

## Werk

**Label:** Zeitschriftenheft

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 1999

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0003](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003) | LOG\_0025

## Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.  
SUB Göttingen  
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1  
37073 Göttingen

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

# Turkic Languages

Edited by  
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with  
Árpád Berta, Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,  
Éva Á. Csató, Emine Gürsoy-Naskali, Irina Muravyova,  
Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Sumru A. Özsoy,  
with the editorial assistance of  
Vanessa Locke and Sevgi Ağcagül

3 (1999) 2

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden



The journal **TURKIC LANGUAGES** is devoted to linguistic Turcology. It addresses descriptive, comparative, synchronic, diachronic, theoretical and methodological problems of the study of Turkic languages including questions of genetic, typological and areal relations, linguistic variation and language acquisition. The journal aims at presenting work of current interest on a variety of subjects and thus welcomes contributions on all aspects of Turkic linguistics. It contains articles, review articles, reviews, discussions, reports, and surveys of publications. It is published in one volume of two issues per year with approximately 300 pages.

Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Lars Johanson, Turkic Languages, Institute of Oriental Studies, University of Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany. The fax number +49-6131-368662 and the e-mail address [johanson@mail.uni-mainz.de](mailto:johanson@mail.uni-mainz.de) may also be used for communication.

Books will be reviewed as circumstances permit. No publication received can be returned.

Subscription orders can be placed with booksellers and agencies. For further information, please contact: Harrassowitz Verlag, D-65174 Wiesbaden, Germany; Fax: 49-611-530570; e-mail: [verlag@harrassowitz.de](mailto:verlag@harrassowitz.de).

The financial support  
of Türkiye Şişe ve Cam Fabrikaları A. Ş., Istanbul, Turkey,  
for the distribution of this volume is gratefully acknowledged.

© Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1999

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing and binding by MZ-Verlagsdruckerei GmbH, Memmingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

ISSN 1431-4983

# Contents

## Turkic Languages, Volume 3, 1999, Number 2

Editorial note by Lars Johanson	149
---------------------------------	-----

### Articles

Aylin Küntay & Dan I. Slobin: The acquisition of Turkish as a native language. A research review .....	151
Marti Roos & Hans Nugteren & Zhōng Jīnwén: On some proverbs of the Western and Eastern Yugur languages.....	189
Mefkûre Mollova: Sur certains termes d'un hymne turk du Codex Cumanicus .....	215
Jurij V. Ščeka: Spoken Turkish: Synchronic and diachronic aspects.....	241

### Report

Gerjan van Schaaijk: The Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics.....	272
---	-----

### Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Christiane Bulut, <i>Evliya Çelebis Reise von Bitlis nach Van. Ein Auszug aus dem Seyahatname</i> .....	277
Ahmet Kocaman: Review of Doğan Aksan, <i>Anlambilim – anlambilim konuları ve Türkçenin anlambilimi</i> .....	282
Ahmet Kocaman: Review of Neşe Emecan, <i>1960'tan günümüze Türkçe – bir sözlük denemesi</i> .....	284
Klaus Röhrborn: Review of Shôgaito Masahiro, <i>Kodai uigurubun abidatsumakusharon jitsugiso no kenkyû</i> . [Studies in the Uighur version of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya-ṭīkā Tattvārthā]	286
Robert Ermers: Review of Karl A. Krippes, <i>Kazakh (Qazaq)-English dictionary</i> .....	289
Mariya Yakovleva: Review of V. P. Neroznak (ed.), <i>The national languages of the Russian Federation. The encyclopaedia</i> .....	293



## Editorial note

*Turkic Languages*, Volume 3, 1999, Number 2

This issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES completes the third volume of the journal and concludes a “period of probation” agreed upon with the publishing-house three years ago. The enterprise has enjoyed great success during this exciting test period, rapidly finding its place among the international periodicals devoted to issues of the Turkic world. Needless to say, the work will be continued.

The first paper of the first issue of our journal was an introductory article written by Karl Heinrich Menges, “Der neuen Zeitschrift *Turkic Languages* zum Geleit”. The author, widely known as one of the most prominent Turcologists of the 20th century, was planning further contributions to the journal. Now it is a sad duty to report that Karl Heinrich Menges died in Vienna on the 20th of September 1999 at the age of 91. His death is a substantial loss to scholarship in Turkic linguistics. Forthcoming issues of TURKIC LANGUAGES will contain contributions commemorating and appraising the life work of this remarkable scholar.

The present issue includes the already announced research review by Aylin Küntay and Dan I. Slobin on issues in Turkish developmental psycholinguistics, “The acquisition of Turkish as a native language”, containing a complete bibliography of research in the field. An article by the Moscow-based Turcologist Jurij V. Ščeka deals with synchronic and diachronic aspects of spoken Turkish.

From the southwestern part of the Turkic world we take a huge step to the southeastern regions. Marti Roos, Hans Nugteren and Zhōng Jīnwén deal with proverbs of the Yugur—“Yellow Uyghur”—groups in China, both the Turkic-speaking Western Yugur and the Mongolic-speaking Eastern Yugur. An older stage of Turkic is the subject of Mefküre Mollova’s study on a hymn in the important 13th-14th century Kipchak source known as Codex Cumanicus.

Furthermore, Gerjan van Schaaik reports on the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics held in 1998 in Oxford.

The review section contains contributions by Mark Kirchner, Ahmet Kocaman, Klaus Röhrborn, Robert Ermers and Mariya Yakovleva concerning books published by Christiane Bulut, Doğan Aksan, Masahiro Shôgaito and others.

*Lars Johanson*

# **The acquisition of Turkish as a native language. A research review**

**Aylin Küntay & Dan I. Slobin**

Küntay, Aylin & Slobin, Dan I. 1999. The acquisition of Turkish as a native language. A research review. *Turkic Languages* 3, 151-188.

The following research review summarizes materials that deal with linguistically relevant observations of first-language acquisition of Turkish by monolingual children. It is organized under the main headings morphology, grammar and discourse, and phonology.

*Aylin Küntay, Department of Psychology, Koç University, Çayır cad., İstinye 80860, İstanbul, Turkey.*

*Dan I. Slobin, Department of Psychology, 3210 Tolman #1650, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-1650, U.S.A.*

## **Introduction**

The study of Turkish child language acquisition is relatively recent. The first review and theoretical discussion of this area was that of Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985), summarizing and evaluating all material available at that time. Apart from several parental diary studies of the seventies, the review was based on experimental studies carried out by Slobin and his students, supplemented by tape-recorded naturalistic data, covering the range of 2 to 5 years of age.<sup>1</sup> Verhoeven (1991) provided a more recent

<sup>1</sup> The following studies were cited in Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985); we include them here for the sake of completeness: Aksu (1973, 1978a, 1978b), Ammon & Slobin (1979), Clancy & Jacobsen & Silva (1976), Ekmekçi (1979, 1986a), Johnston & Slobin (1979), Özbaydar (1970), Savaşır (1982, 1983), Slobin (1977, 1981, 1982, 1985, 1986), Slobin & Aksu (1982), Slobin & Bever (1982), Slobin & Talay (1986). The data gathered in Istanbul by Slobin in 1972-1973 are now

review of selected research. In the current review, we carry on through the end of 1998, summarizing all material known to us that deals with (a) linguistically relevant observations of first-language acquisition of Turkish by (b) monolingual children. For this purpose, we set aside the large literature on the language development of bilingual Turkish children in Europe (especially France, Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Sweden) and Australia. We also do not review the small number of studies on development of Turkish reading and writing skills in school-age children. Our focus is thus on preschool acquisition of spoken Turkish in Turkey, from a linguistic point of view.<sup>2</sup>

The majority of the studies discussed here are based on the language development of urban children growing up in professional and educated families. A Dutch research team headed by Ludo Verhoeven (Aarssen 1996; Akıncı 1999; Akıncı & Jisa (forthcoming); Boeschoten 1987, 1990; Boeschoten & Verhoeven 1986; Verhoeven 1987, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993) has carried out comparable research with children of working-class families in small cities and rural areas (mainly in the Adana region) as well as village children in Central Anatolia (Polatlı region). The language development of these children does not differ in any significant ways from that of the several urban samples in this age range. The review is organized under the headings: Morphology, grammar and discourse, and phonology.

### **Morphology**

As already noted by Aksu-Koç and Slobin, the morphological system of Turkish is acquired with remarkable ease and rapidity by children before their second birthday. The authors made the following observation in comparison with acquisition of grammatical morphology in other languages (Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1985: 847):

available to public access in the CHILDES archive (<http://childes/psy/cmu/edu>). There are 54 corpora of child speech in the age range 2;0-4;8.

- <sup>2</sup> Much of the research in developmental psycholinguistics poses questions that do not concern the linguistic structure of the language being acquired, such as memory and cognitive capacities, speech perception, narrative skills, interpersonal interaction, and biological maturation. We have decided that such issues lie outside of the range of interests of readers of this journal.

“The discussion of typical morphological errors is briefer than comparable chapter sections on the development of other languages, since the remarkable regularity and transparency of Turkish morphology precludes a high rate of error in the early phases of development. Where errors typically occur is in later phases, when the Turkish-speaking child encounter problems of complex syntax, as discussed in relation to nominalization errors and errors in deverbal and denominal derivation, and late acquisition of relative clauses.”

This summary holds up in the light of recent research.

Aksu-Koç and Slobin had reported full mastery of the nominal inflection system, and much of the verbal paradigm, by the age of 24 months or earlier, noting productivity as early as 15 months (Ekmekçi's 1979 report of her child's production of *bebeki* for *bebeğin* baby+GEN). This finding has now been confirmed by large-scale studies of early language conducted at Anadolu University in Eskişehir (Özcan 1996, Topbaş & Maviş & Başal 1997). These investigators have made longitudinal observations of more than 100 children between the ages of 15 and 72 months, confirming that all forms of nominal casemarking are present by 23 months, and that multiple suffixes appear on nouns as early as 15 months: possessive + dative, possessive + accusative, possessive + locative. Several precocious examples follow:

(1) Age 16 months:

*Ellerime* (bak).  
 hand:PL:POSS.1SG:DAT<sup>3</sup> look  
 ‘(Look) at my hands.’

<sup>3</sup> The following abbreviations are used in glosses: ABL [= ablative]; ACC [= accusative]; AGENT [= agentive]; AOR [= aorist]; CAUS [= causative]; DAT [= dative]; DIM [= diminutive]; EREK [= converb *erek*]; ERKEN [= converb *erken*]; EVID [= evidential]; FUT [= future]; GEN [= genitive]; INCE [= converb *ince*]; IP [= converb *ip*]; INST [= instrumental]; LOC [= locative]; MOD [= modality]; NEG [= negative]; NOM [= nominalizer]; OPT [= optative]; PA [= direct past]; PAST.NOM [= past nominalizer]; PL [= plural]; POSS [= possessive]; PRO [= pronoun]; PROG [= present progressive]; PV [= passive]; REL [= relativizer]; TOP [= topical marker *da*]; YN [= yes-no question marker]; 1SG [= first-person singular]; 2SG [= second-person singular]; 3PL [= third-person plural].



## (2) Age 18 months:

*Ayağına koy bebeği.*  
 foot:POSS.2SG:DAT put baby:ACC  
 'Put the doll on your legs.'

*Kazağımı attım.*  
 sweater:POSS.1SG:ACC throw.away:PA.1SG  
 'I threw away my sweater.'

## (3) Age 23 months:

*Senin arkanda değilim.*  
 PRO.2SG:GEN back:POSS.2SG:LOC NEG:1SG  
 'I'm not in back of you.'

*Sucukların arasına zeytin koy.*  
 Sausage:PL:GEN between:DAT olive put  
 'Put (some) olives between the sausages.'

Productions such as *emzikimi* ([= *emziğimi*] 'my pacifier') at 19 months, like the earlier reported *bebeki* ([= *bebeğin*] 'baby's') at 15 months, are clear indications of productive control rather than rote imitation. Overregularizations are rampant in the acquisition of all Indo-European languages; in the case of *ğ* → *k* overregularization (i.e., ignoring the obligatory elision of intervocalic *k*) we have a rare example of a parallel phenomenon in child Turkish. The Eskişehir researchers also present data on multiple affixing to verbs, such as:

## (4) Age 23 months:

*Götürsünler beni.*  
 take:OPT:3PL PRO.1SG:ACC  
 'Let them take me (there).'

Several studies by Özden Ekmekçi (1987), of Çukurova University in Adana, give ample evidence of the early creative use of grammatical morphology. The observations come from diary studies and recordings of at least 25 children, covering the age range of 15 months to 7 years. We reproduce here only a small number of the imaginative and competent linguistic formations of these young children. All of them demonstrate the productivity and flexibility of Turkish morphology. The data

show at least two types of verb derivation from adjectives and from nouns. (Ages are given in the format {years;months}.)

Adjective → verb:

- (5) *Saçımı* **güzelt.** (wanting mother to tidy her hair) [age 3;7]  
 hair:POSS.1SG:ACC make.nice  
 'Make-nice my hair.'
- (6) *Ben şimdi gerçekleşmişim.* (after pretending to be drunk) [age 4;0].  
 I now come.to.self:EVID:1SG  
 'Now I've come to myself.'
- (7) *Siz de teyzem gibi emeklendiniz.* [age 5;3].  
 you also aunt:POSS.1SG like retire:PV:PA:2PL  
 'You also became retired like my aunt.'

Noun → verb:

- (8) *Dondurma dilliyorum.* (licking ice-cream) [age 3;6].  
 ice.cream tongue:PROG:1SG  
 'I'm tongue-ing ice-cream.'
- (9) *Anneciğim, seni öpücükleyebilirmiyim?* [age 4;9]  
 mommy:DIM:POSS.1SG you:ACC kiss:MOD:YN:1SG  
 'Mommy, can I kiss you?'

There are also examples of noun derivations, chiefly with the agentive suffix:

Noun → noun:

- (10) *bakkalcı, berberci* [age 3;2]  
 grocer:AGENT barber:AGENT

And there are complex derivations using two or more grammatical elements, such as:

Verb → noun:

- (11) *Buradaki herkes küstürücü.* [age 5;3].  
 here everybody offend:CAUS:AGENT  
 'Everybody here is (an) offender / causing offense.'

The degree of morphological productivity exhibited by Turkish preschoolers goes far beyond what has been reported for child speech in Indo-European languages, even those with the morphological complexity of the Slavic languages. Most of these forms cannot be labeled as "errors"; rather, they reveal the Turkish child's subtle grasp of the word-formational opportunities inherent in the language.

Parental speech to preschool children presents the child with rich opportunities for segmenting and combining grammatical morphemes and learning their meanings. Küntay & Slobin (1995, 1996) studied the speech of one Turkish mother to a child during the age period of 1;8 to 2;3. Consider, for example, two high-frequency words—the verb *koy-* 'put' and the noun *el* 'hand'. The lists in 12 and 13 present the forms of these two words in the mother's speech, in order of descending frequency of occurrence.

- (12) 18 forms of *koy*:  
*koy, koyma, koyalım, koyacağım, koyacağız, koyacaksın, koyucan, koymanı, koymak, koymadan, koydum, koydun, koyduk, koyarmısın, koyuyoruz, koymuşlar, koyayım, koyalım.*
- (13) 17 forms of *el*:  
*ellerini, elini, elinle, elleri, elin, ellerin, ellerinle, eline, elinde, elimizi, ellerimi, eller, elinin, elindeyken, elindekini, elimden, el.*

The child is thus presented with rich data for acquisition of the inflectional systems. Küntay and Slobin note that overall, verbs present the learner with a greater degree of complexity than nouns: Verbs tend to have more suffixes than nouns, and the suffixes occur in a greater number of combinations. On average, verbs directed to the child have 2.18 morphemes while nouns have 1.96 morphemes. Furthermore, the average verb occurs with 16.95 different combinations of suffixes, while the average noun occurs with 7.65 combinations. Essentially, this pattern is due to the fact that many different types of notions are marked on verbs,

while nouns are only marked for number, case, and possession. The relative difference between verb and noun complexity is reflected in pre-school speech. A study of 39 children between the ages of 2;0 and 4;8 (Slobin 1982) found mean morpheme lengths of 2.60 for verbs versus 1.67 for nouns. More extensive studies of the distribution of forms in corpora of parental and child speech would be valuable. To our knowledge, such frequency data are not yet available for Turkish.

Küntay and Slobin discuss the changing forms that a lexical item can undergo in successive adult utterances to a child. They propose the term *variation set* to characterize a sequence of utterances with a constant intention but varying form. Variation sets are characterized by three types of phenomena: (1) Lexical substitution and rephrasing, (2) addition and deletion of specific reference, and (3) reordering. Consider, for example, the following series of adult remarks, uttered while removing pits from fruit; note the changing positions and forms of the verb *çıkart-* 'remove':

- |   |                                  |
|---|----------------------------------|
| (14) <i>Çıkarttım benimkinin çekirdeğini.</i> | 'I.removed the pit from mine.'   |
| <i>Sen de mi çıkartıcan?</i> [child nods]     | 'Will.you.remove too?'           |
| <i>Çıkart bakım.</i>                          | 'Remove (it), let's see.'        |
| <i>İmmh! Aferin yavrum! Sen de</i>            | 'Mm-hm. Good for you!            |
| <i>çekirdeğini çıkarttın.</i>                 | 'You.removed your pit too.'      |
| <i>İkimiz de çekirdeğini çıkarttık.</i>       | 'Both of us we.removed the pit.' |

Küntay & Slobin point out the potential importance of variation sets for the learner (1996: 276):

"Several important features can be noted in this variation set. If you listen to it, even without knowing Turkish, the verb stands out as an acoustic unit. It is a sort of acoustic gestalt which achieves saliency as it stands out against a shifting background. The root, too, begins to stand out, against an array of different suffixes. This seems to be a figure-ground phenomenon in auditory speech perception."

It is possible that discourse and perceptual factors such as these have served to maintain the morphological and word-order patterns of the Turkic languages over millennia.

### **Grammar and discourse**

Most early research on Turkish child language development was devoted to the learning of features that are prominent from an Indo-European point of view. Recourse to a discourse-level of analysis was not seen as immediately crucial for the study of the acquisition of agglutinative morphology, nominalized subordinate clauses, or evidential modality. The scarcity of acquisition research in the discourse area led Aksu-Koç and Slobin to call for future studies exploring “relations between grammar and discourse in various genres” (1985: 876). Much recent research in Turkish child language has undertaken the study of grammatical processes in discourse. Studies are based on two major types of data (occasionally supplemented by laboratory experiments): Spontaneous and prompted conversation between adults and children, and narratives elicited by picture storybooks. Data are available from the earliest productions of two-word utterances through to late childhood (about age 12), often with comparable adult samples. We review research on grammar and discourse under six headings: (1) Information structure: Word order and reference, (2) voice and valence, (3) tense, aspect, modality, (4) relative clauses, (5) converbs and conjunctions, (6) verbs of motion.

### **Word order and reference**

Research reported in Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985: 856-858) demonstrated that Turkish children by the age of 2;0 appropriately use a wide variety of pragmatic word orders in their spontaneous speech, and comprehend all six orders of subject-object-verb in controlled psycholinguistic experiments (Slobin & Bever 1982). More recent research confirms these findings for preschool-age speech and extends them to narrative discourse in preschool and school-age children (Aksu-Koç 1994). Aksu-Koç analyzed stories produced in response to a picture-book that tells a story without words (the “frog story” studied by Berman and Slobin 1994).<sup>4</sup> She found that young children commanded the principles of pragmatic word order presented by Erguvanlı (1984): Sentence-initial position for topic, immediate preverbal position for focus, and postpre-

<sup>4</sup> The frog-story texts are available to public access, in several computer formats, in the CHILDES archive (<http://childes/psy/cmu/edu>). There are ten narratives from each of the following age groups: 3, 5, 9, adult.

dicate position for background information. She found, however, a much higher percentage of verb-final orders in narrative (about 90%) than in conversation (about 50% for both preschoolers and parents, as reported in Slobin 1982). The two genres do not differ with regard to verb-medial orders, leading Aksu-Koç to suggest that (1994: 366):

“... both in conversational and in narrative discourse the nonstandard orders preferred for perspective shifting are the same, though the frequencies of their use are different. This difference probably has to do with the different demands of dialogic versus monologic discourse for organizing information in terms of emphasis, focus, and topic maintenance.”

Both genres have a high proportion of subjectless constructions, especially verb and object-verb sentences, with a lower rate of verb-object sentences. Thus preschool children deal adequately both with argument ellipsis and postposing of subject or object.<sup>5</sup>

It is important to consider the role of the adult model in established word-order patterns for the child's acquisition. Early research (Slobin 1975, 1982; Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1985) had already characterized the child-directed discourse of adults by variable word order, pragmatically employed to facilitate comprehension and compliance on the part of a child. In their case study of Turkish child-directed speech, Küntay & Slobin (1996) systematically studied patterns of reordering of nouns and verbs. They found that 25% of the variation sets that maintain the same set of lexical items feature a change in word order. For sets that preserve an explicit verb across successive utterances, the verb changes position from one utterance to the next 37% of the time. The following variation set is typical:

- (15) **Ver** *ellerini*.  
 give hand:PL.POSS.2SG:ACC  
 ‘Give (me) your hands.’

<sup>5</sup> We are aware of a study of the acquisition of word order in the framework of Chomsky's Principles and Parameters approach (Ekmekçi & Cam, forthcoming), but we have not had the opportunity to access this report. There is also a paper on acquisition of negation in the GB framework (Koskinen forthcoming) that we have not obtained for this review.

*Ellerini*                      **verirmisin?**  
 hand:PL:POS:ACC   give:AOR:YN:2SG  
 'Will you give (me) your hands?'

*Ellerini*                      **ver.**  
 hand:PL:POSS.2SG:ACC   give  
 'Give (me) your hands.'

Studying the behavior of lexical items in successive rephrasals in discourse demonstrated that verbs are more prone to repositioning and morphological form alternations than nouns in Turkish child-directed speech. Küntay & Slobin pointed out that the Turkish language learner needs to pay attention to variation across utterances in discourse in order to learn to differentiate lexical categories: "In Turkish, the child must learn to track lexical items across varying utterance positions, with different associated collections of agglutinated morphemes, moving in and out of patterns of ellipsis" (1996: 284).

The ways Turkish children mark information structure (Lambrecht 1994) in their own discourse have recently been the subject of several studies. In her analysis of conversational data, Ekmekçi (1986b) had illustrated early use of word order in encoding discourse status (givenness vs. newness) of nominal elements. The Turkish child studied by Ekmekçi (age 1;7-2;4) always placed indefinite noun phrases in the immediately preverbal focus position, reserving the postverbal position for backgrounded constituents. Several recent studies have systematically investigated how Turkish children of different ages manage referential continuity in extended discourse, especially in comparison to speakers of languages with an obligatory article system. The definiteness interpretation of a referent in Turkish is determined by a conglomeration of devices: Case, word order, optional article-like elements, and contextual cues. Accordingly, the system for expressing the discourse status of nominals is more diffuse than in languages with articles like English or French. Dasinger & Küntay (1998; also Küntay 1995) analyzed the nominal devices used for introducing referents into picture-book narratives elicited from Turkish and Finnish speakers of different ages. The comparative study aimed to contribute to the emerging area of interest regarding relations of language typology and the development of grammatical markers (Slobin 1997b). The analyses indicated that in both Turkish and Finnish, the rate of use of indefinite forms for introducing

characters into discourse increases with age. However, the Turkish children were observed to rely on the numeral *bir* 'one' as an indefinite marker from earlier ages compared to the Finnish children, who have access to a similar indefinite article-like element, *yks(i)* 'one'. Dasinger & Küntay speculated about a "higher degree of grammaticization of the numeral one as an indefinite article" (1998: 272) in Turkish. They concluded with a caution for typological studies built upon simple a priori dualisms (1998: 273):

"Global typological distinctions between article and non-article-bearing languages are inadequate to account for the differences between Turkish and Finnish. Although both languages are considered article-less languages, [other] language-specific pressures favor certain devices over others for expressing definiteness."

Özcan (1997) focused on a different subpart of the nominal system—third-person pronouns—in her analyses of referential continuity in children's connected discourse. In a study of video-elicited narratives of children of ages 3, 5, and 7, she laid out the factors that govern third-person pronominalization (*o, onlar* 'he / she / it, they') and null subjects (third-person marking on the verb). She reported that the rate of usage of overt pronominal subjects is rare in the narratives of children of all age groups. As in the speech of adults, explicit pronouns were used in only 5% of the clauses, with clear preference given to null subjects for continued reference to discourse entities. In addition, Özcan noted that, from early ages on, pragmatically motivated use of pronouns for contrast and switch-reference mirrors the usage of adults. In similar fashion, Küntay (1995), studying picture-elicited narratives, found that 3-year-old children appropriately use null subjects for maintaining reference to characters, making only infrequent use of overt pronouns. Children do not appear to have any difficulty in applying the unmarked strategy for continuing reference to narrative participants in Turkish through an unambiguous person marking on the verb. Despite early usage of anaphoric null forms, both Özcan (1993, forthcoming) and Küntay (1995) observed gradual development with respect to adult-like usage of referential introductory devices. In both studies, prefacing of nominal expressions with an indefinite form did not appear frequently in the speech of narrators younger than 7, and developed further thereafter.



Küntay (1997), in a dissertation study, further explored strategies employed by Turkish preschool children to introduce referents into different types of extended discourse. The guiding question was how children deploy their first-mention strategies in different kinds of discourse contexts, i.e., different kinds of picture-based storytelling, conversational narratives, and conversational lists. In addition to eliciting two types of picture-based narratives, she conducted naturalistic studies of various organized and free-time activities at two preschools in Istanbul. About 90 hours of extended discourse from 3- to 5-year-olds were collected over a course of three months. In the picture-elicited data, Küntay found an effect of the selected construction type for framing character-introductory referential expressions: For both of the picture-series tasks used, use of the *var* 'exists' construction included character references with *bir* 'one' plus a referential term. In general, static predicates such as presentatives tended to co-occur with indefinite forms in first-mention devices. However, in corroboration of many other studies of preschool children's referential strategies in picture-prompted connected discourse, Küntay's picturebook data showed that explicit indefinite noun phrases were not frequently used for first mentions.

Different strategies for introducing referents emerged in analyses of conversational lists and narratives collected from the same set of children. In producing lists, children focused on successive character introductions with simple predication frames, prefaced by indefinite forms. It is plausible that the predictable structure of lists, which allows ellipsis of non-nominal information, has a facilitative effect on children's abilities to incorporate many new entities while moving through extended discourse. In personal narratives, as well as in lists, children commonly used presentational constructions for referring to characters for the first time. In introducing third-person participants, they used a special presentational construction featuring the existential predicate *var* 'exists' together with possessive pronouns, linguistically establishing the relation of the referent to themselves (e.g., *Benim bir kameram vardı* 'I had a camera'). Such constructions allow children to postpone further description or elaboration about the referents until the following utterance(s). Küntay also found that some children used unexplained proper names in some of their stories, while providing detailed description accompanying the mention of proper names in other stories. It is clear that preschool children have fragile referential skills for the use of proper names; but

further studies are needed to tease apart the factors that lead to “appropriate” or “felicitous” use of proper nouns.

Another line of research that pertains to pragmatic issues of information structure has focused on the conversational pragmatics of subject pronouns. Slobin & Talay (1986) examined hour-long speech transcripts from nine children aged 2;4-8, analyzing all utterances containing subjects expressed by first-person pronoun or verb inflection alone. They found that young children overuse pronouns in comparison to adults, mainly in postposed positions to express assertive statements or to counter an adult’s stance; for example:

(16) Adult:

*Sen hiç masal bilmiyormusun? Bir tane anlat bize.*

‘Don’t you know any story? Tell us one.’

Child:

*Anlatmıyorum ben masal.* [age 2;0]

tell:NEG:PROG:1SG I story

‘I won’t tell (a) story.’

Topbaş & Özcan (1997) also set out to determine the pragmatic force of pronominals in Turkish child conversation, but mainly in discourse organizing rather than in interactional functions. Their data included naturalistic speech from 66 children, aged 15-72 months, recorded in different settings, such as conversations and elicited storytelling. They reported that even 15-month-old children have full control of null subjects for continued reference and full noun phrases for switched reference in third-person. Mastery of the functions of overt pronouns is also observed as early as 15 months of age. Below are some early examples provided by Topbaş & Özcan for different pragmatic functions of the first-person pronoun:

(17) Establishing a new topic:

*Ben toppla oynuyom.* [age 1;3].

I ball:INST play:PROG:1SG

‘I’ll play with (the) ball.’

Expressing contrast between referents:

*Ben sayıcam. Sen söyleme.* [age 1;3].

I count:FUT:1SG you say:NEG

'I'll count. You don't say.'

Switching referents:

*Bak bu salıncak. Ben oturucam.* [age 1;3].

look this swing I sit:FUT:1SG

'Look this (is a) swing. I'll sit.'

Emphasizing referent:

*Bak bu:da ben söylüyorum.* [age 1;6]

look this I tell:PROG:1SG

'Look I'm saying this.'

Another example from Topbaş & Özcan, given below, is similar in function and form to example 16 above from Slobin & Talay:

(18) Adult:

*Hadi pamuk prensesi anlat.*

'OK, tell "Snow White".'

Child:

*Anlatmıycam ben pamuk prensesi.* [age 2;4]

tell:NEG:FUT:1SG I "Snow White"

'I won't tell "Snow White".'

### Voice and valence

The narrative studies (Aksu-Koç 1994; Berman & Slobin 1994: 515-538; Slobin 1994, 1995) show uses of causative, passive, and reflexive at age 3, with the addition of reciprocal at age 5. Whereas causative morphology serves to mark clauses of high transitivity, the latter three valence modifications have the effect of reducing transitivity. These forms increase in relative frequency with age, indicating narrative abilities for backgrounding, perspective shifting, and topic maintenance. The morphological patterns of all four forms, however, pose no problems for acquisition. Slobin (1994) reports early use of agentless passives (ages 2;0-2;6) in spontaneous speech, used to express two types of non-agentive perspective: (1) Resultant states in the past tense (e.g., *kırıldı*

break:PV:PAST '(it) got broken', *yırtılmış* tear:PV:EVID '(it) must have gotten torn') and (2) potential state changes in the present (e.g., *takılmıyor* attach:PV:NEG:PROG '(it) doesn't get attached') and aorist (e.g., *açılır* open:PV:AOR '(it) opens'). He suggests "that these types of non-agentive perspective are cognitively available to children before they are used in narrative" (1994: 357). Ketrez (forthcoming) characterizes such constructions as "middle structures" (e.g., *açıldı* open:PV:PAST '(it) opened') and "passive verbs" that have non-specific agents (e.g., *yenmeyecek* eat:NEG:FUT '(it) won't be eaten'). Using longitudinal data from three children between the ages of 1;3 and 3;3, she reports early acquisition of such structures. However, the children have difficulty with passives that include specific agents, resulting in errors such as:

- (19a) *Onu ellenmiyecem.* [age 1;11]  
 that:ACC touch:PV:FUT:1SG  
 'I won't be-touch it.' [=I won't touch it.]

- (19b) *Ben kapandım.* [age 1;11]  
 I close:PV:PAST:1SG  
 'I was.closed.' [=I closed (it).]

Ketrez suggests that the acquisition of passive morphology precedes the acquisition of its syntactic requirements. (She cites a report of similar findings by van der Heijden (1997), but we have not had access to that paper.)

### **Tense, aspect, modality**

The acquisition of the tense-aspect-modality system in Turkish has been researched in detail in various studies by Aksu-Koç (1978a, 1998, forthcoming). She used three sets of data in her various analyses: (1) A longitudinal corpus of three children beginning at age 1;9, (2) an experimental study of 60 children from ages 3 to 6, and (3) longitudinally recorded mother-child conversations of four children, all between 1;1 and 3;3. In her studies of tense-aspect marking, Aksu-Koç focused on four verbal inflections: *-DI*, *-Iyor*, *-Ir*, and *-mİş*. The longitudinal observations allowed her to determine the developmental sequence of the use of these verbal suffixes in children's speech and in maternal input. The aggregated results indicate that the first inflection to emerge is the direct past (*-DI*), observed at 1;5 (forthcoming). Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985)

had noted, reviewing tense-aspect markers in a less comprehensive dataset, that initial uses of the *-DI* suffix, “encoded punctual changes of state resulting in immediately observable end states at the time of speech” and only later “evolved into a general past tense, as the child became cognizant of the fact that a current state is the result of a past process” (p. 863). In a more recent study, Aksu-Koç (1998) examined the inherent aspect (Aktionsart) of verbs inflected for tense-aspect in both children’s and mothers’ speech in mother-child interaction data. During the initial period of use, all of the child utterances with *-DI* involved achievement verbs, such as *bul-* ‘find’, *aç-* ‘open’, *tak-* ‘insert, attach’, and *otur-* ‘sit.down’. Early divergences from this exclusive cooccurrence of direct past marking with achievement verbs were rather limited—primarily restricted to accomplishment verbs such as *boya-* ‘paint’, *kaka yap-* ‘defecate’, *bitir-* ‘finish (transitive)’. Aksu-Koç reports that although the mother’s past utterances refer to routine activities of non-present people and past activities, early child past utterances are used as a marker of actions completed in the immediate context.

The second tense-aspect marker to emerge is *-Iyor* at age 1;7, at first restricted to state and activity verbs. Two weeks later, achievement and accomplishment verbs appear with *-Iyor* as well. Using these data, Aksu-Koç (1998) makes a persuasive case against the innateness of the state-process distinction proposed by Bickerton (1981). The children, she suggests, follow the pattern presented by the input language in using the *-Iyor* marker for both processes and states.

The acquisitional precedence of *-DI*, the marker of direct past, to *-Iyor*, the present / imperfective, raises a question, since the latter is more frequent in child-directed speech. Aksu-Koç provides a plausible explanation for the observed frequency mismatch between the speech of mothers and children. She notes that *-Iyor* exhibits multifunctional uses in the mothers’ speech.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Aksu-Koç notes the following functions: Reference to ongoing activity (*Bana mı el sallıyorsun?* ‘Are you waving at me?’), questioning of intentions and desires regarding subsequent activity (*Nasıl istiyorsun?* ‘How do you want (it)?’), reference to norms of behavior (*Onlar elleniyor mu?* ‘Are they to be touched?’), habitual activity *Nasıl çağırıyorsun kediye?* ‘How do you call for the cat?’), and existing states (*Burada ne yazıyor?* ‘What is (he) writing here?’). By contrast, *-DI* is used mainly in reference to actions carried out and completed in the immediate

The third tense-aspect-modality inflection, *-Ir*, is first used for marking deontic modality, indicating positive or negative intention for action. Early examples cited by Aksu-Koç (1998) are:

- (20) Deontic modal uses of *-Ir*:

*Bir daha yapmam.*  
again do:NEG:AOR.1SG  
'I won't do (it) again.'

*Yok ellemem yok.*  
no touch:NEG:AOR.1SG no  
'No, I won't touch (it), no.'

*Yerim.*  
eat:AOR.1SG  
'I'll eat (it).'

At this first stage, the only types of verbs marked with *-Ir* are activity and state verbs in child speech, although the inflection is used most frequently with activity and achievement verbs in child-directed speech. From the second stage on, the most frequent category marked by *-Ir* in child speech consists of achievement verbs, such as *sıkış-* 'get.stuck', *vur-* 'hit', and *ver-* 'give'. Also, in this second period of acquisition, there is a differentiation within the modal function: 41% of the utterances with *-Ir* express epistemic modality, that is, possible consequences of action independently of the self. Some examples are given below:

- (21) Epistemic modal uses of *-Ir*:

*Elin dıgıdıy [= sıkışır].*  
hand:POSS get.stuck:AOR  
'Your hand will get stuck.'

context. Given the multiple functions of *-Iyor* in child-directed speech, Aksu-Koç suggests that the abstraction of a core meaning for *-Iyor* may not be as simple a process as it is for *-DI*.

Gavani                      vuyasin [= *kafanı vurursun*].  
 head:POSS.2SG:ACC   hit:AOR.2SG  
 'You'll hit your head.'

In the final period observed, *-Ir* is used to refer to norms of action relevant to both epistemic modality and habitual aspect, such as:

- (22) Epistemic / habitual uses of *-Ir*:  
*Bebek geyekiyi [= gerekirmi]?*  
 baby    required:AOR:YN  
 'Is a doll required?'  
*O    olmaz.*  
 that   be:NEG:AOR  
 'That won't work. / That can't be.'

The perfect / inferential *-mİş* is first observed in the child's speech at 1;7, used at first only with nonverbal, inherently stative predicates (e.g., *burdaymış* 'it is (evidently) here'). In the next stage the usage extends to all kinds of verbs, but is only observed in the context of picture descriptions and story-telling.<sup>7</sup> In all other contexts the use of *-mİş* is limited to stative verbs and achievement verbs that comment on existing or newly achieved states. As we know from previous psycholinguistic research (Slobin & Aksu 1982; Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986), *-mİş* is also a marker of nonwitnessed modality in adult speech. Furthermore, it is "a defining feature of baby talk, used by adults to direct the child's attention to what is worth noticing in the world and to what constitutes reliable evidence" (Aksu-Koç 1998: 275).

Interpreting the above findings, Aksu-Koç emphasizes the role of input in the emergence of tense-aspect morphology. She finds evidence for a "distributional bias hypothesis" in child-directed speech (Shirai & Andersen 1995), observing a tendency to use certain inflections with certain types of verbs. This bias is also reflected in the child's own speech, showing a strong correspondence to the distribution in the mother's speech. Aksu-Koç suggests that "input, by displaying the specific linguistic structures and the distributional properties of the language, plays

<sup>7</sup> Aksu-Koç speculates that such use in the narrative genre leads to the discovery of the reportative function, which is a much later development.

a significant role in determining the course of language" (1998: 276). The data have also shown, however, that in the early period of acquisition the child has stronger preferences for using inflections with certain types of verbs than suggested by the input patterns. As established in her earlier studies of tense-aspect morphology (1978a, 1988), Aksu-Koç (1998) reports an early limitation of *-DI* to achievement verbs and *-Iyor* to activities and statives. Like Behrens (1993, 1996, in press), who found similar patterns in acquisition of tense-aspect marking in German, Aksu-Koç suggests that such a "predisposition involves cognitive-processing strategies which, guided by the dominant patterns of the input, become functional in delineating the semantics of tense-aspect marking" (1998: 277).

Aksu-Koç (forthcoming) also studied the modal system that is subsumed under tense-aspect distinctions in Turkish. With respect to acquisition of epistemic modality in Turkish, Aksu-Koç has focused on two verbal suffixes: *-mİş* and *-DIr*. In addition to indicating perfect and imperfect aspect respectively, *-mİş* and *-DIr* are used in evidential modal functions to indicate a speaker's level of commitment to the factivity or the certainty of the asserted statement: *-mİş*, an evidential marker, allows speakers to modify their commitment to the factivity of what is being stated in terms of available evidence, while *-DIr* provides information on the degree of confidence in the asserted proposition, thus serving as a judgment marker. The Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985) review covers the acquisition of *-mİş* in its aspectual and modal functions. The initial uses of *-mİş* do not carry any inferential connotations; only later does the form evolve into a past tense marker of indirect experience. The hearsay function of *-mİş* is the latest to emerge, indicating that marking information for its source is a cognitively complex function.

