

## Werk

**Titel:** A tentative (graphemically-based) reconstruction of the vowel phonology of an ear...

**Autor:** Proverbio , Delio Vania

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2012

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0016](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0016) | LOG\_0033

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

# A tentative (graphemically-based) reconstruction of the vowel phonology of an early 18th-century Turkish-ğaršūnī text from Edessa (present-day Şanlıurfa)

**Delio Vania Proverbio**

Proverbio, Delio Vania 2012. A tentative (graphemically-based) reconstruction of the vowel phonology of an early 18th-century Turkish-ğaršūnī text from Edessa (present-day Şanlıurfa). *Turkic Languages* 16, 200–214.

The present contribution is aimed at tentatively analysing the vocalic system exhibited by an early 18th-century Turkish booklet written in Syriac characters. The linguistic relevance of such a document arises from a peculiarity of its writing system. While, even in the best case of a fully vocalized text, a Turkic text written in Arabic alphabet denotes a system of vowel notation which is merely triadic, the aforementioned manuscript shows an almost fully vocalized Turkish text in Western Syriac script, which implies five vocalic signs: the Greek letters <α>, <ε>, <υ>, <ο> and <ϖ>. The vowel structure which emerges from this sketch exhibits a well-balanced system of regular disharmonies.

*Delio Vania Proverbio, Scriptor Orientalis. Curator of Oriental Collections, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cortile del Belvedere, V-00120 Città del Vaticano.  
E-mail: proverbio@vatlib.it*

## 0.

The focus of the present paper is an intriguing early 18th-century Turkish-ğaršūnī booklet, MS Vatican Library, Vat. turc. 83.<sup>1</sup> I examined the historical context within which it was produced and read in a previous work (Proverbio 2004). On the last folios (158v–161v), the booklet's first owner, a certain *Tūmā Şarrāf* from Edessa (*Urfali*), registered birth and death events from as early as the year 1738 until the year 1774 (Proverbio 2004: 596–601). Therefore, the first registered date (Vat. turc.

1 For a compendious outline and explanation of the transliteration system here adopted, see Proverbio 2012. Just a minor point to add, among others, relating to the transliteration system adopted in Hazai & Tietze 2006: as far as the vowel signs which marks a morpheme boundary are concerned, in my system I make use of the opposition between zero- and nonzero-graphemes, e.g. *\_Viy]* → *ᵛᵛ#* versus *\_Vi]* → *ᵛᵛ#* (which means *\_ViCØ]*), while in Hazai & Tietze 2006 we find the consistent opposition *ᵛᵛ#* (which means *\_Viy]*) versus *ᵛᵛ#*. Thus *ᵛᵛᵛᵛ#* (Hazai & Tietze 2006) versus *ᵛᵛᵛᵛ#*.

83, 159v: Proverbio 2004: 598) is a sound *terminus ante quem* for the execution of the manuscript. The book bears a collection of meditations on a variety of Christian topics, including the passion of Jesus Christ (51v–94v), written in an Anatolian Turkish dialect, in Syriac script.<sup>2</sup>

### 0.1.

The linguistic relevance of such a document lies not only in the sound fact that, as observed by Johanson 1978, “the 17th century is [to be] regarded as the decisive developmental phase” for Anatolian Turkic, but arises from a peculiarity of its writing system. While, even in the best case of a fully vocalized text, a Turkic text written in Arabic alphabet denotes a merely triadic supralinear system of vowel notation, the present occurrence of an (almost fully) vocalized Turkish text in Western Syriac script implies *five* vocalic graphemes, namely, the Greek letters ⟨α⟩, ⟨ε⟩, ⟨ι⟩, ⟨ο⟩ and ⟨υ⟩.<sup>3</sup> Even a cursory survey within the heterogeneous (and relatively poor) Turcological bibliography relating to what is generically defined as “Suryani Harfli Türkçe Metinler” (from Ölmez 1999 to Hazar & Özmen 2011) would confirm the exceptionality of such an occurrence. In the present paper I will endeavour to sketch a tentative reconstruction of the vowel phonology of the dialectal area from which the aforementioned text originates.

### 0.2.

A first result is that a regular harmony, or a “fully applied labial harmony” law could hardly be inferred. On the contrary, the “fresco” which emerges from this sketch configures some regular disharmonies, since it appears evident that “the vowels of a word may disagree in the value of some harmonic feature not only through lexical exceptionality but also because of some supervening phonetic principle” (Johnson 1980: 89) This result would provide further proof of the soundness and correctness of the theory of the “indifference stage”, which may eventually evolve into regular vowel harmony or disharmony.<sup>4</sup> Within this straightforward diachronic perspective, the theoretical approach implemented by Clements and Sezer appears not only artificial but even misleading, since “the existence of large numbers of exceptions” or “cases of disharmony” (Clements & Sezer 1986: 213) cannot be satisfactorily ex-

2 A bibliographic summary of the Turkish-garšūnī heterographic phenomenon is to be found in Proverbio 2012, note 26.

3 I limit myself to merely referring to what is still the best and most thorough study of the diacritical and vocalization system of the Syriac language: Segal 1953. Regarding the Western Syriac script, see esp. 44–45.

