ALDO GALOTTA
(Napoli)

16th CENTURY OTTOMAN TURKISH AS REPRESENTED IN THE GHAZAVAT-I KHAYREDDIN PASHA

I

The study of Ottoman Turkish phonology has mostly resorted to the so-called transcription-texts, which, in comparison with the texts in Arabic characters, have the advantage of designating better the vowels and of recording mostly the spoken language. New perspectives in the study of the transcribed texts have been opened by the book of the Hungarian scholar Prof. G. Hazai, *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhunderts* . . .; Prof. Hazai, having had at his disposal a sufficiently extensive transcribed text, the *Colloquia familiaria turcico-latina* by Jakab Nagy de Harsány (1672) (the extent of this text by itself is equivalent to all hitherto known and published transcribed texts), has fixed new criteria for statistical study in the field of historical phonology and morphology.

Scholars, on the other hand, have taken no interest in a particular kind of text, the vocalized ones in Arabic characters used from the beginning of Anatolian Turkish literature. Altough these texts show a conservative trend, they, as we shall see, do not fail to reflect the evolution of spoken language.

For this reason, I thought it would be useful to apply Hazai's criteria to an extensive text of the XVIth century, the *Ghazavat-i Khayreddin Pasha* by Muradi, as preserved in ms. 1663 of the Escurial in Madrid. This ms. has 320 folios, is entirely vocalized and was written certainly between 1543 and 1578.

In this paper I shall show only a few results of my research, deferring a complete analysis to a more extensive study which I hope to publish in a short time.

II

Before dealing with the phonetic phenomena I wish to say something about the graphic system. In Anatolia, this system appears to be an original invention. As pointed out fifty years ago by V. Bartold, at the beginning it distinguishes itself by representing Turkish vowel sounds by the use of the Arabic vowel-signs called *harekat* 'movements', instead of the letters of lengthening *(alif, waw, ya) (scriptio plena)* employed by Central Asiatic Turkish under the influence of Uigur script.

During the centuries the system evolved. There is an evident trend to a wider use of the *scriptio plena* particularly in the open syllables (a similar distinction between open and closed syllables has been drawn by A. van Gabain for the ancient Uigur scriptura, see *Alttürkische Grammatik*, 1974, p. 16). A comparison between the text of the *Ghazavat* and a text written in the second half of the XVIth century which reaches us in a copy dated 1445, the *Marzuban-name* (ed. Z. Korkmaz, Ankara 1973), is enough to show that the change happened in the lapse of time separating the two texts. I shall limit myself to a few examples. Of course there are variations which anyway are not such as to invalidate the general conclusions, as will appear clearly from a complete examination. I use the new Turkish alphabet indicating *scriptio plena* by the mark of length.

Initial position

[a]

Open syllable: M[arzuban-name] ara (26) — Gh[azavat] ara (41) ~ āra (5); M. ayak (25) — Gh. ayak (18) ~ āyak (4); M. āt 'horse' (5) — Gh. at (3) ~ āt (15); M. ād 'name' (14) — Gh. ad (2) ād (30); M. al- (28) — Gh. al- (167) ~ āl- (28).

Closed syllable: M. at 'horse' (1) ~ āt (1) — Gh. at (24) ~ āt (5); M. al- (32) ~ āl- (1) — Gh. al- (86).

[e]

M. and Gh.: always *scriptio defectiva*.

[ẹ]

Open syllable: M. ẹd- (58) — Gh. ẹd- (4) ~ ēd- (487); M. ẹr- (8) — Gh. ēr- (32); M. el (5) — Gh. ẹl (2) ~ ēl (9).

Closed syllable: M. ẹt- (38) — Gh. ẹt- (274) ~ ēt- (3); M. ẹr- (21) — Gh. ẹr- (4) ~ ēr- (10).

[i] [ī]

Open syllable: M. iki (24) — Gh. iki (3) ~ īki (102); M. ile (2) — Gh. īle (258); M. i- (8) — Gh. i- (12) ~ ī- (453); M. iç- (17) — Gh. iç- (77) ~ īç- (85); M. in- (3) — Gh. in- (1) ~ īn- (16).

Closed syllable: M. iç- (2) — Gh. iç- (14) ~ īç- (8); M. in- (2) — Gh. in- (6); M. ismarla- (9) — Gh. īsmarla- (39).

[o] [u] [ö] [ü]

Open syllable: M. üzer- (5) — Gh. üzer- (29) ~ ǖzer- (103); M. oku- (9) ~ ōku- (1) — Gh. oku- (11) ~ ōku- (23); M. ur- (7) ūr- (3) — Gh. ur- (2) ~ ūr- (36); M. öl- (19) — Gh. öl- (5) ~ ȫl- (41).

