

## Werk

**Label:** Zeitschriftenheft

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 1998

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0002](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002) | LOG\_0020

## Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

## Editorial note

*Turkic Languages, Volume 2, 1998, Number 2*

The present issue of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* begins with two contributions dedicated to the memory of Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov, a scholar of overwhelming importance for the development of linguistic Turcology in the twentieth century. As his colleague Èrvand Sevortjan once characterized him, Baskakov “personifies the living history of Turkic linguistics of the postrevolutionary years”. His active role in official Soviet language politics is far from uncontroversial and has often been severely criticized. On the other hand, the general consensus is that he was a great scholar of immense erudition and productivity. Baskakov, who devoted his entire life to the study of Turkic languages, traced his own family’s lineage back to a thirteenth century Tatar *basqaq* (‘governor, commissioner’) of the Khan of the Golden Horde.

Another vital ingredient in Baskakov’s life was music. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union he composed hymns for the young republics of Karakalpakistan, Altay, and Tuva. One charming product of his hobby is the “PIAC Hymn” (*Гимн ПИАК-а*), which Baskakov presented to the 32nd meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference convened by Bernt Brendemoen and held in Oslo in 1989. The text integrates the “Turks” with other “tribes” into an “Altaic family”, but a subsequent verse playfully adds that the Altaic theory is not generally accepted. It acknowledges the existence of “orthodox”, “skeptics” and “Nostraticists”:

Не все согласны алтаисты  
с алтайскою теорией  
Есть ортодоксы, скептицисты,  
ностратики с фантазией .

In the first article of the present issue, Christiane Bulut deals with relativization strategies in Middle Ottoman texts. Michael Dobrovolsky, an expert in the field of Chuvash phonology, describes the stressing of Russian loanwords as represented in Nikolaj Ivanovič Ašmarin’s Chuvash materials from the end of the nineteenth century. Robert J. Ermers,

who has spent years conducting linguistic and literary studies in the newly independent Republic of Kazakhstan, scrutinizes certain opinions expressed in publications of the Soviet period concerning the history of Kazakh as a literary language. A non-Turcological problem of indisputable interest for general Turcologists is dealt with in Stéphane Grivelet's article on the attempt to change the official script of Mongolia. The well-known historian and philologist Sergej Kljaštornyj deals with Al-Birūnī's version of an old Turkic genealogical legend. The situation of one of the endangered Turkic languages of South Siberia is described in Irina Nevskaja's account of the revival of literary Shor. The author is a representative of the Novosibirsk school of linguistics and a leading scholar in the ongoing attempts to describe Shor and related languages. Finally, Klaus Röhrborn's analysis of the restructuring of lexemes continues the author's long-standing morphological studies of neologisms created in the course of the Turkish language reform.

Helga Anetshofer reports on a remarkable Turkish lexical project initiated and carried out by Andreas Tietze. The review section contains contributions by Geoffrey Haig, Michael Hess, and Mark Kirchner.

*Lars Johanson*



**Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov  
(22.03.1905–26.08.1996)**

**Gunnar Jarring**

Jarring, Gunnar 1998. Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov (22.03.1905–26.08.1996). *Turkic Languages* 2, 161-162.

*Gunnar Jarring, Pontus Ols väg 7, 26040 Viken, Sweden.*

When in 1964 I took up my post as Sweden's ambassador to the Soviet Union, I looked forward to meeting Soviet scholars of Turcology. I knew them by name and reputation and had corresponded with some of them, but I also knew how delicate their position was with regard to personal contacts with foreigners. This was at the height of the Cold War and the ensuing political suspicion against all foreigners. Among them, ambassadors were considered to be a more exquisite and often

malevolent variety, although less so in my case, as I was from a small, neutral country. So I bided my time.

But one day I was asked to pay a visit to the Chief of Protocol of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. He told me that the Soviet Turcologists residing in Moscow wanted to invite me to a colloquium on such and such a date. Would I accept?

This was the beginning, with official blessing, of my acquaintance with Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov. It resulted in a personal friendship which continued after I left Moscow in 1973 and lasted as long as he lived. By and by my meetings with the Soviet Turcologists became more frequent. I responded by inviting them to my embassy for a luncheon or dinner. It was always Baskakov who was the leader of the group that came. The others represented different Turkic peoples and were all active researchers in their respective fields. For me, these meetings were precious moments which highlighted my otherwise quite dull diplomatic life.

Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov was an outstanding Turcologist with a deep knowledge of all the Turkic peoples and tribes of the Soviet Union. The list of his innumerable published works brings to light a gold mine of linguistic erudition ranging from Karakalpak to Altay Turkic, including profound investigations into philological problems within the Turkic world. In addition, Baskakov had wide interests outside his appointed academic field. He was a collector of everything relating to the life of the unhappy Russian emperor Paul I. He loved classical music, including church music. It should not be forgotten that he was a composer in his own right. He composed a hymn dedicated to the PIAC meeting in Oslo in 1989. All his leisure time was spent in Zvenigorod, a place that was like music to him.

A great Turcologist has left us, a man of much wisdom and a true humanist.

# **In memory of Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov**

**Dmitrij M. Nasilov**

Nasilov, Dmitrij M. 1998. In memory of Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov. *Turkic Languages* 2, 163-170.

*Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Ul. Oranžerejnaja, 20. 141200 Puškino, Russia.*

On the 23rd and 24th of March, 1995 a conference celebrating the 90th birthday of Professor Nikolaj Aleksandrovič Baskakov, doctor of philology and pre-eminent Russian Turcologist, was held at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. At this conference, numerous followers and colleagues delivered reports on various Turcological subjects, dedicating their presentations to the hero of the day. The conference materials were published in 1997 in a special proceedings volume (Tenišev 1997). Unfortunately, Baskakov only saw the first proofs of the book to be published in his honour. He died in late August 1996 after a brief illness.

Seventy years of this scholar's life were devoted to the world of Turcology he loved so well. Baskakov was a remarkably versatile Turcologist who fulfilled his creative potential up to the last day of his life and to whom no aspect of this composite science was alien. More generally, he was a richly talented person with a keen poetic and musical intuition. Baskakov's academic legacy is strikingly vast: The last list of his publications contains 639 titles (Tenišev 1997: 33-42) including dozens of monographs. Baskakov's scientific contributions and pedagogical activities—he trained a large number of graduate and doctoral students from practically every Turkic-speaking republic—have left an indelible mark in Turcology.

His scientific career began when he was a student taking part in expeditions (1926-1927) to the Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kirghiz and Uzbek republics to collect linguistic and ethnographic material for the Depart-

ment of History and Ethnography at Moscow University, from where he graduated in 1929 after having received a universal Turcological education.

Ethno-linguistic expeditions conducted by the university turned out to be the very foundation upon which the richest field research of many Turkic dialects developed. After graduating from the university, Baskakov worked for various educational institutes and research organisations, regularly embarking on expeditions and business trips in order to collect linguistic, folkloric and ethnographic material. He also provided scientific advice to some Turkic-speaking republics, such as the Kazakh, Karakalpak, Khorezm, Kirghiz and Altay republics, and to areas with Noghay settlers. Every such trip enriched the young Turcologist, and the unique ethno-linguistic material he gathered never remained in his archives for very long, but was continuously evaluated and became Turcology's permanent property.

Baskakov first visited Oyrotiya (now the Altay Republic) in 1934 in connection with the issues of language development and the organisation of a national school system there. The related linguistic and didactic problems are reflected in his works (Baskakov 1935, 1940a). From that time on, Baskakov never really interrupted his Altay language studies. During the Second World War, he returned to the Altay where he had the opportunity to study the Altay Turkic dialects more closely and to classify them. The major result of this work is a series entitled "The northern dialects of the Altay (Oyrot) language" (Baskakov 1958b, 1965-1966, 1975, 1985a). His works also treated many aspects of the toponymy, onomastics, folklore and ethnography of the Altay people. He participated in the compiling and publishing of Altay dictionaries (Baskakov & Toščakova 1947; Baskakov 1964). In 1991 he wrote the national anthem of the Altay Republic (Baskakov 1997b); his last publication devoted to an Altay Turkic subject is Baskakov (1994).

Baskakov's Noghay expedition resulted in essays on the Noghay dialects, including text material and dictionary (Baskakov 1940b), another dictionary (1963) and a language grammar (1997a).

The achievements in Turkic lexicography are closely linked with the name of Nikolaj A. Baskakov. Beginning with the first Uyghur-Russian dictionary (Baskakov & Nasilov 1939), he took part in compiling and editing a number of Turkic language-Russian dictionaries (Karakalpak—1958a, Turkmen—1968, Noghay—1963, Khakas—1953, Gagauz—1973, Karaim—1974).

The 1930s, when Baskakov's scientific career was just budding, were characterised by the intensive language policy of the Soviet state. Its most important activities then included the development of alphabets for languages previously not written, the transcription of texts from the Arabic alphabet into first the Latin and then the Cyrillic script; the establishment of literary languages and language norms; the creation of national schools teaching indigenous languages; the elaboration of language didactics; the development of textbooks and dictionaries; and, finally, the scientific description of languages and dialects. Together with other Turcologists of our country, Baskakov played an active role in all of these measures, fruitfully co-operating with young people from the various national groups. More than once, he returned to one of the cardinal questions, namely how to improve the national alphabets and orthographies (Baskakov 1982).

Baskakov made an exclusive contribution to the study of the grammatical structure of Karakalpak. Having begun with a brief grammar (Baskakov 1931, 1933), he later composed a major work (Baskakov 1951-1952) on the language, containing a comprehensive description of its morphological categories and illustrated with rich material taken from folklore as well as colloquial and literary speech. In addition, the grammar was described by means of a system which applied to Turkic language structure in general. This work exercised an appreciable influence, particularly in the Turkic-speaking republics, evident from the fact that Baskakov often edited or advised on subsequent Turkic grammars.

For many years Baskakov was engaged in creating an integrated system of description for the Turkic languages. He became interested in problems concerning the parts of speech, word formation, lexical morphology, verbal nouns, moods and conjugation, word origin, Turkic phonology, the syntax of word combinations and extended sentence structure, and so on. The scientist often expressed his own, original point of view on most of the questions occupying Turcologists. That appears to be the reason for the friendly characterisation of Baskakov's view as "baskakčilik", coined by the witty Nikolaj K. Dmitriev. Meanwhile, Russian Turcology received, if not the only one, certainly an extraordinary and remarkably comprehensive description of the structure of the Turkic languages, including their phonological, morphological and syntactic systems (Baskakov 1975, 1979a, 1988a). Further developing this body of historical and typological findings, whose significance has yet to be fully grasped, remains the task of future scholars.



Baskakov's theoretical milestone is the acknowledgement of the organic isomorphism of all language levels, with syntax occupying the superordinate level. It was he who defined the general structure of the Turkic languages and described their morphologies, which, in turn, served as the basis for their phonological description (Baskakov, 1988a: 8). Within this conceptual framework, the scientist also rehabilitated the formation history of the Turkic linguistic type, i.e. the developmental course of these languages: From isolation to agglutination by means of analytic mechanisms (morpheme order in word formation is defined in terms of attributive relations). Baskakov's theory of Turkic language structure was polished through his disputes with Nikolaj K. Dmitriev, Ėrvand V. Sevortjan, Boris A. Serebrennikov, Gennadij P. Mel'nikov and other language theorists, but its undoubted advantage over the other Altaists' constructions lies in the aforementioned integrative principle, according to which every phonological regularity and grammatical category is grounded within the linguistic system. Such a composite approach reflects ideas of Gustav Ramstedt, Heinrich Winkler, Władysław Kotwicz, Jean Deny, and Kaare Grønbech. However, aside from Winkler, who proposed a theory of the Altaic linguistic type and history at the beginning of the century, Baskakov was the first Russian Turcologist to develop his own Altaistic theory. Baskakov's type of general understanding of the Turkic languages is seconded in the works of only a few other scientists, such as Boris A. Serebrennikov, Gennadij P. Mel'nikov and Aleksandr M. Ščerbak. Baskakov shared certain views regarding the genetic relationship of the Altaic languages (Baskakov 1981), which helped him construct his theoretical framework. It is thanks to his efforts and support that the works of Ramstedt, Kotwicz and Räsänen appeared in Russian—works that played an important part in the development of Altaistic studies in our country.

Baskakov dealt not only with the synchronic and diachronic typology of the Turkic languages, he also participated in the development of their historical grammar; in addition to works published earlier, he authored a number of sections in the substantial historical grammar composed under the direction of Ėdhem R. Tenišev at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Baskakov 1984b, 1988b).

Baskakov was a graduate and later curator of the Moscow Turcological school—which traditionally dealt with the wide range of "Turco-Slavic" problems—and many of his works are dedicated to this subject,

with Baskakov (1979b [1993], 1985b) being particularly distinguished. His numerous published works on Turkic ethnography, toponymy and onomastics are related to this theme. His most interesting later ethnographic work is a description of the traditional Turkic theatre (Baskakov 1984a), which draws on materials gathered during his expeditions in the 1930s.

Two more of Baskakov's works became part of the fundamental stock of Russian Turcology. The first is a classification of Turkic languages in which linguistic criteria are correlated with the history of Turkic ethnos formation and differentiation originating from an epoch of Hiung-nu tribal alliance (Baskakov 1952). It should be noted that this classification has not only come to occupy a permanent place in all Turcological textbooks, but is also applied in the majority of Russian reference works (encyclopaedias, dictionary-reference books, ethnographic studies, etc.) when the Turkic languages and their dialects are characterised.

The second of Baskakov's major contributions to the field is his textbook on general Turcology, which to this day has no worthy substitute. It has gone through three publications (Baskakov 1960, 1962 [1969]) and educated more than one generation of Turcologists, both in Russia and the Turkic-speaking republics.

During his many years of activity, Baskakov came into contact with countless scholars involved in different fields of study of the Turkic peoples. These personalities, who together form a picture of the modern world of Turcology, constitute a special chapter in the scientist's legacy.

Nikolaj Baskakov, with his noble character and scientific disinterestedness, was also the model Russian intellectual. The most senior member of staff of the Institute of Linguistics (since 1937), he never held high-level posts, instead devoting all his energy to science. He was always smart, calm and even-tempered; he had an excellent command of the Russian language, was a lover of nature, florist and meloman. As an aficionado of Russian history, Baskakov was particularly fond of the era of Paul I and collected rarities from that time. Finally, Nikolaj Baskakov was a devoted husband and father. He is remembered by his friends and colleagues for all of this and more.

The scope and significance of Baskakov's contribution to Turcology can be compared to the output of a large team of researchers with different specialities, ranging from the musical critic to the historiographer. His activities earned him the title of "honoured man of science" in the

Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Karakalpak and Turkmenistan; he is also a honoured member of a number of foreign Oriental societies (Great Britain, Germany, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Turkey) and laureate of the PIAC prize. Baskakov participated in numerous linguistic and oriental congresses and symposiums where he delivered interesting and original reports.

The works of this prominent scientist will continue to attract the attention of Turcologists and Altaists, of typologists and of representatives from many other branches of the humanities.

Nikolaj Baskakov described his road through life in his autobiography (Baskakov 1995).

### References

- Baskakov, N. A. 1931. *Kratkaja grammatika karakalpakskogo jazyka*. (Trudy Kompleksnogo naučno-issledovatel'skogo instituta Karakalpakskoj AO. Sekcija étno-lingvističeskaja. Razr'ad lingvistiki 1.) Turtkul'.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1933. Karakalpakskaja učebnaja kniga po karakalpakskomu jazyku. *Bjulleten' Kritiki-bibliografičeskogo instituta* 3. Moskva. 46-49.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1935. *Rodnoj jazyk v ojrotskoj škole*. (Prosvješčenije nacional'nostej 2.) Moskva.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1940a. *Metodika izučenija rodnogo jazyka v altajskoj škole: Posobije dlja učitelej altajskix škol*. Ojrot-Tura: Ojrotobinacizdat.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1940b. *Nogajskij jazyk i jeho dialekty. Grammatika, teksty, slovar'*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1951-1952. *Karakalpakskij jazyk*. I: *Materialy po dialektologii: Teksty i slovar'*. II: *Fonetika i morfologija 1. Časti reči i slovoobrazovanie*. Moskva. Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1952. Klassifikacija tjurkskix jazykov v svjazi s istoričeskoj periodizaciej ix razvitija i formirovanija. In: Vinogradov, Viktor (ed.) *Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija AN SSSR* 1. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR. 7-57.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1958a. *Karakalpaksko-russkij slovar'*. [Priloženie: *Očerk grammatiki karakalpakskogo jazyka*.] Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1958b. *Altajskij jazyk*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.

- Baskakov, N. A. 1960. *Tjurkskie jazyki*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1962 [1969]. *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1963. *Nogajsko-russkij slovar'*. [Priloženie: *Očerki grammatiki*.] Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1964. *Russko-altajskij slovar'*. Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1965-1966. *Dialekt černevyx tatar (tuba-kiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1972. *Dialekt kumadincev (kumandy-kiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. (ed.) 1973. *Gagauzsko-russko-moldavskij slovar'*. Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1975. *Istoriko-tipologičeskaja xarakteristika struktury tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1979a. *Istoriko-tipologičeskaja morfologija tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1979b [1993]. *Russkie familii tjurkskogo proisxoždenija*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1981. *Altajskaja sem'ja jazykov i ee izučenie*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1982. Dostiženija i problemy v usoveršenstvovanii alfavitov i orfografii tjurkskix jazykov. In: Musaev, Kenesbaj M. (ed.) *Opyt soveršenstvovanija alfavitov i orfografii jazykov narodov SSSR*. Moskva: Nauka. 27-30.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1984a. *Narodnyj teatr Xorezma*. Taškent: Fan.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1984b. Protetičeskie soglasnye. Struktura slova i sloga. In: Tenišev, Ė. R. (ed.) *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Fonetika*. Moskva: Nauka. 380-402, 422-432.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1985a. *Dialekt lebedinskix tatar-čalkancev (kuu-kiži)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1985b. *Tjurkskaja leksika v "Slove o polku Igoreve"*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1988a. *Istoriko-tipologičeskaja fonologija tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.

- Baskakov, N. A. 1988b. *Kategorija naklonenija*. In: Tenišev, Ė. R. (ed.) *Sravnitel' no-istoričeskaja grammatika tjurkskix jazykov. Morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka. 324-367.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1995. *Ja sdelal vse, čto mog. Biobibliografičeskij očerk. 1930-1990*. Biškek: Akyl.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1997a. *Nogajskij jazyk*. In: Tenišev, Ė. R. (ed.) *Jazyki mira: Tjurkskie jazyki*. Moskva: Indrik. 328-335.
- Baskakov, N. A. 1997b. Gimn Respubliki Gornyj Altaj. In: Tenišev, Ė. R. (ed.) *90 let N. A. Baskakovu: N. A. Baskakovu ot kolleg i učениkov*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury. 27-29.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Inkižekova-Grekul, A. I. 1953. *Xakassko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Jaimova, N. A. 1994. Šamanskije misterii Gornogo Altaja. *Kan-Altaj*. N 2. Gorno-Altajsk: Fond imeni S. S. Surazakove: Čaptygan. 14-16.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Karryev, B. A. & Xamzaev, M. J. (eds.) 1968. *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Nasilov, V. M. 1939. *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Toščakova, T. M. 1947. *Ojrotsko-russkij slovar'*. [Priloženie: *Očerk grammatiki ojrotskogo jazyka*.] Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovar'ej.
- Baskakov, N. A. & Zajončkovskij, A. & Šapšal, S. M. (eds.) 1974. *Karaimsko-russko-pol'skij slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Tenišev, Ė. R. (ed.) 1997. *90 Let N. A. Baskakovu: N. A. Baskakovu ot kolleg i učениkov*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury.

# **Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish**

**Christiane Bulut**

Bulut, Christiane 1998. Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 2, 171-197.

This paper is based on data from the supposed autograph of the *Seyahatname*, a seventeenth-century travelbook written by the famous Turkish globetrotter Evliya Çelebi. An overall review of the syntactic features of the *Seyahatname* reveals that most of the morphosyntactic strategies forming subordinate clauses in present-day Turkish have already been applied in Middle Ottoman. Strikingly enough, genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas seem to compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages.

The claim presented in this paper is that the competing strategies of relativization are employed as a means of functional differentiation: Turkic non-finite relative clauses are used to render restrictive relative clauses, whereas constructions with a finite verb form introduced by the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* are confined to the appositive type of relative clauses.

*Christiane Bulut, Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany, e-mail: bulut@mail.uni-mainz.de*

## **General remarks, sources, etc.**

Up to the present, very few studies have focused on a description of the syntactic features of Ottoman Turkish. Especially the language in Middle Ottoman texts has so far been characterized as somewhat “corrupted” by loan elements of mostly Persian or Arabic origin, which invaded the lexical, morphological and syntactic layers of a basically Oghuz idiom. Yet, keeping the ongoing discussion of language contact phenomena in mind, it might also be interesting to have a closer—and, hopefully, unprejudiced—look at some aspects of cross-linguistic interaction as represented in Ottoman Turkish.

This paper is based on a very limited choice of data, as we will discuss strategies of relativization in a single Middle Ottoman prose text. Our source is the supposed autograph of the *Seyahatname*, a travel book written by the famous Turkish globetrotter Evliya Çelebi in the second half of the 17th century. Being one of the highlights of Ottoman literature, several copies and popular editions of this text are available. Portions of a scientific edition, which have started to appear only recently, are based on the generally agreed upon archetype Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 304 to 308. Examples relevant for our paper have been taken from a passage comprising roughly 120 pages in print of the archetype Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305, 236b to 259b.

It goes without saying that a broader corpus of different texts is necessary to arrive at more general conclusions concerning the function of similar phenomena in Ottoman Turkish.

An overall review of the syntactic features of the *Seyahatname* shows that most of the morphosyntactic strategies forming subordinate clauses in present day Turkish were already applied in Middle Ottoman. Strikingly enough, genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas seem to compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages.

In the field of relativization, for instance, we find the presumably Iranian syntactic type, combining two clauses with a finite verb by means of a conjunction *kim / kih*, alongside the Turkic type of embedding the non-finite verb form preceding the head of the relative clause into a main clause.

The following points will be discussed in this survey:

- How can the characteristics of “Iranian” and Turkic strategies of relativization be described, which subtypes are represented within the material?
- Do specialized subtypes correlate with specific functions?
- Can a certain distribution of these coexisting patterns be traced?
- How do the copied syntactic patterns function in Ottoman Turkish, are they confined to functions more narrow or specialized than in the languages they were borrowed from?
- Do the two coexisting types complement each other in forming a functional system of relativization?

It should be noted that we will restrict our discussion to examples of attributive or adnominal (in contrast to absolutive or free) relative clauses, only.

### 1. A general definition of relative clauses

It is a well-known fact that relative clauses differ quite considerably in their syntactic structures across languages. Yet, setting out from purely semantic characteristics, we could attempt the following general definition for the attributive relative constructions in our material:

Relative clauses (henceforth RC) are dependent, adnominal constructions which contain either defining or additional comments referring to a certain element within the embedding clause. This central element, which will be called head (= basic segment), may consist of a nominal, a nominal clause or a pronoun.

As already mentioned, two opposite strategies of relativization are at work in our material: We find the presumably Indo-European syntactic type, combining two clauses with a finite verb by means of the relator *kim / kih*, alongside the Turkic type of embedding the non-finite verb form preceding the head of the relative clause into a main clause. In contemporary Turkish, the Indo-European type for the most has been given up. Where it still appears, its function is restricted to the rendering of plot-advancing relative clauses. This topic has been dealt with at length in Johanson (1975).

### 2. The “Turkic” strategy of relativization

The “Turkic” RC contains a non-finite verb form (a participle or verbal noun with or without a personal marker). According to the principle that defining elements precede the defined entities, this type of RC is pre-positive; it always precedes its *head*:

- (1) Bu      kuh-ı              Sübhandà      otlayan  
       DEM mountain:EZ    Süphan:LOC    graze:PART



devabatuñ çođı ikişer quzular.<sup>1</sup> (243a28)  
 cattle:GEN most:POSS two:DSTR lamb:AOR:PL  
 ‘Most of the sheep which graze / grazing on this mountain of  
 Süphan lamb twice a year.’

The subject position of the main clause is taken by the genitive construction *devabatuñ çođı* ‘most of the cattle’, followed by an adverbial expression and a finite verb form.

At the same time, this genitive construction forms the head of a pre-positive “nominalized” relative clause based on the embedded subjunctive *otlayan* ‘grazing’. As in this case the head correlates with the agent of the relative clause, in the prevailing time / aspect constellation of the relative construction the so-called present participle in *-(y)An* is obligatory as the nonfinite verb form of the embedded clause.

### 2.1. Subtypes of the Turkic relative construction

To characterize the Turkic strategy of relativization, we chose the most simple type of relative construction: In our example 1, the head correlates with the agent of the RC.

Like in contemporary Turkish, various subtypes of the Turkic embedded RC can be found in our material, too. We will not give a detailed description of every pattern applied to form “Turkic” subordinative RCs in our text. Instead, the distribution of certain categories of relative clauses in our text will be presented according to the systematic classification for contemporary Turkish elaborated by Johanson (1989). In his article *Subjektlose Sätze im Türkischen* (1989), Johanson showed that the choice of a nominalized subjunctive basically depends on the correlation of the head (as part of the main clause) with the agent, the direct or indirect affectee or another, mostly adverbial, element of the RC. As the inventory of our Ottoman materials largely agrees with the types

<sup>1</sup> The system used here to transcribe the Ottoman examples deviates from the alphabet of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft mainly with regard to the rendering of vowels: Basically, vowels written *plene* are given in normal type, *hareke* is indicated by ‘ (apostrophe), vowels which do not appear in the Arabic script are given in italics. For a more detailed explanation of this interpretative transcription see Bulut (1997).

described by Johanson (1989), it will be sufficient to mention the basic constellations and to give one example for each subtype.

Table 1: Constellations of coreference between the head and the agents of prepositive RCs

<b>Constellation I</b>	<b>Constellation II</b>	<b>Constellation III</b>
coreference head → (a) agent of the RC or (b) its possessor	coreference head → (a) direct affectee (accusative object) or (b) its possessor	coreference head → (a) indirect affectee / adverbial term of place, time or manner {or (b) its possessor}
subjunctors without personal markers: participles in <i>-(y)En</i> , <i>-mİş</i> , <i>{-(y)EcEk}</i> or aorist participle	subjunctors with personal markers: verb noun + POSS = <i>-dİGI</i> , *{participle + POSS = <i>-(y)EcEgI}</i>	subjunctors with or without personal markers: = <i>-dİGI</i> , <i>-(y)EcEk</i>

Note: The inventory of infinite subjunctors forming relative clauses is based on contemporary Turkish; braces {...} mean that the respective form rarely ever occurs in the Ottoman materials checked, \*{...} that no examples at all could be found.

The following examples of prepositive relative clauses from the *Seyahatname* illustrate the basic constellations of coreference between head and agent of the RC; numbers in parentheses refer to the respective pages of the autograph Ms. *Bağdat Köşkü* 305.

### 2.1.1. Constellation I

In constellation I, the head is coreferential with (a) the agent of the RC or (b) its possessor. In this constellation, subjunctors without personal markers appear, e.g. the participles in *-(y)En*, *-mİş*, *{-(y)EcEk}* or aorist participle.

### 2.1.1.1. -(y)En

For constellation Ia, coreference of the head with the agent of the RC, see example 1 above. Example 2 represents constellation Ib, coreference of the head with the possessor of the agent of the RC:

- (2) *Ve i'tıbarı 'olmayan nesnelerin*  
and worth:POSS be:PART thing:PL:GEN

*medh-i kelamında melalet vardır. (240b22f)*  
praise:EZ rhetoric boredom exist: PRS 3SG  
'And in the wordy praise of things that are not subject  
of common interest lies boredom.' Literally: "things  
whose common interest does not exist"

### 2.1.1.2. -miş

Example 3 shows a relative construction with the participle in *-miş* as an infinite subjunctive in constellation Ia. Yet, for constellation Ib, no convincing construction could be found:

- (3) *Bir yalçın divar gibi qayaya*  
a steep wall like rock:DAT

*d'ay'an°m'ış ağac nerd-ban ilè çıqılır. (246a18)*  
lean:PART tree ladder with POSP go up:PASS:AOR 3SG  
'People climb up there on a wooden ladder that leans against a rock as  
steep as a wall.'

### 2.1.1.3. Aorist

With the aorist participle, both positions of constellation I can be realized; example 4 represents constellation Ia, while in example 5 constellation Ib is relativized:

- (4) *Semm-i helahilden nişan verir bir şudur. (243b20)*  
deadly poison:ABL sign give:PART a water: COP  
'It is a water which equals deathly poison.'

- (5) *Ve q'ol kemikleri yedişer s'ekizer arşın*  
and arm bone:PL:POSS seven:DSTR eight:DSTR yard

g'el'ir            qalın ve    t'aviil   kemikler dir. (238a20)  
 come:PART thick and long bone:PL COP  
 'They are long, strong bones whose [...] ulnas are about  
 seven to eight yards long.'

#### 2.1.1.4. {-(y)EcEk}: Diathetic indifference

More difficult to group are relative constructions with the infinite subordinator in {-(y)EcEk}, as this entity typically yields constellations of diathetic indifference. Formally, they correspond to constellation I, thus implying coreference between the head and the agent. Semantically, they behave like constellation II, coreference with the direct affectee (cf. *yiyecek bir şey* 'something which will be eaten / to eat' and not 'something which will eat') or constellation III, coreference with the indirect affectee or an adverbial term of place, time or manner, corresponding to relative adverbs both in German and English, e.g. the place where, the time when (cf. example 6: *gidecek yolları* 'paths on which one can walk' and not 'paths which can walk').

In general, passivation would be a means to avoid expressing an agent. In terms of relative clauses, passivation on the embedded subjunctive yields coreference of the head with the direct or indirect affectee of the relative clause. Yet, in connection with heads semantically referring to place / location, cases of diathetic indifference (Johanson 1989: 209) occur: The subjunctive sometimes lacks diathetic marking. Although the context obviously implies coreference of the head with a direct or indirect affectee, the surface structure of this type of relative constructions shows coreference of the head with the agent of the relative clause.

(6) *Ve her birinden birbirinè qayalar*  
 and each one:POSS:ABL one:POSS:DAT rock:PL

*içrè imdadà gidècek yolları vardır. (252b11f)*  
 inside:POSP help:DAT go:PART path:PL:POSS exist  
 'And (the towers) have paths on which one can get from one  
 to the other within the rocks for assistance {'if help is needed'}.'

### 2.1.2. Constellation II

In constellation II, the head is coreferential with (a) the direct affectee (accusative object) of the RC {or (b) its possessor}. In this case, subjunctors with personal markers appear; in most instances, position IIa is taken by possessive forms of the verb noun in *-dIK* [= *-dIGI* etc.]; for position IIb, our material did not yield any attributive construction. There are also no examples where the entity  $\{-(y)EcEgI\}$ , consisting of the so-called future participle and a possessive marker, forms adnominal relative clauses.

- (7) *Bunlar ma-beynindè cem' etdikleri*  
 they between:POSS:LOC collect:VN
- beyzàlarà nişan qomamışlar idi. (238b21f)*  
 egg:PL:DAT sign put:NEG:PF INFR 3PL  
 'They had not marked the eggs they had collected between them.'

### 2.1.3. Constellation III

In constellation III, the head is coreferential with (a) the indirect affectee of the RC or an adverbial term of place, time or manner {or (b) its possessor}. In this case, subjunctors with personal markers appear, e.g. entities in *-dIK* with possessive suffixes as in example 8, or without personal marker, namely the future participle in *-(y)EcEk* as in example 9,. Position IIIb is not represented at all.

Interestingly, no coreference of the head with a dative of the RC (cf. Turkish: *verdiğim adam* 'the man whom / to whom I gave') could be traced; in all cases checked, the head is an expression referring to time or location. Thus, the relative clause would need an introducing relative adverb both in German and English, e.g. 'the place where / the time (when)':

- (8) *Hicretten bu üstühanları temaşa etdigimiz*  
 Hegira:ABL this bone:PL:ACC see:VN:POSS 1PL
- maḥaldè 1065 senè idi. (238a29)*  
 time:LOC 1065 year was  
 'The time we saw these bones was the year 1065 after the Hegira.'

## 2.2. Summary: The inventory of prepositive RCs

The main difference between the Ottoman and the contemporary Turkish inventory of prepositive relative clauses obviously lies in the forms of the so-called future participle. In our material, combinations of *-(y)EcEk* with personal marker *>-(y)EcEgI*, etc. do exist; yet, they only appear in absolutive position, where their function is restricted to the rendering of complement clauses.<sup>2</sup>

Judging from the fact that—with one exception—virtually every possible main type of the Turkic strategies of embedding relativization is represented in the text, “gaps” in the area of function can not be made responsible for the existence of a second pattern of relative constructions in our material. There must be another functional differentiation at work.

## 3. The “Indo-European” strategy of relativization

In contrast to the “Turkic” strategy of relativization, RCs of the Indo-European type contain a finite verb form. With regard to the matrix clause, their position is different as well: They never precede their heads and only very rarely immediately follow it. In most cases, the RC follows the main clause, as in example 9 below:

- (9) *Amma bu nehr-i Hoşaf haqqakîh h'oş abdır*  
 Yet DEM river:EZ Hoşaf really nice water:COP
- kim ab-ı zülalden nişan verir. (237a32)*  
 CONJ water: EZ delicious sign give:AOR:3SG  
 ‘Yet, this Hoşaf river is really a nice water, which equals  
 the waters of paradise.’

Formally, two independent clauses, each containing a finite verb form, are connected. In theory, each of these clauses could lead a life of its own. Co-ordination here is only indicated by the free relator *kim*: Thus,

<sup>2</sup> The functions of the unit *-(y)EcEk* in present-day Turkish constitute a rather new development anyway. Adamović (1985: 92ff.) explains that since the 14th century a modal verb noun in *-(y)EcEk*—in most cases of verbs that denote movement or dwelling—is attributed to *nomina loci*. The action expressed in these forms was generally impersonal, without designation of an agent.

before going on with an analysis of this type of relative construction, we should have a closer look at the connecting element.

### 3.1. The relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim*

In our material, we find three similar relators, namely *kih*, *kî* and *kim*. In all probability, the relators *kih* and *kî* are copies of Persian *ke*, whereas *kim* may be derived from the Turkish interrogative pronoun *kim* ‘who’.<sup>3</sup>

The relator *kih* (or its presumed variant *kî*) either functions as a disjunctive entity, especially after *verba sentiendi* and *dicendi*, or, in sentence-final position, as a kind of emphatic marker in the sense of ‘indeed / certainly not’. Besides its disjunctive functions, which it shares with *kî* and *kih*, *kim*—though far from being a relative pronoun—is the only one of these relators that appears in relative constructions.

The conjunctive entity *kim* is not subordinative: It is thus impossible to co-ordinate two phrases introduced by *kim* with the conjunction *ve*; Turkish subordinative subjunctors, on the other hand, may be co-ordinated. Thus, very much like Persian *kè*, the conjunctive *kim* itself may function as a co-ordinative relator.

### 3.2. *Kim* as a polyfunctional relator

As already mentioned, the applicability of *kim* is not restricted to relative clauses. Basically, *kim* appears in two functions, which are not explicitly marked on the sentence surface. As early as 1680, Meninski described the different roles this relator can play.<sup>4</sup>

These two functionally different types of *kim* can be defined as follows:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> As it is not essential for our topic, taking up the discussion about the origin of the three relators would go too far; for basic information on the etymological background see Clauson (1972: 720-721).

<sup>4</sup> In his grammatical concept, *ki* and *kim* pass for a “relativum”. Obviously, intonation is not seen as a means of functional differentiation, cf. Meninski (1756, I: 94): “Ubi nota relativum hoc ki, etiam quando significat quod vel ut, legi semper debere immediate & indissolubiliter cum præcedenti verbo vel nomine, cui postponitur ...”.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Johanson (1993: 254) concerning the relator *ki* in Modern Turkish. In our material, there is a tendency to attach *kim* in disjunctive function directly to the

1. In all probability, the first type—which we will call “disjunctive *kim*”—was set off by an intonational stop after the relator. *Kim* in this case belongs to the first of the connected clauses (as already noted by Meninski), functioning like a clause-final colon. An overall translation of *kim* in this position would be ‘that is:’ (= “und zwar:”). In this constellation, only contextual criteria indicate how the following clause shall be interpreted. Thus, disjunctive *kim* yields causal, temporal or consecutive interpretations at the same time.
2. With the second type—which could be called “conjunctive *kim*”—the intonational stop would be before the relator. In this constellation, *kim* is part of the second clause, which necessarily has to be interpreted as a relative clause.

With written sources, of course, the differentiation of the two basic functions of *kim* by intonation is missing. Thus, an interpretation of the role the polyfunctional relator *kim* plays greatly depends on contextual criteria.

Table 2 sums up the basic functional differentiation of the three relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim* as represented in our material.

Table 2: The polyfunctional relators *kih*, *kî* and *kim*

	<i>kih</i> (~ <i>kî</i> )
(1) Disjunctive 'that' or 'colon' (after verbs of perception / <i>verba sentiendi</i> and <i>dicendi</i> )	(2) Emphatic (in sentence-final position)

preceding element; this is of course only possible with Arabic letters which can be connected to the left. Yet, in its conjunctive function the relator is, for the most part, written separately.



	<i>kim</i>
(1) Disjunctive	(2) Conjunctive
'that' or 'colon' → <i>kim</i> :	connecting relative clauses
(the connected clause may be interpreted as causal, temporal or consecutive)	containing a finite verb form
Presumably differentiated through intonation:	
	intonational stop (1) after disjunctive <i>kim</i>
	(2) before co-ordinative relator <i>kim</i>

### 3.3. Subtypes of relative clauses co-ordinated by *kim*

As the following survey demonstrates, postpositive relative clauses can appear in all of the basic constellations of coreference between the head and the agent of the RC defined in Table 1.

#### 3.3.1. Constellation I

For constellation Ia cf. example 9. Example 10 represents constellation Ib; the head, *qal'è-'i qavi*, corefers with the possessor of the agent of the relative clause. This is formally indicated by the possessive suffix *+i* attached to the agent, *taş*.

The strategy applied here for the rendering of constellation Ib, which would require the use of a relative pronoun in the genitive in German or English, is typical of languages which either have no relative pronoun at all (as e.g. Modern Persian) or whose relative pronouns cannot be marked for case (as is the case with the relative pronouns *'alladî*, *man* and *mâ* in Arabic). In Arabic and Persian, resumptive enclitic pronouns may function as case markers in the constellations discussed here. An enclitic pronoun (congruent with the head) is attached to the entity of the relative clause this head corefers with. Turkish uses a possessive suffix for positions which correspond to the genitive of the relative pronoun. In constellations II and III, anaphoric pronouns may appear; yet, as will be demonstrated below, they are in fact rarely used in our material.

- (10) *Bir qal'è-'i qavidir kim her*  
 a castle:EZ strong:COP CONJ every

taş‡ fil c'üssəsi qadar vardır. (245a10f)  
 stone:POSS elephant body:POSS POSP exist  
 'It is a strong castle, whose every stone has the size of the body  
 of an elephant.'

### 3.3.2. Constellation II

The material yields no example for constellation IIb; predictably the agent in constellation IIa, which is easy to relativize, is not taken up by an anaphoric pronoun:

- (11) Şehr-*i* Tebriz-*i* dil-avizdir kim senè  
 city:EZ Tabris:EZ charming:COP CONJ year

991 tarihîndè [...] Şah-ı 'Acem istila êdüp ... (238b8f)  
 991 date:POSS:ABL king of Persia occupy:GER  
 'It is the charming city of Tabris, which the king of Persia  
 occupied in 991 ...'

### 3.3.3. Constellation III

As constellation III is more difficult to relativize, one would expect the indirect affectee coreferring with the head of the RC to be taken up by an anaphoric pronoun. Interestingly, in example 12, which shows relativization of the dative in constellation IIIa, no resumptive pronoun (e.g. *aña*) is used. Example 13 may illustrate constellation IIIb; yet, the syntactical structure allows various interpretations:

- (12) Bir ılıcà vardır kim  
 a hot spring exists CONJ

her senè [...] niçè biñ adamlar [...] gel'üp ... (245a35f)  
 every year so many thousand man:PL come:GER  
 'There is a hot spring, which is visited every year by  
 thousands of people [...].'

- (13) Qırq yıldà bir sedd-*i* Nemrud êder kim  
 forty year:LOC a ziggurat make:AOR 3SG CONJ

ta esasından zirvè-'i a'lasnà yedi  
 very bottom:POSS:ABL top:EZ highest:POSS:DAT seven

gündè 'ummallar seng-i ħara° [...] çıkarırlarmış. (237a6)  
 day:LOC worker:PL granite stones bring up:INFR 3PL  
 'Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat, literally: "from whose very bottom to its top it is said the builders had to bring up granite stones (enumeration of other materials left out here) in seven days."'6 [the builders, it is said, had to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top in seven days.]

Examples like 13 are to some extent equivocal, as in this context the function of the relator is by no means clear. If it has to be interpreted as conjunctive *kim*, the construction can be understood as a syntactically complex relative clause: The basic segment *sedd-i Nemrud*<sup>7</sup> corefers with the possessor of the indirect affectee ('place') of the relative clause, which is in the ablative or dative case, respectively. Interestingly, this complex sentence can easily be translated into a Persian relative construction: The (presumably anaphoric) Turkish possessive markers +*i* on *esas* and *zirvè-i a'lasnà* will be rendered by a clitic pronoun 3SG +*aš*, the ablative and dative markers have to be transformed into the prepositions *az* ('from') and *tâ* ('to'):

- (14) *Dar çehel ruz borc-i sâxt ke az*  
 within forty day tower:REL MARK built CONJ from
- pâye ta ğolle-aš kârgarân senghâ-râ dar*  
 foot to peak:CLT 3SG worker:PL stone:PL:ACC in
- haft ruz bâlâ bordand / kešidand.*  
 seven day up bring:PST 3PL

<sup>6</sup> Note that relativization of this position is not possible in standard English, where pronoun retention in this case would be rather unusual.

<sup>7</sup> Due to the possessive suffix on *esas*, there is some evidence for *sedd-i Nemrud* being the head of the relative clause. One could of course also think of an adverbial RC with *qırq yılda* as the head.