4 Cf. Johanson 1978: 152: “(Phenomena) which cannot be explained within the framework of a labial harmony in progress but only as facts of a linguistic stage prior to the vowel harmony”.

plained within a purely synchronic framework, which turns out to be inadequate in disengaging the complex pattern of a “linguistic stratigraphy”. From a diachronic point of view, “predictability”, “bidirectionality” and “unboundedness” as features of Turkish symmetrical vowel harmony system (Clements & Sezer 1986: 217) are disproved by the existence of an historically differentiated “restriction” of the outward vowel harmony.<sup>5</sup>

Facing some evidences of a “regular disharmony”, András Bodrogligeti, in his thorough inquiry into the Turkic column of the so-called Isfahan Anonymous—a triglot lexicon found in MS Vatican Library, Borg. pers. 14—drew a (perhaps) incorrect perspective (Bodrogligeti 1968: 26): “In the I[sfahan] A[nonymous] this rule [i.e. the vowel harmony rule] partially *lost* (?) its validity. Certain suffixes, so far as it can be detected in the orthography, appear chiefly in their palatal form even after roots consisting of velar vowels, *cyālyuzlūg* [y'lwzlwk] “loneliness” (213r 3), *nabūd olmāk* ('wlmk). Similar exceptions (?) from the rules of vowel harmony can be observed in Aynallu”.

𐌆𐌆	= <la>	𐌆𐌆	= <bi>	𐌆𐌆	= <g>
𐌆𐌆	= <le>	𐌆𐌆	= <bo>	𐌆𐌆	= <g>
𐌆𐌆	= <lo>	𐌆𐌆	= <bo <sub>w</sub> >	𐌆𐌆	= <g>
𐌆𐌆	= <ba>	𐌆𐌆	= <bu <sub>w</sub> >	𐌆𐌆	= <č>
𐌆𐌆	= <ba <sub>1</sub> >	𐌆𐌆	= <ye <sup>h</sup> >	𐌆𐌆	= <k>
𐌆𐌆	= <bu>	𐌆𐌆	= <p>	𐌆𐌆	= <č>

The phonemic vowel inventory of Modern Turkish: aıou – eiöü (cp. Hulst – Weijer 1991: 12; Comrie 1997: 884) and of Chagatay / Osmanlı: aïou – äëiöü / aiou – eëiöü.

	Front		Central	Back	
	Unrounded	Rounded		Unrounded	Rounded
High	i	ü		ı / ĩ	u
Mid	e	ö	ë / è		o
Low				a	

5 As far as such assessments of the author, the referees observes: “All historical records have two faces: although orthographic standardization is a modern phenomenon, they certainly follow some kind of norm learned and applied in the community. Local varieties, i.e. the local dialect of the writer/copyist, can also emerge to various degrees in the written texts. It is very difficult to describe to what degree the two faces emerge in the sources. This depends on many factors. Therefore only certain tendencies of the spoken dialects can be described on the base of the written records.”

	a	ĩ	o	u	ă	ě	i	ö	ü
	a	ı	o	u	e	é	i	ö	ü
Rounded	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
Unrounded	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	-
Back	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
Central	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-
Front	-	-	-	-	+	-	+	+	+
High	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+
Mid	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	
Low	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1.0 A contrastive, morphophonemic analysis<sup>6</sup> of the vowel inventory exhibited by Vat. turc. 83.<sup>7</sup>

### 1.1 The grapheme ⟨α⟩ (⟨α₁⟩)

---

/ă/, /a/	45v l. 4 and <i>passim</i> : ⟨lafndýmn⟩ “efendimin”
	47r l. 10 and <i>passim</i> : ⟨gando <sub>w</sub> da <sub>1</sub> ⟩ /gändüdä/ “kendide”
	61v l. 3 and <i>passim</i> : ⟨na <sub>1</sub> şkl⟩ “ne şekil”
	71r ll. 12–13: ⟨lafndm geğāyý go <sub>w</sub> nu <sub>w</sub> z letden⟩ /ăfândim geğāyi göniz êtdên/ “efendim geceyi günüz etti”
	68r l. 11: ⟨lan <sub>1</sub> hahamn⟩ “ana hahamın” “I am your Rabbi”

---

### 1.2 The grapheme ⟨ε⟩ (⟨ε₁⟩) versus ⟨ι⟩ (⟨ι₁⟩)

#### 1.2.1

The thesis, arguable from Drimba 1997 and Stein 2002, according to which in early transcriptions ⟨ε⟩ could have represented [i]/[ĩ] (cf. Drimba 1997: 40) is made questionable by the following evidence, which instead validate the view that ⟨ε⟩ represents /ě/.

In exploiting the text of the *Rudimento della lingua turchesca* by Giovanni Agop (1685), Vladimir Drimba misinterpreted some occurrences of the Latin grapheme ⟨ε⟩, so far as it is used in Agop’s transliteration system. In fact, he failed to recognize

6 The notational conventions applied in this paper are based upon a (simplified) version of the SPE-type rules (Chomsky & Halle 1968: 61–66, § 1.2. *Notational Conventions*; Jensen 2004).

