Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003|LOG_0020

Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of İsmet Cemiloğlu, *14. yüzyıla ait bir Kısas-ı Enbiyâ nüshası üzerinde sentaks incelemesi.* (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 602.) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 1994. 21, 271 pages.

Mark Kirchner, Department of Turcology, Johann Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität, P. O. Box 111932, D-60054 Frankfurt a.M., e-mail: M.Kirchner@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Studies on Ottoman Turkish have until recently been more or less restricted to phonetical and morphological issues, syntax being left aside. Cemiloğlu's attempt to investigate the syntax of an anonymous 14th century *Kısas-ı Enbiyâ* (Eski Eserler ve Yazmalar Kütüphanesi in Bursa, Inv. 141), a genre characterized by a clear and action-packed plot, is a step into a new field of research that deserves to be noticed outside Turkey also.

Despite the fact that the *Kısas* were based on stories of saints written in another Oriental language, the syntactical structures correspond to what we expect for Old Ottoman Turkish. This is not astonishing since only few texts of that time are not translations from other languages. Cemiloğlu notes (p. xxi) that the first twenty leaves of the manuscript read like a translation.

Unfortunately the question of form and language of the underlying text is treated only superficially. Neither the Persian titles of the stories (some of the titles are Arabic) nor the hundreds of Arabic quotations give us a clear idea of the source, since either the Persian titles might be a creation of the Turkish author or the Arabic quotations might be reminiscent of quotations within the Persian text. The large amount of syntactical copies from Persian would represent more general evidence if we knew exactly that the manuscript was based not on a Persian but on an Arabic text.

In the second part of his book (pp. 121-243), Cemiloğlu presents the neatly transcribed legible text on which the syntactical study is based. It is followed by short remarks on orthography and related subjects (pp. 244-257), a useful glossary and, finally, as an appendix, some facsimile pages of the manuscript.

The author's method of studying syntax is influenced both by traditional grammar and structuralism. Unfortunately, issues of general interest, definitions and ter-

minology are discussed chiefly on the basis of the Turkish grammars by Ergin, Ban-
guoğlu and Gencan as well as other traditional studies from Turkey that are more or
less meagre in syntax. Although studies in modern Turkish are now integrated into
general linguistics, this is still not valid for studies on older stages of the language
published in Turkey. Apart from this insufficiency, Cemiloğlu presents much
valuable material, clearly arranged, and many interesting comparisons with Modern
Turkish.

Some (critical) remarks:

The first topic of the study is coordinated noun phrases (pp. 9ff.). What
Cemiloğlu calls "tekrar grubu" as opposed to "bağlama grubu" are asyndetic vs.
syndetic coordinated NPs. The material is arranged according to a semantic classifi-
cation and also includes intensive adjectives (e.g. *toptolı* 'chock-full'), which should
be treated within the morphology and not the syntax.

Next we find a presentation of the material according to its syntactic function.
This form of presentation makes sense for the object position, where we observe
double marking with the accusative (*yiri gögi gördi* 'He saw heaven and earth'), but
not for the adverbial or predicative positions.

The same goes for the authors treatment of syndetic coordinated noun phrases.
The material is too elaborately classified, which is without relevance for the discus-
sion of syntactic rules. The room taken up by this classification would have been
better used to explain the function of the conjunctions *u / ü*, *ve* and *ile* in these
phrases. Generally speaking, over-classification is the weak point of this syntax.

Nevertheless, its rich material gives us a wider and deeper insight into Ottoman
syntax than most of the dispersed studies and remarks in former editions of Ottoman
texts. On pp. 18-23 the author presents interesting data on izafet groups. There are,
for example, izafet groups with a definite person as possessor which have no genitive
marking (*İbrâhîm anası* 'Ibrahim's mother', cf. Modern Turkish *İbrahim'in annesi*).
This is also observed in constructions with possessive participles: *Âdem ekdügi
buğday deve ḳuşınuñ yumurdası gibiydi* (fol. 23a) 'The wheat that Adam sowed was
as big as an ostrich's egg'.

The syntax of postpositions (pp. 33-38) also differs from that of Modern Turk-
ish. For example, *şoñra* 'after' governs the ablative case with expressions of time,
while there is no case marking in such constructions in the modern language.

Treating the postposition *ḳadar,* Cemiloğlu is aware of the fact that it has two
functions with different government in Modern Turkish, but he combines the count-
ing words *o kadar, şu kadar* (*ol ḳadar, şol ḳadar* in his text) with the corresponding
postpositions *onun kadar, şunun kadar.* Instead of listing two different postpositions
ḳadar and *degin,* the author deals with the latter as a "form" of the first one ("daha
çok 'değin' şeklinde görülmektedir", p. 36). If we examine the examples listed for

the dative case, we only find examples of *degin*, while for the nominative case only *kadar* is listed. If this is true of the whole text, it would mean that *kadar* and *degin* are functionally differentiated.

The function of B-converbs is claimed to be not different from Modern Turkish ("fonksiyon bakımından bugünkü Türkiye Türkçesinden farklı değil", p. 45). As Cemiloğlu lists the forms out of context, his claims have to be proved by an examination of the text. Indeed, the text shows no clause chaining with B-converbs as known from later Ottoman Turkish, and thus resembles Modern Turkish. We see that the functional domain of B-converbs in Classical Ottoman is, in this text, occupied by juxtaposition and coordinating conjunctions.

Ki-clauses (pp. 60-63) are analyzed as "external clauses" ("dış cümle") which formally and semantically depend on the main clause.

On pp. 65-77, the author presents interesting statistics on the parts of speech and their position within the sentence. It should be noted that sentences with SOV-order are interpreted as "regular sentences" ("kurallı cümleler"), while divergent orders are suspected to be a result of influence from the underlying non-Ottoman text. Nevertheless, Cemiloğlu's statistics provide a good basis for further investigation into Ottoman text linguistics.

The chapter "Mânâlarına göre cümleler" ("Sentences according to their meaning", pp. 78-87) deals with several moods of Ottoman sentences. Interrogative clauses are arranged according to formal aspects as well as to their "functions", which prove to be mere contextual variants, such as the "function of worry and anxiety" ("üzüntü ve kaygı fonksiyonu") or the "function of the absence of knowledge" ("bilinmezlik fonksiyonu") (pp. 86-87). On pp. 98ff. Cemiloğlu makes some interesting observations on plural agreement and *ad sensum* constructions. He clearly shows, on the basis of rich material, that plural marking on the finite verb was more developed in the Old Ottoman text under investigation than in Modern Turkish.

