

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2019

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0023 | LOG_0020

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Klára Agyagási: Reviews of I. P. Pavlov 2017, *Sovremennyj čuvaškij jazyk 2: Morfologija* [Contemporary Chuvash 2. Morphology]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk. 448 pp., and V. I. Sergeev 2017, *Morfologija čuvaškogo jazyka. Slovoizmenenie, formoizmenenie i formoobrazovanie* [Chuvash morphology. Inflection, form modification, and word formation]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk. 398 pp. ISBN 978-5-87677-229-9.

Klára Agyagási, Institute of Slavic Studies, University of Debrecen H-4032 Debrecen, Egyetem tér 1. E-mail: agyagasi.klara@arts.unideb.hu

Truly scientific descriptive morphological research into the Chuvash language has been carried out for 120 years now. Ašmarin's monograph (1898) was the first to discuss grammatical phenomena that occur in both standard Chuvash and its regional dialects. The author's aim was to provide a comprehensive overview of Chuvash morphology, with specific focus on the systems of inflection and derivation, reviewing them, in the traditional fashion, by parts of speech. At the same time, Ašmarin discussed a number of morphological phenomena in a Turkic historical and Volga region areal context. While the pioneering nature of the work is clearly important to emphasize, it has to be pointed out that, precisely because of the comprehensive nature of the work, many smaller issues are treated in insufficient detail. All in all, Ašmarin's work long served, as the point of departure and point of reference for all later Chuvash descriptive grammars.

The authors of the 1957 volume on Chuvash morphology, edited by I. P. Pavlov, narrowed down their focus to providing an overview of the normative features of the morphology of modern Chuvash. This handbook describes the full system of the workings of standard Chuvash, however, the discussion of form and function is not entirely unified or consistent throughout this multi-author publication.

The sketch of Chuvash grammar (Andreev 1961), published as an appendix to Sirotkin's 1961 Chuvash–Russian dictionary, provides no further insight compared to the 1957 volume, but is very useful nevertheless. It is precisely the self-professed sketchy nature of the work that enables it to provide a clear, systematic and brief overview of the most often used morphological elements of the Chuvash language with concise references to their functions. After this work by Andreev, no comprehensive work on the descriptive morphology of standard Chuvash was published by an authentic Chuvash author for half a century, although authors devoted a great deal of attention to specific details of Chuvash morphology. A list of such publications was compiled in Batčenko's bibliography of Chuvash linguistics (Batčenko 2004: 33–44).

In addition to the description of the morphological system of standard Chuvash, effort to collect and publish information on the characteristics of Chuvash regional dialects were ongoing in the second half of the 20th century. A summary of research into morphology published in various places over the years is included in Sergeev's monograph (2007: 161–255), and discusses, by part of speech, issues of regional dialects which differ from the morphology of the standard variety.

After the above-mentioned antecedents, and perhaps not coincidentally in the same year two very detailed descriptive grammars of Chuvash were published, building on each other in their method of language description—the life works of two renowned Chuvash morphologists.¹

I. P. Pavlov. 2017. *Sovremennyy čuvaškij jazyk 2: Morfologija*. Naučnyj redaktor, avtor primečanij i kommentarijev: V. I. Sergeev [Contemporary Chuvash 2. Morphology. Scientific editor and author of notes and comments V. I. Sergeev]. ISBN 978-5-87677-214-5. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk. 448 pp.

This volume consists of two theoretical chapters (Parts of speech; Morphological categories; pp. 5–35) and 11 descriptive linguistic chapters (pp. 36–419), followed by the editor's notes and comments (pp. 419–442) and concluding with a table of content (pp. 444–447).

In Chapter 1, Pavlov evaluates the method of language description used in previously published Chuvash descriptive grammars, in which the interpretation of parts of speech and their characteristics is automatically based on the notion of part of speech developed for other languages. In his opinion, the notion of part of speech is not a universal in linguistics, from which it follows that classification of vocabulary into parts of speech should primarily be based on the characteristics of the given language. In Chuvash, the classification of words into parts of speech cannot be carried out solely on the basis of their morphological characteristics, since some parts of speech do not necessarily have full grammatical paradigms. Similarly, they cannot simply be assigned syntactic functions, as there are more parts of speech than sentence elements. Furthermore, in the Chuvash language all parts of speech can serve in more than just one syntactic function. For these reasons, Pavlov considers it practical to define Chuvash parts of speech on a semantic basis. According to his observations, items of the Chuvash lexicon form classes on the basis of general semantic characteristics. Pavlov categorizes semantic characteristics as class characteristics, thus defining 11 parts of speech: nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, onomatopoeic words, conjunctions, particles, and interjections. The

1 I. P. Pavlov passed away in June 2002. The work discussed below is the monograph edited by his students. It is based on his works published in Chuvash and the university lectures he gave during his long career as a professor. V. I. Sergeev lived to see his most important work published before passing away in the autumn of 2018.

parts of speech are organized hierarchically in the language, with the place of each part of speech defined by the extent to which the quantity of grammatical characteristics carried by them increases or decreases. The parts of speech together form lexical and grammatical class-forming categories, since it is not the forms of words, but the words themselves, that form oppositions. Because the characteristics of categorial meaning, morphology, derivation, and valency are manifested in each part of speech group in a unique fashion, Pavlov considers parts of speech to be primal structural elements of grammar.

The reason for the necessity of Chapter 2 was, that the author uncovered a considerable number of inconsistencies found in descriptive grammars of various Turkic languages in their comparisons with the structure of Chuvash regarding their morphological and part-of-speech categorizations of lexemes with identical morpheme structure and syntactic function.

Pavlov believes this is because the morphological categories used in describing sister Turkic languages are either not defined precisely enough or not sufficient in number to elucidate the logical basis for the differential definition of the same linguistic phenomena. For this reason, the chapter begins by defining the notion of morphological category, as the system of forms expressing identical meanings but positioned in opposition to each other. In Chuvash, for instance, distinctiveness (*kategorija vydelenija*) is a separate category formed by two elements (-i/-xi, vs. -sker) in opposition (cf. *värmanti* ‘being in the forest’).² In Tatar words, forms of similar meanings (*urmandagı*) are regarded as adjectives of secondary derivation, with the morpheme *-dagı* being a derivational element, since Tatar does not have any other form of the same meaning in opposition to this grammatical form. In this chapter, Pavlov provides a list of which parts of speech can have which morphological categories in the Chuvash inflectional system. The system he draws up makes it possible for word forms that cannot be distinguished on the basis of their forms (i.e. homomorphs) to be defined for part of speech on a logical basis, through a comparison of shared and distinctive categories.

The first of the descriptive grammatical chapters is about nouns (pp. 36–119). In addition to providing a lexical and grammatical categorization, which is an obligatory part of any descriptive grammar, Pavlov introduces new aspects of describing nouns. He devotes detailed attention to nouns used as postpositions, providing exact definitions of the formal possibilities of their individual as well as auxiliary use. He establishes a range of new categories of nouns, the first of which is the differentiation of object number (*kategorija predmetnogo čisla*) and person number (*kategorija ličnogo čisla*), a distinction made meaningful by the expression of the category of nominal person. The latter is equivalent to the category of nouns marked for the person of the possessor in earlier grammars. Another new category is that of direction, expressed in forms derived with *-(A)lla-*. In this case Pavlov resolves an old dilemma, since earlier grammars qualified this word form as either a secondary

2 For more about this phenomenon, see Luutonen (2011).

direction marking case or as an adverb.³ Other innovations include the category of distinctiveness, mentioned above, and the category of the comparative forms of nouns (*kategorija stepenej sravnenija imen suščestvitel'nyx*). The chapter also includes a detailed and in-depth discussion of case marking of nouns and of the grammatical semantics of cases. The chapter concludes with an overview of the models of dual case marking, where case-marked forms of nouns receive further case marking.

