

## Werk

**Titel:** Editorial note

**Autor:** Johanson, Lars

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2018

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0022](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0022) | LOG\_0026

## Kontakt/Contact

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

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

## Editorial note

*Turkic Languages, Volume 22, 2018, Number 2*

The present issue of *TURKIC LANGUAGES* starts with three papers on languages of the western part of the Turkic-speaking world.

Jaklin Kornfilt raises the question of whether Turkish, according to principles in the framework of formal linguistics, is an “NP language” or a “DP language”. The question concerns the suggested typological divide between languages whose traditionally defined noun phrases are determiner phrases (DP) and languages whose noun phrases only extend to NP. It has been claimed that Turkish belongs to the latter type, and a number of relevant properties have been proposed. The author argues that, at best, the properties can be explained in other ways, and that, at worst, the NP hypothesis makes wrong predictions with respect to Turkish. The phenomena that are claimed to characterize Turkish as an NP language fail to establish such a characterization. Analyzing Turkish noun phrases as determiner phrases is at least as successful.

Hasmik Kirakosyan & Ani Sargsyan deal with medieval Persian-Ottoman bilingual dictionaries, in particular copies kept in the Mesrop Mashtots Institute of Ancient Manuscripts in Yerevan. Dictionaries of this kind, so-called *farhangs*, were compiled as educational tools and used in *medreses* to help with reading and understanding the patterns of Persian classical literature, and also for teaching the Arabic-Persian loan vocabulary and the parts of Persian grammar that were relevant for Ottoman Turkish. The manuals are important witnesses of the linguistic interrelations and cultural milieu of their time.

Henryk Jankowski presents a small corpus of spoken Krymchak recorded with one single informant. Written Krymchak is well-documented in modern and pre-modern texts representing a variety of styles. The spoken language, however, is very poorly documented. Even a small corpus, such as the one presented here, is thus of high value. Competent native speakers of Krymchak are, however, hardly available today. The linguistic competence of this informant, born in 1924 in Simferopol, was relatively limited. She could remember to some extent the language she heard and spoke in her childhood. According to the author, Krymchak as spoken by this informant is morphologically a NW Turkic language, but phonologically a mixture of SW and NW Turkic.

Four contributions deal with the northern-most parts of Turcia.

Irina Nevskaya, Larisa Tybykova, Mikhail Vavulin, Olga Zaytseva, and Evgeniy Vodyasov report on the results of field research in the Altai Mountains, where a number of Turkic runiform rock inscriptions were digitalized by means of three-dimensional technologies. The outcome has led to revised readings of two inscriptions on the basis of new analyses of their runiform signs. One of the texts sheds

light on the ancient religious terminology of the area. The recorded data will soon be freely accessible to all interested researchers.

Elisabetta Ragagnin presents brand new data on Tuhan, a small Sayan Turkic language spoken in the county of Tsagaan Üür in the East Khövsgöl region of Mongolia. It is moribund, only used by a handful of old speakers and semi-speakers. While displaying typical Sayan Turkic characteristics, it preserves a number of otherwise unknown archaic features. It shares certain isoglosses with Tofan, and others with Altay and Khakas. Since Tuhan appears to be highly important for comparative Turcology, the author quite rightly characterizes it as a precious “gem” among the South Siberian Turkic languages.

Gregory D. S. Anderson deals with the wide range of functions of the Sayan Turkic converb in {-GAš}, especially its roles in complex sentences and narrative structures. It appears to be in the process of being pushed into the finite system as an anterior marker. Its most salient and common feature is the propulsive function, the power to advance the discourse when expressing narratively equal events. In some taiga varieties, the converb is claimed to have been grammaticalized as a same-subject marker in a switch-reference system. Varieties such as Jungar Tuvan and Dukhan have a tail-head linkage system, where the converb is used to set off chunks of discourse by copying sequences of the finite predicative element of a sentence at the beginning of the following sentence. In varieties such as Tofan and Soyot, the use of {-GAš} has been extended into the domains of the {-p} converb in complex predicates and auxiliary verb constructions.

Chris Lasse Däbritz presents a corpus-based analysis of three so-called placeholders (lexical fillers) in the North-Siberian Turkic language Dolgan. These are lexical items that replace other lexical items in a clause. While searching for the right lexical item, the speaker typically fills the arising pause with a nominal or verbal placeholder. The items *kim* and *kimne:-* occupy the same syntactic slot as the substituted lexical item, whereas *kaña:-* functions differently. The Dolgan placeholders are relatively complex in form and function. They are investigated here with respect to their morphosyntactic properties, functional domains, and etymologies.

István Vásáry devotes an obituary to András J. E. Bodrogligeti (1925–2017).

The editors are pleased to announce that, starting from volume 21 (2017), *TURKIC LANGUAGES* is indexed in Web of Science’s Arts and Humanities Citation Index (AHCI).

*Lars Johanson*