

## Werk

**Titel:** Reports

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2017

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0021](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0021) | LOG\_0028

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

## Reports

# Finnish Tatars and the trilingual Tatar-Finnish dictionary

**Jorma Luutonen & Arto Moisio & Okan Daher**

Luutonen, Jorma & Moisio, Arto & Daher, Okan 2017. Finnish Tatars and the trilingual Tatar-Finnish dictionary. *Turkic Languages* 21, 266–280.

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<sup>1</sup> in a country with a population of 5.5 million.

- <sup>1</sup> 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*,<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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. *н*) 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<sup>4</sup> (est. 1925), which usually only accepts Tatars as members.<sup>5</sup> 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,<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> 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<sup>8</sup> 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** *abınırğa* 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:

<i>afu</i>	гафу
<i>kimä</i>	көймә
<i>kanvert</i>	конверт
<i>eskrim</i>	фехтование
<i>hisap</i>	счёт
<i>Almanya</i>	Германия
<i>kristal</i>	хрусталь
<i>yäş</i>	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 (*счѐт* '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 /ɣ/ of Kazan Tatar often has no counterpart in Finnish Tatar words, e.g. *ayep* 'fault' cf. *zaen*; *lanät* 'curse' cf. *ләгънәт*; *mosizä* 'miracle' cf. *могъџиза*; *şair* 'poet' cf. *шагъйрь* (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*; *numır* 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'; *bilauka* cf. Kaz., Russ. *булавка* 'pin'; *çomadın* cf. Kaz., Russ. *чемодан* 'suitcase'; *piraşuk* 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'; *istakan* cf. Kaz., Russ. *стакан* 'glass, tumbler'; *işkaş* 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 *клуба* 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. *з*, 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 *х* 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 *av* 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<sup>9</sup>

- English-Tatar Dictionary—Инглизчә-татарча сүзлек—İnglizçä-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].<sup>10</sup> Kazan: Tatar kitap nəşriyäte.
- 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 nəşriyäte.

### 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/lexicaxxi.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-ugrilaisien kielten opintoja varten, XVIII. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne.

<sup>9</sup> Individual words have been taken from sources not listed here.

<sup>10</sup> 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).
- Zheltoy, 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**

Astrid Menz. 2017. Linguistic topics at *Turkologentag 2016: Second European Convention on Turkic, Ottoman and Turkish Studies*, Hamburg, September 14–17, 2016. *Turkic Languages* 21, 281–285.

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 Turkologenkongferenz*. 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: Fuzûlî'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: *-dl vs. -mlş: 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 Tuvinischen* (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- ekfilinin (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 Altınkamaş & 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. Birsal 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 *-mİş* and *-(y)mİş*, 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.