The second descriptive chapter discusses adjectives (pp. 120–151). The first section of the chapter talks about the part-of-speech characteristics of adjectives, the second about their lexical and grammatical categorization. Pavlov describes adjectives expressing characteristics, their comparative forms, and the forms expressing the intensity of characteristics. Also in the case of adjectives he identifies distinctive forms as a separate category, and introduces the nominal and adjectival forms of this category. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the category of adjective time, which is characteristic of adjectives with a predicative function, and does not have any special marker in the present and the postfix *-ččě* in the past.

A description of numerals is given on pages 152–173, with their characterization from a part of speech point of view and an overview of the simple and complex numeral constructions. Pavlov introduces a new category for numerals as well. In his opinion, the previous, derivation-based categorization of numerals into cardinal, ordinal, disjunctive, and collective numerals is not motivated by either morphological or semantic characteristics, since every group contains words belonging to the same part of speech and with the same grammatical and semantic elements. For this reason, he suggests that instead of using of various groups of numerals as a starting point, it is more sensible to use a unified morphological category, which he calls the numerative (*numerativ*). He considers the variability of forms in the numerative category to be declensional rather than derivational, because the elements *-měš*, *-šar/-šer*, and *-ān/-ēn* express a relationship with other parts of the sentence in similar way as how case markers fulfill the same function in the case of nouns. In the rest of the chapter he discusses the attributive, non-attributive, and substantive use of cardinal numerals, before introducing the category of person in the description of numerals as well (due to the fact that numerals can also be marked with personal possessive suffixes).

The fourth descriptive chapter discusses pronouns. The introductory section of the chapter gives an overview of the part-of-speech characteristics of pronouns, followed by a review of the traditional pronoun groups.

The fifth descriptive chapter focuses on the verb (pp. 194–307). In this large chapter, Pavlov categorizes the morphological characteristics defined by the morphological categories of the system of verbs into four thematic sections (voice, de-

3 Historically, what we have here in fact, is the development of the Old Turkic noun *ula* ‘border marker, roadside column’ into a postposition, and its further grammaticalization. For details, see Agyagási (2001).

clension, the category of tense, and declensional paradigms). The first topics in the section on voice are the grammatical semantics, formation, and functions of the infinitive, followed by the definition of the category of verb form. Pavlov remarks that there are more derivative elements than form-modifying ones in the formal expression of the category of verb form, but he still discusses this category in the system of form modification. He surveys the base form and the passive-reflexive, mutual, and causative verb forms, addressing issues of transitivity and intransitivity here as well, since they are closely related to the formation of passive forms. The next thematic unit of the section on voice is aspect. By aspect, Pavlov understands the affirmative vs. negative, and possible vs. impossible opposition expressed by paradigmatic pairs of verbs.

Affirmative forms do not have a morphological marker, while negative forms do (cf. the allomorphs *-m*, *-mA* and *-mAs*). He analyzes the morphological differences of the attributive and adverbial uses of negative forms and in a separate section talks about the intensive forms of verbs. About 30 one-syllable verbs belong here, whose base forms have the intensifying element *-AIA* attached. In Chuvash the formation of intensive forms would belong under the topic of Aktionsart, as a part of aspect, but Pavlov does not discuss it separately.⁴ He does however assign the tense division of actions (*kratnost'*) to a separate verb category, within he includes verbs expressing momentary, frequentative, and delayed actions, the first of which does not have a morphological marker, while the latter two are marked with *-kAIA*.

The next thematic section analyzes the phenomena forming the categorial background of declension. In addition to the well-known categorial characteristics of person, there is a detailed treatment of the obligatory and non-obligatory cases of the expression of person, which is covered in connection with the tense forms of predicative and non-predicative uses and personal possessive marking. The other obligatory category of declension is number, which Pavlov calls the category of personal number (*kategorija ličnogo čisla*) in Chuvash. The reason for this terminological innovation is that already in the name of the category the author expresses, the well-known fact that in Chuvash verbal paradigms person markers express the categories of number and person at the same time.

The perhaps most important difference between Pavlov's work and earlier works describing Chuvash concerns the interpretation of the category of tense. Earlier approaches operated with notions relating to the declension of finite verbs, thereby excluding tense expressed by adjectival and adverbial participles.

Thus, Pavlov departs from the part-of-speech based (and hotly debated) classification of the participial forms of verbs and creates a new temporal system based on a functional perspective. The members of this system are as follows: temporal meaning expressing forms with predicative roles (all finite verbs and some participles), temporal meaning expressing forms with attributive roles (traditionally, these are called adjectival participles), temporal meaning expressing forms with adverbial

4 On issues regarding action mood, see Lebedev's 2016 monograph.

roles (traditionally, these are called adverbial participles), temporal meaning expressing forms with subject roles (here Pavlov includes forms fulfilling the function of the subject that are created with a distinctive element using a verbal base and, thus are characterizable by grammatical tense),⁵ and, finally, temporal meaning expressing forms with object roles (these are the forms in which definite object case marking attached to the nominalizer). Every member of the system is able to express absolute and relative time, which is illustrated by the author in the analysis of examples.

Mood does not appear as a separate category in Pavlov's description of the language due to the fact that Chuvash verb forms do not have separate elements expressing only tense or only mood. Tense and mood are represented together in them, and Pavlov mentions them as comprising a shared category. In his view, mood is not a separate category either because in Chuvash there is only modality in verbs. Every mood, formerly treated as a separate category, expresses two kinds of modality: either the reality or irreality of the action. Thus, the traditional indicative mood expresses the realis modality of the action, whereas the traditional conditional, imperative, and permissive moods can be categorized among the forms of the verb expressing future irrealis modality.

A separate thematic section is dedicated to the paradigms of the Chuvash system of verbs, arranged by tense. This topic is already a well-developed aspect of Chuvash descriptive morphology, and Pavlov has only adjusted the names of the various tenses to the newly created temporal system and categorized the predicative participles as part of the declension system.

The sixth descriptive chapter of the book gives an overview of adverbs (pp. 308–319). The author deals with the part-of-speech characteristics of adverbs, their lexical and grammatical classification, the description of the process whereby individual words and lexical constructions become adverbs, and the possibility of forming the comparative in the case of adverbs expressing tense and mood.

The seventh descriptive chapter (pp. 320–346) treats onomatopoeic words as a separate part of speech. There are a great number of onomatopoeic words in Chuvash—which is why it is no coincidence that Pavlov pays such detailed attention to them. The chapter opens with a discussion of the notion of this part of speech and an overview of the history of research into it. The author then analyzes the meanings and phonological forms of onomatopoeic words as well as their structural types, conjugation, and possible syntactic functions.

