

REVIEWS

LARS JOHANSON (2001): *Discoveries on the Turkic Linguistic Map*. (Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul. Publications 5) Stockholm.

There are scholars who recognise the importance of field-work researches and one of them is Lars Johanson, representative of Scandinavian and German Turcology. His lecture given in honour of Professor Gunnar Jarring on the occasion of the latter's 90th birthday served as a solid basis for his latest book: *Discoveries on the Turkic Linguistic Map*.

What are the new discoveries? To get the answer one should read the handsome booklet. On pages 28–29 we see the location of 39 different Turkic peoples.

If one holds in hand the manual *The Turkic Languages* edited by the Johanson – Csató couple, there is a striking difference. In the latter on pages XVI–XVII one can find the centre of each of 33 Turkic peoples.

Paying tribute to his esteemed colleague, G. Jarring, Johanson underlines the importance of the Swedish research tradition. Field-work activities have always been aiming at new linguistic data and no wonder that new Turkic languages were explored in the difficult geographical zone of Iran, Turkestan and Afghanistan. Still we justly have great expectations also concerning the less investigated areas of China and Mongolia.

Though there are languages in danger on the Turkic linguistic map, parallel to this there are most promising efforts achieved by our Mainz colleagues in the huge Turkic world both in Europe and Asia. We can also catch a glimpse at the different field-work projects carried out by scholars from Novosibirsk, Novokuznetsk, Bloomington, Szeged, Uppsala, Tokyo.

The book contains the most up-to-date bibliography concerning Turkic languages. A table of contents could only add to the value of this work.

Éva Csáki

ÖZTOPÇU, K. – ABUOV, ZH. – KAMBAROV, N. – AZEMOUN, Y. (1999): *Dictionary of Turkic Languages. English: Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Uzbek*. 2nd edition. London–New York, Routledge. GBP 19.99

The Dictionary of Turkic Languages (DTL) is the outcome of the co-operation of a group of four people. The dictionary was first published in 1996, on which G. Doerfer wrote a review. In it he compared DTL to Karşılaştırmalı Türk Lehçeleri Sözlüğü (KTLS), its minor Turkish variant. Doerfer came to the conclusion that this kind of dictionary is very practical for those interested in Turkic languages on the surface, but not useful for those with scholarly am-

bitions. Especially Chuvash, Yakut and Khalaj data would have been of great importance but instead, the words are chosen from eight other languages (Azeri, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uyghur and Uzbek). Fortunately there are some very handy works like Budagov's, Radloff's (*Versuch eines Wörterbuch der Türk-Dialekte*) and the late Severtjan's and Räsänen's enterprise at our help.

The second edition of DTL consists of two parts. Part one offers the equivalents of the basic English wordlist (some 1850 words altogether) in Azeri, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkmen, Uyghur, Uzbek. Part two consists of the indexes of (each of the above) Turkic and English languages.

Dictionaries are always indispensable tools of research and in most cases they are interesting enterprises. Thanks to the compilers we can study how different the spelling was even if the languages of the late Soviet Union used the same alphabet. It may have also been the aim of politics to make it look so different – except for the international words like *balet* or *bank*. Yet in the case of the English word *automobile* (p. 11) we find it written in Cyrillic script with a final *ѣ* in most cases (Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Uzbek), and without it in Azerbaijani. In the case of Turkish the French loan *otomobil* is given in this dictionary, though *araba* is of common usage.

Studying the indexes one comes to the conclusion that the basic English wordlist is not the basic Turkic vocabulary. Otherwise we would not find such words as the Turkish word *baklava biçimi*, not to speak of the forms Kyrgyz *aldında* or Azeri *üstündä*, for they are not stems that we normally search for in a dictionary.

My comments on certain details are the following:

p. 3. The meaning of the English word *address* is *adres* also in Azerbaijani. Though in the dictionary in hand *ünvan* is given as the word for it, *ünvan* is rather for *rank*.

p. 8. The meaning of the English word *anybody* is reflected differently in statements or questions in Turkic, therefore we find *kimse* and *herkes* in Turkish. There is no clue though which stands for which.

p. 9. The English word *arm* is reflected as *kol* and its variants in Turkic, except for Uyghur, where we find *biläk*. The latter word is well known ever since the Buddhist texts but there it meant 'wrist' (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 338). Is there any reason why we should suppose that human anatomy has changed?

It is interesting to see that Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar and Uzbek languages do not make a difference between *arm* and *hand*, at least we find *kol* for both in DTL. In Uyghur vocabulary we find *biläk* for *arm* whereas it stands for *wrist* almost in all the other languages represented in DTL.

As for general linguistics one can see how Old Turkic *yüräk* 'heart' (Clauson 1972, p. 965) is preserved with phonetic changes in most languages, while there stands the Arabic loan *kalb* for it in Turkish. The spread and influence of Arabic scientific works is responsible for the latter.

Though further observations could be made, in general this work is a very useful contribution.

All in all we agree with Doerfer's summary: "Dem Interessierten Laien wird in der besprochenen Arbeit ein wertvolles praktisches Instrument zum ersten Eindringen in die tiefen Probleme der Turkologie gegeben."

Éva Csáki