

TURCOLOGICA 62

Turkic-Iranian Contact Areas

Historical and Linguistic Aspects

Edited by Lars Johanson and Christiane Bulut

Harrassowitz Verlag

Historical, cultural and linguistic aspects of Turkic-Iranian contiguity

Lars Johanson

Turkic-Iranian interaction

Turks and Iranians have been interacting for at least one and a half millennia, and the close contiguity has led to a mutual dependence with profound cultural and linguistic effects. The present volume deals with some aspects of these symbiotic bonds.

PETER B. GOLDEN sketches the history of what he calls the “uneasy symbiosis of Turk and Iranian” from the mid-fourth century on, defining a pattern of interaction that dates back to the earliest known periods of Turkic history. Turkic-speaking groups were in early contact with the Iranian nomads that dominated the Central Eurasian and Inner Asian steppes. Already the early Turkic empires were active in promoting trade and cultural exchange.

The origins of the old Türk state is associated with Iranian elements. Its ruling clan had lived in the Saka and Tokharian regions of East Turkistan and comprised non-Turkic elements. The Soghdian influence on the state was considerable. The Soghdians, international merchants of long standing with numerous trading colonies along the Silk Route, needed the military power of the Türks. Soghdian men of commerce and diplomacy served as intermediaries in the relations with Iran, Byzantium and China. The Soghdian language was associated with centers such as Bukhārā and Samarkand and functioned as the lingua franca of the Central Asian Silk Routes. As the Türks advanced westward, they also came into close contact with the Khwarizmians.

The Uyghur state that succeeded the Türk Empire was even more closely associated with Soghdian elements. After the fall of the Uyghur nomadic state many Uyghurs moved to Eastern Turkistan, a predominantly Iranian and Tokharian region, which now became increasingly Turkicized. The Khazar state, which extended in the Volga-Caspian-North Caucasian-Pontic area, was subject to important Iranian influences, its main contact points with the Islamic world being Khwarezm and Iran.

All subsequent Turkic nomadic states employed specialists from the sedentary realms. The Soghdians and, later on, other Iranians served bureaucratic and diplomatic functions in Turkic states in Central Asia and the Near East. All major Islamic

states led by Turks shared a close symbiosis with the Iranian world. Islam came to the Turkic peoples in an Iranicized garb. The old Turco-Soghdian symbiosis continued in Islamic form in the states of the Karakhanids, Ghaznavids, Seljuks, Khwarezmshahs, Ilkhanids, Timurids, Uzbeks, Safavids, Mughals, Ottomans, etc. They all followed patterns established in Central Asia, a blend of Islamic, Turkic and Iranian traditions, with a culturally Persianized bilingual ruling elite, a Turkic soldiery and an Iranian bureaucracy.

Turkic, Iranian and Arabic traditions thus shaped a new culture. The Turks first became closely acquainted with Persian during the cultural rebirth under the Samanids. In the ninth and tenth century New Persian gave rise to a rich literature. Persian had a profound impact on the Turkic literary languages. Turkish became the language of the Ottoman Empire, but men of culture and learning were expected to know Arabic and Persian as well. Ottoman Turkish was deeply impacted by borrowings from Persian.

In the course of the long interaction, Turkic groups have borrowed and transformed many elements of Iranian culture. On the other hand, they have steadily assimilated considerable numbers of Iranians. Most parts of Central Asia have been overwhelmingly Turkicized. The Turkic and Mongol conquests have advanced the Turkicization of much of Anatolia and Azerbaijan. In Azerbaijan, older Iranian and Paleo-Caucasian populations have been largely Turkicized.

PETER ZIEME's contribution to the present volume is devoted to particular signs of Iranian-Turkic contacts of the earliest periods: "hybrid" personal names among the Old Turks and Ancient Uyghurs. These are names consisting of more than one element, with at least one element of non-Turkic, generally Middle Iranian or New Persian origin.

While Iranian-Turkic contacts for the earliest period have always been postulated, it is not easy to produce the linguistic evidence for them. As the author remarks, the question of language contacts in ancient Central Asia remains, as a whole, "an open field". Names may, however, offer important clues for our knowledge of the cultural history of the Turks. When Turks started to use more than one element in their personal names, they also adopted foreign elements matching their cultural backgrounds. In the Seljukid world and later, mixtures of Arabic-Persian and Turkic elements in personal names are frequent and well known. Byzantine sources contain rich materials on these combinations. The author remarks that the slow infiltration of Muslim words and names of Arabic-Persian origin must be examined.

