

3. SUMMARY
THE PRIEST GJURO ADAM BÜTTNER'S MANUSCRIPT LEGACY
IN TURKISH LANGUAGE

Gjuro Adam Büttner was German by descent and a priest by vocation. He served as a priest in Zemun from 1744 to 1779, as the first diocesan priest after the liberation from the Turks. His manuscript papers in Turkish language were found in the Diocesan Library in the Diocese of Đakovo and Srijem. As far as it can be determined, nobody has previously worked on them. Büttner's papers include a German-Turkish Dictionary (128 pages), several small volumes dealing with religious and linguistic instruction and two lists of proverbs in the Turkish language. We can assume that he used the materials for religious and educational purposes since during Büttner's tenure in Zemun the parish was on the very frontier between the Christian world and the Ottoman Empire. Manuscript materials of this kind and size can be considered a real rarity in Croatian terms.

Immediately after the first insight into the papers, as one of the most important issues – regarding the fact that this is a material whose author, place and time of writing are unknown – a question concerning its origin arose. Since it was found at Büttner's, one of the possible answers to this question might be that Büttner had brought it to Zemun with him from Germany, which, considering the European "oriental" schools at the time, might have been completely possible. The fact that the Turkish language in the manuscript reveals some features belonging to the West-Rumelian dialect of the Turkish language itself cannot sufficiently support the "Zemun origin" of the material. However, the papers contain toponyms which locate it rather precisely: the examples mention Zemun, Belgrade, the rivers Sava and Danube in a number of occasions. Conclusions can be made in a similar immediate way on the grounds of several notes from the manuscript that it was written in the period between 1740 and 1790, i.e., at the time of Büttner's tenure in Zemun.

This book, due to the extent of the materials, deals solely with the Dictionary. The Dictionary itself comprises c. 3700 entries in the German languages which were translated to c. 3150 lexical units in the Turkish language. The material gathered from

the volumes and documents served only in the purpose of comparison in certain cases. Furthermore, it helped to determine that Büttner used the grammar books of François M. Meninsky, published in 1680, and Jean-Baptiste Holdermann, which was published in 1730 in Istanbul.

The transcription of Büttner's Turkish language is based on German graphy at the time. Büttner himself left no reading instructions, as was done by some other compilers; his complete work, including the Turkish legacy, has no "grammar" pretensions, thus, it is evident he deemed his work could be followed through some familiar grammar book from that time.

It is certain that Büttner had no knowledge of Arabic alphabet. His entire manuscript bears no Arabic writings. Furthermore, in his transcription he was inconsistent in following any "authority" before him, although it may be assumed that some elements were indeed acquired from his predecessors. His Dictionary should in this light be considered as his phonetic interpretation of the Turkish language, in the extent and stage he had acquired.

Unlike vowel changes which often had identical forms in the Black Sea area or the West-Rumelian Turkish, the consonant changes and features of Büttner's Turkish, provided they may be confirmed in Turkish dialects, can be assigned to a certain geographical area with more difficulty; they are found in entire Anadolia. On much rarer occasions they may be found in dialects and thus should partly be interpreted as changes resulted from the adjustment of Turkish pronunciation to German.

Hence, Büttner's consonants reveal a tendency toward spirantization which is mostly conditioned by the influence of the German language (e.g. $n\check{c} > n\check{s}$, $k > h$, etc.). In Büttner's Turkish language, the consistency may be noticed more easily in the segments conditioned by the German language, and not Turkish, which is understandable since his Turkish was a language largely acquired via written sources and most likely idiosyncratic only to Büttner (and, possible, *the school* from which he acquired it). Nevertheless, basic features of his language can be determined with consonant analysis. These features are a partial similarity with the West-Rumelian Turkish and the knowledge of the Turkish language from the Istanbul area which could not have been formed solely from Molino and Meninsky (as may most evidently be seen in the analysis of /g/ and /ɣ/ in postvocalic position).

The features determined via vowel analysis may be classified into several groups:

I) features found in the West-Rumelian Turkish:

- a) the archiphoneme /é/ takes the form of /e/ (e.g. *elci* (11), *elcılık* (2))
- b) the archiphoneme /ö/ in the first syllable takes the form of /ü/ (which is interesting in this case since it differs from Molino and Meninsky) (e.g. *ülmek* (97), *üldy* (perf.) (102))

- c) palatalization /i/ with /y/ and sibilants (e.g. *csikmak* (1), *jildys* (28))
- d) in the position of /u/ in modern standard Turkish (MST), in first syllables there is /o/, but less used than in dialects (although present both with Molino and Meninsky) (e.g. *bogda* (51), *ogramak* (49)).

