmaz (1995, 1: 376) mentions a reduction of the use of the converb in -ıp (and also in -erek) compared with that of the standard language. It is, however, also in this case not easy to make a comparison to the spoken standard language because there are no data available on the frequency of this form in different discourse types. However, I have the impression that converb clauses built on -ĭp are far less frequent in the spoken language than in the written language anyway.

In the dialect texts I indeed encountered only a few cases of this converb. Nevertheless, they include interesting cases that show a chain of -ıp forms as in example 15.

(15) Elini öptükden sora o sîz üzzügüni
hand:POSS3SG.ACC kiss:CONV that engagement ring:ACC
taçıp goçıp çîçıp gidiller. (D 2)
attach:CONV stand up:CONV go out:CONV go:AOR.3PL
‘After kissing his hand, they attach this engagement ring,
stand up, and go away.’

In this example the converb form çîçıp together with git- make up a verbal phrase meaning ‘go away’ and are not an example for converb clause plus matrix clause. Still, we have a chain of -ıp-forms rather untypical of the standard language. Examples like this are, as mentioned above, rare, and the converb clauses are rather short, mostly consisting only of the predicate.
Purpose clauses

Purpose clauses as a rule follow their matrix clauses. After verbs of motion the dependent clause mostly has an infinitive + dative-marked predicate in same-subject constructions, as in example (16). Interestingly, in this construction it is possible to extract the complement of the dependent predicate and put it in sentence-initial position. Whereas the dependent clause can follow its main clause in Standard Turkish too (see 16a), it is impossible to have its predicate complement in sentence-initial position as in (16b). The complement can only be extracted from the dependent clause if it is put in the post-predicate position as in (16c).

(16) Cehizi gidiller toplamya. (D 6)
    dowry:ACC go:PRS.3PL gather:INF.DAT
    ‘They go to gather the dowry.’

(16a) Gidiyorlar cehizi toplamaya.
(16b) *Cehizi gidiyorlar toplamya.
(16c) Gidiyorlar toplamaya cehizi.

In the optative or imperative mood, the predicate of the dependent clause of verbs of motion can also be used as a kind of subjunctive as in (17). The use of the optative or imperative is not restricted to non-same-subject constructions, as this example demonstrates.

(17) Herkes uyir gocagari čižir ki
    Everyone sleep:PRS3SG go:PRS3SG old woman go out:PRS3SG ki
    gapiți aça da cellatlar gele. E 10
    door:ACC open:OPT3SG and hangman:PL come:OPT3SG
    ‘Everyone sleeps (but) the old woman goes out to open the door so that the hangmen can come (in).’

With other verbs the predicate of the purpose clause is always optative or imperative, see examples (18) and (19). Purpose clauses with the predicate in the optative or imperative mood are most often introduced by ki, however, not without exceptions, as can be seen in example (21) below.

(18) O čarşař čižuna þader bekliller ki čaršafi görsünner. (D 18)
    that sheet go out:CONV wait:PRS.3PL ki sheet:ACC see:IMP3PL
    ‘They wait until that sheet comes out, so that they can see the sheet.’

(19) Halvaci Güzeli Eba:li Sinan’ïn golandan duttu
    H. G. E.S.:GEN arm:POSS3SG.ABL grab:PST.3SG
ki döge, yere vura. (D 39)

ki hit:OPT3SG ground:DAT throw:OPT3SG

‘Halvaci Güzel grabbed Ebali Sinan by his arm in order to hit him and throw him onto the ground.’

The choice between optative and imperative seems to be optional, compare example (20) with (21).

(20) ... dülbendini açır. Bu uşarın

headscarf:POSS3SG.ACC open:PRS3SG this child:GEN

üzüne çeker ki sineχ gonaşın. (E 33)

face:POSS3SG.DAT draw:PRS3SG ki fly sit down:NEG.IMP3SG

‘She undoes her headscarf. She draws it over this child so that the flies cannot sit down on it.’

(21) ... aylın gelmiş benim çocuğuma

wife:POSS2SG come:PF3SG my child:POSS1SG.DAT

biše etmemiş, üsdünü

nothing do:NEG.PF3SG surface:POSS3SG.ACC

beşle örtmüş sineχ goniya. (E 33)

even cover:PF3SG fly sit down:NEG.OPT3SG

‘Your wife had come but she did no harm to the child, she even had covered him so that the flies could not sit down on him.’

The following example is very interesting in that there is one purpose clause introduced by ki which is dependent on the matrix clause gelir followed by a second purpose clause dependent on the predicate of the preceding clause gultara.

(22) Gelir ki güzi gultara.

come:PRS3SG ki girl:ACC rescue:OPT3SG

tonce daha getmiye. (D 55)

night once more go:NEG.OPT3SG

‘He comes to rescue the girl so that she would not go out again at night.’

In Azerbaijanian of Iran we find a very similar set of purpose clause models, with infinite + dative on the one hand and ki + optative on the other. Here, too, both types always follow their matrix clause, see Kiral (2001: 126-128). A similar type of purpose clause with the predicate in the optative or imperative mood is attested for Iraqi Turkmen by Bulut (2000). The introducing element ki seems to be preferred in
non-same-subject constructions in Iraqi Turkmen, see Bulut (2000: 167). Both authors explain these clause patterns as copies of Iranian models.

**Conclusion**

In this article, the focus has been on some complex constructions that show various different characteristics from Standard Turkish. These are, on the one hand, archaic forms such as the use of the gerund in -diyi and archaic usages such as the ability of the converb in -ip to build chains of clauses. On the other hand, we find in these dialects syntactic patterns that came into the language as a result of selective code copying and, therefore, must have been innovations at one point of time. From the viewpoint of the modern standard language, however, these “innovations” are to be judged as archaisms. The origin of the temporal clause introduced by nasi is not clear yet. Although in some Turkish dialects we find right branching temporal clauses introduced by question adverbs—mostly forms of ‘when’ but as in Gagauz also forms of ‘how’—these all have a non-modal finite predicate.

The above-mentioned patterns and forms are by no means all that can be said about the dialects of Erzurum, neither with regard to the deviations from the standard language nor as a possible treatment as a corpus of spoken Turkish as such. The text material I have used for this article offers a rich source for further study.
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