It has recently become possible to study names of Iranians and Turks in Turfan and Dunhuang on a larger scale, through documents reflecting a Soghdian-Turkic symbiosis. Some hybrid names have been found among the Soghdians. Middle Iranian Turfan texts exhibit Manichean names that consist of Middle Persian and Old Turkic elements. The author's recent investigations into Old Turkic onomastics have focused partly on hybrid names among the Old Turks and Uyghurs. Some results of this research are presented here. Most of the texts from which the names and titles

are extracted may belong to the period of the 10th-11th centuries or later, up to the 13th-14th centuries. In many cases the Turkic name elements themselves, often titles, are of non-Turkic origin. Zieme deals particularly with names ending in *čor*, *sanjun*, *inal*, *tegin*, *yegän*, *šaxan*, etc., and a set of names listed in the *Mahrnāmag*, a text which is of special interest because of its old age (dated early 9th century).

Literary languages

Several contributions to the present volume deal with the origins, developments and functions of written literary languages.

BERT G. FRAGNER discusses the functions of New Persian in various phases of Islamic history up to the 19th century, demonstrating how linguistic data may be highly relevant for cultural and historical research. New Persian developed from the 8th century on as an independent literary language. Certain scholars have seen this as an expression of a “Persian renaissance”, a self-confident effort to re-establish the cultural and political magnificence of the Sasanid Empire.

Fragner takes a different view, based on an interpretation of the actual functions of the language from its first formative period onwards. With the acceptance of the cultural hegemony of Islam, New Persian became a complementary language to Arabic, capable of fulfilling analogous and additional functions. It was the first language in history that was successfully made fit for Islam, and it became the “second language” of Islam. It underwent “semiotic Islamization”, acquiring adequate linguistic resources that were necessary for its use in various social functions and contexts in a society characterized by the hegemony of Islam. In a kind of division of tasks with Arabic, New Persian particularly contributed to historiography, poetry and epics.

The language spread geographically from the 11th century on and was the medium through which Central Asian Turks became familiar with Islam and urban culture. New Persian was widely used as a transregional lingua franca, a task for which it was particularly suitable due to its relatively simple morphological structure. It developed into a decisive factor for a large region of the Islamic cultural area. Within the general cultural framework of Islam, a subsystem emerged which was based on the strong prestige and the semantic flexibility of New Persian. It was a pre-modern communicative network that conveyed shared knowledge of epics, poetry and narrative prose in all geographic parts of its area of validity.

Fragner sketches the spread of New Persian as a hegemonial prestige language in the world of Islam, e.g. as an administrative language in numerous Turkic states. In the late Middle Ages, new Islamic literary languages were created on this model: Ottoman, Chaghatay and Urdu, which the author regards as “structural daughter lan-

guages” of New Persian. However, the hegemony of Persian declined in the 19th century at the latest.

BO UTAS formulates the question whether New Persian as a written language has a multiethnic origin. Fragments of Persian poetry found in manuscripts from Turfan and written in Manichean script show that the conventions of early Classical New Persian poetry were established and spread over an extended area already around 900.

What was the linguistic background of this development? It has been claimed that New Persian was born in Eastern Iran through adaptation of the spoken form of the Sasanian Middle Persian “court language”. It may rather have developed in a heterogeneous linguistic area as a result of fundamental sociolinguistic changes. It was brought into use soon after the Islamic conquest by the conglomerate of peoples that lived together in Eastern Iran and Central Asia. After Soghdian had declined as a lingua franca due to the advance of Islam, New Persian filled a need for interethnic communication along the trade routes.

Written New Persian is not the result of the codification of a specific spoken variety. While it is based on some kind of Middle Persian, it is not a direct, linear continuation of it, but a partly new construction. If its formation took place in Khorasan and Transoxiana, speakers of many different languages were involved. New Persian must be regarded as something of a multicultural construction. The author is tempted to talk of the emergence of a pidgin and its subsequent creolization.

The similarities and differences between Middle Persian and early New Persian have not been well described. At its first appearance, New Persian shows a vocabulary of mixed origin and simplifications in comparison to its predecessor. It exhibits a profoundly new structure of the verbal system, essential changes in the nominal and pronominal system and syntactic differences.

The simplification may have occurred under the influence of other languages, including Turkic. The symbiosis between Turkic languages and Persian, which has continued up to our days, may have started already in that period. A comparative study of the transition from Middle to New Persian and the development of Turkic languages in contact with the Iranian milieu from the 6th to the 8th centuries could shed light on this process.

