

Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Balász, Danka; Schmidt, Szonja

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2010

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0014 | LOG_0036

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Balázs Danka & Szonja Schmidt: Review of Hendrik Boeschoten & Julian Rentzsch (eds.), *Turcology in Mainz / Turkologie in Mainz*. (Turcologica 82.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 2010. 292 pages. ISSN 0177-4743. ISBN 978-3-447-06113-1.

Balázs Danka, SZTE Altajisztika Tanszék, 6722, Egyetem u 2., Szeged, Hungary. E-mail: altajdogak@freemail.hu

Szonja Schmidt, 9176, Kossuth u. 1., Mecser, Hungary. E-mail: schso@yahoo.com

The book under review came into being to honour Lars Johanson's 70th birthday and to draw attention to the scholarly tradition in comparative and historical Turkic linguistics that Johanson developed as Johannes Benzing's successor on the Turcological chair at Mainz. The contributors are previous Ph.D. students, Humboldt fellows and other scholars associated with the Institute of Oriental Studies during the time when Lars Johanson was professor of Turcology there. We may add that the two authors of this review also had the opportunity to study with Lars Johanson when he was a visiting professor at Szeged University.

The volume bears witness to the prominent position Turcology at Mainz has occupied in the last decades. The majority of the articles were originally presented at a symposium held June 9 to 11, 2006 at the Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz on the occasion of Lars Johanson's birthday. An unfortunate drawback of the volume is that the editors, who actually pay tribute to Lars Johanson with this volume, did not include an introduction explaining the crucial role Lars Johanson has played in the development of Turcology at Mainz. Since the volume is *de facto* a festschrift for Lars Johanson, he himself has not contributed to it. Thus, readers who are not familiar with the history of this institute, find in the individual papers only sporadic information about Lars Johanson's contribution.

The volume consists of twenty-two articles in English and German. Short presentations of the contributions will be given here. We will deal with two papers in more detail: Larry Clark's article *The Turkic script and the Kutadgu Bilig* (Balázs Danka) and Abdurishid Yakup's article about three contact settings of *Turkic codes in West China* (Szonja Schmidt).

Ahmet Aydemir, who earned his doctorate at Mainz under Lars Johanson's supervision, examines in his contribution *Textuelle Funktionen von Konverbien im Altai-Tuwinischen* (pp. 9–16) converb types in Altay Tuvan on the basis of Lars Johanson's theoretical framework, not only on the level of clauses, but also on the level of texts. Turkic converbs are examined with respect to the following points:

their text-building and text-dividing functions, their text-cohesive and text-coherent functions, the syntactic description of converbs from the view of clause binding, and different connectivity phenomena. In Tuvan, it is possible to build so-called periodic clause chains based on non-modifying converbs. These clauses do not modify the meaning of the next clause; thus they describe successive events of equal rank from the point of view of the narration. In (older and modern) Turkic languages the *-(y)Up* converb suffix belongs to this type. Like other non-Europeanized Turkic languages, Tuvan very often uses this technique to build clause chains, based on the suffixes *-(V)p* and *-GAš*. At the end of such a clause chain there is a single finite verb on which tense, mood, aspect, etc. are marked. The mentioned suffixes also have text-coherent functions, i.e. modifying meanings, although—according to the author—they are not marked syntactically. Since in this case the converb form is in topic position of the second clause, it seems that this function is marked, i.e. by the position of the converb in the clause, and not only on the semantic level. The narrative clause pattern is the following: One finite predication serves as the base of a complex sentence, which has its own illocutional force, and is marked with aspect, mood, tense, etc. Predications can also be realized as infinite constructions on the syntactic level but are bound to and can be interpreted through the main clause. Intra- and postterminal verb forms do not participate in describing events of equal ranks, since they do not describe events in their totality. They thus cannot be parts of narrative clause chains of equal ranks; they are always subordinated to such a predication of clause chains. The author gives a description of Altay Tuvan examples in this framework. He describes Altay-Tuvan *-(V)p* and *-GAš* as non-modifying converb forms, and *-sA*, *-Glža*, *-(V)rdA* and *-GAndA* as terminal modifiers. He gives examples of lexicalised converbs functioning as adverbs of time and circumstance. The question whether or not Mongolic played a role in the genesis of such clause chain patterns in Altay Tuvan is not examined.

