# review of: Éva Ágnes Csató, Bo Isaksson, Carina Jahani (eds.) 2005: Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion. Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic. London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon

Agnes Korn

a hyphen. The Sanskrit *chāyā* (the Old Indic word corresponding to the Ardhamāgadhī one) that Mylius quotes for every lemma is surely interesting, but maybe also somewhat confusing for readers, since the relationship to the Middle Indic word may be of entirely differing kinds, viz. regular Old Indic predecessor with similar or dissimilar meaning (e.g. *heu* "cause; proof, reason" vs. Old Indic *hetu-*; *puvva* (term for a group of scriptures) vs. *pūrva-* "first"), Old Indic borrowings (e.g. *hetu-*), including also words that morphologically do not correspond to each other (e.g. *solasama* "sixteenth (also name of a fasting exercise)" is related to Old Indic *ṣoḍaśa-* "sixteen"). Unlike in the Ardhamāgadhī dictionary, attested *chāyā*s are not differentiated from reconstructed ones. Moreover, readers of the present book may quite well wonder whether an Old Indic term is used for a (the same?) philosophical concept as is the Middle Indic one; this is clearly the case in some instances, but not necessarily in all others. Indeed, those who study the scriptures themselves will need to use a dictionary anyway, and all lemmata of the present book indeed appear to also figure in Mylius's Ardhamāgadhī dictionary.

It seems that a certain finalizing touch might yet have been applied to address the issue that the entries are not quite convincingly consistent (see also above for abbreviations like *Myth*), some offering ample information while others are rather concise (mostly with the information also found in the Ardhamāgadhī dictionary): for instance, many personal names are given only with a gloss (of the style *tiaṁkara* "name of a monk"), with or without literal translation of the name before or after the gloss (e.g. *paṁkappabhā*: name of the fourth hell ("mud"), *caṁdī* [no. 973, somewhat misplaced] "angry woman", epithet for Śiva's wife). At the other end of the scale, there is e.g. a long entry for *paesi* (name of a king) complete with commented advice where to go for further information. A parallel situation applies to other entries (cf., for instance, the names of divine residences, e.g. *caṁdavaṇṇa* and *caṁdasiṁga* being merely glossed as such, while *pala*, *palaṁba*, *pāṇata* etc. come with additional explanations).

The generous layout makes readng the book pleasantly easy, although more use of typographical variation (e.g. for Jainist terms quoted in the glosses and for comments in the bibliographical lists), would have made it even more so. Cross-references and the like prove to be conscientiously reliable, although readers would surely have profited from a few more of these in cases that are referred to in the text of the entries in a form different from that of the lemma itself: for instance, the central concept of *titthaṁkara* "maker of a passage; term for a group of holy men" is quoted in the Old Indic form *tīrthaṁkara* in the explanations of the names of the holy men themselves; *jakkha* "member of a class of deities; demon" is only to be found as *yakkha* in the text of the entries.

Notwithstanding the notes above, the present book is interesting to browse, and is surely a welcome tool for Jainist studies. As Mylius notes in the preface, much remains to be done in Jainist research, and a comprehensive lexicon of Jainist philosophical terms is an urgent desideratum.

*Agnes Korn,* Frankfurt am Main

*Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion. Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic.* Ed. by Éva Ágnes Csató, Bo Isaksson and Carina Jahani London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon 2005. Pp. ix, 373.

The work under discussion presents the papers of a conference on language contact held in Uppsala in 2001; it contains five articles in the section on Iranian languages and dialects,

seven on Semitic, ten on Turkic and two additional papers, plus an introductory article by Lars Johanson that outlines the scope of this highly relevant field of research. While some of the articles present a cross-linguistic discussion of phenomena that are likely to mirror language contact, other contributions study dialects that have been particularly heavily influenced by neighbouring languages. To scholars of Iranian, Semitic and Turkic, the present book offers new material from a vast range of speech varieties, and novel analyses of the same. Everyone who is interested in issues of language contact and areal typology in general will find highly relevant discussions of these points from a variety of viewpoints. Since not all the articles can be presented in detail here, I will discuss a few, and summarise the others rather briefly (which is by no means intended to imply any hierarchy), to illustrate the broad range of topics and approaches offered in this very rich volume.