New Persian may have started as a comparatively “crude” spoken language in a mixed milieu, but it rather quickly began to develop as a standardized written language. It became an important means of communication, to whose development many peoples, Iranian and non-Iranian, contributed. It had a central function in the interethnic communications of “greater Iran”, Central Asia, and India, and it continued to play a dominating role in large parts of Western, Central and Southern Asia for more than one thousand years.

BARBARA FLEMMING deals with the influence of Persian literature on Turkic literatures, commenting on the background of the literary tradition. What needs to be examined, she argues, is how Turkic authors acquired Iranian poetry, what kind of stylistic and conceptual changes occurred, etc.

It has been erroneously assumed that the Old Anatolian Turkish literary language was created in Anatolia and that its authors transformed a primitive language into a literary medium by submitting themselves to Persian influence. In reality, the Oghuz Turks who came to Anatolia brought with them from Khorezm and Transoxiana their own written language, literary traditions and models. Anatolia very early became a centre of Islamic science, literature and art.

In particular, the author discusses the status of the Old Anatolian Turkish mesnevi *Xusrev u Şīrīn*, written in 1397 by Faxrī (Faxreddīn Ya‘qūb). It is one of the many adaptations of Nizāmī’s well-known epic poem. Faxrī had at his disposal a highly evolved literary language as well as a store of literary devices and topoi that had been developed in Persian and Turkic literature. He mastered the rhetorical means of both his own language and Persian.

The Turkic literature of the 14th century extended over a wide geographical area. Faxrī exhibits a number of similarities with Qutb, who wrote a corresponding mesnevi twenty-five years before in the Khorezm area. Both used an elaborate literary language whose elements are partly found in the older Islamic Turkic poetry. While none of the poems can be characterized as original creations, they are not merely translations of Iranian poetry. Both poets also had Turkic literary models.

The mesnevi literature of the Persians and the Turks begins in the 11th century. It employs the same metrics and deals with the same topics. The first known product of the Islamic Turkic literature is *Qutaḍyu bilig*, a mesnevi accomplished 1069-1070 by Yūsuf of Balasayun at the Karakhanid court in Kashgar. The work proves the intimate knowledge of its author with the Arabic-Persian literary canon. According to Flemming, it is difficult to imagine that this should have been the first Turkic attempt in the mesnevi genre. Persian and Turkic authors of mesnevis continued to pursue the same topics and models for many centuries. There was always a tension between inherited traditions and the wish to develop originality. Not even the early Anatolian Turkish poets of the 13th and 14th centuries regarded themselves as mere translators. They had their Turkic models: For example, Yūnus Emre is a spiritual heir of the Turkistanian sufi poet Aḫmed Yesevī, and Aḫmed Faqīḥ and Şeyyād Ḥamza are also influenced by Central Asian Turkic poets.

HENDRIK BOESCHOTEN deals with the value of medieval Koran translations for comparative Turcology. No attempts at systematic syntheses have been made so far. Most works are “interlinear translations” in which the Arabic text is reproduced and glossed word by word. Another type is the “commented translation”, in which the translated verses are elaborated upon and the word order is more adjusted to the Turkic pattern. The text may also contain explanatory notes and be made more readable through alternatives to the literal translations. Another type is represented by translations of Koranic verses embedded in so-called tefsirs, which may be of very different nature. Some works are treatises with quotations from the Koran along with translations. Many medieval books including tefsirs contain quotations of Koranic verses, accompanied by translations into various varieties of written Turkic.

The value of linguistic evaluations of Koran translations has been claimed to be limited. For example, the texts have been said to be less useful for studies in historical syntax. However, the author claims that there are powerful reasons to study precisely the syntactic patterns of these texts and that they are highly interesting. The question concerning the Persian impact is not clear. On the one hand, Persian texts may have influenced the translation. On the other hand, the Turkic varieties themselves may have copied certain Persian construction types. The lexical features in the manuscripts may be compared in the light of the history of Turkic. Authors of early works generally look for Turkic equivalents of religious terminology, either introducing terms from pre-Islamic times, e.g. Soghdian terms, or creating neologisms. Later on, many of these lexemes are rendered by Arabic or Persian equivalents.

