Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003|LOG_0037

Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Christiane Bulut, *Evliya Çelebis 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 morphonology (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 Aḥmed 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 Neudecker'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 ǧīm 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 obervations 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 "*conj*unctor". 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 parenthetic 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 İslām olan qalʿe-i Vāna dāḫıl 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 qalʿenüñ şarqisi ve cenübisi ṭarafında olan Vân Deryāsı bir ḫalīc-i ṣaġīr[e] gibi nümāyāndır* ... (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 *ḥalīc-i ṣaġīr[e]* and not *Vān Deryāsı* 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 pecularities 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)lp* 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 transliteraion. 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 Türkische*n*. *Journal of Turkology* 1, 213-269.

Kirchner, Mark 1998. Review of Hannah Neudecker, *The Turkish Bible translation by Yaḥya bin 'Isḥaḳ, also called Ḥaki. Turkic Languages* 2, 320-323

Neudecker, Hannah 1994. *The Turkish Bible translation by Yaḥya bin 'Isḥaḳ, also called Ḥaki (1659)*. Leiden: Oosters Istituut.

Tarama sözlüğü. 13. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan tanıklarıyle 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 neologims 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 completey 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 suprising, 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 uigur-ubun abidatsumakusharon jitsugiso no kenkyû* [Studies in the Uighur version of the Abhidharmakośabhâṣya-ṭîkâ Tattvârthâ]. 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 jahrhundertelange 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 Paralleltexten. 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 Abhidharmakośabhâṣya (hier: AKBh) des Vasubandhu, ein Kommentarwerk, in dem Sthiramati das AKBh gegen die Kritik des Saṅghabhadra verteidigt (vgl. La Valleé 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. *śâstrakâra*) 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 Paralleltexte – 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 ("Uigurubun 'Abidatsumajunshôriron', 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-uigurisches 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 (Taishô-Edition Bd. 29, Nr. 1558), die von der im chinesischen Sthiramati-Text zitierten Fassung des AKBh-Textes leicht abweicht. Shôgaito 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).

Shôgaitos 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 *okïṭ-* statt *ukïṭ-* zu lesen: **nä üčün t(ä)ŋri burhan kapile toyïnïg okïṭu ṭripitakeya tep sözlädi* "warum rief der göttliche Buddha den Mönch Kapila, indem er sagte: 'O Tripiṭaka!'"

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

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

In Abhi B, Z. 1579, dürfte *umagay* ein Schreibfehler für *umakï* sein: **burun ärkligniŋ ymä ök ïrak yakïn buluŋ yïŋaktakï yïdnïŋ adïrṭïn körmädin bilgäli umakï 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 – *bolmïš* bei einer letzten Korrektur offenbar übersehen worden. Die Übersetzung scheint von *bulmïš* auszugehen, was zweifellos richtig ist: **tayak tegüči adïg bulmïš 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. *бала* '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-қимл бағындынқы* '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 *өзиң 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 *ata* in fact means 'grandfather' and *жасарандеп* 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 *партия* (198) three names are given, viz.

Азат, 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), *орналастыру* (190) *уағдаластық* (259), *шағын* (270), *шайқасу* (271), *шыңылдау* (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), *Xalïq 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): *жойғыш* (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), *курескер* (134), *медаль* (175), *орнау* (190), *партияада 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), *соккы* (218), *улыорыс* (262), *шегіт-қақпай* (276), *шығысу* (281, repeated on 58), *даңпырт* (64), *казачество* (115, partially repeated on p. 12), *мекендеы* (176, repeated on p. 180), *орныгу* (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: *ал-дыбда* (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 auto-nomous 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 sta-tus. 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 in-troduces new laws concerning the languages of the constituent republics of the Rus-sian 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 at-tempts to define the legal status of each particular language.

The author suggests that one should differentiate between the concepts of a "na-tional 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 lan-guage, 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 Yurij 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. A-mong 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.