

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Title | "Artificial Idiomaticity" : in Neologistic Terms of Republican Turkish |
| Author(s) | Röhrborn, Klaus |
| Citation | 京都大学言語学研究 (2001), 20: 1-10 |
| Issue Date | 2001-12-24 |
| URL | http://dx.doi.org/10.14989/87810 |
| Right | |
| Type | Departmental Bulletin Paper |
| Textversion | publisher |

“Artificial Idiomaticity” in Neologistic Terms of Republican Turkish

Klaus Röhrborn

I.

One of the principal goals of language planning—as one should suppose—is transparency of newly invented lexemes. This may more or less be true for languages like Esperanto which are created entirely new. Language planning in natural languages has to take into consideration the already existent language and may accept more complexity and even opacity to avoid a conflict between neologistic terms and the spoken language.

In the first phase of the Turkish language reform up to 1934 nearly all newly invented words were without morphological motivation or experienced a very deficient one. This was the period during which the objective of the reform was the “tracing back to the origin” (özleştirme). This catchword referred to the replacement of the Arabic and Persian elements of Ottoman Turkish with genuine Turkish word stock which one sought to obtain from historical or dialectal varieties of the Turkish language or even from other Turkic languages. Lexical items from these sources might have been quite regularly motivated in their original environment. In the context of contemporary Turkish they lost their motivation. Suffice it to cite the example *saylav* “deputy”, originally a Tatar word with the meaning “election”. In Tatar *saylav* is a very regularly motivated word, whereas, in Turkish it is without any motivation resulting from the transfer to another language. In Turkish neither the stem *sayla-* is known nor is the suffix *-v* in use. But even with some knowledge of the Tatar language it would have been difficult to ascertain the meaning of the Turkish neologism *saylav* due to the re-semanticization. The reformers considered it quite legitimate to ascribe an entirely new meaning to a word of archaic or dialectal origin.

In 1935 a new language policy began. Thereafter, the catchword was “enrichment and embellishment” (zenginleştirme ve güzelleştirme), i.e. the creation of a scientific nomenclature based on the European model. Whereas, previously, finding suitable dialectal or archaic words played the leading role in the search for neologisms, the “invention (*uydurmak*)” of neologisms now came to be the order of the day, and the term *uydurmak*

did not bear the pejorative connotation in the mouths of the reformers¹ which it was to obtain in later years at the hands of the opponents of the language reform.² “Invention” meant that one did not merely associate new meanings with existing words. Rather, for the new meanings also new signs were coined.

II.

One might expect that under such conditions it should be desirable as well as possible to create morphologically motivated terms, but this has not been the case. The newly coined terms also are idiomatic to a considerable degree. The means of word formation in Arabic and in the European languages differ to a high degree from the means Turkish has at its disposal. Apart from suffixes Arabic and the European languages use prefixes and transfixes, where here we are referring to so-called “inner inflexion”. But this difference does not seem to be the motivation for the idiomaticity mentioned above. In this study we will describe the formation of abstract, mostly scientific nominal terms which were created by the language reformers as equivalents to Arabic or Western terms. The Turkish terms were derived from verbal bases with one of the deverbal abstract suffixes *-KX*, *-mA*, *-X*, *-(X)m*, *-Xn*, *-y(X)ş*, *-(X)t* etc., as in *kilgi* “practice” (< *kil- “to make, to do”), *kisilma* “contraction” (< *kisil-* “to contract”), *eleştiri* “criticism” (< *eleştir-* “to criticize”), *geçişim* “interference” (< *geçiş-* “to interfere”), *bükün* “inflexion” (< *bük- “to inflect”), *dalics* “dive (sports)” (< *dal-* “to dive”), *denet* “control” (< *dene- “to control”), etc. The verbal noun can also be an object noun, i.e. a verbal noun denoting the direct object of the base verb as in the case of *soy-* “to undress, to peel” with the abstract object noun *soyut* “abstractum, abstract”. Inasmuch as these suffixes belong to the so-called transpositional derivation, they do not add to the formations any of the purely semantical content which might be embodied completely in the verbal bases which are accordingly the source of the idiomaticity.

¹Cf. the statements of Ataç (Uyguner-Tuner 1972, 8) and Emre (Korkmaz 1992, 317).

²Cf. the pejorative use of *uydurma* in the title of Timurtaş 1979.

III.

