

# **TURKEY, KAZAKHSTAN AND THE CRIMEA**

SECTION OF TURKIC, MONGOLIAN AND KOREAN STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF ASIAN STUDIES  
FACULTY OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY POZNAŃ

---

TURKIC STUDIES 3

**TURKEY, KAZAKHSTAN AND THE CRIMEA**  
**TEN YEARS OF TURKOLOGY IN POZNAŃ**

Edited by

HENRYK JANKOWSKI



POZNAŃ 2013

Reviewed by: Marek Stachowski  
Ildikó Bellér-Hann

The publication of this book was financially supported by Department of Asian Studies,  
Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures, and Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań.

© Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, Poznań 2013

Cover design: Helena Oszmiańska, basing on Turkish and Kazakh motifs

Proof-reading: Anna Mojska

Sub-editor: Dorota Borowiak

Typesetting: Anna Marcinkaniec

ISBN 978-83-232-2658-1

WYDAWNICTWO NAUKOWE UNIwersYTETU IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU  
61-701 POZNAŃ, UL. FREDRY 10

[www.press.amu.edu.pl](http://www.press.amu.edu.pl)

Sekretariat: tel. 61 829 46 46, fax 61 829 46 47, e-mail: [wyd nauk@amu.edu.pl](mailto:wyd nauk@amu.edu.pl)

Dział sprzedaży: tel. 61 829 46 40, e-mail: [press@amu.edu.pl](mailto:press@amu.edu.pl)

Ark. wyd. 7,00. Ark. druk. 8,25 + wklejka

Druk i oprawa: UNI-DRUK s.j., LUBOŃ, UL. PRZEMYSŁOWA 13

## Table of contents

---

Foreword .....	7
HENRYK JANKOWSKI	
Ten Years of Turkology in Poznań .....	9
RADOSŁAW ANDRZEJEWSKI	
The Image of Turkey's Ethnic Groups in Jokes .....	19
GULAYHAN AQTAY	
Adjectives in Modern Kazakh .....	37
ANDRZEJ DROZD	
Tatar Inscriptions from the Eighteenth Century in Belarus .....	47
CEM ERDEM	
Turkish Folk Poet and Singer Âşık Merdanoğlu .....	61
HENRYK JANKOWSKI	
Baytursinulı's Works on the Kazakh Language – An Attempt at Assessment .....	75
BAGHDAN MOMYNOVA	
Semantic Groups of Kazakh Gestures and their Representation in Verbal Language .....	91
BIYBAYŞA NURDĀWLETOVA	
Some Linguistic Features of the Kazakh Oral Epic in Mañğıstaw .....	99
Dorota Smętek	
The Question of the Existence of a Common Literary Language of the Crimean Karaites in the Nineteenth Century .....	111
Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak	
Some Notes on the Seventeenth-Century Crimean Khanate on the Basis of Judicial Records .....	123



## Foreword

---

This volume presents papers written by the staff of the Section of Turkic, Mongolian and Korean Studies of the Department of Asian Studies, the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, and two invited contributors from Kazakhstan, Baghdan Momynova (Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty) and Biybayşa Nurdāwletova (Sh. Esenov Caspian State University of Technology and Engineering, Aqtaw) who have cooperated with our section. The volume is dedicated to the tenth anniversary of Turkic studies, which were initiated as an integrated MA program in Poznań in 2002. Instead of inviting many guests from other institutions that run university courses and conduct research in Turkish, we chose to present our own contributions. This is because the Turkology staff in Poznań is mostly composed of young teachers and researchers. The two colleagues invited from Kazakhstan mark our profile of work that, although being primarily focused on Turkey, is directed toward the northwestern area of the Turkic world. The third area, which combines the Kipchak sphere with the Oghuz realm on its territory, is the Crimea. The picture is completed with our own Turkic culture, Lithuanian-Polish Tatars. The volume begins with an outline of the history of Turkic studies at our university.



HENRYK JANKOWSKI

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## Ten Years of Turkology in Poznań<sup>1</sup>

This article briefly outlines the history of Turkic studies in Poznań. Practical Turkish was first offered to the students of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań in 1982 as a free elective. That year also marks the beginning of Turkological research in Poznań. Turkish was initiated in 2002 as an integrated master's program. In 2007, the study was divided into a three-year undergraduate BA and a two-year postgraduate MA programs. In addition to the figures and events related to the courses and degrees, this outline provides details on teaching staff, their research, activities, contacts with other institutions and publications.

### 1. Background

The first MA study program in Turkic studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań was initiated in 2002 as a fourth Oriental specialization after Japanese, Chinese and Arabic.<sup>2</sup> This program was run by the Department of Oriental Studies<sup>3</sup>, which is part of the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures. The curriculum and syllabuses were developed by this author with the support of the department, faculty and university authorities.

Turkic studies in Poznań did not spring into being from nothing. Practical Turkish was taught as a language course for the students of various specializations almost continuously from 1982 on. As a school without a long tradition of oriental studies, the university held a relatively good collection of Turkology books and journals, mostly German and some English publications from the period before

---

<sup>1</sup> For a Polish version of this outline see Jankowski 2012a.

<sup>2</sup> For the history of Oriental studies in Poznań see Jankowski (2003, 2007).

<sup>3</sup> In Polish *Katedra Orientalistyki*, which was restructured in 2005 to the Institute of Oriental Studies (*Instytut Orientalistyczny*) and from 2008 onwards has been the Department of Asian Studies (*Katedra Studiów Azjatyckich*).

1939 as well as recent Soviet, Hungarian and other East European publications. However, the university library and the library of the Institute of Linguistics also held some important recent books published in Western Europe and America. Soviet publications included books and journals from Soviet Turkic republics, i.e. Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Turkmen and Uzbek, as well as some from Tatar, Yakut and other autonomous regions of the USSR.

There were also books from related fields, e.g. Mongolian and Tungusic. From 1982, when the idea of the future Turkology department was first conceived, books were also acquired from Turkey.

## 2. Starting point

When we started first admissions in 2002, our colleagues in Krakow and Warsaw, where Turkology had existed for a long time, gave our initiative a warm welcome. However, our intention was not to copy their curriculum, but to develop something new. Emphasis was put on modern Turkish and another obligatory Turkic language to be taught practically throughout the five years of the MA program, along with such subjects as grammar, history and culture. We thought of Central Asia and our choice became Kazakh as the language and culture of the largest and most prosperous, as we then assumed, post-Soviet state. This second Turkic language was designed as supplementary to Turkish, important for both practice and research.

The first specialists were Henryk Jankowski as professor (from 1996) and Andrzej Drozd (JD in 2000) as adjunct and MA in Arabic whose specialization was also the art of Islam and the language, literature and culture of Polish and Lithuanian Tatars. We were supported by Niyar Qurtbilal, a Crimean Tatar fluent in Turkish, who was a doctoral student. Lecturers in Turkish and Kazakh came from their respective countries. It was Tamer Gençer who was sent to us by the Turkish Ministry of National Education a year before the first students were enrolled, as well as Gulayhan Aqtay, assigned to our department by the Ahmet Yasawi International Kazakh-Turkish University from the city of Turkistan, Kazakhstan.

The first curriculum included a practical Turkish course with 300 hours a year throughout the first four years of the study and sixty hours in the last year. Practical Turkish was conducted every day from Monday to Friday, two hours per day. Kazakh was taught on a similar basis four days a week, which amounted to 240 hours annually throughout the first four years of study and thirty hours in the last year. Our first students had all of their language classes with native speaking lecturers and this system brought about very good results. When they went to Turkey and Kazakhstan for mobility grants, they were highly assessed by the hosting universities. Our students frequently surpassed students from other

universities. Descriptive grammar of Turkish and Kazakh were two courses provided with the aim of helping students understand the languages taught by the native speakers without a medium language and also to explain the structure of Turkish and Kazakh in the terms of modern linguistics. Initially, the grammar portion was planned for three years, but it soon proved that two years were enough and grammar courses were completed at the end of the second year of study. In the first year the curriculum also included such subjects as an introduction to Turkic studies, the culture of Turkey and Central Asia and Islam. In the second year of the study the students took Buddhism in Central Asia, introduction to Arabic studies, Arabic paleography and Chinese writing. We intended to educate future Ottomanists and specialists able to study the Turkic languages of China. The specialization courses of the third year also included a comparative grammar of Turkic languages, Old Turkic, Khwarezmian Turkic literature and Mongol paleography. This course was later transformed into Written Mongolian. In the fourth year the students were obliged to take Chagatai literature after the completion of Khwarezmian. These subjects were supplemented by oral and written translation from and into Turkish, a course in Polish Tatar literature and another in Islamic law. At the same time students started working on their MA theses, for which we offered an MA seminar continuing to the end of their studies. The fifth year included four courses, a continuation of practical language courses, the MA seminar and a selected lecture. According to the requirements, there were also some compulsory and elective non-specialization courses such as logic, then philosophy, information science, etc.

Some courses of this first curriculum have been retained and are offered today as well, while others continue with various changes, either required by new regulations or practice. In 2006 a deficiency in our curriculum, the lack of Turkish literature, was removed and the number of translation classes increased.

### **3. Shift into undergraduate, postgraduate and doctoral programs**

After some minor changes mentioned above, we substantially reshaped the curriculum in 2007 when the integrated MA program was transformed into a three-year undergraduate BA and a two-year postgraduate MA programs according to the Bologna Process. The new system of education was confronted with new expectations of students and their attitudes. It caused additional modifications of the curriculum to be implemented almost annually.

The basic idea was to create two independent study programs, although access to the postgraduate program is limited for candidates who graduated from programs other than Turkic studies because they must have a command of Turkish

at the B2 level according to CEFR requirements. Another idea was to move the more specialized courses from the initial years of the old integrated program to the postgraduate program and to cancel some subjects not strictly related to Turkology.

Here I will present some of these changes. The culture of Turkey and Central Asia was divided into two different courses: the history and culture of Turkey and the history and culture of Central Asia. The former was afterwards further divided into the history of Turkey and the culture of Turkey, and the latter was limited to the culture of Central Asia. Chinese writing was transferred to the postgraduate program, but later removed from the curriculum. However, our students may still take practical Chinese as an elective within the course of modern foreign language. Arabic paleography was replaced with Ottoman paleography and finally with Ottoman Turkish. In 2009 we began offering a new course on the history and culture of Mongolia, changed in 2012 to Mongolian Literature and Culture. Written Mongolian was cancelled, but students wishing to study Mongolian may take this course as an elective. Islam was made optional along with Buddhism and Judaism, although the overwhelming majority of our students prefer Islam. Khwarezmian literature was substituted by pre-classical Turkish literature with a greater focus on Turkey.

Although some subjects from the old curriculum were included in the new MA program, it is in fact a completely new scheme. Practical Kazakh was replaced with specialized Kazakh (business, administration, banking etc.), Islamic law with Turkish law, Old Turkic with Orkhon Turkic and Old Uyghur. New courses were introduced as well: business Turkish, the history of Turkish art, codicology and epigraphy, literature and culture of the Karaites and fieldwork Turkology.<sup>4</sup>

It should be noted that most subjects are taught in Turkish from the second year of the BA program onwards. This has both advantages and drawbacks. Among the advantages one may include the possibility to read courses in the language of specialization, thus making progress and developing language skills. A drawback is the difficulty of understanding new subjects with multiple new words and terms. Another drawback is that Turkish-language classes hamper professional development in our national language.

As all other study programs in Oriental languages, Turkology is not a mass specialization. Since 2007, when our first students graduated, only 35 students have received MA diplomas: 2007 – 9, 2008 – 2, 2009 – 6, 2010 – 5, 2011 – 5 and 2012 – 7, which gives an average of 5 students per year<sup>5</sup>. One student, Bermet Bazarkulova from Kyrgyzstan, received a financial grant from our university and

<sup>4</sup> The current curriculum is available at <<http://www.azjatystyka.amu.edu.pl/index.php?site=22&txtid=38>>.

<sup>5</sup> A full list of all MA and BA theses with the names of their holders and supervisors is available at <<http://www.azjatystyka.amu.edu.pl/turkologia/index.php?site=4#>>.

was awarded her MA degree in 2001, after the approval of a Turkic studies curriculum, but before the first admissions.

Outstanding students may apply for a four-year doctoral program, run at our faculty with financial grants. The first to complete this program and receive a PhD degree in 2003<sup>6</sup> was the aforementioned Niyar Qurtbilal from the Crimea. She was awarded a grant from the Polish government. Two more doctoral students defended their dissertations in 2012: Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak<sup>7</sup> and Dorota Smętek.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4. Staff members

As was mentioned above, at the outset our teaching staff was small. We consisted of staff members from the Section of Near and Middle Eastern Studies, which was transformed into the Section of Turkic, Mongolian and Korean Studies in 2005: Henryk Jankowski, Andrzej Drozd, Gulayhan Aqtay and Niyar Qurtbilal (2002–2006). At present our section, in addition to the two former members, employs the following academic teachers: Radosław Andrzejewski (from 2009), Dorota Smętek (from 2013), Otgonsukh Tsagaan (from 1994) and Cem Erdem (from 2012). The Turkic Studies program is run in cooperation with the Section of Kazakh Studies, established in 2009, which employs three specialists: Gulayhan Aqtay (between 2002–2009 with the former section), Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak (from 2011) and Luiza Banach (from 2012). Therefore, there are six employees in the former and three in the latter sections, one a titular, full professor, three assistant professors (adjuncts), two senior lecturers and three lecturers. Seven staff members are Turkologists; one is a specialist in Mongolian (Otgonsukh Tsagaan)<sup>9</sup> and one a specialist in law and Arabic (Andrzej Drozd). In the past the following academic teachers were employed at the sections: Yasemin Anastazja Çetiner (2007–2009), Natalia Waszyńska (2008–2010), Zuzanna Grzywacz (2009–2010) and Karol Wojciechowicz (2010–2012), all of whom graduated from our university.

The native speaking lecturers in Turkish assigned to us by the Turkish Ministry of National Education have included Abdullah Ertit (2002–2006), Halil Küçükler

<sup>6</sup> On the basis of the thesis *Güney-Doğu Kırım'ın Mikrotoponimisi (The Microtoponymy of South-East Crimea)*, written in Turkish.

<sup>7</sup> On the basis of the dissertation *Protokoły rozpraw sądowych XVII wiecznego Krymu. Analiza językowa i kulturowa (Proceedings of hearings from seventeenth century Crimea. A linguistic and cultural analysis)*, written in Polish.

<sup>8</sup> On the basis of the dissertation *Crimean Karaim Version of Melukhat Sha'ul. Critical Edition and Linguistic Analysis*, written in English.

<sup>9</sup> She got her PhD degree in 2004 on the basis of the thesis *Linguistic image of the world of Mongols as reflected in proverbs* submitted in Polish (*Językowy obraz świata Mongołów na podstawie przysłów*).

(2006–2007), Murat Öztürk (2007–2009) and Tülay Çulha (2011–2012), with our present Turkish lecturer being Cem Erdem. During 2004–2010 we also employed Mustafa Gökay Saral (2004–2011), who was contracted outside our bilateral cooperation.

As for Kazakh, apart from Gulayhan Aqtay, who has worked with us from the very beginning, we have had the following lecturers from Kazakhstan: Damira Beysenova (2004–2005), Gulzhan Bakayeva (2005–2006) and Bibigül Khalykova (2009–2009),<sup>10</sup> the first three from the University in Türkistan, the last from Al-Farabi University in Almaty.

According to the regulations governing universities in Poland, doctoral students are also obliged to teach, with a workload of 60–90 hours per year. Accordingly, all of our doctoral students conducted courses, some more than three hours per week: Niyar Qurtbilal, Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak, Dorota Smętek and Karolina Romanowska, who has not completed her doctoral degree.

## 5. Domestic and international cooperation

The students participating in our programs, as all other students in Poland and Europe, are eligible for the Erasmus mobility scheme. We have cooperation agreements with the major universities of Turkey, such as Istanbul University, Ankara University, Ege University in Izmir, Anadolu University in Eskişehir, Çukurova University in Adana and Caucasus University in Kars. Their students also visit our department every year. This exchange is very advantageous for both sides. Outside Turkey, we have agreements with a few universities in Kazakhstan, e.g. Al-Farabi Kazakh National University in Almaty, Abai University in Almaty, Gumilev Eurasian University in Astana and others.

Students and academic teachers from Central Asia, mainly from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, are among our constant visitors. Our past visiting professors include Mahanbet Zhusupow (Tashkent), Sawle Tazhibayeva (formerly Taraz, now Astana), Biibaysha Nurdauletova (Aqtaw), Alibii Shapauov (Kökshetaw); among doctoral students Otabek Nosirov (Bukhara), Ziyada Abdulzhanova (formerly Almaty, now Astana) and Nuraly Ötegen (Almaty).

Some guests have come from non-Turkic countries close to our interest, e.g. Muyasar Mirzoyeva (Tajikistan) and Fahime Sayyahyan (Iran).

We do not invite professors from other Polish academic institutions that run Turkic studies too often, since we regularly meet at conferences and symposia. Our distinguished guests have included Prof. Marek Stachowski (Jagiellonian University) and Prof. Dariusz Kołodziejczyk (Warsaw University).

<sup>10</sup> Bibigül Khanym, our excellent former teacher, untimely passed away in Almaty in 2010.

Our visiting guests often come from abroad. The inauguration in 2002 was marked by lectures and seminars by Prof. Mehmet Ölmez (Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Istanbul). We have also hosted Prof. Ildikó Bellér-Hann (University of Copenhagen), Prof. Claus Schönig (Free University, Berlin), Prof. Peter Zieme (Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Berlin), Prof. Mustafa Özkan (Istanbul University) and others.

The Section of Turkic, Mongolian and Korean Studies convened the first meeting of the Polish Turkological Conference in 2007. This conference has become a regular event and is being organized alternately by the three Polish universities that run programs in Turkic Studies. The second meeting was convened in Warsaw (2008), the third in Krakow (2009), the fourth in Poznań (2010), the fifth in Warsaw (2011), and the sixth is announced to be held in Krakow this autumn.

We have not organized any international conferences yet, but we have held several small meetings, among them a Polish-Turkish workshop in linguistics and literature in 2011 with the participation of our teaching and research staff and colleagues from Çukurova University, Adana.

## 6. Research and publications

The basic domains of research in our center include Turkish (e.g. Jankowski 1993, 2012b), Kazakh (e.g. Aqtay, Jankowski 2011), Karaim (Aqtay 2009, Jankowski 2009, 2010b), Crimean Tatar (Jankowski 2006, 2010a) and Polish Tatar or, more exactly, Tatar of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Drozd 1999, Drozd with Dziekan and Majda 1999, Drozd with Dziekan and Majda 2000, Jankowski with Łapicz 2000, Stefaniak-Rak 2009a, Stefaniak-Rak 2009b). Naturally this is not a full list of our publications and fields of research.<sup>11</sup>

Since 2009 we have been publishing an online, peer-reviewed series called *Turkic Studies* with free access, in which this volume also appears. Two volumes have been published so far.<sup>12</sup>

We also try to encourage our students to do research and publish their articles but so far very few have done so; among the few are Andrzejewski with Pankalla (2008). Some of the MA theses have also been excellent and worth publishing, e.g. Grzywacz's dissertation, which was revised and submitted anew in English and published as the second volume of *Turkic Studies*. Another one should also be revised, translated into English and published this year.

<sup>11</sup> For a full list of publications see <http://www.azjatystyka.amu.edu.pl/turkologia/index.php?site=4>.

<sup>12</sup> The first volume is Dorota Smętek's bibliography *A Bibliography of Turkic Studies in Przegląd Orientalistyczny 1948-2008* (2009), the second one is Zuzanna Grzywacz's study *Traditional Kazakh Medicine in Change* (2010), see <http://turkicstudies.amu.edu.pl/>.

The first attempt to produce a publication with students was Aqtay (Akhtay 2005, second edition 2007). She edited a collection of Polish folktales, translated into Kazakh by the students under her guidance and published with short glossaries after each tale. This was the first practical aid for Kazakh prepared by our center and published in Poznań.

When assessing the output and achievements of our institution, it is clear that we cannot compete with either Krakow or Warsaw, where Turkology has a long established teaching and research tradition, highlighted by such masters as Tadeusz Kowalski or Ananiasz Zajączkowski, not to speak of famous centers in such countries as Germany, France or Japan. However, in some fields, e.g. Karaitic studies, our achievements are recognized worldwide. Our Turkology department is also one of the few that provide regular classes in Kazakh backed by grammar and culture.

Although we are a Member State of the European Union and our jobs are open to all other EU citizens, the salaries offered by Polish universities are too low to attract scholars from other countries. Therefore, we have to rely on our own graduates, but educating them to achieve the highest level of proficiency is a long process.

## Bibliography

- Akhtay, Gulaikhan. 2005. *Studnia trzech braci. Podania i legendy polskie w przekładzie na język kazachski. Юш ағайынның құдығы. Қазақ тіліне аударылған поляк аңыздары*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza [2nd edition in 2007].
- Andrzejewski, Radosław, Andrzej Pankalla. 2008. Kazach zsiada z konia? Fantazmat a tożsamość etniczna, *ALBO albo*, 4, 105–112.
- Aqtay, Gülayhan. 2009. *Eliyahu ben Yosef Qılcı's Anthology of Crimean Karaim and Turkish Literature. Vol. I Introduction, Text and Indexes; Vol. II Facsimile*. Istanbul: Yıldız Dil ve Edebiyat Dizisi 8].
- Aqtay, Gülayhan, Henryk Jankowski. 2011. *Słownik kazachsko-polski*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Drozd, Andrzej. 1999. *Arabskie teksty liturgiczne w przekładzie na język polski XVII wieku*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Drozd, Andrzej, Marek M. Dziekan, Tadeusz Majda. 1999. *Meczety i cmentarze Tatarów polsko-litewskich*. Warszawa: Res Publica Multiethnica [Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich. Tom II].
- Drozd, Andrzej, Marek M. Dziekan and Tadeusz Majda. 2000. *Piśmiennictwo Tatarów polsko-litewskich*. Warszawa: Res Publica Multiethnica [Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich. Tom III].
- Grzywacz, Zuzanna. 2010. *Traditional Kazakh Medicine in Change*. [=Turkic Studies 2: [http://www.turkicstudies.amu.edu.pl/turkic\\_studies\\_2\\_2010.pdf](http://www.turkicstudies.amu.edu.pl/turkic_studies_2_2010.pdf)].
- Jankowski, Henryk. 1993. Török-tatár nyelvi kölcsönhatás Dobrudzsában, *Keletkutató* 1993, 2, 108–115.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2003. A History of Oriental Studies in Poznań: Juha Janhunen, Asko Parpola (red.). 2003. *Remota Relata. Essays on the History of Oriental Studies in Honour of Harry Halén*. Helsinki, 87-102 [= *Studia Orientalia* 97].

- Jankowski, Henryk. 2006. *A Historical-Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Russian Habitation Names of the Crimea*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2007. Orientalistyka poznańska: Tadeusz Majda (ed.). *Szkice z dziejów polskiej orientalistyki. Tom IV*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 127–170.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2009. Translations of the Bible into Karaim, *Religion Compass*, 3, 4 (2009), 502–523.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2010a. *Język krymskotatarski*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2010b. Two Crimean Karaim Financial Registers of the eighteenth Century, *Archivum Ottomanicum* 26 [2009] 2010, 17-39.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2012a. 10 lat turkologii w Poznaniu, *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 3–4 (2012), 142–148.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2012b. Rounded–unrounded vowel harmony in Turkish: Éva Kincses-Nagy, Mónika Biacsi (eds). 2012. *The Szeged Conference. Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics held on August 20–22, 2010 in Szeged*. Szeged: Department of Altaic Studies [=Studia Uralo-Altaica 49], 253–264.
- Jankowski, Henryk, Czesław Łapicz. 2000. *Klucz do rajju. Księga Tatarów litewsko-polskich z XVIII wieku* [Key to Paradise. An eighteenth-century manuscript of Lithuanian-Polish Tatars. Translation into Polish with notes and comments]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog.
- Smętek, Dorota. 2009. *A Bibliography of Turkic Studies in Przegląd Orientalistyczny 1948-2008*. [=Turkic Studies 2: [http://www.turkicstudies.amu.edu.pl/turkic\\_studies\\_1\\_2009.pdf](http://www.turkicstudies.amu.edu.pl/turkic_studies_1_2009.pdf)].
- Stefaniak-Rak, Katarzyna. 2009a. Index to the summary of Tatar landed estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of 1631 by Jan Kierdej, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 33, 241-274.
- Stefaniak-Rak, Katarzyna. 2009b. Index of place names to the summary of Tatar landed estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of 1631 by Jan Kierdej, *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, 33, 275-280.



RADOSŁAW ANDRZEJEWSKI

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## The Image of Turkey's Ethnic Groups in Jokes

Although the specificities of what is considered humorous differ from culture to culture, certain shared patterns may be identified cross-culturally. One of these is making fun of neighboring groups, who constitute what could be termed familiar strangers, a practice that has been documented in numerous parts of the world in different periods. The English laugh at the Welsh, the French ridicule the English, Americans make fun of Poles, Poles mock the Russians, etc. The aim of this article is to explore which groups the Turks laugh at or, in other words, to analyze the patterns of ethnic humor in Turkey observable in jokes.

### 1. Introduction

The idea of this article first occurred to me while studying the traditional Turkish shadow play, usually referred to as Karagöz, or 'black eye', who is the principal character of the play (Boratav 1996: 600–603). What really enthralled me was the multiplicity of social differences (gender, social status as well as ethnic and regional differences) of late Ottoman society presented in a stereotyped yet pleasant way. Among the peripheral characters, such as *Matiz*, the Drunkard; *Çelebi*, a well-educated and wealthy gentleman; *Beberuhi*, a very talkative and grumbling dwarf; *Tiryaki*, a drug-addicted old man, we may find also characters such as the Albanian, the Arab or the Laz. Ünver Oral rightly notes that the characters in the Turkish shadow play were subject to change and many new characters were developed with new plays. Nevertheless, the most popular characters of religious or ethnic origin are Arabs, Jews, Armenians, Greeks, inhabitants of the Black Sea region (referred to as Laz), Persians, Albanians and *Frenks* – Europeans (And 2001: 402). Each of them possesses specific features and many of the jokes are based on

the linguistic mistakes, usually in pronunciation, made by these characters. The Albanian always tries to get profits from any deal, regardless of the occupation he holds in a particular play; he strongly pronounces the *r* sound. The Arab, although kind-hearted, asks about the same thing many times, thus driving everyone mad; he makes all types of pronunciation lapses. The Laz is an impetuous boatman or merchant, who either remains silent or throws words at the speed of a machine gun (Mutlu 2002: 14–16). Depicted in a humorous way, these clearly identifiable stereotypes of the members of late Ottoman society encouraged me to scrutinize the question of the image of ethnic groups of present-day Turkey that can be observed in Turkish jokes, referred to as *fikra*.

The Turkish word *fikra* means “Kısa ve özlü anlatımı olan, nükteli, güldürücü hikayecik; anekdot” (Akalin 2010: 695); “Anlatımı kısa ve özlü olan nükteli, güldürücü hikaye” (Özkan, Yelten 2006: 231); “Kısa ve özlü anlatımı olan, nükteli, güldürücü küçük hikaye; anekdot; kıssa” (Karahana 1916). These definitions are very similar and may be presented in English as ‘a short and succinct humorous story’. Thus *fikra* is similar to an anecdote, and this is how it is translated into other languages: ‘anecdote’ (Bezmez, Brown 1999: 371); ‘рассказ, басня, анекдот’ (Mustafayev, Starostov 1977: 298); ‘anegdota (Kozłowska 2009: 312). However, the character of many *fikras* suggests that they should be treated as jokes, according to the definition given by English dictionaries: “a thing that someone says to cause amusement or laughter, especially a story with a funny punch line” (Soanes, Stevenson 2005: 936); “something said or done for the purpose of creating amusement” (Read 1999: 688). In this article I will use the terms ‘joke’ and ‘anecdote’ interchangeably, as it functions in Turkish.

The primary sources used in this article are some popular websites, mostly those of humorous content, as well as websites devoted to particular cultural groups, many of which also provide some interesting examples of jokes. The choice of Internet sources was dictated by the specific subject of my research. The Internet, with its lack of control and censorship (whether we agree with it or not), seems to be the best place to share many informal, funny, sometimes even offensive materials which in other circumstances might be considered politically incorrect, improper or even banned. The secondary sources are meager, since the relationship of the Turks to their neighbors and other groups such as the Karapapak or the various Caucasian groups remains seriously understudied.

Before focusing on the “ethnic” jokes, two more introductory remarks need to be made. First, the most popular and at the same time most studied Turkish jokes are those about Nasreddin Hodja. Anecdotes about this sometimes wise, sometimes naive folk philosopher owe their popularity to their didactic context and refined humor. Despite the fact that they are widespread all over the Balkans, the Middle East and Central Asia, among the Turks they are considered purely Turkish, and as such they are placed in almost each Turkish textbook for

foreigners. Such an approach is supported by the studies of Turkish scholars, who analyze the aforementioned anecdotes in search of Turkishness (Boyras 2010). Although Nasreddin Hodja is believed to be essentially Turkish, in anecdotes he is never confronted with members of other nations or ethnic groups, which to some extent may explain his popularity. The characters that appear in the stories represent a wide spectrum of different professions and types (e.g. the neighbor, the judge, the butcher, the woman, the poor man, etc.), but never other territorially or culturally defined groups. Even during Nasreddin's travels through the countryside, his visits to distant villages, the local folk are never called by their name. Only in a limited number of anecdotes is the plot connected with a particular geography (usually Akşehir and Konya) that still does not indicate any of the cultural groups of Turkey.

Secondly, in Turkey, ethnic jokes are not classified as a separate group; instead, these are typically included in wider groups of regional jokes (*mahalli fıkralar* or *yerel fıkralar*) that represent the jokes of local communities at the expense of their various neighbors without any distinction or hierarchization made between particular cultural groups. The collection and study of jokes started as late as the 1990s. We lack a regional or ethnic joke corpus of the earlier period since it was beyond the scope of ethnographers and dialectologists' interests, who used to collect other elements of oral tradition, such as *türkü*s, proverbs, mourning songs, etc. Research into this topic is rendered harder by the fact that many of those works written in the 1990s and 2000s, such as Ibrahim Altunel's PhD thesis *Anadolu Mahalli Fıkra Tipleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*, remain unpublished or that access to them remains limited. Some individual ethnic jokes are scattered in works devoted to the study of particular regions or cities, but their number is far from being satisfactory and justifies further research into the subject. At the same time, the existence of ethnic jokes in the collections of regional anecdotes proves that some communities in the past were singled out to become the butt of jokes among their neighbors. Nevertheless, to date only a few scholars have selected jokes focusing on ethnic (or religious) groups as a field of their studies. Erman Artun has studied jokes on the Abdals, Nurdan Kılınç has analyzed Yörük jokes from the Antalya region, while Bektaşî jokes were the subject of interest of Dursun Yıldırım and other scholars. The aforementioned works have been published in Turkish, thus the present article would probably be the first attempt of presenting the question of Turkish ethnic jokes in English.

## 2. The question of ethnicity

Probably one of the most problematic aspects of ethnic jokes in Turkey that makes the topic so relevant today is the question of ethnicity itself. Previous centuries brought some serious changes in this field since the Ottoman Empire was

traditionally organized in the *millet* system. *Millet* denoted neither a nation nor an ethnicity, but a form of social organization based on religion, state of mind and the subjects' mutual consideration of one another (Ortaylı 2010: 18). The origination of particular nations inspired by the European Enlightenment was implied in secession of subsequent provinces from the Ottoman Empire and in formation of new nation states. Later in Anatolia the Ottoman diversity was replaced by the Kemalist unitary state; however, in the first years of the Republic, the new idea of a territorial Turkish state, based on the nation called Turks, was difficult to acquire for the people bound to religion and Ottoman dynasty (Lewis 1972: 414–415). Nevertheless, the idea of Turkish nation was quickly adopted and many cultural groups (both ethnic and religious) “became” Turks. The level of their assimilation and the possible threat they pose to the entity of the Turkish state implies the very different attitude towards them. Although according to the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey (§ 66), every citizen of Turkey is considered to be a Turk, while the status of religious or ethnic minorities is not regulated, these diverse cultural groups function in the collective consciousness to a greater or lesser extent and as such they constitute the subject of my study.

However, ethnicity is not a leading principle of social organization in Turkey and the term ‘ethnic groups’ should not be treated here in the classical Barthian sense (Barth 1969: 11) since “no single concept is capable of providing a comprehensive framework for all the different kinds of groups that matter to actors in Anatolia today” (Hann 2003: 18). For these reasons the term ‘cultural group’ was introduced in this paper and used as a synonym for ‘ethnic group’. These diverse approaches are also the reason why the Laz and Armenians were excluded here from the Caucasian peoples, although regionally they should be treated as a whole. The term ‘ethnic jokes’ is used here as jokes ‘associated with’ a group, where ‘associated with’ can refer either to the distinctive jokes told within a group or to those told about the group by outsiders (Davies 2008: 157).

### 3. Ethnic groups in Turkish jokes

#### 3.1. The Laz

As the first group, the most represented one, I would like to analyze the interesting case of the Laz. The Laz are a non-Turkic speaking group of Caucasian origin who inhabit mostly the eastern coast of the Black Sea region. The language they speak belongs to the Kartvelian languages and is not related to Turkish. The number of ethnic Laz was estimated at 92,000 in 1980; however, the number of speakers was only 30,000 (Lewis 2009: 534). Interestingly enough, as a result of various

factors, including migration, mixed marriage and bilingualism, the ethnonym Laz has lost its original meaning and spread over the whole population of the eastern part of the Black Sea region, including the Turks, Hemshins, Mingrels and other groups (Bellér-Hann, Hann 2003: 293–323).

The Laz, or rather the Black Sea peoples, are represented in jokes by the archetypical character called Temel, who is sometimes accompanied by his mate Dursun. In caricatures he is depicted as an adult with a Roman nose (referred to as *Laz burnu* – ‘the Laz nose’) and a tasseled hat that has only recently been colored purple and light blue to reflect the colors of the immensely popular football team Trabzonspor<sup>1</sup>. Just as the Laz in the Turkish shadow play, Temel speaks the local dialect, or rather makes some pronunciation lapses believed to reflect the dialect of the Black Sea region. Although the dialectological aspect is usually just one of the comic features serving as a background for the plot and the punch line, in some cases it constructs the leading incongruity, as in the joke below (originally Temel speaks the dialect):

One day Temel travels on the train. Suddenly a black person enters his compartment and asks: ‘May I sit down?’ Temel agrees. After a long silence Temel asks: ‘Are you a black man?’ The passenger: ‘Yes, how did you guess?’ Temel replies: ‘From your accent’<sup>2</sup>.

Despite the language Temel speaks, the main source of the joke is his simplicity, gullibility, and innocence. Although he is usually depicted as an oaf or a harmless village fool, who digs eight holes in the ground just to have his eight passport photographs taken<sup>3</sup>, he often finds surprisingly logical and efficient ways of solving problems or comments on implausible situations, that also serve as the main source of hilarity. It has to be stressed that the overall image of Temel is always positive. The venue of the jokes is usually the cities of the Black Sea region, mainly Trabzon, as well as Rize and Of, hence Temel’s foolishness is often combined with the negative image of the region, considered as underdeveloped and technologically backward, just as in the joke presenting the text of an e-mail, signed by Temel:

Dear holder of this message, you have just received a Laz virus. Since we are not technologically advanced here in Trabzon, this is a MANUAL virus. Please delete all the files from your hard disk on your own and send this e-mail to everyone you know. Thank you for your cooperation<sup>4</sup>.

The most interesting element in the Temel jokes is the fact that despite his undoubted connections to the Black Sea region he often appears in jokes of “a British, a German and a Russian” pattern confronting three (sometimes more) nationalities. Such anecdotes are common all over the world and the nationalities are

<sup>1</sup> In fact the team drew the colors from the Trabzon crest.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.fikrasi.com/temel-ve-zenci-10140.htm> (date of access: 12.02.2013).

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.fikracenneti.com/cesitli-fikralar/vesikalik-2> (date of access: 12.02.2013).

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.fikracenneti.com/temel-fikrulari/hacker-temel-2> (date of access: 12.02.2013).

subject to change according to local stereotypes. However, in Turkey the standard pattern goes as follows: “A German, a Russian (or other nationalities) and our Temel...”. Moreover, the expression “our Temel” is not given in the standard, neutral possessive form of *bizim Temelimiz* but in the form of *bizim Temel*, without the possessive suffix, that indicates positive commitment and identification with the subject (Stachowski 2007: 58). In such international jokes Temel becomes a representative not only of the Laz people or the Black Sea region, but of the whole Turkish nation with its positive and negative features, its problems and worries. In other words, he is a self-stereotype of the Turk:

An American, a European and our Temel met at the international economic conference. They discuss the problem of distributing public funds. The American says: ‘We draw a line on the ground and we toss the money up in the air. The amount of money that falls on the left side of the line goes for public service, the amount on the right is invested’. The European: ‘We have a similar system but we draw a square on the ground. Then we toss the money up in the air. The amount of money that falls outside the square goes for public service, the amount that falls into the square goes for the government support’. Our Temel: ‘We also have a similar system but we don’t draw anything. The government tosses the money up in the air, the amount that falls on the ground goes to their pockets, the amount that remains in the air goes for public service’<sup>5</sup>.

The same is applicable for the jokes in which Temel holds a particular profession usually connected with public service, such as a policeman, a customs officer or a teacher, or when he appears in venues not connected with the Black Sea region, meeting some public persons (Tanrıbuyurdu 2007: 106).