In his conclusions (pp. 114-118) the author regrets the lack of a detailed and systematic syntax of Modern Turkish, which could have been used as a model for his investigations. In spite of this lack, Cemiloğlu has ventured to write a syntax of Old Ottoman on the basis of a suitable text. Even if the method applied is a less appropriate model for further studies, a great many of the observations and data can, as the author hopes, serve as "building material" for a historical syntax of the Ottoman language.

Ahmet Kocaman: Review of Kamile İmer, *Türkiye'de dil planlaması: Türk dil devrimi* [Language planning in Turkey: The Turkish language reform]. (Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları 2166, Yayımlar Dairesi Başkanlığı kültür eserleri dizisi 230.) Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı, 1998. 219 pages. ISBN 975-17-2067-2.

Ahmet Kocaman, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Gazimağusa, KKTC. E-mail: Kocaman.as@mozart.emu.edu.tr

The Turkish language reform has drawn the attention of many scholars outside Turkey, since it is one of the best examples of success in many facets of language planning (LP) over a short period of time. It has been particularly praised for the consistency attained in alphabetization, in lexical modernization, and in the spread of scientific terminology; see Fishman (1974: 74), Brendemoen (1990), Doğançay-Aktuna (1995), Boeschoten (1997).

In Turkey itself much has been written about the language reform, but scarcely anything about language planning in general, as the purification movement was always in the forefront of discussions. The book under review, written by Kamile İmer and published by the Turkish Ministry of Cultural Affairs on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of the Republic, deserves scholarly attention as it changes the previous narrow outlook on the issue.

Kamile İmer has been working on this topic since her doctoral dissertation (İmer 1976). The present book is a kind of reappraisal of the whole process.

The book consists of five chapters, an introduction and a conclusion. In the first chapter, the basic concepts of language planning (definition, scope, organs, objectives, etc.) are scrutinized. The model (Haugen 1983) used in describing and evaluating the language planning process is explained. The author notes that language planning has two aspects, policy planning and language cultivation. Policy planning is concerned with the selection and codification, while language cultivation covers implementation and elaboration (spread). Selection and implementation are primarily socially oriented and components of status planning, whereas codification and elaboration are linguistically oriented and treated within the scope of corpus planning.

The second chapter briefly studies the development of the Turkish language up to the Republican era. The author notes that, with the adoption of Islam, Arabic and Persian words started to influence Turkish. In the sixteenth century there was almost a diglossic situation in the country. Ottoman was used in literature and among the government elite, and less influenced varieties of Turkish were used among the people in general. During this period also, grammatical rules were borrowed from Arabic

and Persian. Only in the second half of the nineteenth century—through the influence of the new journalism and some language-conscious groups such as *Genç kalemler* ["Young authors"]—was the need for purification of the language emphasized. Actual language planning, however, did not become possible until the Republican period.

İmer evaluates the language planning of the Republican era in two parts. The first period roughly covers the years 1923-1980. In this period, first under the charismatic leadership of Atatürk and later his close friend İnönü, language planning was implemented very successfully. As the author remarks, almost all objectives of the language planning in terms of codification and elaboration were attained. There was nationwide support for graphicization, lexicalization, terminological modernization, etc. The confusion of similar words such as *ayrım* 'difference', *ayrıntı* 'detail', *ayrıcalık* 'privilege', *ayrılık* 'separation' caused some minor difficulties, and some semantic distinctions had to be made when using foreign elements and native words like *şüphe* vs. *kuşku* 'doubt', *aşk* vs. *sevgi* 'love'. But the spirit of modernization reigned over language as well as over other fields of activity in the country. This reflected the enthusiasm of the people as well as the determination of the administration in those years.

According to the author, the same enthusiasm has not continued after the 1980s, when *Türk Dil Kurumu*, The Turkish Language Society, was transformed into a government office. This period was anticipated as far back as the 1950s, when the Democratic Party came to power. In that period, the language of the earlier constitution, which contained many Arabic and Persian loans, was readopted, and the use of foreign elements in government documents was encouraged. The same attitude was readopted at the beginning of the 1980s, when the structure of the Language Society was changed.

However, as İmer remarks, despite bans on the use of some lexical items, mostly neologisms, and other coercive measures, the language reform seems to have taken root. Today there is not much rift in terms of the vocabulary used between opposing groups of journalists.

As the author points out, language reform is only one of the objectives of language planning, but the public often equates these two concepts, because lexicalization—particularly in the form of neologisms—is most evident in the everyday use of language. This has also been true in recent years. People have started to raise complaints about the flooding of foreign words, especially English ones, into the language. Some even describe it as a deterioration or a decay of the Turkish language.

In the last chapter, İmer recapitulates the perspectives of language planning in general and proposes that the new Language Society be transformed into a language

academy and the present *Türk Dil Derneği* be given the former status of *Türk Dil Kurumu.*

The book is a brief but remarkable survey of language planning in modern Turkey. It displays a consistent use of methodology and includes a comprehensive bibliography. The terminology is wisely used, and differences between related terms are clearly accounted for. İmer's explanations are clear-cut and very illuminating. The book will serve as an indispensible primary source for those studying Turkish language planning and Turkish linguistics in general.

References

Boeschoten, H. 1997. The Turkish language reform forced into stagnation. In: M. Clyne (ed.) *Undoing and redoing corpus planning.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 357-383.

Brendemoen, B. 1990. The Turkish language reform and language policy in Turkey. In: G. Hazai (ed.). *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenchaft.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 454-493.

Doğançay-Aktuna, S. 1995. An evaluation of the Turkish language reform after 60 years. In: *Language problems and language planning* 19, 221-249.

Fishman, J. A. (ed.) 1974. *Advances in language planning.* The Hague: Mouton.

Haugen, E. 1983. The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In: Cobarrubias, J. & J. A. Fishman (eds.) *Progress in language planning. International perspectives.* The Hague: Mouton. 269-290.

İmer, K. 1976. *Dilde değişme ve gelişme açısından Türk dil devrimi.* [The Turkish language reform from the point of view of change and development in the language] Ankara: TDK.

Christoph Schroeder: Review of Jaklin Kornfilt, *Turkish*. (Descriptive grammars.) London: Routledge, 1997. xxxii+575 pages. Hb. £ 110,-. ISBN 0-415-00010-6.

Christoph Schroeder, Universität – GH Essen, FB 3, Türkisch, D-45117 Essen.

