Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001|LOG_0041

Reviews

Sumru A. Özsoy: Review of Gerjan van Schaaik. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1996. 277 pages. ISBN 3-447-03806-3.

Sumru A. Özsoy, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, P.K. 2 Bebek, TR-80815 İstanbul, Turkey.

Studies in Turkish grammar by Gerjan van Schaaik aims at offering a formal analysis of the morphosyntactic properties of Turkish within the framework of Functional Grammar (FG) proposed by Dik (1989). It addresses some of the problematic areas of Turkish morphosyntax that have hitherto been only partially treated in approaches such as Köksal (1975), Hankamer (1986, 1988) and Solak & Oflazer (1991). Nevertheless, the impact of the book should be sought more in the extent of its contribution to the linguistic analysis of the language than in its attempt at formalism. *Studies in Turkish grammar* contains extensive discussion on a wide range of linguistic phenomena and, for some, provides novel approaches and analyses. As such, the book is a source for scholarly investigation into the morphosyntactic properties of Turkish, with insightful observations about the structure of the language that suggest topics for further research.

As pointed out by the author in the introductory chapter, the book is divided into two main sections: "Fundamentals" in Chapters 2-5 and "applications" discussed in Chapters 6-8.

Chapter 1 introduces the basic concepts of Functional Grammar, in particular the notion *term*, and surveys some of the more salient features of Turkish grammar "which are relevant for a minimal understanding of the data which are discussed in the remainder of the book" (p. 2). The discussion of Functional Grammar in Chapter 1 is concise, intending more to give an overall view of the theory and mention its basic constructs relevant to the discussion than to define them in detail. The constructs are more comprehensively explained in the ensuing chapters as they are called upon in relation to Turkish facts.

The outline of the Turkish grammar in the second half of the chapter is necessary only for those who are not already familiar with the language. It touches upon the most basic linguistic phenomena, i.e. the prototypical features of the language, with

no apparent intent to fully describe them at this point. The phenomena mentioned—Vowel Harmony and Consonant Assimilation in phonology, nominal and verbal inflectional paradigms in morphology, and noun phrase (NP) and clausal structures in syntax, the latter focusing mainly on some facts of word order and negation—are all treated more extensively in the pertinent parts of the book in later chapters.

The "fundamentals" chapters deal with various aspects of nominal terms; Chapter 2 morphology, Chapter 3 syntax, Chapter 4 lexical representation and Chapter 5 generation. Chapter 2, "The morphology of Noun Phrases", focuses on the much debated issues of definiteness, referentiality, and specificity in Turkish in terms of morphological marking on PATIENT noun phrases in the canonical VP-internal object position. The chapter comprises mainly two sections (2.1) dealing with *term operators* and (2.2) with *term agreement,* the former predictably constituting the main thrust of the chapter.

On the subject of definiteness, van Schaaik's main claim is that the element *bir,* generally analysed as indefinite article in structures such as *Ayşe bir kitap arıyor* (Lewis 1967, Johanson 1977, Nilsson 1985), is in fact a marker for NUMBER. The analysis is based on the distribution and co-occurrence patterns of the element *bir,* the accusative marker *-(y)I* and the overt plurality marker *-lAr* on the noun. Van Schaaik opposes the traditional account of *bir* as indefinite article by showing that the distinction between definiteness and indefiniteness holds for plural as well as singular noun phrases marked with the accusative suffix *-(y)I* and argues that it is therefore the presence and absence of the accusative marker *-(y)I*, not of *bir,* which needs to be correlated with (in)definiteness. The latter he considers to "express a 'hidden' value for Number" (p. 32).

Consequently, pairs such as *Mehmet Ø kitap arıyor* and *Mehmet bir kitap arıyor* (van Schaaik's 6 and 7 respectively) provide no motivation for him to correlate the presence of *bir* in the second sentence with indefiniteness, but rather with the category Number signalling singularity. To incorporate this analysis into the Functional Grammar framework, van Schaaik proposes to leave the values for the two term operators, i.e. ±definite operator and the number operator, unmarked. Thus, van Schaaik's representation of a (partial) noun phrase structure in Turkish is [*bir*/ØN-pl/Ø-acc/Ø] where *bir*/Ø represents number, pl/Ø plurality, and acc/Ø (in)definiteness.

For van Schaaik, the three-way contrast between the structures *Mehmet bir kitap-Ø arıyor, Mehmet bir kitab-ı arıyor,* and *Mehmet kitab-ı arıyor* (van Schaaik's 23a-c) involves the interplay of discourse-bound constructs of indefiniteness, specificity and definiteness respectively. Specificity is defined as signalling the identifiability of the referent of the term by the speaker while the hearer is expected to "construct" a referent in the sense of Dik (1987).

Van Schaaik's major contribution to the semantic issues related with reference is to contrast "specificity" with "genericity", where specific is taken to mean non-generic and also discourse-referential. Claiming that "not all generic terms are non-referential in an absolute sense", the author distinguishes between two types of generic constructions, i.e. "strong" vs. "weak", where it is claimed that a reverse correlation holds between the type of the generic construction and its degree of referential force. Strong generics are assumed to have weak referential force, while weak generics possess strong referential force. In Turkish, these categories possess morphosyntactic correlates, with the terms in strong generic statements being "zero-marked for subject NPs and /.../ with the accusative for object NPs" (p. 76). Noun phrases in weak generic statements, on the other hand, contain the element *bir* both in singular subjects and objects.

