Werk

Label: Zeitschriftenheft

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2003

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0007|LOG_0017

Kontakt/Contact

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

info@digizeitschriften.de

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 7, 2003, Number 2

Editorial note by Lars Johanson 149

Obituary

Lars Johanson: Andreas Tietze (26.04.1914–23.12.2003). 151

Articles

Richard M. W. Dixon: A program for linguistics 157
Vladimir P. Nedjalkov: Kirghiz reciprocals 181
Javanshir Shibliyev & Necdet Osam: Sociopolitical changes and language:
A retrospective view of Azerbaijanian 235
K. David Harrison & Gregory D. S. Anderson: Middle Chulym:
Theoretical aspects, recent fieldwork and current state 245
Fuyuki Ebata: Paired words in Yakut (Sakha) 257
Nurettin Demir: On *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish 268
Lars Johanson: Turkish in Trabzon 275

Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 7, 2003, Number 2

This issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES begins with R. M. W. Dixon's manifesto "A program for linguistics", in which the author explains what he thinks linguists, including scholars of Turkic languages, should devote their energy to. He then relates this idealized program to the current situation. Dixon, Director of the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, is an internationally leading linguist, whose recent thought-provoking book *The rise and fall of languages* (1997) has attracted exceptional attention around the globe. There, like in the present article, the author suggests that every linguist should assume a responsibility for documenting some of the endangered languages of the world before they disappear.

An immediate answer to this desideratum is given in the article submitted by K. David Harrison and Gregory D. S. Anderson. Both authors are experienced field researchers who have carried out remarkable work on the South Siberian languages Khakas, Tuvan and Tofan. Anderson's first contribution to TURKIC LANGUAGES was an article on historical aspects of Yakut phonology (volume 2, number 1, 1998). The article published today presents the results of recent fieldwork on Middle Chulym, one of the most critically endangered and least documented native Siberian languages. It is spoken along the upper reaches of the Chulym river, an area it once shared with Yeniseyic varieties. The Middle Chulym population partly goes back to former speakers of Yeniseyic, Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic. Its Turkic component is heterogeneous as well, reflecting one more Khakas-like element and another more Tatar-like element.

Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, Institute of Linguistic Research, St. Petersburg, has already published two articles in TURKIC LANGUAGES on reciprocals in Karachay-Balkar (volume 6, number 1) and Yakut (volume 7, number 1). In the present issue, the author turns to the means of expressing reciprocity in Kirghiz, a language where the reciprocal suffix also marks the 3rd person plural on verbs.

Javanshir Shibliyev and Necdet Osam, Eastern Mediterranean University, analyze the language situation in Azerbaijan, where three sociopolitical changes within less than two centuries—the "colonial", the "imperial" and the "global" change—are mirrored in the development of the national language.

Fuyuki Ebata, Tokyo University, discusses the morphological, semantic and syntactic characteristics of so-called paired words in Yakut, specifying how they differ from compounds.

Nurettin Demir, Başkent University, Ankara, deals with the interesting use of the indirective evidential particle *imiš* in Cypriot Turkish.

A review article deals with Bernt Brendemoen's description of the Turkish dialects spoken in the province of Trabzon, their phonology and historical development.

As reported in the last issues of TURKIC LANGUAGES, Turkic studies has recently lost a number of valuable representatives who dominated the field in the second part of the twentieth century, Nikolaj A. Baskakov, Johannes Benzing, Gunnar Jarring, Karl Heinrich Menges, and others. Today we are sad to announce the bitter loss of three more great scholars.

On May 29, 2003, James Russell Hamilton died in Paris after an accident in his home. He was born on March 14, 1921, in Topeka, Kansas, but had since 1947 lived in France, where he acquired French citizenship in 1974. Hamilton, who was active in the field of East Old Turkic philology, published a number of valuable editions and monographs. His thesis about the history of the Uyghurs according to Chinese sources ("Les ouighours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties") was published in 1955. He edited several texts in a highly competent way, first a long manuscript about the two princes Kalyāṇaṃkara and Pāpaṃkara, and later further texts from Dunhuang. Hamilton wrote most of his works in French, and he applied a transcription system of his own.

On December 23, 2003, the Austrian scholar Andreas Tietze died in Vienna; see the obituary "Andreas Tietze (26.04.1914 – 23.12.2003)".

Only four days later, on December 27, 2003, the German scholar Gerhard Doerfer, born on March 8, 1920, in Königsberg, passed away in Göttingen. We shall return to his life and work.

Lars Johanson

Andreas Tietze (26.04.1914–23.12.2003)

Lars Johanson

Johanson, Lars 2003. Andreas Tietze (26.04.1914-23.12.2003). *Turkic Languages* 7, 151-156.

This obituary is dedicated to the memory of the Austrian Turcologist Andreas Tietze, who passed away on December 23, 2003.

Lars Johanson, Institute for Oriental Studies, Turcology, University of Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: johanson@mail.uni-mainz.de

On December 23, 2003, the Austrian Turcologist Andreas Tietze died in Vienna of a cerebral haemorrhage. He was born in Vienna on 26 April 1914, shortly before the outbreak of the first World War. His father was the art historian Hans Tietze, who led the reorganization of the museums of Vienna after the war, and his mother was Erica Tietze-Conrat, a well-known art historian in her own right. Andreas Tietze is survived by his widow, Mrs. Süheyla Tietze (née Uyar), whom he married in 1952, and their four children, Filiz, Deniz, Nur and Ibrahim.

Andreas Tietze was granted honorary doctorships by Boğaziçi University and Konya University and was a member or honorary member of several learned societies, e.g. the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the Turkish Historical Society (Türk Tarih Kurumu), the Turkish Academy of Sciences (TÜBA), and the Societas Uralo-

Altaica. Three *Festschriften* were presented to him, two on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, and one on his eightieth birthday. As late as November 2003, he received an award in Istanbul from the İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi for his outstanding contributions to the study of the Turkish language.

Andreas Tietze enjoyed a good education. He attended primary school in Grinzing and the Piaristengymnasium, where he passed his matriculation exam in 1932. At the University of Vienna, he studied economic history with Alfons Dopsch as well as East European history, Balkan history, Slavic languages, Turkish, Persian and Arabic. After archival studies in Italy he wrote his Ph.D. thesis on the agricultural problems of Italian mercantilism ("Agrarprobleme im italienischen Merkantilismus") and received his doctorate in 1937.

This was a dark period in the modern history of Austria. Already in 1934, as a young student, Andreas Tietze had witnessed the "July uprising" in Vienna. Given his Jewish background and his left-wing sympathies he chose to move to Istanbul in 1937 in order to escape Nazi persecution. One year later, Austria's "Anschluss" forced his parents to emigrate to the United States.

The young scholar had become increasingly interested in Turkish language and history. He had already travelled extensively in Central, West and Southwest Anatolia. In Turkey he started to work in the field of Turcology. In 1938 he was appointed lecturer in German and English at the Edebiyat Fakültesi of Istanbul University, and remained in that function for many years without obtaining a position more adequate for Turcological research. In 1949 he worked as Assistant Professor in Turkish studies at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and from 1952 to 1953 he spent one year as guest professor at the same university. In 1958 he was invited to UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) to teach Turkish and Ottoman language and literature. He stayed in Los Angeles for fifteen years, acting as the head of the department of Middle Eastern Studies from 1966 to 1970. After a guest professorship in Vienna in 1971, he decided to return to his native country. In 1973 Andreas Tietze was appointed Full Professor of Turcology and Islamic Studies (Turkologie und Islamkunde) at Vienna University.

Andreas Tietze's years in Istanbul constituted a very important and prolific phase in his life. He became acquainted with many leading scholars, e.g. Adnan Adıvar and Hellmut Ritter. He was not able to work on the old manuscripts of the rich Istanbul libraries since all the valuable materials there had been removed to Anatolia during the war. Instead, he focused on research in the living language and published numerous works on dialects, folk literature, the development of Turkish, its grammar, its relations to other languages, etc. Many of his papers appeared in the journal *Oriens*. He also published a Turkish reader for foreigners, *Türkisches Lesebuch für Ausländer* (1943). Tietze was, from the very beginning, one of the members of the editorial committee of the revised edition of Sir James Walter Redhouse's *A Turkish and English lexicon* (Constantinople 1890). After two decades of preparation, the *Redhouse yeni Türkçe-İngilizce sözlük* was finally printed in 1968. In 1958, Tietze

published, together with Henry and Renée Kahane, the seminal book *The lingua franca of the Levant. Turkish nautical terms of Italian and Greek origin.*

During his years in the USA, Tietze wrote a number of studies on Turkish folklore as well as on philological and linguistic topics, e.g. a book on the riddles in the Codex Cumanicus, *The Koman riddles and Turkish folklore* (1966) and, with İlhan Başgöz, *Bilmece, a corpus of Turkish riddles* (1973). He also produced teaching materials such as *Turkish literary reader* (1963) and *Advanced Turkish reader. Texts in the social sciences and related fields* (1973).

The years in Vienna were a highly fruitful phase of Tietze's activities. He published a book on the Turkish shadow theatre (1977), and, together with Avedis Sanjian, a study of *Eremya Chelebi Kömürjian's Armeno-Turkish poem 'The Jewish Bride'* (1981). He started researching the works of the famous 16th century Ottoman historiographer Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali and edited two of his major works, *Muṣṭafā 'Ālī's description of Cairo of 1599* (1975) and *Muṣṭafā 'Ālī's counsel for sultans of 1581* (two volumes, 1979, 1982). In 1991, Tietze edited *Akabi Hikayesi. İlk Türkçe roman (1851)*, written by the Armenian Vartan Paša, the first Turkish novel modelled on a European literary pattern. He also initiated and edited (1975-1984) the *Turkologischer Anzeiger/Turkology Annual*, which was to become the major bibliographical source for Turkish studies. From 1973 to 1983 he was the editor of *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde der Morgenlandes*. In a series of publications from 1982 on, Tietze dealt with what he called "Abdalology", investigations into the origin and language of the so-called Abdal groups in Anatolia and in China. In 1994, he published, together with Otto Ladstätter, the book *Die Abdal (Äynu) in Xinjiang*; cf. Peter Bakker's review in *Turkic Languages* 1 (1997), 144-146.

Apart from text editions and dictionary work, Tietze wrote numerous important contributions to the knowledge of Turkish language and culture, documenting remarkably wide interests in various fields. One specific characteristic is his interest in the living language. His preferred topics included lexicography and lexicology, loanwords from Persian, Arabic, Greek, Slavic and other European languages in Turkish, the influence of Turkish on other languages, problems of syntax, morphology, word formation, phraseology, stylistics, the principles and practise of editing texts, folk literature (shadow theatre, riddles), and the cultural and intellectual history of Turkey. In 1983, Tietze published a pioneering study in which he cites 226 phraseological usages of the word *burun* 'nose'. His works on syntax deal with the "free genitive", integration of direct speech, "erlebte Rede", the use of conditionals, passive-medioreflexives, possessive and plural suffixes, focus functions, etc. One of his last articles deals with the neutralization of syntactic rules in poetry as exemplified by Ottoman metrical poetry (1994). Though he mostly dealt with Ottoman-Turkish, he possessed a profound erudition in general Turcology.

Andreas Tietze also translated literary works from and into Turkish. He thus published *Die Ölweide. Neuere türkische Erzählungen* (1964) and contributions to *Die Pforte des Glücks und andere türkische Erzählungen* (1969). In 1948, he

translated, together with Behçet Necatigil, Rainer Maria Rilke's novel *Die Aufzeichnungen des Malte Laurids Brigge* into Turkish.

With his valuable contributions to Turcology, Tietze very early gained a reputation as a leading scholar in the field. In Turkey he was known as the foremost foreign specialist on Turkish: "Türk dilinin en önemli yabancı uzmanı". He loved the Turkish language, which he mastered with stylistic perfection. He possessed all the knowledge necessary to deal with the complex cultural history of Turkey. He was able to use Latin, Greek, Byzantine, Arabic and Persian sources and he was familiar with a dozen modern languages. He was a highly intelligent, systematic and hard-working scholar. His work and personality have had a deep impact far beyond the three countries where he worked, Turkey, the United States and Austria. He was an inspiring and admired colleague and teacher who treated all his interlocutors with the same respect and friendliness. He was a modest, generous person, without a whit of professorial conceit, always prepared to listen attentively and to give inspiration, encouragement and assistance. I myself made his acquaintance in 1971, when he, to my astonishment, wrote me several letters with valuable comments to my book on Turkish aspect and offered me help at the start of my scholarly career. Like so many others in my generation, I later learnt very much from this remarkable scholar and human being.

As already mentioned, Andreas Tietze had very early done intensive research on Turkish lexicology and published a series of articles on Greek, Slavic, Arabic, Persian and other loanwords in Turkish. Most of these articles have now been reprinted in *Wörterbuch der griechischen, slavischen, arabischen und persischen Lehnwörter im anatolischen Türkisch / Anadolu Türkçesindeki Yunanca, İslavca, Arapça ve Farsça ödünçlemeler sözlüğü* (1999). Tietze continued his lexicological studies over the years, collecting a wealth of data from Ottoman and Turkish texts. In the 1980s he planned to publish an etymological dictionary together with Johannes Benzing. As the conceptions of the two scholars turned out to be too different to serve as a basis for cooperation, both continued their individual work according to their own ideas. In 1991, Tietze decided to publish his large collections. This resulted in highly intensive activities during the last phase of his scholarly life. It was clear to me that this broad project, whose development I followed from a distance, could only be carried out by a scholar such as Tietze with his unique philological and linguistic experience. In order to work efficiently, he needed young assistants who could take over some of the editorial work. He succeeded in choosing good collaborators with the relevant qualifications and adequate linguistic knowledge.

The aim of this project was to compile an etymological dictionary that also dealt with the Ottoman-Turkish vocabulary in its historical and contact-induced development. The focus was on the morphological, syntactic, phraseological and stylistic characterization of the vocabulary, with detailed chronological information and rich examples of the contextual use of the words. The lexemes were extracted from written sources ranging from the earliest Old Anatolian Turkish documents to contemporary Turkish literary texts. One specific intention was to shed light on the less

known vocabulary of older periods. The material included texts representing dialects of various regions, social groups and cultural milieus.

Tietze himself gave an account of the earlier stage of the project in "Der türkeitürkische Wortschatz", *Archivum Ottomanicum* 14 (1996), 5-37. Helga Anetshofer provides detailed information on the first volume in "Some remarks on Andreas Tietze's forthcoming Turkish lexicon" in *Turkic Languages* 2 (1998), 284-307.

The first volume of the lexicon, which was to carry the title "Türkiye Türkçesi söz hazinesi. Etimoloji, dil tarihi, sözyapılışı" (Turkish vocabulary. Etymology, language history, and word formation), was ready for publication in 1998. It appeared four years later, comprising 763 pages, now under the title *Tarihi ve etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi lugatı. Sprachgeschichtliches und etymologisches Wörterbuch des Türkei-Türkischen*, volume 1: A-E, published by Simurg Kitabevi and the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Istanbul and Wien 2002). Thirteen younger scholars assisted the editor: Ben Tietze, Helga Anetshofer, Kerstin Tomenendal, İnanç Feigl, Sena Doğan, Diana Karabinova, Hakan T. Karateke, Can Etker, Walter Scheithauer, Şule Pfeiffer-Taş, Walter Posch, Antonios Koliadis and Sevim Yılmaz-Önder.

The result is an amazingly informative etymological and historical dictionary that gives detailed definitions of the lexemes in stylistic, morphological and syntactic terms as well as rich references. While the etymologies do not include reconstructions of hypothetical Turkic forms and lists of all corresponding words in other Turkic languages, the volume does contain numerous valuable paragraphs that summarize information on a wide range of topics: cultural history, linguistic variation, phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, etc.

Thus, one huge step has been taken towards the accomplishment of the project. On December 30, 1992, at the age of 78, Andreas Tietze wrote me that he had decided to publish a kind of etymological dictionary *sui generis* based on his articles on the lexicon of Ottoman-Turkish. In one year, however, he had barely finished the letter A. He knew that he would never accomplish this work, but he would, as he said, be happy if he could live long enough to see the "end" of the first volume:

> "Vor einem Jahr habe ich beschlossen, meine (veröffentlichten und noch unveröffentlichten) Arbeiten zur Lexik des Osmanisch-Türkeitürkischen ergänzend zusammenzufassen zu einer Art etymologischem Wörterbuch (aber allerdings sui generis). In einem Jahr bin ich nur ganz wenig über den Buchstaben A hinausgekommen (A allein hat fast 400 Seiten). Ich weiß natürlich, daß ich das Werk niemals fertigstellen werde, aber wenn ich wenigstens das Ende des erstens Bandes (A – C oder Ç) noch erleben kann, werde ich mich glücklich fühlen (ich werde demnächst 79)."

Tietze lived long enough to see a first volume appear that even includes the letter E. The dictionary is planned to comprise six huge volumes plus an index volume. It will be an indispensable tool for anybody dealing with older and more recent Turkish

sources. It will be of highest value for the knowledge of the history of Turkish language and culture, and it will inspire and facilitate further studies in these fields. It is of utmost importance that this extraordinary dictionary be accomplished according to Andreas Tietze's intentions and on the basis of his own comprehensive preparatory work.

A program for linguistics

R. M. W. Dixon

Dixon, R. M. W. 2003. A program for linguistics. *Turkic Languages* 7, 157-180.

An agenda is presented for the discipline of linguistics. For every question that asks "how", there should be a related enquiry into "why". The "why" questions are generally shunned by linguists; only some of them can presently be provided with informed answers. Building on these matters, linguistics must attempt evaluations of the relative worth of different languages (in terms of specified criteria). And, like other sciences, linguistics should essay predictions concerning languages, both about what structural possibilities may be found in a newly studied language, and about how a given language is likely to change over time. Sadly, few of the people who currently call themselves "linguists" attempt to deal with more than a small fraction of what is outlined here. In essence, the discipline of linguistics needs to reinvent itself in order to properly explain the nature of human language.

R. M. W. Dixon, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, Institute for Advanced Study, La Trobe University, Bundoora, VIC, Australia 3086.

The editor of this journal asked me to write a paper about general linguistics which might be of interest to scholars of Turkic languages, among others. I enquired whether he wanted me to describe what people who call themselves linguists presently do, or rather what I think linguists should do. He opted for the latter, and suggested that I could, at the end, relate this to the current situation. So, here is the idealised program that I describe.

1. Languages in context

Just as one would not consider studying an animal without reference to its habitat and habits, so a language can only properly be studied in terms of the situation in which it is used. We need to know about the speech community—its social organisation, political system, economic basis, religious predisposition, laws and beliefs. We need to know what kind of relations (political, trade, social) the speech community has with its neighbours; and we need to know what kind of terrain they inhabit.

Some of these questions may seem inappropriate for a language such as English or Spanish, spoken in many nations by peoples with a variety of cultures and religions, and living in a variety of ecological zones. English is spoken, worldwide, by around four hundred million people, and Spanish by more than three hundred million. However, of the four thousand or so languages currently spoken, only about a hundred and twenty have more than one million speakers. The great majority of lan-

guages have (and always have had) less than ten thousand speakers. That is, a typical language is spoken by a fairly homogeneous social group, in a particular type of terrain. The fact that some languages have a very large number of speakers is a recent development (within the past couple of thousand years). In fact, languages with many speakers probably do show recurrent differences from languages with relatively few speakers; it may be that languages with many speakers tend to have a relatively simple word structure, and place more reliance for the communication of meaning on the ways in which words are combined (what is called syntax). This is an important topic for study by linguists.

Just as each language must be considered in terms of its community of users, so each utterance in a language must be considered in terms of its context of use. That is, for any utterance we must take account of who said it, to whom, where, when, and in what circumstances (for example, there is a difference between something said in a job interview, and the same thing occurring within a tête-à-tête conversation). We need to know not just what was said but also whether there was a between-the-lines message; and what the pragmatic effect might be.

To consider language out of its social context (as a kind of algebra, or as a truth-value logic) will lead to no real insight into the intrinsic nature of language—as a social habit and as a social skill. Similarly, quoting and attempting to analyse a sentence without reference to its context of use is a lazy and misguided course of action. Speakers' opinions about what they can say do not fully accord with what they actually do say. And what may be said varies with the context of use. Unfortunately, much of the work currently called "linguistics" does consider languages without reference to their social context, and does examine sentences outside of an actual context of use. I will return to this in §7.

2. The questions to be asked

Linguistics consists in the systematic study of languages as social phenomena. This involves posing—and attempting to answer—a series of interconnected questions concerning the nature of language and of language use.

As in any discipline, the first step is to pose the appropriate questions. These fall into two broad types. The "how" questions are the most basic, investigating the nature of language, its interaction with its social context, and its historical development. The "why" questions build on this basic knowledge, enquiring into the reason for a particular language being organised in the way it is. At an advanced stage of investigation, linguists should also attempt evaluation and prediction. That is, it is relevant to enquire whether one technique of linguistic organisation is more effective than another (for example, it may make a language easier to learn). Or, indeed, whether one language is better than another, for some specific purpose. And a linguist should be able to predict that if a language has a certain feature then this is likely to implicate some further feature. Along the temporal axis lie predictions concerning how a given language is likely to change in the future, assuming certain social conditions.

3. The "how" questions

HOW-1. Investigate how each language is organised—both within itself, and in relation to the situations in which it is used

The primary function of language is to pass a potage of meaning from speaker to hearer. The meaning has first to be organised; this is done by the grammar of the language. Different aspects of meaning are coded by members of large open word classes (noun, verb, adjective). The words are then joined together in various kinds of sentence pattern. Each language requires a number of specifications from grammatical systems such as gender and tense. The systems involved vary from language to language; one language may specify tense but not gender, another gender but not tense, another both, another neither. And the nature of the system also varies. In one language the tense contrast is past versus non-past, in another future versus non-future, and in another past versus present versus future, while a further language distinguishes three futures, one present, and five pasts.

The two components of a linguistic description directly relating to meaning are the lexicon, a listing of the word bases in open classes, and the grammar, dealing with the analysis of word forms (morphology) and the ways of combining words (syntax). These two components are directly linked—the meaning of a word will determine which grammatical system may apply to it, and which sentence types it can occur in. For example, *hear* and *see* have similar meanings and can both be followed by either a *that* clause or by an *-ing* clause (*I heard / saw that she was laughing*, and *I heard / saw her laughing*). *Conclude* and *infer* have similar meanings and can be followed by a *that* clause but not by an *-ing* clause (we can say *I concluded / inferred that she is clever* but not **I concluded / inferred her being clever*). This can be explained in terms of the meanings of *that* and *-ing* clauses, and of the meanings of types of verbs (full details are in Dixon 1991).

It is an unfortunate feature of the present-day scene that, for the major languages, different groups of practitioners—with different methodologies and priorities—construct dictionaries (or lexicons) and write grammars. Ideally, these activities should be integrated.

To convey meanings (coded in terms of grammar and lexicon) to a hearer, they must be accorded physical expression. This can involve sounds, or signs. Like meanings, sounds and signs are, in their raw state, fluid. Each spoken language has a system of phonological representation, which relates to lexicon and grammar, on the one hand, and to speech sounds, on the other. A sign language has a similar system, which could be called signology. That is, a sentence (whose slots are filled by words) will have a phonological or signological representation, and this will be realised by a stream of sounds (or of signs) that a hearer can understand and interpret.

Returning to the HOW-1 question. The basic business of linguistics is to investigate the organisation of each language and produce a lexicon, grammar and phonology (or signology) for it. Some parts of the lexicon and grammar have a meaning in terms of the world at large (for example, the ideas of past and present time, and of

male and female sex). But other parts may have a meaning in terms of the particular social organisation of beliefs and habitat of the community of speakers—for example, terms referring to colours of cattle and to bride-price, and categories of possession relating to kinship organisation.

HOW-2. Investigate and explain the ways in which (how) languages differ

This can be briefly exemplified for negation. There are various ways in which negation can apply. In English these include: (a) negation of a noun or noun phrase, as in *No honest person would tell a lie*; (b) negation of a complete sentence, as in *He can't write the review* (he may be illiterate, or too busy); (c) negation of a verb, as in *He could always not write the review* (he could decline the invitation, if he were afraid that his review might offend the author). Note that these can be combined, as in *I didn't* (b) *dare not* (c) *buy it* (I didn't want to buy it but my wife had told me to and I was scared of how angry she might be if I didn't comply), and *No* (a) *honest person would not* (b) *tell the truth.*

There are various ways of marking these—and other—types of negation. As can be seen, English uses *not* for (b) and (c) and *no* for (a). In Punjabi, there is just one negator, *naii*; this is either placed after the element which is being negated, or *naii* can be in its normal position just before the verb, with the element that is to be negated being stressed (Bhatia 1993: 120).

Languages vary in how many strategies of negation they employ. The only one found in all languages is sentence negation, like (b) in English. And there are different ways of marking negation. Whereas English has a particle *not*, which—for sentence negation—follows the first word of the verbal component (as in *He might not have been enjoying it for all I know*), in Jarawara (see Dixon 2004)—spoken in the southern Amazonian rainforest—negation is shown by a suffix to the verb. Compare *o-tafa* 'I'm eating' (where the subject 'I' is shown by prefix *o-* to the verb *-tafa-* 'eat') with *o-tafa-ra* 'I'm not eating' (where the negative suffix *-ra* is added to the verb). In Fijian, negation can only be shown through the verb *sega*, which means 'it is not the case'. The sentence 'I'm not eating' has to be translated as, literally, 'That I am eating is not the case'.

Most languages have an interjection 'no' which can be used to provide a negative answer to a polar question (such as 'Are you eating?'). Note that in English this has the same form as the noun negator (*no*), different from the clause and verb negator (*not*). In others it has the same form as the sentence negator. And in some languages there is no simple word 'no'. In Jarawara, for instance, where negation is marked by an affix to the verb, a negative answer to a question (such as 'Are you eating?') must be a full sentence with the verb bearing the negative suffix *(o-tafa-ra* 'I'm not eating').

The paragraphs above provide a sample of how one studies the ways in which languages differ. For the typology of negation, one must first establish the different mechanisms of negation that human languages show, and the scope and marking of each. Besides noun, sentence and verb negation, there may also be negation in a sub-

ordinate clause (*I said that he didn't lie* is quite different from *I didn't say that he lied*), a negative tag (as in *He lied, didn't he?*) and a negative marker of disjunction (*I like neither apples nor pears*). We also find that some verbs (e.g. *forbid, fail, forget*) are inherently negative; that is, they behave like a positive verb plus a negative marker.[1]

We need also to examine how the system of {positive, negative} interacts with other systems within the grammar of a language. In some languages the same distinctions are made for person, number and tense in positive and in negative clauses. In others there is variation, and it is a universal fact that—where variation occurs—there will be less choices available in a negative than in a positive sentence (never the other way round). For example, in Estonian, in a positive clause a verb has separate forms depending on whether the subject is first, second or third person and, if it is first or second person, whether it is singular or plural. In the negative, each verb has a single form, used for all persons and numbers. In Amharic, the verb of a positive sentence has separate forms for past ('did') and for preterite ('has done'); in a negative sentence, one form covers both past and preterite meanings.

I have tried here to illustrate a microcosm of the broad field of linguistic typology, the study of how languages differ.

HOW-3. Study how each language is used by its speakers

Two communities may utilise the same language but deploy it in quite different ways, according to their interpersonal perceptions and social niceties. Scientists in western countries follow the convention of couching any statement in the passive (*An experiment was devised to investigate ...*, rather than *I devised an experiment to investigate ...* and *It was observed that ...* rather than *We observed that ...*). Taking the agency out of an action is supposed to make the science more objective. Other varieties of English freely use active sentences, with the participants taking personal responsibility for what they do.

All languages have ways of asking questions, but the actual use of questions varies a lot. In English, a question can be used as a mild form of command, e.g. *Would you mind opening the window?* In Russian and in Danish, a negative question is more polite than a positive one, and is generally preferred (one would ask 'Isn't there any bread?' rather than 'Is there any bread?'). In Aboriginal communities of Australia, people tend to avoid direct questioning of a visitor ('Where are you from? Are you married? How many children do you have?'). Instead, an interlocutor might volunteer this kind of information about themself, and the visitor would then be expected to reciprocate.

[1] It is an interesting feature of English that *some* in a positive sentence corresponds to *any* in a negative one. Compare *I ordered him to eat something* with *I ordered him not to eat anything*. The inherently negative verb *forbid* behaves like *order*-plus-*not* in taking *any*, as in *I forbade him to eat anything*.

Plainly, the way in which a language is used interrelates with how the language is structured. One can only avoid attributing agency by using a passive if the language includes a passive in its inventory of construction types (not every language does). And so on.

HOW-4. Study how each language is learnt—most centrally, by children, but also by adults

There are some recurrent features that apply in all instances of language acquisition. For instance, if a language has a trilled rhotic (like the *r* sound in Scots English), this is one of the last sounds to be mastered by a child, especially when it occurs in word-initial position. Other observations are language-specific. For examples the fricatives *ð* (as in *the*) and *θ* (as in *thin*) pose special difficulties for an adult learner of English (if these sounds do not occur in their native language).

A good deal of work has been done on topics such as when and how relative clause constructions are acquired. Unfortunately, the great bulk of this study relates to well-known languages, with a large number of speakers. There is a great need for detailed studies of child language acquisition in small tribal societies, in the Americas and in Africa. Little information is available on how children master some of the more unusual grammatical categories, which are predominantly found outside the mainstream languages of Europe and Asia.

For example, some languages require that each statement include a marker of the type of evidence on which it is based—whether the speaker saw it happen, or heard it, or inferred it from indirect evidence, or had it reported to them by someone else. Little work has yet been done on how children acquire such an evidentiality system. Would they start with a binary contrast (say, visual versus non-visual, or perhaps reported versus non-reported) and gradually build up to the four-term system? (Languages with grammatical marking of evidentiality are predominantly found in North and South America, in languages of the Tibeto-Burman family from East Asia, and in some of the languages of Eastern Europe and Central Asia—including the Turkic family—and the Caucasus.)

HOW-5. Study the ways in which languages change over time

A language is always in a state of change, as each generation uses it in a slightly different way from the previous one. Change is, as a rule, slow enough that the oldest and youngest speakers in a community can understand each other.

There are two conflicting principles at work in language change. One is the inherent laziness of humankind which tends towards least effort in pronunciation. The prefix *in-* (as in *inapplicable*, *indubitable*) becomes *im-* before *p-* (as in *implausible*) simply because *-mp-* (both sounds being made with the lips) is easier to say than *-np-* (a tongue sound followed by a lip sound). As another example, *want to* is reduced to *wanna* in certain environments.

In Old English, each noun had endings showing case and number. A final nasal ceased to be pronounced, and then the preceding unstressed vowel (which had now

come into word-final position). Originally we had forms like nominative singular *nama* and accusative singular *naman*; both of these reduced simply to *name* (pronounced [neim]) in modern English. The failure to pronounce final segments of words led to the loss of case and number marking on nouns.

The other principle relates to the need for efficient communication; to achieve this, certain fundamental distinctions must be maintained. In south-western France, sound changes occurred such that some words fell together; both 'cock, rooster', from Latin *gallus*, and 'cat', from Latin *gattus*, became *gat*. This homonymy might lead to confusion. To avoid it, *gat* was kept for 'cat' but replaced in its meaning of 'cock, rooster' by *pul*; this is a development from Latin *pullus* 'chick', and is here shifted in meaning to fill a lexical gap (Bloomfield 1933: 396-398).

When the erosion of word endings in English led to the loss of cases, new ways had to be found for indicating the function of a noun phrase in a sentence. Object function, previously shown by accusative case ending, was now indicated by placing the noun phrase immediately after the verb; benefactive function, previously shown by dative case, came to be marked with the preposition *to* (as in *John gave a book to Mary*).

The evolution of a language is a constant balance between laziness, which tends to lose contrasts, and the need for clear communication, which requires distinctions to be made between words, between grammatical specifications, and between construction types.

Language change happens over time. To properly study this, we need to observe a language over a fair period—at least several centuries, ideally several millennia. One person's lifetime is too short to achieve more than a glimpse of change in progress. What are required are sets of language data gathered over a long period. These are, sadly, lacking for the great majority of speech communities. There are records of Ancient Greek and Sanskrit going back about three thousand years, but for most languages the time depth is a fraction of this. For Slavic languages, for instance, the oldest records are from the tenth century CE. In North and South America and in Australia, the white invaders came and conquered and—in the great majority of cases—autochthonous languages had died out within about three generations of intensive contact. In Australia, there are a handful of reasonably good grammars from the nineteenth century, but these languages have long passed into extinction. Of the languages still actively spoken, only one (Arrernte, or Aranda) was accorded a reasonably full documentation more than fifty years in the past.

There is, however, a branch of linguistics which can recover past stages of languages. This leads into the next question.

HOW-6. Investigate how languages are genetically related

Prototypically, each political group has its own language. If the group expands in size, it may split into two (as with Spain and Portugal, for example). Each of the new political groups will develop its own identity, customs and laws. At first they will speak mutually intelligible dialects of one language, but these will change in-

dependently of each other, getting more dissimilar until they are no longer mutually intelligible—that is, they have become distinct languages.

Now when a number of languages have evolved from a common ancestor (called the 'proto-language' of the group), and provided they have not diverged too much, it is generally possible to perceive this genetic relationship and to reconstruct (i) a good deal of the lexicon, grammar and phonology of the proto-language, and (ii) the systematic changes by which each modern language developed from the proto-language. To achieve this, one must have a fair-sized collection of word bases and of grammatical elements which have similar form and similar meaning between the modern languages. For example, Kulina and Jarawara (small tribal languages spoken in Brazil and Peru) can be shown to be genetically related through cognates such as: Kulina *phaha*, Jarawara *faha* 'water'; Kulina *wapha*, Jarawara *wafa* 'woolly monkey'; and Kulina *ephe*, Jarawara *efe* 'leaf'. These examples (and other similar ones) demonstrate a recurrent association between *ph* (an aspirated labial stop) in Kulina and *f* (a labial fricative) in Jarawara. This provides a tiny sample of the extensive correspondence sets between languages (which involve every type of lexical and grammatical element) needed to provide a genetic connection.

It has been possible to prove, beyond doubt, that all the Indo-European languages make up one genetic family (there are over a hundred of them, ranging from Welsh to Albanian, from Italian to Persian, and from Latvian to Maldivian). Similarly, it has been shown that Turkish, Uzbek and Uyghur all belong to the Turkic family; that Hebrew, Arabic and Amharic all belong to the Semitic family; that Crow, Dakota and Winnebago belong to the Siouan family; and so on.

There can be a number of reasons for similarities between languages. Two of the minor ones are chance, and some universal tendency (for example, the word for 'blow' typically begins with a labial sound like *b* or *p* or *ph*, followed by a back vowel such as *u* or *o*). The major ones are shared genetic inheritance—as just outlined—and borrowing from neighbours. This leads into the next "how" question.

HOW-7. Study how languages in contiguity influence each other

There is always some degree of contact between individual speech communities living in a given geographical area. These links are likely to involve trade and intermarriage, and may also extend to music and dance, sport, and technical collaboration. As a consequence, there will be a degree of bilingualism or multilingualism between members of the speech communities. This can lead to the languages becoming more like each other. A limited number of words are likely to be borrowed; habits of pronunciation may become more similar; and—most pervasive of all—grammatical patterns are likely to be adopted or modified. The languages will gradually become more similar in their structural organisation, effectively converging towards a common grammatical pattern.

Thus a "linguistic area" is established. A well-known instance of this is South Asia, where languages of the Indo-Aryan subgroup of the Indo-European family, of the Munda subgroup of the Austroasiatic family, of the Dravidian family, and of the

Tibeto-Burman family, have converged in terms of certain critical features. These include retroflex consonants, two kinds of causative, and the trait of subjects in some types of sentences being marked with dative case (rather than the normal nominative case). In fact, South Asia is more than just a linguistic area; it can be described as a "translation area". That is, a sentence in, say, Bengali, can be changed into a sentence in, say, Tamil by merely substituting Tamil lexemes and grammatical elements for those in Bengali; the grammatical organisation of the sentence stays unchanged. We do, of course, still have quite separate languages since the actual forms used (the words and affixes) are different.

Some work has been done on language contact—on what kinds of grammatical features are most likely (and which are least likely) to be borrowed between languages, and under what social conditions; but much more is needed. Work on genetic connections between languages has a longer history and there has been a tendency to misconstrue similarities due to contact as being proof for genetic relationships. The fact that two languages share some typological feature—say, each has a system of four genders—cannot in itself constitute genetic evidence. For this we would need close correspondences of form and of meaning between the markers of gender in the two languages (plus many more instances of form / meaning correspondence).

As noted above, the establishment of genetic relationships is the one area of linguistics where we can offer definitive proof, which is accepted by all practitioners in the field. This applies to perhaps two hundred language families across the world. Unfortunately, a small number of people have muddied the waters by suggesting unsupportable links between some of these established language families. They may illicitly take typological similarities (without any extensive correspondences of form and meaning) as genetic indicators. For instance, it has been suggested that the Turkic, Tungusic and Mongolic families make up a macro-family, which has been called Altaic. In fact the three families have considerable typological similarities, but lack the systematic correspondence of forms necessary for justifying a genetic link.

Some investigators are overly generous in recognising similarities of meaning, such that—in fact—anything could be related to anything (for example, the identification of a word meaning 'egg' in one language with that meaning 'an owl species' in another, supposedly linked through an unattested intermediate meaning 'eye', see O'Grady (1990: 457)).

There is, of course, no general approval by linguists of such work. But, sadly, the media is enamoured of illusions such as "proto-world", with the consequence that great publicity is accorded to the idiot fringe of linguistics, while the solid but unsensational work being done by the core of workers is passed by.

4. The "why" questions

There is, naturally, a "why" question associated with each "how" question. Why is a given language organised in the way that it is (and not in some other way)? Why do languages differ in the ways that they do (and not in other ways)? Why do languages

change in the ways that they do (and not in other ways)? Why do languages in contact influence each other in the ways that they do (and not in other ways)? And so on.

Let me present a sample of six specific "why" questions.

(a) Why does Lahu (a language of the Tibeto-Burman family whose territory spans the borders of China, Burma and Thailand) have five spatial demonstratives, translated as 'here', 'there', 'way over there', 'up there' and 'down there', whereas Chinese and English have just two, 'here' and 'there'? As a corollary, we can ask whether Chinese or English might develop a system similar to that in Lahu.

(b) Why does Turkish have no genders, while French has two, German has three, and Swahili has eight?

(c) Why does Japanese have a developed system of honorific speech registers, while French has two forms (*tu* and *vous*) of the singular pronoun 'you', whose use depends on social distance, and English has nothing of this sort?

(d) Why does Jarawara have three past tenses (one extending from a few seconds to a few weeks ago, another from a few weeks to a couple of years in the past, and the third from a couple of years back to the beginning of time), while Russian just has one past tense?

(e) Why does the "Pennsylvania German" dialect spoken by Old Order Mennonites in Canada differ from standard German in that the verb *wotte* 'want' has changed its grammatical profile so that it can no longer be used in constructions like 'I want to come'?

