
BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ DERGİSİ

Beşeri Bilimler – Humanities

Vols. 8-9 – 1980-1981

A CASE OF SYNTACTIC CHANGE: KI CONSTRUCTIONS IN TURKISH * *

Eser Erguvanlı^a

ABSTRACT

This article shows that the particle *ki* in Turkish, which marks certain kinds of subordinate clauses, has been borrowed from Persian. The developments in the function of *ki* since the time it first entered the language are investigated, and the restrictions on its present-day usage are discussed. An explanation as to how the language has accommodated such a syntactic change is given.

This paper aims at investigating and tracing the historical development of the particle *ki*, a general subordinate clause marker in modern Turkish, the dialect of interest being the Turkish spoken in Turkey today (the restrictions on the subordinator *ki* as it is used today are discussed later on in the paper). The present-day usage of the particle *ki* in the language is of special concern to us since there were hardly any subordinators in Old Turkic, which we come to realize as we study Orkhon Turkic, the earliest dialect of Turkic languages for which there are written records, dating from the eighth century A.D. Instead, participles, nominalizations and gerunds were used to express different kinds of subordination, such as relative clauses, complements, temporal clauses, respectively. Let us look at a few examples from Orkhon Turkic:¹

- (1) Ülküş öl-tæ çī anta tiril-ti (BK E3)
 many die-partic there come=to=life=pst
 'Many who died there came to life (again)
-

^a Dr., Department of Linguistics and Literature, Boğaziçi University.

- (2) *il tut-siq-iḡ-in bunta ur-tur-t-m..yaḡıl-ıḡ* (TE 15)
 state seize-nom-gen-acc here engrave-caus-pst-1sg mistaken ger

öl-sik-iḡ-in yæ mæ bunta ur-tur-tu-m
 die-nom-gen-acc also here engrave-caus-pst-1sg
 'I had inscribed here how to seize (other) states and I had also inscribed here how you would perish by going astray (Lit. I had inscribed here the seizing of states and I had also inscribed here the perishing by going astray)'.

- (3) *uluḡ oḡl-um aḡrı-p yoḡ bol-ça quḡ sæ nüniḡ balbal* (EK S9)
 great son-my become=sick-ger nothing be-ger Qu general state

tikaē bir-ti-m
 erect give-pst-1sg
 'When my eldest son became sick and died, I erected the statue of General Qu (for him)'

So, the occurrence of the particle *ki* as a subordinator must be due to a later development in the language. The term "subordinator" is used here for any free morpheme that marks a subordinate clause, and by "subordinate clause" we mean a clause that is a constituent of another clause (i.e. is embedded in the main clause), and semantically is dependent on another clause. Thus relative clauses, complements (subject complements or object complements), temporal clauses are all different kinds of subordinate clauses, since syntactically they are embedded in the main clause and, semantically, their interpretation is dependent on the main clause. The term "conjunction" is used to refer to any free morpheme that connects clauses together, neither clause being a constituent of or dependent on one another (e.x. 'and, or, but' in English).

The existence of the particle *ki* in Turkish today, then, suggests that there has been a change in the strategy for marking subordination at some point in the history of the language. To give an example of what such a change means, let us consider verb complements and relative clauses as two kinds of subordination; in Orkhon Turkic verb complements were expressed in the form of nominalizations (as in (2) above) and relative clauses in the form of participles (as in (1) above) preceding the verb. On the other hand, these two kinds of clauses follow the main verb when introduced by the subordinator *ki*. Below we illustrate in a schematic way, the relative clause and verb complement structure in Old Turkic and in a corresponding *ki* construction.

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| (4) | Old Turkic | | <i>ki</i> construction |
| | [V] _{partic.} – NP | | NP – [<i>ki</i>] _{rel.} |
| | [V] _{nom.} – NP | | VP – [<i>ki</i>] _{comp.} |

Could such a linguistic change, namely a change in the strategy of marking subordination, have been motivated internally or externally? At first thought, there may appear to be some evidence for internal change, for in Orkhon Turkic there was a suffix *-ki* that got attached to nominals in the dative/locative case in an NP construction. For example:

- (5) *köñül-tæ -ki sab-im-in ur-tur-tu-m* (KT S12)
 heart-loc message-my-acc engrave-caus-pst-1sg
 'I had the message {in my heart/mind engrave
 {that was in my heart/mind engraved'

These types of constructions exist in modern Turkish, too.

- (6) *köşe-de-ki ev*
 corner-loc house
 'the house {at the corner
 {which is at the corner'

Such constructions with the suffix *-ki* may appear to correspond to reduced relative clauses in English, 'the house at the corner' being derived from 'the house which is at the corner'. One might be tempted to call the suffix *-ki* a special kind of relative marker used only in locative NP constructions, and then claim that this usage of *-ki* was extended to being a general relative clause marker, and later got more generalized as to mark any kind of subordinate clause. Such changes have been noted to take place in other languages, too (see Givón, "Verb complements and relative clauses: a diachronic case study in Biblical Hebrew"); however, this does not appear to be the case in Turkish. While there is no further evidence to show this kind of internal change should have taken place, there is strong evidence to prove that this is a case of syntactic borrowing from Persian.

The contact with the Persians and thus with the language dates back to the tenth century, when certain nomadic Turkic tribes in Central Asia started migrating towards the west. This resulted in the Turkic people living next to the Persians and mixing with them, due to military conquests and trade. The influence of Persian on Turkish, then, can be said to have started on the colloquial level, and after the conversion of the Turks to Islam in the eleventh century, this influence spread to the literary level, as well. In short, we can say that Persian influence was exerted in three ways:²

- a) through people living together, which formed the colloquial layer
- b) through the literature, and language used in schools
- c) by the fact that Persian was a lingua franca of those times, used especially in trade.

In the eleventh century, Turks under the Seljuk dynasty overran Persia and Persian became the language of Turkish administration and literary culture until the thirteenth century. During the Ottoman Empire, knowledge of the Persian language and literature was a prerequisite in the classical literary circles; as a result, numerous literary works were produced in the Persian literary tradition.

In contemporary Persian, the particle *ke* is used to mark any kind of subordinate clause, with almost no restrictions on it. The historical development of *ke* in Persian is worth noting: in Middle Persian there were three distinct morphemes (*ke*, *ka*, *ku*) to mark different types of subordination, which then got merged into one, i.e. *ke*, around the tenth century.³ The distribution of the three morphemes in Middle Persian were as the following:

- i) *ka* was a subordinator which functioned as **when, while, because, if, as**, and as a relative adverbial, such as in 'on the day when...'
- ii) *ke* was the interrogative pronoun 'who(m)' and it also functioned as the relative pronoun
- iii) *ku* was the WH-word 'where', used in questions and subordinate clauses; it also functioned as a subordinator, such as **if, when, for, because, so that**.