The first comprehensive description of Modern Standard Turkish published in English since Swift 1963, Underhill 1976, and Lewis 1975, is sure to arouse interest in the worlds of linguistic Turcology and general linguistics.[*]

Turkish is intended for the linguist, especially for the general linguist, typologist or comparative linguist who is interested in a thorough description of a language he / she has not much knowledge of. The book is part of a series entitled "Descriptive Grammars", edited by Bernard Comrie. To date, the series includes 29 descriptions of different (and mostly minor) languages. According to Comrie's "Editorial statement" (pp. iii-iv), the general aim of the series is to provide *comparable* descriptions which are able to bridge the gap between traditional description and its often isolated terminology on the one hand, and modern linguistic theory on the other hand. As with all the other descriptions in the series, a structured *Questionnaire*, first published in *Lingua*, vol. 42 (1977) provides the framework for the description of Turkish in *Turkish*.

1. Presentation of the book

The book comprises nearly 600 pages. It has a detailed and useful table of contents, a not so useful index (see below, section 3.), and a five-page bibliography. A "brief overview of some important characteristics of Modern Standard Turkish"—not included in the first edition—and a short list of *errata* in form of a seven-page addendum are available free of charge from the publisher.

Five chapters follow the questionnaire, in covering "Syntax" (Chapter 1, 211 pages), "Morphology" (Chapter 2, 271 pages), "Phonology", (Chapter 3, 32 pages), "Ideophones and interjections" (Chapter 4, 3 pages), and "Lexicon" (Chapter 5, 17 pages), followed by 18 pages of endnotes.

Turkish presents a synchronic view, with only a few remarks with regard to the history of a morpheme (for example, on page 260, the suffix *-in* in *yazın* is described

---

as "the old instrumental", and the Arabic dual is noted as having been borrowed by Ottoman as *-ayn*, p. 265).

The author of *Turkish*, Jaklin Kornfilt, is a recognized expert on the language and well known for her linguistic work within the theoretical framework of Government and Binding as well as Minimality Theory. One could say that the emphasis she places on syntax and morphology is influenced by this theoretical approach. Also, Kornfilt's approach basically represents the modern American linguistic discussion. Other Turcological points of view are not discussed, nor are European works (Turkish ones included) integrated to the extent they could have been, which explains the astonishingly short bibliography and gives the discussion a certain imbalance. Although this does not lessen the high quality of the book as a descriptive grammar, the reader should not expect an introduction to the variety of analyses of or approaches to Turkish grammar.

1.1. Chapter 1, "Syntax"

Chapter 1 thoroughly describes the main parts of Turkish syntax, starting with "Sentence Types"(1.1.1.) and an overview of "Subordination" (1.1.2.), followed by "The internal structure of sentences and phrases" (1.2.), "Coordination" (1.3.) and more specific functional domains, such as "Negation" (1.4.), "Anaphora" (1.5.), "Reflexives" (1.6.), "Reciprocals" (1.7.), "Comparison" (1.8.), "Equatives" (1.9.), "Possession" (1.10.), down to functional-pragmatic aspects, such as "Emphasis" (1.11.) and "Topic" (1.12.). Some smaller subsections follow, viz. "Heavy shift" (1.13.), "Other movement processes" (1.14.), "Minor sentence types" (1.15.), and "Operational definitions for word classes" (1.16.).

In particular the subsections 1.4. to 1.12. contain comprehensive information for non-Turcological linguists interested in questions of scope, accessibility and variability in a functional domain. But Turcological linguists, too, will find many new insights into topics which have not been treated consistently in this way before, if at all. Let me point out some of these:

1. To my knowledge, Kornfilt is the first to deal with the phenomenon of adjective arguments (pp. 94-95). It is particularly interesting to see that Turkish does not allow adjectives to have accusative arguments. For example, the verb *kıskan-* 'envy' takes accusative arguments, as in 1, but the corresponding adjective *kıskanç* 'envious' only allows dative arguments, as in 2:

(1) (p. 94, 373)
   Hasan Ali-yi   kıskan-ıyor.
   Hasan Ali-Acc.   envy-Pr.Prog[1]
   'Hasan envies Ali.'

(2) *Hasan Ali-ye (*Ali-yi)   kıskanç*
   Hasan Ali-Dat. (Ali-Acc.) envious
   'Hasan is envious of Ali.'

For linguists interested in the transitional relationships between word classes and the morphosyntactic consequences accompanying them, this opposition may point to the non-verbal character of adjectives in Turkish, since it means that they may not assign grammatical case.

2. In the section "Adjective clauses" (1.1.2.3.), after having described participle clauses and briefly noting *ki* constructions (see below, section 2.1.), Kornfilt identifies a further type of relative construction which is rarely discussed under that heading.[2] It is a kind of correlative, semantically akin to free relatives, and, structurally, an embedded conditional:

(3) (p. 60, 259)
   Ben Chomsky ne   yaz-ar-sa   on-u   oku-r-um
   I   Chomsky what write-Aor.-Cond.   that-Acc. read-Aor.-1.sg.
   'I read that which Chomsky writes.'

The discussion deserves mention because it shows Kornfilt's emphasis on functions instead of classification on a formal basis.

3. In the "Coordination" section (1.3.), Kornfilt very clearly shows that the enclitic conjunctional postposition *-(y)lA* has different syntactic properties when used as a coordination marker and a comitative marker (pp. 114-116). First, as a coordinator for noun phrases and nominalized clauses, *-(y)lA* appears between the conjuncts and cliticizes onto the first conjunct, while as a comitative marker, it cliticizes onto the second noun phrase in the unmarked word order. Second, when the postposition is used with the subject of the sentence, the coordinate structure triggers plural agreement on the predicate, while with the comitative construction, the predicate is in the singular. And third, coordinate structures may not be broken up by moving

*

[1]   In the examples from the book I follow the interlinearization given therein.

[2]   Ozil (1993) is another noteworthy exception.

either constituents, whereas the noun phrases involved in the comitative construction may move.

4. It is one of the positive outcomes of a description based on a pre-structured framework that topics are raised which are usually neglected. For example, the semantic distinction between "alienable" and "non-alienable" possession is generally not regarded as a distinction with syntactic or morphological reflections in Turkish. Consequently, it is not dealt with in traditional descriptions. In the "Possession" section (1.10.), however, Kornfilt shows that the distinction between alienable and non-alienable may in fact be seen as having an impact on Turkish. First, it makes a difference in the possibility of separating genitive constructions in existential sentences (p. 186). Thus, while alienable possession, as in 4, allows for the separation of the genitive, non-alienable possession, as in 5, does not:

(4) (p. 186, 677)
    Hasan-ın   garaj-da   beş   araba-sı var.
    Hasan-Gen. garage-Loc. five car-3.sg. exist
    'Hasan has five cars in the garage.'

