CODE-COPYING IN IRANO-TURKIC
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Introduction
Turkic and Iranian are not closely related to each other, and they basically represent rather different language types. Long and intensive contacts in some areas have, however, led to considerable typological convergence between certain Turkic languages and Persian (Johanson, 1992: 62). Interesting results of this long symbiosis are found in the converging Central Asian languages Uzbek and Tajik. The southwestern part of the Turkic world offers similar cases of profound influence.

The southwestern part includes Turkish, Azerbaijani, and several other Turkic varieties spoken in Iran. Most of them belong to the so-called Oghuzic branch of Turkic: Turkish, Azerbaijani, South Oghuzic, Khorasan Turkic. One language, Khalaj, has a different origin.

The bulk of the Turkic population in this area are descendants of the Seljuks, Oghuz tribes that founded a state on the Syr-Darya in the eleventh century and then went farther westwards to conquer Khorasan and Anatolia. Basically, the Khorasan Turks go back to tribes that remained in Khorasan, while the Azerbaijani, South Oghuzic and Ottoman Turks are descendants of the Oghuz who moved farther west. The ancestors of the Khalaj, however, are non-Oghuzic Aqhu tribes that probably fled to Central Iran during the Mongol expansion in the thirteenth century.

The area has for five centuries been politically divided into a western, Turkish part and an eastern, Iranian part, a division that is also connected with the internal Islamic schism between Sunni and Shii. There are still many common elements. East Anatolia and Iran are intense ethnolinguistic contact zones in which Turkic and Iranian have been spoken side by side for a millennium. Many speakers in rural areas of east Anatolia have an Iranian mother-tongue, mostly Kurdish, whereas vast layers of the population of Iran are bilingual or even trilingual, speaking Persian plus a Turkic variety and/or Kurdish.

From the fifteenth century on, there has been an increasing divergence of the main West Oghuzic varieties, Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijani. While the latter still played a considerable role in the Safavid state of Iran (Johanson, 1997), its significance decreased subsequently. In 1828, Azerbaijan was divided between Persia and Russia into Southern and Northern Azerbaijan. In the North, the language was developed and standardised, a task that was intensified in the Soviet era and after independence was gained in 1991. There was no corresponding development in the South,
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where the official use of the Azerbaijani language was even banned after World War II. In spite of this, the dialect of Tebriz has acquired considerable prestige and influence as a kind of norm variety for Iranian Azerbaijanian.

The Turkic varieties of the area mostly form continua without sharp boundaries. Thus, there is a gradual transition from Turkish to Azerbaijanian, the latter already beginning in east Anatolia. There is a similar continuum from Tebriz Azerbaijanian to South Oghuzic.

The Irano-Turkic area

The focus of the present paper will be on the Iranian area. Here, the language contact situation is asymmetrical, all Turkic varieties being more or less influenced by Persian without counter-currents worth mentioning. Persian, the only official language, is strongly dominant, other idioms having the status of provincial dialects without established norms and under overwhelming Persian influence. The Persification is promoted by increased education and communication. It is typical of the sociolinguistic conditions that practically all Turks of Iran, at least males, are bilingual, but generally do not, no matter how well educated, read and write their mother-tongue. The Roman-based alphabet for Azerbaijanian which was officially adopted by the Republic of Azerbaijan in 1991 may eventually also come to play a considerable role in the Irano-Turkic area.

The long and intensive contacts with Persian in largely bilingual groups have led to profound language change through copying of lexical, syntactic, phonetic and morphological structures. All varieties have been affected: Azerbaijanian, South Oghuzic and, particularly strongly, South Khorasan Turkic and Khulaj.

There has also been linguistic copying from Turkic prestige dialects. As is well known, Istanbul formed a western normative centre for Ottoman Turkish. In the Iranian area, the influential dialect of Tebriz played an analogous, though much weaker normative role. Peripheral areas have often been less affected by this impact, but instead exposed to stronger Iranian influence.

Irano-Turkic languages

The Oghuzic varieties of Iran have a considerable geographical distribution. Azerbaijanian is probably spoken by at least fifteen million in Northwestern Iran and a number of enclaves. South Oghuz, i.e. Qa"

The description of most Irano-Turkic languages has begun only recently, mainly through the epoch-making work of Gerhard Doerfer, Göttingen, and his collabor-
ators, Wolfram Hesche, Semih Tazcan and others. It is important to intensify research in this area, since many Irano-Turkic varieties spoken in relative isolation, e.g. Khalaj, are now seriously endangered.