The contribution by Filiz Kıral "Modal Constructions in Turkic of Iran" may be classed in the comparative category: the author describes how Turkic varieties spoken in Iran tend to replace synthetic modal constructions with analytical ones on the Persian model. Similarly, "Bilateral Code Copying in Eastern Persian and South-Eastern Turkic" by Lars Johanson discusses certain verbal constructions that might show mutual (rather than "bilateral") influence of Tajiki and Uzbek: while Tajiki duratives with *īst-* appear to be modelled on Turkic ones with *tur-* (both "stand"), Uzbek, the language that one would expect Tajiki to derive its Turkic elements from, uses another verb in this function. However, Johanson assumes that Tajiki copied the construction from an earlier stage of Uzbek that may have used *tur-* (as do other Turkic varieties). In this context, it would be interesting to discuss whether the durative use of *īst-* in Tajiki, a particularly archaic variety of Persian in several respects, might continue the use of the verb as an auxiliary in *perfectum praesens* function in Middle Persian (Henning 1934:246, cf. also Rastorgueva/Molčanova 1981:114–117), e.g. (transliteration and German translation of both examples in Andreas/Henning 1933:299–300): *(…) gōhr ī gyān andar ēn nibēg pad was gyāg paydāgēnēd ēstēd* "(…) the substance of the soul has been (lit.: stands) explained in this scripture in many places" (fragment no. M 9, column II recto, line 11–13), *gyān (…) andar tan ā'ōn āmixt ud passāxt ud bast ēstēd če'ōn* ... "the soul (…) is (lit.: stands) so mixed, mingled and bound in the body that …" (M 9 II r, 16–18). As an example of the opposite direction of influence, Johanson suggests that Uzbek and Uyghur constructions involving the converb in *-ip* in intraterminal function (*-ip* being otherwise postterminal) are modelled on Iranian.

Under the title "Semitic in Iranian: Written, Read and Spoken Language", Bo Utas explores the various ways in which language, script, religion and politics may be related in the case of Old, Middle and New Persian (and other Iranian languages). He starts by highlighting some points that tend to be underestimated, among these the fact that a scribe has not only the function of encoding a text (script being only one of the mnemonic devices that may be used for this purpose), but also of reading aloud such a text. The reading need not be in the language of the encoding (for instance, it has been assumed that Elamic texts were rendered in Old Persian, and (some) Aramaic ones in Old and Middle Persian and other languages). Nor does the oral rendering of a written text necessarily reflect the spoken language. Utas compares the latter to wild vegetation and the former to a garden (for which one chooses plants from the wild vegetation, combines them with some foreign ones, and applies a careful layout to the garden as a whole) to illustrate the difference. So foreign influence is only to be expected in written texts from such contexts, and the script (often associated with a specific religion) may influence how a language is analysed.

Needless to say, some of the processes conceptualised by Utas are difficult to pin down in the evidence from earlier periods. However, observations from contemporary languages may nicely illustrate his points, as is shown by Carina Jahani's article "The Glottal Plosive: A Phoneme in Spoken Modern Persian or Not?". The prestige associated with the Arabic script has led (inter alia) to the widespread misconception represented, for instance, by Ṣādeqī 1987:230: "The glottal stop is distinctive at the beginning, middle and end of words". Using

material from interviews, Jahani shows that there is free variation with zero in word initial position (ergo the glottal stop not a phoneme); in the remaining contexts, the glottal stop has phonemic status, but its actual pronunciation depends on factors like the frequency of the given word, syntax and topicalisation, the formality of the speech situation, the age of informants and preferences regarding "correct Persian" (often implying spelling pronunciation). Apart from solving a much discussed question of Modern Persian grammar, Jahani's approach is a remarkable progress vis-à-vis many studies that often do not even distinguish between the grammars of literary and spoken Modern Persian.

Four articles discuss Central Asian Arabic (specifically the texts collected in the Bukhara region by Vinnikov around 1940) from a typological perspective: "Linguistic Contacts in Central Asia" (Guram Chikovani), "Uzbekistan Arabic: a Language Created by Semitic-Iranian-Turkic Linguistic Convergence" (Otto Jastrow), "Bukhara Arabic: A Metatypized dialect of Arabic in Central Asia" (Robert Ratcliffe) and "Central Asian Arabic: The Irano-Arabic Dynamics of a New Perfect" (Gernot Windfuhr, in the Iranian section of the book). This dialect (which, as shown by Jastrow, belongs with the dialects of Iraq) differs radically from other Arabic varieties in morphology and syntax: while Arabic usually shows VSO, Bukhara Arabic has adverbials and objects preceding the verb as do Tajiki and Uzbek (Jastrow), usually with pronominal suffix on the verb indexing the object (Ratcliffe). The dialect is specifically interesting in combining noun+adjective (linked by a suffix that functions like the Persian *eẓāfe*), noun+genitive and prepositions (thus also other Arabics and Tajiki) with relative+noun, i.e. with a modifying participle construction preceding the head noun exactly as in Uzbek. Likewise, parallel to Uzbek, but not found in other Arabics are the use of infinitive constructions in subject function and as object and subordinate clauses, and of an active participle of "stand" (see also above on Tajiki) in what Ratcliffe calls a subordinate serial verb (maybe rather a durative construction). Bukhara Arabic has lost the definite article, marking indefiniteness instead, and has developed a specific marker for identified direct objects, as in both Persian and Turkic (Jastrow). Neither is the conjunction *wa* "and" used, different methods being used for joining verbs and nouns, respectively. While Ratcliffe wonders whether this difference might be a characteristic feature of SOV languages, one would surely refer to the absence of "and" in Altaic, and assume that the use of *ya* "with" joining nouns in Bukhara Arabic may be motivated by the parallel use in Turkic (Turkish *ile* "with, and", Uzbek *bilan*, e.g. *biz bilan siz* "we and you"); perhaps Ratcliffe's question might be modified to ask whether serial verbs (including converb constructions) are also found in languages that are not SOV.

