

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2009

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0013 | LOG_0043

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Juha Janhunen: Review of Arienne M. Dwyer, *Salar: A study in Inner Asian language contact processes. Part 1: Phonology*. (Turcologica 37,1.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007. xv + 336 pp. ISSN 0177-4743, ISBN 978-3-447-04091-4.

*Juha A. Janhunen, Professor and Chair, Unit of Altaic and East Asian Studies,
Department of World Cultures, University of Helsinki, Box 59, 00014 Helsinki, Finland.
E-mail: asiemajeure@yahoo.com*

Originally presented as a doctoral dissertation in 1996 (University of Washington) and scheduled to appear in book form in 2000, this long-awaited work was at last published, in updated form, in 2007. The volume is based on Arienne Dwyer's extensive field work among Salar speakers in the 15-year period between 1991 and 2006. Unfortunately, it still remains only the first of a set of two planned volumes, which together, it is hoped, will ultimately constitute the most comprehensive modern reference tool on the Salar language. After the grammar of Ė. R. Tenishev (1976), this is the first major contribution to Salar studies.

Salar has long remained one of the most insufficiently known Turkic languages, spoken by a relatively small population comprising perhaps only 50,000 (by even the most positive estimate no more than 70,000) people in the remote Sino-Tibetan border region also known as Amdo. The largest concentration of Salar speakers is within Xunhua Salar Autonomous County of Qinghai Province, located at a section of the Upper Yellow River in an ethnic environment dominated by Amdo Tibetans and Chinese Moslems (Dungans or *Huihui*). Due to secondary migrations, there are also Salar communities in Xinjiang, especially in the Yili region, which, importantly, were also covered by Dwyer's field work.

Both the ethnic origin of the Salar speakers and the taxonomic position of Salar among the Turkic languages remain unsolved issues, and Dwyer's discussion of this topic (pp. 1-25, 32-68) offers no definitive conclusion, though she supports the idea of an 'archaic' Western Turkic origin with Northern and Eastern Turkic influences. In any case, it is obvious that the Salar are one of the small displaced Turkic and Mongolic populations that remain in the Amdo region as relicts of the Mongol empire (13th to 15th centuries). Not surprisingly, during some 600 years of isolation, the Salar language has become one of the most aberrant forms of Common Turkic.

Indeed, the question as to what the original taxonomic position of Salar may have been is almost irrelevant given how much the language has changed from contact with the local non-Turkic languages, including Hezhou Mandarin, Amdo Ti-

betan, and, historically, Mongolic. Traditionally, many Salar speakers are traders who are more or less fluent in the languages of their trading partners. Even today, many Salar speakers, especially males, are trilingual in Salar, Amdo Tibetan and Hezhou Mandarin. On the other hand, the Salar live in some of the least 'developed' parts of China, with extremely low levels of income and literacy, a situation that has favoured the preservation of the native language and culture.

After discussing Salar history and culture (pp. 1-25), full of religious fundamentalism, tribal feuds, and rebellions nourished by controversies between the different 'orders' of Islam, Dwyer presents an overview of Salar linguistic history (pp. 26-68), as well as dialectology and history of research (pp. 69-94), after which follows the main part of the book, devoted to phonology (pp. 94-308). The volume concludes with a comprehensive bibliography of all previous scholarship on the Salar language (pp. 309-326). The forthcoming second volume will apparently deal with morphology and syntax, and until it is published the work remains incomplete.

From the point of view of interlingual intelligibility, Salar is, together with Chuvash, Yakut, and Sarygh Yughur, one of the most idiosyncratic Turkic languages. When discussing this issue (pp. 26-32) Dwyer slightly overemphasizes the impact of geography, as opposed to chronology. Chuvash and Sarygh Yughur, for instance, which Dwyer mentions as two 'isolated' Turkic languages, are mutually no less unintelligible than Chuvash and Tatar. Clearly, it is not so much the geographical distance as the chronological separation that makes languages different.

Even so, it is clear that the idiosyncracies of Salar are due to an exceptionally rapid speed of evolution, a property shared by the other, mostly non-Turkic, languages of the Amdo region. The region is a laboratory of language contact, for many diachronic developments are shared across language borders. For instance, the Salar spirantization of initial **b* to *w* can hardly be separated from the similar development in Amdo Tibetan and certain forms of local Mongolic. The same is likely true of the loss of syllable-final **r*, a common trend in many Amdo Tibetan 'farmer' dialects, and also in certain forms of local Mongolic. For such areally conditioned phenomena it is unnecessary to look for more distant parallels in other branches of Turkic, such as Uighur or Oghuz.

The coexistence of different language families in a region often produces puzzling cases of material convergence. For instance, as Dwyer correctly notes (p. 62 note 38), the Salar accusative ending *-ni* is formally identical to the connective (genitive-accusative) ending **-ni* as attested in all the Mongolic languages of the region. In the pronouns (p. 64-65), there are parallels such as Salar [Gala] 'where/whither' = Santa [q^hala] = Bonan [hala] ~ [hali] = Wutun [ali] id. These are not simple borrowings, and, indeed, it seems that more often than by 'copying', adjacent languages somehow produce similar results from their own material resources.