Code-copying

In the following article, different types of Persian impact on Irano-Turkic varieties will be surveyed and classified according to the descriptive framework of the Code-Copying Model (Johanson, 1992; 1993a, forthcoming; Bucku, 1996: 84-92).

The model implies that copies of elements from foreign codes are inserted into a native ‘basic code’ which provides the morphosyntactic frame for the insertion. Copying processes yield global and selective copies. Global copying means that a unit of a foreign code is copied as a whole into the basic code. The copy is a global block of structural, i.e. material, semantic, combinational and frequentational properties. Selective copying means that the original is one selected structural—material, semantic, combinational or frequentational—property of such a block. Mixed copies combine the two processes. Foreign blocks are copied into the frame of the basic code, whereas selected foreign properties are copied onto units of the basic code.

In the following graphic, the globe symbolizes a global block of material, semantic, combinational and frequentational properties. Material properties concern the shape, (semantic) properties the content, (combinational) properties word-internal and word-external combination patterns, and (frequentational) properties the frequency of use.

Global copying

Selective copying

Linguistic copying is conditioned by different communication needs and a complex interplay of factors. It would be important to find out under what circumstances typological features in the Irano-Turkic varieties are susceptible to influence, and to establish continua of varieties on the basis of such criteria.

The following survey, which comprises conventionalised code-copies resulting from dynamic processes of influence, draws upon published data as well as unpublished data collections, in particular those underlying Filiz Kural’s investigations into Persian syntactic influences on Azerbaijani spoken in Iran (1997). Examples marked as “Tebriz Azerbaijani” are quoted from Kural’s materials. The survey will be arranged according to the scheme given below. The sign = will be used in the sense of ‘copied from’.
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Simple lexical copies

Most global copies are simple lexical copies. The lexical influence of Persian on
Irao-Turkic varieties is generally very strong. Without going into detail, it should be
pointed out that, due to Persian influence, the vocabulary of Southern Azerbaijanian
nowadays differs considerably from that of Northern Azerbaijanian, which has pre-
served more of the native vocabulary and also has been exposed to Russian influence.
Thus words for phenomena of modern life often differ, e.g. Southern Azerbaijanian
miz ‘table’ vs. Northern Azerbaijanian stol = Russian stol, riznâma ‘newspaper’ = Persian riznâma vs. gazeta = Russian gazeta, xâna dandan ‘tooth-
paste’ = Persian vs. dî pastasî = Russian zabâna pasto, materially consisting of
Azerbaijanian dît ‘tooth’ + pasta = Russian = Italian. There has been a particularly
strong Persian lexical influence on Khalaj and southern Khorsan Turkic (Doerfer,
1977: 179–183). In Khalaj, even numerals from sixty on and many temporal ex-
pressions are copied from Persian.

Global copies are often accommodated morphologically to fit the actual morphosyn-
tactic frame of the basic code. Copies of Persian lexical verbs are mostly based on glo-
bal copies of perfect participle forms. In order to adapt them, i.e. prepare them for
insertion, auxiliary verbs such as ete ‘do’ are used, e.g. Azerbaijanian putide elâ
‘cover’ = Persian putidan ‘cover’. Some Iranian varieties such as Tajik and Kurdish
use similar devices, posttirindé participles in -masi plus native auxiliaries, to copy
Turkic (Uzbek, Turkish, Azerbaijanian) verbs, e.g. north Tajik tâpîrîz ‘kardan
‘confide’-Uzbek tâpîrîn ‘confide’ (Doerfer, 1967: 33, 1993; for Kurmanji, see Balut
forthcoming).

Simple free grammatical copies

Global copies of grammatical items are also found in Irao-Turkic varieties. The free
ones include ez‘and’, tâ ‘up to, until’, ëm ‘for’ and xî ‘that’ (etc.), all used much
like their Persian originals. The use of *ki* must be analyzed in the framework of mixed copies. The same goes for *ta* and *ten* as purposive and causal junctions, respectively, since their use as global copies is connected with certain combinational patterns. For spoken Persian purposive clauses with *ke* and *ta*, see Laserd (1957: 236 ff.).