Closed syllable: M. ol (15) ~ ōl (141) — Gh. 0l (3) ~ ōl (789); M. ur- (9) ~ ūr- (2) — Gh. ūr- (3) ur- (9); M. oğl- (10) — Gh. ōğl- (10) ~ oğl- (15); M. öl- (22) ~ ȫl- (2) — Gh. öl- (3) ~ ȫl- (26) —

Medial position

[a]

Open syllable: M. dahi (121) — Gh. dahi (389) ~ dāhi (435); M. sat- (4) — Gh. sat- (11) ~ sāt- (25); M. Kal- (23) — Gh. Kal- (49) ~ Kāl- (29); M. toprāǧ- (3) ~ toprāǧ- (2) — Gh. tpraǧ- (1) ~ toprāǧ- (5); M. ara- (1) — Gh. ara- (7) ~ arā- (13); M. bāş (16) ~ baş (2) — Gh. bāş (42) ~ baş (11)-

Closed syllable: M. baş (4) ~ bāş (7) — Gh. baş (3) ~ baş (2); M. sat- (5) — Gh. sat- (4); M. sal- (2) — Gh. sal- (8); M. Kal- (31) — Gh. Kal- (55) ~ Kāl. (7)-

[e]

Scriptio plena occurs 2 times in the M.: *nitēkim, yiyēsinün*; 8 times in the Gh.: *sēsin, sēçüb, istēdiler, ötēden, gönderüb, düzēnin, kēsilmedin, seksēn* (always in open syllables, save the last word).

[ẹ]

Open syllable: M. gice (19) — Gh. gẹce (53) ~ gēce (39)-
Closed syllable: M. girçek (15) — Gh. gẹrçek (21)-

[i] [ï]

Open syllable: M. girü (50) — Gh. girü (42) ∼ gīrü (27); M. gid- (8) —
Gh. gid- (12) ∼ gīd- (129); M. gir- (14) — Gh. gir- (1) ∼
gīr- (31)-
Closed syllable: M. git- (1) — Gh. git- (166) ∼ gīt- (13);
M. gir- (9) — Gh. gir- (58) ∼ gīr- (7)-

[o] [u] [ö] [ü]

Open syllable: M. boğaz- (3) — Gh, boğaz- (2) ∼ bōğaz- (10);
M. tut-(32) ∼ tūt- (3) — Gh. tut- (9) ∼ tūt- (54);
M. tur- (5) ∼ tūr- (1) — Gh. tur- (32) ∼ tūr- (95)-
Closed syllable: M. tut- (32) ∼ tūt- (2) — Gh. tut- (15) ∼ tūt- (8);
M. tur- (8) ∼ tūr- (1) — Gh. tur- (12) ∼ tūr- (10);
M. gönder- (1) — Gh. gönder- (108) ∼ gōnder- (49)-

Final position

In the M. *scriptio plena* (i. e. use of *alif, waw, ya, ha-i resmiye*)
(about 60%) alternates with *scriptio defectiva* (about 40%) to designate
final vowels, particularly A and I. In the Gh., on the contrary, final
vowels are always marked by *alif, waw, ya, ha-i resmiye*, save 2 times
out of 128 in the word *şimdi* and 38 out of 52 in *yigirmi*.

PHONOLOGY

As for phonology I shall limit myself to giving an idea of the
phenomenon of illabial and labial assimilation in the Gh. The pheno-
menon appears there more developed than in the M., but it does not
achieve always the dimensions it has in the *Colloquia familiaria* by
H[arsány]. Here are some data:

Illabial assimilation

a−u>a−ï: altun (M. 25, Gh. 51, H. 2) ∼ altïn (H. 10);
yardum (M. 9, Gh. 76, H. 3) ∼ yardïm (M. 4, Gh. 24);
yarun (Gh. 5, H. 4) ∼ yarïn (M. 10, Gh. 2) ∼
yarinki (H. 1).
a−u−u>a−ï−u: yalunuz (M. 2, Gh. 17) ∼ yalïnuz (Gh. 28) ∼ yalïnüz
(>a−ï−ï)   (H. 1) ∼ yalïnïz (H. 6).
e−ü>e−i: degül (M. 34, Gh. 173) ∼ degil (Gh. 5, H. 70);
eyü (M. 34, Gh. 124, H. 3) ∼ eyi (H. 1); demür (M. 8)
∼ temür (Gh. 89) ∼ demir (H. 3); kendü (M. 64, Gh.

