Linguistic Areas

Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective

Edited by

Yaron Matras
University of Manchester

April McMahon
University of Edinburgh

and

Nigel Vincent
University of Manchester

palgrave
macmillan

First published 2006 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010
Companies and representatives throughout the world

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978–1–4039–9657–2
ISBN-10: 1–4039–9657–1

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Linguistic areas : convergence in historical and typological perspective / edited by Yaron Matras, April McMahon, Nigel Vincent.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 1–4039–9657–1 (cloth)
1. Areal linguistics. 2. Historical linguistics. 3. Typology (Linguistics) 4. Languages in contact. I. Matras, Yaron, 1963– II. McMahon, April M. S. III. Vincent, Nigel.
P130.L56 2006
417—dc22 2005056583

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 06

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham and Eastbourne

Contents

List of Figures and Maps

Figures

Maps

7

On the Roles of Turkic in the Caucasus Area

Lars Johanson

1 Turkic in the Caucasus area

In this chapter I shall discuss briefly the roles of the Turkic varieties in the Caucasus area in order to illustrate some processes in historical contact linguistics. The term 'Turkic' will be used for 'Turkic-speaking', without any genetic or cultural implications. The general term 'code' refers to a language or a variety of a language. The following kinds of Turkic are found in the area today:

Azeri or Azerbaijanian (*azærbayǰanǰa*) is mainly spoken in the Republic of Azerbaijan and in Iran, by at least 20 million people, and there is a sizeable Azeri-speaking population in the south-eastern part of Georgia. Scattered speaker groups are found in Armenia, Daghestan and Nakhichevan. The linguistic borderline between Azeri and Turkish runs through East Anatolia. For Azeri dialects, see Caferğlu and Doerfer (1959: 281).

Kumyk (*qumuqča*) is spoken by about 280,000 people north of the Azeri area, in the lowlands on the north-easternmost fringe of Daghestan. The area extends from Derbend in the south to Achi-Su in the north, close to the lower course of the Terek river. In the south, the area is confined to a narrow strip; the middle part is interrupted by a Dargi-speaking zone. Dialects include Boinaq, Khasavyurt and Khaidaq (Benzing, 1959: 392).

Noghay (*noγayča*) has fewer than 80,000 speakers. The Black Noghay area extends between the lower reaches of the rivers Terek and Kuma in Northern Daghestan, while the area of Central Noghay is largely situated in the Stavropol' territory. Small groups of White Noghay are found in Chechnya and Karachay-Cherkessia, on the Kuban' river and its tributaries.

Karachay-Balkar (*qaračay-malqarča*) is spoken by about 150,000 Karachay and 85,000 Balkar in the Alpine ravines on the northern flank of the Greater Caucasus range. The Karachay inhabit the uppermost river

valleys in Karachay-Cherkessia. The Balkar live to the south, east and south-east of the Karachay area, in the higher valleys of Kabardino-Balkaria. Dialects include Karachay, Malqar (Cherek), Baksan, Chegem and Khulam-Bezinga (Pritsak, 1959: 342; Appaev, 1960).

Small groups of Stavropol' Turkmen (*türkpen*, Russian *truxmen*) live near the speakers of Central Noghay of the Stavropol' territory. Several brands of Turkic meet in the Caucasus area. Azeri belongs, like Turkish, to the western subbranch of the South-western – Oghuz – branch. Stavropol' Turkmen belongs to the eastern subbranch of the same branch. Kumyk and Karachay-Balkar belong to the western, Kipchak-Kuman, subbranch of the North-western – Kipchak – branch. Noghay belongs to the southern – Aralo-Caspian – subbranch of the same branch.

For the purposes of this chapter, the Caucasus area will be divided into a Northern and a Southern sub-area. The Northern sub-area corresponds, from the European point of view, to Ciscaucasia and consists of the northern side of the Greater Caucasus range, the plains north of it, and the northern coastal region. The Southern sub-area consists of the southern coastal region, Transcaucasia, including extensive adjacent zones of Kartvelian, Armenian, Iranian and Neo-Aramaic varieties.

2 Migrations

The Turkic languages are genealogically related to each other in a straightforward way, and exhibit rather well-defined common features. This family's huge geographical area of distribution extends from the south-west, Turkey and its neighbours, over Western Turkistan to the south-east, to Eastern Turkistan and further into China. From there it stretches to the north-east, via southern and northern Siberia, up to the Arctic Ocean; and to the north-west, across western Siberia and Eastern Europe, – today even to Western Europe. In the past, the area also included compact Turkic-speaking regions in the Ponto-Caspian steppes, in the Crimea and so on.

There have been massive displacements of Turkic-speaking groups throughout their known history. Numerous movements away from relatively homogeneous speech communities have caused successive splits into groupings and subgroupings of genealogical descendants. The family has undergone differentiation into a few primary branches, known as Oghuz, Kipchak, Bulgar and so on. Through further differentiation, more specialized kinds of Turkic have emerged as secondary or tertiary branches. From here the family tree branches out further into dialect groups, and regional and local dialects. The continuous migrations have led to the separation of related varieties, so that these do not occur in clear-cut geographic clusters. About twenty Turkic languages, in the political sense, are used today, each consisting of a set of dialects plus a standard variety with a certain area of validity.

3 Contact processes

The continuous movements and displacements of Turkic groups have led to numerous contacts with other codes, both inside and outside the family. When dealing with traditionally nomadic populations, we may reckon with linguistically relatively homogeneous tribes: basic communities, groups of families living together under the same leaders, and sharing certain customs. Contact influence is already operative at this level, because of exogamy and other kinds of encounters with outside groups. There may be influences from mutually intelligible codes and from foreign codes. Similar phenomena typically occur at higher levels, within tribal confederacies. These alliances for common political purposes are not necessarily kin-based, united by ties of descent from common ancestors. In the contact history of Turkic-speaking groups, such confederacies have usually been multidialectal and even multilingual.

The differentiation of Turkic has been caused partly by complicated contact processes, in which Turkic varieties have copied foreign linguistic elements from their neighbours – some more and some less. Intensive contacts with Mongolic, Iranian and Slavic varieties have resulted in convergence of different kinds (Johanson, 2002). Since the spread of Islam among the Turks from the tenth century onwards, most Turkic varieties have been influenced heavily by Arabic, mainly through Persian mediation. Because of contact-induced change, many Turkic codes have become more similar to genetically unrelated codes. Code shift has often taken place. The contacts have also induced numerous changes in non-Turkic varieties, or led to code shift of non-Turkic groups.

