

Marek Stachowski

Jagiellonian University, Kraków

**SOME FEATURES OF THE VOWEL ADAPTATION
OF ARABIC LOAN-WORDS
(ALONG WITH A FEW REMARKS ON THEIR
CONSONANTS) IN AN OTTOMAN TURKISH
DICTIONARY BY ARCANGELO CARRADORI (1650)**

1. General remarks

Arabic (and Persian) loan-words in Ottoman Turkish are, despite their great number and significance, far from being adequately examined, even if numerous studies on this topic have been published in various journals. If an Arabic etymon of an Ottoman Turkish word is exactly determined one can safely use it for establishing phonological processes leading to its perfect adaptation in Turkish. In addition, this knowledge helps to chronologically arrange and explain sound changes affecting the indigenous vocabulary of Ottoman Turkish. However, two conditions should be met that determine the sense and the eventual success of such an investigation. One of these conditions is that the Arabic etymon should be established with due regard to chronology and dialectology, the other being that the Ottoman Turkish record has been correctly read. The latter condition is more or less assured if one uses so called transcription texts, i.e. those written in non-Arabic scripts, as is the case with an Ottoman Turkish dictionary compiled by Arcangelo Carradori in 1650. Fortunately, the modern editor of this work, Luciano Rocchi (2011), is fully aware of the first condition and this allows him to differentiate between Ott. *zamk* <zamch> and *somk* <somch> ‘glue, gum, resin’ as two distinct Turkish reflexes of two distinct Arabic phonetic variants: literary *ṣamḡ* and colloquial *ṣomḡ* id. (364)¹. Similarly, Egyptian, rather than Classical Arabic forms are suggested for Ott. *gemal* <ghiernal> ‘appearance, looks’ (160)

¹ Double- and three-digit numbers in parentheses always refer to pages in Rocchi 2011. Notations in <...> are either Carradori’s Latin-script renderings of Ottoman Turkish words or Latin-script transliterations of a traditional Arabic spelling.

[< Egypt. *gamāl* id. = literary Ar. *ġamāl* id. > standard Ott. *cemal* id. = modern Tksh. *cemal* id.] and for Ott. *gâvz* <ghiaus> ‘nut’ [< Egypt. *gōz* id., presumably contaminated with literary Ar. *ġawz* id. (158 s.v. *gâvz hindistan*) > standard Ott. *cev(i)z* id. = modern Turkish *ceviz* id.]. However, the lack of preparatory studies and a lack of cooperation between Turkologists and Arabists in this respect make it impossible to allow for such differences in every instance.

Nevertheless, neither the danger of always finding only wrong etymons nor the complexity of the problem should be overestimated. It is in this spirit that I decided to look for phonetic phenomena that can be observed in Carradori’s dictionary. As a result, five vocalic problems are presented below, all of them having something to do with the phonetic evolution of Turkish and Turkic.

Sometimes also the problem of the transmission channels of a specific word arises, especially when an Arabic etymon has been transferred from one Turkic language into another, which possibly is the case with (at least) some Baraba Tatar words that have been probably borrowed not directly from Arabic but rather through Kazan Tatar or Uzbek (Stachowski M. 1998: 250). This problem, too, remains virtually uninvestigated.

As is well known, transcription texts display vowels better than texts in the Arabic script. Incidentally, this is sometimes valid for consonants, too; especially, if the original Arabic notation is being repeated by all copyists in a traditional way, that is, regardless of its actual pronunciation. A European author did not in the majority of cases care much about whether or not he was regarded as illiterate just because he could not read and write the Arabic spelling of a word he had heard and hence wrote down its real pronunciation. This is, for instance, the case with the above-mentioned word *gemal*, spelled <ghiemal> in the Latin, but <ġmāl> in the Arabic script (160). Had Carradori only used the Arabic script we would in no way be able to prove (or, maybe even to hit on the) idea of its real pronunciation with [g].²

Another good point about transcription texts is that they more often than not attest colloquial formations and meanings hardly, if ever, observed in texts of classical Ottoman high culture. Such are, for instance, diminutives like Ott. *inecik* <inegich> ‘heifer’ (189) [< **inekçik* < *inek* ‘cow’] and *iplicik* <ipligich> ‘a fine string, thread; Ital. *cordicella*’ (189) [< **iplikçik* < *iplik* ‘thread, yarn’].³

Some phonetic variants (not necessarily only of Arabic loan-words) seem to contribute to quite different problems as well. This is for instance the case with Ott. *burdogan* <burdogan> ‘club (weapon)’ (91), a unique -r- variant of

² Numerous examples of this kind are adduced in Duman 1999.

