

# Why transcribe Ottoman Turkish texts?

by H.E. Boeschoten\*

Most editors of Ottoman texts consider a transcription in Latin characters an obligatory part of their philological work. According to Hazai<sup>1</sup>, they are minimally required:

- (a) to transcribe the texts, that is to take a position as far as the sound structure is concerned,
- (b) to translate the texts, that is to also take a position as far as the interpretation of the contents is concerned, and
- (c) to enable the reader to perform a check on the editor's work by publishing a facsimile of the original sources.

In this contribution I will try to show that Hazai's first requirement is ill-conceived. My arguments are partly based on matters of a principal nature, and are partly conclusions drawn during the work on the edition of a section of Evliyā Çelebi's *Seyāhātname*<sup>2</sup>.

This work is of considerable relevance for our topic for a number of reasons:

1) The archetype manuscript is far from fully vocalised, but a great number of vocalisations do occur scattered over the whole manuscript<sup>3</sup> in an apparently unsystematic way. The vocalised word-forms are not only infrequent items or toponyms, etc. Any form can occur vocalised in some passage or other. Because the work is so voluminous, a systematic study of the vocalisations will yield data on the vowel qualities of almost every form of the language employed by the author.

2) For his time, Evliyā Çelebi was an accomplished phonetician. This can be concluded from the samples of various languages contained in the *Seyāhātname*<sup>4</sup>.

3) In spelling as much as in style Evliyā Çelebi exhibits a rather non-conformist attitude<sup>5</sup>. It should be noted that this may partly be due to the fact that the archetype manuscript was still only a draft. However this may be, we can at least be assured that the text under consideration is orthographically less conventional than most 17th-century works.

One basic problem with Hazai's first requirement is that he does not specify what he means by 'sound structure' (*Lautstand*)<sup>6</sup>. Is he asking for a phonematization of the text, or should sub-phonological characteristics also be reflected in a transcription? In this connection it must be noted that so far all editors have offered some mixture of transcription and transliteration; for example, differences in spelling which

cannot possibly have phonological significance, most notably those occurring in Arabic loans, are reflected in all these transcriptions. It is often stressed that a 'correct' transcription must, *inter alia*, render a reconstruction of the original text in Arabic characters possible. This position may easily lead to the misunderstanding that the representation of what is *written* may cause problems for a transliteration. This is hardly the case, however. The real problems start where sounds, more especially vowels, are *not* indicated in the original text, i.e. are written defectively. It is precisely in these cases that the editor has to put his cards on the table: transliteration perforce becomes transcription.

The reconstruction of the sounds underlying a written text is to a large extent, implicitly or explicitly, dependent upon insights based on the analysis of external sources. We transcribe an occurrence *كلوب* in a 17th-century Ottoman text automatically as *gelüb*, and not *kelüb*, because the voiced *[g]* is univocally attested even for a much earlier period. But if we are to decide between *kendü* or *gendü*, for *کندو* we have to consider a lot of evidence. Is this word spelled with *kef-i Fārsī* somewhere in the manuscript? What conclusions can be drawn from other contemporary sources, such as the 'transcriptional documents'? Does the background of the author/scribe throw any light on the matter? We may even consider the possibility that we should transcribe *kendi*, if we want to offer a phonematized text, and find evidence that the form with *wāw* reflects a traditional ('archaic') spelling habit.

So, choices made for a transcription procedure are either based on external evidence, or reflect results obtained from an analysis of the text to be edited itself. Choices made by the editor which are based on the first type of evidence are mostly trivial, but in any case they are not directly connected with the text to be transcribed at all. Those of the second kind clearly rank among the linguistic results obtained by the editor. To my mind, an implicit presentation of such results as part of his transcription procedure must be considered unsatisfactory. Why not state them separately as research results?

Apart from these objections-in-principle against the supposed linguistic (*wissenschaftliche*) value of a transcription, new insights from the field of historical linguistics force us, I think, to adopt a somewhat different approach to the problem of variable spelling.

As I will explain, careful consideration of a number of cases to be found in the *Seyāhāt-nāme* can lead to the conclusion that a fully consistent transcription is impossible.