In her most recent work on epistemic modality, Aksu-Koç (forthcoming) focuses on *-DIr*, the development of which starts later and takes longer than *-mİş*. As suggested by Aksu-Koç, *-DIr* is used in adult language to make certain, categorical assertions (e.g., *Uçan ve yumurtlayan bu hayvan bir kuştur* 'A bird is an animal that lays eggs and flies', and to make uncertain, hypothetical statements (e.g., *Bayatlamıştır onlar, yeme* 'They're spoiled, don't eat (them)'). That is, *-DIr* imparts two opposite meanings to the predicate, that of factivity and nonfactivity. In naturalistic studies of mother-child discourse, Aksu-Koç observed that the first uses of *-DIr* were nonfactive, mainly for questioning in search for knowledge (e.g., *Bunlar nedir anne?* 'What are these, mother?') or in



contexts where there is no available evidence for the proposition (e.g., in response to mother asking location of a toy, *Yatağındadır* '(It's) in bed.'). In experimental production studies prompting for uncertainty indications from children of ages 4, 5, and 6, she found that 4- and 5-year-old children used adverbs (such as *belki* 'maybe', *galiba* 'probably', or *bence* 'according to me') or negations in order to convey their degree of uncertainty. Even the oldest age group, 6-year-olds, used the *-Dir* marker sparingly, instead preferring adverbial strategies. These data suggest that the acquisition of the full range of functions of *-Dir* spans a longer period than examined by Aksu-Koç. Further studies with older children and in different kinds of settings are needed.

### Relative clauses

Relative clauses are a late acquisition in Turkish, in comparison with Indo-European languages; they are also less frequently used in conversation and narrative (Slobin 1986). This is no doubt due to factors of morphological complexity and non-transparency (nonfinite verbs in nominalized or participial forms), along with word order (prenominal position). By contrast, Indo-European relative clauses retain most of the morphology of finite clauses; are marked by relative pronouns of various sorts; and are postnominal.

Dasinger & Toupin (1994) carried out a detailed analysis of relative clauses in the frog-story, comparing Turkish with English, German, Spanish, and Hebrew. Here we will briefly present their findings with regard to Turkish. As shown in Slobin's (1986) earlier studies of spontaneous speech, an early and frequent form is the locative form with *-ki*, as in:

- (23) *Elindekini*                      *atıyor*. [age 3;6]  
       hand:LOC.REL:ACC throw:PROG  
       'He throws the one that's in his hand.'

By contrast, relative clauses with the participial forms *-An* and *-Dik* are a later development, serving a more restricted range of functions than functionally comparable constructions in Indo-European and Semitic languages. For example, the prenominal position of relative clauses makes it unlikely that they will be used for the purpose of character introduction, such as the English, "Once upon a time there was a boy *who*...". Relative clauses are also not available for narrative continuation,

such as, “The bees start chasing the dog, *who ran away*” (that is, narrative flow does not allow for Turkish relative clause order, such as ‘The bees *the running-away dog* start to chase’). It is not until age 9 that Turkish children occasionally begin to use relative clauses for adult-like narrative functions, such as:

- (24) *Baktıkları her yerden çeşitli hayvanlar çıkıyor.* [age 9]  
 ‘Various animals emerge from every place that they look.’

The late development of relative clauses in the frog-story texts is apparently due to narrative functions, rather than the grammatical morphology of deverbal forms. For example, a check of the original data (CHILDES archive) shows that *-Dik* is readily available to preschoolers for its temporal function (25a, 25b), its complement function (26), and its subordinate clause function (27).

- (25a) *Çocuk uyandığında kurbağa yok.* [age 5;4]  
 ‘When the boy woke up there was no frog.’
- (25b) *Kurbağayı orada göremedikleri zaman her yere bakıyorlar.* [age 5;3]  
 ‘When they couldn’t see the frog there they looked everywhere.’
- (26) *Annesinin yanına gittiğini anlıyorlar.* [age 5;0]  
 ‘They understood that (he) had gone to his mother’s side.’
- (27) *Onlar da gülüyorlar, bakamadıkları için.* [age 5;0]  
 ‘They’re smiling, because they couldn’t look.’

Özcan (1997, forthcoming) has replicated and extended experimental research on relative clause comprehension and production, reported earlier by Slobin (1982, 1986). In comprehension tests, children (ages 5, 7, 9) are asked to act out complex sentences using toy animals; in production tasks they are asked to describe pictures. At issue is the “parallel function hypothesis” advanced by Sheldon (1974), which proposes that it is easier to process relative clauses in which the embedded and matrix nounphrase have the same grammatical function (subject or object). Slobin (1982) had found that children younger than 5 could not perform such tasks. Özcan did not find strong support for the parallel function hypothesis in older children who could perform the tasks. However, the

sentences involved in such research are not typical of either spoken or written discourse, thereby posing problems for generalized interpretation of the findings.<sup>8</sup>

### Converbs and conjunctions

Aksu-Koç & Slobin (1985: 862) had noted the use of converbs in spontaneous speech in the third year of life. Narrative research on the frog-story has enriched the developmental story, covering ages 3 to 9 (Aksu-Koç 1994; Aksu-Koç & von Stutterheim 1994; Berman & Slobin 1994: 538-554; Slobin 1988, 1995). The preferred type of clause linking at all ages is the use of converbs, with rare and late use of the non-Turkic conjunction *ve* 'and'. The uninflected nonfinite forms provided by converbs are morphologically transparent and syntactically non-complex. However, they differ in terms of the conceptual integration of events into sequences of linked clauses. Converbs marking simultaneity (*-ken*) and temporal overlap (*-Ince*) are regularly used by 3-year-olds and are highly frequent by age 5, as in the following examples:

(28) Verb-*ken*:

*Burda köpek düşmüş aşağıya camdan bakarken.*  
 Here dog fall:EVID down window:ABL look:ERKEN  
 'Here the dog fell down while looking out of the window.'

(29) Verb-*Ince*:

*Köpek de şaşırmuş onu görünce.* [age 5;0] .  
 dog TOP surprised:EVID PRO.ACC see:INCE  
 'And the dog was surprised upon seeing him'

<sup>8</sup> The following are examples of the four sentence types employed in this sort of research (to be acted out with sets of three toy animals): subject embedded, matrix subject: *Ineği düşüren kuş zebraı okşasın* 'The bird that knocks down the cow should kiss the zebra'; subject embedded, matrix object: *Lamanın ellediği kaz kediye ısırısın* 'The goose that the llama touches should bite the cat'; object embedded, matrix object: *Eşek devenin sevdiği koyunu itsin* 'The donkey should push the sheep that the camel pats'; object embedded, matrix subject: *Lama zürafayı iten kurdu ısırısın* 'The llama should bite the cow that pushes the giraffe'.

Sequenced clauses with *-Ip* develop slightly later, probably due to demands of narrative continuity and coherence; for example:

- (30) Verb-*Ip*:  
*Yavruyu alıp ona bakıyorlar.* [age 6;0]  
 baby:ACC take:IP PRO:DAT look:PROG:3PL  
 'Taking the baby (frog), they looked at it.'

By the end of the preschool period there are even chains of clauses with several converbs:

- (31) *Sonra camdan bakarken, bir kavanozu*  
 then window:ABL look:ERKEN a jar:ACC  
  
*alıp da köpek başına geçirmiş.* [age 5;2]  
 take:IP TOP dog head:POSS:DAT put.on:EVID  
 'Then while looking out of the window, and having taken a jar,  
 the dog put it over his head.'

The last example also contains the particle *DA*, which is used from a very early age to join clauses with contrasting reference or topics, such as:

- (32) *Çocuk uyuyor, köpek de uyuyor.* [age 4;0]  
 child sleep:PROG dog TOP sleep:PROG  
 'The boy is sleeping, the dog is sleeping too.'

By contrast to *-ken*, *-IncE*, and *-Ip*, the converb *-ErEk* is a late development, not appearing until age 7-9 in the frog-story data, and late to emerge in spontaneous speech as well. Slobin (Berman & Slobin 1994: 547-551; Slobin 1988, 1995) attributes this delay to the conceptual complexity involved, because this converb functions to treat two situations as constituent parts of a single superordinate event. He likens *-ErEk* linking to serial-verb constructions, following Li and Thompson's analysis of Mandarin. In both instances, the related elements "refer to events or states of affairs which are understood to be related as PARTS of ONE overall event or state of affairs" (Li & Thompson 1981: 594). Slobin proposes four types of event packaging with *-ErEk*. The only type to emerge before age 7 is used to describe the manner of movement

presented in the main clause. These uses are frequent in adult speech to preschoolers (Küntay & Slobin 1996: 228) and are found occasionally in the speech of 3-year-olds. An example from the frog-story is given below:

- (33) *Yüzerek geri gittiler.* [age 7]  
 swim:EREK back go:PA.3PL  
 'They went back swimming.'

The other uses of *-ErEk* occur only occasionally in the 7-9 age range. A very general use of the converb might be called circumstance, presenting component elements of an event as a kind of amalgam, such as:

- (34) *Çocuk bir kütüğe yaslanarak köpeğe "sus" diyor.* [age 9]  
 child a log:DAT lean:EREK dog:DAT "shh" say:PROG  
 'The boy, leaning on a log, says "shh" to the dog.'

In purpose uses, an act is defined in the *-ErEk* clause with a goal following in the main clause:

- (35) *Kurbağa kavanozundan çıkarak kaçtı.* [age 9]  
 frog jar:POSS:ABL leave:EREK escape:PA  
 'The frog, leaving the jar, escaped.'

Consecutive linking presents a retrospective view of a preliminary event phase that enables the subsequent phase. The preliminary phase can be a preparatory act or movement (36a), a cause (36b), or a motivating state (36c):

- (36a) *Hemen gözlerini kapayarak uyudu.* [age 9]  
 immediately eye:PL:POSS:ACC close:EREK sleep:PA  
 'Immediately closing his eyes, he slept.'
- (36b) *Baykuş çocuğu kovalayarak onu korkuttu.* [age 9]  
 owl child:ACC chase:EREK PRO:ACC scare:CAUS:PA  
 'The owl, chasing the boy, scared him.'

- (36c) *Geyik ayağa kalktı ve çok sinirlenerek*  
 deer stand.up:PAST and very get-irritated:EREK

*şiddetle koşmağa başladı.* [age 9]  
 force:INST run:NOM:DAT start:PA  
 'The deer stood up and, getting very irritated,  
 started to run with force.'

The last example (36c) is a rare instance of the use of *ve* 'and' in children's narratives. Note that it is not used to simply join two clauses, as English *and*; rather, it is part of a package that links several clauses in an event complex. Berman & Slobin note that *ve* is a rare and mature form, primarily used by adults "to build a special sort of event complex in which converbs are used to set up preparatory phases which are then linked to a consequence by means of *ve*" (1994: 552-553). They give the following example, containing *ve* along with two converbs, *-Ip* and *-ErKen*:

- (37) *Camın açık bırakıldığını farkedip*  
 window:GEN open leave:PV:PAST.NOM:ACC notice:IP

*camdan bakarlarken köpek aşağıya düşüyor,*  
 window:ABL look:PL:ERKEN dog down fall:PROG

*kavanoz başında ve kavanoz kırılıyor.* [age adult]  
 jar head:POSS.3SG:LOC and jar break:PV:PROG

'Noticing that the window had been left open, the dog—while they were looking out of the window—fell down, with the jar on his head, and the jar got broken.'

Aksu-Koç (1994: 433) suggests that children's control of *-ErEk* at about age 9 leads to a re-allocation of converb functions. She proposes that *-ErEk* takes on functions of conveying simultaneity of events, thereby restricting *-Ip* to the indication of sequence of events. Her comparison of 5-year-old and 9-year-old narrations of the same situation clearly shows this change in pattern:

(38a) *Onlara güle güle deyip uzaklaşmış.* [age 5]  
 PRO.3PL:DAT goodbye say:IP leave:EVID  
 '(They) said goodbye to them and went away.'

(38b) *El sallayarak gidiyor.* [age 9]  
 hand wave:EREK go:PROG  
 'Waving his hand, (he) goes.'

The patterns of development of clause combining in narrative are also found in non-narrative speech. Özcan and Topbaş, at Anadolu University in Eskişehir, have been gathering spontaneous speech samples from 40 monolingual children in the age range from 2;6 to 5;6. As in the narrative samples, *-ken*, *-IncE*, and *-Ip* are present early on, whereas *-ErEk* is infrequent, cited only at age 4;0 (and missing in samples at 4;6, 5;0, and 5;6). As in the narrative data, *ve* is absent at all ages. The following connectives are used from 2;6 onwards: *-DIğI zaman*, *-mEdEn önce*, *için*, *-DIğI için*, *-mEk için*, *sonra*, *çünkü*, *ama*, *ki*. Verhoeven (1989), in a sample of village children, finds the same patterns with regard to clause combining, with the same three converbs present in his 5-year-old sample, and the addition of *-ErEk* in his 7-year-old-sample.

Özyürek (1996) examined children's use of temporal and evaluative connectors in a study of how children (ages 5, 9, 13) talk about a conversation that they have witnessed. She found that the connective *DA* 'in turn' was favored by 9- and 13-year-olds more than by 5-year-olds. Özyürek suggests that, with age, children assume a narrator role and tend to organize their reports as pairings of utterances for their listeners.

### Verbs of motion

Slobin (1997a, in press; Berman & Slobin 1994: 620-639; Özçalışkan & Slobin, in press) has explored implications of lexicalization patterns for discourse organization, with particular attention to the domain of motion events. The work is crosslinguistic in plan, including Turkish among others. He makes use of a typological distinction proposed by Talmy (1985, 1991, in press) with regard to the preferred locus of expression for the path component of motion events. Compare the set of path verbs in Turkish (*girmek* 'enter', *çıkma* 'exit / ascend', *geçmek* 'cross / pass', etc.) with the set of path particles in English (*in*, *out*, *up*, *across*, *past*, etc.). The English pattern leaves the main verb slot open for either a general verb of motion (*go*, *move*, etc.) or a verb of manner of motion (e.g.,

*run, crawl, stroll*, etc.). This lexicalization pattern allows for compact expression of path and manner in a single verb-particle construction (*run in, crawl out*, etc.). In Turkish, by contrast, when the main verb slot is occupied by a path verb, manner can only be expressed by an associated nonfinite verb (e.g., *koşarak girmek* 'runningly enter': cf. English *run in*) or phrase (e.g., *ayaklarının ucunda inmek* 'on foot-tips descend': cf. English *tiptoe down*). The Turkish preference for expressing path in the main verb is shared by the other Turkic languages, along with the Romance, Semitic, and Dravidian languages, Japanese, Korean, and others. The English preference for expressing path in an element associated with the main verb is shared by the other Germanic languages, Slavic, Finno-Ugric, Chinese, and others.<sup>9</sup>

There are two major consequences of these lexicalization patterns for child language: (1) Size and diversity of the lexicon of verbs expressing manner of motion, and (2) narrative attention to the locations of physical landmarks.

### **Lexical diversity**

Slobin finds that languages like Turkish, that rely on path verbs, tend to have a limited collection of manner verbs, in comparison with languages of the opposite type, such as English. This is apparently due to the free availability of the main verb slot for the encoding of manner in the latter type, facilitating attention to this dimension of motion. Slobin (in press) has documented the frequency and diversity of manner verbs in a number of languages of both types, across a number of genres (spontaneous and elicited narratives, novels, conversations, newspaper reports). The first group of languages includes Turkish, Spanish, French, and Hebrew; the second group includes English, German, Russian, and Mandarin Chinese. In all cases, languages of the second group have greater diversity (number of types) of manner verbs, and make more frequent use of such verbs (number of tokens). These patterns have been documented

<sup>9</sup> Talmy refers to the Turkish type as "verb-framed", because it is the verb that "frames" the core element of a motion event; the English type is referred to as "satellite-framed", because this function is carried out by an associated element. Talmy's typology embraces not only motion, but also the encoding of a range of temporal and causal relations. Slobin & Hoiting (1994) suggest some revisions and extensions of the typology.



in narratives elicited from children by means of a picture storybook, the frog story (Aksu-Koç 1994; Berman & Slobin 1994; Özçalışkan & Slobin 1999). At all ages tested (3, 4, 5, 7, 9, adult), English narratives have higher type and token frequencies of manner verbs than Turkish. For example, in describing a picture in which an owl suddenly emerges from a hole in a tree, 100% of Turkish narrators—at all ages—simply use the verb *çıkma* ‘exit’, whereas English speakers at all ages prefer manner expressions such as *fly out* and *pop out*. Berman & Slobin (1994) suggest that language plays a role in directing the child’s attention to particular dimensions of experience, with the consequence that the domain of manner of motion becomes more elaborated for speakers of particular languages.<sup>10</sup>

### **Narrative attention to physical landmarks**

Languages like English, that use path particles, allow for the compact expression of several components of a trajectory using a single verb. For example, in the “frog story”, the protagonist, a small boy, is caught in a deer’s antlers and thrown down by the deer. The following are typical patterns of “event conflation”, describing the actions of the deer:

(39a) *He threw him over a cliff into a pond.* [age 5]

(39b) *He tips him off over a cliff into the water.* [age 9]

It can be inferred from the English constructions that there is a cliff located above a body of water. In a language like Turkish, narrators often provide such information explicitly, as in the following examples:

<sup>10</sup> Slobin (1996) and Berman & Slobin (1994: 611-641) broaden this proposal to embrace a range of notions of space, time, and causality, discussing the cognitive consequences of becoming a native speaker of a particular language. With regard to Turkish acquisition, they also note possible consequences of learning evidentials and converbs for conceptions of evidence and event structure.

- (40a) *Ancak önlerinde bir uçurum vardı. Altıda göldü. Çocuk hız yaptığı için, geyiğin başından köpeğiyle birlikte düştü.* [age 9]  
 'Just in front of them there was a cliff. Below there was a lake.  
 Because the boy was making speed, he fell from the deer's head together with his dog.'
- (40b) *Geyik tam uçurumun kenarına geliyor. Orada da bir göl var. Onları oraya atıyor.* [age 9]  
 'The deer comes right to the edge of the cliff.  
 And there is a lake there. He throws them to there.'

Berman & Slobin (1994: 623) report that this sort of extended locative description is typical of 9-year-old narrations in Turkish, as well as Spanish and Hebrew. In all three of these languages, 42% of 9-year-olds provide such descriptions of landmarks, such as the cliff and the water in the above examples. By contrast, English and German 9-year-olds rarely provide this sort of detail, preferring to package path information in a series of directional verb particles. Berman and Slobin propose that differences in lexicalization patterns demonstrate "an impact of grammatical typology on rhetorical style".

In concluding this section on studies of grammar and discourse, we underline the tight interrelations between lexicalization patterns, syntactic constructions, and discourse functions—in acquisition as well as in mature language use. The few studies of Turkish child language that have been conducted from this point of view are consistent with findings in other languages, and point to a number of issues for future research. Finally, we turn to a brief review of research on the acquisition of Turkish phonology.

### Phonology

The 1985 overview of Turkish child language research (Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1985) does not include any phonologically relevant work. Although many (morpho)phonological properties of Turkish lie in the forefront of linguistics research, work on acquisition in this area is still quite sparse.

Topbaş (1996) studied the speech of 20 children between the ages of 1 and 3 from a phonological perspective. In addition, she observed the acquisition process of two children in the same age range in a longitudinal design. All the children were recorded during natural interaction with

their caretakers, such as mealtime and play with toys. Topbaş groups the phonological processes she observes in the children's speech into two categories: Syntagmatic simplification and paradigmatic simplification. The first category includes: Syllable elision (e.g., [pə] /para/), syllable reduplication (e.g., [dədə] /doktor/), consonant elision (e.g., [ku] /kuş/), vowel lengthening (e.g., [bə:mək] /parmak/), consonant cluster simplification, (e.g., [tək] /türk/), consonant assimilation (e.g., [kəmək] /parmak/). Among the paradigmatic phonological processes, Topbaş lists fronting, palatalization, plosivization, gliding, and voicing / devoicing. In her conclusions, Topbaş suggests that the speech of Turkish children is phonologically transparent and comprehensible at early ages. She speculates that Turkish phonotactic processes and syllable templates are perceptually and productively simple, facilitating phonological acquisition.

In another paper, Topbaş (1989) finds reliable correlations between the frequencies of the phonemes /k/, /t/, and /ç/ in adult speech to children and those in the speech of the children themselves. She finds that /k/ is the most frequent phoneme in the children's inventory, as in child directed speech. She points out that "fronting", which has been proposed as a universal in child phonology, is not observed in Turkish. Velar consonants are acquired from early on and, if anything, front consonants tend to be substituted by back ones.

Phonological acquisition of Turkish is an obvious area calling for further investigation. Some possible research directions could involve study of the acquisition of vowel harmony and disharmonic exceptions, vowel and consonant length, epenthesis, final consonant voicing and its exceptions—areas that have proven particularly interesting to theoretical phonologists working on Turkish (Sharon Inkelas, personal communication, 1999).

## References

- Aarssen, J. 1996. *Relating events in two languages: Acquisition of cohesive devices by Turkish-Dutch bilingual children at school age*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.
- Akıncı, M.-A. 1999. *Développement des compétences narratives des enfants bilingues turc-français en France âgés de 5 à 10 ans*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université Lumière Lyon 2, Lyon, France.]
- Akıncı, M.-A. & Jisa, H. (forthcoming). *Development of Turkish clause linkage in the narrative texts of Turkish-French bilingual children in*

- France. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Aksu, A. A. 1973. *The development of request forms in Turkish children*. [Unpublished paper, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.]
- Aksu, A. A. 1978a. *Aspect and modality in the child's acquisition of the Turkish past tense*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.]
- Aksu, A. A. 1978b. The acquisition of causal connectives in Turkish. *Papers and reports on child language development* 15, 129-139.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1986a. Role of transitivity in acquisition. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference, August 9-10, 1984*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 229-248.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1986b. The acquisition of past reference in Turkish. In: Slobin, D. I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 247-264.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1988a. Simultaneity in children's narratives: The development of cohesion in discourse. In: Koç, S. (ed.) *Studies on Turkish linguistics*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University Press. 55-78.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1988b. *The acquisition of aspect and modality: The case of past reference in Turkish*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1992a. *Eğitim düzeyi ve cinsiyetin anlatı yapısına etkisi*. [Unpublished paper presented at the 7th National Congress of Psychology, Hacettepe University, Ankara.]
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1992b. *The development of complement constructions*. [Unpublished paper.]
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1993. Anlatı yapısının kavramsal ve dilsel gelişimi. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 1993, 51-60.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. 1994. Development of linguistic forms: Turkish. In: Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I. (eds.) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 329-385.
- Aksu-Koç, A. 1998. The role of input vs. universal predispositions in the emergence of tense-aspect morphology: Evidence from Turkish. In: Shirai, Y. & Slobin, D. I. & Weist, R. E. (eds.) *The acquisition of*

- tense / aspect morphology*. Special issue of *First Language* 18, 255-280.
- Aksu-Koç, A. (forthcoming). *Changes in the bases for children's assertions: The acquisition of epistemic -DIr*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. & Slobin, D. I. 1985. Acquisition of Turkish. In: Slobin, D. I. (ed.) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition 1. The data*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 839-878.
- Aksu-Koç, A. A. & Slobin, D. I. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In: Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (eds.) *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 159-167.
- Aksu-Koç, A. & von Stutterheim, C. 1994. Temporal relations in narrative: Simultaneity. In: Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I. (eds.) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 393-455.
- Ammon, M. S. & Slobin, D. I. 1979. A cross-linguistic study of the processing of causative sentences. *Cognition* 7, 3-17.
- Behrens, H. 1993. *Temporal reference in German child language: Form and function of early verb use*. Zutphen: Koninklijke Wöhrmann. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam.]
- Behrens, H. 1996. *Evidence for semantic and morphological sophistication in early tense marking in German*. [Unpublished paper presented at the Seventh International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Istanbul.]
- Behrens, H. (in press). Cognitive-conceptual development and the acquisition of grammatical morphemes. In: Bowerman, M. & Levinson, S. C. (eds.) *Language acquisition and conceptual development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I. 1994. *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bickerton, D. 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers.
- Boeschoten, H. E. 1987. Acquisition of modality in Turkish. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Studies on modern Turkish*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press. 231-241.

- Boeschoten, H. E. 1990. *Acquisition of Turkish by immigrant children: A multiple case study of Turkish children in the Netherlands aged 4 to 6*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boeschoten, H. E. & Verhoeven, L. T. 1986. Turkish language development of Turkish children in the Netherlands. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference, August 9-10, 1984*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 269-280.
- Choi, S. & Aksu-Koç, A. 1998. Development of modality in Korean and Turkish: A crosslinguistic comparison. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. & Özsoy, A. S. & Küntay, A. (eds.) *Perspectives on language acquisition*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 77-96.
- Clancy, P. T. & Jacobsen, T. & Silva, M. 1976. The acquisition of conjunction: A cross-linguistic study. *Papers and Reports on Child Language* 12, 71-80.
- Dasinger, L. & Küntay, A. 1998. Introducing referents in elicited discourse: Finnish vs. Turkish. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. & Özsoy, A. S. & Küntay, A. (eds.) *Perspectives on language acquisition*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 263-276.
- Dasinger, L. & Toupin, C. 1994. The development of relative clause functions in narrative. In: Berman, R. A. & Slobin, D. I. (eds.) *Relating events in narrative: A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 457-514
- Ekmekçi, Ö. 1979. *Acquisition of Turkish: A longitudinal study on the early language development of a Turkish child*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.]
- Ekmekçi, Ö. 1986a. The developmental errors in pre-school Turkish speech. In: Aksu-Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 249-268
- Ekmekçi, Ö. 1986b. The significance of word order in the acquisition of Turkish. In: Slobin, D. I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 265-272.
- Ekmekçi, Ö. 1987. Creativity in the language acquisition process: A Turkish case-study. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Studies on modern Turkish*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press. 203-210.

- Ekmekçi, Ö. & Cam, C. (forthcoming). *Head parameter setting in the acquisition of Turkish as a first language*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Erguvanlı, E. E. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- van der Heijden, H. 1997. Verbs in mono- and bilingual acquisition of Turkish. In: İmer, K. & Uzun, N. E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August, 7-9, 1996*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi. 109-116.
- Johnston, J. R. & Slobin, D. I. 1979. The development of locative expressions in English, Italian, Serbo-Croatian and Turkish. *Journal of Child Language* 6, 531-547.
- Ketrez, N. (forthcoming). *What does a child have to acquire when acquiring passive?* [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Koskinen, P. (forthcoming). *Children's acquisition of negation: Early evidence from Turkish*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Küntay, A. 1995. *Developing referential cohesion in elicited Turkish narratives*. [Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.]
- Küntay, A. 1997. *Extended discourse skills of Turkish preschool children across shifting contexts*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.]
- Küntay, A. & Slobin, D. I. 1995. Nouns and verbs in Turkish child directed speech. In: MacLaughlin, D. & McEwen, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* 1. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. 323-334.
- Küntay, A. & Slobin, D. I. 1996. Listening to a Turkish mother: Some puzzles for acquisition. In: Slobin, D. I. & Gerhardt, J. & Kyratzis, A. & Guo, J. (eds.) *Social interaction, social context, and language: Essays in honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 265-286.
- Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, C. N. & Thompson, S. A. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.



- Özbaydar, B. 1970. 12-24 ay arasında dil gelişmesi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Tıbbi Psikoloji Çalışmaları* 8, 79-86.
- Özçalışkan, Ş. & Slobin, D. I. 1999. Learning "how to search for the frog": Expression of manner of motion in English, Spanish, and Turkish. In: Greenhill, A. & Littlefield, H. & Tanu, C. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*. Boston, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Özçalışkan, Ş. & Slobin, D. I. (forthcoming). *Expression of manner of movement in monolingual and bilingual adult narratives: Turkish vs. English*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Özcan, H. 1993. *Coherence in narratives of Turkish-speaking children: The role of noun phrases*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading.]
- Özcan, H. F. 1996. *Is two-stage model of grammatical development universal? A study on morphological agreement in the development of L1 Turkish*. [Unpublished paper presented at the Seventh International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Istanbul.]
- Özcan, H. F. 1997. Pronominalizations in the narratives of Turkish-speaking children. In: Clark, E. V. (ed.) *The Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Annual Child Language Research Forum*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information. 243-258.
- Özcan, H. F. 1998. Definite and indefinite nouns in the discourse of Turkish-speaking children. In: Johanson, L. (ed.) *The Mainz meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 552-567.
- Özcan, H. F. (forthcoming). *Production of relative clauses in the acquisition of Turkish: The role of parallel function hypothesis*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Özcan, H. F. & Topbaş, S. 1996. *A semantic analysis of conjunctions in the acquisition of Turkish*. [Paper presented at the Seventh International Congress for the Study of Child Language, Istanbul.]
- Özyürek, A. 1996. How children talk about a conversation. *Journal of Child Language* 23, 693-714.
- Savaşır, I. 1982. The functional equivalents of the middle voice in child language. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8, 607-616.



- Savaşır, I. 1983. *How many futures? A study of future reference in early child language*. [Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.]
- Sheldon, A. 1974. The role of parallel function in the acquisition of relative clauses in English. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 13, 272-281.
- Shirai, Y. & Andersen, R. W. 1995. The acquisition of tense-aspect morphology: A prototype account. *Language* 71, 743-762.
- Slobin, D. I. 1975. On the nature of talk to children. In: Lenneberg, E. H. & Lenneberg, E. (eds.) *Foundations of language development: A multidisciplinary approach*. New York: Academic Press. 283-297.
- Slobin, D. I. 1977. Language change in childhood and in history. In: Macnamara, J. (ed.) *Language learning and thought*. New York: Academic Press. 185-214.
- Slobin, D. I. 1981. The origins of grammatical encoding of events. In: Deutsch, W. (ed.) *The child's construction of language*. London: Academic Press. 185-199.
- Slobin, D. I. 1982. Universal and particular in the acquisition of language. In: Wanner, E. & Gleitman, L. R. (eds.) *Language acquisition: The state of the art*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 128-172.
- Slobin, D. I. 1985. Crosslinguistic evidence for the Language-Making Capacity. In: Slobin, D. I. (ed.) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition 2. Theoretical issues*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1157-1256.
- Slobin, D. I. 1986. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. In Slobin, D. I. & Zimmer, K. (eds.) *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 277-298.
- Slobin, D. I. 1988. The development of clause chaining in Turkish child language. In: Koç, S. (ed.) *Studies on Turkish linguistics*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University. 27-54.
- Slobin, D. I. 1994. Passives and alternatives in children's narratives in English, Spanish, German, and Turkish. In: Fox, B. & Hopper, P. J. (eds.) *Voice: Form and function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 341-364.
- Slobin, D. I. 1995. Converbs in Turkish child language: The grammaticalization of event coherence. In: Haspelmath, M. & König, E. (eds.) *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective: Structure and meaning of*

- adverbial verb forms—adverbial participles, gerunds*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 349-371.
- Slobin, D. I. 1996. From “thought and language” to “thinking for speaking”. In: Gumperz, J. J. & Levinson, S. (eds.) *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 70-96.
- Slobin, D. I. 1997a. Mind, code, and text. In: Bybee, J. & Haiman, J. & Thompson, S. A. (eds.) *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 437-467.
- Slobin, D. I. 1997b. The universal, the typological, and the particular in acquisition. In: Slobin, D. I. (ed.) *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition 5. Expanding the contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1-39.
- Slobin, D. I. (in press). Verbalized events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In: Niemeier, S. & Dirven, R. (eds.) *Evidence for linguistic relativity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Slobin, D. I. & Aksu, A. A. 1982. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. In: Hopper, P. J. (ed.) *Tense and aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 185-200.
- Slobin, D. I. & Bever, T. G. 1982. Children use canonical sentence schemas: A crosslinguistic study of word order and inflections. *Cognition* 12, 229-265.
- Slobin, D. I. & Hoiting, N. 1994. Reference to movement in spoken and signed languages: Typological considerations. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 20. 487-505.
- Slobin, D. I. & Talay, A. 1986. Development of pragmatic uses of subject pronouns in Turkish child language. In: Aksu Koç, A. & Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference, August 9-10, 1984*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Press. 207-227.
- Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In: Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language typology and semantic description 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 36-149.
- Talmy, L. 1991. Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 17. 480-519.

- Talmy, L. (in press). A typology of event integration. In: L. Talmy (ed.) *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Topbaş, S. 1989. Seslerin kullanım sıklığı ve Türk çocuklarının /k/, /t/, /tS/ seslerini edinimi üzerindeki etkileri. IV. *Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirisi*. Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi.
- Topbaş, S. 1996. Sesbilgisi açısından dil edinim süreci. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 1996, 295-309.
- Topbaş, S. & Maviş, I. & Başal, M. 1997. Acquisition of bound morphemes: Nominal case morphology in Turkish. In: İmer, K. & Uzun, N. E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August, 7-9, 1996*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi. 127-137.
- Topbaş, S. & Özcan, H. F. 1995. *Anlatılarda bağlaç kullanımı: Normal çocuklar ve özel eğitim gereksinimli öğrenciler arasında bir karşılaştırma*. [Paper presented at the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Oxford, UK.]
- Topbaş, S. & Özcan, H. F. 1997. Pronominals and their pragmatic functions in the acquisition of Turkish. In: İmer, K. & Uzun, N. E. (eds.) *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August, 7-9, 1996*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi. 139-148.
- Verhoeven, L. 1987. Acquisition of spatial reference in Turkish. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Studies on modern Turkish*. Tilburg: Tilburg University Press. 217-230
- Verhoeven, L. 1989. Acquisition of clause linking in Turkish. In: Ben- nis, H. & van Dernenade, A. (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1989*. Dordrecht: Foris. 153-162
- Verhoeven, L. 1990. Acquisition of discourse cohesion in Turkish. In: Koç, S. (ed.) *Studies on Turkish linguistics*. Ankara: Middle East Technical University. 437-452
- Verhoeven, L. 1991. Acquisition of Turkish in a monolingual and bilingual setting. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Turkish linguistics today*. Leiden: Brill. 113-149
- Verhoeven, L. 1993. Acquisition of narrative skills in a bilingual context. In: Ketteman, B. & Wieden, W. (eds.) *Current issues in European second language acquisition research*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr. 307-323.

# On some proverbs of the Western and Eastern Yugur languages\*

Marti Roos & Hans Nugteren & Zhōng Jīnwén

Roos, Marti & Nugteren, Hans & Zhōng Jīnwén 1999. On some proverbs of the Western and Eastern Yugur languages. *Turkic Languages* 3, 189-214.

The Yugur are a people living in Gānsù Province in northwest China. The ethnic and linguistic diversity of this area is reflected in the Yugur proverbs.

Marti Roos & Hans Nugteren, Leiden University, Department of Comparative Linguistics, P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

Zhōng Jīnwén, Institute of Literature and Arts, Central University for Nationalities, 27 Báishíqiáo Road, 100081, Beijing, P.R. China.

The Yugur (“Yellow Uyghur”) are one of China’s 56 officially recognized nationalities, consisting of 12,297 persons according to the 1990 census. The Yugur live primarily in Sùnán Yugur Autonomous County, and in Huángníbǎo Township of Jiǔquán City, both in Gānsù Province. The total population of Sùnán Yugur Autonomous County numbers 35,500 people, about half of whom are Chinese; the Yugur people number 8,820, and the Tibetans 8,390; a small number of Mongols, Monguor and Hui reside in this area as well.<sup>1</sup>

The Yugur themselves consist in fact of four linguistically different groups. The largest of these are the Turkic-speaking Western Yugur (Xībù Yùgù), comprising roughly 4,600 persons; they mainly live in the western part of the county, in the Dàhé and Míng huā districts. The

\* The authors would like to express their gratitude to Mark Kirchner for all his efforts in preparing the manuscript for publication.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Yáng (1993: 103).

Mongolic-speaking Eastern Yugur (Dōngbù Yùgù) number about 2,800; they mainly live in the county's eastern part, in the districts of Kānglè and Huángchéng.<sup>2</sup> The Western Yugur call themselves “*sarīy yōyīr*” (*sarīy* ‘yellow’, *yōyīr* ‘Yugur’), the Eastern Yugur “*šéra yōyīr*” (*šéra* ‘yellow’, *yōyīr* ‘Yugur’). A limited number of the Yugur living in Dàhé and Huángchéng are bilingual in Western and Eastern Yugur. A very small number of the Yugur living in Huángchéng District reportedly speak Tibetan. The remaining Yugur of the Autonomous County and the Yugur of Huángnǎo Township speak Chinese. Chinese is the language of contact between the different linguistic groups, and functions as the written medium. Both Western and Eastern Yugur are non-written languages.

The collection of Western Yugur proverbs presented below consists of 32 items which were recorded in August 1994 and August 1995 with Zhōng Jīnwén and in September 1995 with Xuělián, and of the materials occurring in Malov (1967) and Léi (1992).<sup>3</sup> It appears that the collection of proverbs excerpted from the dictionary by Léi is largely convergent with the one in Malov. The Eastern Yugur proverbs presented here all derive from Bolčuluu and Ĵalcan (1988).<sup>4</sup> Beside the proverbs, eight proverbial expressions dealing with folk wisdom, which were recorded by Zhōng Jīnwén in 1992 in the Yugur area, are included.

<sup>2</sup> Figures from Chén & Léi (1985: 1); Ĵuunast (1981: 1) however estimates that the number of Turkic-, Mongolic- and Chinese-speaking Yugur is more or less equal.

<sup>3</sup> Of these older materials, nos. 2, 4, 15, 17, 19, 30, 31, 32, 43 and 51 were known to Zhōng Jīnwén and Xuělián. Mr. Zhōng (*çəŋil yak<sup>h</sup>ir*), aged 32, and Miss Xuělián (*k<sup>h</sup>uncis*), aged 18, are both native speakers of the Western Yugur language. Proverbs without source citation are known to both.

<sup>4</sup> Nos. 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 16, 18, 22, 25, 29, 31 and 33 were recorded from Sū Jiànguó (Eastern Yugur surname *sultés*), a middle-aged man; all other proverbs were recorded from Ān Yúnxíá (Eastern Yugur surname *ančar*), a woman in the prime of life.

The resulting samples of 61 Western Yugur and 35 Eastern Yugur proverbs are arranged in alphabetical order, using an IPA-based transcription system.<sup>5</sup>

Parallels in other Turkic and Mongolic languages, as well as Chinese and Tibetan have been indicated incidentally. A number of Yugur proverbs are already attested in Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī's eleventh century dictionary *Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk*. Apart from proverbs in their own language, Western Yugur speakers also use proverbs in the Chinese language, which are not translated.

The Western Yugur use the vernacular term *k<sup>h</sup>ip śōz* (*k<sup>h</sup>ip* 'custom, tradition', *śōz* 'word') to designate the proverb, next to the Chinese term *xiēhòuyǔ*, a two-part proverb, of which the first part consists of a metaphor, while the second part cites the application. There are also many Western and Eastern Yugur metaphorical proverbs that cite the application first, and then the metaphor. Occasionally, the application may be dropped. The Eastern Yugur use the term *k<sup>h</sup>ep* to denote the proverb.<sup>6</sup>

Western Yugur proverbs do not feature the syllabic verse, i.e. the traditional Turkic verse structure which most commonly consists of seven syllables (4+3) or an augmentation of this number to eleven (4+4+3). Many of the two-part proverbs, though, have lines with an equal number of syllables. Some proverbs feature 4-syllable lines, a form which often occurs in Chinese idioms (*chéngyǔ*).

In Eastern Yugur proverbs, vertical alliteration, i.e. rhyme of the initial consonant and vowel of the first words of the two propositions, is frequent. This vertical alliteration is typical of Mongolic, and not original to Turkic.<sup>7</sup> It only occurs in those Turkic languages which are or have been in contact with Mongolic languages, but is less frequently used by the more western Turkic peoples or by the modern Uygurs. Horizontal alliteration, i.e. rhyme of the initial consonant and vowel of words within a verse, occurs only incidentally in the Western and Eastern Yugur proverbs. Parallel grammatical structures are frequent for mne-

<sup>5</sup> The single graphemes *ʒ, ʒ̣, ʒ̥, ʒ̧, c, č, ɕ, ɕ̣* used here represent IPA double graphemes [*dz, dʒ̣, dz̥, dʒ̧, ts, tʃ, tʂ, tʂ̣*]; *ʒ̣, ʒ̥, ʒ̧* represent IPA [*ʒ, ʃ, ɕ*], and *é, ẹ́, ó, ọ́, ú, ụ́* represent IPA [*ə, ɜ, ø, ɔ, u, ụ*].