Reserving a more extensive discussion of some of the theoretical as well as analytical issues inherent in van Schaaik's analysis of specificity and genericness to other contexts, we will confine ourselves here to observe that the definition given for specificity, i.e. that which is intended by the speaker, at least for Turkish, should also be extended to include not only what is in the mind of the speaker but also of the subject. Thus, the structure *bir N+acc* in *Mehmet bir kitab-ı arıyor* may, in some discourse context, express reference to what is identifiable by the subject of the sentence, not necessarily merely by the speaker; the speaker, by virtue of this belief / knowledge on the part of the subject, conveys the fact that there exists a book identifiable by someone who is known to him / her as well as the hearer.

Van Schaaik's discussion on definiteness in Turkish, on the other hand, will be commented upon in a slightly more detailed manner. Van Schaaik, having made the claim that "*bir* is the formal expression of singularity" (p. 33), then proceeds to draw upon contextualized evidence to show that *bir* is indeed an inherent indicator of number. A number of arguments can be raised against his claim, however. One very obvious argument, which is also noted by the author himself in a footnote (p. 33), is the fact that Turkish distinguishes between stressed and unstressed *bir* in structures such as *Mehmet BİR kitap yazdı* vs *Mehmet bir kitap yazdı*. The distinction is correlated with the readings assigned to the two structures; while the former unambiguously receives the number reading, the latter is assigned the indefinite reading. Voiding *bir* of its [-definite] feature fails to capture the difference in these two otherwise similar structures. Note that further evidence to the fact that *bir* is not totally devoid of inherent indefiniteness is provided by the fact that one of the indefinite pronouns in Turkish is *biri(si)*.

Furthermore, van Schaaik's claim that the prenominal position is only for Number, raises the question of why Turkish should have two slots for number, both of which, in accordance with the argument presented in the chapter, would be filled

contemporarily. As is well-known, in those cases in which the prenominal number position is filled in a Turkish NP, the affixal slot is obligatorily empty; *iki kitap/*lar*. Thus, the atypical nature of those structures in which both slots are filled, i.e. the constructions with the number adjunct *bir* in prenominal position in which the affixal number slot would be analyzed as being occupied with the null singular marker, is rendered possible by the placement of stress on the prenominal number adjunct. Hence, van Schaaik's analysis, which merely assigns category Number to the prenominal adjunct position, falls short of explaining the difference between these structures.

Moreover, one possible analysis of noun phrase terms not containing *bir* and not marked with the accusative suffix, i.e. the incorporation argument, is left out of the discussion totally. Van Schaaik in fact acknowledges this in a footnote, noting duly that there are counter-arguments to the incorporation analysis of these structures. These are instances of nouns referring to 'unique' entities, such as *Türkçe* and *Kuran*, which, in contrast to predictions based on their semantic properties, are not marked with the accusative marker *-yI* , as in structures such as *Türkçe/*yi konuş-* and *Kuran/*ı oku-*. However, in the reading available to these noun phrases, they refer to an undefined, i.e. indefinite, portion of the entity they identify, not its entirety, and, as such, behave in a manner not different from indefinite nouns. The predications in these cases contrast with structures such as *İngilizce konuş-* and *roman oku-* respectively. As such, these structures do not posit counter-examples to the incorporation argument.

Note that the distinction becomes clearer in the contrast presented by a question such as *Türkçe-yi/*Ø söktün mü artık?* in which the reference is unquestionably to the whole linguistic system of Turkish, hence the ungrammaticality of the structure in which there is no accusative marker on the noun. Similarly, *Kuran-ı oku-*, with the noun phrase marked with the accusative suffix, refers to the action of reading the whole book rather than part of it and contrasts with the structure in which the noun phrase is not marked with the accusative marker, i.e. *Kuran/*ı oku-* as already exemplified above.

Chapter 3 deals with the syntax of noun phrases wherein all noun phrase structures that contain more than one noun with its one or more adjectival restrictors are treated as COMPLEX TERMS "based on a noun plus one or more embedded terms". Discussed in this category are possessive, locative, directional and source embeddings as well as quantification structures. The main aim of the chapter is to propose a set of expression rules for the various noun phrase structures within the Functional Grammar framework, where the economy of the rules proposed constitutes a point of theoretical significance for Functional Grammar. One significant proposal here is the distinction made between the suffix *-SIn* in ablative partitives and the third person

singular possessive suffix, noting that "the suffix *-SIN* in the sequence 'Noun-TEn Card-SIN' (expressing the partitive as a whole) cannot be regarded as a formal element expressing Possessive Concord" (p. 86). He assumes it to be "a *tier* or *linker* connecting two nominal word groups, quite similar to the case of compound nominals" (p. 86). Also left out of the account in the discussion on locative embeddings in which the restrictor is taken to be marked with the locative suffix *-DE* and the relator *-ki*, are those constructions in which the restrictor is marked with the relator *-ki* but not the locative suffix, as in the temporal expression *bugünkü haberler*.

