Recenzje / Reviews

László Károly, *Modern Turkic Languages*, Uppsala University and Molnar & Kelemen Oriental Publishers (Bibliotheca Turcica 2), Uppsala and Budapest, 2022, xviii + 261 pp.

László Károly's *Modern Turkic Languages* appeared in the year when another introduction to Turkic languages was published, the second edition of Lars Johanson and Éva Á. Csató's *Turkic Languages* (the first edition published in 1998 and reprinted in 2006) and one year after Lars Johanson's *Turkic*, both mentioned in *Modern Turkic Languages* (p. 1). The basic part of Károly's book are short descriptions of twenty-eight modern Turkic languages with language samples, written down and recorded, available from audio files through QR codes (pp. 19–236), basically intended for teaching. Just to compare, Johanson and Csató's *Turkic Languages* gives place to only ten modern Turkic languages treated autonomously (Turkish, Gagauz, Azeri, Turkmen, Noghay, Kirghiz, Uzbek, Uyghur, Yakut and Chuvash); six languages are presented in pairs (Tatar with Bashkir, Kazakh with Karakalpak and Yellow Uyghur with Salar), and the rest in large groups. Johanson's *Turkic*, which is a large monograph aiming at the presentation of the structure of Turkic, shortly introduces nearly all thirty-nine modern Turkic languages (Turkish, Gagauz, Azeri, Kashkay, Äynallu, Iraq Oghuz, Khorasan Oghuz, Turkmen, Karachay-Balkar, Kumyk, Crimean Tatar, Karaim, Tatar, Bashkir, Noghay, Kazakh, Kipchak Uzbek, Karakalpkak, Kirghiz, Altay, Uzbek, Uyghur, Khakas, Shor, North Altay, Chulym, Tuvan, Tofan, Dukhan, Tuhan, Soyot, Yakut, Dolgan, Chuvash, Khalaj, Salar, Yellow Uyghur and Fuyü).

At this point it is worth noting how the author writes the names of languages.[1] Firstly, he drops English suffixes and prefers the forms *Tyva* to *Tuvan* or *Tuvinian*, the latter being a reflex of the Russian medium. The exceptions are the long established *Turkish* and *Krymchak*, the former with an English suffix, the latter as a Russian name emerged in the 19th century, later adopted by the speakers of this language, and *Azeri*, with the Irano-Arabic suffix *-i* (< *-ī*). Secondly, he avoids *h* in *gh* in some languages, using such

---

[1] For the sake of coherence, unless referring to another author or specially stressed, I will use the same forms of language names as Károly, although I normally use other forms for some.

forms as *Kyrgyz*, *Nogai* and *Uigur*, not *Kirghiz*, *Noghay* and *Uighur* or *Uyghur*, as well as *Oguz* for the more usual *Oghuz*. It is a good step toward a simpler and more uniform spelling, as there is, e.g., *Dolgan* and not **Dolghan*. Thirdly, in some cases he prefers the forms closer to native pronunciation, e.g. *Kazak* and *Kyrgyz*, not Russian-influenced Kazakh, and Kirghiz. This is again a good solution, since we use *Karakalpak* and not **Karakalpakh*. Fourthly, Károly explains where he uses *i* and *y* for [j]: *i* for the coda positions and *y* in the onset of a syllable. Although using the uniform *i* or *y* would probably bring more uniformity, the manner of spelling that Károly uses is long established in Turkic studies, e.g. Radloff's *ai* 'moon; month' versus *ajak* 'foot', though not used consistently. I have a few remarks to Károly's spelling. Firstly, if the author wishes to bring the names closer to the native pronunciation, *Kumuk* should be used instead of *Kumyk*. Secondly, the letter *y* is used for both [j], as shown just beforehand, and [ɨ], i.e. *Chulym*, *Krymchak*, *Kumandy*, *Kumyk*, *Kyrgyz* and *Tyva*. This spelling is especially inconvenient in the words or names like "Yysh" [jɨʃ] (p. 20). Thirdly, he uses a short form *Chalkan* instead of the usual Chalkandu. This short form is rarely employed in the studies, but see the title "Handbuch der Tschalkantürkischen" by Erdal, Nevskaya et al. (2013: vii), in which the bare form *Čalqan* is mentioned beside suffixed forms.[2] Fourthly, *Oguz Uzbek* suggests that it is an Oguz variety of Uzbek as *Kipchak Uzbek* is a Kipchak variety of Uzbek. However, there is a difference between the two. While Kipchak Uzbek is really a variety of Uzbek with residual vocabulary and grammar, the people who speak a non-Turkmen Oguz variety in Uzbekistani Khwarezm identify as Uzbeks only in official situations, calling elsewhere themselves *Turki*.