At the time of contact with the Turks, the merging of the three subordinators (*ke*, *ka*, *ku*) into *ke* had already taken place; that is, in Early Classical Persian *ke* was being used as a subordinator to mark relative clauses, verb complements any other kind of subordinate clause, as well as functioning as the interrogative pronoun 'who'. In the modern Persian of today, *ke* appears to carry the same functions; some examples are provided below to illustrate the different functions of this particle, as used today.⁴

- (7) Mardy *ke* mikhanad bradar-am ast (rel. clause)
man rel.m. singing brother-my is

'The man who is singing is my brother'

- (8) Ou eteraf kard *ke* pool ra dozdize bod (compl.)
he/she confess did comp. money d.o. steal was
'He confessed that he stole the money'

- (9) Ou dar ra bast *ke* kesy seday garye-ash ra
he/she door d.o. close sub. anybody sound cry-her d.o.

na shnavad (purpose cl.)

neg heard

'She closed the door so that nobody heard her cry(ing)'

- (10) *be inke raftan...* (compound sub.)
 before sub . go-I
 'Before I go ...'
- (11) *berou bīrūn ke sohb şod* (sub.)
 go out sub. morning has become
 'Go out because it is morning'

The earliest written documents after contact with Persians date from the eleventh century; in these texts we come across subordinate clauses in Turkish introduced by *kim* that follow the same structural pattern as the Persian. This shows that the subordinator *ke* in Persian was borrowed into Turkish as *kim* along with a change in the strategy of expressing subordination. One might wonder why the Persian *ke* was not borrowed as it was, being the pivot of the borrowed structure, but rather became *kim* in Turkish. This very point, I believe has certain implications as to how the borrowing may have actualized in the minds of the speakers. We know that the interrogative pronoun meaning 'who' in Persian was also *ke*; interestingly enough, the interrogative pronoun 'who' in Turkish was and is *kim* (Orkhon Turkic *kaem* > *kim*). So we claim here that Turkish speakers substituted their own word for 'who' *kim* in instances where the Persian subordinator *ke* was used, phonetic similarity between the two morphemes facilitating this loan translation (calque).⁵ These borrowed structures with *kim* that we find in the Turkish of the eleventh to sixteenth centuries are the source of the *ki* constructions in present-day Turkish. In order to trace the course of this syntactic borrowing up to now, data from the sources given below have been selected for investigation.

- I. Kutadgu Bilig (Knowledge of Happiness - verse) 11th century
- II. Çarhname (verse - 83 couplets) 13th century
- III. Öndördüncü Asır Betikleri (Extracts of prose from fourteenth century) 14th century
- IV. Baraḡ-nāmā (verse - 176 couplets Khorazmian (Eastern Turkish dialect) 14th century
- IV. Chagatay (Eastern Turkish) 16th century
- VI. Dede Korkut Kitabı (an epic) 15-16th century

- VII. Kâtip Çelebi'den Seçmeler (Selections from K. Çelebi) 17th century Ottoman Turkish
- VIII. Ah Beyoğlu, Vah Beyoğlu (novel) present-day Turkish (written)
- IX. Yağmur Dolu Bulutlar (short stories) present-day Turkish
- X. Sivas ve Tokat Ağzı (Sivas and Tokat dialects) present-day Turkish (spoken)
- XI. Doğu İllerimiz Ağzından Derlemeler (selections from Eastern provinces) present-day Turkish (spoken)
- XII. Nevşehir ve Yöresi Ağzları (dialects of Nevşehir and vicinity) present-day Turkish (spoken)

After examining the data carefully, what the impact of this borrowing has been on Turkish syntax and what implications this particular case study may have for historical linguistics will be discussed.

The earliest examples of the new structures with *kim* in Turkish can be found in Kutadgu Bilig (11th century), used in the following manner.

- (12) Akı suret-in kim köreyim tise / kel-ip körsü
generous face-acc who see say / come-ger see-3=sg

hakan yüz-ün-i usa
emperor face-poss-acc able
3=sg

'The one who } wants to see a generous face (or generosity
Whoever }

in face), should come and see the emperor's face'

- (13) Kayu kim toğar er-se ölgü gerek⁶
which who born be-cond die must
'Everyone who } is born must die'
Whoever }

- (14) Neteg kim biligsiz bil-ümez munu / ukuşlug ukupan
What-like sub.ignorant know-able neg this / wise understand

küzet-ür a-nı

(l. 27-28)

cherish-3= sg it-acc

'Just as the ignorant one is not able to know this, the wise ones understand and cherish it'

- (15) Negü bar ajun-da anar hilesiz / Negü hile bar kim
What exist world-loc there pure/what trickery exist rel.

anar çaresiz

there remedyless

'What exists in the world that is pure, (and) what trickery is there that has no remedy?'

In (12) the interrogative *kim* 'who' appears to function more like an indefinite pronoun meaning 'the one who' or 'whoever'. In (13) and (14) *kayü kim* 'whoever' and *neteg kim* 'just as' are a single semantic unit though they are compound in form. In fact, such compound forms were employed rather frequently in *Kutadgu Bilig*; let us look at one further example of this sort:

Ne teg kim tile-di-me bol-di kamung⁷

what like sub. wish-pst-1sg be-pst all

'The kinds (of things) that I wished, all happened (whatever I wished happened)'

These examples suggest that the compound forms which were a single semantic unit, were open to multiple analysis; that is, they could have been taken as a) frozen forms with a single semantic interpretation, or b) made up of separate parts, with *kim* functioning as a relativizer following its head. If, indeed, *kim* in all these compound forms was reanalysed as a relative marker, then we could speculate and claim this to be a factor that would facilitate the extension of the usage of *kim* to mark other kinds of subordination. In sentence (15), we have an example of *kim* marking a relative clause, just as it would in Persian .

In *Çarhname* we see *ki* occurring as a variant of *kim*; there seems to be some distinction, though not a very consistent one, in their distribution. *Kim* is often used to introduce relative clauses, while *ki* appears to mark verb complements, temporal clauses, and other types of subordination. However, such a distinction does not hold for our source on fourteenth century where *kim* is used in all kinds of subordination. On the other hand, we come across a similar distinction in the distribution of *kim* vs. *ki* in the two Eastern Turkish dialects given here, though their data are from a later period. At this point, it is difficult to give a satisfactory account of this peculiarity, but it appears that certain dialects have preserved the usage of *kim* longer than others. The following examples illustrate how this borrowed structure was used in the thirteenth century.

- (16) Muhammed **kim** cihan-un fahr-ı idi (1.77)
 Muhammed rel. world gen pride-poss was
 3=sg
 'Muhammed who was the pride of the world'
- (17) An-un, **kim** taht-ın-ı yel götür-ür-dü / ölüm-e
 he-gen rel. throne-poss-acc wind take-aor-pst / death-dat
 3=sg
 oğra-dı, ad-ı Süleyman (II. 72-3)
 happen-pst name-poss= 3=sg Süleyman
 'His name is Süleyman whose throne the wind took and
 death came onto him'
- (18) Bu bir derd-dür **kim** yok-tur an-a derman (I. 63)
 this one pain-emp rel. exist-not it-dat cure
 'This is a pain that a cure does not exist for'
- (19) San-a bir kaç öğüt-ler ver-e-yim ben / ki
 you-dat one many advice-pl give-opt-l- sg I / sub.
 her birisi dür ol-a ya mercan ~ (II. 8-9)
 each one = of = them pearl be-opt or coral
 'Let me give you some (pieces of) advice such that each
 one of them will be a pearl or coral'
- (20) Bu dünya, bil ki san-a baki kal-maz (I.28)
 this world know comp. you-dat permanent remain-ıeg-aor.
 'Know that this world does not remain permanent to you'
- (21) Vefa umma, **ki** yok-tur hiç vefa-sı (I.47)
 loyalty expect-neg sub. exist-neg-emph any loyalty-poss -3=sg
 'Don't expect loyalty for he has no loyalty'

Examples (16) - (18) show us several instances of **kim** used as a relative clause marker; in (19) and (21) **ki** is a subordinator for a purpose clause and a complementizer in (20).

