

## Werk

**Titel:** Reviews

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2000

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0004](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0004) | LOG\_0021

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

## Reviews

Mark Kirchner: Review of Cholpan Khoussainova & Rémy Dor, *Manuel de qazaq. Langue et civilisation*. Paris: Langues & Mondes 1997. 195 pages + 2 compact discs. 270 FF.

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

One of the new tasks of Turcology is to prepare good textbooks for the state languages of the independent republics of Central Asia. For Kazakh, little was done until recent times, both in the NIS countries and elsewhere in the world. The few introductory books are didactically of debatable merit (e.g. Moldabekov 1992), or have been prepared in haste to meet the demand of travellers and businessmen (e.g. Abouy & Öztopçu 1994).

The book under review, written by a renowned European Turcologist and a Kazakh native speaker, aims at filling this gap without being too academic. Kazakh is introduced on the back of the book as “une langue simple”, a language where “la connaissance de soixante suffixes suffit pour maîtriser la grammaire et parler de tout et de rien.” The manual is intended for students without any knowledge in Turkic languages. Nevertheless even those who have a good command in one or two Turkic languages should take Kazakh seriously and study it lesson by lesson even if there may be some redundancy. Each of the 19 lessons presents grammatical explanations, useful exercises with solutions in an appendix, dialogues and additional information about Kazakhstan and Kazakh culture (unfortunately the transcription in these passages is not coherent). The dialogues, which are related to each other in their contents, give a good impression of spoken Kazakh and are not boring at all. This feature and many other details (writing exercises in Cyrillic handwriting, illustrations, etc.) give the impression of a manual prepared with love and care. The CDs are of good quality, and although one of the speakers has a Russian accent, this is not so bad since it reflects the linguistic reality in Kazakhstan.

The authors of the textbook under review have done pioneering work. Thus it is quite natural to find mistakes or misleading descriptions in the first edition. The following list of selected inaccuracies (page numbers in brackets) is presented here as an additional information for teachers or students who intend to use the textbook:

- (5) *mäshür* not *mäšüwr*.
- (7) It is more than a simplification to say that: “l’accent tonique est toujours à la fin du mot”. In Kazakh, as in other Turkic languages, there are a lot of systematic exceptions that should be mastered by beginners.
- (8) The Cyrillic letter <y> is transcribed *uw* resp. *üw* after consonants, but *w* after vowels, <q> is *ya* resp. *yä* according to front vs. back harmony.
- (15) *ä* is not a “variété de *a*” but a separate phoneme.
- (16) *student pe* not *student ped*.
- (17) *iše me* “(s)he drinks” is given as the interrogative form of *išedi me* “he drinks”. Later, p. 33, there is an exercise where interrogative sentences have to be modelled according to the pattern *bala özi žüredi > bala özi žüredi me?*
- (18) Two classes of voiced consonants (“sonores” = *b, v, g, ğ, d, z, ž* and “sonantes” = *m, n, ñ, l, r, y*) are defined in order to give the rules for the distribution of several suffixes (p. 23). Unfortunately this classification does not fit the distribution in many cases. Thus the plural suffix is not *-dAr* “après les sonores et les sonantes”, but after all voiced consonants besides *r* and *y*.
- (24) According to the authors of the manual, the *-DI* past is also used for an action whose completion “est certain dans le futur”. If there is such a meaning at all, this is a marginal contextual nuance.
- (25) It should be noted that the infinitive suffix is *-(U)w* and causes the loss of final high vowels of verbal stems.
- (26) As stated above, some sentences in the dialogues exhibit syntactic influence from Russian. In the sentence *Žak mağan aytı sender Parižde kezdesipsiñder* ‘Jacques told me that you have met in Paris’ punctuation marks could have been used to stress the construction.
- (38) The verbal negation is only given as *-mA* and *-pA*, with no mention of the allomorph *-bA*.
- (40) The translation of the French sentence “ce livre est à moi (le mien)” should be *bul kitap meniki* not *bul kitabi meniki*.
- (43) *bügin* not *büwgin*.
- (48) *taniysin* not *tanisin*; *oqiysin* not *oqisin*.
- (56) The second person imperative plural is *-(I)ñlz* not *-ñlz*.
- (61) The description of the distribution of the genitive allomorphs is a little misleading. It should be *-nlñ* after vowels and nasal consonants and *-dlñ* for the remaining voiced consonants. It is not the genitive suffix which is composed of two elements but the genitive construction.
- (62) *Žaqtiñ kitabi* not *Žaqtiñ kitabi*.
- (68) *kompozitorlariniñ* not *kompozitorlarini*.
- (69) *keširüw* not *kešerüw* “pardonner”.
- (71) In the section “le futur” the authors show a “présent-futur inactuel” with the suffix *-AtIn*. According to Kazakh grammars, this form is not used in the sense of a future tense but in the apodosis of conditional sentences.
- (73) *kitapši* not *kitapši*; *qonaqšil* not *qonaqšil*.
- (79) The translation of *ketkenge* should be “pour ceux qui partent” instead of “pour ceux qui viennent”.

- (81) *ešnärse* not *ešnarse*.
- (86) The sentence *qalağa barmaq bolıp, äzirlik žasaldı* “Ayant l’intention d’aller en ville, il fit des préparatifs” does not illustrate the participial use of *-MAK*. A phrase like *aytpaq söz* “a word that has to be said” would be more illustrative. The infinitive *-(U)w* and the verbal noun *-(I)s* are not used as participles.
- (92) *menen žas* not *menden žas*.
- (93) *muñdı* not *mundı*.
- (103-105) The meaning of constructions with auxiliary verbs depends also on the gerund on the main verb. Thus *-(I)p al-* and *-A al-* do not have the same meaning, here given as “la capacité d’effectuer une action”.
- (105) *kelip qaldı* not *kelip šaldı*.
- (114) *esikten beri* not *esiktin beri*; *sabaqtan soñ* not *sabaqtan sol*.
- (115) *tañerteñnen* not *tañerteñen*.
- (116) *almanıñ* not *almanıñ*.
- (126) *meniñ* not *menin*.
- (130) *üşewimiz* not *üşewmiz*.
- (139) *kitaptı* not *kitaptı*.
- (140) *köñildi* not *könildi*; *änder* not *änder*.
- (147) *äldeqayda* is an indefinite pronoun not a postposition.
- (150) *orışsa* not *orša*.
- (165) In the “repères bibliographiques” the French student will surely miss the “Dictionnaire Français-Kazakh” by L. Kydyrbayeva and the “Dictionnaire Kazakh-Français” by D. Indjoudjan (both Paris 1983).
- (170) *dušpan* is not “étranger” but “ennemi”.
- (173) *köriskenşe* is not “bientôt” but “à bientôt”.
- (174) “valise” is *qol žügi* not *qol žügin*.