### 3.2. Other Caucasian peoples

The third pattern of ethnic jokes are those about Caucasian peoples in particular, mostly the Adyghe (*Adıgeler*), but also the Circassians (*Çerkezler*), the Kabardians (*Kabardeyler*), the Abkhazians (*Abhazlar*), the Abazins (*Abazalar*) and the Chechens (*Çeçenler*). Members of the aforementioned groups arrived in the territory of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century as a result of the Caucasian policy of tsarist Russia, fleeing from wars and repression (Matuszek 2007: 11–44). In the twentieth century they succumbed to assimilation, maintaining their ethnic identity based mostly on clan ties and tribal structure. This is confirmed by some jokes on the Adyghe people, where the basic differentiation between the Circassians and Kabardians may be observed; however, the subdivision goes further, thus, we may note such ethnonyms as *Şapşığ* ‘Shapsug’ or *Abzeh/Abzeg*<sup>6</sup> ‘Abzegh’ which resemble the dialects of Circassian (Neroznak

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.fikracenneti.com/search/Vergi> (date of access: 12.02.2013).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.kafkasyaliyizbiz.tr.gg/F%26%23305%3Bkrallar.htm> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

2002: 37) or the unidentified ethnonyms (toponyms?) of *Lekopkuže/Lekopkua*<sup>7</sup> and *Hatikoy*<sup>8</sup>.

The analysis of jokes about Caucasian peoples and connecting stereotypes to a particular group are extremely difficult since each ethnic group is characterized by various negative features and in many cases the same feature is attributed to more than one group. Moreover, most probably these jokes reflect old tribal animosities that were brought to the territory of Turkey in the nineteenth century. For instance, in three subsequent yet different anecdotes posted on the Turkish website devoted to the Caucasian peoples, the Abaza, the Abhaz and the Abzeh are presented as rustlers, respectively. Furthermore, in the last joke two Abzehs steal a horse but later on the same horse is stolen from them by the Abaza<sup>9</sup>. Presumably, one of these ethnic groups is presented here with a self-stereotypical approach but it is difficult to determine exactly. It is also plausible that the joke was coined by a third ethnic group.

Interestingly, the anecdotes mentioned above include many local elements or references to the Caucasus and the common Caucasian culture and history. The Circassian cannot ride a horse<sup>10</sup>, the Chechen sits in a trench with the Abhaz<sup>11</sup>, the Hatigoy wants to buy an accordion<sup>12</sup> (an instrument that is not found in Turkish musical culture) or the Abaza rates being executed by the Russians higher than working<sup>13</sup>. One of the anecdotes (which could not be fully quoted here due to its length) starts as follows:

Before the exile, there was a beautiful girl called Gufabe who lived in a village in the Caucasus. Her beauty, wisdom and hospitality were famous among the neighboring Adyghes. A young Shapsug called Ale, who lived high in the mountains also heard her name<sup>14</sup>.

In the following lines Ale visits Gulafe and is fed hot soup. He pretends to have burned his tongue to trick Gulafe but she finds out his plans and punch-lines the situation with a funny comment given in Circassian (translated into Turkish). Such a cultural approach combined with the usage of tribal ethnonyms, local names and some expressions in particular languages may possibly denote the

<sup>7</sup> <http://adigexer.sosyomat.com/etiket/%C3%A7erkes-f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>8</sup> [http://corumdoganlarkoyu.com/forum/viewthread.php?thread\\_id=738](http://corumdoganlarkoyu.com/forum/viewthread.php?thread_id=738) (date of access: 19.02.2013). In another version this ethnonym is given in the form *Hatigoy*. Most probably it is a deformed version of the ethnonym *Хьаткьо*, mentioned by Neroznak (2002: 48).

<sup>9</sup> <http://adigexer.sosyomat.com/etiket/%C3%A7erkes-f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.kafkasyaliyibiz.tr.gg/F%26%23305%3Bkralar.htm> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>11</sup> [http://birgo.mynet.com/sesssis\\_02/yazi/abhaz---adige--cerkes---fikralari---cadikasani-](http://birgo.mynet.com/sesssis_02/yazi/abhaz---adige--cerkes---fikralari---cadikasani-) (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.kafkasyaliyibiz.tr.gg/F%26%23305%3Bkralar.htm> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.kafkasyaliyibiz.tr.gg/F%26%23305%3Bkralar.htm> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.cerkes.gen.tr/category/cerkes-fikralari/page/6/> (date of access: 19.02.2013).

in-group character of these jokes, although, neighboring folk could familiarize themselves with local customs. After all, cross-cultural jokes appear as a result of cultural interaction. However, in another joke a Kabardian willing to manifest his ethnic identity enters the club with a T-shirt he ordered but instead of *Kabardey* 'Kabardian' it says *Kadir Bey* 'Mr. Kadir'.<sup>15</sup> The pun is in fact supposed to suggest that the Turks do not even recognize the ethnonym Kabardian.

### 3.3. Armenians

Armenians, along with the Greeks and the Jews, belong to the group of three minorities that were recognized by the Lausanne Treaty in 1923. In the Ottoman Empire they constituted one of the most numerous and influential *millet*s and this historical background is the reason why they are not discussed with other Caucasian peoples. Their situation drastically changed after the mass-deportations of Armenians in 1915–1917, when 1.5 million of them lost their lives (Lewis 1972: 417). The uneven assessment of those events, often referred to as the Armenian Genocide, creates lots of controversies that have a great impact on Turkish-Armenian relations. Nevertheless, contrary to expectations, the number of jokes about the Armenians is surprisingly low, far lower than the number of jokes about other Caucasian peoples. Moreover, there are no jokes directly connected with the events of 1915.

We may distinguish two main patterns of jokes about the Armenians: one of them concerns men, the second women. The latter presents Armenian women in an obscene way, often during oral sex<sup>16</sup> or while talking about it.<sup>17</sup> However, they merely provide the background for the general punch line. The stereotype of some sexual dissipation and immorality which may be observed here is applicable for other non-Muslim groups as well and is most probably supposed to express the comic content consecutively protecting the honor of Muslim women or, broadly speaking, the religious superiority of Muslims over Christians.

The former pattern is based on the stereotype of the crafty and avaricious Armenian who is always confronted with *Kayserili* 'the inhabitant of Kayseri, Kayserian', a leading attribute of Turkish jokes, who possesses the same features as the Armenian, but it is always the Kayserian who tricks the Armenian. Furthermore, the Armenian may be tricked even by a Kayserian child<sup>18</sup>. The stereotype,

<sup>15</sup> [http://birgo.mynet.com/sesssis\\_02/yazi/abhaz---adige---cerkes---fikralari---cadikasani-](http://birgo.mynet.com/sesssis_02/yazi/abhaz---adige---cerkes---fikralari---cadikasani-) (date of access: 19.02.2013).

<sup>16</sup> <http://hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=9414&yazarid=22> (date of access: 22.02.2013).

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra\\_no=1468](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra_no=1468) (date of access: 22.02.2013).

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.avsarobasi.com/forum/index.php?action=printpage;topic=151.0> (date of access: 22.02.2013).

as well as the rivalry between the Armenian and the Kayserian, can be traced back to Ottoman times when many Armenians worked as goldsmiths, jewelry-makers and traders (Ortaylı 2010: 152), while Kayseri with its large Armenian minority<sup>19</sup> was one of the most important centers of trade in Anatolia. The rivalry is clearly visible in the following anecdote:

One day one of the Kayserians borrowed money from his Armenian friend. When the lender asked when he would get the money back, the Kayserian said: ‘When the snow of Erciyes<sup>20</sup> melts’. The Armenian waited a year, finally he went and asked his friend to give the money back but the Kayserian showed the mountain and said that the snow hadn’t melted yet. The Armenian understood that he had been tricked so he decided to trick another Kayserian. He borrowed money from him and he said that he would give it back when the snow of Erciyes melts. After a period of time this Kayserian came and asked the Armenian to give the money back. The Armenian said that the snow hasn’t melted yet, but the Kayserian quickly replied: ‘This is this year’s snow, last year’s one melted a long time ago’. The surprised Armenian didn’t know what to say so he gave the money back.<sup>21</sup>

It should be noted that in Turkish jokes it is the Kayserian who is the main swindler and scrounger, whereas his attitude is confronted with another stereotyped individual, i.e. the Armenian or the Jew. There are more jokes about the Kayserians than Armenians, but the common features and the historical background allow us to ask the question of the presumable overlap of these two different yet very similar stereotypes. Nevertheless, although historically such overlap could be possible, just as the sparse population of Laz coincided with the peoples of the Black Sea region, we lack any evidence of such a process. Therefore, the supposed identity must remain a hypothesis.

### 3.4. The Kurds

A complete opposite of congenial Temel anecdotes are the less popular jokes about Kurds. Although the Kurds constitute approximately 18–20% of Turkey’s population, the unregulated status of the Kurds in Turkey, problems with assimilation and in extreme cases the Kurdish separatism and terrorism (of which both sides of the conflict are mutually accused) create serious social tensions. This leads to the formation of various negative stereotypes which further function in jokes.

Generally, jokes about the Kurds may be subdivided into two categories: anti-Kurdish and pro-Kurdish. The first category, where a strong negative and offensive context may be observed, exposes such features as foolishness or even stupidity, illiteracy, poverty, savagery and barbarity, greed, etc. In these jokes the Kurds do

<sup>19</sup> According to *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, in 1849 the Armenians constituted ca. 27% of the male population of Kayseri (İpşirli 2002: 99).

<sup>20</sup> The highest mountain (3,916 m) in Central Anatolia, located in the Kayseri province.

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.fikraccneti.com/cesitli-fikralar/erciyes> (date of access: 22.02.2013).

not know the names of animals<sup>22</sup>, do the hardest jobs, normally done by a crane<sup>23</sup>, wait for the financial support from the government to stay alive after death<sup>24</sup>, throw Molotov cocktails<sup>25</sup>, rape a woman, a man and a donkey<sup>26</sup> or put their hands into dog excrement and lick their fingers to get some money<sup>27</sup>. Another common butt of a joke is Kurdish separatism, punch-lined with the short question: “What is the best joke about the Kurds? The Kurds have proclaimed independence”<sup>28</sup>.

The second category also operates with similar negative stereotypes; however, these stereotypes serve as a means of criticizing the attitude of some interest groups of Turkish society, Turkish regulations, administration, army, etc. In one of these jokes a Kurd from the provinces who comes to Istanbul is told by a local that the Turks cross the street at the green light while the Kurds cross at the red<sup>29</sup>. Although it is the Kurd who is unfamiliar with the traffic lights, the joke criticizes the anti-Kurdish sentiment of some members of Turkish society. Another good example of this type of joke, in which the official status quo is criticized, is provided by the following anecdote:

A lawyer comes to Diyarbakır to investigate the problem of torture in the local prison. He takes the taxi from the airport and asks the driver: ‘People say prisoners here are tortured, is it true?’ Taxi driver: ‘Separatists and communists throw dirt at the state. There is no torture here. Are you a policeman or an officer?’ Lawyer: ‘Neither, I’m a lawyer’. Taxi driver: ‘Why have you come here?’ Lawyer: ‘To defend some of the imprisoned’. Suddenly the taxi driver turns to the lawyer and starts: ‘I swear, they torture people, some prisoners became crippled, some of them have died’. The surprised lawyer: ‘So why did you say there is no torture?’ Taxi driver: ‘This is my official opinion’<sup>30</sup>.

Interestingly, jokes about the Kurds are the only group of ethnic jokes that cause heated discussion on Internet forums and websites. The authors of these posts are accused of fascism, intolerance and dissemination of hate, which leads to the destabilization of Turkey while the adversaries are reproached with hypocrisy since they defend only the Kurds, concurrently laughing at the Laz or Bektaşî

<sup>22</sup> <http://fikra.elookat.com/Deve-kusu-fikrasi,f39.htm> (date of access: 14.02.2013). In fact in this joke the punch line is the pun of *devekuşu* (“ostrich”).

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/k%C3%BCrt-f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1/> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.avsarobasi.com/forum/index.php?action=printpage;topic=151.0> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/k%C3%BCrt-f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1/> (date of access: 14.02.2013)

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.bizimmekan.com/fikra/9279-gayboldim.html> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>27</sup> <http://fikra.elookat.com/Islem-hacmi,f1190.htm> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.uludagsozluk.com/k/k%C3%BCrt-f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1/> date of (access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.eksisozluk.com/show.asp?t=k%C3%BCrt+f%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.belawela.com/hikayeler-f14/kurt-fikralari-t20280.html> (date of access: 14.02.2013).

jokes. Nonetheless, the existence of the aforementioned jokes and discussion of them proves that despite claims to the contrary, the Kurdish issue continues to evoke strong emotions.

### 3.5. The Jews

The Jews represent another group recognized by the Treaty of Lausanne that constituted a separate *millet* in the Ottoman Empire. After the emergence of an Israeli state many Turkish Jews left the country, however, Jewish jokes can still be heard. The image of Jews in Turkish jokes is very complex and consists of various stereotypes that may be observed also in the Jewish jokes of other cultures. Jewish jokes can be presented from two different viewpoints: the international and the Turkish one. The first one represents jokes most probably borrowed directly from other languages and cultures. In the jokes of this type the action takes place in other countries such as the USA or Germany; among the peripheral characters we may find Hitler, a Talib, an Arab, a Russian or a Catholic. The most dominant theme is business, yet faith and the Holocaust are noteworthy as well. In typical jokes about business, the Jew bargains with the Russians about a carriage full of corpses,<sup>31</sup> whereas the Jewish student gets twenty dollars from the teacher for saying that the greatest man in history was Jesus Christ, although he thinks it was Moses.<sup>32</sup> The Jew, who decided to become a Catholic, eats meat on Friday,<sup>33</sup> while Hitler and Stalin make plans for the Third World War, which involve the killing of fourteen million Jews and a bicycle repairman. When asked why they should kill the bicycle repairman, Hitler replies: "See, no one will ask about the Jews".<sup>34</sup>

The Turkish type presents mostly the stereotype of the cunning and covetous Jew rooted in Turkish culture. Among the characters we may encounter the Janissary, the qadi, the Bektāşi, though most frequently the Jew is confronted with the Kayserian or the Armenian, even despite the fact that historically there was no Jewish minority in Kayseri (İpşirli 2002: 99). Moreover, some jokes about Armenians occur exactly in the same form in this group, the only difference being that the Armenian is replaced with the Jew; for instance, the joke quoted above (3.3.) may also be found as a Jewish joke.<sup>35</sup> There are also some jokes in which the subject is

<sup>31</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra\\_no=788](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra_no=788) (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>32</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&catid=13&fikra\\_no=981](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&catid=13&fikra_no=981) (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>33</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra\\_no=20229](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra_no=20229) (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.fikracenneti.com/cesitli-fikralar/hitler-ve-stalin-2> (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.avsarobasi.com/forum/index.php?action=printpage;topic=151.0> (date of access: 23.02.2013).

not business, but sexuality (similar to the Armenian jokes). However, they present a very diverse and fluctuating image of the Jews, like in the two jokes below:

A Jew grabbed a Christian and started to beat him. After the Christian couldn't move the Jew tied him to a tree and continued with the torture. 'Why are you doing this?' asked the Christian with his last ounce of strength. 'Because of the Jewish genocide you have done' replied the Jew. 'But it was many years ago' said the Christian. 'I know but I have just found out,' said the Jew.<sup>36</sup>

A drunk Janissary came across a Jew and started to beat him, saying 'You've killed Jesus!' The terrified Jew said 'But it was 1,500 years ago!' 'I just found out!' said the Janissary.<sup>37</sup>

As we may observe in the above anecdotes, the Jew is presented both as an aggressor and a victim. The joke is based on historical incongruity, thus it is neither the ethnicity nor the stereotype that is the butt of the joke. Similar fortuity is perceptible also in other Jewish jokes. Remarkably, sophisticated Jewish jokes popular among Israeli Jews and Jewish diaspora are not observed in Turkey.

### 3.6. The Greeks

The Greeks represent the third group of officially recognized minorities in Turkey. Despite the fact that today the Greek minority has almost disappeared (Lewis 2009: 578), Turkish-Greek relations, due to some historical events such as the Greco-Turkish War of 1919–1922 or the Cyprus conflict, are strained and animosities can be observed. The rivalry is particularly noticeable in the field of sports; however, it is also reflected in jokes. The anecdotes about Greeks, even if they do not operate within particular stereotypes, appear as the most coherent yet most offensive among the ethnic jokes in Turkey. The general pattern may be reduced to sexual relations, mostly between men, where the Turk always plays the dominant and the active role, or, when there is no direct confrontation, the Greeks are presented as homosexuals.<sup>38</sup> The plot and the circumstances are subject to change, however, the main theme remains static. A representative example of this type of highly offensive and obscene joke is as follows:

Temel and a Greek found themselves on a desert island. The Greek asked Temel whether they would have sex. Temel agreed. When the Greek wanted to penetrate Temel, the latter one screamed 'Oh Jesus!'; the Greek withdrew none too soon. The second time the same situation was repeated, the third attempt also ended in the same way. Now it was Temel's turn. When he was about to penetrate the Greek, the latter one screamed 'Oh my God!' but Temel added 'In the name of God' and continued.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>36</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra\\_no=22653](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra_no=22653) (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>37</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/yazdir2.php?islem=fikra&fikra\\_no=1886](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/yazdir2.php?islem=fikra&fikra_no=1886) (date of access: 23.02.2013).

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.fikracenneti.com/cesitli-fikralar/gunah-2-2> (date of access: 24.02.2013).

<sup>39</sup> [http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra\\_no=16778](http://www.fikra.gen.tr/index.php?sayfa=mektup&fikra_no=16778) (date of access: 24.02.2013).

### 3.7. The Terekemes – the Karapapak

*Terekeme* and *Karapapak* are two ethnonyms usually used interchangeably for a group of Turkic origin, closely related to the Azeris, who inhabit Northeastern Anatolia, mostly the Kars and Ardahan provinces as well as the surroundings of the Turkish cities of Muş and Iğdır. The number of Karapapak in Turkey remains unknown. Türkoğlu and Ercilasun provide some historical data according to which the total number of this group in Kars province at the beginning of the twentieth century ranged between 30,000 and 50,000 (Ercilasun 1983: 45, Türkoğlu 2001: 470). Turkish scholars also agree on the decisive year 1828 and the Türkmençay Treaty that ended the Perso-Russian War as the moment of the Karapapak's arrival in Anatolia (Ercilasun 1983: 45).

Interestingly, despite the relatively small number of Karapapak, the number of Karapapak jokes is impressive; at [www.azeribalasi.com](http://www.azeribalasi.com) alone, a Turkish website devoted to Azeri culture, there are more than two hundred anecdotes about Terekemes. The most striking element of the Karapapak jokes is the language – each anecdote tagged as a Karapapak joke is given in the Karapapak dialect, closely related to the Azeri language. Moreover, contrary to the Laz jokes where only Temel's lines are given in the dialect, most of the Karapapak jokes are posted in Karapapak in their entirety. A typical joke goes as follows:<sup>40</sup>

Terekeme esgerriğini yaper. Birgün savak erkennen lavaboda tıraş olanda yanındaki obir aynıya bakdı sesdendi:  
 – Ay gardaş haralısan?  
 – Garsdıyam.  
 – Aya mende Garsdıyam.  
 – Harasınansan?  
 – Mamaşdıyam.  
 – Aya mende Mamaşdıyam, kimlerdensen?  
 – Tezebeyin oğluyam.  
 – Biy öyün yıkılsın ola, mende Tezebeyin oğluyam. Yoksa sen Fako'sanmı!

A Terekeme was doing his military service. One day, early in the morning, he went to the bathroom to get shaved. He looked in the mirror next to him and asked:  
 – Hey brother, where are you from?  
 – I'm from Kars.  
 – I'm also from Kars.  
 – Where exactly?  
 – From Mamaş.  
 – I'm also from Mamaş. Who are you?  
 – I'm Tezebey's son.  
 – Let your house collapse, I'm also Tezebey's son. Aren't you Fako?

Just as in the Laz jokes, the language constitutes the main incongruity of Terekeme jokes in several cases. In one of the anecdotes a Terekeme soldier is ordered to climb a rope and then to jump but he is afraid to do so and he shouts *Hoppanamerem* 'I can't jump', which in standard Turkish is given in the form *hoplayamıyorum*. The commander, who does not understand, orders another Terekeme to translate, however, he gets only the syllabized answer *Hop-pa-na-me-rem*.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Since this joke is in non-standard Turkish, we quote it in the original form with the parallel Turkish translation.

<sup>41</sup> <http://terekemem.tr.gg/Terekeme-F%26%23305%3Bkralar%26%23305%3B.htm> (date of access: 12.03.2013).

The second most striking feature of Karapapak jokes is the appearance of various personal names (e.g. Durdağı and Gülevat, Yurdagül Abla, Kalbayı Emi) and toponyms (Ergine plateau, Çamdıra village, Aktaş) or even short introductions stating the actuality of the stories or pointing out the exact time, e.g. “It was before the radio was brought to Kars”.<sup>42</sup> On the other hand, in many anecdotes the main characters are not referred to by a particular name but by a generalized form, mostly a *Karapapak* or *Karşlı* ‘a citizen of Kars’. The butt of the jokes are some cultural elements, such as the custom of drinking tea with a lump of sugar in one’s mouth. The unfamiliarity with religious rules and customs is ridiculed in several cases as well. Interestingly, among the jokes analyzed here there also exists a specific subgroup of anecdotes in which the Karapapaks are confronted with the Kurds. The appearance of such a confrontation is not surprising since both groups inhabit the same regions and the common neighborhood leads to various forms of interaction, including minor animosities. However, the quarrels are presented in a delicate, amusing way deprived of offensive content that point to overall more balanced neighborly relations.

Despite the large number of Karapapak jokes, it is difficult to pinpoint particular stereotypes that constitute the main butt of the joke. Among the negative features attributed to the Terekemes we find backwardness and religious illiteracy as well as cowardice and greed. However, there are also some positive aspects such as cleverness or courage. The dichotomy between cowardice and courage visible in the jokes about Karapapak soldiers shows the ambivalent attitude towards the analyzed group. Nevertheless, the overall image should be regarded interchangeably positive.

#### 4. Conclusions

Since the data presented in this article is limited and does not exhaust the subject, it is premature to draw a final conclusion. However, it is possible to make some observations. It should be added that the analysis of ethnic jokes in modern Turkey is very important from the perspective of assimilation and nationalism, since these questions seem to dominate folklore studies in Turkey (Başgöz 1998, 2011, Korkmaz 2008). Ethnic jokes stand in opposition to the official Turkish ideology, which corresponds with the classical theories of humor. Mary Douglas states that the joke is “the triumph of intimacy over formality, the unofficial values over official ones” (Douglas 1999: 152), while for Bakhtin laughter was always the contradiction of dogmatic solemnity and authority, offering an alternative truth about the world (Kasparski 1983: 155–159).

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.azeribalasi.com/showthread.php/5657-Azeri-Terekeme-F%C4%B1kralar%C4%B1> (date of access 12.03.2013).

According to Holland, jokes or humor in general may serve as a weapon to attack individuals, types of people or behavior, institutions, and even deities (Holland 1982: 17). However, for Mary Douglas a joke has nothing to do with social offence, obscenity nor abomination that threatens the order of society. "It represents a temporary suspension of the social structure, or rather it makes a little disturbance in which the particular structuring of the society becomes less relevant than another. But the strength of the attack is entirely restricted by the consensus on which it depends for recognition" (Douglas 1999: 158). Tomczuk-Wasilewska labels this type of humor aggressive, but despite its negative context she does not perceive it unequivocally. In many cases humor is used to raise one's self-esteem by humiliating others and as such has often been used as a tool of manipulation and a manner of expressing views and ideas such as racism, sexism, nationalism, atheism, etc.; thus, it may be regarded as egocentric or anti-social. On the other hand, the aggressive approach is used to stigmatize improper behavior, bad attitudes, inefficient rules and regulations and, therefore, it may have a very positive impact on society (Tomczuk-Wasilewska 2009: 43-46). In fact, in ethnic jokes it is not the particular group that is ridiculed or attacked, but some familiar yet criticized, incongruous values, such as greed, sloth, stubbornness or backwardness, which are frequently associated with this group in a stereotyped way.

The main incongruities observable in Turkish jokes violating the commonly accepted cultural standards that shape the national identity are religious illiteracy, sexual attitude and language. The former is applicable for Muslim groups of Turkic origin, namely the Karapapaks and Yörüks (Kılınç 2010: 58-60), whereas the second aspect mostly applies to the members of the non-Muslim communities. The cultural groups to be ridiculed are expected to speak a dialect or at least use some dialect expressions. The most striking example are the Laz jokes, but linguistic bullying may also be observed in jokes about other groups, even those not analyzed here, as some Avshar and Gypsy jokes. Apart from the above issues, almost each group is regarded as somehow backward and slow-witted. Interestingly, except for the Caucasians depicted as rustlers, no group is stigmatized with thievery.

The level of offence also varies between particular ethnic groups. Subgroups that did not manage to coin their identities at the decline of the Ottoman Empire (such as the Avshars or Chepnis<sup>43</sup>) and which constituted the core of the modern Turkish nation hardly ever become the butt of any jokes. The groups of Turkic origin that differ from the common Turkish culture in some cultural or religious aspects, such as the Karapapaks, Yörüks or Abdals, are the object of minor ridicule. The same is applicable for the groups that easily succumbed to assimilation, e.g. the Caucasian peoples, Pomaks, Hemshins or the Laz. Moreover, the archetypal

<sup>43</sup> Both groups were regarded as separate ethnic groups by Ahmet Caferoğlu in the 1940s.

Laz – Temel – became the self-stereotype of the Turk in many cases (see 3.1.). Not surprisingly, the most offensive jokes are those about the groups who due to different reasons had problems with assimilation, i.e. the Greeks, Jews, Armenians, and Kurds. Interestingly, there are almost no jokes about Romany, even though they clearly constitute a separate group. Although the inter-ethnic jokes may serve as a safety valve, it is important to stress that the number of highly offensive jokes is very limited, which is partially the result of the disappearance of the target groups. On the other hand, the constantly strained social situation in east Turkey and the assassination of the Turkish reporter of Armenian origin, Hrant Dink, in 2007 prove that some ethnic problems are too serious to be laughed at.

## Bibliography

- Akalın, Şükrü Halûk (ed.). 2010. *Türkçe Sözlük*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- And, Metin. 2001. Karagöz: *İslam Ansiklopedisi, cilt 24*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 401-403.
- Artun, Erman. 2006. *Çukurova Halk Kültüründe Yerel Fıkra Tipi: Abdal Fıkraları*. [http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/HALKBILIM/erman\\_artun\\_cukurova\\_fikra.pdf](http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/HALKBILIM/erman_artun_cukurova_fikra.pdf).
- Barth, Fredrik (ed.). 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Başgöz, İlhan. 1998. More about Politics and Folklore in Turkey, *The Journal of American Folklore*, vol.111, no. 442 (1998), 413–415.
- Başgöz, İlhan. 2011. Türkiye’de Folklor Çalışmaları ve Milliyetçilik, *Turkish Studies vol.6/3* (2011), 1535–1547.
- Bellér-Hann, Ildikó, Chris Hahn. 2003. *İki Buçuk Yaprak Çay. Doğu Karadenizde Devlet, Piyasa, Kimlik*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Bezmez, Serap, C.H. Brown. 1999. *Redhouse Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük*. İstanbul: SEV Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık.
- Boratav, Perteve Naili. 1996. Karagöz: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, new edition*. Leiden: Brill, 601-603.
- Boyras, Şeref. 2010. Nasreddin Hoca Fıkralarına Göre Türk Kimliğini Oluşturan Temel Nitelikler, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* 3 (2010), 81–88.
- Davies, Christie. 2008. Undertaking the comparative study of humor: Victor Raskin (ed.). *The Primer of Humor Research*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 157-182.
- Douglas, Mary. 1999. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Ercilasun, Ahmet B. 1983. *Karş İli Ağızları*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Hann, Chris. 2003. *History and Ethnicity in Anatolia*. Halle: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
- Holland, Norman N. 1982. *A Psychology of Humour*. London: Cornell University Press.
- İpşirli, Mehmet. 2002. Kayseri: *İslam Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 25*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 96–101.
- Karahan, Leyla (ed.) 2000. *Örnekleriyle Türkçe Sözlük*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Kasperski, Edward (ed.). 1983. *Bachtin. Dialog, język, literatura*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kılınç, Nurdan. 2010. *Antalya Yöresi Yörük Fıkraları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Isparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, <http://eprints.sdu.edu.tr/773/1/TS00837.pdf>.

- Korkmaz, Zeynep. 2008. Türkiye Türkçesi Ağızlarında Dil Özellikleri – Etnik Yapı Bağlantısı ve Beklentilerimiz, *Türk Dili* 679 (2008), 3–10.
- Kozłowska, Maria. 2009. *Słownik turecko-polski*. Warszawa: eMKa.
- Lewis, Bernard. 1972. *Narodziny nowoczesnej Turcji*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Lewis, M. Paul (ed). 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Matuszek, Ewa. 2007. *Narody Północnego Kaukazu. Historia – kultura – konflikty 1985–1991*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Mustafayev, E. M.-E., L.N. Starostov (ed.). 1977. *Turecko-Russkij Slovar'*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Russkij jazyk.
- Mutlu, Mustafa. 2002. *Karagöz Sanatı ve Sanatçıları*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Soanes, Catherine, Angus Stevenson (ed.). 2006. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: University Press.
- Neroznak, V.P. (ed). 2002. *Gosudarstvennye i titul'nye jazyki Rossii: énciklopedičeskij slovar'-spravočnik*. Moskva: Academia.
- Ortaylı, İlber. 2010. *Ottoman Studies*. Istanbul: Bilgi University Press.
- Özkan, Mustafa, Muhammet Yelten. 2006. *Türkçe'nin Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Babiali Kültür Yayıncılığı.
- Read, Allen Walker (ed.). 1999. *The New International Webster's Comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language*. Naples: Trident Press International.
- Stachowski, Marek. 2009. *Gramatyka języka tureckiego w zarysie*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Tanrıbuyurdu, Erol. 2007. Temel Fıkralarında Sosyal Eleştiri, *Milli Folklor* 75 (2007), 104–107.
- Tomczuk-Wasilewska, Jolanta. 2009. *Psychologia humoru*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Türkoğlu, İsmail. 2001. Karapapaklar: *İslam Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 24*. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 470.



GULAYHAN AQTAY

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## Adjectives in Modern Kazakh

The aim of the present article is to show how some types of adjectives are used in modern Kazakh. The article presents the state of research in this field. An attempt was made to demonstrate differences between spoken and normative forms.

### 1. State of research

In contrast to the noun and the verb, the adjective in Turkic languages is not regarded as an interesting and difficult class of words and does not attract much interest on the side of Turkologists.

Regarding Kazakh, there are some studies on the Kazakh adjective, but they examine standard language and do not discuss the language used in everyday natural situations. In fact there is only one printed book devoted to adjectives – Şakenov (1961) – but there are also a few unpublished dissertations, including Aqközov (2006), Esmatova (2005), Kulmamyrova (2010), Mamayeva (1999) and Sarbalayev (1993). Naturally, many grammars and language studies of a more general scope include chapters on adjectives: Balaqayev (1954), Isqaqov (1961), Musabayev (1951), Tölewov (1975), Orazbayeva (1988) and Janpeyisov (2002).

### 2. Some parallels between Kazakh and other Turkic languages

It seems that Kazakh is not very different from other Turkic languages as far as the use of adjectives is concerned and it goes in line with them. Within Turkic languages, Kazakh is similar to those that are strongly affected by Russian as a dominant language. In this respect, Kazakh differs from Turkish as affected by West European languages and the Turkic languages of Iran and China,

which are influenced by Persian and Chinese, respectively. For example, in many works in which Kazakh and other Turkic languages influenced by Russian borrow Russian words along with adjectival suffixes, Turkish borrows the same from Western Europe, e.g. Turkish *Amerikan* ‘American’, *biyolojik* ‘biological’, Kazakh *американский, биологический*, although the standard languages have forms with genuine suffixes, i.e. Tur. *Amerikalı*, Kaz. *америкалық* and Kazakh *биологиялық*.

There are many examples like these and we may say that Turkic languages use many foreign suffixes that form adjectives from nouns, often together with the nouns as their bases, e.g. Kazakh *розовый* ‘pink’ (← Russian; the Russian word is derived from *роза*, ‘rose’). It may be caused by the fact that Turkic languages use productively rather a low number of suffixes forming adjectives from nominals, e.g. eight suffixes according to Isqaqov (1991: 172–176), of which only two (+LI and +LIQ) are general; all others have specific meanings and, therefore, are limited in use. Moreover, +LIQ is not a specifically adjectival suffix, for it also forms nouns. Isqaqov also provides a list of seven non-productive suffixes, of which only one, -IL, as in *қызыл* ‘red’, is genuine Turkic, although it is a deverbal, not denominal suffix; the remaining six are Persian and one is Arabic. A similar conclusion may be drawn from Janpeyisov (2002: 462).

As is well known, this is a feature common to all Turkic languages that have the same words for nouns and adjectives used for the material of which something is made, e.g. Kazakh *темір* ‘iron; made of iron’, *ағаш* ‘wood; wooden, made of wood’, see such Tur. phrases as *mermer saray* ‘a palace built from marble’, *kerpiç duvar* ‘brick wall’, *ipek entari* ‘silk dress’, *tahta sandık* ‘wooden box’, *lastik top* ‘rubber ball’, *taş köprü* ‘stone bridge’, *keten gömlek* ‘linen shirts’ (Gencan 1966: 110).

### 3. The scope of Kazakh–Russian contacts

There are a few recent studies on Russian-Kazakh language contacts and the impact of Russian on Modern Spoken Kazakh, e.g. Auer and Muhammedova (2005), Muhammedova (2006) on code-mixing and a more general article by Jankowski (2012) that also presents a historical background of Russian-Kazakh code-mixing and copying.

Before having contact with Russian, the Kazakhs borrowed words, suffixes and structures from Persian and Arabic, but not directly, since the transmission of Arabo-Persian words went through Uzbek and Tatar. For example, there are many adjectives in Kazakh borrowed from Arabic that are derived with the suffix *-iy*, e.g. *кәсіби* ‘vocational, specialist’. Most of these adjectives are borrowed together with the suffix. However, the suffix *-iy* was adapted to Kazakh and forms a few

adjectives from genuine words, e.g. *қазақы* (also pronounced [*қазағи*]) ‘Kazakh; in Kazakh style’ and *түркі* ‘Turkic’.

The third important contact language, Oirad, being a Western Mongol language, has not influenced Kazakh structures because of its Altaic character, i.e. similar to Turkic. Oirad borrowings in Kazakhs are basically lexical. With regard to morphology, it is likely that the suffix *+май* is of Oirad origin, but it forms diminutive nouns in Kazakh, e.g. *шешетамай* ‘mom’ ← *шеше* ‘mother’ + *май*.

Jankowski (2012: 26) has claimed that Russian loanwords are used in almost all spheres of life in modern Kazakhstan. He added that “there also exists a high standard variety of Kazakh, free of code-mixing and code-switching, but in most cases it functions in strictly limited situations”. To this I would add that there are some programs on various TV channels, e.g. *Біз* on Khabar TV and *Айтұға оңай* on Kazakhstan TV, which invite people of all professions, ages and social statuses and initiate debates on multiple social problems to demonstrate that modern spoken Kazakh may be free of Russian structural borrowings and may function as a fully-fledged means of communication.

As far as adjectives are concerned, most Russian words and suffixes are found among qualifying adjectives, especially relating to fashion, new technology and the world that the Kazakhs have come to know through Russian. Some basic qualities are expressed by genuine Kazakh adjectives; e.g. *жаман* ‘evil, bad, wrong’, *ашық* ‘light’, *көк* ‘blue; green’ *анық* ‘clear’, *суық* ‘cold’, *үлкен* ‘big, great’, *кең* ‘broad, vast’. However, for many qualities that may appear basic, Russian adjectives are used, e.g. *свежий* ‘fresh’, *серьёзный* ‘solemn, earnest’, including non-basic color terms for which Kazakh has its own words, but which are borrowed from fashion, *бежевый* ‘beige’, cf. Kaz. *ақшыл сары* or *сарғыш* ‘id’. In relation to such loanwords as *свежий* and *серьёзный* it may be presumed that Kazakhs probably use them thinking that they are simpler and more exact than the Kazakh equivalents. In fact, the Kazakhs use different adjectives with different nouns for what the Russians only use *свежий* and *серьёзный*, e.g.

(1) *свежий*: Kaz. *жас ет*, Rus. *свежое мясо* ‘fresh meat’, Kaz. *таза ауа*, Rus. *свежий воздух* ‘fresh air’, Kaz. *жаңа түскен жеміс*, Rus. *свежие фрукты* ‘fresh fruit(s)’;

(2) *серьёзный*: Kaz. *байсалды мінез*, Rus. *серьёзный характер* ‘solemn character; earnest character’, Kaz. *салмақты ой*, Rus. *серьёзная идея* ‘serious thought’, Kaz. *байсалды/байыпты/салмақты адам*, Rus. *серьёзный человек* ‘earnest man’.

It is noteworthy that Kazakh uses Russian adjectives for those qualities for which Turkish and Uzbek use Arabic or Persian loanwords, e.g. Kaz. *вкусный* ‘tasty’, cf. Tur. *lezzetli*, Uz. *lazzatli*, *mazali*, see the Kaz. equivalent *дәмді* (Kaz. ← Ar. *дәм* ‘taste’ + Kaz. suffix +LI); *чистый* ‘pure’, cf. Tur. *halis*, *saf*, Uz. *sof*, see Kaz. *таза*.

Jankowski (2012: 36) has indicated four semantic fields in which the Kazakhs do not use their own adjectives, but Russian loanwords: (1) adjectives derived from the names of countries, states and nations, e.g. *германский* ‘German’ *китайский* ‘Chinese’ *российский* ‘Russian’; (2) adjectives derived from town and city names, e.g. *актауский* ‘of/from Aqtaw’, *алматинский* ‘of/from Almaty’; (3) adjectives denoting qualities and characteristics of products and goods, e.g. *детский* (*киімдер*) ‘children’s dresses’, *женский* (*жемпірлер*) ‘women’s jumpers’; and (4) adjectives denoting material, fabric etc., e.g. *кожаный* ‘made from leather’.

As it is seen from the examples above, Kazakh uses Russian adjectival suffixes even with Kazakh words, e.g. *актауский* ← Kaz. *Ақтау* (the name of the city Aktau/Aqtaw), see also an Old Russian loanword *ауылный* ‘of village; rural’ ← Kaz. *ауыл* ‘village’ + Rus. suffix + *ный*.