The eighth descriptive chapter discusses postpositions (pp. 347–360). The author interprets the notion of postpositions and states that their function is close to that of case markers. It is therefore no coincidence that in Chuvash there are case markers that have been grammaticalized from postpositions, whereas other postpositions are closely related to independent nouns. For this reason, Pavlov divides postpositions

5 The distinctive element is called a nominalizer by Luutonen (2011) precisely on the basis of function.

into two types: primary and secondary. He distinguishes different groups in the secondary type based on their origin (from nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs). He touches on the issue of the cases governed by postpositions and reviews their morphological characteristics, also creating a classification of postpositions by meaning, with 21 elements in it.

Conjunctions are discussed as a separate part of speech on pp. 361–384. The author defines the conjunctions with reference to the fact that they fulfill primarily syntactic functions rather than morphological ones. He classifies them from functional as well as structural perspectives and then delineates their groupings based on their origin (since in modern Chuvash there are very few primary conjunctions). A separate section deals with the use of conjunctions and the role of their positions in subordinate clauses.

Particles (pp. 385–410) occur in great numbers in the Chuvash language. Pavlov defines this part of speech, points out the three possible syntactic positions that particles can occupy in a sentence, and provides examples of the three-element-constructions in which a particle occupies the central place. The author also discusses the orthographic rules that result from the different positioning of the particles. Finally, he classifies particles based on semantic considerations. Accordingly, Chuvash has particles that express fine mental colorations, emotional and expressive content, and modal and strengthening colorations.

The final descriptive chapter contains an overview of interjections (pp. 411–418). Pavlov interprets the notion of this part of speech, and demonstrates the typical phonological structure and functional variants of interjections.

Having surveyed the contents of Pavlov's monograph, one can clearly conclude that the author has fulfilled his goal. He has created a Chuvash descriptive grammatical monograph in which the method used to describe of the language is aligned with its characteristics and Turkic origin. He has created a clear system in which every important morphological, derivational, and functional characteristic of all the parts of speech is described with sufficient attention and as part of a well-presented structure. Through a novel, appropriately argued reinterpretation of individual grammatical phenomena, the author greatly facilitates a better understanding of the morphology of the Chuvash language. This is a high quality volume of modern, scientifically performed language description.

V. I. Sergeev. 2017. *Morfologija čuvaškogo jazyka. Slovoizmenenie, formoizmenenie i formoobrazovanie* [Chuvash morphology. Inflection, form modification, and word formation]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk. 398 pp. ISBN 978-5-87677-229-9.

While the aim of Pavlov's monograph was to provide a coherent description of the morphology of the modern Chuvash language in a Turkic linguistic framework, and in a way that avoids the inconsistencies and mistakes of earlier works, Sergeev's work sets different goals. Sergeev makes the structure of the Chuvash system of

morphology the object of his investigation, approaching morphological phenomena from a typological perspective. He does not aim to provide definitive answers to the questions he raises, his intention being, instead, to uncover discrepancies and introduce a new, typologically grounded approach to Chuvash linguistics.

The first chapter of the book, “The theory and terminology of morphological structure” (pp. 8–22) provides a theoretical foundation. Sergeev enumerates and defines a number of notions that were not used in Chuvash descriptive linguistics in earlier times, but that are well-known in the general linguistics literature written in or translated into Russian. These include morphotaxis, “morpheme taxis”, the ordering of morphemes, the grammar of ordering, word form, lexeme, and grammeme. Since Sergeev’s book is about the inflection of Chuvash word forms and form modification, he provides a detailed description of the historical stages of the interpretation of this notion in the Turcological literature, and illustrates the variant of it that he himself uses in Chuvash. According to it, word-form change consists of changing largely categorial and rarely non-categorial forms (the marked plural, personal possessive marking, and case forms according to the rules of agglutination). These rules are determined by historically developed morphotaxis.

Accordingly, the second chapter (pp. 23–66) is titled “The characteristics of the Chuvash agglutinative structuring: Categorial forms of form creation (inflection) and form modification (formal markers manifesting individual grammatical categories)”. The chapter starts out by defining the notion of morphological category. Sergeev differentiates between morphological category as a central notion of linguistics and as a grammatical category. In his view, the latter is composed of grammemes, which are elementary grammatical units. (This distinction is necessary because in agglutinating languages the forms participating in inflection each carry a unit of grammatical meaning.) Morphological categories are usually treated as part-of-speech dependent notions in the Russian linguistics literature, however Chuvash has categories that are independent of parts of speech and participate in both derivation and form modification. For this reason, Sergeev introduces the “central” (*steržnevoj*) vs. the part-of-speech independent (*skvoznoj*) categorial qualifications, thereby providing a theoretical foundation for the permeability of inflections across parts of speech in Chuvash. Through a detailed analysis of forms with distinctive derivational suffixes, he also demonstrates their categorial and non-categorial forms.

Chapter 3 (pp. 67–115) examines the grammatical rules of morpheme ordering. This issue has never been addressed, either in earlier descriptions of Chuvash or in the Turcological literature in Russia, since the description of grammatical elements in the languages described followed the model of Russian, an Indo-European, flexional language. Thus, in this chapter Sergeev argues against the practice of all those Turcologists who mechanically used the notions and terms of Russian inflectional morphology to analyze Turkic languages. Instead of using a set of notions based on a different typological model, he suggests the introduction of explicit (marked) and implicit (unmarked) morphological categories. Unmarked categories (zero morphemes) occur in great numbers in Chuvash, and provide a range of interpretative

possibilities, even within the same part of speech. Analyzing these on the basis of concrete Chuvash examples, he concludes that for a morphological phenomenon to become a categorial phenomenon, it is absolutely necessary for the language to possess an unequivocal formal marker that represents the exact same grammatical content, in the full range of elements of the given part of speech, in the same way. In Chuvash, in his opinion, it is generally safe to say that in form creation, further elements always attach to categorially marked stems, and these elements can also be either categorial or non-categorial.

In three other chapters of the monograph, Sergeev discusses the morphemic structure of Chuvash parts of speech in accordance with the terminology and principles established in the theoretical framework earlier, in the three subsystems of inflection, categorial, and non-categorial form creation. In Chapter 4 (pp. 116–268) nominals are discussed, in Chapter 5 (pp. 269–325) verbs, and, finally, in Chapter 6 (pp. 326–341) an analysis is provided of special categorial and non-categorial parts of speech (adverbs, onomatopoeic words, postpositions, and auxiliaries). After the analytical chapters, the volume contains a conclusion (pp. 342–346), appendices (pp. 347–371), a detailed bibliography (pp. 372–382), a list of abbreviations (pp. 383–384) and an index of affixes (pp. 385–392).

In his work, Sergeev has provided a new foundation for modern Chuvash descriptive linguistics. While successfully pointing out the uniquely Chuvash morphological formations and their morphological structures, he also identifies those structural similarities that connect Chuvash with other Turkic languages on a typological and genetic basis. With its sharp insight into complex issues, and comprehensive and stable foundation in the linguistics literature, this work goes beyond the narrowly defined framework of descriptive morphology and opens up an avenue for research in Chuvash morphosyntax, while also deserving a place among the outstanding works of linguistic typology as well.