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Bolčuluu (1984: 67).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Doerfer (1964: 867) and Hangin (1985 : 13).

monic reasons, thus giving rise to end rhyme, especially in Eastern Yugur.

### Western Yugur proverbs

- 1 *a<sup>h</sup>qa yīrlayantan sən yaγī tekkīš*  
*aq tənñi(γ) yīrlayantan sən amīr pōlyış* (L 251a)  
*axqa yīrlawandan sən yaγī tékkeš,*  
*aq tənñi(γ) yīrlawandan sən amīr pōñiś*  
 (M 169:4: Sanyškap, December 1910)  
 ‘Monks quarrel after singing, laymen are peaceful after singing.’
- 2 *a<sup>h</sup>qalarta ċ<sup>h</sup>ūwek yɔq,*  
*paqalarta quzuruq yɔq* (L 50a)  
*axqalarda ċūwek yɔq,*  
*paqalarda quzruq yɔq* (M 170:12)  
*a<sup>h</sup>kalarta ċ<sup>h</sup>ūk yɔq,*  
*paqalarta quziñiq yɔq*  
 ‘Monks do not have braids, frogs do not have tails.’
- 3 *a<sup>h</sup>t nayo surniksi-ma, qaylasa ċiyintin ɔytī*  
 ‘Even if a horse stumbles, if it runs, it is faster than a donkey.’
- 4 *awananiñ paγī qīz-ɔγīlta,*  
*qīz-ɔγīlniñ kōñil q<sup>h</sup>arñi γ t<sup>h</sup>ayta* (L 50b)  
 ‘The liver of the parents is on the children,  
 the heart of the children is on the snowy mountain.’
- 4a *ananiñ kōñil qīz-ɔγīlniñ pōzta par,*  
*qīz-ɔγīlniñ kōñil ta<sup>h</sup>sta par*  
 ‘A mother’s heart is on her children’s body, the children’s heart is on the stone.’  
 • Parents feel concerned about their children, but children are concerned with themselves.

A variant form featuring *awa* ‘father’ exists as well. This proverb occurs widely (cf. Bläsing 74: 233). See also Eastern Yugur no. 9.

- Mgr *a:xa a:mané skél k<sup>h</sup>u: ścün tère i:, k<sup>h</sup>u: ścüné skél t<sup>h</sup>aş tère i:* (Čeng 552: 82)  
 ‘The heart of father and mother is on the son and daughter, the heart of the son and daughter is on the rock.’ (The heart of man is directed towards the younger generations.)
- Dgx *ana awəini ɕuʁə k<sup>h</sup>əwoŋ oɕ<sup>h</sup>in ɕiəɾə, k<sup>h</sup>əwoŋ oɕ<sup>h</sup>inni ɕuʁə t<sup>h</sup>aşl ɕiəɾə wo* (B 315:4)  
 ‘The heart of father and mother is on the son and daughter, the heart of the son and daughter is on the stone.’
- Ord *e:ʒi a:wūi: sana: a<sup>h</sup>ɕ<sup>h</sup>-ùreɖu; a<sup>h</sup>ɕ<sup>h</sup>-ùri: sana: ɣaɖaŋɖu* (Mos 1937 504: 88)  
 ‘The concern of the parents is on their children, the concern of the children is on the rocks.’ (Mos 1947 531: 88)
- Tib *ma sñiñ bu dañ bu sñiñ rdo* (Gergan 221:542)  
 ‘A mother’s heart on her child; a child’s heart on a stone’ (of a child who is incapable of expressing his feelings).
- Tuva *ava kiži tölüm deer, aži-tölü şölüm deer* (X S40)  
 ‘A mother says “my child”, the child says “my steppe”.’
- 5 *ɕar pɔɣan yɔqq<sup>h</sup>aɣan ɕ<sup>h</sup>i a<sup>h</sup>ttan pezik*  
 ‘A camel, having become meagre and died, is [still] bigger than a horse.’
- Ch *yǔside luòtuobǐ mǎ dà* (Chén 56)  
 ‘A camel having died of hunger and disease is [still] bigger than a horse.’
- 6 *ciyinintaqīŋ ta<sup>h</sup>sī kīltīŋ*  
 ‘The outside of donkey dung is shiny.’
- NM *lū<sup>24</sup> fəŋ<sup>44</sup> tǎ<sup>44</sup> tǎi<sup>21</sup> piɔ<sup>52</sup> miǎ<sup>44</sup> kuǔ<sup>21</sup>, pu<sup>21</sup> tsɿ<sup>21</sup> lǐ<sup>52</sup> t’əu<sup>24</sup> sa<sup>44</sup> tɕ’iŋ<sup>24</sup> k’uǔ<sup>44</sup> (lǚ fèn dàndànr biǎomiàn guāng, bù zhī lītou shà qíngkuàng)* (Liú 224: 4)  
 ‘The exterior of a donkey’s dropping is shiny, but you do not know what is inside.’
- Tib *boñ-bu’i oñ-ril* (Gāo 354)  
 ‘A donkey dropping.’ (Shiny on the outside, worthless on the inside.)
- 7 *ɕ<sup>h</sup>iniñ miɔn niɕɔr uzin pusa-ma, t<sup>h</sup>aɣniñ neraqīntaqī ɔ<sup>h</sup>tti yio yatayaq* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1994)  
*ɕ<sup>h</sup>iniñ mɔyni ninīŋ uzin pusa-ma, t<sup>h</sup>aɣniñ neraqīntaqī ɔ<sup>h</sup>tti yio yataş* (Xuělián, September 1995)



- ‘However long the camel’s neck, it cannot eat the grass on the other side of the mountain.’
- The power of man has its limits.
- Mgr *tʰème:né kuçéné ştura, ula kelaçe vesé ite atam* (Čeng 538: 21)  
 ‘However long the camel’s neck, it cannot eat the grass on the other side of the mountain.’
- Tib *rñā-moñ ske-riñ – la-kha rgyab-kyi rcwa mi-rag* (Gāo 354)  
 ‘However long the neck of the camel, it cannot touch the grass behind the mountain.’
- 8 *enik yer lilasa, sītīk kšʰp,*  
*aryaçī kīsī is tuʰtsa, sōz kšʰp*  
 ‘If a cow ploughs the earth—much urine,  
 if a lazy person takes up work—much talking.’
- A cow is not apt for ploughing since it has no strength, and urinates a lot when doing heavy labour; bulls and oxen are used for ploughing.
- NM *læ<sup>52</sup> lü<sup>24</sup> ʃō<sup>44</sup> mē<sup>44</sup> sɿ<sup>52</sup> ñio<sup>44</sup> tuē<sup>21</sup>* (*lǎn lú shàng mò shǐ niào duō*) (Liú 224: 2)  
 ‘A lazy donkey going to the mill excretes and urinates a lot.’
- 9 *eren (~ erī) marya uş,*  
*ezer kšʰkī tiort* (L 30a, L 80b)  
 ‘A man’s competition three, the corners of the saddle four.’
- The meaning of this proverb is obscure.
- Kāš *er sōzi bir, eđer kški üč* (Brock 68: 213, DK II: 104)  
 ‘A man’s word one, the saddle’s straps three.’ (It is appropriate to do as one says.)
- 10 *eʰsenken işt taʰrtō trō* (L 96a)  
*isenyen işt tartu-drō* (M 169: 5)  
 ‘The dog bites the one who trusts.’
- Rather: ‘A trustworthy dog bites.’
- 11 *ey eyta ɔyurçitan fannayɔ,*  
*yil yilta sutan qɔʰrqɔɔ* (L 34b)  
*ey eyta ɔɯurçitan fannaɯɔ,*  
*yil yilta sutan qɔpɔqɔ (~ qɔrqɔɔ)* (M 169: 6)

- ‘Each month one must beware of thieves, each year one must fear the water (i.e. from the mountain rivers).’
- NM *yè yè fáng zéi bù shī huò, yuè yuè fáng hàn, bù rěn è, nián nián fáng hàn, bù shī gé* (Oost 334: 955)  
 ‘By guarding every night against thieves, one does not lose one’s goods, by guarding every month against drought, one does not endure starvation, by guarding every year against drought, one does not lose one’s style.’
- 12 *ištīŋ i<sup>h</sup>ci<sup>s</sup>ti aq yaɣ salɪ walmas*  
 ‘One should not place white butter in a dog’s intestines.’
- Kir *it içine sarı may jakpayt* (Šam 163)  
 ‘One does not keep yellow (i.e. melted) butter in a dog’s intestines.’
- Kzk *iyttiŋ išine sarımay žaqpas* (Kirchner 32: 143)  
 ‘Butter does not befit a dog’s stomach.’ (An evil person cannot appreciate a good thing.)
- Ord *нәхә: ғеғүсүнәдү шара ғүсү жәхәхәроғ-уғһи*: (Mos 1937 605: 518)  
 ‘Butter does not fit in a dog’s stomach.’ (You have no luck.)  
 (Mos 1947 594: 518)
- 13 *ištīŋ i<sup>s</sup>msi yī ŋti yaɣan ti<sup>s</sup> unmis*  
 ‘An elephant’s tooth does not come out in a dog’s mouth.’
- Ch *gǒuzuili zhāngbuchū xiàngyá* (HZ 65)  
 ‘A dog cannot emit ivory from its mouth.’ (A filthy mouth cannot utter decent language.)
- NM *gǒuzuili tǔbuchū xiàngyá lái* (Oost 96: 281)  
 ‘Elephant’s teeth do not protrude in a dog’s mouth.’
- 14 *kīsī ɕ<sup>h</sup>qesa, lar unik kiɣik,*  
*ĩŋt ɕ<sup>h</sup>qesa, a<sup>h</sup>rq unik kiɣik*  
 ‘If man sits down, words come out, if a dog sits down, shit comes out.’
- 15 *kīsī larlaso tanisqo,*  
*mal ɕ<sup>h</sup>qaso tanisqo* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)
- 15a *kīsī lir larlaso tanisqo,*  
*mallir ɕ<sup>h</sup>qaso tanisqo* (Xuělián, September 1995)

- ‘People learn to know each other by talking to each other, livestock learn to know each other by sniffing at each other.’  
 • This proverb is widely distributed (cf. Bläsing 642: 4308).
- Kāš *kīši sōzlešū, yīlkī yīōlašū* (Brock 65: 194, DKII:199)  
 ‘Men talking to each other, livestock smelling each other.’
- Sag *mal kisteze tanıscaŋ, kizi čooqtaza tanıscaŋ*  
 (R III: 828, RP II: 64: 704)  
 ‘If horses neigh, they learn to know each other, if people talk, they learn to know each other.’
- Alt *at kištešse tanıžar, kiži ermektešse tanıžar* (RPI:2:23)  
 ‘If horses neigh to each other they learn to know each other, if people talk to each other, they learn to know each other.’
- Tuva *mal kištežip tanıžar, kiži čugaalažip tanıžar* (XS132)  
 ‘Horses learn to know each other by neighing to each other, people learn to know each other by talking to each other.’
- Nuyg *at kišnišip tepišar, adām sōzlišip tonušar* (SK76:905)  
 ‘Horses find each other by neighing to each other, people learn to know each other by talking to each other.’
- 16 *k<sup>h</sup>īsī pīr wučin,*  
*mal ke<sup>h</sup>p wučin* (L 313b)  
*kīse per wučīn,*  
*mal kep (~ kōp) wučīn* (M 170: 10: Sanyškap, 14 February 1911)  
 ‘Man with one (i.e. woman), livestock with many (i.e. females).’
- 17 *k<sup>h</sup>īsī q<sup>h</sup>arīsa, kōŋlī q<sup>h</sup>arīyīmes,*  
*terek q<sup>h</sup>arīsa, yeltīs, q<sup>h</sup>arīyīmes* (L 209b; Zhōng 227)  
*kīse qarāsa, kōŋel qar(i)wīmes,*  
*terik qarāsa, yiltīs qarwīmes* (M 170:8: Tonja Serin, March 1910)  
*kīsī q<sup>h</sup>arīsa, kōŋlī q<sup>h</sup>aryīmis,*  
*terik q<sup>h</sup>arīsa, kīn q<sup>h</sup>aryīmis* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘Man grows old but not his heart, the tree grows old but not its root.’
- Nuyg *adām qerisa, kōŋlī qerimaydu* (SK132:1626), *sōgāt qerisa, yiltizi qerimas* (SK132:1625)  
 ‘Man grows old but not his heart; the willow grows old but not its root.’  
*ādēm qēri bōlyan bīlen, kōŋlī qērimas; derax qēri bōlyan bīlen,*  
*yiltizi qurūmas* (Le Coq 40: 272)

- ‘Man grows old but not his heart, the tree grows old but its root does not wither.’
- Mgr *k<sup>h</sup>un s̱o:liʒa s̱ir i: s̱o:lim, ɓaɓ s̱o:liʒa s̱ɔ:ɔr i: s̱o:lim* (S/M 338)  
 ‘When man grows old, his heart does not age, when the tree grows old, its root does not age.’
- Ch *rén lǎo xīn bù lǎo* (HZ 174)  
 ‘Man grows old, his heart does not grow old.’
- 18 *kīsī yūzki tīrlip par,*  
*terik tīpki tīrlip par* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1994)  
 ‘Man lives by “face” (i.e. self-respect), a tree lives by the root.’  
 • See also Eastern Yugur no. 10.
- Ch *rén yào liǎn, shù yào pí* (HZ 180)  
 ‘Man needs “face”, a tree needs bark.’
- NM *rén huó liǎn, shù huó pí, qiángtóu huóde yī tuán ní* (Oost 70: 204)  
 ‘Man lives by his face, the tree lives by its bark, and the top of the wall lives by its lump (i.e. the quantity which fits onto a spade) of mud.’
- 19 *k<sup>h</sup>īsī ye menek yɔq pɔlsa, taltaqīnī sutayaq trɔ,*  
*semenke tuz yɔq pɔlsa, sunī sutayaq trɔ (~ ustey trɔ)*  
 (L 93a, L 116a, L 44a)  
*kiseye minik yɔq pɔsa, taltaqīnī ustayaq-trɔ,*  
*seminye tuz yɔq pɔsa, sunī ustayaq-trɔ* (M 169:1)  
*kīsī yi mek yɔq pusa, taltaqīnī istayaq (~ istidi),*  
*semenki tuz yɔq pusa, sunī istayaq (~ istidi)* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘If man has no money, he is like the ghost (of a dead man), if food has no salt, it is like water.’
- 19a *ç<sup>h</sup>aya tuz yɔq pusa, sunī istayaq,*  
*kīsī yi menek yɔq pusa, uzittī istayaq* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘If tea has no salt, it is like water, if man has no money, he is like a devil.’
- NM *chá wú yè (~ yán) bù rú shuǐ, rén wú qián bù rú guǐ* (Oost 239: 687)  
 ‘Tea without leaves (~ salt) is inferior to water, a man without money is inferior to a devil.’

Mgr *ç<sup>h</sup>a:té tapsé kuisa scu t<sup>h</sup>éki, k<sup>h</sup>unté tau kuisa mo:té t<sup>h</sup>éki:*  
(Čeng 553: 87)

‘If tea is without salt, it is like water, if a person is without a voice, he is like a wooden stick.’

20 *kīsīnīŋ alyan i lǐ y qīsqa,*  
*kīsīnīŋ yiyintīmsī y imsaq* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)

‘The hand of somebody [you] took something from is short, the mouth of somebody [you] ate something from is soft.’

- One feels obliged to a person one has benefited from.

21 *kīsīnīŋ kizkī,*  
*a<sup>h</sup>tīŋezer*

‘Man’s clothes, a horse’s saddle.’

- Man is dressed up by his clothes, a horse is dressed up by its saddle.

22 *kīsīnīŋ u<sup>h</sup>tīrta timin koyɔq,*  
*kīsīnīŋ artīnta permin koyɔq* (Zhōng Jīnwén, September 1994)

‘It is not done not to speak in front of a person, it is not done not to give at a person’s back.’

- The meaning of this proverb is obscure.

23 *kus kustī suzmisi, ya<sup>h</sup>ç kus emis*

‘If a cow does not butt a cow, it is not a good cow.’

- It is good to work hard.

24 *k<sup>h</sup>emzī ç<sup>h</sup>saqqa tɔzmas*

‘One does not eat one’s fill by bread crumbs.’

- See also no. 38.

25 *malnīŋ pɔzta a<sup>h</sup>ltīm a<sup>h</sup>qīp par,*  
*kīsīnīŋ pɔzta t<sup>h</sup>er a<sup>h</sup>qīp par* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1994)

‘On the body of livestock flows gold, on the body of people flows sweat.’

- Man works hard and earns his living by working and using livestock. A variant using *kumīs* ‘silver’ exists as well.

- 26 *marçan niçor ya<sup>h</sup>ş pusa-ma, ulaya qarasa, am ya<sup>h</sup>ş köztiyik* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘However good coral may be, if one looks at it when it is strung, it seems even better.’
- 27 *ni kīsī yi ni mal par* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘As man, so his livestock.’
- 28 *ni yəq pusa-ma, menik yəq puma,  
 ni parusa-ma, kim paruma*  
 ‘Whatever you may not have, do not have no money, whatever you may have, do not have disease.’
- 29 *əşqa q<sup>h</sup>arisa, mula əyinçiq* (L 37a, L 209b)  
*qu<sup>h</sup>rtqa q<sup>h</sup>arisa, qiz əyinçiq* (L 201a)  
*əşqa qarāsa (~ qarisa), mla əy(i)nčiq,  
 qurtqa qarāsa, qiz əynčiq*  
 (M 169: 7: Kutučin-axka, 15th April 1910)  
 ‘If an old man grows old—boy’s toy, if an old woman grows old—girl’s toy.’
- Nuyg *qeri adām – kičik bala* (SK 132: 1628)  
 ‘An old man — a small child.’
- 30 *pašta teñir pezik pe trə,  
 yerniŋ a<sup>h</sup>ltiriŋta taqa pezik pe trə* (L 94a)  
*pašta teñir pezik pi-trə,  
 yerniŋ altiriŋda taqa pezik pi-trə,  
 eyenni yulurse pəñiş mi-drə*  
 (M 169: 3: Asyrma-wanda, December 1910)  
 ‘Over the head, Heaven is big, under the earth, the maternal uncle is big; if one kills a nephew, it is possible.’
- 30a *pašta teñir pezik trə,  
 yerte taqa pezik trə* (Zhōng 227)  
 ‘Over the head, Heaven is big, on the earth, the maternal uncle is big.’  
 • A reference to the important position of the maternal uncle within Yugur society. Formerly, a Yugur marriage could consist of a “Heavenly marriage”, in which a girl was married to Heaven, after

which she could have relationships with men. The children born to her were taken care of by her brother. The last sentence in Malov, for which he in turn refers to Katanov 1907: 281-2, is enigmatic.

- 31 *pay k<sup>h</sup>i sī wučin uruγ-tari γ pəl,*  
*pat<sup>h</sup>ir k<sup>h</sup>i sī wučin t<sup>h</sup>anqaraq pəl* (L 119b)  
*pey kise wučin uruγ-tariγ bəl,*  
*patir kīse wučin tanqaraq pəl* (M 169: 2)  
*pay k<sup>h</sup>i sī ucin uruγ-tari γ pəl,*  
*pat<sup>h</sup>ir k<sup>h</sup>i sī ucin t<sup>h</sup>anqaraq pəl* (Zhōng 227)
- 31a *pat<sup>h</sup>ir kī sī ucin t<sup>h</sup>anqaraq pəl* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘Be a relative to a rich person, be a sworn brother to a brave person.’
- 32 *pezik tasqa pezik q<sup>h</sup>ar tusγɔ,*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ic<sup>h</sup>iγ tasqa k<sup>h</sup>ic<sup>h</sup>iγ q<sup>h</sup>ar tusγɔ* (L 116a)  
*pezik tasqa pezik qar tuskɔ,*  
*kičik tasqa kičik qar tuskɔ* (M 171: 15; Sanyškap, 1913)  
*pezik tasqa pezik q<sup>h</sup>ar tusko,*  
*ki<sup>h</sup>ciγ tasqa ki<sup>h</sup>ciγ q<sup>h</sup>ar tusko* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘On a big stone falls much snow, on a small stone falls little snow.’
- 33 *pīti galtaŋ,*  
*asī martam* (L 299a)  
 ‘His legs without trousers, his mouth boastful.’
- 34 *q<sup>h</sup>itiya yay kə<sup>h</sup>kī tmi,*  
*yɔγiɾa sey kə<sup>h</sup>kī tmi* (Zhōng Jinwén, August 1995)  
 ‘Do not show butter to a Chinese, do not show vegetables to a Yugur.’
- 34a *q<sup>h</sup>iti kī sī yi yay salma,*  
*yɔγiɾ kī sī yi cay salma* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘Do not put butter in front of a Chinese, do not put vegetables in front of a Yugur.’  
 • The Chinese are not accustomed to drinking butter tea, and instead of stirring the butter into the tea, they will swallow the lump of butter at

once. Yugur people are not accustomed to a choice of vegetable dishes with their rice, and will eat the vegetables at once instead of eating them together with the rice.

- 35 *qız wučin tisme,*  
*q<sup>h</sup>ıraq pučin t<sup>h</sup>eγısme* (L 124b, L 66b)  
*qız wučin tısme,*  
*qıraq wučin tekısme* (M 170: 9: Sanyškap, December 1910)  
 ‘Do not argue with a girl, do not race with a young mare.’
- Kāš *qız birle kürešme, qıraq birle yarıšma* (Brock 60:118, DK I: 353)  
 ‘Do not wrestle with a virgin, do not race with a young mare.’
- 36 *qoy car pusa,*  
*paş car pumas* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1994)  
 ‘If a sheep grows thin, its head does not grow thin.’  
 • If a rich person becomes poor, his ambitions still remain.
- Mgr *ima: skala:sa ta su:l pōsçi:* (Čeng 546: 55)  
 ‘Even if a goat grows thin, its tail remains stuck up.’ (If a man becomes poor, he does not lose his ambitions.)
- 37 *qoy q<sup>h</sup>ıraq tiki ciyin intaqpezik köztiyik*  
 ‘Donkey dung in a sheep’s pen seems big.’  
 • Donkey dung is not very big, but may seem so if compared to sheep dung.
- 38 *saqaltaqi semenki tōzmas*  
 ‘One does not eat one’s fill by the food in one’s beard.’  
 • See also no. 24.
- Nuyg *burttiqī ašta qōrsāq tōymaydō* (Le Coq 30: 181)  
 ‘The stomach does not become full from the food in the beard.’ (Said of useless activities.)
- NM *húzū shàng de fàn chībubǎo* (Oost 34: 93)  
 ‘One cannot eat one’s fill from the food in one’s beard.’
- 39 *sōyilyini<sup>h</sup>ttatıγ,*  
*saqıyan kīsī ya<sup>h</sup>ş* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘Roasted meat is tasty, a person waited for is good.’



- 40 *sīmīk yɔq pusa, i<sup>h</sup>t qaytan kiŋ-i,*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ur i<sup>h</sup>t yɔq pusa, yaɣ qaytan kiŋ-i* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
*sīmīk yɔq pusa, i<sup>h</sup>t qantan kiŋ-i,*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ur i<sup>h</sup>t yɔq pusa, yaɣ qantan kiŋ-i* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘If there is no bone, where would the meat come from? If there is no fat  
 meat, where would the grease come from?’
- 41 *surnīkmis a<sup>h</sup>t yɔq,*  
*emis yɔq kīsī yɔq* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘There is no horse that does not stumble, there is no man without fault.’
- 41a *surnīkmiyin a<sup>h</sup>t yɔq,*  
*emis etmiyin kīsī yɔq* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘There is no horse that does not stumble, there is no man who  
 does not err.’  
 • Said of people who pretend not to make mistakes.
- 42 *tas niyɔr pezik pusa-ma, sunī ayītī walmas*  
 (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘However big the stone, it cannot block up the water.’
- 43 *tas pezik pɔlsa, wannɔ maŋqī ʃ trɔ*  
*k<sup>h</sup>īsī yus pɔlsa, qīzī ɣlaw maŋqī ʃ trɔ* (L 196a, L 311a)  
*tas pezik wɔsa, waŋlɔ maŋqīš tīr,*  
*kse yus wɔsa, qīzīɤlaw maŋqīš-trɔ* (M 171:16: Sanyškap, 1913)  
*tas pezik pusa, wannaya maŋqī ʃtī*  
*kīsī yūs pusa, qīzī ɣlo maŋqī ʃtī* (Xuělián, September 1995)  
 ‘If a stone is big, one must walk past it, if a person is bad, one should  
 walk around him.’
- 44 *tastī ʃartu<sup>h</sup>tsa-ma, ta<sup>h</sup>qī-la qa<sup>h</sup>tīɣ*  
 ‘Even if one breaks the stone into pieces, it is still hard.’
- 45 *tīl ačīɣ, kəŋīl tatīɣ* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘The tongue is bitter [but] the heart is sweet.’  
 • See also no. 46.
- 46 *tīmsīɣyüstī,*  
*kəŋīl ya<sup>h</sup>ʃtī* (Xuělián, September 1995)

‘The mouth is bad [but] the heart is good.’

- See also no. 45.

- 47 *uŋ (y)e<sup>h</sup>lč̣i yumutsa, ɕ<sup>h</sup>uɕaɣa p̣iz uryantay*  
(L 27b, L 45b, L 56a, L 298b)  
*uŋ a<sup>h</sup>qa yumutsa, t<sup>h</sup>ulumɣa yaɣ salɣantay* (L 132a)  
*üč (~ uš) elč̣i yumutsa, čučaka p̣iz urkandar,*  
*üč axqa yumutsa, tulumka (~ marxqeq) yaɣ salɣandar* (M 170: 13, November 1913)  
‘If three shamans come together, it is as if they stab the bag with an awl (i.e. disagreement), if three monks come together, it is as if they put butter in the sheepskin bag (i.e. agreement).’  
• Malov recorded this anti-shamanist proverb from the shaman Smalaškap, in the village of Dōnghǎizi (i.e. Míngǎi).

- 48 *ye<sup>h</sup>lč̣in̄iŋ t̄ims̄iɣ lian̄zi yɔq k<sup>h</sup>ur* (L 99a, L 142b)  
‘The mouth of a shaman is a bracket without a crossbeam.’

- 49 *yilann̄iŋ ala ta<sup>h</sup>s̄inta par,*  
*k̄is̄in̄iŋ ala i<sup>h</sup>č̣inti par*  
‘The multi-colouredness of a snake is on its outside, the multi-colouredness of man on his inside.’  
• A variant of this proverb featuring ‘livestock’ is already recorded by Kāšyarī, and widely distributed. Western Yugur seems to represent the Mongolic form of the proverb featuring ‘snake’.
- Mon *kün-i eriyen dotura, moyai-yin eriyen ɣadana* (Aalto 4: 3)  
‘Man is mottled on the inside, a serpent is mottled on the outside.’
- Ord *k<sup>h</sup>uni erē: ɖɔ<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>ɔrɔni, mɔɖɔ:n erē: ɕaɖanani* (Mos 1937 551: 310)  
‘Man’s multi-colouredness is on his inside, a snake’s multi-colouredness is on its outside.’ (Mos 1947 561: 310)
- Kāš *kiši alasi ič̣d̄in ȳilq̄i alasi taš̄d̄in* (Brock 65: 193, DK 125)  
‘The multi-colouredness of man is on the inside, the multi-colouredness of cattle is on the outside.’<sup>8</sup>
- Nuyg *hayvann̄iŋ alisi teš̄ida, adām̄niŋ alisi ič̣ide* (SK 51: 584)

<sup>8</sup> Kāšyarī translates *ala* as ‘leprous’.

- ‘The multi-colouredness of an animal is on its outside, the multi-colouredness (i.e. disguise) of man on his inside.’
- Kir *adam alast – içinde, mal alast – tışında* (Şam13)  
 ‘Man’s multi-colouredness is on his inside, cattle’s multi-colouredness is on the outside.’
- Tib *stag-gi ri-mo phyi-nas, mi’i ri-mo nañ-nas* (Gergan 192: 299)  
 ‘The pattern of the tiger is on the outside, and that of a man on the inside.’  
*gčan-gzan ri-mo rgyab-la yod, mi-yi ri-mo khog-tu yod* (Gāo 156); cf. Duncan 177: 107 [no Tibetan text]  
 ‘The stripes of wild beast are on the outside, the stripes of man are on the inside.’
- 50 *yol maṇṣa suannama* (L 332a)  
*yol maṇṣa sṇanlama* (M 171: 14: Sanyškap, 1913)  
 ‘Do not count (i.e. the days) when travelling.’
- 51 *yol ya<sup>h</sup>qin sīqasqo*,  
*k<sup>h</sup>isī ya<sup>h</sup>qin qa<sup>h</sup>qisqo* (L 186b, L 322b)  
*yol yaqin – s(i)qasqo*,  
*kīsī yaqin – qáqisγo* (M 170: 11: Tonja Serin)  
*yol ya<sup>h</sup>qin pusa, sīqasqo*,  
*kīsī ya<sup>h</sup>qin pusa, qa<sup>h</sup>qisqo*  
 ‘If the paths are [too] near, they will squeeze one another, if people are [too] near, they will collide with each other.’  
 • One should keep distance when driving herds along the road, otherwise the herds will become mixed up.
- 52 *yoc kīsī par*,  
*yoc t<sup>h</sup>ala yoc* (Zhōng Jīnwén, August 1995)  
 ‘There are people who have nothing, there are no fields that have nothing.’  
 • One does not need to be poor, one only has to work for one’s living.
- NM *rén qióng, dì xiān qióng* (Oost 73: 211)  
 ‘[If] man is poor, [it is because] the earth is poor first.’
- 53 *yüwas a<sup>h</sup>ttī k<sup>h</sup>im-ma mīnin saqīnqaq*  
*amīr kīsīnī k<sup>h</sup>im-ma imsin saqīnqaq*

‘Anyone likes to mount a calm horse, anyone likes to use a quiet man.’

NM *rén shàn shòu rén qī, mǎ shàn shòu rén qí* (Oost 67: 194)

‘A friendly man allows himself to be bullied, a friendly horse allows itself to be mounted.’

Tib *rta-čhuñ bžon bde, mi-čhuñ bkol bde* (Gāo 216)

‘A small horse is a joy to ride, a small man is a joy to command.’

### Western Yugur folk wisdom

1 *ker yeryi q<sup>h</sup>alsa, qara tuskış*

‘If a cup falls on the floor, bad luck will occur.’ (To be prevented by drawing a cross on the floor.)

2 *kīsīnīñ kōzti malnī sanama*

‘Do not count livestock under the eye of a[nother] person.’  
(Your livestock might decrease.)

3 *k<sup>h</sup>uayzīnī tīwīnti tu<sup>h</sup>tsa, ya<sup>h</sup>qīnqa perīş, pa<sup>h</sup>çīnta tu<sup>h</sup>tsa, uzaqqa perīş*

‘If [a woman] holds the chopsticks at the lower end, [her parents] will marry her off nearby, if she holds them at the top, [they] will marry her off far away.’

4 *k<sup>h</sup>empiş yī<sup>h</sup>ptī haptamas: mīla tōqqanta k<sup>h</sup>īntik mōynta hōraq q<sup>h</sup>aş*

‘A woman should not step on a rope: [for] when her child is born, the umbilical cord will coil around [his] neck.’

5 *mīla aynī çōrsa, q<sup>h</sup>ulaq q<sup>h</sup>alxanīş*

‘If a child points to the moon, [his] ears will fall off.’

6 *mīla tīl yimis, yisi sōz kō<sup>h</sup>p*

‘A child should not eat tongue, if he eats [it], [his] words [will be] many.’

7 *mīş yūz yūsa, k<sup>h</sup>ec<sup>h</sup>īn kiş*

*mīş yuzun yusa mō la, yučīn k<sup>h</sup>elyektrō*

(M 23: 32: Sanyşkap, 5th Decmber 1910)

‘If a cat washes its face, a guest will come.’

NM *māor xī liǎn jīntiān yǒu kèrén dào* (Oost 155: 457)

‘If a cat washes its face, a guest will come today.’

- 8 *yüş yeryi q<sup>h</sup>alsa, k<sup>h</sup>ec<sup>h</sup>in kiş*  
 ‘If a towel falls on the floor, a guest will come.’

### Eastern Yugur proverbs

- 1 *a:rtaq k<sup>h</sup>ü:n nere q<sup>h</sup>et<sup>h</sup>a:nan,*  
*a:rtaq mɔ:rɛ k<sup>h</sup>ülesɛn q<sup>h</sup>et<sup>h</sup>a:nan (BJ 271: 9)*  
 ‘The pampered son makes people lose face, the pampered horse wastes sweat.’
- 2 *čarq<sup>h</sup>i:n sein né k<sup>h</sup>ürɣen,*  
*čalaw:i:n sein né xara mutɛn ne (BJ 276: 8)*  
 ‘The best to order about is a son-in-law, the best to repair and maintain is black wood.’
- 3 *čéké: ma:n sa:lɣat<sup>h</sup>i,*  
*čémčék k<sup>h</sup>ü:n ku:šét<sup>h</sup>i (BJ 270: 4)*  
 ‘A goat with a spotted face gives much milk, a person with affected [manners] uses many tricks.’
- 4 *ču:n otor tök<sup>h</sup>ör neyɛtor k<sup>h</sup>erek (BJ 273: 18)*  
 ‘Plan for a hundred days! One day [it] is necessary.’
- 5 *č<sup>h</sup>aq č<sup>h</sup>awar su:taq pu:?*  
*časɛn č<sup>h</sup>awar su:taq pu:? (BJ 275: 1)*  
 ‘Does time always remain time, does snow always remain white?’
- 6 *č<sup>h</sup>émékč<sup>h</sup>é nɔɣq<sup>h</sup>ɔi šɛŋšéwa: qačar βɔlɣonté yaβnɛi (BJ 276: 6)*  
 ‘A stealing dog smells and runs everywhere.’
- 7 *ečenɛ piyté t<sup>h</sup>art<sup>h</sup>é, temet<sup>h</sup>é yaβsanté lɛ metene,*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ü:nɛ piyté pü:sɛn yaβsa metene (BJ 273: 19)*  
 ‘If one walks with bags and camels on one’s own body, one does not notice, but if a louse is walking on a[nother] person’s body, one notices.’
- 8 *βesɛne čü:r č<sup>h</sup>üsɛn,*  
*qatésɛnɛ hru:r t<sup>h</sup>u:sɛn (BJ 277: 10)*  
 ‘The tip of grass is blood, the root of a stake is oil.’

- 9 *hk<sup>h</sup>e č<sup>h</sup>yi:n set<sup>h</sup>kəl k<sup>h</sup>ün hk<sup>h</sup>onté,*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ü:n hk<sup>h</sup>oné set<sup>h</sup>kəl u:la qataté* (BJ 272: 17)  
 ‘The heart of father and mother is on the son and daughter, the heart of  
 the son and daughter is on the mountain and rock.’  
 • See also Western Yugur no. 4.
- 10 *k<sup>h</sup>ü:né nü:rt<sup>h</sup>é č<sup>h</sup>üsén k<sup>h</sup>erek,*  
*t<sup>h</sup>u:raqt<sup>h</sup>é qatar k<sup>h</sup>erek* (BJ 272: 16)  
 ‘Man’s face needs blood, a tree needs bark.’  
 • See also Western Yugur no. 18.
- 11 *k<sup>h</sup>ü:n pēyan pōlsɔ ta pēyan pa:n kēčēt<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>é poto!*  
*k<sup>h</sup>ü:n šalt<sup>h</sup>an pōlsɔ ta šalt<sup>h</sup>an pa:n kēčēt<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>é poto!* (BJ 275: 2)  
 ‘Even if a person is rich, do not call him rich, even if a person is poor,  
 do not call him poor.’  
 • A rich person may become poor, a poor person may become rich.
- 12 *lu:sa, elčiyené č<sup>h</sup>enesenté ač<sup>h</sup>a:n ač<sup>h</sup>é yitaβa* (BJ 269: 2)  
 ‘Compared to the donkey, the mule cannot carry a burden.’
- 13 *mēla hteisa, nɔɣq<sup>h</sup>ɔi luŋsasa* (BJ 270: 7)  
 ‘A child from youth, a dog from [untranslated].’
- 14 *mɔɣq<sup>h</sup>ɔr q<sup>h</sup>ut<sup>h</sup>aka qa:rē tain,*  
*mu: p<sup>h</sup>üsəyüi čalu:n tain* (BJ 271: 10)  
 ‘A blunt knife is an enemy to the hand,  
 a bad woman is an enemy to the man.’
- 15 *mu: pe:rété aman ölöne,*  
*xara qulért<sup>h</sup>é q<sup>h</sup>usun šik<sup>h</sup>e βamna:* (BJ 271: 11)  
 ‘In [the presence of] a bad daughter-in-law the mouth wears out,  
 black flour absorbs a lot of water.’
- 16 *mu: p<sup>h</sup>üsəyüi t<sup>h</sup>uklasa neye ywe: xai βai,*  
*t<sup>h</sup>ara:lan mu: βolsɔ neye čəl βai* (BJ 277: 11)  
 ‘If one meets a bad woman, it is a misfortune for one generation,  
 if the year’s harvest is not good, one meets disaster for only one year.’

NM *qūbuduì lǎopo yī bèizi qióng, dǎbuduì huǒjì dàng nián qióng*  
(Oost 312: 890)

‘If one enters into bad marriage, one is poor for a life time, if one forms a bad partnership, one is poor for [just] that year.’

17 *mu:n q<sup>h</sup>aβša<sup>q</sup> xara,*  
*mɔɔɔin čüsən t<sup>h</sup>eŋkert<sup>h</sup>è* (BJ 274: 23)

‘An evil person’s idea is bad, the snake’s blood is in Heaven.’

• The meaning of this proverb is obscure.

18 *narané taɣasa nūr xalu:n,*  
*niyɔné taɣasa ketsén č<sup>h</sup>atnan* (BJ 277: 9)

‘If one follows the sun, the face is warm, if one follows a high official, one eats one’s fill.’

• See also no. 19.

Mon *nara dayabal dayaraqū ügei, noyon dayabal ölüskü ügei* (Aalto 6: 30)

‘Whoever travels with the sun does not freeze, whoever travels with a prince does not starve.’

Mgr [no Monguor text] (Xi 52)

‘Follow the sun [you] won’t suffer cold, follow the Party [you] won’t be depressed.’

19 *narané taɣasa piy tula:n,*  
*niyɔné taɣasa q<sup>h</sup>aβša<sup>q</sup> xara* (BJ 273: 20)

‘If one follows the sun—warmth on the body,  
if one follows a high official—bad idea.’

• See also no. 18.

20 *olot<sup>h</sup>è t<sup>h</sup>eŋkert<sup>h</sup>è pɔɔɔ:mküi,*  
*tu:č<sup>h</sup>è hk<sup>h</sup>onté xɔrémküi* (BJ 270: 5)

‘In a rumbling sky, there is no rain, for a girl who loves to sing, there is no wedding.’

Mon [No Mongolian text.] (Han 171)

‘A rumbling sky does not rain; a much-praised girl does not marry.’

[No Mongolian text.] (Krue 71)

‘A rumbling sky, no rain; a girl with a bad reputation, no wedding.’

