Werk

Titel: Articles

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001|LOG_0010

An anchorage for Turkic language studies

Lars Johanson

The journal *Turkic Languages* is an international periodical devoted to Turkic language studies in a broad sense, established to meet the growing scholarly interest in the languages of the Turkic-speaking world and to promote the development of linguistic Turcology. It is intended to be a common forum for scholars of various theoretical orientations, an anchorage for all kinds of serious studies in the field, committed to both tradition and innovation. It aims at presenting a variety of topics of interest to a wide range of readers. Besides articles, review articles and reviews, *Turkic Languages* will contain reports on interesting scholarly activities.

Lars Johanson, Institute for Oriental Studies, Turcology, University of Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany.

Introducing Turkic Languages

The journal *Turkic Languages* introduced with this issue aims to be an international scientific periodical devoted to Turkic language studies in a broad sense. Its goal is to meet the rapidly increasing scientific interest in Turkish and other languages of the extensive Turkic family.

While planning this journal, the editors have received highly positive reactions from numerous scholars in the field. Currently, there is no central forum for Turcological linguistics, and the existing journals of Oriental studies can only devote rather limited space to Turkic language studies. It is often difficult to find one's way through the thicket of periodical literature containing relevant contributions.

Moreover, the last two decades have seen the emergence of strong currents of Turkish and Turkic language studies outside traditional Turcology. The lack of a common forum has led to unnecessary barriers between different circles with basically similar scholarly interests. The results achieved within one group have often remained unknown to other groups. It is necessary to overcome such hurdles, which have

seriously hampered Turkic linguistics in its evolution and prevented it from establishing standards. Many people active in the field have stressed the need to revive linguistic Turcology in all its aspects.

As a result of recent political developments, Turkic languages of Central Asia and other areas have attracted considerable general attention. In spite of their growing importance, however, Turkic language studies have by no means attained the position they merit. Turcology faces serious problems when trying to cover its enormous field of study in a reasonable way. Joint efforts of scholars of different orientations are needed to help incorporate Turkic studies into education systems around the world. It is hoped that *Turkic Languages* will at least be able to contribute positively in this direction.

Language studies

Turkic Languages will be concerned with the languages of the entire Turkic-speaking world and cover descriptive, historical, comparative, areal, social, typological, acquisitional as well as other aspects. The scope of interest will not be restricted to linguistic issues in a narrow sense; however, Turkic language data must play a central role in all contributions. Discussions on questions of philology, literature, oral texts, history, etc. are most welcome provided they are based on language data. Contributions basically dealing with theoretical issues but referring to Turkic data will also have a natural place in the journal.

Attention will be paid to genetic, typological and contact relations with other languages, in particular Altaic (Mongolic, Tungusic, etc.), Paleoasiatic, Indo-European (Iranian, Slavic, Germanic, Greek, etc.), Uralic, Chinese. We also invite representatives of neighbouring disciplines to submit articles on topics of common interest. In order to set and maintain high theoretical and methodological standards, linguistic Turcology needs stimulation "from outside" as well.

Coexistence and exchange of ideas

While the editors do have their own theoretical orientations and preferences, the journal as such is not committed to any linguistic theory. The editorial policy will be open-minded rather than dogmatic, the primary goal being a reasonable qualitative level. We welcome all well-argued and methodologically sound contributions based on available knowledge.

As a result of this flexibility, many readers will certainly find a good deal of controversial material in the journal, for example, in questions concerning theory and method or the genetic affiliation of Turkic languages. Different opinions will be allowed to coexist and even clash, provided they are properly argued and free from insulting personal attacks. The diversity that arises when many currents flow together will certainly stimulate a fruitful exchange of ideas.

Tradition and innovation

It is hoped that the journal will promote the development of Turkic linguistics by bringing together scholars dealing with Turkic data under different perspectives. The journal is meant to be an anchorage for all kinds of serious Turkic language studies, a platform where scholars of different traditions and orientations may come together to talk and listen to each other, to establish contacts and interconnections. This should provide for innovation and contribute to the broadening of the perspectives in a field where there is still so much more to discover.

Tradition is no less important—a certain continuity based on knowledge accumulated in the field. The journal would like to contribute to the development of a certain culture in this respect in order to preclude "the invention of the wheel" over and over again. Authors are therefore asked to try to take notice of previous work relevant for their topics. It is hoped that the very existence of *Turkic Languages* will facilitate the much-desired flow of information.

A path of communication

While Europe-based in the sense of being edited by a group of European scholars, the journal will be open to contributions from all directions of the compass. All those engaged in Turkic language studies, however geographically dispersed, are invited to support the journal by submitting articles, reviews, etc. Each volume should contain a balanced mixture of topics that interest a wide range of readers. Since one goal is to reach a broad international readership, the preferred language of publication will be English.

Turkic Languages will also publish reports on interesting ongoing scholarly activities (projects, research groups, conferences, etc.), making it possible for readers to keep up-to-date on research initiatives.

The ultimate aim is thus to clear a path of communication through the landscape of Turkic language studies.

Der neuen Zeitschrift *Turkic Languages* zum Geleit

Karl H. Menges

Menges, Karl H. 1997. Der neuen Zeitschrift *Turkic Languages* zum Geleit. *Turkic Languages* 1, 7-13.

In his welcoming address to the new journal, the author gives a short sketch of the development of Turkic studies and the concomitant attempts of creating an appropriate periodical of Turkic studies. Interest is focused on the then center of Turcology in Berlin with its treasures from Turfan, and the small, but efficient staff of scholars around Willi Bang-Kaup. The author, himself a scholar from the Berlin circle, experienced the development after Turcology's first success and, after World War I, the increasing material difficulties. The situation in Russia as well as that in Europe are discussed, and the creation of some Turcological periodicals is given due attention. No attempt at a thorough and complete evaluation is attempted here.

Karl Heinrich Menges, Orientalisches Institut der Universität Wien, Universitätsstraße 7 / V, A-1010 Wien, Österreich.

Wir von der alten Türkologengeneration, die wir noch den Begründern unserer Wissenschaft zu Füßen saßen, können uns sehr gut daran erinnern, daß wir damals, vor 60, 70 Jahren, das Fehlen einer türkologischen Zeitschrift als einen großen Mißstand empfanden. Kurz vor der Jahrhundertwende sind die Orxon-Inschriften entziffert worden, und kurz nachher wurden die ersten Turfan-Funde bearbeitet und unter anderen Sprachen das Ujgurische einwandfrei gelesen, das sich alsbald in seiner ganzen Bedeutung als große Kultursprache Central-Asiens, das nunmehr Türkistan geworden war, erkennen ließ. Es gab damals in Deutschland wie überhaupt in Mittel- und West-Europa eine stattliche Reihe von germanistischen, romanistischen, klassisch-philologischen Zeitschriften, es gab sogar eine vorzügliche *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, auch bedeutende semitistische und aegyptologische, von welchen einige im Zusammenwirken mit der archaeologischen For-

schung entstanden waren. Gerade dieser letztere Umstand, die Zusammenarbeit von Archaeologie, Philologie und Linguistik, traf für die Türkologie in vorher ungeahnter Bedeutung zu, aber zu der Gründung einer eigenen Zeitschrift kam es nicht, obwohl der Deutsche Kaiser die Forschungen in der Oase von Turfan aus seinen privaten Mitteln nachhaltig unterstützte.

Wieso es nie zur Schaffung einer türkologischen Zeitschrift kam, ist mir unbekannt; es läßt sich nur mutmaßen, daß, wenn es dafür sachliche Gründe gab, die Vielschichtigkeit der Turfan-Forschung es nicht zu einer solchen Gründung kommen ließ. Es wäre damals ohne Zweifel die beste Lösung gewesen, eine Zeitschrift der Turfan-Forschung ins Leben zu rufen, in welcher nicht nur türkologische, sondern auch iranistische, toxarologische und sinologische Themen behandelt worden wären. Da das aber nicht zustandekam, mußten diese wie auch die türkologischen Arbeiten in allen möglichen Zeitschriften und Serien untergebracht werden.

So erging es dann der Türkologie, daß zwar die Arbeiten über zu den Turfanfunden gehörige Texte und sonstige Materialien von der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin veröffentlicht wurden, daß aber Forschungsergebnisse der Türkologie, sowohl aus Turfanfunden, wie auch aus anderen Quellen, in anderen Zeitschriften oder Serien veröffentlicht werden mußten, auch nicht selten in solchen, die nicht hauptsächlich orientalistische waren, wie z.B. *Le Muséon* in Louvain oder die Akten der Kgl. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Brüssel, in welchen Willi Bang einige seiner bedeutendsten Studien veröffentlicht hat, abgesehen von Veröffentlichungen seiner Arbeiten in anderen Zeitschriften wie der *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde* des *Morgenlandes, Túrán, Keleti Szemle* u.a., und dann später den Ungarischen Jahrbüchern, die eine ganze Anzahl türkologischer Beiträge von Bang wie auch seinen Schülern veröffentlichten. Rein topographisch gesehen, waren die *Ungarischen Jahrbücher* das Nächstliegende, denn sie wurden vom Ungarischen Institut der Universität Berlin herausgegeben, in welchem Bangs Türkologische Abteilung wie auch die Finno-Ugrische untergebracht war.

Im Ausland lagen die Dinge sehr ähnlich: nirgends gab es eine specielle türkologische Forschungs- und Lehreinrichtung, sogar nicht einmal in England mit dem Britischen Museum, in welchem ein Großteil der von Sir Aurel Stein aus Ost-Türkistan eingebrachten Sammlungen zur Verfügung stand. Als Universitätsfach war weder Centralasienkunde

noch Türkologie vertreten. Erst mit und nach dem II. Weltkrieg hat sich die Lage etwas verändert, da das Türkische, vornehmlich das Alt- und Neu-Osmanische, immerhin auch als Lehrfach eingerichtet wurde. In Frankreich mit seiner Tradition von Études turques und ihrer Vertretung an der Sorbonne befaßte man sich ebenfalls vornehmlich mit dem Osmanischen, obwohl schon zu Ende des XVIII. Jhdts. auch "turc oriental", d.h. Čagatajisch, beachtet wurde und Pelliot in der ersten Hälfte dieses Jahrhunderts grundlegende Forschungen zur Türkologie und Mongolistik durchgeführt hat.

Im Gegensatz zu Deutschland, England und Frankreich hat Rußland schon immer, seit seiner Existenz und seiner unmittelbaren Nachbarschaft, nicht nur peripherisch und in weiter Ferne, mit türkischen und anderen altajischen Völkern zu tun, im vollen Sinn dieses Begriffs, und nach der Ausbreitung des Russischen Reiches über ganz Nord-Asien und tief nach Central-Asien hinein wurden die Beziehungen zu altajischen Völkern, vornehmlich den türkischen, immer intensiver. Die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit ihnen setzte erst im XVIII. Jhdt. mit einigen Versuchen ein, entwickelte sich aber zu regelrechten türkologischen Studien erst mit Castréns Forschungen in Sibirien um die Jahrhundertmitte und denen Radloffs von den 1860'ern ab. Das war in Rußland eine ganz andere Situation als in Europa: es war nicht die fast ausschließliche Beschäftigung mit dem Osmanischen, sondern gleichzeitig und vordringlich die mit einer Reihe anderer Türksprachen, von welchen das Čagatajische als große Literatursprache und als *lingua franca* nicht nur in Türkistan, sondern auch jenseits seiner Westgrenzen von großer Bedeutung war, so daß sich dadurch notwendigerweise für Rußland neue Interessengebiete eröffneten. In Rußland waren türkische Sprachen Universitätsfach von 1811 ab in Kazaň, von wo dies 1854 nach St. Petersburg als Centrum verlegt wurde, und existierte dort auch noch nach der Umgruppierung zahlreicher wissenschaftlicher Institute 1919 und in späteren Jahren. In Kazaň wurde die Türkologie in die Missions-Abteilung der Geistlichen Akademie eingegliedert. Nach seinen wegbereitenden Feldforschungen im Altaj wurde Radloff nach St. Petersburg berufen, womit der Beginn der wissenschaftlichen türkologischen Forschung in Rußland angesetzt werden kann.

` Rußland war mit den *Izvestija* der Akademie der Wissenschaften in St. Petersburg / Leningrad, später dann in Moskau, und den zahlreichen anderen Publikationsreihen, *Zapiski, Soobščenija, Doklady* u.a. Reihen der Akademie wohl versorgt, aber eine speciell türkologische Zeitschrift,

die auch dort durch die Funde in Türkistan und der Mongolei bereichert
worden wäre, gab es nicht und schien auch nicht geplant gewesen zu
sein. Ab und zu erschien ein türkologischer *Sbornik* (Sammelband),
später oft in den Hauptstädten türkischer Republiken wie Samarqand,
Taškent, Baku, Ufa oder Kazaň, aber erst lang nach Ende des II. Welt-
krieges kam es zur Gründung der *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* in Baku, in
der dann türkologische Arbeiten aus der gesamten Sovet-Union,
manchmal sogar auch aus dem Ausland, erschienen, und damit einen
gewissen, wenn auch beschränkten Einblick in den Gang der türkologi-
schen Forschung dort erlaubten.

Zurück nach Berlin: Bang war nicht dazu zu bewegen, die Gründung
einer türkologischen Zeitschrift auf sich zu nehmen. Er war damals zu
sehr von seinen ujgurischen Textstudien in Anspruch genommen und
lehnte unser Ansinnen mit dem Hinweis auf sein Alter – er war damals
gerade 60 geworden – und die mit der Gründung einer Zeitschrift ver-
bundenen Mühen ab, was er, wie auch früher schon, mit der Mahnung
abschloß, das müßten einmal wir Jüngeren in besseren Zeiten unterneh-
men. Es kamen aber Nazismus und Krieg, und noch eine längere Zeit
nach dem Krieg konnte man nicht an eine solche Gründung denken,
sondern begnügte sich mit den vorhandenen bekannten Publikations-
möglichkeiten.

Der Initiative einiger Gelehrter ist es zu verdanken, daß die *Ungari-
schen Jahrbücher* 1952 in neuer Form mit einem auch officiell beträcht-
lich erweiterten Forschungsgebiet als *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* unter
die Herausgeberschaft des bisherigen Herausgebers der *Ungarischen
Jahrbücher*, Julius von Farkas, und der Schriftleitung von Omeljan
Pritsak ab Band 24 weitergeführt wurden. Der Ausbreitung der For-
schung auf den beiden verwandten Sprachgebieten entsprechend sind
die *Ural-Altaischen Jahrbücher* im Lauf ihrer weiteren Existenz die ein-
zige mit diesem Aufgabenkreis reichhaltige und umfangreiche Zeitschrift
geworden. Da von den beiden Gebieten vordringlich die Türkologie
bearbeitet wurde, – eine Folge der Fachvertretung an den Universitäten,
die ja nicht von strikt-wissenschaftlichen Gesichtspunkten bestimmt
war, – hat sich ein größerer Bedarf an Publikationen auf türkologischem
als dem anderer altajischer Sprachen ergeben. Angesichts dieser
Umstände konnte der junge Türkologe H. Váry nach längerem Lehr-
und Studienaufenthalt in der Türkei die *Materialia Turcica* 1975 ins
Leben rufen, die somit ihrem Namen gemäß die einzige türkologische

Zeitschrift in Deutschland wie auch anderen westlichen Ländern wurden und sich bald allgemeiner Wertschätzung erfreuten.

In Ungarn hatten schon einige Jahre nach dem I. Weltkrieg *Túrán* und *Keleti Szemle* ihr Erscheinen einstellen müssen, und in Deutschland ist die Mitte der 20'er Jahre gegründete Zeitschrift *Morgenland* nicht über das 1. Heft hinausgekommen. Türkologische Arbeiten wurden nach wie vor von allgemein-orientalistischen oder hauptsächlich semitistischen und islamwissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften wie *der Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Der Islam* u.a. veröffentlicht, selten in weitergespannten Zeitschriften wie *Journal Asiatique* oder *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*. Der vom Islamwissenschaftler Helmut Ritter gegründete *Oriens*, der sehr bald von Rudolf Sellheim weitergeführt wurde, konnte sich durch hauptsächlich islamwissenschaftliche Beiträge gut entwickeln. In ihr haben nicht nur semitistische, sondern auch türkologische Beiträge Aufnahme gefunden. Nicht so glücklich war *Le Monde Oriental* in Schweden, der die Zeit des II. Weltkrieges nicht mehr erlebte; er war in Titel und Thematik allgemein-orientalistisch und wurde später durch *Orientalia Suecana* ersetzt, die auch türkologische Arbeiten veröffentlichten.

Im Wesentlichen von den Turfan-Forschungen und damit zusammenhängenden Problemen inspiriert war die Gründung des *Central Asiatic Journal* im Sommer 1952. Der 1. Halbband erschien 1955, und die Initiatoren können nun auf eine ununterbrochene Reihe von 40 Bänden zurückblicken. Die ganze Anlage dieser Zeitschrift hat schon von Anfang an für ihre Thematik einen großen Spielraum erlaubt, welcher ganz dem Charakter der Central-Asien-Forschung allgemein und Turfan speciell entsprechend die große regionale wie auch thematische Weite der Zeitschrift bedingt.

In Polen nahm immer der *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* und in der ČSR, jetzt ČR, das *Archiv Orientální* die Anliegen der Türkologie wahr, während in Ungarn nach dem II. Weltkrieg meist die Specialabteilungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften auch für die Türkologie offenstanden.

Der Balkan hat trotz – oder gerade wegen? – seiner halbtausendjährigen Beherrschung durch die Osmanen und seiner Bekanntschaft mit diesen wie mit anderen türkischen Völkern und Eroberern auf türkologischem Gebiet relativ wenig geleistet. Nur die Bulgaren haben sich angesichts der von ihnen schließlich doch anerkannten altajisch-türkischen

Herkunft bis zu einem gewissen, leider doch noch ungenügenden Grad mit der Türkologie befaßt.

Die Türkei leidet immer noch an einem beträchtlichen Nachholbedarf; obwohl an Veröffentlichungsmöglichkeiten kein Mangel herrscht, ist die Zahl und Qualität der ausgebildeten Kräfte immer noch für die Bedürfnisse des Landes viel zu gering, was der über lange Jahre betriebenen Bildungspolitik zuzuschreiben ist.

Die Lage der Türkologie in Korea und Japan ist in vielen Hinsichten *sui generis* und kann daher hier nicht skizziert werden. In keinem der beiden Länder gibt es türkologische Zeitschriften, wohl aber orientalistische und philologische Reihen, die auch türkologische Beiträge bringen, gelegentlich auch solche mit Bezugnahme auf die eigenen Sprachen.

Die Türkologie wurde in den USA im Jahr 1942 an der Columbia University mit dem Klassisch-Ujgurischen officiell eingeführt. Da man sich im Krieg der Notwendigkeit guter Sprachkenntnisse von vorher dortzulande selten oder gar nicht betriebenen Sprachen bewußt wurde, hat sich die Türkologie parallel zu den an mehreren Universitäten eingerichteten praktischen Kursen ("intensive language courses") des Neu-Osmanischen entwickelt. Während nur zwei, später drei Universitäten die Türkologie als solche aufrechtzuerhalten bemüht waren, verschwand sie nach Kriegsende immer mehr aus dem Interessenkreis der einzelnen Institute wie leider auch der Geldgeber, so daß sich die Studenten anderen Fächern wie Slavistik, von der sie oft herkamen, oder Anthropologie (im Sinne der Ethnologie in Europa) zuwandten. Mit der Emeritierung der Initiatoren des Faches wurde oft auch das Fach selbst geschlossen. Immerhin ist es erfreulich, daß das von Şinasi Tekin begründete, ab 1976 an Harvard University erscheinende *Journal of Turkish Studies* weiterhin existiert und trotz seinem Titel nicht auf das Osmanische beschränkt ist.

In Frankreich mit seinem altbewährten, reichhaltigen *Journal Asiatique* wurden schließlich in den frühen 70'er Jahren die *Turcica. Revue d'Études turques*, directeur-fondateur Irène Mélikoff, an der Universität Straßburg ins Leben gerufen.

In Rußland wie auch seinen sovetischen Successorenstaaten hat es lange Zeit keine einzige türkologische Zeitschrift dieses Namens gegeben, ohne Zweifel, weil man dort vorzügliche Publikationsmöglichkeiten bei der Akademie der Wissenschaften und ihren Filialen im ganzen Reich mit vielfältigen, oft wenig übersichtlichen Veröffentlichungsreihen außer und neben den zahlreichen *Izvestija, Zapiski, Soobščenija* etc.

und den recht häufig erscheinenden *Sborniki* zur Verfügung hatte. Schließlich wurde in Baku erst 1970 die *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* gegründet, in der auf Grund der Lehr- und Forschungstätigkeit in der Sovet-Union die lebenden Türksprachen im Vordergrund standen resp. stehen. Nach der Wende 1990 lautete der Name der Zeitschrift *Tjurkologija*, die dann aber nicht mehr lang existierte und ab 1994 ihr Erscheinen einstellte. Sie erlaubt einen gewissen Einblick in das wissenschaftliche Geschehen in der Türkologie dort, ist aber, wie auch andere Zeitschriften, noch nicht im Stande gewesen, die neugewonnene Freiheit auch in der Wissenschaft zum Durchbruch zu bringen. Die Thematik ist daher wie die früherer Bände noch nicht auf dem Niveau einer echten wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift.

Die hier nur kursorisch skizzierte Situation auf dem Gebiet türkologischer Zeitschriften ist diejenige, in welche die jetzt von Professor Lars Johanson gegründete Zeitschrift *Turkic Languages* eintreten wird. Sie ist nach dem Wunsch ihres Begründers eine vornehmlich sprachwissenschaftliche, im besten Sinn dieses Begriffes, vergleichend-historisch, diachronisch, wie auch rein-beschreibend, synchronisch, außerdem lexikologisch und etymologisch, ohne dabei die sprachliche Entwicklung der neueren und neuen Literatursprachen der einzelnen türkischen Völker unberücksichtigt zu lassen. Eine Zeitschrift mit derart weitgesteckten Zielen an der Schwelle des III. Jahrtausends zu begründen, ist eine sehr erwünschte, notwendige und mutige Tat, der die Türkologen und Altajisten der Welt entgegensehen und dem Gründer ihre herzlichsten Glückwünsche für die erfolgreiche Durchführung seiner großen Aufgabe übermitteln.

Turkic languages and linguistic typology

Bernard Comrie

Turkic languages are frequently cited as examples of languages having particular typologically interesting properties, such as vowel harmony, agglutinative morphology, left-branching syntactic structure, and nonfinite means of complex sentence formation. However, the very Turkic phenomena that are typically cited in basic typological handbooks turn out to be even more interesting from a typological viewpoint when viewed in more detail. Some illustrative examples are cited to demonstrate this, from the domains of vowel harmony, agglutination, and relative clause formation.

Bernard Comrie, Department of Linguistics GFS-301, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1693, USA.

1. Introduction

At first sight it might seem strange to make a plea, as I shall, for greater cooperation between the fields of Turkic linguistics and linguistic typology, because already many features of Turkic languages play an important illustrative role in language typology. Thus Turkish is as often as not the language chosen to illustrate vowel harmony, with examples like *çocuk-lar-ımız* child-PL-1PL 'our children' versus *ev-ler-imiz* house-PL-1PL 'our houses' showing that a given word must have either all back vowels or all front vowels. A linguist wishing to illustrate agglutinative morphology will as likely as not dip into Lewis (1967: xx) and select an example like *çalış-tır-ıl-ma-malı-y-mış* work-CAUS-PASS-NEG-NEC-COP-INFER 'they say that s / he ought not to be made to work'. For illustration of left-branching (head-final) word order, a typologist will probably choose between Japanese and Turkish, the latter being selected, for instance, by Comrie (1989: 87-91), with the following examples:

(1)   *Hasan   öküz-ü   al-dı.*
      Hasan   ox-ACC   buy-PST
      'Hasan bought the ox.'

(2)   *büyük şehir*
      big   city
      'the big city'

(3)   *kadın-ın   tavuğ-u*
      woman-GEN   chicken-3SG
      'the woman's chicken'

(4)   *adam için*
      man   for
      'for the man'

(5)   *(adam-ın   kadın-a   ver-diğ-i)   patates*
      man-GEN   woman-DAT   give-VN-3SG   potato
      'the potato (that the man gave to the woman)'

An example like 5 (where the brackets mark clause boundaries) from Turkish is more likely than not to be used to illustrate nonfinite means of combining clauses into complex sentences.

In fact, each of the phenomena mentioned above, and many other features of Turkic languages as well, turn out to be much more interesting from a typological viewpoint once one starts to examine them in more detail, noting not only the finer points of individual Turkic languages, but also the finer differences among Turkic languages, and also some differences between Turkic and some other languages, differences that are not obvious from the gross observations that examples like 1-5 are typically used to illustrate. In sections 2-4 below, I shall examine three of these phenomena, namely vowel harmony, agglutinative morphology, and the Turkic relative clause as illustrated in 5.

2. Vowel harmony

While Turkish or some other Turkic language is frequently used to illustrate vowel harmony, the Turkic languages in fact illustrate only one type of vowel harmony, namely vowel harmony where the vowels of affixes are affected by the vowel of the stem, more strictly in Turkic,

given the suffixing nature of the languages, where the vowels of suffixes are affected by the last vowel of the stem. Note that this more precise formulation—requiring, of course, still further precision to cover all cases—requires us to consider also the exceptions to vowel harmony, as when the plural of Turkish *elma* 'apple' is *elma-lar*, not **elma-ler*, the back / front quality of the suffix vowel being conditioned by the back / front quality of the last stem vowel, neglecting the quality of preceding vowels.

A radically different kind of vowel harmony, called dominant / recessive vowel harmony, is illustrated by Chukchi, a language of the Chukotka peninsula in Russia's Far East. In Chukchi the vowels form dominant / recessive pairs e_1 / *i, o* / *u, a* / e_2. As in Turkic languages, words often consist of several morphemes, and all the vowels of a word must belong to the same vowel harmony class. If at least one morpheme in a Chukchi word has a dominant vowel, all other vowels in the word must shift to their dominant counterpart. For instance, the lexical morpheme *milg-* 'match' is recessive, while the lexical morpheme *poyg-* 'spear' is dominant. The essive case suffix *-u* is recessive, while the comitative suffix *-(ə)ma* is dominant. (The comitative suffix requires the co-presence of the recessive prefix ge_2-, though this will be omitted from the following discussion, for the sake of ease of presentation). Combining these morphemes together gives us: recessive + recessive (no change) *milg-u* 'as a match'; dominant + recessive (change in the second morpheme) *poyg-o* 'as a spear'; (recessive +) recessive + dominant (change in the first morpheme) *ga-melg-əma* 'with a match'; (recessive +) dominant + dominant (no change): *ga-poyg-əma* 'with a spear'. In other words, in the Chukchi type of vowel harmony the vowels of roots are just as likely to have to change in combination as are the vowels of affixes, since certain vowels are dominant by nature of their phonetic quality, and not, as in Turkic languages, by virtue of their position in the morphological structure of the word.

Another issue that concerns Turkic vowel harmony from a typological and theoretical viewpoint is the proper treatment of exceptions to vowel harmony. The general problem of the proper treatment of exceptions remains one of the great unsolved controversies of phonological theory, with two diametrically opposed approaches. One, characteristic particularly of generative phonology in the 1960s and illustrated for Turkish by Lees (1961), assumes that morphemes should be given an abstract underlying representation so that phonological rules can operate

regularly. The other assumes that such abstract phonological representations should be disallowed, the exceptional nature being described in some other way, for instance by means of lexical exception features. Abstractness was a major issue in phonological theory in the 1960s and 1970s, and although it is no longer at the forefront of theoretical phonological discussion, it should not be thought that the problem has been solved. Rather, phonological theorists have turned to other problems, such as the relation between regular phonological alternations and articulatory phonetics, problems where the issue of abstractness tends not to arise.

While the problem of abstractness arises in the analysis of vowel harmony in many Turkic languages, a particularly interesting case is presented by Uyghur, as a result of various historical changes, in particular the merger of the front vowel *i* and the back vowel *ï*. The analysis presented in Hahn (1991: 45-52) is abstract, and thus represents *kiymä-* 'not wear' as /kiy-mA-/ wear-NEG, but *qiy-ma* 'not cut' as /qïy-mA-/ cut-NEG, following the usual convention of using capital letters to represent vowel archiphonemes in suffixes, i.e. the surface vowel distinction in the suffix syllable is represented underlyingly as a vowel distinction in the stem syllable. The umlauting of the stem vowels *a* and *ä* before a following *i* (also *ï* on the abstract analysis) gives rise to further possible applications of abstract representations, as when *beriškä* 'to the giving' and *berišqa* 'to the going' are distinguished as /bär-Iš-GA/ and /bar-Iš-GA/, with the surface distinction again falling on a vowel different from the one that marks the distinction underlyingly. (The vowel of the suffix /-Iš/ is actually epenthetic on Hahn's analysis, but this does not affect the question at issue.) A further complication is added by the fact that instances of *i* arising through raising do not trigger umlaut, so that surface *a* appears before surface *i* in *barimän* 'I will go', underlyingly /bar-a#män/ (with *män* part of a new vowel harmony domain). The complex interaction of these phonological alternations, leading to the opaqueness of many of the environments originally responsible for individual alternations and elegantly described by Hahn using the abstract approach, would be worthy of attention by any phonologist interested in either the theoretical issue of abstractness or the typology of exceptions to vowel harmony.

3. Agglutinative morphology

The agglutinative nature of Turkic morphology, both derivational and inflectional, is well known to typologists, as is its contrast with fusional morphological systems such as that of Russian, and indeed a comparison similar to 6 below is given in Comrie (1989: 44):

		Turkish *adam* 'man'		Russian *lipa* 'lime-tree'	
		SG	PL	SG	PL
	NOM	*adam*	*adam-lar*	*lip-a*	*lip-y*
	ACC	*adam-ı*	*adam-lar- ı*	*lip-u*	*lip-y*
	GEN	*adam-ın*	*adam-lar-ın*	*lip-y*	*lip-Ø*
	DAT	*adam-a*	*adam-lar-a*	*lip-e*	*lip-am*
	LOC	*adam-da*	*adam-lar-da*	*lip-e*	*lip-ax*

(6) appears at the left of the table header.

(Both paradigms are partial.) In Turkish, we find constant realization (subject to purely phonological variation such as vowel harmony) of the plural morpheme and of the case morphemes, while in Russian number and case are fused into non-segmentable case–number morphemes, like accusative singular *-u* and dative plural *-am*. The agglutinative nature of Turkish morphology is further illustrated by such words as *çalış-tır-ıl-ma-malı-y-mış*, cited in section 1.

But a question that always arises with morphological typology is: Can we go any further with typological morphological distinctions of this kind? What *follows* from such differences among languages? For at least part of the answer to this question, we must turn to two perhaps surprising areas, namely first language acquisition and language contact.

One of the most solid and interesting results from the cross-linguistic study of first language acquisition is that agglutinative morphology, as in Turkic languages, is much easier to acquire than is fusional morphology, as in the morphologically more conservative Indo-European languages like the Slavic languages. As noted by Slobin (1986: 275), children acquiring Turkish as a first language have fully mastered nominal inflection by the end of their second year, whereas children acquiring a language with fusional inflection, such as Serbo-Croatian, *never* master the nominal inflection system by the end of their second year. It is rare that one can make a decisive claim about a language or some part of a language being more or less complex than another language or the cor-

responding part of another language, but here we have a clear case, at least judging on the evidence from first language acquisition, that agglutinative morphology is simpler than fusional morphology. (This, of course, still leaves open the question of whether one can measure the relative complexity of entire languages, or whether simplification in one area is likely to be matched by complexity in some other.)

In his study of language contact involving Turkic languages, Johanson (1992) notes that the agglutinative (as opposed to fusional) nature of the morphology of Turkic languages has proved an "attractive" property for borrowing, as can be seen that a number of languages in contact with Turkic languages have become more agglutinative, less fusional, in the aftermath of this contact. A nice example is provided by the comparison of nominal declension in Classical Armenian and Modern Eastern Armenian, as in 7, using the noun *ban* 'word, thing'; only the forms of the nouns are cited, omitting prepositions, etc. that are conventionally cited in Armenian paradigms:

		Old Armenian		Modern Eastern Armenian	
(7)		SG	PL	SG	PL
	NOM	*ban*	*ban-kʻ*	*ban*	*ban-er*
	DAT	*ban- i*	*ban-icʻ*	*ban-i*	*ban-er-i*
	ABL	*ban-ē*	*ban-icʻ*	*ban-icʻ*	*ban-er-icʻ*
	INS	*ban-iw*	*ban-iw-kʻ*	*ban-ov*	*ban-er-ov*
	LOC	*ban-i*	*ban-s*	*ban-um*	*ban-er-um*

Of the number-case forms cited, in Classical Armenian only the instrumental plural is agglutinative in structure, whereas in Modern Eastern Armenian all the plural forms are transparently agglutinative, as in Turkish.