7 Cp. Uçar & Yener 2012: 204–206, for a brief survey of the graphemic devices used to disambiguate high and low labial vowels in the *Divân-u Luğâti 'l-Türk* by Maḥmūd Kâşğari, in later Old Ottoman texts and in Manichaean Uyghur texts.

precisely a representation of /ë/, by claiming that: “pour [i] sont employés “i” et (*cas singulier*) “e” [...] “ocumaz řeniz” (= *okumazsınız*)”. Stein 2002: 353, speaks of “Schwankungen” in early transcribed Turkic text, which resulted in “unklaren Notierungen mit tiefen Vokale (e, o)”. Curiously, it was also Drimba who (unknowingly) signalled another case of “unklaren Notierungen mit tiefen Vokale”: cp. Drimba 1976: 112: “1. amu “vuluua” [...] la graphie “amu” est, très probablement, une *faute* du copiste, au lieu de “ami” (amī)”. A further survey of previous literature will eventually expand the case studies.

---

/ë/	52r l. 15: <bedro <sub>w</sub> s> /bëdros/ is a calque from Armenian Պէտքով <sup>8</sup> Thus: 45v l. 12 and <i>passim</i> : <fëkr nam 1zı> /fëkr namāzi/ “fıkr namazi” 69r l. 11 and <i>passim</i> : <1ensā 1n> “insan”
[V → a / V ë]	47r l. 16: <1ostýdan> /üstëdan/ “üsteden” (cp. <i>infra</i> ); 47r, l. 16: <1etmamıš> /ëtmamış/ “etmemiş”; 46v l. 15: <1edrsa 1n>, /ëd(a)rsān/ “edersen” 49r l. 3: <go <sub>w</sub> renmāz>, /görënmāz/ “görünmez” 49r l. 6: <verma 1dy> /vërmād(i)/ “vermedi” 64v l. 11: <peškāš> “pişkeş”
[V → ë / V a, ä]	47r l. 3: <kamellıg> “kamillik” 47v ll. 3: <ayë <sup>h</sup> > “ay#i” 49r l. 7: <go <sub>w</sub> nahlreyn s1ba 1bný> /günahl(a)rën säbābini/ “günahların sebebini”, which alternates with (57r. l. 15: <gownehlarem> /günëhlarëm/. The alternance <α>/<ε> within the aforementioned occurrences, is further disproof of the equation <ε> = [i]/[i]. Moreover, the second occurrence is a perfect paradigm of “regular disharmony”: [V → a / V ë] + [V → ë / V a]. 57v ll. 3, 6: <ħa 1ç 1ç aqtën> /ħāç açaqtën/ (>*ħāç atçaqtën) “haç at#ıcak#tan”: according to Jean Deny (Deny 1929: 997 note 2 = Deny & Elöve 1941: 950 note 4) “le même phénomène (disparition de la voyelle i) s’est produit en azéri”; <marħ 1matsız siya 1satlar çkten> /mārħāmātsız siyasātlar(ë)çäktën/ (>* siyasātlar ëtçäktën) “merhametsiz siyasetler et#ıcek#ten”; we may observe that the vowel of the morpheme #-Dën# is not affected by the vowel feature (backness/frontness) of the preceding syllable; 57v l. 13: <takmel 1etdi> “teknil etti” 47v l. 17: <sağır 1olmuşlar>; 57v l. 14: <şā 1gertlarınyı 1getdi> “şagirdlerini gitti”

---

8 On the syncretic milieu in which Chaldaeans, Syro(-Catholics) and Armenians lived in eighteenth-century Edessa, see Proverbio 2004.

9 Another, though different, striking case (57v l. 1): <dowlatlo<sub>w</sub>> /dövlätlü/ for “devletlü”.

46r ll. 6–9: <fəkr 1et kÿ ya<sub>1</sub>rtmešdan | lawl laşlen na<sub>1</sub> lÿdÿ ÷ gorçak byr | şe<sub>n</sub>  
da lgeldeÿn ya ll lan w byr go<sub>w</sub>za<sub>1</sub> galmaz | ğomla<sub>1</sub> mavġo<sub>w</sub>datdn lalġaq ÷  
zahmatsuz ýlrdÿ) /fəkr ət ki yartmēšdan äv(ä)l aslēn nā idi gürçäk bir šē  
dagēldēn yalan v(ä) bir gözä gālmāz ğümlä mavġüdatd(ē)n alġaq zahmatsız  
yaratdı/ “Keep in mind that: (in) which (did it consist) your essential nature,  
(as it came) from the Creator? (It consisted in that: since you are) a true  
thing, You can not be a falsehood, and (even if You are) the vilest thing of  
the universe, (so vile) that it cannot be seen by anyone, (God) created (it)  
effortless(ly)”.

### 1.3. The grapheme ⟨u⟩ (⟨u<sub>y</sub>⟩, ⟨u<sub>w</sub>⟩) versus the grapheme ⟨ı⟩ (⟨ı<sub>y</sub>⟩) in morphophonemic context

#### 1.3.1. A number of occurrences and regular phenomena which clearly show the existence of a limited outward vowel harmony or “regular disharmony”

⟨ı<sub>y</sub>⟩ → ⟨u<sub>y</sub>⟩: [V → ĩ / V i]

49v ll. 8–9: <laÿıġı<sub>y</sub>mu<sub>zn</sub> lltı<sub>y</sub>na<sub>1</sub> | laldeq wçagnıdeq) /ayaġımız(i)n altınā al#dēq vä-  
çāġnā#dēq/ “ayaġımızı altına aldık ve-ceġnedik”;—again, we observe that the vowel of  
the morpheme #-dēq# is not affected by the feature value of the preceding vowel: a fact  
which definitely disagrees with the general palatal harmony rule; cf. Johnson 1980: 90:  
V → [vback] / V [V, vback] C<sub>0</sub>\_\_.

