

OTTOMAN TURKISH

DENOMINATION OF THE PERIOD

The issue as regards the denomination of the language belonging to the period which spans the period covering the time from the coming of the Oguzlar to Anatolia to the establishment of the Turkish Republic has been discussed in sundry works. We have a great many works inherited from the period of the fourteenth century. Such a richness of material has failed to provide us with a central term for describing them these different terms are used by scholars: Old Anatolian Turkish, Old Turkey Turkish, Old Ottoman Turkish. The term Old Ottoman is also used for the same period. Nevertheless, Turks began to pervade into Europe in the end of the fourteenth century. From the beginning of the fifteenth century onwards, officials and soldiers who spoke Turkish went to a great many cities: from Sarajevo to Belgrade, from Belgrade to Cairo, etc. The language of the period which extends from the development of the Ottoman Empire as a political and economical power to the conquest of Istanbul is denominated as Old Anatolian Turkish, the language belonging to the following period is called Ottoman Turkish.¹ However, we should point out that the characteristics pertaining to this language did not disappear all at once, as we are able to find them in works written in the following centuries as well. Therefore, some literary historians sets the beginning of the new period as of the end of fifteenth century. The Old Anatolian language can be subdivided into three periods: 1. The Seljuk Period (between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries), 2. The Age of the Beylikler (Princdoms) (fourteenth centuries) and 3. The Ottoman Period (the second half of the fifteenth century).

Denomination of the new period and the new period and the determining the subdivisions is an issue by itself. For the language of this period the term Ottoman Turkish is used. Both of them implies a hybrid written language dominated by Arabic and Persian elements and detached from the Turkish spoken by the public. In the usage of the terms sometimes sentimental judgements were in the foreground; on the one hand negative secondary meanings accompanied to what is really intended with an attitude as if a language other than Turkish is in question, on the other hand some excessive interpretations have been made without considering the actual situation.

Németh, the famous Hungarian Turkologist who used the term Ottoman Turkish in so that it would include Turkey Turkish stays the following with respect to the domination of the period in the year 1952: The terms 'Ottoman Turkish' and 'Ottoman Turkish Language' may sound artificial, unattractive, insipid, and even meaningless to the liking of the new generation in present situation of Turkey; nevertheless, in my opinion these terms incorporate the seven-hundred-year history of particular tributary which comes from the main body of Turkish.² With this approach Németh rejects the terms 'Anatolian Turkish' and 'Turkey Turkish' on account of the fact that the language in question was also used in areas other than this region.

Within the scope of this study we designate all kinds of Turkish which emerged with predomination of Ottoman state as a political and cultural power in the middle of the fifteenth century and used until the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. The

present-day Turkish spoken in Turkey is the direct extension of this language which we do not have much information with respect to its impressions, and some periods of which has not been investigated thoroughly.

WRITTEN LANGUAGE OF THE OGUZES

The oldest characteristics of the language spoken by Oguzes, who continuously immigrated to the Southeast with the names Seljuks and Turkmens, are seen on the rock inscriptions of Orhun. Forms include *b*-instead of *m*- in the beginning of a sentence: *ben*, *biñ* “1000”, *beñgü* “infinite”, *buñ* “boredom”, *beñ* “moles”, *bin*-etc.; past tense made up by using the suffixes *-muş/-miş*; the repetition *iş küç* in the expression *iş küç bermek* etc.

Despite the fact that the emergence of Oguz as a medium of writing took place in Anatolia since the thirteenth century, it had begun to develop while the Oguzes were still in Central Asia a very long time ago. No sooner than the Great Seljuk State had formed in Khorasan area (1040), they came to Anatolia via Iran and Azerbaijan and founded Anatolian Seljuk State (1075). In the dictionary he compiled in the second half of the eleventh century he specified the distinctive characteristics are as follows:

1. Modification of *t->d*- in the beginning of the word.
2. Modification of the consonants *w* and *d* within the word or in the end of the word to *v* and *y* respectively.
3. Dropping of the thin and thick consonants *g* found in the affix or in the beginning of syllable.
4. The use of the future tense adjective-verb suffix *-ası/-esi* etc.

During the age of Anatolian Seljuks who were beaten by Moguls and whose predomination had ended in the year 1308, the Turkish language and a literary concept based on this language did not develop much due to the fact that the administrators were closer to the Arabian and Persian culture. Besides, the language used as a medium of writing in Oguzes was not very different than the Eastern Turkish tradition. According to the thesis of writers such as Mecdut Mansuroğlu, Mustafa Canpolat, Zeynep Korkmaz the Old Anatolian Turkish was under the influence of Eastern Middle Turkish, i.e. the written language of Uigurs. However, in the first period of Ottoman Turkish pure Turkish elements began to appear since the beginning of the fifteenth century.³

There are not prestige variants above accents that would be considered as norm in the foundation of the Old Turkish writing tradition. The language bears the traces of Oguz language; however, it has progressive variations along with the partly mixed elements of Eastern Turkish. As late as the twelfth century, in Kharzem and Khorasan, a Western Turkish written language was developed –no matter how it bears the characteristics of distinct accents and Oguz language—related to the Central Asian Turkish written language. The first Anatolian Turkish represents this language to a great extent. The language of the period brought from Khorasan due to the Turkish immigrations was denominated the language of “olga-bolga” on account of the changeability in the verb *ol-~bol-* when it occurs in the beginning of a word in the researches concerning Ottoman Turkish. It was only from the beginning of the thirteenth century that of Anatolian Turkish written language developed quite independently along with Oguz language characteristics.

A very small number of the works incorporating the characteristics of Karahanlı, Kıpçak and Oguz group have come down to us from the Age of Anatolian Seljuk State. The most significant of these is the *Behcetü'l hadâik*, which was written in the turn of the twelfth century and in the beginning of the thirteenth century. The writer of this book of sermons is unknown; we are able to take it for granted that it was written in Anatolia. The *Kıssa-i Yusuf*, which was written in 1233. The *Feraiz Kitabı*, which was translated from Persian to Turkish by Fakih Yakut Arslan in the year 1343, The *Kudûri Tercümesi*, couplets and poems of Mevlana and his son Sultan Veled in Turkish, the works of Hoca Dehhani and Ahmet Fakih, The *Yusuf u Zeliha* of Şeyyad Hamza, poems of Yunus Emre are considered among the first works of Oguz written language which emerged in Anatolia.⁴

As Anatolia was beginning to become a Turkish land from the beginning of the eleventh century, Seljuks was using Persian in the administration issues of state, whereas they were using Arabic in religion and science. The language spoken by people was considered as a vulgar local spoken language, and it was unable to cope with the two cultural languages for a long time. People who spoke Persian and took shelter in Anatolia due to the Mogul raids contributed to solidify the state of Persian in Anatolia. In the thirteenth century, Turkish was still in a fairly questionable position. However, even then Turkish was used in mystical works, particularly in the works that aim at spreading the religion and written language, which had to be vulgar in order to be understood by the lay public. Although the new emerging Anatolian Turkish poetry had been back to the period of Seljuks, Turkish scarcely had a chance to develop as a cultural language after the fall of the Seljuk State, in the fourteenth century. The administrators of the Beyliks, which had been established in Anatolia, were mostly speaking only one language. Therefore, Turkish began to be favored as a courtly language in the beyliks; besides it began to be used as the language of administration, and as a literary language in the competition of culture between the palaces. The population of beyliks was mostly composed of Turkish clans; this factor should have played an important part in the popularity of Turkish.

The language used in this period should be a blend of various Oguz accents. It was not a language, which was encoded with respect to phonology, morphology, vocabulary, and spelling by any means; it was not a language, which had set standards. Mostly, it is a combination of the accent of Oguz clans and among these we can find the traces of Eastern Turkish from time to time. As we see below, in the works belonging to this period a spelling similar to Eastern Turkish is used at times. Therefore, in the works of poets belonging to the first period we come across with a spelling almost with no rules. Including Arabic and Persian, we find different spelling of the same word.⁵

The complexity of the language of works rendered in this period is not surprising. Despite the abundance of Turkish elements the variants of Old Anatolian language were considered as below the standard after a century and works written in this language were rendered in the language of the “educated”. We are able to infer this from the *Kabusname* translation of Mercimek Ahmet: “...one day I was at the disposal of the sultan and saw that Sultan [Murâd Han] ibn Muhammed Han ibn Bayezid...holds a book in his hand. This weak disappointed man requested information about the book from the magnanimous one. He mellifluously replied that it was the *Kabusname* and added that it was a nice book containing many a moral

tales and advice but it is written in Persian language. Someone translated it into Turkish but not said clearly. Mark Kirchner who studied on different translations of the *Kabusname* assumes that there were previous translations other than that of Mercimek Ahmet.⁶

PERIODS OF OTTOMAN LANGUAGE

The period called Ottoman Turkish can be categorized into certain subdivisions with respect to the characteristics of language in itself: 1- The Beginning Period which means the transition period in which in characteristics of Old Anatolian Turkish was substituted with new ones; this period extends from the middle of the fifteenth century to the sixteenth century. 2- Classical Period in which the functional domain of Turkish were expanded and the standard Turkish was separated from the language spoken by the public; it extends from the sixteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth century. 3- Renovation Period that extends from the middle of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century; in this period a new standard language began to flourish. 4- Turkey Turkish which does not differ much from the present day Turkish; this period extends from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present-day. We should point out that each period could be considered in subdivisions according to various characteristics; besides, it is also possible to indicate different periods, which includes other time divisions on account of other criteria. Nevertheless, let alone the absence of sufficient detailed studies that could supply criteria, it is unnecessary to involve in such an attempt within the scope of this study.

DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD OTTOMAN TURKISH

Along with the establishment and rise of Ottoman State the language develops. Development of a language from a local dialect to the standard language is a noteworthy fact. Besides, it is also interesting to determine that it substitutes a sample with respect to the fact that developing from a local dialect to the standard is closely tied to having a conscious unity and identity and the conscious rise of a group of people. A small beylik (princedom) on the Northeast border of Seljuks developed politically and as a military power; consequently it conquered very important territories in Western Anatolia and Rumalia.

Despite the fact that the beys (princes) of this state were not on par with Seljuks with respect to cultural refinement, they had the potential sufficient to develop a standard language. With the birth and rise of Ottoman State, which was denominated according to its founder's name, an Ottoman state language flourishes based on the Anatolian dialects, which had been used previously. The conglomeration of variants, which constitutes Old Anatolian Turkish, was sufficient to function as a literary, religious, and didactic medium of communication. However, when it became necessary to create a standard language, based on Turkish, to support the organization of Ottoman State the above-mentioned conglomeration proved insufficient. Ottoman Turkish developed from being a local dialect towards being a medium of communication between those who use different dialects. As a written and spoken variant it acquired a supranational character along with the expansion of the empire and the employment of non-Turkish people in administration. Despite the fact that a fairly homogeneous standard written language did not develop, the

function of Ottoman Turkish increased to a considerable extent in the administrative procedures. In the meantime sources were completed with a great number of elements from Arabic and Persian, which were the prestigious languages.⁷

Although the new language became a binding factor with the strengthening of Ottomans, it never had a codification with respect to its form as a complete book of rules. For the Turkish there was not a prescriptive grammar book or a spelling book that would set the rules beforehand. There were only certain rules concerning spelling, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary for the Arabic and Persian elements. Along with the development of the information pertaining to both languages, this situation emerged in conforming to the spelling and pronunciation rules in the source languages. With the strengthening of Ottoman Empire (zenith: the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries) and the flourishing of the written language a gradual drifting from Turkish started. The language that emerged in this manner, in the administration of the elite, which had the power in their hands, drifted away from the spoken variants in an accelerating manner; only those who had a good knowledge of Arabic and Persian understood it. This was a kind of chosen style made up of foreign elements and used in the official procedure. Shortly afterwards, as we have already indicated, the other variants of old Anatolian Turkish were considered as substandard and the works written in these variants were transmitted to Turkish of the literate. Standard Ottoman Turkish was not a common national language, which functions as a means of writing and speaking at the same time. None of the social layers of Ottoman society was using the high standard variant as a medium of daily spoken language. A conspicuous distinction came into being between the standard language and the remaining variants.⁸

Nevertheless, the variant Ottoman Turkish cannot be reduced to a simple contradiction, which determines the distinction between the “standard”- “peculiar to the lower classes”. Style theorists suppose that there is a “middle Turkish which functions” as “the spoken language of the educated class” in between the “vulgar Turkish” and the “fluent Turkish”. From the transition point, a less formal common language developed which functioned as the norm of spoken language for a long time. The foundation of this Western Ottoman standard language was Istanbul Turkish spoken by the educated. This Turkish had become predominant at a fairly early time; it was an uncoded spoken language variant with supraregional effect, with no binding characteristics and literary traits. For centuries, those who came from different social layers modified it and it incorporated the elements, which came from all directions. The onrush of the speakers from a great many regions led to some innovative changes inherent within the characteristics of Turkish still being spoken in Turkey. Herein, we are considering a spoken language, which is sometimes used in writing, not a written language. Due to the scarcity of available keepsakes belonging to language the inventory of this language has not been made sufficiently.⁹ Owing to the fact that a great many words were borrowed from Arabic and Persian sources in scientific and administrative writings, the fields in which Ottoman Turkish functioned were expanded to a great extent. The language became normative practically, and there was a decrease in the number of free variants. However, the normativeness cited here is unofficial. Likewise, we have not any available “spelling book” prescribing the characteristics of the norms, as we have already mentioned. A

completely prescriptive normativeness, that is- a normativeness which sets the rules concerning writing and speaking in Ottoman Turkish has never existed.

When this written language was being made up first, it was quite closer to the language spoken by public. Afterwards, in the hands of the administrative elite, it considerably differed from the language spoken by public. The new language was only intelligible for those who spoke Arabic and Persian; it was nor understandable for the lower classes. After a while it became a fairly elite language. Setting a monotonous norm as the language of an empire led to the inflexibility and stagnation of this language at the same time. Ottoman Turkish had drifted from being a language fit for each and every situation in which a language can be used, and more than being a standard variant it was supported by foreign elements, subsequently it turned out as a style used only for official purposes.¹⁰ Thus, standard Ottoman drifted from being an all-purpose language functioning as both a medium of writing and speaking.

Consequently, there has been an extreme gap between the upper language and the other variants. Attempts aiming at the compensation of the detachment yielded no result. Afterwards, this style, which drifted away from the daily spoken language, had to leave its place to a standard language developed from variants rivalling each other.

Nevertheless we should emphasize that Ottoman Turkish was a language used as a medium of communication between the speakers of different dialects. Speaking Ottoman Turkish outside the group was approved due to the prestige the administrators had. Using this variant was significant with respect to the relative social identity of the person who spoke this language. Ottoman Turkish acquired the ability of being a standard language with respect to its function. Old Ottoman documents indicate that these new forms were prevalent over an expansive geographical region.¹¹

In the consequence of the establishment of Ottoman Empire as a power Ottoman Turkish became more binding as a new fangled standard language. The approval for its usage was realized by means of the sanctions and rewards of the state: In the strict social system of the Empire speaking standard language meant a way-out to make a career. In every new conquered region the learned men (ulema) were trying to solidify the organization of the state. Even if it was unofficial, the encoding and development of the state language was parallel to this expansion and strengthening. As it was indicated above Ottoman Turkish acquired a supranational character in the consequence of the employment of those whose mother tongue was not Turkish in the defence and administration of the state.

It is often said that the main difference in the emergence of Ottoman Turkish is due to its vocabulary; on the other hand, it did not effected in the internal configuration of the language, that is- the phonological inventory, vowel harmonies and morphological tools and sentence structure to a considerable extent. Nevertheless, in the domains of the language other than vocabulary, very considerable differences emerged between the conglomeration of variants and Ottoman Turkish though not felt as conspicuous as those in the vocabulary.

THE LANGUAGE OF ISTANBUL

With respect to language, Istanbul was a city in which sundry kinds of languages were spoken. The dialect of city was a collection of local variants emerged in the consequence of the fusion of miscellaneous tendencies. The influence of deep or surface variants and the influence of various ethnic elements whose language was not Turkish were significant. Some characteristics that is peculiar to Turkish pronunciation sounds typical to those who come from Greek, Armenian, Jewish or other origin. In Karagöz shadow play the identities of these minorities are indicated, in a distorted manner, along with certain phonetic characteristics conforming their traditions. However, we have no available documents, which would prove that this people were speaking different variants of Turkish.¹² The same situation applies to the texts written by Greeks.¹³

The city dialect of Istanbul obviously differs from the standard language that is based on Istanbul speech. Some characteristics of this can be seen in the prose works written in the second half of the nineteenth century; for instance, in the works of Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar. Herein the unconstrained style of the educated class of society is in question. As it is frequently stated today, woman spoke Old Istanbul Turkish in the elite districts of the capital in its prime. Herein, a language far more isolated from the languages spoken by the upper and lower classes of society should be considered.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the characteristics of “euphonious Turkish”, which was spoken mostly by woman, has not been researched sufficiently.