Another "un-Arabic" feature of the Bukhara variety involves tense forms based on verbal nouns, yielding a perfect and a present continous. The subject is marked by clitics that in the 1st and 2nd person would otherwise index the object, and a second clitic referring to the object may be added. Ratcliffe considers this to be modelled on Persian and Turkic, both of which have verbal endings that are "similar to those which mark possessor" – which is basically correct, but does not imply (pace Ratcliffe's table on p. 153) that Persian and Turkic "clitic pronouns" index subject, object and possessor. Windfuhr suggests an alternative explanation, viz. that Central Asian Arabic structures like (Windfuhr's examples) *zorbin-ak-um* "you have hit them" reflect contact with an Iranian language that shows ergativity of the Sulaimani Kurdish type, marking both agent and object on the verb, cf. *xwardū-t-im* "you have eaten them", both showing a structure participle-2SG-3PL. This would imply that at the time of this contact (i.e. before the migrations of Central Asian Arabic into its present location, the last part of which may have been in the 15th century?), there was an Iranian variety in the required region that showed patterns like *xwardū-t-im* in a sufficient number of examples. However, in sentences that consist of more than the verb, the agent clitic tends to be affixed elsewhere, e.g. on the object, or an adverbial in Iranian ergative languages; more regular affixing of the agent clitic to the ergative verb seems to be a rather recent phenomenon. Likewise interesting is the Bukhara Arabic past progressive formed by the present/future prefix *m-* + an uninflected form of the verb, for which one would surely compare the Persian past imperfective *mī-kardam*, i.e.

the imperfective prefix (which is regular in the present tense) plus the simple past. Bukhara Arabic has also copied conjunctions from Persian and interrogative *mi* and the suffix *či* from Turkic.

A particularly strong point of the present volume is that it offers several pieces of the authors' research on previously more or less undescribed dialects, mostly quoting some sample sentences or text samples, as do e.g. Sven-Olof Dahlgren ("On the Arabic of Arabkhane in Eastern Iran", not to be confused with Arabkhane in Uzbekistan) and Éva Csató ("On Copying in Kashkay"). Several of these varieties are set in a decidedly multilingual environment, speakers using a local dialect, the national language, and a regional vernacular for social and economic interaction. This applies to the varieties described by Bo Isaksson in "New Linguistic Data from the Sason Area in Anatolia" (speakers using an Arabic variety, Turkish and Kurmanji) and to "Iranian Influences in Sonqor Turkic" by Christiane Bulut, quoting text samples she collected (languages used here including Sonqor Turkic, multiple varieties of Persian and Kurdish).

Structures found in dialects like these, which demonstrate various linguistic influences on lexical, morphological and syntactical level, may also shed light on texts from earlier periods, which is demonstrated by Hendrik Boeschoten's "Some Notes on 'Mixed' Written Western Oghuz Turkic" and by Heidi Stein's "Traces of *Türki-yi Acemi* in Pietro della Valle's Turkish Grammar (1620)", both types of text showing interesting layers of different Turkic varieties.

