Report

6. Deutsche Turkologenkonferenz

Julian Rentzsch

This report provides an account of selected contributions to the 6. Deutsche Turkologenkonferenz, which was held at Frankfurt am Main, July 23-26, 2005.

Julian Rentzsch, Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, DE-55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: rentzsch@mail.uni-mainz.de

The Deutsche Turkologenkonferenz

The German Conference of Turcologists is the main Turcological conference in Germany taking place more or less regularly, and a major meeting place of Turcologists in the world. From the very beginning it was intended to gather academics from all fields of Turkic and Turkish studies including linguistics, literature, history and anthropology. In practice, it displays an affinity towards linguistic Turcology. This conference, held once every three to five years, attracts scholars from all over the world.

The present conference was the sixth one in a succession starting in 1987. Previous meetings were held at Bamberg (July 3-6, 1987), Rauischholzhausen (near Gießen, July 13-16, 1990), Leipzig (October 4-7, 1994), Hamburg (March 15-18, 1999) and Mainz (October 4-7, 2002).

The general assembly of the Frankfurt conference did not take a decision concerning the venue of the next meeting.

The Frankfurt Meeting

The conference held at Frankfurt July 23-26, 2005, was conducted under the general theme of "Kontinuität und Erneuerung in der Turcia" (Continuity and innovation in the Turkic world). In terms of size it was beyond all previous meetings: It was attended by more than one hundred registered participants; some ninety papers were read during four days in two sections. The bulk of the papers focussed on linguistics, but there was also a variety of non-linguistic contributions. The sheer number of papers resulted in an extremely rich choice of topics, but naturally also in a rather wide variation in quality.

Contributions ranged, among others, from the refined presentation of research data to reports on work in progress up to the identification of desirable topics for research.

The conference was organized very well in terms of logistics. Planning and implementation of the event, provision of equipment and handouts and, last but not least, catering met the highest demands. We are indebted to the head of the Department of Turcology at Frankfurt, Marcel Erdal, and his assistant Elisabetta Ragagnin as well as their staff. The conference site was located in a pleasant setting at the new Westend Campus of the University of Frankfurt.

Contributors and contributions

The 6. Deutsche Turkologenkonferenz hosted some of the most renowned scholars in Turcology. Among the participants there were some extremely talented and promising young academics, too.

The fact that the German Conference of Turcologists is a conference of Turcologists *in* Germany and *not* merely a conference of German Turcologists, reveals itself in the international composition of the attendants. Besides the big names in German Turcology, the conference hosted scholars from all over Europe. Two major groups consisted of participants from Turkey and the Russian Federation. There were also scholars from the USA and the People's Republic of China.

Among the thematic fields covered in the papers were Old Turkic, Turkish of Turkey, Siberian Turkic, the application of Generative Grammar to Turkic, language contact, diachrony, the classification of Turkic, as well as literature and history.

Papers

Due to the large number of contributions, only a small selection of papers can be mentioned here.

Old Turkic

Ablet Semet presented a lexical analysis of some Old Uyghur Buddhist texts translated from Chinese. As he pointed out, different translators from the *Šïŋku Šäli Tutuŋ* team employed a variety of equivalents for one and the same technical term. For example, the Chinese term *xue shan* 'Himālaya' is rendered as *haimavati taγ, qarlïγ taγ* or *haimangiri*, reflecting the individual translators' differing degrees of command of Sanskrit.

Klaus Röhrborn reconsidered the vocalism of copies from Sanskrit into Old Turkic. In transcribing these words, some scholars apply the rules of palatal harmony to these loans while others do not. In most cases, we simply cannot be sure how the Old Uyghurs read these words. Discussing the Sanskrit stems ending in *-a*, Röhrborn argued in favour of reading these endings, rendered in the Uyghur texts with the grapheme *yod*, as <*-e*>, not as <*-i/-ï*>. The argument was mainly of a negative kind:

Brahmī-glosses suggesting a reading as <-*i/-i*> were added much later when the knowledge of how to read the Sanskrit lexemes had already been lost.

In a paper titled "The history of writing in Mountain Altai", Larisa Tybykova and Irina Nevskaya reported among other things about recent discoveries of Old Turkic runiform inscriptions, inscriptions in Mongol script, as well as a Mongol and a Tibetan document in the Mountain Altai region.