The function of copies of the Persian preposition *ta* in a Turkish frame is interesting. While they may maintain their position, as if they were prepositions, they generally need a postpositional native subjunctor to be syntactically anchored in the clause, e.g. Khurasan Turkic *ta äkäc diän [to (= Persian) end];dative to] ‘to the end’ (Fazzy, 1977: 74). This phenomenon is often called ‘double coding’, but the functions are not identical. The copied relation only specifies a semantic relation, whereas the native marker takes care of the anchoring. However, Khalaj deviates from this pattern by also using *ta* as an anchoring postposition, e.g. äkäk künkä *ta* [two day; dative to (= Persian)] ‘up to two days’, *ta dütge ko (= Persian) noon; dative to (= Persian) ‘until noon’ (Doerfer, 1988: 98), which is not possible in Azerbaijan varieties. Khalaj may even copy a Persian simple preposition such as *bi *without*, e.g. *bi sûm without you* (Doerfer, 1988: 97–98). This case is a mixed copy, since it also involves a copied combinational pattern.

**Bound grammatical copies**

Copies of bound grammatical items are rare. However, numerous Irano-Turkic varieties all over the area, Azerbaijanian, South Oghuzic and Khurasan Turkish dialects, use copies of the Persian comparative suffix *-tar* instead of the native *-ak*, e.g. Tebriz Azerbaijanian *hisnätar* ‘bigger’. The term signals a comparatively high degree of the property denoted, but to express a standard of comparison syntactically (‘than’), a native ablative suffix is required. Since the latter réinsor is sufficient to form a comparative construction, the addition of *-tar* is syntactically redundant (Johnsson, 1992: 26).

Some Irano-Turkic varieties also display copies of the suffix *-i*, considered to mark Persian nominals for ‘indefiniteness’, e.g. *kestîbi* ‘a book’. Turkic lacks an equivalent native marker, but possesses the indefinite article *bir*, corresponding to Persian *yek*. In Azerbaijanian, the suffix only occurs as part of complex copies, but in Khalaj, it is copied globally as such and also added to native items (Doerfer, 1988: 95). It can thus even be used, as in Persian, together with the indefinite article, e.g. *bi miftîri ‘a person*’ = *yek person*; *-i*. This is an example of a mixed copy: a global copy within a copied combinational pattern.

**Complex lexical copies**

Many Irano-Turkic varieties display complex global copies whose originals are lexeme combinations. Some varieties are formed with the Persian *izafat* relation (*yek*), which marks head-dependent relations in nominal phrases (Lazerd, 1957: 62 ff.). Copies of combinations of nouns with other nouns, adjectives or numerals are, like simple copies, provided with the necessary Turkish morphosyntactic markers, e.g. Tebriz Azerbaijanian *cyde novçüda [least izafat relation New Year] (= Persian); dative at] ‘at the New Year’s fest’. Non-final members of such complexes may even carry copies of Persian plural suffixes, e.g. Khurasan Turkish *isâmâyë *fazîr [masc/plural izafat relation]

Copies of prepositional phrases normally take Turkic case morphology to be able to occur adverbially, e.g. tebriz azerbaijanian dar tahlittar [in nature] [as Persian]:LOCATIVE] 'in nature' = dar tahlittar. Again, a native relativizer is required for the syntactic anchoring. But certain fixed expressions may dispense with this anchoring, e.g. be hâr hâl 'in any case' = be hâr hâl. They are often used as adjuncts (conjunctive adverbials), and some of the originals contain Persian demonstrative pronouns, e.g. be hamin sütar 'therefore' = be hamin sütar, dar in surat 'in that case' = dar in surat, gâhî az in = ahl az in 'before this'.