In the case of Russian words, low register spoken Kazakh does not use Kazakh suffixes at all. As a result, full copies from Russian are used, e.g. *минеральный* (*су*) ‘mineral (water)’ *электронный* ‘electronic’, although standard Kazakh recommends the use of Kazakh suffixes, i.e. *минералды*, *электронды*. The model of borrowing is identical to older borrowing from Arabic, which adopted words along with suffixes; see *кәсіби* ‘vocational, specialist’, above. Consequently, we mostly hear full Russian forms, whereas in dictionaries and normative texts we see the forms derived with Kazakh suffixes.

#### 4. Semantic groups of Kazakh adjectives

Kazakh adjectives may be subdivided into a few groups: those expressing quality, e.g. *жас* ‘young’, quantify, e.g. *санаулы* ‘multiple’ and those that show the place or time, e.g. *үйдегі* ‘(being) at home, in the house’ and *бүгінгі* ‘today’s’.

Traditional Kazakh grammars subdivide adjectives into two groups, characterizing or qualifying (*сапалық*), and relative (*қатыстық*), which are normally derived from other word classes and retain the semantic features of the words from which they are derived; see Isqaqov (1991: 168), Janpeyisov (2002: 461).

Isqaqov (1991: 167) exemplified the group of Kazakh words which are used as both nouns and adjectives with the word *қамыс* ‘reed’, which may be used as a noun, e.g. *қалың қамыс* ‘thick reed’, and as an adjective, e.g. *қамыс қора* ‘reed fence’. He also demonstrated that not only nouns may be used as adjectives, but adjectives may be used as nouns likewise, e.g. *үлкенге үлкенше, кішіге кішіше қызмет ет* ‘serve the great with what is great, serve the small with what is small’.

A slightly different classification of adjectives is found in the works of the first Kazakh grammarian and the founder of Kazakh linguistics, Baytursınılı. In his morphology, written in 1915 and reprinted in Cyrillic script in 2003, Baytursınılı

groups Kazakh adjectives into two classes. In one there are adjectives that express the quality pertaining to their origin, in the other there are adjectives that express an inner or outer quality, shape, form, color, style, state and mode (1915: 217). The former group contains the adjectives of the type discussed above, Baytursınulı's examples being the following: *ағаш аяқ* 'wooden leg', *күміс қасық* 'silver spoon', *алтын жүзік* 'golden ring', *қағаз ақша* 'banknote, lit. paper money', *жез құман* 'brass pitcher', *киіз қалпақ* 'felt headgear', *мақта жіп* 'cotton thread' and *қайыс жүген* 'bridle made of leather strip'.

It must be noted that occasionally some nouns other than those designating material or substance may also be used in a similar way. For example, the noun 'child' is used as an adjective meaning 'young' as in *бала бүркіт* 'young eagle' where *бүркіт* means 'eagle'; *бала қаз* 'young goose', where *қаз* means 'goose'.

Many attributive phrases of this kind have become compounds, either old, e.g. *кемпірқосақ* 'rainbow' ← *кемпір* 'old women' + *қосақ* 'one of a pair', or new, e.g. *балабақша* 'kindergarten' ← *бала* 'child' + *бақша* 'garden'. This formation model served for creating many terms, e.g. Baytursınulı's term for a 'grammar' *тіл-құрал* ← *тіл* 'language' + *құрал* 'tool'.

It is evident that qualifying adjectives may be subdivided into many further groups. In the following, I will present two semantic groups of Kazakh adjectives, one of those which designate colors, the other of those denoting the material of which something is made.

#### 4.1. Adjectives that denote colors

Firstly, it should be stressed that at least the words for basic colors may be used as both nouns and adjectives, e.g. *ақ* 'white' (adjective) and 'something white' (noun). Secondly, Kazakh color terminology must be assessed as rich. Kazakh has its own words for both a generic term *түс* 'color' and a restricted one *өң* 'tinge, pigmentation' and many specific colors, basic and mixed. However, many terms for mixed colors have a restricted use, mostly for animals, more specifically for cattle and horses or only horses. While basic colors, such as *ақ* 'white', *қара* 'black', *қызыл* 'red', *сары* 'yellow', *көк* 'blue; green', *қоңыр* 'brown', *жасыл* 'green' are Kazakh, more specific colors, e.g. 'violet', or 'pink' are borrowed from Russian, i.e. *фиолетовый* and *розовый*. It must be stressed that Kazakh does possess its own terms for these colors, i.e. *күлгін* and *қызғылт*, respectively. The spread of these Russian loanwords is related to fashion.

Among restricted color terms there are such as *бурыл* 'roan' or *тарғыл* 'patchy; mottle; dapple' Musabayev (1951: 7–8). Some non-basic color terms are formed with the addition of words that denote intensity or its lack, e.g. *ал* (not used alone). Unfortunately, different sources provide different meanings

of some terms containing *ал*, e.g. Januzaqov (1999: 29) says that *ал* used before a basic color term expresses its light variety, whereas Isqaqov (2006:309) claims that the word *ал* refers to the intensity of a color. Accordingly, *ал қара* is explained in Januzaqov's dictionary as 'all black; intensive black', and not 'blackish'.

#### 4.2. Adjectives that denote material

The range of materials from which objects are produced is very wide. There are many kinds of raw and refined materials typical of traditional and old technology; see above at *темір* and *ағаш*. They include plant and animal fibers, metals, other minerals such as stone, sand, earth, plant structures such as wood, and organic materials of animal origin such as horn and bone. The materials of traditional technologies are either genuine Turkic words or old borrowings, whereas synthetic materials used in new technologies are mostly international words, in the case of Kazakh borrowed via Russian. In the following there are some examples.

##### 1. Plant fibers

*жібек* 'silken, silk'; it is used with *мата* 'fabric; cloth', *орамал* 'kerchief', *көйлек* 'dress', *жіп* 'thread'; figuratively with *жел* '(light) wind', *дауыс* '(nice) voice';

*мақта* 'cotton'; it is used with *көрпе* 'quilt (stuffed with cotton)', *көрпеші* 'pillow to sit on (stuffed with cotton)', *жастық* 'pillow (stuffed with cotton)'; interestingly, for socks, shirts and other types of clothing the Kazakh use *матадан жасалған* 'made from cotton', if sewn, *мақтадан тоқылған* 'made from cotton', if woven, but in most cases they use Rus. *х/б* (pronounced *хыбы*) ← *хлопок* 'cotton'.

##### 2. Animal fibers and skin

*былғары* 'fine leather'; it is used with *сөмке* 'bag', *қолған* 'glove(s)', *белбеу* 'belt', *кеудеше* 'mantle', *күрте* 'jacket', *етік* 'boot(s)';

*жүн* 'woollen, wool'; it is used with *шұлық* 'socks', *мата* 'fabric, cloth', *байпақ* 'thick socks', *арқан* 'rope'; note that instead of standard *шұлық* (← Rus. *чулок* ← Trk. *çulğaq*), they use another Rus. borrowing *носки*, pronounced *нәски*;

*тері* 'leather, hide; fur'; it is used with *қолған* 'glove(s)', *етік* 'boot(s)', *тон* 'coat', *шалбар* 'trousers';

*түбіт*; it is used with 'mohair', *шәлі* 'shawl, scarf', *орамал* 'kerchief'.

### 3. Metals

*алтын* ‘golden, gold’; it is used with *сағат* ‘watch’, *қасық* ‘spoon’, *жүзік* ‘ring’, *сақина* ‘wedding ring’, *алқа* ‘necklace’, *сырға* ‘earring’, *білезік* ‘bracelet’, *медаль* ‘medal’, *ақша* ‘coin’; figuratively with *той* ‘celebration of wedding anniversary’, *шааш* ‘hair’, *бесік* ‘cradle’;

*болат* ‘steel’; it is used with *қанжар*, *семсер* ‘sword’, *найза* ‘lance, pike’; *жез* ‘brass’; it is used with *құман* ‘pitcher’, *шылапшыын* ‘large bowl’; figuratively with *таңдай* ‘orator’, *телпек* ‘legendary helmet’;

*күміс* ‘silver’; it is used with the same as *алтын* ‘golden, gold’, i.e. *сағат*, *қасық*, *жүзік*, *сақина*, *алқа*, *сырға*, *білезік*, *медаль*, *ақша* and figuratively with *той*; in addition, with *күлкі* ‘laugh’ and *көмей* ‘having nice voice’;

*қаңылтыр* ‘tinplate’; it is used with *қалбыр* ‘sieve’, *пеиш* ‘stove’;

*қорғасын* ‘lead’; it is used with *оқ* ‘bullet’;

*мырыш* ‘zinc’; it is used with *үзеңгі* ‘stirrup’;

*мыс* ‘copper’; it is used with *қазан* ‘cauldron’, *шере* ‘nail’;

*темір* ‘iron’; it is used with *жол* ‘railway’, *күрек* ‘spade’, *қазық* ‘rod, bar’, *самы* ‘ladder’, *таяқ* ‘horseshoe’, *тор* ‘grating’, *есік* ‘door’, *шелек* ‘bucket’, *құрал* ‘tool’, *ілемек* ‘hook’, *ожау* ‘ladle’, *тарақ* ‘comb’, *шынжыр* ‘chain’.

### 4. Other minerals

*құм* ‘sand’; it is used with *кесек* ‘large brick of sand and other components employed in Kazakhstan for building’, *қорған* ‘fortress’; also: *боран* ‘storm’, *сағат* ‘clock’;

*қыш* ‘earthen; clay’; it is used with *құмыра* ‘pitcher’, *кесе* ‘cup’, *ыдыс* ‘container; pot’;

*тас* ‘stone’; it is used with *жол* ‘road’, *еден* ‘floor’, *көмір* ‘coal’, *көпір* ‘bridge’, *көше* ‘street’, *қайрақ* ‘whetstone’, *қамал* ‘fortress; castle’, *қорған* ‘heap’, *құдық* ‘well’, *үй* ‘house’.

### 5. Organic materials

*мүйіз* ‘horn’; it is used with *көзілдірік* ‘glasses’, *садақ* ‘bow’;

*сүйек* ‘horn’; it is used with *тарақ* ‘comb’.

### 6. Plant structures

*ағаш* ‘wooden’; it is used with *есік* ‘door’, *орындық* ‘stool; chair’, *сандық* ‘box’, *тарақ* ‘comb’, *терезе* ‘window’, *күрек* ‘shovel’, *үй* ‘house’, *ескек* ‘oar’, *бесік* ‘cradle’, *соқа* ‘plough’, *табақ* ‘plate’, *төсек* ‘bed’, *самы* ‘ladder’, *көпір* ‘bridge’, *қасық* ‘spoon’;

*тақтай* ‘board’; it is used with *еден* ‘floor’, *үстел* ‘table’.

## Abbreviations

- Kaz. – Kazakh  
 Trk. – Turkic  
 Tur. – Turkish  
 Rus. – Russian  
 Uz. – Uzbek

## Bibliography

- Aqkózov 2006 = Аккөзов, Әбдіжәлел. 2006. *Сапалық сын есімдердің семантикасы және жүйесі*: филология кандидаты ғылыми дәрежесін алу үшін жазылған ғылыми еңбек [unpublished doctoral thesis; available at: The National Library of Kazakhstan in Almaty].
- Auer and Muhammedova 2005 = Auer, Peter, Raihan Muhammedova. 2005. 'Embedded language' and 'matrix language' in insertional language mixing: Some problematic cases. *Rivista di linguistica* 17,1, 35-54.
- Balaqayev, Isqarov 1954 = Балақаев, М., А. Исқақов (eds). 1954. *Қазіргі қазақ тілі. Лексика, фонетика, грамматика*. Алматы: Қазақ ССР Ғылым академиясының баспасы.
- Baytursinov, A. 1915. *Til-qural. Qazaq tiliniñ sarfi. 2-nşı jıldıq*. Orınbor [reprinted in Құл Мұхаммед, М, Әнес, F (et al. eds). Байтұрсынұлы, Ахмет. 2003. *Бес томдық шығармалар жинағы*. Алматы: Алаш Мұрасы].
- Gencan, Tahir Nejat. 1966. *Dilbilgisi*. Istanbul: Ahmet Sait Basimevi.
- Esmatova 2005 = Есматова, Меңдікыз. 2005. *Есім негізді туынды сын есімнің сөзжасамдық жүйесі*: филология кандидаты ғылыми дәрежесін алу үшін жазылған ғылыми еңбек [unpublished doctoral thesis; available at: The National Library of Kazakhstan in Almaty].
- Isqarov 1991 = Ысқақов, Ахмеди. 1991. *Қазіргі қазақ тілі. Морфология. Толықтырылып, өңделген екінші басылымы*. Алматы: Ана Тілі.
- Ысқақов, Ахмеди, Нұргелді Уәли (eds). 2006–2011. *Қазақ әдеби тілінің сөздігі. Он бес томдық. I том А–А (2006), II том А–Б (2006), III том Б–Б (2006), IV том Б–Д (2007), V том Д–Ж (2007), VI том Ж–Ж (2007), VII том Ж–К (2007), VIII том К–Қ (2007), IX том Қ–Қ (2008), X том Қ–М (2009), XI том М–О (2009), XII том О–С (2010), XIII том С–Т (2010), XIV том Т–Ұ (2011), XV том Ұ–Я (2011)*. Алматы: Арыс (vol. I–XI), Қазақ энциклопедиясы (vol. XII–XV).
- Japreyisov = Жанпейісов, Ербол (ed.). 2002. *Қазақ грамматикасы. Фонетика, сөзжасам, морфология, синтаксис*. Астана: Қазақстан Республикасы Білім және Ғылым Министрлігі, Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл Білімі Институты.
- Jankowski 2012 = Jankowski, Henryk. 2012. Kazakh in contact with Russian in modern Kazakhstan, *Turkic Languages* 16 (2012), 25–67.
- Kulmatyugova 2010 = Кулмамырова, Жадыра. 2010. *Араб және қазақ тілдеріндегі сапалық сын есімдердің типологиясы*: филология кандидаты ғылыми дәрежесін алу үшін жазылған ғылыми еңбек [unpublished doctoral thesis; available at: The National Library of Kazakhstan in Almaty].
- Мамаева 1999 = Мамаева, Г. 1999. *Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі күрделі сын есімдер*: филология кандидаты ғылыми дәрежесін алу үшін жазылған ғылыми еңбек [unpublished doctoral thesis; available at: The National Library of Kazakhstan in Almaty].
- Muhammedova 2006 = Muhammedova, Raihan. 2006. *Untersuchung zum kasachisch-russischen Code-mixing (mit Ausblicken auf den uigurisch-russischen Sprachkontakt)*. München: Lincom.

- Musabayev 1951 = Мұсабаев, Ғ. 1951. *Қазақ тіліндегі сын есімнің шырайлары*. Алматы: Қазақ ССР академиясының баспасы.
- Sarbalayev 1993 = Сарбалаев, Ж. 1993. *Қазақ тіліндегі конверсия мен адъективация*: филология кандидаты ғылыми дәрежесін алу үшін жазылған ғылыми еңбек [unpublished doctoral thesis; available at: The National Library of Kazakhstan in Almaty].
- Şakenov 1961 = Шакенов, Ж. 1961. *Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі сын есім категориясы*. Алматы: Қазақ мемлекеттік оқу-педагогика баспасы.
- Tölewov 1975 = Төлеуов, Ә. 1975. *Қазақ тілінде зат есім мен сын есім тудыратын жұрнақтар*. Алматы.
- Tomanov 1988 = Томанов, М. 1988. *Қазақ тілінің тарихи грамматикасы*. Алматы: Мектеп.
- Orazbayeva 1988 = Оразбаева, Ф. 1988. *Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі сын есім синонимдер*. Алматы: Мектеп.



ANDRZEJ DROZD

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## Tatar Inscriptions from the Eighteenth Century in Belarus

Although the western part of the contemporary Republic of Belarus comprises the area of the early settlement of the Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, few remnants of this settlement survive today. Most of the Tatar population in Belarus (which is the largest one among the Tatars of the historical Grand Duchy of Lithuania) now inhabits places settled at a later time from the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or new settlements from the Soviet period.

During three expeditions (1998, 1999, 2001) we explored the existing sites and studied the present situation of the Tatar population and its cemeteries, which are the main source of Tatar epigraphy. There are twenty-nine cemeteries in which inscriptions have been found (Dowbuciszki [Доўбучкі], Sielec I [Сялец I], Zabłocie [Забалацьце], Nowogródek [Навагрудак], Łowczyce [Лоўчыцы], Iwie [Іўе], Korelicze [Карэлчы], Maluszyce-Dołhinów [Малюшычы-Даўгінава], Horodyszczce [Гарадицца], Osmołowo [Асмолава], Orda [Арда], Lachowicze [Ляхавічы], Nowa Mysz [Новая Мыш], Mir [Мір], Olkiewicze, Kopyl [Капыль], Uzda [Узда], Śmiłowicze [Сміловічы], Karolin, Ambrosowicze (or Ambroziewiczze) [Амбросавічы], Dokszyce [Докшыцы], Widze [Відзы], Miadzioł [Мядзэл], Słonim [Слонім], Niekraszuńce I [Някрашунцы I], Niekraszuńce II [Някрашунцы II], Skidel [Скідаль], Sandykowszczyzna [Сандыкоўшчына]) (Drozd 2009).

Our exploration covered not only the Tatar sites within Polish borders from before 1945 but also the area that had been annexed by the Soviet Union in 1921 (and since 1795 had continuously been outside the borders of the Polish state, under Russian or Soviet rule, which is a significant factor for the local culture of the local Tatar communities), with such Tatar settlements as Minsk (Мінск), Śmiłowicze, Uzda, and Kopyl (Drozd et. al. 1999: 70–73).

## 1. Cemeteries

The records of the Polish Muftiat from Vilnius (Wilno) of 1939 reported twenty-two active and twenty-seven non-active cemeteries within Polish territory that is now part of Belarus (KM 1939: 62–69).

The largest concentration of Tatar burial places in contemporary Belarus is the area of the Dowbuciszki congregation (Pol. *dżemiat*) near Oszmiana, known for its important mosque from the eighteenth century and the place of residence of Derwisz Czelebi Hadži Murzicz, ‘the *cadi* of all the Tatars of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania’ in the second half of the sixteenth century (Zakrzewski 1989: 145). This area comprised eighteen cemeteries (only two were reported to be active in 1939: Dowbuciszki and Łostaje). It was one of the largest concentrations of *mizars* ‘cemeteries’ in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, comparable to that in the Rejże (Raižiai) area near Olita (Alytus) in Lithuania with fourteen known cemeteries, and to that in the Sorok Tatary (Tat. name Kyrk, see Jankowski 2008) congregation along the Waka (Vokė) River with nine cemeteries reported in 1939 (Drozd 2013). Like in Rejże, the Dowbuciszki area comprised many individual manorial farms spread between Oszmiana, Krewo, Mołodeczno and Smorgonie, along the historical track from Vilnius to Minsk.

We discovered that two cemeteries in Dowbuciszki and Łostaje are still active, as they were before 1939. In contrast to the Rejże congregation, in which the local tradition remembers almost all of the ancient burial places and thanks to a vivid Tatar community, most of the old *mizars* were lucky not to be destroyed by the communist “order”, only a few dozen of the non-active cemeteries located before 1939 in the surroundings of Dowbuciszki were not destroyed during or after World War II and were preserved in the local memory (Upper Kaskiewicz, Sielec I; the localization of a few other destroyed ones can still be established, e.g. Sielec II, Dzieraki, Polany, Kajacienięta I and II).

It is an important loss since we have no possibility of tracing back the development of the Tatar epigraphy in this area before the second half of the eighteenth century. The same concerns other smaller areas of early Tatar settlement such as in the Niekraszuńce congregation (only two late cemeteries are preserved in Niekraszuńce and one earlier was plowed after 1950 in Ułanowszczyzna).

Similar to some other existing Tatar settlements (as in Niemież near Vilnius), we find a remarkable lack of the early cemeteries kept in the memory of the local Tatar community in Łowczyce near Nowogródek, the famous pilgrimage center with the tomb of the holy Aulija Kontuś. The oldest grave inscriptions (and probably the oldest graves, too) in Łowczyce *mizar* are dated back to the mid-eighteenth century, which is much later than the origins of this Tatar settlement, reported in the sources since the sixteenth century and considered to be one of the oldest Tatar villages in the Nowogródek voivodeship.

In the case of several settlements it is not clear whether the cemeteries existing today were the only ones in each village since the beginning of its settlement. That is the case of Iwie, with a large Tatar town community since the second half of the sixteenth century, where two burial places from before the nineteenth century have been preserved, or in Osmołowo near the center of the Radziwills' Duchy of Kleck, with the Tatar community dating back to the beginning of the sixteenth century, in which one old cemetery from before the nineteenth century was leveled after World War II. The existing cemetery in Osmołowo was founded in the beginning of the nineteenth century or a little earlier, apparently after the older one, mentioned above, was full. Soon, before 1830, another cemetery in the neighboring village of Orda was founded.

Apart from that our exploration resulted in discovering more cemeteries than reported by the Polish Muftiat in 1939: two early cemeteries in Kajacienięta in the Dowbuciszki area (both were non-active and leveled after 1950) and one in the village of Dołhinów near Maluszyce (see below). Another one, not reported by the Muftiat, is a later cemetery from the nineteenth (or late eighteenth) century in Sandykowszczyzna near Grodno. This shows that the registry of cemeteries made by the Muftiat was incomplete, and that the oldest cemeteries could have been recorded only if they were preserved in the local memory (the same can be seen in the old Tatar settlement around Vilnius, where important gravestones have been discovered recently in places that had disappeared from the Tatars' memories in the twentieth century or before: Miedniki, Lit. Medininkai and Ponary, Lit. Paneriai).

We can say that the existence of old Tatar cemeteries depended on the existence of the Tatar community; once it disappeared, the graveyards usually disappeared too. This is exemplified by Józef Ułan's grave of 1757, "Lieutenant of His Royal Majesty" as it was inscribed, that we came across in Dołhinów near Maluszyce, a very old Tatar village owned by the Ułan-Maluszycki family in the Nowogródek voivodeship. This gravestone was used as the groundwork for a kennel and was literally excavated by our expedition (together with Henryk Jankowski) in 2001. Other gravestones from this cemetery were used to build walls in local farmers' houses.

On the other hand, the *mizars* in Belarus represent quite thoroughly the development of the sepulchral epigraphy in numerous Tatar communities that appeared in towns, mostly at the end of the eighteenth century or beginning of the nineteenth century, when the general migration of many Tatar groups inside the country took place. Except for the *mizar* in the capital city of Minsk, which was demolished in the 1960s (the same happened to the *mizars* in Vilnius and Kaunas), all of them exist today.

We should stress that most of the Tatar cemeteries in the present territory of Belarus belong to communities settled in towns, which is opposite to the situation

in contemporary Poland and Lithuania, where rural communities have been predominating until the twentieth century and founded most of the *mizars* in the surrounding countryside.

The oldest “urban” *mizar* is found in Mir, a town located near an impressive medieval castle. The Tatar community settled on Radziwill land in Mir was reported in the seventeenth century (Tyszkiewicz 1989: 268–270) and the *mizar* existing today was apparently founded at the same time. The oldest grave inscriptions we have found can probably be dated to the second half of the eighteenth century.

The next oldest cemetery is that in Nowogródek, the historical center of the voivodeship, though now a rather peripheral and small town with a great past. The beginning of the Tatar community in Nowogródek is unclear; some sources report the presence of an imam in Nowogródek in 1575 (Tyszkiewicz 1989: 287, 293), but most of archival evidence is from the last quarter of the eighteenth century when the local Tatars managed to obtain the king’s permission for building a mosque in 1792 and soon separated from the Łowczyce congregation. The oldest inscription in the Nowogródek *mizar* is dated 1774 and it probably indicates the approximate time of the founding of the *mizar* (Drozd et. al. 1999: 56).

All of the other “town” *mizars* bear inscriptions not older than the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Until 1830, dated grave inscriptions occurred in the following *mizars*: Iwie (from 1806 on), Karolin near the town of Dołhinów (from 1823 on), Miadziół (from 1826 on) and Lachowicze (from 1828 on).

From the next five decades of the nineteenth century, dated inscriptions exist in the *mizars* in: Słonim, Widze, Uzda, Śmiłowicze, Kopył, Nowa Mysz, Horodyszcze and Korelicze.

From the beginning of the twentieth century onwards, inscriptions appear in the following *mizars*: Dokszyce, Ambroziewiczze/Ambrosowicze near Głębokie, Olkiewiczze near Oszmiana and Skidel.

All of these places, in addition to the non-existing town *mizars* in Minsk, Kaunas and Vilnius, the Łukiszki district, as well as the existing *mizars* in Vilnius, Lipówka district, Święciany (Lit. Švenčionys) and Sołoki (Lit. Salakas), form a map of “urban” Tatar settlement, in which two groups can be distinguished: an older one dating back to the sixteenth–seventeenth centuries, but represented with inscriptions not earlier than from the eighteenth century, and a later one dated back to the period from the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to the middle of the nineteenth century, represented with inscriptions mostly from the nineteenth century.

Three of these cemeteries are located in territories that did not belong to the Polish state after 1795 (and which were part of Soviet Belarus after 1921): Śmiłowicze, Uzda and Kopył.

The “town” *mizars* in Belarus were usually located outside of town borders, sometimes several miles away from them. Only in a few cases the *mizars* were located closer to the center and in the course of time they have been incorporated by growing towns such as those in Nowogródek or Kopyl.

We can show one feature that distinguishes the sepulchral habits of Tatar communities settled in towns from those settled in the countryside. In contrast to the communities settled in villages, the town communities normally used only one burial place since their beginning until the present, even if a cemetery was located out of the borders of a town.

The reason for this was probably of an economic nature: while the inhabitants of towns, usually of a lower economical status such as tanners and gardeners, had to purchase land for their *mizar* (or obtain it as a donation) and faced some legal restrictions, the rural communities, which owned lands and traditionally enjoyed higher social status, had no such limitations.

It is significant that the same trend as in the case of rural Tatar communities occurred in the Ottoman territories where one community founded and used several separate burial places at the same time (Drozd 2010). This rather did not happen among the Tatar communities in the towns of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In some cases, Tatar “urban” communities did not found their own *mizars* for the first decades of their existence and used the cemeteries of a neighboring community, even if it was situated far away. The case of the Kleck community that came into existence in the second half of the eighteenth century and built its own mosque in 1881 (Bairašauskaitė 1996: 161) is particularly interesting, for they have never founded their own *mizar* and used the *mizar* in the neighboring village of Osmołowo.

## 2. Inscriptions

Although in this paper we describe only inscriptions dated directly or indirectly to the eighteenth century, we should clarify that the years 1850–1830 can be regarded as the main time frame distinguishing early Tatar grave inscriptions. There are several reasons for that.

The main reason is the deep changes undergone by the culture and society of the eastern territories of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. After 1820 we can observe the disappearance of old cultural patterns and trends, usually of the baroque provenance in the arts, which is known as “Old Polish culture”, in which the Polish-Lithuanian Tatars had participated for a few centuries. The decades after the Napoleon era and the November Uprising (1830–1831), with the implementation of modern social ideas and institutions, particularly in the sphere of education, changed many aspects of the local society.

One specific area of this process was the sepulchral customs and practices of the Christian environment of the Tatars, including gravestone epigraphy. We can say that since that period Tatar inscriptions have been patterned directly on the Christian neighborhood. One must remember that before the beginning of the nineteenth century the Christians in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not erect durable ground graves with inscriptions. Christian sepulchral epigraphy had existed in other forms such as tombs in churches, memorial plates or funeral portraits and banners. After the beginning of the nineteenth century it became visible permanently in outdoor spaces.

This also resulted in the emergence of professional handcrafting of grave-stones for Christians, which also influenced the appearance of the Tatar *mizars*.

Since that period we can see a remarkable growth of the number of Tatar graves with inscriptions in general. This can be seen in the cemeteries founded in the seventeenth–eighteenth century, both in rural and urban settlements, with inscriptions occurring since the eighteenth century. In some “town” cemeteries that had been founded at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the first inscriptions appear around the period between 1820 and 1840. Inscriptions also appear in new cemeteries that were founded in this period.

Within the category of early inscriptions we determined three subcategories: (1) the seventeenth century, (2) the eighteenth century, and (3) the first decades of the nineteenth century. Each of these has certain peculiar features and is represented in certain cemeteries.

The early inscriptions in Belarus, dated from 1757 to 1830, were discovered on fourteen out of the twenty-nine Tatar cemeteries in which we came across grave inscriptions.

Inscriptions from the period before 1830 were found in: Dowbuciszki, Łostaje, Nowogródek, Łowczyce, Zabłocie, Maluszyce-Dołhinów, Sielec I, Mir, Orda, Osmołowo, Lachowicze, Miadzioł, Niekraszuńce I and Karolin. Inscriptions from the eighteenth century are present only in the first six, with thirteen dated inscriptions in this group. Fifteen are undated, but they can be considered as dating from the eighteenth century or from the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

This figure is significant. It is much smaller than the number of early inscriptions in Lithuanian cemeteries (e.g. Rejże, Bazary, Niemież or Sorok Tatory) and remarkably incomparable to that in the Podlasie and Suwałki area (Lebiedziew, Studzianka, Bohoniki, Kruszyniany and Winksznupie). Although there are only fifteen cemeteries with early inscriptions in Poland and Lithuania, they make up approximately 88% of the total number of inscriptions from the period before 1830. The early epigraphic material from Belarus makes up only 12%. Moreover, there are no inscriptions older than the middle of the eighteenth century in Belarus at all. Even if we take into consideration that our exploration of the cemeteries in

Belarus was not that intensive as in Poland and Lithuania, it still seems that there were many fewer epigraphic monuments from the early period.

Still we should stress that on the other hand the cemeteries from Belarus, particularly those of urban communities, represent the most diverse and developed epigraphy in the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century among the Tatar settlements. It is mostly in the *mizars* of town communities at this time that particular patterns, both in text formulas and in the decoration, developed to distinguish certain *mizars* and to let us consider them as having peculiar “styles”. This phenomenon had not appeared before the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

As far as early inscriptions are considered, we cannot distinguish any peculiar styles that would distinguish the *mizars*, although some trends can be pointed out. We can determine some common features for this material that appears to be similar to those in *mizars* located in contemporary Poland and Lithuania. Below we will analyze inscriptions from the eighteenth century, found in six cemeteries in Belarus (Dowbuciszki, Łostaje, Nowogródek, Łowczyce, Zabłocie and Maluszyce-Dolhinów).

1. Decoration. Arrangement of the inscription. The gravestones in the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries were rarely decorated, usually by the calligraphic elaboration of the text (Drozd 2011: 275). In the Dowbuciszki *mizar* four gravestones were discovered on which the formula of *šahāda* (which forms the largest part of the inscriptions) was surrounded with a plain rectangular frame. One of them is dated 1763/1177, while the others are undated. This form of decoration was not continued in this cemetery in the next century and we can assume that all of the undated gravestones are not later than the eighteenth century.

In the gravestone mentioned above from 1763, the Muslim year date of 1177 is written vertically along the frame.<sup>1</sup>

On the grave of colonel Mustafa Achmatowicz (famous commander of the insurgent cavalry from the Kościuszko Insurgency, 1794) from 1795 in Łostaje, the inscription is divided on three sections placed in two gravestones: *šahāda* on the western surface of the western stone, the name on the eastern surface of the eastern stone, and the date on the western surface of the eastern stone.<sup>2</sup>

2. Alphabet. There are two trends observable in the Tatar inscriptions from the period discussed: exclusive using of the Arabic alphabet and an implementation of the Latin alphabet to render the descriptive part of the inscription. Both are represented in the graves from Belarus, but the former predominates.

<sup>1</sup> Such arrangements datable to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are known from other cemeteries, for example in Studzianka, in the Podlasie region of Poland.

<sup>2</sup> Dividing the inscription to the western stone with *šahāda* and eastern stone with information about the deceased was practiced regularly in the *mizar* of Winksznupie at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Drozd et. al. 1999: 81–82). It can be occasionally also found in other *mizars* such as Kruszyniany or Studzianka.

The Latin alphabet entered Tatar inscriptions on three levels. The first one was only the description of the date of death, while the rest of the inscription was rendered in Arabic script (Dowbuciszki 1763, Łostaje 1795, Nowogródek 1789). The second one was both the date and information about the deceased, while a pious formula such as *šahāda* was rendered in Arabic script (in the material analyzed it occurred only once: Nowogródek 1789). The third level was the exclusive use of the Latin alphabet – in this case the pious formula did not appear at all. It was significant not only due to the fact that the confession of such a grave was not marked in any way (the crescent appeared on the Tatar gravestone several decades later in the nineteenth century), but it should be considered as one of many evidences of an important process in the culture and social position of the Polish-Lithuanian Tatar community in the eighteenth century, which resulted in close integration with the noble class of Polish-Lithuanian society. In our material it is represented in two Nowogródek inscriptions: one from 1774 and the other on the undated grave of M. Lebieziowa, as well as in the aforementioned gravestone of Lt. Józef Ułan from Maluszyce-Dołhinów, 1757.

We should stress that in the discussed material the Arabic script still predominates in rendering information about the deceased, even if it is in Polish (as in Łostaje, 1795: *Muštafā Achmatowicz pułkownik* <..> ‘Colonel Mustafa Achmatowicz <..>’). Only in Nowogródek (three inscriptions), Łowczyce (one inscription) and Maluszyce (one inscription), Latin script was used to determine the deceased. A similar trend can be seen in some other *mizars*, as in Studzianka in Podlasie. By contrast, most of the dating in the inscriptions was rendered with Latin script (when the Christian calendar was used), usually with the use of the abbreviations adopted in the Polish writing custom. The beginning of the nineteenth century brought about a more frequent use of Latin script in describing the deceased rather than just in the dating.

3. Language. There were three languages in use in the early Tatar grave inscriptions from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: Arabic, Turkish and Polish. All of them were used – within a diverse scope – to render the informative part of the inscriptions (describing the deceased and the date of death), and the first two for the religious part (formula of the confession or prayer) (Drozd 2013).

In the case of the cemeteries in Belarus from the eighteenth century, we only encountered the Turkish language in a few inscriptions. One is in Dowbuciszki on Ziuhra’s undated grave: *Allāh bir* ‘God is one’. This formula occurred in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, though not frequently. Another one is found in Zabłocie on the gravestone of Aminia Tupalska from 1798: *Allāh rahmet* ‘God[’s] mercy’.

We should note that during the nineteenth century Turkish prayer formulas such as *Allāh riḍāsičün* ‘for God’s sake’ or *Allāh rahmet* ‘God[’s] mercy’ in several variants, became popular in many *mizars*. The frequency of the use of these

Turkish formulas distinguished the cemeteries in contemporary Belarus from the *mizars* in Poland or Lithuania.

In contrast to the low frequency of the Turkish texts, most of the discussed inscriptions contain the Arabic component that is *šahāda* (see below). Another example of the use of Arabic is an inscription from Nowogródek (1790/1791) in which the Arabic affiliation form *ibn* was used to determine the deceased and the Arabic word *sana'* 'year' was used to indicate the year of the death according to the Muslim calendar (1206). Both formulas were used in the Ottoman epigraphy as well.

Turkish influence is also evident in the use of the Arabic formula *marḥūm*, popular in Turkish grave epigraphy. There are two examples of its use in the discussed material, one in Dowbuciszki (undated grave of Ḥanifa), and the other in Mir (1795, but the reading of this inscription is uncertain).

The use of the Polish language can be identified at least when the form of the deceased's surname is Polish even if rendered in Arabic script (with a Muslim first name such as 'Ayšā Szamowicz in Dowbuciszki, 1763, sometimes a corrupted one such as Dawyt Janowicz in Nowogródek 1789 or 'Ayšā [which should be read *Ajsza*] Adamowa Jakubowska in Nowogródek, undated).

The Polish language occurred regularly in the dating of the death according to the Christian calendar, as mentioned above. In the Polish dating the Latin names of months were also used, e.g. *Juni 7 d* (Dowbuciszki, 1763) (June 7), rendered with the Latin alphabet.

4. Content of the inscription. In contrast to many inscriptions from the nineteenth century in Belarus with extended text forms, the early inscriptions from the eighteenth century were mostly quite simple. It consisted of two parts, the devotional and informative.

The devotional part of the inscriptions from Belarus in the eighteenth century was mainly in the format of confession, i.e. *šahāda (lā ilāha illā 'llāhu Muḥammad rasūlu 'llāhi)* 'There is no god but God, Muhammad is the messenger of God' and rarely the Turkish *Allāh bir* 'God is one'. More frequently the *šahāda* was the only text inscribed on a gravestone. Moreover, there is a group of undated gravestones from Dowbuciszki located in the early part of the cemetery, probably from the second half of the eighteenth century, with only *šahāda* inscribed. We can see the same in some other cemeteries, for instance in Kruszyniany or Bohoniki in Podlasie, or in Sielec I close to Dowbuciszki (in this case we cannot confirm the dating of the inscriptions, since we have only one dated gravestone from 1808, but it is likely that the undated inscriptions from this cemetery are from the second half of the eighteenth century, not later than the beginning of the next century).

We should stress that *šahāda* was the most frequent and important oriental component of the gravestones of the Polish-Lithuanian Tatars, almost absent in

Ottoman sepulchral epigraphy since the classical period (the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries). This fact indicates that the main patterns for the Polish-Lithuanian Tatar epigraphy should not be directly searched for in Ottoman imperial culture (the exceptions are only evidenced in a few cemeteries such as in Słonim [Drozd et. al. 1999: 68–69]).

In Dowbuciszki we found an exceptionally extended form of the *šahāda*: *lā ilāha illā 'llāhu Muḥammad rasūlu 'llāhi lā ilāha <i>llā 'llāhu wāḥdahu lā šarīka lahu* (1763) ‘There is no god but God, Muhammad is the messenger of God. There is no god but God, the only one and He has no companions’. This formula is additionally extended with the phrase *Allāh wāḥidan wa-ḥatta muslimūna 'alā* [*Ayšā Szamowicz*] with a corrupt form and, therefore, unclear meaning.