While the aforementioned papers were concerned with East Old Turkic, Árpád Berta presented some results of research on West Old Turkic copies into Hungarian carried out in collaboration with A. Róna-Tas. This extremely valuable study will contribute significantly to our knowledge of West Old Turkic which is fragmentary due to the scarcity of the material preserved. West Old Turkic loans in Hungarian display characteristic features partly also known from Chuvash, such as rhotacism and lambdacism or initial *s*- instead of East Old Turkic *y*-, e.g. Hungarian *szél* ~ West Old Turkic **sel* ~ East Old Turkic *yel* 'wind'.

Turkish

Among the linguistic papers on Turkish, Margarete Ersen-Rasch spoke about the application of the plural suffix in Turkish in different environments. She refuted some widespread theories on the application of the plural in specific contexts and argued in favour of an opposition between internal and external perspective. Although the data presented here did certainly not constitute a complete analysis, the paper offered an interesting impetus for further consideration.

In his paper on Turkish intensive adjectives, Hans-Georg Müller formulated a set of phonological rules for the *auslaut* in the reduplication syllable.

Songül Rolffs presented selected problems of Turkish syntax from the viewpoint of language didactics.

Astrid Menz presented some typological remarks on Turkish counterfactual conditional clauses. Among other things, she discussed the role of *idi* as a distalizing marker (for support of this assumption in other contexts, see Johanson 1971: 52, Rentzsch 2005: 44) and the impact of contextual factors and temporal satellites on the interpretation of conditional clauses as counterfactual versus still possible, e.g., *Ali dün / yarın gelse alışveriş yapardık* 'If Ali had come yesterday, we would have gone shopping/If Ali came tomorrow, we would go shopping'. Intertwined with the latter problem is the question of the obligatoriness of *idi* in order to signal counterfactualness. As Menz pointed out, there are heavy restrictions on the use of aspect markers in the protasis (**gelirseydi*), while the apodosis is more flexible in this respect. In the discussion, the question was raised to what extent *geleydin* in the sentence *Dün geleydin sohbet ederdik* adds a shade of regret to the statement. The answer is disarmingly trivial: Although this sentence was equated to conditional clauses like *Dün gelseydin/gelsen sohbet ederdik* 'If you had come yesterday, we would have talked' in the paper, it is not a conditional clause by nature though it may fulfill similar communicative functions. Essentially however, it is a construction based on a

voluntative, most suitably translated as 'It was desirable that you come–we would have talked'. The result of the distalization of the voluntative is a possible secondary reading of regret. Astrid Menz's paper showed that conditional clauses pose a number of intricate and interesting problems. Besides, it is to be expected that Turkic languages differ a great deal in this field.

In a paper titled "Loanwords from English in modern Turkish and the language reform in Turkey", Elena Volodina observed an increasing influence of global copies from American English into Turkish. In connection with the sociolinguistic question why English words are attractive for copying processes, she discussed the role of the media and the tendency towards Westernization and contrasted these factors with the activities of the Türk Dil Kurumu directed towards 'purism'.

Siberian Turkic

Irina Nevskaya based her discussion on what she called "The category of taxis in Turkic languages" on material from Shor, Altai and Khakas Turkic. She defined taxis as "correlation of events in time". Her observations in the paper focussed mainly on taxis readings produced by various types of converbs. From her contribution it became apparent that taxis is not a "category" in the linguistic sense. All converbs under discussion primarily have linguistic functions different from the signalling of taxis relations. Consequently, taxis readings evolve as secondary interpretations of the primary linguistic function of the respective items.

Irina Tarakanova showed in her paper that in languages like Khakas items usually considered as particles, e.g. *oq, daa, la*, display uses resembling those of suffixes. She argued for a careful distinction between particles and suffixes as this distinction reflects the formal integration of an item into a word, and thereby the degree of grammaticalization.

Natalia Shirobokova talked about what she called "The Oghuz-Kypchak paradox in Yakut". As she argued, Yakut displays Kipchak traits in the sound system and Oghuz traits in morphology. From this alleged "paradox" she concluded that Yakut presents a problem for the classification of Turkic. Personally, I am sceptical about the relevance of some of the classification criteria she presented: I would disagree that *-mIš* is so typical for Oghuz, and *-GEn* for Kipchak. Quite on the con-trary, *-mIš* is well represented in non-Oghuz languages such as East Old Turkic, Khwarezmian Turkic and Chaghatay. On the other hand, *-GEn* as a finite unit is also represented in non-Kipchak languages such as Uzbek and Uyghur. Synchronic criteria alone prove insufficient for the classification of Turkic.