In the introduction (pp. 1–18), the author presents the structure of his book, discusses some important and debatable questions of Turkic studies and presents the structure of language descriptions which are identical for each language. Thus each section is composed of (1) the name of the language described, its ISO code, its name(s) in the original orthography, if available, the status, the basis of the literary language, if existing, its territory, territories of migration, dialects, and the statistical data on language speakers; (2) alternative name(s); (3) special features of lexicon, phonology and grammar with Old Turkic and other comparative references; (4) the alphabet; if this is lacking, a usual form of writing, and if this is also lacking, the phonemic transcription; (5) the language sample, in principle, in the standard written variety, read up by a native language speaker, recorded from his/her voice and stored in an audio file and retrievable through a QR code;[3] (6) the interlinear analysis of the first ten sentences of the sample, including the title which consists of a text in transcription, morphonological segmentation, morphological glossing and English translation; and (7) the bibliography. The bibliography at the end of each section is very short. There are only a few items even at the big languages that

---

[2] According to Radloff (*Aus Sibirien. Lose Blätter aus dem Tagebuche eines reisenden Linguisten. Erster Band und anderer Band*, Leipzig 1884, p. 212), the endoname of this people is "Ku-Kishi", while "Tschalgan", i.e. *Čalgan*, is the name of one of the two sub-divisions of which they are composed.

[3] The recordings are also available in the form of the open access at the author's university website: Viewed 8 May 2024, <https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-464285>.

are very well examined and hundreds or thousands of books and articles are devoted to them. Therefore, I will not comment on this section, for it would require addition of many items. The bibliography section is divided to grammars (G), dictionaries (D) and sometimes miscellaneous materials (M). There is also a short general bibliography at the end of the book (pp. 243–247).

The transcription for all languages is the IPA standard. The Turkic consonants and vowels are shown in two tables (pp. 7–8). I think that it would be better to provide the samples, as well as words and forms in the description according to their actual pronunciation and not to their orthographic standards. After all, the IPA is the phonetic, not the graphic standard. This is particularly important for the languages which use orthographic standards very unsuitable for their phonetic structure and phonological processes, e.g. Kazak, Turkmen or Tyva.

With regard to alternative names of languages and peoples who speak them, some are quite numerous (e.g. for Tyva), some contain only a few or one item (e.g. for Uzbek). Naturally these names may not be complete, especially if we take into consideration multiple inter-Turkic relations. For instance, the Kazakhs once commonly called the Bashkirs *Estek* and the name *Eštek ~ Ištäk* was widespread beyond the Ural. The Tatars, quite interestingly, were called *Noγay* in Central Asia, the Khakas called the Altais *Tileg* or *Tileges* (Teleŋet), etc.

The last part of the introduction is devoted to the classification of the Turkic languages (pp. 12–18) including a map (pp. 14–15). The author points to some difficulties that make a perfect classification impossible, i.e. how to distinguish between the language and the dialect, how to treat the mutual intelligibility and the approach of the users of a language, a dialect or a variant. We can complicate this issue further, stressing that intelligibility between the users of a dominant and a dominated language is normally asymmetric (e.g. Crimean Tatars and Azerbaijanians mostly understand Turkish, but the Turks rarely understand Crimean Tatar and Azerbaijanian) and intelligibility of two languages or variants has some limitations. Sometimes it happens that the users of a variant do not have a uniform opinion of the status of the variant they use. Among extralinguistic problems to which the author calls attention there are political aspects, e.g. the case of North Altai in Russia and the treatment of Turkic languages in Turkey where the languages are called *lehçe*, an ambiguous term denoting both a Turkic dialect and a Turkic language. To overcome ambiguity, he mostly employs the term *variety* in reference to dialects, subdialects and other problematic variants. He adds that some special varieties are not discussed as separate languages, but are mentioned at the section of the basic language variety, e.g. Tofa under Tyva.

Károly's classification is geographical. He begins it with the Central (or Siberian) branch as a core area to symbolically demonstrate how the Turkic-speaking peoples spread "from the approximate region of West and South Siberia, Western Mongolia and potentially the Trans-Baikal area" (p. 16). There are seven branches in this classification: Central (or Siberian), North-Eastern, Southern (or Turkestan), South-Western (or Oguz), Khalaj, Chuvash and Western (Kipchak).

There are several problems with this classification. Firstly, the Central (or Siberian) branch comprises a very large territory (although with minimal density in several regions) and some of its languages like Fuyu Kyrgyz and Yugur take extreme or peripheral, not central positions. Secondly, even if the other branches are shown clockwise, the assigned geographic locations are not identical with their real locations, e.g. the southern branch (Uzbek and Uigur) falls to the south-west rather than the south which is the territory of Yugur and Salar, which is also seen on Károly's map. Károly's south-western (or Oguz) branch is situated farther to the south-west. The western (or Kipchak) branch is situated to both the west (Kumyk and Nogai), the south-west (Karakalpak and Kazak) and the north-west (Bashkir, Tatar and (West) Karaim). Thirdly, the classification puts Khalaj (branch E) and Chuvash (branch F) side by side between the south-western and western branches, which fits the real geographical locations of these two languages only symbolically. However, it should be added that few classifications could solve this problem. Therefore, Johanson's idea of calling these languages enclaves seems to be better. Alternatively, we can use the term isolated Turkic languages.