References

- Agyagási, K. 2001. Zur Geschichte der tscheremissischen *-la/-lä* und der tschuwaschischen *lla/-lle* Adverbialsuffixe. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 6, 9–14.
- Andreev, N. A. 1961. *Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk čuvaškogo jazyka: Priloženie čuvaškoro-russkogo slovarja* [A short sketch of the Chuvash grammar: Appendix to the Chuvash-Russian dictionary]. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej. 599–630.
- Ašmarin, N. A. 1898. *Materialy dlja issledovanija čuvaškogo jazyka 2: Učenie o formax (morfologija)* [Materials for the research of the Chuvash language. Studies on morphology]. Kazan': Tipografija Imperatorskago Universiteta.
- Batčenko, E. I. 2004. *Čuvaškoe jazykoznanie: Bibliografičeskij ukazatel' (1730–2002)* 1. [Chuvash linguistics: bibliographical index (1730–2002) 1]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk.
- Lebedev, Ė. E. 2016. *Akcionsartovye značeniya složnoverbal'nyx form v čuvašskom jazyke* [Aktionsart-meanings of the compound verbal constructions in Chuvash]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj institut gumanitarnyx nauk.

- Luutonen, J. 2011. *Chuvash syntactic nominalizers: On *-ki and its counterparts in Ural-Altaic languages*. (Turcologica 88.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Pavlov, I. P. (ed.) 1957. *Materialy po grammatike sovremennogo čuvaškogo jazyka 1: Morfologija* [Materials on contemporary Chuvash morphology 1]. Čeboksary: Čuvašskoe gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo.
- Sergeev, L. P. 2007. *Dialektnaja sistema čuvaškogo jazyka* [The system of dialects of the Chuvash language]. Čeboksary: Čuvaškij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij universitet imeni I. Ja. Jakovleva.

Marcel Erdal: Review of Gülcan Çolak 2017². *Türkçede fosil kelimeler*. İstanbul: Bilge Kültür-Sanat, 256 pp. ISBN: 978-605-9521-49-9.

Marcel Erdal, Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

Language change involves all aspects of language, perhaps most obviously the lexicon. Lexemes continuously fall out of use; others are created in various processes; others change their meaning. The loss of a lexeme does not involve its derivatives: *buğ* ‘grief, sorrow, distress’ has disappeared from Modern Turkish; but its derivative *bunalmak* ‘to get exasperated’ is common, as is the verbal noun *bunalım* ‘melancholy, crisis, despondency’. Nor are compounds affected by such loss: *çakır* ‘wine’ is no longer in use in Turkish, but the exocentric compound *çakırkeyif* ‘tipsy’ is. Gülcan Çolak, the author of the book under review, has adopted the term ‘fossil’, used by Coffey (2013), to refer to lexical units such as *fro* in *to and fro*, *shrift* in *to give somebody (or something) short shrift*, or the verb *to wit* ‘to be aware of something’ in *unwitting*, applying it, e.g., to Turkish *çakırkeyif*. She deals with now obscure elements used in Modern Turkish compounds, set expressions, binomes and biverbs, nursery rhymes, proverbs and the like, which are no longer in free use. Although the 212 items dealt with in separate entries were independent and meaningful at some earlier stage and/or are in free use in dialects—though not necessarily with the meanings they would be expected to have today in the mentioned types of contexts—speakers of present-day Standard Turkish are unable to assign any meanings to them. This is something the author determined through actual interviews with persons with various levels of education.

Bacanlı & Tokuç (2018) have, in Volume 22/1 of this journal, published a paper with rather similar content to the work of Çolak; their paper uses the content of Çolak’s first edition (2015), “revisiting it”, as they say in their abstract. The present review deals with Çolak’s second edition (2017). Some important differences between the studies of Bacanlı & Tokuç (2018) and of Çolak can be perceived already in their titles: Çolak is about “kelimeler”, i.e. ‘words’ which function as distinct elements in the syntagm even when they bear no meaning by themselves. Bacanlı & Tokuç have expanded the topic to cover parts of lexical units like *cran-* in *cranberry* or *çıl-* in *çılgin* ‘crazy’ with the argument that cranberries are berries and that the suffix *-gin* forms stative-resultative adjectives from verbs, e.g., *yorgun* ‘tired’ from the transitive verb *yor-* ‘to tire’. The perceived connection with intransitive *çıldır-* ‘to go crazy, lose one’s sense’ does not, however, accord with speakers’ grammatical knowledge because *-dır-* is a causative suffix. Bacanlı & Tokuç also happen to use a rather loose definition of the term “morpheme”, a term normally defined as “a minimal linguistic element having a meaning”. Bacanlı & Tokuç’s eight “criteria for determining cranberry morphemes in Turkish” are significant for advancing research on the topic, not only concerning Turkish.

The most important difference between the two studies is that Bacanlı & Tokuç based their work on the *Türkçe Sözlük*, the dictionary of the Turkish Language As-

sociation (Türk Dil Kurumu), whereas Çolak has extracted her material from the *Türkçe Ulusal Derlemi*, the Turkish National Corpus administered by Yeşim and Mustafa Aksan at Mersin University. The aim of the *Türk Dil Kurumu*, throughout its changing history, has never been one of pure documentation; its declared aim is “to reveal the beauty and richness of the Turkish language and to elevate it among the world’s languages to the high position it deserves”. The various editions of the *Türkçe Sözlük* have followed the political and cultural changes in the country in ways that need not be discussed here. Although I am not aware of any specific influence that this declared aim has had on such things as the choice of idioms, the esthetic and functional views of the various editors of the *Türkçe Sözlük* must surely have had an impact; there is no doubt that the Turkish National Corpus is a more solid basis for scientific endeavors concerning language use.

Another important difference between the two studies is that Bacanlı & Tokuç list items which speakers—apparently actually the authors themselves—feel they would not be able to interpret if taken out of their immediate context, whereas Çolak has actually looked at the items in their real—both petrified and freely construed—contexts and has statistically weighed the different types of use against each other. If the documentation of a term is less than 75%, Çolak does not include it among its “fossils”, while Bacanlı & Tokuç include it without considering any quantification. I will give one example: Çolak finds that in 8 of the 63 instances of *seyran* documented in the corpus, the word is used independently with the meaning ‘promenade, outing’, 12.7% of the documentation; since the other 87.3% are said to be instances of idiomatic use, *seyran* is included in the list. In 16 instances, the term is used in the binomes *bayram seyran* and *seyir seyran*, in 13 in the phrases *seyran et-*, *seyrana çık-* and *seyran eyle-* ‘to go on an outing’, and in 13 in the proverb *İki gönül bir olunca samanlık seyran olur* ‘When there is love, material difficulties don’t matter’, literally ‘When two hearts unite, a barn becomes an outing’. Four instances show a shortened projection of this proverb, *samanlık seyran ol-*, when the speaker refers to ‘unconditional love’ under the assumption that the addressee knows the proverb. The expression *bayram değil seyran değil*, finally, literally signifies ‘it is neither a festival nor an outing’; it is used to indicate that there must be a secret reason behind the interest shown by the person who is being talked about, and assumes the addressee’s familiarity with the binome *bayram seyran* ‘fun’: Recourse to *seyran* ‘promenade’ could not be explained without its use in this binome. *bayram değil seyran değil* is the only expression for *seyran* listed by Bacanlı & Tokuç who, wrongly, I think, call this a proverb. Unlike Çolak, I think the phrases *seyran et-*, *seyrana çık-* and *seyran eyle-* use *seyran* literally and not as a “fossil”; this view lowers the idiomatic uses of *seyran* in the corpus to 67%, below the author’s (arbitrary) limit of 75%. I still think this way of treating the material is essential, as it gives readers the possibility to make up their minds for themselves.