Lexical representations of nominal predicates constitute the theme of Chapter 4. Bound by the tenets of Functional Grammar which rejects transformations, van Schaaik represents the morphophonemic variation in Turkish stems in the form of archiphonemes. The discussion includes Final Stop Devoicing, K/Ø Alternation, Vowel Insertion/Deletion, Degemination and Glottal Stop and Disharmonic Roots. While still superior to the traditional approach of listing roots in their nominative form, the approach nevertheless faces the shortcoming common to archiphoneme analyses—that of assigning dual function to the archiphoneme, i.e. marking the sound unit that either undergoes or triggers change.

Chapter 5 deals with lexical generation. A Phonological Module with two possible models as opposed to a Morphological Module is considered for the process of lexical generation in Turkish. On the basis of psycholinguistic relevance, van Schaaik concludes that a Morphological Module which assumes parametrization of the function STEM into relevant morphological categories such as Number Agreement, Possessive Concord, Case, each related to a certain phonological form, is more appropriate for Turkish. Within the phonological model that operates on fully specified morphological units produced as output of the Morphological Module, a series of rewrite rules which make the necessary phonological adjustments to both root and affixes maps abstract morphological structures onto corresponding phonological forms. An alternate phonological model, on the other hand, assumes partially specified units as input, as opposed to the fully specified ones of the former approach, wherein the phonological and morphological processes are serialized, the phonological output being yielded "as soon as a morphological structure is *sufficiently* specified" (p. 134). Van Schaaik appropriately raises the psycholinguistic relevance of a Phonological Module, both models of which operate on a stem form.

The three "applications" chapters, 6-8, discuss compounding, embedding and similarity constructions respectively. In Chapter 6, van Schaaik proposes a reformulation of the compounding process wherein the *-SI* morpheme that appears on the rightmost element in a compound and is homophonous with the third person possessive marker (and which, as such, has been traditionally analyzed as the third possessor suffix) is claimed to be a distinct morpheme, i.e. compound marker (CM). The

crux of van Schaaik's argumentation lies in determining the level at which the compound marker is attached to the compound. Compounding is analyzed as an output of a Predicate Formation Rule which "produces a compound predicate *without* a Compound Marker" (p. 148). A late (terminal?) expression rule attaches the compound marker to the compound predicate only in those cases where the latter functions as a term. This formulation allows van Schaaik to account for the constraint that prohibits the occurrence of two *-SI* morphemes, the third person possessive marker and the compound marker (in his analysis) in those constructions where both are predicted to occur. See Kornfilt (1986) for an alternate analysis of the phenomenon in a framework which assumes the two forms to be the same, i.e. third person singular possessive marker. In those cases in which the compound is restricted by a possessor, it is the possessive marker, not the compound marker, that is attached to the rightmost element.

Having the compound marker introduced by a late expression rule rather than the syntactic rule of compounding provides van Schaaik the further advantage of generalizing the analysis to some derivational processes as well as accounting for some properties of Turkish compounds in general, such as coordination of either of the terms of a compound.

Chapter 7 deals with non-finite embedded predications in the syntactic frame of a non-verbal negator. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of the morphology of verbal embeddings in Turkish. Although some of the examples illustrating the properties may not be agreed upon by all the speakers of the standard dialect (cf. (10c) with *olan* in parentheses and (11a) on p. 182) and forms other than *-DIK* (as participle and nominalizer) and *-yAn* are not treated (i.e. no mention is made of *-mA* or *-yI*), the discussion is nevertheless to the point. In the analysis of existential structures based on *var/yok*, van Schaaik, in conformity with the tenets of Functional Grammar, assumes these to be realizations of a predicate operator in a structure in which "a locative predicate is applied to an indefinite term" (p. 185). Structures such as *Nereden gelip nereye gittiğimi bildiğim var mı?* are analyzed as instances of closed predicational terms and the relative clauses *Ali'nin yazdığı kitap* vs. *kitap yazan adam* are analyzed as open predicational terms.

Van Schaaik's innovative approach in this chapter is to view the periphrastic constructions that occur in nominal negated structures, i.e. those embedded under *değil*, as open predicational terms. Focusing on the interpretation of these verbal embeddings as being distinct from the propositional content of those cases in which the verb is used predicatively, van Schaaik claims the former to be "attributive" in function; "the fact that *-mIş* in such PCs does not express 'inferential past' is a clear indication that the verbal complex is a participle, the first argument of which is relativised" (p. 199). Generalizing the implications of this analysis to other predicative

suffixes, van Schaaik derives all verbal forms embedded under *değil* from participle constructions. This leads to the analysis in which the *-yAn* participle is claimed to be the expression of the operator 'prs2' in relative clauses and *-Iyor* in predicative function. A further consequence of the analysis is the proposal that structures such as *İlk önce ben de geri dönmeği ister değilim* (van Schaaik's 69a) are derived from headless relative clauses in which the verbal complex *geri dönmeği ister* predicates over the pronominal term *ben*. Though an ingenious proposal, the likelihood of the analysis needs to be considered. For one thing, note that not all the predicational suffixes in Turkish inherently possess the semantic variation that is neutralized in embedded clauses as in the case of *-mIş*. Thus, generalizing from the particular case of one suffix to all the others lacks the support of independent evidence. Note further that, semantically, what is negated in the *değil* structures is not the actual state of affairs but the assumptions, beliefs or claims about it as presented to the speaker in the previous discourse (cf. Tura 1981). Hence, paraphrasing these structures as open predicational structures, i.e. relative clauses, falls contrary to the function of the structures. What is significant is that all participles with the exception of *-DI* behave similarly with respect to having the person agreement appear on the operator *değil*. *-DI*, on the other hand, exhibits this property only optionally.