Looking at the prose of fourteenth century (Ondördüncü Asır Betikleri) we get a very clear idea of how extensively **kim** was used at that time; in other words, the syntactic borrowing of the structures with **ke** in Persian was now complete and the new structures appear to be in full use in Turkish. The examples below show the various usages of **kim** in the fourteenth century.

- (22) Ol **kim** kendü-ye layik değil ise
 he rel. self-dat worthy neg cond.
 'He who is not worthy of himself'
- (23) Her **kim** yüksek mertebe-ye er-di
 every rel. high rank-dat reach-pst
 'Everyone who reached a high rank'
- (24) Ve ol dört hurma ağaç-lar-ın-a altun-dan üzüm bağla-dı-lar
 and that four date tree-pl-poss-dat gold-abl grape tie-pst-3= pl

kim salkum-lar-ı kızıl yakut idi
 rel. bunch-pl-poss red ruby be-pst
 'And they tied golden grapes, whose bunches were of red rubies, to those four date trees'
- (25) Her **kim-in** himmet-i ancak taam ard-ınca ol-ur
 every who-gen piety-poss only? back-poss-ger be-aor
 'He whose piety depends only on his background'
- (26) Sor-du **kim**: "bu-lar ne dur-ur?"
 ask-pst comp. this-pl what stand-aor
 'He asked, "What are these?"'
- (27) Put-lar eyle-yüp İbrahim el-in-e ver-ir-di **kim**
 cross-pl do-ger İbrahim hand-poss-dat give-aor-pst sub.

 bazar-da sat-a
 market-loc sell-opt
 'He/she would make crosses and give them to İbrahim so that he would sell (them) at the market'
- (28) Sanır-lar-dı **kim** turunç kes-er-ler
 think-3-pl-pst comp. orange cut-aor-3- pl
 'They thought they were cutting oranges'
- (29) Ben Siyurg-dan ayruk kimse bil-mez-in ve ol ben-im
 I Siyurg-abl apart anybody know-neg=aor-l= sg and it I-gen

 ana-m-dur **kim** ben-i bisle-di ve her gece ban-a iş ol-ur
 'another-poss-emph. conj I-acc feed-pst and every night I-dat partner be-aor

 'I do't know anybody else apart from Siyurg and it/she

is her mother for she fed me and is a companion to me every
night

- (30) Siymurg an-ı kaynağ-ı-yla dut-tu, ve götür-üp uç-tu,
Siymurg he-acc claw-poss-inst grasp-pst and take-ger fly-pst

hatta kim gevde-sin Süleyman ön-in-de ko-di
finally conj. body-poss Süleyman front-poss-loc put-pst
'Siymurg grasped him with her claws and flew away taking
her, and finally put her body in front of Süleyman'

As these examples show, constructions with *kim* are varied and abundant by this period. There are innumerable instances of *kim* as a complementizer, as in (28), most frequently with verbs of wishing, such as *diledi kim* 'he wished that', *buyurdu kim* 'he requested that', and verbs of cognition, such as *gördi kim* 'he saw that', *sandı kim* 'he thought that'. As a relative clause marker, *kim* was also extensively used, as sentences (22)-(25) exemplify. Other kinds of subordinate clauses, such as the purpose clause in (27), were also introduced by this particle. In (29) *kim* is functioning as a conjunction by itself, and in (30) has formed a compound conjunction by being juxtaposed to *hatta* 'finally'. *Kim* could also be used to introduce direct quotes as (26) shows.

In *Barağ-nāmā*, an example of Eastern (Khorazmian) popular Turkish literature of the fourteenth century, we notice a clear-cut distinction in the distribution of *ki* versus *kim*, the former being used only as a conjunction and the latter as a relative clause marker, as exemplified below in (31) and (32), respectively.⁸

- (31) ot tutuş-ıp sina-sığ-a ol zaman / çek-di bir
fire flare-ger breast poss-dat that time/heave-pst one

ahe ki bol-di bağır-i qan (87v, 1.5)
sigh conj. fill-pst innards-poss blood
'Then the fire (of grief) flared up in his breast; he
heaved a deep sigh and was filled with anguish (lit. and
his innards filled with blood)'

- (32) tağla kim bol-sa qiyamat aşkar / bar-ham olğay
morning rel. be-aor doomsday at hand / shatter be-fut
bu cihan-ı bemađar (91r, 1.1)
this world ephemeral
'On the morning that doomsday is at hand, this ephemeral
world will shatter'

This distinction between the usages of *ki* and *kim* is rather significant since *Baraq-nāmā* is a popular work representing the colloquial language. We notice that *ki* and *kim* are used in a more restricted way, that is to say that there are no verb complements or other subordinate clauses introduced by these particles. Each morpheme has a single function: *ki* is used as a conjunction and *kim* as a relativizer. This fact also lends some support to our claim that it was the WH-word *kim* . . . 'who' that extended its function to a relative marker by analogy to Persian, and *ki* then developed to be used to mark any other kind of subordination. Such a distinction was also seen to some extent in *Çarhname*, and will be witnessed in Chagatay as well.

Chagatay is another Eastern Turkic Language that had its peak in literature in the sixteenth century. It is a classical literary language which was in use from the beginning of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century in Central Asia and Eastern Turkestan; it was also used by the non-Oghuz Turks of European Russia. Among the modern Turkic languages, Uzbek and New Uighur are taken to be the ones most closely related to it. In Chagatay too, we find subordinate clauses introduced by *ki/kim* which show once more that this syntactic borrowing was not restricted to just one or two dialects of Turkic languages, but is a much wider and more complex phenomenon. In fact, the Turkic languages spoken in Iran, such as Azerbaijani, Kashkay, etc. have all borrowed this structure along with some others. In Chagatay *kim* and *ki* were both used, the former mostly with relative clauses and the latter with other kinds of subordinate clauses, though not always in a very consistent manner.⁹

- (33) *Mülk, kim sultan—ı yoq, cism-i dur-ur, kim*
country rel. ruler-poss exist-neg body-poss stand-aor rel.

can-ı yoq
soul-poss exist-neg
'A country that has no ruler is (like) a body that has
no soul'
- (34) *Şart bu-dur, ki aylağ ta 'bir ilm-in-i ma 'lum*
condition this-emph comp. do interpreting science-poss-acc known
'The condition is this, that you learn the science of
interpretation (of dreams)'
- (35) *sağın-dı kim cavid erür milkat-i*
think-pst comp. eternal be-aor dominion-poss
'He thought that his dominion would be eternal'

- (36) yet-ti uşanda, ki Zaliha er-di
 reach-pst place-there sub Zaliha be pst
 'He reaches the same place {where Zaliha was
 that
- (37) İkki elig-in-i andaç berk tu-ti, kim tebræ næ al-ma-dı
 two hand-poss-acc so tight hold-pst sub. ? take-neg-pst
 'He held both his hands so tightly that he could not move'

One point that needs to be mentioned in these examples is that, andaç 'so' in (37) anticipates a kim-subordinate clause to follow it; such structures will be seen in modern Turkish, too

In Dede Korkut, an epic believed to have been narrated in the thirteenth century but written down in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, we notice that both forms, kim and ki, are used interchangeably. It is believed that the language of Dede Korkut conforms to the Turkish spoken in the Azarbaijani area at that time. Kim/ki are used in constructions similar to those of the fourteenth century, as will be seen in the following examples.