(f) Why does Igbo (spoken in Nigeria) have a small class of just eight adjectives (which are similar to nouns in their grammatical properties) whereas Korean has a large open class of adjectives (which are similar to verbs in their grammatical properties)?

In our present state of knowledge, useful answers can be provided for only some of these questions. Taking them one at a time:

(a) The Lahu speech community lives in scattered villages in mountainous country (Matisoff 1973). Whether something is 'up' or 'down' with respect to the speaker is as relevant as whether it is 'near' or 'far' (shown in 'here', 'there' and 'way over there'). The grammatical coding of the height of something referred to thus assists efficient communication. (A similar feature is found in many—but not in all—smallish speech communities inhabiting hilly country.)

It is unlikely that Chinese or English would develop a similar system, simply because these languages have hundreds or millions of speakers living in every kind of terrain. That is, a grammatical feature relating to a particular aspect of the environment could not be adopted into a non-local language.

(b) I have no explanation for the varying number of genders (or the lack of genders) in these languages.

(c) The Japanese people have a highly stratified society, with strict conventions of "politeness"; the relative social status of speaker and hearer determines the speech register that is employed (and this, in turn, serves to mark their relative status). In

the history of Japanese, the use of honorifics has waxed and waned according as social ranks were accorded more or less importance (Shibatani 1990: 123-124).

The French people recognise levels of formality: *tu* is used when addressing a close relative or an intimate friend or a colleague of similar age (and also for talking to children, servants and animals), with *vous* being employed in other circumstances. The ripening of a relationship towards intimacy is marked by shift from *vous* to *tu*. Social relationships in England lack any such clear demarcation, and there is no corresponding linguistic device. (Originally, English had *thou* for singular and *ye* or *you* for plural address. Then *thou* became restricted to addressing friends, children and people of inferior rank, with *you* employed as a mark of respect or when addressing a superior; this is rather like the current situation in French. Finally, *thou* dropped out of use, with *you* becoming the only second person pronoun, in both singular and plural number.)

(d) I have no explanation for why Jarawara should have three past tenses while Russian only has one. Note that there are other languages used by a small speech community (with just a few hundred members) which have a single past tense. And there are languages with millions of speakers that have several past tenses (e.g. Swahili).

(e) The Old Order Mennonite community in Canada which uses Pennsylvania German has strong religious beliefs, which subordinates self to the will of God. The idea of an individual wanting something for themself is in direct conflict with their faith. This would seem to have motivated the change whereby *wotte* 'want' can no longer be used with an infinitival complement, as in 'want to come' (Burridge 2002).

(f) I have no explanation for why Igbo has just eight items in its adjective class (they are 'large' and 'small', 'new' and 'old', 'good' and 'bad', 'black, dark' and 'white, light') while Korean has a large open class of adjectives. Nor for why in Igbo adjectives are similar in their grammatical properties to nouns, while in Korean they resemble verbs (for example, they take tense suffixes like verbs).

In fact, linguists only occasionally ask "why" questions. I have heard the opinion that each language is ideally suited to its speech community, and vice versa—"that's the way it is". In this view it is politically incorrect to ask why Turkish should have no genders while Swahili has eight (or even to enquire "how" a particular language is suited to its speech community).

If linguistics is to fulfil its function—of fully explaining the nature of human language—then the "why" questions must at some stage be faced. Plainly, the "how" questions come first, and a great deal of work is needed before these can be considered to have been dealt with in a satisfactory way. But, while dealing with the "how" questions, a linguist ought to at all times bear in mind that these are a way-stage that should lead up to the "why" questions. The value of information gained through asking "how" lies ultimately in the light it can shed on "why".

Questions (a-f) were selected to illustrate the magnitude of the task. For (a), (c) and (e), I was able to point towards an answer (which should be pursued in much

more detail). For (b), (d) and (f), I was at a loss to provide any sort of answer. And most of the "why" questions that could be asked belong to this category.

Linguists simply do not pose "why" questions like those given above. In any scholarly endeavour, the first task is to recognise the questions that should be considered, and articulate them as clearly as possible. A great deal of time and thought and research will then have to go into providing answers. Linguists have yet to pose the appropriate questions.

Here is a further small sample of the kinds of "why" questions that need to be asked (for most of them I have, at the present time, no answer):

(g) Languages include a number of words with shifting reference, depending on who the speaker and hearer are, what the place is, and what the time is, for an utterance. There are first and second person pronouns, 'I' and 'you'. John says to Mary 'I'm hungry' and Mary replies 'You're hungry'; John is referred to by 'I' when he is speaking and by 'you' when Mary is speaking. There are spatial demonstratives, 'here' and 'there'. John is standing by the door and Mary by the table; he says 'Put the parcel on the table there!' and she replies 'I've put it on the table here'. What is 'there' for John (distant from him) is 'here' for Mary (near to her). And there are time shifters, like 'yesterday', 'today' and 'tomorrow'. What is 'today' today becomes 'yesterday' tomorrow.

From examination of a wide range of languages, it appears that there are always pronouns 'I' and 'you'. Why is this? I can imagine a language without 'I' and 'you' (indeed, young children's language sometimes passes through a stage like this)—why does every human language include these pronominal shifters? There are some languages which have a single nominal demonstrative 'this / that' (one word corresponding to both *this* and *that* in English. But it appears that every language has at least two spatial demonstratives, 'here' and 'there'. Why is this?

There are languages which have time words 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow', but lack anything corresponding to English *today*. And there are some languages which even lack 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow'. Jarawara is like this. One can of course refer to 'yesterday' with a circumlocution such as 'before the sun went down'. There is a verbal suffix *-mina* 'morning'; when used with past tense it refers to 'this morning' and with future tense to 'tomorrow morning' or just 'tomorrow'; but there is no lexeme 'tomorrow'. Now why do some languages, like Jarawara, have words for 'I' and 'you' and 'here' and 'there' but lack words for 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow'? It is not that they lack any perception of time—recall that Jarawara distinguishes three past tenses.

(h) The answer I provided for question (a)—concerning why Lahu has demonstratives 'up there' and 'down there'—was that this speech community lives in mountainous country. Some other groups living in similar terrain include specification of 'up' and 'down' in their grammar. But not all. Why not? Why should some groups of mountain-dwellers code information about their geographical habitat in their grammar, while other groups omit to do this?

(i) It has been the accepted doctrine of linguistics, for a couple of hundred years, that each language has only one parent. Suppose that one political group, speaking language X, merges with another political group, speaking language Y, so that they become a single community. This community will either speak language X (with quite a few loans from Y) or else they will speak language Y (with quite a few loans from X). It will not speak a language which is a blend, equally related to X and to Y.[2] Why is this so?

There are many examples of this. For instance, when the Normans (speaking a dialect of French) invaded England in 1066, the new Norman-plus-Saxon community soon came to speak just English (with some admixture of French words, but virtually no French grammar). When the English invaded New Zealand, in the nineteenth century, the common language of the new English-plus-Maori community came to be English, with just some words (no grammar) taken over from the Polynesian language Maori.

(j) Why is it that contiguous languages tend to become more like each other in certain ways but not in others? For instance, if a language without tones comes into contact with one or more languages that have tones, it is likely to develop its own system of tones. This applied to Vietnamese, under contact with Chinese; and it has applied across a large area of Africa. If a language with no gender system comes into contact with one or more languages that have gender, then it is rather likely to develop its own system of genders (by change within itself). The attributes of 'having tones' and 'having a gender system' tend to diffuse between languages within a geographical area. But it appears (on the basis of preliminary study) that, for instance, the attribute of 'having a complex tense system' typically does not diffuse in the same way. Why not?

5. Evaluation

It is normal in any enquiry to assess and evaluate. Scholars enquire which is the preferred alternative—of economic systems, political systems, taxonomic models, ideas concerning the origin of the universe. Similar questions should surely be asked concerning languages. Given two languages, X and Y, which is the most complex? Which is easiest to learn? Which language is—overall—better?

Such questions are never asked by linguists. Indeed it is considered subversive to even think of them. There is a reason.

[2] This scenario applies to spontaneous language development. There are examples of "mixed languages", but in each case this is the result of deliberate and conscious construction of a language, generally by an ethnic group which wishes to have a language of its own, or to have a special language style for certain in-group purposes. See Dixon (1997: 11-13). Creoles constitute a special case, which it is not pertinent to discuss here.

The self-aggrandisement of the white race has had a number of consequences. Beginning in the sixteenth century, the white race (previously confined to Europe and adjacent parts of Africa and Asia) colonised almost the whole world. By 1910 the only countries that were not governed by white people were Liberia, Ethiopia, Thailand, China, Tibet, Japan and Korea. The situation began to reverse after the second world war, when the indigenous peoples of Africa, Asia and the Pacific Islands re-established their own control over their territories. (This reversal happened too late for the Americas, Australia and New Zealand, where the white invader had established a superiority of numbers, with the indigenous peoples being left as a marginalised minority.)

Hand-in-hand with this political imposition came a total lack of respect for the religions, laws and customs of the indigenous population. And, most especially, for their languages. It was believed (as an article of faith) that the languages of non-white people—whether in Africa, in Brazil, in New Guinea, or in Australia—were simple affairs, with just a few hundred words and a paucity of grammar. These were looked upon as primitive peoples, and it was natural that they should speak primitive languages.

Attitudes of this sort persist today. In Australia, for example, people talk of Aboriginal "dialects" but of European "languages". They evince surprise and disbelief when told that there were originally about 250 distinct languages spoken in Australia, as different from each other as are Turkish and Hungarian. When I began field work in Australia, in 1963, a white farmer asked what I was doing. "Writing a grammar of the local Aboriginal language" brought the response "That should be pretty easy." When I enquired why, he replied: "They haven't got any grammar". (My published grammars of two of the languages of that region run to 420 and 563 pages respectively—Dixon 1972, 1977.)

The first task of the writer of a textbook or the teacher of an introductory course in linguistics is to combat this mistaken belief. We stress that there is no such thing as a primitive language in the world today. All languages are roughly equal in complexity. The *Oxford English Dictionary* may comprise half-a-million words but many of them lie in specialised fields (such as law and medicine) or are archaic. It is likely that the average speaker of any language (whether English or Turkish or Chinese or Lahu or Jarawara) has about the same size working vocabulary—about ten thousand words. And the grammar of every language has about the same level of complexity; it takes about three to five hundred pages to explain the grammatical organisation of any language, in moderate detail. Some languages do, of course, have complex word structures while others have rather simple word structures; but those with simple word structure tend to have complex syntax, and vice versa. The areas of complexity differ from language to language but—according to the received doctrine among linguists—the overall level of complexity is about the same. There are no primitive languages.

This is true. No language is a hundred times or even ten times as complex as any other (which is what the European colonisers believed). All languages spoken in the

world today are *roughly* similar in their lexical and grammatical wealth. But surely they are not all *precisely* equal? Some may be a little better than others—perhaps ten or twenty percent better. This is a question that I have posed in academic debate and been told—by some—that it is quite out of order.

There are three historical stages. Firstly, the belief that non-white-skinned people speak primitive languages. Secondly—to rebut this—the statement that no present-day language is in any way primitive; they are all roughly equal in complexity. I suggest that we are now ready to proceed to the next step. Agreeing that all languages are *roughly* equal, we can suggest that they are not all *exactly* equal, and then enquire whether some might be better than others (with specification of what is meant by "better" in this context).

Two reasons have been given to me for not proceeding to the third stage. One is that it might be confused with returning to the first stage. This is a matter of genuine concern, since there are many people who do still (as a matter of ignorance, or prejudice) subscribe to this belief. The other reason—given me by a linguist of Polish origin—is that one shouldn't, as a matter of political correctness, attempt to evaluate languages. She was scandalised when I gave a talk entitled "Are some languages better than others?" and exclaimed "But I could never evaluate or criticise my native language, it would be like criticising my mother, which I would never do."

Nevertheless, it clearly behoves linguists to naturally move beyond the "how" and "why" questions, to the matter of evaluation. This must relate to some specified parameter(s). I will briefly mention some of these.

(1) How easy is it to learn a given language, (a) for a child, and (b) for an adult?

It is undoubtedly the case that a language with simple word structure is easier to acquire a basic competence in, than a language with complex word structure. This applies for both child and adult learners.

One thing that militates against easy acquisition of a language—especially by an adult learner—is a plethora of irregularities. Before embarking on linguistic fieldwork in Amazonia, I endeavoured to learn Portuguese. A high proportion of lesson time involved memorising irregular verb after irregular verb. Irregularities are a needless complication, which contribute nothing to the communicative power of a language. A student learning a language like Turkish, with rather little irregularity, can devote all their efforts to achieving an understanding of word structures and of the basic syntactic patterns, which serve to code and transmit meanings. In similar vein, a language like Turkish with an agglutinative structure (where each meaning element has a segmentable form) is easier to learn than a language like Latin with fused morphemes (for example, the *-t* of *amat* 'he/she loves' is a portmanteau coding all of: third person, singular number, present tense, active voice, and indicative mood).

How easy it is for an adult to learn language X depends on what their first language is, and how similar it is to X. For example, someone who already speaks a tone language is likely to find it easier to learn X, if X has tones, than will a speaker of a non-tone language. As another example: if, in a multilingual region, all the languages have a simple consonant-vowel-consonant-vowel structure (as in *bali*

'head'), except for one language, Y, which has much more complex structures (as in *smbarg* 'head'), then people will find it hard to learn Y, and Y will be less and less acquired as a second language and less used as a language of inter-group communication than the other languages of the area. Similar remarks apply to a language with complex word structure, in an area where other languages have a simple word structure.

(2) How does a language measure up with respect to explicitness?

The ideal language should have the means to refer to any situation explicitly and unambiguously, with the amount of detail that is required. To this end, words and grammatical elements should each have a specific meaning. In English the word *hot*, when applied to food, can mean either 'of high temperature' or 'very spicy'. This can and does cause confusion. German is a better language in this respect, having distinct adjectives *heiß* 'hot in temperature' and *scharf* 'spicy hot'. When comparing two languages, one has to evaluate such instances over the whole grammar and lexicon.

(3) How does a language perform in terms of succinctness and cohesiveness?

If there are two ways of saying something, which differ only in length, then the shorter way is better. A two-syllable word is superior to one of six syllables, all else being equal. It is good to communicate a message as quickly and efficiently as possible. As a corollary to this, a simple word should be preferred to describe a common property, rather than some compound or circumlocution. It is easier to say *blue* rather than something like *sky-coloured*, and to say *cruel* rather than something like *hard-hearted.*

In similar fashion, communication is more effective if two clauses which are linked semantically are joined together in grammar. For example, *John jumped off the wall and twisted his ankle* is more cohesive than *John jumped off the wall and John twisted his ankle*. And *I don't like that man who tormented the cat* is superior to *I don't like that man; that man tormented the cat.*

(4) How does a language perform in terms of richness and subtlety of expression?

If a language has varying ways for referring to a given thing or action or property, this will provide wide possibilities of description. For example, corresponding to English verbs *cover* and *cook*, the Australian Aboriginal language Dyirbal has, in each instance, both a verb and an adjective. There is a verb *guban* 'cover' and its participle *gubangu* 'covered' can refer to something covered in any way; for example, a blanket over just half a bed, or crumpled up on it. There is also a non-cognate adjective *ngulguñ* and this means 'covered properly, covered all over'. The verb *ñadjun* 'cook' has a participle *ñadjungu* which can describe something being cooked a bit or a lot, not enough or too much. In contrast, the non-cognate adjective *ñamu* means 'cooked to perfection'. (This is just a sample, Dyirbal has several dozen more verb-and-adjective pairs, where English has just a verb.)

(5) How does a language measure up in terms of richness of grammatical systems?

Some languages have three nominal demonstratives. Their meaning can be 'this, near speaker', 'that, near hearer' and 'this, distant from both speaker and hearer'; or

else 'this, near speaker', 'that, mid-distant from speaker' and 'that, far from speaker'. These provide more information than the two nominal demonstratives in English, *this* and *that*, and will facilitate the transfer of more exact information. Similar remarks apply to a tense system which distinguishes several degrees of past and / or of future. A pronoun system which recognises three numbers (for example, 'you one', 'you two' and 'you more than two') is more informative than one with just two numbers ('you one' and 'you more than one') and this is in turn superior to the second person pronoun system in formal English which just has one term, *you*, referring to any number of people. (An invitation such as *Would you like to come to dinner?* leaves the hearer not knowing whether or not their spouse is also invited, sometimes with embarrassing consequences.)

The evaluation of a language (and comparison of the relative merits of two languages) must relate to one or more of the functions for which the language is intended. For example (this list is far from exhaustive):

- Just describing events, such as a battle or a sporting contest or a tea party.
- Talking about things that are specific to a given community. For instance, if some group has a classificatory kinship system (where everyone in the community is regarded as related to everyone else, by applying a set of algorithms) then an appropriate set of nouns and verbs will be needed to talk about this.
- For technical description; for example, of how to build a machine and how to operate it.
- For philosophical (or religious) discourse, ruminating on the nature of matter or the purpose of life.
- For song and poetry and various kinds of literature.

The value of a language can have consequences for the people who use it. Suppose that there are two small communities, A and B, at the opposite ends of a large island with other communities between them. In each of A and B, a charismatic leader emerges who is determined to conquer all other communities and rule the entire island. But whereas A has a language with complex word structure, considered difficult to learn by outsiders, B has a language with simple word structure, similar to that of most other languages in the island and considered easy to learn. Which leader is more likely to succeed in controlling the island? Plainly, many factors will be involved—weapons available, military organisation and strategy, how conquered groups are treated and whether they will ally themselves with the conqueror and join his army. But language will be one factor. The greater accessibility of the B language, in this particular situation, will provide the leader of the B people with a definite advantage.

My comments here have been tentative and exploratory. There is no tradition of evaluating languages (and of asking questions such as "Are some languages better than others"?) on which I can draw. But if linguistics is to tackle the analysis and assessment of its subject matter in the way that other disciplines do, these are questions which must be systematically investigated by linguists.

6. Prediction

The basic profile of science is to describe, to explain, and then to predict. For example, in 1915 it was suggested by Percival Lowell that perturbations in the orbit of the planet Uranus could be explained in terms of the gravitational attraction of an outer planet in a certain position. The prediction was confirmed when Pluto was actually observed, in 1930.

There are a number of ways in which linguists could make predictions about languages, which might be confirmed or falsified. I will briefly mention three. Firstly, it is possible to predict what the semantic content of a given grammatical category will be. Secondly, it is possible to say that if a grammar includes a certain feature, then this is likely to entail the presence or absence of some further feature. And, thirdly, it should be possible to predict how a given language is likely to change over time.

One caveat is in order. In any discipline (like linguistics) dealing with some aspect of the behaviour of humans, the results will be in terms of probabilities rather than of certainties. Linguistics does not feature "laws" like those of physics; it deals instead in strong tendencies, in likely correlations, and in predictions that have a high chance of proving to be correct.

(i) Predicting the content of a small adjective class.

Under (f) in §4, I admitted that I did not know why Igbo (and other languages) have a small class of adjectives, while Korean (and other languages, including English) have a large adjective class. What *can* be done is to *predict*, for a language with a small adjective class, what its semantic content is likely to be. The prototypical members of an adjective class are words referring to dimension, age, value, and colour. Recall, from §4, that Igbo has two of each: 'large' and 'small' (dimension), 'new' and 'old' (age), 'good' and 'bad' (value), and 'black, dark' and 'white, light' (colour). Slightly bigger classes may include more words from these semantic types (for example, 'long', 'short', 'red') and also some physical property items (for example, 'raw, green, unripe', 'heavy', 'light', 'sharp', 'hot'). Only when an adjective class is much bigger (with at least a few score members) is it likely to include terms referring to human propensities (for example, 'happy', 'jealous', 'kind', 'clever').

If you tell me that, working on a previously undescribed language, you have recognised a small class of, say, fifteen adjectives, I will be able to predict what their meanings are likely to be. I wouldn't expect my predictions to tally exactly, but I would expect to have a high measure of success. (If I had a bet on the outcome, I'd expect to make money.)

Similar predictions can be made in many other areas of grammar. Suppose you discover that your newly described language has two varieties of complement clause (which can function as object of a main verb), one like English 'to' as in *I decided to go*, and one like English '-ing' as in *I like eating*. Now I would predict that verbs like 'want' and 'hope' and 'try' and 'tell' would take a 'to-type' clause, while verbs

like 'see' and 'hear' and 'imagine' would take an '-ing-type' clause. These predictions are likely to be predominantly—but not absolutely—correct.

(ii) Predicting associations between the components of a grammar.

In a sentence like *Woman sees man*, there is one verb and two nouns. The grammar must be able to specify whether it is the woman who does the seeing and the man who is seen, or vice versa.

There are basically three ways of showing this. Some languages have what is called "dependent marking": for example, what is subject is shown by nominative case ending and what is object by accusative ending. Thus, Latin has *mulier virum videt* for 'woman sees man'; since the nominative ending on *mulier* 'woman' shows that it is subject, and the accusative ending on *virum* 'man' shows that it is object, the three words in this sentence can occur in any order—for example *virum videt mulier* or *virum mulier videt*—without any difference in meaning.

Other languages (including Swahili and Navaho) have what is called "head marking"; this requires obligatory subject and object pronouns as part of the verb. A sentence such as 'woman sees man' would be rendered as, literally, 'woman man she-him-sees'. Again, the words 'woman' and 'man' can occur in any order, since what is subject and what is object are shown by the pronoun indicators 'she' and 'him' on the verb.

And there are languages which simply use the order of words in a sentence to indicate their function, as in English where the subject precedes the verb and the object follows it.

Now if a language has head marking we can predict that it is unlikely to have dependent marking, and vice versa. If it has neither dependent marking nor head marking, then it is likely to use the order of words to show syntactic function. As with most linguistic generalisations, this is not a hard-and-fast prediction. There are some languages which show both head marking and dependent marking (for example, Classical Arabic). And there are languages which lack head marking and dependent marking but also permit words to occur in any order in a sentence (for example, Lao); here, what is subject and what is object has to be inferred from the surrounding discourse and from the situational context. But the number of exceptions to our statement that a language is unlikely to have both dependent marking and fully-developed head marking are relatively few, and do not affect the value of this generalisation concerning a strong and pervasive tendency across human languages.

Other types of prediction are possible about the interaction between components of a grammar. As mentioned under "HOW-2" in §2, if there are different numbers of tense choices available in positive and in negative sentences, then the greater set of choices will be in positive sentences. Just a little work has been done on dependencies between grammatical systems. As a further example, the number of gender specifications available may depend on the tense that is chosen, but we never find the number of possible tense specifications depending on the gender that is chosen (see

Aikhenvald & Dixon 1998). Generalisations like this can be the basis for predictions concerning how some newly described language is likely to be structured.

(iii) Predicting how a language will change.

The ways in which a given language is likely to change will depend on (among other factors) the social circumstances in which it is used, the languages it is in contact with, and the speakers' attitudes towards their own and towards other languages.

The ways in which a given language is likely to change in the future would surely be a fruitful field of enquiry. However, linguists have scarcely ventured into it. I will here just put forward some elementary speculations concerning likely future directions for English.

Old English had a rich array of irregular verbs, and also some irregular nouns; these are gradually being replaced by regular forms. The plural of *cow* used to be *kine* and has been replaced by *cows*. The plural of *brother* was *brethren* but has now been replaced by *brothers* (the form *brethren* is retained just for members of a religious order). In due course, *oxen* will certainly be fully replaced by *oxes* and, I predict, *children* will—not soon, but in the fullness of time—be replaced by *childs*.

Irregular verbs are also gradually being regularised; for example, *dreamed* is now often used in place of *dreamt*, *kneeled* in place of *knelt*, *lighted* in place of *lit*. Occasionally a new irregular verb is introduced (for instance, *dove* can be used in American English in place of *dived*, on the pattern of *drive* and *drove*, *ride* and *rode*) but the overall tendency is towards reducing the number of irregularities. It takes little imagination to suggest that this trend will continue, and only a little more to suggest which irregular forms may fall out of use over the next centuries (I'd opt for the elimination of, among others, *crept*, *fled*, *bled*, *flung*, *strung*, *ground*, *swore* and *blew*.)

Let me venture to predict another kind of change which has not yet (to my knowledge) commenced. English is replete with what are called "phrasal verbs". These each consist of a verb plus a preposition, but with the combination having a meaning that cannot be inferred from the meaning of its parts. For example, *take after*, as in *She takes after her mother*; and *pick on*, as in *The teacher picked on John*; amd *sum up* as in *He sums up the situation in one sentence*. At present each of these is one lexeme which consists of two words; the tense is shown on the first word, the verb. I predict that, in the not too distance future, these may be reanalysed as each being a single complex word, with tense added at the end. That is, instead of *He sums up the situation* we will hear *He sum-up-s the situation*; and also *She take-after-s her mother*, and then—eventually—things like *The teacher pick-on-ed John.*

A serious examination of how languages are known to have changed in the past—and why, and under what conditions—should be allied with a study of present-day dialect variation. From this, it should be possible to predict how a major language like English is likely to change over future time. And also how a small tribal language (most of whose speakers also have some proficiency in the lingua franca of the nation in which they live) is likely to change. (If, indeed, it does not move into ex-

tinction, as the vast majority of small languages are likely to, in the fairly near future.)

7. The present situation in linguistics

I will now, as promised, look briefly at the concerns of people who are on the payroll of departments of linguistics. By and large, these are quite different from those discussed above.

Chomsky is by far the best known linguist, both within and without the field. He has spawned a succession[3] of formal theories that are held to be "simple and elegant ... with fundamental principles that have an intuitive character and broad generality". Chomsky does state that "language is a biological system, and biological systems typically are 'messy'". His modus operandi is to investigate the "human language faculty", focussing on what is called "logical form". This appears to be a kind of computational mechanism which relates to just a part of the grammar of a language (leaving aside the messy bits), considered quite apart from any cultural context. There is no attempt to provide a framework in terms of which a comprehensive grammar of a natural language could be formulated; rather, bits of individual grammars may be taken account of (without any reference to how they relate to the rest of the grammar), as they may be perceived to help explicate some aspect of the "human language faculty".

Chomsky states that the "task at hand" for his Minimalist Program "is to show that the apparent richness and diversity of linguistic phenomena is illusory and epiphenomenal, the result of interaction of fixed principles under slightly different conditions" (quotations from Chomsky 1995: 29, 8). His program operates in terms of constraints, rule-systems and principles that are inviolable. This is in stark contrast to the substantive generalisations in linguistic typology (as briefly mentioned above), which are—due to the nature of language—almost always probabilistic in nature, describing strong tendencies but very seldom absolutive correlations.

A plethora of other formal theories have emerged, briefly flourished, and then faded (these have mostly been initiated by Chomsky's students). One current preoccupation is Optimality Theory, which was first introduced in phonology. There are a number of possible "optimality constraints" and each language utilises those most appropriate for its structure. For example, if in language X each word ends in a vowel, then "having each word end in a vowel" is an optimality constraint for the language. (There may be odd violations, such as a few unassimilated loans which end in a consonant.) This is rather like saying, at the end of a football match, that the team which won was destined to win. Optimality Theory has recently been extended to

[3] Since about 1970 the names used by Chomsky for his sequence of formal theories include: Standard Theory, Extended Standard Theory, Revised Extended Standard Theory, Government and Binding Theory, Principles and Parameters Theory, and the Minimalist Program (I may have blinked and missed a couple).

syntax. Instead of constraints, rule schema and principles which are inviolable, we now have constraints, rule schema and principles which are violable, with a form that shows least violations being preferred (Barbosa et al. 1998: 1-2). Unsurprisingly, the problems which could not be solved within the earlier Minimality Program, have since reappeared in different guise within Optimality Theory.

Approaches of this type are espoused by more than half of the people employed, across the world, in departments of linguistics.[4] There is a particular concentration of formalists in the eastern part of the USA, with considerable pockets in the centre and west, and also in Europe. And there are camp-followers in South America. In Australia, formalists are fairly scarce.

The only way to become a competent practitioner in any craft or discipline is to actively engage in it. A watchmaker must actually make and mend watches, a surgeon must perform operations, a geologist must examine rocks (both in the field and in the laboratory), an organic chemist must conduct experiments in the laboratory. In the same way, a linguist must describe languages. The ideal apprenticeship is to undertake fieldwork on some previously undescribed (or scarcely described) language—recording, transcribing and analysing texts; observing how people use the language in the daily round; writing a grammar and phonology; compiling a dictionary; and publishing a volume of annotated texts.

Once a linguist has mastered the fundamentals of the discipline in this way, they are equipped to go on to the next stage, working on linguistic typology. This involves studying the grammars of a selection of languages, inductively inferring some putative generalisation (for example, that mentioned under (ii) in §6, that gender specifications available may depend on the choice from a tense system, never the other way round). The next step is to thoroughly check a generalisation, examining as many languages as possible (not, at this stage, just a sample of languages).

Only some of the people who call themselves typologists follow this path. Besides the great mass of formalists (who are explicit about what they are doing) there is also a group who can be called "armchair typologists". They have not undertaken the apprenticeship which is necessary for mastering the fundamentals of linguistics—writing a grammar of a language (ideally, based on fieldwork in a community where the language is actively spoken). The armchair typologists simply try to do typology "in the raw"; this is rather like someone attempting to make generalisations in geology without ever having examined in detail a single rock. Their work is, by and large, slight and unenlightening. Indeed, they share with the formalists a predilection for pretty little, nice-and-neat statements, which mock the untidy and messy nature

[4] A few formalists have done a little work on languages—for example, Baker (1988, 1996) includes data on Mohawk from his own field work. However, this is based on elicitation from English, rather than on analysis of running texts in Mohawk, examined within the cultural context in which they occur. And Baker's transcription is inadequate in that he does not distinguish vowel length. (This is rather like failing to distinguish between *sleep* and *slip*, *deep* and *dip*, etc. in work on English.)

of the totality of a human language (a messiness which they have never exposed themselves to).

Moving beyond the formalists and the armchair typologists, there are some hundreds of people describing languages, learning the discipline, and then going on to judicious typological work on an inductive basis. These people—a minority of those employed in university departments of linguistics—are involved in the true business of linguistics, adding to the objective stock of knowledge concerning spoken languages, and working together to refine our understanding of the basic nature of human language.

They ask some of the "how" questions but—as yet—scarcely any of the "why" questions. Nor do they pay attention to evaluation of whether some languages are—in certain defined respects—better than others. And they are almost never concerned with prediction. Linguistic scholars of today are, effectively, nibbling at the surface of an apple of knowledge concerning the nature of language; we need to take a measured bite, towards the core.

In essence, the discipline of linguistics needs to reinvent itself, in order to tackle the questions I have outlined. This can only be done by a new generation dissociating itself from most of its elders, and setting out to really investigate the nature of language, as it is used.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. 1998. Dependencies between grammatical systems. *Language* 74, 56-80.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barbosa, Pilar & Fox, Danny & Hagstrom, Paul & McGinnis, Martha & Pesetsky, David 1998. *Is the best good enough? Optimality and competition in syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Bhatia, Tej K. 1993. *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Bloomfield, Leonard 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Burridge, Kate 2002. Changes within Pennsylvania German grammar as enactments of Anabaptist world view. In: Enfield, N. J (ed.) *Ethnosyntax. Expolorations in grammar and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 207-230.

Chomsky, Noam 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. *A grammar of Yidiñ*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1991. *A new approach to English grammar, on semantic principles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1997. *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2004. *The Jarawara language of southern Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matisoff, James A. 1973. *The grammar of Lahu*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

O'Grady, Geoff N. 1990. Prenasalization in Pama-Nyungan. In: Baldi, Philip (ed.) *Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 451-476.

Shibatani, Masayoshi 1990. *The languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirghiz reciprocals

Vladimir P. Nedjalkov

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 2003. Kirghiz reciprocals. *Turkic Languages* 7, 181-234.

Kirghiz has two principal means of expressing reciprocity, the reciprocal suffix *-š* and the reciprocal pronoun *birin-biri* 'each other'. The suffix can also express assistive meaning, whereas it lacks sociative and comitative meanings. With a restricted group of verbs it expresses competitive and anticausative meanings. Its most interesting function is the marking of the 3rd person plural on verbs. Its distribution overlaps with that of the reciprocal pronoun.

Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Linguistic Research, Tuchkov per. 9, St. Petersburg, 199053 Russia. E-mail: nedjalkov@typology.spb.su

1. Introduction

Kirghiz belongs to the Southern (or Aralo-Caspian) subgroup of the Northwestern (Kipchak) group of the Turkic languages. It is spoken natively by more than 2,500,000 Kirghiz. About 90% live in the Republic of Kyrghyzstan. There are Kirghiz minorities in the neighbouring countries Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Mongolia and China.

Kirghiz has two principal means of expressing reciprocity, the reciprocal suffix *-š* and the reciprocal pronoun *birin-biri* 'each other' which are used singly or co-occur in the same clause.

(1) a. *Kïz* *apa-sï-n* *öp-tü.*
girl.NOM mother-her-ACC kiss-PAST.3
'The girl kissed her mother.'

b. *Kïz* *menen* *apa-sï* *öb-üš-tü.*
girl.NOM and mother-her.NOM kiss-REC-PAST.3
'The girl and her mother kissed.'

Both types of reciprocals occur in all the three diathesis types of both subject-oriented and object-oriented constructions.

Verbal forms with the suffix *-š* can also express an assistive meaning:

(2) a. *Apa-m* *kamïr* *šuuru-du.*
mother-my.NOM dough.NOM knead-PAST.3
'My mother kneaded the dough.'

b. *Men apa-m-a kamïr šuuru-š-tu-m.*
I.NOM mother-my-DAT dough.NOM knead-REC-PAST-1SING
'I helped my mother to knead the dough.'

Kirghiz differs from Yakut in that its reciprocal suffix lacks the sociative and comitative meanings. Sociatives are attested only in folklore and they are rejected by native speakers. With rather restricted groups of verbs, the reciprocal suffix marks the competitive and the anticausative meanings.

The most interesting function of the Kirghiz reciprocal suffix is optional marking of 3PLUR on verbs. Thus this suffix may occur twice in a verb form, as a reciprocal and as a plural marker:

(3) a. *Alar kamïr šuuru-š-tu.*
they dough knead-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They kneaded the dough.'

b. *Alar kamïr šuuru-š-ïš-tu.*
they dough knead-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They helped (somebody) to knead dough.' (assistive)

The reciprocal pronoun *birin-biri* is inflected for case and person, and it takes possessive plural markers in agreement with the person of the subject. This reciprocal pronoun stands in complex relation to the reciprocal suffix; they are in overlapping distribution. Thus the reciprocal pronoun is odd with the verb *öp-* 'to kiss' in (4) (cf. (1b)), but on the other hand the reciprocal suffix is ungrammatical in (5b), and it is lexicalized in (5c).

(4) ? *Alar birin-biri öp-tü.*
'They kissed each other.'

(5) a. *Men anï terek-ke bayla-dï.*
I.NOM he.ACC tree-DAT tie-PAST.3
'I tied him to a tree.'

b. **Biz terek-ke bayla-š-tï.*
(intended meaning:) 'We tied each other to a tree.'

c. *Men anï menen bayla-š-tï-m.*
I.NOM he.ACC with tie-REC-PAST-1SING
'I made a bet with him.' (lexicalized meaning)

d. *Biz birin-biri terek-ke bayla-dï.*
'We tied each other to a tree.'

Many verbs with a reciprocal meaning are derived from nominal bases by means of the suffix *-laš*:

(6) *bet* 'face' → *bet-laš-* 'to meet face to face'

The bulk of the material used in this paper is borrowed from a two-volume Kirghiz-Russian dictionary and a one-volume Russian-Kirghiz dictionary, and also from specialist literature. The evaluations of grammaticality and acceptability reflect the intuitions of the young Kirghiz linguist Talay Abdiev, who has also supplied the examples cited without references. I am grateful to him for his invaluable help. Sometimes, his evaluations are at variance with the dictionary data, which may be due to dialectal factors.

2. Grammatical notes

The principal outline and also some of the important features of Kirghiz grammar coincide with those of Yakut. Therefore we refer the reader to the article on Yakut published in *Turkic Languages* 7, 1 (Nedjalkov 2003). We shall list only some important points of difference.

2.1. Morphonology

The suffixes in Kirghiz have fewer allomorphs than in Yakut: not more than 12 as a rule. Thus, for instance, the dative case marker has only 8 variants (*-ga/-ge/-go/-gö; -ka/-ke/-ko/-kö*) corresponding to the 20 variants in Yakut.

2.2. Case, number and possessivity

There are only six cases in the Kirghiz noun. Kirghiz lacks the comitative case, but it has the genitive which is lost in Yakut. The case endings follow the markers of plurality and possessivity (cf. *apa-sï-n* in (1a) and *apa-m-a* in (2b)). The non-possessive case paradigm of the noun *kïz* 'girl' in the singular:

(7)

NOM	*kïz-Ø*	ACC	*kïz-dï*
GEN	*kïz-dïn*	LOC	*kïz-da*
DAT	*kïz-ga*	ABL	*kïz-dan*

In the following, the nominative case is as a rule not indicated in the glosses.

In the possessive declension the endings may differ, e.g. the dative case endings are *-a/-e/-o/-ö* (see (2b)). If the 1PLUR or 2PLUR possessive marker is used the accusative case ending is *-d/-di/-du/-dü,* while the accusative ending co-occurrent with the 3rd person possessive marker (common for SING and PLUR) is *-n* (cf. (11)). The plural marker, which is not always used, is the suffix *-lar/-tar*, etc. (e.g. *at* 'horse', *at-tar* 'horses', *kïz* 'girl', *kïz-dar* 'girls'). An adjective when used attributively precedes the head noun and is not inflected. In an attributive possessive phrase, the head noun

requires the genitive case of the attribute and the possessive suffix of the head noun agrees with the person and number of the attribute:

(8) *at-tïn* *baš -ï*
horse-GEN head-its
'a horse's head'

2.3. Tense-aspect system

Like Yakut, Kirghiz has two sets of agreement markers on the verb: one of the sets is used on verbs only (see (9)) and the other coincides with the possessive markers on the noun (see (10)). The 3rd person verb form has no plural marker, while Yakut has the plural suffix *-ler*. Therefore, when the optional 3PLUR marker *-š* (which is placed before the tense marker and converbal marker) is not used, the SING and PLUR are not distinguished in the 3rd person. The following tables illustrate the present and past tense paradigms which make use of different agreement paradigms.

These agreement markers are also used in the perfect marked by *-gan/-kan/-gän/ -käm*, past habitual in *-ču*, future in *-ar* and also in nominal predicates.

(9) Present (the marker *-a/-e/-o/-ö/-y*)

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
1.	*al-a-mïn* 'I take'	*al-a-bïz* 'we take'
2.	*al-a-sïŋ* 'you take'	*al-a- sïŋar* 'you take'
3.	*al-a-t* 's/he takes'	*al-a-t* 'they take', *al-ïš-a-t* 'they take'.

(10) Past (the marker *-dï/-di/-du/-dü/-tï/-ti/-tu/-tü*)

	SING	PLUR
1.	*al-dï-m* 'I took'	*al-dï-k* 'we took'
2.	*al-dï-ŋ* 'you took'	*al-dï-ŋar* 'you took'
3.	*al-dï-Ø* 's/he took'	*al-dï-Ø* 'they took', *al-ïš-tï* 'they took'

There are numerous periphrastic verbal forms containing converbs and auxiliaries.