However, Johanson goes on to note that while, given a choice between agglutination and fusion, agglutination seems to be the more attractive, when faced with long agglutinative strings like *çalış-tır-ıl-ma-malı-y-mış*, languages in contact with Turkic have refused to adopt such extremes, i.e. such long agglutinative strings have not proven to be attractive. The crucial distinction can be captured using Sapir (1921)'s indices of fusion and of synthesis. Turkish has a low index of fusion, i.e. morphemes are usually readily segmentable, and this is more attractive than a high index of fusion, as in a fusional language. Turkish also has a high index of synthesis, i.e. words on average consist of a rela-

tively large number of morphemes, and this is unattractive relative to a low index of synthesis. In other words, what seems to be attractive is a low index of fusion combined with a low index of synthesis. It would be interesting, incidentally, to see if this same unattractiveness of a high index of synthesis in language contact also translates into the requirement of a longer time for first language acquisition. Such information as I have suggests that it does not, i.e. that children acquiring Turkish as a first language do not experience any undue problems with long strings of morphemes like *çalış-tır-ıl-ma-malı-y-mış*, so that there seems to be an interesting research area teasing out the factors that lead to different evaluations of "attractiveness" for differences of morphological typology under the differing conditions of language contact and first language acquisition.

4. Relative clauses

Turkish relative clauses, as in 5, repeated here as 8, have a number of typologically interesting properties, but there is one in particular that will interest here, namely the absence of any pronominal element in the relative clause referring back (or forwards) to the head noun, as in the literary English construction of 9 with the relative pronoun *whom*, or the colloquial English construction of 10 with the personal pronoun *it*:

(8)   *(adam-ın   kadın-a   ver-diğ-i)   patates*
      man-GEN   woman-DAT give-VN-3SG   potato
      'the potato (that the man gave to the woman)'

(9)   *the man (whom I saw)*

(10) *the road (that I don't know where it leads)*

The question arises as to how to analyze relative clauses like 8, with no pronominal reference to the head noun within the relative clause. At least two major possibilities offer themselves. First, one could analyze them in a manner similar to that for the types illustrated in 9-10, claiming that at some level of analysis there is a direct object noun phrase in the relative clause, but that this has a zero realization. Alternatively, one could claim that at no level of representation does the relative clause of 8 have a direct object, and that the precise relation between the modifying clause

and the head noun is established by pragmatic, rather than syntactic means.

This second analysis is proposed for the seemingly very similar construction of Japanese (11) by Matsumoto (1988):

(11) *(gakusei   ga   kat-ta)   hon*
       student   NOM   buy-PST   book
       'the book (that the student bought)'

A striking piece of evidence in its favor in Japanese is that one can have modifying-clause structures that are superficially identical to 11 but which cannot receive an interpretation with a "missing" noun phrase in the modifying clause, as in 12:

(12) *(sakana   ga   yake-ru)   nioi*
       fish   NOM   cook-PRS   smell
       'the smell (of fish cooking)'

(*Yakeru* in 12 is an intransitive verb; a literal translation into pseudo-English would be 'the smell that fish cooks'.) Another factor in its favor is that the basic structure of 11 does not change if one relativizes on some constituent other than the direct object, e.g. the subject, as in 13:

(13) *(hon   o   kat-ta)   gakusei*
       book   ACC   buy-PST   student
       'the student (who bought the book)'

How do Turkic languages measure up against the typological split between languages like Japanese, where there is evidence against positing a "deleted" noun phrase in modifying clauses, and languages like English, where there is clear evidence for such an analysis—in the case of English in the form of an overtly realized pronoun? As shown in more detail in Comrie (forthcoming), on the basis of work assisted by students of Turkic languages at the University of Mainz, Turkic languages seem to fall into two groups, the one behaving like Japanese, the other like English; the latter group, which includes Turkish, does so despite the absence of an overt pronominal element. One of the languages belonging to the first group is Karachay-Balkar. In Karachay-

Balkar, as in Japanese, the same relative clause construction is used for relativizing on both subjects, as in 14, and on direct objects, as in 15:

(14)   *(kitab-ï   al-γan)   oquwču*
       book-ACC   buy-PRT   student
       'the student (who bought the book)'

(15)   *(oquwču   al-γan)   kitap*
       student   buy-PRT   book
       'the book (that the student bought)'

Karachay-Balkar also uses the same basic construction in examples paralleling Japanese 12:

(16)   *(et   biš-gän)   iyis*
       meat   cook-PRT   smell
       'the smell (of meat cooking)'

Turkish, however, uses different constructions depending (approximately) on whether a subject or a non-subject is relativized, with a participial construction as in 17 for a subject and a verbal noun construction as in 18 for a non-subject:

(17)   *(kitab-ı   al-an)   öğrenci*
       book-ACC   buy-PRT   student
       'the student (who bought the book)'

(18)   *(öğrenci-nin   al-dığ-ı)   kitap*
       student-GEN   buy-VN-3SG   book
       'the book (that the student bought)'

Moreover, Turkish does not allow the construction as in 16.

In other words, detailed consideration of Turkic relative clauses suggests that a typological "isogloss" runs through the Turkic languages, with languages like Karachay-Balkar on the one hand following a pattern that is widespread in Asia, while other languages like Turkish follow a pattern—namely sensitivity to the syntactic position that is relativized on—that is typical of European languages, even if the Turkish construction in more superficial respects, such as the absence of pro-

nominal reference to the head within the relative clause, resembles that of other Turkic languages rather than that of mainstream European languages. Whether the Turkish pattern reflects the historical interaction of Turkic and European syntactic patterns would be a subject worthy of further study.

5. Conclusion

In this article, I have tried to show that cooperation between Turkic linguistics and typological linguistics must go beyond just scratching the surface of the typological properties of Turkic languages. Yet in these few remarks I have in turn been able only to scratch the surface of these further possibilities for cooperation between the two fields. It is my hope that future contributions to *Turkic Languages* will develop this cooperation further.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	NEG	negative
ACC	accusative	PASS	passive
CAUS	causative	PL	plural
COP	copula	PRS	present
DAT	dative	PRT	participle
GEN	genitive	PST	past
INFER	inferential	SG	singular
INS	instrumental	VN	verbal noun
NEC	necessitative		

References

Comrie, Bernard 1989². *Language universals and linguistic typology.* Oxford: Blackwell, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, Bernard (in press). Attributive clauses in Asian languages: towards an areal typology. In: Boeder, W. & Schroeder, Ch. & Wagner, K.H. & Wildgen, W. (eds.) *Sprache in Raum und Zeit. In memoriam Johannes Bechert. Band 2: Beiträge zur empirischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Hahn, Reinhard F. 1991. *Spoken Uyghur.* Seattle, London: University of Washington Press.

Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten.* (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Band 29, Nr. 5.) Stuttgart: Steiner.

Lees, Robert B. 1961. *The phonology of modern standard Turkish.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matsumoto, Yoshiko 1988. Semantics and pragmatics of noun-modifying constructions in Japanese. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 14, 166–175.

Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: an introduction to the study of speech.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Slobin, Dan I. 1986. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. In: Slobin, Dan I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics.* (Typological Studies in Language 8.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 273–294.

Turkish language reform: the episode of the Sun-Language Theory

Geoffrey L. Lewis

The Sun-Language Theory, which saw Turkish as the most ancient of languages, was the brain-child of Atatürk, himself an enthusiastic amateur etymologist. His motive in launching the theory is still disputed among Turkish scholars. Was it to justify abandoning the campaign to replace the Arabic and Persian words in the Turkish vocabulary with native equivalents, once it had become clear that these were not always possible to find? Was it to legitimize the fashionable pastime of concocting Turkish etymologies for manifestly non-Turkish words? The article suggests that he launched the theory simply because he believed in it.

Geoffrey L. Lewis, St Antony's College, Oxford OX2 6JF, Great Britain.

Readers of *Turkic Languages*, especially those acquainted with Uriel Heyd's masterly little book (Heyd 1954), will know something of the tragicomic story of Turkish language reform. The present article enlarges on one chapter in that story.

Atatürk's purpose in putting his personal authority and the power of the State behind the reform was to rid Turkish of its Arabic and Persian vocabulary. In 1932 the *Söz derleme seferberliği*—word-collection mobilization—was started, in order to find native equivalents for all the words doomed to oblivion. After some months, when the impossibility of the task had become obvious, it was announced that words, whatever their origin, that were current among the people, were to be regarded as Turkish. This sensible provision, however, could have made little impression on those reformers who had chosen the opposite course, which was to devise Turkish etymologies for Arabic words. Atay (1965, 1969: 478) tells of a discussion at a meeting of the Dictionary Commission about possible replacements for *hüküm* 'judgment':

"Naim Hazım Hoca was sitting on my right, Yusuf Ziya on my left. I said, 'There's no equivalent for it. Let's keep it.' They both replied 'Impossible!' I turned to my right and said, 'Professor, you say that the origin of Arabic is Turkish. You claim as originally Turkish any word we cite from the Koran.' I turned to my left. 'And you, Professor, maintain that all languages derive from Turkish. You resort to all kinds of dodges to show that the French *chambre* is derived from *oda*. And now, when it comes to a word like *hüküm*, which has entered into village speech, the two of you dig your toes in.' We had quite an argument. After the meeting, I met my friend Abdülkadir in the upper corridor of Dolmabahçe Palace. He it was who had once said to me, 'I know most of the dialects of the Asian Turks. I also understand the dialect spoken by people like you and Yakup Kadri. If there's one dialect I can't make head or tail of, it's the dialect of the Turkish Language Society.' On this occasion he said, 'You look worried. Tell me what words are bothering you and I'll find Turkish origins for them.' 'Well,' I replied, 'there's this word *hüküm*.' 'Don't worry,' he said, 'tomorrow we'll make *hüküm* Turkish.' Next day he quietly put into my hand a slip of paper on which he had noted that some dialects had a word *ök* 'intellect', and that in several of them it took the form *ük*. I had myself discovered that in Yakut there was a word-building suffix *üm*. The rest was easy: *ük* plus *üm* had in the course of time become *hüküm*. When the meeting began, I said, '*Hüküm* is Turkish,' and gave a full account of what I had learned, which reduced the two Professors to silence. We had laid the foundations of the science of—I won't say fakery, but flim-flam. [Uydurma demiyeyim de yakıştırmacılık ilminin temelini atmıştık.] That evening I gave Atatürk a report on the Commission's proceedings and he was delighted that we had won so important a word by this fabrication. What he wanted us to do was to leave as many words in the language as possible, so long as we could demonstrate that they were Turkish."

Atatürk, that is to say, was satisfied that *hüküm* could be reprieved now that it had been provided with a Turkish pedigree. Although he amused himself by finding Turkish etymologies for foreign words, he did not really believe that all languages derive from Turkish; the consequence of such a belief would have been to retain all the Arabic and Persian elements in the language, which was the opposite of his intention. So for a short time he seized on the *öztürkçe*—'pure Turkish'—words produced by the reformers and used them in his speeches and letters.

Turks refer to the speech he made on 3 October 1934, at a banquet in honour of the Swedish Crown Prince and Princess, *as baysal utkulu nutuk*, the speech characterized by *baysal utkusu*, this expression standing out as the oddest of all. It contains three French words, *Altes Ruvayâl* and *Prenses*, and only one word of Arabic origin, *tarih* 'history' (or two if we count *tüm* 'all'). It also contains some startling neologisms. Here is a sample sentence (full text and glossary in Levend 1972: 424-426):

> "Avrupanın iki bitim ucunda yerlerini berkiten uluslarımız, ataç özlükerinin tüm ıssıları olarak baysak, önürme, uygunluk kıldacıları olmuş bulunuyorlar; onlar, bugün, en güzel utkuyu kazanmıya anıklanıyorlar: baysal utkusu."— 'Our nations, which hold firm their places at the two extremities of Europe, in full possession of their ancestral qualities have become the agents of tranquillity, progress and harmony; today they are preparing to win the most beautiful victory of all: the victory of peace.'

The speech was composed in Ottoman and then translated into öztürkçe. An eyewitness (Tankut 1963: 125) noted that Atatürk delivered it "with the awkwardness of a schoolboy who has just begun to read". This self-inflicted injury must have vexed him greatly, for he was a proud man and a master of his own language, possessing the rare gift of being able to extemporize lengthy Ottoman periods of the kind that others might struggle for hours to compose. One can only imagine his mortification, after all the effort he had invested in the language reform. And then there appeared a *deus ex machina*: along came Kvergić.

Some time in 1935, Atatürk received a 47-page typescript in French, entitled "La Psychologie de quelques éléments des langues turques", by a Dr Hermann F. Kvergić of Vienna. The theme was that man first realized his own identity when he conceived the idea of establishing what the external objects surrounding him were. Language first consisted of gestures, to which some significant sounds were then added. Kvergić saw evidence for his view in the Turkish pronouns. *M* indicates oneself, as in *men* the ancient form of *ben* 'I', and *elim* 'my hand'. *N* indicates what is near oneself, as in *sen* 'you' and *elin* 'your hand'. *Z* indicates a broader area, as in *biz* 'we' and *siz* 'you'. Further, Kvergić considered that Turkish was the first human language to take shape. Nothing could have been more timely.

Two months before, a copy of the paper had been sent to Ahmet Ce-
vat Emre, the chairman of the grammar section of Türk Dil Kurumu, the
Language Society, who after a cursory examination dismissed it as un-
substantiated and worthless. Atatürk was more impressed, partly be-
cause having discussed it with Emre he suspected that the latter's rejec-
tion of it was due to his seeing in Kvergić a potential rival. "To me," he
said, "the psychological analyses look important." He thought that
primitive man might well have given vent to exclamations like "Aaa!"
and "Ooo!" and that language could have emerged from utterances of
this kind. He passed the paper on to İbrahim Necmi Dilmen, the secre-
tary-general of the Language Society, and said, "It looks important; have
it evaluated." Dilmen talked it over with Hasan Reşit Tankut, Naim
Hazım Onat and Abdülkadir İnan, who saw merit in the psychological
analyses (Emre 1960: 342-346). The result of Atatürk's subsequent
lucubrations, aided by these and others of the staff of the Society, was
Güneş-Dil Teorisi, the Sun-Language Theory, which saw the beginning
of language as the moment when primitive man looked up at the sun and
said "Aaa!"

That vocable, *ağ* in Turkish spelling, was the "first-degree radical of
the Turkish language". It originally meant sun, then sunlight, warmth,
fire, height, bigness, power, god, master, motion, time, distance, life,
colour, water, earth, voice. As man's vocal mechanisms developed,
other vowels and consonants became available, each with its own shade
of meaning. Because the primeval exclamation was shouted, and it is
obviously easier to begin a shout with a vowel than with a consonant,
any word now beginning with a consonant originally began with a
vowel, since abraded. The words *yağmur* 'rain', *çamur* 'mud' and *ha-
mur* 'dough', for example, are compounded of *ağmur* 'flowing water'
preceded by *ay* 'high', *aç* 'earth' and *ah* 'food' respectively. (The reader
is urged not to waste time searching the dictionary for the last four
words.)

The Third Language Congress (Dil Kurultayı), in 1936, was domi-
nated by what Heyd (1954: 34), with admirable restraint, refers to as
"this amazing theory". Atatürk's responsibility for the theory is not dis-
puted, though clearly he did not do all the donkey-work. Dilâçar (1963:
50) says that the paper on the application of the analytical method of the
theory, described in the agenda as the work of İsmail Müştak Mayakon,
who read it to the Congress on 27 August 1936, was wholly due to Ata-
türk.

The first hint of what was coming was in a paper entitled "The sun, from the point of view of religion and civilization" presented on the first day by Yusuf Zıya Özer. The theory was mentioned only at the very end:

> "It must be seen as quite natural that the sun, which plays so important a part in human culture, has ... exercised no less influence on language too ... We should therefore take pride in the fact that the Sun-Language Theory has been propounded as a product of the Turkish scientific outlook, which has been linked to the sun since time immemorial."

Dilmen began the next day with a lengthy outline of the theory, proving, among other things, the identity of English *god*, German *Gott* and Turkish *kut* 'luck'. The proof is simple enough: *Gott* is *oğ* + *ot*, *god* is *og* + *od*, *kut* is *uk* + *ut*. He avoids explaining the second *t* of *Gott* by spelling it with only one *t*. Similar moonshine was delivered on that second day and three following days, the sixth day being given over to the foreign scholars.

Space does not permit a full examination of the material presented to the Third Congress, much as one would like to go into the content of papers with such intriguing titles as Tankut's "Palaeosociological language studies with panchronic methods according to the Sun-Language Theory" and Dilâçar's "Sun-Language Anthropology". Emre's contribution, however, deserves a word, because Zürcher (1985: 88) describes him as "l'un des rares linguistes un peu sérieux de la Société".

Although Emre had expressed his contempt for Kvergić's "La Psychologie de quelques éléments des langues turques", a work which was not devoid of sense, he was wildly enthusiastic about the Sun-Language Theory. At the Third Congress he presented a paper called "Terminoloji ve Güneş-Dil Teorisi" (TDK 1937: 190-209), mostly on the origin of the French borrowings *filozofi*, *filozof* and *filozofik*, all of them commonly supposed to be from the Greek *phil-* 'to love' and *sophía* 'wisdom'. Having learned that the etymology of Greek *phil-* was doubtful, he had evidently decided that the word was his to do with as he would, to the following effect.

> "As the Sun-Language Theory shows, no word originally began with a consonant, so the first syllable of *filozof* was *if* or *ef*, and in its primitive form *ip* or *ep*. Now *ip* or *ep* in Turkish meant 'reasoning power' [this is no

better founded than his preceding assertions]. Further, the Greek *phil-* is supposed to mean 'to love' or 'to kiss'."

Emre rejected the first sense, because Aristotle used *sophía* alone for 'philosophy', so the *philo-* could only be an intensifying prefix, having nothing to do with love. On the other hand he accepted the second sense, because *ip*, besides meaning 'reasoning power', was clearly the same as the Turkish *öp-* 'to kiss'. Next, the original form of *philo-* was *ipil-*, the function of the *il* being "to broaden the basic meaning of the *ip*", and this was obviously the same word as *bil-* 'to know'. As for *sophía*, that did indeed mean wisdom; compare *sağ* 'sound, intelligent' and *sav* 'word, saying'. In short, *filozofi*, *filozof* and *filozofik* were Turkish, so there was no need to create replacements for them.

The impact of the theory on books and articles published during its brief reign is easily recognized. Turning the pages of İnan's book (1936), for example, you see it to be a compendium of notes mainly on the history of the language and on its dialects, particularly that of the Kirghiz. Then, after a discussion of various views on the etymology of the name, you come across the following and know you have left the realm of scholarship for the land of the Sun-Language Theory:

	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)
Kırgıy	(ık	+	ır	+	ıg	+	ıy)
Kırgız	(ık	+	ır	+	ıg	+	ız)

This table purports to show the components of the words *Kırgız* and *kırgıy*, the latter being the Kazak-Kirghiz word for falcon, a bird which may have been the Kirghiz tribal totem. Then comes the analysis. *Ik* is the first-degree principal root, representing abrupt motion, *ır* confirms the root meaning, *ıg* is the object or subject over which the abrupt motion recurs, while *ıy* is the expression and nominalization of this. The first three elements of *Kırgız* and *kırgıy* are identical in form and meaning, but one of the final elements ends in *y*, the other in *z*. The explanation is that the function of *ıy* was to turn the word into a noun. In the totemistic period all surrounding subjects and objects were the same, but once the concepts of distance and the individual had emerged, all such subjects and objects, starting from the centre, the ego, were expressed by the element *z*. To his credit, İnan at this point loses interest in the Sun-

Language Theory and goes on to talk about his experiences among the Kirghiz.

Atatürk's faith in his theory must have been shaken by the reactions of the foreign guests at the 1936 Congress, a distinguished group including Alessio Bombaci, Jean Deny, Friedrich Giese, Julius Németh, Sir Denison Ross and Ananiasz Zajączkowski. One, variously referred to as Bartalini, Baltarini and Balter, and variously described as Lector and Professor in Latin and Italian at Istanbul University, mentioned it tactfully in the course of a graceful tribute to Atatürk and the new Turkey:

> "La théorie de la langue-Soleil, par son caractère universel, est une preuve nouvelle de la volonté de la Turquie de s'identifier toujours davantage avec la grande famille humaine."

Four of them did not mention it at all in their addresses to the Congress or subsequent discussion, two thought it "interesting". One agreed that all human speech had a common origin, but saw that origin in Sumerian rather than Turkish. Two wanted more time to think about it. The only foreign guest to swallow it whole was Kvergić, who volunteered the etymology of *unutmak* 'to forget':

> "Its earliest form was *uğ+un+ut+um+ak*. *Uğ*, 'discriminating spirit, intelligence', is the mother-root. The *n* of *un* shows that the significance of the mother-root emerges into exterior space. The *t / d* of *ut* is always a dynamic factor; its role here is to shift the discriminating spirit into exterior space. The *m* of *um* is the element which manifests and embodies in itself the concept of the preceding *uğ-un-ut,* while *ak* completes the meaning of the word it follows and gives it its full formulation. After phonetic coalescence, the word takes its final morphological shape, *unutmak*, which expresses the transference of the discriminating spirit out of the head into the exterior field surrounding the head; this is indeed the meaning the word conveys." (TDK 1937: 333)

About Atatürk's motive in launching the theory, opinions differ. Did he deliberately take up Kvergić's idea of the antiquity of Turkish and develop it in order to justify ending the purge of words of Arabic and Persian origin?

Karaosmanoğlu (1963: 110) saw in the theory "a concern with seeking a new shape, a middle way, for his attitude to language". Hatiboğlu

(1963: 20) is more explicit: Atatürk put the theory forward to end the impossible situation in which satisfactory replacements could not be found for words that were being expelled from the language.

Banarlı (1972: 310-311) is of the same opinion:

> "Atatürk tried öztürkçe and took a personal part in the efforts in this direction. As the experiment advanced, however, this same Atatürk saw quickly and clearly what sort of impasse the Turkish language and Turkish culture had been dragged into by those vying with each other to bastardize the whole thing. Eventually he took upon himself the duty of rectifying the situation and, by a stroke of tactical genius, availed himself of the Sun-Language Theory to drop the öztürkçe experiment."

So is Ercilasun (1994: 89):

> "The conclusion emerging from all these brochures and articles written by Atatürk is this: one of his aims when launching the Sun-Language Theory was to give up excessive purification and to ensure the survival in the language of such words as *millet* 'nation', *mühim* 'important' and *sabah* 'morning' ..."

Ertop's (1963: 90) view is quite different:

> "Those who assert that the Sun-Language Theory was used by Atatürk in order to limit the purification are overlooking Atatürk's personality. He never refrained from acting decisively and radically in any matter which he believed might affect the good of the nation ... He did not use the theory as a means of turning the clock back; had he believed in the necessity for such a move, he would have made his ideas plain, openly and directly."

This argument has some force, but it is harder to accept Ertop's subsequent remarks, which reflect the views of the many adherents of the old Language Society[1] who refuse to believe that Atatürk abandoned the campaign to "purify" everyday speech. He goes on to offer what he calls clear proof that the theory was not advanced with the aim of slowing the

---

[1]   That is, the Society as it was before 1983, when it was in effect nationalized as part of a new Atatürk Cultural, Linguistic and Historical Institution linked to the Prime Minister's office.

pace of language reform: *(a)* work on the reform went on after the theory was propounded, *(b)* technical terminology continued to be put into pure Turkish, and *(c)* Atatürk busied himself with linguistic concerns almost until his death. While all three statements are accurate, they are irrelevant to the question of whether or not Atatürk had tired of the campaign to purge the general vocabulary and concocted the Sun-Language Theory to justify abandoning it. The basis of all three items of "proof" is the fact that, while he sometimes tried his hand at finding öztürkçe equivalents for items of general vocabulary, his overriding concern was with technical terms.

Heyd's statement (1954: 36) that the Sun-Language Theory gradually faded out after Atatürk's death needs to be modified; the theory had already begun to fade out during his lifetime, and interest in it evaporated the moment he died. Tankut says (1963: 125) that the theory was carried to excess by people out to make a name for themselves, and Atatürk eventually abandoned it. There are several pieces of evidence that he was still interested in it in 1937. One is Özden's testimony (see next paragraph) that the topic was still alive in March of that year, another is that Atatürk was still corresponding with Kvergić in September 1937. A third is that in that month the seventeenth session of the Congrès International d'Anthropologie was to be held in Bucharest, and Atatürk decided that a Turkish delegation should go there to make the theory known to the learned world (Tankut 1963: 123-125). According to a report subsequently presented to Atatürk, the paper was well received, but as the proceedings of the congress were never published this cannot be confirmed.

Âkil Muhtar Özden was a highly respected medical man who served on the Language Commission (Dil Komisyonu). Among his notes on a session held on 8 March 1937 are these (Tevfikoğlu 1994: 100-113):

> "Atatürk at once began to deal with the question of technical terms. He asked what I had been doing. I told him I was working on the lines he had indicated and that I was having difficulty in applying Sun-Language to abstract words. He asked for an example. The word *muvazi* ['parallel'] came to mind. The analysis started immediately. It was proved that *parallel* was Turkish."

Others of his notes read: "atom (Türkçe)" and "Geometri (Türkçe)", with no explanation of the first assertion and, for the second, a terse "ge=gen=geniş"; i.e. the first syllable of *geometri* is not the Greek *gē*

'earth' but the Turkish *geniş* 'wide'. On *poligon* he made two notes: "Türkçe / Pol=bol / gen=en" and "gen=geniş / poligon (genişliği çok)." These can be expanded as follows: *Poligon* is Turkish. *Pol* is *bol* 'abundant', *gen* is *en* 'width' and *geniş* 'wide'; *poligon* means 'of much width'. Later on comes an analysis of *likid* 'liquid': "*Likid* (Türkçe) Yg-il- ik-id-ēy Yg=Katı İl=Bunu namütenahiye kadar uzaklaştıran, yani yok eden ek. (İlik Türkçe katı olmayan bir şey demektir)." In other words, *liquid* is Turkish, originally *yg-il-ik-id-ey*. *Yg* means 'hard'. *İl* is the suffix removing it to infinity, i.e. annihilating it (*ilik* ['marrow'] is Turkish, meaning a thing which is not hard).

The foregoing instances of the application of the theory are not cited just for their inherent fun. They also demonstrate the unscholarliness of the officers of the Language Society (as well as of Dr Kvergić) who unblushingly delivered themselves of such drivel in public. And these people and others like them were largely responsible for the creation of öztürkçe, a fact which explains why so much of it violates the rules of the language.

A dispassionate examination of the evidence leads to the following conclusion. When Atatürk launched the theory, it was not with the express intention of justifying a change of course. He had decided that a change was due, because he had seen the futility of trying to make the mass of the people give up their ancestral vocabulary. On the other hand, he could not abandon his declared purpose of liberating Turkish from the yoke of foreign languages (Arsal 1930: 1). Language was his hobby. He loved playing at etymology and he may have persuaded himself that the Turkish derivations he and others found for the ostensibly non-Turkish elements in the language could be justified. He was already toying with the notion that "what made man aware of his identity was the sun" before he had read Kvergić's paper, which asserted the antiquity of Turkish (but did not mention the sun). The elements of the Sun-Language Theory all came together in his mind and he published it. It was not an excuse to justify a change of policy; it was a systematization of his ideas. He launched the theory because he genuinely believed in it; he started to abandon it when he saw that foreign scholars regarded it as nonsensical. He must also have sensed that the best native opinion too, though scarcely outspoken, was on their side.

A related topic that may conveniently be discussed here is the much debated question of whether Atatürk, while adhering to the new techni-

cal terms, many of which he devised himself, gave up the use of neologisms for everyday concepts.

There is no shortage of misrepresentations of his attitude; here is one specimen (Gültekin 1983: 72):

"After 1936 he saw the extremist aspects of the purification campaign and he corrected them. But can one deduce from this that he withdrew from the language movement which he initiated in 1932? ... Atatürk did not return to pre-1932 Turkish. It is well known that in 1937 he himself worked especially on the purification of scientific language. Again, his bequest of a share in his estate to the Language Society shows that he wanted the work on language, which he initiated in 1932, to continue."

And another (Yücel 1982: 36):

"If one may speak here of coincidence, it is by an interesting coincidence that the year [1936] in which the name Türk Dili Tetkik Cemiyeti was changed to Türk Dil Kurumu was, according to a view frequently advanced by some, the year in which Atatürk realized that this kind of undertaking was a dead end, i.e., that *he had made a mistake*, and put a stop to the purification exercise. If one bears in mind *(a)* that until the end of his life Atatürk was very closely involved in the Language Society's endeavours and, more important, *(b)* that he directed these endeavours along the lines of his own views, and *(c)* that this change of name could not possibly have been made without his knowledge, then ... one is bound to state categorically that in giving permission for such a change Atatürk fell into an inconsistency."

The italics, which are Yücel's, must be intended to point to the enormity of the implication. Atatürk was in fact not afraid to admit that he was fallible, but idolatry, by definition, denies the humanity of its object. By italicizing these words, Yücel seems to reject the possibility not only of Atatürk's making a mistake but of his realizing that he had done so.

To disprove the common assertion that he never returned to pre-1932 Turkish, we need only examine the proof-texts, his own speeches and writings. While in general exhibiting a desire to avoid using words of Arabic origin if Turkish synonyms—or synonyms he believed to be Turkish—existed, they show that he was no longer going out of his way to give up the words he had used all his life in favour of unnecessary neologisms. Since 1933, 26 September had been celebrated as Dil Bay-

ramı, the Language Festival. The vocabulary of his telegrams to the Language Society on this occasion is worthy of study. Those he had sent in 1934 and 1935 had been couched in öztürkçe throughout.[2] They included such words as *kutunbitikler* 'messages of congratulation', *orunlar* 'official bodies' and *genelözek* 'general headquarters', none of which proved viable. The 1936 telegram contained four words of Arabic origin: *mesai* 'endeavours', *teşekkür* 'gratitude', *tebrik* 'congratulation' and *muvaffakıyet* 'success'. The 1937 telegram contained six: *münasebet* 'occasion', the *hakk* of *hakkımdaki* 'about me', *mütehassis* 'moved', *teşekkür* and *muvaffakıyet* again, and *temâdi* 'continuation'. But of no less significance than the old words he used are the new words which he used; *birlikte* 'together', *duygu* 'sentiment', *bildiren* 'conveying', *değerli* 'valuable'; the inference is not that he had abandoned the language reform, for then he would have said *beraber*, *his*, *tebliğ eden* and *kıymetli* or even *zikıymet*. What he was doing was adhering to the wholly praiseworthy aspect of the reform: making full use of the existing resources of the language. His use of *kutlulamak* as well as *tebrik etmek* in the 1936 telegram is a perfect example, reflecting the stylist's desire to avoid repeating a word if a synonym can be found.

On 1 November 1936 he delivered his annual speech opening the new session of the Grand National Assembly. It too was peppered with words of Arabic origin, including *sene* 'year', *tetkik* 'research', *tamik* 'investigation in depth' and *temenni* 'wish'. So too was his speech on the same occasion in 1937, in which he even used *millet* and *memleket* rather than *ulus* and *yurt* for 'nation' and 'country'.

His last message to the Language Society is significant. It consists in two sentences of the speech read for him by the Prime Minister, Celâl Bayar, at the opening of the new session of the Assembly on 1 November 1938, nine days before he died. It is worth quoting, because it has often been used as evidence that the Society never ceased to enjoy Atatürk's support in its efforts to eliminate everyday pre-reform words from the language. Both the contents and the language of the message give the lie to that claim:

> "Dil Kurumu en güzel ve feyizli bir iş olarak türlü ilimlere ait Türkçe terimleri tespit etmiş ve bu suretle dilimiz yabancı dillerin tesirinden kurtulma yo-

---

[2]   The text of the 1933 telegram does not seem to be available. The texts of the later telegrams appeared in the September issues of *Türk dili*, 1934-1937.

lunda esaslı adımını atmıştır. Bu yıl okullarımızda tedrisatın Türkçe terim-
lerle yazılmış kitaplarla başlamış olmasını kültür hayatımız için mühim bir
hâdise olarak kaydetmek isterim."—'The Language Society, in a most excel-
lent and successful endeavour, has established Turkish technical terms pertain-
ing to the various sciences, and our language has thus taken its essential step
on the road to liberation from the influence of foreign languages. I should like
to place it on record, as an important event for our cultural life, that teaching
has begun this year in our schools from books written with Turkish technical
terms.'

The partisans of "purification" will not give Atatürk credit for saying
what he meant. Those words, in which he praises the Society for its
work on technical terms and for nothing else, are often cited as com-
mendation of the Society's "sürdürülen özleştirme çabaları"—'continued
efforts at purification'. In fact they reflect his disillusion with those of its
"experts" who sat round his table night after night, drinking his rakı and
applauding his views without ever having the honesty—even if they had
the knowledge—to tell him that some of the ideas he came out with
could not be taken seriously.