- (38) Gör-di-ler kim ol yiğit kim baş kes-üp—tür kan
 see-pst-3=pl comp. that youth rel. head cut-ger-emph blood
 dök-üp-tür Pay Püre Big-ün sağ-in-da otur-ur (D. 74-3-4)
 shed-ger-emph Pay Pure Big-gen right-poss-loc sit-aor
 'They saw that this youth who has cut heads and shed
 blood sits on the right of Pay Püre Big'
- (39) Kim-ün ki oğl-u kız-ı yoq kara otağ-a kon-dur-un (D. 10-8)
 who-gen rel. son-poss daughter-poss exist = neg black tent-dat
 stay-caus-2=sg
 'Make those who don't have a son or a daughter stay in
 the black tent'
- (40) Maslahat gör-di-ler ki Dede Korkut varsun di-di-ler (D.82-7-5)
 proper see-pst-3 pl conj. Dede korkut marry say-pst-3 pl
 'They found it proper and said that Dede Korkut should
 marry (her)
- (41) Her ne ki buyur-sa kabul id-er-ler-idi (D.2-9-10)
 every what rel. request-cond accept do-aor-3=pl-pst
 'Whatever he requests, they would accept'

- (42) Dirse Han iste-di kim oğlan-çuğ-in-in üstün-e
Dirse Khan want-pst comp. son-poss-gen top-dat

gürle-yip düş-e-ydi
roar-ger fall-opt-pst

(D. 23-3-4)

'Dirse Khan wanted/wished that he could fall on his son roaringly'

(38) is a typical example to show how extensively *kim* was used, with two occurrences of it in the same sentence; the first *kim* introduces a verb complement while the second one marks the relative clause for which *yigit* 'youth' is the head noun. In (39) the pronoun *kim* is inflected for genitive and the *ki* following it is a relative marker. The function of *ki* as a conjunction can be seen in (40); the two sentences in this case could be conjoined without the *ki* (one way of co-ordination in Turkic syntax being mere juxtaposition of two clauses). In (42) we have an example of *kim* as a complementizer.

Selections of prose from *Kâtip Çelebi* (essays on historical events, various disciplines of the times, etc.) that date from the seventeenth century contain only occurrences of *ki* to mark different kinds of subordination. The complete switch from *kim* to *ki*, then, must have taken place sometime around the sixteenth century.

- (43) Bil *ki* ders okut-mak, takrir et-mek en üstün ibadet-tir
know-comp. lesson teach-inf lecture do-inf most high service-emph
'Know that to teach and to lecture are the highest forms
of service to God'

- (44) Den-ir *ki* bu adet üzerin-e ol-ur, fakat külli kaide
say-pass comp. this habit top-dat be-aor but general law

değil-dir
neg-emph

'It is said that this rests on habit but is not a general law'

- (45) Meleke insan-da yerleşmiş, kökleşmiş bir keyfiyet-tir
mastery person-loc settled rooted one condition-emph

ki, çabucak kaybol-maz
rel. quickly disappear-neg-aor

'Mastery (of something) is an internalized, rooted condition
in a person that will not disappear quickly'

- (46) Kimisi, bu bir yol-dur *ki* ora-ya git-mek için ulu ve
some this one way-emp sub. there-dat go-inf for great and

yüce ol-an Allah-tan başka yol yok-tur, de-miş-tir
 lofty be-partic God-abl other way exist-neg-emph say-pst-emph
 'Some have said, this is a way such that to go that way
 there is no other means than through almighty and lofty God'

Sentences (43)-(46) exemplify the uses of *ki* as a complementizer of an active verb, of an impersonal passive, a relative marker and subordinator, respectively.

Lastly, we need to look at modern Turkish in order to be able to compare and contrast the usage of *ki* in the present-day language versus earlier times. This will also provide us with some insight as to how the language has coped with a borrowed structure, one with a syntax foreign to Turkic. In order to be sure *ki* constructions were truly assimilated into the spoken language and did not remain as a structure just in the literary style, we looked into the spoken Turkish of today. This was done by going through some material collected for dialectal studies by two Turkish linguists, Ahmet Caferoğlu and Zeynep Korkmaz. Most of the subjects chosen for these dialect studies were illiterates from small towns and villages. Three dialect areas were selected: a) Sivas and Tokat (central Turkey), b) Eastern provinces, and c) Nevşehir and vicinity (central south-east). All of the subjects from these three areas used structures with *ki* in their speech, which implies that this borrowed structure has been internalized by the speakers and, thus, must be considered as part of present day Turkish. However, *ki* has a more restricted usage now; relative clauses with *ki* are quite rare having a new set of restrictions (these will be discussed below): *Ki* is frequently found to introduce direct speech after verbs of saying, and its function as a complementizer is kept in certain instances; *ki* still appears in compound subordinators, which are mainly borrowings from Persian. Here are some examples from these three dialect areas:

- (47) Gelin bak-ıyor *ki* gayn-ın-ın kelle-si bir yer-de
 bride look-prog comp. in=law-poss-gen head-poss one place loc
 göde-si bir yer-de (Sivas and Tokat)
 body-poss one place-loc
 'The bride sees that the head of her in-law is at one
 place and his body is at another place'
- (48) Eğer *ki* vur-sa-ydı gürtü-yü yedi gat yer-e soh-acak-tı
 if sub. hit-cond-pst scoundrel-acc seven floor earth-dat stick-fut-past
 'If he hit the scoundrel he would send him seven floors
 down the earth'

- (49) *Gız-ın oda-sın-a var-dı-lar ki gız yok*
 girl-gen room-poss-dat reach-pst-3=pl sub. girl exist=neg
 'They reached the girl's room and the girl wasn't there'
 'When they reached the girl's room, the girl wasn't there'
- (50) *Baba-sı da iki dene zehilli at yolla-dı ki aslanzade-ynen*
 father-poss part.two times poisonous horse send-pst sub.
 Aslanzade with
oğl-u bin-sin öl-sün, gız ban-a kal-sın
 son-poss mount-opt die-opt girl I-dat remain-opt
 'His father sent two poisonous horses so that Aslanzade and his son
 would mount on them and die, (and) the girl would be
 left for me (i.e. the father)'
- (51) *Bunnar-da bir adet var-mış ki nişan-dan üç gün*
 these-loc one custom exist-pst sub. engagement-abl three day
 sona damat ol-acak (Eastern provinces)
 after groom become-fut
 'They (these ones) had a custom (such) that he would
 become a groom three days after the engagement'
- (52) *Söyli-yeceğ-im bu ki bu tokma-nan bi patişah-ın*
 say-fut-poss-I=sg this comp. this mallet-with once king-gen
baş-ın-a bi imam-ın baş-ın-a vur-acam
 head-poss-dat once imam-gen head-poss-dat hit-fut
 'What I'm going to say is that I'll hit the king's head
 (first) and the imam's head next, with this mallet'
- (53) *Gız da dim-iş ki: "ben-i alacağına altından bir deve*
 girl conj. say-pst comp I-acc marry-instead golden one camel
yap-tır (Nevşehir and vicinity)
 make-caus
 'And the girl said: "Instead of marrying me have a camel
 made of gold'
- (54) *Ben Gültekin-i heç dö-mem ki!*
 I Gültekin-acc ever beat-neg aor-I=sg part.
 'I never beat Gültekin!'

