Werk

Titel: 2

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2017

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021|LOG_0018

Turkic Languages

Edited by
Lars Johanson

in cooperation with
Hendrik Boeschoten, Bernt Brendemoen,
Éva Á. Csató, Peter B. Golden, Tooru Hayasi, László Károly,
Astrid Menz, Dmitrij M. Nasilov, Irina Nevskaya,
Sumru A. Özsoy, Abdurishid Yakup

21 (2017) 2

Contents

Turkic Languages, Volume 21, 2017, Number 2

Editorial note

In the present issue of TURKIC LANGUAGES Birsel Karakoç investigates subordinated existence and possessive clauses in modern Oghuz and Kipchak languages. The clauses in question are based on the non-verbal predicate {BAR} 'existent' and the verbal predicate {BOL}. Since Turkic languages lack a verb 'to have', these predicates are normally used for indicating possession. The paper analyzes the distributions and functions of the two predicate types in complement and relative clauses. The predicates {BAR} 'existent' and {YOK} 'non-existent' can be followed by possessive suffixes that refer to the subject, and by case suffixes that mark the syntactic role of the subordinated clause, e.g. *bar-ï-n* (third person + accusative) 'that there is', 'that X exists'. In many languages, forms of {BAR} are extended with various elements such as {EKEN}. The verbal predicate {BOL} can be extended with similar elements. The author presents a precise analysis of the complex systems in question, summarized in several synoptic tables and illustrated with numerous text examples from Turkish, Turkmen, Tatar, Bashkir, Noghay, Kazakh, and Kirghiz.

Hans Nugteren's paper is a contribution to the discussion of the genealogical position of the Lopnor variety, the most aberrant of the varieties grouped together under the label of Modern Uyghur. The paper discusses similarities and differences between Lopnor, Standard Uyghur, and Kirghiz. Lopnor phonetic features such as fourfold harmony in the low vowels, vowel contractions, and numerous consonant assimilations deviate from Standard Uyghur. Some crucial phonetic developments and tendencies are in agreement with Uyghur, but, according to the author, the possible presence of a Kirghiz-like Kipchak component also needs to be investigated. Several non-Uyghur phonetic features are comparable to modern Kirghiz. Some are reminiscent of Kipchak, though they are not present in Kirghiz alone. Superficially similar developments such as sound harmony have taken place in other parts of the Turkic-speaking world, e.g. in Yakut and Turkmen, and could well have occurred elsewhere. Delateralization of syllable-initial -*l*- as shared with Kirghiz, e.g. *baš-ta*- vs. *bašla*- 'to begin', has developed independently several times in different parts of the Turkic-speaking world, e.g. in Bashkir, Kazakh, Western Yugur, and Northeastern Turkic. While the nominal and verbal morphology mostly resembles that of Uyghur, it also displays non-Uyghur forms. Only some of these, however, suggest Kipchak influence. Some non-Uyghur lexical elements have striking parallels in Kirghiz, but do not constitute evidence for a Kipchak layer in the vocabulary. According to the author, it makes sense to look beyond the official status of Lopnor as a dialect of Uyghur. The variety should be studied as a potential sister language of Uyghur and Uzbek. The fact that Lopnor has become "virtually Uyghur" does not bear on the question of whether it was originally a kind of Uyghur. Many questions

relevant to this problem remain unresolved. Lopnor needs to be systematically compared to varieties of Uyghur, especially neighboring ones such as Khotan, Qomul, and Turfan, which show lexical and phonological similarities to it. The Kipchak component of both Lopnor and Standard Uyghur will have to be investigated further.

Irina Nevskaya and Saule Tazhibayeva deal with Kazakh hypocorisms, which are typically formed with special suffixes added to reduced forms of personal names, e.g. *-(V)š, -(V)ška, -žan, -tay, -KAn.* Honorific hypocorisms are formed with *-Ake, -eken,* and for addressing relatives the markers *-(A)w, -(A)y* are attached to kinship terms. Third person possessive suffixes are used in honorific forms for addressing family members in a polite manner, e.g. *apa-sï* 'respected grandmother!'. There are also special endearment forms, e.g. affectionate nicknames. The authors deal with their topic in a broad comparative perspective, discussing corresponding hypocoristic patterns in various other Turkic languages. They show that most South Siberian languages such as Altay, Khakas, and Shor use diminutive markers, whereas Tuvan instead employs syncopated name forms. They finally stress that the study of Turkic hypocorisms is a very promising research field and presents some directions for further investigations.

Uli Schamiloglu's paper on the rise of Runiform Turkic as the first Turkic vernacular literary language draws upon the author's earlier work on the Black Death of the mid-14th century as the main factor leading to the sudden demise of Syriac Turkic, Volga Bolgharian, and the language of the Golden Horde. The turbulent history of Turkic literary languages in this period is only understandable through an awareness of this world-historical phenomenon. Here the author returns to the era of East Old Turkic. The Black Death was the second pandemic of bubonic plague to afflict the Old World. The author sees a solid basis for exploring the same range of phenomena for the pandemic of bubonic plague in the 6th–8th centuries C.E. as the main factor leading to the decline in the use of Soghdian among the Türk, the rise of Runiform Turkic as a vernacular-based literary language to take its place, and the subsequent demise of Runiform Turkic. He stresses the need to expand our vision of the linguistic and philological history of Turkic to embrace an interdisciplinary vision of the past while rewriting the history of the Turkic epigraphic and literary languages.

An-King Lim adds a brief note on the functions of the East Old Turkic denominal verb formatives *+lA-, +A-, +tA-,* and *+lAn-,* with the aim of refining the conceptual characterizations suggested in two papers published earlier in TURKIC LANGUAGES.

Astrid Menz reports on the contributions to Turkic linguistics at the German *Turkologentag* held in September 2016 at Hamburg University.

Jorma Luutonen, Arto Moisio, and Okan Daher sketch the history and characteristics of the Mishar Tatar minority in Finland and report on the compilation of a trilingual Finnish Tatar–Kazan Tatar–Finnish dictionary.

Bernt Brendemoen reviews Silje Susanne Alvestad's critical edition of the Uppsala manuscript of Muḥammed Hevā'ī Üskūfī's 17th century Ottoman glossary *Maḵbūl-i 'ārif*.

Bert Fragner reviews the volume *Turks and Iranians. Interactions in Language and History*, edited by Éva Á. Csató, Lars Johanson, András Róna-Tas, and Bo Utas.

Finally, Saule Tazhibaeva reviews Aynur Abish's monograph *Modality in Kazakh as spoken in China* (Turcologica 107).

*

It is with profound sadness that the editors note the passing of four outstanding scholars in the field of Turkic studies.

June 26, 2017: The leading Russian Turcologist Dmitrij Mixailovič Nasilov, our esteemed coeditor of TURKIC LANGUAGES.

July 25, 2017: The German Turcologist Margarete I. Ersen-Rasch, well-known for her precise descriptive work on Turkish, Tatar, and Bashkir.

August 15, 2017: The Russian Altaist and Turcologist Valentin Ivanovič Rassadin, most famous for his innovative work on the Tofan language.

September 13, 2017: The Turkish Turcologist Semih Tezcan, an eminent scholar particularly devoted to the study of East Old Turkic and Khalaj.

Lars Johanson

The rise of Runiform Turkic as the first Turkic vernacular literary language

Uli Schamiloglu

Schamiloglu, Uli 2017. The rise of Runiform Turkic as the first Turkic vernacular literary language. *Turkic Languages* 21, 161–177.

This paper draws upon the earlier work of the author on the Black Death as the main factor leading to the sudden demise of Syriac Turkic, Volga Bolgharian, and the language of the Golden Horde in the 14th century C.E. to argue that the Plague in the Time of Justinian (6th–8th centuries C.E.) was the main factor leading to the decline in the use of Soghdian among the Türk, the rise of Runiform Turkic as a vernacular-based literary language to take its place, and Runiform Turkic's subsequent demise.
Key words: Bubonic plague, Türk Empire, Soghdian, Runiform Turkic, Old Turkic

Uli Schamiloglu, Department of German, Nordic, and Slavic, 818 Van Hise Hall, University of Wisconsin, 1220 Linden Drive, Madison WI 53706 USA. Department of Kazakh Language and Turkic Studies, Nazarbayev University, Kabanbay Batyr Avenue, 53, Astana, Kazakhstan 010000. E-mail: uschamil@wisc.edu; uli.schamiloglu@nu.edu.kz

Introduction

The study of the history of the Turkic languages faces a rather complex set of issues and obstacles.[1] Ideally one should consider approaching this topic strictly as a question of the historical development of specific linguistic features. As Lars Johanson has noted in his standard treatment of the history of Turkic, however:

> It is impossible to find linguistically meaningful criteria for a periodization of the development of the Turkic group as a whole... The periodization of the Turkic literary idioms which have emerged in different cultural centers is rather controversial. The reason is that it mostly depends not only on linguistic criteria, but also on extralinguistic—political and cultural—ones (Johanson 1998: 84).

In his classification of the historical periods of Turkic Johanson first identifies an *Older Period*, with a so-called "Old Turkic" consisting of 1. East Old Turkic proper, 2. Old Uyghur, and 3. Karakhanid. Following this, he identifies a controversial *Middle Period* divided into "East Middle Turkic", consisting of 1. Khorezmian Turkic

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Workshop on "Turkic Linguistics: The State of the Art. On the occasion of Lars Johanson's 80th Birthday", Institut für Slavistik, Turkologie und zirkumbaltische Studien, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz (Mainz, Germany, March 19, 2016).

and 2. Early Chaghatay Turkic, and "West Middle Turkic" consisting of 1. Kipchak Turkic and 2. Oghuz Turkic. This is followed by the *Pre-modern Period* and the *Modern Period* (Johanson 1998: 85–87). Many other Turkologists have also proposed various periodizations, sometimes featuring numerous periods and sub-periods for the history of recorded Turkic languages and their antecedents (see, e.g. Róna-Tas 1982).

Working backwards chronologically, I would say that in the case of the modern period, it is clear that the state plays a role in shaping literary languages, with the case of modern Turkish serving as a classic and well-studied example (Lewis 1999); to this one should certainly add all the Turkic literary languages of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as well as the present-day People's Republic of China. For just one aspect of this for the Turkic languages of the former U.S.S.R., see Baldauf (1993). But there were major transformations in literary languages in the pre-modern period, too. In some of my work I have attempted to demonstrate that we must consider extra-linguistic factors in the study of the history of the Turkic languages, especially the sudden end of writing systems for specific historical Turkic written languages in the 14th century.[2] As some of my readers may know, I attribute these major instances of the "death" of an epigraphical or literary language in the pre-modern period to outbreaks of epidemic disease in the Old World, in particular of bubonic plague (Schamiloglu 1993, 2016a). The question of the relationship between literary languages and sudden large-scale outbreaks of epidemic disease (or "pandemics") is not, however, a question which has been central to the classic narrative in Turcology with regards to the history of the development of the Turkic literary languages. Nonetheless, I am now convinced that we cannot offer a periodization of the history of the written Turkic languages without it.

In this paper I would like to draw upon this same framework to offer a brief outline of the rise in an earlier period of Runiform Turkic (or Orkhon Turkic)—which falls under Johanson's East "Old Turkic proper"—as the first Turkic vernacular-based literary language.

Bubonic plague and its impact on languages

In order to present my argument, I should first begin with a brief introduction to the role of bubonic plague in recorded human history. This disease, which has resulted in the sudden death of large segments of societies in certain periods, is caused by the bacillus *Yersinia pestis*. See most recently the essays in Green (2014). Recent research is also focusing on the relationship between variations in climate and outbreaks of disease (Campbell 2016). The bacillus spreads from rodents (and other animals, too) to humans via fleas and infects the lymph nodes (or buboes, hence the name), or else it can be spread as droplets through the air, which leads to pneumonic plague. Before the discovery of penicillin bubonic plague was associated with a very

---

2   See the references in the final concluding section at the end of this paper.

high rate of mortality. As a result of this high rate of mortality we see sharp short-term declines in local populations as well as longer-term demographic decline over decades and even centuries, abandonment of some towns and settlements, social disruption, inability to bury the dead properly, labor shortages, inflation, technological regression, increased religiosity, morbidity, and many other phenomena, including the decline in non-vernacular languages which have been acquired through a religious education, as well as many other phenomena which I cannot describe here. One additional factor to consider is that epidemics affect sedentary populations—especially densely-inhabited urban centers—much more readily than nomadic populations.

However much I am fascinated endlessly by the political, social, economic, and cultural consequences of the "Black Death" of the 14th–16th centuries and later (see most recently Schamiloglu 2017), in this paper I would like to focus on the philological and/or linguistic impact of outbreaks of this disease. As the Black Death has been studied in such great detail for Western Europe, it should be a prime region for considering the impact of the Black Death on literary languages.

As is well known, Latin was the dominant literary language in Europe in the medieval period. It would not be accurate to state that the Black Death caused the decline of classical literary languages in medieval Western Europe, because the decline of Latin and the beginnings of Romance vernacular languages far predate the 14th century;[3] there are also counter-examples such as the case of Hungarian. What is striking, however, is how many significant figures in the rise of English vernacular literature lived in the second half of the 14th century, the half century following the initial arrival of the Black Death. This period includes Geoffrey Chaucer (circa 1343–1400), the author of the *Canterbury Tales*, who is widely considered the father of English literature. Other major figures in English literature in this period include the poet John Gower (circa 1330–1408) and William Langland (circa 1332–circa 1386), author of *Piers Plowman* (Horobin 2010: 182).

The situation is far different for the vernacular literatures which are descended from Latin. Even so there is a different, equally illustrative example to be found in the history of Italian literature. Of the three major figures of this era, Dante Alighieri (1265–1321) lived and died before the Black Death and Petrarch (1304–1374) began his career before the arrival of the Black Death. The third major founding figure of Italian literature in this period, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), wrote his *Decameron* in 1350–1353. What is so interesting about the *Decameron*, a major work in the canon of Italian literature, is that it is devoted to the stories told by a group of individuals who have fled the plague in Florence, which establishes a clear link between plague and Italian vernacular literature (Highet 1949: 181–195). Petrarch also influenced Chaucer, see Highet (1949: 93–103).

---

3   A bibliographic treatment of the topic is available in Tremblay (1989). For a different perspective on the rise of vernacular languages in Europe and Asia, see Cohen (2011).

I would argue that it is not a coincidence that one can see the second half of the 14th century as an important period in the development of vernacular literatures in medieval Europe; I have only considered two examples. The death of large numbers of individuals in densely populated urban centers as well as in monasteries would have resulted in the decimation of the educated religious class who would have been the bearers of Latin as a literary tradition. Although the Black Death did not initiate the decline of Latin, it surely must have speeded up the rise of new vernacular-based literatures. As I have argued elsewhere, I see a similar relationship between the Black Death and medieval Turkic literary languages in this period. If anything, the relationship between plague and the fate of literary languages is much clearer for medieval Turkic languages. In my view, there is a close correlation between the documented waves of plague in the mid-14th century and the sudden spike in the number of Syriac Turkic and Volga Bolgharian funerary inscriptions—followed by a near or total absence of further funerary inscriptions. It also coincides with the end of the literary language of the Golden Horde (Schamiloglu 1993, 2016a).

Yet the Black Death is only the second of three major outbreaks of bubonic plague in recorded human history caused by the bacillus *Yersinia pestis*. The third is "modern plague", which broke out in the late 19th century (Little 2011).[4] There was also the first recorded outbreak of bubonic plague, to which I will turn my attention now.

Overview of the plague in the time of Justinian

The first historically-recorded outbreak of bubonic plague, and the subject of a contribution of mine to the recent Festschrift for Professor Peter B. Golden, is the "Plague in the Time of Justinian" (Schamiloglu 2016b). This original outbreak of bubonic plague, which lasted from the mid-6th to the mid-8th century C.E., is often considered to have been the most severe of the three major outbreaks of bubonic plague in recorded human history. In the present paper, I would like to try to make the case that the Plague in the Time of Justinian should be seen as an important factor in the rise of Runiform Turkic as the first Turkic vernacular-based literary language.

As I argued in that paper, we now know based on genetic analysis that the origin of the outbreak of the bacillus *Yersinia pestis* in the 6th century is traced back to the Qinghai-Tibetan plateau, the intersection of the Silk Road and the Horse-Tea Road.[5] According to Procopius (Book I, xxii–xxiii and xxiv: 8, 12), the outbreak began in 541 C.E. in Pelusium in Egypt, arriving from Ethiopia, but how it got there we do

---

4   For those of my readers who are wondering, I have not discerned any philological or linguistic impact of the modern outbreak of bubonic plague, though it would be useful for Turcologists to be aware that there are many contemporary publications in Tatar, Kazakh, and other languages reporting outbreaks of the disease and how to treat it.

5   I refer the reader to the discussion and citations in that article rather than repeating them here.

not know. One possibility is that it spread via the Indian Ocean region to the Red Sea, but how? We are not sure, but we can be certain that it did not arrive via the route Lake *Ïsïḳ-köl*, Central Asia, the Crimea, and Constantinople to Alexandria and Sicily. In other words, it must have followed a path which was very different from the path which the Black Death followed in the mid-14th century.

The plague in the time of Justinian and the Türk Empire

The "Plague in the Time of Justinian" coincides with the era of the Türk Empire. The First Türk Empire, which was established in 552 C.E., expanded very quickly across Central Asia to as far as the Black Sea region, but it collapsed suddenly in 581.[6] As a result of civil war in the 580s, the First Türk Empire split into an eastern half and a western half. The Eastern Türk Kaghanate managed to survive until it was absorbed by T'ang China in 630, and the Western Türk Kaghanate was defeated by T'ang China in 657. It is out of the chaos in the west that the Khazar and Bolghar states emerge. The Second Türk Empire emerged with the revolt of A-ših-na Ḳutluḳ (Elteriš Kaghan) and his brother Ḳapaɣan Kaghan against T'ang China in 679. The inscriptions dedicated to Kül Tègin (who died in 731 due to an illness), Bilgä Ka-ghan (683/684–734, who died by poisoning), and the other Runiform Turkic in-scriptions relate events which took place in the early 8th century. The Second Türk Empire was finally replaced by the Uyghur Kaghanate in 744.

The question of what relationship the Plague in the Time of Justinian might have had with respect to the population of the Türk Empire is, in my view, critical to understanding the history of the rise and fall of both the First and Second Türk Em-pires. As I have argued, if we look for direct and especially indirect evidence of the impact of the Plague in the Time of Justinian on the ancient Türk, we can actually find both kinds of evidence (Schamiloglu 2016b). At the same time, the reluctance of Sinologists to accept that references to outbreaks of disease in this period could have been bubonic plague has been an obstacle to progress in the historiography on this period.

Clearly the Türk Empire was established in a region approximately 2000–3000 km away from Tibet, not immediately next door, but still much closer than Ethiopia. The fact that the Plague in the Time of Justinian arrives in Egypt in 541 suggests that it could have emerged in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau as late as 541, but more likely prior to that year. I have suggested that the sudden departure of the Avars for Eastern Europe after their defeat by the Türk in 552 could be related to the fact that Eastern Europe was already suffering from depopulation by that time; the depopula-tion of Eastern Europe by this time is a point which is accepted by historians of this pandemic. It might also be possible that the departure of the Avars could have some

---

6   For standard treatments of the history of the Türk Empire, see Sinor (1990), Golden (1992: 12–141); and Beckwith (2011: 112–118). See most recently the encyclopedic work by Ercilasun (2016).

relationship to the outbreak of disease in that region in the east, but I am not certain about that.

According to Theophanes, in 588–589 the Türk claim that there had been a plague many years earlier in "Turkey" (Theophanes 1997: 389). Theophylactus Simocatta (d. ca. 630–640) also informs us in his *History* that some Türks who had fallen prisoner to Chosroes were marked on the forehead by their mothers with the sign of the cross. This was upon the advice of Christians in order to escape the effects of a strong plague (Theophylactus Simocatta 1985: 154–155, n. 739). On the other hand, the same author also notes in connection with the Western Türk embassy to the Emperor Maurice (598) that the Türk are said to boast that they had never seen the occurrence of contagious disease since the earliest times (Theophylactus Simocatta 1985: 188).

According to Twitchett, the earliest mention of bubonic plague in a Chinese encyclopedia is from 610 (Twitchett 1979: 35–69, especially 42ff.) Yet he considers it only "conjecture" that the epidemics described in the sources for the period 636–655, 682, 707, and 762 might have been caused by bubonic plague. As I have argued elsewhere, the fact that this pandemic of bubonic plague originated in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau suggests that we should have great confidence in identifying bubonic plague as the cause of most and more likely all of these major outbreaks of disease. Let us recall that Kül Tègin died in 731 of an illness, too.[7]

The languages in the Türk Empire before the time of plague

It is well known that Soghdian, an Iranian language, served as a *lingua franca* in early medieval Central Asia.[8] We may consider the Bugut inscription, an inscription included in a Türk Kaghan's burial complex, the most important piece of evidence for this. This inscription, which was written in Soghdian but includes Turkic names, titles, and other words, is believed to date from the last quarter of the 6th century. It may be considered direct or indirect evidence that the Türk used Soghdian as a written language in this period, or at least that Soghdian was used as a *lingua franca* among them (Kljaštornyj & Livšits 1971, 1972). As noted by Erdal, Turkic names are also found in Bactrian manuscripts from Afghanistan (Sims-Williams 2000, Erdal 2004). These facts support the notion that there was a period of time when the Türk (or other Turkic-speaking peoples) did not yet write in their own language. De la Vaissière considers that the Soghdian alphabet was used to write Turkic texts throughout the history of the Türk and Uyghur Empires. In an aside which can only be greeted with amusement by Turcologists, however, he adds that this was except for "a rather brief period of national xenophobic reaction within the elites" in the

---

7   Whether one can ever find any evidence for what illness or disease he might have died
     from, I do not know. Perhaps nobody has thought it worthy of investigation until now.
8   On the Soghdians see de la Vaissière (2005). For an overview of the Soghdian language,
     see Yoshida (2016).

early 8th century during which period they used the "runic" alphabet instead of the Soghdian alphabet (de la Vaissière 2005: 202).

When and why did the runiform alphabet begin to be used? In the words of Erdal, the "earliest readable, understandable and datable Turkic texts are the official inscriptions of the second Turk kaghanate, the Orkhon inscriptions, the first of which appears to have been from slightly before 720 A.D." (Erdal 2004: 4). This is part of a larger corpus of about 200 inscriptions, which Erdal presumes date from the 7th–10th centuries (Erdal 2004: 6–7). These inscriptions are found mostly in present-day Mongolia (the territory covered by the Second Türk Empire and the Uyghur Kaghanate which succeeded it) and in the upper Yenisey basin.

The origins of the runiform alphabet remain shrouded in a veil of mystery.[9] It is clear that this alphabet shares many of the characteristic features of an alphabet going back ultimately to the Aramaic alphabet, though with additional letters whose origins are not entirely clear. What is also not clear is why the élite of the Second Türk Empire and then the Uyghur Kaghanate would suddenly adopt the runiform alphabet. Also not clear is why, after a period of use as the official language of the Second Türk Empire and then the Uyghur Kaghanate, the official use of this alphabet suddenly ceases.

Of course, we cannot be sure of the dates of the other inscriptions in runiform alphabet, and certainly the interpretation of many of them remains controversial, too. A separate issue is the fact that the same alphabet has also been used to write a well-known book of divination, the *İrk bitig* (9th–10th centuries?) and other purposes. As has been noted, however, this work might have been a later copy from an original in Uyghur alphabet (Tekin 1993: 6). Nevertheless, this begs the question of why the runiform alphabet was used to copy this work and to write the other (later?) texts in Turfan and neighboring regions.

The languages in the Türk Empire during the time of plague

I would like to turn next to the fate of Soghdian, which was once used as a *lingua franca* in the region inhabited by the ancient Türk. I would like to propose that the decline of the Soghdian language among the Türk and the sudden rise of Runiform Turkic can be explained through a complex set of phenomena which are consequences of the Plague in the Time of Justinian. I draw upon my earlier and continuing research on the impact of the Black Death for the model on which to base this conclusion. As we will see later, the history of Runiform Turkic fits a pattern which, significantly, is replicated in a number of identical ways in the 14th century.

It is clear from the sources for medieval Europe and the Middle East that the Plague in the Time of Justinian brought massive demographic decline upon those regions it struck. I am not aware of direct evidence for the demographic history of

9 See the discussion and references in Erdal (2004: 28–29 and 38ff.). For a detailed background discussion of the runiform alphabet tradition in Eurasia, see Kyzlasov (1994), though the author's approach is very different from the one offered here.

Mongolia and the eastern steppe region in this period, but we can look for parallel
examples in the region. Mariko Namba Walter, to cite one example, writes about the
decline of Soghdian colonies in Dunhuang by the mid-8th century and their disap-
pearance by the end of the 9th century "due to political and economic instability"
(Walter 2006: 21). Remarkably there are census figures for the Dunhuang district
(*chün*)—which is of course some distance away from Mongolia—showing that the
number of households in that district declined by over 45 percent from 609 C.E. to
740 C.E. (Giles 1915):

Year	2 C.E.	140 C.E.	280 C.E.	609 C.E.	740 C.E.
Households	11,200	7,748	6,300	7,779	4,265
Persons	38,335	29,170	N/A	N/A	16,250

I am well aware that such population figures can be quite controversial and are sub-
ject to various interpretations.[10] On the other hand, traditional scholarship usually
does not even consider the history of epidemic disease as a factor in discussions of
the population history of Inner Asia.[11]

Assuming that this method and the comparison to Dunhuang are valid—I think
this is a reasonable assumption but there might be those who disagree—we can posit
a parallel demographic decline in the Second Türk Empire, too, since the Plague in
the Time of Justinian was, as far as we know, a universal phenomenon in the Old
World. This would suggest that, in all likelihood, a large number of the people
knowing Soghdian language (who probably were not a large percentage of the pop-
ulation) and/or a large number of the people who knew the Soghdian alphabet and
were able to carve an inscription in Soghdian would have died. (There could be
other possible economic factors which I will not consider here, see Schamiloglu
2016c.) I am not suggesting that Soghdian died out completely; after all, it survived
in Central Asia and would serve as the basis for the rise of a New Persian literary
language, nor did the use of Soghdian by Turkic speakers end completely.[12] But I am
suggesting that the number of speakers of Soghdian present among the Türk in the
seat of the Second Türk Empire must have declined suddenly to a critically low
mass such that Soghdian (especially Soghdian as a second language acquired by
non-natives as a learned literary language) temporarily ceased to be used in the
Second Türk Empire by ca. 720 C.E.

---

10 See, for instance, the discussion in Twitchett (1979: 35ff).
11 For a recent example, see Étiènne de la Vaissière (2017).
12 For late "Turko-Soghdian" letters, see Yoshida (2017).

What we see next is the creation of a series of inscriptions in what we call the "runiform" alphabet from the Second Türk Empire.[13] The most important of these major inscriptions have been well known to Turcologists for well over a century, including the Kül Tėgin inscription, the Bilgä Kaghan inscription, the Tonyuḳuḳ inscription, and the Ongin inscription, to which we should add the Šine-Usu and Küli Čor inscriptions from the Uyghur Kaghanate. Additional inscriptions such as the Terh inscription have been found in the 20th century (Kljaštornyj 1982). Beyond this corpus of major monuments in the Runiform Turkic language—to which new inscriptions are being added as a result of continuing archeological excavations— there is, of course, the large number of undated and/or difficult to read inscriptions as well as articles from daily life, coins, etc. which also bear texts in the runiform alphabet.[14]

Runiform Turkic as a vernacular language

Next I would like to make the case that Runiform Turkic was a written version of a living language in the 8th century. More precisely, I think it was the language of the Turkic oral literature of that period. In other words, it was a very specific kind of language and a very special kind of language. It was not a primitive or a simple language, it was a highly developed language of oral literature, similar in most respects to the language(s) of Turkic epics of the 19th–20th centuries.

Alessio Bombaci's classic introduction to the second volume of *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* offers a wonderful, succinct overview of the language of the Runiform Turkic inscriptions (Bombaci 1965: xi–lxxi, especially ii–iv). He describes a series of literary features and devices used in the language of these inscriptions whose main points I would like to offer in an abbreviated summary here. These include:

The use of historical narration which underlines the difficulty of the action, as in "snow as high 'as a lance'".
The drawing of attention to the figure of the hero, including the horse of the hero (a point to which I will return below), the wounds received, and the enemies killed.
The use of concrete descriptions to express abstract concepts, as in *erür barur* 'who comes and goes' to represent the concept of "liberty", or *aδaḳ ḳamšattï* 'shook their feet' to express "rebellion".
The use of similes, as in *otča bortča keldi* 'he arrived like fire and storm'.

13 For an overview see Tekin (1968: 9ff.), and the works cited in Erdal (2004: 6–10). Erdal takes a more expansive definition of Old Turkic as the basis for his work. See also most recently Ercilasun (2016).
14 A useful catalog of such texts is to be found at the "Türk Bitig" website run in English, Kazakh, and Russian by the Language Committee of the Ministry of Culture and Information of Republic of Kazakhstan: http://bitig.org/. Accessed: 10 April 2017.

The use of synonymic tautologies with both nouns, as in *iš/küč* 'work', and verbs, as in *öl-/yit-* 'to perish'.

Parallelism with repetition of a smaller or larger part of the sentence with the variation of only a few words:

> Synonymic parallelism: *ädgüti ešid, katïydï tïŋla* 'listen well!'.
> Antithetic parallelism: *üzä kök täŋri, asra yaγïz yer* 'above the blue sky, below the gray earth'.
> Enumerative parallelism: *inisini ičisintäg kïlïnmaduk erinč/oγlï kaŋïntäg kïlïnmaduk erinč* 'the younger brothers had not been created like the older brothers, the sons had not been created like the fathers'.
> Parallelism with variation: *sabï süčüg/ayïsï yïmšak ermiš* 'his words were sweet, his presents were nice'.

One can add many other literary points such as alliteration, even the 4 + 3 meter which continues to be well known in later periods.

Let me return to the image of the horse. In the Kül Tègin inscription we see the following:

> (E32) ...When he [i.e., Prince Kül] was twenty-one years old, we fought against (the army of) General Čača. First he (mounted) Tadïk Čor's gray horse (and attacked. There that horse) (E33) was killed. Secondly, he mounted İšbara Yamtar's gray horse and attacked. That horse, (too), was killed there. Thirdly, he mounted Yègän Silig Bèg's dressed bay horse and attacked. That horse, (too), was killed there. They hit (him) with more than one hundred arrows on his armor and caftan; (but he did not let the enemy hit him) even once on his face or head. (Tekin 1968: 268–270)[15]

The same inscription later includes multiple references to Kül Tegin's horse, including:

> (E35) ...Prince Kül mounted Bayïrku's (white stallion) (E36) and attacked...
> (E37) ...Prince Kül mounted the white-headed horse and attacked. This white-headed gray (horse)...
> (E40) ...He [i.e., Prince Kül] fought a great battle, we were told. He mounted the white horse of Alp Šalči and attacked. There he killed and subjugated the common Türgis people. ...

I would ask whether the horses mounted by Prince Kül Tègin are really any different from Rustam's great horse Rakhsh in Firdawsī's *Shāhnāme*, or Kökötöy Khan's

---

15 I am simply citing Tekin's English translation in order not to distract the reader, but I have adopted the same transcription for names as elsewhere in this paper.

famous steed Maniker in the *Memorial Feast for Kökötöy Khan* from the *Manas* cycle. They are all widespread literary motifs not limited just to Central Asian oral literatures. The conclusion—which I am certainly not the first to reach—is that we must consider the language of the Runiform Turkic inscriptions to be a highly-developed language of oral literature.

Thus, I would argue that Runiform Turkic is derived from the language used for oral poetry, and as such it was probably more or less identical with the language of the oral literature of the Türk. Yet, at the same time, the great issue which remains unsolved in my mind is the question of whether the language of the Runiform Turkic inscriptions represented just one single specific living dialect or not.[16] Is it possible that it represented a literary dialect of oral literature rather than representing features specific to exclusively one dialect of Turkic?

For exploring this idea further, I would suggest a comparison of the language of oral literature among the Turkic speakers of this period with the Arabic Jāhilīya poetry of the pre-Islamic period, which emerged out of nowhere as a highly-developed language of oral poetry. As Loya (1974) writes regarding this period:

> These were a host of poets erupting all over northern Arabia, from Syria to Yemen and from the fringes of Iraq to the borders of Egypt, masterfully reciting highly developed *qasîdas* (odes) in one and the same language, betraying little of the dialects of their region. Above all, their poetry, vigorous and vivid as it was in general, was cast in the same, steel structure of a set of complex metrical schemes.

The authors writing for the New Edition of the *Encyclopaeda of Islam* state flatly regarding the Arabic language of Jāhilīya poetry:

> It is beyond doubt, however, that in the late 6th cent. A.D. it was a purely literary dialect, distinct from all spoken idioms and super-tribal. It is today often referred to as the "poetical *koinē*". (Rabin et al. 1960–2007)

I suspect the same argument can be made for the language of pre-modern Turkic epic poetry. In other words, the language of pre-modern Turkic epic poetry may have actually been an inter-dialect language of oral literature, at least in the central regions where the specific dialects were mutually intelligible. Whether this was the case for the Runiform Turkic language is a matter worthy of further consideration. (It would also be a relevant issue to consider in the debate over the branch of the Turkic languages to which the language of the Runiform Turkic inscriptions belonged.)

The further back we go in time, the more plausible this could be, but since the oldest transcription of Turkic epic poetry by Chokan Valikhanov is from the mid-

---

16 For a discussion of this issue see Erdal (2004: 14), and most recently Aydin (2016).

19th century,[17] we will probably never have the data we need to study this question in depth. Of course, in the 20th century nation-states have established formal literary languages (emphasizing and reinforcing, of course, the differences between modern dialects) in which epic poetry is now sung.

The end of Runiform Turkic

While we cannot, of course, say that Runiform Turkic ceased to exist completely, we can at least observe that Runiform Turkic was no longer used as an official language following a brief career of perhaps just a few decades in the Second Türk Empire and the Uyghur Kaghanate. The disruption caused by the Plague in the Time of Justinian led not only to the political disarray which allowed the Uyghur Kaghanate to replace the Second Türk Empire, but to cultural and technological regression as well, just as it would in the 14th century. This interpretation is consistent with the notion that there were outbreaks of plague in the 8th century. Whether the death of Kül Tègin in 731 is due to plague, we do not know, but the use of the runiform alphabet for writing Turkic seems to have suffered a setback by the second half of the 8th century. If it was an acquired skill shared only by a relatively small number of educated individuals, this specialized knowledge was at risk in the event of a sudden outbreak of epidemic disease. Is it possible to argue that so large a percentage of the community of speakers of the spoken or literary dialect of Runiform Turkic died that it led to the demise of the community speaking this language? I am not sure, but if so, this would also have a bearing on the discussion of to which branch of the modern Turkic languages Runiform Turkic was closest.

After the 8th century Runiform Turkic seems not to have served an official function, but the fact that it continued at all (or had perhaps even a resurgence?) may be attributed to the demographic and therefore cultural and technological rebound following the end of the waves of plague in the second half of the 8th century.

After Runiform Turkic

After the sudden cessation in the use of Runiform Turkic, we once again see a return of the Soghdian script as well as its new incarnation as the Uyghur script plus an assortment of other related and unrelated scripts (Manichaean, Tibetan, Brahmi, etc.) to write Turkic.[18] This time, however, these scripts are used to write multiple dialects of Old Turkic (Erdal 2004: 7–8 and elsewhere). I cannot go into this topic in great detail, since it would require a great amount of additional research beyond the scope of this paper. I would say, however, that the rise of Old Turkic in various derivatives of Aramaic and other alphabets, even the Tibetan alphabet, needs to be contextualized. First of all, in the 9th–10 century we see the result of the great rise in religiosity associated with the onslaught of waves of plague (and perhaps gratitude

---

17 This has been published by Hatto (1977).
18 See the treatment of this topic in Clauson (1962), and Róna-Tas (1991).

at the end of waves of plague after 762?); this results in the beginning of a large-scale translation of canonical religious texts. We also see multiple alphabets being used, perhaps suggesting the end of the hegemony of one tradition or another, or perhaps multiple attempts to create new traditions, which probably also reflect different religious traditions. Finally, this comes at a time of rebounding population, which helps to improve economic and therefore cultural conditions for investing in religious education (and therefore language education) and knowledge production. Eventually we see the development of a more standardized language.[19]

While some of these texts probably use a stilted language, perhaps the result of mechanical translation from one or more canonical languages into a new variety of canonical Turkic for one or another religious tradition, others seem to be refreshingly modern. I am not sure that I would consider the language of the Runiform Turkic inscriptions to be the same dialect as the language of some works in Old Uyghur. In particular, when I consider the language of the "Tale of the Good Prince and the Bad Prince" in Old Uyghur (Hamilton 1971), I think of its language as representing the spoken vernacular.[20] I am struck by how close the language is to, say, modern Uzbek. In this regard, differentiating between the various Turkic vernaculars of this early period remains a matter worthy of further investigation.

Conclusion

I have tried in some of my writings to underscore the importance of the Black Death of the mid-14th century for understanding the turbulent history of Turkic literary languages in this period. We can only understand the sudden disappearance of the Syriac Turkic and Volga Bolgharian epigraphical languages as well as the literary language of the Golden Horde through an awareness of this world-historical phenomenon.[21] After the disappearance of Volga Bolgharian we can observe quite clearly the Kipchakization of the Middle Volga region.[22] I have also proposed that the transformation from the orthographic system of Old Anatolian Turkish to that of Ottoman Turkish reflects the loss of the learned Central Asian orthographic tradition and a shift to the Arabo-Persian system more common in the Middle East.[23] In a similar vein I would argue that Chaghatay Turkic, whose rise is most closely associated with the career of ᶜAli Šir Nävai (1441–1501), can be seen as a language closer

---

19 See the comment on an Old Uyghur *koine* in Erdal (2004: 7–8).
20 Reference was made to this work and its "vernacular language" by a participant at the First International Conference on the Role of Religions in the Turkic Culture (Budapest, Hungary, September 9–11, 2015), which I attended. Unfortunately I have not been able to identify who that person was. Nevertheless I have reached this conclusion independently through reading this text with graduate students.
21 See Schamiloglu (1991) and (2012).
22 See Schamiloglu (2016a) and (2016c).
23 See Schamiloglu (2004: 255–279, especially 268–269).

to the spoken vernacular in Central Asia; indeed Babur says exactly this.[24] We also see the otherwise inexplicable renaissance of the Uyghur alphabet in Central Asia in this era, including one of the manuscripts of the *Ḳutadɣu bilig*.

In the sphere of literature and religiosity, I have also suggested that the Black Death is the cause of the disruption of the Islamic Turkic literary tradition in the Golden Horde after the creation of the *Nähǰ ül-färädis*. I have suggested that Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Xusräv äl-Xorezmi (or Kärdäri, according to one manuscript described in the 19th century by Šihabäddin Märǰani) wrote the *Nähc ül-färädis*, whose subtitle is *Uštmaχlarnïŋ ačuḳ yolï* ("The Clear Path to Heaven"), as a pious act during the time of plague. I have also argued that Süleyman Çelebi's poem honoring the birth (*mevlid*) of the Prophet Muhammad is a similar work of Islamic piety inspired by death in this period, with even the Arabic name, *Vesilet ün-neǰat* ("The Path of Salvation"), suggesting a parallel to the *Nähǰ ül-färädis*.[25]

I do not pretend that this is a topic which I have exhausted, as I am still reflecting upon the impact of the Black Death upon Turkic languages and cultures in the 14th–16th centuries. I believe I still have at least a few additional historical languages whose demise, transformation, or rise out of the ashes of Middle Turkic I have yet to describe. But, as I would like to remind my readers through this contribution, the Black Death was only the second pandemic of bubonic plague to afflict the Old World and that we have a solid basis for exploring the same range of phenomena for the pandemic of bubonic plague in the 6th–8th centuries.

I hope that I have been able to make a convincing case for the need to expand our vision of the linguistic and philological history of Turkic to embrace an interdisciplinary vision of the past while rewriting the history of the Turkic epigraphical and literary languages. Returning once again to the era of Old Turkic and the Plague in the Time of Justinian, perhaps it is not a coincidence, after all, that the Old Turkic runiform inscriptions belong to roughly the same period as the oldest dated text in English, *Cædmon's Hymn*, a religious poem composed between 658 and 680, or as texts parallel to the next major landmark in the history of English literature, Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, written in the late 1380s during the era of the Black Death.

References

Aydın, Erhan 2016. Dialectal elements in the vocabulary of the Uyghur Khanate Inscriptions. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 69:3, 285–300.

Baldauf, Ingeborg 1993. *Schriftreform und Schriftwechsel bei den muslimischen Russland-Sowjettürken (1850–1937): Ein Symptom ideengeschichtlicher und kulturpolitischer Entwicklungen* [Alphabet reform and alphabet change among the Muslim Turks of Russia and the Soviet Union (1850–1937): A symptom of intellectual historical and cultural political developments]. (Bibliotheca orientalis Hungarica 40.) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

---

24 See Schamiloglu (2012: 506).
25 I hope to publish this in one or more papers on the Muslim Turkic *mevlid* tradition (in preparation).

Beckwith, Christopher I. 2011. *Empires of the Silk Road. A history of Central Eurasia from the Bronze Age to the present*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bombaci, Alessio 1965. The Turkic literatures. Introductory notes on the history and style. In: Boratov, Pertev Naili (ed.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 2. Wiesbaden: Steiner. xi–lxxi.

Campbell, Bruce M. S. 2016. *The great transition: Climate, disease and society in the Late-Medieval world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clauson sir, Gerard 1962. *Turkish and Mongolian studies*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Cohen, Walter 2011. The rise of the written vernacular: Europe and Eurasia. *Publications of Modern Language Association* 126: 3, 719–729.

Ercilasun, Ahmet Bican 2016. *Türk Kağanlığı ve Türk Bengü taşları* [The Türk Kaghanate and the Türk inscriptions]. Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Central Asia 3.) Leiden: Brill.

Giles, Lionel 1915. A census of Tun-huang. *T'oung Pao. Second series* 16: 4, 468–488; https://depts.washington.edu/silkroad/cities/china/dh/sochist.html. Accessed: 8 April 2017.

Golden, Peter B. 1992. *An introduction to the history of the Turkic peoples. Ethnogenesis and state-formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*. (Turcologica 9.) Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz.

Green, Monica (ed.) 2014. Pandemic disease in the Medieval World: Rethinking the Black Death. *The Medieval Globe* 1: 1.

Hamilton, James Russell 1971. *Le conte bouddhique du bon et du mauvais prince en version ouïgoure. Manuscrits ouïgours de Touen-Houang, Mission Paul Pelliot* [The Buddhist tale of the Good and the Bad Prince in Uyghur version. Uyghur manuscripts from Dunhuang, Mission Paul Pelliot]. (Documents conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale 3.) Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique.

Hatto, Arthur T. 1977. *The memorial feast for Kökötöy Khan (Kökötöydün aši). A Kirghiz epic poem*. (London Oriental Series 33.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Highet, Gilbert 1949. *The classical tradition: Greek and Roman influences on Western literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horobin, Simon 2010. Middle English language and poetry. In: Saunders, Corinne (ed.) *A companion to Medieval poetry*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 181–195.