2.4. Reflexive and reciprocal pronouns

Kirghiz differs from Yakut in that reflexive and reciprocal pronouns are formed from different bases. The reflexive pronoun is formed from the base *öz* 'self' (nominative *özü-m* '(I) myself', *özü-ŋ* '(you) yourself', *özü* '(s/he) him/herself', *özü-lör-ü/öz-dör-ü* '(they) themselves', etc.), while the reciprocal pronoun is formed from the numeral *bir* 'one' by means of reduplication. Both pronouns are inflected for person and case, the reflexive pronoun having both singular and plural forms, and the reciprocal only plural forms. Both pronouns take the case endings of the possessive declension. The reflexive pronoun has the nominative case while the reciprocal does not have it. The reciprocal pronoun has two variants for each person, (11b') and, less frequently, (11b") (for the latter see (52b), (60) and (61)). Here are the *accusative* case forms of both pronouns (see (40) for the forms of four cases):

(11)	a. Reflexive pronoun	b. Reciprocal pronoun
1SING	*özü-m-ü* 'myself'	-
2SING	*özü-ŋ-ü* 'yourself'	-
3SING	*özü-n* 'him/herself'	-
1PLUR	*özü-büz-dü* 'ourselves'	b'. *bir[i]-biri-biz-di* = b". *biri-biz-di biri-biz* 'each other'
2PLUR	*özü-ŋör-dü* 'yourselves'	*bir[i]-biri-ŋer-di* = *biri-ŋer-di biri-ŋer* 'each other'
3PLUR	*özü-dör-ün* 'themselves'	*biri-n-biri* = *bir[i]-biri-n* 'each other'

In Kirghiz orthography, the reciprocal pronouns under (11) are usually spelt as *birin-biri, biri-biribizdi, biribizdi biribiz*, etc. In the examples below, they are divided into morphemes.

2.5. Voice (means of valency change)

Kirghiz is like Yakut in that it has three valency decreasing voices and one valency increasing voice. What follows is a list of the voice markers and their principal and additional meanings. The names of the suffixes only partly reflect their functions; moreover, the passive and the reflexive suffixes seem to be used in the functions reflected in their name less commonly than in other functions. The meanings of different markers may be similar (cf. 13.5). Thus, if we take into account lexicalizations, the general overview is very complicated. Among all the verbs (11,645 items) registered in the two-volume Kirghiz-Russian dictionary (Judaxin 1985a-b), verbs with the voice markers comprise 5,350 items, or 46%; verbs with causative suffixes comprise 3,200 items (Sadykov 1995: 23; Abdiev 1995: 36).

1. The *passive* suffix *-ïl/-il/-ul/-ül/-l*. Forms with this marker can also express the reflexive proper, anticausative, and a number of other meanings:

(12)		
a.	*ǰaz-*	'to write'
	→ *ǰaz-ïl-*	'to be written' (passive)
b.	*ïgïr-*	'to press somebody/something to somebody/something'
	→ *ïgïr-ïl-*	'to press oneself to somebody/something' (autocausative)
c.	*ǰïyna-*	'to gather something/somebody'
	→ *ǰïyna-l-*	i. 'to be gathered' (passive), ii. 'to gather' (anticausative)
d.	*as-*	'to hang somebody/something'
	→ *as-ïl-*	i. 'to be hanged' (passive), ii. 'to hang oneself (reflexive).

2. The *reflexive* suffix *-ïn/-in/-un/-ün/-n*. This marker can also express a number of other meanings, e.g. the possessive-reflexive, passive (after root-final *-l*), anticausative, etc.:

(13) a. *ǰuu-* 'to wash'
→ *ǰuu-n-* 'to wash oneself' (reflexive proper)

b. *as-* 'to hang somebody/something'
→ *as-ïn-* i. 'to hang oneself' (reflexive proper),
ii. 'to hang something on oneself' (reflexive-possessive)

c. *uypala-* 'to tangle something'
→ *uypala-n-* 'to get entangled' (anticausative)

d. *al-* 'to take'
→ *al-ïn-* 'to be taken' (passive)

3. The *reciprocal* suffix *-iš/-iš/-uš/-üš/-š*. This suffix may also render the assistive and the anticausative and competitive meanings; it also has a special function of marking plurality in the 3rd person (see (1b), (2b), (3)). Kirghiz never uses a reduplicated reciprocal suffix to express reciprocity, which sometimes happens in Yakut. This may be due to the fact that the suffix *-š* may be repeated in the same form as a 3PLUR marker only, the first suffix being reciprocal or assistive (see (3b)). In the Kirghiz-Russian dictionary, 960 verbal forms with the reciprocal suffix are registered (Abdiev 1995: 114), of which in my opinion not more than half have the standard reciprocal meaning (see 9.3).

4. The productive *causative* suffixes *-t, -dïr/-dir/-dur/-dür, -tïr/-tir/-tur/-tür,* the unproductive suffixes *-ar, -kar, -ïz* (and their variants), and two or more very rare suffixes. The suffix *-t* occurs in 82% and *-dïr* in 15.5% of all the causatives (Abdiev 1996: 33). In the Kirghiz-Russian dictionary 78% of causatives are derived from intransitives (Abdiev 1995: 136). The productive causative suffixes can also render the passive, viz. permissive-passive, meaning (see Kudajbergenov 1987b: 252-253).

(14) a. *öl-* 'to die'
→ *öl-tür-* 'to kill'
→ *öl-tür-t-* 'to order/allow to kill' (causative proper)

b. *čap-* 'to catch (of a trap)' (lit. 'to hit')
→ *čap-tïr-* 'to get caught (in a trap)' (permissive passive)

c. *ǰeŋ-* 'to win'
→ *ǰeŋ-dir-/ǰeŋ-dir-t-* i. 'to let oneself be conquered', i. 'to be conquered',
iii. 'to submit/resign oneself' (Judaxin 1985a: 248)

Among verbal derivatives registered in the Kirghiz-Russian dictionary (Judaxin 1985a-b) the forms considered below are represented as follows: causatives comprise 60%, reciprocals 17.9%, passives 12.5%, reflexives 9.8% (see Abdiev 1996: 33).

3. Combinability of voice markers

The voice markers may co-occur in the same verbal form in various combinations. The purpose of the following survey is to give an approximate idea of the place of the reciprocal suffix among other voice markers.

1. The *causative* markers derive verbs from reflexives, and reciprocals, and passives (but not from passives proper), and causatives (cf. (21h), (15)). Alongside a double causative suffix (see (14a)), in specialist literature there are mentions of treble use of the causative suffixes (cf. (16d); Junusaliev 1966: 495). (Besides, a combination of the causative suffix *-dïr* with the reciprocal suffix, i.e. *-štïr* (< *-š-dïr*), may function as a single derivational morpheme; cf. (21k) and (160)-(171)).

(15) *kak-* 'to hit/beat'
→ *kag-ïn-* 'to clean oneself by beating dirt, dust, etc. off one's clothes, shoes, etc.'
→ *kag-ïn-dïr-* 'to make somebody clean his clothes, shoes, etc.'

(16) a. *ǰaz-* 'to write'
→ b. *ǰaz-dïr-* 'to order to write'
→ c. *ǰaz-dïr-t-* 'to order to write via a second person'
→ d. *ǰaz-dïr-t-tïr-* 'to order to write via a third person'

2. The *reciprocal* marker may combine with causatives derived from intransitives, but it does not combine with causatives derived from transitives, with a few exceptions. It combines with two-place intransitives containing the passive or the reflexive marker (not in their proper meaning; see (17) and (21g)). In its anticausative function, it appears jointly with the passive or reflexive marker thus forming derivatives from transitives (including lexicalized reciprocals) (see 13.5).

(17) *ïgïr-ïl-* 'to press oneself to ...' (cf. (12b))
→ *ïgïr-ïl-ïš-* 'to press oneselves to each other' (reciprocal proper)

3. The *passive* marker does not as a rule combine with reflexive or with reciprocal derivatives. In exceptional instances of this type the meaning of the suffixes *-n* and *-š* on the intransitive underlying verbs is not felt; semantically, the passive form is related to the first verb in the derivational chain; cf. (18c) and (18a), and (19c) and (19a).

(18) a. *oylo-* 'to think'
b. *oylo-n-* 'to fall to thinking'
c. *oylo-n-ul-* 'to be the object of thinking' (Judaxin 1985b: 63)

(19) a. *čirke-* 'to tie/link camels (etc.) in single file'
b. *čirke-š-* 'to stretch (being tied) in single file'
c. *čirke-š-il-* 'to be tied/linked in single file' (Judaxin 1985b: 364)

The passive suffix combines freely with causatives, in particular with two-place causatives:

(20) *öl-* 'to die'
→ *öl-tür-* 'to kill'
→ *öl-tür-ül-* 'to be killed' (see also (21i))

4. The *reflexive* marker seems to be the least capable of being added to other voice markers; at least the Kirghiz-Russian dictionary does not register any derivatives of this kind (Abdiev 1995: 40).

I have cited above only some of the meanings of voice derivatives. To give an idea of the complexity of derivational relations, here is a set of all the derivatives of the verb *bayla-* 'to tie something to something/tie up' that are registered in the dictionary (Judaxin 1985a: 96-97).

(21) a. *bayla-* 'to tie something to something/tie up'
b. *bayla-l-* 'to be tied to something/tied up' (passive)
c. *bayla-n-* i. 'to tie something to oneself' (reflexive possessive), ii. 'to be tied to something/tied up' (passive)
d. *bayla-t* 'to order to tie, etc.'(causative)
e. *bayla-t-tïr-* 'to order to tie via somebody' (causative)
f. *bayala-n-t-* 'to order to tie something to oneself' (causative)
g. *bayla-n-ïš-* 'to get connected with somebody on the phone, etc.' (lexicalized reciprocal)
h. *bayla-n-ïš-tïr-* i. 'to tie somebody/something with somebody/something' (lexicalized causative), ii. 'to coordinate something with something (lexicalized causative)
i. *bayla-n-ïš-tïr-ïl-* 'to be tied together' (passive from (h))
j. *bayla-š-* i. *'to tie each other' (*reciprocal), ii. 'to help to tie' (assistive), iii. 'to wager, compete' (lexicalized reciprocal)
k. *bayla-š-tïr-* 'to tie something/somebody together/with each other' (causative) (see 13)

The following example taken from Judaxin (1985a: 97) illustrates (21i) in which the reciprocal suffix is followed by two more suffixes, causative and passive:

l. *At-tar bayla-n-ïš-tïr-ïl-ïp, koštoš turul-up tur-gan-ïn körö-sü-ŋ.*
'You will see how the horses tied together are standing in pairs.'

4. Diathesis types of reciprocals with the suffix -š only

4.1. Subject-oriented reciprocal constructions

4.1.1. "Canonical" reciprocals

4.1.1.1. Derived from two-place transitives

The lexical range of this type of verbs is similar to that in Yakut; therefore, I shall confine myself to a list of base verbs and a few sentential examples: *alda-* 'to deceive', *aŋdï-* 'to watch/spy on', *arba-* 'to enchant', *at-* 'to fire', *bil-* 'to know', *čakïr-* 'to call', *kabarla-* 'to inform', *kapa kïl-* 'to offend', *karasotto-* 'to judge/try/put on trial', *kör-* 'to see', *kuu-* 'to chase', *makta-* 'to praise', *mušta-* 'to hit (with a fist)', *oyrondo-* 'to destroy', *öp-* 'to kiss', *sök-* 'to scold', *sïyla-* 'to respect', *sura-* 'to ask', *tab-* 'to find', *tikte-* 'to look', *türt-* 'to push', *šïldïnda-* 'to tease', *ǰala-* 'to lick (of animals)', *ǰanč-* 'to hit/beat', *ǰït-* 'to smell'.

(22) a. *Al meni sotto-du.*
he I.ACC take.to.court-PAST.3
'He took me to court.'

b. *Biz sotto-š-tu-k.*
we take.to.court-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We took each other to court.'

(23) *Sura-š-pa-y tab-ïš-kan.*
ask-REC-NEG-CONV find-REC-PERF
'They found each other without asking each other.'

The latter example is a saying with a pejorative meaning (used of thieves, drunkards, etc.).

4.1.1.2. Derived from two-place transitives with a split object valency

This type is entirely parallel to the respective Yakut type:

(24) a. *Al meni kökürök-kö türt-tü.*
he I.ACC chest-DAT push-PAST.3
'He pushed me on the chest.'

b. *Biz eköö-büz kükürök-kö türt-üš-tü-k.*
we two-we chest-DAT push-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We pushed each other on the chest.'

4.1.1.3. Derived from two-place intransitives

Reciprocals are formed from the following limited group of verbs, most of which require a dative object: *ačuulan-* 'to get angry with', *čende-* 'to approach', *katta-* 'to pay a visit to', *kïzuulan-* 'to be/become furious (while speaking) with', *kork-* 'to

become afraid/scared of' (this stem takes an ablative object), *korǰongdo-* 'to swear at/abuse', *söykön-* 'to rub against', *süyön-* 'to lean against', *taarïn-* 'to get offended with', *ïmda-* 'to wink at', *ïškïr-* 'to whistle to', *ǰoluk-* 'to wink at', etc.

(25) a. *Men alar-ga ïškïr-dï-m.*
I.NOM they-DAT whistle-PAST-1SING
'I whistled to them.'

b. *Biz alar menen ïškïr-ïš-tï-k.*
we they with whistle-REC-PAST-1PLUR
lit. 'We with them whistled to each other.'

Derived two-place intransitives, including autocausatives with the reflexive suffix *-n*, can form reciprocals in *-š* (note that reciprocals cannot be formed from the underlying three-place intransitives):

(26) a. *Al tayak-tï dubal-ga süyö-dü.*
he stick-ACC wall-DAT lean-PAST.3
'He leaned the stick against the wall.'

b. *Al dubal-ga / maga süyö-n-dü.*
he wall-DAT I.DAT lean-REFL-PAST.3
'He leaned against the wall/on me.'

c. *Biz süyö-n-üš-tü-k.*
we lean-REFL-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We leaned against each other.'

4.1.1.4. Derived from one-place intransitives

The examples below illustrate this type of derivation. Similar reciprocals are also registered in Yakut (Nedjalkov 2003: 49-50):

(27) a. *aŋkušta-* 'to squeak/cry (of marmots)'
b. *aŋkušta-š-* 'to exchange squeaks (of marmots)' (Judaxin 1985a: 59)

(28) a. *kišene-* 'to neigh'
b. *kišene-š-* 'to communicate by neighing' (Judaxin 1985a: 390)

4.1.2. "Dative" reciprocals

These reciprocals retain the direct object of the underlying construction, expressed by a noun either with zero ending or in the accusative case form. The base verbs producing this type of derived diathesis may be divided into two semantic groups: (1) three-place transitives with an obligatory indirect object, of the type 'to give'; (2)

three-place causatives derived from two-place transitives, of the type 'to cause somebody to build a house, etc.'.

1. Three-place transitives fall into two syntactic subtypes: (a) verbs taking an indirect object in the dative case, e.g. *ayt-* 'to tell', *at-* 'to throw', *ber-* 'to give', *sat-* 'to sell', *suylö-* 'to tell', *sun-* 'to offer', *šïbïra-* 'to whisper', *taši-* 'to carry (something to somebody)', *ubada kïl-* 'to promise', *ïrgït-* 'to throw', *ûaz-* 'to write'; and (b) verbs requiring an indirect object in the ablative case: *al-* 'to take', *bekit-* 'to hide', *sura-* 'to ask'. Compare:

(29) a. *Men koŋšu-m-a kese sun-du-m.*
I neighbour-my-DAT cup offer-PAST-1SING
'I offered my neighbour a drink.'

b. *Men menen koŋšu-m kese sun-uš-tu-k.*
I with neighbour-my cup offer-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My neighbour and I offered each other drinks.'

(30) *Alar saat al-ïš-ïš-tï.*
'They swapped their watches.' (lit. '... took from each other').

2. Three-place causatives. An instance of this type of base verbs is *körsöt-* 'to show' derived from the two-place transitive *kör-* 'to see':

(31) a. *Men koŋšu-m-a kitep-ti körsött-tü-m.*
I neighbour-my-DAT book-ACC show-PAST-1SING
'I showed the book to my neighbour.'

b. *Biz [koŋšu-m] eköö-büz kitep-ter-ibiz-di körsöt-üš-tü-m.*
we neighbour-my two-we book-PLUR-our-ACC show-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We two [(with) my neighbour] showed our books to each other.'

4.1.3. "Possessive" reciprocals

This type involves a possessive or part-whole relation between the subject and direct or indirect object referents. The object is either in the nominative, with zero marking (as in (26b)) or in the accusative case of possessive declension (as in (26c)); in the underlying construction the possessor of the object referent is expressed by the genitive case of a noun, or it may be implied. These reciprocal forms can be derived from either transitive or intransitive two-place verbs. In both cases the valency is retained, the possessive attribute to an object being omitted (cf. *uul-um-un* in (24a)). The possessors are expressed by the subject of the reciprocal construction (cf. *uul-um* in (24b)).

4.1.3.1. Derived from two-place transitives

The reciprocal form of a number of transitive verbs can occur in a "possessive" construction as well as in the "canonical" type, with the difference that the object of the underlying construction contains an indication of the possessor (marked by a possessive attribute and/or a possessive suffix), this possessor being denoted by the subject in the derived construction (cf. 'to kiss a girl' → 'to kiss each other'; 'to kiss a girl's cheek' → 'to kiss each other's cheeks'). The reciprocal form of the following base verbs can be used in "possessive" constructions: *(ün) al-* 'to hear (somebody's voice)', *(kol) karma-* 'to seize (somebody's hand)' (the converb of its reciprocal form is used as a formula: *kol karma-š-ïp* 'holding each other by the hand' (Judaxin 1985a: 392), *(but-ï-n) kemir-* 'to bite off (somebody's leg)', *(kol) kïs-* 'to shake somebody's hand' (see (24)), *öp-* 'to kiss', *(čač) ör-* 'to braid (somebody's hair)', *(üy/üy-lör-dü) örttö-* 'to burn (somebody's house)', *(kan) tök-* 'to shed (somebody's blood)', *(arka-lar-ïn) ǰïšï-* 'to wash/rub/clean by rubbing (somebody's neck)', *(moynuman) ǰïtta-* 'to kiss (somebody's neck)', and the like.

(32) a. *Men uul-um-un kol-u-n kïs-tï-m.*
I son-my-GEN hand-his-ACC shake-PAST-1SING
'I shook my son's hand.'

b. *Biz uul-um eköö-büz kol kïs-ïš-tï-k.*
we son-my two-we hand shake-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My son and I shook hands with each other.'

(33) a. *Men koŋšu-m-un kol-u-n karma-dï-m.*
I neighbour-my-GEN hand-his-ACC grasp-PAST-1SING
'I grasped my neighbour's hand.'

b. *Biz koŋšu-m ekööbüz kol karma-š-tï-k.*
we neighbour-my two-we hand grasp-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My neighbour and I grasped each other's hands.'

(34) a. *Kïz-ïm menin čač-ïm-ï ör-dü.*
daughter-my I.GEN hair-my-ACC braid-PAST.3
'My daughter braided my hair.'

b. *[Biz] kïz-ïm ekööbüz čač ör-üö-tü-k.*
we daughter-my two-we hair braid-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My daughter and I braided each other's hair.'

c. *[Biz] kïz-ïm ekööbüz čač-ïbïz-dï ör-üš-tü-k.*
we daughter-my two-we hair-our-ACC braid-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My daughter and I braided each other's hair.'

4.1.3.2. Derived from two-place intransitives

There are few instances of this kind of derivation; an example is the verb *kara-* 'to look at', which requires a dative object (see (35)), and *öp-* 'to kiss' which is usually transitive but can also occur with an ablative object (see (36)):

(35) a. *Men kïz-ïm-ïn bet-i-ne kara-dï-m.*
I daughter-my-GEN face-her-DAT look-PAST-1SING
'I looked into my daughter's face.'

b. *Biz eköö-büz bet-ibiz-ge kara-š-dï-k.*
we two-we face-our-DAT look-REC-PAST-1PLUR
lit. 'We looked into each other's faces.'

(36) a. *Men kïz-ïm-ïn bet-i-nen öp-tü-m.*
I daughter-my-GEN face-her-ABL kiss-PAST-1SING
lit. 'I kissed my daughter's face.'

b. *Biz kïz-ïm eköö-büz bet-ten öb-üš-tü-k.*
we daughter-my two-we face-ABL kiss-REC-PAST-1PLUR
lit. 'My daughter and I kissed each other's faces.'

4.2. Causatives from reciprocals

Basically, any subject-oriented construction can be transformed into an object-oriented construction embedded in a causative construction. The reciprocal relationship of the former is retained in the latter:

(37) a. *Ak it kara it-ti kap-tï.*
white dog black dog-ACC bite-PAST.3
'The white dog bit the black dog.'

b. *Ak it menen kara it kab-ïš-tï.*
white dog and black dog bite-REC-PAST.3
'The white and the black dogs bit each other.'

c. *Čal menen koŋšu-su it-ter-di kab-ïš-tïr-ïš-tï.*
old.man and neighbour-his dog-PLUR-ACC bite-REC-CAUS-PLUR-PAST.3
'The old man and his neighbour set the dogs on each other'

For unclear reasons, causative reciprocals of this type sometimes sound unnatural, the reciprocal pronoun instead of the reciprocal suffix being more acceptable.

(38) a. *Kiši-ler öl-tür-üš-tü.*
man-PLUR die-CAUS-REC-PAST.3
'People killed each other.'

b. **Al kiši-ler-di öl-tür-üš-tür-bö-dü.*
he man-PLUR-ACC die-CAUS-REC-CAUS-NEG-PAST.3
(intended meaning) 'He did not allow people to kill each other.'

c. *Al kiši-ler-di biri biri-ne öl-tür-t-pö-dü.*
he man-PLUR-ACC each other-DAT die-CAUS-CAUS-NEG-PAST.3
'He did not allow people to kill each other.'

4.3. Nomina actionis

Deverbal nouns are derived mostly by means of the suffixes *-iš/-iš/-uš/-üš/-š* and *-oo/-öö/-uu/-üü*. The latter suffix alone is registered on nouns derived from standard reciprocal verbs. These nouns retain the object (both direct and non-direct) valencies of the base verbs, the subject valency being transformed into genitive:

(39) a. *Kïz apa-sï-n kučakta-dï.*
daughter mother-her-ACC embrace-PAST.3
'The daughter embraced her mother.'

b. *Kïz-dïn apa-sï-n kučakt-oo-su.*
daughter-GEN mother-her-ACC embrace-NR-her.NOM.SING
lit. 'The daughter's embracing of her mother.'

5. Diathesis types of reciprocals with the pronoun *birin-biri* 'each other'

5.1. Introductory

Here are the forms of the reciprocal pronoun for the four most frequently used cases (see also (11)):

(40)

	1PLUR	2PLUR	3PLUR
ACC	*biri-biri-biz-di*	*biri-biri-ŋer-di*	*biri-biri-n / biri-n-biri*
GEN	*biri-biri-biz-din*	*biri-biri-ŋer-din*	*biri-biri-nin*
DAT	*biri-biri-biz-ge*	*biri-biri-ŋer-ne*	*biri-biri-ne*
ABL	*bir-biri-biz-den*	*biri-biri-ŋer-den*	*biri-biri-nen*

5.2. Subject-oriented reciprocal constructions

5.2.1. "Canonical" reciprocals

5.2.1.1. Derived from two-place transitives

The same verbs can be used in these constructions as those considered in 4.1.1.1, but there are certain preferences (see 5.4).

(41) a. *Men kečik-pe-š üčün anï šaš-tïr-dï-m.*
I be.late-NEG-NR in.order.not he-ACC hurry-CAUS-PAST-1SING
'In order not to be late I made him hurry.'

b. *Biz ekөö-büz kečik-pe-š üčün biri-biri-biz-di šaš-tïr-dï-k.*
'In order not to be late we made each other hurry.'

(42) *Biz biri-biri-biz-di ǰemele-di-k.*
'We reproach each other.'

5.2.1.2. Derived from two-place transitives with a split object valency

This type is parallel to the reciprocals discussed in 4.1.1.2. Compare:

(43) a. *Al anï koltuk-ka uku-du.*
he he.ACC side-DAT push-PAST.3
'He pushed him in the ribs.'

b. *[Alar] biri-n-biri koltuk-ka uku-š-up* ... (Judaxin 1985b: 302)
they each-ACC-other side-DAT push-REC-CONV
'[They] pushing each other in the ribs ...'

5.2.1.3. Derived from two-place intransitives

This type seems to be more common among pronominal reciprocals than among suffixed ones (cf. 4.1.1.3). Some of the verbs require simultaneous use of the reciprocal suffix and reciprocal pronoun.

(44) a. *Al ata-sï-na ačuulan-dï.*
he father-his-DAT get.angry-PAST.3
'He got angry with his father.'

b. *Alar biri-biri-ne ačuulan-ïš-tï.*
they each-other-DAT get.angry-REC-PAST.3
'They got angry with each other.'

(45) a. *Al ata-sï-nan kork-tu.*
he father-his-ABL get.scared-PAST.3
'He got scared of his father.'

b. *Alar biri-biri-nen kork-uš-tu.*
they each-other-ABL get.scared-REC-PAST.3
'They got scared of each other.'

(46) a. *Uy dubal-ga söykö-n-dü.*
cow wall-DAT rub-REFL-PAST.3
'The cow rubbed against the wall.'

b. *Uy-lar biri-biri-ne söykö-n-üš-tü.*
cow-PLUR each-other-DAT rub-REFL-3PLUR-PAST.3
'The cows rubbed against each other.'

5.2.2. "Dative" reciprocals

Unlike suffixed "dative" reciprocals, those with the reciprocal pronoun occur in constructions derived from underlying constructions both with three-place transitives and three-place causatives from transitives, and also from constructions with a benefactive or assistive object (i.e. there are pronominal reciprocals from assistives):

(47) a. *Ata-m dos-u-na et bïšïr-t-tï.*
father-my friend-his-DAT meat cook-CAUS-PAST.3
'My father asked his friend to cook the meat.'

b. *Ata-m menen dos-u*
father-my and friend-his

biri-biri-ne et bïšïr-t-ïš-tï.
each-other-DAT meat cook-CAUS-3PLUR-PAST.3
'My father and his friend asked each other to cook meat.'

(48) a. *Ata-m maga ot taši-dï.* (benefactive)
'My father carts hay to/for me.'

b. *Ata-m eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-ge ot taši-dï-k.*
'My father and I cart hay to/for each other.'

(49) a. *Ata-m ma-ga ot taši-š-tï.* (assistive)
father-my I-DAT hay.NOM cart-REC-PAST.3
'My father helped me to cart hay.'

b. *Ata-m eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-ge ot taši-š-tï-k.*
father-my two-we each-other-DAT hay cart-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'My father and I helped each other to cart hay.'

5.2.3. "Possessive" reciprocals

Like in constructions with a direct object of alienable and inalienable possession, the possessor is denoted by the genitive case.

(50) *Karïškïr-lar biri-biri-nin but-u-n kemir-iš-ti.*
wolf-PLUR each-other-their.GEN foot-his-ACC gnaw-3PLUR-PAST.3
lit. 'Wolves gnawed off each other's paws.'

(51) *Biz eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-din bal-dar-ïbïz-dï taanï-y-bïz.*
we two-we each-other-our-GEN child-PLUR-our-ACC know-PRES-1PLUR
'We know each other's children.'

5.3. Object-oriented reciprocal constructions

Constructions of this type are formed freely from subject-oriented constructions. Note the peculiarity of expressing the reciprocal sense if the referents of both objects (accusative and dative) coincide:

(52) a. *Al soldat-ka biz-di öl-tür-t-ö-t.*
he soldier-DAT we-ACC kill-CAUS-CAUS-PRES-3SING
'He orders the soldier to kill us.'

b. *Al biri-biz-di biri-biz-ge öl-tür-t-ö-t.*
he one-our-ACC one-our-DAT die-CAUS-CAUS-PRES-3SING
'He orders us to kill each other.'

Compare the analogous construction with *biri* in a non-reciprocal meaning:

c. *Biri-ŋ-di biri-ŋ-e öl-tür-t-ö-m.* (Judaxin 1985b: 93)
one-your.SING-ACC one-your.SING-DAT die-CAUS-CAUS-PRES-1SING
'I will make one of you kill the other.'

5.4. Interrelation of the reciprocal suffix and reciprocal pronoun. Their co-occurrence

Five main types of interrelation of these reciprocal markers can be distinguished. Let us consider the following sentence:

(53) *Ördök-tör keede biri-n-biri kubala-š-ïp* ... (Judaxin 1985a: 435)
duck-PLUR sometimes each-other chase-3PLUR-CONV
'Ducks sometimes chase each other.'

This verb may assume the following reciprocal forms:

(54) a. *kubala-š-ïp* – the reciprocal suffix only
b. *biri-n-biri kubala-p* – the reciprocal pronoun only
c. *biri-n-biri kubala-š-ïp* – both the reciprocal pronoun and suffix/3PLUR
d. *kubala-šï-š-ïp* – both the reciprocal and 3PLUR suffixes
e. *biri-n-biri kubala-šï-š-ïp* – the reciprocal pronoun and both suffixes

Variant (54e) is rejected by the informant and it is not registered in the dictionaries. Variant (54d) is rather rare, because context usually makes it clear whether variant (54a) is reciprocal or plural. In isolated sentences, however, the informant may opt for (54d) (cf. 9.2).

The main opposition here is between (54a) and (54b). Some verbs are preferable in form (54a) and other verbs in (54b). This is relevant for the cases considered in section 7 on restrictions. A number of verbs seem to be used in either form indis-

criminately, like the verb in (53)-(54), though the informant prefers variant (54a) for this particular verb. Here are examples of verbs of this type:

(55) a. *Biz eköö-büz köpkö kuu-š-tu-k.*
'We pursued each other for a long time.'

b. *Biz eköö-büz köpkö biri-biri-biz-di kuu-du-k.*
(same meaning)

(56) a. *Biz eköö-büz sïyla-š-ču-buz.*
'We respected each other.' (*-ču-* is HAB)

b. *Biz eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-di sïyla-ču-buz.*
(same meaning)

The verb in (57) usually occurs in form (57a), (57b) being characterized as possible but very rare. This is probably due to the high frequency of the reciprocal situation described. This also pertains to the reciprocal *teb-iš-* 'to kick each other' (about horses), which however has occurred with the reciprocal pronoun in a text (probably for emphasis). The informant sees the suffix *-š-* as unambiguously reciprocal.

(57) a. *Alar kučakta-š-tï.*
'They embraced each other.'

b. *Alar biri-n-biri kučakta-dï.*
(same meaning)

(58) *... čunaŋda-š-ïp kel-iš-e-t, biri-n-biri teb-iš-e-t.*
press.ears-3PLUR-CONV come-3PLUR-PRES-3 each-other kick-REC-PRES-3SING
'... (they = horses) approach *each other* pressing their ears, kick *each other.*'
(Judaxin 1985b: 377)

The verb *ǰala-* 'to lick' is preferable in form (59b):

(59) a. *Küčük-tör ǰala-š-tï.*
'The puppies licked (whom?)'

b. *Küčük-tör biri-n-biri ǰala-š-tï.*
'The puppies licked each other.'

Verbs with different means of encoding reciprocity may occur in one sentence:

(60) *Bir-biri-ne kön-üš-kön-dön kiyin*
each-other-DAT get.used-REC/3PLUR(?)-PART-ABL later

süy-üš-üp *ket-e-t.* (Judaxin 1985a: 423)
love-REC-CONV AUX-PRES-3
'After [they] get used to each other, they will fall in love with each other';
cf. *süy-* in (70).

Instances like (54c) with the reciprocal *-š* are hard to find among sentences in the 3rd person because this suffix can be interpreted as 3PLUR, and, as I have mentioned above, the informant rejects the doubling of *-š* in these cases. Here is an example with a 1st person predicate which shows the possibility of co-occurrence of the two suffixes:

(61) *Sen ekөö-büz biri-biz-di* *biri-biz* *köz-gö* *say-iš-pas-bïz.*
you two-we each-our-ACC other-our eye-DAT put.out-REC-NEG.FUT-1PLUR
'We [you and I] won't put out each other's eyes.' (Judaxin 1985b: 123)

5.5. Nomina actionis

Nomina actionis are formed in the same way as deverbal nouns from suffixed reciprocals (see 4.3):

(62) a. *Koŋšu-m* *menen* *apa-m* *biri-n biri* *sïyla-š-a-t.*
neighbour-my and mother-my each-ACC other respect-REC-PRES-3
'My neighbour and my mother respect each other.'

b. *Koŋšu-m* *menen*
neighbour-my and

biri-n biri *apa-m-ïn* *sïyla-š-uu-sï.*
each-ACC other mother-my-GEN respect-REC-NR-their
lit. 'My neighbour and my mother's [their] respect for each other.'

6. Simultaneity and succession of reciprocal acts

In this respect Kirghiz reciprocals are similar to those of Yakut and other languages, because temporal sequence of reciprocal acts is dependent on the lexical meaning of a verb. Simultaneity of reciprocal acts is inherent in the verbal meaning in (1b), (26), (32), (33), etc. The following are examples of non-simultaneous successive actions:

(63) *Biz ekөö-büz katta-š-a-bïz.*
'We visit each other.'

(64) *Biz ekөö-büz köpkö kezektešip* *kuu-š-tu-k.*
we two-we long by.turns chase-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We chased each other by turns for a long time.'

(65) *Biz ekөö-büz köpkö kaytar-ïö-tï-k.*
'We two guarded one another for a long time' (= 'by turns'); cf. *kaytar-* in (70).

The following is an example of chain relations within a reciprocal situation:

(66) *Karkïra-day* *eerči-š-ip* ... (Judaxin 1985b: 473)
crane-like follow-REC-CONV
'Following each other like cranes ...'

7. Productivity and restrictions on reciprocal formation with the suffix *-š*

Kirghiz suffixed reciprocals are formed from a large number of verbs and are numerous in the dictionary, though they are somewhat less productive than in Yakut. This section contains fragmentary observations meant to give the reader an idea of possible restrictions on their formation. Some of the restrictions are general, such as the absence of reciprocals from causatives derived from transitive verbs (as it happens, this restriction is observed in Yakut as well). Reciprocals are not derived from some two-place causatives, nor from some two-place transitives and intransitives in general, which seem to be subject to individual restrictions (see (5b)). A number of verbs do have a form in *-š* but with a lexicalized meaning (cf. (5c)) rather than with a standard reciprocal meaning. In these cases, as well as in the previous ones, the reciprocal meaning is commonly rendered by the reciprocal pronoun (cf. (5d). The existence of a lexicalized meaning in the reciprocal form (5c) is unlikely to be the reason for the absence of the reciprocal meaning proper, the form in *-š* of other verbs often combining both the reciprocal proper and a lexicalized meaning. Here are a few causatives derived from intransitives (see (67)) and transitives (see (68)) which do not take a reciprocal form:

(67) *kal-tur-* 'to leave (somebody)' (← *kal-* 'to stay')
kel-tir- 'to bring (somebody)' (← *kel-* 'to come')
šaš-tïr- 'to make (somebody) hurry' (← *šaš-* 'to be in a hurry')
ǰat-kïr- 'to make (somebody) lie down' (← *ǰat-* 'to lie down')

(68) *bil-dir-* 'to inform (somebody)' (← *bil-* 'to know')
ez-dir- 'to order (somebody) to press' (← *ez-* 'to press')
sat-tïr- 'to make (somebody) sell' (← *sat-* 'to sell')

But a reciprocal is derived from the following three-place causative (with a unique lexicalized causative suffix) due to its lexical meaning:

(69) *kör-* 'to see'
→ *kör-söt-* 'to show'
→ *kör-söt-üš-* 'to show something to each other'

In the informant's opinion, suffixed reciprocals from the following verbs sound unnatural, though some of them are registered in the dictionary (it is hard to say whether this is related to the time factor, as the dictionaries at our disposal were compiled in the 1950s). With these verbs the informant prefers the reciprocal pro-

noun instead of the suffix. Here are a few two-place transitives (see (70)) and two-place intransitives (see (71)) from which suffixed reciprocals are not formed:

(70) *kaytar-* 'to guard' (cf., however, (65))
süy- 'to love' (cf., however, (60))
korgo- 'to guard/defend'
sïla- 'to stroke'
küülö- 'to egg on'
tüšün- 'to understand'
moyso- 'to destroy/kill'
unut- 'to forget'
sat- 'to sell/betray'

(71) *ačuulan-* 'to be angry/swear'
kork- 'to be afraid/scared of'
modïray- 'to stare with wide open eyes'

The pronominal reciprocal in (72) is more acceptable than the suffixed derivative, which the informant considers somewhat unnatural, though it is registered in the dictionary and illustrated by a sentential example; the informant suggests a suffixed reciprocal *tikte-š-* of the verb *tikte-* 'to look fixedly/stare' which is very close in meaning. Curiously enough, in the dictionary the reciprocal meaning of this verb is illustrated by a sentence with the reciprocal pronoun (see (73)); as it happens, the verb *kara-* 'to look' is cited in the specialist literature both with the reciprocal suffix and reciprocal pronoun (see (72c)). This shows that the boundary between the acceptable and non-acceptable is not clear-cut.

(72) a. *Biz eköö-büz kara-š-tï-k.*
we two-we look-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We (he and I) looked at each other.'

b. *Biz eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-di kara-dï-k*
(same meaning)

c. *... bir neče sekund*
one several second

biri-n-biri kara-š-tï. (Kudajbergenov 1987b: 243)
each-ACC-other look-3PLUR-PAST.3
'... (they) looked at each other for a few seconds.'

(73) a. *... biri-n-biri tikte-š-ip* ... (Judaxin 1985b: 235)
each-ACC-other stare-3PLUR-CONV
'... staring at each other.'

b. ... *tikte-š-ip* *tur-a-t* *eki* *šer* (Judaxin 1985b: 235)
stare-REC-CONV AUX-PRES-3 two athlete
'... two athletes staring at each other.'

In the following two examples the suffixed reciprocal is correct but sounds less natural than with the reciprocal pronoun; it is registered in the dictionary (Judaxin 1985a: 49). I cite these data in order to give the reader an idea of live perception of various reciprocals by a native speaker and divergences from the dictionary.