Despite these mistakes, the *Manuel de qazaq* is a good introduction to Kazakh for student groups as well as autodidacts. I have used Khoussaïnova & Dor’s textbook in my course “Introduction to Kazakh” for undergraduate students, most of whom successfully learned Kazakh (along with some French) with its help.

*References:*

- Moldabekov, K. 1992. *Govorim po-kazaxski*. Alma-Ata: Ana tili.
- Abouy, Z. & Öztopçu, K. 1994. *Colloquial Kazakh – a mini course*. Guilford: Audio-Forum.

Claus Schönig: Review of Larry Clark, *Turkmen reference grammar*. *Turcologica* 34. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998. xxi + 708 p.

The *Turkmen reference grammar* by Larry Clark is intended “to be an accessible, practical and comprehensive reference work for students, researchers and linguists” (p. xvii) on the written and spoken standard Turkmen language. Consequently the author uses an easily understandable language to explain grammatical forms and their functions and provides a lot of examples. This gives even students inexperienced with Turkic languages access to Turkmen. At the same time it makes this reference grammar an important reservoir of grammatical information and language material not only for Turcologists but also for anyone seeking linguistic (and even historical, demographic etc.) data on Turkmen. The grammatical description depends on the Turkmen standard grammar of 1970-1977 (p. xix). Additionally Clark had the cooperation of three Turkmen members of the Turkmen Language Project (see p. xix). Clark’s descriptions are full of interesting details—many of them already known, but never before presented in a grammar not written in Russian.

The introduction (p. 1-26) contains information about the history, name, language and study of modern Turkmen. There follows a chapter on the sound system (p. 27-86) including the description of the Cyrillic alphabet and orthography. Morphology and parts of the syntax (e.g. subordinated clauses which minimally consist of a participle or a gerund) are treated in the chapter on the *grammatical system* (p. 87-484). The chapter about syntax is relatively short (p. 485-504). The lexicon is treated on p. 505-568. Here, besides remarks on word derivation, we find a subchapter about thematic groups of words like time and calendar, human body,<sup>1</sup> kinship, greeting, etc. The book ends with lists of various paradigms (p. 569-660), a rich bibliography (p. 661-678) and a very useful index (p. 679-708).

In most parts of the grammar Clark uses the traditional terminology of the classical Latin-based grammatical system still widely in use in Turcology. But occasionally he gives descriptions and explanations which are at least unusual. Thus, e.g., he calls *-mA-* a negation particle and not a suffix (p. 212). He differentiates between *postpositions* (p. 405-426) and *auxiliary nouns* (p. 427-431), where many Turkic grammars use only the term *postposition*. Clark’s postpositions consist of postponed functional words like *göra* ‘according to’ or *sari* ‘toward’ which take no case ending. The term *auxiliary nouns* designates nouns of time and space which appear in genitive constructions of the type *öy içinde* ‘inside the house’. It makes sense to separate these two groups of function words, even if the designation *auxiliary nouns* should better be replaced by a more specific term. But because of the many material and functional correspondences between the two groups, a total separation into completely different groups is perhaps a little bit too radical. I think it would be more

<sup>1</sup> As we can guess from Clark’s table of Turkmen anatomy (p. 562), the Turkmen, like the other Turks under Chinese and former Soviet rule, seem to get by without (designations for) genitals.

adequate to treat them as sub-groups of a category of expressions bearing case-like function.

The case forms of the third person singular possessive suffixes are explained as follows: “The consonant *n* /n/ also appears before all case suffixes when they are added to a word ending in the third person possessive suffix +*ı*/i /+ı/i/” (p. 70). This rule allows, of course, a very simple description of the case-marking strategies of Turkmen which is fully sufficient for practical purposes. But for students of Turcology the designation “pronominal *n*” should have been added, i.e. it should be said that from a diachronic point of view this *n* seems to be part of the possessive suffix. In the related case of final *n* in “possessive and case stems” of demonstrative pronouns (p. 193) Clark speaks only of “altered stems” and gives no reference to the comparable phenomenon on the possessive suffixes. Even if the grammar is intended to be a practical tool, such elementary knowledge of Turcology should have found some place in it. Moreover, the fact that pronominal *n* is treated together with buffer consonants may additionally cause wrong associations by students and scholars inexperienced in Turcological questions.

Another quite unusual designation made by Clark is *verbal* which “consists of those verb forms that cannot appear as final verbs of a sentence. Non-final verbs include the infinitive, participles and gerunds” (p. 327). In this definition of the *infinite verbal forms* (i.e. deverbal forms which can serve as predicates of non-finite clauses) a fourth category—the verbal nouns—is not mentioned; they appear only a few lines later. Although the verbal nouns in *-mA* and *-(y)IG* “share certain features with the infinitive” in *-mAK*, Clark wants to separate them (p. 333). He writes that both verbal nouns “plus possessive suffix reflect the process of an action”, whereas parallel infinitive constructions “indicate only that the otherwise undefined action is possessed by a definite person” (p. 333). Additionally, the verbal nouns cannot be used in constructions with *gerek*, *mümkün* or *islemek*, as can the infinitive. These arguments do not seem very convincing to me. First of all *verbal noun* is a morphological category. Nouns can be defined by the ability to take possessive and case suffixes—and both are true of the infinitives as well as of Clark’s verbal nouns. Furthermore, both types possess—in contrast to derivational verbal nouns—the ability to carry syntactic complements with them like finite forms do. That infinitives can appear in constructions different from those in which the verbal nouns are used is not a valid argument either. One could also say that the form in *-Ip* is not a gerund, only because it appears in constructions in which the other gerunds can not be found. Additionally, an assumed opposition “*process of an action (-mA, -(y)IG)* versus *undefined action (-mAK)*” can be taken as a direct hint to an underlying aspectual opposition between the forms—and, on the contrary, makes it seem very possible that infinitive and verbal nouns are members of one system of forms which is used to form predicates of non-finite complementary (sub-ordinated) sentences.

