

Werk

Titel: Editorial note

Autor: Johanson, Lars

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2017

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021 | LOG_0022

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Editorial note

Turkic Languages, Volume 21, 2017, Number 2

In the present issue of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* Birsal 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-ı-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. *baş-ta-* vs. *baş-la-* ‘to begin’, has developed independently several times in different parts of the Turkic-speaking world, e.g. in Bashkir, Kazakh, Western Yugur, and North-eastern 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-sı* '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 Ūskūfī's 17th century Ottoman glossary *Maḡbūl-i 'ārif*.

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

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