ILLABIAL ASSIMILATION: I — CLASS
[N. A. = not-assimilated; A. = assimilated] nn. = numarous

	Gh.				H.			
	N.A.	A.	%		N.A.	A.	%	
{mIş} (part.)	38	2	95	5	61	0	100	0
{(s)I} (3 itip. poss.)	nn.	14	≈100	—	95	14	≈ 87	13
{(y)I; nI} (acc.)	nn.	0	100	0	43	0	100	0
{mIş} (past. tense)	nn.	0	100	0	23	0	100	0
{CI} (den.)	nn.	1	≈100	—	21	0	100	0
{mI} (interr.)	nn.	0	100	0	18	0	100	0
{(I)nci} (ord. numbu)	10	6	≈ 63	≈ 37	6	0	100	0
{(I)yur} (Gh. (I)yürür)	16	8	≈ 65	≈ 35	1	0	100	0
{(y)E//(y)I} (ger.)	12	24	≈ 33	≈ 67	1	0	100	0
{(y)Iş} (dev.)	6	18	25	75	2	1	≈ 66	≈ 33
{IIK}	38	62	38	62	4	30	≈ 12	≈ 88
{(I)n} (reflez.)	75	63	≈ 55	≈45	0	58	0	100
{(I)l} (pass.)	45	58	≈ 44	≈56	0	25	0	100
{(I)ş} (recip.)	31	45	≈ 40	≈60	0	17	0	100

ILLABIAL ASSIMILATION: Ü — class.

	Gh.				H.			
	N.A.	A.	%		N.A.	A.	%	
{(y)Ub}	nn.	12	≈100	—	141	0	100	0
{Uz} (I pl. poss.)	nn.	1	≈100	—	70	0	100	0
{(U)n} (II. sg. poss.)	nn.	1	≈100	—	29	6	≈83	≈17
{(U)m} (I sg. poss.)	nn.	7	≈100	—	67	22	≈75	≈25
{(E)r//(U)r} (cons.)	nn.	16	≈100	—	0	2	0	100
{Uz} (II. pl. poss.)	nn.	0	100	0	4	9	≈31	≈69
{(U)n} (II. pl. poss.)	79	32	≈ 71	≈29	15	51	≈23	≈77
{(U)m} (I. pl. poss.)	77	41	≈ 65	≈35	11	50	≈18	≈82
{SUn} (III. sg. oft.)	nn.	1	≈100	—	4	39	≈ 9,3	≈90,7
{IU}	nn.	22	≈100	—	10	121	≈ 8	≈92
{DUr} (caus.)	nn.	1	≈100	—	4	68	≈ 5,5	≈94,5
{DUK}	nn.	6	≈100	—	6	97	≈ 5,8	≈94,2
{CUK}	nn.	5	≈100	—	0	7	0	100
{(y)ElU} (ger.)	0	1	0	100	0	1	0	100

| | 142) ~ gendi (H. 72); getür- (M. 33, Gh. 76, H. 3) ~ getir- (Gh. 3) ~ getir (H. 2). |
| i−ü i−i: | incü (M. 3, Gh. 1, H. 2); içün (M. 4, Gh. 238, H. 55) ~ içun (H. 1) ~ için (H. 2). |

Labial assimilation

ü−i>ü−ü:	gümiş (M. 1, Gh. 3) ~ gümiş (H. 3) ~ gümüş (Gh. 7).
u−ï>u−u:	unït- (M. 5, Gh. 12) ~ unut- (Gh. 8) ~ onut (H. 4); kurï (Gh. 2) ~ kuru (M. 1, H. 3).
o−ï>o−u:	togrï (Gh. 54) ~ dogrï (H. 12) ~ togru (M. 28) ~ dogru (H. 3); okï- (M. 3, Gh. 21) ~ oku- (M. 7, Gh. 37, H. 23).

As regards the illabial and labial assimilation in the suffixes I limit myself to a comparison with the text by Harsány (in the M. the phenomenon is very little developed). I follow Hazai's distinction between the I-class and the U-class of morphemes. I consider the most common suffixes among those indicated in the two tables on p. 434 and 435 of Hazai's book.

The principal aim of this paper has been to draw attention to the texts in vocalized Arabic characters. As far as the graphic system is concerned a systematical study is needed of the Preottoman and Ottoman literary monuments and a reconsideration from this point of view of the first products of Anatolian Turkish literature confronting them with the texts written out of Turkey. A thoroughly study is also needed in order to ascertain its evolution which can be also useful for dating manuscripts. As regards the vowel system, I have pointed out the spreading of the letters of lengthening and have showed the occurrence of *scriptio plena* and *scriptio defectiva* in the open and closed syllables of our text. The results of my research should of course be checked with other texts.