Johanson, Lars 1998. The history of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 81–125.

Kljaštornyj, Sergej G. 1982. The Terkhin inscription. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 36: 1, 335–366.

Kljaštornyj, Sergej G. & Livšits, Vladimir A. 1971. Sogdijskaja nadpis' iz Buguta [Soghdian inscription from Buguta]. *Strany i narody vostoka* 10. Moscow: Nauka. 121–146.

Kljaštornyj, S. G. & Livšits, Vladimir A. 1972. The Soghdian inscription of Bugut revisited. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 16, 69–102.

Kyzlasov, I. L. 1994. *Runičeskie pis'mennosti Evrazijskix stepej* [Runic writing systems of the Eurasian steppes]. Moscow: "Vostočnaya Literatura" RAN.

Lewis, Geoffrey 1999. *The Turkish language reform: A catastrophic success*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little Lester K. 2011. Plague historians in lab coats. *Past and Present*, 213:1, 267–290.

Loya, Arieh 1974. The detribalization of Arabic poetry. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5: 2, 202–215.

Rabin, Chaim et al. 1960–2007. ʿArabiyya. In: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition, ed. P. Bearman, et al. Leiden: Brill. Available at: http://dx.doi. org/10.1163/1573–3912_islam_COM_0061. Accessed on: 9 April 2017.

Róna-Tas, András 1982. The periodization and sources of Chuvash linguistic history. In: Róna-Tas, András (ed.) *Chuvash studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 113–169.

Róna-Tas, András 1991. *An introduction to Turkology*. Szeged: University of Szeged.

Schamiloglu, Uli 1991. The end of Volga Bulgarian. *Varia Eurasiatica. Festschrift für Professor András Róna Tas*. Szeged: University of Szeged. 157–163.

Schamiloglu, Uli 1993. Preliminary remarks on the role of disease in the history of the Golden Horde. *Central Asian Survey* 12: 4, 447–457.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2004. The rise of the Ottoman Empire: The Black Death in Medieval Anatolia and its impact on Turkish civilization. In: Yavari, Neguin & Potter, Lawrence G. & Oppenheim, Jean-Marc (eds.) *Views from the edge: Essays in honor of Richard W. Bulliet*. New York: Columbia University Press. 255–279.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2012. Ortaçağ dillerinden modern dillere: Avrupa ve Türk dünyasında yeni edebi dillerin varlığa gelmesi [From Medieval Languages to Modern Languages: The Rise of New Literary Languages in Europe and the Turkic World]. In: Önal, Mehmet Naci (ed.) *IV. Dünya Dili Türkçe Sempozyumu Bildirileri. 22–24 Aralık 2011, Muğla* 1. Ankara. 501–507.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2016a. Chapter IX. Prirodnyj i social'no-ekonomičeskij krizisy. 2: Vlijanie Černoj smerti na Zolotuju Ordu: Politika, ekonomika, obščestvo, civilizacija [Natural and socio-economic crises. 2: The impact of the Black Death on the Golden Horde: Politics, economics, society, civilization]. In: *Zolotaja Orda v mirovoj istorii / The Golden Horde in world history. Kollektivnaja monografija*. Kazan: Institut istorii im. Sh. Mardzhani AN RT. 679–694.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2016b. The plague in the time of Justinian and Central Eurasian history: An agenda for research. Karatay, Osman & Zimonyi, István (eds.) *Central Eurasia in the Middle Ages. Studies in honour of Peter B. Golden*. (Turcologica 104.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 293–311.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2016c. Gravestones and the history of Medieval Tatar civilization: A brief overview. In: *Islam i tjurkskij mir: Problemy obrazovanija, jazyka, literatury, istorii i religii. Materialy VIII. meždunarodnoj tjurkologičeskoj konferencii* [Islam and Turkic world: Problems of education, language, literature, history and religion. Materials of the VIII. International Turkic Conference]. Kazan: Elabuga Institute of Kazan Federal University & Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University. 76–80.

Schamiloglu, Uli 2017. The impact of the Black Death on the Golden Horde: Politics, economy, society, and civilization. *Golden Horde Review (Zolotoordynskoe obozrenie)* 5: 2, 325–343.

Sims-Williams, Nicholas 2000. *Bactrian documents from Northern Afghanistan. 1. Legal and economic documents*. (Studies in the Khalili Collection 3, Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum 2: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia 6: Bactrian). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinor, Denis 1990. The establishment and dissolution of the Türk Empire. In: Sinor, Denis (ed.) *The Cambridge history of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 285–326.

Tekin, Talât 1968. *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic*. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic Altaic Series 69.) Bloomington: Indiana University.

Tekin, Talât 1997. *Irk bitig: The Book of Omens*. (Turcologica 18.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Theophanes 1997. *The chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern history, AD 284–813*. Translated by Cyril Mango et al. New York: Oxford University Press.

Theophylactus Simocatta 1985. *Geschichte*. Translated by Peter Schreiner. (Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur. Abteilung Byzantinistik 20.) Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

Tremblay, Florent A. 1989. *Rise of vernacular languages/L'emergence des langues vernaculaires*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.

Twitchett, Denis 1979. Population and pestilence in T'ang China. In: Bauer, Wolfgang (ed.) *Studia Sino-Mongolica. Festschrift für Herbert Franke*. (Münchener ostasiatische Studien 25.) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag. 35–69.

de la Vaissière, Étienne 2005. *Soghdian traders: A history*. Translated by James Ward. (Handbuch der Orientalistik 8: Central Asia 10.) Leiden: Brill.

de la Vaissière, Étienne 2017. Early Medieval Central Asian population estimates. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/29974601/Early_medieval_Central_Asian_population_estimates. Accessed: 8 April 2017.

Walter, Mariko Namba 2006. Soghdian Buddhism. *Sino-Platonic Papers* 174, 21. Available at: http://sino-platonic.org/complete/spp174_Soghdian_buddhism.pdf. Accessed: 8 April 2017.

Yoshida, Yutaka 2016. Soghdian language. 1. Description. *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Online edition, 2016, http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/Soghdian-language-01. Accessed: 8 April 2017.

Yoshida, Yutaka 2017. Turko-Soghdian letters. http://www.persee.fr/doc/ephe_0000-0002_2000_num_113_109_11784. Accessed: 8 April 2017.

The position of the Lopnor dialect

Hans Nugteren

The so-called Lopnor dialect is arguably the most aberrant of the main dialects of Modern Uyghur. Malov was struck by its peculiar developments, leading him to devote a separate book to Lopnor, rather than including it in his book on Uyghur dialects. At first sight, Lopnor distinguishes itself from its relatives mainly in the field of phonetics. Fourfold vowel harmony in the low vowels and numerous consonant assimilations give it a distinctly non-Uyghur appearance. Although the non-Uyghur features of Lopnor have been attributed to "Old Kirghiz" (a variety of Old Turkic) ancestry, several of them are in fact comparable to modern Kirghiz. This article investigates whether it is warranted to assume the presence of a Kirghiz-like layer or component in Lopnor and discusses similarities and differences between Lopnor, Standard Uyghur and Kirghiz, as well as the characteristics which cannot readily be connected to other Turkic languages. The focus is on systematic and incidental phonetic developments. The paper concludes with a brief selection of morphological and lexical features.
Keywords: Lopnor dialect, Uyghur, Turkic languages, classification

Hans Nugteren, Georg-August-Universität, Seminar für Turkologie und Zentralasienkunde, Heinrich-Düker-Weg 14, 37073 Göttingen, Germany.
E-mail: Hans.Nugteren@phil.uni-goettingen.de

1. Introduction

The Lopnor dialect[1] is the Turkic idiom traditionally spoken by the Loptuqs,[2] pastoralists and fishermen of Southeast Xinjiang.[3] Lopnor may have had more than 25,000 speakers during the last century, but this figure has been declining for several decades.

---

1   This article is an expanded version of a paper I submitted after my talk at the 2006 *International Turkish Linguistics Conference* in Uppsala.

2   This name derives from *lop-luq*, with *-l- > -t-* as discussed below. The name Lopnor will be used here rather than Lop in order to avoid confusion with Lop in Khotan prefecture. *Lop Nur* (Mongolian for 'Lake Lop') used to be a salt lake, and is today an ecological disaster site. It was famously mentioned by Marco Polo. The etymology of the name *Lop* (or *Nop*) is unclear. For an overview of proposals see Esmael Abdurehim (2014: 25).

3   Osmanov (1983) lists the following main locations where Lopnor was spoken: Mirän, Döŋqotan, Γoday, Tuŋčekä, Yaman Xuwa, Mirsali, Šutaŋ, Qaraqum, Aqsupu, Barayčekä, Čoŋköl, Čara, Oymanköl, Yeŋisu, Arγan, Tikänlik, Šiniγa, and Küzläk. For an extensive survey of historical, geographical and ethnographical information I refer to Esmael Abdurehim (2014), who also takes into account hard-to-access Chinese publications.

Although the Lopnor vernacular was recognised as a separate entity before the concept of a standardised Modern Uyghur language took shape, today it is classified as one of the three main dialects of Modern Uyghur. The two others are the Khotan dialect located in Southwest Xinjiang, and the so-called Central dialect that ranges over northern and western Xinjiang, encompassing the sub-dialects on which the Modern Uyghur standard language was based. There is considerable variation within the Central dialect, but even Lopnor and Khotan are not homogeneous.

There are considerable phonetic and lexical differences between the several re-corded Lopnor varieties. Malov's data are from Mirän and Ča(r)qiliq. Fu et al. (2000) distinguish two subdialects, Yùlí (尉犁) and Mirän-Čaqiliq (米兰-若羌). Many of the documented forms are not specified for locality.

Two examples of phonetic differences that may impede intelligibility are the de-velopment of *r (represented by r, y, Ø or vowel lengthening), e.g. Döŋqotan qarγa, Mirän qayγa, Čara qaγa 'crow' (cf. Gao 1994: 62), and the development of *p (rep-resented by p or w): süwür-, süwüü-, süpüy- 'to sweep' (Fu et al. 2000: 3116).

Lopnor is increasingly influenced by standard Uyghur both because of Uyghur language media and schools and the displacement and dispersion of its speakers.

The Lopnor dialect (henceforth simply "Lopnor") has several remarkable fea-tures that clearly set it apart from the rest of Uyghur (henceforth "Uyghur"). At first sight, this mainly concerns a more elaborate vowel harmony system than that of Uy-ghur, vowel contractions, and numerous consonant assimilations, both within stems and on morpheme boundaries.

Since at first sight some of these features look like Kirghiz rather than Uyghur, it makes sense to investigate whether they are indicative of an actual Kipchak con-nection or stratum in Lopnor. Malov[4] was the first to suggest that deviating features of Lopnor are due to a connection with so-called "Old Kirghiz". However, because this label usually refers to a corpus of Runic inscriptions, which is defined by his-torical and geographical criteria rather than by a set of linguistic features, it would be difficult to investigate such a connection.[5] At the same time, Lopnor undisputedly shares Uyghur or Chaghatay (Southeastern Turkic or "Karluk") features.

In this paper, we will present a number of phonetic features that may be helpful in finding out more about the origins of Lopnor and more accurately locating its po-sition in the Turkic family tree, especially in its relationship to modern Uyghur and modern Kirghiz. Is Lopnor a sister language to Uyghur? And if not, is it an indepen-dent Chaghatay language with Kipchak elements or an "Uyghurised" Kipchak lan-

---

4   See Malov's (1956) introduction. According to Wei (1989: 239) Lopnor "preserves some of the characteristics of old Kirgiz". No linguistic features are discussed.

5   Non-linguistic arguments supporting such a connection will not be discussed here. Osma-nov (1983) mentions that a small subgroup of western Loptuqs called themselves Kirghiz (Qirγiz). It has to be kept in mind, however, that the name Kirghiz occurs as a tribal name elsewhere in Turcia, including among the Manchurian Khakas ('Fuyu Kirghiz') and West-ern Yugur (Yellow Uyghur).

guage? Were the Kirghiz-like features of Lopnor really adopted from Kirghiz, or are their similarities due to parallel but independent developments? Non-Turkic components of Lopnor will be mostly ignored here, although they contribute to its diminished intelligibility.

The literature on Lopnor is characterised by an abundance of variant forms. This is not unexpected, as the published materials span several decades and were recorded in different locations. Moreover, the language is changing rapidly, as is often the case with non-written languages under pressure. The data used in this paper were in large part taken from Malov's monograph, as his materials retain the unpolished quality of field notes without much standardisation and interpretation. (For example, Malov did not decide which of a number of variants was the "original" one or the "best" one.) Although he only published texts and a lexicon, and did not visit all the localities, Malov provides a broad picture of the language. His is the oldest extensive collection of data and although the book is teeming with pronunciations and grammatical forms taken from Uyghur, it is likely to preserve more of the character of a less Uyghurised Lopnor. Further materials were taken from the publications of Mirsultan Osmanov (Osmanop), the most prolific author on Lopnor, and from the dictionary edited by Fu Maoji, complemented by lexemes from Гаррariwа, Гopuri, and Tenišev. Most publications approach Lopnor in the manner of a so-called *idioticon*, whereby deviations from the standard are described, rather than the language as a whole.

The materials presented by Esmael Abdurehim (2014), the most recent sizeable publication on Lopnor, constitute a type of "almost-Uyghur", which may be representative of a language in its final throes. As the present survey focuses on "linguistic archaeology" and aims to find the oldest retrievable layers of Lopnor, the word shapes documented by Abdurehim have not been considered here.

In these pages, the locality and author of each discussed item will not be indicated. The notations were (re)transcribed and, especially in the case of Fu et al.'s narrow transcription, simplified for the sake of comparison.

2. Doublets

In the published Lopnor materials, many etyma are represented by two or more forms that differ beyond the type of phonetic variation found within any language. While some of these internal variants are difficult to explain, others provide us with insights about the development of Lopnor.

As in the examples in the following list, we can often classify the recorded Lopnor forms into at least two recognisable groups, represented here by a selection of the extant variants. Often we find that one group is close to Uyghur, while the other looks quite different.

In itself this does not prove much, as the reason can be different in each case, and it is not always obvious which of the two is the original Lopnor form. In some cases the left column form may be due to intra-Turkic copying (perhaps from

Kirghiz or another Kipchak language), and the right column form native Lopnor, whereas in others the left one may be native Lopnor, and the right hand one a form adopted from or influenced by standard Uyghur. However, even in most cases where the right hand form is typically Uyghur (such as *yeŋi*, *tonu-*) we have no evidence to establish whether the non-Uyghur form is Kirghiz, or native Lopnor, or just an older stage of Uyghur.

Lopnor (less Uyghur-like)	Lopnor (more Uyghur-like)	Standard Uyghur	
ene	*ana*	*ana*	mother
ol	*u*	*u*	he/she
ani	*onu*	*uni*	her/him
ma	*mu*	*mu*	also
yaŋï ~ yaŋi	*yeŋi*	*yeŋi*	new
tanï-	*tonu-, tunu-*	*tonu-*	to know
taqaγu ~ taqu ~ taqo	*toχo*	*toχu*	chicken
buzuu	*muzay*	*mozay*	calf
bülüü	*biley*	*biläy*	whetstone
söök	*söŋŋök*	*söŋäk*	bone
tiy-	*teg-*	*täg-*	to touch
eyiz ~ eez	*egiz*	*igiz*	high
oono- ~ ono-	*oyna- ~ oyno-*	*oyna-*	to play
moyun	*boyun*	*boyun*	neck
čimin	*čiwin*	*čiwin*	mosquito; fly
minän	*bilan ~ bilän*	*bilän*	with
sač	*čač*	*čač*	hair
šeš-	*yeš-*	*yäš-*	to untie
it-	*yüt-*	*yüt-*	to lose
anday	*andaq*	*andaq*	like that
söylö-	*sözzö- ~ sözdö-*	*sözlä-*	to speak
umšaq	*yumšaq*	*yumšaq*	soft
tooroq ~ toyoq	*toγγoq ~ toγraq*	*toγraq*	poplar
qoštu	*χošnu*	*χošna*	neighbour
ayli ~ alli	*aldï*	*aldi*	front
dö(y)t	*tö(y)t*	*töt*	four
yoγγon	*yutqan*	*yotqan*	blanket

The most convincing cases of non-Uyghur influence are those in which the Lopnor form is incompatible with modern Uyghur, and cannot easily be explained as an earlier stage of Uyghur or as a secondary development of the Uyghur form. The stronger cases include *buzuu*, which could hardly have developed from its Uyghur cognate *mozay*, and *anday*, a typical Kipchak form. There are many pitfalls in evalu-

ating these variants, and each set should be looked at separately. For instance, the development *tiy-* 'to touch' is a Kipchak-like innovation from original **täg-*, but *eyiz* (< **ediz*) 'high' is an older form than *egiz*, which developed its *-g-* secondarily in Uyghur. Sometimes the Uyghur-like forms have undergone typically Lopnor developments, so that they look "more Lopnor" than the actual Lopnor form. An example of this is *sözzö-* (corresponding to Uyghur *sözlä-*), whose assimilated *-zz-* lends it a non-Uyghur appearance. It is however likely that the form *söylö-* is the native Lopnor one. Likewise, *qoštu* 'neighbour' could be a secondary development of a pre-modern Uyghur form *χošnu* (< **koŋšĭ*).

The existence of such variants, of which the list above represents only a fraction, can be explained if Lopnor is either an Uyghur dialect with many elements from another Turkic language, or a more remotely related language that has become increasingly influenced by Uyghur.

Many phenomena observed in Lopnor can be understood in terms of diglossia, in which speakers attempt, mostly successfully, to switch between standard Uyghur and correct Lopnor depending on what is socially required in a given situation. This diglossia leads to constant triangulation, whereby familiarity with the distinguishing features of Lopnor and Uyghur leads to the acquisition of a set of intuitive sound laws, which enable speakers to create hypercorrect Lopnor forms or hypercorrect standard Uyghur forms. On the one hand the application of Lopnor sound laws to Uyghur words produces forms like the abovementioned *sözzö-*, which is merely a "Lopification" of Uyghur *sözlä-*.

On the other hand, the Uyghurisation, i.e. the "subtraction" or "cancellation" of perceived Lopnor sound laws from forms that were not actually Lopnor, leads to unexpected forms. The historically incorrect form *maχla-* 'to praise' developed from *maχta-* based on the knowledge that Lopnor often changes *l* into *t* as in *bašta-* 'to begin' vs. Uyghur *bašla-*. The form *maχla-* arose in an attempt to create a correct Uyghur form, although *maχta-* is in fact a Mongolic word and does not contain the verbalizer suffix *-lA*. *Ökmä* 'lungs' developed from *ökpä* < **öpkä*, based on the knowledge that *-p-* after a voiceless plosive may correspond to *-m-* in Uyghur, although the Uyghur form is actually *öpkä*.

The Lopnor form *mašana* 'car' developed from *mašina* based on the knowledge that Uyghur raises *a* > *i* in middle syllables. The form *mašana* can be viewed as an attempt to provide *mašina* (a Russian word) with a correct Lopnor counterpart by undoing a perceived standard Uyghur development. The Lopnor form *poštu* 'mail' developed from *počta* (also from Russian) based on the knowledge that word-final low vowels of Uyghur often correspond to original high vowels, as in Lopnor *öčkü* 'goat' vs. Uyghur *öškä*, Lopnor *yetti* 'seven' vs. Uyghur *yättä*. Lopnor *yalin* 'udder' developed from Uyghur *yelin*, based on the knowledge that Uyghur *e* is often the result of palatalisation of *a* followed by *i*, as in *qelin* 'thick' vs. Lopnor *qalin*. However, *yelin* has never had *-a-*, although it is now perceived as phonologically back-vocalic in Uyghur. These forms would not have arisen if Lopnor had developed in isolation.

In short, both "Lopified" Uyghur words and Lopnor words that are, or could be, secondarily Uyghurised, should be kept apart in discussions about the history of Lopnor.

3. Features shared with Uyghur (and not with Kirghiz)

The features that Lopnor shares with Standard Uyghur are mainly old features that were preserved in both languages, but were lost elsewhere. The loss of "pronominal *n*" is a shared Chaghatay innovation also found in Uzbek.

1. Retention of **u/ü* after unrounded syllable
2. Tendency to merge **ï* with **i*[6]
3. Retention of intervocalic **-g* (but cf. *-AgU* under 6.7)
4. Retention of final **-g* except in monosyllables (in Lopnor as *-g/γ* or *-k/q*)[7]
5. Retention of **y-* as such, or, before high vowels, elision (no *ǰ-*)[8]
6. Ablative *-DIn*, as in *öydün* 'from the house'
7. Loss of "pronominal *n*", as in *ičidä* 'inside it' (vs. *ičindä* in other Turkic languages)
8. Secondary *-g-* from earlier *-y-*.[9]

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
aγu	*oγa*	*uu*	**agu*	poison
ačuq	*očuq*	*ačïq*	**ačuk*	open
qattïγ	*qattiq*	*qatuu*	**ka(t)tïg*	hard
ölüg	*ölük*	*ölü(ü)*	**ölüg*	dead
yapuγ	*yopuq*	*ǰabuu*	**yapïg*	horse blanket
il	*yil*	*ǰïl*	**yïl*	year
eger	*egär*	*eyer*	**ädär*	saddle

6 The merger of **i* and **ï* has different consequences in Lopnor than in Uyghur. Uyghur words that have no other vowels than *i*, whatever its origin, tend to take back vocalic suffixes in inflection, e.g. *piš-* 'to cook', *čiš* 'tooth', *iz* 'track', *tiz* 'knee' take back vocalic suffixes, whereas Lopnor *piš-*, *tiš*, *iz*, and *tiz* take front suffixes.

7 The Khotan dialect systematically preserves *g/γ* in these circumstances. The double representation of **g* in Lopnor raises the question whether perhaps the Lopnor forms in *-k* are all due to Uyghur influence. Alternatively, Lopnor variants such as *orγoγ* 'sickle' and *ördög* 'duck' may be the result of confusion caused by the voicing of final *-k/-q* when suffixes are attached.

8 Some Lopnor words display *ǰ-* < **y-*, e.g. *ǰirgen-* 'to be disgusted', *ǰaŋïla-* 'to renew', *yat* ~ *ǰat* 'strange', *yigiymä* ~ *ǰigiymä* 'twenty', *yüyü-* ~ *ǰürü-* 'to go'. These seem to be too marginal to be meaningful. Some instances of *ǰ-* seem to be due to sandhi phenomena, e.g. *aγït ǰel* 'speech' < *aγïz yel*. Standard Uyghur words with *ǰ-* are usually taken from Kipchak or Mongolic, e.g. *ǰawïγa* 'wool shorn in summer', *ǰigdä* 'narrow-leaved oleaster', *ǰiyän* 'nephew' (replacing direct developments from CT **yapaku, *yigdä, *yegän*).

9 This is a Chaghatay development also found in Uzbek.

There is some doubt as to point 1, as the sources show many cases of unrounding of *u/ü* after an unrounded first syllable, such as *ašiq* 'ankle', *qamïš* 'reed', *taši-* 'to carry', *tani-* 'to know', *yari-* 'to become bright', which may represent the native Lopnor development. For all of these words, there are recorded variants with rounded second syllable. Such forms, as well as *ačuq* 'open', *ayu* 'poison', and *qazuq* 'stake' may in fact represent pre-modern Uyghur forms rather than original Lopnor ones.

Point 3 is also problematic, as both Lopnor and Uyghur feature contraction of *VGV* sequences in trisyllabic stems such as *toχu* (**takagu*) 'chicken' and *mozay* (**buzagu*) 'calf'. Moreover, Uyghur has several Kipchak-type developments, such as *köküyün* (**kö:kägün*) 'gadfly', *üyür* (**ögür*) 'herd of horses', *yaw* (**yagï*) 'enemy'. The preservation of *-g-* in Uyghur may in fact be restricted to shorter stems.

4. Uyghur features absent from Lopnor

The following Standard Uyghur developments were originally absent from Lopnor. Most of these deviations are mentioned in surveys of the distinguishing features of Lopnor, in support of the official dialect divisions of Uyghur. These are mostly pre-Uyghur forms, that is to say, the Lopnor forms failed to undergo typical Uyghur developments. This means that in these cases Lopnor tends to agree with the majority of Turkic languages, making these features of little classificatory value.

    1. Lowering of word-final high vowel > *a/ä*
    2. Raising of medial syllable *a/ä* > *i*
    3. Umlaut of first syllable *a* > *e* before second syllable *i*
    4. Rounding of first syllable *a* before second syllable *u*
    5. Affrication of **t-* before high vowel + *č* or *š*[10]
    6. Assimilation of **s-* before *č* or *š*

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
ilqi	*yilqa*	*ǰïlqï*	**yïlkï*	herd of horses
yetti	*yättä*	*ǰeti*	**yä(t)ti*	seven
balasi	*balisi*	*balasï*	**bala-sï*	her child
aqadu	*aqidu*	*aqat*	**ak-a turur*	it flows
balïq	*beliq*	*balïq*	**balïk*	fish
taqu	*toχu* (~ *tuχa*)	[*tooq*]	**takagu* [**taguk*]	chicken
tište-	*čišlä-*	*tište-*	**tišlä-*	to bite
tüš-	*čüš-*	*tüš-*	**tüš-*	to fall
sač	*čač*	*čač*	**sač*	hair

---

10 The retention of **t-* in this environment is shared by the Central Uyghur Turfan and Qomul dialects.

5. Non-classificatory Lopnor innovations

The most striking features of Lopnor, at least from the perspective of a speaker of Standard Uyghur, are often not unique within Turkic, and are not very useful for classification purposes, although they are almost invariably mentioned in publications about Lopnor.

5.1. Metathesis of consonant clusters -pr-, -gl-, -gr-, -tl-, -dl-

The Common Turkic consonant clusters -pr-, -gl-, -gr-, -tl-, -dl- tend to be inverted in Lopnor, often resulting in forms similar to those seen in South Siberian Turkic and Western Yugur (see Nugteren & Roos 2006: 114-117).

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
teywe-	tewre-	terme-	*täprä-	to shake
yilɣa-	yayla-	ïyla-	*ïgla-	to cry
olɣoq	oylaq	ulaq	*oglak	kid goat
burɣa	buɣra	buura	*bugra	camel stallion
qultuq	qutluq	quttuu	*kutlug	lucky
taltiq	tatliq	tattuu	*ta:tlïg	sweet
ilda-	hidla-	ǰïtta-	*(y)ïdla-	to smell
alta-	atla-	atta-	*a:tla-	to step

In eereš- 'to follow' (from earlier *egreš-, cf. Uyghur ägäš- (< *ärgäš-), Uzbek ergaš-), the cluster developed in the opposite direction. Lopnor älgäk 'sieve' agrees with *älgäk, whereas Uyghur ägläk was metathesised. A genuine, systematically applied preference for certain orders of consonants may have existed, as it does in South Siberian languages, but it appears in that case to have been obscured by a tendency to opt for the reverse order of that in Standard Uyghur. Other non-classificatory metatheses include azïɣ 'mouth', urɣuy 'Uyghur' (*agïz, *uygur).

5.2. *-g > -q in monosyllables

This development, a natural extension of the general tendency to devoice word-final *-g, also occurred in the Central Uyghur dialects of Qomul and Turfan.[11]

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
taq	taɣ	too	*ta:g	mountain
yaq	yaɣ	[ǰow (dial.)]	*ya:g	grease
čiq	čiɣ	čiy	*čïg	plant name

11 Further, note that in both Standard Uyghur and Western Yugur the dative of taɣ 'mountain' is taqqa rather than *taɣɣa.

5.3. Consonant assimilations

The tendency to assimilate consonant sequences, which to some degree is found in all Turkic languages, is taken further in Lopnor. This does not only affect stems but also plays an important role in inflection. (Gao lists four consonant variants for the plural suffix *-LAr*, and seven for the acc./gen. case *-NI*.)[12] This often results in "monotonous" paradigms, e.g. *biz* 'we' > gen. and acc. *bizzi*, dat. *bizgä*, loc. *bizzä*, abl. *bizzin*, and can make stems indistinguishable; e.g. *assa* may represent *ačsa* 'if s/he opens', *aš-sa* 'if it exceeds', *at-sa* 'if s/he throws' or *as-sa* 'if s/he hangs'.[13]

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
yassuq	*yastuq*	*ǰastïq (ǰazdïk)*	**yastuk*	pillow
qizzar	*qizlar*	*qïzdar*	**kïz-lar*	girls
ippi	*yipni*	*ǰipti*	**(y)ip-ni*	thread (acc.)
ešäkki	*išäkniŋ*	*ešektin*	**äšgäk-niŋ*	donkey (gen.)
tappas	*tapmas*	*tappas*	**tap-mas*	s/he won't find

5.4. Loss of preconsonantal *-y-*

Preconsonantal *y*, both from original **y* and from **d*, is generally dropped, and the preceding vowel lengthened, as in *quuqa* 'singed hair' < **kuyka*, *ooγot-* 'to wake up (tr)' < **odgat-*, *saara-* 'to sing' < **sayra-*, *quuruq* 'tail' < **kudruk*, *aari-* 'to separate' < **adïr-*, *oono-* 'to play' < **oyna-*.

5.5. Sibilant assimilation and dissimilation

In words with initial *s-* followed by *č*, Lopnor often features the original unassimilated forms alongside Uyghur-like assimilated forms, e.g. *sač ~ säč ~ šäš ~ čač ~ čäč ~ čeč* 'hair', *sačqan, čäčkän, čičqan* 'mouse' (Uyghur *čač, čašqan*).

In three words containing the sequence *sVs*, the first *s* is elided in Uyghur. Lopnor has both the original form and the Uyghur-type dissimilations. Kirghiz changed the second *-s* to *-z*, as in Western Yugur. There are in fact two Turkic verbs for 'to be thirsty', **us-* and **suvsa- > susa-*, which seem to have been conflated in Uyghur. In the case of **süs-*, Lopnor developed an additional disyllabic form *üssü-*, which further developed a dissimilated form *üstü-*.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	Yugur		
sus- ~ us-	*suz-*	*us-*	*suz-*	**sus-*	to scoop
süs- ~ üssü- ~ üstü-	*süz-*	*üs-*	*suz-*	**süs-*	to butt
ussa- ~ susa-	*suusa-*	*ussa-*	*us-*	**suvsa-*	to be thirsty

---

12 Counting all vocalic variants, this adds up to 16 and 28 allomorphs, respectively.

13 Some of these assimilations, e.g. *assa < at-sa*, can also be observed in spoken Uyghur.

The originally homophonous stems *sïš 'skewer' and *sïš- 'to swell' have under-
gone different developments. The former is recorded in Lopnor in the assimilated
form šiš ~ šäš 'sharp object', whereas the latter is documented in the Uyghur-like
form išši- which lost the initial consonant.[14] Kirghiz has šiši-. For more on sibilant
assimilations in Turkic see Schönig (2009).

5.6. Geminated consonants

The native Lopnor treatment of geminated consonants within stems is unclear, as
several stems are recorded in single-consonant and geminate versions, including
several numerals (2, 7, 8, 9, 30). aččïq 'anger', ottoyo (*otra) 'middle', qattïγ 'hard'
and ittik 'sharp' agree with Uyghur, but this may be due to the influence of the stan-
dard language.[15] Lopnor features further geminates of its own, often involv-
ing -p- and -ŋ-, such as uppa 'face powder', ippar 'musk', qussuq 'vomit', aŋŋiz
'stubble', oŋŋoy 'easy', siŋŋar 'one of a pair', which may not always be relevant to
historical phonology.

5.7. w > g/γ

w may become g or γ in both Turkic and non-Turkic words, e.g. (native) yagaš
'well-behaved', (Arabic) ayγal 'first', gözür 'minister', haga 'air', (Persian) dergüš
'derwish', mögö 'fruit', (Mongolic) sugay 'barren' (Uyghur yuwaš, awwal, wäzir,
hawa, därwiš, mewä, suway). This phenomenon is also known from Central Uyghur
dialects such as Turfan and Qomul.

5.8. Vowel rounding

Rounding of vowels by labial consonants and/or vowels of the second syllable leads
to deviations from Uyghur, as in the items below. A similar tendency in Uyghur
mostly affects a/ä of the first syllable followed by u/ü, and does not occur when
there is a geminate or consonant sequence between the first and second vowel.

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz		
pušuy-	pišur-	bišïr-	*bišur-	to bake
üčüy-	[ičküz-]	ičir-	*ičür-	to give to drink
čürü-	čiri-	čiri-	*čirü-	to rot
költür-	kältür-	keltir-	*kältür-	to bring
köŋrü	käŋri	keŋ(i)ri	*käŋrü	wide
sömrü-	sämir-	semir-	*semri-	to become fat
yölpü-	yälpü-	jelpi-	*yelpi-	to fan

14 šüšüy- 'to swell', the non-Uyghur form recorded by Malov, is likely an aorist or a
   causative form (from an earlier *šiš-ür-).
15 Some words appear with an interesting dissimilation: istik (< *issig) 'hot', uššaq tüštäk (<
   uššaq tüššäk < *uvšak tävšäk) 'tiny', and üstü- (< üssü- < *süs-) 'to butt'. This de-
   velopment may be due to hypercorrection as the sequence -st- normally becomes -ss-.

6. Kirghiz-like developments in Lopnor?

Now we arrive at some developments that are reminiscent of Kirghiz, although upon closer inspection some of the details differ.

6.1. Fourfold vowel harmony in low vowels

The appearance of *o* and *ö* in non-first syllables is one of the most obvious similarities between Lopnor and Kirghiz. In cases of *u* in the stem, neither Lopnor nor Kirghiz rounds the suffixes.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	
ördöktör	*ördöktör*	*ödäklär*	ducks
qoyloruwiz	*qoylorubuz*	*qoylirimiz*	our sheep (pl.)

6.2. Stronger tendency to labialise *i* in suffixes

Suffixes with original *I* alternation, exemplified here by the nomen agentis suffix *-čI*, the 3rd person possessive *-(s)I*, and the converter *-kI*, are rounded after a rounded syllable in Lopnor and Kirghiz, but remain unrounded in Uyghur. Suffixes with the high vowel *X*, such as the 1st person possessive *-(X)m* and the passive *-(X)l*, generate rounded and unrounded suffix variants in Uyghur as well.[16]

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	
qoyču	*qoyču*	*qoyči*	shepherd
qolu	*qolu*	*qoli*	her hand
taqusu	---	*toχusi*	his chicken
öydökü	*üydögü*	*öydiki*	the one in the house

6.3. Delateralisation of syllable-initial *-l-*

This development is not only shared by Lopnor and Kirghiz, but can also be found in Kazak, Bashkir, Northeastern Turkic and Western Yugur, indicating that it occurred a couple of times independently.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	
bašta-	*bašta-*	*bašla-*	to begin
uqta-	*uqta-*	*uχla-*	to sleep

This development does not necessarily result in similarities with Kirghiz, as can be seen in the following words:

---

16 The absence of rounding in Standard Uyghur is partly an artefact of the written language. The genitive and ablative case endings are always written with <*i*>, although in spoken Uyghur they can be rounded. However, the accusative ending and the third person possessive are usually really unrounded.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	
ässä-	*este-*	*äslä-*	to remember
üllük	*ündüü*	*ünlük*	with sound
aŋla-	*aŋda-*	*aŋla-*	to hear

The details of how the Lopnor assimilations came about are unknown. Lopnor *äs-sä-* may have developed from a Kirghiz-like form *ästä-* (like *yassuq* above), or directly from *äslä-*, and in either case it could be borrowed from Uyghur. In spite of this uncertainty, these few examples show that several consonant sequences behave differently in Lopnor than in Kirghiz. After nasals, *-l-* does not appear to assimilate in Lopnor, and the sequence *-nl-* normally undergoes regressive assimilation.

6.4. Denasalisation of syllable-initial *-n-* and *-m-*

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	
öttü	---	*ötnä*	borrowing
hečteme	*ičteme*	*hečnemä*	nothing
teppek ~ tepmek	*teppek*	*täpmäk*	to kick
toqpaq ~ toqmaq	*toqmoq*	*toqmaq*	bludgeon

6.5. Initial or medial *b/p* > *m* due to word-final nasal

The development of initial **b* > *m* is common throughout Turkic in short words such as *män* 'I'. Remote assimilation as in *moyun* is not restricted to Kirghiz either, but is found in Northeastern Turkic and Western Yugur as well. Apart from the examples below, *m-* may appear in words without any nasals, such as *biläk ~ miläk* 'wrist', *boy ~ moy* 'stature', *bulut ~ mulut* 'cloud'. If these words were taken from texts, they may of course be sandhi forms.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur		
murun	*murun*	*burun*	**burun*	nose
moyun	*moyun*	*boyun*	**boyun*	neck
čimin	*čïmïn ~ čïbïn*	*čiwin*	**čï:pïn*	fly

6.6. Nasal dissimilation

Mostly in disyllabic words in which *n* co-occurs with another nasal, Lopnor shares a tendency with Kirghiz to change the *n* into *l*. This mostly affects non-Turkic lexemes, such as *maymïl* 'monkey', *ambal* 'functionary', *qalun* 'law' (Uyghur *maymun*, *amban*, *qanun*).

6.7. Contraction of *-AgU* in trisyllables

The words with three syllables that end in the sequence *-AgU* behave in a peculiar way in Uyghur as well. In disyllabic words, intervocalic *-g-* is preserved in Uyghur, but in this set of trisyllabic words we see that the *-g-* is lost and the end of the word

is contracted. The forms in Lopnor seem to be the result of another type of contraction. Although the contracted vowels in Lopnor are usually high, it is conceivable that they developed from a Kazak-like *-aw/-ew* or Kirghiz *-oo/-öö*.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur		
bülüü	*bülöö*	*biläy*	**bi:lägü*	whetstone
buzuu	*muzoo*	*mozay*	**buzagu*	calf
üčüü [~ *üčögü*]	[*ičegi*]	*üčäy*	**ičägü/ki*	intestines
γuru ~ γiro	*qïroo*	*qiro*	**kïragu*	hoar frost
küyü	*küyöö*	*küyö/küyo*	**küdägü*	brother-in-law[17]
üčü-län	*üčöö*	*üčäy-län*	**üčägü*	all three[18]

6.8. Further contractions

Other contractions in Lopnor generally look like Kipchak as well, but Standard Uyghur is not consistent here and apparently also contains Kipchak forms, with semi-vowels *-w-* and *-y-* instead of expected *-g-*.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur		
kiiz	*kiyiz*	*kigiz*	**kidiz*	felt
mee ~ megä	*mee*	*meŋä*	*?*bäñi*	brain
müüs ~ müyüs	*müyüz*	*müŋgüz*	*?*büñüz*	horn
söök	*söök*	*söŋäk*	**söŋök*	bone
ür	*üyür*	*üyür*	**ögür*	herd
köküün	*kögöön*	*köküyün*	**kökägün*	gadfly
tünüün	---	*tünügün*	**tünä kün*	yesterday
suq	*suuq*	*soγaq*	**sogïk*	cold[19]
quula-	*quu-* (*qubala-*)	*qoγla-*	**kovla-*	to chase

17   The Uyghur word is omitted by some dictionaries and marked as dialectal by others. More commonly listed is the compound *küy'oγul* 'son-in-law'.

18   Older, non-standardised sources do have Uyghur forms without the *-y-*; e.g. Jarring mentions (among other variants) *üčöwlän*; and likewise for other numerals. Malov gives a greater variety of Lopnor forms for 'the two of us/you/them' (but notably without a form resembling the present-day standard Uyghur form) *ikkälän, ikkelän, ikkölän, ikülän*, as well as *ikkö-zü* and *ikkülä-biz* 'the two of them/us'. Uyghur variants mentioned by Jarring (1964:143) clearly involve the postposition *bilän*. Apparently, the *-y-* in *üčäylän* is not of the same origin as that in the other examples, which clearly contain the suffix *-AGU*.

19   Turfan *sooq*. An anonymous reviewer stated that both *soq* and *soγuq* are standard Uyghur forms. Kibirov & Cunvazo have *soq*; other dictionaries that have this entry mark it as dialectal and have either *soγaq* or *soγuq* as the standard form. The Uyghur adjective shapes *soγ ~ soq ~ sooq ~ souq ~ sawuq ~ sowaq*, as well as the verb *sowu-* (Lopnor *suu-*) 'to become cold' (on which the dictionaries agree) are themselves indicative of Kipchak influence.

6.9. Loss of preconsonantal -*n*-

Lopnor has a tendency to elide *n* before *č*, as in *sačqaq ~ sančqaq ~ čančïγaq* 'fish spear',[20] *ičke ~ inčke* 'thin', *teč ~ tïnč* 'quiet' (the forms with preserved -*n*- may be Uyghurisms). This development, which only occurs in syllable-final position, is shared with Kirghiz, but is also found in South Siberian Turkic and Western Yugur. In the case of *qonču* (< *konč*) 'bootleg' the final vowel, perhaps originally the 3rd person possessive suffix, prevented the elision of -*n*-. Unlike in most Siberian languages, the verbs *čanč- ~ čänč- ~ čanči- ~ sanji-* 'to stab' and *yanč- ~ yanči-* 'to crush' preserve the -*n*- in Lopnor.

The rare cluster -*nt* was solved in different ways. It was simplified in *an* < *ant* 'oath' and Arabic *qän* 'sugar', whereas Iranian *kenti* 'town' adds a final vowel. In Russian words the cluster is broken up, as in *ilminit* 'element', *sikinut* 'second', *simunut* 'cement'.

7. Miscellaneous non-Uyghur phonetic features

The following Lopnor forms clearly do not agree with Standard Uyghur, though they may resemble forms in Uyghur dialects. They do not necessarily have (similar-looking) parallels in Kirghiz.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	Yugur		
aŋŋila-	*aŋgïra-*	*haŋra-*	*haŋqïla-*	**aŋïla-*	to bray
čikänäk	*čïqanaq*	*jäynäk*	*ćiʰkinik*	**čikänäk/*	elbow
				*čikanak	
γurtta-	*uurtta-*	*otla-*	*ortta-*	**avurtla-*	to sip, gulp
iŋŋal	*iŋgen*	*hingan*	*unkin*	**ingän*	camel mare[21]
küygäk	*kürek*	*küräk*	---	**kürgäk*	spade
loto	---	*yota*	*yoda*	**yota*	thigh; shank
oŋortqo	*omurtqa*	*omurtqa*	*oŋïrqa*	*?*oŋurka*	backbone
suuru-	*sapïr-*	*soru-*	*sor-*	**savur-*	to winnow
tamγaq	*tamaq*	*tamaq*	---	**tamgak*	throat
tunuq	*tunuq*	*tiniq*	---	**tïnuk*	clear
türkük	*türkük*	*tüwrük*	---	**tirgük*	post, pole
~ töbrük					
toolu	*dobul ~ dool*	*tula*	---	**tolï*	hail[22]
~ tulu(q)					
uya	*uya*	*uwa*	*oya*[23]	**uya*	nest
ürügdä-	*ürgülö-*	*(m)ügdä-*	---	*?*ürüg-*	to nap, doze
~ ürgüdä-					
yïγač	*jïγač*	*yaγač*	*yiγaš*	**ïgač*	wood

20 Malov (1961) reports *sašqaq* 'fishing rod' for Dolan dialect.
21 Khotan has *hiŋgal*.
22 Most dictionaries that list *tula* mark it as dialectal and view *möldür* (from Mongolic) as the standard word. Malov (1961: 162) gives *tula* for Aqsu dialect. It is attested in older Uyghur sources *tolu ~ tolä* (Jarring 1964: 311), *toli* (Menges 1954: 127).
23 Western Yugur *oya* means 'egg'.

yulduz	*jïldïz*	*yultuz*	*yiltïs* ~ *yultïs*	**yulduz*	star[24]
ildiz	---	*yiltiz*	*yiltïs*	**yïldïz*	root
ičke	*ičke*	*inčike*	*śiki*	*?*yiŋičke*	thin
yoyγan	*ǰuur(t)qan*	*yo(r)tqan*	---	**yogurkan*	blanket[25]

8. Morphological features

The following table provides a selection of features of Lopnor inflectional morphology, showing that the choice of suffix in Lopnor may be the same as in Standard Uyghur or Kirghiz, but in several cases resembles neither. The way Lopnor combines possessive and case suffixes (without pronominal *n*) resembles the Uyghur situation. The merger of accusative and genitive is a phenomenon known from Mongolic, but it can also be found in a number of Turkic languages.[26] There is no obvious connection with Kirghiz or with Kipchak in general. In some cases, conjugation differs from both Uyghur and Kirghiz. The Lopnor suffix shapes may be internal innovations, but in some cases, as in the preservation of the aorist suffix variant -*Ur*, Lopnor is more archaic than Uyghur and Kirghiz.