(5) (p. 186, 678)
    ?? / * Hasan-ın   alçı-da   bir kol-u   var.
             Hasan-Gen. plaster-Loc. one arm-3.sg. exist
    Intended reading: 'Hasan has one arm in a cast.'

Second, the distinction between alienable and non-alienable possession makes a difference in subject possessive noun phrases of non-nominalized embedded clauses, which at the same time receive the direct object marking of the superordinate clause:

(6) (p. 187, 682)
    (Ben) [[Hasan-ın   diş-in-i]   ağrı-yor]   san-ıyor-du-m.
    I   Hasan-Gen. tooth-3.sg.-Acc. hurt-Pr.Prog. believe-Prog.-Past-1.sg.
    'I believed Hasan's tooth to hurt.'

Here, the interpretation of the possession is always alienable. Thus, as Kornfilt points out, it is suggested that "Hasan's tooth would somehow be hurting on its own, without Hasan himself necessarily feeling the pain" (p.187).

5. Traditional descriptions are often troubled by the fact that Turkish verb phrase adverbials such as *erken* 'early', and *dışarı* 'out' may be inflected for adverbial case, e.g. *erken-den* (early-ABL), and *dışarı-ya* (out-DAT). Kornfilt examines this phe-

nomenon from a pragmatic angle where it appears as an instance of topicalization of the adverbial (p. 202).

1.2. Chapter 2, "Morphology"

With 272 pages, Chapter 2 is one of the most detailed descriptions of Turkish morphology written in a language other than Turkish. The chapter has two main subsections, "Inflection" (2.1., pp. 212-444) and "Derivational morphology" (2.2., pp. 444-482). The subsection on inflection follows the traditional path of describing the inflectional properties of each word class, the operational definitions of which are outlined in the last subsection of the syntax chapter.

Again, we find numerous new insights. Particularly remarkable are the detailed treatment of the expressions of local and nonlocal semantic functions in the sentence (pp. 226-255), the subsection on voice categories (pp. 323-336), and the treatment of clitics (pp. 435-444). The overview on incorporation (pp. 396-405) is of note here because it is not confined to the much-discussed direct object incorporation, but also examines cases where postpositions, adverbs, adjectives and other constituents may be regarded as incorporated.

The subsection on derivation is considerably short, given the scope dedicated to this part of Turkish morphology in traditional descriptions such as Banguoğlu (1986) and Ergin (1985). Only the most productive derivational morphology is dealt with. Borderline cases between inflection and derivation are discussed without the author taking explicit standpoints, for example, with regard to nominalization as against the derivation of nouns from verbs (p. 450), formation of adverb clauses as against deriving adverbs from verbs (p. 464) and incorporation as against compounding (p. 477). Not discussed is the use of the converb suffix *-ArAk* with *ol-* 'be' in combination with adjectives, as in *asgarî ol-arak* (minimal be-CONV) 'at least', literally 'being minimal'. Kornfilt labels these combinations the "derivation of adverbs from adjectives" (p. 478). One could also speak of the formation of a subjectless adverbial clause, which can, admittedly, be translated into English in the form of an adverb.

1.3. Chapter 3 "Phonology"

Chapter 3 presents a concise overview of Turkish phonology. The chapter is comparatively short, but references to more detailed treatments of specific phonological topics are included. The frequent statement of "rules" and "principles", the status of which is not completely clear to readers not familiar with the generative approach, is, however, slightly confusing. Sometimes, more "traditional" explanations could have accompanied the description. For example, we find a treatment of the "distinctive

degrees of length in various segments" on page 501. Here, Kornfilt shows that two facts can lead to the distinctiveness of long vs. short vowels in Turkish, which, essentially, has only short vowels (p. 489). The two facts are the long vowels in some loanwords, and, second, the process of "compensatory lengthening" triggered by the "soft g" / "yumuşak g" in syllable-final position (when it cannot be resyllabified with a following vowel) (p. 488). In a synchronic approach, "compensatory lengthening" is undoubtedly the appropriate term for the process. But a short note explaining that the lengthening results from the loss of a voiced velar fricative in Turkish (cf. Csató & Johanson 1998: 204), would have been helpful.

1.4. Chapters 4, "Ideophones and interjections", and 5, "Lexicology"

Chapter 4 lists a number of Turkish ideophones and interjections. The section on interjections (4.2.) contains a few notes on the way in which the yes / no clitic *ml* is used to express shades of modality and the way in which the forms *şey* 'thing' and *falan (filan)* 'and so on' are used in order to structure unplanned spoken discourse.

Chapter 5 provides a useful tool for lexicologists interested in large-scale typological comparisons, since it gives (scarcely commented) lists of words, organized by semantic fields such as "Kinship", "Color", "Body parts" and the like.

2. Some topics in detail: Critical remarks

It goes without saying that a 600-page description of Turkish grammar is bound to contain numerous topics that can be viewed in different ways, that are open to discussion and criticism or that, simply, show shortcomings or create confusion. In this section, I shall address some of these topics.

2.1. The complementizer *ki*

The treatment of the form *ki* is confusing (pp. 3, 12 / 13, 45, 60, 321-323 and 443). When introducing *ki*, Kornfilt calls it a "complementizer" which subordinates finite clauses (p. 46), mostly complement clauses. It is classified as a clitic because it attaches to the preceding word (p. 443), occurs with a subsequent pause and cannot be stressed.

On page 60, some examples are given where constructions with the clitic *ki* may be regarded as resembling relative clause constructions. The discussion closes with the remark that these constructions "have come into disuse".

Later, in the morphology chapter, the topic of the clitic *ki* is taken up again. Here, Kornfilt says that it is used "as a relative pronoun" (pp. 321-322) and states that "it is possible to use the Indo-European [relative clause] construction with relative pronouns" in Turkish (p. 323). An example:

(7) (p. 323, 1137)
O   yer   ki   herkes   çok iyi bil-ir
that place which everybody very well know-Aor.
'That place which everybody knows (it) very well.'

Certainly, if we translate *ki* as 'which', we obtain the English relative clause. But constructions like 7 are copies from Iranian languages. There, the phonologically similar form is not a pronoun, nor even used as such. It is simply a subordinator.

It is also confusing to first speak of the "disuse" of a pseudo-relative construction and then to imply that the respective subordinator is regularly used in such constructions. And it adds to the confusion when in the section on anaphora (1.3.) a completely different suffix *-ki*, which attaches to headless genitive modifiers and modifiers of time and place, is also said to function "in some sense" like a relative pronoun (p. 131).