First in the nineteenth century, language reforms, which led to a shift of standard, were started. Standard language had to give way to a less formal form. The general Istanbul language laid the path for this process. The moderate language reformers led by Turkists suggested writing Turkish as spoken by the people, particularly by women. Thus the “middle” variant developed into a new standard variant, which has been the foundation essential for the national language of the present-day Turkey and required for other developments of written language.¹⁵

VARIATION AND CHANGES

As for the variation pertaining to the old social classes, we should point out that the demonstrations of this language, which we might call “vulgar Ottoman Turkish”, only indicated the deviations from the upper class language and constituted an Ottoman Turkish that does not sound pleasant with respect to its style. Each standard depends on the influence of the competing norms, and it requires to be deciphered by means of these. For instance, in the middle Ottoman dictionaries written by foreigners the words referred as being vulgar led to a variation, which replaced the standard. The transition is mostly gradual. For some time there has been two variants peculiar two social classes; one of them was progressive, the other was conservative. In the following generations, the innovations expanded and generalized in a manner that would include other social classes; thus it got rid of the social tag attached to it. a purposeless language change has turned into a regular language change. Basically, the variants of substandard could be incorporated into the standard. Something that was considered as vulgar and uncultivated in a stage of development could be approved in the next. The mainlines of the disintegrations of old morphological structure which was typical for Old Ottoman Turkish should have been like this. Variants, which were socially in a superior position, could have had innovative

features that arise from copying phonological characteristics. Variants with lower prestige could have taken the elements of prestige and thus the gap between them and the superior variant were narrowed.¹⁶

In the shaping of the variants with no literary traits a general language is considered as a criterion. Below this we are able to find the language of the public, slang and vulgar language as a substandard less prestigious than the language spoken by the public. Concerning the language commonly spoken in Istanbul, there is ample information in the transcribed texts not written in Arabic alphabet and particularly written by the foreigners who lived in Istanbul. Investigation of these texts has almost become a distinct field of researches regards to Turkology.¹⁷

ALPHABET AND SPELLING

In the spelling of Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish Arabic alphabet was used. Although there are valuable works written in other alphabets and also known as transcription texts, particularly significant with respect to the language research, they never turned into alphabets in which Ottoman Turkish was extensively used. In the development of the standard written language, especially in the beginning, the spelling bears the characteristics of two distinct writing traditions: 1. Uigur writing tradition, 2. Arabian- Persian writing tradition. The impression of these traditions on spelling can be summarized as follows:

THE INFLUENCE OF UYGUR WRITING TRADITION

1. Indication of the vowels in writing كاتوروك “getürüñ”
2. Use of نك group to indicate the nasal sound n: گۆنل “göñül”
3. Use of the letter س in words, which has back vowels: ساقين “sakın”
4. Use of چ for ج, and use of ب for p: تاپا “...e doğru”
5. Writing suffixes separate from the root and stem. “اكسوك سوز” “eksüksüz”

THE INFLUENCE OF ARABIC- PERSIAN WRITING

1. Concealing vowels in writing: يگرم “yigirmi”
2. Use of the letter ك to indicate the nasal ñ: گوزك “gözün”
3. Use of the letter ص in words including back vowels.
4. Use of چ for ج, and use of پ for p.
5. Adjacent writing of suffixes to the root and stem.
6. Use of nunation اولمد “ölmedin (ölmeden önce).”¹⁸

PHONOLOGY

OLD OTTOMAN TURKISH AND VOWELS IN OTTOMAN TURKISH

Similar to Old Anatolian Turkish eight vowels are supposed to exist in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish: *a, ı, o, u, e, i, ö, ü*.

However, similar to Old Turkish again, the existence of long vowels and the closed *e* is disputable and it is appropriate to handle them separately.

Long Vowels: The fundamental long vowels of the main Turkish are supposed to be shortened in Old Anatolian Turkish. Although it is maintained that *imales* ((pronunciation of a short vowel as a long one) in the poems written in *aruz* (the prosody of the classical Arabic- Persian tradition) show the fundamental vowels, in a comprehensive study he made Brendemoen indicated that this could be considered as correct to a certain extent.¹⁹ According to him in the poetry of Karahanlı *imale*

showed the real extensions, and although the long vowels have long since shortened in Oğuz written language which was an offshoot of Eastern Turkish tradition of Anatolia, the etymological extensions which correspond to *imale* could only be accounted for considering the influence of Eastern Turkish written language.

However, the existence of long vowels (*gāl*, *sāy*-, *çīban*, *yōk* etc.) in Turkmen which belongs to Eastern part of contemporary Oğuz group indicate that the long vowels are kept in main Oğuzca whereas they are shortened in Western Oğuzca.

In the words, which derived from Arabic and Persian, there is a great number of long vowels.

Closed *e*: Similar to Old Turkish, in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish the vowel closed *e* is sometimes shown by the symbol which indicates the vowel *i*, sometimes without a symbol. On the other hand there is no incoherence in the indication of open *e* and open *i*. At present-day, Turkologists have a tendency towards approving the existence of a closed *e* in the stems, which are pronounced as *e* or *i* in modern Turkish but shown with *ye* in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish. It is also asserted that the indication of *ye* in Ottoman Turkish represents the vowel *I*, not the closed vowel *e*.²⁰

Having studied the texts belonging to this period, we realize that the stems, which fluctuate between the vowels *e* and *i* in the root, syllable in the periods of Old and Middle Turkish changes into *e* or *i* in Turkey Turkish., and in the stems written with a regularly this vowel is represented only with *e*. (Yılmaz 1991: 160-161):

de-~di->de-; et-~it->et-; gece~gice; ver-~vir->ver-; gey-~giy->giy-; eşit-~ışit->ışit-; get-~git-; eki~iki>iki etc.

sev-=sev-; ses=ses; gel-=gel- etc.

VOWEL HARMONIES

FRONT-BACK HARMONIES

In Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish the front-back harmony is strong. On this period, the possessive suffix-*ki*, which does not conform to harmony today, had a back vowel harmony form which begins with voiced consonant: *başında-gı*, *uçmakda-gı* etc. Besides, the *idüg-i* forms of the auxiliary verb *i-* (today, only the *i* form exists) which comes from Old Turkish verb *-er* and get the adjective-verb *-dük* enters the front-back harmony: *az idüğün*, *hak idüğün* etc.

FLAT-ROUND HARMONY

With respect to Old Turkish and Turkey Turkish this harmony is relatively weak in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish. Due to various reasons, there is a conspicuous state of becoming round in the first periods. This incident emerges both in roots and stems, and suffixes. The state of becoming round in roots and stems is due to three reasons:

1. Drop of the sound *-ğ/-g* in the end of polysyllable words: *kapıg>kapu*, *sarıg>saru*, *bilig>bilü*, *sevig>sevü* etc.

2. Influence of the labial consonants: *demür*, *kirpük*, *bülezük*, *süvri* etc.

3. Constructive suffixes with no flat vowel form and used in making up words:

-(u)k/-(ü)k: *aç-u-k*, *del-ü-k*, *eksü-k*, *taniş-u-k* etc.

-aru/-erü: *il-erü*, *iç-erü*, *yuk-aru* etc.

-dur/-dür-: *bil-dür-*, *yap-dur-* etc.

- ur/-ür: *ir-ür-, sav-ur-* etc.
- gur/-gür: *ir-gür-, dir-gür-* etc.
- lu/-lü: *saadet-lü, et-lü, ev-lü kanat-lu* etc.
- suz/-süz: *din-süz, yir-süz, arı-suz* etc.
- (y)ıcl/- (y)ici: *tur-ıcl, dilen-ici* etc.
- cı/-ci; -çı/-çi: *yol-cı, ok-çı* etc.

The connective vowels of voice suffixes are generally flat, sometimes round.

gör-i-n-, bul-ı-n-, dok-ı-n-, dut-ı-ş-, bul-ı-ş-, öp-ı-ş-, kuç-ı-ş-, kuç-u-ş-, kurt-ı-l-, düz-i-l-, göz-i-k-, göy-ü-n-, ur-u-n-, tut-u-l-, süs-ü-l- etc.

From time to time, we are able to find the round vowel forms of *-lık/-lik* the suffix which is used to make a noun: from noun . *toğru-lık, ayru-lık, nazük-lük, kul-luk* etc.

Besides these, there are some instances of becoming round which we can call örnekseme (analogy): *altun, dilkü, kendü, delü, sayru, üzengü, azuk, kadgu, yanku* vb.

