Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Volume 62 (2), 241–249 (2009)
DOI: 10.1556/AOrient.62.2009.2.6

REVIEWS

MARCEL ERDAL: *A Grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2004, xii + 575 pages (Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section Eight, Central Asia, Volume 3). ISBN 90-04-10294-9.

The first comprehensive grammar of Old Turkic was written by Annamarie von Gabain in 1941 (*Alttürkische Grammatik – mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch Neutürkisch*, Leipzig, Harrassowitz), which was a brilliant work of its time. It has been republished twice with slight modifications (1950, 1974) and served as a base for further studies on Old Turkic for decades.

In the course of time a great many of shorter and longer studies came into being on various aspects of the Old Turkic grammar (cf. the history of research in his book under review: Erdal 2004, pp. 22–36; hereafter *GOT*), and it became more and more difficult to be informed in the vast literature published in this domain. On the other hand, it also became evident that a new handbook of the Old Turkic grammar should be written to sum up our knowledge of this field, since the grammar of Gabain became outdated in many respects even in the 1980s.

It is the great merit of Marcel Erdal to take this difficult (or formidable as he writes in the introduction) task and, bringing together the literature and the available sources, to publish his new and up-to-date grammar of Old Turkic not only for providing a simple description but for being a kind of breeding ground for further studies.

The name of the author is well known for those who have ever dealt with Old Turkic. Starting his carrier in the 1970s, he had important papers on this field, see e.g. The Chronological Classification of Old Turkish Texts. *CAJ* 23 (1979), pp. 151–175; Die Morphemfuge im Alttürkischen. *WZKM* 71 (1979), pp. 83–114. In 1991 he published his masterwork on *Old Turkic Word Formation* (*A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*). Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1991 (Turcologica 9) (hereafter *OTWF*) which was based on his earlier PhD dissertation. This book opened a new chapter not only in the study of Old Turkic, but in the entire Turcology. Unfortunately, many of his methodologically important remarks could not gain ground in the present discussions of Turcology.

The grammar of Erdal is built up in a standard way containing the following chapters: (1) Introduction (pp. 1–36); (2) Graphemics, Spelling, Phonology and Morphophonology (pp. 37–136); (3) Morphology (pp. 137–356); (4) Syntax

0001–6446 $ 20.00 © 2009 *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest*

(pp. 357–514); (5) Pragmatics and Modality (pp. 515–530); (6) Notes on the Lexicon (pp. 531–536); and finally the Abbreviations, References, Bibliography and two Indices (terms and notions, and Old Turkic elements).

Throughout the book the author always points to the fields which were hitherto not sufficiently described in the literature. For instance, research has been done on paleography, but only to a limited extent. Although Gabain discusses paleography in her grammar, Erdal rightly did not include it into his grammar (p. 41). It must be analysed, because of its immensity and complexity, in an independent publication. The author also clearly indicates the places where his analysis is (1) weak (e.g. tense and aspect), or (2) almost entirely missing (e.g. dialectology, diachrony which are "left for others") (p. xi). For the interpretation or clearer description of certain Old Turkic phenomena he usually cites Mongolic (mostly for reconstructing the antecedents), Middle and New Turkic data. In addition, the reader will find many corrections for the older literature, e.g. Erdal rightly says that a form *ilk* cannot be posited for Old Turkic (p. 190, n. 329), or that no stems as **üst*, **alt* and **ast* can be based on *üstün* 'above', *altïn* 'lower' and *astïn* 'beneath', these are special forms in +*dXn* related somehow to *üzä* 'above', *al* 'place beneath' and *asra* 'below' respectively (pp. 181–182). He also correctly writes that *aša* in *kögmän aša kïrkïz yeriŋä tägi s[ülädimiz]* and *käčä* in *käm käčä čik tapa sülädim* cannot be handled as postpositions – as was done by former scholars – but only as converbs (pp. 334–335). The grammatical features of Old Turkic are demonstrated by a great number of example phrases and sentences – together with excellent translations and useful corrections for the former interpretations. But sometimes the reader can detect the "digressive" nature of the author. For instance, certain phonological problems, which were already discussed in their right places, crop up again in the chapter of morphology without any relevance to the given discussion. E.g. analysing the element *-dOk* (p. 294), Erdal starts to speak about its spelling, a problem which has been described in details in § 2.32. Furthermore, we can learn four times that Erdal analyses *ärkän* as **ärür kän* (pp. 124, 288, 341, 344).

