

Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Kirchner , Mark

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003 | LOG_0021

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of İsmet Cemilođlu, *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. Cemilođlu'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. Cemilođlu 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), Cemilođlu 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, Banguoğlu 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 classification and also includes intensive adjectives (e.g. *toptolu* ‘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 göği gördü* ‘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 discussion 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 ekdüğü buğday deve kuşunuñ 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 Turkish. 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 *kadar*, Cemiloğlu is aware of the fact that it has two functions with different government in Modern Turkish, but he combines the counting words *o kadar*, *şu kadar* (*ol kadar*, *şol kadar* in his text) with the corresponding postpositions *onun kadar*, *şunun kadar*. Instead of listing two different postpositions *kadar* and *degin*, the author deals with the latter as a “form” of the first one (“daha çok ‘degin’ 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 *kaḏar* is listed. If this is true of the whole text, it would mean that *kaḏar* 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 Cemilođlu 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, Cemilođlu’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. Cemilođlu 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, Cemilođlu 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.