Lars Johanson's dear friend, the late professor of Altaic Studies at Szeged University, Árpád Berta, presents in his posthumously printed article *Zwei ungarische Familiennamen türkischer Herkunft*, i.e. two Hungarian family names of Turkic origin (pp. 17–25). Berta expands the group of Hungarian proper names of Turkic origin with two family names: *Csató* and *Homoki*. The family name *Csató* goes back to two different names in Hungarian. The first, which has been dealt with in the literature before, is *Cyatho* appearing first in the second half of the 16th century. This is probably a copy from Serbo-Croatian, where the word goes back to Ottoman Turkish *kâtib*. The second historical correspondence *Chatho* is probably identical with the Hungarian common name *chath* 'buckle, snap' (1395), which has its origin in Old Turkic *čat* or *čati* 'fusion'. Although the form *Csató* could be a Hungarian development with the diminutive suffix *-ó* it is more likely that it is a copy of Turkic *čatiq* or *čataq*.

For the second proper name, *Homoki*, Berta shows that this name is a derivation of Hungarian *homok* 'sand' with the Hungarian adjectival suffix *-i*, which occurs after place names meaning 'from'. Hungarian *homok*, which is of Turkic origin, has

its correspondence in Kazakh *qumaq*, Turkmen *gumak*, Uzbek *qumâq*, and Altay *kumak*, in Mongolian *qumag*, *qumaki* with the meaning 'sandy land'. The word *qum* and its phonological variants mean only 'sand'. Hungarian *Homok* as a place name can be found in early sources. For the form *homok* and its Turkic equivalents, as the author demonstrates, the form **kum(V)+(A)-(O)k(V)* can be reconstructed. According to the author, the Hungarian proper name *Homoki* and the Mongolian *qumaki* are copies from the period when in Proto-Turkic the word-final vowel was indecisive.

Uwe Bläsing, who earned his doctoral degree in Mainz, writes about *Two knives from North-East Anatolia: kakva and cakva* (pp. 27–38). The author deals with two designations of cutting tools, which have a wide range in several languages. He connects the first word *kakva* with Georgian *kaḱv-i* 'a hook, a hookler'. The alternative forms of this word can also be shown in Turkish dialects (*kakuç*, *kakuça*). The second designation of knife has its form in Georgian *ჭაყვა*, but the author shows that it is a copy from Persian. With the form *čaki* and its phonetical forms the same Persian word can be found in SW Turkic languages and in the languages of the Indian subcontinent as well. Doerfer has discussed the Persian word as a Mongolian loan (Lit. Mong. *čaku*, *čaka*, Khalkha *tsax* 'a prop, a support, a pole, a pile'), but its meanings shows that this etymology is problematic. Bläsing points out that the pocket-knife is a native component of Iranian culture; from here the phenomenon and its designation spread out to Ottoman lands, to the Eastern Iranian languages, and to Georgian. Similar forms with the meaning of knife can be found in a wider Eurasian range; nevertheless the author wisely refrains from deeper etymological commentaries.

Lars Johanson's successor on the Turcological chair at Mainz, Hendrik Boeschoten, addresses a contact linguistic issue in his article on *The assignment of a matrix language in Turkic language contacts* (pp. 39–47). He examines the question of the establishment of a matrix language for mixed utterances based on Turkic data. The theoretical model of Matrix Language Frame developed over the course of several years by Carol Myers-Scotton distinguishes between a matrix language (ML) and an embedded language (EL). However, some linguists have argued that a clear separation between the matrix and the embedded languages is not possible because the matrix language may interact with the embedded language. This interaction, however, contradicts a basic restriction on EL-islands in the MLF framework. Boeschoten attempts to solve this problem by explaining such interactions not as syntactic but rather as pragmatic processes. His argumentation focuses on the category of definiteness in Turkish-Dutch contact. The data show that the Dutch definite/indefinite marking, which has pragmatic relevance, operates on Dutch expressions embedded in Turkish. His further examples, however, do not support the assumption that a distinction between morphosyntactic and pragmatic rules could solve the problem of the MLF framework, and the article remains inconclusive.