In sentence (47), *ki*, introduces a complement to the verb, this appears to be a common usage of *ki* especially after verbs of cognition in speech. *Ki* in (48) is part of the subordinator *eğer* 'if', a borrowing from Persian; most of the time only *eğer* is used for *ki* has no separate function in this case in Turkish. Sentence (49) has two reading depending on what function *ki* may be believed to have; in the first reading *ki* is functioning as a proper conjunction, while the second reading it is marking a temporal subordinate clause. In (50) we have a purpose clause marked by *ki*. In (51), *ki* is used as a relative clause marker; but the relative clause is extraposed; the head N remains before the predicate while the clause occurs after the verb. (52) and (53) exemplify the usage of *ki* as a complementizer and *as* introducing a direct quote, respectively. (54) shows a different usage of *ki*, where it is marking an "elliptical" construction. We come across many cases of such elliptical structures in the written language as well, and the term will become clearer below.

There remains only the contemporary literary language to be looked at before we draw any conclusions. Typical examples from the sources listed earlier are provided below.

- (55) Emin-im ki Ali sınıf-ın-ı geç-ecek.
 certain-I=sg comp. Ali class-poss-acc pass-fut
 'I'm certain that Ali will pass his class'
- (56) Ben-i süzüş-ün-den anlı-yor-um ki baba dost-um
 I-acc eye-poss-abl understand-prog-I =sg comp. father friend-poss
 bana dair bir şey-ler anlat-ıyor
 I-dat about one thing-pl tell-prog
 'I could understand from his eyeing me that my father's
 friend was telling some things about me'
- (57) Bunlar-ı öyle bir saflık, öyle bir içten, çocuksu söyl-er-di
 these-acc such one naivety such one sincerity childish say-aor-pst
 ki doktor katla katıla gül-er-di
 comp. doctor a lot laugh-aor-pst
 'She would say these childishly with such naivety and such
 sincerity that the doctor would split his sides with laughter'
- (58) O esmer, kısa boylu, tıkHz biri-ydi ki yüzü ille
 he dark short heighted chubby one-pst rel. face-poss part.
 fakir fukura-ya hiç gül-mez-di

poor pauper-dat ever laugh-neg-aor-pst
 'He was a dark, short and chubby person whose face would
 never smile to the poor (ones)'

- (59) Kusur işle-me-di-m ki yüz-üm kızır-sın
 mistake do-neg-pst-l=sg comp. face-poss blush-aor-3sg
 'I didn't do anything wrong that my face should blush'
- (60) O diyor ki: "boş ver-e-lim okul-a"
 he say-prog comp. empty give-opt-l=pl school-dat
 'He says, "Let's forget about school"'
- (61) Sonra otur-duğ-u semt dolmuş, ya da otobüs-le en azından
 then live-nom-acc quarter car or part. bus-with at least
 yirmi dakika öte-de-ydi ki o da trafiğ-in böylesine
 twenty minute away-loc-pst conj. that part.traffic-gen such
 karış-ma-dığ-ı normal gidiş-le
 confuse-neg-nom-poss normal going-with
 'Then the quarter he lived in was, at least, twenty minutes
 away by bus or car, and that was at a normal pace when
 the traffic wasn't so confused'
- (62) Bir yudum iç-ti-m ki zehir gibiymiş
 one sip drink-pst-l=sg conj. poison like-pst
 'I drank one sip and it was like poison'
 (I drank one sip which was like poison)
- (63) Şerife gaz ocağ-ın-a çaydanlığ-ı tam otur-t-uyor-du ki
 Şerife gas stove-poss-dat kettle-acc just sit-caus-prog-pst.sub.
 orta kat-ın kiracı-sı Seniha gel-di
 middle storey-gen tenant-poss Seniha come-pst
 'Şerife was just putting the kettle on the gas stove when
 Seniha, the tenant of the middle storey came in'
- (64) O ban-a inan-maz ki!
 he l-dat believe-neg-aor part
 'He doesn't believe me'
- (65) Erken gel-diğ-in-e öyle sevin-di-m ki!
 early come-nom-poss-dat such please-pst-l=sg part

'I'm so pleased that you came early (I'm so pleased of your early coming)'

- (66) Ne kadar para ist-iyor-sun ki?
 what amount money want-prog-2-sg part
 'How much money do you want?'
- (67) Bir ev ki ev!
 one house par. house
 'It' such a house (What a house)'
- (68) Ne yazık ki cevap-ın-ı bil-mi-yor-um
 What pity comp. answer-poss-acc know-neg-prog-1-sg
 'Unfortunately, I don't know its answer'
- (69) O kendi yatağ-ın-ı bile yap-maz kaldı ki san-a
 he own bed-poss-acc even make-neg-aor let alone you-dat
 yemek pişir-ecek
 food cook-fut
 'He doesn't even make his own bed, let alone cook food for you'

Looking at the data above, we can classify the *ki* constructions in present-day Turkish into three groups: a) those constructions with a syntax borrowed from Persian, as seen in sentences (55)-(59) (with the exception of (58)) where *ki* is a complementizer. All of these sentences can also be expressed by a Turkic structure where the verb complement would be in the form of a nominalization preceding the main verb; to take an example, (55) can also be expressed as:

- (55') Ali-_i-nin sınıf-ın-ı geç-eceğ-in-e emin-im
 Ali-gen class-poss-acc pass-nom-poss-dat certain-1-sg
 'I'm certain of Ali's passing his class (I'm certain that Ali will pass his class)'

In (58), however, *ki* is used to relativize a possessor in a sentence with a nominal predicate. In fact, one of the restrictions on *ki* when it functions as a relativizer is that the predicate of the sentence has to be non-verbal (i.e. either an existential or a nominal),¹⁰ with the relative clause always extraposed (i.e. never preceding the predicate). Because of extraposition *ki* can, in fact, be taken as a conjunction; for example, in (58), *ve* 'and' can be substituted for *ki* giving us, "he was a dark short, chubby person and his face would never smile for the poor". Thus, *ki* in

such instances does not intrude into Turkic syntax (what 'intruding' into Turkic syntax means will become clearer as we discuss this point later on in the paper), as a relativization with the particle *ki* would. b) Sentences (62)-(63) exemplify those constructions in which the position of *ki* does not violate the native syntax of Turkish, for it functions as a conjunction in these cases. (62) may appear to contain a relative clause; however, it seems to me that *ki* is a conjunction here too, since the meaning of the sentence implies that there are two consecutive actions involved, namely making one sip and then realizing that it was like poison, rather than just one action of having a sip that was like poison. c) Sentences (64)-(69) contain instances of *ki* where it is used in an innovative way; that is, they have no corresponding structure in Persian. There is no other way of expressing such sentences, and they are now part of the native syntax. (64)-(66) are examples of elliptical *ki* constructions, for the complement after *ki* has been ellided, leaving the hearer to imagine what could have followed. For example, (65) can be interpreted as having the following underlying sentence:

(65') Erken gel-diğ-in-e öyle sevin-di-m ki tahmin
 early come-nom-poss-dat such please-pst-1=sg imagine
 ed-e-mez-sin
 do-abil-neg=aor-2=sg
 'I'm so pleased that you come early, that you can't imagine'

In this sentence *öyle* anticipates a *ki* clause, as was the case in (37) in Chagatay. It may also be argued that the final *ki* in these instances is an emphatic marker rather than marking an elliptical construction. In Persian, *ke* may be used as an emphatic marker but, unlike in Turkish, it can occur after any word that needs to be emphasized but never sentence finally, which is the only place it can occur in Turkish, with this function. In fact, Don Stilo (personal communication) argues that the emphatic *ke* in Persian is a separate morpheme from the subordinator, since Kurdish (an Iranian language) has the morpheme *ko* as the emphatic marker, while *ke* is reserved for marking subordinate clauses. The situation in Turkish is different due to the fixed sentence final position of *ki*, where the clause following it appears to be ellided. However, as sentences like (66) suggest, *ki* may be acquiring the function of an emphatic marker, independent of any influence from Persian. (67) is an exclamatory sentence making use of the particle *ki*; (68) and (69) show frozen *ki* conjunctions which have become relexicalized as a single semantic unit.