³ The tendency to elide -k- before a consonant is not of a general character, cf. *alçakrak* <alçiakrak> ‘inferior, vilior; niedriger. schlechter’ (1680, Meninski’s *Thesaurus*) < *alçak* ‘low; mean’; *kiçirek* <kçrk> (14th century) ~ *küçükrek* <k’učiuk’rek>, *kiçirek* <k’çirek>, *giçirek* <g’çirek> (1680, Meninski’s *Thesaurus*) < *küçük* ‘little’ (both examples after Stachowski S. 1999: 64, 67).

what usually is *buzdogan* id. One cannot but think of other remnants of the Old (or Late Proto-?) Turkic times in which both *r* and *z* reflexes of the (Early) Proto-Tkc. **r₂* (> *r* in consonant clusters, but > *z* in other positions [see Helimski 1986: 47, 48]) occurred side by side before they were brought into line in favour of either *r* or *z*. Word pairs like *burdogan* ~ *buzdogan* are relatively rare in Turkish (but cf. *dokuz* ‘nine’ vs. *dokurcun* ‘Nine Men’s Morris’ [see Stachowski M. 2011: 110 where other examples, too, are given]) which makes the word *burdogan* especially important, actually not only for Ottoman Turkish linguistic history but, at the same time, also for Turkic comparative studies.

Let us pass on now to the presentation of five vowel phenomena.

2. Vowel changes

[2a] Ar. *aw* > Tksh. **av* ~ **ev* > **ov* ~ **öv* > *o* ~ *ö*. Examples:

Ott. *coab* <gioab> ‘answer’ (100) < **covab* < **cavab* (< **cevab*)⁴ < Ar. *ġawāb* id. > modern Tksh. *cevap* id.

Ott. *cöher* <gioher> ‘jewel’ (100) < **cövher* < **cevher* < Ar. *ġawhar* id. > modern Tksh. *cevher* id. – Cf. also Carradori’s derivatives: *cövherli* <giouherli> ~ *cöveherli* <gioueherli> ‘main, fundamental’ (100), demonstrating the former existence of *öv* variants: **cövher* and **cöveher*.

Ott. *mävlut* <maulut>⁵ ~ *mövlut* <moulut> ‘funeral; funeral banquet’ (243) < **mevlût* [-l’u-] < Ar. *mawlūd* ‘the Prophet’s birthday’. – Essentially, this word means ‘a religious meeting in memory of a deceased person, in which the *Mevlūd* [or *Mevlid*; a poem written by Süleyman Çelebi (1351-1422)] is chanted’ (Redhouse 1979: 768a).

Because the Ar. *a* principally yields *e* in Turkish (see [2b] below) we have first to assume the change of Ar. *aw* into Ott. *ev*, and then a possible labialization > *öv* (but cf. *mävlut*). The fact that the reflex is velar in the case of Ott. *coab* can be explained as the result of the impact of non-palatal sounds in the next syllable, whereas the palatal pronunciation of *-l-* in **mevlût* has supported the palatalization of the first-syllable vowel. The labialization was, in turn, triggered by *-v-*, the only labial consonant that appears in all three examples and, in addition, always immediately follows the vowel of the first syllable.

At first glance, one is inclined to interpret the word pair *havz* <haus> ~ *huz* <huz> ‘watering place’ (173) [< Ar. *ḥawḍ* ‘bassin’] in the same way. However, in this case, a **hoz* rather than *huz* should be expected. There exist two other possibilities of explaining this form: It results from either a syncope (Ar. *ḥawḍ* <ḥwḍ> > Ott. **havuz* > **hüz* > *huz*) or a wrong reading of the Arabic word,

⁴ For **cavab* < **cevab* cf. the evolution of Ott. *meydan* > *maydan* in [2b].

⁵ Rocchi (2011: 16) uses <ä> to render a particularly open vowel he posits in words spelled by Carradori with <a> but known from other sources to have been pronounced with [e].

namely with ⟨w⟩ = [u]. The latter possibility did really sometimes occur, even if such an explanation should be, at least in some examples, somewhat modified by considering Arabic dialects, as is the case with Tksh. *Musul*, the name of a city in Iraq that need not necessarily be interpreted as a wrong reading of the Arabic spelling ⟨mwṣl⟩ for literary Ar. (*al-*) *Mawṣil* (Türkmen 2009: 153) because the word is pronounced (*el-*) *Mōṣul* in North Iraq and this variant fits the Tksh. *Musul* clearly better than (*al-*) *Mawṣil*, also in regard to the vowel of the second syllable. In this context, one wonders whether two out of three Ottoman Turkish examples with labialized vowel (*coab*, *cöher*), too, reflect the North Iraq Arabic pronunciation. This cannot be just dismissed, that is true; however, the form *mövlut* points to a possibility of the existence of transitional variants like **covab* and **cövher* which do not fit the pattern of *Mōṣul* (not **Mōwsul*).