Ord *ɔu:ht<sup>h</sup>u t<sup>h</sup>eŋgerindü ɔɔɔ:m ügüi, č<sup>h</sup>u:ht<sup>h</sup>u k<sup>h</sup>ü:xkxendü xɔrim ügüi*  
(Mos 1937 563: 368)

- ‘For the rumbling sky there is no rain; for a girl with a bad reputation there is no wedding celebration.’ (Mos 1947 568: 368)
- Tib [no Tibetan text] (Duncan 235: 637)
- ‘The clouds that have many dragon-sounds (i.e. thunder) are without rain; the maiden who talks too much will have no wedding feast.’
- 21 *ɔɔq t<sup>h</sup>arawê xɔli:né sein,*  
*t<sup>h</sup>ele:n q<sup>h</sup>usuné ɔiri:né sein* (BJ 272: 13)
- ‘It is good when family and relatives are far, it is good when firewood and water are near.’
- Ord *urukt<sup>h</sup>ɔrɔlĩ ɣɔɔɔ sɛ:n; usu t<sup>h</sup>ule:n ɔ:ɔ sɛ:n* (Mos 1937 501: 73)
- ‘It is good when relatives related by marriage are far, it is good when water and firewood are near.’ (Mos 1947 529:73)
- Tib *gñen dañ ñi-ma rgyañ-nas sro, me dañ ma }gram-du bsten* (Gāo 199)
- ‘Relatives and sun make warm from afar, keep fire and mother nearby.’
- 22 *péyan péyanta:n p<sup>h</sup>út<sup>h</sup>ê pök!*  
*ùγüi ùγüite:n p<sup>h</sup>út<sup>h</sup>ê qɔmɔta!* (BJ 275: 3)
- ‘Rich man, do not be arrogant because of your wealth, poor man, do not be sad because of your poverty.’
- Tuva *bay men deeš bardamnava, yadu men deeš muɣarava* (XS 28)
- ‘Do not be arrogant because of your wealth, do not be sad because of your poverty.’
- 23 *p<sup>h</sup>üséγüi k<sup>h</sup>ün č<sup>h</sup>ei t<sup>h</sup>ɔɔɔn,*  
*hqanar k<sup>h</sup>ün ail t<sup>h</sup>ɔɔɔn* (BJ 273: 21)
- ‘Woman circles around the seat of honour, man centers around the premises.’
- NM *hàoshìde nǚrén zhuān guōtái, xiā shìde nánrén zǒu zhōu fǔ, hǎoshìde kè mǎ bù shàng zhēng* (Oost 34: 93)
- ‘An officious woman [may] circle [only] around the kitchen range, [while even] a foolish man [may] walk through the prefectures; a convenient mare cannot go to war.’
- 24 *sa:γq<sup>h</sup>éγüi mailamt<sup>h</sup>aqai,*  
*sanayüi ɲi:mt<sup>h</sup>ki:* (BJ 270: 6)
- ‘The one that will not be milked tends to bleat, the naive one tends to smile.’



- 25 *sein ačérwɪ:n úyúr ɔlotnéi,*  
*mu: ačérwa βolsɔ úyúr paraq(è) βai* (BĴ 276: 7)  
 ‘The herd of a good stallion will increase; if the stallion is bad,  
 the herd will come to an end.’
- 26 *seinla yaβsa salβér,*  
*mu:la yaβsa maŋqás* (BĴ 271: 12)  
 ‘Going with the good ones, a bird of prey,  
 going with the evil ones, a ghost.’
- 27 *sein neret<sup>h</sup>è čun, seiralakč<sup>h</sup>è na:mér* (BĴ 272: 14)  
 ‘Summer is the one with the good name,  
 autumn is the one that brings good [things].’
- 28 *sein sanat<sup>h</sup>è ü:lul<sup>h</sup>ala*  
*mu: sanat<sup>h</sup>è ni:l<sup>h</sup>et<sup>h</sup>ele* (BĴ 270: 8)  
 ‘A person with good intentions makes [people] cry,  
 a person with evil intentions makes [people] laugh.’
- Nuyg *ɔs yǐ ylittur, düšmen küldüür* (Le Coq 14: 55)  
 ‘A friend makes one cry (i.e. by well-meant admonitions),  
 an enemy makes one laugh (i.e. by flattery).’
- 29 *šérwalaq parès u:la, nak t<sup>h</sup>ɔrɔwɔ: su:néi,*  
*aménan altaɬa ta u:layam altaq<sup>h</sup>š βai* (BĴ 276: 5)  
 ‘The yellow tiger roams about the mountains and woods,  
 he would rather lose his life than his mountain.’
- 30 *šik<sup>h</sup>e k<sup>h</sup>ün k<sup>h</sup>elesen qačart<sup>h</sup>è,*  
*šik<sup>h</sup>e šu:n qailsan qačart<sup>h</sup>è* (BĴ 269: 3)  
 ‘A great man has room to talk, a big bird has room to fly.’
- 31 *u:lwa βolwɔnè seiné u:!*  
*t<sup>h</sup>amak<sup>h</sup>i:n seiné p<sup>h</sup>üt<sup>h</sup>è sɔrɔ* (BĴ 277: 12)  
 ‘Eat the best of every meal, do not smoke the best of tobacco.’
- 32 *üyüi, péyan né üye: lé tü:laβa,*  
*mɔrt<sup>h</sup>è, yaβwan né mör lé tü:laβa,*

*qasaq, č<sup>h</sup>ejwe ej lè tü:laβa,*  
*t<sup>h</sup>ɔɔɔɔ, maŋlɛk k<sup>h</sup>ör lè tü:laβa* (BJ 269: 1)

‘The words of the poor and the rich do not match; the paths of the man on horseback and the man on foot do not match; the widths of the coarse woollen cloth and the fine woollen fabric do not match; the patterns of the silk and the satin do not match.’

- 33 *xara hk<sup>h</sup>ö kuku:k sein pɔlsɔ ta ya:qé šu:n pai,*  
*xara k<sup>h</sup>érèi mu: pɔlsɔ ta su:q<sup>h</sup>é šu:n pai* (BJ 275: 4)  
 ‘Although the deep blue cuckoo is beautiful, it is a bird that flies off; although the black crow is ugly, it is a resident bird.’

- 34 *xara piy hk<sup>h</sup>üye:, la:n aman p<sup>h</sup>üt<sup>h</sup>eye:* (BJ 272: 15)  
 ‘The black body is dead, the red mouth is closed.’

- 35 *xwa:rt<sup>h</sup>é qarsan č<sup>h</sup>éq<sup>h</sup>ense a:rsa qarsan eβer ta:βa*  
 (BJ 274: 22)  
 ‘The horn that grows out later passes the ear that came out earlier’  
 (the pupil surpasses the master).  
 • A widely distributed proverb (Bläsing 298: 1758).

- Tuva *baštay üngen kulaktı soǵnay üngen mıyıs erter* (XS 36)  
 ‘The horn that came out last passes the ear that came out first.’

- Tel *ozo çıqqan qulaqtan soñ çıqqan müüs ozındı* (R I: 1147)  
 ‘The horn that came out later passed the ear that came out earlier.’

- Kzk *burin šıqqan qulaqtan keyin šıqqan müyız ozar* (Kirchner 8: 35)  
 ‘The horn that came out last passes the ear that came out first.’ (The next generation takes over from the former.)

- Kir *murnun çıkkın kulaktan, kiyinki çıkkın müyüz ozgun* (Šam 233)  
 ‘The horn that came out last passed the ear that came out first.’ (The next generation takes over from the former.)

- Tib *sña-skyes ma-lčog-las phyi-skyes rwa-čo riñ* (Gāo 151)  
 ‘The horn that appeared later is longer than the ear that appeared earlier.’

**List of abbreviations<sup>9</sup>**

Alt	Altay	Mgr	Monguor
B	Bökh	Mon	Mongolian
BĴ	Bolčuluu & Ĵalcan	Mos	Mostaert
Brock	Brockelmann	NM	Northwest Mandarin
Čeng	Čenggeltei	Nuyg	New Uyгур
Ch	Chinese	Ord	Ordos
Dgx	Dongxiang	R	Radloff 1893-1911
DK	Dankoff & Kelly	RP	Radloff 1868
Han	Hangin	Sag	Sagay dialect of Khakas
HZ	Heng & Zhang	Šam	Šambaev
Kāš	Kāšyārī	SK	Sadvakasov & Kibirov
Kir	Kirgiz	S/M	de Smedt & Mostaert
Kzk	Kazak	Tel	Teleut
L	Léi	Tib	Tibetan
M	Malov	XS	Xadaxane & Sagan-ool

**References**

- Aalto, P. 1950. Some South-Mongolian proverbs. *Mémoires de la Société finno-ougrienne* 98, 1-12.
- Bläsing, U. 1994. *Tschuwaschische Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Bolčuluu. 1984. *Dōngbù Yùgùyǔ cíhuì / Ĵegün Yuyur kelen-ü üges*. Hohhot: Nèi Měnggǔ Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- Bolčuluu & Ĵalcan. 1988. *Dōngbù Yùgùyǔ Huàiyǔ Cáiliào / Ĵegün Yuyur kelen-ü üges kelelge-yin matèriyal*. Hohhot: Nèi Měnggǔ Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- Bökh et al. 1983. *Dōngxiāngyǔ Cíhuì / Dūngsiyang kelen-ü üges*. Hohhot: Nèi Měnggǔ Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- Boratav, P. N. 1964. Les proverbes. In: Bazin, L. et al. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 67-76.
- Brockelmann, C. 1920. Altturkestanische Volksweisheit. *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* 8, 50-73.
- Čenggeltei et al. 1986. *Tǔzúyǔ Huàiyǔ cáiliào / Mongyor kelen-ü üges kelelge-yin matèriyal*. Hohhot: Nèi Měnggǔ Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.

<sup>9</sup> Sources are cited by page, and if available by number.

- Chén Zōngzhèn. 1980. 'Tūjuéyǔ cídiǎn' zhōngde yànyǔ. *Mínzú Yǔwén* 4, 51-57.
- Chén Zōngzhèn & Léi Xuǎnchūn. 1985. *Xībù Yùgùyǔ jiǎnzhì*. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Dankoff, R. & Kelly, J. 1982-1985. *Mahmūd al-Kāšyarī. Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luḡāt at-Turk)* 1-3. Harvard: Harvard University.
- Doerfer, G. 1964. Die Literatur der Türken Südsibiriens. In: Bazin, L. et al. (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 862-885.
- Duncan, M. H. 1961. *Love songs and proverbs of Tibet*. London: Mitre Press.
- Gāo Bǐngchén (ed.) 1992. *rGyun-spod bod-rigs gtam-dpe bsags-mjod (bod rgya gñis 'gril) / Chángyòng Zàngzú yànyǔ cídiǎn (Zàng Hàn duìzhào)*. Lánzhōu: Gānsù Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Gergan, J. 1942. A thousand Tibetan proverbs and wise sayings with short explanations of obscure phrases. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 8, 157-276.
- Hangin, J. G. 1985. Mongolian folklore: A representative collection from the oral literary tradition 1. Mongolian studies. *Journal of the Mongolia Society* 9, 13-78.
- Heng Xiao-jun & Zhang Xue-zhi. 1988. *A Chinese-English dictionary of idioms and proverbs*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jūunast. 1981. *Dōngbù Yùgùyǔ jiǎnzhì*. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Khasbaatar. 1985. *Tǔzúyǔ Cíhuì / Mongyor kelen-ü üges*. Hohhot: Nèi Měnggǔ Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- Kirchner, M. 1993. *Sprichwörter der Kasachen*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Krueger, J. R. 1967. *Mongolian folktales, stories and proverbs*. (Publications of the Mongolia Society. Occasional Papers 4.) Bloomington: The Mongolia Society.
- Le Coq, A. von 1911. *Sprichwörter und Lieder aus der Gegend von Turfan. Mit einer dort aufgenommenen Wörterliste*. (Baessler-Archiv. Beiheft I.) Leipzig: Teubner.
- Léi Xuǎnchūn 1992. *Xībù Yùgù-Hàn cídiǎn*. Chéngdū: Sìchuān Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.
- Liú Lǐ 1989. *Huímín Wūlǔmùqí Yǔyán zhì*. Ürümqi: Xīnjiāng Dàxué Chūbǎnshè.

- Malov, S. E. 1967. *Jazyk želtyx ujgurov. Teksty i perevody*. Moscow: Akademija Nauk.
- Mostaert, A. 1937. *Textes oraux Ordos*. (Monumenta Serica Monograph I.) Peking: H. Vetch.
- Mostaert, A. 1947. *Folklore Ordos (Traduction des textes oraux Ordos)*. (Monumenta Serica Monograph 11.) Peking: Fu Jen Catholic University Press.
- Oost, J. van. 1918. *Dictions et proverbes des Chinois habitant la Mongolie sud-ouest*. (Variétés sinologiques 50.) Zi-ka-wei près Chang-hai: T'ou-se-we.
- Radloff, W. 1868. *Proben der Volksliteratur der Türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens. II. Theil. Die Abakan-Dialecte (der Sagaische, Koibalische, Katschinzische), der Kysyl-Dialect und der Tscholym-Dialect (Küärik)*. St. Petersburg: Eggers.
- Radloff, W. 1893-1911. *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte I-IV*. St. Petersburg: Eggers & Schmitzdorff [etc.].
- Smedt, A. de & Mostaert, A. 1933. *Le dialecte monguor parlé par les mongols du Kansou occidental. IIIe partie: Dictionnaire monguor-français*. Peip'ing: Imprimerie de l'Université Catholique.
- Sadvakasov, G. & Kibirov, Š. (eds.) 1978. *Uygur maqal ve temsilliri / Uygurskie poslovicy i pogovorki*. Alma-Ata: Akademija Nauk.
- Šambaev, S. 1979. *Kyrgyzsko-russkie poslovicy, pogovorki i izrečeniya*. Frunze: Mektep.
- Xadaxane, M. & Sagan-ool, O. (eds.) 1966. *Tüva üleger domaktar, čečen söster / Tuvinskie poslovicy i pogovorki*. Kyzyl: Tuvinskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Xi Yuanlin 1994. Monguor proverbs. In: Stuart, K. & Limusishiden (eds.) *China's Monguor minority: Ethnography and folktales*. (Sino-Platonic Papers 59.) Philadelphia: Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Pennsylvania. 52-58.
- Yáng Yǐngzhōng (ed.) 1993. *Gānsù Shǎoshù Mínzú dìfāng. Gānsù Shěng Mínzú shìwù wěiyuánhùi. Lánzhōu: Gānsù Mínzú Chūbǎnshè*.
- Zhōng Jinwén. 1995. *Yùgùzú Wénhuà Yánjiū*. Běijīng: Zhōngguó Mín-háng Chūbǎnshè.

# Sur certains termes d'un hymne turk du Codex Cumanicus

Mefküre Mollova

Mollova, Mefküre 1999. Sur certains termes d'un hymne turk du Codex Cumanicus. *Turkic Languages* 3, 215-240.

Among the Latin Catholic texts translated into Turkic in the Codex Comanicus, there is one hymn, "Ave Porta Paradisi", which contains certain difficult Turkic passages, terms and expressions that have been retranslated into Latin. These supplementary interlinear Latin translations are very valuable, but need thorough explanations in several cases, as they to some extent represent misunderstandings of the Turkic text. In singular cases, amendments of the Turkic text should be made. Alongside details in the existing interlinear translations and the possible interpretations of several strophes, the existing translations of the hymn are discussed.

*Mefküre Mollova, 3 rue du Beau Site, 94500 Champigny sur Marne, France.*

Dans cet article, nous traiterons l'hymne "Ave Porta Paradisi", traduit du latin en turk oriental littéraire qui est la langue turke du Codex Cumanicus. Cet hymne, d'une valeur poétique, religieuse et spirituelle considérable, consiste en 77 quatrains de vers octosyllabiques.

Kuun (1880: 186-206), le premier, les a translittérés, arrangés métriquement et soigneusement annotés. Chez lui, la dernière strophe étant associée à l'hymne suivant, c'est Bang qui l'a restituée, en partant de l'original latin qui aurait servi de source à la traduction turke. De même, c'est à Bang que revient le grand mérite de la détermination de cette source latine qui, à son tour, contribue à une traduction exacte de la version turke en une langue européenne ou autre (Bang 1914: 241-276).

Bang a transcrit et traduit les strophes 3, 4, 7, 13, 18, 22, 28, 39, 40, 59, 74 et 76. (Par la suite ces strophes ont été soumises à des notes de critique textuelle de la part de Andreas 1914, Zalemann 1910, Munkácsi 1915, Németh 1916, Asim 1916, Çağatay 1944, von Gabain 1954, Kenesbaev & Kuryžanov 1964, des lexicographes Grønbech 1942,

Quryšžanov et alii 1978 et Kowalski 1928, la strophe 5.) Seuls Radloff (1887) (chez qui on trouve 76 strophes, car il a travaillé sur l'édition de Kuun) et Drimba (1973) (chez qui le nombre des strophes remonte à 77) ont transcrit et traduit l'hymne entièrement.

Les spécialistes en traduction de textes religieux savent bien combien leur tâche est difficile, car une lourde responsabilité pèse sur leurs épaules. Autant plus qu'ils appartiennent souvent à tel ou tel milieu social et religieux. Tel serait le cas des traducteurs turks des textes chrétiens du Codex Cumanicus. Nous sommes portés à croire que ces traducteurs furent des intellectuels coumans, khazars, ouigours, versés en langue turke écrite de l'époque. Ils ne pouvaient pas ne pas se servir d'un bagage terminologique religieux très développé, mais tout autre, dont ils disposeraient. Ainsi, les termes chrétiens latins furent traduits en turk par des termes chamaniques, bouddhiques, manichéens, nestoriens et islamiques très divers quasi-correspondants.

Les termes les plus difficiles furent dotés de traductions latines interlinéaires supplémentaires, écrites sur le Codex Cumanicus conservé. Ces traductions interlinéaires sont très précieuses, mais insuffisantes; elles nécessitent des commentaires, des explications plus détaillées et même des études spéciales. Prises telles quelles, elles risquent de nous détourner du vrai sens des termes. Les turkologues-traducteurs qui ont accordé trop de confiance à ces traductions interlinéaires, en faisant abstraction des données turkes, sont tombés dans l'erreur (v. par exemple les strophes 27, 35, 69, 71 analysées ici).

Aujourd'hui le lecteur de ces textes se heurte à une double difficulté: D'une part les termes turks sont devenus archaïques et lui-même, appartenant à un autre milieu, à une autre croyance, n'arrive pas à les comprendre et d'autre part, les traducteurs modernes de ces textes turks en une langue européenne, en se basant uniquement sur les traductions latines interlinéaires, ont contribué à la complication de leur signification textuelle.

Voilà pourquoi ici nous voudrions attirer l'attention sur le fait, qu'à côté (1) de la source latine et (2) des traductions latines interlinéaires complémentaires des termes turks, il faut (3) considérer ces traductions d'une manière critique (comme une sorte de signal d'alerte – "Attention, signification difficile!") et les rattacher aux termes turks, en tirer les significations désirées et (4) expliciter les termes et expressions turks archaïques qui ne furent pas traduits en latin.

Pour notre part, nous allons essayer de chercher, et de discuter ces problèmes dans 25 strophes (les strophes 7, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 35, 41, 42, 53, 55, 59, 60, 65, 68, 69, 71, 76, 77), transcrites et traduites en français avec des commentaires et comparées et, si nécessaire, à celles de Radloff et de Drimba, en ajoutant quelques corrections linguistiques, basées sur les données graphiques.<sup>1</sup>

Ainsi, “Ave Porta Paradisi”:

7 *Awe Mariya! ičríχñ*  
*Teñrí tínttí äsä ham boyñ*  
*barčalardan artuq are*  
*sení tabubtur ham sílí.*

‘Ave, Marie! après que Dieu a scruté ton intérieur (= ton âme) et ton corps, il t’a trouvée supérieure à toutes (les femmes), sainte et chaste.’

Traduction de Radloff (1887: 92):

“Ave Maria, dein Inneres  
 Hat Gott aufgesucht, und dein Körper  
 Ist heiliger als Uebrige.  
 Dich hat der Fürst rein erfunden.”

Celle de Drimba (1973: 276):

“Je te salue, Marie! après que Dieu a scruté ton intérieur (= ton âme) et ton corps, il t’a trouvée plus sainte et plus chaste que toutes (les autres femmes).”

Pour nous, *artuq* signifie ‘supérieur’, *are* ‘saint’, *sílí* ‘chaste’. Dans la traduction de Drimba *artuq* reste non traduit. “Plus sainte et plus chaste que toutes (les autres femmes)” nous donne à penser que toutes les femmes sont aussi saintes et chastes.

12 *Awe qíz, kímñíñ tuyaní*  
*ičkózímísníñ yaríyí*

<sup>1</sup> La flèche (→) indiquera que le mot qui le précède a été corrigé sur le manuscrit du Codex et remplacé par un autre mot ou un graphème par un autre, où tous les deux sont justes et méritent d’être respectés.



*erîp azamî qutqardî,  
ôlîmîndâ uyutmadi.*

‘Ave, Vierge, dont le proche parent (c.-à-d. Jésus envers sa mère), étant la lumière de notre œil interne, a sauvé les hommes et ne les a pas laissé dormir dans leur mort (éternelle).’

*Iĉkôzîmîsnîñ yarîyî* furent traduits en latin par *genitus interioris oculis nostri ens*. L’œil intérieur c’est ‘oudjat’ – terme égyptien désignant une faculté attribuée à Horus, fils de dieu: celle de voir avec l’œil de l’esprit, dessiné dans les représentations artistiques sur la poitrine, et qui voit dans l’obscurité de la nuit; on a pour modèle le soleil nocturne, qui – dit-on – est vu par des sages porteurs de flammes spirituelles.

*/azâni ... ôlîndâ ujutmadi/*: La traduction latine interlinéaire de cette expression est: *In morte sua non permisit obdormire*. Selon la croyance chrétienne, l’Homme depuis la chute du couple primordial – Adam et Eve – jusqu’à l’arrivée du Jésus, était condamné à une obscurité éternelle et c’est Jésus qui l’a sauvé.

Mais on peut tout aussi bien l’interpréter comme la très ancienne représentation de l’homme androgynal, qui dans la mythologie grecque se présente comme la fable d’Ouranus (le Ciel, le Père) et Gaïa (la Terre, la Mère). Leurs enfants restaient enfermés dans le ventre de la terre et étaient donc condamnés à la mort (“dormir dans leur mort”) et à une nuit sans jour ils ont pu être sauvés par leur plus petit frère Cronos, qui, sur le conseil de leur mère Gaïa, a mutilé leur père et a ainsi permis à tous d’atteindre la vie et le jour.

13 *Awe Mariya kîm bîzgä*

*urux tuûwrup-sen asîya;*

*barĉamîs d(a) andan başqa*

*teyîşlî edîk tas bolmaya (→ bolmaqya)*

‘Ave, Marie! Tu nous as accouché d’un rejeton; sans lui nous serions tous condamnés à la pétification (→ perdition).’

Notes: *tas* (variante de *taş*) *bolmaya* est traduit supplémentamment en latin par *omnes nos quidem astricti ad perdicionem*. Cette traduction fut acceptée par Radloff (1887: 94): “Alle haetten wir ohne ihn / Ausgeschlossen vom Heile sein muessen.” et Drimba (1973: 266, 277): “sans lui nous serions tous destinés à la perdition”. *Tas bolmaya* se rapporte à

une étape de l'histoire de l'humanité, où l'accouchement difficile pouvait aboutir à la pétrification de l'homme dans le ventre maternel.

14 *Awe kímniñ termäsindä*  
*yalyz qonuptur Mišixa,*  
*aypsız anda kímni qıldı,*  
*meñi tauwya ayındırdı.*

“Ave, (celle,) dans le sanctuaire (= ventre maternel) de qui seul le Messie a habité (et se trouvant là,) a rendu immaculée celle-ci et l’a élevée sur la montagne éternelle.”

Notes: Nous nous arrêtons sur cette strophe pour indiquer que les anciens termes *termä* et *meñi tauw* et l’expression *meñi tauwya ayındır-* se sont adaptés aux exigences de la nouvelle religion.

Entre *meñi tauw* chamanique et la montagne sacrée chrétienne il y a une différence. La montagne sacrée chrétienne est mythique, et aucun mortel ne peut y aller. Tandis que *meñi tauw* chamanique est réelle. Elle est vénérée comme le royaume des esprits et des ancêtres. C’est là que les chamanistes font leurs cérémonies religieuses et cultuelles. Mais cette montagne sacrée est interdite aux femmes. Et si l’on constate qu’une femme a transgressé cette interdiction, on change de mont. Mais ici la Vierge Marie, femme exceptionnelle, selon la croyance chrétienne, a le droit de monter sur la montagne éternelle. On voit que la strophe est le produit des deux traditions – chamanique et chrétienne. C’est ainsi qu’entendrait le traducteur turk et se ferait entendre à ses proches claniques.

Ainsi, *termä* primitivement une cabane chamanique et un habitat hémisphérique, sur le modèle du ciel, et en Inde *Mandapa* ‘tente’, initialement, simple abri, deviennent: *termä* le nom du sanctuaire et *Mandapa* un élément du temple hindou.

18 *Awe qız, kímniñ kertegı*  
*kündey yarıxtır ham isı;*  
*Kristus küyöwnı qondurdıñ ~ qondırdıñ,*  
*barčalarnı sówındurdıñ ~ sówındırdıñ.*

Nous y cherchons deux variantes: *küyöw* correspond une fois au latin *tabernaculum* ‘sanctuaire’ et une autre fois le même terme fut retraduit en latin par *sponsus* ‘marié’. Ainsi, variante 1 – notre traduction:

‘Ave, Vierge, dont le *kertek* (lit nuptial au baldaquin primitif) est clair comme le jour et chaud; tu y as hébergé Christ – lieu (*ou* maison) d’adoration et (par là) tu (nous) as tous réjouis.’

Pour *kertek* v. Mollova (1987: 31, no. 20).

La strophe 18 de l’original latin:

*Ave de cuius intimo  
Christus processit thalamo,  
in sole tabernaculum  
fixit, qui regit saeculum.*

Symboliquement on se trouve encore devant le ventre maternel, clair comme le jour et chaud, et Jésus est comparé au sanctuaire-lieu d’adoration ou de passion qui régit les générations.

En partant du lat. *in sole tabernaculum fixit* ‘il a fixé le tabernacle dans le soleil’ nous estimons qu’il faut chercher dans *küyöüw* deux mots: *küy* et *öüw* ‘maison’. Que signifie *küy*? ‘\*adoration’ ou ‘\*passion’: *küyöüw* ‘lieu d’adoration (*ou* de passion), sanctuaire’(?); tatar de Kazan *küyäv bülmäsi* ‘chambre nuptiale [litt. chambre / coin séparé pour le marié (dans la yourte de la mariée)]’. La chambre nuptiale, lumineuse et chaude, c’est le ventre maternel de Marie. Marie a hébergé dans ce ventre Jésus qui est de Lui-même un lieu d’adoration. Cf. (kirg.) *küy* ‘1) komfort’, *zažitočnost* – Komfort, Wohlhabenheit; 2) *blagoprijatnyj slučaj* – eine günstige Gelegenheit; *küy-* (v) (Alt. Tel. Leb. Kir. Kkir.), qui à côté de ‘goret’ *sgoret* – brennen, verbrennen’, signifie encore ‘*vozgoret*’ *ljubov’ju* – in Liebe entbrennen; *mal küydü* (Kir.) ‘skot’ *xorošo udalsja* – das Vieh ist gut gerathen’ (Radloff 1911: 2, 1418).

Variante 2: Cela étant ainsi, une deuxième main a ajouté au dessus de *küyöüwní qondurdíñ* leur traduction latine *sponsum hospitata es* ‘tu as hébergé le jeune marié’. Avec cela on obtient une nouvelle interprétation de la strophe turke qui devient, selon Drimba (1973: 278):

“Je te salue, Vierge, dont la chambre nuptiale est lumineuse et chaude comme le soleil: tu (y) as hébergé le fiancé Christ et (par là) tu (nous) as tous réjouis.”

Nous y cherchons une comparaison analytique; notre traduction:

'Ave, Vierge, dont le *kertek* (lit nuptial au baldaquin primitif) est clair comme le jour et chaud; tu y as hébergé Christ tout comme un marié et tu (nous) as tous réjouis.'

La même image, avec les mêmes termes (*kertek* et *kuyouw*), se retrouve dans un autre hymne du CC, appelé *A solis ortus cardine* (strophe 12):

*Kertek ačmey ešikini*  
*kuyouw čiktı – sönäli!*  
*Bıs barčalarnı ündetti*  
*toyğa yurup urγ(u) uralı!*

'Le marié est sorti (= Jésus est né) sans ouvrir *kertek* (baldaquin du lit nuptial), ni (même) la porte (de la chambre nuptiale) – réjouissons-nous en! Il nous a fait crier tous (de joie) – allons au festin! battons les gros tambours de guerres!'

L'Homme venu de l'Orient, aurait du mal à comprendre la conception de Jésus par une simple Parole du Dieu (v. strophes 59, 60). Ici il chercherait à l'expliquer en partant du modèle de l'autocréation du soleil.

Selon une très ancienne croyance, le soleil est né sans être mis au monde par une mère et un père. On dit qu'il s'autocrée tous les matins et s'autodétruit tous les soirs. Et selon une variante de cette croyance, non seulement le soleil, mais aussi la lune sont nées sans être mis au monde par une mère.

Puisque Jésus est mis au monde par une mère, l'auteur de la traduction latine interlinéaire en question aurait cherché une troisième manière d'autocréation; une autocréation dans le ventre maternel!

La croyance en la naissance du soleil d'une mère serait connue des anciens Turks également. De l'expression turke *anasınıñ kōrū / kōrū* "homme très rusé (litt. l'aveugle de sa mère)" il suivrait de comprendre que le soleil du soir, devenu amoureux de sa propre beauté, et puni par l'aveuglement, tombe dans le ventre de sa mère qui est aussi un symbole de l'océan primordial. Donc seul un soleil aveugle (ou borgne) est capable d'engendrer sa mère par son esprit qu'il porte en soi.

Avec le temps, cette expression cosmologique, fut rapportée à la vie humaine et devenue vite tabou. Rappelons-nous la tragédie *Œdipe roi* de Sophocle!

Ainsi, pour le traducteur de l'hymne *kuyouw* est un 'lieu de passion; sanctuaire' et pour un lecteur de cet hymne le même terme signifiant le

jeune homme au lendemain de son mariage, comparé à un soleil, celui-ci a traduit *küyöüwní qondurdñ* par lat. *sponsum hospitata es*. De sorte que les deux variantes de notre hymne peuvent être expliquées et la strophe 12 de l'autre hymne devient claire.

/ur gurali/, translittéré bien par Kuun (1880: 217) qui y cherche *ur*, variante de *ir*, il le traduit par 'cantus' et *gurali*, transcrit, *guruli* 'canamus'; cf. kaz. *küylämäk* 'canere', *külmäk* etc. (ibid., note 1), fut corrigé par Radloff (1887:110) comme *yürçayalı*: *toyça yürüp yürçayalı* "zur Hochzeit wollen wir gehen und zechen."; Drimba (1973: 323, 325): *toyça yürüp yügüräli* "(car) il nous a tous mandés de courir au festin"; nous (Mollova 1987: 27, 29, 32 (no. 22)): *toyça yürüp ürçurali!* – "courons au festin et gagnons la grâce de Dieu (litt. faisons-nous bénir par Dieu)!"; Grønbech (1942: 266) "urgur-" – non transcrit; il renvoie à *jügür*- "laufen" Quryšžanov et alii (1978: 135) *urçur*- 'courir'. Maintenant nous y cherchons *urçu ur*- 'battre gros tambour', de *urçu* 'orudie, kotorym b'jut (arme – tambour)' (DTS – Maḥmūd al-Kāšyarī) et *ur*- 'battre'.

19 *Awe kímñíñ qurbaníní*  
*yauwlı kórup yarılıyadı*  
*teñu közkórdı öpkäsín*  
*qoyup beriptir alyışín.*  
 'Ave, (celle,) à qui (Dieu), trouvant le sacrifice très cher,  
 a eu pitié d'elle; (et) quittant sa colère très ouvertement visible,  
 a donné sa bénédiction (?).'

Les deux derniers vers de cette strophe sont discutables. Ils furent traduits différemment par les spécialistes.

Radloff (1887: 95):  
*tññ kös köñü öpkäsín*  
*quyup, bāriptur alyışín.*  
 "Seine ganz gerechten Zorn  
 Aufgebend, giebt er seinen Segen."

Drimba (1973: 278):  
 "Quittant sa colère entièrement justifiée, il nous a donné sa bénédiction."

Dans un autre article (Mollova 1992: 100) nous avons interprété la graphie que nous avons lu /teŋu-kózkórdɑ/ comme *teñu-kózkór(r)dä* et nous l'avons traduite par 'très visiblement; très ouvertement'; cf. tat. balk. *köz kórırde* id. Mais maintenant nous la lisons *teñu-kózkórdı* ou, comme les autres, *teñu-kózkónu* au sens de 'très ouvertement et équitablement', de *teñu* 'très' + *köz* 'œil; yeux' + *kónu* 'juste, équitable': *teñu kózkórdı* 'très ouvertement visible'(?).

Ce que nous ne comprenons pas ici c'est la colère soi-disant très visible et équitable de Jésus (Dieu)!

Dans la strophe latine (19) correspondante il n'est pas question de colère:

*Ave, cuius holocaustum  
pingue fuit atque castum  
soli Deo quae cantasti  
et in corde iubilasti.*

Alors il en suit de supposer que l'expression discutable fut ajoutée par le traducteur turk qui aurait du mal à comprendre la conception spirituelle de Jésus, qui étant tombé au commencement en colère, par la suite a acquiescé et a béni sa mère.

20 *Ave Mariya anamıs!*  
*Senı súp cın xanıms*  
*barčadan üşun (→ üstun → üsun) kóturdı,*  
*xanlık dačını keydirdı.*  
'Ave, Marie, notre mère! En t'aimant, notre vrai Roi t'a élevée au-dessus  
de tous et t'a posé sa couronne royale.'

Ce qui est à remarquer ici c'est la correction de /vsun/ en /vʃtun/ et en exponctuant le *t* une troisième main a restitué le /vʃun/. *üşun* d'*üstun* est connu, mais *üşun* pour nous est nouveau, probablement un régionalisme; cf. (Schor.) *üštü* 'plečo – Schulter' (Radloff 1911: 1907).

21 *Ave qız kımđän atasıs*  
*qurtley tuwıp beymıs Jesus*  
*burulıpturyan ılannı*  
*basıp sančtı (dayı öltirdı →) erksıs kıldı.*

‘Ave, Vierge! C’est d’elle qui est né sans père, comme un ver notre  
Seigneur Jésus qui a écrasé de ses pieds et a piqué le serpent tortillé (et  
l’a tué →) et l’a rendu impuissant.’

Notes: La première lettre de *sančtí* est détériorée. Kuun (1880: 275) y cherche un *j*: *jančtí* ‘contrivit’; Radloff (1887:95): *jancti* le laisse non traduit et ne l’introduit pas dans son *Versuch* (1911); Drimba (1973: 279): *yančtí*: *basip yančtí* ‘a écrasé de ses pieds (litt. en foulant)’; nous: *sančtí* ‘a piqué’.

La conception spirituelle de Jésus y est illustrée par deux cas d’auto-création: Celui du ver et celui du serpent. La position de l’auteur envers le premier est neutre, alors qu’envers le deuxième cas elle est ouvertement négative. Son modèle latin (strophe 21) dit:

*Ave, de cuius germine  
sine virili semine  
sicut vermis concipitur  
per quem serpens conteritur.*

22 *Awe Yessenin čibuyí!*  
*Tayaq bizgä sendän bítí.*  
*Egrímísní ol kóndurír ~ kóndírír,*  
*kučsísímísní koturír ~ kotírír.*  
‘Ave, ramille de Jésus! C’est de toi qu’a poussé un bâton pour nous. Il  
redresse les improbables parmi nous et soulève les impuissants parmi nous.’

Dans la traduction des deux derniers vers nous suivons Radloff (1887: 95) qui dit: “Der die Krummen unter uns grade macht, Der die Schwachen unter uns erhebt.” Alors que la traduction de Drimba (1973: 279) est basée sur la traduction latine interlinéaire: “Il redresse ce qui est de travers en nous et appuie ce qui est faible en nous.” = lat.: *curvum nostrum rectificat(,) infirmus nostrum sustentat*. Par bâton nous entendons l’axe universel vertical.

26 *Awe, kím atínä kôrä*  
*bu jähannín teńízínä*  
*batmaz yulduznı tuurdın,*  
*könülík yolın korguzdın.*

‘Ave, (toi) qui, étant digne de ton nom, as donné naissance à l’étoile qui ne submerge pas dans la mer de ce monde, et (qui nous) as montré la voie de la justice.’

Note: “L’étoile qui ne submerge pas dans la mer de ce monde” nécessite une petite explication: Selon l’ancienne croyance, les étoiles en se couchant, tombent dans les flots de la mer qui encercle la Terre. De même, le soleil, en se couchant, se transforme en une étoile, mais cette étoile ne tombe pas comme les autres, dans la mer. Donc on a en vue le Soleil qui est considéré immortel et on veut dire par cette comparaison que Jésus est immortel aussi, tout comme le Soleil.

27 *Awe qíz, kímniñ qoatí*  
*erdí arí tín mihirí;*  
*boyíñ anda čičeklenmíš*  
*Teñrí sendän qačan tuuwmíš.*

‘Ave, Vierge, dont la force a été le Saint-Esprit – son gage (*mihir* – terme islamique, litt. “garantie en pièces d’or qu’on enrégistre dans le contrat de mariage que le mari s’oblige à payer à sa femme en cas de divorce”); ton corps a fleuri lorsque Dieu est né de toi.’

Cf. turc *anasının nikâhını iste-* ‘demander des prix excessifs’.

Les deux premiers vers furent traduits autrement par Radloff (1887: 96):

“Ave Jungfrau, deren Kraft  
 Der Wunsch des heiligen Geistes war,”

Et par Drimba (1973: 280):

“Je te salue, Vierge, dont la force a été l’affection du Saint-Esprit;”

Note: Le vers *erdí arí tín mihirí* fut muni d’une traduction interlinéaire latine: *vigor erat spiritus sancti desiderium vel effectus* (Kuun 1880: 192). C’est cette interprétation que traduisent Radloff et Drimba.

28 *Awe, úníñ orıyananı,*  
*kórkíñ yeníptır Libannı,*



*kím bízím účun óltürüldí*  
*buzouwley anîñ anasí.*

‘Ave, toi, dont la voix a surpassé l’orgue et la beauté du Liban, tu es la mère de celui qui a été mis à mort comme un veau pour nous.’

Note: Ici on a une seule phrase complexe. Radloff et Drimba l’ont partagée en trois propositions indépendantes. La traduction de Radloff (1887: 96):

“Ave, deine Stimme hat ihn geschlagen,  
 Deine Schönheit hat übertroffen den Libanon;  
 Der unseretwegen getödtet wurde  
 Wie ein Kalb, dessen Mutter bist du.”

Dans la Bible (Ezéchiel 31: 2-3, 8-10) nous lisons: “Le Pharaon est comparé à un cèdre du Liban ... Parmi les nuages émerge sa cime ... aucun arbre au jardin de Dieu ne s’égalait en beauté ... Mais parce qu’il s’est enorgueilli de sa hauteur, je l’ai livré aux mains du prince des nations, pour qu’il le traite selon sa méchanceté; je l’ai détruit.” C’est de ce cèdre cosmique qu’il serait question dans le passage: “la voix a surpassé la beauté du Liban.”, c.-à-d. “la voix qui monte plus haut que le cèdre du Liban et qui le surpasse par sa beauté”.

35 *Awe qíz! elbeklígíndän*

*kím tílesä alír rayyan*

*susun janní, kím esírtír*

*ham aš tinní, kím tóydírír.*

‘Ave, Vierge! celui qui demande reçoit gratuitement de ta miséricorde (ou de ton abondance) de la boisson qui enivre l’esprit (litt. l’âme) et de la nourriture qui rassasie l’âme (litt. l’esprit).’