Owing to the fact that they include either round or flat vowels, a group of verb and noun inflections cause the breaking up of harmony. We are able to enumerate these suffixes as follows:

Inflection suffixes which include only the round vowel form:

1. Adverb-verb suffix *-(y)up/- (y)üp; -(u)ban/- (ü)ben*: *gel-üp, id-üp, geç-üp, al-uban, oyna-y-uban* etc.
2. Adverb-verb suffix *-(y)u/- (y)ü*: *ağla-y-u, gözle-y-ü* etc.
3. Imperative mood, 3. personal suffixes *-sun/-sün; -sunlar/-sünler*: *di-sün, bil-sün, oyna-sun, ağla-sunlar, görme-sünler* etc.
4. First plural personal suffixes *-(y)uz/- (y)üz; -vuz/-vüz*: *biz-üz, perişan-uz, degül-üz, toğrı mı-y-uz, ne-vüz* etc.
5. Third singular personal suffixes *-dur/-dür; -durur/-dürür*: *iş-dür, güneş-dür, yakın-dur, diri-durur* etc.
6. Past tense adjective-verb suffix *-duk/-dük*: *al-dug-ı-n-dan sonra, söyle-dük için, içeri gir-dük yirde* etc.
7. Simple Present Tense suffix *-(u)r/- (ü)r*: *yat-u-r, yanku-lan-u-r, sığın-u-r* etc.
8. First person plural suffix used in the inflection of subjunctive mood and obligation mood *-vuz/-vüz*: *kıl-a-vuz, söyle-y-e-vüz, al-sa-vuz, gel-se-vüz* etc.
9. First person possessive suffix *-(u)m/- (ü)m*: *bil-ü-m, kat-u-m, akl-u-m* etc.
10. First person possessive suffix *-(u)muz/- (ü)müz*: *bağr-u-muz, din-ü-müz, çara-muz, ümid-ü-müz* etc.
11. Second person possessive suffix *-(u)ñ/- (ü)ñ*: *kulag-u-ñ, şah-u-ñ, derd-ü-ñ* etc.
12. Second person possessive suffix *-(u)ñuz/- (ü)ñüz*: *beg-ü-ñüz, iş-ü-ñüz* etc.
13. Relative suffix *-(n)uñ/- (n)üñ* (after “ben” and “biz” pronouns *-üm*): *iş-üñ aslı, a-n-uñ zülf-i, ben-üm derd-ü-m, biz-üm ilduz-u-muz* etc.
14. Past Tense suffixes which appears in the declension of first and second person singular and plural *-du-m/-dü-m; -du-k/-dük, -du-ñ/-dün; -du-ñuz/-dün-üz*: *vir-dü-m, al-du-m, gelme-dük, bil-dük, bil-dün, sev-dün, kılma-du-ñuz, aña-du-ñuz* etc.

Inflectional suffixes with only flat vowel form

1. Indicative suffix -(y)ı/-(y)i; -nı/-ni: *kol-ı, göz-i, sözüm-ni, kuş-nı* etc.
2. Third person possessive suffix -(s)ı/-(s)i: *söz-i, kapu-sı* etc.
3. Question suffix -mı/-mi: *sakınur mı, usanmaduñ mı, degül mi* etc.
4. Past tense suffix which appears in the inflection of third person singular -dı/-di: *otur-dı, gül-di, dur-dı* etc.
5. Indefinite past tense suffix -mış/-miş: *bul-muş-am, tol-muş dur-muş-uz* etc.
6. Imperative second person singular suffix -gıl/-gil: *tut-gıl, vir-gil* etc.
7. Second person singular and plural suffixes used in the inflection of verbs –sın/-sin; -sız/-siz: *sevinür-sin, bilür-sin, işide-siz, añlaya-sız* etc.
8. Second person singular and plural informative suffixes –sın/-sin; -sız/-siz: *sen-sin, güneş-sin, canlarum-sız, kör-siz* etc.
9. Adverb-verb suffix –ınca/-ince: *ol-ınca, gör-ince* etc.

Recent studies carried out with respect to the texts, particularly those which are written in alphabets other than those in Arabic alphabet and known as transcribed texts has yielded significant results. In accordance with this, the vowel harmony concerning the stems closer to the root has developed earlier. Generally speaking, we are able to state that the labial harmony started to develop in the seventeenth century, and in the eighteenth century changed into a spoken language similar to that we use in the present-day. The statistical studies which are maintained today will show us the kind of development concerning separate words and suffixes with respect to the labial harmony.

By starting the study of transcribed texts Johanson had made an important contribution to the matter concerning the date of the emergence of vowel harmony. This starting date has also been the starter of a resourceful dispute concerning this complex process in the field of morphonology. Its principle is based on a new classification of important morphemes with regards to the labial harmony. This categorization does not depend on the existence of the morphemes in question in the form of –ı/-i or –u/-ü in Old Anatolian Turkish; on the contrary it considers a specific class. The vowel of this class goes back to the connective vowel of Old Anatolian Turkish and the vowels of texts belonging to this period were recorded either flat or round, and as a matter of fact they have a limited modality in Old Turkish. In an elaborate study, Johanson deals with the phonological values of these vowels and cannot find a noticeable tendency towards harmony. On the contrary he believes that it belongs to the neuter period, accordingly the opposition of flat-round is done away and the neuter vowels pronounced between are predominant. Besides, the remnants of the old open vowels should be considered.

Afterwards, Johanson develops his ideas with help from the transcribed texts. These are the unique source of information for Ottoman morphology. Certainly, these sources should be used carefully with respect to the fact that they do not represent the actual sounds. However, with his approach of neutrality, Johanson was able to account for and classify the sounds hitherto difficult to explain. The bulk of his study relies on a source concerning Azeri spoken language of the seventeenth century which is in the library of Uppsala University. In this source which is also called Turkish-Persian, Johanson states that in the development of flat-round harmony Azeri Turkish was more recessive, on the other hand Ottoman Turkish was

more advanced. In the seventeenth century Ottoman Turkish this harmony is fairly advanced. Azeri Turkish bears the traces of previous stage.²¹

CONSONANT CHANGES

1. The state of palatal sound *n*: Although the sound thin *n* (ny) in a word or at the end of it in Old Turkish has changed into *y* in all Turkish languages, with the exception of Halaçça, in main Oguzca it was preserved as *n* in some words. In the *Divan*, Kaşgarlı Mahmut states that Oguzlar used to say *kanu* instead of *kayu*. In the Old Anatolian Turkish we are able to observe the development of *kanı*, *kankı*, and *hangı* in the modern Western Oğuzca (Turkey Turkish), *hansi* in Azerbaijan Turkish, *angı* in Gagauz Turkish; on the other hand, in the Eastern Oguz Turkish (Turkmençe) we can trace the development of *haysı* along with *y*.

There are also some instances that show the distinction of the Old Turkish sound *ny* as *yn* and *ym*: Old Turkic *kony*>Az., Trkm. *goyun*, TT *koyun*; Old Turkic *kanyak* “kaymak”> TT *kaymak*; Old Turkic *bony* “boyun”>*boyun*.²²

2. *t->d-* change in the beginning of a word: This change which has been one of the typical characteristics of Old Anatolian Turkish is not regular and coherent. It does not take place in each and every word; likewise, there are different spellings of this word in the same text. In addition to this, there is no overlapping with the situation in the present-day Turkish. We are able to observe that in Turkish words with front vowel harmony the change of *t->d-* has almost been completed, and the double forms are mostly current for words with back vowel.

tag>dağ, *te->di-*, *tüş>düş*, *ter>der* (TT *ter*), *titre->ditre-* (TT *titre-*), *tut->dut-* (TT *tut-*), *tog->doğ-*, (TT *doğ-*), *ton-* (TT *don-*), *tamar* (TT *damar*) etc.

3. *k>g* modification in the beginning of a word: Despite the fact that this modification is current or most of the words it is incoherent similar to *t>d* modification in the beginning of words. Since we are unable to determine the extent of this, Turkish is considered as standard.

kök>gök, *keç>geç-köz>kiçi* (TT *küçük*), *kişi*, *kendü* etc.

4. The state of the sound *k*: When it is used initially it was not voiced as the sound *k-*, it preserved its originality: *kamu*, *kaygu*, *kanda*, *kangı* etc. In the word, in the beginning and in the end it often turned out to be the fricative *ḵ*: *daḵı*, *yoḵsa*, *yoḵsul*, *uyḵu*, *bıraḵ-*, *yaḵ-*, *arḵa*, *çıḵ-*, *koḵu* etc.

5. The state of the sounds *ğ* and *g*: The sounds *ğ* and *g* were dropped in the end of the polysyllable words, in the suffixes, and the beginning of the second syllable:

bilig>bilü, *sarig>saru*, *edgü>eyü*, *sargar->sarar-*, *bolga biz>bolavuz*, *tarıg-lag>tarla*, *kelgen->kelen* etc.

6. *b>v* modification in the word in the end and in the beginning of syllable:

seb->sev-, *ab>av*, *ebir->evür-*, *yabız>yavuz*, *ben ben>ben-ven*, *eb>ev*, *tabışgan>tavşan* etc.

7. The state of the sound b- in the beginning of a word: It has been changed into v in three words: *bar->var-*, *bar>var*, *ber->ver-*.

In one word it has been dropped: *bol->ol-*.