Bernt Brendemoen, who earned his degree with Lars Johanson in Scandinavia and worked in Mainz as a visiting professor, is a prominent researcher in the field of Turkish dialectology. His paper *Some remarks on the copula in the Eastern Black Sea dialects* (pp. 47–54) examines the question whether the use of the copula *i-* and

-Dİr and their cognate forms in the Turkish dialects of Rize and Trabzon is an archaic feature or is due to copying from a substrate language. In the two dialects the copula *i-* may serve as an independent word, allowing a freer word order in which the copula may precede the predicate, e.g. *adım idü fatma kara* 'My name is Fatma Kara'. This phenomenon is concentrated on the western (Trabzon) side of the river *İyidere*, which has been one of the main passages of immigration into the Eastern Black Sea area. A concentration of other dialect features—also found in Turkic varieties having a strong Iranian substrate, e.g. Iranian Azeri and Halaç—is also typical of this area. The paper also tries to separate forms that are probably copied from Standard Turkish, i.e. the forms where *i-* is syncopated. That *-Dİr* and cognate forms carry no meaning of 'subjective certainty' seem to be an archaic feature, but it is impossible to tell whether *-Dİr* itself and its cognate forms are archaisms compared to the zero suffix, or whether the unmarked use of *-Dİr* is a copy from a substrate language. The paper points out that there is not sufficient dialect material available to answer these questions correctly.

Christiane Bulut, who received her doctorate in Mainz and later habilitated there, worked at the institute for many years. Her topic is *Languages, dialects and peoples in Orhan Kemal's Adana novels* (pp. 55–88). Orhan Kemal's realistic style in his novels with motifs connected to the Çukurova plain allows a detailed description of the peoples, customs, and linguistic peculiarities of this region. The author aims to find which elements are used as characteristic features of the Adana dialect in six novels of Orhan Kemal. At the same time she gives a very detailed description of the Turkish dialect of the Adana region. Bulut first deals with Orhan Kemal's life and the historical background of this region. The formation of today's linguistic diversity in the region is shown in detail. In addition to Standard Turkish and different Turkish dialects, Armenian, so-called Rum, Arap uşağı, Mâcirler, Karadenizli/Laz, Kurdish codes are spoken in this area. The dialectal features of verb morphology, syntax, adverbs, and lexicon are shown with reference to the novels. As an effect of multilingualism, several of the demonstrated dialectal phenomena are influences of foreign codes. At the end of the paper, the author gives a survey of the non-standard lexicon of the novels.

The American scholar Larry Clark, who has been a Humboldt-fellow at Mainz, addresses, in his contribution on *The Turkic script and the Kutadgu Bilig* (pp. 89–107), the problematic issue whether Muslim Turks of the Karakhanid realm used Arabic or Uyghur script for their literary language, or, if not, what kind of script they actually used. A very serious philological work lies beyond the article, which provides a new theory based on the examination of the only original 11th–12th century documents in the Karakhanid language, the so-called Yarkand documents.

The Yarkand documents are written in Arabic script and another, Sogdian-based script, which the author calls the "Turkic" script. The *Kutadgu Bilig*, which was also written in the 11th century, some years before the first of the Yarkand documents (1080), survived only in three manuscripts, two in Arabic, and one in Uyghur script. The author first comments on Reşid Rahmeti Arat's and Alessio Bombaci's opinions

concerning the kind of script used for the composition of *Kutadgu Bilig*. Bombaci countered Arat's opinion, namely that the original was in Uygur script and that the Vienna manuscript represents the oldest form of the text. He claimed that the original text was in Arabic script and provided a witty proof based on a verse which included a wordplay or, more precisely, a play on letters, namely the vocalised or unvocalised written form of the word *bilig* 'knowledge'. Clark, however, according to Dankoff's textual principle, reconstructs a vocalised written form of this word in the original text and brings forward four additional logical reasons why Yūsuf probably wrote his work with vocalised words. Thus, he once more opens the discussion about the original script of the *Kutadgu Bilig*.