Two other examples adduced in Türkmen (2009: 153), i.e. Ott. *çöğen* (with a few variants not mentioned there but recorded in other dictionaries: *çevgen* ~ *çevgân* ~ *çöven*) ‘mallet, club (as used in an Oriental sort of polo game)’ < Pers. *čavgān* id., and Ott. *nöbet* ‘guard duty, watch’ < Pers. *navbat* id. are of special interest to us because they are both Persian rather than Arabic loan-words in Turkish which means that, here, the labial vowel results from the indigenous Turkish evolution and, unlike *Musul*, cannot be easily ascribed to an Arabic dialectal form. In the context of Carradori’s examples, it is better to include *çöğen* and *nöbet* in the same group as *coab*, *cöher* and *mövlut*, rather than to interpret them as the results of erroneous reading of the Arabic script.

In other words, the change of Ar. *aw* into Ott. *o* ~ *ö* can reflect either an Arabic dialectal shape or a genuine Turkish tendency to labialize non-labial vowels preceding an Ar. labio-velar approximant ⟨w⟩ = [w], i.e. Ar. **aw* > Ott. **av* ~ **ev* > **ov* ~ **öv* (> *o* ~ *ö*) or, only very occasionally, a wrong reading of an Arabic spelling form.

Besides, the testimony of Ott. *ö(y)kele-* [in: 1sg.aorist: ⟨ochielerum⟩ = Ar. ⟨ʿwyklrm⟩] ~ *ökelen-* (G. Molino’s dictionary of 1641) ~ *öykelen-* (TS) ‘to get angry, boil’ (all examples after Rocchi 2011: 265), being phonetic variants of the standard Turkish form *öfkelen-* id., clearly points to the fact (or at least a possibility) that there once might have existed a transitional link with an approximant [j] = Tksh. ⟨y⟩, i.e. Ar. **aw* > Ott. **av* ~ **ev* > **ov* ~ **öv* > **oy* ~ **öy* (> *o* ~ *ö*).

Furthermore, an alternation model must have existed as well because one can also encounter traces of changes in the opposite direction, e.g. Ott. *varince* ⟨varinge⟩ ‘*biol.* spider’ (338) for standard Ott. *öürümce(k)* id.; Ott. *veçi* [in: *veçi et-* ‘to sharpen’, lit. ‘to make its point’, 1sg.aorist ⟨veci ederum⟩] (339) for standard Ott. *ucı* ‘its peak/cusp/point’. Consequently, Ott. *vaşak* ‘*biol.* lynx’ should be regarded as a phonetic variant of Ott. *üşek* id. rather than an inner-Turkic loanword in Ottoman Turkish (cf. Stachowski M. 1991: 104), even if the reasons for a simultaneous velarizing of the originally palatal vowels (cf. Middle Tkch. *üşek* id.; Khak. *üs*, Yak. *ūs* < Proto-Tkch. **üş* id.) still remain unclear.

[2b] The interaction between *a* and *e*

The general rule is that Ar. *ā* > Ott. *a*, Ar. *a* > Ott. *e* if no consonants have influenced the given vowel (for instance, Ar. *l* is – apart from the word *Allah* – perceived as palatal, Ar. *ḵ* as velar, so that Ar. *ḵibla* ‘direction of the Kaaba in Mecca’ > Ott. *kible* id.). However, there exist exceptions to the rule that cannot always be easily explained.

One such group comprises Ott. *zalim* <salim> ~ *zalım* <zalem> ‘oppressiv, cruel, bloody’ (363 s.v. *zalim*, *zalım/zalım ol-*) [> *zalimlik* <zalimlich>, <salimlich> ~ *zelimlik* <zelimlich> ‘cruelty’ (l.c.)] < Ar. *ẓālim* id., as well as Ott. *meydan* <meidan> ~ *maydan* <maidan> ‘square, yard’ (243) < Ar. *maydān* id. In both cases the vowel harmony appears to be the best explanation of vowel changes: [a] Ar. *ẓālim* > Ott. *zalim* (> *zalım*) → *zalimlik* (> *zelimlik*); [b] Ar. *maydān* > Ott. *meydan* > *maydan*⁶.

The other group is created by words whose vowels cannot be possibly explained by rules of the vowel harmony. This is the case with Ott. *hereket* ‘movement, motion’, attested, for instance, in Ott. *hereket et-* <herechiet ...> ‘to move’ (175) and some other derivatives. The Arabic etymon of this word is *ḥarakat* and the expected Turkish reflex should be **hereket*, indeed; however its modern equivalent is *hareket*. Chronologically we should view the modern *hareket* as a successor form of the 17th century *hereket*. On the other hand, this does not seem possible because a harmonically perfect sequence *e – e – e* would not have readily changed into a dysharmonic one: *a – e – e*. In addition, a somewhat later source, namely F. Meninski’s dictionary (1680: 1747) adduces this word as <hærek’et> ‘Bewegung, Procedur, That’, i.e. *hareket* because his <æ> denotes a short *a* in Arabic and Persian words (op.cit., *Proœmium*). There are, as it seems, two possibilities to explain this situation: [a] the Arabic word yielded, from the very beginning, two slightly different reflexes: an expected *hereket* and an unexpected *hareket*; [b] at first, the only reflex was *hareket* which, in the course of time, became *hereket* due to the vowel harmony. In both cases, the most important question is why the unexpected variant *hareket* has come into being at all.