Conversely, treatment of etymological matters tends to somewhat lag behind the high standard set by the volume as a whole. This specifically applies to "Persian and Turkish Loans in the Arabic Dialects of North Eastern Arabia" by Bruce Ingham, focussing on terms for clothing and other household items. Readers will tend to agree with Ingham's "in some cases I may have missed the ultimate origin" of the words discussed, for instance (to name but a few, lemmata in the form quoted by Ingham) Arabic *ġuṭi* "tin, box" and *yāqa* "collar", which are not Persian, but Turkic (see Doerfer nos. 1569, 1802); *bāǰ* "tythe" not Turkic, but Persian (Horn no. 148), thus also *cākūc* "hammer" (Persian *čakuš*, Horn and Hübschmann no. 443, maybe with influence from *čāqū* "small knife" of unclear etymology), Khuzestani *wafur* "ice cream" certainly not "from", but related to Persian *barf* "snow", etc. Some use of the relevant literature (see the references for a list of some etymological dictionaries) would have changed the impression of a "general convergence under the umbrella of Islam" to reveal a broader cultural context: quite a few of the discussed words are of Indic origin (e.g. *šikar* "sugar", *girmiz* "pink colouring", *šāl* "shawl", see Lokotsch nos. 1855, 1219, 1802). This will hardly come as a surprise, as the field of cloth, including the substances used for dying it is particularly liable to borrowing, and Indic influence is widely reflected in the pertinent terminology. Ingham suspects possible Indic connections in the literary sphere, comparing the formula (roughly translating "Once there was, there was not…") that introduces a fairy tale in Arabic, Persian, Turkic etc. (also in Czech, by the way) with a quote from Ṛgveda X, 129.1a: the Vedic imperfect *āsīd* "was" ("is" according to Ingham, misquoting Macdonnel 1917:207) does place the action in primordial times – beyond the usual sphere, thus somewhat parallel to the oriental phrase. However, the philosophical problem described in the Vedic hymn (how the cosmos emerged from a situation where there not only was no existence, but even the non-existence did not exist yet) seems to be the converse rather than a parallel to the oriental formula, which would imply simultaneous existence and non-existence.

In "The Turkish Contribution to the Arabic Lexicon", Stephan Procházka presents the results of his investigation of Turkic items in Modern Standard Arabic. Even if the examples he discusses might leave the reader wondering whether the share of items that are not originally Turkic may be somewhat higher than the 10% that Procházka would admit, this will hardly affect the conclusion, viz. that Turkic items chiefly occur in the field of private life (including terms for household items, clothing, measures, festivals), and that "the Turkish impact on both written and dialectal Arabic is actually quite limited".

Bernt Brendemoen's article "Some Remarks on the Phonological Status of Greek Loanwords

in Anatolian Turkish Dialects" extends the perspective on lexical copying in the oriental cultural sphere to the west.

There are also some articles on specific sorts of language contact, among these "Lexical Areas and Semantic Fields of Arabic Loanwords in Persian and Beyond" by John Perry, treating the function and semantic spheres of Arabic nouns in -*a/-at*, which have been copied into Persian either with -*a* or with -*at* (and with both in a number of cases), Mark Kirchner's contribution "Adverbial Clauses in an Old Ottoman Turkish Interlinear Version of the Koran", (owing to the nature of the sacred text, the Turkish rendering is a glossing with comments rather than a translation, comparable to the Middle Persian renderings of the Avestan texts), and Geoffrey Lewis' article "The Strange Case of Ottoman", focussing on the Turkish language reform (for more context and background information, see the author's book (Lewis 1999) on the same topic).

In Jan-Olof Svantesson's article "Vowel Harmony – Areal or Genetic?", the author concludes that an areal spread of vowel harmony seems possible (although no clear case of this has been found so far), which implies that vowel harmony is not a good indicator for assessing possible genetic affiliation of languages; on the other hand, no instance of genesis of vowel harmony seems to have been claimed yet either. One wonders how Svantesson would relate this to the issue (mentioned in the beginning) of the relation (if any) of vowel harmony in Altaic and Uralic. Topics that might have been addressed include vowel harmony in other regions (e.g. in Africa) and the absence of agreement as to whether (or to what degree) vowel harmony in Uralic is inherited or developed secondarily (cf. e.g. Collinder 1960:215), for all of which Vago 1980 might have been mentioned.

Abdulaziz Lodhi's article "Convergence of Language on the East African Coast" offers a very welcome introduction to the fascinating, but hitherto little studied topic of linguistic contact of oriental (Semitic, Turkic, Iranian and Indic) and African languages and the context in which it has taken place.