The author then turns to the treatment of the fourteen bilingual and biscriptual legal documents of Yarkand written between 1080–1135. The documents can be divided into three groups: Arabic language and Arabic script, Turkic language and Turkic script, and Turkic language and Arabic script. The author argues that the use of the language and the script of the documents shows a chronological direction, and assumes that Arabic script gradually replaced the Turkic script in the use of legal courtesy. He argues that all originals of the documents were written in Arabic script and language, and that the documents in Turkic are contemporary copies for the contracting parties. This is a very interesting part of the article as the author gives a possible reconstruction of the protocol of entering into a contract in the Karakhanid court, based on the content of the individual documents, and the interconnection between them.

The author then deals with the question of the aforementioned "Turkic script". According to Kāšyārī, there was one script before 1070—the time of the composition of his work *Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk*—for writing Turkic. Clark compares the Turkic script presented by Kāšyārī in his *Dīwān* with the script used in the Yarkand documents and draws the conclusion that "it was a variant of the Sogdian script which can be called Turkic script after Kāšyārī, and not that variant of Sogdian script which today we call Uygur script" (p. 98). Clark undertakes a detailed analysis of the forms and phonematic values of the individual letters and diacritics in other Sogdian and Uygur texts. He concludes that the Turkic script of the Yarkand documents and the abecedary of Kāšyārī are not completely identical, although they are very close to each other. The author arrives at the final conclusion that *Kutadgu Bilig* was most probably originally written in the Turkic script.

Éva Á. Csató visited Mainz for the first time on a Norwegian scholarship. Her paper on *Two types of complement clauses in Turkish* (pp. 107–123) points out that the properties of complement clauses (CC) based on *-Dlk* and *-mA* in Turkish have not been properly described in recent typological works. With the comparison of the two types, the paper contributes to the cross-linguistic typology of complementation. Turkish CCs are subordinated with bound subjunctors, and the predicate is usually based on a nonfinite verbal category. The paper gives the syntactic criteria that serve to distinguish between complement clauses (clause-like subordinated arguments with *-mA* and *-Dlk*) and non-subordinated clauses assuming argument-like semantic

relations to a matrix clause. Csátó presents the classifications for CCs found in Stassen (1985) and Cristafaro (2005), i.e. that CCs are 'balanced' (~ finite) or 'deranked' (~ infinite). Cristafaro adds the 'mixed' type, to which Turkish belongs. Csátó shows that Cristofaro's typology uses only functional criteria and ignores the difference between subordinated and non-subordinated clause-like structures. Subordinated clauses based on *-Dik* and *-mA* differ in their semantics: *-Dik* clauses convey a proposition that has a truth value, while those with *-mA* do not convey any propositional meaning.

Nurettin Demir, who earned his Ph.D. in Mainz under the supervision of Lars Johanson, is today one of the prominent Turkish representatives of the Turcological tradition developed in Mainz. Together with other Turkish Turcologists who studied in Mainz, he has translated many of Johanson's works into Turkish. His article *Zum fokalen Präsens in zyperntürkischen Dialekten* (pp. 123–133) illustrates, with well-interpreted examples, that the Cypriot Turkish dialect can use aorist forms in *-Xr* as focal presents (like standard Turkish *-Iyor*). While other Turkish dialects and Turkic languages have usually developed a focal present form based on a converb form and an auxiliary modal verb, such forms are quite rare in Cypriot Turkish. The author gives some possible reasons for this phenomenon: First, the Turkish settlers of Cyprus had spoken a dialect in which the renewal of the present had not taken place. Secondly, the standard language has only had a weak influence on this dialect so that the speakers are not motivated to replace the old focal present form. Thirdly, the Greek contact language has a form that expresses habitual as well as momentary actions. As a summary, the author gives a concise sociolinguistic report on the present situation of the Cypriot Turkish dialect and outlines possibilities concerning its future.