As far as the phonological apparatus is concerned, Dwyer follows a conservative approach, as is common in Altaic studies, the focus being on the non-technical aspects of phonetics and diachrony, rather than on systematic synchronic phonology.

In principle, Dwyer distinguishes phonemes ('underlying inventory') from allophones ('surface inventory'), but in practice these levels are vaguely defined. Often, the 'phonemic' sequences actually seem to be morphophonemic representations and/or diachronic reconstructions. For instance, the phonetic transcriptions [tulu'yu] ~ [tiuliu'yu] 'fox' are 'phonemized' (p. 149) as /tylge/, which cannot be synchronically correct. Similar examples abound in the work, which makes several chapters, such as the one on syllable structure and prosody (pp. 139-162), somewhat difficult to digest.

Dwyer is also rather diffuse about the dialectal differences at the phonological level. Although she lists two main 'dialects' (Amdo vs. Yili) and several 'vernaculars' (pp. 77-86), she minimizes dialectal information in the actual phonological description. Since there is much segmental variation in Salar at the phonetic and phonemic levels, and in the data quoted by Dwyer, it is not always clear to the reader when this variation is conditioned by idiolectal factors, and when it is connected with true regional differences. There also seem to be significant generational differences in Salar. For instance, the vowel paradigm is being simplified from eight to six to five (?) vowels in the speech of younger individuals, with further implications for vowel phonotactics. Dwyer does not implicate the specific age groups and localities that have a particular vowel system.

In this connection, the choice of the IPA system for the rendering of the phonemic sequences of Salar may also be criticized. The IPA may be fine when phonetic distinctions (at a rather rough allophonic level) are to be indicated, but it is an awkward and often misleading choice when it comes to phonemic notation. In the Salar case, the language could easily be transcribed by using either the Chinese *pinyin* system, as has been done in some Salar text publications before, or an adaptation of the Turkish Roman orthography, as also used today for several Central Asian Turkic languages. Due to the closeness of Salar phonology to local Chinese, the *pinyin* system would be the best option.

The emphasis on phonetics also results in Dwyer occasionally discussing in unnecessary length trivial detail with little phonological importance; two examples are the strength correlation of the obstruents (pp. 98-108) and the preaspiration of postvocalic strong obstruents (pp. 191-201). Both phenomena have a shallow areal background and do not interfere with the actual phonemic sequences, nor with the segmental correspondences between Salar and the other Turkic languages. Ultimately, it is a question of different phonetic ways that retain the same original strength correlation: it can be supported either by voice (unvoiced vs. voiced) or by aspiration (aspirated vs. unaspirated), or by both, and the aspiration, if present, can both precede (preaspiration) and/or follow (postaspiration) the obstruent segment.

For purposes of comparative Turkology, the most important part of Dwyer's book is the lengthy chapter on diachrony (pp. 202-301). After initially touching upon the interesting question concerning the asymmetry of the Proto-Turkic subparadigm of stops (pp. 205-208), though with no substantial new insights, Dwyer goes on to list the diachronic sources of the Salar phonemes, considering both the

inherited Turkic and the borrowed Tibetan, Chinese, Mongolic, Arabic, and Persian vocabulary of the language. Unfortunately, the lack of consistent information on the dialects, and the problems inherent in the phonetic notation, make this section less easy to use than would be the case had a different framework been used.

In general, the diachronic information given by Dwyer is reliable, though certain individual explanations might need slight revision. For instance, as possible sources of Salar [hadi] ~ [xadzi] ‘Chinese’ Dwyer mentions (p. 245) both Amdo Tibetan [hdza] (Written Tibetan <rgya>) and Bonan [xdi] (more correctly [hti]) id., of which only the latter, a variant of **kitai* ~ **katai* and a cognate of Santa [q^hitei] id., can be relevant. Examples like “mahka” ‘wound’ and “gahtça” ‘language’ (p. 254), borrowed from Amdo Tibetan [ma^hka] resp. [h^hka^htça] (Written Tibetan <rma.kha> resp. <skad.cha>), are not cases of segmental /h/ insertion but, rather, examples of the regular phonetic preaspiration of medial strong stops. The correct segmentalizations would therefore have to be [ma^hka] resp. [ka^htça], i.e. /maka/ resp. /gatça/.

Such criticisms of minor details do not diminish the general value of Dwyer’s work. It is of considerable merit to have reintroduced the Salar language in an accessible form, and in the English language, to an international readership. The reader looks forward to the publication of the second volume in the near future.

László Károly: Review of P. A. Slepcev (ed.), (*Bol’šoj*) *tolkovyj slovar’ jakutskogo jazyka* [*Saxa tilin bihārīlāx (ulaxan) tiljita*], Vol. 1 [A], Vol. 2 [B], Vol. 3 [G–I], Vol. 4 [K–küölähinqā], Vol. 5 [küölähis gīn–kāčärä]. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 2004, 680 pages; 2005, 912 pages; 2006, 844 pages; 2007, 672 pages; 2008, 616 pages. ISBN 978-5-02-032332-2.