Özgü (1963: 37) notes that Atatürk, in that last message to the Lan-
guage Society, used "such foreign words as *feyizli, tesir, tedrisat, mü-
him*, and *hâdise*, which did not yet sound incongruous" and she sancti-
moniously adds: "The younger generation is further advanced, thanks to
the inspiration and the command it has received from Atatürk." Instead
of singling out five of the fourteen "foreign words" he used in those two
sentences, she could have been better employed in noticing that he used
only two of the new words, *terim* rather than *ıstılah* for technical term
and *okul* rather than *mektep* for school. His use of them is under-
standable: *terim* was the new technical term *par excellence*, while *okul*
did not have the pre-Republican religious and social connotations of
mektep.

What motivated those who were not content to follow Atatürk's lead
and confine their creative urge to technical terms? They began with a ge-
nuine desire to close the gap between the official and the popular lan-
guage, or at least to comply with his desire to do so. When he decided
that things had gone too far, and reverted to his natural mode of expres-
sion, they allowed a decent interval for him to depart from the scene and
then resumed their work, having developed a taste for inventing words,
which for many of them had become a profession. So they continued to

invent, for which one should not blame them too harshly; after all, Atatürk's withdrawal from the wilder shores of öztürkçe was based on a personal decision which he did not seek to impose on anyone else. But while continuing to invent, they persisted—and this was their unpardonable offence—in claiming to be following in the footsteps of Atatürk.

For a defence of their position, that of Aksoy (1982: 144-145) would be hard to beat, depending as it does on his coolly equating the Language Society with the nation:

> "Let us suppose that we have been misinterpreting the Sun-Language Theory and that Atatürk, after practising purification for two or three years, used the theory as a way of reverting to the old language. If we accept this, what does it change? Has the current of purification which began in 1932 stopped? Has it not gradually broadened and gained strength? Is what is meant that since Atatürk gave up purification we must do so too? If that were the case, would we not have done so when he did? The fact that that did not happen and that the purification went on; what does that prove? Is it that the nation persisted in purification in spite of Atatürk, or that the allegation that he abandoned the purification is wrong? Certainly the latter, for never has the nation taken a course opposed to the principles of nationalism, populism and independence."

All that is proved by the "fact that that did not happen and that the purification went on" is that the Society—not the nation, which was never consulted—persisted in the purification although Atatürk had abandoned it. Whether its persistence was justified is another matter. Had the Society not persisted, Atatürk's goal of liberating the language from the Arabic and Persian yoke would not have been achieved. But one may recognize this without insisting that he himself never "gave up purification", because he indubitably did, and to deny that he did is to falsify history.

To revert to the Sun-Language Theory: Dilmen, who had been giving a series of lectures on it at Ankara University, cancelled the course on Atatürk's death. When his students asked him why, he replied, "Güneş öldükten sonra, onun teorisi mi kalır?"—'After the sun has died, does its / his theory survive?' (Banarlı 1972: 317). It was not mentioned, for good or ill, at the 1942 Congress. Atatürk never publicly repudiated it; why did he not "make his ideas plain, openly and directly" on this matter? A sophistic answer might be that as he had never put his name to it he could fairly have claimed that it was not his business to disown it.

But the simple truth is that although his belief in it had been shaken by the reception given to it by the foreign guests at the 1936 Congress, he still clung to it because he saw it as his contribution to scholarship.

One can well understand his reluctance to engage in a public debate which might have entailed a public retreat, and not just because it would have hurt his pride. In the Thirties there were more pressing calls than the Sun-Language Theory on the time and energy of a head of state, particularly one in poor health. During 1937 and until a matter of days before his death on 10 November 1938, Atatürk was spending much of his waning strength on coercing France into ceding the Hatay to Turkey. The memory of the Sun-Language Theory must have recurred to haunt him while he was trying to concentrate on matters of high policy. What began as a harmless after-dinner pastime had ended up as an incubus.

It is recorded (Tevfikoğlu 1994: 92-113) that during the evening of 16 October 1938, when Atatürk lay on his deathbed, he said again and again in delirium "Aman dil ... Aman dil ... Dil efendim." Some interpret this as 'For pity's sake, the language', and explain it according to their point of view, either as 'Don't let them go on ruining the language' or as 'Don't let them stop the language reform.' Others cite the well-known fact that he habitually pronounced *değil* as *dīl,* and prefer 'For pity's sake ... It isn't ...' What he really meant is unknown, save only to God.

References

Aksoy, Ömer Asım 1982. *Dil gerçeği.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

[Arsal], Sadri Maksudi [1930]. *Türk dili için.* (Türk Ocakları İlim ve Sanat Heyeti neşriyatından millî seri 1.) [İstanbul].

Atay, Falih Rıfkı 1965. 'Hüküm' nasıl kurtuldu? *Dünya,* 16 May 1965.

Atay, Falih Rıfkı 1969. *Çankaya.* İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş.

Banarlı, Nihad Sâmi 1972. *Türkçenin sırları.* (İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti'nin 66., İstanbul Enstitüsü'nün 53. kitabı.) İstanbul.

Dilâçar, A[gop] 1963. Atatürk ve türkçe. In: *Atatürk ve Türk dili.* (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 41-52.

Emre, Ahmet Cevat 1960. *İki neslin tarihi: Mustafa Kemal neler yaptı.* İstanbul: Hilmi Kitabevi.

Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican 1994. Atatürk'ün kaleminden çıkan yazılar. *Türk dili: Dil ve edebiyat dergisi* 1994:2, 85-91.

Ertop, Konur 1963. Atatürk devriminde Türk dili. In: *Atatürk ve Türk dili.* (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 53-99.

Gültekin, M[ehmet] Bedri 1983. *Türkçenin dünü ve yarını*. Ankara: Kaynak Yayınları, 72.

Hatiboğlu, Vecihe 1963. Atatürk'ün dilçiliği. In: *Atatürk ve Türk dili*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 9-22.

Heyd, Uriel 1954. *Language reform in modern Turkey*. Jerusalem: The Israel Oriental Society.

İnan, Abdülkadir 1936. *Türkoloji ders hülasaları*. İstanbul: Tarih, Dil ve Coğrafya Fakültesi.

Karaosmanoğlu, Yakup Kadri 1963. Atatürk ve türk dili. In: *Atatürk ve Türk dili*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 103-110.

Levend, Agâh Sırrı 1972. *Türk dilinde gelişme ve sadeleşme evreleri*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 347.) Ankara.

Özgü, Melâhat 1963. Atatürk'ün dilimiz üzerine eğilişi. *Atatürk ve Türk dili*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 23-40.

Tankut, Hasan Reşit 1963. Atatürk'ün dil çalışmaları. *Atatürk ve Türk dili*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 224.) Ankara, 111-140.

TDK 1937. *Üçüncü Türk Dil Kurultayı 1936: tezler, müzakere zabıtları*. Ankara: Devlet Basımevi.

Tevfikoğlu, Muhtar 1994. Dr. Âkil Muhtar'ın Dolmabahçe'deki dil çalışmalarıyla ilgili notları. *Türk dili: Dil ve edebiyat dergisi* 1994: 2, 92-113.

Yücel, Tahsin 1982. *Dil devrimi ve sonuçları*. (Türk Dil Kurumu Tanıtma Yayınları Dil Konusu Dizisi 32.) Ankara.

Zürcher, Erik Jan 1985. La théorie du "langage-soleil" et sa place dans la réforme de la langue turque. In: Auroux, Sylvain & Chevalier, Jean-Claude & Jacques-Chaquin, Nicole & Marchello-Nizia, Christiane (eds.) *La linguistique fantastique*. Paris: Denoël, 83-91.

Code-switching and ongoing linguistic change

Hendrik Boeschoten & Ad Backus

In the present contribution we discuss findings from our research on Turkish / Dutch code-switching by adolescents in the migrant setting in the Netherlands. We will compare these findings with similar data on Morrocan Arabic / Dutch code-switching. A striking feature in the data under consideration is the frequent occurrence of grammatically reduced stretches of Dutch that are incorporated into basically Turkish utterances. We refer to this phenomenon as "telegraphic switching", and show that it is not induced by limited L2-competence of the informants. Rather, it seems typical of contexts where the languages are in a sociolinguistically asymmetrical context and the typological distance between them is considerable. We go on to discuss possible future diachronic developments in the light of the code-switching data.

Hendrik Boeschoten & Ad Backus, Tilburg University, Linguistics Department, Postbox 91053, NL-5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.

Introduction

In the present contribution a number of characteristics of Turkish / Dutch code-switching by adolescents will be discussed. The data under consideration have previously been analysed by Backus (1992); they consist of an hour and a half of self-recorded conversation between four twenty-year-old adolescents. The results obtained are compared with the analysis provided by Nortier (1990) of (Moroccan) Arabic / Dutch code-switching, also by adolescents.

The data used here are limited, but we are confident that they provide a good idea of the code-switching patterns that can be expected to arise in conversations among adolescents with a good proficiency in their first and second languages. Backus (1996) shows that the patterns focussed on here are characteristic of the intermediate generation, i.e.

those adolescents who were not born in the Netherlands and had part
of their education in Turkey, and part of it in the Netherlands. The real
second generation exhibits rather different mixing types. Nevertheless,
we want to stress that the level of competence in Dutch of our in-
termediate generation informants is native-like. It is the way in which
the speakers acquire their two languages, not their proficiency in abso-
lute terms, that matters in bringing about code-switching patterns
(Backus 1996).

The contact setting involving Dutch and Mediterranean immigrant
languages is obviously asymmetrical; Dutch is of course the strongly
dominant language in society, while the immigrant languages have on-
ly community functions. In this situation, code-switching, likewise, on-
ly functions as part of the first language repertoire.

It seems to us that some recurring patterns discussed below are of
some consequence for the linguistic modelling of code-switching. The
discussion concerns, firstly, the switching of Dutch stretches larger
than single words which nevertheless are integrated into Turkish gram-
matical structures, and secondly, the frequent suspension of grammar
that occurs in Dutch intra-sentential switches.

One conclusion drawn by both Backus and Nortier is that frequent
switching within sentences appears to be a salient feature of in-group
conversation. The percentage of mixed utterances in the speech of Nor-
tiers 11 informants was about 40%, without much individual variation,
whereas the relative frequency of Dutch and Arabic monolingual
stretches varied greatly, according to the language preference of the in-
dividual informants.

In contrast, Boeschoten & Verhoeven (1987) found that the fre-
quency of intra-sentential switching with younger children (aged 4 to
8) was an individual characteristic of the informants. The same can be
said about the frequency of (single word) switching by first generation
adult immigrants. It is the adolescents growing up in an immigrant
environment that provide the social networks for the actuation of ver-
bal behaviour in which code-switching features prominently.

In the following we will focus on insertional code-switching,[1] i.e.,
the use of Dutch elements in Turkish utterances. Stated differently,

---

[1] In the linguistic literature "code-switching" is usually employed as a cover term
     for language mixing phenomena, and we conform to this practice. We are, in

Turkish is the matrix language throughout (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993; our views on the theory proposed in that book are put forward in Backus & Boeschoten 1996). Thus, we view the mixed speech from a synchronic perspective and offer no interpretations in terms of related diachronic processes such as interference and borrowing.

Work on code-switching has been done out of various research interests. From the late seventies on a sharp distinction has developed between sociolinguistically motivated research and work from a theoretical linguistic perspective. Sociolinguists have concentrated on the symbolics and on the discourse functions of the mixing of two (or more) languages. Theoretical linguists made their contribution in the shape of syntactic constraints that were aimed not so much at *explaining* switching points, but rather at formulating *constraints* on switching at certain positions in a sentence. Thus, their emphasis was on intra-sentential switching, while sociolinguists have taken more interest in code-switching at the discourse level. Two influential constraints, held to be universally valid, were proposed in Poplack (1980). The *Free Morpheme Constraint* states that a bound morpheme cannot be from a different language than the root morpheme to which it is attached. The *Equivalence Constraint* prohibits switching at points in a sentence where the surface structures of the two languages involved do not overlap. Other proposals abstract from surface structure by formulating constraints based on, for example, government or subcategorisation restrictions (for a review, see Clyne 1987).

An entirely different concept has been developed by Clyne who noticed that constraints can be overridden in code-switches "triggered" by what he termed "homophonous diamorphs": forms with interlinguistically similar form and meaning, including cognates and borrowings, which can therefore not be unambiguously assigned to one or the other language (Clyne 1987). The important role triggering plays in bilingual discourse has been attested by various authors, e.g. Muysken (1987).

other words, not claiming that speakers are actually "switching" back and forth from one language to the other. Cf., e.g., Backus (1996) and Boeschoten (forthcoming).

Are we prepared to define "code-switching" in normative terms?

As a general cover-term, code-switching is defined by all authors in
similar fashion: "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of
passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or
subsystems" (Romaine 1989: 111, after Gumperz; similar definitions
in Muysken 1990: 17, Clyne 1987: 740, among others). However, Pop-
lack (1990: 37) adds a condition to this definition; according to her:

> "Code-switching is the juxtaposition of sentences and sentence fragments,
> *each of which is internally consistent with the (...) rules of the language of its
> provenance"* (our emphasis).

Like earlier terminological mix-ups, this one, too, is motivated by
certain *intra-sentential* switching types. The fact remains that the use
of this definition does not fit the data in many contact settings (e.g.,
example 1 below), notably for the kind of contact situation discussed
presently (cf. Clyne 1987). Thus the question is raised what to do with
instances of code-switching which conform to the commonly accepted
definition, but fail to meet Poplack's annex. In this connection, Muy-
sken (1990: 16) raises the issue of so-called "ragged" (i.e., non-con-
stituent) switching. Muysken rather rigidly concludes that these in-
stances could either be treated as exceptions, or should be viewed as
evidence for a non-syntactic treatment of code-switching. In fact, one
of the two examples (here example 1) cited by Muysken falls into a
recurring pattern [V^a P^a N^d V^d_{inf}] in Nortier's study (Nortier 1990: 140,
examples 194-196), and therefore certainly does not look like an "ex-
ception". Recall that triggering, too, often leads to the violation of con-
straints.

(1)   Xeṣṣ-na   m^{c}a   *bestuur   praten.*
       must-we   with   board   talk
       'We must speak with the board.'

Another possibility, which we will explore, is to consider at least cer-
tain types of ragged switching as evidence for ongoing linguistic
change.

In the meantime it has become clear that the (psycho-)linguistic pro-
perties of code-switching cannot be studied in isolation from the socio-
linguistic setting. But this is not all. As Clyne (1987) has argued con-

vincingly, it makes little sense to dissociate code-switching performance from other effects of language contact, most notably from convergence phenomena (cf. also Johanson 1992). This is one reason why a linguistic analysis of intra-sentential code-switching, based on a naive contrastive analysis for the given contact situation, is to be regarded as methodologically unsound.

Besides, considering the social asymmetry of contact between Dutch and immigrant minority languages, at least in this case it makes little sense to account for a strong tendency towards unidirectionality by formulating post hoc constraints. There is only one instance (out of 230 Turkish / Dutch switches; a triggered switch) for which Backus (1992: 48, example 44) identifies Dutch, and not Turkish, as the matrix language. In some cases mixed utterances are indexed explicitly as Turkish in Backus' corpus. This is prototypically true for nominal sentences. Turkish has zero copula for third person subject. Often an utterance will be indexed for Turkish by function elements (examples 2-4) or by discourse markers (examples 5 and 6).[2]

(2)   *Box*-lar *vijfenveertig watt*, ama *versterker veertig watt.*
'The speaker-s (are) 45 watts, but the amplifier (is) 40 watts.'

(3)   *-Tweeweg* mi *drieweg* mi?
'(Are) they two-way or three-way?'
-Vierweg.
'(They are) four-way.'

(4)   Şimdi bu *nul komma vijfentwintig.*
'Now, this is 0,25 '

(5)   Bi dakika, *één gedeeld door vier nul komma vijfentwintig.*
'Just a moment, one divided by four is 0.25.'

(6)   *Da's niet te vertalen man! Woordenboek* da *weerdeloos.*
'You can't translate that, man! The dictionary (is) useless, too.'

---

[2]   Example 5 is drawn from a data-set collected by Ömer Konak.

In other cases (cf. 6), the clitic conjunction *da / de* is used. Similar linear indexing strategies are discussed by Muysken (1987).

Finally, it seems that certain L_1-internal conversion patterns inherited from previous contact situations may play an important role. The data may seem disturbing to those who wish to formulate universal constraints. Like the data presented by Clyne (1987), they rather seem to suggest that surface equivalence, dependency relations, X-bar-theory, etc., all play some role in code-switching performance (besides triggering, monolingual conversion patterns, etc.). To try and save the day for one monolithic constraint by labelling deviant patterns as nonce-borrowing (Sankoff, Poplack & Vanniarajan 1986), ragged (i.e., non-constituent) switching, etc., invariably leads to cyclic reasoning.

Specific patterns of intra-sentential switching

From the data on both Turkish / Dutch and on Arabic / Dutch code-switching certain frequently recurring patterns stand out. Remarkably, the frequent patterns are quite different ones in the two cases. In the first place, the distribution of single word switches revealed a striking difference. Whereas the use of single Dutch verbs in Arabic sentences is rare, in Turkish discourse Dutch verbs seem to be freely inserted on the basis of the set conversion formula INF *yap-*. On the other hand, Dutch prepositions seem to be strictly barred from Turkish sentences, whereas they sometimes crop up in the Arabic utterances of Nortier's informants. As Arabic is a prepositional language, just like Dutch, this finding highlights the basic idea behind the "equivalence constraint" (cf. Table 1).

	Arabic / Dutch (Nortier 1990)	*Turkish / Dutch* (Backus 1989)
N	71%	58%
ADJ	7%	11%
ADV	10%	4%
V	3%	26%
P	2%	—
REST	6%	—

Table 1: Single word switches reported by Nortier (1990: 137) and Backus (1989: 27)

VP switches

Set incorporation patterns for verbs of another language is a common feature of the Turkic languages: some verb with neutralised content ('do') is combined with a verbal noun ("infinitive") of the contact language. The verbs 'do' may be different in different Turkic languages: *qıl-* in Eastern languages (Uzbek, Qirghiz, etc.), *et-* in Western languages (Tatar, Turkish, etc.). However, the contact situation in the Netherlands shows that synchronically not standard Turkish *et-*, but the verb *yap-* is employed for the incorporation of Dutch verbs (and as a word formation device in general, such as in *park yap-* 'to park' and *telefon yap-*; compare also English / Cypriot Turkish *çek et-* 'to check' and *fayılla-* 'to file', Vanci 1991). If the contact language has no infinitive, as in Southern Slavonic languages, this circumstance by no means stands in the way of the integration of switched verbs, because then the present stem is used as a basis for the word formation procedure (for Macedonian verbs in Balkan Turkish, cf. Jašar-Nasteva 1957).

Similar conversion of verbs, employing "do"-verbs, is known from many bilingual contexts and has been discussed at length by Romaine (1989: 123ff.) for Panjabi-English, and by Sankoff et al. (1990) for Tamil / English code-switching. In the Turkish / Dutch case, the link with borrowings from an earlier stage comes to the surface in odd instances like 7 in which the etymologically French loan has taken on Dutch phonetic shape.

(7)   Bunlar   bittane   şey   *organise*   yap-mış, *de Diskotheekactie.*
        they   a   thing   *(orγa.nise.)*   do-INFER
        'They have organised something, the "Discotheque Action".'

More interesting than single verb switches are the object + verb switches, which have also been reported for English / Panjabi and English / Tamil code-switching. In the Turkish / Dutch case, the switched pairs are integrated unambiguously into Turkish syntax (examples 8-13). Even in our relatively small corpus, the full range of the marking of number and specificity (i.e., ± accusative, cf. Johanson 1977) is re-

presented; Dutch articles and plurals never occur in these constructions and are rejected by bilinguals (but they occur elsewhere).[3]

(8) nerede / nerede *klacht*   *indienen*   yap-tınız   şimdi?
     where   complaint   file   do-PRET-2PL now
     'Where have you now filed [your] complaint(s)?'
     ((...) **een klacht / klachten indienen* yaptınız (...))

(9) Türkler alsa,   *klant*-lar   *wegjagen*   yap-ıyor.[4]
                       customer-PL   chase   do-PROGR
     'If he were to take Turks, he chases away customers.'
     ((...), **klanten wegjagen* yapıyor)

(10) Babam-a   bir   *smoes*   *verzinnen*   yaptık,
     my-father-DAT a   pretext   make-up   do-PRET-1PL
     schoolfeestje var diye.
     'We made up a pretext for my father, saying there was a school-party.'
     ((...) **een smoes verzinnen* yaptık (...))

(11) Bu   bisürü   *taal*-lar-ı   *beheersen*
     he   a-lot   language-PL-ACC   master
     yap-ıyor-ken...
     do-PROGR-CONV
     'While he is proficient in a lot of languages...'

(12) Ben   *kamer*-im-i   *opruimen*   yap-ar-ken,
     I   room-POSS1SG-ACC   tidy   do-AOR-CONV
     hepsini   geri   korum.
     'When tidying my room, I put them all back.'
     ((...) **m'n kamer / m'n kamer-i opruimen* yaparken (...))

[3] Backus (1996: 175) reports one case of a Dutch plural in the syntactic slot under consideration: *Belli bir grenzen overschrijden yapınca...* 'If one oversteps certain thresholds...' (meant metaphorically). The interpretation of *grenzen*, which ends in a shwa, as a (Turkish) accusative (*grenz-ı*) was rejected by informants.

[4] Note the counterfactual apodosis /-yor/ (instead of /-ar/) in 9. The point to be considered here is that code-switching may provide an environment where Turkish semantic rules are somewhat relaxed (cf. also the conditional in example 23).

(13) *Politiek gesprek*-ler-i *ophouden* yap-ın la,
political talk-PL-ACC stop do-IMP man!
sorry voor de interruptie.
'Stop the political conversations, man, sorry for interrupting.'

As has been noted before, Nortier (1990) reported that hardly any Dutch verbs were used in Arabic / Dutch switches. Arabic seems to lack conversion formulas of the Turkic and Indo-Aryan (including Tamil as an areal feature?) type.

The intuitions of native speakers and researchers seem to concur in assuming that prefixing with aspect + person would be the "normal" way to integrate Dutch verbs into Arabic (Nortier 1990:178), just as it has been reported for French / Arabic code-switching (Bentahila & Davies 1983). But in her actual corpus, Nortier seems to have found periphrastic structures with 'do'-verbs to be the predominant (though still infrequent) pattern.

Adjectives used attributively and adverbally

One rule of Dutch seems to work in [Adj N]-switches:[5] the agreement rule for the adjective (a schwa, spelled *-e*, is added to attributive adjectives, except if the head noun is neuter and indefinite, compare 14 and 15; cf. also Backus 1992:55):

(14) O *blond-e meisje afstuderen* yaptı.
that blond-AGR girl get-degree do-PRET
'That blond girl got (her) degree.'

(15) *Engels*-i bir tane *blond meisje*-dan alıyordun.
English-ACC a blond girl-ABL take-IMPERF-2SG
'You got the English (lessons) from a blond girl.'

---

[5] Adj / noun switches do not occur very frequently in the data-set, thus reflecting a well-known distributional feature of code-switching data in general. Fortunately, the agreement pattern discussed presently is borne out by the new data presented in Backus (1996, e.g. examples on pp. 156, 174, 190).

The one apparent exception was the one in 16. This is no real exception, because it involves word formation with the suffix /-lI/, the application of which suspends an intra-Turkish agreement rule, too (cf. 17). Another interesting case would be 13, in which adjective agreement is apparently suspended by the Turkish plural marking on *gesprek*.

(16) şöyle *hoek*-lu, *schuin*   *vorm*-lu   (and not: *schuin-e vorm*-lu)
       thus   edg-y   slanted   shape-d
       'edgy and with a slanted shape like that'

(17) kiyafet 'dress'   ⇒ kiyafet-li
                                       'cloak-ed (with a cloak)'
       dervis kiyafet-i   ⇒ dervis kiyafet-li   / *kiyafet-i-li
               -POSS3
       'derwish cloak'   'with a dervish cloak'

On the other hand, primary adjectives used adverbially seem to occur randomly with and without schwa (cf. 18 vs. 19), whereas in Dutch the zero-marked form would be required invariably. However, there are only 4 cases in the corpus.

(18) *Dagelijks* da   yapıyoruz da.
       daily   too   we-do   too
       'And we do it daily, too.'

(19) (...)   yani çok   bakkalları vardı, *economisch- e*   yükseldi.
                                            economically   rise-PRET
       '(…) that is, they had many grocers, they had advanced economically'

For predicative single adjective switches, on the other hand, the zero-marked form is always selected, in accordance with Dutch rules.

Telegraphic switching

"Syntactic simplification" is rejected categorically by Nortier (1990: 201-202) as an explanation for certain phenomena that occur in her data-set, most notably for the frequent article deletion (cf. example 20;

Moroccan Arabic would require an article following the demonstrative *dak*).

> (20)   *dak* stoplicht
>   'that traffic light'

After all, what is not there cannot be simplified. Muysken (1987) applies the term "suspension of grammar" to switches apparently lacking syntactic cohesion. Apart from article deletion, this type of switches seems to be relatively scarce in the Arabic / Dutch code-switching investigated by Nortier, and doesn't form a discernible pattern, apart maybe from a certain tendency for subordination with empty COMP (as in 21 = Nortier 1990: 132, example166) and the use of adverbial (Dutch) PP's without preposition (as in 22 = Nortier 1990: 135, example175).

> (21)   *Één   minuut   nog   niet   weg*, kan   l-bulis u ka-yduzu.
>   one   minute   yet   away   not
>   'They had not left one minute (when) the police-officer passed by.'

> (22)   Weqᶜat   li-ya *lagere   school.*
>   'It happened to me (in) primary school.'

The frequency of ocurrence of these patterns is not very high, however (3 cases without and 20 with complementizer, and 3 cases without preposition vs. 6 with, respectively).

The Turkish / Dutch data offer a somewhat different picture here. Switches between clauses look well-formed, although the matter is difficult to judge because of the low frequency of occurrence (cf. 23 and 24).

> (23)   Güzel yemek pişiriyor-sa, *dan zouik wel komen.*
>   'If she cooks a nice meal, then I would come.'

> (24)   *Kun je zo zien hé,*   öyle   *student*   ol-duğ-u-nu.
>   thus   be-VN-POSS3SG-ACC
>   'You can see immediately, can't you, that she is just a student.'

The type of object clause seen in 24 is especially interesting, and warrants further investigation: our impression is that the order of main and

subordinate clause is not reversible (while both orders would be per-
mitted in both Turkish and Dutch). The interjection *hé* could be an in-
stance of flagging, i.e., an element signaling that a switch is coming.

On the other hand, apart from single word switches and the patterns
discussed above, the Turkish / Dutch switching patterns look irregular.
Many of these switches involve the absence of a (Dutch) preposition /
(Turkish) postposition, as in 25. Here, by the way, the tag *biliyon mu*
indexes a Turkish sentence, with zero copula. Another type, with the
object pronoun dropped, is represented by 26.

(25)   *Zestien programma programmeerbaar*, biliyon mu?
       '(It is) programmable (with) 16 programmes, you know?'

(26)   Bugün   *laat*   oldu   ya,   yarın   *krijg*   *je*
       today   late   become-PRET   PRTC   tomorrow   get   you
       misschien ,   maandag.
       may-be   monday
       'Today it has grown late, tomorrow you may get (it), on Monday.'

If the syntactic integrity of switched sequences is accepted as a criteri-
on for "legitimate" code-switching, the Turkish / Dutch switching pat-
terns look decidedly odd; they are asymmetrical in that they maintain
the integrity of the Turkish syntax, but not of the Dutch. Nor can the
structure of the Dutch switches be related in general to the level of L_2
proficiency of the informants. Besides, relatively sophisticated rules of
Dutch like adjective agreement and verb placement in second position
(e.g., 26) are in fact exhibited by the code-switching patterns.

To us it looks as if the data reflect a certain telegraphic (in the sense
of "reductionist as to function elements") sloppiness, i.e., contain an
implicit reference to fuller structures; to illustrate this we offer a series
of further examples:

(27)   Benim saçım niye *spoel* biliyon mu? (for: (...) *gespoeld* oluyor (...))
       'Do you know why my hair is being *rinse(-d)*?'

(28)   Babam bana kızıyor, biliyor musun, eve geç gelince, *wordt boos man.*
       'My father gets angry with me, y' know, if I come home late, *(he) gets
       angry, man!*'

(29) Bir tane *donkere jongen*-nan, *donker* değil de *bruine huidskleur*.
'With a *dark boy*, not *dark* but *(having a) brown skin.*'

(30) Yoksa *box*-tan mı, *dicht bij elkaar*,ondan mı?
'Or from *the speaker(-s), (which are) close to each other*, is that why?'

(31) Bakıyor ki *uitgaan* yapıyorlar, mesela *uit eten*.
'He sees they are *going out*, for instance, *out for dinner*.'

(32) Türkiye'de partilerde tapanca dasımak *mag wel*.
'In Turkey *(it is) O.K.* to carry guns with political parties.'

(33) Politiek essahtan *reet interesseren* yap-ıyor.
'Politics really does*(n't) interest (me) a fucking bit*.'
(Dutch: ...*interesseert me geen reet*, i.e., even the negation is lacking)

We assume that this telegraphic switching mode has originated for three reasons: (1) The switches reflect previous stages of L_2 development of the informants and of others. Consider, for instance, the conventionalised use of Dutch modal verbs as modal particles, exemplified by 32. In fact, *moet* 'must' is one of the few Dutch forms which can safely be assumed to have been integrated as a loanword into the Turkish of (some of) the first generation immigrants (Boeschoten & Verhoeven 1985). (2) The switches serve to avoid problems with surface structure equivalence, the lack of which would block code-switching almost totally if the speakers minded Poplack's rules (suspension of grammar as a "neutrality strategy", cf. Muysken 1987). To take one example, in 29 *bruine huidskleur* functions as a PP, but contains neither a Dutch preposition, nor a Turkish postposition. This may explain to a certain extent the fact that in Arabic / Dutch code-switching the syntactic integrity of Dutch stretches is upheld to a much greater extent: the surface structures of Dutch and Arabic are more equivalent; in particular, both languages are prepositional. It is not surprising that the one common case of reduction found by Nortier (1990) was the frequent deletion of articles before Dutch nouns. Moroccan Arabic and Dutch differ in their use of determiners. (3) The code-switching mode forms part of the Turkish repertoire. Hence the one-sidedness of the "suspension of grammar".

It could be argued, on the other hand, that reduced structures are simply features of any spoken language. Thus, 31 seems to match the similarly reduced, but quite acceptable, Dutch utterance *Hij ziet dat ze uitgaan, bijvoorbeeld uit eten*. For the kind of reduction illustrated by example 33, on the other hand, it is inconceivable to think of any sort of monolingual equivalent.

Special considerations for asymmetric code-switching

The diachronic dimension

One problem with many linguistic studies of code-switching is that they tend to treat the languages involved in the contact situation as invariant, or even take only standard languages into account. Clyne (1987) argues against the legitimacy of this procedure and claims that code-switching cannot be studied in isolation from other contact phenomena, in any case not in the context of immigration communities. Many minority languagues show some measure of syntactic convergence towards the dominant language of the country of immigration. This may happen more easily in English / Dutch and English / German contact than in the case of Turkish / Dutch and Arabic / Dutch contact. But, as was pointed out before, code-switching in an immigration context such as the one discussed here can be expected to form an integral part of the minority language repertoire, and is therefore precisely one of the realms of performance through which the language changes. Most importantly, the code-switching mode itself changes. For a recently established immigrant community language, a model of ongoing change is needed (we find support for this position with Clyne 1987 and Nortier 1990: 208; cf. also Nartey 1982 on another bilingual situation judged to be unstable).

Constraints and neutrality strategies

In describing and interpreting the data, we view constraints as tendencies, not as universal rules governing synchronic performance. Clyne (1987:761) concludes from his data:

> "Our data suggest that the structural-integrity / equivalence constraint applies, but only if we accept that the syntax of the two language systems may already have converged through transference, and even when it is violated by syntactic convergence at the point of code switching".

We take this reasoning to be open to inversion, say:

> "Syntactic convergence takes place, among other things, in order to create equivalence sites for code-switching".

Syntactic convergence may thus result from (one of) the neutrality strategies presented by Muysken (1987).
The structure encountered in Turkish / Dutch code-switching can be summarized as follows:

> Syntactic integrity is only preserved at the clausal level. This also means that the clause is the level at which language indexing takes place.

> Dutch clauses are normally monolingual; the major exception seems to be the occasional switching of adverbial clauses (cf. example 24). In other cases, Dutch auxiliaries appear to be integrated into Turkish as loanwords (with shift of word-class; e.g. example 32).

> Within Turkish clauses, Dutch grammar is suspended in Dutch multi-word stretches; this interpretation naturally has implications for a theory of lexical insertion.