Clark includes forms like *bar* ‘exists’, *yoq* ‘does not exist; no’, *däl* ‘is not’ and the element *eken* in the group of *modal words* (p. 377-380). The modal words are

said to “have two basic functions: to express the speaker’s attitude toward what she or he is saying, and to add some shade of emotional or other meaning to a word, phrase or sentence” (p. 377). Most of the elements treated in this paragraph may be described this way. But I doubt that—except for the case when *yoq* means ‘no’—this definition really matches the main functions at least of *bar*, *yoq* and *däl*. These three words—different from other words treated in this paragraph—mainly appear in predicative position.<sup>2</sup> Whereas the simple positive copula form gives information that an entity “is” (which may mean that the entity exists) or that it can be identified with another entity or by a quality or quantity, the words in question are used to make statements about (non-)existence or non-identification. Therefore, they could be best designated as copulative elements and should be treated together with other forms taking part in the formation of nominal predicates, i.e. mainly forms of the copula corresponding with Old Turkic *är-* and its derivatives and later developed substitutes for the present tense copula (Old Turkic *ärür*). To use Clark’s own words: They are used to construct “what she or he is saying” and—different from real modal words of assertion, uncertainty, assumption etc.—do not express more of a “speaker’s attitude” than any non-modal, indicative deverbal form does. In the sentence *atlar bar* ‘there are horses’ the element *bar* is simply the predicate (or the complement of a virtual present tense copula predicate) of a nominal clause and does not express the speaker’s positive attitude toward the “saying” ‘(they are) horses’. In *bu at däl* ‘this is no horse’ *däl* is simply the negation of the copula and reports the non-identity of the subject referent with the referent of *at* ‘horse’. If *däl* ‘is not’ is a modal word, then verbal negations with *-mA-* should also be treated as modal expressions.

A comparable case is perhaps *eken* (p. 386-387). It always follows the predicate and takes instead the possessive or the pronominal personal endings. Clark’s examples and description are reminiscent of the function of *ekan* in Uzbek and *ekändur* in Chagatay, except for the fact that the Chagatay form additionally signalizes anteriority. Especially the Chagatay form can be called the anterior (“past tense”) copula of the indirect perspective, i.e. a form which bears a functional value comparable to that of the aspectotemporal deverbal forms (see Schönig 1997). As an indirective form *ekändur* can not be combined with *di*, which is the basic deverbal form of the past tense direct perspective in Chagatay. In contrast, the Chagatay form *ekin* can be combined with all finite predicates—because it has lost its copula status, does not take part in the perspective system and has become a modal particle expressing doubt or assumption. The question arises whether Turkmen *eken* can still be treated as such a perspective copula form or whether it proceeded in its development towards a modal particle. The fact that it still takes personal endings may be taken as an argument for its copula character. Unfortunately, Clark gives no detailed information about the distribution of *eken* on different types of finite predications, which would help to clarify this question.

<sup>2</sup> The elements *bar* and *yoq* additionally function to a limited degree as predicates of relative clauses of the type *su bar yerde* ‘in places where water exists’.

In the field of verbal morphology Clark uses some terms in an at least ambiguous and imprecise way. On page 209 the chapter *Verbs* starts as follows:

“Verbs are words which convey the action of a sentence. They may be described according to the time of the action (tense), the duration of the action (aspect), and the speaker’s attitude toward the action (mood).

The forms of Turkmen verbs may be divided into two basic groups: those verb forms which appear at the end of a sentence to indicate its predicate and those which do not appear at the end of a sentence. The final verbs (also called ‘finite verbs’) bear suffixes of tense, aspect and mood, as well as of person and number.

The non-final verbs (also called ‘non-finite verbs’) lack one or more of these categories and thus cannot appear at the end of a sentence, except in special circumstances.”

The paragraph *Tense and Aspect* starts:

“Verbs which serve as predicates of sentences typically express both tense and aspect.” (p. 217)

In both instances Clark uses *verb* (and in one instance *verb form*) in the sense of “deverbal form which can serve as a finite or a non-finite predicate”, in short “(non-) finite verb(al form).” In other passages the term *verb* is used in the sense of *verb root or stem* to designate the class of lexemes which are non-nominals and non-particles. Thus we find remarks like “A Turkmen simple verb typically consists of one syllable, but also may have two syllables if its root and suffix cannot be isolated” (p. 210). Thus different morphological and syntactic forms share the same designation *verb* (sometimes accompanied by more specific terms like *verb stem*, *verb form* or *predicate*), a situation one should try to avoid. In the case of the term *final verb* we know from the lines cited above that it is synonymous with *finite verb*. From the sentence “The group of final verbs includes all those treated under Tense/Aspect (/.../) and Mood (/.../) below, as well as the formations dealt with under Descriptive verbs below” (p. 209) it does not become clear whether Clark additionally wants to include all the verbal combinations treated there or only the forms used to derive the *present continuous tense* (see below) under the designation “final verb”.

We find the same unclear situation for the term *tense*. Under the headline *Tense and Aspect* Clark begins:

“The category of tense concerns the correspondence between the verb form and the concept of time. It refers to the time in which the action takes place, whether it occurs in present, past or future time.