The relationship between the different versions must be established. In some cases, the translators may have copied verbatim from an existing model, in other cases they have not. Many Old Anatolian Turkish manuscripts seem to belong to one rather widespread tradition. Other versions are more independent from this tradition and from one another. For the history of Turkic, the exact relationship between the Eastern and Western versions is important. The claim that the tradition of interlinear translations came to Anatolia from Central Asia seems convincing, although it has not been fully substantiated. The author also remarks that the application of identical techniques of interlinear translation may lead to similarity between independent works. The tradition must be considered in a broad perspective. A close comparison with translations into Persian would be of great value. Many manuscripts are trilingual, containing both a Turkic and Persian translation. A closer study of these versions would offer a first insight into the relationship between Persian and Turkic translations. Translated Koranic material occurring in other sources may offer a basis for understanding the relationship between the written norm and the “un-Turkic” patterns prevailing in the interlinear translations.

MARK KIRCHNER discusses temporal clauses of simultaneity in Ottoman Turkish, Azerbaijani and Persian. Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijani have been subject to strong influence from Persian in the domain of complex sentences. While both use strategies for coding temporal relations that go back to Persian patterns, they differ considerably in the expression of simultaneity, partly due to the different conditions of their contact with Persian. Persian influenced literary Turkish in the classical Ottoman period, but the influence has ceased in modern Turkish.

The contacts of Azerbaijani with Persian are more vital. On the other hand, the political division of the Azerbaijani-speaking area has led to different developments in the North and in the South. The linguistic situation in the South is characterized by bilingualism and the suppression of written Azerbaijani. Literary Azerbaijani of the North and especially spoken varieties of the South display several constructions of simultaneity that are based on Persian patterns. It is contemporary spoken Persian—not New Persian in its classical form—that has delivered these patterns in Azerbaijani. The spoken language of the South has a large number of

Turkic and Persian-inspired strategies for the expression of simultaneity, a situation reminiscent of the one reflected in early Ottoman Turkish texts.

Early Turkish documents in Asia Minor display many structures that seem to be influenced by Persian. The strongly Iranicized language of these old texts is often explained as a result of clumsy translations from Persian. But the texts emerged in a setting where Turkish-Persian bilingualism was widespread. The situation was thus not very different from the current situation in the South of the Azerbaijanian-speaking area. Modern Turkish has not preserved many Persian-inspired strategies, but the complex junctor *-diği zaman*, a copy of Persian *zamānī ki*, is frequently used to express simultaneity.

Spoken Iranian varieties

The rest of the contributions of this volume primarily deal with spoken languages.

GERNOT WINDFUHR discusses synoptic models for the analysis of verb systems in Iranian and Turkic. He deals with standard and colloquial Persian of Iran, Tat spoken in the southeast Caucasus and Tajik in Central Asia. The latter two varieties have been in extended contact with Turkic languages, Tat with northern Azerbaijanian and Tajik with Uzbek. The languages discussed are members of the greater Iranian linguistic area that is bilingual to a considerable degree. The paper is concerned with innovated distinctions that have developed differently in Persian of Iran, Tat and Tajik: extended verb systems including evidentials, progressives, etc. Tajik Persian has expanded its verb system substantially compared to Persian of Iran and to Tat. It has an evidential set of forms and a suppositional set derived from the evidential. In each case, the impetus has come from differentiations in the symbiotic Turkic languages. New categorical distinctions have been copied and integrated. The aim of the paper is to present a new model for the synoptic mapping of entire verb systems or larger sections of them including tense, aspect, actionality and modality concepts.

DONALD L. STILO deals with inconsistent patterns in word order typology, 'split' adpositional patterns in the Iranian area. The author suggests that some of these patterns can be accounted for as areal phenomena. Languages located in areas where two opposite syntactic patterns meet may stabilize as mixed in their typology of adpositions and form syntactic buffer zones with a fluctuation between, or a merger of, the patterns. These languages may have both prepositions and postpositions, or merge these two opposites into one hybridized pattern of circumpositions.

Between a consistently postpositional northern zone including Turkic, Caucasian languages, Armenian and some Iranian languages, and a consistently prepositional southern zone including Semitic languages, Persian, Luri, etc., there is a third zone with a high concentration of mixed adpositional types. This buffer zone appears on

two different fronts in the Iranian area: one in the west and one in the east. The western front extends from Northern Kurdish in eastern Turkey and northeast Iraq to the Central Plateau languages of Iran. All Kurdish languages fall within this buffer zone. All have prepositions, postpositions and circumpositions. At the eastern front, the postpositional zone of Turkic and Indic meets the prepositional zone of Persian. This buffer zone includes most Eastern Iranian languages, Hazara, Tajik dialects, Baluchi and some Western Dardic languages.