László Károly, University of Szeged, Department of Altaic Studies, H-6722 Szeged, Hungary. Egyetem u. 2. E-mail: laszlokaroly@hung.u-szeged.hu

Persons interested in the language of the Yakut people can choose from among a variety of dictionaries according to their needs: Dealing with the historical aspects of the language, one can benefit from the famous dictionary of K. È. Pekarskij (*Slovar’ jakutskogo jazyka* 1-3, St. Peterburg-Leningrad: Akademija Nauk, 1907-1930). The literary language of the socialist period is covered by a dictionary edited by P. A. Slepcev (*Jakutsko-russkij slovar’*, Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija, 1972). The special lexicon of the Yakut dialects is also accessible via the *Dialektologičeskij slovar’ jakutskogo jazyka* (edited by P. S. Afanas’ev et alii, Moskva: Nauka, 1976) and its “additional” volume *Dialektologičeskij slovar’ jazyka saxa*

[*Saxa tüölbä tilin tiljita*] (edited by M. S. Voronkin *et alii*, Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1995).

Although a new dictionary has appeared in the edition of W. Monastyrjew (*Jakutisch. Kleines erklärendes Wörterbuch des Jakutischen (Sacha-Deutsch)* (Turcologica 68) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006; cf. my review in *Turkic Languages* 11: 279-284), a comprehensive dictionary of the present-day language had been missing until recently. In order to study the modern literary language and its newer lexical elements, one only had the following possibilities: 1. making a field trip to Yakutia; 2. visiting Yakut websites on the Internet. Now it seems that we are getting closer to an up-to-date dictionary of the modern Yakut literary language, since scholars at the Yakut Academy under the leadership of P. A. Slepcev have started to publish a voluminous dictionary to fill this gap. With the fifth volume already out, the lexicon is covered from *a* to *kāčärä*. According to my calculation, based on these five available volumes, the entire dictionary (which is planned to have around thirteen volumes) will include at least 85,000-90,000 words and phrases, making it one of the largest corpora compared to the available dictionaries of the other Turkic languages.

The first volume has an extraordinarily long, but very useful introduction (bilingual, in Yakut and Russian). In the preface the authors describe the main aims of the dictionary (namely demonstrating, disseminating and fortifying the literary norm) and about earlier contributions to Yakut lexicology. In addition we learn that the dictionary is based on a catalogue of three million cards which was started in 1972. At the end of the preface the principles according to which the authors prepared the dictionary are summed up in eight points: (1) The lexical material is collected from various sources (literary works, spoken language, etc.). Only words found to be frequent were included—even if they were dialectal, colloquial or archaic. New Russian elements appearing in mass media and informal communication, slang words, etc., however, are not included. (2) Besides the headwords, a huge variety of phrases and expressions is also given. (3) The primary goal of the dictionary is to define the meaning of the words as precisely as possible because the authors considered this a focal point of the literary norm. (4) The semantic side of the words is illustrated by means of example sentences. (5) Although research on stylistics has only been started recently, the authors make a great effort to classify the lexemes stylistically, as a first step toward establishing a stylistic norm for the language. (6) Grammatical characteristics of the words are also given. (7) The dictionary is made for the widest readership. At the same time, it tries to meet with the highest scientific needs. Additionally, as an aid for non-native readers, the meanings are given in both Yakut and Russian. (8) Etymologically related words in Turkic, Mongolic and Tungusic are also mentioned.

In the next chapter, the structure and set-up of the dictionary is thoroughly described by means of examples according to the following points: 1. composition of the dictionary, 2. the meaning, 3. word classes and derivation, 4. the Russian meaning, 5. the grammatical character of the words, 6. the stylistic character of the words,

7. example sentences, 8. spelling and accent, 9. etymology, 10. the structure of the entries.

This chapter is followed by 1. the abbreviations (terms and languages), 2. the names of writers and journalists, and 3. the sources used. Finally the Yakut alphabet and the signs used are given.

Comparing the lexical material of this new dictionary with those of Soviet times, the reader can detect significant differences. One of them is the clearly visible effort of freeing the language from the written, or so called “knižnyj” Russian terms. For example in Slepcev 1972 we find many Russian loanwords with initial /v/, a sound which was generally considered a foreign phoneme in Yakut. In the new dictionary, the reader will not find such forms: the word *ventiljator* ‘ventilator’, e.g., is now *bāntilāār*, *vanna* ‘bath’ can only be observed in its Yakutized form *bānnay*. The same is true, e.g., for Russian loanwords with initial /f/: Instead of former *fabrika* ‘factory’ we can now only see the Yakutized form *bābirika* in the dictionary. It is worth noting, however, that some, formerly well-known Yakutized words of Russian origin cannot be found in the dictionary: see e.g. *balīta* (← *валюта* ‘currency’). Maybe some other form related to *xarčī* ‘money’ was chosen as a standard word for ‘currency’, but it will take some years for this question to be answered.