Similarity constructions are the topic of Chapter 8. Van Schaaik analyzes *gibi* as a predicate that functions both predicatively and attributively, with the functions being encoded in the position in which *gibi* occurs in the sentence; predicative *gibi* occurs clause finally, attributive *gibi* in prehead position.

With respect to the range of facts it covers as well as the extent of argumentation and analyses it contains, *Studies in Turkish grammar* is a major contribution to the field of Turkish linguistics. Presenting much food for thought for further research on the topics discussed, as well as those not discussed, is much to the credit of any book in linguistics, and van Schaaik's *Studies in Turkish grammar* does just that. The occasional editing flaws in no way interfere with the readability of the text nor deter from its content, although their elimination prior to reprinting will undoubtedly enhance the next edition.

References:

Dik, S. 1989. *The theory of Functional Grammar* (Part 1: The structure of the clause). Dordrecht: Foris.

Hankamer, J. 1986. Finite state morphology and left to right parsing. [Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Tilburg, The Netherlands.]

Hankamer, J. 1988. Parsing Nominal Compounds in Turkish. In: *Morphology as a computational problem*, Occasional Paper 7, University of California at Los Angeles.

Johanson, L. 1977. Bestimmtheit und Mitteilungsperspektive im türkischen Satz. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Wiesbaden), Supplement III: 2, 1186-1203.

Kornfilt, J. 1986. The Stuttering Prohibition. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Taylan, E. E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 59-83.

Köksal, A. 1975. *A first approach to a computerized model for the automatic morphological analysis of Turkish.* [Ph.D. dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara.]

Lewis, G., 1967. *Turkish grammar.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Nilsson, B. 1985. *Case marking semantics in Turkish.* [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stockholm, Stockholm.]

Solak, A. & Oflazer, K. 1991. Implementation details and performance results of a spelling checker for Turkish. *Computer and Information Sciences* 6, 1057-1066.

Tura, S. 1981. 'Yes, he hasn't' and a few other not's in Turkish. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society.* Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society. 317-327.

Árpád Berta: Review of Lars Johanson. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten* [Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts]. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main 29, 5.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992. 137 pages. ISBN 3-515-06176-2.

Árpád Berta, József Attila Tudományegyetem, Egyetem utca 2, H-6722 Szeged, Hungary.

The question at the core of all the issues Lars Johanson addresses in this book is the following: Assuming a contact situation between languages, is it possible to specify those structural features which tend to promote language change, and define its dynamics and intensity? Conversely, is it possible to specify the structural features that inhibit language change?

What has already been published on this question would fill a small library, but a conclusive answer is yet to be had.

Johanson does not—indeed, cannot—undertake to discuss the correlation between language contact and language change in all its complexity, and significantly restricts both the subject and the range of his investigation. Essentially, he focuses on language contacts with "an immediate, non-lexical impact on the spoken language" (p. 7). As for the range of his investigation, it is confined to *long-term, intensive* influences in contact situations where one of the languages involved is a Turkic language. Johanson proposes, in particular, to discuss language contacts—both those showing Turkic dominance, and those showing non-Turkic dominance (p. 11)—which have been the staple of linguistic and sociolinguistic analyses of contact situations: The Turkic influence on the Greek dialects that were spoken in Central Anatolia, for instance; the Balto-Slavic influence on the Karaim spoken in Lithuania, Poland and the Ukraine; and Iranian-Turkic language contacts. Fortunately for the reader, however, the author does not always stay within these self-imposed limits, and illustrates his points with a much wider range of examples.

Johanson is primarily a linguist, but he is at home in sociolinguistics, and is very much aware that the outcome of any particular contact situation will depend to no small extent on extralinguistic factors: Political, economic and / or cultural dominance, numerical superiority, which language was autochthonous in the area of contact, the measure of bilingualism in the area, and so on.

Language, for Johanson, is both a technique and a product. Every language is a—historically determined—creative technique, one suitable for generating (inventing), implementing and modifying (changing) the rules regulating the realization of a linguistic variable. It is, at the same time, a product, one capable of being described and analyzed. In describing language change, we can speak of *new linguistic factors* having taken the place of the *old*.

The author, as noted above, is interested primarily in asymmetrical language contacts, i.e., those in which we can distinguish a *dominant* language (language B) and a *dominated* language (language A). The dominance relationship between languages can be one of *social* dominance or *structural* dominance.

While optimally, the factors underlying social dominance (political, economic and cultural dominance, numerical superiority, autochthony in the area of contact, etc.) can be described with a fair degree of accuracy, structural dominance is not quite so easy to define.