Furthermore, Kornfilt fails to mention that Turkish has a second form of *ki*. It is used in the spoken language and differs from the clitic *ki* in that a pause occurs before it, it can be stressed and it introduces (finite) sentences which could, under certain circumstances, be viewed as a near-equivalent to non-restrictive relative clauses:[3]

(8) *Onlar çok sev-diğ-im*   *insan-lar-dı,*
    they   very love-PART-POSS.1SG   people-PL-PST

k i *hala seviyorum.*
k i still love-PROGR-1.SG
'They were people I liked very much, (*ki*) I still like (them).'

2.2. Adjectives and adverbs

On page 91 we find the simple statement that in Turkish, "almost any adjective may be used as an adverb". In a certain way, Konfilt contradicts herself on this topic. On page 404, she mentions that "nonderived adverbs" may not leave the position immediately in front of the verb and may, in this position, be viewed as incorporated. What is omitted, however, is the fact that adjectives in the position of adverbs, which are not morphologically marked as adverbs (i.e., which do not have the suffix *-CA* or are reduplicated), *always* occupy this position. Since Kornfilt does not ex-

---

[3]   The example comes from a corpus of spoken Turkish in Istanbul, 1993-1995.

plain her concept of incorporation (does the incorporated element form part of the verb or does it retain its syntactic status?), the question remains whether the "adverbial" use of adjectives really leads to free adverbial forms or whether it should rather be viewed as the formation of a complex construction with the verb it precedes.

2.3. Postpositions

Five pages in the syntax chapter deal with postpositional phrases (pp. 100-104). It seems that, with regard to postpositions, Kornfilt tries to create a certain uniformity of a word class which, in Turkish, is in fact highly heterogenous.

First, in the "Operational definition for the postpositional phrase", we find the statement that postpositions can easily be distinguished from adjectives because the latter do not assign case (p. 100). The distinction is not that easy. Turkish has a number of forms which, like adjectives, can be used attributively and predicatively. They form complex phrases with complements, to which they assign (adverbial) case, i.e. *ait* 'belonging', 'concerning', *yönelik* 'directed', *bağlı* 'connected, 'related', *ilgili* 'concerning', 'related'. What distinguishes the phrases headed by these forms from phrases headed by so-called "postpositions" like *ile* 'with' and *için* 'for' is the fact that the latter phrases cannot be used attributively, while the first phrases cannot be used adverbially. Thus, a syntactic restriction in the "Operational definition for the postpositional phrase" stating that postpositional phrases are adverbial phrases would have been appropriate. This then would have forced Kornfilt to reconsider the statement made on page 424: "postpositional phrases can also be used as modifiers of noun phrases". On the contrary, it is an important syntactic feature of Turkish that it generally does not allow postpositional phrases to be modifiers, at least not in noun phrases with full lexical first, second or third order nouns (in the sense of Lyons 1977) in head position.

Second, it is problematic to analyze words like *önce* and *sonra* as "postpositions without argument" (pp. 100, 102) when they are used as bare adverbial forms in the meanings of 'previously' and 'later'. Morphosyntactically, these two forms behave exactly like adverbials when they are bare—and "adverbials" is what they are called in another section, on page 452. Is this a sign of inconsistency, or does the author agree that the forms should be assigned two domains of use, on the one hand as postpositions, and on the other hand as adverbs?

Third, further on in the subsection, Kornfilt shows that "postpositions" like *kadar* 'as much' and *gibi* 'like' may take tensed clauses as complements (p. 103). See an example with kadar:

(9) (p. 103, 402)
[yarışma-yı   kazan-acak] kadar   (güzel)
competition-Acc.   win-Fut.   as much as   beautiful
'As much (beautiful) as to win the competition'

The above example is presented under the heading of "Finite adverbial clauses". We find similar examples on page 97 under the same heading. Here, Kornfilt explains that these clauses "are not genuinely finite, although they are not nominalized" (A reference to this remark would have been appropriate on page 103). I fail to understand why these clauses are not nominalized. Kornfilt may have explained the complement clauses *kadar* may take as clauses formed from attributive participles. These participles are based on the combination of the verb stem with the (future tense) suffix *-EcEk* or the (past tense) suffix *-mlş*. Both participle types are mentioned in the morphology chapter. In the syntax chapter, however, *-mlş* and *-EcEk* appear only in combination with *olan*, 'being', the participle form of *ol-*, 'be' (section on relative clauses, pp. 65-66). Once the existence of participial *-mlş* and *-EcEk* forms is acknowledged, why not regard the respective (verbal) arguments of *kadar* as participle phrases which, consequently, may be said to have a certain degree of nominalization?

The complications with *gibi* and *kadar* do not end here. In a certain way, Kornfilt is right in listing *gibi* under the heading of postpositions taking finite clauses as complements. *Gibi* is rather unique in this respect. It shares three features with *kadar*. These features are not possible with any (other?) postposition: First, the phrases headed by *kadar* and *gibi* may be attributive, predicative and adverbial. Second, as mentioned above, the two forms may take phrases headed by *-mlş* and *-EcEK* participles as complements. Third, both *kadar* and *gibi* may be combined with the possessive suffix of the third person singular and act as anaphoric noun phrases:

(10) *Bunun   gibi-sin-i   çok   gör-dü-k.*
     this(GEN)   like-POSS.3SG-ACC   a lot see-PRT-1PL
     'We have seen lots of this (like this).'

(11) *Bu   kadar-ı   yet-er.*
     this as much-POSS.3SG   be enough-AOR.3SG
     'This (of it) is enough.'

This is a feature which *kadar* and *gibi* share with adjectival modifiers. And *gibi* (but not *kadar*) may also take finite clauses (that is, clauses with a person marker from the predicative / verbal paradigm) as complements:

(12) (van Schaaik 1996: 275)
      Beni hiç   *gör-me-miş-sin*   *gibi dur-up*   *bak-ma!*
      me   emph(neg.) see-NEG-PST-2SG like stand-CONV look-NEG (IMP)
      'Don't stand there and look at me as if you've never seen me!'

The four features listed above are not shared by any other postposition. Are *gibi* and *kadar*, then, postpositions? They would at least have to be described as highly exceptional members of this word class. On the other hand, the evidence van Schaaik (1996) gives in his thorough analysis of *gibi*-constructions rather suggests that they should be classified as (non-finite) predicates.

3. *Turkish* and the questionnaire

Some of the qualities and some of the problems of *Turkish* are related to the questionnaire which forms the base for the book.