In "Iranian as a Buffer Zone Between the Universal Typologies of Turkic and Semitic", Donald Stilo examines eight features of a wide range of Middle Eastern languages to discuss to what extent language contact can account for the relative position of demonstratives, adjectives, numerals, relative clause vs. noun, adverb vs. adjective, adpositions, and direct object vs. verb. Stilo presents an impressive amount of data to illustrate the notion that "areality can usually explain patterns that are opposite from the expected universal pattern". Aspects that might be addressed in follow-up studies to refine the picture and avoid simplifications could include more attention to markedness of features (i.e. an assessment of the probability that the feature under discussion is due to areal influence) and more discussion of some far-ranging approaches: for instance, what does it mean for a given Iranian variety in a specific location that, as a group, "Iranian languages are sandwiched between typical VO languages (…) and typical OV languages"? Since, as underlined by Stilo, earlier stages of Iranian varieties are comparatively well attested, the chances are good to follow Johanson's suggestion (p. 205) that "each step of convergence should be determined" to give a refined picture of the processes involved.

Indeed, the articles in the present volume make it possible to study the stages by which "linguistic convergence and areal diffusion" may proceed: contact-induced language change is likely to make use of competing constructions that are already present in the language, furthering the use of the option that is parallel to the one of the influencing language at the expense of other possibilities. In Central Asian Arabic, for instance, the shift from VSO to SOV translates into practice by an already available marked structure being transformed into the general pattern. Right-branching relative clauses are preferred over Turkic left-branching ones in conditions of adaptation to Persian, be it in a Turkic variety spoken in a Persian environment (see the article by Filiz Kıral) or in the framework of a translated text; the two types may also be used to differentiate non-restrictive relative clauses from restrictive ones (thus in texts studied by Claudia Römer in "Right-Branching vs. Left-Branching Subordinate

Clauses in 16th Century Ottoman Historical Texts: Haphazard Use or Stylistic Device?”).

There are some difficulties with fonts and special signs (diacritics not on letters e.g. on pp. 151, 359; *œ* instead of *æ* in Johanson's article, etc.), which in some places render the material somewhat ambiguous (e.g. which syllable of *ma aʿrafs* (p. 179 l. 4) should have been in italics (here used to indicate stress)?; what do *ǧ* and *c* in Arabic words on p. 176–178 stand for?). Transcription of language material is not always consistent (for instance, *c*, *ç* and *tʃ*, *dʒ* for the affricates, *ê* etc. vs. *e:* etc. for long vowels, both *ñ* and *ɴ* for the velar nasal, in the examples on pp. 259–264 quoted from the same text).

The mention of a few infelicities should not, however, in any way detract from the main fact: the volume under discussion offers a rich collection of data from most interesting Iranian, Semitic and Turkic varieties, alongside fine thought-provoking analyses. With its many inspiring synchronic and diachronic approaches, it makes for a fascinating read, and is a very welcome contribution to the study of an overall interpretation of language contact phenomena.

*Agnes Korn,* Frankfurt am Main

## *References*

Andreas, Friedrich C. and Walter B. Henning 1933: “Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II”. In: *Sitzungsberichte der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pp. 292–363 (= Walter B. Henning 1977: *Selected Papers* I (*Acta Iranica* 14), pp. 191–260).

Clauson, Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Collinder, Björn 1960: *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages* (*A Handbook of the Uralic Languages* 3). Stockholm: Amqvist & Wiksell.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1963–1975: *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* (*Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* 16, 19–21). Wiesbaden: Steiner, 4 vol.

Eren, Hasan 1999: *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bizim Büro Basım Evi (2nd ed.).

Henning, Walter B. 1934: „Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente“. In: *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253 (= *Selected Papers* I (*Acta Iranica* 14), pp. 65–160).

Horn, Paul 1893: *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*. Straßburg: Trübner.

Hübschmann, Heinrich 1895: *Persische Studien*. Straßburg: Trübner.

Lewis, Geoffrey 1999: *The Turkish Language Reform: A Catastrophic Success*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.

Lokotsch, Karl 1927: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Macdonell, Arthur A. 1917: *A Vedic Reader for Students*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.

Maciuszak, Kinga 1996: “Notes on Etymology of the New Persian Colour Names”. In: *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 1, pp. 25–37.

Räsänen, Martti 1969–1971: *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen* (*Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae* 17). Helsinki, 2 vol..

Rastorgueva, Vera S., and E. K. Molčanova 1981: „Srednepersidskij jazyk“. In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija* 2. Moscow, pp. 6–146.

Ṣādeqī, ʿAlī-Ašraf 1987: “Arabic I: Arabic elements in Persian”. In: *Encyclopædia Iranica* II, pp. 229–231.

Tietze, Andreas 2002: *Tarihi ve etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi lugatı* 1: *A-E*. İstanbul: Simurg etc.

Vago, Robert 1980: *Issues in Vowel Harmony: Proceedings of the CUNY Linguistics Conference on vowel Harmony 14th May 1977* (*Studies in Language Companions* 6). Amsterdam etc.: Benjamins.