

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1998

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0002 | LOG_0035

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

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 Kasusuffixen 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.