TABLE I

Variable spelling in Evliyā Çelebi's *Seyāhāt-nāme*  
(around 1680)

feature	instance	vol. place
şagīr nūn	1. a. <i>ne istersin</i> استرسین	III 79v,29
	b. <i>ne istersiñ</i> استرسک	V 150r,10
closed /é/	2. a. <i>dér</i> دیر	IV 209r,8
	b. <i>dérler</i> درلر	IV 215v,26
	c. <i>dérim</i> دریم	IV 207v,25
	d. ?? درم	passim
labial vowel-harmony	3. a. <i>olmüšdir</i> اولمشدر	IV 227r,35
	b. <i>olmuşdur</i> اولمشدر	IV 231r,1
	c. ?? اولمشدر	passim
	4. a. <i>vardir</i> واردر	passim
	b. <i>dānedārdur</i> دانه داردر	IV 202r,30
	c. <i>köydür</i> کویدر	IV 192r,34
	d. <i>mumdür</i> مومدر	V 112r,10
	e. ?? واردر	passim
	5. a. <i>kendüvi</i> کندوی	IV 194v,10
	b. <i>kendüvi-de</i> کندویده	IV 193v,11

In Table I instances of variable spelling are listed for a number of sounds in certain contexts. It is no accident that this type of variation is encountered precisely in the spelling of those elements in the phonological structure of Ottoman Turkish which were involved in a process of change during the 17th century: /ñ/ (*şagīr nūn*) was on its way to coincide with /n/, closed /é/ was disappearing<sup>7</sup> and labial vowel harmony was establishing itself for the forms listed in the table (the participle /mIş/, the copula suffix /dUr/ and the second syllable of the lexeme *kendü*). Recent sociolinguistic research has shown that we may believe what we see here<sup>8</sup>: a broad spectrum of phonetic realisations is to be expected for changing sounds. This means that there is no need to assume either the existence of intermediate sounds which are spelled either way, or the perseverance of 'archaic' spellings to explain this variation. On the contrary, at least for the examples cited in Table I, we would be on the wrong

track. Note that the same type of variation in spelling is reflected in the 17th-century transcriptional documents. A few examples from Jakab Nagy de Harsány's *Colloquia* are listed in Table II below<sup>9</sup>.

TABLE II

Variable spelling in Jakab Nagy de Harsány's *Colloquia Familiaria Turcica* (1672).

1. a. <i>verirüz</i>	(= <i>vérirüz</i> )	p. 61
b. <i>virirüm</i>	(= <i>vérirüm</i> )	p. 36
2. a. <i>eigse</i>	(= <i>eyice</i> )	p. 58
b. <i>ejügse</i>	(= <i>eyüce</i> )	p. 116
3. a. <i>oldikten ßonra</i>	(= <i>oldikten sonra</i> )	p. 54
b. <i>olduktan ßonra</i>	(= <i>olduktan sonra</i> )	p. 43

This situation results in a dilemma we cannot possibly resolve. For the linguistic reasons explained above, these forms cannot be normalised (e.g., phonematized). On the other hand, should we decide instead to stick to direct transcription instead, there is no way to decide what to do with the instances where these forms are written defectively in the original.

One final point can be made concerning the transcription of Arabic loanwords. Many instabilities in the phonetic realisations of these loans can still be encountered even today. Undoubtedly they originated from the special position of Arabic in the Ottoman Empire, and the high level of proficiency in this language obtained by many intellectuals. In practice, editors transcribe those loanwords according to normative patterns, for instance following the entries in Sir James W. Redhouse's dictionary or Meninski's *Thesaurus*. Forms marked as 'vulgar' by these authors, which actually often correspond already to Republican Turkish variants, are discarded. Now of course the term 'vulgar' is not used to indicate lower-class language use. Rather, those variants are marked with it, which threaten the established norm, precisely because they make their appearance in the speech of the educated. Therefore a normalised transcription procedure for Arabic loanwords is often a mere formality. For many items it cannot be claimed that the transcription chosen reflects the phonic representation which was *always*, or even *usually* employed by the author or scribe in his speech. On the other hand, in this case also the type of variation encountered in the 'transcriptional documents' makes it impossible to fix a standard for the *spoken* language of the educated in retrospect<sup>10</sup>.

The conclusion from all this must be that a transcription is a medium ill-suited for the presentation of

#### Illustration on p. 25:

A page from vol. IV of Evliyā Çelebi's *Seyāhāt-nāme* (ms. Topkapı Saray Library, fol. 287 verso).

Note the marginal addition at bottom left; additions like these occur throughout the archetype manuscript; the author was still using this version as a basis for editing work (in this particular instance the addition has been crossed out subsequently). Vocalisations which are relevant for the problems discussed in this paper are for instance: şıbyan-ı-nuñ (genitive -(n)uñ, line 6) düş-miş (line 1), çiq-dıqça (line 8), ek-dır-üp (line 20), taş-lıq (line 3).

