

Werk

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2013

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0017|LOG_0024

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

From the beginning to the end, İsen's analyses of *tezkire* works reflect glimpses of various inter- and intra-linguistic aspects of the gradual emergence of literary Ottoman Turkish, as the development process of the *tezkire* genre was very much intertwined with the development of the literary language and the cultural factors contributing to its standardization. An overview of linguistic and stylistic aspects of the two earlier *tezkire* works *Heşt-Behişt* of Sehî and *Tezkire* of Hasan Çelebi, produced in the 16th century, for example, demonstrates how simplicity, clarity and the natural flow of spoken Turkish of the time were the essential mode of the first work of the genre in Turkish, *Heşt-Behişt*, and how this took an exalted imperial turn with such bombastic diction, tone and voices that necessitated the use of highly educated rare Arabic and Persian loanwords organised in the structure of the extended Persian-style *modified-first* word groups and phrases laden with specialised topoi, set phrases and clichés in an abstract semantics. In this context, İsen's investigation of the changing stylistics of these works in his articles is sometimes constructed in a comparative textual model, as he, for instance, compares the linguistic styles of Sehî and Hasan Çelebi on page 67 and explains how deeply these two styles contrast in their descriptions of Sultan Jem as a poet. With this and with similar analytical writings, the author explicates how Ottoman Turkish prose language is reflected in *tezkire* works and how these works in turn influenced the linguistic and stylistic attributes of the *tezkire* genre through the passage of time.

In summary, it should be said with certainty that Mustafa İsen's *Tezkireden Biyografiye* is a collection of meritorious studies on Ottoman Turkish biography writing and classical Turkish literature that brings together highly valuable findings, evaluations and interpretations produced by the author over many years of rich academic and research activities. The work, therefore, has much to offer to anyone engaged in Turkish and Middle Eastern cultural and literary history, Turkology or Turkic linguistics.

Gulayhan Aqtay: Review of Zaire Batayeva, *Colloquial Kazakh (The Complete Course for Beginners) with CDs and MP3s*. London & New York: Routledge. 2013, 309 pages.

Gulayhan Aqtay, Department of Asian Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University, Al. Niepodległości 24, 61-714 Poznań, Poland. E-mail: akgul@amu.edu.pl

A feature distinguishing this textbook from other Kazakh textbooks known to me is that it is constructed on dialogues and contains few texts. Texts can be found in only three units: 11, 12, 14, out of fourteen. In this feature it is similar to the other text-

books of the series, e.g. *Colloquial Korean* by Danielle Ooyoung Pyun and In-Seok Kim (1996 and many subsequent printings).

The textbook includes acknowledgements (pp. xii), an introduction (pp. xiii–xiv), a section on phonetics and the alphabet called “The sounds of Kazakh”, the main body of the textbook consisting of fourteen units (pp. 9–220), a grammar summary (pp. 221–232), a key to the exercises (pp. 233–252), translations of the dialogues 7–14 (pp. 253–269), a Kazakh-English glossary (pp. 270–291), an English-Kazakh glossary (pp. 292–306), and an index (pp. 307–309). The translations of the dialogues in units 1–6 are placed after each dialogue.

Most units are composed of the following sections: dialogues, cultural point, exercises, vocabulary and language points. However, the number of dialogues, cultural explanations and exercises differs from unit to unit. In different units there are from seven to thirteen exercises and from two to eight dialogues. Cultural points have not been prepared for units 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 14.

The selection of dialogue topics is good and useful for beginners, but when looking closely at the dialogues, e.g. unit 5 *Have a nice trip*, unit 6 *Business trip*, unit 11 *It is not my size*, unit 14 *I fell sick*, we have the impression of reading a phrasebook rather than a course book. However, thanks to the grammatical explanations and exercises, the learner is provided with a more complex aid to master Kazakh at the beginner’s level.

In contrast to many existing textbooks for learning Kazakh which are biased by the focus on a single component, this book has the virtue of a diversified method. Each dialogue is followed by exercises linked to the main theme and vocabulary. Therefore, even in the absence of texts, *Colloquial Kazakh* must be evaluated as a good tool for learning the language. This is especially true of the dialogues. The dialogues are natural and reflect spoken Kazakh as used in real, everyday situations, even if their sound on the accompanying CD is sometimes unnaturally modulated. However, in my opinion some dialogues are too difficult for beginners; they should be placed in a course book for learners at a more advanced level.

Despite my generally positive opinion about this textbook, I have many specific remarks to its various components.

1. Remarks on vocabulary

(1) *Бұйымтайыңыз бар ма?* (p. 9) ‘Can I help you?’ This is an idiom strongly related to Kazakh culture, used in some specific situations, but not used in common conversations. The normal equivalent is *Көмек керек пе?* or *Не сұрайын деп едіңіз?*

(2) *Өзің қай рудан боласың?* (p. 29) ‘Which tribe are you from?’ The question about somebody’s tribe or clan is really important for the Kazakhs when they meet for the first time. However, it may not be used in all situations, and it is rather difficult for a learner to master it as early as unit 2.

(3) In the cultural point which explains the social structure of Kazakhs social categories such as *төре* ‘somebody from khan’s family’, *қожа* ‘descendant of the Arabs who once conquered Central Asia’ are missing.