8. d>y modification in the word and in the end of the word: *adır->ayır-*, *ked->gey-*, *edgü>eyü*, *kod->koy-* etc.

9. Voicing of consonants: The consonants *p*, *ç*, *t*, *k* which comes after main long vowels have changed into their voiced equivalent: *çākır->çağır-*, *ōt>od*, *ōç>öc*, *kōker->göger-*, *tūp>dib* etc.

10. Loss of y-: It is not regular, it is found in some words: *yılan>ılan*, *yıpar>ıpar*, *yılduz>ilduz*, *yürek>ürek*.

11. Derivation of v-: Only in the verb *ur->vur-*.

HARMONY OF CONSONANTS

Despite the similarity of the voiced and unvoiced consonants in connections of Turkish is a general rule, just as in Old Turkic there are exceptions of this rule in Old Anatolian Turkish and Ottoman Turkish. Since the following suffixes have only voiced forms in Anatolia Turkish, when they are affixed to the roots and stems which end with unvoiced the consonant harmony, at least in writing, is spoiled:

Dative:	-da/-de
Ablative:	-dan/-den
Simple past tense:	-dı/-di, -du/-dü
Adjective-verb suffix:	-duk/-dük
Active suffix:	-dur/-dür

MORPHOLOGY

NOUN DECLENSION

CASE SUFFIXES²³

NOMINATIVE

Relative case -*uñ/-üñ*, -*nuñ/-nüñ* (relative case suffix forms of the personal pronouns I and we becomes *benüm* and *bizüm* on the analogy of the possessive suffix:

Demonstrative case:	-ı/-i, -yı/-yi; -nı/-ni
Accusative:	-a/-e, -ya/-ye; -ga/-ge
Dative:	-da/-de
Ablative:	-dan/-den; -dın/-din; -da/-de
Vehicle	-n; -la/-le, -lan/-len
Equality:	-ça/-çe
Direction suffix:	-ra/-re; -ru/-rü
Absence suffix:	-suz/-süz

POSSESSIVE SUFFIX

1st person singular:	-um/-üm, -m
2nd person singular:	-uñ/-üñ, -ñ
3rd person singular:	-ı(n)/-i(n); -sı(n)/-si(n)

1st person plural:	-umuz/-ümüz, -muz/-müz
2nd person plural:	-uñuz/-üñüz, -ñuz/-ñüz
3rd person plural:	-ları/-leri

INFLECTION OF VERBS

1. Definite Past: It is inflected by personal suffixes derived from possessive roots. However, in the first person singular, under the influence of the adjective-verb *-duk/-dük*, similar to Turkey Turkish, *-k* is used as personal suffix:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-du-m/-dü-m	-du-k/-dü-k
2nd person	-du-ñ/-dü-ñ	-du-ñuz/-dü-ñüz
3rd person	-dı/-di	-dı-lar/-di-ler

2. Indefinite Past: While the suffix was only being used for the third person singular in the beginning it began to be used for the first and second person on analogy. In the beginning it was only used along with the affirmative verbs because the adjective-verb *-miş/*

-miş was not used in negative constructions.²⁴

In the inflection personal suffixes of pronoun origin are used. Therefore, in the first person singular we are able to find both *b->v*, and *b->∅* forms of the pronoun:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-miş-am/-miş-em -miş-van/-miş-ven	-miş-uz/-miş-üz
2nd person	-miş-sın/-miş-sin	-miş-sız/-miş-siz
3rd person	-miş-dur/-miş-dur -miş durur/-miş durur-	-miş-lar/-miş-ler miş durur-lar/-miş durur-lar -miş-lar-dur/-miş-ler-diir

3. Simple Present Tense: It is mostly made up of round vowel, and to a certain extent with flat-open and flat-closed vowels. The verb which ends with a vowel mostly gets the auxiliary sound *y* and added as *-(y)ur/-(y)ür*; however, just as it is today *-r* might come directly. It is inflected with personal suffixes of pronoun origin:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-ur-am/-ür-em -ur-van/-ür-ven -ur-ın/-ür-in	-ur-uz/-ür-üz
2nd person	-ur-sın/-ür-sin	-ur-sız/-ür-siz
3rd person	-ur/-ür	-ur-lar/-ür-ler

Present continuous tense suffix in the present-day sense of the term can only be found in the second half of the fourteenth century. It is first seen in verbs indicating action; nevertheless, it is regarded as coarse by many writer. Having been shortened towards the end of the ifteenth century it becomes *-(I)yür*. The first grammar in which this was referred to belongs to Pietro Della Valle. *Jazijúr*, *Jazijurúr*.

Afterwards it is cited by Meninski. The first form of²⁵ suffixes mentioned in the transcribed texts is a closed vowel. Both relying on the samples in the historically old texts and considering the distribution in the present-day, we are able to state that there were present continuous suffixes. Alongside the example given above we come across other instances of suffixes derived from a form such as *-yörür*, though scarcely. Amongst the reasons of scarcity concerning this variant we can enumerate the disappearance of the written languages of Central and Western Anatolia when this suffix began to emerge in the fifteenth century, and the use of Istanbul Turkish in grammars written by foreigners. Istanbul Turkish was out of the effective range of this suffix. Another interesting point with respect to the present continuous tense suffix is the fact that this suffix cannot be found in works written before eighteenth century. The suffix in question appears as *isteiyor* in the grammar written by Holderman. Afterwards we find traces of this suffix in a Turkish-Italian phrase book. Viguier who mentions this suffix years later indicates that the combining suffix is the same as the simple present tense vowel. Limited use of the vowel before *-yor* in its present-day form is a situation which emerged in the twentieth century.²⁶

4. Future Tense: Future Tense emerged in Old Anatolian Turkish Period and in the works belonging to the following periods it was constituted with the infrequent future tense suffix and the personal suffixes of pronoun origin *-isar/-iser*:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	<i>-isar-am/-iser-em</i> <i>-isar-van/-iser-ven</i>	<i>-isar-uz/-iser-üz</i>
2nd person	<i>-isar-sın/-iser-sin</i>	<i>-isar-sız/-iser-siz</i>
3rd person	<i>-isar/-iser</i>	<i>-isar-lar/-iser-ler</i>

There are different standpoints concerning the suffix *-acak/-ecek*. It was first detected in the thirteenth century as an adjective-verb indicating obligation and futurity: future object.²⁷ M. Adamović who has published a book concerning conjugation of verbs briefly accounts for the emerged in the source writings in the middle of the fourteenth century after the action verbs and location word as an adjective verb, e.g. *sığınacak yer*, *varacak yer*. Its first use as a future tense suffix began in the second half of the fourteenth century. In the beginning its use is confined to the third persons. Use of this suffix for all persons should have begun in the fifteenth century. Having developed thus, it replaced the future tense suffixes-they did not only indicate. In the consequence of this development *-isar/-iser* disappeared. The future tense function of subjunctive mood was limited as a result of the development of the suffix *-acak/-ecek*.

While the widespread use of the suffix *-acak/-ecek* took place earlier in the vernacular, this suffix was considered vulgar in the written language. Until the seventeenth century, those who prefer a literary style preferred the subjunctive suffix to the new suffix. Therefore the suffix in question does not appear in the oldest transcription texts. It was first used in the written language in the seventeenth century.²⁸

5. Imperative Mood: Similar to the situation in Turkey Turkish, we are not able to determine a certain mood suffix. The concept of mood and person is expressed by using the same suffix. It is observed that *-n* which is the last vowel of the suffix in the first person singular began to change into first person possessive *-m* by analogy.

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-(y)ayın/-(y)eyin -(y)ayım/-(y)eyim	-(y)alum/-(y)elüm
2nd person	-gil/-gil	-uñ/-üñ; ñ, -uñuz/-üñüz
3rd person	sun/-sün; -suñ/-süñ	-sun-lar/-sün-ler

6. Subjunctive mood: Conjugated with personal suffixes of pronoun origin.

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-(y)a-m/-(y)e-m	-(y)a-vuz/-(y)e-vüz
2nd person	-(y)a-sın/-(y)e-sin	-(y)a-sız/-(y)e-siz
3rd person	-(y)a/-(y)e	-(y)a-lar//-(y)e-ler

Although this subjunctive form belongs to Old Anatolian Turkish it had been used until the end of the seventeenth century.

7. Conditional mood:

	Singular	Plural
1st person	-sa-m/-se-m	-sa-vuz/-se-vüz
2nd person	-sa-ñ/-se-ñ	-sa-ñuz/-ñüz
3rd person	-sa/-se	-sa-lar/-se-ler

VERBAL NOUNS

1. Noun-verb suffixes:

-mak/-mek: *kılmak, bilmek* etc.

-maklık/-meklik: *söyle-meklik, dur-maklık* etc.

2. Adjective-Verb suffixes:

Past Tense adjective-verb suffixes:

-duk/-dük (-duğı/-düğü): *bin-dügi, çık-duğı-n, di-düg-üñ* etc.