Judging from the fact that a nearly one-to-one translation into a Persian RC is possible, example 13 may of course be interpreted as an Ottoman relative construction which is either formed according to Persian models or may even be a translation from a Persian text. Yet, with intonational patterns or punctuation missing, some ambiguity remains. In the given constellation, one might also understand the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* as a disjunctive entity: ‘Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat: [It is said that] the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

The vague relation between these two propositions may also allow a temporal interpretation: ‘Within 40 years, he built a ziggurat: [it is said that] meanwhile the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

Presuming that the indefinite pronoun *bir* was stressed, a consecutive interpretation seems possible as well: ‘Within 40 years, he built [such] a ziggurat that [as they tell] the builders needed seven days to transport (all the materials) from its very bottom to the top.’

Thus, example 13 is interesting in two respects: It demonstrates that complex (relative?) constructions use syntactical means very close to those found in New Persian. At the same time, it shows how ambiguous some of these Ottoman patterns are, where clause combining is only indicated by the polyfunctional relator *kim*. The same ambiguity arises for instance with patterns where *kim* combines with a *nomen loci*, as e.g. *üzer-* in ex. 15 +POSS+case (LOC):

- (15) Amma gayet ‘ariz divarlardır  
 but quite broad wall:PL:COP 3SG
- kim* ‘üzèrindè atlı  
 CONJ upper side:POSS:LOC horse:INST
- c’èrid° ‘oynas’à m’ümkindir. (245a13)  
 polo play:COND possible:COP 3SG

In all probability, example 15 should be interpreted as a relative construction, which also has a parallel in the respective Persian patterns. Furthermore, the analytic pattern is another factor displaying Iranian structural features: In Turkish, possibility can be rendered synthetically by the suffix *-Ebil* attached to the verb stem. Iranian languages may

combine an impersonal modal expression (e.g. *momken ast* ‘it is possible’ in Persian) with the subjunctive of the following verb. Many of the modal constructions in Ottoman Turkish reflect Iranian patterns, the optative or imperative holding a position similar to that of the subjunctive in the respective Iranian constructions.

With *kim* as a conjunctive relator, example 15 can be translated as a relative construction: ‘They are really thick walls, on which it would be possible to play polo.’

Yet, supposing that *kim* here has to be understood as a disjunctive relator, the sense would change to a consecutive meaning: ‘They are really thick walls, so that it would be possible to play polo on them.’

### 3.4. Pronoun retention

Basically, our material provides two types of right-branching RCs: Those connected only by the polyfunctional relator *kim* and others, which contain an additional resumptive pronoun.

Meninski’s grammar (1756: I, 93-94) offers a whole paradigm of so-called “relative pronouns”, which in fact are combinations of the free relators *kih / kim* with the oblique forms of the anaphoric pronoun *ol* (*kih anuñ, añna, anı, andan, anlaruñ, anlara, anları, anlardan*). Compared to our material, where oblique forms of *bu* also appear, as well as to common place language universals this paradigm looks a bit too schematic.<sup>8</sup>

Only in combination with an anaphoric pronoun, would clauses introduced by the polyfunctional relator *kim* be marked explicitly as RCs. Yet, in simple relations of coreference between head and agent of the RC—as e.g. in our constellations I and II—resumptive pronouns are in general rarely used across languages. In fact, pronoun retention is a rather marginal phenomenon, restricted to the more complicated relations of head and correlate as represented in constellation III. Here, the relativized position is taken up again by an anaphoric pronoun within the RC, which may consist of an oblique form of *ol* or *bu*.

<sup>8</sup> Pronoun retention, for instance, would be possible but quite unusual with relativization of the accusative; in cases of relativization of the position of the genitive, a Turkish possessive marker is obviously preferred to the analytic pronoun *anuñ*, cf. example 11: *kim her taşı ...* ‘every stone of which’.

Interestingly, constellations with pronoun retention are extremely rare in our material; combinations of *kim* with the respective oblique forms of *bu*, namely *kim ... bunlaruñ*, *ki ... bunlardà* and *kim bundan* appear only once throughout our material. In altogether five instances, the dative is relativized by means of the resumptive pronoun *aña*, which immediately follows the relator *kim*. Yet, the sentence structure in all five cases is exactly the same as in examples 16 and 21, below: “... is the place (X), which (Y) calls (Z)”:

- (16) 'Ol derè nehr-'i D'önd'irm'è d'ir° kim  
 that river river:EZ Döndirme COP 3SG CONJ  
  
*aña* B'en°d-'i M'ah'i der°ler. (245b18)  
 Prn:DAT dam:EZ fish say:AOR3PL  
 ‘It is the river Döndirme, which they call Bend-i Mahi (‘fish-dam’).’

Only in RCs introduced by *kim aña*, is the formal markedness of the syntactic function explicit and no other interpretation possible. Constellations with oblique forms of *bu* behave differently: Especially in one instance (*kim ... bunlaruñ* in 241a24f), where the resumptive pronoun does not immediately follow *kim*, a disjunctive reading of the relator would be possible as well.

- (17) Cümlè hayrat -u hasanat şahibleridir  
 all charitable act and good deeds owner:PL:POSS:COP 3SG  
  
*kim* (...) Altun Hälqàhî cisri  
 CONJ Altun Hälqàhî bridge:POSS  
  
*ve* Çoban köprüsi bunlaruñ binasıdır (241a24f)  
 and Çoban bridge:POSS Prn:PL:GEN building:POSS COP

A conjunctive interpretation of the relator *kim* yields the following translation: ‘They are all beneficent and charitable men, whose buildings are the Altun Hälqàhî and the Çoban Bridge.’

With *kim* in disjunctive function, e.g. a causal meaning can be interpreted: ‘They are all beneficent and charitable men, as the Altun Hälqàhî and the Çoban Bridge are their buildings.’

Thus, the role of conjunctive *kim* as co-ordinative relator with relative clauses can be described as follows: Without additional distinguishing features such as intonation or punctuation, most postpositive RCs coordinated by the polyfunctional relator *kim* display a vague markedness of their syntactic function. The only position where this function finds an explicit formal expression is a combination of *kim* with the resumptive pronoun immediately following.

Table 3: Conjunctive *kim* as co-ordinative relator / conjunctive with relative clauses

	<i>kim</i>	<i>kim</i> + anaphoric pronoun
Formal markedness of	vague	explicit: <i>kim aña / bunlardà / bundan</i>
syntactic function		vague: <i>kim ... bunlaruñ</i>
Frequency	high	marginal

#### 4. Frequency of the subtypes of prepositive and postpositive relative clauses

Finally, we may compare the distribution of the representatives of the two opposed strategies of relativization in our material. As roughly two thirds of the relative clauses are prepositive, the Turkic left-branching type is altogether predominant.

With both types of relative clauses, constellation I—coreference of the head of the main clause with the first agent of the relative clause—is the most frequent subtype in our material. In constellation Ia, the prepositive type is clearly predominant, making up two thirds of the total, whereas with Ib, the postpositive RC clearly dominates. Thus, the right-branching pattern ..., *kim filan şeyi var* is preferred to the left-branching *filan şeyi olan ...*, by a ratio of approximately 6 to 1.

With constellation II, the Turkic type of RC dominates.

In constellation III, which is the most difficult to relativize, the right-branching type, including subtypes with pronoun retention, is slightly pre-eminent.

Leaving aside the preponderance of certain subtypes in different constellations, the overall impression is that both strategies—in theory—can appear in all three possible constellations. As the two patterns are not applied complementarily, they are most obviously competing in certain areas of relativization. Table 4 presents the inventory of pre- and postpositive RCs in Ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305, 236b to 246b:

Table 4: Distribution of pre- and postpositive RCs

	Prepositive		Postpositive
Constellation I coreference head → (a) agent of the RC or (b) its possessor	-POSS	Total: 72	Total: 36
	participles in -		
	(y)En	(a) 37	(a) 24
		(b) 2	(b) 12
	-mİş	(a) 20	
		(b) 1 (?)	
	{-(y)EcEk}	(a) 1 (?)	{+ optative: 2}
	aorist	11	
		(a) 10	
		(b) 1	
Constellation II: corefer- ence head → (a) direct affectee (accusative object) or (b) its possessor	+POSS		
	-dİGI	(a) 13	(a) 1
	*{-(y)EcEgI}		
Constellation III: coreference head → (a) indirect affectee / adverbial term of place, time or manner {or (b) its possessor}	+ ~ -POSS	(a) Total: 12	(a) + (b) Total: 17
	-dİGI	6	head → place: 5
	-(y)EcEk	5	head → means: 3
	aorist	1	kim aña: 6
			kim bunlaruñ: 1
		kim bunlardâ: 1	
		kim bundan: 1	

If in certain constellations the choice between a pre- or a postpositive RC exists, we have to ask which criteria are involved in the decision for one or the other type. Traditionally, three explanations have been given for the application of a right-branching RC in favour of the left-branching Turkic type:

1. As postpositive RCs contain a finite verb form, they can be employed to render complex verb forms—which otherwise could not be done by the infinite subjunctive of the Turkic RC.



2. The postpositive RC is less grammaticalized than the nominalized Turkic type—it thus allows focusing by means of changing the word order. (Not true for pronoun retention.)
3. As the relation between the tenses used within the main clause and the relative clause is free, the Indo-European pattern may be employed to render plot-advancing RCs. (This is clearly the case in contemporary Turkish.)<sup>9</sup>

We have carefully checked all these arguments. Yet, as far as the postpositive RCs in our material are concerned, there are 1) neither very complex verb forms within the RCs, nor 2) convincing examples of focusing by variation of word order. 3) Plot-propulsing postpositive RCs do appear, but they make up much too little a share to offer an explanation for the application of the right-branching RCs in general.

### **5. State of definiteness of the head**

As far as we can judge from a very limited data base of a single text, the choice of a prepositive or a postpositive RC mainly depends on the state of definiteness of the head.

#### **5.1. Left-branching RCs**

The Turkish prepositive type of RCs always combines with indefinite heads. In this case, the relative clause contains information which is necessary in order to understand the construction as a whole. It can be identified, in other words, with the well-known type of restrictive or defining relative clause.

In the following example, it would not be possible to omit the RC without changing the meaning of the whole sentence. The prepositive RC refers to the head “men”, in this case the genitive object of the embedding clause. If we omitted the relative clause, the remaining sentence would mean that “(the / all) men’s hair falls out”. Yet, only by way of the information contained in the relative clause does it become clear that this statement is restricted to a certain group of men—those, namely, who have bathed in a certain well.

<sup>9</sup> For an extensive discussion of these arguments see Johanson (1975) and Lehmann (1984: 272-274)

- (18) Her bar giren adamlarūñ  
 every time go:PART man:PL:GEN
- şaçı ve şaqalı d'ökülür. (243b28)  
 hair:POSS and beard:POSS fall out:AOR 3SG  
 'The hair and beard of the men who go into (the  
 water of this well) falls out.'

## 5.2. Right-branching RCs

In the case of postpositive RCs, on the other hand, we can discern two categories of definiteness of the head. Following Lehmann's (1984) classification, we will describe them as follows:

### 5.2.1. With inherently definite heads

Names and pronouns are inherently definite.<sup>10</sup> With heads belonging to one of these two categories, the relative clause does not function as a definition of the term in question (Lehmann 1982: 282: ≠ "Begriffsbildung"). It rather has the character of additional information or a comment on the head noun. In the following examples, dropping the appositive RC would not influence the meaning of the head, which—as a name or pronoun—is inherently definite:

- (19) *Ve 'Er°'uğrul pederi Süleyman Şahdır kim {...}*  
 and Ertuğrul father:POSS Süleyman Şah:COP 3SG CONJ
- nehri Fırata ğarq olup andà medfundır. (241a7f)*  
 river:EZ Fırat:DAT drown:GER there buried:COP 3SG  
 'And the father of Ertuğrul is Süleyman Şah, who drowned  
 {...} in the river Fırat and was buried near there.'
- (20) *Qal'è-'i Ves°tan y'olıdır kim*  
 fortress:EZ Vestan , road:POSS:COP 3SG CONJ

<sup>10</sup> There are of course cases where the uniqueness of the proper name can be neutralized, as, for instance, if there are several people with the same name: Are you the Mehmet (one of several persons with this name) who wants to marry my daughter?

Hakkari vilâyeti içrè (...) Vanà gider. (236b35ff)  
 Hakkari province:POSS POSP Van.DAT go:AOR 3SG  
 'It is the road to the fortress of Vestan, which leads through  
 the province of Hakkari (...) up to the city of Van.'

- (21) Erzen-Baycandır kim añā 'Acem m'üverrihleri  
 Erzen-Baycan CONJ Prn:DAT Persian historian:PL POSS

'Azerbaycan derler o kim  
 Azerbaijan say:AOR 3PL that CONJ

şehr-i Tebriz-i dil-avizdir. (238b8f)  
 city:EZ Tabris:EZ charming:COP 3SG  
 'It is Erzen-Baycan, which the Persian historians call Azerbaijan,  
 that one, which is the city of Tabris, the charming.'

### 5.2.2. Indefinite relative constructions → indefinite and specific heads

The head of postpositive RCs can also be indefinite and specific (“a certain”, in contrast to indefinite and unspecific “someone, anything”). According to Lehmann (1984: 265), this state of definiteness of the head yields an indefinite relative construction. In such a constellation, the semantic difference between restrictive and appositive RCs with respect to term definition (“Begriffsbildung”) is neutralized. As to the theoretical precepts of linguistic universals, the relevant position can be taken both by restrictive and appositive RCs. Yet, a careful analysis of our material reveals that in this constellation appositive relative clauses dominate.

- (22) Yinè bu maḥallè qarib bir  
 again this place:DAT near INDEF

'ayn-ı germa vardır kim qayadın şazrevan  
 spring:EZ hot exist:COP 3SG CONJ rock:ABL cascade

gibi kendüyi pertab êdüp aşığıdaki  
 like RFL:ACC plunge:GER below:LOC:particle

‘aşr<sup>m</sup>-fi-aşr havz-ı kebirè rızan olur. (245b3f)  
 ten-by-ten pool:EZ big:DAT flow:AOR 3SG  
 ‘Near this place is another hot spring, which—gushing down the rocks  
 like a cascade—flows into the big “ten-by-ten” pool below.’

### 5.2.3. With the cataphoric pronoun *ol* preceding the head

Heads combined with appositive RCs may sometimes be preceded by the anaphoric pronoun *bu* (‘this, the aforesaid’). The combination with the cataphoric pronoun *ol* as in 23, on the other hand, yields a restrictive RC.

In all probability, this pattern is a copy of a certain Persian RC type where “the demonstrative adjective *ân* is often used to denote the restrictive clause” (Thackston 1978: 126).<sup>11</sup> Interestingly, it also has parallels in present-day Turkic varieties that show syntactical influence from Iranian languages, as e.g. Iraqi Turkmen, cf. ex. 24.

- (23) Bend-i Mahi ol maḥaldır kim  
 Bend-i Mahi that place:COP 3SG CONJ
- yıldà bir kerrè [...] Van deryasınıñ  
 year:LOC once Van lake:POSS:GEN
- balıqları raygan olup (237b5f)  
 fish:POSS PL gather:GER  
 ‘Bend-i Mahi is the place where once a year all the fish of the  
 lake of Van are gathered.’

- (24) Gètti o yerä  
 go:PST 3SG that place:DAT
- ki ayrındılar. (Hassan 1979: 10 / 147)  
 CONJ part:PST 3PL  
 ‘He returned to the place where they had parted from each other.’

<sup>11</sup> If the position after the head of a Persian RC is already occupied by possessive pronouns or pronominal enclitics, the restrictive marker *+i*, which in other constellations introduces restrictive RCs, cannot be used. Instead, the complex noun phrase will be preceded by the cataphoric pronoun *ân*.

## 6. Summary

Thus, we may conclude that Middle Ottoman Turkish applies two opposite strategies of relativization, which are distributed according to their function.

The Turkic type represents the restrictive RC. It is strongly grammaticalized and shows a closer affinity to its head on a semantic level, too.

The Indo-European type, which represents the appositive type of RC, shows less grammaticalization. The relation to its head is less explicitly marked on the sentence surface, the semantic relation vague.

Characteristic features of the two competing relativization patterns can almost be described as antonyms. The following table presents the main oppositions in syntactic structure and the applied strategy of clause combining in a simplified and generalized way.

Table 5. Some characteristics of the competing strategies of relativization

	Turkic type	Indo-European type
Syntactic structure:		
Position of relative clause in relation to head	prepositive, left-branching (rectum → regens)	postpositive, right-branching (regens → rectum)
Verb form within the relative clause	subjunctive: non-finite / nominalized verb forms	finite verb forms
Word order	rigid word order	variable word order (focusing is possible in subtypes without pronoun retention)
Pronoun retention	∅	possible with certain subtypes
Strategy of clause combining:	embedding into main clause / subordination	co-ordination by polyfunctional conjunctive <i>kim</i>
Grammaticalization	high	low
Markedness / explicitness of syntactic function	explicit	vague
Function on the semantic level	restrictive / defining “Begriffsbildung”	appositive / commenting
State of definiteness of the head	indefinite	(1) inherently definite ~ (2) indefinite and specific
Frequency of the respective pattern	2 / 3	1 / 3
Frequency of the subtypes cf. Table 4		

## 7. Conclusions

The analysis of our rather limited data base shows that genuine Turkic strategies within some syntactic areas compete with patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic—maybe Iranian—languages:<sup>12</sup> Turkic non-finite clauses with subordinators—nominalized deverbal forms—may occur alongside clauses containing a finite verb form and an introducing conjunctive. To exemplify the employment of these “Indo-European” strategies in clause combining, we chose relativization. Yet, relativization is by no means the only area where structurally different patterns fulfil a similar syntactic function. In our material, we found similar phenomena in the field of causal and final clauses, as well.<sup>13</sup>

The initial question was, why—at a given stage in language—these different strategies of clause combining are used parallel to one another. We can conclude now that they were employed as a means of functional differentiation: Turkic non-finite relative clauses are used to render restrictive relative clauses, whereas constructions with a finite verb form introduced by the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* are confined to the appositive type of relative clauses. The only exceptions to this rule are the rare examples where a cataphoric pronoun precedes the head of a restrictive—postpositive—relative clause.

Which conclusions do constellations—as reflected in the area of relativization—allow? Let us presuppose that relative clauses introduced by the polyfunctional conjunctive *kim* are—in one way or another—copies of Indo-European patterns. In Indo-European languages, as for example contemporary Iranian languages, similar constructions with *ke / ku* are the only pattern in forming both restrictive and appositive relative clauses. Yet, their function within Ottoman Turkish (as the presumably copying language) is restricted to the appositive type of relative clauses, whereas the genuine Turkic strategy of relativization is confined to restrictive relative clauses. This situation mirrors one of the characteristic developments of copying processes: The copy never shows all the traces

<sup>12</sup> The Indo-European origin of the relative constructions connected by *kim* is generally accepted in Turcology. Yet, these structures must have been copied at quite an early stage of Turkic language history, as their appearance in AET and Middle Turkic texts demonstrates.

<sup>13</sup> See Bulut (1997).

of the original, but rather deviates in regard to form, function or combinational properties.

In code copying, strategies of clause combining are relatively easily copied: Clause combining takes place on a high level of syntactic organization, whereas the deeper layers of sentence structure and the level of morphology may remain unaffected. When we try to elaborate on the implications of copying strategies in clause combining, we should therefore keep in mind that a more thorough study would have to include all levels of copied elements in Ottoman Turkish.

Is Ottoman Turkish then a high copying variety? Compared to Turkic languages which are heavily influenced by Iranian languages, e.g. Southern Azerbaijani and Khalaj, there are less fundamental changes in the sentence structure represented in our material. In the two languages mentioned above, important changes took place on the syntactic level, leading to heavy restrictions or even the abandonment of Turkic strategies of clause combining, for instance in the area of relativization.<sup>14</sup> A second characteristic development in Turkic languages of Iran (cf. Soper 1987) is the replacement of another subordinative pattern—the gerund constructions. Verb concatenation and adverbial subordination by the Turkic device of gerundialization are given up in favour of—again—Indo-European constructions with sentence initial conjunctions and finite verb forms. Thus, the most important change on the syntactic level of high copying varieties seems to be the substitution of Turkic subordinative structures by Indo-European strategies of clause combining.

<sup>14</sup> In certain high copying varieties such as Southern Azerbaijani and Khalaj, the Turkic pattern is, for the most, replaced by the Iranian type of relative clauses. Similar conditions of language contact prevail in Gagauz spoken in Moldavia; especially in certain constellations in spoken Gagauz, the Indo-European relative constructions with the relator *ani* outnumber the genuine Turkic constructions with nominalized element, cf. the materials of Astrid Menz (forthcoming) for Gagauz. Iraqi Turkmen varieties, which have developed both under the influence of Iranian languages and Ottoman Turkish, display a mixed system: While in some constellations prepositive RCs with infinite subjunctors appear, the Iranian construction with a cataphoric pronoun introducing the postpositive restrictive RC is represented as well.

Yet, Ottoman Turkish—at least as represented in our limited choice of data—employs the copied structures only as an additional means of functional differentiation, while the genuine Turkic patterns of relativization and gerund constructions remain intact.

### References

- Adamović, Milan 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill
- Bulut, Christiane 1997. *Evliya Çelebis Reise von Bitlis nach Van. Ein Auszug aus dem Seyahatname. Interpretierende Transliteration, kommentierte Übersetzung und sprachwissenschaftliche Bemerkungen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hassan, Hussin Shahbaz 1979. *Kerkük ağzı*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Istanbul, Istanbul.]
- Johanson, Lars 1975 (1991). Some remarks on Turkic ‘hypotaxis’. *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 47, 104-118. [Reprinted in: Johanson, Lars 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 210-224.]
- Johanson, Lars 1989. Subjektlose Sätze im Türkischen. In: Brendemoen, Bernt (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 193-218.
- Lehmann, Christian 1984. *Der Relativsatz: Typologie seiner Strukturen; Theorie seiner Funktionen; Kompendium seiner Grammatik*. (Language Universals Series 3.) Tübingen: Narr.
- Meninski, Franciszek 1680 (1756). *Linguarum orientalium, Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae institutiones* I-II. Wien.
- Menz, Astrid (forthcoming). *Kontaktbedingte Besonderheiten in der Syntax des Gagausischen*.
- Soper, John David 1987. *Loan syntax in Turkic and Iranian: The verb system of Tajik, Uzbek, and Qashqay*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.]
- Thackston, Wheeler McIntosh 1978. *An introduction to Persian*. Tehran: Soroush.



# The stressing of Russian loanwords in Ašmarin's *Materialy* (1898)

**Michael Dobrovolsky**

Dobrovolsky, Michael 1998. The stressing of Russian loanwords in Ašmarin's *Materialy* (1898). *Turkic Languages* 2. 198-214.

An examination of the words borrowed from Russian into Chuvash found in Ašmarin's 1898 *Materialy* shows that some borrowings are insensitive to the phonetics of the Russian source words and show only the alleged "default" margin stress typical of Chuvash reduced vowel words, while other forms show a greater sensitivity to Russian phonetics in that they treat Russian reduced unstressed vowels as analogous to the reduced vowels of Chuvash. It is proposed that these borrowings with their diverse stress patterns do not necessarily reflect a chronological order of entry into Chuvash but at least reflect diverse sources of borrowing.

*Michael Dobrovolsky, Linguistics Department, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4.*

## Introduction

This paper presents an analysis of the stressing of certain Russian loanwords in Chuvash.\* Unless otherwise indicated, the data are from the list of Russian loanwords into Chuvash found in Ašmarin (1898: v-vi). Further loanwords have been gathered from examples illustrating other phenomena throughout the first section of the same work, and from sev-

- \* Research leading to this paper was made possible by a Senior Fellowship at the Calgary Institute for the Humanities during 1996 and 1997. I would like to acknowledge the Institute's generosity and support here. This paper has also benefited from input received at oral presentations, as well as from the helpful observations and corrections by an anonymous reviewer for this journal. All opinions and remaining errors of fact are my own.

eral other sources, in particular Fedotov (1990). When drawing examples from the latter source, I have avoided loanwords that are obviously of a more recent provenance, such as contemporary technological terms.

Ašmarin's main list of borrowings is organized by subject—government, religion, farming, etc.—so any generalization about stress patterning is initially obscured. Even when organized by location of stress placement, the stressing of these borrowings does not at first appear to be consistent. A number of forms match the stress of the Russian source words as expected, e.g., Russ. *obéd* > Chuv. *apát* 'dinner'.<sup>1</sup> However, some forms show final stress in Chuvash despite the fact that they are non-finally stressed in Russian, e.g., Russ. *cérkov'* > Chuv. *čirkú, čürkú* 'church,' Russ. *starósta* > Chuv. *starastá* 'elder,' etc. A number of other forms show sensitivity to vowel reduction in Russian; in these forms, unstressed and reduced Russian vowels are treated as if they were Chuvash reduced vowels and so excluded from stress, e.g., Russ. *vóbla* > Chuvash *óbāl* (fish species). Finally, there is at least one disyllabic form in Chuvash with initial stress where the Russian loan source shows final stress, e.g., Russ. *ovín* > Chuvash *ávān* 'barn.'

In this paper, I will suggest that the Chuvash metrical adaptation of the Russian loanwords shows different degrees of sensitivity to Russian phonetics on the part of the borrowers. This diversity of adaption is consistent with the words' entry into Chuvash at different time periods, from different Chuvash dialects, and from different social sources. The paper focuses strictly on stress patterns in the loanwords. It does not deal with such complex and controversial issues as the shift of Russian vowels to their Chuvash counterparts, although understanding such processes contributes to the loanword dating process. The paper is also emphatically not an etymological study, though some etymologies are discussed insofar as they help sort out the appearance of certain stresses on loanwords. The paper is organized as follows. In section 1., I present the two major stress rules of Chuvash; in section 2., the loanwords by

<sup>1</sup> Note also the partial phonetic adaption of the Russian form: The unstressed reduced Russian /o/ is assimilated as [a], which is its pronunciation in Russian, and the final devoiced /d/ is pronounced [t] as in Russian. In standard Chuvash pronunciation, non-geminate obstruents are lax and frequently voiced intervocally. Thus the phonetic adaption of Russian *obéd* in Chuvash is [aβát] or [abát].

stress grouping, and in section 3., I offer some further observations and conclusions.

### 1. The Chuvash stress rules

The description of Chuvash stress presented in Ašmarin is consistent with the stress pattern of Anatri or Lower Chuvash speech:

“Stress in Čuvaš ... is usually on the final syllable when it is long, or when the entire word consists of short syllables: *tāmàn* — *snowstorm*, *kaḅàn* — *rick*, *tivlèt* — *abundance*, *šüremellè* — *one must go*, *kěmël* — *silver*, *tătāmār* — *we stood*, *čăpărkkă* (B.) — *whip*.<sup>2</sup>

Stress falls on the penultimate syllable of a word when it is long and the final syllable is short: *kārāk* — *grouse*, N. *türä* — *bay* (color of horse), *tèrēm* — *I said*, *šämräk* — *young*.

Stress is usually on the third syllable from the end when it is long and the following syllables are short: *šăprămār* — *we hit*, *šîrëkën*, alder (Gen. case). In this way, stress falls on the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh syllable from the end if these syllables are long (full) and the following short: *ilëttëmër* — *we would take*, *kălăttămār* — *we would say*, *părătămărččë* — *we would give*, *sävănătămărččë* — *we would be happy*, *šävărănătămărččë* — *we would turn*.” (p. 19)

In other words: Stress falls on the last full (i.e., unreduced, short) vowel of a word; if a word does not contain any full vowels (i.e., contains only the “reduced” vowels *ě* and / or *ǎ*), stress falls on the last vowel of the word.<sup>3</sup> The phonological status of the “full” and “reduced” vowels appears to parallel long and short vowels in other languages. In current mora theory (e.g. Reynolds 1994) it is possible to view the full vowels

<sup>2</sup> Ašmarin provides more examples, as well as further details on the stressing of certain affixes as well; this has been omitted here. He abbreviates dialect names with capital letters; here and elsewhere in this paper, B. = Bujinskij (dialect), K. = Kormyšskij.

<sup>3</sup> As has been pointed out to me by an anonymous reviewer, Ašmarin’s description of Chuvash stress is consistent with the middle or transitional Chuvash dialect as well, as evidenced in the recently published material of Joseph Pápay, which was also collected in 1898 (see bibliography).

as bimoraic and the short vowels as monomoraic. However, Jakovlev (1987: 50) observes that the qualitative differences between the two sets of vowels could just as well serve as a stress cue.

When literary Chuvash was established, the stress pattern of the Viryal or Upper Chuvash dialect was selected as the standard. Current normative Chuvash stress is therefore as follows: Stress falls on the last full (i.e., unreduced, short) vowel of a word; if a word does not contain any full vowels (i.e., contains only the “reduced” vowels *ě* and / or *ǎ*), the *first* vowel of the word is stressed. In some contemporary metrical analyses, e.g. Hayes (1995), this type of stress pattern, which is allegedly found in other, unrelated languages, is labeled a “default left” pattern; this implies that the stressing of final full vowels is a special case and initial stress is the other or “elsewhere” option.<sup>4</sup> Of course, as was shown above, in the Anatri dialects of Chuvash described by Ašmarin, the “elsewhere” option is final stress—a “default right” stress pattern. This paper assumes that the Anatri “default right” stress described by Ašmarin forms the basis for stressing the majority of the loanwords he cites. However, only the “default” or right-edge stressing portion of the rule was initially employed by speakers to all loanwords. Viryal “default left” will be seen to play a role in some loanwords. Since stress placement in Chuvash is predictable in either dialect, I will not indicate it in the transcriptions which follow. Stress marks have been added to Russian words to facilitate comparison.

## 2. Stress groupings in the loanwords

This section breaks down Ašmarin's presentation of loanwords by stress type. I have omitted monosyllables from the list; in many cases, Russian monosyllabic words appear as disyllabic in Chuvash due to epenthesis (e. g. *mixě* < *mex* (Russ. dial.) ‘bag’ = Standard Russian (SR) *mešók* , but cf. Chuv. *mǎjǎx* in 2.3.); other signs of phonological adaption are also found, e.g., Russ. *krest* > Chuvash *xěres* ‘cross,’ Russ. *vsex* > Chuvash *vośśax* ‘entirely.’

<sup>4</sup> I think this stress rule for Viryal Chuvash should be revised in certain critical details; it is my view that Chuvash is a mixed pitch-accent / stress system, and the reduced vowel “stress” at the beginning of Viryal forms is a high-low pitch accent that can be found on all forms irrespective of their vowel content (Dobrovolsky, forthcoming). At this time, I have no opinion on Anatri stress.

As I shall show, one set of forms, probably early borrowings into Anatri dialects, shows consistent application of Chuvash final vowel stressing irrespective of vowel type in the source words; a second set of forms shows sensitivity to the phonetics of the Russian source words; and a third consists of words that in all likelihood entered Chuvash through the Viryal dialect.

### 2.1. Final stress in Russian = final stress in Chuvash

In this subset, final unreduced vowels in Russian are stressed finally in Chuvash.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>apat</i>	<i>obéd</i>	'dinner'
<i>karap</i>	<i>korábl'</i>	'ship'
<i>karttus</i>	<i>kartúz</i>	'powder bag'
<i>kolač, kulaś</i>	<i>kaláč</i>	'white bread'
<i>koršak</i> (K)	<i>goršók</i>	'pot' (Ašmarin 1898: 29)
<i>kěpěrne</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province' (cf. 2.4., 2.6.)
<i>kosar</i>	<i>kosýr'</i>	'planing knife'
<i>lupas</i>	<i>labáz</i>	'shed'
<i>mišavaj</i>	<i>meževój</i>	'land surveyor'
<i>mušik</i>	<i>mužík</i>	'muzhik'
<i>pila</i>	<i>pilá</i>	'saw' (tool)
<i>Pukrav</i>	<i>Pokróv</i>	Feast of the Protection
<i>putret</i>	<i>podr'ád</i>	'contract'
<i>saltak</i>	<i>soldát</i>	soldier
<i>sappan</i>	<i>zapón</i>	'apron'
<i>saśšóm</i>	<i>sovsém</i>	'entirely'
<i>saxxot</i>	<i>zaxód</i>	'latrine' {'stop-over'}
<i>suxa, soxa</i>	<i>suxá</i>	'wooden plow'
<i>śonat</i>	<i>senát</i>	'senate'
<i>truba</i>	<i>trubá</i>	'pipe'
<i>tiječuk</i>	<i>d'jačók</i>	'sacristan, sexton'
<i>vitre</i>	<i>vedró</i>	'bucket'
<i>xěresnatte</i>	<i>krestnyj otéc</i>	'godfather'
<i>xupax, xobax</i>	<i>kabák</i>	'tavern' (obs.)

### 2.1.1. Observations

Though the stress correspondence is straightforward in these forms, it must be emphasized that the Russian stressed vowels are exactly the ones which would be stressed according to the Chuvash stress rule cited by Ašmarin: “stress the last full vowel of a word”. In other words, these words are in all probability stressed as a matter of rule and not in mere imitation of Russian stress.

Russian *kosýr* ‘planing knife’ can also be stressed on the first syllable, but the *Slovar’ russkix narodnyx govorov* (SRNG) (15: 94) cites the form with final stress as the one used in the (former) Simbirsk province, which encompassed Chuvashia in Tsarist times.

### 2.1.2. Additions

The following words can be added to this set.

<i>jantar</i>	<i>jantár</i>	‘amber’	‘glass’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>matrus</i>	<i>matrós</i>		‘seaman’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>patak</i>	<i>batóg</i>		‘walking-stick’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>pěrene</i>	<i>brevnó</i>		‘log’ (Fedotov 1990: 210)

## 2.2. Non-final stress in Russian = final stress in Chuvash

In the next set of forms, unstressed final vowels in the Russian source words are finally stressed in Chuvash, irrespective of Russian phonetics.

By “irrespective of Russian phonetics,” I mean: Russian unstressed /e/ and /o/ are neutralized thus: /e/ → /i/ and /o/ → /a/. Unstressed /a/ (including those /a/’s that evolved from unstressed /o/) is phonetically [ʌ] when immediately preceding a stressed vowel, and is reduced to [ə] two or more positions before a stressed vowel or following it (Russ. *akan’e*). Thus, Russian /moloko/ ‘milk’ is phonetically [məlɔkó], /knjiga/ ‘book’ is [kn’i’gə]. It should be noted, though, that /o/ → /a/ neutralization is not found consistently in the Russian dialects of the Central Volga region, where Russian and Chuvash speakers interacted. The area is a transitional zone between Russian dialects that show this phonological development and those that do not (Matthews 1967 (1960), Vlasto 1986). It is therefore possible that some borrowings may have entered Chuvash from neutralizing dialects, and others from dialects without this neutralization. We should thus not necessarily expect

all Russian /o/'s to neutralize to /a/ and its respective allophones in borrowings.

Given words that do show (standard) Russian *akan'e*, we might well expect Chuvash speakers to interpret final unstressed and reduced vowels in Russian as being analogous to Chuvash reduced vowels, and thus exempt them from stress. However, in the following borrowings, Chuvash final stress is applied to the unstressed and sometimes even reduced final vowel of the Russian sources. Chuvash speakers at the time of these borrowings, in other words, were insensitive to the phonetic characteristics of Russian, and applied the "default" final stress of Anatri Chuvash to all loanwords.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čirkü, čürkü</i>	<i>cérkov'</i>	'church'
<i>čitnaj</i>	<i>sítnyj xleb</i>	'loaf from sifted flour'
<i>juka</i>	<i>v'júga</i>	'blizzard'
<i>kěnege</i>	<i>kníga</i>	'book'
<i>kěreple</i>	<i>grábli</i>	'rake'
<i>laša</i>	<i>lóšad'</i>	'horse' (Ašmarin 1898: 23)
<i>matka</i>	<i>mátka</i>	'woman' (Čeboksary uezd)
<i>papaś (K)</i>	<i>(povival' naja) bábka</i>	'midwife'
<i>páraśnik</i>	<i>prázdnik</i>	'day off' (cf. 2.4.)
<i>pervej, pervaj</i>	<i>pérvyj</i>	'at first'
<i>pičěke, pičke</i>	<i>bóčka</i>	'barrel'
<i>puľ'a</i>	<i>puľ'a</i>	'bullet'
<i>salat</i>	<i>sólod</i>	'malt'
<i>sappon</i>	<i>zápon</i>	'apron' (but cf. 2.2.1.)
<i>šapa</i>	<i>žába</i> [toad]	'frog'
<i>šělep, šělepke,</i>	<i>šl'ápa</i>	'hat'
<i>toľ'a</i>	<i>dól'a</i>	'portion'
<i>upli</i> (but cf. <i>obāl</i> )	<i>vóbla</i>	(fish species)
<i>xitre</i>	<i>xítryj</i>	'beautiful' {< cunning, subtle}

#### Polysyllabic Russian forms:

Penultimately stressed in Russian

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>Kārkoři (K)</i>	<i>Grigórij</i>	Gregory (Ašmarin 1898: 44)
<i>Kāśal'n'i</i>	<i>Kreščénie</i>	'baptism'

<i>kupāsta, kopsta</i>	<i>kapústa</i>	'cabbage'
<i>munčala</i>	<i>močálo</i>	'bast'
<i>ošmuxxa</i>	<i>vos' múška</i>	1/8 of a pound
<i>pätavkka</i>	<i>pudóvka</i>	one-pood (measure of weight)
<i>starasta</i>	<i>starósta</i>	'elder'
<i>varinkke</i>	<i>vorónka</i>	'funnel' (Ašmarin 1898: 29)
<i>xašat</i>	<i>gazéta</i>	'newspaper' {loss of final V}

## Antepenultimately stressed in Russian.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kěpěrne, kupir</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province'

## Initially stressed in Russian.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>mačča</i>	<i>mática</i> "joist"	'ceiling'
<i>müttarn'äk</i>	<i>mýtar' (nik)?</i>	'horse dealer' (from Russian colloquial speech. Ašmarin 1898: v)
<i>kěrepenkke</i>	<i>grívenka</i>	monetary unit (ten-kopek piece)
<i>kěrenkke</i>	<i>grívenka</i>	monetary unit (ten-kopek piece)
<i>šaluna, šalu</i>	<i>žálovan' e</i>	'salary'

As the subsections of this class show, the Chuvash borrowings are finally stressed even when the Russian polysyllabic words have antepenultimate or initial stress.

## 2.2.1. Observations

Chuvash *čirkü, čürkü* < Russ. *cérkov'* 'church' can be explained as the Chuvash alternation *-ěv ~ -ü / -äv ~ -u* found in the short list of commonplace words like *tu ~ täv* 'mountain', where the full-vowel word is the citation form and the longer stem the oblique form. This is a productive alternation in Chuvash and probably influenced the borrowed form in that Russian *cérkov'* was interpreted as an oblique stem. Ašmarin notes:

"Nouns ending in "u, ü" in the singular Gen. and Dat./Acc. cases change these sounds to "äv, ěv": (*iv, ěv*) *šu* — *fat*, *čirkü* — *church*, Gen. *šävän, čirkěvën*, {Dat.} *šäva, čirkěve*. The same phenomenon occurs when these nouns bear the



possessive pronoun suffixes: *šávám* — *my fat*, *šávă* — *your fat*, *šávě* — *his fat*, *čirkěvēm*— *my church*, *čirkěvě*— *your church*, *čirkěvě* — *his church*, and so on. But in the Dat./Acc. singular, the same nouns revert to the sounds “u, ü” with the 2nd and 3rd person singular suffixes: *čirküne* — *your, his church {Acc.}*, *to your, to his church*; *šuna* — *your fat {Acc.}*; *to your fat šune* — *to his fat, his fat {Acc.}*.” (p. 30)

Chuvash *müttarn’ăk* < Russ. *mýtar* ‘horse dealer’, or probably Russ. *mýtar’nik*. Stress has shifted to the final vowel of the source word root.

Russian *zapón* ~ *zápon* is listed with both final and non-final stress in SRNG. Whichever the source form was, the word has come into Chuvash with final stress.

Russian *grivenka* ‘ten-kopek piece’ appears to have entered Chuvash as *kěrepenkke* via Tatar *grăbănkă*. I claim this on the basis of the Chuvash medial /p/, which directly corresponds to the Tatar phoneme, as well as on the vowel correspondence and the final stress, which is found in Tatar. Ašmarin provides the Tatar form (as well as forms in several Ugric languages, which do not match up well with the Chuvash form) without comment

Chuvash *kěrenkke* ‘ten-kopek piece’ is *kěrepenkke* with partial syllable loss due, I suggest, to the little discussed presence of rhythmic stress in Chuvash, leading to a pre-loss pronunciation *kěrèpenkké*. I have observed such rhythmic stress in Chuvash speech; from the perspective of foot-based metrical theory (Hayes 1995), forms like *kěrèpenkké* and rhythmic alterations such as *Šùpaškár* ~ *Šupàškartá* ‘Čeboksary ~ in Čeboksary’ suggest that Chuvash builds right-headed rhythmic feet that apply (in the formal sense) from right to left.

### 2.2.2. Additions

To this list we may add:

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kašni</i>	<i>kážny</i> (dial. = <i>káždyj</i> )	‘every’
<i>kělenče</i>	<i>skl’ánka</i>	‘bottle’ (Fedotov 1990: 139 [sic = 193])
<i>papka</i>	<i>bábka</i>	‘mandrel’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>taram</i>	<i>dárom</i>	‘free, in vain’ (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>čilaj</i>	<i>célyj</i>	‘a lot’ (Fedotov 1990: 275)
<i>šăpka</i>	<i>zýbka</i>	‘cradle’ (Fedotov 1990: 222)

<i>šurka</i>	<i>škúrka</i>	'hide, skin' (Fedotov 1990: 281 provides this form but questions its being a loanword.)
--------------	---------------	---

The form *săpka* exhibits a characteristic of the next class as well, in that the (Chuvash) unstressed vowel is reduced.

### 2.3. Russian final stress = Chuvash final stress; Russian vowel reduction appears in some positions in Chuvash

In these borrowings, final unreduced vowels in Russian are stressed, as expected, but the reduced or weakly stressed non-final vowels of Russian are reduced in Chuvash. In other words, these forms indicate a phonetic sensitivity to the Russian reduced or weakly stressed vowels and so may reflect a later, more sophisticated stage in the assimilation of loans.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čälxa</i>	<i>čulók</i>	'stocking'
<i>kěrpe</i>	<i>krupá</i>	'groats'
<i>kěsle</i>	<i>guslí</i>	'psaltery'
<i>mălatuk</i>	<i>molotók</i> [mələtók]	'hammer' [Note the fine-tuned replication of standard Russian pronunciation; the substitution of /u/ for Russ. /o/ is also consistent.]
<i>păršovoj</i> (K.)	<i>birževój</i> ( <i>izvoščik</i> )	'carrier; cabman' (SRNG 2: 293)
<i>pășal</i>	<i>piščál'</i>	'(hand)gun'
<i>săvāk</i>	<i>sovók</i>	'shovel, scoop' (Ašmarin 1898:29) <sup>5</sup>
<i>tălăp</i>	<i>tulúp</i>	'sheepskin coat' (Ašmarin 1898: 32)

#### 2.3.1. Observations

The initial back reduced vowel of the K. form *măjăx* = Russ. *mešók* 'bag' may well have developed through phonetic assimilation to the final (here, stressed) vowel. Note that this word appears twice in the list, and that its other form is non-assimilated (section 2.).