50r l. 5: <tlatlı<sub>y</sub>lvġ) /t(a)latlılġ/”üçlülük”, “Trinity”;

The patterns [V → ĩ / V i] is to be found regularly in the affixal morpheme #-(i)yüz#  
(cp. Edip 1945: 37) “-VnVz”, “yours”: f 52v l. <sv<sub>y</sub>zen lafndı<sub>y</sub>vu<sub>w</sub>z) /süzēn äfändi-  
yüz/ “sizin efendiniz”; ll. 14–15: <bÿrı<sub>y</sub> bÿrı<sub>y</sub>vu<sub>w</sub>zn) “bir biriniz(in)”;

Observe the following sequence (52v ll. 4–5): <ħa<sub>1</sub>qur wfa<sub>1</sub>qur wba<sub>1</sub>leq  
lavçowşy w|gownehkar) “hakir ve-fakir ve-balık avcısı ve-günahkar” ([V → ĩ, ē / V  
a]), to be considered under the light of *Reverse VdH6b* (see below);

The grapheme ⟨o⟩ (⟨o<sub>w</sub>⟩) represents all the rounded vowels:

/ü/, /ö/	46r l. 3: <lo <sub>w</sub> çowngı <sub>y</sub> da'vat) “üçüncü davet”; 47r l. 16: <lostıdan) /üstēdan/ “üsteden”; 47v ll. 3–4: <lagar go <sub>w</sub> naı <sub>ı</sub> ı <sub>y</sub> lagar laye <sup>h</sup>   ğomla <sub>1</sub> go <sub>w</sub> go <sub>w</sub> n saltanatıyl) “eger güneşi eger ayı cümle gōġün saltanatıyla” 47r l. 10: <gandowdaı <sub>1</sub> ) /gändü#dā/ “kendide”;
/o/	47v l. 13: <to <sub>w</sub> paı <sub>1</sub> l wko <sub>w</sub> r lolmuş) “topal ve-kör olmuş” 52r l. 6 and <i>passim</i> : <çowq) 54v l. 20 and <i>passim</i> : <yo <sub>w</sub> q)
/u/	54v l. 10: <bo <sub>w</sub> yo <sub>w</sub> ror) “buyurur”
/ol/, /ul/	45v l. 2: <bo <sub>w</sub> lw <sub>w</sub> nan) “bolunan”

---

46v l. 17: ⟨y<sub>i</sub>men lo<sub>w</sub>lwrsan⟩ “yemin olursan”  
 48r l. 6: ⟨doğro<sub>w</sub>⟩ “doğru”  
 52r ll. 14: ⟨lo<sub>w</sub>to<sub>w</sub>rmeš⟩ “oturmuş”  
 55r l. 11: ⟨bo<sub>w</sub>lo<sub>w</sub>nwr⟩ “bolunur”

---

Lastly, the lexeme ⟨swrp⟩, which occurs in the unvocalized (49v ll. 7, 20; 50v l. 10, 71v l. 5, 74r l. 7 and *passim*) as well as in the vocalized form (52v ll. 6–7), is a calque from Armenian *Սուրբ*. Now, apparently, the vocalized form seems contradictory: ⟨su<sub>w</sub>rp⟩ /sīrp/. In fact, this occurrence turns out to be the strongest among the aforementioned arguments. We have to consider the *whole* syntagm ⟨su<sub>w</sub>rpbedros⟩, “St. Peter”, in order to understand that this phonetic transcription is perfectly correct: /sīrpēdros/ (> \*srpēdros), according to the “Vokalschwächungen oder Synkopen in vortonigen Silben” (cp. Solta 1963: 87, notes 1 and 2).

All these arguments compel us to discard the hypothesis according to which ⟨v⟩ (⟨v<sub>y</sub>⟩) and ⟨v⟩ (⟨v<sub>y</sub>⟩) could be allographs.

### 1.3.2.

Thus, since ⟨v⟩ (⟨v<sub>y</sub>⟩, ⟨v<sub>w</sub>⟩) represents /i/ (cp. 58r ll.9, 10: ⟨wa<sub>l</sub>qutda<sub>l</sub>⟩, 62r l. 3 and *passim*: ⟨wa<sub>l</sub>qut⟩ /vaqit/ “vakıt”):

---

VdH1a.b	V →	[+unround ]	/	V	[+unround ]	[αC <sub>0</sub> ] C <sub>0</sub> __C <sub>0</sub> ]word
		[+back ]			[+back ]	[β∅]
		[+high ]		α	[+low ]	
				β	[+mid ]	
					[α +central ]	
					[β +front ]	

---

#### *vback*:

47v ll. 10–11: ⟨lns<sub>l</sub>n bo<sub>w</sub>lwnwr dar<sub>l</sub>oq lyčnda<sub>l</sub>⟩ “insan bolunur darlık içinde”

48r l. 7, 51v l. 12, 61r l. 11: ⟨le<sub>y</sub>mansuz⟩ /ëymansız/ “eymensiz”

51v l. 16: ⟨lavč<sub>w</sub>ları<sub>w</sub>nn⟩ “avçılarının”