Lopnor	Uyghur	Kirghiz	
-*NI*	-*niŋ (-nIŋ)*	-*NIn*	genitive
-*NI*	-*ni*	-*NI*	accusative
-*DIn*	-*Din (-DIn)*	-*DAn*	ablative
-*(I)miz* ~ -*(I)wiz*	-*(I)miz*	-*(I)bIs*	possessive 1pl
-*ImGA*	-*ImGA*	-*ImA*	poss. 1sg + dative
-*IŋŋA*	-*IŋGA*	-*IŋA*	poss. 2sg + dative
-*IGA*	-*iGA*	-*InA*	poss. 3sg + dative
-*(s)InI*	-*(s)ini*	-*(s)In*	poss. 3sg + accusative
-*day/-teg*	-*däk*	-*dAy/-dek*	like[27]
-*(A)r* ~ -*Ur*	-*(A)r*	-*(A)r*	aorist
-*A-di-män*	-*A-män*	-*A-mIn*, -*A-m*	present-future 1sg
-*A-du-lar*	-*(I)š-A-du*	-*(I)š-A-t*	present-future 3pl[28]
-*Ani* ~ -*yni (?)* ~ -*Ay*	-*(A)y*	-*(A)yIn*	imperative 1sg
-*Ali* / -*yli*	-*(A)ylI*	-*AlI(K)/-ylI(k)*	imperative 1pl

Some suffixes only differ in their treatment of vowel harmony. The potential suffix, which goes back to the verb *al-* 'to take', did not develop a front vocalic alternant in Lopnor, leading to forms such as *kiralmadim* vs. Uyghur *kirälmidim* 'I could not enter'. Conversely, the 1st person plural of the past tense -*DUk* has front vocalic

---

24 Jarring has *yulduz* ~ *yu̜ldu̜z* (160) 'star' and *yildiz* ~ *yïldïz* (157) 'root'.

25 The Uyghur form with -*r*- was recorded by Katanov (see Menges). The -*t*- is secondary.

26 This merger is found in Dagur and the Mongolic languages of Gansu and Qinghai, Turfan dialect, Fergana Uyghur, Uzbek of Afghanistan, and South West Kipchak.

27 -*däy/-dey* is also reported for Khotan dialect (Gao: 143, Malov 1961: 105) and in Keriya dialect (Malov 1961: 105).

28 The plural -*LAr* is also used with other indicative verb forms, as well as with the imperative -*sUn*. In the Uyghur verb, -*LAr* can only be used on the 2nd person imperative.

alternants, whereas Uyghur only has *-Duq*, cf. Lopnor *süzzük* 'we strained', *kör-mödük* 'we did not see' vs. unharmonic Uyghur *süzduq, körmiduq*.[29]

A discrepancy in the present-future is the retention in Lopnor of the *y* of the converb before the question particle, as in *yilγaymisiz* vs. Uyghur *yiγlamsiz* 'will you cry?' (< *ïglayu mu siz*), *barmaymisen* vs. Uyghur *barmamsen* 'aren't you going?'.

untul- 'to forget', *aγrit-* 'to hurt (intransitive!)' have the meanings of **unut-* and **agïr-*, although they contain the passive and causative suffixes, respectively.[30]

The pronouns *ol* 's/he/it/that' and *bu* 'this' have primary case forms such as dat. *aŋŋa, oŋŋo*, abl. *andin ~ annin*, dat. *muŋa, moŋŋo*, loc. *munda*, abl. *mundun*, as opposed to the innovative Uyghur forms based on the genitive: *uniŋγa, uniŋdin, buniŋγa, buniŋda, buniŋdin*.

Fu's materials suggest a predilection for disyllabic intensifying reduplication of adjectives, e.g. *köppö-kök* 'very blue', *oppo-oχšoš* 'very similar', *sappa-sarïq* 'very yellow' vs. Uyghur *köp-kök, op-oχšaš, sap-seriq*. The longer form, with parallels elsewhere in Turcia, may contain *ma* 'also'. Cf. Uyghur *sapmu-saq* 'very safe', Western Yugur *kük pe kük* 'very blue', Karachay *sappa-sarï* 'very yellow'.

The weakening of colour adjectives deviates as well: *kökšül* 'bluish', *sarγišin* 'yellowish', *qizγišmal* 'reddish' vs. Uyghur *köküš, saγuč, qizγuč*, Kirghiz *kögüš, kökčül, sarγïč, sarγïlt, sarγïmtal, qïzγïlt, qïzγïltïm*.

In derivational morphology there are numerous non-systematic differences from Uyghur, including *alwasqu* 'demon, monster' vs. Uyghur *alwasti*, Kirghiz *albarstï, artïq* vs. Uyghur *artim* 'load'; *burma* 'drill' vs. Uyghur *burγa*, Kirghiz *burγu*; *imizäk* 'nipple of feeding bottle' vs. Uyghur *emizgä*, Kirghiz *emizdik*; *kölögüč ~ kölögö* 'shade', vs. Uyghur *köläŋgä*, Kirghiz *kölökö ~ kölöŋkö*; *oynaγuč* 'toy' vs. Uyghur *oyunčuq*;[31] *künes* vs. Uyghur *küngäy* 'sunny side', Kirghiz *künös, küŋgöy*; *pišqaq* 'cheese' vs. Uyghur *pišlaq*, Kirghiz *bïštaq*; *söyünčük* 'a gift of money' vs. Uyghur *söyünčä*, Kirghiz *süyünčü ~ čüyünčü*; *süwürgüč* 'broom' vs. Uyghur *süpürgä*, Kirghiz *šïpïrγï*; *tamǰuq* 'drop' vs. Uyghur *tamčä*, Kirghiz *tamčï*; *yapuruγ* 'harrow' vs. *yopurγa* in other dialects (Uyghur *söräm*).

The deverbal nominal suffix *-GU* is popular, as in *ačqu* 'key', *basqu* 'stairs', *salγu* 'single-plank bridge over a canal', *yapqu* 'blanket', *yarγu* 'wound', as is *-mA*, as in *ešme* 'oar', *ilma* 'ear pendant', *qaqma* 'chisel (for stone)', *baqma bala* 'foster child'.

---

29 Forms like *kälduq* 'we came' do occur in Lopnor, but they should probably be interpreted as Uyghurisms.

30 Cf. also *susat-* 'to be thirsty' and *oγut-* 'to vomit' alongside the base forms *susa-* and *oγu-*. This is reminiscent of verbs denoting involuntary actions, such as **asur-* 'to sneeze' and **käkir-* 'to belch', appearing with the causative in Western Yugur and Siberian Turkic.

31 An anonymous reviewer reports that *oyniγuč* is a common Uyghur word for 'toy'. In the dictionaries I have only found it in the meaning 'early ripening melon'. On the other hand, the phonetic shape *oynaγuč* does support Uyghur origin, as the expected native Lopnor development would be **oonoγuč* or perhaps **oonooč*.

Lopnor *bala yatiš(i), balayatquč* and Uyghur *baliyatqu* 'womb' express the same idea, 'where a child lies', by means of the same stems, but with different suffixes (Kirghiz *jatïn* 'place to lie down; womb').

The verbs *zoru-* and *čoŋu-* 'to become big' are formed with the verbalizer *-I* or *-U* vs. Uyghur *zoray-*, *čoŋay-* with the suffix *-Ay*. Lopnor *yöli-* ~ *yölü-* 'to become wet' uses the same verbalizer (cf. Uyghur *höllän-*). Lopnor *azza-* 'to decrease (intr.)', formed with *-LA*, is used vs. Uyghur *azay-*. A Mongolic verbalizer appears in *qaqšï-* 'to become dry', *yarïmšï-* 'to become half as much'.

Some new derivations from old stems are discussed in the following section.

9. Lexical features

Numerous Lopnor lexemes are absent from Uyghur, and are therefore often listed as peculiarities in the literature. A large portion of them, for instance fishing and boating terminology, are of Mongolic origin, and are not pertinent to our present topic. The following selection includes apparently old words that happen to survive in Lopnor, as well as regional words shared with neighbouring dialects. The impression of specific similarity to Kirghiz is somewhat exaggerated by the following table; several of these lexemes are also attested elsewhere in Turcia.

Lopnor	Kirghiz	Uyghur	Yugur		
awušqa	*abïšqa*	---	*ošqa*	*avïčka*	old man[32]
az(i)na-	*azïna-*	---	---	---	to neigh[33]
ör-	*ör(ü)-*	---	---	*ör-*	to climb
qaraq	[*qarek*]	[*qaraq*]	*qaraq*	*karak*	eye [pupil][34]
qurtqa	---	---	*qu^h rtqa*	*kurtka*	old woman
qarïšqur	*qa(rï)šqïr*	---	---	---	wolf[35]
sayγaq	*sayγaq*	---	---	---	gadfly[36]
saysï-	---	---	---	*sarsï-*	to scold[37]
suγ elik	---	---	*sugïlig*	*suk älig*	index finger
sulu	*suluu*	---	---	?< *silig*	beautiful[38]
tüŋül-	*tüŋül-*	---	---	*tüŋül-*	to lose hope[39]

32 Khotan has *obušqa* 'old man' (Гopuri).

33 A form *azna-* 'to bellow' is reported by Jarring, and one of the anonymous reviewers stated that *azna-* 'to neigh' is a common Uyghur word. Osmanov, Гopuri and Mihray give *kišnä-* as its standard Uyghur equivalent. It is not listed by Nadžip, Schwarz and the UHL; the Large Uyghur dictionary of 2006 gives Uyghur *azna-* '(of a bull) to roar before rutting'.

34 Lopnor *qaraq* also occurs in the compounds *aq qaraq* 'white of the eye', *qara qaraq* 'iris' and *olγon qaraq* 'pupil'.

35 Possibly a taboo-related *Ersatzwort* from *kara ičkur* 'black belt' (also found in Kazak and elsewhere in Kipchak).

36 This derives from the verb *say-* 'to stab, prick' which is attested in Kirghiz but not in Lopnor.

37 Гopuri reports Turfan *sarsi-* 'to shout and shove, to mistreat, torment'.

38 Perhaps a development of *sïlïg* < *silig* 'smooth', cf. Uyghur *siliq*.

üčük	*ičik*	---	*iʰrćikʰ*	**ičük*	fur coat
yumuš	*ǰumuš*	---	---	**yumuš*	matter

Lopnor *örmügücü* 'spider' stems from **(h)ör-* 'to weave', but displays many irregular developments in the endings throughout central Turkic. It corresponds to Uyghur *ömücük*, Yugur *orïmčï*, and Kirghiz *örmökčü*.[40]

Among kinship terms, an etymologically problematic category, it is interesting that Lopnor has *ača* 'father' as in Yugur, and *ene ~ inä* 'mother', *eǰe* 'elder sister' as in Kirghiz.[41]

I will conclude here with a number of Lopnor lexemes which do not cast light on Lopnor's affinities within Turkic, but underscore its uniqueness. Some are old Turkic words, such as *altin* 'underside', *läk* 'crocodile' (DLT *nag*, originally Sanskrit *nāga* 'serpent'), *opur* 'pit, hole' (Old Turkic *oprï*), *qaaliq* 'vine trellis; storage' (Old Turkic 'attic'?), *qaŋ* 'grandfather' (Old Turkic 'father'), *yuruŋ* 'scrap' (DLT *yurun* 'id'). *suuq-* 'to hide' (*soq-* in Turfan) is an extended meaning of **suk-* 'to insert'.

Some words are apparently based on old stems, such as *bolduruq* 'leaven, yeast' from *bol-* 'to become; (of dough) to rise', *čayqaq* 'wave' from the verb **čayka-* 'to shake, stir, rinse', *qoluštuq* 'love' from **kol-* 'to ask for (a girl in marriage)',[42] *sančalaq* 'thorn' from *sanč-* 'to pierce', *sarayan* 'reed bed', possibly related to **sa:z* 'swamp', and *toqšuryuč* 'poker (for the fireplace)' from **tokï-š-ur-* 'to knock together'.

Others are etymologically unclear, such as *kirišek* 'palate', *qipal* 'temple (of the head)', *siyrim* 'spindle whorl', *soqomoq* 'pole for tying up horses', and *sög* 'stone (in fruit)'.

Yet others are morphologically transparent, but semantically specialized, such as *baylaq* 'shackles', lit. 'tie, bond', *uyčaq* 'two-year-old bovine', lit. 'small bovine', and *ipčäk* 'rein', lit. 'small cord'. Lopnor *sekirgüč*, lit. 'hopper', is used for 'grasshopper', whereas in South Siberia the same formation denotes the flea.

Creative compounds include Lopnor *yarištamal* 'bat', which seems to go back to **kariš* 'spread arms, fathom' and **ta:pan* 'sole'. Other inventions include *aaqa quuruq* 'anus', lit. 'back tail', *iyïqwaši* 'kneecap' (also Kirghiz), lit. 'spindle-whorl', *paqa taš* 'tortoise'[43] instead of Uyghur *taš paqa* (lit. 'stone toad'), *oraq waš ï* 'horse's muzzle with a bump' (also Kirghiz), lit. 'sickle-head', *qazaŋ qapi* 'snail', lit. 'pot bag', *tam tekä* '*Uroctea* spider', lit. 'wall buck', *sayq sïqmaq* 'bladder (of livestock)',

39 One reviewer provides the equivalent Uyghur form *tügül-*, which I have not found elsewhere in that meaning.

40 The more common Kirghiz *ǰörgömüš* was remodelled on the basis of the verb **yörgä-* 'to wrap'.

41 The more widely occurring *ata*, *aba/awa*, *dada* 'father' and *ana* 'mother' are also found in Lopnor. Malov records *apa* ('mother' in Uyghur) with the meaning 'form of address from a younger to an older co-wife'.

42 Note also Lopnor *qoluqtuq* 'having a suitor (said of a girl)' from the same verb, with an equivalent in Kirghiz *qoluqtu* 'bride'.

43 Thus according to Fu et al. Malov has *paqa taš* 'low stone'.

lit. 'yellow squeezing', and *qarin yayqandi(si)* 'last child', lit. 'result of a shake of the belly'.

10. Preliminary conclusions

Although the Khotan dialect was not evaluated here, we can certainly agree with Wei (1989) that Lopnor is the most divergent of the Turkic idioms grouped together under the name "Modern Uyghur". Under other circumstances, it might have been widely considered a Turkic language. However, it does not automatically follow from the materials discussed here that the deviations from Uyghur should be attributed to non-Chaghatay influences, let alone to partial Kipchak ancestry.

Lopnor phonology reveals a mixed character, apparently involving contributions from at least two Turkic languages. Most crucial phonetic developments and tendencies, such as the development of word-final *-g* and pronominal *n*, are in agreement with Uyghur. Vowel harmony, vowel contractions and consonant assimilations deviate from Standard Uyghur. Some of the non-Uyghur phonetic features in Lopnor are reminiscent of Kipchak, but they are not exclusive to Kirghiz, nor are they peculiar enough to make an external source the only possible explanation.

These superficially similar developments do not necessarily follow the same rules as in Kirghiz. Moreover, the same developments have often taken place in other parts of Turcia. For instance, the fourfold vowel harmony in low vowels can also be found in Yakut and Turkmen, and could well develop elsewhere. The delateralisation of *-l-* has developed several times independently in different parts of Turcia, e.g. in Bashkir (but not in Tatar), in Kazak (but not in Noghay), in Western Yugur and in South Siberian Turkic. The treatment of the sequence *-AgU* is one of the more convincing instances where the Lopnor forms are incompatible with Uyghur, and could indeed be of Kirghiz, or at least Kipchak, origin.

Most Lopnor nominal and verbal morphology resembles that of Uyghur. It does feature non-Uyghur forms in both derivation and inflection, but only some of these, such as the equative *-day*, specifically suggest Kipchak influence.

Although some of the Non-Uyghur elements of the Lopnor lexicon have sometimes striking parallels in Kirghiz, many such items seem to be old words that happen to be replaced by foreign lexemes in Standard Uyghur, and do not constitute evidence for a Kipchak "layer".

In view of the above, it makes sense to look beyond Lopnor's official status as a subdivision of Uyghur and study it as a separate Chaghatay variety, a non-written sister language to Uyghur and Uzbek with its own convoluted history, as Malov did 60 years ago. The fact that Lopnor, in its linguistic decline, has now become 'virtually Uyghur' is undeniable and interesting, but does not bear on the question of whether it was *originally* a kind of Uyghur.

The aim of this paper has been to contribute to the discussion of the linguistic history of Lopnor, which is far from being settled. Many Turcological questions relevant to this problem are still unresolved.

Lopnor needs to be systematically compared with varieties of Uyghur, especially neighbouring ones such as Khotan, Qomul, and Turfan, which have already shown similarities to Lopnor in lexicon and some details of phonology.

The Kipchak component of Lopnor as well as of Standard Uyghur will have to be investigated further. It is insufficiently appreciated that the development of Uyghur itself has not been straightforward, which has led to internal inconsistencies, as exemplified by the development of the similarly-structured items *buzagu* 'calf', *kïragu* 'hoarfrost', and *takagu* 'chicken' into Uyghur *mozay*, *qiro*, *toχu*. Apart from its Chaghatay core, which it shares with Uzbek, Uyghur also displays a noticeable Kipchak influence, as well as remnants from Old Uyghur.

References and further reading

Abdurehim, Esmael 2014. *The Lopnor dialect of Uyghur. A descriptive analysis*. Helsinki: Unigrafia.

Aliyeva, Minara 2013. *Lobnor ağzı* [The Lopnor dialect]. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Asanaliev, Üsönbek 1967. *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk lobnorskogo jazyka* [A concise grammar of the Lopnor language]. Frunze: AN Kirgizskoj SSR.

Clauson, Sir Gerard 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fù Màojì (ed.-in-chief) & Hašim & Mihray & Sòng Zhèngchún. 2000. *Wéiwú'ěryǔ Luóbùhuà yánjiū /Uyγur tiliniŋ lopnur täläppuzi üstidä tätqiqat* [Research on the Lopnor vernacular of Uyghur]. Peking: Zhōnghuá Mínzú Dàxué Chūbǎnshè.

Gāo Shìjié 1994. *Wéiwú'ěryǔ fāngyán yǔ fāngyán diàochá* [Uyghur dialects and dialect investigation]. Peking: Zhōnghuá Mínzú Dàxué Chūbǎnshè.

Гappariwa, Amina 1980. Lùn Xiàndài Wéiwú'ěryǔ fāngyán jí mínzú wénxué yǔyánde jīchǔ fāngyán hé biāozhǔnyīn [Discussion of the basic dialect and standard pronunciation in the modern Uyghur dialects and popular literature]. *Mínzú Yǔwén* 2, 24–30.

Гopuri, Гulam 1986. *Uyγur šiwiliri sözlügi* [Dictionary of the Uyghur dialects]. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Jarring, Gunnar 1964. *An Eastern Turki-English dialect dictionary*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Jilan, Pärhät Muhämmäd'eli 2007. *Hazirqi zaman uyγur tiliniŋ diyalekt wä šiwiliri luγiti* [Dictionary of the modern Uyghur dialects]. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Judaxin, Konstantin K. 1965. *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'* [Kirghiz-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia.

Kibirov, Šaudin V. & Cunvazo, Jusup 1961. *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'* [Uyghur-Russian dictionary]. Alma Ata: AN Kazaxskoj SSR.

Malov, Sergej E. 1956. *Lobnorskij jazyk. Teksty, perevody, slovar'* [The Lopnor language. Texts, translations, glossary]. Frunze: AN Kirgizskoj SSR.

Malov, Sergej E. 1961. *Ujgurskie narečija Sin'czjana. Teksty, perevody, slovar'* [The Uyghur dialects of Xinjiang. Texts, translations, glossary]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.

Menges, Karl Heinrich 1933. *Volkskundliche Texte aus Ost-Türkistan. Aus dem Nachlass von N. Th. Katanov* [Folklore texts from East-Turkestan. From the collection of N. Th. Katanov]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Menges, Karl Heinrich 1954. *Glossar zu den volkskundlichen Texten aus Ost-Türkistan* 2. [Glossary to the folklore texts from Eastern Turkestan 2.]. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Mihray [Mihaili] 1999. Wéiwú'ĕryŭ Luóbùhuàde tèyŏucí [Characteristic words of the Lop idiom of Modern Uyghur]. *Mínzú Yŭwén* 4, 76–78.

Nadžip, Èmir N. 1968. *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'* [Uyghur-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Sovetskaja Ènciklopedia.

Nugteren, Hans & Roos, Marti 2006. Prolegomena to the classification of Western Yugur. In: Erdal, Marcel, & Nevskaya, Irina (eds.) *Exploring the eastern frontiers of Turkic*. Wiesbaden. 99–130.

Osmanov [Osmanof, Osmanop], Mirsultan 1982. Xiàndài Wéiwú'ĕryŭ Luóbù fāngyán jiǎnjiè [Brief account on the Lop dialect of Modern Uyghur]. *Mínzú Yŭwén Yánjiū Wénjí*. Xining. 531–558.

Osmanov, Mirsultan 1983. *Hazirqi zaman uyɣur tiliniŋ lopnor diyalekti* [The Lopnor dialect of Modern Uyghur]. *Türkiy Tillar Tetqiqati* 2, 45–89. Peking.

Osmanov, Mirsultan 2004. *Hazirqi zaman uyɣur tiliniŋ xotän diyalekti* [The Khotan dialect of Modern Uyghur]. Ürümči: Xīnjiāng Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.

Osmanov, Mirsultan 2006. *Hazirqi zaman uyɣur tiliniŋ lopnor diyalekti* [The Lopnor dialect of Modern Uyghur]. Ürümči: Xīnjiāng Qīngshàonián Chūbǎnshè.

Pritsak, Omeljan 1959. Das Neuuigurische [Modern Uyghur]. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta* 1. Wiesbaden: Steiner. 525–563.

Schönig, Claus 2009. Zischen will gelernt sein [Hissing must be acquired]. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 62: 2, 131–184.

Schwarz, Henry G. 1992. *An Uyghur-English dictionary*. Bellingham: Western Washington University.

Tenišev, Èdgem R. 1990. *Ujgurskij dialektnyj slovar'* [Uyghur dialect dictionary]. Moscow: Nauka.

Wei Cuiyi 1989. An introduction to the Modern Uyghur literary language and its dialects. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 79, 235–249.

Uyɣurqə-Hənzuqə luqət/Wéi Hàn Cídiǎn [Uyghur-Chinese dictionary]. 1982. Ürümči: Xīnjiāng Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.

Uyɣurčä-Xänzučä luɣät/Wéi Hàn Cídiǎn [Uyghur-Chinese dictionary]. 2000. Ürümči: Xīnjiāng Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.

Uyɣurčä-Xänzučä luɣät/Wéi Hàn Dà Cídiǎn [(Large) Uyghur-Chinese dictionary]. 2006. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2004. Research on the Uyghur dialects in China. *Turkic Languages* 8, 7–40.

Yakup, Abdurishid 2005. *The Turfan dialect of Uyghur*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zhào Xiāngrú & Zhū Zhìníng (eds.) 1985. *Wéiwú'ĕryŭ jiǎnzhì* [Concise grammar of Uyghur]. Peking: Mínzú Chūbǎnshè.

Subordination of existence and possessive clauses in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages

Birsel Karakoç

In the present paper I investigate subordination of existence and possessive clauses in contemporary Oghuz (Southwest) and Kipchak (Northwest) Turkic languages from comparative and typological points of view. One of the typological features of Turkic languages is that existence and possessive clauses are based on the same predicates. The characteristics and crosslinguistic distribution of two predicate types used in complementation and relativization of these clauses will be analyzed; these are the non-verbal predicate {BAR} and the verbal predicate {BOL}. The following results have been found. Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as Turkmen, an East Oghuz language spoken in Central Asia, use both {BAR} and {BOL} (in their bare forms or in various extended forms). The respective clauses in these languages are accordingly characterized by a formal diversity which to a certain extent ensures that distinct semantic notions are encoded by distinct formal devices. While {BAR} is also attested in some Turkish dialects, Standard Turkish (West Oghuz) makes exclusive use of {BOL}, a verb that allows ambiguities by being able to appear in quite a number of meanings and functions. In Turkic varieties that, as a result of intensive contact with Iranian or Slavic languages, exhibit right-branching and finite subordinate clauses, {BAR} appears as a typical predicate.

Keywords: Kipchak Turkic, Turkish dialects, Turkmen, subordination, possessive clause, existence clause

Birsel Karakoç, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University, Box 635, SE-75621 Uppsala, Sweden. E-mail: birsel.karakoc@lingfil.uu.se

1. Introduction

In this contribution I investigate subordination of existence and possessive clauses in contemporary Oghuz (Southwest) and Kipchak (Northwest) Turkic languages from comparative and typological points of view. Turkic languages are characterized by their lack of a verb corresponding to 'to have' in English or its cognates, as found in many European languages.[1] Instead, in Turkic, predications indicating possession are typically marked by existential predicates, which means, that existence and possessive clauses are based on the same predicates and share essential categorial affinity. Two core types of predicates are available in these clauses: i. the non-verbal

---

1   See Stassen (2009) for a crosslinguistic typology of predicative possession; see also Aikhenvald & Dixon (eds.) (2013).

predicate {BAR} meaning 'existent', 'present', and ii. the verbal predicate {BOL} with quite a number of meanings and occurrences.[2] Examples (1–4) illustrate these two predicate types as used in non-subordinate (main) clauses; (1–2) are existence clauses, and (3–4) convey predicative possession.

(1) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Üstelde   kitap   bar.
table-LOC book   existent
'*There is* a book on the table.'
Lit.: 'on the table book *existent*'

(2) South Kipchak, Noghay
Burun-burun   zamanda   bir   ķan   bol-ɣan.
former-former   time-LOC   a   khan   BOL-PTER
'Once upon a time *there was* a Khan.' (Karakoç 2005: 64)
Lit.: 'once upon a time a Khan *was/existent*'

(3) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Ardabil
Menim bi   dene   oğlum   var,   bi   dene   ķïzïm.
I.GEN   a   piece   son-PSS1SG existent   a   piece   daughter-PSS1SG
'I *have* a son and a daughter.' (Karini 2009: 283)
Lit.: 'my, my a son, my a daughter *existent*'

(4) South Kipchak, Noghay
Ķanïŋ   üš   ķïzï   üš   kedesi   bol-ɣan.
khan-GEN   three   daughter-PSS3   three   son-PSS3   BOL-PTER
'The Khan *had* three daughters and three sons.' (Karakoç 2005: 64)
Lit.: 'Khan's, his three daughters, his three sons, *were/existent*'

In existence clauses, the noun referring to the existent entity is syntactically positioned after the noun that is marked by the locative case and denotes the location (1–2).[3] As for the possessive clauses, where the possessor takes a genitive case and the possessee agrees with the possessor in person and number, the existential predicate {BAR}, negated as {YOĶ}, performs a function comparable to that of the verbs 'to have', 'to possess' (3). The verb {BOL} 'to be(come)', negated as {BOLMA}, is capable of conveying various dynamic or static meanings in copular, existence and pos-

---

2 It is possible to find further types resulting from linguistic renewals, such as *bulun-* 'to be found' in Turkish existence clauses, e.g. *Masada bir kitap bulunuyor* [table-LOC a book be found-PRS] 'There is a book on the table'. The present paper focuses on the core types {BAR} and {BOL}.

3 The locational copular clauses, such as *Kitap üstelde* [book table-LOC] 'The book is on the table' (South Kipchak, Kazakh), where the syntactic order of the constituents, and hence the information structure, is realized differently, are not included in the present analysis.

sessive clauses (Karakoç 2005, 2007 [2002], forthcoming). In existence clauses, it can denote a dynamic ('to come about', 'to come into being') or a static ('there is/ are', 'to exist') meaning (2). Similarly, it indicates dynamic ('to acquire', 'to take possession of') or static ('to have', 'to possess') possession (4) in possessive clauses.

The morphosyntactic, semantic and discursive qualities of these predicate types in non-subordinate (main) possessive clauses have been comparatively analyzed for Oghuz and Kipchak languages in Karakoç (forthcoming). The purpose of the present paper is to explore their characteristics and distribution in subordinate (non-main) existence and possessive clauses. The analysis will focus on complement clauses (Section 2) and relative clauses (Section 3). Typological properties of these clauses in some Turkic languages that developed under intensive contact with Slavic or Iranian languages will be analyzed separately in Section (4). Adverbial clauses are excluded from the present paper, as they constitute a large and diversified domain of subordination including various formal and semantic subdomains (temporal, causal, conditional, purposive, etc.), which, I think, deserve an elaborate separate analysis.

The data analyzed was gathered from a number of literary sources, published texts including among others traditional/oral genres, internet sites, linguistic descriptions and grammars, and corpora of spoken vernaculars (published for instance in the context of master's or doctoral theses). Examples are also taken from my own collection of recordings.[4] Standard Turkish examples are rendered in the official orthography. Examples from other Turkic languages and vernaculars, which are found in various transcriptions or Cyrillic- or Latin-based orthographies, are rendered in a crosslinguistic Turcological transcription. The notations given in small caps within curly brackets, for instance {BAR}, are intended to cover possible phonological variants of the given cognates in languages under investigation. Morphological glossings of forms or structures in the running text are shown in square brackets.

2. Complementation of existence and possessive clauses

The non-verbal predicate {BAR} is attested in nonfinite complement clauses of older Turkic varieties, for instance *ahčasï var ïdukïna* [money-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT] 'that X has money' (Eckmann 1982–1983: 95) in Mamluk Kipchak from the Middle Turkic period. In contemporary Standard Turkish, the use of {BAR} is widely restricted to non-subordinate, main clauses (for its limitations—lexical/ idiomatic uses and special meanings—in embedded constructions, see 2.3.). This means, that the verbal predicate {BOL} is the main choice in Turkish subordinate clauses, where it can appear with its various dynamic and static meanings (Karakoç 2007 [2002]). In contemporary Kipchak languages, however, and in Turkmen, which

---

4 I would like to thank Raima Auyeskhan, Shynar Auelbekova, Uldanay Jumabay, Aynur Aibixi, Said-Ali Kudaynetov, Kenjegul Kalieva, and Ak Welsapar who kindly discussed some of the examples presented in this paper.

belongs to the eastern sub-branch of Oghuz Turkic, {BAR} alongside {BOL} is pro-
ductively operative in subordinate clauses. Furthermore, {BAR} is still in use, though
not frequently, in complement clauses of some Turkish dialects.

2.1. Morphosyntactic appearances of the predicates {BAR} and {BOL}

In my crosslinguistic data, following morphosyntactic patterns of {BAR} are found.
Under complementation, the bare predicate {BAR} (or the negated {YOḲ}) can be
directly followed by a possessive suffix, which refers to the subject of the comple-
ment clause,[5] and a case suffix, marking the syntactic role of the complement within
its superordinate clause, e.g. *bar-ï-n* [existent-PSS3-ACC] 'that there is', 'that X ex-
ists', 'that X has'. Further, there are extended forms of {BAR} containing: i. the non-
finite copular marker {EKEN} meaning 'that X is', e.g. *bar eken-* in Kazakh, Noghay,
Kirghiz, Kumyk, etc., or the corresponding nonfinite copular suffix *-IdIK-* 'that X is'
in Turkish dialects: *var-ïdïK-*, ii. the suffix {LIK},[6] e.g. *bar-lïK-* in Karachay-Balkar,
Tatar, Bashkir, Turkmen, *joḳ-tuK-* in Kirghiz, etc., iii. the nonfinite copular marker
eken- followed by the suffix {LIK}, e.g. *bar eken-diK-*, *žoḳ eken-diK-* in Kazakh. The
possessive and case suffixes attach to the extended forms, e.g. *bar eken-i-n* [existent
COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Noghay, *bar-lïy-ï-n* [existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Tatar, *bar
eken-dig-i-n* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Kazakh ('that there is', 'that X
exists', 'that X has').

As a verbal predicate, {BOL} behaves differently. Under complementation, in or-
der to be capable of forming a nominal base for the subsequent possessive and case
markers, {BOL} first takes a nonfinite suffix, such as *-DIK* or *-mA* in Turkish,
or *-GAn* in Kipchak Turkic languages, e.g. *ol-duK-*, *ol-ma-* in Turkish, *bul-yan-* in
Bashkir. {BOL} takes participles denoting prospectivity in different languages, e.g.
bol-ayaK- in Noghay, *bul-ačaK-* in Tatar, *ol-acaK-* in Turkish, *bol-a turyan-* or *bo-
lor-* in Kirghiz. In Kipchak and Turkmen complement clauses, {BOL} can be found
in extended forms containing: i. the nonfinite copular marker {EKEN} attached to the
participial base, e.g. *bol-yan eken-* in Noghay, and ii. the suffix {LIK} attached to the
participial base, e.g. *bol-yon-duK-* in Kirghiz. Possessive and case suffixes attach to
the simple or extended forms, e.g. *bul-yan-ï-n* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Bashkir, *ol-
duğ-un-u* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish, *bol-yan-dïy-ï-n* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC]
in Kazakh, *bol-yan eken-i-n* [BOL-NFIN COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Noghay ('that there/it

---

5   Note that in an existential complement clause, the noun referring to the existent entity is
     the syntactic subject with which the possessive suffix attached to the predicate agrees. In
     a possessional complement clause, the possessive suffix on the predicate refers to the
     possessed element.
6   Though some researchers consider this suffix to be derivational (e.g. Rentzsch 2005 in the
     context of modern Uyghur), following Johanson (2006: 60) I leave open the possibility of
     tracing it back to an older copular form.

BE',[7] 'that X EXIST', 'that X HAVE'). Furthermore, {BAR} and {BOL} can occur in combination, e.g. *bar bol-γan-ï-n* [existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Kazakh, *var ol-duğ-un-u* [existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish, *bar bol-γon-duγ-u-n* [existent BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Kirghiz.

Table (1) reviews morphosyntactic structures of {BAR} and {BOL} as presented so far. It should be pointed out that not all these structures are available to the same extent in all languages investigated. Each language has its own preferences and limitations. For instance, {BAR} has a restricted use in Standard Turkish (see 2.3), whereas it can still be found in combination *var-ïdïK-* in Turkish dialects. Thus, the table aims to summarize formal possibilities found in the entire body of cross-linguistic data.

Table 1: Structures of predications attested in existential and possessional complement clauses

		-{LIK}	+{LIK}
{BAR}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BAR}-PSS-CASE	{BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE
	+[COP.NFIN]	{BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE	{BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE
{BOL}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE	{BOL}-NFIN-LIK-PSS-CASE
	+[COP.NFIN]	{BOL}-NFIN-EKEN-PSS-CASE	-
{BAR}+{BOL}	-[COP.NFIN]	{BAR}+{BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE	{BAR}+{BOL}-NFIN-LIK-PSS-CASE

In complementation of interrogative clauses conveying existence or possession, we find two patterns: i. where {BAR} and its negated form {YOK} are combined, for instance *bar-joḳ eken-i-n* [existent nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Kirghiz, *bar-ïn-ï yoγ-un-ï* [existent-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-PSS3-ACC], *bar-dïγ-ïn-ï ya yoḳ-duγ-ïn-ï* [existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC or nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC] or *bar-yoḳ eken-lig-in-i* [existent nonexistent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC] in Turkmen ('whether there is (or not)', 'whether X exists', 'whether X has'), and ii. where the verbal predicate {BOL} and its negated form {BOLMA} are combined, the first part taking the converb suffix {IP} and the second negated part taking a nonfinite suffix, for instance *ol-up ol-ma-dïğ-ïn-ı* [BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkish or *bol-up bol-ma-dïγ-ïn-ï* [BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC] in Turkmen ('whether there/it BE (or not)', 'whether X EXIST', 'whether X HAVE').

---

7   The notation of the words 'be', 'exist' and 'have' using small caps is intended to cover the possible dynamic or static meanings of {BOL} in past or present contexts, for instance BE will present 'become(s)', 'is/are', 'became', 'was/were'. This issue will be analyzed further below in 2.5.

2.2. Complement clauses based on {BAR}

The following examples from Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as from Turkmen and Turkish dialects, illustrate the morphosyntactic structures of the predicate {BAR} (or the negated {YOK}) in complement clauses. (5–9) exemplify the structure of the bare predicate {BAR} in existence clauses (5–7) and possessive clauses (8–9), where possessive and case markers are directly attached to the bare form.

(5)   North Kipchak, Bashkir
       Ah   bïlar   donyala   Negim   kebi tebigetteŋ   ḳatï   zolomona
       INTER   they   world-LOC   N.   like nature-GEN   hard   cruelty-PSS3-DAT
       tašlanyan   balalar   ða   bar-ï-n   belheler.
       throw-PAS-PAR   child-PL   also existent-PSS3-ACC   know-CD-3PL
       'If only they knew that there are also children like Negim who are left to nature's hard cruelty.' (BA)
       Turkish: 'Ah bunlar Negim gibi tabiatın katı zulmüne bırakılan çocukların da *olduğunu* bilseler.'

(6)   South Kipchak, Karakalpak
       Bala bulardïŋ basïnda   bir   kayγïnïŋ   bar-ï-n   biledi.
       child   these-GEN head-PSS3-LOC   a   trouble-GEN   existent-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-3SG
       'The child understands that they are in trouble.'
       Lit.: '… that there is trouble on their heads …' (KA)
       Turkish: 'Çocuk, bunların başında bir dert *olduğunu* anlar.'

(7)   South Kipchak, Kazakh
       Bilmeym   oylarïnda   ne   bar-ï-n.
       know-NEG-PRS-1SG   thought-PL-PSS3-LOC   what   existent-PSS3-ACC
       'I do not know what they think.' (Muhamedowa 2016: 32)
       Lit.: '… what there is in their thoughts …'
       Turkish: 'Kafalarında/fikirlerinde ne *olduğunu* bilmiyorum.'

(8)   South Kipchak, Noghay
       … onïŋ   anasïna   usaytayan   yerleri   bar-ï-n
       … she-GEN   mother-PSS3-DAT   resemble-PAR   place-PL-PSS3   existent-PSS3-ACC
       köredi.
       see-PRS-3SG
       '… he sees that she has features resembling those of her mother.' (Kapaev 1989: 161)
       Turkish: 'Onun annesine benzeyen tarafları *olduğunu* görür.'

(9)   South Kipchak, Kazakh
       Azamat   biyznesti   damïtuw   üšün   tayï   ḳanday   usïnïs-pikirleri
       A.   business-ACC develop-INF   for   another   what   offer-opinion-PL-PSS3

bar-ï-n   suradï.
existent-PSS3-ACC   ask-PST
'Azamat asked what kind of proposals and opinions they had for business develop-
ment.' (Muhamedowa 2016: 36)
Turkish: 'Azamat, işi geliştirmek için başka ne gibi önerileri *olduğunu* sordu.'

The complement clauses in (10–21) are based on the extended form {BAR-LIK} (or
the negated {YOḲ-LIK}. (10–12) exemplify existential complement clauses, while
(13–21) contain possessive clauses.

(10) North Kipchak, Tatar
      Yigit   šul uḳ vakit, čïbïḳ bilen kükte   hikmet
      young man immediately rod   with globe-LOC magic
      bar-lïγ-ï-n   sizip ...
      existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC   recognize-CV
      'The young man immediately recognizes with a rod that there is a magic in the globe
      ...' (TA)
      Turkish: 'Genç hemen çubukla kürede bir sihir *olduğunu* anlayıp ...'

(11) East Oghuz, Turkmen
      Olar aϴï   bu dünyäde   yamanlïyïŋ,   dušmančïlïyïŋ
      they in fact this world-LOC malice-GEN   enmity-GEN
      bar-dïy-ïn-ï-da[8]   *unudupdurlar.*
      existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC-also   forget-PTER-3PL
      'They have probably forgotten that there is malice and enmity in this world.' (Welsapar
      1988: 44)[9]
      Turkish: 'Onlar asıl bu dünyada kötülüğün ve düşmanlığın *olduğunu* da unutmuşlar.'

(12) East Oghuz, Turkmen
      Öz   aralarïnda   šeyle adamïŋ   bar-lïy-ïn-a
      self   among-PSS3PL-LOC   such   person-GEN   existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT
      olar   ïnanyarlar.
      they   believe-PRS-3PL
      'They believe that there is such a man among themselves.' (Welsapar 2006: 126)
      Turkish: 'Kendi aralarında böyle bir adamın *olduğuna* onlar inanıyorlar.'

---

8   In my Turkmen data, both *bar-dïK-* (as found in this example) and *bar-lïK-* (for instance
    in (12)) are attested. The former is regarded as a written variant. Similarly, *bar eken-diK-*
    is considered the more formal variant of *bar eken-liK-* (Ak Welsapar, p.c.).
9   According to Ak Welsapar, author of the book from which this example is taken, the use
    of *bar-lïK/bar-dïK* is similar to that of *bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK-*, which means that
    they are interchangeable (compare (29)).

(13) North Kipchak, Tatar
      Bulattïŋ   aḳčasï   bar-lïy-ï-n   (yuḳ-lïy-ï-n)
      B.-GEN   money-PSS3   existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC   (nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC)
      beläm.
      know-PRS-1SG
      'I know that Bulat has (doesn't have) money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 151)
      Turkish: 'Bulat'ın parası *olduğunu* (*olmadığını*) biliyorum.'

(14) North Kipchak, Bashkir
      Ziläneŋ   aḳsahï   bar-lïy-ï-n   (yuḳ-lïy-ï-n)
      Z.-GEN   money-PSS3   existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC   (nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-ACC)
      beläm.
      know-PRS-1SG
      'I know that Zilä has (doesn't have) money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146)
      Turkish: 'Zilä'nin parası *olduğunu* (*olmadığını*) biliyorum.'

