

Werk

Titel: Editorial note

Untertitel: Turkic Languages, Volume 2, 1998, Number 1

Autor: Johanson, Lars

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1998

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002 | LOG_0008

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 2, 1998, Number 1

It is a well-known fact that the community of scholars in the field of Turkic studies has not adopted any general conventions for transcription and transliteration. While the editors of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* certainly want to encourage standardization, we do not imagine solving the problem by imposing strict transcription rules on contributions submitted to the journal. Nevertheless, a few general guidelines will be drawn up here.

If a contribution is confined to one Turkic language, a language-specific set of characters may be used. If details about the pronunciation are unimportant, it may be enough to use the standard spelling conventions of the language in question. The style sheet of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* (1: 151-156) prescribes the use of Roman script "whenever possible". The official orthography of the Republic of Turkey may thus be used for modern Turkish. The situation is less clear with the recently introduced, but not yet sufficiently established Roman-based orthographies for Azerbaijani, Turkmen, etc.

For comparative purposes, it is advisable to use identical symbols across languages. Since various alphabets and orthographical conventions are applied to the different Turkic languages, transcription will be necessary. Transliteration of the highly varying Cyrillic and Arabic scripts distorts the phonetic shapes and makes cross-linguistic comparison difficult.

As regards transcription, the style sheet urges authors to apply standard systems, preferably the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) or the traditional "Turcological notation" as presented in J. Deny et al., *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1, Wiesbaden, 1959, xv-xv (cf. L. Johanson & É. Á. Csató, eds., *The Turkic languages*, London, 1998). If more precise transcriptions are necessary in order to show details of running speech, it is advisable to use IPA symbols. The inventory of symbols will vary according to the choice of the phonetic levels of representation. If a broader level is sufficient, notation at a narrower level should be avoided.

The second volume of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* is introduced by an article on historical Yakut phonology by Gregory D. S. Anderson. Árpád Ber-

ta continues his research on Hungarian tribe names of Turkic origin, a work which has already produced a number of noteworthy conclusions. Arienne M. Dwyer, presently an Alexander von Humboldt scholar at Mainz, investigates the Oghuz origin of Salar, a language to which she has devoted years of fieldwork and research. Andrej L. Malchukov, primarily known for his extensive work on the Tungusic language Even—formerly called Lamut—, addresses a general syntactic problem in Altaic languages. Wolfgang-E. Scharlipp publishes two texts from Gunnar Jarring's collection of Eastern Turki materials. Claus Schönig concludes his thorough discussion on questions of classification of the Turkic languages. Marek Stachowski presents a remarkable case in Dolgan as a possible result of contact with the Samoyedic language Nganasan.

In the review section, Özlem Yılmaz comments on Hamza Zülfikar's monograph on Turkic onomatopoeia. Finally, Victor A. Friedman evaluates Alf Grannes' fine collection of articles on the Turkish influence on the Bulgarian language. Both Friedman and Grannes are renowned Slavists with a profound knowledge of Balkan varieties. Their contact-linguistic research concerning Slavic dialects in that area has had a highly beneficial effect on linguistic Turcology as well.

Lars Johanson