52r l. 11: ⟨ylral<sub>l</sub>dum⟩ “yaraladım”

54v ll. 14, 18; 59r. 11 and *passim*: ⟨leda<sub>l</sub>lo<sub>w</sub>m⟩ /ëdalim/ “edelim”

#### *vfront*:

60r l. 11, 62r l. 7: ⟨ča<sub>l</sub>ku<sub>w</sub>b⟩ /čäkib/ “çek#ib” (The vowel of the morpheme #-ib# is not affected by the vowel feature [+frontness] of the preceding syllable)

#### *vcentral*

52r l. 10: ⟨deš<sub>w</sub>m lyl<sub>l</sub>⟩ “dişim ile”

59r l. 5: ⟨hazrlrnmış<sub>w</sub>dör⟩ “hazırlanmıştır”

64r l. 1 and *passim*: ⟨leš<sub>w</sub>t⟩ /ëşit/ “işit!”



*vrounded*48v l. 16: <saḳlo<sub>w</sub> dur> /saḳludīr/ “saklıdır”56r l. 13: <lo<sub>w</sub>ldo<sub>w</sub>ğım> /olduğım/ “olduğım”55r l. 3: <lağçıları qo<sub>w</sub>ro<sub>w</sub>du<sub>y</sub>> /ağaçları kurudī/ “ağaçları kurudu”60r l. 9: <mo<sub>w</sub>ško<sub>w</sub>lu<sub>w</sub>mu<sub>w</sub>z> /mōškülümiz/ “mōškülümüz”65r l. 1 and *passim*: <šo<sub>w</sub>ku<sub>w</sub>rlar> /šükīrlar/ “šükūrler”81v l. 4: <nā<sub>l</sub> do<sub>w</sub>šo<sub>w</sub>nu<sub>w</sub>r> /nā dūšünīr/ “ne dūšünūr”**1.3.3.**

However, certain occurrences indicate an evolution toward an incipient outward vowel harmony, emerging as a secondary development:

VdH2	V → [+unround ]	/	V [+unround]	[αC <sub>0</sub> ] C <sub>0</sub> __C <sub>0</sub> ]word
	[+front ]		[+mid ]	[βØ]
	[+high ]		[α +central]	
			[β +front]	

As stated by Johanson 1978: 153, these parallel, secondary occurrences “tend toward a reduced, lax articulation”, though they still seem to be submitted to a regular disharmony law.

Cp. the case of morpheme #-lxQ# (on “the progressive suffix {I°Q}”, cp. Johanson 1978: 155; Erdal 2004: 149–150):

[V → i / V ē]

48r l. 6: &lt;ḥelūdkrký&gt; /ahēlīdkrki/ “ahılıkdır-ki”; 47r l. 3: &lt;kamelluğ&gt; /kamēllik/ “kamillik”

[V → ē / V ī]

61r l. 11 and *passim*: <ḥeymansuzlēğ> /ēymansīzlēğ/ “eymensizlik”*versus* [V → i / V ē, ā] 48v l. 3: <şerklüğyn> “şerklüğine”, 50v l. 17: <belmazlığı, ma> “bilmezliğime”.

The incipient oscillation emerges clearly from the following, aberrant occurrence (74r l. 4): <olmazlı ε yq> “ölmezlik”.

49v l. 7, 51r l. 1, 52r l. 7: <letdum>, 49v l. 13: <ḥ'rarl't' benderdu<sub>y</sub>> “hararete bindirdi”, 52v l. 1: <ban tanýdum> “ben tanıdım”; *versus* 48v ll. 9–10: <werdy> “verdi”, 49v ll. 6: <letdu<sub>y</sub>>, 52r l. 1: <de<sub>y</sub>du<sub>y</sub>> /dēdi/ “didi”. By that way, we may observe that, under this perspective of regular disharmony, the parallel occurrence on 52v l. 11: <du<sub>y</sub>du<sub>y</sub>> /dīdi/ “didi” strengthens the idea that <u<sub>y</sub>> and <ı<sub>y</sub>> can not be allographs. Occurrences such as <da'lgelde<sub>y</sub>n> /dagēldēn/ (46r l. 8, see above); <da'lgelder> /dagēldēr/ (60r l. 10); or (56v l. 5): <čā'wormēšder> /čavurmēšdēr/, are precisely cases of indifferent, phonetically neutral utterance, as clearly explained by Johanson 1978. But the relative rarity of such

occurrences indicates that the linguistic stage of our text precedes even the “indifference stage”.

### 1.3.4.

The following occurrence can be interpreted as a case of vowel dissimilation parallel to a following occurrence of vowel disharmony ( $V \rightarrow \text{ĩ} / V \text{ ě}$ ): 51r l. 1: <qo<sub>w</sub>llwğýna<sub>1</sub>šo<sub>w</sub>ru<sub>w</sub>t letdvm> /Kulluginä šürüt ětdim/ “kulluğuna şürüt ettim” (obviously, \*#-rüt# is not a morphological unit)

$$\begin{array}{l} V \rightarrow [+unround ] / V [+round ] \quad [\alpha C_0] C_0\_C_0]_{\text{word}} \\ \quad [+back ] \quad \quad \quad [+front ] \quad [\beta\emptyset] \\ \quad [+high ] \quad \quad \quad [+high ] \end{array}$$

### 1.3.5.

Concerning the affixal morpheme #-mXš#, if the preceding syllable exhibits the vowel /ě/, its vowel pattern follows VdH1b (*vmid*: /ětmiš/).