The most conspicuous possibility seems to be a velarizing impact of the word-initial consonant *h-* (but the problem should be investigated against a larger background). If this conjecture is true one might ask whether Tksh. *balgam* ‘phlegm, mucus’ < Ar. *balgam* id., too, has its *a* – *a* due to the velarizing influence of *ḡ* – a difficult question because both the shortness of Ar. *a* and the palatalizing impact of Ar. *l* should rather lead to an Ott. reflex like **belgem*. Indeed, Carradori’s Ottoman Turkish variant *belgam* <belgam> (73 s.v. *balgam* <balgam>, <balgham>), incidentally supported by Molino’s (1641) *belgam* <belgham>, <belgam> id. (l.c.),

⁶ For *meydan* > *maydan* cf. **cavab* < **cevab* in [2a] above.

clearly points to a two-stage process: [a] Ar. *balgam* > Ott. *belgam*, i.e. the vowel in the second syllable was velarized because of ġ, while Ar. *a* in the first syllable was regularly rendered by Ott. *e*; [b] Ott. *belgam* has created a newer and harmonically correct variant *balgam* (interestingly enough, not **belgem*, even if it generally is the vowel of the first syllable that decides about the vowel harmony of the entire word). And this model can be also used for explaining how Ott. *dalal* <dalal> ~ *tellal* <tellal> ‘town crier’ (114) was formed: [a] Ar. *dallāl* > Ott. **dellal* (~ *tellal*); [b] Ott. **dellal* > **dallal* > *dalaḻ*.

[2c] The *a* ~ *ɪ* alternation

This is an old and much-debated problem in Turkology. I, too, have added some thoughts to this discussion (Stachowski M. 1993: 22-28, 33, 35); nevertheless, the opinion expressed by S. Georg and A. Vovin (2003: 333: “[...] the alternation of *a* and *ī* in Yakut, which admittedly puzzled an authority like Nikolaus Poppe in his day, has been convincingly explained by Stachowski (1993) [...]”) is most flattering, indeed, but – alas – too optimistic. The question still deserves further discussion. Nevertheless, apart from the complicated problem of the “initial situation” from which the change started, it can be readily posited that, from an unknown time on, an “alternation model” has been functioning. It facilitated a relatively free change of *a*-words into their *ɪ*-counterparts (and vice versa). As far as Arabic loan-words in Carradori’s dictionary are concerned the following examples should be cited:

Ott. *ambig* ‘still, distilling apparatus’ (58). – Usually, the Arabic etymon of this word is held to have sounded *inbīk* ‘cup’ (> modern Tksh. *imbik* ‘distilling apparatus’). In this case, we might accept the *ɪ* > *a* change in Ottoman Turkish. On the other hand, European forms like Pol. *alembik*, Germ. *Alambic*, Engl. *alembic*, etc., clearly point to an Arabic source like (al-) *anbīk*. In this situation, the change of Ar. *i*- (? > Ar. **a*-) > Tksh. *a*-still remains to be explained.

Ott. *dirahem* ‘dirhem (unit of currency)’ (124). – Rocchi (2011: 124) is – because of the Ottoman-Arabic spelling <drhm> – of the opinion that the Ottoman Turkish form *dirahem* results from an anaptyxis rather than reflects the Arabic plural *darāhim*. The problem is, however, that the anaptyxis vowel is narrow in Turkish, which is why an intermediary shape like **dirihem* should be assumed. Now, if the anaptyctic vowel in **dirihem* were lowered the result should have been **direhem* which is not the case. Therefore, I am rather inclined to explain Carradori’s form *dirahem* as a consequence of contamination of either *dirhem* or **dirihem* ~ **direhem* with the Arabic plural form *darāhim*. The more so as neither **dirihem* nor

7

For simplified geminates see [3b] below.