The situation encountered seems to imply that lack of typological surface equivalence (i.e., generally speaking, neither in the sense of "syntactic integrity" as formulated by Sridhar & Sridhar (1980), nor in the strict sense of linear word order) does not inhibit code-switching, but leads to massive application of neutrality strategies. On the other hand, the Dutch rule of adjective agreement seems to be strictly observed. Turkish and Dutch both have [Adj N] order, which means that there is no problem with surface equivalence. But this is as far as it goes, since the absence of NP's without agreement is *not* predicted. Dependency-related constraints (like the government constraint) must be invoked to show how in this particular type of NP's, Turkish determiners can somehow trigger a Dutch rule of agreement. How exactly this can be

done is not yet clear.[6] The situation is less clear for Dutch / Arabic switching. Although Nortier (1990) finds none of the syntactic constraints validated, she also rejects the notion of syntactic simplification. As Clyne (1987) indicates, it makes little sense to discuss the present type of code-switching solely in terms of universal constraints. The constraints must be studied in their relationship with neutrality strategies.

Triggering and language change

Triggering offers a more constructive way to get around the lack of equivalence. We can hardly expect the kind of syntactic convergence described by Clyne for languages with phonetically similar function elements to occur in contexts involving typologically and genetically distinct languages. Instead, triggering set off by content words may eventually result in entirely new phrase structures. For example, in examples 1 and 12 the Dutch nouns (*bestuur, kamer*) are cultural borrowings[7] (cf. for example Myers-Scotton 1993: 169). As such, they can be considered part of the Arabic and Turkish lexicons, and, being cognates shared with Dutch, are therefore potential trigger sites. In the examples, Dutch verbs are triggered on the basis of the Dutch collocations *met het bestuur praten* and *kamer opruimen*. In a sense this would result in specific rules for code-switching separate from the rules of the monolingual modes. But in effect, in the asymmetrical case of code-switching these new rules may eventually form part of local varieties of the immigrant languages. One candidate would be the type of ragged switch in 1; the other examples in Nortier (1990: 140) also look as if they may well have been triggered. In these switches the lack of equivalence which results from the requirement that verbal complements must be tensed in Arabic, is circumvented.

As another example, let us consider PPs in Turkish / Dutch codeswitching. PP-switching mostly involves idiomatic phrases (Backus 1992: 55-56). In earlier cases, Dutch grammar was suspended, as in 34 (Boeschoten & Verhoeven 1987):

[6]   Example 24 (with COMP indexed for Turkish) also seems to run counter to the government constraint.

[7]   In the case of *kamer*, the context of the utterance is connected with student life, in which *kamer* has the specific connotation of a room rented by a student.

(34)   *op oog*   gözlük   var.
        on eye   glasses   there-is
        'On (her / the) eye(s) there are glasses.'

This constraint on PP-switching contrasts heavily with the conventionalised PPs involving Tajik prepositions followed by Uzbek case-marking found in Uzbek dialects in Afghanistan (Boeschoten 1983), as in 35-37:

(35)   *misli*   bizdi   bayråγ-ïmïz-deγ
        like   our   flag-POSS1PL-COMPER
        'like our flag-like'

(36)   *tå*   sinp-i   *šaš*-gača
        till   class   six-TERM
        'until grade six-until'

(37)   *dar*   zamån-ê Dawud   *u* Zåiri   bulardê   waxtiga
        in   time-of   and they-GEN   time-POSS3-LOC
        'in the time of Dawud and Zahir... in their time'

The (etymologically) Tajik prepositions obligatorily govern case. Exactly the same type of duplication has been found in Northern Tajik dialects, i.e., the type leads to the same type of convergence in the several balanced bilingual contact situations between Uzbek and Tajik that prevail in Central Asia. The point is that duplication with Dutch prepositions is categorically rejected by bilingual native Turks; nevertheless it seems that it may occasionally result from triggering. Example 38 is one of the five cases attested by Backus (1992, 1996: 345):

(38)   *Je*   moet   naar   een Türk   ev-i-ne   bak-acağ-ın.
        you   must   to   a   Turk(ish) house-POSS3-DAT   look-FUT-2SG
        'You have to look at a Turkish house.'

(39)   Mutta se oli *kidney*-sta   *to* aorta- an
                                     -from   -to
        'But it was from the kidney to the aorta.'

We speculatively assume that the category of prepositions has found its way into Uzbek as a consequence of triggering. Come to think of it, couldn't the duplication in the Finnish / English switch 39 (Muysken 1987) result from triggering, too?

Access to the lexicons

The interpretation offered so far raises miscellaneous questions about lexical access and borrowing. Most importantly, if we reconsider the verb + object switches in Turkish it seems that the Dutch lexicon is accessible not only for single words, but also for lexical subcategorisation. That is, we reject for the present data the model laid down by Romaine (1989: 130, cf. also fig. 4.4), who denies "constructions such as *exams pass kërna* any special syntactic or semantic status in bilingual discourse". In the examples cited above, verb + object seem to form idiomatic units; the switches ensuing could be termed compound nonce borrowings.

> (40)   Çalışıp ta ne yapacağın, sen de *vrij* al.
>   'What are you going to do working, you take off, too.'
>   (*vrij nemen -> vrij* al-)

A variation on this theme is the semi-calque exemplified by 40; note that the verbs involved here are highly frequent in both languages which may facilitate synonym-matching between the Dutch and Turkish lexicons.[8]

A second point which comes to mind is the relation between telegraphic switches and borrowing. Compare 41, in which the subcategorisation for PP-complement is copied into Turkish, with 42, in which it is not (cf. also the German-Turkish switch 43, cf. Pfaff, Kardam & Voss 1989: 70).

---

[8]   Another example we cited in an earlier version is the following: *Ecevit macht'a gelecekti, öyle mi?* 'Ecevit was going to grasp power, isn't it?' (*aan de macht komen -> macht'a gel-*). Johanson (1993: 215) rejects this interpretation and prefers an equation with Turkish *iktidara gel-*. He might be quite right here, but the issue seems unresolvable on a descriptive basis. As such, this illustrates a typical methodological problem of contact linguistics.

(41) O diyor, ben *uitmaken*   yap-tım   kız-ınan, *zou dé kloppen?*
              finish do-PRET1SG   girl-with
      'He has finished (his relation) with the girl, would that be true?
      (Dutch *het uitmaken met X* 'finish one's relation with X; note that the
      dummy *het* has been dropped)

(42) *Politiek   gesprek*-ler-i   *ophouden*   yap-ın   la,
      political   talk-PL-ACC   stop   do-IMPman!
      sorry   voor   de   interruptie.
      'Stop the politics conversations, man, sorry for interrupting.'
      (Dutch *ophouden met* X 'stop (doing) X')

(43) Ama   ınhölüsünü   *heiraten* yapıyor.
      but   corpse-POSS3-ACC   marry   do-PROG
      'But ... she marries his corpse.'

We suppose that 42 is restructured out of the grammatically stripped
syntagma *gesprek ophouden yap-*. On account of the apparent conven-
tionality of the verb + object switches we would not, mutatis mutandis,
automatically accept the shift of subcategorisation as evidence for the
integration of *ophouden* as a borrowing. On the other hand, further
integration of these borrowings can result in a reflection of successive
levels of L_2-proficiency in the individual or over generations. Compare
cases like Polish reflexive verbs borrowed into Karaim, a Turkic lan-
guage: *straccet-* 'make an effort' (Polish *starać się*, with phonetic ref-
lection of the clitic), vs. *bavcet-* 'have a good time' (Polish *bawć się*,
with the clitic dropped; Wexler 1983: 35).

Inherited accommodation facilities

Nortier (1990) and Muysken (1990) have pointed out the importance
of a language's linguistic contact experience, previous to that under
investigation (i.e., contact with French and Spanish as colonial lan-
guages in the case of Moroccan Arabic). Normally, one would expect
contact-induced structural properties of the language to be rather peri-
pheral in the system. Indeed, neither the dropping of Dutch articles in
single word switches, nor the single verb switches reflect the patterns
found in (Moroccan) Arabic / French code-switching. But Turkish
(like many other languages) has a fully productive word formation de-
vice for the accomodation of verbs from any language. On the other

hand, the data from Turkish / Dutch code-switching seem to suggest
that a borrowed form like the complementizer *ki* in 44 has only peri-
pheral status in the spoken varieties under investigation: the equiva-
lence site offered by it is not exploited.

(44)   Birdenbire   anladım   *ki* o   bana   anam   kadar   yakındır.
       'I suddenly realised *that* she is as close to me as my mother.'

Thus, if we consider the role of existing patterns in the inherited loan
periphery of language in code-switching, we also have to spot the pat-
terns which, like the integration scheme for French verbs in Moroccan
Arabic in the case of Arabic / Dutch code-switching, seem to play no
role, and explain that fact. Similarly, explanations for non-occurence
of switches which would be allowed for by universal constraints would
also be very important (Muysken 1990).

Conclusion

In models for code-switching phenomena to be encountered in recently
established immigrant communities with strongly dominated commu-
nity languages, universal constraints are bound to play a less important
role than is suggested in the literature for relatively symmetrical lan-
guage contact situations. A descriptively adequate handling of the data
leads one (a) to emphasize the importance of non-syntactically moti-
vated surface-phenomena such as triggering, and (b) to call for a dia-
chronic approach. In immigrant contexts, code-switching basically
forms part of the immigrant's linguistic repertoire. It seems that typo-
logical closeness between the minority language and the dominant lan-
guage leads to rapid one-sided convergence (Clyne 1987), and that ty-
pological distance leads to a type of intra-sentential code-switching in
which L_2-grammar is mostly suspended in L_1-structure. In the latter
case, (future) restructuring leads to conventionalised code-switching
structures which may form an integral part of the minority language in
question at future stages.

References

Backus, A. (1989). *Codewisseling onder Turkse jongeren in Tilburg.* [MA thesis, Tilburg University.]

Backus, A. (1992). *Patterns of language mixing. A study of Turkish-Dutch bilingualism.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Backus, A. (1996). *Two in one. Bilingual speech of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Backus, A. & Boeschoten, H. (1996). Review article of: 1. C.Myers-Scotton 1993, Social motivations for codeswitching. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2. C. Myers-Scotton 1996, Duelling languages. Oxford: Clarendon Press. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6, 129-153.

Bentahila, A. & Davies, E. E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-English code-switching. *Lingua* 59, 301-330.

Boeschoten, H. (1983). *Ösbekisches aus Aibak (Samangan).* Utrecht University, Department of Turcology.

Boeschoten, H. (forthcoming). Code-switching, code-mixing and code-alternation: what a difference. To appear in: R. Jacobson (ed.) *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon II.* Berlin: Mouton / De Gruyter.

Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (1985). Integration niederländischer lexikalischer Elemente ins Türkische: Sprachmischung bei Immigranten der ersten und zweiten Generation. *Linguistische Berichte* 98, 347-364.

Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (1987). Language mixing in children's speech: Dutch language use in Turkish discourse. *Language Learning* 37, 191-215.

Clyne, M. (1987). Constraints on code-switching. How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25, 739-764.

Jašar-Nasteva, O. (1957). Vlijanieto na makedonskiot jazik vrz albanskite i turkskite govori vo Makedonija. *Makedonski Jazik* 8, 147-164.

Johanson, L. (1977). Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III / 2, 1186-1203.

Johanson, L. (1992). *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten.* Stuttgart: Steiner.

Johanson, L. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, G. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Immigrant languages in Europe.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 197-221.

Lehtinen, M. (1966). *An analysis of a Finnish-English bilingual corpus.* [Ph.D. Thesis, Indiana University.]

Myers-Scotton (1993). *Duelling languages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Muysken, P. (1987). Neutrality in code-mixing. In: *Eigen en Vreemd: Handelingen van het 39e Filologencongres Amsterdam.* Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit.

Muysken, P. (1990). Concepts, methodology and data in language contact research. In: *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data.* Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 15-30.

Nartey, J. N. (1982). Code-switching, interference or faddism? Language use among educated Ghanians. *Anthropological Linguistics* 24, 183-192.

Nortier, J. (1990). *Dutch and Moroccan Arabic in contact: Code switching among Moroccans in the Netherlands.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Pfaff, C. & Kardam, F. & Voss, J. (1989). *Natürlicher bilingualer Spracherwerb von Kita-Kindern. Vom Krippenalter bis zu den ersten Grundschuljahren. Arbeitsbericht III: Verbalmorphologie.* Berlin: Freie Universität.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en español. *Linguistics* 18, 581-616.

Poplack, S. (1990). Variation theory and language contact: concepts, methods and data. In: *Papers for the Workshop on Concepts, Methodology and Data.* Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 33-66.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Sankoff, D. & Poplack, S. & Vannirajan, S. (1990). The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change* 2, 71-101.

Sridhar, S. & Sridhar, K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-mixing. *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 34, 407-416.

Vancı, Ü. (1991). Cypriot Turkish: Some empirical observations. Paper read at *5th Turkish Linguistics Conference*, London, 1990.

Wexler, P. (1983). Is Karaite a Jewish language? *Mediterranean Language Review* 1, 27-54.

Further notes on the *Irk Bitig*

Marcel Erdal

This paper deals with one of the more enigmatic, certainly one of the most beautiful texts created by the composite civilisation of Central Asia in Tang times. It proposes interpretations of its divinational contents, critically reviewing previous suggestions, and deals with details of its Old Uygur dialect.

*Marcel Erdal, Department of Turcology, J. W. Goethe University,
P.O. Box 11 19 32, D-60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany.*

The *Irk Bitig* is a fifty-eight leaf booklet discovered in 1907 by Marc Aurel Stein in the famous manuscript grotto of the "Halls of the Thousand Buddhas" in Shazhou, near Dunhuang in Western China. Its Old Turkic content figures 65 "chapters", consisting of a few sentences each and ending in statements such as "This is bad" or "This is very good", and a colophon. These wonderfully concise outlines of a narrative or a situation served the divinatory interpretation of casts of three knucklebones or three four-sided dice. Stein entrusted this and three other manuscripts in Old Turkic runes to Vilhelm Thomsen, the decipherer of the script, for publication; Orkun's (1938: 71-93) and Malov's (1951: 80-92) versions are practically translations of Thomsen's (1912: 190-214) edition into Turkish and Russian respectively, with minor enhancements and a few additional notes.

Tekin (1993) is a reedition of the text together with an introduction, "explanations", a glossary and—at last—facsimiles. Tekin has some good ideas concerning a few *ırk*s, but some of these are not new: The book has several drawbacks, disregard for progress already achieved being the weightiest of them. Quite a few scholars have published their thoughts on particular passages in this text, for which they all deserve credit. Examples are Kljaštornyj (1981: 126-130) and various remarks in

Roux (1966).[1] With such an important source, scholarly attempts at an interpretation should be quoted even if one does not agree with them (and argued against if necessary).

As it is, Tekin has missed some relevant ideas. The chapter headed "Previous Works on Irk Bitig" (Tekin 1993: 2) only contains reference to the editions mentioned, to Hamilton (1975),[2] to Clauson's "Notes on the Irk Bitig" (1961) and to "Irk Bitig üzerine yeni notlar" (Erdal 1978). Thomsen called his edition of the *Irk Bitig* a "preliminary note" (1912: 195).

The title of the present paper is meant as a follow-up to the various "notes"; its main (but not only) purpose is to bring together references to relevant research mentioned neither by Tekin (1993) nor by Clauson (1961) or Erdal (1978), towards a definitive edition one day in the future. The *Irk Bitig* is the most noteworthy direct testimony of Turkic lore and culture in the first millennium. Some readers interested in this source will, naturally, not be too well-versed in Old Turkic and its problems and mostly make use of the translation. Some of the translations of Tekin (1993) are definitely unacceptable. Linguists may, e.g., be misled by the way he renders some of the causatives.

The remarks following below will, like the treatment in Tekin (1993), be chiefly text oriented. Altaic astragalomancy practices and knuckle-bone games (*aşık oyunu*) feature animal names for sides of the dice, perhaps connected in some way with the many animals appearing in the *Irk Bitig*.[3] This and colour symbolism are among the topics which might

---

[1]   The latter will not be discussed in this paper, insofar as it concerns neither textual interpretation nor linguistic features; as can be seen in the book's index under "Irq Bitig", it discusses the divination book on twenty different pages. Nor will work by I. V. Stebleva on poetic forms (quoted in Kljaštornyj 1981), for the same reason.

[2]   Tekin (1993) actually writes "1973"; he also dates my *Notlar* as 1977. On p. 29, references to Tekin (1985) and to "Ramstedt 1915" are left unelucidated, the latter actually being Ramstedt (1913) (see bibliography).

[3]   A recent paper on such practices and games is Axmet'janov (1988), which documents the rich Turkic terminology in this domain; earlier literature is also quoted there. Roux (1959-60: 57) (in a paper equally ignored by Tekin 1993) has statistics on the various animals appearing in the *Irk Bitig*, the horse figuring most often.

help in trying to solve its enigmas.[4] Research into the Altaic anthropological context should be deepened and detailed comparisons carried out with Tibetan divination books, of which there is quite an abundance.[5] Cf. Hamilton (1975: 9-10, notes omitted):

> "En tibétain ... on a trouvé de nombreux manuels ou fragments de manuels d'un type tout à fait analogue, c.-à.-d. composés de présages qui débutent toujours par une série de petits ronds groupés en trois éléments, comptant chacun de un à quatre,[6] et qui se terminent par l'énoncé du sort bon ou mauvais. D'une manière générale, cependant, on remarque que, par rapport à *l'ïrq bitig*, les textes des présages en tibétain sont nettement ... plus élaborés avec des alternances de vers et de prose. La plupart des manuscrits de ces manuels tibétains ... proviennent, comme *l'ïrq bitig* de la grotte aux manuscrits de Chatcheou ... ."

Other such Tibetan fragments were found near Turfan, another area of intensive Turkic settlement.

> "Quant à *l'ïrq bitig* " Hamilton sums up his view, "on doit vraisemblablement le tenir pour un reflet simplifié et tardif de grands modèles tibétains."

There is not a word of reference to Tibetan parallels in Tekin (1993: 3), where we read:

> "The artistic style used in the book indicates that it is not a work translated from a foreign language. There is no doubt that it was compiled by a Turk who seems to have had a literary talent in using his native tongue."

Thomsen (1912: 194) also thought that

---

[4] In some cases, the colour names obviously merely serve purposes of alliteration, a very strongly constitutive element in the *Irk Bitig*; thus e.g. *sarıg atlıg sawçı, yazıg atlıg yalawaç* (ırk 11).

[5] See Thomas (1957: 113-115, 140-143) for a general comparison. The two manuscripts described by Thomas on pp. 140-141 are outwardly particularly similar to the *Irk Bitig*.

[6] This is exactly the arrangement in the *Irk Bitig*.

"several of the details are so closely connected with the mode of living of the
Turks that ... it is impossible to conceive that (these paragraphs) are transla-
tions from another language" (1912: 194).

It does, indeed, seem clear that the *Irk Bitig* is not a translation but the
work of a skilled and gifted author. Zieme (1991) gives ample evidence
for the use of skill and talent in the abbreviation and adaptation of for-
eign texts to Turkic verse patterns, however, some of the beautiful
Manichaean hymns no doubt have Middle Iranian models. Spontaneous,
unforced parallelism, alliteration and assonance on the one hand, and
topics such as the joys of the *bäg* in *ırk* 5, the description of the tent in
ırk 18 or the hunt of the khan with his retinue in *ırk* 63 on the other, do
indeed have as strong a Turkic flavour as the *Dede Korkut* epic.[7] Roux
(1966: 291) points out the similarity between *ırk* 5, where human birth
echoes animal birth, and a particular passage in *Dede Korkut*, where a
similar parallelism is expressed.

Yet, early Turkic culture was also composite and must have assimi-
lated elements from the surrounding societies, where everyday life may
not have been too different from that of the early Turks. In a Tibetan
divination manual (Francke 1924: 7 ff.) we encounter camels going to
drink water when the day gets hot, exuberant antilopes, cold winds in
open fields and deer too gentle to butt with their horns, all of which very
much remind us of the *Irk Bitig*'s nature descriptions. Tibetan iconog-
raphy may help us find out who the messenger on a yellow horse (*ırk*
11) is, or what the golden-headed snake with a golden stomach (*ırk* 8)
and the white horse which chooses its adversary in a contest (*ırk* 19)
stand for (to mention just a few of the protagonists). The all-powerful
talım kara kuş of *ırk* 3, for instance, reminds us of the Tibetan cult of the
eagle Garuḍa holding a snake in his mouth (Hoffmann 1950: 145-146),
in its turn derived from the Indian *garuḍa* eating up *nāgas*.

Not only foreign evidence can help us discover the spiritual and eth-
nological significance of the text, of course; we should also look for it in
the mythology of the South Siberian and other Altaic peoples. Thus
(going back to the same mythical being), the (Mongolian) Buryats con-

[7]   von Gabain (1964: 215) thinks that the term *uzun tonlug* used in this source to
denote 'women' (*ırk*s 22 and 42) is a "Hinweis auf seßhafte Lebensweise mit
ihren feierlicheren Gewändern"; the Turks of the 10th century must, however, no
doubt have been acquainted with both modes of life.

sider the eagle to be the ancestor of the shamans; for the (Turkic) Altay tribes the eagle (*kara kuş*) is the son of the sky god *Ülgän* (cf. also Harva 1938: 157). L. P. Potapov (quoted by Kljaštornyj 1981: 135) notes that the figure of a road god riding on a dappled horse, called *yer yol payan* or *tengere,* survived among the shamans of the Teleut (an Altay tribe) till the beginning of this century. This is clearly the old road god on a dappled horse of *ırk*s 2 and 48 (and perhaps 47).

Thomsen thought it could not be definitely settled whether the book is of Buddhistic or Manichaean origin but, he writes, "most outer and inner criteria speak in favour of the latter" (1912: 196). Hamilton (1975: 13-17) again discussed the question with reference to some nouns and proper names in the colophon, but could reach no decision either. Thomas (1957) speaks of the Tibetan divination books in very similar terms, noting that there is nothing particularly Buddhistic about them; their background seems to be generally Bon-po, but not necessarily so. Concerning the *Irk Bitig,* the

> "possibilité de l'existence d'un certain état de syncrétisme entre le bouddhisme et le manichéisme, ou, à tout le moins, de la cohabitation de communautés religieuses bouddhiques et manichéennes"

was evoked by Hamilton (1975: 14). Since then, contact and mutual influence between these religions in the Uygur milieu has been much discussed. It must, perhaps, also be conceded that such a text as the *Irk Bitig* can have been composed in a manner which, if not areligious, is still indifferent as to a choice between "standard" religions; the importance of these for the Uygurs may have been exaggerated because so much of the extant material does come from the clergy. Roux also denies both Manichaean and Buddhistic influence on this text, saying it seems "purement turc" (1966: 45).

The fight between two animals, described again and again in so many configurations in the *Irk Bitig,* is one motive which catches one's attention: A perennial theme in High Asian art (and hence thought) since times immemorial (cf. Roux 1966: 273), several vivid descriptions of such fights can still be found in verse by Abai, the Kazakh national poet. These points touch upon content. According to Peter Zieme (personal communication), the occurrence of the word *manistan* 'Manichaean monastery' in the colophon settles the question of the author's religious adherence: Since the *Irk Bitig* was written for two of the author's hear-

ers residing in a *manistan*, the author, too, must be a Manichaean. Then, however, the term *guru,* which is the second part of his name, is certainly remarkable. Another question which ought to be answered is whether there are any clearly Buddhist manuscripts in runic script; if not, this is further evidence for Manichaeism.[8] The fact that the author happened to be a Manichaean would not, however, necessarily make the text a Manichaean one; it should not be included into a corpus of Manichaean writings any more than Mickey Mouse should be considered a Christian figure or the gospel of St. John a Jewish text.

One of the features common to the *Irk Bitig* and Tibetan *Mo*-divination (dealt with, among other places, in Thomas (1957, ch. VI) is the series of small circles, arranged in three groups of from one to four, in continually alternating combinations; a line of such circles heads each omen (*ırk* in Old Turkic) to represent the die-marks shown on three casts of dice. The cast triads of the *Irk Bitig* were first published in Thomas (1957: 142), and reappear in Tekin (1993).[9] The triads are left-aligned in the latter, whereas Thomas rightly assumes that the direction of the writing, which reads from right to left, governs also that of the "eye" groups. This is important if one is trying to find out rules of divination. Similar systems were in use in Antiquity in Greece and India and are still part of the lore of many Turkic and Mongolian peoples: Good casts and bad casts might have remained the same, or may have changed in some interesting way. Such rules may, if discovered, in turn help us understand more about the text. Roux (1966: 43-44) points out, at any rate, that it can be good both if an animal wins (e.g. the panther in *ırk* 31) and loses (the panther in *ırk* 49) showing that, if anything, the cast must have mattered.

A very different domain still needing some elucidation is the place of the *Irk Bitig* within runic paleography and orthography. According to Tekin, "the runic syllabic letters *ot* and *up* / *üp* do not occur elsewhere" (1993: 4). This is not at all the case. *up* / *üp* is known from the Turfan manuscripts, as stated in Thomsen (1912: 191; see von Le Coq 1909: 1051, 1059). It has also turned up twice in what appears to be a letter, in Tezcan & Zieme (1971: 456). *ot* seems to appear thrice in the Ongin inscription (Clauson 1957), as made likely by Tryjarski & Hamilton

---

[8]   Peter Zieme has recently identified some runic manuscript fragments as Manichaean liturgical material.

[9]   For *ırk* 53, the data of Tekin (993) are right, those of Thomas wrong.

(1975: 177). There seems to have been a whole series of labialised voiceless stops, ^{w}k, ^{w}t and ^{w}p, possibly neutral as to frontness. The sign for ^{w}p appears subsequently to have been used to express the sound sequences ök and ük; the labiovelar characters were apparently kept alive by the many suffixes ending in rounded vowel + voiceless velar.

The labialised stop runes are not syllabic signs in the sense of the Semitic alphabets: They merely indicate that a rounded vowel is the kernel of the syllable they close.[10] In this sense, $s^1w^wkws^1mIs^2$ = sokuşmiş (ırk 2), $t^1wt^1w^wpn^1$ = tutupan (ırk 16) or $t^2\ddot{w}^wkl^2$ = tükäl (ırk 27) are not redundant; they are, in fact, quite common in this text. These signs are used also when they occur as second element in clusters, when, that is, there is a phoneme between them and the vowel: $k^2\ddot{w}r^{2w}kl^2\ddot{w}g^2$ (ırks 18 and 64) is körklüg 'beautiful'; it need not be read as "körüklüg" with the EDPT (followed by Tekin (1993)). Since there is good evidence for this orthographical feature also from the inscriptions, the word sometimes spelled as $t^2\ddot{w}r^{2w}k$ is not türük or türkü but just türk.

Irk 15 has twice d in turdı and thrice t in aztı. Johanson (1979: 114, with n.) discusses the matter summarily and explains it through the Irk Bitig's lateness (cf. ündi – boltı in ırk 53). Erdal (1978: 94) had already, comparing ölümdä oz- in ırks 13 and 17 with twice ölümtä oz- in ırk 49, pointed out that such fluctuation does not take place in "early" sources.

The spelling of /e/ in this text has never been commented upon. be, bel, ber- el, et-, keçä, ken, keyik, te-, teril-, ye-, yel, yer, etc. are all consistently spelled with I in the Irk Bitig, as done in the Uygur and Manichaean writing systems; this is unlike the Runic inscriptions, which, to represent /e/, show variation between implicitness and I. This fact need not be evidence for a source in Uygur script but could just mean that the scribe was influenced by Uygur spelling. Tekin (1993) transcribes these instances as bir-, yi- etc.; this practice is as unjustified in this case as with other Old Turkic texts, once we find that the documentation of sources in Brāhmī Tibetan and inscriptional runic scripts accords with comparative evidence.

This is after all where transcription differs from transliteration. The verbs s^2d^2- (thrice) and l^2t^2- (twice) and the numeral k^2I (thrice), which start off with an implicit vowel, should, on the other hand, be read as

---

[10] In the Irk Bitig, labialised consonants never seem to be used to open a syllable, as ko etc.

äşid-, äl(i)t- and *äki;* Tekin (1993) here writes *(e)lt-, (e)ki* and *(e)şid-.*[11] *äki* and *äşid-* are spelled with (implicit) /ä/ without variation in the Orkhon inscriptions as well. The inscriptions of the Uygur kaganate, Tariat and Šine-usu, also frequently have *(ä)ki*, without a single exception, while Uygur consistently writes *iki* (*also* in Brāhmī and Tibetan writing). The runic manuscripts in Le Coq (1909: 1057, 1058) (TM 342 2 r 10 and TM 326 r 2), on the other hand, have *ikinti*. The shape of 'two' appears to be a dialectological and not just an orthographical matter: *äki* and *iki* do not, I think, go back to **eki,* as already argued in Erdal (1993: 145) (against Doerfer 1971: 292, a.o.).[12] *äşid-* is further found in BT V[13] (Manichaean; here equally common as *eşid-*), BT III, frequently in the Xuan Zang text, sometimes in the Maitrisimit, often in other Buddhist sources and twice (beside frequent *eşet-*) in Brāhmī texts; so there is nothing special about its appearance in the *Irk Bitig*.

The case of *äl(i)t-* is a bit more complicated: Uygur consistently writes this verb with I and the runic inscriptions fluctuate between an implicit vowel and I, which would make us read *el(i)t-*; this is in fact what several Brāhmī instances have. There is one Brāhmī instance read *ält-ür* (TT VIII F 9) though, and the modern dialects vary in the shape of this verb. So I retain *äl(i)t-* as far as the *Irk Bitig* is concerned, and consider this to be a dialect characteristic: /e/, then, is always spelled with I in this source, as in Uygur writing.

On the representation of initial /a:/ in the *Irk Bitig,* Doerfer (1995, 328) goes a bit beyond the observations of Tekin (1993: 4).

Another phonic characteristic which distinguishes the *Irk Bitig* from inscriptional texts is the treatment of word-initial labial consonants when there is a nasal as next consonant. In nine different lexemes and in the pronoun 'I', the *Irk Bitig* has initial /m/ as in Uygur manuscripts; cf. also *munçuk* in the runic manuscript T II T 14 from Turfan. The runic inscriptions (including the ones from the Yenisei basin) write b. Retaining /b/ in this position would be typically Oguz. This again brings

---

[11] Write colophon instead of 67 in Tekin (1993: 54) under *(e)şid-:* There is no *ırk* to be numbered 67. *(e)rmiş* for *(ä)rmiş* in the last line of p. 8 and *ölümde* for *ölümdä* in the last line of p. 10 are also simple errors.

[12] *äki* may possibly be due to an early reanalysis related to *äk* 'a joined piece', a noun surviving only in the South West.

[13] This and other abbreviations referring to Uygur sources are to be found in the UW.

up the question of dialectal affinities. Erdal (1978: 106, 112) had pointed out that the form *sınuq* (*ırk* 48) is said to be Oguz in the DLT (fol. 604), *sıŋuq*[14] being considered by Kāšġarī the "normal" form; further, that *künäş* (*ırk* 57) is the Oguz word for 'sun'. *sın-ok* is, however, attested in the *Qutadgu Bilig* and in an Uygur economical document (Erdal 1991: 243), whereas *sıŋok* does not seem to appear outside the DLT (cf. Erdal 1991: 361-362); *kinäş* (regularly from *künäş*) has in the meantime also appeared in Khaladj (translated as 'sonnig, nach der Sonne').

Another relevant dialectological feature is the spelling of the word for 'reed' in *ırk* 10, which is *kamuş*; *ırk* 38 again has the normal *kamış* and other vowels adjacent to labial consonants are not rounded in this text. Vowel rounding in this position is otherwise, in Old Turkic, found in the few manuscripts in Sogdian script, which also show other "western" characteristics. There does not seem to be anything definitely Oguz about the *Irk Bitig*, then, although the possibility of such an early dialect assignment cannot be excluded; in any case, its language appears not be any "standard" variety of Old Uygur either. According to Clauson (1961: 218),

> "it is written in what Professor von Gabain has aptly called 'the Manichaean *n*-dialect'; but as", Clauson suggests, "this is for all practical purposes identical with the language of the Orkhon inscriptions, it would be simpler to call all the *n*-dialects "Türkü", distinguishing the language of the manuscripts, if necessary, by calling it 'Manichaean Türkü'".

Hegaard (1976: 97, footnote) argues against this, pointing out that the *Irk Bitig* has two occurences of *bul-* 'to find' but no occurence of *tap-*, the other verb with this meaning. One would find it difficult to agree with his contention that the Orkhon inscriptions have no instance of *bul-* as his interpretations of the relevant Orkhon passages are hardly acceptable. Hegaard's criticism of Clauson's position appears, in itself, to be justified.

Tekin (1993: 5-6) features a list of "scribal errors", which, however, is incomplete; add the following: In 15, the first instance of *oglı* is written as wg¹I; in 20, *odguru* is written without the final w; in 25, *kamşa-* is spelled with s² instead of s¹ and *ol* is spelled as l¹w; in 27, *bolmiş* is spelled with two m's instead of one; in 33, *ter* is spelled as t²II. Some of

---

[14] I would now write these as *sınok* and *sıńok* respectively (cf. Erdal 1996).

the errors just mentioned and the ones on the list of Tekin (1993) have been emended tacitly in the transcription while others have not.