In the introduction (Chapter 1) the author first places Old Turkic into a broader context discussing Proto-Turkic and the very controversial Altaic language family, then he defines the borders and limits of Old Turkic (both in time and place). Here a significant difference can be seen between the viewpoint of Erdal and that of Gabain. While Gabain defined Old Turkic as the language form not influenced by Islam and not written in the Arabic script, Erdal uses a more adequate definition based on chronological and linguistic criteria. As a result, many later sources written, e.g., in the Uygur script, now handled as Middle Turkic, and the works of Kāšġarī (*Dīvān luġat al-Turk*) and Yūsuf the Chamberlain (*Qutadġu Bilig*) are included into the Old Turkic corpus. Of course, only this latter definition is acceptable today. The final part of the introduction deals with the history of research.

Chapter 2 is starting with graphemics which is a very short guide to the understanding of the various scripts used for Old Turkic. It is followed by the description of the sound system together with the definition of the archiphonemes. In this section the reader can perceive a strangely hybridised presentation of the distinct phonemes and their possible allophones/pronunciations – as a mixture of phonology and phonetics. Except some very general statements, I think we do not have the chance to correctly predict the real pronunciation of the phonemes on the base of the not too regular writing systems used for Old Turkic (and here I do not touch the problems arising from the applied systems, i.e. the *abjad*s and *abugida*s). For instance, the author tries to prove that the voiced velar fricative was realised as a stop in certain environments or as unvoiced uvular fricative in others, an idea which may be true because of universal analogies and parallels from modern Turkic, but lacking real evidences (see e.g. p. 78). It would have been a good addition for this section to separately analyse/describe the sound system of the primary stems, and that of the

suffixes. The next section is devoted to phonotactics and phonetic processes giving a very detailed description of the various sound changes such as assimilation, syncopation, metathesis, haplology etc., which helps the beginners to understand the very deviant forms of the various Old Turkic texts. The chapter ends with morphophonology.

Chapter 3 is about morphology where the reader finds the sections of nominals (nouns, pronouns, numerals etc.), verbs (finite and non-finite verb forms, analytical verbs, types of action, aspect and tense etc.), adjuncts (adverbs, postpositions, particles etc.) and interjections; various ways of inflection and derivation are described in their appropriate sections. The weakest point of this chapter is that the author just gives the standardised forms of the derivational morphemes with no examples in many cases, and refers the reader to his *OTWF* for further reading. If the reader does not have the book in question he/she stays up in the air. For instance, there are no examples even for the most common deverbal elements such as -(*O*)*k* and -(*X*)*g* (p. 152), and there are no examples for the better understanding of Erdal's ergative, as again there are no examples in the sections of denominal and deverbal verbs (pp. 227–228).

Chapter 4 is devoted to syntax including nominal and adjunct phrases, sentence patterns, word order, clause subordination, direct speech, etc. This is also a detailed chapter of the book, for instance, the description of the functions carried by the case markers is exhaustive. We also get a precise description of the various types of subordinate and coordinate clauses. However, the relation between the case markers and verbs, i.e. which cases and which way the verbs govern, should have been analysed more thoroughly.

The last two – unfortunately very short – chapters (5th and 6th) are on pragmatics, modality and on the lexicon. I personally miss an independent chapter on discourse analysis, especially something on the relation between discourse and syntactic structure, or discourse and context. The excuse of the author may be that hardly any research has been pursued by the scholars of Old Turkic in this respect. Others might be happy to get more on semantics.

After the numbered chapters there is an extremely short list of abbreviations and references. The list is incomplete and the author directs the reader to his *OTWF*, Röhrborn's *Uigurisches Wörterbuch* and the bibliographical work of Adam, Laut and Weiss (*Bibliographie alttürkischer Studien*, 2000). This is not an appropriate practice at all. The bibliography is also incomplete only containing the most relevant studies for writing the book. The book finally ends with two well usable indices.

After the general description of the chapters, I continue my review with minor additions for various passages of the book in the same order as the original statements appear in the book:

On p. 60 Erdal writes that Turkic *är* 'man' does not necessarily come from **ärä*, accordingly it is not an immediate counterpart of Mongolic *ere* id., and rejects that Mongolic *saga-* 'to milk' goes back to Proto-Turkic **saga-* (> Old Turkic *sag-*). Thus he is seemingly against the hypothesis that Mongolic is a proof for the Proto-Turkic coda vowels, but he only provides – a complicated and unconvincing – solution for Mongolic *ere*, namely the Turkic plural form *äräṅ* was copied to Mongolic where the final /n/ later became metanalysed, and forgets to speak about the other examples of this phenomenon, cf. *kap-* : *kaga-*, *boz* : *boro* and the like.