Complex grammatical copies

There are also globally copied complex items of a grammatical nature: complexes that have already been grammaticalized to relativators in the original text. Interestingly enough, such items are more susceptible to global copying than simple grammatical items. Simple Persian prepositions such as dar 'in', az 'from', be 'to' are only part of globally copied complex adverbial expressions, but there are also complex prepositions that are globally copied as such. They typically consist of a nominal core that conveys a specific content plus a simple preposition such as dar, az, and be that anchors them syntactically in the Persian clause. A frequent pattern is simple preposition + nominal core + zifat marker, e.g. az sabah [from reason zifat relation] 'because of'. A number of such constructions have been globally copied into various Turkish languages. (For causal junctions, see Johanson 1993b and 1996.) Irano-Turkic varieties display complex copies such as tebriz azerbaijanian dar murodet-e 'with respect to', dar hâr-yero 'concerning', az târîqe 'on the part of', Some may have a reduced shape, e.g. dar hadî 'within', concerning', dar hudûd 'about'. Other types are represented by sârej az 'outside', mîr hut 'concerning', geyr az 'except', be 'after'. Some of the copies seem to function as prepositions, which is remarkable in view of the dominant head-final syntax of Turkish. In reality, most of them cannot anchor a nominal phrase syntactically in a Turkish clause, but need the help of native relativators. Only in a few cases, e.g. geyr az 'except', be 'because', can they achieve a similar function, e.g. in the quality of a native anchor is not required. But sârej az 'outside' requires a locative suffix, az târîqe 'on the part of' and mîr hut 'concerning' a dative suffix, and dar hâr-yero 'concerning' an ablative suffix, e.g. dar hâr-yero wuxtîlîan 'concerning my childhood'. The prepositional copies specify the semantic content of the relation signalled, whereas native case markers or postpositions take over the syntactic anchoring. The syntactic properties of the global copy thus deviate considerably from those of the original. In all Iranian-influenced Turkish languages, a prepended be 'after' = hâl 'normally' needs a postposed relativator, e.g. Uzbek had az nûnâ [after meal,ABLATIVE] 'after the meal' (Boeschoten, 1983: 52). Khalaj may even use a synonymous Turkish postposition, e.g. bîd az akîkî kûndûrsoy ['after (= Persian) two days,ABLATIVE after'] 'after two days' (Doerfer, 1988: 98). But remarkably enough, Khalaj bîd az can also dispense with a native anchor, e.g. bîd az min 'after me'. As we will see, there is also a strong tendency to turn preposed items of this kind into postpositions.
The globally copied complex clause junctions include the causal junctor çünkü as well as the temporal junctions tâ ki ‘until’ = tâ ki, vaâ ki ‘while’ = vaqqi ke and nêği ‘he, she, it’ = nêği ke [noun + indefiniteness suffix + i + ki]. Besides the above-mentioned adjuncts of the type gâh ãz ‘in front of this’, there are also copies of the corresponding subordinators provided with ke, e.g. gâh ãz ‘in front of this’ = gâh ãz ke, na'd ãz ‘after’ = ba'd ãz ke, tâ inê ‘until’ = tâ inê ke.

Many of the complex junctions mentioned above represent mixed copies, since they are connected with copied combinational patterns.

Selective phonological copies

Structural properties can also be copied selectively on to items of the basic code. Copying of material properties occurs in several Iran-Turkic varieties. Thus, in South Oghuzic dialects and Khaliq, [0] and [j] have largely lost their roundedness under the influence of the Persian sound system, e.g. Khaliq ãx ‘day’; k3 ‘eye’. This phenomenon is seldom attested in Azerbaijanian and Quâlg’. Copies of phonological combinational patterns include disturbances of intervocalic sound harmony structures in Azerbaijanian. South Oghuzic and Khorasan Turkic, where nonharmonic suffixes are often found, e.g. Azerbaijanian el马m âx ‘do’. Khaliq has a weak harmony system, e.g. varjí ‘we went’, hâculâh ‘opened’ (itself) (Doerfer, 1983: 32). Quâlg’s is less affected by this phonological copying from Persian.

Copies of semantic properties

Numerous examples of semantic properties copied from Persian are found in the lexicon. Grammatical items are also affected. Thus, properties of the Persian perfect, consisting of the perfect participle + copula, e.g. safte est ‘has gone’, have been copied onto the Azerbaijanian item -îyãf[a]j/, which behaves as a typical postterminal with present relevance, e.g. gedibî ‘has gone’. In non-third persons, forms in -mîs are used, e.g. gelim Sanchez ‘I have come’. Without expressing the inferentiality typical of Turkish post-terminal -mîs items, e.g. gelim Sanchez ‘I have apparently come’ (Johansson, 1971: 280 ff.), the fact that -mîs forms do not signal inferentiality in Iran-Turkic varieties seems to be due to Persian influence. (For Khaliq, see Doerfer, 1988: 176.)

Properties of the Persian copula -îyãf[a]j ‘is, exists’ have been copied onto Turkic -dîr so that the latter may also express existence in the sense of ‘there is’, which is normally taken care of by the adjective var ‘existing’. (For the copula use in Khaliq, see Doerfer, 1988: 203.)