Some binomes, like *estek köstek* ‘all sorts of excuses for getting away from a task’, are mentioned by Bacanlı & Tokuç but not by Çolak, because they have, according to Çolak, dropped out of use altogether.

Many items noted by Çolak are listed as coming from contact languages like Armenian or Kurdish or Italian, but most turn out to have originally been Persian or Arabic. Some of the items that are obsolete in Standard Turkish are traced back to dialect documentation; *tefek* in the binome *ufak tefek* ‘small’, e.g., is quoted in Çolak (2017: 104) from Anatolian dialects (also in the earlier form *tevek*, coming from Early Anatolian Turkish *tegek*) with the meaning ‘grapevine, vine sprouts’. The phonetic processes permitted through, and in fact encouraged by, binome formation are of special interest. To determine the source of obscure terms, Çolak has had recourse to quite a number of studies.

Finally, Çolak has a diachronic dimension (not undertaken by Bacanlı & Tokuç), showing when presently obscure items were in regular use as lexemes and what their meaning was at that time; for this purpose she refers to recent work by Durgut, Ölmez, Şen and others. This helps exclude items which are mere jingles (subjectively excluded also by Bacanlı & Tokuç). The documentation which Çolak has used for determining the history of her “fossil” terms includes sources such as the *Seyahatname* of Evliya Çelebi, the *Ferec ba’d eş-Şidde* edited by the late Andreas Tietze and the late György Hazai a few years ago, and the records of the kadis of Istanbul. The process of “fossilization” turns out to have its roots in the earliest sources. Take *ev bark* ‘home, household’ for example. While the binome *äv bark* (also used in such phrases as *ävleri barkları* or *ävlig barklığı* but also found in connex spelling, as *ävbark*) is exceedingly common in all varieties of Old Turkic (inscriptional, Manichaean, Buddhist or secular), *bark* is used by itself only in the Kök Tegin and Bilgä Kagan inscriptions, referring several times to a memorial edifice. The 11th century Khâqânî scholar Maḥmūd already states (fol. 176) that “one never uses *bark* alone but only paired with *äv*” and (fol. 590) quotes the verse *äwin barkın satıgsadı* with the Arabic translation that the enemy “wished to sell his houses and his landed property” (Dankoff & Kelly translations). Çolak (2017: 59) finds that *bark* is supplied with a definition in several 17th–19th century Ottoman dictionaries and is used by itself in a single instance in the Modern Turkish National Corpus (referring to a religious structure in an archeological description), as against 71 instances of *ev bark* documented there.

Bacanlı and Tokuç treated Çolak’s book as a mere source of documentation, but I hope to have shown that it is indeed much more than that.

References

- Bacanlı, Eyüp & Tokuç, Saide 2018. Cranberry morphemes in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 22, 63–84.
- Coffey, Stephen J. 2013. Lexical fossils in present-day English: Describing and delimiting the phenomenon. In: McConchie, R.W. et al. (eds.) *Selected proceedings of the 2012 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 47–53.
- Dankoff, Robert in collaboration with James Kelly 1982–1985. *Maḥmūd al-Kāşyarī, Compendium of the Turkic dialects* 1–3. Duxbury: Harvard University Printing Office.

Leonid Kulikov & Ilona Manevskaia: Review of Robert I. Binnick. 2012. *The past tenses of the Mongolian verb: Meaning and use*. (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 1). Leiden: Brill. xxii + 236 pp. ISBN 978-90-04-21429-3.

Leonid Kulikov, Ghent University, Faculty of Arts and Philosophy, Linguistics Department, Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium. E-mail: Leonid.Kulikov@UGent.be

The book under review is written by Robert I. Binnick [RB], professor of linguistics at the University of Toronto, a renowned expert in Mongolian and the theory of tense, and former vice president of the Mongolia Society, who has published extensively on both Mongolian and tense/aspect. In this book the author revisits and to some extent reconsiders his earlier (1979, 1990) research on Mongolian past tenses.

Mongolian is a language with a notoriously complicated system of past tenses that has puzzled several generations of linguists and remains the topic of lively discussions till now. While the number of past tenses (four) is not unheard of, it is the character of relations between them that makes the Mongolian system typologically interesting and descriptively challenging for linguists, and of special interest not only for scholars of Mongolian, but for all linguists who study structurally and/or genetically related languages, including in particular Turcologists and, more generally, scholars of the Central Asian linguistic area.

The book opens with a short preface (pp. xi–xiii), which outlines the general context of the issues to be discussed. This is followed by Chapter I, “The Problem of the Mongolian Past Tenses” (pp. 1–59), which offers a more detailed overview of the problem. In the introductory section, “The Mongolian Past Tenses”, the reader finds a convenient anticipatory summary of the main claims and conclusions of RB (pp. 12–14). The complex system of functional distinctions between the four past-tense markers is described in terms of the following categories (which, in turn, are quite intricately related with and not entirely independent of each other): evidentiality (evidential/inferential), “recency or immediacy” (proximal/distal past), deictic/anaphoric (= “relating the occurrence recounted in their clause to a contextual time”, p. 13) past; spoken/written language. RB’s summary of the main functions of the four past-tense morphemes, *-jee*, *-lee*, *-sen*, and *-v* (in RB’s notation) is also conveniently reproduced in simplified form in his three-dimensional scheme on p. 109. With minor changes and a few clarifications and corrections adopted from Brosig’s (2013) very detailed and useful review of RB’s book, this scheme can be presented in a condensed tabular form as follows (RB’s labels are in some cases followed by more standard and/or more self-explanatory terms):

	evidential = firsthand		inferential = indirective
	in spoken language	in written language	
proximal = recent past (+ present, near future)	-lee (deictic; topic-switch in discourse)		—
(neutral (?))	-sen	-v	
distal = distant past	(anaphoric)		-jee (deictic; conclusive in discourse)

Note that the somewhat confusing label “inferential” is employed in the same sense as “indirective”,¹ – a term more widely adopted in Turkic scholarship after Johanson (2000).

The next two sections provide a detailed overview of approaches to the analysis of the system of past tenses, subdivided by the author into two groups, semantic and pragmatic theories. RB demonstrates the inadequacy of the purely semantic approaches, arguing for the advantages of the pragmatic theories. These operate, in particular, with such notions as evidentiality, which, according to RB, are indispensable for understanding of the Mongolian system of tenses.

The following three chapters offer a more detailed discussion of the functions of the past tense markers under study. Chapter II, “Use and Interpretation of the Past Tenses in the Spoken Language” (pp. 61–111), consists of three sections that outline the three functional dimensions that serve as a basis for a pragmatically oriented analysis of the past tenses: evidential/inferential (evidentiality), distal/proximal, and deictic/anaphoric. The last division appears somewhat controversial in the theoretical conception of the author, especially in so far as the applicability of the latter member of this opposition is concerned. In particular, while RB’s definition of the anaphoric tenses as those “which relate the time of the eventuality only *indirectly* to the time of utterance, their relationship to this deictic centre being mediated by a *reference time*” (p. 102) largely corresponds to the standard, widely-accepted understanding of the notion of “anaphoric tense” (see, e.g., Higginbotham 2009: 102–115), it is somewhat unclear why it should apply, according to RB, to the usage of the *-sen* past that is described in a Mongolian textbook as the past tense that “is used to talk about an action that has taken place at a set time in the past (e.g., I walked

1 RB only briefly mentions the equivalence of “inferential” and “indirect” on p. 41, fn. 62.

home yesterday)” (p. 106). Likewise, Brosig (2013: 239) qualifies the use of the term “anaphoric past” with regard to both *-v* and *-san (-sen)* forms as “somewhat puzzling”.