<sup>5</sup> Ašmarin (1898: 29) has *savāk*, but this appears to be a misprint, as that word means 'joy'.

### 2.3.2. Additions

The following may be added to this set.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kěsel</i>	<i>kisél'</i>	'blancmange, kissel' (Fedotov 1990: 194)
<i>čálan</i>	<i>čulán</i>	'storeroom' (Fedotov 1990: 272)

### 2.4. Non-final stress in Russian = non-final stress in Chuvash

These forms accurately reflect the Russian source word stress, in contrast with those cited in section 2.2. Recall that forms like Russ. *v'júga* > Chuvash *juka* 'blizzard' showed an insensitivity to the reduced final vowel of the Russian source word: Chuvash stress applied to the rightmost vowel. The following forms are different from the ones in section 2.2: The final reduced or unstressed vowel of Russian is treated like a Chuvash reduced vowel and taken into account, i.e., exempted, when Chuvash stress is applied. In other words, the *entire* stress rule of Chuvash is consistently applied here, not merely the default portion. Thus, these forms, like those in section 2.3., show a sensitivity to Russian phonetics that is analogized in Chuvash stress.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>čaškă</i>	<i>čáška</i>	'cup'
<i>jaščák, ješčěk</i>	<i>jáščik</i> "box"	'wicker vehicle' (box wickers)
<i>kuperčă</i>	<i>gubérnija</i>	'province' (cf. 2.1., 2.6.)
<i>lešnitsă</i>	<i>lesníčij</i>	'forestry officer'
<i>părašn'ák</i> (K)	<i>prázdnik</i>	'day off' (cf 2.2.)
<i>pěreměk</i>	<i>pr'ánik</i>	'spice cake'
<i>sastăp</i>	<i>zástup</i>	'spade'
<i>saxxăr</i>	<i>sáxar</i>	'sugar'
<i>smilă</i> (K)	<i>smélyj</i>	'bold'
<i>săpaššipă</i> (K)	<i>spasíbo</i>	'thanks' (Ašmarin 1898: 44)
<i>tijakkân</i>	<i>d' jákon</i>	'deacon'
<i>tikět</i>	<i>déget'</i> (dial.) <sup>6</sup>	'tar' (= Standard Russian <i>děgot'</i> )
<i>obăl</i> (cf. <i>upli</i> )	<i>vóbla</i>	(fish species)
<i>vulăš, volăštă</i>	<i>vólost'</i>	'provincial government'

<sup>6</sup> Thanks to an anonymous referee for providing this donor form.

It could be argued that these forms reflect the full Viryal stress rule and are borrowings from this dialect. But since all of these forms show only one or two reduced vowels following the single full vowel in the word, the stress placement would be the same in either dialect. The important point is that no matter what the borrowing dialect, the Russian reduced vowels are treated like Chuvash reduced vowels when stress is applied.

### 2.5. Russian final stress = Chuvash non-final stress

Ašmarin's list provides one initially puzzling instance of a word in whose stress in Chuvash flatly contradicts the stress of the Russian source word. In this form, the final Russian *stressed* vowel is transferred to Chuvash as a reduced vowel, and the first vowel of the word is stressed.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>avăn</i>	<i>ovín</i>	'barn'

#### 2.5.1. Observations

Chuvash *avăn* 'barn' is an interesting case. Though Ašmarin includes it in the list of words borrowed from Russian, Gordeev (1979) (cited in Fedotov 1990: 167) claims that Russian *ovín* is a borrowing from Bolgar, i.e., Ancient Chuvash. In this view, Chuv. *avăn* = Tatar *ävän* ultimately derives from Ancient Turkic *äv* 'house'. So the problem may not be that the Chuvash stress is anomalous, but rather that the Russian stress requires an explanation.

#### 2.5.2. Additions

To this set the following may be added.

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>däväl</i>	<i>d'ávol</i>	'devil' (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>jamšák</i>	<i>jamščík</i>	'coachman' (Fedotov 1990: 151)
<i>suntăx / sontăx</i>	<i>sundúk</i>	'trunk, chest' (Fedotov 1990: 227)

Russ. *d'ávol* > Chuv. *däväl* is only anomalous if it is assumed to be a borrowing into the right-stressing Anatri dialect. If it is a borrowing into Viryal, then its initial stress is normal.

The simplest explanation for these forms is the assumption that they entered the language through Viryal speakers, who simply applied the default (left) stress rule in all cases irrespective of vowel quantity or quality—just as the forms in section 2.2. show that Anatri speakers at one time applied the default (right) stressing rule across the board.

Further speculation is always possible. For example, note that all of these forms have the typical Viryal initial stress and that in some cases, their first vowels are relatively sonorous in comparison with the Russian stressed vowels: *a* versus *i* in Russ. *avín* and *jamščík*, and *a* versus *u* in Russ. *zastúp*. It is possible that Viryal speakers interpreted these vowels as stressed because of their high sonority thus reinforcing the application of the Viryal default left-stress pattern.

The Russian form *sundúk* enters Chuvash as *suntăx* / *sontăx* (the *u* / *o* variation is dialectal). Ašmarin notes (1898: 29):

“The change from “u (o)” to “a” in the words *kăšal*, *măntarăn* arises from the fact that Čuvaš in general does not tolerate the appearance of two “u”s or “o”s in a root ending in a consonant. This is noticeable in a number of borrowings from Russian:

Russ.	goršok	voronka	sovok
Čuv.	koršak (K.)	varinkke	săvăk” (see footnote 5)

In this case, Chuvash (Viryal) speakers may have reacted to the rounded vowel constraint by applying the default left-edge stressing and consequently reducing the following vowel.

## 2.6. Forms showing loss or addition of final vowel or syllable

### 2.6.1. Loss

Chuvash	Russian	
<i>kanvit</i>	<i>konfěkty</i> [stress?]	‘bakery sweets’
<i>kupir</i>	<i>guběrnija</i>	‘province’
<i>kăran</i>	<i>granica</i> “boundary, edge”	‘boundary’
<i>kurpun</i>	<i>gorbátyj</i>	‘hunchback(ed)’
<i>săvaj</i>	<i>svája</i>	‘pile’
<i>šelle</i>	<i>žalěj</i> < <i>zhalějka</i>	(folk music instrument)
<i>xal’ar</i>	<i>xoléra</i>	‘cholera’

All but one of the forms above appear to have resulted from morphological analysis of the Russian forms by Chuvash borrowers in that the lost syllables are all inflectional endings (usually nominative singular, but nominative plural in the case of Russ. *konfekty*). It is significant, though, that these endings are all weak and occur immediately following a stressed syllable. As is clear from the preceding sections, in most instances this position does not result in the deletion of the Russian vowel or syllable. In the case of Russ. *žalėj* < *žalėjka* > Chuv. *šelle*, a final weak diminutive suffix has been dropped (or perhaps was absent on the original borrowed form).

### 3. Discussion

Before drawing any conclusions, we must consider the possibility that these loanwords were simply stressed as in Russian, but that Ašmarin did not record this detail. This is unlikely for two reasons. First, Ašmarin is very careful with his transcription. For example, he makes a point of noting that while double letters in Chuvash orthography reflect geminate consonants in native words, they do not do so in the Chuvash pronunciation of Russian loanwords (in his phonetic transcription, Ašmarin uses the superscribed breve to indicate a short vowel):

“In words borrowed into Čuvaš from Russian, doubled consonants are written only to indicate voiceless pronunciation: Jakku (pron. Jaku) — Jakov, pätavkka (pron. pidavka) — pudovka; Kurm. saxxär (pron. saxir) — *sugar*.” (p.44)

Ašmarin does not make a parallel observation about stress on loanwords.

Second, there is evidence that transcribers who recorded Chuvash speech in a standard orthography (or, the competing orthographies of the time) deliberately spelled borrowed words in a way that indicates their stress as pronounced by Chuvash speakers. In some instances, Ašmarin's own phonetic transcriptions support this view, as in the example above, where he transcribes Russian *sáxar* ‘sugar’ > Chuv. K. *saxxär* phonetically according to Chuvash pronunciation as [saxir], the shortened second vowel clearly paralleling the reduced vowel transcription. (On the same page, Ašmarin also provides Chuvash *pätavkka* [pidavka] < Russian *pudovka* ‘unit of weight’).

The application of stress to the loanwords in Ašmarin's list is consistent when viewed as primarily reflecting Anatri stress patterns, but in one layer of the borrowings it shows a general insensitivity to Russian phonetics. This suggests that in an initial period of loanword adaptation an Anatri type of Chuvash stress was applied across the board, irrespective of Russian vowel quality. This process of loanword adaptation is typical of early stages in the assimilation of a second-language phonology. In a second stage, greater sensitivity is shown to Russian vowel quality—which apparently parallels Chuvash bimoraic vowel *quantity*. Such sensitivity does not directly reflect acquisition of the Russian stress pattern—it is after all the Chuvash stress pattern that emerges. But it can be argued that the emergence of the more fine-tuned application of Chuvash stress occurred when speakers of Chuvash became more sensitive to the phonetic details of Russian stress and its segmental phonetic fallout. The stress pattern of another set of loanwords indicates that they were borrowed via the Viryal dialect.

A striking feature of these adaptations is their insensitivity to syllable weight. Stress placement in both the “earlier” and “later” borrowings is unaffected by the structure of word-internal Russian syllables; the presence of codas that make for heavy syllables does not effect stress placement, for example. What the Chuvash stress rules are in fact sensitive to is vowel quantity. When Russian final reduced vowels are interpreted as Chuvash “short / weak / reduced” vowels (i.e., monomoraic vowels in some views, as noted) they are excluded from the first part of the Chuvash stress rule. I have argued elsewhere (Dobrovolsky 1998) that Chuvash phonology in general does not reflect a sensitivity to syllable structure; these borrowed forms are in line with that claim.

A second noteworthy characteristic of this data is the way in which it reflects the two parts of the Chuvash stress rule—or perhaps the two stress rules of Chuvash. Dobrovolsky (1990) speculates that the Chuvash stress rule is not a single rule with a special portion (“stress the last full vowel of a word”) and a default / elsewhere portion (“stress the last (Anatri) / first (Viryal) vowel of a word with only reduced vowels”). Rather, it was proposed that these two patterns are two separate entities. As remarked in footnote 4, I believe that the “default” rule of Chuvash stress is more akin to a pitch accent, while the last full vowel of a word is made prominent by extending its length. If edge “stress” in Chuvash is a pitch accent that extends across two syllables, there are two phonetic results we might expect. First, this accent may not be as salient as stress-

through-length on full vowels. This appears to be the case. Ašmarin writes that “in words consisting exclusively of short vowels, stress is scarcely noticeable.” (p. 19, footnote 1). Jakovlev (1987: 51) confirms this fact, and adds that the first vowel's loudness and length are quite variable. Secondly, we might well expect the left-edge or right-edge accent to occur in *all* forms, irrespective of whether they contain full vowels or not. This means that the either / or formulation of Chuvash stress is incorrect, and that in finally stressing borrowed forms such as those in section 2.1., Chuvash speakers were not so much applying a default *stress* but rather producing the expected *pitch accent* on the right edge of the word.

Finally, we may well ask if the generalizations made in this paper about relative times of borrowing find any support in other analyses. Of course, linguistic idealizations capture overall patterns without necessarily reflecting the complex borrowing process. It may well be that many of these words entered Chuvash at nearly the same time, but through different intermediaries, such as popular speech, school teachers, journalists, missionaries, and thus in different forms; the idea of an easily identifiable progression from one stage of borrowing to the next may be illusory. However, the patterned groupings of borrowing types are not—they reflect various kinds of adaption of loanword stress.

Further questions arise. Does this greater sensitivity to phonetics indicate more sophisticated, or bilingual speakers? An increasing influx of Russian loans? Only a detailed study of the times of entry of each word into Chuvash speech—a difficult task in light of the paucity of written sources for early Chuvash—will enable us to state with certainty the origins of each item's stress. Nonetheless, we are still very fortunate to have available the sophisticated transcriptions of linguistic pioneers like Pápy and Ašmarin.

### References

- Agyagási, Klára (ed.) 1997. *Der tschuwaschische Nachlaß von Joseph Pápy. Tagebuchfragment, tschuwaschisches Wörterverzeichnis.* (Bibliotheka Pápayensis, Band VII.) Debrecen.
- Ašmarin, N. I. 1898. *Materialy dlja izslédovanija čuvaškago jazyka. Čast' pervaja. Učenie o zvukax.* Kazan': Tipo-Litografija Imperatorskogo Universiteta. [Microfilm.]
- Dobrovolsky, Michael 1990. On Chuvash stress. In: Brendemoen, B. (ed.) *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the*



- Permanent International Altaistic Conference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 113-124.
- Dobrovolsky, Michael 1998. Chuvash without syllables. In: Johanson, Lars (ed.) *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference of Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 3-27.
- Fedotov, M. R. 1990. *Čuvaško-marijskie jazykovye vzaimosvjazi*. Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Universiteta. Saranskij filial.
- SRNG = Filin, F. P. (ed.) 1965. *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Hayes, Bruce 1995. *Metrical stress theory: principles and case studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jakovlev, P. J. 1987. Slovesnoe udarenie v čuvašskom jazyke. In: Pavlov, I. P., & Gorškov, A. E. & Fedotov, M. R. (eds.) *Voprosy fonetiki, grammatiki i onomastiki čuvaškogo jazyka*. Čeboksary: Naučno-issledovatel'skij Institut jazyka, literatury, i ékonomiki pri Sovete Ministrov Čuvaškoj ASSR. 48-53.
- Matthews, W. W. 1967 (1960). *Russian historical grammar*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Reynolds, Bill 1994. Trochaic feet in the morphology of a language with unbounded feet: The case for Chuvash. [MS, paper presented at the Chicago Linguistic Society, 1994.]
- Vlasto, A. P. 1986. *A linguistic history of Russia to the end of the eighteenth century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

# Soviet opinions on the history of literary Qazaq

Robert J. Ermers

Ermers, Robert J. 1998. Soviet opinions on the history of literary Qazaq. *Turkic Languages* 2, 215-232.

Seyilbek İsayev and Rābiya Sızdıqova belong to the best known specialists of the history of literary Qazaq. In the present article, the author discusses their opinions on this subject, based on two of their most recent publications in Qazaq. While giving a sketch of what is known of the history of literary Qazaq, it discusses and questions İsayev and Sızdıqova's "Soviet approach". In this respect, it brings to light a number of problems which either remain unanswered by both scholars, or for which they fail to give an argumentation that is acceptable for their Western colleagues.

Robert J. Ermers, University of Haifa, Department of Arabic Language and Literature, 31905 Mount Carmel, Haifa, Israel.

## Introduction

The present article aims at giving two of the prevalent opinions in Soviet linguistics on the history of literary Qazaq. For this we use two recent Qazaq publications, i.e. Seyilbek İsayev's *Qazaq ädebiy tiliniñ tarixi* ("A history of literary Qazaq"), 1996, on the one hand, and Rābiya Sızdıqova's *Qazaq ädebiy tiliniñ tarixi (XV-XIX ғasirlar)* ("A history of literary Qazaq (XVth-XIXth centuries)"), 1993, on the other.<sup>1</sup>

Soviet Turcologists usually divide the recent history of Qazaq into four main periods: (a) The period from the sixteenth until the eighteenth

<sup>1</sup> In Kazakstan both İsayev and Sızdıqova are considered distinguished scholars of the history of Qazaq. Their various publications on the subject include Sızdıqova (1964, 1968a, 1968b, 1970, 1979, 1981, 1984, 1989, 1991), İsayev (1970, 1973, 1976, 1983).

century; (b) the eighteenth century until the first half of the nineteenth; (c) the second half of the nineteenth century until 1917 and, finally, (d) the Soviet period after 1917. In this article we shall discuss the first three periods, and touch briefly upon the fourth, considering both authors' views on these issues.

The use of the term "Soviet Turcologists" here should perhaps be explained. After all, the Soviet Union does not exist anymore, and therefore, strictly speaking, the label "Soviet" has become an anachronism. Until recently, Soviet historians had peculiar views on the history and development of the Central Asian Turkic peoples, which drastically changed with a turn in Communist Party policy (see, for example, Tillet 1969). The same can be said of Soviet Turcologists. In their scholarly writings they had to follow certain paths indicated by Soviet authorities, which dictated certain linguistic and ethnic divisions between peoples. The scholars' approach to and concepts of the human sciences have not basically changed since the Central Asian republics gained independence. Indeed, many of the publications that appeared after 1991 are only slightly, sometimes even posthumously altered versions of earlier works. The label "Soviet", thus, is to be understood as a general indication for those whose scholarly concepts were formed during the Soviet era.

### **1.1. Accessibility of Soviet linguistics**

Several reasons can be mentioned for the lack of familiarity with books and articles published in the former Soviet Union. In the first place, few of their publications ever reached Western libraries; second, there was the language problem. Soviet publications were typically written in Russian, which many Western Turcologists have a poor command of. Thus, only the most prominent Turcological studies, dictionaries, and works by the few scholars who had them translated made it to the West. Hence hardly any Western scholar was able to gain an overview of the quality of Soviet research in Turcology. Of course, there were also many publications in local Turkic languages, but hardly any was seriously studied in the West.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, both Russian and Central Asian libraries, institutes and, last but not least, the colleagues themselves have become more accessible to foreign researchers. The language problem, however, has not been solved, mainly because many Central Asian scholars are updating their publications in their native

languages first. This holds especially for Qazaq, in which since 1991 a considerable number of publications on ancient and recent history, Islam, ethnography and linguistics have seen the light.

The history of literary Qazaq is not very well documented for obvious reasons: Although the Qazaq people possessed a rich oral literature which was being preserved and transmitted by poets (*aqıns*) and singers (*jıraws*), like most other nomadic peoples, they did not use their language as a written medium. The Qazaqs were barely literate until the middle of the nineteenth century, and Qazaq was rarely written until about fifty years later. A common Turkic language in Arabic script, mostly Chaghatay or Tatar, served as the medium of written communication for the Qazaqs until the 1920s. As of the second half of the nineteenth century, scholars in the Russian Empire (among whom a Qazaq officer in the Russian military, Šoqan Wälixanov (1835-1865), deserves special mention) who had followed the Russian settlers to Central Asia became interested in the cultures and languages of its indigenous peoples. At their initiative, the first linguistic samples of Qazaq (and Qıryız) were collected and some of the century-old epics and tales were finally put down in writing.

### 1.2. Definition of “literary language”

The points of view as to where and when the history of literary Qazaq begins very heavily depend on the respective definitions of what a “literary language” is. If one accepts only written corpora whose linguistic features can be analysed and studied, the history of literary Qazaq would begin at the end of the nineteenth century. Amanjолоv, Sawranbaiev, Qurišjanov and Balaqayev, for example, relegate the development of literary Qazaq to the time when it became a written medium at the end of the nineteenth or the beginning of the twentieth century (cf. İsayev 1996: 53; Sızdıqova 1993: 19). On the other hand, if one assumes that oral literature is equal to written literature, it is legitimate to include the period in which only an oral literature existed. In the latter case, obviously, the problem remains that the language of the undocumented periods cannot be studied, even though ancient literary themes and styles may be still be reconstructed from relatively recent material.

It is with this point that İsayev’s (1996: 6-36, 37-108) and Sızdıqova’s (1993: 5-17) argumentation starts. Both go to some pains to define the term “literary language” (*ädebiy til*) in the second sense. In their opinion, “literary language” is not identical with “written language”

(*jazba til*), for it may be based on an oral literature as well (İsayev 1996: 8-9). They contend that the spoken variety (*awizša ädebiy til*, SİZDİQOVA 1993: 14) should be considered a literary medium, too. Whether written or not, a literary language underlies certain norms and rules; it must be understood by all speakers of a given community, although dialects may exist and other languages may serve as media of written communication (İsayev 1996: 14, 25, 39). Moreover, in their opinion, the correlation between “literary language” and “written language” in Soviet linguistics was largely based on the concept of literary language within the urban Russian culture and the socio-linguistic situation of the Russian language. Since Russian had undergone a long development as a written literary medium, this correlation could easily be upheld, to the extent that literary language became almost synonymous with written language.

Thus, according to İsayev (1996: 9) we should not assume that, just because there was only a small written Qazaq literature before 1917, the language of the Qazaq epics had no literary value at all. It was not likely, İsayev writes, that a ruler like Abılay Xan, who in the eighteenth century had united the three confederations of Qazaq tribes, did not have any kind of literary language. Based on these assumptions rather than, in our opinion, real arguments, both SİZDİQOVA and İsayev posit the beginnings of modern literary Qazaq in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (SİZDİQOVA 1993: 51). In this period the tribes that were to form the Qazaq people joined under the leadership of the *xans* and, SİZDİQOVA argues, thus a common language for poetry developed. Names of epics, poets and singers begin to be transmitted from this era on. Even though it appears quite legitimate to posit the origin of literary Qazaq in the fifteenth century, sketching its linguistic development is not easy: There is virtually no original Qazaq material.

## 2. Opinions on the earliest stages of literary Qázaq

A typical feature in many Turkish and Soviet Turcological publications, especially those of scholars who themselves are of Turkic descent, is that the history of the respective modern Turkic languages is claimed to begin with the eighth-century runic inscriptions of the Orxon. Via the language of the Uygur manuscripts, that of Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī in the eleventh century, and other sources, most scholars argue, the languages in those sources have finally developed into modern Turkish, Qazaq, Uygur or Uzbek—depending on the origin of the scholar in question.

İsayev and Sızdıqova form no exception. Sızdıqova (1993: 27-64), for instance, lists four types of historical sources of literary Qazaq, which in her opinion were important for both the oral and the written Qazaq literary languages: 1. *xalıqtıñ awızeki söyleu tili* (the spoken language), the Codex Comanicus (13th century) and the *Mamlūk* grammars (14th century) (but with the exclusion of *at-Tuhfa az-zakiyya*); 2. *Qazaq awız ädebiyetiniñ tili* (the oral literary language), the Qazaq—and Nogay—epics and folktales; 3. *ortayasirliq türki yeskertkişteri* (the ancient—lit. “medieval”—Turkic manuscripts), among which *Oyuznāma* (9th century), *Qutaδyu bilig*, *Dīwān luyāt at-turk* (11th century), *Hibat al-ħaqā’iq* (12th-13th century), *at-Tuhfa az-zakiyya* (14th century), the *Muħabbatnāma* (1353); and 4. the language of the eighth-century Orxon inscriptions. In spite of her detailed listing, Sızdıqova does not convincingly describe how these sources relate to modern (literary) Qazaq.

The oldest ones are posited as documents of the various written literary languages of the respective time periods. Here İsayev and Sızdıqova apply the definition of “literary language” discussed above. In their opinion, the written languages Turkic peoples used in the past were hardly ever identical with the ones they actually spoke. In this way, both Sızdıqova and İsayev argue, the ancestors of the Qazaqs used various languages as written media: In an early period this was the language of the runic inscriptions, later that of the *Dīwān* and the other sources, while another variety—or even another language—served as a means of oral communication. The language(s) in the *Mamlūk* grammars, varieties of Qipčaq, are regarded as reflections of a previous stage of colloquial Qazaq. An exception is *Tuhfa*, whose Turkic language material is supposedly very close to Qazaq (edited by Halasi Kun 1942; discussions in Fazylov 1976 and Ermers 1995). Based on this material not only Sızdıqova and İsayev but also a large number of other authorities on Qazaq linguistics to whom they refer—i.e. Maryulan, Zubanov, Amanjolov and Musabayev (İsayev 1996: 43-46; a summary of all views on pp. 52-53; Sızdıqova 1993: 17-19)—attempt to detect traces of Qazaq in these ancient sources.

### 3.1. The 16th to 17th century, and the 18th century to the first half of the 19th century

As noted above, the main problem in the study of the ancient epics and other linguistic documents, for example tales (cf. the bibliography in Alpısbaiev 1986-1988), is that they were first recorded as recently as the

eighteenth century and that their texts were printed and published in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The ancient epics that most likely originate from the seventeenth century or earlier are those of Buqar, Aqtamberdi and Ümbetey; of a slightly later date are Köteš, Šal and Ĵanaq (İsayev 1996: 109-110; Sızdıqova 1993: 123-124; also Kümisbayev 1994). Most of the early epics cannot be precisely dated, for they were put down in several variants a long time after their conception. Even in their extant written form, these linguistic documents have not yet been sufficiently analysed. As a result, they can hardly serve as a basis for a diachronic analysis of seventeenth-century Qazaq. Sızdıqova's (1993: 123-131) and İsayev's (1996: 165-169) discussions of pre-seventeenth century Qazaq are therefore typically limited to presentations of isolated words, morphemes and suffixes, and illustrations of their respective use. They offer lengthy examples from the epics as they were recorded in the eighteenth century, without giving any bibliographical references. Both İsayev and Sızdıqova touch upon issues such as theme, form, type of rhyme and reading variants of the early epics, which indeed can be reconstructed from the material, but which would benefit literary criticism rather than linguistic analysis.

In addition to the literary works, there is the official correspondence the Qazaq *xans* maintained with one another and with foreign (Russian) rulers, in addition to a number of simple bilingual word lists. The linguistic material in many of these word lists and official documents (from 1785 until 1828), does not in practice reflect eighteenth century Qazaq (cf. İsayev 1996: 163-164; Sızdıqova 1993: 167-173). Apart from a few clear instances of registered spoken Qazaq (*qoy yeti* 'mutton', *betene qaradım* 'I looked him in the face', *duqan bayası* 'shop / market price'), here, too, we encounter much influence from the written literary languages of that time: Chaghatay and Tatar (the latter seems to İsayev unlikely in view of the distance). Examples include *bilen* 'with' for Qazaq *men*, *yerdi* 'he was' for *yedi*, and *qonaqlay bardım* 'I went on a visit' for *qonaqtap bardım*.

There are a number of historical works written by Qazaqs, such as Qadıryalı Qosımuli's seventeenth-century *Ĵamī' at-tārīx / Ĵama'a at-tawārīx* (on which Sızdıqova has published, cf. note 1 above) and the genealogical work *Šajira-i turk* (about 1640 AD), which were written down in the literary language of the time, i.e. Chaghatay (characterised as *orta asiyalıq türki edebiy til*, İsayev 1996: 108). İsayev (1996: 125-148) and Sızdıqova (1993: 114-122), like most of their colleagues,

search for traces of typical features of Qazaq in these works, but they have to admit that, apart from some forms that are typically Qipčaq, there are few convincing leads that specifically point to Qazaq.

The later period, which in İsayev's study comprises the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century, is far better documented. The reason for this lies in intensifying contacts with the Russians who at that time were colonising Central Asia. They set up markets, founded cities, built churches and established schools which also admitted non-Russian pupils (from 1822).<sup>2</sup> The first practical needs for translating word lists arose. Later on the Russians settlers and merchants were joined by scholars who had become interested in the languages and cultures of the Central Asian peoples. At the initiative of scholars such as Adelung, Divaev, Igelstrøm, Klaproth, Pantusov, Shegrin and others, tales, epics, poems, songs and other specimens of the rich oral literature were finally written down. The manuscripts were collected and transferred to archives in the Russian Empire (at first especially in St. Petersburg, later also Almatı), where many of them remain. They are reliable records of the ancient Qazaq epics as they were recited in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and provide much valuable linguistic and literary material on the Qazaq language of that era.

To mention a few grammatical features that became standardised for Qazaq during this period: The infinitive ending *-mAQ* was replaced by *-U*, the typically Qipčaq infinitive ending still current in modern Qazaq, viz., ... *bil-mek kerek-dür* 'it is necessary to know...' and *tumaqtıñ ölmeği bar* 'after birth follows death' (Şortanbay) vs. *ölgeniñşe toyu joq* 'one cannot become satisfied until one dies' (cf. Sızdıqova 1993: 202-211). Also, the ending *-Ar-GA* (AOR-DAT), e.g. *bar-ar-ya* 'in order to go', *kör-er-ge* 'in order to see', was replaced by forms with *-U*, i.e. *-U-GA*, viz., *bar-u-ya*, *kör-ü-ge* and, occasionally, *-mAK-Ka* / *-mA-GA* (INF-DAT), e.g. *al-maq-qa*, *ber-me-ge*.

### 3.2. The second half of the nineteenth century to 1917

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the birth of the poets İbrahim (Abay) Qunanbay (1845-1904), Şäkärım Qudayberdi

<sup>2</sup> It is an interesting fact that from 1783 the Russian tsarist government supported the endeavours of Qazan Tatars to spread Islam among the Qazaqs; to this end, it even sponsored the foundation of mosques and Islamic schools.



(1858-1931), the teacher / writer Ibiray Altinsarin (1841-1889), and the poet / singer Ĵambıl Ĵabay (1846-1945),<sup>3</sup> whose works were to be of definitive importance for the development of the Qazaq literary language. In view of the importance attributed to these two in Soviet studies of Qazaq, it is useful to briefly describe their position in the development of literary Qazaq.<sup>4</sup>

Through the Russian school system, Abay and his contemporaries (except Ĵambıl) had received a solid education; indeed they had become well acquainted with Russian and Western classical literature. It was not long before they started writing and publishing in Qazaq, their native language. Their generation witnessed and contributed to the transitional period in which Qazaq—and other Turkic languages—developed from, in İsayev’s and Sızdıqova’s terms, a non-written literary language into a written medium, i.e. a “written literary language”. It is this transition which marks the development of modern literary Qazaq.

Altinsarin is credited with being the first to write prose in Qazaq and to teach Qazaq based on the language spoken by the people. In some of his publications and letters Altinsarin expressed his concerns about common Qazaqs not being able to understand the written language of the press, which contained too many Arabic and Persian loanwords, and Tatar and Chaghatay forms. Especially the available religious literature was difficult to comprehend, Altinsarin argued. With this in mind, he wrote an interpretation of the *Šarī‘a* (*Šarī‘at ul-islām*, Qazan, 1884) employing as few Arabic loanwords as possible and a variety of written Qazaq that was much closer to spoken Qazaq than Chaghatay. In this

<sup>3</sup> Ĵambıl was much praised by the Soviet government, since he incorporated elements of Soviet life and its ideals in his traditional songs and poems. It is likely that this traditional folk singer was impressed by the benefits of the system and was unable to criticise it.

<sup>4</sup> Altinsarin was also convinced, no doubt inspired by his mentor, the missionary and linguist Nikolaj Imin’ski (1822-1891), that the Cyrillic script was much more suitable for Qazaq than the Arabic one. Nevertheless, for his *Šarī‘a* Altinsarin used the Arabic alphabet, for he reckoned that a book with a religious content would be unacceptable to the Qazaq readership if written in the Cyrillic script (cf. Baldauf 1993). In order to get his book published, he applied to his mentor Imin’ski for help, but the latter was not very eager to see to the publication of a religious manuscript; for this reason publication of the *Šarī‘a* was much delayed.

work Altınsarin created a number of neologisms for abstract notions (such as, reportedly, *talaptılıq* ‘initiative’, *uqıptılıq* ‘accuracy’) that replaced the Arabic and Persian words.

According to Sızdıqova, Altınsarin—like Abay—based his style on the supra-dialectal spoken language (*jalpıxalıqtıq söyleu tili*, Sızdıqova 1993: 253) which was being used by the poets and reciters. Thus Altınsarin contributed to the foundation of the national written literary Qazaq language (*ultııq jazba ädebiy tili*). Furthermore, no doubt inspired by his mentor Ilmin’skiy, he compiled a didactic grammar of Russian for Qazaq pupils in primary schools (*Naçal’noe rukovodstvo k obučeniju kirgizov russkomu jazyku*, 1879), and he also experimented with a new alphabet for Qazaq based on the Cyrillic script instead of the Arabic, which does not very well suit Turkic languages. Especially for these latter activities his works were much praised by later Soviet politicians, who liked to portray Altınsarin as a proponent of close relationships between the Qazaq and Russian peoples.

Abay’s contributions to modern Qazaq were complementary to those of Altınsarin in the sense that he developed a Qazaq vocabulary and prose style, although it seems that he, too, could not always escape Chaghatay and Tatar forms. For example, he used the verbal ending *-MIš* rather than Qazaq *-γAn*, and expressions such as *kibik* ‘like’, *ol-* ‘to be’ and *ošbu* ‘this’, for *siyaqtı*, *bol-* and *bul*, respectively (cf. Sızdıqova 1993: 230-235, Nuryaliev, Xasenov et al. 1995: 298; Abay 1993). In addition to his articles, essays and translations of Russian classics, Abay wrote a large number of highly valued poems, many of which were, and still are, used as song texts. Through his poems Abay was able to preserve the essence of Qazaq traditional poetry and carry it into the twentieth century, despite the continuing and increasing influence of Russian culture, which had had its impact on Abay himself as well. His interest in his native cultural heritage did not prevent him from seeing the benefits of studying Russian and maintaining contacts with Russians in general, as this would open the Qazaqs’ eyes to progress and innovation: *Orışsa oqu kerek, xiykmet te, mal da, öner de, yilim da — bäre orısta tur...* (“It is necessary to learn Russian; wisdom, money, art, science—the Russians have it all...” Abay 1993: 51). Notwithstanding this, he was also aware of the cultural problems a general orientation towards Russian culture could bring about, and he warned Qazaq parents not to expose their children to too much Russian influence. Due to his importance, not only as a poet, but also as an intermedi-

ate between the old and the modern cultural worlds of the Qazaqs, Abay is still regarded as a philosophical and poetical genius comparable to writers of international acclaim.<sup>5</sup>

The importance of Abay and Altınsarin for the development of Qazaq is very much stressed in all Soviet studies on the history of Qazaq. Indeed, their interest in writing in Qazaq seems to have developed against all odds. Both had received a Russian education, and both acknowledged that everything one could possibly associate with progress and development was in Russian hands. In that respect nearly all matters relating to the Qazaq culture seemed of little practical value. Nevertheless, Abay and Altınsarin clearly understood that the Qazaq people was about to lose its identity in the new circumstances, without having been able to properly define it. It is probably not exaggerated to assume that they realised that they belonged to the last generation still having direct roots in the ancient (literary) traditions, while at the same time well enough acquainted with the new media in order to be able to preserve their heritage. Some other Soviet sources (e.g. Ĵarmuxamedov 1995) assert that

<sup>5</sup> Abay's writings and his significance for Qazaq culture were brought to the attention of the general public in the 1920s and 1930s by the Qazaq writer and playwright Muxtar Äwezov (1897-1961). Äwezov, who originated from the same tribe (Tobıqtı) and geographical region (Semey-Semipalatinsk) as Abay, centred his *magnum opus*, the trilogy *Abay jolı* ('Abay's way'), around the person of the latter. The underlying aim in Äwezov's work was to picture the life of Qazaq nomadic society in the recent past as he himself had known it during his youth. With his regard for the works of Abay, Äwezov paved the way for the intensive study of Abay's works and philosophy, known as *Abaytanu* "Abay studies". Moreover, in his numerous scholarly publications Äwezov greatly contributed to the study of literary Qazaq and the historiography of the Qazaq people (see, for example, Äwezov 1995). Furthermore, he was one of the first scholars to point out the importance of the Qırız Manas epic and initiated its recording in writing. In the 1930s Äwezov was persecuted on charges of "nationalism", like many of his contemporaries but, unlike them, only briefly imprisoned. By carefully choosing the style of his works, he was able to avoid serious sanctions. In the late fifties, however, he narrowly escaped local adversaries by fleeing to Moscow on the eve of his impending arrest. After two years in Moscow, where he enjoyed high esteem as a writer and philosopher, he was rehabilitated—and even awarded the prestigious Lenin Award—after which he was able to return to Almatı.

Abay knew Altınsarin, or at least was familiar with his works, and took them as a source of inspiration.

Still, the language in the printed media, such as newspapers (e.g. *Türkistan welayatiniñ gazetisi* 1870-1883, *Dala welayatiniñ gazetisi* 1888-1902) and books which were being published in this period, remained preponderantly a “general Turkic language”. Their readership was limited to the Turkic intelligentsia in Turkistan, and most publications were printed in Tashkent, Qazan and Orenburg. Therefore—apart from occasional articles and poems in Qazaq (and even Qaraqalpaq) and other Turkic “dialects” appearing towards the end of the century—the language shows predominantly features of either Chaghatay or Tatar. In the columns of the newspapers and journals socio-political and scientific vocabularies could develop along with the appropriate styles (Sizdiqova 1993: 227-237). Only in the first two decades of the twentieth century did a number of purely Qazaq journals emerge (e.g. *Serke* 1907, *Qazaq* 1907, 1913-1914, *Qazaqstan* 1911-1913, *Ayqap* 1911-1915). Abay’s language, the history of the editions of his writings, and the journals and newspapers show features that indicate that the formalisation process had not been completed. This process received new impulses by the transitions from the Arabic script to other alphabets (see the brief discussion below).

During Abay’s and Altınsarin’s lifetimes a new generation of very gifted and productive writers, poets and playwrights was born, of whom we shall mention a few: Axmet Baytursinov (1873-1938), Mayjan Jumabayev (1893-1938), Iliyas Jansügirov (1894-1938), Säken Seifullin (1894-1938) and Muxtar Äwezov (1897-1961). This generation, in their enthusiastic contributions to the journals listed above as well as others, built upon the linguistic foundations laid by Abay and Altınsarin. Almost inevitably, many were also engaged in political activities, and a large number of them fell victim to Stalin’s rigorous and merciless repression of nationalism and its representatives during the 1930s (compare, for example, Nurpeisov 1995).

In the period following the 1917 October Revolution, the Turkic languages of Central Asia underwent important reforms. Until 1924, for all Turkic languages in Turkistan—if written at all—the unsuitable Arabic script had been in use. As pointed out above, the Arabic script usually does not indicate the vowels. When applied to Turkic languages, many spelling conventions fix the shape of words, thus creating a strong ambiguity as to their pronunciation. However, precisely because of this

ambiguity and the spelling conventions which everybody could interpret in their own way, the texts remained perfectly intelligible for the general readership among the various Turkic peoples. Arabic consonants were interpreted in various ways, as obvious in Arabic loanwords, e.g. *hāĵa* ‘need’ from which developed the Qazaq words *qajet* ‘need’— in official language use, a counterpart of the more common *kerek*—and *äjjet* ‘practical need, custom’ (with a derivative *äjjetxana* ‘toilet’). In some instances even the important distinction between front and back words was not evident from the orthography, and a number of Arabic loanwords actually developed two variants, e.g. *ġumir* ‘lifetime’ < Arabic *‘umr*, *maylum* ‘known’ < Arabic *ma‘lūm*, *qazir* ‘presently’ < Arabic *hāġir*, vs. *ömir*, *mälim*, *äzir*, respectively. (In modern Qazaq, *ömir* [öbür], *mälim* and *qazir* have become the canonised forms.)

There is some evidence that a similar case holds for genuine Qazaq words, e.g. *sin* ‘you’, *bisken* ‘ripened’ vs. *sen* and *pisken*, respectively. The readings of these words and others depended, of course, on the extended laws of vowel and consonant harmony. Some further examples are the postpositions *sekildi* ‘like’ and *ġana* ‘just, mere’, whose forms change according to the parameters of [voiced / voiceless] and [back / front], e.g. *tüye sekildi* (front) ‘like a camel’ vs. *bul siġildi* (back) ‘like this’, and *ataq qana* (voiceless-back) ‘just a reputation’ vs. *adam ġana* (voiced-back) ‘only mankind’, and *bir ġäne* (voiced-front) ‘only one’; modern Qazaq has reduced this range to *sekildi* and *ġana*, respectively. In his poems Abay creatively applied different variants of the same word for sake of rhythm or rhyme (cf. Biyzaqov 1995).

In the first decade of Soviet rule, a much debated alphabet reform was accepted and different Latin scripts were developed and accepted for Qazaq, Uzbek and Qiryiz (cf. Baldauf 1993; for Uzbek cf. Fierman 1991). Still later, in 1940, the Soviet government imposed virtually without any formal discussion adapted versions of the Cyrillic alphabet on all Turkic languages in the union.

### 3.3. The base of modern literary Qazaq: Dialect or koine

The recent history of literary Qazaq has been puzzling scholars for a long time. One of the most intriguing questions is which language or variety Abay (and his contemporaries) used for his writings in Qazaq. In the discussion among Soviet scholars two opinions are prevalent. The first is that Abay used the more or less artificial supra-tribal literary variety which poets of all Qazaq tribes had used until his time—a *koiné* in a

sense similar in its application to Classical Arabic as a literary supra-tribal language.<sup>6</sup> The second opinion is that Abay wrote in his own dialect, more specifically, the north-eastern variety of Qazaq. Thus that particular dialect became the basis of modern Qazaq. For this second hypothesis (which is supported by yet another eminent Qazaq scholar, Amanžolov) İsayev (1996: 44) presents the following two arguments: (i) The north-eastern area was closest to the more developed Russian civilisation; (ii) it was the language of the influential Qazaq writers and intellectuals Abay and İbiray Altınсарin. Accordingly, the emergence of modern literary Qazaq is posited after the second half of the nineteenth century, when Abay started writing.<sup>7</sup>

İsayev's (1996: 57) and Sizdiqova's point of departure, though, is the hypothesis of the supra-tribal variety. In their view Abay and Altınсарin (see discussion in 3.1.) used a supra-dialectal variety of Qazaq that Qazaqs of all tribes understood, in particular the one that had been used for the epics. At the same time, however, İsayev (1996: 57) recognises that there were only minor differences between the Qazaq dialects.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> After the emergence of Islam, during the Arab conquests, Classical Arabic was used as a *koine* for military communication. In regard to modern Arabic dialects, the term *koine* is also applied when speakers from different linguistic regions use features that are commonly understood.

<sup>7</sup> In a famous article on literary Qazaq, Brill Olcott (1985) argues that politically active Qazaq poets (e.g. Babatay-uli (1802-1871) and Ötemis-uli (1804-1846)) who had been educated in Tatar religious schools, wrote in Qazaq as early as the first half of the nineteenth century. Brill Olcott further argues that the Soviet authorities much exaggerated Abay's role, because he had received a Russian education, and thus matched the image of the Russified Qazaq intellectual they intended to promote. In the framework of the present article we cannot elaborate on this issue. Interestingly, although İsayev and Sizdiqova do mention the names of these poets, they do not state their importance for the history of Qazaq as a written language.