4 The introduction of Turkic

When and how did Turkic enter the Caucasus area? The processes of migration have been highly complex, and most answers given so far are partly speculative. There are many open historical questions with respect to the origins of the Turkic populations and their linguistic backgrounds. Turkic does not belong to the indigenous languages of the Caucasus area (Nakh-Daghestanian, Abkhaz-Circassian, Kartvelian), but was introduced relatively late, at least later than the ancestors of Armenian and some Iranian languages.

One early main wave of immigration came from the north and included a number of different nomadic complexes. The history of the Eurasian nomads offers many examples of sudden and far-flung political expansion. Numerous tribal complexes with Turkic-speaking elements have passed into the Caucasian area.

Turkic-speaking groups probably participated in the campaigns or political organization of the Hunnic tribal groups, which appeared on the northern slopes of the Caucasus in the middle of the fourth century. But it is unknown

to what extent the Huns or their ruling groups can be defined linguistically as Turkic. Nothing is known about a Hunnic language.

This case teaches us an important lesson. The old nomadic complexes were linguistically and ethnically heterogeneous, comprising elements of different origin. The known designations refer to the representative groups of the tribal confederacies, but do not tell us which tribes were included. The ethnic or linguistic affiliation of a constituent tribe is not necessarily identical with that of the leading elite group of the complex. Titles are not limited to specific linguistic groups. Given the heterogeneous composition of the nomadic complexes, it is often impossible to determine with which tribes or under which tribes Turkic-speaking groups appeared in the Caucasus area.

The same principles apply to conglomerates such as Bulgars, Western Türk, Khazars, Oghuz, Pechenegs, Kumans, Mongols, later Kipchak groups and so on.

- From the end of the fifth century, the Bulgars (*Onóguroi, Búlgaroi*) appeared in the steppes along the Kuban' river north-west of the Caucasus, and later established the independent state of Great Bulgaria on the eastern Pontic steppes, with its centre on the Kuban' river. We do not know what languages the confederated tribes spoke.
- Under the rule of the large tribal confederacy of the Western Türk, numerous tribes moved westwards and spread out over the steppes as far west as the lower Volga. Again, we know very little about the linguistic and ethnic composition of the tribes dominated by the ruling groups.
- When the West Türk Empire was destroyed in 657–9, tribal groups known as Khazars (*Xázaroi*) established a realm that existed from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. It extended over the Volga – Caspian – North Caucasian – Pontic steppes including the Kuban' region and the Daghestanian foothills.
- The Khazars, whose state religion was Judaism, fought against the Arabs in the Caucasus region – for example, at Derbend and Daryal Gorge (*Daryal deresi*) in the upper Terek valley. One Bulgar conglomerate remained along the Kuban' river, in so-called Black Bulgaria, in the southern part of the Khazar realm. Newcomers belonging to Kipchak Turkic confederacies destroyed the Khazar state and finally absorbed its population, including the groups of Black Bulgaria.
- The Pechenegs roamed on the steppes up to the eleventh century and were finally defeated in Bulgaria.
- The Kumans, who appeared at the middle of the eleventh century, destroyed the Khazar state. They entertained good relations with Georgia. Kuman groups served as auxiliaries in the Georgian army and helped to defeat the Seljuks in 1121.
- At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Mongol armies invaded the Pontic steppes, defeating the Kumans. Under the so-called Golden Horde,

Derbend and the river Terek in the Caucasus area became the frontier against the Ilkhans, the Mongol successor-state in Persia.

- Under the overlordship of the Western Türk, Oghuz tribes had migrated westwards rather early, from the end of the ninth century onwards; they were later defeated by Pechenegs and Kumans.
- Oghuz tribes also migrated south-westwards, some of them having advanced greatly by the second half of the tenth century. An Islamic tribal confederacy known as the Seljuk set out for conquests in Iran, the Arab countries and the Byzantine Empire. They seized Persia, overran Transcaucasia in 1045, moved on to Mesopotamia, and, exerting their dominion over the Caliphate (1055), conquered the greatest parts of its empire, finally taking possession of Anatolia. These confederacies laid the foundations for the south-western branch of Turkic in Turkmenistan, Iran, Transcaucasia, Anatolia and the Balkans. Thus, with the Seljuk conquest in the eleventh century, Oghuz Turkic arrived in Azerbaijan.

The linguistic effects of the old migratory movements are difficult to assess. The early Oghuz in the Ponto-Caspian steppe regions, the Pechenegs and so on, are only known from titles and personal and tribal names. Not a single line in Khazar has been found. The only relatively well-attested old language is Kuman, as documented in the *Codex Cumanicus* (fourteenth century).

The political expansion of the old nomad complexes was not necessarily tantamount to the expansion of Turkic. Some of the incoming complexes were led by Turkic elites. Others were led by non-Turkic elites, though they contained Turkic subgroups. Interestingly, the armies under nominally Mongol leadership were predominantly Turkic-speaking; the Mongol expansion meant a breakthrough for the expansion of Kipchak Turkic, rather than for Mongolic.

5 The Turkic varieties

Let us summarize some basic facts about the individual Turkic varieties of the Caucasus area:

- Kumyk entered the area in the early Middle Ages. The territory of Kumyk has had vivid contacts with elements from the steppe from the Hunnic era onwards; that is, in the Bulgar, Khazar, Kipchak and Mongol periods. The Kumyks may be partly of local (that is, Daghestanian) origin, including speakers of Nakh-Daghestanian who moved to West Kipchak at different periods. The language clearly goes back to the early kind of Kipchak Turkic that is known from the eleventh century onwards and may have spread into the north Caucasian area at the time of the Khazar empire. It became one of the Turkic languages of the lowland areas that functioned as a lingua franca in the region, serving trade and inter-group communication. Kumyk was dominant in the eastern part of the north Caucasus area, often used by Chechens, Avars and other tribes. Today, few non-Kumyks learn the language, since Russian has taken over the inter-group communication function.
- Noghay arrived relatively late in the area, namely after the break-up of the Golden Horde at the end of the fourteenth century. It is a Kipchak language of a later type, not of the early western type to which Kumyk belongs. The Noghays once formed a nomadic state on the lower Volga under Russian supremacy; they were later expelled from the area by the Kalmyks and scattered all over the Ponto-Caspian steppes. Most groups were absorbed by other Kipchak elements and gave up their language. Only the parts that lived in the north Caucasian area maintained it. The Noghays, originally Kipchakicized Mongols, also comprise Turkicized groups of local origin. Noghay once functioned as a lingua franca in north-western and central Daghestan.
- The speakers of Stavropol' Turkmen are descended from Turkmen tribes brought from the Mangyshlak region to the North Caucasus in the eighteenth century.
- The Karachay-Balkar language is an older entrant from the steppes. The ancestors of its speakers must have lived in the north Caucasian plain, from where they were pushed into the mountainous areas by the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century. Their new habitat was the home of Alan tribes, which had remained in North Caucasia since the Khazar era. The Karachay-Balkar developed a close symbiosis with the Alans and were strongly influenced by them. They have even been called Alans themselves by some of their neighbours. In the late Middle Ages, at the beginning of a period of cooling weather that caused highlanders to move downhill, the Karachay-Balkar were driven by Kabardians and Circassians to poorer locations in the highlands.

  Today's Karachay-Balkar speakers seem to be a mixture of elements from Bulgar, Oghuz and Kipchak tribes, with Iranian Alans and assimilated indigenous Abkhaz-Circassian and even Kartvelian (Svan) elements. In particular, groups of Digor Ossetic speakers have shifted to Karachay-Balkar. The Kabardians refer to the Karachay-Balkar as Ossetes, whereas the Digor Ossetes call them As or Assi. The Karachay-Balkar differ from other Turkic groups in terms of specific anthropological and cultural features, sharing, for example, the Nart heroic epics with Ossetes, Kabardians, Abkhaz and others. The language of the so-called Black Bulgars settling in the Kuban' region in the south part of the Khazar empire may be one of the basic elements of Karachay-Balkar. These Bulgars were later assimilated by other Turkic-speaking groups. The ancestors of the Karachay-Balkar were probably Kipchakicized at the end of the eleventh century (Pritsak, 1959: 341). However, the attempts to connect *balqar ~ bolqar ~ malqar* with the name of the Bulgars seem to rest on a superficial sound resemblance.

- Many different ethnic and linguistic elements have been involved in the history of Azerbaijan. Its northern part was the ancient Albania, inhabited by the Albanói, the linguistic ancestors of the present-day Udi speakers. Numerous peoples from the east passed into the area. The Seljuk conquest in the eleventh century eventually led to its massive Turkicization, with older Iranian and Paleo-Caucasian populations being largely assimilated. The Mongol conquests brought in new waves of Oghuz and other Turkic groups, which additionally advanced Turkicization. Azerbaijan is now an almost exclusively Turkic-speaking country.

6 Contact languages

Turkic has been in contact with most languages of the Caucasus area (Gecadze, 1977). This relatively limited territory displays a remarkable linguistic diversity, with numerous languages spoken under symbiotic conditions for more than 4,000 years, probably with widespread bi- and multilingualism. (For a survey of peoples and languages, see Geiger *et al.*, 1959.)

- Karachay-Balkar has had close contacts with the Digor dialects of the Iranian language Ossetic, which goes back to varieties of the nomadic complex of the Alans. It has also had contact with the Abkhaz-Circassian languages Abkhaz, Abaza, Adyghe and Circassian, and the Kartvelian language Svan.
- Noghay used to be in close contact with Kalmyk. White Noghay, which formerly interacted with Circassian, Abaza and Karachay, now has little contact with Caucasian languages. Small groups near Mineral'nye vody still live in the neighbourhood of Abkhaz and Circassian groups. Black Noghay in Northern Daghestan is in touch with Kumyk.
- Kumyk has been in contact with its immediate Nakh-Daghestanian neighbours: for example, Avar, Lak, Dargi and Khaidaq.
- The language of the Stavropol' Turkmen has been influenced by Noghay and Kumyk. Judging from the Noghay clan name *türkpen*, some groups of speakers are being absorbed by the Noghays (Golden, 1992: 392).
- Azeri has been in contact with Tatic (Tat and Talysh), Persian, Lezghic, Udi, Armenian, Georgian, Mingrelian, Kurdic, Neoaramaic and so on.

7 Linguistic effects

When trying to assess the linguistic effects of these encounters, we face, as always in contact linguistics, the problems of distinguishing inherited features from those that are copied, and determining the source and direction of contact influence. The effects of the old migration waves that reached the Caucasus area from the north are the most difficult ones to interpret. In the following, some ascertained or potential contact-induced phenomena will be mentioned.

The linguistic effects will be discussed in terms of the model of code-copying; see, for example, Johanson (2002: 8–19). Copying means the insertion of copies of elements of a model code into a basic code. Global copying concerns morphemes or morpheme sequences as a whole with their material, semantic, combinational and frequential properties. Selective copying concerns individual material, semantic, combinational and frequential properties. Copying never just means the transfer of elements from one code to another code, but always implies creative adaptation.

In the case of 'take-over' influence (adoption), speakers take over copies from a dominant foreign code in their own primary code. In the case of 'carry-over' influence (imposition), speakers carry over copies from a given primary code into their variety of a foreign code. In the case of code shift, copies carried over from a former primary code may remain as substratum features in the new primary code.

In contact situations, code maintenance – with adstratum features – and code shift – with substratum features – yield different results. Many contact-induced phenomena found in varieties of the Caucasus area may result from substratum influence following code shift. In this case, the question is: Which groups have shifted, the existing local populations or the incoming groups?

7.1 Lexical copying

Lexical copying between Turkic and non-Turkic varieties is common in the Caucasus area. The Turkic influence is considerable in various regions. For centuries, until recent times, Turkic varieties have been prestige codes represented by elite groups ruling large parts of the area (Menges, 1968: 176).