**direhem* seem to be attested in any 17th century source. – Besides, cf. Ott. *fahaşe*, *hazane*.

Ott. *fahaşe* ~ *fahşe* ~ *faeş* ~ *feşe* ‘prostitute, meretrix’ (151). – In Rocchi (2011: 151), the form *faeş* is rightly interpreted as the result of a hypercorrect apocope of *-e* that must have been wrongly identified with the Turkish dative suffix *-e*. Thus, the Arabic word *fāḥiṣa*, fem. < *fāḥiṣ* ‘immoral, obscene’ yielded, in Ottoman Turkish, the literary form *fahişe* ‘prostitute’ which was afterwards a source of three descendants: [a] *fahaşe*, with the *a – i* > *a – a* assimilation; [b] *fahşe*, resulting from so-called *Mittelsilbenschwund*; (c) **faheşe*, with the *i – e* > *e – e* assimilation and the later loss of the intervocalic *-h-*, i.e. **faeşe*. The latter variant was in the course of time partially reinterpreted as dative and changed into *faeş*, and partially adapted to the Turkish phonological system without hiatuses, i.e. **faeşe* > *feşe*. None of these models displays the *a ~ ı* (or *e ~ i*) alternation affecting single vowels; just the opposite: in every instance only vowel sequences (*a – i* and *i – e*) are concerned.

Ott. *hazane*, in: *gümiş hazanesi* ‘silversmith’s shop/treasury’ (174) = modern Tksh. *hazîne* ‘treasury’. – Although this word, being a reflex of Ar. *ḥazīne* ‘treasure chamber, treasury’, seems to unequivocally show the *a ~ ı* alternation, Rocchi (2011: 174) rightly assumes the possibility of a contamination of Tksh. *hazîne* ‘treasury’ with Tksh. *-hâne* (< Pers. *ḥāna* ‘house’), being extremely often the second part of names for buildings and/or storage spaces. This conjecture is, in addition, supported by Carradori’s peculiar notation of *hazane-si* ‘its treasury’: <chhazanesi>, possibly a misshaped Latin rendering of the Arabic-script notation *<ḥẓhānhsy> (Rocchi l.c.: *<ḥazhānsy>).

Ott. *sahablık* ‘owing, possession’ (281). – This is a derivative of Ott. *sahab* ‘owner’, attested in this form, e.g., in G. Molino’s dictionary (1641). Both words have their literary equivalents in Ottoman Turkish: *sahib* and *sahiblik* (Rocchi 2011: 281) and go back to Ar. *ṣāḥib* ‘owner’. The form *sahab* can be only to a limited extent viewed as the result of *a ~ ı* alternation. Rather, the mechanism was – in this case, too – a simple vowel assimilation: *a – i* > **a – ı* > *a – a*.

There exist also some other examples of *a < ı* change in this source. However, they all generally represent the very same evolutionary model.

In this context another Arabic loan-word in Ottoman Turkish should be mentioned, namely Ar. *ḳīrāt* ‘carat’ > Ott. *kirat* id. Its European reflexes have almost invariably an *-a-* in the first syllable: Engl. *carat*, Germ. *Karat*, Fr. *carat*. It. *carato*, Pol. *karat* id. But cf. Span. Port. *quilate*, Catal. *quirat*, Basque *kilate* id. Taken into consideration that a form with *-a-* is attested also in some Ottoman Turkish transcription texts, e.g. *karat* in Montalbano’s *Turcicae linguae ... Syntaxis* of ca 1630 (Gallotta 1996: 299) one wonders whether Ottoman Turkish

should be accepted as an intermediary on the way from Arabic to Central and Eastern European languages whereas the languages of the Iberian Peninsula have borrowed the word directly from Arabic.

While reconstructing indigenous Proto-Turkic words whose modern reflexes sometimes have *a* and sometimes *ı* one has every right to hesitate about which one of these vowels should be accepted for the proto-form. However, the proto-forms of Arabic loan-words in Ottoman Turkish are mostly ready (or “almost ready” if one has to find them first in Arabic dialects or written sources) which means that the vowel of the proto-form and the direction of the phonetic change need not be assumed or conjectured any more.

The lesson that Arabic loan-words teach us is that we have in the first place to decide if $\text{ı} > a$ and $a > \text{ı}$ changes should be viewed as examples for the $a \sim \text{ı}$ alternation if caused by vowel assimilation processes like those mentioned above. If not, the alternation must be limited to two situations only: [a] the change in monosyllabic words; [b] the change of a sequence of identical vowels: $a - a$ (or $\text{ı} - \text{ı}$) $> a - \text{ı} \sim \text{ı} - a$, except that the latter can be regarded as simply a case of dissimilation. But then, if dissimilation is a case of the $a \sim \text{ı}$ alternation why should assimilation not be? On the other hand, if we exclude both assimilation and dissimilation from the question of $a \sim \text{ı}$ alternations only monosyllabic words will remain as candidates. Is this not too restrictive?