-miş/-miş: *göger-miş ekin, öğren-miş geyik* etc.

Past Tense adjective-verb suffixes:

-an/-en: *eyle-y-en, dut-an, dinil-en* etc.

-ar/-er, -ur/-ür, -ır: *ak-ar su, uyı-r gişi, düş-er olsa* etc.

-maz/-mez: *yara-maz hava, bil-mez gişi* etc.

Future Tense adjective-verb suffixes:

-acak/-ecek: *var-acak yer, di-y-eceg-üm söz* etc.

-ası/-esi: *kapumuz yok sığın-ası, vir-esi-y-e reva degül* etc.

3. Adverb-verb suffixes:

-(y)a/-(y)e: *gül-e gül-e, ceng ed-e ceng ed-e* etc.

-(y)ı/-(y)i, -(y)u/-(y)ü: *ağlaş-u ağlaş-u, di-y-ü, ugra-y-u* etc.

-(y)urak/-(y)ürek, -(y)arak/-(y)erek: *eglen-ürek, acı-y-urak, gez-erek* etc.

-ken, iken: *gün doğar-ken, ider iken* etc.

-(y)ınca/-(y)ince: *gice ol-ınca, olma-y-ınca, toy-ınca yedi* etc.

-madın/- medin: *ayakdan düş-medin, hükm eyle-medin* etc.

-(y)ıcak/-(y)icek: *yat-ıcak, anadan doğ-ıcak* etc.

-dukça/-dükçe, -dugınca/-dügince: *belürt-dükçe, toğ-dukça, es-dügince, tur-dığınca* etc.

-dukda/-dükde, -dugında/-düginde: *ak-dukda, bil-dükde, işit-düginde* etc.

-(y)up/-(y)üp, -(y)uban/-(y)üben; -(y)ubanı/-(y)übeni, (y)ubanın/-(y)übenin: *ideme-y-üp, ırla-y-up, eyle-y-üben, çık-uban, vir-übeni, al-ubanın* etc.

CONJUGATION OF THE ADDITIONAL ACTION

While the additional action is conjugated with personal suffixes of pronoun origin in the first and second persons it is conjugated with *durur* which is the form of Old Turkic verb *tur-* with the present simple suffix.

Singular	Plural
<i>sayru-van, sayru-y-am</i>	<i>sayru-vuz</i>
<i>sayru-sın</i>	<i>sayru-sız</i>
<i>sayru durur</i>	<i>sayru durur-lar</i>
<i>diri-ven, diri-y-em</i>	<i>diri-vüz</i>
<i>diri-sin</i>	<i>diri-siz</i>
<i>diri dürür</i>	<i>diri dürür-ler</i>

(Adamović 1985: 28)

BASIC PHONETIC AND MORPHONOLOGICAL CHANGES WHICH EMERGED IN THE TRANSITION TO MODERN TURKEY TURKISH

Changes

1. Gradual strengthening of the vowel harmonies
2. Drop of the sound *ğ* and its effect on lengthening the adjacent vowel
3. Change of the sound *ñ* to *n*
4. Disappearance of the vehicle suffix *n*, indicative suffix *-ra/-re*, ablative *-dın/-den*
5. Drop of the suffix *-rak/-rek* which is used in the comparison of adjectives
6. Commencement of the use of *-yor* the present progressive suffix
7. Emergence of the suffix *-acak/-ecek* instead of the future tense suffix *-rak/-rek*
8. Harmonization of the additional action *durur* in the form of suffix *-dur/-dür*
9. Disappearance of the second person imperative suffix *-gil/-gil*
10. Disappearance of certain adjective-verb and adverb-verb suffixes: *-ısar/-iser, -uban/üben* etc.²⁹

VOCABULARY

It is widely acknowledged that Ottoman Turkish had swiftly drifted away from the vernacular with respect to its vocabulary. Nevertheless, similar to Turkish, a historical dictionary of Ottoman Turkish including all of the words in the extant sources is yet to be written. Besides, owing to the lack of statistical studies which show the ratio of the foreign words in the available works, it is impossible to comment on the alienation of the vocabulary. Popular publications which aim at determining the ratio of foreign words in the language of the period are chosen according to the result which the writer wants to obtain. On the other hand, obtaining scientifically sound results can only be possible by studying extensively on different kinds of works.

In mentioning the vocabulary, we should point out that Ottoman Turkish included some words from Oğuz language group to which it belonged to, and along with this words it differed from other dialects of Turkish. This fact has been disregarded for a long time. As a matter of fact, when we exclude the loan words coming from the other tongue and those acquired in the consequence of relations with other languages, we are able to mention a vocabulary peculiar to Oguz group of languages. The following words can be given as examples.³⁰

Oguz Group	Others
1. ısır-	1. tişle-
2. köpek	2. it
3. kapı	3. eşik
4. keçe	4. kiyiz
5. bul-	5. tap-
6. ileri	6. burun, murun
7. eyi, iyi	7. yakşı
8. el	8. kol
9. tavşan	9. koyan
10. dudak	10. erin
11. çok	11. köp
12. göbek	12. kindik
13. başka	13. özge
14. dinlen-	14. tın-
15. dön-	15. kayt-
16. yolla-	16. yiber-
17. söyle-	17. sözle-
18. güneş	18. kuyaş
19. söğüt	19. tal
20. yen-	20. ut-
21. kurt	21. böri

The most important source which could supply us with information concerning the vocabulary of Ottoman Turkish is the *Tarama Sözlüğü* which is compiled by scanning 160 distinguished works. However, despite the fact that the above-mentioned work is an important source, apart from relying on the works prior to the sixteenth century it aims at finding out “pure Turkish” words and present new words to the movement of purification. The material chosen for this purpose includes certain words instead of incorporating the whole vocabulary. Despite compiled from written texts, Ottoman Turkish dictionaries prepared by well-known lexicographers such as Berardo da Parigi (1665), F. Meninski (1680), Vankulı (1729) are not mentioned among the sources. Nevertheless, despite its shortcomings and limited aim, we should once again stress that it is still the most extensive historical dictionary. A general index is not supplied in the text editing studies. Mostly, Arabic and Persian words are included. However, in recent years besides the compilation of a more comprehensive dictionary by Türk Dil Kurumu, we also witness that some interesting studies which could supply material to the historical dictionary with respect to certain subjects. A study maintained by Krakow University can be given as an example of these.

As a result of a systematical study made by S. Stachowski, a dictionary including the words making nouns from verbs and nouns from nouns and used in similar meanings (with the suffixes *-CI* and *-ICI*) derived between the thirteenth and twentieth (the latest in 1917) centuries. Similar to the present-day situation, these suffixes function to derive words such as 1. Doer of an action 2. Anyone who supports a certain political or social idea or the representative of an ideology, anyone who represents or shares something 3. Making up the names of people who are in the position indicated in the stem of the word. The stem derived from these suffixes are mostly followed by the suffix *-IXk*. Throughout his study, Stachowski fixed a total amount of 1,498 words. The bulk of words derived with the suffixes in question were obtained in the seventeenth century; on the other hand the number of entries total 428 in the twentieth century. Along with the suffixes derived with the suffixes cited above and determined in the sources, 132 words were fixed in the *Tarama Sözlüğü*. From the fourteen of these 1,498 words are fixed, starting from the date after the transcribed texts were began to be written. The remaining 118 words belong to Old Anatolian Turkish words. First of all, with respect to the sources it relies on Stachowski's study differs from the *Tarama Sözlüğü*. In relying on the distinguished works cited last, the researcher makes use of four groups of resources: 1. The *Tarama Sözlüğü*, 2. Lexicographical studies compiled by distinct Turkish and non-Turkish researchers who are interested in certain language keepsakes, studies which are yet to be scanned in the *Tarama Sözlüğü*, 3. Ottoman Turkish sources written in Latin, Cyril and Greek alphabets, and also known as transcription texts, 4. Ottoman Turkish loan words which exist in the languages of neighboring countries. Despite the fact that the loan words are amongst the most significant sources of a language, the absence of an etymological dictionary in the neighboring languages is one of the factors that renders the use of these sources fairly difficult. Owing to the contribution of the material not only did our information with respect to Ottoman Turkish vocabulary extended but also the words we know were supported with new documents and new sound variants. Another significant aspect of this contribution is the determination of a complete chronology of the words. Since the bulk of words with respect to chronology is constituted of translated written texts we are able to see the phonological changes they had been throughout the history; moreover, we can study the semantic changes they have been exposed to. Besides, the existence or absence of these words in the neighboring languages is significant as regards to the locations in which Turkish was used.