The Swedish scholar Joakim Enwall, who has been a Humboldt fellow at Mainz, writes on *Turkish texts in Georgian script: Sociolinguistic and ethno-linguistic aspects* (pp. 135–145). The author, an expert in the Georgian language, provides an aid for Turcologists dealing with Turkic texts of the West Oghuz type written down in Georgian script between the early 18th and late 19th centuries. These texts use the so-called *mxedruli* or cursive script. The material consists of five manuscripts: (i) the Four Gospels (dated 27 November 1739), (ii) the Georgian-Turkish/Tatar Textbook, (iii) the Old Testament story of Abraham and Isaac, (iv) Turkish poems, (v) The medical book *Karabadini kartul-somxur-turkuli* (dated 1753). The dialects of these texts are not identified yet. Enwall assumes that the texts may originate from the Samtskhe-Javakheti area in southwestern Georgia. The so-called 'Franks' or Georgian Catholics lived in this area. According to a Georgian scholar, "the Christian transcription texts could have been used by Georgian Catholics who had become turkified in language, but who kept their Christian faith. By using the Georgian script they were to some extent able to hide the contents of the books" (p. 144).

Marcel Erdal once worked at Mainz as a Humboldt fellow and has, after he became professor at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main, been in close contact with Turcology at Mainz. His contribution on *Inalienability*

and syncopation in Turkish (pp. 147–153) discusses cases of syncopation, i.e. dropping a high medial vowel in Turkish. Syncopation occurs before derivational suffixes, e.g. *bağır-ışmak* ‘to cry out in a group’ from *bağır-* ‘to shout’. Syncopation also occurs before a possessive suffix in words denoting body parts (inalienables), e.g. *beyin* ‘brain’ vs. *beyni* ‘his/her brain’. This syncopation, however, does not take place before case suffixes, e.g. *burnu* ‘his/her nose’ vs. *buruna* ‘to nose’. In Bang’s opinion, the syncopation of inalienable nouns is caused by the strong juncture between these nouns and the third person possessive suffixes, which become a part of them. That is why not-inalienables do not syncopate; hence the difference between *koyun* ‘bosom’ (inalienable) and *koyun* ‘sheep’ (not inalienable).

Dybo (2005) claims that 21 lexemes of which 18 represent inalienable nouns had final consonant-clusters in Proto-Turkic. Erdal finds this claim unacceptable for several reasons. He shows that the lexemes drop their final syllable through syncopation and that they belong to two classes: inalienable nouns with possessive suffixes, and verbs followed by derivational suffixes. Thus, he concludes, the final consonant clusters must be secondary.

Birsel Karakoç, who studied in Mainz with Lars Johanson and earned her doctoral degree there, wrote a paper on the etymology of *-ki* under the title *Mutmaßungen über die Etymologie des türkischen Suffixes {KI}* (pp. 155–166). Her contribution aims to demonstrate the participial origin of the Turkic suffix. In older sources, this suffix is always combined with case suffixes or appears, less frequently, after participles. Its plural and case forms are always provided with the pronominal *-n-*. It is mostly invariable, a rare feature in Turkic languages, but, as Karakoç observes, it causes lengthening of the vowel of a preceding locative suffix in Turkish. The author’s hypothesis is that {KI} emerged through contraction of **ārki*, where *ār-* was a copula.

Mark Kirchner was one of Lars Johanson’s first Ph.D. students. His article *Tatarisch in der Russischen Föderation* (pp. 167–173) draws attention to the current sociolinguistic situation of the Tatar language in the Republic of Tatarstan in the Russian Confederation. The paper points out that Tatar is a dominated code although the Tatars constitute the majority of the population in their republic, where Tatar is one of the official languages. The author analyses the geographical, ethnographical, historical, political and social reasons why Tatar has become an endangered language. An important factor is that two-thirds of the speakers of Tatar live outside the territory of the republic. The main geographical reason is that Tatarstan is situated in a linguistic area in which the majority of the population speaks Russian. Tatarstan is geographically isolated from the other large Turkic languages and, thanks to the earlier minority politics of the former Soviet Union, the Tatars do not have good political relations with the neighbouring Bashkirs. The most important of the inner reasons is the absence of linguistic resources, i.e. the insufficient use of Tatar in the media and education. One example: a department of Tatar language and literature exists at the University of Kazan, but there is no university in which the language of

education is Tatar. The author draws the conclusion that the linguistic status of Tatar has to be changed in order to maintain the survival of the Tatar language.