The informative part usually consisted of two components: the name of the deceased and the date of the death. In the eighteenth century it was regularly rendered in Polish, unless the Arabic or Turkish forms of the affiliation occurred (Ar. *ibn*, *bint* ‘son, daughter’ or Tur. *oğlı*, *qızı* ‘id’) which were in continuous use from the seventeenth to the twentieth century.

The name of the deceased, if it was given at all (see above), could consist of only the first name (as in Dowbuciszki: *Maryam*, 1791; *Hanifa*, undated; *Ziuhra*, undated). In one case it was rendered in regular Polish form composed of the name and surname but completed with the Arabic form with the patronymic, i.e. *Muṣṭafā ibn ?Alī Murz<icz>* ‘Mustafa, son of Ali Murz<icz>’ (Nowogródek, 1790/1791). In other inscriptions the Polish regular form of a name and surname was given, sometimes completed with a husband’s name, as *Ajsza Adamowa Jakubowska* ‘Ajsza, Adam Jakubowski’s wife’ and *M. Lebieżniowa* ‘M. Lebież’s wife’ (both from Nowogródek, undated). In two cases the military rank of the officer was provided: *Muṣṭafā Achmatowicz pułkownik* ‘Colonel Mustafa Achmatowicz’ <..> (Łostaje 1795), Jozef Ułan RJKM ‘Jozef Ułan, cavalry captain of His Royal Majesty’ (Maluszyce-Dołhinów 1757). The latter one is of particular interest since it represents the customary abbreviation typical of the Old Polish writing culture and is direct evidence of the cultural assimilation of the Tatar upper class to the local society. Similar inscriptions from the eighteenth century with abbreviations of military ranks are found in other *mizars* such as Kruszyniany, Rejże and Studzianka.

In two other inscriptions the name and the surname of the deceased person is given only in the Latin initials, which also follows Old Polish writing and epigraphic customs: SB (Nowogródek 1774) and MM (Nowogródek 1789).

The dating on the inscriptions in the discussed material is diversified. As mentioned above, about half of the inscriptions were dated with the date of the death (these are: Dowbuciszki 1763, 1791; Łostaje 1795; Łowczyce 1765; Nowogródek 1774, 1789, 1789, 1790/1791, 1795; Zabłocie 1798; Maluszyce-Dołhinów 1757; and Mir 1115/1776, 1795). Most of the dated inscriptions have the dates of the

Christian calendar. In two cases the Christian date is completed with the year in the Muslim calendar (Dowbuciszki 1673/1177, Mir 1795/1210), and two other inscriptions are dated only with the year of the Muslim calendar (Mir 1190 [1110?], Nowogródek 1206). Both of the latter ones are introduced with the Arabic word *sana'* (Tur. *sene*) 'year'. In the case of Christian dating, the Polish abbreviation *R* of the word *roku* 'in the year' and *M* of the word *miesiąca* 'in the month' may occur. Some of the inscriptions dated with the indication of the month and the day had the Latin names of the months or their abbreviation, e.g. 176<3> *Juni 7 d* '176<3>, June the 7th day' (Dowbuciszki), *R 1791 M maia 1 <d>* 'The year 1791 month May the 1st <day>' (Dowbuciszki), *1795 ma 5* '1795 Ma(y) the 5th' (Łostaje).

## Conclusions

The discussed inscriptions represent the same or similar form or content as the other Tatar inscriptions from the eighteenth century discovered in Poland and Lithuania. This confirms our previous conclusion that only after the second decade of the nineteenth century the sepulchral epigraphy of the Polish-Lithuanian Tatars developed and became frequent and more diverse. Another remarkable feature is that most of the inscriptions from the eighteenth century can be attributed to the higher class of Tatar society who were wealthy landowners and army officers, and therefore more assimilated to the Old Polish culture. This is interesting since the enduring Polish cemeteries and grave inscriptions came into being later, in the first decades of the nineteenth century, while Tatar inscriptions started appearing more regularly since the middle of the eighteenth century. We can assume that the Old Polish culture, also the sepulchral one, and the epigraphy that existed in other forms, visible for example in (or on) churches, in a way could have inspired the Tatars who implemented the local patterns in their *mizars*. In spite of this their own, Muslim forms were also practiced.

## Inscriptions

### Dowbuciszki

#### 1763 (1177)

[99x75x17]  
176<3>  
Juni 7 d(nia).

**Translation**  
1763  
June the 7th day

*lā ilāha illā ‘llāhu Muḥammad  
rasūlu ‘llāhi lā  
ilāha <i>llā ‘llāhu wāhda  
hu lā šarīka lahu  
Allāh wāḥidan wa-ḥatta  
muslimūna ‘alā  
‘Ayšā Szamowicz*  
[along the right edge of the inscription field, vertically]  
1177

There is no god but God, Muhammad  
is the messenger of God. There is no  
god but God the only  
one and He has no companions.  
God-only-and-until  
the-Muslims-for  
Ajsza Szamowicz

1177

**1791**

[86x77x22]  
*lā ilāha illā ‘llāhu  
Muḥammad rasūlu  
‘llāhi  
Maryam R[oku] 1791  
M[iesiāca] maia 1 <d>*

**Translation**

There is no god but God  
Muhammad is the messenger  
of God  
Marjam. The year 1791  
month May day 1st

**undated (2nd half of the eighteenth century)**

[82x57x11]  
*lā ilāha illā <'>llāhu  
Muḥammad rasū  
lu <'>llāhi*

There is no god but God  
Muhammad is the messenger  
of God

**Łostaje  
1795**

[100x73x27; the western stone]  
*lā ilāha  
illā <'>llāhu  
Muḥammad  
rasūlu  
‘llāhi*  
[119x64x19; the eastern stone]  
[the eastern side]  
*lā <..>  
Muṣṭafā  
Achmato  
wicz pulkow  
nik <..>*  
[the western side]  
1795  
ma 5

**Translation**

There is no god  
but God  
Muhammad  
is the messenger  
of God

<..>  
Mustafa  
Achmato-  
wicz Colonel

1795  
May the 5th

**Nowogródek****1774**

[69x62x28]  
1774  
S B

**Translation**  
1774  
S B

**undated (end of the eighteenth century)**

[75x90x22]  
*lā ilāha illā 'llāhu*  
*Muḥammad*  
*rasūlu 'llāhi*  
*Ajsza Adamowa Jakubowska*

**Translation**  
There is no god but God  
Muhammad  
is the messenger of God  
Ajsza Jakubowska Adam's wife

**Zabłocie****1798**

[72x73x21]  
*lā ilāha illā 'llāhu Muḥammad*  
*rasūlan Allāh. Allāh*  
*raḥmet 1798.*  
*Aminia T<u>palska*

**Translation**  
There is no god but God Muhammad  
is the messenger of God. God's  
mercy.  
Aminia Tupalska

**Maluszyce-Dolhinów****1757**

[100x56x31]  
Jozef  
Ułan  
R[otmistrz] J[ego] K[rólewskiej] M[ości]  
1757

**Translation**  
Józef  
Ułan  
Captain of His Royal Majesty  
1757

**Mir****1190 (1775/1776)**

[74x67x35]  
*lā ilāha illā <'>llāhu*  
*Muḥammad rasū*  
*lu <'>llāhi s[anat] 1190*  
*' d <.> ' r n '<....>*

**Translation**  
There is no god but God  
Muhammad is the messenger  
of God. The year 1190  
<....>

## 1795/1210

[A 16; 90x75x17]  
*lā ilāha illā*  
*'llāhu Muḥammad*  
*rasūlu 'llāhi*  
 1210  
*marḥum* <.>t l <> n  
 1795

**Translation**

There is no god but  
 God. Muhammad  
 is the messenger of God.  
 1210  
 the deceased <.....>  
 1795

## Abbreviations and symbols (in the inscription texts)

- <> – corrupt text  
 [ ] – editor's additions  
 Ar. – Arabic  
 Lit. – Lithuanian  
 Pol. – Polish  
 Tur. – Turkish

## Bibliography

- Bairašauskaitė, Tamara. 1996. *Lietuvos totoriai XIX amžiuje*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Drozd, Andrzej. 2009. The decade of exploration of the Polish-Lithuanian Tatars' epigraphy. Results and perspectives, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 62,1, 22–36.
- Drozd, Andrzej. 2010. Wiejskie cmentarze w południowej i środkowej Anatolii. Świat turecki w oczach badaczy: Ewa Siemieniec-Golaś, Jordanka Georgiewa-Okon (eds.). *Od Anatolii po Syberię*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ, 39–47.
- Drozd, Andrzej. 2011. Decoration in the culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Tatars: Preliminary study: Biedronska-Słota, Beata, Magdalena Ginter-Frolow, Jerzy Malinowski (eds.). *The art of Islamic world and artistic relationships between Poland and Islamic countries*. Kraków: Manggha, Polish Institute of World Art Studies, 271–282.
- Drozd, Andrzej. 2013. Inskrypcje tatarskie z XVII w. na terytorium Litwy: Tadeusz Majda (ed.). *Studia z dziejów i kultury ludów tureckich*. Warszawa: Dialog, 57–69.
- Drozd, Andrzej, Marek Dziekan, Tadeusz Majda. 1999. *Meczety i cmentarze Tatarów polsko-litewskich. Katalog Zabytków Tatarskich, t. 2*. Warszawa: Res Publica Multiethnica.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2008. The Tatar Name of Sorok Tatary/Keturiasdešimt Totorių Discovered: Tamara Bairašauskaite, Halina Kobeckaitė, Galina Miškinienė (eds). 2008. *Orientas Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos visuomenės tradicijoje: totoriai ir karaimai. Orient in the Social Tradition of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: Tatars and Karaims. Orient w tradycji społeczeństwa litewskiego: Tatarzy i Karaimi. Ориент в общественной традиции Великого княжества Литовского: татары и караймы*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla, 147–157.
- KM = 1939. *Kalendarz muzułmański*. Wilno: Muzułmański Związek Religijny w RP.
- Zakrzewski, Andrzej B. 1989. Osadnictwo tatarskie w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim – aspekty wyznaniowe, *Acta Baltico-Slavica*. 20, 137–153.

CEM ERDEM

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

# Turkish Folk Poet and Singer Âşık Merdanoğlu

*Âşık* literature is a genre of folk literature believed to have roots in oral poetry and Islamic culture, which exists among many Turkic peoples. This literature has been subject to substantial changes since the nineteenth century due to the changes in social life and the modernization of Turkey. However, it still has many features inherited from the old tradition. This article attempts to present the life, art and poems of Âşık Merdanoğlu, a folk poet and singer from the Sivas region whose original name is Musa Merdanoğlu. He was born and raised in the Alevi-Bektaşî tradition and combines elements of mysticism and popular images in his songs. He writes his poems in syllabic meter and sings them by playing a stringed instrument. Merdanoğlu is one of the most important representatives of the modern *âşık* literature for his intimate, unique and specific style.

## 1. Introduction

The literature of Turkish folk singers is an important part of our history of culture. It is a kind of literature created by wandering folk poets who may be compared to medieval European minstrels or bards. Turkish folk singers, called *âşık*, sing their songs, recite poems or tell popular stories accompanied by music (Sakaoğlu 1989: 105). As Lewis (1986: 697) shows, the term *âşık* is used of a class of wandering poet-minstrels, who sang and recited at public gatherings. It is claimed that Anatolian Turkish folk literature is closely related to the literary traditions, beliefs and philosophy of popular singers (Günay 1996: 101). In other words, their poetry and performance have served as a kind of mirror of Turkish culture, lifestyle, world view, pleasure and intimacy from the very beginning. Scholars argue that Turkish poems were initially recited or sung with the accompaniment of stringed

instruments played by the bards (Sakaoğlu 1989: 105). Due to the influence of Sufi movements and Islamic monastery literature in Anatolia, the literature of poets or *bakşı* developed in accordance with the rules of Islam (Günay 1999: 8). According to Oğuz (2007: 138), “*Âşık* literature is a kind of literature performed by folk singers who sing poems composed by themselves and other poets or tell popular stories and play stringed instruments”.

After Turkish culture had gained a new identity in its new homeland in Anatolia, the epic singers called *bakşı* were replaced with the bards singing lyric poems with an Islamic character. Therefore, Turkish literature of the pre-Islamic period went through a process of change to obtain the form as evidenced in the tradition of *âşık* literature. At first they followed the syllabic prosody of popular poets, but later were subjected to Persian influence, both directly and through the Persian-influenced Turkish Sufi poets (Lewis 1986: 697).

Some pre-Islamic practices have not disappeared and they continue to exist among the forms of the literature of Islamic religious orders. These practices show their influence mostly in Bektaşî literature. *Âşık* literature, raised in Anatolia, based on both Turkish poetry before the Islamic period and Bektaşî poetry, developed its unique form and content as evidenced in later poems. This new development brought to life a new type of artist (Artun 1996: 15-16). *Âşık* literature is composed of the works of poets who generally write their poems in syllabic meter and play a stringed instrument. It developed from the oral tradition to become an important branch of folk literature that reflects the feelings of modern society. The creators and performers of this literature, called “folk poets”, “poets who play a stringed instrument” or “bards”, with their skills and talent enjoy great popularity even today (Karahan 1991: 550).

*Âşık* literature exists in a vast geographical area, particularly in Rumelia (the European part of Turkey) and many other areas of the Balkans as well as in Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. The bards provide entertainment and tales about love, nature, heroism, bravery, etc. They play their stringed instruments and tell folk stories in various open public places, cafes and ceremonies such as those related to military services and weddings. There are some rules regulating the career of an *âşık*. Thus, a person who desires to be one must work as a disciple with a master. The master teaches his disciple how to play the stringed instrument, recite a poem, how to put on a performance, compete, transfer the techniques of the works of masters, and how to memorize poems and stories. The disciple follows his master and becomes familiar with other disciples and learns from their knowledge. A disciple who completes his apprenticeship with a master is given a pseudonym<sup>1</sup> that he can now use as an *âşık*. That means that his mastership was accepted and he may continue his job on his own (Artun 2001: 35-64).

<sup>1</sup> This is called *mahlas* in Turkish and corresponds to a pen name in literary tradition.

Since the sixteenth century, *âşık* literature has bred many important representatives such as Karacaoğlan, Âşık Ömer, Dertli, Dadaloğlu, Bayburtlu Zihnî, Âşık Seyranî, Erzurumlu Emrah, Âşık Şenlik, Âşık Ruhsatî, Âşık Veysel, Âşık Ali İzzet Özkan and Âşık Mahzunî Şerif. However, the tradition started to decline in the nineteenth century due to the socio-cultural changes in life and the world in which folk singers were raised and to disappear in the twentieth century. Due to the spread of mass communication and the development of industry, cultural differences between the rural and the urban population gradually began to disappear; young people are immigrating from villages to cities to find jobs, and even those living in the villages prefer urban culture. As a result, the social and individual demands for the art are changing. Folk literature is also influenced by social and cultural changes and the poets began to modify their art in order to adjust to new demands, often abandoning tradition and ideas. Consequently, folk poetry is in a stage of losing its most distinctive characteristics. The oral tradition of singing poems with the accompaniment of stringed instruments is being replaced with the written literature of folk poets. In spite of maintaining the tradition of playing stringed instruments and employing the syllabic meter and verse typical of *âşık* literature, folk singers use their original names and surnames instead of their pseudonyms. Some do not even use the term *âşık* and employ titles for their poems. Present-day changes include a change in the sources of inspiration and different expectations on the part of new types of people in the new environment, and all this affects folk poetry. They take on such topics as love, peace, unity, solidarity and friendly relationships. As global civilization entered closed environments, the bards who were once representatives of small communities started to adopt more universal ideas and reflect them in their songs. However, the break with the traditional social and natural environments brings many problems that have resulted in a break with the oral tradition of poetry and singing. A new generation of folk singers appeared who had not learned from a master, but composed poetry and music on their own (Artun 2001: 46, 52-53).

Apart from the oral tradition of folk poetry that still exists, today many folk singers wish to gain popularity and access to a wide audience by use of electronic equipment and written song lyrics. Traditionally, the *âşık* performed their art in front of an audience either in an open space or inside a building and maintained direct contacts with the listeners. Recently some of them melodiously recite poems written down on a piece of paper or use printed copies. On the other hand, folk singers may have access to a wide audience of people by performing their songs on the television, radio and disseminating their songs by electronic media. This has led to a change in the *âşık* tradition of mastering skills, initiation and performance. In big cities, instead of learning from a master, those interested in becoming an *âşık* enroll in courses for those skilled in song and poetry. Those who cannot take a course learn from recordings on cassette or CD and imitate the *âşık* and their

poems. Despite some negative aspects, the accessibility to *âşık* literature thanks to electronic media has some positive sides. The candidates for the career of an *âşık* are not restricted by the skills of a single master, but may learn from different folk singers from various regions of Turkey. The *âşık* who record their songs can gain popularity countrywide. As a result, local styles and manners of performance can be heard by people all over the country (Çobanoğlu 2000: 124-158).

This illustrates that the *âşık* can only protect their places within the tradition when they react to the changes in public life and shape their poems accordingly. The *âşık* tradition is a common heritage for most of the Turkic communities. Being supported by mystical institutions that carried the ideas of Islam, it began declining in the nineteenth century due to the fact that these institutions could not execute their function (Köprülü 1962: 29). We have to study this tradition and record the still existing folk singers to prevent it from being forgotten and disappearing and to interpret it accurately.

One of the most significant representatives of the tradition of folk singers in the twenty-first century is Merdanoğlu. Merdanoğlu, having grown up in the Alevi-Bektaşî tradition, is one of those *âşık*s whose life and work has been little examined. In this study, an attempt is made to present information on Merdanoğlu's life and literary output, examine his relation to the Alevi-Bektaşî tradition in which he grew and composed his poems as well as to characterize his poetry.

## 2. The Life of Merdanoğlu

The exact date of Musa Merdanoğlu's birth is unknown.<sup>2</sup> According to his account, he was born in 1935, while registry records provide his date of birth as January 1st, 1939. He is from the village of Kaymak in the Şarkışla district of the Sivas province (Merdanoğlu 2002: 9). Merdanoğlu loves his homeland and expresses his longing for it in his poetry. His homeland is mentioned in his poems, e.g.:

Vilayetim Sivas, ben Şarkışla'dan,  
Köyümüz Kaymaklı arkadaşlardan,  
İsmim Aşık Musa uçan kuşlardan,  
Bir haber duyarsan getir postacı.

I was born in Sivas province, Şarkışla district,  
My village is Kaymak with my dearest friends,  
My name is Aşık Musa from flying birds,  
Oh postman, if the news come bring them to me (Merdanoğlu 2002: 158).

<sup>2</sup> Information on Musa Merdanoğlu is based on an interview with him on May 14, 2006 in Ankara.

Merdanoğlu soyum belli,  
Anam, babam, dayım belli,  
Adı Kaymak köyüm belli,  
Bu vatan benim vatanım.

My ancestors are known as the Merdanoğlu,  
My parents and uncles are all renowned people,  
My village Kaymak is also well known.  
This land is my homeland (Merdanoğlu 2002: 53).

Merdanoğlu dertli ağlar diyorlar,  
Engeller yolunu bağlar diyorlar,  
Coşmuş Kızılırmak çağlar diyorlar.  
Köyden köye geçilirken gidelim.

Merdanoğlu weeps bitterly, they say,  
His path is full of hurdles, they say,  
The gushing Kızılırmak babbles, they say.  
Let us pass from village to village (Merdanoğlu 2002: 164).

The village where Merdanoğlu was born and spent his youth is 500 meters west of the Kızılırmak River. The population of the village is gradually decreasing. Once there were sixty houses in the village, but due to immigration to cities, now only twelve houses remain. Before the eight-year-long compulsory education system was implemented, there was a primary school in the village. At present the school is closed. The percentage of literacy in Kaymak village is around 30%. It grew after the young population left the village. The source of income of the people living in Kaymak is agriculture and livestock breeding (Merdanoğlu 2002: 11). There are many verses referring to Musa Merdanoğlu's village and his childhood spent in it. Some of these are as follows:

Fermanı da deli gönül fermanı.  
Var mı ola ayrılığın dermanı  
Bizim köyde sürmemişler harmanı.  
Arpa, buğday biçilirken gidelim.

That decree was a mad destruction,  
Is there a remedy for separation?  
In our village the grain was left unthreshed.  
Let's leave when the barley and wheat are harvested (Merdanoğlu 2002: 130).

Bir zamanlar çiftçi idim köyümde.  
Tarla sürdüm, tohum ekтім, herk ekтім.  
İki evlek yeri sulamak için,  
Kaya yardım, su getirdim, ark ettim.

Once I was a farmer in my village,  
 I ploughed the fields, planted the seeds, let the land lie fallow,  
 Just to irrigate two acres of land,  
 I spilt the rock, brought water, and made the canal (Merdanoğlu 2002: 129).

Merdanoğlu's father was Ali Merdanoğlu, a farmer born in 1915. He was the only child of the couple Gevher and Süleyman Merdanoğlu. Süleyman joined the army during World War I, leaving his wife pregnant. He fell at Sarıkamış and never returned home. Musa's grandmother, Gevher, became paralyzed when she heard about him. Fortunately, Gevher gave birth to her son Ali before this happened. For this reason, Ali Merdanoğlu could not have any brothers or sisters. Ali Merdanoğlu, the father of Musa, the future *âşık*, died in 2000 (Merdanoğlu 2002: 12). His mother Hatice was born in the village of Beydiğın in 1910 and was illiterate. However, she is a folk poet and can sing. Hatice Merdanoğlu used to recite the following verse while working on the crops:

Kahpe felek nedir senden çektiğim,  
 Kinimi derelere doldurdun.  
 Yeter artık sana boyun büktüğüm,  
 Dost ağlattın düşmanımı güldürdün.

O damned fate, you are a whore who harms me,  
 You filled the streams with my rage.  
 How long will you oppress me,  
 Make my friends cry and my foes laugh? (Merdanoğlu 2002: 162).

The influence of a tutor and the entire apprenticeship system based on tradition is very important for the development of the skills of a young, beginning folk singer. In this regard it must be said that the role of his family, i.e. reciting poems in an improvisatory way or reciting poems of other poets by his family members, had a positive effect. Merdanoğlu reported that his mother used to improvise poems.

Until the age of 15, Merdanoğlu worked as a farmer and shepherd in summertime and as a worker in Adana in wintertime. After his military service, he completed his education at primary and secondary schools and then started to work as a clerk for the Parliament (Merdanoğlu 2002: 32).

As for his personality, it must be said that the ideas of temporality and mortality, fairness and justice are the basic concepts in his life. We can see these ideas in his poems. He explained this in the following:

"My dear compatriots, as you know the world is not everlasting for anyone. We all are mortal. Every position is transitory. Nobody who is brave surrenders to injustice. Always be brave and honest because only brave and honest people should be part of our nation. You may not strive to anything through evilness.

Evilness stems from ignorance. This world is very vast. There is nothing better than to respect each other in this vast world. Being honest is the highest virtue. May God not set apart anyone from honesty” (Merdanoğlu 2002: 32).

Musa Merdanoğlu, who suffered so much in his life, is an outstanding folk singer. He always adhered to his ideas and transmitted them to us in his poetry.

### 3. Musa Merdanoğlu’s initiation into the folk singer’s profession and his *âşık* career

*Âşık* tradition is not alien to the place where he was born. Sivas, the main city in his small homeland, is connected with Erzurum, one of most important cities of *âşık* tradition in various periods. The mutual relations of both cities, beside economic and commercial contacts, also include cultural ties. In fact it is *âşık* tradition that serves as the most important in cultural relations. Many folk singers were brought up in Erzurum throughout history. Hundreds of meetings of folk singers took place in Erzurum’s various cafes in different periods. Undoubtedly, people from Sivas, Bayburt and Erzincan were also familiar with these events. In a similar way, Sivas and its region is also the birthplace of multiple famous folk singers. Many *âşık* were and are still raised there.

Musa Merdanoğlu’s career and personality were shaped out in this tradition. He first began to play a stringed instrument at the age of 12–13 thanks to Âşık Veysel Şatıroğlu. He began to perform with the encouragement of Âşık Veysel and was considerably influenced by the stories and folk songs he heard. Later on, as he did not have any stringed instrument, he played a loaner. He bought his first stringed instrument before his military service, which he served in Denizli.

The stringed instrument and the poem are inseparable from each other. It can be said that the tradition of *bade içme* ‘drinking wine’ has an important place in the initiation to composing and reading poems for the *âşık*. As a matter of fact, *bade içme* is related to dreams. Traditionally, wine was served by a sage who dreamed about this. Âşık Merdanoğlu also dreamed about an *âşık* who gave him wine when he was fourteen. He recounts this in the following way:

“It was a hot summer day. I was on the hills where I pastured our flock. I drove the flock to the spring after having fed them. They were drinking water and I was lying. I was in a kind of sleep. While I was sleeping, a white bearded guy approached me with a girl. The guy with the white beard told me to get up. ‘Why are you sleeping? I brought the girl with whom you are in love. Get to know her and drink this sorbet.’ I objected. I said that I had not fallen in love with anyone. However, when I woke up, I found myself near a puddle, but I could not see anybody around. I left the animals on the hills and came to the village in fear. When I came to the village, I became speechless and could not speak. When my father

realized the situation, he went to Alaçayır, saw Hoca Hamit and got a talisman for me. They said that I had been touched by a spirit. In fact, what happened to me was nothing else than foretelling the love for the girl I saw in my dream. This was how I fell in love when I was fourteen. However, they still made me wear the talisman” (Merdanoğlu 2002: 13).

After that Musa Merdanoğlu began to look for the girl whom he saw in his dream. He recounted how he looked for and found her:

“A long time passed after that. One day when I was eighteen years old I went to the village of Alaçayır with my blood brother İsmail Aydın and my cousin Ali Topçuoğlu. The villagers, gathered around a quern in the center of the village, were pounding wheat for *bulgur*. We came to them and greeted them. When I looked around I was dazzled by what I saw. I spotted the girl I had seen in my dream a few years ago. I fell into a faint. When I came to my senses, I learned that the name of the girl was Balkız. After that, I went to Alaçayır and tried to see her almost every day. However, it was not possible. When Balkız’s mother saw that I was in Alaçayır, she did not let Balkız out of the house. I was thinking of eloping with her<sup>3</sup>; yet, I could not find a chance. Later on, I heard that Balkız married someone else. It was a disaster for me. However, since it is not allowed in our culture and tradition to have interest in a woman after her marriage, the issue was finished” (Merdanoğlu 2002: 13-14).

Merdanoğlu’s tale of how he symbolically drank wine, found the girl whom he loved and finally was obliged to give her up is reflected in the following verses:

Bir hoş bade verdin elime benim,  
Hiç mi acımadın halime benim,  
Yavru ceylan gibi yoluma benim,  
Çıkmasan düşmezdim ben bu sevdaya.

Why do you give me the wine of love,  
Have you no mercy for me?  
Had not you crossed my path like that of a small gazelle,  
I would not have fallen in love with her (Merdanoğlu 2002: 170).

The tradition of giving new names to heroes and saints after their initiation or sanctification goes back to the age of medieval literature and is a symbol of their individualism; this was also the case for poets. A new name may be given by a sheikh, by a master or spiritual leader, or it may be chosen by the poet himself (Elçin 1997: 44).

<sup>3</sup> Eloping is not a pleasant tradition in the villages. However, sometimes it occurred. It happened in three basic ways. The first one is that a man forces a girl to elope with him. The second one is that they elope together. The third one is that a girl forces to a man to elope with her (Çopuroğlu 2000: 170).

While many *âşık* were given a pseudonym in their dreams by a dervish, a sage, Saint Hızır, an old white bearded man etc., Merdanoğlu chose a pseudonym himself. As demonstrated by Koerbin (2011: 197), the convention of self-naming is common in Persian and Ottoman lyric poetry.

In addition to pen names, adjectives as attributes are also often used by and for people who have a specific function in the culture of Islam (Elçin 1997: 43). Merdanoğlu uses the following forms of his name and pen name in his poems: *Âşık Musa*, *Musa*, *Merdanoğlu*, *Âşık Merdanoğlu*, *Merdanî* and *Âşık Merdan*. The meaning of the word *merdan* is “brave, manly” and is quite suitable as a good pen name.

## 4. Impact of Alevi tradition upon Merdanoğlu

### 4.1. Line of the Prophet’s family from Imam Ali to Imam Huseyin

The sensitiveness and values of individuals are underlined by the society in which they grow up. As Merdanoğlu comes from the Alevi-Bektaşî tradition, it influences his ideas. When he loves, he also loves because of his love for Ali:

Gerçekleri gören gözün var diye,  
Muhabbete yarar sözün var diye,  
Ehlibeyti seven özün var diye,  
Ben seni Ali aşkına sevdim.

Your eyes can see the truth,  
Your words can tell the love,  
Your heart can love the Prophet’s line,  
I love you with Ali’s love (Merdanoğlu 2002: 161).

While examining the content of Merdanoğlu’s poems from the religious point of view, his love for the Prophet’s family and the Twelve Imams is evident, e.g.

Kısmetini bol ver aşk ummanından,  
Fazla da istemem dünya malından.  
Ayırma Muhammet, Ali yolundan,  
Doğru yoldan eğri yola düşürme.

Give me a good fortune from the sea of love,  
I don’t ask for more from the wares of the world.  
Don’t separate me from the path of Muhammad and Ali,  
Don’t lead me astray on the path of the crooks (Merdanoğlu 2002: 92).

Merdanoğlu geçer Hak için canından,  
Başka da anlamam dinden, imandan,

Destur Muhammet'ten Şahı Merdan'dan,  
Olmayınca hakikate eremez.

Merdanoğlu can die for God,  
Though I don't understand much about faith and imams,  
You have to follow Muhammad and Ali,  
You will not find the truth otherwise (Merdanoğlu 2002: 99).

Gayet tatlı geldi dünya malı.  
Böyle mi sevilir Muhammet, Ali,  
Çoğumuz büyüdük ağaç misali.  
Meyvesiz selvinin boyuna döndük.

The worldly goods are charming sweets,  
Should Ali and Muhammad be loved like this?  
Most of us grew like trees,  
Grew to the height of fruitless cypresses (Merdanoğlu 2002: 97).

Yezit vazgeçmedi dünya malından,  
Sen de ayrılmadın Hakk'ın yolundan,  
Abbas 'ı kestiler iki kolundan,  
Nasıl ağlamayım İmam Hüseyin?

The Yezit didn't give up on the wares of the world,  
Just as you didn't leave the path of God,  
They cut the two arms of Abbas,  
Imam Hüseyin, how can I not cry (Merdanoğlu 2002: 103).

#### 4.2. Haji Bektaş Veli, Yunus Emre and Abdal Musa's mysticism, and folk poets

A characteristic feature of the poetry of folk poets and epic singers is that they inherit the ideas from their masters and great predecessors. Therefore, there are many common intertextual identities and similarities in their works. It is seen both in their content and form. Islamic mysticism spread out across many countries with steadily growing force. It was especially after Muhyi Ad-Din that the idea of monism became influential among the mystics (Köprülü 2007: 196–197). There are a few Alevi-Bektaş groups that adopt this philosophical doctrine as the basis of their belief systems. Some *âşık* from other regions such as Âşık Veysel Şatıroğlu and Ali İzzet Özkan also affected Merdanoğlu. Naturally, the ideas and thoughts of the most important representatives of Sufism in Anatolia, such as Haji Bektaş Veli, Mevlana and Yunus Emre, also had a great impact on his poetry. The Alevi-Bektaş background of the society in which Merdanoğlu lives determines the system of beliefs reflected in his poems.

İlim deryasında akıp çağlayan,  
Kadın erkek eşit haklar sağlayan,  
Hakikati üç noktaya bağlayan,  
Sözünde barış var Hacı Bektaş'ın.

In the ocean of knowledge, flowing and cascading,  
Ensuring equal rights for men and women,  
Binding the truth to three points,  
Haji Bektaş pronounces the words of peace (Merdanoğlu 2002: 114).

Küskünleri kabul etmez yolumuz.  
Böyle demiş Hacı Bektaş Veli'miz,  
Doldur pir aşkına içek dolumuz,  
Al da barışalım Ali aşkına.

Our way doesn't accept the resentful,  
As our patron saint Haji Bektaş Veli said,  
Fill our cups, let's drink for the love of our sage,  
Let's make peace in the name of Ali (Merdanoğlu 2002: 109).

Merdanoğlu tells us his feelings after his first visit to the shrines of Haji Bektaş in the following quatrain:

Bugün dergahına geldim,  
Hacı Bektaş pîrim benim,  
Eşiğine yüzler sürdüm,  
Şu kapıda kulun benim.

Today I came to your dervish lodge,  
O Haji Bektaş, my beloved sage,  
I put my face on your threshold,  
I am a servant at your order (Merdanoğlu 2002: 112).

Whenever Merdanoğlu encounters any trouble, he begs Haji Bektaş Veli for help:

Perişan haldeyiz şaşırđık kaldık.  
Yetiş carımıza gel Hacı Bektaş.  
Çoğaldı derdimiz fena bulandık,  
Derdimize derman ol Hacı Bektaş.

We are miserable, and struck and upset.  
We implore you to come to help us, O Haji Bektaş.  
Our sorrows multiplied, we are sick with grief,  
Be the cure to our pain, O Haji Bektaş (Merdanoğlu 2002: 113).

Merdanoğlu, who invites the people to obey Haji Bektaş's advice, speaks about Haji Bektaş Veli's virtues in the following poem:

Dođru yoldan eđri yola sapmayan,  
Hak var iken hurafeye tapmayan,  
İkilik bilmeyen, ayırım yapmayan,  
Özünde barış var Hacı Bektaş'ın.

He doesn't deviate from the right path to the wrong,  
He believes in God and not in magic,  
He doesn't acknowledge duplicity, he doesn't discriminate,  
Haji Bektaş pronounces the words of peace (Merdanođlu 2002: 115).

Abdal Musa, who is one of the nobles in Haji Bektaş Veli tradition, is sometimes also mentioned in his poems:

Ađlaya ađlaya düřtüm yollara,  
Gülmek için geldim Abdal Musa'ya.  
Dertliyim efendim derdime derman,  
Bulmak için geldim Abdal Musa'ya.

I set off on a journey, weeping and weeping,  
I came to Abdal Musa to find delight.  
I am miserable, Sir, be the cure to my pain,  
I came to Abdal Musa to find one (Merdanođlu 2002: 116).

Merdanođlu, who says that if someone wants to be an *âşık* he "should be like Yunus", refers to Yunus Emre as a model for a folk singer:

Yalancı âşığı tutarlar tařa,  
Hakk'a teslim olan kalır baş başa,  
Benlik davasıyla gezilmez bořa,  
Dolacaksan Yunus gibi dolmalı.

People throw stones at lying bards,  
Only those who submit to God find the truth,  
You shouldn't wander around in vain,  
If you want to be a master, you should be like Yunus (Merdanođlu 2002: 117).

## 5. Conclusion

Âşık Merdanođlu, whose real name is Musa Merdanođlu, born in the Sivas region, is one of the present-day folk singers and poets who grew up in the Alevi-Bektaş tradition. He composes and recites poems in accordance with this tradition, combining lyrical songs with instrumental melodies.

It is the Alevi-Bektaş tradition that played an important role in the shaping of his poetic skills, but he also inherited the talent of improvisation from his mother.

Another factor that contributed to his career is reading the poetry of such representatives of the Alevi-Bektaşî tradition as Haji Bektaş Veli, Yunus Emre, Pir Sultan Abdal and others. Among his contemporary masters there are such figures as Âşık Veysel and Âşık Mahzunî Şerif.

At present most of the *âşık* first write down their songs and sing them playing a stringed instrument, but they are also able to improvise. Merdanoğlu gives many concerts in public places, but he also uses written and electronic media to transmit his songs to listeners.

As a folk poet and singer who has a natural and smooth, but at the same time quite individual style, he employs mystic motifs and successfully benefits from traditional methods of narration.

## Bibliography

- Artun, Erman. 1996. *Günümüzde Adana Âşıklık Geleneği (1966-1996) ve Âşık Feynman*, Adana: Adana Valiliği İl Kültür Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Artun, Erman. 2001. *Âşıklık Geleneği ve Âşık Edebiyatı*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Çobanoğlu, Özkul. 2000. *Âşık Tarzı Kültür Geleneği ve Destan Türü*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Çopuroğlu, Y. Cemalettin. 2000. "Fırat Havzası Evlilik Kültürü I: Düğün Öncesi". *Fırat University Journal of Social Science*, 10, 2: 163-193.
- Elçin, Şükrü. 1997. *Halk Edebiyatı Araştırmaları I*, Ankara, Akçağ Yay.
- Günay, Umay. 1989. *Âşık Tarzı Şiir Geleneği ve Rüya Motifi*, Ankara, Akçağ Yay.
- Günay, Umay. 1996. *Âşık Tarzı Edebiyat Hakkında Düşünceler*, Mehmet Kaplan İçin, Ankara, Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları
- Karahan, Abdülkadir. 1991. "Âşık Edebiyatı", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi, c.3, İstanbul.
- Merdanoğlu, Musa. (2002). *Ozanın Feryadı*, Ankara: Kuloğlu Matb.
- Köprülü, M. Fuad. 1962. *Türk Saz Şairleri* Ankara: Güven Basımevi.
- Köprülü, M. Fuat. 1989. *Edebiyat Araştırmaları I*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Köprülü, M. Fuad. 2004. *Saz Şairleri I*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Köprülü, M. Fuad. 2007. *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Lewis, B. 1986. 'Ashîk: H. A. R. Gibb, J. H. Kramers (et al. eds). *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Volume I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 697.
- Oğuz, M. Öcal. 2007. *Âşık Şiiri (16-20. Yüzyıl) Ozan-Baksî'dan Âşık'a Dönüşüm*. Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi, İstanbul: Ktb Yay.
- Koerbin Paul. 2011. Pir Sultan Abdal: Encounters with Persona in Alevi Lyric Song. *Oral Tradition*, 26/1: 191-220
- Sakaoğlu, Saim. 1989. Türk Saz Şiiri, *Türk Dili (Türk Şiiri Özel Sayısı)*, 3, 445-450.



HENRYK JANKOWSKI

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## **Baytursınulı's Works on the Kazakh Language – an Attempt at Assessment**

The aim of this paper is to present the ideas about language of Aqımet Baytursınulı, the founder of Kazakh linguistics and the first Kazakh author of Kazakh grammar. An attempt was made to present and discuss grammatical categories and linguistic terms as well as to assess his methods and identify possible sources of linguistic description.