Notes: *Elbeklígíndän*. *Elbeklík* signifie ‘bonté; miséricorde’ (cf. kirg. *elpeklik* ‘vivacité, agilité, serviabilité, bienveillance’). Mais ce terme fut traduit en latin par: *de tua abundantia*. Dans l’original latin on a de même: *Ave domus ubertatis* (Drimba 1973: 292). Ainsi, ici *elbeklík* signifie ‘source d’abondance (de la boisson et de la nourriture)’. v. *sarxít* dans la strophe 69.

Interprétation de Radloff (1887: 97):

*Ave qız, ölbäkligiñdän*

*kim tiläsä alir raiyan,*

*susuz cannı kim äzirtir*

*häm ac tinnı kim toidırır.*

“Ave Jungfrau, von deinen Ueberflusse

Kann jeder Wunsch umsonst empfangen,

(Denn sie ist es) die die durstende Seele trinkt

Und die hungrige Seele sättigt.”

Traduction de Drimba (1973: 281) :

“Je te salue, Vierge! celui qui veut, reçoit gratuitement de ton abondance de la boisson qui enivre l'âme et de la nourriture qui rassasie l'esprit.”

Vásáry interprète les deux derniers vers à sa manière (1977: 53):

“A drink which intoxicates the soul, and satisfies the hungry soul.”

Ainsi, Radloff corrige *susun* en *susuz* ‘assoifé’, *aş* en *ac* ‘affamé’; Vášáry accepte *susun* pour ‘boisson’, mais corrige *aş* en *ač* ‘affamé’; il traduit *ǰannı* et *tinnı* par ‘soul’. Pour lui, *susun* est un substantif et *ač* un adjectif; le pronom relatif *kım* s’associe une fois à *susun* et une autre fois il ne joue aucun rôle; ainsi *susun* devient le sujet commun des deux propositions coordonnées. Tout cela est fortuit, traduit à la hâte.

Notes: 1) Pourquoi *kım* est placé après *ǰannı* et *tinnı*? Probablement pour des raisons de la césure: 4/4 syllabes, quoique dans l’hymne la place de la césure est respectée seulement lorsque les unités lexicales le permettent. C’est cette place de *kım* sans doute qui a donné raison à Radloff de prendre *susun* pour *susuz* et *aş* pour *ac* ‘affamé’. 2) Au point de vue de l’astrologie-théologie *ǰannı* et *tinnı* ont échangé leur place. On aurait attendu:

*susun, kım tinnı esirtir,*

*ham aş, kım ǰannı tıydırır.*

‘de la boisson qui enivre l’esprit et de la nourriture qui rassasie l’âme.’

C’est la traduction que nous proposons.

Dans la traduction des textes religieux du CC les traducteurs font bien distinction entre *tın* ‘esprit’ et *ǰan* ‘âme’. Les dieux, les esprits s’alimentent du “breuvage d’immortalité”, qui est le *soma* pour les divinités

de l'Inde et *nektar* pour Jupiter, le lait etc. Tandis que la nourriture s'offre aux âmes des mortels. Les Turcs, en mangeant un mets spécial, exquis, disent: *Ölmüşlerimizin janına deysin!* et, en adressant leurs prières aux esprits, disent: *Ölmüşlerimizin ruhuna fatiha!*

41 *Awe Mariya, kım Teñrîñ*  
*köruwsap sen susadın,*  
*muradına endi teydin,*  
*yüzün körä oltrup-turđın.*

'Ave, Marie, qui, désirant voir ton Dieu, as été assoiffée (de lui): maintenant tu as obtenu ce que tu désirais et voyant son visage, tu l'as contemplé longuement.'

Notes: Cette strophe est construite sur deux types différents. Les deux premiers vers – sur le type: 7 syllabes, avec la césure entre la quatrième et la troisième syllabes (type 7: 4/3) et les deux derniers vers – sur le type 8: 4/4.

Dans le Codex l'apostrophe est employée comme signe d'abréviation pour: *r, ar, er, ír, ur, úr, ru, rü, rí, re, ra*. Ici elle est pour un *r* (et pour un *ur*). Pour un *r*, exigé par l'isosyllabisme. Radloff (1887: 99) a fait de /olt'upt'din/ *olturduñ: yüzün körä olturduñ* "sein Antlitz schauend sitzt du da"; Drimba (1973: 270, 282) a pris l'apostrophe pour un *ur*, ce qui déforme le vers: 9: 4/5. Chez lui: *yüzün körä olturup-turđın* "voyant sa face, tu t'es assise".

42 *Awe yarıñnıñ anası,*  
*kım tuurur ata Teñrî;*  
*yollarıñnı ol bawladı → başladı,*  
*meñuluk tauwya yetkirdi.*

'Ave, mère de la lumière qu'engendre Dieu le père; (les liens de ton âme-destinée étant rompus) c'est Lui qui les a reliés (au ciel et t'as sauvée de la mort éternelle) → c'est Lui qui a mené tes destinées et t'a fait parvenir à la montagne éternelle.'

Notes: Radloff (1887: 99): *yollarıñnı ol bawladı* "Deine Wege hat er gebunden"; Drimba (1973: 282): *yollarıñnı ol başladı* "il a préparé tes voies". Mais là il y a deux verbes qui reflètent deux croyances différentes. Selon la croyance chamanique, chaque personne a trois âmes essentielles: Une âme-ombre, une âme corporelle et une troisième, l'âme-

destinée. La première se trouve à l'intérieur de la personne vivante. Elle peut quitter le corps de celle-ci et errer là où elle désire. Par cette séparation de l'âme du corps s'explique le fait que l'homme se voit dans le songe, voyage dans les pays inconnus et qu'il converse avec des gens qu'il n'a jamais connus.

L'âme corporelle ne quitte jamais le corps tant que l'homme est vivant.

L'âme-destinée se trouve hors du corps de l'homme. Des liens invisibles la lient à la divinité des Cieux et la destinée de l'homme se trouve dans les mains de cette divinité. Si la divinité rompt le lien-destinée, alors l'homme meurt. Parfois le chaman, avec la permission de cette divinité, peut lier le lien rompu et sauver ainsi l'homme de la mort. Anisimov (1958: 61-63) rapporte ces informations en parlant des Evenques. Elles seraient également valables pour les anciens Turks.

C'est cette croyance que nous cherchons dans l'expression *yollarıñnı ol bawladı*. Dans le chamanisme c'est le chaman-messager qui lie les liens rompus, dans le texte chrétien du Codex c'est Jésus qui accomplit ce rôle. Et en plus c'est Jésus qui y apparaît comme la divinité même des liens. Car le verbe *bawladı* fut traduit en latin supplémentairement par *disposuit* 'il dispose de'. Cette divinité, selon la croyance des Turks, serait ce qu'ils appelaient *Yol Teñrı* 'dieu de la route' ou 'Dieu de la chance'; *yol* 'route; chance'.

Mais, voilà qu'une main a corrigé *bawladı* en *başladı*, de *başla-* 'mener; conduire': *yollarıñnı ol başladı* 'c'est Lui (Jésus) qui a mené tes destinées'; cf. turk oriental *but degen insa:nnı xuda:dın ajrıp ebedi ottın qutulmajdurıan jollæ başlap baræ durıan ba:ıl bir neme dur ...* "That (thing) which is called *but* (idol) is a wrong thing which has separated man from God and leads him onto a road from which he will not be saved from the eternal fire." (Jarring 1991: 11, 15).

53 *Awe, kım enç kōñülindän*

*Teñrıgä kōturdıñ qurban*

*öz bauwursaqıñ Jesusnı,*

*bıznı tırgızmekgä öldı.*

'Ave, (toi,) qui de bon gré as offert à Dieu en sacrifice ton fils chéri (litt. tes propres entrailles), Jésus, (qui) est mort pour nous rendre vivants (litt. pour nous ressusciter).'

Notes: Il nous semble qu'après *Yesusní* il devait avoir un pronom relatif (*kím* 'qui') ou un pronom personnel (*ol* 'il') qui serait omis pour des raisons métriques. *Bízní tǵǵzmeġǵä* est muni d'une traduction latine interlinéaire: *nos ad vivificandos*. C'est cette traduction latine que traduisent Radloff 1887: 101 ("um uns lebendig zu machen") et Drimba 1973: 284) ("pour nous rendre vivants"). Mais le traducteur turk se serait servi d'une expression basée sur l'idée de la réincarnation, reconnue surtout en Inde.

55 *Awe kónülük auwālǵ!*

*Kónü egeč oyluñ öldi.*

*Sóuñġaysen soñġu kundä*

*oylıñ → oyluñ öcín qačan alsa.*

'Ave, toi, principe de la justice! bien qu'étant juste, ton fils est mort;  
(mais) te réjouirais-tu au dernier jour (de jugement) si ton fils tirait vengeance (de sa mort)?'

Notes: Le premier vers est composé sur le type: 7: 4/3, les autres sur le type: 8: 4/4; cf. strophe 41.

Nous traduisons *sóuñġaysen* et *alsa* par des verbes au conditionnel: Le poète aurait souhaité que Jésus se venge du mal que les autres Lui ont causé, mais il n'en est pas sûr.

Radloff (1887: 101) traduit les deux derniers vers par:

"Erfreuen wirst du dich in späteren Tagen,

Wenn dein Sohn seine Rache nehmen wird."

Drimba (1973: 285):

"(mais) tu te réjouiras au dernier jour, quand ton fils tirera vengeance (de sa mort)."

59 *Awe, kím bolmıšsen aar*

*ana, kím Teñgrıdän tuwar*

*sözley: alay bızgä teydı*

*ten keyınıp Teñrı sózı.*

'Ave, (toi,) qui es devenue mère de celui qui est né (engendré) de Dieu par le verbe: ainsi le Verbe de Dieu en s'incarnant (litt. en se revêtant de corps) nous a été donné comme présent.'

Traduction de Radloff (1887:102):

“Ave, die du ihm eine Mutter  
Gewesen, von der Gott geboren,  
In der Rede ist so zu uns gekommen  
Gottes Wort, indem es sich in einen Körper kleidete.”

Traduction de Drimba (1973: 285):

“Je te salue, (toi,) qui es devenue mère de (litt. à) celui qui est engendré  
par Dieu comme un mot: ainsi est arrivé à nous, en s’incarnant (litt. en  
se revêtant de corps), le Verbe de Dieu.”

Note: L’expression *Teñrí sôzí ten keyín*- ‘le verbe de Dieu se revêtir du corps’ est peut-être forgée par le traducteur; v. Mollova 1993: 137, où nous disons: “Avec ce terme (*et’öz/etez*) on exprime l’unité de deux corps, matériel et spirituel, où l’âme et la matière sont prises pour des substances identiques.” V. encore la strophe 60.

M. E. Tryjarski, qui a eu l’amabilité de lire le manuscrit de cet article, nous écrit: “‘le verbe de Dieu se revêtir de corps’ – c’est une expression incompréhensible et bizarre. Plutôt: ‘se revêtir de corps (en parlant du Verbe de Dieu, c.- à-d. de la deuxième personne de la Sainte-Trinité)’. Cette expression est sûrement “forgée par le traducteur”, comme vous le dites, mais il l’a fait très bien!”

60 *Awe saa, kím Teñrígä*

*janín ham tenín hämäšä → hämäzä*

*susapturup içíptírsen,*

*etezgä síñríptírsen.*

‘Ave, toi, qui as bu (l’amour) de Dieu, dont ton âme et ton corps ont toujours été assoiffés, et l’as absorbé dans le corps.’

Traduction de Drimba (1973: 286):

“Salut à toi, car ton âme et ton corps ayant toujours été assoiffés de Dieu, tu l’as absorbé dans le (= ton) corps.”

Note: L’expression *etezgä síñír*- ‘absorber dans le corps’ serait, peut-être de nouveau, forgé par le traducteur, qui connaîtrait bien *etez* – terme bouddhique, brahmanique, manichéen, composé de: *et* ‘1) chair; 2) corps; 3) essence, substance, nature’; anc. tk. *äd* ‘Materie, Wert, Güter’

+ öz ‘selbst, eigen, Körper, Leben, Person, das Selbst’ (von Gabain 1950: 323, 353).

65 *Awe sen! tauw̄larnĩn tauw̄í!*

*sendän kışĩ kesmeyn → kesmey sındĩ.*

*Tauw̄ya taş → Taş tauw̄ya, kım bítíp östí*

*kók yerní barča tolturdí → toltírdí.*

‘Ave, toi qui es la montagne des montagnes! (Le rameau) s’est brisé de toi sans que l’Homme l’aie taillé. La pierre, qui a surgi de la montagne et a grandi, a complètement rempli le ciel et la terre.’

Note: *Tauw̄ya taş* fut corrigé en *taş tauw̄ya*. Radloff (1887: 103): *tauya taş* “die Steine, die zum Berge”; Drimba (1973: 273, 287): *tawya taş ~ (taş tawya) kım bitip östi* “la pierre qui a surgi et a grandi sur la montagne”.

Pourquoi cette correction? C’est parce que le correcteur reconnaît la priorité à la pierre. Car selon la très ancienne tradition, lors de la création Dieu jeta de son Trône une pierre précieuse dans l’abîme; un bout s’enfonça dans l’abîme, l’autre émergea du chaos. Ce bout forma un point, qui commença à s’étendre, créant ainsi l’étendue, et le monde fut établi dessus; ce fut la pierre fondamentale (de Champeaux 1976: 202). Selon une croyance attestée chez les Grecs, après le déluge les hommes naqurent de pierres semées par un Dieu. l’Homme naissant de la pierre se trouve dans les traditions sémites et certaines légendes chrétiennes en font même naître le Christ (Chevalier & Gheerbrant 1990: Pierre). D’après cette strophe la première variante exprime une étape plus avancée de la création, car dans les premiers vers de la strophe Marie est comparée à la montagne des montagnes. La version corrigée s’allie surtout au dernier vers de la strophe analysée ici: Jésus est la pierre fondamentale; c’est de lui qu’ont pris naissance le ciel et la terre.

68 *Awe, kimgä yaş yaşındän*

*us ouwretmíš Teñrí tuuwr̄yan → tuuwr̄yan*

*sóz, kım aníñ kóp tañlarín*

*ayte bíllipsen, barčasín.*

‘Ave, (toi,) à qui le Verbe géniteur de Dieu a enseigné, depuis son âge tendre, la sagesse, de sorte que tu as pu annoncer beaucoup de ses miracles, (même) tous.’

Note: Par une exponctuation *tuuŭryan* fut corrigé en *tuuŭryan* (v. Drimba 1973: 274). Cette correction peut être expliquée de deux manières: 1) On a ici un phénomène phonétique – chute de *r* devant une consonne – trait caractéristique au turk du CC (Mollova 1990: 157); 2) on peut y chercher un phénomène lexico-sémantique: Le verbe *tuw-* signifiant à la fois ‘naître’ et ‘mettre au monde’; cf. *tuymas* ‘sterile Frau’ (Menges 1973: 12).

Radloff (1973: 103): *tāñri tūryan söz* “das von Gott erzeugte Wort”; Drimba (1973: 274, 287): *teñri tuŭryan söz* “le Verbe géniteur de Dieu”.

69 *Awe kimgä yamŭrleyin*  
*soyurŭal yawdī Teñridin*  
*anča čaqlī, kīm bu jahan*  
*toldī barča sarχītīndān.*

‘Ave, (toi,) sur laquelle la grâce est tombée en abondance comme une pluie, à tel point que ce monde s’est rempli entièrement de ta surabondance (ou de tes *sarχīt* “nourriture et boisson restées d’une cérémonie organisée avec des morceaux de viande qui se jettent aux feux rituels et de la boisson qui se verse sur ces feux”).’

*Sarχīt* fut traduit supplémentairement en latin par *residuum* ‘reste’, ce qui est aussi juste. *Sarχīt* ‘abondance, surabondance’ et ‘reste(s), relief(s)’. Originellement *sarχīt* est le repas (boisson et nourriture) offert aux esprits, dieux, par le moyen du feu, dont la fumée sert de véhicule et le transporte aux destinataires célestes. Le reste de *sarχīt* est consommé par les mortels. Etant considéré comme béni des esprits, ce repas (ce reste) devient le symbole d’abondance. V. encore la strophe 35.

Ligeti (1973: 154, 161), en étudiant mong. *bilegür*, tibétain *Ihag-ma* “l’exédent, les restes de la viande de sacrifice”, cite ouïg. *qalınču*, mong. *sarqud* ‘les restes de la boisson de sacrifice’; chez Pelliot ce dernier mot signifie ‘boisson de sacrifice’. Ligeti cite encore tk. *sarχīt* du CC, *sarqūt*, *sarqut* ‘restes de boisson (et de nourriture) des repas offerts à des invités distingués’ et déclare: “Le mot turc devait appartenir à la terminologie de sacrifice” (v. encore Mollova 1993: 126-129).

Chez les anciens Alévîs, même l’eau de l’ablution d’un saint ne se jette pas. Dans l’histoire de Hacı Bektaş Veli, Kadıncık ana – la bonne femme –, qui a hébergé ce chef alévî, ne jette pas cette eau et la boit. Le nez du Saint pendant l’ablution ayant saigné et cette femme ayant de



nouveau bu cette eau, elle tombe enceinte. Dans cette fable on peut chercher la croyance en la conception par le sang viril.<sup>2</sup>

Traduction de Radloff (1887: 104):

“Ave dir, zu der wie ein Regen  
Freude von Gott herabfloss,  
So lange bis diese Welt  
Erfüllt war von deinem Ueberflusse.”

Celle de Drimba (1973: 287):

“Je te salue, (toi,) sur laquelle la grâce est descendue (litt. a plu) de Dieu, comme une pluie, jusqu’à ce que ce monde se soit entièrement rempli de tes restes.”

71 *Ave, saa, kôknîñ kôrkî*

*dunyanîñ sen tîrekî,*

*ôktemnîñ müzîn sîndîrîyan,*

*mizkin(n)î → miskin(n)î baxtîya teyîrîyan.*

“Ave, toi, beauté du ciel, colonne du monde, qui as brisé les cornes de l’orgueilleux et qui as fait toucher les misérables à la félicité (éternelle).”  
(traduction de Drimba; chez lui: la corne).

<sup>2</sup> En voilà la fable:

“Hacı Bektaş Veli – Kadıncık ana.

Kadıncık’ın âdetiydi, Hunkâr, abdest alsa, yemekten sonra ellerini yıkasa o suyu, hemen içerdi. Bir gün Hunkâr abdest alırken burnu kanadı. Kadıncık, dedi, bu suyu ayak değmiyecek bir yere dök. Kadıncık leğeni kaldırıp götürdü. Şimdiye kadar o tertemiz suyu içerdim, bunu ne diye dökeyim, hayırlısı bu, tiksirmeden bunu da içeyim dedi.

Hunkâr Kadıncık’ın yüzüne baktı, bu hal, malûm olmuştu zaten kendisine, Kadıncık dedi, bu suyu da içtin mi? Kadıncık, erenlere ne malûm değil, erenlerden artanın bir yudumunu bile dökecek yer bulamadım, ancak karnımı buldum dedi.

Hunkâr, Kadıncık dedi, bizden umduğun nasibi aldın; senden iki oğlumuz gelecek adımızla, onlar, yurdumuzun oğlu olacak, halkın 70 yaşındakileri, onların 7 yaşında olanının elini öpsünler ...” (Gölpınarlı 1958: 64-65)

Note: *Öktemniñ müzín sındıryan* '(toi) qui as brisé les cornes de l'orgueilleux'. Cette expression est munie d'une traduction latine interlinéaire: *superbi cornu quae confregisti*.

Ici *müzí* fut traduit par Grønbech et Drimba au singulier. En voilà un exemple typique pour le rôle négatif des traductions latines interlinéaires dans le Codex Cumanicus! Car, selon une typicité des langues turkes, dans un contexte un substantif peut être pris aussi bien au singulier qu'au pluriel, et ici il fallait traduire *müzí* au pluriel. S'il était au singulier on aurait indiqué laquelle des deux cornes se brise (la corne gauche – côté solaire)? Tryjarski nous a procuré une sentence biblique, où 'cornua' est au pluriel: *Et omnia cornua peccatorum confringam* (Ps. 75: 10). Nous le remercions bien.

Ainsi, dans la Bible il est question de casser les cornes des pécheurs et dans notre hymne – de l'orgueilleux. C'est Jésus qui casse les cornes de l'orgueilleux qui est le représentant du mal, le Diable. Dans l'iconographie turke *Erlik*, dieu des enfers, a une tête de bœuf. Et à l'origine, l'animal aux cornes à casser fut précisément le bœuf, le taureau, ou le buffle.

On dit que le Bœuf céleste est luni-solaire. Cela veut dire que le Bœuf représente à la fois les deux principes: Solaire, masculin et lunaire, féminin. La Lune, planète froide et humide, symbolise les six mois de l'hiver, et le Soleil, planète chaude et sèche, les six mois d'été. En hiver c'est la Lune qui regne, en été c'est le Soleil. L'équinoxe de printemps marque la fin du regne lunaire et le commencement de celui du Soleil. C'est le Bœuf (Taureau) zodiacal.

Casser les cornes du Taureau c'est déclarer l'arrivée de la belle saison, et reconnaître la suprématie du Soleil par rapport à la Lune.

Or l'image de la Lune c'est le croissant, représenté par les cornes du Taureau. Apis, la Vache céleste des Egyptiens, a une marque blanche en forme de croissant de Lune sur l'épaule droite, côté lunaire; il est consacré à la Lune. Le scarabée à cornes du Taureau est aussi consacré à la Lune.

"Mais je crois" – dit Dupuis (1795, 2: 108b) – "que les cornes du scarabée qui offrent dans cet insecte une image sur la terre des cornes, que la lune dans son croissant présente à nos yeux dans le ciel, donnent l'origine de cette consécration, comme les cornes de cette même planète ont donné lieu au choix du Taureau, pour signe de son exaltation. La tradition sacrée, sur la génération d'Apis, confirme les rapports imaginés par les prêtres entre le bœuf sacré et la lune. Plutarque disoit qu'Apis

naissait d'une vache qui, au moment du coït, éprouvait l'action de l'influence de la lune, lorsqu'elle répand une lumière féconde sur la terre, et que c'est à cause de cela, qu'on trouve sur Apis beaucoup de marques, qui ont trait aux phases de la lune. Cette vache l'a conçu par l'action du feu céleste, dont elle est frappée. Sémélé, frappée de la foudre de Jupiter, met au monde Bacchus."

Le thème de casser les cornes du Taureau est assez bien étudié sur le plan astronomique-calendrique et artistique. Ainsi, Eliade (1963: 316-317) dit: "The origin common to both groups of ceremonies—the display of the Maypole (May 'pouvoir' [notre note]) and the beginning of a new 'time'—can be clearly seen in quite a number of traditions. In some places for instance, the custom is to 'kill' the May King, who represents vegetation and stimulates its growth." Volčok (1982: 67-68), en étudiant l'histoire du Roi aux cornes de Buffle dans l'iconographie protoindienne, écrit: "Esli verxovnyj bog-bujvol iz pečati javljaetsja bogom-pokrovitelem 12-letnego cikla Jupitera, to tak skazat', po usloviju ritual žertvoprinošenija bujvola ("ubijstvo bujvola") dolžen znamenovat' načalo goda, a takže cikla let. U protoindijcev dva načala goda: S osennego ravnodenstvija (po bolee drevnemu, trexsezonnomu kalendarju) i s letnego solncestojanija (po šestisezonnomu kalendarju)."



Le Roi aux cornes de Buffle  
(iconographie protoindienne)

Le Roi y est entouré de quatre Vivants: Le Tigre, l'Eléphant, le Rhinocéros et le Buffle, représentants de quatre saisons.

Roux, en analysant les reliefs d'Aghthamar et la peinture de Samarra sur le même sujet, où un personnage, le genou droit posé sur le sol, saisit, un taureau par les deux cornes et le contraint à baisser la tête, y cherche un rite chamanique de "verser le sang qui contient l'âme". Roux (1971: 194, 201) estime que ce rite est imposé à l'iconographie abbaside

et arménienne par les Turcs. L'immolation réelle du taureau, la tauromachie etc. sont des aspects différents de ce rite. V. encore *buzouwley* dans la strophe 28.

76 *Awe Yesusnîñ anasnä,*  
*awe ananîñ öylünä!*  
*Alyış bîzgä ol kîm bersîn*  
*öwğän anasî (→ öwđîrgän ana) yalbarsîn!*  
*Alay bolsun!*  
 'Ave, Mère de Jésus, ave Fils de la Mère! Que la chère maman bénie (→  
 Que la mère qui s'est faite bénir) (le) prie de nous donner sa bénédiction.  
 Ainsi soit-il!'

Notes: Nous traduisons *anasî* par 'maman', forme affective, spéciale; cf. dans un autre hymne du Codex Cumanicus: *Owluma bol dep – anasî!* "Sois maman de mon fils!" (Mollova 1987: 26, 23).

*Öwğän anasî*, corrigé, devient *öwđîrgän ana*. Kuun (1880: 258): *övgâ anasi*; Radloff (1887: 105): *övgän anasina yalbarsîn* "Möge flehen zu seiner geliebten Mutter!"; Drimba (1973: 275, 289): *öwdürgän ana yalbarsîn* "Que sa mère bénie prie". Dans une note il reconnaît seulement qu'un *d* fut ajouté à *öwgän*. Chez lui *öwğän anasî* furent omis.

La dernière phrase de cette strophe nous paraît renversée; le pronom relatif *kîm* est placé à l'intérieur de la proposition circonstancielle de but, au lieu d'être au commencement:

*öwğän anasî (...) yalbarsîn*  
*kîm ol bîzgä alyış bersîn!*

77 *Awe oğul, awe ana,*  
*awe sen üstungî ata!*  
*kîmnî köktäğî hazîzlär*  
*öwer ham barča fristälär → uçmaqlı tînlär.*  
 "Ave, Fils, ave, Mère, ave, toi, Père suprême que louent les saints du  
 ciel et tous les anges → les esprits du paradis." (Traduction de Drimba,  
 1973: 289.)

Note: Dans la mythologie chamanique turke, la notion d'ange faisant défaut, le premier traducteur s'est servi d'un persisme: *Fristä* (avec un *s*). Et un autre, le trouvant obscur, a ajouté un mot composé, forgé peut-

être par lui *učmaqlı tın* littéralement ‘esprit du paradis’. Dans la Première partie du Codex Cumanicus le mot latin *angelus* fut traduit en turk (et en persan) par *frısta* et encore par un nom composé turk: *elčinga* ou *elčın̄ya* ‘messagère (litt. sœur-messagère)’ probablement d’une divinité masculine. Car selon le système binaire, la divinité féminine a son messager et la divinité masculine sa messagère (v. Mollova 1993: 133-135).

### Conclusion

Ainsi, ayant poursuivi le but de chercher et d’essayer d’expliquer certains traits culturels (astrologiques, chamaniques, bouddhiques, islamiques etc.), adaptés aux exigences chrétiennes dans certains strophes de l’hymne “Ave Porta Paradisi”, il nous est arrivé de constater encore:

(1) Qu’il y aurait des termes et expressions, forgés par les traducteurs: *Teñrí sôzı ten keyın-* ‘le Verbe de Dieu se revêtir du corps’ (strophe 59); *etezgä sñır-* ‘absorber dans le corps’ (strophe 60); *učmaqlı tın* ‘ange (litt. esprit du paradis)’ (strophe 77);

(2) et que certaines graphies devaient être lues et traduites autrement. Ce sont: *sanč-* ‘piquer; aiguillonner’ (strophe 21); *urγ(u) ur-* ‘battre gros tambour de guerre’ et *küyóuŋ* ‘lieu (maison) d’adoration (ou de passion); sanctuaire’ (?) (variante 1 de la strophe 18).

### Bibliographie

- Andreas, F. C. 1914. Nachwort à l’article de Bang 1914, 74-78.  
 Anisimov, Arkadij Feodorovič 1958. *Religija évenkov*. Moskva, Leningrad: Akademija Nauk.  
 Asım, Necib 1916. Kıpçak Türkçesine dair. *Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 1:4, 381-383.  
 Bang, Willy 1911. Beiträge zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus. *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres de l’Académie Royale de Belgique* 1, 13-38.  
 Bang, Willy 1914. Der Komanische Marienpsalter nebst seiner Quelle herausgegeben. In: Bang, W. & Markwart, J. (eds.) *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*. (Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Neue Folge 13: 1.) Berlin: Weidmann. 239-276.  
 Çağatay, Saadet 1944. Codex Cumanicus sözlüğünün basılışı dolayısıyla. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 2:5, 764.  
 Champeaux, Guillaume de 1976. *Introduction au monde des symboles*. Paris: Zodiaque.

- Chevalier, Jean & Gheerbrant, Alain 1990. *Dictionnaire des symboles*. Paris: Robert Laffont.
- Drimba, Vladimir 1973. *Syntaxe comane*. București: Editura Academiei, Leiden: Brill.
- Dupuis, Charles-François 1796. *Origine de tous les cultes ou religion universelle*. Paris: Agasse.
- Eliade, Mircea 1963. *Patterns in comparative religion*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing.
- von Gabain, Annemarie 1950. *Alttürkische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Porta Linguarum Orientalium.
- von Gabain, Annemarie 1954. Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* 1. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 243-251.
- Grønbech, Kaare 1942. *Komanisches Wörterbuch. Türkischer Wortindex zu "Codex Cumanicus"*. Kopenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki 1958. *Vilâyet-Nâme. Menâkıb-ı Hunkâr Hacı Bektaş Veli*. İstanbul: İnkılâp kitabevi.
- Jarring, Gunnar 1991. *Culture clash in Central Asia: Islamic views on chinese theatre. Eastern Turki texts. Edited with translation, notes and vocabulary*. (Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis.) Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Kenesbaev, Smet K. & Kuryšžanov, Abžan K. 1964. O novom izdanii "Codex Cumanicus" v Kazaxstane. *Izvestija Akademii Nauk Kazaxskoj SSR, Serija obščestvennyx nauk* 3, 35-45.
- Kowalski, Tadeusz 1928. À propos du Codex Cumanicus, fol. 69, 9-10. *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 6, 210-215.
- Kuryšžanov, Abžan Q. & Žubanov, Askar Q. & Belbotaev, Almasbek B. 1978. *Kumanša-qazaqša žiılık sözdiik*. Almaty.
- Kuun, Geza 1880. *Codex Cumanicus bibliothecae ad templum Divi Marci Venetiarum*. Budapest: Academia Hungarica.
- Ligeti, Louis 1973. Le sacrifice offert aux ancêtres dans "L'Histoire secrète". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 27/2, 145-161.
- Menges, Karl Heinrich 1976. *Volkskundliches Sprachmaterial aus Ost-Türkistan* 1. Leipzig.
- Mollova, Mefküre 1987. Sur un hymne du Codex Cumanicus. *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 45: 2, 25-33.

- Mollova, Mefküre 1990. Codex Cumanicus, le bouddhisme et le turk oriental. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 80, 141-165.
- Mollova, Mefküre 1992. Sur certains mots comans et persans dans le "Codex Cumanicus". *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 48: 1 (1992), 83-127.
- Mollova, Mefküre 1993. Nouveaux côtés dévoilés du Codex Cumanicus. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 83, 117-148.
- Munkácsi, Bernhard 1915. Conte-rendu de Bang 1914. *Keleti Szemle* 15 (1914-1915), 326-330.
- Németh, Julius 1916. Zu den "Osttürkischen Dialektstudien" von Willy Bang und Josef Marquart. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 70, 447-448.
- Radloff, Wilhelm 1887. *Das türkische Sprachmaterial des Codex Cumanicus*. (Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VIIe série, 35: 6, 91-105.) St. Pétersbourg.
- Radloff, Wilhelm 1893-1911. *Opyt slovarja tjurkskix narečij* [Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte] 1-4. StPeterburg.
- Roux, Jean-Paul 1971. Le Taureau maîtrisé, recherches sur l'iconographie médiévale du Proche-Orient. *Syria* 48, 187-201.
- Vásáry, Istvan 1977. Susun and süsun in Middle Turkic texts. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31, 51-54.
- Volčok, B. J. 1982. K probleme interpretacii protoindijskix izobraženij i simbolov. *Sovetskaja étnografija* 1982/3, 54-69.
- Zaleman, Karl G. 1910. Zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus. *Izvestija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk* 944-945, 949-950.

# Spoken Turkish: Synchronic and diachronic aspects

Jurij V. Ščeka

Ščeka, Jurij V. 1999. Spoken Turkish: Synchronic and diachronic aspects. *Turkic Languages* 3, 241-271.

The study of spoken Turkish seems to be lagging behind the study of such spoken Indo-European languages as English, French, German and Russian. Spoken language, being different in many basic features from the written form, should be considered as a functional variety of standard (literary, normative) language. Therefore, it is deeply incorrect to treat the peculiarities of spoken Turkish as deviations from certain rules observed in the written form and regarded as the only correct ones. The subsystem of standard spoken Turkish comprises all levels: phonetics, morphology, syntax, etc., and shows a great richness of forms and shades of meaning. The study of spoken Turkish is important both synchronically and diachronically. The classes of spoken constructions and models represent and illustrate basic features of the development of grammatical categories in Turkic and Altaic languages. Spoken language is an important and indispensable basis for the reconstruction of parent forms of protolanguages and of their semantics.

*Jurij V. Ščeka, Institute for Afro-Asian Studies, Turcology, Moscow University, 11 Mokhovaya St., 103911 Moscow, Russia.*

In spoken Turkish as it is reflected in modern fiction, one can find a large number of whole passages where no grammatical affixes are used:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| – <i>Bilmem ama, korkuyorum.</i>                      | – ‘I don’t know, but I’m afraid.                                 |
| – <i>İçip sarhoş olmaktan mı?</i>                     | – Of drinking and being drunk?                                   |
| – <i>Evet.</i>  | – Yes.   |
| – <i>Deli! Bu ne be? Bira. Buzlu su gibi bir şey!</i> | – You are mad! What is it? Beer. It’s something like cold water! |
| – <i>(Garson:) Buyrun?</i>                            | – (Waiter:) What will you have?                                  |
| – <i>Bana bir duble votka!</i>                        | – A double vodka for me!   |



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| – <i>Ne o?</i>  | – What's that?                          |
| – <i>Sert bir içki.</i>                                 | – A strong drink.' (OKD: 210)           |
| – <i>Geniş geniş pencereler, pırıl pırıl musluklar.</i> | – 'Large windows, shining taps.         |
| – <i>Ya yüz numaralar? Nasıl abla?</i>                  | – And what about toilets? How are they? |
| – <i>Bal dök yala!</i>                                  | – You just pour honey and lick it!      |
| – <i>Vay anasını!</i>                                   | – That is something!' (ODK: 115)        |

*Allah! Yeyim! Isırayım! Ulan kitap gibi karı be! Bu karı var ya bu karı! Şimdi n'olacak biliyor musun? Bol meze, bol şarap, yahut rakı, dışarda lapa lapa kar, içerde soba çıtır çıtır ... Ha? Bunu soyacaksın. Öf Allah öf!*  
 'My God! I want to eat, to bite (her)! What a peach of a woman! That woman over there! You know how it should be? Plenty of food and wine or rakı, a heavy snowfall outside and an oven burning hot inside... You see? You make her undress. Oh, God!' (OKY: 24)

To evaluate this fact, we should remember some general principles. The order of language categories appearing in a modern inflected word shows which category developed first and which one developed later. For instance, in a verbal inflected form such as *söyleilmeyeceksiniz* 'you will not be made to speak (= they will not urge you to speak)' the order of categories is: (1) root (lexical categories; *söy* ~ *söz* 'word'), (2) derivational categories (*-le*), (3) inflectional affixes: (a) voice (*-t, -il*), (b) negation (*-me*), (c) mood and tense (*-ecek*), (d) person and number (*-siniz*).

Accordingly, there was a stage of the language evolution when no grammar (= no inflection) existed. Every major stage of language evolution finds its reflection in modern linguistic structure in the form of different functional varieties. The most important (functional and structural) differentiation of modern standard (literary) language can be described as its deviation into written and spoken forms (Švedova 1960: 5). We shall not dwell here in detail on the theory of spoken language, which has been actively developed since the 1960s in Indo-European and Russian linguistics and considers spoken language as having its own structure and its own norms or "rules" (Lapteva 1976: 364; Martinet 1960: 6; Aupècle 1973). Before spoken language had been thoroughly studied, it was regarded as a kind of sum total of deviations from the literary (standard) form. To our mind, it is a great shortcoming of many present-

day grammars of Turkish that no special effort is made to describe spoken Turkish as a separate structure having its own “rules” different from those of written Turkish. Thus Mehmet Hengirmen classifies *devrik cümle* “the inverted phrase” as opposite to *kurallı cümle* “a phrase built according to the rules” (Hengirmen 1995: 365). Attempts to consider typical spoken phenomena from the theoretical standpoint of one (= written) grammatical principle inevitably lead to unsurmountable difficulties. Just to give an example, we should note that a form of spoken Turkish such as *-dı + personal ending + mı* (*Odama geldim mi pencereyi açarım* ‘as soon as I come into my room, I open the window’) cannot (to our mind) be classified as a verbal adverb (*ulaç*), for it can have personal endings (Gencan 1979: 404). We think that it is precisely because of the inflexible approach to and the nondifferentiation of the principles of grammar that “Mit reinen ‘Formenklassen’ ist eine funktionell relevante Klassifikation kaum zu erreichen” (Johanson 1990: 202).

The examples of spoken dialogues presented above are none other than living manifestations of those remote stages when human language had no grammar. We proceed from the assumption that before a category and its corresponding set of affixes had been created, its meaning, being less regular and mixed with different emphatic and emotional shades, was expressed through repetition or reduplication of already existing speech patterns. Some basic principles of the evolution of phonological units (phonemes) can be reconstructed using the example of the language acquisition of children who repeat their first syllables (*la la la ...*) because, before the existence of phonemes, a sound of any definite quality can be obtained only by way of its multiple repetition. Such a repetition of syllables marks the creation of the first rhythmic level, that of syllables. Then follows the development of the rhythm of the word level, at which stage a protoword could have a certain shape (certain linguistic qualities) only through repetition (there existed no phonemes proper). The third and fourth rhythmic levels are those of syntagm and phrase (Šćeka 1992). Here, it is important to emphasize that (1) prosody was the basis of phonology and (2) the repetition of already existing intonational (and protogrammatical) units was the basis of future grammatical categories.

The synchronic reflection of diachrony occurs at different levels, those of (a) text (the above examples), (b) phrases (see below), (c) syntactic position inside a sentence (see below), (d) syllables inside a word (*besbelli* ‘quite clear’, *kıpkırmızı* ‘quite red’, etc.) and (e) phonemes in a

succession of syllables (as specified above in connection with child language acquisition).

The level of phrases can also reflect protogrammatical stages, at the same time manifesting the process of the formation of syntactic positions inside the sentence:

*Kırmızı yandı ... Bizimki bekliyor. Bir kocakarı birden. Geldi geldi arabamıza tosladı.*

'The red light was burning ... The driver of ours is waiting. All of a sudden an old woman. She came quickly and bumped into our car.' (OKY: 76)

*Ne ne ne? Hakaret mi? Ben mi? Sana mı? Ben sana mı hakaret ediyorum?*  
'What? Insulting? Me? Insulting you? Am I insulting you?' (OKY: 128)

*Bana ne? 'What do I care?'*  
*Sana ne ha? 'How is it that you don't care?' (OKY: 79)*

*Sen ha? Burada ha? Hayrola!*  
'You? Here? Hello!' (OKY: 96)

The sentences here can be rewritten in the standard form as

*Birden bir kocakarı geldi.*  
'All of a sudden an old woman came.'

*Sen burada mısın?*  
'Are you here?'

Therefore the phrase *Bir kocakarı birden* can be considered as the subject and the phrase *Geldi geldi* as the predicate (as the subject-phrase and as the predicate-phrase in the given context).