In North Caucasus, Turkic varieties of groups occupying the lowland areas used to function as lingua francas for trade and inter-group communication. Up to the period of Russian dominance, mountaineers coming down to the lower regions to trade or to work would learn these Turkic varieties. It was quite common for Caucasians to be at least bilingual. The lowland markets were instrumental in spreading Turkic varieties (Wixman, 1980). As mentioned earlier, north-western and central Daghestan was dominated by Noghay, while north-eastern Daghestan was dominated by Kumyk. Up to the first part of the twentieth century, there was a tendency to extend Turkicization into the North Caucasus area, for political and economic reasons.

Even more important was the transregional validity of Azeri, also throughout Persia, a situation that continued at least until the eighteenth century. Azeri was used for inter-group communication in south-eastern Daghestan, and even further north-west.

In the Northern subarea, Turkic and non-Turkic varieties have exchanged a quantity of loanwords. The foreign lexical impact on Noghay and Kumyk is, however, relatively moderate. For the Turkic lexical influence on non-Turkic varieties, see Šagirov (1989, esp. ch. 2); Džidalaev (1990); Alekseev and Šejxov (1997: 117–18 and the literature noted there).

In the habitat of the speakers of Karachay-Balkar, a homogeneous cultural area with many similarities between its various linguistic communities, the lexical exchange has been relatively balanced. The Ossetic vocabulary mirrors long-standing and intensive Turkic contacts. The way of the borrowing may be difficult to determine, since many copied Turkic words are also found in other Ponto-Caspian languages.

Though code shift to Turkic must have been common, there are no indications of heavy substratum effects on Karachay-Balkar. The basic lexicon is of Turkic origin (Siemeniec-Gołaś, 2000). The loanwords from the adstratum languages belong to restricted domains, mainly nouns relating to the local conditions of life, flora and fauna, local cultural terminology and so on.

Karachay-Balkar is rich in Ossetic and Kartvelian loanwords. The numerous loans from Digor Ossetic are also present in Karachay, although its speakers have not had any direct contact with this variety during recent centuries. There are certain differences. Thus the Ossetic word *cægat* 'north, the northern side of a mountain' has been copied into Balkar as *čeget* in the same meaning, while it means 'forest' in Karachay. The long and strong Alan influence is manifest in numerous ethnonyms and topographic names. Some Alan names of saints and other terms from the Christian sphere have been preserved (Pritsak, 1959: 341). The Ossetic numerals were previously used by the Balkar (Abaev, 1933: 80–1). An influence from the Caucasian environment (Comrie, 1981: 212) is found in the former Karachay-Balkar and Kumyk vigesimal counting system, with numerals based on the concept of twenty – for example, Karachay-Balkar *eki ǰiyirma bla on* ('two twenty with ten') for 'fifty', Kumyk *üč yigirma* ('three twenty') for 'sixty'.[1]

The situation in the Southern sub-area is quite different. The vocabulary of Transcaucasian Turkic is heavily influenced by a substratum: groups speaking Iranian and Caucasian varieties have shifted to Turkic, carrying over local terminology to their new primary code. According to Stilo (2005), the substratum is essentially Tatic. Thus words such as *tum* 'seed' and *ǰüt* 'wooden plough; pair' match Tat *tum* and *ǰut* exhibiting the typical sound changes *-xm-* > *-m-* and *-ft-* > *-t-*; compare Persian *toxm, ǰoft*. Persian has for centuries been a culturally dominant adstratum code from which languages of the whole area have copied lexical items relating to a wide range of domains, in particular cultural, erudite vocabulary.

Azeri and Kumyk have exerted strong lexical influence on neighbouring Nakh-Daghestanian languages. For example, Lezghian has copied Turkic words extensively, many of which ultimately go back to Persian and Arabic elements; for example, *daɣ* 'mountain', *saburlu* 'patient', *rangsuz* 'colourless'. It has also adopted Turkic suffixes; for example, *-či* in words such as *kolxozči* 'kolkhoz farmer', and even the plural suffix *-lar/-ler* in words such as *daɣlar* 'mountains' (Haspelmath, 1993: 72, 101, 120).

On the Turkic lexical influence on Georgian, see Golden (1994). There is a very extensive pattern of borrowings from later Oghuz Turkic, coming from the Turkish dialects spoken in the Eastern part of the Ottoman Empire and from the Safavid state in Iran (Golden, 1999: 54)

7.2 Sounds and sound patterns

All Turkic varieties of the area have copied phonetic and phonological features including certain common characteristics of the Caucasian languages.

Strongly aspirated voiceless stops, for example, [tʰapʰ] 'to find', occur in various contact zones. In Azeri dialects, strongly aspirated unvoiced stops occur typically in initial, but also in final position, for example, [tʰopʰ] 'cannon', Nukha dialect [sytʰ] 'milk'. Kumyk voiceless stops are aspirated, for example, [pʰ], [tʰ] and [qʰ], except after other consonants and word-finally. In Karachay-Balkar, phonological copying has created a consonant system whose structure is very similar to that of Ossetic. Voiceless obstruents form pairs based on the feature of aspiration: [pʰ] versus [p]; [tʰ] versus [t]; [kʰ] versus [k]; [qʰ] versus [q]; and [ʧʰ] versus [ʧ]. The aspirated sounds occur word-initial, for example, [kʰɛltʰir-] 'to bring'; [ʧʰatʃ] 'hair'; [qʰuru] 'dry'; [tʰana] 'calf'; in intervocalic position, for example, [qʰɯʧʰɯr-] 'to shout'; [qʰatʰɯn] 'woman'; and as the second part of consonant clusters, for example, [øtkʰɛn] 'passed'; [ølʰyr-] 'to kill'; [qʰorqʰup] 'fearing' (Pritsak, 1959: 349–50).

Karachay-Balkar has also copied the Caucasian articulation of ejectives, obstruents produced with a glottalic egressive airstream mechanism. Karachay-Balkar ejectives are mainly suffix-initial voiceless obstruents, for example, [batʰtʼ ɯ] 'sank' (*bat-* 'to sink' + past tense), obviously used as partitioners that makes bound morphemes identifiable in spite of their phonetic variability.

In Kumyk dialects, certain consonants are articulated with a glottal stop, mainly in loanwords from the Caucasus, but also in native words, for example, [qˀɯrq] 'forty'. This feature is typical of the southern Khaidaq dialect spoken in the Derbend region but is also to some extent present in the central Kumyk dialect spoken in Boynaq (Bujnaksk) and neighbouring villages.