To suggest an idea we can list some examples given in the book as follows: For instance, the word *rüşvetçi* (briber) is referred for the first time in a source belonging to the year 1911. Likewise, we see that the word *muştucu* (müjdecî-harbinger) survived until the year 1791. However, it is not found in the sources belonging to the following years, and the researcher made use of. On the other hand, this word is still used in Anatolian dialects today. Actually, in Anatolian dialects it does not have the same meaning. It is recorded as "A brownish insect which looks like a butterfly and bringing good luck to the houses it entered"³¹ From Stachowski's study we learn that the word *mektupçu* was recorded in written sources in the year 1641, the word *yoğurtçu* in 1828, *yolcu*-in the form of *yolçı*- in the fourteenth century, *yağcı*- in the sense of oil producer- in 1641 (its metaphorical meaning is not mentioned in the sources), *çikolatacı* in 1835, *entrikacı*- as *entrigacı* or *entrikacı*- in 1911. The word

“büyücü” is used as *bögici*, *böğücü*, *buguci* for the first time in 1680, il dit *aminci* used only once in the year 1828. The word gazeteci that we use today is mentioned as *gazetacı* and *kazetacı* in the sources in the year 1917. From the publication cited it is possible to trace the semantic changes which the words have been exposed to in the course of time. Here, due to the fact that we have not sufficient space, we are unable to give some examples. Nevertheless, for those who are curious we suggest to refer to the semantic change which the word *çorbacı* determined in a source belonging to the year 1672- had undergone.

In order to have a whole-some judgment with respect to the vocabulary resources of Ottoman Turkish which spans a fairly expansive period, we should stress that the researcher is meant to rely on lexicographical studies which aim at comprehending the language entirely not on the words which would justify the point of view he wants to put forward. We should also point out that in compiling such a dictionary the sources needs to be chosen very carefully. In order to determine the linguistic traits of this period, choosing extreme samples that would represent only one type consequently or selecting the intelligible samples of the present-day will not suffice. Turkology has enough accumulation of information and supplies which could cope with such a research. In fact, with respect to sources there is no insufficiently of material.

LANGUAGE RELATIONSHIPS

In the studies concerning the relationship of languages which has improved in recent years, that is in the branch of linguistics which deals with the co-existence of languages and the consequences of their confrontation ; and aiming at finding an answer to what has chanced, how and why they have changed. There have been important studies concerning language relationships of Turkish in recent years. Moreover, Lars Johanson who emphasized this matter intensively developed a model in the study of language relationships, which is also used for other languages with the contribution of Turkish material. According to this model, Johanson rejects the term “loan” which is used extensively in linguistics both in Turkish and in several Western languages on account of the fact that there is no loss in the source language and there exists no original in the target language. he rightly proposes the term duplicating instead. In case of a language interaction, this code- copying model presupposes the copying of the socially dominant language (B- code, the elements of the dominant code) to the frame of sentence belonging to the socially recessive language (A-code, the weak code). In accordance with this, more than the addition of the elements of the source language B to the target language A, the elements copied make up a sample similar to that of A language system; henceforth, the concept of loan is not in question here. The elements copied undergo a process in order to conform to the system of the target language. Thus, these elements lose the characteristic of resembling to a socially superior language. In the meantime, since the copy belong to the system of the language A more than to the language B it is presupposed that there will always be some minute differences between the copy and the original. In the process of copying the existence of two different kinds are presupposed: global copies and selected copies. In the first process, copying of an element as a block to another language is in question; in the second, copying one or more of the structural characteristics of material, meaning, and connection is

considered. Besides this, there are also mixed copies which emerge due to the accompaniment of some structural division copies to the main copies.

In his book the *Strukturelle Faktoren in Turkischen Sprachkontakten*,³² which he published in the year 1992, and in some of his articles L. Johanson set the theoretical perspective of this model and applied it; thus, he managed to make it widespread. New studies concerning Turkish and the languages it interacts intensively indicate that it is possible to observe an interaction in almost every field of languages. The extent of changes arising from interaction is handled extensively in the aforementioned study.

OTTOMAN TURKISH AS A TARGET LANGUAGE

It is a generally accepted fact that Turkish was not only in the position of a target language in Ottoman Period. First of all, owing to the fact that it was a medium of communication in a large area such as Southeastern Europe, North Africa alongside Anatolia, it influenced all of the languages in the areas it was predominant. The studies, which have been carried out, indicate that similar to the flow of elements from other languages to Turkish, there has also been a lively influx from Turkish to other languages. In general copying method and the copied material might be simple or complicated with respect to morphological traits, independent or adjacent, it might incorporate one or more words. For instance, the suffix *-āt* which was copied from Arabic is adjacent and in the course of time it was added to other words (*gidişāt*). Some of the obvious differences between languages also exist with respect to the interaction pertaining to the loans of general and divisional character. Literary Ottoman Turkish acquired a heterogeneous character due to the fact that it had a tendency towards excessive copying in producing words for new concepts. In Ottoman Turkish the word *muallime* belongs to a gender category that does not exist in Turkish and it constitutes a sample for copying. Grammatical genders belong to insignificant, semantically vacuous distinctions. They can be set aside without need for compensation, they are not indispensable. For instance, Ottoman literary language was developed by authors with sundry literary and historical background. It remained as a definite recessive variant from a social point of view along with some unattractive conspicuous character in dividing into extreme compartments. Certain foreign elements (Arabic and Persian) used to constitute a distinct subsystem. The divisions of vocabulary consisting of general copies with reproductions based on the originals showed some structural irregularities by deviating with respect to the sound harmony. The etymological information pertaining to them led to their characterization by leaving the harmonization sanctions. This kind of special treatment situations arise from the social behavioral patterns of the language transmitters in the foreground.

Some Turkish languages such as Ottoman Turkish has been exposed to the influence of foreign language syntax from the beginning. For a century, the syntax of standard Turkey Turkish, for instance in the field of press, as a matter of fact, has been under the influence of dominant European (in the beginning that of French) languages.

OTTOMAN TURKISH AS A SOURCE LANGUAGE

Research has shown that in the areas in which Ottoman Turkish was predominant, Turkish made very significant inroads. In some languages Turkish copies were approved as a part of the general language or were rejected as a foreign element. Ottoman Turkish did not only give words to the languages with which it interacted, but also led to the emergence of new structures or the development of new tendencies which might already have existed.³³ While the effects on vocabulary were being researched with respect to language interaction, we are able to remark that the structural effects have been investigated in a more systematical manner in recent years.³⁴

(*) Translated by İsmail Akyıldız

¹ With respect to disputes ref. Timurtaş 1994: VII- VIII, Németh 1960:1, Kerslake 1998: 180-181.

² Németh 1957: 1.

³ With respect to disputes concerning the matter ref. Doerfer 1990.

⁴ Özkan 2000: 63-65; For detailed information see. Canpolat 1967; Korkmaz 1968, Korkmaz 1972, Korkmaz 1973; Korkmaz 1974; Mansuroğlu 1956; Mansuroğlu 1959; Tekin 1973/74; Buluç 1955; Buluç 1956; Ergin 1950; Ertaylan 1949; Ertaylan 1960.

⁵ As regards to use of Arabic in Anatolia bkz. Scharlipp 1995: 106 vd.

⁶ Kirchner 1996: 144.

⁷ Johanson 2002.

⁸ Johanson 2002.

⁹ Johanson 1989, 2002.

¹⁰ Johanson 2002.

¹¹ Hazai 1978: 46.

¹² Armenian- Turkish text written before the seventeenth century might be indicating the daily spoken language of Istanbul. ref. Sanjian/Tietze 1981: 62.

¹³ Johanson 2002.

¹⁴ Ref. Johanson 2002.

¹⁵ Ref. Johanson 2002.

¹⁶ Ref. Johanson 2002.

¹⁷ For general evaluation of the studies concerning this kind of texts. Ref. Hazai 1978.

¹⁸ Mansuroğlu 1959: 162.

¹⁹ 1996: 335- 345.

²⁰ Foy 1900a:180-186, 1900b:180-215.

²¹ Johanson 1979.

²² Schönig 2002.

²³ Mansuroğlu 1959: 168; Kerslake 1998: 188.

²⁴ Adamović 1985:188.

²⁵ For more detailed information Ref. Adamović 1985:116-120.

²⁶ Adamović 1985: 116-120.

²⁷ Mansuroğlu 1959: 168; Kerslake 1998:188.

²⁸ Adamović 1985: 92-112.

²⁹ Hazai 1964: 58.

³⁰ Johanson 1998: 120.

³¹ DS 3224.

³² For Turkish version Ref. Nurettin Demir. Ankara 2002 (in print).

³³ Ref. Prokosch 1983, Halasi-Kun 1969, 1973, 1982, Reinowski 1998; With respect to Bulgarian Ref. Johanson 1998: 149.