<sup>8</sup> The phonological differences between the modern Qazaq dialects are of the type [ɔɔ] ~ [ɕɔɔ] 'road', [ʃöp ~ čöp] 'grass', [bas ~ baš] 'head' and [ɜel ~ yeɪ] 'wind' (cf. Omarbekov 1992), which are either difficult to convey in Arabic script or obscured by the writing conventions. In neither of these cases can the ancient material serve as a reliable basis for far-reaching conclusions. Nor are the dialectal differences in vocabulary much help, since apart from being scarce, they can often be

Neither İsayev nor Sızdıqova sustain their premise of a supra-tribal language with further argumentation, although it conjures up the question to what extent this literary variety may have differed from the Qazaq dialects (and, for that matter, from closely related languages such as Qaraqalpaq and Nogay).

#### 4. Evaluation

Sızdıqova's and İsayev's works do not meet the expectations of their Western colleagues. For example, in works dealing with the history of literary Qazaq, a Western scholar would expect to read about the historical linguistic connections between Qazaq, on the one hand, and the closely related Qipčaq languages, on the other. Sızdıqova and İsayev, however, concentrate on Qazaq only. They even do so for stages where one could raise the question whether a Qazaq language as such already existed separately from Noghay, Qaraqalpaq and, perhaps, Qıryız and Tatar. In regard to the material in the ancient Qipčaq sources, for example, they fail to give their own opinions on the development of Qazaq from a common Qipčaq ancestor, merely repeating some isolated linguistic features, reportedly Qazaq, from studies carried out by scholars specialised in those particular branches of Turcology.

Until the second decade of the twentieth century, these and other Turkic peoples were hardly identified as separate—except, perhaps, to some minor extent by themselves—since until less than a century ago they had been governed and colonised as one single administrative area: Turkistan. It is a historical fact that the division of Central Asia into separate republics and autonomous areas as it was initiated by the Russian and Soviet authorities was largely artificial, and must to some extent have been perceived as such by the peoples themselves at the time. This artificial division was in the interest of the same authorities who had nothing to gain from an awakening unifying nationalism among the Turkic peoples of Central Asia.

A sign of the influence Soviet policy with regard to Central Asian peoples had on the development of Turkic studies in the former Soviet Union is that—at least in the major libraries in Qazaqstan—there is a disappointingly small number of publications on the related languages

accounted for as loans from neighbouring Turkic languages, such as Uzbek or Tatar.

and few comparative studies of Qazaq and neighbouring Turkic languages. At the same time, the libraries in the adjacent republics are equally poorly equipped with material on Qazaq. It appears that the scholars and research institutes in the republics were allowed and encouraged to conduct research in their own standard languages, while others more or less independently specialised in general Turcology. Except for the relatively small number of great Soviet Turcologists who are known and esteemed in the West, most Soviet scholars apparently did not pay much attention to fundamental issues, such as how the modern Turkic languages are related to one another, and which position the ancient sources occupy in their common history.

The consequences of this approach have been the development of very narrow specialisations in Soviet Turcology, and the seemingly anachronic claims of today's scholars of Turkic origin that the ancient sources reflect earlier stages of their respective languages. For İsayev and Sızdıqova this results in a picture of Qazaq as if it had evolved independently and inevitably down from the language of the runic inscriptions. They hardly, if ever, refer to structural similarities of Qazaq with Qaraqalpaq, Noghay, Bashkir, Qırız, or more remotely related Qıpchaq languages, such as Qarachay-Balkar. If properly taken into consideration, studies of that type could, no doubt, shed an interesting light on earlier stages of Qazaq and its alleged relation to the language in the ancient sources. The manifold points of resemblance of İsyev's and Sızdıqova's studies in structure, style and contents, is probably also inherent to this tradition.

Another issue is İsayev's and Sızdıqova's assumption that Abay's and Altınsarin's language was based on a supra-tribal variety of Qazaq, a poetical *koine*. Although in itself quite interesting, this assumption is not sustained by any argumentation as to how and when this *koine* came into existence, and in what sense it would differ from Qazaq dialects (i.e. despite careful reading nothing to this effect was found in either scholar's works). This is the more surprising considering their position on this issue differs from that of some other leading scholars in the field such as Amanjolov.

A minor point of criticism is that the samples of the ancient poems are, as a rule, not properly dated; thus the reader in many instances does not know from which periods the samples that are being compared to one another date, nor is there any clue as to which editions were used.



These and other differences in approach make it difficult to find one's way through Sizdiqova's and İsayev's studies.

It is certainly no coincidence that both Sizdiqova's and İsayev's works appeared after 1991, while preliminary studies were published during the late eighties, the years of *perestroika*. Until the recent past, scholarly manuscripts were subjected to strong censorship regarding apparent signs of "exaggerated nationalism" before they were released for publication. As a result, it must have been very difficult indeed to produce original research. When attempting to understand and interpret these difficulties, one cannot but feel enormous respect for the achievements of Sizdiqova, İsayev and other Soviet scholars. They have laid the foundations for the study of the history of Qazaq without having had any possibilities for inspirational exchanges of opinion with colleagues from outside. At the same time their scholarly work was severely hampered by political restrictions and prescriptions. Even if it is not possible always to agree with their methodological principles, we are grateful to İsayev and Sizdiqova for bringing to light their opinions on the history of literary Qazaq. Their studies form real stepping stones for a new generation of scholars, both in Kazakstan and abroad, who will be able to benefit from their work and freely apply new methods to the material.<sup>9</sup>

### References

- Abay (= Qunanbay, İbrahim) 1993. *Qara söz. Poemalar*. Almatı: Yel.
- Alpısbayev, T. (ed.) 1986-1988. *Qazaq xalıq ädebiyeti. Yertegiler*. Almatı: Jazuşı.
- Äwezov, Muxtar 1995. *Abay Qunanbayev. Monografiyalıq zerttewler men maqalalar*. Almatı: Sanat.
- Baldauf, Ingeborg. 1993. *Schriftreform und Schriftwechsel bei den muslimischen Rußland- und Sowjettürken (1850-1937): Ein Symptom ideengeschichtlicher und kulturpolitischer Entwicklungen*. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó.
- Biyzaqov, S. 1995. Awızeki söyleu tili. In: Nuryaliyev, Xasenov et al. 1995, 106-107.
- Brill Olcott, M. 1985. The politics of language reform in Kazakhstan. In: Kreindler, Isabelle T. (ed.) *Sociolinguistic perspectives on Soviet na-*

<sup>9</sup> The author wishes to thank Hans Nugteren and Marti Roos for proof-reading a draft version of this article.

- tional languages; their past, present and future*. Berlin, New York and Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. 183-204.
- Ermers, Robert J. 1995. *Turkic forms in Arabic structures. The description of Turkic by Arab grammarians*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands.]
- Fazylov, E. I. 1976. Zamečaniya o rukopisi i jazyke 'at-Tuḥfa'. In: Kljaštornyj, S. G. & Petrosjan, J. A. & Tenišev, Ė. R. (eds.) *Turcologica. K semidesjatiletiju akademika A. N. Kononov*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Nauka. 334-340.
- Fierman, William 1991. *Language planning and national development. The Uzbek experience*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Halasi Kun, Tibor. 1942. *La langue des Kiptchaks d'après un manuscrit arabe d'Istanbul*. Budapest: Société Körösi Csoma.
- İsayev Seyilbek 1970. XX yaşirdiñ basında yı qazaqtıñ jazba ädebiyeti men ädebiy tili turalı. In: İsanov, Q. I. (ed.) *Qazaq ädebiyeti II*. Almatı: Ministry of Education.
- İsayev, Seyilbek 1973. *Qazaq ädebi tiliniñ sovet dävirinde damyı*. Almatı: Mektep.
- İsayev, Seyilbek 1976. *Qazaq ädebiy tiliniñ qalıptasıp, damu kezñderi*. Almatı.
- İsayev, Seyilbek 1983. *Qazaqtıñ merzimdi baspasöz tiliniñ damyı*. Almatı: Kazakstan.
- İsayev, Seyilbek 1996. *Qazaq ädebiy tiliniñ tarixi*. Almatı: Ana tili.
- Ĵarmuxamedov, M. 1995. Altınsarin. In: Nuryaliyev, Xasenov et al. 1995, 83-84.
- Kümisbayev, Ö. 1994. *Tereñ tamirlar*. Almatı: Ğilim.
- Nuryaliyev, R., Xasenov, I. et al. (eds.) 1995. *Abay – Enciklopediya*. Almatı: Qazaq Enciklopediyası / Atamura.
- Nurpeisov, Keñes. 1995. *Alaš häm Alašorda* ["Alaš and Alašorda"]. Almatı: Atatek.
- Omarbekov, S. 1992. *Geografija fonetičeskix različij kazaxskoj reči*. Almatı: Rawan.
- Qosımulı, Q. *Ĵamı' at-tawārıx*. Ed. Qazan 1851.
- Sawranbaiev, N. 1982. *Qazaq til biliminiñ mäseleleri*. Almatı.
- Sinor, Denis 1969. *Inner Asia. History, civilization, languages. A syllabus*. Indiana University, Bloomington, The Hague: Mouton.
- Sızdıqova, Räbiya 1964. Tekstologiya mäseleleri turalı oylar. *Ĵıldız* 8.

- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1968a. VIII yasirdin II jartisindeyi epistolyaliq dokumentterdin tili. In: Balakaev, M. et al. (eds.) *Qazaq ädebiy tilinin tarixi*. Almati: Mektep. 28-35.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1968b *Abay jiyarmalarinin tili*. Almati: Filim
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1970. *Abay öleñderinin sintaksistik qurilisii*. Almati: Filim
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1979. Ädebiy tilinin statusi. *Qazaq SSR Filim Akademiyasinin Xabaršisi* 6, 56-7.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1980. *Sözder söyledi*. Almati.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1981. XV-XVII yasirlarda yi qazaq körkem ädebiyeti tilinin leksikasi jayinda. In: Keñesbaev, İ. Sizdiqova, R. & Qurişjanov, A. (eds.) *Qazaq ädebi tilinin qaliptasi tarixi men damy joldari*. Almati: Filim. 60-86.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1984. *XVIII-XIX yasirlarda yi qazaq ädebiy tilinin tarixi*. Almati: Mektep.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1989. *Yazyk 'Jamii at-tawariyx'*. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1991. *Qadyryali bi Qosimuli jene onin jilnamalar jinayi*. Almati: Qazaq Universiteti.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1993. *Qazaq ädebiy tilinin tarixi (XV-XIX yasirdar)*. Almati: Ana tili.
- Sizdiqova, Rabiya 1995. Awizyeki soyleu tili. In: Nuryaliyev, Xasenov et al. 1995, 106-108.
- Tillet, Lowell 1969. *The Great Friendship. Soviet historians on the non-Russian nationalities*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

# **An attempt to change the official script of Mongolia**

**Stéphane Grivelet**

Grivelet, Stéphane 1998. An attempt to change the official script of Mongolia. *Turkic Languages* 2, 233-246.

Since democratization in 1990, Mongolia has experienced an attempt to change the official script from the Cyrillic script, adopted in the 1940s, to the traditional Mongolian script, which had previously been in use. However, after four years of reform, the Cyrillic script was confirmed as Mongolia's official script. Currently, both scripts are used, resulting in concurrent digraphia. The study of the Mongolian attempt of script change and of the public debate surrounding this proposed reform could shed some light on similar processes, notably in former Soviet republics.

*Stéphane Grivelet, 33 rue Beausoleil, F-66000 Perpignan, France.*

In recent years, a number of attempts and projects aimed at script reform and script change have appeared in countries which were formerly part of the USSR, notably in the Turkic-speaking republics (Comrie 1996: 783-784). Most of these events took place after the collapse of the USSR, although some occurred a few years before, such as the reintroduction of the Latin script in Moldavia (Rogers 1990). Outside the USSR, a similar phenomenon could be observed in a former satellite country, Mongolia. Being, since 1924 a socialist country, Mongolia was closely linked to and strongly influenced by the USSR for nearly seven decades.

This influence was also reflected by Mongolian language policies, especially in the 1930-1950 period, when Latinization and Cyrillicization attempts were conducted which almost ended centuries of use of the traditional Mongolian script.

The attempt to change the official script in Mongolia from the Cyrillic to the formerly banned Mongolian script during the years immediately following the peaceful democratization of the country in 1990 is an in-

teresting example of new-found linguistic independence. Although this script reform was overturned in 1994, with Cyrillic keeping its role as the official Mongolian script, during the first years of the reform the coexistence of the Cyrillic and Mongolian scripts created a situation of concurrent digraphia (Grivelet 1994, 1995).

The study of this ongoing situation could shed some light on similar processes in former Soviet republics which are also trying to achieve script change. In this context, it seems important to examine the reform itself, in terms of legislation and implementation, and also to consider the main groups and the arguments which shaped the debate concerning the place and status of the different scripts in Mongolia.

### **Historical background**

Mongolia has known a rather chaotic history of script, during which the classical Mongolian script (also called Uighur script or Uighur-Mongolian script) has been the only one in continuous use since its introduction in the 13th century, when the Mongolian Empire was created (Pelliot 1925: 288-289). A close relationship exists between the political situation in Mongolia and the development and disappearance of writing systems. The creation of a new regime could lead to the implementation of a new form of script. For example, the 'Phags-pa script (or square script) was introduced in 1269, during the reign of the emperor Qubilai, as the writing system for the new Yuan dynasty, but it did not survive the fall of this dynasty in the second half of the 14th century.

In the 20th century, the time of Mongolian autonomy and, later, independence, the script situation was also somewhat complex. Even if the statistics presented by the socialist regime probably did underestimate the literacy level in order to make the achievements of its alphabetization policy appear greater, it should be assumed that literacy in the Mongolian script was quite low in the first decades of the 20th century.

Another script, the Tibetan one, which was taught in the numerous Mongolian Buddhist monasteries, was also used by monks individually for writing Mongolian (Grønbech 1953, Bawden 1960).

In the 1930s, in a move similar to the linguistic policies enforced in the USSR, the Mongolian People's Republic began a Latinization campaign which lasted for a few years (particularly 1930-1932) but achieved little result. However some sections of newspapers were published in Latin script, and this script appeared on stamps, book covers, etc. This script reform attempt was ended by the "New Turn Policy", which op-

posed the previous initiatives as being a leftist deviation (Bawden 1989<sup>2</sup>: 344). A second Latinization attempt, in 1940-1941, was also short-lived.

Furthermore, at that time in the USSR, the policy of Cyrillicization of minority languages was already in full swing. In 1941, the decision to change from the Mongolian to the Cyrillic script was made in Mongolia, though it was implemented with some delay. The earlier stage of this reform witnessed some confusion brought on by proposals of different versions of the new orthography (Damdinsüren 1942, 1946). From 1946 onwards, the Cyrillic script became the official script in Mongolia. At the same time, the relationship with the USSR was fostered. The new script itself was often called “Russified script” (*orosjin bičig*), and it tried to stay close to the form of Cyrillic script used for Russian. The new Mongolian alphabet, for example, used all the signs found in Russian Cyrillic, even if that resulted in inconsistencies for Mongolian orthography.

After this script change, general literacy in the Cyrillic script was achieved in Mongolia within a relatively short time span. The Mongolian script itself did not totally disappear, but its presence in Mongolia was extremely limited: It was not taught in schools but was retained in the philological department of the university. A few other uses remained: Older people still used this script, one reason being that it is faster to write than Cyrillic and is thus particularly useful for personal notes. The Mongolian script was also used for decorative purposes, e.g. on book covers. One could find self-teaching manuals on the script in Mongolia, published in Ulaanbaatar in rather large numbers by Mongolian standards. The Mongolian script was also kept in use among the Mongols living in Inner Mongolia, an autonomous region in China.

In the 1980s, during the last years of the socialist regime and at a time of political changes very similar to those taking place in the USSR, the Mongolian script underwent a sort of revival. It was reintroduced, from 1986 onwards, in secondary schools as a compulsory course in the 7th and 8th grades. Teaching materials for pupils and teachers were published in 1986 and 1987. In the academic year 1989-1990 an experiment was also conducted in one school in Ulaanbaatar with a first-grade class which was taught exclusively in the Mongolian script.

### **Democratization, and the choice of the Mongolian script as the future official script**

During 1989-1990 winter, peaceful demonstrations in Ulaanbaatar created a change toward a more democratic regime in Mongolia. A return to traditional Mongolian values was one of the demonstrators' demands, and the Mongolian script was stressed as a symbol of Mongolian identity.

In 1990, after the demonstrations and with beginning democratization, demands for a comprehensive reintroduction of the Mongolian script, and for a change of official script were cemented by legislative efforts.

Although various decrees supported official script change and were intended to prepare the country for it, the Mongolian script was never granted the status of official script. Foreign analyses have often missed this point. For example, observers such as Kin Bing Wu state that "the classical Mongolian script has been reintroduced as the national script to replace the Cyrillic script adopted from Russian" (Kin Bing Wu 1994: 3).

During the months after the demonstrations, the first step of the reform was largely to promote a reintroduction of the Mongolian script, thus paving the way for script change, as apparent in decree no. 285, passed on 1 June 1990.

This decision concerning the general teaching of the Mongolian script, gave some guidelines for the 1990-1995 period. It was aimed at three main areas: The school system, adult education, and the creation of modern resources for the printing of materials in the classical script. These steps were intended to prepare for script change in official documents and, according to the text of the decision, to "restore the national cultural heritage". Thus a renewal of the teaching of Mongolian script was targeted at all school levels for the 1990-1995 period. The decree called for the training of school teachers in the Mongolian script, and for the production of textbooks and dictionaries.

At the level of adult education, courses were to be set up by the ministries, state organizations, municipalities and firms for employees at their workplaces. Also, basic and higher educational institutions were authorized to conduct courses at the request of organizations and individuals.

Finally, the creation in 1991-1992 of a foundation for the acquisition of computers and printing materials was intended to introduce new technologies for publishing in the Mongolian script.

On 30 May 1991, one year after decree no. 285, the upper house of parliament, the *Baga Xural* (which disappeared after the new constitution of 1992), passed decree no. 36 aimed at preparing to change official documents from the Cyrillic to the Mongolian script. In a very short text (one sentence, with a one-sentence preamble) the *Baga Xural* asked the government to provide for adequate preparation to facilitate this change, which was to take place throughout Mongolia in 1994. The preface of this decree states that the Mongolian script expresses the cultural and moral traditions of the Mongols and that it is a precious Mongolian contribution to human heritage.

This decision (the only one taken by the parliament until decree no. 66 of 8 July 1994) was completed by governmental decree no. 186 of 21 June 1991, which presented the concrete steps for the implementation of decree no. 36. It reinforced the aim to achieve full Mongolian script literacy among the Mongolian population during the 1991-1993 period. It placed responsibility for this campaign mainly with the Ministry of Education, which was to reintroduce the script in schools and create the appropriate manuals. Local institutions such as municipalities and *aimag* 'regions' were asked to take measures to involve the general public in the alphabetization process. The press also were to support the reform by publishing information about it and by using the Mongolian script itself in certain newspaper sections.

The main goals of decrees no. 285 and 36 were the extension of instruction and the preparation for use as official script. However it is interesting to note that from an individual point of view double proficiency, i.e. literacy in both scripts was sought (*xos bičigten*).

Mongolian script was first reintroduced in the educational system. During the 1990-1991 academic year, 300 schools introduced the classical script in the first grade. In 1991-1992, the Mongolian alphabet was used as the teaching script for all first graders. Courses in the script were also started for older pupils.

Evening classes for adults were created as well, but do not seem to have had much success. Although participation in these classes was substantial, the participants often did not achieve a good command of the Mongolian script. A Ministry of Education official reported that 50% to 60% of 16-49 year-olds were involved in the study of the Mongolian



script, “yet the quality leaves much to be desired. According to the rough data, 22% of the adult population have basic elementary reading skills, and 30% quite moderate reading skills” (Batmagnai 1993: 25).

In 1994, the year the official script of Mongolia was scheduled to change, preparations did not seem to have been successful. The Mongolian script had been reintroduced into the school system and was being studied in the primary grades, but heavy criticism was voiced regarding the pupils’ lack of proficiency. Among adults, full literacy in the Mongolian script—the goal of legislative acts taken since 1990—had obviously not been attained. In an opinion poll conducted in May 1994, 6.5% surveyed said that they could read and write the Mongolian script fluently and 16.57% that they could read it fluently and write it fairly well. 30.57% could not write it but were able to read it a little, 21.37% could only sound it out with difficulty, and 23.93% could neither read nor write the Mongolian script (*Ardyn erx* “People’s Right”, 13 May 1994).

The main failure of the reform was probably the absence of the Mongolian script in everyday life, even after the efforts of those few years. The script was still confined to symbolic and ornamental uses. It could be found on door plates, one side of banknotes and on stamps. It did appear in the streets in a more spontaneous manner—however only in the graffiti made by school children.

All major newspapers were still published in the Cyrillic script. They did not heed government decree no. 286 of 1991 calling for the use of the Mongolian script in a section of every newspaper: None of them had begun to employ the Mongolian script, except once again for ornamental purposes such as the newspaper’s title, which might be written in both scripts; or company names in advertisements. The only publications in Mongolian script were either magazines devoted to the promotion of the script, mainly informing on the state of the reform, and even these were sometimes published in both scripts, e.g. *Mongol bičig soyol* “Mongolian script and culture”; or magazines for children (e.g. *Dino*, *Unaga* ‘colt’). In bookstores, teaching materials were nearly the only books in Mongolian script to be found.

The general mood toward the reform also seemed to have changed between 1990 and 1994. After years of economic hardship, the prospective efforts and costs associated with a change of writing system had diminished the reform’s appeal. Thus the process seemed stalled the very year when the official script change was to be implemented.

Notwithstanding the mixed results of the first years of the script reform, the government passed a new decree (no. 64, 16 March 1994), which sought to intensify the preparatory work necessary for the transition to the Mongolian alphabet as the script of official affairs. In one of this decree's seven points, the various ministries and state organizations were asked to take appropriate steps to ensure that employees at every level were trained in the Mongolian script before the end of 1994, in such a way that they would be able to conduct official business in that script by 1995. The decree also required all Mongols between 16 and 49 years old to be taught to read and write in the script by 1995-1996 at the latest.

The Ministry of Justice was in charge of drafting and publishing standard forms and documents in the Mongolian script by the end of 1994. In the school system, this script would have to be used as the teaching medium from first to fourth grade, and afterwards for the humanities, while the Cyrillic script was to be used in science classes from grade five through ten.

This decision stoked the debate around script change, which was very intense and emotional and raged on until the main legislative debate and decision in the Mongolian parliament, scheduled for the summer of 1994. The parliamentary debate was heated as well. The absence of satisfactory results from the preparatory stage was put forward, and the government proposed to postpone the reform until 2001. The parliamentary commission in charge of education, science and culture, on the other hand, supported a decree project aimed at resuming teaching in the Cyrillic script and confirming it as the official script of Mongolia. The decree project was adopted by the parliament on 8 July 1996.

It was thus decided by parliament, in decree no. 66, that official affairs should still be conducted in the Cyrillic script (called the Cyrillic-Mongolian script in the decree) and that this script was to be taught in schools from 1994-1995 onward. On the other hand, the government remained in charge of developing a national program to promote basic instruction and use of the Uighur-Mongolian script by continuing the work of the previous three years. Furthermore Mongolian script was to be one of the principal subjects taught in school. This decision constituted a complete change of direction in Mongolian language policy since the Mongolian script now came to be considered a secondary script.

Still, efforts to reintroduce the classical script were not abandoned. A new policy was cemented in 1995 with the vote in parliament for a na-

tional program for the Mongolian script (decree no. 43) and a governmental decree (no. 223 of December 1995) which laid out the corresponding guidelines. This decree did not aim to change the official script, but rather to promote the use of the Mongolian script in newspapers and other publications. It also called for teaching it in schools, however as a separate subject and not as the main script of instruction. Moreover, in the last article of the decree, the government clearly specified that this new decree superseded the decrees made in the 1990-1994 period, thus confirming the abandonment of the project to change the official script.

The election in June 1996 of a new majority in the Mongolian parliament and the creation of a new Mongolian government made up of the Social Democratic and National Democratic parties will only reinforce this tendency, as both coalition partners are largely opposed to a script change.

### **The debate over official script change**

The reintroduction of the Mongolian script and the drive to have it recognized as the official state script aroused different opinions and created a heated debate in Mongolia which, in 1997, is far from being concluded.

It was quite usual for foreign analysts to place supporters and opponents of the reform along broader political lines, with the democrats allegedly more inclined towards the change, and the former socialists, with more conservative views, favoring the Cyrillic script. This sketchy view does not do justice to Mongolian reality, where we may observe that the government in place until 1996—still headed then by the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, which won the first free elections—actually promoted the Mongolian script through official decrees, whilst the opposition parties, such as the Social Democrats or the National Democrats, showed much less enthusiasm for this reform.

Within the script reform debate itself, we can distinguish between the general opinions of the Mongolian population, which can be discerned through various opinion polls, and specific currents of opinion, represented by organized groups and associations lobbying for one type of script.

Some opinion polls addressed the issue of official script. One of these studies, presented in May 1994 by the studies center of the Mongolian parliament, showed that 11.25% of the sample supported the

Mongolian script as state script, while 87.32% were in favor of the Cyrillic script (*Ardyn erx*, 13 May 1994). On a much smaller scale, our own inquiry in 1994 based on a sample of one hundred students at the Mongolian State University showed that 67% of the students supported the use of Cyrillic as the official script, 23% were in favor of the Mongolian script, and 10% had other opinions (either the use of both scripts or changing to the Latin alphabet). Another sociological study, carried out in June 1994 by the Mongolian Academy of Science with the support of the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, recorded divergent opinions with 6.1% favoring a change the Mongolian script, 19.6% opposing such a change, and 71.7% supporting the use of both writing systems as official scripts.

A large part of the script debate was conducted by a few individuals and associations supporting a specific script and expressed mainly in newspaper articles. These groups may be divided into four main movements: The promoters of the Latin script, the Cyrillic script, the Mongolian script, and of two scripts.

The smallest group by far favored a change from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet. Created in February 1993, the Latin Alphabet Society had gained a membership of around thirty by 1994. This association succeeded in publishing a few pages of Mongolian written in Latin script in the newspaper *Ulaanbaatar*, through the help of one of its members, a journalist working for that newspaper (*Ulaanbaatar*, 12 March 1994). The orthography of these pages was inspired by Cyrillic orthography and was quite different from the Latin type used in the 1930s. The supporters of the Latin script rejected the choice of Mongolian script as being a return to the past. The Cyrillic script was also criticized, not only for its orthographic shortcomings, but also for its connection with the socialist era. As one of the association's leading members, Mönxbayar, has stressed: "... no one can deny that Cyrillic is an alphabet which was introduced in Mongolia in haste under the pressure of Stalin's supporters" (*Mongol Messenger*, 18 January 1994: 3). Nevertheless, as a transition to Latin script appears impossible, its advocates provisionally lend their support mainly to the Cyrillic alphabet, which is seen to be more modern than the Mongolian script.

The supporters of the Cyrillic script, numerous in Mongolian society, were not particularly organized, so that much opposition to the script reform was made on an individual basis. An association named *Šine bičig* "New Script" was created on 25 March 1994, the anniversary of

the adoption of the Cyrillic script in 1941. Its inception followed the new governmental decree at the beginning of March 1994, which tried to give fresh impetus to the script reform. Between March and July 1994, the supporters of the Cyrillic script published numerous articles against the reform, especially in the leading Mongolian newspaper, *Ardyn erx*. Their position was based on the following points: The main argument against the Mongolian script was related to its introduction as the teaching medium in schools. The promoters of the Cyrillic script contended that the proficiency of first grade students in reading and writing was much lower after the introduction of the Mongolian script than it had been when Cyrillic was the script of instruction. Also it was said that these school children were cut off from the rest of society, where the Cyrillic script was still in use. Furthermore they had limited access to books, magazines, etc.

In addition to the above, a historical argument was put forward, emphasizing the great progress made in raising the general level of literacy in Mongolia after the introduction of the Cyrillic script. The importance of the Cyrillic script in contemporary history and culture was also stressed, as this script had been in use for nearly half a century and the efforts to transcribe the material written since 1950 would be enormous. The script reform was further criticized for lack of feasibility. The situation of post-socialist Mongolia, especially the economic situation, was not considered robust enough for such an important change. It was also argued that a change from the Cyrillic to the Mongolian script would transform a fully literate population into a largely illiterate one.

Finally, the Mongolian script was opposed for reasons of modernity. Its orthography was said to represent a former state of Mongolian, different from the contemporary language, and thus not suited to everyday demands of a modern country. It was also stressed that international contact, especially with Western countries and with Japan, could be impaired by the use of the Mongolian script instead of the more internationally known Cyrillic.

The proponents of the Mongolian script were the most active and well organized. A few associations existed, some connected to private institutions of higher education devoted mainly to the teaching of the script. They played an active part in lobbying for the Mongolian script as the official script, and for the diffusion of the script, occasionally publishing magazines and manuals on this subject.

The Mongolian Script Association (*mongol bičig xoršoolol*) was created in 1989, before democratization. Its first members were mostly older people with a good knowledge of Mongolian script. The main aim of this association was to extend the teaching of the script, especially by organizing classes for adults. The association subsequently grew, with the creation of an institute of higher education and an adult school mainly geared towards secretaries. The institute offered a curriculum including foreign language courses and classes on the Mongolian script. After intensive preparation, students were supposed to use the script, and have lessons about its orthography, history, etc.

The Association for the Mongolian Script (*mongol bičig tölöö*), founded in January 1994, was a more recent creation, and its aims were more political. Its creation provided the opportunity for organizing a large meeting at the government palace in Ulaanbaatar with hundreds of participants, including the prime minister, several members of government and various political leaders, among them the last head of state of the socialist era, Mr. Batmönx.

The Academy of the Language and Civilization of the Mongolian Nationality, created in 1993 by the Mongolian linguist Luwsanjaw, does not really qualify as an association for promoting the Mongolian script, but still has some features in common with those mentioned above. The academy offered a mixed curriculum with foreign language classes and courses on the Mongolian script and traditional Mongolian culture. Here, too, after a semester of intensive Mongolian script instruction, the students were supposed to be able to use the classical script. The academy also participated in the publishing of a magazine called *Mongol bičig soyol* ("Mongolian Script and Culture"), which was devoted to the Mongolian script. On a more general level, the academy lobbied members of parliament through activities such as presenting modern teaching methods and printing materials related to the classical script.

The supporters of the Mongolian script shared a number of arguments, the main one being cultural and historical. The Mongolian script was considered an essential legacy of the Mongolian past, being at once a symbol of traditional Mongolian culture and a means of access to it (through the texts written in the classical script). The script was seen as one of the main features of traditional Mongolian society. Another aspect of this argument was the criticism of the Cyrillic script, which was seen as a foreign import and a symbol of Mongolia's socialist past.

A conceivable pan-Mongolist argument was surprisingly rare in Mongolia. Only a few people underlined that one of the greatest advantages of the script was that it would enable communication between all groups of Mongolian-speaking people, even if the spoken dialects differed somewhat. The possible expansion of relations with the Chinese region of Inner Mongolia, where the Mongolian script is still in use, was hardly emphasized.

Also rarely voiced, the argument of usability was mainly based on the fact that the Mongolian script is faster to write than its Cyrillic counterpart. According to some of its supporters, its orthography is also more adapted to writing Mongolian.

Supporters of the Mongolian script also developed what could be called a legal argument. Considering the different decrees related to the reintroduction of the Mongolian script, they asked the government to take measures for the application of these decrees, trying to place the debate not so much at the level of choice but rather around the question of when this change should occur.

A fourth tendency favored the option of simultaneously having the Mongolian and the Cyrillic script. This proposal was not supported by any organized group, but by individual proponents, especially politicians. The former candidate of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Mr. Tüdeu, was an advocate of this idea, saying that it would be good for the Mongols to have "two horses" (*Ardyn erx*, 7 June 1994). The Mongolian President, Mr. Očirbat, also declared that he supported the idea of utilizing the two scripts concurrently. There were no specific arguments reserved to this position, but more a combination of many different arguments linked to other groups. For example, the Mongolian president, in a letter to parliament before the July 1994 script debate, stated that there was no doubt that the Mongolian people should learn and use the Mongolian script, since it was the cultural legacy of the Mongols. However, he also contended that the Cyrillic script should not be discarded, because it too formed a part of Mongolian culture and, furthermore, represented the script of a generation (*Ardyn erx*, 29 June 1994). This position mostly tended to maintain the established use of scripts in Mongolia.

### **Conclusions**

In the Mongolian case, it is possible to observe some of the difficulties and contradictions that can appear in the attempts to reverse the script

reforms made from the 1920s to the 1940s. The move to reinstate the Mongolian script as the official script of Mongolia may have garnered some support during the immediate aftermath of the democratization process, but soon faced opposition. The main shortcomings of the reform were related to its problematic diffusion among an adult population already fully literate in the Cyrillic script.

At the time of the scheduled official script change, a contradiction existed between the desire to revive the Mongolian script and the wish expressed by most Mongols to retain the Cyrillic script as the official script. Although the reintroduction of the Mongolian script and its instruction in schools were desired by most Mongols, who acknowledged its cultural importance, the central question regarding the status of each script remained an unresolved issue. The new policy elaborated in 1994 endorsed the rare situation of concurrent digraphia created by the first years of the reform; the Cyrillic script continued to be used extensively, and the Mongolian script was reintroduced without managing to penetrate everyday life, being used essentially for symbolic purposes.

The future of this concurrent digraphia is unclear. One might wonder whether the current situation is just a stage of a long-term script reform in Mongolia—which may eventually see the disappearance of one of the scripts—or whether the two scripts currently in use will continue to co-exist, each having its own functional areas.

### References

- Batmagnai, S. 1993. Present state of teaching Mongol script and future directions for developing teaching materials and reference books. In: Dorj, P. & Ganbaatar, D. & Uranchimeg, S. (eds.) *National workshop on the preparation of the literacy follow-up materials in Mongolia*. Tokyo: Asian Cultural Centre for UNESCO. 24-27.
- Bawden, Charles 1960. Mongolian in Tibetan script. *Studia Orientalia* 25: 3.
- Bawden, Charles. 1989<sup>2</sup> [1968]. *The modern history of Mongolia*. London: Keagan Paul International.
- Comrie, Bernard 1996. Script reform in and after the Soviet Union. In: Daniels, Peter T. & Bright, William (eds.) *The world's writing systems*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 781-784.
- Damdinsüren, C. 1942. *Mongol šine üsgüig dürem*. Ulaanbaatar.
- Damdinsüren, C. 1946. *Mongol šine üsgüig towg dürem*. Ulaanbaatar.



- Grivelet, Stéphane 1994. L'émergence d'une digraphie concurrente en Mongolie. *LINX* 31, 111-121.
- Grivelet, Stéphane 1995. Reintroducing the Uighur-Mongolian script in Mongolia today. *Mongolian studies* 18, 49-60.
- Grønbech, Kaare 1953. Mongolian in Tibetan script. *Studia Orientalia* 19: 6.
- Kin Bing Wu. 1994. *Mongolia: Financing education during economic transition*. (East Asia & Pacific region series, World Bank discussion papers 226.) Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1925. Les systèmes d'écritures en usage chez les anciens mongols. *Asia Major* 2, 284-289.
- Rogers, Kenneth H. 1990. The relatinization of Moldavian: Linguistic nationalism in the Moldavian SSR. *Geolinguistics* 16, 57-65.

#### **Newspaper articles**

- Ardyn erx* ["People's Right"], 13 May 1994 [93 (792)]: 87, 32 xuw'n šine üsgiig demjje.
- Ardyn erx* ["People's Right"], 7 June 1994 [110 (809)]: Tengeriin dor törj, gajrin dor šingedeg. [By L. Tüdeu.]
- Ardyn erx* ["People's Right"], 29 June 1994 [126 (825)]: Mongol ulsin ix xurald.
- Mongol Messenger*, 18 January 1994 [3 (133)]: Classical Mongolian Language—Pros and Cons.
- Ulaanbaatar*, 12 March 1994 [47 (506)]: Mongolemys elegans. [Supplement in Latin script.]

# **Al-Birūnī's version of an old Turkic genealogical legend. On the semantics of Turkic "baraq"**

**Sergej G. Kljaštornyj**

Kljaštornyj, Sergej G. 1998. Al-Birūnī's version of an old Turkic genealogical legend. On the semantics of Turkic "baraq". *Turkic Languages* 2, 247-252.

In "India" and "Mineralogy", two works by al-Birūnī, Choresmian scholar (11th century), there are fragments of an Old Turkic genealogical legend. Both fragments have been adopted into the history of the Kabul-Shahs' dynasty and show their Turkic origin. More importantly, correlations between al-Birūnī's fragments and the Chinese fixation of an Old Turkic genealogical legend (7th century) may be identified. In al-Birūnī's text, the relation between the "origin of the cave", the "wolf" genealogy and the king's right to power in Turkic mythology is expressed.

*Sergej G. Kljaštornyj, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Oriental Studies, 18, Dvorcovaja nab., 191065 St.-Petersburg, Russia.*

Old Turkic genealogical legends are related to those few folklore-ethnological relics that can be traced back to the time when a Proto-Turkic ethnic community was being formed. Two such legends recounting the derivation of Ashina—the ruling clan of the Turkic empire (6th-8th centuries)—were written down earlier than others. In the middle of the 6th century, both legends were briefly fixed by Chinese historiographers from the sayings of the Turks themselves. As our analysis has proved, they are two variants of the same narration (see Kljaštornyj 1965, cf. Sinor 1982: 223-257). According to the main story, the ancestors of Ashina were exterminated by their enemies. Only a ten-year-old boy with severed arms and legs remained alive. He was saved from death by a she-wolf which later became his wife. The young man was finally killed by his enemies while the she-wolf hid from their pursuers in a mountain cave situated to the north of the Turfan oasis (Eastern Tien-

Shan). There she gave birth to ten sons who on growing up married Turfan girls and created kins of their own. The most dexterous one of the she-wolf's sons named Ashina became the chief of the new tribe.<sup>1</sup> His descendants led the tribe out of the cave and resettled in the Altay region.

The cult of the ancestors' cave existed in the ancient Turkic state along with the cult of the qaghan kin (see Pelliot 1929). Special honour was paid to the wolf, expressed in various (mostly military) symbols (see Esin 1972). Remnants of the wolf cult have been repeatedly fixed among Turkic peoples, though zoolatric motives prevailing in them do not allow connecting them with the genetic myth (see Potapov 1958: 135-142).

The first iconographical proof that links the legendary genealogy of the Turkic qaghans with the parent mother-she-wolf and parent father-man is a recently discovered ancient Turkic historical monument. It is the Soghdian-language Bugut stele (dated A.D. 582), at the top of which a boy with stumped arms and legs is depicted at the moment a she-wolf is saving him (see Kljaštornyj & Livšic 1972). No verbal reflections of the legend have remained in this written monument.

Another possibility for cross-checking the Chinese version of this ancient Turkic legend is found in al-Birūnī's report on the Turkic origin of the Kabul royal dynasty. The ethnicity of the early medieval dynasties from Tokharistan, Kâpisa, Zabulistan and adjacent regions still remains a topic of debate. The supreme suzerainty of the Western Turkic qaghans was established here during the reign of Ton-yabghuqaghan (A.D. 612?-630) who passed the power over the newly conquered land to his son Tardu-shad whose headquarters were in Qunduz (see Chavannes 1903: 52, 130, 196). Nonetheless, according to Josef Marquart's opinion presently supported by Robert Göbl, the local Yueh-chi (Kushans) and Hephtalite (in Robert Göbl's terminology "Hunno-Iranian") dynasties managed to preserve power in their former possessions (Marquart 1901: 291 and Göbl 1967: 7-8, 256-258). However, alongside this, the titles of these rulers and their favorites had undergone noteworthy changes: By the 8th century one finds among them *tegins*, *eltebers*, *tarhans*, *shads* and *tuduns*. Göbl, arguing against Roman Ghirshman, who had supposed the emergence of Turkic dynasties in

<sup>1</sup> On the etymologies of Ashina see Kljaštornyj (1994: 445-447)

Tokharistan and Kâpisa, suggests that the usage of Turkic titles itself gives evidence not of the change of dynasties, but of a certain tribute to the fashion that appeared under the influence of the supreme Turkic suzerains (see Göbl 1967: 256-258). However, the question is not all that easy. First of all, the ethnic structure of the local population obviously changed—the Turks had become its visible part not only in Tokharistan, where mostly Qarluqs had settled, but in Zabulistan as well (see Chavannes 1903: 160-161). The dynasty of the Tokharistan yabghu from the Ashina family succeeded that of Tardu-shad (see Chavannes 1904: 20). It had been preserving Turkic names and titles for at least two centuries, combining them with the titles of the former rulers. Thus, the yabghu of Tokharistan Qutluḡ (A.D. 728) was at the same time named “king of the Hephtalites” (Chavannes 1904: 49). In this very period the king of Kâpisa was named “tegin-shad” (Chavannes 1904: 59), which seems to reflect his family relations with the Turkic dynasty (only people from the royal family could have borne the title “tegin”). Kâpisa was the region located to the extreme south of the Western Turkic empire, and Hsüan Tsang, who had visited it in A.D. 630 and 644 calls it “boundary” and mentions together with this that ten smaller principalities were subordinate to it (Chavannes 1903: 197). Kabul obviously was also included in that number, as it was Kabul and Zabulistan which Ibn Khurdadbih called the border regions of “great” Tokharistan (see Barthold 1934: 874 and Stein 1973: 13-20).

Let us now look at what al-Birūnī says:

“The Indians had in Kabul kings from the Turks who were said to derive from Tibet. The first of them was Barahtakin. He entered a cave in Kabul which no one could enter other than by moving sideways or crawling. There was some water in there and he left some food there for several days. This cave is still known, it is called Var. Those people who consider it a good omen, visit it and take water from it, which is very difficult to do. Crowds of peasants were working by the entrance to the cave... Several days after Barahtakin had entered it, someone suddenly came out of it, and the people all together could see that he emerged as though being born from his mother's belly. He was wearing Turkic garments consisting of a qaba', high headgear, boots and weapons. People paid honours to him as to a miraculous creature designated for kingdom. He ascended the throne there and his title was Shah of Kabul. The kingdom remained with his sons for generations, the number of which is about sixty.” (Sachau 1887: 257)

A shorter variant of the same legend is found in al-Birūnī's "Mineralogy":

"The inhabitants of Kabul in the days when they were illiterate [i.e. before their conversion to Islam, S. K.] believed that Barahtakin, the first of the Turkic kings, had been created in a local cave which is nowadays called Bughra and had come out of it wearing a [king's] headgear (kalansuva)." (Belenitskij 1963:27)

Correlations between the ancient Turkic genealogical story and the legend mentioned by al-Birūnī are sufficiently evident. However, only al-Birūnī's version clearly shows the connection of the "cave" birth with the right to royal power, which is not so obviously reflected in the Chinese fixation of the legend. Jean-Paul Roux (1966: 284-287) relates this motif to the ancient cult of the cave-mother who bears the ancestor-beast (the heavenly beast). However, the beast motif seems to be missing in al-Birūnī's text. In this regard the name of the hero of this legend attracts our attention. It is "(...) Barahtakin" and obviously corresponds to the Turkic Barah-tegin.