There are apparent exceptions from these areal patterns. Southern Talysh is exclusively postpositional, as expected for this zone. But Northern Talysh, far beyond the buffer zone of Central Iran, has postpositions, prepositions, circumpositions and new compound forms. It is located in the heart of a postpositional zone and is still not completely postpositional. In Central and Southern Iran there are Georgian and Armenian dialects that are postpositional, but they are areally exceptional, located in enclaves inside a prepositional zone. The reason may be of a sociolinguistic nature: influence of postpositional Turkic dialects. Areal phenomena, as well as the sociolinguistic factors acting on them, need to be integrated into the research.

The author aims at a framework that explains and predicts the existence of alternating or hybridized types as a universal tendency. Most of his data indicate that areal factors are at work. When a given language has inconsistent typology or deviates from the expectations of the universal theory, the areal factor may be the reason. Where relevant, the areal axis should be considered in examining universals. On the other hand, areal factors do not necessarily supercede universals or diachronic-genetic factors.

A. SUMRU ÖZSOY & YEKTAN TÜRKYILMAZ report on the findings of a research project on five Kurmanji dialects of Turkey. Three of the dialects are spoken mainly in the northern sections of the mid-eastern region of Turkey, in the province of Sivas, whereas two are spoken in the southern part of the region, mainly in Maraş. The aim of the research project is to determine the nature of the differences across the Kurmanji dialects.

Geographical factors play a significant role in determining the properties of the individual dialects. It is possible to determine larger dialect areas of Kurmanji, i.e. northern vs. southern dialect groups. Though each dialect has its own set of properties, the divergences from the standard variety show similarities between the northern and the southern dialect area. The explanation for the geographical distribution of dialects probably lies in the geo-physical structure of the region. Northern dialects have been spoken in a mountainous region where contacts with the neighbouring Turkish-speaking villages must have been very restricted. In the case of the southern dialects, the geographical boundaries separating the various linguistic groups are not very sharp. They have been spoken in a region whose landscape is less rough than that of the northern region.

The authors describe the phonological systems of the dialects, which differ from each other the most in their vowel systems. The dialects exhibit a considerable degree of variation, differing from each other with respect to the nature and degree of

divergence from the standard dialect. One of the relevant questions is whether the front rounded vowels in the Sinemili dialect of Kurmanji represent a case of language contact.

GEOFFREY HAIG discusses the Turkish influence on the Kurmanji dialect of the Tunceli province, one of the heavily Turkicized varieties spoken in the northwestern parts of the Kurmanji speech zone. These varieties differ considerably from the dialects of southeast Anatolia which constitute the basis of standard Kurmanji. Haig presents original data on five phenomena for which Turkish influence appears to be most evident, comparing them with corresponding structures in other varieties.

The Tunceli numerals 11-19 have been reshaped according to the Turkish numerals. They are composed of the word for 'ten' plus the word for the corresponding number, thus "ten-x" instead of "x-ten" as in standard Kurdish. The areal distribution of this pattern may be confined to the dialects to the north and west of Diyarbakır, whereas it does not seem to be found further south and east. The possessive construction 'X-of-Y exists' for 'Y has X', which is comparable to the Turkish *var* construction, may be a contact-induced innovation. The only Kurmanji dialects in which this type is dominant are dialects spoken inside Turkey; it has also been adopted for standard Kurmanji.

Whereas the standard Kurmanji reflexive pronoun *xwe* can only be used when its reference is identical with that of the subject of the same clause, the use of the Tunceli reflexive pronoun *xa* is not strictly bound to subject coreference. In dialects such as Tunceli, *xa* is becoming a generalized possessive enclitic.

The Tunceli dialect has developed a specific system of marking the difference between the static and the dynamic copula ('be' vs. 'become'), allowing for a uniform predicate-final word order, the only order permitted for copula constructions in Turkish. This leads to the loss of a word order feature: the postpredicate position of nominal complements of dynamic copulas.

In the spoken Tunceli data *û* 'and' is not used as a clause coordinator, a feature that may be common to several dialects in the northern and western parts of Turkey. Clauses are coordinated by loose concatenation and a characteristic intonation. There is also considerable use of stronger markers of sequentiality such as *ondan sonra* 'after that, then'. These coordination methods may have been influenced by Turkish.