In certain cases both the learned and Yakutized variants appear in the dictionary, as e.g. *gās* and *gaz* ‘gas’. Since *gaz* is more frequently used, it is handled as the base form. Accordingly, in the dictionary we find the heads “*gaz (gās)*” and “*gās kör gaz*”; the example sentences are under the head words to which they belong. Interestingly enough, the inflected form *gahinan* clearly shows full integration (i.e. *VzV* > *VsV* > *VhV*) of the word *gaz* into the system of the Yakut language. Other examples of this category are *kvitancija* ‘receipt’ (*kibitānsiyā*) and *buxgalter* ‘book-keeper’ (*bugāltīr*) where again the non-Yakutized forms are the more frequent, and thus the preferred ones.

Another important question regarding the lexical material presented in the dictionary is the number of newly appearing words or phrases. In such a huge corpus, one may expect many of them, which is indeed the case. Without trying to be exhaustive, I mention here only some very special findings of mine. For instance, the phrase *babīa kōmūs* (fol’k.) ‘postojannyj ėpitet, opisvyajuščij ladon’ ili palec personaža jakutskogo geroičeskogo ėposa olonho’ was known to me only from heroic epics; now we get an exact definition of the term and three example sentences illustrating its usage. Having an entry in the dictionary, the dialectal word *božunuoy* ‘zajčonok, zajčiška’ must be prevalent among the native speakers, though I could not observe it in any other Yakut dictionaries known to me. Another word is *bokōror* ‘vospalenie golovnogo i spinnogo mozga, ėncefalomielit’ known to me only from a medical paper of R. Stone entitled “Siberia’s Deadly Stalker Emerges from the Shadows” (*Science* 296 (26 April 2002): 642-645) as *bokhoror* ‘Viliuisk encephalomyelitis’. The form *bokhoror* (or, in conformity to the Turcological notations, *boxoror*) is possibly a dialectal variant coming from the paper of K. G. Umanskij, “*Boxoror*” (*ĕtnografičeskij analiz problem viljujskogo ėncefalomielita*) in Sovjets-

kaja étnografija 1974/4: 133-143. According to the etymological meaning “the stiffness; skovannyj, skovannost’”, the word *bokōror*, although it is not noted in the dictionary, is highly likely to be related to the verb *bokōr-* ‘slabet’, s vozrastom stanovit’sja nemoščnym’. Since there are no example sentences provided for *bokōror*, my analysis must stop here.

Also in the head, besides other things, we find the morphological description of the given lexemes (only if they can be derived mechanically, i.e. the meaning is predictable). For example, *būtaydas-* is analysed as ‘būtaydā- *diāntān xolb. tuh.*’ (a cooperative–reciprocal form), *gīpsālān-* is ‘gīpsālā- *diāntān atin tuh.*’ (a passive form). It is a very useful addition, but unfortunately the meanings of the derived lexemes are not given, only some example sentences. On the other hand, the applied system is inconsistent: While *gāstāhīm* is analysed as ‘gāstā- *diāntān xay. āta*’ (action noun), *būtalāhīm* ‘zaputyvanie perednih nog lošadi (pered puskom na past’bu)’ remains unanalysed (its base is *būtalā-* ‘nadevat’ puty na perednie nogi lošadi pered puskom ee na vypas’); cf. § 28.3 in the introduction of the first volume. Moreover, many other derivatives, e.g. words in *+LĀx* and *+TXŋX* are also not analysed (cf. *gāstāx* ‘gazovyj; gazirovannyj; gazificirovannyj’ and *gāstīŋi* ‘gazoobraznyj, kak gaz’ ← *gās*); cf. § 31 in the introduction. Of course, in many cases the meaning of the derivatives is not predictable, but the system used must be consistent, with or without morphological analysis.

At the end of the entries of the headwords considered primary, the reader will find etymological remarks in the shape of corresponding forms from, according to the authors, Turkic, Turko-Mongolic, Mongolic and Evenki. In the case of Russian loanwords remarks are only given if the corresponding Russian words are archaic or dialectal. This part of the dictionary can easily be completed with many additional parallels. The verb *abīrā-* ‘spasat’, *izbavljat* (ot bedy, gibeli)’, e.g., is of Mongolic origin, cf. *abura-* ‘to save, rescue, help, deliver, preserve life; to protect’; *bary-* ‘v sumerkah vydeljat’ sja bol’šim temnym siluétom, bol’šoj ten’ju, etc.’ clearly corresponds to Mongolic *baruyi-* ‘to become dark, sinister, obscure; to be troubled, downcast; to grow dark in the face’; *bāt* II ‘nebol’šaja dolblenaja lodka (iz brevna)’ is an old loanword from Russian dialectal *бам* ‘lodka’. Further such data can be found in the book of St. Kałużyński entitled *Iacutica (Prace jakutoznawcze)*, Warszawa: Dialog, 1995.