As far as the existing classifications are concerned, the author mentions a few early attempts, from Adelung in 1820, to Korsh in 1910, which can be ignored because they were unsystematic, incomplete and are now outdated. I agree with the author that the first classifications that marked the "new era" were those by Ramstedt in 1917 and Samoilovich in 1922, which – we should add – were structural, i.e. based on phonetic criteria.

There are some more important differences between Károly's classification and the previous ones. For instance, aside from Turkish, there are two Turkish variants, Anatolian and Rumelian Turkish on the level of languages. Rumelian is defined as a variety of Turkish spoken in the Balkans (p. 187), but it is not clear why Anatolian Turkish has been separated from Turkish. By the way, Urum which was positioned in the western sub-branch of the South-western (Oguz) branch, is not typically south-western, since there is also a Kipchak or north-western variety of Urum what Károly recognises himself in the respective chapter (p. 57). Not all variants mentioned in the classification are shown on the map, but all languages discussed in the main part are.

The languages discussed are presented in alphabetical order from Altai to Yugur. The use of language descriptions is facilitated by the list of sixty-four tables (pp. x–xi) and the list of abbreviations and symbols (pp. xiii–xv). We shall add that the pagination is user-friendly, page numbers are also shown on the beginning pages of all chapters.

A general remark about the section *alternative names* is that the alternative names are provided without a historical background. For example, showing the names "Kyrgyz, Kazak Kyrgyz, Kyrgyz Kaisak" for Kazakh (p. 106) is only correct with reference to the past, for presently none of these names is used for Kazakh.

After the main part of the book, there are notes on the informants and people who recorded the samples (pp. 237–242), the general bibliography mentioned above, indexes of languages (pp. 249–254) and geographical names (pp. 255–261).

In the following, I will review the presentation of all the twenty-eight languages in the order as they appear in Károly's book.

1. Altai

The language names, i.e. *Altay tili*, are used beside ethnonyms, in this case "Altai Kizhi", also "Tuba Kizhi", "Yysh Kizhi", "Kumandy Kizhi" and "Chalkan Kizhi" ~ "Ku Kizhi". To the alternative names of Teleut, we have to add *Payat* (Russian *бачатский*). According to Tokmašev (2010: 21), the Teleuts are called *Tadar Kiži* (i.e. the Tatar people). The term "Chui" is abstracted from the Russian name of the river *Чуя*, while the Teleŋit name is *Ču kiži*, see "*Tschü Kishi* (Tschuja-Leute)" in Radloff (1884: 215). It is likely that Radloff's form is correct and Altai *Čuy sū* provided in the Altai-Russian dictionary (Baskakov and Toščakova 1947: 206) and in Molčanova (1979: 346) are influenced by Russian.

I have three comments on this section. First, there is no need to provide the Written Mongolian form *širege(n)* as the source of the Altai *širē* 'table', since this word is identical to Modern Mongolian *širē*, but more importantly, to the same Kalmuk form (Ramstedt 1976: 359), as Oirat was the donor of most of the Mongolic words to Altai. This is also true of many other Mongolic loanwords in other Turkic languages described below. Second, the initial Altai *b-* is in fact unaspirated, non-tense [p]. Third, in many cases, the rounded-unrounded vowel harmony in Altai works better than the current spelling standard shows. For example, the graphic *Соҥында* 'afterwards', as it is clearly heard from the recording, is pronounced [soŋunda] and not [soŋïnda], as in Károly's transcription (p. 25).

2. Azeri

With regard to the names of this language, Tiflis Turkish or Tiflis Tatar was more frequently used than Azerbaijanian Tatar. It would be interesting to refer to the last debate on the official name of Azeri in the early 1990s when the name of the language was first established as *türk* like before 1936 and only in 1995 was proclaimed as *Azərbaycan dili* by the parliament.

My comments on the special features in this section are the following. Not only ‹g› is pronounced as *gʲ* (probably the symbol [ɟ] is better after a front vowel), but also its strong equivalent ‹k› is pronounced as *kʲ* (or [c]) in some positions.

Although I have no intention to add new titles to the bibliography, it is worth noting that the Azerbaijanians published two voluminous dictionaries with English as a second language: Hacıyev's (ed.) 2005 Azerbaijanian-English dictionary with ca 55,000 words and collocations and Məmədov's (ed.) 2004 English-Azerbaijanian dictionary with ca 80,000 words and collocations.

3. Bashkir

The claim that "Bashkir has a relatively small number of loanwords of Persian and Arabic origin" (p. 37) needs clarification. It is true in relation to the languages deeply influenced by Persian and Arabic like Turkish, Azerbaijanian or Uzbek and even also Tatar, its closest kindred language, but within the north-western branch Bashkir does not seem to be exceptional in this respect. We can find a good deal of Persian and Arabic words even in the first ten sentences of Károly's sample: *duθ* 'friend' (in a few derivatives), *zaman* 'time', *yän* 'soul', *hawa* 'air', *räχät* 'delight' (in *räχätlĭk*), *dŏnya* 'world', *ämmä*