قازنلریبان قیمنلری کجده بکیمینات اول کیمانه دوشیفده گیان قیمنوب اینهده ده دوشیش اسیسه اولی قیمنون  
 یول قیبلان و شاغز اولدو بپ بوستن اولر جمله خلیق بویاله کوشیفدی بیابا نیاله کچنلر و بوداغلرده اقله قیلا  
 سکفله داغلارنده و قره طاشلیقده اولماکرات قدر قیلا نیاولور موصلهمن آشیق بونقده دَره سیر کماندن  
 التیزین عیقلانیا کراخانده لری و لاریه اما اصلاننده بریا طلی بوقدر صافیه خندقده باغچه لری یوقدر اما باغچه  
 غایت جوقدر ختی بزدک قمر کماننده اولان چمنارستان اهره بجه بیکر سرآمد و قداقت قواق اناجلر  
 وارکم هر یو بیوقدر سر حکمتده حکمت شراب قماشتا بو قوم صیبا نلد جزائنه خیز اتمکه قچان بود یا کجمله  
 اشیا رایتنه صوبیوز و مکده باشلنده بو شهر صیبا نلری بریبره جمع اولوب هر قواق اناجانه صغیر  
 و کینیز بتمشتر و کسز و یوزیز مقدار غلاملر بو قواقلره قلامشوب چقد قجه تاز زوره اعلا رینه  
 وارد قلدنده قواق اناجانه قیلا اولما یوب بار قیبلانده هماغا چار برتیکه یای کیم اکیلدوب ستر نکون  
 اولور کسز جمله جکر گوشه لری قواق اناجانه دل لرینه یا زره قوش کیم صا بر لک قواق اناجانه او بر آسمانه  
 چتمش او جزا و غلاملر کز لینی تاپیره دوشوب قیله بو کره نازره سیده طفلانلر بیز بیز دالردن  
 کتولورن بیله آتاز لری بو کره قواق اناجانه یو کیم غنیغله اناج اولور له قرق الدی اولان غلاملر اما هر قدر  
 اولداریتا اناجانه دغر و غنده قار بو کره اناجانه دپیره نوب قالمقا ایستاما زخمیاز ننده غلاملر قور  
 هار اوغزده اناجانه آشغراون عدد اولان کتور دوما اناجانه هان فقیر قواق بار قیبلان خلاص اولوب  
 بر کره قرق البر عدد او شاق ایله کور کور بون بون قالمقوب تا او بر طرفده بیره اکیلدوب بری بجه قدر  
 فقیر قواق کا صاغه و کا صوغه یا طوب قالمقوب صالنه صالنه برقرار اولور اما بو عدله اناجانه لیک  
 طره نه خرامان خرامان بو قدر غلاملر اولور ننده ایکن صالندجه طفلان ایچد خانلرک صوت خیز لری ایله  
 بو کورنه خاننده کلکری واردم کتص صیبا خاننده کات اناجانه صاغر طرفه صالیزکن جمله بر ایغزورن کلکری صو  
 خالی صو دوز فریاد ایوب شفا ایدره قچانکم اناجانه صول طرفه اکیلدور و رره مؤن و رره مؤن دوز آغازه ایدر  
 تا که اناجانه فقیرینه برقرار دغر بر کره دمن اناجانه باله جیقوب اناجانه آشغرا کور بپ آشیق  
 بیره اینلرینه اناجانه عنکوت کور طر مشوب ینه اناجانه بار قیبلانده زمینه اکیلدوب قیله بو کره دمن اناجانه  
 افندره قالمقوب صالنا نلر کجمله صو آشیق تلوب دمن آشغرا اناجانه اناجانه قور اولور اولنده حلاله صون  
 چاغر برکم صدار یما فلاک جقاره اگر خوش حالنه سه لرا آشیق کیل اناجانه کیلر له هیز بظا بنو بظا بنو  
 هو کورتنی عیقله دیوب ان اولوب بر لری بون کورده شقالر ایدر لرا اما غمرایت بونده در کم بریاد قواق  
 اناجانه لری اکیله طره فنه بریله اکلک احتما لری قیدر بقر بوم جمله صیبا بعدال عمر خواجه لر نند اولدولنده  
 بریله اناجانه اولور ایبر لری طر تمانا کاهدم اما آناجانه قیدر شید زهره دنا غلاملر عیبار بر سنکستان و جزیره زمین  
 اولانغیله بیز کور بو سر حده غلاملرینه اناجانه مثل زیر او مشوره الحاق برجامه و بر حید و مسافر براجون  
 برخان واردر غیره اثر ناند بر حام و بر حار صوب اناجانه اصلاننده اما ایلا رنده قیونلری جوقدر لکن شهر حلید  
 ایشر با تا هر کله قز باش مو قومک قرق بیک عدد قیونلر اولر سور نیو اول قیون ماد کچون کفیلده مامور  
 اولدوغز نیو نیو قیونلر بر لری بر کم لکن بو قوم بیزه اکرام ایوب خن کیم اناجانه حایه صنده مکش اتیق زوق صفا  
 اندک آب هوای غایت لطیفده احوال قوم نیانلر مشقه تا تخنده سلطان میلان خانده اطاعت ایوبینه  
 کتور لاند نیکت با ب عیقلان لریله او جاق بکر اولمشله خاک با کلرند تهاوز عیقله بوقدر طبع علم صا جوبیر  
 مکرمه جمله آتیک آد مه مالکده ینه بولره محمدی عدوتور اما القابلرند امرای نیانلر دوقدر بولور  
 عیقلر کوزنده صا دقلق اولورنده شمشیر بلنده خنر اننده آتش باره اکلرند و غایت عیقلارند و حیده و قصد  
 بریبره بولرند بولره و انند کلن یوز نفر آدم لری یالو سا و نلر آدم لریله اجانبجه روانه اولوب جانیشتر  
 ماضیه منزل رواجق سلطان مراد خان هانف عدوت استکنده بوعاده مکش ایوب صالا او طایفه بیزه بر صغه وار