Eduard Sachau in his edition of al-Birūnī's "India" reads *barahtakîn* as he seems not to have known that this name is also mentioned in al-Birūnī's "Mineralogy". Nevertheless, his explanation of the second part of this name as the Turkic title "takîn" (Sachau 1887: 360-361) is correct. Belenitskij, the translator and commentator of "Mineralogy", identifies both these forms of the word and suggests the correct reading of the form fixed in "India". However, he also says that "the exact meaning of this word has not been established" (Belenickij 1963: 421). The word *barah / baraq* has an unequivocal meaning in Turkic languages: 'shaggy dog', 'shaggy', 'dishevelled' (Dankoff & Kelly 1982: 190, Clauson 1972: 360 and Doerfer 1965: 728). The alternation "wolf / dog" is frequently recorded in genealogical stories of Turkic and Mongolian peoples (see Roux 1966: 329-335), but in this case the synonymic denomination of the wolf as 'shaggy' can not be excluded, since taboo names of ancestors are usual in Turkic onomastics (see Potapov 1958: 142). The connection between beast-ancestor and "cave" birth, which by al-Birūnī's time had already been comprehended and anthropomorphized, is still rather clearly apparent in this story. Thus, in early medieval Kabulistan there still remained some reminiscences of the ancient Turkic qaghan cult of the ancestor's cave inseparable from the genealogical

dynastic (and respectively kin) cult of beast-foreparent. On the other hand, a later fixation of the archaic Central Asian story by al-Birūnī bears witness (more evidently than the ancient Chinese narrations) to the social reorientation of the kin-family mythology, which had absorbed the idea of sacral legitimization of royal power (i.e. the power of military leaders of a family) at the time when a state was beginning to form.

### References

- Barthold, W. 1934. Tokharistan. In: Houtsma, M. T. & Wensinck, A. & Heffening, W. & Gibb, H. A. R. & Lévi-Provençal, E. (eds). *Enzyklopädie des Islam* IV. Leiden, Leipzig: Brill, Harrassowitz. 874.
- Belenickij, A. M. (transl.) 1963. *Abu-r-Rejxan al-Birūnī. Sobranie svedenij dlja poznanija dragocennostej. Mineralogija*. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
- Chavannes, E. 1903. *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*. St-Petersbourg: L'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Chavannes, E. 1904. Notes additionnelles sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux. *T'oung pao. Archives pour servir à l'étude de l'histoire, des langues, de la géographie et de l'ethnographie de l'Asie Orientale* 5. Leiden: Brill.
- Clauson, Sir G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dankoff, R. & Kelly, J. (eds.) 1982. *Mahmūd al-Kašyarī. Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)* I. (Sources of oriental languages and literatures 7.) Harvard: Harvard University Printing Office.
- Doerfer, G. 1965. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Esin, E. 1972. *Tös and Moncuk*. Notes on Turkish flag-pole finials. *Central Asiatic Journal* 16/1, 17-31.
- Göbl, R. 1967. *Dokumente zur Geschichte der iranischen Hunnen in Baktrien und Indien* 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kljaštornyj, S. G. 1965. Problemy rannej istorii plemeni tjurk (Ašina). In: *Novoe v sovetskoj arxeologii. Pamjati S. V. Kiseleva*. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR. 278-281.
- Kljaštornyj, S. G. 1994. The royal clan of the Turks and the problem of early Turkic-Iranian contacts. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 47/3, 445-447.

- Kljaštornyj, S. G. & Livšic, V. A. 1972. The Sogdian inscription of Bugut revised. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 26/1, 69-102.
- Marquart, J. 1901. *Eranšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i*. Berlin: Kästner.
- Pelliot, P. 1929. Neut notes sur des questions d'Asie Centrale. *T'oung pao. Archives pour servir à l'étude de l'histoire, des langues, de la géographie et de l'ethnographie de l'Asie Orientale* 26. Leiden: Brill. 213-214.
- Potapov, L. P. 1958. Volk v starinnyx narodnyx pover'jax i primetax uzbekov. In: *Kratkie soobščeniya Instituta ètnografii* 30. Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR. 135-142.
- Roux, J.-P. 1966. *Faune et flore sacrées dans les sociétés altaïques*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Sachau, E. (ed.) 1887. *Al-Birūnī's India*. London. [Arabic original].
- Sinor, D. 1982. The legendary origins of the Türks. In: *Folklorica: Festschrift for Felix Y. Oinas*. (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Studies 14. Bloomington. 223-257.
- Stein, M. A. 1973. A contribution to the history of the Šahs of Kabul. *East & West*, N. S. 23/1-2, 13-20.

# The revival of the Shor literary language

**Irina Nevskaja**

Nevskaja, Irina 1998. The revival of the Shor literary language. *Turkic Languages* 2, 253-269.

This article is devoted to the present-day sociolinguistic situation in Mountain Shoriya (Kemerovo Region, South Siberia, Russia). The Shors, who speak one of the Siberian Turkic languages, are the indigenous population of Mountain Shoriya. Their language has survived in spite of unfavourable circumstances such as its literary tradition being interrupted for half a century. At present, the Shors are trying to restore social functions to the language. The Turcological traditions at the Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute have facilitated (and even instigated) the revival of the Shor literary language.

This article touches upon the history of literary Shor and of Shor language research in Novokuznetsk, and analyses recent developments in Shoriya: The revival of Shor as a language taught at school, and of written Shor. Special attention is paid to problems facing Shor Turcologists who have provided the revival process with a scientific foundation.

*Irina Nevskaja, Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute, ul. Belana, 21-60, 654005 Novokuznetsk, Russia.*

## 1. General information

The Shors are one of the minor indigenous Turkic peoples of Siberia. In the former USSR there were slightly over 16,000 Shors. According to the 1989 census, 12,585 of them lived in Kuzbass (Kemerovo Region), in South-Western Siberia (*Itogi* 1989: 42). According to Johannes Benzing's classification, Shor belongs to the Aral-Sayan group of North Turkic, alongside Khakas, Altay and Tuvan (Benzing 1959: 1-5). Karl Heinrich Menges distinguishes the Central-South-Siberian group (also called Abakan or Khakas), comprising Shor and Khakas with their dialects (Menges 1959: 5-11). Both classifications agree that Shor is close to Khakas, Altay and, to a lesser degree, Tuvan.

The Shors inhabit Mountain Shoriya, the northern part of the Sayan-Altay mountain region. The ethnonym which was introduced by Wil-



helm Radloff at the end of the nineteenth century and came to be used officially, was originally the name of one of the Turkic family clans or tribes (*sööks*) which spoke rather similar Turkic dialects. The Turks of Altay also used the term “Shor” for the Turkic-speaking population of the Kondoma (Shor *Qondum*), Mrassu (Shor *Pras*) and Tom (Shor *Tom*) river basins.<sup>1</sup> At that time, this population did not have a collective native name. The ethnonym spread as the official and native name of this ethnos in the mid-1930’s, during the nascent national consolidation of the Turkic Sayan-Altay ethnic groups. Earlier, in official documents, the native population of Mountain Shoriya was referred to as “Smith Tatars” (Russian *kuzneckie inorodcy, kuzneckie tatary*), since they were considered to be skilful smiths. They were also named after the place where they lived (Tom, Kondoma, Mrassu Tatars: Russian *černevye tatary, mrasscy, kondomcy, verxotomcy*), or according to the name of their *söök* (the Abas, the Shors, the Kalars, the Kargas, etc.: Russian *abincy, šorcy, kalarcy, kargincy*).

The ethnic group evolved from various Turkic and non-Turkic sources. The ethnonym *aba*, the name of one of the Töläs *sööks*, is encountered in Chinese sources dating from 603 (Pritsak 1959: 630). The Shors are considered to be Turkicised Ob-Ugrians: Linguistic, ethnographic and anthropological research shows the presence of an Ob-Ugric substratum in the ethnos. Shor toponymy contains many Ket names (e.g. the river names ending in *+zas / +sas*), indicating that the region was inhabited earlier by Kets.

Many questions of Shor ethnic history have not yet been solved. As a separate nation with its own identity and national sentiment, it developed within the Turkic-speaking population of this region during the last three centuries. The Shor ethnologist Valerij Kimeev delineates three periods of its ethnic history (Kimeev 1994: 4-6):

<sup>1</sup> Shor language examples are presented in phonemic transcription based on the *Fundamenta* system (Deny et al. 1959: xv). For the transliteration of publications in Shor, we use the Cyrillic transliteration alphabet for non-Slavonic languages used by German libraries. For the transliteration of Russian words and citations, we use the international scholarly system employed by linguists specializing in Russian and Slavonic studies (System III) (Shaw 1967).

1. The formation of territorial ethnic groups of Shors within the administrative ethnic territory (Russian *Kuzneckij uezd*), from the beginning of the seventeenth until the beginning of the twentieth century.
2. National and cultural consolidation in the framework of an autonomous national district (*Gorno-šorskiy nacional'nyj rajon*), 1926-1939. At that time, the processes of national development were very intensive. The most important contributing factors were the development of the literary language, school instruction in Shor and the spread of literacy among the Shor population.
3. From the early 1940's until very recently, the survival of the Shor nation within the conditions of the active spreading of the dominant Russian culture. During these years the Shors lost their literary language and were at the brink of total assimilation.

## **2. The sociolinguistic situation in Shoriya in the late 1980's**

The rapid industrial development of the area in the twentieth century almost destroyed the traditional Shor way of life and had a profound influence on the area. The massive influx of mainly Russian-speaking migrants set assimilation processes into motion which threatened not only the Shor language but also the very existence of the Shor nation.

Beginning in the 1950's, the following new economic and social factors emerged:

- Small farms were merged, and many Shor villages disappeared; people, in search of work, had to move to cities (where the assimilation processes moved even faster).
- The rural population was reduced, the urban population in Mountain Shoriya grew.
- Schools in small Shor villages were closed.
- Shor boarding schools were opened (these were primary and secondary educational institutions in big villages and industrial centres, where Shor children lived apart from their families during the academic year and were instructed in Russian).

As a result, by the end of the 1980's, Shor came to have an inferior social status: It was not a written language, nor a language of school education. Furthermore, its transmission to younger generations had almost stopped, and the number of speakers had dramatically diminished. The language competence of speakers had declined, especially that of urban

Shors (only 3% could speak Shor fluently in 1986, versus 20.1% in 1976), while their competence in Russian increased.<sup>2</sup> In 1989 only 59.4% of the Shors considered Shor to be their mother tongue, versus 76.6% in 1970. The number of Shors who regarded Russian as their mother tongue had increased from 24.4% to 39.1% (*Itoigi* 1989: 42).

We thus see that people preferred to give up their mother tongue. The history of the Shor literary language is important for the analysis of the factors leading to this situation.

### 3. The history of the Shor literary language in brief

Shor could be called one of the “oppressed languages” of the former USSR. During the twentieth century alone, the Shor language lost its literary tradition twice.

The first time was just after the October Revolution, when the church schools founded by the Altay missionaries were closed. The Russian Orthodox Church had begun Christianising the indigenous peoples as soon as Siberia became part of the Russian Empire. The Altay Mission founded in 1828 spread its influence throughout the territory of Mountain Shoriya, Mountain Altay, and the Minusinsk Region, where Turkic-speaking indigenous Siberian peoples (Altays, Shors, Teleuts, Kumandus) lived. The founders of the Altay Mission, Father Makarij (Gluxarev) and Father Stefan (Landyšev), established new methods of missionary work among aboriginal peoples, including the study of their languages, outlook, traditions and beliefs.

The Altay missionaries preached in the native languages of Siberia’s native peoples. They devised methods for translating Christian literature into Altay, Shor, Teleut, and Kumandu. These translations were made with the help of priests who were themselves indigenous. They were based on their deep knowledge of Siberia’s mythological traditions and languages. The Altay missionaries published books in the native languages of the Siberian people, founded primary and secondary schools

<sup>2</sup> The results of a recent sociolinguistic study appear in Patruševa (1994). They are somewhat doubtful. According to our observations, the number of urban Shor speakers is much larger. In our opinion, Patruševa’s data reflect the attitude of urban Shors to their mother tongue: People did not want to acknowledge that they spoke Shor.

and religious tertiary schools, where they trained national priests and teachers for Shor schools.

The first Shor alphabet was devised by the Altay missionaries in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was based on the Cyrillic alphabet (plus *ö, ü, ŋ* and *i*), and was very economical (only 26 characters) and scientifically well grounded.<sup>3</sup> Its creation was preceded by long scientific research conducted by the linguists of the Altay Mission. Their results were presented in *Grammatika altajskogo jazyka* ("Altay language grammar"), published in Kazan' in 1869. The Mission published the first Shor alphabet book *Šorskij bukvar' dlja inorodcev vostočnoj poloviny Kuzneckogo okruga. Šor kižileri balalaryn mičikke ürgetče* ("Shor alphabet book for the natives of the eastern half of the Kuznetsk District. Teaching Shor people's children to write") in 1885, and two religious books: *Svjaščennaja istorija na šorskom narečii dlja inorodcev vostočnoj poloviny Kuzneckogo okruga* ("The holy history in the Shor dialect for the natives of the eastern half of the Kuznetsk District") (Kazan' 1883), and *Ukazanie puti v carstvie nebesnoe na šorskom narečii. Tegridiņ čarygynga kirčeņ čoldy ködüšče* ("Showing the way to the Garden of Eden in the Shor dialect. Showing the way leading to heaven's light") (Kazan' 1884).

One of the first primary schools in Shoriya was opened in the village of Kuzedeevo by the well-known missionary and linguist Vasilij Verbickij, who taught at this school. By the time of the October Revolution, there were schools in all the larger villages. In the northern part of Shoriya, about 40% of the population was literate. Shor was the language of school teaching, written communication, and literature. The Shor literature of the time was sparse; there were only Shor translations of religious literature, and original works. Most of the latter seem to have been lost: We have only one poem in Shor. It was written by Ivan Štygašev, the first Shor writer, who studied in the Kazan' Theological College and in 1885 published a book in Russian which contained this one Shor poem. After 1917, with the outbreak of the revolution and civil war, all schools were closed, and the literary tradition hence interrupted.

At the time of the Soviet cultural revolution of 1927, a new Cyrillic-based Shor alphabet was created. Between 1929 and 1939, the pan-

<sup>3</sup> An analysis of the Shor alphabets appears in Nevskaja (1990) and Nevskaja (1993).

Turkic alphabet *janalif*, based on Latin, was used. From 1939 on, the Cyrillic script was once more promulgated.

In 1927, the Shor national district was formed. Though the district was short-lived (it was annulled in 1939), this was an important period for the development of the Shor literary language. It was taught at schools, a considerable number of books in Shor were published (more than 150 titles) and the language, folklore and ethnology of the Shors were studied intensively.

However, the tragic events of 1937-1945 had a devastating effect on the culture of the Shors. In 1942 the last issue of the Shor language newspaper *Қызыл Шор* ("Red Shoriya") was published, and all the Shor schools closed. For the next half century, the Shor language was no longer written or taught at schools. Its functional sphere became minimal: It was only used at home for everyday topics. All other cultural needs were met by Russian, which was the language of education, literary works and the mass media, as well as administrative, political, and economic relations. During this period, several generations of urban Shors grew up with at best minimal competence in Shor.

At present, history is giving the Shor language a chance (probably its last one) to become a literary language. The steady growth of Shor national sentiment and political activity, the Shors' interest in their national culture and language, and changes in the country as a whole can contribute to this. We hope that what we are now witnessing in Shoriya might be the beginning of a fourth period in its history: A period of ethnic and linguistic revival.

The revival of literary Shor began with the publishing of Shor textbooks, the training of Shor language teachers, and the teaching of Shor at schools and in Shor language circles.

#### **4. The revival of Shor at schools**

In 1988, a Chair of Shor Language and Literature was created at the Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute (NGPI). The first head was Andrej Čudojakov. The same year, a Shor department was established in the Faculty of Philology and teacher training began in Shor language and literature. A year later, teachers of different subjects, Shors themselves, began to teach Shor in a number of schools. They were graduates of a two-year course training leaders for Shor language circles. The course was organised in Novokuznetsk by Alisa Esipova. The Shor alphabet book and textbooks for the primary years were written by Nadežda

Kurpeško (Kemerovo) and members of the department. In 1994 the first graduates of the national department (five people) began to work at schools in the Kemerovo Region. At present, about 20 teachers of Shor work at schools in the Tashtagol and Mezhdurechensk districts of Mountain Shoriya, in cities and villages alike. Some schools which were closed 10-30 years ago resumed teaching; some schools were rebuilt.

#### 4.1. Turcology in Novokuznetsk

During the 50 crucial years of Shor language history, the collecting, compiling and describing of material still available has not stopped. Shor language research has been carried out mainly by foreign-language lecturers at the Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute under the guidance first of Andrej Dul'zon (Tomsk), then of Elizaveta Ubrjatova (Novosibirsk), and at present Maja Čeremisina and Natal'ja Širobokova (Institute of Philology, Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences). The NGPI offered scientific seminars on Shor at the Chair of Foreign Languages, headed first by Mixail Abdraxmanov, then by his successor Elektron Čispijakov. He was the first Shor linguist, a doctor of science and one of the founders of the Turcological school in Novokuznetsk. Shortly before *perestroyka* (1975-1985), he taught Shor at the Shor language seminar organised for the members of the department. His aim was to attract linguists (Germanicists by training) to Shor language research, thus continuing the tradition founded in Siberia by Radloff. In class, Čispijakov used the manuscript of his Shor language textbook (which was not published until 1992, after the author's death). Almost all the participants in the seminar became Shor language researchers.

When in the late eighties we witnessed the awakening of Shor national sentiment and the desire to restore social functions to the language, there were already people (among them also Shors) qualified to cope with this task. When the Shor Department was opened, the core research group consisted of Favzija Čispijakova, Irina Šencova, and Nina Šavlova. Beside the Shor Department, there were two other groups of Turcologists at the Chair of Foreign Languages: In Novokuznetsk (Elektron Čispijakov, Alisa Esipova, Irina Nevskaja, Natal'ja Mixailova), and in the regional centre of Kemerovo (Nadežda Kurpeško). All three groups worked closely together.

The Shor Department was headed by Andrej Čudojakov, a well-known Shor folklorist, who collected Shor folklore for more than 40

years until his death in 1994. He prepared a volume of Shor heroic epics, which is to appear this year in the series *Pamjatniki fol'klora narodov Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka* ("Folklore of the peoples of Siberia and the Far East"), published by the Institute of Philology, Siberian Division of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Novosibirsk).

The first years of the department's existence were difficult yet productive ones. The teaching of Shor and the training of language teachers demanded academic plans and programmes, as well as the writing and publication of elementary school and university textbooks in Shor. All the linguists dealing with Shor took part in this work.

Initially, the most important task facing such linguists was to provide the revival process with a scientific foundation: To create a modern Shor orthography, choose a standard dialect, and establish literary norms.

#### **4.2. The modern Shor alphabet**

The revival of the Shor written language was based on an orthography put forward by Elektron Čispijakov. It was discussed many times by linguists both in Novokuznetsk and in the Academy of Sciences.

By 1988, the Shor language had had several writing systems, the best of which was the one developed by the Altay missionaries. The Cyrillic alphabet used before 1942 contained notorious characters rendering combinations of the consonant [j] and a vowel. They were used not only in Russian borrowings, but in native Shor words as well, which made morpheme identification more difficult and broke down one-to-one phoneme-grapheme correlations. In addition, this alphabet did not have characters for many specific Shor sounds. The Missionary alphabet, in contrast, was logical and economical. It was based on the principle of *one grapheme for one phoneme*. Consequently, not all allophones and their phonetic realisations were rendered by separate characters. This was fully justified in a period when the entire Shor population spoke Shor and only a few people spoke Russian. At present, the situation has reversed; many young Shors have to study Shor almost as a foreign language. Therefore, it was necessary to make the new graphic system as close to a phonetic transcription as possible, so that students of Shor could easily identify the graphic and phonetic shapes of a word and avoid mistakes in reading and writing.

The new Shor alphabet proposed by Čispijakov eliminated the *j*-characters in native words and early Russian borrowings fully assimilated in the language. Several new characters were introduced for specific Shor

sounds, such as uvular allophones of the phoneme /k/. But neither phonetic nor phonemic principles were fully applied: Not all voiced allophones have separate graphemes. E.g. *ɣ* denotes both voiced and non-voiced allophones of the corresponding phoneme, and *ʒ* denotes both a separate phoneme and one of the allophones of /k/. The grapheme *ä* proved to be unnecessary: Modern authors do not use it. It was meant to render a front wide vowel whose phonemic status is unclear. It may be an allophone of /a/ or /e/, a dialectal variant of one of them, or a separate phoneme.<sup>4</sup> That means that an improvement of the Shor writing system requires further phonological and phonetic research of the Shor language system.

### 4.3. The standard dialect

The Shor language has always had a rich system of rather distant dialects and subdialects. The main dialects are Mras and Qondum. The names of the Shor dialects go back to the names of the rivers. Shors speaking the Mras dialect live in the basin of the river Mrassu (Shor *Mras* or *Pras*). The Russians apparently adopted the word combination *Mras su* (or *suy*) 'water, river' > *Mrassu*, which literally means Mras-river as the river's name. The Russian name of the dialect is *mrasskij* where the first *s* is a part of the root and the second *s* belongs to the suffix *+sk+* which forms adjectives from nouns, mainly from geographical names, i.e. *kemerovskij* from Kemerovo, *moskovskij* from Moskva. The traditionally used dialect name Mrass (Pritsak 1959: 630) may have appeared due to back-formation since the suffix *+k+* also exists in Russian: *kuzneckij* from *kuznec* 'smith'. The name of the Kondoma dialect also goes back to the Russian name of the river Kondoma (Shor *Qondum*).

We prefer to use the Shor river names for the names of the dialects: Mras and Qondum.

The Mras and Qondum dialects differ in a number of phonetical, morphological, syntactic, and lexical features, e.g. the Old Turkic *-d-* is reflected as *-y-* in Mras and as *-z- ~ -s-* in Qondum: Mras *ayaq* > Qondum *azaq* 'leg'. The labial harmony is more consistent in Mras. The present-tense marker which goes back to the analytical aspectual form

<sup>4</sup> A preliminary description of the Shor consonant and vowel phoneme systems is found in Borodkina (1977) and Pospelova (1977).



with the auxiliary verb *čat-* 'lie, live' is *-ča* in Mras and *-čyr* or *-čyt* in Qondum:

	'I go'	'He / she / it goes'
Mras:	<i>men parčam</i>	<i>ol parča</i>
Qondum:	<i>men parčadym / parčarym</i>	<i>ol parčyr</i>
	(from:	(from:
	par-yp čad-yr-ym;	par-yp čad-yr
	go-gerund lie-aorist-1.p.sg)	go-gerund lie-aorist)

In Mras, the construction with the gerund *-ArdA* expresses co-occurrence of two events which are not localized on the time axis: *ol kel-erde ...* 'each time when he came / comes / will come ...'; in Qondum, this construction has the meaning of co-occurrence of two events in the future: 'when he will come'.

The Mras *em* 'house' corresponds to the Qondum *üġ* or *üy* 'house' (for more details see Čispijakova (1991)).

Certain factors resulted in a rapid divergence of dialects in the second half of the twentieth century. They include: The absence of super-dialectal literary norms in the unwritten period, the mobility of the language system itself (especially the verb), and rapid processes of contraction at morpheme junctions (different in the two dialects, see the above given examples). The dialect distance complicated the choice of a standard dialect.

In the 1930's, the Mras dialect was chosen as the standard. It was spoken by a large part of the population in northern Shoriya (which was also more economically and culturally advanced), and by most of the Shor intelligentsia. By the late eighties, the situation was different: Northern Shoriya (the lower reaches of its major rivers, the Qondum and the Mras rivers) had become a conglomeration of industrial centres, a large industrial megalopolis, in which the Shors were a minority. The compact Shor population which had preserved the language and the national culture lived in the south, in the upper reaches of these rivers. They spoke the Qondum dialect and the upper-Mras subdialects of the language. Nevertheless, the lower-Mras variety of the language was again chosen as the basic one, the reasons being, first, because it continued a literary tradition (it was the literary language of the thirties), and second, it preserved original, non-contracted, affix formatives of grammatical categories to a greater extent. But the sociolinguistic situation had

to be taken into account, and the proposed literary norms were not very strict: Some Qondum dialect forms were included alongside Mras ones.

#### 4.4. Literary norms

Creating literary norms was an important task for Shor linguists. There were many problematic questions concerning Shor orthography:

- How to represent long vowels and consonants: Long segments have a tendency to be shortened in speech so that they sound like short ones. (It was decided to render long vowels and consonants by reduplicating the corresponding graphemes.)
- How to render complex verbs: whether to write them as one graphic word or as a word combination. (It was decided to render them as a combination of two graphic words, as is traditional in Shor.)
- How to render combinations of nouns with postpositions and particles. (It was decided they should be written separately unless the particle appears inside a word form, as in *sarna-b-oḵ-ča-m* [sing-GER-PARTICLE-PRS-1] ‘but I am singing already’.<sup>5</sup>

In practice, all these rules are violated: Complex verbs are written as one word, long vowels and especially long consonants are not reduplicated, particles are written together with nouns, while case affixes are sometimes written separately.

Elektron Čispijakov’s work *The graphics and orthography of the Shor language* became the basis for school and university textbooks, for the revival of Shor literature. The book was published in 1992, after the author’s death, but it was used by all Shor linguists long before.

#### 4.5. A modern alphabet book

An important milestone in the history of the teaching of Shor was the publication of the modern *Shor alphabet book* in 1990. It was written by Nadežda Kurpeško, who at present holds the chair of the Association of

<sup>5</sup> The Shor present-tense marker goes back to an analytical aspectual form consisting of the *p*-gerund of the main verb and an auxiliary existential verb *ča-* ‘to live, to lie’ (see also 4.3). Its formation is quite recent, taking place within the last century. The fact that a particle can enter such a word form proves that it was formerly a combination of two graphic and phonetic words.

Shor People; she wrote several textbooks and teachers' manuals for Shor and Teleut primary schools. Shor language teachers began to use this alphabet book as soon as it was published, without waiting for the whole cycle of school textbooks to appear or for the first trained teachers of Shor to graduate from the institute. The social demand was so great that it was impossible to wait several years.

#### **4.6. Shor teachers**

Most of the first teachers of Shor were graduates of the two-year post-graduate course in Shor language circle leader training. The course was organised at the Novokuznetsk State Pedagogical Institute by Alisa Esipova. The students, who were themselves Shors, were teachers of different subjects and already spoke Shor. They completed four one-month sessions in Novokuznetsk during the winter and summer holidays, and individual study the rest of the time. They were trained in teaching methods, Shor grammar, Shor geography, history and ethnology, psychology, music, and child psychology. They had ethnographic field practice as well. When the need arose, they were prepared to teach Shor. Many of them still work as Shor language teachers today.

Primary school teachers were (and still are) another source of Shor teachers. They were well acquainted with the methods of early-stage language teaching, since their first speciality was Russian-language teaching.

Beginning in 1993, the graduates of the Shor Department of the NGPI started teaching Shor at schools in Shoriya.

The systematic instruction of Shor at schools began in 1990. But we must also mention some earlier attempts, such as Esipova's. She taught Shor at meetings of the Club of Shor Youth, which she organised in 1986 in Novokuznetsk. Irina Šencova also wrote lessons in Shor, which were published in the newspaper *Krasnaja Šoriya* in Tashtagol.

#### **4.7. Textbook publishing**

In response to the social demand, Shor linguists were writing and publishing Shor textbooks for schools and institutes.<sup>6</sup> The published literature falls into three groups: (1) school textbooks; (2) textbooks for uni-

<sup>6</sup> A list of published books is to be found in the section "Recent publications on Shor".

versity students; (3) textbooks for adults studying the language on their own.

Among the published school books, there are, beside the *Shor alphabet book*, textbooks for the second and third grades, and *The Russian-Shor and Shor-Russian learners' dictionary*, *A grammar of the Shor language* by Mixail Amzorov. Textbooks for the fourth and fifth grades have been written but not yet published.

Generally speaking, these school textbooks are modelled on native-language textbooks. Exercises and texts are meant for a person who already speaks the language. This is often not the case in Shoriya. There are, of course, short dictionaries in each textbook. But learning a language anew with the aid of such textbooks is not easy. It is also necessary to create Shor textbooks for those who have to study it as a foreign language.

Especially needed now are textbooks for university Shor courses. Some Shor department students do not speak Shor well.<sup>7</sup> For them the Shor academic course should be longer. However these students already bear a double load at the institute: They are trained to become teachers of both the Russian and Shor language and literature. Therefore, the number of academic hours devoted to studying Shor cannot be so great. Consequently, good textbooks, intensive methods and technology should be used.

In 1988, we had only Dyrenkova's *Shor grammar* and *Shor folklore* which were published in 1940-1941 and reflect the language of that time. The Turcologists at Novokuznetsk had to carry out intensive scientific research of all language levels and of the folklore, and then write textbooks for students. Textbooks on phonetics, dialectology, folklore, a learner's dictionary, and a chrestomathy have already been published. In addition, there is a textbook on the Shor verbal system (Nevskaja, forth-

<sup>7</sup> The situation is different for students who speak Shor. They often have problems with Russian and should have additional courses in Russian. As a rule, such students come from far-away villages where they could not be well trained in all subjects because of a lack of teachers. These students have many problems with theoretical subjects and with foreign languages. Their family situation, too, is often problematic. Finally, the government stipend for students is not sufficient. Many students cannot cope with all these difficulties and give up.

coming), and a full bibliography of Shor literature (Esipova & Nevskaja, forthcoming).

These textbooks can be used by people wishing to study Shor. But there are also textbooks specially devised for adults: Čispijakov's book mentioned above, a Shor-Russian phrase book (Amzorov & Šencova 1992), and finally a textbook written by Šencova and Dmitrij M. Nasilov (1994). All these textbooks received an eager welcome.

### **5. The revival of written Shor**

The Shor people have preserved their rich folklore throughout the history of their nation. The revival of written Shor was supported by this epic tradition, and by the joint efforts of outstanding representatives of the Shor and Russian people, who believed in the future of the Shor language and culture.

In the early 1990's, short publications in Shor began to appear from time to time in local newspapers, mainly in the newspaper *Gornaja Šorija* (published in Tashtagol). The first booklet in Shor (with Russian translations) was the youth (manuscript) magazine *Elim*, written and published by students and teachers of the Shor Department of the NGPI. Its first issue appeared in 1992, the second in 1993. Also in 1992, the first collection of poems by a young Shor poet, Nikolaj Belčegešev, *Tuğan čer – tağlyğ Šor*, was published in Novokuznetsk. Two years later, the collection of poems by Gennadij Kostočakov, *Ala tağlarym*, appeared. By this time, there were several people writing verse and short stories in Shor, among them Andrej Čudojakov. In 1995, a Shor literary reader was published. It was composed of major original works by Shor authors, beginning with the first Shor poet's, Ivan Štygašev's, verse. In 1996, another collection of poetry written by a young Shor poet, Lubov' Arbačakova, appeared in Mezhdurechensk. Finally, at the Gorno-Altaysk Conference of the Union's Section of Turkic Peoples (1996), Gennadij Kostočakov, Nikolaj Belčegešev, and Lubov' Arbačakova were nominated for membership in the Union of Writers of Russia.

### **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my gratitude to the Conference of the German Academies of Sciences and to the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation: The article was written when I was in Germany with a scholarship of the Conference in 1997. Thanks to the Alexander von Humboldt Founda-

tion, I had a chance to update and to prepare the final version of this article.

### References

- Benzing, J. 1959. Classification of the Turkic languages. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) 1959. *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 1-5.
- Borodkina, I. P. 1977. Sostav glasnyx fonem v mrasskom dialekte šorskogo jazyka. In: Ubrjatova, E. I. (ed.) 1977. *Jazyki narodov Sibiri*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet. 11-23.
- Itoži Vsesojuznoj perepisi naselenija 1989 goda. Vypusk 4. Nacional'nyj sostav*. 1990. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Kimeev, V. M. 1994. *Narody Kuzbassa za 30 let (Ėtnodemografičeskij spravočnik)*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet.
- Menges, K. M. 1959. Classification of the Turkic languages. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) 1959. *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 5-11.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1990. O novom šorskom alfavite. In: *Tjurkskaja fonetika – 90: Pervaja vsesojuznaja konferencija. Alma-Ata, 26 – 28 nojabrja: Tezisy dokladov*. Alma-Ata. 88.
- Nevskaja, I. A. 1993. Iz istorii šorskogo alfavita. In: Tybykova, A. T. et al. (eds.) 1993. *Jazyk i kultura altajcev*. Gorno-Altajsk: Gorno-Altajskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo. 88-92.
- Patruševa, G. M. 1994. Sovremennye ètničeskie processy u šorcev. In: Kimeev, V. M. & Lavrent'eva, L. A. & Tokmašev, J. K. & Sogrina, N. G. & Bobrov, V. V. & Nevskaja, I. A. & Tivjakov, S. D. (eds.) 1994. *Šorskij sbornik. Vypusk 1*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet. 216-222.
- Pospelova, N. B. 1977. Sostav soglasnyx fonem v šorskom jazyke. In: Ubrjatova, E. I. (ed.) *Jazyki narodov Sibiri*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet. 24-34.
- Pritsak, O. 1959. Das Schorische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) 1959. *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 630-640.
- Shaw, J. Thomas 1967. *The transliteration of modern Russian for English-language publications*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

### Recent publications on Shor

- Amzorov, M. P. & Šencova, I. V. 1992. *Šorsko-russkij razgovornik. Kazak-šor erbekteri*. Novokuzneck: Novokuzneckoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Amzorov, M. P. 1992. *Šor tiliniŋ grammatikazy*. Novokuzneck: Novokuzneckoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Čispijakov, E. F. 1992a. *Grafika i orfografija šorskogo jazyka: učebnoe posobie dlja studentov i prepodavatelej*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Čispijakov, E. F. 1992b. *Učebnik šorskogo jazyka: posobie dlja prepodavatelej i studentov*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Čispijakova, F. G. & Šavlova, N. V. 1992. *Učebnoe posobie po fonetike šorskogo jazyka*. Novokuzneck: Novokuzneckoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Čispijakova, F. G. 1991. *Učebnoe posobie po dialectologii šorskogo jazyka*. Novokuzneck: Novokuzneckoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Čudojakov, A. I. 1995. *Étjudy šorskogo éposa*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Esipova, A. V. 1993. *Opredelitel' naja funkcija pričastij v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Novosibirskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta.
- Kimeev V. M. & Lavrent'eva, L. A. & Tokmašev, J. K. & Sogrina, N. G. & Bobrov, V. V. & Nevskaya, I. A. & Tivjakov, S. D. (eds.) 1994 *Šorskij sbornik. Vypusk 1*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskij GU.
- Kostočakov, G. V. (ed.) 1995. *Ulger: Kniga dlja čtenija na šorskom jazyke*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Kurilov, V. F. et al. (eds.) 1996. *Podgotovka sovremennogo specialista v sootvetstvii s gosudarstvennym obrazovatel'nym standartom: materialy raboty naučno-praktičeskoj konferencii. Čast' 8. Tjurkologija*. Novokuzneck.
- Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. & Apon'kin, F. J. 1993. *Šor – kazak pasok kaza k – šor ürgedig söstük*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. & Širobokova, N. N. 1991. *Biverbal'nye konstrukcii s glagolami bytija -p čat, -p odur, -p čör v šorskom jazyke*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. 1992a. *Šor pičik: Bukvar' dlja šorskix škol*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.

- Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. 1992b. *Šor tili 2. Ijginči klasstyn grammatikazynyn nomy*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Nasilov, D. M. & Šencova, I. V. 1994. *Šor tilinge ūrgenčabys. Izučаем šorskij jazyk*. Kemerovo: Kuzbassvuzizdat.
- Nevskaja = Nevskaya, I. A. 1993. *Formy deepričastnogo tipa v šorskom jazyke*. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Novosibirskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta.
- Nevskaya, I. A. (ed.) 1998. *Šorskaja filologija i sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nye issledovanija. Vypusk 1*. Novosibirsk: Novokuzneckij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij institut.
- Redlix, S. M. & Petuxov S. I. & Kurilov V. F. & Esipova, A. V. & Nevskaya I. A. (eds.) 1997. *Kačestvo podgotovki i problemy povyšeniya konkurentosposobnosti vypusknikov pedvuzov na rynke truda: materialy raboty naučno-praktičeskoj konferencii. Ėtnoregional'nyj komponent gumanitarnogo obrazovanija v Kuzbasse*. Novokuzneck.
- Šencova I. V. 1997. *Aspektual'nye formy glagola v šorskom jazyke*. Kemerovo: Kemerovovuzizdat.
- Šencova, I. V. 1994. *Šor tili 3. Ūžinči klasska nom*. Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Sudačakov, M. L. & Čul'žanov, G. D. & Kostočakov, G. V. 1992. *Šorsko-russkij slovar'*. Novokuzneck: Novokuzneckoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.



# Restrukturierte Lexeme in der türkischen Sprachreform

**Klaus Röhrborn**

Röhrborn, Klaus 1998. Restrukturierte Lexeme in der türkischen Sprachreform. *Turkic Languages* 2, 270-283.

This article describes the creation of Turkish neologisms by means of restructuring foreign lexemes during the Kemalist era. In contrast to folk / popular etymology, this is the conscious, planned phonetic imitation of foreign models. The restructured neologisms are classified and listed according to various features: Neologisms which completely imitate the foreign word, neologisms which partly imitate the foreign word and at last restructurings that only create an incomplete and deficient motivation. Finally the restructuring process is examined in light of the linguistic theories of the Kemalist period. The author introduces a hitherto neglected curiosity, esoteric restructuring which creates a motivation only plausible to a small circle of specialists.

*Klaus Röhrborn, Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde, Georg August-Universität, Papendiek 16, 37073 Göttingen, Germany.*

## 1. Einführung

Restrukturierung von Lexemen fremder Sprachen ist ein universelles Phänomen, und solche Bildungen sind als *calques phonétiques* auch aus den europäischen Sprachen bekannt. Man kann von einem allgemeinen Bedürfnis des Sprechers nach Motivation ausgehen, das vor allem bei mehrsilbigen lautlichen Entlehnungen aus exotischen Sprachen erkennbar wird. Dabei wird der fremde Lautkörper so umstrukturiert, daß er wie eine Ableitung von einem Erbwort oder wie ein Kompositum aus zwei einheimischen Elementen aussieht.

Die aus den Elementen von restrukturierten Wörtern erschließbare Bedeutung, die sogenannte "Bildungssemantik", ist meist weit weniger aufschlußreich als die Bildungssemantik von komplexen Erbwörtern. Sie hat also weniger Bezug zum Denotat und scheint in manchen Fällen geradezu in die Irre zu führen. Dennoch werden auch solche Restruktu-

rierungen von den Sprechern akzeptiert. Sie werden offenbar einem bedeutungslosen mehrsilbigen Lautkörper vorgezogen. Vielleicht nur, um das fremde Wort leichter im Gedächtnis behalten zu können. Man denke an die Beliebtheit von mnemotechnischen Versen im Lateinunterricht. Solche Verse können ja ohne jeden Bezug zur Bedeutung der lateinischen Vokabeln sein, die man memorieren will.<sup>1</sup> Die "Hängematte" kann unter diesem Aspekt noch als eine geglückte Restrukturierung gelten, wenn auch eine "Matte" normalerweise auf dem Fußboden liegt (vgl. Wahrig 1972: Sp. 1652, 2382). Weniger hilfreich ist die Restrukturierung "Meerkatze", die ja eine Affenart bezeichnet, die überdies keinerlei Beziehung zum "Meer" hat (Wahrig 1972: Sp. 2392). Immerhin verrät die Bildungssemantik, daß es sich um ein vierfüßiges Tier handelt. Ein Grenzfall ist offenbar dann erreicht, wenn nur eine grammatische Bedeutung in den fremden Lautkörper hineinprojiziert wird. Ein solches restrukturiertes Lexem erinnert dann nur durch sein Affix an die Wörter der eigenen Sprache, wenn auch die Wortbasis im Erbwortschatz nicht existiert.<sup>2</sup>

Restrukturierung ist im allgemeinen ein spontaner Prozeß. Der Sprecher handelt nicht bewußt, wenn er ein Fremdwort durch Restrukturierung interpretiert ("Volksetymologie"). Es gibt aber bemerkenswerte Ausnahmen, und der Begriff "Restrukturierung" ist weiter als der Begriff "Volksetymologie". Wer sich zum erstenmal mit dem Chinesischen befaßt, stellt mit Überraschung fest, daß die Chinesen dem entlehnten Eigennamen meist auch eine Bedeutung beilegen, die nicht aus der Gebersprache stammt. So ist die Silbe *dé* (Giles 1912: 10845) für 'deutsch'<sup>0</sup> zweifellos eine lautliche Entlehnung aus dem Deutschen. Sie vermittelt aber gleichzeitig die Bedeutung 'Tugend' o.ä., so daß also chin. *déguó* (Giles 1912: 10845, 6609) 'Deutschland' wörtlich bedeutet: 'Tugend-Land'. Man hat hierfür die Tatsache verantwortlich gemacht, daß die Chinesen in ihrer traditionellen Art des Transkribierens fremde Laute nicht mit Lauten, sondern nur mit Silben der eigenen Sprache wiedergeben können. Und diese Silben haben immer auch Bedeutung, ja in der Regel hat jede Silbe sogar mehrere Bedeutungen, die dann durch verschiedene Schriftzeichen disambiguiert werden. Eine "schöne" Ent-

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. den Merksatz: "In die Semmel biß der Kater" zum Memorieren der lateinischen Multiplikativzahlen.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. die Beispiele unter 2.2.

lehnung ist dann eine Bildung, die auch inhaltlich einen gewissen Bezug zu dem Bezeichneten hat (Ladstätter 1967: 9-11). Zweifellos ist der Schöpfer einer solchen chinesischen Bildung sich darüber im Klaren, daß er eine Restrukturierung vornimmt, wenn er zwischen den verschiedenen Schriftzeichen das passende auswählt.