The northern Azeri dialects of Zaqatala and Gax, spoken in regions bordering on Daghestan and Georgia, exhibit pharyngalized vowels typical of the Lezghic language Tsakhur. In words such as [oˤlka] 'country' and [oˤʧ] 'three' they obviously function as substitutes for the rounded vowels [ø] and [y]; compare Standard Azeri [ølkæ], [yʧ].

These sound types may be a result of adstratum influence (adoption, 'take over' processes) or substratum influence (imposition, 'carry over' processes), or both. In the North Caucasus area, adoption seems more plausible in many cases. For example, the Karachay-Balkar glottalic stops are marginal phonemes without a significant functional load. This is also the case in the neighbouring Ossetic dialect, whose Iranian sound system has not undergone any radical changes.

The situation seems to be different in the Southern sub-area. The innovations found in Azeri dialects of this area seem to be a result of strong substratum influence. Northern dialects have much in common with some southern dialects spoken in Iran – for example, the Khoy dialect. The front stops [k] and [g] are palatalized, e.g. [kʲim] 'who', [gʲyn] 'day'. In certain northern and southern dialects they are pronounced as palatal affricates. Stilo (1994) suggests that the obstruents [ʧ], [ʦ], [ʤ], [ʣ], [kʲ] and [gʲ] are the result of systemic shifts because of a very early substratum. This could be a result of code shifts to Turkic from Iranian varieties of the Tatic type, which, in turn, may also have had Caucasian substrata. North-western Persian and Armenian exhibit similar consonant systems. According to Stilo, Armenian was probably influenced by Urartian, and the Iranian dialects could have inherited the same system. Another Azeri pecularity that may have emerged in a similar way is the voicing of [q] to [ɢ], e.g. [ɢɯız] 'girl'. Some dialects also display a rather un-Turkic fricativization of labial consonants, e.g. [gʲælif] < [gʲælip] 'has come' in the Genje dialect.

Another phonological substratum effect may be the infringements on the systems of sound harmony in various Turkic varieties in the Caucasus area. Deviations of this kind are found in some Karachay-Balkar dialects as a result of contacts with Abkhaz-Circassian languages (Akbaev, 1963: 47); they are also typical of Kumyk dialects and of Azeri dialects spoken in zones of close contact with Nakh-Daghestanian languages such as Dargi, Lak and Tsakhur – for example, Khaidaq [giraman] 'I enter' (Dmitriev, 1940, 1962; Kerimov, 1967). In Azeri dialects, the sound harmony is disturbed by fronting tendencies. Many suffixes are invariable – that is, exhibit non-harmonic forms, for example, in the Nukha and Baku dialects.

On the other hand, Turkic-like sound harmony tendencies may be found in some non-Turkic varieties. Thus the emergence of a front versus back vowel harmony and a rounded versus unrounded vowel harmony may be observed in the Lezghic languages Udi and Lezghian as well as in some other Caucasian languages.

7.3 Grammar

Contacts between Turkic and non-Turkic varieties have led to changes in grammatical structures in the sense of adstratum and substratum effects. The Turkic varieties have, however, essentially retained their basic grammatical properties. Grammatical morphemes are mainly of Turkic origin, though sometimes used in new ways according to foreign models. Even where foreign structures have been copied, native morphological material has normally been employed. The Turkic varieties do not share the common morphosyntactic feature of what has been called the Caucasus *Sprachbund*, namely the characteristic ergative alignment. On the other hand, it seems that Turkic has exerted considerable grammatical influence on many non-Turkic languages of the area.

7.3.1 *The Northern sub-area*

Some North Caucasian areal phenomena may have resulted from, or have been stimulated by, contacts with Turkic. Although Ossetic has essentially preserved its Iranian character, it shows certain signs of foreign grammatical influence. It lacks the complex system of verbal suffixes typical of Turkic, but its nominal inflection tends towards the agglutinative type, for example, with case endings following the plural endings.

One North Caucasian areal feature is the syntactic subordination by means of non-finite verbal forms, for example, adverbial clauses with converbs instead of finite verbs. For example, the use of the Ossetic converb in *-gæ* may have been supported by contact with Turkic in the sense of frequential copying; that is, shift in relative frequency under the influence of an element in a model code. Abkhaz-Circassian and Ossetic converb forms of the verbum *dicendi* 'to say' are used as citation particles to convey reported speech or thought, which matches the typically Turkic use of converb forms such as Karachay-Balkar *deb* 'saying', for example, Ossetic *zæ ɣ gæ*. Following Turkic models, Ossetic has also developed postpositions such as *kæ s gæ*, converb of 'to look', meaning 'according to', for example, *mænmæ gæ s gæ* 'according to me' ('to me looking'); compare Karachay-Balkar *köre*.

7.3.2 *The Southern sub-area*

The situation in the Southern sub-area is, again, rather different. In a geographically contiguous area we are confronted with certain common tendencies of the individual languages, independently of their linguistic relatedness. I shall comment on some cases in which Turkic varieties have played more or less important roles.

7.3.2.1 Intraterminals. Several languages of the Southern sub-area exhibit similarities in their aspect-tense structures (for Kartvelian, see Christophe, 2004). Intraterminals – that is, presents and imperfects – are often formed with inessive constructions based on locative metaphors meaning 'to be in[side]', for example, Armenian *ertumem* 'I am going'; Talysh *kårdæ* (< *kårde-dæ*) 'is doing'; Lezghian *fizwa* 'is going'; Bagvalal *ig'iyax ira* 'is doing'; Neo-Aramaic *brixšin* 'I am going'. The development of these items may well be interpreted as aspectual convergence in the direction of Turkic, where intraterminality is a stable grammatical category. Items such as Azeri *getmækdæ* and Turkish *gitmekte* <go-INFINITIVE-LOCATIVE > 'is going' are widespread in the Turkic family, for example, Modern Uyghur *qilmaqta* 'is doing', *qilmaqta idi* 'was doing'.