The research done on tracing the development of *ki* constructions in Turkish suggests the following conclusions: the structures with *ki* were introduced to Turkish after contact with Persians in the tenth century. The fact that the morpheme *ke* in Persian at that time was the interrogative pronoun 'who' as well

as a general subordinate clause marker appears to have caused the Turkic interrogative pronoun *kim* 'who' to be substituted as the subordinator in the borrowed structures. The earliest data show frequent cases of *kim* used as a relative marker and relatively few cases as a marker for other kinds of subordinate clauses. This syntactic borrowing may have forced a reanalysis of *kim* in certain instances which then facilitated the extended usage of *kim*. One question comes to mind; that is, how and why was there a switch *kim* to *ki* in Turkish? I offer the following explanation, realizing that, at this point, it is more of a speculation based on what we have found. Several dialects were noted to contain both forms with a distinction in their functions (though not a very consistent one in every case); in others there was a period when both forms appeared to be used interchangeably. This situation is reminiscent of the three subordinators *-ka, ku, ke-* in middle Persian merging into *ke*. A similar merger appears to have taken place in Turkish, too. It may have been too difficult to distinguish between the separate functions of *kim* and *ki* (in cases where the distinction existed) all the time; and in cases where they were used interchangeably, the speakers may still have preferred to stick to one form and avoid any confusion. Once this change took place, we would expect *ki* rather than *kim* to be the form to last, since this way there would be a one-to-one correspondence between form and function (i.e. *kim*: interrogative pronoun, *ki*: subordinator).

In Persian *ke* was used, from the tenth century onwards, to mark conjunctive clauses, relative clauses, verb complements and in any other kinds of subordinate clause. The data on Turkish up to the present time show that, once *ki* was borrowed into the language, any structure with Persian *ke* was adopted and used productively. However, it must be remembered that Turkic structures corresponding to the borrowed Persian ones were never completely abandoned; both the foreign and native constructions were used side by side in the language. What do we mean by native Turkic syntax and foreign syntax? Persian being an Indo-European language has a loose SOV word order, whereas Turkish, a member of the Altaic language family, is a rather rigid verb final language. We find that modifiers precede their head in Turkish (i.e. adj. -N; gen. -N; rel.cl.-head N; nominalization-V) while they follow their head in Persian (i.e. N-adj.; N-gen.; head N-rel.cl.; V-comp.). Terms such as 'disrupting the native syntax' are then used in those cases when a change was caused in the ordering of the NP or VP modifier constituents. Such a change was caused in the NP and VP constituents when subordinate clauses with *ki* were introduced into the language. The presence of these new structures then gave rise to 'syntactic doubling' in the language, since the Turkic constructions remained in use, too. The percentage of the borrowed structure used versus the Turkic structure appears to vary with each writer, depending on the background of the writer. But the fact that *ki* is used in modern (spoken and written) Turkish indicates that this borrowing has been well-assimilated into the language

and is part of the grammar now. However, *ki* has a much more restricted usage now as compared to earlier stages of the language. Contact with Persian culture and language and its influence on Turkish does not exist anymore; from this aspect, too, it is very interesting to find out what the restrictions on *ki* constructions today are. The Turkic form of relativization has taken over (i.e. with participles preceding the head noun), except in certain cases, as was seen in (51) and (58), where the head NP is a predicate nominal or an existential predicate. *Ki*, in these cases, is also open to analysis as a conjunction, which shows that syntactically it does not disturb the NP constituent. Conjunctional usage of *ki* has been kept in modern Turkish; this is not surprising since several other conjunctions, such as *eğer* 'if', *hatta* 'even', *çünkü* 'because' etc. have been borrowed from Persian and are in full use today. Conjunctions don't intrude into the NP and VP syntax directly; that is, they don't change the modifier preposing hierarchy of Turkish and are thus easily tolerated. *Ki* today is also used as a complementizer and to introduce direct quotes, the latter posing no immediate threat to the native syntax. Verb complements with the foreign syntax are used side by side with the nominalizations of the Turkic pattern; however, in many instances there appear to be slight semantic distinctions between the two structures. In present-day Turkish, *ki* is most frequently used with complements of verbs of cognition, such as *baktı ki* "he saw that / he realized that", *zannetti ki* "he thought that". The verb *bakmak* 'to look (at)' acquires a slightly different reading ('to realize') when followed by a *ki* complement, as in (70) below. In fact, *bakmak* does not take a nominalized complement, shown by the ungrammaticality of (71). We need to use a different verb to have a nominalized complement, as exemplified in (72).

- (70) Ali bak-tı ki hava karar-mış
 Ali see-pst comp air darken-pst
 'Ali realized that it had darkened'

- (71) *Ali hava-nın karar-diğ-in-i bak-tı
 Ali air-gen darken-nom-poss-acc ee-pst

- (72) Ali hava-nın karar-diğ-in-i fark et-ti
 Ali air-gen darken-nom-poss-acc notice do-pst
 'Ali noticed that it had gotten dark (Ali noticed the darkening of the day)'

Other verbs of cognition that take complement clauses introduced by *ki* are also subject to certain restrictions. For example, *anlamak* 'to understand' is a verb that may have its object complement either in the form of a nominalization preceding the verb, or introduced by *ki* in which case the complement clause would follow the verb. However, in this case, we notice a difference in

the semantic interpretations of the two forms that ought to be variants of one another. The example below illustrates this point.

(73) Artık anla-dı-m ki kimse-ye itimat et-me-yecek-sin
 by= now understand-pst-1-sg comp nobody -dat trust do-neg-fut-2-sg
 'By now I have understood that you / one should not trust anyone'

(74)a Kimse-ye itimat ed-il-me-yeceğ-in-i artık anla-dı-m
 nobody-dat trust do-pass-neg-fut-nom-poss-acc now understand
 pst-1-sg

'By now I have understood {that nobody should be trusted
 { you shouldn't trust anybody

b Kimse-ye itimat et-me-yeceğ-in-i artık anla-dı-m
 nobody-dat trust do-neg-fut nom-poss-acc now understand-pst-1-sg
 'By now I have understood that you/öne will not trust anyone'

(74)_b is/a direct nominalization of the *ki* complement in (73) without being passivized, and yet (73) and (74) need not be synonymous; 'you' in (73) may have an impersonal reading while in (74) b it cannot. In order to get the impersonal meaning in a nominalization, we need to have the verb in the passive form; (74) a, then, is the corresponding nominalized form of (73). In other cases where there are no particular restrictions on either the *ki* clauses or their nominalizations, we find however, that there exists a semantic distinction between the two forms. To illustrate this point, we repeat (59) with a reason clause introduced by *ki* and give its nominalized form as (59') below.