Sometimes the authors provide incorrect etymological cognates. For example, *abaga* ‘djadja’ is not of Turkic origin, but related to Mongolic *abaga* ‘parental uncle’. The well-known Yakut word *abāhi* ‘zloj duh, etc.’ is hardly related to Turkic *abači* ‘a bogy’ (the cited form *abaču* is not known to me from Old Turkic), cf. the problems and etymological attempts related to this word in M. Stachowski’s *Jakutisch abāhy ‘Teufel’* (Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia 6 (2001): 173-180). The word *iāmāx* ‘kol’ceobraznye ser’gi, etc.’ has nothing to do with Old Turkic *āgmā* ‘the arch, or vault, in a house’, it is of Mongolic origin, cf. *egemeg* ‘earring’. Although we can dispense easily with the missing etymological remarks, since this is

not the primary goal of the dictionary, the incorrect etymologies need to be criticized severely because the dictionary will reach a wide readership.

The form *aġabīt* 'svjaščennik, pop' (i.e. with a long vowel in the last syllable!) is a problem: It is a petrified first person plural possessive form of *aga* 'otec (detej)' literally meaning 'our father'. Firstly, the vowel of the possessive suffix in question is short; the word is written as *aġabit* in all the other dictionaries. Secondly, the feminine variant *iyābit* 'popad'ja (žena svjaščennika)' is written with a short vowel in the same dictionary. Having no better solution, I assume a printing mistake here.

In the entries there are cross-references for variants and synonyms. The meaning of the variants is never given, only a reference to the main form; cf. e.g. the pair *īrbāñnik* 'kōr irbāñnik' and *irbāñnik* 'solnečnye bliki, igrajuščie na legkoj rjabi vody', which is a clear way to indicate what is preferred and what is considered only variant. In other cases we find references for synonyms either in the head or at the end of the entry with the abbreviations *diān kurduk* 'same as' and *tāñn.* 'compare', respectively; see e.g. the words *baġaǰ* I 'muñxa diān kurduk' and *dōbōñnik* 'legko, prosto, bystro' with the synonyms *dābigis* 'bez osobogo truda, legko, bystro, skoro' and *ilbičča*. In the case of *īrimtiyī* 'virusnaja bolezn', poražajuščaja nervnuju sistemu životnyh (preim. domašnih), bešenstvo', however, the synonym *īrār iarī* (tāñn.) is mentioned without referring to the headword of the entry where it appears, which may mislead the inexperienced reader, while the phrase *īrār iarī* has no independent entry: It is under *īr-* I 'stradat' poterej rassudka, umopomešatel'stvom, sojti s uma, etc.'

Not being a native speaker of Yakut, it is beyond my competence to make a decision concerning certain segments (mostly in connection with semantics and stylistics) of the dictionary. However, I can say without any reservation that, compared with earlier works, the authors have made a significant step forward in many respects: the great number of example sentences together with their sources help the reader to determine or better understand the meaning, the sphere of use, and the stylistic value of the different lexemes. This is helped by synonyms (in the Yakut meaning), variants (at the end of the entries) and additional remarks on the style (in the head of the entries). Here are some typical examples: We can learn about the word *bōgōxtük* (not known from other dictionaries) that it is part of the spoken language (*kāps.*) meaning 1. 'tak, čtoby bystro ne progolodat'sja, sytno' and 2. 's nadeždoj, so spokojnoj dušoj otноситel'no čego-l., spokojno'. Both meanings are illustrated by examples: 1. *Bōgōxtük ahā*. 2. *Ikki sil ustata üčügäydik bilsibit jon kurduk -- bōgōxtük sananabīn*. The abbreviation "XS" after the second example indicates the source, namely the journal *Xotugu sulus* 'Polaris'. The word *jahāx* (only found in the dictionary of Monastyrjew) is marked as a historical term (*istor.*) and, besides the meaning 'jasak', those who are not familiar with the historical terminology can learn that it is 'natural'naja podat' (preim. pušninoj) s narodov Sibiri i Severa v XVII-XX vekah'. The word *ĵogustay* 'malen'kij, maljusen'kij' (also not known from other dictionaries) is defined as poetical and an example is quoted from Semen Petrovič Danilov: [Čičāx] kāpsātān ārārđi Kāgiññi-kāgiññi Ĵogustay bāyātā

Ҕoxsollon olordo. Other words such as neologisms, euphemisms, official or scientific terms also show the wealth and thoroughness of the dictionary in these respects.

In my present review I have only had the possibility to discuss the recently published first five volumes of the modern Yakut explanatory dictionary. If the preparation of the further volumes goes well (approximately one volume per year), we will see the whole corpus in its entirety in about seven to ten years. We will then have to return to this enormous work to re-analyse and complement the present discussion. I am sure this dictionary will reach its main goal and become a compass in the establishment of a new literary standard of the modern Yakut language (or *буһуҕу эдэр литературнай тылбыт* as expressed by the authors). And as a bonus, it will be an extremely useful source for those who are interested in any aspect of Yakutology.