There are numerous parallels between the verbal systems of Azeri and some adjacent non-Turkic varieties. Nakh-Daghestanian languages such as Andi, Avar, Archi and Lezghian possess old intra-terminal items that have undergone defocalization, such as the Azeri old present in *-Ar*, for example, *yazar* 'will write, writes'; compare the new focal present in *-Ir*, for example, *yazïr* 'is writing, writes' (Johanson, 2000c: 92–3). The Lezghian *-da* form has,

by virtue of a similar value, general and partly modal functions interpretable as 'habitual', 'future', and so on, for example, *fida* 'goes, will go', *fidaj* 'went, would go'. It has therefore been characterized as a 'Future' with a 'future/habitual polysemy' (Haspelmath, 1993: 276). The item *kulše* 'throws, will throw' of Khvarshi (Daghestanian Tsezic group) displays analogous uses. The Iranian languages Talysh and Tat exhibit similar items with habitual and modal (mostly potential) readings, for example, Talysh *ahåndi* 'read, used to read, would read'. The relevant similarities between Azeri and Tat are discussed by Grjunberg (1962); see the comparative table pp. 17–18.

7.3.2.2 Evidentials. Evidentials, categories that state the existence of a source of evidence for a propositional content (Aikhenvald, 2004: 1), are easily copiable in areal contacts. Turkic languages, which possess stable evidentials of the indirective type (Johanson, 2000, 2003) are known as sources of their diffusion. Indirectives appear in contact areas such as the Balkans, Anatolia, the Volga region and Central Asia (Johanson, 2000a: 83–4; 2003: 288–9). If they appear in a number of languages of the Caucasian area, one is justified in considering possible Turkic influences.

The expression of indirectivity is closely connected with postterminality, a view on events from an orientation point posterior to their inherent relevant limit (Johanson, 1971: 283; 2000: 29, 102–4). Expressions of postterminality vary according to the degree of focality, the relative narrowness of the time interval around the orientation point. With high-focal postterminals, the interval is narrow, which yields static or resultative meanings, for example, English *is gone*. With low-focal postterminals, the interval is wider, which yields 'perfect' meanings, for example, English *has gone*. The development from postterminality to evidentiality can be accounted for as a process of defocalization. Focal postterminals may lose their focality and finally even their postterminal character, which often leads to the emergence of new high-focal postterminals.

The widespread development of postterminals into evidentials in the Caucasus region is not necessarily a result of Turkic influence, but contact with Turkic may have supported it in the sense of frequential copying and internal 'latent tendencies towards indirectivity' (Johanson, 1996: 87).

In most Kartvelian languages, defocalized postterminals have evidential functions. Modern Standard Georgian does not possess any special morphological category to code evidentiality, but one of the meanings of the so-called perfect is regarded as being evidential, for example, *uc'vimia* 'it has obviously rained'. This is thought to be a rather recent phenomenon, since the Old Georgian perfect was purely resultative. Christophe (2005) asssumes that Kartvelian evidentials have evolved from high-focal postterminals through processes of cyclic grammaticalization. The Georgian static item *sc'eria* 'it is written' and the resultative *dac'erila* (< Old Georgian *dac'eril ars*) originally differed with respect to the degree of focality of the postterminal view. The former item had the highest degree, whereas the latter became increasingly defocalized. Mingrelian resultatives are products of the same diachronic process of cyclic grammaticalization by which postterminals turn into evidentials, leaving a gap that is filled by new postterminals. The new resultatives take over the original function of the older ones, but only to become increasingly evidential themselves.

Laz, Mingrelian, Svan and some adjacent western dialects of Georgian have developed elaborate Turkic-like evidential systems that also include present, imperfect and future items (Harris, 1985: 296–300). The Georgian particle *turme* 'apparently', for example, *turme tovli mosula* 'it has apparently snowed', also expresses evidentiality with non-past events, which is reminiscent of the use of Turkish and Azeri *imiš*. Some Georgian dialects, for example, Ingilo, spoken in an Azeri surrounding, use the particle *ǧopil* (*a*), a perfect form ('it has been') based on the past participle of 'to be'. It might be interpreted as a semantic copy of Azeri *imiš*; compare *camodis ǧopil* '(s)he is apparently coming' (Boeder, 2000: 314, nt 17) with Azeri *gælir imiš*. The difference lies in the fact that *ǧopil* is an invariable particle, added to inflected verb forms, whereas *imiš* is added to non-finite forms and bears the personal endings. Boeder still sees good reasons for considering *ǧopil* an areal phenomenon due to code copying (2000: 284). The inflected copula is suffixed to finite verb forms in several Kartvelian varieties, for example, *ǧopil-m* in Khevsur, an East Georgian dialect that has been in close contact with Chechen-Ingush. The Laz dialects of the Findikli-Arhavi region in Turkey use the evidential particle *doren*, a form of 'to be', after finite verb forms. In the Hopa region, however, the corresponding element is used as a finite copula verb, with the preceding verb form lacking personal endings; this matches the use of *imiš*.

The use of the East Armenian perfect to express evidential meanings corresponding to those of the Georgian perfect may be because of contacts with Turkic and Iranian (Johanson, 1992: 245, 282; 2002: 99, 146–7; Kozintseva, 2000: 414). West Armenian, formerly spoken in Eastern Turkey and thus a contact language of Turkish, has a distinct evidential particle *eγer* developed from the inferential participle of the verb 'to be'; see the above-mentioned Ingilo particle *ǧopil*. Like *ǧopil*, *turme* and *imiš*, *eγer* is a more general evidential particle that is not only used with the perfect (Donabédian, 1996: 95–7). Tat displays the evidential particle *miš*, a copy of Azeri *imiš*. The Tat perfect may have evidential readings itself, but the particle is often added to it (Grjunberg, 1963: 88).

Turkic-like evidentiality systems exist in numerous Nakh-Daghestanian languages. Defocalized postterminals display evidential functions in Avar. The Nakh languages Chechen and Ingush use the participle *xʌnnə* 'been' of *xʌlar* 'to be', for example, *a: ra v-eannə xʌnn-u*: 'he has apparently gone out' (Boeder, 2000: 314). This particle is reminiscent of the Khevsur particle *ǧopil*, but, like Azeri *imiš*, it bears the inflection marker.

Abkhaz-Circassian languages possess evidentials that seem to have already existed in Proto-Abkhaz and Proto-Circassian in the eighth and ninth centuries. If this is true, it cannot, of course, be attributed to Turkish influence. Chirikba stresses that there was 'no discernible Turkish presence in Abkhazia prior to the sixteenth century' (Chirikba, 2003: 266).