Planmäßige Restrukturierung von fremden Lexemen begegnet uns auch in der Zeit der türkischen Sprachreform. In Abschnitt 4 dieser Studie wollen wir nach den Gründen für diese Erscheinung fragen. Zunächst sollen die Bildungen im einzelnen vorgestellt werden. Wir unterscheiden zwischen "Totalrestrukturierung", wenn das fremde Wort zur Gänze lautlich imitiert wird, und "Teilrestrukturierung", wenn das nur teilweise der Fall ist. Die "Teilrestrukturierung" umfaßt Bildungen, die nur in der Wortbasis oder im ersten Kompositionsglied das fremde Lexem lautlich nachahmen, und Bildungen, die nur im Suffix das fremde Lexem lautlich imitieren.

Gewisse Abweichungen von der traditionellen türkischen Wortbildung sind für die Zeit der Sprachreform nicht ungewöhnlich, und sie kommen auch bei restrukturierten Bildungen vor. Eine Besonderheit gegenüber dem Gros der Neologismen sind umfangreiche Bedeutungsinklusiven in den Basen von deverbalen Ableitungen, wie sie sonst nur für stark idiomatisierte Wörter typisch sind. Sie stellen willkürliche semantische Restriktionen dar, die keinerlei Regelmäßigkeit erkennen lassen. Solche Inklusionen werden – durch eckige Klammern ausgezeichnet – in unseren Paraphrasierungen erkennbar. Diese Paraphrasen sind eine Umschreibung der Bildungssemantik mit Mitteln der Satzsyntax und sollen – unter Wiederholung des Basisverbs – "semantisch äquivalent" zu dem betreffenden restrukturierten Wort sein. Wenn wir von "Motivierung" sprechen, so gehen wir vom idealen Sprecher aus, der die Neologismen und die neologistischen Suffixe vollkommen beherrscht. Die Angaben in runden Klammern sind Quellenhinweise. Wenn dort ein Hinweis auf das *Türkçe Sözlük* (TS) fehlt, so handelt es sich um kurzlebige Neologismen, die nicht in das erste *Türkçe Sözlük* von 1945 aufgenommen worden sind.

## 2. Restrukturierung mit intakter Motivierung

### 2.1. Totalrestrukturierung

#### *ayrıt*

‘Kante’ < Nomen subiecti von *ayır-* ‘trennen, scheiden’, \**ayır-it* (mit Synkope) ‘etwas, das [zwei Flächen voneinander] trennt’ (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 74; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *arête*.

#### *belleten*

‘wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift’ < Nomen subiecti vom Neologismus *bellet-* ‘lernen lassen, lehren’, *bellet-en* ‘etwas, das [wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse] lehrt’ (*Türk Dili* 21-22 [Februar 1937], 5-9; noch TS 1988) insinuiert durch frz. *bulletin*.

#### *egemen*

‘souverän, mit Vorherrschaft’ < denominales Nomen vom Neologismus *ege* ‘Schutzpatron’, *ege+men* ‘mit der Eigenschaft eines Schutzpatrons’ (vgl. *kölemen* ‘sklavisch’) (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 41; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *hégémone*.

#### *genel*

‘allgemein’ < denominales Nomen vom Neologismus *gen* ‘weit, breit’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+Al*, *gen+el* ‘auf das Weite bezüglich’ (*Türk Dili* 12 [Juni 1935], 5; 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 27; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *général*.

#### *kamun*

‘öffentlich, allgemein’ < denominales Nomen vom Neologismus *kamu* ‘Öffentlichkeit, Allgemeinheit’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+n* (alter Instrumental?), *kamu+n* ‘mit Öffentlichkeit’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 137), insinuiert durch frz. *commun*.

#### *komutan*

‘Befehlshaber’ < Nomen subiecti zum neologistischen Verb *komut-* ‘anspornen, ermutigen’, *komut-an* ‘einer, der [die Soldaten usw.] anspricht’ (CK 1935; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *commandant*.

*kural*

‘Lehrsatz, Regel, Prinzip’ < Nomen instrumenti (?) von *kur-* ‘bauen, gründen’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+Al*, *kur-al* ‘etwas, mit dem man [eine Wissenschaft usw.] begründet’ (?) (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 30; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *corollaire*.

*nomal*

‘normal’ < denominales Nomen vom Neologismus *nom* ‘Gesetz’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+Al*, *nom+al* ‘dem Gesetz entsprechend’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 76,184), insinuiert durch frz. *normal*.

*okul*

‘Schule’ < Nomen loci von *oku-* ‘lernen’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *-Al*, *oku-l*, ‘Ort, wo man lernt’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 107; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *école*, gleichzeitig partielle Lehnübersetzung von osm. *mektep*.

*örgan*

‘Organ (des Körpers)’ < Nomen subiecti von *ör-* ‘flechten, bauen, organisieren (?)’, *ör-gen* ‘etwas, das intensiv baut / organisiert (?)’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 44; noch TS 1988), insinuiert durch frz. *organe*.

*simey*

‘Schema’ < denominales Nomen vom Neologismus *sim* ‘Zeichen’ mit dem polysemen neologistischen Suffix *+Ay*, *sim+ey* (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 161), insinuiert durch frz. *schéma*.

*somtöz*

‘Verbindung von zwei gegensätzlichen Begriffen, Synthese’ < Determinativkompositum aus dem neologistischen Adjektiv *som* ‘massiv, echt’ und *töz* in der neologistischen (?) Bedeutung ‘Substanz’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 129, 160), insinuiert durch frz. *synthèse*.

*soysal*

‘gesellschaftlich, sozial’ < denominales Nomen von *soy* ‘Familie, Stamm’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+sAl*, *soy+sal* ‘auf den Stamm bezüglich’ (*Türk Dili* 12 [Juni 1935], 6; 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 39, 163; noch TS 1988, allerdings mit Bedeutungsänderung), insinuiert durch frz. *social*.

*varsay-*

‘annehmen, Hypothese aufstellen’ < “Zusammenbildung” aus *say-* ‘annehmen’ und *var* ‘vorhanden’, *var* plus *say-* ‘etw. als vorhanden annehmen’ (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 35; noch TS 1988), planmäßige Restrukturierung / spontane Volksetymologie von osm. *farzet-*.

*yantitöz*

‘Gegenbehauptung, Antithese’ < Präfixbildung mit dem Neopräfix *yanti-* ‘anti-’ und dem Nomen *töz* in der neologistischen (?) Bedeutung ‘Substanz’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 98), insinuiert von frz. *antithèse*.

## 2.2. Teilrestrukturierung

Eine partielle Restrukturierung liegt vor in Bildungen, die nur einen Teil des fremden Lautkörpers lautlich imitieren. Der andere Teil wird übersetzt. Es handelt sich also meist um eine Kreuzung zwischen Lehnprägung und *calque phonétique*. Man könnte von “Stamm-Restrukturierung” sprechen, wenn nur der Stamm des fremden Wortes – mehr oder weniger vollständig – imitiert wird, aber nicht das Affix. Zunächst Beispiele, die das Suffix nicht in die Imitation einbeziehen:

*arkasal*

‘archaisch’ < denominales Nomen von *arka* ‘das Hinten-Befindliche’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *+sAl*, *arka+sal* ‘das [zeitlich] Hinten-Befindliche betreffend’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 90), Stamm insinuiert von frz. *archaïque*.

*dil atanlık*

‘Dilettantismus’ < denominales Nomen von der “Zusammenbildung” *\*dil atan* ‘mit [laienhafter] Sprache herumwerfend, Dilettant’ und dem Suffix *+lXk* zur Bildung von Abstrakta, *dil atan+lük* (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 106), Stamm insinuiert von frz. *dilettantisme*.

*dural*

‘dauerhaft’ < deverbales Nomen von *dur-* ‘stehenbleiben, fort dauern’ mit dem neologistischen Suffix *-Al*, *dur-al* ‘auf das Fortdauern bezüglich’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 33; noch TS 1988), Stamm insinuiert durch frz. *durable*.

*salay*

‘Speichel, Spucke’ < Nomen obiecti von *sal-* ‘entlassen, hinwerfen’ mit dem neologistischen denominalen / deverbale Suffix +*Ay/-Ay*, *sal-ay* ‘etwas, das man hinwirft’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 240), insinuiert durch frz. *salive*.

*yantinomluk*

‘Widerspruch innerhalb eines Satzes, Antinomie’ < denominales Nomen von dem mit *yanti-* ‘anti-’ präfigierten neologistischen Nomen *nom* ‘Gesetz’ usw. und dem Suffix +*lXk* zur Bildung von Abstrakta, *yantinom+luk* (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 98), Stamm insinuiert durch frz. *antinomie*.

In den bisher zitierten Beispielen war das Suffix oder die Endung des fremden Wortes nicht Teil der Restrukturierung. In ähnlicher Weise kann auch das Präfix eines fremden Wortes ausgenommen werden:

*astöz*

‘Hypothese’ < Präfixbildung mit dem Neopräfix *as-* ‘unter-, hypo-’ und dem Nomen *töz* in der neologistischen (?) Bedeutung ‘Substanz’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 113), Stamm lautlich beeinflusst von frz. *hypothèse*.

Man könnte von “Suffix-Restrukturierung” sprechen, wenn nur das Suffix des fremden Wortes nachgeahmt wird, nicht aber der Stamm:

*dikit*

‘Stalagmit’ < Nomen obiecti von *dik-* ‘etw. aufrichten’ mit dem Suffix *-Xt* ‘etwas, das [der herabtropfende Kalk] aufrichtet (mit semantischem Zusatzmerkmal ANTERIORITÄT)’, *dik-it* (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 83; noch TS 1988), Suffix insinuiert von frz. *stalagmite*.

*sarkıt*

‘Stalaktit’ < Nomen subiecti von *sark-* ‘nach unten hängen’ mit dem Suffix *-Xt*, *sark-ıt* ‘etwas, das nach unten hängt’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936] 83; noch TS 1988), Suffix insinuiert durch frz. *stalactite*.

Das Suffix *-Xt* wird häufig zur Bildung von Nomina obiecti von transitiven Verben, seltener zur Bildung von Nomina subiecti von intransiti-

ven Verben verwendet,<sup>3</sup> hat also eine “ergative Orientierung”, wie Erdal (1991) es für das Altürkische formuliert hat.

Schließlich kann auch ein Glied eines fremden Kompositums lautlich imitiert werden und die Bedeutung des ganzen Kompositums übernehmen. *Korun* ‘Schutzhaut, Hornhaut’ ist ein Nomen subiecti von *koru-* ‘schützen’ mit dem polysemen neologistischen Suffix *-Xn*: *koru-n* ‘etwas, das [das darunterliegende Gewebe] schützt’ (TS 1945-1988), zweifellos insinuiert von frz. *couche cornée* ‘Hornsicht’. Ursprünglich sollte *korun* nur in der Verbindung *korun tabakası* ‘Schutzschicht’ gebraucht werden<sup>4</sup> und wäre dann eher als Nomen actionis ‘Schutz’ zu analysieren.

### 3. Formale Restrukturierung mit gestörter oder fehlender Motivierung

Die bisher erwähnten Bildungen waren oder sind morphologisch transparent und semantisch motiviert. Das gilt uneingeschränkt allerdings nur für Individuen, die die neologistischen Wortstämme internalisiert haben und die auch mit dem freien Umgang mit Suffixen, wie ihn die Reformer praktizierten, vertraut sind. In manchen Fällen aber scheint die formale Restrukturierung für die Reformer wichtiger gewesen zu sein als die Motivierung: Die Bildung könnte also ein türkisches Wort sein, aber die Bildungssemantik gibt nur einen schwachen oder gar keinen Hinweis auf das Denotat. Auch die Schöpfer eines solchen Neologismus hätten ihr Produkt nicht in der oben<sup>5</sup> beschriebenen Weise paraphrasieren können:

*diyelek*

‘Dialekt’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 36; noch in TS 1945), morphologisch interpretierbar als denominales Nomen von einem nicht-existent Nomen *\*diye* (Hypostasierung des Indeklinabile *diye* ‘sagend’) mit dem Suffix *+lAk* in unklarer Bedeutung, *diye+lek*; insinuiert von frz. *dialecte*.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. z.B. *yakıt* ‘Brennstoff’.

<sup>4</sup> Vgl. *Türk Dili* 23-26 (Oktober 1937), 364.

<sup>5</sup> Vgl. das Ende von Abschnitt 1!



*toput*

‘Bodensatz, Niederschlag’ (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 199; noch in TS 1988), morphologisch interpretierbar als denominales Nomen von *top* ‘Ballen’ mit dem polysemen neologistischen Suffix *+Xt, top+ut*; insinuiert von frz. *dépôt*.

Die Neologismen *tangan* ‘Tangente’, *kotangan* ‘Kotangente’, *kosakan* ‘Kosekante’ und *kafçitan* ‘Koeffizient’ (*Türk Dili* 17-18 [Mai-Juni 1936], 32; 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 358, 361) imitieren lautlich ihre französischen Äquivalente *tangent, cotangent, cosécant* und *coefficient*. Am Wortende von *tangan* und *kotangan* ist das deverbale Suffix *-gAn* erkennbar, am Wortende von *kosakan* und *kafçitan* das deverbale Suffix *-An*. Beide entsprechen nicht nur lautlich, sondern auch funktional ungefähr den Endungen der französischen Partizipien bzw. Verbalsubstantive *tangent, cotangent* usw. Die Stämme *\*tan-*, *\*kotan-*, *\*kosak-* und *\*kafçit-* sind im Türkischen freilich nicht vorhanden.

In den folgenden Beispielen sind semantisch passende Stämme vorhanden, aber die Suffixe sind sonst nicht belegt. Sie sind also formal unikal oder in der vorliegenden Bedeutung unikal:

*cebrik*

‘algebraisch’ ist eine denominalbildung von *cebir* ‘Algebra’ mit dem mutmaßlich unikalenen Suffix *+Xk*, *\*cebir+ik* (mit Synkope) (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 24). Das Suffix wurde insinuiert vom Suffix des frz. *algébrique*. Ein denominales *k*-Suffix ist im Türkischen nur zur Bildung von Caritativa o.ä. bekannt. Von Cevat Emre<sup>6</sup> wurde jedoch ein solches Suffix zur Bildung von “Beziehungs-Adjektiven” vorgeschlagen, zweifellos unter Einfluß der europäischen Sprachen. Wenn noch mehr Bildungen mit diesem Suffix bekannt werden, ist von einem Lehnsuffix auszugehen, und *cebrik* wäre dann auch äquivalent paraphrasierbar.

*çekül*

‘Senkblei’ wurde als deverbales Nomen von *çek-* ‘anziehen (Erde)’ analysiert (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 79; noch TS 1988), mit dem unikalenen Suffix *-Ul*. Insinuiert von osm. *şakul*.

<sup>6</sup> Vgl. *Türk Dili* 5 (April 1934), 96.

*eksen*

‘Achse’ wurde interpretiert als Weiterbildung von *ek* in der Bedeutung ‘Verbindungsglied’ (Danışmend 1935; *Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 81-82; noch in TS 1988). Das Suffix ist unikal und nicht analysierbar. *Eksen* ist wohl insinuiert von griech. *axon* ‘Achse’ oder von der Kompositionsform des dt. *Achse*, seinerzeit von besonderer politischer Aktualität (“Achsenmächte”).

Das soeben Gesagte gilt auch für Teilrestrukturierungen, wenn also an türkische Stämme imitierende Suffixe (*ikilem*, *önder*) oder Suffixoide (*üçgen* usw.) angehängt werden, die sonst nicht oder nicht in einer passenden Bedeutung belegt sind:

*ikilem*

‘Dilemma, schwierige Wahl zwischen zwei Möglichkeiten’ ist ein denominales Nomen von *iki* ‘zwei’ mit dem seltenen neologistischen Suffix *+lAm* (Zülfikar 1991: 102), das hier in einer sonst nicht üblichen Verwendung vorliegt, *iki+lem* (TS 1945; noch TS 1988). Die Bildung wurde durch das frz. *dilemme* angeregt.

*önder*

‘(politischer) Führer’ (CK 1935; *Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 7; noch in TS 1988) ist sicher eine lautliche Teilimitation von engl. *leader* ‘Führer’, denn wir wissen, daß *leader* damals in der Türkei einen gewissen Bekanntheitsgrad hatte.<sup>7</sup> *Önder* ist heute noch in Gebrauch, die Wortendung aber nicht analysierbar, weil das neologistische Suffix *+dAr* ‘einer, der an dem von der Basis bezeichneten Ort sich befindet’ nur einmal in dieser Bedeutung<sup>8</sup> verwendet wurde. Die Anregung zur Bildung des Wortes dürfte von dem bei Kaşgari belegten *soñdar* ‘Verfolger’ gekommen sein.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Vgl. *Türk Dili* 10 (Oktober 1934), 9.

<sup>8</sup> Im Neologismus *yönder* (< *yön+der*), der in Danışmend (1935) als Substitut für osm. *müsteşar* ‘Unterstaatssekretär’, in TS (1945) aber als Substitut für osm. *mürşit* ‘religiöser Führer’ auftaucht, hat das Suffix nicht diese Bedeutung.

<sup>9</sup> Clauson (1972: 836b); vgl. auch *Türk Dili* 3 (Juli 1933), 41.

*üçgen*

‘Dreieck’, *dörtgen* ‘Viereck’ usw. (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 35; noch in TS 1988) sind Teilrestrukturierungen nach frz. *trigone* usw. Die Schöpfer dieser Bildungen haben offenbar an Determinativkomposita<sup>10</sup> gedacht: Die Satelliten sind Zahlwörter, und als Nukleus dient der Neologismus *gen* ‘Weite, Breite’, der sich nicht durchsetzen konnte und hier auch in semantischer Hinsicht nicht gut paßt.

#### 4. Restrukturierung im Kontext der sprachwissenschaftlichen Theorien der 30er Jahre

Jens Peter Laut hat in seiner profunden Studie über die sprachwissenschaftlichen Theorien zur Zeit des Kemalismus darauf hingewiesen, daß diese Theorien auch auf die türkische Sprachreform erheblichen Einfluß hatten. Bereits auf dem 1. Türkischen Geschichtskongreß wurde die These von der indogermanisch-türkischen Sprachverwandtschaft geäußert, die dann bis zum Jahre 1935 im Zentrum der sprachwissenschaftlichen Diskussion stand.<sup>11</sup> Es läßt sich denken, daß eine solche These dazu ermuntern konnte, den Fremdwörtern aus den “verwandten” europäischen Sprachen eine türkische Deutung zu geben, denn gleichzeitig galt ja in dieser zweiten Phase der Sprachreform, die von 1932 bis zum Oktober 1935 dauerte, das Prinzip der “Assimilierung” (*özleştirme*), nach dem alle nicht-türkischen Wörter durch genuin türkische ersetzt werden sollten. Voraussetzung ist natürlich eine gewisse sprachwissenschaftliche Naivität, mit der man aber rechnen kann, zumindest bei den zahlreichen Angehörigen der Türkischen Sprachgesellschaft, die sich aus dem politischen und militärischen Bereich rekrutierten.

Die große Zeit des Restrukturierens war die 3. Phase der Sprachreform. Diese Phase beginnt im Oktober 1935 mit der Propagierung der sogenannten “Sonnensprach-Theorie” (*güneş dil teorisi*), die bis zum Tode Atatürks im November 1938 das sprachwissenschaftliche Denken völlig beherrscht: Nach dieser Theorie gehört der Urmensch der türkischen Rasse an, “und seine Sprache entwickelt sich ... zu einem türkischen Idiom, das die Ursprache der Menschheit geworden ist. Alle Ras-

<sup>10</sup> Andreas Tietze (1995-1996: 7) spricht von einem Suffix +*gen*. Von einem Suffix würde man jedoch erwarten, daß es der Palatal- und Konsonantenharmonie folgt.

<sup>11</sup> Laut (1993: Abschnitt I, 4.3.).

sen und Sprachen der Welt gehen auf diesen Urmenschen und sein Prototürkisch zurück.”<sup>12</sup>

Nach der Sonnensprach-Theorie waren also die Wörter aller Sprachen von türkischem Ursprung. Man konnte sie deshalb ins Türkische übernehmen und mußte sie nicht durch genuin türkische Wörter ersetzen. Der Beweis der Verwandtschaft wurde durch eine spezielle Form der Restrukturierung geführt, die man als “esoterische Restrukturierung” bezeichnen könnte. Sie ist vom Sprecher nicht nachvollziehbar, auch wenn er die Neologismen und Methoden der neologistischen Wortbildung kennt.

Zwei Verfahren lassen sich unterscheiden. Im ersten Fall wird wenigstens versucht, eine Motivierung des Fremd- oder Lehnwortes zu konstruieren. Die Interpretation stützt sich aber auf archaisches oder nicht-türkeitürkisches Wortmaterial, das dem Sprecher des Türkeitürkischen unbekannt ist und deshalb nicht zur Motivierung taugt. Als Beispiel sei der Neologismus *ekzey* ‘Übung’ angeführt, eine Teilrestrukturierung von frz. *exercice*. *Ekzey* wird als deverbales Nomen auf *-(A)y* präsentiert (*ekze-y*), abgeleitet von einem dubiosen archaischen Verb *ekze-* ‘sich üben’ (*Türk Dili* 23-26 [Oktober 1937], 82). In der Regel wurden Fremdwörter aus dem Französischen, die nicht sehr verbreitet waren, in dieser Weise restrukturiert. Kaum eines dieser Wörter hat Eingang in die Wortlisten und Wörterbücher gefunden.

Der zweite Typ der esoterischen Restrukturierung verzichtet völlig auf eine Motivierung durch türkisches Wortmaterial. Vielmehr erklärt man die “eigentliche” Bedeutung des fremden Lautkörpers durch Rückgriff auf semantische Werte, die den Lauten oder Lautgruppen von Natur aus inhärieren (“Lautsymbolismus”). Nach dieser Methode ist z. B. das arabische Lehnwort *akıl* ‘Verstand’ in *ak* und *ıl* zu zerlegen. Das erste Element ist eine Form der “Urwurzel” *ağ*, hier in der Bedeutung ‘Macht, Herrschaft’, und *ıl* ist ein Suffix mit der Bedeutung ‘alles, die gesamte Außen- und Innenwelt, Ausdehnung’, so daß *akıl* “eigentlich” bedeutet: ‘das, was alles beherrscht’.<sup>13</sup> Diese Art der esoterischen Restrukturierung verändert den Lautkörper des Fremd- oder Lehnwortes nicht, und in dieser Weise wurden in der Regel die arabischen Lehnwörter, die seit langem eingebürgert waren und auf die man nicht verzichten konnte,

<sup>12</sup> Laut (1993: Abschnitt I, 3.2.3.6.).

<sup>13</sup> Laut (1993: Anhang, Dokument 7, S. 45 des Originaldokuments).

analysiert. Sie konnten nun – mit türkischem Paß – unverändert im Wörterbuch verbleiben.

Wenn es sich anbot, hat man natürlich auch in der 3. Phase der Sprachreform in herkömmlicher Art restrukturiert. Beispiele dafür (*belleten*, *çekül*, *eksen* usw.) hatten wir unter 2.1. und 3. bereits genannt. Im übrigen war die Phase des esoterischen Restrukturierens mit dem Tode Atatürks (November 1938) schlagartig zu Ende. Das erste umfassende Wörterbuch der Sprachgesellschaft von 1945 verzeichnet die französischen Fremdwörter nicht in esoterisch restrukturierter Form, sondern in phonetischer Originallautung. Auch bei arabischen Lehnwörtern findet sich dort wieder ein Hinweis auf ihre arabische Herkunft.

### 5. Index der restrukturierten Wörter

<i>akıl</i>	4.	<i>eksen</i>	3.	<i>önder</i>	3.
<i>arkasal</i>	2.2.	<i>ekzey</i>	4.	<i>örge</i>	2.1.
<i>astöz</i>	2.2	<i>genel</i>	2.1.	<i>salay</i>	2.2.
<i>ayrıt</i>	2.1.	<i>ikilem</i>	3.	<i>sarkıt</i>	2.2.
<i>belleten</i>	2.1.	<i>kafçıtan</i>	3.	<i>simey</i>	2.1.
<i>cebrık</i>	3.	<i>kamun</i>	2.1.	<i>somtöz</i>	2.1.
<i>çekül</i>	3.	<i>komutan</i>	2.1.	<i>soysal</i>	2.1.
<i>dikit</i>	2.1.	<i>korun</i>	2.2.	<i>tangan</i>	3.
<i>dil atanlık</i>	2.2.	<i>kosakan</i>	3.	<i>toput</i>	3.
<i>diyelek</i>	3.	<i>kotangan</i>	3.	<i>üçgen</i>	3.
<i>dörtgen</i>	3.	<i>kural</i>	2.1.	<i>varsay-</i>	2.1.
<i>dural</i>	2.2.	<i>nomal</i>	2.1.	<i>yantınomluk</i>	2.2.
<i>egemen</i>	2.1.	<i>okul</i>	2.1.	<i>yantıtöz</i>	2.1.

### 6. Abkürzungen und Literatur

CK = *Osmalıcadan Türkçeye cep kılavuzu*. İstanbul, 1935. Devlet basımevi.

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

Danişmend, İsmail Hami 1935. *Türkçe-osmanlıca-fransızca sözlük*. İstanbul: Kanaat kütüphanesi.

Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon 1-2*. (Turcologica 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Giles, Herbert 1912<sup>2</sup>. *A Chinese-English dictionary 1-2*. Shanghai, London.

- Ladstätter, Otto 1967. Zur Integration abendländischen Begriffs- und Wortgutes ins Chinesische (Teil 1). *Oriens Extremus* 14 (1967), 1-26.
- Laut, Jens Peter 1993. *Das Türkische als Ursprache? Sprachwissenschaftliche Theorien in der Zeit des erwachenden türkischen Nationalismus*. [Habilitationsschrift der Universität Göttingen, ungedruckt.]
- Tietze, Andreas 1995-1996. Der türkeitürkische Wortschatz. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14 (1995/1996), 5-37.
- TS 1945 = *Türkçe sözlük*. İstanbul, 1945. (Türk Dil Kurumu 3, 1.) [In einigen Exemplaren mit Erscheinungsdatum 1944]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- TS 1988 = *Türkçe sözlük*. Yeni baskı. Bd. 1-2. Ankara, 1988. (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 549.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Wahrig, Gerhard (Hrsg.) 1972. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Gütersloh, Berlin, München, Wien: Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag.
- Zülfikar, Hamza 1991. *Terim sorunları ve terim yapma yolları*. (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 569.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

# Some remarks on Andreas Tietze's forthcoming Turkish lexicon

**Helga Anetshofer**

Anetshofer, Helga 1998. Some remarks on Andreas Tietze's forthcoming Turkish lexicon. *Turkic Languages* 2, 284-307.

This article aims to provide information concerning the origin and realisation of Andreas Tietze's lexical project and to give some statistical details of the recently finished first volume, A-E. As the section on the monolinguality of the lexicon and scientific objective demonstrates, the priority of the study lies in presenting an abundant Turkish vocabulary by including some new lexemes never quoted before (gleaned from unpublished Ottoman material and modern Turkish novels). Extensive literary references serve as evidence for each lexeme and as a source of stylistic, morphological and syntactical matters. A few sample pages are included in order to give an idea of the arrangement of the lexicon. The last section presents newly suggested etymologies and describes the innovative system of summary paragraphs covering all aspects of linguistic research.

*Helga Anetshofer, Institut für Turkologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Schwenden-  
erstr. 33, 14195 Berlin, Germany, E-mail: anetshof@zedat.fu-berlin.de*

## 1. Introduction

The aim of this article is to give a brief account of Andreas Tietze's current lexicographical project in order to inform the scholarly community about the current status of the preparation of his new Turkish lexicon, which will be entitled *Türkiye Türkçesi söz hazinesi. Etimoloji – Dil tarihi – Söz yapılışı*. The recently completed first volume (A-E) is to be published this year.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my thanks to my esteemed professor Andreas Tietze for giving me the opportunity to write this article. Tietze already prepared an account of an earlier stage of the project (Tietze 1995-1996).

It was in the 1950s and 1960s especially that Tietze carried out intensive research on Turkish lexicology, resulting in a series of articles concerning matters like Greek, Slavonic, Arabic, Persian, etc. loanwords in Turkish and Turkish word formation.<sup>2</sup> Also well known is his participation in the new edition of Sir James Redhouse's invaluable Turkish-English Lexicon from 1890, the *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük* (Redhouse 1968), which is still considered to be "ein besonderer Höhepunkt in der türkischen Lexikographie" (Stein 1990: 349). Over the years Tietze has continued his lexicological studies, frequently publishing articles on this topic, and he has collected a myriad of data, extracted from the Ottoman and Turkish literary materials he worked on and recorded on index cards comprising the particular lexeme with all references. Fortunately, about five years ago he decided to publish his large collection. During the past three years intensive work has been performed to bring this project to fruition. Some students at Vienna University were offered the opportunity to assist in organisational, technical and scientific matters, which they have done and continue to do with great pleasure and commitment.<sup>3</sup>

Although the project was originally intended as an etymological dictionary, the etymological priority was dismissed in favour of a detailed definition of each lexeme in stylistic, morphological and syntactical terms and the incorporation of summary paragraphs on various topics (morphology, phonetics, handling of loan elements, toponyms, special lexical units, etc.). These paragraphs, which I will return to in more detail below, combine all the cited lexemes which display a special feature. We consider this approach to be an innovation in Turkish lexicography.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. Technical details

The corpus of the first volume of the lexicon comprising the letters A-E has recently been finished. For the time being, roughly 13,900 lex-

<sup>2</sup> See a complete list of Tietze's lexicological works in the forthcoming first volume of the lexicon in question.

<sup>3</sup> These are my fellow students İ. Feigl, D. Karabinova, K. Tomenendal, and myself.

<sup>4</sup> A similar approach can be found e.g. in the French dictionary *Le Robert méthodique* (Rey-Debove 1982).



emes and 370 summary paragraphs are furnished on 1,360 pages, but these numbers should not be regarded as final. Although no further lexemes are to be included, the number of pages will probably increase owing to the incorporation of some additional summary paragraphs.<sup>5</sup> The lexicon contains a large bibliography of the literary sources from which the references have been taken, and a smaller one of secondary literature. Furthermore there will be an index of cross-references concerning reading variants; a list of the summary paragraphs in thematical order will also be added. The volume will be published in Istanbul. No final decision has been made concerning the publisher.

### 2.1. Monolinguality and scientific objective

The lexicon is monolingual. Its language was designated to be exclusively Turkish, above all to avoid having to translate the extensive literary references into any European language, which would simply have doubled the size of the work. In any case, the carefully chosen references give a clear account of the possible meanings of the lexemes involved. Tietze rejected the idea of modernising some obsolete expressions in his Turkish explanations (e.g. *bilhassa*, *mâmur etmek*, *şahsın ehemmiyetini ifade eder*, *kelimenin menşei*, *o makamın sembolü mânasına gelir*, etc.), as his younger assistants had suggested, arguing that an educated young Turk—interested in language—should be familiar with these expressions. The scientific objective is to present an abundant vocabulary of the Turkish language—Tietze calls it “Grundwortschatz”, which I consider an understatement—extracted from literary sources ranging from the earliest Old Anatolian Turkish sources of the 13th century to the contemporary Turkish novel. For this purpose, texts from all social groups (urban / rural, educated / uneducated) have been used, including genuine Turkic lexical material as well as borrowings from other languages. Morphological, stylistic and (whenever possible) etymological comments are provided for each lexeme. The particular merit of this work lies in the combination of the explanations with copious reference material. Even the very important *Tarama Sözlüğü* (TS 1963-1977) does not provide such an abundance of refer-

<sup>5</sup> My contribution to this volume consists of approximately 60 summary paragraphs. Some more paragraphs remain to be done. Meanwhile Tietze is working on the letter H.

ences, and moreover confines itself to Turkic words only. On the other hand, an important part of lexicography, i.e. phraseology, which for practical reasons is traditionally incorporated in dictionaries, had to be minimised to keep the project within reasonable limits (consider Tietze's pioneering study on the phraseology of the word *burun* 'nose', in which he cites 226 phraseological usages of *burun*, Tietze 1983). Nevertheless, to a certain degree phraseological matters are implicit in the literary references. Proverbs, which traditionally form a category of their own (cf. Stein: 344-345), are completely excluded.

Tietze's new lexicon is certainly geared toward advanced scholars of Turkish studies who already have a sound knowledge of the basic vocabulary. The definitions of the lexemes are kept as brief as possible—priority usually being given to their older meanings. Some natural and systemic derivations which are often of more recent or secondary meaning are not even mentioned, e.g. the lexeme *ağırlık* is offered only with the meanings 'vakar, hürmet' and 'ikram, atıyye' (for both of which references can be found in the earliest Ottoman sources), ignoring the common present-day meaning 'heaviness, importance'. Nor are all possible derivations, e.g. those formed by the very common denominal verbal formative *+IA*, cited if they are not of special semantic interest. To give another example regarding the priority of special meanings: The entry for the lexeme *domuzluk* does not refer to the modern and obvious meaning 'swinish behaviour' (which can be looked up in any other Turkish dictionary), but gives only the special meaning 'değirmende suyun çıktığı ve çarkın döndüğü yer', stating that the derivative's connection with the nominal stem is opaque. Moreover Tietze has consciously excluded some (more or less common) neologisms, especially those which are difficult to etymologise. The criteria for the exclusion of certain neologisms in contrast to others are not always easy to understand, e.g. it is not obvious at first sight why *bitki*—the *-KI* derivative from *bit-* 'grow' and very common in present-day Turkish as 'plant'—only appears with the meaning 'ürün' and a note to compare it with Az. 'göyarti, nâbatat' (besides the older homonym *bitki / bitgi* 'son, uç' from *bit-* 'end'), while a derived verb like *duruzla-* 'kısaca durmak, duraksamak' created and used by a single author (Kaçan 1990: 19) is introduced and even becomes the subject of a summary paragraph. But, taking into consideration that *bitki* is a very common derivative (found in any dictionary) and that *duruzla-* is an interesting form which seems to show a new deverbal verbal

formative, which I will refer to later, the decision appears to be sound. Tietze's decision to exclude those neologisms which were invented during the Kemalist era without any reference to philological or linguistic facts and can only be explained in terms of the persons who participated in their creation also seems reasonable: Consider the emergence of the word *bay* (like 'Bay Özkan'), which was created as a modification of the old title *bey* (like 'Fuat bey', originally denoting aristocratic status).<sup>6</sup> Preceding the surname, which does not correspond to Turkish syntax, it was obviously created analogously to the French 'Monsieur ...' and was intended to divest the Turkish Republican citizens of any social status reminiscent of the imperial Ottoman past.

Hence, it is not the aim of this lexicon to take the place of older Turkish lexicons such as Redhouse, TS or TüS (1988) by repeating well-known lexemes for the sake of completeness, but rather to provide a few new or very rare lexemes never before quoted in any lexicon. For these reasons, the lexicon will not prove very useful to a beginning Turkish reader or for reading modern Turkish newspapers, but it will be a rich and indispensable source for any philologist or linguist dealing with older Turkish (Ottoman) sources or the modern Turkish novel.

## 2.2. Linguistic terminology

In the course of furnishing the lexemes with grammatical explanations and writing summary paragraphs on matters such as morphology, phonetics, etc., we were confronted with the persistent problem of Turkish linguistic terminology. Since the language of the lexicon is Turkish, we tried to employ more or less all linguistic terms used in Turkish. However, it is well known that there is still no standard terminology applied by all linguists in Turkey. We tried to make use of Korkmaz' *Grammer terimleri sözlüğü* (1992), but, as Tietze pointed out, a great number of the terms given there can only be regarded as suggestions, since they have yet to be accepted throughout Turkey. Thus priority was given to comprehensibility for a large readership over consistency, which means that older Arabic terms, Turkish neologisms as well as Latin and French (e.g. "calque"), seldom German (e.g. "Volks-etymologie") and English (e.g. "backformation"), terms are used side

<sup>6</sup> In 1934 *bay* was officially announced as the replacement of *bey* (Steuerwald).

by side in the following way: Arabic terms are restricted to those still commonly used (e.g. "isim", "sıfat", "fiil", etc.),<sup>7</sup> Turkish neologisms are employed if firmly established (otherwise terms from European languages are used). Each linguistic term is followed by its Latin equivalent in parentheses. As the sample pages below demonstrate, not even this concept could be carried out consistently. Whenever there is more than one possibility of expressing a linguistic term in Turkish (which is not a rare phenomenon), the one which seemed to be more common or logical (to us) was chosen; e.g. *karşılıklılık* 'reciprocity' (Ergin 1972, Uysal 1980, Banguoğlu 1974, Ediskun 1985, Gülensoy 1994: 101) instead of *işteşlik* (Uysal uses this term collectively for *karşılıklılık* 'reciprocity' and *birliktelik* 'co-operation'; Ediskun uses this term as equivalent to *ortaklaşa* and in the same collective way as Uysal; in Korkmaz' terminology this term is used as equivalent to *ortaklaşma* without any differentiation between the meanings of 'reciprocity' and 'co-operation'). Analogously to *karşılıklılık* we created the term *ortaklık* 'co-operation' instead of *ortaklaşa* (Banguoğlu), *ortaklaşma* (Ergin, Korkmaz, see above), *ortaklık* (Gülensoy) and *birliktelik* (Uysal, Ediskun, see above). In the same way we introduced the term *dönüşken* 'reflexive' instead of *dönüşlü* (Ergin, Banguoğlu, Korkmaz) analogous to *etken*, *edilgen*, *ettirgen*. Resolving the problem of Turkish technical terminology (which is an ongoing process) before the publication of the first volume does not seem very likely. A complete list of all terms used in the lexicon will be provided.

### 2.3. Arrangement and description of the lexemes

The lexemes are arranged in alphabetical order and rendered consistently in modern Turkish orthography. Verbal lexemes are quoted with their stems only (e.g. *doğ-*) following nonverbal lexemes. Phonetic variants are listed side by side (*ceyran* / *ceylân* 'zarif bir çeşit karaca', *bargâh* / *baregâh* / *barigâh* 'padişahın karargâhı, saray, taht salonu'), with the variant reflecting modern standard pronunciation given first.

<sup>7</sup> The word *isim* alone is used for 'noun', and *isimden* is employed for 'denominal'. To denote categories of nouns *ad* is also used, e.g. *yer adı*, *topluluk adı*, but *somut isim*, *soyut isim*, *kılış ismi*, *alet ismi*, etc. Tietze also employs various obsolete terms such as *haber* 'predicate' and *müşareket* 'co-operative'. I prefer Turkish neologisms in these cases.

Etymologically different homonyms as well as words deriving from one single stem but belonging to different grammatical units (e.g. usage of *can* as noun *can* I, or adjective *can* II) or language units (e.g. *dayak* I ‘destek’ in Anatolian dialects, and *dayak* II ‘dövülme, darb’ in modern standard Turkish) have been divided into different paragraphs marked by Roman numerals. If the given word does not belong to present-day standard Turkish there is a note on the specific language subunit to which it belongs preceding the particular lexeme (abbreviated or in parentheses). The most important subunits are: AD. ‘Anadolu diyalektleri’, O. ‘Osmanlıca’, EO. ‘Eski Osmanlıca’, RD. ‘Rumeli diyalektleri’, (Argo), (Çocuk dili), (Halk ağzı), (Konuşma dili), (Néologisme). In this terminology EO. refers to old Turkic words, sometimes with rather different phonetics, which already became obsolete in the course of the 16th century (like *aşağarak / aşağırak* ‘daha aşağı’, *demren* ‘ok ucu’, etc.), and O. refers especially to Arabic and Persian loanwords from the classical and late Ottoman period (now obsolete) as well as some institutional terms belonging to Ottoman history (like *divan* I ‘eski zamanda devlet idaresinin büyük meclisi’ or *balyemez* ‘eski zamanda kullanılan büyük top’ < İt. ...). The particular lexeme is succeeded by a short definition in single quotation marks, followed by the etymology introduced by the symbol < (if the word a lexeme is traced back to has the same meaning as the modern Turkish version, the abbreviation a.m. ‘aynı manada’ is noted, b.m. refers to ‘bilinen manada / bugünkü manada’). Following the lexicographical sources (DS, TS, Meninski, Redhouse, etc.) the literary references are cited underlined. An effort has been made to consistently provide (whenever possible) both an early and a modern reference for one particular meaning, introduced by the symbol ×. Ottoman Turkish references are quoted in transcription according to İA, but with the use of *η* instead of *ñ* and the additional grapheme *ê* (sometimes also *i*) for the sound “closed e”.

See the following examples, i.e. one page from the lexicon for each letter:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Since my intention is only to give an impression of the structure of the lexicon, abbreviations in this part of the article will not be cited completely in the list of abbreviations.

## A

*aldatmaca* 'aldatmak kasdiyle oynanan oyun' (oyun isimlerinde geçen *-maca* ek terkihi için krş. *köşekapmaca* vs.). × *Bilinçsiz yığınlar, karşılıklı oynanmış oyunun içyüzünü nerden bilsindi? Basın bu aldatmacanın başlıca günahkârlarındandı.* (B. Arpad 1976 s. 81).

EO. *aldavu* 'hile' < *alda-* fiilinden *-vu/-vü* isim eki ile, krş. Kazan, Kırım, Kırgız *aldau* a.m. Radloff WB I, 413. × *Ağırbaşlılıkla ve aþullukla bunca vaktür ki şol işi bitürmez diyüb ta'n itdükleri yegdür aldavu-yula tiz başardı diyüb ögdüklerinden.* (Mercimek Ahmed 1944 s. 76).

*aldır-* b.m. (almağa emir veya sebebiyet vermek) < ET. *altur-* a.m. Clau-son s. 133. × *Ondan bu iş için hem üç bin frank komisyon almış, hem de dört tablosunu aldırmuş ona.* (M. Balaban 1959 s. 68). EO. 'savaşta kaybetmek, kaptırmak': × *Çocalığım vakti aldurduğum yalnız oğul.* (Dedem Korkut 1973 s. 68). (Geçişsiz) *-al-e aldir-* (ekseriya menfi) 'dikkat etmek, ehemmiyet vermek': × *Size ait bir şey yok, rahatınızı bozmayın, hiç aldırmayın!* (S. M. Alus 1944 s. 107). × *O kadar ne aldırıyorsunuz? Kim görecektir?* (a.e. s. 20). × *Aldırma be! Daha az çalış sen de, kaytar biraz.* (Peride Celal 1991 s. 355). Kelimenin semantik gelişmesi henüz kâfi derecede araştırılmamıştır.