### **1. Life and professional career**

Baytursınulı, also called Baytursun ~ Baytursın, Baytursunof, Baytursynov in the official Russian use (born 1873, Sarıtübek – executed 1938, Almaty), was a great Kazakh scholar, theoretician, practitioner, political activist, publisher and enlightener. He was an active member of the Kazakh national Alash movement and Alashorda government (1917–1920), its commissary for education, and after its fall a commissary of culture and education in the government of the Kazakh (then called Kirghiz) Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. In the first years of the establishment of Soviet authority in Kazakhstan, similarly to other leading members of Alash, he cooperated with the Bolsheviks, although he did not hesitate to oppose those decisions that he deemed were against his country and nation. The period 1913–1928 was the most fruitful for him and his contribution to the progress in Kazakh culture, education and research in this period is invaluable.

Aside from poems, newspaper articles and occasional writings, Baytursınulı published primers, textbooks and grammars for schools. When he started his career, there were no national schools and institutions, and the number of educated Kazakhs was low. Therefore, his works were designated for schools as practical

aids for both children and adults to educate them in the national language. His textbooks were designed for the teaching of language and literature. Although written with a practical purpose, his grammar of 1914, reprinted many times in updated and revised editions, must be assessed as a work with a serious theoretical background, unlike any other grammar written by a Turkic author of that time. His literature textbook that was published in 1926 also presents a very high level and at the same time is a study on the theory of literature.

Baytursınulı completed a two-year Russian school in Torgay in 1891, then he studied four years at a school in Orenburg. Between 1895–1909 he worked as a teacher in various schools for Kazakh children. He was engaged in a mass protest on the wave of the Russian revolution of 1905 and put under observation. Arrested in 1909 and jailed in Semey (Semipalatynsk), he was exiled from Kazakh territories to Orenburg in 1910 where he was forced to live until 1917. It is during the Orenburg period that he, together with Ālihan Bōkeyhan and Mirjaqıp Duwlatulı, published the first long-existing Kazakh weekly *Qazaq* (1913–1918) and wrote and published his first textbooks. He was very active until 1928, when the repression against the Kazakh intellectuals started, especially against those who had participated in the national movement. Afterwards he was arrested and jailed, released in 1934, but in 1937 arrested again, sentenced to death and executed (Qıyrabayev, Sızdıqova, Qoygeldiyev 2009: 90–93). After 1928, his name disappeared from public life.

It must be said that a detailed, critical assessment of his works is difficult, for probably no library in the world has all his books. A good collection of Baytursınulı's publications, though not all, is kept in the National Library of the Republic of Kazakhstan, some on microfilms and scanned. There is a good annotated bibliography of Kazakh publications published in 1925 and 1927, comprising the years 1923–1927, recently republished (Duwlatulı 2003: 253–356), as well as a new catalogue of publications in Arabic and Latin scripts by Asqarbekova and Zamzayeva, 2006 and 2007, respectively (henceforth AZ and AZ-2).

## 2. Baytursınulı's works on language

### 2. 1. Primer (*oquw quralı or qazaqça älifba ~ älippe*)

Baytursınulı's role in the creation and implementation of the reformed Arabic writing for schools in Kazakhstan has been evaluated by many researchers. One of the best studies in the West that shows its Russian and Soviet background was written by Baldauf (1993), while one of the most recent studies in Kazakhstan is Wäli (2007: 32–37).

The first part of Baytursınulı's primer *Oquw quralı* lit. 'tool for reading' was first published in 1912 in Orenburg (Jüsipulı 1998: 206) and reprinted six

times in 1914, 1921, 1922 (two printings), 1923 and 1925 (Duwlatulı 2003: 258, Baytursinuli 2006 (volume 4): 306). I do not have access to the first edition of this book, as it was unavailable at the National Library of Kazakhstan while I worked on Baytursinuli's works, and it was absent from the catalogue of the library. Fortunately, a photocopy of the title page was provided in Baytursinov (1992: 32) and Baytursinuli (2006 (volume 4): 16): *اوقۇۇ قۇرالى. اصول صوتيه جولى مين ترتيب ايتلگهن قازاقچا الفبا. نچى كتاب*. It is likely that the fourth edition of 1922 which came out in Tashkent was very similar or identical, since it bears an identical title (AZ 79), although various editions have different numbers of pages, varying from 74 to 96. The title page of the 1922 edition can be seen in a photograph in AZ (13): *اوقۇۇ قۇرالى. اصول صوتيه جولى مين ترتيب ايتلگهن قازاقچا الفبا. نچى كتاب*. *Киргизский букварь. “Уку-Куралы”*. The unavailability of some publications of that time is a serious obstacle in research. It is for this reason that Baldauf dates the beginning of Baytursinuli's primer to 1913 when its second part was printed; she seemingly did not have access to the publication of 1912 and attributed the first attempt to reform Arabic script for Kazakh to Mustaqim Maldibayev's publication of 1912 in which he applied the phonetic method *usuli savtiyā* (Baldauf 1993: 257). This publication is absent from the catalogue. Thus Baldauf claims that Baytursinuli launched his reform in 1913, after having discussed and practised it in the newspaper *Qazaq* that he co-edited.

The first publication of 1912 was reprinted in Cyrillic script in Baytursinov (1992: 32–47), then in Baytursinuli (2006 (volume 4): 16–33). The primer presents 29 letters (i.e. Baytursinuli's 28 letters and the palatalizer) one by one, provides examples, short phrases and sentences after each letter as well as additional words and short texts for reading in the second part.

This primer combines Baytursinuli's invention with the rules of easy or so-called phonetic reading, first elaborated by Ismail Bey Gasprinski in the Crimea in the 1880s and spread among the Tatars in Kazan and elsewhere, although the method was adopted from Turkey.

The second part of *Oquw quralı* was published a year later, also in Orenburg. It is absent from Jüsipulı's bibliography (1998: 205–214), but the catalogue provides the full title of it in both Arabic and Cyrillic scripts (AZ 75), which may be transcribed as *Oquw quralı. Qazaqdan basqa türki, 'arab, farsı sözderine jazılattın harflardı üyretiw için häm oquwğa töseliw için tärtib tärtib etilgen älifbağa jalğas. 2-nçi kitab* 'Primer. A continuation of the primer composed for teaching and learning letters occurring in words of non-Kazakh origin, i.e. Turkic, Arabic and Persian', 52 pages (Baytursunof 1913). According to the editors of Baytursinuli (2006: (volume 5): 280), it was reprinted two times in 1923 and 1924, but the catalogue does not show these editions.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It should be added that there were a few other publications prepared by Baytursinuli and also called *Oquw quralı*, e.g. one printed in Semey on 30 pages, designated for

When we assess Baytursınulı's primer, we have to say that the Kazakh enlighteners like him had a very difficult task to do. There were neither Kazakh national schools nor written standard Kazakh. The Turkic peoples of Central Asia and the Volga-Ural region as well as to some extent the northern Caucasus and Dagh-estan used written Eastern Turkic, called *Türki* (in Kazakh pronunciation [türkü]), called Chaghatai in the West, which existed in a few local variants. Baytursınulı was aware that this literary language, not used in natural communication, was quite distinct from spoken Kazakh and because of multiple Arabic and Persian words difficult to understand. Therefore, he endeavored to combine teaching genuine Kazakh with words and texts characteristic of *Türki*. The term *oquw quralı* coined by Baytursınulı shows his invention which manifests more extensively in his grammar of 1914.

Baytursınulı's primer was very simple and written with a minimum of instructions and remarks. Conciseness is a characteristic feature of Baytursınulı's style, when we read his works it appears that there is no single excessive word. Whereas we may abridge the narration of some authors, it is not possible with Baytursınulı, since any reduction makes his text incomprehensible.

Baytursınulı was an ardent opponent of the shift to Latin writing. He argued that the modified, reformed Arabic alphabet, Kaz. *töte jazuw* 'simple, easy writing' was quite adequate for Kazakh. He was afraid that the introduction of a new writing system in a nation that had just started its adventure with education would be a disaster. In 1925, one year before the representatives of Turkic peoples of the Soviet Union decided in Baku that all Turkic languages would use a unique Latin alphabet, Baytursınulı prepared a new edition of his primer, entitled *Älib-biy. Jaña qural*, which was published in 1926 and reprinted two times, the second edition released in 1927 and the third and final in 1928 (AZ 105, 122, Duwlatulı 2003: 258, 317).

In the new edition Baytursınulı replaced the Ottoman terms with Kazakh equivalents, e.g. *usül-i savtiye* with *dıbis negizgi ädis* and *dıbis ädisi* 'phonetic principle; phonetic method', *usül-i cedid* with *jaña ädis* 'new method' and the term *älifba* 'primer' with *älib-biy* (Baytursınulı 1926: 3).

Although in a table on p. 76 Baytursınulı shows the alphabet consisting of 24 letters, in the main body of the book he in fact presents 28 letters, since four of the twenty-four were taught on pages 66, 70, 72 and 74 with the modifier ء as عى [i], ءؤ [ü], ءو [ö], ءا [ä]. The alphabet consisted of the basic Arabic letters except those that were unnecessary for Kazakh (ث ح خ نص ض ط ظ غ) with the addition of two Persian گ پ and two Turkic letters ژ ڭ for consonants, more exactly, the latter for semi-vowel [w]. The former two letters were also used earlier for some other

adults (probably the predecessor of the later *Sawat aşqış*, see also a publication co-authored with Şonanlı, which was a large chrestomathy comprising 412 pages, republished in Cyrillic script in Baytursınulı (2004); see a photocopy of its original title page on p. 21 .

Turkic languages, including Ottoman Turkish (though not in all manuscripts and books), whereas the latter two were used for Tatar (again, not in all manuscripts and books). The Kazakh consonant [ʃ] (ş) was noted with the letter چ, as in earlier publications in Kazan, but in the new edition in 1926 it was replaced with ش, which rendered Kazakh pronunciation more properly and broke with the old Turkic tradition. The vowels were rendered by five letters ا و ؤ د ی, but four of them occurred with the modifier as shown above. While the modifier called *däyekşi* was Baytursinulı's invention, the *ḍamma* above *wāw*, which rendered [u] and with the *däyekşi* [ü] was used earlier by Tatar reformists. The use of the diacritical sign above *wāw* was the object of a debate in Kazakhstan, since in Tatar the letter و did not render [u ü], like in Baytursinulı's alphabet, but [ö ö], though etymologically Turkic /u ü/, since in Tatar *u* → ö and *ü* → ö.

In general one has to agree with Baldauf (1993: 255) who stresses that the Kazakh language reform was rooted in Tatar, at least at the beginning, and that linguistically Kazakh was emancipated from Tatar earlier than the writing. Even the idea of *däyekşi* was first considered by the Tatar reformists, who however did not implement it, so it should be regarded as Baytursinulı's idea, at least in practice (Baldauf 1993: 272). One has to agree with Baldauf, who argued that the implementation of the reform was easier for the Kazakhs who did not have a long tradition of written literature than for such Turkic peoples as the Tatars, the Uzbeks or the Azerbaijanians and who had to reckon with their written tradition.

## 2.2. Grammar (*til-qural*)

Baytursinulı is the author of a complete grammar, i.e. consisting of phonetics, orthography and basic morphology (1914, 1925a), a detailed morphology (1915) and syntax (1925b), although phonetics was just a few paragraphs. Qıyrabayev, Sızdıqova and Qoygeldiyev's (2009: 95) information that the first publication of 1914 is morphology, the second one of 1915 is phonology and a volume "published from 1916 on" is syntax, is inexact. In fact, there is no volume devoted exclusively to phonology and the volume published in 1915 is morphology. The date 1916 provided by these authors is enigmatic, since no Baytursinulı's work is known to me from that year, nor it is listed in the catalogue.

One should have in mind that all these volumes were of a practical character and intended for schools. Baytursinulı has planned his grammar carefully and published it in subsequent parts, some reprinted, some republished with minor and terminological changes. In the introduction to the first edition he noted that the teachers should instruct pupils slowly, trying to be rather careful and thorough than superficial and hasty. The whole series was planned for three years of instruction in primary schools.

Baytursınulı has explained his interpretation of grammar and the meaning of his term *til-qural* a few times in his grammars; the most extensive definition was presented in his *Til-jumsar* of 1928. He says there that language is a mechanism (*qural*) composed of multiple components and he compares it to a machine (Baytursınulı 2005 (volume 3): 283). He said that there are two types of language users, understood as the users of a machine: one group of people only has a general knowledge how to use it in practice without knowing language's inner structure, while the other group of people also knows its deeper structure – they are like specialists who are familiar with the construction of a mechanism. Baytursınulı tried to teach schoolchildren and illiterate adults how language is constructed, how it works, and of what parts it is composed.

### 2.2.1. First grammar of 1914 (*sarf*)

As mentioned above, this grammar (Baytursınulı 1914) is phonetics with orthography and basic morphology. The term *sarf*, although sometimes understood as morphology, in Ottoman Turkish denoted 'grammar' (NRTED 985) and in this sense spread in the Crimea and among Volga Tatars. The author says that this is a grammar for the first year of teaching and it contains general information on speech and sentence; words and syllables; syllables and sounds, and the letters used for them as well as orthography; and lastly the forms of words. It was first published in Orenburg in the Tatar printing house of the Huseinov brothers and reprinted in 1918 in Tashkent. Later this grammar was reprinted a few more times, in 1920 and 1922 and recently it was republished in Cyrillic script in Baytursınulı (1992: 140–171) and Baytursınulı (2005: 28–69). An updated and linguistically modernised edition appeared in 1925 with the misleading sub-title *Dıbis jüyesi men türleri* 'phonetics and the types of sounds' (see below) – it was republished in Cyrillic script in Baytursınulı (2005: 70–104).

At the beginning Baytursınulı writes that his grammar is intended for three-year schools. He stresses that the Kazakh children who attend Russian or Tatar schools are educated in these languages and are unable to use Kazakh properly. This is why he has prepared this grammar. Then Baytursınulı gives some general information on language and languages. He says that there are three types of languages: (1) isolating languages (*tübirşik til*); (2) agglutinating languages (*jalğamalı til*) and (3) inflective languages (*qoparmalı til*). He gives examples and says that Kazakh is an agglutinating language like Turkish and Finnish.

Proceeding to the description of Kazakh, he makes a distinction between such categories and notions as *söylev* 'speech' and *söylem* 'sentence' (p. 1), *söylem* 'sentence' and *söz* 'word', *söz* 'word' and *buwun* 'syllable' (p. 3), *buwun* 'syllable' and *dıbis* 'sound' (p. 4).

Baytursınlı describes such units of morphology as *tübir* 'root', *tuwındı* 'derived (form)', *qos söz* 'compound word', *qosalqı söz* 'enclitic' and *qosımşa* 'suffix' (p. 19). The suffixes may be lexical (*jurnaq*) and grammatical (*jalğaw*). He classifies words into two major groups, *atawıış sözder* lit. 'naming words' and *şılaw sözder* 'connecting words'. The former group includes such word classes or parts of speech as *zat esim* 'noun' (p. 32), *sın esim* 'adjective' (p. 35), *san esim* 'numeral' (p. 36), *esimdik* 'pronoun' (p. 38), and *etistik* 'verb' (p. 40). The latter group contains *üstew* 'adverb' (p. 42), *demew* 'particle and conjunction' (p. 44), *jalğawlıq* 'postposition' and *odağay söz* 'interjection' (for the two latter see the new edition, Baytursınlı 2005: 64).

A drawback of Baytursınlı's phonetic approach in this grammar is that the sounds are not always clearly distinguished from letters. On the one hand Baytursınlı is quite aware of this difference which is clear from the title of the section *Qazaq sözindegi dıbısdar häm olardıñ härfderi* 'the sounds of the Kazakh language and their letters' (p. 6) as well as what he writes just below, i.e. *Qazaq tilinde 24 dıbıs bar* 'there are 24 sounds in the Kazakh language' or when he says that *Dıbısdar dawıstı, dawıssız häm jartı dawıstı boladı* 'the sounds fall into vowels, consonants and semi-vowels'. Moreover, whenever he thought the term *härf* is ambiguous or should be distinguished from 'vowel', he used it, e.g. *Söz basında a dıbısı joq jerde \ härfi tursa, ol başka dawıstı dıbısqa süyew üşin qoyılğan tayaq esebinde qoyılsa da ayılmaydı* 'If a letter stands in the initial of a word where there is no vowel *a*, it stands as a support for another vowel and is not pronounced' (p. 11). However, despite distinguishing between a sound, *dıbıs*, and a letter, *härf*, he shows five 'voiced letters' (*dawıstı härfder*) below: ۵ ى ۆ ۋ ۱, and not *dawıstı dıbısdar* 'vowels'.

This contradiction was caused by the fact that Baytursınlı prepared an alphabet strictly on the phonetic (more exactly, phonemic) principles according to which each letter renders a distinct sound, i.e. a letter is practically equal to a sound. However, as formerly in his primer, Baytursınlı does not show four front letters with the modifier *däyekşi*, also called palatalizer. Another reason was Baytursınlı's very concise style, see above. Wäli (2013: 47) interprets four of Baytursınlı's five vowels as invariant phonemes, each of which has two variants, one back [a o u ı], the other front [ä ö ü i].

### 2.2.2. Morphology (*sarf, söz jüyesi*)

The first edition of the comprehensive morphology of 1915 has the same title as the above one with the only difference being that the subtitle says it is intended for the second year of study (see the bibliography in Baytursınov 1992: 443).<sup>2</sup> It

<sup>2</sup> Note that the date on the title page is 1914.

was unavailable to me as it was, absent from the catalogue of the National Library. The analysis is based on a modern edition in Cyrillic script (Baytursınulı 2005: 105–190). This edition is in general reliable, but there are some mistakes stemmed from an incorrect reading of the original.

The morphology discussed here is the most voluminous of the entire series of grammars. In contrast to Baytursınulı's book on phonetics and basic morphology of 1914 called *sarf*, republished in 1925, see above, this one does not contain phonetics. It starts with the section *söylew bölimleri* 'parts of speech' (105) and describes nine word classes. The first is *zat esim* 'noun' (105–129). The author divides nouns into *jalqı* 'proper' and *jalpı* 'common' (106). The following noun categories are discussed: *jekelik* and *köptik* (*ayırıs*) 'singular and plural (number)', *qalıp* 'form' of which there are two types, one *jay* 'simple', the other *täweldi* 'possessive'. In the possessive form the noun takes suffixes that express *oñaşa* 'one possessor' and *ortaq* 'more possessors; collective'. The possessive suffixes also show *jaq* 'person': 1st person or *mendik* 'I-ness', 2nd person or *sendik* 'you-ness' and 3rd person or *bögdelik* 'other-ness'.

Baytursınulı was ahead of his time in discovering the category of politeness. In addition to the above noun categories, he demonstrated suffixes expressing *sıpayılıq* 'polite, politeness' and *anayılıq* 'plain, plainness', e.g. *atalarıñ* 'your forefathers PLUR PLAIN' and *atalarıñız* 'your forefathers PLUR POLITE' (109–110). In the later part of this morphology, he also pointed out the category of politeness on the verb.

The final noun category discussed by Baytursınulı is *septik* 'case'. The following six case suffixes and the rules of suffixation are presented: (1) *ataw* 'nominative', (2) *ilik* 'genitive', (3) *barıs* 'dative', (4) *tabıs* 'accusative', (5) *jatis* 'locative', and (6) *şığıs* 'ablative' (111 ff). Then Baytursınulı proceeds to word formation, where he discusses the suffixes that form words from nouns (122–129).

Adjectives (*sin esim*) in Baytursınulı's classification fall into *tek sinı* 'expressing a feature pointing to the origin', e.g. *ağaş*; *maqta* 'wooden; made of cotton' and *sır sinı* 'expressing a feature', e.g. *biyik*; *qızıl* 'tall, high; red' (129). There is also a section on word formation in which the author presents the suffixes that form words from adjectives (134–136).

The next word class is *san esim* 'numeral' with some types such as *eseptik*, *rettik*, *jadağay*, *temildik* 'ordinal, cardinal, collective, partial' (136–137).

The pronoun is subdivided into six types *jiktew* 'personal', *siltew* 'demonstrative', *suraw* 'interrogative', *jektew* 'general; lit. restricting', and *tanıqtıq* 'indefinite' (141–148).

Among the verb (*etistik*) categories there are ten types of diathesis (*etis*) and fourteen of mood (*ray*). Diathesis includes some forms that we at present really consider diathesis, i.e. *ortaq* 'cooperative', *özdik* 'reciprocal', *özgelik* 'causative', *bedeldi* 'factitive causative', *ırıqsız* 'passive' or *şağıs* 'cooperative causative',

but other types are different categories, i.e. transitivity, such as *sabaqtı* ‘transitive’ and *salt* ‘intransitive’, actionality such as *dürkindi* ‘iterative’ and *ösiñki* ‘intensifying’ (148–152). Among Baytursınlı's classes of mood there are such that can be taken as modal categories, i.e. *biylik* ‘imperative’, *şarttı* ‘conditional’, *erewil* ‘concessive’, *reniş* ‘recenting’, *qalaw* ‘desiderative’, *senimdi* ‘optative, hoping’, *senimsiz* ‘dubitative’, *boljal* ‘suppositive’, *könis* ‘declarative’, *qayraw* ‘incentive’, and *teris* ‘optative’ but also *tuyıq* ‘infinitive’, *aşıq* ‘plain (i.e. no exponent)’, *muñ* ‘sorrowful’, and *azalı* ‘affective’ (152–166).

After that Baytursınlı presents four auxiliary verbs that express the progressive and he calls this category of action *nağız osı şaq* ‘true present tense’ (167). There are three converbs, *kösemeşe* (168), three participles, *esimşe* (174), and at the end of the verb section, formation of words derived from verbs (179–182). Diathesis and mood are illustrated with multiple tables and examples.

The remaining word classes are identical to those in the 1914 grammar, though presented more in-depth.

### 2.2.3. Phonetics (*dıbis jüyesi*)

As mentioned above, this is a ghost volume. Despite the subtitle *dıbis jüyesi*, the 1925 edition is in fact the fifth updated, revised version of the 1914 book (Duwlatulı 2003: 258); see also the copy of the title page of the original publication in Baytursınlı (2005: 70), which I will provide in the transcription: *Til-qural. Dıbis jüyesi men türleri 1. til tanıtqış kitab. Qazaq-qırğız bilimpazdarınıñ 1-nşi tobınıñ qawlısı boyınşa özgerilib 5-nşi basılıwı* ‘Grammar. Sound system and its parts. First part of the textbook for language teaching. Fifth edition updated according to the decision of the first department of Kazakh-Kirghiz scholars’, and also in Russian: *Грамматика казахского языка. “Тил-Курал” Часть 1-я. Фонетика*. It is an intriguing question why this book was titled in such a misleading way. We may try to explain this inaccuracy supposing that one word, *söz* ‘word’, was dropped from the title *Dıbis jüyesi men türleri*, since in such a case the title would have the form *Dıbis jüyesi men söz türleri* ‘Sound system and word classes’. However, this edition was reprinted twice in two subsequent years 1926 and 1927, apparently in the identical form and with an identical title (AZ 96, 105).

The section on phonetics in the 1925 edition is very similar to the first edition of 1914. There are differences in the lexicon and terminology. In the updated edition some Eastern Turkic words were replaced with Kazakh equivalents, e.g. in place of *söylew häm söylem* there is *söylew men söylem* ‘speech and sentence’ (74), instead of *buwın häm dıbis* there is *buwın men dıbis* ‘syllable and sound’ (77). The Kazakh word *tañba* ‘sign; mark’ was in some paragraphs substituted for the Arabic *hārf* ‘letter’ (78) and instead of *jazuw qağıydaları* ‘rules of spelling’,

we see *söz jazuwınıñ jalpı erejeleri* ‘general rules of writing words’ (83), though *ereje* used for *qağıyda* is also a loanword, a Persian borrowing, but a more adapted one, and is also present in the earlier version.

As it was mentioned above, it is in this edition that Baytursınulı introduced the term *däyekşi* ‘modifier’ in the form of the Arabic *hamza* without a support placed before a word to mark its front vowels. However, he points to the rule of vowel harmony only directly and does not change his approach in his later works. At this point we have to note that vowel harmony in Kazakh was demonstrated as early as 1922–1923 by Dosmuhambetov. Dosmuhambetov first published his article on this question in the journal *Çolpan* (see a modern edition: Dosmuhambetov 2010: 39–41, 134–139, 272–280), and shortly after that in 1925 his study appeared in the form of a book (Duwlatulı 2003: 264). Although Baytursınulı had time to revise his approach, he did not do so. It must be observed that neither Baytursınulı nor Dosmuhambetov acknowledged the existence of rounded-unrounded harmony in Kazakh explicitly.

#### 2.2.4. Syntax (*söylem jüyesi*) and other works

The last part of Baytursınulı’s grammar series is syntax. According to the bibliography in Bautursınov (1992: 443), it was first published in 1923 in Orenburg and was called *Söylem jüyesi häm türleri. Üşinşi til tanıtqış kitap. Birinşi basılıwı* ‘The system of sentence and its types. The third part for teaching language. The first edition’. The catalogue lists only its second edition of 1924 under the title *Til-qural. Söylem jüyesi häm türleri*, published in Qızıl Orda (AZ 84). The new, third revised edition appeared in print in 1925 with a slightly kazakhised subtitle *Söylem jüyesi men türleri* (Duwlatulı 2003: 259, AZ 90). Then it was reprinted a few more times, apparently in an unchanged form, since Duwlatulı points to a fourth edition in 1927 (2003: 318; absent from AZ), and AZ shows an eighth edition of 1928, probably the last one (AZ 122). The bibliography in Baytursınulı (2006 (volume 5): 280) points to five editions in the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927, which contradicts what was said before.

I will discuss the third revised edition of 1925 which was reprinted in Cyrillic characters in Baytursınulı (2005: 191–266), to which I have access. In the introduction the author explains the meaning of the term *söylem* ‘sentence’, its difference from *söylev* ‘speech; utterance’ and he says what ‘syntax’ is (191–192). In the subsequent part he deals with the parts of sentence, i.e. *bastawış* ‘subject’ (194–199), *bayandawış* ‘object’ (199–207), *anıqtawış* ‘attribute’ (208–211), *tolıqtawış* ‘compliment’ (212–216), and *pısıqtawış* ‘adverbial’ (216–221). He also points to embedded words that are not strictly integrated with the rest of the sentence. In the second part of the syntax, Baytursınulı shows various types of sentence as well as

subordinate and main clauses (234–253). The basic part of the syntax is followed by examples for exercises.

Baytursınulı also prepared a book called *Til jumsar* lit. ‘language user’ in two volumes: volume one *Til-jumsar. Söylew, oquw, jazuw tilin jumıs täjiribesi arqılı tanıtatın 1-inşi kitap* in 1928, 46 pages (AZ 122), for a photocopy of the title page see Baytursınov (1992: 334), and volume two *Til-jumsar. Söylew, oquw, jazuw tilin jumıs täjiribesi arqılı tanıtatın ekinşi kitap* in 1929, 90 pages (AZ 133), which may be translated as ‘Language user. The first/second book teaching spoken, read and written language by exercises’. I have not had access to the original editions, but the first part was republished in Cyrillic script in Baytursınov (1992: 335–356) and Baytursınulı (2005 (volume 3): 283–308). As the author says in the introduction to the first part, this book is a practical aid to teach the structure of the language to children with the application of a new method. Baytursınulı stressed the importance of exercises and practice. The second part was intended to broaden and deepen the acquired knowledge and abilities.

### 3. Assessment of Baytursınulı's works on language

Most importantly, we have to answer the question of what is original in Baytursınulı's grammar and what is modeled on existing grammars he could have used. Looking at morphology, word classes and syntax, it is evident that Russian grammars affected Baytursınulı's ideas, but his terms and categories are far from just a simple imitation. For example, if we compare his grammar with Russian grammars he had access to, e.g. Vostokov's grammar of 1831 and some subsequent ones, we see many similarities, but also many differences. What is similar is the order of word classes in morphology, i.e. the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the pronoun, and the verb. However, in Russian grammars of that time there is no common term for the remaining word classes, as Baytursınulı's *şılaw sözder*.

Some terms are also similar in meaning to the Russian equivalents, e.g. the name of the nominative *ataw* and the Russian *именительный*, but names of other cases are different, e.g. *родительный* and *ilik* ‘genitive’, *дательный* and *barıs* ‘dative’. Also the term *septik* ‘case’ has nothing in common with the Russian *падеж*.

Although the position of the verb is the same as in Russian grammars, the treatment of verb categories is different. The parts of sentence are the same, some and particular units have names with similar meanings, e.g. *tolıqtawış* and Russian *дополнение* ‘compliment’, though some are different, e.g. *bastawış*, Russian *подлежащее* ‘subject’.

Even if Baytursınulı used Russian grammars as a model, he did it in a creative, not imitative way. It was so because he was aware of the structural difference

between Russian and Kazakh, which he expressed in the introduction to the first book in the series. Therefore, some categories of Russian, e.g. grammatical gender, irrelevant to Kazakh, are not discussed, and some other, e.g. the postposition, are his novelty.

It may be claimed that the following aspects are innovative in his grammar: the description of vowels and consonants; the category of politeness; the classification of possessive suffixes into one possessor and more possessors or collective; the types of diathesis; the types of mood.

It is unlikely that a grammar of a Turkic language could influence his ideas and description. As for Turkish, there were many grammars written in Europe before 1914, but most of them presented the description of Turkish in a pre-modern way. Even if Baytursinuli had access to European grammars in Orenburg between 1910–1914, it is unlikely that he could read Latin, German, or French. We should not forget that his education lasted only six years. Moreover, in 1926 Baytursinuli admitted himself that he was proficient in three languages only: Russian, Kirghiz and his native Kazakh (Baytursinuli 2006 (volume 4): 276). The same problem is with the Turkic languages spoken in Russia. It is unlikely that Baytursinuli could read Böhlingk's compendium of Yakut (1851) or Castrén's grammar of Koibal and Karagas (1857), both written in German, but even if so, the comparison shows that they are quite different. Kazembek's grammar of Turkish-Tatar was also written in a completely different way (Kazembek 1846). There were some grammars of Kazakh, but the only good one written by a Turkologist was that by Melioranski (1894, 1897). However, the comparison of these two grammars shows that Melioranski is very different and could not be a model for Baytursinuli.

Therefore, although his education in Russian and the years spent in Orenburg influenced most of his ideas about language, his description of Kazakh is original and innovative. Although in some respects, such as the relation to Arabic script, Baytursinuli was conservative, he realized the fact that the progress of the Kazakh people was only possible on the basis of the national language. He was convinced that the Kazakhs could get ahead only if they overcame illiteracy and became educated through the medium of their national language. This conviction helped Baytursinuli break with Tatar, Chaghatai and Russian models of description. It helped him understand his language. Most of his linguistic terms are words understood by common people and they are an important key to using the language creatively. It is evident if we look how influential he was in the circle of the emerging Kazakh intelligentsia. Naturally not all of his ideas are correct, as I tried to point out above, as he confused some categories and neglected others.

If we evaluate Baytursinuli's work we have to take into consideration the circumstances in which he worked. A son of a political victim, he was arrested and jailed a few times and deported as far as Arkhangelsk. His constant travels across the immense lands of Kazakhstan certainly did not facilitate his work; he could not

have a rich library nor other materials to work with. Except for Orenburg, there were no good libraries or bookstores, if any, in most places where he stayed. To really understand how he lived and worked, it is very instructive to visit his museum, in Baytursınulı's street in Almaty. He was a very modest man and possessed so little.

Lastly, it must be said that *Ādebiyet tanıtqıŝ*, his study on literature published in 1926, is more original and theoretically better grounded than his works on language. Nobody else in the Turkic world wrote anything of this kind before him. As we can see, Baytursınulı was motivated by practical needs. Initially, he did not write theoretical studies, since there were few people to read it. Therefore, his first task was to bring literacy to the Kazakhs and after a very short period of time he could see the results. We can be sure that Baytursınulı would write a comprehensive grammar with a better theoretical background, if not the ban, persecution and imprisonment. Therefore, the evaluation of *Ādebiyet tanıtqıŝ* should be the subject of another, separate article, a homage that should be paid to this exceptional man not only in Kazakhstan but in the whole Turkic world. This has already been done by the Kazakh authors in Kazakh. The most thorough evaluation of Baytursınulı's *Ādebiyet tanıtqıŝ* was presented by Isimaqova (2009: 167–176). She argues that some ideas about the novel known as part of Bakhtin's theory of the 1970s (in fact, his first study was published in 1929) were already formulated by Baytursınulı (Isimaqova 2009: 174).

#### 4. Baytursınulı's impact

A great tragedy of Kazakh culture, science and national language is that nearly all nation-minded intellectuals, especially those who participated or supported the Alash movement were persecuted, condemned and executed in the 1930s. The name and the works of Baytursınulı were banned and his name appeared anew only in 1989 when a selection of his works was published in the transcription to the current standard Cyrillic writing (Baytursınov 1989). This first new edition was in some points incomplete and some proper names were transformed into Russian forms. The most complete and reliable publication is the five-volume selection of his writings republished in the 2000s (Baytursınulı 2003–2006).

As Baldauf (1993: 273) has demonstrated, his idea of modifier (*däyekŝi*) had a great influence not only in Kazakhstan but also outside both on script reformers and advocates of Latin. It was accepted by the Tatars and the Kirghiz, for Kirghiz see also Wäli's notice (2007: 36). In Baldauf's opinion (1993: 260) Baytursınulı's reformed script is the only one that can really be considered phonetic.

Despite the political ban, most of his ideas about language and his multiple terms survived. For example, all names of case suffixes, the terms for 'diathesis', 'mood', all names of word classes, i.e. noun, adjective, verb etc., the name of such

basic linguistics units as subject, object, predicate, attribute, complement, types of sentence and clauses that he coined are used until presently. Similarly, nearly all his terms of morphology and many terms of phonetics are also retained, such as consonant, vowel, suffix, ending, stem, root and derivation. Baytursınulı was aware that Kazakh must be protected against Tatar and Russian. The emancipation from Tatar succeeded, but Russian was still a great danger. We can see how disastrous Russian influence proved on Kazakh which started in Kazakhstan after the communists got rid of such people as Baytursınulı, Bökeyhan and Duwlatulı, and only allowed to work those who slavishly did what they wanted.

Naturally, not all Baytursınulı's terms have survived. Some of them, e.g. *til-qural*, are not used any longer and now the international term borrowed via Russian, *grammatika*, is used – see e.g. Jiyenbayulı's Grammar of 1930, designed for schools (AZ-2 23), as well as many other subsequent grammars. Another term created by Baytursınulı, *oquw quralı*, was replaced with *oquwlıq* 'textbook'.

However, some Kazakh authors have returned to Baytursınulı's terminology. For example, Mirzabekov's practical phonetics published in 1993 as *Qazaq tili fenetikasi* 'Phonetics of the Kazakh language' in the 1999 edition was renamed *Qazaq tiliniñ dıbis jüyesi* 'the sound system of the Kazakh language', exactly in Baytursınulı's spirit. Moreover, the term *oquwlıq* in the subtitle was replaced with Baytursınulı's *oquw quralı* as well.

Baytursınulı, after whom the Institute of Linguistics at the Kazakh Academy of Sciences is named, is certainly the founder of the Kazakh linguistic school and language teaching. His classifications, concepts and terms are encountered in most textbooks for Kazakh in Kazakhstan. Regrettably, his ideas could not develop for so many years and after the ban on him and other independent Kazakh scholars almost all innovations in linguistics were copied from Soviet linguistics and cut off from the rest of the free world. This is still often seen in Kazakhstan, though a group of conscious Kazakh linguists are doing their best to bring his heritage back to Kazakh linguistics. The greatest homage to Baytursınulı was paid with the appearance of the commemorating volume edited by Malbaqov and Sızdıq (2013), whose title is very instructive of how patriotic Kazakhs respect him: "Ahmet Baytursınulı – spiritual leader of the Kazakhs". However, his ideas about language and literature are not familiar to the international reader; only Baldauf has evaluated Baytursınulı's contribution to the creation of a reformed writing system for Kazakh and its impact. Therefore, this is still a task to be undertaken.