(15) North Kipchak, Bashkir
      Ziläneŋ   nisä   balahï   bar-lïy-ï-n   belmäyem.
      Z.-GEN   how many child-PSS3 existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG
      'I don't know how many children Zilä has.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 147)
      Turkish: 'Zilä'nin kaç çocuğu *olduğunu* bilmiyorum.'

(16) South Kipchak, Noghay
      ... *tek oḳïtuwšï sorasa,   oḳïwšïdïŋ   biliminiŋ*
      ... only teacher ask-CD   student-GEN   knowledge-PSS3-GEN
      bar-lïy-ï   körindi.
      existent-LIK-PSS3   appear-PST
      '... when the teacher asked, it became apparent that the student had knowledge.' (Ka-
      paev 1989: 161)
      Turkish: 'Öğretmen sorunca öğrencinin bilgili *olduğu* (bilgisinin *olduğu*) göründü.'

(17) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
      Men ḳoy   ǰayïp   čïḳḳan   törlördön   anda-sanda   alardï
      I   sheep herd-CV go out-PAR field-PL-ABL   sometimes   they-ACC
      uǯuratïp   ḳalïp,   mïltïyïmdïn   ǰoḳ-tuy-un-a   öKünüp   tim
      come across-CV PV-CV   rifle-PSS1SG-GEN   nonexistent-PSS3-DAT   regret-CV   quiet
      bolčumun.
      BOL-HAB.PST-1SG
      'I sometimes suddenly came across them on the fields where I was tending my sheep. I
      would regret not having my rifle and used to stay quiet.' (Kasapoğlu 2005: 363)
      Turkish: '/.../ Tüfeğimin *olmamasına* pişman olup sesimi çıkarmazdım.'

(18) East Oghuz, Turkmen
      İlki bilen-ä šu   kärde   on bäš yïl   stažïmïŋ
      first of all   this job-LOC   fifteen year   experience-PSS1SG-GEN

bar-dïy-ïn-ï   *yatladayïn.*
existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC   remind-OPT1SG
'First of all, let me remind you that I have fifteen years experience on the job.' (Clark
1998: 379)
Turkish: 'Öncelikle bu işte onbeş yıllık bir tecrübemin *olduğunu* size hatırlatayım.'

(19) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Bu   bir   köpi   gečip,   aδï   ġalan   halḳ.
this   a   many-PSS3 pass-CV   little-PSS3 remain-PAR people
Türkmeniŋ   gelejeginiŋ   bar-lïy-ïn-a   mende indi   ïnam   aδ.
Turkmen-GEN future-PSS3-GEN   existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT I-LOC now   trust   little
'This is a folk where many vanished and few remained. Now, my faith that the Turk-
mens have a future has lessened.' (Welsapar 2006: 113)
Turkish: 'Bu, çoğu yok olup azı kalan bir halk. Türkmenin geleceğinin *olduğuna* dair
güvenim artık az.'

(20) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Onuŋ   miraΘïnda   jedelli   yerleriniŋ   bar-lïy-ïn-ï
X-GEN   heritage-PSS3-LOC   controversial place-PL-PSS3-GEN existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC
kim   bilenok?
who   know-NEG.PTER3
'Who doesn't know that X has controversial issues in his heritage.' (Welsapar 2006:
126)
Turkish: 'Onun mirasında tartışmalı yerlerin *olduğunu* kim bilmez?'

(21) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Akjagülüŋ   iki giδïnïŋ   bar-dïy-ïn-a   geŋ ġaldïm.
A.-GEN   two daughter-PSS3-GEN   existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT   surprise-PAST-1SG
'I am surprised that Akjagül has two daughters.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün iki kızının *olduğuna* şaşırdım.'

The clauses in (22–27) illustrate the use of the productive nonfinite copular mor-
pheme *eken-* in the combination {BAR EKEN}. (22–23) exemplify existential comple-
ment clauses, while (24–27) denote possession.

(22) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
İčinde   em   ne   bar   eken-i-n   ḳaysï   bir
inner-PSS3-LOC   also   what   existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC which a
ayaldar   bilišken   joḳ.
woman-PL   know-REC-PTER   nonexistent
'Most of the women did not know what there was inside of it.' (KIA)
Turkish: 'İçinde ne *olduğunu* kadınların birçoğu bilmiyordu.'

(23) South Kipchak, Noghay
Šoradïŋ külemsirewinde bir yamanlïḳ bar   eken-i-n
Š-GEN   smile-PSS3-LOC a   malice   existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC
seze   kelgen Paša ...
feel-CV PV-PART P.
'Paša, who has recognized that there is malice in Šora's smile ...' (Džanbidaeva &
Ogurlieva 1995: 55)
Turkish: 'Šora'nın gülümsemesinde bir kötülük *olduğunu* sezen Paşa ...'

(24) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Azamat biyznesti damïtuw   üšün   tayï   ḳanday usïnïs-pikirleri
A.   business-ACC develop-INF for   another what   offer-opinion-PL-PSS3
bar   eken-i-n   suradï.
existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC ask-PST
'Azamat asked what kind of proposals and opinions they had for business develop-
ment.' (Muhamedowa 2016: 36)[10]
Turkish: 'Azamat, işi geliştirmek için başka ne gibi önerileri *olduğunu* sordu.'

(25) South Kipchak, Noghay
... em onïŋ aylaḳ üyken bibliotekasï bar   eken-i-n
... and X-GEN very   big   library-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC
esitken.
hear-PTER
'... and, he had heard that X had a very big library.' (Kazakov 1983: 21)
Turkish: 'Hem onun çok büyük bir kütüphanesi *olduğunu* işitti.'

(26) West Kipchak, Kumyk
Baliki, o giši   özünü   raxmulu yüregi   bar
maybe that person self-GEN kind   heart-PSS3 existent
eken-ge   süyünüp   yïrlaydïr...
COP.NFIN-DAT be glad-CV   sing-PRS-COP
'Maybe, this person is glad that he has a kind heart and is singing.' (KUA)
Turkish: 'Belki o kişi merhametli bir yüreğinin *olmasına* sevinip şarkı söylüyordur.'

(27) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Anïn eski kitebi bar   eken-i-n   uḳtum.
X-GEN old book-PSS3 existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST
'I heard that X has old books.'
Turkish: 'Onun eski kitapları *olduğunu* işittim.'

10 According to Muhamedowa (2006: 36), examples as given in (9) and (24) are free options
    with the same meaning.

The use of the extended predicate {BAR EKEN-LIK} is exemplified in (28–31). (28–29) contain existential complement clauses, while the complement clauses in (30–31) convey predicative possession.

(28) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
   Bul kitepķanada eski kitepterdin   bar   eken-dig-i-n   uķtum.
   this   library-LOC old book-PL-GEN existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PAST-1SG
   'I heard that there are old books at this library.'
   Turkish: 'Bu kütüphanede eski kitapların *olduğunu* duydum.'

(29) East Oghuz, Turkmen
   Olar aƟïl   bu   dünyäde   yamanlïyïŋ,   dušmančïlïyïŋ
   they in fact this world-LOC malice-GEN   enmity-GEN

   bar   eken-lig-in-i-de   unudupdurlar.
   existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC-also forget-PTER-3PL

   'They have probably forgotten that there is malice and enmity in this world.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
   Turkish: 'Onlar asıl bu dünyada kötülüğün ve düşmanlığın *olduğunu* da unutmuşlar.'

(30) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
   Tekebayev Atambayevdin   ķanča   baylïyï   bar
   T.   A.-GEN   how much property-PSS3 existent

   eken-dig-i-n   ačïķķa čïγarat.
   COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC bring to light-PRS-3

   'Tekebayev brings to light how much property Atambayev has.'
   (http://kaganat.kg/2017/01/31/tekebaev-atambaevdin-kancha-bajlygy-bar-ekendigin-achykka-chygarat/)
   Turkish: 'Tekebayev, Atambayev'in ne kadar varlığı *olduğunu* açığa çıkarıyor.'

(31) East Oghuz, Turkmen
   Akjagülüŋ iki gïðïnïŋ   bar   eken-lig-in-e
   A.-GEN   two daughter-PSS3-GEN existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT
   geŋ ġaldïm.
   surprise-PAST-1SG
   'I'm surprised that Akjagül has two daughters.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
   Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün iki kızının *olduğuna* şaşırdım.'

The complement clauses in examples (32–37), representing the Turkish dialects, are based on the contracted forms of the Oghuz counterpart *var-ïdïK-*, a combination of {BAR} with the archaic copular morpheme *-IdIK-*.

(32) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Aliefendi, Alanya
      Öküz var-ïdï:-n   *za:tän   bilmäyörüz.*
      ox   existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC   anyway   know-NEG-PRS-1PL
      'Wir wußten doch gar nicht, daß die Ochsen dort waren.' (Demir 1993: 155)
      'We didn't really know that the oxen were there.'
      Standard Turkish: 'Öküz *olduğunu* zaten bilmiyoruz.'

(33) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Babadağ, Denizli
      Ne   var   ne   yoḳ,   *čoluḳ čojuḳ?*
      what   existent what   nonexistent   child and the like
      Amjaŋ   *aŋlattï   ya   ne*   *var-dï:n-a,*   *beš*
      uncle-PSS2SG   tell-PAST well what   existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT   five
      evla:dïmïz   *va:,*   *üč*   *o:lan   iki   ġïz.*
      child-PSS1PL   existent   three   son   two daughter
      'What do you have, child and the like? Well, your uncle told you, what we have; we
      have five children, three sons and two daughters.' (Kanaç 2010: 137)
      Standard Turkish: 'Ne var ne yok, çoluk-çocuk? Amcan anlattı ya ne(yimiz) *olduğunu*,
      beş evladımız var, üç oğlan, iki kız.'

(34) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
      Domatislerde,   hormon olan   domatislerde   ilač
      tomato-PL-LOC   hormone BOL-PAR tomato-PL-LOC   chemicals
      var-ïdï: *belli   olur.*[11]
      existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3 obvious BOL-AOR
      'It will be apparent that there are chemical agents in tomatoes which have been in-
      jected.'
      Standard Turkish: 'Domateslerde, hormon olan domateslerde ilaç *olduğu* belli olur.'

(35) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
      Domatislerde   hormon   yoġ-udu:n-u   *anlarïz.*
      tomato-PL-LOC   hormone   nonexistent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC   recognize-AOR-1PL
      'We recognize that there is no hormone in tomatoes.'
      Standard Turkish: 'Domateslerde hormon *olmadığını* anlarız.'

(36) West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
      Ayša Ankara'da   halasïnïn   *var-ïdï:n-ï*   *yeni   ö:rendi.*
      A.   Ankara-LOC aunt-PSS3-GEN   existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC recently   find out-PST
      'Ayša recently found out that she has an aunt in Ankara.'
      Standard Turkish: 'Ayşe Ankara'da halası(nın) *olduğunu* yeni öğrendi.'

---

11 Examples (34–37) are taken from a recording of a conversation with Züleyha Turan, a
   speaker of the given Turkish dialect.

(37)   West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Çukurbağ, Karaman
       Aysanïn   bi   ġïzï   var-ïdï:n-ï   duydum.
       A.-GEN   a   daughter-PSS3   existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
       'I heard that Ayša has a daughter.'
       Standard Turkish: 'Ayşe'nin bir kızı *olduğunu* duydum.'

The following examples illustrate subordination of interrogative clauses expressing existence or possession in the sense of 'whether there is/are', 'whether X has'. Example (38) from Kirghiz contains a combination of {BAR} and {YOK} (*bar-jok eken-i-n*). Turkish equivalent of *bar-jok eken-i-n* would be *ol-up ol-ma-dığ-ın-ı*, a combination of the converbial *ol-up* with the negated participial *ol-ma-dığ-ın-ı*. Similarly, (39) from Turkmen and (40) from a Turkish dialect denote subordinate interrogative clauses.

(38)   East Kipchak, Kirghiz
       Anan   čïnïdayï   suunun   tübündö   ak   bürtükčölör
       then   bowl-LOC-KI water-GEN bottom-PSS3-LOC white particle-PL
       bar-jok   eken-i-n   tekšeret.
       existent-nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC   explore-PRS3
       'Then, they check whether there are white particles in the water at the bottom of the bowl.' (KIA)
       Turkish: 'Sonra kasedeki suyun dibinde beyaz parçacıkların *olup olmadığı* kontrol edilir.'

(39)   East Oghuz, Turkmen
       Akjagülüŋ   gïöïnïŋ   bar-yoķ   eken-lig-in-i[12]
       A.-GEN   daughter-PSS3-GEN   existent-nonexistent   COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC
       Θoradïm.
       ask-PAST-1SG
       'I asked whether Akjagül has a daughter or not.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
       Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün kızının *olup olmadığını* sordum.'

(40)   West Oghuz, Turkish dialect of Kulu
       Var-ïdï:n-ï   yoġ-udu:n-u   bilmiyon.
       existent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC nonexistent-COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG
       'I don't know whether there is or not.' (Adnan Küçükgöl, p.c.)
       Standard Turkish: '*Olup olmadığını* bilmiyorum.'

2.3. Restrictions of {BAR} in Standard Turkish complement clauses

The Turkish adjectival predicate *var*, a cognate of the Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen *bar*, is not capable of directly taking possessive and case markers in embedded

---

12 In this example, *bar-yoķ eken-lig-in-i* can be replaced by *bar-ïn-ï yoɣ-un-ï* or *bar-dïɣ-ïn-ï ya yoķ-duɣ-ïn-ï* with the same meaning.

clauses (compare the unacceptable uses in (41) and (42) with the uses in (6) and (8) respectively), unless it—preferably combined with *yok*—appears in lexical and/or idiomatic expressions, e.g. (43–44). Compare *varını yoğunu* in Turkish with the lexical use of *varï* in Azeri (45).

(41) West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
      *Çocuk, bunların başında bir dert var-ın-ı anlar.
      Intended: 'The child understands that they had trouble.'

(42) **Onun annesine benzeyen tarafları var-ın-ı görür.*
        Intended: 'He sees that she has features resembling those of her mother.'

(43) *var-ın-ı*   *yoğ-un-u*   *bilmek (*var-ın-ı bilmek)*
      existent-PSS3-ACC   nonexistent-PSS3-ACC   know-INF
      'to know everything (all the details) about someone or something'

(44) *var-ın-ı*   *yoğ-un-u*   *kaybetmek (*var-ın-ı kaybetmek)*
      existent-PSS3-ACC   nonexistent-PSS3-ACC   lose-INF
      'to lose one's all' (Redhouse: 1218)

(45) West Oghuz, Azeri
      Bir   kišinin,   dövleti,   var-ï,   malï,   koyunu
      a   man-GEN   prosperity-PSS3 possession-PSS3 property-PSS3 sheep-PSS3
      heddinden artïk čox   idi.
      limit-ABL   more many COP.PST
      'A man had an excessive prosperity, possession, property and sheep.' (AA)

Further, the Turkish words *varlık* and *yokluk*, formal cognates of Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen {BAR-LIK} and {YOK-LIK}, never denote a complement clause in the sense 'that there is (not)' or 'that X has (does not have)'. Compare the unacceptable examples (46) and (47) with (10) and (13) respectively. In cases in which *varlık* or *yokluk* appear as complements of superordinate clauses, it is a question of their lexical meanings (*varlık* 'existence', 'being', 'wealth', 'possessions'; *yokluk* 'absence', 'non-existence', 'lack', 'poverty') (48–49). Compare examples (48–49) which exhibit a nominal complementation ('existence', 'possession') with example (50), which illustrates a clausal complementation based on the predicate *olduk-* 'that there is'.[13] At this point, it should be noted that Kipchak and Turkmen words {BAR-LIK} and {YOK-LIK} can also exhibit comparable lexical meanings, e.g. *barlïk* 'the whole', 'abundance', 'wealth', 'existence' in Noghay. See also the use of Kirghiz *barlïk* in example (30).

---

13 See Herkenrath & Karakoç (2017) for a recent analysis of criteria for distinguishing clausal versus nominal complementation in Turkish.

(46)   West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
*Genç hemen çubukla kürede bir sihir var-lığ-ın-ı anlayıp ...'
Intended: 'The young man immediately recognizes with a rod that there is a magic in
the globe ...'

(47)   *Bulat'ın parası var-lığ-ın-ı biliyorum.
Intended: 'I know that Bulat has money.'

(48)   Bütün   varlığ-ın-ı   bağışladı.
all   possession-PSS3-ACC   donate-PST
'X donated all his/her possessions.'

(49)   Böyle bir   sorunun   varlığ-ın-ı   inkar edemeyiz.
such a   problem-GEN existence-PSS3-ACC deny-NEG.MOD.AOR-1PL
'We cannot deny the existence of such a problem.' (Karakoç 2007 [2002])

(50)   Böyle bir   sorunun   ol-duğ-un-u   inkar edemeyiz.
such a   problem-GEN BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC deny-NEG.MOD.AOR-1PL
'We cannot deny that there is such a problem.'

The combined form *var ol-* is sometimes found in existential complement clauses,
however, it displays restrictions by having a special meaning strongly implying an
absolute existence ('that it exists') (51–53) or a dynamic existence ('that it comes
into being/existence'). Hence, it does not occur in clausal complements simply
corresponding to 'that there is' or 'that X has'. This specific meaning explains the
relatively infrequent occurrence of *var ol-* in the data. It appears to be too strongly
marked to be used in neutral existence clauses. Compare examples (54–55) with
(22–25) above. The same is true for the negated form *yok ol-*, which is not found in
complements corresponding to 'that there is not' or 'that X does not have'. In em-
bedded clauses, it typically conveys a dynamic meaning ('that something/ someone
disappears, vanishes, becomes nonexistent'), see (56) (Karakoç 2007 [2002]).

(51)   West Oghuz, Standard Turkish
var   ol-duğ-u   bilinmeyen   bir şeyin   ortaya çıkarılması
existent BOL-NFIN-PSS3 know-PAS-NEG-PAR a   thing-GEN find out-PAS-INF-PSS3
'to find out something which you don't know exists at all'
(https://www.seslisozluk.net/var-olduğu-daha-önce-bilinmeyen-bir-şeyin-ortaya-
çıkarılması-nedir-ne-demek/)

(52)   Hep   orada, karşımızda   durmak,   var   ol-duk-ların-ı
always there   in front of-PSS1PL-LOC stand-INF   existent BOL- NFIN-PSS3PL-ACC
birbirlerine   duyurmak,   herkesten   ayrı   ve değişik
one another-PSS3PL-DAT announce-INF everyone-ABL distinct and different

olduklarını   ima etmek için.
BOL-NFIN-PSS3PL-ACC   imply-INF   for
'... so they might always be there, standing before us, announcing their existence, nay, their individuality and distinction.' (Pamuk 2001: 130)[14]

(53) *Sanki bu   âlemde   neden var   ol-duğ-um-u   bu*
     as if this   world-LOC why   existent BOL-PSS1SG-ACC   this
     usûllerle   resmedilirsem   daha iyi   kavrayacaktım.
     fashion-PL-INS depict-PAS-AOR-COP.CD-1SG more good understand-PROS-COP.PST-1SG
     'Had I been depicted in this fashion, it seemed, I'd better understand why I existed in this world.' (Pamuk 2001: 132)

(54) **İçinde ne var ol-duğ-un-u kadınların birçoğu bilmiyordu.*
     Intended: 'Most of the women did not know what was inside of it.'

(55) **Hem onun çok büyük bir kütüphanesi var ol-duğ-un-u işitti.*
     Intended: 'and, he had heard that X had a very big library.'

(56) *Bunun   ispatı,   kitapların,   ciltlerin   parçalanıp   yok*
     this-GEN   proof-PSS3 book-PL-GEN volume-PL-GEN torn-PAS-CV   nonexistent
     ol-ma-sı,   ama   içindeki   resimli   sayfaların,   başka
     BOL-INF-PSS3 but   inside-PSS3-LOC-KI   illustrated page-PL-GEN   other
     kitapların,   başka ciltlerin   içine   girerek   sonsuza
     book-PL-GEN   other volume-PL-GEN inside-PSS3-DAT   enter-CV eternity-DAT
     kadar yaşayıp Allah'ın   âlemini   göstermeye   devam etmesidir.
     till   live-CV Allah-GEN world-PSS3-ACC show-INF-DAT   continue-INF-PSS3-COP
     'The proof of this resides in the fact that the illustrations in manuscripts and volumes that had been torn apart and vanished have passed into other books and other volumes to survive forever in their revelation of Allah's worldly realm.' (Pamuk 2001: 85)

2.4. Complement clauses based on {BOL}

As analyzed so far, in Standard Turkish the verbal predicate {BOL} remains the exclusive choice in both types of complement clauses, existential and possessional. That means that in the Turkish equivalents of all the examples given in (5–39), the bare form {BAR} or its extended variants {BAR-LIK}, {BAR EKEN} or {BAR EKEN-LIK} are to be replaced by {BOL} (compare the respective Turkish translations of these examples). In contrast to this, Kipchak Turkic languages, as well as Turkmen, have both {BAR} and {BOL} at their disposal. Consider existence and possessive clauses based on {BOL-GAN}, {BOL-GAN-LIK} or {BOL-GAN EKEN} in (57–61). In example (62) from Karachay-Balkar, {BOL-GAN} and {BAR-LIK} immediately follow each other in similar contexts. In these languages, {BAR} and {BOL} also appear in

14 In examples taken from Pamuk (1998), I keep the English translations made by Erdağ M. Göknar (see Pamuk 2001).

combination (63). Example (64) illustrates the use of {BOL} in a subordinate inter-rogative clause. Examples (65–69) illustrate {BOL} in combination with participles denoting prospectivity.

(57) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Onïŋ   üyde   bol-γan-ï-n   (bol-γan-dïγ-ï-n)   kim   ayttï?
X-GEN house-LOC BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (or BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC) who say-PST
'Who said that X was at home?'
Turkish: 'Onun evde *olduğunu* kim söyledi?'

(58) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Murun bul kitepḳanada eski kitepterdin   bol-γon-duγ-u-n   uḳtum.
earlier this library-LOC old book-PL-GEN BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
'I heard that there used to be old books at this library.'
Turkish: 'Eskiden bu kütüphanede eski kitapların *olduğunu* duydum.'

(59) South Kipchak, Noghay
Onïŋ   balasï   bol-γan   eken-i-n   esittim.
X-GEN child-PSS3 BOL-NFIN COP.NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
'I heard that X had a child.'
Turkish: 'Onun bir çocuğu *olduğunu* duydum.'

(60) South Kipchak, Kazakh
Onïŋ   kitapxanasï   bol-γan-ï-n   (bol-γan-dïγ-ï-n)   estidim.
X-GEN library-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (or BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC) hear-PST-1SG
'I heard that X had a library.'
Turkish: 'Onun bir kütüphanesi *olduğunu* duydum.'

(61) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneŋ aḳsahï   bul-γan-ï-n   beläm.
Z.-GEN money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-1SG
'I know that Zilä had money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146)
Turkish: 'Zilä'nin parası *olduğunu* biliyorum.'

(62) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
Har bir   tašda   ne   bol-γan-ï-n   sezgendi.
each   stone-LOC what BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC recognize-PTER-COP
Ol   tašlanï   γïrjïn kibik ašaγandï.
that stone-PL-ACC bread like eat-PTER-COP
Köp   tašlada   ne   bar-lïγ-ï-n   sïnaγandï.
many stone-PL-LOC what existent-LIK-PSS3-ACC examine-PTER-COP
'He recognized what there is in each stone. He ate stones like bread and examined what there is in many stones.' (KMA)
Turkish: 'Her bir taşta ne *olduğunu* anlamış. O taşları ekmek gibi yemiş. Birçok taşta ne *olduğunu* araştırmış.'

(63) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Anïn   eski kitebi   bar   bol-ɣon-duɣ-u-n   uḳtum.
X-GEN old book-PSS3 existent BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1SG
'I heard that X had old books.'
Turkish: 'Onun eski kitapları *olduğunu* duydum.'

(64) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Aḳjagülüŋ   gïðïnïŋ   bol-up   bol-ma-dïy-ïn-ï   ϴoraðïm.
A.-GEN   daughter-PSS3-GEN BOL-CV BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC ask-PST-1SG
'I asked whether Akjagül had a daughter or not.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün kızının *olup olmadığını* sordum.'

(65) North Kipchak, Tatar
Bulattïŋ   aḳčasï   bul-ačaɣ-ï-n   (bul-ma-yačaɣ-ï-n)   beläm.
B.-GEN   money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC (BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC) know-PRS-1SG
'I know that Bulat is (not) going to have money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 151)
Turkish: 'Bulat'ın parası *olacağını* (*olmayacağını*) biliyorum.'

(66) North Kipchak, Bashkir
Ziläneŋ   aḳsahï   bul-maϴïn   äyttelär.
Z.-GEN   money-PSS3 BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-ACC tell-PST-3PL
'They said that Zilä is not going to have money.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 147)
Turkish: 'Zilä'nin parası *olmayacağını* söylediler.'

(67) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Men Aḳjagülüŋ   čaɣaϴïnïŋ   bol-jaḳ-dïy-ïn-ï   (bol-jay-ïn-ï)
I   A.-GEN   child-PSS3-GEN BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-ACC (BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC)
bildim.
know-PST-1SG
'I knew that Akjagül was going to have a child.' (Ak Welsapar, p.c.)
Turkish: 'Akcagül'ün çocuğunun *olacağını* bildim.'

(68) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
Ayšanïn   köp   aḳčasï   bol-o   tur-ɣan-ï-n   bilem.
A.-GEN   much money-PSS3 BOL-CV PV- NFIN-PSS3-ACC know-PRS-1S
'I know that Ayša is going to have much money.'
Turkish: 'Ayşe'nin çok parası *olacağını* biliyorum.'

(69) *Ayšanïn   balasï   bol-or-u-n   uḳtum.*
A.-GEN   child-PSS3 BOL-NFIN-PSS3-ACC hear-PST-1S
'I heard that Ayša is going to have a child.'
Turkish: 'Ayşe'nin çocuğu *olacağını* duydum.'

2.5. Ambiguity versus formal diversity: Attempting to explain the distribution

Needless to say, that the Turkish system allows for ambiguities since various dynamic and static contents of existence and possession (both in present and past contexts) are denoted by one and the same predicate. In contrast to this, Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen clausal complements are characterized by a formal diversity, which to a certain extent ensures that distinct semantic notions are marked by distinct formal devices. Such diversity as is found in Kazakh and Turkmen can be reviewed by following minimal pairs appearing to indicate similar overall readings, see (70–72). Note that in translations, the notation of 'have' in small caps is intended to cover possible static and dynamic meanings and subtle nuances in past or present contexts (see Footnote 7).

(70) South Kipchak, Kazakh

  a. *Siŋlimniŋ*   *bar-ïn-a*   *süyünemin.*
      sister-PSS1SG-GEN   existent-PSS3-DAT   be glad-PRS-1SG
  b. *Siŋlimniŋ bar-lïy-ïn-a süyünemin.* [existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  c. *Siŋlimniŋ bar eken-in-e süyünemin.* [existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  d. *Siŋlimniŋ bar eken-dig-in-e süyünemin.* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  e. *Siŋlimniŋ bol-yan-ïn-a süyünemin.* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  f. *Siŋlimniŋ bol-yan-dïy-ïn-a süyünemin.* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  Overall meaning: 'I am glad that I HAVE a sister.'

(71) South Kipchak, Kazakh

  a. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ*   *žoy-ïn-a*   *ökinemin.*
      rifle-PSS1SG-GEN   nonexistent-PSS3-DAT   regret-PRS-1SG
  b. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ žok-tïy-ïn-a ökinemin.* [nonexistent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  c. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ žok eken-in-e ökinemin.* [nonexistent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  d. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ žok eken-dig-in-e ökinemin.* [nonexistent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  e. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ bol-ma-yan-ïn-a ökinemin.* [BOL-NEG-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  f. *Mïltïyïmnïŋ bol-ma-yan-dïy-ïn-a ökinemin.* [BOL-NEG-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  Overall meaning: 'I regret that I do not HAVE my rifle.'

(72) East Oghuz, Turkmen

  a. *Uyamïŋ*   *bar-ïn-a*   *begenyärin.*
      sister-PSS1SG-GEN   existent-PSS3-DAT   be glad-PRS-1SG
  b. *Uyamïŋ bar-dïy-ïn-a begenyärin.* [existent-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  c. *Uyamïŋ bar eken-in-e begenyärin.* [existent COP.NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  d. *Uyamïŋ bar eken-lig-in-e begenyärin.* [existent COP.NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  e. *Uyamïŋ bol-an-ïn-a begenyärin.* [BOL-NFIN-PSS3-DAT]
  f. *Uyamïŋ bol-an-dïy-ïn-a begenyärin.* [BOL-NFIN-LIK-PSS3-DAT]
  Overall meaning: 'I am glad that I HAVE a sister.'

In what follows, I will attempt to explain the complex formal diversity characterizing Kipchak Turkic and Turkmen by considering the following kinds of oppositions.

The first opposition pertains to the essential semantic domains of the predicate types {BAR} and {BOL}. The non-verbal predicate {BAR} and its extended forms are responsible for the static meanings in 'present' contexts ('that there is' or 'that X has'), whereas {BOL}, as a verb, largely but not exclusively implies dynamic readings ('that it comes/came into being/existence' or 'that X takes/took possession of). Furthermore, the {BOL} predicate, either in its bare form or its extended forms depending on the preferences of individual languages, is involved in the expression of static existence or possession, often emphasizing a 'past' reading ('that there was' or 'that X had').[15] For instance, *bar-, bar-lïK-, bar eken-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-γan-, bol-γan eken-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Noghay (compare e.g. 8, 16, 23, 25 and 59), *bar-, bar-lïK-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bul-γan-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Bashkir and Tatar (compare e.g. 5, 14, 15 and 61) (see Ersen-Rasch 2009a and 2009b), *bar eken-(diK)-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-γon-(duK)-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Kirghiz (compare e.g. 17, 22, 27, 28, 30 and 58), *bar-, bar-lïK-/bar-lïK-, bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK-* [+STA, -PST] versus *bol-an-, bol-an-dïK-* [+DYN] or [+STA, +PST] in Turkmen (compare e.g. 11, 12, 18–21, 29, 31 and 64). The situation concerning dynamic or static 'past' readings, depending on the given context, may cause some fluctuations in the use of {BOL} in Kipchak languages and Turkmen, even if not to the same degree as in Turkish. A further static domain typically expressed by {BOL} concerns the prospective aspect. In combination with participles denoting prospectivity, {BOL} conveys static existence or possession in future ('that there will be/ is going to be' or 'that X will have/is going to have'). For instance, *bol-ayaK-* [+PROS] in Noghay, *bol-jaK-* or *bol-jak̦-dïK-* [+PROS] in Turkmen, *bul-ačaK-* [+PROS] in Tatar, *bol-a turγan-* or *bolor-* [+PROS] in Kirghiz (examples 65–69). Possible functional expansions or limitations of {BOL} in particular languages need to be considered separately.

The second opposition arises, in my view, between the bare form {BAR} and its copulative extension {BAR EKEN}, both having the values [+STA, -PST]. This opposition might be a result of diachronic renewals. More concretely, the bare form {BAR} is a prototypical and basic form often found in varieties which can be characterized as oral, spoken, informal, vulgar or traditional, whereas {BAR EKEN} can be seen as a formation prevailing in more standardized and formal genres and language uses. Such an opposition can be observed in Noghay.

Another opposition occurs between those forms not containing the suffix {LIK}, i.e. *bar-, bar eken-, bolγan-,* and those containing it, i.e. *bar-lïK-/bar-dïK, bar eken-liK-/bar eken-diK, bol-γan-dïK-*. According to my observations, North and West Kipchak languages, as well as the South Kipchak language Noghay spoken outside of Central Asia, seem to use {LIK}-based formations relatively less frequently than the Central Asian Turkic languages Kazakh, Kirghiz and Turkmen, as well as Uzbek

---

15 It should be pointed out that "present" or "past" in such nonfinite clauses of Turkic languages are to be interpreted in relation to the viewpoint markers in the given superordinate clauses, and by considering the higher structures of the underlying discourse types.

and Uyghur, which belong to the Karluk branch. As regards providing a satisfactory explanation, which should go beyond such observations, I must recognize that this paper runs into some obstacles. It turns out not to be a trivial matter to gain a deeper insight into the factors behind this variation. The bare forms, as opposed to those containing {LIK}, are often considered to belong to spoken registers and traditional genres (see e.g. Zhang 2004: 324, Ersen-Rasch 2009a: 146). In Turkmen, forms not containing {LIK} (*bar-*, *bar eken-*) are regarded as archaic and nonstandard, i.e. belonging only to some vernaculars, and thus are largely nonexistent in standard written language. The special contribution of {LIK}, be it semantic, pragmatic, genre-related, discourse type-related, variety-related, etc., as well as its dubious and disputable etymological source (see my comment in Footnote 6), is a comprehensive Turcological topic that needs to be investigated, not only in the context of our subject concerning existence and possessive clauses, but also for the entire verbal systems of the languages involved.[16] In my opinion, the {LIK}-based forms as opposed to the bare forms (yet, only in varieties where this opposition is still operative and productive) seem to appear to highlight events in given speech situations (in our context, implying a stronger relevance of existence or possession) and thus are more appropriate for certain discourse types. This *ad hoc* observation needs to be questioned in further research by carefully taking into account, among other things, the above-mentioned linguistic areas.

A further opposition can be observed either between the simple form {BOL} and the combined form {BAR BOL}, as in Turkish, or between the simple forms {BAR}, {BOL} and the combined form {BAR BOL}, as in Kipchak varieties or in Turkmen. By strongly conveying absolute existence, the Turkish combination *var ol-* appears as a marked member of an opposition (*olduK-* versus *var olduK-*). This also seems to be the case for other languages, though more data and analysis are needed for the individual languages in this respect as well.

3. Relativization of existence and possessive clauses

Regarding the use of {BAR} and {BOL} in relative clauses, I found a comparable distribution across our languages. The non-verbal predicates {BAR} and {YOK}, alongside the verbal predicate {BOL}, are widely found in Kipchak and Turkmen relative clauses. Examples (73–74) from Kazakh and Turkmen respectively illustrate existential relative clauses based on the predicate {BAR} or {YOK}. In (73), the noun marking the location of the existence clause (*žer* 'place') is the relativized final head, whereas in (74) the relativized constituent (head noun) refers to the existent entity (*Türkmen filmleri* 'Turkmen movies').

---

16 See Herkenrath & Karakoç (2017) for an analysis of the complex forms *-mIşlIK* and *-mAzlIK* in Turkish context.

(73) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Kitap bar   žerde   yïlïm   boladï.
      book existent   place-LOC   knowledge   BOL-PRS-3SG
      'Where there are books there is knowledge.'
      Turkish: 'Kitap *olan* yerde ilim olur.'

(74) East Oghuz, Turkmen
      Biðiŋ   makӨadïmïz,   iŋ   täðe   we   internet ulyamïnda
      we-GEN   intention-PSS1PL   most   new   and internet site-PSS3-LOC
      yok   Türkmen   filmlerini /.../   Өiðe   yetirmekden   ïbarat.
      nonexistent Turkmen   film-PL-PSS3   you-DAT   provide-INF-ABL   consisting
      'Our only goal is to provide you with the newest Turkmen films which are not available
      on internet sites.' (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eeVl-s1XJlE)
      Turkish: 'Bizim amacımız, en yeni ve internet sitelerinde *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) Türk-
      men filmlerini size ulaştırmaktan ibaret.'

Examples (75–77) illustrate relativization of possessive clauses. In (75), from Ka-
zakh, *žeti basï bar* 'that *has* seven heads' is an attribute to the head noun *sarï kus*
'yellow bird'. The possessee *žeti bas* 'seven heads' in the relative clause receives a
possessive suffix agreeing in person and number with the possessor *sarï kus* (head
noun). According to some native speakers, *bar* in this position may be combined
with *bolyan* (i.e. *žeti basï bar bolyan*). If the relative clause had been based on *bar
bolyan*, the clause might have had a past reading: 'that *had* seven heads'. Note that
the corresponding clause in Turkish employs the predicate *olan* or the adjective *yedi
başlı*. Use of an adjective is also possible in Kazakh: *žeti bastï sarï kus*. In (77) from
Kirghiz, the relative clause *bayar-körürü jok* is based on the negated form {YOK}.

(75) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Astïnda   žatkan   žeti   basï   bar   sarï   kus   eken.
      under-LOC   lie-PAR   seven head-PSS3 existent yellow bird   COP.EVID
      'That which lies under it is evidently a yellow bird that has seven heads.' (KXÄ: 42)
      Turkish: 'Altında yatan yedi başı *olan* (or yedi *başlı*) sarı (bir) kuş imiş.'

(76) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      mügedek balalarï   bar   äyel
      invalid   child-PL-PSS3 existent   woman
      'a woman who has invalid children' (Muhamedowa 2016: 38)
      Turkish: 'sakat çocukları *olan* (bir) kadın'

(77) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
      İlgeri zamanda   Baydad   šaarïnda   bayar-körürü
      former time-LOC   Baghdad   city-PSS3-LOC   caregiver-PSS3

ǰoḳ   bir toyoloḳ   ǰetim   ǰašaγan   eken.
nonexistent a   motherless-fatherless orphan live-PTER COP.EVID
'In former times, in Baghdad, there was a motherless-fatherless orphan who did not
have anyone to take care of him.' (KIA)
Turkish: 'Eski zamanlarda Bağdat şehrinde kendine bakan kimsesi *olmayan* anasız-ba-
basız bir yetim yaşarmış.'

(78) East Kipchak, Kirghiz
      Dayrasï bar,   toosu   bar   baška ǰaḳ
      river-PSS3   existent mountain-PSS3 existent other place
      sendey   körünböyt.
      you-EQU   see-PSS-PRS-NEG-PRS3
      'Other places with rivers and mountains do not look like you.' (KIA)
      Turkish: 'Irmağı, dağı *olan* başka yer senin gibi görünmez.'

{BAR} is frequently found in proverbs (79–84) or in general statements (85). Exam-
ples (82–84) represent headless relative clauses, such as *ayasï bar* 'the one who has
an older brother' (82), *sözi bar* 'the one who has something to say' (83), where the
genitive case marker directly attaches to {BAR}. In such proverbs, which might in-
dicate fixed and archaic usages and express general, ageless wisdom, {BAR} and
{BOL} cannot be interchangeable. Otherwise, {BAR} can be replaced by {BOL} with
a similar reading (cf. example (85) with example (73) given above).

(79) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      İt   žoḳ   žerde   šoška üredi.
      dog   nonexistent place-LOC pig   increase-PRS3
      'In a place where there is no dogs, pigs will multiply.'
      Turkish: 'İtin *olmadığı* (or it *olmayan*) yerde domuz ürer.'

(80) West Kipchak, Kumyk
      Erišiw   bar   üyde   bereket bolmas.
      contention existent house-LOC blessing BOL-NEG.AOR
      'In a house where there is contention, there is no blessing.'
      'Kavga *olan* evde bereket olmaz.' (KUA)

(81) West Kipchak, Kumyk
      Bala bar   üyde   balax   yoḳ.
      child existent house-LOC misfortune nonexistent
      'In a house where there are children, there is no misfortune.'
      'Çocuk *olan* evde bela olmaz.' (KUA)

(82) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Aγasï   bar-dïŋ   žaγasï   bar.
      older brother-PSS3 existent-GEN collar-PSS3   existent
      'The one who has an older brother has a collar (i.e. he has security).'
      Turkish: 'Ağabeyi *olanın* yakası olur.'

(83) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
      Sözi   bar-nï   küčü   bardï.
      word-PSS3   existent-GEN   strength-PSS3 existent-COP
      'The one who has a word [something to say] has strength.'
      Turkish: 'Sözü *olanın* gücü vardır.' (KMA)

(84) West Kipchak, Karachay-Balkar
      Atasï   bar-nï,   jïlï   kelse   da kesi   jaš.
      father-PSS3   existent-GEN   year-PSS3   come-CD also self-PSS3   young
      'The one who has a father is always young, even if his age has come.'
      Turkish: 'Babası *olanın* yaşı gelse de kendisi gençtir.' (KMA)

(85) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Kitap bol-γan   žerde   γïlïm   boladï.
      book   BOL-PAR   place-LOC   knowledge   BOL-PRS-3SG
      'Where there are books there is knowledge.'
      Turkish: 'Kitap *olan* yerde ilim olur.'

According to Ersen-Rasch (2009b: 143), in Tatar, a relative clause is based on {BAR} if it introduces new information (86). In other cases, as well as in past tense, {BOL} is preferred (87–88).

(86) North Kipchak, Tatar
      Akčasï   bar   bu   keše   ešlämi.
      money-PSS3   existent this   person   work-NEG.PRS3
      'This person who has money does not work.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 143)
      Turkish: 'Parası *olan* bu kişi çalışmıyor.'

(87) North Kipchak, Tatar
      Akčasï   bul-γan   Timur Berlinγa bara.
      money-PSS3   BOL-NFIN   T.   B.-DAT   go-PRS3
      'Timur, who has money, goes to Berlin.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 142)
      Turkish: 'Parası *olan* Timur Berlin'e gidiyor.'

(88) North Kipchak, Tatar
      Elegräk   aḳčasï   bul-ɣan   ḳïz xäzer inde yarlï.
      earlier   money-PSS3 BOL-NFIN   girl now   poor
      'The girl, who had money earlier, is now poor.' (Ersen-Rasch 2009b: 142)
      Turkish: 'Eskiden parası *olan* bu kız şimdi fakir.'

Further, I rarely observe the use of the negated copular marker *emes* 'not' in Kazakh
and Kirghiz relative clauses expressing 'nonexistence' (89–90). According to native
speakers, these clauses might in a similar reading be formed with the predicate
{YOḲ} (91). The coverage and distribution of this interesting usage needs to be in-
vestigated.

(89) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Žerde   de emes, kökte   de emes bir altïn saray ...
      earth-LOC also not   sky-LOC also not   a   gold   palace
      'A palace that exists neither on the earth nor in the sky ...' (KXÄ: 29)
      Turkish: 'Yerde de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) gökte de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) altın bir
      saray ...'

(90) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Ne   kökte emes ne žerde   emes, altïnnan žasalɣan saray ...
      neither sky-LOC not   nor earth-LOC not   gold-ABL build-PAR palace
      'A palace, that exists neither in the sky nor on the earth, and that was built with gold ...'
      (KXÄ: 30)
      Turkish: 'Ne gökte ne de yerde *olan* (*bulunan*) altından yapılmış bir saray ...'

(91) South Kipchak, Kazakh
      Žerde   de žoḳ   kökte   de žoḳ   bir altïn saray ...
      earth-LOC also nonexistent sky-LOC also nonexistent a   gold   palace
      'A palace that exists neither on the earth nor in the sky ...'
      Turkish: 'Yerde de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) gökte de *olmayan* (*bulunmayan*) altın bir sa-
      ray ...'

As is obvious from the Turkish translations of the Kipchak and Turkmen examples,
Turkish typically employs the verbal predicate {BOL} in relativization of existence
and possessive clauses. {BAR} is not common, unless it occurs in combination with
{BOL}. Similar to the analyzed complement clauses, however, the form *var ol-* de-
notes absolute existence ('that/which absolutely exists'); see (92–93). Consider also
the Kazakh form *bar bolɣan* in (94) and the Turkmen form *bar bolan* in (95). The
negated form *yok ol-* usually indicates a dynamic meaning 'that disappears, van-
ishes', see (96).