The inventory of verbal bases in Turkish differs considerably from the inventories of Arabic, French, German or English, the languages from which the models for the neologistic terms were taken. It was not easy to find Turkish verbs the meaning of which corresponded exactly to that of verbs of the “donor languages”. For the production of adequate copies of the foreign scientific terms one had to resort to two means: to construct completely new verbal bases or to change the semantic content of already existing ones.

(1) At first we will study newly invented base verbs which could not be used independently before the language reform. In some cases words were formed which would not have developed spontaneously, such as *denkle-* “to compensate” (as base of *denklem* “equation”)³ or **yoğunla-* “to condense” (as base of *yoğunlam* “condensation”).⁴ Spontaneous formations should have been *denkleştir-* and *yoğunlaş-*. Other formations were closer to spontaneous word formation, but as a matter of chance had not yet been formed, as e.g. **içle-* “to include, to comprise” (as base of *içlem* “comprehension”),⁵ **düzenleş-* “to be put in a coordinated order” (as base of *düzenleşim* “coordination”),⁶ or **uzlan-* “to specialize” (as base of *uzlanım* “specialisation”).⁷ These terms did not always find their way to general acceptance, but, nevertheless, they were indeed formed.

(2) As one knows, the diathesis-suffixes *-(X)l-* and *-(X)n-* have the same meaning, but they are distributed complementarily along phonological lines. Following the stems ending in *-l-* or with a vowel, the passive voice, or, better said, the “impersonal voice”, is normally formed with the suffix *-(X)n-*, in all other cases with the suffix *-(X)l-*. For some verbs there may exist in the endemic vocabulary, apart from the passive form ending in *-(X)l-*, some kind of reflexive ending in *-(X)n-*, like for example *görül-* “to be seen” versus *görün-* “to appear”. However, these are but a few cases, and the suffix *-(X)n-* is relatively seldom used.

Alongside the verb *açıl-* a verb such as, e.g. *açın-* was not realized in the endemic vocabulary. This position was empty, so to say, and such free positions were used by the language reformers in patterning reflexive verbs after those of the European languages: alongside the endemic word *açıl-* “to be opened, to open”, one consequently formed the neologistic verb *açın-* (as base of *açınım* “development”),⁸ to which one only bestowed

³TS. 45-98.

⁴TS. 45-74.

⁵TS. 45-98.

⁶TS. 83-98.

⁷TS. 45.

⁸TS. 55-98.

the reflexive, not the passive meaning. Adjacent to the endemic word *çözül-* “to be loosened, to loosen” the neologism *çözün-* was formed (as base of *çözünme* “dissolution”),⁹ which was solely to have the meaning “to dissolve, to melt”. Next to the endemic word *eğil-* “to be bent, to bend”, the neologistic basis *eğin-* emerged (as base of *eğinim* “inclination”)¹⁰ which was only to be used in its metaphorical meaning “to tend toward”. Aside of the endemic *yayıl-* “to be spread, to spread” the neologistic base verb **yayın-* “to spread (itr.)” can be reconstructed from the derivatives *yayınma*¹¹ or *yayınım* “diffusion (of light)”.¹² Neologistic base verbs on the reflexive-suffix *-(X)n-* do not always actually have a “reflexive” meaning. The endemic word *değiş-* “to change” is only restricted in its meaning by means of the suffix *-(X)n-*: the neologistic **değişin-* (as base of *değişinim* “mutation”)¹³ means “to change rapidly, to mutate” and is intransitive like the original base *değiş-*.

(3) The causative formatives *-t-* and *-TXr-* also follow a phonological distribution: the suffix *-t-* is restricted to the position after polysyllabic stems ending in a vowel or in *-l-* or *-r-*, whereas the suffix *-TXr-* occupies the remaining positions. Here in some cases the ‘empty positions’ were used by the language reformers to form new base verbs in contrast to the rules of Turkish word formation, as in *içitim* “injection” (< **içit-* “to inject”, parallel to the irregular causative *içir-* “to let drink”) or *kalitim* “inheritance, transmission” (< **kalit-* “to leave, to transmit”, the regular form **kaldir-* “to let remain” blocked by *kaldir-* “to lift”).