In another contribution on the classification of Turkic, Claus Schönig reconsidered possible subgroups in the so-called "*-GAn*-Turkic sphere" comprising Kipchak, South Siberian Turkic and the South-Eastern group. Taking South Siberian Turkic as a starting point and considering the isogloss between *tay* and a 'more Kipchak' type *taw* within Siberian Turkic, he proceeded along selected critical factors

and isoglosses to the West. His considerations resulted in a proposal of a sub-classification of Kipchak into Western Kipchak, Central Kipchak and Kirghiz Kipchak.

Diachrony

In a paper on continuity and renewal in the development of Turkic, Lars Johanson investigated discontinuity in the sense of the rise and fall of the optative paradigm in Ottoman Turkish. The "pseudo-paradigm" of volitional markers in Modern Standard Turkish strongly resembles the one found in East Old Turkic. In the development of Ottoman Turkish, however, an optative paradigm once emerged and vanished again. Johanson argued that, did we not know older stages of Ottoman Turkish, we would probably assume that the Turkish pattern of volitional markers is in direct succession to the Old Turkic one. What we can learn from this example is that a discontinuous diachronic development may be concealed by the similarity between paradigms at different synchronic levels.

Julian Rentzsch compared the status of the intraterminality opposition in the finite and non-finite inventories of three South-East Turkic languages, namely the languages of the Baburname, Uzbek and Uyghur. Much of the morphological material that has been preserved in the modern languages has undergone the well-known semantic processes of defocalization and focal renewal. As for the renewed items, there are some divergent developments in Uzbek and Uyghur. The paper included some remarks on the functional status of the converb *-GEč* and the semantic development of the morphological type *-mEKtE*.

In her paper, Filiz Kıral investigated the types of imperatives in Khalaj and proposed a new classification of the imperatives to a reduced set of three types instead of the ten types suggested by Gerhard Doerfer.

Andreas Waibel's paper was about vocative forms in some modern Turkic languages. As he observed, the possessive of the second person singular and items resembling it function as some kind of vocative in a number of Turkic languages, e.g. Chuvash, Kumyk, Yellow Uyghur, Khakas. Similar functions of the possessive of the second person singular are attested in some Samoyedic languages. Waibel suggested the possible existence of a vocative in Proto-Turkic. The question of how the use of the possessive of the second person singular as a vocative could be motivated was left unexplained. Moreover, this usage in Turkic could be the result of language contact rather than the remnant of a Proto-Turkic vocative.

Two papers were related to the *Sonderforschungsbereich* 295, titled "Cultural and linguistic contacts in West Asia and North-East Africa" at the University of Mainz:

Heidi Stein discussed some morphoplogical features in Turkic texts from Iran of the 15th and 16th century. She was especially concerned with the first person of the negative Aorist, which displays variants such as *-mEzEm*, *-mEnEm* and *-mEn*. As she pointed out, these items are relevant both for classificational and diachronic questions.

Sevgi Ağcagül and Caroline Riera-Darsalia discussed some phonetic, morphological and syntactic features of a transcription text in Lingua Turcica Agemica, a Gospel translation in Georgian script from the 18th century. Some of the syntactic features under investigation result from contact with Persian. The text proves extremely interesting for our knowledge of the development of West and South Oghuz varieties.

Abdurishit Yakup examined those phonetic processes in Uyghur commonly known as *umlauting* and *raising*. He described the Uyghur *umlaut* as a process mainly of raising and only to a lesser degree of fronting. Raising is a process of reduction or neutralization of low vowels in unstressed syllables. Although Yakup presented some instances for *umlaut* phenomena from East Old Turkic and Chaghatay, he pointed out that the Uyghur *umlaut* is a rather recent phenomenon. At the time of the early research of Eastern Turki, *umlaut* was much less developed and less wide spread than today. As Abdurishit Yakup showed, the development of the Uyghur *umlaut* is accelerated and re-enforced by the influence of the standard language. At present, the closing of $e > i$ and $ö > ü$ is in progress.