Tunceli Kurmanji almost completely lacks circumpositions, but uses postpositions for locatives and benefactives. The use of the clause-enclitic conditional marker *-sE* to mark counterfactuals, also noted in other varieties of Kurmanji of Turkey, is clearly copied from Turkish. The Tunceli dialect does not exhibit the shift from ergative to the double oblique construction that is found in the Diyarbakır region. Given the otherwise strong Turkish influence on the Tunceli dialect, the author concludes that loss of ergativity is not necessarily triggered by contact influence but may have other sources.

The author also mentions the widespread use of copies of Turkish verbs occurring in the deverbal form in *-miš*, e.g. *yašamiš bün* 'to live', *sevinmiš bün* 'to be happy', *başlamiš kırın* 'to begin'.

Spoken Turkic varieties

In an article which is probably the last one of his hand to be published, GERHARD DOERFER (†) offers an overview over the Turkic dialects—local, regional and area dialects—in Iran and the Afshar dialect of Kabul. The survey is based on materials collected by Doerfer and his collaborators in Göttingen during a number of expeditions to the regions in questions. The materials comprise Azerbaijani, South Oghuz, i.e. Kashkay (Qaşqā'ī) and related dialects, Khorasan Turkic, Turkmen and the non-Oghuz language Khalaj. The latter represents an autonomous language group, which has been influenced only superficially by elements copied from Oghuz. The author lists characteristic phonological and morphological features of the dialects. According to the author, Khalaj exhibits a vowel system with three quantity degrees and has preserved an older Turkic *h-*, e.g. *hat* 'horse' (Turkish *at*).

The Oghuz dialects form a continuum from Turkish and northern Azerbaijani to northern Turkmen: Turkish – Azerbaijani – South Oghuz – Khorasan Turkic – Turkmen. The Oghuz dialects can hardly be classified genetically: all classifications must follow regional principles. Distant dialects sometimes display common traits, and adjacent dialects may differ considerably from each other. Deeper common traits of the Irano-Turkic varieties have only arisen through a more or less powerful Persian impact. This influence is strongest in the lexicon, particularly in Khalaj and southern Khorasan Turkic, much less in Turkmen. Phonology and, to a lesser extent, morphology and syntax are also affected. The Persian influence on the vowel system is strongest in Khalaj. The sound harmony has been disturbed in many dialects.

ÉVA Á. CSATÓ deals with Turkic varieties spoken in the large Kashkay (Qaşqā'ī) confederation in the southwestern part of Iran. The Turkic Kashkay tribes have different historical and linguistic backgrounds. Dialectal differences can be traced back to the different origins of the tribes. The internal relation between the Turkic varieties spoken in the confederacy is 'equilibrium' in the sense that none of them is dominant or dominated. There is no strong effort to develop one standard Kashkay language. A description of Kashkay must distinguish between different linguistic systems. Features occurring in the Kashkay texts already published may represent different varieties.

The author compares the current linguistic situation with the situation mirrored in texts recorded by Gunnar Jarring in 1943–1944. Due to his diplomatic career, Jarring was for many years prevented from working on the edition of his Kashkay texts. He later handed over the material to the author for description and publication.

Jarring's materials, which consist of a number of texts, represent the variety spoken by the Amaleh more than fifty years ago. Certain phonological, grammatical and lexical features are inspected. Jarring's texts document a language variety that is lexically less Iranicized than the normal colloquial language spoken today. Some verb forms found in Jarring's material are not attested in recently recorded data. One

difference between the present situation and the one fifty years ago is that there are now definitely fewer speakers who can speak a not too strongly Iranicized variety.

The study of the linguistic situation in the Kashkay confederation may give some new insights into processes that may have taken place in the glottogenesis of other Turkic languages. A typical situation in the history of Turkic groupings is the establishment of confederations of linguistically heterogeneous groups. A politically and geographically defined linguistic area may lead to the development of common features and eventually to the development of a new language.

BERNT BRENDEMÖEN'S contribution is devoted to a specific case of Turkic-Iranian language contact-induced copying, the pronunciation of vowels in words of Arabic origin. The pronunciation typical of the East Anatolian Turkish and the Eastern Black Sea dialects is also found in Azerbaijanian and reflects the vowel system present in Persian. The Azerbaijanian pronunciation is due to code copying from Persian. The pronunciation in East Anatolian dialects is also due to copying from Persian, in some cases via Azerbaijanian.