(4) The reciprocal suffix, as well, finds only comparatively seldom use in Turkish word-formation. There exist many verbs of which no reciprocal secondary formation is lexicalized, and these gaps now become occupied by neologisms. The verb *andiriş-* only exists as a neologism in its meaning “to make one another conscious of one another, to be analogous” and supplies the basis for the important term *andirişma* “analogy”.¹⁴ Also **iletış-* “to give sth. to one another”¹⁵ was not lexicalized and therefore used as a neologistic base with the meaning “to transmit messages to one another, to communicate” as a basis for the often used term *iletışim* “communication”.¹⁶

⁹TS. 83-98.

¹⁰TS. 45-66.

¹¹TS. 45-98.

¹²TS. 83-98.

¹³TS. 83-98.

¹⁴TS. 83-98.

¹⁵Since 1988 in TS.

¹⁶TS. 83-98.

IV.

(1) In other cases the verbal bases of neologistic terms could be used independently before the language reform, but not with the meaning to be reconstructed from the neologistic terms. There are many endemic words in which the reciprocal suffix has become obscure and no longer has a reciprocal meaning at all, as e.g. in the word *giriş-* “to start doing sth.”. The reciprocal verb derived from *gir-* “to enter”, **giriş-* with the meaning “to interfere, to overlap” does not exist in the endemic vocabulary inasmuch as the position is occupied by *giriş-* “to start doing sth.”. The language reformers use the reciprocal **giriş-*, however, in a manner of speaking, in resemanticized form, and form therewith the important term *girişim* “interference”¹⁷ in physics. **giriş-* alone in the sense of “to interfere, to overlap” is not yet included in the dictionaries. But it is only a matter of time and speakers will begin using the base verb also independantly through retrograde derivation from the term *girişim*.

A similar case is presented by the verb *eriş-*, which in the endemic vocabulary simply means “to arrive, to reach”, without a reciprocal connotation of any sort—here one needs only to observe the phrases: *Yüksek bir dereceye erişmek* “to reach a high degree” or *Bahar erişti* “spring set in”. In the neologistic term *erişim* “traffic, connection”¹⁸ there lies a resemanticized **eriş-* with the meaning “to reach one another”. A derivation nearly parallel to *erişim* is *ulaşım* “traffic, contact”.¹⁹ *ulaş-* in the endemic vocabulary merely has the meaning “to arrive, to reach”, and the meaning “to associate with one another, to contact one another”, contained in *ulaşım*, is not yet included in the dictionary. The endemic word *iliş-* means “to stick, to adhere to”²⁰ without any recognizable reciprocal connotation. In the neologism *ilişki* “mutual relationship”²¹ the verb *iliş-* nevertheless is used with a clearly reciprocal meaning.

(2) The European languages to a great extent use words stemming from the spoken language employed in a metaphorical sense, as, e.g., German *empfangen* “to receive” is also used for the “receiving” of radiowaves etc., or English *attract*, the use of which is extended to the pull of gravity, e.g. when the sun “attracts” the earth. The Turkish language reformers soon became aware of the fact that there was an inexhaustible reservoir for new terms at hand.

To create abstract verbs corresponding to the verbal nouns mentioned above, a unique technique was developed which allows for the scientific meanings of the colloquial

¹⁷TS. 45-98.

¹⁸TS. 45-98.

¹⁹TS. 45-98.

²⁰As in the sentence: *Gözüm bu kelimeye ilişti* “my eyes were fixed on this word”.

²¹TS. 45-98.

verbs to enjoy application, where the scientific meanings do not appear in the same form as do the colloquial meanings. Actually, this technique is not a new one, since it was the usual technique for the production of the scientific vocabulary in Ottoman Turkish. Ottoman Turkish actually forms new verbs from Arabic infinitives with the succeeding, quasi-auxiliary verb *et-* “to make”, which for the most part belong to the abstract or scientific language, as for example *keşfet-* “revelation” plus “make” in the sense of “to discover” or *tahlil et-* “solution” plus “make” in the sense of “to analyze” etc. This means that Arabic infinitives are transformed into verbs with an abstract meaning through their combination with the verb *et-* “to make”. Analogous to this procedure, the language reformers construct, parallel to the concrete Turkish verbs, “infinitives”, or more correctly, verbal nouns with an abstract meaning, which are in turn verbalized again: i.e. from *aç-* the verbal noun *açın* is formed with the meaning “researching, research”²² and then in consequence the verb *açınla-* with the meaning “to carry out research, to investigate”. Or from *çöz-* the verbal noun *çözüm* is coined with the meaning “solution” in mathematics,²³ and again from this the verb *çözümle-* “to analyze”.