Hans Nugteren's paper focussed on the East Old Turkic combined suffix *-čUlAyU* and its modern descendants. Following Erdal (2004: 190, fn. 330), he analyzed this item as consisting of the equative marker plus *-layU* and described its semantics as indicating similarity. He then linked this and related items to modern elements like Khakas *-čĭli*, Tozhu *-šĭlay*, Shor/Altai/Kirghiz *-čilep*, Western Yughur *-čĭlo* and Yakut *-LU:*. He also discussed the possible development of this item from a suffix to a word in a number of languages such as Tofa, Khakas, Shor and Western Yugur. The paper addressed some very interesting questions, and the argumentation was presented in a very convincing way.

Dmitrij Nasilov dealt with questions of reconstruction of Turkic verbal forms, arguing that in historical linguistic research a strict distinction between word-formation and inflection is not justified. One case in point is the common Turkic verbal marker *-A*, which takes part in forming lexemes, converbs and tense forms. Another instance is the resultative: the perfect formation must be considered in connection with the ancient stative formatives of the type *-°K*.

Contact

Hendrik Boeschoten reconsidered some Turkic Koran translations of the Eastern and Western tradition and discussed their influence on linguistic structures in Turkic. This influence is obviously not restricted to terminology but extends to syntax and idiomatics. In Boeschoten's opinion, the structural changes inspired by Koran translations manifested themselves in theological literature first and subsequently influenced literary styles in general.

Uwe Bläsing discussed phytonyms in Turkish dialects with Georgian sub- or adstratum influence. His paper focussed on two lexemes occurring in a few villages in the Artvin province, namely *abet otu* 'punk' and *köndar* 'thyme'. Their etymology

was investigated with great scrutiny and not only traced back to Georgian, but also related to cognates in other Kartvelian languages and the languages of the Caucasus area in general. Besides linguistic information, Bläsing presented a wealth of information on peripheral matters, the cultural background and the use of the plants.

Language maintenance

The issue of language death and revitalization of endangered languages was addressed by two speakers.

Mieste Hotopp-Riecke talked about Internet support for the Crimean Tatar language.

Éva Á. Csató gave a detailed account on attempts to maintain and strengthen the Karaim language within the small community of speakers that still exists in Trakai, and to motivate Karaim children to learn their language.

Generative Grammar

Jaklin Kornfilt presented "Some tentative correlations in Turkic relative clauses". It is a well-known fact that Turkic languages differ with respect to the formation of various kinds of relative clauses. One group of languages, more or less restricted to Western Oghuz, employs different types of morphemes according to whether the subject referent in the relative clause is co-indexed with the head (*okuyan adam* 'the man that read/s') or not (*okuduğu kitap* 'the book s/he read/s'). In the majority of Turkic languages, this distinction is irrelevant: *oquyan adam* 'the man that read/s' vs. *oquyan kitab* 'the book that (someone) read/s'. The subject referent of the relative clause may, and sometimes must, be marked by suffixes of the possessive type. This marking is placed on the predicate of the relative clause in languages of the first group and on the head in the languages of the second. Taking this interesting difference as a starting point, Jaklin Kornfilt launched a thorough investigation of a few related problems within the Generative Syntax framework. Although many of the conclusions drawn are indisputable, I think that some questions remain. For example, in the following two relative clauses

(1) <*kitabï alγan oquwču*> 'The student <who bought the book>' and
(2) <*oquwču alγan kitap*> 'The book <that the student bought>',

the absence of the subject referent in (1) and of the object referent in (2) within the relative clause was identified by the author as a "gap". She postulated 'phonologically empty pronouns', 'silent resumptive pronouns', 'movement of empty operators', etc. Here, I think, the old handicap of Generative Grammar becomes evident. 'Pronouns' and 'operators' are postulated on the basis of English structures and identified as zero in the languages under investigation. The most primitive structures in Turkic have to be 'explained' as reduced variants of much more complex reconstructed base structures. This raises the question whether an adequate model for

language description should not take the simple structure as a starting point and proceed to more complex and elaborate structures from there.

Litip Tohti's paper "A new approach to Turkic studies in the frame of Generative Syntax" represented another attempt to apply Generative Syntax to Turkic, especially modern Uyghur. The stated objective was "to reconsider the inadequate descriptions of traditional grammar" and "to find better solutions". In order to reach this most welcome aim, the author applied everything Generative Grammar has to offer to Uyghur words, phrases and sentences. Among other things, diathetical suffixes are identified as "light verbs". Simple Turkic structures as e.g. *körüštürül-* <see: COOPERATIVE.CAUSATIVE.PASSIVE> 'to be made to see one another' render extremely complicated tree structures, which immediately raises the question of the descriptive adequacy of the model. The paper in itself stands out as an interesting example for the reception of Western linguistic models in the East.