### Symbols

<> graphic representation in ambiguous cases

[] phonetic representation

// phonemic representation

## Bibliography

- Altinsarin 1879 = Алтынсаринъ, И. 1879. *Киргизская Хрестоматія*. Оренбургъ: Типографія И. И. Ефимовскаго-Мировицкаго.
- AZ = Аскарбекова, Набат, Толқын Замзаева. 2006. *Араб графикасымен басылған қазақ кітаптарының каталогы (1841–1932)*. Алматы: Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық Кітапханасы.
- AZ-2 = Аскарбекова, Набат, Толқын Замзаева. 2007. *Латын графикасымен басылған қазақ кітаптарының каталогы (1928–1942). I-бөлім. Жалпы бөлім, Философия, Психология, Логика, Атеизм, Дін, Қоғамдық-саяси ғылымдар, Тіл білімі, Жаратылыстану ғылымдары*. Алматы: Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық Кітапханасы.
- Baldauf, Ingeborg. 1993. *Schriftreform und Schriftwechsel bei den muslimischen Russland- und Sowjettürken (1850–1937): ein Symptom Ideengeschichtlicher und Kulturpolitischer Entwicklung*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Baytursinov 1989 = Байтұрсынов, Ахмет 1989. *Шығармалары. Өлеңдер, аудармалар, зерттеулер*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Baytursinov 1992 = Байтұрсынов, Ахмет. 1992. *Тіл тағалымы (қазақ тілі мен оқу-ағартуға қатысты еңбектері)*. Алматы: Ана тілі.
- Baytursinuli 1926 = بايتۇرسىنۇلى، اقىمەت. ءالب-ءىبى. جاڭا قۇرال. قازاعىستان ءىلىم ورداسى مەكتەبەتە قولدانىۋعا ۋىعارعان. Кзыл Орда. [Baytursinuli, Aqimet. 1926. *Ālib-biy. Jaŋa qural. Qazaǵıstan Bilim Ordası mektepte qoldanuǵa uǵarǵan*].
- Baytursinuli, Aqimet. 1928. *Elib-biy. Saŋa aural. 3-nı ıret basılıwı*. Oızıl Orda: Qazaǵıstan Bilim Ordası [the book is in Arabic script: بايتۇرسىنۇلى، اقىمەت. ءالب-ءىبى. جاڭا قۇرال. قازاعىستان ءىلىم ورداسى مەكتەبەتە قولدانىۋعا ۋىعارعان. ۳نشى رەت باسلىۋى ; this page also in Latin: a. baitursyn ulь. jaŋa qural. 3- basylwь, and Cyrillic: А. Байтурсунов. 1928. *Новый букварь. Издание 3*. Кзыл Орда: Казиздат; the 3rd edition of Baytursinuli 1926; reprinted and transcribed into Cyrillic in 1998].
- Baytursinuli 2003–2006 = Байтұрсынұлы, Ахмет. 2003–2006. *Бес томдық шығармалар жинағы. I том – Өлеңдер, әдеби-ғылыми зерттеулер (2003), II том – Оқу құралы (2004), III том – Тіл-құралы (2005), IV том – Әліптелер мен мақалалар (2006), V том – Ер Сайын, 23 жоқтау, мақалалар (2006)*. Алматы: Алаш Мұрасы [ed. A. Ісімақова et al.; note that there were at least two various printings with different page numbering].
- Baytursunof 1914 = بايتۇرسۇنوف. ءتل-قورال. قازاق ءتلنىڭ صرفى. ءبرنچى جلدق. Оренбургъ: А. А. Ху-саиновъ и ко. [Baytursunof, Aqimet. 1914. *Til-qural. Qazaq tiliniñ sarfi. Birinçi jldıq*].
- Baytursunof 1922 = بايتۇرسۇنوف. اوقۇۇ قۇرالى. اصول صوتيه جولى مين ترتيب ايتلگەن قازاقچا الفبا. ءنچى. باسلىۋى. Киргизский букварь. “Уку-Куралы”. 1922. Ташкент: Туркестанское Государственное Издательство. [Baytursunof, A. Oquw quralı. Usul sawtıya jolı men tǎrtib etilgen qazaqça Ālif-ba. Birinçi jldıq kitab 4-nçi basılıwı; 4th edition; the 1st edition was printed in 1912 in Orenburg].
- Dosmuhamedov 1922–1923 = Досмұхамедов, Халел. 2010 (1922–1923). Қазақ тілінің сингармонизм заңы: Сәрсөбай Кәрібаев (ed.). 2010. *Шолман. – 1922 жылдың 1923* Алматы: Ан-Арыс, 39–41, 134–139, 272–280.
- Duwlatalı 2003 = Дулатұлы, Міржақып. 2003. *Бес томдық шығармалар жинағы. 3. Көсемсөз, әдеби сын, зерттеу мақалалары, қазақ тілінде басылған кітаптар көрсеткіштері*. Алматы: Мектеп. [ed. Ж. Ысмағұлов et al.]
- Il'minskii 1861 = Ильминский, Н. И. 1861. *Материалы для изучения Киргизскаго нарѣчія*. Казань.

- Isimaqova 2009 = Ісімақова, Айгүл. 2009. *Алаш әдебиеттануы*. Алматы: Мектеп.
- Jüsipulı 1998 = Жүсіпұлы, Маханбет. 1998. *Ахмет Байтұрсынов және қазіргі қазақ тілі фонологиясы*. Алматы: „Ғылым”.
- Kazem-bek 1846 = Каземь-бек, Мирза А. 1846. *Общая грамматика турецко-татарского языка. Второе издание*. النحو ابوها و يقوي في الدرايات داروها. Казань.
- Malbaqov, Sızdıq 2013 = М. Малбақов, Р. Сыздық (et. al. eds). 2013. *Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы – Қазақ руханиятының көсемі. Халықаралық ғылыми-теориялық конференцияның материалдары*. Алматы: Елтаным баспасы.
- Melioranskij 1894, 1897 = Мелиоранский, П. М. 1894; 1897. *Краткая грамматика казакь-киргизскаго языка. Часть I. Фонетика и этимология; Часть II. Синтаксись* Санктпетербургь: Типографія Императорской Академіи Наукь.
- Mırzabekov 1999 = Мырзабеков, Сапархан. 1999. *Қазақ тілінің дыбыс жүйесі. Оқу құралы*. Алматы: Сөздік-Словарь.
- NRTED = Alkim, U. Bahadır (et al., eds.). 1991. *Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-İngilizce Sözlük. New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*: Redhouse Yayınevi.
- Qıyabayev, Sızdıqova, Qoygeldiyev 2009 = Қирабаев, С., Р. Сыздықова, М. Қойгелдиев. 2009. *Байтұрсынов: Ғ. Әнес, С. Смағұлова (eds). Алаш. Алашорда. Энциклопедия*. Алматы: Арыс, 90–96.
- Wäli 2007 = Уәли, Н. 2007. А. Байтұрсынұлы – ұлттық жазудың негізін қалаушы: Уәли, Нұргелді, Құралай Күдерінова, Анар Фазылжанова, Орынай Жұбаева (eds.) 2007, 32–37.
- Wäli 2013 = Уәли, Н. 2013. А. Байтұрсынұлы әліпбиінің фонологиялық негіздері туралы: М. Малбақов, Р. Сыздық (et. al. eds) 2013, 46–49.
- Wäli, Küderinova, Fazıljanova, Jubayeva 2007 = Уәли, Нұргелді, Құралай Күдерінова, Анар Фазылжанова, Орынай Жұбаева (eds.) 2007. *Латын графикасы негізіндегі қазақ әліпбиі: тарихы, тағалымы және болашағы*. Алматы: Арыс.

## **Semantic Groups of Kazakh Gestures and Their Representation in Verbal Language**

In everyday life people not only use spoken language, they also communicate using conventional signs. Conventional signs have become an important component of meta-communication and information exchange. It is obvious that most conventional signs can be classified as semiotic signs. In addition to semiotic signs, there are also non-verbal means of communication. In the course of meta-communication, communicating parties show many mimic gestures and cues using such parts of the body as the chin, head, hands, eyebrows, eyes and lips, and often several at the same time.

With the help of meta-communication we can receive different information. Gestures and facial expressions reflect the mood of a person and their character; express their attitude to the listener and their assessment of a particular action, various life events and circumstances. Therefore, information acquired through paralinguistic communication can be divided into several groups: (1) personal features of an individual; (2) characteristics of his or her social group; and (3) national or territorial attributes of the speaker (Bejsembaeva 2002: 5).

From the viewpoint of formation, non-verbal linguistic units can be divided into the following groups: (1) phonational, e.g. tempo, tone of voice, participation of voice, pause, melody; (2) kinesthetic, e.g. movement, facial movements, gestures, posture; and (3) graphic features, e.g. writing, autograph, symbols, etc.

Due to the fact that the national characteristics of non-verbal modes prevail over its other characteristics, mental originality and cultural specificity are largely preserved in kinesics. "The culture of a man is not just a certain human mindset and feeling, it is also language knowledge and fluency in non-verbal codes adopted in a society, it is a movement toward regulations and rules of the communicative behavior that makes people feel and be aware of their belonging to a given culture in the indispensable combination of attention and respect for the culture

of others and its native speakers” (Krejdlin 2002: 151). Indeed, experience shows that people who do not know a language try to communicate through gestures and facial expressions, but if they do not know the national culture of the people with whom they want to communicate, it can result in many cases of confusion, sometimes even in absurd situations. Therefore, gestures and facial expressions can be both universal and nation-specific.

If there is a lot of information concerning mankind’s history, customs and traditions, the type of nationality can be recognized by non-verbal means. “It is because non-verbal components such as language strategies are a national phenomenon. They mirror the basic elements of the customs and traditions of a nation.” (Seysenova 1998: 143).

The use of non-verbal units related to the cultural identity of the Kazakhs in literary works of writers gives a special colouring to their style and narration, e.g. *sarqıt berüw* ‘giving food from a festive table’, *sarqıtıñı iştirüw* and *sarqıtıñı qaldıruw* ‘leaving food from a festive table for someone’, *añnan qaytıp kele jatqan añsınıñ bir toğızın qarısı jolıqqan ya qalağan adamnıñ üyine baylaw* ‘hunter should give one ninth of his game to anybody he encounters when returning from hunting or tie it to the gate of the benevolent man’s house’; *tañğı astan awız tiygiziw* ‘not to miss breakfast and to take at least a small piece of food’; *jañadan kelip körşi qonğan üyge erüwlik berüw* ‘inviting the new-coming neighbours over and offering presents to them’, *qudalarmen quyırıq-bawır jesüw* ‘to eat a meal made of rump and liver with the parents of one’s daughter or son, or with matchmakers’ and *şaşuw şaşuw* ‘offering candies on joyous occasions by tossing them’.

There are many idioms in Kazakh related to the emotional character of gestures. Such idioms reflect the traditional Kazakh culture. In the following, there is a list of what are probably the most common idioms of this type: *bata berüw*, *onıñ onı jäne teris türi* ‘blessing somebody or cursing somebody with a special hand gesture’; *omırawın sütin kökke sawuw* ‘working in vain’, *moynına burşaq saluw* ‘asking for lost things’, *artınan topraq şaşuw* ‘doing something behind somebody’s back’, *qol jayuw* ‘opening the palms of somebody’s hands in a gesture of blessing’, *bet sıypaw* ‘stroking one’s face with the palms of the hands (after a prayer or meal)’, *şaş sıypaw* ‘stroking one’s hair to show a sense of tenderness and affection’, *köñil aytuw* ‘extending one’s condolences’.

The essence of non-verbal communication undoubtedly lies in its ethnical characteristics so that its verbalization in written form only enriches the linguistic image of the world. Gestures and facial expressions can be distinguished by age and sex features.

For example, the following Kazakh gestures refer to men: *qamşımen közge şuquw* ‘pointing the whip to the eyes, i.e. accusing someone of something’, *tös qağıstıruw* ‘hugging each other, touching the chests to show friendship (it is customarily performed by fathers-in-law at weddings)’, *arqağa qağuw* ‘clapping on

the shoulder as a sign of approval and praise', *ıyǵınan nuqıp jiberüw* 'hitting on the shoulder', *birin-biri iyterip qaluw* 'pushing each other which means quarrel'.

Another group of signs is characteristic of women: *bet jurtuw* 'ripping, scratching one's face as a sign of mourning', *ernin şıǵaruw* 'sticking out one's lower lip forward to mock or annoy somebody', *betin şımşuw* 'pinching one's cheek as a sign of shame for someone's bad behavior, wicked deed', *şaşın jayıp jiberüw* 'unbraiding one's hair as a sign of mourning', *oramal bulǵaw* 'waving a handkerchief (after someone)'. Jubanov (1999: 41) who first studied non-verbal modes of this type defined them as characteristic of the language of women.

Kazakh meta-communication is also differentiated by age. The usage of gestures and facial expressions by children differs from those by the adults. Children use several gestures and facial expressions one by one or in a complex way, e.g. *tilin şıǵaruw* 'sticking out one's tongue', *awzın qıysındatuw* 'twisting one's mouth', *ıyǵın qıyqındatuw* 'hamming one's shoulders', *sanın şapalaqtaw* 'slapping one's thighs', *turǵan ornında sekiruw* 'jumping in place', *birimen biri sekirip jürip quşaqtasuw* 'embracing each other while jumping', which is a mixture of kinesics and touching.

We have assigned a task to the students who worked on their BA and MA theses to conduct a questionnaire to identify the active types and frequency of non-verbal communication modes. The results show that schoolchildren use body movement such as the motion of the hands and arms at an average frequency. Nevertheless, the common gesture among boys is *qol alısuw* 'shaking hands', because the custom of *qol alısip amandasuw* 'greeting by shaking hands' between men has been established since ancient times. The questionnaire demonstrated that the eldest, senior grade schoolchildren greet girls with a kiss on cheek, which is recently becoming a habit. The study demonstrated that young, junior grade schoolchildren scoff each other by showing their tongues, push each other in order to direct one's attention and young schoolgirls applaud and jump when they are pleased.

In comparison with other stylistic varieties of language, the frequency of non-verbal expressions in literary style is high and their semantic types are multiple. They can be divided into the following semantic groups: archaic non-verbal expressions, professional non-verbal expressions, optional non-verbal expressions, vulgar and rude gestures, taboo gestures and dialect non-verbal expressions.

Archaic non-verbal expressions include the following: *betine küye jaǵuw* 'spreading soot on one's face' (blackening someone's good reputation, defaming); *at quyrıǵın kesisüw* 'cutting the tail of a horse off' (breaking off relations, terminating communication); *artynan topyraq şaşuw* 'throwing soil behind somebody' (saying goodbye).

Optional non-verbal expressions are used in the same context and have identical meaning, e.g. both *qol bulǵaw* 'waving hand' and *tumaq bulǵaw* 'waving (one's) cap' mean 'saying goodbye'.

Professional non-verbal expressions are normally limited in use to certain areas of professional activity.

Taboo gestures are believed to go back to the remote past and to be related to myths and old beliefs of the Kazakhs. They are linked to the national consciousness, culture, spiritual and material life reflected in language and meta-communication. Therefore, understanding and interpreting taboo gestures can be a method of understanding the culture of an ethnic group or people. For example, *tiliñdi ŧıǵarma, uyat boladı* ‘do not stick out your tongue, it is rude’, *adamǵa qarap kerilme* ‘do not stretch, staring at somebody’ (it is impolite), *adamǵa qarap qoliñdi ŧoŧaytpa* ‘do not point a finger at somebody’ (it is impolite) etc. are non-verbal taboo expressions in traditional Kazakh culture.

As for dialect non-verbal expressions, we can show their diversification in a few examples related to the custom of offering tea to a guest. For instance, turning the teaspoon upside down on the cup, turning the cup upside down or bending the edge of the tablecloth are differently understood in different districts.

There may be various relationships between non-verbal expressions, such as antonymy, homonymy or paronymy. Non-verbal expressions may be optional and of various styles and registers, for example occasional, archaic, vulgar or rude. Some of them are deeply rooted in the linguistic image of the world of a culture.

Culture specific non-verbal expressions are often introduced to other cultures and nations by literature. Translations of literary works from one language into another are one of the primary sources of the knowledge of a culture and a platform of intercultural dialogue. Correct and accurate translation – either literal or equivalent – of non-verbal expressions verbalized in a text is a necessary prerequisite for the understanding of national specificity, the heritage of a nation. Regarding translation methods, it is very important to identify the non-verbal expressions properly and choose a suitable translation. Some non-verbal expressions are difficult to render by the means of another culture. When translating, one has to pay attention to various issues such as the usage of the most appropriate grammatical structures and aesthetic features of a literary work. The correct interpretation of stylistic function of non-verbal expressions is essential for the translator, but also the language and readers who will read a literary work.

In the following attention will be paid to the verbalization of some non-verbal expressions in Muhtar Äwezov’s novel *Abai’s Way* (Kaz. Абай жолы).

... *Үйдің іші әрі қайран боп, әрі сүйсініп, қарқылдай күле жөнелді. Майбасар қысылғаннан, үнсіз гана лекітiп күле берiп, Абай бітірген уақытта, басын шайқап, дымы құрып, боқтап жіберді де:*

– *Қап! Қап! Мына жаманның қылығын-ай!.. Енді қайттым, бәтір-ау?!  
Абай күліп мысқылдап:*

– *Бол, ататын болсаң, өлеңмен ат, Майеке, әйтпесе, тыңдамаймын! – деп, басын шайқады* (Äwezov 1989a: 92).

In this passage *basın ŧayqaw* ‘shaking one’s head’ expresses two different meanings: 1. ‘hopelessness, being in some indeterminate state’, 2. ‘superfluous, unnecessary action’ and even ‘denial; resignation’. This passage was translated into Russian so that the Kazakh expression ‘shaking one’s head’ was rendered by two similar, but different expressions:

*Жигиты рахохотались, пораженные неожиданной выходкой, – песня понравилась всем. Майбасар, растерявшись, не нашелся, что ответить. При последних словах песни он только **покачал головой** и крепко выругался.*

*– Ну и ну! Вы смотрите, что выделывает этот озорник! – усмехаясь, сказал он. – Как же мне быть?!*

*Абай насмешливо подзадорил его:*

*– Отвечайте, Майеке, если хотите! Но только в стихах, иначе и слушать не стану. – И он **замотал головой** (Auezov 1997b: 117).*

As we can see, we can translate this passage in two different ways, either from Kazakh or Russian. In the following, I will provide a translation from Russian as it is a better-known language:

“The young men burst out laughing, hit by a sudden outcome – everyone liked the song. Maybasar, confused, did not know what to say. At the last words of the song he just **shook his head** and firmly swore.

‘Oh, you! Look what this wicked guy makes!’ He said, smiling. ‘Well, what shall I do?’

Abay mocked him:

‘Answer, Mayeке, if you want! But only in verse, otherwise I will be unable to listen.’ And he **shook his head**.”

The translated text is a result of the creative process and is also a literary work. As can be seen from the above passage, the interpreter reproduces the contents of the source text adequately, saving its aesthetic values and the originality of the words. The translator knows both languages perfectly and demonstrates his rich imaginative potential, as evidenced by the equivalence of verbalization of the non-verbal expressions.

Sometimes the translation of a non-verbal expression may be nearly literal and quite successful, as in the following examples of the translation of *Abai’s Way* into Russian:

*Көрішiлес, туысқан елдің ауыр жайларын Қадырбай күрсiне түсiп, қиналып тыңдады. Жүдеп, мұңайып отыр. **Басын шайқап, таңдайын қағады** (Äwezov 1989a: 241).*

*Старик слушал, не скрывая глубокой печали: горе соседнего племени удручало его. Изредко он **покачивал головою и причмокивал языком** (Auezov 1997ba: 285).*

“The old man listened, making no secret of deep sorrow: the miserable condition of the neighboring tribe depressed him. Occasionally, he **shook his head and smacked his lips**.”

In this passage, *shaking his head* does not mean denial, but a state of despair, empathy and bitterness, which is expressed by two non-verbal expressions. Our observations show that the translation of this complex expression is done adequately.

The expression ‘to bow the head’ frequently denotes ‘recognition of power, superiority and value of someone’, so it is with respect and admiration, though it also shows approval and consent. The similarity of such gestures in both Kazakh and Russian cultures enables an equivalent translation. For example:

*Айтқан сөзін құп алды да, үндеместен бас иді* (Auezov 1989a: 237);

*Он молча склонил голову в знак согласия с нею* (Auezov 1997a: 280);

‘He **bowed his head silently in a gesture of agreement** with her’.

There are cases when it is difficult or impossible to transfer fully the meaning of non-verbal expressions while translating Kazakh fiction into Russian. This may be caused by a few factors. Naturally, the first reason lies in the competency of the translator. Another reason may be the lack of an equivalent non-verbal expression in the target language. In such a case, the translator must find an approximate expression. When the translator renders the content in favor of a non-literal, but approximate expression, it may result in the loss of the beauty and impressiveness of the source language. Moreover, if the translator is too far from the original, the translation may even be false and this may distort the original text or its meaning.

For example, the passage:

*Өз қадірін жоймайтындай, тең тәрбиелі сыпайылықпен бас иіп: Мен Ибрагим Құнанбаевпын. Халықтан шыққан жұпыны кісімін, – деді* (Auezov 1989a: 396) was translated into Russian as

*Абай учтиво снял тымак и сдержанно, с достоинством поклонился. – Я, Ибрагим Кунанбаев, просто человек из народа, – ответил он и выжидательно поднял глаза на чиновника...* (Auezov 1997b: 132).

‘Abay took his fur cap off and **bowed** reservedly, with dignity.

‘I am Ibrahim Kunanbayev, a man from ordinary people’, he said, and looked expectantly at the official”.

In the Kazakh tradition the gesture *bas iyiw* ‘bowing (one’s) head’, apart from a ‘recognition of power, superiority and value of someone’, as said above, also denotes ‘tilting one’s head slightly and holding it for a while’, while Russian *поклониться* means ‘bowing to the ground before someone’. At this point it must be stressed that there is a slight difference in greeting in both cultures. Therefore, while the Russian translation shows bowing down typical of Russian customs, it does not render how the Kazakhs greet and show respect.

There are frequent cases when non-verbal expressions are completely ignored and left untranslated. Such a case is called lacuna. Lacunae in translation are different from close translation. Some non-verbal expressions are untranslatable, which

makes the rendering difficult to do. It is evident that it is not without reasons. The reasons are specific, individual features of particular languages and cultures. The analysis of the translation of different non-verbal expressions is an important task for research.

In conclusion, we would like to say that Kazakh meta-communication is as important as verbal communication. The translation of the non-verbal components of overall communication is also important, since it depicts the way of Kazakh thinking and culture.

### Bibliography

- Auezov 1997a = Ауэзов, Мұхтар. 1997a. *Путь Абая. Книга 1*. Алматы: Ана тілі [Перевод: А. Никольский, Л. Соболева].
- Auezov 1997b = Ауэзов, Мұхтар. 1997b. *Путь Абая. Книга 2*. Алматы: Ана тілі [Перевод: А. Никольский, Л. Соболева].
- Äwezov 1989a = Әуезов, Мұхтар. 1989a. *Абай жолы. Роман-эпопея. 2 томдық. 1-кітап*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Äwezov 1989b = Әуезов, Мұхтар. 1989b. *Абай жолы. Роман-эпопея. 2 томдық. 2-кітап*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Bejsembaeva 2002 = Бейсембаева, С. 2002. *Невербальные компоненты коммуникации в казахском языке*. Алматы [unpublished candidate dissertation].
- Jubanov 1999 = Жұбанов, Қ. 1999. *Қазақ тілі жөніндегі зерттеулер*. Алматы: Ғылым.
- Krejdlin 2002 = Крейдлин, Г. Е. 2002. *Невербальная семиотика: Язык тела и естественный язык*. Москва: Новое Литературное Обозрение.
- Seysenova 1998 = Сейсенова, А. Д. 1998. *Лингвистикалық мәдениеттану: этикет нормаларына салыстырмалы талдау*. Алматы [unpublished candidate dissertation].



# Some Linguistic Features of the Kazakh Oral Epic in Mañğıstaw

## 1. Kazakh epic tradition

The tradition of epic singing occupies a special place in Kazakh culture. The epic output of the fifteenth–nineteenth centuries is a bridge between the oral and written tradition. The singers known from this period are distinguished by their oratorical, improvisatory, vocal and memorizing abilities as well as philosophical competence that brought into being a special national culture.

Epic singers are called *jıraws* and their epic is called *jır*. One of the most characteristic features of epic singing is its oral performance and transference. Epic singers perform their poetry orally for the audience, creating oeuvres from various historical and contemporary stories perceived through their emotions. Their narratives spread among the people and live in the memory forever. Epic singers once acted as advisers to the khans and aristocracy as well as mediators between the khans and ordinary people, transmitting khans' decrees and orders to the people and giving feedback to the sovereigns. They participated in public and political life and joined military campaigns. They transformed the words of the sovereigns into oratorical speeches. The special position of epic singers required eloquence and oratorical ability, promptness in thinking and ability to build narrative poetry and perform it in song form.

Another important kind of ability is memory, called *jadkeştik*. They performed both their own epics and tales invented by other masters. Such great epic singers of Mañğıstaw<sup>1</sup> as Abıl, Nurım and Qaşagan were able to sing the entire cycle of *Qırımñ qırıq batırı* 'The Crimea's forty heroes' consisting of forty tales in three months without interruption. In the twentieth century this tradition was continued by Murın Señirbekulı. From the eighteenth century onward the oral tradition of

---

<sup>1</sup> Better known as Manqışlaq (Mankyshlak).

Kazakh epic singing shifted to oral poetry (*aqındıq*), which brought about a characteristic Kazakh school. According to Răbiġa Sızdıq (Сыздық 2004: 130–131), the difference between epic singers and poets is the following: “An epic singer is not just an ordinary man, he is a public activist, a thinker and a leader. The epic singer does not sing tales about ordinary matters and the immaterial daily routine of life. He sings tales important to the nation, gives advice on how to avoid evil and how to do good deeds. By contrast, a poet is not expected to carry out such tasks as his poetry refers to the ordinary lives of the people, their happiness and sadness, their suffering and needs, their desires and dreams. The theme of a poem performed by a poet is everyday life, his own entourage and environment. Therefore, the thematic scope of a composition by a poet is free. This difference is reflected in language.”

The transition from oral epic to oral poetry has its historical reasons. In the eighteenth century, there were important changes in the Kazakh reality. The Khanate declined and was replaced by a new social and political structure. Along with this change, the mission fulfilled by epic singers at khans’ courts also dwarfed and began to disappear. However, there was need for their ideological help at the time of wars with their aggressors. As a result, oral epic singing coexisted with oral poetry in this transitory period, which is known as the period of epic singing and poetry (*aqın-jırawlar*). Beside such epic singers as Aqtamberdi, Tătiġara, Umbetey and Buhar, also poets such as Őal and Kőteő were acting. Some acted as both oral epic singers and poets, e.g. Abıl, Nurım, Aqtan, Aralbay and Qaőaġan.

In order to understand the special nature of the oral epic singer, it is worth explaining the etymology of the term *jıraw*. The Kazakhs employ the terms *jıraw*, *jırşı*, *aqın*, *őayır* and *taqtaq* for singers of tales and poets. In Karakalpak and some other Turkic languages the term *baqsı* is used as a term corresponding to Kazakh *aqın*. The word *baqsı* denotes in Kazakh a shaman playing a *qobız* ‘a horsehair stringed musical instrument played with a horsehair bow’ with its enchanting melody and unusual movements (dance, jumping to a yurt’s chimney opening, putting glowing iron into his mouth), who was supposed to cure ill people by ridding them of evil demons. Wălihanov (Уăлиханов 1985: 11–14) in his well-known article on the shamanistic relics among the Kazakhs observes that the shamans were associated with admiring the world, love of nature and a cult of ancestors. A shaman had the skills of enchanting and deep knowledge that distinguished him from other people. A shaman was also a poet and an instrumentalist, a sage and a healer, thus he was a person with diversified skills and competences. In Mongol, this word was used for a teacher, similar to Uyghur *bahşı*, while the Turkmens employed it for a poet.

Őirmunskij and Zarifov (Жирмунский, Зарифов 1947) demonstrated that the Uzbeks called different types of epic singers *bahşı*, *őayır* and *cırov*. Vesolo-

vskij (Веселовский 1989: 75–81) emphasized that the poetry and epics of ancient people were strictly tied to magic. In his view, poetry and music of a working society had the power of activating sorcery or, in other words, people believed in the magic of poetry. Borovkov pointed out that the word *cirov* was little used by the Uzbeks, who called epic singers *bahşi* and *şayir* (Боровков 1958 : 69). Jubanov (Жұбанов 1978: 11–14) observed that in Karakalpak there is a term *ögiz jıraw* to denote the singers of the heroic epic. Some relate the word *ögiz* to *ozan*. According to Barthold, the word *ozan* was used in Old Turkic for a performer of *destans* and Oghuzname, who played special instruments.

It is evident that both the Kazakhs and other Turkic peoples regarded epic singing as a special competence of a virtually holy character. It must be for this reason that epic and long *destans* were performed throughout centuries and transmitted from generation to generation.

## 2. The most outstanding epic singers

Among the representatives of the Mañğıstaw school of epic singers there are not only Kazakhs, but also neighboring Turkmen and Karakalpak singers. In the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries there were such renowned performers as Abıl Ötembet (1777–1864), Qalniyaz Şopıqulı (1816–1902), Nurım Şırşığululı (1831–1908), Qaşağan Kürjimanulı (1841–1929), Aqtan Kereyulı (1850–1912), Aralbay Oñğarbekulı (1854–1914) and Ömir Qaraulı (1859–1922). The subsequent generation of epic singers born in the second half of the nineteenth century continued their activities until the first half of the twentieth century, trying to combine the old with the new. Sättiğul Jañğabilulı (1876–1966) may be considered their first representative, but there are at least thirty other epic singers acting at the same time or after him.

The first oeuvres of epic singers were published in the nineteenth century in Russia by Russian missionaries (Melioranskij), and were later published by Tatar publishers in Kazan and Bashkir Divayev. The publication of epics continued during Soviet rule in Kazakhstan. However, as far as the Mañğıstaw epic is concerned, works of not more than about thirty singers appeared in print, and the others remained unknown. Soviet publications were censored and the censors made deep cuts in the works. It was only in the 1990s that the entire output of Mañğıstaw epic singers that had been registered began to appear in print (Нұрдәулетова 2007).

Material for this article is taken from the following collections: *Qayırtpay ketken Qaşağan* (Жылқышыұлы 2011), *Abıl*, *Nurım*, *Aqtanım* (Назарбекұлы 1997), *Aq beren* (Сыдықов 1972), *Köne künniñ jır kümbezi* (Нұрдәулетова 2007) and *Jır Darıya* (Сыдықов 1995).

### 3. Linguistic features of the epic school of Mañğıstaw

The epic singers whose oeuvres are analyzed in this paper lived in the period from the eighteenth–nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century. The language of their works does not differ much from present-day literary Kazakh. Despite this there are some words and meanings in their poetry that are encountered in neither modern literary Kazakh, modern oral literature nor the poetry of singers from other regions of Kazakhstan. These words will preliminarily be termed archaic and analyzed from the point of view of contextual meaning, dialect features and comparative etymology. The number of distinct lexical units is over 200, but they are not registered in the works of all of the poets. This may be related to the different periods of their lives, subject of their works, but also to the fragmentary preservation of the material. For instance, the words *alqa*, *dürew*, *bayraq* and *sürgin* are present in the works of all singers, while *alğınşı*, *al böri*, *jegde* and *qarjalaw* are found only in Abıl. It may be assumed that all of the latter words were part of the lexicon of eighteenth-century Kazakh, whereas such words as *küder* and *üb*, found in the epic of Sättiğül who lived in the twentieth century, were not standard words. The word *alaman*, regarded as Old Turkic, does not occur in Abıl's epic. This may be explained by the fact that Abıl mostly dealt with social problems and his epic, not heroic in its character, lacks many terms related to warfare, struggle and battle. Qalniyaz, often called the singer of war, uses the term *alaman* in the meaning 'soldier', whereas Nurım employs it in the sense not related to war at all, e.g. *alamandarıñ köp eken, asatpastan jep qoydı* 'your soldiers are so many, they ate and did not let others eat'. As is seen, he uses this term to designate peaceful people. In the epic of Aqtan, Ömir and Aralbay, the word *alaman* is used in the sense 'soldier, military man', though not in the context of ongoing war, but as an idea of a soldier, e.g. *azın köpke yeñgergen, alamanğa jel bergen* 'he equated few with many, he gave wind to the soldiers'. In Qaşağan's work this word is used in the meaning 'public, publicity'.

The word *alqa* is used by Abıl as 'group; environment', e.g. *alqada qızıl tildi sayraytın* 'he sang with his red tongue for his companions'. A similar meaning is found in Nurım's epic, while Aralbay uses it as 'group; environment; audience; poetic contest', e.g. *alqada atıñ jattalğan* 'your name was memorized by the people'; *alqağa tüsse kösemim* 'when my boss comes home'; *on törtte alqa aldında topırağın şaşılğan* 'your ashes were spread before the audience in fourteen'. Sättiğül uses the word *alqa* in the meaning 'jury assessing the eloquence contest', e.g. *alqağa alğan bayraqın* 'the flag taken by the jury'.

The word *bayraq* is absent from Abıl and Qalniyaz.<sup>2</sup> It occurs in three meanings as it is evidenced in the works of other epic singers: Nurım's works (1)

<sup>2</sup> It is possible that the custom of inviting epic singers to ceremonies and celebrations was not widespread and they performed their tales at the court of khans only.

‘contest, competition’, e.g. *bayraqqa qosqan tumarlı* ‘a talisman-bearing (particularly in the races)’; (2) ‘prize, reward’, e.g. *bayraqtı jerde jügirgen* ‘he won the reward combatting on the ground’; Sättiğül’s works (3) ‘ceremony, reception, party’, e.g. *Şayıriñ jaqsı köredi, oqsawlı bayraq alğanın* ‘your poet likes to be invited to ceremonies’.

The word *ozal* is unknown in Abıl’s works; Qalniyaz uses it as ‘former; ancient’, e.g. *Qazaq pen Noğay aralas. El eken tuwıs ozaldan* ‘The Kazakhs and the Noghays have been correlated since ancient times’. Other epic singers employ this word as an adverb ‘from beforehand; earlier’. Murat uses it in the form *azaldan*, e.g. *adıra qalğan bul qonıs, qayırsız eken azaldan* ‘this camp is damned, it is ill-fated forever’.

We could not find the word *beren* in Abıl, Qalniyaz, Nurım or Qaşağan’s epic. Its lack at Qalniyaz poetry must be accounted for as caused by the loss of much of Qalniyaz’s poetry, since it occurs in other pieces of heroic epics. Aqtan uses this word in the meaning ‘dauntless hero’, e.g. *beren batır sazarğan* ‘the dauntless hero became glum’, similar to Sättiğül, e.g. *belgili beren tuqımsıñ, duşpanın salğan tabanğa-ay* ‘you are a famous brave hero who tramples the foe with his foot’. Murat employs *beren* in the meaning ‘solid armor made of steel’, e.g. *men – baldağı altın aq beren* ‘I am like white honey golden armor’ or *atamnan qalğan berender, bek sawutımdı kiyermin* ‘I am putting on the solid armor inherited from my father’.

The word *soy* is absent from Abıl’s epic; Qalniyaz uses it in the meaning ‘personality, people, nation’, e.g. *taralıp öser boy qayda, buringıday soy qayda* ‘where are the people to grow and spread, where are the people like beforehand’, *elimniñ neşe soyı bar* ‘how many kinds of people are among my nation’. Other epic singers use this word in a similar meaning of ‘people, progeny, offspring’, either in a concrete, e.g. *buringı ata soyında* ‘in the old generation’ or metaphorical sense, e.g. *men sürginniñ soyımın* ‘I am a son of deported people’. In Nurım’s works the word *soy* is used in composition with other nouns, e.g. *ata soy* ‘(one’s) father’s offspring; paternal lineage’, *aqsunqar qustıñ soyı* ‘the offspring of the white falcon’, *şinjırlı soydıñ toqımı* ‘the offspring of the chained people’ or *iri soydıñ urıǵı* ‘the offspring of great people’.

The word *sürgin* in both Abıl’s and other authors’ poetry designates a horse walk, e.g. *öleñim sur jorğa attıñ sürginindey* ‘my poem is like the walking of a grey ambler’. It expresses the fluency and smoothness of speech. We can deliver further examples, e.g. *tabanı taypaq sürginmin* (Qalniyaz) ‘my speech is as smooth as a horse’s walk’, *jorğamın sürgin basqanı-ay* (Aralbay) ‘my words flow as my ambler’s walk’, *tuyağım taypaq sürginmin* (Aqtan) ‘my speech is as fluent as a hoof’. It seems that the word *sürgin* expresses the idea of harmonious, cooperative fluency rather than ‘great success, triumph; swiftness, hurry’. When

they tie the idea of walking to the flat sole of a foot or hoof, they do not express any reckless race, but the elegant, gentle walking of a horse. The horse is a close friend of people who grew up with horses, their colts and foals. There are many terms and idioms to express special kinds of horse walking other than running, e.g. *ayañdaw* ‘pacing’, *kiytiñ jorğa* ‘gaiting ambling’, *jol jorğa* ‘slow ambling’, *şalma jorğa* ‘quick ambling’, *şawıp salatın jorğa* ‘galloping ambling’, the most elegant ambling being *sürgin jorğa*. It was why the word *sürgin* combined with *jorğa* was used in poetry, e.g. *jorğanıñ sürgini* ‘ambler’s walk’.

The freedom of poetic expression of epic singers does not surrender to the common style of contemporary language. For instance, Abıl, who lived in the eighteenth century, uses the archaic word *jegde* ‘shirt; armor’, Qaşağan, who lived in the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, employed such words as *küs* ‘callus; sticky sweat’, *şalgırt* ‘clever; eloquent’, *ala jawlı* ‘dappled, mottled’ or *arşılan* ‘lion’, *surqıl* ‘greyish’. Sättiğül made use of such words as *qarı* ‘old, elder’, *üb-* ‘to rob, to plunder’, *oyraqan* ‘blow, hit’, *älpay* ‘ability’ and *marqam* ‘help’, which were not part of the active Kazakh vocabulary at his time. Aralbay used Arabic and Persian words instead of the standard Kazakh ones, e.g. *halb* ‘heart’, which is the Arabic word for Kazakh *jürek* (Баранов 1984: 349) or *zeban* ‘language, talk, speech’, which is the Persian word for Kazakh *til* (Будаговъ 1869: 603).

Sometimes we find words that must have been considered neologisms at the time they were used, e.g. *aywanbaq* ‘zoo’, as in *Jır Darıya* (Сыдықов 1995: 436). This word ← *aywan* ‘animal’ + *baq* ‘garden’ corresponds to the present-day *aywanattar parki* ‘zoo’. Another example is Nurım’s *şatırhat*, used in the meaning of the present-day ‘diploma’.

Many of these words may be regarded as archaic, i.e. not used at present. They belong to various semantic fields. In the following, I will provide and discuss some of them.

(1) *ala jawlı ter* ‘sticky sweat’. The component *ala* was discussed in Sızdıq (Сыздық 1994: 30). Among many meanings of this word, there is one relating to ‘war, strife’, another to ‘swift-footed horse’, e.g. *Men jüldeli jüyriqpin | Ala jawlı ter şığıp | Süyegim qızbay aşıman* ‘I am a reward-gaining swift horse | Sticky sweat appears on me | The gallop inflames my bones’. In the quoted verse, *ala jawlı ter* is not just ordinary sweat, it is a kind of sweat that appears on the skin as from unusual fatigue or competition. This idiom may be compared with another one, *ala may bol-* ‘to be greasy’. The word *jawlı* means ‘greasy, fatty’ and it is derived from OT *jağ* ‘fat, grease, oil’. There is still another idiom, *attı qızıl may qıl-* ‘to tire out the horse’.

