Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Árpád, Berta

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001|LOG_0044

Kontakt/Contact

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 isola-
tion 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 read-
ers.

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 Tes-
tament 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 uni-
form 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-