Scriptio plena occurs rarely in the first monuments of Anatolian Turkish literature. This fact has been explained as a Central Asiatic influence or as a rendering of Turkish long vowels. It is hard to suppose such a fact in a later text.

As for phonology, certainly the texts in Arabic script are liable to reflect a conservative trend; but we can affirm that the data we have from these texts are not subjected to the reservation which can be advanced for the texts in transcription.

S u m m a r y

XVIth CENTURY OTTOMAN TURKISH AS REPRESENTED
IN THE GHAZAVĀT-I KHAYREDDĪN PASHA.

The principal aim of this paper is to draw attention to a particular
kind of texts, that is to say the vocalized ones in Arabic characters
used from the beginning of Anatolian Turkish literature. Although these
texts show a conservative trend, they do not fail to reflect the evolution
of the spoken language.

For this reason, I thought it would be useful to apply the criteria
fixed by Prof. G. Hazai in his book *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII.
Jahrhunderts* . . . , Budapest 1973, to an extensive text in Arabic script
of the XVIth century, the *Ghazavāt-i Khayreddīn Pasha* by Murādī,
as preserved in ms. 1663 of the Escurial in Madrid. This ms. has 320
folios, is entirely vocalized, and was written, without any doubt, between
1543 and 1578.

As far as orthography is concerned, a comparison, limited to the
vowel system, between the text of the *Ghazavāt* and a text written in
the second half of the XIVth century which has reached us in a copy
dated 1445, the *Marzubān-nāme* (ed. Z. Korkmaz, Ankara 1973) enables
me to point out the expansion of the letters of lengthening and to show
the occurrence of *scriptio plena* and *scriptio defectiva* in the open and
closed syllables of our text.

As for phonology, I limit myself to give an idea of the phenomenon
of labial and non-labial assimilation in the *Ghazavāt*. It appears there
more developed than in the *Marzubān-nāme,* but it does not achieve
always the dimensions it has in the *Colloquia familiaria* by Harsány.
As regards the suffixes, I consider the most common ones to be among
those indicated in the two tables on pp. 434 and 435 of Hazai's book.

Certainly the texts in Arabic script are liable to reflect a conser-
vative trend; but we can affirm that the data we have from these
texts are not subjected to the reservation which can be advanced for the
texts in transcription.

R e z i m e

TURSKI JEZIK U XVI VIJEKU PREDSTAVLJEN U DJELU
GHAZAVĀT-I KHAYREDDĪN PASHA

Glavni cilj ovog rada je da se obrati pažnja na posebnu vrstu
tekstova, vokalizirane tekstove pisane arapskim slovima koji se javljaju
od početka turske književnosti u Anadoliji. Iako ovi tekstovi pokazuju
konzervativan pravac iz njih se može pratiti razvoj govornog jezika.

Zbog toga sam mislio da će biti korisno da primjenim kriterij prof. G. Hazai-ja koji je iznio u svojoj knjizi *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII Jahrhunderts* . . . , Budapest 1973, na jedan obiman tekst pisan arapskim slovima iz XVI vijeka, Ghazavāt-i Khayreddin Pasha od Murādī--ja, koji je sačuvan u rukopisu 1663 u Escurial-u u Madridu. Ovaj rukopis ima 320 folija, potpuno je vokaliziran, a napisan je bez svake sumnje između 1543. i 1578. godine.

Poređenje ograničeno na sistem vokala, između teksta Ghazavāt i teksta Marzubān-nāma (Z. Korkmaz, Ankara 1973) pisanog u drugoj polovini XIV vijeka koji je došao do nas kao prepis iz 1445. god. omogućuje mi da ukažem na raširenost izduženih slova i da pokažem javljanje *scriptio plena* i *scriptio defectiva* u otvorenim i zatvorenim slogovima u našem tekstu.

Što se tiče fonologije, ograničio sam se na fenomen labijalne i non-labijalne asimilacije u djelu Ghazavāt. Ovdje je asimilacija mnogo razvijenija nego u Marzubān-nāme, ali ne postiže uvijek dimenzije kao u djelu *Colloquia familiaria* od Harsány-ja. Što se tiče safiksa, razmotrio sam najčešće među safiksima naznačenim u dvije tabele na strani 434 i 435 u Hazai-jevoj knjizi.

Naravno tekstovi pisani arapskim slovima su podložni da pokazuju konzervativan pravac, ali možemo utvrditi da podaci iz ovih tekstova nisu od manje vrijednosti od onih podataka koje pružaju tekstovi u transkripciji.