

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1998

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002|LOG_0017

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Özlem Yılmaz: Review of Hamza Zülfikar, *Türkçede ses yansımaları ke-
limeler* [Onomatopoeia in Turkish]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayın-
ları, 1995. VIII + 699 pp.

Özlem Yılmaz, *Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul,
Turkey.*

The study under review is divided into the following parts: “Preface”, “Introduction”, “Onomatopoeia from the point of view of phonetics”, “Onomatopoeia from the point of view of morphology”, “The hendiadys in onomatopoeia”, “Conclusion”, “Some remarks on the concept index”, “Concept index”, “Some remarks on the dictionary”, “The sources of the dictionary and their abbreviations”, “Abbreviations of toponyms”, “Dictionary” and “Bibliography”.

The “Preface” (pp. vii-viii) states the study’s aim and the methods it employs. Though the author indicates that Modern Turkish is the particular area of investigation, the study actually covers the Southwest (Oghuz) group of Turkic languages. Zülfikar has used materials from written modern language texts and dictionaries, Anatolian dialects and, to a large degree, Turkish and the works of modern authors. In addition, he refers to Azerbaijani and Turkmen structures in order to support and explain the findings. The *Dīvānu luyāti’ t-türk* and sources from the Old Turkic period are included in this examination as well. However, the book does not take into consideration those onomatopoeic roots or derivatives found in the *Dīvānu luyāti’ t-türk* and Old Turkic but absent in the Oghuz group.

The “Introduction” (1-22) lists the terms used for onomatopoeia in Ottoman Turkish, Ancient Greek, Latin, some Western European languages (English, German, etc.), Russian and Turkic languages. Linguists’ definitions of onomatopoeia are presented, and the basic features of onomatopoeia are explained in detail. Additionally, this section provides an overview of studies on the Turkish onomatopoeia carried out in Turkey and elsewhere.

Zülfikar discusses the role of onomatopoeia in the formation of languages and also looks at onomatopoeia in child language. He disagrees with Ferdinand de Saussure’s position that the linguistic sign is arbitrary and that onomatopoeia usually

play the role of arbitrary language signs by losing some of their initial characteristics.

The second chapter entitled “Onomatopoeia from the point of view of phonetics” (23-91) consists of two parts: vowels and consonants. The section on vowels only considers the eight vowels used in written Turkish and discusses the role of vowel harmony in onomatopoeia. In the part devoted to the consonants, the twenty-one consonants used in the written language are examined. The author also demonstrates the features of the consonants *h, ħ, ğ, k, ŋ* (written *ñ*) and analyzes their functions in onomatopoeia, pointing out the relationship between them and natural sounds. Furthermore, this chapter also addresses consonant assimilation, consonant mutation, geminates, metathesis and consonant elision.

The next chapter, “Onomatopoeia from the point of view of morphology” (91-161) is made up of three parts:

1. The primary forms: In this part, the author shows that the primary forms constitute the non-separable, monosyllabic minimal parts of onomatopoeia. These components, which might be called nucleus forms, occur in certain patterns in the language. By combining with one another, the vowels and consonants which form these nuclei reflect natural sounds. The structure, function and use of these primary forms are explained.

2. The secondary forms: In this section, Zülfikar claims that the secondary forms are nominal structures which were expanded from the primary forms by means of affixes. The affixes in question are *-il* (*-il, -ul, -ül*) and *-ır* (*-ır, -ur, -ür*), sometimes *-ış* (*-ış, -uş, -üş*), and rarely *-a* (*-e*), *-ı* (*-i, -u, -ü*). The function and use of the secondary forms are shown.

3. The derivatives: They were formed by duplication of the primary and secondary forms or by attaching various affixes in order to perform certain grammatical functions. The author has subjected the onomatopoeic verbs and nouns derived from the primary and secondary forms to a thorough examination.

“The hendiadys in onomatopoeia” (161-165) is attributed the following functions: Creating continuity, intensifying meaning, harmonizing pronunciation, imitating natural sound, denoting one concept with two words, and repeating the primary or secondary forms to obtain a new meaning. In fact, the principal purpose of the hendiadys is to intensify and reinforce the meaning.

In the “Conclusion” (165-168), the researcher contends that the onomatopoeia form five word groups: Noun, adjective, adverb, verb, and interjection. The onomatopoeia throw light on the sound history of Turkish and lead researchers to the language’s formation. Onomatopoeia are systematic and regular. They constitute a word category, the structure of which most closely approaches the nature of Turkish and best reflects the way the language functions.

The “Index of concepts” (173-280) follows the chapter entitled “Some remarks on the concept index” (171-172). The material presented in the concept index is arranged alphabetically in five columns. The first column contains the concept number and the primary form, the second column, the hendiadys of this primary form, if any. The third column displays the hendiadys of the secondary forms, the fourth column lists all derivatives in alphabetical order and the fifth column, the general meanings of derivatives which as a group derive from a specific root. In this manner, all synonymous derivatives of onomatopoeia can easily be found, making this index a useful research tool.