Both contributors displayed a high familiarity with the languages they investigated as well as the model and terminology they favoured. In my opinion, it did not become obvious what exactly Generative Grammar at its present state has to offer for the description of Turkic. On the other hand, the model could benefit from the work of skilled generativists such as Kornfilt and Tohti and become an adequate means for the study of Turkic in a modified form.

Terminology

Gülshen Sahatova presented her views about the possibilities of syntactic uses of Turkmen verbal nouns. Her discussion was confined to the functional status in the sentence, while the semantic functions of the individual items were ignored. Addressing a number of terminological questions, she argued against the term *Nebensatz* for the types of subordination accomplished by the use of verbal nouns. Although this school of terminology can be considered of minor influence in modern Turcology, it has some currency in other Altaistic disciplines such as Mongolistics. What we can learn from this contribution is the necessity to define carefully what is meant by specific terms.

History and literature

A rough sketch of some papers on history and literature will suffice at this point.

The fall of the Krimean Khanate and the process of Russification was the object of Barbara Kellner-Heinkele's paper. In order to shed some light on the rather obscure events, she referred to a travelogue of the natural scientist Peter Simon Pallas published in 1801.

Larry Clark tried to reconstruct the processes of Turkicization and Islamization in the Yarkand oasis in the 11th century. Taking the so-called Yarkand documents into account, he argued that these processes, although interrelated, did not occur simultaneously. According to his theory, which was based on the personal names in the documents, Turkicization in Yarkand took place prior to Islamization.

Hansgerd Göckenjan presented a paper on the role of sword and saber as magic symbols of authority in Eurasian nomadic horseman societies.

Volker Rybatzki read a paper on Jews in pre-fifteenth century Central Asia.

Jakob Landau reported on the project "An annotated bibliography on conversion to Islam in the Ottoman Empire", which will be completed soon.

Claudia Römer investigated alliteration in Ottoman prose of the 16th century.

In a contribution on Ottoman poetry in Cyprus, Matthias Kappler identified some specific Cypriot traits in texts from the 18th and 19th century.

Klaus Kreiser dealt with statues and monuments dedicated to poets in Baku. He presented some findings on the interrelation of iconography and literary history.

Christiane Bulut discussed the language and identity of Tilim Khan, a Turkic *aşık* popular in Bayadistan in Iran.

Michael Hess presented Alevi martyr figures as a continuity starting from Ali, Hüseyn and Hasan over Nesimi and Pir Sultan Abdal to the *şehit*s of the Sivas massacre of 1993.

Martin Strohmeier examined the reception of World War I in the Turkish fiction and biographical literature.

Mediha Göbenli compared the image of female characters in selected novels of Orhan Kemal and Kemal Tahir.

Slobodan Ilić presented an overview of Sufi publications in the former Yugoslavia from 1878 till today.

Erika Taube dealt with Tuvan popular texts from Cengel in the Mongolian Altai, which she will publish in several volumes in the series *Turcologica*.

Turkic studies in Germany and abroad

One of the conclusions one can draw from this conference is that Turcology is an extremely vigorous discipline. Germany, which has always had an immense impact on international Turcology, still attracts scholars from all over the world. Among the those assembled at Frankfurt were most of the renowned scholars in the field as well as some very talented newcomers.

In light of the recent considerations to shut down the Department of Turcology at Frankfurt, it is appropriate to ask whether coming generations will find positive conditions for scholarship in the future. In Germany there has recently been a general tendency to reduce academic studies, research, education and the training of the coming generation. The situation in other countries where there is no such discipline as Turcology as well as in countries where this discipline has been destroyed, gives us reason to pessimism with respect to the future of Turcology in Germany. On the other hand, given the fact that there are still a number of promising young Turcologists, let us be optimistic that they will prevail.

Many valuable papers were presented at the conference, but not all contributions were able to meet critical demands. The organizers of future conferences of this kind should consider a previous evaluation and selection of papers.

Some papers were subject to long delays because of technical problems. Here it became obvious that one can overdo things. The use of technology should be restricted to cases where it is vital for the kind of material to be presented.

References

Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.

Johanson, Lars 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Rentzsch, Julian 2005. *Aspekt im Neuuigurischen*. (Turcologica 65.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.☐