But most abundant in spoken Turkish are such cases of clustered phrases which contain different grammatical affixes. That is why we can consider this class of peculiarities of spoken Turkish as reflecting later evolutionary stages and showing that the formation of grammatical categories occurred simultaneously with the formation of the simple sentence proper, i.e. with the formation of parts of the sentence (syntactic positions). Although reduplication of one kind or another is also often observed, these are not so much cases of reduplication, but of aggregates

of two (or more) predicative centres on their way from coordination to subordination. The clusters of phrases under discussion are connected by means of intonation. They can be subject- and predicate-phrases:

*Herifte bir boy var, iki metre şerefsizim!*

'The guy has such a height. Two metres upon my word!' (OKO: 140)

(= *Herifin boyu iki metredir* 'The guy is two metres tall'.)

Object- and predicate-phrases:

*Ne gördün de korktun?* 'What did you see and what were you afraid of?

*Ne göreceğim? Ananı!* 'What should I see? Your mother!' (RPO)

(= *Ananı gördüm* 'I saw your mother'.)

The semantics of an indirect object-phrase can be expressed:

*Gece yarısından sonra aklımız hükmetti mi çek oğlum şoför, artık Ankara mı olur, İstanbul mu, İzmir mi?*

'If we just decide after midnight, then come, our dear driver, take us to Ankara, Istanbul or Izmir.' (OKY: 89)

Due to the dialogical nature of spoken language, corresponding phrases can be uttered by different speakers. Subject- and predicate-phrases:

– *Ama benim dedem ...* – 'But my grandfather ...

– *Canavar mı?* – (Is he) a monster?

– *Canavar ya!* – Yes, he is!' (OKO: 169)

Object- and predicate-phrases:

– *Size bir şeyler bıraktı mı bari?* – 'Has he left you something at least?

– *Ne gibi?* – Like what?

– *Kırık sarık, ev mev ...* – Some old property, a house.'

(OKY: 127)

We should also note the emphatic reduplication of phrases as leading, at further stages of evolution, to the creation of some spoken predicative constructions (see below):

*Müslümanlık bu değil! Hayır! Bu değil müslümanlık!*

'This is not Islam (piety)! No! There is no piety in it!' (OKY: 79)

*Hala konuşuyor, hala konuşuyor!*

'He is still talking, still talking!' (OKY: 80)

*Söyle seviyor musun? Ha? Seviyor musun?*

'Are you in love? Say, are you in love?' (OKY: 115)

*Bırakma beni, n' olursun bırakma!*

'Don't leave me, please, don't!' (OKY: 122)

One important feature of spoken language is that it is closely connected to a given situation, which constitutes an integral extralinguistic component of the texture of spoken speech. Therefore spoken Turkish abounds in such patterns of utterances which contain no subject-, complement- or predicate-phrases. We do not believe that these cases should be considered a kind of ellipsis (the omission from a sentence of a word or words that would complete or clarify the construction), because in the given situation these utterances are complete and need no further clarification. Here are examples of nominal or predicative phrases where there is no explicitly expressed predicate or, accordingly, subject:

*Namus mu? Şeref mi? Ulan sende namus, şeref ne gezer?*

'Honesty? Honour? What have you to do with honesty and honour?' (OKY: 118)

*(Az aşağı al arabanı kardeşim) ... Al al al al, az daha al . Tamam.*

'(Move your car back a little bit, old man) ... Come, come. That's all.' (HTH: 227)

The stages of linguistic evolution when modern parts of the sentence were represented by separate utterances are reflected in some peculiar constructions of present-day Turkish. These are, for instance, the constructions with reduplicated forms of *-dı* and *-mış*:

*Geberdikleri bir şey değil, ilaçtı, şuydu buydu boşuna bir sürü masraf oluyor.*  
 'It is not important that they died, there are some unnecessary expenses like medicine, one thing and another.' (OKY: 66)

*Türküydü, gavuruydu, yüzlerce kızı çıkıyor istasyona.*  
 'Hundreds of girls come to the station, Turkish and foreign girls.' (HTH: 238)

*Evden fırlayışım var. Yağmurmuş, karmış, soğukmuş.*  
 'I rush out from the house. No matter if it rains, snows or is cold.' (OKY: 93)

As can be seen from the examples given, the repeated forms of *ilaçtı*, *şuydu buydu* and *türküydü*, *gavuruydu* have not developed into a certain part of the sentence, since there is always another explicit expression of the subject (in our examples these are *bir sürü masraf* 'some expenses' and *yüzlerce kız* 'hundreds of girls'). The last example represents the form of a separate phrase with the general meaning of an adverbial modifier.

The further development of separate situationally oriented phrases resulted at the stage of the creation of syntactic positions proper in such peculiarities (a) of written language as nominal sentences proper and (b) of spoken language as sentences with zero-expression of syntactic positions (Šćeka 1983a). There is an important difference between a written language nominal sentence and a spoken sentence with zero-expression of the predicate, because the latter implies a certain concrete speech situation, whereas the former has a descriptive value only:

*Su! ... Azıcık su!*  
 'Water! ... A little water!' (RPO)

*Ah! İlyas ağabeyi, onun sesi.*  
 'Ah! Brother Ilyas, it is his voice!' (RPO)

– *Vay. Sen ha?* – 'Oh, you!  
 – *Ben ya hemşerim. Nasılsın?* – Yes, it's me, my fellow. How are you?'  
 (OKY: 100)

A spoken phrase with zero-expression of the predicate can have an interrogative and other forms, it is emotionally coloured, which is not the case with the written nominal sentence. In spoken Turkish not only the

predicate but also other parts of the sentence can have zero-expression, representing a special class of spoken sentences.

The syntactic peculiarities of spoken Turkish can be very generally described as (1) zero-expression of syntactic positions (see the examples above) and (2) double or reduplicated expression of syntactic positions (Ščeka 1983b), which we shall dwell upon in more detail below.

The reduplicated expression of a sentence part peculiar to spoken Turkish and often referred to by Turkish linguists as *ikileme* (Korkmaz 1992) should be strictly distinguished from homogeneous parts of the sentence in written language. The latter represent two syntactic positions having the same function and referring to the same word and are pronounced with an enumerative intonation. The former constitutes one syntactic position containing a reduplicated or a double element always pronounced with a unifying intonational pattern.

A close study of spoken Turkish in general and of reduplicated parts of the sentence in particular is very important from a synchronic point of view. This class of syntactic models comprises the two following subdivisions.

(1) Models of the nominative structure of the sentence are such models where the double syntactic elements modify the propositional nomination (Švedova 1966: 131): *Kapıyı çarptı ayrıldı buradan* 'He slammed the door and went away from here' Here both verbs in the position of the predicate take part in the nomination with their lexical meaning: *çarptı* 'slammed' and *ayrıldı* 'went away'.

(2) Predicative constructions are structures where the reduplication or the double element modifies the communicative and / or grammatical (predicative) meaning of the sentence: *Saatimi kaybettim gitti* 'I just lost my watch' Here the double elements (*kaybettim gitti*) do not influence the nominative aspect of the sentence (*saatimi kaybetmem* 'my having lost the watch'), but specify special shades of its predicative meaning. The element *gitti* does not realize its lexical meaning. Predicative constructions of spoken Turkish represent a large variety of forms expressing different shades of meaning, in their richness by far surpassing the comparatively well-known predicative categories of the written language. Therefore, as indicated, they are of great interest from the point of view of the synchronic description of modern Turkish.

No less important is their diachronic aspect, for reduplicated and double elements reflect the evolution of grammatical categories (see above). In order to understand the mechanism of the creation of gram-

matical categories, we should bear in mind another important feature of spoken Turkish involving its semantics. The development of any grammatical category and its corresponding set of affixes was preceded by the existence of only the simplest form from this set covering the meaning of all other future forms of a given paradigm. This principle is largely reflected in modern spoken Turkish, where one form of a given grammatical or communicative paradigm is often used in the meaning of the other. In such cases, the meaning expressed always contains some additional emphatic shades. These phenomena can be described as expressive transformations of aspect (Šćeka 1982) and are referred to by Turkish linguists as *anlam kayması* ‘the shift of meaning’ (Gencan 1979: 373-377). Here are some examples.

(1) Interrogative → affirmative:

*Belâ mısın sabah sabah?* (= *belâsın*).

‘Are (aren’t) you being a nuisance? (= you are)’ (RIH: 55)

*Çarem kalmadı, kapıp koyverdim kendimi boşluğa. Sen misin atlayan, bir çığlık koparmışım* (= *atlayan benim*).

‘There was nothing to do, I threw myself in the precipice. Was it really me who threw himself? I gave a shout (= I threw myself).’ (IHM: 68)

*Ne korktum ben!*

‘I was so scared!’ (RPO)

(2) Interrogative-negative → affirmative:

*Ne ki yediğimiz zaten? Bir kuru ekmek değil mi oğlum?* (= *yediğimiz kuru ekmektir*).

‘And what do we eat? Isn’t it only dry bread? (= we eat only dry bread)’ (RPO)

*Onlar girmiyorlar mı mutfığa hiç?* (= *giriyorlar*)

‘Don’t they enter the kitchen at all? (= they do enter the kitchen)’ (RPO)



## (3) Negative → affirmative:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| – <i>Dinleteceksen de!</i>   | – ‘Say, if they listen to you!’  |
| – <i>Dinleteceğim elbet! Evde bir şey<br/>olacak da ben İlyas’a demeyeceğim,<br/>Allah Allah! (= İlyas’a diyeceğim).</i> | – ‘Certainly they will listen! There is<br>something happening in the house<br>and I shouldn’t speak to İlyas about<br>it, my God! (= I shall speak to<br>İlyas’ (RPO) |
| – <i>Doğru mu bu, baba?</i>  | – ‘Is it so, father?’  |
| – <i>Yoo, yoo, yalan! (= bu gerçektir).</i>  | – ‘No, no, it is a lie! (= it is true)’<br>(RPO)   |

## (4) Affirmative → negative:

*Demek bizim de suçumuz varmış aa! (= suçumuz yok).*  
‘So we are guilty too! (= we are not guilty)’ (RPO)

## (5) Interrogative → negative:

*Öfff! Böyle bir evin içinde küslük olur mu be? (= olmaz).*  
‘Oh, is it possible to quarrel in such a house? (= it is not)’ (RPO)

*Peki ama, hırsızlık mı ediyoruz biz ha? (= etmiyoruz).*  
‘Well, are we stealing? (= we are not)’ (RPO)

The above brief observations already demonstrate that, for instance, negation (a grammatical category) has issued from the emphatic question (a communicative category): *Ne bileyim ben?* ‘What do I know?’ → *Bilmiyorum* ‘I don’t know’.

In addition to the shift of communicative meaning, the shift of grammatical meaning is also largely typical of spoken Turkish. Most important seems to be the shift of mood semantics, imperative → indicative:

*Hepimizi bir gülme alsın, bir gülme alsın ... Eh kırıldık yani (= çok güldük).*  
‘All of us burst out laughing, I say we laughed until we cried.’ (HTH: 302)

A structural classification of the predicative constructions of spoken Turkish can be made according to their basic types described in Table 1. The abbreviations and numbers indicate where the corresponding examples are discussed below. The blank spaces in the table imply the exist-

ence of corresponding constructions, although they are not mentioned in the present paper.

Table 1

	reduplication				syn.	ant.	a single element	
	interj.	full	partial	+fix.1	+fix.2		+fix.1	+fix.2
subj.		S.1	S.2			S.5		S.8.
d.obj.		DO.1	DO.2			DO.5		DO.8.
i.obj.					IO.4	IO.5		
attrib.		Attr.1			Attr.4	Attr.5	Attr.6	Attr.8
a.mo.		Am.1	Am.2		Am.4	Am.5		Am.8
pr.n.		Prn.1	Prn.2		Prn.4	Prn.5	Prn.7	Prn.8
pr.v.	Pr.0	Pr.1	Pr.2	Pr.3	Pr.4	Pr.5	Pr.6	Pr.7 Pr.8

Abbreviations: interj. = interjections, fix. = fixed, syn. = synonyms, ant. = antonyms, subj. = subject, d.obj. = direct object, i.obj. = indirect object, attrib. = attribute, a.mo. = adverbial modifier, pr.n. = predicate nominal, pr.v. = predicate verbal.

S.1. A full reduplication of the subject expresses its strong emphatic accentuation. The repeated subject occupies the inverted position after the predicate: *Senin bu azgınlığını tenesir paklar tenesir!* 'You will die in debauchery, as you lived!' (OKY: 12). *Dünya, ... değişiyor dünya!* 'The world ... is changing, the world is!' (OKY: 71). The repeated subject can be a noun with an attribute or a pronoun: *Bu karı var ya bu karı!* 'That woman over there!' (OKY: 24). *O ne burun o?* 'What a nose it is, what a nose!' (OKY: 140). A still stronger emphasis is expressed by the repetition of the whole construction: *O ne hinoğlu hindir o, o ne kahpe dinli kızılbaştır o!* 'What an old fox he is, what a faithless giaour!' (HTH: 247). The following example shows the formation of this construction from two separate phrases: *Ama baban? Taş çatlarsa razı olmaz baban!* 'But your father? He won't accept it, not for the world!' (HTH: 118).

S.2.1. A partial reduplication means that the repeated element differs in some of its formal features from the first one. Nevertheless, we can still consider it as a (partial) reduplication, bearing in mind that it reflects very remote stages of evolution, when a repeated chain of syllables was just one linguistic form in spite of different phonemes occurring in it (because these phonemes are different only in the present-day phonological

system). The construction under consideration consists of two elements in direct succession (there are no other words between them). First of all, it concerns those cases when the reduplicated subject resembles onomatopoeic words and when the reduplicated subject is represented by interjections: *Ama gene de bütün gününü doldurur bu ıvır zıvırlar ha!* 'But all the same, this rubbish took him the whole day to do' (OKY: 59). *Sıra tanımayan ekselansa heeey de denir oha da!* 'One can say hey and look here at an excellency who does not want to stand in the queue' (OKY: 75).

There is a large number of reduplicated words in spoken Turkish, one of which cannot be used separately and has no separate meaning. Such double elements also belong to the construction under discussion, although they are nearer to the case of synonym pairs: *Konu komşu toplanmış, ağlaşıyordu* 'Neighbours and acquaintances came and wept together' (OKY: 53).

S.2.2. Somewhat different from the above is the case of the reduplication with an initial *m-*: *Vallahi benim açlığım maçlığım geçti* 'Really, I am not hungry any more' (RPO). *Okumak mokumak, Avrupaya mavrupaya gitmek filan fostu fos* 'It was all in vain to study, to go to Europe and the like' (OKY: 89).

S.5. The subject can be represented by a pair of synonyms or a pair of words which can be considered as having a similar meaning in the given context: *Şimdi gençlerde adap, erkân ne gezer desene!* 'Now young people have no good breeding, no civility!' (OKY: 128). *Evine gelenlerin gözü gönlü açılacak* 'All who came to see his house should be fascinated and charmed' (OKY: 52). *Eli ayağı titriyordu* 'He trembled all over' (OKY: 81). *Öylesine kolu kanadı kırılmıştı ki* 'He was so crestfallen' (OKY: 134). *Oda, odadaki eşyalar, şu bu öyle manasızlaşmıştı ki!* 'The room, the things in the room, everything in it became so meaningless!' (OKO: 153). *Herhalde vardır bir elli beş, altmış* 'Certainly she is fifty-five or sixty' (OKY: 128). As can be seen from these examples, the shades of meaning expressed by constructions of this type vary in different cases and are not easy to describe. The example with *adap erkân* seems to involve an emphatic negation. In the examples with *gözü gönlü*, *eli ayağı*, *kolu kanadı*, it is the intensity of the action that is emphasized. *Şu bu* has a pluralistic shade of meaning (= all things) and *bir elli beş altmış* conveys that the numbers are approximate.

In many cases it is not easy to draw a clear-cut line between a predicative construction of the type under consideration and the nominational

syntactic model: *Nene lazım elin keçisiyle koyunu?* ‘What do you need other people’s goats and sheep for?’ (OKY: 57). If the speaker means just goats and sheep, it is a nominational model. But if he means something like ‘the property of other peasants’, it is a predicative construction with a shade of emphatic negation (= ‘you do not need other people’s property’).

S.8. This type contains a single notional element (a verb) with the following fixed elements: (a) Interrogative pronoun and (b) the marker of the conditional mood: *Ne (kim, nerede ... ) ... -sa* + personal ending: *Ama ne yapsa nafile* ‘Whatever he did was in vain’ (HTH: 316). *Kime sorsam bilmez* ‘Whomever I ask, they do not know’ (OKO: 55).

DO.1. A full reduplication of the object expresses its strong emphatic accentuation. The repeated object occupies the inverted position after the predicate: *Değil böyle çay, ... şampanya patlamalıyım şampanya!* ‘Not such tea, ... I should uncork a bottle of champagne’ (OKY: 93). Some examples show the process of the formation of this construction from two separate phrases: *Fırın – dedi –. Fırın! Fırını anlatsana!* ‘The bakery, he said, the bakery! Tell us about the bakery!’ (OKY: 84).

DO.2. A partial reduplication of the object can be based on the rule of adding *m-* or exchanging the first consonant by *m-*: *Ben amirimden emir almışım. Açamam kapı mapı* ‘I’ve got an order from my chief. I can’t open any doors!’ (OKY: 65). In the given example, the construction describes a stronger degree of refusal.

DO.5. The object can be represented by a pair of synonyms or by such words which are similar in meaning in the given context: *Bense lafi sözü hiç sevmem* ‘As for me, I don’t like idle talk’ (OKY: 55). *Kafalarını gözlerini kırdırmışlar* ‘They perished’ (OKY: 141). *Zeytin peynir getir!* ‘Bring something to eat like olives and cheese!’ (RPO). *Ellerini kollarını sallayıp geziyor* ‘They walk freely’ (HTH: 333). *Bir iki demem dedim ya!* ‘I already said that I shall act at once!’ (OKO: 129). *Şuralarını, buralarını düzelttiler* ‘They set everything straight’ (OKY: 27). These examples express an emphatically accentuated negation (*lafi sözü*), a greater intensity of the action (*kafalarını gözlerini*), and an object described approximately, which comes close to the meaning of the pronoun *filân* (*zeytin peynir* = *zeytin peynir filân getir* ‘bring something to eat like olives and cheese’). In some cases the reduplicated object is very close to a phraseological expression: *Ellerini kollarını sallayıp gezmek* ‘to walk freely’, *bir iki dememek* ‘to act at once, not to hesitate to do

something'. Often the construction expresses the semantic shade of plurality (*şuralarını buralarını*).

DO.8. This construction contains a single notional element (a verb) with the following fixed elements (a) an interrogative pronoun and (b) the marker of the conditional mood: *Ne (kim, nerede ... ) ... -sa* + personal ending: *Git ne halin varsa gör, haydi!* 'Go and pull through all by yourself!' (OKY: 113).

IO.4. In this construction the indirect object contains a pair of words expressing homogeneous notions plus fixed notional elements: *Lambanın ne kırmızısına aldırıyor, ne yeşiline* 'He pays attention neither to the red nor to the green traffic light' (OKY: 76). This example involves a negation by means of *ne ... ne ...*.

IO.5. This type of predicative construction contains an indirect object represented by a pair of synonyms or a pair of words with similar meaning in the given context: *Devlete millete dua etmeliydim* 'I had to offer praise to the state and the people' (OKY: 58). *Eşe dosta, gelene geçene rakı, şarap ikram etmeliyim* 'I should offer rakı and wine to all my friends, to everyone who comes' (OKY: 93). *Dereden tepeden konuştuk* 'We talked about one thing and another' (OKY: 109). There is an emphatic affirmative meaning in the first example (*devlete millete*) and the pluralistic shade of meaning in the example which follows it (*eşe dosta, gelene geçene*). The last example is a phraseological expression (*dereden tepeden konuşmak* 'to speak about one thing and another').

Attr.1. A full reduplication of the attribute often consists of interjections or imitative words: *bir pöh pöh cümlesi* 'a phrase of irritation' (HTH: 318), *şu lapa lapa karlı havada* 'in this weather with heavy snowfall' (OKY: 87), *küme küme işçiler* 'crowds of workers' (OKY: 95). Interjections (*pöh pöh*) make the phrase more expressive. Reduplicated attributes also convey the idea of multitude or the intensity of the action (*küme küme, lapa lapa*).

Attr.4. One frequently used predicative construction consists of the reduplication of the attribute with the fixed particle *mu* (otherwise an interrogative particle) between the elements: *bacağında bol mu bol, kirli mi kirli, yamalı mu yamalı gri bir pantolon* 'wearing very loose, very dirty and all patched-up trousers' (OKY: 68), *kara, kuru, upuzun, beceriksiz mi beceriksiz adam* 'a wizened, very tall and very clumsy person' (OKY: 87), *mert mi mert bir arkadaşım* 'my friend who is very noble' (OKY: 94). As can be seen from the above examples, this construction expresses a higher degree of the quality and emphasizes it.

Attr.5. In spoken Turkish, attributes can often be expressed by a duplicate: *terbiyesiz, utanmaz adam* 'an ill-bred, shameless man' (OKY: 80), *yaşlı başlı kadın* 'a wise, honourable woman' (OKY: 128), *o halim selim, namazında niyazında hatun kişi* 'that kind, pious woman' (HTH: 129), *gelmiş geçmiş bütün maliye nazırları* 'all ministers of finance who came and went' (HTH: 295) *İler tutar yerim kalmamıştı* 'No intact place was left on me' (OKY: 126). The duplicate attributes can express an accentuated, emphatic rendering of the quality described (*terbiyesiz namus-suz*). Another subclass of these constructions comprises pairs of words that have become lexical expressions (*yaşlı başlı* 'grown wise with experience', *halim selim* 'kind, soft-hearted', *namaz niyaz* 'prayer, praying', *gelmiş geçmiş* 'one who has come and gone'). Such duplicates also impart a certain stylistic value to spoken language. In some cases, one of the elements cannot be used separately (*iler* in *iler tutar* 'safe, intact').

Attr.6. The reduplicated attributes can consist of antonyms: *Beyazıt'ta kızlı erkekli, irili ufaklı öğrenciler* 'At Beyazıt schoolboys and schoolgirls, big and little' (OKY: 71), *Kadınlı erkekli çocuklu, baylı bayanlı ya da küme küme işçiler ... irili ufaklı işyerlerine giriyor* 'Workers as women, men and children, as gentlemen and ladies or crowds of workers ... start their big and small jobs' (OKY: 95). *İşçiler. Kadınli, erkekli, çocuklu* 'Workers. Women, men and children' (OKY: 120). The last example illustrates separate phrases as the origin of these constructions.

Attr.8. This construction consists of a single attribute plus *ne* or *ne kadar* and expresses a higher degree of the quality and emphasis: *Ulan ne matrak kızsın be!* 'Oh, what a funny girl you are!' (OKY: 103).

Am.1. As is well known from the grammar of standard Turkish, an adjective which qualifies a verb becomes an adverb, for instance, *bunu güzel yaptın* 'you did it well' (Hengirmen 1995: 164). The full reduplication of an adjective normally qualifies a verbal form and functions as an adverbial modifier. Such constructions can be considered a kind of borderzone between stylistically neutral and spoken Turkish: *İhtiyarlığı kolay kolay üstümüze konduramayız* 'We can't easily let ourselves become old' (HTH: 214). *Başörtüsünü sinirli sinirli çözdü* 'She nervously untied her kerchief' (OKY: 25). *Kurnanın yanına suçlu suçlu baktık* 'We looked guiltily towards the tap' (OKY: 131). *Aptal kızı gene yelli yelli konuşuyor ha!* 'His stupid daughter is talking nonsense again!' (OKY: 114). *Nereye böyle yelli yelli?* 'Where are you going so full-sail?' (OKY: 113). The last example (*Nereye böyle yelli yelli?*) is al-

ready a typical spoken syntactic model based on the zero-expression of the predicate.

A reduplicated noun modifying a verbal form also functions as an adverbial modifier, although a single noun (with the exception of a few phraseological expressions) never modifies a verb—an important feature of distinction between adjectives and nouns (Kononov 1956: 135). Some of the constructions under consideration seem to belong to the stylistically neutral form of the language: *Soyduk kabuklarını, dilim dilim yedik* ‘We peeled and ate them slice by slice’ (OKY: 131). But most often they should be considered as belonging to spoken Turkish, since e.g. *dilim dilim yedik* conveys no emphasis. In most other cases there is a certain amount of expressive value involved, turning the reduplicated noun in the function of an adverbial modifier into a spoken predicative construction: *Şaşılacak şey, kuzu kuzu kalktı* ‘It was astonishing, but he rose like a lamb’ (OKY: 133). *Sütü burnundan fitil fitil getiririm sonra* ‘I shall make you repent this bitterly then’ (OKY: 114). *Yan yan baktı* ‘She looked askance’ (OKY: 27). The last example is a more expressive form of the spoken phraseological expression *yan bakmak* ‘to look askance, to look with an unfavourable eye’. Since the ability to modify a verb is a distinguishing feature of adjectives (as an important feature of neutral standard Turkish), the reduplication of nouns in the function of adverbial modifier should be considered as a spoken predicative construction reflecting those stages of the evolution when there was no differentiation between nouns and adjectives. A full reduplication of the word *zaman* becomes an adverbial modifier of time: *zaman zaman* ‘from time to time’.

Onomatopoeic elements can be used in repeated form only: *Sabah-leyin yüzünü bir açtım, ne açayım? Çıldır çıldır bakıyor* ‘In the morning I opened his face and what do I see? He looks with glassy eyes’ (OKY: 53). *Buram buram terler* ‘He sweats heavily’ (OKY: 87).

Spoken Turkish furnishes examples showing successive stages of the formation of the syntactic position of adverbial modifier through separate phrases and a nominal phrase (see examples below) as well as the formation of lexical stems of verbs (e.g., *tiril tiril titremek* ‘to shake all over’): *Çinko tas kaynıyor. Fokur fokur* ‘The zinc basin is boiling. With all its might’ (OKY: 123). *Boru ötmüştü. Uzun uzun, kalın kalın* ‘The whistle blew. Very long and very deep’ (OKY: 120). *Tıpkı tıpkı Alain Delon* ‘Just like Alain Delon’ (OKY: 27).



The spoken form of the adverbial modifier can consist of the reduplication of pronouns: *Nasıl nasıl alaya alırlardı!* 'How, just how, they would make fun (of him)!' (OKY: 32). *Kim kim gidiyorsunuz?* 'Whom are you going with?' (HTH: 299).

Am.2. This predicative construction is similar to the previous one, but the repeated elements have formal variations of some kind or other: *Yanaklarını şapur şapur öperdim* 'I gave her smacking kisses on both cheeks' (OKY: 97). A typical variation can be the substitution of the initial consonant by *m-*: *Ben dışarı mışarı çıkmam* 'I shan't go out at all' (OKY: 115). This example shows in particular that the repeated element, being an adverbial modifier, at the same time modifies the whole predication since it expresses a strong unwillingness of the speaker to perform the action described by the verb.

Another subclass of the construction under consideration is the reduplication of the element with different case endings: *Cebimde tamı tamına üç tane çeyrek* 'There are three twenty-five banknotes in my pocket only' (OKY: 95). *Onu alaya alırlardı inceden inceye* 'They would make fun of him in a refined way' (OKY: 32).

The elements of the construction can be represented by synonyms or antonyms: *Bu zamanda insanı malıyla, parasıyla ölçüyorlar* 'In our time, they appraise a man by his property and his money' (OKY: 128), *aşağıdan yukarı, yukarıdan aşağı süzdükten sonra* 'after eyeing (him) from head to foot and up and down' (OKY: 27).

Am.4. This class of construction comprises reduplication together with some fixed elements, such as *ama, hiç, da*, etc: *Herkesin ama herkesin içinde bir yerlere dokunur* 'She touched absolutely everybody to the quick' (OKY: 101). *Garsonluk ile hiç mi hiç bağdaşamadı* 'In no way did it become him to be a waiter' (HTH: 308). *Bu kadının yaşı olsun olsun da otuz* 'At the utmost, the age of this woman was thirty' (OKY: 13).

Am.5. The elements of the construction can be synonyms: *Odadan doğru dürüst çıktığım mı var benim?* 'And properly speaking, do I go out from the room at all?' (RPO).

Am.8. The distinguishing feature of this construction is a certain fixed element, for instance *-dır*: *Kaç gündür koltuğunun altında taşıyordun onları?* 'For how many days have you been bringing those things in your arms?' (RPO). Being originally a copula, *-dır* shows here (as in many other cases of the *dır*-modality) also the process of the formation of a syntactic position from separate phrases.



Prn.1. This type of spoken predicative construction consists of the (full) reduplication of an element: *Yüzünün derisi ta ensesine kadar kırış kırış* 'The skin of his face is wrinkled to the very back of his head' (OKY: 41). This element can be onomatopoeic: *Tramvaylar, ... dolmuşlar vızır vızırdı* 'The trams, ... cars were scurrying' (OKY: 96).

A different variety of this construction is represented by repetitions of a more loose character, being much closer to the case of separate phrases: *Yazık, çok yazık!* 'It's a pity, a great pity!' (HTH: 252). *Kafama bir vurdum ki, ağa haklı, yerden göğe kadar haklı* 'I thought better of it, the gentleman is right, absolutely right' (OKY: 114). *Kız vallaha değil kız, billâha değil* 'Really not, girl, upon my word not' (OKY: 118).

Prn.2. The reduplication of an element with different endings: *Kız alı al, moru mor* 'The girl's face is very red, exceedingly purple' (OKY: 72). As can be seen from the given example, such reduplications often occur two times with different words (in this case *al* and *mor*).

Prn.4. This construction comprises the reduplication and a fixed element (*mı, işte*): *Dolmuşlar nazlı mı nazlı* 'The minibuses are so capricious' (OKY: 74). *Kızın zarif bacaklarına hayranlıkla baktığı anları unutamıyordu. Bacaktı işte bacak. Yer yüzündeki milyonlarca güzel baktan biri* 'He could not forget those moments when he looked with admiration at the slender legs of the girl. These were just legs. One (pair) of millions of beautiful legs on earth' (OKY: 103). The construction in the first example (*nazlı mı nazlı*) expresses a higher degree of the quality described. The construction in the second example (*bacaktı işte bacak*) has a different (inverted) structure and conveys some specific shades of emphatic meaning (= 'just legs and nothing more').

The repeated constructions with *var* and *yok* can be classified as a different subdivision: – *Ayak sesi var!* – *Varsa var! Sana ne ayak sesinden?* – 'I can hear footsteps! – Well, and what then? What do you care about it?' (RPO). *Sende o gök gözüün var mı yok mu?* 'Do you have that blue amulet, or don't you?' (HTH: 316).

Prn.5. These are predicative constructions of the nominal predicate consisting of synonyms, words with a certain semantic similarity or elements with some formal variations: *İyi güzel, fakir fukaranın biraz yüzü gülecek* 'Well done, fine, it will make the poor happy' (HTH: 297). *Her yerler kir, pas içinde* 'Everywhere there is dirt and mud' (OKY: 52). The first example (*iyi güzel*) is a phrase with zero-expression of the subject, the predicate of the second example is *kir, pas içinde(dir)*.

A subclass of these constructions contains the repetition of the copula as well: *Hayır pabuçları eskiydi, yamalıydı* 'His charity-boots were old, all patched' (OKY: 120).

Prn.7. This construction of the nominal predicate contains a fixed structural (not notional) element: *Bu kadar güzel eşyalara bir hanım lâzımdı da* 'Such fine things just need a lady to own them' (OKO: 173). *Şaraplar da tesirsiz be!* 'Even wine has no effect!' (OKO: 123). *Para-sızsın galiba!* 'It seems you have no money!' (OKO: 162). *Hiç te değil!* 'Not at all!' (RPA). *Ne bu halin ya?* 'What just happened to you?' (RPO). These predicative constructions convey some additional expressive shades of meaning, for instance astonishment (*be*), supposition (*galiba*) and others.

The same fixed structural elements form the predicative constructions with *var*, *yok*: *Senin bu dostun var ya!* 'You have this friend of yours, don't you!' (RPA). *Meteliğim yok be!* 'I'm without even a penny!' (OKO: 166). *Sonunda ölüm yok ya!* 'They won't kill you!' (OKO: 122). *Burada da su yok yahu!* 'There is no water here either!'.

Prn.8. This construction of the nominal predicate contains a fixed notional element: *Bekârdı nasıl olsa* 'He was unmarried in any case' (OKO: 186). *Bizim patron iyi insan nasıl olsa!* 'Our boss is a good man in any case!' (OKO: 125). *Dargın filan değiliz* 'I'm not offended or anything' (OKY: 127). *Kalender bugün daha sabahtan bir yorgundu* 'Already today Kalender was so tired since morning' (HTH: 235). *Bir canı sikkındı* 'He was so uneasy' (HTH: 236). The construction with *bir* (*bir yorgundu*, *bir ... sikkındı*) emphasizes a higher degree of what is described in the nominal predicate.

The most important peculiarities of the predicative constructions in spoken Turkish are connected with a largely diversified system of special formal features of the verbal predicate.

Pr.0. The reduplication of onomatopoeia can be considered a separate subclass. They certainly do not belong to the class of verbal predicates, but reflect some very remote stages of the evolution when no verbs proper existed: *Futbol topu üçü arasında tık tık tık* 'The ball was going bang bang between the three of them' (OKY: 47). *Kar savruluyor. Taşutlar tek tük* 'There is a snow-storm. Traffic is sparse' (OKY: 86). There are examples of onomatopoeia pronounced as separate phrases: *Son gittiğim yerde fevkâlade karşılandım tabii. Hoş beş* 'Certainly they received me very well where I went last time. We greeted each other' (OKY: 109). Onomatopoeia can be used with an auxiliary verb: *Bunu*

*sevgilimde denemek arzusuyla içim şimdi büsbütün vık vık eder* 'Now I am burning with the desire to try it on my beloved' (HTH: 167). *Liseyi, ortayı, hatta ilki olsun bitireme, sonra da geç karşıma bana cart curt et!* 'You couldn't learn at college, in secondary or even in primary school, and now you come and snap at me!' (OKY: 134).

Close to onomatopoeic elements is the reduplication of interjections. Such constructions express an emotion connected with what is denoted by the notional element: *Hay bunak hay!* 'What a silly man!' (HTH: 244). *Hey babam hey!* 'Well, well!' (OKY: 93).

Pr.1. These predicative constructions consist of a full reduplication of the verb and can be divided into several different subtypes (Ščeka 1979). A multiple reduplication of the verb, especially in the imperative, has the communicative meaning of an emphatic inducement to fulfill the action: *Bak bak bak! ... Ayak sesleri var!* 'Hush, just listen! ... I can hear footsteps!' (RPO). *(Suyu) al al al al!* 'Just drink, drink!' (RPO). *Al suyunu al!* 'Just drink your water!' (RPO). *Bırak çalsın be kardeşim n'olursun çalsın!* 'Let him play, old chap, please, let him play!' (HTH: 196). The repeated forms of the verb in the imperative mood show a large variety of spoken peculiarities suggestive of the process of the formation of grammatical forms. For instance, the following example may illustrate a stage preceding the formation of the participle: *Onbeş kuruş bu, boru mu? Harca harca bitmez!* 'It is fifteen kurush, it's no joke! Spend it as long as you like!' (OKY: 95).

The reduplication of the verb in the indicative mood conveys different expressive shades of meaning peculiar to the spoken language: *(Kocamın metresini) gördüm gördüm, benden güzel olsa vallahi gam yemezdim!* 'I really have seen (my husband's mistress), if she was more beautiful than me, upon my word, I wouldn't be sad!' (OKY: 18). *Anladık anladık ama her şeyin bir ölçüsü olur* 'I see, I see, but we should keep within limits with everything' (HTH: 283). *Biliyorum biliyorum, aran iyi değil* 'I know, I know, you are on bad terms with him' (OKY: 53). – *Çekil şuradan! – Çekilmeyeceğim, çekilmeyeceğim!* 'Get away from here! – I won't, I won't!' (RPO).

Another subclass of the constructions under consideration is connected with a pair of elements, intonationally more united and expressing duration or intensity of the action: *Bal rengi gözlerini açarak dikkatle baktı* 'He looked intently, opening his honey-coloured eyes' (HTH: 264). *Düşündüm düşündüm çıkaramadım* 'I turned it over in my mind, but I couldn't understand' (OKY: 27). *Gözlerim kapalı kapanıveriyor*

'My eyes are just closing' (HTH: 331). *Durdu, sallandı sallandı, sonra yıkılırcasına çekti gitti* 'He stopped, swayed for a while, and then went away as if breaking down' (OKY: 40). *Soluk dudaklarını kızarması için dişleriyle ezdi ezdi* 'She repeatedly bit her pale lips to make them red' (OKY: 53). *Çocuğun ardına düştü düştü* 'She followed the lad readily' (OKY: 28). As in the last example (*düştü düştü*, meaning in this context the readiness of a young girl to follow at once her beloved one), there can be a large variety of shades of meaning expressed, according to the given context. A gradual development of the action can be expressed as well as its intensity: *O her yanından sağlık fışkıran genç irisi ufalmış ufalmış ufalmıştı* 'This stalwart guy, showing healthiness in every aspect, started getting smaller and smaller' (OKY: 133). A higher intensity of the action together with its being sudden can also be expressed: *Araba o hızla gitti gitti, kaldırıma çıktı* 'The car went suddenly at the same speed and got onto the sidewalk' (HTH: 215).

An important subclass of constructions based on the full reduplication of the verbal element consists of the repetition of the verb in any person, singular or plural, of the *ır*-tense conveying the modal-expressive meaning of disdain or irritation, caused by someone else's question. There are two submodifications of this construction, one being the full reduplication of the affirmative or of the negative form and the other consisting of the first element in the affirmative and of the second element in the negative form: – *Yine sinemaya mı gidiyorsun? – Giderim giderim, sana ne?* – 'Are you going to the sinema again? – Whether I go or not, what do you care?' (RPA). – *Ahmet İngilizce bilmiyor. – Bilmez bilmez, mecbur değil.* – 'Ahmet doesn't speak English. – Well, he doesn't, he isn't obliged to' (RPA). – *Sen hiç çalışmıyorsun. – Çalışırım çalışmam, dert mi sana?* – 'You don't work at all. – Whether I work or not, what do you care?' (HTH: 155). – *O kızı alırım almam, size ne?* – 'Shall I marry her or not, what do you care?' (OKY: 116). It should be noted that this construction can describe an action in the present, future or past: – *Ahmet dün sinemaya gitti. – Gider gider, yasak değil.* – 'Ahmet went to the cinema yesterday. – Let him go, it isn't forbidden.'

Another subclass of the predicative construction under consideration is the full reduplication of the verbal element expressing a limit of the action. It is typical for this construction that the same verb is in the predicate of the sentence: *Bu işte çok az ücretle çalışacağım. Fakat kazanırım kazanırım bir gazoz parasını kazanırım hiç değilse* 'I shall work in this job for a very small salary. But I shall earn something, at

least I shall have enough to buy some soda water' (OKO: 155). *Kazansa kazansa ancak şu kadar bir şey kazanabilir* 'He will earn practically nothing at the utmost' (OKO: 157). *Kalsan kalsan yalnız iki gün kalabilirsin* 'At the utmost, you can remain for two days only' (HTH: 76). *Ola ola bugün Ankara barosunda kırtipil bir avukat olup çıktım* 'I became an unfinished lawyer at the Ankara bar, that's all I could do' (HTH: 224). *Kala kala dört lira kalmıştı* 'Only four liras remained' (OKY: 95).

A modification of this construction consists of the reduplication of a verbal adverb instead of the finite verbal form: *Uğraşa uğraşa bunu mu yapabildin yalnız?* 'Is that all you could do after so much work?' (RPO).