46r l. 4 and *passim*: <letm<sub>w</sub>š> (*versus* the harmonized occurrence on f. 46v l. 7: <letmeš> “etmiş), 47r l. 16: <letma<sub>1</sub>m<sub>w</sub>š>,

If the preceding syllable exhibits a labial vowel, the “regular disharmony” rule is:

*vround*: /olměš/

$$\begin{array}{l} V \rightarrow [+unround ] / V [+round] \quad [\alpha C_0] m\_š]_{\text{word}} \\ \quad [+back ] \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad [\beta\emptyset] \\ \quad [+mid ] \end{array}$$

47v l. 11: <došmeš> /düşměš/ “düşmüş”; 47v l. 16 and *passim*: <lolmešlar> “olmuşlar” (but a few lines above, l. 13: <lolmuš> /olměš/; 78v l. 10: <došmu<sub>w</sub>š> /düşměš/); 52r ll. 13–14: <laš<sub>α</sub>lğ<sub>iy</sub> lo<sub>w</sub>to<sub>w</sub>rmeš> “aşağı oturmuş”; 56v l. 5: <č<sub>α</sub>lwormešder> /čavurměšděr/; 62v l. 1: <dormeš> /dürměš/ (but a few lines below “labialized” as follows: l. 5: <n<sub>1</sub>su<sub>w</sub>ko<sub>w</sub>t lolmoš> /nä süküt olmüš/ “ne süküt olmuş”);

or, more generally:

$$\begin{array}{l} V \rightarrow [+unround ] / V [+/-round] \quad [\alpha C_0] m\_š]_{\text{word}} \\ \quad [+back ] \quad \quad \quad [+back ] \quad \quad \quad [\beta\emptyset] \\ \quad [+mid ] \end{array}$$

46r l. 1: <y<sub>α</sub>rtmeš> /yar(a)tměš/ “yaratmış”

59r l. 7: <ħ<sub>α</sub>lzrlameš<sub>α</sub>r> “hazırlamışlar”

65v l. 11: <naš<sub>1</sub>kl qo<sub>w</sub>durmeš qo<sub>w</sub>dv<sub>w</sub> gýbý> “ne şekil kudurmuş kudur gibi”

74r l. 7: <qo<sub>w</sub>ru<sub>w</sub>meš> /qorěměš/ “korumuş”

(but cf. the following occurrence 75v l. 1: <s<sub>w</sub>moš> /sävěmüš/ “sev-imiş”)

### 1.3.6.

As far as the affixal morpheme #-DxC<sub>0</sub>/Ø#, marking the aoristic past tense, is concerned, aside from the following diathetic, “disharmonic” paradigm:

First person, sing.: /-dīm/  
 52r l. 11: <y|ral|dīm> “yaraladım”, 72r l. 5 and *passim*: <le<sub>y</sub>dīm>  
 Second person, sing.: /-dēn/  
 47v l. 1: <d|g<sub>y</sub>š|lmazden> /dāgiš(a)mazdēn/ “değişmezdin”  
 65r l. 5: <ç|ıqartden> “çıkartdın” “You brought out”  
 72r ll. 12–13: <š|rab<sub>y</sub>n<sub>y</sub> le<sub>y</sub>çurden> /šarabini eçirdēn/ “şarabını içirdin”  
 Third person, sing.: /-dī/  
 55r l. 3: <ağ|çlar<sub>y</sub> qo<sub>w</sub>ro<sub>w</sub>du<sub>y</sub>> /ağaçları kurudī/ “ağaçları kurudu”

We observe, at least for the first person singular, the following oscillations:

[V → ē / V i]:  
 50r l. 5, <šo<sub>w</sub>ko<sub>w</sub>r yağ|l|šd<sub>y</sub>rdēm> “şükür yaqlaştırdım, yaqlaştırayım” (to be compared with 55v l. 11: <bo<sub>w</sub>ykder> /büy(i)kdēr/);  
 [V → ē / V ä]:  
 67v ll. 13–14: <š|ğrtlr<sub>y</sub>na| banzadēm> “şagirdlerine benzedim” (cp. 51r l. 3: <šo<sub>w</sub>ko<sub>w</sub>rlar yağ|lašd<sub>y</sub>rayē<sub>m</sub>> “şükürler yaqlaştırayım”  
 [V → ü / V i]:  
 52v l. 2: <l<sub>y</sub>m|n g|ltu<sub>w</sub>rdom> /äyman gätirdüm/ “eyman getirdim”; this occurrence incidentally disproves the equation <u<sub>w</sub>> = <o> /ü/.

We may observe that, when a secondary outward vowel harmony affects the affixal morpheme #-TxR-#—see *supra*: /bēndērdī/; the occurrence <le<sub>y</sub>rdüm> on 51r l. 2 is at least ambiguous, since <y> may be interpreted as <ı<sub>y</sub>> as well as <ε<sub>y</sub>>—the vowel pattern of the morpheme #-TxC<sub>0</sub>/Ø#, which follows the aforementioned affix, obviously conforms to VdH4a.