(2) *alğınşı* ‘woman’. The present-day Kaz. *äyel* ‘woman’ is used instead of old *qatın*, which in the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century was the normal word for ‘woman’, but now has become a pejorative

denomination. *Qatın* went through different semantic changes. However, an even older word for woman is *alǵanım* and *alǵınşı*. According to Sızdıq (1994: 37), the word *alǵanım* was used for a ‘woman’ in old epics and the poetry of epic singers like Mahambet. We may deliver an example from Abıl, *alǵınşı al-sañ aruwdı al, artıñda julap qalsa kim almas* (Назарбекұлы 1997: 35) ‘if you take a woman, take a pretty one, if she weeps for you, nobody takes her’. In this poem the word *alǵınşı* is used in the meaning ‘woman, friend, pretty, girl’. This word is derived from the verb *al-* ‘to take’ with the suffix *-KInşI* that forms nouns. There is a difference between *alǵanım* and *alǵınşı*. The former denotes something, somebody completely possessed, while the latter is more like ‘something, somebody to take’. Naturally, *-m* in *alǵanım* is a first person possessive suffix and the word may be used with other possessive suffixes as well, e.g. *alǵanıñ* ‘the one for you to take’, and it also occurs in poetry (Назарбекұлы 1997: 42).

(3) *añla-* ‘to understand’. This verb occurs in many Turkic languages, for the distribution see Sevortjan (Севортян 1974: 154), for Old Turkic see DTS (47), while the normal Kazakh verb for ‘to understand’ is *tüsin-*. However, *añla-* is used by many epic singers, e.g. *altı jasta añlanıp, aralastıñ aqılǵa* (Aralbay, see Назарбекұлы 1997: 192) ‘when you were six years old, you began to understand’. The word *añla-* is present in modern Kazakh in the form *añda-*; therefore, it is equivalent to its derivative *añdal-* ‘to be evident’. However, the meaning of *añlan-* as above is different.

(4) *arqayın* ‘carefree’. Nurmaǵanbetov (Нұрмағанбетов 1965: 135) argues that *arqayın* is a dialect word for standard Kaz. *erkin* ‘free’ and shows the parallels in Chaghatai *arkavin*, Azerbaijani *arxayın*, Kumuk *arqavayın*, Turkmen *arkayın* and Noghai *erkin*, which corresponds to Kaz. *erkin*. However, the meaning of *erkin* ‘free’ is different from *arqayın* ‘calm, slow’. We can quote this word from Tümen’s poetry as *arqayın jat* (Нұрдәулетова 2007: 354) ‘lie in peace; lie in calm’.

(5) *alqa* ‘ring, round; earring’. This word, discussed above, was later used in such meaning as ‘entourage; what is around’. The word is of Arabic origin (Радловъ 1893: 389); for more of the etymology see Sızdıqova (Сыздықова 1994: 39–40).

(6) *alaman*. This word was also discussed above. In one of Qaşaǵan’s poems, there is the following paragraph: *jırşısı bolsa jırlatıp, alaman basın qurlatıp, jaqsılıqqa tıñdatqan* (Жылқышыұлы 2011: 66) ‘if there is a singer, he sings, he calls upon people to assemble, and he presents his tale to good people’. Sızdıq (Сыздық 1994: 31) explains the word *alaman* from the stem *ala-* ‘to rob, to lute’. This is because in Turkic languages *alaman* has two meanings. One of them is ‘crowd assembled for plundering, luting’. Budagov evidences these words as *alaman*, *alamançı* in Turkmen, Azerbaijani and Chagatai, in which they mean

‘1. robbing, plundering. 2. robbing, plundering a group of people’. In Uighur it has the meaning ‘1. group; majority. 2. robbing, plundering’. The modern Turkish dictionaries list this word in the meaning of ‘people assembled to rob, plunder’ and qualify it as old. Sızdıq also draws attention to a meaning of this word occurring in Kazakhstan’s western provinces of Atraw and Mañğıstaw. One can quote the word *alaman* in a similar meaning from Tajik (1) *hist* ‘attack for plundering’ (2) *arch* ‘action of a rebelling crowd against somebody guilty’ (Бертилье 1954: 22). According to Dosmuhamedulı (Досмұхамедұлы 1991: 147), the word *alaman* means ‘people who disregard rules and commands, who do not reckon with others’.

However, in some epic tales from Mañğıstaw, *alaman* occurs not in the meaning of ‘a plundering crowd’, but ‘an assembly that listens to somebody’s speech’, e.g. Qaşağan’s *mäjiliske bası birigip, köp jıynalğan eken alaman* (Жылқышыұлы 2011: 149) ‘a crowd assembled of many people’. This meaning of the word *alaman*, quoted from Qaşağan, is also present in Nurım’s epic. He uses this word in reference to the people who assembled at a time of peace that followed strife. The phrase *alaman basın qurlatuw* was used in the meaning of assembling, agitating people, the meaning of ‘assembly’ being especially clear in the combination with *qurlatuw* (*qur qulatuw*) used in Mañğıstaw.

(6) *düre-* ‘to spread’. Qaşağan, recounting the genealogy of the Adai tribe, sang *atamız Alşın, Quduwar, üdireppiz tört baladan* (Жылқышыұлы 2011: 149) ‘our forefathers are Alshyn, Qudywar, we spread from four sons (of them)’. Aralbay related *Jaralğalı jan bolıp, düregeli san bolıp, köregeli dän bolıp* (Aralbay, Nurım, Aqtanım 1997: 264) ‘the man is born, the children are begotten and sprout like seeds’.

The verbs *düre-* and *üdire-* ‘to spread’ are cognate, the former being a phonetic variant of the latter. The origin of this verb was examined by Nurmağambetov (Нұрмағанбетов 1994: 32) who regarded it as a Turko-Mongolian word, attested to in such works as *Nahğ al-Farādīs*, *Qışaş al-Anbiyā* and modern languages such as Turkmen, Karakalpak, Altay, Tuvan, Khakas and Yakut. He also gave examples from Mongolian and compared it with Kaz. *törkin* ‘woman’s paternal family’.

(7) *aq qoyqın* ‘white, fine wool’. We can encounter this word in Qalniyaz’s epic *Aq qoyqınday kir boldı | aruwlardıñ ajarı | Älpeştegen aruwdıñ | qattı sindi nazarı* (Нұрдәулетова 2007: 92) ‘the faces of pretty girls | were dirty as thick wool | the look of the groomed girl | became glum’. This word is evidenced in a few dictionaries and is accounted for as related to *qoy* ‘sheep’ and *qoyqın* ‘rug woven from thick thread’. Abıl said *on beste oymawıttay ülgı alğan qız | şulğawdı qoy maqpaldan şulğanğan qız* (Сыдықов 1995: 18) ‘a girl who learned a lot when she was fifteen | she knitted the sock from crude wool’ (QTTS 1974: 170). In the Kazakh tradition the material called *qoy maqpal* belongs to fine

materials for textile and knitting, while figuratively it designates precious, valuable objects. If a girl wore socks knitted from such material, she was distinguished and rich. In our opinion, the word *qoyqın* is derived from *qoy* ‘sheep’ and this word is also present in the compound *qoy maqpal*. However, *qoyqın* is not fine wool. It is worth noting at this point that I have found an interesting passage in the section of rare manuscripts at the National Library of the Kazakh Republic (file 1083, fascicle 2) in which the word *qoyqın* occurs along *şıt* ‘kind of cotton’. These two materials are said in this document to be not appropriate for a reward in a horse race. It is because *qoyqın* is made of crude wool and taken for a cheap, low-priced fabric. Therefore, the reason for comparing a girl’s face to this fabric must be the color, not the quality of the material. If something white is becoming dirty, it is evidently and clearly seen, the same as a spot on the face of a groomed girl. And this is naturally to be understood figuratively as a blot on the reputation.

(8) *qarjal-*. In the ten-volume dictionary of Kazakh (QTTS 1982: 96), this word is explained as an archaic verb meaning ‘to be tired, fatigued, worn out; to be exhausted’. It is possible that it is derived from *qarı-* ‘to grow old’, cf. the Kaz. saying *qaridiñ – quridiñ* ‘once you have grown old, you have perished’.

In our epic, the verb *qarjal-* occurs in Abıl’s works, e.g. *qabırğası qatqan kâri boz | qarjalğan küni añ almas* ‘an old man whose wall got stiff cannot have any game’.

(9) *suw tağınıñ qulını* ‘foal of a wild horse’. This complex denomination occurs in the following verse: *on eki ata Bayulı | Sahıranıñ men Nurımı | suw tağınıñ qulını* (Нұрдәулетова 2007: 129) ‘twelve clans of Bayulı subdivision | Nurım of the sands | the foal of water hill’. The word *suw*, in the legend associated with *suw* ‘water’, should be amended to *suwin* ‘elk’, for *suwin* in it denotes a stallion that comes out from water. In other legends, *suwin* is a protector of horses who resides in water. In some legends it comes out from water and copulates with mares. Only some equeiries who foretold events were able to distinguish between the *suwin* and an ordinary horse. We can still hear old men who tell legends of an animal that comes up from water, throws flames from its mane and rushes to the horses.

In the epic *Er Şoban* there is a passage that goes *tümendi buzğan er de bar | suwin tüsti jüyrık bar* (Сыдиқов 1972: 69) ‘there are heroes who can fight ten thousand | there are *suwin* colored stallions’. *Suwin* is not an elk here, but a mythical horse. *Suw tağı(nıñ) qulını*, perceived here as *suwdağı tağı* ‘a beast in water’, is a periphrasis for *suwin*.

(10) *übi* ‘precious, valuable part of furniture, household’. This word is attested to in the Kaz. verb *üpte-* ‘to rob-; to take away possessions’ as well as in the noun *übi* ‘household objects; furniture’. The Kazakh etymological dictionary, explaining the verb *üpte-*, documents the noun *üp* from Kirghiz, Altay and a verb in Tuvan (QTQES 204).

We find this old word in the works of epic singers from Mañğıstaw, e.g. Sättiğul's *qazına jasaw übinen | qatarlap jyuğan jüginen* (СЫДИҚОВ 1972: 69) 'with all belongings, dowry and valuable objects | with the amassed load'. All of the three words at the beginning are of a similar meaning and this figure should be treated as a pleonasm; for pleonasm see Sızdıq (СЫЗДЫҚ 1994: 174).

The Kaz. word *übi* must be derived from *\*üp*, which is not attested in Kazakh, but known in Kirghiz, Altay etc., see above. It was retained only with the third person possessive suffix *+I* in the form *übi*. Words that emerged in this way are called by Qaliyev (Қалиев 1985: 123) radioxoids.

### Conclusion

In conclusion we may say that there are many archaic and dialect words in the epics of Mañğıstaw poets. Some archaic words go back to Old Turkic, some are common to the majority of Turkic languages, in particular Karakalpak, Turkmen and Noghay, and may also be found in more distant languages such as Siberian Tatar, Altay, Tuvan, Khakas, Azerbaijanian, Kumuk, etc. There are a few reasons why such words were preserved in oral poetry. The epic tradition formed a special school whose representatives transmitted works from generation to generation and retained it as a national heritage and spiritual culture. Epic singers highly valued the richness of words and material objects. They raised gifted pupils and taught them how to be a great master of eloquence. The Kazakhs preserved their old epics as perfectly in their memory as the knowledge of their genealogies.

The school of epic singers transmitted oral tradition to subsequent generations without spoiling its beauty. This transmission was possible due to their exceptional talent and memory. Even if many archaic words became outdated and incomprehensible to the audience, they could be fairly familiar to the masters of words. It is because their knowledge of epics must have been deeply reflected in their linguistic image of the world. Without this, the ties between later, e.g. Sättiğul, Ibrayım, and early epic singers, e.g. Abıl, Nurım, Qalniyaz, would be broken.

Our textual analysis demonstrates that the far-going change of archaic words that are unfamiliar to the present-day reader starts with the shift from oral to written literature. It emerges with the disappearance of the oral epic tradition and the rise of written poetry. The conceptual world of old epic singers steadily becomes an unsolvable riddle to subsequent generations, the understanding of words weakens and communication between the performer and the listener breaks down.

## Bibliography

- Baranov 1984 = Баранов, Х. К. 1984. *Арабско-русский словарь*. Москва: Русский язык.
- Bertil'e 1954 = Бертилье, Е. Э. 1954. *Таджикско-русский словарь*. Москва: Государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей.
- Borovkov 1958 = Боровков, А. К. 1958. Вопросы изучения эпоса народов Средней Азии и Казахстана: В. И. Чичеров (ed.). *Вопросы изучения эпоса народов СССР*. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР.
- Budagov 1869 = Будаговъ, Лазарь. 1869. *Сравнительный словарь турецко-татарскихъ нарѣчій. Томъ I A–F*. Санктпетербургъ.
- Dosmuhameduli 1991 = Досмұхамедұлы, Халел. 1991. *Аламан*. Алматы: Ана тілі.
- DTS = Наделяев, В. М., Д. М. Насилов (ed.). 1969. *Древнетюркский словарь*. Ленинград: Наука.
- Jıqıziıı 2011 = Жылқышыұлы, Жетібай. 2011. *Қайыртпай кеткен Қашаған*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Jubanov. 1978 = Жұбанов, Есет. 1978. *Эпос тілінің өрнектері*. Алматы: Ғылым.
- Nazarbekuli 1997 = Назарбекұлы, С. (ed.). 1997. *Абыл, Нұрым, Ақтаным*. Алматы: Қағанат.
- Nurdawletova 2007 = Нұрдәулетова, Б. (ed.). 2007. *Көне күннің жыр күмбезі*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Nurmaghanbetov 1965 = Нұрмағанбетов, Ә. 1965. *Қазақ тілі говорларының батыс тобы*. Алматы: Ғылым.
- Nurmaghanbetov 1994 = Нұрмағанбетов, Ә. 1994. *Бес жүз бес сөз*. Алматы: Рауан.
- Qaliyev 1985 = Қалиев, Ғ. 1985. *Қазақ говорларындағы диалектілік сөз тудыру*. Алматы: Мектеп.
- QTQES = Ысқақов, А., Р. Сыздықова, Ш. Сарыбаев (ed.). 1966. *Қазақ тілінің қысқаша этимологиялық сөздігі*. Алматы: Ғылым.
- QTTS = Ысқақов, А. Ы. (ed.). 1974–1986. *Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. 1–10 том*. Алматы: Ғылым.
- Radlov 1893 = Радловъ, В. В. 1893. *Опытъ словаря тюркскихъ нарѣчій. т. I*, Санктпетербургъ.
- Sevortjan 1974 = Севортян, Э. В. 1974. *Этимологический словарь тюркских языков*. Москва: Наука.
- Sıdıyqov 1972 = Сыдықов, Қ. 1972. *Ақ берен*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Sıdıyqov 1991a = Сыдықов, Қ. 1991a. *Күржіманұлы, Қашаған, Топан*. Алматы: Жалын.
- Sıdıyqov 1991b = Сыдықов, Қ. 1991b. *Алқалаған әлеумет. Қашаған, Шыныяз, Мұрат, Насихат жыраулардың шығармалары*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Sıdıyqov 1995 = Сыдықов, Қ. (ed.). 1995. *Жыр дария. Маңғыстаудың ақын-жыраулары*. Ақтау: Ақтау баспаханасы.
- Sızdıq 1994 = Сыздық, Рәбиға. 1994. *Сөздер сөйлейді*. Алматы: Санат.
- Sızdıq 2004 = Сыздық, Рәбиға. 2004. *Қазақ әдеби тілінің тарихы*. Алматы: Арыс.
- Sızdıqova 1995 = Сыздықова, Рабиға. 1995. *Абайдың сөз өрнегі*. Алматы: Санат.
- Veselovskij = Веселовский, А.Н. 1989. *Историческая поэтика*. Москва: Высшая школа.
- Wälihanov 1985 = Уәлиханов, Шоқан. 1985. *Таңдамалы шығармалар жинағы*. Алматы: Жазушы.
- Žirmunskij, Zarifov 1947 = Жирмунский, В. М., Х. Т. Зарифов. 1947. *Узбекский народный героический эпос*. Москва: Госхудлитиздат.

Translated from Kazakh by Henryk Jankowski



DOROTA SMĘTEK

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

---

## The Question of the Existence of a Common Literary Language of the Crimean Karaites in the Nineteenth Century

This article aims to discuss the characteristics of the written language used by the Crimean Karaites, which was preserved in handwritten books called *mejumas*. The study will be performed on the basis of the heretofore examined *mejumas*, namely those published by Aqtay (2009), Çulha (2010a) and the unpublished doctoral thesis written by Smętek (2012).<sup>1</sup> The *mejuma* of Eliyahu Qılcı, who was a resident of Bahçesaray, was copied in 1903–1904 (Aqtay 2009: 28). The *mejuma* of Qatıq was copied in approximately 1808 by two different Karaites, Barukh Mangubi and a second person whose name and provenance remain obscure (Jankowski 2004: 106–107, Çulha 2010a: 43–44). The *mejuma* of Kohen was copied in 1876 by Samuel, son of rabbi Kohen, whereas the original theater play copied into the manuscript was translated by Abraham Lutski in Gözleve in the first half of the nineteenth century (Smętek 2012: 26–31). The first two *mejumas* contain Turkic folklore texts, i.e. tales such as *Aşıq Qarip 'niñ Meselesi ve Türküsü* and *Tünbel Oğlannıñ Meseli* and various types of poems and songs such as *türkü*, *mani*, *se-mai*. The last manuscript, the *mejuma* of Samuel Kohen, comprises a translation into Turkic of the Hebrew drama entitled *Melukhat Sha'ul*. Thus the material on which the comparison will be performed includes three collections that contain a wide diversity of texts written in the Crimea in the span of a hundred years.

---

<sup>1</sup> A renowned Turkologist, Radloff, was the first scholar who published a selection of Crimean Karaim texts collected from a few manuscripts and literary works by J. Erak (1888, 1896). In this compilation the text is provided in the block Hebrew letters and it was not critically edited, only part of it (pp. 241–408) was provided in a Cyrillic transcription. Presently, Çulha (2010b) published the whole of Radloff's *mejuma* in the Latin script.

The language of the manuscripts is a literary variety of Crimean Turkish with an admixture of Crimean Tatar used by the Crimean Karaites with features characteristic of Crimean Karaim, which distinguish it from other languages of the peninsula (Aqtay 2009: 28–48, Smętek 2012: 48–93).<sup>2</sup> In a substantial description of the Turkic languages of the Crimea, Doerfer (1959: 370) stated that the Crimean Tatars and the Crimean Karaites used the same modern literary language the basis of which was essentially the northern *Zentralkrimturkische*, that is the dialect of Bahçesaray. In other words, the southwestern features were dominant and in many aspects the language was very similar to Turkish. On the other hand, in an article devoted to Karaim-Tatar songs in which the Kipchak features alternated with the Oghuz ones, Zajączkowski argued that the language of these literary works should be identified as Crimean Tatar (Zajączkowski 1939: 43–45). That being said, the lexical remnants of Crimean Karaim are not to be underestimated. The goal of this paper is to determine to what extent the material preserved in *mejumas* is linguistically uniform and to establish whether there existed a unified literary language of the Crimean Karaites in the nineteenth century that was different from common written Crimean Turkish.

## 1. Phonology

It must be noted that in many cases words have different phonetic features; they vary not only from manuscript to manuscript but within one *mejuma*. It is hard to say whether these phonological disparities stem from the lack of a standardized language or are also a result of the nonexistence of vocalization, which makes it impossible to determine the phonological properties beyond any doubt, especially a tentative reading of the vowels *a* and *e*. The word denoting ‘quickly’ can be used as an example of this alternation. It is written (or only transcribed) differently in each manuscript, i.e. in Kohen’s *mejuma*: *çebüçek* (MSK 46b) ~ *çebücek* (MSK 6b), in Qılcı’s *mejuma*: *çabicek* (MEQ 333/4) ~ *çabiçek* (MEQ 369/12), whereas in Qatıq’s *mejuma*: *çabıcaq* (MQat 61/2).

### 1.1. Consonants

Most of the phonological features of consonants in the manuscripts are correspondent. The consonants *d-*, *g-* and *q-* appear in word-initial position in the dominant part of the lexicon. Moreover, the texts reveal the following phonological processes:

<sup>2</sup> To our knowledge, Crimean Karaim was lexically and phonetically more archaic than Crimean Tatar and retained more northwestern features (Jankowski 2003a: 116).

*k-* → *g-*, e.g. *kömür* → *gömir* (MEQ 32/11, MQat 3/6)<sup>3</sup> ‘coal’, *köşe* → *göşe* (MSK 16b, MQat 167/14) ‘corner’, *kendi* → *gendi* (MSK 2b, MEQ 39/18, MQat 7/6) ‘self’. Sometimes this change also occurs in word-medial position, e.g. *herkes* → *hergez* (MSK 1a, MEQ 232/9, MQat 15/6) ‘everyone’.

*g-* → *q-*, e.g. *gam* → *qam* (MEQ 203/12) ‘grief’, *gayrı* → *qayrı* (MEQ 513/2, MQat 2/6) ‘other’, *gazap* → *qazab* (MSK 5b, MEQ 224/14, MQat 117/13) ‘anger’, *gurbet* → *qurbet* (MEQ 32/13, MQat 201/17) ‘foreign country’. There is also the opposite process, that is a word-initial shift *q-* → *ğ-*, e.g. *qıybatlı* → *ğıybatlı* (MSK 25b) ‘dear’, *qayıp* → *ğayıp* (MEQ 260/3, MSK 3b) ‘lost’ (though the original Arabic form is *ğ-*), *qabir* → *ğabir* (MQat 156/5) ‘grave’.

*t-* → *d-*, e.g. *taq-* → *daq-* (MSK 41b, MEQ 84/10, MQat 32/11) ‘to attach’, *türlü* → *dürlü* (MSK 3a, MQat 14/11) ‘various’, *titre-* → *ditre-* (MSK 3b, MEQ 11/8<sup>4</sup>) ‘to shiver’, *tükür-* → *dükür-* (MQat 197/5) ‘to spit’.

*q-* → *χ-* : *qaçan* → *haçan* (MEQ 222/17, MQat 40/3) ‘when’, *qursaç* → *hursaç* (MEQ 208/7) ‘belly’, *kumru* → *humru* (MQat 180/4) ‘dove’. This process was not attested in Kohen’s *mejuma*.

*-ğ-* → *-h-* : *aşağı* → *aşağa* (MSK 7b, MEQ 344/4, MQat 17/21) ‘bottom’, *bağışla-* → *başışla-* (MSK 7b, MQat 5/7) ‘to forgive’.

In addition, Aqtay (2009: 34-35) presented the following phonological changes: *h-* →  $\emptyset$  and *-p-* → *-b-*, which are not observed in the other *mejumas*.

## 1.2. Prothesis and epenthesis

Another common feature of the language of the manuscripts typical of Crimean Karaim is the addition of the sound *h* in word-initial position. There are multiple examples in each *mejuma*. Thus, only words that can be found in more than one manuscript are demonstrated. The  $\emptyset-$  → *h-* prothesis appears in words of Arabic and Persian origin, such as:

*elbette* → *helbet* (MSK 56a, MEQ 199/18, MQat 20/12) ‘certainly’, *hayva* → *ayva* (MEQ 132/13, MQat 8/13) ‘quince’, *acaba* → *hacaba* (MSK 1b, MEQ 300/11, MQat 34/5) ‘I wonder’, *arzu* → *harz* (MSK 11b, MEQ 301/13, MQat 179/23) ‘desire’. The latter forms a verb that has five variants, namely: *harz eyle-* (MSK 11b, MQat 179/23) ~ *harzla-* (MSK 18b) ~ *harızla-* (MSK 5a) ~ *harzula-* (MSK 23a) ~ *harzıla-* (MEQ 591/10, MQat 75/12).

<sup>3</sup> I refer to the contents of the *mejumas* in the following manner: MEQ for the *mejuma* published by Aqtay (2009), MQat for the *mejuma* published by Çulha (2010a) and MSK for the one edited by Smętek (2012). I provide page and line numbers of the respective manuscripts (MEQ, MQat, only page number for MSK). These numbers should not be confused with the pagination of the corresponding published editions.

<sup>4</sup> The dominant variant provided by Aqtay is *ditire-* (MEQ 332/11).

This process is also present in Turkish words, e.g. *işte* → *hüşte* (MEQ 112/3) ‘well’, *uç* → *huç* (MQat 77/21) ‘tip’, which is far more rare than the Arabo-Perisian words. There are also examples of  $-\emptyset-$  →  $-h-$  epenthesis, that is the addition of a sound in the middle of a word, such as *deruni* → *derhuni* (MSK 4a, MEQ 33/9) ~ *derhum* (MQat 48/19) ‘inner’, *seda* → *seddah* ~ *sedah* (MSK 38a, MEQ 177/18) ‘sound’.

Moreover, there are two cases of vowel prothesis. The first one,  $\emptyset-$  →  $i-$  prothesis, occurs in words borrowed from Russian, namely *стол* → *istol* (MSK 36b) ‘table’, *сбор* → *izbor* (MEQ 458/6) ‘rally’, *сборка* → *izborka* (MQat 122/5) ‘collecting’. The second one,  $\emptyset-$  →  $u-$  prothesis is found in an Arabic loanword: *rüya* → *uruya* (MSK 34a, MEQ 418/5) ‘dream’, is not present in Qatıq’s *mejuma*. In a number of Arabic loanwords the following epenthesis appears:  $-\emptyset-$  →  $-y-$ , added before  $-i-$  in Arabic loanwords, e.g. *daim* → *da’yım* (MSK 45a, MEQ 175/8, MQat 201/16) ‘permanent’, *şair* → *şayır* ~ *şayir* (MEQ 14/12, MQat 37/11) ‘poet’, *kail* → *qayıl* (MEQ 119/17, MQat 6/3) ‘consent’.

### 1.3. Vowel harmony

Rounding harmony is not strictly obeyed in the *mejumas*. Although in the majority of words a syllable with a rounded vowel is followed by another syllable with a rounded one, there are many cases in which this rule does not apply. In the following section, examples of the most common processes related to roundedness are provided.

#### 1.3.1. After labial consonants unrounded vowels become rounded:

– after  $p$  ( $i$  →  $u$ ): e.g. *yapıl-* → *yapul-* (MSK 20a, MEQ 155/1, MQat 111/4) ‘to be made’, MQat 3/6) ‘door’, *hapıs* → *hapus* (MEQ 213/2, MQat 45/15) ‘prison’;<sup>5</sup>

– after  $b$  ( $i$  →  $u$ ): e.g. *sabır* → *sabur* (MSK 7b, MEQ 212/18, MQat 54/7) ‘patience’, ;

– after  $m$  ( $i$  →  $u$ ): e.g. *mıktar* → *muqtar* (MSK 2b, MEQ 296/3, MQat 68/7) ‘amount’, *misafir* → *musafir* (MQat 76/2) ‘guest’ and ( $e$  →  $u$ ): e.g. *mekruh* → *mukruh* (MSK 27b) ‘abominable’, *qamış* → *qamuş* (MSK 56a, MEQ 33/17) ‘reed’.

Moreover, this process occurs after  $d$  ( $i$  →  $ü$ ): *diz* → *düz* (MSK 29b, MEQ 77/6) ‘knee’, *diş* → *düş* (MSK 2b, MQat 25/10) ‘tooth’, *dilber* → *dülber* (MSK 27a, MEQ 419/4, MQat 56/10) ‘beautiful’.

<sup>5</sup> *punar* (MEQ 111/7, MQat 44/17) ‘spring’ has retained its etymological vowel  $u$ , whereas *qapu* (MSK 6a, MEQ 39/17) is more complicated; if one considers this word as Turkish, which is probably the case, this form is original, and not the modern standard *qapı*.

1.3.2.1. The opposite process, that is losing roundedness, can be observed in the following words

– *u* → *ı*, e.g. *mutlaq* → *mitlaq* (MEQ 345/2, MQat 27/18) ‘surely’, *murad* → *mirad* (MEQ 175/6, MQat 80/21) ‘aim’, *usul* → *usıl* (MSK 53b) ‘quietly’,  
 – *ü* → *i/i* after the consonant *m-*, e.g. *mübalğa* → *mibbalğa* (MSK 13b) ‘exaggeration’, *mübarek* → *mibarek* (MEQ 205/14) ~ *mibbarek* (MSK 30a, MQat 120/10) ‘blessed’, *münasip* → *minasip* (MSK 53a, MEQ 4/6, MQat 14/18) ‘suitable’, *mürekkep* → *mirekep* (MEQ 33/18, MQat 164/14) ‘ink’.

This shift is not regular, and the above-listed words also appear with the rounded vowels *-ü-* and *-u-*, i.e. *murad* (MSK 12a, MEQ 441/6, MQat 6/12), *mutlaq* (MSK 35b, MEQ 387/2, MQat 58/4), *usul* (MSK 44a, MEQ 398/6), *mübarek* (MQat 120/5). In other cases every vowel in the word undergoes this process, e.g. *süpür-* → *sipir-* (MEQ 344/13, MQat 59/9) ‘sweep’, *bülbül* → *bilbil* (MEQ 5/5, MQat 44/10) ‘nightingale’, *küfür* → *kifir* (MSK 18a) ‘curse’.

The lack of rounding harmony in the root of the word is not frequent. The *mejuma* of Qatıq provides the widest variety of examples of this process, whereas the *mejuma* of Samuel Kohen contains hardly any. The following words undergo this shift: *doğru* → *doğrı* (MEQ 35/4, MQat 6/4) ‘right’, *büyük* → *biyük* (MEQ 174/11) ~ *büyük* (MQat 14/8) ‘great’, *otur-* → *odır-* (MQat 75/19) ‘sit’, *oku-* → *oqı-* (MQat 31/4) ‘read’, *omuz* → *omız* (MQat 63/2) ‘shoulder’, *oyun* → *oyın* (MEQ 55/4, MQat 24/4) ‘game’, *ömür* → *ömir* (MSK 7b, MQat 2/19) ‘life’. In the majority of cases these words occur alternately with their rounded counterparts.

1.3.2.2. Another common feature of losing roundedness is reflected in the word-formative suffixes.

It applies to polysyllabic words as well as to those with only a one-syllable root. This shift is not regular; in all three *mejumas* words with suffixes obeying and disobeying rounding harmony alternate with each other. It suffices to present this process as exemplified by the suffixes *-lıq* and *-sız*:

– *lıq*, e.g. *oğulluq* (MEQ 554/2) ~ *oğullıq* (MQat 61/5) ‘sonship’, *zulümlük* (MQat 196/1) ~ *zülümlük* (MEQ 484/15, MQat 19/13) ‘cruelty’, *qusurluq* (MEQ 419/7) ~ *qusurlıq* (MQat 156/10) ‘deficiency’, *günlük* (MEQ 10/10) ~ *günlük* (MQat 115/12) ‘daily’,

– *sız*, e.g. *ussuz* (MQat 38/20) ~ *ussız* (MSK 31a, MEQ 515/3) ‘stupid’, *öksüz* (MSK 20a, MEQ 10/10) ~ *öksüz* (MEQ 83/17, MQat 162/11) ‘orphan’.

That being said, there are a few words in which suffixes exist only in the unrounded variants:

– *lik* ~ *-lıq*, e.g. *dostlıq* (MEQ 588/14, MQat 78/7) ‘friendship’, *şükürlik* (MEQ 9/4, MQat 65/9) ‘thanking’, *yollıq* (MEQ 364/8, MQat 58/7) ‘for a trip’, *ğuruşlıq* (MEQ 554/14, MQat 61/12) ‘worth an amount of kurush’, *ömürlük* (MSK 3b, MEQ 336/6) ‘forever’, *büyüklik* (MSK 14a, MEQ 228/7) ‘greatness’.

-sız ~ -siz, e.g. *uyğunsız* (MQat 38/13) ~ *uyğunsız* (MEQ 514/8) “inappropriate”, *yolsız* (MQat 196/19) “pathless”.

## 2. Syntax

The word order of literary Crimean Karaim differs from typical Turkic syntax. This disparity is most apparent trait in religious texts and “in translations from Hebrew in which syntactic structures and word order are copied into Karaim” (Jankowski 2003a: 119). As it was stated above, the language of the manuscripts reveals a limited influence of Crimean Karaim. Nonetheless, remains of the ancestors’ language can be observed at the level of syntax. Especially the *mejuma* of Kohen, which contains a text translated from Hebrew, namely *Melukhat Sha’ul* ‘Saul’s Kingdom’ (MSK 1a-62b), provides various examples of Hebrew influence on word order. At the level of a simple phrase, Turkic SOV order is obeyed. That being said, the prepositional place of a subordinate clause in complex sentences is disregarded even in typical Turkic participial clauses, such as *Biñ şükürler Allah’a bizi buraqtığın uçun* ‘I thank a thousand times to God that he let us live’ (MSK 40a). Below, I present examples of subordinate clauses that are characteristic of the language of the manuscripts and differentiate it from Crimean Turkish and Crimean Tatar.

### 2.1. Clauses formed with verbal nouns

Clauses formed with the verbal noun *-mA* and the dative suffix *-yA* are the most prevalent type of postpositional clauses. Contrary to other Turkic languages they never occur prepositionally, that is before the main clause. In the *mejumas* of Kohen and Qılcı this type of clause is used frequently, e.g. *Seniñ gözleriñ çarq gibi döneyirler, padişahıñniñ hasımlarınıñ qarşısına ceza göstürmeye* ‘Your eyes are spinning like wheels to punish the enemies of the king’ (MSK 5a) or *babam hadırlandı düğün edmeye* ‘my father made preparations for the wedding’ (MEQ 5/12). Although the occurrence of this type of clause in Qatıq’s *mejuma* is relatively rare, it is possible to provide the required examples, such as *Günlerden bir gün bu qızniñ babası çıkar çölge av avlap quş dutmaya* ‘One day the father of this girl went out to the wilderness to hunt and catch birds’ (MQat 133/19–21).

### 2.2. Subordinate clauses introduced by *ki*

Subordinate clauses with the conjunction *ki* are widespread. They introduce a wide variety of subordinate clauses in the postpositional position, which is uncommon

in other Turkic languages.<sup>6</sup> The least number of clauses of this type is provided in the *mejuma* of Qatıq, as it contains Turkic folk texts and is not influenced by Hebrew syntax like the remaining *mejumas*. In Qatıq's *mejuma* most of the subordinate clauses introduced by *ki* are noun clauses, which are common to both Crimean Turkish and Crimean Tatar (Jankowski 2010: 320), such as *anası gördü ki hiç söz geçecek digil* 'his mother saw that she does not have influence (on him)' (MQat 58/4). However, there occur a limited number of syntactic structures constructed with *ki*, characteristic of the language of the other *mejumas*.

### 2.2.1. Relative clauses

Relative clauses introduced by the conjunction *ki* are a characteristic feature of Karaim. Here, an abundance of this type of clause is to be observed. Firstly, when *ki* follows a subject, it bears the meaning 'who; that', e.g. *mahtavlı olsun ol Tañrı ki Tora bize verdi* 'May He be praised who gave us the Torah' (MEQ 290/5–6), *unut cümle qasavetlerini ki var idi sana evvelden* 'forget all your sorrows that you had before' (MSK 24a). Secondly, when the conjunction *ki* is preceded by *ne*, it means 'what, that' and refers only to non-human subjects, e.g. *ne ki ekersin onu çöplersin* 'you reap what you sow' (MEQ 46/16), *Aş gerek, suy gerek, qahve, tütün ne ki lazım ise yaparız* 'Food, water, coffee or tobacco, we will prepare everything that you need' (MQat 136/ 10–12). Lastly, a less common clause is introduced by *ki* following *hangisi*, having the meaning of 'which', e.g. *Uzaqtan arslan gövdesi yatayır, hangisi ki paraladı* 'Far away lies a body of a lion, which he has torn to pieces' (MSK 7a), *kanareyka quşu var edi hangisi ki gendi gözü gibi qıybatlayıp (...) besler edi* 'he had a canary whom he loved a lot (...) and fed' (MEQ 303/4–5).

### 2.2.2. Clauses of time

The occurrence of temporal clauses is rare, yet examples are provided in both Qılcı's and Kohen's *mejumas*. Clauses are formed either with *ne zaman ki* or *ne vaqt ki*, which bear the meaning 'when', e.g. *naqadar hoşlanırlar evladları ne zaman ki (..) üzerlerine güneş şafaqları gerilirse* 'how much men enjoy it when the sun spreads its glow over them' (MSK 1b), *ne vaqt ki hatırıma gelirse (...) saçlarım dimdik durayırlar* 'when I think about it (...) my hair stands on end'

<sup>6</sup> The conjunction *ki* is present in Turkish and some other Turkic languages; however, its use is limited to only a few types of clauses. Krimchak and Armeno-Kipchak, in which subordinate clauses are also formed postpositionally with the conjunction *ki*, are another exception to this rule (Jankowski 2003b: 143).

(MEQ 385/6–8). Moreover, in Qılcı's *mejuma* another temporal construction was attested, namely *qaçan ki ~ haçan ki*, e.g. *askeriñ tertipsiz bilmezdir zakon qaçan ki qılıçın çaldı* 'your soldier is disorganized, he did not know the law when he stole your sword' (MEQ 164/5–6).

### 2.2.3. Clauses of purpose

Clauses of purpose are used to express wishes or goals and are formed with the conjunction *ki* and a verb in the optative or jussive mood. There are multiple examples in all three *mejumas*, e.g. *ben de qoşulıp geldim ki avara gezmeyim* 'I joined them too so I would not lose my way' (MEQ 297/11–12), *Halqı evle rahat edeyim ki hiçbir tariqden sıqlet çekeyiriz demesinler* 'I will make them so comfortable that they would not say that they suffer in any way' (MQat 19/9–11) and *Gel peşimizden ki güneş doğmadan evvel leşler düşsinler* 'Come with us so that dead bodies will fall before sunrise' (MSK 51b).