Pr.2. This type of predicative construction consists of a partial reduplication of the verbal form, i. e. the verbal form is repeated with some variations.

Pr.2.1. The affirmative form plus the negative form (most often) of the third-person singular or plural of the imperative mood can express the meaning of the speaker's indifference towards the action being or not being performed: *Evdoksiya duysun dusmasın, acısın acımasın, ağlasın ağlamasın, patronu metresine ne derse desin yahut demesin, Kâmran'a vız geliyordu* 'Kamran didn't care a straw about Evdoksiya's knowing it, whether she would pity him, cry for him, about what his boss would or would not tell his mistress' (OKO: 155).

Pr.2.2. Another construction of this type has the first element in the conditional and the second in the imperative mood: *Diskoteğe gidiyorsak gidelim işte* 'If we are going to a discotheque, then let's go' (RPO).

Pr.2.3. A large subclass of the constructions under consideration is formed according to the formulas: (a) *-dıysa + -dı* and (b) an interrogative pronoun + *-dıysa + -dı*: *Söylediyse söyledi, ne önemi var?* 'If he said it, he said it, is it (so) important?' (RPO). *Kim aldıysa aldı ben yapamayacağım bunu* 'Whoever took it, I won't be able to do it' (RPO). *Ne mi düşündüm? Ne düşündümse düşündüm* 'What was I thinking of? It doesn't matter' (HTH: 225). *Size kim söylemişse yalan söylemiş* 'Whoever told you, told you a lie' (HTH: 227). – *Niye ederse etsin, bana ne?* – 'With whatever purpose he does it, what do I care? – *Hangi rakıyı tercih edersin hemşerim?* – *Hangisi olursa olsun.* – 'Which raki do you prefer, old fellow? – Any sort will do' (OKY: 98). Some minor variations of the construction are possible, for instance the verb can be repeated for the third time with *de / da*, one of the elements can be in the negative form of the conditional mood: *Söylesin de ne söylerse söylesin!* 'Let him say whatever he says!' (HTH: 196). *Dünyada ben olmasam da*

*olur* ‘Nothing will happen if I leave this world’ (OKY: 42). The last example (*olmasam da olur*) illustrates the form of the predicate which is largely used as a substitute for /.../ *-mayabilir* (*gelmiyebilirsin = gelmesen de olur*).

Pr.2.4. The second-person singular (or plural) of the imperative mood + *-bilirsen* (*-bilirseniz*), meaning ‘do something if you can, try and do something’: *Artık al gözünü camekandan alabilirsen!* ‘Now just try and not look at the shop window!’ (HTH: 270). *Tut gülmeni tutabilirsen* ‘One can’t help laughing’ (HTH: 308). *Ondan sonra tut bizi tutabilirsen* ‘You won’t be able to hold us after it’ (HTH: 318). *Dayanabilirsen dayan!* ‘Just try and bear it!’ (OKY: 92).

Pr.2.5. A simple tense of the indicative mood + *-masına* (*-mesine*), expressing a concessive shade of meaning: *Bir şeyler çizmeğe, sandığını şenlendirmeğe çalışmış. Sandık şenlenmiş şenlenmesine ya, çiçekler, çiçeklerin yaprakları olmamış* ‘He tried to paint something, to beautify the box. The box became more beautiful, but the flowers, their leaves didn’t turn out well’ (OKY: 41). *Dolmuşlar gelmesine geliyorlar ya, daha çok Sirkeci durağına yanaşıyorlar* ‘As for coming, minibuses came, but they stopped more often at the Sirkeci stop’ (OKY: 74). *Kim lâf atar, kim konuşmak isterse durur, konuşmuş konuşmasına, ama o kadar* ‘If someone wanted to address her and speak with her, she stopped and spoke, but no more than that’ (OKY: 102).

Pr.3. These predicative constructions consist of the reduplication of the verb and contain a fixed structural (non-notional) element: *Bardağı dibinden tutmuş, parmakları arasında çeviriyor da çeviriyordu* ‘He held the glass at the bottom and kept turning it in his hand’ (HTH: 232). *Anasının memesini emiyor da emiyor* ‘He keeps sucking his mother’s breast’ (HTH: 332). *Teyze ağlar da ağlar* ‘Auntie keeps crying’ (HTH: 332). *Problemin içine dalmış, çıkamaz da çıkamazmış* ‘He plunged into thought, solving the problem, but could not solve it in any way’ (HTH: 276). The above examples show that this construction expresses the meaning of a greater duration of the action, or, as in the last example (*çıkamaz da çıkamazmış*), a greater extent, intensity of it.

A similar expressive value is conveyed by the constructions with *mu* or *ki* as fixed elements: *İnsan bu kalın paltoyu giyerse terler mi terler* ‘If someone puts on this thick overcoat, he will perspire heavily’ (OKY: 87). – *Ah, bu rekabet ah, gözü çıksın!* – *Çıksın ki çıksın!* – ‘Ah, this competition, damn it! – Yes, damn it!’ (OKY: 34).



There can be other fixed elements expressing specific emphatic shades of meaning: *Kaçmıştı, kaçmıştı ha!* 'Well, to be sure, she ran away!' (OKO: 182). *Kapat, kapat da aramızda halledelim* 'Stop it, let us settle it between us' (OKY: 118). *Bak hele bak!* 'Look, just look!' (OKY: 92).

A subclass of the construction under consideration is represented by elements repeated with some variations of their form (here the affirmative and the negative forms): *Yıllık kazancımı gün hesabına vursam her gün beş, altı lira ya düşer ya da düşmez* 'If I divide my annual income by days, it will be something like five, six liras a day' (OKY: 91).

Pr.4. This construction is similar to the previous one, but its fixed element is a notional one: *Bu sözler bana bir dokunsun, bir dokunsun!* 'These words offended me so much!' (HTH: 325). *İçim bir kötülendi, bir kötülendiydi ki!* 'I felt so bad, so bad!' (OKY: 52). In these examples we can see that the construction conveys the emphatic meaning of a greater intensity of the action. The elements can be expressed by synonyms: *On dakikanın içinde bir ifritleşsin, bir şirretleşsin!* 'In ten minutes, she got so nervous, so quarrelsome!' (HTH: 129). *Çocuk bir şaşır-sın, bir bocalasın* 'The child lost his head and felt upset' (HTH: 276). In the following example the second element is *iki* instead of *bir*, which gives the construction a different shade of meaning, that of repeated action: *Bir doladım, iki doladım* 'I turned round once, twice' (OKY: 113).

Another subclass of the construction under consideration has the fixed element *babam*, which is a construction often used with the *ır*-tense and expresses a peculiar meaning of intensity and duration: *Yıkanır babam yıkanır* 'He washes himself with all his might' (HTH: 282). One can find examples showing that the fixed element (*babam*) has developed from the form of address: *Dünya değişiyor kardeş değişiyor* 'The world is changing, old fellow, it is changing' (OKY: 71).

There are other constructions of this type, for instance the constructions with the fixed element *bakayım* or *bakalım* and the verb in the imperative mood: *Dur bakayım dur!* 'Wait a moment, wait!' (RPO). *Anlat bakalım anlat!* 'Come, tell it, tell it!' (RPO).

Pr.5. In this predicative construction we have a pair of synonymous verbs instead of the reduplication of one verb: *Şu deminki mesele için düşündüm taşındım* 'I have thought over this problem we spoke about lately' (OKY: 114). *Konu döner dolaşır imam hatip okullarının islahına dayanır* 'The question turns and rests on the reform of the mullah schools' (HTH: 297). *Gençlik çağı duman misali erir biter* 'Youth melts

away like haze' (HTH: 214). *Yumuşak deriyi itina ile parmak uçlarından tutup havaya kaldırdı. Evirdi çevirdi* 'He took up the soft leather carefully with his finger tips. He turned it round and round' (HTH: 141). *Yemekler yenilir içilir* 'The food is eaten and drunk' (HTH: 283). The construction expresses a greater duration and / or intensity of the action (*düşündüm taşındım, döner dolaşır, evirdi çevirdi*) or some special shades of meaning, for instance the action being gradual (*erir biter*). The verbs of the last example (*yenilir içilir*) can be considered nearly synonymous in the given context; they are used here not only to mark the difference between eating and drinking (i.e. their lexical meaning), but they also express the duration and intensity of the action denoted by the predicative construction. In the imperative mood, synonyms add more emphasis to the request: *Etme eyleme kardeşim, bunun neresi günah?* 'Don't, please, don't, my boy, is it really a sin?' (HTH: 297). *Yapma, etme, eyleme!* 'Don't do it, please, don't!' (HTH: 321). *Dinle bak gerisini!* 'Just listen to what happened next!' (HTH: 297).

In order to express still greater emphasis, a pair of repeated synonyms can be used: *İşçiler bitip tükenmiyor, yorulup usanmıyordu* 'The workers didn't get tired, didn't lose their strength' (OKY: 95).

It is possible to find many examples where each synonym has its own subject or other words modifying it, thus showing the process of the formation of the construction under consideration from separate phrases: *İsterse kimse görmesin, kokusu çıkmasın. Kendisi biliyordu ya* 'Nobody may see it or know anything about it. But he knew it himself' (OKO: 156). *Bu onu daha bir açar, daha bir sevimli yapar* 'It makes him more expressive, more agreeable' (HTH: 250).

Pr.6. This type contains a pair of antonyms instead of synonyms. Some of these constructions can express a greater intensity and duration: *Camiyi hop kaldırıp hop oturtuyordu* 'He made the mosque (the people in the mosque) rise and sit down again' (OKY: 81). Also a greater emphasis can be expressed: *Sensiz yaşayamam ölürüm!* 'I won't be able to live, I'll die without you!' (OKY: 122). On the other hand, this construction, if used with verbs in the past tense, expresses an action which had taken place one time: *İçeri girmiş çıkmışlar* 'They served a term of imprisonment' (OKY: 141). But if the tenses are *-yor* or *-ır*, a regularly performed action is expressed: *Okula gidip geliyorlar* 'They attend school' (OKY: 35). Some antonym pairs have become lexical expressions, for instance *atıp tutmak* (a) 'to boast, to exaggerate', (b) 'to abuse,



to defame, to scold': *Besbelliydi bize atıp tuttuğu* 'It was clear that they had abused us' (HTH: 223).

As with the constructions based on synonyms, antonyms can have separate words modifying them: *Erkek kardeşini sorarsanız, al onu vur ona* 'As for his brother, he is a reprobate' (HTH: 251).

Pr.7. This predicative construction consists of a single verbal form plus a fixed non-notional element, such as *ya, ki, be, ha, yahu* and others: *Anasından öyle kazık gibi doğmadı ya!* 'He isn't just as stiff as a poker from birth!' (OKO: 125). *Bir iki demem dedim ya!* 'I've just said that I won't hesitate!' (OKO: 129). *Tanımam ki!* 'But I don't know him!' (OKO: 184). *İşler öylesine tıkrında gider ki!* 'Everything goes so well!' (OKO: 124). *İnsan karı yüzünden bu hale gelir mi be!* 'Is it possible that one comes to such a state because of a woman!' (OKO: 152). *Senin yoluna ölürüm be!* 'I am ready to die for you!' (OKO: 131). *Size yazdı ha?* 'She wrote you a letter, didn't she?' (OKY: 121). *Hâlâ dediğini diyor yahu!* 'He still repeats it over and over again!' (BFI: 181). *Git şuradan yahu, zaten canımız sıkkın!* 'Go away from here, I feel wretched as it is!' (BFI: 181). *Kadıncağıza bir şey yapmasa bari!* 'If only he didn't do something to the poor woman!' (OKO: 179).

Pr.8. These spoken predicative constructions include a single verbal element plus a fixed notional element, constituting an important feature of spoken Turkish (Ščeka 1979).

Pr.8.1. (a) *ne ... se beğenirsiniz*, (b) *ne ... se iyi*. In both cases the *sa*-form is that of the conditional mood most often in the third-person singular. This construction expresses the action as being unexpected, with emotions of surprise or indignation on the part of the speaker: *Geçen gün şu ... gazeteci terezi ne uydursa beğenirsiniz?* 'What, of all things, did this ... unfledged journalist think up the other day?' HTH: 333). *Bizim oğlan ne haltetse iyi?* 'What, of all things, has our son done?' (KTK: 226). It should be noted that the expressiveness of this construction is based on (a) the use of the interrogative pronoun in an emphatically affirmative meaning and (b) the shift of meaning of the mood for a past action, as expressed by the form of the conditional mood.

Pr.8.2. (*Sakın*) ... *ayım deme* or (*sakın*) ... *alım demeyin*. This construction conveys the meaning of an emphatic interdiction of the action described by the verb. *Sakın yalan söyleyim deme!* 'Take care not to tell lies!' (RPO). *Jandarmalar gitmeden önce aşağı inelim demeyin!* 'Take care not to come down before the police go!' (RPO). As a rule, the fixed

and the lexically free elements are both in the singular or plural form, but there can be exceptions: *Burada kalacaksınız. Buradan çıkayım demeyin!* 'You will remain here. Take care not to leave this place!' (KYI: 251). *Sakın ha* is also possible: *Sakın ha konuşayım deme!* 'Take care not to speak!' (IEA: 442).

Pr.8.3. (*Bir*) ... *alım dedik* or (*bir*) ... *ayım dedim*. This construction expresses an emphatic willingness of the speaker to perform an action: *Portakalları yiyelim dedik* 'We decided to eat the oranges' (OKY: 131). *Evinizi bir göreyim dedim* 'I decided to see your house' (RPO). The elements of the construction can be separated by other words: *Bir uğrıyayım bakayım Erol bey oğlumuz nasıldır dedim* 'I decided to come and see how our son Erol is' (RPO).

Pr.8.4.a. *Varsın ... sın(lar)*. The meaning of this construction is similar to that of the English expression 'let him (them) ..' *Hakkı üstümüze gelirse ... varsın gelsin!* 'If Hakkı attacks me ... let him attack (me)!' (KTK: 391). There can be other words between the elements of the construction: *Bize ne! Varsın acıdan ölsün!* 'What do we care! Let him die of pain!' (KYI: 45).

Pr.8.4.b. *Var(in) ... (in), varayım (...alım) ...eyim (...elim)*. The meaning of this modification is similar to that of the previous one, i.e. an emphatic rendering of an order or stimulation: *Var git kardeş. Yolun acık olsun!* 'Well, go, old fellow. Happy journey!' (KYI: 295). *Varın hesaplayın, iki yüz bin lira yılda ne para getirecek sendikaya!* 'Come, calculate how much money two-hundred-thousand liras will bring for the trade union!' (ERS: 101). There can be other words between the elements of the construction: *Varın işinize gidin!* 'Come, go your way!' (KYI: 222). Examples showing this construction in the first-person singular and plural: *Memedim köye gelseydi doğru eve gelirdi. Gene de varayım gideyim* 'If my Memed came to the village, he would come home at once. Let me go (and see) all the same' (KYI: 21). Sometimes instead of the fixed element *varayım (varalım)* the verbal adverb *varıp* is used: *Varıp bir duvar dibinde dileneyim bari!* 'Shall I beg, sitting by the wall, perhaps!' (OKY: 146). Both elements can have the form of the optative mood: *Cehennemde yanarmışım. Vara yanaydım, hey Allah!* '(He says) I should burn in hell. Let me burn, by God!' (KTK: 2).

Pr.8.4.c. The fixed verb *varmak* and the free lexical verb, both in the form *-dı* or *-ır* of the indicative mood. This modification expresses a stylistic colloquial shade of meaning ('just', 'simply'): *Vardı tabancayı yerden aldı* 'He just picked up the gun from the ground' (KYI: 117).

*Varır değirmenin oraya giderim* 'I shall simply go there to the mill' (KYI: 205). The form *-ip* is possible, especially when the free lexical element is in the present *yor*-tense: *Dili varıp da bir türlü soramıyor* 'In no way had he the heart to ask' (KYI: 173). The cases when the fixed element *varmak* has words modifying it should be considered other subclasses of this construction: *Oh, iyi vardım da bunu yaptım. Canım sağ olsun!* 'It is very well that I just did it. Good for me!' (HTH: 125).

Pr.8.5. A verb in the imperative mood plus *bakayım* or *bakalım*. There can be no agreement in number and person between the fixed element and the verb. This construction renders a request more emphatic: *Şu camı aç da sor bakayım!* 'Open that window and ask!' (KTK: 330). *Ne oluyorsun, be Kâmrân? Ne var? Anlayalım bakalım!* 'What happened to you, Kâmrân? What is it? Let me know!' (OKO: 149). The verb *bakmak* can be the lexical (free) element of the construction: *Dur ki bak bakalım, seni paralamaz mıyım!* 'Wait and see, I shall tear you to pieces now!' (KTK: 437). When the lexical element has the third-person form, the construction may express the indifference of the speaker towards the action described: *Demek öyle dedi? Desin bakalım!* 'She said so, you say? Let her say so!' (KTK: 368).

Pr.8.6. A verb in the imperative mood plus *göreyim* or *görelim*. This construction can have also the fixed elements *bir* and / or *da*. The meaning is similar to that of the previous construction: *Aynı şeyi Mecliste bir başvekil yapsın göreyim!* 'Just let a prime minister do it in the Meclis!' (HTH: 190). *Yahu sen bana nasıl "lân" diyebilirsin? Bir dene de görelim!* 'But how can you say "hey" to me? Just try and do it!' (BFI: 181).

Pr.8.7. *Gel* or *gelin* (*de*) plus the verb in the imperative mood. The agreement in number is observed between the fixed element and the verb. As to the person, the verb may be in the first or second person. The construction expresses an emphasized request or advice: *Gelin bağışlayalım. O da bizim köylümüz* 'Let us forgive him. He is also from our village' (KTK: 207). The lexically free element of the construction often conveys a shifted communicative meaning, for instance the negative form of the verb plus a special intonation express an emphatic affirmation. In such cases there are additional special shades of meaning: *Fabrikada gözleri kör eden kömür tozları. Sen gel de verem olma!* 'There is coal dust at the factory. It is impossible not to fall ill with tuberculosis!' (ERS: 137). Other shifts of meaning are possible. For example, a form of possibility with the construction under discussion can emphasize the impossibility of the action: *Sesi kulağımda. Kulağımda ama gel*

*de bulabil!* 'I can hear his voice. I hear it, but try and find him!' (KTK: 339).

Pr.8.8.a. *...ır gider(di)* + personal endings. The meaning of this construction depends on whether the verb is terminative or nonterminative. If the context implies the nonterminative meaning of the verb, the construction expresses duration: *Hep birlikte gül gibi geçinip giderlerdi* 'They all lived very happily together' (OKO: 186). If the meaning of the verb is terminative, the construction emphasizes the action being irrevocably terminated: *Sen mahpusa girersen, ölürsün, geberir gidersin* 'If you find yourself in prison, you will die, you will be done for' (KTK: 360).

Pr.8.8.b. *...muş gitmiş(ti)* + personal endings. This modification expresses an irrevocably terminated action or an expressive subjective implication of a greater intensity of the action: *Halk toplanacağına daha da dağılmış gitmiş!* 'Instead of gathering together, people dispersed even more!' (RPO). The free lexical element can have the *ıp*-form, especially when the meaning is negative: *Müthiş bir ateş içindeydi. Yüzü uzayıp gitmişti* 'He had a bad fever. His face just pinched' (BFE: 194).

Pr.8.8.c. *...ıp gidiyor(du), ...ıp gidecek(ti)* + personal endings. The meaning of this modification is similar to that described for modification 8.a (for the nonterminative verb): *Aramızdaki bu ilişki sürüp gidiyordu* 'This link between us was going on' (NAB: 59). *Bu ne zamana kadar sürüp gidecekti?* 'Till what time should it go on like that?' (OKO: 153).

Pr.8.8.d. *...di* + personal endings + *gitti* (or *gittiydi*). There is no agreement in person and number between the fixed and lexically free elements. The meaning emphasizes the action as being irrevocably terminated, corresponding to the English equivalents 'never', 'after all': *Burası fabrika mı, kerhane mi, anlamadım gitti* 'Is it a factory or a brothel, I just can't understand' (OKY: 112).

Pr.8.9. *Ha babam ...ıyor* or *...ır* + personal endings. This construction expresses a higher intensity of the action, corresponding sometimes to the English expression 'with all one's might': *Ha babam kaçıyor* 'He runs with all his might' (NAB: 104).

We have considered some classification principles of the predicative constructions in spoken Turkish. These constructions and other spoken syntactic models are important both with respect to synchrony and diachrony. As a matter of fact, the classes of spoken constructions and models represent and illustrate basic features of the development of grammatical categories in Turkic and Altaic languages. In the origin of a

grammatical category there lies a general, yet undefinable expressiveness given by the reduplication of elements. The next stages are represented by fixed elements appearing in the constructions along with the reduplications. At the end of this development, we find constructions consisting of one lexically free element and one fixed element, the latter being the archetype of the future grammatical marker proper. Through the examples of spoken constructions, we can observe the semantic origins of particular grammatical categories and the development of their semantics from emphatic components of generalized communicative categories (e.g. emphatic interrogation) to the meaning of specific grammatical categories (e.g. negation). Thus, spoken language is an important and indispensable basis for the reconstruction of parent forms of proto-languages and of their semantics.

#### Sources cited in the text

- BFE = Baykurt, F. 1974. *Efendilik savaşı*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 BFI = Baykurt, F. 1975. *İçerdeki oğul*. Ankara.  
 ERS = Enis, R. 1968. *Sarı it*. İstanbul: Ararat yayınevi.  
 HTH = Taner, H. 1970. *Hikâyeler*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 IEA = İzzet, E. 1930. *Aşk güneşi*. İstanbul: Remzi yayınevi.  
 IHM = Ihmalyan, J. 1971. *Učebnoe posobiye po tureckomu razgovornomu jazyku*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.  
 KTK = Tahir, K. 1971. *Körduman*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 KYI = Kemal, Y. 1958. *İnce Memed*. Sofya: Narodna Prosveta.  
 NAB = Nesin, A. 1975. *Bir sürgünün anıları*. İstanbul: Tekin yayınevi.  
 OKD = Kemal, O. 1958. *Devletkuşu*. İstanbul: Remzi yayınevi.  
 OKY = Kemal, O. 1974. *Yağmur yüklü bulutlar*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 OKO = Kemal, O. 1975. *Oyuncu kadın*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 RIH = Ilgaz, R. 1959. *Hababam sınıfı*. Ankara: Bilgi yayınevi.  
 RPA = A play by Radio Ankara: *Acı tebessüm*.  
 RPO = A play by Radio Ankara: *Oğullar*.

#### References

- Aupècle, M. 1973. La langue française écrite en milieu étranger à l'école primaire. *Le français dans le monde* 99, 20 - 36.  
 Gencan, T. N. 1979. *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları.  
 Hengirmen, M. 1995. *Türkçe dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Engin yayınevi.

- Johanson, L. 1990. Studien zur türkeitürkischen Grammatik. In: Hazai, György (ed.) *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft* 1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 146-301.
- Kononov, A. N. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva, Leningrad: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
- Korkmaz, Z. 1992. *Gramer terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu basımevi.
- Lapteva, O. A. 1976. *Russkij razgovornij sintaksis*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- Martinet, A. 1960. *Éléments de linguistique générale*. Paris: Colin.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1979. Nekotorye strukturno-semantičeskiye osobennosti predikativnyx konstrukcij s glagolnymi povtorami v tureckoj razgovornoj reči. *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 4, 75-83.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1982. Aspektno-èkspressivnye transformacii v tureckoj razgovornoj reči. *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 3, 63-71.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1983a. Predloženiya nazyvnye i s glagolom v nulevom vyražeenii v tureckoj razgovornoj reči. *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 3, 64-71.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1983b. O sootnošenii parnyx clenov predloženiya i nekotoryx tipov predikativnyx konstrukcij v tureckoj razgovornoj reči. *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 6, 68-75.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1986. Predikativnye konstrukcii s polnoznačnymi fiksirovannymi elementami v tureckoj razgovornoj reči. *Sovetskaja tjurkologija* 5, 70-79.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1992. Élementy teorii sintaksičeskoj cvyazi i intonologii v sinxroničeskom i diaxroničeskom osveščeenii. *Voprosy jazykoznaniya* 5, 118-131.
- Švedova, N. Y. 1960. *Očerki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj reči*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.
- Švedova, N. Y. 1966. *Osnovy postrojenija opisatelnoj grammatiki sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.

# **The Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics**

**Gerjan van Schaaik**

van Schaaik, Gerjan 1999. The Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. *Turkic Languages* 3, 272-276.

The Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics was held in Oxford (UK) in August 1998 and was attended by 82 participants from 15 countries. Apart from two panel sessions, on typological traits on Turkic languages and on language contact, the following linguistic areas were covered: psycholinguistics, bilingualism, language acquisition, discourse and pragmatics, syntax and morphology, phonetics and phonology, computational applications.

The next conference will be organized by Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, and will be held in Istanbul from 16-18 August 2000.

*Gerjan van Schaaik, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü, 80815 Bebek – İstanbul, Turkey.*

The Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics was held from 12 to 14 August 1998 at Lincoln College in the historical city of Oxford, England. The conference was convened by Celia Kerslake of the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford and by Aslı Göksel of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. There were 82 participants from fifteen different countries: 23 from Turkey, eighteen from Germany, thirteen from the UK, ten from the US, three from the Netherlands, two each from Japan, France, the Czech Republic, Canada and Australia, and one participant each from Sweden, Norway, Austria, Russia and Italy. A total number of 55 papers was presented. The conference venue was Lincoln College, a collection of beautiful old buildings, lodgings and gardens located at the site where in 1427 the Bishop of Lincoln, Richard Fleming, founded the “College of the Blessed Mary and All Saints, Lincoln, in the University of Oxford, commonly called Lincoln College”. As many of the participants undoubtedly noticed, in this wonderful place in the very heart of the city



and university, the spirit of academic work performed through the ages is still clearly in the air.

True to the tradition of these Turkological conferences, there were, in addition to the more serious activities during the daytime, quite a number of possibilities to unwind: Plenty of sightseeing in Oxford and its surroundings, a reception with a generous supply of drinks and delicious snacks, an exquisite dinner in a Lebanese restaurant, and of course, the more or less unavoidable visit to Blackwell's bookstore. To top it all off, the weather was beyond expectation. And it was in this excellent atmosphere that the last ICTL meeting of this century took place.

After Celia Kerslake's opening speech, the presentation of papers started in a series of theme-oriented parallel sessions and two panel sessions.

The aim of the first panel discussion, entitled *Linguistic evidence from peripheral Turkic languages* and chaired by Lars Johanson, was to find out what exactly constitutes the "Turkic type", since what is generally understood by this term is largely based on descriptions of Turkish. Apart from the introductory remarks by the chairman, the following papers were presented: *Consonantalization and obfuscation* by Arienne Dwyer; *On word order properties of genitival possessive constructions* by Eva Ágnes Csató; and *Lexical copying in Turkic: The case of Eynu* by Tooru Hayasi.

The objective of the second panel discussion, entitled *The role of yapmak, etmek and olmak in diaspora Turkish* and chaired by Petek Kurtböke, was to shed some light on the question how data and analyses can contribute to the description of these verbs within a language-contact framework. The papers read were: *The replacement of et- by yap- is evident in migrant Turkish. Is there anything to be learned from history?* by Hendrik Boeschoten (presented by Petek Kurtböke); *The use of yap- in Turkish-Norwegian code-switching* by Emel Türker; *The development of yapmak as auxiliary and main verb in the speech of Turkish bilingual children* by Carol Pfaff; and *Delexicalised verbs in Turkish from a corpus perspective* by Petek Kurtböke.

Roughly speaking, the remaining papers covered the following fields: (1) psycholinguistics; (2) studies on bilingualism; (3) studies on language acquisition; (4) discourse and pragmatics; (5) syntax and mor-



phology; (6) phonetics and phonology; and (7) computational applications.<sup>1</sup>

1. Psycholinguistics was covered by two papers: *Linguistic representations of movement in space and time* by Şeyda Özçalışkan\* and Dan Slobin; and *Cross-cultural speech act realisation: The case of requests in the Turkish speech of Turkish monolingual and Turkish-German bilingual speakers* by Leyla Marti.

2. Studies on bilingualism included the following topics: *How to get rid of the Turkish morphological system?* by Ineke van de Craats; *Grammatical properties in Turkish and Dutch possessive constructions* by Ineke van de Craats\*, Norbert Corver and Roeland van Hout; *Turkish relative clauses: Are they vulnerable to loss in language-contact situations?* by Kutlay Yağmur; *Development of Turkish clause linkage in the narrative texts of Turkish-French bilingual children* by Mehmet-Ali Akıncı\* and Harriet Jisa.

3. The field of language acquisition was addressed in the following papers: *Production of relative clauses in the acquisition of Turkish: The role of parallel function hypothesis* by Hülya Özcan; *When can children indicate the basis for their assertions? The acquisition of -DIR* by Ayhan Aksu-Koç; *What does a child have to acquire when acquiring the passive?* by Nihan Ketrez; *Children's acquisition of negation: Early evidence from Turkish* by Paivi Köskinen; *Head parameter setting in the acquisition of Turkish as a first language* by Cem Can and Özden Ekmekçi; *Children's preferences in early phonological acquisition: How do they reflect sensitivity to the ambient language?* by Seyhun Topbaş and Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz.

4. Studies in discourse phenomena and pragmatics were represented by the following papers: *Plural agreement and discourse* by Mark Kirchner; *Differences in speech and gesture organisation in Turkish and English spatial discourse* by Aslı Özyürek; *Ya, şey, yani, işte: Interactional markers of Turkish* by Nurdan Özbek; *Politeness and the use of 'Esağfurullah'* by Arın Bayraktaroğlu.

5. Besides a number of papers on general syntactic and morphological aspects, there was a rich variety of papers on the following sub-

<sup>1</sup> In cases where a multi-authored paper was presented by one person, the name of that person is followed by an asterisk.

topics: relative clauses, clause linkage, modals, adverbial constructions, verb valency, and historical aspects of Turkish.

General papers: *Relativization of the constituents of the converb segment in the complex predication in Turkish* (read in Turkish) by Kemal Güler; *The properties of null objects in Turkish* by Ümit Deniz Turan; *Is there a focus position in Turkish?* by Aslı Göksel and Sumru Özsoy; *Double dative marking in Gagauz* by Yuu Kuribayashi; *The noun / adjective distinction in Turkish* by Friederike Braun\* and Geoffrey Haig; *Higher order compounds in Turkish* by Gerjan van Schaaik.

Relative clauses: *Some formal types of Turkic relative clause equivalents* by Claus Schönig; *Locating relative agreement in Turkish and Turkic* by Jaklin Kornfilt; *Copied relative constructions in Khalaj* by Filiz Kırıl; *Why Turkish needs -ki* by Christoph Schroeder.

Clause linkage: *Clause linkage strategies in Turkish* by Fatma Erman-Akerson; *Strategies of clause-combining in Iraqi Turkmen* by Christiane Bulut.

Modals: *Semi-grammaticalised modality in Turkish* by Eser Taylan; *Analytical modal constructions in Gagauz* by Astrid Menz.

Adverbial constructions: *Specifier position of functional phrases in Turkish* by Gülşat Aygen-Tosun; *Piti piti karamela sepeti or how to choose your own adverb in Turkish* by Mireille Tremblay and Hitay Yüksek.

Verb valency: *(Are there really) Four operations for four affixes?* by Hitay Yüksek; *Changing argument structure without voice morphology: A concrete view* by Jaklin Kornfilt; *On the aspectual properties of unaccusatives* by Mine Nakipoğlu; *Detransitivizing passives* by Murat Kural.

Historical aspects: *Reflexive pronouns in Old Anatolian Turkish* by Mevlut Erdem; *Nogayca'da çekimli bol- ekeylemi ve Türkiye Türkçesi'ndeki işlevsel karşılıkları* (read in Turkish) by Birsal Karakoç; *Marked and non-marked genitive constructions in 16th-century Ottoman documents* by Claudia Roemer.

6. In the domain of phonetics and phonology the following papers were presented: *Acoustic analysis of voicing contrast in Turkish stops* by Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz; *Palatal synharmonism in the Turkic languages* by Irina Selyutina; *Labial attraction in Turkish: an empirical perspective* by Sharon Inkelas\*, Gunar Hansson, Aylin Küntay; *On non-final stress in Turkish simplex words* by Cem Çakır; *An integrated analysis of Turkish stress patterns* by Engin Sezer; *Clitics in Turkish* by

Marcel Erdal; *To be or not to be faithful* (on emphatic reduplication) by Meltem Kelepir; *On fusional features in Turkish* by Armin Bassarak.

7. The only paper in the area of computational applications was *The spoken Karaim CD: Sound, text, lexicon and "active morphology" for language learning multimedia* presented by David Nathan, who showed how the data on Karaim as collected by Éva Ágnes Csató are stored on CD-rom and how these data can be retrieved by means of a multimedia program that enables the user to simultaneously read and listen to text fragments.

The organisers of the conference aim at publishing the proceedings before the end of 1999, and since the deadline for submission of the final version of the papers was set as early as 10 October 1998, the issue of publication is clearly being tackled with commendable energy this time.

During the wrap-up session it was decided where to hold the next conference and how the planning committee should be made up. Furthermore, there was some discussion as to whether there is a need for abstracts to be selected anonymously. But an overwhelming majority of participants seems to feel quite comfortable with this system, which has been in practice since Eskişehir 1992.

We do hope to have another fruitful meeting in the year 2000. This time at Boğaziçi Üniversitesi in Istanbul: where the continents meet!

## Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Christiane Bulut, *Evliya Çelebi's Reise von Bitlis nach Van. Ein Auszug aus dem Seyahatname. Interpretierende Transliteration, kommentierte Übersetzung und sprachwissenschaftliche Bemerkungen*. (Turcologica 35.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1997. 9, 404 pages.

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

Over the past few decades Evliya Çelebi's (1611 – [?] 1684/85) *Seyahatname*, the most important of all Ottoman Turkish travel books, has been rediscovered for serious philological, historiographic und linguistic research. As a result, several monographs and partial editions have been published. Christiane Bulut's dissertation from 1995 presents Evliya Çelebi's journey from Bitlis to Van, together with linguistic studies of several aspects of the text. With this work, she helps to close a gap in the edition of the *Seyahatname* and—what might be of greater importance in the context of this journal—shows us that Ottoman Turkish does not deserve to remain a neglected branch of linguistic Turkology. The following (for the most part critical) notes on some details and concepts refer chiefly to the “linguistic remarks” (“sprachwissenschaftliche Bemerkungen”) of this outstanding study.

The book under review ends where the work of the author once began, with a reproduction of ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305, folio 236b-259b, unfortunately not on separate plates but still in readable quality. Even a short glance at the manuscript reveals how much work Bulut had to undertake before she could present her results on morphology (39-54), clause chaining (67-79) or relative clauses (84-110). The presentation of the precise transcription with an accurate parallel translation into German (144-263) forms the link between manuscript and linguistic investigation. This part is doubtlessly of great importance for Oriental studies, since even recent Turkish editions of the *Seyahatname* are based on the old Ahmed Cevdet edition, which suppresses up to 50% of the manuscript, partly because of political considerations. The transcription applied is designated as an “interpreting transliteration”. Its most significant feature is that information which has no graphic representation in the original

script is marked by italics. The result of this system is a Latin-script version of the text, which on one hand clearly distinguishes between the contemporary editor's interpretations and the features of the manuscript in Arabic script, and, on the other hand, does not tire a reader interested in syntax or history with unnecessary diacritics. In this respect researchers may be more likely to apply Bulut's system than Neu-decker's (1994) (cf. Kirchner 1998), which gives every detail of the original script by using more diacritics. The only disadvantage of Bulut's transcription is that she does not make a clear decision between a system based on the contemporary Turkish script and the traditional transcription used in Oriental studies: Using <c> for *ġīm* together with <q> for *qāf*, of course, does not produce misunderstandings but is an unnecessary break with tradition.

The author regrets that she cannot yet provide detailed investigations of the historical, political and other aspects related to the contents of the manuscript (12), although she does present some valuable tools for a better understanding of the text: Itinerary (127-130), index of technical terms of the Ottoman administration, titles, measuring units, etc. (294-305), index of names (places and persons) (306-339) and a short chapter about other sources on the area (131-134), which unfortunately does not mention the wealth of Islamic sources on the historic places around Lake Van.

The linguistic investigation begins with some observations on orthographical peculiarities of ms. Bağdat Köşkü 305 (24-38). Some of Boeschoten's (1988a) findings are presented in a more detailed way. One of the most interesting facts is that /a/ and /e/ are often represented by the grapheme *he* in non-initial open syllables, even in Arabic loanwords. Some remarks on details in this chapter:

- *qurşumlı* for *qurşunlı* is noted as the only example for a dissimilation (?) *nl* > *ml* (30). Actually Evliya Çelebi uses *qurşum* for *qurşun* "lead" in other places of the *Seyahatname* (cf. Tarama Sözlüğü).

- The remarks on laryngeal *h*, *ḥ* and *ḫ* under the heading "Vertauschung arabischer Grapheme ohne Phonemcharakter" ("Confusion of Arabic graphemes without phonemic value") (30-31) are a little misleading. According to Bulut, numerous interchanges in the spellings of lexemes with these laryngeals show that the "articulatory variants" are probably "allophones of /h/". Is it really a case of "articulatory variants" in places where we note interchanges in the spellings? On the same page the author states that *ḥ* and *h* were not pronounced differently, while the "guttural character" of *ḫ* (is *ḫ* more guttural than *h* or *ḥ*?) was partly preserved in Ottoman pronunciation. Was this *ḫ* really an allophone of /h/ or, my preference, an allophone of /k/, or a separate phoneme?

- The graphic and the phonological levels are also intertwined when Bulut discusses the graphic marking devices for signalling front vs. back quality of the vowels (30-31). In certain contexts the Ottoman writing system employs pairs of graphemes

that are used in Arabic to represent emphatic consonants and their counterparts. In Ottoman Turkish they are neither allophones nor are they emphatic as stated by Bulut; their use on the graphic level has little to do with the system of Turkish consonants. If the concerned Turkish consonants, e. g. /s/, have allophones at all, these are slightly fronted or backed variants.

In Chapter 2, entitled "Morphonology", Bulut investigates the vowel system of the suffixes, proceeding from Johanson's theory of the development of vowel harmony in Ottoman Turkish. Considering the fact that the same was done with a smaller database by Boeschoten (1988b), the author does not expect particularly novel findings (39). A glance at the meticulous presentation of various suffixes (40-50) shows that this expectation is fulfilled. Nevertheless, the reader should not miss the excellent tables contrasting the author's findings for most of the interesting suffixes with those of Johanson, Boeschoten and a recent Turkish dissertation.

Bulut's investigation of Evliya Çelebi's syntax also employs Johanson's consistent and applicable analysis of Turkic languages, especially with regard to the description of converb clauses, the classification of language contact phenomena, the problem of subordination in Turkish clauses and the classification of clause combining strategies in adverbial clauses. Problems arise when Bulut tries to incorporate other approaches into this model, as we can see in the case of Turkish relative clauses. After presenting various syntactic characteristics of Evliya Çelebi's language (for example the well-known differences of genitive marking in comparison with modern Turkish, 63-66) Bulut deals with the topic of clause chaining. However, this type of clause combining can hardly be described as "characteristic of the text under investigation" (67), as stated in the introduction of the chapter, since clause chaining is common in many styles and in all periods of language history except late Ottoman Turkish. The author goes further than the usual general outlines by making individual analyses of these highly complex structures, using a suitable graphic presentation. In this context we should mention Bulut's findings concerning clauses with *ve* coordination in addition to *-(y)Ip* converbs and clause chaining without finite predicate.