## 2. Appendix

### 2.1 Regarding the ablative suffixes #-DIn# / #-DAn# in Ancient Osmanlı and in early Turkish-garšūni

2.1.1. The occurrences of the morpheme #-DIn#, aside from the more common #-DAn# in MS Manchester, The John Rylands Library, Turkish 75—an elegant, beautifully gilded, late sixteenth-century manuscript which appears to be the last tome of a pre-modern Turkish edition of the Arabian Nights—definitely disprove the claim by Timurtaş 1977: 72, according to which: “Öndin sözündeki klişeleşmiş -din şekli başka kelimelerde görülüyor. (Kelimeyi başka türlü açıklayan, -din’i ablativ ekini kabul etmeyenler de vardır)”.

**2.1.2.** According to Bodrogligeti 2001: 42 § 3.1.4.2.7: “The alternate use of **-dan/-dän** and **-dın/-din** is not a clear cut indicator of dialect boundaries. Both may occur in the work of the same author”. Cp. Mansuroğlu 1959: 169, § 32126. Doerfer 1993, § 5.15 (*Ablativ*): 151–159: p. 151: “Im „Alt“- und Mitteltü. erscheinen die Ablativsuffixe *-DA* (= Lokativ), *-DAn* und *-DIn*. Dagegen ist *-Dän/-DXn*, mit Vierfachvokal, z.B. in *öpděn* ‘vorn gelegen’, in Runenschrift [...]”.

**2.1.3.** As far as Old Turkish is concerned, a glimpse into the tradition in Brahmi script shows an analogous occurrence of *Irregularität*e bezüglich der *Vokalharmonie*.<sup>10</sup> Cp. Maue 1996: xxii, § 2.1.4.2 (*gestörte* [!] *Vokalharmonie*): “In ganz auffälliger Weise zeigt die Vinayavibhaṅga-HS Kat.Nr. 3 vordervokalisches Lokativ-Formans *+t/dä* nach hintervokalischen Wörtern”. Some examples are provided on note 69: “Nr. 25 *olarnidä*, Nr. 44 *boynindä*, [*a*]rkasindä, Nr. 66 *aşlukdä*, Nr. 86 *Ra-jagurdä*, Nr. 90.96 *ugurdä*”.

**2.1.4.** As far as the so called *Confession of Gennadios Scholarios* – a fifteenth century Turkish text which has been transmitted to us in Greek writing (cp. Proverbio 2010: 38, note 45)—is concerned, though (until now) the most comprehensive description of its main graphemic and morphophonemic features is far from being completely satisfactory, a few observations may be pointed out. Halasi-Kun 1992, [English translation of Halasi-Kun 1939]: 82 and foll.: “*Locative* [...] *-de* is found [...] 3. With certain Arabic words which have an *a* in the last syllable: ἰσατὲ “in Jesus”, τουνιατὲ “in the world”. [...] *-den* occurs [...] 3. With certain Arabic words which have an *a* in the last syllable: ἀτατέν “from His forgiving”, κεαμαλτέν “from His perfectness”, ρουχτέν [!] “from the soul”.

## 2.2

VdH6a	V →	[+unround ] [+αfront ] [+βcentral ] [+mid ]	/	V	[+unround ] [+front ] [+high]	[αC <sub>0</sub> T__n] <sub>word</sub> [β∅]
VdH6b	V →	[+unround ] [+back ] [+low ]	/	V	[+unround ] [+back ] [+high]	[αC <sub>0</sub> T__n] <sub>word</sub> [β∅]
				α	{	
				β	{	[+central ] [+mid ]

<sup>10</sup> Cp. Maue 1996: xxii, § 2.1.4.

Reverse VdH6a	V →	[+unround ] [+front ] [+high ]	/	V	[+unround ] [+front ] [+mid]	[αC <sub>0</sub> ] T__n]_word [βØ]
Reverse VdH6b	V →	[+unround ] α [+back ] [+high ] [+central ] β [+mid]	/	V	[+unround ] [+back ] [+low]	[αC <sub>0</sub> ] T__n]_word [βØ]
VdH6c	V →	[+unround ] α [+front ] [+mid ] β [+back ] [+high ]	/	V	[+unround ] [+central ] [+mid]	[αC <sub>0</sub> ] T__n]_word [βØ]

VdH6		Reverse VdH6	
ış#den	<b>a M</b>	Kān-āmā-kān#dın	<b>b M</b>
yānın#dan	<b>b M</b>	söyleşmek#din	<b>a M</b>
Memleketinden	<b>a M</b>	⟨lorα,den⟩ /oradēn/ “oradan”	<b>b V</b>
Güherdāş-ı-Teterī-den	<b>a M</b>		
qāṭı’#dan	<b>b M</b>		
şehrin#den (vs Bağdād şehrindin)	<b>a M</b>		
sōzin#den	<b>a M</b>		
⟨lgh,ıdan⟩	<b>a V</b>		
⟨lostýdan⟩ /üstēdan/ “üstenen”	<b>b V</b>		
⟨ya,ırtmeşdan⟩	<b>b V</b>		
⟨sawyedun⟩ /sāv(i)yēdīn/ “seviyeden”	<b>c V</b>		
⟨derna]ğendan⟩ /dērnāğēndan/ “dernekinden”	<b>b V</b>		