The concept index employs a simple transcription system which differs from the official Turkish alphabet only in the use of the symbol \tilde{n} (for η). The verb stems are noted without the infinitive affix and followed by a hyphen, e.g. *baç et-* ‘to kiss’, *hıçkır-* ‘to sob’, *tıkla-* ‘to knock’, etc.

A simple transcription system is likewise used in the dictionary (291-695). As the author states, onomatopoeia compiled from historical texts and dictionaries are written in transcription at the beginning of each entry and in Arabic characters in the explanations. For some onomatopoeia an exemplary sentence is given to clarify the meaning. The verb stems are recorded in the dictionary with the respective infinitive affix, e.g. *barlamak* ‘to blaze’, *kangırmak* ‘to twist’, *vınlamak* ‘to hum’, etc.

The dictionary contains approximately 8,000 entries. Parts of onomatopoeia which are themselves not onomatopoeic are italicized, e.g. “*güp güp atmak*” ‘to beat’, “*üs burun*” ‘touchy’, “*üf dimek*” ‘to blow’, etc. The definitions of the onomatopoeia are followed by the sources (in abbreviation) where they were found.

In summary, it can be said that Zülfikar has delivered a comprehensive work which will prove useful to Turcologists and which certainly fills a gap in a field that has scarcely been studied in Turkey.

Victor A. Friedman: Review of Alf Grannes, *Turco-Bulgarica: Articles in English and French concerning Turkish influence on Bulgarian.* (Turcologica 30.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996. ix + 320 pp. ISBN 3-447-03819-5.

Victor A. Friedman, Slavic Department, University of Chicago, 1130 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, U.S.A.

The influence of Turkish on the Balkan Sprachbund is one of the oldest and most fruitful pursuits of Balkan linguistics. As early as 1884 Miklosich published a series

of articles on the influence of Turkish on the lexicons of languages of Eastern and Southeastern Europe (Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish) that is both seminal and classic. Since that time, numerous works have appeared on this topic, including whole dictionaries such as Škaljić's exemplary work on Serbo-Croatian and Boretzky's on Albanian. (We can also mention here Jašar-Nasteva's dissertation on Macedonian, which unfortunately has not yet seen publication.) The politics of Turkish in the Balkans has not been without its effect on the course of scholarship, particularly in Bulgaria, where at times attempts have been made to obscure the significance of Turkish influence, and thus it is all the more useful to have Grannes' collection available. Grannes is one of the world's foremost specialists on Turco-Bulgarian contact. The present volume collects in one place some of his most important works on the subject spanning over a quarter of a century (1969-1996). In so doing it makes available to a broader reading public a valuable body of work that deserves to be collected in one place. At the same time, Grannes was able to update his work where called for, rendering it even more useful.

The collection consists of twelve articles (1-286), a list of abbreviations (287-91), a rich bibliography of over 300 items (292-310), and an index of about 2,000 Turkish words (311-320). There is also a useful introduction (vii-xi) describing the state of Turkish etymological studies in Bulgaria, which makes clear to the uninformed reader the necessity and usefulness of the work under review. The bibliography is organized in such a way that all the relevant entries for the entire series of articles are at the end of the book. A weakness in the organization, however, is the fact that while the bibliography consists of two parts, in the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, respectively, in the actual articles citations of works in Cyrillic are sometimes in Cyrillic and sometimes in Latin transcription, which makes checking the references a bit awkward. A knowledge of Bulgarian (or at least a reading knowledge of a closely related language such as Macedonian or Serbian) is essential for gaining the full benefit of this highly useful collection, for while lexical citations are always translated into English or French, example sentences in several of the lexicons are left unglossed.

The largest part of the work is concerned with Turkish lexical and productive morphological elements in Bulgarian. Of the twelve articles, seven contain lexicons totaling approximately 140 pages, i.e. about half of the main body of the work. Of these lexicons, one is based on the works of Bulgaria's first dramatist, Dobri Vojnikov, two are based on the works of Ivan Vazov, the most important Bulgarian novelist of the nineteenth century, three focus on the highly productive Turkish derivational affix *-IV₄k* (realized in Turkish as *-lık*, *-lik*, *-luk*, *-lük* and in Bulgarian as *-lăk*, *-lik*, *-luk*, *-ljuk*, respectively, depending on the laws of vowel harmony in

standard Turkish plus other factors in the dialects and in Bulgarian), and one based on a series of articles published in 1924-1926 by a medical doctor from Šumen, in Eastern Bulgaria. Taken together, these lexicons constitute an invaluable summary of a large part of the Turkish lexicon in Bulgarian, thus comprising virtually a dictionary of the Turkish lexical element in Bulgarian, albeit not one using as many possible sources as in works such as Škaljić's and Boretzky's.