*aldırış et-* (ekseriya menfi) 'dikkat etmek, ehemmiyet vermek' < *aldır-* (son gösterilen mânada). Mânası aynı olduğu için fiilin dolambaçlı yoldan ifadesi izaha muhtaçtır. × *Geldiği masadan onu izleyen meraklı bakışlara aldırış etmiyor.* (A. Yurdakul 1991 s. 167). × ... *bana gelen mektupların sayısı dördü, beşi buldu amma, benim hiç aldırış ettiğim yok gibi idi.* (O.C. Kaygılı 1939 s. 156).

O. *aleddevâm* 'devam ederek' < Ar. 'alâ/(iki ünsüzden evvel) 'ala, l/(d'den evvel) d harfi tarifi, ve *dawâm* 'devam'.

O. AD. *alef/alaf* 'hayvan yemi, saman, kuru ot' DS 183-184 < Ar. '*alaf* a.m. × [Öküz şikayet eder:] *Çün namâz-ı şâm eve gelürem başa olkadar 'alef virmezler ki nîm-sîr olam.* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 192b).

AD. *alefe* 'hayvan yemi' Emiroğlu 1989 s. 37 < Ar. '*alüfa* a.m. 'imam, goban gibi kimselere belli bir süre için verilen ücret' DS 210.

AD. *alefi* 'deri cilâlamakta kullanılan mermer tozu' DS 210 < Gr. *aloifé* 'madeni eşyayı temizlemeğe yarayan toz' Tietze 1955 nr. 6.

*alegori* 'sembollerle anlatılan soyut bir fikir' < Fr. *allégorie* < Lat. *allēgoria* a.m. < EGr. ἀλληγορεῖν (*allegorein*) 'başka (yâni mecazi) sözlerle ifade etmek' (*allos* 'başka' ve *agoreúein* 'bir mecliste konuşmak' *agorá* 'meclis').

alegorik 'alegori vasfında' < Fr. *allégorique* a.m. (bk. alegori). × *O* [yâni Halide Edib Adıvar'ın Tatarcık adlı romanı], *bir geçiş döneminin alaborası içinde, bu dönem sosyetesinin gerçekçi ve alegorik bir portresidir.* (V. Günyol 1992 s. 115).

## B

AD. bürtle-/pürtle- 'birdenbire çıkmak, fırlamak, taşmak; toprak altından yüze çıkmak (tahullar hakkında)' DS 828, 3499 < ses taklidi ve ekspresif fiillerden.

AD. bürtle-/pürtle- 'ortaya çıkarmak; kabartmak, şişirmek' < *bürtle-/pürtle-* fiilinin ettirgen (causativum) hali. × *Esker nöbetine dinelir gibi. Madalyayı da yakasında görünecek gibi eyice bürtleymiş.* (F. Erdinç 1973 s. 86).

O. büruc 'burclar, Zodiyakdaki yıldız kümeleri' < Ar. *burûc* a.m. [*burc* kelimesinin çoğulu]. × *Şoĥbet kamer Ĥameldeyiken, Cedydeyiken, Miyzandayiken ĥüb olur ki bular neşât bürücdür.* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 208a).

bürudet 'soğuk (isim); his soğukluğu, resmiyet' < Ar. *burûda* a.m. × *Nezahet Hanım daha Şefik Celâlettin ile teehhüle razı olduğu zaman kızı Handanın kalbindeki bürudet adeta husumet haline girmiştir.* (Fazlı Necip 1930 s. 221).

O. bürük 'şimşekler' < Ar. *burûq* a.m. [*barq* kelimesinin çoğulu]. × *Ol dem yel çıktı, ra 'd u bürük u bārān geldi.* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 179a).

O. bürüz 'gösterme, teşhir' < Ar. *burûz* a.m. × *Nāgāh duĥter tâcım başından götürdi, mıkna 'asını bıraktı. Zuhūr u bürüz temām oldu.* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 200b-201a).

bürü- 'sarmak, örtmek, her tarafını kaplamak' DS 829, TS 743 < ET. *bür-* a.m. Clauson 355. × *Gördi bir ağac bitmiş ki hıc âferiyde anuĥ gibi yoğun ve uzun ağac gördüğü yokdur. Şöyleki gölgesi ol dağı bürümüş.* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 195b). Mecazi mânada: × *Pâdişāhı gayret-i İslām bürüdi.* (F. Giese 1929 [890/1485] s. 178). '(düşmanı) kuşatmak': × *Şubĥdem ol kal'aya yürüdiler / Gâziler çevre yanın bürüdiler.* (Enverî 1928-29 [869/1464] s. 38).

AD. bürük 'bürgü, çarşaf, kadınların sokak giysisi' DS 828 < *bürü-* + fiilden somut isimler yapan *-k* eki, krş. *kaşık*. × *Efendim, herifin biri bürüğe bürünüp karı kılığında karılar hamamına girmiş.* (A. Nesin 1961z s. 136).

AD. bürükle-/bürükle- 'baş, yüz örtmek (kadın hakkında), çarşaflamak' DS 828 < *bürük* + isimden fiil yapan *-le-* eki. × *Oĥlan "Ana, hele başını ört. O gelin hasta, doktor getirdim baksın" diyor. Kadın başını örtüyor, yüzünü bürüklüyor.* (U. Günay 1975 s. 294). *bürüklen-/bürüklen-* 'örtünmek, çarşaflanmak': × *Gız bürihlenir, "Ben yenmem aşıĥı" diyor.* (B. Seyidoĥlu 1975 s. 234).

bürüncek/bürümcek 'ham ipekten dokunmuş bez' DS 829, 743-744, R. Dankoff 1991 s. 20 < *bürün-* fiilinden yapılmış bir isim (krş. derincek). × *Gördi kim 'avrat bürüncüğün ev dīvārı üzerine kırmış.* (A. Zajaczkowski 1934 [1405] s. 22).

bürüme 'bütün vücudu kaplıyan' TS 743 < *bürü-* + fiilden edilgen sıfatfiil (participium passivum) mânasında sıfat yapan *-me* eki. × *Bürime donlu yèg atlar binürler / Kılıç elde vü kalkan yapınurlar.* (Şeyhoğlu Muştafâ 1979 [1540] no. 5602).

### C

AD. canp 'kola bitişik vücut parçası' THASDD 1041 I, 246, 'kağnıda kola bitişik parça' DS 857 < Ar. *canb* 'vücudun yanı, böğür' (Tietze 1958 nr. 44).

O. canperver 'can besleyen, insanın kalbine iyi gelen' < Fa. *cân-parvar* a.m. [*cân* + *-parvar* 'besleyen']. × *Müsâfire çıkan ta'âmları zikr olunduğı üzre lezîz u cân-perver aşçılar bişürdüğü ni 'metden bile elezz u hoşter olub ...* ('Âlî 1982 II, 146).

O. canrûba 'cazip, hoş, latif' < Fa. *cân-rubâ* 'öldürücü'; muhtemelen *dilrûba* yerine yanlış kullanılma. × *Gönül çekici, canrûba bir koruya açılıyordu kapı.* (B. Uzuner 1994 s. 59).

cansiperane 'canını verircesine, canını feda edercesine' < Fa. *cân-sipārāna* [*cân* + *sipār*(dan) 'üstünde tepinmek, tepmek' + zarf eki olan *-āna*]. × *Neden saç sakal, giyim kuşam daha cansiperane savunuluyor da, iç dünyalar, düşünceler bu kadar bir heyecanla değiştirilip dışa vurulmuyor?* (A. Ağaoğlu 1993 s. 70).

O. cansitan 'katledici, öldürücü' < Fa. *cân-sitān* a.m. [*cân* + *-sitān* 'kapan, alıp götüren']. × *Gün olmazdı ki bir âfitāb-ı 'âlem-tābı dest-i tağallüb-ile çeküb almaya ve vücūdı gencini harāb edüb kenz-i 'iffetine efi-denān u şu 'bān-ı cân-sitān salmaya.* ('Âlî 1979 I, s. 181).

O. cansuz 'canı yanan, ızdırıp çeken' < Fa. *cân-sūz* a.m. [*cân* + *-sūz* 'yanan']. × *Âşıka rahm eylemekte şem 'dür rüşen delil / Kim döker pervāne-i cân-sūz için kan yaşlar.* ('Ömer bin Mezîd 1982 s. 176).

cant 'motördeki eklem yerleri' ?? < Fr. *jointe* ?? × *Bin beş yüz kilometrelik yolları döne döne kavrulmuş cantlara bakıyorum: pırıl pırıl o cantlar, kendimi içinde görüyorum.* (M. Güler 1990 s. 124).

cantiye/centiyane/kantiyane 'bir çiçek ismi, kızıl kantaron' TüS < Lat. *gentiāna* a.m. (rivayete göre, bu çiçeğin köklerinin ilâç olarak kullanmasını icad eden Milâddan önce 2. asırda yaşayan İlliriya kralı *Gentius*'un adından). G. Meyer 1893 s. 29.



capcanlı 'dipdiri, sapsağlam, taptaze, uyanık' < *canlı* + kuvvetlendirici öntakı, réduplication ile tezat ünsüzü, krş. *dipdiri, büsbütün*. × *Yaşlı olmasına yaşlıydı ya, gene de boz şayak urbaları içinde dimdik, capcanlı bir vücudu vardı*. (M. Başaran 1964 s. 74).

## Ç

çırnık I bk. çernik.

(Argo) çırnık II 'değersiz, kıymetsiz; çirkin, sakil' Devellioğlu 1959 s. 77 < başka kaynaklarda bulamadığımız kelime görünüşe göre Ahmed Vefik Paşa'nın piyeslerini yeni harflere çevirenler tarafından bazan *çırık* (bk. *cerik/çerik*) bazan da *çırnık* diye okunan kelimeye dayanıyor; kelimenin kullanışı çok küçük bir para birimi ('mangır') fikrini veriyor. Acaba aslı *zırnık* mıdır? × *Dokuz para, bir akça, beş pul, daha bir çırnık fazla yok. Geliyor mu işinize? ... Haydi, iki çırnık daha. - Etme be yahu, iki çırnık dediğin birer kadeh rakı parası!* (Ahmed Vefik Paşa 1933ka s. 53-54).

AD. çırına 'baykuş'/çırına 'çulluk' DS 118, 1236 < Gr. (Karadeniz dial.) *tziróna* 'bir çeşit kuş' A. A. Papadopoulos 1961 II, 387 (Gr. kelimenin aslı belli değildir).

EO. çırp- I '(kılıçla) kesmek' TS 908 < *çarp-* I fiilinin varyantı.

çırp- II '(haltyı) silkelemek' < *çarp-* I fiilinin varyantı. × *Ellerindeki ekmek kırıntılarını, unları çırparak dışarıya çıktı*. (Yaşar Kemal 1976 s. 130). 'yiyecek bir şeyi çatalla hızlı hızlı vurarak köpürtmek': × ... ? '(ellerini) birbirine vurmak, alkış tutmak': *Salondakiler ellerini hep birlikte ağır, durgun bir tempoyla çırptılar*. (A. Özakin 1982 s. 117).

(Argo) çırp- III 'çalınmak, hırsızlık etmek' < *çarp-* II fiilinin varyantı.

AD. çırp- IV 'boyalı çırpı ipiyle çizgi çekmek' Meninski 1680 I, 1597 < *çarp-* I fiilinin varyantı. 'elden geçirmek, düzeltmek; (evi) silmek, süpürmek, badana yapmak; (çamaşır) yıkamak; (çabucak) bitirivermek, tüketmek': × *Lâf değil, 27 beygir kuvvetinde; saatte 70 kilometreyi çırpıveriyor*. (S.M. Alus. Akşam gaz. mayıs 1941).

AD. çırpak 'çok ince değnek' DS 1188 < *çrp-* II + fiilden nomen instrumenti yapan -ak eki, krş. *bıçak, tutak*. × *Katra bir çırpak vuruyorlar. Hâlâ dağdan dağa sürüyüp durur katır Arap kızını*. (M. Tuğrul 1969 s. 329).

çırpala- '(suyu) püskürtmek' < *çrp-* + fiilden küçültme ve tekrarlama fiili yapan -ala- genişlemesi, krş. *dürtele-*, *oğala-*. × *Hemen ırmakta avuçlarına doldurduğu su ile yüzünü hızlı hızlı çırpalar ve kendini fabrikanın içine dar atardı*. (Kenan Hulûsi 1938 s. 124).

çırpı I 'dal kırpıntısı' (ekseriya *çalı çırpı* terkininde) < *çırp-* II + fiilden nomen instrumenti yapan -ı eki, krş. *ütü, yakı*. AD. 'yün atmak için kullanılan araç' DS 1189.

çırpı II yalnız *bir çırpıda* 'ara vermeden; bir lahzada' terkininde < *çırp-* (hangi mânada?) + fiilden nomen actionis yapan -ı eki, krş. *koşu, yazı*. × *Salih bütün bu sözleri bir çırpıda Ustaya söyledi*. (Yaşar Kemal 1976 s. 196). × *Bizim gözlerimizin bir çırpıda göreceği çirkinlikleri o hiç fark edemiyordu*. (A.Ş. Hisar 1944 s. 26). 'gerilmiş boyalı ipe düzgün çizgi çekme usulü'. O. 'dokunmuş bezleri beyazlatma ameliyesi'. *çırpıcı* 'bez beyazlatıcısı' Meninski 1680 I, 1598, TS 907.

## D

O. düreşan 'inci saçan' < Fa. *dur-afşân* a.m. [*dur* 'inci' + *afşân* 'saçan']. × *Yüz gördi; mâh-ı dür-efşân*. (Ferec 855/1451 v. 151a).

düret-/türet- 'yaratmak, icat etmek' TS 1328-30 < ET. *törüt-* a.m. Clauson 536. × *Sanırsın bağbozumuna değil, bayrama gidiyoruz! Bu ossuruğu cinlinin düretmesi bunlar!* (F. Baykurt 1967 s. 202).

dürlü/türlü 'çeşit' < ET. *törlüg* a.m. Clauson 546-547. Clauson'a göre etimolojisi belli değildir ve bugün Türk dillerinin bazısında bulunan *tür* 'şekil, örnek vs.' (bk. M. Räsänen 1969 s. 506) kelimesiyle alâkası yoktur. Bugün TT.'de kullanılan *tür* 'nevi, çeşit' kelimesi *türlü* kelimesinden bir backformation'dır. × *Dört dürlü sāza çār-pāre uydurdu*. (Ferec 855/1451 v. 203a). 'çeşitli, mütenevvi, ayrı ayrı': × *Dört yaña bağa dururken gördi ki havādan bir ulu kuş indi. Dürlü reng üzerinde mevcūd, 'aceb-şüret*. (Ferec 855/1451 v. 233b). × *Bu gez uğramışam dürlü kazāya*. (Meħmed 1965 s. 90 nr. 1230). × *Yaldızlı döşeği bir köşeye taht gibi kurulmuşdu. Her tarafı irili ufaqlı türlü biçimde zarif püfler dolduruyordu*. (H.R. Gürpınar 1341 s. 188). × *Her kasık mutlaka yumruk gibi fırlamaz ya, onun da türlüsü var. Bazı kasıklar çatlar da üstünden hiç belli olmaz*. (S.M. Alus 1933p s. 122). *türlü bin* 'bin türlü': × *Deminden beri herifin türlü bin edepsizliğini anlatır, sonra da herife eyvallah edersiniz*. (A. Nesin 1961z s. 186). *dürlü dürlü/türlü türlü* 'çok çeşitli' Meninski 1680 II, 2061, 2163: × *Zen-i bennā buyurdu dürlü dürlü ta 'āmlar bişürdiler*. (Ferec 855/1451 v. 22a). × *Dürlü dürlü tezvîrâtile, ne dediyse dēyüb Sulţān Cemi gerü Rûm tarafına hareket êtdürdi*. (F. Giese 1929 s. 185). × *Kadınlar, Satılmışın evinde davulcunun bağrdıklarını türlü türlü tefsir ederlerken, komşulardan birinin küçük oğlu çıkageldi. "Anne!" dedi, "Moskofla muharebe edecekmışiz."* (E.E. Talu 1937 s. 184). *bir dürlü daħı* (15. asır Osmanlı fermanlarında kullanılan formül) 'her hangi bir başka şekilde': *Her ne bulunursa bunlara teslim êdesiz. Bir dürlü daħı êtmeyesiz*. (F.

Kraelitz 1921 s. 63). *bir türlü ... bir türlü* 'ikisi de iyi olmayan iki şık arasında bocalayanın kararsızlığını ifade eder': × *Şimdi, kalksam bir türlü, kalksam bir türlü idi. Bereket versin, Emine, pişkin davranarak, beni bu güç mevkiden kurtardı ...* (O.C. Kaygılı 1939 s. 217).

AD. *dürmeç/düremeç* 'içine katık konularak sarılmış yufka ekmeği' DS 1634 < *dürme* 'dürülmüş' ve *aş*, krş. *bulamaç, sütlaç*. Üç heceli varyant, *dür-fiilinin \*düre-* diye bir varyantını icap ettirir. × *Bu soğukta arpa ekmeği! Çaresiz, yiyecekti. Dürmeç yaptı. Kopardı. Aç kurt gibi yemek istedi. Gitmiyor aşağı.* (Ü. Kaftancıoğlu 1972 s. 12). × *Yufkalar arasına soğanı, patatesi doldurup, tuzluyor, sonra düremeç yapıp ısırtıyordu.* (F. Baykurt 1961o s. 27).

O. *dürrâa* 'bol kollu ceket' < Ar. *durrâ'a* a.m. × *İmdi dürrâ'a vu taylasâna kanâ'at et!* (Ferec 855/1451 v. 104b).

## E

AD. *evdin-/evtin-* 'didiklemek, kümes hayvanları ayaklarıyla yeri eşmek, eşinmek; hastalığın verdiği ağrı, sızı veya acı ile kıvrınmak, insan bir sıkıntı etkisiyle hiç bir şey yapmadan oturmak' DS 1817-18 < ET. *evdin-* [*evdi-* 'toplamak' fiilinin reflexivum hali]. Clauson 7. × *Irazca evdinip duruyordu. "Bir habarı bir habar!" deyip dönüyordu.* (F. Baykurt 1961 s. 160).

*evdir-/ivdir-* 'acele etmek; acele ettirmek' DS 1802 < *ev-/iv-* fiilinin causativum hali. × *Yalan mı söyleyelim? Onbaşı evdirdi, yemeği yemeden çıktık. Yanımıza biraz ekme aldık ama, o da tutmadı.* (F. Baykurt 1961o s. 177).

EO. \**eveden* 'tamamiyle, büsbütün, eyice' TS 1568 < acaba *eyüden* yerine hata mı?

AD. *evək/ivek* 'acele' DS 1804, TS 2133-34 < ET. *evək* a.m. Clauson 8-9. × *Bir ivek işi var sanayduş temen ...* (Mes'ūd bin Aḥmed 1991 no. 479). × *İşümüz ivekdür, ilümüz ırāḥ.* (a.e. no. 2089).

*evele- eveleyip gevele-* tabirin kısaltılmış varyantı. × *Çok yadırgadığım bir şey var, onu söyliyeceğim ... Farkındasın, evelemekle kalmıyorum, uzattım bile ...* (B. Karasu 1994na s. 118).

*evele- gevele-* 'bir şeyi açık söylememek için onu ağzının içinde çevirerek mırıldanmak' < mânası ikinci kelimededen kaynaklanan kafiyeli terkip, *evele-* 'ağzı içinde evirip çevirmek'. × *Muharrir dua edecek amma aklına bir şey gelmiyor, yarabbileri tekrarlıyor. Dünya ahvalini düşününce eveleyip gevelemekten başka yapılacak bir şey olmadığını anlar, neticede kendilerine hak verir.* (R.H. Karay 1940g s. 122).

AD. evelik/evelek/efelik/efelek 'yenebilen bir ot, labada' DS 1667, 1804-1805 < Erm. *avel* 'çalı, çırpı, süpürge' + *-ik* küçültme eki (?) U. Bläsing s. 91 nr. 163, R. Dankoff 1995 no. 36.

ever- '(oğlunu) evlendirmek, düğünü yapmak' DS 1805-1806, TS 1568-71 < *ev* + isimden fiil yapan genişleme ve causativum, krş. *suvar-*. × *Bu 'âlemde maḫşūd olan bir kaç nesnedür: oğul evermek ve kız çākarmak ve dünyādan āḫirete yüz suyile naql eylemek. İndi bu nesneler Sulṭān Murāda müyesser oldı.* (F. Giese 1929 s. 128). × *Sulṭān Murād Hān Edrenede oğlı Sulṭān Mehmedi everdi, Dulğadır oğlı Süleymān beg kızı Sulṭān Zılvaı düğün eyleyüb aldı.* (Oruc b. 'Ādil 1343/1925 s. 64). Bāzan 'kız evlendirmek' için de kullanılır: × *Bizüm gibi fakīrlerūñ evlādını kim ister ve ister olsa daḫı bir entāricūk yapub ere vērmege kudretümüz yokdur ki everelüm.* ('Alī 'Azīz 1268 s. 215).

AD. evet I 'acele, çabuk' DS 1803-04 < *ev-* + ?? Krş. *evet et-* 'acele et-' DS 1806 ve *evetle-/ivetle-* DS 1806, 2571, TS 2134, Meninski 1680 I, 619. Clauson 6'ya göre Kağari'nin bir yerde gösterdiği *évet* 'acele' kelimesi muhtemelen *évek* yerine bir yazılış hatasıdır. Fakat TT.'deki durum böyle bir kelimenin mümkün olduğunu ortaya koyar. × *Oradan da savışıp gēdiy. Évet évet gēdiyken bi kövün urgundan geçiymiş.* (Ö.A. Aksoy 1945 I, 388).

### 3. Specifics

#### 3.1. Etymology

Turkic words: Considering Doerfer's high demands on an "ideales türkisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch" (taken from his comments on Räsänen's work from 1969, Doerfer 1971) we have to admit that the etymologies in the new lexicon are rather limited. Since the aim of this work is to provide abundant Turkish lexical material, the author has completely refrained from reconstructing a hypothetical original Turkic form (marked by \*) for each lexeme based on Ancient Turkic, Khalaj and Chuvash (as Doerfer had suggested). Nor are all the corresponding words in other Turkic languages listed. Whenever possible, the oldest Turkic form of a lexeme appearing in literary sources, introduced by ET. 'Eski Türkçe' (= Ancient Turkic), is provided. It is well known that this vague term includes runic inscriptions and manuscripts as well as Manichaean and Uyghur texts from the 8th to the middle of the 14th century (the chronological or geographical delimitation is rather difficult, cf. Erdal 1991: 4). The Ancient Turkic form is given in accordance with recent sources (primarily Clauson 1972, secondarily

Erdal 1991, Räsänen 1969). Occasionally there is a note to compare a lexeme with forms in other Turkic languages, if no Ancient Turkic reference could be found, e.g.:

*cıvı-* ‘cıvıklaşmak, ıslak ve yapışkan hale gelmek’ < birkaç Türk dilinde *yibi-* ‘ıslanmak’ M. Räsänen 1969 s. 202. <...>

AD. *cır-/çır-* ‘yırtıp parçalamak’ < krş. Çağ. *yır-* ‘azıcık yarmak’ M. Räsänen 1969 s. 201. <...>

Older and younger literary references attempt to reflect the historical development or constancy of a particular lexeme within Ottoman / Turkish boundaries (from the 13th century onward). The above-mentioned language subunits such as EO., O. give some additional information about the historical delimitation. Moreover calques from other languages are pointed out:

*demiryol/demiryolu* ... < Fr. *chemin de fer*’in tercümesi; zamanla bundan *demiryolu*, yâni bir izâfet terkibi oluyor. Buna benzer bir gelişme için krş. *pencşenbih gün* → *perşembe günü*. <...>

In principle, divergent scholarly opinions on the etymology of certain lexemes are quoted. If no etymology could be found at all or if the etymology cited is uncertain, the entry is marked by < ?? >. One example of an etymology newly suggested by Tietze: In the course of looking for the origin of the obviously derived verbal form AD. *ditsin-/titsin-* ‘tiksinmek, iğrenmek’, it is first of all identified as a variant of *tiksin-*, with the assimilation /ks/ → /ts/. Although +*sXn-* (or even -*sXn-*) is a probable verbal formative,<sup>9</sup> no adequate nominal stem (or verb stem)

<sup>9</sup> According to Erdal (1991: 523-535) the +*sIn-* formative belongs to the category of “types of inaction” and denotes ‘considering someone/something or one self to be in a certain class’, e.g. *ävsin-* ‘to reckon (a house) as one self’s and stay in it’, *ärsin-* ‘to show manliness’; *azsin-* ‘az görmek’ (Tietze, Lexicon), *güzelsin-* ‘etwas gut, angenehm finden’ (Schakir 1933: 40-41). Very rare and doubtful is -*sIn-*, e.g. *ansın-* ‘söz söylemek isterken söylememek’ (Tietze, Lexicon), for different meanings see: DS 279, TS 1407 (erroneously has *eğsin-*). Vásáry claims that “the suffix ±*sXn-*, the reflexive form of ±*sI-* forming intransitive simulative verbs can

*dik/tik* can be traced. Since Chaghatay has *tiskin-/tizgin-* 's'éloigner, s'écarter, se ranger' (Pavet de Courteille 1972 [1870]: 258) and Anatolian dialects show *tiskin-* 'bıkmak, usanmak, istememek' (DS: 3940) and the meaning of the derived verb can be related to *tez-* 'to run away, fly' ("[s]urvives as *tez-/tes-* only(?) in some NE dialects and SW Tkm., elsewhere displaced by *kaç-*" Clauson 1972: 572; DS: 3907), Tietze considers it to derive from *tez-/tes-* and the very rare and poorly attested intransitive verbal formative *-KXn-* (cf. *dolgun-* 'öfkelenmek, hiddetle köpürüp taşmak' Tietze, *Lexicon*; *çizgin-* 'dönmek, dolaşmak' TS 915; *taşkın-*, *uçkun-/uckun-*, *yutkun-*),<sup>10</sup> which through metathesis later becomes *tiksin-*.

Loanwords: The language of origin is given as Ar., Fa., Fr., Erm., etc. Arabic and Persian words are quoted in their original form, but in transcription; some Greek words are additionally cited in Greek letters. For the sake of Turkish readers especially, etymologies of modern educational terms are sometimes explained in detail according to the relevant literature, e.g. *akademi* 'yüksek ilim müessesesi' < Fr. *académie* < EYun. *ακαδημία* (*akademía*) 'Platon'un ders verdiği okul' (ismini okulun sahibi olan Akadēmos adlı şahıstan almıştı). <...>. In addition to references to his (and others') earlier research, Tietze has added some new unpublished material.

### 3.2. The literary sources

Owing to the immense effort that would have been involved in using manuscripts only for obtaining literary references, the great majority of the Ottoman sources (in all about eighty) have not been consulted in their original versions, but in the form of modern editions. Naturally this procedure is accompanied by a slight factor of uncertainty. The

be attested <...> frequently", without giving any example of a derivative of a verbal stem (1993: 114).

<sup>10</sup> This formative can be considered as producing medial verbs. Deny mentions *yutkun-* 'ravalier sa salive', *uçkun-* 's'effrayer, avoir subitement peur', *taşkın-* 'déborder' and describes its origin as opaque (1921: 532, footnote 2). Banguoğlu suggests *-KIn-* as consisting of *-(I)k-* and *-(I)n-*, both having a medial-reflexive meaning, which seems to be very likely (1974: 279). On the other hand, there seems to be no basis for his contention that *-KIn-* produces intensive verbs (cf. Erdal 1991: 650-651).

(unpublished) manuscripts or facsimile editions of fewer than a dozen works have been used. These are e.g. some works by Muṣṭafā ‘Ālī (late 16th century), the storybook *Ferec ba‘de ş-şidde* from 1451 (Budapest, Academy of Sciences), Topçıbaşı ‘Abdülkâdir’s *Ta’rîh-i âli ‘Osmân* from 1644 (Vienna, National Library), the hagiographical legend *Şaltuk-nâme* (compiled in the 1480s), and Sehî Beg’s *tezkire Heşt bihişt* (1538), the latter two being facsimile editions in the series *Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures (Turkic sources 4 and 5, Harvard University)*. Use has been made of all genres of traditional Anatolian / Ottoman literature, prose as well as poetry: The poetic works comprise about thirty *dīvāns*, *meşnevîs* and scattered poems from the 13th to the beginning of the 19th century, i.e. ranging from Mevlânâ’s Turkish verses to Seyrânî’s mystical folk poetry (1807-1866). The majority of these works certainly belong to the period between the 13th and 16th centuries. The prose works include epics and hagiographic legends, chronicles (*tevârîh*), descriptions of religious and military campaigns (*ğazavât-nâme*), travel accounts, biographies of poets and saints (*tezkiretü ş-şu‘arâ*, *tezkiretü l-evliyâ*) and others. Moreover, documents and registers concerning trade, administration and Islamic law, traditionally part of the *münşe‘ât* literature, have also been examined. Special attention has been given to recently edited works which had not yet been used as sources for lexicons.

Modern Turkish literature from the Tanzimat period onward is represented by the numerous works of more than 280 authors from Abasıyanık, Sait Faik to Yümer, Sacid. The first Turkish novel modelled on a European literary pattern, *Akabi Hikayesi* by the Armenian Vartan Paşa (1851, edited by Tietze 1991) was followed by numerous modern novels as well as other literary genres, all of which have served as reference material: Short stories (*hikaye*, *öykü*), comedies, tales (*masal*), modern poetry, biographies (*hatıralar*, *anılar*), travel accounts (*gezi notları*), plays (*oyun*, *piyes*), and others. More than 35 novels from the 1990s alone were exploited. All references were obtained directly from the original sources; quoting references from other lexicons has generally been avoided. The Anatolian dialect material recorded by Ahmet Caferoğlu during the 1940s and 1950s contributes a number of new lexemes not found in DS (edited by Türk Dil Kurumu 1963-1982).

Apart from a few exceptions, neither oral information from native speakers nor newspaper texts were used as sources because of their

high degree of incertitude and limited verifiability. The *feuilletons* by the author Sermet Muhtar Alus, however, which appeared in the *Akşam gazetesi* from 1940 to 1950 constitute one of the rare exceptions to this principle.

### 3.3. The summary paragraphs

This innovative part of the lexicon systematically presents short descriptions of various Turkish language phenomena. The explanation (e.g. concerning meaning and usage of a certain suffix) is incorporated in the text of the lexicon. To make the paragraph visible it is printed in smaller types and indented. It follows the first lexeme displaying the phenomenon under consideration, i.e. when we describe the causative allomorph *-(ı)t-* in a summary paragraph we place it after the lexeme *acıt-* which is according to the alphabetical order the first one displaying *-(ı)t-*. The summary paragraph (in our Turkish terminology: "Toplu Bakış Maddesi") contains general information on the particular phenomenon, depending on the subject (morphology, syntax, functional and diachronic matters, etc.). This information generally represents the current state of linguistic research. The sources employed are quoted. In some cases original research on as yet unattested or incompletely described phenomena is provided in brief. As the lexicon aims to address a broad range of scholars, advanced linguistic terminology and the use of linguistic symbols have been kept to a minimum in the explanations, e.g. 'ek' and 'genişleme' have been used to denote 'formative'; the allomorphs of the causative formative (*-(X)t-*, *-DXr-*, *-Xz-*, etc.) are simply called 'ettirgen ekinin şekilleri'; the allophones of a formative are not marked by *X* (as in *+lXk*) but by '-lik vs.'; as the last example demonstrates, deverbal as well as denominal formatives are marked by *-* (e.g. *-ış-* vs., and *-siz* vs.). The added explanation 'fiilden', 'isimden' is considered to be sufficient in these cases. Often there is a reference to other summary paragraphs which discuss similar topics (e.g. *dansöz* □). Explanations, cross-references and sources are followed by the other lexemes in A-E exhibiting the same feature. See the following examples on the causative allomorphs which are subject to verbal morphology (not all lexemes involved are quoted here):

*acıt-* 'acı vermek, incitmek' < *acı-* IV'ün geçişli hali. <...>

Ettirgenlik (causativum) ekinin birkaç şekli vardır (*ağdur-/ağdır-* □, *artur-/artur-* □, *büküt-* □, *çıkar-* □, *damzur-/damzır-* □). ET.'de en yaygın olan *-(ı)t-* vs. şekli



zamanla bir birleşim olan *-dr-* vs. şekli yüzünden kullanımdan düştü. *-t-* şekli yalnız çok heceli fiillerde ünlü ve /t/, /l/, /y/ seslerinden sonra saklanmış durumdadır. A-E cildindeki misaller şunlardır: *acıt-*, *aksat-*, *#apart-*, *ayılt-*, *azalt-*, <...>. Fakat *-it-* vs. şeklinin özellikle /k/ ara sıra da /y/ ve başka katı seslerden sonra da saklandığı görülür: *akit-*, *aşıt-*, *azıt-/azıt-*, *bakıt-*, *bayıt-*, *çarpıt-*, <...>. İki ettirgenlik ekinin, *-dur-at-* şeklinde beraber kullanıldığı tek bir örnekte görüldü: *##buldurat-*. # işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur, ## işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde iki ettirgenlik şekli katılmasına rağmen iki dereceli ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur. (B. Johanson 1976-1977: 110-116, 1977: 121-126).

AD. ağdur-/ağdır- 'kaldırmak' DS 88, TS 30-31 < ağ- 'yükselmek' fiilinin ettirgen <...>

Ettirgenlik (causativum) ekinin, dağılımı kesin kurallara uymayan fakat genelde fonetik şartlara bağlı olan ve görev ayrımı bulunmayan birkaç şekli (ve birleşimi) vardır (krş. *acıkdur-* □, *anıştır-* □, *artur-/artır-* □, *çıkır-* □, *damzur-/damzır-* □). Bugün en yaygını, daha eski olan *-(ı)t-* vs. eki (*acıt-* □, *büküd-/büküt-* □) ile başka öğelerin birleştiği olan *-dır-* vs. şeklidir. Genelde yalnız tek heceli fiil köklerine katılan *-dır-* vs. şekli zamanla ET.'de en yaygın olan ettirgen şekli olan *-it-* vs. ekinin yerini almış (b. Johanson 1976-1977: 110-111, 1977: 121-126, Erdal 1991: 799): *ağdur-/ağdır-*, *aydır-*, *azdır*, *#bandır-*, *#basdır-/bastır-*, <...>. # işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur.

artur-/BSTT. artır- 'çoğaltmak, büyümek' < ET. *artur-* a.m. Clauson 210, <...>

Çeşitli *ettirgenlik* (causativum) eki şekillerinin arasında (*ağdur-/ağdır-* □, *acıt-* □, *çıkır-* □, *damzur-/damzır-* □) ET.'de yaygın olan bugün kullanımdan düşmüş yalnız tek heceli fiil köklerine gelen *-gır-/-(ı)r-* vs. şekli de vardır (< ET. *-gur-/-(u)r-*). *-(ı)r-* vs. şekli özellikle /ç/, /ş/, /t ~ d/ ünsüzlerinden sonra takılır (b. Erdal 1991: 733-734). A-E cildindeki misaller: *artur-/artır-*, *aşır-*, *#basır-*, *batır-*, *bişir-*, *bitir-*, <...> *-gır-* vs. şekli ise /t/, /z/, /t/ ünsüzlerinden sonra kullanılır: *dırgür-*, *durgur-*, *##durgut-* (\*dur-gur-t-), *ergür-* (b. Erdal 1991: 756, Johanson 1976-77: 126-127; Banguoğlu 1974: 286-287). # işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur, ## işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde iki ettirgenlik şekli katılmasına rağmen iki dereceli ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur. Ettirgenlik ekinden farklı olan *-(ı)r-* eki için krş. *ayır-* □.

*çıkır- çık-* I ve II fiillerinin bütün mânalarında ettirgen (causativum) hali: <...>

*Ettirgenlik* (causativum) ekinin birkaç şekli vardır (*acıt-* □, *damzur-/damzır-* □). Nadir olan ve az sayıda örnekleri saklanmış olan *-ar-* vs. şekli *-(g)ır-* vs. şeklinin (b. *artur-/artır-* □) eski bir değişimi gibi görünür. İlgili misaller: *çıkır-*, *çöker-##çökert-*. *-dır-* vs. şeklinin (b. *ağdur-/ağdır-* □) oluşuna paralel olarak *-it-* vs. ile

ar- vs. eklerinin birleşmesinden nadir olan *-der-* vs. şekli ortaya çıkmıştır: *aktar-*, *dönder-*. (B. Erdal 1991: 737-738, Banguoğlu 1974: 278). ## işaretiyle belirtilen fiillerde iki ettirgenlik şekli katılmasına rağmen iki dereceli ettirgenlik fonksiyonu yoktur.

EO. *damzur-/damzır-* 'damlatmak' DS 1354-55, <...>

*Ettirgenlik* (causativum) ekinin birkaç şekli vardır (*acıt-* □, *ağdur-/ağdır-* □, *artur-/artır-* □, *çıkar-* □). ET.'de oldukça yaygın olan yalnız tek heceli (özellikle /m/, /t/ ünsüzleriyle biten) fiil köklerine gelen *-ız-* vs. şekli tamamıyla kullanımdan düşmüş ve yalnız çok az örnekte fark edilmeden kalmış durumdadır (b. Banguoğlu 1974: 293): *damzur-/damzır-* (< ET. *tamuz-/tamız-* ...), *dütüz-*, *emzür-/emzir-* ile *emzik* (< ET. *emüz-*).

In addition there is a paragraph on the formative *-(X)t-*, not in causative but in medial function, see below. (There are also additional paragraphs concerning composite formatives which are combinations of causative formatives with others, such as the iterative *-(X)ktXr-çiziktir-*, etc. and the iterative-intensive *-(X)ştXr-araştır-*, etc.).

AD. *büküd-/büküt-* 'bir sıkıntı ile büzülme' DS 819 < ET. *büküt-* (mânası tam anlaşılmıyor) <...>

Yalnız tek heceli fiil köklerine gelen ettirgenlik (causativum) şekline (krş. *acıt-* □) benzeyen kullanımdan düşmüş *-(t)t-* vs. eki çok nadir fakat eski olan *orta-dönüşken* (medial-reflexivum) anlamı taşıyor, yani vücudun veya aklın kendine dönük oluş veya kılışlarını belirtir (b. Erdal 1991: 642-643). A-E cildindeki misaller şunlardır: *büküd-/büküt-*, *büzüt-*, *diret-*.

Aside from the description of very common verbal and nominal formatives, some very rare or new formatives are also introduced. The combined deverbal verbal formative *-(X)zLA-* is one of these. Tietze lists four words of this iterative / intensive formation, nearly all of them used only by the author M. Kaçan (1990). With the exception of the last one, which is also more common, they all belong to the language subunit argot: *alızla-* 'emmek, içine çekmek' (?) × *Cıgaraya harman kalmış beyni, lezzeti alızlayınca, sekiz kar köpeği gibi çalışmaya başladı* (113), *duruzla-* 'kısaca durmak, duraksamak' × *Şoparlar Berber Ali'nin evinin önünde duruzladılar* (19) ×, *koşuzla-* × *Abe millet koşuzlayan Tina abulamız bıçaklanmış. Er tarafı kan içinde kalmış* (100) and *sıvazla-* 'mit der Hand über etwas streichen'

(Steuerwald 1972: 826), ‘bir şeyin üstünde yavaş yavaş, hafifçe el gezdirmek; okşamak’ (TüS 1988: 1303).<sup>11</sup> Morphologically  $-(X)zIA-$  obviously consists of the ergative formative  $-(X)z$ , which denotes the object of transitive stems and the subject of intransitive stems (cf. Erdal 1991: 323-327),<sup>12</sup> and the most common denominal verbal formative  $+IA-$ . The resulting combined formative can be considered as a specific type of action, i.e. it adds a notion of iterativity and intensification to the action denoted by the verb stem. (Comparable to  $-(X)zIA-$  is the combined formative  $-(X)şIA-$  consisting of the ergative formative  $-(X)ş$  and  $+IA-$ , which also expresses intensity, e.g. *dürtüşle-* ‘dürtüp durmak’ (Tietze); ‘üst üste birkaç kez dürtmek; birini uyarmak veya kışkırtmak’ (TüS 420), *sıvaşla-* (= synonymous with *sıvazla-*)  $\times$  *Irazca*, *Ahmed’i dizine doğru çaktı, sırtını sıvaşlamaya başladı.* (F. Baykurt 1959: 33).

The summary paragraphs deal not only with Turkish morphology, many of them also take up features of Persian, Arabic and French (and, more seldom, Italian, English, Latin and Slavonic) word formation in Turkish loanwords. Sometimes the summary paragraphs provide information regarding the chronology of the adoption of a particular feature, and its independent development within Ottoman / Turkish, see the following example:

O. abesiyat ‘boş şeyler’ < *abes* ve sıfat eki  $-î(y)$  ile çoğul eki  $-ât$ .  $\times$  ...

Ar.’da  $-al/-at$  ile biten yâni müennes (dişi) sayılan bir çok isim, çoğulda bunlar yerine  $-ât$  ekini alır (krş. □ *adalet*). Bu  $-ât$  (Tk.’de  $-at$ ) ekini,  $-î$  ile biten (krş. □ *adalf*) sıfatların sonunda da buluruz. Bu gibi Tk.’de  $-iyat$  ile biten isimler nomina abstracta collectiva mânasında olur, mâna itibariyle Lât.  $-ica$  ile nihayetlenen kelimelere benzerler, ms. *Turcica* ‘Türkiyat’. Tk.’de kendi başına bir ek olmuş

<sup>11</sup> Probably the derived argot verb *çakozla-* ‘beobachten, lauschen, zuhören; merken, begreifen, hinter etw. kommen’ (Steuerwald 1972: 165), ‘anlamak, kavramak, sezme’ (Aktunç 1990: 69) also belongs to this formative. *çakoz* could be a phonetic variant of the Turkish synonymous derivative *çakız* ‘bir durumu anlama, bilme’ (Aktunç: 69) constructed on the analogy of the ending of Greek masculine nouns  $-os$ .

<sup>12</sup>  $-(X)z$  is no longer productive in modern standard Turkish. It only remains in some petrified adjectival nouns such as *diniz* ‘sakin, durgun, sessiz’, *tıkız* ‘çok sıkıştırılmış, bastırılmış, çok dolu’, etc. (cf. Banguoğlu 1974: 263).

olan *-iyat* eki, sonunda *-i*'si olmayan sıfatlarda da bulunabilir, ms. *abesiyat*. A-E cildinde geçen *-iyat* ile teşkil edilmiş kelimeler aşağıda sıralanmıştır: *abesiyat*, *akliyat*, *ameliyat*, *ayniyat*, *ciddiyat*, *dırdıriyat* (Türkçe kökten), *edebiyat*, *evveliyat*.

