

Werk

Titel: Editorial note

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2013

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0017|LOG_0008

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 17, 2013

The present double issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES contains papers on a broad variety of topics.

*

In the first part of the volume, Eyüp Bacanlı deals with high-focal intraterminal markers, aspectual and preaspectual, in the Denizli dialects of Turkish. Intraterminal meanings are examined with respect to various focality degrees, including prosodic differences. Particular attention is given to high-focal postterminal functions of the markers *-b-duru* and *-b-otur*.

Bernt Brendemoen investigates the use of action nouns in *-mA* in Balkan Turkish, where its absence in embedded volitional clauses is seen as a 'Balkan Sprachbund' feature. However, in some dialects, also West Rumelian ones, it is used with purposive meaning and in complements of *başla-* 'to begin', usages that may be regarded as archaisms.

Birsel Karakoç analyzes syntactic and semantic properties of Old Ottoman copular clauses preceded by the element *ki*, in particular clauses provided with the markers *-dUr*, *olur* and *ola* and their corresponding Persian structures. The difference between *-dUr / olur* and the optative *ola* is claimed to indicate a distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses.

In the framework of the 'co-phonology' approach, developed within Optimality Theory, Eser Erguvanlı Taylan analyzes Turkish suffix-initial V~0 and C~0 alternations. Four different co-phonologies are proposed to capture the dependencies between the morphological constructions and the phonological processes.

Darya Kavitskaya's contribution deals with the segmental inventory and the evolution of sound harmony in Crimean Turkic, the differences between its major varieties with respect to front vs. back and unrounded vs. rounded harmony.

On the basis of phonological, semantic and chronological considerations, Peter Sauli Piispanen deals with a number of newly suggested lexical borrowings from (Pre-)Yakut into the Yukaghiric languages of far northeastern Siberia. According to the author, several borrowings, which relate to hunting and wandering, are quite recent. Many are semantically connected to elementary phenomena, and a few loans have their origin in the tales of surrounding tribes.

Ingeborg Hauenschild deals with Turkic names for the horsetail plant, which has been valued as human food and animal fodder and is used in traditional medicine. The names refer to its unusual appearance or to its valuable properties. Some names are found in nearly all Turkic languages, whereas others are attested only in individual branches or languages.

*

The second part of this double issue presents contributions to a conference in Szeged devoted to the publication of *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian* (2011), authored by András Róna-Tas and Árpád Berta with the collaboration of László Károly. Martine Robbeets published a review of this work in volume 16 of *TURKIC LANGUAGES*. Our journal will devote two additional review articles to it.

Klára Agyagási deals with West Old Turkic and the Volga Bulgarian loans in Cheremis. The book published by Róna-Tas, Berta and Károly provides unique lexical materials concerning the Ogur varieties spoken between the 5th and 12th centuries. However, Volga Bulgarian loans in Cheremis can give us many missing details concerning this language. The author analyzes phonetic and derivational details of four Ogur words, comparing the forms in which they are mirrored in Hungarian and Cheremis. Both sources are needed to reconstruct the Ogur word stock and the varieties of Ogur word formation existing from the 5th until the 16th century.

Mária Ivanics deals with the Turkic etymology of the Hungarian word *dara* ‘grist, rubble’, concluding that the word cannot be related to the East Old Turkic word *tariy* ‘grain, millet’ since it never referred to a whole grain. It is proposed that the Hungarian word is an Ottoman loan of ultimately Persian origin.

Lars Johanson’s paper discusses the roles of Turkic sonorant consonants in contact with certain obstruents, arguing against an alleged sound law according to which Old Turkic obstruents became voiceless after stem-final *n*, *l*, *r*, as a result of dissimilation. The author assumes that original dental, velar and affricate stops had become weak fricatives in intervocalic position. With the loss of Proto-Turkic short final stem-vowels, the fricatives came into direct contact with the sonorants and assimilated to them, turning into weak stops. The weak cluster *nj* emerged in the same way as *nd*, *ld*, *rg*, etc.

László Károly compares the results of the monograph *West Old Turkic. Turkic loanwords in Hungarian* (2011) with *An etymological dictionary of Altaic languages* by Starostin et al. (2003). The latter opened a new chapter in Altaic research, but also revealed several problems that must be solved. The author points out some of the most crucial problems that might prevent progress in Altaic studies.

István Vásáry’s paper is devoted to the integration of Turkic loan words with final plosives into the Russian grammatical paradigm. Investigating 51 Russian words that were once copied from a Turkic form in *-k/-g* and now have different endings, the author raises the question whether the Russian final *-g* reflects a Turkic final *-g* or Russian alternations of an original *-k*. Another question is whether the presence of a Russian final *-ga* in many cases is the outcome of a Russian or Turkic development, or both. It is suggested that the large number of Turkic loans in *-ga* corroborated the Russian development *-g > -ga* and essentially contributed to the spread of the latter element.

The final paper in this part of the volume is István Zimonyi’s contribution, which deals with West Old Turkic and the formation and early history of the Hungarian tribal confederation. It provides a number of detailed comments on the monograph

West Old Turkic from a historical point of view, stressing the need for integration of the results of linguistic, archaeological and historical investigations.

*

The third part of the present volume contains a long paper of a very special nature, “Our views on the Chaghatay language”, written by Mirsultan Osmanov, Ürümchi, and the late Hämit Tömür, Minzu University of China, Beijing. It presents opinions that many Turcologists today would consider idiosyncratic or inaccurate, particularly the view of Chaghatay as the direct descendant of written Old Uyghur. The editors find it valuable as a document of the history of the native modern Uyghur research on Chaghatay that began in the 1960s. The authors are highly renowned Uyghur scholars.

*

The volume concludes with two reviews. Fikret Turan comments on a collection of articles and conference papers by Mustafa İsen on topics concerning Ottoman biographical literature. Gulayhan Aqtay reviews the textbook *Colloquial Kazakh* by Zaure Batayeva.

*

The editors are extremely sorry to inform our readers that the great Japanese linguist Masahiro Shogaito, to whom we owe so many excellent contributions to Turkic linguistics and philology, passed away on March 23, 2014 at the age of 71. We will come back to his life and work.

Lars Johanson