**M** = Manchester, The John Rylands Library, Turkish 75

**V** = Vat. turc. 83



## References

- Bodrogligeti, András 1968. On the Turkish vocabulary of the Isfahan Anonymous. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 21/1, 15–43.
- Bodrogligeti, András 2001. *A grammar of Chagatay*. (Languages of the World / Materials 155.) München: Lincom Europa.
- Chomsky, Noam & Halle, Morris 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clements, George N. & Sezer, Ermin 1986. Vowel and consonant disharmony in Turkish. In: van der Hulst, Harry & Smith, Norval (eds.) *The structure of phonological representations 2*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications. 213–255.
- Comrie, Bernard 1997. Turkish phonology. In: Kaye, Alan S. (ed.) *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. 883–898.
- Deny, Jean 1929. *Grammaire de la langue turque (dialecte osmanli)*. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Langues Orientales Vivantes) Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Deny, Jean & Elöve, Ali Ulvi 1941. *Türk dili grameri (Osmanlı lehçesi)*. İstanbul: Maarif Matbaası.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1993. *Versuch einer linguistischen Datierung älterer osttürkischer Texte*. (Turcologica 14.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Drimba, Vladimir 1976. Miscellanea Cumanica 5. Mots attestés par des formes possessives. In: *Księga dla uczczenia pamięci Jana Reychmana (1910–1975)*. [Rocznik Orientalistyczny 38.] Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. 111–115
- Drimba, Vladimir 1997. La grammaire turque de Giovanni Agop (1685). In: Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara & Zieme, Peter (eds.) *Studia ottomanica: Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 47.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 39–46.
- Edip, Kemal 1945. *Urfa ağzı*. (Türk Dil Kurumu, D. 25.) İstanbul: Bürhaneddin Erenler Basımevi.
- Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik: Achte Abteilung, Zentralasien 3.) Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Halasi-Kun, Tibor 1939. Gennadios török hitvallása. *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum* 1, 137–247.
- Halasi-Kun, Tibor 1992. Gennadios' Turkish confession of faith. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 12, 5–103.
- Hazai, György & Tietze, Andreas 2006. *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde "Freud nach Leid" (Ein frühosmanisches Geschichtenbuch) 1: Text; 2: Faksimiles des osmanischen Originals*. (Studie zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Türkvölker 5.1/5.2) Berlin: Klaus Schwarz.
- Hazar, Mehmet & Özmen, Abdullah 2011. Mardin Süryanilerine Süryani harfleriyle yazılmış birkaç Türkçe metin üzerine. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 4/16, 172–177.
- van der Hulst, Harry & van de Weijer, Jeroen 1991. Topics in Turkish phonology. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik & Verhoeven, Ludo (eds.) *Turkish linguistics today*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. 11–59.
- Jensen, John T. 2004. *Principles of generative phonology. An introduction*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 250.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Johanson, Lars 1978. The indifference stage of Turkish suffix vocalism. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*, 151–156.

- Johnson, C. Douglas 1980. Regular disharmony in Kirghiz. In: Vago, Robert M. (ed.) *Issues in vowel harmony*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 6.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. 90–99.
- Mansuroğlu, Mecdut 1959. Das Altosmanische. In: Deny, Jean & Grønbech, Kaare & Scheel, Helmuth & Togan, Zeki Velidi (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* I. Aquis Mattiacis: Steiner. 161–182.
- Maue, Dieter 1996. *Alttürkische Handschriften. Teil 1: Dokumente in Brāhmī und Tibetischer Schrift*. (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland 13/9.) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Ölmez, Mehmet Ali 1999. Süryanî harfli Eski Uygurca bir tıp metni. In: 3. *Uluslar Arası Türk Dil Kurultayı 1996*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları. 815–820.
- Proverbio, Delio Vania 2004. Turco-Syriaca: Un caso estremo di sincretismo linguistico e religioso: i libri di Tommaso Şarrāf da Edessa (xviii sec.) nella biblioteca portativa di Tommaso caldeo da Alqōš. *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicæ Vaticanæ* 11, 583–635.
- Proverbio, Delio Vania 2010. *Turcica Vaticana*. (Studi e testi 461.) Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Proverbio, Delio Vania 2012. On the subject of transliterating Ottoman and other Turkic texts written in Arabic script for philological purposes. *Turcica* 44, 317–332.
- Segal, Judah Benzion 1953. *The diacritical point and the accents in Syriac*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Solta, Georg Renatus 1963. Die armenische Sprache. In: Deeters, Gerhard & Solta, Georg Renatus & Inglisian, Vahan (eds.) *Armenisch und kaukasische Sprachen*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten 7.) Leiden: Brill. 80–128.
- Stein, Heidi 2002. Einige mittelosmanische Daten zur Labialharmonie (Suffixe der *genera verbi* bei H. Megiser). In: Demir, Nurettin & Turan, Fikret (eds.) *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*. (Grafiker Yayıncılık 4.; Araştırma ve İnceleme Dizisi 3.) Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları. 351–362.
- Timurtaş, Faruk K. 1977. *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi XV. yüzyıl (Gramer-metin-sözlük)*. (İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları 2157.) İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.
- Uçar, Erdem & Yener, Mustafa Levent 2012. Eski Türkçede ilk hecedeki yuvarlak ünlüler meselesi ve *Dīvānu Lugāti-it-Türk* [On the question of the first syllable rounded vowels in Old Turkic and *Dīvānu Lugāti-it-Türk*]. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken* 4/2, 203–212.