(4) The author gives three proverbs concerning the tribal structure in the initial part of the textbook (p. 30), and this is also too early for such difficult expressions. In addition, it is difficult to comprehend why plural forms are used in a conversation between two people, e.g. *Тобықты боламыз, өзің ше? Өзің қай рудан боласың? – Біз кіші жүзденбіз, адай боламыз* (p. 29) ‘We are Tобыkty. And yourself? Which tribe are you from? – We are from the Little Jüz, we are [being] Aday’. Moreover, the author does not explain why plural forms are used.

(5) The sentence *Уақыт он бес* (p. 49), translated as ‘It is 3’, literally ‘fifteen’, is odd since the Kazakhs normally say ‘three’.

(6) *Әкімші* (p. 47) ‘administrator’ should be *әкімшілік қызметкер*.

(7) It is strange that the author does not use some already accepted Kazakh terms for new objects and concepts but rather uses Russian words, e.g. *парк* (p. 102, 120) ‘park’ for *саябақ*; *паспорт* (p. 46) ‘passport’ for *төлқұжат*; *интернет* (p. 94, 195); ‘internet’ for *ғаламтор*, but at the same time adapts her own words for those objects and concepts for which the Kazakhs use Russian words, e.g. *ениілеңіз* (p. 91) ‘to reserve’ for *бронь жаса-*, *брондап қой-*. Although the verb *ениіле-* exists in Kazakh, it means ‘to inherit; to share’, it is not used in the meaning ‘to book, to reserve’. For example, the sentence *Қонақ үйден бөлме ениілеуім керек* (p. 95) ‘I have to book a hotel room’ should be *Қонақ үйден бір бөлмеге тапсырыс беруім керек*. She also prefers Russian loanwords for such kinship terms as *мама* (p. 39, 61, 132) ‘mum’ and *пана* (p. 39, 61) ‘dad’, which naturally do have Kazakh equivalents, i.e. *анашым* ‘(my) mum’ and *әкешім* ‘(my) dad’ and which are used again nowadays by people educated in Kazakh.

2. Remarks on grammar

(1) *э* (p. 5) is not a Kazakh vowel, it is the Russian letter for the vowel [e], used exclusively in Russian borrowings.

(2) On the contrary, in some paragraphs on phonetics, she ignores the forms written with the Russian letters *б, в, д* (p. 19, 224), e.g. *клуб па?* ‘(Is this) a club?’ or *б* (p. 48), e.g. *клубта* ‘in a club’.

(3) The form *мынау* ‘this (one)’ in *мынау жігіт кім?* (p. 40) ‘Who is that man?’ is incorrect, the correct form is *мына*; this mistake is repeated on page 36.

(4) The grammatical rule given as “If the verb stem ends on *қ* or on a double consonant such as *ңд* or *ст* add the ending *и*” (p. 56) is wrong; it is easy to give many exceptions to this rule, e.g. *ренжі-* ‘to be offended’, and there are many other cases in which the final vowel of the stem changes to *и*, e.g. *ренжиді* ‘He/she is offended’.

(5) The author provides Kazakh verbs in the nominal or so-called infinitival forms (p. 21, 23, 25, 27, 47, 54, 58, 59 etc.). It would be better for a learner to know

the stem form, which is also the form used in all good dictionaries, e.g. *оқу* (p. 283) 'to read', whereas the stem and dictionary form is *оқы-*, needed to attach suffixes.

(6) *Олар жетпіске таяп қалды* (p. 39) 'They are approaching 70'. In this sentence we see the auxiliary verb *қалды*, which expresses the final phase of an action, event or process, but the author does not explain this in the grammar point. In such an initial part of the textbook as unit 3 the author should give an easier form, e.g. *Олар жетпісте* 'They are seventy'.

(7) In the grammar section discussing wish, intention and desire (p. 138), it would be useful to show the verb *қала-* 'to want', since in some cases it must be used, e.g. *Димаш інісінің шай ішкенін қаламайды* 'Dimash does not want his young brother to drink tea'.

(8) In the section in which obligation is presented as expressed by the modal words *қажет, керек* (p. 94) 'it is needed; it is necessary', the modal word *муіс* of a similar meaning should also be added.

(9) There is no information on how polite (e.g. *-сыздар, -сіздер*) and plain (e.g. *-сыңдар, -сіңдер*) forms should be used.

(10) There are many non-evidential forms in the textbook expressed by the auxiliary verb *екен*, which is good, since these forms are frequently used. However, they are explained only in unit 13 (p. 200).

Lastly, it should be said that there are a number of errors committed by careless processing or editing. For instance, printing mistakes in Kazakh words have been found on the following pages: 32, 40, 43, 63, 78, 109, 118, 180, 184, 199, 212, 213, 214, 219, 220. There are also some cases of disobeying the rules of Kazakh spelling, e.g. *Ахмет-ұлы* (p. 10, 12), *Ахмет-қызы* (p. 12), *Болат-ұлы* (p. 13), the correct forms being *Ахметұлы, Ахметқызы, Болатұлы*, while in other places the writing of Kazakh surnames is correct, e.g. *Айдынұлы* (p. 95). Other mistakes include omission of suffixes, e.g. *Димаш* (p. 141), correctly *Димаштың; аурухана* (p. 211), correctly *ауруханаға*, or similar slips.

In conclusion, Batayeva's *Colloquial Kazakh* is one of the best textbooks for the learners of Kazakh ever published. It breaks with the Soviet-style course books that teach an unnatural, somewhat engineered language. All the dialogues in this textbook reflect real communicative situations. Despite some shortcomings and mistakes, which should be corrected in subsequent editions, I recommend it to those who intend to start their adventure with Kazakh.