The first step toward its definition is to determine how far the two contact languages are similar from the point of view of their structure and typology, and to what extent they differ. Johanson ascribes particular importance to a language's structurally attractive features, which experience has shown to be particularly suitable for

copying. "Copying" is a term Johanson has recommended to replace "borrowing" or "transfer" in a number of other works (cf. Johanson 1993a, 1993b), and the latest literature indicates that this term is becoming accepted by more and more Turkic scholars. It is, undoubtedly, a more adequate term than "borrowing". What both terms are meant to describe is a change in the rules regulating the realization of a linguistic variable in a particular language: A language copies into its own code elements from the code of the contact language. The copied elements of the contact language enter the copying language, which incorporates these elements in its own code.

Johanson differentiates two types of influence on a speaker of language A: a) When language B influences the A speaker's use of A (the classical example of "borrowing" in traditional linguistics); and b) when, in the case of a native A speaker becoming bilingual, language A influences the A speaker's use of language B (Johanson calls this *Unterschiebung*, i.e. imposition due to language shift).

Linguistic interaction can give rise to several types of copying. *Global copying*— where B units, "blocks", are copied into A as a whole—is to be distinguished from *partial or selective copying*, where only certain properties of B are copied into A.

Johanson then gives a comprehensive, 46-point typology of the Turkic languages (pp. 22-32), a summary that will be welcomed, and not just by linguists who know little of Turkic studies but like to use Turkic examples nevertheless.

Chapter II (p. 33-61) is much more than a critical review of the part that structural factors have, to date, been thought to play in language contacts. As so often in his works, Johanson warns against the kind of unsubstantiated conclusions one so often encounters in the literature, and is very guarded in the wording of his own findings. He discusses the preconditions of structural influence in language contact, the question of the stability of linguistic elements, and the matter of attractive features. I found myself subscribing to a great deal of what he had to say about relative attractivity (p. 47-51). Judging by the Turkic influence on Greek, and the Russian influence on Turkic, Johanson concludes that the want of a typological similarity between linguistic sub-systems (i.e., the want of "objective structural equivalence") is no impediment to copying. (Karaim, which was influenced by Slavic, is particularly rich in phonetic and syntactic examples to this effect.) What counts is the *subjective evaluation* of the presence or absence of structural equivalence, though admittedly, in the case of structurally dissimilar languages, the copy in language A is usually strikingly different from the language B original.

Johanson specifically calls attention to influences productive of far-reaching language change, pointing out that these are inconceivable without the requisite social conditions. Far-reaching language change, however, does have some structural aspects, the gradualism (successiveness) of the copying process being a cardinal one. Optimally, a linguist will be able to substantiate the assumption of gradualism with

exact linguistic data. For instance, Johanson mentions the case of A languages whose B language loanwords can be shown to have entered those languages at different stages of linguistic development, and cites the Russian loanwords in the Turkic languages as examples. In other cases, it is more difficult to obtain empirical confirmation of successiveness. For though researchers have no doubt that Hungarian was exposed to a long period of Turkic influence prior to the tenth century, they have yet to conclusively identify which Turkic loanwords entered Hungarian at which stage of its development. The problem, of course, is much more complex than the case of the Russian loanwords in the Turkic languages. The early Turkic loans in Hungarian are unlikely to have come from one and the same Turkic language, and so are likely to reflect not just chronological differences, but linguistic and dialectal differences as well. Insufficient knowledge of Turkic linguistic history as well as the linguistic convergence resulting from this protracted period of far-reaching Turkic influence on Hungarian have made it impossible to distinguish the various chronological layers. (Little wonder, then, that Johanson has failed to cite the example of Turkic influence on Hungarian at any of the number of places where he might have. Hungarian Turcologists are just beginning to make some headway in the fields of concern to him; the area of lexical copying, where we have the most concrete results, is not among the subjects he deals with in this book.)

The second chapter ends with Johanson distinguishing what he calls the two basic types of strong linguistic influence: Case a, where, in spite of being powerfully influenced by language B, the A speech community keeps its native A language; and case b), where the A speech community gives up its native A language and becomes B-speaking. It is this process, completed, that is meant by "language shift". An interesting variant of case b, Johanson points out, is when a large A-speaking community, which has acquired language B, influences the B spoken by the original B speech community. As a historical illustration of this variant, Johanson cites the Turks who spoke Bulgarian as an acquired language. I believe that we can assume a similar development in the wake of the language change that took place among the Khazar-speaking Kabars, who joined up with the Hungarian tribes in the 9th century.

Chapter III (p. 61-114) discusses instances of the global and selective copying that have resulted from the contact between the Turkic and non-Turkic languages. Johanson gives examples for every system within the language system as a whole, from the phonological system to morphology and syntax. One can only regret that this wealth of material is not itemized in an index.

Johanson summarizes his findings in the concluding chapter of the volume, "General and areal trends" (p. 114-127). All Turkic language contacts, we learn, independently of whether they were relatively superficial, or were protracted, intensive and conducive to far-reaching change, were characterized by the same fundamental

feature: It was always the structurally attractive features that were copied. Long-term, intensive contacts, however, also tended to lead to the convergence of the languages involved. Convergence, in such cases, was always in the direction of greater simplicity.

Convergence, Johanson points out, can occur spontaneously as well, and is not necessarily the result of language contact. Accordingly, one needs to weigh all the evidence very carefully before describing any particular instance of convergence as the result of language contact, rather than spontaneous development. (For my part, I would take a more skeptical position on this score. For there are cases where all the care in the world can not satisfy us that a particular instance of convergence has one, rather than the other cause.)