Chapter III, “Use and Interpretation of the Past Tenses in the Written Language” (pp. 113–146), discusses in detail the differences between the spoken and written varieties of Mongolian and focuses on the peculiarities of the uses of past tenses in the latter.

Chapter IV, “The Discourse Functions of the Tenses” (pp. 147–213), deals with the peculiar uses of these tense markers in narration. They encompass a range of functions that are peculiar to a plethora of languages of the Central Asian region and in fact require a separate descriptive dimension to capture the peculiarities of their use, including such discourse functions as the use of *-lee* to signal change of theme (topic switch).

The short concluding section, “Remarks in Lieu of a Conclusion” (pp. 215–220), emphasizes innovative aspects of the monograph, which include the use of two additional categories, distal/proximal² and, especially, the anaphoric/deictic distinction.

The book concludes with a lists of references and subject index.

While the overall contribution of RB’s book to a better understanding of the verbal system of Mongolian is beyond any doubt, a number of critical remarks of more formal character are in place here.

A serious drawback of the book is its rather meagre theoretical introduction, which leaves the most important theoretical concepts without detailed explanation. Although we find few brief definitions on pp. 12–14, intermingled with RB’s short summary of his description of the uses of the past tense markers, this hardly suffices for such intricate notions as evidentiality or anaphoric tense. A number of important theoretical issues such as the question of whether the category of evidentiality should be considered as belonging to the domain of modality (which is taken for granted by RB;³ for a general discussion of this issue, see Narrog 2010) are, unfortunately, left without any proper discussion. Instead of at least minimal references to the most important theoretical studies on this and other categories (such as, first of all, Johanson & Utas 2000, Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003 and Aikhenvald 2004),⁴ we find an astonishing reference to the Wikipedia article on evidentiality (p. 41, fn. 62), which is certainly out of place in a serious academic work. Likewise, I am not sure it

2 This is of course not entirely a novelty; for instance, the *-jee* tense is described as distant past as early as Ševermina 1958: 83 (“davnoprošedšee vremja”), as noticed by RB himself (p. 15).

3 For instance, on p. 62 we read: “it is a starting point to recognize that the Mongolian past tenses principally differ not in tense or aspect, but rather in modality (and specifically, in evidentiality)”.

4 Only Aikhenvald & Dixon 2003 appears in the “List of works cited” (p. 223).

is appropriate to directly appeal to the opinion of a native speaker in support of the author's terminological preferences, as RB does in fn. 1 on p. 61, where we read:

Tserenchunt, a native speaker, writes, "I completely agree with your conclusion about the inferential and evidential past tenses in Mongolian as in Turkic languages" (personal communication, June 1, 2007).

No doubt, terminological issues are of particular importance for this complex domain of verbal categories, and require more attention and accuracy, especially more accurate references to the relevant literature. Thus, although RB mentions the equivalence of the terms "inferential" and "indirect" (or, more precisely, "indirective"; see Table above) on p. 41, fn. 62, no reference is given to the seminal paper by Johanson (2000) or earlier works by Johanson from the 1990s, where this term is introduced and properly explained.

Another, albeit minor yet quite annoying, shortcoming pertains to the transliteration. Brosig (2013: 239) has mentioned the presence of some faults in transcriptions of Mongolian forms. Unfortunately, RB is also inconsistent and inaccurate in the Romanization of Cyrillic (Russian), in particular, in bibliographical references. Largely following the British standard transliteration, rather than the much more widely-used by Slavists and recommendable scientific transliteration, also known as the International Scholarly System (but nevertheless rendering *u* and *u* as *š* and *č*, respectively, in accordance with the latter convention!), he fails to be consistent within this hybrid system. Thus, Cyrillic *ь* [*mjagkij znak*] is sometimes omitted, as in *glagol[']nyi* and *Mongol[']skom* (reference to Dugarova 1991, p. 224), but not in *Kas'yanenko* and *mongol'skii* (same page); Cyrillic *я* is rendered both as *ya* and *ia* (*Kas'yanenko* and *iazyk* in the same reference on p. 224), Cyrillic *ы* both as *y* and *i* (*iazyk* and *Sovremenii* in the very same reference), let alone obviously mistaken spellings such as *Sovremenii* (instead of the correct *Sovremennii* with double *nn*; the recommended scientific transliteration is *Sovremennyj*).

The above-listed shortcomings and drawbacks do not of course diminish the importance and value of the book under review. Altogether, it offers a major contribution to Mongolian linguistics as well as to the typology of tense and evidentiality. Mongolian and Altaic scholars, as well as those interested in the study of verbal categories, will certainly benefit from reading it.

The book under review opens a new linguistic series at Brill, *Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory* (with Brian Joseph as Managing Editor), which transparently echoes the well-known series *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* at de Gruyter. This obviously marks a new round of competition between these two prestigious publishers of linguistic literature, which, we may hope, will serve the interests of the readers, contributing to an overall increase in the quality of the publications.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, Robert M. W. (eds.) 2003. *Studies in evidentiality*. (Typological Studies in Language 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Binnick, Robert I. 1979. Past and perfect in Modern Mongolian. In: Schwarz, Henry G. (ed.) *Studies on Mongolia: Proceedings of the First North American Conference on Mongolian Studies*. Bellingham: Western Washington University. 1–13.
- Binnick, Robert I. 1990. On the pragmatic differentiation of the Mongolian past tense. *Mongolian Studies* 13, 47–56.
- Brosig, Benjamin 2013. [Review of:] Binnick, Robert. *The past tenses of the Mongolian verb*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012. *Linguistics* 51: 1, 235–241.
- Higginbotham, James 2009. *Tense, aspect, and indexicality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johanson, Lars. 2000. Turkic indirectives. In: Johanson & Utas (eds.) 2000: 61–87.
- Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.) 2000. *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24). Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Narrog, Heiko 2010. Evidentiality in epistemic modality—let’s get the whole picture. Comment on ‘Building a Semantic Map: Top-Down versus Bottom-Up approaches’ by Ferdinand de Haan (2010). *Linguistic Discovery* 8: 1, 118–122.
- Ševernina, Zoja V. 1958. Analitičeskie glagol’nye formy v sovremennom mongol’skom jazyke [Analytic verbal forms in the contemporary Mongolian language]. In: Sanžeev, Garma D. et al. (eds.) *Filologija i istorija mongol’skix narodov* [Philology and history of the Mongolian peoples]. Moscow: Izdatel’stvo vostočnoj literatury. 82–100.

Goran Pavelić: Review of *Književna smotra: Journal of World Literature* 173: 3, Zagreb, 2014, 180 pp.

Goran Pavelić, Zagreb, Croatia.