(92) West Oghuz, Turkish
Theophile Gautier için olduğu   gibi o   zamanki hanımlar
T.   G.   for BOL-PAR-PSS3 like that time-KI lady-PL
ve   beyler   için de tabiat var   ol-an,
and gentleman-PL for also nature existent BOL-PAR
görülen,   sevilen   bir şeydi.
see-PAS-PAR like-PAS-PAR a   thing-COP.PST
'As it was for Theophile Gautier, so was it for the ladies and gentlemen of that time,
that nature was something which was existent, was seen and enjoyed.' (Hisar 1955: 36)

(93) West Oghuz, Turkish
"Evet, kör olmak   ve var   ol-ma-yan   ülkelere
yes   blind BOL-INF and existent BOL-NEG-PAR country-PL-DAT
kaçmak" dedi   Leylek.
flee-INF say-PST stork
'"Aye", said Stork, "going blind and fleeing to nonexistent countries"' (Pamuk 2001:
489)

(94) South Kipchak, Kazakh
semyasï   bar   bol-γan jigit ...
family-PSS3 existent BOL-PAR young man
'the young man who has a family ...' (Jumabay 2016: 39)
Turkish: 'ailesi *var olan* genç ...'

(95) East Oghuz, Turkmen
Türkmen dilinde   ol Ɵöðleriŋ   oðal düypli
Turkmen language-PSS3-LOC that word-PL-GEN earlier in depth
derŋelmändigi   üçin olar haḳda häðire čenli-de
examine-PAS-NEG.PAR-PSS3 for they about now till
bar   bol-an maγlumatlar   o diyen köp däl.
existent BOL-PAR information-PL such   many not
'Since those words have not previously been examined in depth in the Turkmen langu-
age, there has not been much information about them until now.' (Azmun 2016: 12)
Turkish: 'Türkmen dilinde o sözler önceleri kapsamlı bir şekilde ele alınmadığı için
şimdiye kadar onlar üzerine *var olan* bilgiler de o kadar fazla değil.'

(96) West Oghuz, Turkish
İstanbul'un yirmi   yılda   bir yanıp   yok
Istanbul-GEN twenty year-LOC a   burn-CV nonexistent
ol-ma-yan   mahallesi   mi var   ki   kitap kalsın?
BOL-NEG-PAR quarter-PSS3 Q   existent JUNC book remain-IMP
'Is there a neighborhood in Istanbul that hasn't been burned to the ground at least once
every twenty years that we might expect such a book to survive?' (Pamuk 2001: 207)

4. Contact-induced patterns for embedding existence and possessive clauses

In Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic varieties that develop under the strong linguistic influence of Iranian or Slavic languages, we usually find contact-induced right-branching relative or complement clauses based on finite verb forms.[17] In the data for such contact languages, {BAR} is a usual predicate in embedded existence and possessive clauses. It typically appears as a finite form after a junctor, such as *ani* in Gagauz or *ki* in Iranian Azeri. Examples (97–98) from Gagauz illustrate finite and right-branching complementation of existence clauses. The clause *ani varmïš ga-gauzlarda osoy adet* 'that there was such a tradition among the Gagauz' in (97) functions as a direct object argument of the superordinate clause *Dadu annattïydï Tezaa*. Example (98) has a comparable structure. Compare the Turkish translations of these contact-induced patterns.

(97) West Oghuz, Gagauz
Dadu   annattïydï   Tezaa,   ani   var-mïš   gagauzlarda
grandfather tell-PST-COP.PST Teza-DAT   JUNC   existent-COP.EVID Gagauz-PL-LOC
osoy   adet.
such   custom
'Grandpa told Teza that there was such a custom among the Gagauz.' (GA)
Turkish: 'Dede Teza'ya Gagauzlar'da böyle bir adet *olduğunu* anlatmıştı.'

(98) West Oghuz, Gagauz
Bu   iši   Simu   kendi da   pek   islaa   annardï
this   issue-ACC   S.   self   also very   good   understand-AOR-COP.PST
ani   var   bu   dünneeda   išler   paasïz,   ani
JUNC   existent this world-LOC issue-PL invaluable JUNC
alïp   satïlmeerlar.
buy-CV   sell-PAS-NEG.AOR-3PL
'Simu could understand this very well: there are things in this world which are invalua-ble and not for sale.' (GA)
Turkish: 'Simu kendi de, bu dünyada pahasız (pahası olmayan), alıp satılamaz işler *olduğunu* çok iyi anlıyordu.'

The Gagauz examples in (99–100) show finite relativization of existence clauses introduced by the junctors *angï* or *ne*, respectively. (101–104) exemplify a comparable role of the finite predicate {BAR} in relativizing existence clauses in Iranian Azeri.

17 See Menz (1999) for Gagauz, Csató (2000) for Karaim, and Kıral (2001) for Iranian Azeri.

(99)   West Oghuz, Gagauz
te o,   ani   yip   var   aya:nda,   o   benim čojü:m.
the one   JUNC   cord   existent   foot-PSS3-LOC   that   I.GEN   son-PSS1SG
'The one who has a cord on his foot, he is my son.' (Moschkoff 1904: 61)
Turkish: 'Ayağında ip *olan*, o benim oğlum.'

(100) West Oghuz, Gagauz
Ķurķanïn   biri   šiširmišti   kendisini   sarķïtmïštï
turkey-GEN   one-PSS3   puff-PTER-COP.PST   self-PSS3-ACC   hang   down-PTER-COP.PST
pupuliġasïnï   da   hiç bir šey   görmezdi
comb-PSS3-ACC   and   nothing   see-NEG.AOR-COP.PST
ne   var   önünde.
what   existent   in front-PSS3-LOC
'A turkey puffed himself up and let his comb hang, so that he could not see what was in
front of him.' (GA)
Turkish: 'Hindinin biri şişirip kendini, ibiğini sarkıtmıştı ve önünde *olan* hiç bir şeyi
görmüyordu.'

(101) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
o   resmler   ki   var-dï ...
that   custom-PL   JUNC   existent-COP
'those customs that exist ....' (Doğan 2010: 235)
Turkish: '*Olan* (*bulunan*) adetler ...'

(102) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
Bizim   mentegede hasïllar   ki   var-dï,   almadï,
we-GEN   region-LOC   product-PL   JUNC   existent-COP   apple-COP
üzümdi,   sifïjatdï,   buġdadï,   noxuddï.
grapes-COP   melon-COP   wheat-COP   chickpea-COP
'The products which are found in our region are apples, grapes, melons, wheat and
chickpeas.' (Doğan 2010: 351)
Turkish: 'Bizim bölgemizde *olan* (*bulunan*) ürünler elma, üzüm, kavun-karpuz, buğday
ve nohuttur.'

(103) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Ardabil
O   arzular   ki   var-rar-ïdï   bularïn   mesem   ürehlerinde
that   desire-PL   JUNC   existent-PL-COP.PST   this-PL-GEN   innocent   heart-PSS3PL-LOC
'Those desires which are found (which they had) in their innocent hearts ...' (Karini
2009: 408)
Turkish: 'Bunların masum yüreklerinde *olan* arzular ...'

(104) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
o   aġ seġġel   ki   var-dï   mejlisde
that   white-bearded   JUNC   existent-COP   gathering-LOC

o:n   ġabaġïnda   ġoyalla   yere.
he-GEN in front-PSS3-LOC   put-AOR-3PL   ground-DAT
'They put it on the ground in front of the elderly man (lit. white-bearded) who is in this
gathering.' (Doğan 2010: 379)
Turkish: 'O toplantıda *olan* (*bulunan*) aksakalın (yaşlı kişinin) önüne koyarlar yere.'

Examples (105–107) illustrate the copied pattern for relativization of possessive
clauses in Gagauz and Iranian Azeri. In the Gagauz example in (105), the possessee
ḳuvedi 'his strength' (head noun) attaches to the existential predicate {BAR}, which
itself follows the junctor *ne ḳadar* 'how much'. The relative clauses from Iranian
Azeri (106–107) exhibit similar typological characteristics. Example (105) further
includes a contact-induced pattern where the agreement (possessive) suffix is at-
tached not to the possessed element (as is the usual procedure in Turkic), but to the
predicate {YOḲ} (as similarly is the case in Persian) (see Karakoç, forthcoming).
Similar finite right-branching structures based on the predicate {BAR} can also be
found in Karaim, a West Kipchak contact language.

(105) West Oghuz, Gagauz
    Baḳdï   ufaraḳ   kïvraḳ boylu   ḳïza   da   güldü
    look-PST small   long   height-DER   girl-DAT and laugh-PST
    ne   ḳadar var-dï   ḳuvedi.
    what much existent-COP.PST   strength-PSS3
    'He looked at the little, tall girl and laughed with all his strength.' (GA)
    Turkish: 'Ufak, boylu kıza bakıp bütün gücüyle (sahip *olduğu* bütün güçle) güldü.'

(106) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
    ... herkesin   tavanï   var-dï   oxur,   gèdir   yuxarïya.
     someone-GEN strength-PSS3 existent-COP study-PRS3 go-PRS3 upward-DAT
    Herkesin,   tavanï   yox-dï,   èle penjimin aldï   ya
    someone-GEN strength-PSS3 nonexistent-COP so   fifth class   complete-PST or
    doġġuzun aldï   ġeyidi   ketde   kešāverzjïlïğ èliri.
    ninth class   complete-PST return-PRS3   village-LOC   peasant-DER do-PRS3
    '… those who have strength study and make progress. Those who do not have strength
    come back to the village and work as peasants, after having completed the fifth or ninth
    class.' (Doğan 2010: 400)
    Turkish: 'Gücü *olan* okuyor, ilerliyor, gücü *olmayan* beşinci ya da dokuzuncu sınıfı bi-
    tirdikten sonra köye dönüp çiftçilik yapıyor.

(107) West Oghuz, Iranian Azeri of Urmia
    bir miġda:rïn   daġïdar   na:tavannara, olarïn   ki
    one part-PSS3-ACC portion-PRS3 weak-PL-DAT   they-GEN   JUNC
    yox-larï-dï.   Olarïn   ki   var-rarï-dï,
    nonexistent-PSS3PL-COP   they-GEN   JUNC existent-PSS3PL-COP

here pul   ġoyallar,   bi   dene   ġurbannïǧ   alallar.
all   money put-PRS-3PL a   piece animal for sacrifice buy-PRS-3PL
'They portion out a certain part to the poor, to those who do not have (anything). Those
who have (property), they all contribute money to buy an animal destined for sacrifice.'
(Doğan 2010: 383)
Turkish: 'Bir kısmını gücü *olmayanlara* (fakirlere) dağıtırlar. İmkanı (malı) *olanlar*,
hepsi para koyup bir tane kurbanlık alırlar.

5. Recapitulation of the results

Table (2) gives a schematic overview of the morphosyntactic structures I have found
in complement clauses of the investigated languages.[18]

Table 2: Structures of nonfinite clausal complements conveying existence or possession

	Type of clausal complementation	Morphosyntactic structure
1	Existence clause based on {BAR}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
2	Existence clause based on {BARLIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BARLIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
3	Existence clause based on {BAR EKEN}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR EKEN}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-EKEN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
4	Existence clause based on {BAR EKENLIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR EKENLIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-EKEN-LIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
5	Existence clause based on {BAR IDIK}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BAR IDIK}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BAR}-IDIK-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
6	Existence clause based on {BOL}	[N-LOC + N-NOM + {BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix
	Possessive clause based on {BOL}	[N-GEN + N-PSS-(GEN) + {BOL}-NFIN-PSS-CASE] + Matrix

Morphosyntactic structures found in nonfinite relative clauses are summarized in
Table (3).

---

18 Extended structures of {BOL}, such as *bol-ɣan-dïḳ-* in Kazakh and *bolɣan eken-* in
   Noghay, are not shown in this table.

Table 3: Structures of nonfinite relative clauses conveying existence or possession

	Type of clausal relativization	Morphosyntactic structure
1	Existence clause based on {BAR}	[N-NOM + {BAR}] + HN–LOC [N-LOC + {BAR}] + HN-NOM
	Possessive clause based on {BAR}	[N (possessee)-PSS + {BAR}] + HN (possessor)
2	Existence clause based on {BOL}	[N-NOM + {BOL}-PAR] + HN-LOC [N-LOC + {BOL}-PAR] + HN-NOM
	Possessive clause based on {BOL}	[N (possessee)-PSS + {BOL}-PAR] + HN (possessor)
3	Relativization of nonexistence based on {EMES}	[N-LOC + {EMES}] + HN-NOM

Table (4) illustrates the inner structures of some of the contact-induced embedded clauses.

Table 4: Contact-induced structures of embedded clauses conveying existence

Type of subordinate clause	Morphosyntactic structure
Finite complementation of existence based on {BAR}	Matrix + [JUNC + {BAR} + N-LOC + N-NOM]
Finite relativization of existence based on {BAR}	HN-NOM + [JUNC + {BAR} + N-LOC]

Concerning the distribution of these structures, the following results among others have been found:

Standard Turkish only makes use of complement structures in (6) in Table (2), and of relative clause structures in (2) in Table (3). The predicate {BAR} has extensive restrictions. This means that, being the only option, the predicate {BOL} is *per se* operative with its various static and dynamic meanings and can refer to both present and past contexts. It has been argued that this can be a potential source of ambiguities.

Some Turkish dialects still use complement structures based on the combination of {BAR} with the archaic nonfinite copular marker -*IdIK*- (structure 5 in Table 2).

In the East Oghuz language Turkmen, and in Kipchak languages, {BAR} alongside {BOL} can be attested in its different bare and extended shapes. That is, these languages display existence and possessive structures as in (1–4) in Table (2), though, especially in Turkmen, structures in (1) and (3) are often regarded as archaic, vulgar and nonstandard. Further, the relative clause structures in (1–2) in Table (3) are available in these languages. The structure in (3) in Table (3), based on the negated copular marker *emes* 'not', seldom occurs in Kazakh and Kirghiz relative clauses expressing 'nonexistence'.

In languages that have both {BAR} and {BOL} at their disposal, {BAR} typically denotes static readings referring to present contexts, whereas {BOL} is usually responsible for dynamic semantic domains. Fluctuations can however be observed in the sense that {BOL} can also convey static meanings, particularly referring to past contexts. The degree of such static usages and formal preferences (for instance *bolγandïK-* in Kazakh vs. *bolγan eken-* in Noghay) may vary across the languages. Furthermore, the domain for prospective existence and possession is mainly occupied by the verbal predicate {BOL}.

Gagauz, Iranian Azeri and Karaim, which to different degrees have undergone contact-induced language change, have developed right-branching and finite complement and relative clauses. In such constructions, {BAR} is the typical choice (see structures given in Table 4).

Table (5) is intended to present the results so far for the respective branches by comparing the functions of the nonfinite predicate types (which means that the contact-induced finite structures in Gagauz, Iranian Azeri and Karaim are not included in this table). In terms of the distribution of {BAR} and {BOL}, the Central Asian Oghuz language Turkmen shares common characteristics with the Kipchak languages.

Table 5: Predicate types used in nonfinite subordination of existence and possessive clauses

	West Oghuz	Kipchak Turkic & Turkmen (East Oghuz)
[+DYN]	{BOL}	{BOL}
[+STA]	{BOL} [-PST], [+PST], [+PROS] contexts	{BOL} mainly restricted to [+PST] or [+PROS] contexts
	{BAR} not common in West Oghuz, but available in complement clauses of some vernaculars	{BAR} productive in [-PST] contexts

Abbreviations

1	First person	LIK	Suffix in -*lIK*
2	Second person	LOC	Locative
3	Third person	MOD	Modality
ABL	Ablative	N	Noun
ACC	Accusative	NEG	Negation
AOR	Aorist	NFIN	Nonfinite suffix in a complement clause
BAR	Non-verbal predicate in {BAR}	NOM	Nominative
BOL	Verbal predicate in {BOL}	PAR	Participle

CD	Conditional	PAS	Passive
COP	Copular	PL	Plural
CV	Converb	PROS	Prospective
DAT	Dative	PRS	Present tense
DER	Derivational	PSS	Possessive
DYN	Dynamic	PST	Past tense
EQU	Equative	PTER	Postterminal
EVID	Evidential	PV	Postverb
GEN	Genitive	REC	Reciprocal
HAB	Habitual	Q	Interrogative
HD	Head noun	SG	Singular
INF	Infinitive	STA	Static
INS	Instrumental	X	he, she, it
INTER	Interjection	*	Ungrammatical structure
JUNC	Junctor		

References

AA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 1993–1997. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 1/11: *Azerbaycan Türk edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 1/11: Turkic literature from Azerbaijan]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.) 2013. *Possession and ownership. A crosslinguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Azmun, Yusup 2016. *Söz kökimiz, öz kökimiz* [The roots of our words, our own roots]. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.

BA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2004. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 29/30: *Başkurt edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 29/30: Bashkir literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Clark, Larry 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar.* (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Csató, Éva Á. 2000. Karaim. In: Stolz, Thomas (ed.) *Minor languages of Europe.* Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Demir, Nurettin 1993. *Postverbien im Türkeitürkischen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung eines südanatolischen Dorfdialekts* [Postverbs in Turkish: With special consideration of a South Anatolian village dialect]. (Turcologica 17.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Doğan, Talip 2010. Urmiye ağızları [The dialects of Urmia]. PhD thesis. Kırıkkale: Kırıkkale Üniversitesi.

Džanbidaeva, Dženetxan Kubraevna and Ogurlieva, Yelena Sidaxmetovna (eds.) 1995. *Nogaj literaturasy. 6. klass üšin* [Noghay literature. For grade 6]. Čerkessk.

Eckmann, János 1982–1983. Memlûk-Kıpçak edebiyatı [Mamluk-Kipchak literature]. In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*, 85–99.

Ersen-Rasch, Margarete 2009a. *Baschkirisch. Lehrbuch für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene* [Bashkir. A textbook for beginners and advanced learners]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Ersen-Rasch, Margarete 2009b. *Tatarisch. Lehrbuch für Anfänger und Fortgeschrittene* [Tatar. A textbook for beginners and advanced learners]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

GA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 1999. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 12: *Romanya ve Gagavuz Türk edebiyatı.* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 12:

Turkic literature from Romania and Gagauz literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Herkenrath, Annette & Karakoç, Birsel 2017. Two questionable candidates for subordinatorship: -mIşlIK and -mAzlIK in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 21, 46–78.

Hisar, Abdülhak Şinasi 1955. *Boğaziçi mehtapları* [Bosporus moonlights]. Istanbul: Hilmi kitabevi.

Johanson, Lars 2006. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London & New York: Routledge. 30–66.

Jumabay, Uldanay 2016. Kazakh relative clauses in comparison with corresponding constructions in other Turkic languages. Unpublished term paper. Uppsala University, Uppsala.

KA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2003. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 23: *Karakalpak edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 23: Karakalpak literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Kanaç, Işılay 2010. Denizli'nin Babadağ ilçesi ağzı [The dialect of Babadağ in Denizli]. Masters thesis. Denizli: Pamukkale University.

Kapaev, Isa 1989. *Sülder. Birinši kniga* [Sülder. First book]. Čerkessk.

Karakoç, Birsel 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen* [The finite verbal system in Noghay]. (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Karakoç, Birsel 2007 [2002]. Nogayca ve Türkiye Türkçesinde tümleç yan cümlelerinde yüklemleştiriciler [Predicators in Noghay and Turkish complement clauses]. In: Károly, László (ed.) *Turcology in Turkey*. (Studia uralo-altaica 47.) Szeged: Altajisztikai Tanszék. 337–359. First published in: Demir, Nurettin & Turan, Fikret (eds.) *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson. Lars Johanson Armağanı.* Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları. 193–215.

Karakoç, Birsel (forthcoming). Predicative possession in Oghuz and Kipchak Turkic languages. In: Johanson, Lars & Nevskaya, Irina & Federica Mazzitelli, Lidia (eds.) *Linguistic possession. New insights from the languages of Europe and North and Central Asia.* (Studies in Language Companion Series.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Karini, Jahangir 2009. Erdebil ili ağızları [The dialects of Ardabil]. PhD thesis. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.

Kasapoğlu Çengel, Hülya 2005. *Kırgız Türkçesi grameri* [Kirghiz grammar]. Ankara: Akçağ.

Kazakov, Valerij 1983. *Togyz kaptal. Povest'ler men xabarlar* [Nine kaftans: Tales and stories]. Čerkessk.

KIA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2005. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 31, 32: *Kırgız edebiyatı* 1–2 [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 31, 32: Kirghiz literature 1–2]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Kıral, Filiz 2001. *Das gesprochene Aserbaidschanisch von Iran* [The spoken Azeri from Iran]. (Turcologica 43.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

KMA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2002. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 22: *Karaçay-Malkar edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 22: Karachay-Balkar literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

KUA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2002. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 20: *Kumuk edebiyatı* [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 20: Kumyk literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

KXÄ = 1988. *Kazak̦ xalyk ädebijeti. Ertegiler* 1–3 [Kazakh folk literature. Fairy tales 1–3]. Almatï. Žazušy.

Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax. Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel* [Gagauz syntax. A study of contact-induced language change]. (Turcologica 41.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Moschkoff, Valentin A. 1904. *Mundarten der bessarabischen Gagausen. Gesammelt und übersetzt von V. Moschkoff* [Dialects of Bessarabian Gagauz. Text and translation by Moschkoff]. St. Petersburg.

Muhamedowa, Raihan 2016. *Kazakh: A comprehensive grammar.* London & New York: Routledge.

Pamuk, Orhan 1998. *Benim adım kırmızı* [My name is Red]. İstanbul: İletişim yayınları.

Pamuk, Orhan 2001. *My name is Red.* Translation by Erdağ, M. Göknar. London: Faber and Faber.

Redhouse = *Redhouse sözlüğü. Turkish/Ottoman-English.* Istanbul 1997.

Rentzsch, Julian 2005. *Aspekt im Neuuigurischen* [Aspect in Uyghur]. (Turcologica 65.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Stassen, Leon 2009. *Predicative possession.* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TA = Kösoğlu, Nevzat (ed.) 2001. *Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi* 17, 18, 19: *Tatar edebiyatı* 1–3 [An anthology of Turkic literature outside of Turkey 17, 18, 19: Tatar literature]. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı yayınları.

Welsapar, Ak 1988. *Gawunkelle* [The melon head]. Ashgabat: Magaryf.

Welsapar, Ak 2002. *Kepjebaş* [Cobra]. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.

Welsapar, Ak 2005. *Eğri gılıç* [The bent sword on the old carpet]. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.

Welsapar, Ak 2006. *Mülli Tahırıň hudaylığı* [Mulli Tahir]. Stockholm: Gün neşirýaty.

Zhang, Dingjing 2004. *Xiàndài hāsàkè yǔ shǐyòng yǔfǎ* ['A practical grammar of Modern Kazakh']. Beijing: Chinese Minzu University Press.

Kazakh hypocorisms
in a comparative perspective

Irina Nevskaya & Saule Tazhibayeva

The article deals first and foremost with Kazakh hypocorisms. This category is intertwined with the categories of the Diminutive and the Vocative, as well as with the category of subjective evaluation of reality, in particular in the formation of endearment and honorific terms. Diminutive markers may build hypocorisms and vocative forms (along with building new lexemes), and hypocorisms, together with endearment and honorific formations of nouns expressing interpersonal relations, may act as vocatives. Each language has its own system for expressing these categories, comprising both grammatical and lexical devices.

Hypocorisms are built in very different ways in Turkic languages, employing affixation (e.g. diminutive, endearment and honorific affixes) and other means (syncopation, ellipsis, etc.). Kazakh hypocorisms are formed with specialized affixes that are used exclusively to build endearment (affectionate) and honorific hypocorisms from reduced person noun stems, mostly not used as separate lexemes. Diminutive affixes on common nouns do not build hypocorisms. In contrast, Tuvan practically does not use any diminutive, endearment or honorific affixes to build hypocorisms, as the respective morphemes have been incorporated into Tuvan full names; instead various types of ellipsis and syncopation of full names serve this end. Most South Siberian languages (Shor, Altai, Khakas) use "general" diminutive markers, also applied to common nouns as well to express "objective" evaluation of the size of their referents. Used with person names and nouns expressing interpersonal relations, such diminutive affixes fulfill the function of subjective evaluation of reality, being expressive language means.

Keywords: hypocorisms, diminutive, vocative, endearment and honorific affixes, kinship terms, subjective evaluation, expressive language means

Irina Nevskaya, Frankfurt University, Senckenberganlage 31, 60325 Frankfurt, Germany. Tomsk University, Institute of Philology, Siberian Division of RAS, Novosibirsk. E-mail: nevskaya@em.uni-frankfurt.de
Saule Tazhibayeva, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Turcology, K. Satpayev Str. 2, Astana 010008, Kazakhstan. E-mail: tazhibaeva_szh@enu.kz

1. Introductory remarks

This article deals with Kazakh person names and nouns denoting interpersonal social relations (e.g. kinship terms) and their categories: hypocorisms, diminutives,

forms of endearment, honorifics and vocatives that are intertwined with each other in a very complex way.[1]

Diminutive formations have a complex semantic structure and participate in various semantic oppositions. They express smallness in size, which is their prototypical function. The opposite of the diminutive is the augmentative, a morphological form of a word which expresses greater magnitude, often of size but also of other attributes. Thus, the category of the diminutive is connected with the category of quantity and participates in the semantic opposition of "lesser-greater" quantity together with the category of the augmentative. The assessment of whether an entity or quality is smaller than a certain "norm" is a type of subjective evaluation of reality (Plungjan 2011: 149–150).

Diminutive formations are also used to render affect, e.g. an attitude or emotion that a speaker brings to an utterance. In particular, they can form terms of endearment (including nicknames and hypocorisms) expressing sympathy, pity, or a loving and caring attitude, especially when addressing children, but also other loved and cherished persons (e.g. family members, but not only). In certain contexts, they can express other emotions (disrespect, contempt, disgust, etc.), and may be used to humiliate the referent of the term. In these usages, they serve the end of expressing emotions and belong to the category of expressive language means. The latter embraces numerous additional linguistic elements, e.g. interjections, such as the Russian *ax* 'ah!', conveying surprise, delight, or fright, and *ox* 'oh!', conveying sadness or pain; the verbs *axat'* 'to say *ax*; to gasp', *oxat'* 'to say *ox*; to moan', derived from these interjections, etc.

Reduced forms of personal names (*hypocorisms*) practically always have expressive functions, unlike diminutive formations. Quite often, hypocorisms do not carry any diminutive morpheme, but are formed in other ways (e.g. stem syncopation). Nevertheless, they may contain a diminutive suffix. Diminutive formations from person names always have evaluative and expressive functions, unlike those from other noun classes that can only express "smallness", i.e. the prototypical semantics of all diminutives..

In terms of social deixis, hypocorisms (with or without diminutive affixes) express informal, close personal relations. In some cultures, they even may be used when addressing people with lower social standing. In this respect, they are the opposite of honorific language means. As we will show in this article, some *hypocorisms* in Kazakh express exactly the opposite semantics, acting as honorific means.

Hypocorisms are often used as vocative forms, similar to other diminutive formations from bases denoting certain classes of persons: gender and age terms, kinship terms, terms denoting various types of social interaction (e.g. teacher, friend),

---

etc. Consequently, vocatives, being a special category in Turkic languages (Juldašev 1956), also deserve our attention in this article.

In Turkic studies, diminutives have received more attention that the categories of hypocorisms and vocatives, see 2.1. Nevertheless, they remain a category that has not yet been studied sufficiently. As for research on Turkic hypocorisms, we can mention an article by Dorug-ool A. Monguš devoted to hypocorisms in Tuvan (1973, reprinted in 2009). Scattered comments on hypocorisms can be encountered in derivational morphology descriptions. It is usually stated that diminutive affixes also build diminutive forms of proper names. Concerning Turkic vocatives, we can refer to an article by A. A. Juldašev (1956) on Turkic forms of address.

Different diminutive name forms in Kazakh and other Turkic languages illustrate cultural norms and the ways of addressing each other in formal and informal situations. This article gives a general description of Kazakh hypocorisms and their functions including vocative ones in a cross-Turkic comparative perspective, with a special emphasis on a series of South Siberian Turkic languages belonging to North-East Turkic (e.g. Tuvan, Shor, Altai). Our paper will also look at further means of address used by other Turkic languages.

2. Diminutives

2.1. Turkic diminutives as an object of linguistic research

Diminutives have been a frequent topic of scientific discussion in general and typological linguistics. In particular, much research is devoted to the use of diminutives in connection with children's speech in Russian (Voeikova 1998), Hebrew (Ravid 1998), Finnish (Laalo 1998), Italian (De Marco 1998), and Lithuanian (Savickiene 1998). The formation of diminutive names in Hungarian has been the subject of special research from a phonological perspective (Weijer 1989). There are also recent descriptions of diminutives in lesser studied languages of Eurasia (e.g. see Dolozova 2007 about Itelmen diminutives).

In most Turkic languages, diminutives have not been a topic of special monographic research, a recent study of Khakas being a rare exception (Tarakanova 2011). There are a number of articles describing diminutive formations in Turkmen (Muradov 1975), Kazakh (Mamanova 1983), Shor (Esipova 1998), etc.

Diminutives are usually not mentioned in grammar books (see *Sovremennyj kazaxskij jazyk* 1962). This can be explained by their word-building status; diminutives are considered to belong to lexicon, not grammar. They are mostly described in chapters on word formation alongside other affixes building nouns from nominals. However, we will not find diminutive formations in dictionaries. Thus, they seem to be overlooked by both grammar and lexicon studies of Turkic languages.

2.2. Diminutives' functions

Grammatical and derivational functions of diminutive formations are often distinguished by some authors (e.g. Esipova 1998).

Diminutive affixes can fulfill purely derivational functions forming new words referring to different entities than their bases do: cf. Altai *tülkü-ček* [fox-DIM] 'fox cub' and '(my) dear fox' from *tülkü* 'fox' formed by the diminutive affix *-čAk*. The usage of diminutive suffixes to build names for juvenile animals is a classic example of their derivational functions. In (1), *tülküček* is a diminutive formation that does not denote fully grown foxes that are small in size, but fox cubs. In order to express the smallness of the fox cub, the adjective *kičinek* 'small' is used.

Altai
(1) *Kičinek tülküček ene-zi-niŋ ḳuyruġ-ï la kire.*
    small   fox.cub   mother- POS3-GEN tail-POS3 PTCL till
    'A small fox cub is as long as its mother's tail.'

Along with their derivational use, diminutive formations can express subjective evaluation of an entity. Esipova (1998: 90) distinguishes emotional and non-emotional subjective evaluation expressed by diminutives.[2] In case of non-emotional evaluation of entities, their size is evaluated as comparatively smaller than a certain "norm": e.g. *üy* 'house' and *üy-ček* [house-DIM] 'a small house'. It is an "objectivized", non-emotional evaluation.

In the case of emotional evaluation, a caring and loving attitude, or in certain contexts, disrespect or irony can be expressed by diminutive formations: e.g. neutral *üy* 'house' and *üy-čegeš* [house-DIM] '(my) dear small house', or 'a tiny (old) house'. In this case, the size of the house does not really matter; one can use *üy-čegeš* when speaking about a relatively big house, which probably became very old. In certain contexts, *üy-čegeš* can be used ironically, referring to a big villa as if it were a modest small house. Thus, expressive discourse does not have anything to do with the truth value of propositions expressed by it. Esipova (1998) stresses that Shor diminutives are very often used in emotional expressive speech. Because smallness of living beings is often connected with warm feelings towards them (e.g. attitude toward children), it is not always possible to distinguish these two types of subjective evaluation from each other. Diminutives can express both semantic components simultaneously: the smallness of an object and the speaker's loving attitude toward it.

---

2   Compare the position of Marcel Erdal (2004) who also distinguishes two types of evaluative semantics expressed by diminutives: pragmatic evaluation and expressive evaluation.

2.3. The status of diminutive formations

Diminutive formations are mostly treated as separate lexical entities. However, they are quite systematic formations with predictable semantic results (if we leave aside the rather limited lexicalized entities), especially those with evaluative semantics. How should we define diminutive affixes that express the category of subjective evaluation—as grammatical or as derivational ones?

Of course, this is an open question for general and Turkic linguistics. Normally, we would define something as a lexeme and not as a word form if it is stored in the lexicon as a whole and is not composed "on demand" according to certain rules. The opposite is true for grammatical forms of the same word. A lexeme preserves its lexical meaning in all its grammatical forms that are marked by grammar affixes. Derivational affixes form new words with their own paradigms.

Thus, where do evaluative diminutive formations belong—grammar or the lexicon?

In order to answer this question, we also need to take into consideration the following aspects of diminutive formations.

Firstly, diminutive affixes are present in a series of already petrified entities undoubtedly belonging to the lexicon. In this case, their derivational status is clear.

Secondly, there is a variety of diminutive suffixes in each Turkic language; their choice is mostly determined by the morphological context. Thus, in Altai (Čumakaev 2017), the diminutive suffix *-AK* is added to two-syllable stems ending in *n* and *š*: *ḳoyon-oḳ* 'a dear little hare / a leveret, a young hare' (*ḳoyon* 'hare'),[3] *čičḳan-aḳ* 'a dear little mouse / a young mouse' (*čičḳan* 'mouse'), *töŋöž-ök* 'a dear small stump' (*töŋöš* 'stump'). The suffix *-Aš* is added to two-syllable stems ending in *k*, *ḳ* and *ŋ*: *ayaġ-aš* 'a dear little cup' (*ayaḳ* 'cup'), *teertpeeg-eš* 'a dear little flatbread' (*teertpeek* 'flatbread'), *torboġ-oš* 'a dear little bull / a young bull' (*torboḳ* 'bull, ox'), *ḳayïŋ-aš* 'a dear little birch' (*ḳayïŋ* 'birch'); its variant *-š* is added to three-syllable words ending in *o*: *oboġoš* 'a dear little haystack' (*oboġo* 'haystack'). The suffix *-(I)čAk* is added to disyllabic stems ending in a vowel or to one-syllable words ending in a consonant (other than *k*, *ḳ* and *ŋ*): *tura-čaḳ* 'a dear little house' (*tura* 'house'), *taž-ičaḳ* 'a dear little stone' (*taš* 'stone').

Thirdly, diminutive affixes can be combined with each other building complex diminutive markers: Altai *suu-čaġ-aš* [river-DIM-DIM] 'dear little river' (*suu* 'river').

Fourthly, various diminutive forms of the same substantive can exist; cf. Shor *üy-ček* 'a little house', *üy-čeg-eš* 'a dear little house'.

---

3   With animal names, it is especially difficult to distinguish between the derivational and evaluative functions of diminutives. Diminutives seem to be the most frequent way to form names of young animals. In addition, juvenile animals can be denoted by special lexemes, e.g. Altai *ḳulun* 'foal, colt', and by lexicalized possessive phrases with the head word *bala* 'child', e.g. Altai *čičḳan* 'mouse'—*čičḳan-nïŋ bala-zï* [mouse-GEN child-POS3] 'a young mouse, lit.: mouse's child'.

These features of diminutive formations bring them closer to the lexicon than to grammar. It is typical that they are considered to be a part of the word building system of a language and, consequently, that diminutive formants are evaluated as word building ones (Erdal 2004). See, however for example Esipova (1998) who has an opposing point of view on the status of diminutives in Turkic languages, considering them to be representatives of a grammatical category of subjective evaluation of reality (when they serve evaluative and expressive functions).

3. Hypocorisms

Hypocorisms are built in very different ways in Turkic languages, employing affixation (e.g. diminutive, endearment and honorific affixes) and other means (syncopation, ellipsis, etc.).

3.1. Kazakh hypocorisms

Some Kazakh hypocorisms are built by syncopating their parts, which are distinct morphemes (*-bek*, *-bay*, etc.), e.g. *Žamal* from *Žamalbek*. However, they are typically formed by specialized affixes. The Kazakh language has a number of affixes that form hypocorisms, which are primarily used in direct address, but not only. More than one hypocorism can be formed from the same stem. Due to long-term close contacts with the Russian language, Russian diminutive suffixes are sometimes used in such formations.

We distinguish two classes of such formations: hypocorisms expressing affection and endearment, and those expressing respect, which are used as honorific language means.

3.1.1. Kazakh affectionate diminutive names related to children and close relatives

There are a number of patterns of forming hypocorisms that are used to address children and close relatives.

3.1.1.1. Pattern I. Hypocorisms formed by the affix *-(V)š ~ -koš*

The suffix is added to anthroponomical stems ending in a vowel. These hypocorisms express personal closeness and informality.

Official name	Hypocorism (PN stem -š)
Madịna (*f*)	*Madịna-š* 'dearest Madina' (compare *Madịn-očka,* with the Russian suffix *-očka*)
Amịna (*f*)	*Amịna-š* 'dear Amina' (compare *Amịn-očka*)

If the name ends in a consonant, the stem should be shortened to one syllable; if it ends in a consonant, a variant of the suffix -*š* with a preceding vowel is added; after a reduced stem on a vowel or a sonant, the variant -*koš* is used.

Official name	Hypocorism (shortened PN stem -*Vš* / -*koš*)
Ahmet (m)	*Ah-oš* 'dear Ahmet' (compare *Ahmet-ik*)
Aynur̦ (f)	*Ay-koš* 'dear Aynur' (compare *Aynur-očka*)
Žanar (f)	*Ža-koš* 'dear Zhanar' (compare *Žanar-očka*)

If the name consists of more than two syllables, the affix is added to a shortened form of the name consisting of the first two syllables, the last of which should be an open syllable. Distinct morphemes are normally omitted. However, some shortened stems do not form a hypocorism, probably for semantic reasons; *balta* is just 'hammer', not **Balta* '*dear Balta'; *Žuma* is 'Friday', not **Žuma* '*dear Zhuma'.

Baltabay (m)	*Balta-š* 'dear Baltabay' (compare *Baltabay-čik*)
Žumabike̦ (f)	*Žuma-š* 'dear Zhumabike'

If the second syllable is closed, the final consonant is omitted.

Žamalbek (m)	*Žama-š* 'dear Zhamalbek' (compare *Žamal'-čik*)

The hypocorism with the affix -*š* of the name *Abdraxman* (m) is *Ab-iš* 'dear Abdraxman' (compare *Abdraxman-čik*); probably because the consonant clusters are difficult to pronounce, it gets reduced to one syllable.

This suffix is also added to common nouns referring to persons. In a well-known Kazakh lullaby it is added to the stem *böpe* 'baby', see (2).

(2)	*Äldi̦ äldi̦ ak̦ böpe-m*	Hushaby my sweet baby child
	Ak̦ tösekke žat böpe-m	My baby, sleep in the safe (white) bed
	Aynalayïn böpe-š-i̦m	My dearest sweetheart baby
	Taptïm bak̦ït öziṇnen	I found happiness from you
	ᶦUk̦tay γoyšï köke-š-i̦m	Sleep my sweetheart.
	(Kazakh folk lullaby)	

Such formations express affection and love. Affectionate names with the stem containing the suffix -*š* are used by family members to express parents' strong feeling of adoration for their children, grandparents' for grandchildren or relatives' for cousins, nephews and nieces. This is how the elders express their gentle feeling of fondness towards younger ones.

Characteristic features of this pattern are as follows:

Addressee's age:	Speaker's age:
newly born till adult	much older than the addressee

3.1.1.2. Pattern II. Hypocorisms formed by the affix -*š* + the suffix -*ka*

This is a variant of the previous pattern; it combines hypocorisms formed by the Kazakh diminutive suffix -*š* with the suffix -*ka*, apparently copied from Russian. These derivatives express a high degree of personal closeness and informality.

Official name	Hypocorism
	(shortened name stem -*(V)š* / -*koš* + -*ka*)
Bota (f)→	*Bota-š-ka* '(my) dearest Bota' (c. *Botaš-eč-ka*)
Mayra (f) →	*Mayra-š-ka* '(my) dearest Mayra' (c. *Mayra-š-eč-ka*)
Arman (m)→	*Arma-š-ka* '(my) dearest Arman' (c. *Arman-čik*)
Ahmet (m)→	*Ah-oš-ka* '(my) dearest Ahmet' (c. *Ahmet-ik*)

As we see, these suffixes (also combined together) are added to already shortened personal names in order to form their especially affectionate forms.

3.1.1.3. Pattern III. Hypocorisms formed by the morpheme -*žan*

The cliticized morpheme -*žan* (from the Persian noun meaning 'soul') is a dedicated morpheme expressing the speaker's endearment and affection. The -*žǎn* marker is also used in Uzbek (e.g. *Akmal-žǎn; Xafiz-žǎn)*, Turkmen (*Orađ-žan, Göđel-žan*), and elsewhere (Žanuzakov 1971: 159).

Official Name	Hypocorism
	(PN stem-*žan*)
Aynur (f)	*Aynur-žan* 'dearest Aynur, sweetheart Aynur'
Aysulu (f)	*Aysulu-žan* 'dearest Aysulu, sweetheart Aysulu'
Serik (m)	*Serik-žan* 'dearest Serik, sweetheart Serik'
Ahmet (m)	*Ahmet-žan* 'dearest Ahmet'

In cases where the morpheme -*žan* has become part of a full name, the latter does not form a hypocorism with the same affix: *Ayžan (f), Gülžan (f), Seytžan (m), Ahmetžan (m)*, compare the hypocorism *Ahmet-žan* from the full name *Ahmet*.

Formations with -*žan* express personal closeness and informality; see (3). They are also encountered in Kazakh folklore (4) and (5), indicating that this element entered the Kazakh language a long time ago.

(3)   [*Serįk*   *Astana-ɣa*   *ket-kelį*   *žat-įr.*]
       Serik   Astana-DAT   go-INF   lie:AUX-AOR
       "*Serįk-žan,*   *žol-įŋ*   *bol-sįn*   *de-p"* *ata-sį*
       PN-DIM   way-POS2SG   be- IMP3   say-CV grandfather-POS3
       bata-sįn   *ber-d-į.*
       blessing-POS3ACC   give-PST-3
       '[Serik is going to Astana.] "Dearest Serik-dzan, let your way be (successful)
       (i.e. I wish you good luck)," his grandfather blessed him (lit.: gave his blessing).'

(4)   *Aynalayįn,*   *Šege-žan,*
       dear   PN-DIM
       söz-įŋ-e   *sonda* *sen-eyįn!*
       word-POS2SG-DAT   then   believe-IMP1SG
       'Dearest , Shege, I will then rely on your word (lit.: believe your word)!'
       (Qïz Žibek 2008: 84)

(5)   *Žįbek-žan*   *žįgįt*   *taŋda-y*   *bįl-d-į*   *eken*!
       PN-DIM   fellow   choose-CV   know-PST-3PTCL
       'It seems that dearest Žibek knew how to choose a fiancé!' (Qïz Žibek 2008: 35)

Characteristic features of formations with -*žan* are as follows:

    Addressee's age: Speaker's age:
    newly born till 12   elderly people

3.1.1.4. Pattern IV: Hypocorisms with the suffix -*tay*

The marker -*tay* is added to shortened stems consisting of the first syllable of the
name. Hypocorisms with this suffix express sympathy, as well as a loving and car-
ing attitude towards a child on the part of a grown up.