The author makes two further significant points in conclusion, one historical, the other of relevance to comparative Altaic studies.

Johanson finds that the history of the Turkic languages shows a two-fold pattern of development: Though there was a natural trend to linguistic differentiation (divergence), time and again a koine would also develop, showing that there was a trend to convergence as well.

The second point has to do with the established fact that the later any Mongolian source is, the more structural similarities it will reveal between the Mongolian and the Turkic languages. This, Johanson emphasizes, is not necessarily incompatible with the assumption that historically, Mongolian and Turkic belonged to the same family of languages. He does note, however, that if the Altaic languages are related, their relationship must date back to be the very earliest times; this would account for the extreme paucity of their common features. It would make sense to look for further common features in the area of the language that has shown the greatest stability. From the point of view of the Turkic languages, this would be seem to be the complex verbal system, which appears to be particularly archaic and intact.

One can only hope that researchers will follow up on both of these points in the future.

Obviously, a concise review cannot do justice to every important thing that an author says. My own objective in reviewing Johanson's book has been to call attention to this seminal work, to recommend it to the attention of general linguists, those doing research on language contacts, and not least of all, specialists in Turkic studies.

As befits the significance of Johanson's contribution to the subject, this is a book that will likely be quoted time and again. Chances are that scholars will also be inspired to rethink and develop some of his conclusions, which is another effect of an outstanding work.

Johanson, as noted above, has opted to disregard the examples of Turkic-Hungarian contact, and—as already explained—for good reason. All this serves to bolster

the argument that Hungarian Turcologists need to consider the reassessment of early Turkic-Hungarian language contacts as one of the most pressing of their tasks. A new, insightful synthesis of everything we know about the subject might answer the question of what traces the Turkic languages have left on Hungarian, besides the well-established examples of lexical copying. Johanson's work would tie in with an undertaking of this sort in at least two respects. On the one hand, the book would give a certain direction to the investigation; on the other, the empirical evidence turned up in the course of exploring this "new" contact situation would be an excellent test of Johanson's theses and hypotheses.

References:

Johanson, Lars 1993a. Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. In: Extra, Guus & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) 1993. *Immigrant languages in Europe.* Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide. 83-94.

Johanson, Lars 1993b. Zur Anpassung von Lehnelementen im Türkischen. In: Laut, Jens Peter & Röhrborn, Klaus (eds.) *Sprach- und Kulturkontakte der türkischen Völker. Materialien der zweiten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz Rauischholzhausen, 13.-16. Juli 1990.* (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 37.) 93-102.

Árpád Berta: Review of Marek Stachowski. *Studien zum Wortschatz der jakutischen Übersetzung des Neuen Testaments.* (Polska Akademia Nauk – Oddział w Krakowie, Prace Komisji Orientalistycznej 23.) Kraków: The Enigma Press, 1995. 57 pages + appendix.

Árpád Berta, József Attila Tudományegyetem, Egyetem utca 2, H-6722 Szeged, Hungary.

This is the third volume published within the past two years by Marek Stachowski, an outstanding representative of the younger generation of the distinguished Polish school of Turkic studies. Stachowski's first work (Stachowski 1993a) was on the history of Yakut vocalism; the second (Stachowski 1993b) was a discussion of the Dolgan lexicon, a Turkic language very close to Yakut.

This latest book is an offshoot, as it were, of the earlier volumes, and marks another important junction in a well-planned scholarly career.

What forms the basis of Stachowski's study is the second Yakut translation of the New Testament. The work of D. A. Kukhnev, the second translation was printed in 1898 in Kasan. (Stachowski was unable to get a copy of the first translation, which antedated Kukhnev's by forty years.) The New Testament text analyzed by Stachowski is significant in a number of respects. Though it appeared nearly fifty years later than Böhtlingk's famous Yakut grammar, Kukhnev's translation is one of the earliest and most widely-known of all Yakut language monuments. To boot—as Stachowski also notes (p. 5)—it is a work which, for all its importance, has, for some inexplicable reason, been overlooked by researchers until now.

In the brief introduction (pp. 5-11), Stachowski calls attention to some of the unique problems presented by Kukhnev's text.

He speaks, for instance, of the difficulty of translating into Yakut a text replete with the concrete nouns that come up time and again in the New Testament. 'Oil', 'donkey', 'dove', 'manger', 'vineyards' all refer to things for which there were no words in nineteenth-century Yakut, the language of a people living in relative isolation in the subarctic climate of Siberia. In the case of words of this sort, Kukhnev could choose between one of two possible solutions. Either he adopted the Russian word from the Russian New Testament that served as the basis of his translation, or he tried to define the unfamiliar creature or thing in terms familiar to his Yakut readers.

Kukhnev's translation is written in the same modified Cyrillic alphabet as Böht-lingk's Yakut grammar, and shows only one significant departure from the latter in respect of orthography. As opposed to Böhtlingk's grammar, in Kukhnev's New Testament no distinction is made between the plosive [g] and the spirant (fricative) [γ]: The grapheme g is used for both. Stachowski ventures the assumption that this uniform rendering of two phonemes was due to the limitations of the available printing technology, rather than to phonological considerations (p. 7). His tentative conjecture is absolutely correct. Kukhnev's book was printed in Kasan, in V. M. Kljuchnikov's press. All the material printed using the modified Cyrillic alphabet compiled by N. I. Il'minski which came off the contemporary Christian Tatar press (cf. Berta 1994: 116) has the Cyrillic г grapheme for [g] and [γ] alike. We can safely assert, therefore, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the use of the same grapheme to mark the Yakut plosive and spirant alike was dictated by the limited typographical facilities of the contemporary presses in Kasan.