Syntactic combinational copying

Syntactic combinational copying is common. Thus, constituent order patterns may be copied, e.g. INDEFINITE ARTICLE+ ADJECTIVE ATTRIBUTE+ HEAD in Tehran Azerbaijanian hî ãsê adam ‘a funny man’, instead of ADJECTIVE ATTRIBUTE+ ARTICLE+ HEAD. The interrogative suffix -mîs, which has no Persian equivalent, is mostly absent and replaced by a special intonational pattern. Several Iran-Turkic varie- ties exhibit possessive constructions in which the adjective var ‘existent’ takes over combinational properties of the Persian verb dîsêtan ‘have’, e.g. Khaliq hâ suym.
In most Irano-Turkic varieties, the suffix -iK takes over properties of the Persian abstract suffix -i in globally copied items, e.g. Rajaei Azeri: der-istam (lit. 'taste') in Persian: der-e. 

Properties of Persian modal verb constructions expressing 'want', 'be able', 'have to' have been copied onto equivalent items in Irano-Turkic varieties, e.g. czyay bil: 'be able' + optative = tevəməstan + subjunctive, gürlən 'necessary' + optative = həyyat 'necessary' + subjunctive. The construction icə: 'want' + optative = xənamə + subjunctive has ousted the native construction -mAK + icə: (For Aynalz, see Kowalski, 1937: 66.) Combining these properties of the Persian infinitive are often copied onto the Southern Azeri: bəqənən verbal noun in -mAK, which may occur in genitive constructions such as -o evin alıməri [that house:GENITIVE buy:INFINITIVE:3:poss] 'the purchase of that house' (without passive marking) = xənamə xənəm. Similar constructions with intransitive verbs are known in Old Ottoman (Kleinmichel, 1973: 167 f.).

Postpositions modelled on prepositional patterns

There is a tendency to turn copies of Persian prepositions into postpositions, e.g., by copying properties of dəstit combinations on to Turkic possessive constructions. Turkic has declarative postpositions of the structure NOMINAL CORE + POSSESSIVE SUFFIX + SIMPLE RELATIVE corresponding to the Persian pattern SIMPLE PREPOSITION + NOMINAL CORE + IZAFAT RELATIVE. The nominal core is often a spatial noun such as id 'interior, arge back'. Given their special syntactic behaviour, these postpositions are not simply members of normal possessive constructions, but constitute a particular word class (Johanson, 1974).

The nominal cores are often global copies from prestigious contact languages, e.g. Turkish sehfelik [reason => Persian: sehf + Arabic: il] 'because of', təvəfən [side (=> Persian): il] 'on the part of', yənəxə [shadow (=> Persian): yənəxə] 'thanks to'. Comparing patterns under prepositions such as English because of (for the reason [+ Romance] of). Thus, postpositions such as Tebriz Azeri: məmənədən 'with respect to' are modeled on patterns such as dər mərəd-ə. Khala also exhibits postpositions of a more reduced shape, e.g. təfr (+'dative' 'towards', where only the nominal core ('side') is left. As is well known, complex nouns tend to undergo formal simplification in the course of their grammaticalisation processes.

Combination of copying in clause junction

There are many other types of syntactic combinational copying. In the area of clause junction, Turkic techniques concerning the use of junctors and aspectual-temporal items have been replaced by Persian ones. Head-initial Persian patterns tend to replace head-final patterns of the Turkic type. Combinational copying has led to new place-
ment patterns. In all Turkic varieties under strong Persian influence, finite clauses placed in front of their heads have largely been replaced by postposed clauses with finite morphology, formed according to Persian patterns. Most syntactic copying in the area of clause junction is mixed, the junctors being global copies of Persian originals (see below).

Copying of frequentional properties

Frequentational properties are often copied to the effect that a given element increases its frequency. In Iranian Turkic varieties, Persian plural marking has induced a wider use of the Turkic plural suffix, namely on predicates occurring with collective nouns such as mardom 'people' (constructio ad sensum). However, the use of plural markers after certain quantifiers, e.g. Tbriz Azerbaijani čex adanam [many make] plurals, 'many men'—cf. Turkish çok adan [many men]—is basically an example of combinatorial copying. Persian influence has also led to a more frequent use of vâ and ki as sentence-introducing items in the sense of 'and then, moreover'.