'but', *ğanğal* 'quarrel', *aθïl* 'original', *därt* 'ardour'. In fact Bashkir has many Persian and Arabic loanwords in all parts of speech and all domains of life, e.g. *azat* 'free', *taða* 'clean', *saf* 'pure, clean', *ður* 'big', *raθ* 'true'; *qala* 'city, town', *χaywan* 'animal', *yawap* 'answer', *χaq* 'truth', *χoquq* 'law', *yarðïm* 'help', *fayða* 'benefit', *zaman, waqït, mäl* 'time', *räwïš* 'form, kind; manner', *χata* 'mistake', *waqïya* 'event', *taθtamal* 'towel', especially among conjunctions, e.g. *ämmä, läkin, fäqät* 'but', *häm* 'and', *yäki, ällä* 'or', *sŏnki* 'because', *ägär* 'if' and other function and modal words, e.g. *χatta* 'even', *bälki* 'perhaps', *yäγni* 'that is'. Almost all Islamic terminology is also borrowed, e.g. *Alla, Xoday* 'God', *iblis* 'devil', *färĭštä* 'angel' and *doγa* 'prayer'. Therefore, in this respect it does not differ from other "Islamic" Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, Karachay or Kumuk of its branch, although naturally each has its own specificity. The problem of the Bashkir consonants θ, δ is quite complicated. The author naturally could not go into details, he only said that common Turkic *s, z* changes into θ, δ. However, it should be added that this change does not occur in the initial, except for the word *ður* 'big, great' and its derivatives (by the way, this is the correct form and not "*ðor* ⟨зор⟩", p. 38). It should also be added that there are exceptions to this rule in the medium (*s, z*) and the final (*z*) in Persian and Arabic loanwords. e.g. *äsir* 'captive', *arzan* 'cheap', *χas* 'typical of'.

4. Chulym

Although nowadays some Chulym phonic recordings are available online, it is great that the author managed to append a short sample of this tiny language spoken by a few native speakers only, even though the informant is not a good language speaker and reads the texts with difficulty. Károly pays attention only to Middle Chulym, since – as he says – Lower Chulym is dead. This solution enables the author to concentrate on non-contradictory forms in the section of special features, for Lower Chulym is not a *z*-language like Middle Chulym, but a *y*-language. This feature has not been shown among the characteristic traits, but can be found in the examples analysed, i.e. *mɛn uzalakɨm* 'I have not slept yet'. Károly notes that Chulym uses grammar words of Russian origin and exemplifies this with *što* 'that' and *a* 'and'. However, this is not an exclusive property of small, dying out languages as Chulym, it is typical of all languages once spoken in the Soviet Union and at present in Russia, see Dimitriev's study on so-called barbarisms in Bashkir, in particular the presence of a similar word *š(ï)tùbï* 'so that' (Dmitriev 1962: 461). The function words like these are also frequently used in the substandard varieties of titular languages of the post-Soviet Central Asian languages. Moreover, they are present in Károly's samples of other languages, although not discussed in the corresponding special features, e.g. *a* 'and' in Altai (p. 22) and *ä* 'id' in Bashkir (p. 39).

5. Chuvash

The special features of Chuvash take more place than those of the preceding languages. It is probably because the author pays special attention to Chuvash as a key language for the study in historical grammar and vocabulary. More space is required by sound changes (table 13) the number of which in Chuvash is high. There is one small thing to

be pointed out, i.e. Károly says that word-initial *y-* and *č-* > *ś-*, but among his examples there is also one for the medial-position, i.e. *uś-* 'to open' < *ač-* (p. 49). Discussing the lexicon, the author demonstrates contact with Mari (a Finno-Ugric language) and inner Turkic contact with Kipchak languages, while in the previous languages only Persian, Arabic, Mongolic and Russian contact was discussed.

6. Crimean Tatar

This heterogenous language with many variants and a complicated geopolitical background is presented well and I have no comment on this. Black Sea Tatar as an alternative name is not in fact much used, and to the best of my knowledge is not used in Turkic studies at all. As a matter of fact, Crimean Tatars often refer to their language in an abbreviated form as *tatarča ~ tatarša* when speaking among themselves.

7. Dolgan

Discussing the Dolgan lexicon, Károly points to Evenki and Nganasan borrowings. He demonstrates some of many interesting grammatical features of Dolgan. It is good that attention is paid to those features which differentiate Dolgan from Yakut (Sakha), since Dolgan is considered an ethnic variety of Yakut. In other words, the relation between Dolgan and Sakha is like that between Krymchak and Crimean Tatar and Urum and Crimean Tatar, though in these cases Turkish is also an important player.

8. Gagauz

Palatalization of consonants in the vicinity of front vowels shown as a Gagauz feature induced by Slavic is in fact a feature typical of some other Turkic languages spoken in Russia, but especially of some sociolinguistic varieties, mostly children who are taught the language through the Russian alphabet and who do not acquire the language in natural situations in the spoken form. If we take Standard Turkish as a reference language to which Gagauz is very similar, we will get many differentiating features, but the studies mostly focus on syntax which has an "un-Turkic" character. Therefore, Károly devoted more space to this than in the corresponding points of other languages. With reference to the alternative names of Gagauz, it can be noted that the Gagauz once often called their language Turkish (*Türkçe*). It is like the Turkic peoples of Siberia (e.g. Shor, Khakas, Chulym etc.) who called their language Tatar.