Another early Ph.D. student of Lars Johanson, who later worked as assistant in Mainz, Astrid Menz, investigates *Klusile und Affrikate im Anlaut armenischer Globalkopien in den Dialektmaterialien von Erzurum* (pp. 173–190). Formerly mentioned by Dankoff 1995, Armenian loanwords in Turkish have a complicated history considering the process of copying and the contact language. The author uses Dankoff's corpus to demonstrate the realizations of affricates and plosives in initials of Armenian global copies of the Erzurum dialect of Turkish. In this corpus about 220 words are recorded from the Erzurum dialect. The word-initial voiced consonants of Armenian appear either voiced or voiceless in the copies. The author gives a very informative six-page comprehensive word list of the dialectal forms and of their West Armenian correspondences.

The Russian Turcologist Irina Nevskaya, an expert in Siberian Turkic languages, was a Humboldt fellow in Mainz. In her contribution *Converbs as depictive predicates in South Siberian Turkic* (pp. 191–200) she distinguishes three different syntactic functions of converb constructions: predicates in converbial clauses, depictive predicates and adverbial modifiers of manner. Depictive predicates (as in the example *he drank his tea cold*; or Tuvan *ol bisten xoradap čorbaan*) are syntactically dependent on the main predicate, and refer to the subject, object or to another nominal with a syntactic function different from the subject or object. In South Siberian Turkic a depictive construction contains a main predicate and a depictive one, which is related to one of the participants of the main predicate. It is dependent on the main predicate and belongs to the same prosodic unit as the main predicate. The predicates that allow use of a depictive predicate belong to certain semantic groups. Depictive predicates can describe physical or mental states of their controllers, and should be distinguished from manner adverbials, resultatives, complements of the main predicate, main predicates of subordinated clauses, and complex predicates. The contribution describes how depictive predicates can be expressed in South Siberian Turkic, and gives Khakas and Tuvan examples of converbs based on *-(V)p*, *-A* and *-GAš* which functions either as a depictive or a non-depictive predicate. The author discusses how depictive predicates can be distinguished from other types of predicates, and concludes that the test of negation is one of the most precise diagnoses of them: if the negation includes the converb in its scope, it is either a depictive predicate or an adverbial modifier of manner.

Elizabetta Ragagnin earned her Ph.D. under the supervision of Lars Johanson. She contributed to the volume an article on *Some observations on the fortis vs. lenis opposition of consonants in Sayan Turkic* (pp. 201–208). After representing today's speakers of Sayan Turkic, the author deals with the realization of fortis vs. lenis opposition in this group. Johanson in his article *Zur Konsonantenstärke im Türkischen* (1986) pointed out that in the history of Turkic languages the opposition between fortis and lenis consonants has played a crucial role. This claim is today widely accepted so that for Proto-Turkic an opposition between two syllable types is assumed:

a syllable type consisting of a long vowel + lenes (V:C^l) vs. a syllable type consisting of a short vowel + fortes (VC^f). According to Johanson (1986), the opposition of Proto-Turkic fortis and lenis in primary syllables is reflected in modern Turkic in different forms. Ragagnin discusses how the opposition is realized in Sayan Turkic, where, alongside short and long vowels, there is also a distinction between pharyngealized and non-pharyngealized / glottalized or non-glottalized vowels. The paper represents the morphophonological variants of fortis and lenis when a suffix with vowel onset is added to the base: before a long vowel, the pharyngealization can be observed.