The emendations in some of the *ırk*s are marked as such, while the ones in 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25 (twice), 27, 33, 34, 42, 52, 57 and 61 are tacit. 48 and 50 are emended only in the error list but not in the text. The transcription creates some new errors of its own: In the last sentence of *ırk* 5, read *bäg är* instead of just *bäg*, in *ırk* 8 *(ä)bint(i)n* instead of *(ä)bintin*, in *ırk*s 11 and 18 *(a)ñıg* instead of *(a)ñ(ı)g*, in *ırk* 24, *tiläyür* instead of *til(ä)yür*, in *ırk* 25, *buk(u)rsı* (or *bok(o)rsı, bok(a)rsı* etc.) instead of *bukursı*. In *ırk* 18, the word *köznöki* is written as if it had an explicit rounded vowel after the z (which is not the case). In 32, *asıgı war* 'there is a profit in it' is left untranslated, the words 'Know thus' appearing instead.

Unfortunately, the text offered by Tekin notes neither the ends of pages of the manuscript, nor are these numbered in the facsimile: This makes it very cumbersome to check manuscript passages, unless one has recourse to Thomsen's edition. The *ırk*s 10, 13 and 14 have twice double-dots at the end instead of 'It is good', 'It is bad' etc., between which space was apparently left for introducing these later. Such double double-dots are not marked in Tekin's edition, which disregards all original punctuation. The glossary lists words starting with *ka, kı, ko* and *ku* before words starting with *kä, ki, kö* and *kü*, although front and back /k/ are nowhere distinguished graphically (not, that is, as *q* and *k*).

The following notes on the various *ırk*s are supplementary to what can be found in the literature quoted by Tekin (1993). Points on which I fully agree with the editor are gone over in silence, which may make this paper seem unduly critical.

1.[15] Various Brāhmī texts show that the verb which Tekin (1993) writes as *olur-* was pronounced as *olor-;* this second vowel is retained in Yakut and reflected in Chuvash *lar-*, all signifying 'to sit (down)'.

The translation of *altun örgin üzä olorupan mäŋiläyür män* as "I enjoy sitting on the golden throne" is infelicitous, as sitting on the throne is unlikely to be the object of the Chinese emperor's beatitude. Better, I think, is something like 'Sitting on the golden throne I am in a state of happiness'. The sequence *olorupan mäŋiläyür män* also appears in *ırk* 4, and *ırk*s 51 and 56 similarly have *turupan mäŋiläyür män*. In those

---

[15] This and the subsequent boldface numerals refer to the *ırk*s in consecutive numbering.

cases, Tekin's translation as "I enjoy sitting / staying" may possibly be correct, as the subjects are various animals in obviously static situations. Even there, however, there may be more spirituality in the situation than this translation reveals: *Irk*s 4 and 56 stress the contiguity to a tree, the importance of which within shamanism is well known (cf. also Roux 1966: 376).

An "explanation" by Tekin (1993) expresses the opinion that *keçä* is not the equative form of **ke*, the root of *ken, kedin, kerü* (< **ke+gerü* by haplology) and *keç* (// *ka+ç*, cf. *kaçan*) as proposed in Erdal (1978: 88), but "derived from keç [ke:ç] 'late' with the ancient dative-locative suffix {+A}". I fail to see any argument against the first-mentioned etymology; Doerfer (1995: 327) gives further arguments to support it.

2. According to DLT fol. 53, *ala* signifies 'spotted black and white' when said of a horse; this and *ala+ça*, which later replaced it, are well documented for horses in Sağol (1995). Kāšḡarī says that, applied to humans, *ala* signifies 'leprous'. 'leprous' is also given in later lexicography; UW 90 b and the EDPT can therefore hardly be right about this term.

See the discussion of *ırk* 48 for *yol* (or *yul*) *täŋri*.

j¹l¹g¹ is translated by Tekin (1993) as "joyful", with the glossary adding "jolly". This translation is taken from the Yakut binome *külü: salı:*, for which Böhtlingk (1851) gives the same meaning in his dictionary (Pekarskij 1907-1930), whom Tekin quotes, mentions Böhtlingk as his source for it). Böhtlingk derives the word from *sala:-* 'to lick', < *yalga-*, and Yakut *salı:* by itself has the meaning 'licking'; the special semantic development of the binome is best explained through metaphor. The Yakut word is therefore rather unlikely to throw light on this problem. *(a)yl(ı)g*, proposed before for the *Irk Bitig* passage, fails to give an acceptable meaning. *ya+lıg* 'bow-bearing' would be another possible rendering of the characters. *yïlig yumşak*, which Erdal (1978: 89) quotes from TT I 178 (in Tekin (1993) wrongly "TT I 14"), is found also in BT II 1260 and in the Yükünç section of the Maitrisimit, 4 a 17 (Geng & Klimkeit 1988: 14). *yılı-g* remains the best reading in spite of the implicitness of the first vowel, for which cf. the reading *t(ı)g* in *ırk* 39.

The content of *-mış* is rendered with 'apparently'; this is a misleading translation of the evidential in the given context.

3. To account for *talım*, Tekin (1993) posits *talı-* as "a variety of well-attested *tala-*", which he quotes from U II 76. There the text has

talıp kuna käsip after a lacuna; the proposal of EDPT 490 b to read this hapax as *tälip kuna käsip* 'to pierce' is much likelier. This suggestion is also followed by Zieme (1991: 208, n. 394).

Concerning *kara kuş* 'eagle' see Doerfer (1967-75, 3: 431) and Menges (1982: 113-115) and what I quote in the introduction to this paper. In the QB and the DLT, the term also refers to the planet Jupiter. *talım kara kuş* is found here and in *ırk*s 43 and 51, here apparently referring to the 'sea eagle', in *ırk* 51 to the 'golden eagle' (who lives on mountains). *kara kuş* is not just "a predatory eagle" (as Tekin (1993) writes), but the Old Indian mythical bird *garuḍa*; this latter also has golden wings, like the bird in this *ırk*, and is the vehicle of *Viṣṇu*. Cf. TT VI 432 *täŋrilär, yäklär, ulug küçlüg luular, gantarvılar, asurlar, talım kara kuş kanları, kinarılar, maxoragilär ...* 'Götter, Dämonen, große, mächtige Drachen, *Gandharvas, Asuras, Garuḍas, Kiṃnaras, Mahoragas ...*', where the editors add: "Der uig. Name 'König der schwarzen *Raubvögel*' spielt an auf ihren machtvollen Kampf gegen die Drachen".

The *talım kara kuş* was already identified as Garuḍa in U II 20, 23 (= KIP 142), due to a parallel Chinese text. These *may* be taboo terms, as the 'royal eagle' (which is black) is in many Turkic languages called *bürküt. bürküt* appears to be the original name, if one follows Doerfer (1967-1975, II: § 782), who thinks that *bürküt* is originally Turkic although just as wide-spread in Mongolian. He is, however, able to document it in Turkic only from the 14th century on; so it may nevertheless come from Mongolian, even though Mongolian has *bürgüt* with /g/. In the Tüŋkä dialect of Buryat Mongolian (quoted by Menges 1982: 113), the royal eagle is called both *bürgüt* and *xaŋgardi;* this latter comes from *qan Garuḍa,* thus closing the circle.[16]

5. Tekin (1993) is unaware that his suggestion to interpret b[1]wd[1]l[1]l[1]g[1] as 'having a nose peg' was made by Zieme (1979: 479), who already quotes all the evidence. Zieme's proposal occurs in a review and refers to Roux (1976: 559-560). Roux's paper (equally unknown to Tekin) tried to interpret this same word as what is in fact a loan from Persian.[17] Roux remarks that both the mare and the she-camel

---

[16]   The term was already borrowed into Old Uygur with an *i* / *ï*, and went on into Mongolian in this shape.

[17]   Otherwise, the paper has some very interesting material on the use of knucklebones among the Turks and Mongols. The *ırk* is already discussed in Roux

are white; this, he notes, is a sacred colour,[18] the colour of animals dedicated to Altaic deities (as *ıdok*). 'Gold', which the hooves and the nose peg are to be made of, is the mark of royalty.

Tekin (1993) translates the sentence *üçünç kunçuyı urılamış* as 'his third princess had just given birth to a son', opting for polygamy in the society described. Obviously, Thomsen's "Thirdly, his wife had brought forth a male child" is much better in the context: There is a triad of events, and the birth of a son is the climax of the series.

Roux strangely translates the sentence *mäŋilig bäg är ärmiş* as "c'était un beg mâle, heureux", which would assume that *är* qualifies *bäg;*[19] in fact, the syntagmatic relationship is the inverse. *bäg är* also appears in the first sentence of the *ırk* and has turned up a number of times in Uygur texts; it might possibly simply mean 'gentleman'. Tekin's translation of *kunçuy* as 'princess' should, in any case, be replaced by 'lady': 'princess' is what the term meant originally; however, like *katun,* its denotees became more and more plebeian with time and the term came to signify just 'woman' in the end.

8. The golden-headed snake whose head is to be 'plucked out of its house' might be the poison-spitting snake whose head is crushed by Garuḍa (see above; Harva 1938: 62, 85); however, this does not explain why and by whose sword its golden stomach is to be cleaved open.

Arat (1965: 397, note to 12, 42) suggests that *intin* 'out of the hole' should be read as *irtin* 'sol, şimal' and *(ä)bint(i)n* as *birtin* 'sağ, cenup'. This far-fetched suggestion makes sense only if the original was in Uygur script.

10. Erdal (1991: 419) argued that the first word of this *ırk* should be read as *(e)sn(ä)g(ä)n* and not as *(ä)sn(ä)g(ä)n* (see also Erdal 1991: 382-383). This turns out to be contrary to the orthographical practice of the *Irk Bitig* (with the possible exception of *äl(i)t- / el(i)t-*). The verb signifying 'to yawn' probably comes from *äs-in* just like the other Old Turkic verb mentioned there. Clauson's 'snuffling' (1961) is not bad either.

Tekin (1993) renders *bars* here as "leopard", in *ırk*s 31 and 49 and in the colophon as "tiger" and gives both translations in the glossary. Ac-

---

(1959-1960: 58). We understand from a note to that passage that the aberrant idea is actually due to Jean Deny.

[18] Cf. *ırk* 41.

[19] Tekin (1993) altogether drops the word *är* (which is clear in the facsimile).

cording to Doerfer (1967-1975, II: 235-236), the term must have de-
noted the 'panther' (while 'tiger' was *kaplan*, 'jaguar' *irpiş*). The attri-
bution of manly virtues (*alp ärdäm*) to the panther does not, I presume,
follow from his having his head among the reeds, as the use of *antag*
would normally presuppose: Rather, this is a stereotype, as discussed in
Roux (1966: 235).

11. Tekin (1993) translates *yazıg* here as 'dark brown' but in *ırk* 50
as 'bay', reflecting the hesitation in the EDPT entry for the word. There
it is considered to be either a metathesis of *yagız* (not too likely, since it
appears twice) or related to Ibn Muhennā's *yōzag*, translated as *kumayt*
'dark bay' (not very convincing either, as a hapax). The proposal of
Thomsen contradicts the sound laws.

12. There has been a long discussion whether k¹m¹l¹- should be in-
terpreted as *kamla-* 'to perform shaman tricks' or *kamıl-* 'to fall down'.
Erdal (1978) and Tekin (1993) quote most of the earlier views. Add
Kljaštornyj's (1981: 127) and Molnár's (1996) defense of *kamla-*. Mol-
nár further proposes understanding the words *awka barmış* 'went hunt-
ing' as *abka barmış* 'went to practice sorcery', thinking of Kāšġarī's
abaçı and *abakı* 'bogy, idol' and Mongolian *ab* 'witchcraft, sorcery'.
This proposal would explain why the *a* of *āw* is not explicit, which it
should normally be in the *Irk Bitig;* the *a* isn't written out in the instance
of *ırk* 43 either, however, where *aw* is certain (see Meyer 1960: 52-53).

One problem with the idea is the stem-final vowel in Kāšġarī's terms;
another, that runic *b* represents Old and Common Turkic /w/, whereas
the DLT's *b* is /p/. *kamla-* is not attested in Old Turkic at all; it is con-
ceivable, however, that magical terminology would have stayed out of
the sources we happen to have. The practice of animal consecration, al-
luded to in *ırk* 41, is not, after all, found in any other Old Turkic source
either; the next earliest evidence for this practice, widespread among
Turkic tribes in the 19th century, comes from accounts related to the
Mongols (see Roux 1966: 177-186).

Bang (1925: 237, footnote 3) proposed *kamıl-* but went on with an
unacceptable interpretation of the sentence *täŋridä ärklig ter*, which has
several other possible renderings: Taking *ärklig* to be the accusative of
the participle *är-kli*, he offers the translation "(den infolge des Sturzes
Gestorbenen) stellt (das Bildchen) im Himmel seiend dar". This follows
his idea that the *ırks* were originally accompanied by drawings (in ac-
cordance with Indian but not Tibetan practice). *te-*, however, can hardly

signify 'darstellen'. See Erdal (1991: 662) for another interpretation of this phrase.

13. In the note to Tezcan (1975, l. 72) *täŋrilig kurtga* 'a devout old woman' is compared to the phrase *täŋri bol-,* which is a euphemism for dying (with further literature, a.o. Harva 1938). In this terminological context, the phrase might signify 'an old woman about to die'. In that case, however, the text might better have had *täŋrilik kurtga,* which would, again, be possible only if the original text were written in Uygur writing. The interpretation might benefit from the comparison with other passages where *täŋrilig* appears. The one passage I could find (*täŋrilig burxan* in BT XIII 2, 126) does not help much, however. Some of the (six) instances which appear in the Kutadgu Bilig (which can also be read as *täŋrilik*) were translated as 'devout', but Dankoff (1983) understands them differently.

14. *katıgtı* 'firmly' is now known to consist of two words: *tı* 'firm' appears by itself as well.

15. *keyik* should not be translated as 'deer', as Tekin (1993) does; in Old Turkic it denotes any wild animal. There is, in this *ırk,* a trifold division of living beings capable of receiving *kut:*[20] Humans, birds and, perhaps, four-legged animals. Are we to understand that fish and insects are excluded, or do we have here the apparently universal predilection for triples? Kljaštornyj (1981: 123) points out the mythical aspects of this *ırk.*

16. The word *s(ä)mriti* of this *ırk* was understood by Thomsen, Orkun, Malov, Clauson and Erdal (1978) as a gerund. Tekin (1993) takes it to be the causative form *sämri-t-ti* (which is a perfectly legitimate reading with the orthographical practice of this text) and proposes the translation "fattened (itself)". This translation is impossible for two reasons: Firstly, causatives of *transitive* verbs can be used with passive meaning in Old Turkic (as discussed in Erdal 1991: 844-847, with literature), but causatives of intransitive verbs (as *sämri-* 'to fatten') are always just transitives and have no reflexive (or medial) meaning. Secondly, the perfect (*-di*) and the evidential (*-miş*) forms are never used in parallel fashion as postulated, unless the latter can be understood to refer to somebody's thoughts.

---

[20] Note the remarks of Roux (1966: 42) on the similarity of the animal and the human condition before God shown in this *ırk.*

The solution proposed by Hamilton (1978: 248-252) (unknown to Tekin 1993) should be unacceptable for this same reason. Like Tekin (1993), Hamilton also takes *sämriti* to be a finite verb, but from the simple base. This is acceptable semantically; however, beside the problem just referred to in connection with Tekin's interpretation, we probably have some difficulty with *t* (instead of *d*) after a vowel in the perfect form. Erdal (1991: 784) had, in the entry *sämri-t-*, proposed a further solution involving the gerund, equally disregarded by Tekin (1993). Still another way to understand the sentence would be *sämri-t-i ye-r+in öpän* 'remembering that he had eaten (*ye-* in the aorist participle form) his fill'.

utru yirdä[21] *ogrı sokuş-* '(On its way home) a thief came across' is equally unsatisfactory, the translation part put into brackets being unwarranted and quite unnecessary and in any case not a correct translation of *utru* (if that is what it was intended to be). Hamilton (1978: 249-250) plausibly thinks that WTRW could be an error for WRTW *ortu* 'middle' (which was probably pronounced as *orto*); "faute d'autant plus compréhensible," he adds, "que la métathèse *-rt-* → *-tr-* était fréquente en turc ancien". He further compares the passage to *orto yerdä amgaka sokuşmış* (my spelling) in *ırk* 49. This proposal fails to account, however, for *utru eki ... kişi oglın sokuşmış* in *ırk* 2.

yel 'mane' is not discussed by Tekin (1993), while Hamilton (1978: 250) compares it with the entry in DLT fol. 450 (referred to in EDPT 924 b). The EDPT 916 entry shows the base forms of Qarakhanid and Middle Turkic to have been *ya:l* and *yalıg*, but I have come across no instance for the word for 'mane' in Uygur. The *Irk Bitig* lexeme being quite clear in its context and Yakut *siäl* a problemless cognate, *yel* must be posited for eastern Old Turkic. The statement in Doerfer (1967-1975, IV: § 1806) that "tü. *yäl* scheint nicht belegt zu sein" does not hold, then, and Mongolian *del* can very well be related to it. The dialect variant *yal*, on the other hand, could have resulted from a contamination with a cognate of Mongolian *dalu* 'shoulder blade'.

The base of k[1]wd[1]wr[1]s[1]wg[1]Iŋn[1]IŋA is by Tekin (1993) emended to an unattested *kudursug*, whereas *kudursugın*, Hamilton's proposal (1978: 250-252), stays closer to the manuscript and takes the various other attested forms of the word denoting the tail area of the horse into consideration: The scribe apparently wrongly wrote the stem-final nasal as ŋ, then corrected this to n without deleting the error. The last two

---

[21] Tekin's transcription for what I would give as *yerdä*.

vowels could also have been meant to be ı and u or ı and o: The form appearing in the Turkic-Khotanese wordlist (Emmerick & Róna-Tas 1992) is *kudıs(ı)gon*; this should either be read with /z/,[22] or else represents a simplification of the cluster through the dropping of /r/. Doerfer (1967-1975, III: § 1494) deals with the word in detail. See Hamilton's discussion for everything else; it is clear, in any case, that the stem ended in /n/, as opposed to Tekin's choice.

17. Tekin (1993) translates *täŋri küçiŋä* as 'thanks to the strength given by Heaven', following EDPT 693 a, possibly in view of *täŋri küç bertök üçün* in the Köl Tegin and Bilgä Kagan inscriptions (KT E 12, BQ E 11). The phrase can be compared to *täŋri qutınta* 'by the grace of Heaven' (thus, with capital H in both translations) in *ırk* 15: I would rather ascribe *küç* to *täŋri,* as previous editors have done; cf. the imperial Mongolian formula *möŋke tengri-yin küčün-dür* 'in the might of Everlasting Heaven', attested already in the seal of the great-khan Güyüg (1246) and in the Secret History. It appears also in Turkic (*mäŋgü täŋri küçindä*) and Persian (*bi quwwat-i xudāi*).[23]

Tekin (1993) writes *yol sub* 'way and water', Malov (1951) *yul sub* 'a spring and water'; in view of parallelism between *yul sub kör-* and *yaş ot kör-* and between these and *sub içipän yaş yepän,* I would prefer Malov's choice.

18. The word spelled as *köznök*, where Tekin (1993) retains the earlier translation 'window', must instead be the same as *köznäk* 'hole'; this is attested in *suw köznäki* (TT III 55) 'water hole' and in *toornuh köznäki ... köznäkläri ... alko köznäklär* (BuddhUig I 389, 390, 392), where it refers to holes in nets. The variant *köznök* appears nowhere else, but tents in any case have smoke holes (see also Erdal 1991: 639-640, n. 305).

The second elements in the sequences *köznök* and *körklüg, ägin* and *ädgü, bagış* and *bar* in this *ırk* have obviously been chosen for the sake of alliteration and are therefore a bit arbitrary as far as content is concerned. Tekin 1993 follows the EDPT (744 b) in reading $k^2\ddot{w}r^{2w}kl^2\ddot{w}g^2$ as *'körüklüg'* and translating this as 'can be seen through'. The same spelling is found also in *ırk* 64, there translated as 'with a wide view'. Such a form is not known from anywhere else, however, nor is there

---

[22] The well-known *r ~ z* alternation has a further variant *rs*, as in *ti:z* 'knee' / *tirsgäk* 'elbow'; cf. *kumursga* in *ırk* 37.

[23] Discussed in Kotwicz (1934: 134 ff) and elsewhere.

any *körük* (beside the word signifying 'bellows'). There is a near-participial suffix *-(X)glXg* (discussed in Erdal 1991, § 3.119) but none of the shape *-(X)klXg*. I have no doubt that the word meant is *körklüg* 'beautiful' although it is spelled with ^wk in the second syllable: This happens elsewhere as well when the syllable has a rounded peak, even though a sonorant intervenes between the vowel and the stop.

Malov takes *bar*, which Tekin (1993) translates as 'they are all there', to be the aorist of *ba-* 'to bind', which may be preferable.

19. Kljaštornyj (1981: 129-131) proposes reading *ak ata* instead of *ak at* 'white horse' in this *ırk*, pointing out that *odguru* is, in *ırk* 20, (as an error, I would say) spelled without the final w; *ak ata* is supposed to be a Manichaean deity. In a review, Zieme (1984) gives three convincing arguments against this suggestion. One might add to his arguments that one cannot both entertain such a thought and support the idea, as Kljaštornyj does in that same passage, that the word b¹wl¹wg¹ of this *ırk* is to be read as *bolug* and signifies 'existence', i.e. Buddhistic *ažun*. Reading this word as *bulug* and translating the passage as 'chose its adversary in three quests' (Erdal 1991: 184-185) gives, I think, a more satisfactory meaning.

According to Kāšġarī (fol. 53), *ak* is used among the 'Turks' for horses' colours, whereas the Oguz are said to use it for anything. The non-Oguz early general word for 'white' was *ürüŋ / yürüŋ*. According to Sağol (1995), *ürüŋ* is, indeed, never used for horses. In (later) Uygur the distinction apparently weakened; the *UW* has a few instances of *ak* qualifying entities other than horses. It seems to have been kept up in the *Irk Bitig*, however: *Irk* 5 supplies us with a minimal pair, *ak be* 'white mare' against *ürüŋ ingän* 'white she-camel'; elsewhere in the *Irk Bitig ürüŋ* is applied to a calf, a cow and a falcon. All this speaks against *ak ata*.

20. Note that the second vowel of *turguru* is implicit, although the suffix *-gUr-* has the archiphoneme /U/; this contradicts the theory propounded by Doerfer in various publications, to the effect that only /X/, which is said to encompass only reduced vowels, is implicit. The matter is discussed in Erdal (1996).

In translating *titir bugra* as 'a camel stallion (with a herd of) females', Tekin (1993) is following the EDPT and, before that, Clauson (1961: 221). Clauson quotes QB 2312, where there is

"a description of the qualities required of a general. It says that he must have the qualities of various animals ... and, if he is taking revenge, be as vindictive as the *titir bugrası*."

This account is, for Clauson, sufficient justification for the grammatically and semantically far-fetched translation 'the camel stallion with a herd of females'. The 'female camel' is *ingän,* occurring in *ırk* 5, where it corresponds to *bugra* as 'male camel'. The camel which the Old Turks were primarily familiar with must, of course, have been the (two-humped) Bactrian camel. Although Thomsen did not translate *titir* in his text, he gives the full and (I think) correct explanation in his notes (and is joined by Malov): Quoting the Houtsma text where the difference between *ingän* and *titir* is explained, he shows that *titir* is the Arabian one-humped female camel, which was used in Central Asia for mating with the native two-humped male camel.

It appears to have been known in West Turkestan since the Arabian conquest in the 8th century. The DLT's translation of *titir* as Arabic *nāqa* 'female camel' must, I assume, be understood to refer to the 'female dromedary'. Roux (1959-1960: 37-38, 40-41) discusses the term and the present passage and, in view of shamanist thinking, reaches certitude in his view that *titir bugra* is a 'hermaphrodite camel'. I find Thomsen's hypothesis more convincing and take *titir bugra* to have signified 'a male hybrid between a male Bactrian and a female Arabian camel'; *titir* would then refer, here, to the breed rather than the gender.

Tekin (1993) (like Thomsen) translates *köpük* as 'froth'. Roux (1959-1960: 58-59), in his discussion of the passage, translates this word as 'bave' (saliva). Nobody else, in fact, seems to have asked what might actually have been meant by this camel's 'froth', which appears to attain such universal diffusion. Roux connects the *ırk* with the miraculous saliva of various folklore and belief systems, where it gives remedy to the sick and resurrects the dead. According to him, it must be this saliva which wakes the sleeping and raises those lying down (which he interprets as referring to the sick and the dead). Roux further, in this connection, raises the question (which he leaves open) as to what "religion" might lie behind this belief in the present case.

21. Tekin (1993) is, of course, right in reading *(ä)t-* 'to sing' in this *ırk:* Not only because *te-* 'to say' "does not make sense here", but also because it would have been written with I.

yıl yarumazkan is translated by Clauson (1961: 221) as 'before the year brightened (that is 'before the days got long')'; for Tekin (1993) it is 'before (the new) year dawned'. I find Clauson more appropriate.

As Tekin (1993) points out, the verb *ödi- / ödü-* 'to get excited' survives in Kirghiz; Palló (1959: 254) postulated it to have survived in Chuvash as *ur-* 'rasend sein',[24] taken into Hungarian as *üz-*.

22. Doerfer (1995: 328) points out that 'mirror' is *küzŋü* and not *közŋü*, quoting the entry in Doerfer (1967-1975, III).

The omen of this *ırk* is the worst in the *Irk Bitig*: This is the only *ırk* with the predicate 'very bad' (*añıg yawlak*); the *ırk* is said to be 'distressing' (*muŋlug*). The anthropological background for this characterisation no doubt lies in the significance which a person's reflection in a mirror or in water was believed to have for one's fate (cf. Harva 1938: 252-254, 349).

23. We find *täzkin*, the wrong interpretation, also in Bang (1934: 199); nobody now any longer doubts Clauson's *täzäk+in* (Clauson 1961).

käkük appears also in Maitrisimit 32 v14, where this bird is said to attack the Indian cuckoo and the peacock (see Erdal 1991: 192). In DLT fol. 409 the term is rendered as 'falcon', by which 'a species of falcon' is apparently meant. This is also what we find in Tekin's glossary, but the translation accompanying the text writes 'eagle'. The inconsistency appears to come from a hasty reading of the EDPT entry: That entry quotes the translation 'eagle' from Steingass' Persian dictionary, a rendering of *zummaj*, the word used by Kāšġarī to translate *käkük*. Kāšġarī adds that its "bones are used in conjurations and love potions and their spells": There might have been some such use also for this bird's (dried) dung, or it may merely have been an omen. Tekin (1993) follows Erdal (1978) in emending çwk[2] to *çäkik* (making 'lark' in his translation into a vocative, however, where I had taken it to be in adnominal function). In view of love potions and spells and the boy who finds the falcon's dung, another lexeme, equally mentioned in DLT fol. 409, is perhaps better suited to the context: *çäkik* 'the penis of a small boy', which would give 'May the flesh of your penis be blessed'. That the sentence *ätiŋ kutlug bolzun* should be addressed to a 'lark' (as in Tekin's transla-

---

[24] The shift *ö > u* has its parallel in Chuvash *kur-* < *kör-* 'to see' and *kun* < *kün* 'day'.

tion) seems implausible in any case, as there would be no connection whatsoever with the previous sentence.

24. The word written by Tekin (1993) as *ortu* was pronounced as *orto*, as shown in Brāhmī practice; all Turkic languages not featuring labial attraction after [o] have *orta*. Similarly, *täglök* instead of Tekin's *täglük* (cf. Erdal 1996).

In his interpretation of *yütür-*, Tekin (1993) disregards Erdal (1978: 96-97), where another instance of this verb in U I is mentioned. Erdal (1991: 815-816) takes *yütür-* (also found in a Ht manuscript) to be a direct derivate from the base of *yüd-*, *yük* etc. and not to stand for *yüdür-*; instead, *yütür-* is stated there to be the earlier verb signifying 'to load', before the regularised *yüd-tür-* was created. Tekin (1993) regards "*yütür-* as the causative of a verb **yüt-*", taken to be "a dialectal form of OT *yit-* which survives only in Yakut *süt-* 'to be lost, get lost'". There is not a single trace of a Yakut dialect form in Old Turkic, however, where, on the contrary, *yit-* is attested unchanged in all sorts of texts. Similar to *süt-*, Yakut also has unexplained *sü:rbä* < *yegirmi*; there is no reason to take the Yakut forms to be old.

29. This *ırk* remains problematical even with Tekin's convincing interpretation for *oş-iç* as 'internal organs, intestines', because of the difficulty in translating *oyma är* as "a man whose job is to hollow out slaughtered animals": As shown in Erdal (1991: 316-320), *-mA* derivates from transitive verbs denote objects of these verbs and not their agents;[25] furthermore, there is a lexeme *oyma* 'boot'.

31. Roux (1966: 99, n. 10) notes the parallelism between this *ırk* and *ırk* 34. See Erdal (1991: 435-436) for *äŋ* and its derivates. For the binome, further add *äŋçi mäŋçi käyikçi* in Maitrisimit 75 r 5 (and *ırk* 49 below).

33. Tekin's translation of *kidizig suwka sukmış* as '(A man) put the felt into water' is contestable on feminist grounds; 'somebody put felt into water' is surely better.

34. Tekin (1993) takes the khan's soldiers to be the object of *köçürü konturu*. I would follow Malov (1951) in taking the object to be 'the

---

[25] This against Erdal (1978: 99 with footnote 43). The statement there to the effect that there is no noun *oy* is also wrong: *oy* 'hole; pit' is found several times in the HT's text and also in Höllen 113 and Einf IV 6. On the other hand, a lexeme *oyug* 'mark; ornament' is attested in QB 3382 and survives in a number of Turkic languages to this day (cf. Tezcan 1981: 54).

enemy', who is referred to just before the phrase in question; the khan and his soldiers, on the other hand, are the topic of the following sentence.

35. In Tekin's translation of *yolta* as 'on (his) way (back home)', the contents of the second bracket is unwarranted; going out to war, one might be happy to be brought right back home by a swan even before and not just after the fight.

Cf. Roux (1966: 353) for the place of the swan in Turkic myth.

There is no punctuation between *urup* and *anın;* taking *anın* to be the instrumental of *ol* and translating it as 'with him' is therefore unjustified. Furthermore, the common *anın* always signifies 'therefore, thereby', as one can see in the entries of EDPT and UW. Schulz (1978: 154-155, § 186) proposes reading *urupanın* and translating the passage as 'nachdem der Schwan ihn auf seine Flügel gesetzt hatte'. The expanded gerundial ending *-(X)pAnIn* is discussed in Johanson (1988: 143-146); it appears at least twice in the Maitrisimit, and in Manichaean fragments edited in M II and III. In view of the probable instrumental origin of the last part of the ending,[26] I would prefer 'indem er ... setzte'; this covers the content of 'thus', which Tekin (1993) adds in brackets at the beginning of the next sentence. In this I follow Johanson (1988: 143), where the sentence is translated as "The swan put [him] on his wings and [so] rose in the air and [so] brought him to his parents." Clauson (1972: 194, 617, s.vv. *ur-* and *qalı-*) got this sentence wrong because he failed to see that the swan is the agent (as already noted by Schulz 1978: 213).

36. In his "explanations" to this *ırk*, Tekin (1993) argues (agreeing with Erdal 1978: 102) for interpreting *atlıg* as 'having horses' and not as 'having a name, title, reputation'; this is also how these instances are rendered in the glossary. The translation, however, (wrongly) offers 'bearing ... titles' and 'having a ... reputation'! Further, Tekin (1993) understands (more or less following Clauson 1961) *üküş atlıg, kobı atlıg* and *uçruglug* as attributes of *ögrünç, korkınç* and *kut* respectively; I still believe (cf. Erdal 1978: 102) that these phrases should be interpreted as concessive (or temporal) clauses: '(Even when / Even though) possessing many horses, you have no joy; when (your) horses are unlucky, you are not worried; (when) flying (your) banners (for war), you do not enjoy the favour of heaven.' *uçrug,* finally, is not a flag for celebrations, as Tekin's translation might make one think; see the sources quoted for

---

[26] This is the position also of Ş. Tekin (1980: 71), in a long footnote.

this lexeme in Erdal (1991: 211-212): All of its uses referred to in earlier literature are warlike; the others describe Buddhist ceremonies irrelevant here.

37. *kumursga* is the general word for 'ant' outside Oguz; in the northeast (Shor, Yakut) there is a related form, to be reconstructed as *kımırdagaş* or *kımırdagaç*. Yakut further has *kımırıt* 'a small insect'. Variants in these languages as well as Khakas, Kazakh etc. show that the rounding in the first two vowels is secondary, no doubt being due to the /m/. See Erdal (1991: 84) for an etymology.