Copying frequentational may affect the use of constituent ordering patterns. As in spoken Persian and Kurdish, adverbials of direction and purpose are often postposed, e.g. Tebriz Azerbaijani O geddi Tefif [he go-past Tiflis-dative] 'He went to Tiflis'. Mán vârûm ama baxmaya [I sit-past dative look-infinitive-dative] 'I sat down to watch it'. (vâ mean instead ē began-ē to. The tendency is not observed in clauses embedded according to native Turkic rules, e.g. evâ ēdâna [house-dative go PARTICIPLE LOCATIVE] 'when going home'.

Spoken Persian often uses sentence-initial问候als to the so-called nominative pensens marking a sentence topic which is not necessarily referentially identical with the first actant (subject). The referent can be taken up again in the sentence with a properly case-marked anaphoric pronoun item in the proper syntactic position. (For this technique, see Windfuhr, 1976: 72.) Iranian Turkic varieties often display similar initial sentence topics, e.g. Tebriz Azerbaijani Dâdâti vâ: ē yazibâl [father-NOM situation good COPULA PAST] 'As for his father, the situation was good'. Such patterns are also observed in other Turkic languages, e.g. Ottoman Turkish, it seems appropriate to speak of frequentational copying in this case.

Frequentional copies in clause junction

Certain Iranian-Turkic clause junction types are frequentational properties of Persian originals. Their increased use means decreasing frequency of participle and converses. Relative clauses with attributed participles are rare. Forms with the participle suffix -(y)an are predominantly used as nouns. This corresponds to the restrictive use of the Persian present participle -andā which has lost many of its verbal properties and passed into the category of nouns (Lorenz, 1964: 137). This tendency is observed in all Iranian Turkic varieties, Azerbaijani, Khorasan Turkic, Khalaь, etc. (For Khalaь, see Doerffer, 1988: 232; for Aghan Uzbek dialects under strong Iranian influence, see Thalhammer, 1978: 83; Boeschoten, 1983: 44.)

The decreasing use of Turkic clause-combining techniques has led to a reduction of Türkic subjunctives. Tebriz Azerbaijani has preserved the temporal junctors -(y)andā 'when', -(y)annan xora 'after', -(y)annan gabax 'before'. Terminal and
Mixted copies

Mixed copies consist of copied combinatory patterns with at least one Turki native item. Besides complex global copies of the type rûc be rûc 'day by day', many Turki language also have synonymous mixed copies such as gûm be gûm 'day to day' Persian day). In Irano-Turkic varieties, most phraseological verbs consisting of a nominal item and an auxiliary verb are mixed copies of Persian originals. The nominal item is copied globally, and the auxiliary is a Turki verb, mostly dâ- 'do, make' = kordan, onto which combinational properties of the original are copied, e.g. Tebriz Azerbaijanian tâdlâ elân 'endeavour' = Persian taflâ kordan 'endeavour', telefon var [telephone strike] 'call' = Persian telefon zadan 'call'. Some variants are sold selective copies, containing both an equivalent Turki nominal and a Turki auxiliary, e.g. sângal var [beard strike] -êtî var [beard (= Persian) xîrke] 'shave' = -êtî zadan. Historically, they often represent a later stage of development than the mixed copies.

While the tâflât construction is normally not copied to be used with Turki items, Khalaj offers examples that include one Turki member, e.g. balâlî wâdîr [village (Turki)] tâflât relâtor another 'another village' = dibîl dîgâr (Doerfer, 1988: 99). Mixed copies with a native item as first member are also possible in Tebriz Azerbaijani, e.g. bâlî bê màtsû [fish (Turki)] tâflât relâtor particular 'the particu-
lar fish'. (For Khorasan Turkic and Afghan Uzbek, see Fazíy, 1977: 70 and Bowechohn 1983: 51, respectively.)

Semantic and combinational properties of Persiaun grammatical items are sometimes copied onto Turki units in order to use them analogously. Thus, the Turki demonstrative pronouns bu 'this' and o 'that' may occur in mixed copies such as Tebriz Azerbaijani g¡bî az bu 'before this' = g¡bî az in, ba'd az 'after that' = ba'd az ìn. Such adverbial copies may also be anchored syntactically by means of Turki postposi-
ions, e.g. g¡bî az ìn yêwûx 'before that', ba'd az ìn yêwûx 'after that'. Tebriz Azerbaijanian also uses zavadan k 'after', a mixed copy of the Persian subjunctive ba'd az în. This kind of selective copying seems to presuppose the existence of corre-
globally copied grammatical items.