In many cases there is no secondary verbal formation with the suffix + *la-*, but the abstract verb is replaced by a function-verb construction with *yap-* “to make”, *bulun-* “to be (existent)”, *gerçekleştir-* “to realise”, *ver-* “to give” etc. as in the case of *devir-* “to overturn, to overthrow” with the metaphorical noun *devrim* “revolution”²⁴ and the function-verb construction *devrim yap-* “to carry out a revolution”, or in the case of *kat-* “to add” with the metaphorical noun *katki* “contribution, support”²⁵ and the construction *katkıda bulun-* “to contribute sth.”.

One should bear in mind that the process of metaphorization, or metaphoric “mutation”, occurs within the root verb. The verb *aç-* “to open” receives the metaphorical meaning “to discover”, and the verb *çöz-* “to undo (a belt etc.)” receives the metaphorical meaning “to solve, to analyze”. Yet these verbs themselves are not supposed to be used; the metaphorical meanings of *aç-* and *çöz-* are not listed in any dictionary. The metaphorical, abstract meanings are only to be found in the secondary formations *açın* and *açınla-*, and *çözüm* and *çözümle-*, respectively. Formations of this type are likely to run into the hundreds. I will only name a few of them here: *al-* “to take” with the abstract verbal noun *algı* “perception”²⁶ and the verbal derivation *algıla-* “to perceive”, *çek-* “to pull” with the abstract verbal noun *çekim* “attraction (of the earth etc.)”²⁷ and

²²TS. 45.

²³TS. 45-98.

²⁴TS. 45-98.

²⁵TS. 74-98.

²⁶TS. 45-98.

²⁷TS. 45-98.

the secondary verbal construction *çekimle-* “to attract (the earth etc.)”²⁸, *sön-* “to become extinguished” with the abstract verbal noun *sönüm* “the paying off, extinction (of a debt)” and the verbal derivation *sönümle-* “to pay off”, *uy-* “to fit, to match”, *uygu* “equivalence, assignment, correspondence”,²⁹ *uygula-* “to assign, to make use of”.

(3) Apart from the metaphorical shift in the meaning, the narrowing of the meanings of endemic words plays an important role in the formation of scientific terms. In this case the referential meaning of an endemic word is restricted to specific scientific subject matter through the addition of certain semantic features. Here the same recipe which we have already seen applied in connection with the other terms is employed: The referentially restricted base verb is not used; instead the basic form is considered to be “blocked” by the basic meaning. Only a nominal extension of the base verb enjoys application. From this deverbative noun again in turn, when exigent, a verb is derived, and one obtains a formation which is comparable to the verbal construction of the type *tarif et-* “definition” plus “to make” in the sense of “to define”, which is very common in Ottoman Turkish. The basic verb *dene-* “to examine, to test sth.” by the additional semantic feature TOWARDS CONFORMITY WITH THE NORM is limited to “to control”. This meaning nevertheless becomes efficacious only in the deverbative noun *denet* “control”,³⁰ and not in the basic verb. A secondary formation of *denet*, the verb *denetle-* should then be used for “to control”.

In the case of the verb *dene-*, the semantic core of the verb was extended by an additional feature. In other cases particular actants are restricted in their extension by additional semantic features so that the verb is limited in validity to a certain specific context. In the base verb *sal-* “to let out, to send away” the subject-actant is restricted to GLAND or CELL, so that a verb *sal-* “to let out sth. as secretion, to secrete” is obtained. This verb *sal-*, however, first manifests itself in the deverbative noun *salgi* “secretion”,³¹ from which in turn the verb *salgıla-* “to excrete sth. as secretion” is formed. In the basic verb *arüt-* “to clean” the object-actant is restricted to CHEMICAL PRODUCTS, so that the verb “to refine” occurs from which the noun *arütüm* “refining” is derived. For the verbal “to refine” the basic verb is not used here but rather the function-verb construction *arütüm yap-* “refining”³² plus “to make”.

(4) Analogously, in some cases one has assigned the extended meaning of an endemic verb to a base verb of a neologistic term: as a companion to the endemic *diz-* “to put things in a row, to arrange in linear order” one created a verb *diz-* “to arrange, to system-

²⁸TS. 45-98.

²⁹TS. 45-74.

³⁰TS. 30.

³¹TS. 45-98.

³²TS. 83-98.

atize” (as base of *dizgi* “order, system”)³³ by deleting the semantic feature IN LINEAR ORDER.

V.