9. Karachai-Balkar

To the point presenting the name of this language, I would add a note that it is the product of Soviet language and ethnic policy. Both Karachais and Balkars normally refer to their language *Qaračay til* and *Malqar til*, respectively. However, quite frequently both call their languages *tawča* and *taw til* '*lit* mountaineer-language'. Although there is no conflict over this question, even some language materials published nowadays are called only Karachai and Balkar. The classification of Karachai-Balkar dialects is correct, for some features do not divide between Karachay and Balkar but overlap. The most distinct

is the Balkar dialect of Cherek. Although Károly attributes the change $y > ʒ$ to Balkar as a whole (p. 79; in fact, it should be $y > z$ or, more exactly, $y > (> dʒ) ʒ > z$), this is in fact a trait of the Cherek dialect only. Other features selected for Karachai-Balkar well characterize this literary language. Interestingly, the sample provided by the author is Balkar.

10. Karaim

Since the author ignores Lower Chulym as an extinct variety, he is also right to ignore the Crimean Karaim variety which went into disuse gradually in the 20th century. The remaining two western Karaim varieties, a northern and a southern one, the latter also dead, but spoken until recently, still in the 1990s, are presented so that no comments are needed. There is only one case of spelling inconsistency in the sample: if *Częstochowa* is spelled in the Polish standard, there should also be *Nowogródek* instead of *Nowogrodek*. It should be noted that in the sample the typical north-western Karaim phonological change $a > e$ before a suffix beginning with [j] is not marked in the written part of it, i.e. *karajs > karejs* 'who looks after', *abrajsyn > abrejsyn* 'you protect', *alaj > alej* 'thus' and *ukszaj > ukszej* '(it) resembles' (p. 88).

11. Karakalpak

Károly says that Karakalpak is very similar to Kazak and some of Karakalpak special features are matched with those in Kazak. There is little to comment on this section. Perhaps we can add that the form *bizler* 'we' (p. 92) is also used in Kazakh as *bizder*. The name Kalpak shown as alternative to Karakalpak is very bizarre and coined artificially.

12. Kashkai

Kashkai is a language of the southern branch of the South-Western or Oguz Turkic languages to which all other languages of the branch, but also Khorasan Turkic, a language of the eastern (according to Doerfer 1990: 19) or north-eastern (according to Károly) Oguz sub-branch are referred. While the inclusion of Songor, Ainallu and Afshar in Kashkai is fully understandable, the inclusion of Khorasan Turkic may be debatable, since it shares some features with Turkmen and Uzbekistani Khwarezmian Turkic. All these language varieties, except for Iraq Oguz, share a common vocabulary and grammar features copied from Persian and are relatively similar to each other, and this must be the reason why the author presented them in one chapter. My single comment on this is that the instrumental-comitative suffix +Xnɛn (p. 99) is not a good example for a non-harmonic suffix, for it is an enclitic (< *bilän*) which is non-harmonic in some other Turkic languages such as Crimean Tatar, Kazakh and various Turkish and Azerbaijanian dialects as well.

13. Kazak

The presentation of Kazak is in general correct. Despite this we can make various minor comments. Firstly, the verb *baq-* should be translated 'to look after' rather than 'to look' (p. 106), for the normal Kazakh verb denoting 'to look' is *qara-*, as Károly demonstrates himself further in the section of special features (p. 108) and as he translates

the corresponding Kyrgyz verb (p. 138). Secondly, he discusses the prothetic *w* before /ø o/ and the prothetic /j/ before /ε/, but in the sample marks only the latter. Thirdly, he argues that Kazakh contains relatively few Persian and Arabic loanwords (p. 106), but in the section of Kyrgyz he maintains that Kyrgyz has a huge amount of them (p. 138). As is known, these two languages are relatively similar and their lexicon is also similar, even if they are not as similar as Kazak and Karakalpak. In my view, this opinion should be more balanced. In fact, the number of Persian and Arabic loanwords is also high in Kazakh, although naturally much lower than in neighbouring Uzbek or Uigur. At the same time, the proportion "huge" used in relation to Kyrgyz may probably be slightly moderated.

14. Khakas

One comment should be made on Károly's treatment of Khakas dialects. In his opinion, Khakas is divided into two groups: one comprising Sagai and the other comprising Kacha (an artificial form, derived from Rus. *kačinskij*, while their own name is Xās) and Kyzyl, while Beltir, Koibal and Kamas are said to be extinct. Despite the fact that Károly is aware of the existence of Khakasian Shor, he does not recognise it as an existing dialect. His limitation of Khakas varieties into two is at least debatable, for current studies still register Xās, Sagai, Xyzyl and Shor dialects. For instance, one of the most recent dictionaries evidences Xās, Sagai, Xyzyl, Xoibal, Beltir, Shor and even Pürüt (!) words. Four of them (Xās, Sagai, Xyzyl and Shor) are qualified as dialects and three (Beltir, Xoibal and Pürüt) as subdialects (Subrakova 2006: 14–15).