(74) a. *Biz alda-š-pa-y-bïz.*
we deceive-REC-NEG-PRES-1PLUR
'We do not deceive each other.'

b. *Biz biri-biri-biz-di alda-ba-y-bïz.*
(same meaning)

As a rule, suffixed reciprocals from compound verbs (comprised of a noun and a desemanticized verb) sound unintelligible, and the reciprocal pronoun is used for rendering the reciprocal sense; cf.:

(75) a. **Biz eköö-büz kapa kï-ïš-tï-k.*
we two-we grief do-REC-PAST-1PLUR
(intended meaning:) 'We grieved each other.'

b. *Biz eköö-büz biri-biri-biz-di kapa kïl-dï-k.*
(same meaning)

(76) a. **Biz ǰek kör-üš-ö-büz.*
we hatred see-REC-PRES-1PLUR
(intended meaning:) 'We hate each other.'

b. *Biz biri-biri-biz-di ǰek kör-ö-büz.*
(same meaning)

In one instance a diathesis restriction seems to be in force which forbids the use of a suffixed reciprocal: the latter are not used to express benefactive reciprocal relations:

(77) a. *Men aga et bïšïr-dï-m.*
I he.DAT meat ook-PAST-1SING
'I cooked meat for him.'

b. **Biz eköö-büz kezekteš et bïšïr-ïš-tï-k.*
we two-we by.turns meat cook-REC-PAST-1PLUR
(intended meaning:) 'We cooked meat for each other by turns.'

c. *Biz eköö-büz kezekteš biri-biri-biz-ge et bïšïr-dï-k.*
(same meaning)

8. Expression of reciprocal arguments

Subject expression in reciprocal constructions is no different from that in non-reciprocal constructions. It is also more or less the same as in Yakut. Constructions with the reciprocal pronoun can be *simple* only, while constructions with suffixed reciprocal verbs can be either *simple* or *discontinuous*. In the former case the subject is expressed by a conjunctive phrase with the conjunction *menen* 'and'. In the latter case the second argument is expressed by a comitative phrase with the postposition *menen* 'with' and the predicate agrees with the first argument only. (Note that in Yakut *kïtta* 'and/with' takes the same position between the arguments in both the conjunctive and postpositional functions and the predicate agrees either with the first argument or with both.) The 3PLUR marker in (78a) is seen by the informant as quite grammatical but not the best variant (though it is quite acceptable with some reciprocals), while in (78b) it is ungrammatical because the first argument is in the singular. This pertains to sentences with the second argument in the plural as well (see (78c)):

(78) a. *Kïz menen apa-sï öb-üš-tü / öb-üš-üš-tü.*
daughter and mother-her kiss-REC-PAST.3 kiss-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'The daughter and her mother kissed each other.'

b. *Kïz apa-sï menen öb-üš-tü / *öb-üš- üš-tü.*
daughter mother-her with kiss-REC-PAST.3
(same meaning) lit. 'The daughter kissed with her mother.'

c. *Kïz alar menen öb-üš-tü /*öb-üš- üš-tü.*
lit. 'The daughter kissed with them.'

It should be noted that the grammar of Kirghiz interprets both expressions of the arguments with *menen* 'and' and *menen* 'with' as subjects: "The grammatical subject in this case is expressed by a combination of at least two words which are joined by the conjunction *menen* or by the postposition *menen*" (Kudajbergenov 1987b: 242-243). I hesitate to interpret the comitative group with the postposition *menen* 'with' as a real object, but at the same time agreement of the predicate with the first component only hinders viewing the second argument as a part of the subject, as in sentences with the conjunction *menen*. This is probably an intermediate type of constructions.

In constructions with the conjunction *menen* of the (78a) type the reciprocal pronoun can be added, as a rule, while this is impossible in constructions with the postposition *menen* of the (78c) type. This may be an additional argument in favour of interpreting constructions with a comitative phrase as discontinuous.

Kirghiz has special expressions for dual subjects in all the three persons.

(79) a. *[biz] ata-m eköö-büz*
we father-my two-we
'my father and I'

b. *[siler] ata-m eköö-ŋör*
you.PLUR father-my two-you
'my father and you'

c. *[alar] ata-m eköö-Ø*
they father-my two-they
'my father and s/he'

The following lexicalized reciprocal allows either (i) the comitative or (ii) the dative and even the accusative marking of the second argument. In case (i) the meaning of the predicate is 'to quarrel/fight', in case (ii) it is 'to scold somebody':

(80) a. *ur-* 'to beat' → *ur-uš-* 'to fight/quarrel/squabble'

b. *Men anï menen / aga / anï ur-uš-tu-m.*
I he.GEN with he.DAT he.ACC beat-REC-PAST-1SING
(i) 'I quarrelled with him.', (ii) 'I scolded him.' (Judaxin 1985: 309)
(The first *anï* is an abridged form of the genitive *anïn*.)

9. The suffix *-š* as a plural, sociative and assistive marker. Nomina actionis in *-š*

9.1. Introductory

In Yakut, the productive meanings immediately related to the reciprocal meaning are sociative, comitative and assistive. Of these three meanings the assistive alone is productive in Kirghiz, the sociative meaning being practically non-existent. The plural meaning is grammaticalized and enters into a different grammatical category, because its marker, i.e. the suffix *-š*, can co-occur with the reciprocal/assistive marker. Therefore, this suffix as a plural marker may be viewed as its homonym, though they are close enough semantically since both imply plurality of participants.

9.2. Plural

The suffix *-š* is used as a 3PLUR marker not only in Kirghiz but also in the neighbouring Kazakh and Uzbek languages. This function of *-š* is also attested in Ancient Turkic. As it happens, the examples cited for Ancient Turkic are often interpreted as sociative, though all the relevant verb forms are in the 3rd person; therefore, it is not clear whether they contain the inflectional plural suffix (i.e. an agreement marker) or a marker of the sociative meaning. In Kirghiz it is clearly a pure agreement marker, though an optional one. Unlike the purely inflectional 1PLUR and 2PLUR markers, this suffix is also used on converbs (see (84), (86)). Most likely, this usage is de-

scended from the sociative use and this may be related to the loss of the latter function. Note that in the 1st and 2nd person the singular and the plural are sharply distinguished, while in the 3rd person the endings coincide.

(81) a. *Biz dušman-dï at-tï-k.*
we enemy-ACC shoot-PAST-1PLUR
'We shot at the enemy.'

b. *Biz at-ïš-tï-k.*
we shoot-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We exchanged shots.'

c. *Alar dušman-dï at-ïš-tï.*
they enemy-ACC shoot-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They shot at the enemy.'

d. *Alar at-ïš-ïš-tï.*
they shoot-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They exchanged shots.'

In sentences of the (81c) type when used in a context, the direct object may be elipted, in which case the verbal form with the suffix *-š* (unlike the (81d) type) may be ambiguous:

e. *Alar at-ïš-tï.*
i. 'They shot [at somebody].' (*-ïš-* is 3PLUR)
ii.'They exchanged shots.' (*-ïš-* is REC)

In textual examples cited in the dictionary, constructions of the (81d) type, i.e. with double *-š*, are very rare, because context, including the lexical meaning of the predicate, usually contains an indication of the reciprocal meaning or of 3PLUR, but in isolated sentences of the (81e) type presented to the informant his first interpretation is 3PLUR, his second the reciprocal, other things being equal; cf. also:

(82) *Alar sagïn-ïš-a-t.*
i. 'They are missing somebody' (*-ïš-* is 3PLUR)
ii. 'They are missing each other' (*-ïš-* is REC)

In causative derivatives from reciprocals the plural marker *-š* follows the derivational marker, but, as usual, it precedes the tense marker (with the verb under (83a) the plural marker is not used as a rule):

(83) a. *Alar kučakta-š-tï.*
they embrace-REC-PAST.3
'They embraced.'

b. *Alar ...* *kučakta-š-tïr-ïš-tï.*
they embrace-REC-CAUS-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They made them embrace each other.'

There seem to be no rigid rules of the use of the suffix *-š* as a plural marker. The following tentative observations can be made with respect to the reciprocal *-š* and plural *-š:*

(a) if the underlying verb is a one-place intransitive, the suffix *-š* usually has the 3PLUR meaning; the same reading obtains in those cases when a two-place transitive is used with a non-possessive direct object; in the following example the informant allows the omission of the plural suffix *-š*, though he prefers the variant with this suffix.

(84) a. *Kïz-kelin-der* *tur-uš-a-t,*
girl-bride-PLUR stand-3PLUR-PRES-3

ïrdï *ug-uš-up* *sïnd-aš-ïp.* (Judaxin 1985b: 181)
song listen-3PLUR-CONV appraise-3PLUR-CONV
'The young brides stand listening to the song and appraising it.'

b. *... belsen-iš-ip* *tur-uš-up.* (Judaxin 1985b: 192)
prepare.for.a.fight-3PLUR-CONV stand-3PLUR-CONV
'... [they] stand preparing for a fight.' (see also *kel-iŋ-e-t* in (58))

(b) If the underlying verb is a two-place intransitive or transitive and if the object is absent, the suffix *-š* is interpreted either as a reciprocal or as a plural marker, depending on the context and frequency of the given reciprocal (see (84)):

(85) a. *Kiši-ler* *öl-tür-üš-üš-pö-dü.*
man-PLUR die-CAUS-REC-3PLUR-NEG-PAST.3
'People did not kill each other.'

b. *Kiši-ler öl-tür-üš-pö-dü.*
'People did not kill [anybody].'

(86) *Ene-si* *menen* *kör-üš-üp,*
mother-his.ACC with see-REC-CONV

ez-il-iš-ip *öb-üš-üp.* (Judaxin 1985b: 445)
press-PASS-REC-CONV kiss-REC-CONV
'He met with his mother; they kissed heartily.'

(c) If a sentence contains the reciprocal pronoun and the verb is suffixed with *-š*, the interpretation of the latter suffix as reciprocal or as plural is not clear, but it does

not affect the interpretation of the sentence (nevertheless, the informant views this suffix with a degree of certainty either as plural or as reciprocal) (see (88a)).

(d) If a verb contains two suffixes *-š*, the first of them is naturally reciprocal and the second is plural. In these cases the informant usually objects to the use of the reciprocal pronoun (or requires that one of the suffixes be omitted).

(87) *Küčük-tïr biri-biri-n ûala-š[*-ïš-]-t-ï.*
'The puppies licked each other.'

In some frequent reciprocals, the informant does not accept the second (plural) suffix *-š-*.

(88) a. *Alar biri-n biri süy-dü / süy-üš-tü.*
they each-ACC other love-PAST.3 love-REC/3PLUR?-PAST.3
'They fell in love with each other.'

b. *Alar süy-üš[*-üš]-tü.*
they love-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They fell in love with each other.'

But in the following cases with frequently used reciprocals, the informant allows the optional plural marker; e.g.:

(89) *Alar ïmda-š[-ïš]-t-ï.*
'They winked at each other.'

(90) *Alar koŋšu-m menen ayant-tï süylö-š[-üš]-tü.*
they neighbour-my with square-ACC talk-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They talked with my neighbour about the square.'

9.3. Sociative

The sociative meaning is ascribed to the reciprocal suffix both in specialist literature and in dictionaries. But the examples provided do not as a rule have this meaning: they usually contain the suffix *-š* marking the 3PLUR meaning instead of the sociative (this confusion is natural, since these meanings are contiguous; see also 3. in 2.5); therefore, substitution of the 1PLUR or 2PLUR subject for a 3rd person subject involves omission of this suffix (existence of a sociative form for the 3rd person only is rather unlikely); thus (91a) which is used as an illustration of the sociative meaning in a modern grammar of Kirghiz does not transform into a sentence with a 1PLUR or 2PLUR subject; in (91b) and (91c) the 1PLUR agreement marker is the ending *-k*:

(91) a. *Ayša menen Kalïyša*
A. and K.

kül-üp ǰat-ïš-tï. (Kudajbergenov 1987b: 242)
laugh-CONV AUX-3PLUR-PAST.3
'Ayša and Kalïyša laughed.'

b. **Biz kül-üp ǰat-ïš-tï-k.*
'We laughed'

c. *Biz kül-üp ǰat-tï-k.*
(same meaning)

A distinctive feature of sociative meaning is simultaneity of actions. If the suffix *-š* in the following sentence were sociative in meaning rather than plural, the verb would not collocate with an adverb meaning 'one after another', but this is not the case:

(92) *Alar biri-nin art-ï-nan biri kel-iš-ti.*
'They came one after another.'

Convincing examples that would prove the sociative reading, can be sentences with a 1PLUR or 2PLUR subject. In present-day Kirghiz the sociative meaning has practically disappeared; it is only preserved in folklore texts. In the dictionary I have found the following folklore examples with the sociative meaning:

(93) a. *Olǰolo-š-up mal al-dï-k.* (Judaxin 1985b: 67)
capture-REC-CONV cattle take-PAST-1PLUR
'We took the cattle as loot.'

b. *Sabak-tï birge oku-š-tu-k*
lesson-ACC together learn-REC-PAST-1PLUR

köŋül-go akïl toku-š-tu-k.
heart-DAT reason weave-REC-PAST
'We learnt lessons together, grew wise together.' (Judaxin 1985b: 246)

c. *Emček-ti birge em-iš-ken*
breast-ACC together suckle-REC-PART

ene-leš-im de-er... ele-m. (Judaxin 1985b: 455)
mother-SUFF-my say-PART AUX-1SING
'I called my milk-brother [who] suckled the breast together [with me].'

d. *Bir tuugan-day tuu-š-tu-k.*
one blood.relative-like be.born-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We were born together like blood relatives.'

e. *Čal-gïn-dï birge čal-ïš-tï-k.* (Judaxin 1985b: 340)
reconnoitre-PART-ACC together reconnoitre-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We did reconnaissance together.'

f. *Tooru-l-du birge tooru-š-tu-k.* (Judaxin 1985b: 251)
reconnoitre-PASS-ACC together reconnoitre-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'We did reconnaissance together.'

g. *... kayǰerde köŋül kal-ïš-tï-k?* (Judaxin 1985b: 340)
why heart leave-REC-PAST-1PLUR
'... why did we grow cold? (implying 'to each other')

About half the forms with the sociative meaning of the suffix *-š* have occurred in hortative sentences (the hortative marker for 1PLUR is *-alï(k)/-eli(k)/-olu(k)/-ölü(k)*), i.e. the speaker urges the addressee to perform a joint action. This meaning is also evident in (94f) with the present-future tense of a 1PLUR predicate:

(94) a. *Taarïnïč-tï ǰoy-uš-alïk.* (Judaxin 1985a: 263)
resentment-ACC stop-REC-IMPER.1PLUR
'Let us forget our resentments.'

b. *Ötkön-ketken-di unut-uš-alïk.* (Judaxin 1985b: 306)
past-ACC forget-REC-IMPER.1PLUR
'Let us forget the past.'

c. *Ïldïyla-š-ïp kel-eli.* (Judaxin 1985b: 430)
go.down-REC-CONV AUX-IMPER.1PLUR
'Let's go down [from the mountains to the valley].'

d. *Sonun turmuš bal-ï-nan*
wonderful life honey-its-ABL

sor-uš-alï, ǰalǰal-ïm. (Judaxin 1985b: 157)
suckle-REC-IMPER.1PLUR darling-my
'Let us taste the honey of wonderful life, my darling.'

e. *Oylo-š-up kör-ölü!* (Judaxin 1985b: 63)
think-REC-CONV see-IMPER.1PLUR
'Let us think!'

f. *Kiyin oylo-n-uš-a-bïz.* (Judaxin 1985b: 63)
then think-REFL-REC-PRES-1PLUR
'Then we'll think about it.'

9.4. Assistive

This meaning is highly productive in the Kirghiz reciprocal marker. If the subject is singular, the meaning of the reciprocal suffix is usually assistive, excepting cases with a lexicalized or unproductive meaning. The person who receives help is denoted by the dative case (cf. *ma-ga* in (95b, c)), or it is not mentioned (cf. (96c, d, e)). The following examples contain the assistive forms of an intransitive and a transitive verb respectively (see also (2) and (3)):

(95) a. *Men ište-di-m.*
'I worked.'

b. *Al ma-ga ište-š-ti.*
'He helped me to work.'

c. *Alar ma-ga ište-š-iš-ti.*
'They helped me to work.'

(96) a. *Al koy-du sat-t-ï.*
'He sold sheep.'

b. *Alar koy-du sat-ïš-t-ï.*
'They sold sheep.' (*-ïš-* is a plural marker here)

c. *Al koy-du sat-ïš-t-ï.*
'He helped [somebody] to sell sheep.'

d. *Biz koy-du sat-ïš-t-ïk.*
'We helped [somebody] to sell sheep.'

e. *Alar koy-du sat-ïš-ïš-tï.*
they sheep-ACC sell-REC-3PLUR-PAST.3
'They helped [somebody] to sell sheep.'

Causative forms cannot be derived from assistives:

f. **Al sat-ïš-t-t-ï.*
(intended meaning:) 'He ordered [somebody] to help [somebody] sell [something]'.

The assistive reading is the only one possible in (96d), i.e. in a situation where *-š* cannot be interpreted either as a 3PLUR marker (because the verb is in the 1st or 2nd person) or as a marker of reciprocity (because, in particular, this meaning is rendered by the reciprocal pronoun), on condition that the lexical meaning of the verb allows the assistive meaning:

(97) a. *Siler makta-š-tï-ŋar.*
you.PLUR praise-REC-PAST-2PLUR
i. *'You praised each other.'
ii. 'You helped somebody to praise somebody.'

b. *Siler biri-biri-ŋer-di makta-dï-ŋar.*
'You praised each other.'

If *-š* is omitted, the sentence retains its grammaticality, but the dative case form acquires the meaning of beneficiary, its referent not taking part in the action described:

(98) a. *Al eje-si-ne paxta ter-iš-ti.*
he sister-his-DAT cotton-wool gather-REC-PAST.3
'He helped his sister to gather cotton-wool.'

b. *Al eje-si-ne paxta ter-di.*
'He gathered cotton-wool for his sister.'

Reciprocal constructions from assistives can be formed with the help of the reciprocal pronoun only; see (49b) in 5.2.2.

10. Other meanings of the suffix *-š*

10.1. Verbs with the suffix *-š*

The unproductive meanings of this suffix include the sociative; to be exact, this meaning is lost in present-day Kirghiz. It is considered above alongside the assistive meaning because it is also very close to the reciprocal and the assistive meanings. Kirghiz differs from Yakut in that it lacks the converse meaning in the reciprocal suffix, and it has a larger number of competitive verbs. Let us consider the unproductive meanings of the suffix in question.

10.1.1. Anticausative

This meaning is registered not only in derivatives from lexical reciprocals which are also lexical causatives (e.g. *batta-* 'to glue something to something' → *batta-š-* 'to get glued'; see 13.2) but also in a number of derivatives from other verbs that are lexical causatives but not lexical reciprocals; in the example below the suffix *-š* co-occurs with the passive marker *-l* but it is not related to the passive in any way:

(99) a. *Men čač-ïm-ï nïmda-dï-m.*
I hair-my-ACC wet-PAST-1SING
'I wetted my hair.'

b. *Čač* *nïmda-l-dï.*
hair wet-PASS-PAST.3
lit. 'The hair is wetted [by somebody].'

c. *Čač* *nïmda-l-ïš-tï.*
hair wet-PASS-REC-PAST.3
'The hair became wet.'

(100) a. *mayla-* 'to smear (with fat)'

b. *Bet-i* *mayla-n-ïš-ïp* *tur-a-t.*
face-his smear-REFL-REC-CONV AUX-PRES-3
'His face shines (with fat).'

(101) a. *Toŋ* *alma* *tiš-im-di* *kama-dï.*
sour apple tooth-my-ACC make.sore-PAST.3
lit. 'A sour apple made my teeth sore.'

b. *Tiš-im* *kama-š-tï.*
tooth-my.NOM make.sore-REC-PAST.3
lit. 'My teeth became sore.'

10.1.2. Competitive

The verbs with this meaning denote all kinds of contests. Some of them may have other, reciprocal proper or lexicalized meanings alongside the competitive. Most likely, these are cases of the development of a reciprocal or sociative meaning in each verb rather than derivation according to a given pattern (among Turkic languages, this competitive pattern is produced only in Karachay-Balkar; see Nedjalkov (2002: 61-65)). Examples:

(102) *ayt-* 'to tell, speak'
→ *ayt-ïš-* i. 'to compete in improvisation' (about narrators of folk tales)
ii. 'to argue/squabble'

at- 'to shoot'
→ *at-ïš-* i. 'to compete in shooting', ii. 'to exchange shots'

atta- 'to jump/jump over'
→ *atta-š-* 'to compete in jumping over something'

čap- 'to run/ride fast'
→ *čab-ïš-* 'to compete in running/riding' (Judaxin 1985b: 333)

čert- 'to play a string instrument'
→ *čert-ïš-* 'to compete in playing a string instrument'
(Judaxin 1985b: 359)

eŋ- 'to touch ground (of riders)'
→ *eŋ-iš-* 'to compete in dismounting the rival riders'

say- 'to stab with a spear'
→ *say-iš-* i. 'to compete in spear fighting(of riders)'
ii. 'to put out each other's eyes, etc.'

sal- 'to direct the horse'
→ *(at) sal-iš-* 'to compete in horse racing'

salmakta- 'to estimate'
→ *salmakta-š-* 'to measure one's strength with somebody'

tart- 'to pull/drag'
→ *(ulak) tart-iš-* 'to compete in goat-pulling (of riders)'

taskakta- 'to trot fast'(of horses)
→ *taskakta-š-* 'to compete in horse trotting races'

ǰeŋ- 'to win'
→ *ǰeŋ-iš-* 'to compete, try to win'

10.1.3. The meaning of diminishing and entangling

A number of rather heterogeneous derivatives in *-š* from one-place intransitives have the meanings of *diminishing* in size, *entangling* of parts of a whole, and the like (sometimes the derivative verb is close in meaning to the underlying verb):

(103) *čipta-* 'to fit closely'
→ *čipta-l-iš-* 'to get matted'

kuru- 'to dry (up)' (intransitive)
→ *kuru-š-* 'to shrink/contract'

uyu- 'to curdle/coagulate', 'to accumulate'
→ *uyu-š-* 'to get matted/crumpled'

10.2. Verbs with the complex reciprocal-causative suffix *-š-tïr*; the intensifying meaning

This suffix is a combination of the reciprocal and the causative suffixes, but in the derivatives considered below it functions as a single morpheme, because verbs with the reciprocal suffix alone do not correlate with the respective derivatives with this complex suffix (see the (b) examples in (104)-(108)). The underlying verb (see the (a) examples below) and the derivative (which does not manifest a causative meaning) are usually very similar in lexical meaning, the latter verb denoting a more *intensive*

and/or *repeated* action (see Abdiev 1995: 97-98). The analogous Turkish suffix *-(i)ş-tir* is also used in this meaning (see Lewis 1967: 148).

(104) a. *oylo-* 'to think'
→ a'. *oylo-n-* 'to start thinking'
[→ b. *oylo-n-uš-* ?] (cf. (94f))
→ c. *oylo-n-uš-tur-* 'to ponder/think hard about something'

(105) a. *kara-* i. 'to look', ii. 'to look after'
[→ b. *kara-š-* i. 'to look at each other', ii. 'to help to look after']
→ c. *kara-š-tïr-* 'to look for something intensively'

(106) a. *aŋda-* i. 'to understand/go deep (into)', ii. 'to notice'
[→ b. *?aŋda-š-* (not registered in the dictionaries)]
→ c. *aŋda-š-tïr-* 'to find out/make inquiries' (Judaxin 1985a: 59)

(107) a. *sura-* 'to ask'
[→ b. *sura-š-* 'to question each other']
→ c. *sura-š-tïr-* 'to question again and again' (Judaxin 1985b: 166)

(108) a. *izde-* 'to look for'
[→ b. *izde-š-* 'to look for each other'?]
→ c. *izde-š-tir-* 'to look for something intensively'

Sentential examples:

(109) *Men munu oylo-n-uš-tur-ay-ïm.*
'I am thinking it over.'; 'I will think it over again and again.'

(110) *Kara-š-tïr-ïp, akča taap ber-iŋiz.*
look-REC-CAUS-CONV money find.CONV give-2PLUR
'Look for some money (for me).' (Judaxin 1985a: 350)

(111) *Men akča izde-š-tir-di-m.*
'I asked around for money (intensively, asking many people).'

On other usages of the complex *-š-tïr* see 13.2-13.3.

The meanings of intensity and iterativity of the reciprocal-causative suffix are present in other Turkic languages. See, among others, Gordlevskij (1928: 35), Sevortjan (1962: 356-358), Lewis (1967: 148), Schlögel (1985: 106-109).

11. Lexicalization

11.1. Introductory

Lexicalized verbs with the suffix *-š* are represented by derivatives, with the exception of those dealt with above, on which this suffix cannot be substituted for by the recip-

rocal pronoun (on condition the meaning is more or less retained), i.e. by those derivatives whose meaning does not include that of the underlying verb in a more or less standard way. The main lexical domains of these reciprocals, with the exception of individual instances, are similar to lexicalizations in Yakut to a greater or lesser extent. Lexicalized derivatives are usually reciprocal in meaning. Some of them retain a standard reciprocal meaning alongside the lexicalized one. In some cases the meanings of the underlying base and the derivative differ to such a degree that they may be viewed as occasional coincidences of the stems (this does not concern metaphorical shift in instances like *tayï-* 'to slide/glide' → *tayï-š-* 'to compete').

11.2. Some types of lexicalization

I shall list the main lexical groups of lexicalized reciprocals, to give an idea of their semantic range in Kirghiz. References to the entries are not given: they can be found according to the alphabet (this also concerns the lists of verbs in section 12).

1. The most numerous group comprises intransitive reciprocals denoting various *hostile actions, competing,* etc.:

(112)

ayt-	'to speak/say'
→ *ayt-ïš-*	'to quarrel/argue'
čalkïlda-	'to churn' (intransitive)
→ *čalkïlda-š-*	'to thrash/flog each other'
čel-	'to catch with horns'
→ *čel-iš-*	i. 'to engage in single combat' ii. 'to catch each other with horns (of bulls)'
čelkilde-	'to bubble'
→ *čelkilde-š-*	'to thrash/flog each other'
čuku-	'to pick'
→ *čuku-š-*	'to trip each other'
kïyra-	'to break' (intransitive)
→ *kïyra-š-*	'to come to blows'
kïzar-	'to blush'
→ *kïzar-ïš-*	'to attack each other like cocks'
maymakta-	'to tie a horse by the front leg'
→ *maymakta-š-*	'to accuse each other' (Judaxin 1985b: 12)
ooru-	'to be ill'
→ *(köŋül* 'heart'*) ooru-š-*	'to offend/hurt each other'

tayï- 'to slide/glide'
→ *tayï-š-* 'to compete'

2. Another group comprises intransitive verbs with the lexical meanings of *coming to an agreement, becoming friends, getting reconciled* and the like:

(113) *(ǰït* 'smell') *al-* 'to smell/catch the smell of'
→ *ǰït al-ïš-* 'to live in concord'

agar- 'to glitter'
→ *agar-ïš-* 'to forgive the past to each other'

beki- 'to strengthen'
→ *beki-š-* 'to become friends'

čïk- 'to go out of'
→ *čïg-ïš-* 'to get on/along with somebody

de- 'to say'
→ *de-š-/de-š-iš-* 'to come to an agreement'

kel- 'to come'
→ *kel-iš-* 'to agree'

košto-l- PASS 'to take a spare horse'
→ *košto-l-uš-* i. 'to accompany each other'
ii. 'to become friends/close'

tap- 'to find'
→ *tab-ïš-* i. 'to get reconciled'
ii. 'to find each other'

ǰara- 'to like'
→ *ǰara-š-* 'to make peace/get reconciled'

ǰuuru-l- PASS of 'to knead'
→ *ǰuuru-l-uš-* 'to become close (friends)'

3. Reciprocals with the main meaning of *intention to obtain or achieve* something with an implied response action from another referent comprise a separate group:

(114) *söykön-* 'to rub against something'
→ *söykön-üš-* 'to pester/badger'

šïlkïlda- 'to be loosely attached (a horseshoe, etc.)'
→ *šïlkïlda-š-* 'to flirt with somebody' (Judaxin 1985b: 420)

tiy- 'to touch'
→ *tiy-iš-* 'to flirt with somebody'

4. Individual derivatives:

(115) *al-* 'to take'
→ *al-ïš-* 'to exchange' (lit.'take from each other')

bošo- 'to weaken (of a joint)'
→*bošo-š-* 'to weaken (of a person)'

čak- 'to strike fire'
→ *čag-ïš-* 'to shine by reflecting light'

kir- 'to enter'
→ *kir-iš-* 'to begin something'

say-gïla- 'to stab repeatedly'
→ *say-gïla-š-* 'to have a stabbing pain'

tište- 'to bite/take with one's teeth'
→ (*ok* 'arrow') *tište-š-* 'to give an oath to each other (with an arrow in the teeth)' (Judaxin 1985b: 65)

ǰïl- 'to move slowly'
→ *ǰïl-ïš-* 'to be deprived of something'

12. Denominal lexical reciprocals with the suffix *-la-š*

In this section I have also included the few deverbal derivatives with this suffix.

12.1. Introductory

The main means of verbal derivation from other parts of speech is the suffix *-la/-da/-ta*. It is extremely productive. As is obvious, *-la-š* is a combination of the suffix *-la* and the reciprocal suffix *-š*. Initially, reciprocal verbs were formed from verbs in *-la* by means of *-š*, i.e. in the regular way described in section 4 (e.g. *soyul* 'cudgel' → *soyul-da-* 'to beat with a cudgel' → *soyul-da-š-* 'to beat each other with a cudgel' (Judaxin 1985b: 158)), and later the complex *-laš* came to function as a single suffix and derive verbs which do not have correspondences in *-la* (see Kudajbergenov 1987a: 212), e.g. *araz* 'quarrel' → [**araz-da-* →] *araz-daš-* 'to quarrel' (Judaxin 1985a: 63). As these derivatives do not have corresponding words with a non-reciprocal meaning, they are included among lexical reciprocals by definition.

12.2. Verbs with the suffix *-la-š*

These derivatives commonly belong to the lexical groups of competing, aggressive actions, entering into friendly relations, uniting, belonging to a group, joint actions, exchange of information, coming to an agreement, greeting, position opposite each other, meeting, etc. Some of the derivatives are slightly lexicalized. There are over 60 units of this type in our data. Here are representative lists of these lexical groups.

12.2.1. Verbs of hostile actions, competing, etc.

(116)

akïy	'a singing competition'
→ *akïy-laš-*	'to compete in singing'
araz	'quarrel'
→ *araz-daš-*	'to quarrel'
arïz	'complaint'
→ *arïz- daš-*	'to quarrel/be at law'
arip	'witchcraft, magic'
→ *arip-teš-*	'to compete in witchcraft'
azuu	'fang'
→ *azuu-laš-*	'to fight furiously'
bas (kel-)	'(to be) equal'
→ *bas-taš-*	'to compete, to bet'
čatak	'quarrel, wrangling'
→ *čatak-taš-*	'to quarrel, wrangle, argue'
čïr	i. 'squabble', ii. 'squabbler'
→ *čïr-daš-*	'to squabble/begin a squabble'
karši	'enemy'
→ *karši-laš-*	'to set out against each other'
kïsa	'revenge'
→ *kïsa-laš-*	'to reproach each other for the past'
miyzam	arch. 'law'
→ *miyzam-daš-*	'to be at law/litigate'
möröy	'the result of a victory'
→ *möröy-löš-*	'to compete'
ökmöt	'government, authorities'
→ *ökmöt-töš-*	'to be at law/litigate'

til	'quarrel'
→ *til-deš-*	'to quarrel'
ǰaak	'jaw'
→ *ǰaak-taš-*	'to squabble'
ǰadaal	'quarrel/wrangling'
→ *ǰadaal-daš-*	'to become embittered against each other'
ǰaŋǰal	'quarel/wrangling'
→ *ǰaŋǰal-daš-*	'to quarrel/wrangle'

12.2.2. Verbs of friendly relations

(117)

dos	'friend'
→ *dos-toš-*	'to become friends'
kuda	'father of son-in-law'
→ *kuda-laš-*	'to become in-laws'
moyun	'neck'
→ *moyun-daš-*	'to embrace each other by the neck'
munaza	'reconciliation'
→ *munaza-laš-*	'to get reconciled'
šerik	'friend'
→ *šerik-teš-*	'to become friends'
tamïr	'friend, pal'
→ *tamïr-laš-*	'to become friends on exchanging presents'
tatuu	'peaceful, friendly'
→ *tatuu-laš-*	'to get reconciled/become friends'
ïlïm	'sympathy, liking'
→ *ïlïm-daš-*	'to be on friendly terms with'
ïray	'mood'
→ *ïray-laš-*	'to make peace/get reconciled'

12.2.3. Verbs of uniting, belonging to a group, joint actions, etc.

(118)

algoo	arch. 'mutual help in farming'
→ *algoo-loš-*	'to help each other in farming'
artel	'artel'
→ *artel-deš-*	'to join in an artel'

bir	'one'
→ *bir-deš-*	'to unite' (intransitive)
borbor	'centre'
→ *borbor-doš-*	'to get centralized'
kiidip	'chase'
→ *kiidip-daš-*	'to unite for a chase' (Judaxin 1985a: 454)
maydan	'battle field'
→ *maydan-daš-*	'to fight jointly'
öz	'(one's) own'
→ *öz-döš-*	'to become close/one of'
uyum	'organization'
→ *uyum-daš-*	'to become organized'
üy-	'to put into a heap'
→ *üy-löš-*	'to gather together'
ǰamaat	arch. 'community'
→ *ǰamaat-taš-*	'to be a member of community'

12.2.4. Verbs of communication

(119)

akï	'payment'
→ *akï-laš-*	'to make mutual payments, to bargain'
ant	'oath'
→ *ant- taš-*	'to give an oath to each other'
aŋgme	'conversation'
→ *aŋgme-leš-*	'to converse'
sooda	'trade, trading'
→ *sooda-laš-*	'to bargain'
ubada	'promise'
→ *ubada-laš-*	'to give each other promises'
ǰoop	'reply'
→ *ǰoop-toš-*	'to talk, to make a deal'
ǰüyö	'reasonable argument'
→ *ǰüyö-löš-*	'to give each other arguments'

ǰüz	'face, cheek'
→ *ǰüz-döš-*	'to talk standing face to face'

12.2.5. Verbs of greeting and saying goodbye

(120)

aman (bol!)	'(be) well, happy(!)'
→ *aman-daš-*	'to inquire after each other's health'
esen	'well, happy'
→ *esen-deš-*	'to inquire after each other's health'
koš!	'goodbye!'
→ *koš-toš-*	'to say goodbye'
salam	'hello'
→ *salam-daš-*	'to say hello to each other'

12.2.6. Verbs of spatial relations

(121)

arka	'back'
→ *arka-laš-*	'to be back to back to each other'
bet	'face'
→ *bet-teš-*	'to meet face to face'
but	'foot'
→ *but-taš-*	'to get entangled (of feet)'
kanat	'wing'
→ *kanat-taš-*	i. 'to become close neighbours' ii. 'to fly wing to wing'
köz	'eye'
→ *köz-döš-*	'to meet tête-à-tête'

12.2.7. Verbs with non-reciprocal (or peripheral reciprocal) meanings

(122)

kata	'mistake'
→ *kata-laš-*	'to make mistakes'
kïrgïz	'Kirghiz'
→ *kïrgïz-daš-*	'to become like a Kirghiz'
kïštak	'kishlak (village in Central Asia)'
→ *kïštak-taš-*	'to become settled'
madaniyat	'culture'
→ *madaniyat-taš-*	'to become cultured'

načar	'weak'
→ *načar-laš-*	'to become worse'
sistema	'system'
→ *sistema-laš-*	'to be(come) systematized'
ǰergilik	'indigenous, local'
→ *ǰergili-teš-*	'to start using the local language (in business, clerical work)'

12.2.8. Lexicalized derivatives

This group includes verbs without semantically more or less related underlying bases:

(123)	*ataan-daš-*	'to shift work, etc. on each other/argue', cf. *ata-/ataa-* 'to call/name'
	boor-doš-	'to fraternize'; cf. *boor* 'liver'
	kez-deš-	'to meet, come across', cf. *kez* 'moment, time, occasion'
	sep-teš-	'to help each other', cf. *sep* 'dowry'

13. Lexical reciprocals and their derivatives. Verbs of joining and separating

13.1. Introductory

This domain of reciprocals seems to be more elaborate in Kirghiz than in Yakut. Three main groups of lexical reciprocals and their derivatives can be distinguished. In Groups A and B the underlying verbs are three-place transitives (and also some two-place verbs taking a plural object). These groups differ in the character of derivatives. Thus in Group A the derivation is: $a > b > c$ (see (124)). In Group B both derivatives are related immediately to the underlying verb: $a > b$ and $a > c$ (see (125)).

The underlying (and the derived reciprocals of the (c) type in Group B)) lexical reciprocals in Groups A and B have such typical meanings (denoting mostly connecting) as 'to connect', 'to gather', 'to mix', 'to glue/paste', 'to make closer', 'to make denser', 'to part', 'to compare', 'to replace', 'to tie', etc. As we can see, the final derivatives of the (c) type in both groups are more similar to the underlying transitives (sometimes, in the Russian-Kirghiz dictionary a Russian verb is translated into Kirghiz by two, types (a) and (c), transitives at once; thus the Russian verb *sojedinjat'* 'to connect' is translated by *ula-* and *ula-š-tïr-* (Judaxin 1957: 803). The Russian verb *svjazyvat'* 'to tie' is translated by *bayla-* and *bayla-š-tïr-* (Judaxin 1957: 763)). In Group A derivation of the $a > b$ type results in an anticausative meaning, and derivation $b > c$ brings back the causative meaning. In Group B derivation a > b results in a variety of meanings, most commonly the assistive. In the case of $a > c$ derivation the meaning is more or less retained or changes slightly.

(124) Group A

	a.	*ula-*	'to join something with something'
→	b.	*ula-š-*	'to join' (intransitive) other'
→	c.	*ula-š-tïr-*	'to join something with something'

(125) Group B

	a.	*bayla-*	'to tie something to something/tie up'
[→	b.	to *bayla-š-*	'to help to tie', *'to tie each other']
→	c.	*bayla-š-tïr-*	'to tie (e.g. horses) together'
			(Judaxin 1985a: 96-97, 1985b: 302, 304)

In Group C, unlike in the first two groups, the underlying verbs are two-place intransitives (including those with a plural subject) (see (126)). Typical meanings of these intransitives are 'to gather', 'to meet', 'to compete', 'to argue', 'to join', 'to divorce/part', and also such peripheral reciprocal meanings as 'to get entangled', 'to wrinkle', 'to catch (on)', etc. The difference within pairs (126a) and (126b) is minimal (note the highly developed synonymy of derivatives in Kirghiz). (126) contains a maximum derivational chain for the types of morphological derivatives with the chosen suffixes. In most cases, however, the opposition (126a) seems to be valid.