This does not, however, exclude Turkic impact in general. The discussion on possible contact-induced effects has so far focused one-sidedly on the contribution of Oghuz Turkic – that is, Turkish and Azeri, and very often exclusively on contacts during the period of Ottoman domination. According to Boeder (2000: 227) the evidentiality system of Mingrelian may partly be a result of contacts with Turkish. Svan, which has always been remote from Ottoman domination, may have modelled its system after that of Mingrelian (see Sumbatova, 1999; Friedman, 2000: 357). Although it is still not clear when the evidential variants of the Georgian perfect arose, Boeder nevertheless concludes: 'For the time being, the hypothesis that the evidential meaning of the Georgian perfect developed under the influence of Turkish–Georgian bilingualism is a real possibility, as far as we know' (2000: 297–8).

While this may be true, the presence of evidentials is certainly not a convergence phenomenon in which only Oghuz Turkic has been involved. The emergence of Turkic-like evidential categories may result from, or have been supported by, other Turkic varieties in the area. Golden notes that even the Georgians have dealt with virtually every Turkic group that entered the North Caucasus region (1999: 96). We are confronted with the much wider issue of Balkan–Pontic–Caucasus–Caspian contacts. The Bulgarian evidentiality system points clearly to pre-Ottoman contacts with Turkic (Johanson, 1996). Certain Kipchak Turkic languages may use the particle *e(r)ken*, once widespread in the area (Johanson, 2004; forthcoming), as an utterance-final particle added to main clauses, without carrying personal markers. Karakoç (2005: 31) deals with Noghay sentences in which the personal markers are carried by *eken*, and sentences in which they are carried by the preceding verb, for example, *Nege kelgen ekenler?* 'Why do they seem to have come?'; *Nege kelgenler eken?* 'I wonder why they have come'. Turkish and Azeri *imiš* only represents the first model. As we have seen, however, the second model is found in many evidential constructions in the Caucasus area.

7.3.2.3 Syntax. The Southern sub-area exhibits many common syntactic features. Azeri dialects exhibit strong Iranian influences in the syntax. Stilo (2004) discusses possible substratum structures such as the use of the subjunctive after modals for example, *istiræm gedæm* 'I want to go', copied Iranian function words, loss of the question particle *mi* (replaced by intonation), confusion of subjunctive and optative forms, for example, *istir gedæ ~ istir getsin* 'wants to go' (also typical of Northern Talyshi), and certain loan translations.

The unmarked constituent order in Turkic is verb-final. This is also the case in Georgian, Armenian, Nakh-Daghestanian and Abkhaz-Circassian languages

such as Dargi, Lezghian, Chechen, Ingush and so on. Georgian and Armenian have, however, switched from verb-object to object-verb order since the medieval period. This typological reversal may well be the result of areal contacts with languages of the opposite type. In Old Georgian, adjuncts generally followed their nominal head. Turkic languages normally have preposed relative clauses (Johanson, 1992: 274–5; 2002: 135–7); this is also the case in Nakh-Daghestanian. Ossetic is the only Iranian language of the area that sometimes exhibits preposed relative clauses. Postposed relative clauses of the Iranian kind are normally found in spoken Georgian, Armenian, Circassian and Azeri (Stilo, 2004). Spoken Azeri also makes heavy use of postverbal subordinate clauses and regularly places constituents expressing destination/goal after the verb, for example, *gediræm evæ* 'I go home' (Stilo, 2004).

The decline of ergative constructions and the emergence of Turkic-like syntactic structures in some Caucasian varieties are not necessarily contact-induced phenomena, but they may be rooted in internal tendencies that have been supported and generalized through contacts with Turkic in the sense of frequential copying. For the loss of ergativity in one dialect of Udi (Gukasjan, 1973: 43), Azeri influence seems to have been the decisive triggering factor.

8 Similar and different roles

The languages of the Caucasus area as defined in the present chapter certainly do not qualify as a single *Sprachbund*. The sub-areas, however, rather constitute continuous communication areas exhibiting a good deal of bi- or multilateral convergence. It is often impossible to judge the directions of influence. The spread of areal features cannot always be accounted for by one source of diffusion. If we had access to detailed historical data, however, cases of multilateral convergence would probably turn out to consist of series of unilateral and bilateral code-copying processes (Johanson, 1992: 279–84; 2002: 143–9). Many common features observed in the sub-areas may be because of contact-induced frequential copying that has supported latent internal tendencies.

The Turkic languages of the Northern and Southern sub-areas differ considerably from one another with respect to their roles.

8.1 The Northern sub-area

In spite of a long, symbiotic coexistence with their non-Turkic neighbours, the Turkic languages of the Northern sub-area display relatively little foreign influence. Kumyk and Karachay-Balkar have essentially maintained the features of Early West Kipchak – 'Kipchak-Kuman' – as documented in the *Codex Cumanicus* (Magomedov, 1966; Xabičev, 1966; Berta, 1998). Noghay exhibits little influence from the Caucasus area beyond loanwords, although

Menges speaks of a strong influence of Circassian (1959: 436). None of the languages shows any major syntactic peculiarities.

The situation of Karachay-Balkar, which has long developed in relative isolation from other Turkic languages, is particularly interesting. In the 1930s, the Marr school of linguistics focused on this language as an exemplary crossbreed of Turkic and Caucasian ('Japhetic') elements. According to Marr's theory, languages arise by processes of interweaving and combining – linguistic development is seen as constant 'mixing'. The alleged 'mixed' status of Karachay-Balkar is, however, by no means supported by the data. The neighbouring languages have left relatively little imprint on it. It has retained the character of its Turkic subgroup, just as Ossetic has largely retained its Iranian character. The influence exerted by Ossetic and the North Caucasian languages on Karachay-Balkar is much more limited than the reverse influence. As already mentioned, while language shift must have been common through the centuries, the overall picture is not dominated by substratum influence.

8.2 The Southern sub-area

The situation in the Southern sub-area is quite different. Transcaucasia and northern Iran constitute a multilingual convergence area whose languages share typological traits at all levels. Azeri displays numerous deviations from the inherited type of Turkic, much more than the Turkic varieties of the Northern subarea.