   1. It is an indisputable quality of a pre-structured framework that one learns a lot about structures which are not represented in the grammar of Turkish. In conjunction with this, Kornfilt often gives ungrammatical examples (marked as such) and notes shadings of acceptability in order to give clear pictures of the structural frame within which linguistic phenomena are to be understood.

   2. On the other hand, *Turkish* does not offer what the questionnaire does not ask for. For example, we do not find anything about the differences between planned and unplanned speech and we do not find any information about stylistic variations. Similarly, the section on ideophones (4.1.) is rather disappointing. Ideophones are described as if they existed outside of the systematic part of the language. That is, the questionnaire does not ask for the way in which emphatic forms are integrated into the phonological system of the language. In this respect, phenomena such as the productive emphatic reduplication with systematic phonological variations in the reduplicated form (of the type *ev mev* 'house(s) and the like'; cf. Tietze 1953) might have been interesting, or the combination of lexical and phonological variation in the form of frozen binominals (of the type *hayal meyal* 'evanescent', *çoluk çocuk* 'household'). But the absence of these topics does not come as a surprise. Linguistic descriptions usually concentrate on what is in the focus of contemporary research. In pre-structuralistic descriptions, we find a dominance of lexicology, morphology and phonology, while the syntax is neglected; in contemporary structure-oriented approaches, syntax is given more weight, but those dimensions of language are neglected which are difficult to systemize within the framework of current theories. The questionnaire on which *Turkish* is based, and, therefore, *Turkish* itself, are no exceptions to this tendency.

3. The authors of the questionnaire, Bernard Comrie and Norman Smith, wanted "the general direction of description within the questionnaire" to be "from function to form" (Comrie & Smith 1977: 8). The structure of the questionnaire is not as radical in its "function-to-form" approach as it could be.[4] Nevertheless, the emphasis on functional domains, especially in the syntax chapter, allows Jaklin Kornfilt to illustrate the complex interplay of different formal devices in an elaborate and highly successful way.

On the other hand, the emphasis on "function to form" is disadvantageous when one is interested in the way forms serve different kinds of functions. The authors of the questionnaire saw the solution to this problem in an index of forms "enabling the reader to go equally from form to function" (Comrie & Smith 1977: 8). For example, if I want to learn something about the functional load lying on word order in Turkish, then this index may be used by intensive cross-referencing, allowing me to move from one place where word order is mentioned in the fulfillment of a certain function to the next. Another possibility could have been an index listing all forms mentioned and the places where they appear in the book. Instead of being a mere convenience for the reader, cross-referencing and indexing would then form an essential part of the description as the "other half", so to speak, or the form-to-function part.

Unfortunately, this task is not effectively fulfilled by the index in *Turkish*, nor by any other of the books in the series. For example, my question about the function of word order in Turkish is simply left unanswered: "word order" (or "constituent order") is neither an item in the index nor does it form a section in the book. Of course, it is treated in various places in the syntax chapter. But since the cross-referencing is equally unsatisfactory, I would have to read the entire chapter in order to collect a "catalogue" of the functions of word order in Turkish.

4. Conclusion

We could go on discussing the book as one of its numerous merits is the fact that it is thought-provoking. Jaklin Kornfilt has an exquisite knowledge of the language and is a theoretical linguist. Most of the time she resists the temptation of rounding off the edges where this might give the work a smoother finish. Thus, *Turkish* demonstrates the richness of the grammar of Turkish while at the same time making it accessible to comparative investigations. In this way *Turkish* achieves its aim of

---

[4]   For example, the basic divisions of the questionnaire are again form-based ("Syntax", "Morphology", ...). See Mosel (1987: 52-55) and Lehmann (1989: 144-148) for discussions.

bridging the gap between traditional viewpoints and modern linguistic theory. Jaklin Kornfilt is to be congratulated for an outstanding achievement which is bound to become a key reference grammar for both comparative linguists and linguistic Turcologists. *Turkish* deserves a place in the library of every linguistic department.

References

Banguoğlu, Tahsin. 1986². *Türkçenin grameri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu basım evi.

Comrie, Bernard & Smith, Norval 1977. Lingua descriptive studies: Questionnaire. *Lingua* 42, 1-72.

Csató, Éva Á. & Johanson, Lars 1998. Turkish. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. (Language Family Descriptions.) London: Routledge. 203-235.

Ergin, Muharrem. 1985¹⁶. *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi yayınları.

Lehmann, Christian. 1989. Language description and general comparative grammar. In: Graustein, Gottfried & Leitner, Gerhard. *Reference grammars and modern linguistic theory*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 226.) Tübingen: Niemeyer. 133-162.

Lewis, G. L. 1975². *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: University Press.

Lyons, John 1977. *Semantics* 1-2. Cambridge: University Press.

Mosel, Ulrike 1987. *Inhalt und Aufbau deskriptiver Grammatiken (How to write a grammar)*. (Arbeitspapier Nr. 4, N.F.) Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln.

Ozil, Şeyda 1993 Türkçede eş işlevli dilbilgisel yapılar – ortaçlar ve koşul tümceleri. In: İmer, Kâmile & N. Engin Uzun (eds.). *VII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri*. (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi yayını 371.) Ankara. 85-94.

van Schaaik, Gerjan 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Swift, Lloyd B. 1963. *A reference grammar of modern Turkish*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 19.) Bloomington, The Hague: Indiana Unversity Publications.

Tietze, Andreas 1953. Die Wiederholung mit verändertem Wortbeginn. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 15, 92-108.

Underhill, Robert. 1976. *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Stephen A. Wurm: Review of Lars Johanson & Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.), *The Turkic languages.* (Routledge Language Family Descriptions.) London, New York: Routledge, 1998. xxiii + 474 pages. ISBN 0-415-08200-5.

Stephen A. Wurm, Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia.