(59) Kusur işle-me-di-m ki yüz-üm kızır-sın
 mistake do-neg-pst-1-sg comp. face - poss blush - aor - 3-sg
 'I didn't do anything wrong {that my face should blush
 {for my face to blush

(59') Kusur işle-me-di-m öyle-yse yüz-üm kızır-maz
 mistake do-neg-pst-1 sg so-cond face-poss blush-neg-aor
 'I didn't do anything wrong in which case (if that is so)
 my face won't blush'

It is then quite apparent that (59) and (59') are not synonymous. We can then conclude that *ki* clauses with a syntax foreign to Turkish have become part of the grammar now by developing i) their own set of syntactic restrictions, and ii) a distinct semantic interpretation from their corresponding Turkic patterns.

We claim that these factors constitute a basic motivation for the preservation of this borrowed structure in the language.

We now need to look into relative clauses with *ki* and see if the claims above hold true for them, too. We have shown that one of the main changes in the usage of *ki* today from the earlier periods of the language (i.e. after *ki* was borrowed into language) is the tendency to lose its function as a relativizer. Today there are more restrictions on relativizations with *ki*; for example sentences (16), (17) and (33) cannot be expressed with a *ki* relativization any more. In present-day Turkish relative clauses introduced by *ki* can only be found when i) they are extraposed (i.e. occur after the predicate) in sentences with non-verbal predicates, ii) they introduce a possessive and come after the verb (i.e. predicate can be verbal in this case), and iii) they are restrictive relative clauses. Examples below illustrate these points.

- (75)a Bazı insan-lar var-dır ki her iste-dik-ler-in-i
 certain people-pl exist-emph rel. every want-nom-pl-poss-acc
 el-de ed-er-ler
 hand-loc do-aor-3=pl
 'There are certain people who get all they want'
- b Her iste-dik-ler-in-i el-de ed-en bazı insan-lar
 every want-nom-pl-poss-acc hand-loc do-partic certain people-pl.
 var-dır
 exist-emph.
 'There are certain/some people who get all they want'
- (76)a Bu öyle korku-ç bir aci-dır ki kimse dayan-a-maz
 this such awful one pain-emph rel nobody bear-able-neg=aor
 'This is such an awful pain that nobody can bear'
- b Bu kimse-nin dayan-a-mı-yacağ-ı korkun-ç bir aci-dır
 this nobody-gen bear-able-neg-fut nom-poss awful one pain-emph
 'This is an awful pain that nobody can bear'
- (77)a Ali anne-sin-e bir hediye al-mış ki eş-i bul-un-maz
 Ali mother-poss-dat one gift get-pst rel. same-poss find-pass neg=aor
 'Ali has got a gift for his mother for which a similar
 one can't be found'

- b Ali anne-sin-e eş-i bul-un-maz bir hediye al-mış
 Ali mother-poss-dat same-poss find-pass-neg=aor one gift get-pst
 'Ali has got a gift, for which no similar one can be
 found, for his mother'
- (78) Bu soru-nun cevab-ı, ki hepiniz-in bil-diğ-in-e emin-im,
 this question-gen answer-poss rel. all-gen know-nom-poss-dat
 sure-lsg
 kitab-ın son sayfa-sın-da
 book-gen last page-poss-loc
 'The answer to this question, which I'm sure you all know,
 is in the last page of this book'
- (79)a *Bu adam ki çok zengin bütün para-sın-ı kumar-da
 this man rel. very rich all money-poss-acc gambling-loc
 kaybet-ti
 lose-pst
- b Çok zengin ol-an bu adam bütün para-sın-ı kumar-da
 very rich be-partic this man all money-poss-acc gambling-loc
 kaybet-ti
 lose-pst
 'This man who is very rich lost all his money in gambling'
- (80)a *Anahtar-ım ki dün kaybet-ti-m bul-du-m
 key-poss rel. yesterday lose-pst I-sg find-pst I-sg
- b Dün kaybet-tiğ-im anahtar-ım-ı bul-du-m
 yesterday lose-nom-poss key-poss-acc find-pst-I-sg
 'I found the key that I lost yesterday'

In (75)a and (76)a, we have extraposed relative clauses with *ki* in sentences with non-verbal predicates, as stated in restriction (i). The ungrammaticality of (79)a and (80)a also show us how this restriction operates in verbal-predicate sentences; the subject and direct object NP in (79) and (80) respectively, cannot be relativized with *ki* but can only be expressed as participles. There is also a slight semantic distinction between (75)a and b; in (75)a we are talking about a 'certain people' (specific) who form a group by themselves, whereas in (75)b 'certain people' may refer to any / some individuals (non-specific) among a larger group of all people. This semantic distinction may be attributed to the place of the head noun in the sentence; that is, a noun in sentence initial topic position has a definite or specific reading, whereas a noun in focus position (i.e. right before the predicate), if not specified, is likely to get an indefinite or non-referential reading. In (76)a, *öyle* 'such' anticipates the occurrence of *ki* similar to such ... that constructions in English; how (76)a differs in meaning

from (76)b is fairly clear here. (77)a exemplifies an extraposed relative clause with *ki*, in a verbal predicate sentence; however, *ki* introduces a possessive in this case as stated in restriction (ii). We have a restrictive relative clause with *ki* in (78); such occurrences of *ki* are rather rare in the language. Extraposed relative clauses with *ki* do not intrude into the syntax of the noun phrase; this point then can be viewed as being favourable for their preservation in the language. In some cases, such relative clauses can be interpreted as containing merely additional information, and *ki* can be taken as a conjunction, as was the case in (58).

One question still remains to be answered; that is, whether syntactic borrowing has triggered any other changes in the language or not. One might have expected a further change to take place in word order, since this was initiated to some extent by the borrowed *ki* constructions. However, the situation in Turkish suggests that the language went back to its verb final pattern after contact with Persian ceased, rather than undergoing a bigger change. The theory of word order change as proposed by John Hawkins gives us a good insight as to why this might have happened in Turkish. In this theory, word order patterns are viewed in terms of NP and VP modifier hierarchies; for a verb final language, the modifier NP hierarchy would then be;

(81) Num-N & Dem-N & Adj-N & Gen-N & Rel-N

and a modifier VP hierarchy would be:

(82) Adv-V & Obj-V & SubdV-MainV & Subj-V

A syntactic doubling (i.e. two different syntactic forms for the same semantic interpretation) within the hierarchies has to take place before we can talk about language transition. In Turkish, then, we have witnessed a syntactic doubling within the NP and VP modifier hierarchies; constructions with *ki* caused the relative clauses and verb complements to follow their head while they would normally precede their head, as was shown in (81) and (82). Though there was grounds for language transition in Turkish we notice that this syntactic doubling didn't spread to other constituents in the modifier hierarchies. The theory also claims that there is pressure exerted by the NP and VP modifier hierarchies to retain the most optimal consistency, which then implies that languages have an internal pressure to be as coherent as possible. The fact that *ki* in present-day Turkish has a much more restricted usage than before implies that the internal pressure exerted by the NP and VP modifier hierarchies towards an optimal consistency resulted in a more regular verb final pattern.