In addition to its tense, the action may be viewed according to its aspect, that is, whether its occurrence is indefinite, continuous or perfect (completed) in duration.” (p. 217)



Whereas here *tense* and *aspect* appear to be different categories, the following lines tell us the opposite:

“Thus, tense may be described according to time (present, past, future) and to aspect (indefinite continuous, perfect), and, in some cases, according to various modalities of action (definite, habitual, subjective, unrealized).” (p. 217)

It seems that Clark wants to describe what Johanson (e.g. 1971) calls *aspecto-temporality*. This means that at least indicative finite verbal forms express a temporal relation between the act of speech and the event designated by the finite predication and its extensions, and at the same time convey an aspectual component, i.e. a special perspective subjectively chosen by the speaker under which an event may occur incompleting, at the point of completion, already completed or simply as an undifferentiated whole. Clark’s intention also becomes clear from his descriptions of the individual finite forms treated in this paragraph. Even if the terminology is different and contextual realizations of functional values of the forms are sometimes taken as their basic functions (e.g. the signalization of habituality by the aorist, see p. 219), the threefold aspectual system described by Clark can in principle be explained by applying Johanson’s model.

In the paragraph *Words and Grammar* (p. 93-96) the author states that “Turkmen indicates the aspect of duration of an action within the tense suffixes added to verbs /.../, but also describes the beginning, process, cessation and other characteristics of action through constructions consisting of two verbs /.../”. Such constructions are treated in detail in the paragraph *Descriptive Verbs* (p. 311-325). The functions of the verbal combinations in question are given accurately. Most of these verbal combinations are used to indicate different ways or phases of performing an action (German *Aktionsarten*) and ultimately belong to the derivational and not the grammatical tools of Turkmen. Thus, in connection with the combination *-p čiq-* Clark speaks of “characteristics of an action” (p. 213). But on pages 95-96 he enumerates aspectotemporal (“tense”) forms together with a verbal combination like *-p bol-* indicating “finished action”. Even if forms like the present tense in *-yAr* or the “subjective past indefinite tense” in *-IpdIr* go back to verbal combinations, they function in modern Turkmen as aspectotemporal markers and should not be treated together with the biverbal combinations on the same functional level. The same holds true for the combinations *-p du:r*, *-p yatı:r* and *-p otı:r*. They are correctly treated as aspectotemporal indicators of the so-called *present continuous tense* (p. 224-228). According to the information given in this paragraph, the combination *-p yö:r* “is used only for descriptive verb formations” and not as a special “tense” form. But in the paragraph about descriptive verbs *-p yö:r* is then treated together with the three other forms. Here the four combinations are said to “serve as descriptive verbs that depict the process of doing something constantly, continuously or regularly” (p. 321-322). As we can see, the weak point of Clark’s analysis of these biverbal forms is that he does not clearly differentiate between aspectuality and actionality—like his

model, the Soviet Turkmen grammar. This originates in a wrong interpretation of the role of “duration of an action”. Whereas different aspect forms can be used subjectively to present one and the same event within its realization, at its critical points or even after these points have been passed, actional forms are used to derive verbs with specialized different meanings from a basic verb. These new verbs designate objectively different actions. The actions expressed by some of these verbs are non-transformative and are well compatible with the idea of “duration”—like the aspectual forms presenting an event in the course of realization. The actions expressed by transformative verbs are easily compatible with the ideas of “shortness” or “completion” like aspectual forms focussing on the critical points of an event. Thus “duration” and “shortness” turn out to be contextual realizations of functional values belonging to two different levels of grammar.

The definition of *sentence* is given without using one syntactic term, such as subject or predicate (p. 492), and mainly relies on the fact that they express a complete thought (see also p. 484). The definition is very broad and also includes exclamations. The terms subject and predicate appear only in connection with the differentiation between simple and composite sentences.

Despite all the critical remarks, I think that Clark’s work is an important and useful basic work on the grammar of standard Turkmen. It is very useful both for learners of Turkmen and for practical purposes. But because of the ample detailed informations, it also makes for an inspiring read while providing a reference work for scholars of Turcology and linguistics.

#### References

- Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen*. (Studia Turcica Uppsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.  
 Schöning, Claus 1997. *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name*. (Turcologica 31.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Christoph Schroeder: Review of Lars Johanson (ed.), in cooperation with Éva Ágnes Csató, Vanessa Locke, Astrid Menz, and Dorothea Winterling. *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994*. Turcologica 32. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998. x+765 pp. Hb. DM 164.--. ISBN 3-447-03864-0.

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

*The Mainz Meeting* brings together the article versions of the papers presented at the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, which was held August 3-

6, 1994, at the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz. The meeting continued a tradition initiated in 1982 by Dan I. Slobin and Karl Zimmer. Earlier International Conferences on Turkish Linguistics had been held at Berkeley in 1982, Istanbul in 1984, Tilburg in 1986, Ankara in 1988, London in 1990 and Eskişehir in 1992. Since the Mainz Meeting, further conferences have taken place in Ankara in 1996, and in Oxford in 1998. All the meetings so far have resulted in a conference volume (see the list given in the bibliography). Since the International Conference on Turkish Linguistics is the only international conference series which combines modern linguistic thinking with the study of Turkish, the conference volumes provide an insight into current works on Turkish linguistics and the discussion in the field which no linguist interested in the study of this language can do without.

In a certain way, *The Mainz Meeting* is different from the previous volumes. As Lars Johanson, the editor of *The Mainz Meeting*, writes in the introduction: "The novelty of the Mainz meeting was that the range of topics was extended to include other Turkic languages besides Turkish as well as problems of general linguistic Turcology ... It was our hope that the meeting would promote the development of modern linguistic scholarship in the field by bringing together Turcologists and linguists dealing with Turkic / Turkish matters under different aspects and perspectives" (ix).

In this review, Section 1 will present the book and its articles in the order in which they appear in the volume. In Section 2 we will try to formulate some general impressions.

1. *The Mainz Meeting* contains 49 papers plus a two-page editor's introduction. The length of the papers ranges from 4 to 35 pages. The papers are divided into 14 chapters, according to their topics. A helpful alphabetical list of the authors and contributions is provided; there is no index.

In Chapter 1, "Phonology", first Michael Dobrovolsky argues that Chuvash is a language whose phonological processes are not syllable dependent but rather dependent on phonological weight ("Chuvash without syllables", 3-27). Next, Marti Roos describes the phenomenon of preaspiration in Western Yugur, a phenomenon rarely attested in the languages of the world ("Preaspiration in Western Yugur monosyllables", 28-41).