This book which presents itself as a book on the Turkic languages is in fact much more. It is an excellent compact introductory work on Turcology, including very good concise chapters on the speakers of Turkic languages; a historical sketch of the Turkic peoples, one on Turkic writing systems (to which some of the current alphabets of several Turkic languages are given in the *Appendix* to the book), and general Turkic linguistic chapters on the structure of Turkic; on the reconstruction of proto-Turkic and the genetic question; and on the history of Turkic. It is not before page 138 that, with the description of Old Turkic, discussions of individual Turkic languages begin. The whole book is very well and clearly written, and constitutes an outstanding introductory textbook for students of Turcology and Altaic studies. The table of the speakers of Turkic languages in the various relevant countries, and the list of the large numbers of tables of grammatical and other elements included in the book add to the user-friendly nature of the book. As is stated in the *Preface*, it differs from previous surveys of the Turkic languages by trying to meet the requirements not only of Turcologists, but of a variety of readers, such as those without a previous knowledge of Turcology, among them general linguists, typologists, historical linguists, and others. The theoretical basis is relatively neutral. To this it may be added as an important valuable feature, in which it differs from some other introductions to Turcology, that the descriptions of the various Turkic languages do not follow a general entirely rigid pattern strictly applied to all the languages, but each of them tends to be an individual description in the light of features of each language. However, a similar range of core features is presented in every description, more or less in the same order, which facilitates the comparison of such features in different languages. A commendable feature of the descriptions is the avoidance of excessively technical language and terminology, which will be welcomed by readers who lack specialized knowledge of Turcology and Altaic studies. Another point to be welcomed by non-specialists is the use of names for the various Turkic languages which reflect the common general usage in the world, not the names increasingly

employed in specialist Turcological literature, e.g. Yakut instead of Sakha, Kirghiz instead of Kyrgyz, etc.

Hendrik Boeschoten's general chapter on the speakers of Turkic languages constitutes a good overview. The facts that there is no automatic match between ethnic groups and languages and that boundaries may be very ill-defined are pointed out. The abovementioned table of speakers of Turkic languages is found in this chapter. Boeschoten points out that, while the numbers of speakers mentioned give a fair indication of first-language speakers, they may well be subject to revision. There are gaps in the material, e.g. for Turkey, no statistics exist about small refugee groups who speak Turkic languages other than Turkish.

Peter Golden's historical sketch of the Turkic peoples makes excellent reading as a concise overview of historical events which constitute necessary knowledge for anyone interested in the Turkic linguistic and general world.

Lars Johanson's extensive chapter on the structure of Turkic, which gives a fairly detailed account of the phonological, morphological and syntactic features of the Turkic languages, will be of particular interest to non-Turcologist linguists who look to this book as a source of concise general information on the nature, patterns and typology of the Turkic languages.

András Róna-Tas's chapter on the reconstruction of proto-Turkic and the genetic question is introduced by a definition of proto-language and of proto-Turkic, including its possible original homeland, followed by a well-presented sketch of proto-Turkic. In the section on proto-Turkic and the genetic question, the author adopts a well-argued, very cautious view of the question of a possible genetic relationship between Turkic and Mongolian and even more so of the Altaic hypothesis.

Lars Johanson's very extensive chapter on the history of Turkic consists of a concise first section describing the historical development of the present differentiated picture of several groups of Turkic languages from a proto-Turkic unity, followed by a very detailed long section on diachronic phonology which also includes the phonological adaptation of lexical borrowings. A shorter section deals with the historical development of morphology and a brief section is devoted to the lexicon from a historical point of view. The chapter is highly informative, and together with the chapter on the reconstruction of proto-Turkic preceding it, constitutes an excellent introduction to Turkic historical linguistics.

András Róna-Tas's chapter on Turkic writing systems offers a discussion of systems used for Old Turkic which are of Semitic or Indic origin, of systems used for Middle Turkic, and of systems used for modern Turkic languages. Of the latter, the Arabic script has been almost completely abandoned now. One notable exception is Modern Uyghur in China for which a new system of Arabic script has been developed in which all vowels are written. For most Turkic languages, the Cyrillic script

has been in use during the last half century or more, though some languages (e.g. Turkmen and Uzbek) have now changed to Latin alphabets, and several other republics in the area of the former USSR have plans to adopt the Latin script as well. In the 1920s and early 1930s, several Turkic peoples of the then USSR had developed Latin alphabets but were forced to replace them by Cyrillic. Turkish, for which an Arabic alphabet had been in use, switched to a modified Latin alphabet as from 1928. It might have been desirable to add a few script specimens, especially of those employed for Old Turkic and Middle Turkic.

Then follow descriptions of individual Turkic languages, the first being a fairly detailed description of Old Turkic by Marcel Erdal. This is the Turkic language documented by texts and other materials dating from the seventh to the thirteenth centuries AD, in runiform, Old Uyghur and other scripts. It was spoken in parts of present-day Mongolia, northwest China and the Karakhanid state further west. The second description of Turkic languages no longer spoken today is a relatively brief one of Middle Kipchak by Árpád Berta. It summarizes the major features of Kipchak dialects spoken between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries in the South Russian steppe and in the Near East. This is followed by a somewhat longer description of Chaghatay by Hendrik Boeschoten and Marc Vandamme. Chaghatay can be described as a succession of stages of written Turkic, as the high literary language of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Central Asia. In its focal area it represents previous stages of the Uzbek and Uyghur written languages, though it had certain special characteristics such as a complex syntax copied from Persian. The chapter describes characteristics of the classical period of Chaghatay, without mentioning too much the variations found in the sources for it. The last chapter dealing with a Turkic language no longer spoken today is the one on Ottoman Turkish by Celia Kerslake. This was the official and literary language of the Ottoman Empire, a variety of West Oghuz Turkic, from about 1300 to 1928. The author gives a survey of its historical development and its subdivision into three diachronic phases: *Old Ottoman*, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries—a language clearly different from modern Turkish in some respects. *Middle Ottoman* in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries—a language overloaded with Arabic and Persian lexical elements, morphological elements and sub-clausal syntactic structures, while at the same time, its use of native Turkish subordinate syntactic structures increased at the expense of Persian ones. *New Ottoman*, in structure was in many respects very similar to Modern Turkish, but still abounded in Arabic and Persian elements. The description of the language itself, Persian-type clauses and nominal phrases, the syntactic role of Arabic verbal nouns, as well as the Turkification of Ottoman syntax in the closing years of the Ottoman era, also receive attention.

The first of the chapters dealing with contemporary languages is Éva Csató's and Lars Johanson's excellent detailed presentation of Turkish. This is followed by a chapter on Turkish dialects by Bernt Brendemoen. This chapter certainly adds to the great value of the book, as this subject is rarely dealt with separately in a compendium volume like this one. It is unfortunate, however, that the Balkan and Thracian dialects have not also been dealt with.

The short chapter, also by Brent Brendemoen, on the Turkic language reform, is also a most welcome addition to the book. It is of considerable interest to people who have learned or intend to learn Turkish with the help of older textbooks at their disposal which would make them acquire lexical items which are no longer in general use.