The signs used by Erdal for voiced orals in the table of consonants (p. 62) is a bit ambiguous. From the letters <v d y g> the reader may have the impression that Old Turkic has both stops and fricatives in this slot. However, this is not the case: Erdal defines both /d/ and /g/ as fricatives (not including the special cases when they are handled as stops). Accordingly, it would have been better to present a more detailed table of consonants with a clear definition of stops and fricatives. Adding letter /b/ to the table would have made it more intelligible and compliant to the reconstructed Proto-Turkic system of consonants. On the other hand, this notation could have relieved the author of apologising why he had not used Greek letters for the fricatives.

Erdal's idea (p. 113) that *otačï* comes from **ot+ač+čI* meaning '*a person busy with small herbs' is smart but far from reality: on the one hand, there is no diminutive suffix +(*A*)*č*, but only +(*X*)*č* (cf. *OTWF* § 2.12), on the other, the medical doctor *otačï* has possibly nothing to do with small herbs, because it is not indicated in the sources, see e.g. *birök otačï ämči ärsär ot yäm algay* 'if he is a physician he will accept the fragrant herbs and spices' (U I 7, 3–4).

On p. 118 Erdal correctly states that the phoneme /d/ was highly likely realised as stop in case of the runiform ligatures of the type /n/ + alveolar or /l/ + alveolar, but he leaves the question of ligature /n/ + /č/ open. As a possible solution, we can presume, on the analogy of the other two ligatures, that this letter did not indicate /nč/, but /nǰ/, thus the usual examples of this category could be interpreted as *anǰa*, *ïnǰa*, *ärinǰ*, *yinǰü*, *sanǰ-* and the like.

In the literature the derivational element *+(A)gU* is usually referred to as collective. Contrary to this definition, it is added to *bir* 'one' (> *birägü* 'an individualised entity from a group of people'), and in other cases it does not simply denote a vague mass of things/persons, but a group of well definable individuals or items. See e.g. *bo üčägü kaviš*(*s*)*ar* 'if these three assemble' (Tuń 12) where *üčägü* is not just a group of three unspecified entities, but a group of three tribes, namely Tabgač, Kïtań and Oguz, each of them are being important by their own rights. And cf. the problem of *adïnagular* discussed in *OTWF* (p. 95). Accordingly, it would be better to define *+(A)gU* as individualiser.

Discussing the ablative suffix, Erdal writes that the runiform letters <WGzDndN> (Tuń 8) have to be interpreted as *Oguzdundan* 'from the direction of the Oguz' and thus the ablative is *+dAn* here, because "its vowel would (after a rounded vowel) have had to be explicitly spelled as I if the inscription had had the ablative suffix as *+dIn*" (pp. 174–175). But we have no clear information of this vowel, since it is never explicit in the runiform inscriptions. By the same token, we can read the given word as *Oguzdundun*, in conformity with the rule that if a vowel is not spelled it can be from the same type as the former one.

In the description of the so-called aorist, Erdal (p. 240) discusses the possible relation between *-r* and *-yUr* and writes that "*-yUr* is not necessarily the older form …, although it did not survive very well into Middle and Modern Turkic". Even if it is contracted, this "long" form of the aorist is well visible in a number of modern Turkic languages as a dominant variant, see e.g. the Yakut word *sanïr* 'he/she thinks' which highly likely goes back to **sanā-yïr*, and *dïr* 'he/she speaks' to **diä-yir*. It is also the case with Khakas where *oynirġa* 'to play' possibly comes from **oyna-yïr+ġa*. But of course it cannot be a vote for or against the age of *-yUr*.

This "long" form of the aorist is analysed by Erdal (p. 241) as a contraction of **-yU ärür*, which, on the one hand, cannot be supported by any evidence, and on the other, leaves the question open why there is a very symmetric distribution of the aorist with that of the vowel converb, namely -(*A*)*r*, -(*I*)*r*, -(*U*)r, *-yUr* and *-A*, *-I*, *-U*, *-yU*.

Using the same solution, Erdal (p. 308) traces the prospective participle *-gAlIr* back to **-gAlI ärür* which is also without real foundation, and in contradiction with our knowledge on Old Turkic.

On p. 310 Erdal mentions two different ways for the analysis of -(*X*)*pAn*: (1) it is a compound of **-bA* and the instrumental case; (2) it comes from -(*X*)*pAnXn*, which is a compound of -(*X*)*p* and *anïn*. Although the first is acceptable (only if **-bA* is considered participle), the second one seems to be very plausible (note that on p. 327 Erdal gives **-(X)pA* as the base of -(*X*)*pAn*, which must be the same as the formerly reconstructed **-bA*, but possibly from an other stratum of Turkic).