[5]

[10]

[15]

[20]

[25]

[30]

[35]

linguistic results. Hazai's first requirement has to be rejected for reasons both of principle and of practice. A facsimile edition accompanied by a translation is quite acceptable in general, although it is conceded that the situation has to be assessed differently if no

archetype, or at least superior, manuscript is available. If a text yields data which throw light on the phonology or phonetics underlying it, the editor should discuss them in his introduction<sup>11</sup>.

## NOTES

\* University of Tilburg

<sup>1</sup> Hazai's literal text is this:

(a) die Texte zu transkribieren, das heißt, eine Stellungnahme in bezug auf den Lautstand zu liefern;

(b) die Texte zu übersetzen, das heißt, auch eine Stellungnahme in bezug auf die inhaltlichen Zusammenhänge abzugeben;

(c) durch die Veröffentlichung der Faksimiles der Quellen eine Kontrolle zu ermöglichen.'

G. Hazai, *Kurze Einführung in das Studium der türkischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (1978), p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> M. van Bruinessen & H. Boeschoten (eds.), *Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir*. Leiden: Brill (in the press).

<sup>3</sup> The *Seyāhāt-nāme* consists of ten volumes. The archetype of volumes 9 and 10 is lost. In volumes 7 and 8 vocalisations are very scarce. Even diacritical dots and lines are mostly lacking. Volume 6 was in much the same shape, but there diacritics have been added subsequently with a different type of ink. For details on the archetype MS, cf. P.A. Mackay, 'The Manuscripts of the *Seyahatname* of Evliya Çelebi' in: *Der Islam* 52 (1975), pp. 278-298, and R.F. Kreutel, 'Neues zur Evliya Çelebi Forschung' in: *Der Islam* 48 (1972), pp. 269-298.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, *op. cit.*, Introd. Ch. IX. f., and references.

<sup>5</sup> This is the reason why E. Prokosch uses him as a main source for his *Studien zur Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen*. Freiburg i.Br.: Klaus Schwarz (1980). The term *Vulgärosmanisch* in this context may be misleading. It is applied in the sense in which Evliya's contemporary Meninski already uses *vulgaris* in his *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium* (1680), approximately in the meaning of 'non-

standard'. For details on Evliya Çelebi's spelling, cf. Van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, *op. cit.*, Introd. Ch. VIII. d. and references, and R. Dankoff, *Evliya Çelebi in Bitlis*. Leiden: Brill (in the press).

<sup>6</sup> To simplify matters, I will in the following restrict the discussion to diplomatic editing work. Collation, of course, will create problems of its own for the transcription procedure.

<sup>7</sup> Dankoff, *op. cit.*, points out that the variable spelling of /é/ may actually be connected with the existence of different allophones in closed and open syllables.

<sup>8</sup> See Van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, *op. cit.*, Ch. IX, for details and references.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. the edition in G. Hazai, *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im 17. Jahrhundert*. Budapest: Ak. Kiadó (1973).

<sup>10</sup> In order to become convinced of the impossibility of achieving this, one has only to consult a few entries of S. Stachowski, *Studien über die arabischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen*. Wrocław etc.: Wydawnictwo Pol. Ak. Nauk (1975-1981), 3 vols.

<sup>11</sup> One non-technical argument is often put forward in favour of the transcription praxis. One of the purposes the transcription of Ottoman Turkish texts serves, it is said, is to put them within the reach of the contemporary Turkish public. This argument does not impress me. If a person takes the trouble to acquire the lexical knowledge he needs for the understanding of High-Ottoman prose, he would be well advised to learn the Arabic alphabet — and the system of its application to Turkish — as well. After all, he can expect the latter effort to be infinitely smaller than the former.