³⁴ The influence of Turkish is indicated in the books concerning language interaction Ref. Bechert/Wildgen 1991. Despite it was written such a long time ago, in order to find a general evaluation of the studies-1950-1985-concerning the influence of Turkish on the other languages Ref.

Tietze 1990a. For the influence of other languages on Turkish Ref. Tietze 1990b. For the structural effect of Turkish on the other languages Ref. Johanson 1992.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamović, Milan (1985), *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, Leiden-E. J. Brill.

Bechert, Johannes, Wolfgang Wildgen (1991), *Einführung in the Sprachkontakt-Forschung*, Darmstadt.

Brendemoen, Bernt (1980), “Labiyal Ünlü Uyumunun Gelişmesi Üzerine Bazı Notlar”, *Türkiyat Mecmuası* XIX, 223-240.

Brendemoen, Bernt (1990), “The Turkish Language Reform and Language Policy in Turkey”, *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Teil I, Hrsg. György Hazai, Akadémiai Kiadó, 454- 493, Budapest.

Brendemoen, Bernt(1996), “Osmanlı ve Çağatay Şiirinde İmale”, *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1992: 335-345*, Ankara.

Buluç, Saadettin (1955), “Eski bir Türk dili yadigârı. Behcetü’l-hadâ’ik fî mev’izeti’l-halâ’ik”, *TDED* 6: 119-131.

Buluç, Saadettin (1956)), “Behcetü’l-hadâ’ik fî mev’izeti’l-halâ’ik’den örnekler”, *TDED* 7: 17-44.

Canpolat, Mustafa (1967), “Behcetü’l-hadâ’ik’in dili üzerine”, *TDAYB* 1967: 165-175.

Develi, Hayati (1998), “18. Yüzyıl Türkiye Türkçesi Üzerine”, *Doğu Akdeniz* 1: 27-36.

Doerfer, Gerhard (1990), “Die Stellung des Osmanischen im Kreise des Oghusischen und seine Vorgeschichte”, *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Teil I, Hrsg. György Hazai, Akadémiai Kiadó, 13-34, Budapest.

Duman, Musa (1998), “Damak Ünsüzlerinin Klâsik Osmanlı Türkçesi Dönemindeki Gelişmelerine Dair”, *Doğu Akdeniz* 1: 1-26.

Ergin, Muharrem (1950), “Bursa kitaplıklarındaki Türkçe yazmalar arasında”, *TDED* 4: 107-132.

Ertaylan, İ. Hikmet (1949), “VII. H/XIII. M. asra ait değerli bir Türk dili yadigârı. Behcetü’l-hadâ’ik fî mev’izeti’l-halâ’ik”, *TDED* 3: 275-293.

Ertaylan, İ. Hikmet (1960), *Behcetü’l-Hadâyik*, facsimile, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Publication 859, İstanbul.

Foy, Karl (1990a), “Das aidinisch Türkische”, *KSz.* I: 180-186.

Foy, Karl (1900b), “Türkische Vocalstudien”, *MSOS.* III: 180-215.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor (1969), “The Ottoman Elements in the Syrian Dialects”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 1, 14-91.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor (1973), “The Ottoman Elements in the Syrian Dialects”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 5, 17-95.

Halasi-Kun, Tibor (1982), “The Ottoman Elements in the Syrian Dialects”, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 7, 117-267.

Hazai, György (1964), “Türk Dilinde Tarihsel Gelişme Dönemleri”, *Bilimsel Bildiriler* 1963: 57-60, TDK pub., Ankara.

Hazai, György (1978), *Kurze Einführung in das Studium der türkischen Sprache*, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 76, 573-575.

Johanson, Lars (1979), "Die westoghusische Labialharmonie", *Orientalia Suecana* 27-28: 63-107, Sweden.

Johanson, Lars (1989), "Substandard und Sprachwandel im Türkischen", In: Holtus, Günter&Radtke, Edgar (ed): *Sprachlicher Substandard II. Standard und Substandard in der Sprachgeschichte und in der Grammatik. Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 44: 83-112, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Johanson, Lars (1990), "Historische Grammatik", *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Teil I, Hrsg. György Hazai, Akadémiai Kiadó, 74-103, Budapest.

Johanson, Lars (1992), *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J.W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Stuttgart.

Johanson, Lars (1993), "Rumi and the birth of Turkish poetry", *Journal of Turkology* 1:23-37, Szeged.

Johanson, Lars (1998), "Zum Kontakteinfluss türkische Indirektive", *Turkologie heute- Tradition und Perspective*, Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Leipzig, 4.-7. Oktober 1994, S. 141-150, Yay. Nurettin Demir- Erika Taube. Wiesbaden.

Johanson, Lars (2002), "Türkisch" In: Roelcke, Thorsten (ed.). *Handbuch der sprachlichen Variation*, Berlin, de Gruyter (in print).

Kerslake, Celia (1998), "Ottoman Turkish", *Turkic Languages* 179-202, London and New-York.

Kirchner, Mark (1996), "Zwei osmanische Bearbeitungen des persischen Qâbusnâma als Quelle zur türkischen Sprachgeschichte", *Symbolae Turcologicae* 143-156, Stockholm.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1968), "Eski Bir Kudurî Çevirisi", *Bilimsel Bildiriler* 1966: 225-231, Ankara.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1972), "Selçuklular Çağı Türkçesinin Genel Yapısı", *TDAYB* 17-34, Ankara.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1973), "Das Oghusische im XII. und XIII. Jahrhundert als Schriftsprache", *CAJ* 17: 294-303.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1973/74), "XI-XIII. yüzyıllar arasında Oğuzca", *TDAYB* 41-48.

Korkmaz, Zeynep (1975), "Eski Türkçedeki Oğuzca Belirtiler", *Bilimsel Bildiriler* 1972: 433-446, Ankara.

Mansuroğlu, Mecdut (1954), "The rise and development of Written Turkish in Anatolia", *Oriens* 7: 250- 264.

Mansuroğlu, Mecdut (1956), "Şeyyâd Hamza'nın Doğu Türkçesine Yaklaşan Manzumesi", *TDAYB* 125-144.

Mansuroğlu, Mecdut (1959), "Das Altosmanische", PhTF, 161-182, Wiesbaden.

Németh, Julius (1960), "Osmanlı Türk Dili Araştırmalarının Yeni Yolları", *Bilimsel Bildiriler* 1957: 1-14.

Özkan, Mustafa (2000), *Türk Dilinin Gelişme Alanları ve Eski Anadolu Türkçesi*, Filiz Kitabevi, İstanbul.

Prokosch, Erich (1983), *Osmanisches Wortgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen*, Berlin.

Reinkowski, Maurus (1998), "Türkische Lehnwörter im Bagdadische-Arabischen. Morphologische Adaptation an die arabische Schemabildung und Bedeutungsveränderung", *Turkologie heute -Tradition und Perspektive. Materialien der dritten Deutschen Turkologen- Konferenz*, Leipzig, 4.-7. Oktober 1994, S. 239-245, yay. Nurettin Demir-Erika Taube. Wiesbaden.

Sanjian, A. K& A. Tietze (1981), "Eremya Chelebi Kōmürjian's Armeno-Turkish poem" 'The Jewish bride', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 79, 278-281.

Scharlipp, Wolfgang E. (1995), *Türkische Sprache arabische Schrift. Ein Beispiel schriftlicher Akkulturation*. Budapest.

Schönig, Claus (2002), "Zur Entwicklung und internen Differenzierung des Westghusischen", *Scholarly Depth and Accuracy, A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*, pub. by. Nurettin Demir, Fikret Turan, Ankara.

Stachowski, Stanislaw (1996), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Bildungen auf -CI/-ICI im Osmanisch-Türkischen*, Jagiellonian University Press, Krakow.

Tarama Sözlüğü, (1963-1979), TDK, Ankara.

Tekin, Şinasi (1973/74), "1343 tarihli bir Eski Anadolu Türkçesi metni ve Türk dili tarihinde 'olga-bolga' sorunu", *TDAYB* 59- 157.

Tietze, Andreas (1990a), "Der Einfluss der Türkischen auf andere Sprachen (Die Veröffentlichungen seit etwa 1950)", *HdTS*. 119-145, Budapest.

Tietze, Andreas (1990b), "Die fremden Elemente im Osmanisch- Türkischen", *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft, Teil I*, Hrsg. György Hazai, Akadémiai Kiadó, 104-144, Budapest.

Timurtaş, F. Kadri (1994), *Eski Türkiye Türkçesi, XV. Yüzyıl, Gramer-Metin-Sözlük*, İstanbul.

Turan, Fikret (1996), *Old Anatolian Turkish: Syntactic Structure*, Harvard University, The Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, PhD thesis, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Yılmaz, Emine (2007), "Ana Türkçede Kapalı e Ünlüsü", *Turcology in Turkey*, 522-539, Szeged.