Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Kirchner , Mark

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003|LOG_0038

Kontakt/Contact

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. Baǧdat 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 *ğīm* 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 "*con*junctor". 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 cenūbisi 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 *ḫalīc-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)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