In 2014, the editorial board of the eminent Croatian journal *Književna smotra* dedicated the entire third issue of volume 173 to the commemorating of the twentieth anniversary of the Chair of Turkish Studies at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. This thematically heterogeneous issue, entitled *Prvih dvadeset hrvatske turkologije* ‘The first twenty years of Croatian Turkish studies’, is edited by a guest editor, Marta Andrić at the Department of Turkish Studies in Zagreb. The issue contains contributions by current and former associates of the Department from Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Turkey, including essays, scholarly articles in literary studies, linguistics, cultural history and other disciplines of Ottoman studies, translations of Turkish prose and poetry, and a bibliography of works by the Department’s tenured and visiting lecturers and associates. In addition, it is lavishly illustrated with old postcards of Istanbul from the Zellich print house, which contribute to the distinct charm of the publication.

Following a brief introduction by Marta Andrić, there is an extensive interview *Turkish Studies—Great Challenges / Turkologija—veliki izazov* with Professor Ekrem Čaušević, who deserves most of the credit for the founding of the Department in 1994 and its development into a respected programme of Turkish studies in Croatia. This interview is of interest not only for the facts presented, but also for the professor’s recollections about people and circumstances that influenced his academic career. Regarding the future of the Department, Professor Čaušević is an ardent advocate for the founding of a Chair of Arabic and Persian studies and, ultimately, an integrated university programme of Oriental languages at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. The introductory part of the publication closes with an inspired essay, *Turska, tursko i turčijat* (Turkey, all things Turkish and Turkishness) by Miljenko Jergović, a distinguished Croatian and Bosnian-Herzegovinian writer, journalist and essayist whose works have been translated into more than twenty languages, who attempts to decipher what “Turkish” means in the minds of the South Slavic people who formerly lived under Ottoman rule, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The section titled *Kratka biografija studija turkologije* ‘A brief biography of Turkish studies’ consists of two parts. In the article *Povijest turkologije u Hrvatskoj* ‘The history of Turkish studies in Croatia’, Anđelko Vlašić provides an overview of the growth of interest in Turkish studies in Croatia, beginning with the first unsuccessful initiative to establish a chair of Oriental Studies at the end of the nineteenth century. An important milestone in the institutionalization of Turkish and Ottoman studies was the establishment of the Oriental Collection at the Yugoslav (today Croatian) Academy of Sciences and Arts, which, with its 2,100 Arabic manuscripts and 770 Ottoman documents, is one of the most valuable collections of its kind in

Southeast Europe. Alexei Olesnicki, a Russian Orientalist of Ukrainian descent, worked on the collection from 1928 to his death in 1943. In addition to archiving the manuscripts, he conducted scholarly research in Ottoman studies and briefly taught the Turkish language at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb. However, the establishment of the Chair of Turkish Studies would have to wait until 1994. Since then, in only two decades, the Zagreb Department of Turkish Studies has assumed a prominent position in the academic world. In addition to its having an exceptionally fine curriculum, it should be mentioned that two scientific projects have been carried out under its aegis, as well as two international symposiums and a translation workshop organized and led by Professor Ekrem Čaušević, and later by Marta Andrić, which produced new translators of Turkish literature. *Bibliografija odabranih znanstvenih radova nastavnika i suradnika Katedre za turkologiju (1994–2014)* ‘The bibliography of selected scholarly works by lecturers and associates of the Department of Turkish studies [1994–2014]’, compiled by Barbara Kerovec, University of Zagreb, consists of 132 bibliographic entries that testify to the Department’s prolific activity.

The introductory texts are followed by a review article, *U potrazi za novim jezikom* ‘In search of a new language’, by Azra Abadžić Navaey, University of Zagreb. It presents the most significant aesthetic, cultural, historical and ideological features of late Ottoman and Turkish literature from the mid-nineteenth to the twenty-first centuries.

The section *Hrvatskoj nepoznati klasici* ‘Classics unknown to Croatia’ presents lesser-known classical works of Turkish literature, such as: *Pobunjenik s Taurusa* (Memed, my hawk) by Yaşar Kemal, *Slike ljudi iz mog zavičaja* (Human landscapes from my country) by Nazım Hikmet, *Zaboravljeni* (The forgotten) by Oğuz Atay, and *Na jednoj džezazi* (The made-to-order funeral oration) by Aziz Nesin. The cited texts were translated from Turkish by Marta Andrić and Barbara Kerovec.

The section *Novo čitanje starih tekstova* ‘The new reading of old texts’ contains four contributions. In the first, *Orhan Pamuk i novo čitanje osmanske povijesti* ‘Orhan Pamuk and a new reading of Ottoman history’, Azra Abadžić Navaey focuses on Pamuk’s attitude toward Ottoman history and culture, on the basis of his two novels, *The Silent House* and *The White Castle*. In the following article, *Zbirka lijepih i mudrih riječi slađa je od kadaifa: Što nam osmanske osobne bilježnice govore o čitanju?* ‘A collection of beautiful and wise words is sweeter than kadaif: What can be inferred about reading practices from Ottoman personal miscellanies’, the author Tatjana Paić-Vukić, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, examines Ottoman personal miscellanies (Tur. *mecmua*, Ar. *mağmū’a*) from the Oriental Collection of the Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, and uses them as sources for the history of reading.

Professor Alena Čatović, University of Sarajevo, authored the article *Citatnost u klasičnoj osmanskoj književnosti: Tahmis pjesnika Hayâlîja* ‘Citation in Classical Ottoman literature: The poet Hayâlî’s *Tahmis*’, in which she explains the poetics of classical Ottoman literature, that is, the imitation, repetition and reproduction of

canonical texts. Professor Nenad Moačanin and Kornelija Jurin-Starčević, University of Zagreb, in the article “*Novi*” *Evlija Čelebi: autograf “Putopisa”* ‘The “new” Evliya Chelebi: The autograph manuscript of the “Travelogue”, charts the way for a comparative analysis of the Travelogue, that is, Šabanović’s translations of *Seyahatnâme* and Volumes V, VI and VII of the autograph, in order to establish—on the basis of selected examples—the range and quality of information, ascertain the credibility of some of Evliya’s testimonies, and contribute to an assessment of the reliability of *Seyahatnâme* as a historical source for the history of Croatia and neighbouring regions. The authors have managed to uncover abundant source materials that can be used in historical, ethnological, cultural, anthropological, sociolinguistic, archaeological and other types of research.

The section *Dašak Carigrada* ‘A breath of Constantinople’ consists of four texts about Istanbul, the most significant, best-known and largest city of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey. The article *Carigradska tiskara “Zellich”* ‘The Zellich Printing House in Constantinople’, by Vjeron Kursar, University of Zagreb, reads like an immigrant’s dream-come-true about a printing house in Istanbul established by Antonio Zelić from Dalmatia (born in Brela), in the mid-nineteenth century. He arrived in Istanbul in 1840, at a time when significant reforms were being introduced and modernization was under way throughout the Ottoman Empire. In the year 1869, Zelić opened his own lithographic printing house, *Zellich et fils*, employing his offsprings and extended family. In addition to high-quality posters and postcards, the printing house also produced other items, and in 1914 it was commissioned to print Ottoman banknotes. The Zelić family received prestigious Ottoman and Persian awards for their achievements, as well as awards from the Vatican and the Kingdom of Serbia. After the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire the socio-political circumstances changed, and in the 1930s the Zelić family left Istanbul in search of business opportunities elsewhere. Today, some members of this family live in Greece, Spain, France and Brazil, although Mario Zelić’s family still lives in Istanbul. This article is accompanied by an extensive list of printed materials, books, magazines and newspapers produced by the Zellich et fils Printing House.