Gerjan van Schaaiк: Review of Esin İleri, *Lehrbuch der türkischen Sprache*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 2007. XIV + 289 pages, ISBN 978-3-87548-344-4, Euro 29.80

*Gerjan van Schaaiк, SMES – Leiden University, Postbus 9500, 2300 RA Leiden, NL.
E-mail: G.J.van.Schaaik@hum.leidenuniv.nl*

Aim

Lehrbuch der türkischen Sprache is a book intended for students who have a full command of the German language. This is an important condition because it is the language used for grammatical explanations and instructions to the exercises, as well as for the preface and introduction. According to the preface, the book aims to lead to “communicative competence for daily life, travel and professionals (teachers)” at the A2-B1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Furthermore, it is claimed that this course will require a beginning student with no prior knowledge of Turkish to invest some 220 hours of instruction (“Unterrichtsstunden”). In terms of the European Credit Transfer System this part of the work load (for classroom instruction alone) would be equivalent to $220/28 = 7.85$ credits. It is to be expected that some additional time should be allotted for homework, preparation for tests, et cetera. The (standard) ratio between instructional time and time to be spent on homework is however an unknown factor, which makes it difficult to calculate or even estimate the overall course load in terms of the ECTS.

Taking a quite different perspective, we could reason as follows: assuming four hours per week of classroom instruction plus six to seven hours per week for homework over a period of thirteen weeks (one term), the total workload of a complete course adds up to approximately 140 hours, which equals 5 credits. Given the size of

the book, the complexity of the subject matter, the intended final level of competence, the number of exercises and the size of the vocabulary, I believe that the total workload of this course cannot exceed 10 credits (and actually comes closer to 5 credits).

Structure

The book is published in a nice, practical format and comprises twenty lessons, each of which is based on dialogues, grammatical explanation, exercises and a vocabulary section, all presented in this order. It contains a table of contents covering four pages, showing among other things which *conversational topics* (such as greetings, shopping, asking the way, visiting a restaurant) together with their corresponding *grammatical issues* are treated in each chapter. Unfortunately, a register / subject index is lacking, to the effect that in order to look up a certain topic one must rely entirely on the table of contents. At times, certainly as long as one has not yet become very familiar with the contents, this might be a rather laborious enterprise. On the other hand, a very practical list of abbreviations is included at the beginning of the book. And at the end of the book there are two special sections. A “module” in which some vocabulary is presented in a diversified way: articles of clothing, vegetables, fruit and sun-dried fruits, and body parts. The second special section is the key to the exercises.

The book is enlivened by a multitude of illustrations, all well chosen and well finished. They come in two sorts: drawings and photographs, and they are applied in the text body as well as in a number of exercises—their function, however, is not purely ornamental but intended as a graphic representation of things and situations to be expressed by Turkish words and phrases.

A special word of praise is in place for the vocabulary lists at the end of each chapter. They are well thought-out: some adjectives are presented together with their antonyms (and translations), e.g. *başarılı* ⇔ *başarısız*, and, where possible and useful, grammatical, derivational or phraseological information is given in red print, e.g. to *otobüs durağı* ‘bus stop’ the item *durak*, -ğ*ı* ‘stop’ is included; *Anadolu* ‘Anatolia’ is followed by *Anadolulu* ‘Anatolian person’; to *eldiven* ‘glove’ the phrase *bir çift eldiven* ‘a pair of gloves’ is added.

Method

The teaching method underlying the way the book is organized is referred to as post-communicative: “das aktive und bewusste Lernen”, that is, active learning with a strong appeal to the awareness of what is being learned. This approach is materialized in the following sequence of activities: reading & comprehension, followed by listening & speaking. Apparently, these skills are to be developed under the guidance of a teacher. Since the book is designed for instruction in a classroom (I think preferably by a native speaker of Turkish), it is not a priori suitable for self-study.

Two CDs have been added after the publication of the book. The reviewer did not have access to these.

Evaluation

The main question for a reviewer of course books is always to what extent the ultimate aim as formulated in the preface is actually accomplished. No doubt that working one's way through this book will lead to a thorough knowledge of the most frequent structures of Turkish, albeit on an elementary / basic level. The final level is definitely basic, though not superficial. In my opinion, the student who finishes this course will very well be able to entertain a conversation on a variety of topics.

Moreover, the vocabulary contains some 2000 words, a number which is more than sufficient for most daily situations. And of course, good proficiency in the skills of listening and understanding (passive knowledge) is always a precondition to the more productive skills such as speaking and writing (active knowledge). On top of it, the level attained at the end of the course is an excellent basis for further development. As indicated above, the final level is elementary / basic, since participles, converbs and other means of building complex structures are excluded. This circumstance precludes all attempts to read even the simplest novels, let alone newspaper articles.

Some criticisms

My overall impression is that we have a solid book in hand, rich in dialogues, well-chosen illustrations, good exercises, and a balanced and well-structured vocabulary. In short, it is a book that would be most welcome to anyone who wants to make quick progress on a basic and not too complicated level. A few minor points already mentioned are the lack of an index and a CD which would facilitate self-study. But there is more.