The various language descriptions that follow in the book are in geographical order and at the same time, they very largely follow the classification of Turkic languages into the Oghuz, Kipchak, Uyghur, Siberian and Oghur branches. Therefore, the language descriptions following those of Turkish also belong to the Oghuz branch, i.e. Azerbaijanian, the Turkic languages of Iran, and Turkmen.

The description of Azerbaijanian is by Claus Schönig. The language is very closely related to Turkish, with a very high degree of mutual intelligibility. It is regarded by some scholars as one of the Turkish dialects extending from the Balkans to the Caucasus and into Iran. Since 1991, Azerbaijanian has been written in a modified Latin alphabet. The description of Azerbaijanian is followed by a description of Turkmen, also by Claus Schönig. The language is not readily mutually intelligible with Turkish and Azerbaijanian, in part for phonetic reasons, i.e. the presence of long vowels and the interdental articulation of s and z. Both descriptions are concise.

The next description of the Turkic languages of Iran, by Gerhard Doerfer, reports on the findings of the Göttingen expeditions between 1968 and 1976 whose results very substantially changed and clarified the Turkic language situation in Iran. The extent of the Azerbaijanian dialects area was clarified, as was that of other Oghuz dialects, now referred to as Southern Oghuz, and previously unknown Turkic dialects of the Khorasan area were discovered. Dialects in Northern Khorasan were previously believed to be Turkmen, but are now known to be Khorasan Turkic (or East Oghuz) dialects, and different from Turkmen. At the same time, the results of the expeditions, which produced good information on the Khalaj language in Central Persia, showed it to constitute an additional branch of Turkic and thus altered the classification of Turkic languages. Khalaj is now regarded as having split off from common Turkic as a separate Turkic branch before the latter split up, but its splitting-off postdated that of the splitting-off of the Oghur branch from common Turkic. In his description, the author briefly presents features of South Oghuz, mentions historical and demographic facts relating to the Turkic languages of Iran, lists differences be-

tween the Oghuz dialects, and finally presents a few features of Khalaj which has been heavily influenced by Iranian and Tati, but has preserved some very archaic Turkic features.

The next description, that of Tatar and Bashkir by Árpád Berta, is the first of five devoted to languages of the Kipchak branch of Turkic languages. Tatar and Bashkir are closely related. The description constitutes a fairly detailed account of both.

The next description is that of the West Kipchak languages, i.e. Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Crimean Tatar, and Karaim, also by Árpád Berta. This is a general concise account of these four very similar languages.

This is followed by a description of Kazakh and Karakalpak by Mark Kirchner which essentially deals with Kazakh, mentioning some of the differences of the very closely related Karakalpak on the final half-page.

The next one is a concise description of Noghay by Éva Csató and Birsel Kara-koç. The main part of the language is spoken between the Caucasus and the Volga.

The last of the Kipchak branch languages, Kirghiz, is described by Mark Kirchner. Kirghiz is closely related to Kazakh, but has also strong genetic bonds with the Siberian branch of Turkic languages, particularly with the Altay Turkic languages.

The Uyghur Turkic branch languages come next, with Hendrik Boeschoten's description of Uzbek the first of two. After Turkish, Uzbek is the second most important Turkic language. As a literary language, it is the continuation of Chaghatay. Since 1993, a Latin alphabet has been in use for it. The description is fairly detailed, as may be expected, considering the importance of Uzbek.

This is followed by a description of Uyghur by Reinhard Hahn. This is modern Uyghur, formerly known as Eastern Turki. Most Uyghur speakers live in China in Xinjiang where it is the second official language and also a regional inter-ethnic lingua franca. A number of Uyghurs live in the Kazakh republic and elsewhere. Uyghur is very closely related to Uzbek, with a very high degree of mutual intelligibility between them. Uyghur is the only Turkic language today to be written with a modified Arabic alphabet which indicates all the vowels. Dialect differentiation is considerable. The description is rather detailed.

The next chapter deals with Yellow Uyghur and Salar, again authored by Reinhard Hahn. Yellow Uyghur is located in Sunan county in northwestern China and, in spite of its name, belong to the Siberian branch of the Turkic languages. The author points out that there are significant inconsistencies and discrepancies in the few published descriptions of this little studied language, and unfortunately, gives no information on its morphology and syntax, except mentioning that there are some significant morphological simplifications in it. Salar is spoken further southeast in Gansu and appears to be historically developed from an Oghuz Turkic language which during its eastward migration acquired influences from the Uyghur and Kip-

chak branches of Turkic languages and other languages. The author mentions results
of such influences, but again provides no details of morphology and syntax except
for saying that there are various types of simplification in Salar morphology. This
lack of information on the morphology and syntax of these two languages, even if it
were highly tentative and pointed out contradictions in sources, is one of the very
few shortcomings of this otherwise so highly informative excellent book.

The next chapter, by Claus Schönig, deals with South Siberian Turkic which can
be divided into four main branches: Altay, Yenisey, Sayan and Chulym Turkic, each
of them comprising several languages and / or dialects. These languages show nu-
merous common features, but differ considerably in detail. Several of the languages
exhibit ties with outside Turkic languages, e.g. Altay Turkic has close ties with
Kirghiz, Sayan Turkic has features bringing it closer to Yakut, etc. The description
is fairly detailed and represents a general account of languages of the four branches of
South Siberian Turkic.

. The next chapter, by Marek Stachowski and Astrid Menz, is a description of
Yakut which constitutes, with the closely related Dolgan language, the North Sibe-
rian division of Siberian Turkic. The Yakut language is aberrant in containing a set
of phonological and morphological classificatory features that distinguish it from all
other Turkic languages, and heavy lexical influences from Mongolic (in particular
Buryat), Tungusic and Yeniseian languages, with only about 30 per cent of its vo-
cabulary derived from Turkic. The vowel harmony is very complex, and the conso-
nants undergo progressive and regressive assimilation at morpheme boundaries. The
description is rather detailed, especially on the syntactic and sentence levels, and
allows good insights into this complex language.

The last chapter is a rather detailed account, by Larry Clark, of Chuvash, the only
surviving member of the Oghur or Bulghar Turkic, the first Turkic branch to split
off from Common Turkic in the remote past. Chuvash has developed from proto-
Turkic through a series of sound changes and replacements which, together with the
assimilations of the Finnic Mari language, obscure the Turkic character of its mor-
phosyntax and lexicon. The description is rather detailed and allows good insights
into the language.

The descriptions are very informative and present an up-to-date survey of current
knowledge in the fields covered. They are followed by an extensive, very useful
index.

All in all, this is a magnificent book highly recommended to anybody with an
interest in Turkic languages and Turcology.