    Official Name   Hypocorism
                                   (PN stem-*tay*)
    Batįrhan (m) →   *Ba-tay* 'dearest Batyrkhan'
    Ålįmžan (m) →   *Ål-tay* 'dearest Alimzhan'
    Kŭlįmhan (f) →   *Kŭl-tay* 'dearest Kyulimkhan'
    Ḳaldïkŭl (m) →   *Ḳal-tay* 'dearest Kaldykyul'

Characteristic features of formations with -*tay* are as follows:

    Addressee's age: Speaker's age:
    from 12 till 18   elderly people

The marker *-tay* can be added to Kazakh kinship terms. The resulting formations express a feeling of tenderness while addressing beloved and cherished family members, e.g.:

Kinship terminology →	Diminutive with *-tay*
apa	*apa-tay* 'beloved granny, grandmother' (equivalent to the Russian *babulja*)
ata	*ata-tay* 'beloved grandfather' (equivalent to Russian *dedulja*)
žeŋge	*žeŋge-tay* 'beloved sister-in-law'
aɣa	*aɣa-tay* 'beloved elder brother/uncle'

Žeŋgetay is mostly used as a vocative word; see (6). It expresses close relatives' respect and affection for their sister-in-law.

(6) *Žeŋge-tay,*   *šày*   *ber-iŋiz-ši!*
     sister-in-law-DIM   tea   give-IMP2PL-PTCL
     'Beloved sister-in-law, be so kind and serve me tea!'

The possessive marker of the first person singular can be added to these formations to express special affection, personal closeness and respect, see (7)–(10).

(7) *Apa-tay-ïm,*   *awïr-ma-ŋïz-šï!*
     grandmother-DIM-POS1SG   be.ill-NEG-IMP2PL-PTCL
     'My beloved grandmother, please, don't be ill.'

(8) *Apa-tay-ïm*   *šarša-d-ï.*
     grandmother-DIM-POS1SG   get.tired-PST-3
     'My beloved grandmother has got tired.'

(9) *Žeŋge-tay-ïm*   *ak.köŋil.*
     sister-in-law-DIM-POS1SG   white.heart
     'My beloved sister-in-law is a very sincere person (lit: 'white heart').'

(10) *Aɣa-tay-ïm*   *Taraz-da.*
     grandfather-DIM-POS1SG   Taraz-LOC
     'My beloved brother is in Taraz (a city).'

3.1.1.5. Pattern V: Hypocorisms with the suffix *-KAn*

In Kazakh, hypocorisms with the marker *-KAn* are widely used to express the small size of their referents (equivalent to formations with the English suffix *-y/-ie*, e.g.: *Elizabeth → Betty*, *Lizzie*). They convey warm affectionate feelings towards the referred person. The *-KAn* markers are added to the first syllable of the name if this

syllable is closed. Its last consonant is omitted if it has a low vowel. In case the first syllable starts with *ḵ-*, the suffix is added to the second syllable:

Official name →   Hypocorism
                                         (shortened PN stem plus -*KАn*)
Šahmụhambet, Šakarịm, Šaуmerden →   *Šă-ken* '(my) dear Shaken'
Sadwaḵas, Sărsenbek, Seуfụlla →   *Să-ken* '(my) dear Saken'
Ḵožahmet, Ḵožamḵụl →   *Ḵoža-ḵan* '(my) dear Kozhakan'
Rịsgül →   *Rịs-ken* '(my) dear Rysken'

3.1.2. Hypocorisms with honorific semantics

Kazakh has special honorific hypocorisms formed from shortened stems of personal names plus a number of honorific affixes. Honorific forms of personal names convey respect, and are used when addressing or referring to a person.

3.1.2.1. Pattern I: hypocorisms with the affix -*Ake*

These are formed from shortened stems (only the first syllable of the official name) by adding the suffix -*àke/-eke*. Their function is to express friendly, informal politeness combined with the highest respect. This suffix is used with both male and female names.

Official name   Honorific hypocorism
                       (first syllable of full PN stem plus -*Ake*)
Askar (m)→   *Aseke* '(our) highly respected Askar'
Asaụ (m)   *Aseke* '(our) highly respected Asau'
Álịbek (m) →   *Áleke* '(our) highly respected Alibek'
Baуlan (m)→   *Bàke* '(our) highly respected Baglan'
Žabaуhan (m)→   *Žàke* '(our) highly respected Zhabaykhan'
Malịka (f)→   *Màke* '(our) highly respected Malika'
Saltanat (f)   *Sàke* '(our) highly respected Saltanat'
Raụšan (f)   *Ràke* '(our) highly respected Raushan'
Serуazị (m)→   *Sàke* '(our) highly respected Sergazy'
Dịnmụhammed (m)   *Dịmeke* '(our) highly respected Dinmuhammed'
Kụ̈ldụbala (f)→   *Kụ̈leke* '(our) highly respected Kyuldubala'
Gụ̈lžaxan (f)→   *Gụ̈leke* '(our) highly respected Gyulzhaxan'

When the first syllable is closed, its final consonant is omitted (except for *l*) while its vowel is replaced by the first vowel of the affix: *Baуlan > Bàke*. If the name begins with the vowel *a* and the first syllable is closed, the affix is placed after the final consonant: *Askar > As-eke*. However, if the names start with the vowel *a* followed

by the consonant *m*, the vowel is omitted.[4] Thus, names like *Amangeldï* (m), *Amïna* (f), *Amantay* (m, f), *Amangül* (f) etc. all have the same honorific hypocorism *Màke*. Names consisting of more than three syllables retain two first syllables; the rules should be applied to the second syllable: *Dïnmụhammed > Dïmeke*, (with assimilation of *n* to *m* and contraction of *mm*).

All in all, the rules for building such hypocorisms are not always straightforward and regular. Connotations and how the resulting name sounds play a certain role in this, along with the morphological context and the syllabic word structure. It is not always possible to separate the word stem from the affix.

In modern Kazakh, honorific forms of personal names are widely used in everyday life and the official press, both in oral and written communication. They can be applied to people of any social standing. In cases where the status of the addressed person is higher than that of the speaker, this form expresses respect and distinction. If the status of both participants in the communication is equal, it expresses respectful politeness. A wife can use this form when addressing her husband in the presence of other people in order to show his high status in the family and the respect with which he is treated in the family.

One can even address the President of Kazakhstan, *Nursultan Nazarbaev*, with the honorific hypocorism *Nụreke*; see (11) introducing an open letter to the President of Kazakhstan.

(11)　*"Assalaụmaɣaleykụm,　kụrmettị　Nụreke,　men　žaŋaɣï*
　　　　greeting　　　　　　respectful　PN:HYP　I　just
　　　　öz-ịŋịz　sïna-ɣan　pedinstitut-tịŋ　rektor-ï
　　　　self- POS2PL　criticize-PP　pedagogical.institute-GEN　rector-POS3
　　　　Aldamžarov-pïn",— de-d-ịm.　Nụreke-ŋ　de　kol-ịn　soz-a
　　　　PN-1SG　　　say-PST-1SG　PP:HYP-POS2SG　PTCL　hand-POS3ACC　stretch-CV
　　　　menịŋ　kol-ïm-dï　al-ïp:　"Men, Zàke,　sịz-dị
　　　　my　　hand-POS1SG-ACC　take-CV　I　　PN:HYP　you: PL-ACC
　　　　bịl-e-m　ɣoy",—de-d-ị.
　　　　know-PRS-1SG　PTCL　say-PST-3
　　　　'"Assalaumaɣaleykum, highly respected Nureke. I am Aldamžarov, the rector of the Pedagogical Institute, whom you have just criticized", I said. The highly respected Nurekeŋ greeted me stretching out his hands: "I know you, respected Zäke", he said.'

This highly productive affix is also used to form honorific hypocorisms from foreign names: *Nikolay > Nàke, Lars > Làreke, Andrey > Àleke*.

It is used as a form of address, but not only. When it is used in the absence of the person referred to, it can have ironical connotations.

4　The first two sounds of such names would give a word denoting the female sex organ; this combination of sounds is therefore not considered suitable for a respectful form of address.

In Žanuzakov's opinion, this marker goes back to the marker *-aka* (Žanuzakov 1971: 162). In western Kazakhstan, this archaic marker is still used as a honorific to express the highest respect of the referent: *Seytḵalï* → *Seyt-aka; Šamγalï* → *Šam-aka* (Žanuzakov 1971: 161).

In Uzbek, *àkà* is used as a separate lexeme expressing the highest respect only of a male person, e.g. *Kamal-àkà; Dilmurat-àkà; Zakir-àkà*. The wife addresses her husband with the component *àkà* and using the second person plural verb forms. In Kazakh, there is no gender differentiation; the marker *-Ake* can be added to male and female name stems.

Characteristic features of formations with *-Ake* are as follows:

Addressee's age:	Speaker's age:
from 35	appr. same as the addressee' (+/-5 years)
Addressee's status:	Speaker's status:
high (administrative position, standing in the family hierarchy, or other)	same or lower

The marker *-Ake* is used with kinship terms in the speech of Kazakhs from China who migrated back to their historical motherland after the 1990s (interview with Prof. Tursunkhan Zaken, 52 years old, Astana 2016), e.g.:

Aγa—aγeke 'cherished elder brother'
Apa—apeke 'cherished mother'
Àke—àkeke 'cherished father'
Ata—ateke 'cherished grandfather'
Àže—àžeke 'cherished grandmother'

In Kazakh folklore, the marker *-Ake* is widely used with both person names and kinship terms, to express friendly, informal politeness combined with the highest respect; see (12)–(15). In (14), the honorific hypocorism is combined with the possessive marker of the 1st person singular.

(12) *Šešeke,   bïr   ḵu̯anïš-tï   kör-d-ïm   de-y-dï.*
     mother.HON   one   happiness-ACC see-PST-1SG   say-PRS-3
     '"Cherished mother, I saw one happiness", he says.
     ("Qozï Körpeš Bayan Suluu" 1959: 104)

(13) *Bayan   ḵïz-dïŋ   ḵu̯yew-ï   men,   eneke.*
     PN   girl-GEN   husband-POS3 I   mother-in-law.HON
     'Respected mother-in-law, I am the husband of the girl (by name) Bayan.'
     ("Qozï Körpeš Bayan Suluu" 1959: 192)

(14) *Äkeke-m*   *til-in*   *al-ma*   *de-gen.*
      father.HON-POS1SG tongue-POS3ACC   listen-NEG   say-PF
      'My dearest father told me not to listen to him.'
      ("Qozï Körpeš Bayan Suluu" 1959: 143)

(15) *Rawšanbek-ti*   *sat-ïp al-ïp*   *Ķaždeke-m* (<*Ķaždembek*)
      PN-ACC   buy-CV take.AUX-CV   PN.HON-POS1SG
      kün   bat-ķan   soŋ   saray-ïn-a   en-e-di.
      sun   set-PP   after palace-POS3-DAT enter-PRS-3
      'My dear Qaždembek who has bought Raushanbek, enters the palace after sunset.'

3.1.2.2. Pattern II: honorific hypocorisms with the affix *-eken*

The marker *-eken is* added to person name stems shortened to their first syllables. When it is a closed syllable, its final consonant is omitted. If the syllable ends in two consonants, the last one is omitted: *Lars > Lareken.*

Hypocorisms with *-eken* are used with the names of officials in the press, on TV etc.; e.g. Nursultan Nazarbaev can be referred to as *Nureken.*

This marker usually expresses warm, sincere feelings towards elder persons, respected officials, writers, composers, singers whose creations are popular, and whom people respect and love: *Yafu →Yaf-eken* (Yafu Qayyrbekov is a famous Kazakh poet); *Ķasïmbek → Ķas-eken* (Kasymbek Bukhmetov was a respected person, who founded a number of museums about famous Kazakhstani people); *Nursultan → Nur-eken.*

It is characteristic of all Kazakh diminutive or honorific affixes encountered in Kazakh hypocorisms that they are only used to build formations from person name stems or from stems denoting participants in various interpersonal relations (kinship terms, social bonds, etc.). These formations have evaluative and expressive semantics and express endearment, affection, love and sympathy on the one hand, or respect, distinction, politeness, on the other. They are not used for building diminutives from nouns denoting non-animate entities.

3.2. Hypocorisms in South Siberian Turkic languages

In the course of the conversion of the Turkic peoples of South Siberia to Christianity, many adopted Christian names as pronounced in Russian, with some adaptation to the rules of Turkic phonetics. This happened in the Mountainous Altai, Mountainous Shoria, Khakassia and other places. Nevertheless, with Christian names, inherited affixes are mostly used (see 4.5). The Tuvan people were not converted and have preserved the original system of personal names and their hypocorisms to a greater extent (see 3.2.1.).

Some peoples that adopted Christianity kept their original names for domestic use and gave their children an official "public" name and a secret "home" name. At present, mostly native names are given to newly born children in South Siberia. All these processes need describing and studying. Here, we use some results of the

sparse research that was available to us. Still, big differences in building hypocorisms in different Turkic languages are quite obvious.

3.2.1. Hypocorisms in Tuvan

Diminutive forms of personal names (*hypocorisms*) constitute a unique anthroponomical system in each Turkic language. The peculiarities of the Kazakh system are especially visible if we compare Kazakh hypocorisms to Tuvan ones. A description of Tuvan hypocorisms was made by D. Monguš (1977, reprinted in 2009). Below, we use his observations and examples.

It is interesting that Tuvan hypocorisms are normally formed without any diminutive markers.

Tuvan personal names consisting of two stems are shortened by omitting their second part: *Anay-Xaak > Anay, Oynaar-ool > Oynaar*.

If the first part of the name used to be a nickname, is can be omitted: *Čoon-Šïva > Šïva* (*čoon* 'fat').

Personal names consisting of one stem can be shortened if they have two or more syllables. Often it is an affix which is syncopated: *Salbaḳḳay > Salbaḳ, Mïldïḳpan > Mïldïḳ, Čečekmaa > Čeček, Saarbay > Saar*, etc. Paradoxically, originally diminutive affixes that have become a part of the full name can also be omitted (see *Salbaḳḳay > Salbaḳ*).

The affixes *-ČAK ~ -ČXK, -KAy, -Ay, -l(D)Ay, -BAy, -BAA, -ČAp*, and *-ČX* are most frequently omitted. The first six affixes are originally diminutives. If there are two diminutive affixes that have become part of the full name, only the last of them is omitted: *Ḳara-š-pay > Ḳaraš, Ool-čuḳ-ḳay > Oolčuḳ, Ool-aḳ-ḳay > Oolaḳ*.

Personal names consisting of one syllable do not get shortened.

In two- and three-syllable underived words (also if we cannot divide them into morphemes synchronically), the following rules determine the production of hypocorisms.

In words with a long first vowel and an open second syllable, the last vowel is omitted (*Šooma > Šoom*); if such a word has a closed final syllable and an open penultimate one, the last two sounds are omitted (*Sodunam > Sodun*); when the penultimate syllable is closed, the last syllable is omitted completely (*Čadamba > Čadam*). The resulting hypocorisms have closed last syllables.

These rules also apply if a name has a long first vowel. There are not many Tuvan names of this structure, but many loaned Russian names with a stressed first syllable belong to this class, as the stressed vowel is borrowed as a long vowel into Tuvan; consequently, they also follow these rules in building their hypocorisms: *Miša* [miːʃa] > *Miš* [miːʃ].

Other types of two-syllable words do not get shortened. As for four-syllable personal names (quite rare), they lose their last two syllables, but the last syllable of the resulting hypocorism should be closed.

The resulting hypocorisms have evaluative and expressive functions. However one should bear in mind that we can speak of a hypocorism only when the longer form exists as a full name. Since there are many full names that have diminutive (or other) affixes as parts of their full stems, hypocorisms may be homonymous with full names. Only the contrast between a diminutive and the corresponding full name determines whether or not it is a hypocorism.

One may suppose that diminutive affixes used to be evaluative at some stage of the Tuvan historical development and lost this function when becoming parts of full names. Since diminutive affixes have become parts of official names in Tuvan, they are not used for building hypocorisms here. The only exception is the suffix -*ČXq* which may either add a loving and tender attitude, or bear ironical connotations, depending on the context, the hypocorism *Ḵoynaa-žïḵ* (from *Ḵoynaa*) may mean 'dear Koynaa' or 'despised Koynaa'. Monguš even states that the ironical connotations prevail in cases where such formations are used. However, he also states that this affix sometimes expresses a loving and caring attitude, and thinks that this trend could be fostered by contacts with the Russian language, which uses diminutives abundantly.

Thus, Tuvan has practically "lost" its use of diminutive affixes as a means of expressing the category of subjective evaluation. Hypocorisms are instead formed by syncopation of full names.

4. Vocatives

Most hypocorisms are primarily, but not exclusively, used as forms of address. However, in the traditional cultures of most Turkic peoples, certain taboos restrict the use of personal names by younger family members. Kinship terms are used instead of personal names. These receive a special morphology when used as forms of address, which often coincides with the morphemes building hypocorisms.

4.1. An overview of Turkic forms of address

In sentences containing vocative forms, the latter usually occupy the initial position. In most cases, there are no special forms of address. The vocative function is fulfilled by a specific intonation pattern, with a pause after the address word: Tatar *jï-gït, tur!* 'Stand up, young man!' However, some Turkic languages have special vocative morphology (see Juldašev 1956).

In Kumyk, the affix -*(A)w* is applied to the words denoting the addressed person, e.g. *ini* 'younger brother', *aya* 'uncle', *egeči* 'aunt', as well as to some further words: *Iniw!* 'Younger brother!'; *Ayaw!* 'Uncle!'; *Ečiw!* 'Aunt!'; compare 4.2.1.1. In Kumyk, the same affix can be applied to hypocorisms, though in that case the resulting forms can be used in more than just the vocative function: *Zakaw* (from the personal name *Zakar'ya*), *Kaliw* (< *Kalimat*), etc. This shows that it is a regular means of building vocative word forms.

The affix *-(A)y* can also be used in this function in Kumyk and in many other Turkic languages (e.g. Tatar, Bashkir, Kirgiz, Altai, Khakas, etc.). Its usage is confined to addressing people: *ana-y* 'Mother!' (Kumyk), *ata-y* 'Father!' (Kumyk, Bashkir), *inä-y/äsä-y* 'Mother!' (Bashkir), *ḳïz-ïy* 'Girl!', *tuγan-ay* 'Sibling!' (Tatar). In Tatar, the word *jïŋgä* 'wife of an older brother' has the vocative form *jïŋgi* (with the Tatar correspondence of *-i* to *-äy* with the vocative *-y*). Tatar personal names also have diminutive forms (hypocorisms) with the final *-y* added to their shortened stems: *Ibray* (< *Ibrahim*), *Kamay* (< *Kamaletdin*), etc.; see also 4.2.1.2. The Altai language has only a few formations with the suffix *-y*: *ada* 'father' > *ada-y*; *ene* 'mother' > *ene-y*. These can be considered vocative words and belong to the lexicon. With other stems, the possessive affix of the 1st person singular is used when addressing younger persons: Bashkir *ul-ïm* 'my son'.

In the discussed cases, the affixes *-(A)y* and *-(A)w* have grammatical functions that serve to form vocatives. However, there are also words that are not used without the vocative element (Juldašev 1956); Bashkir *äpsäy* 'Mother!' has only this form, and is used only as a form of address. Consequently, it is a vocative word, and the suffix *-y* here combines the purely derivational semantics with the grammatical function of address. Such words should be included in dictionaries.

In Old Turkic, there used to be a vocative case with the marker *-(A)y*. It is logical to suppose that such formations are remnants of this formerly much more widely used case form.

These are specialized morphemes pertaining to the category of the vocative. There are also other, non-specialized morphemes that have vocative functions in certain contexts: e.g. possessive affixes combined with a specific intonation of address may also serve the function of vocative markers.

In Khakas, when addressing close relatives and older family members, the affix of the second person singular is obligatory alongside the vocative intonation; e.g. when addressing one's grandfather it is necessary to say *aġa-ŋ* [grandfather-POS2SG] 'grandfather! (lit.: your.SG grandfather!)', when addressing one's uncle, to say *aja-ŋ* [uncle-POS2SG] 'uncle! (lit.: your.SG uncle!)', and when addressing one's elder sister to say *čaja-ŋ* (from *čaja* 'elder sister'). Here, the possessive affixes serve a vocative function, as the possessive semantics is not expressed here. You are addressing your own sister, not the sister of the listener; compare also the use of the second person singular possessive marker with the hypocorism *Nụreke* in (11). Also in Khakas, some formations are not used at all without the possessive suffix, and thus are vocative words: *tayïŋ*! 'Uncle (on the mother's side)!' does not exist without the possessive marker, which has become a part of the stem.

It is a regular phenomenon in Turkic languages that possessive affixes are used with kinship terms in the vocative functions. It is connected with various taboos to use personal names when addressing family members. In the Tatar language, the wife addresses her husband as *äti-sị!* [father-POS3] 'Husband! (lit.: his/her father)!'. In Turkmen, it is necessary to indicate the name of the son or the daughter while

addressing his/her father; it gets the marker of the genitive case: *Murad-ïŋ dädä-θį!* 'Husband (lit.: the father of Murad)!'.

In all Turkic languages, the possessive affix of the first person singular is used in vocative functions. However, while the above-described cases present the vocative function proper of the possessive affixes of the 2nd and 3rd person singular, the possessive suffix of the 1st person also has evaluative semantics and expresses a loving and caring attitude toward the addressed person: Uzbek *båla-m!*, Turkmen *čaġa-m!* 'My child!', Tatar *ķįz-įm!* 'My daughter!', etc. Some forms of address are impossible without the possessive affix of the 1st person singular, e.g. Bashkir *ķustįm!* 'My brother!'.

Diminutive affixes can also be applied to forms of address. Juldašev distinguishes diminutive affixes proper and affixes of affection (Russian *laskatel'nye*, lit.: 'caressing' affixes) used in forms of address. The former can be used with the function of "objective evaluation" of the size of objects. The latter are applied only to living beings and fulfill only expressive functions.

Affixes of affection, in their expressive and evaluative function, are broadly used when addressing people close to the speakers in all Turkic languages: Bashkir *äsä-käy! / inä-käy!* 'Dear mother!', Kirgiz *ana-ke!* 'Dear mother!', *opa-žon! / oyi-žon! / aba-žon!* 'Dear mother!', etc. They are also added to personal names (in their full or syncopated form) to build hypocorisms: Azeri *Äkbärǰan, Färidäǰan*, Turkmen *Orað-žan, Gaðelžan*, Uzbek *Akmalžån, Xafizžån*, Tatar *Fazlįķay*, etc.

Addressing a child, one can use both affixes of affection and possessive affixes of the 1st person singular: Uzbek *båla-žån-im*, Tatar *bala-ķay-įm / bäbį-käy-įm* 'my dear child'; Uzbek *uɣli-ginà-m*, Tatar *uļį-ķay-įm* 'my dear son', etc.

Diminutive affixes proper, when addressing living beings, serve only expressive functions of subjective evaluation. They can be used alone or in combination with possessive affixes of the 1st person: Khakas *xïz-iǰax, xïz-ïm* 'my dear daughter', Altai *bala-čaġ-ïm, bala-m* 'my dear child'.

Although the primary semantics of affixes of affection is one of subjective evaluation and expression of emotions, the frequent use of some formations with these affixes in addressing people, led in some cases to a fading out their emotional semantic components. Thus, some words with these affixes became just vocative words: Tatar *äniki!* 'Mother-in-law!' (compare *äni* 'mother'), *ätiki!* 'Father-in-law!' (compare *äti* 'father'). The presence of the affix of affection *-KAy* in their stems can be detected only with the aid of an etymological analysis. These Tatar formations are used only as vocative words for addressing family members; compare *äniki!* 'Mother-in-law!' and *ķayïnana / biyana* 'mother-in-law'.

4.2. Kazakh vocatives

All hypocorisms can be used as vocative forms. In addition, there are other formations that serve vocative functions.

4.2.1. Formations with vocative affixes proper

4.2.1.1. Affix -(Aw)

The Kazakh affix -(A)w is applied only to kinship terms and builds forms expressing feelings of affection toward the addressed persons: *Aɣaw!* 'Uncle!', *Apaw!* 'Mother!', *Ataw!* 'Grandfather!' *Žezdew!* 'Brother-in-law!'.

4.2.1.2. Affix -(A)y

A characteristic feature of Kazakh etiquette is that personal names should not be used when addressing older members of the family. Within a family, younger persons address their elders using the kinship terms with the *-y* marker expressing respect and affection at the same time:

> *ata→ ata-y* 'respected grandfather'
> *àže → àže-y* 'respected grandmother'
> *àke → àke-y* 'respected father'
> *apa → apa-y* 'respected mother/elder sister'
> *aɣa → aɣa-y* 'respected elder brother / uncle'
> *žeŋge → žeŋge-y* 'respected auntie / sister-in-law'

Using some of these formations, one can address close family members, or even unknown older persons, e.g. *žeŋge-y* 'respected auntie / sister-in-law'. See (16)–(18).

(16) *Žeŋge-y   ḳanša   bala-ŋïz   bar?*
       aunt-VOC   how.many child-POS2PL there.is
       'Auntie, how many children do you have?'

(17) *Àke-y   demalïs-ḳa   šïḳ-t-ï.*
       farther-VOC rest-DAT   go.out-PST-3
       '(Our respected/beloved) daddy retired.'

The form *žeŋge-y* can be used with reference to a relatively young woman if the interlocutor wants to stress his/her respect for her husband, who is either older than the interlocutor, or whose social position is higher than that of the interlocutor; see (18).

(18) *Bïz-dïŋ žeŋge-y   žaḳsï   adam.*
       we-GEN sister-in-law-VOC   good   person
       'Our respected sister-in-law is a nice person.'

The kinship term with the vocative -*(A)y žeŋge-y* can accept another vocative marker -*(A)w*. In this case, such an address form expresses surprise and astonishment; see (19).

(19) *Žeŋge-y-aw,   sïz   ʷosïnï   da   bïl-me-y-sïz   be?*
     aunt-VOC-VOC   you:PL that.ACC   PTCL   know-NEG-PRS-2PL Q
     'Auntie, don't you know that?'

(20) *Žeŋge-y-aw,   bul kalay   bol-ɣan-ï?*
     aunt-VOC-VOC   this how   happen-PP-3
     'Auntie, how has it happened?'

4.2.2 Vocative with possessive affixes

All the vocative forms can additionally take a possessive marker of the 1st person singular in order to express especially cordial and informal address, usually when addressing younger people. Hypocorisms with affixes of affection can also be used with this possessive marker; see 3. It is also used with stems without any affix of affection: *kïz-ïm!* 'My dear daughter!'.

4.3. Terms of endearment (affectionate nicknames) used as forms of address

Each Kazakh child has his/her own affectionate nickname, often a zoomorphic term or other term of endearment. Here, we will list only a few such forms of address, typical of Kazakh culture.

Zoomorphic terms of endearment:

Affectionate nicknames connected with different kinds of birds:
karɣa-m [crow-POS1SG] 'my (little baby) crow';
suŋkar-ïm [falcon-POS1SG] 'my (little baby) falcon'.

Affectionate nicknames connected with different small animals:
kulïn-ïm [foal-PPS1SG] 'my dearest (little) foal';
bota-š-ïm [colt-DIM-POS1SG] 'my dearest little colt';
koz-ïm [lamb-POS1SG] 'my dearest (little) lamb'.

Terms of endearment connected with names of planets, stars:
ay-ïm [moon-POS1SG] 'my moon';
kün-ïm [sun-POS1SG] 'my sun';
žuldïz-ïm [star-POS1SG] 'my star'.

Terms of endearment connected with kinship terminology:
köke-š-ïm 'my dear father/uncle' < *köke* 'father/uncle';
äke-š-ïm 'my dear father' < *äke* 'father'.

4.4. Polite terms of address in Kazakh

Kazakh hypocorisms with the honorific affixes are used as polite forms of address today.

Kazakh people use the possessive affixes of the 3rd person when addressing family members in a very polite manner. This is especially typical for the speech of elder generations, e.g. *ata-sï!* [grandfather-POS3] (lit/: his/her grandfather) 'respected grandfather!' or *apa-sï!* [grandmother-POS3] (lit/: his/her grandmother) 'respected grandmother!'.

Before the Soviet era, there used to be polite forms of address expressing respect towards the addressed person: *mïrza* 'mister', *bïkeš* 'madam' (the *-š*-form of the word *bike* 'woman'), *taksïr* 'lord', *katïn* 'miss', etc. After Kazakhstan gained its independence in 1990, there were attempts to revive these forms of address; see (21). These forms have not, however, been adopted by modern Kazakh society and are not used in everyday life.

(21) *Batïr-ï   Eset-tey   γalïm-ï   Zulkarnay mïrza-day,*
       warrior-POS3 PN-SIM   scientist-POS3 PN   mister-SIM
       änši-si   Gülnäz   hanïm-day halïk   bakïttï,
       singer-POS3 PN   lady-SIM   people happy
       ulï   halïk,—   de-d-ï   ʷol   ʷoylan-ïp   žat-pas-tan
       great people   say-PST-3   s/he   think-CV   lie.AUX-AOR.NEG-ABL
       'He answered immediately (lit.: without thinking), "The nation that has warriors like Eset, scientists like Mr. Zulqarnay, singers like Mrs. Gyulnaz is a happy great nation.'

4.5. Altai, Khakas and Shor hypocorisms and vocatives

The first description of the morphology of the Altai language (*Grammatika altajskogo jazyka* 1869) stated that special affixes are added to personal names or kinship words to express love, affection and respect: e.g. the affix *-(X)š*: *Ivan > Yïbanïš* '(my) dear Ivan'; *Nikita > Nikitiš* '(my) dear Nikita'.

In modern Altai fine literature we find further diminutive affixes used to form hypocorisms: *Miša > Miš-ek* '(my) dear Misha' (the suffix *-Ak* is added to the shortened stem of the personal name).

Personal names of Altai origin take diminutive affixes proper which are also used to build forms of common nouns, similar to the formations of Khakas and Shor hypocorisms: Khakas *Xordï-ǰax!* 'Dear Xordy!' < *Xordï* (f).

Also, formations with the vocative affix *-(A)y* are used to form both hypocorisms and vocative words from kinship terms: Khakas *u:ǰay* 'dear granny' < *u:ǰa* 'grandmother on the father's side', *xaday* 'dear wife' < *xat* 'woman, wife (not respectful)', Khakas Kyzyl dialect *aγay* 'uncle' < *aγa* 'grandfather on the father's side, uncle'. The affix is used to form hypocorisms (*Gena-y* < *Gena*, *Kolya-y* < *Kolya*), and in forms of address after the possessive affix of the 1st person singular: *kuday-ïm-ay!* 'my dear Kuday! (Oh, my God!)'. It can also form diminutives from common stems:

Khakas *töŋey* 'hillock, mound; knob, protuberance' < *töŋ* 'hillock' (Tarakanova 2011: 40).

However, in Shor and Khakas, the affix *-(A)s* (Khakas) / *-(A)š* (Shor) is used to build only vocatives and endearment forms from kinship terms: Khakas *aja-s!* 'dear older brother!' < *aja* 'older brother', *pije-s!* 'dear older sister!' < *pije* 'older sister', (Tarakanova 2011: 36), Shor *eneš* 'dear mother' < *ene* 'mother'. In Altai, some kinship names may get the affix *-š*, and sometimes formations with this affix have a clear semantic shift: *aba* 'father' > *aba-š* 'grandfather'.

5. Conclusion

The categories of diminutives, terms of endearment and respect, vocatives and hypocorisms have various means of expression in Turkic languages. Each language has its own system for expressing these categories, comprising both grammatical and lexical devices. All these categories are intertwined with each other in complex ways: diminutive markers may build hypocorisms, vocative forms and new lexemes; hypocorisms act as vocatives.

One should distinguish between diminutives proper, evaluative diminutives (which also may be used in both purely diminutive functions and in subjective evaluations of reality), endearment and honorific terms, and vocatives. The status of each of these categories may be different in a specific Turkic language.

The category of vocative forms was formerly built by two main specialized morphemes in all Turkic languages—the affixes *-(A)w* and *-(A)y*. This category can be assessed as a lexical one, and the corresponding formations as lexical items belonging to the lexicon on the following grounds: these formations are limited in number; and they cannot be formed synchronically from nouns used in the vocative function. The majority of such formations are stems denoting close relatives, and some of them have become opaque and can no longer be divided into morphemes, as their stems, without the vocative affix, do not exist as independent lexemes.

Although specialized vocative affixes are no longer active, a number of non-specialized affixes are used synchronically in vocative formations: primarily the possessive affixes of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person singular and some affixes of endearment. Alongside person names, the vocative morphology is applied to certain classes of nouns: those denoting kinship terms and terms of other interpersonal relations. The vocative formations with affixes of endearment from common nouns denoting kinship terms have become opaque in most cases. Thus, only possessive affixes are productive markers of vocatives at present (in combination with the specific intonation).

Hypocorisms are used in vocative functions, but not only. Thus, they are a separate category, one that has not yet been studied sufficiently, if at all, in many Turkic languages. Our research on Kazakh hypocorisms has shown that Kazakh has specialized affixes that are only used to build affectionate and honorific hypocorisms from

reduced person noun stems. In Kazakh, diminutive affixes used with common nouns do not build terms of endearment and respect.

In contrast, Tuvan hardly uses any diminutive, endearment or honorific affixes to build hypocorisms; various types of syncopation of full names serve this end instead.

In Kazakh, nouns referring to person names possess a grammatical evaluative category expressing the speaker's attitude to their referents. It has two main members—terms of endearment and honorific forms. These semantic types are expressed by specialized morphemes that can be applied to all person names synchronically and produce hypocorisms following certain rules.

Thus, evaluative and expressive formations from Turkic person names and names of various interpersonal relations, alongside vocatives, make up a very promising research field. It is clear that this article cannot give an exhaustive description of any of the above-mentioned categories, even for one language, but can only delineate some directions for further investigation. We hope that this article will stimulate further interest in this topic among our colleagues.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative case	PF	perfect (TAM)
ACC	accusative case	PL	plural
AOR	aorist	PN	person name
AUX	auxiliary	POS	possessive
CV	converb	PP	perfect participle
DAT	dative case	PRS	present TAM
DIM	diminutive	NEG	negation
GEN	genitive case	PST	past TAM
HON	honorific	PTCL	particle
HYP	hypocorism	Q	question particle
IMP	imperative	SG	singular
INF	infinitive	SIM	simulative case
LOC	locative case	TAM	tense/aspect/mood

References

Čumakaev, Aleksej Ė. 2017. Imja suščestvitel'noe [The noun]. In: Nevskaya, Irina A. et al. (eds.) *Grammatika sovremennogo literaturnogo altajskogo jazyka. Morfologija* [A grammar of the contemporary literary Altai language]. Gorno-Altajsk: Institut altaistiki. 22–48.

De Marco, Anna 1998. The acquisition of diminutives in Italian. In: Grills, Steven (ed.). *Studies in acquisition of number and diminutive marking.* (Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 95.) Antwerp: University of Antwerp. 175–192.

Dolozova, Ol'ga N. 2007. *Formal'nye i formal'no-semantičeskie osobennosti kategorii diminutivnosti na materiale itel'menskogo jazyka. Avtoreferat* [Formal and semantic features of the category of diminutives (on the material of the Itelmen language)]. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University.

Erdal, Marcel 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.

Esipova, Alisa V. 1998. Formy sub''ektivnoj ocenki [Forms of subjective evaluation]. In: Nevskaya, Irina A. (ed.) *Šorskaja filologija i sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nye issledovanija* [Shor philology and comparative research]. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo Novosibirskogo universiteta. 90–116.

Grammatika altajskogo jazyka 1869: *Grammatika altajskogo jazyka (sostavlennaja členami Altajskoj duxovnoj missii)* [A grammar of the Altai language compiled by the members of the Altai Mission]. Kazan: Tipografija Kazanskogo universiteta.

Juldašev, Axnef A. 1956. Zvatel'nye slova v tjurkskix jazykax [Vocatives in Turkic languages]. In: Dmitriev, Nikolaj K. (ed.) *Issledovanija po sravnitel'noj grammatike tjurkskix jazykov* 2. *Morfologija* [Comparative grammar of Turkic languages 2. Morphology]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR. 329–334.

Laalo, Klaus 1998. Diminutives in Finnish child-directed and child speech: morphopragmatic and morphophonemic aspects. In: Grills, Steven (ed.) *Studies in acquisition of number and diminutive marking.* (Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 95.) Antwerp: University of Antwerp. 137–148.

Mamanova, Galija I. 1983. Osnovnye tipy affiksov sub''ektivnoj ocenki imen suščestvitel'nyx v kazaxskom jazyke [Main types of affixes of subjective evaluation in the Kazakh language]. *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 6.

Monguš, Doorug-ool A. 1973 (reprinted in 2009). Sokraščennaja forma ličnyx imen v tuvinskom jazyke [Abridged forms of personal names in the Tuvan language]. In: *Učenye zapiski tuvinskogo naučno-issledovatel'skogo instituta jazyka, literatury i istorii*. Kyzyl. 16. 146–155; Reprinted in: Monguš, Doorug-ool A. *Tuvinskij jazyk i pis'mennost'. Izbrannye trudy* [Tuvan language and writing. Selected works]. Kyzyl: Tyvapoligraf. 67–77.

Muradov, Amanbaj 1975 *Vyraženie laskatel'nosti i umen'šitel'nosti v imenax turkmenskogo jazyka. Avtoreferat* [Means of expression of the endearment and diminutive semantics in Turkmen names]. Ashgabad.

Plungjan, Vladimir A. 2011. *Vvedenie v grammatičeskuju semantiku: grammatičeskie značenija i grammatičeskie sistemy jazykov mira.* [Introduction to grammatical semantics: grammatical meanings and grammatical systems of languages of the world]. Moscow: Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet.

Qozï Körpeš Bayan Suluu 1959: Awezov, Muxtar O. & Smirnova, Nina S. (eds.) *Qozï Körpeš Bayan Suluu* [Kozy Kyorpesh Bayan Suluu (personal name)]. Alma-Ata: Qazaq SSR Ğilïm Akademijasïnïŋ Baspasï.

Qïz Žibek 2008. Sadyrbaev, Sultanghaly (ed.) *Qïz Žibek* [Kyz Zhibek (personal name)] Almaty: Kazakh University.

Ravid, Dorit 1998. Diminutive -*i* in early child Hebrew: An initial analysis. In: Grills, Steven (ed.) *Studies in acquisition of number and diminutive marking.* (Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 95.) Antwerp: University of Antwerp. 149–174.

Savickiene, Ineta 1998. *The acquisition of diminutives in Lithuanian.* In: Grills, Steven (ed.) *Studies in acquisition of number and diminutive marking.* (Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 95.) Antwerp: University of Antwerp. 115–134.

Sovremennyj kazaxskij jazyk. 1962. Balakaev, Maulen B. & Baskakov, Nikolaj A. & Kenesbaev, Smet K. (eds.) *Sovremenyj kazaxskij jazyk. Fonetika i morfologija* [The contemporary Kazakh language. Phonetics and morphology]. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.

Tarakanova, Irina M. 2011. *Diminutivy v xakasskom jazyke* [Khakas diminutives]. Abakan: Servisnyj punkt.

Voeikova, Maria D. 1998. *Acquisition of diminutives by a Russian child: Preliminary observations in connection with the early adjectives.* In: Grills, Steven (ed). *Studies in acquisition of number and diminutive marking.* (Antwerp Papers in Linguistics 95.) Antwerp: University of Antwerp. 97–114.

Weijer, Jeroen M. van de 1989. The formation of diminutive names in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 39, 353–371.

Žanuzakov, Tölqoža D. 1971. *Qazaq yesimderiniŋ tarïxï* [History of Kazakh names]. Alma-Ata: Ghylym.

A note on the Old Turkic denominal verb formatives *+lA-, +A-, +tA-,* and *+lAn-*

An-King Lim

Lim, An-King 2017. A note on the Old Turkic denominal verb formatives *+lA-, +A-, +tA-,* and *+lAn-. Turkic Languages* 21, 259–265.

Conceptual representations of the denominal verb formative *+lA-, +A, +tA-* and *+lAn-* that were previously characterized with the schema DO-base in Lim (2011a 2011b) are now refined with the ENGAGE-base schema and the responsive DO-schema with the INDUCE-base schema. Thus, we have
(1) *+lA-* is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE the literal capacity of the base without an object or to gainfully ENGAGE an association of the base with an object';
(2) *+A-* is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE the metaphorical capacity of the base without object or to gainfully ENGAGE an association of the base with an object';
(3) *+tA-* is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE the metonymical capacity of the base without an object or to gainfully ENGAGE an association of the base with an object';
(4) *+lAn-* is the INDUCE-base schema 'to gainfully INDUCE the literal or referential attributes or capacity of the base without an object or to gainfully INDUCE an association of the base with an object.'
Keywords: East Old Turkic, word formation, Turkic historical linguistics

An-King Lim, 4575 Bernada Circle, Salt Lake City, Utah 84124-4742, USA. E-mail: an-king.lim@me.com

Introduction

In Lim (2011a and 2011b), some of the denominal verb formatives, notably *+lA, +A, +tA-* and *+lAn-,* were characterized as various forms of conceptual representations, all involving the schema DO-base. Specifically, these are *+lA-* 'literal DO-base schema with and without an object', *+A-* 'the referential DO-base schema', *+tA-* 'the synecdoche DO-base schema', and *-lAn-* 'the responsive DO-base schema'. Here we will refine these conceptual characterizations with a more specific yet still cogent formulation by replacing the DO-base schemas with the ENGAGE-base schema and the responsive DO-schema with the INDUCE-base schema. Thus,

    (1) *+lA-* is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE mostly the literal capacity of the base with or without an object' (Lim 2011a: 5–43);

(2) +*A*- is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE mostly the meta-phorical capacity of the base' (Lim 2011a: 43–50);

(3) +*tA*- is the ENGAGE-base schema 'to gainfully ENGAGE mostly the meto-nymical capacity of the base' (Lim 2011b: 203–205);

and in response to the expectations of +*lA*-

(4) +*lAn*- is the INDUCE-base schema 'to gainfully INDUCE the literal or re-ferential attributes of the base'. (Lim 2011b: 205–231).

Examples of the use of the templates

First we rephrase some of the selected citations in items (2) and (3) using the templates of the revised schemas. Note that the designations *a* and *b* in parentheses () refer to references Lim (2011a) and Lim (2011b) respectively and the accompany-ing numbers are page numbers in the reference.

(a43)
a:š 'food'
a:š+a- 'to eat', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of food to be edible'
a:š+a- 'to enjoy s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage the metaphorical capacity of food (equating food to s.t. enjoyable)'

(a43)
mang 'gait, a fast gait'
mang+a- 'to tread', or 'to gainfully engage (the metaphorical capacity of gait) (equating gait to trampling)'

(a44)
beḏiz 'ornamentation, picture, painting'
beḏiz+e- 'to adorn s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage the metaphorical capacity of a picture (equating picture to decoration) on s.t.'