Tekin's translation of *turur* as 'lays down' is doubly misleading ('lies down' is no-doubt meant).

38. I agree with Tekin's "explanations" of this *ırk,* where we read: "It was Clauson who first understood this sentence correctly (1961: 223)." Surprisingly, Tekin's own translation radically differs from Clauson's and is unacceptable: He takes *kalmiş* and *unamaduk* to be finite, but these must be attributive participles, as the topic of the first clause and the object of the second one are left unstated till the third clause. Communicative principles are violated in a manner postulated by Tekin (1993) only under formal subordination. Further, the addition of '(alone)' is unwarranted. Bang (1930: 17) writes *abïnču-qatun* with a hyphen and offers the translation "sie ist (am Ufer) im Röhricht geblieben und mag ein von Gott verstoßenes 'Freudenmädchen' werden" with unstated reference for "sie". Bang was also mistaken in taking *qatun* to signify 'woman' as Ottoman *kadın.*

40. This *ırk* is discussed by Hamilton (1978: 252-254) and Tezcan (1981: 76-77), both ignored by Tekin (1993). I accept Tezcan's translation, which is "Yırtıcı kuzukapan, kürekkemiği kadar geniş ok temreniyle (= gagasıyla) yalçın kayayı yararak vurup[27] yalnız başına yaşıyor". His interpretation starts off with the verse *kalıkta uçuglı kara kuş yorı* in QB 5378. He then correctly identifies the last word of this verse with Kirghiz *joru* 'bearded vulture' and takes *orı* of *ırk* 40 to be an alternant of the same word.[28] The QB's association of the word with *kara kuş* is a

---

[27] Better *yararcasına vurup*: One does not strike by splitting but rather splits by striking.

[28] *orı* could rather just be an error of the manuscript, of which quite a number are mentioned above: Qarakhanid initial /y/ is not otherwise dropped in any variants of Old Turkic, if one disregards cases as *yıgla-* 'to weep', where the /y/ is a reflex of *h. The opposite relationship can be found in *oşuk* 'helmet' in the DLT, cor-

strong argument in favour of this interpretation, as this is the term nor-
mally qualified by *talım* 'rapacious' (like *talım orı* in this *ırk*). Other-
wise, there is only *talım balık*, a sea monster;[29] neither humans (Tekin)
nor ravines (Hamilton) can be qualified in this way. Tezcan's translation
of *yorı-* as 'yaşa-' is also the correct one (as against Tekin's 'march-
ing'): The meaning 'leading a certain way of life', which this verb also
has (cf. examples in the EDPT entry), is further attested in *ırk*s 20, 45
and 49. *yarın*, finally, is not 'shoulder' but 'shoulder blade', which is a
further reason to prefer Tezcan's interpretation over Tekin's.

41. The form *buzagula-çı* was already defended against Clauson's
"grammatically impossible" in Erdal (1991: 434); another example for
this word is also quoted there from UigPañc 115.

Speaking of a cow, *timiş* can hardly, with Tekin (1993), be translated
as 'she said'. *te-* is here better rendered with 'to think'; the woman in *ırk*
42 is also, no doubt, 'thinking'.

Tekin (1993) translates *idukluk*[30] as 'to dedicate to heaven'; I propose
'for consecration'. The practice among Turks and Mongols of con-
secrating animals to otherworldly beings is discussed in Roux (1966:
177-186), who points out that the present passage is the earliest evidence
of this practice. There is no reason to believe that the Sky God was ever
the only possible recipient of *ıdok* animals.

42. *idiş* 'cup' is expanded to *ıdış+lıg* four times in the older two
manuscripts of the QB, which probably means that the word originally
had back vowels. We find the (presumably secondary) front variant also
in *idiş+ig* (twice) in BT I.

44. The ablative suffix in the *Irk Bitig* is written by Thomsen as
+d(i?)n, by Orkun as +d'n, by Malov as +din, by Tekin as +d(ä)n. In
Old Uygur and Qarakhanid, the ablative suffix has a high vowel exclu-
sively. In the few examples of this morpheme found in runic inscrip-
tions, the vowel is, as here, unspecified. One would not mind the suffix
being read as +dAn in Orkhon Turkic: It nowadays has this shape in all

---

responding to *yoşuk* (twice) in another runic manuscript published in Thomsen
1912.

[29]   See Hamilton (1978: 253). Hamilton also quotes a derivate *talm+a-*, which may
be a misreading of *tarma-* 'to scratch with claws, to lacerate' (documented in Er-
dal (1991: 568) and discovered in M III 29,31 by Peter Zieme). *tarma-*, in turn,
may possibly come from *tal(ı)m+a-*.

[30]   Probably pronounced as *ıdoklok* (cf. Erdal 1996).

Turkic languages except Modern Uygur, and may well have done so in Orkhon Turkic as well. The *Irk Bitig,* however, is less likely to have diverged from Uygur in this matter; the possibility of Oguz affinities is discussed above.

Schulz (1978: 154) proposes reading *togan kuş oŋ tırŋgakı ögüşüpän* "nachdem seine rechte Kralle abgeschürft war, erhob sich der Falke in die Luft ..." instead of genitive *kuşuŋ.* He may be right, although there is no punctuation before *oŋ:* The sentence referring to the hare is in the so-called double subject construction,[31] and we might want to assume parallelism.

45. *näçök yorıyın* should have been translated as 'How shall I live?', in accordance with the translation for *yorı-* accepted above for *ırk* 40. Here is the sense of *yorı-* that no doubt served as the source for the use of this verb as a durative auxiliary.

46. The image of animals becoming stuck in mud and dying appears to have been common; cf. *inçä kaltı täriŋ titigtä çomukmış ud täg* 'just as an ox submerged in a deep bog' (ShōAgon B(1)270), used metaphorically for a person weighed down and mired in lust. Tekin (1993) says that it was Clauson (1972: 119) who first interpreted this *ırk* correctly. In fact, Rachmati (1930: 468, n. to l. 74, where *titig* occurs) already corrects Thomsen's interpretation, translating *titig* as 'Schlamm' and referring to the DLT. He adds:

> "Die von THOMSEN, *Wahrsagebuch* ... angenommene Bedeutung des Wortes 'B r u n n e n' paßt hier nicht. Hr. Prof. W. Bang hatte mich schon längst auf diesen Umstand aufmerksam gemacht."

Orkun also has the correct translation "çamur", and we further find it in Roux (1959-60: 59), where the author ascribes his interpretation to Louis Bazin. Roux's words are worth repeating: .

> "Il ne s'agit pas d'une anecdote empruntée de la vie quotidienne, encore moins d'un symbolisme religieux; c'est une fable. Un personnage puissant, par suite d'un accident, se trouve tomber à la merci d'un individu quelconque."

This view gains further weight when one remembers that the camel is, in the Turkic world, proverbial for its strength and tenacity.

---

[31] See Erdal (forthcoming), where further examples for this construction are given.

48. The manuscript here visibly has *karı yol täŋri* and not *kara yol täŋri*, as first noted in Erdal (1978: 106) (correct in Tekin 1993). There is, then, no reason why this should not be the same god as the one appearing in *ırk* 2 (and possibly also *ırk* 47). Kljaštornyj (1981: 134-135) not only adheres to *kara* (although he quotes my paper on p. 127), but wants to emend this to *kara atlıg yol täŋri*. He concludes that there were two such deities, one riding on a dappled and another on a black horse. He sees his theory supported by a passage in Movses Kagankatvatsi (i.e. Dasxurantsi)'s "History of the Caucasian Albanians",[32] where the Western Türk (7th century) are said to have worshipped several road gods.[33] Other sources quoted by Kljaštornyj accord with the *Irk Bitig* in referring to just one such god, however:[34] L.P. Potapov's Altay materials already mentioned above speak only of a road god riding on a dappled horse, and there is no trace anywhere of one riding on a black horse.

Also very interesting is the state mentioned in a Tibetan manuscript found in the same cave as the *Irk Bitig,* quoted by Lalou (1965: 192),

[32] Translated in Dowsett (1961), who shows (xviii-xix) why the attribution of the surname *Kagankatvatsi* comes from a misinterpretation.

[33] Here is part of the passage (Dowsett 1961: 156; the rest is also worthy of interest): "Using horses as burnt offerings they worship some gigantic savage monster whom they invoke as the god *T'angri Xan*, called *Aspandiat* by the Persians. Possessing completely anarchical minds they stumble into every sort of error, beating drums and whistling over corpses, inflicting bloody sabre and dagger cuts on the cheek and limbs, and engaging naked in sword fights — O hellish sight — at the graves, man against man and troop against troop, all stripped for battle. Numerous groups wrestled with each other and in the orgy performed swift gallops on horseback, wheeling this way and that. Some were occupied in weeping and wailing, others in a game of diabolical fury. They played their games and danced their dances with obscene acts, sunk in benighted filth and deprived of the sight of the light of the Creator. They made sacrifices to fire and water and to certain gods of the roads, and to the moon and to all creatures considered in their eyes to be in some way remarkable."

[34] Kljaštornyj still propounded the same theory at a lecture given at the University of Giessen on 24 May, 1995. The handout: "Das *Irk Bitig* stellt eine deutliche Verbindung zur Staatsideologie her dadurch, daß die eine [Gottheit, i.e. the one of ırk 2] das *qut* 'die göttliche Gnade' verleiht, die andere die Ordnung im Staat garantiert." The last clause alludes to the sentence *elig etmiş män in ırk* 48.

whose *lha* ('deity': "pas tout à fait 'dieu', ni *deva*") is said to be Yol-taṅ-re'= *Yol taŋrı*: Its capital was called "ču-ba *balık*", its rulers were "*hirkin*" and "*tarkan*" and its minister "*Türgüš* A-ma-ča"; this must have been a Turkic state, as all the terms mentioned are clearly Turkic.[35]

Clauson (1961: 223) was in favour of reading *yul täŋri* "the god of the spring" instead of *yol täŋri*, these two being, orthographically speaking, equivalent. This idea has not been accorded any attention and, in view of the god's occupation, does not *prima facie* seem convincing. Harva (1938: 400-404) has some details which make *yul* possible as well:

> "(Die Wassergeister) sollen dann auf den Wegen wandern und ihre kleinen Kinder, die sie reichlich haben, auf einem Ochsen mitnehmen. Man glaubt weiter, daß die Wassergeister auf ihren Wanderungen von einem Ort zum anderen verschiedene Stimmen hervorbringen. Um diese zu hören, setzen sich die Menschen an Wegkreuzungen, an Eislöcher oder neben verlassene Jurten. Aus dem, was sie dann gerade hören, sagen sie die Geschehnisse des kommenden Jahres voraus."

Erdal (1978) had proposed that the second word in the sentence *sınokıŋın sapar män, üzükiŋin ulayur män* uttered by the road god be emended to read as here, against *säpär* of the manuscript; this proposal (actually originally made in the note to Ht X 1176 by Tezcan 1975) is accepted by Tekin (1993). The sentence appears to contain a fixed expression: QB 1858 reads *sınokug sapar ol buzukug etär* "It mends what is broken and repairs what is in ruins" (Dankoff 1983), there predicated upon "intellect". Since *sapar* and *säpär* look identical only in Uygur script, I had postulated this to have been the script of a preceding version; this hypothesis is strengthened by the alliterative patterns: If

---

[35] The Tibetan transcription of *Türgüš* can only be interpreted as having *ü* in the second syllable. This should also be the variant of the runic inscriptions, seeing that the second vowel is implicit in all the numerous instances found there. As distinct from some other early titles, Turkic etymologies are possible for *tarkan* and *hirkin*: the former from *tar-* 'to disperse (the enemy)', the latter from *irk-* 'to collect, heap up'; this is actually how the title *irkin* is explained in DLT fol. 67. The suffix was pronounced with [k] after /r/, /l/: Erdal (1991: 327) mentions Brāhmī instances of *käl-kin* and *tur-kun*. Note further *taṅrı*, the Western variant of the word for 'god, sky'.

üzükiŋin ulayur is to show at least visual alliteration,[36] like *sınokıŋın sapar* preceding it and *elig etmiş* following, ü and u cannot originally have been in runes. *sap-* and *ula-* form a common biverb, and *ulal-* often goes with *sapıl-*, *ulag* with *sapıg* (see Erdal 1991: 200 and 669-670). *sap-* also forms a biverb with *et-*, however, as e.g. in the QB example quoted, and from this we have the binome *sapılgan etilgän* in the DLT. Now in BT VIII A 115 we find the binome *etmäksiz säpmäksiz* with front k, which makes us wonder whether Uygur biverbs such as *etip sapıp* should not be read as *etip säpip*. The BT VIII phrase could also make us wonder whether *säpär* in this *ırk* is necessarily purely graphic.[37]

50. Tekin (1993) states that *tigrä-t-* and *yadrat-* "have not been understood correctly by previous scholars". However, the special horse-related use to which *tigrä-t-* is put here was already known to EDPT 486; Erdal (1991: 788) quotes an Uygur example with a more general meaning. Concerning *yadrat-*, the Altay-Turkic *yayrat-* is quoted both by Thomsen and the EDPT. Both considered it to be derived from the aorist of *yad-*, whence Clauson's 'make it lie down'. Tekin's translation 'make it run until it (almost) spreads down (on the ground)' seems to stem from fantasy:[38] Nothing is said in the text about the bay horse being made to run. Both *yayra-* and *yayra-t-* are in common use in Turkmen as well, with meanings similar to Turkish *yayıl-* and *yay-* respectively; Clauson is therefore probably right both with his etymology and his translation. *tärit-* is discussed in Erdal (1991: 737) together with its derivate *tärt-är-*.

Tezcan (1991: 155) (disregarded by Tekin 1993) discusses *üçürgü* 'a horse's sweat cloth (placed under the saddle)'; its many cognates in the Turkic languages[39] all start with /ü/ or /i/ against Clauson's etymology (q.v. Tekin 1993). Tezcan proposes a derivation from *iç* 'inside' (with backward assimilation of vowels). Now (personal communication) he would also consider a derivation from *iç-ür-* (here) 'imbibe (tr.)', which seems much likelier to me: I don't know of any denominal suffix +*ürgü*.

---

[36] That this is often the case can be seen in Zieme (1991): *ö* and *ü* often go together, as do *i, ı* and *e*, and so forth.

[37] Unless the frontness of *säpmäksiz* is ascribed to rhyming with *etmäksiz*.

[38] Likewise the translation 'to make a horse run until it becomes exhausted' offered in the "explanations".

[39] Many of these can be found in Sevortjan (1974: 394).

The verb which Tekin (1993) writes as *topul-* was apparently pronounced as *topol-;* see Erdal (1991: 394) for both a Brāhmī example and cognates. The stem itself is discussed there on p. 621 together with a number of additional runic and Uygur examples. *topl-ok,* which Tekin (1993) for some reason writes with an asterisk, is discussed there on p. 248.

53. The similarity between this *ırk* and the following passage is striking: *kara bulıt örläntöktä karlıg togan tüpintä; boz bulıt örläntöktä buzlug togan tüpintä* 'when the black cloud rises, there is a white falcon behind it; when the grey cloud rises, there is an icy falcon behind it' (HamTouen 15, 2-5). Hamilton sees in this an allusion to the *Ediz* and *Yaglakar* (recte *Yaglakır* ?) tribes. The similarity between the two texts cannot be a coincidence, even though their spirit is diametrically opposed. Zieme (1991: 371, n. 65) quotes this *ırk* as having "Strophen mit deutlicher strophischer Alliteration".

bış- 'to ripen etc.' consistently has back vowels in its very numerous forms and derivates in Old Uygur and Karakhanid, but front vowels here. The only exception I know of is *büş(ü)r-* in TT VIII M 22, which may possibly represent more wide-spread popular pronunciation; it may, alternately, have been (at the time) a dialect variant. Cf. *idiş* (*ırk* 42) discussed above.

54. Roux (1966: 41-42) points out the remarkable parallelism of the raven addressing God as the servant (thus, I think, more appropriately, as against Roux's and Tekin's 'slave') addresses his master, and God listening to the raven. He further notes that God also listens to the maral deer of *ırk* 60, and bestows *kut* upon young birds and animals in *ırk* 15. This is how the Early Turks felt about the unity of nature, and Roux gives examples for a similar view of things in modern Siberia.

55. *törüt-* cannot have signified 'to get oneself made (something)', as causatives of intransitive bases do not convey passive, reflexive or medial meaning. Something similar to passive or medial meaning obtains only when the base is transitive: The secondary causee can then become identical with the instigator or primary agent. *töröt-* (read better thus!) is well attested with the meaning 'to create, bring into existence'. Might *ärklig* be an error for *ärkli*? The sentence would then signify 'Being in the army, he caused the dispatch of messengers'; this might be something indicative of the resonance of the man's deeds.

atı yetiglig has to signify 'his horse being led (for him)', implying that he has a groom to do it, or that he receives a hero's welcome. This is

contrary to most of the opinions about this phrase till now, including Erdal (1978: 109-110) and Tekin (1993). Exceptions are Bang (1923: 119-120), who translated *yitiglig* as 'bezaumt', referring to *kolın yetip* in KP 36, 3. Malov was also on the right path when he translated the form as 'dressed in parade harness' on the base of an entry in Budagov (1871: 348-349). Turkish *yädäk* is not a loan from Persian, as Clauson (1961: 224) claimed in his attempt to show that "Malov's explanation is misconceived"; this word happens to have gone in the opposite direction (see Doerfer 1967-1975, IV: § 1831 and Erdal 1991: 395, n. 462). *yet-iglig* must, indeed, be a "passive participle" (as the DLT defines this formation); cf. Erdal (1991: 345). *yitig,* which Tekin (1993) mentions, probably never existed, the *-(X)glXg* form being derived directly from the verb. This does not, of course, preclude a special semantic development. Understanding the noun *at* as 'reputation' (as still defended by Kljaštornyj 1981: 128) is unacceptable because that word has a long *ā* whereas the vowel here is implicit.

atan- is never 'to be famous', as we read in the EDPT and in Tekin (1993). It can signify 'to be called by a certain name' or 'to be considered to be something' if accompanied by a predicate; otherwise always 'to be appointed to an office': See EDPT, *UW* and Erdal (1991: 590-591).

57. Tekin (1993) takes $k^1n^1g^1I$ to be a derivate from *kan-* 'to be satisfied' and translates it as 'her favorite (lover)'. This translation is not very convincing, as *kan-ıg* is only attested with the meaning 'cheerfulness, satisfaction', in the DLT. Tongerloo (1987: 215) sees in this word the Middle Persian *kanig* 'maiden', borrowed via Sogdian. *kanig* has indeed come into Old Turkic through Sogdian: It appears as *knyg rwšn tngrii* in M III 6,2$_2$ (text 1), as *kny rwšn tngri* in BT V 207 (text 11), referring to the Manichaean deity also called *virgo lucis.* Tongerloo's proposal assumes that the word was borrowed into Uygur as a common noun and not only as part of the proper name of a deity. This assumption is not easy to follow, especially since the words constitute mere transferences of Sogdian spelling and do not, e.g., show the Q / Γ letter. In Old Turkic, this deity is sometimes referred to as *yarok kızı;* in M I 25,34 she is *äzrua täŋrining amrak kızı yaşın täŋri.* Still, the idea should not be rejected offhand. Nor should Tekin's proposal, in view of Mongolian *qani* 'friend, companion'. Doerfer (1995: 328) thinks the final velar may, in this latter word, possibly have been lost due to the "bolgaroide Schicht". This proposal may be more problematical than one might

think: As far as I can remember, Mongolian and Chuvash share many instances of the loss of final /k/ but not, for some reason, the loss of final /g/.

kan agı ülämiş 'The king distributed riches' is actually a perfectly good reading of the first sentence; further, *bäglig ol* 'They (i.e. the riches) belong to the prince(s)' is a good continuation of the third sentence if this is understood to say 'Why should the king distribute riches?' However, there seems to be no way in which this interpretation could connect with the pail in the sun.

Doerfer (1995: 328), raises the question (mentioning the relevant entry in Räsänen's etymological dictionary) whether the strange variation of *köŋäk ~ könäk* could reflect an attempt at expressing a palatalised velar or dental nasal.

Erdal (1978: 111-112) thought that the only other Old Turkic occurrence of *nalük* was in a Manichaean text and took this as an indication for the Manichaean nature of the *Irk Bitig*. There are, however, attestations in Buddhist texts as well. The etymology of the form is discussed in Erdal (1991: 122).

künäş 'a sunny place' is a hapax here in Old Turkic. The word is otherwise known from Oguz and has turned up, in the apparently original meaning, in Khaladj (Doerfer 1987: 114). Erdal (1978: 112) was therefore probably right in reaching dialectal conclusions from its appearance in this text.[40] Note already von Gabain: "Das alte -*ny*-, bzw. das dialektische -*n*- statt dem häufigeren -*y*- erscheint im man. Irq-bitig in *künäš* ..." (von Gabain 1976: 76). The word is, indeed, attested in Yakut with nasalised /ỹ/ (cf. Schönig 1990: 265), in Dolgan with /ñ/ (Stachowski 1993: 161); this regularly corresponds to the Old Turkic phoneme transcribed as ñ. *künäş* and *kuyaş* 'the blazing heat of the midday or midsummer sun' seem to go back to the same source with ñ, perhaps via **kuynaş* and fronting. Contamination with *kün* 'sun' must have made the difference: /ñ/ is otherwise always retained in this text, e.g. in *koñ, añıg, tur(u)ña* and *çıgañ*; in fact, runic texts do not write [ñ] other than with the appropriate character.[41] I have taken [n] from /ñ/ to be

---

[40] The absence of this noun in other Old Turkic texts could, of course, also be due to a coincidence: Not too many of them might perhaps be expected to mention "sunny places".

[41] A further (less likely because rather more tentative) etymology would be *kün *yaş*, the latter being the putative base of *yaşu-* 'to flash'.

just as secondary as [y], as I have written elsewhere; whether Uygur script uses n for [ñ] due to the lack of an appropriate character, as others have thought more recently, is irrelevant here.

58. The word which Tekin (1993) reads as *öt* 'advice' has an *ü:* Erdal (1991: 449) under *üt+lä-* mentions three Brāhmī instances for the vowel. Examples for the common binome *üt saw* are listed there on p. 187. The derivation from *ö-* 'to remember' proposed in EDPT 36 is therefore untenable.

60. Tekin (1993) may perhaps be right in following the EDPT's emendation of *bädiz* to *bädük;* translating this as 'big (and) powerful' will not do, however, as 'powerful' is not denoted by *bädük.*

61. The correct interpretation of *tüşn+ä-k* is the one given in Erdal (1991: 251). Erdal (1978: 112-113) is wrong, as there is no early suffix *-Ak.* Roux (1966: 44) points out that the qualification of this *ırk* as "bad" implies identification with the crane and not with the hunter; perhaps, he thinks, the author felt it was unfair to place snares right into animals' resting places.

64. The note to TT VI 254 suggested replacing Thomsen's *buymul* 'untrained' (from Süleyman Efendi) by 'untrainable' and relating this to *muyga,* attested there. This suggestion is made obsolete by Clauson (1961: 225). Erdal (1991: 99) already has the (correct) reading with *o* (re-proposed by Tekin 1993) and discusses the derivation from *boyun.*

Hauenschild (1994: 75-76) identifies *tograk* as the *'populus euphra-tica (populus diversifolia)';* its fruit does look like a little nut. What is meant is not, of course, a nut in the strict sense, as Tekin's translation would make us believe.

The concluding paragraph: *ançıp* is not in the *UW,* it is, however, attested thrice in the (runic) Šine Usu inscription from the Uygur ka-ganate. The sentence in which this word occurs is understood in an un-tenable way by Kljaštornyj (1981: 129); it is, admittedly, somewhat am-biguous.

Colophon: Cf. Bazin (1991: 235-237) for the date. Doerfer (1995: 327) defends Bazin's dating as against Tekin's.

A number of examples for *manistan* from published and unpublished manuscripts are collected in Zieme (1975: 47-48, n. to l. 414); all of these appear to be Manichaean, as far as one can judge.

kiçig dintar is not 'young pious (disciple)', as translated by Tekin (1993): Hamilton (1975: 15-16) showed that *kiçig* serves the purpose of self-effacement, and Old Turkic *dintar* denotes monks.

In his review of Tekin (1993), Doerfer (1995: 327-328) writes:

"Das Irk Bitig ... ist zuerst von V. Thomsen publiziert worden, danach von vielen Forschern immer wieder behandelt oder herangezogen ... . Talat Tekins verdienstvolle Arbeit stellt nun einen gewissen Abschluß dar, so daß nur noch wenig zu erforschen oder zu sagen bleibt." (1995: 327-328)

The reader of the present paper will, I think, have to agree that this is not quite the case as yet. The *Irk Bitig* remains mysterious even after all the material considered here is added to what Tekin has brought together; "les sibylles sont volontiers obscures", says Roux (1959-60: 59). Still, many of the *textual* problems have, I believe, presently come pretty close to a solution. *Irk Bitig* studies can now go on to throw more light on the iconographical and anthropological background of this fascinating source.[42]

References

Arat, R. R. (= Rachmati) 1965. *Eski Türk şiiri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Axmet'janov, R. G. 1988. Slova kuzy ~ qorγu i terminy igry v al'čiki v tatarskom i russkom jazykax. *Materialy po tatarskoj dialektologii* 6, 108-116.

Bang, W. 1923. Das negative Verbum der Türksprachen. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 17, 114-131.

Bang, W. 1925. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Zweiter Brief: Uzuntonluγ – die Krone der Schöpfung. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 5 , 231-251.

Bang, W. 1930. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Fünfter Brief: Lautliches – allzu Lautliches. *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 10, 16-26.

---

[42] Addition: The following study of the *Irk Bitig* came to the author's attention too late to be taken into consideration: Ikeda, Tetsuro 1984. The Irq Bitig, an ancient Turkic book on divination. *The Bulletin of the International Institute for Linguistic Sciences*. Kyoto: Sangyo University, 6, 81-125. (In Japanese.)

Bang, W. 1934. Turkologische Briefe aus dem Berliner Ungarischen Institut. Siebter Brief: Neue Ansichten – neue Einsichten? *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 14, 193-214.

Bazin, L. 1991. *Les systèmes chronologiques dans le monde turc ancien.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 34.) Budapest-Paris: Akadémiai Kiadó, Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Böhtlingk, O. 1851 [1964]. *Über die Sprache der Jakuten.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 35.) Bloomington: Indiana University, The Hague: Mouton.

Budagov, L. 1871. *Sravnitel'nyj slovar' turecko-tatarskix narečij* II. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.

Clauson, Sir G. 1957. The Ongin inscription. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* 177-192.

Clauson, Sir G. 1961. Notes on the "Irk Bitig". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 33, 218-225.

Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dankoff, R. 1983. Yūsuf khaṣṣ ḥājib. *Wisdom of royal glory (Kutadgu Bilig). A Turko-Islamic mirror for princes.* Translated with an introduction and notes by R. Dankoff. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.

DLT: Maḥmūd al-Kāšǧarī. *Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luǧāt at-Turk).* Edited and translated with introduction and indices by Robert Dankoff in collaboration with James Kelly. Parts I-III. (Sources of Oriental languages and literatures 7. Turkish sources 7.) Harvard University Printing Office, 1982-1985.

Doerfer, G. 1967-75. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit* I-IV. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 16, 19-21.) Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Doerfer, G. 1971. *Khalaj materials.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 115.) Bloomington: Indiana University, The Hague: Mouton.

Doerfer, G. 1987. *Lexik und Sprachgeographie des Chaladsch,* Textband. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Doerfer, G. 1995. Review of: Tekin, T. 1993, Irk Bitig. The Book of Omens. *Central Asiatic Journal* 39, 327-328.

Dowsett, C. J. F. 1961 (translator). *The history of the Caucasian Albanians* by Movsēs Dasxurançi. (London Oriental Series 8.) London: Oxford University Press.

EDPT: See Clauson 1972.

Emmerick, R. E. & Róna-Tas, A. 1992. The Turkish-Khotanese word list revisited. *Central Asiatic Journal* 36, 199-241.

Erdal, M. 1978. Irk Bitig üzerine yeni notlar. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten* 1977, 87-119.

Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon.* (Turcologica 9.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erdal, M. 1993. *Die Sprache der wolgabolgarischen Inschriften.* (Turcologica 13.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erdal, M. 1996. Zum alttürkischen Vokalsystem. In: Emmerick, R. E. & Sundermann, W. & Warnke, I. & Zieme, P. (eds.) *Turfan, Khotan and Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie von Gabain und die Turfanforschung", veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12.12.1994).* Berlin, 67-82.

Erdal, M. forthcoming. Topic, subject and possessive compounds. [Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics (Mainz 1994), to appear in the proceedings.]

Francke, A. H. 1924. Tibetische Handschriftenfunde aus Turfan. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 3, 5-20.

Geng, Sh. & Klimkeit, H.-J. 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit,* in Zusammenarbeit mit H. Eimer und J. P. Laut herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Hamilton, J. 1975. Le colophon de l'Ïrq Bitig. *Turcica* 7, 7-19.

Hamilton, J. 1978. Sur deux présages de l'Ïrq Bitig. In: *Quand le Crible était dans la Paille ... Hommage à Pertev Naili Boratav,* présenté par R. Dor et M. Nicolas. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, 247-254.

Harva, U. 1938. *Die religiösen Vorstellungen der altaischen Völker.* (FF Communications 125.) Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Hauenschild, I. 1994. Botanica im *Dīvān luġāt at-turk. Journal of Turkology* 2, 25-100.

Hegaard, S. E. 1976. Some expressions pertaining to death in the Kök-Turkic inscriptions. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 48, 89-115.

Heissig, W. & Krueger, J. R. & Oinas, F. J. & Schütz, E. (eds.) 1976. *Tractata Altaica Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata*. Wiesbaden: Harrasssowitz.

Hoffmann, H. 1950. *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon Religion*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1950, 4.) Mainz: Verlag der Akademie.

Johanson, L. 1979. *Alttürkisch als "dissimilierende Sprache"*. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1979/2.) Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Johanson, L. 1988. On the renewal and reinterpretation of "instrumental" gerunds in Turkic. *Oriens* 31, 136-153.

Kāšġarī: See DLT.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. 1981. Mifologičeskie sjužety v drevnetjurkskix pamjatnikax. *Tjurkologičeskij Sbornik* 1977, 117-138.

Kotwicz, W. 1934. Formules initiales des documents mongols aux XIIIe et XIVe ss. *Rocznik Orientalisztyczny* 10, 131-157.

Lalou, M. 1965. Catalogue des principautés du Tibet ancien. *Journal Asiatique* 253, 189-215.

Malov, S. E. 1951. *Pamjatniki Drevnetjurkskoj Pis'mennosti. Teksty i issledovanija*. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Menges, K. H. 1982. Etymologika. *Central Asiatic Journal* 26, 105-118

Meyer, I. R. 1960. *Vokallængde i tyrkisk*. [M.A. thesis, University of Copenhagen.]

Molnár, Á. 1996. Traces of shamanism in the Ïrq Bitig "Book of divination". *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1992 (26 Eylül 1992 - 1 Ekim 1992.)* (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları: 632). Ankara, 367-371.

Orkun, H. N. 1938. *Eski Türk yazıtları* 2. Istanbul: Devlet Basımevi.

Palló, M. K. 1959. Hungaro-Tschuwaschica. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 31, 239-258.

Pekarskij, E. K. 1907-1930. *Slovar' jakutskogo jazyka* I-III. Petrograd / Leningrad: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk / Akademija Nauk SSSR.

QB: [Yūsuf khaṣṣ ḥājib] *Kutadgu Bilig*. I, Metin. Arat, R. R. (ed.). İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Basımevi, 1947.

Rachmati, G. R. (= Arat) 1930. Zur Heilkunde der Uiguren. *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 24, 451-473.

Ramstedt, G. J. 1913. Zwei uigurische Runeninschriften in der Nord-Mongolei. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 30/3. Helsinki

Roux, J.-P. 1959-60. Le chameau en Asie centrale. Son nom – son élevage – sa place dans la mythologie. *Central Asiatic Journal* 5, 35-76.

Roux, J.-P. 1966. *Faune et flore sacrées dans les sociétés altaïques.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Roux, J.-P. 1976. A propos des osselets de Gengis Khan. In: Heissig, W. et al. (eds.), 557-568.

Röhrborn, K. 1977-1994. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Sağol, G. 1995. Tarihi şivelerde at donları. In: Gürsoy Naskali, E. (ed.) *Türk kültüründe at ve çağdaş atçılık.* Istanbul, 126-146.

Schönig, C. 1990. Das Lenatürkische und die sprachlichen Merkmale des nordöstlichen türkischen Areals. In: Brendemoen, B. (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (Oslo, June 12-16, 1989).* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 263-285.