The first stage of the penetration of Arabic loanwords into West Oghuz Turkic occurred during the expansion through Iran in the 9th-11th centuries. The loanwords acquired at that stage had a shape similar to the one they had in Persian. The situation in the East Anatolian and Eastern Black Sea dialects essentially represents a tradition dating back to this first stage. In Ottoman times, the pronunciation was modified according to the pronunciation in Arabic. A large additional amount of more or less learned words was introduced. This pronunciation spread from the big cultural centers in the West, e.g. Bursa, Istanbul and Konya.

The borderline between the West Anatolian and East Anatolian dialects roughly follows the Euphrates. The East Anatolian dialects share most of their features with Azerbaijanian. Although there is a sharp borderline between the East Anatolian and the Eastern Black Sea dialects, they share a few features, one of which is the pronunciation of vowels in words of Arabic origin. Thus, the spread of loanwords differed from the general linguistic development in the two areas. The author asks why the boundary between two traditions of pronunciation—a boundary between two cultural spheres—runs along the Euphrates, coinciding with the major isoglosses dividing West and East Anatolian dialects. Why does it not run farther to the east? And why are the Persian style loanwords also used in the Eastern Black Sea coast dialects?

Brendemoen suggests that the latter tradition goes back to a period in which East Anatolia had not yet been included into the Ottoman Empire but which may have been decisive for the influence of Iranian culture. The Aqqoyunlî state in East Anatolia and Iran, which reached its greatest expansion in the 1460s and 1470s, developed a culture in which Turkic tribal elements were mixed with refined Persian urban traditions. Because of the strong Persian impact, bilingualism probably developed among the speakers of Turkish. The Persian shape of the Arabic elements that already existed in the vernacular of the tribesmen was consolidated, and new words of Arabic origin were added via Persian and Azerbaijanian. When the Aqqoyunlî

had to leave Iran, they brought loanwords in this shape to East Anatolia and the Eastern Black Sea coast. Because of the prestige Iranian culture enjoyed in East Anatolia in the late 15th century, the Arabic words were preserved in their Persian garb. The old border between the Ottoman and the Aqqoyunlî land essentially coincided with the border between the East and West Anatolian dialects which roughly follows the Euphrates River.

HEIDI STEIN more or less deals with the same topic, the occurrence of front vs. back vowels in loans from Arabic-Persian in 16th century Ottoman Turkish. The author assumes two main stages in the adaptation process. The first words of Arabic origin had been copied from Persian and adapted to Turkic phonology. A second stage is represented by High Ottoman loans that largely maintained features of a foreign phonology. The result was a wide separation between a high standard variety and colloquial varieties. The first stage included the loss of original vowel length. The vowels *ā* and *ū* triggered back word structures, whereas *ī* triggered fronting. One variant of *ā* triggered fronting, especially in Persian words. At the second stage, the short vowels *a* and *u* were fronted. Emphatic, velar and laryngeal consonants of Arabic triggered a back pronunciation.

Sources in non-Arabic scripts are usually products of a lower standard and thus useful for the study of non-high varieties. The author presents examples, words of everyday speech, from the Middle Ottoman transcription text of Hieronymus Megiser (1612), which reflects the transregional lingua franca of the western part of the Ottoman Empire. It represents one of the middle varieties spoken by people with an average education. The analysis shows that Persian and Arabic loanwords in colloquial Middle Ottoman were phonologically well integrated. The front-back relation was more “balanced” than in High Ottoman of later times with its higher degree of front pronunciation.

MARCEL ERDAL deals with the consonant glide *y* occurring in morpheme juncture as a “binding” consonant. He regards it as a hiatus bridger occurring before suffixes with initial vowels and contributing to morphological transparency by clearly delimiting the suffixes. He assumes that *y* has simply been added before suffixes such as the converb suffix *-(y)lp*, e.g. *yaša-yip* ‘living, having lived’.

The palatal glide is much more prominent in Western Oghuz than elsewhere in Turkic, and the author ascribes its emergence to the areal influence of Western Iranian languages, which widely resort to consonantal glides. Persian, Kurdish and Zaza make extensive use of suffix variants with and without an initial consonant depending on whether the stem ends in a vowel or a consonant. East Old Turkic does not seem to have possessed any hiatus-preemptory *y*. The author thus claims that a fundamental change in morphophonemics has taken place in Western Oghuz. The palatal glide is clearly the result of areal convergence among the Western Iranian and Western Oghuz language. It must have been the West Iranians who were the first to resort to consonant glides.

Standard Turkmen has given up the Common Turkic resistance to the clashing of vowels in morpheme junctures and contracts stem-final vowels with suffix-initial

vowels, e.g. *yāšā-p* 'living, having lived'. Erdal does not assume that this contraction has passed through an intermediate stage involving *y*.