Chapter 2, "Morphology" also consists of only two contributions. First, Armin Bassarak discusses the pros and cons of the assignment of functional categories to Turkish morphological units, such as the tense / aspect suffix *-Iyor*, the verbal noun markers *-DIK-*, *-(y)AcAK* and *-mA-*, the plural suffix *-lEr* and the question marker *-mI* ("Functional categories in Turkish—remarks on the interaction between morphology and syntax", 45-56). In the second contribution in this chapter, Ömer Demircan divides the Turkish voice categories into "subtraction" (passive, reflexive, reciprocal) and "addition" (causative, mediative) processes ("Affixal behaviour in Modern Turkish", 57-72).

Seven papers contribute to Chapter 3, “Communicative Functions and Referentiality”. First, Marcel Erdal takes a fresh new look at Turkish exocentric adjectival compounds of the type *el-i açık* (hand-POSS.3SG open) ‘generous’, lit.: ‘his hand (is) open’, that is, compounds in which, contrary to the canonic Turkish pattern, the qualified element comes first and has the possessive suffix of the third person singular. The author argues that these constructions emerged from Old Turkic constructions with a sentence-initial topic and a possessive-marked, subjectival sub-topic. With regard to the distinct coding of subject and topic, then, Old Turkic has similarities with certain Sino-Tibetan languages as well as with Japanese (“Topic, subject and possessive compounds”, 75-84).

The next two articles in this chapter deal with pragmatic aspects of word order. Aslı Göksel investigates how linear order interacts with the interpretation of quantified expressions such as *Bir hemşire her hastaya bakıyor* (a nurse every patient=DAT she=looks=after) ‘A nurse is seeing every patient’. Special emphasis is given to the pre-verbal focus position and the post-predicate position (“Linearity, focus and the postverbal position in Turkish”, 85-106). Next, Jaklin Kornfilt shows that it is possible to relate syntactic and discourse-based properties of “inverted sentence” constructions (i.e. constructions in which the post-predicate position is employed) by applying an analysis of Right Dislocation (“On rightward movement in Turkish”, 107-123).

Taking a promising Turcological viewpoint in order to look at a much discussed problem of Turkish linguistics, Claudia Römer shows that the required use of the accusative suffix with possessive-marked direct objects, which is prevalent in Turkish, did not exist in 16th century Ottoman Turkish. The use of the accusative suffix in Ottoman, then, was much less bound to parameters of definiteness than in modern Turkish (“Marked and non-marked direct objects in 16<sup>th</sup>-century Ottoman documents”, 124-134).

The two following contributions again concentrate on discourse-pragmatic aspects of Turkish. Şükriye Ruhi investigates the distribution of the two connectors *ama* and *fakat* (both meaning ‘but’) on syntactic, pragmatic and textual levels. The author shows that *ama*, which may appear in the post-predicate position and never combines with *ve* ‘and’, functions on the pragmatic level, where it marks a turn in the discourse. *Fakat* on the other hand, which may combine with *ve* and never appears in the post-predicate position, is an adversative connector and functions on the textual level of cohesion (“Restrictions on the interchangeability of discourse connectives: A study on *ama* and *fakat*”, 135-153). Next, Ümit Deniz Turan contributes to the discussion of referentiality and object incorporation in Turkish. The author points out that incorporated objects may function as antecedents to zero reference and discusses the theoretical consequences of this finding (“Zero object arguments and referentiality in Turkish”, 154-182).

It is difficult to see how the last article in Chapter 3 relates to the topic of the chapter. Working within a Generative Grammar framework, Joop Veld attempts to

explain why Turkish allows certain clauses to appear in the pre- as well as postverbal position (i.e. nominalized clauses), while certain other embedded clauses (i.e. finite complements to verbs like *sanmak* 'believe') may not leave the preverbal position, and again other subordination types (i.e. clauses introduced by means of *ki*) may only appear in postverbal position ("Postverbal clausal constituents in Turkish", 183-196).

Chapter 4 combines three papers on "Converbs". First, looking at Altaic languages in a much broader perspective than the other authors, Walter Bisang argues that the particular type of clause combining by means of converbs, nominalizations and conjunctive verbs of the type *diye*, which is prevalent in all Altaic languages including Japanese, must not necessarily be seen as the outcome of a genetic relationship between these languages. Rather, the "attractiveness" of this bundle of typological features, which is also found in Tamil, Amharic, Quechua, as well as in Uralic languages such as Lamut / Ewen, may have brought about this parallel between the languages, which was then reinforced in the course of their development by way of "structural similarity" as a secondary force of attraction between languages of the same area ("Structural similarities of clause combining in Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tungusic and Japanese—a typological alternative to the hypothesis of a genetic relationship", 199-223).

Two papers on converbs in individual Turkic languages follow. Nurettin Demir investigates the combinations in which the Turkish verb *dur-* 'stay' may be used as a postverb. The author distinguishes between two types of combinations, (i) "complex verbs", which are combinations of a full lexical verb with *dur-* in the function of an auxiliary, and (ii) "complex predicates", which are combinations of two full lexical verbs, one of which is *dur-*. According to the author, the distinguishing feature between the two constructions is stress, i.e. while the first type has the stress on the first syllable of the first verbal element, the second has the stress on the second syllable. Both constructions allow two types of combinations in terms of the syntactic relationship between the two verbal elements, (i) paratactic, and (ii) hypotactic ("On the status of a Turkish postverb", 224-233).

Converb constructions in the Siberian Turkic language Shor are the topic of Irina Nevskaya's contribution. Shor converbs in *-p* are generally regarded as belonging to the type of converbs which do not allow a subject different from that of the matrix clause. Exceptions to this rule show noteworthy patterns, that is, different subjects are allowed when the two subjects stand in a part-whole, possessive or inclusive relationship to each other, or when a causal or temporal relationship is at issue. According to the author, this shows that the difference between same-subject and different-subject converbs should not be regarded as categorical, but that one should rather speak of a continuum between the two types ("Subject valency of Shor gerunds", 234-243).