Mixted copies with junctors

As we have stated, several copies of combinational patterns discussed above are in reality mixed copies. An extreme case is Khalaj bi sê 'without you' with a global copy of a preposition together with its combinational pattern.

In all Ilron-Turkic varieties, the preferred way of linking a dependent clause to its head by means of a junctor has been changed. Copies of Persian subordinate clauses are mostly finite postpositive predications with globally copies free junctors. (See the
parameters discussed in Johanson (1993b and 1996). The postpositive relative clauses are usually marked with the junctor ki = ke. Many copies of this versatile Persian rela-
tor do not behave as genuine subjunctors in the basic codes they are inserted into. They are often used as conjunctors, even if the original may be subordinate. The same is true of many other junctor copies.

On the other hand, there are obviously cases of genuine embedding of clauses intro-
duced by copies of Persian subjunctors. Such clauses differ considerably from corre-
sponding structures in languages such as Turkish. For example, Irano-Turkic causal clauses marked with cânê or dön 'because' may precede the clauses they are in con-
struction with. This is not possible with Turkish cânê clauses, which are not subordi-
nated in the sense of being syntactically embedded. The complex topic of determining subordinate structures cannot be dealt with in depth here.

The new combinational patterns involve changes in the position of the junctors. The pattern: predication + junctor is changed into: junctor + predication, e.g. 'X come-when' > 'when X comes'. Subjunctors mostly occur at the periphery of the depen-
dent with which they form a constituent. They tend to stand behind a dependent that precedes them, and in front of a dependent that follows it. Ordering patterns and 
subjunctor types are thus closely interconnected. Subjunctors cannot be copied into 
incongruous structures, i.e. copies of Persian subjunctors cannot be inserted directly 
into Turkic frames to fill the slots of postpositions or converb markers. In Irano-
Turkic varieties, most native subjunctors except the simple case markers have been 
replaced by copies of prepositive junctors. The resulting patterns are thus strongly 
frame-changing (Johanson, forthcoming).

The result of cyclic copying processes

Copying has led to considerable morphosyntactic convergence of the Persian and 
Irano-Turkic codes. On the other hand, copies always differ from their originals. Conventionalised copies are immediately subject to the normal grammaticalisation 
processes of the basic code, which creates further differences. The contact varieties 
thus often display structures found neither in Iranian nor in less Iranianized Turkic var-
ieties. An original may even disappear, whereas its copy remains in the recipient code and 
develops further there. For example, the above-mentioned unit -mil, which serves to 
accommodate copies of Uzbek verbs in Tajik, is unproductive in Uzbek.

Continuous copying may still lead to increasing similarity of the codes involved. More equivalence positions for insertion of new copies are created. By incorporating 
new items and structures, the basic code is permanently reshaped to form the basis for 
new frame-changing developments. A dynamic grammar concept is needed to account 
for the snowball effect of these successive copying processes.

The analysis of copying may prove very problematic if the periods of contact and 
influence are as protracted as in the case of the Irano-Turkic symbiosis. We must 
reckon with cyclic renewals of basic codes, a permanent creation of new leks prepared to 
integrate new copies. It is mostly impossible to decide what is inserted and what 
constitutes the native code at a given point in time. Deeply affected languages such as 
Khalaj contain layer after layer of copies constantly changing the basic frame.

What would finally appear if all these Iranian layers could be neatly peeled off one 
after the other? The oldest form of Turkic known to us seems to be influenced by
Iranian, and there are even reasons to suspect that the oldest form of New Persian is influenced by Turkic. What is the hard Turkic core like? Given the scanty materials at our disposal, it seems that historical Turkology will never be able to answer this question. Its work will, at best, be more like peeling a number of concentric coats of an onion. Understanding more recent copying processes will, however, also give insights into deeper layers.

NOTES

1 A research project currently being carried out at the University of Mainz is devoted to aral processes in South Asia and West Iran, comprising the two work groups 'Areal typology of South Alamanic dialects' and 'Typological change in Turkic varieties of West Iran'. The project attempts to determine what dynamic processes emerge through contact and influence of normative centres, and what roles the tension between centres and peripheral play. The ultimate goal is a synthesis of the emergent and development of varieties under areal-typological aspects.
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