(a44)
esin 'breezes, gentle wind'
esn+e- '(of breeze) to blow, to yawn', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of breezes'

(a44)
esin 'breezes, gentle wind'
esn+e- 'to yawn', or 'to gainfully engage the metaphorical capacity of breezes (equating a breeze to the 'wind' of yawning)'

(a45)
köngül 'the mind'

köngl+le- 'to think seriously about s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of the mind'

(a46)
ört 'flame'
ört+e- 'to light or burn s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of a flame'

(a47)
su:v 'water'
suv+a- 'to irrigate land, to water animals', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of water'

(a48)
tepiz 'an envious person'
tepz+e- 'to be envious', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of an envious person'

(a49)
ya:ğ 'grease, fat'
yağ+a- 'to present a sacrifice', or 'to gainfully engage the metaphorical capacity of fat (equating fat to an item of sacrifice in the old Turkic culture'

(b204)
al 'dirty trick, device'
al+ta- 'to trick s.o.', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of dirty trick'
al+ta- 'to soothe, to console', or 'to gainfully engage the metonymical capacity of a device, associating the meaning of devices or tricks with the meaning of comforting placebos'

(b204)
ba:ğ 'bond, tie'
bağ+da- 'to trip s.o.; to cross one's legs', or 'to gainfully engage the metonymical capacity of a tie, associating the meaning of bond, tie with the meaning of feet or legs in contact'

(b204)
i:z 'footprint'
is+te- 'to seek s.t. or to ask for it', or 'to gainfully engage the metonymical capacity of a footprint, associating the meaning of footprint with the meaning of information'

(b205)

tıl 'the tongue'

tıl+da- 'to use the tongue; to make excuses; to incite', or 'to gainfully engage the literal or metonymical capacity of the tongue, associating the meaning of using the tongue with the meaning of making arguments'

(b205)

ün 'the sound of a human voice'

ün+de- 'to call', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of the sound of a human voice'

ün+de- 'to summon; to invite', or 'to gainfully engage the metonymical capacity of the sound of a human voice, to call up s.t., associating the meaning of using the sound of a human voice with the meaning of calling up s.t. in mind or calling up s.o. for a social function'

In light of the reflexive nature of the Turkic deverbal formative -*Xn*-, as discussed in Lim (2008a: 22–56), we now have the INDUCE-base schema +*lAn*- as a response to the expectations of the ENGAGE-base schema +*lA*-. The INDUCE-base schema is akin to the ablative formation in the denominal noun domain, inducing attributes from the base, while the ENGAGE-base schema is akin to the dative formation in the nominal case vocabulary. We can now rephrase the following citations excerpted from Lim (2011b) and observe the use of the templates for the two schemas (1) and (4).

(b206)

aḏak 'leg, foot'

aḏak+la- 'to fit legs on furniture', or 'to gainfully engage the capacity of legs to be put on furniture'

aḏak+la- 'to trample on', or 'to gainfully engage the capacity of legs to trample on s.t.'

aḏak+la- 'to give s.o. a leg up onto a horse', or 'to gainfully engage the capacity of legs to help in mounting'

aḏak+la- 'to measure in paces', or 'to gainfully engage the capacity of legs to measure distance'

aḏak+lan- 'to have legs', or 'to gainfully induce the presence of legs'

aḏak+lan- 'to stand or move on legs', or 'to gainfully bring forth the function of legs'

(b208)

beḏük 'big, great, high, tall'

beḏük+le- 'to be or become big, to consider to be big', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of bigness'

beḏük+len- 'to grow', or 'to gainfully induce the referential capacity of the genesis of greatness'

(b209)
borta 'thin sheet of gold'
borta+la- 'to fasten plates of gold on s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of plates of gold'
borta+lan- 'to be gilded with plates of gold', or 'to gainfully induce the value of gold plates'

(b210)
butık 'branch of a tree'
butık+la- 'to prune', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of branches of a tree, to be pruned'
butık+lan- 'form branches', or 'to gainfully induce the presence of branches, bring forth branches'

(b213)
et 'flesh'
et+le- 'to fatten', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of the flesh'
et+len- 'to put on flesh', or 'to gainfully bring forth the presence of flesh'

(b216)
ka:r 'snow'
kar+la- 'to snow', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of snow to fall'
kar+lan- 'to be full of snow', or 'to gainfully induce the presence of snow'

(b217)
kır 'top of mountain'
kır+la- 'to travel through a mountain', or 'to gainfully engage a mountain top'
kır+lan- '(of mountain) to come to a peak', or 'to gainfully induce the nature of a mountain top'

(b222)
sak 'awake, alert'
sak+la- 'watch over', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of alertness'
sak+la- 'to comply with', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of alertness'
sak+lan- 'to protect oneself, to be protected', or 'to gainfully induce the nature of being alert'
sak+lan- 'to keep watch over', or 'to gainfully induce the quality of being alert'

(b223)
sinir 'muscle, sinew, tendons, bow string, nerve'

sinir+le- 'to cut the leg tendon', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of the tendon subject to cut'

sinir+le- 'to put a bow string on a bow', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of the bow string'

sinir+len- '(beef meat) to be stringy', or '(beef meat) to gainfully induce the nature of sinew'

(b224)
sirke 'a nit'
sirke+le- 'to pull nits', or 'to gainfully engage nits'
sirkelen- '(bof s.o.'s head) to have nits', or 'to gainfully induce the presence of nits'

(b224)
su:v 'water'
suv+la- 'to irrigate', or 'to gainfully engage water'
suv+lan- 'to be moist and full of water', or 'to gainfully induce the nature of water'

(b225)
tilkü 'fox'
tilkü+len- 'to behave like a fox', or 'to gainfully bring forth the nature of a fox'
(b227)
tu:z 'salt'
tuz+la- 'to salt s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage salt'
tuz+lan- 'to be salted, to be made salty', or 'to gainfully induce the nature of salt'

(b228)
uruğ 'seeds'
uruğ+la- 'to sow seeds', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of seeds'
uruğ+la- 'to swarm', or 'to gainfully engage the referential capacity of seeds in large numbers'
uruğ+la- '(of crops) to form ears', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of seeds'
uruğ+lan- 'to form seeds', or 'to gainfully bring forth the presence of seeds'

(b229)
ya:ğ 'grease'
yağ+la- 'to grease s.t.', or 'to gainfully engage grease'
yağ+la- 'to be oiled', or 'to gainfully induce the benefit of grease'

(b229)

yat 'rain magic, rain storm'

yat+la- 'to perform magic ceremonies with stones to bring rain', or 'to gainfully engage the literal capacity of rain magic'

yat+lan- 'to perform magic ceremonies', or 'to gainfully induce the referential capacity (the ceremony) of rain magic'

(b231)

yumur 's.t. round'

ymur+la- 'to knead s.t. into a ball', or 'to gainfully engage in the literal capacity of s.t. round'

ymur+lan- 'to round up a flock of animals', or 'to gainfully induce the referential quality of s.t. round'

References

Lim, An-King 2008. The Old Turkic cognitive categories *-Xk* and *-Xn*. *Turkic Languages* 12, 22–56.

Lim, An-King 2011a. The meaning structure of the Old Turkic denominal verb formatives 1. *Turkic Languages* 15, 3–50.

Lim, An-King 2011b. The meaning structure of the Old Turkic denominal verb formatives 2. *Turkic Languages* 15, 201–247.

Reports

Finnish Tatars and the trilingual Tatar-Finnish dictionary

Jorma Luutonen & Arto Moisio & Okan Daher

The first part of the article gives an account of the history and characteristics of the Finnish Tatar minority of approx. 700 people. This group was formed about a hundred years ago when Mishar Tatar-speaking merchants from Tsarist Russia began to settle in Finland. Special emphasis is given to factors explaining the vitality of the Tatar heritage language. The second part describes the compilation and characteristics of the Tatar-Finnish dictionary, which contains both Kazan Tatar and Finnish Tatar vocabulary. The problems encountered in dictionary making are treated as evidence giving insight into the language ecology of the Finnish Tatar language community.
Key words: Tatar, Finland, minority language, language vitality, lexicography.

Jorma Luutonen & Arto Moisio, Research Unit for Volgaic Languages, University of Turku, FI-20014 Turku, Finland. E-mail: jorma.luutonen@utu.fi and arto.moisio@utu.fi. Okan Daher, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 38 B, FI-00014 Helsinki, Finland. E-mail: okan.daher@helsinki.fi.

Introduction

There are some seven million Tatar speakers in the world. Most live in the Russian Federation (over five million). Kazan Tatar is an official language in the Republic of Tatarstan, which is located in the Volga region in Russia. Compared to the millions of Volga Tatars, the present-day Finnish Tatars are a tiny minority consisting of approx. 700 people[1] in a country with a population of 5.5 million.

---

1 The estimate is based on the number of members in the two Finnish Tatar Islamic organizations. The Finnish Islamic Congregation centered around the Finnish capital Helsinki is the largest with 570 members as of February 2017 (source: the Population Register Centre of Finland). Its sister organization, the Islamic Congregation of Tampere, had 83 members at the beginning of 2017 (source: the congregation itself). The total number of members in these two congregations is 653. Practically all traditional Finnish Tatars, whose ancestors came to Finland about a hundred years ago or earlier, are members of these two organizations. In recent decades, the number of Finnish Tatars has been

In 2016, Arto Moisio and Okan Daher published an 11,000 word Tatar-Finnish dictionary *Tataarilais-suomalainen sanakirja*,[2] which combines Kazan Tatar and Finnish Tatar in one trilingual dictionary. This article illuminates the special character of this dictionary and describes the practical lexicographical problems encountered in its preparation, taking into account the historical and sociolinguistic background of the Finnish Tatar language community.[3] The difficulties and phases of the dictionary editing process are treated as evidence revealing interesting facets of the language ecology of the Finnish Tatar variety.

The origin and language of the Finnish Tatars

The Finnish Tatars came to Finland from Russia during the latter half of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century. They mainly originate from Tatar villages of the Sergach district in the province of Nizhniy Novgorod in Tsarist Russia. Ancestors of today's Finnish Tatars practiced agriculture as smallholders in their home villages. Due to declining income from farming, they began developing trading activities in their own province. Trade trips gradually began to reach all the way to Saint Petersburg along the railway, and then to Finland, which was then a grand duchy belonging to Russia. After Finland became an independent state in 1917 and the situation in Russia was chaotic after the communist revolution, itinerant Tatar merchants began to settle in Finland with their families, establishing textile, clothing and fur shops in towns and provincial centers. Trade guaranteed a stable income for Tatar families, and it also brought Tatars into contact with the Finnish population, thus preventing isolation and marginalization. This resulted in their quick and successful integration into Finnish society (Daher 2016: 96).

The migrant Tatars were speakers of the western Mishar dialect of Tatar. In Finland, the language of these migrants developed in a new linguistic and cultural environment, producing a new variety, Finnish Tatar. Minor differences between the languages of different cities, or between families, can be observed. Finnish Tatars previously used Arabic script, but this was later gradually replaced by a Latin orthography superficially rather similar to that of Turkish, though with two extra letters, *ñ* (Kaz. ң) and *ä* (Kaz. ә); for an overview until the 1990s, see Daher (1999).

---

slowly declining. There are also an unknown number of new Tatars living in Finland, who have immigrated, often in connection with marriages, during the past two decades.

2 The dictionary was compiled at the Research Unit for Volgaic Languages (University of Turku, Finland). The project received financial support from the Kone Foundation. The Research Unit has also previously published materials on Turkic languages: the electronic word lists of Tatar and Chuvash (2016), a Chuvash-Finnish dictionary (2007), and a Reverse dictionary of Chuvash (2009); see the list of references.

3 A good reference for those interested in the Finnish Tatars is the anthology (in Finnish) of articles from different times on Finnish Tatars edited by Beretdin (2011).

The characteristics of the Finnish Tatar community

The first and the second generation after immigration created a strong mental and material basis for building the Finnish Tatar community. They were industrious and showed mutual solidarity; education was highly valued. Unemployment has not been a problem among Finnish Tatars (Daher 2016: 97, 102).

The life of Finnish Tatars is centered on the family, the home, which is supported by a well-organized community. The most central organization of the community is the Finnish Islamic Congregation[4] (est. 1925), which usually only accepts Tatars as members.[5] It provides for the members' religious services, organizes children's education in religion and Tatar language and culture, and arranges cultural and sports activities. The congregation also functions as the national representative body of the Finnish Tatars (Daher 2016: 96, 99–101).

Due to their full integration and participation in Finnish society, the Tatars have developed a dual identity. In a balanced way they have combined their own linguistic and cultural heritage and religion with the values of the Finnish mainstream society. On the other hand, integration has brought massive influence from the majority culture; in contexts such as mixed marriages and bilingual families the two cultures meet every day on all levels (Daher 2016: 97–98). A gradual assimilation to the Finns seems irreversible in the long term, but new small-scale immigration in connection with marriages of Finnish Tatar men with women from Tatarstan or other Tatar communities of the world gives new hope for the preservation of Tatar language and culture in Finland.

How have the Finnish Tatars been able to keep their language alive?

The Finnish Tatars living today represent the 4th and 5th generations since the emigration from Russia. Their ability to retain their heritage language in active use for so long time is admirable. In the following, we will discuss various themes or factors that are crucial if one wants to explain the vitality of the Finnish Tatar language.

Because the structure and the sound system of Tatar resemble those of Finnish, it was easy for the immigrating Tatars to learn the new language. On the other hand, not being genealogically or areal-linguistically related, the two languages were not easily mixed. So the Tatars became fully bilingual. The spheres of use of the two languages are clearly defined: Tatar is spoken at home and with other Tatars in social organizations and at international events, but Finnish is used in non-Tatar contexts. Finnish Tatars have highly developed language awareness and linguistic iden-

---

4   A sister organization, the Islamic Congregation of Tampere, was established in this inland city in 1943.

5   When Tatars are married with non-Tatars, both spouses can be members if both are Muslims. Most often this is the case in marriages between Finnish Tatars and representatives of other Turkic peoples.

tity; there does not seem to have been any essential conflict between the languages (Daher 2016: 96, 98–99).

Tatar is commonly spoken in families and the community, and so children learn it as their first language. The family ties are strong, and grandparents and relatives also take part in the Tatar education of the youngest ones (Daher 2016: 98).

The Tatars had their own primary school in Helsinki called the Turkish Primary School between 1948 and 1969, which in addition to the Finnish primary school curriculum gave instruction in the Tatar language, and the religion and history of Turkic peoples. Today, children's study of the mother tongue is supported by a play group which the Finnish Islamic Congregation organizes on weekends, and by mother tongue courses in the autumn and spring terms and during summer vacations. The young people can also, for example, participate in choir and theatre performances arranged by a cultural society (Daher 2016: 98, 100).

The Islamic religion, which the Finnish Tatars have inherited from their ancestors in the Volga region, is highly important to the small community. Religious education is given by the congregation's imam in the Tatar language. Weekly meetings arranged by the congregation offer recreational activities and an opportunity for pensioners and the elderly to meet each other. The congregation publishes *Mähallä Habärläre* (Congregation News), which appears sporadically in the form of magazine or newspaper. The Finnish Tatar literature includes song books, religious textbooks, books of fairy tales, cook books, poetry and fiction, but the total quantity is rather small (Daher 2016: 99–100).

Finnish Tatars have a practical and realistic attitude towards their native language. During the past century, language change has been slow and undramatic. There do not seem to have been any extreme views in linguistic matters, or unrealistic aspirations to change the character and societal status of the language. Even the most controversial issue of all time, the change from Arabic to Latin orthography, which did cause some disputes, did not divide the community.

The Finnish Tatar language has received strength from two powerful centers of Turkic languages. The first power center, which was most important in the Soviet era, is Turkey. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Tatarstan took over as the most prominent source of influence (Daher 2016: 98–99). These linguistic power centers, however, are located far from Finland. Unlike prominent neighboring languages, distant sources of influence are less likely to assimilate their weaker neighbors. Due to the great distance, only very small-scale emigration of Finnish Tatars to the Turkic-speaking centers has taken place.

The preceding paragraphs have highlighted the strong sides of the Finnish Tatar community. Paradoxically, the weaknesses seem to be concealed in the same phenomena that give strength. The relatively closed community is cautious about accepting Tatar speakers from outside as full members, which might prevent the community from growing. The place of religion in the center of activities might make it difficult for fully secularized Tatars to feel at home in the community. The strict

principle of holding all events in the Tatar language might keep bilinguals with poor Tatar knowledge from participating fully.

In these days when social life has partially moved to the virtual reality of social media, Finnish Tatars do not deal with each other in real life as much as in earlier decades. Participating in social organizations has also become less attractive to young Finnish Tatars.

Language policy and language planning

In the 19th century, and for the writers of the first constitution of Finland (1922), the question of the linguistic rights of small minorities was not yet prominent. We can, however, note that in those times Finland was more multilingual and therefore probably more tolerant than in the latter half of the 20th century. The new constitution of Finland, which took effect in 2000, grants linguistic rights to several named minorities, and to "other groups" to which the Tatars belong (Const 2000). Finland has also ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages,[6] which protects and promotes historical regional and minority languages traditionally used by the nationals of the European states (Chart 1992). The general attitude towards Tatars in Finland has traditionally been positive, but they are so fully integrated into society that their existence is seldom remembered.

There has probably never been an organization or committee that would have set as its main goal the developing and planning of the Finnish Tatar literary language. The Finnish Islamic Congregation, however, also functions as a language society in the sense that it is the main organizational body for and producer of Finnish Tatar literature. The board of the congregation can, for instance, propose new rules of orthography to the general meeting of the members. This has happened at least once, when the letter *ä*, after a vote, was added to the Finnish Tatar alphabet in 2004. The congregation currently has a Committee of the mother tongue,[7] which arranges instruction in the Tatar language. Due to the small size of the community and the absence of a specific institutional language-planning organ, the Finnish Tatar literary language has mainly been developed through the efforts of individuals: teachers, scholars, imams, and others whose work included conscious handling of written Tatar.

How the dictionary came into being

The work on the Tatar-Finnish dictionary began in 2009 as a hobby of Arto Moisio who, while attending a course in the Tatar language held by Mansur Saykhunov from Kazan, started to compile a Tatar-Finnish word list for his personal use. During

---

6   The Charter was signed in 1992 and ratified by Finland in 1994, and it came into force in Finland in 1998.

7   Formerly, matters of teaching, publishing and culture were combined under one committee.

the following years, this word list evolved into a Tatar-Finnish dictionary project which was included in the working plan of the Research Unit for Volgaic Languages. Moisio continued to supplement the manuscript with lexemes from various Tatar vocabularies and dictionaries that happened to be available in Turku (see the list of dictionary sources). The most important of those were two Tatar-Russian Dictionaries: *Татарско-русский словарь—Татарча-русча сүзлек* (2004; 25,000 entries), and *Татарско-русский словарь—Татарча-русча сүзлек* (1966; 38,000 entries). Another important source was a list of the 10,000 most frequent word forms in contemporary Tatar texts produced by Jorma Luutonen. This list was used as a guide in selecting words from large dictionaries. A number of words were collected from Tatar news pages on the Internet, as well as the Tatar Wikipedia. In this phase of the work, the manuscript only contained Kazan Tatar words.

Around 2013, Moisio and Luutonen began to think that introducing vocabulary from the language of Finnish Tatars would increase the value of the dictionary. Contact was established with a representative of Finnish Tatars, Okan Daher, lecturer in Tatar in the University of Helsinki and honorary president of the Finnish Islamic Congregation. By deciding to invite a recognized Tatar teacher and former organizational leader to the dictionary project, the project team inadvertently continued the tradition of influential individuals being the prime agents in the development of Finnish Tatar literary language. During the editing process, Okan Daher consulted other Finnish Tatars, some representatives of the oldest generation, and some scholars in Kazan.

There were no previous Finnish Tatar dictionaries[8] for the project team to use. The time frame and limited resources of the project precluded doing field work among Finnish Tatars, or compiling a Finnish Tatar text corpus for the use of the project. As Finnish Tatar is close to Kazan Tatar and most of the Kazan Tatar vocabulary can also be used by the Finnish Tatar, the simplest way of filling the slot reserved for Finnish Tatar in the dictionary was to transcribe the Kazan Tatar entry words into the alphabet used by Finnish Tatars. This conversion from Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet was done by Mansur Saykhunov in Kazan using a computer program. The change was not straightforward because of the peculiarities of the Kazan Tatar orthography. The transcribed words were then checked and adjusted to the phonetic patterns of the Finnish variety by Okan Daher. He also supplemented the dictionary with words typical of Finnish Tatar but not known by the Kazan Tatars. Many of these are loanwords from Turkish and European languages. If the transcribed Kazan Tatar word represented a concept not known to Finnish Tatars, e.g. concepts pertaining to the Russian societal and political system, it was deleted and replaced by a hyphen (-).

---

8   Ymär Daher, PhD and Docent of Turcology, who taught Tatar at the University of Helsinki before his son Okan Daher, worked on a Tatar-Finnish dictionary, but the location of the manuscript is currently unknown.

The method chosen for compiling the Finnish Tatar material in the dictionary makes it practically impossible to draw a clear line between Finnish Tatar vocabulary and the transcribed Kazan Tatar words which may or may not have been used by the Finnish Tatars. This reflects, on the one hand, the relative proximity of the two varieties, which makes most Kazan Tatar words *potential* Finnish Tatar words, and, on the other hand, the limitedness of Finnish Tatar literary tradition, which is not able to provide enough specifically Finnish Tatar material for the dictionary project. The floating line between Finnish Tatar and Kazan Tatar in the dictionary also mirrors the language-ecological situation, where the slowly assimilating population of Finnish Tatar speakers hopes to get new strength from the direction of Tatarstan.

The present Finnish-Tatar dictionary is a hybrid by nature. It is a bilingual Kazan Tatar-Finnish dictionary supplemented by Finnish Tatar counterparts to most lexemes. The floating line between Finnish Tatar and Kazan Tatar in the dictionary makes the status of the Finnish Tatar material unclear in the sense that the user of the dictionary cannot know whether a certain word is really used in the language community. On the other hand, including the lexemes given as Finnish Tatar words in the dictionary codifies them as part of the Finnish Tatar literary language.

Problems encountered in introducing words representing the Finnish Tatar language into the dictionary will be discussed in the following sections. Certain differences between the Finnish and Kazan varieties became fascinatingly tangible during the work; they will be explained against the historical and sociolinguistic background of modern Finnish Tatar.

The structure of the entries, and the appendices

The structure of entries can be seen in the following example.

> **абынырга** *abınırga* kompastua, kompuroida.
> **бусагага абынырга** kompastua kynnykseen.

The Kazan Tatar Cyrillic entry word (boldface) comes first, followed by the Finnish Tatar equivalent in Latin letters (italicized) and the Finnish equivalents *kompastua*, *kompuroida*. Then, after a period, an example of the use of the word in Kazan Tatar (boldface) is given accompanied with a Finnish translation ('stumble over the threshold').

The only Finnish Tatar part of the entry is the italicized equivalent of the Kazan Tatar word. The usage examples, as well as all semantics (expressed in the dictionary by the Finnish equivalents or translations) were taken from Kazan Tatar-Russian dictionaries. It is clear that the languages differ semantically from each other in many cases, and in particular idioms formed according to Russian models are not part of the Finnish Tatar language. At first it was planned to distinguish semantics common to both varieties from meanings only typical of Finnish Tatar or Kazan

Tatar, but consistent marking of this distinction proved to be impossible to carry out in the frame of this project.

In many cases, the word given as the Finnish Tatar equivalent is a completely different word, e.g. in the entry

клумба *çäçäklek* kukkapenkki

where a Turkic word for 'flower bed' is used in Finnish Tatar instead of the Russian loanword in Kazan Tatar. Two equivalents for the Kazan Tatar word can be found in several cases, e.g. in the entry for the word meaning 'cinema':

кино *kino, sinema* elokuva.

Here we have two international variants from the same Greek root *kin-*. In a couple of cases, three words are given, e.g. the entry for 'stock, depot, storehouse':

склад *stok*, *depo*, *ambar* varasto.

An example of a word with no apparent Finnish Tatar equivalent is the Russian loanword meaning the very important document in the Soviet era, 'pass, permit':

пропуск kulkulupa.

The entries have been listed in the Cyrillic alphabetical order, which means that Finnish Tatar speakers who do not know Cyrillic letters may find it difficult to find Finnish Tatar words in the dictionary. In addition to a transliteration table (Appendix 1 in the dictionary), some five hundred words thought to be the most problematic in this respect are listed in Appendix 2. In this list, the Finnish Tatar word is given first, and then the Kazan Tatar entry word under which the translation of the word into Finnish can be found. For instance, the following word pairs can be found in the list:

afu	гафу
kimä	көймə
kanvert	конверт
eskrim	фехтование
hisap	счёт
Almanya	Германия
kristal	хрусталь
yäş	яшь.

One can see that the reasons for the differences between Finnish and Kazan Tatar words in the list can be diverse: dialectal (*afu* 'pardon', *kimä* 'boat'); writing the

word as it is pronounced in old Russian loans (*kanvert* 'envelope'); loanwords taken from different languages (*eskrim* 'fencing' < Turkish cf. *фехтование* 'id.' < Russian); Russian loanwords in Kazan Tatar (*счёт* 'bill, account'); international words received through different languages (*Almanya* 'Germany' < Turkish cf. *Германия* 'id.' < Russian; *kristal* 'crystal' < Finn. *kristalli* 'id.' cf. *хрусталь* 'id.' < Russian); orthographical peculiarities of Kazan Tatar Cyrillic spelling (*yäş* 'young' cf. *яшь* 'id.'). Providing a full list of Finnish Tatar words with references to their Cyrillic counterparts in the appendix would have been ideal, but that would have expanded the dictionary too much.

Loanwords

Finnish Tatars have had continuous contact with Classical Arabic through religious rites where prayers and citations from the Koran are read in that language. A regional variety of Chaghatay, the "Volga Turki", which was used in writing by the Volga Tatars before modern literary Tatar, also contained Arabic elements. In the Tatar-Finnish dictionary, the pronunciation and spelling of many old Arabic loanwords in Finnish Tatar differ somewhat from those of Kazan Tatar. The postvelar /γ/ of Kazan Tatar often has no counterpart in Finnish Tatar words, e.g. *ayep* 'fault' cf. *гаеп*; *lanät* 'curse' cf. *ләгънәт*; *mocizä* 'miracle' cf. *могҗиза*; *şair* 'poet' cf. *шагыйрь* (cf. Daher 1999: 47). In many words, a back vowel, usually /a/, sometimes also /u, o/, is used in Finnish Tatar instead of a front vowel in Kazan Tatar, e.g. *rahmät* 'thanks' cf. *рәхмәт*; *rähat* 'comfort' cf. *рәхәт*; *ahlak* 'moral' cf. *әхлак*; *möbaräk* 'blessed' cf. *мөбәрәк*; *mährum* 'deprived' cf. *мәхрүм*; *mohtäräm* 'respected' cf. *мөхтәрәм*. Differences can also be found in old Persian loanwords, e.g. *finduk* 'hazelnut' cf. *фундук*; *numɩr* cf. Finn. *numero*, Swed. *nummer* 'number' (Kaz. *цифр* 'number' < Russ. *цифра* < Arab.).

Russian loanwords can be divided into old and new ones. The old loans are known to Finnish Tatars and are written like they are pronounced, e.g. *adiyal* cf. Kaz. *одеял*, Russ. *одеяло* 'blanket'; *padval* cf. Kaz., Russ. *подвал* 'cellar', *patnos* cf. Kaz., Russ. *поднос* 'tray'; *piçät* cf. Kaz., Russ. *печать* 'seal, stamp'; *tavar* cf. Kaz., Russ. *товар* 'goods, product'; *vagzal* cf. Kaz., Russ. *вокзал* 'station'. In some cases, the Finnish Tatar pronunciation differs somewhat from Russian, e.g. *banna* cf. Kaz., Russ. *ванна* 'bath'; *bɩlauka* cf. Kaz., Russ. *булавка* 'pin'; *çomadan* cf. Kaz., Russ. *чемодан* 'suitcase'; *pɩraşuk* cf. Kaz., Russ. *порошок* 'powder'. In rare cases Finnish Tatar is closer to Russian than Kazan Tatar: *piç* cf. Kaz. *мич* < Russ. *печь* 'stove'. Some loans have a prothetic vowel before a word-initial consonant combination in the source language, e.g. *eskelet* cf. Kaz., Russ. *скелет* 'skeleton'; *estena* cf. Kaz., Russ. *стена* 'wall'; *ɩstakan* cf. Kaz., Russ. *стакан* 'glass, tumbler'; *ɩşkaf* cf. Kaz., Russ. *шкаф* 'cupboard'. An epenthetic vowel making the pronunciation easier can be found in *noyaber* cf. Kaz., Russ. *ноябрь* 'November'.

The new Russian loanwords are a result of the massive influence of Russian during the past hundred years. Most of them are unknown to Finnish Tatars. In some

cases, the Russian loanwords represent meanings or concepts not relevant in the cultural context of present-day Finland, e.g. *пропуск* 'pass, permit', *станок* 'machine-tool'; such words lack a Finnish Tatar equivalent in the dictionary. If the concept is familiar, Finnish Tatar words not representing the same lexeme are given as equivalents; see *клумба* and *склад* in the preceding section.

Finnish Tatars have had close contact with Turkey, especially during the Soviet era, which resulted in numerous Turkish loanwords not familiar to Kazan Tatars, e.g. *eskrim* and *Almanya* in the preceding section; *anayasa* 'constitution', *bayrak* 'flag', *bira* 'beer', *sigorta* 'insurance', *dürbün* 'binoculars', *grev* 'strike (of workers)', *havacılık* 'aviation', etc. During the dictionary editing process, a search for a Finnish Tatar equivalent for a Kazan Tatar word quite often led to selecting a Turkish word for the Finnish Tatar equivalent. This reflects the fact that Turkish is still an important source for new vocabulary, especially for the older generation.

The Finnish Tatar material of the dictionary does not contain any borrowed indigenous Finnish words. This might at first sight be surprising because the contacts between Tatars and Finns in Finland have been very close for a century. The main reason for the absence of Finnish loanwords obviously has to do with the way the Tatar-Finnish dictionary was compiled: the work was based on editing the transcribed Kazan Tatar word list, and Finnish loanwords were not specifically collected. In spoken Finnish Tatar, Finnish words are often used if a suitable Tatar expression does not come to mind. Nisametdin (2011: 310), who describes the spoken Finnish Tatar in the beginning of the 1970s, notes that words for new concepts, e.g. 'car', 'electricity', 'ice hockey' and 'atmosphere', are taken from Finnish (*auto*, *sähkö*, *jääkiekko*, *tunnelma*) but inflected according to the rules of the Tatar language. The research team only observed that—except for international words received through the mediation of the Finnish language—there are no Finnish loanwords in the Tatar-Finnish dictionary a few days before the book was going into print. This probably reflects, on the one hand, a certain degree of self-sufficiency of the Finnish Tatar language in its domain of use, and, on the other hand, the clear separation between Tatar and Finnish in the language awareness of Finnish Tatars; though Finnish words are used, they are not conceived belonging to the heritage language by Tatars.

The problem of international words

From the viewpoint of the working process, words of foreign origin, especially those that can be called international words, were the tricky ones. Practically all international words have been mediated to Kazan Tatar by the Russian language, whereas Finnish Tatars have usually received the corresponding words through the Finnish language, or, generally, from the Northern and Central European cultural sphere. Due to the primacy of spoken language among the Finnish Tatars, their literary tradition is relatively weak. Nevertheless, we can fairly confidently state that the most commonly used international words are part of the Finnish Tatar lexicon. In the case

of less frequently used internationalisms, we cannot answer the question of their existence or non-existence in Finnish Tatar because no extensive text corpus of Finnish Tatar is available. On the other hand, the compilers have done a kind of performative act by including a great number of international words in the dictionary, thus preliminarily establishing them as part of the Finnish Tatar language. The mediating language in most cases is Kazan Tatar, which thus—on the pages of this dictionary—has superseded Turkish, Finnish and other European languages in this role. Including the new international words in the dictionary, however, does not make them real for the members of the language community unless they begin to use them.

As the spelling of international words often varies in languages, the exact phonological and orthographical form of international words sometimes constituted a minor problem. For instance, the Kazan Tatar word for 'lexicon' is *лексика* whereas in Finnish the form is *leksikko*. Instead of these, *leksikon* was selected as the Finnish Tatar form of the word (cf. Swed. *lexikon* and German *Lexikon*). In some cases, the chosen orthographical form resembles that of the corresponding Turkish word, e.g. *lisä* 'high school' cf. Turk. *lise* (< French *lycée*), Finn. *lyseo*, Kaz. *лицей*. The absence of specific orthographical principles for writing international words in Finnish Tatar resulted in most of them being left in the form they had after being transcribed from Kazan Tatar Cyrillic orthography, e.g. *advokat* 'lawyer', *adekvat* 'adequate', *administrativ* 'administrative', *administrator* 'administrator', *admiral* 'admiral', *adres* 'address', etc. The decision to do so can be justified by stating that most of these words have already been successfully adapted to the Tatar word structure patterns by Kazan Tatars. There are some systematic differences however. Kazan Tatar and Russian international words beginning with *g* (Cyr. *г*, e.g. *гармония*, *гонорар*) regularly begin with *h* in Finnish Tatar, as in Finnish and many western languages: *harmoniyä* 'harmony', *honorar* 'fee, honorarium'. The Cyrillic *x* of Kazan Tatar and Russian is represented by *k* in many Finnish Tatar words, both in the beginning and middle of the word, e.g. *arkiv* 'archive', *kimik* 'chemist' cf. *архив*, *химик*; here again Finnish Tatar resembles Finnish and many western languages. The Cyrillic *ц* in Kazan Tatar is usually replaced by *s* in Finnish Tatar, e.g. *sement* 'cement', *konsert* 'concert', *tradisiyä* 'tradition' cf. *цемент*, *концерт*, *традиция*. Finnish Tatar word-initial *au* usually corresponds to Kazan Tatar *ав* if a consonant follows, e.g. *august* 'August', *Austriyä* 'Austria' cf. *август*, *Австрия*. A similar case is *eu-* in *euro* '€' cf. *евро*. In some cases, the Finnish Tatar word seems to be a mixture of traits from east and west, e.g. *libanlı* 'Lebanese' cf. Kaz. *ливанлы* (Finn. *Libanon*, Russ. *Ливан* 'Lebanon').

Indigenous words

From the viewpoint of the working process, common indigenous words of Kazan Tatar and Finnish Tatar proved to be quite easy to manage, which is understandable because these words are usually closely related to spoken language, which is regu-

larly used in communication among Finnish Tatars. Indigenous transcribed Kazan Tatar words were simply adapted to the Finnish Tatar phonology, which is based on the Mishar Tatar dialect.

It is possible that among the transcribed indigenous Kazan Tatar words listed in the dictionary as Finnish Tatar words there are also words that have never been in use among Finnish Tatars. However, since Mishar and Kazan Tatar are close to each other, and the separation of Finnish Tatars from their relatives in the Volga region has not been longer than about one hundred years, there is no need to suppose that the number of these "additional" Finnish Tatar words in the dictionary is great.

It is important to notice that although spoken Finnish Tatar and Kazan Tatar are linguistically in a dialectal relation to each other, the Tatar-Finnish dictionary is no more a dialect dictionary of Finnish Tatar than it is of Kazan Tatar. The languages it aims to represent can be characterized as literary norms, though in the case of Finnish Tatar, the codification of the literary standard is still in a nascent stage. If the Finnish Tatar material had originated during extensive field work among Finnish Tatar speakers, or if it had been collected from a large text corpus, the resulting dictionary would have been different. For instance, much more variation would have been visible. Generally, the Finnish Tatar material in the present dictionary reflects the conception of mother tongue in its written form held by educated Finnish Tatars having contact with both Tatarstan and Turkey.

Keeping in mind the reservations expressed in the preceding passage, some remarks can be made about the most conspicuous differences between Finnish Tatar and Kazan Tatar variants of lexemes. Perhaps the most striking difference between the varieties is the existence of only velar /k/ and /g/ in Finnish Tatar, whereas Kazan Tatar has both velar (/k/, /g/) and postvelar (/q/, /ɣ/) phonemes. Thus, Finnish Tatar orthography only needs the graphemes k and g. A laryngeal *h* is also missing in Finnish Tatar, and the *h* sound resembles the corresponding consonant in Finnish. Nisametdin (2011: 307–310) compares spoken Finnish Tatar (at the beginning of the 1970s) to the Mishar dialect and the Kazan Tatar literary language. She gives examples of words in which the vocalism of Finnish Tatar differs from that of Kazan Tatar, e.g. Finn. Tat. *bögön* 'today' cf. Kaz. *бүген*; Finn. Tat. *monça* 'sauna' cf. Kaz. *мунча*. In the Tatar-Finnish dictionary, the Finnish Tatar variants are *bügen* and *munça*, thus representing Kazan Tatar vocalism. In all, Nisametdin gives about fifty example words where Mishar type vocalism or consonantism differing from that of Kazan Tatar could be seen in the 1970s. When we compare these words to those in the Tatar-Finnish dictionary, we observe that an overwhelming majority of them are found in a form that essentially corresponds to that in Kazan Tatar. The small number of words differing from standard Kazan Tatar language have to do with old Arabic loanwords discussed earlier in this article. However, the dictionary contains some individual dialectal Mishar words, e.g. *kimä* 'boat' (cf. Kaz. *көймә*); *ü* 'house, home', which is only used in spoken language (cf. Kaz. *өй*). One trait usually mentioned as typical of Sergach Mishar dialect, namely the use of the affricate *c* instead of *č*, had already partly disappeared, according to Nisametdin (2011: 309), by the

1970s. She notes that "those Finnish Tatars who know well their mother tongue use the *č* sound, which is typical of the Kazan Tatar literary language" (transl. by J. L.). The change of the Finnish Mishar Tatar dialect towards the standard of modern Kazan Tatar was noted by Halén (1999: 330) in the 1990s. The prominence of the Kazan Tatar lexical pattern in the Finnish Tatar material of the dictionary, though in transcribed and adjusted form, could be seen as a further step in the direction already discernible in the preceding decades.

At present, Kazan Tatar's influence on the Finnish Tatar language is growing. One factor strengthening the trend is that the new Tatar teacher who gives instruction to children is not a representative of Finnish Tatars.

Conclusion

We hope that the description of the dictionary making process in its historical and sociolinguistic context will give users of the dictionary enough background information to find the best way of utilizing the Finnish Tatar material in it. We have also demonstrated how various features of the dictionary reflect the language ecology of the community speaking and writing in the language.

The Finnish Tatars are an interesting example of a minority that has been able to retain the vitality of its language heritage for a relatively long period. We could say that the Finnish Tatars have found a way of integrating with the majority population without assimilating to it. On the other hand, we lack detailed information about the language habits of the youngest generation. We do not know, for instance, to what extent Finnish Tatar is present in social media. A sociolinguistic investigation of the language use of different generations would give a scientific basis for the evaluation of the current degree of vitality of the Finnish Tatar language. Further, a fundamental study has not yet been carried out of how the Mishar Tatar dialect of the small immigrant group gradually changed into the Finnish Tatar variety. One problem for this kind of research project would presumably be the scarcity of suitable linguistic material. For instance, no digital corpus of Finnish Tatar texts has been created. Collecting the existing texts from public and private owners and digitizing them could be a first step towards producing such a resource. Better availability of materials of the mother tongue would also help with the launching of a language revitalization program for the Finnish Tatar minority.

Abbreviations

Arab. = Arabic
Finn. = Finnish
Finn. Tat. = Finnish Tatar
Kaz. = Kazan Tatar
Russ. = Russian
Swed. = Swedish
Turk. = Turkish

Vocabulary sources of the Tatar-Finnish dictionary[9]

English-Tatar Dictionary—Инглизчә-татарча сүзлек—İnglizçə-tatarça süzlek. 2007. Compiler Garifullin, S. F. Kazan: Magarif publishing house.

Fathullova, K. S. & Yusupova, A. Sh. 2012. *Татарча-русча-инглизчә сөйләүлек* [Tatar-Russian-English phrase book].[10] Kazan: Tatar kitap nəşriyəte.

Safiullina, F. & Fathullova, K. 2001. *Татарский язык. Интенсивный курс* [The Tatar language. An Intensive Course]. Kazan: Həter.

Татарско-русский словарь—Татарча-русча сүзлек [Tatar-Russian Dictionary, ca. 38,000 words] 1966. Ed. by Abdrazakov, K. S. & al. Moscow: Sovetskaja enciklopedija.

Татарско-русский словарь—Татарча-русча сүзлек [Tatar-Russian Dictionary, ca. 25,000 words] 2004. Ed. by Ganiyev, F. Ä. & al. Kazan: Tatarstan kitap nəşriyəte.

References

Bedretdin, Kadriye (ed.) 2011. *Tugan tel: Kirjoituksia Suomen tataareista* [Tugan tel: Writings about Finland's Tatars]. Helsinki: Suomen Itämainen Seura.

Chart 1992 = European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages 1992. http://www.coe.int/en/web/european-charter-regional-or-minority-languages/text-of-the-charter.

Const 2000 = The constitution of Finland. 11 June 1999. (In force from 1 March 2000.) http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf.

Daher, Okan 1999. Orthographical traditions of the Tatar minority in Finland. In: Janhunen, Juha & Rybatzki, Volker (eds.) *Writing in the Altaic world.* Studia Orientalia 87. Helsinki: Suomen Itämainen Seura. 44–48.

Daher, Okan 2016. Tatar minority in Finland—fully integrated into society. In: Daher, Okan & Hannikainen, L. & Heikinheimo-Pérez, K. (eds.) *National minorities in Finland. A richness of cultures and languages.* Published by Minority Rights Group Finland. Riga: Dardedze holografija. (The same text but with richer illustrations can also be found on the Internet: https://realnoevremya.com/articles/1224-okan-daher-about-tatars-in-finland; 3.8.2017.)

Halén, Harry 1999. Suomen tataarit [Tatars of Finland]. In: Löytönen, M. & Kolbe, L. (eds.) *Suomi—maa, kansa, kulttuuri.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 753. Jyväskylä: Gummerus. 315–332. (Also published in: Bedretdin, Kadriye (ed.) 2011, 1–26.)

Luutonen, Jorma & al. (eds.) 2016. *Electronic word lists: Komi, Chuvash and Tatar.* With SFOu WordListTool 1.4. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 31: 2. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.—http://www.sgr.fi/lexica/lexicaxxxi.html.

Moisio, Arto & Fomin, Eduard & Luutonen, Jorma 2007. *Tšuvassilais-suomalainen sanakirja* [Chuvash-Finnish Dictionary]. Publications of the Department of Finnish and General Linguistics of the University of Turku. Turku.

Moisio, Arto & Daher, Okan 2016. *Tataarilais-suomalainen sanakirja—Татарча-финча сүзлек—Tatarça-finçä süzlek* [Tatar-Finnish dictionary]. Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisten kielten opintoja varten, XVIII. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

---

9 Individual words have been taken from sources not listed here.
10 Translations of the non-English titles in square brackets by J. L.

Nisametdin, Feride 2011 (1974). Havaintoja Suomen tataarien kielestä [Observations about the language of Finland's Tatars]. In: Bedretdin, Kadriye (ed.) 2011, 303–316.