(126) Group C

a. *birik-*		'to unite' (intransitive)
→ *birik-tir-*		'to unite' (transitive)
b. *birig-iš-*		'to unite' (intransitive)
→ *birig-iš-tir-*		'to unite' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 136)

13.2. Group A: three-member derivational chain *vt* > *vi* > *vt*; anticausatives with the suffix *-š*

At least 10 three-place transitives and two-place transitives with a plural object belong in this group. They are lexical causatives. Nearly all of them denote combining or joining of two or more entities. Besides the above mentioned (124a, b, c), the following verbs belong here:

(127)

a. *batta-*		'to paste something with starch'
→ b. *batta-š-*		'to get glued/stuck together'
→ c. *batta-š-tïr-*		'to paste/glue something together'
		(Judaxin 1985a: 117)

(128)

čapta-		'to glue something to something'
→ b. *čapta-š-*		'to get glued together'
→ c. *čapta-š-tïr*		'to glue something together' (Judaxin 1985b: 348)

(129) a. *čatï-* 'to tangle something (threads, strings, etc.)'
→ b. *čatï-š-* 'to become tangled'
→ c. *čatï-š-tïr* 'to tangle something' (Judaxin 1985b: 352-353)

(130) a. *epte-* 'to join/glue together' (rare)
→ b. *epte-š-* 'to become joined'
→ c. *epte-š-tir-* 'to glue/join into one' (Judaxin 1985b: 459)

(131) a. *tij-* 'to touch (e.g. of one knee against the other)'
→ b. *tij-iš-* 'to come into contact/adjoin'
→ c. *tij-iš-tir-* 'to make something come into contact' (e.g. knees) (Judaxin 1985b: 233-234)

(132) a. *topto-* 'to gather (e.g. people) into a crowd'
→ b. *topto-š-* 'to gather into a crowd' (intransitive)
→ c. *topto-š-tur-* 'to gather something into a pile' (Judaxin 1985b: 253)

(133) a. *ïkta-* 'to press'
→ b. *ïkta-š-* 'to press oneselves to each other'
→ c. *ïkta-š-tïr-* 'to press two entities tightly together' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985b: 428)

Compare sentential examples for (131):

(134) a. *Anïn üstüŋkü tiš-i astïŋkï tiš-i-ne tij-di.*
he.GEN upper tooth-his lower tooth-his-DAT touch-PAST.3
'His upper teeth clenched with (lit. 'touched') his lower teeth.'

b. *Anïn üstüŋkü tiš-i menen*
he.GEN upper tooth-his and

astïŋkï tiš-i tij-iš-ti.
lower tooth-his touch-REC-PAST.3
'His upper and lower teeth clenched (lit. 'touched each other').'

c. *Al tiš-ter-i-n tij-iš-tir-di.*
he tooth-PLUR-his-ACC touch-REC-CAUS-PAST.3
'He clenched his teeth together.'

The following verbs are close to these verbs, but the semantic opposition between the first and the second members is not quite (standard) causative: in general, here as well as in some other cases and, it seems, cross-linguistically, the semantic relation between (b) and (c) is more regular than between (a) and (b), i.e. valency decrease involves a greater shift in meaning than valency increase. The relation between (a) and (b), e.g. in (137) and (138), is not so much purely semantic (in the sense that

meaning 'a' can be obtained from meaning 'b' by subtracting a certain sense) as metaphoric and figurative.

(135) a. *kak-* 'to hit'
→ b. *kag-ïš-* '?to collide/come to blows'
→ c. *kag-ïš-tïr-* 'to hit one thing against another'
(Judaxin 1985a: 312-313)

(136) a. *ǰap-* 'to close/cover'
→ b. *ǰab-ïš-* 'to get glued/stuck together'
→ c. *ǰab-ïš-tïr-* 'to glue something together' (Judaxin 1985a: 209)

(137) a. *arala-* 'to walk between something' (transitive)
→ b. *arala-š-* 'to get mixed'
→ c. *arala-š-tïr-* 'to mix something' (Judaxin 1985a: 63-64)

(138) a. *kajčïla-* 'to cut something with scissors'
→ b. *kajčïla-š-* 'to cross like scissors' (intransitive)
→ c. *kajčïla-š-tïr-* 'to cross/fold something like scissors'
(Judaxin 1985a: 323-324)

Compare:

(139) a. *Oŋ but-u sol but-u-na kajčïla-š-tï.*
right leg-his left leg-his-DAT cross-REC-PAST.3
'His right leg crossed his left leg.'

b. *Al oŋ but-u-n sol but-u-na kajčïla-š-tïr-dï.*
he right leg-his-ACC left leg-his-DAT cross-REC-CAUS-PAST.3
'He crossed his legs.' (lit. 'He placed his right leg across his left leg.')

The data discussed in this section seem to indicate that there is a tendency for opposition *vi* > *vt* (where both members are marked, cf. *-š* > *-š-tïr*) to acquire a more important role, i.e. to cover a larger number of verbal pairs, and, correspondingly, for the opposition *vt* > *vi* to lose in importance. This is particularly obvious when the semantic opposition of *vi* > *vt* is more regular than *vt* > *vi*; cf., for instance, (135)-(139). It may be tentatively proposed that one of the functions of the suffix *-š-tïr* is to mark object-oriented reciprocals. In this role, it appears not only with standard reciprocals (see 5.3), but also in the domain of lexical reciprocals. And in view of this the material of the subsequent section is particularly significant, because in this case the suffix in question is added to transitive lexical reciprocals (cf. also 10.2).

13.3. Group B: two-member derivational chains vt_i > *vt/vi* and vt_i > *vt*; complex suffix *-š-tïr*

In this group derivatives with the suffix *-š-* are assistive in meaning (most commonly), or lexicalized, etc., and thus their meaning is not part of the meaning of the respective derivative with the suffix *-tïr-*. Therefore we can assume that *-š-tïr-* functions as a single derivational morpheme: it came to be perceived as such probably due to the existence of oppositions considered in 13.2 where it is not a compound suffix. In this group a transitive verb is derived from another transitive, and the moment of joining two entities rather than joining one of them to the other is implied by the derivatives more strongly than by the base verbs; besides, there may be various individual differences between the base and the derivative, but generally their meanings are close enough. This probably reveals a tendency to express the joining or combining of two or more entities by morphological means.

(140) a. *kotor-* i. 'to change horses', ii. 'to move horses from one pasture to another'
[→ b. *kotor-uš-* 'to help to change horses or move them ...']
→ c. *kotor-uš-tur-* 'to move many horses from one pasture to one place' (Judaxin 1985a: 409-410)

(141) a. *kuj-* 'to pour something (into)'
[→ b. *kuj-uš-* 'to help to pour something (into)']
→ c. *kuj-uš-tur-* 'to pour something from several vessels into one' (Judaxin 1985a: 457)

(142) a. *kura-* i. 'to make something out of pieces' (e.g. a patchwork quilt)
ii. 'to accumulate/save/gather' (e.g. cattle)
iii. 'to put something in order'
[→ b. *kura-š-* 'to help to accumulate, etc.]
→ c. *kura-š-tïr-* i. 'to accumulate/save/gather' (e.g. cattle)
ii. 'to put something in order'iii. 'to construct (one object out of several)' (Judaxin 1985a: 247, 248)

(143) a. *sal-* 'to put something into something'
[→ b. *sal-ïš-* 'to help to put something into something']
→ c. *sal-ïš-tïr-* i. 'to put several things one into another'
ii. 'to compare' (Judaxin 1985b: 125)

(144) a. *sïna-* 'to check/test something'
[→ b. *sïna-š-* 'to help to check/test']
→ c. *sïna-š-tïr-* 'to compare something with something' (Judaxin 1985b: 181)

(145) a. *togo-* 'to count something as something (e.g. as part of a debt)'
[b. *togo-š-* 'to stand against/opposite each other']
→ c. *togo-š-tur-* 'to count something as something' (e.g. as part of a debt)' (Judaxin 1985b: 241-242)

(146) a. *teŋe-* 'to equalize/make something equal'
[→ b. *teŋe-š-* 'to compare (e.g. one's height) with somebody' (intransitive)]
→ c. *teŋe-š-tir-* i. 'to equalize/make something equal'
ii. 'to compare with respect to height and length'
(Judaxin 1985b: 226)

(147) a. *tüy-* i.'to knit (a net)', ii. 'to tie into a bundle'
[→ b. *tüy-üš-* 'to help to knit, to tie ...']
→ c. *tüy-üš-tür-* 'to tie (e.g. several bundles) together'
(Judaxin 1985b: 278-279)

(148) a. *ur-* 'to hit/beat'
[→ b. *ur-uš-* 'to fight/squabble']
→ c. *ur-uš-tur-* i. 'to hit one against another'
ii. 'to bring together for a fight'
(Judaxin 1985b: 306, 308, 309)

(149) a. *ǰïyna-* 'to gather something (e.g. cotton-wool)'
[→ b. *ǰïyna-š-* 'to help to gather something']
→ c. *ǰïyna-š-tïr-* i. 'to gather something'
ii. 'to tidy up (a room, flat, etc.)
(Judaxin 1985a: 277; see also (12) in 13.1)

(150) a. *Men bul kap-tï baška kap-ka sal-dï-m.*
I this sack-ACC another sack-DAT put-PAST-1SING
'I put one sack into another.'

b. *Men kap-tar-dï (*kap-tï) sal-š-tïr-dï-m.*
I sack-PLUR-ACC sack-ACC put-REC-CAUS-PAST-1SING
'I put the sacks one into another.'

(151) a. *Men kazan-ga suu kuy-du-m.*
I pot-DAT water pour-PAST-1SING
'I poured water into the pot.'

b. *Men suu-lar-dï bir kazan-ga kuy-uš-tur-du-m.*
I water-PLUR-ACC one pot-DAT pour-REC-CAUS-PAST-1SING
'I poured water (from several vessels) into one pot.'

The following instance probably belongs here too, though it denotes disconnecting:

(152) a. *böl-* 'to divide (into two or more parts), separate (something from a whole)'
[→ b. *böl-üš-* 'to divide between/among oneselves']
→ c. *böl-üš-tür-* 'to divide/distribute something among some people' (Judaxin 1985a: 151-152).

13.4. Group C: two-place intransitives and their causative derivatives

The following subgroups can be distinguished here.

13.4.1. Verbs with root final *-š-*. Reciproca tantum (?)

It is expedient to consider verbs with the root final *-š-* here: though the connection of this component with the reciprocal suffix is not always obvious, these verbs are mostly reciprocal in meaning and quite numerous. With regard to the four-member derivational group under (126), only the first pair is registered for these verbs. Syntactically and semantically, *a* > *b* corresponds to *b* > *c* of Group A. If the dictionary does not register a causative, it is indicated below by a question mark. These verbs fall into a number of distinct lexical groups.

(a) The underlying verbs denote *competition*:

(153) a. *eregiš-* 'to argue/rival'
→ b. *eregiš-tir-* 'to cause to argue, etc.' (Judaxin 1985b: 461)

(154) a. *küröš-* 'to wrestle with each other'
→ b. *küröš-tür-* 'to organize wrestling' (Judaxin 1985a: 471)

(155) a. *meldeš-* i. 'to compete', ii. 'wager', iii. 'to come to an agreement'
→ b. ? (Judaxin 1985b: 24)

(156) a. *ǰarïš-* i. 'to compete', ii. 'to compete in running'
→ b. *ǰarïš-tïr-* 'to organize a competition' (Judaxin 1985b: 237)

(b) The underlying verbs denote diminishing in volume/size, entangling, wrinkling:

(157) a. *arpalïš-* 'to interlace' (intransitive)
→ b. ? (Judaxin 1985a: 69)

(158) a. *bïrïš-* 'to wrinkle' (e.g. of a face') (intransitive)
→ b. *bïrïš-tïr-* 'to wrinkle/crumple' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 172)

(159) a. *bürüš-* 'to double/huddle oneself up' (intransitive)
→ b. *bürüš-tür-* 'to cause to double/huddle oneself up' (Judaxin 1985a: 168)

(160) a. *čataš-* 'to entangle' (intransitive)
→ b. *čataš-tïr-* 'to entangle' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985b: 352)

(161) a. *čürüš-* 'to wrinkle' (intransitive)
→ b. *čürüš-tir-* 'to wrinkle/crumple' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985b: 380)

(162) a. *karïš-* 'to be cramped' (intransitive)
→ b. *karïš-tïr-* 'to cause to be cramped' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 356)

(163) a. *kuruš-* 'to shrink/contract' (intransitive)
→ b. *kuruš-tur-* 'to cause to shrink/contract' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 451)

(c) The underlying verbs denote establishing contact, spatial proximity:

(164) a. *aykal-/aykalïš-* i. 'to be entangled [mutually]'
ii. 'to meet in single combat'
→ b. ? (Judaxin 1985a: 30)

(165) a. *aykaš-* i. 'to be piled cross-wise', ii. 'to adjoin/be in contact'
→ b. *aykaš-tïr-* 'to put cross-wise' (Judaxin 1985a: 30)

(166) a. *ermeš-* 'to clutch/grasp at something',
fig. 'to worry/pester' (intransitive)
→ b. ? (Judaxin 1985b: 463)

(167) a. *tutaš-* 'to adjoin' (intransitive)
→ b. *tutaš-tïr-* 'to place next to something/make contiguous' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985b: 272)

(168) a. *ǰanaš-* 'to be/move next to somebody/something' (intransitive) (cf. *ǰan* 'side')
→ b. *ǰanaš-tïr-* 'to place next to something' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 226)

(169) a. *ǰarmaš-* 'to clutch/grasp at something',
fig. 'to adhere/follow somebody' (intransitive)
b. *ǰarmaš-tïr-* 'to cause to clutch/grasp' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 236)

(d) A residual verb:

(170) a. *almaš-* 'to change into/take turns' (intransitive)
→ b. *almaš-tïr-* 'to change/replace' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 52)

Sentential examples:

(171) a. *Ïlay menen kum aralaš-tï.*
'Clay and sand got mixed.'

b. *Ata-m ïlay menen kum aralaš-tïr-dï.*
'My father mixed clay and sand.'

13.4.2. Verbs without root final *-š*

Example (126) can be amplified by the following derivational chains obtained from the dictionaries:

(172) a. *aǰïra-* 'to part'
→ *aǰïra-t-* 'to cause to part'

b. *aǰïra-š-* 'to part from each other/divorce'
→ *aǰïra-š-tïr-* 'to separate' (Judaxin 1985a: 24)

(173) *büt-* 'to knit (of bones)' (intransitive)
→ *büt-ür-* 'to make (bones) knit' (transitive) (Judaxin 1957: 821)

(174) a. *čogul-* 'to gather/crowd'
→ *čogul-t-* 'to gather/pile up'

b. *čogul-uš-* 'to meet with/see each other'
→ ? (Judaxin 1985b: 364)

(175) *irkil-* 'to crowd/pile up'
→ *irkil-t-* 'to gather into a pile' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985a: 304)

(176) a. *kabïl-* 'to meet' (intransitive)
→ *kabïl-t-/ kabïl-dïr-* 'to cause to meet'

b. *kabïl-ïš-* 'to meet/come to blows'
→ ? (Judaxin 1985a: 311)

(177) a. *kezik-* 'to meet with/run into'
→ *kezik-tir-* 'to meet'

b. *kezig-iš-* 'to meet with'
→ *kezig- iš-tir-* 'to cause to meet' (Judaxin 1985a: 366 and 1957: 831)

(178) a. *šire-* 'to weld' (of two pieces)
→ *šire-t-* 'to weld' (transitive)

b. *šire-š-* 'to weld' (intransitive)
→ *šire-tir-* 'to weld' (transitive) (Judaxin 1985b: 409)

(179) a. *ǰoluk-* 'to meet' (intransitive)
→ *ǰoluk-tur-* i. 'to arrange a meeting' (of two or more persons),
ii. 'to meet' (transitive)

b. *ǰolug-uš-* 'to meet each other'
→ *ǰolug-uš-tur-* 'to arrange a meeting' (Judaxin 1985a: 259)

(180) a. *ïkta-* i. 'to press oneself to something'
→ *ïkta-t-* i. 'to cause/order somebody to press oneself to something'
ii. 'to press somebody/something to somebody/something'
iii. 'to press somebody to something'

b. *ïkta-š-* 'to press oneselves to each other'
→ *ïkta-š-tïr-* 'to press two or more entities tightly together'
(Judaxin 1985b: 427-428)

Synonymous forms of these verbs may differ in shades of meaning and in frequency. Thus, for instance, (126a) *birik-* and *birik-tir-* are much more common in speech than the respective forms in *-iš*, i.e. *birig-iš-* and *birig-iš-tir-*. The latter form is considered by the informant as grammatical though not used in speech. There occur non-standard, individual semantic relations. Thus in (177) and (179) the underlying forms *kezik-* and *ǰoluk-* happen to be synonymous to the respective causatives *kezik-tir-* and *ǰoluk-tur-*, the only difference lying in the patterns of government; e.g.:

(181) a. *Al ma-ga* (DAT) *kezik-ti.*
'He met me.'

b. *Al me-ni* (ACC) *kezik-tir-di*
'He met me.'

13.5. Anticausatives with the suffixes *-l* and *-n* and their relation to anticausatives in *-š*

Above, I have considered anticausatives with the suffix *-š* only. As has already been mentioned (see 2.5), the anticausative meaning can also be marked by the suffixes *-l* and *-n*; besides, it can also be signalled by the complex suffixes *-l-iš* and *-n-iš*. These affixes can also derive anticausatives from lexical reciprocals. Some of these formations are the only way of deriving anticausatives, while others have parallel forms; therefore, the overall picture is very complicated (e.g. *bayla-* and its derivatives in

(21)). It is relevant to consider derivatives with these suffixes and relations between them as well. Four main cases can be distinguished. The choice of a suffix for a derived anticausative is very complicated and the causes of their selectivity are not clear. The classification given below is based on the dictionary data.

1. Anticausatives with the suffix *-l* or *-n* do not have parallel synonymous forms with the suffix *-š*.

(182) a. *koš-* 'to join two or more entities'
b. *koš-ul-* 'to join (of two entities)' (Judaxin 1985a: 412)
c. *?koš-uš-*

d. *Eki too koš-ul-ba-y-t eki el koš-ul-a-t.*
two mountain join-PASS-NEG-PRES-3 two people join-PASS-PRES-3
'Two mountains will not come together, two people will come together.' (Judaxin 1985a: 412)

(183) a. *uypala-* 'to entangle/ruffle'
b. *uypala-n-* 'to get crumpled/entangled/ruffled' (Judaxin 1985b: 301)
c. *?uypala-š-*

2. Anticausatives with the suffix *-l* or *-n* have parallel synonymous forms in *-š*:

(184) a. *čapta-* 'to paste/stick something to something'
b. *čapta-l-* 'to get pasted/stuck to something'
c. *čapta-š-* (same) (Judaxin 1985b: 348)

(185) a. *ula-* 'to join something with something'
b. *ula-n-* 'to join' (intransitive)
c. *ula-š-* (same) (Judaxin 1985b: 302-303)

3. Anticausatives are formed by means of the complex suffixes *-l-iš* or *-n-iš* which are a combination of the above suffixes. Here each of the two components expresses an anticausative meaning. Thus (186) is a kind of combination of (184b) and (184c), and (187) a combination of (185b) and (185c).

(186) (= (184d)) *čapta-l-iš-* (same as (184b-c)) (Judaxin 1985b: 348; Judaxin 1957: 641)
(187) (= (185d)) *ula-n-iš-* (same as (185b-c)) (Judaxin 1985b: 302)

4. In anticausatives with the complex suffixes the meaning of *-l* or *-n* cannot be singled out: these complexes are idiomatic, i.e. the passive meaning of (188b) is absent in (188c):

(188) a. *čirma-* 'to wind/twine something round something'
b. *čirma-l-* 'to be wound/twined'(passive)

c. *čirma-l-ïš-* 'to intertwine' (intransitive) (anticausative) (Judaxin 1985b: 392)

Sentential examples:

(189) *Biz koš-ul-uš-tu-k.*
'We joined *together*.' (cf. (182))

(190) *Biz karaŋge koridor-do ur-un-uš-tu-k.*
'We collided in a dark corridor.' (Judaxin 1957: 831)

(191) *J̌ïlan but-um-a oro-l-uš-tu.* (Judaxin 1985b: 80)
snake leg-my-DAT twine-PASS-REC-PAST.3
'A snake twined itself round my leg.'

References

Abdiev, T. K. 1995. *Konstrukcii s kauzativnymi glagolami v kirgizskom jazyke* [Constructions with causative verbs in Kirghiz]. [Unpublished candidate dissertation.] St. Petersburg: Institut lingvističeskix issledovanij.

Abdiev, T. K. 1996. Kirgizskie glagoly v statističeskom osveščenii [A statistical survey of Kirghiz verbs]. In: A. P. Sytov (ed.) *Leksikologija, leksikografija, grammatika*. St. Petersburg: Institut lingvističeskix issledovanij. 28-33.

Gordlevskij, V. A. 1928. *Grammatika tureckogo jazyka* [A grammar of the Turkish language]. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Instituta jazykovedenija.

Judaxin, K. K. (ed.) 1957. *Russko-kirgizskij slovar'* [Russian-Kirghiz dictionary]. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.

Judaxin, K. K. 1985a. *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'* [Kirghiz-Russian dictionary] 1. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija'.

Judaxin, K. K. 1985b. *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'* [Kirghiz-Russian dictionary] 2. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija".

Junusaliev, B. M. 1966. Kirgizskij jazyk [The Kirghiz language]. In: N. A. Baskakov (ed.) *Jazyki narodov SSSR* 2. *Tjurkskie jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka. 482-505.

Kudajbergenov, S. 1987a. Slovoobrazovanie glagola [Verbal derivation]. In: Zaxarova 1987, 209-31.

Kudajbergenov, S. 1987b. Kategorija zaloga [The category of voice]. In: Zaxarova 1987, 238-53.

Lewis, G. L. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nedjalkov, V. P. 2002. Karachay-Balkar reciprocals. *Turkic Languages* 6, 19-80.

Nedjalkov, V. P. 2003. Yakut reciprocals. *Turkic Languages* 7, 30-104.

Sadykov, T. 1995. *Teoretičeskie osnovy kirgizskoj fonologii i morfologii* [Theoretical foundations of Kirghiz phonology and morphology]. [Abstract of a candidate dissertation.] Almaty: Institute of linguistics.

Schlögel, S. 1985. *Zur Kausativierung im Türkischen*. (Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Arbeitspapiere 48.) Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Sevortjan, Ė. V. 1962. *Affiksy glagoloobrazovanija v azerbajdžanskom jazyke* [Affixes of verb derivation in Azerbaijanian.] Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.

Tojčubekova, B. 1987. Imja dejstvija [Nomina actionis]. In: Zakharova (ed.). 310-21.
Zaxarova, O. V. (ed.) 1987. *Grammatika kirgizskogo literaturnogo jazyka* [Grammar of the Kirghiz literary language]. 1. Frunze: Ilim.

Sociopolitical changes and language: A retrospective view of Azerbaijanian

Javanshir Shibliyev & Necdet Osam

Shibliyev, Javanshir & Osam, Necdet 2003. Sociopolitical changes and language: A retrospective view of Azerbaijanian. *Turkic Languages* 7, 235-244.

Language reflects the changes taking place beyond it. This becomes more important when it concerns sociopolitical settings that are completely different. For less than two centuries the Azerbaijanian language has faced three of them: colonial, imperial and global. The paper intends to analyze the language situation in Azerbaijan with brief recourse into its language in both colonial and imperial settings, and also the impact of the linguistic globalization language on the Azerbaijanian language.

Javanshir Shibliyev & Necdet Osam, Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimağusa, KKTC, via Mersin 10, Turkey. E-mail: javanshir.shibliyev@emu.edu.tr, necdet.osam@emu.edu.tr

Introduction

The last two decades of the twentieth century left the members of all societies face to face with a new phenomenon: globalization. The world once again after the Cold War was divided into two camps: those who considered globalization a new stage of integration or internationalization of values, beliefs and relations, and those who found it an oppressive machine of supranational powers that must be blamed for all misfortunes.

Many sociolinguists began speaking of *linguistic genocide* (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000) committed by a *killer language*, *Tyrannosaurus Rex*, who is found guilty of "cannibalism, a common feature of dominant language" (Phillipson 2000: 1). Moreover, the conventional belief that language contact makes languages rich and colourful has been found wrong due to 'unidirectionality of borrowing', "since loan words can be the tip of a cultural iceberg, symptoms of a wider malaise" (Phillipson 2000: 2). On the one hand, "globalization is a 'killing agent' because the 'free market' ideology demands homogenization and, thus, kills diversity" (Skuttnabb-Kangas 2000). On the other hand, "never before in history have there been as many standardized languages as there are now: roughly 1,200" (Fishman 2002: 4). Globalization is said to be a foe of diversity; however, from Risager's (2002) point of view, the emergence of a great number of 'nation states' built on the principle of a 'state language' are the products of globalization.

Thus, it can be assumed that linguistic globalization takes place when a global language, English, replaces and displaces local languages in many of the domains in which they had originally been used including education. Moreover, linguistic globalization or Anglo-Americanization is responsible for linguistic homogenization due to its influence on the vocabulary of the local languages since the local languages lose the competition due to the lack of power and prestige. Subsequently, due to globalization, English has become the most widely used language in the world. The attitude toward globalization is not unanimous. For those who consider English a language which has to play the role of the widest lingua franca with dozens of local Englishes, "globalization is a unity of the global and local, a unity of homogenization and heterogenization" (Risager 2002: 3). Concerning the history of globalization, it goes back as far as "1000 A.D., when the global spread of science, technology and mathematics was changing the nature of the world ..." (Sen 2002: 6). Our aim is not to justify the friends or foes of globalization. The aim is to analyze the language situation in three subsequent settings including globalization.

The peripheral language in the colonial setting

The history of language contact between Azerbaijanian and Russian goes back to the early 1800s, when the Russian Empire kept expanding and capturing more and more territories. Russia's assimilationist language policy was based on the wide-range relocations of populations. Furthermore, efforts to create favourable conditions for people who had newly immigrated to the region forced the locals to leave their lands (Mamedov 2000). Also the oil boom in the19th century caused the influx of various ethnic groups to Baku.

These processes radically changed the ethnic and linguistic situation in that region (Mamedov 2000). It would be difficult to speak of deliberate language planning by the colonizers. The dissemination of the hegemonic Russian language would be the result of imposition. As a matter of fact, Russian did not seem to be an explicitly dominant language in Azerbaijan during the early period of conquest. But later, when relocations necessitated a lingua franca and the language of the center, Russian gained power and thus, gradually became the dominant language. The relationship between the local language and the language of the center reflected the constructs of the colonialist cultural mythology, which characterized local languages as tribal languages. It must be pointed out that the Azerbaijanian language was also used as a lingua franca in the region (Balaev 1992).

The second half of the 19th century was the period when the formation and standardization of the Azerbaijanian language got its impetus. After many centuries, the idea that the existing Arabic alphabet failed to meet the linguistic requirements of Azerbaijanian was put forward (Əliyeva 1996). This could not be explained by the linguistic considerations alone, as the sociopolitical movements taking place in Europe had cultivated pro-Western sentiments even in the suburbs of Tsarist Russia. As the connection with Europe could only be established through the center, Russia, the Russian language began to be considered a window to Europe. The changing

balance of power in the world in the second half of the 19th century was reflected in the linguistic balance of power. The European languages began to be associated with progress and development, while the Oriental languages including Arabic were equated with backwardness.

Though the Russian language began to gain power in the region, the awareness of the Azerbaijanian intelligentsia of the importance of the mother tongue increased. In spite of the assimilationist policy of Tsarist Russia, it could not establish Russian, the language of the Empire, as an international language because of its social significance in the minds of native peoples, especially in the countryside. Thus, Azerbaijanian was widely used in pre-revolutionary Azerbaijan. The colonial setting with the dominant Russian language could not impact local languages significantly due to the fact that language contact was significant in a few domains only. In fact, it was almost impossible to speak of the direct 'physical' contact of the dominant language with the languages of the 'tribes'.

Language policy in an imperial setting

The Soviet Empire's language policy was also based on the idea of assimilation, though it was subjected to certain 'corrections'. The main difference seems to be the fact that its expansion was not based on imposition or neglect, as it was before. Unlike colonial Russia's inconsistent pragmatic language policy, the communist regime had worked out a well-organized scientifically justified language planning based on the ideologization of the Russian language, the demonic policy of Russification. As the idea of communism was based on creating a classless society with collective values, this could be achieved by establishing a new type of social entity, a *Soviet man* or *Soviet people*, whose language might be the *Great Russian language*, whereas the other languages could co-function with Russian in their own territories as peripheral languages.

It was not difficult to observe that Moscow implemented a two-stage language policy. In stage one, the early policy of the Soviets, the emphasis was to develop various languages by using them in education and in public and professional domains. One of the aspects to such a policy was the elevation of regional dialects into 'languages', a policy of 'divide and rule'. Its goal was to prevent the formation of large language blocks and allow the central government to insist that Russian be used as a lingua franca. But it was not an easy task, since the illiteracy rate was very high. Moreover, many of the languages were not written. Additionally, some languages, including Azerbaijanian, were using Arabic scripts. By introducing alphabets other than Arabic, Russia could solve some other problems as well.

The second stage was to 'universalize' the knowledge of Russian. With this came forced Cyrillicization of the former Latin and Arab scripts. Covertly this was Russification but overtly it was used to glorify and unify. Language planning design looked like a Russian *matrjoška* doll: the largest *matrjoška* had a national language that appeared as a result of the policy of *korenacija* ("rooting" policy). The largest *matrjoška* was the ideologized Russian while the 'rooted' smaller one was in her.

The minority languages within the territory of the domain languages were arranged on the basis of their ethno-territorial ranks. Consequently, their vulnerability depended on the status they possessed. The language lacking power and prestige could not win the language competition. As a result, its habitat would gradually disappear. The existence of more than 80 small nations has been threatened by the Russian and Soviet Empires during recent history (Vahtre & Vikberg 1991).

To realize its plan of assimilation, the Soviet Empire used policy of relocation, either voluntarily or by imposition. As a result, there appeared a unique ethnolinguistic situation in the USSR. In such a situation, the politically empowered Russian, a language of interethnic communication, became dominant in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the national languages in the republics could only perform limited functions. As a result, the Great Russian language was about to swallow their language by Russifying them through the exportation of words to local languages when words were needed. Consequently, all the languages were subjected to strong influence by the Russian language as a donor language, which led to their homogenization. In other words, it would not be quite correct to assume that homogenization of languages is the specific feature of globalization. In fact, linguistic imperialism was the first stage of linguistic globalization. The ethno-linguistic situation in Azerbaijan was a mirror reflection of that of the Soviet Union as a whole.

During the years of the communist regime, Azerbaijan was one of the most multiethnic republics. With Azerbaijanian as a majority language, Azerbaijan was (and still is) a home for indigenous ethnic minorities such as Lezgins, Avars, Talyshs, Tsakhurs, etc. According to the 1989 census (Goskomitet SSSR 1989), the whole population of Azerbaijan was 7,021,200 of which 82,7% were ethnic Azerbaijanians. The remaining 17.2 % were Russians, Armenians, Lezgins, Avars, Ukrainians, Tatars, Jews, Kurds, Georgians, Udins, Tats, Mountain Jews, Tsakhurs and others.

One of the actions taken by the Soviet language policy was corpus planning: to replace the existing modified Latin alphabet by the Cyrillic one in order to establish uniformity within the Soviet Union and also to isolate the Azerbaijanian language from Turkish. Unable to withstand the overwhelming political power of the Russian language, Azerbaijanian was stripped off many of its functions.

The corpus of the language had undergone serious deformations both structurally and lexically. There were all the symptoms of an abnormal diglossia: *High Azerbaijanian*, which was heavily Russified, was mainly used in science and administrative domains, and *Low Azerbaijanian* was used in rural areas mainly. The population could roughly be divided into three main groups in terms of language use. The first group consisted of people who lived in urban areas. Russification was very high there due to the fact that, first of all, in urban places the rate of indigenous people was low and, second of all, nearly all administrative bodies were located there. Suffice it to mention that schools where Azerbaijanian was the language of instruction comprised only 45% of the total in Baku. This happened in a republic where the indigenous people comprised 82.7% of the total population (Pašaeva 1997).

The use of Russian within the different layers of the population varied. Russian almost became a dominant language in institutions of higher education. It was the working language in almost all institutional activities. The rural population of Azerbaijan belonged to the second group where Russian had a very limited functional domain. In villages mainly the male population had a certain command of the Russian language. The Azerbaijanian language they used could preserve its purity to a certain degree. Certain parts of the national intelligentsia who tried to make the people aware of the graveness of the situation were usually called *nationalists* or *pan-Turkists*.

As a result of the devastating Russification machine, Russian had become the native language for many representatives of the language minorities, whereas the reverse was not true for the Russian immigrants. They never experienced a need to learn the language of the indigenous nation. Only 0.4% of Russians spoke the languages of indigenous ethnic groups (Goskomitet SSSR 1989).

It should be mentioned that Russian also intruded into the areas of everyday Azerbaijanian language use. Alongside code switching, code mixing was a usual practice. Even those who did not have any command of the Russian language used Russian words in their everyday speech.

The other function of the Russian language was that it was a donor and filter language for national languages including Azerbaijanian. Such a situation could be explained by the fact that, first of all, the heavily centralized system made Moscow (and thus Russian) a place where things were coined (e.g., *kolxoz, sovxoz, rajkom, kompartija, perestrojka, glasnost'*, etc.) and, second of all, the access to foreign languages occurred mainly through Russian. Thus, the Soviet Union was an empire village with Russian as its imperial language.

National language policy of independent Azerbaijan

After the collapse of the Soviet Empire, Azerbaijanians obtained a chance to rebuild their nation in which language could play a mobilizing role. The nation had to be very careful since the language issue "in the developing countries is of crucial importance in their economic, political, and social development" (Ferguson 1996: 272). It was vitally important for Azerbaijan to take correct decisions "in terms of at least three important goals", as Ferguson stated, namely, for establishing "national unity and national identity", "access to modern science and technology", and for "international communication" (Ferguson 1996: 272). Moreover, it was vitally important to take correct decisions because language policies are usually planned for relatively long periods and could definitely have further sociopolitical implications. In other words, as Daoust states, "the devising of a language planning policy implies a vision of a future sociolinguistic situation that should be brought about" (Daoust 1997: 440).

The newly established nation-state focused its language policy on two directions: status planning and corpus planning. Status planning was crucial for the new state since it intended to change "the function of a language or a variety of a language and

the rights of those who use it" (Wardhaugh 2002: 353). The status of Azerbaijanian has been defined by *The Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the State Language* adopted in 1991. The Law established the legal status of the Turkic (later Turkic was replaced by Azerbaijanian) language as a state language. According to the Law, the use of the state language was obligatory in all governmental establishments as well as in all spheres of political, economic, public, scientific and cultural life and in the function of international communications on the territory of the republic. Also, the Law defined the state's official attitude to ethnic minority groups. The Law guaranteed all citizens of the republic of Azerbaijan the right to choose the language of education, to organize schools in any language (Article 3). In 1992, the National Assembly of the Azerbaijanian Republic adopted two decrees: "*On the State Language in the Republic of Azerbaijan*" and "*On the protection of the rights and liberties of national minorities, small-numbered peoples and ethnic groups living in the Republic of Azerbaijan and on rendering assistance for the development of their languages and cultures*" (Pašaeva 1997).

Later, the Constitution adopted in 1995 also defines the Azerbaijanian language as an official language and guarantees the free use and development of other languages spoken by the population. It guarantees the citizens' right to educate in their native language.

As for corpus planning, the aim is to develop the language so that it could serve "every possible language function" (Wardhaugh 2002: 353). The Azerbaijanian language had already developed rich lexical resources and a highly standardized grammar that completely meets all the needs of the modern society. That was why priority in corpus planning has to be directed towards modernization, which implies extending the lexicon, either by coinage or by borrowing, and introducing new expressions. As with other languages, Azerbaijanian uses internal and external sources of lexical expansion. On the one hand, the standard language used dialects to enrich its lexical stock, on the other hand, foreign words have entered the language as loanwords or calques. But a certain part of these words remain *quantitative borrowings* (Osam 1997).

Nevetherless, the most politicized issue in corpus planning, alphabetical reform, had to be re-addressed. The point was that to transform back to the Latin script was important for Azerbaijan for different reasons, both linguistic and non-linguistic. The change could be of great sociopolitical importance. In 1991 the National Board of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Azerbaijan issued a decree on the renewal of the Azerbaijanian alphabet with Latin graphics. The decree suggested a stage by stage implementation of the new alphabet gradually broadening its functional range.

Considerable changes have taken place in the socio-political sphere during the period, which has considerably changed the ethno-linguistic situation in Azerbaijan. According to the data of the State Statistical Committee, after ten years of independence the titular nation, Azerbaijanians comprise 91% of the total population. In other words, the share of the titular nation grew from 82.7% in 1989 to 91% in 1999. In comparison with other newly established nation-states this figure is not considerable.

In some of them the share of non-titular (generally Russian-speaking) nations comprises less than 1% (Strel'cova 2001). The policy of building nation-states on the basis of the titular language seems to be the main reason that the countries emerging in the territories of the former USSR are becoming more and more monolingual.

Parallel to monolingualism, it is not difficult to witness something that logically seems impossible: the knowledge of minorities of their mother tongue is very high. According to data provided by the State Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Azerbaijanian language is the mother tongue for 99% of Azerbaijanians while 99.7% of Russians consider the Russian language as their mother tongue. Mother tongue competence of Udins (99.3%) and Tsakhurs (99.3%) is extremely high. Approximately the same is true for Avars and Georgians, whose competence in their mother tongue is more than 98%. A great majority of Lezgins (96.1%) and Talyshs (89.6%) consider the respective languages as their mother tongue. However, for only 32.1% of Ukrainians is the Ukrainian language the mother tongue (Statistical Yearbook 2002).

The legal actions on minority languages, especially those directed toward acquisition planning seems to be highly effective. It is noteworthy that the Azerbaijanian government has taken effective measures in language acquisition planning. For instance, "in the 1996-1997 academic year, 23,919 pupils were taught the Talysh language, 16,600 pupils were taught the Lezgin language, 4,082 pupils were taught the Avar language" (Pašaeva 1997). Moreover, newspapers, magazines, books, and dictionaries are published in the native languages of these ethnic minority groups. In 1996 alone there were published "books in the minority languages with the total circulation of 57,000 books". Among them were alphabets in six languages like Talysh (15,000 copies), Tat (5,000 copies), and Kurdish (2,000 copies) (Pašaeva 1997).

"Liberated" by globalization

Two developments are characteristic of the Azerbaijanian language in the age of globalization. On the one hand, the Russian language keeps decreasing its function as a donor language. On the other hand, linguistic imperialism has obtained a direct access to all domains of the Azerbaijanian language avoiding Russian as a filter language. The influence of the global language, English, can be witnessed in two main directions: replacement and displacement.

Empirical observation of language use in various means of mass media over the past ten years has revealed certain interesting tendencies. First of all, Anglicisms (i.e., English words or phrases that are used in another language) are used as synonyms to words previously borrowed from Arabic or Persian while the frequency of use of the latter has gradually decreased, which implies that at later stages Arabic and Persian words are likely to become archaisms. For instance, words like *konflikt* (conflict), *informasiya* (information), *provokasion/provokasiya* (provocation), *auksion* (auction) and *kompromis* (compromise) tend to be used more frequently than their previously borrowed synonyms *münagişə, məlumat, təxribat, hərrac* and *güzəşt* correspondingly. Moreover, it has been observed that nearly all recent neologisms are

of Anglo-American origin. They cover nearly all spheres of life: *eksklusiv* (exclusive), *tok-şou* (talk-show), *konseptual* (conceptual), *biznesmen* (businessman), *mer* (mayor), *korrektə* (correct), *imic* (image), *ofis* (office), *korrupsiya* (corruption), *mesaj* (message), *prezentasiya* (presentation), *missiya* (mission), *seminar-trening* (seminar-training), *monitoring* (monitoring), *brifing* (briefing), *grant* (grant), *blef* (bluff), *elektorat* (electorate), *spiker / eks spiker* (speaker / ex-speaker), *legitim* (legitimate), *loyal* (loyal), *şou-biznes* (show-business), *killer* (killer), etc.