Schulz, P. 1978. *Verbalnomina und Konverbien als adverbiale Ergänzungen im Alttürkischen.* [Ph.D. dissertation, Justus-Liebig University, Gießen.]

Sevortjan, E. V. 1974. *Etimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov (obščetjurkskije i mežotjurkskije osnovy na glasnyje).* Moskva: Nauka.

Stachowski, M. 1993. *Dolganischer Wortschatz.* (Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 1086, Prace Jezykoznawcze 114.) Kraków: Nakładem Uniwesytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Tekin, Ş. 1980. *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule* I-II. (Berliner Turfantexte 9.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Tekin, T. 1985. üze zarfı hakkında. In: *Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi, Istanbul, 23-28 Eylül 1985. Tebliğler. I, 1: Türk Dili.* Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 253-260.

Tekin, T. 1993. *Irk Bitig. The Book of Omens.* (Turcologica 18.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Tezcan, S. 1975. *Eski Uygurca Hsüan tsang biyografisi. X. bölüm.* Ankara (no publisher).

Tezcan, S. 1981. Kutadgu Bilig dizini üzerine. *Belleten* 45, sayı 178, 23-78.

Tezcan, S. 1991. Türk Dil Kurumu Yağma Hasan'ın böreği mi oldu? *Çağdaş Türk Dili* 40, 149-156.

Tezcan, S. & Zieme, P. 1971. Uigurische Brieffragmente. In: Ligeti, L. (ed.) *Studia Turcica*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 17.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 451-460.

Thomas, F. W. 1957. *Ancient folk-literature from north-eastern Tibet (Introductions, texts, translations and notes.)* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Klasse für Sprache, Literatur und Kunst 1952: 3.) Berlin.

Thomsen, V. 1912. Dr. M. A. Stein's manuscripts in Turkish "Runic" script from Miran and Tun-huang. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 181-227.

Tryjarski, E. & Hamilton, J. R. 1975. L'inscription turque runiforme de Khutuk-Ula. *Journal Asiatique* 263, 171-182.

UW: See Röhrborn 1977-1994.

van Tongerloo, A. 1988. Iranian elements in Old Uygur. In: Bryder, P. (ed.) *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Manichaeism (August 1987, Lund)*. Lund, 213-219.

von Gabain, A. 1964. Die alttürkische Literatur. In: Bazin, L. & Bombaci, A. & Deny, J. & Gökbilgin, T. & İz, F. & Scheel, H. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 2. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner, 211-243.

von Gabain, A. 1976. Alttürkische Texte in sogdischer Schrift. In: Káldy-Nagy, Gy. (ed.) *Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in honour of Julius Németh*. Budapest: Loránd Eötvös University, 69-77.

von Le Coq, A. 1909. Köktürkisches aus Turfan. Manuskriptfragmente in köktürkischen "Runen" aus Toyok und Idiqut-Schähri (Oase von Turfan). *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 41, 1047-1061.

Zieme, P. 1975. *Manichäisch-türkische Texte*. (Berliner Turfantexte 5.) Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Zieme, P. 1979. Review of: Heissig, W. & Krueger, J. R. & Oinas, F. J. & Schütz, E. (eds.) 1976, *Tractata Altaica Denis Sinor sexagenario optime de rebus altaicis merito dedicata. Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 74, 479-481.

Zieme, P. 1984. Review of: *Tjurkologičeskij sbornik* 1977 (1981). *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 79, 37-38.

Zieme, P. 1991. *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang. Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung*. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 33.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Counting-out rhymes of Turkey

Rémy Dor

La comptine est un genre mineur peu étudié mais riche d'enseignements. Ces petites formules que les enfants récitent avant une séance de jeu constituent un véritable laboratoire de langue et une source irremplaçable de connaissance des mécanismes d'acquisition de la culture. Pour la première fois, les comptines de Turquie sont étudiées et classées.

The counting-out rhyme is a minor genre in folklore classification. These little formulas beginning a game session are an actual language laboratory. They are very useful for the understanding of the mechanisms of culture acquisiton. For the first time Turkey's counting-out rhymes are studied and classified.

Rémy Dor, Direction of the Near and Middle East Dept., INALCO, 73, rue Broca, F-75013 Paris, France.

Counting-out rhymes—which could be defined as set phrases used by children before they start a game—have generally been overlooked as a folklore genre. The child was considered a non-person by the adults, and its verbal output was therefore considered non-discourse, devoid of any interest. Adults found young children's linguistic and poetic activity disturbing, as they could neither follow them to the utmost limits of language, nor share their indifference to denotation. In Europe it was not until the end of the 19th century that general compulsory schooling was established, that the first works on the subject were published, but they were still rare. As a matter of fact, teachers were the first to understand how useful these ditties were to young children in their exploration of the world. Scholars, and particularly the founders of ethnology were not interested in them, as the words of Rossat (1910: 244) clearly show:

"I didn't even try to give a more or less accurate French translation of these ditties; I think any such attempt would be perfectly useless ..., it would be childish to rack one's brain to give meaning to these sounds which don't have any whatsoever."

The bibliography on the subject is limited to a Swiss anthology compiled by Blavignac in 1879, an American study at the end of the 19th century (Bolton 1888), a German work written by Bodmer in 1923, a French doctoral thesis published by Arleo in 1982 and an American dictionary of counting-out rhymes published by Abrahams & Rankin in 1980. As far as I know, nothing has been published so far about Turkey, and this justifies my interest.

I will begin with a brief presentation of the corpus I have chosen before trying to show its interest from a linguistic point of view and, finally, discussing what information it provides in other fields.

1. The corpus

The earliest mention I know of a counting-out rhyme in Turkey dates from approximately one century ago. Reverend J. L. Barton noted it down in the area of Harput and communicated it to H. Bolton, who gave it a rather fanciful transcription (Bolton 1888):

American rendering:	Turkish reconstitution (?):
Ilp ilp ilmedén,	*Ip ip ilmeden*
Selug silug silmedén;	*Sülük sülük silmeden*
Yel khos kepené;	*Yer koz kepene(k)*
Kepen ichini bazàr;	*Kepen(ek) içi bit pazar*
Ichinde ayoo gezér,	*İçinde ayu gezer*
Ayoo beni khookhoòdĕ	*Ayu beni korkuttu*
Khoolakhĕmĕ sar'ghĕdĕ;	*Kulağını sarkıttı*
Alàghĕnà,	*Alağına*
Chalàghĕnà,	*Şalağına*
Akh dedì,	*Al dedi*
Chekh dedì	*Çık dedi*

With this exception, the first person who has, though indirectly, studied these rhymes is my mentor and friend Pertev Naili Boratav. From the late 1930s to the early 50s, he gathered, throughout the towns and

villages of Anatolia, a comprehensive collection of game and game-related rhymes. One must keep in mind that the function of the counting-out rhyme is to determine the "it" (in Turkish *ebeleşmek*). I have drawn from these archives all elements related to counting-out rhymes. To these I added the material gathered by A. Caferoğlu around the same time in other towns and villages of Anatolia, material that constitutes a felicitous complement to Boratav's documents.

Pertev Naili Boratav's archives are presently at the Laboratoire d'Ethnologie et de Sociologie Comparative UPX-Labethno/PNB VIII/ 3, IX/1, IX/3 of Paris-X University. Here is a detailed list:

Dosye I
Zarf 1. Ankara (1945). Kaynak: I-XIX (186 formül, 487 oyun)
Zarf 2. Ankara (1947-48). Kaynak: XX-XXVII (8 formül, 104 oyun)
Dosye II
Zarf 1. (1945) Kaynak: XXVII-XXXIII (47 formül, 104 oyun)
Zarf 2. (1947-48) Kaynak: XXXIV-XLVI (25 formül, 236 oyun)
Zarf 3. Ankara (1945-46). Kaynak: 1-7 (22 oyun)
Dosye III
Zarf 1. Ankara (1947-48). Kaynak: XLVII-LX (24 formül, 235 oyun)
Dosye IV
Konya (1953). Oğuz Tansel (646 formül)
Dosye V
Konya (1954). Oğuz Tansel (Pertev tarafından düzenlenmemiş; I-LVI' a kadar düzenledim)
Dosye VI
Yozgat (1947-48). İ. Gökbahar (40 formül, 345 oyun)
Dosye VII
Gölköy (1948-49). Yetkin (320 oyun)
Dosye VIII
Zarf 1. Tokat (1950). Ercan (25 formül)
Zarf 2. Sandıklı (1950). İ. Başgöz (12 formül)
*   İzmir (1950). H. Eğilmez (19 formül)*
*   Mersin (1954). Cahit Öztelli (30 formül)*
*   Kayseri (1950). Göğceli (2 formül)*
Zarf 3.Tokat (1950). İ. Başgöz (düzenlenmemiş)
Zarf 4.Ankara, Kastamonu (1941, 1950-52). P. N. Boratav

A. Caferoğlu tarafından derlenen malzemeler:

C I =   *Anadolu dialektolojisi üzerine malzeme, Ankara 1941*
C II =   *Doğu illerimiz ağızlarından toplamalar, İstanbul 1942*
C III =   *Anadolu ağızlarından toplamalar, İstanbul 1943*
C IV =   *Güney-doğu illerimiz ağızlarından toplamalar, İstanbul 1945*
C V =   *Kuzey-doğu illerimiz ağızlarından toplamalar, İstanbul 1946*
C VI =   *Orta-Anadolu ağızlarından derlemeler, İstanbul 1948.*

The whole body of documents I have checked contains 1208 counting-out rhymes, which delineate 237 basic types (see different examples at the end of this article). Each type represents an unlimited number of forms. Variation is indeed the main feature of the counting-out rhyme.

Some of them present an interesting characteristic: they are partly or totally constituted of "wild words". These words are coined by children themselves and are a means for the individual to elaborate his own language. This can be considered a memory of the capacity we all have, when we are born, to speak all languages; counting-out rhymes bear a trace of this gift of tongues. Hence frequent borrowings from foreign languages, which in fact, can no longer bear that name as they are automatically integrated.

2. A few linguistic characteristics of counting-out rhymes

I shall first focus on wild words (400 in my corpus) and their phonological structure.

Table 1. Initial vowel order by decreasing frequency

Initial vowel order in the wild words (decreasing frequency):
        e a i o ı ü u ö
Initial vowel order in standard Turkish (Bazin 1994: 77):
        a e i o u ü ö ı
Initial vowel order in Pre-Ottoman Turkish (Khourchid 1990: 60):
        a e i u o ö ü ı

We notice that the order of the initial vowels differs from that of standard Turkish.[1] Children prefer open front vowels to their back counterparts. We also notice the unusual frequency of the closed nonlabial vowel /ı/.

The same remark could be applied to initial consonants:

Table 2. Initial consonant order by decreasing frequency

Initial consonant order in the wild words:
>   **m** d t b p k **h** s **l** z f ç **r** ş g v c n y j

Initial consonant order in standard Turkish (Alpman: 1969):
>   k d y b t g s c ç **h** **m** f v p **r** **l** ş z n j

Initial consonant order in Pre-Ottoman Turkish (Khourchid1990: 60):
>   k b s d y **m** t **h** g n ş f c ç z p v **r** **l** (j)

The unusual frequency of the letters /m, h, r, l/ in wild words points to the very ontology of language, as these contoids are precisely those we find in the babble which precedes the appearance of language. The labial vowel /o/, tightly connected to affectivity, plays a considerable role in noninitial position. We can thus pick out the following words:

Table 3. /o/ in noninitial position

[C+/o/] monosyllables:	bo, co, do, dö, go, ho, jo, po
[C+/o/+Cnasal] monosyllables:	bom, con, mom, pon, töm, von, zon
[/o/ ending] disyllables:	ago, diro, katzo, mendo, rofo, vizo
[/o/ ending] trisyllables:	ambaro, bekribo, fedamo, fiyango, istirbo
	karako, lipanto, nebido, sebedo, sibedo
[/o/ ending] quadrisyllables:	dosinado, orinado, gandalifo, simanesto
[/o/ ending] pentasyllables:	aleredino

---

[1]   I also used Alpman (1969), which contains 459 entries and constitutes a reference corpus coherent with my 400 wild words.

Children don't hesitate to juxtapose consonants in clusters which are not all within the norm of standard Turkish, which prefers a liquid (r, l) followed by an occlusive (p, t, k) (cf. Ergin 1990).

Table 4. Consonant clusters

t+n	natnar	f+t	buftin, buftiri	ş+n	kuşna,
f+r	pufra	r+f	morfa		
t+l	batlak	d+r	dra, dras		
m+r	somru	r+n	naldırnaç		

Vowel disharmony is frequent because it allows the speaker to create unexpected sounds, and we can notice a tendency to play on the contrast between harmonic features:

Table 5. Vowel disharmony

[+POST, -POST]	/ a - e/:	alerestina, badelek, laleke, panse, zatelyon
[-POST, +POST]	/e - a/:	belnannacı, berani, çemdan ena, enna, fedamo, perani
[+APERT, -APERT]	/i - a/:	tizma, bedira, kiyaru, mikramarum
[-APERT, +APERT]	/a - i/:	akribi, amil, babili, dandik, gandalifo gandi, lali, makedi, pali, sadraki
[+LAB, -LAB]	/o - i/:	domil, dosi, orinado
	/o - e/:	moden
	/u - i/:	kukulik
	/u- e/:	buşye
	/ü - a/:	kütüpa
[-LAB, +LAB]	/i - o/:	gandalifo, istirbo, keterizon
	/e - o/:	mendo, sebedo, simanesto
	/a - o/:	aylom, bayloz, farfoylom

If we now turn to the morphology of normal words in the counting-out rhyme, we notice that it adheres to a basic communication pattern. A sample of 64 counting-out rhymes shows us that nominal predicates are twice as numerous as verbal ones.

Table 6. Number predicational morphemes

Type of predicational morpheme:	Number:
nominal	42
imperative	21
constative /DI/	16
indefinite present /Er/	4
nonconstative /mİş/	2
progressive present /İyor/	1
suppositive /sE/	1

Thus, we have only few verbs, either in the imperative or the constative form, which are the most essential forms for children, being the first they learn, as Ayhan Aksu-Koç (1988: 198-199) has shown. There is hardly any occurrence of the present progressive or the future.

The conditions of use of the substantive are equally telling. The predominance of the absolute case is overwhelming. Among spatial cases, only the directive, which has a positive connotation for the speaker, occurs from time to time; its opposite, the ablative, which marks separation and rejection, is almost absent.

Table 7. Number of case morphemes

Case morpheme:	Number:
absolute	430
directive	27
locative	14
accusative	12
genitive	8
ablative	4

Given the particular status of the act of counting-out, which is distinct from speech as well as from song, I deeply regret having only written documents at my disposal. I think that the originality of counting-out rhymes would be best emphasized by an acoustic analysis of their prosodic characteristics. Counting-out rhymes seem to be hinged on the production of regular rhythmic movements, and this is true all over the world; which is probably the reason why they travel so easily. This is illustrated in the following example:

1. *Entita*	1. 'Un deux trois'
2. *Jini jinipa*	2. 'Nous irons au bois'
3. *Kay sen siz*	3. 'Quatre cinq six'
4. *Geve dizi diz*	4. 'Cueillir des cerises'
5. *Diz on suz*	5. 'Dix onze douze'
6. *Katuron suz*	6. 'Elles seront toute rouges'

The Turkish version collected in Konya (1950) preserves the rhythm of the French original.

Another interesting perspective is the comparison of the deviation from linguistic standards in counting-out rhymes with that in school-children's usual language. Kâmile İmer's investigations (İmer 1987: 211-216) show that, besides sentences which are both communicative and grammatical, we find sentences that are communicative but non-grammatical, and sentences that are neither communicative nor gram-matical, which she calls "masses of words", and which should be com-pared to the wild words of the counting-out rhyme.

Finally, the counting-out rhyme mirrors the child's constant sway between sound and meaning, which is probably a mere transposition of the link between external reality and his inner interpretation. Every wild word can therefore become language through semanticization, and, conversely, every word can become wild through desemanticiza-tion. From one variant to another, *kome balir* (wild) thus becomes *gör-me batır* (semanticized), whereas *bir baba laklak* (semanticized) be-comes *bim bara rak rak* (wild).

A careful study of the way a child breaks up adults' words and re-constitutes new elements from snatches of speech, along with a thor-ough understanding of the variation which allows an automatic re-newal in order to make up for the formal warping, should enable us—thanks to the counting-out rhyme—to reach a better understanding of Turkish. The counting-out rhyme is, indeed, a real language laboratory. But it goes further than that and offers an incredible amount of infor-mation in other fields.

3. Importance of the counting-out rhyme in other fields

The origin of the counting-out rhyme is mysterious and controversial. It comes from figures, which precede letters, and it therefore refers to the origins of the individual, of society and of communication. As the

name shows, counting-out rhymes point to the activity of counting. This activity is surprisingly old, and counting-out rhymes thus bear traces of the different states of the counting systems, as well as traces of inclusion or exclusion processes which enable us to define sets.

We know that the Turks have used three different systems, one after the other. The first is original in its expression of numbers from eleven to ninety-nine, as it replaces the additive process (11=10+1) with an ordinal one (*bir yegirmi* 'eleven'=1 out of 20, or *tokuz yüz* 'ninety-nine'= the ninth unit before 100); this system is comparable to others in the ancient Indo-European world. Yet around the tenth century, under the cultural influence of China, the system evolved toward the positional norm: *on artukı bir* 'one after ten'= eleven. As early as the eleventh century, the modern counting system based on Indian figures became common among the Turks: *on bir* 'eleven'= 10+1.

We will therefore have to examine carefully the enumerative series which appear in Turkish counting-out rhymes. Beside the sequence 1-2-3, *bir-iki-üç* (which is universal in counting-out rhymes), we notice a sequence 1-5-6, *bir-beş-altı*, which I cannot explain. The importance of six, which frequently occurs in counting-out rhymes, is easy to understand: six is the first perfect number (a whole number equal to the sum of its divisors, 3+2+1= 6); one is the unit, the necessary starting point, except if we start counting from the base (10). But why five, if it is not preceded by four? Maybe because of its cultural weight in the Islamic civilization (5 daily prayers, 5 elements in the Mekka pilgrimage, 5 *takbir* in the profession of faith, 5 books in the *xamsa* ...).

Nine is the figure which appears most often, either alone or in a sequence. This comes from the mechanical characteristics of the counting system: the last element of a series naturally draws attention; ten is the base of the counting system, and as such, it marks the beginning of a new series. Nine, then, is the last unit, and is as important as one, which is the first; this is why, for instance, the first Indian mathematicians used the word *anka*, which means 'figures', to designate the figure nine.

The number 40 occurs frequently as well, probably because it is loaded with symbolism, but also because it marks a break: you count to three (see the symbolic meaning in French), which, transposed into tens, gives 10, 20, 30; with 40, something new begins, hence such a counting-out rhyme as:

Ali Veli / kirk dokuz elli 'Ali Veli / 49, 50'.

Counting-out rhymes provide ample information in another field that is equally dependent on numbers: prosody. It will be necessary to study verse patterns: couplets, quatrains etc. as well as types of rhymes and rhythms. For the time being, all we can say is that most counting-out rhymes comprise between two lines in the shortest and twenty-eight in the longest. When a counting-out rhyme is shorter than two lines, it is either elliptic (a single element is enough to suggest the whole) or structured around syllables, and it then tends towards the call, the vocative, or the scream. When a counting-out rhyme is longer than twenty lines, it is difficult to distinguish it from a song. From this point of view, scanning is interesting, because it reveals that the line of the counting-out rhyme is divided into *darbe* of one to three syllables.

We have to study not only the form but also the contents. Counting-out rhymes are so many narratives staging various characters, two aspects it would be interesting to classify. The counting-out rhyme is also a means of conveying basic knowledge, popular beliefs and social rituals. It is therefore necessary to study what parents, teachers and society as a whole convey to the child through this medium. Counting-out rhymes provide information for the historian, the sociologist and the anthropologist—all the more so, as the corpus I have established, though compiled in the forties, was in fact elaborated during the early years of the Republic.

There is a last line of research which is farther from my interests, but which is nonetheless important, as it deals with what counting-out rhymes teach us about the structuring of the child's imagination, and how the child expresses his fears, his anxieties, his expectations and his wishes. We have a lot to learn from Turkish counting-out rhymes, at least in order to establish an intercultural comparison.

Conclusion

These brief reflections have enabled us to delineate the notion of the counting-out rhyme, a formula of inclusion and exclusion preceding a game and endowed with a particular linguistic form, associating a gesture to each syllable. Yet this delineation remains blurred. Of course, the core of the corpus—that is, the counting-out rhyme—can be characterized precisely enough to make it possible to invent a Turkish counting-out rhyme, on the following pattern for instance:

un, deux, trois / c'est toi le roi
eins, zwei, drei / du bist frei
una, dos, tres / piedra libre es

I can invent a Turkish counting-out rhyme which, though not present in my corpus, is perfectly possible and completely regular:

bir, iki, üç / oyundan güç

Nevertheless, the belonging to the genre of rhyme becomes more and more doubtful as we move away from this core. As soon as it loses its numeric form, the rhyme tends to merge with other oral genres: the riddle, the *tekerleme,* which opens a fairy tale, the *mâni* (to which it is tightly connected) and even, for longer forms, with rounds, lullabies and songs. It is, then, harder to identify, and requires subtler forms of analysis. Nonetheless, the counting-out rhyme remains, because of all it teaches us about Turkish language and culture, one of the keystones of the oral tradition in Turkey.

Different types of counting-out rhymes
A. Numerical

<div align="center">

XVII

1. *Bir iki üç dört beş altı yedi*
2. *Bunu sana kim dedi*
3. *Diyen dedi*
4. *On yedi.*

</div>

1. 'Un deux trois quatre cinq six sept.'
2. 'Qui t'a dit ceci?'
3. 'Qui l'a dit l'a dit.'
4. 'Dix sept.'

Variants (31):
ANKARA   (a [BIV3]; b [AI1O]; c [AVII3]; d [AVIII4]; e [AX8]; f
              [AXII7];
              g [AXVIII9]; h [AXIX2]; i [AXXIX3]; k [BIV56]; m [BIV66])
DİYARBAKIR   (r [T215])
GİRESUN   (j [CV130])
İSTANBUL   (s [T227])
İZMİR   (n [E6])
KONYA   (l [T11]; p [T68]; q [T171]; t [T267]; u [T309]; v [T373];
              w [T419]; x [T89]; y [T499]; z [T518]; aa [T529];
              ab [T529]; ac [T586]; ad [T606]; ae [T612])
MERSİN   (o [Ö12])

XIX
1. *Bir iki üç dört beş altı yedi sekiz dokuz*
2. *On*
3. *Kırmızı don*
4. *Git komşunun damına kon.*

1. 'Un deux trois...neuf,
2. Dix,
3. Culotte rouge,
4. Va te percher sur le toit du voisin!'

Variants (33):
ANKARA   (a [BIV2]; c [AI11]; d [AVII4]; e [AVIII5]; f [AX9]; g [AXII6];
          h [AXIII1]; i [AXVIII10]; j [AXIX1]; k [AXXIX7]; m [BIV45];
          n [BIV55]; o [BIV64])
ÇORUM   (b [CI106])
ELAZIĞ   (l [ALVII9])

KONYA   (r [T119]; s [T179]; t [T190]; u [T214]; v [T303]; w [T317]; x
            [T318];
            y [T349]; z [T401]; aa [T420]; ab [T440]; ac [T512]; ad [T563];
            ae [T563]; af [T594]; ag[T631])
MERSİN   (q [Ö13])
SANDIKLI   (p [Ba9])

B. Alphabetical

LXV
1. *A A asma*
2. *BA BA basma*
3. *SE SE sünbül*
4. *Menekşe gül.*

1. 'A A vigne,
2. BA BA imprimé
3. SE SE jacinthe
4. Violette rose.'

Variants (4):
KONYA   (a [T122]; b [T278]; c [T367]; d [T418])

C. Totally wild

LXXIV
1. *Albo*
2. *Istirbo*
3. *Nebido*
4. *Ambaro.*

1. 'Albo,
2. Istirbo,
3. Nébido,
4. Ambaro.'

Variant (1):
YOZGAT   (a [Gö17])

*
XCVI
1. *çin pon tataki*
2. *Lâleke lespiki mandoli*
3. *Kara çiçi kara çiçi*
4. *Vıy vıy vıy*
5. *Pitaçi bam bim bom*

1. 'Tchinn ponn tataki,
2. Lalèkè lèspiki, manndoli,
3. Noir tchitchi, noir tchitchi,
4. Vïy vïy vïy,
5. Pitatchi bim bam boum.'

Variant (1):
İZMİT   (a [AXLVI66])

D. Partially wild

LXXVIII
1. Anya manya kumpanya
2. Bir şişe şampanya

1. 'Agnie magnie compagnie,
2. Une bouteille de champagne.'

Variants (21):
ANKARA   (a [AXIII9]; b [XXVII2]; c [AXXXII4]; s [BIV])
KONYA   (d [T62]; e [T128]; f [T146]; g [T201]; h [T410]; i [T175]; j [T361];
         k [T421]; l [T481]; m [T581]; n [T593]; o [T514]; p [T523]; q
         [T598]; r [T610]; t [T362]; u [TXXX3])

1.	hanya	manya	kumpanya		(b,u)
	anya	manya			(f,h)
	ayya	mayya	şampanya		(i,k)
	hayıgo	maya			(g)
	hanya	manya	koca	Konya	(o)
	ayya	manya			(r)
	hanya	manya	şampanya		(t)

2.	ø			(d,j,n,o,p,s)
	şampanya			(q)
	iki	şişe	şampanya	(b,c,f,k,u)
	yedi	şişe	şampanya	(e)
	bir	şişe	kumpanya	(i,l)
	canım ister	şimpanya		(t)
	canım ister	dondurma		(l,m)
	benim canım ister	dondurma		(h,r)

3.	koca	Konya		(e,f,g,h)
	ister	misin		(u)

E. Totally semanticized

CXCVII

1. *Testim kırıldı*
2. *Suyum döküldü*
3. *Annem dövecek*
4. *Babam sevecek*
5. *Ebelik kim gelecek*

1. 'Ma cruche s'est brisée,
2. Mon eau s'est renversée.'
3. Maman me battra,
4. Papa m'consolera.'
5. La trime qui fera?'

Variants (2):
ANKARA   (a [AXXIX4])
KONYA   (b [T395])

*

CXCVIII

1. *Ya şundadır ya bunda*
2. *Helvacının kızında.*

1. 'Soit dans celle-ci, soit dans celle-là,
2. Il est à la fille du marchand de helva.'

Variants (11):
ANKARA   (a [XLVI10]; b [AV6]; c [AVII10]; d [AXIV12];
           e [AXIX10]; i [AI5]; j   [AXIV13])
BURSA   (f [AXLVIII4])
İSTANBUL   (h [T250])
KONYA   (g [T177]; k [T446])

References

Aksu-Koç, A. 1988. *The acquisition of aspect and modality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alpman, C. 1969. *Cimnastik terimleri sözlüğü.* Ankara: Anakara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Bazin, L. 1994. Note sur la fréquence des voyelles turques. In: *Les Turcs: des mots, des hommes.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Bolton, H. 1888. *The counting-out rhymes of children.* London.

Ergin, M. 1990. *Türk dil bilgisi.* Istanbul: Özal Matbaası.

İmer, K. 1987. A study of schoolchildren's use of standard Turkish. In: Boeschoten, H. E. & Verhoeven, L. T. (eds.) 1987. *Studies on modern Turkish.* Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Khourchid, S. 1990. La langue de Yunus Emre: contribution à l'histoire du pré-ottoman. Ankara: TTK Basımevi.

Rossat 1910. *Rondes enfantines, berceuses jeux et empros.* Paris.

A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (1)

Claus Schönig

This attempt to classify the modern Turkic languages makes use of many data already known and sometimes used in earlier classification models. Older stages of Turkic, especially Old Turkic, are not neglected, but the author does not intend to integrate the historical steps of Turkic into this classification at this stage of its development. One important point is to include data that are not predominantly phonetic. Besides those, lexical, morphological and syntactic data are taken into consideration. Another important point is that a mere genetic classification is insufficient. Rather, we can observe developments of areal grouping during which Turkic languages of various genetic sub-branches form new territorial units and become involved in linguistic areal interaction. The article will be published in three parts.

1. Introduction

This is an attempt to classify the Turkic languages with respect to linguistic features, the relevance of which has been proven by comparative works about North East Turkic, Turkish and Kirghiz. It makes use of many data already known and used in earlier classification models, but sometimes puts them into new constellations and correlations.

My aim is to classify the modern Turkic units, let us say of the last 100 or 150 years. I will pay attention to historical stages of Turkic and try to connect—if possible—modern linguistic facts with older ones. But I do not intend to integrate the historical steps of Turkic into this classification at this stage of development of the proposed model. These steps should be investigated separately and synchronically before being incorporated.

An important point is not to include mostly phonetic data, as has been the case in former classification models; see, e.g., Arat (1929 and 1953),

Baskakov (1962), Benzing (1959b), Menges (1959a and 1968), Ram-
stedt (1957), Räsänen (1949 and 1953: 26–31), Samojlovič (1922),
Doerfer (1985), Poppe (1965), Tekin (1995). All these models contain a
number of important points, which I have tried to incorporate into my
model. If such features belong to "common knowledge" in Turkology, I
do not give bibliographical data concerning them.[1] Besides phonetic data,
I have tried to make use of lexical, morphological and syntactic data.
Phonetic features may be sufficient to individualize every single Turkic
unit (even subdialects), but languages consist of more than sounds. If
one wants to set up a classification which can be used to explain
historical developments and interactions with other languages, one must
find features in all the other fields of grammar.

Another important point is that a merely "genetic" classification is not
sufficient. We have good reasons to assume that all the contemporary
Turkic languages have not *directly* developed from a common ancestor.
According to such a "tree model" this "proto-Turkic" ancestor would
have split up into a certain number of sub-groups, which again would
have split up into smaller groups and so on. The reason for this devel-
opment would be that in separate parts of the ancestral unit some lin-
guistic features change with different results while shifting from one
time level to another. Such a transmission of features from one historical
step to the next I call *genetic heritage*. But if we have to give up the idea
that genetic heritage is the only way of diachronic transmission of
linguistic features, we can no longer hang on to the model of a genetic
"tree", leading back to one "proto-Turkic" unit, which split into more
and more sub-units until finally reaching the status of today. This is only
one component in the development of the Turkic languages.

In addition, we can see developments of areal grouping, during which
Turkic languages of different genetic sub-branches form new territorial
units and become involved in linguistic *areal interaction*—not only with
each other but also with non-Turkic languages, leading to the develop-

[1]   Here I would like to thank many colleagues whose works may not be mentioned
      in the bibliography, but who greatly inspired me to write this article. I can only
      beg their pardon if an article or a book of theirs contains special information and
      is not cited. This article is the product of some years of work, in which I may
      have learned facts but forgotten the sources from where I learned them. I want to
      extend special thanks to these colleagues, who spent time with me discussing the
      many different problems of language classification.

ment of new features within the Turkic languages in question. By a careful analysis of areal features one may discover linguistic connections of languages to areas to which they belonged in earlier periods of their development. Thus, at least some of the movements of the Turks can be reconstructed and compared with historical data. Paying attention to the genetic connections between the Turkic languages as well as to the areal ones makes the proposed classification model more complicated, but at the same time (as I hope) more appropriate for describing reality.

A common set of genetic features constitutes a *genetic string,* a set of areal features an *interactive area.* An interactive area may contain elements of different genetic strings. Vice versa, a unit belonging to a genetic string may also bear features of different interactive areas. Normally, isoglosses drawn by the features of one set are not totally congruent. Especially, with the growth of number of Turkic sub-units belonging to a super-unit, the number of features not attested in one or the other unit also increases. This leads to the fact that neither genetic strings nor interactive areas have sharp borderlines—they oscillate. If the analysis of linguistic data leads to diachronic conclusions, one should try to make use of historical data for external control.

I differentiate four main diachronic layers in the development of Turkic: New Turkic (TN), Middle Turkic (TM), Ancient Turkic (German *Alttürkisch,* TA) and proto-Turkic (pT). I use TA in the sense of pre-Chingisid Turkic, whereas the term Old Turkic (OT) is used for non-Islamic TA, i.e. Runic Turkic and Old Uigur. Then there follows the Middle Turkic period up to a date which is still open to investigation. Classical Middle Turkic ends in the 16th century. To set a border in time, I assume all products of spoken language from the second third of the 19th century on as New Turkic. The period between the 16th century and the beginning of New Turkic I consider a "twilight zone", for which no detailed information is available. For the written languages, one should keep in mind their high degree of conservativity, so that one must be aware of being confronted with monuments written at the beginning of the 20th century but, from a linguistic point of view, still belonging to Middle Turkic.