Stachowski gives us some short excerpts from Kukhnev's translation (pp. 11-16), and then gives us, in alphabetical order, the word stock that forms the backbone of his work (pp. 17-43). There are about 450 items in this little Yakut-German diction-ary. In compiling his word list, Stachowski included every lexeme of Kukhnev's New Testament translation which either does not occur in any known Yakut diction-

ary, or differs enough from its entry there (phonologically, morphologically and/or semantically in particular) to warrant its inclusion here as new information. Stachowski gives the lexical items of his little dictionary in a transliterated form, and always in context. His careful German translations of the Yakut words have one eye on Luther's translation of the New Testament. For a number of entries, Stachowski provides etymological details which further enhance the value of his little dictionary.

An index (pp. 45-56) of the German meanings of the Yakut words in the dictionary makes the work even more practical to use.

Though Marek Stachowski's latest book is slim enough to pass for a brochure, its usefulness, reliability, and above all the fact that it has introduced Turkic scholars to a new Yakut lexical source will undoubtedly guarantee this slim volume the status of an invaluable reference work for a long time to come.

References:

Berta, Árpád 1994. Graphische Probleme des Tatarischen. In: Werner, Ottmar (ed.) *Probleme der Graphie.* (SciptOralia 57.) Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 107-120.

Stachowski, Marek 1993a. *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus.* Rozprawy Habilitacyjne Nr. 264. Uniwersytet Jagielloński. Kraków.

Stachowski, Marek 1993b. *Dolganischer Wortschatz.* Prace Językoznawcze. Zeszyt 114. Uniwersytet Jagielloński. Kraków.

Fahrünnisa Bilecik Kahraman: Review of Emine Gürsoy-Naskali (ed.) *Bozkırdan bağımsızlığa Manas* [Manas from the steppes to independence]. (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 625.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1995. 294 pages. ISBN 975-16-0737-8.

Fahrünnisa Bilecik Kahraman, Marmara Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Göztepe, İstanbul, Türkiye.

Narrated in an elevated style, epics carry very important messages about the culture, the spirit and the moral and aesthetic values of the nations from whose folk traditions they originate and in this way epics have maintained a bridge between the generations through the ages. However, for Kirghiz people, the epic of Manas represents much more than an ordinary epic: Manas is a symbol of their identity, even today.

The epic of Manas, the longest epic known in the world, is a masterpiece of Kirghiz culture and, as regards its content, it is more like an encyclopedia.

After UNESCO recognized 1995 as the year of the Manas, the first scientific gathering on the Manas "The International Conference on the Manas" was organized in Istanbul on May 23 and 24, 1995 by the Center for Turkic Studies of Marmara University.

The papers presented at this conference have been collected under the title of *Bozkırdan Bağımsızlığa Manas* 'Manas from the Steppes to Freedom'. The volume contains, in addition to the papers, the text of the two opening speeches held by Emine Gürsoy-Naskali, the director of the Centre for Turkic Studies, and Osman Fikri Sertkaya. The full program of the conference is included, as well. The papers are grouped according to their subject matter.

The first part called *Destan Geleneği* 'Epic tradition' includes papers on the narration characteristics of the epic and the Manas minstrels: *Manas destanında giriş merasimleri* 'Introductory rituals in the epic of Manas' by Bilge Seyitoğlu, Turkey (p. 1-8); *Manas cana bayırkı Türktördün epikalık saltı* 'Manas and the epic tradition of Turks in the old ages' by Raisa Kıdırbayeva, Kirghizstan, in Kirghiz (p. 9-20), and in Turkish translation (p. 21-31); *Variation and stability in the transmission of Manas* by Karl Reichl, Germany, in English (p. 32-47), and in Turkish translation (p. 48-60); *Manas ozanları* 'The Manas minstrels' by Meral Gölgeci, Turkey (p. 61-94); and *Manas destanının epizotları* 'The episodes of the epic of Manas' by Bilge Seyitoğlu, Turkey (p. 95-100).

The part called *Kültür Bağları* 'Cultural ties' includes papers on the cultural ties of the epic of Manas with the Altay region and Anatolia: *Manas destanı ve Altay destanlarının dilindeki ortak yönler* 'The common characteristics in the language of the epic of Manas and the Altaic epics' by Aleksandra Tıbıkova, High Altays (p. 101-109); *Manas destanı ve Anadolu halk edebiyatı* 'The epic of Manas and Anatolian folk literature' by Fikret Türkmen, Turkey (p. 110-115).

Dil Bağları 'Linguistic ties' comprises one paper, *The Kirghiz enigma* written by Claus Schönig, Germany, in English (p. 116-124), and in Turkish translation (p. 125-127).