On the level of grammatical explanations I certainly have a few complaints. Partly because a number of factors leave me with the impression that the author is not very well-versed in these matters, and partly because the great number of people who deserve big thank you's (page XII) obviously had no influence on the numerous inconsistencies and downright old-fashioned ideas about how to explain certain grammatical phenomena. Here we go...

Taking a contrastive perspective, the alphabet and sound system of Turkish is compared with those of German. On page 1 we read that "...most sounds of Turkish are familiar to the German-speaking learner due to his mother tongue; only few sounds of Turkish must be learned anew [...die meisten Laute des Türkischen sind dem deutschsprachigen Lerner von seiner Muttersprache her bekannt; nur wenige Laute des Türkischen müssen neu gelernt werden".] Roughly speaking this is true, but significant and audible differences are to be found in the tasty details, which unfortunately are not always presented or carefully explained.

Take the *ö*, which sounds ‘longer’ in *schön* ‘beautiful’ than in *Dörfer* ‘villages’. For a similar difference, compare the *a* in *Jahr* ‘year’ with the one in *Mann* ‘man’. And what about the *e*, to which the sound value “open e” [offenes *e* (*ä*)] is assigned, as exemplified by *Ente* ‘duck’ and *Kätzchen* ‘kitten’, thereby ignoring the fact that the letter *e* in Turkish may stand for different sounds, as in: *gel* [ge] ‘come!’, *şey* [še] ‘thing’ and *eğmek* [e: -mek] ‘to bend’. Without any indication of which one to choose, the reader is at this stage totally left in the dark, despite the fact that on page 3 a single statement can be found on the quality of vowels: “All Turkish vowels are open and not long” [Alle türkischen Vokale sind offen und nicht lang], immediately followed by a series of remarks dealing with spelling.

On the phonological level there are some omissions as well. We mention only: aspiration of the /t/ in word final position (as in: *dur* ‘stop!’ and *var* ‘there is/are’) and aspiration of /p/, /t/, /ç/ in syllable initial position (as in: *kapı* [k^ha + p^h] ‘door’, *tütün* [t^hü + t^hün] ‘tobacco’ and *çiçek* [ç^hi + ç^hek] ‘flower’). Nor is there any systematic treatment of vowel reduction phenomena in relation to accentuation, as occurring in for instance: *anlayamaz* [an + lı + ya + maz] ‘(s)he cannot understand’ and *söyleyebilir* [söy + li + ye + bi + lir] ‘(s)he may say’, et cetera.

Pages 3 and 5 depict cross sections of the human mouth, showing the tongue position relative to the palate and other points of articulation. In the light of the contrastive approach to the sound systems of Turkish and German, it remains to be seen to what extent these illustrations contribute to a better understanding of the mutual differences (not the similarities—these are irrelevant) between the vowels of Turkish and those of German. For example, a difference between the sounds *e* and *ö* on the one hand and *i* and *ü* on the other can hardly be distinguished on page 3. And contrary to what is stated on page 2, that the *ğ* is a “Dehnungs-konsonant” (*sic*) ‘lengthening consonant’, it is represented on page 5 as a guttural obstruent.

The caret (^), merely an orthographical symbol which is not always consistently applied in Turkish texts, is said to function as indicating palatalisation (of a preceding consonant, that is), which is exemplified in İleri’s book by *gâvur* [gja:+vur] ‘heathen, infidel’, *kâğıt* [kja:+hut] ‘paper’, *ilâç* [i+laç] ‘medicine’ and *lâstik* [las+tik] ‘tyre’. This is in fact correct, but why it is not explained what palatalisation actually is, and next, why the effect of palatalisation is indicated (by the symbol “j”) only for /g/ and /k/ and not for /l/ remains unclear to me. Also, there are some other (minor) problems with representations. The symbol “+” is used in the first chapter as a marker of syllable boundaries, but in the remainder of the book it indicates morpheme boundaries, although the symbol “-” is used in verb forms (e.g. pp. 30-31). So why is there one symbol for different types of boundary, and why are inflectional boundaries indicated by two different symbols?

Furthermore, in a very limited number of cases the *ğ* is used as a phonetic symbol and accentuation marks are used in lieu of a more straightforward representation of lengthening and accent position. For *ağa* ‘large landowner’, *değer* ‘worth’ and *yığıt* ‘hero’ we get on page 6 the awkward [á+ğà], [dé+ğèr], [yí+ğít] rather than for instance the much simpler and accurate [a:+a], [de:+er], [yi:+it].

As for other issues concerning grammar, I think that most things will work out well: Turkish is Turkish and there are many ways leading to Rome. After all, grammar in a book of this kind is not an exercise in its own right, but should be seen as a supportive device in elucidating the structure of the language in a maximally possible efficient way, as well as a means to preventing overzealous students from writing up their own logical (and sometimes—in most cases due to a lack of sufficient data and analytical skills—illogical) systems.