Chapter 5, "Voice", presents three contributions. Michael Hess investigates the properties of Ottoman diathesis constructions. In the author's approach, the respec-

tive suffixes are called “remodelling suffixes” and arranged into four groups, (i) slot-diminishing constructions, (ii) slot-adding constructions, (iii) reciprocal constructions, and (iv) combinations of the first and second type of constructions. Of particular interest are remarks about the grammaticalization of agent phrases in Ottoman passive constructions and the (possible) function of the postposition *ile* “with” in the establishment of causee-phrases in causatives (“The syntax of Ottoman diathesis and related phenomena”, 247-257). In the next paper, Leonid Kulikov investigates patterns of causee-marking in Tuvinian causative constructions. Through accusative-marking of the causee, Tuvinian allows for double-accusative constructions. Thus, Tuvinian seems to challenge the typological claim that, cross-linguistically, the causee is shifted to the leftmost syntactic position not already occupied (“Causative constructions in Tuvinian: Toward a typology of transitivity”, 258-264). Causativity is also the topic of the paper by Vügar Sultanov, who views it as a semantic category of Turkish verbs (“The category of causality in Turkish”, 265-268).

Chapter 6 combines six contributions dealing with various aspects of “Relative Clauses”. Ayhan Aksu-Koç and Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan investigate the referent-identifying (or re-identifying) and referent-characterizing functions of different types of relative clauses (= attributive participle phrases) in Turkish and their use in narratives produced by adults with different educational backgrounds (“The function of relative clauses in narrative discourse”, 271-284).

The behaviour of genitives in relativization is treated in Fatma Erkman-Akerson’s article. The author shows how different types of genitive constructions (inherent vs. exclusive possessives, states of affairs, subject-nominalized verbs) behave differently with regard to “split genitives” in relativization, that is, in constructions where a genitive attribute becomes the head of a relative construction and thereby loses the genitive marking, while the head of the genitive in turn becomes part of the relative clause, as in *baş-ı ağrı-yan çocuk* (head-POSS.3SG ache-PRT child) “the child whose head aches” (“Genitival subjects in Turkish relative constructions”, 285-298).

In the next paper, Geoffrey Haig inquires into the “preferred interpretation” of those relative clauses in which more than one interpretation is possible with regard to the relativized syntactic position. The author arrives at a typologically relevant “preferred interpretation hierarchy” (“On some strategies for case recovery in Turkish relativization”, 299-320).

Headless, non-endophoric relative clauses formed from subject-participles are the topic of Celia Kerslake’s contribution. The author investigates their preferred readings with regard to the semantic (i.e. [+human]) and referential-semantic (i.e. [+definite], [+referential]) properties of the concept to which they refer (“Definiteness, referentiality and animacy in pronominal participial clauses in Turkish”, 321-347).

Next, Şeyda Ozil investigates the factors determining the choice between the use of future participles with and without the participle form of the auxiliary *ol-* “to be”. The author shows that the use of the auxiliary is a textual, not a grammatical option, which adds certain modal meanings to the meaning of the accompanying participle

based on a lexical verb (“The choice of the relative participles *-(y)EcEK* and *-(y)EcEK + ol-*”, 348-360).

In a new look at relativized locative phrases and relativizations with incorporated subjects, and working within a transformational framework, Sumru Özsoy arrives at an analysis of subject Determiner Phrases of unergatives (“Locative inversion, VP-adjunction and Turkish relativization”, 361-375).

In Chapter 7, “Syntax and Semantics”, only Maya Cheremisina’s contribution does not deal with Turkish. The author investigates the morphosyntactic properties of the negative particle *emes* in Altai Turkic, showing that *emes* should be classified as a marker of nominal negation (“Negative constructions with the particle *emes*”, 379-383).

Turning to Turkish, first Sarah Kenelly shows that with regard to the constituent properties of object NPs with pre-head locative phrases, different analyses may be made, depending on whether the NP is an object of a destruction verb or a creation verb. The analysis is based on properties of scrambling and on adverb positions (“Locality conditions in Turkish”, 385-403).

Turkish nominalizations and their case-assigning properties are the topic of the paper by Murat Kural. The author arrives at an analysis in which the *-k* contained in the nominalizing suffixes is seen as the complementizer head. The absence of *-k* in nominalizations, then, corresponds with the deletion of the complementizer (“Subordinate Infs and Comp in Turkish”, 404-421).

Next, Gerjan van Schaaijk investigates in detail the morphosyntactic behaviour and the semantics of phrases headed by the so-called “postposition” *gibi* ‘like’. The author shows that phrases headed by *gibi* behave significantly differently from other postpositional phrases. *Gibi*, then, should be analysed as a two-place predicate, expressing a wide range of similarity expressions (“On the usage of *gibi*”, 422-457).

In one of the few contrastive papers of the volume, Hitay Yüksekler shows that, in Turkish, unaffixed nouns, that is, nouns without the possessive suffix, cannot have structures which are equivalent to complements of English nouns. Thus the prenominal position, i.e., the position where one expects to find complements, is restricted to modifiers in Turkish, and the function of the possessive suffix is to create an argument position (“Possessive constructions of Turkish”, 458-477).

The topic of Karl Zimmer’s paper is the position of the Turkish question marker *-mI* in so-called “object-verb incorporations”. The author demonstrates how the position of *-mI* between the incorporated noun and the incorporating verb creates focus questions. The type of incorporation, however, makes a difference in the type of question evolving (categorical focus question in ad-hoc incorporations,thetic focus question in lexicalized incorporations). On the other hand, the position of *-mI* after the whole phrase denotes an inquiry as to whether some state of affairs prevails (“The case of the errant question marker”, 478-481).

In the sole contribution in Chapter 8, “Stylistics”, Ahmet Kocaman takes a critical standpoint against the increasing employment of colloquial speech as a stylistic

device in the Turkish mass media (“Stylistic fluctuations in the use of everyday Turkish”, 485-497).