Relative clauses are dealt with under the aspect of code copying (Johanson 1992). Bulut directs her attention especially to a supposed functional differentiation between copied and "Turkic" strategies of relativization. Arguing for such a differentiation, she says that it is "unlikely" that a "language copies structure just for the sake of decoration" (84). Considering the fact that Ottoman Turkish was an extremely elaborated language of the court, of administration and education, stylistically motivated grammatical structures should not be categorically ruled out. In Ottoman Turkish, "decorative" functions and grammatical functions interact in various ways that may be a subject of further investigation. Examining the relative clauses in her corpus, the author makes use of concepts employed in several of Johanson's monographs and pa-

pers and adopts the opposition coordination vs. subordination, which is defined on a formal-syntactic basis. According to this concept, copied postpositive relative constructions are *linked* (not subordinated) to the preceding clause by a “conjunctor”. In another paper based on her thesis (Bulut 1998: 182) the author speaks explicitly of “relative clauses *co-ordinated* by *kim*”. On the other hand, Bulut defines relative clauses according to “semantic criteria” as a category of dependent clauses that explain the content of or define an element in the matrix clause, the so-called basic segment. (“... die ein Element im Matrixsatz, das sog. Basissegment, ... inhaltlich erläutern oder definieren”) (84). It is hard to understand how the syntactic concept of “matrix clause” can be used for structures that are analysed as not being embedded or subordinated. Both criteria, the semantic and the syntactic one, give us reasonable definitions of relative clauses that differ considerably from each other in their results; they should only be used if a hierarchy has been established between them. Apart from that, Bulut does not give an answer to the status of the intrapositive relative clauses with *kim* that are sometimes used by Evliya Çelebi (89). Are they to be treated as linked parenthetical constructions or is this a case of subordination? The last section in the chapter on relative clauses deals with a supposed functional differentiation between prepositive and postpositive relative constructions in the language of Evliya Çelebi (106-110). While the general distribution between prepositive and postpositive relative constructions is 2:1, both strategies have grammatical domains in which one of them dominates (107). However, according to Bulut, the crucial criterion for the distribution of the two constructions is semantic: Restrictive relative clauses vs. appositive relative clauses (108). The author claims that prepositive relative constructions are *always* restrictive and postpositive constructions are, with a single exception, appositive. The rule is formulated somewhat differently in Bulut (1998: 190): “the Turkish prepositive type of RCs always combines with indefinite heads”. Bulut’s finding exactly fits the typological predictions; however, a glance at Evliya Çelebi’s text makes clear that the proposed rule does not work in the claimed absolute manner, at least for prepositive relative clauses. Some examples with Bulut’s German translation:

– ... *sedd-i İslâm olan qal‘e-i Vâna dâhil olurken* ... (242a/27) “wenn Ihr ... in die Festung Van, dieses Bollwerk des Islam, eingezogen seid ...” Evliya Çelebi may have preferred the prepositive non-restrictive relative clause because the matrix clause of the relative clause is embedded into a converbial clause. A construction with *kim* would have either been intrapositive, which Evliya Çelebi would have disliked, or separated far from its basic segment.

– ... *bu qal‘enün şarqisi ve cenübisi tarafında olan Vân Deryâsı bir halic-i şağır[e] gibi nümâyândır* ... (242b/6) “... ist der Van-See, der an der östlichen und südlichen Flanke dieser Festung liegt, wie ein kleiner Meerbusen anzusehen.” A postpositive



relative construction is probably avoided because *halîc-i şağîr[e]* and not *Vân Deryâsı* would then be interpreted as the basic segment.

– Further examples of non-restrictive prepositive constructions: 239a/26, 243a/19, 243b/11 (basic segment not inherently definite), 243b/34, 245b/22.

The reason for the deviation from the expected rule may be that prepositive constructions are the primary and unmarked strategy for relative clauses in Turkish. This strategy can principally be used for restrictive and appositive sentences, while the postpositive *kim* constructions copied from Persian are a secondary strategy with a specialized function. This relationship is reflected also by the frequency of both strategies in the text.

The chapter on relative clauses is followed by a presentation of some peculiarities of adverbial and complement clauses (111-123). Again Bulut follows Johanson's model for the description of Turkic syntax. This is especially true of causal clauses, which are classified according to Johanson (1993) mainly on the basis of formal syntactic connection. In this context, Bulut proposes a third position on this scale called "Doppelkodierung" ("double coding"), i.e. coding with "Turkish" and copied means (122-123). In my opinion, this kind of double coding merits further attention, but clauses of this type should not be treated as a third and more deeply embedded position but as a subsection of position 2 "Einverleibung" ("embedding"). In this chapter, as in the ones preceding it, the author shows that the syntactic structures of Evliya Çelebi's language have quite a lot of properties copied from Persian. However, Bulut states in the introductory remarks to the syntax of the text that the investigated text confirms the standard thesis "... daß im Hochosmanischen vor allem auf dem Gebiet des Lexikons Fremdelemente dominierten, während die türkische Morphologie und Syntax weitestgehend unbeeinträchtigt blieben" (59). Given the fact that there are more or less clearly defined domains for copied structures in Evliya Çelebi's syntax, as shown by Bulut, it is confusing to claim that the syntax remains largely unaffected, unless this assertion is clearly restricted to the basic principles of Turkic syntax. In this context, it should be said that even clause chaining with *-(y)Ip* converbs in Ottoman Turkish, a construction that is attested from the oldest Turkic documents, is influenced to a certain degree by Persian and Arabic text construction patterns with coordinative conjunctions. If the syntax of Ottoman Turkish were really more or less uninfluenced, it is again hard to understand where the copied syntactic structures that, according to Bulut, have almost completely disappeared in contemporary Turkish (84) came from. I believe that in spoken standard Turkish of the late 20th century a considerable amount of structures copied from Persian still survives.

It is a shortcoming of the book review genre that critical remarks tend to require much more space than praise. With that in mind, I would like to briefly conclude this review with the statement that Bulut's investigation of Evliya Çelebi's language



is without doubt the best text-based study on Ottoman Turkish I know. In addition, she has managed to present a perfect edition of a significant text along with preliminary studies illuminating its historical background.

### References

- Boeschoten, Hendrik 1988a. Evliya's spelling and our transliteration. In: Van Bruinessen, Martin & Boeschoten, Hendrik (eds.) *Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir*. Leiden: Brill. 71-80.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik 1988b. The Seyahatname as a source for linguistic investigation. In: Van Bruinessen, Martin & Boeschoten, Hendrik (eds.) *Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir*. Leiden: Brill. 81-103.
- Bulut, Christiane 1998. Copied strategies of clause combining. Relativization in Middle Ottoman Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 2, 171-197.
- Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. Bd. 2, Nr. 5.) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Johanson, Lars 1993. Typen kausaler Satzverbindungen im Türkischen. *Journal of Turkology* 1, 213-269.
- Kirchner, Mark 1998. Review of Hannah Neudecker, *The Turkish Bible translation by Yahya bin 'Ishak, also called Haki*. *Turkic Languages* 2, 320-323
- Neudecker, Hannah 1994. *The Turkish Bible translation by Yahya bin 'Ishak, also called Haki (1659)*. Leiden: Oosters Instituut.
- Tarama sözlüğü. 13. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan tanıklarıyla tarama sözlüğü 1-8. Ankara 1963-1977.

Ahmet Kocaman: Review of Doğan Aksan: *Anlambilim – anlambilim konuları ve Türkçenin anlambilimi*. Ankara, Engin Yayınevi 1998, 232 pp.

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

Doğan Aksan is one of the few Turkish linguists who work on Turkish semantics. His interest in meaning goes back to the early 1960s, and his first article (*Anlam alışverişi olayları ve Türkçe* [Semantic borrowing and loans in Turkish] TDAY Bel-

leten 1961) was followed by several articles over the following years, which eventually resulted in a compact, seminal study on Turkish semantics: *Anlambilin ve Türk anlambilimi – ana çizgileriyle* ([Semantics and Turkish semantics—the main issues] Ankara, 1971).

This book has remained the first and almost only contribution to semantics in Turkish for years. It was a short, but succinct survey of basic issues of semantics, written within the framework of semantic theories prevalent in those years, and it was largely restricted to lexical semantics. The book was unavailable for some time, and Aksan, as a responsible scholar, had been thinking of revising it. 1998 witnessed not a revision but the birth of a new book: *Anlambilim: Anlambilim konuları ve Türkçenin anlambilimi*, a more comprehensive achievement with an emphasis on Turkish sentence semantics.

The new book comprises an introduction and four chapters. After the introductory notes about language, linguistics and semantics in general, Chapter 1 presents a survey of the basic concepts of lexical semantics, including referential and affective meaning, antonymy, polysemy, homonymy, context, signification, etc. The chapter ends with brief notes on Aktionsart (manner of action) and aspect as they relate to lexical meaning and gives a short account of semantic changes.

The second chapter is based on concepts laid out in the previous chapter and concentrates on polysemy, synonymy, homonymy, converseness, etc. in Turkish. This and the previous chapter are largely an extension of the related issues dealt with in the earlier book.

Chapters 3 and 4, on the other hand, constitute the backbone and most original part of the book in that they treat the sentence semantics of Turkish in some detail for the first time. The author classifies the syntactic features affecting Turkish sentence semantics into the six following categories:

1. Flexibility of Turkish syntax
2. Nominalization, adjectivization and adverbialization
3. The uses of reduplication
4. Rare use of personal pronouns
5. The use of adjectives
6. The influence of the copula *-Dir* on sentence meaning

After a discussion of each of these topics in turn, the chapter takes up the contribution of inflectional suffixes to sentence meaning and examines topics such as restriction, reinforcement, guessing, equalizing negative-positive conclusions, inverted sentences and varied expression patterns in Turkish sentences. From time to time there is overlapping with pragmatic issues, but this chapter is definitely an original con-

tribution to Turkish semantics as it succinctly and expertly incorporates the discussion of modality and functional perspective into the description of sentence meaning in Turkish for the first time.

One of the best aspects of Aksan's book is that it is wisely delimited, i.e. its main concern is linguistic semantics, and, although occasional references are made to earlier language periods, its scope is strictly restricted to present-day Turkish.

A further merit of the book is that general linguistic theory forms the basis of discussion, but Turkish sentence semantics is not treated in terms of other languages justifying the theory, but rather on its own terms. With its transparent terminology, smooth style and comprehensive bibliography, Aksan's book deserves the attention of everyone interested in meaning in general, as well as specialists in Turkish linguistics and semantics.

**Ahmet Kocaman:** Review of Neşe Emecan, *1960'tan günümüze Türkçe – bir sözlük denemesi* [Turkish from 1960 to the present – an appraisal of the new lexis]. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi yayınları, 1998.

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

The "global village", as McLuhan calls it, is becoming ever smaller, and this brings languages into closer contact. Shakespeare's motto "neither a borrower nor a lender be" no longer works. The process affects both sides, but borrowing languages are affected even more deeply. Turkish is one of those languages which has been undergoing a rapid transformation in recent decades, and the phenomenon has been discussed by many people, linguists and non-linguists alike (see e.g. *Çağdaş Türk Dili*, 1996). The issue has often been examined within the framework of the Turkish language reform. Emecan goes beyond this and describes the recent developments completely from a scientific point of view.

The book comprises five chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter deals with neologisms from a theoretical standpoint. In this chapter the author points out that the main defining criterion for neologisms is meaning, i.e. that neologisms introduce conceptual novelties into the language.

The second chapter is concerned with the neologism as related to lexicology, lexicography and sociolinguistics, and the third chapter classifies neologisms in Turkish in terms of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics.

The fourth chapter seems to be a digression in the book. It is an overall appraisal of the trends of change in the Turkish dictionary through its various publications from 1959 to 1988. There are interesting points to note in the quantitative analysis here, but these points are only indirectly related to the main theme of the book. Perhaps it would have been better justified if the discussion focused on how many of the loans were incorporated into the different editions of the dictionary. Yet, it is a concise but illuminating chapter that enables the reader to appreciate the lexical developments in Turkish vocabulary and might later be developed into an independent work in itself.

The fifth chapter presents the list of 1,150 new items studied, covering material from 1960 to 1990. These items were collected from three popular dailies (*Cumhuriyet*, *Milliyet* and *Hürriyet*), and the data were also substantiated by means of visual and aural media. The list of items are categorized into three groups according to whether they are completely made up of foreign elements (e.g. *check up*). Table 17 (p. 173) further provides a recapitulation of the findings in terms of structure and source language. (Apparently there is a misprint in this table; figure 417 refers to words of Western rather than Arabic-Persian origin.)

Emecan summarizes some of her findings in the following way:

- (a) One-word neologisms are rare (176 items, 15.3%).
- (b) Two-word items form the largest group (455 items, 39.56% of the data).
- (c) Of these neologisms, only 22% (253 items) are made up of native Turkish elements, which, she thinks, is an indication of the loss of enthusiasm for reform.
- (d) Words of Western origin are the most common among new items (491 items, 42.69% of the data). This is not surprising, as globalization is a concept originating in the West, and Western technology, science and even life-style have spread throughout the world in recent years.
- (e) Emecan finally emphasizes the fact that neologisms formed by derivation have not been very common in Turkish in recent years (only 67 items, 5.82%); direct loans, compounding and translation seem to be more popular methods. The author notes that this trend leads to certain problems in the spelling and pronunciation of Turkish.

Emecan's book is an important contribution to the depiction of recent developments in Turkish vocabulary over the last 50 years. We need more in-depth studies in this

area, studies that must not overlook the findings of this work. Those interested in Turkish—lexicologists, lexicographers and linguists in general—will find much of note in this concise but well-substantiated work.

#### References

*Çağdaş Türk dili – Dilimizin kirlenmesi ve dilimizin bugünkü durumu özel sayısı*, 102-103, Ağustos-Eylül 1996, Ankara.

Klaus Röhrborn: Besprechung von Shôgaito Masahiro, *Kodai uigurubun abidatsumakusharon jitsugiso no kenkyû* [Studies in the Uighur version of the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya-ṭīkā Tattvārthā]. 1-3. Kyôto 1991-1993. XIV, 346 S.; X, 416 S.; VIII, 504 S., davon 462 Tafeln.

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

Das Studium der buddhistischen Dogmatik hat in Japan eine jahrhundertlange Tradition, und es nimmt nicht Wunder, daß es Haneda Tôru war, der in einer Studie von 1925 den alttürkischen Abhidharmakośa-Kommentar des Sthiramati zum ersten Mal der wissenschaftlichen Öffentlichkeit vorgestellt hat ("Kaikotsu yakuhon anne no kusharon jitsugiso", in: *Haneda hakushi shigaku ronbunshû*, Bd. 2, Kyôto 1958, S. 148-182). Die Bearbeitung hat noch weit über 50 Jahre, bis 1991, auf sich warten lassen, denn dieser Text bietet besondere Schwierigkeiten. Er hat nicht die übliche Wortfolge des Türkischen, sondern die Wortfolge der chinesischen Vorlage. Diese Vorlage aber ist nur für einen kleinen Teil des alttürkischen Textes bekannt oder erschließbar.

In der Einleitung (Bd. 1, S. 1-21) beschreibt Shôgaito die Beziehung des alttürkischen Sthiramati-Kommentars zur chinesischen Vorlage oder besser vielleicht: zu den chinesischen Paralleltexen. Der alttürkische Text besteht aus zwei Teilen, die traditionell nach der Signatur der British Library als Or. 8212-75 A (hier: Abhi A) und Or. 8212-75 B (hier: Abhi B) bezeichnet werden. Abhi A ist die alttürkische Version der chinesischen Übersetzung des ersten Buches von Sthiramatis Kommentar zum Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (hier: AKBh) des Vasubandhu, ein Kommentarwerk, in dem Sthiramati das AKBh gegen die Kritik des Saṅghabhadra verteidigt (vgl. La Vallée Poussin: "L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu. Traduction et annotations". T.

1-6. Nachdruck Bruxelles 1971. T. 1, S.11). Das erste Buch von Sthiramati kommentiert nur einen kleinen Teil des ersten Buches des AKBh (Kârikâ 1-8), der in der Taishô-Edition (Bd. 29, Nr. 1558) gerade eine und eine halbe Seite umfaßt. Abhi B ist der – am Anfang und am Schluß unvollständige – Text des 4. Buches von Sthiramatis Kommentar, der einen Teil des 2. Buches von Vasubandhus AKBh erläutert (vgl. Einleitung, S. 1-5).

Die chinesische Fassung des von Sthiramati kommentierten Werkes (AKBh) ist also in der Taishô-Edition (s.o.) leicht zugänglich. Auch die chinesische Fassung des Kommentars von Sthiramati ist in einem Pariser Manuskript erhalten. Leider aber in extrem verkürzter Form, so daß sie keine Hilfe für das Verständnis der alttürkischen Version bietet (vgl. Einleitung, S. 8-13). Ein Bruchstück des chinesischen Sthiramati-Kommentars ist auch in Peking erhalten. Der im Alttürkischen überlieferte Teil findet sich aber dort nicht (vgl. Einleitung, S. 13-15), und auch in der tibetischen Version des Sthiramati-Kommentars fehlt der im Alttürkischen erhaltene Teil (vgl. Einleitung, S. 6-8).

Vom Wortlaut der Vorlage von Abhi A kennen wir also nur die Zitate aus AKBh, die Sthiramati anführt, und diese Zitate sind sehr kurz, jedenfalls im Verhältnis zu den kommentierenden Passagen aus Sthiramatis Feder, die teilweise in Form eines Dialogs zwischen einem Kritiker (skr. *codaka*) und einem Kommentator (skr. *śâstra-kâra*) abgefaßt sind. So umfaßt das erste Zitat aus AKBh nur die Zeilen 75-78 von Abhi A, der folgende Kommentar des Sthiramati geht dagegen von Zeile 79 bis Zeile 447. Und ähnlich ist das Verhältnis zwischen Zitat und Kommentar auch bei den übrigen 62 Zitaten des AKBh-Textes, die sich in Abhi A finden. Die 4585 Zeilen von Abhi A kommentieren so lediglich eine und eine halbe Seite des chinesischen Textes von AKBh in der Taishô-Edition.

In Abhi B fehlen die Zitate aus dem AKBh. Der alttürkische Abschreiber gibt aber einen Hinweis auf die kommentierten Abschnitte des AKBh, indem er das erste Zeichen (oder die ersten Zeichen) des jeweils kommentierten Abschnittes des chinesischen AKBh-Textes in den alttürkischen Text einfügt. Das bedeutet, wie Shôgaito bemerkt, daß der Text von Abhi B nur verständlich war und ist, wenn der Leser den chinesischen Text von AKBh ebenfalls zur Hand hatte oder hat. Zu Abhi B gibt es also überhaupt keine chinesischen Paralleltex te – jedenfalls nicht in AKBh, wie das für Abhi A der Fall ist. Eine Reihe von Zitaten aus dem Abhidharmanyâyânusâra-śâstra – das ist der oben erwähnte kritische AKBh-Kommentar des Saṅghabhadra – geben aber dennoch eine gewisse Hilfe. Shôgaito hat solche Zitate aus Abhi B gesammelt und in einer separaten Publikation in Band 18 (1987), S. 159-207, seiner Zeitschrift *Gaikokugaku kenkyû* [Annals of foreign studies] herausgegeben (“Uiguru-bun ‘Abidatsumajunshôron’, daiei toshokan shozô Or. 8212-75 B kara”). Man findet in dieser Studie nicht nur den alttürkischen Text und den chinesischen Paral-

leltext des Saṅghabhadra, sondern auch ein chinesisch-ugurisches Glossar, das für das Verständnis des gesamten alttürkischen Sthiramati-Textes von Bedeutung ist. Es bleibt zu prüfen, ob der in Abhi A gelegentlich erwähnte "Kritiker" (skr. *codaka*) vielleicht auch mit Saṅghabhadra zu identifizieren ist.

In Abhi A gibt es zahlreiche Korrekturen, die offenbar von der Hand des Abschreibers stammen. Sie verbessern den AKBh-Text nach der chinesischen AKBh-Übersetzung des Xuanzang (Taishō-Edition Bd. 29, Nr. 1558), die von der im chinesischen Sthiramati-Text zitierten Fassung des AKBh-Textes leicht abweicht. Shōgaito schließt daraus mit Recht, daß der Kopist von Abhi A den chinesischen Sthiramati-Text nicht kannte und nur die Xuanzang-Übersetzung zur Hand hatte. Er hat dann den Sthiramati-Text, den er abschreiben wollte oder sollte, nach der Xuanzang-Übersetzung "korrigiert" (vgl. Einleitung, S. 15-17).

Shōgaitos Edition ist mustergültig und wäre – beim gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung – in Europa nicht machbar gewesen. Die Edition wird begleitet von einer japanischen Übersetzung und von einem philologischen Apparat, der die Korrekturen und Schreibfehler registriert. Der erste Band enthält den Text von Abhi A, der zweite Band den Text von Abhi B und einen vollständigen Index für den gesamten Text, der dritte Band die Faksimiles. Man findet kaum Druckfehler und ganz wenige Lese- oder Interpretationsfehler (Wortfolge im Folgenden normalisiert):

In Abhi A, Z. 1629, 1630, würde man statt *yügmäkin* besser *yügmäkig* lesen: *\*beš yügmäkig ol abidarim ärür tep sözlämämiš ol* "er hat nicht gepredigt, daß die Fünf Skandhas der Abhidharma sind". Das Possessiv-Suffix von *yügmäkin* hätte keinen erkennbaren Bezug.

In Abhi A, Z. 2483, ist sicher *oküt-* statt *uküt-* zu lesen: *\*nä ücün t(ä)gri burhan kapile toyinīg okiṭu ṭripitakeya tep sözlädi* "warum rief der göttliche Buddha den Mönch Kapila, indem er sagte: 'O Tripitaka!'"

In Abhi A, Z. 2904, und an vielen anderen Stellen, wo *bir tāk* transkribiert wird, dürfte *bir täg* "gleich" gemeint sein.

In Abhi B, Z. 1486, ist der Dativ *tägmäzkä* wohl eine Fehlesung für *tägmäzkän*: *bir ikintikä tägmäzkän ...* "bevor sie einander erreichen ...".

In Abhi B, Z. 1579, dürfte *umagay* ein Schreibfehler für *umakī* sein: *\*burun ärkligniy ymä ök irak yakın buluṭ yığaktaki yığnıñ adırṭın körmädin bilgäli umakī näčükin bolgay* "wie würde es möglich sein, daß das Nasenorgan ebenso den Unterschied von nahen und fernen Gerüchen verstehen kann, ohne sie zu sehen?"

In Abhi B, Z. 2101, ist – wie auch im Index – *bolmiš* bei einer letzten Korrektur offenbar übersehen worden. Die Übersetzung scheint von *bulmiš* auszugehen, was zweifellos richtig ist: *\*tayak tegüci adig bulmiš ol* "hat den Namen 'Stütze' erlangt".

Wie gesagt, kann das den vorzüglichen Eindruck, den man von dem Werk gewinnt, überhaupt nicht beeinflussen. Wir haben jetzt eine solide Basis für weiter-

führende Studien zu diesem Text, der durch seinen Index auch für das "Uigurische Wörterbuch" ausgewertet werden kann.

Robert Ermers: Review of Karl A. Krippes, *Kazakh (Qazaq)-English dictionary*. Kensington, Maryland: Dunwoody Press. 1994. ISBN 1-881265-02-1. 290 pp.

*Robert Ermers, Vlagberg 33, 5845 ED Sint Anthonis, The Netherlands.*

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, its former satellite states have opened to the world. Western scholars are now relatively free to travel and seek out academic contacts, and Central Asian students leave in droves to study abroad. Turcological and Islamic studies in the West are experiencing new impulses. This also applies to the compilation of dictionaries.

The compilation and edition of a bilingual dictionary is a tedious and difficult task. It demands a thorough knowledge of both languages involved, in addition to a strict adherence to lexicographical principles. Ideally, the bilingual dictionary contains only those entries and definitions which its user is most likely to look for, should list as few obsolete words as possible and take great care with neologisms. Dictionaries also have a social function: They are often regarded as normative in linguistic matters, the sources people refer to when in doubt; a bilingual dictionary is therefore per se a meeting place of peoples and cultures. As is known, the Soviet Union made use of the prestige of lexicographical works for political purposes, too. One of its policies obliged lexicographers to include Soviet propaganda in their work. This led to the awkward occurrence of translated quotations from Lenin's (and Stalin's) works or the proceedings from communist party gatherings as examples in both bilingual and monolingual dictionaries.

Some of the principles underlying the compilation of the dictionary under review are explained in detail by its chief editor (vii-xiv). One is the transcription of all Qazaq words according to their pronunciation, hence *қазақ* – Qazaq, in order to avoid transcriptions through Russian, such as "Kazakh" and "Kazak" (however, "Kazakh" on pp. 5, 233). The official name of the "Republic of Qazaqstan" in Latin script is "Kazakstan", or even "Kazakhstan", which is not likely to change.

Significant lacunae in the selection of entries are e.g. *балал* 'child', *жау* 'enemy', and *аяқ* in its sense of 'drinking bowl'. A praiseworthy initiative is the inclusion of



Latin names of most—not all, e.g. *табан* (230)—plants and animals, which makes it easy to trace a species' exact name also in languages other than English. Useful is the inclusion of the names of Qazaq writers (Сәкен Сейфуллин, 213), ancient rulers (Қасым хан, 49) and organisations (*алаш*, 13; a lengthy entry on the Cossacks who bear no relation to the Qazaqs, *казачество*, 115). Persons are entered under their first names only, which sometimes renders it difficult to find them.

For many entries a satisfactory translation is not given, e.g. *қысырақ* (168), *саба* (204), *тантағар* (235), and accurate descriptions are given instead (although that of *бесбармақ* [46] 'a Qazaq dish' should have been more elaborate). In some of these instances explicatory Russian translations are provided, whose purpose here is not clear, viz., *сын-қымл бағындыңқы* 'subordinate clause of manner' (Russ. *придаточное предложение образа бействия*, 227; also 167, 194, 254).

The indication of the passive on a semantic rather than a morphological base may lead to confusion; all intransitive verbs are labeled *v-pass*, e.g. *абалау* 'to bark' (1), *хабардар болу* (268), whereas both transitive and causative verbs are marked with a mere *v*, viz., *айыру – айырту* (8); *қарау* 'to look' (147) is labeled *v*, the fact that it governs the dative case not being indicated. Surprisingly, the words *бар* (38) and *жоқ* (98) are marked as verbs *v-pass* too. Apart from the fact that this is not correct, since they are not verbs—Western grammar provides no adequate category for these words—this label is of no aid in accounting for certain common expressions (which, incidentally, are not included in the dictionary), such as *бар адамдар* 'all people' and *анасы жоқ адамдар* 'people who do not have a mother'. Perhaps the compiler's confused concept of these words has kept him from providing any examples.

Cited forms of address are always in the second person singular, which, however, is not the regular polite form. Qazaqs are quite particular about using the plural form with strangers. In this way, *амансың ба?* 'are you well?' (16) and *өзің тірі бол* may you yourself live! (193), *өркенің өссін* (195) are not quite appropriate.

The dictionary is not free of an occasional slip of the pen in both English and Qazaq orthography. Examples are, e.g., (47) *Doesn't there seem to be any citizen ...!* (151) *That young lives ...* (also 193, 241), and (92) *жау* instead of *жауу* 'to fall' (of rain), *щека* (283) for *щётка* 'comb' (which is, in fact, a loanword, viz. *тарақ*; also 197). There are mistakes in the English translations of exemplifying sentences, e.g. (91) *мен атамды жасартамдеп шашын боядым* 'I dyed my mother's hair to make her look younger'—where *ата* in fact means 'grandfather' and *жасаранден* is a Qazaq dialectal form—(cf. also *контрреволюция* 125), as well as unlabelled usage of colloquial American English, e.g. *шығынату* (281) *Gonna finagle him ...*; *жену* (95) *C'mon, let's bet ...* Nor is political terminology a strong point, e.g. (169) 'liberal-democratic' and 'liberal-socialistic', where the reader is presented rather vague descriptions, e.g. "a party in Russia". At *нартия* (198) three names are given, viz.

*Азам, Алаш, Бирлесу*, i.e. two political parties and a trade union, respectively, none of which contains the word *партия* in its name.

The mistakes and errors mentioned so far may be due to a lack of time and attention during the proofreading of the manuscript. In the choice of the examples which serve to illustrate the usage of the entries some features of the dictionary come to light which evidence a systematic general lack of interest. Generally, lexicographers try to limit the number and length of their examples in order to save space and to gain more internal coherence. The examples they typically provide consist of candid, brief phrases and idiomatic expressions. In contrast with these principles, the exemplifying sentences and expressions in this particular dictionary are often of unusual length, some of them occurring more than once in the same or a similar wording, e.g. *сыю* (229) – *желеу* (94), *қонақ асы беру* (154) – *құрметіне* (162); a lengthy quotation from Qazaq literature is found under *туралану* (249), and the many references to the ancient city of Otrar (23, 112, 128, 145, 235, 251, 274, 275). The references to the endangered “gleamy-eyed steppe-antelope” (28, 47, 167, 179, 162, 238) must probably be understood as a private joke.

There are many allusions to warfare and international peace/war politics (see also comments below): *бөлшектеп бұзу* (51), *конвенция* (125), *қарасты* (147), *орналас-тыру* (190) *уағдаластық* (259), *шағын* (270), *шайқасу* (271), *шынжылдау* (282). In fact, there is much more to say about the examples. In the first place, an additional aim of the dictionary seems to have been to inform the user about developments and opinions in the recent history and politics of Qazaqstan. Therefore, the dictionary contains in the first place a considerable number of bibliographical references to newspaper articles and headlines. Among the newspapers quoted are *Aruana* (244, 260), *Azia* (283, 288) *Egemendi Qazaqstan* (244, 121 for *Yegemendi*), *Xalyq Kengesi* (248), *Xalıq Kongresi* (139). By assuming this policy, the compilers have taken the risk of the dictionary becoming outdated soon. Secondly, there is the content of the exemplifying sentences. If a dictionary should at all serve the aim of informing its users of current developments, one would expect to find brief and neutral texts. This, however, does not hold for the dictionary under review. Most of the examples can without exaggeration be characterised as rather tendentious. There are four main subjects, namely (a/b) the Soviet past of Qazaqstan, (c) Russians, Russian policy, (d) exaggerated Qazaq nationalism, and (e) international politics:

(a) Statements against Soviet rule *азшылық* (5) *ашық қою* (27) *хабардар болу* (268), *кез келген* (118) and *қарамағы* (146).

(b) Pro-Soviet, or neutral statements (often in relation with war activities): *жой-ғыш* (98): *During the years of the Great Patriotic War, our nation's air defence troops wiped out 7313 enemy plane [sic], and 4168 of its attack aircraft with [3145, sic] anti-aircraft artillery and machine-guns* (also under *зениттік* (109). Further refer-

ences are *держава* (68), *көңіл болу* (129), *күрескер* (134), *медаль* (175), *орнау* (190), *партияда жоқтар* (198), *плацдарм* (200), *рейд* (203, about *комсомол*), *төралқа* (248).

(c) Statements with messages directed against Russians and other Slavonic peoples, Russia and Russian politics, e.g., *айбалта* (5): “*Орыспен дос болсаң айбалтаң өмкір болсын. If your friend is Russian, keep your axe sharp. Орыспен дос болсаң айбалтаң жаныңда болсын. If your friend is Russian keep your axe nearby.* (Qazaq proverb, two variants; repeated on p. 229), *As a result of the socio-political upheavals, Slavic civilization is in a crisis* (repeated on p. 149). More anti-Russian statements are found under *алаңдаушылық* (12), *соққы* (218), *ұлыорыс* (262), *шегіт-қақпай* (276), *шығысу* (281, repeated on 58), *даңпырт* (64), *қазацество* (115, partially repeated on p. 12), *мекендеу* (176, repeated on p. 180), *орнығу* (190).

(d) Qazaq-nationalist: *жиілу* (98): *They circulated the notion of interfering in the sovereignty of the Republic of Qazaqstan* (repeated under *қол сұғу* 154), Further: *алдыбда* (14), *басынан өткізу* (41), *езгі* (73), *жазлау* (82, repeated under 120), *өзін сылаған* (193).

(e) Negative statements on international political issues: Afghanistan (221), Gaza (275), Israel (41, 155), Japan/Russia (12), Pakistan (33 38), Pakistan/Poland (22), Poland (163), UK/Argentina (103), US/China (151), South Africa (24, 217), Vietnam (196).

The number of these statements is too large and their contents and style are too serious as to ascribe them to mere slips of the pen. True, some of the anti-Soviet statements may originate from informants, who indeed may have still had many a reason for criticising the former Soviet authorities. The statements of the other categories, however, are actively directed against existing states and peoples. Some of them must have been taken blindly from the Soviet press of the seventies and eighties, and as such breathe the atmosphere of the now obsolete slogans against the former Soviet Union’s international opponents. Others are coined in a similar style, reflecting an exaggerated and inappropriate form of Qazaq nationalism.

As has been mentioned above, the dictionary itself is, apart from some minor points, well arranged and reflects the work of a serious editing team that deserves credit for this part of the job. The choice of exemplifying sentences, however, has turned it into a questionable and dated political document calling for instant revision.

Mariya Yakovleva: Review of Vladimir P. Neroznak (ed.), *The national languages of the Russian Federation. The encyclopaedia*. Moscow: Academia, 1995. 18, 400 pages, 2 tables, 2 appendices, index. ISBN 5-87444-029-1.

*Mariya Yakovleva, Moscow State Linguistic University, Arhangel'skij per., 7, kv. 12, 101000, Moskva, Russia.*

The Institute of the Russian Peoples' Languages of the Russian Federal Ministry of Ethnic and Regional Policies has published an encyclopaedic reference book entitled *The national languages of the Russian Federation*, containing 29 articles categorizing each language of the Russian Federation that has gained the legal status of an official language.

The dictionary is the second book in a series of encyclopaedic reference books prepared by the Institute. (The first one, *The Red Book of the languages of Russia*, was published in 1994.) The present book is the first descriptive reference book on the official languages of the member states of the Russian Federation. The necessity of this work was caused by big changes that have taken place in the country for the past several years. The former territory of the Soviet Union is now a mosaic of newly formed states. One of these, the Russian Federation, incorporates a number of autonomous or semi-autonomous political entities. Within these, for the first time in many years, languages other than or in addition to Russian, have received a legal status. In the light of these changes, a new and up-to-date reference book on this subject was urgently needed. Thus, the creation of *The national languages of the Russian Federation*.

The first chapter of the book under review is "The language reform in Russia: 1990 to 1995" (pp. 5-16), written by the editor-in-chief, Vladimir P. Neroznak. It introduces new laws concerning the languages of the constituent republics of the Russian Federation and discusses their new roles. The author gives a detailed explanation of the definitions used in the book and points out the problems arising from the attempts to define the legal status of each particular language.

The author suggests that one should differentiate between the concepts of a "national language" and an "official language", as it is done by the UNESCO. Vladimir P. Neroznak believes that the specific conditions in Russia call for the introduction of the concept of a "title language", i.e. a language whose name is identical with that of the ethnos that is incorporated in the official appellation of a state or a national territorial formation within the Federation. For example, the Komi-Permyak language, whose name comes from the ethnonym, also found in the title of the Komi-

Permyak autonomous region. The article includes two tables: "The genetic classification of the national title languages of the Russian Federation (according to linguistic families, groups and subgroups)", and "An alphabetical list of national and title languages of the Russian Federation, with definitions of their social status" (pp. 14-15).

The section entitled "On the structure of the dictionary entry" (pp. 17-18) offers a standard model for such an entry, made up of three parts, each containing 25 items.

The first part, "Ethno-sociolinguistic data" discusses problems of the language, its relation to a particular linguistic group or family, the number of its speakers, its territorial spread and functional range and sphere. It looks at the main stages of its external history, its dialects, as well as at academic sources devoted to its study.

The second section—"Data on the language system"—contains information necessary for the proper understanding of the particularities of all levels of the language; the main features of the sound system; the morphological type; grammatical categories and their formal expression; auxiliary parts of speech; the principal patterns and rules of word-formation; sentence structure, the relationship between the semantic and syntactic components of the sentence, types of sentences; general characteristics of the vocabulary, problems of its evolution; peculiarities of toponymy and anthroponymy; stylistic differentiation of the literary language and its functional styles; data on historical grammar; the history of the description of the language, the major dictionaries and grammar books.

The final section "Bibliography" describes sources of general information, reference books and the principal academic descriptions that should help the readers to get more detailed information about a language.

The dictionary entries are arranged in alphabetical order. The languages described in the work belong to different genetic groups and typological orders and possess different sociolinguistic properties, yet by now all of them have acquired the legal status of national languages. Russian is the national language of the Russian Federation; Altay, Buryat, Kalmyk, etc. are the national languages of republics within the Federation; Avar, Darghi, Kumyk and others are the principal literary languages of Daghestan; Adyghe, Bashkir, Ingush, etc. are the title languages of republics within the Federation, and Komi-Permyak is a detached variant of the Komi language. Special attention is given to the Russian language (pp. 187-230, written by Yuriy N. Karaulov, Vladimir P. Neroznak and Marija V. Oreškina).

The dictionary provides information on ten Turkic languages: Altay, Bashkir, Karachay-Balkar, Kumyk, Nogay, Tatar, Tuvan, Khakas, Chuvash, and Yakut.

Turkic-speaking peoples (more than 12 million speakers in the Russian Federation) occupy the second place (after Slavic-speaking peoples), among a large number of other peoples populating multinational Russia. All Turkic languages have been declared official languages of republics belonging to the Russian Federation. All of

them have their literary forms and functional-stylistic strata. Moreover, they are taught in secondary schools and institutes of higher education.

The articles on Turkic languages are written by leading experts in Turcology. Among them Mirfatih Z. Zakiev, Zinnur G. Uraksin, Ivan A. Andreev, Petr A. Slep-cov, Dorug-ool A. Monguš, Venedikt G. Karpov, Dmitrij M. Nasilov, and Alij A. Čečenov.

The ethnolinguistic descriptions of the various peoples deserve much attention and interest. The same can be said about the information on the historical formation of the written languages and the development of methods and materials for teaching them in school. Each article lists the most recent Turkic-language publications.

Experts on other languages of the Altay linguistic family can also draw a lot of valuable material from the dictionary articles.

The vast "Appendix" presents laws of the Russian Federation "On the languages of the peoples of the RSFSR", the Declaration on the Languages of the Peoples of Russia, laws on the languages of the republics of the Russian Federation and tells about the goals of the State programme on maintaining and promoting the languages of the peoples of Russia. The edition ends with an "Index of languages and dialects" discussed in the dictionary.

Although the number of authors contributing to the dictionary is large, the edition adheres to the stereotyped pattern of presenting the material. At the same time, the authors allow themselves to differ in their ways of presenting the material.

The dictionary under review maintains solid academic standards and answers up-to-date needs. It deserves attention as a serious scientific work in ethno- and sociolinguistics.

The dictionary is remarkable in that it addresses a wide audience: Philologists, ethnographers, historians, sociologists, teachers, the mass-media and anyone interested in Russian history and the languages of the Russian Federation.

People who wish to deepen their knowledge of a certain language, can consult the thorough bibliographical apparatus following each article.

The continuation of the dictionary / reference book series, planned by the Institute of the Languages of Russia, will be two encyclopaedic works mentioned earlier. They are "The disappearing languages of Russia and neighbouring states", that includes historical, cultural and linguistic information about peoples who lived in Russia (or the former Soviet Union)—the Scythians, the Bulgars, the Khazars etc.—and "Ethnic diaspora in Russia", a summary of historical and cultural information about the main ethnic diaspora and their languages—Greeks, Jews, Koreans, Germans, and others.

Unfortunately, the question concerning the publication of these interesting and indispensable books is still open. Since the Institute of the Languages of Russia has been

reorganized into the Institute of Peoples of Russia, linguistic programmes have become of minor importance. Meanwhile, as the already published dictionary / reference book shows, the Institute's staff of highly professional linguists can create sound scientific works.