### 2.2.4. Clauses of manner

This type of clause is common and exists in two variants, namely *naslı ki* and *nice ki ~ neçik ki*, which have the same meaning 'as', e.g. *Naslı ki ona layıq görünürse Avişay evle olur* 'it will be so as it befits Him, Abishai' (MSK 52a), *naslı ki geldi evle gitsin* 'she should go as he came' (MEQ 305/17), *Saňa benim doğruluğımı, egriligimi bildirmek için naslı ki sen qoyınına altın tas qoyulduğundan haberiñ olmadı deyı, yemin edeyirsın* '(I say it) in order to declare my honesty and deviousness, just as you have promised that you did not know that you had been given a golden bowl' (MQat 139/20–22). It must be noted that the variant *neçik ki* occurs only in Qılcı's *mejuma* and is a remnant of old Crimean Karaim, e.g. *Adam oğlanı neçik ki geldiñ evle gidersin* 'Man, you will go as you came' (MEQ 34/9–11). It is present in a Crimean Karaim translation of the Bible (Jankowski 1997: 23) as well as in letters written in Lutsk Karaim, where *neçik* 'as; how' is the most prevalent conjunction that introduces clauses of manner (Németh 2011: 61).

### 2.2.5. Terminative clauses

A terminative clause is introduced by the conjunction *ta ki*, which has the meaning of 'until'. This clause is absent from Qatıq's *mejuma*. The examples from the other *mejumas* are as follows: *Ben ondan vaz geçmem, ta ki o ölüme*

*gelmeyince* ‘I will not give up until he dies’ (MSK 31a), *bala hattan ziyade ağlar edi ta ki belinde taqat qalmadı* ‘the child cried excessively until it didn’t have any strength left’ (MEQ 294/16–17).

### 3. Vocabulary

#### 3.1. Turkic vocabulary

The vast majority of the lexicon is based on Crimean Turkish and Crimean Tatar vocabulary. There is a significant number of words typical of Crimean Karaim and a few inter-dialectal loanwords that were attested only in the northwestern dialects of Karaim, i.e. *bayla-* (MEQ 91/4, MQat 19/6) ‘to fasten’, *pir* (MQat 27/3, MSK 5a) ‘old’, *yır* (MEQ 159/4–5, MSK 14a) ‘song’. The preservation of a few archaic words demonstrates an ongoing process of the withering of Kipchak features in favor of the southwestern vernacular of Turkic, which was by then dominant in the peninsula.

#### 3.2. Hebrew loanwords

The *mejumas* comprise words that are borrowed from Hebrew but each has a different set of Hebrew vocabulary that does not overlap with the lexicon in the other manuscripts. The *mejuma* of Qılcı comprises the widest variety of Hebrew loanwords that refer to diverse semantic fields, e.g.: *goy* (MEQ 249/13) ‘non-Jews’, *Devvarim* (MEQ 271/1) ‘Deuteronomy’, *hasid* (MEQ 206/3) ‘devout’, *roçeah* (MEQ 272/11) ‘killer’. According to Jankowski (2003a: 119), the number of Hebrew loanwords in Crimean Karaim texts, which are not of religious nature, is not high. Indeed, while browsing the index of Hebrew words in the publication by Aqtay (2009: 765–773), it can be noticed that the dominant part of loanwords appear on the pages containing the work entitled *Çuf Devaş* ‘Honeycomb’ (MEQ 204–291), which depicts biblical events of the Pentateuch. The impact of Hebrew in the remaining manuscripts is less prominent, mainly because of the nature of their contents. Hebrew vocabulary is limited and mainly visible in various names as well as in geographical terms. The *mejumas* of Qılcı, Qatıq and Kohen contain a significant amount of Hebrew personal names, e.g. *Moşe*, *Şemuel*, *David*, *Avraham*, *Ya’qov* etc. All of the characters’ names in the theater play are Hebrew, whereas in the other texts Hebrew names coexist with Turkic surnames, e.g. *Mordehay Fenerli* (MEQ 187/7), *Yefet Arabacı* (MEQ 190/9–10) or *Yehuda Yel* (MQat 150/16). Additionally, we can find the following ethnic and geographical names: *Peliştim* (MSK 6b, MEQ 226/7) ‘Philistines’, *Amaleq* (MEQ 234/3, MSK 1a) ‘Amalek’,

*Çiyon* (MSK 22a) ~ *Çiyyon* (MEQ 281/3) ‘Zion’, *Miçri* (MQat 111/5) ‘Egypt’ and *Yeruşalim* (MQat 12/8) ‘Jerusalem’.

Throughout the manuscripts, loanwords related to religion constitute an important part of the vocabulary of Hebrew origin. The Hebrew word denoting ‘God’, namely *Adonay* (MSK 30a, MEQ 228/16), alternates with its Turkic and Arabic counterparts, namely *Tañrı* (MSK 50a, MEQ 56/3, MQat 153/19) and *Allah* (MSK 4a, MEQ 9/4, MQat 20/17). Words such as *çadıq* (MSK 16b) ~ *çaddiq* (MEQ 47/11) ‘saintly, pious; righteous’, *kohen* (MSK 39b, MEQ 251/3) ‘priest’ and *qodeş* (MSK 41b, MEQ 147/7) ‘saint’ are absent from Qatıq’s *mejuma*, where we encounter their Arabic and Russian equivalents, that is *mibarek* (MQat 2/16) ~ *mibbarek* (MQat 120/10) ‘saint’ and *duhovni* (MQat 132/2) ‘priest’. Nonetheless, Qatıq and Qılıcı’s *mejumas* contain religious words such as *rebi* (MQat 150/10) ~ *rebbe* (MQat 194/12) and *ribbim* (MEQ 443/18) ‘rabbi’, *qadoş* (MQat 150/23, MEQ 232/17) ‘holy’, which are not attested in Kohen’s *mejuma*.

There exist other Hebrew loanwords that are not related to religion and are present in all three *mejumas*. As in the examples demonstrated above, many of them are attested in different phonetic variants, whereas other remain homonymous, e.g. *qosemci* (MSK 57b) ~ *qosem* (MEQ 267/9) ‘magician’, *şabat* (MQat 123/16) ~ *şabbat* (MEQ 9/13) ‘Saturday’, *şevet* (MSK 43a, MEQ 254/5) ‘tribe’, *yom d* (MSK 62b) ‘fourth day, i.e. Wednesday’, *yom a* (MEQ 408/7) ‘Sunday’, *tam* (MSK 7a, MEQ 2/5, MQat 5/15) ‘end’, *gadol* (MQat 158/21, MEQ 259/7: in *kohen gadol* ‘great priest’) ‘great’. Although the number of Hebrew loanwords in the *mejumas* is low, their occurrence is a distinctive Karaim feature of the language of the manuscripts, which distinguishes it from other literary varieties of Turkic that were used in the Crimea.

### 3.3 Russian loanwords

The percentage of Russian loanwords is relatively low and only a few of them can be found in more than one *mejuma*. The most distinctive group of words are the names of months present in each manuscript, e.g. *avustos* (MQat 182/20) ← Rus. *август* ‘August’, *dekabr’* (MEQ 192/15) ‘December’, *noyabr’* (MSK 62b) ← Rus. *ноябрь* ‘November’. Curiously enough, they occur together with Hebrew names of days of the week, e.g. *sene 1903, yanbar 16, yom h* (MEQ 31/13–14) ‘year 1903, January sixteenth, Thursday’. There are only nine words of Russian origin that can be found in more than one *mejuma*. They are as follows: *baraban* (MSK 60a, MQat 123/20) ← Rus. *барабан* ‘drum’, *guarda* (MSK 34a) ~ *guyarda* (MEQ 50/8) ← Rus. *гвардия* ‘guards’, *duhovni* (MQat 123/2) ~ *duhovni* (MQat 157/17, MEQ 459/15) ← Rus. *духовный* ‘priest’, *duma* (MQat 122/13, MEQ 459/6) ← Rus. *дума* ‘assembly; council’, *kepik* (MQat 16/4, MEQ 426/9)

← Rus. *копейка* ‘Russian monetary unit, coin’, *qazarma* (MQat 122/6, MEQ 458/8) ← Rus. *казарма* ‘barracks; garrison’, *numer* (MQat 123/6, MEQ 460/6)  
 ← Rus. *номер* ‘number’, *saldad* (MQat 122/1) ~ *saldat* (MQat 123/20, MEQ 160/13) ← Rus. *солдат* ‘soldier’, *yipke* (MQat 150/8) ~ *yupka* (MEQ 461/2) ← Rus. *юбка* ‘skirt’.

There is evidence in each manuscript of a characteristic manner of adapting words that is also attested in other Turkic languages. Russian loanwords, which have two consonants in word-initial position, acquire the vowel *i* to simplify pronunciation, e.g. *izborka* (MQat 122/5) ← Rus. *сборка* ‘assembly’, *izbor* (MEQ 458/6) ← Rus. *сбор* ‘rally’, *istol* (MSK 36b) ← Rus. *стол* ‘table’.

#### 4. Conclusion

As can be seen, it is impossible to conclude that there existed a standardized literary language of the Crimean Karaites in the nineteenth century. The language of each examined manuscript is influenced by the provenance of the source text. Vocabulary and syntax differ in texts of Hebrew origin or of religious nature from those borrowed from the abundant Turkic folklore that was commonly shared by the inhabitants of the Crimea. What is more, the educational background and linguistic environment of a copyist was another factor that affected the linguistic properties of a given manuscript. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that there exists an undisputable number of affinities and common features that distinguish the language of the Karaim manuscripts from Turkic vernacular dialects used in the literary works of other Crimean minorities, with the exception of Krimchak.

#### 5. Samples of texts from the *mejumas*

##### Tenbel oğlanniñ meselesi, Qılcı’s *mejuma* (MEQ 419/2–9)

*Bir zamanda bir memleketde bir fuqare var edi. Qarısı ilen ve bu fuqarenin birden bir oğlu var edi. Evle dülber edi ondan ziyade dülber olmaq mümkün digil. Nihayeti padişaha layıq bir oğlan. Lakin bu oğlanniñ qusurluğu o ki tenbel oturduğu yerine yemegini yer edi. Anası babası hasevet ederek duruyırlar.*

##### Tünbel oğlanniñ meselesi, Qatıq’s *mejuma* (MQat 127/3–7)

*Bir zamanda bir fuqare var edi. Onıñ da birden bir oğlu var edi. Qararsız tümbel edi. Üç güne qadar aş suy vermeseler qarnım bile aş demez edi. Çışarı bile çıqmaz edi. Her v’aqit sağıt verip alır ediler.*

**Mihal's monologue**, Kohen's *mejuma* (MSK 15a)

*Sevle endi, gördiğün var mı dilberlikte onıñ gibi çocuq? Lakin dilberligiñi buraqayım. Bir qaç gün aqdemimize gördüm dilber manavşa seher manavşa gibilerden yaqışıklı. Zan ettiim ki qoqusu da cümlelerinden ziyede olur. Lakin onu qoqladığım dan sonra 'aksine oldum.*

## Bibliography

- Aqtaý, Gülayhan. 2009. *Eliyahu ben Yosef Qılcı's anthology of Crimean Karaim and Turkish literature*. İstanbul: Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları.
- Baskakov, N. A., A. Zajączkowski, S. M. Shapshal (eds). 1974. *Karaimsko-rusko-pol'skij slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- Çulha, Tülay. 2010a. *Kırım Karaycasının Katk Mecuması. Metin-Sözlük-Dizin*. İstanbul: Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları.
- Çulha, Tülay. 2010b. *Proben der Volksliteratur der Nördlichen Türkischen Stämme. von W. Radloff. VII. Theil. Kuzey Türk Boylarının Halk Edebiyatından Örnekler. VII Bölüm*. İstanbul: Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1959b. Das Krimtatarische: Jean Deny (et al., eds). *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 369–390.
- Ha-Efrati, Joseph Troppowitz. 1829. *Melukhat Sha'ul ha-Melekh ha-Rishon al Yeshurun*. Vienna: Anton von Schmidt.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2003a. On the language varieties of Karaims in the Crimea, *Studia Orientalia* 95 (2003), 109–130.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2003b. Position of Karaim among the Turkic Languages, *Studia Orientalia* 95 (2003), 131–153.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2004. The contents of Katyk's *Mejuma*: Tenišev, È. (ed.) *Tjurkskaja i smežnaja leksikologija i leksikografija. Sbornik k 70-letiju Kenesbaja Musaeva*. Moskva: Rossijskaja Akademija Nauk. Institut Jazykoznanija, 103–119.
- Jankowski, Henryk. 2010. *Język krymskotatarski*. Warszawa: Dialog.
- Németh, Michał. 2011. *Unknown Lutsk Karaim Letters in Hebrew script (nineteenth–twentieth centuries). A Critical Edition* [Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia 12]. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego: Kraków.
- Radloff, V.V. 1896. *Proben der Volksliteratur der Nördlichen Türkischen Stämme. Theil VII. Mundarten der Krym*. St. Petersburg.
- Smętek, Dorota. 2012. *Crimean Karaim Version of Melukhat Sha'ul. Critical Edition and Linguistic Analysis* [unpublished doctoral thesis].
- Zajączkowski, Ananiasz. 1939. Tatarsko-karaimskie piosenki ludowe z Krymu (tzw. *čij*), *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 14 (1939 [1938]), 38–65.

## Some Notes on the Seventeenth-Century Crimean Khanate on the Basis of Judicial Records<sup>1</sup>

The present article discusses the contents of register 10, one of 121 preserved volumes containing judicial records of the Crimean Khanate from the years 1077/1666–1080/1669–1670. It also provides information on courts, judges and the types of legal documents.

### 1. Introduction

In juridical practice *sicil* ‘register; judicial record’ is a register of documents created as a result of procedural steps conducted by a *ḳāzī* in a sharia court, issued rulings and judgments, as well as notes regarding the activities of the *ḳāzī* and local officials. These documents may be subdivided into the following types: *fermān* ‘behest’, *ḳanūn-nāme* ‘compiled laws and statutes’ and *buyuruldu* ‘writ, behest’, which were issued by the center of power. These documents are also known as *ḳāzī defterleri*, *ḳāzī sicilleri*, *sicillāt-ı şer‘iyye* (*şer‘iyye sicilleri*), *maḥkeme defterleri*, *zabt-ı vekāyi‘ defterleri* and *da‘vā defterler* (Oğuz 2010: 9–10). The term *sicil* is translated as “a set of registered official documents” (Devellioğlu 2006: 951). This word is also frequently used for a document containing the judgments of a *ḳāzī*, and in various other technical senses (de Blois 1997: 538).

### 2. Short characteristic of register 10

Register 10<sup>2</sup> is one of 121 volumes recorded in the Crimean Khanate, which was a vassal state of the Ottoman Empire, and preserved to date. The registers or *Sicils*

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was written with the financial support by National Science Centre (Poland), grant no 3810/B/H03/2011/40.

<sup>2</sup> *Aş-Şuqūq aş-şari‘iyya wa as-siğillāt al-mar‘iyya* vol. 10.

are kept in the National Library of Russia in St. Petersburg. They were originally handed over to the Russians by the last Crimean chief judge (*ḳāzī-‘asker*) Mehmed Aga after the annexation of the Crimea by Russia and placed in the archives of Simferopol. In the year 1905 the collection was moved to the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg (Królikowska 2010: 41). The records in the register were made during the reign of Khan Adil Girey, who performed this function from the year 1076 to the year 1081 of Hijra (1666–1671 according to the Gregorian calendar). Register 10 was written in the years 1077–1080 of Hijra, which is between September 1666 and the year 1669 or 1670 (until May) of the Gregorian calendar, when the year 1080 of Hijra ends. The missing day and month of the last record makes establishing the date of the last record impossible. In the discussed *sicil* there are no official letters sent from the center of power of the *fermān* (except one), *buyuruldu*, and the *kanūn-nāme* type. Among other documents typical of the local authorities there is mainly *hüccet* ‘document’, however, there is no *mürāsele* ‘correspondence, letter’ or the typical *ma‘rūz* ‘petition, application’. What is more, there are a few examples of *ṭapu senedi* ‘testimony, land grant made by a khan’ and *i‘lām* ‘judgement’. *Hüccet* is a document that does not include a *ḳāzī*’s judgment during proceedings. Records of this type were often filed at the request of the interested party. Despite the judgment not being written, the document was usually evidence in favor of the person at whose request it was written and it documented a favorable consideration of the case. It had to contain the *ḳāzī*’s seal and signature. The record in the register was made according to *hüccet*. The documents in the register do not contain the judge’s seal and signature. They provide personal data of the parties as well as all of the details of the lawsuit. In cases of documents regarding land sales, it was also necessary to establish and settle the transaction details (payment of the amount due, acquisition, and waiver of any rights to the sold land and/or property after its official transfer to the new owner). Documents of the *hüccet* type include such cases as financial support (maintenance), sales, purchases, appointment of proxy, divorces, inheritance, conclusions of agreements, *diyyāt* ‘damages on the part of the torturer, for the benefit of the injured party or their family’, warranty of incurred debt, inheritance, etc. *İ‘lām* ‘judgement’ resembles *hüccet*, and its characteristic feature is the presence of the judgment in the investigated case, i.e. the decision made by the *ḳāzī*. Originally the meaning of the term was “notice, notification” (Akgündüz 1988: 20–22; Şahin 2001: xxviii–xxx; Akgündüz 2009: 150–154).

### 3. *Ḳāzī* and some of his underlings

The *ḳāzī* ‘judge; *cadi*’ was a very important officer in the administration of the khanate. He was a judge appointed by the khan and designated to resolve inter-personal conflicts and oversee concluded contracts. He was the one upholding

justice and law and order in a given district, or the *każā'*, which he was in charge of. Judicial registers include information on the types of cases that were officiated by the *każī*, actions undertaken by him, personal data of the judges, and districts.

Because of the importance of the office held by the *każī*, the person who was to be appointed to this function had to meet a number of requirements; apart from a good (sufficient) knowledge of law, he had to be a man: of age, believing and righteous, impartial, and hold the qualifications needed to hold the office. This function could not be held by women, even the most educated and conversant with law. However, should the man lose any of his attributes, he was removed from the office. His task was to treat all inhabitants of a given district equally, supervise appointment of guarantors, pay off debts, appoint guardians and curators, as well as preparing contracts, which were subsequently recorded in *cadi* registers. The duties of a *każī* involved the supervision of *vakfs* in the subordinated district (Ortaylı 1994: 9–10; Taş 2006: 3). The results of research made by Gulam Murtaza Azad show that a *każī* “should be a wise person with deep understanding. Knowledge was less demanded. (...) [The Crimean KS-R] *każī* should be competent enough to be able to write down the entries in the *sicils* and to issue sentences as well as to supervise the work of his underlings” (Królikowska 2010: 108–109). Following the Ottoman administration, *każā'*s were created in the Crimean Khanate, and then *każīs* and *subaşı*s were appointed. They were to promote lawfulness and public order, which gave them the opportunity to exercise direct control over the territories (Berki 1962: 5–6; İpşirli 1998: 660–661).

Except for the *każī*, *nā'ib* ‘representative, governor’ is also mentioned in *sicils*. He was an office clerk who was often delegated by the *każī* to handle minor cases in the district subordinate to the main district. The *nā'ib*'s key responsibilities involved executing tasks delegated by the *każī*, getting acquainted with presented cases, and providing preliminary establishments. He repeatedly appeared in court as a witness of an event, i.e. *şuhūd el-ḥāl* (Akgündüz 2009: 175–176; Taş 2006: 3; Ortaylı 1994: 31). If a *nā'ib* was one of the witnesses, then there was an adequate notation informing that a given person served as the *każī*'s representative in the signatures.

*Każī* and *nā'ib* safeguarded law and order. They performed an important function in the judicial administration. The *subaşı*, on the other hand, was a person who performed a very important field function of upholding public order. His duties involved guarding security and watching over order in a city and collecting taxes. Since the end of the sixteenth century *subaşı*s were appointed by *beylerbey* and *sancākbey*, to whom they were subject. They were also obliged to support the *każī* in procedural steps. They had the duty to implement orders which the *każī* received from the central authorities, as well as to prosecute and catch criminals and punish convicts (Abacı 2001: 64–65; Ortaylı 1994: 34–35).

A *subaşı* also had his men, called the guard's helpers (*subaşı hizmetkârı*), who assisted him in fulfilling the tasks appointed to him. Mentions of *subaşı*s and their helpers can be also found in the court records.

There were no separate buildings to house courts. Local mosques or the *kāzî*'s house were where *kāzîs* officiated, listening to the parties and pronouncing the appropriate judgments. It also came about that the hearings took place in the house of the parties or in the field, under the open sky, if such a need arose. If he was a teacher, the school (*medrese*) where he taught became an additional seat of court (Ekinçi 2002: 963; Ortaylı 1994: 50).

#### 4. The function of *vakfs*

Another element of the community life is *vakıf* or *vakf* – a pious foundation that worked for the benefit of spiritual development and welfare of the impoverished inhabitants, which also appears in register 10 on the occasion of incurring a debt, for example. The functioning of *vakfs* was based on tangible property that people gave to their fellow human beings. A donation had to be made voluntarily, with no pressure exerted by a third party. A foundation could also be supported by performing some activities and providing services for its benefit. *Allah*'s satisfaction in the good deed was to be the reward for the good done to fellow human beings. *Vakfs* provided different types of support to the community. Hundreds of poor people, students and learned men used their services. They dealt with care and welfare, worked for the religious development of inhabitants, economic activity, education and cultural activities (Ateş 1987: 11; Şahin 2001: x–xiii; İnalçık 2000: 40).

#### 5. Types of cases in register 10

*Sicils* represent various aspects of social life and relations between people. They enable an understanding of the meaning of the institution of the court as a place that regulated the everyday lives of the inhabitants of the Crimea. In the records we can find a confirmation of the fact that a male family member (e.g. husband, son, and father) would represent a woman in court despite the fact that a female could appear for herself with no proxy (Faroqhi 1988: 204). There are official records in which women testify and claim their rights themselves; nonetheless, it is noted that a man was given authorization in the majority of cases (63B).

In connection with the increased interest in purchasing slaves, their legal status had to be established. They could be sold, hired for work, bequeathed or donated (Özdem 2010: 86). Thanks to these records, a lot of information can be

found on owner–slave relations, when the slave was included in the possessions, when the slave was released (16B), what was done when he escaped (130B), how children begotten from relations of a free man and a slave woman were treated (11A) or what the value of slaves was (at the moment of sale/purchase (15B), at the valuation of the possessions of a deceased person (29B)). The records also include a range of information regarding entered transactions, i.e. the purchase and sale of a property (121A), confirmation of the identities of guarantors (89B) or the exchange of debts to commodities (81A). In addition to that, register 10 shows the family life of the inhabitants of seventeenth-century Crimea. There are notes regarding the appointment of childcare (68A), appointing guardians to the underage or curators after the death of a parent (109B). There are also cases involving entering marriage contracts (89B), etc. These types of notes depict the Crimean community and family life.

## 6. Some typical components of the register and information on the material and spiritual culture of historical Crimea

The court records make it possible to learn about the daily life, culture and language of the inhabitants in a given area because of the variety of the subject matter. In addition to that, they serve as a source of knowledge of the organization of cities, toponymy, anthroponomy, social and cultural relations, as well as the organization of the judicial administration.

### 6.1. Names and their division

Names constitute a substantial part because of the character of court records, e.g. the function of the *ṣuhūd el-hāl* ‘witnesses to the event’, and also the means of identification of the parties in the proceedings by their name and their father’s name. Names occurring in register 10 can be divided into two main categories:

- (1) Muslim names or names connected with Islamic culture, e.g.:
  - ‘*Abd el-Laṭīf*’ (139B); ‘*Islām*’ (16B); ‘*Abd el-Kerīm*’ (5A); ‘*Abd el-Halīm*’ (39A); ‘*Abd Allāh*’ (135B); ‘*Alī*’ (135B); ‘*Ömer*’ (134B); ‘*Ösmān*’ (134B); ‘*Hüseyn*’ (133B); ‘*Muṣṭafā*’ (134B); ‘*Aḥmed*’ (133B); ‘*Dervīṣ*’ (130A); ‘*Halīl*’ (88B); ‘*Maḥmūd*’ (88B); ‘*Ca’fer*’ (130A); ‘*Halīm*’ (84A); ‘*Gāzī*’ (116A); ‘*Ṣa’bān*’ (18A); ‘*Āyşe*’ (126A); ‘*Faṭmā*’ (137A)
- (2) non-Muslim:
  - the names of the Karaites or Jews (*Yahūdī*) who lived in the Crimea, e.g. ‘*İsāk*’ (115A); ‘*İyguda*’ (3A); ‘*İlyā*’ (21A); ‘*İshāk*’ (14B); ‘*Avrahim*’ (51A); ‘*Şuloma*’ (69B); ‘*Mortuḥay*’ (69A); ‘*Dāvūd*’ (68B); ‘*İsāk*’ (40B)

- (3) the names of mainly Ruthenians and Cossacks (*Rusī el-aşıl*, *Qazaq*): *İvan* (33B); *Maruşka* (or *Maruşke*) (116B), *Vaşıl* (106A), *Petre* (29A), *Yürke* (114A); *Andrey* (109A); *Semen* (107A); *Fedor* (103B); *Qaska* (10B)
- (4) the names of other non-Muslims, mainly Christians (*zimmī*); some could also be Ruthenians and Cossacks: *Dimitri* (86A); *Balabān* (13A); *Aşfadur* (134A); *Sava* (116A)
- (5) the names of other (mainly Turkic) inhabitants of the Khanate: *Cāntemür* (104A); *Arslan* (75B); *Kökçe* (63B); *Avcı Bay* (18B); *Kel Bahār* (16B); *Kökey* (138A); *Carılkap* (107A); *Atmanay* (107A); *Hūrī Hān* (48A); *Melek Sīmā* (15A); *Hān Bike* (12A); *Esem Hān* (3A); *Qırım* (126B); *Aqay* (125A); *Dost* (124A); *Eşbülāt* (121B); *Balkız* (63B).

The names reveal a lot about the inhabitants of the Crimea and represent the assimilation of the immigrant population, e.g. *Rusī el-aşıl el-Hāc Yūsuf bin ‘Abd Allāh nām ğulām* (43A) ‘a boy named el-Hac Yusuf, son of Abd Allah, of Ruthenian origin’; *Nazar bin Satılmış nām zimmī* ‘non-Muslim, [probably a Christian, KS-R] named Nazar, son of *Satılmış*’ (79A). It proves that Christians and Ruthenians adopted Muslim names or names popular in Islamic culture.

## 6.2. Nationalities and ethnic groups

*Sicils* are one of the sources from which we can learn who lived in the Crimean peninsula at that time. In the reviewed register the following groups were mentioned: Tatars (50A), Nogais (98A), Greeks (118B), Armenians (87A), Cossacks (103B), Jews (138A), Russians, and Ruthenians (83B). There are also notes on Hungarians (70A), Adygeans<sup>3</sup> (16B), Moldovans and others. The term Jew is almost certainly used to denote the Karaites or Karaims. The khan and sultan’s administration did not distinguish between Karaites and Jews and treated them as one nation who confessed Judaism. As distinct from other non-Muslims, they lived in *Çufut Kale*<sup>4</sup> near Bahçesaray on special terms and enjoyed special privileges. They had the right of political independence and to be municipal overlords. In addition to that, they had numerous tax concessions (Fisher 1978: 34). Beside Karaites there are mentions of Persians (138A), Lithuanian Tatars (Lipka 1A) and Dnieper Cossacks (*Özü Qazaqı* 29A<sup>5</sup>) in the records.

<sup>3</sup> A collective name for non-Turkic, Caucasian Muslim nationalities.

<sup>4</sup> From *cuhūd* ‘Jews’; *Çufut Kale* ‘Jewish castle’.

<sup>5</sup> In Register 10 is *Özü Qazaqı* (29A), not *Özü Qazağı* ‘Dnieper Cossack’.

### 6.3. Material culture

The judicial registers have enormous significance for the studies of the material culture of the inhabitants of the Crimea. They refer to notes regarding hotchpot after the deceased in particular. The names of objects, animals, tools, clothes, as well as the adjectives which court recorders used when describing features of each item comprise an invaluable source of the knowledge of the inhabitants of the Crimea at that time.

Among foodstuffs, various kinds of cereals are worth mentioning, e.g. *arpa* ‘barley’ (111A), *buğday* ‘wheat’ (111A), *çavdar* ‘rye’ (111A), *macar* ‘dried red [winter] wheat’ (112B), *şaman* ‘straw [but also] rye’ (57A) and *tarı* ‘millet’ (85A).

The records taken in Ottoman Turkish also contain words of Crimean Tatar, a northwestern Turkic language, which do not have their equivalents in southwestern Turkic languages (to which Ottoman Turkish belongs).

The content of the records serves as a confirmation of the significance of animals, mainly horses, in the life and culture of Tatars. *Sicils* are abundant in terms which precisely discern sex, age and kind of a given animal: *baytal* (113B) ‘filly’, cf. Kazakh *байтал* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 114); *cabağı* (113B) ‘foal between the sixth and the twelfth month of life’, cf. Kaz. *жабағы* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 259); *kınanca* (112A) ‘camel or bull that is three years old’, cf. Kaz. *құнанша* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 547); *urğacı* (99B) ‘female animal’, cf. Kaz. *ұрғашы* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 899); the colors of horses and colors of other animals: *börte* (56A) ‘grey’, cf. Kaz. *бөрте* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 163); *seren/ciren* (56A) ‘chestnut’, cf. Kaz. *жирен* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 307); *koba* (41B) ‘fawn’, cf. Kaz. *құба* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 538); *şur* (25B) ‘greyish, ashen’, cf. Kaz. *сұр* (Сыздықова, Хұсайын 2001: 738).

Colors, fabrics, and items of clothing also constitute a large portion of the records. Owing to them we can find out which colors served as the prism for the perception of the world, what clothes were worn, and what fabrics were used. Apart from the basic colors, i.e. white, black, blue, there are also *al* ‘red’ (139A); *alaca* ‘colorful, many-colored’ (139A); *boz* ‘grey, ashen’ (139A); *ergavānī* ‘purple’ (55A); *nefī* ‘dark green’ (115B). The most interesting fabrics are: *beledī* ‘cotton fabric’ (120A); *bürüncük* ‘fabric from raw silk’; *çul* ‘woolen fabric’ (14A); *dībā* ‘ornamented silk of good quality’ (133A); *dülbend* ‘muslin’ (132B); *harīr* ‘silk’ (103A); *ipek* ‘silk’ (119B); *keçe* ‘felt’ (9B); *kettān* ‘linen’ (141A); *kirbās* ‘fabric, cloth’ (57A); *serāser* ‘precious fabric interwoven with gold thread’ (133A); *şūf* ‘woollen fabric’ (87B); *yün* ‘wool’ (9B). Among the clothing we can find some overcoats, which are important elements of the wardrobe: ‘*abā* ‘coat’ (116A); *aş*

*kürk* ‘ermine’ (139A); *boyama semmür kürk* ‘dyed sable’ (139A); *börk* ‘fur-leather hat’ (90A); *ceyrān semmür kürk* ‘deer and sable fur’ (133A); *davşan kürk* ‘rabbit fur’ (100B); *ferāce* ‘women’s collarless coat’ (85B); *paça semmür kürk* ‘fur from sables’ legs’ (139A); *kedi kürk* ‘cat fur’ (119B); *sincāb kürk* ‘squirrel fur’ (92B); *tilki kürk* ‘fox fur’ (115A). Apart from furs and sheepskin furs, many other items can be found: *çağşır* ‘type of trousers’ (119B); *çintiyan* ‘type of women’s trousers’ (116A); *kebe* ‘felt pinafore’ (119A); *kolcak* ‘glove’ (113A); *makrama* ‘large scarf’ (120A); *pāturī* ‘a certain type of trousers’ (86B); *şūf çamaşır* ‘underwear from woollen fabric’ (87B); *terpüş* ‘fez’ (65B); *yabınca* ‘burqa from thick wool’ (115A). Additionally, jewellery and gemstones, which were luxurious goods, are worth mentioning here. The most interesting are: *cevāhir kuşak* ‘decorative belt set with jewels’ (66A); *elmās yüzük* ‘diamond ring’ (132B); *fırūze taş* ‘turquoise’ (93A); *kehrübār* ‘amber’ (132B); *mücevher küpe* ‘jewel earrings’ (64B); *akīk tesbīh* ‘a type of agate prayer beads’ (119B).

*Sicils* also document everyday life of the inhabitants of the Crimean Khanate in mentions of very strange items, tools, and weapons, e.g. *bağrac* ‘small bucket, kit’ (120B); *boyunsa* ‘yoke’; (112A); *bukağı* ‘fetters, shackles’ (108B); *çağçaklık tahta* ‘board for a barrel’ (111A); *çontuk* ‘log’ (103A); *destī* ‘pitcher’ (115A); *eger* ‘saddle’ (109A); *eşkek* ‘oar’ (100A); *fağfurī kāse* ‘porcelain bowl’ (66B); *hokka* ‘inkwell’ (90A); *faraş* ‘dustpan’ (103A); *kefgür/kevgür/kevgir* ‘colander, skimmer’ (120B; 102B); *kırkılık* ‘cullet’ (112A); *mikraş* ‘scissors’ (120A); *öreke* ‘spindle’ (120A); *sakal tarak* ‘beard comb’ (36B); *ulpak* ‘down, feathers’ (100B); *zincir ma’a bilekçe* ‘handcuffs [chain and bracelets]’ (53A); *iskence* ‘vice’ (97A); *dülger keser* ‘carpentry saw’ (111A); *şaban* ‘plough’ (112B); *türen* ‘iron part of a plough’ (5B); *şorguc* ‘plume; helmet feathers’ (132B); *mermī* ‘bullet; arrowhead’ (85A); *kemān* ‘bow’ (113A); *avlanış ok* ‘hunting bow’ (95B).

Adjectives used by court recorders offer considerable insight into the inhabitants of the Crimea at that time: *berbat işlenmiş* ‘embroidered or ornamented in an ugly, slovenly manner’ (2B); *cedīd* ‘new’ (135A); *çürük* ‘rotten, broken’ (85B); *köhne* ‘old’ (138B); *zarflı* ‘with a cover, box, in a box’ (139A); *tikme* ‘sewn’ (92B).

#### 6.4. Spiritual culture

In the inheritance notes in the register 10 there are titles of various literary works and religious literature or names of their authors (*Ḥayātī, Muḥī ed-Dīn, Sa’d ed-Dīn* 141B), which enables us to get to know the spirituality and interests of their owners. Apparently, they were all manuscripts, as print was not known in the Crimea at that time. The Quran is predominant among them. What is more, the mentioned works were composed by distinguished authors; for instance the one

by *Fuzûlî*, whose poems have enraptured with their beauty to the present day. However, it should be noted that books other than the Quran appeared very rarely. Some of them include: *Dîvân-ı Fuzûlî* (95B); *Dîvân-ı Necâtî* (95B); *İskender nâme* (37A); *Manṭık* (141B); *Mecmû'â-i fıkhî* (141B); *Ta'rîfât* (141B).

## Conclusions

The variety and richness of information included in *sicils* make learning about the judicial administration and the life of the inhabitants of the Crimean Khanate possible. Furthermore, the notes provide documentation of the names of animals, objects and book titles. Knowledge of the functioning of the society, including the kinds of fabrics and tools used as well as their names is exceptionally valuable and essential for a better understanding of the reality of the seventeenth-century Khanate. A familiarity with the judicial registers of that time offers researchers a possibility to analyze and interpret detailed data on various areas of life.

## Bibliography

- Aş-Şuqûq aş-şari'yya wa as-siğillât al-mar'ıyya* vol. 10.
- Abacı, Nurcan. 2001. *Bursa Şehri'nde Osmanlı Hukukunun Uygulanması (17. Yüzyıl)*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Akgündüz, Ahmet. 1988. *Şer'îye sicilleri tom I-II*. İstanbul: Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Akgündüz, Ahmed. 2009. *İslam ve Osmanlı Çevre Hukuku*. İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayınları.
- Ateş, İbrahim. 1987. *Vakıf ve Çocuk*. Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Berki, Ali Himmet. 1962. *İslâm'da Kaza Hüküm ve Hâkimlik ve Tevabii*. Ankara: Yargıçoğlu Matbaası.
- de Blois, F. C. 1997. *Sıdjill*: C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W. P. Heinrichs, G. Lecomte (ed.). *The Encyclopaedia of Islam. Volume IX*. Leiden: Brill, 538.
- Devellioğlu, Ferit. 2006. *Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lugât*. Ankara: Aydın Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Ekinci, Ekrem Buğra. 2002. *Osmanlı Hukukunda Mahkeme Kararlarının Kontrolü (Klasik Devri)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Faroqhi, Suraiya. 1988. *On Altıncı ve On Yedinci Yüzyıl Kadı Sicillerinde Kaydolunan Ev Satışkarıyla İlgili Belgelerin Şekil Açısından Değişimi*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.
- Fisher, Alan. 1978. *The Crimean Tatars*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- İnalçık, Halil. 2000. *Osmanlı'da Devlet, Hukuk, Adlet*. İstanbul: Eren.
- İpşirili, Mehmet. 1998. *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kazaskerlik (XVII. Yüzyıla kadar)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Królikowska, Natalia. 2010. *Law and Division of Power in the Crimean Khanate. A Study on the Reign of Murad Giray (1678–1683)*. Warszawa: Instytut Historyczny Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego [unpublished doctoral dissertation].
- Oğuz, Mustafa. 2002. *Girit (Resmo) Şer'îye sicil Defterleri (1061–1067)*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, Türk Tarih Ana Bilim Dalı, Yeni Çağ Tarihi Dalı [unpublished doctoral dissertation].

- Ortaylı, İlber. 1994. *Hukuk ve İdare Adamı Olarak Osmanlı Devletinde Kadi*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Özdem, Zeynep. 2010. *Kırım Karasubazar'da Sosyoekonomik Hayat*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Сыздыкова, Р. Ф, К. Ш. Хұсайын. 2001. *Қазақша-орысша сөздік*. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс.
- Şahin, Salih. 2001. *İstanbul Kadılığı 225 No'lu Şer'yye Sicillerinin Transkripsiyonu ve Değerlendirilmesi*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Kamu Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı Mahallî İdareler ve Yerinden Yönetim Bilim Dalı [unpublished doctoral dissertation].
- Taş, Ahmet Kankal-Kenan Z. 2006. *195 Nolu Mardin Ser'yye Sicili Belge Özetleri ve Mardin*. İstanbul: Mardin Tarihi İhtisas Kütüphanesi Yayın No: 4.