Tarihi Perspektif 'Historical perspective' addresses questions of the diachronic evaluation: *"Manas" eposundagı genealogiyalık tsiklizatsiya printsibinin maanisi* 'The concepts of the epic of Manas extending to the generations and the historic dimension of the epic' by Aynek Caynakova, Kirghizstan, in Kirghiz (p. 128-144), and in Turkish translation (p. 145-159); *Kaşgarlı Mahmut'un Divanı ve Manas destanında Doğu Türklerinin savaşları* 'The Divan of Mahmud of Kashgar and the wars of the Eastern Turks' by Tınçtıkbek Çorotegin, Kirghizstan (p. 160-164).

In the part titled *Sosyal Yapı* 'Social structure' the following papers discuss the steppe and city relationships and the social life in the epic: *Manas destanında şehir ve bozkır* 'City and steppe in the epic of Manas' by İnci Enginün, Turkey (p. 165-176); *Manas destanında sosyal ilişkiler ve bunların Dede Korkut hikayeleri ile mukayesesi* 'The social aspects in the epic of Manas and their comparison with those in Dede Korkut stories' by Naciye Yıldız, Turkey (p. 177-191).

Bozkır Kanunu ve Savaş 'The Law of the Steppe and War' deals with martial terminology, plundering and the deaths of the heroes: *Manas destanında askeri terimler* 'The martial terminology in the epic of Manas' by İris Beybutova, Kirghizstan (p. 192-196); *Manas destanında ganimet anlayışı* 'The concept of 'plundering' in the epic of Manas' by Esra Karabacak, Turkey (p. 197-201); *Manas destanında kahramanların ölümü* 'The deaths of the heroes in the epic of Manas' by Saim Sakaoğlu, Turkey (p. 202-223).

The section called *Bozkırda Yurt* 'A home in the steppe' contains two papers on marriage and family structure: *Manas destanında evlilik geleneği* 'The tradition of marriage in the epic of Manas' by Gülden Sağol, Turkey (p. 224-233); and *Orta Asya Destanlarında bir evlilik türü* 'A type of marriage in the epics of the Central Asia' by Fahrünnisa Bilecik, Turkey (p. 234-240).

İnançlar 'Religion' treats questions of Shamanism and other totemist faiths as well as Islam: *Manas destanında islamî unsurlar* 'Islamic elements in the epic of Manas' by Nuri Yüce, Turkey (p. 241-255); *Manas ve Seytek destanlarında ant içme şekilleri* 'Types of oaths in the epics of Manas and Seytek' by Özlem Deniz, Turkey (p. 256-268).

Dördüncü Boyut 'The fourth dimension' provides the readers with two analyses of the dreams: *Kanıkey'in rüyası* 'The dream of Kanıkey' by Arzu Erdoğan-Öztürk, Turkey (p. 269-270); and *Manas destanında rüya* 'Dreams in the epic of Manas' by Sebahat Deniz, Turkey (p. 271-277).

The last part of the volume, *Kimlik ve İdeoloji* 'Identity and ideology' raises questions of cultural identity and aspects of race, language and religion: *İpek Yolu destanlarında kültürel kimlik ve ideolojik tahrifat* 'Cultural identity in the Silk Road epics and ideological degeneration' by Lauri Harvilahti, Finland (p. 278-287); and *Manas destanında soy-dil-din üçgeni* 'Race-language-religion in the epic of Manas' by Emine Gürsoy-Naskali, Turkey (p. 288-294).

The essays analyze many different aspects of the epic of Manas, and the collection can be considered a reference book on the subject.

Erdal Şahin: Review of Emine Ceylan. *Çuvaş atasözleri ve deyimleri.*
(Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi 10.) Ankara: Simurg, 1996.
xxıı+198 pages. ISBN 975-7172-08-1.

*Erdal Şahin, Marmara Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı
Bölümü, Göztepe, İstanbul, Türkiye.*

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, academic interest in research on the Turk-
ic peoples of the former Soviet Union has increased in Turkey. Dictionaries and a
number of anthologies in various Turkic languages have been published.

Several of these studies have been published in *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi*
'Studies on Turkic Languages' edited by Mehmet Ölmez. The book under review,
Çuvaş Atasözleri ve Deyimleri 'Chuvash Proverbs and Idioms', written by Emine
Ceylan, is the tenth title in this series.

The introduction to the volume gives the reader information about the Chuvash
and an overview of previous studies on Chuvash proverbs and idioms.

The main part of the book (pp. 1-114), contains a comprehensive list of Chuvash
proverbs and idioms. Each proverb and idiom is given first in the Chuvash orthogra-
phy and then in a Latin transliteration. A Turkish translation follows. If there is a
corresponding proverb or idiom in Turkish, it follows in italics on the fourth line.
The proverbs and idioms are arranged in the order of the Chuvash alphabet, sorted
by the first word.

In the Chuvash-Turkish glossary (pp. 115-172), the Chuvash words are rendered
in the Latin alphabet. The list contains 1,850 entries. The etymology of the Turkic
words is indicated. In addition, there is a Turkish-Chuvash word list (pp. 173-197)
with 1,350 entries.

Ceylan's book along with Bläsing's publication of Chuvash proverbs provide
Turcologists with excellent source materials for further investigations into this intri-
guing Turkic language and culture.

Reference:

Bläsing, U. 1994. *Tschuwaschische Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten.*
    (Turcologica 20.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.