Alena Čatović is the author of the article *Poezija osmanskih sultana* ‘The Ottoman sultans’ poetry’. The Ottoman sultans were great patrons of the arts and sciences, who nurtured a particular affinity for poetry. The article presents translations of poetry by the Ottoman sultans from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: Murat II, Mehmed II, Bayezid II, Selim I, Suleiman I, Selim II, Murat III and Mehmed III. In the article *Vijesti i djela što su se širili Europom prije i nakon pada Carigrada* ‘News and works in Europe before and after the fall of Constantinople’, Özlem Kumrular writes about how the Ottoman expansion in Europe caused the emergence of new genres of European literature. Between myth and reality, featuring heroes and antiheroes, these texts tried to create a wall of defence against the Ottomans by portraying them in an almost entirely negative fashion.

The section dedicated to Istanbul ends with the presentation of *The Istanbul Encyclopaedia*, a famous work by historian and journalist Reşat Ekrem Koçu (1905–

1975). Koçu began writing this unusual encyclopaedia (there is something Borgeesian about it) at the end of World War II, while the eleven volumes of the second edition were published between 1958 and 1973. A markedly anti-encyclopaedic approach, resistance to categorization, random selection of topics and complete lack of systematization are just some of the features of this permanently open-ended book in the making. Croatian readers have already had the opportunity to familiarize themselves with Koçu's work through Pamuk's book *Istanbul: Memories and the City*. Azra Abadžić Navaey wrote the introductory note about the *Encyclopaedia*, while Petra Hrebac translated selected entries.

The section *Hrvati i Osmanlije* 'The Croats and the Ottomans' consists of two articles about the relationship between the Croats and the Ottoman Empire. In the article *Ćud srdito kripka / un carattere di feroce energia: Osmansko Carstvo u Kraljskom Dalmatinu* 'A temper of ferocious energy: The Ottoman Empire in Kraljski Dalmatin', Professor Davor Dukić, University of Zagreb, writes about articles published in the official gazette of the French authorities, *Kraljski Dalmatin / Il Regio Dalmata (1806–1810)*. The Croatian articles were mostly translated from Italian, and were the first to present the Ottoman Empire in a predominantly positive way, which, considering the state of French-Ottoman relations during the Napoleonic era, should not come as a surprise. When considered as a whole, the attitude of *Kraljski Dalmatin* towards the Ottoman Empire is marked by mixed feelings of superiority and moderate respect.

In the article *Dubrovački mladići jezika: Studenti osmansko-turskoga u vrijeme Dubrovačke Republike* 'Ragusian Youth: Students of Ottoman Turkish in the Period of the Ragusan Republic', Vesna Miović, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, presents interesting facts about the young men of Ragusa who were trained to become official interpreters (dragomans) in the service of the Republic of Ragusa, which maintained strong political and trade relations with the Ottoman Empire. The Ragusians needed interpreters not only at the Porte, but also in the neighbouring Ottoman province of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The system of educating Ragusan dragomans was well established by the eighteenth century, and at the end of the century there was an initiative to open a public school for learning Ottoman Turkish.

In the section *Tursko žensko pismo: Sevgi Soysal* 'Turkish women's writing: Sevgi Soysal', the Turkish novelist, lawyer and journalist Ece Temelkuran, whose two novels have been translated into Croatian, wrote a short essay specifically for publication in this issue, *Kamo će književnost, Sevgi?* 'Where is literature headed, Sevgi?', in which she discusses Sevgi Soysal (1936–1976), a writer whose works have been categorized as new realism. Banned and imprisoned, Sevgi Soysal died before she managed to complete her last novel. This issue contains one of her short stories, *Bojiti polumjesec* 'Painting the crescent moon', translated by Marta Andrić.

The section *Prevođenje u bojama Crvene* 'Translating in the Colours of Red' contains an article titled *Turska književnost u hrvatskim prijevodima (1990–2013)* 'Turkish literature in Croatian translations (1990–2013)', co-authored by Neven Ušumović and Ekrem Čaušević. The authors examine the general popularity and

reception of Turkish literature and culture (including soap operas) in Croatia during a set time frame. Orhan Pamuk is the most widely read and well-known Turkish writer in Croatia. However, an increasing number of translated works have familiarized the Croatian public with new authors and genres. The Department of Turkish Studies, where today's acclaimed translators developed their craft, undoubtedly deserves the most credit for the prolific production of well-received literary translations from Turkish into Croatian. This article is complemented by statistical data on the readership of individual works, and a bibliography of literary translations from Turkish into Croatian and vice versa.

Barbara Kerovec and Marta Andrić co-authored the scholarly article *Turcizmi u književnim prijevodima s turskoga jezika* 'Turkish loanwords in literary translations from the Turkish language'. Based on the semantic analysis of examples from the translated works of Orhan Pamuk and contextual analysis, it was concluded that Turkish loanwords in the Croatian language can be classified into two groups: (1) civilizational (words of Turkish origin for which no appropriate Croatian synonyms exist), and (2) stylistic (Croatian synonyms exist). The aim of the analysis was to establish whether there is a need to use Turkish loanwords and, if so, what kind of expressive advantages might they provide. Notwithstanding occasional attempts to "purify" the Croatian language, the fact remains that some Turkish loanwords have become fully integrated lexical material within the Croatian language, though to a lesser extent in Croatia than, for example, in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This thematic issue of the journal *Književna smotra* closes with a commemorative piece and a book review. Tatjana Paić-Vukić writes about her late colleague Muhamed Ždralović (1944–2007), a distinguished scholar who spent several decades researching Arabic manuscripts, particularly from Bosnia, and also taught a course on Islamic Civilization as an external associate at the Department of Turkish Studies. The last text is Marta Andrić's review of Ekrem Čaušević's book *The Turkish language in Ottoman Bosnia* (The Isis Press, Istanbul, 2014). The book contains Čaušević's previously published scholarly papers on the so-called Bosnian-Turkish language, manuscripts of Turkish grammar and dictionaries authored by Franciscans in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as articles related to the cultural history of that country and, to a lesser extent, Croatia. In this book, Čaušević compiled the results of his—and by extension, others'—research on the historical circumstances under which so-called Bosnian-Turkish was formed, its features, sociolinguistic status and designation. In the introduction, the author questions the widely held belief that people in Bosnia, where the planned settlement of ethnic Turks never occurred, spoke one of the dialects of West Rumelian Turkish. Based on the available sources, he concludes that so-called Bosnian-Turkish cannot be classified as a West Rumelian dialect, but rather as a (no longer existent) variety of Turkish which developed on a non-Turkish (South Slavic) substrate language. Čaušević's book is a valuable source of facts and conclusions for Turkologists, linguists and historians alike. Publishing it in English was definitely a prudent decision that increased its potential readership.

With respect to readership, it is a pity that only the Croatian-speaking public can enjoy this issue of *Književna smotra*, though twelve contributions have English summaries.

On this occasion, we congratulate the members of the Department of Turkish Studies on their upcoming twenty-fifth anniversary in 2019!