CHRISTIANE BULUT analyzes processes of syntactic copying exemplified by various means of relativization in Turkic varieties of "transitional" regions in East Anatolia, Iraq and West Iran. Long and extensive contacts with the Iranian languages Persian and Kurdish have led these varieties to develop clause-combining means that differ considerably from the genuinely Turkic ones. On the basis of fieldwork data collected in a Turcological project at Mainz, the author tries to reconstruct earlier stages of the relevant code copying processes. Copying of relativization patterns is found in many contacts of Turkic with Iranian. Variations in these patterns indicate the varying relations between the dialects in contact.

The dialects in question belong to the Oghuz branch of Turkic and have developed in the influence sphere of the two major Oghuz languages Azerbaijani and Ottoman Turkish. They share numerous features that distinguish them from both types. The populations of East Anatolia, Iraq and West Iran were in close contact for centuries even after the establishment of the borders of the Ottoman and the Safavid empires. Due to the mobility of different Turkic tribes, the dialect borders do not coincide with the political ones. It is nearly impossible to set up classificatory criteria of general validity for this heterogeneous area. One common feature is a relatively strong Iranicization at all linguistic levels.

Iraqi Turkic has been influenced by the prestige languages Persian and Turkish. Different layers of contact-induced phenomena mirror the frequent change of prestige language. Most of the speakers of Iraqi Turkic know Kurdish and Arabic. Many have learnt modern Turkish via the mass media, which has led to a diglossia of Iraqi Turkic vs. Standard Turkish. Though Iraqi Turkic exhibits many contact-induced features, it has, unlike the neighbouring dialects in Iran, preserved relative constructions of the Turkic type. The speakers of Iraqi Turkic are separated from their Turkic neighbours in Iran by Kurdish-speaking areas.

The nearest dialect is Sonqor, spoken in a predominantly Kurdish region. Iranicization has reached a higher level here than in most other Iran-Turkic varieties. Further dialects are found in the region of Bayadistan, east of Hamedan. The historical background of these varieties is still unclear. Sonqor Turkic and the Bayat dialects have completely restructured their sentence syntax on Iranian models. The whole system of relativization is based on patterns copied from Iranian, and the copied structures are close to their Iranian originals.

Older dialect texts that might shed light on these processes are almost completely missing. Some information can be drawn from sources written in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish. Given the history of settlement, texts in Old Anatolian Turkish may to some extent reflect traits of the spoken local varieties of the area and thus help reconstruct older stages. The relativization patterns of these texts show a high degree of Iranicization, the copies being very similar to the models. Turkic means of relativization are less developed.

With the emergence of Ottoman Turkish as a prestige language, the Iranian patterns lost their prominent role. Turkic means of relativization were increasingly used. Middle Ottoman copies of relativization patterns diverge considerably from their Iranian originals. Most subtypes of the copied structures survived up to the 19th century. With the formation of modern Turkish, the Iranian-type relative constructions were marginalized. Persian has now completely lost its former role as a prestige and literary language in Turkey.

The process of syntactic Iranicization must have begun early. The copied relativization patterns in modern Irano-Turkic varieties have exact counterparts in Old Anatolian Turkish, exhibiting the same degree of structural closeness of originals and copies. Many Old Anatolian Turkish texts can be interpreted as reflecting the language of Turco-Iranian bilingual authors of the 13th and 14th centuries.

The modern dialects dealt with in Bulut's paper show a high degree of Iranicization that can only emerge in a setting of intensive contact with a sizeable proportion of bilinguals. They are spoken outside of the sphere of influence of the Turkish and Azerbaijanian standard languages. Like in Old Anatolian Turkish, the close similarity to the copied Iranian system of relativization is due to the lack of a Turkic prestige language. The fully developed system of relativization in Old Anatolian Turkish texts implies that the copying took place in a similar setting before the Oghuz tribes arrived in Anatolia, probably in Seljuk Iran, where Persian influence was considerable. This type of copying is not due to patterns originating in translations of Persian texts. The preservation of the patterns throughout the Old Anatolian Turkish period shows the strong influence of Persian as a prestige language among the Turkic tribes in Anatolia before the emergence of the Ottoman Empire. The similarities in Old Anatolian Turkish and in the modern Irano-Turkic dialects may indicate that the dialects have preserved very old contact-induced patterns or that similar settings have led to similar results.