

## Werk

**Label:** ReviewSingle

**Autor:** László , Károly

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2009

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0013](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0013) | LOG\_0045

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

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<sup>h</sup>itei] id., can be relevant. Examples like “mahka” ‘wound’ and “gahtça” ‘language’ (p. 254), borrowed from Amdo Tibetan [ma<sup>h</sup>ka] resp. [h<sup>h</sup>ka<sup>h</sup>tça] (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<sup>h</sup>ka] resp. [ka<sup>h</sup>tça], 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 Slepčov 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 boggy’ (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 'muḡxa 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 *joġustay* '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 Kāġiññi-kāġiññi Joġustay bāyātā