Suomen Islam-seurakunta. Finlandiya İslam Cemaati. (The Internet site of the Finnish Islamic Congregation.)—http://tatar.fi/en/islam-2/ (24.3.2017).

Zheltov, Pavel & Fomin, Eduard & Luutonen, Jorma 2009. *Reverse dictionary of Chuvash. Обратный словарь чувашского языка.* Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 33. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

Linguistic topics at *Turkologentag 2016: Second European Convention on Turkic, Ottoman and Turkish Studies*, Hamburg, September 14–17, 2016

Astrid Menz

This report reviews the contributions on Turkic linguistics at *Turkologentag* 2016 held September 14–17, 2016 at Hamburg University, Germany.
Keywords: conference report, Turkologentag, Turkish linguistics, Turkic linguistics

Astrid Menz, Orient-Institut Istanbul, Susam Sokak 16, TR-34433 Cihangir, Istanbul. Turkey. E-mail: menz@oidmg.org.

Between 14 and 17 September 2016 an international scientific conference focusing on Turcology, Turkish and Ottoman Studies, *Turkologentag 2016,* took place at Hamburg University, Germany. This was the second time that *Turkologentag* was jointly organized by a local organizer, in this case the Department of Turcology of Hamburg University and the Society for Turkic, Ottoman, and Turkish Studies (Gesellschaft für Turkologie, Osmanistik und Türkeiforschung, GTOT). The first *Turkologentag* was held in 2014 at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University in Munich, Germany, locally organized by the Institute for the Near and Middle East. The predecessor of the Turkologentag was the conference series *Deutsche Turkologenkonferenz*. The first of these conferences took place in 1987 in Bamberg, Germany. When it comes to participants, the target group of this conference widened over the years from German Turcologists to German speaking Turcologists, and finally European (including Turkish) Turcologists, which is clearly visible in the conference proceedings that initially were German-only publications. The first English contribution, published in the proceedings of the 1999 conference, was the only non-German contribution in this volume. The proceedings of the 2002 conference contain several English as well as the first Turkish contribution. The organizers of the 2014 conference consequently opted for a change of name as well as an official change in the scope of the target group. Since 2014, the conference aims at reaching all European researchers in the fields of Turcology, Turkish, and Ottoman Studies. More than 400 participants from 25 countries and their contributions were selected to attend the *Turkologentag* in Hamburg. The contributions were divided in altogether 12 scientific sections. Two of these sections were explicitly dedicated to

language topics, the section for *Linguistics* and a section for *German-Turkish Languages Research*. The sections on *Cultural Studies* and *Social Sciences and Migration Studies*, as well as the section *Studies on Central Asia/Volga Region/Siberia* also contained contributions with linguistic topics. In what follows, I will briefly present the language-related contributions.

The panel *Turkic Languages and Literatures under Persian Influence,* jointly organized by Elisabetta Ragagnin and Benedek Péri, was held on the first day of the conference in the section on *Studies on Central Asia/Volga Region/Siberia*. In her paper titled *Turkic-Persian language contact in Iran,* Ragagnin gave a general overview of the Persian linguistic influence, while the other three papers in this section were dedicated to more specific problems regarding literature and language: Benedek Péri, *Two sides of the same coin: Fuzūlī's The Weed and the Wine and the Anonymous Book of Secrets*; Ferenc Péter Csirkés, *Sadiqi Beg and the Politics of Turkic in Safavid Persia*; Réka Stüber, *The Language of Wisdom: Evidence from the Qutadgu Bilig for Persian syntactic interference*.

In the section *Linguistics*, five panels were held, one of which was a thematically organized panel, while the other four contained individual contributions on Turkic languages.

The panel titled *Five Dimensions of Distance in the Turkic Language Family*, was organized by Lars Johanson, whose contribution introduced five parameters, genealogical distance, typological distance, lexicostatistical distance, intelligibility distance, and perceived distance, which can be used to measure the distance between various Turkic varieties. The ultimate aim behind measuring the degrees of distances between the various Turkic languages is to gain new insights into their family-internal relations. The remaining three contributions of the panel presented case studies for the degrees of distance between various linguistic varieties spoken in different regions of the Turkic-speaking world: Irina Nevskaya, *Chalkan's distance to Shor and Southern Altai*; László Károly, *On the Yakut-Mongolic-Tungusic triangle: Its consequences on language distance;* Éva Á. Csató & Astrid Menz, *The intimacy of Eastern European Turkic: Gagauz and Karaim*.

The remaining four linguistic panels comprised contributions to Modern Turkish and Turkic Languages. Some of the announced contributions, however, had to be cancelled because their speakers could not travel to Germany due to the confusing situation at Turkish universities in the aftermath of July 15.

Diana Hayrapetyan from Yerevan State University talked on *Reduplications and duplicate forms with synonymous components of Modern Turkish*.

Gülschen Sahatova attempted an alternative evaluation of the use of *-miş* in the Turkish dialect of Cyprus: *-dI vs. -mIš: Vermittelte Evidentialität am Beispiel des Zyperntürkischen* (Conveyed evidentiality on the example of Turkish from Cyprus).

Mevlüt Erdem's *Asymmetry and dissymmetries on the accusative and dative marking in Turkic languages* discussed cases where the accusative and dative cases are not isomorphic in Turkic languages. He looked into the question of to what extent the accusative or dative marking of the verbs affects syntactic operations and

their codification in the mental lexicon, and claimed that there is no one-to-one mapping, at least for some verbs, between grammatical relations and morphological markings in Turkic languages.

Irina Nevskaya & Saule Tazhibayeva, in their lecture on *Diminutives and honorifics in North-West and North-East Turkic,* compared the diminutive forms and their pragmatics in Kazakh, a Kipchak Turkic language, to those in Shor, a Siberian Turkic language. They looked at the areal distribution of such diminutive morphemes, their etymologies, and at the patterns used for diminutive forms of personal names in the Turkic languages under study.

Bülent Özkan, from Mersin University, reported on his project of establishing a database-supported corpus platform for Turkish that will enable a researcher to build a corpus matching her research question: *Türkçe için kendi kendine derlem platformu oluşturma projesi* (The project of a self-composing corpus platform for Turkish).

Lusine Sahakyan, in her talk on *Microtoponyms in the district of Chayeli (Province of Rize)* presented the findings of her fieldwork on names for smaller geographical units like pastures, meadows, etc. While most of the toponyms in the area where she worked are Armenian words, some are mixed Turkish-Armenian compounds.

Ahmet Aydemir, in his paper *Typen von Finalsätzen im Tuwinischen* (Types of purpose clauses in Tuvan), spoke on on adverbial clauses of purpose in Tuvan. He demonstrated the various types with data from written standard Tuvan, as well as from various dialects.

Sema Aslan Demir presented a paper with the title *Türkmencede ER- ekfiilinin (copula) yan cümledeki izleri* (Traces of the copula *ER-* in dependent clauses in Turkmen) on the function of the copula as a predicator in dependent clauses in Turkmen. The use and function of this copula in Turkmen is unique among the Oghuz languages.

Sultan Tulu's contribution titled *Dede Korkut'ta sıfat-fiilli tamlama grupları* (Participle phrases in the Kitab-ı Dede Qorqut) deals with some passages in the *Kitab-ı Dede Qorqut*, where it is unclear whether the passage in question should be read as a converb consisting of participle + locative or as the participle followed by the particle da/de.

In a session on Cultural Studies Astrid Menz, in her talk *Neues von Dr. Kvergić,* presented a hitherto unknown typewritten dictionary by the (in-)famous Hermann Feodor Kvergić, whose contribution to the formation of the Sun Language Theory in the 1930s is still debated.

Altogether four panels dealt with Turkish in the diaspora. One of them took place within the broader section *Social Sciences and Migration Studies*. Organized by Kutlay Yağmur under the title *What can we learn from the second wave of Turkish-maintenance studies?*, the panel discussed sociolinguistic topics related to the presence and especially the maintenance of Turkish as a heritage language in Europe, Australia and the USA. Different maintenance patterns in various regions, as well as intergenerational differences, were the scope of the four presentations in

this panel: Memet Aktürk-Drake, *How do Turkish speakers in Sweden differ from the rest of Western Europe?*; Feyza Altınkamış & Hülya Özcan, *Immigrant bilingualism at home contexts: Voices of the young bilinguals*; Mehmet-Ali Akıncı, *From first to third generation Turks in France: What researches show us about language practices*; Kutlay Yağmur, *Intergenerational differences in language maintenance and shift patterns of Turkish: Speakers in Australia and the USA.*

Three thematic panels were related to Turkish-German language research.

In a panel given the title *Remembering, Learning, and Moving Multilingualism* Annette Herkenrath gave a presentation *Remembering multilingualism: Oral narratives of Turkish speakers in Germany* illustrating the thematic organization of memories in discourse and the grammatical procedures that occur.

Emel Türker-van der Heiden & Gözde Mercan's paper *Learning Turkish as a second/foreign language: Genitive and possessive structures* was related to the acquisition of the Turkish genitive construction by native speakers of Norwegian.

Till Woerfel, Christoph Schroeder & Juliana Goschler presented a study on the differences in acceptability of manner-of-motion verbs with so-called path satellites between monolingual and bilingual speakers of Turkish, *The encoding of motion by Turkish-German bilinguals—Evidence for a German-Turkish variety.* The findings of their study are taken as one piece of evidence for the development of a Turkish variety in Germany that is influenced by certain characteristics of German.

The panel titled *Acquisition and Use of Turkish by Turkish-German Bilinguals* was organized by Yazgül Şimşek together with Zeynep Kalkavan-Aydın and Jochen Rehbein. It focused on the evaluation of fieldwork results and research on the acquisition of Turkish by bilingual children in Germany. The first contribution, by Zeynep Kalkavan-Aydın *Sprachbiographien und Spracherwerb deutsch-türkisch bilingualer Kindergartenkinder—Daten aus dem SPREEZ-Projekt* (Language biographies and language acquisition of German-Turkish bilingual pre-school children), investigated the language acquisition of pre-school bilinguals. The remaining three contributions dealt with spoken and written language data of students between 12 and 18 years old: Yazgül Şimşek, *Tense and aspect in written texts of Turkish-German bilingual students*; Esin Işıl Gülbeyaz, *Syntaktische Entwicklung in der Erst- und Zweitsprache* (Development of syntax in first and second language); Nur Bülbül, *Textsortenbasiertes Schreiben im Türkischen am Beispiel von Sachtexten des Türkischunterrichts der Sekundarstufe I* (Turkish text production on the example of non-fictional texts for Turkish classes secondary schools, 1st to 5th year).

The third panel on Turkish-German language research was titled *Continuity, Contact, and Dominance Patterns (Turkish-German, Turkish-French).* Due to a cancellation, the French-Turkish aspect was not discussed; the two remaining contributions concentrated on the German-Turkish situation. Carol Pfaff, in her talk on *Continuity and contact-induced change in Turkish in Germany: Pronominal and demonstrative usage in three generations of children and adolescents in Berlin,* presented findings from her 20 years of studies of Turkish-German bilingualism and its effects on Turkish. Birsel Karakoç & Annette Herkenrath, in their contribution *The*

pragmatics of evidentiality in bilingual Turkish: A corpus-analytical approach, reported on their corpus-based research on how the cognitive-mental category of "evidentiality", linguistically realized in Turkish by the grammatical markers *-mIş* and *-(y)mIş,* is realized in the Turkish of bilingual children.

The numerous and diversified contributions at the conference in Hamburg indicate the importance of linguistic studies within the broader field of Turcology. The fact that four panels dealt solely with the presence of Turkish in Northwest Europe clearly shows that linguists and Turcologists are collaborating productively.

Reviews

Bernt Brendemoen: Review of Silje Susanne Alvestad *The Uppsala manuscript of Muḥammed Hevāʾī Üskūfī's* Maḳbūl-i ʿārif *(1631) from a Turcological perspective.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 105.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2016.

Bernt Brendemoen, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo, Postbox 1010 Blindern NO-0315, Oslo, Norway.
E-mail: bernt.brendemoen@ikos.uio.no

Writing rhymed dictionaries cannot be said to have been *en vogue* in the Ottoman empire (or elsewhere), but still, from the 16th century onwards, at least three have come down to us. The first one, which served as a methodological pattern for the subsequent ones, is Şāhidī Ïbrāhīm Dede's Persian-Turkish versified glossary the *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī* (1544); the second is a Bosnian-Turkish glossary, Muḥammed Hevāʾī Üskūfī's *Maḳbūl-i ʿārif* from 1631, and the third one an Armenian-Turkish dictionary by Refīʿi Kālāyī from around 1800. Of these, *Maḳbūl-i ʿārif* has received the most attention. Not long after it was written, it was mentioned by Evliyā Çelebī in the section of the *Seyāḥatnāme* where he deals with Bosnia, and Evliyā gives long examples from the text. However, the text has experienced a revival in modern times, not only because it is the first "dictionary" of any South Slavic language, but also because Üskūfī is one of the very first to name the language "Bosnian", a fact that without doubt has given the text high prestige in modern times. However, the claim that "Üskūfī is to Bosnian what Dante is to Italian"[1] seems to be a gross exaggeration.

In 2011, the 380th anniversary of Üskūfī's glossary and the 410th anniversary of the birth of its writer were celebrated in Bosnia. In that connection, a new edition was prepared, and it appeared in Tuzla the same year.[2] Some years previously, a manuscript of the text had been "rediscovered" at the University library in Uppsala. This manuscript is reproduced in facsimile in the Tuzla book, but the transcribed text is unfortunately not a transcription of this manuscript, but has been reproduced from earlier editions of the text based on different manuscripts. In some places, there are important divergences between the transcribed text and the Uppsala manuscript. What Silje Susanne Alvestad has now done, is to make a critical edition of the Uppsala manuscript, comparing it with earlier editions. She also gives the first English translation of the text, and addresses some important questions raised by the text itself.

---

1 Suggested by the Bosnian historian Enver Imamov; see p. 1 in the book under review.
2 Kasumović, Ahmet & Mønnesland, Svein: Bosansko-Turski Rječnik. Muhamed Hevai Uskufi, 1631 godine. Tuzla 2011.

Each line of the text is rendered first in transliteration, then in transcription (using Modern Turkish characters such as ç and ş) as well as in the transcriptions of earlier scholars such as Okumuş (2009) and Kadrić (2011), and finally in English translation. The author writes (p. 27) that her principles for transliterating and transcribing the text are inspired by Christiane Bulut's 1997 edition of the section of Evliyā Çelebī's *Seyāhatnāme* that deals with the journey from Bitlis to Van, but she is obviously unaware of the (in my view, unjust) criticism Bulut received because her transliteration principles were so unorthodox, since she does not comment on it.

The rhymed glossary is the central part of the *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif*, but it is preceded by a long introduction and followed by a short afterword, both written in versified high style Ottoman. (The afterword is missing from the Uppsala manuscript, but for the sake of completeness, the author has used the text from the Tuzla edition.) The Turkish language of the glossary part, however, is much simpler. Elaborating the views of Kerima Filan (p. 18), the author defends the (actually quite obvious) view that the target group of the book is not Bosnians who want to learn Turkish, but Turks who wish to learn Bosnian, since Bosnian, alongside the other South Slavic languages, was frequently heard in court circles in Istanbul, where it was spoken by the *devşirme*s, who almost exclusively came from the Balkans. The fact that the target group was Turks must be the reason why Turkish is the "meta language" not only in the glossary, but also in the introduction and the afterword. The Bosnian component consists entirely of independent words. Besides, the introduction and afterword, with their heavy literary style, would also be incomprehensible to anyone not very familiar with Ottoman Turkish. The author also holds the view that Üskūfī himself was a *devşirme* boy who was taken to Istanbul and received his education there, and she mentions the possibility, based on the introduction, that he wrote his glossary after returning to Bosnia as a pensioner (p. 11). (Üskūfī may still have been a Muslim by birth, since Muslim boys were also occasionally brought to Istanbul as *devşirme*s.)

Another possible target group of the glossary, not mentioned by the author, could be Turks who were not at the court in Istanbul, but who lived and worked in Bosnia but did not know Bosnian.[3] The Ottoman officials and clergy were probably not recruited from among the local Muslims, but were appointed from Istanbul and came from different parts of the empire. Although Turkish was the language of the rulers, most of the local population did not learn to speak it, although during the centuries of Ottoman rule their Slavic language was inundated by all kinds of Turkish terminology. In this respect, the high status enjoyed by the Turkish clergy and

---

3 Whatever the target group may have been, it should be pointed out that *Maḳbūl-i 'ārif* has a weak pedagogical structure. Although the glossary starts with primary concepts such as "God" and "man", we soon find verses such as *Şo tuzdur, riç sözdür, susasın da muçi ti!* "*So* is salt, *rič* is word, and you shut up! is *muči ti!*" (p. 59), where the logical consistency between the "entries" is rather weak.

officials should not be underestimated.[4] This brings us into the question whether there has ever really been a Turkish dialect of its own in Bosnia. The Turkish vocabulary of *Makbūl-i 'ārif* at least gives no indication of any Balkan Turkish element at all. There is a great difference between the Turkish in the introduction and the afterword on one side and the Turkish in the glossary on the other, but the difference has nothing to do with dialect differences. Based partly on the previous research by Kerima Filan and partly on her own investigations, Alvestad clearly shows that the highly literary language of the introduction and the afterword abounds in Arabic and Persian elements, while the language of the glossary is quite simple and unsophisticated, using almost entirely Turkish words (pp.116–119). There are phonological characteristics reflecting 17th century Turkish (pp. 120), such as lack of labial harmony in some suffixes, but similar forms are found all over the Turkish-speaking area.

In some manuscripts, *Makbūl-i 'ārif* bears another title, *Potur Šahidija*. This enigmatic title is discussed at length in the book (pp. 21–25). The last element must refer to Şāhidī İbrāhīm Dede, the writer of the Persian-Turkish versified glossary mentioned above, which also must have been widely known, since the meaning here must be "book in Şāhidī's style", i.e. "versified glossary". The element *potur* means "Bosnian Muslim", i.e. "convert to Islam", especially from the rural areas of Bosnia, and has slightly pejorative connotations. The etymology, however, is not clear; either it comes from Slavic *poturica*, which would mean 'little Turk', or there is a connection with the designation of the special kind of baggy trousers used in the Balkans, where only the part from the waist to above the knees is baggy, while the lower part of the legs is very narrow. Such trousers are indeed called *potur*, which possibly has an Armenian etymology. Evliyā Çelebī states that the Bosnians were called *potur* because of the trousers they wore, but Dr. Alvestad indicates that it could also be the other way around. It is difficult to give a proper answer, but it should be kept in mind that using the name of a characteristic piece of clothing to refer to the whole group of people wearing it (by the way of *pars pro toto* or metonomy), especially in a pejorative meaning, is not uncommon, cf. *Blackshirt* or *Camicia nera*, 'member of an armed squad of Italian fascists under Mussolini', later used

---

4   In an (unfortunately) unpublished PhD thesis, *Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscan Texts*, Florence Graham (Oxford University) has shown the abundance of Turkish lexical elements in the kind of colloquial language in the two areas where one would expect the Turkish impact to be weakest. There seems, however, to be an important difference between the areas in that agricultural terminology is mostly found in Bulgaria. This could perhaps indicate that the contact between Turkish- and Bosnian-speakers was largely an urban phenomenon in Bosnia because the Turks there largely belonged to the clergy or administration, while there were considerable waves of Turkish immigration from Anatolia into Bulgaria from the 14th century onwards.

more generally with the meaning 'militant fascist', or *burqa* with the meaning 'woman wearing a burqa', etc.

Silje Susanne Alvestad has done a very thorough job indeed, studying the *Maḳbūl-i ʿārif* with new both Turcological and Slavicist eyes, and without neglecting previous work on the field, thus making an important step forward in philology.

Bert Fragner: Review of Éva Á. Csató, Lars Johanson, András Róna-Tas, and Bo Utas (eds.) *Turks and Iranians. Interactions in language and history.* (Turcologica 105.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2016, 296 pp. ISSN 0177-4743. ISBN 978-3-447-10537-8.

Bert Fragner, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Dr. Ignaz Seipel-Platz 2, 1010 Wien, Austria. Email: bert.fragner@oeaw.ac.at

This volume is published on the occasion of The Gunnar Jarring Memorial Program at the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study—a very appropriate setting for a project dealing with Turko-Iranian historical and linguistic interactions. It ought to be added that such "interactions" in history and linguistics/philology almost automatically include aspects of cultural studies as well. There are scholars for whom this goes without saying; particularly regarding Turkic and Iranian peoples it is worth stressing that in many cases different linguistic conditions do not immediately indicate analogous diversity in cultural matters. There is too much evidence throughout history of the fact that linguistic domains are not at all congruent with cultural domains; in many cases the overlapping aspects are much more significant than those of separation.

It is this perspective that is scrutinized by the contributors to this exceptional volume. The initiative to compile such a volume was presumably taken by Éva Á. Csató and Lars Johanson, but there is no doubt that an active part was also taken by scholars deeply rooted in Iranian Studies, such as Bo Utas, Prods Oktor Skjærvø, the late Werner Sundermann, Judith Josephson and Donald Stilo. Readers of the contributions to this volume may repeatedly be reminded of the famous saying *tatsiz türk bolmās baššiz börk bolmās* 'There is no Persian except in the company of a Turk, (just as) there is no cap unless there is a head to put it on'[5] preserved by Maḥmud Kashghari's *Dîvânü l-lûgati Türk*.

Historically, cases of Irano-Turkic interaction are focused on two main areas, the steppe regions of Central Asia and the Plateau of Iran, both understood broadly so as to include Eastern Europe, Anatolia and the Balkans, not to mention the Subcontinent. Some appetizers deserve to be mentioned: Peter B. Golden offers an excellent historical framework for the basic concept of the volume (*The Shaping of the Turks in Medieval Eurasia*) as something like a thematic overture; Skjærvø and the late professor Sundermann offer case studies concerning what I call the "Turfan complex". Shifting topographically toward the Iranian Plateau, Bo Utas places the quest for differences between Middle Persian and New Persian onto the Turko-Iranian grid, and Judith Josephson does something similar for middle Persian verbal struc-

---

[5]   Dankoff, Robert & Kelly, James (eds.) 1984. *Maḥmūd al Kāšgarī. Compendium of the Turkic dialects. (Dīwān Luɣāt at-Turk).* Washington, D.C.: Harvard University. Vol. 2: 103.

tures. András Róna-Tas offers *Nine notes on Turks and Iranians in Eastern Europe*, and Golden contributes an intrinsic study concerning Türk and Khazaro-Iranian interaction in the Middle Ages.

Lars Johanson touches explicitly on the quest for convergences between Turkic and Iranian languages quoting Gerhard Doerfer's hyperbolic *apercu*, according to which northern vernacular Tajik from the vicinity of Tashkent can be perceived as something like a "Turkish language *in statu nascendi*". This is probably not a scholarly definition, but it may serve as a plausible illustration of the close and tightly interwoven relationship between Turkic and Iranian languages—not only in a strict linguistic sense but also in a cultural and historical sense. It seems to me that there is a particular and even delicate problem here: in a cultural and historical perspective the "Iranian" and the "Turkic" realms cannot practically be separated, and most scholars concerned with these topics will immediately agree with such a statement. Nevertheless, it seems difficult to subordinate theoretically diverse phenomena to the domains of one or the other of these two disciplines. It seems to me that the problem is rooted in the traditions of the two disciplines themselves; for generations, Turkic/Turkish Studies and Iranian Studies were primarily defined by (historically comparative) linguistic criteria. There were also, however, closely related researchers who might have perceived themselves as at home in something vague like "Oriental" or "Islamic" studies, and more recently "Middle Eastern" Studies, and who cared much less about this kind of taxonomical subordination.

One of the Russian ancestors of our studies, Vladimir Bartol'd, has never defined himself as a Turkologist or an "Iranologist"; he saw himself rather much more pragmatically, as belonging to the family of "Orientalists". Neither historians belonging to the "Turkic" side nor those from the "Iranian" side can refrain from identifying themselves as the scholarly descendants of Bartol'd among others. A similar pattern can be ascribed to Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. His position as an ancestor of "Ottoman Studies" is undeniable, but he enjoys equal standing for having been at the forefront of the scholarly study of Persian Poetry and history as well.

This consideration is not very much questioned and reflected upon in the volume. Instead, it is dedicated to a large number of substantial case-studies of Turkic-Iranian interaction. Cases of linguistic interference, not to say convergence (reminding me of Gerhard Doerfer!), are treated in a masterly fashion by among others Donald Stilo and Christiane Bulut. There are two contributions which I especially appreciate, because they so intensely represent how Iranologists can benefit from Turkologist activities: Heidi Stein's "Persian Syntactic Influence on Irano-Turkic Texts (16th century)" and István Vásáry's "The Role and Function of Mongolian and Turkic in Ilkhanid Iran". They are relevant for themes and questions which I have tried to deal with for more than thirty years.

After so many attempts at thematic rapprochement and convergence, this volume is definitely a milestone, and we have to thank its editors and contributors for having presented such a beautiful specimen of intellectual and disciplinary cross-fertilization. The volume invited me to think more substantially about possibilities of estab-

lishing an institutional body (something like a "permanent conference") to promote enduring contacts and exchange of perspectives between Turcologists and Iranologists. Referring to Vladimir Minorsky, Hans Robert Roemer once made the remark—with particular reference to the period of Timurid reign—that Turks and Iranians (in his wording "Tajiks") are like oil and water, they do not mix. Flatly rejecting this statement, Beatrice Manz coined the beautiful bon mot that "Turks and Persians are not like oil and water; they are much more like oil and vinegar". In my view this metaphor applies to Turcologists and Iranologists as well.

Saule Tazhibayeva: Review of Aynur Abish *Modality in Kazakh as spoken in China* (Turcologica 107.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 2016. 250 pp. ISBN: 978-3-447-10626-9

Saule Tazhibayeva, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Department of Turcology, K. Satpayev Str. 2, Astana 010008, Kazakhstan. E-mail: sauletazhibaeva@mail.ru

The reviewed book is a comprehensive study of the expressions of modality in Kazakh as spoken in China. The Kazakh population in China is about 20 million. The Kazakh language is used in a very wide area both in Kazakhstan and outside of it with little dialectal variation. The Kazakhs have a strong national and linguistic identity; all speakers throughout the world understand each other easily, and share similar national and cultural traditions. This became especially evident when repatriated Kazakhs began to return to their historical motherland from various countries. Although Kazakh varieties are quite similar in spoken communication, the language is currently written in three distinct alphabets: Cyrillic, Arabic and Latin. Kazakhs understand each other in oral speech, but the different writing systems cause problems, especially in scholarship. Because of this, it is especially important to study Kazakh varieties that became separated from the main ethnic area as a result of the deportation in the 1930s during the collectivization in the USSR and in the period of the famine. The variety of Kazakh spoken in China is preserved in the form in which it had existed before the Soviet era in Kazakhstan, when Kazakh was strongly dominated by Russian. At present, there are rapid processes of cultural assimilation of Kazakhs to Chinese culture. Therefore it is important to describe the language in a well-defined theoretical framework, as has been done in the reviewed monograph.

Abish's study begins with an introduction. Here she points out that she does not provide any systematic comparison with the Kazakh varieties spoken in Kazakhstan. This opens up a perspective for future comparative research on the Kazakh language in China and in Kazakhstan.

The volume is well structured and consists of five main chapters logically connected with each other. A detailed list of references and an appendix are added.

The linguistic data used in this study comes exclusively from Kazakh as spoken in China. In the introduction, Abish gives a brief review of research on Kazakh in China, including important sociolinguistic data such as number of speakers, education, institutions, publications, and broadcasting using Kazakh. This is an important contribution providing general information about Kazakh in China for English-speaking readers.

Modality, the main issue of the monograph, is analyzed in a framework based on the works of Lars Johanson, whose framework defines semantic notions of modality from a functional and typological perspective. Kazakh applies three formal devices, grammaticalized suffixes, particles, and lexical markers, to express various modal

notions. A great advantage of the work is that examples are presented in Turcological transcription with interlinear annotation and a free translation.

In the chapter *Modality*, the conceptual domain of modality is defined. Modality markers convey the expression of attitudes towards the proposition; these can be notions of volition, epistemic evaluation, and deontic evaluation. Notions of volition include demands, requests, directives, commands, impositions, entreaties, admonitions, warnings, exhortations, proposals, recommendations, advice, encouragement, incitement, etc. Epistemic evaluation covers various types of assessments of the propositional content that can reflect a commitment to the truth value of the proposition, i.e. to its certainty, probability, possibility, etc. Deontic evaluation expresses directives that impose or propose that an action should be carried out in order to compel, incite or encourage to action, in the sense of 'should', 'ought to' and the like. Further distinctions between subjective (p. 13) and objective modality (p. 14), personal and impersonal constructions (p. 16), and illocutionary modality are also discussed in the study. Some examples of non-modal notions, i.e. inherent properties, are also presented.

Three chapters describe modal notions that are conveyed by moods, modal particles, and lexical expressions respectively.

Turkic languages have rich and well developed systems of grammatical moods. This is well illustrated by the example of Kazakh as spoken in China. In the chapter *Moods* (pp. 18–69), grammaticalized suffixes expressing different modal notions are presented:

> highly grammaticalized inflectional forms of verbs (imperative, voluntative, optative, hypothetical);
> the non-productive imprecative in $\{-G^4I^2r\}$;
> modal nuances expressed by the aorist $\{-(A^2)r\}$;
> periphrastic expressions of modality;
> $\{-G^4I^2\}$ + possessive personal markers + *kel-* or *bar*
> $\{-sA^2\}$ + *iygi* + ^{y}*edi*; $\{-sA^2\}$ + *deymin*; $\{-sA^2\}$ + *kerek*.

The forms, basic semantic and syntactic properties, and usages of moods, imperative, voluntative, optative and hypothetical are presented in detail. The author points out that imperative and voluntative are different paradigms. In some Turkic grammars, the paradigms are merged into a so-called "imperative" paradigm including the imperative and the third-person voluntative, or into a so-called "optative" paradigm that also includes voluntatives of the first persons.

In the chapter *Modal particles* (pp. 70–113), the author studies the peculiarities of modal particles in Kazakh expressing cognitive or affective attitude towards the events described. The particles dealt with include *Γ²oy, šI², aw, ʷözi, D²A², mI²s, ⁱyà, à, de, deši, deseŋši* and *bilem*. Abish describes their variants, their syntactic positions, their basic semantic properties, and their usages.

It is important to note that all the above-mentioned particles are treated in the academic grammar of modern Kazakh (Žanpejisov & Xusajnov & Oralbaeva eds. 2002). The particles play a significant role in spoken communication.

The chapter *Lexical expressions* (pp. 114–153) is devoted to lexical means of expressing modal notions with the help of adverbs and verbal and nominal constructions. The most frequently used lexical expressions of modality are classified according to their semantics.

The author classifies modal adverbs with respect to their modal meanings:

Possibility: *bàlkịm* 'maybe, perhaps', *bàlkiy* 'perhaps', *mụmkụn* ‹мүмкін› 'possible';
Probability: *àytewịr/àytew* 'anyway' or 'anyhow', *bàrịbịr* 'all the same, nevertheless', *čamasỵ* 'probably', *siyayỵ* 'seemingly', *àsịlị* 'actually', *sịrà* 'apparently, probably', *zadỵ* 'essentially', *tegị* 'obviously, apparently';
Certainty: *àrine/àlbette* 'of course, certainly', *sözsịz, sözjok̦* 'surely'.

Modal meanings of volition can be expressed by verbs of different semantics such as

bụyụr- 'to order to be done', *ʷötịn-* 'to entreat, ask', *sụra-* 'to beg', *tałap ʸet-* 'to request, ask', *ụsụnụs ʸet-* 'to suggest', *k̦ała-* 'to want, wish', *tịle-* 'to wish, desire', *ụmụt ʸet-* 'to hope', *armanda-* 'to hope, aim at', *kökse-* 'to wish, desire'.

Modal meaning of necessity can be expressed by nominals such as

k̦ajet, kerek, tiyịs 'needed, necessary', *łazịm* 'necessary, ought', *jön* 'right, correct, suitable' or *abzał* 'right, correct, admissible', *dụrụs* 'right, true, correct', *łayỵk̦* 'suitable, appropriate', *šart* 'essential', *mịndettị* 'obligatory', *màžbụr* 'constrained, compelled'.

Modal meaning of possibility can be expressed by verbs such as

boładỵ 'to be possible', *jołber-* 'to allow', *rụk̦sat ʸet-* 'to permit', *jołɣoy-* 'to allow', *tiyịm sał-* 'to forbid, prohibit', *čekte-* 'to forbid', *teje-* 'to restrict, limit' or *jołberme-* 'not to allow', *rụk̦sat ʸetpe-* 'not to permit'.

The following constructions expressing probability are presented:

bołar 'to become, be possible', *čỵɣar* 'can turn out to be', *körịnedị* 'it seems', *ụk̦saydỵ* 'it looks like', *siyak̦tỵ* 'like, similar', *sịk̦ịłdỵ* 'like, similar', *sekịldị* 'like, similar', *àlpettị* 'like, similar', *mụmkụn* 'possible', *ịk̦timał* 'probable', *kàdịk* 'improbable', *bołmasỵn* 'it is hopefully not'.

Exactly parallel usages of the same verbs are also found in Modern Kazakh. Only a few of them are not preserved in modern Kazakh: *kökse-* 'to wish', *joļγoy-* 'to allow', *teǰe-* 'to restrict', *kàdïk-* 'probability'.

The definition of modality employed in this research excludes the notions of ability and intentionality. They are not included among the modal categories dealt with. However, descriptions of some non-modal categories are given by the author in the chapter *Non-modal expressions* in which Kazakh data is compared to literary and colloquial Uyghur.

The Appendix contains nine texts recorded by the author in the Kazakh-speaking regions of Xinjiang. Examples from these texts are used to illustrate modal notions discussed in the study.

The author makes some comparisons between Kazakh, Uyghur, and Turkish. I think this is a valuable contribution to comparative Turkic linguistics. In the future it would also be important to compare Kazakh as spoken in China with modern Kazakh as spoken in Kazakhstan. This would be valuable for Kazakh linguistics, especially with regard to the theme of the monograph. In Kazakhstan, several dissertations have been defended on different aspects of modality: Žanpeyisov (1958), Išanov (1968), Mamadilov (1996), Medetov (1982), and Ḵulmanov (2004). Modality as a grammatical category, and modal expressions as a separate part of speech have only been included in academic grammars since Žanpejisov & Xusajnov & Oralbaeva eds. (2002). However, there is no specific research on modality from a functional typological perspective.

It is my conviction that the young scholar Aynur Abish has published a serious piece of research on a theoretically complicated problem. The analysis she has conducted is profound and deep. Her scientific background in German and Swedish academic traditions has helped Aynur Abish to conduct research which is also important for its practical applications. The results of the research can be used in teaching at Kazakhstani universities in the new Kazakhstani multilingual education. The results of the monograph are also important for Kazakh linguistics with respect to making Kazakh better known nationally and internationally.

Literature

Išanov, K. 1968. *Povelitelnoe i želatel'noe naklonenie v sovremennom kazaxskom jazyke.* [Imperative and volitional mood in contemporary Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata

Ḵulmanov, S. 2004. *Ḵazaḵ tilindegi mumkindik modal'diginiŋ funkcionaldy-semantiḵalïḵ örisi* [The functional-semantic field of modality of possibility in the Kazakh language]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Almaty.

Mamadilov, K. 1996. *Ḵazirgi ḵazaḵ tilindegi etistiktiŋ modal'dïḵ ḵurïlïmdarï* [Grammaticalized modal devices in Modern Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Almaty.

Medetova, G. 1982. *Modal'nost' predloženija i sredstva ee vyraženija v turkskix jazykax* [Modality of assumptionand ways of its expression in Turkic languages]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata.

Žanpejisov, E. 1958. *Modalnye slova v sovremennnom kazaxskom jazyke* [Modal words in contemporary Kazakh]. Abstract of dissertation for the degree Candidate of Philology. Alma-Ata.

Žanpeyisov, E. & Xusajnov, K. & Oralbaeva, N. (eds.) 2002. *Ḳazaḳ grammatikasï. Fonetika, sözžasam, morfologija, sintaksis* [Kazakh grammar. Phonetics, lexicon, morphology, syntax]. Astana: Astana poligrafija.

Ingeborg Hauenschild

Türksprachige Gräsernamen

Eine lexikologische Untersuchung nebst Glossar

Diese Studie befasst sich mit der Wortgeschichte, der Wortbildung und der Wortbedeutung türksprachiger Gräsernamen. Der Band gliedert sich nach den verschiedenen Gräserarten. Im ersten Kapitel werden die teils schon im Alttürkischen, teils erst in späterer Zeit belegten Benennungen kultivierter Gräser wie Gerste, Weizen und Roggen behandelt. Die beiden weiteren Kapitel widmen sich den Einzel- und Gruppenbezeichnungen für wilde Gräser. Unter Gruppenbezeichnungen listet Ingeborg Hauenschild solche Gräsernamen, die eine besondere gemeinsame Eigenschaft einer Gruppe von Gräsern beschreiben. Gebräuchliche Benennungsmotive wilder Gräser können das gesamte Erscheinungsbild, spezifische Pflanzenteile oder für bestimmte Abschnitte der Vegetationsperiode typische Merkmale, aber ebenso Standort und Verwendung betreffen. Zum Abschluss wird untersucht, welchen konkreten Farbwert die auf jeden beliebigen Gegenstand anwendbaren Farbattribute bei Gräsern wiedergeben und welche Tierfarben sich gleichfalls auf Gräser beziehen lassen. Ein Glossar mit allen ermittelten türksprachigen Gräsernamen unter ihren botanischen Bezeichnungen sowie ein nach Sprachen unterteilter Index erschließen das Buch.

Éva Á. Csató, Birsel Karakoç, Astrid Menz (Eds.)

The Uppsala Meeting

Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics

This volume contains a selection of papers presented at the 13th International Turkish Linguistics Conference convened by Éva Á. Csató. The Uppsala meeting continued a significant tradition of gatherings held biannually since 1982.
The selected papers deal with different fields of linguistic studies including discourse, pragmatics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, semantics, lexicology, word formation, syntax, dialectology, language acquisition, second language learning, bilingualism, language contact, historical linguistics, phonetics and phonology, contrastive studies, and Turkish Sign Language. The language studied in most papers is Turkish, but other Turkic languages such as Azeri, Kazakh, and Modern Uyghur are also represented. An introductory report gives a comprehensive account of the wide range of contributions presented at the conference. An overview of the Turkic language family accompanied by a map provides a first orientation even for readers not familiar with Turkic.

Christiane Bulut

Linguistic Minorities in Turkey and Turkic-speaking Minorities of the Peripheries

Language plays an important role for the identity building of nation states and smaller linguistic communities. The authors of this volume present different aspects of the mutual influences between linguistic identity, political dominance, religious denomination, and the social, political, and historical frameworks in which language choice or maintenance take place. Another major issue is the expression of a specific culture as reflected in literature and religious texts. Examples presented include Anatolia and the peripheries of Turkey, such as the Balkans, Greece, the Caucasus, the northern Black Sea region, Cyprus, and Iraq.
In these regions, most speakers of minority languages are bi- or multilingual, while the distribution of spoken varieties often does not coincide with political borders, which cut through much older areas of settlement or historical domains. Across the greater area, the long-lasting and at times extensive contacts of genealogically unrelated languages, representing the Turkic, Indo-European, Semitic, and South Kartvelian families, have led to considerable structural changes and linguistic convergence. These contacts have also contributed to the formation of characteristic regional traits in the cultures of the different peoples of these regions.

VERLAG **H** PUBLISHERS
HARRASSOWITZ

Oliver Corff, Kyōko Maezono

Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen „Fünfsprachenspiegel"

Systematisch angeordneter Wortschatz auf Manjurisch, Tibetisch, Mongolisch, Turki und Chinesisch
Vollständige romanisierte und revidierte Ausgabe mit textkritischen Anmerkungen, deutschen Erläuterungen und Indizes
Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Oliver Corff, Kyōko Maezono, Wolfgang Lipp, Dorjpalam Dorj, Görööchin Gerelmaa, Aysima Mirsultan, Réka Stüber, Byambajav Töwshintögs, Xieyan Li

Index 1: Manjurisch

Index 2: Tibetisch

Index 3: Mongolisch

Index 4: Turki

Index 5: Chinesisch

Indices komplett

Manjurisch, Tibetisch, Mongolisch, Turki und Chinesisch

Wörterbuch + 5 Indices komplett

Der fünfsprachige Wörterspiegel ist das umfangreichste mehrsprachige Wörterbuch der Qing-Zeit (1644–1911) und wurde vermutlich zwischen 1790 und 1794 erarbeitet. Nach Sachgebieten geordnet umfasst es 18.671 Lexeme in den Sprachen Manjurisch, Tibetisch, Mongolisch, Turki und Chinesisch. Tibetisch und Turki werden zusätzlich durch manjurische Transkriptionen ergänzt, deren Variantenreichtum Rückschlüsse auf einzelne Schreiber und Dialekteinflüsse des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts zulässt. Das Wörterbuch eröffnet umfassende Einblicke in die materielle, geistige, administrative und sprachliche Welt des Qing-Reiches, ist eines der größten bekannten Transkriptionsmonumente für Tibetisch und Turki und darf nach Umfang und historischer Bedeutung als Standardwerk der multilingualen Lexikografie der Qing-Zeit schlechthin bezeichnet werden.

Der Text liegt nun erstmals vollständig revidiert und romanisiert vor. Neben textkritischen Anmerkungen sowie deutschen Übersetzungen und Erläuterungen enthält der Band umfangreiche Hinweise zu Textquellen des Wortschatzes (e.g. der älteren chinesischen Literatur) sowie zur Etymologie des Turki-Materials, für welches zahlreiche Wortwurzeln persischen und arabischen Ursprungs nachgewiesen werden. Zudem werden in der Wiedergabe sämtlicher Schriften einschließlich der chinesischen Zeichen individuelle Schreibvarianten berücksichtigt.

Aufgrund der Anordnung seiner Einträge nach Sachgebieten entzieht sich das *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstellte Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen* (Fünfsprachenspiegel) einer direkten Nutzung als Nachschlagewerk für unbekannte Wortformen. Eine wie auch immer strukturierte alphabetische Anordnung des Wörterbuches hätte immer nur eine der fünf Sprachen berücksichtigen können.

Um die Einträge aller Sprachen nachschlagbar zu machen, wurden für Manjurisch, Tibetisch (in Romanisierung der tibetischen Schrift, nicht aber für die manjurischen Umschriftsysteme), Mongolisch, Turki (auch hier für die Romanisierung der arabischen Schrift, nicht aber für die Ausspracheangaben in manjurischer Schrift) und Chinesisch (hier graphematisch geordnet) Indices erstellt, die es im Gegensatz zu früheren Werken erstmals erlauben, alle Wortbestandteile auch komplexer Komposita einzeln nachzuschlagen, unabhängig von ihrer Position im Eintrag. Darüber hinaus lassen sich auch alle Schreibvarianten des Pekinger Nachdrucks, der auf dem Chonghuagong-Manuskript basiert, nachschlagen. Insbesondere bedeutet dies den versucht lückenlosen Nachweis auch aller Varianten chinesischer Schriftzeichen.