[2d] Vocalic prosthesis *e-*

Adding a prosthetic vowel makes possible the avoidance of word-initial consonant clusters or single consonants (*r, l, m, n, z*) that are not tolerated as the onset of a word in Turkish. While working on prosthesis and anaptyxis in Ottoman Turkish linguistic history almost twenty years ago, I could list no more than six examples with *e-*, all of them attested only in the 19th century, whereas the *i-* prosthesis cases were documented as early as in the 17th century (Stachowski M. 1995: 177). Fortunately, Carradori’s dictionary makes a revision of this dating possible – the *e-* prosthesis was also known in the 17th century:

Ott. *erazil* ‘hired bandit/assassin’ (144; in view of the rules of the vowel harmony I would rather suggest Carradori’s notation <erasil> be read *eräzil*) < Ar. *raḍīl* > modern Tksh. *rezil* ‘shameful, vile, disreputable’.

Another example is Persian but – what is more important – here, too, the *e-* was added in order to avoid a word-initial *r-*, that is: Ott. *erişte* ‘vermicelli, macaroni’ < Pers. *rišta* id.

A special case in this context is Ott. *reze* ‘hinge’ < Ar. *razza* id. Its prosthetic form is read *ıräzä* by Rocchi (2011: 278). However, the original Latin spelling <arazah> allows for other readings, as well. First of all, one might wonder why this simple notation should not be read just as it is, i.e. *araza*. Unfortunately, this

is not that easy because short Ar. *a* is reflected as *e* in Turkish. Thus, Ar. *razza* should first of all yield *reze* in Turkish. A prosthetic form of this word could be either **ereze* or **ireze*. Unfortunately, we do not know why Carradori sometimes uses the letter <a> where we would expect instead <e> but the fact that he sometimes does is beyond question. In this situation, his <arazah> should be read **ärüzä* or possibly even **ereze*, and this interpretation fits the other examples (Ott. *erazil* and *erişte*) quite well.

To sum up, the prosthetic *e-* is attested – true, somewhat scarcely (only three examples in this source) – already in Carradori’s lifetime. This means that not only high vowels (*i/ı, ü/u*) but also *e, ä/*a* were used as prostheses in the 17th century. The only prosthetic vowel that appears exclusively in the 18th century is *o-* but this fact is only once attested, namely in Ott. *oruba* (1791) ‘furniture’ < It. *roba* id. (Stachowski M. 1995: 178).

[2e] Vowel epenthesis and elision

The elision generally concerns three-syllable words, the epenthesis two- or sometimes three-syllable ones.⁸ However, the epenthesis is an extremely rare phenomenon – a fact that makes any general statement a bit risky. I can present only four examples here:

Ott. *cöveherli* – see Ott. *cöher* in [2a].

Ott. *ikarar* <icarar> **‘confession’* [in: *ikarar et-* ‘to confess’, 1sg.aorist: <icarar ederum>] (185) < Ar. *ikrār* ‘confession’ (> modern Tksh. *ikrār* id.) > Ott. (Carradori) *ikararlık* <icararlich> id. – Rocchi (2011: 185) rightly calls attention to another reading possibility: **ikırar*. Carradori’s notation <icarar> could probably also be viewed as the result of the *a ~ ı* alternation that has distorted an unattested variant **ikırar*. Since the epenthetic vowel in Turkish generally is high (cf. the other examples in this section), a direct derivation of *ikarar* < Ar. *ikrār* seems less possible, but cf. *soğora* and *tep(e)si* below.

⁸ The formulations “two-syllable” and “three-syllable” refer to the number of syllables in the original Arabic word. Cases like Ott. *bahis* ‘subject, topic, question’ < Ar. *baḥs* ‘discussion’, i.e. cases in which a word-final consonant cluster of an Arabic monosyllable is broken are not allowed for here (unlike, e.g. in Özçelik 2002: 1038; Duman 1995: 76-80). Incidentally, such consonant clusters were attested in Ottoman Turkish, or at least in some transcription sources even in the 18th century, e.g. in M. Wiczorkowski’s *Breve compendium...* of 1721: Ott. *fıkr* ‘thought’, *ilm* ‘science, doctrine’, *kuds ~ kudis* ‘saint’, and so on (Podolak 1990: 105). The other difference is that anaptyctic vowels inserted into originally monosyllabic Arabic words are moveable, that is, they occur only in closed syllables, as is, for instance, the case with Ott. and modern Tksh. *şehir* ‘town’, *şehirde* (loc. sg.), *şehirler* (nom. pl.) but *şehir* (acc. sg.), *şehre* (dat. sg.). The cases adduced in this article generally display clusters characterised by two features: (1) the clusters are generally tolerable in Turkish phonotactics but they were, nevertheless, broken in 17th century Ottoman Turkish; (2) the anaptyctic vowel in these words is stable and never disappears.

Ott. *mikıdar*, in: *bir mikıdar* (*mikıdar?*, *mekıdar?*) <bir mechadar> ‘a number (of)’ (244) < Ar. *miḳdar* ‘number, amount, quantity’ > modern Tksh. *mikdar* ~ *miktar* id.