15. Khalaj

It is a great delight to anybody interested in Turkic studies to listen to the Khalaj recording provided by Károly. His short survey of Khalaj demonstrates great variation of some grammatical forms, e.g. the genitive (p. 123). Károly's description is original, since it shows several characteristic traits of Khalaj different from those usually presented in the introductions which mostly focus on archaisms. My comments on this chapter concern loan forms. While the comparative suffix +tar in Kashkai is said to be a copy from Persian (p. 99), the identical suffix in Khalaj is not marked in this way (p. 123). The words *kul:i* and *tεmp:mi* 'all, entire' for the superlative are also not qualified as Arabic. Some of the special lexical and grammatical features shown by the author can also be easily recognised by the reader as archaic, since the Old Turkic parallels are provided. I would like to say at this point that the initial Khalaj *h-*, regarded by Doerfer and all who follow him, including Károly, as the reflex of Proto-Turkic **p-*, is heard in the recording as a light pre-aspiration. The presence of Khalaj *h-* may only be an internal development of this language induced by Persian and in my opinion the arguments for Proto-Turkic **p-* are weak.

16. Kumyk

Károly's presentation of Kumyk, as that of many other languages, includes some special features rarely shown in other introductions and general works, as, e.g., the assimilation *-ld-* > *-ll-* (p. 130). With regard to special postpositions *yimik* 'like' and *taba(q)*

'towards' (p. 131), it should be added that these postpositions are not significantly different from those in other languages, since the former is a development of Old Turkic *kipi* and is known in Turkic languages in many forms, e.g. *kibik, kibi, gibi* etc., including closely located and related Karachai-Balkar *kibik*, and the latter reflects Old Turkic *tapa*, also present in many forms in the modern languages as *taban, taman*, etc., e.g. Karachai-Balkar *taba* and Nogai *tabaɣan* (p. 147).

17. Kyrgyz

To the alternative names of the Kyrgyz one can add their old Russian name *dikokamennye kirgizy* 'the Wild Stone Kyrgyz' used by the Russians to distinguish them from the Kazakhs whom the Russians called Kyrgyz. To the description of Kyrgyz, I also have a few minor remarks. Firstly, the wording "in suffixes with open vowels except after *u*" should be formulated as "[...], i.e., except *u*", for *u* is not open. However, this problem is more complex, because labial harmony also works after *ü*. Therefore, probably the best way to formulate this rule is "after round vowels except *u*". Secondly, to the demonstrative pronouns one should add at least *tetigi(l)* and *tē tetigi(l)* 'that (one) far away', the first element of the latter is present and translated as 'that' in sentence 7 (p. 144). Despite these remarks the short characterisation of Kyrgyz is good.

18. Nogai

The denomination of the Nogai dialect spoken on the Kuban river as Ak Nogai 'White Nogai', coined by Baskakov, has no ethnic grounds. Unfortunately, this artificial name is repeatedly used in the studies following Baskakov. The correct name should be Quban Noɣay, which is the endonym of this population (Bulgarova 1999: 105; Jankowski 2000: 149). I have several comments on this section. Firstly, it is hard to agree with the claim that both /æ/ and /ɛ/ are most commonly articulated as /ɛ/. In reality, these two vowels are clearly different in pronunciation. Secondly, the claim that Nogai [q] is voiced in the intervocalic position as /g/ is misleading. It is voiced, but it is never pronounced in this position as a stop as suggested by the use of the letter ⟨g⟩. Between vowels, but also after weak consonants except for /ŋ N/ this consonant is a weak (or voiced) fricative [ɣ] or [ʁ] which can also be clearly heard from the recording. This is also shared by some other languages, e.g. Tatar, for which the author gives the same form (p. 179). However, we should add that this question is often unsatisfactorily or wrongly shown in Turkic studies and requires revision. Thirdly, if the author indicates the change /d͡ʒ/ > /j/ in the initial of the Arabic and Persian loanwords (p. 147), it would be good to mention the same change in Bashkir. Fourthly, *qazaqlïq* translated 'the land of Kazaks' in the sample is a bit misleading, for it suggests 'the land in which the Kazakhs live', but in the epos and the historical context *qazaq* denoted 'a free man, a wanderer', so a better translation would be 'he became a free/independent man'. In the same text, *ïslar üšin* should be translated 'to capture' and not 'to spy out'. Beyond these minor things the description of Nogai is good with such strong points as verbal adjectives (participial or participant nominals) and verbal adverbs (converbs).

19. Sakha

The special features of Sakha (Yakut), like those of Chuvash, take slightly more space (ca four pages) than those of the other languages which is caused by a special position of Sakha among the Turkic languages due to its many archaic and innovative features. I would only signal one question. It is interesting that in Károly's view the difference between *barïaχ* 'let us (you and me) go!' and *barïaɣïŋ* 'let us (all of us) go!' is regarded as the opposition intimate : general (p. 156), while according to other opinions it is exclusive and inclusive or minimal and augmented inclusive.