Alongside the direct intrusion into the Azerbaijanian language, words of Anglo-American origin have obtained access as calques. For instance, money laundering is translated directly as *pulların yuyulması* or *kirli* or *çirkli pulların yuyulması* (*pul* 'money', *yuyulmasi* 'washing', *kirli / çirkli* 'dirty'). Yellow press is also directly translated as *sarı mətbuat* (*sarı* 'yellow', *mətbuat* 'press').

The ever-increasing influence of Anglo-American linguistic imperialism can be witnessed even in the facades of buildings in big cities. Bilingual inscriptions with Russian and Azerbaijanian are not seen anymore. English has already replaced Russian. In other words, English seems to be replacing Russian as a second language in Azerbaijan. Moreover, the pair *mağaza – magazin* ('shop' in Azerbaijan and Russian) has almost disappeared. The words 'market' (e.g. *Elektro market, Home market, Gloria mini-market*), 'shop' (e.g. *Carpet shop, Shop 777*), 'store' (e.g. *King's store*), *oil / oyl / petrol* (e.g. *Səlyan oyl, Həmid petrol*) are but a few examples.

The other direction, displacement of the Azerbaijanian language by the English language is obviously felt in education. Over the last ten years departments of English language teaching and translation have been mushrooming. Moreover, English as the language of instruction in the teaching of certain subject matter courses has become commonplace. Also, there is a tendency to establish 'American' universities where the language of instruction is English. 'English' elementary and secondary educational institutions are appearing on the basis of traditional elementary and secondary education. Language centers and private teachers of English, both native and nonnative, who promise to teach English within an extremely short period of time have been occupying a significant part of the advertisement sections of the local mass media.

There have been radical changes in the balance of the linguistic situation in Azerbaijan. According to the results of our questionnaire carried out with 500 students from five universities in Baku, the Russian language is a first language or second language for 17.8% of the respondents, while the percentage for their parents is 57.2% for the same questionnaire item. On the other hand, 47.8% of the respondents stated that they knew two languages, English and Russian, but for their parents the share of English is 5.8%. This implies that the process of replacing Russian with English has gained impetus in Azerbaijan. As for other European languages, German and French, the number of those who know them is very insignificant. Arabic and Persian, traditionally popular languages in the region, keep steadily decreasing.

Due to sociopolitical reasons, Russian has been diminishing its role as a filter mechanism for loanwords taken into the Azerbaijanian language directly from Eng-

lish. The survey covering the changes in the recent decade has clearly revealed a massive intrusion of Anglicisms into Azerbaijanian. As a result, the lexical stock of the language expands mainly at the expense of adding Anglo-Americanized words. Additionally, due to the power it possesses, English has become the most prestigious language in Azerbaijan since the knowledge of English relays moral and psychological power (Diamond 1999). The users of the English language symbolize the popular Western culture. Second of all, the English language has more instrumental value than the Azerbaijanian language. It means access to a better education or a good job. Thus, if the present situation continues for longer periods, the Azerbaijanian language may find it hard to compete with the English language on equal terms.

Conclusion

As can be inferred, a peripheral language is subjected to serious impacts of the dominant language no matter what setting it is in—colonial, imperial, or global. In all these settings, the peripheral language is the evident loser since it lacks power. While the imperial setting allows the existence of multi-centers, the global setting recognizes the legitimacy of one center. In other words, in the imperial setting there could be several dominant languages, whereas in the global setting, there is only one globally dominant language, English. Moreover, this global language leads local languages to homogeneity since it is the only donor language. Due to the acceleration of integration processes taking place both in the economical and social domains, the acceleration of homogenization seems inevitable.

References

1989. *Goskimitet SSSR po statistike. Itogi vsesojuznoj perepisi naseleniya.* Moskva: Goskom po statistike.

2002. *Statistical Yearbook of Azerbaijan.* Baku: The Statistical Committee of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Əliyeva, X. 1996. *Ortag Turk ədəbi dili problemi.* Baku: Tusi Pedagogical University. [Unpublished PhD dissertation.]

Balaev, A. 1992. *Azerbaidžanskoe nacional'noe dviženie.* Baku: Elm.

Daoust, D. 1997. Language planning and language reform. In: Coulmas, F. (ed.) *The handbook of sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 436-452.

Diamond, J. 1999. *Status and power in verbal interaction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Ferguson, C. A. 1996 *Sociolinguistic perspectives. Papers on language in society, 1959-1994.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. A. 2002. The new linguistic order. http://www.uoc.edu/humfil/articles/eng/fishman/fishman.html

Mamedov, A. 2000. Aspects of the contemporary ethnic situation in Azerbaijan. http://www.ca-c.org/journal/eng01_2000/05.mammedov.shtml

Osam, N. 1997. Dil kirlenmesine sayısal bir yaklaşım. In: *Dil Devriminden bu yana Türkcenin görünümü* (Dil Derneği Yayınları 7.) Dil Derneği: Ankara. 59-67.

Pašaeva, G. 1997. Voprosy jazykovoj politiki v nezavisimom Azerbaidžane. http://www.bsos.umd.edu/cidcm/partners/159.htm

Phillipson, R. 2001. Global English and local language policies: what Denmark needs. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 25, 1-24.

Risager, K. 1999 Globalization and internationalization – friends or foes? *Sprogforum* 13, 712.

Sen, A. 2002 Globalization: Past and present. http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/gei/text/senpubs/sen_globalization_past_present.pdf

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education—or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ & London, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Strel'cova, Y. 2001. Problemy russkogo jazyka i obrazovanija v rossijskix diasporax v novom zarubežie. In: Olkott, M. B. & Semenova, I. (eds.) *Jazyk i ėtničeskij konflikt*. Moskva: Gendalf. 51-59.

The Constitution of the Azerbaijanian Republic. http://geo.ya.com/travelimages/aconstit.html

Vahtre, L. & Vikberg, Y. 1991. *The Red Book of the peoples of the Russian and Soviet Empire*. Tallin: NGO Red Book.

Middle Chulym: Theoretical aspects, recent fieldwork and current state

K. David Harrison & Gregory D. S. Anderson

Harrison, K. David & Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2003. Middle Chulym: Theoretical aspects, recent fieldwork and current state. *Turkic Languages* 7, 245-256.

Based on a recent field trip, the authors report the existence of a small number of remaining speakers, and discuss various grammatical and sociolinguistic findings. Most importantly, this includes a naïve native orthography devised by a member of the Middle Chulym (Ös) community, subsequently abandoned under pressure from local Russians, but easily resurrected by its creator upon request. It is an ingenious and highly economical way of utilizing literacy in Russian to capture a phonologically very different language. This orthography with slight modification will serve as the basis for children's readers primers currently in production by the authors.

K. David Harrison, Linguistics Department, Swarthmore College, 500 College Avenue, Swarthmore, PA 19081-1397, U.S.A. E-mail: dharris2@swarthmore.edu

Gregory D. S. Anderson, Max-Planck-Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher Platz 6, D-04103 Leipzig. E-mail: altai_sayan_greg@hotmail.com

0. Introduction

This article presents results of fieldwork conducted in July 2003. We present the current state of the Middle Chulym language and speech community, a newly collected annotated text, a report of a native orthography, and some thoughts on the future prospects for the language.

The Middle Chulym people speak one of the most critically endangered and least documented native Siberian languages. The Middle Chulym nation (native ethnonym [øs] ~ [ø:s]), currently numbers 426 registered members. They reside in villages in or near their ancestral territory along the upper reaches of the Chulym river (native hydronym [øs] ~ [ø:s]) in Tomsk and Krasnojarsk districts. The Middle Chulym language belongs to the Turkic family and is a peripheral member of the Altai-Sayan areal grouping, though located geographically north and west of this mountain complex.

At the time of initial Russian incursion on Middle Chulym territory, the Lower Chulym speakers lived to the west and southwest, speakers of the Samoyedic language Sel'kup to the north and northeast, speakers of the Ob-Ugric language Khanty (Ostyak) to the northwest, speakers of Khakas (Turkic) to the southeast. Most sig-

nificantly, the Middle Chulym shared the same general area with speakers of the now-extinct Yeniseic languages Arin and Pumpokol. An extensive presence of Yeniseic hydronyms in the area reflects this substrate (e.g., *Tegul'det, Chindat*, with the characteristic Pumpokol word *det ~ dat* for 'river' underlined).

It seems likely that the Middle Chulym people arose from the linguistic assimilation to Turkic of former Yeniseic language speakers, and to a lesser extent Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic speakers, who were riverine subsistence fishers and hunters. Interestingly, the Turkic component appears itself to have been heterogeneous, reflecting both a more dominant Altai-Sayan Turkic component (presumably Khakas-like), from the southeast, and a less pronounced, more Tatar-like element moving up from the southwest. This combination of substrate components and the mixing of two substantially different Turkic varieties formed the unique system of present-day Middle Chulym.

Today, the Middle Chulym people are living in grinding poverty in small villages. The population is primarily engaged in fishing, small-scale gardening (cabbage and potatoes), animal husbandry (cows and chickens), hunting (bears, squirrels, rabbits) and gathering (berries, nuts). The use of a few traditional technologies (building fur-covered wooden skis for hunting, making hand-chiseled wooden canoes, net and trap fishing) is still evident.

Chulym people were dropped from census statistics as a distinct ethnic group after 1959 and reclassified as "Khakas". Some now accept this ethnonym despite acknowledging that they cannot understand the Khakas language. In the 1970's, the Chulym were forcibly consolidated into larger (Russian-speaking) settlements, under the government's village consolidation program, which was driven by in part by recurrent flooding of low-lying villages and in part by the perceived economic non-viability of small villages. In the process, the Chulym lost their concentrated population base and traditional language milieu, and became dispersed among dominant Russian populations in larger villages. However, in 1999 they regained separate ethnic status in Tomsk oblast' and were registered with the authorities (to be precise, the Department of Justice of Tomsk oblast') as an ethnic organization called "Čulymec" ([tʃulɯmjets], literally 'Chulym man'). This organization, run by an elected seven-member council, belongs in turn to the state-sponsored umbrella organization "The Association of the small-numbering peoples of the North". Some Chulym have expressed dissatisfaction with the representation provided them by this latter organization, which they perceive as being dominated by local ethnic Sel'kup and uninterested in improving the plight of the Chulym. Moreover, the change of legal status has to date yielded no tangible results in terms of cultural revitalization or improvement of their living conditions.

Table I outlines the ethnographic information about this poorly known Turkic-speaking people of central Siberia.

Table I: Basic Information on Middle Chulym

Community: [Middle] Chulym
Native ethnonym: *bistiŋ kiʃiler* ('our people')
Exonyms: 1. *xakas* 2. *jasatʃnije* (Russian 'tribute-payers')
Language: Middle Chulym (Altaic, Turkic, South Siberian)
Native designations for language: 1. *øs tili ~ ø:s tili,* 2. *tadar dili*
Ethnologue code: CHU
Status: critically endangered, moribund
Number of fluent speakers: probably as few as 40

1. New findings from expedition to the Chulym, July 2003

1.1. New materials collected

In July, 2003, under the auspices of ASLEP, the Altai-Sayan Language and Ethnography Project,[1] the authors undertook a two-week pilot visit to four Middle-Chulym speaking villages in Tegul'detskij rajon of Tomsk oblast', in the Russian Federation. There were no known audio or video recordings of the language before our pilot expedition in July 2003. During the pilot expedition, we made audio / video recordings of twelve fluent speakers, numbering about forty individual sessions, and representing approximately six hours total recorded materials. While the number of extant formal genres is quite small, we were able to collect the following: (i) greetings; (ii) songs, including a wool-spinning song; (iii) aphorisms; (iv) bear and moose hunting stories. Of informal and elicited genres, we collected (v) personal and biographical narratives; (vi) narrated demonstrations of how to use fur-covered skis, fishing lures, dugout wooden canoes and other cultural objects; (vii) spontaneous conversation; (viii) verbal and nominal paradigms embedded within sentences; and (ix) word lists including toponyms, body parts, colors, fauna, flora, kin terms, numerals, and other lexemes.

1.2. Current state of language use

We estimate there are about 40 native and fluent speakers of Middle Chulym, all now over the age of 50. We found just three households where Chulym is sometimes spoken as a language of casual communication among adults. Outside of households, we found Chulym spoken when any two or more fluent adults meet each other, whether outdoors or in a house, and in some cases despite the presence of Russian monolinguals. Clearly, the range of speaking situations and genres has constricted. For example, six speakers told us that they did indeed remember their parents or grandparents telling stories, tales, and singing songs, but none of them

[1] Generous funding of this research and fieldwork by Volkswagen-Stiftung is gratefully acknowledged.

claimed to remember any of these. Three speakers were able to produce song couplets (Russian *častuški*) and one middle generation speaker produced a single aphorism. All speakers we interviewed could on request produce wordlists, verbal paradigms, and sentences. Nearly all were able to tell a brief narrative, e.g. their personal history, an event, etc. Four speakers demonstrated and described the use of traditional technologies (e.g. wool spinning, wooden skis, medicinal plants, hunting).

1.3. Speaker demographics

The twelve fluent speakers we recorded range in age from 51 (born 1952) to 94 (born 1908). Dialect diversity is somewhat surprisingly still evident despite the small number of total speakers. During the preliminary field visit, we stayed in four Middle Chulym-speaking communities. The villages that we visited, with numbers of fluent speakers counted by us include the following:

(1)	Belyj jar	3	Ozernoe	5
	Novošumylovo	6	Tegul'det	8

There is exactly one household in Beliy Yar where Chulym is the preferred language.

In addition, there are three villages that we have not yet visited, which are reported to have a small number of speakers as well. These villages, with the reported numbers of speakers that we hope to find there during the next field session are

(2)	Beregaevo	3 to 5
	Pasečnoe	3 to 5
	Tjuxtet	2 to 3

The first village is in Tomsk oblast' while the other two are found across the border in Krasnojarsk Kraj.

1.4. Prospects for revitalization

Middle Chulym is clearly moribund, with no reported fluent speakers under age 50. We found no passive or semi-speakers under the age of 30. We found four passive speakers ("I can understand when the old people speak, but I can't speak the language") in their early to mid 30s. Among the middle generations there is a strong sense of loss at the passing of the language and an active desire to see what measures can be taken to begin this. One step in this direction is discussed in section 3 below.

1.5. Overall assessment

Currently there are still enough fluent / competent speakers to produce a solid grammatical description and annotated video recordings. In our opinion, within five to eight years from now it will become extremely difficult if not impossible to ade-

quately document this language. As in the case of many endangered languages, we feel a sense of urgency is warranted. We therefore plan to continue our field documentation at the earliest possible opportunity.

2. Some linguistic findings

During a pilot field trip in July 2003, the authors verified a significant portion of published statements on the grammar of the language and collected new data.

2.1. Tense

There exists a large number of verb forms, some of which lack parallels in other Turkic languages of the region, or even any other known or documented Turkic language. We noted, for example, a rare present in *-ibil* (3) and an unusual future tense form in *-lik* (4, 5), and its corresponding negative future *-bik* (6). (Note that each datum given herein is followed by the initials of the consultant who provided it, as well as the date and page number from our field notebooks. A full list of consultants' names, birth years and villages is given in 4).

(3) *Po moγalak tur-ubul.*
this bear stand-PRES
'This bear is standing (there).' [I.S. 7/17 p. 3]

(4) *Män al-lik-im palik.*
I take-FUT-1 fish
'I will take (some) fish.' [A.B. 7/16, p.2]

(5) *Iften-nik-im.*
work-FUT-1
'I will work.' [A.B. 7/16, p.2]

(6) *Kør-byk-ter.*
see-NEG.FUT-PL
'They won't see.' [A.B. 7/16, p.1]

Both the present and the (positive and negative) future are commonly used, we found, by Middle Chulym speakers. One challenge we encountered in the tense / aspect / mood system is that in addition to the present tense in *-ibil*, we noted at least four other forms that seem to function as present tense forms, as follows:

(7) *-e(j)di / -adi* A present tense, also used in the narrative past (8).
-iptir / -tir A progressive tense, also seems to have a non-progressive function (9).

-tʃi / tʃadi A present tense, contrastive function not yet established.
-ibila tʃadi A compound present tense, contrastive function not yet established (10).

(8) *Kajnaar bar-eydi-ŋ?*
to.where go-PRES.II-2
'Where are you going?' [A.B. 7/17 p. 4]

(9) *Kajdin kee-ptir sän?*
from.where come-PRES.III 2
'Where do you come from?' [A.B. 7/17 p. 5]

(10) *A juditʃ sedlo-zun dɪŋne-bɪl-ɪ tʃadi.*
well Yudich saddle-3.ACC hold.tight-PRES-CV AUX
'Well Yudich is holding for dear life onto his saddle.' [I.S. 7/17 p. 4]

Some of these are additionally used as a narrative present in what are properly past tense contexts. Assuming these are not due solely to obsolescence and collapsing contrasts among verbal paradigms, the nuances of these multiple, overlapping present tense forms remain to be investigated in future fieldwork.

2.3. Discourse reference

A switch reference system—marking the introduction of new referents in contrast to previously introduced ones—operates at the discourse level but has no unique morphological marker. Instead, it uses the converb *-p* to denote that multiple verbs in a sequence have the same subject. Long sequences of verbs with *-p* followed by a single inflected verb is characteristic of same subject forms in the Middle Chulym narrative style.

(11) *Mæn pir kanza tarta-p.*
I one pipe pull-CV
'I smoked one pipe (of tobacco).'

(12) *Anzondɯn pɯɯtʃaɣ ap anɯ soj-up.*
then knife take-CV 3.ACC skin-CV
'Then I took out my knife, skinned it.'

(13) *Eed-in kæme-zi-m-ge sa-p æp-ke tʃan pa-ɣa-m.*
meat-3-ACC boat-3-1-DAT put-CV house-DAT return TLOC-PST-1
'Put its meat in my boat and returned home.' [V.G. 7/19/03]

2.5. Encoding motion

Some evidence for the use of the translocative (Anderson 2002) is found in our Middle Chulym notes.

(14) *Uz-ip bar-is-xan-nar.*
fly-CV TLOC-PFV-PAST-PL
'They flew away.' [A.B. 7/15/2003 p. 6]

(15) *Aalɯɲʃ oydaʃ pa-ɣan.*
moose fell.over TLOC-PST
'The moose fell over.' [V. G. 7/19/2003 p. 8]

2.6. Benefactive voice

Instances of self-benefactive / subject version (Anderson 2001) are attested in our field recordings.

(16) *sän a:-p al-ir-di-ŋ*
you take-CV SUBJ.VERS-FUT-ASSRTV.PST-2
'you took, will have taken' [IS/AB 7/16/03 p. 4]

(17) *Tʃakʃɯ-lɯn køz-yp tɯŋle-di-p-tʃa-p al-ɣa-m men.*
good-ADV see-CV boom-VSF-CAUS-CV AUX-CV SBEN-PST-1 I
'... Aimed well, then made it go boom!'

Based on other Turkic languages, we would have predicted the existence of such forms, but they had not been described as such in the literature.

3. Middle Chulym literature

Middle Chulym is an unwritten language. Indeed, it is one of the few indigenous Siberian languages never to have been committed to writing, even during the quasi-enlightened period following the founding of the USSR in the 1920s and 1930s, when the state devised pedagogical materials for numerous, previously unwritten native Siberian languages. Middle Chulym has thus become endangered in part as a result of neglect and open hostility from the state during the twentieth century. In the 1940s, with the establishment of the "second mother tongue" policy, children were rounded up into boarding schools and forbidden to speak their mother tongue (Krivonogov 1998), even beaten if they did so. We collected from Chulym community members a number of first-hand reports about their experiences of ethnic and linguistic repression that led to the rapid abandonment of the language.

While lacking a standardized orthography, or indeed any recognized status at all, it is not the case, we discovered, that no one has ever attempted to write the Middle Chulym language. An important finding of our pilot survey of the language was the previously unknown existence of the prior invention and continuing use of a naive orthography by one speaker. Mr. Vasilij Mixajlovič Gabov, born 1952, the youngest fully fluent speaker we found and one of the better speakers overall, related to us how he had begun keeping a daily hunting journal written in Chulym. He began this project in the late 1980's and continued for three successive years during winter hunting seasons while spending extended periods at his hunting lodge. In the proc-

ess of writing, he developed his own orthography, ingeniously adapting the Russian alphabet to this end. Unfortunately, Gabov later discarded his own journal and stopped writing. He did so, he reports, after being ridiculed by a Russian acquaintance for attempting to write in his native tongue. However, he still remembers his writing system and readily produced a written version of a moose-hunting story (see below). We outline the writing system here and reproduce the moose story below.

3.1. A native orthography for Middle Chulym

Aside from Russian letters, Gabov's orthography employs the following orthographic conventions:

(18)	Cyrillic character(s)	Phonetic value(s)
	{я}, {a...ь}	[æ]
	{ё}, {o...ь}	[ø]
	{ю}	[ju], [y]
	{э е} (word initial)	[e:]
	{и}	[i], [ɯ] (after {ч} or {ш} only)
	{ы}	[ɯ], [i] (in declined forms only)
	{н}	[n], [ŋ]
	{г}	[g], [ɣ]

We propose one change to Gabov's orthography to recognize the important phoneme [ŋ] in Middle Chulym:

(19)	Cyrillic character(s)	Phonetic value
	{нг}	[ŋ]

The following comments should be made on the system evinced in Gabov's orthography. First, vowel length, though contrastive in Chulym, is only sporadically represented. This could be modified by simply using doubled vowel symbols (e.g. {aa}). The potential problem of representing Chulym front rounded vowels is adequately handled as follows. A single soft sign {ь} appearing after the coda of the initial syllable denotes that all vowels in the word are front vowels, e.g. {кёзюмь} = [køzym]. Similarly, the presence of any Russian character representing a glide + vowel combination (e.g. {я}) indicates that any other vowels in the word are to be pronounced as front vowels. The frontness of all vowels in a word, may therefore be signaled by the presence of a single soft sign *or* a single palatalized vowel symbol anywhere in the word. This is a highly economical, simple solution that avoids the use of diacritics or extra letters.

Though we did not have the opportunity to test Gabov's orthography in the field, we assume it can be learned and read easily by other Chulym speakers, nearly all of whom are literate in Russian. Further, our research on Tofan (Anderson & Harrison, forthcoming), a similarly small and endangered Turkic language of Siberia, suggests that orthographies that make only minimal departures from known

writing systems are more likely to win wide acceptance among speakers. Any departure from the familiar Russian system, even though it may encode greater phonetic / phonemic detail, is less likely to be accepted. In Tofan, for example, the introduction by Rassadin (1994) of seven new, non-Russian letters evoked negative attitudes from Tofan speakers and may well have been the cause of speakers' failure to embrace the proposed orthography. In the course of two year's fieldwork on Tofan, we found only two speakers actively using a version of Rassadin's orthography.

We propose that Gabov's orthography is the current best solution for writing Middle Chulym. It may well represent the only real chance for an orthographic system to gain acceptance while speakers remain. With this in mind, at the request of the Middle Chulym council, we have produced a Middle Chulym storybook that adopts Gabov's system with only very minor emendations to render it internally consistent, and without the introduction of any new letters. The storybook (Anderson & Harrison 2003) will be the first book to be published in Middle Chulym. Gabov's orthography will also serve as the basis for introducing literacy to the Middle Chulym via a planned elementary primer or ABC book requested by the Chulym council.

3.2. Shooting a moose

The following story was told and written down by Vasilij Mixajlovič Gabov (born 1952), at his home in Tegul'det village, Tomsk region, Russian Federation on 18 July 2003. It was recorded in digital video. The spoken and written versions differ slightly, in that the spoken version is prefaced by three lines, which translate as "Listen, boys, I will tell you a story. When I was young ...". We reproduce the written version herein.

3.3. Full written text in native orthography

Артян туруп, кунгарагы шикпанча
мян мылтыгын ап чердюпскем кольге.
Кольдя мен камям полган.
Камя олуруп, амьда парыдым.
Анды корьзям алыч суудун шиктыр,
мян камезын кырга пурнуп, мылтыгын ап
чакшилын кёзюмь, тынледыбжаб алгам мен.
Алыч ойдашпаган.
Мян пир канза тартап, анзондын пичаг ап аны союп,
эедын камезимге сап апьке чан пагам.
Мены апьта апьчим угланеры сагынганнар.

3.4. Interlinearized annotated text [2]

Артян	туруп,	кун	гарагы	шикпанча [3]
ærtæn	*tur-up*	*kyn*	*garag-ɯ*	*ʃɯk-pa:ntʃa*
morning	stand-CV	day	eye-3	rise-NEG.CV

'I got up in the morning before the sun rose,'

мян	мылтыгын	ап	чердюпскем	кольге.
mæn	*mɯltɯγ-ɯn*	*a-p*	*tʃerd-yps-ke-m*	*køl-ge*
I	gun-3.ACC	take-CV	go-PFV-PST-1	lake-DAT

'took my gun and set off to the lake.'

Кольдя	мен	камям	полган.
køl-dæ	*me:ŋ*	*kæmæ-m*	*pol-γan*
lake-LOC	I(-GEN)	boat-1	be-PST

'My boat was at the lake.'

Камя	олуруп,	амьда	парыдым.
kæmæ	*olur-up*	*æmdæ*	*par-ɯdɯ-m*
boat	sit-CV	now	go-PRES-1

'I sat in my boat and set off.'

Анды	корьзям	алыч	суудун	шиктыр,
andɯ	*kør-zæ-m*	*aalɯtʃ*	*su:-dun*	*ʃɯk-tɯr*
now	see-COND-1	moose	water-ABL	come.out-PROG

'Then I look: a moose is coming out of the water.'

мян	камезын	кырга	пурнуп,	мылтыгын	ап
mæn	*kæmææ-zin*	*kɯr-ga*	*purn-up*	*mɯltɯγ-ɯn*	*a-p*
I	boat-3-ACC	bank-DAT	land.boat-CV	gun-3-ACC	take-CV

'I landed the boat on the bank,'

чакшилын	кёзюмь,	тынледыбжаб	алгам	мен.
tʃakʃɯ-lɯn	*køz-yp*	*tɯŋle-di-p-tʃa-p*	*al-γa-m*	*men*
good-ADV	see-CV	boom-VSF-CAUS-CV	AUX-CV SBEN-PST-1	I

'took my gun and aimed well, then made it go boom!'

[2] The IPA transcription is based on audio recordings of V. Gabov reading the text, and on elicitation of word forms. Our transcription shows vowel length, word boundaries, and vowel qualities that are absent (or differ) from the native orthographic text.

[3] {и} appears here because {ы} may not appear after {ш} in Russian. In Chulym, the word [ʃɯkpa:ntʃa] contains only back vowels, and thus obeys vowel harmony. Note also the use of the scope-less negative in this formation to mark 'before'. This kind of syntactic interference is found in Yeniseic languages (Anderson 2003a) and various Siberian Turkic languages as well, e.g. Khakas (Anderson 2003b).

Алыч ойдаш паган.
aalɯʃ oydaʃ pa-ɣan
moose fell.over TLOC-PST
'The moose fell over.'

Мян пир канза тартап,
mæn pir kanza tartap
I one pipe pull-CV
'I smoked one pipe (of tobacco),'

анзондын пичаг ап аны союп,
anzondɯn pɯʧaɣ a-p anɯ soj-up
then knife take-CV 3.ACC skin-CV
'then I took out my knife, skinned it,'

эедын камезимге сап апьке чан пагам.
eedin kæme-zi-m-ge sa-p æp-ke ʧan[4] *pa-ɣa-m*
meat-3-ACC boat-3-1-DAT put-CV house-DAT return TLOC-PST-1
'put its meat in my boat and returned home.'

Мены апьта апьчим угланеры сагынганнар.
men-i æp-te æpʧi-m uglanerɯ saɣɯn-ɣan-nar
I-ACC house-LOC wife-1 children-PL-3 wait.for-PST-PL
'My wife and children were waiting for me at home.'

Note, as mentioned above, that both in Chulym speech and in Gabov's writing system, we find unsystematic and sporadic departures from expected patterns of vowel harmony, for example, in the form [*uglanerɯ*] children-PL-3.

3.5. The first book in Chulym

The story rendered above is one of three short tales that are included in the first ever book in Chulym, entitled Ось Чомактар [øs tʃomaqtar] 'Our (= Chulym) tales'. The stories found in this book include the following.

Hunting a bear (as told by Ivan Skoblin)
Shooting a moose (as told by Vasilij Gabov)
The shamaness (as told by Varvara Budeeva)

To produce this collaborative publication we first recorded the texts and translated them into Russian (and English). The third text was originally collected by R. M. Birjukovič in the early 1970s (Il'jašenko & Kim et al. 1998). We copied it from her

[4] Note the Khakas-like use of a zero allomorph of the *-p* converb before consonant-initial auxiliary verbs (Anderson 1998) in this text.

notebook and checked it with the same speaker who had originally provided it. We had the stories read in Russian to groups of children in Novošumylovo village, Tegul'detskij rajon. These children then offered drawings that they felt appropriately went with the stories. We are now in the process of completing the editing and lay-out of this community-authored book. This is to be supplemented by a full primer for the language that is currently also in production.

4. Consultants

Initials	Given name, surname	Birth year	Village
AB	Anna Budeeva	1932	Ozernoe
VB	Varvara Budeeva	1908	Novošumylovo
VG	Vasilij Gabov	1952	Tegul'det
IS	Ivan Skoblin	1930	Ozernoe

5. References

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 1998. *Xakas.* (Languages of the World Materials 251.) München: LINCOM EUROPA.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2001. Subject version and object version in Tofa auxiliary verb constructions. *Turkic Languages* 5, 240-269.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2002. *Auxiliary verb constructions in Altai-Sayan Turkic.* (Turcologica 51.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2003a. Yeniseic languages from a Siberian areal perspective. In Vajda, E. & Anderson, G. D. S. (eds.) *Studia Yeniseica: Typological studies on Yeniseic.* [Special issue of *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung.*] 12-39.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. 2003b. *Language contact in South Central Siberia.* (Turcologica 54.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. & Harrison, K. David 2001. *Tòfa üleger* [Tofa tales.] *(As told by the Tofa community elders.)* [Published by the Altai-Sayan Language and Ethnography Project and the Tofa Nation.]

Anderson, Gregory D. S. & Harrison, K. David 2003. *Ös chomaktar: Middle Chulym* tales [As told by Ivan Skoblin, Vasilij Gabov and Varvara Budeeva.] Leipzig: Altai-Sayan Language and Ethnography Project.

Anderson, Gregory D. S. & Harrison, K. David (forthcoming). *Grammar of Tofa: a Turkic language of Siberia.*

Il'jašenko, Irina A. & Kim, Aleksandra A. et al. 1998. *Katalog polevyx zapisej jazykov narodov Sibiri (Fondy Laboratorii jazykov narodov Severa Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo universiteta).* [Catalog of field recordings of the languages of the peoples of Siberia (The archives of the Laboratory of Peoples of the North, Tomsk State Pedagogical University)] Tomsk: TGPU.

Kinkade, M. Dale 1991. The decline of native languages in Canada. In: Robins, Robert H. & Uhlenbeck, Eugenius M. (eds.) *Endangered languages.* Oxford: Berg. 157-176.

Krivonogov, V. P. 1998. *Ėtničeskie processy u maločislennyx narodov Srednej Sibiri.* [Ethnic processes among the small-numbering peoples of Central Siberia.] Krasnojarsk: Krasnojarskij Gos. Ped. Universitet.

Paired words in Yakut (Sakha)

Fuyuki Ebata

Ebata, Fuyuki 2003. Paired words in Yakut (Sakha). *Turkic Languages* 7, 257-267.

Yakut (Sakha) displays numerous so-called "paired words" which have been regarded as one type of compounds. However, unlike compounds, paired words can take derivational and/or inflectional suffixes both on the first and the second members. The present paper aims to describe the morphological and semantic characteristics of paired words and to demonstrate that they have many characteristics in common not with compounds, as has been claimed, but with echo words.*

Fuyuki Ebata, Department of Linguistics, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo. 113-0033, Japan. E-mail: fuyuki@gengo.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp

1. Introduction

Many Turkic languages have a type of asyntactic compounds called *hendiadys* (Johanson 1998: 50). Yakut,[1] one of the Turkic languages in Siberia, also has this type of 'compound words', which are called 'paired words' among Russian scholars (*parnye slova* in Russian). Paired words (hereafter abbreviated as PW) occur frequently in both colloquial speech and written materials in Yakut. PW in Yakut have been mentioned in several works such as Xaritonov (1947), Ubrjatova (1948) and Korkina et al. (1982). However, much remains to be examined. The purpose of this paper is to describe the characteristics of PW and consequently to show their position in Yakut grammar.

* An earlier version of this paper was read at the 124th meeting of the Lingusitic Society of Japan (2002). Comments and questions from the audience were very helpful in rivising my paper. The data were collected mainly during my fieldwork in Yakutsk from July to August 2001. I wish to express my gratitude to Nadezhda Matsukawa and Natalia Neustroeva for their patient help as language consultants. Special thanks are due to Professor Tooru Hayasi for valuable comments and advice. I would also like to thank Yeong Kwong Leong Samuel and Yasuhiro Kojima, who provided many critical comments.

[1] Yakut is spoken in the Sakha Republic (Yakutia). Sakha is also used as a name of the Yakut people and their language. The Yakut phoneme inventory is as follows: /p, t, k, b, d, g, tʃ, dʒ, s [s ~ h], χ [χ ~ q], ʁ, m, n, ɲ, ŋ, r, l, j, a, o, e, œ, ɯ, u, i, y, aa, oo, ee, œœ, ɯɯ, uu, ii, yy, ɯa, uo, ie, yœ/.

First, I would like to give a simple example of PW. (In the examples below, PW are enclosed by brackets, and the underlined parts in the translation correspond to them.)

(1) *[Kyn ɯj]* *aas-an* *is-er.*
[day month] pass-CV AUX-PRES.3SG
'Time passes.'

In (1), we have an example of PW *kyn ɯj* 'time', which consists of two nouns *kyn* 'day' and *ɯj* 'month', but has a single meaning 'time'. Such an example may remind us of a compound. But in terms of inflection and/or derivation, PW show differences from compounds.

(2a) *Kini-tten* *[kyn-ym* *ɯj-ɯm]* *taχs-ar.*
he[2]-ABL [day-1SG.POSS month-1SG.POSS] go out-PRES.3SG
'My time is exhausted by him.'

*(2b) *Kini-tten* *[kyn* *ɯj-ɯm]* *taχs-ar.*
he-ABL [day month-POSS1SG] go out-PRES.3SG

*(2c) *Kini-tten* *[kyn-ym* *ɯj]* *taχs-ar.*
he-ABL [day-POSS.1SG month] go out-PRES.3SG

PW can take inflectional and/or derivational suffixes, but unlike normal compounds, each component of PW must take a suffix of the same function, i.e., both **kyn ɯj-ɯm* in (2a) and **kyn-ym ɯj* in (2c) are ungrammatical. However, in the case of normal compounds, only the latter component takes an inflectional and/or derivational suffix. An example of this is *altan ot* 'dandelion' shown in (3a).

(3a) *altan* *ot-um*
copper grass-1SG.POSS
'my dandelion'

*(3b) *altan-ɯm* *ot-um*
copper-1SG.POSS grass-1SG.POSS

In the following example, *kelii barɯɯ* 'coming and going' is a deverbal noun.

(4) *[Kel-ii*[3] *bar-ɯɯ]* *yksee-te.*
[come-DER go-DER] increase-NPAST
'Coming and going increased.'

[2] In this paper, 'he' is, for convenience's sake, used consistently as third person pronoun both in the glosses and in the translations.
[3] This suffix makes deverbal nouns.

PW can be found in all parts of speech—nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, onomatopoeias, pronouns and numerals. Components of PW may not always be free forms with a lexical meaning of their own. For example, the second component *kœjyyr* of *yœn kœjyyr* 'worm' is never used independently.[4]

(5) *[Yœn-ner-ten kœjyyr-der-ten] kuttan-abɯn.*
[worm-PL-ABL ?-PL-ABL] be afraid of-PRES.1SG
'I am afraid of worms.'

Ebata (2001) examined the descriptions of PW in Ubrjatova (1948) and Korkina et al. (1982), and summed up the features of PW as follows. Hereafter, I would like to call the first component of PW X, the second Y.

(a) PW consist of two different words.
(b) Each component of PW must take the same suffixes (both in derivation and in inflection).
(c) The meaning of PW is not the sum of two components.
(d) PW, together with X and Y are all of the same part of speech.

2. Problems

Ubrjatova (1948) regards Yakut PW as one type of compounds. Surely PW have some features common to compounds. But if we regard PW as a type of compounds, we are then confronted with three problems:

(1) In Yakut, like other Turkic languages, only the last component of a compound takes inflectional and/or derivational suffixes, while the preceding components never do. In contrast, both components of PW must take inflectional and/or derivational suffixes.
(2) In Yakut, compound words must reflect the syntactic structure of Yakut grammar. But this is not the case with X and Y of PW.
(3) Compounds may consist of more than two components. But PW always consist of two components.

So far, I have examined the morphological features of PW. In the following section, I will discuss the semantic features of PW. The second problem, which relates to the syntactic structure of PW, will be discussed in detail in section 5.

3. Semantic types of paired words

In this section all PW in my data are classified by the two criteria given below.

[4] If a component of PW is not used independently and has no lexical meaning of its own, it is glossed with '?'.

(1) Whether X and Y have their own lexical meanings by themselves.
(2) Semantic relation between X, Y and PW.

3.1. Both X and Y have their own lexical meanings

3.1.1. PW is synonymous with X

Of the examples of PW that I could collect so far, 30 examples may be assigned to this category. In passing, Ubrjatova (1948: 307) says that "PW are often seen in modern Yakut literature". Korkina et al. (1982: 113) remark that "they (i.e. PW) are particularly frequent in the words of poetry". It is true that PW have such a stylistic feature. In the present paper, however, we leave problems of the style open and try to describe the characteristics of PW in colloquial speech, in which the use of PW is not infrequent at all.

The meaning of PW is similar to that of X, but it is not always identical. Let us take *sirej χaraχ* 'face' as an example. The PW *sirej χaraχ* 'face' and its first component *sirej* 'face' have basically the same meaning.

(6) *Sirej-e* *delbi* *kirtij-bit.*
face-POSS.3SG very become dirty-RPAST.3SG
'His face became very dirty.'

(7) *[Sirej-e* *χaraʁ-a]* *delbi* *kirtij-bit.*
face-POSS.3SG eye-POSS.3SG very become dirty-RPAST.3SG
'His face became very dirty.'