The new meanings incorporated in the verbal bases of the neologistic terms exert an influence in turn on the base verbs. According to the language reformers’ intention, the meaning “to attract (said of the earth in relation to the sun etc.)” should be associated with the neologisms *çekim* and *çekimle*-.³⁴ In the dictionary of Onen-şanbey from 1993 for this meaning, however, one finds the simplex *çek-*, and this doubtlessly reflects the linguistic reality. Interestingly enough, the official *Türkçe sözlük* in its latest edition of 1998 does not yet list under *çek-* the meaning “to attract (the earth etc.)”. Since 1966 in the language of mathematics the verb *sağla-* “to guarantee, to ensure” also has the terminological meaning “to crosscheck”, although in actuality it was only meant to function as a base verb in the term *sağlama* “crosscheck” with the function-verb construction *sağlama yap-* “to carry out a crosscheck, to crosscheck”. Evidently here the meaning of the term has in turn exerted an influence on the base verb, since from 1983 onward one can find the meaning “to crosscheck” even in *Türkçe sözlük* among the listed meanings of *sağla-*. Spontaneous analogies therefore cannot be prevented, even less so in such a transparent language as Turkish. Doubtlessly, we have to consider this as a spontaneous process and this certainly is not what was originally intended by the language reformers who created the neologisms. This is proven by the fact that the reformers in many cases did not make use of verbs with metaphorical or specialised meanings of the spoken language. The endemic word *yokla-* “to inspect the attendance”, for instance, was used also in the broader meaning “to investigate”. Nevertheless, the reformers decided to associate the meaning “to investigate” with the newly created lexeme *yoklamla-*. In all similar cases the intention was, doubtless, to avoid a conflict between the neologistic terms and the spoken language.³⁵

³³TS. 45-74.

³⁴TS. 45-98.

³⁵Cf. Röhrborn 2001.

References

- Hulusi, Ragip [Özdem] 1935: *Dil mukemmelliği ve dil mukemmelleştirme görünceleri*. In: *Türkiyat mecmuası* 5, 49-78.
- Korkmaz, Zeynep 1992: *Atatürk ve Türk dili. Belgeler*. Ankara. (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, Türk Dil Kurumu. Atatürk dizisi. 574.)
- Maksudi, Sadrî 1930: *Türk dili için*. Istanbul.
- Röhrborn, Klaus 2001: "Distanz zur Alltagssprache" als *Maxime der türkischen Sprachreform*. In: *Studia etymologica Cracoviensia* 6, 127-132.
- Timurtaş, Faruk 1979: *Uydurma olan ve olmayan yeni kelimeler sözlüğü*. Istanbul. (Umur yayınları. 8. İlmî eserler serisi. 3.)
- TS 45: *Türkçe sözlük*. Istanbul 1945. (Türk Dil Kurumu. 3,1.) [Later editions: TS with following year].
- Uyguner, Muzaffer, and Hilmi Tuner 1972: *Tecim, maliye, sayışmanlık ve güvence terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara. (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları. 370.)

共和国トルコ語の造語法における「人工的慣用」

Klaus Röhrborn

要旨

本論文は共和国トルコ語の造語法において、人工的に作られた慣用について述べている。本論文は5つの節から成り立っている。

まず、Iではトルコ語の言語政策上の略史を述べる。1934年以前のトルコ語の言語政策では、新しく作られた語にかんして本来のトルコ語に訳し換える方針であった。1935年に西欧語を基礎にした科学用語を創り出す新政策に転換されたが、改革者にとっては新しい意味を連想しないという点で疎まれていたことを解説している。

IIでは、トルコ語における造語法は動詞から派生された接尾辞を用いるため、接尾辞自体が動詞本来の意味を失い、新しく作られた語は慣用的になることを述べている。

IIIでは、言語改革者がトルコ語固有語から新語を造り出す際、単独では使用されることのない動詞語基を名詞などをもとに改めて設定している例について、態や使役などの観点から考察している。

IVでは、トルコ語固有語の名詞に接辞をつけることで抽象的な意味を持つ動詞を形成したり、動詞語根を隠喩的に解釈しなおして意味を拡張したり、一方で意味を限定することで、新しい語を造る方法について述べている。

最後にVでは、新語に含まれた新しい意味が動詞語基自体の意味に影響を与える例を考察している。造語における最終的な目的は、新語とこれまでにあった語との間の意味的な衝突を避けることであったと述べている。