20. Salar

I have no comments on the presentation of this divergent Turkic language. The author discusses lexical and grammatical influences of contact languages: Chinese, Mongolic and Tibetan, but calls attention to two divergent grammatical features shared with Saryg Yugur, and mention both Oguz and non-Oguz vocabulary of Salar.

21. Shor

In this presentation, the author indicates Mongolic and Russian as the languages which are the donors of loanwords to Shor. Among the examples of Mongolic loanwords there is *kög* 'melody'. It may be a reborrowing from Mongolic, but this is a well-known Turkic word, known in Old Turkic, borrowed from Chinese. In Clauson's (1972: 709) opinion, it is preserved in north-eastern Turkic languages, of which Shor is the one.

22. Tatar

I have two comments on this section. The first is that I would extend the territory on which Tatar-speaking communities spread (p. 178). As is known, it includes a huge area between Finland and Japan. The other is that instead of a general indication that there is /j/ ~ /d͡ʒ/ alternation in the initial, a narrower rule can be formulated for Standard Tatar: /j/ before /a ŭ ü̆ u / and /d͡ʒ/ before /ä ĭ i ï ü/.

23. Turkish

A short, encyclopedic presentation of such a great language as Turkish, with abundant studies of various linguistic schools, is a challenge. Károly has not given more space and bibliography to it than to other languages and dealt with it in the good proportions. With this in mind, one does not have much to comment on. Probably the following remark may be made: It is good that the author evidences secondary long vowels in genuine Turkish words, though in the case of the example *dağ > dā* (p. 187) the term apocope (or dropping, or loss, or deletion of the final consonant with the compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel) is better than contraction. Note that on the next page, the author terms a similar change as disappearance of word-final *-g* in *sarï* 'yellow'.

24. Turkmen

My comments on the special features of Turkmen are the following. Firstly, the author does not discuss morphonological rules, and these are very complex in Turkmen. Secondly, although the author characterizes the primary and secondary vowel length, he does not indicate it in most of his examples, e.g. it should be *baːr* 'there is' instead of *bar*, *høkmaːn* 'absolutely' and not *høkman* (p. 198), *baːðarina* 'to the marketplace' (p. 204) and not *baðarina*; although he knows that the present tense suffix is {-jAːr} (p. 199) all the forms in the paradigm and the examples are short, e.g. *okajar* '(he/she/it) is reading' (pronounced [okojaːr]). This is also the case with other forms, e.g. all negated forms of the present perfect should end in *-oːk*, and not *ok* (again, Károly is aware of this, providing the suffix as {-Anoːk}), and the future tense in [-Ar] after a vocalic stem should contain a long vowel, i.e. [-Aːr], e.g. *oka + -Ar > okaːr* 'he well read', and not *okar* (p. 199).

Once the author says that the classification of Turkmen varieties is based on tribal structure, he should distinguish between the tribes and the sedentary population which is not tribal. Probably some of them (Alili, Ýemreli and Garadaşly) once were such, but their tribal past was forgotten. Moreover, some are from non-Turkmen and still some of non-Turkic descent. These, in Károly's presentation, are Änewli and Nohurly. Ata, Hoja and Şyh, although thoroughly integrated into the Turkmen population, are the groups of foreign origin who did in the past different religious and ritual services to the people and fall outside the Turkmen tribal structure.

25. Tyva

In the description of this language, we find many interesting linguistic facts, some interpreted differently from traditional studies, e.g. the treatment of so-called pharyngealized or glottalized vowels in initial syllables. In Károly's opinion these are low-pitch vowels. I think it is correct, although experimental measurements are sometimes contradictory. I have two comments on this description. Firstly, the form *dɛːʃ* 'in order to' is once derived from * *degɛʃ*, once from * *digɛʃ*, the former of which is correct. Secondly, all words written with *d-* and *b-* should be replaced with *t-* and *p-*, e.g. *dørtɛn > tørtɛn*, since weak *d-* and *b-* do not occur in Tyva in the absolute initial and this transcription is based on the current Cyrillic orthography. The exceptions are the function words after a vowel or a weak consonant including approximants, since they do not occur in the initial of an utterance, so *dɛːʃ* and *dugaːr* (*duɣār*) are correct.

26. Uigur

Providing the language material in transcription and Uigur script based on Arabic as in good handbooks and textbooks, is a good decision. In addition, the examples of Persian and Arabic loanwords are also given in the original respective forms. There are further good points in the description of Uigur, e.g. the presentation of three-scaled politeness degree of personal pronouns and the corresponding possessive and verb suffixes

(p. 216). However, it must be noted that these forms are variously explained in the studies. Nevertheless, *siz* should rather be termed polite than regular. In the translation of sentence 7, "the grandchild's father" should be "his own father".

27. Uzbek

In my opinion, the description of the historical phonological process as "the word-final segment *ig* has changed to [...]" as seen in this section (p. 223) is better than "the sound /g/ has been dropped" as seen in several other sections (e.g., p. 138) and should be employed throughout, for the latter does not specify the position of the sound. The description of Uzbek is also good, I have only two comments on the translations. Firstly, the translation of the verb *aya-* 'to protect' (p. 225) should be 'to pity, to spare'. Secondly, sentence 5 in the sample (p. 228) *Shu qishloqliq bir Tursunqul degan kishi qizini Alixon qishlogʻiga uzatibdi* should be 'A man from this village called Tursunqul married his daughter to (someone from) the village Alixan' and not 'This village commune sent the daughter of a man called Tursunkul to the village Alikhan'.