2. Common Turkic and Norm Turkic

From a practical point of view it seems necessary to define two statistic units: Common Turkic (ComT) and Norm Turkic (NormT). I call a feature Common Turkic, if it is attestable in all linguistic units of Turkic, or

if its loss in one, some or most of these units is explicable. A feature is called Norm Turkic, if it appears in a maximal group of linguistic units. Practically, the designation Norm Turkic covers languages like Turkish, Azeri, Tatar, Bashkir, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Turkmen and others, i.e. languages spoken by around 90% of contemporary Turkic speaking peoples, and especially Old Turkic. With the intention of designating these facts, I use the name "Norm Turkic" for the statistically most widespread type of Turkic, which is bound together by a whole set of common features. Like all features, the Common Turkic and Norm Turkic features may derive from genetic heritage or areal interaction.

2.1. Common Turkic

I can not present a catalogue of Common Turkic features here. To give some examples I only want to mention cases such as the verb *al- 'to take', the basic numerals for the ones up to ten, or the preterite in *-DI. As far as I know, these elements can be found in all Turkic units. At the present, there seems to be no monographic work on Common Turkic features.

2.2. Norm Turkic and non-Norm Turkic

As Norm Turkic (NormT) I designate such Turkic units which (i) show more or less complete loss of word-initial *h- (see Doerfer 1981 and 1982), (ii) have kept the opposition *č- : y- in word-initial position, (iii) show a nominal plural suffix *+lAr, (iv) possess a gerund in -B, (v) display forms of the conditional suffix going back to *-sAr, and (vi) have a 3rd person imperative suffix going back to *-ZUn. By applying these features, three units can be designated as non-Norm Turkic (non-NormT): Chuvash, Lena Turkic (Yakut and Dolgan), and Khalaj.

2.2.1. Khalaj

As the only Turkic language, Khalaj has preserved quite consequently word-initial *h- and shows a 3rd person imperative suffix -tA; the gerund in -B is missing in syntactically free use. Additionally we find a non-Norm Turkic locative in -čA. In the case of the plural and conditional suffixes, Khalaj behaves like Norm Turkic. As we know from Doerfer's investigations, it must have had long and intensive areal contacts with Oghuz (see 4.1.3, 4.1.3.1 and 4.1.3.3).

2.2.2. Chuvash

Chuvash is the only recent representative of the Bolgar Turkic subgroup and is most deviant from Norm Turkic. It shows replacement of the nominal plural suffix *+*lAr* by +sem, a suffix -*(t)tХr* for the 3rd person of the imperative, which perhaps is to be connected with a causative form (see Erdal 1993) use of a gerundial unit -*sA* instead of -*B* (perhaps connected with the Old Turkic conditional suffix *-*sAr*; a -*sAr*-conditional is missing and seems functionally replaced by -*sAn*). By applying features of traditional classifications, it can be additionally individualized by other non-Norm Turkic, typically Bolgar Turkic features such as the sound changes *-*z(-)* > -*r(-)*, *-*d(-)* > -*r(-)* or *-*š(-)* > -*l(-)* or the use of ku instead of bo / bu as the demonstrative of proximity[2] *sarïğ means 'white' and not 'yellow'. There exists a special possessive suffix +*Хšě* of the 3rd person, which is only used with certain nouns (mainly kinship terms), numerals and pronouns (see Benzing 1959a: 736). The plural, possessive and case suffixes do not obey the regular Turkic order plural – possessive – case, but show possessive – plural – case. Chuvash (like earlier Volga Bolgar) has an ordinal suffix of its own different from the most widespread type *+*nč(I)* (see, e.g., Benzing 1954, Erdal 1993 and Adamović 1996). Chuvash has been subject to strong influences from Volga Finnic languages and from Russian. At the same time, it shows many correspondences with non-Bolgar Turkic and other phenomena that are also found in Mongolic, e.g. Turkic *-*d(-)* ↔ Chuvash, Mongolic -*r(-)*, *-*z(-)* ↔ -*r(-)*, *y- ↔ *j-* ~ *č-*, *ti- > *či-* or lack of a pronominal -*n* in the nominative of the 1st and 2nd sg. pronouns.

2.2.3. Lena Turkic

In Lena Turkic (LenaT) the gerund in -*B* is replaced by -*An*, but the suffixes of the conditional and the 3rd p. sg. imperative -*TAr* and -*TIn* can be connected to the Norm Turkic forms of OT -*sAr* and -*zUn* by the sound change *(*z >)*s > t*, which is well attested in some frequent suffixes and some stems in Lena Turkic. Besides *+*lAr* we find additional plural markers such as +*t* or +*ttAr* < *+*t*+*LAr* (see Schönig 1988). Lena Turkic shows numerous additional specialities. As the only Turkic

---

[2]   A comparable pronoun *go(l)*, *gu(l)*, *ko(l)*, *ku(l)* can be found in Yellow Uigur (see Tenišev 1976a: 74), but there it is used in the same function as *o(l)*.

language it has *köt-* for 'to fly', which is perhaps connected with OT *kötör-* 'to raise, to lift up', and a deviant word for 'mouth' (see Doerfer 1988: 174, 1965: 171–172 and Schönig 1988). OT *qïrqïn* '(slave-) girl' has only survived in Lena Turkic in the plural form *kïrgïttar* to *kï:s* 'girl'. The Yakut comitative suffix *+ll:n* can easily be connected with the Old Turkic form *+lXGXn* (see Schönig 1991). Nominal, possessive and pronominal declensions show many deviations from each other. The survival of a dative-locative category like in Old Turkic may be the result of Mongolic and Tungusic influence, the lack of the genitive is perhaps due to interaction with Tungusic.

2.2.4. The Lena Turkic-Chuvash connection

Lena Turkic and Chuvash show a common set of non-Norm Turkic features such as preservation of the Old Turkic low vowel of the second syllable of *olor-* 'to sit down; to sit' (Brahmi texts; see, e.g., TT VIII) in Yakut *olor-*, Chuvash *lar-* and low vowels in suffixes such as the causative suffix *-DWr-* (where the other Turkic units normally have high vowels) or loss of the word-initial opposition *č- : y-*. Furthermore, the Old Turkic verb *tašïq-* 'to go out' (Yakut *taɣïs-*, Chuvash *tux-*; in most modern Turkic languages *čïq-*) has survived in forms much closer to the Old Turkic one than in any other Turkic language. It is still open to discussion whether these common features merely point to a relatively early separation of Bolgar Turkic and pre-Lena Turkic from the other Turkic branches or whether at least some of them indicate in addition closer genetic connection or areal interaction.

3. Central Turkic and Border Turkic

As Central Turkic (CT) I consider all Turkic languages showing the sound change *-d(-) > -y(-)*, i.e. one of the classical features expressed by the word *ayaq* 'foot'. All members of Central Turkic are Norm Turkic. The non-Central Turkic units I call Border Turkic (BT). Border Turkic consists of the non-Norm Turkic units and some Norm Turkic ones.

Other features of Central Turkic are forms of the personal interrogative pronoun reconstructable as **kim*, existence of the verbs **toɣ-* for 'to give birth; to be born' and **ket-* 'to go away (from)' (see 3.2.2.1), replacement of the 1st p. pl. ending *-mIz* by *-K* in the *DI*-preterite and the

conditional, dominant use of *bütün* for 'all, whole',[3] existence of the Old Turkic suffix *+lIK* and the privative suffix *+sIz* (existing in Chuvash and Khalaj as well).

3.1. Genetic internal segmentation of Central Turkic

Central Turkic shows three main branches: Oghuz, Kipchak and South East Turkic (SET); they seem to be tied together internally mainly by genetic strings. These branches and their sub-branches can roughly be characterized by the "classical" keyword *taġlïġ* as follows: In Oghuz at least reflexes of *-ġ* different from -*y* are preserved at the border of velar first syllables; it has mostly become *zero* in non-first syllables (e.g. Turkish *daġlı*). In Kipchak it is represented as *tawlï*, i.e. as *zero* or -*w* after the end of first syllables. In the Kirghiz-Kipchak (Kirghiz and Altay Turkic) sub-branch there is a strong tendency to generalize *-w* in nonfirst syllable-final position (*to:lu:*, see Benzing 1959b). South East Turkic shows the tendency to shift syllable-final *-G*-sounds to -*K* (*taġlïq*, *taqlïq*).

The development of *taġlïġ* reveals the intermediary position of the Uzbek group of units between Kipchak and South East Turkic: Literary Uzbek shows *tåġli*, which I consider to be a geneticly relevant premodern Kipchak form. Other features such as the neutralization of *i : ï* (see Johanson 1986a) or loss of the pronominal *n* (uzb. *atida*, Nuig. *etidä* instead of *atïnda* 'on its horse') connect it with South East Turkic on the level of areal interaction. In accordance with historical sources (e.g. the *Babur-name*), we can reconstruct through linguistic features the development of Uzbek from an immigrant Kipchak unit to a mixed Kipchak-South East Turkic one. Today South East Turkic is best represented by the New Uigur (NUigur) group of units. Unlike Uzbek, it has an ablative suffix *+DIn* instead of *+DAn*. The same form appears in Lower Chulym Turkic, to which it may have been brought by New Uigur ("Bukharian") traders in the 17th century (see Pritsak 1959a: 624). For *taġlïġ* see also 3.2 and 6. We shall return to Central Turkic somewhat later.

---

[3] Chuvash also has *pĕtĕm*. Mainly in North East Turkic we find numerous variations and alternatives such as AltayT *bastïra*, YenT *tekši*, Sayan Turkic: Karagas *tödö*. In Tuvan, among many alternants, we find *büdün* (like in Lena Turkic) or *xamïġ* (also attested in Old Turkic and Mongolic).

3.2. Border Turkic

The feature *-d(-) has undergone various developments in Border Turk-
ic. Its non-Norm Turkic constituents show r (Chuvash), d (Khalaj) and t
(Lena Turkic). Its Norm Turkic constituents are Sayan Turkic (Sa-
yanT:*-d(-) > -d(-)), Chulym Turkic (ChulT), Yenisey Turkic (YenT),
Yellow Uigur (YUigur) and Fu-yü Kirghiz (*-d(-) > -z(-)).[4] The latter
three units seem to belong closer together, especially Yenisey Turkic and
Fu-yü. Yellow Uigur in addition shows similarities to Sayan Turkic,
particularly to Tuvan.[5] z-Turkic and d-Turkic (Sayan Turkic and Khalaj)
have preserved final Old Turkic -G-sounds (*taġlïġ).

Individual features of Sayan Turkic are, e.g., a gerund in *-BIšA:n,
velar forms of the personal interrogative pronoun (see 3.2.1.1), loss of
*ne(mä) as the impersonal interrogative pronoun and ordinal suffixes
such as Karagas (To"fa) +š.KI (? < *+nč+KI), and Tuvan +KI, which
contain (or consist of) the old "correlational suffix" +KI (like in Old
Turkic il+ki 'first'). Especially Tuvan has replaced the verb čïq- 'to go
out, come out' (common to most Norm Turkic units but not to Khalaj)
by ün-. Like Turkmen and Chuvash, Lena-Sayan Turkic does not use
*-K as a personal marker of the 1st p. pl. imperative. A z-Turkic (see fn.
4) speciality are -JAŋ-participles to express habituality, continuation, etc.
Yellow Uigur has preserved the Old Turkic counting system (see fn. 8).
Fu-yü has jibir for 'twenty' (see also 6.1). The most archaic forms of
the Old Turkic word älig 'hand' have survived in Lena Turkic, Chu-
vash, Fu-yü and Yellow Uigur, where they still appear as bisyllabic, e.g.
Yakut ili:, Chuvash ală (see also 4.1.1), Fu-yü alïx, YUigur ïlïγ, elïγ,
elig (see Hu & Imart 1987; Tenišev 1976a and Doerfer 1989a: 186-
187).

---

[4]   In the strict sense of this definition we have to exclude the Shor-dialect of Khakas
      and the Mrass-dialect of Shor showing *-d(-) > *-y(-) from Yenisey Turkic. A
      comparable situation can be found in Chulym Turkic, whose lower dialect shows
      -y(-), whereas its middle dialect and Küärik have -z(-).

[5]   It is still unclear whether the Khalaj and the Sayan Turkic data point only to the
      relatively high degree of conservativity in these languages independently of each
      other or whether it is a sign of a common development in both languages going
      back to closer ties between them in ancient times. Another open question is whe-
      ther LenaT t represents a totally independent development or whether it can be
      connected with the d in Khalaj and / or Sayan Turkic or the z of the other Border
      Turkic units (see Räsänen 1949: 29).

3.2.1. South Siberian Turkic

The Border Turkic units Yenisey Turkic and Sayan Turkic together with the transitory Chulym Turkic (see fn. 4) and the Kirghiz-Kipchak Altay Turkic (see 3.2.3) form the South Siberian Turkic (SST) area;[6] being a young areal group (see Schönig 1991), it has only a very few characteristic features common to every single unit within it, e.g. the use of the Old Turkic verb *yan-* 'to return, turn around', use of OT *bod* to derive reflexive pronouns (see 4.1.3.3) or loss of the plural marker *+lAr* in the 2nd person (see 6). For the word **kin(dük)* 'navel', see 3.2.4.2 and 4.1.3.2. One of the common features is the strong Samoyedic and Yeniseyic (Ket, Kot etc.) substrate already mentioned in Castrén (1857; see also Menges 1955-56 and Janhunen 1989).

3.2.1.1. South Siberian Turkic and non-Norm Turkic

Together with the non-Norm Turkic units Chuvash and Khalaj most South Siberian Turkic units have forms of the personal interrogative pronoun which are *not* reconstructable as CT **kim*. Chuvash, Khalaj, Yenisey and Altay Turkic show forms reconstructable as **käm*. It is impossible to decide whether Lena Turkic belongs to the **käm-* or the **kim*-group. Sayan Turkic together with Fu-yü gain a special profile by showing forms such as Tuvan *qïm* or Karagas *qum*, Fu-yü *gïm*.

---

[6] South Siberian Turkic includes the literary languages and the units, which in Soviet literature are normally treated as their dialects, of Altay Turkic (formerly called "Oyrot"), Yenisey Turkic (lit. languages Khakas and Shor) and Sayan Turkic (lit. languages Tuvan and Karagas / To"fa); Chulym Turkic has never developed a literary language and remains between Altay Turkic and Yenisey Turkic. I prefer the geographical designations to avoid too many associations with the designations of the mostly synthetic literary languages, which sometimes do not obey the isoglosses drawn by features of the units belonging (as "dialects") to the single groups (see fn. 4). Units such as (eastern) Siberian Tatar, Yellow Uigur and Fu-yü behave in some respects very much like SST. As mentioned by Doerfer 1985: 1, (eastern) Siberian Tatar is, in many repects, a transitional group between SST and what I call Volga-Ural-Caucasus Kipchak Turkic.

3.2.2. North East Turkic

South Siberian Turkic together with Lena Turkic formed another inter-
active areal not too long ago—North East Turkic (NET). More or less
exclusive features of North East Turkic are the *nomen actoris* in
+*A(:)ččI* and the total replacement of the privative suffix *+*sIz* by con-
structions of the type *noun (+ possessive suffix) + *yoq*, which can be
found beside *+*sIz* in other Turkic languages as well (Schönig 1991).
As the North East Turkic protoform of the numeral for 'thousand' we
can reconstruct *muŋ* (see also 3.2.4.2 and 6.1). As in Karachay-Balkar,
Fu-yü, Salar and Yellow Uigur a replacement of those Old Turkic tens,
whose connection with the corresponding ones is not transparent, has
taken place in analogy to OT *sekiz on* 'eighty' and *toq(q)uz on* 'ninety'.[7]
In South Siberian Turkic this replacement is perhaps inspired by trans-
parent derivations of tens from ones in neighboring or substrate lan-
guages (Mongolic, Yeniseyic, Samoyedic, etc.); the total loss of *+*sIz*
and the form of the *nomen actoris* are surely due to Mongolic influ-
ences.[8] The same holds true for the reflexive pronouns, where the special

[7]   As in the case of phonotactic rule sets (see 5), units belonging to different sub-
      branches show the same development. Karagas and Yellow Uigur start with
      'twenty', Tuvan with 'thirty', Fu-yü, Altay Turkic and Lena Turkic with 'forty'.
      Only in the YenT-ChulT-group starting with 'sixty', is the distribution in accord-
      ance with subdivisions known from other features. In Castrén's Karagas, even the
      word for 'thousand' is decimalized *(on düs)*. Salar has an alternative additive
      system starting with 'sixty' *elli on ~ *altmïš* (see Teniševev 1976b: 121). In Kara-
      chay-Balkar we find a vigesimal system inspired from neighboring Caucasian
      languages (see Pritsak 1959b; JN: 220).

[8]   That the formally incoherent Old Turkic system of ones and tens really is old is
      proved by the fact that Yellow Uigur, which shows a very strong tendency to
      decimalization, uses in its archaic counting system *üčon* for 'thirty', but *pes otïs*
      for 'twenty-five'. The privative *yoq-constructions could be inspired by Mongol-
      ic patterns with *ügei ('does not exist' = *yoq), e.g. Kalmyk *üzü:r* 'Ende, Gipfel
      etc.', *üzü:r ugE:* 'end-los' (KlmWB 460b). For the *nomen actoris* in -*A(:)ččI* we
      find the Mongolic *nomen imperfecti*, Classical Mongolian -*Γa*, Buryat -*A:*,
      Khalkha -*A:* (see Poppe 1955: 273; Sandžeev 1964: 136-137) in connection with
      the Turkic-Mongolic suffix +*čI* "to form nouns of vocation" like in *alaγači* 'kill-
      er' < *ala-* 'to kill' (Poppe 1954: 45). Even the replacement of *toγ-* by *törö-* (s.
      3.2.3) belongs here. The Mongolic verb for 'to be born' is *törö-* and has strength-
      ened the homonymic Turkic verb against *toγ-.

position of Lena Turkic within North East Turkic can easily be demonstrated. Lena Turkic uses *bäyä*, a borrowing from Mongolic, where it originally ment 'shape, body'—like OT **bod,* which is used as the base of the reflexive pronouns in South Siberian Turkic (see also 4.1.3.3). But while South Siberian Turkic has only copied the Mongolic model, Lena Turkic has made a material copy. Furthermore, Lena Turkic has a 3rd p. sg. pronoun not identical with the demonstrative pronoun of distance (see Schönig 1995d). This is due to the fact that Lena Turkic is part of a young North Eastern Siberian interactive area including mainly Tungusic and Mongolic languages, from which it has received some strong non-Turkic impulses (see Schönig 1988 and 1993d).

There remains a whole set of features which is common to most North East Turkic and South Siberian Turkic units, but is not attestable in Altay Turkic (see 3.2.3).

3.2.2.1. North East Turkic and Chuvash

The Old Turkic verb *ï:d-* 'to send' is kept as a full verb in Lena Turkic *ï:t-*. South Siberian Turkic and Chuvash have also preserved the "short form". But Chuvash *yăr-*, Altay Turkic *ïy-*, Khakas *ïs-* and Tuvan *ït-* also function as auxiliary verbs; in Yenisey Turkic and Sayan Turkic, combinations of this verb and the gerund in *-B* have gained suffixal status such as Khakas *-(I)vIS-* or Tuvan *-(I)vIT-*. "Short forms" have survived in the Kipchak languages Karaim, Kazakh and Kirghiz as well (see also 4.1.1.2).[9] North East Turkic, like Chuvash, does not show the verb **ket-* 'to go away (from)'. While Chuvash uses the verb *kay-*, North East Turkic has lost it in most of the units without a direct or simple lexical substitute. Both groups show a tendency towards desonorization of word-initial and word-final obstruents and sonorization of intervocalic ones.

The connection between Chuvash and North East Turkic goes back to old areal language contacts. There must have been Bolgar Turkic groups

---

[9]   But they also show forms going back to the combination **ï:du ber-,* as Kipchak languages and the South East Turkic New Uigur normally do. According to dictionaries and grammars none of the forms have auxiliary functions in Karaim, in Kazakh only the long form is used as an auxiliary, in Kirghiz both forms. Kirghiz has a third form *ir-* functioning only as an auxiliary verb (KrgRS 302b). The question arises whether this *ir-* is a Bolgar type development of **ï:δ-* (cf. Chuvash *yăr-* id.) (see Schönig 1991 and 1995b).

in Southern Siberia, maybe as early as at the time of the Hsiung-nu con-
federation (see Róna-Tas 1980 and Janhunen 1989: 294). Besides loan-
words, one important argument of Róna-Tas (1982) for old Bolgar-Si-
berian Turkic connections is the shape of the word for 'stirrup'. One of
the groups shows forms pointing back to a protoform with labial initial
vowel and one group—North East Turkic, Chuvash and Yellow Ui-
gur—with illabial initial vowel. Only Altay Turkic has a labial vowel
and does not behave like a North East Turkic language.[10]

3.2.3. Altay Turkic

Altay Turkic often behaves ambiguously. On the one hand, it shows the
Central Turkic feature *-d(-) > -y(-) and has not, for example, lost the
frequent Turkic derivational suffix *+lIK, on the other hand it has nu-
merous non-Central Turkic features common to South Siberian Turkic
and North East Turkic. Thus it has, differently from remaining North
East Turkic, Chuvash and Khalaj, not kept postvocalic *-yUr-aorists

---

[10] See Altay Turkic üzeŋi (RAltS 738b), Khakas ïzeŋe (RXksS 834a), Tuvan
ezeŋgi (TuvRS 577b), Karagas ezʹeŋge (Rassadin 1971: 183), Yakut iŋehe
(RJakS 623a), iŋahe (Rassadin 1971: 183), YUigur ezenky (Teniševe 1976a:
179). In Erdal (1993: 161) we find the following comment on the word for
'stirrup': "Nun kann auch aus einem frühen altuigurischen Text die Form
izäŋü+lük hinzugefügt werden; siehe Erdal 1991: 128-9. Sie zeigt, daß
vermutlich der i-Anlaut der ältere ist und die Form mit /ü/ durch einen
volksetymologischen Abgleich an üzä entstanden ist. Für den Auslaut bleibt die
schon genannte Isoglosse /U/ gegen bolgarisch und sibirisch /A/. In diesem Fall
wie auch in allem anderen stimmen die im Mongolischen zu findenden Elemente
mit der bolgarisch-sibirischen Gruppe überein." Erdal may be right in his
assumption, but it should at least be argued for, because there is no general
"Siberian" form of this word showing final /A/. As we can see from the data
given above, Altay Turkic and Tuvan show high final vowels. One could argue
that the Altay Turkic data are of no importance here because it again does not
behave like SST. The Tuvan (and perhaps the Yellow Uigur) form may be
explained as a metathetic form (Tuvan ezeŋgi < izeŋge). The Yakut forms have a
metathetic protoform as well (iŋehe < *iŋese < *iseŋe; iŋahe, if it is not a
misprint, shows velarization of the vowel neighboring ŋ). But it is impossible to
say whether it really goes back to a form with a low final vowel because in Lena
Turkic high word-final vowels can be lowered. However, the parallel Karagas
form may strengthen this assumption.

instead of *-*r* like most Turkic units,[11] and consequently no longer shows a formal correspondence between the postvocalic forms of the vocalic gerund and the aorist -*yU* – -*yUr*.[12] Some features common to Chuvash and most North East Turkic units are absent in Altay Turkic as well. We find no consistent preservation of the Old Turkic 1st p. pl. ending +*mIz* in the *di*-preterite nor replacement of the verb **toġ-* 'to give birth; to be born';[13] in North East Turkic units it is normally replaced by *törö-*, while Chuvash has *śura-* 'to give birth' *(< *yara-)*. Moreover, Altay Turkic shows typical Kirghiz-Kipchak developments of sound groups consisting of a palatal labial vowel and -*g* or -*ŋ* (see 4).

From the lack of some North East Turkic or South Siberian Turkic features we can deduce that Altay Turkic did not have intensive and / or longlasting contacts with the other members of these groups.

3.2.4. Other connections between Lena Turkic and single South Siberian Turkic units

There are some remarkable common features between Lena Turkic and single South Siberian Turkic units, which perhaps can be assumed to be sporadically preserved products of closer internal contacts during the phase of formation of North East Turkic. As one can guess from the geographical distribution of the North East Turkic constituents, such common features can be found most frequently in Lena Turkic and Sayan Turkic, especially Karagas.

Together with Altay Turkic (and Fu-yü) Lena Turkic substitutes the original tens beginning with 'forty' (see fn. 7) and shows the same distribution of intervocalic consonants in numerals (see 6.1). The Lena

---

[11] In Khalaj we find postvocalic -*yUr* (Doerfer 1980 and 1988), for Chuvash, see Johanson 1976a: 135-136. In Lena Turkic we find -*I:r*, in Khakas -*ir* (with neutral *i* pointing to a contraction). In Shor and Sayan Turkic, the quality of the stem-final vowels decides the quality of the contraction product.

[12] The Old Turkic connection between the suffixes of the vocalic gerund and the aorist ...*C-V(r); V-yU(r)* is preserved in Lena Turkic and Yenisey Turkic in ...*CA(r); ...I:(r)* or ...*i(r)*. For Sayan Turkic, see Schönig (1989). Altay Turkic with its postvocalic **-r*-aorist and **-y*-gerund behaves like a Kipchak language.

[13] The ambiguous meaning of the verbs **toġ-* and **törö-* (transitive or intransitive) does not seem to follow genetic strings or areal patterns. For example, in North East Turkic it is intransitive in Yakut, Khakas and Karagas, but transitive in Altay Turkic and Tuvan.

Turkic *-IAx*-future could go back to *-GO oq* (the Old Turkic *nomen futuri* + particle *oq*), which in Chulym Turkic is preserved as *-GOK*. The Lena Turkic suffix of the comparative case *+TA:GAr* resembles the Khakas suffix *+DAŋAr*, which has a comparable function (see XksGr. 267-268 and Borgojakov 1976). Poppe (1959: 681) supposes that it is taken from Mongolic. In both branches, the interrogative pronoun *qa:ño täg* 'which type, how' has developed into *qay*-stems: in Lena Turkic (e.g. Yakut *xaydak*) and Yenisey Turkic (e.g. Shor *qaydi, qaydïg*, Khakas *xaydi, xaydag*). In the other Turkic units we mostly find *qan*-forms.

3.2.4.1. The Lena-Sayan Turkic area

The Lena-Sayan Turkic area can be defined by the absence of some widespread Central Turkic features (most of which appear in Chuvash and Khalaj as well), e.g of the verb *säv-* 'to love' (which seems to be absent in Khakas), of the nonpersonal interrogative pronoun going back to *ne(mä)* or of verbal combinations with *bašla-* to express 'to begin to'. Moreover, Lena-Sayan Turkic uses *qïl-* but not *et-* for analytic denominal derivations of verbs (see also 3.2.4.2 and 3.2.5). It shows a very low level of formal recursivation (see also 4.1.1.2). Lena Turkic has no stable cursivity markers (see Buder 1989). Sayan Turkic has cursive participles for anteriority and nonanteriority using the "classical" set of the four auxiliary verbs expressing nontransformativity *tur-* 'to stand (up)', *olur-* 'to sit (down)', *yat-* 'to lie down, to lie', *yür(ü)- / yor(ï)-* 'to go' as markers.[14]

On the other hand, Lena-Sayan Turkic shares some non-Central Turkic features with Chuvash such as the absence of *-nčI*-ordinals (see also 2.2.2)[15] or the quite frequent sound change *a > ï* in first syllables, which may have a common source in the two different branches. Together with Turkmen, Lena-Sayan Turkic shows suffixes of the inclusive and exclusive 1st plural persons in the imperative paradigm with the

---

[14] It is impossible to reconstruct a common pronounceable form for a verb of the type *$yV^{lab}r(V)$-* of this meaning.

[15] The Lena Turkic suffix *+(I)s* may be reconstructed as *+nč* (see Schönig 1991; for Sayan Turkic see 3.2). According to Thomsen 1959: 566 (mainly based on Malov's works), Yellow Uigur has an ordinal suffix *+nč*, too. But Tenišev (1976a: 74) only mentions a form such as *+(I)ndzï* or *+(I)ndzïlïq*.

common structure *1st p. inclusive = 1st p. exclusive + 2nd p. pl.*[16] For
the forms in Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic and some Bashkir dia-
lects, see 3.2.5. Nasality of OT *ń* (palatal *n*), which is also preserved in
Khalaj *(-n(-))* and Oghuz *(-yVn(-))*, has partly survived as *"nasal y"*.[17]

3.2.4.2. The Lena Turkic-Karagas connection

Within Sayan Turkic, Karagas shows even closer connections to Lena
Turkic by features only attestable in these two units, e.g. loss of the nu-
meral for 'thousand' and its replacement by a Russian loanword[18] or a
verb **qïn-* (Yakut *gïn-*, Karagas *qïn-)*, which is mainly used to derive
onomatopoeic verbs (see Ubrjatova 1985: 149; JakGr. 225 and Rassadin
1978: 155-157). For 'navel' only the short form of **ki(:)n* exists (see
4.1.3.2). Both units have a partitive case, expressed by suffixes formally
identical with the Old Turkic locative-ablative suffix *+DA*. Furthermore,
we may assume that the Old Turkic ordinal suffix *+nč* has only survived
here (see 3.2). As the only North East Turkic units, Karagas and Lena

[16] I have earned a good deal of criticism for assuming the *inclusive : exclusive* op-
position in the 1st p. pl. of the imperative in Turkmen and North East Turkic as
an archaic feature only reconstructable from New Turkic data. I do not think that
this point is very important in our framework, but I want to point to some facts.
We find this opposition mainly in languages showing a high degree of con-
servativity. Maybe the existence of the categories in North East Turkic may be
explained by areal influences from Mongolic or other neighboring languages. But
why then do they appear only in the imperative and not, e.g., on personal pro-
nouns like in these neighboring languages? If these categories have come into
existence "spontaneously", why then only in the imperative mainly in border
languages and in branches which definitely had no language contacts for hundreds
of years? But as I said before, the point is of no real importance for this classi-
fication model, it would only help to strengthen a set of features already existing
between the border languages.

[17] For Dolgan, see Ubrjatova (1985: 38), for Yakut, see JakGr. (61-62), for Sayan
Turkic, see Menges (1959b: 652), especially for Karagas, see Rassadin (1971:
49). For Oghuz and Khalaj, see Doerfer (1971: 178).

[18] We find Dolgan *tï:hačča*, Yakut *tïhï:nča* and Karagas *tï:sičči*. The original form
muŋ can be reconstructed for Yakut by means of instances such as Radloff (1908:
40) *muŋ* '100 Rubel' and JakRS (244b) *muŋ* 'border, ultimate degree'; *muŋ älbäx*
'very much'. BöWB (150a): in the 19th century *muŋ* was already "ein altes, nicht
mehr gebräuchliches Wort".

Turkic show *qač- besides the *qanča-form of the interrogative 'how much, how many' (see 6).

3.2.5. Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic

Altay and Yenisey Turkic together with Chulym Turkic sometimes demonstrate features different from Sayan Turkic, but common to Kipchak. The division of South Siberian Turkic into Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic and a Sayan Turkic branch can be seen, for example, in the distribution of *K* as a 1st p. pl. personal marker, which only appears in Kipchakoid South Siberian Turkic (mainly in the imperative). It is hereby more closely connected mainly to the modern Kipchak languages, to Azeri and Lena Turkic, which also use *K as a personal marker in the imperative paradigm.[19] Other features separating Kipchakoid South Siberian from Sayan Turkic are the form of the suffix of the 1st p. pl. inclusive—the structure *1st p. inclusive = 1st p. exclusive + (plural marker)*—like in some Bashkir dialects, the use of *et-* as an auxiliary verb for denominal verb derivation like in Oghuz, Kipchak and South East Turkic and marking strategies in the participal systems of Kipchak and South East Turkic. By analogization of case-suffix-final nasal consonants and the distribution of velarity / palatality of the numeral 'twenty' it is more closely connected to Kirghiz, which, at the same time, is separated by these features from the remaining Kipchak group (see 5.1.1 and 6.1).

I call this group Kipchakoid instead of Kipchak because an important feature of modern Kipchak, the preservation of intervocalic *-t-*, has been given up and the forms of the numerals with intervocalic consonants have stabilized in forms more or less different from the current Kipchak type (see 6.1). I assume these features to go back to perhaps several (proto-) Kipchak groups involved on several steps in the glotto-

---

[19] I reconstruct the Lena Turkic exclusive and inclusive forms *-IAx* and *-IAɣlŋ* as *-AylK* and *-AylK + Iŋ*, i.e. going back to the suffix *-AylK*, well-known in most of the modern Kipchak languages. Even if this is not correct, the fact remains that *K* is a typical sign of Kipchak imperative paradigms from the time of the Codex Cumanicus on, which shows *-AllK*. This form appears in modern Kirghiz and is the protoform of the exclusive imperative forms in Altay Turkic dialects, in Chulym Turkic and in Yenisey Turkic Kyzyl. The Azeri form may have emerged by internal analogizations or by areal contacts with Kipchak tribes (see Schönig 1987b).

genesis of South Siberian Turkic and North East Turkic. Perhaps some Kipchak(oid) layer is responsible for the representation *čač of the Old Turkic word for 'hair' sač (see 5).

(To be continued.)