Julian Rentzsch also completed his Ph.D. under Lars Johanson's supervision. His article *Zur Modalität in Türkischen* (pp. 209–225) aims at describing modal morphology in Turkish according to the functional approach of Dik (1997). The author gives a slightly different classification of modal operators than Dik and distinguishes three levels of modality. The three levels are defined in their relation to aspect operators. Whereas Modality 1 includes modality operators within the scope of aspect operators, Modality 2 operators are at the same level as aspect operators. The third level, Modality 3, includes modality operators that are operating on aspect operators. He argues that the proper criteria are intercombinability with each other and combinability with nomina and verbs, but not grammaticality or morphological transparency, since in other Turkic languages transparent operators function in the same way as opaque ones in Turkish, and vice versa. Since some operators analysed here seem to be able to cross the domains set by present classification, the question remains unsettled and inspires further research.

The Belgian scholar Martine Robbeets was a Humboldt-fellow in Mainz and later continued her collaboration with Lars Johanson in projects addressing different historical and theoretical aspects of Altaic genealogical relatedness. Her paper on *The 'intimate' parts of Altaic: Two velar verb suffixes* (pp. 225–238) discusses two velar suffixes that were probably once productive in Altaic verb derivation: the iconic suffix which she reconstructs as Altaic *-ki- and the inchoative suffix which she reconstructs as *-ga. Both suffixes have an initial velar. According to the author's investigation, these suffixes occur lexicalized to a certain extent in verb stems in Japanese, Korean, Mongolic and Turkic.

Heidi Stein was associated with Mainz as a researcher for many years. Her article on *Optativ versus Voluntativ-Imperative in irantürkischen Texten (15./16. Jh.)* (pp. 239–257) seeks to answer the question why the paradigm of the optative and voluntative-imperative coincide in modern Turkish. A comparison of the corresponding paradigms of Turkish with those of Azeri and other Iranian dialects leads to the question whether the latter preserved the optative vs. voluntative distinction because of its use as a subjunctive in complement clauses, thus as a result of code interaction with Persian, or not. The author compares four Iranian Turkic texts with Ottoman-Turkish and Persian. Her thorough examination of the diachronic change of the verbal forms of the mentioned category in main clauses and complement clauses shows that this is not the case. The use of optative and voluntative differs in

Persian and in Iranian Middle-Turkic. She sees the coincidence of the Turkish optative and volitive paradigm in a lower standard of Ottoman-Turkish prose, and leaves open the question of limitation of the optative in Turkish.

Erika Taube was on several occasions visiting scholar in Mainz. Her paper under the title *Zu einem außerlinguistischen Aspekt von Sprache* (pp. 257–267) examines the circumstances of storytelling among some Turkic and other Siberian peoples: why it is obligatory to tell stories when requested, why death is the punishment for denying storytelling, and why the story-teller occasionally denies storytelling. The answers are found in the tales of these peoples. They belong to the folklore and reflect the cultural background of the peoples in question, and have shamanistic origin. The author illustrates the answers with parallel examples taken from the material of each of the above-mentioned ethnic groups. The cultural background is considered as an extralinguistic factor that influences language use. For field researchers, it is useful to know these circumstances, since they can affect the outcome of material collection during linguistic fieldwork.

Mustafa Uğurlu earned his Ph.D. under the supervision of Lars Johanson. He wrote his contribution on *Probleme der Wiedergabe älterer türkischer Text im modernen Türkisch* (pp. 267–277). His paper points out possible mistakes of ‘intralingual translation’, in this case, translations of older Turkic texts into modern Turkish. Translation mistakes originate from the diachronic changes of the language, hardly perceptible for present speakers. The author classifies the possible pitfalls as lexical/semantic, morphological, and syntactic. These types of translation mistakes are illustrated by means of examples taken from different editions of *Dede Korkut Hikâyesi*. Since this field is considered rather new in Turcology, the author stresses the necessity of formulating guidelines and methods for future translations.