While in my view a converb can get case markers if and only the converbial form became lexicalised, Erdal reconstructs such forms as regular ones in Old Turkic. For instance, he emends (p. 313) the runiform examples *bolča* (BK S9) and *yogurča* (Tuń 26) to *boluča* and *yoguruča*, respectively, where the endings are described as the vowel converb + the equative

case marker, a solution which is very controversial, because converbs cannot normally get cases.

Erdal (p. 524) may be right that runiform *yälü kör* (Tuń 26) can be interpreted as 'see to it that you ride fast', but there are different interpretations proposed by other scholars also fitting well to the context, e.g. 'Reitend sieht!' or 'Reite vorsichtig!', or with a highly free translation 'keep a watchful eye [on potential danger of enemies] while riding!'.

The verb *ötün-* is discussed on p. 529 as an example for the reflexion of social structure. For this, another example can be added in order to exemplify the relation or interaction between the two possible participants, one of them is of higher rank, i.e. *anŋa ötündüm* (Tuń 14) is the request of the inferior and *ötündök ötünŋümün äšidü berdi* (Tuń 15) is the acceptance from the superior. Such data could provide more details on discourse.

Erdal (p. 532) gives the verbs *sekirt-* 'let (one's horse) jump' and *yügürt-* 'let (one's horse) run' as examples where the implied objects are left implicit. These are however not good cases for this phenomenon, since Kāšġarī shows counterexamples: *ol bitig okïr ärkän säkritti* 'he made an omission in reading the book or Koran' and *ol anï yügrütti* 'he made him run'.

As a final conclusion, I think that Marcel Erdal's book, one of the most significant works in his *oeuvre*, is an invaluable contribution to the study of Turcology and will be a useful handbook and a source of inspiration for experts of Old Turkic for as long (or perhaps longer) than the grammar of Gabain's *Alttürkische Grammatik* was.

László Károly

KLJAŠTORNYJ, S. G. – SULTANOV, T. I. – TREPAVLOV, V. V. (eds): *Tjurkologičeskij Sbornik 2005: Tjurkskie narody Rossii i Velikoj stepi*. Moskva, Izdatel'skaja firma «Vostočnaja literatura» RAN, 2006, 382 pages.

One of the latest new volumes of *Tjurkologičeskij Sbornik* spans the history of the Eurasian peoples between the 8th and 19th centuries. In addition to articles on ethnic issues and political history, analyses of primary sources also play a key role. It is fortuitous that the book comprises works not only from prominent Oriental Studies centres, but also from less familiar workshops.

R. A. Abdumanapov (Kul'turno-istoričeskaja osnova kyrgyzskogo plemennogo obrazovanija kangdy: pp. 6–20). Abdumanapov examines a possible link between the Kyrgyz Kangdy tribe and the Kanglï, a Qipchak Turkic people. He investigates various sources tied to the Kanglï from the earliest Chinese chronicles up to the 19th century. Prior to the Mongol invasion, the Kanglï led a nomadic life along the Irtish River in the summer months and in the valleys of the Syr-darya, Chu and Talas Rivers in winter. Abu'l-Ghazi mentions them as living in the Issikköl region, which is very near the contemporary quarters of the Kangdy. The author concludes that the proximity of the quarters as well as the similarity of the two tribes bear out the hypothesis of a link between the Kangdy and Kanglï. Further, the fact that the tribal name Kangdy can also be found among the Altaic peoples shows that the tribe must have integrated into the Kyrgyz tribal alliance by the 15th century, when the Kyrgyz and Altaic tribes went their separate ways.

V. Ja. Butanaev (K istorii instituta kištimstva u enisejskih kyrgyzov: pp. 21–25). This short but extremely informative article examines an institution among the Yenisei Kyrgyz known in Kyrgyz as *kesdem*, *kistim*. The meaning of the word in the 17th-century Russian sources is 'commoner, tax (*yasaq*) payer free peasant'. The word *kesdem* first appeared in runic inscriptions in the 8th–9th centuries along the Yenisei River, where it meant 'subjugated, conquered people'. Although the folk etymology of the word refers to tax paid in sable fur (*kis* 'sable', *tim* 'fur'), the author suggests that the word *kesdem* could originally have been an ethnonym for a people conquered by the Kyrgyz. As a parallel example, he notes that the word *hitad* meaning 'Chinese' in Mongolian is not only an ethnonym, but also means 'servant'.

A. V. Vinogradov (Rod Suleša vo vnešnej politike Krymskogo hanstva vtoroj poloviny