But in certain contexts, the PW *sirej χaraχ* can mean 'facial expression', which its first component *sirej* 'face' never does.

(8) *Kini* *sirej-e* *sɯmnaʁas.*
he face-POSS.3SG soft-COP.3SG
'His face feels soft.'

(9) *Kini* *[sirej-e* *χaraʁ-a]* *sɯmnaʁas.*
he [face-POSS.3SG eye-POSS.3SG] soft-COP.3SG
'He has a gentle look on his face.' (lit.: 'His facial expression is soft.')

Similar examples are given below. We can see in these examples that PW generally have more abstract meanings than X.

(10) *Kini* *yle-te* *ytʃygej.*
he work-POSS.3SG good-COP.3SG
'His work is good.'

(11) *Kini* *[yle-te* *χamnas-a]* *ytʃygej.*
he [work-POSS.3SG salary-POSS.3SG] good-COP.3SG
'His working style is good.'

(12) *Dʒie-bit* *χajdaʁ-ɯj.*
house-POSS.1PL how-QP
'How is our house (itself)?'

(13) *[Dʒie-bit* *uop-put]* *χajdaʁ-ɯj.*
[house-POSS.1PL fire-POSS.1PL] how-QP
'How is our home (and our family, etc.)?'

It is worth mentioning that a 'whole-part' relation can be recognized between X and Y of several PW, namely as follows.

sirej χaraχ	'face'	('face' + 'eye')
taŋas sap	'clothes'	('clothes' + 'thread')
yle χamnas	'work'	('work' + 'salary')
yp χartʃɯ	'wealth'	('wealth' + 'money')
yp χamnas	'wealth'	('wealth' + 'salary')

Some PW have negative connotations. For instance, *uu χaar* 'water', which consists of *uu* 'water' and *χaar* 'snow', can represent 'tears', 'snivel' and 'melting snow', etc. We can say that these meanings have negative connotations. But *uu χaar* 'water' cannot represent meanings which do not have negative connotations, for example, 'a glass of water'.

3.1.2. X and Y are synonymous

PW of this category have almost the same meaning as X and Y. (14) is often used at the beginning of a chat.

(14) *Tuoχ* *[sonun* *nuomas]* *baar-ɯj.*
what [news news] existence-QP
'What is the news?' or 'What news is there?'

In some examples of PW of this type, the order of the components may be reversed without changing the meaning of PW. For instance, both (15a) *maχtal basɯɯba* 'gratitude' and (15b) *basɯɯba maχtal* 'gratitude' are used as PW.

(15a) *[maχtal* *basɯɯba]*
[gratitude gratitude]
'gratitude'

(15b) *[basɯɯba* *maχtal]*
[gratitude gratitude]
'gratitude'

3.1.3. X and Y are antonymous

The meaning of PW of this category does not correspond to X or Y. PW of this category have general or common meanings. The semantic range of the whole PW is often larger than that of the sum of X and Y.

(16) *[Sajɯn-nar-ɯ kɯsɯn-nar-ɯ] biir taŋas-ɯnan sɯrɯt-tɯm.*
[summer-CACC winter-CACC] one clothes-INST live-1SG.NPAST
'I wear the same set of clothing throughout the year.'

The PW *sajɯn kɯsɯn* represents not only 'summer and winter', but also 'spring and fall', that is, *sajɯn kɯsɯn* denotes 'throughout the year'. As is shown in (16), a pair of antonyms can have general or common meaning. Another example is shown below.

(17) *Bu taŋas kirtij-en [yryŋ-e*
this clothes become dirty-CV [white-3SG.POSS

χara-ta] billi-bet buol-but.
black-3SG.POSS] be seen-VN.PRES.3SG.NEG become-3SG.RPAST
'These clothes became dirty and their color became unrecognizable.'

According to my consultant, the original color of the clothes in (17) may not be white or black. It can be yellow or other colors.

3.1.4. PW is a hypernym of X and Y

The semantic range of the PW of this category is larger than that of the sum of X and Y. In (18), *kinige kumaaʁɯ* 'books, papers, etc.' may indicate not only 'books and papers', but also 'photos and newspapers etc.'

(18) *Min bygyn dʒie-b-er uruk*
I today house-POSS.1SG-DAT old

[kinige-ler-bi-n kumaaʁɯ-lar-bɯ-n] berij-dim
[book-PL-POSS.1SG-ACC paper-PL-POSS.1SG-ACC] put in order-NPAST.1SG
'Today I put in order my old books, papers, etc. at home.'

In my opinion, the meaning of *kinige kumaaʁɯ* 'books, papers etc.' is very similar to that of *kitap mitap* 'books and such' in Turkish (Swift 1963: 121).

Let us take another example: *bɯɯsaa abɯraa* 'to help'. *Bɯɯsaa* denotes 'to rescue from danger', *abɯraa* denotes 'to aid by concrete means'. These two verbs (which have less general meanings than 'to help') form PW with a more general meaning 'to help'.

(19) *ɯaraχan* *kem-m-er* *kini*
hard time-1SG.POSS-DAT he

mieχe *meldʒi* *[bɯɯsɯɯ-r* *abɯrɯɯ-r].*
I.DAT always [rescue-PRES.3SG aid-PRES.3SG]
'When I am in difficulty, he always helps me.'

3.1.5. Other cases

Four examples in my data remain unclassified into any of the four groups above, since no clear semantic correspondence can be recognized. Among them, one rather unique example is (20).

(20) *[ije* *χara]*
[mother black]
'entire, whole'

3.2. Only X has its own meaning

In most cases, PW of this category have almost the same meanings as their X.

(21) *[baaj* *duol]*
[rich ?]
'rich'

In some cases, PW have negative connotations:

(22) *[sɯt* *sɯmar]*
[smell ?]
'bad smell, odor'

(23) *[Dʒysyn-y* *bodo-nu]* *kœr-œn* *tur-an* *tuoχ* *die-χ-χe-nij.*
[appearance-ACC ?-ACC] see-CV AUX-CV what say-VN.FUT-DAT-QP
'Seeing your awkwardness, (I don't know) what to say.'

It is worth noting that these examples of devaluation do not follow the semantic characterization of PW in previous studies such as Xaritonov (1947: 127), where it is stated that PW always denote larger concepts than their individual components.

3.3. Only Y has its own meaning

No examples of this type are found in my data. Ubrjatova (1948: 306) shows two examples, which my consultants do not accept. In modern Yakut at least it seems that PW of this pattern do not exist. (24) and (25) are taken from Ubrjatova (1948: 306).

(24) *[isi χosu]*
[? blame]
'to blame'

(25) *[sir tal]*
[? choose]
'to favor'

3.4. Neither X nor Y have their own meaning

The meanings of PW of this category cannot be related with X nor Y, since neither X nor Y is used as an individual lexical form.

(26) *[aas tuor] oloχ*
[? ?] life
'lack life'

(27) *[tutun χabɯs]*
[? ?]
'to move quickly'

4. Semantic characteristics of paired words

In section 3 we examined the chief semantic characteristics of PW. The following are the main points:

(1) PW may have more abstract meanings than their components.
(2) PW may denote general, common meanings.
(3) PW sometimes carry negative connotations.

It is also clear that X plays a more important role than Y in determining the meaning of PW. This is because:

(1) If both X and Y have lexical meanings of their own, X's meaning is more likely to be reflected in the PW's meaning than Y.
(2) There are many PW whose X has a lexical meaning of its own while Y does not. But there are no PW (in the author's data) whose Y has a lexical meaning of its own while X does not.

In determining the meaning of compounds, in contrast, the second component seems to play a more important role in languages such as Yakut.

5. Comparison with compound words

In this section PW are compared with compound words in terms of their internal syntactic structure. As is noted in section 2, X and Y of PW do not reflect any aspect of Yakut syntactic structure, while compound words must do so.

For example, one type of compound nouns is parallel to the syntactic construction 'adjective + noun'.

(28) *mas dʒie*
tree house
'a wooden house'

Another type of compound nouns is parallel to the syntactic construction 'possessor + possession'.

(29) *Tujaara kinige-te*
Tujaara book-3SG.poss
'Tujaara's book'

(30) *dʒykeebil uot-a*
Yukaghir fire-3SG.Poss
'aurora (*lit.* the fire of Yukaghir)'

Compound verbs are parallel to the syntactic construction 'full verb + auxiliary verb'.

(31) *aaʁ-an kœr*
read-CV look
'to try to read'

We can recognize from these examples that normal Yakut compound words seem to be syntactic phrases. In contrast, X and Y of PW are not parallel to any syntactic relation of words in Yakut grammar. If we regard PW as a type of compound, we may say that PW are asyntactic compounds (see Bloomfield 1933: 232-235), and the other type of compound words are syntactic compounds.

6. Comparison with echo-words

There is a rather large number of PW of the reduplicational type, for instance, *œjdœœχ tœjdœœχ* 'clever'. In this type, Y is produced from X by a certain morphonological process. The two major patterns of morphonological process are summarized below.

(a) To replace CV of the first syllable of Y with /i-/. (As a result, the following vowels alternate according to vowel harmony.)

kepsee ipsee 'to talk' (*kepsee* 'to talk')
χamsaa imsee 'to move' (*χamsaa* 'to move')

(b) Prothesis or alternation of word-initial consonant.

œjdœœχ tœjdœœχ 'clever' (*œjdœœχ* 'clever')
saŋa maŋa 'word' (*saŋa* 'word')

These words may be called reduplication or echo-words. These echo-words must inflect and/or derivate like PW.

(32a) *[kepsee ipsee]*
[talk ?]
'to talk'

(32b) *[kepse-t*[5] *ipse-t]*
[talk-CAUS ?-CAUS]
'to talk with (someone)'

(32c) *[kepse-t-en ipse-t-en]*
[talk-CAUS-cv ?-CAUS-cv]
'having talked with (someone)'

In Yakut grammar, PW are more similar to echo-words than compounds. The only difference between PW and echo-words is that there is a semantic relationship between the two components of PW, while there is a morphophonemic relationship between the two components of echo-words.

7. Conclusion

So far I have discussed the morphological, semantic and syntactic characteristics of PW. Compared with compound words, PW differ in the three ways indicated below:

(1) Morphologically, only the latter component of a compound takes inflectional and/or derivational suffixes, while the preceding component never does. In contrast, both components of PW must take inflectional and/or derivational suffixes (section 1).
(2) Semantically, X of PW plays a more important role than Y in determining the meaning of the whole PW. In contrast, the second component of compounds plays a more impotant role than the first component in determining the meaning of the whole compound (section 4).
(3) Syntactically, X and Y of PW do not reflect any aspect of the syntactic structure of Yakut, while compound words must reflect its syntactic structure (section 5).

As is mentioned in section 6, PW are more similar to echo-words than compounds. Finally, the author would like to propose a solution for the first problem in section 2.

Given that the formative process of the PW is the same as that of echo-words, the process can be illustrated by the following process. ('-@' stands for inflectional and/or derivational suffixes.)

1. Base: X
2. Inflection and/or derivation: X-@
3. Echo: X-@ Y-@

At first, derivational and inflectional suffixes '-@' are attached to the base X and then the whole 'X-@' is echoed. This process explains why both components of the PW must take inflectional and/or derivational suffixes.

Abbreviations

1	first person	3	third person
ABL	ablative	ACC	accusative
AUX	auxiliary verb	CACC	collective accusative
CAUS	causative	COOP	cooperative
COP	copula	CV	converb
DAT	dative	DER	derivational suffix
DPAST	distant past	FUT	future tense
IMP	imperative	NEG	negative
NPAST	near past	PL	plural
POSS	possessive suffix	PRES	present tense
QP	question particle	RPAST	resultative past
SG	singular	VN	verbal noun

References

Bloomfield, Leonard 1933. *Language*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Ebata, Fuyuki 2001. *Saha-go (Yakuuto-go) no paired words* [Paired words in Sakha (Yakut)]. [M. A. thesis, University of Tokyo.]

Johanson, Lars 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. New York: Routledge. 30-66.

Korkina, E. I. & Ubrjatova, E. I. & Xaritonov, L. N. & Petrov, N. E. 1982. *Grammatika sovremennogo jakutskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.

Swift, Lloyd B. 1963. *A reference grammar of modern Turkish*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 19.) Bloomington: Indiana University Publications.

Ubrjatova, E. I. 1948. Parnye slova v jakutskom jazyke. *Jazyk i myšlenie* 11, 297-328.

Xaritonov, L. N. 1947. *Sovremennyj jakutskij jazyk*. Jakutsk: Gosizdat JaSSR.

On *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish

Nurettin Demir

Demir, Nurettin 2003. On *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 7, 268-274.

The present article aims at illustrating the way the Turkish evidential marker *imiş* functions in the spoken varieties of Northern Cyprus. In addition to its function of indicating evidentiality, i.e. notions of indirectivity, this copula particle in Cypriot dialects has a discourse pragmatic function which is not found in Standard Turkish.

Nurettin Demir, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Başkent Üniversitesi, 06530 Bağlıca, Ankara, Türkiye. E-mail: ndemir@baskent.edu.tr

Introduction

In recent years research on the Turkish varieties of Northern Cyprus has increased. Besides researchers from Turkey, linguists working at universities in Northern Cyprus have published a considerable number of studies on these varieties. In fact, considering the size of the area and the size of the Turkish speaking community, the Cypriot varieties are among the most investigated Turkish dialects. However, dialectal studies in Northern Cyprus are still in their earliest phase. So far, publications dealing with these varieties have concentrated on linguistic differences from Standard Turkish or on how certain distinctive features of Cypriot Turkish are represented in Standard Turkish. Furthermore, lack of profound information about the historical development of Turkish has led to many mistakes. But, since it is not the task of this paper to evaluate the literature that is available at the moment, I will not comment on this issue here.

My aim is to present some facts about the usage of the copula particle *imiş*, derived from the verb **i-* + the suffix *-miş*. A small part of the material investigated consists of examples collected casually in free conversations. The main part, though, includes the results of a project on *imiş* conducted with the graduating class of 2000 of the Polat Paşa Lisesi in Akdoğan. The data obtained here have been revised by speakers of the Cypriot varieties.[1] Since a comprehensive description of the range of use of *imiş* would go beyond the frame of this article, I will only deal with its syntactical and functional properties. In analyzing the former, I will show that in a sentence this form can have various positions other than the post-predicate one. As to

[1] I would like to express my gratitude to Nazmiye Çelebi and her students form the Polat Paşa Lisesi for their support in collecting the material.

the latter, the function of *imiş* is to indicate which part of the sentence is considered as important and thus emphasized.

The Cypriot dialects of Turkish

The first study on the Cypriot varieties of Turkish was carried out by Hasan Eren (1963). The data Eren collected during his fieldwork also served as a basis for his studies on the origin of these varieties. According to Eren, demographic movements from the provinces of Konya, Antalya, İçel (Mersin) and Alanya have played a role in the formation of these varieties. This is proved by documents on the settlement of Turks in Cyprus after the conquest of the island (see Halaçoğlu & Erdoğru 2000). Since in another paper I am dealing with the differences between the Cypriot varieties and the other Turkish dialects, I will not discuss this issue here. In later literature, Eren's view has generally been accepted. It should be taken into consideration, though, that many factors have led to a more complex linguistic situation: immigration at various times, language contact with other varieties spoken on the island, the prestige of Standard Turkish on the one hand and that of the dialects on the other and, finally, the fact that these varieties constitute the language of a territory that is recognized by Turkey as an independent state. Eren's approach is certainly correct when it comes to the historical evolution; it is, however, insufficient to account for the present situation. After the military occupation of Northern Cyprus by the Turkish army in 1974, the situation has become even more complex, offering a good basis for interesting investigations.

imiş in Turkish

Before turning to the analysis of the Cypriot material, it seems appropriate to give some information on the element *imiş* in Turkish. This form goes back to the older Turkic copula particle *er-miš*. In modern Turkish can appear as the free form *imiş* and the suffixed form *-(y)mIş*. In contrast to the verbal suffix *-miş,* which can have high pitch, *imiş* is unaccentable: *açmíş* 'has (evidently) opened : *áçmış* 'is hungry (as s/he told me)', *geçmíş* 'has (apparently) passed' : *géçmiş* 'it (apparently) is late'. Both in verbal phrases as well as in noun phrases it is treated as a part of the predicate, e.g. *yaparmış* 'will (evidently) do (it)' and *güzelmiş* 'is (apparently) beautiful'. Personal suffixes appear after *imiş*: *yaparmışsın* 'you would do (it)' and *güzelmişsin* 'you are beautiful'. It is only in conditional forms that *imiş* can appear after the personal markers, e.g. *yapsammış* 'I am supposed to do it (as I have learned)'. The question particle comes before *imiş*: *yapar mıymış?* 'will s/he do it? (do you know?)', *güzel miymiş?* 'is s/he beautiful? (did you see?)', etc.

The form investigated here has very often been confused with the evidential marker *-mIş*, which creates finite and non-finite forms from primary stems of lexical verbs. Johanson deals with *imiş* and other markers of indirectivity in his studies on aspect-tense categories in Turkish (see Johanson 2000, 1971: 63-64, 1994: 253). Here, I will confine myself to the fact that *imiş* is not a tense marker and that it indi-

cates indirectivity denoting that the event is perceived in an indirect way, i.e. through hearsay, inference, perception, etc. (see Johanson 1971, 1994, 2000, 2003).

-miş in Cypriot Turkish

The postterminal marker *-miş* is rarely used in Cypriot Turkish. Its function is covered by *-DI*. Thus, the Standard Turkish version of the Cypriot Turkish sentence *Adam geldi* can be *Adam geldi* 'The man has arrived' or *Adam gelmiş* 'The man has (obviously/evidently) arrived'.[2] The use of *-miş* in this sense seems, as far as I could observe, to be influenced by Standard Turkish (see below; cf. Brendemoen 1999: 200).

imiş in Cypriot Turkish

As a marker of indirectivity, *imiş* most often occurs in its suffixed form in the Cypriot dialects of Turkish.

(1) *Okula gidecekmiş de okusunmuş da öğretmen olsun.*
'S/he is supposed to go to school and to study and to become a teacher.'

(2) *Okula istemezmiş gitsin.*
'S/he does not want to go to school (as I have heard / learned).'

As can be seen in example (3), suffixation in Cypriot Turkish can go further than in Standard Turkish: the marker can be attached to stems ending in a vowel without the segment of *-y-*:

(3) *Yoldamış.*
'S/he is on the way (as I have heard / learned).'

There is a further characteristic of *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish which is not found in Standard Turkish: while the suffixed forms can only be attached to the predicate in Standard Turkish, in the Cypriot dialects the suffixed form *-miş* can occur other positions. See the following examples where it emphasizes the element it is attached to. (The elements emphasized are underlined in the translations.)

(4) *Sonundamış aşkını ilan etdi.*
'He <u>finally</u> declared his love to her.'

(5) *Sonunda aşkınımış ilan etdi.*
'He finally declared <u>his love</u> to her.'

[2] For a description of a similar phenomenon in the dialects of the Eastern Black Sea Coast, see Brendemoen (1999).

(6) *Sonunda aşkını ilanmış etdi.*
'He finally declared his love to her.'

(7) *Ahmetmiş okula gitmeyecek yarın.*
'They say that Ahmet will not go to school tomorrow.'

(8) *Ahmet okulamış gitmeyecek yarın.*
'They say that Ahmet will not go to school tomorrow.'

(9) *Ahmet yarınmış okula gitmeyecek.*
'They say that Ahmet will not go to school tomorrow.'

The suffix *-miş* is subject to vowel harmony and thus has the following variants: *-mış, -miş, -muş, -müş.*

The free form *miş* can function as a sentence-initial particle:

(10) *Miş sonunda aşkını ilan etdi.*
(Standard Turkish *Sonunda aşkını ilan etmiş.*)
'He finally declared his love to her (as I have heard / learned).'

(11) *Mış Ahmet okula gitmeyecek yarın.*
(Standard Turkish *Ahmet yarın okula gitmeyecekmiş.*)
'They say that Ahmet will not go to school tomorrow.'

In the sentence-initial position, the marker occurs most frequently as *miş*, the back variant *mış* being used very rarely.

Cypriot Turkish displays considerable deviations from the SOV sentence structure typical for Turkic, which will not be dealt with here. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that *imiş* does not occur in sentence-final position following a non-predicate element:

(12) **Okula gitmeyecek yarınmış.*
(intended meaning:) 'As I have heard, will not go to school tomorrow

(13) **Aşık olmadı hiçmiş.*
(intended meaning:) 'He has never fallen in love (as he told me).'

Further functions of *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish

The most prominent function of *imiş* is to present non-first-hand information—as it also does in Standard Turkish. In sentence-initial position, this is its foremost function:

(14) *Miş gelecek.*
'S/he is supposed to come.'

(15) *Birsel dedi ki yazdamış alasın çocuları, denizemiş götüresin.*
(Standard Turkish *Yazda çocukları alıp denize götürecekmişsin.*)
'Birsel has said that in summer you had to take the children to the sea.'

In the first example, the speaker reports something s/he has learned to a third person. In example (15), the speaker tells repeats what s/he has learned from a third person, i.e. Birsel in this case. It is, however, not necessary to mention the source, e.g.:

(16) *Onbir buçukdaymış arayasınız.*
'You are supposed to call at half past eleven.'

A further function of *-miş* is to give some additional notions: it might—by means of, e.g., intonation and a certain context—indicate that the given information is considered not very reliable or even wrong. Irony can also be expressed by the use of *-miş*. The use of the preposed particle *ha* can reinforce the intended meaning, e.g.:

(17) *Miş çok zekidir.*
(Standard Turkish *Çok zekiymiş.*)
'S/he is said to be very intelligent.'

(18) *Ha mış çok zekidir.*
(Standard Turkish *Güya çok zekiymiş.*)
'S/he is said to be very intelligent (but don't believe it).'

The following example displays a third function of *-miş*. The example is taken from a conversation between two persons who are trying to withdraw money from a cash dispenser. One of the persons involved recognizes that s/he has chosen the wrong amount and makes the following statement, where *-miş* is used to express a conclusion.

(19) *Girilen midkarmış hatalıdır.*
(Standard Turkish *Girilen miktar hatalıymış.*)
'The given amount is wrong (as I can see).'

The functions of *imiş* presented here are similar to some of its functions found in Standard Turkish. But in Cypriot Turkish the use of *imiş* is not obligatory as can be seen in the following examples:

(20) *Birsel dedi ki yazda alasın çocuları, denize götüresin.*

(21) *Onbir buçukda arayasınız.*

(22) *Girilen mikdar hatalıdır.*

At this point, the question arises whether the fact that *imiş* can occur in several positions has functional reasons. On the basis of the material examined so far, it seems as if *imiş* stresses the information that is considered important in a sentence. See examples (5)-(7) and (9)-(11), (15)-(16) and (19), where *imiş* has both indirective meaning and is attached to the element that carries the important information.

In the following examples, *imiş* has both indirective meaning and focuses on important information:

(23) *Söyledi banamış geleceydi.*
(Standard Turkish *Bana geleceğini söylemişti.*)
'S/he told me (and not to another person) s/he would come (but s/he didn't).'

(24) *Bu ayın sonundamış gelecek.*
(Standard Turkish *Bu ayın sonunda gelecekmiş.*)
'S/he is said to come at the end of this month (and not at another time).'

(25) *Nazmiye hoca artıkmiş bizi istemez.*
(Standard Turkish *Nazmiye hoca artık bizi istemezmiş.*)
'(It seems as if) Nazmiye does not want to teach us any more (while she did earlier).'

(26) *Babammış anneme yüzükmüş alsın da barışsın.*
(Standard Turkish *Babam anneme yüzük alsınmış da barışsınmış.*)
'It is my father (and nobody else) who is supposed to buy a ring (and nothing else) for my mother so that they reconcile.'

Some examples are difficult to interpret:

(27) *Her zamanmış ona güvenirmiş de yoldamış galmayacakmış.*
'S/he pretends to always trust her/him, so s/he would never cause an accident (by car).'

In this example, indirective meaning is provided in *güvenirmiş* and *galmayacakmış*. At first sight it seems as if the marker that is attached to *her zaman*, i.e. another constituents than the predicate, focuses on what is important in the sentence ('always'). However, it seems more plausible to consider sentences of this kind as a combination of the Standard Turkish use and the use typical for dialects. The reason for this assumption is the fact that these examples were provided by high school students who do not consciously differentiate between Standard Turkish and their dialect. Dialect speakers confirm this interpretation.

Concluding remarks

The examples presented in this paper have shown that *imiş* in Cypriot Turkish can change its position within a sentence. The only restriction is that it cannot be attached to a non-predicate constituent in sentence-final position. In addition to its

function as a marker of indirectivity, it is used as a discourse pragmatic element focusing on what is considered important in a sentence. Both properties are criteria that distinguish the Cypriot dialects from other dialects of Turkish.

References

Brendemoen, Bernt 1999. Doğu Karadeniz ağızlarında *-mIş*'li geçmiş zaman üzerine bir not. In: *3. Uluslar Arası Türk Dil Kurultayı 1999*. Ankara Türk Dil Kurumu. 199-206.

Eren, Hasan 1963. Kıbrıs'ta Türkler ve Türk Dili. In: *X. Türk Dil Kurultayında okunan bilimsel bildiriler 1963*. Ankara: 37-50.

Halaçoğlu, Yusuf & Erdoğru, M. Akif 2000. Kıbrıs'ın alınmasından sonra ada'da yapılan iskânlar ve Kıbrıs Türklerinin menşei. In: *Rauf Denktaş'a armağan*. Ankara: Turan Kültür Vakfı. 208-219.

Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Johanson, Lars 1994. Türkeitürkische Aspektotempora. In: Thieroff, Rolf & Ballweg, Joachim (eds.) *Tense systems in European languages*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 247-266.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Turkic indirectives. In: Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.) *Evidentials*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 61-88.

Johanson, Lars 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R[obert] M. W. (eds.) *Studies in evidentiality*. (Typological Studies in Language 54.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 273-290.

Sağol, Gülden 1997. Kıbrıs ağzı üzerinde yapılan calışmalar. *Bir* 8, 99-106.

Turkish in Trabzon

Lars Johanson

Johanson, Lars 2003. Turkish in Trabzon. *Turkic Languages* 7, 275-296.

This review article discusses issues connected with the diachronic and synchronic status of Turkish dialects spoken in the province of Trabzon on the basis of a recently published monograph by Bernt Brendemoen.

Lars Johanson, Seminar für Orientkunde, Universität Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: johanson@uni-mainz.de

Turkish dialects of Trabzon

The provinces of Trabzon and Rize are the Anatolian regions in which Turkish dialects have preserved most archaic features and, at the same time, developed most innovations due to foreign influence. Nevertheless, the dialects in question have so far been insufficiently studied. A recent publication, however, presents the result of more than twenty years of investigation including fieldwork in more than one hundred villages of the linguistically intriguing Trabzon province:

> Brendemoen, Bernt 2002. *The Turkish dialects of Trabzon. Their phonology and historical development*. Volume I: *Analysis*, 346 pp. Volume II: *Texts*, 280 pp. (Turcologica 50.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

In this thorough study, Brendemoen undertakes to describe and analyze a whole set of Turkish dialects on the basis of very rich material. The intention has been to record texts as little influenced by Standard Turkish as possible. The author deals with the dialects synchronically and diachronically, focusing on phonological properties and pointing out features common to all dialects as well as their distinguishing features. One stated aim is to establish phonological characteristics as parameters for a classification of dialect groups. Another aim is to throw light on the Turcification processes of the area by studying contact phenomena. The author also endeavors to show how the Eastern Black Sea dialects can contribute to our understanding of the emergence of Old Anatolian Turkish and the subsequent historical development of Anatolian Turkish.

This is a highly stimulating piece of work, an epoch-making contribution in a number of ways. It is the first extensive study on the dialects of the entire Trabzon area and the first study to focus on crucial phonological issues. The analysis is based on an excellent body of material, no doubt the richest data ever collected in a single

area in the history of Turkish dialectology. The phonetic transcriptions are careful and consistent. The discussions of empirical facts and the linguistic descriptions are extremely meticulous. The dialect maps of the area constitute significant contributions to a future linguistic atlas of Turkey. The phonetic and phonological structures are studied in detail, with important suggestions on many crucial details of the language history. The interpretations provide a variety of important new insights. It is clearly shown how the Trabzon dialects can contribute to our understanding of Old Anatolian Turkish. Problems and explanations are presented in a clear-cut way. Brendemoen's book is no doubt a major contribution to the knowledge of Turkish dialects and, at the same time, of the history of settlement in Anatolia. It also invites critical discussions on methodological questions.

Brendemoen never chooses easy ways, short cuts or simplistic solutions. He always endeavors to find valid rules for the distributions of sounds and sound variants, and he even investigates subtle cases of sandhi that have never been studied before in this thorough way. In his argumentation, the author leaves no possible solution uninvestigated. He is never afraid of taking up counter-arguments to his own arguments. In other words, his methods are characterized by a high degree of intellectual honesty. As is also obvious from the extraordinarily comprehensive bibliography, the author has taken all the relevant previous literature on linguistic and extralinguistic phenomena into account.

The structure of the analytical part

Volume I, which is devoted to the analysis, consists of a preface (pp. 5-6), nine chapters (pp. 13-300), a conclusion (pp. 301-302), a bibliography (pp. 303-319) and appendices containing sixteen selected texts in English transcription (pp. 320-340) and spectrograms (pp. 341-346) relating to the discussion on unaspirated unvoiced stops (pp. 84-97).

Chapter 1 (pp. 13-48) is an introduction containing a presentation of the purpose, comments on the geographical, ethnic and linguistic situation, a discussion of previous research, information about the texts, principles of transcription, etc. The complex linguistic situation at the Turkish East Black Sea coast is summarized on pp. 17-24. The chapter also presents the author's methods with respect to the phonemic analysis, classification of dialects, etc.

Chapters 2-4 lay the foundation for the classification of the dialects. The data of the texts are compared with one another and with data representing older stages of Turkish.

Chapter 2 (pp. 49-112) contains a synchronic analysis of vowel and consonant segments with some observations on stress and pitch. It contains a vowel and a consonant chart for the Trabzon area. There is a detailed discussion of the phonetic properties of the sounds and their distribution. Two dialect maps indicate isoglosses for certain consonantal sounds. The chapter is intended to establish a phonemic inventory and the allophonic variation as a basis for the classification of the dialects. It

also deals with variation that cannot be used for the classification, but may still be important for the understanding of historical processes.

Chapter 3 (pp. 113-167) deals with morphophonology and focuses on the differences between the dialects. The features are discussed from both synchronic and diachronic viewpoints. The archaic nature of some morphophonemic processes is demonstrated. The text groups represent different historical development stages of Anatolian Turkish. In particular, data on suffix vocalism is put into a historical framework. Suffix classes are shown to be similar to those of Old Anatolian Turkish. The similarities include rounding harmony features in parts of the area. The chapter contains detailed isogloss maps for the areal distribution of suffix classes.

Chapter 4 (pp. 168-220) is devoted to so-called "phonological mechanisms". The mainly diachronic discussions deal with vowel fronting, backing, rounding and raising, consonant lenition, fricativization, palatalization, etc. The features are compared to those of other dialects, in particular Central Anatolian and Rize dialects, but also to other Turkic languages or dialects. Some special features in the Trabzon dialects are claimed to be due to contact with Greek, or, to a lesser degree, Armenian.

Chapter 5 (pp. 221-236) contains an attempt to classify the dialects of the area. Differences between the parts of the area serve as parameters for drawing dialect group borders. The chapter contains a dialect map of Trabzon, a map indicating the distribution of east-west isoglosses and a more detailed map of the Sürmele-Yomra area.

Chapter 6 (pp. 237-248) compares the dialect groups established to neighboring dialects (Rize, Giresun and the "hinterland") as well as to West Rumelian dialects. Here the author tries to determine which features are typical of Trabzon only and which are shared with other dialect groups. He criticizes hypotheses arguing that the similarities between the Eastern Black Sea coastal dialects and those of Western Rumelia are due to immigration from the Black Sea coast to the Balkans.

Chapter 7 (pp. 249-264) is intended to consolidate the hypothesis about the archaic status of certain Trabzon dialects. It presents a diachronic stratification on the basis of phenomena such as sound harmony and present tense formation. Layers due to different waves of immigration are also discussed, e.g. a possible Kipchak influence in the Middle Ages.

Chapter 8 (pp. 265-281) discusses features due to copying from other languages. It seeks explanations of features that cannot be explained according to what is known about the development of Anatolian Turkish. Extensive linguistic copying from Greek is claimed to have taken place, particularly in early periods. The claim is supported by the shape of copies of Greek words found in the dialects. The degree of bilingualism in the Muslim and Orthodox population in Trabzon is discussed.

Chapter 9 (pp. 282-300) offers a rather detailed tentative sketch of the history of Turcification of the Trabzon region. With the help of historical sources and studies the author tries to establish which Turkish-speaking groups settled in Trabzon towards the end of the Middle Ages, introducing Turkish there. He seeks answers to the questions to what extent factors such as immigration and conversion were important for the diffusion of Turkish.

The appendices contain a number of selected texts in English translation as well as four spectrograms.

The texts

Volume 2 contains a corpus of 139 texts representing 113 geographic points. Most of the material was collected in 1978 and 1979. All texts are transcribed, as the author says, in as "unbiased" a way as possible, in order to reflect the actual distribution of sounds.

The texts include historical accounts, folkloristic material, local legends, etc. Many texts treat historical subjects such as the Russian occupation in World War I, the war of liberation against the Greeks from 1919 on, the population exchange with Greece after the Lausanne treaty in 1923, the great flood which destroyed several villages in Çaykara, Of and Sürmene in 1929. Some local legends are of great historical interest, e.g. the legend about the Islamization of Çaykara. There are also variants of a story about climatic changes that forced the population to move closer to the sea. Extremely useful comments on linguistic details and on the cultural background are provided in endnotes.

The text corpus, which covers the whole region, serves as the basis of the linguistic analysis. Since some texts are very short, the author also uses additional data for the classification of dialects.

Some of my very few objections concern the way the Turkish material is presented. Most dialect texts are not translated; as mentioned, only a few translations are given in the appendix to the first volume. The author's motivation is that the main target group consists of persons with a good knowledge of Turkish. "Thanks to the footnotes, a person with reading knowledge of Standard Turkish will be able to understand the texts after some familiarization" (p. 5). But the lack of translations often causes difficulties for this group as well. What is required is in fact familiarity with several registers of spoken Turkish. The author certainly underestimates the group of scholars interested in the problems dealt with in the book. At least, a small glossary would have facilitated the acquaintance with these dialects, which do deviate essentially from Standard Turkish.

The structure of the region

As Brendemoen demonstrates (pp. 15-17), the geographic features of the Trabzon region have been of great importance for its development. A high mountain ridge, the Pontic Chain, isolates the area from the interior of Anatolia. Deep river valleys from north to south, flanked by high hills, make east-west contacts highly difficult. The populations of these valleys have not been exposed to major external impulses. Until the middle of the twentieth century, when the littoral highway was built, communication with the outside world was mainly possible by sea. Two routes of immigration into Trabzon from the hinterland have been important: the İkizdere valley and the Karadere valley.

The linguistic structure of the region is characterized by a strong presence of non-Turkic languages for several centuries (pp. 17-24). All have been influential in shaping the Turkish dialects. Greek was spoken there since early antiquity. Pontic Greek, which developed along its own lines from the early Middle Ages on, was spoken in large parts of the coastal region by a mainly Greek Orthodox population up to the population exchange in 1923. It was the most important language until Turkish became dominant.

There are two groups of Greek-speaking Muslim villages today. The largest one includes most villages in Çaykara and some neighboring villages in the southern part of Sürmene. Greek was formerly spoken by Muslims in a larger area including the southernmost villages of Of. The other Greek-speaking villages are found in the Kumyatak district of Tonya.

There is a certain Armenian element in the Sürmene-Yomra region, which is partly inhabited by immigrants from Rize. Armenian-speaking Muslims, the so-called Hemşinli, have influenced the dialects in some parts of Trabzon. Their strongholds are the Hemşin and Çamlıhemşin districts in Rize. The Hemşinli gave up Armenian at the end of the 19th century, but their variety of Turkish contains a rich vocabulary carried over from Armenian.

Speakers of Laz, a Kartvelian language, live in the littoral parts of Rize and Artvin east of the town of Pazar. There is, according to Brendemoen, no evidence of any significant Laz population in the areas further west in historical times.

The author states that the population was more mixed in older times, also including groups of Kurds, different Caucasian tribes, etc.

Turcification

Brendemoen undertakes an interesting attempt to use linguistic data in order to shed light on the process of Turcification of the East Black Sea region in pre-Ottoman and Ottoman times. The author is primarily interested in settlement of Turkic groups in the Old Anatolian Turkic period, since linguistic features cannot be dated further back than the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. He also examines reports by contemporary historiographers and modern reports based on archival material. It is stressed that the Turcification of the Eastern Black Sea Coast is different from that of the rest of Anatolia.

Chapter 9 provides an interesting survey of the development. Up to the Turkish immigration, the majority of the population of Trabzon and Rize probably consisted of indigenous Caucasian tribes, partly Hellenized religiously and linguistically. The first Turkic-speaking groups may have entered this part of Anatolia rather early. The Turkic groups entering Anatolia after the defeat of the Byzantine emperor in 1071 were almost exclusively Oghuz. Later groups, however, were more mixed, also comprising Kipchak Turkic and other elements.

The Komnenoi established themselves as an exile dynasty in Trabzon at the beginning of the 13th century. In its first period, their kingdom covered the Black Sea coast from Sinop in the west almost to Batum in the east. In the south it was con-

fined by the Pontic Chain. The kingdom of Trabzon was attacked by different Turkish principalities in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. There is evidence of an early Kipchak presence in Trabzon, a pre-Ottoman settlement of a sizeable Kuman population. According to Brendemoen, Kuman elements may also be identified as relic features in the linguistic data.

While some scholars believe that the first Turkish settlers were Çepnis, the sources mention this group only in a few cases in the history of Trabzon of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Çepni stronghold was along the Harşit River, outside the present province, but inside the kingdom. There is no evidence of Çepni settlements within the borders of the modern province Trabzon at that time. The most archaic Trabzon dialects, the author claims, have nothing to do with the Çepni dialect. The Çepni tribe probably came to the western parts of Trabzon at the beginning of the sixteenth century. While this tribe is generally considered to have played an important role in the Turcification of the Samsun-Rize area, Brendemoen shows that the Turkish variety from which the more archaic dialects have developed was separated from the general language development in Anatolia in the early fourteenth century at the latest.

The Aqqoyunlï became more integrated in the Trabzon kingdom than any other Turkic group. In the initial stage of contact in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when they constituted a loose confederation of smaller Oghuz tribes, they represented a menace to the kingdom. The Aqqoyunlï and the Çepnis conducted frequent raids in the area, but there are no documents indicating that they remained there. Later on, the relations softened, partly due to intermarriage. Aqqoyunlï elements probably settled in Trabzon in the second half of the fourteenth century. The upper parts of the valleys, close to the summer pastures, were probably settled by semi-sedentary Aqqoyunlï.