The Uyghur scholar Abdurishid Yakup was also a Humboldt-fellow in Mainz. His paper *Internal contact of Turkic languages: The case of some Inner Asian Turkic languages* (pp. 277–285) deals with contact linguistic issues. Abdurishid Yakup’s main interest focuses on Old and Modern Uyghur varieties. In this paper he provides new material from some little-known Turkic varieties that have internal contacts with neighbouring Turkic codes. In the introduction he calls attention to the importance of doing research not only on the Turkic-non-Turkic contacts but the less-observed internal contacts among Turkic languages as well. In the literature there are several examples of this subject but none of them is discussed sufficiently.

In the subsequent sections, using his own records, Yakup reports his observations of the three Turkic-Turkic contact areas: 1. Salar contact with Kazakh and Uyghur in the İli valley 2. Kirghiz under the influence of Uyghur in South-Western Xinjiang 3. Western Xinjiang where the new Tarbaghatay (Chöchäk) variety of Uyghur is evolving.

The İli variety of Salar spoken in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region has extensive contact with the dominant codes of the area, Kazakh and Uyghur. As an effect of lexemes copied from Chinese, diphthongs and Chinese retroflex consonants can be observed in Salar, but in the İli variety these have been replaced—under the

influence of Uyghur—by monophthongs, respectively the alveo-palatal *ʃ*, *ç* and the postalveolar *ʂ*. The author does not note here that Kazakh could also intensify this change as it also lacks the above-mentioned sounds of Chinese origin. The morphological and in some cases the lexical changes of Salar cardinal numerals, the possessive endings and the possessive of the reflexive pronoun with the Xinghai Salar and Uyghur correspondences, are shown in tables. Only one clearly Kazakh feature in the Ili variety of Salar is represented: the use of the instrumental postposition *menen* beside the postposition *la*, which is commonly used in Salar as an instrumental.

The Southern dialect of Kirghiz in Xinjiang differs in several features from the Northern one, which is probably a result of contacts with other languages, mainly Uyghur. The main phonological and morphological features of the Southern dialect are the following: devoicing of initial *b-*, secondary long vowels as a result of disappearance of intervocalic *-g-*, the infinitive is formed with the suffix *-(X)ʂ* instead of *-X*, the focal intraterminal is *-(X)vat*, the past copula article is *ele*. Yakup illustrates the declension of nouns in a table where he finds that pronominal *-n-* is missing in the locative and dative. He does not observe that pronominal *-n-* is also missing in the ablative case (*-nAn*) as it has suffix-initial *n-* and it represents both dialects of Xinjiang Kirghiz.

The Uyghur variety spoken in Tarbaghatay Prefecture in Xinjiang is under the strong influence of Kazakh, which is—apart from Chinese—the dominant code in this area. Tarbaghatay is one of the most multilingual regions of China where speakers of Chinese, Monghol, Daghur, Uzbek, Tatar, Kirghiz, Russian and Uyghur usually use more than one code in daily life. Especially Uyghurs evidence a strong bilingual status as Kazakh is used in administration and education. This has led to the development of a hybrid dialect of Uyghur. In effect, the alternation of linguistic features like *ʂ ~ s* (*baʂ ~ bas* ‘head’, *taʂta- ~ tasta-* ‘to throw away’), the genitive *+nlñ ~ +Diñ* (*mektepnñ ~ kitaptñ*), infinitive in *-(X)ʂ ~ -Uw* shows intensive bilingualism.

The contact-induced changes are the most extensive in the Tarbaghatay variety of Uyghur and the Southern dialect of Kirghiz in Xinjiang as case morphology and verbal inflection are affected as well. According to Yakup’s opinion, this situation diverges from other internal contacts in Turkic languages where mostly the lexical level of a certain language has changed, even in Sonqor Turkic—which he is referring to—where Iranian strongly influenced the phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax, the system of verb paradigms remained stable. The author observes that the positive attitude of the speech communities of the three represented codes toward Kazakhs and Uyghurs speeds up the bilingualism and integration of these communities, and conversely, that the language change is less intensive where the dominated code’s speakers have a negative attitude toward the dominant code’s speakers.

In conclusion, Yakup points out that the convergence between Turkic varieties even challenges the current classifications of the Turkic languages.