28. Yugur

The description of Yugur is also good. As in the case of Salar, the author calls attention to the influence of Mongolic, Chinese and Tibetan. The Mongolic forms of Eastern Yugur, a Mongolic language, are particularly valuable, for they may be direct sources of these loanwords in Yugur, also called Western Yugur. Parallels drawn between Salar and Yugur are also important. Károly demonstrates both archaic features, e.g. the counting system, the retention of the form *eliɣ ~ iliɣ* 'hand', cf. Old Turkic *älig* (p. 231), and innovative ones, many of which are affected by contact languages, e.g. appearance of retroflex consonants (p. 231), dropping possessive suffixes in genitive-possessive phrases and lack of person suffixes on finite verbs (p. 232). Everybody who reads this book shall enjoy the phonic sample of Yugur.

In conclusion, Károly's *Modern Turkic Languages* is an important contribution to Turkic studies. It has many strong points. As a book intended for teaching, it is very clearly and consistently structured. Independently of the status and importance of a language, all are presented in a similar length, with a similar number of reference studies in the bibliography, and in an identical transcription system. The author has employed the IPA transcription system, avoided by most Turkologists. A very strong point is also use of the original writing system and orthography in the samples for those languages that have one and also providing nearly all words in the transcription and the original writing. The special features are arranged in a consistent system so that it is possible to check particular forms of a category in various languages. If a feature is characteristic of only one or several languages, it is naturally not shown in other sections. Some of these features are commonly used to contrast or compare the languages in Turkology, but some are not found in contrastive or comparative studies. An example of Károly's original contribution is signalling the counting system of a language given that it is different from decimal or if it has different numerals than in common Turkic.

Writing an introduction to all modern Turkic languages requires great erudition from the author. Károly has proved that he has it. His publications include West Old Turkic, Chaghatay, Turkish, Tatar, Yakut and cross-Turkic dimension in various domains such as phonology, morphology, lexicology and historical grammar. Some weaknesses in a publication like this reviewed here are inevitable, especially if the author tries to give a concise product and, therefore, is obliged to avoid presentation of controversial views and questions.

References

Baskakov N. A and T. N. Toščakova, *Ojrotsko-russkij slovar'*, OGIZ, Moskva 1947.

Bulgarova M. A., *Nogajskaja toponimija*, Stavropol'servisškola, Stavropol' 1999.

Clauson Sir Gerard, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1972.

Dmitriev N. K., *Stroj tjurkskix jazykov*, Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury, Moskva 1962.

Doerfer Gerhard, 'Die Stellung des Osmanischen im Kreise des Oghusischen und seine Vorgeschichte', in: *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft. Teil I*, ed. György Hazai, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 1990, pp. 13–34.

Erdal Marcel, Irina Nevskaya, Hans Nugteren and Monika Rind-Pawlowski, *Handbuch des Tschalkantürkischen. Teil 1: Texte und Glossar*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2013.

Hacıyev E. İ. (ed.), *Azərbaycanca-İngiliscə lüğət. Lüğətə təxminən 55.000 söz, söz birləşməsi və cümlə daxil edilmişdir*, Şərq-Qərb, Bakı 2005.

Jankowski Henryk, 'Baskakov's Classification of Noghai Dialects Revisited', *Folia Orientalia* 36 (2000), pp. 149–157.

Johanson Lars, *Turkic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2021.

Johanson Lars and Éva Á. Csató, *The Turkic Languages. Second Edition*, Routledge, London and New York 2022.

Məmədov Q. Q. (ed.), *İngiliscə-Azərbaycanca lüğət. Lüğətə təxminən 80 000 söz, söz birleşmesi ve cümlə daxil edilmişdir. A–Z*, Şərq–Qərb, Bakı 2004.

Molčanova O. T., *Toponimčeskij slovar' Gornogo Altaja*, Gorno-altajskoe otdelenie Altajskogo knižnogo izdatel'stva, Gorno-Altajsk 1979.

Radloff Wilhelm, *Aus Sibirien. Lose Blätter aus dem Tagebuche eines reisenden Linguisten. Erster Band und anderer Band*, T. O. Weigel, Leipzig 1884.

Ramstedt G. J., *Kalmükisches Wörterbuch*, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, Helsinki 1976.

Subrakova O. V. (ed.), *Xakassko-russkij slovar'*, Nauka, Novosibirsk 2006.

Tokmašev D. M., 'Teleutskie teksty', in: *Annotirovannye fol'klornye teksty obsko-enisejskogo jazykovogo areala*, A. Ju. Fil'čenko (ed.), Veter, Tomsk 2010, pp. 315–336.

Henryk Jankowski
(Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland)
ORCID: 0000-0003-2576-1204 iD