Yet, there are a few other suggestions as well for the next edition of this book. For instance, the way the possessive suffixes are represented (p. 17) in the form of an abstraction, could be pursued one step further: *-(I)m*, *-(I)n*, *-(s)I(n)*, *-(I)mIz*, *-(I)nIz*, and *-IArI* (rather than the *ad hoc* and confusing *-IArI*). Why not following the same course as for instance with the imperative second person plural (p. 32, *-(y)In*), the genitive (p. 120, *-(n)In*), and the suffix for the future tense (p. 216, *-(y)AcAk*)? A similar level of abstraction could of course be applied for the paradigms represented on p. 67. Moreover, this would be in line with the common practice in this field.

As a second suggestion I would like to mention a small adaptation to the treatment of the dative (p. 44). Although it is correctly stated that the dative indicates direction, I fail to discern this semantic trait in verbs such as German *aufpassen* ‘to pay attention’, *fragen* ‘to ask’ or *schreiben* ‘to write’ and the like, nor in their respective Turkish equivalents *dikkat etmek*, *sormak*, and *yazmak*. Looking at the German examples, wouldn’t *Fragen Sie den Lehrer!* and *Schreiben Sie an die Tafel!* rather suggest that we are dealing with a direct object in the first sentence and with some location in the latter? Admittedly, this might be confusing, but there is a way out. Better examples are based on *schauen* ‘to look’ and *lachen* ‘to laugh’, and correspondingly, *bakmak* and *gülmek*. Why not include a simple thing like *Okul-a gidin!* ‘Go to school!’ at the very outset to exemplify direction and leave other usages of the dative, e.g. as depending on verb semantics or as used in combination with certain postpositions, for what they are—the intricacies of language?

Third, for a grammar the final level of which is elementary / basic, it can be expected that the bulk of grammatical explanations are related to inflection and that derivational processes are necessarily treated as a poor relation. Fortunately, in a limited number of cases the author has chosen to deviate from this practice. This has been a wise decision. Especially the suffixes *-II* and *-sIz* deserve particular attention on pp. 69f. However, the treatment of the “privative suffix” (a rather unusual term at this level of instruction) is not entirely transparent. Surprisingly, the common German prepositions *mit* ‘with’ and *ohne* ‘without’ are scarcely applied to render the meaning of *-II* and *-sIz*, and rather complicated solutions are offered instead. For instance, *başarılı* is said to be an adjective (*erfolgreich* ‘successful’), but no word about its application as an adverbial (*mit Erfolg* ‘with success, successfully’). Analogously, *dikkat* ‘Aufmerksamkeit, Sorgfalt / attention, caution’ leads to the derivation *dikkatli*, which could be translated adjectively as ‘aufmerksam, sorgfältig’, but which could also be rendered adverbially as ‘mit Aufmerksamkeit’

as in: “mit Aufmerksamkeit etwas beobachten” or ‘mit Sorgfalt’ as in “Allgäuer Käse, mit Sorgfalt produziert!”. The same holds for the suffix *-süz*: the form *başarısız* could simply be translated as ‘ohne Erfolg / without success’ and *gözlüksüz* as ‘ohne Brille / without spectacles’, rather than the long-winded and hard-to-see-through “nicht *bebrillt* bzw. nicht mit Brille, d.h. ohne Brille” or “not spectacled, respectively not with spectacles, that is, without spectacles”. All in all, on the basis of such fragments, it occurs to me that the subject matter might have been inspired by another book. In itself this is a good and common practice, which is however only allowed on the proviso that matters should first be entirely digested and reflected upon before being put in some other publication. Certain grammatical matters should, as it were, be reanalysed or adapted and given a “personal touch” in order to fit into the rest of the book.

As a final point in case, there is this everlasting problem of the negated form of the present tense (p. 105). Let me come straight to the point and offer a straightforward solution at a beginners’ level. Assuming the suffix *-(I)yor* for the present tense, verb forms can be built up in a predictable way: *yürü-yor* ‘(s)he walks’ and *kalk-ıyor* ‘(s)he rises’. Now, ignoring any phonological processes accounting for vowel reduction in relation to the position of stress, we can postulate the fourfold negational suffix *-mI*, which is to exclusively precede *-(I)yor-* to be realised as *-yor* since *-mI* ends in a vowel, instead of the “regular” twofold set *-ma /-me*. Everything becomes now bafflingly simple (cf. the data on p. 105) without the need to point out that “a wide vowel is transformed into a narrow one, according to the laws of the Greater Vowel Harmony” [... das Zeitsuffix *-yor-* macht aber aus einem unmittelbar vorangehenden breitenVokal einen engen Vokal nach den Gesetzen der großen Vokalharmonie]. Expectedly we get: *başla-mı-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t begin’, *bekle-mi-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t wait’, *yürü-mü-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t walk’, *oku-mu-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t read’, *al-mı-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t take / buy’, *ver-mi-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t give’, *gül-mü-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t laugh’, *öl-mü-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t die’, *sor-mu-yor* ‘(s)he doesn’t ask’, et cetera.

To wrap up this section, the remarks made here are not intended to spoil the positive remarks I made in the foregoing sections: they are merely suggestions to help make a good book an even better book in its next edition.