NOTES

- * An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Summer LSA meeting, August 13, 1977 at the University of Hawaii.

The following abbreviations have been used in glossing the examples:

abl.	'ablative'
acc.	'accusative'
aor.	'aorist'
caus.	'causative'
comp.	'complementizer; complement'
conj.	'conjunction'
dat.	'dative'
emph.	'emphatic'
gen.	'genitive'
ger.	'gerund'
inf.	'infinitive'
loc.	'locative'
neg.	'negative'
nom.	'nominalizer; nominalization'
partic.	'participle'
pl.	'plural'
poss.	'possessive'
prog.	'progressive'
pst.	'past'
rel.	'relativizer; relativization'
sg.	'singular'
sub.	'subordinator; subordination'

- 1 Examples of Orkhon Turkic are taken from texts given in *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic* by T. Tekin. The inscription from which the example is selected is given by the initials of that particular inscription; e.g. BK stands for Bilgä Kagan Inscriptions, KT for Kül Tigin Inscriptions.
- 2 This section is mostly drawn from discussions I had with Prof. A. Bodrogligeti, in the Near Eastern Department at UCLA, about how contact between Persians and the Turkic tribes could have taken place.
- 3 The historical stages of the Persian language are:
- I. Ancient Persian-Avestan, Old Persian (6-3 centuries B.C.)
 - II. Middle Persian-Parthian, Pahlavi (Middle Persian), Sogdian, Saka, etc. (3 cent. B.C. - 9 century A.D.)
 - III. New Persian - (9 cent. -)
 - a) Early Classical, 10-14 cent. A.D.
 - b) Late Classical, 14-19 cent. A.D.
 - c) Modern Persian, 19 -

For further discussion of the three distinct subordinators, *ka*, *ke*, *ku* in Middle Persian, see Nyberg (1974), and for the usage of *ke* in Early Classical Persian (i.e. after the merger had taken place) see Lazard (1963). In a brief description of the function of *ke* as found in the grammatical analysis of 10-12 century Persian prose, Lazard states: "L'emploi de *ki* pour introduire des propositions complétives (et le discours direct), causals, finals, consécutives, ainsi que des propositions relatives, n'appelle pas de remarques particulières (p. 472, paragraph 809)".

- 4 The Persian data is largely drawn from work with Fattaneh Ghaneh. I have also benefited greatly from discussions with Don Stilo, instructor of Persian at UCLA, on issues relating to Persian.
- 5 It was, in fact, Prof. Joseph Greenberg who pointed out to me at the LSA meeting, that this was an instance of *calque*. He was also rather critical about calling *ki* constructions in Turkish a case of 'syntactic borrowing,' since what appears to have happened is that the native morpheme *kim* was substituted for the Persian *ke*, which is an instance of 'loan translation'. However, it seems to me that the case in Turkish is more complex than a mere loan translation, for there is a whole new structure entering the language associated with it. We are unable to determine whether the new structure was borrowed into the language first and then came the substitution of the native morpheme *kim*, or the substitution occurred first, which then triggered the usage of the new structure. Since other Turkic dialects that have been in contact with the Persians have undergone a similar change, it seems to me that the syntactic borrowing of the *ki* constructions could have taken place simultaneously with the loan translation of *ke*.
- 6 This example was quoted in the introduction of *Ondördüncü Asır Betikleri*, p. 26.
- 7 This example was given in Dilaçar, A (1972), p: 62.
- 8 In the whole of *Baraq-nāmā*, there were five occurrences of *ki* as a conjunction, six occurrences of *kim* as a relative marker, and four in compound conjunctions, such as *hâr ne kim* (every what who) 'whatever'.
- 9 The Chagatay examples given in Eckmann's *Chagatay Manual* are taken from the works of Nevai, Hamidi, and Şarafaddin (p. 119, 203-9)
- 10 Nominal predicates in Turkish include adjective, pronominal and nominal predicates.

REFERENCES

- Arat, Reşit Rahmeti. trans. 1959. *Kutadgu Bilig*. v. 1 and 2 (Knowledge of Happiness) Yusuf Has Hacib. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Basımevi.
- Birsel, Salâh. 1976. *Ah Beyoğlu, Vah Beyoğlu*. İstanbul: Sander Yayınları
- Bodrogligeti, A. 1974. Ahmad's *Baraq-nāmā*. *Central Asiatic Journal* XVIII: 2, 83-128.
- Boyle, A. 1966. *Grammar of Modern Persian*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Caferođlu, Ahmet. 1944. *Sivas ve Tokat Ađızı* (Sivas and Tokat dialects) İstanbul: Burhaneddin Matbaası.
- Caferođlu, Ahmet. 1942. *Dođu İllerimiz Ađızlarından Toplamalar* (A dialectal study of Eastern Provinces) İstanbul: Burhaneddin Matbaası.
- Dilaçar, Ahmet. 1972. *Kutadgu Bilig İncelemesi* (A study of Kutadgu Bilig) Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi: T.D.K. 340.
- Eckmann, János. 1966. *Chagatay Manual*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Emre, Ahmet Cevat. 1941. *Ondördüncü Asır Betikleri* (Extracts of fourteenth century prose) Ankara.
- Ergin, Muharrem. 1963. *Dede Korkut Kitabı* v. 1 and 2 (The book of the Dede Korkut Epic) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Gencan, Tahir Nejat. 1966. *Dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: T.D.K. 243.
- Givón, Talmy. 1974. "Verb complements and relative clauses; a diachronic case study in Biblical Hebrew" paper read at the Second North American Conference on Semantic Linguistics, Santa Barbara.
- Gökyay, Orhan Faik. 1968. *Kâtip Çelebi'den Seçmeler* (Selections from Kâtip Çelebi) İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Hawkins, John, 1976. "Word Order Change in relation to the logical status of linguistic universals". Unpublished Ms.
- Kemal, Orhan. 1974. *Yağmur Dolu Bulutlar* (Clouds full of rain - short stories) Ankara: Bilgi Basımevi.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep. 1963. *Nevşehir ve Yöresi Ađızları* (Dialects of Nevşehir and vicinity) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1963. *La Langue des Plus Anciens Monuments de la Prose Persane*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Lewis, G.L. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.
- Mansurođlu, Mecdut. ed. 1956. *Çarhname*, Ahmet Fakih, İstanbul: Pulhan Matbaası.

- Nyberg, H.S. 1974. *A Manual of Pahlavi II*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Shaw, Stanford. 1976. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stilo, Don. *Class Notes on Persian Grammar*. UCLA.
- Tekin, Talat. 1968. *A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Thompson, Sandra. *Subordination in Universal Grammar*. Lecture notes for a seminar on subordination, 1975 UCLA.
- Underhill, Robert. 1976. *Turkish Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

ÖZET

Bu makalede Türkçe'de bazı yan cümleciklerde kullanılan *ki* sözcüğünün dilimize Farsça'dan girmiş olduğu gösterilmektedir. Geçen zaman sürecinde, *ki*'nin işlevindeki değişimler ve gelişmeler araştırılmakta, bugünkü kullanımını belirleyen kurallar ortaya konmaktadır. Böyle sözdizimsel bir değişikliğin dilin kendi bünyesiyle nasıl kaynaştığı açıklanmaya çalışılmaktadır.