Furthermore, there are numerous summary paragraphs on phonetics, especially describing phonetic changes which loanwords undergo in Turkish, as well as others which concern purely internal Turkic matters only (e.g. Turkish words not subject to vowel harmony, such as *akçalakçe*, *alev*, *anne*, *atik*, etc.). A few more paragraphs concern idiomatic matters and language varieties (e.g. a short history of argot in Turkey and its lexicographical registration follow the first argot lexeme) and various matters of cultural history. Thus the summary paragraphs cover a wide range of aspects connected with language study, of which this brief account can only give an idea.

### List of abbreviations

- AD. Anadolu Diyalektleri (= Anatolian dialects)  
a.m. aynı manada (= in the same meaning)  
Ar. Arabic  
Az. Azeri  
b.m. bilinen manada/bugünkü manada  
(= in the familiar/present meaning)  
Çağ. Chaghatay  
Fa. Persian  
Fr. French  
EO. Eski Osmanlıca (= Ancient Ottoman)  
Erm. Armenian  
ET. Eski Türkçe (= Ancient Turkic)  
EYun. Eski Grekçe/Eski Yunanca  
(= Ancient Greek)

- O. Ottoman  
 Tkm. Türkmen  
 TT. Türkiye Türkçesi (= Turkish)

### References

- Aktunç, Hulki 1990. *Büyük argo sözlüğü (tanıklarıyla)*. İstanbul: Afa yayınları.
- Banguoğlu, Tahsin 1974. *Türkçenin grameri*. İstanbul: Baha matbaası.
- Baykurt, Fakir 1959. *Yılanların öcü. Roman*. İstanbul: Remzi kitabevi.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1971. Gedanken zur Gestaltung eines idealen Türkischen Etymologischen Wörterbuchs. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 66, 9/10, 437-454.
- DS = *Türkiye'de halk ağzından derleme sözlüğü* 1-12. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 1963-1982.
- Ediskun, Haydar 1985. *Türk dilbilgisi: sesbilgisi – biçimbilgisi – cümlebilgisi*. İstanbul: Remzi kitabevi.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon* 1-2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ergin, Muharrem 1972. *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- Gülensoy = Akalın, Mehmet & Birinci, Necat & Ercilasun, Ahmet B. & Gülensoy, Tuncer & Korkmaz, Zeynep & Parlatır, İsmail & Zülfiyar, Hamza (eds.) 1943. *Türk dili ve kompozisyon bilgileri*. Ankara: Yükseköğretim Kurulu matbaası.
- İA = *İslam Ansiklopedisi. İslam âlemi tarih, coğrafya, etnografya ve biyografya lugati*. İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı. 1966-1988.
- Kaçan, Metin 1990. *Ağır roman*. İstanbul: Metis yayınları.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep (ed.) 1992. *Gramer terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Meninski, Franciscus à Mesgnien 1680. *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium turcicae, arabicae, persicae ... lexicon turcico-arabico-persicum* 1-4. Wien: Joseph Kurzböck.
- Pavet de Courteille, Abel 1972 [1870]. *Dictionnaire turc-oriental*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Räsänen, Martti 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türk Sprachen*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

- Redhouse = Redhouse, Sir James Walter. *A Turkish and English lexicon*. Constantinople 1890.
- Redhouse 1968 = Alkım, U. Bahadır & Antel, Nazime & Avery, Robert & Eckmann, János & Huri, Sofi & İz, Fahir & Mansuroğlu, Mecdut & Tietze, Andreas (eds.) 1968. *New Redhouse Turkish-English dictionary*. İstanbul: Redhouse yayınevi.
- Josette Rey-Debove (ed.) 1982. *Le Robert méthodique. Dictionnaire méthodique du français actuel*. Paris: Le Robert.
- Schakir (geb. Is'haki), S. 1933. *Denominale Verbbildungen in den Türksprachen*. [Ph.D. dissertation, Rome.]
- Stein, Heidi 1990. Lexikographie. In: Hazai, György (ed.) *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft* 1. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica 31.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 335-370.
- Steuerwald, Karl 1972. *Türkisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Tietze, Andreas 1983. Türkisch *burun* ‚Nase‘. Versuch einer phraseologischen Monographie. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 75, 99-156.
- Tietze, Andreas 1995-1996. Der türkeitürkische Wortschatz. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14, 5-37.
- TS = 13. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan tanıklariyle tarama sözlüğü 1-8. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 1963-1977.
- TüS = Eren, Hasan & Gözaydın, Nevzat & Parlatır, İsmail & Tekin, Talât & Zülfikar, Hamza (eds.) 1988. *Türkçe sözlük* 1-2. (Yeni baskı). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Uysal, Sami Sermet 1980. *Yabancılara Türk dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Sermet matbaası.
- Vásáry, István 1993.  $\pm sXn$  and its related suffixes. Studies in Turkic word formation and etymology. *Journal of Turkology* 1, 113-153.

## Reviews

Geoffrey Haig: Review of *Journal of Turkology* 1-2. Edited by Árpád Berta and Ádám Molnár. Szeged: Molnár & Kelemen Oriental Publishers, 1993-1994. ISSN 1216-7835.

*Geoffrey Haig, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.*

*Journal of Turkology* (henceforth JT) was a journal publishing articles on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. Due to a variety of circumstances, publication was terminated in 1994 after only four issues had appeared, leaving the four issues concerned—the subject of this review—something of a *sbornik*. Given the breadth and the standard of scholarship already evident in the first four issues, anyone interested in Turkish linguistics will feel a keen sense of loss that the enterprise was so short-lived.

The articles in the four issues published cover a broad spectrum of Turkological topics, ranging from the Old Turkic runic script to the functions of the post-predicate slot in modern standard Turkish. The emphasis is on the traditional linguistic disciplines: Comparative / historical phonology, dialect studies, etymology, and philological investigations of older texts, but there are also studies from pragmatic and from typological perspectives. Notably lacking are contributions within more formal grammar models. Each volume is rounded off with book reviews and a summary in Turkish (*Türkçe özetler*) of the articles in the volume.

Given the range of topics covered, the present reviewer is not qualified to give equal treatment to all the contributions. My intention is to give a brief summary of the contents, reserving more detailed discussion to those articles which touch my own areas of interest.

### *Volume 1, Number 1 (Summer 1993)*

In Gerhard Doerfer's article *Bemerkungen zur Transkription des Runentürkischen* ("Remarks on the transcription of runic Turkic") (7-22), the author presents his own views on this complex issue. Among his suggestions are that both vowel quality and vowel quantity need to be unequivocally indicated in the transcription. The reconstruction of Old Turkic vowel quantity can, according to Doerfer, be undertaken on the basis of internal reconstruction and comparison with developments in other

Turkic languages, particularly Khalaj. The article closes with a short text sample from *kül teğin* illustrating the principles which Doerfer presents.

In Lars Johanson's article *Rûmî and the birth of Turkish poetry* (23-37), the question of Rûmî's contribution to the development of the Turkish literary language is discussed. Rûmî's main works were written in Persian, the normal vehicle of literary and poetic expression of the time. The question of Rûmî's competence in Anatolian Turkish has never been satisfactorily resolved (although he was certainly fluent in Khorasan Turkish). But the fact that he did not write in Turkish was not necessarily due to a lack of competence in that language, nor to a negative attitude towards it. As Johanson notes, "Rûmî had, from the beginning, a highly developed, functioning literary instrument at his disposal", the Persian literary language (25). As to the question of why Rûmî nevertheless used Turkish elements in some of his poetry, Johanson notes that the kind of bilingual poems found in Rûmî's *Diwân* are "a common phenomenon in multilingual, especially diglossic situations." (31). They need not therefore be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to spread mystical beliefs among the common people, as some scholars have suggested. The use of Turkish elements is quite probably simply a fairly faithful reflection of the prevailing linguistic situation. In fact, it seems quite plausible that one language could come to supersede another as the literary standard by being inserted in an initially fragmentary fashion into the structural framework already established by the original literary language. If that is the case, then Rûmî's bilingual poetry was certainly instrumental in the development of the Turkish literary language. But, as Johanson points out, that is not to claim that it was ever Rûmî's intention to initiate such a development.

In his article *Das Türkeitürkische – eine zentrale Randsprache* ("Republican Turkish—a central peripheral language") (39-58) Claus Schönig discusses the position of Republican Turkish within the Turkic languages, basing his claims on a synchronic comparison of a large number of criteria, including phonetic, morphosyntactic and lexical ones. The title refers to the fact that Republican Turkish displays characteristics of both the central as well as the peripheral Turkic languages. It is reassuring to find that Schönig goes beyond the comparative method as it was developed on Indo-European and gives due consideration to areal and geopolitical factors. This study may be considered a preliminary stage in Schönig's more ambitious project on classifying the Turkic languages, which has already appeared as Schönig (1997a-b) and Schönig (1998).

Edward Tryjarski's scholarly contribution *Religious terminology in Armeno-Kipchak* (59-111) includes a list of some 600 religious terms introduced into Kipchak by Armenian scholars who settled in Polish-Ukrainian territories in the 16th and 17th centuries. The terms are arranged in thematic groupings and presented with abundant information on sources, etymologies, etc. The translators succeeded in



finding—or coining—Kipchak terms for most of the concepts concerned, but the list also contains about 15% of terms based on Armenian lexical material. Quite apart from the broader historical importance, the material presented also offers potential for comparison with similar materials in the Codex Cumanicus and in Karaim, although Tryjarski is cautious regarding a possible link with the Codex Cumanicus (62-63). The introductory discussion provides fascinating background for the non-specialist and one cannot help but share Tryjarski's admiration for the translators, who "succeeded in creating an efficient tool to transpose the Christian religious terminology into the Kipchak dialect which was in no way prepared to perform its new role." (69).

István Vásáry discusses in his article *±sXn and its related suffixes. Studies in Turkic word formation and etymology* (113-153) the origin of the suffix *±sXn*. He refutes the theory of Mongolian origin, claiming instead that *±sXn* is a "composite formative consisting of *±sI* and *-Xn*" (114). Vásáry presents a list of 44 words along with detailed etymologies and sources illustrating his claims. This volume is rounded off by Éva Ágnes Csató's detailed review of *Turkish linguistics today* (edited by Hendrik Boeschoten and Ludo Verhoeven. Leiden: Brill. 1991).

*Volume 1, Number 2 (Winter 1993)*

This issue begins with Hendrik Boeschoten's article *Das Chwarezmtürkische als z-Türkisch* ("Khwarezmian Turkic as a z-Turkic language") (183-193) on the  $\delta \sim y \sim z$  alternation in Khwarezmian. He concludes that the available texts represent a written variety not necessarily directly reflecting the speech of the scribes, who may have been speakers of both a y-variety and a z-variety, whereby the z-variety disappeared in the transition to Chagatay.

Christiane Bulut's article *Evliya Çelebi und die Inschrift von Adana* ("Evliya Çelebi and the inscription of Adana") (195-201) reopens the issue of the authorship of a short inscription in the Hasan Ağa Mosque in Adana. A number of arguments are presented which cast doubt on the accepted view, put forward by Kreutel (1972), that the inscription is by Evliya Çelebi. According to Bulut, Kreutel's description of the location of the inscription is incorrect, and she refutes Kreutel's claims regarding the presence of mistakes in the inscription (which Kreutel had taken as further evidence of Çelebi's supposed absent-mindedness and lack of care). She concludes that it is unlikely that the inscription is by Çelebi.

In his contribution *Angaben zum Präsens im Derleme sözlüğü* ("Information on the present tense forms in the Derleme Sözlüğü") (203-212), Nurettin Demir takes a critical look at the presentation of present tense forms in the *Derleme sözlüğü*. He criticises (i) that suffixes and finite present forms are treated as independent lemmata;

and (ii) that complex verb forms (verb plus modifying auxiliary with present / durative meaning) are treated as infinitives.

The longest article in this issue is Lars Johanson's *Typen kausaler Satzverbindungen im Türkischen* ("Types of causal clause linkage in Turkic") (213-282). Johanson examines complex expressions involving two propositions, a cause (C)—which includes both direct cause and reason—and an effect (E). He establishes a broad typology based on the following three parameters: First, degree of syntactic integration of the C-proposition in E (reminiscent of Lehmann's (1988) cline of "hierarchical downgrading"). There are three values on this parameter: (1) Embedding (*Einverleibung*), by which is meant that the C-clause loses its illocutive force and is coded as a more or less nominalized constituent of the main clause, i.e. C and E constitute a single clause. For example, Turkish [*iş bulamadığı için*] *orada kalmadı* 'she didn't stay there because she was unable to find a job'; (2) Linkage (*Kopplung*), by which C and E are finite clauses but clearly linked by a conjunction: [*orada kalmadı*][*çünkü iş bulamadı / iş bulamadı çünkü*]; (3) Juxtaposition, which involves the contiguous ordering of two independent clauses: *İş bulamadı. Kalmadı orada*. The second parameter is the degree of precision with which the causal relation is expressed. Here again three values are distinguished: (1) Openness, i.e. the causal relation is not expressed by segmental means: *Ali gelmiyor. Çalışıyor*. 'Ali's not coming. He's working'; (2) Vagueness (*Unschärfe*), in which a causal relation is implied either by a "relatively simple signal" such as a simple linker (*Adjunktor*) or by linear order; (3) Precision (*Schärfe*), where the causal relationship is made quite explicit: *Ali çalışıyor. Onun için gelmiyor*. The third parameter is the relative formal complexity of the means used to signal the causal relationship. It is a binary distinction between simple and complex.

Of the 18 logically possible combinations of these three parameters, 13 are discussed in detail with extensive examples from Turkic languages (five combinations are considered not possible, for example Embedding cannot combine with Openness, as Embedding always involves some formal signal of the relationship between C and E). It should be noted that some of the distinctions made are difficult to apply in practice, particularly the distinction between simple and complex, and between Vagueness and Precision, but the three parameters identified can nevertheless be fruitfully considered as continua.

What is important is that this framework allows one to empirically test some claims which have recently been made in typological circles. First, there is the oft-quoted iconic correlation between morphosyntactic integration of one clause into another and semantic and pragmatic closeness: The more intimately bound two events are, the closer the syntactic ties that link their linguistic expressions. Interestingly, Johanson finds little support for this claim in Turkic. The second issue con-

cerns the proposal that there is a universal diachronic pathway from juxtaposition to increasing subordination, ultimately down to nominalization (Lehmann (1988) refers to a process of “desententialization”). Again, Johanson demonstrates that there is little evidence of such a development in Turkic; it is not possible to trace the origins of Turkic embedded nominalizations in some paratactic *Vorstufe*. On the contrary, the non-embedded structures in Turkic are often innovations triggered by language contact. One could perhaps mention one minor piece of evidence in favour of assuming a shift towards increasing nominalization of subordinate clauses: Older stages of Turkic appeared to tolerate nominative subjects of embedded clauses, at least to a greater extent than modern Turkish does. But in modern Turkish, the subjects of a large number of such clauses are required to be in genitive (but not all—the rules concerned are, as Johanson notes (245), quite complex). I have tentatively discussed such a development in Haig (1998: 63-70).

Apart from being a pioneering study in comparative Turkic syntax, Johanson’s article is also a much-needed reminder that many of the generalizations found in typological literature are far from empirically sound. They are at best hypotheses which require careful evaluation in empirical studies of single languages and language families.

Claus Schönig’s article *Anlautvarianten von Plural- und Kasussuffixen im Türkischen* (“Initial segment variants of plural and case suffixes in Turkic languages”) (269-282) offers another contribution to studies on classifying Turkic languages. He examines the process of phonetic assimilation and dissimilation in its effects on the initial dental plosive segments of case suffixes, and on the initial segment of the plural morpheme. Schönig plots a tendency evident in a large area of Turkic by which the phonetically conditioned variants of the suffixes under consideration share an initial segment, [t] (cf. the tables on p. 281). The process does not affect—at least to the same extent—suffixes outside the classic inflectional categories of case and number, and cannot therefore be considered to be a purely phonetic process. Schönig speculates that it may have originated in the other cases with dental plosive initial segments (ablative and locative) and spread from there.

This issue contains a lengthy review section: Four issues of *Dilbilim arařtırmaları* (1990-1993) are reviewed by Éva Ágnes Csató, and Marcel Erdal’s *Old Turkic word formation* (1991) is reviewed in some detail by András Róna-Tas. There is also an obituary of the recently deceased Hungarian Turkologist István Mándoky Kongur.

*Volume 2, Number 1 (Summer 1994)*

In the article *Die Konverbendungen im Mittelkiptschakischen*, (“The converb endings in Middle Kipchak”) Árpád Berta presents some results of his ongoing research on deverbal word formation in Middle Kipchak. As this work is now available in

book form (Berta 1996), I will not deal with it further here. The bulk of this volume is taken up by an extraordinary article by Ingeborg Hauenschild, *Botanica im Dīvān luġāt at-turk* ("Botanical terms in the Dīvān luġāt at-turk") (25-100), a synthesis of philology, botany, history and geography. The author examines the lemmata referring to plants in Maḥmūd al-Kašġarī, giving a botanical definition along with information on historical and geographical aspects, supplemented with information from Arabic, Turkic and other sources. This study will surely be an invaluable source for scholars of cultural history and philology alike.

András Róna-Tas examines the reflexes of some Turkic voice suffixes in Hungarian (*Turkic verb-formative suffixes in Hungarian*, 101-118), noting that distinguishing suffixes of Turkic origin from those of Hungarian origin is in many cases extremely difficult. A further fascinating study combining philology with cultural history is Peter Zieme's *Samboqdu et alii. Einige alttürkische Personennamen im Wandel der Zeiten* ("Samboqdu et alii. Some Old Turkic proper names through the ages") (119-133). That proper names are often based on the form "slave / servant of X", where X designates some deity or person of religious significance, is well known in the Islamic *Kulturkreis*. But names of this pattern were also common in the Chinese Buddhist tradition. In Old Turkic texts a number of names ending in *-tu / du* are attested, whose origin had been a source of puzzlement. Zieme notes that many of them may be reliably traced back to names of the form "slave / servant of X", whereby *-tu / du* corresponds to Chinese *nu* "slave".

*Volume 2, number 2 (Winter 1994)*

In his article *Zum Wandel des auslautenden -G im Kiptschakischen* ("On the evolution of final -G in Kipchak") (163-195) Árpád Berta examines the various reflexes of the Old Turkic derivational suffix *-(X)g* in Kipchak. Two previous proposals, from Benzing (1958) and from Doerfer (1981-1982), are tested against a systematic analysis of an extensive corpus. Berta is unable to confirm either of these hypotheses.

V. G. Guzev examines *Some puzzling aspects of the Turkic runiform script* (197-204). Most scholars apparently assume that the Old Turkic Runiform Script (OTRS) was adapted from an existent writing system, although there is some disagreement on the exact source. Guzev, however, suggests that an indigenous origin may be more likely. His argumentation runs, very briefly, as follows: The richness of consonant signs, the so-called consonantal dualism, is unusual because the pairs of consonants in question are not phonemic contrasts in Turkic. On the other hand, it is unusual for phonemic writing systems to reflect sub-phonemic contrasts (this argument is based on Trubetzkoy 1939: 251). A solution to this paradox is to assume that the signs in question do not represent consonants but syllables of the form VC. The writing system is therefore not phonemic but syllabic. As further evidence for

the syllabic nature of the OTRS, Guzev notes the “extraordinarily large number of signs (thirty-eight)” (200).

Although Guzev’s arguments are clearly put, it is unfortunate that he does not go into more detail on just what is meant by “syllabic script”. Precisely this term has been the subject of great controversy in recent research on the typology of writing systems (for example Gelb’s (1961: 147-153) controversial classification of Semitic writing systems as “syllabic”, see discussion and references in Haig 1992: 64-65). It is evident from Guzev’s discussion that he has been influenced by Gelb’s book (first published in 1952), though it is not mentioned in the references. But more recent work in the theory of writing systems has made many of Gelb’s claims appear less plausible—see for example Sampson (1985), De Francis (1989) or Coulmas (1990). Furthermore, the number of signs in the OTRS, 38, does not seem that extraordinary to me. The Devanâgarî script has 48 signs, but is not generally considered syllabic. A fairly uncontroversial syllabic writing system, Japanese *Hiragana*, on the other hand, has over 70 signs (including signs for palatalized syllables). Note further that Japanese syllable structure is very similar to Turkic. Thus, although it is certainly worth considering the possibility that the OTRS is not strictly phonemic, this does not necessarily imply that it is syllabic.

Post-predicate elements in modern Turkish are the subject of Şükriye Ruhi’s article *Observations on the function of post-predicate elements in written text processing* (205-223). Her main point is that the post-predicate slot (PPS) should not be interpreted solely in structural / pragmatic terms (topic, focus, etc.), but rather in terms of “interpersonal theme”. I have several criticisms to make: First, the examples at the beginning are hardly promising introductory exemplification. In the second example *Eminim ki Ali sınıfını geçecektir* ‘I am sure that Ali will fulfil his course requirements’, the clause after *ki* is identified as post-predicate material (here actually referred to as “post-frame position”, but the author does not seem to make a difference). Yet there is no other possible location for the second clause in the construction chosen. It can scarcely be profitably compared with the usual examples of post-predicate elements, which are elements which could, in a pragmatically unmarked construction, also occur pre-predicatively. Second, although the author goes to some lengths to disentangle the notoriously vague usages of terms such as “topic”, “theme” and “focus”, her suggestions do little to clarify the issue. Her own notion of “interpersonal theme” also remains too vague to be operationalized. Finally, the title of the article refers to “processing written texts”. Apart from being an odd translation of the title of the original Turkish article on which this one is based (... *yazılı metin oluşturma...*), this article contains very little specific reference to processing written texts at all. Most of the paper is based on examples taken from other articles, and the author’s own data are not presented in a fashion which enables the reader to know

under what conditions the data were gathered (how many informants, for example), nor with any clear quantitative analysis. Thus, although one might share her conclusion that the PPS creates “emotive and dramatic effects” (222), the evidence she presents in support of that conclusion is not convincing. Two recent articles on the same subject can profitably be consulted for more detailed treatment, Auer (1990) and Schroeder (1995).

Claus Schönig’s article *Prädikatslose Sätze und postprädikatische Segmente im Babur-name (Haidarabad-Kodex)* (“Predicate-less sentences and post-predicate segments in the Babur-name (Haidarabad Codex)”) (225-243) deals with two marked types of syntactic structure in the *Babur-name*: Sentences without a predicate marker, and post-predicate elements. The material is presented with extensive examples and discussion and should serve as a useful source for comparative and diachronic syntax.

Marek Stachowski looks at *Der Instrumental im Jakūtischen und Dolganischen* (“The instrumental in Yakut and Dolgan”) (246-258). The instrumental is remarkable in these two Siberian languages because it is expressed by a bound case marker rather than a postposition, the pattern found in the majority of Turkic languages. Stachowski lists a large number of different functions fulfilled by the instrumental, discusses the possibility of foreign influence (particularly Russian), and goes into some detail concerning the origin of the instrumental suffix. We still await a comprehensive treatment of case in Turkish, but Stachowski’s article is certainly an important step in that direction.

In their article *Alttürkische Reimsprüche: Ein neuer Text* (“Old Turkic rhymes: A new text”) (259-271), Peter Zieme and Semih Tezcan present a preliminary analysis of an Old Turkic text consisting of rhyming couplets. Of particular interest is a reference in the text to “three suns”, a motive well attested in the Shamanic tradition. Should the authors’ interpretation of the text prove to be correct, this would be the first indication that Turks of the Turfan area were well acquainted with Shamanism (267).

István Vásáry deals with *Çöp and its derivatives: A Turkic family of words and their reflections in Hungarian* (273-292). He examines a number of putative Turkic derivatives of the word *çöp* ‘rubbish’ in Turkic and some possible correspondences in Hungarian. His results lead him to the conclusion that there must have existed a period of full Turkish-Hungarian bilingualism among the Hungarians between the seventh and tenth centuries.

Deniz Zeyrek examines *The function of -mİş in Turkish folktales* (293-303). She identifies three main functions: (a) in formulaic expressions such as *bir varmuş bir yokmuş* ‘once upon a time’, which act as a signal to the listener that what follows is not necessarily factual; (b) for conveying background information, i.e. that which is

existent at the time the main narration occurs, the backdrop, as it were, to the story; and (c) especially in shifts from *-yor*, where the *-mlş* form suspends the immediacy of the narrative, thus heightening the tension. She provides useful material for further studies, and is careful to note that *-DI* past forms are also sometimes used in folktales in similar functions.

In sum, anyone interested in Turkology is likely to find much of interest in the four issues of *JT* reviewed here. The standard of scholarship is high, as are the production standards—I came across scarcely any printing errors, and the layout is clear and consistent. Copies of the journal are still available from the publishers at H-6701 Szeged, P.O. Box 1195, Hungary.

#### References

- Auer, P. 1990. Einige umgangssprachliche Phänomene des Türkischen und ihre Erklärung aus "natürlichen" Prinzipien. In: Boretzky, N. & Enninger, W. & Stolz, T. (eds.) *Spielarten der Natürlichkeit – Spielarten der Ökonomie. Beiträge zum 5. Essener Kolloquium über Grammatikalisierung: Natürlichkeit und Systemökonomie. Universität Essen, 6.-8.10.1988*. Vol. 2 (2). Bochum: Brockmeyer. 271-297.
- Benzing, J. 1958. Γ final dans les langues turques. In: Eckmann, J. et al. (eds.) *Jean Deny Armağanı – Mélanges Jean Deny*. Ankara: 427-430. [Reprinted in Johanson, L. & Schönig, C. (eds.) 1988. *Kritische Beiträge zur Altaistik und Turkologie. Festschrift für Johannes Benzing*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 94-103.]
- Berta, Á. 1996. *Deverbale Wortbildung im Mittelkiptschakisch-Türkischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Coulmas, F. 1990. *The writing systems of the world*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- DeFrancis, J. 1989. *Visible speech. The diverse oneness of writing systems*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Doerfer, G. 1981 / 1982. Zum Vokalismus nicht-erster Silben im Altürkischen. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 73, 47-87 and 74, 103-128.
- Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon 1-2*. Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden.
- Gelb, I. J. 1961 [1952]. *A study of writing*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago.
- Haig, G. 1992. *Schrift und Schriftsysteme in der modernen Linguistik*. [Unpublished MA thesis, Universität Kiel.]
- Haig, G. 1998. *Relative constructions in Turkish*. (Turcologica 33.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Kreutel, R. 1972. Neues zur Evliya Çelebi Forschung. *Der Islam* 48, 269-279.

- Lehmann, C. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: Haiman, J. & Thompson, S. (eds.) *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 181-225.
- Schönig, C. 1997a. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (1). *Turkic Languages* 1, 117-133.
- Schönig, C. 1997b. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (2). *Turkic Languages* 1, 262-277.
- Schönig, C. 1998. A new attempt to classify the Turkic languages (3). *Turkic Languages* 2, 130-151.
- Schroeder, C. 1995. Post-predicate arguments in Turkish. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48 (1 / 2), 204-218.
- Trubetskoj, N. S. 1939. *Grundzüge der Phonologie*. (Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague 7.) Prague.

Michael Hess: Review of Talat Tekin & Mehmet Ölmez. *Türk Dilleri. Les Langues Turques*. Ankara: Simurg, 1995. 150 pages.

Michael Hess, c/o Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Susam sok. 16-18, d. 8, 80060 Cihangir – İstanbul, Turkey.

This work by Talat Tekin and Mehmet Ölmez will be welcome to anyone interested in Turkic languages, specialists and non-professionals alike. It offers a quick and reliable introduction to the topic. All the Turkic languages, both ancient and modern, are described in 31 chapters. The following features are brought together in this book: For virtually every Turkic language there is a sketch of its phonological peculiarities, including the development of characteristic sounds in comparison with Old Turkic; there are original text samples with transcription and (both Turkish and French) translations; and finally, one finds information on the history, geographic location and number of these peoples. At the end of the volume, there is a list of some of the most important alphabets that Turkic peoples have used throughout their history. Finally, the authors provide a bibliography with a small number of titles on each language mentioned, plus a map showing the distribution of the Turkic languages. The book is written in Turkish with a French translation which is most of the time excellent—albeit in some paragraphs of the foreword (by D. Fikri Sağlar, then Minister of Education of the Turkish Republic) it seems to go a bit too far. For



example, on p. 6 “la langue turque” is declared “une des plus anciennes du monde” (“one of the most ancient [languages] of the world”). Not only is this a gratuitous addition to Minister Sağlar’s original Turkish text, but also a debatable assertion, considering the existence of such languages as Ancient Egyptian, the recorded history of which stretches much farther back than the period where even the keenest Turcologists seek the first traces of unrecorded, prehistoric Turkic.

Tekin and Ölmez present a very interesting hypothesis about the origins of the Turkic peoples. They declare it highly probable that the Turkic peoples are descendants of the *Hsiung-nu*, that perennial nomad plague of ancient China. They quote an Old Chinese distich from the *Jin-shu* (the annals of the Jin dynasty, written about the 4th century AD). Using E. G. Pulleyblank’s reconstruction of Old Chinese phonetics, they argue, quite convincingly, that this verse which the *Jin-shu* ascribes to the *Hsiung-nu* could be interpreted as some form of Old Turkic. For instance, the first two words sounded *siu-keh* (diacritics are left out in my quotation) in Pulleyblank’s transcription strikingly resemble the Old Turkic dative form *sü-kä* ‘to the army’, as Tekin and Ölmez point out. And there are other resemblances between the distich and Old Turkic. In the context of their book, one cannot expect Tekin and Ölmez to give a full account of the *Hsiung-nu*-Turkic question, which already has filled numerous volumes. But there are nevertheless some small questions which could cast a shadow on their hypothesis (even if it should be confirmed some time in the future). For instance, the authors relate that the cited verses were uttered in Hunnic in the 4th century. But the entire text of the *Jin-shu* was written down no earlier than the 7th century, on the order of the famous emperor *Taizong* of the Tang dynasty, who ruled AD 627-650. As is well known, the Tang dynasty had intense contacts (both hostile and friendly) with the people calling themselves *Türk*. And this people constitute the speakers of the Old Turkic language to which Tekin and Ölmez’s reconstruction of the couplet belongs. One could easily imagine that the verses represent the Old Turkic of *Taizong*’s time and not some earlier form of (Old) Turkic, e.g. from the 4th century. For one might deduce that perhaps the *Jin-shu*, which served as an official chronicle, wanted to do the Sino-Turkic relations of the time some good by citing the quotation in a 7th century Turkic shape. Such a possibility must first definitely be ruled out by careful examination of the Chinese source material in its context before one can become too optimistic about the *Hsiung-nu* being Turkic. On the other hand, the verses really *could* stem from the *Jin* period and not be a product of Tang era historians. But would it not then be problematic to use for the reconstruction of such a presumably 4th century text a form of Old Turkic attested only from the 7th century onward—without taking into account a possible and even probable internal sound change of Turkic during the three intervening centuries? *Summa summarum*, to the reviewer’s mind there is still nothing too certain

about identifying the *Hsiung-nu* as a Turkic people. Neither is there, incidentally, any positive proof that Attila's Huns may be identified with the *Hsiung-nu*, as Tekin and Ölmez's constant use of "Hun" for *Hsiung-nu* (p. 12 etc.) suggests.

While Tekin and Ölmez thus favour considering the very little known language of the Huns as belonging to the Turkic language family, they surprisingly speak out against regarding Chuvash as a Turkic language—or at least it sounds so on p. 8 where we read: "Ancak, Türk dili terimi Çuvaşçayı da içine alacak biçimde kullanılacak olursa bu pek doğru olmaz." ("But if the term Turkic language is to be used in such a way as also to comprise Chuvash, this is not correct."). Tekin and Ölmez are the only Turcologists of the last forty years or so who do not want to regard Chuvash as a member of the Turkic language family. As a reason for their standpoint, they argue that Chuvash, being an *r* and *l* language, derives from "Mother-Chuvash" (Ana Çuvaşça, p. 8), whereas the other Turkic languages go back to a "Mother-Turkic" (Ana Türkçe, p. 8) with *z* and *ş* in the place of Chuvash *r* and *l*. But Tekin and Ölmez's line of reasoning does not really preclude Chuvash from being a "Turkic" language, since the *r*, *l* / *z*, *ş* sound changes occur in line with phonetic law. And languages that differ in essential parts of their grammar and lexicon only in terms of changes based on phonetic laws are considered, according to linguistic *communis opinio*, as related. Tekin and Ölmez nowhere give an explanation why an exception to this common rule should be made in the case of Chuvash. On the contrary, they continue on p. 14, in spite of their above-mentioned argumentation, to use the term "First Turkic" (İlk Türkçe) for a period of language history when the Bulgar branch (to which Chuvash belongs) had not yet been separated from the other languages of the Turkic languages family. Also, the term "Bulgar Turks" (Bulgar Türkleri) is used on the same page. Both of these terminological practices must, however, be incorrect if one follows the assumption that Chuvash is not "Turkic". While it is true that mutual understandability between speakers of Chuvash and other Turkic peoples is very low (due to the phonetic changes mentioned), this can hardly serve as an argument against the Turkic character of Chuvash either. This can, among other things, be concluded from p. 52, where Tekin and Ölmez state that there is "zero understandability between Yakut and Tuvan" ("Yakutça ile Tuvaca arasında anlaşılabilirlik oranı yüzde sıfırdır.") without suggesting anywhere that one of these languages might not belong to the Turkic language family.

There also a few minor errors in the book. For instance, the first mention of the ethnic name "Bashkir" is not in Kashgari's famous Turkic lexicon, as claimed on p. 78, but in Ibn Faḍlān's travel account of roughly 200 years before. Also the locative case of nouns ending in a vowel is not *-na* (p. 82-83) in contemporary Bashkir, but *-la*. Finally, the authors' usage of the past tense when speaking about Karaite Turkic

(p. 98-99) might be premature considering the fact that there are still some native Karaite speakers today (cf. Csató & Johanson 1996).

Such small corrections are negligible against the indisputable value of this book as a guide to the fascinating world of Turkic languages. The authors' profound knowledge and rigorous scientific standards have not prevented them from writing a readable, for the aficionado even gripping, account of the linguistic interrelationship within the Turkic language family.

#### Reference

Csató, É. Á. & Johanson, L. 1996. Zur Silbenharmonie des Nordwest-Karaimischen. *Acta Orientalia Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48, 329-337.

Mark Kirchner: Review of Hannah Neudecker. *The Turkish Bible translation by Yahya bin 'Ishak, also called Haki (1659)*. Leiden University Library Ms. Cod. Or. 391a (= Publicaties van het Oosters Instituut 4). Leiden, 1994. 9, 404 pages + folia 289r-377v.

Mark Kirchner, Department of Turkology, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, P.O. Box 111932, D-60054 Frankfurt a. M., E-mail: M.Kirchner@em.uni-frankfurt.de

In her "proefschrift", which came into being while she was a research assistant at the Department of Hebrew, Aramaic and Ugaritic Languages and Cultures at Leiden University, Neudecker presents the oldest Turkish Bible translation still in existence. The Ottoman manuscripts have been kept in Leiden (Leiden University Library Cod. Or. 386 and 391a) since the end of the seventeenth century. Nothing is known about the translator except for his name. However, Neudecker has successfully reconstructed the strange history of this early translation (365-382), a story featuring such distinguished *dramatis personae* as, for example, Levinus Warner (1619-1665), professor of Oriental languages at Leiden and resident of the States General at the Sublime Porte in Constantinople. Apparently, translating the Bible from Hebrew into Turkish proved too difficult an undertaking for Warner. He therefore passed the task on to a Jewish dragoman named Haki but succeeded in suppressing the true authorship of the translation. Other characters in this play are the great humanist scholar Comenius, who encouraged Warner to undertake the project and, among others, Ali Bey Bobowski, first dragoman at the Porte, who disliked Haki's Turkish ("obscure

et intricate”) and was finally commissioned by Warner to make a new attempt at translating the Bible into Turkish. Ali Bey Bobowski is not alone in his disapproval of Haki’s Turkish. The editor of the book under review, H. Neudecker, also complains of the shortcomings of Haki’s translation. Neudecker notices inconsistencies in the translation (1): “Haki translates difficult constructions correctly one moment, but incorrectly the next, literally one moment, and with a translation related to a Jewish commentary the next”. However, it should be mentioned that this kind of inconsistency is a general tendency of pre-modern translations into Ottoman-Turkish. The same goes for the editor’s criticism of Haki’s “wording”; using different translations for the same Hebrew words is by no means a sign of “inconsistency” but rather proper Ottoman style, which avoids the repetition of lexical elements. Neudecker’s introduction also contains some general observations on Haki’s “clause syntax”, which she describes as “Semitic instead of Turkish”. Regardless of the question which kind of syntax is used in our text, it should be noted that what is usually meant by “Turkish syntax” is the prototypical system of Modern Turkish. Ottoman Turkish “clause syntax”, on the other hand, shows influence from Persian and other Oriental languages. This means that Standard Ottoman Turkish, and not “Turkish”, would have been a more appropriate guideline for evaluating of Haki’s translation. From that perspective, Haki’s language might deviate less from the norm than Neudecker supposes.

The main part of Neudecker’s book is an excellent edition of Haki’s Bible translation (1 and 2 Samuel, 11-212) including his draft version (Cod. Or. 391a) and the variant readings from the fair copy (Cod. Or. 386). The “elaborate transcription system” employed by the editor combines the accuracy of a transliteration with the convenience of a broad transcription—beyond any doubt an improvement for Ottoman philology. (Nevertheless, I will quote the text without Neudecker’s diacritics wherever they are not needed to illustrate the problems under discussion.)

The edition is followed by detailed “Notes on interpretation problems” and “Notes on textual problems”. I would like to offer the following remarks:

The editor supposes that with *ķırak*, as the counterpart of *mkh* “plague, blow” (1 Sam 4:8), Haki has formed a new deverbal noun by means of the morpheme *-(A)K*. In my opinion it is, more probably, a miswriting of *ķıran* ‘id.’ (214).

Neudecker remarks that 1 Sam. 1:2 *wlw ŧty nŧym* “lit. ‘for him two wives’” has been translated into Turkish using a predicate in the past tense: *var idi*. That is to be expected, since temporal reference, generally not expressed in Hebrew nominal sentences, is obligatory in their Turkish counterparts (238).

Neudecker treats 1 Sam 2:6 *öldürici*, a correspondence of the Hebrew active participle *mmyt*, as a substantive in opposition to the participle *-(y)An*. Thus she believes Haki’s translation to be “inconsistent”. In fact *-(y)lcl* is attested for participles not only in Old Ottoman Turkish but also in later periods (239).

*lebbeyke* (1 Sam 3:4) “here I am for you, i.e. waiting for your commands” is recorded in the Redhouse dictionary as *lebbeyk*. Neudecker wonders about the function

of the third *fatha*, not considering that *-ka* is simply the second person singular personal suffix, which is *-k* in pausa and in spoken Arabic (240).

The editor remarks that Haki erroneously translated 1 Sam 10:3 *gdyyim* ‘kids’ as *ođlan* ‘boy’. Actually, *ođlan* is simply a misreading; the manuscript in the appendix clearly has *ođlak* ‘kid’ (244).

Haki’s translation of 1 Sam 17:51 *mt’rh* ‘out of its sheath’ as *kīninden* is compared to *keyn* ‘clitoris’, but it is more probably a miswriting of Turkish *kın* ‘sheath’ (250).

*diritmezdi* for Hebrew *wl’ yhyh* ‘and did not leave alive’ in 1 Sam 27:11 is obscure to the editor. Even if there are some doubts regarding its lexical content, this form should be connected to *dirilt-* ‘to give life to’; a simplification of clusters such as */ltml/* is not unlikely in Turkic languages. Besides, there is a general tendency to drop *l* before the initial dental of causative suffixes (256).

Haki rendered 1 Sam 31:10 *tķ’w* ‘they fastened’ as *muhaldılar*, a form unclear to the editor. In my opinion it might be a misspelling of *mīhla-*, *mīhla-* ‘to nail’ (259).

Neudecker analyzes 2 Sam 6:5 *defleler*, the translation of Hebrew *btptym* ‘with tambourines’, as *def* ‘tambourine with cymbals’ with the postposition *-le* erroneously preceding the plural ending. Instead of turning Turkish grammar upside down, I propose Persian *dafla* ‘a small tambourine’ to be the word in question (261).

Chapter 4 (275-308) deals with the issue of which Bible text Haki used for his translation. There is actually every internal (e.g. rendering of proper names and Hebrew idiomatic constructions) and external (subdivisions according to Jewish tradition into weekly sections) evidence that the original Hebrew Bible and not an extant translation was used. This chapter also presents interesting comments on “the sentence structure” (295-304), which are based on a synopsis of the Hebrew text, Haki’s and Ali Bey’s translations (the latter also preserved in Leiden University Library) and a modern Turkish Bible (*Kitabı mukaddes*). It becomes clear that Haki’s syntax is very close to that of the Hebrew text on the clause level but different on the phrase level.

Chapter 5 (309-364) discusses “the Turkish of Haki’s Bible translation”. It contains remarks on orthographic interchanges and, among other things, a list of spellings which differ from those in Redhouse’s (old) dictionary. Since Redhouse is not even a very reliable source for Ottoman spelling of the 19th century, this reference work is of doubtful value for earlier periods of the language. Two further remarks:

Neudecker notes the absence of the letter *ta* in 2 Sam 19:26 *aldadı* ‘he cheated’ instead of *aldatdı* (1 Sam 19:17), but she does not note that there are also instances of *alda-* in Ottoman Turkish (319).

On p. 321 the author includes *çaşid* ‘scout, spy’ (2 Sam 15:10) in a list of words or spellings which Redhouse terms “vulgar” (instead of *casus*). Actually *çaşid* is a different etymon, which is semantically merged in *casus* (< Arabic).

Chapter 5 also contains valuable remarks on morphonology (326-357), especially concerning the vowels of suffixes. Neudecker compares the data of her text with

Doerfer's findings ("Zum Vokalismus nächster Silben in altosmanischen Originaltexten", Stuttgart 1985) and those of Hazai ("Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert", Budapest 1973). Haki's creative approach to the Ottoman language is well illustrated by the interesting list of "denominal verbs not found in Redhouse's dictionary" (360-361).

Chapter 6 "The historical background of the translation" (see above) is followed by a good "description of the manuscripts of Haki's Bible translation" (383-397) and a reproduction of the relevant section of Cod. Or. 391a.

Neudecker's neat edition and comprehensive study represent an extremely valuable contribution to the history of the Ottoman language and culture. More milestones like this one are needed to advance the exploration of the earlier stages of Turkish.