Ott. *teciribe* <teğiribe> ~ *tecribe* <teğiribe> ‘experience’ (316) < Ar. *tağriba(t)* id. > modern Tksh. *tecrübe* id. – The reading *teciribe* appears somewhat uncertain, because the use of <gi> (in <teğiribe>) might have just been an Italian graphical device to render ğ since the spelling <teğiribe> is not absolutely unequivocal in this respect.

The epenthesis occurs as well – even if only sporadically – in native Turkic words, e.g. Ott. *yumruk* <iumruch> ‘fist’ (358) but *yumurukla-* [in: 1sg. aorist: <iumuruchlarum>] ‘to fist’ (l.c.). A peculiarly interesting example in Carradori’s dictionary is Ott. *soğora* <songhora> (~ and <[? or >] *soğra* <songhra>) ‘later, then’ (297) with its open vowel. Does it result from epenthesis (in that case compare *ikarar* above) or is it a trace of a Proto-Tkc. dative-directive construction **soğ+a+ra*?

A parallel epenthesis can be observed in Ott. *tepsi* <tepsi> ~ *tepesi* <tepesi> ‘plate, dish’ (319) < Pers. *tabši* ‘plate, tray’ > modern Tksh. *tepsi* ‘tray’.

Unlike epenthesis, elision of word-medial vowel in a three-syllable word is a very popular phenomenon in Turkish. Some examples:

Ott. *hatrı* ‘his/her mind/feelings’ [in: *hatrı hoş edici* <chatri hosc edigi> ‘pleasing’, lit. ‘making his/her mind/feelings good/nice’] (172) < *hatır* <ẖhater> [!] ‘mind, feelings; memory’ (l.c.) < Ar. *ḥāṭir* id.

Ott. *nafka ver-* ‘to feed’ [in 1sg. aorist: <nafqa uerirum>] (252) < *nafka* *‘livelihood’ < **nafika* < **nafaka* < Ar. *nafaka(t)* ‘1. livelihood; 2. alimony, allowance’ > modern Tksh. *nafaka* ‘1. 2. id.’.

Ott. *tekbür* <techbur> ‘sumptuous, luxurious, magnificent’ (317) < **tekbbür* < (? **tekibbür* <) **tekebbür* < Ar. *takabbur* ‘pride, arrogance, haughtiness’ > modern Tksh. *tekebbür* id.

An interesting fact is that indigenous Turkish deverbal *nomina agentis* in *-ıcı* are amazingly frequently subject to elision in Carradori’s dictionary. Some examples:

Ott. *çakıcı* (in: <qapu cıaqgi> ‘door knocker’), lit. ‘knocker’ (101) < **çakıcı* < *çak-* ‘to knock, hit’.

Ott. *çevrici* <ceurigi> ‘translator’, lit. ‘turner; It. *giratore*’ (105) < **çevirici* < *çevir-* ‘1. to turn; 2. to translate’.

Ott. *doldurcı* <doldurgi> ‘one who fills’ (128) < **doldurıcı* ~ **doldurucu* < *doldur-* ‘to fill’.

Ott. *kuşadıcı* <chusciadgi> ‘one who surrounds; surrounding’ (229) < **kuşadıcı* < *kuşat-* ‘to surround’.

Ott. *tutcı* <tutgi> (~ *tutucı* <tutugi>) ~ *dutcı* <dutgi> ~ *dudcı* <dudgi> ‘one who keeps/holds’ (327) < *tutucı* ~ **dutucı* ~ **tutıcı* ~ **dutıcı* < *tut-* ~ *dut-* ‘to keep, hold’.

Ott. *unutcı* <vnutgi> ‘oblivious’ (332) < **unutıcı* ~ **unutucı* < *unut-* ‘to forget’.

This tendency does not seem to be equally often attested in other sources (Stachowski S. 1996; Demir 2005). We are possibly dealing with an individual feature of the Turkish pronunciation of Carradori's informants. Anyway, this question should be discussed in a more detailed way in the future (a phonetical process or a parallelism to denominal *-ci* formations?).

Interestingly enough, there is at least one example of a non-elided variant in Carradori's dictionary, whereas its modern reflex is modified: Ott. *zümürüd* <sumurut> 'emerald' (369) < Ar. Pers. *zumurrud* id. (< Gr. *smáragdos* < ? Indic) (PLOT s.v.; Symeonidis 1976: 80) > modern Tksh. *zümriit* id. Carradori's variant is no isolated example. Also an anonymous author of a Turkish-Spanish notebook of 1611 attests a three-syllable form: Ott. *zimürüt* <simurùth, simuruth> id. (Majda 1985: 238).

* *
*

Both the examples and the comments presented above have, nolens volens, only a temporary character. We are still at the beginning of a thorough scrutiny of Arabic loan-words in Ottoman Turkish, and the next step should be by all appearances be a comparative study of Arabic (and separately: Persian) loan-words in every century, based on possibly all transcription sources of the given period.