The first three of the four papers in Chapter 9, “Language Acquisition”, focus on the bilingual child. First, Jeroen Aarssen investigates the linguistic devices bilingual Turkish children, aged between 4 and 10 and living in the Netherlands, use to introduce a character, maintain reference or switch reference to this character in narratives. The results are compared with the respective linguistic behaviour of monolingual Turkish children living in Turkey (“Acquisition of topic continuity in Turkish children’s narratives”, 501-516).

Turkish schoolchildren’s acquisition of everyday reading skills is investigated in Rian Aarts’ paper. The author compares the skills of Turkish children in Turkey with those in the Netherlands and shows that the respective proficiency of Turkish children in the Netherlands is mostly influenced by the amount of native language instruction they have received in the Netherlands (“Functional literacy of Turkish children in Turkey and in the Netherlands”, 517-526).

In their paper on Turkish-Dutch bilingual speech, Ad Backus and Hanneke van der Heijden present a detailed comparison of code-mixing patterns employed by Turkish-dominant bilingual children and adults. The authors show that children show significantly less intrasentential code-switching than adults do. The findings lead to a discussion of the type of bilingualism displayed by the different age groups (“Life and birth of a bilingual: The mixed code of bilingual children and adults in the Turkish community in the Netherlands”, 527-551).

In the last contribution of Chapter 9, Hülya Özcan investigates the acquisition of discourse principles by three-year-old Turkish children. The results suggest that the children are aware of the difference between pragmatic principles such as [+new] and [+given], but are not yet able to perform this competence linguistically (“Definite and indefinite nouns in the discourse of Turkish-speaking children”, 552-567).

In Chapter 10, two papers contribute to “Dialect Studies”. First, in his discussion of the methods used in Turcological dialectology, Hendrik Boeschoten compares the Turkish *Derleme sözlüğü* with recent lexicographical works in the field of Uzbek dialectology (“On dialect dictionaries”, 571-579).

Next, Tooru Hayasi presents a detailed account of the linguistic features of the dialect of the Bolu province in Turkey. The province is located to the north of the Central Anatolian region. Linguistically, it is an interesting area because of its transitional features in terms of voicing, rounding and harmonization (“Dialect distribution in dialect boundary areas: the case of the Bolu dialect of Turkish”, 581-593).

In Chapter 11, seven contributions deal with various “Historical and Comparative Turkic Topics”. The paper by Selma Çapan reveals the outcome of a test investigating the intelligibility of spoken utterances in six Turkic languages to Turkish speakers. As can be expected, languages such as Azerbaijani and Turkmen, that is, languages closely related to Turkish, appear to be most easily understood by Turkish speakers (“Mutual intelligibility of some Turkic languages”, 597-600).



Using the word *Balqaš*, the name of Lake Balkhash in Kazakhstan, as his main example, Kobej Husainov attempts to show that forms with an initial *p-* or *b-*, and a subsequent vowel plus an *-l-* can be traced back to onomatopoeic roots (“Phono-semantic etymon in Turkic languages”, 601-606).

Kâmile İmer points out recent problems of graphization, standardization and modernization with which Turkish is confronted and discusses these problems in the light of the principles of the Turkish language reform (“Language reform in Turkey and its aftermath”, 607-618).

Western Old Turkic, which was spoken from the 5th century until the beginning of the 13th century (i.e. the time of the Mongolian invasion) in Eastern Europe and the adjacent regions, is the topic of the paper by András Róna-Tas. The author points out phonetic developments in this language and their reflections in certain Hungarian words (“Western Old Turkic”, 619-626).

Steve Seegmiller and Çiğdem Balım present an insightful account of the past and present alphabets used for the Turkic languages of the former Soviet Union (“Alphabets for the Turkic languages”, 627-646).

Erika Taube reports on the sociolinguistic situation of the Tuvian language in Mongolia and the former Soviet Union in light of new socio-cultural developments and influences from Russian and Mongolian. In the concluding section, the author points to the need to make Tuvian a language of school education (“Observations of a non-linguist concerning the Tuvian language in Tuva and Western Mongolia”, 647-655).

Finally, Talat Tekin proves that Kashgari, the famous lexicographer of the eleventh century, was correct in his statement concerning the etymology of Oghuz *tägül* ‘is not’ [Turkish *değil*). It developed from the Argu negative copula *da:ğol* ‘is not’ (“On the etymology of Turkish *değil*”, 656-664).

In Chapter 12, “Contact Linguistics”, we find two papers dealing with traditional Turcological topics, while the focus of the third paper is on diaspora Turkish. First, Klára Agyagási presents a highly detailed investigation of the role of language contact in the development of the Chuvash sound system (“On the characteristics of Cheremiss linguistic interference on Chuvash”, 665-682). Next, Hans Nugteren investigates the origins and ages of Turkic loans in the Southern Mongolian languages Monguor, Bao’an and Dongxiang. He compares the results with those from Eastern Yugur, another member of this group, which has far more Turkic loans than the others (“On some Turkic loanwords in Monguor, Bao’an and Dongxiang”, 683-695).

In one of the few papers of the volume dealing with diaspora Turkish, Emel Türker investigates the Turkish spoken in Norway by second-generation immigrant Turks. In her interpretation of the data, the author puts special emphasis on the relationship between the group’s language behaviour and the social networks of the speakers (“Turkish as an immigrant language: a descriptive study of second generation immigrant Turkish in Norway”, 697-704).

In Chapter 13, “Computational Linguistics”, first Albert Stoop discusses the problem that arises with the computational translation of the Dutch possessive verb *hebben* ‘to have’ into Turkish: In certain main clauses (present tense, past tense), Turkish does not use a copula but an existential nominal predicate *var*; in other clauses (subordinate, future tense), the auxiliary verb *olmak* ‘to be’ replaces *var* (“Some considerations on the implementation of the possessive verb in TRANSIT”, 707-727).

Next, Erkan Tın and Varol Akman develop an approach that uses formalized situation schemes in order to identify anaphoric relations in a computational framework, (“Situating analysis of anaphora in Turkish”, 728-750).