II) features different than those found in the West-Rumelian Turkish:

- a) absent velarization of the phoneme /ö/ (e.g. *böcsekler* (113))
- b) absent velarization of the phoneme /ü/ (e.g. *büllbül* (72))
- c) high vowels in auslaut do not exclusively take the form of /i/ (e.g. *csakü* (100), *gherü* (79)).

III) features found in Anatolian dialects, but not limited to certain areas (this group comprises words mostly of non-Turkish origin):

- a) mutual substitution of phonemes /a/ and /e/ quite often found in words of foreign origin, conditioned by etymon vowels, the influence of surrounding (consonant) phonemes and assimilation according to vowel harmony (e.g. *haber/habar etmek* (7))
- b) labialization of the phoneme /e/ with labial consonants (e.g. *dövlet* (68); *Dövşürmek* (4))
- c) in the position of /i/ in MST in words of foreign origin there are both /a/ (less often) and /e/ (more often) (e.g. *sahab* (124); *hekmet* (70))
- d) in several words as a result of more open articulation and unconditioned by etymon, in the position of /ü/ in the MST Büttner uses /ö/ (e.g. *ösenghiler* (96))
- e) phonemes /a/ and /e/ in the position of /i/ in MST, in some words they are conditioned by etymon (e.g.: *kiaghat* (45)).

IV) features characteristic only for Büttner's Turkish are divided into two groups:

- a) changes conditioned by the influence of surrounding consonants:
 - 1. /e/ > /i/; higher articulation of the vowel is caused by /dž/, /k/ and /y/ (e.g. *askir* (32))
 - 2. /i/ > /i/ under the influence of velar /g/ (e.g. *ghyrmek* (33); *ghysli* (107))
 - 3. /i/ > /ö/, /o/ with /k/ (e.g. *kösch* (120), *köskanğ* (34))
 - 4. /ü/ > /i/ in foreign words under the influence of /dž/ (e.g. *terğime etmek* (1), *üsüm csibresy/ğübresy* (103)).
- b) according to *overconsistent* use of vowel harmony (more often in words of foreign origin):
 - 1. velarization of the phoneme /i/ (e.g. *kyra* (123), *Syncsab* (58))
 - 2. palatalization of the phoneme /u/ (e.g. *megtübler* (18); *Süret* (3)).

V) features of Büttner's Turkish with regard to a labial aspect of vowel harmony:

The primary conclusion is that in words with a palatal vowel base the labial aspect of vowel harmony is almost the same as the one found in MST, whereas in words with a velar vowel base it had not been established yet. Thus in words with a palatal vowel base the original labial vowel part was only kept in *berü*, *gerü* and *kendü*. In words with a velar vowel base, together with the most common original high labial vowel, there are also /ö/ and /i/ (e.g. on the same side: *altön~altun* (53); *altün* (53) i sl.). Most likely the lack of knowledge of the neutral sound /ə/ also contributed to this case.

Morphophonological features of the Dictionary have been defined within the frame of Johanson's theory of vowel harmony development stages, with special attention to *Indifferenz-Stufe* and the neutral vowel /ə/, which writers of transcribed texts recorded in several ways. Suffixes with low vowels are expectedly stable and do not show a one-variant feature of the West-Rumelian Turkish. Suffixes with high vowels, in accordance with Johanson's theory, show that I-suffixes are more archaic than U-suffixes. I-suffixes are in the transition stage between *Relevanz-Stufe* and *Indifferenz-Stufe*, and U-suffixes between *Indifferenz-Stufe* and *Angleichungs-Stufe*.

Büttner's Turkish is not a convenient source for analysis as suggested by Johanson, since the extent of the influences from which he learnt cannot be estimated. Nevertheless, basic features can be determined even for him. One of the most relevant ones is that morphological features of Büttner's dictionary do not provide grounds for a connection with the West-Rumelian Turkish. In texts which clearly belong to the West-Rumelian Turkish these features had been documented as nearly as a century before Büttner's dictionary (e.g. in Illésházy). Molino's Turkish bears more features of the West-Rumelian Turkish (which is evident solely in his grammar (Adamović, 1974), since the dictionary has not been analysed yet). Thus it is necessary to assume that Büttner's Turkish was developed according to a four-variant vowel harmony. In such a way, the same as with vowels, it may be determined that his Turkish is closer to the Istanbul variant, and that the West-Rumelian features can only be found in traces.

In Büttner's, as well as other transcribed texts, there are characteristic peculiarities on morphological and syntax level which may be interpreted as insufficient knowledge of the syntax.

In conclusion, it can be determined that Büttner's Turkish bears features of a learnt language, having poor contact with a living language. The features of the West-Rumelian Turkish were most likely taken from written sources before Büttner's Dictionary. On the other hand, Büttner himself knew certain basic tendencies present in the development of the Istanbul language of the time, before and during the period in which he wrote his dictionary, and had thus adapted his language to these tendencies.