References

- Demir N. 2005: *-CI || -ICI* ekleriyle türemiş kelimelere katkılar. – Siemienieć-Gołaś E. / Pomorska M. (ed.): *Turks and non-Turks. Studies on the history of linguistic and cultural contacts* [Festschrift S. Stachowski] (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 10), Kraków: 75-84.
- Duman M. 1995: *Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesine göre 17. yüzyılda ses değişimleri*, Ankara.
- 1999: Bazı çeviri yazılı metinlerde çok şekilli kelimelerin değerlendirilmesi. – *Uluslararası Sözlük Bilimi Sempozyumu 20-21 Mayıs, Bildiriler*, Gazimağusa [here cited after the reprint in Duman 2008: 175-188].
- 2008: *Makaleler. Eski Türkiye Türkçesinden Osmanlı Türkçesine*, İstanbul.
- Gallotta A. 1996: Giovan Battista Montalbano'nun *Grammatica della lingua Turca* (Türk dilinin grameri)'sının fonetik özellikleri. – *Uluslararası Türk Dili Kongresi 1988 (26 Eylül 1988-3 Ekim 1988)*, Ankara: 295-310.
- Georg S. / Vovin A. 2003: From mass comparison to mess comparison. Greenberg's Indo-European and its closest relatives. – *Diachronica* 20/2: 331-362.
- Helimski E. [= Chelimskij È. A.] 1986: Prosichoždenie drevnetjurkского čeredovanija *r ~ z* i dilemma «rotacizma-zetacizma». – *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 1986/2: 40-50.
- Majda T. 1985: *Rozwój języka tureckiego w XVII wieku (rękopis z 1611 r., ze zbiorów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej we Wrocławiu, sygn. M. 1529)*, Warszawa.

- Meninski F. à Mesgnien 1680: : *Thesaurus Linguarum Orientalium Turcicae Arabicae Persicae*, vol. 1-3: *Lexicon Turcico-Arabico-Persicum...*, Viennae 1680 [new edition by M. Ölmez & S. Stachowski, İstanbul 2000].
- Özçelik S. 2002: Türkçedeki Farsça kelimelerde görülen ses olayları. – *Türk Dili* 612: 1033-1041.
- PLOT = Stachowski S.: *Osmanlı Türkçesinde Yeni Farsça Alıntılar Sözlüğü – Wörterbuch der neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen* (ed. M. Ölmez), İstanbul 1998 [originally published as a series of articles: “Studien über die neupersischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen”. – *Folia Orientalia* 14 [1972-73] – 20 [1979]].
- Podolak B. 1990: Die türkische Sprache in *Breve Compendium Fidei Catholicae Turcico Textu* (1721) von Michał Ignacy Wiczorkowski (1). – *Zeszyty Naukowe UJCMLXII. Prace Językoznawcze* 101: 97-114.
- Redhouse J. 1979: *New Redhouse Turkish-English dictionary*, İstanbul.
- Rocchi L. 2011: *Il dizionario turco-ottomano di Arcangelo Carradori (1650)*, Trieste.
- Stachowski M. 1991: Einige tofalarische Etymologien vor gemeintürkischem Hintergrund. – *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher. Neue Folge* 10: 99-105.
- 1993: *Geschichte des jakutischen Vokalismus*, Kraków.
- 1995: The increasing of the number of syllables and the chronology of anaptyxis and prosthesis in West European loanwords of Ottoman Turkish. – *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 1 (1995): 175-184.
- 1998: Studien zum baraba-tatarischen Konsonantismus. – Stachowski M. (ed.): *Languages and culture of the Turkic peoples* (= *Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia* 5), Kraków: 245-254 [esp. Part II, p. 250-253: “Einige konsonantische Adaptationsprozesse der arabischen und persischen Lehnwörter”].
- 2011: Siberian languages in contact, 2: The nonal counting system in Siberia and Russian *devjanosto* ‘90’. – *Incontri Linguistici* 34 (2011): 109-125.
- Stachowski S. → PLOT.
- 1996: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Bildungen auf -CI ||-ICI im Osmanisch-Türkischen*, Kraków.
- 1999: Das Suffix *-rak* in der osmanisch-türkischen Sprachgeschichte. – *Materialia Turcica* 20: 59-71.
- Symeonidis Ch. 1976: *Der Vokalismus der griechischen Lehnwörter im Türkischen*, Thessaloniki.
- TS = *XIII. yüzyıldan beri Türkiye Türkçesiyle yazılmış kitaplardan toplanan tanıklariyle Tarama Sözlüğü*, vol. 1-8, Ankara 1963-1977.
- Türkmen S. 2009: Arap harfli yazının yanlış yorumlanmasıyla standartlaşmış kelimeler. – *Türkoloji* 17: 146-157.