In four of the twelve articles in this collection (totaling a third of the main body), Grannes discusses the productive Turkish suffix *-IV₄k*, which is used to derive nouns from other nouns (usually resulting in an abstraction, but sometimes also in various forms of concretization). By concentrating on this suffix, Grannes is able to address a variety of general issues related to the penetration and extirpation of Turkisms with respect to Bulgarian. Article VII discusses 509 loans taken over from Turkish—including entirely new formations using only Turkish elements, e.g. *bašibozukčuluk* 'the activity of a *bašibozuk* (Turkish army irregular)'—and shows how most of them are quite close to standard Turkish. Article IX is a discussion with a partial list of those formations in which the productivity of *-IV₄k* has spread both to Bulgarian lexical items and recent loanwords, which Grannes distinguishes in his lexicon. In article VIII, Grannes addresses the issue of the concrete shape of the suffix *-IV₄k* with respect to the generalization of /-lāk/ in words where /-lik/ would be expected by the laws of vowel harmony. There are two possible explanations for this phenomenon. In the West Rumelian dialect of Turkish, whose range includes the western third of Bulgaria, the front / back opposition in high unrounded vowels is neutralized in favor of the back unrounded vowel in closed final (as well as all medial) syllables. As a result, the unrounded variant of *-IV₄k* is always *-lık*. The productivity of /-lāk/ in Bulgarian could thus be the result of West Rumelian sources for the loanwords. On the basis of historical and textual evidence, however, Grannes argues in favor of the second explanation, according to which the suffix /-lāk/ was generalized within Bulgarian itself in the process of the development of the Bulgarian literary language. The final article in this quartet discusses the process of the replacement of *-IV₄k* by native suffixes in Bulgarian.

Articles IX and XII, which deal with Turkish *izafet* (noun compounding) and reduplication in *m-* (e.g. Turkish *kitap mitap*, Bulgarian *knigi migi* 'books and such'), treat two questions of borrowed morphology. The article on *izafet* is a précis of Grannes monograph on the subject, in which he shows how some of the borrowed Turkish constructions helped reinforce productive patterns of noun compounding. The article on reduplicative *m-* is actually a survey of this phenomenon in the languages of Europe and Asia.

Of the remaining half of the collection, four articles (II, IV, V, VI) treat the Turkish lexicon in specific nineteenth and early twentieth century contexts, viz. the writ-

ings of Vojnikov, Vazov, and the dialect of Šumen. The remaining two articles (I and III) address more general issues. The first is an extremely useful general survey of Turkish linguistic influence on Bulgarian at all linguistic levels including a discussion of attitudes within Bulgarian toward that influence. The second treats a key issue in Bulgarian historical sociolinguistics, namely the ambivalent attitude toward the Turkish lexicon in Bulgarian during the nineteenth century as reflected in the writings of Ivan Vazov, one of that century's most important writers.

Taken as a whole, this collection of Grannes' articles demonstrates the importance and pervasiveness of Turkish influence in Bulgarian, while also illustrating the complexity of interactions and attitudes occasioned by this type of language contact. It will be of great use not only for the Slavist, Balkanist, and Turkologist, but also for contact linguistics in general.

For the sake of convenience, the titles of the articles with page numbers are given below.

- I. Turkish influence on Bulgarian (1-30)
- II. Les turcismes dans l'œuvre de Dobri Vojnikov (1833-78), le premier dramaturge bulgare (31-84)
- III. The attitude of the great Bulgarian writer Ivan Vazov towards Turkish loan-words in his mother tongue: A balanced view of a delicate matter (85-98)
- IV. Les turcismes dans le plus célèbre roman bulgare, *Sous le joug* d'Ivan Vazov (99-119)
- V. Les éléments turcs dans la prose épistolaire d'Ivan Vazov (120-134)
- VI. Les turcismes dans le parler bulgare de la ville de Šumen (Bulgarie de l'Est) dans les années 1920 (135-158)
- VII. Bulgare *боклук*. Turcismes du type: *base turque (ou passée par le turc en bulgare) + suffixe turc -лик, -лък, -люк, -лук (<-lx⁴k)* en bulgare (159-209)
- VIII. Bulgare de l'Est *кахнелик*, bulgare de l'Ouest *кахнелък*? La réalisation de l'*i* turc dans le suffixe *-lik* dans les turcismes bulgares à l'harmonie vocalique palatale en *i* ou *e* (210-230)
- IX. Bulgare *курвалък*. Formations hybrides: *Base non-turque + suffixe turc*, adapté et généralisé en bulgare sous la forme *-лък (<-lx⁴k)* (231-239)
- X. Bulgare *фудулук / фудулство / фудулица*. Les suffixes bulgare *-ство, -щина* comme substituts du suffixe turc *-лък, -лик, -лук, -люк (<-lx⁴k)* dans les emprunts turcs (240-249)
- XI. Loan compounds in Bulgarian reflecting three types of Turkish *izafet*-constructions (250-258)
- XII. Le redoublement de type turc à *m*- initial dans les langues des Balkans et du Caucase (259-286)

References

- Boretzky, N. 1975-1976. Der türkische Einfluß auf das Albanische 1-2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera 1962. Turski leksički elementi vo makedonskiot jazik. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Skopje.]
- Miklosich, F. 1884. Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen. (Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-Hist. Klasse 34, 35, 38.) Vienna.
- Škaljić, Abdulah 1966. Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.