In the only contribution in Chapter 14, “Applied Linguistics”, Lütfiye Oktar and Semiramis Yağcıoğlu, who investigate the effect of topic interest on reading comprehension and recall, arrive at the somewhat puzzling conclusion that for university students, topic interest does not seem to have a facilitative effect on learning and recall from expository texts (“The effect of topic interest on reading comprehension and recall”, 753-761).

2. It is not our aim to discuss one or the other theoretical approach, data, methodology or results presented in the volume’s papers. Except for a minority of contributions, the reviewer has the impression that all participants are at the height of the research carried out in their particular field. There are, however, some contributions whose authors one might expect to add just a few more words on the theoretical or methodological tools used, in order to help the general reader to find his or her way through the line of reasoning. Also, it is amazing how few instances of explicit cross-referencing to other papers delivered at the same conference can be found. Rik Boeschoten’s reference to Tooru Hayasi’s contribution (p. 578) is all I was able to find. Given that there is a considerable overlap of research topics (e.g. the six papers on relative clauses) one should expect more.

All in all, it is impressive and promising to see how much ongoing research is being conducted in the field of Turkish and Turcological linguistics. In the near future, the enthusiastic spirit of *The Mainz Meeting* may also bring forth fruitful results in those areas still badly in need of research. The following areas immediately come to the mind of the reviewer.

First, the growing interest in Turkish as a foreign language, and together with this the growing need for high-quality teaching materials, reveals a lack of research in the area of phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical frequency, an area where, since Pierce’s pioneering works (1961, 1962), no substantial research results have been published. Of course, frequency research must be based on comprehensive, well-organized corpora—and these are also urgently needed.

Second, there is a clear lack of research with regard to the development of Turkish in the Northern European diaspora. *The Mainz Meeting* contains four articles related in one way or the other to this subject (cf. Aarssen, Aaarts, Backus & van der Heijden, and Türker). However, only Emel Türker takes first steps towards a more

concise description of grammatical developments in diaspora Turkish, i.e., Turkish in Norway, while the other works are more oriented towards language acquisition in a bilingual context. Given that in Germany for example, Turkish is the most widely used language next to German, it is amazing to see, with regard to Turkish in Northern Europe, how remote Turkish linguistics is from being able to draw general conclusions from individual speakers' language use.<sup>3</sup>

Research on diaspora Turkish clearly suffers from another nearly blank spot, i.e. the lack of research regarding the structure of spoken Turkish. It is encouraging to see that some of the articles in *The Mainz Meeting* in fact refer to spoken discourse (cf. Aksu-Koç & Erguvanlı-Taylan, Ruhi, Kornfilt, and Turan).<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, a move towards a more systematic description of the structural characteristics of the spoken language is still badly needed. Thus, Johanson's plea for a stronger focus on this field (cf. Johanson 1975) is still valid. Only after gaining a clearer picture of the structure of spoken Turkish can we actually begin to understand developments in diaspora Turkish, since, obviously, it is the spoken language which is apt to change in the first place, not the written standard.

3. The Turcological linguist Lars Johanson and his co-workers in Mainz belong to the few scholars constantly "bridging the gap" between old and new traditions in the study of Turkish and the other Turkic languages, between the so-called "philological" and the "modern linguistic" methodology. They have to be thanked for their courage, and for making *The Mainz Meeting*, that is, both the conference and the volume, such a success. *The Mainz Meeting* demonstrates that both the "philologists" and the "linguists" have much to gain from each other's methods, perspectives, and research results. Thus, the volume opens the door to a more integrative view on Turkish and Turcological linguistics, and to a discussion free of prejudice and tunnel vision.

#### References

- Haig, Geoffrey & Braun, Friederike 1999. The state of the Turkish language in Germany. *TASG News. Newsletter of the Turkish Area Study Group* 49, 13-18. (Special edition: Turkish language in diaspora.)
- Johanson, Lars 1975. Gesprochenes Türkisch als Forschungsobjekt. *Materialia Turcica* 1, 1-8.
- Pierce, J. E. 1961. A frequency count of Turkish affixes. *Anthropological Linguistics* 3, 9, 31-42.
- Pierce, J. E. 1962. Frequencies of occurrence for affixes in written Turkish. *Anthropological Linguistics* 4, 6, 30-41.

<sup>3</sup> See Haig & Braun (1999) for a recent overview on the (comparatively poor) state-of-the-art with regard to research on the development of Turkish in Germany.

<sup>4</sup> Not to mention the dialectological works in *The Mainz Meeting* (Nurettin Demir, Tooru Hayasi), as well as Emel Türker's contribution and the contributions to language acquisition, which, certainly, use spoken data.

*International Conferences on Turkish Linguistics: Conference volumes*

- Slobin, Dan & Zimmer, Karl (eds.) 1986. *Studies in Turkish linguistics. Based on most of the papers presented at the Conference on the Turkish Language and Linguistics in Atatürk's Turkey, held May 15-16, 1982, in Berkeley, Calif.* (Typological Studies in Language 8.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan & Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser (eds.) 1986. *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference. August 9-10, 1984.* Istanbul: Bosphorus University Publications.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik E. & Verhoeven, Ludo T. (eds.) 1987. *Studies on modern Turkish. Proceedings of the Third Conference on Turkish Linguistics.* Tilburg: University Press.
- Koç, Sabri (ed.) 1988. *Studies on Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, 17-19 August, 1988.* Ankara: Middle East Technical University.
- Rona, Bengisu (ed.) 1996. *Current issues in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, School of Oriental and African Studies, 15 - 17 August, 1990.* Ankara : Hitit yayınevi.
- Konrot, Ahmet (ed.) 1996. *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics. Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 12-14 August 1992. Eskişehir / Turkey.* Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Faculty of Education.
- Johanson, Lars (ed.), in cooperation with Éva Ágnes Csató, Vanessa Locke, Astrid Menz, and Dorothea Winterling 1998. *The Mainz Meeting. Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 3-6, 1994.* (Turcologica 32.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- İmer, Kâmile & Uzun, N. Engin (eds.) 1997. *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, August 7-9, 1996.* Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia (eds.) 2000. *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages. Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. Lincoln College, Oxford, August 12-14, 1998.* (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