These groups had to interact linguistically with their Greek-speaking neighbors both on the summer pastures and further down the valleys. The peaceful interaction of Greeks and Turks began to necessitate knowledge of each other's languages. For those Aqqoyunlï who decided to become sedentary thorough knowledge of Greek became imperative. The period of Greek-Turkish cultural and linguistic interaction continued for centuries and must have been considerable. Many Turkish-speakers in Trabzon became Christians, and there must have been sedentary Muslims in Trabzon. Important for the spread of bilingualism was forcible language interaction such as kidnapping and taking war prisoners to work as slaves. Language interaction was also created by conversions of Muslims to Christianity, when Turks served as soldiers in the army of the King of Trabzon.

The further development

Brendemoen hypothesizes, on the basis of linguistic evidence, that Turkish was introduced in the Trabzon area at the beginning of the fourteenth century. However, we know nothing about the language of the Aqqoyunlï and cannot ascribe any specific features of the present Trabzon dialects to them. Besides, we do not know

whether the variety developed in the interaction of Aqqoyunlï and Greek-speaking Christians was the only Turkish variety that spread in the area. According to the author, the oldest linguistic stage is partly preserved, especially in the easternmost valleys of Of and Çaykara, and in parts of the Tonya region further west. The dialect of the valleys between the Of and Çaykara and the city of Trabzon is more recent due to later immigrations. The main features of the oldest stage of Turkish were partly preserved and partly changed. This was, according to Brendemoen, due to the isolation from the general language development and to the preserving effect of substrate or adstrate languages.

Turcification is assumed to have started after the conquest of Trabzon by the Ottomans in 1461. After the Aqqoyunlï rule in Iran had been overthrown in 1501, many Aqqoyunlï fled to Anatolia and may preferably have settled in their old lands that were now in Ottoman hands. The presence of Aqqoyunlï from the first settlement facilitated the new settlement. Persian and Azerbaijanian linguistic elements were copied and conventionalized in the Trabzon dialects. Some of the new settlements may have been situated in parts of the Sürmene-Yomra district, which would fit into the picture of the dialect features found there. However, this area also contains other population elements, some of which immigrated later from Rize.

The immigration routes through mountain passes have always been important for the ethnical structure of the region. Different groups have descended through them towards the Black Sea and often settled close to them. The İkizdere valley, which attracted immigrants very early, has a strong Turkish population. The Muslim population in Of increased considerably in the sixteenth century. It had its center along the lower Baltacı Deresi, close to the İkizdere valley. The route through the Karadere valley attracted Turkish-speaking groups from the sixteenth century on and was important for Aqqoyunlï refugees from Iran. From here, the immigrants spread to the next valleys east- and westwards.

Islamization

The Islamization and Turcification of Trabzon in the first century after the Ottoman conquest is rather well known. There was at first a slow increase in the Muslim population. The area was "stabilized"—with the aim of strengthening the Muslim element—through extensive deportations from the neighboring inland, e.g. Amasya, Samsun, Niksar, and also from the Balkans. The deportations had a strong impact on the rural districts.

The southernmost parts of Of, corresponding to parts of the present *ilçe* of Çaykara, remained outside the scope of Turcification and Islamization throughout the sixteenth century. As Brendemoen's dialect texts demonstrate, there is popular tradition of a later mass conversion here, maybe in the seventeenth century. Islamization proceeded more slowly in the valleys of Sürmene than in the northern parts of Of. In the city of Trabzon, conversions played an important role in the sixteenth century. The Muslim inhabitants of the city soon reached half of the population. The conversions certainly continued in rural districts in the seventeenth century.

The reasons for converting to Islam were often economic in nature. For example, sizeable groups of Turkish-speaking so-called Crypto-Christians pretended to convert to Islam, partly for economical reasons. Linguistic Turcification mostly followed the Islamization. There were, however, also exceptions from this rule, e.g. groups of Muslim Turks who settled in Çaykara and acquired Greek.

As for the recent history, Brendemoen points out that after the exodus of the Orthodox in connection with the population exchange with Greece, most parts of the Maçka valley were empty. The people from Sürmene who had become homeless after the flood in 1929 were largely resettled there. Thus most of the population of Maçka speaks a dialect similar to the one of the southern parts of Sürmene.

The oldest Turkish of the region

With respect to the oldest Turkish in Trabzon, Brendemoen assumes an old dialect area in which many archaisms dating back to the early fourteenth century have been preserved. He argues that a specific Turkish dialect that emerged under Greek influence was separated from the general language development in Anatolia in the fourteenth century at the latest and remained isolated for centuries. It was characterized by heavy copying from the dominant language Greek.

The dialect in question started its existence in Trabzon as a minority language with low prestige. The status of the language of the original minority group was enhanced when the religion of this group became attractive and was associated with Islamic erudition and piety. Converts and Muslim immigrants from elsewhere promoted the diffusion of Turkish. In the seventeenth century it became the dominant language, also among the converts. Knowledge of this variety became increasingly important in the local society. The copying processes went on, with new speakers imposing further elements on their new code. Some groups remained Christian but still used Turkish in the local society. The dialect spread over practically the whole province. The archaic dialect area that emerged in this way is still rather homogeneous. Before newcomers from Rize settled in the Sürmene-Yomra area in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there must have existed a continuous dialect area from Of to Vakfıkebir with preserved features from the language of the fourteenth century.

Greek influence

The dialects described by Brendemoen display many innovations, mostly due to copying from Greek. The fourteenth century Turkish dialects imported to Trabzon underwent profound structural changes. Many phonological, morphological and syntactic features are difficult to explain in the framework of an internal linguistic development. The author even suggests that certain archaisms may have been preserved due to the Greek influence.

If the innovative features are due to copying from Greek, they may be explained in two ways: They may be the result of adoption or "take-over influence", i.e. Turkish-speakers in contact with Greek may have adopted them. Or they may be the result

of imposition or "carry-over influence", i.e. Greek-speakers starting to speak Turkish may have imposed them upon their variety of Turkish.

As for the first option, speakers of Turkish may well have adopted features from their Greek-speaking neighbors. We must assume that the first Turkish settlers became bilingual. They probably settled in secluded valleys close to the summer-pastures and the hinterland they came from. Here, knowledge of Greek became necessary for survival. The Turks moved into a kingdom where Greek was the major language. Their initial interaction with the new environment was characterized by the overwhelming number and sociopolitical dominance of speakers of Greek.

According to the second option, speakers of Greek may have imposed features of their original primary code upon the kind of Turkish they started to speak. In this case, Greek would have a substrate function.

The closer the phonetic shape of a lexical copy is to the shape of the copied unit, the more probable is imposition or at least strong bilingual proficiency. In the dialects studied here, Greek loanwords have a shape much closer to their originals than is the case elsewhere in Anatolia, which would suggest imposition. But Turkish-speaking settlers in Trabzon and Rize might also, within a couple of generations, have acquired such a degree of proficiency in Greek that they copied words in a shape very close to the way these were pronounced by their Greek-speaking neighbors.

The linguistic data often do not allow us to conclude whether the copied features are due to adoption or imposition. The truth is probably that the area in question has undergone a complex interplay of adoption and imposition of socially dominated and dominant codes, and that both kinds of interaction have been reiterated several times through history.

Conversion and language shift

We have no information about a major language shift at the initial stage. The only reason for Greek-speakers to shift to Turkish would have been conversion to Islam. There are no reports to this effect. According to Brendemoen, there is no obvious reason for a shift from Greek to Turkish in the Old Anatolian Turkish period. The Turkish-speaking minority was probably not very important up to the Ottoman conquest. There were no social reasons for Greek-speakers to become bilingual before conversions to Islam started or before the Muslims became more numerous or attained a higher social status.

Brendemoen supposes that conversions took place in later periods and assumes a relatively late date for bilingualism to have spread among speakers of Greek. The change of religion may have been accompanied by language shift. Many speakers probably shifted to Turkish in connection with their conversions and imposed features from their mother tongue upon their variety of that language.

On the other hand, not even conversion to Islam necessitated language shift. The Muslim Greek-speaking population in Çaykara and southern parts of Sürmene and in the Kumyatak region of Tonya are likely to have been original Greek-speakers who converted to Islam. In their case, conversion did not necessitate language shift. In

Trabzon and Rize, however, conversion required some degree of bilingualism. Turkish probably became the language of religious instruction. During the last centuries of the Ottoman period, bilingualism must have become very common.

Brendemoen assumes that bilingualism may have had a conserving effect on Turkish. When it was acquired by part of the Greek-speaking population, it was marked in comparison to Greek because of its specific uses. Greek remained unmarked since it was used in all spheres of life. This may explain the archaic stage represented by the Turkish varieties spoken in the bilingual districts.

In the so-called core areas, where the most archaic varieties of the Of-Çaykara and the Maçka-Vakfıkebir dialects are spoken, the speakers are still bilingual, or bilingualism has prevailed there for a relatively long time. If Turkish was the primary language of the bilinguals in the core areas, these must have been descendants of the first Turkish settlers who had to learn Greek in order to survive. This would explain why the Turkish of the bilingual population has preserved so many archaic features. Turkish seems to have entered the Çaykara area only after the sixteenth century. The Greek dialect spoken here represents an archaic stage of development and constitutes a distinct sub-group of Pontic Greek, different from the one in Kumyatak.

Classification of dialects

The main criterion for Brendemoen's classification in dialect groups is similarity and dissimilarity of phonological systems. The author first determines the relevant phonological differences used for the classification and then characterizes each dialect group according to them. He also examines the extension of some features of the dialects outside the province of Trabzon, e.g. Rize, particularly its western parts.

It is widely assumed today that Trabzon, Rize and the littoral districts of Artvin form one dialect group. Brendemoen shows that the westernmost border, running from north to south through the western part of Vakfıkebir, is a conspicuous isogloss bundle. It forms the border between the Eastern Black Sea dialect group and the Central or Western Anatolian group. Thus one of the isogloss bundles dividing Anatolia into three distinctive groups goes straight through the western part of Trabzon. The other dialect borders are made up of less solid bundles of isoglosses.

In Chapter 5, the author gives a survey of the dialects of Trabzon according to the districts of the province. The main dialects of Trabzon postulated by the author are illustrated on map 11 (p. 228). Many features are shared by the most conservative dialects, Of and Çaykara, Kumyatak and the westernmost dialect of Rize. The most important isogloss bundle is shown to separate the Çepni villages from the ones further east. This border divides the West Anatolian dialect group from the Northeast Anatolian dialect group. There are three other rather clear-cut boundaries constituted by isogloss bundles: One separates two text groups of the Of dialects. One separates the Of-Çaykara dialect from the Sürmene-Araklı-Arsin-Yomra dialect. One more diffuse boundary separates the Sürmene-Araklı-Arsin-Yomra dialect from the area further to the west.

However, the area between the western border of Yomra and the Çepni villages is problematic. It is difficult to establish a bundle of isoglosses here. The Of-Çaykara dialect shares many features with the area between the western border of Yomra and the Çepni villages. The very different—and more recent—features of the Sürmene-Yomra dialect goes like a wedge from the mountains down to the sea, separating the Of-Çaykara dialect from the similar dialect of the Maçka-Vakfıkebir area. This shows that the Of-Çaykara and the Maçka-Vakfıkebir areas are relic areas.

Valuable information on other features of the Trabzon dialects is given. One parameter is the present tense of the copula verb *i-* (see below), which is found rarely, mostly in the western part of Rize and the eastern part of Trabzon. In parts of Trabzon, the *-miş* past has a purely postterminal rather than an evidential meaning, which might be due to Greek influence. Especially in the parts of Trabzon where the Greek element is strongest, i.e. in Of und Çaykara—including the southern parts of Sürmene in the east and Tonya in the west—, subjects and objects are often found in a position after the predicate verb. There are many additional parameters, which are not, however, of major importance for the classification of the dialects into main groups.

Diachronic stratification

The discussion of the diachronic stratification of the Trabzon dialects is of utmost interest to general Turcology. Archaisms typical of certain periods are used to determine the time of the isolation of the dialects from the general language development. The most archaic Trabzon dialects are shown to be those of Of, Çaykara and Kumyatak, which exhibit features representing the middle stage of Old Anatolian Turkish of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Brendemoen assumes that the features have been preserved due to massive influence from Greek immediately after the isolation or have been partly transformed along the lines of Greek. He supposes that this was originally also the state of the dialects of Maçka-Vakfıkebir. However, in the southern and western parts of this region we find more recent features due to influence from Çepni and other Central Anatolian dialects. The Sürmene-Yomra dialect may also have been isolated from the general development, preserving certain features due to a substrate. This must, however, have occurred much later than the archaic dialects, maybe in the first half of the sixteenth century.

Transcription practices

Before proceeding to the linguistic analysis, I would like to comment on the transcription practices applied in the book under review. The transcription is based on the modern Turkish alphabet; only in the phonemic analysis are the signs explained on an IPA basis. This may, again, be due to a misjudgment of the range of scholars interested in the topic. This practice also means that the so-called target groups, which ought to have suffered enough from all the idiosyncratic transcription systems used in Turcology, are forced to learn yet another system.

Another critical comment concerns the fact that the transcription often does not indicate certain phonetic differences that may be of importance for the analysis. One example is the nasal velar *ŋ* which is preserved in most West and Central Anatolian dialects, but usually not in East Anatolia, where it corresponds to *n*. In Brendemoen's material, *ŋ* is present in the Çepni dialects, where it has phonemic status. Outside the Çepni area it has an interesting sporadic, though not fully explained, distribution. The author claims that it is absent as a phoneme in the dialects further east—or rather that most texts outside the Çepni texts do not contain examples of a phoneme /ŋ/. In any case, the reader has no chance to check the distribution. Wherever the author judges the nasal velar to be an allophone of /n/, he does not mark it, but simply transcribes it as *n*.

There are also other cases in which the transcription does not show details which are considered by the author to constitute allophonic alternations. For example, frontness and backness of velar stops, i.e. *k* vs. *q* and *g* vs. *ġ*, is not marked, except for cases where the realization is different from what the adjacent vowel suggests, or when the degree of backness or frontness of the stop is higher than is usual in the Trabzon dialects. This also limits the reader's possibility to judge upon the distribution. The situation is similar in the case of front and back *l* sounds, which are regarded as allophones. Back *ɫ* is only marked as such when it occurs with front vowels. In view of the complicated distribution of back and front consonants, the reader would have appreciated a consistent notation of them in the texts, not only in certain cases regarded as especially interesting by the author. I will come back to this specific problem.

Phoneme analysis

The synchronic phoneme analysis is of the classical Prague school type, postulating phonemes as the smallest distinctive units made up of combinations of features. The author claims that the establishment of phonemes in this framework requires that minimal pairs be found. This requirement is of course not easy to meet in a corpus study with all the accidental limitations it may imply.

This type of phonology causes certain problems. The main problem resides in the fact that the author wants to capture the phonology of whole groups of dialects by means of a structuralist kind of phonemics that does not comprise a variational component. Is it possible or justified to try to describe, within one phonological framework of this type, a highly heterogeneous material that probably represents several systems? The fact that the distinctive features are not the same in all text groups has consequences for the description of variants.

The chapter on phonemics would have needed a more differentiated characterization of texts and text groups to help to understand their distinctive features. More general phonological patterns across the area might have been demonstrated by establishing a diasystem, in which the features of the individual systems were confronted and compared with each other. This very difficult task is not approached here. The

author attempts to deal with several phonological systems in a unified, summarizing way, as if they really constituted one single system.

The result of the approach applied here is an amazing amount of overlapping phonemes. The author claims that binary oppositions of phonemes cannot describe certain continua and that one sound may belong to two or more different phonemes in the same dialect. For example, *ä* can be an allophone of three phonemes. Partial overlapping is found very often; So-called "full overlapping" of phonemes is even regarded "as a convergence phenomenon caused by the incompatibility between the Turkish and Greek inventories" (p. 112). Without going into the details of Brendemoen's argumentation in these points, it must be said that the status of so-called "quasi-phonemes" is insufficiently explained. On p. 36 we read the following definition:

> "In some cases a certain sound may have a wide-spread double status both as a marginal phoneme of foreign origin and as an allophone of another phoneme. This creates a complicated picture especially for the low unrounded vowels in the Trabzon dialects, which is further complicated by the fact that one and the same sound in some of the texts also seems to have a quasi-phonemic status also in certain words of Turkish origin. Thus, /ę/ is clearly a marginal phoneme in words of Arabic and Persian origin in some texts (reflecting Persian short /i/), and at the same time a facultative allophone of /e/ in Turkish words before /y/, sometimes also before /n/. In a couple of texts the same sound occurs also in some *specific* words of Turkish origin, e.g. in the stem *gęt-* (≅ ST *git-*) (besides *get-* and *git-*), where the occurrence is unpredictable from a synchronic point of view. Although it is not possible to postulate a minimal pair **gęt-* ~ *get-* or **gęt-* ~ *git-* in any of the texts, the occurrence of the segment is synchronically so singular, or inexplicable, that it requires a status of its own. In the following, we shall call this status *quasi-phonemic*. (The picture is complicated by the existence of transitional dialects where the phonemic status of the segments is unclear.)"

Why is it necessary to introduce a new category "quasi-phonemic" for a sound whose occurrence is not fully predictable by phonological rules? Why not talk of a phoneme /e/ which may be realized as [ę] in words of both foreign and Turkish origin?

According to the Prague school phonology adopted by Brendemoen, an opposition between two phonemes may, in certain positions, be neutralized, the relevant distinctive feature losing its relevance. The result is an archiphoneme, an abstract entity consisting of two phonemes with a suspended distinctive feature. One of the members of the opposition (or even a third non-phonemic segment) may appear as its representative. It seems that the author should have taken this option more seriously in some cases. He often discusses at length whether a given product of neutralization should be considered an allophone of this or that phoneme. This is indeed unnecessary if it simply represents the archiphoneme. The question can only have diachronic relevance.

Brendemoen remarks that it is impossible to decide whether the vowel in *ȯyle*, *bȯyle* and *şȯyle* should be regarded as an allophone of /o/ or of /ö/ and that "the decision is not helped by etymological considerations either" (pp. 59-60). We should basically not expect etymology to help us solve synchronic problems of this kind. (On the historical development of these forms, see below under the heading "Changes".)

Free variation and "compromise forms"

The dialect texts presented by Brendemoen display a good deal of so-called free variation. There is variation across areas, generations, individuals and different registers of individuals. Especially in suffix vocalism, free variation seems to characterize large continuous areas. The author observes similarities with Khalaj in central Iran, which, like the Trabzon dialects, has been under long and strong impact from another language (Persian) and never codified as a written language. Here, the validity of phonological rules is said to vary even more across districts and speakers. In Trabzon, dialect boundaries are more visible, though the variability is higher in some areas than in others.

The author also speaks of "transitional dialects having variation as an inherent feature" (p. 40). Their system, he claims, cannot be described in terms of phonemes at all. He also speaks of "compromise forms", e.g. "compromise vowels". It is difficult to accept these analyses from a synchronic point of view unless we are dealing with transitional *areas,* in which several varieties exist side by side due to mixing of speaker groups. So-called "transitional dialects" can certainly not be described in terms of other systems, but they must have systems in their own right which should be analyzed.

There are further problems connected with the phoneme analysis. Of which phonemes may Ø (zero) be an allophone in this type of phonology? The fact that a certain sound has disappeared, i.e. developed to zero by diachronic change, does not permit us to say that it is synchronically realized as zero. In many words of Standard Turkish, a final vowel has developed historically from *-Vg*, which is also mirrored by the letter *ğ* in the official orthography. In dialects of the Trabzon area the corresponding final vowel is sometimes *u*. This cannot possibly mean that /ğ/ is realized as [u] (p. 190). Otherwise zero might also be an allophone of a former /h/ or /r/ that have disappeared. This would obviously mean confusion of features of a synchronic phonological analysis with the results of diachronic change.

The phoneme analysis in its present form sometimes seems to be too strongly guided by diachronic considerations and the use of the modern Standard Turkish system as a standard of comparison.

Back and front consonants

One problematic issue is the description of backness and frontness of certain consonants, in particular velar stops and *l* sounds. Turkish words normally exhibit a complementary distribution of back and front consonants determined by the backness or

frontness of the vowel in the syllable they belong to. The variants can then be described as allophones of /k/, /g/ and /l/. But in Standard Turkish, front consonants may occur with back vowels in loanwords. In a classic Prague approach, both front and back consonant phonemes must thus be postulated.

The Trabzon dialects exhibit unharmonic syllables as well, even in words of Turkish origin. For example, front and back variants of *l* are not always determined by the vowel of the syllable they belong to. Thus, *bildum* 'I knew' has a front lateral, while *biłur* 'knows' usually has a back lateral. Brendemoen still sees no need to postulate front and back phonemes, because the aberrant cases are too marginal. Besides, the points of articulation of front and back velar stops are much closer to one another than in most Anatolian dialects.

In certain districts, however, front velar stops are strongly palatalized: before back vowels in certain loanwords, but also in words of Turkish origin, e.g. *g'avur* 'infidel' and *g'ol* 'lake'. In such cases the palatalization is marked by an apostrophe in the transcription. In other districts, there is a clearly back articulation in back vowel surroundings. The problem is thus the same as in Standard Turkish: front consonants may occur with back vowels.

However, the analysis offered here often leaves us in uncertainty about the relations between consonants and vowels. Is, for example, the vowel in *kiz* girl' a variant of /i/? The phoneme /ı/ has no allophone [i] in the survey on pp. 67-70.

If we link the frontness and backness to the syllable as such, it is possible to state that there may be syllables and syllable sequences with aberrant realizations of individual vowel or consonant segments (see Johanson 1991, 1993). There may thus be phonetically atypical realizations of individual segments in syllables marked for frontness or backness. If we, however, postulate front and back phonemes in the row *k*, *g*, and *l* in favor of a few anomalous realizations, we give up a cornerstone of Turkic phonology, the distinction of front and back *syllables*. In Trabzon too, backness and frontness are not only properties of the vowels, but rather inherent in the syllable. The author is inclined to accept this analysis. A suprasegmental analysis in line with this syllabic approach is, however, not compatible with the Prague school type of phoneme analysis.

Suffix morphophonology

The core part of the book is the morphophonological account of suffixes. The author shows that the suffix classes in the Trabzon dialects are practically identical with the ones found in Old Anatolian Turkic. The most interesting part concerns the distribution of suffix vowels, which is very close to the distribution in Old Anatolian Turkish. In particular, labial harmony is in the Old Anatolian Turkic stage of development in several parts of the area. On the other hand, front versus back harmony in high suffix vowels is poorly developed in most parts. Certain low vowel suffixes tend not to have this kind of harmony. The situation as a whole can be described rather well with reference to the three stages I have suggested, the relevance stage, the indifference stage, and the assimilation stage (see Johanson 1979a, 1979b, 1986).

The discussion of the distribution of vowel classes in the dialects is of utmost value for studies concerning the history of Ottoman. From now on, it will be impossible to deal with morphophonological questions in Turkish dialects without referring to the thorough treatment in Brendemoen's book.

In the most archaic Trabzon dialects, those high suffix vowels which were originally rounded and those which were unrounded are close to the stage of the fourteenth century. Even earlier archaisms occur as relic features, such as a high vowel in the aorist suffix of the verb *yat-* 'to lie down, to lie', e.g. *yatur*, *yatïr*, and a low vowel in the verb *gör-* to see', e.g. *görer*. However, even the most archaic dialects have undergone innovative processes in the field of labial harmony.

Sometimes it is unclear whether the Trabzon dialects represent archaisms or innovations. Many forms may be interpreted either way. One suffix that might be an innovation is *-lVk*, a suffix forming abstract nouns. I have argued that its original vowel is rounded. Brendemoen's texts provide further arguments for the assumption of a very old labial vowel. The suffix *-lV*, developed from *-lVg*, also has an original rounded vowel, but it displays unrounded vowels in the most archaic Trabzon dialects. This is certainly due to a secondary development, a realization of the indifference stage, preceding the assimilation stage. The secondary unrounded vowel in the Trabzon dialects may still date back to the thirteenth or fourteenth century. In polysyllabic words ending in *-VG*, the vowel developed into a word-final rounded vowel after the disappearance of the velar consonant, e.g. *yazu*, *köprü*. Even the most archaic texts in Brendemoen's material represent a later development, where the vowel is unrounded, e.g. *yazi*, *köpri*. Forms such as *qapï* 'door', attested in the most conservative districts of Trabzon, are probably archaisms that have resisted secondary rounding in contact with labial consonants.

Trabzon dialects display several of the neutralizations known as vowel harmony. In this respect, the western parts of Rize are as conservative as the most conservative dialects of Trabzon. Many texts show a stage where only one distinctive feature is neutralized. As for the distinction between roundedness and unroundedness, the relevance stage has been preserved with the additional tendency to realize high rounded suffix vowels as *u* and high unrounded ones as *i*. There is a clear aversion against front versus back harmony in high vowel suffixes, i.e. against the use of *ï* and *ü*. Brendemoen supposes that this phenomenon is due to intense contact with a language that lacked vowel harmony and the vowels *ï* and *ü* at a time when the relevance stage of unrounded and rounded vowels was still valid in Old Anatolian Turkish.

Changes

Brendemoen's perspective is essentially a historical one, and his analyses of diachronic developments are clearly superior to his synchronic descriptions. In many sections of the book, particularly in the chapter on "phonological mechanisms" (pp. 168-220), the author deals with a variety of interesting developments, most of which cannot be commented on in detail here.

In the field of consonant systems the author studies the extensive lenition processes (pp. 201-216) that are typical of Oghuz languages and found in most parts of the area: in particular deaspiration and voicing. Most Trabzon dialects have preserved the stage characteristic of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though copying from Greek has extended the use of unaspirated unvoiced stops.

The author also makes an attempt to identify traces of Proto-Turkic phonological vowel length in the Trabzon dialects—see the lists of "relatively certain preservation of OT long vowels" on pp. 79-80.

An interesting section deals with two typical features: backing of *ö* and *ü*, and fronting of *ï*. The Karadere valley and neighboring valleys share these features with the "hinterland". They are found in most places and extend into Gümüşhane on the north side of the mountains. The Sürmene-Yomra dialects and the dialects in Rize are similar in this respect. Brendemoen assumes an old Armenian or Caucasian substrate in the Rize region. (This may, as he suggests, also be true of the strongly palatalized velar stops before front vowels and the dental affricates.) When non-Hemşinli immigrants from Rize arrived in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, the population of Sürmene-Yomra spoke the same archaic dialect that was spoken in Of and Çaykara. This dialect had a preserving effect on Rize features such as the absence of *ö*, *ü* and *ï*. The backing and fronting features are not found in Arsin and Yomra villages closer to the sea, places that may have been settled from the sea rather than from the interior.

Brendemoen compares the situation with that in West Rumelian dialects on the Balkans. The backing of *ü* and *ö* shows striking parallels with the situation in the Vidin dialect. The similarity is explained as a secondary development due to disturbances in the front-back harmony. The similarities between the West Rumelian and the Eastern Black Sea Coast dialects have earlier been ascribed to migrations. It has been claimed that the Turkish colonization of West Rumelia must have taken place from the Eastern Black Sea coast. Brendemoen does not see any evidence for this scenario. According to him, the features are rather due to the preservation of archaisms in both areas, two of the northernmost corners of the Turkish-speaking world. Both exhibit innovations due to copying from substrate languages. In the West Rumelian case this language is Bulgarian, which is clearly shown by the backing of *ü* and *ö*. Brendemoen assumes that the bilingualism of the Turkish population in places such as Vidin facilitated the penetration of Bulgarian elements into the Turkish dialect. Since Bulgarian does not have *ü* and *ö*, these vowels were backed. Archaisms such as a less developed front-back harmony in low suffix vowels may have been preserved due to lack of harmony in the substrate language.

Archaisms were also preserved because of the isolated location of the dialects. The isolation of the Vidin dialect from the common language development occurred later than the isolation of the most archaic Trabzon dialects. The West Rumelian dialects may have reached a relatively advanced stage of labial harmony before they were isolated. Their background is thus very different from that of the Eastern Black Sea dialects.

A general shift of *ï* to *i* is unknown in West Rumelian Turkish. There is no fronting as in Trabzon, since Bulgarian, unlike Greek, has a phoneme that is very similar to *ï*. In suffixes with originally rounded vowels we often find an unrounded centralized vowel representing an initial assimilation stage, or rather the indifference stage. Since Bulgarian possessed a very similar vowel with phonemic status, the development stopped at that stage.

I have strong objections concerning the discussion of alleged backing of front rounded vowel in certain words, specifically in words corresponding to modern Standard Turkish *böyle, şöyle, öyle* 'so, this way, that way' etc. and *öbür* 'other'. Word-initial *ü* and *ö* are claimed to undergo a complete backing process (p. 173) in forms such as *oyle, ole, o:le, obiri* and *obi*. Preceding sibilants are supposed to protect the feature frontness, e.g. in *şöyle* 'thus' (p. 184). Why are these cases regarded as instances of backing of *ö*? This is only possible if we treat the vowel in the modern Standard Turkish forms as primary. We must rather look at the development the other way around: the forms with a back vowel are likely to be primary. The form *obir* must be older than *öbür*, given its origin in a combination of *o* and *bir*. Forms such as *oyle, buyle, boyle*, etc. must be older than the modern ones with front vowels, since they originally contain the pronouns *o* and *bu*. The central vowel *ȯ*, which is found most frequently in the three words *bȯyle, ȯyle, şȯyle*, rather represents fronting due to the effect of *y*. If the sibilant in *şȯyle* exerts any influence, it does not serve to protect or preserve the feature frontness but rather to promote it.

Copying from non-Turkic languages

As mentioned, the author explains several features as copies of corresponding features in non-Turkic languages. Numerous possible convergence processes are discussed. It is claimed that the vowel harmony system, at least in a few districts, has been exposed to radical attrition, probably through copying from a sub- or adstrate that lacks vowel harmony.

The author finds several examples of Turkish-Greek convergence due to the incompatibility of the Turkish and Greek phonological systems. As already mentioned, the alleged instances of so-called "full overlapping" of vowel realizations are evaluated as convergence phenomena and claimed to be caused by the incompatibility of the Turkish and Greek vowel inventories. If we formulate this situation in historical terms instead, we might indeed assume that the tendency to fuse the non-high unrounded vowels [e], [ɛ] and [æ] into [ɛ] (written here with IPA symbols) was linked to the influence of the Greek vowel inventory. Backing of *ü* and *ö* as well as fronting of *ï* are further convergence features that may have been due to incompatibility with the Greek—and in some cases perhaps with the Armenian— vowel system.

According to Brendemoen, the Greek system of stops has been imposed upon the Turkish system in different ways. Unaspirated unvoiced stops exist as non-positionally conditioned variants in most parts of the Trabzon area, which is unique from a Turcological point of view. The author tries to establish their geographical distribution and discusses their phonological status. Copying from Greek is supposed to

have extended their use of the unaspirated unvoiced stops. The fact that they remained for a long time after they had become voiced in other Anatolian dialects is probably due to the Greek realization of stops. The preservation of the unaspirated unvoiced stops may be explained by assuming extensive early bilingualism. The rare fricativization of dental stops is also considered a feature copied from Greek. (Alternatively, it may, as the author states in one case, be due to "age and fatigue", p. 100.) According to Brendemoen, the loss of the nasal velar phoneme /ŋ/ is also probably a result of the lack of this phoneme in Greek.

Most parts of the dialect area under investigation exhibit strongly palatalized velar stops preceding front vowels. The only other place in Anatolia with similar features is Rize. However, the strong palatalization in Rize and Trabzon seems to have nothing to do with Greek influence. According to Brendemoen, it is more likely to reflect an areal phenomenon that had its nucleus in Rize and spread to Trabzon. The existence of more than two affricate phonemes in Armenian, Laz and other Caucasian languages may have triggered the doubling of affricate phonemes in the Turkish dialect of Rize, and caused a partial diffusion of this phenomenon in the Trabzon region.

Internal or contact-induced phenomena?

Another question dealt with in the historical sections of the monograph is the possible influence of Kipchak languages on the dialects of Trabzon. Due to the sporadic immigration of Kipchak Turks to the Eastern Black Sea region in the Middle Ages, a certain Kipchak influence is claimed to be observable in the eastern part, Giresun, the western areas of Trabzon and further to the west. The sporadic occurrence of forms such as *dau* 'mountain' may be indicative of this influence. The other examples of alleged Kipchak influence are not quite convincing. Dative forms of the first and second person singular personal pronouns, *baa* 'to me', *saa* 'to you', lacking a nasal element, may resemble Middle Kipchak forms (p. 263), but are rather the result of intervocalic loss of *ŋ* (cf. p. 216).

The author supposes another trace of Kipchak influence in an old present tense formation that is mostly found in the western parts of Trabzon: *bil-ü-y-im* 'I know', *bil-ü-y-sin* 'you know', *bil-ü-y* '(s)he knows', etc. His assumption is that the early existence of this present tense formation in neighboring, especially Kipchak, languages may have triggered a similar formation in parts of Anatolia (p. 262). The forms are correctly explained as consisting of converb + copula stem *i-*. However, the reference to Kipchak forms such as Kumyk *tara-y*, etc. (p. 259), is misleading since the element *-y* occurring here is simply the allomorph *-y* of the converb form after stems ending in vowels.

Brendemoen is certainly right in assuming that the present tense forms of the type *bil-ü-y* do not go back to forms containing an auxiliary verb of the type *yür(ü)-*. As I have suggested (Johanson 2000), they rather seem to be combinations of an intraterminal converb and a following *-y* developed from the copula *i-* (< *er-*). Thus **erür* 'is' may once have played a similar role in the present tense formation as Kip-

chak *turur* 'stands, is' and Oghuz *yorïr* 'moves' did at later stages. The old present tense formation is likely to have been replaced by new periphrases containing an intraterminal converb *-A + turur* or *yorïr*, e.g. *yaz-a turur* and *yaz-a yorïr* 'is writing'.

Forms of *er-* may once have played an important role as copula elements. Archaic dialects of Trabzon and Rize also exhibit free copula elements such as *iyim* 'I am', *isin* 'you are', *iyik* 'we are' (cf. Brendemoen 1997). I have suggested (Johanson 2000) that earlier forms such as * *iyim*—with *i(y)-* developed from **erür*—may have been the first stages of development towards the modern Turkish first person non-past copula forms *-(y)Im* 'I am', etc. There is also a third person form *idur* > *-ydur* 'is', obviously a combination of a form of *er-* plus *turur*. This form may have been common in older stages of Oghuz Turkic. Salar, whose speakers left the main body of Oghuz at the end of the fourteenth century and settled in Western China, still displays the form *i-dər* 'is'. All these forms are not likely to have been copied from Greek, an option considered by Brendemoen. The author alternatively suggests that they may have come in with Turkic groups from Iran.

Isoglosses

Brendemoen's classification of the dialects of the province Trabzon is a highly interesting enterprise with valuable results. Nevertheless, some of its underlying principles are problematic because of a certain vagueness of some core concepts.

The province is said to have several dialects. The author does not, however, want to approach the task of defining what a "dialect" is (p. 41). On the other hand, he appears to have rather firm opinions on what can *not* be a dialect. One requirement is that the area of a particular dialect should have a certain extension, but what extension? Beneath this level there may be "micro-dialects", a rather vague distinction as well.

The author discusses whether "phonemic" parameters are more important than "subphonemic" parameters as isoglosses representing dialect borders. Boundaries formed by subphonemic parameters are taken to divide "varieties" or "accents". Subphonemic features are not less important phonemic ones, the author says, but more difficult to evaluate. Because of their nonphonemic nature, they tend towards idiosyncratic realizations. These criteria are not always easy to apply since they ultimately depend on a relatively vague phoneme analysis. Moreover, the parameters used may, according to Brendemoen's own description, have phonemic status in some dialects, and subphonemic status in other dialects.

To yield meaningful dialect groups, the author points out, the parameters should be ranked according to their classificatory significance. This may seem to be a circular statement, but it means that isoglosses that yield clearly defined areas must be preferred to those that mark scattered occurrences with diffuse boundaries. Besides, parameters based on phonemic differences should get high priority. The occurrence of nonphonemic features cannot serve as characteristics of specific dialect groups.

Parameters are ranked according to their ability to provide as large and clear-cut areas as possible. In his survey of the diffusion of the most important parameters, the author shows that the isoglosses have a relatively strong tendency to appear in bundles. The most important parameter is the status of word-initial unaspirated unvoiced stops. These may occur frequently, under certain conditions, or not at all. An important isogloss is the one that distinguishes the phonemic status of the velar nasal *ŋ* in Çepni dialects from its nonphonemic status in the dialects further east.

Further parameters of high classificatory significance concern the stages of suffix vowel realization, the relevance stage, the indifference stage and the assimilation stage in a number of suffixes of the so-called U- and I-classes.

Sum

Brendemoen's book is admittedly sometimes difficult to read because of the differentiated argumentation, i.e. all the pros and cons intertwined in complex ways. The text is hardly characterized by verbal brevity. The reader is often confronted with complicated discussions with tentative rules, exceptions and exceptions of exceptions. There are heaps of foot- and endnotes, full of complementary information of various kinds. It is not easy to navigate through this wealth of facts, although the task is facilitated through numerous cross-references.

On the other hand, it is utterly rewarding to go through this book with full attention to the details. This giant enterprise carried out by one single person is characterized by a most felicitous combination of linguistic and historical argumentation. It is systematic, astute, thorough and accurate. Some details may be open to discussion or even objection, but the coherent treatment of the problems involved makes the book highly convincing as a whole.

The book also sets new qualitative standards for further dialectological work in Anatolia. Among his "desiderata" expressed at the end of the first volume, the author stresses that details of the diffusion of features cannot be explained until further material has been analyzed. Much new research must be done in Trabzon and Rize if we want to understand the dialectological status of the area better. The desiderata include fieldwork in the Sürmene-Yomra region and in Rize, a large-scale onomastic project, comprising old toponyms and clan names from the Eastern Black Sea region, an investigation of the Çepni dialect, and a general study of the status of the contemporary dialects spoken in Turkey .

References

Brendemoen, Bernt 1997. Some remarks on the copula in a "micro-dialect" on the Eastern Black Sea coast. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 33, 2-8.

Johanson, Lars 1979a. Die westoghusische Labialharmonie. *Orientalia Suecana* 27-28, 63-107.

Johanson, Lars 1979b. Nejtral'naja stadija v razvitii affiksal'nogo vokalizma v tureckom i azerbajdžanskom jazykax. *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 1979: 6, 57-61.

Johanson, Lars 1986. Zum Suffixvokalismus in zwei mittelosmanischen Transkriptionstexten. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 76, 163-169.

Johanson, Lars 1991. On syllabic frontness oppositions. In: *Varia Eurasiatica. Festschrift für Professor András Róna-Tas*. Szeged: Department of Altaic Studies. 77-94.

Johanson, Lars 1993. Graphie und Phonologie im Türkischen: Probleme der Lautharmonie. In: Werner, Otmar (ed.): *Probleme der Graphie*. ScriptOralia 57. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 83-94.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Traces of a Turkic copula verb. *Turkic Languages* 4, 235-238.