Transcaucasia was largely Turkicized during the Seljuk era. Oghuz Turks had begun to move into Azerbaijan in the eleventh century. Turkicization began in the north and continued into the south by the twelfth century (Golden, 1992: 225). At the time of the immigration, numerous mutually unintelligible varieties were spoken in the area, for example, various brands of Tatic, Caucasian Albanian, Kurdic, Armenian, Aramaic and possibly remnants of Parthian. According to Stilo (2004), these varieties had probably already formed an 'Arax *Sprachbund*', as we find here today. The linguistic diversity facilitated a shift to a Turkic lingua franca, which soon became the primary code of large parts of the population. There was probably a rapid shift to Turkic, a process which subsequently expanded into other Iranian-speaking areas.

Many Caucasians had probably shifted to Iranian, Armenian and Aramaic before they shifted to Turkic; others may have shifted directly to Turkic. Many features from Iranian and its Caucasian substrata were imposed on the incoming Turkic varieties, which had already been subject to Iranian influence in Central Asia and Khorasan.

Stilo points out that Persian was not a spoken language in the area at the time of Oghuz immigration. It has, however, served ever since as a highly influential adstratum language because of its cultural dominance.

The number of Turkic newcomers who had moved into Azerbaijan, displacing the old ruling class and causing the code shift, seems to have been small. The shift was not based on a massive migration, and thus took place with little genetic impact. Today's Turkic-speaking Azeris are related most closely to their nearest non-Turkic neighbours, that is, genetically closer to Armenians and some Caucasian-speaking groups than to other Turkic-speaking populations (Nasidze and Stoneking, 2001). This closeness is certainly caused by shared Caucasian substrata.

9 Reasons for the linguistic impact

What was the reason for the strong linguistic impact of the small Turkic-speaking elite groups? The situation may be compared with that of other areas in which Turkic has played major roles. Many originally non-Turkic groups have abandoned their primary codes in favour of Turkic varieties. In Central Asia, sizeable Iranian-speaking groups shifted to Turkic. In the north of the Turkic world, Tungusic-speaking groups adopted Yakut (Pakendorf, 2001). Southern Siberia offers similar scenarios, with Southern Samoyed, Ob-Ugrian and Yenisei Ostyak (Ket) substrates. Old Bulgar groups went up the Volga River to the Volga-Kama confluence area and established a state there. Some of these Bulgars imposed their language on Finno-Ugric populations, which led to the emergence of Chuvash (Johanson, 2000b). On the other hand, Turkic-speaking groups have shifted to non-Turkic languages. One of the important Bulgar movements, caused by pressure from the Khazars, was the migration of one group to the Danube, the Byzantine frontier. These Balkan Bulgars very soon gave up their primary code in favour of a Southern Slavic variety, today's Bulgarian. In old Eastern Europe, other Turkic groups of unknown size, Bulgars, Kumans, Pechenegs and others, adopted Slavic varieties. In recent times, Turkic groups have massively replaced their primary codes with Russian.

Contacts leading to shift depend on social dominance relations. The size of the incoming groups relative to the local groups may be relevant, but political expansion is not always accompanied by mass population movements. The proportions may vary considerably. Elite minorities may impose their codes on comparatively large local indigenous populations. Shifts of this kind occur without major demographic changes.[2]

The introduction of Turkic into the Caucasus area has rather been the result of minor movements, but the influential roles of the Turkic varieties is obvious. One reason for the linguistic success of Turkic elite groups was their advanced political organization, which contributed significantly to their dominance. As mentioned, they were prestige languages and served as lingua francas in bilingual intercourse.

The situation of the Turkic-speaking newcomers in the Caucasian area differed essentially from that of the Turkic groups on the Balkans. Both Caucasian sub-areas were characterized by an extreme diverseness of mutually unintelligible codes which mainly exhibited rather complex structures.

Prestige languages with structural properties that made them relatively easy to learn (Johanson, 1992: 199–206; 2002: 41–8) could be used to bridge the gaps between the local speech communities.

10 Balkan–Pontic–Caucasus–Caspian contacts

What must be kept in mind is that Oghuz Turkic is not the only source of Turkic impact on the non-Turkic varieties, and of Turkic contributions to common areal tendencies. The highly probable influences from various older Turkic tribes that invaded the area should not be ignored: Bulgar elements from the end of the fifth century onwards, Western Türk elements from the sixth century onwards, Khazar elements from the seventh century onwards, and Kipchak Turkic elements of the earlier and the later type from the tenth century onwards. It is not possible to establish, as Gadžieva (1979) has attempted, one single type of early Turkic for the Caucasus area, but it is necessary to deal with the linguistic situations within a more general framework of Balkan–Pontic–Caucasus–Caspian language contacts.[3]

Acknowledgement

Work on this chapter, which is a contribution to the Special Research Project (SFB) 295 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, was carried out while the author was Guest Scientist at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig. The chapter is based partly on a talk given at a meeting of the Genetics-Linguistics Group ('geneling') on 2 April 2002. I profited very much from the paper 'Languages and Prehistory in the Caucasus' given by Johanna Nichols on 18 April 2002. I am particularly grateful for the fruitful discussions I had with Helma van den Berg, the ardent investigator of Daghestanian languages, whose life ended only one year later, on 11 November 2003 in Derbend, Daghestan.

Notes

1 As is well known, counting by twenties is also found in some West European languages. Thus Old French *quatre vins dis* (modern French *quatre-vingt-dix*) for 'ninety' is modelled on Basque *laurogeitahamar* (< *laur-hogei-eta-hamar*).

2 A further question is whether the incoming groups have been predominantly male, mating with indigenous females who have shifted their code. New methods of population genetics will finally allow answers to questions of these kinds.

3 It is not possible to deal with linguistic similarities between the Balkan and Caucasus areas in this chapter. It is, however, interesting to note that, according to Nedjalkov (2002), Karachay-Balkar is the only Turkic language in which verbs marked with the reciprocal suffix -(V)š have a competitive meaning 'to do something competing with each other'. This meaning happens to be similar to that of the Bulgarian reflexive clitic.

References

Abaev, V. I. (1933) 'Obščie elementy v jazyke osetin, balkarcev i karačaevcev', *Jazyk i myšlenie*, vol. 1, pp. 71–89.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004) *Evidentiality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Aikhenvald, A. Y. and R. M. W. Dixon (eds) (2003) *Studies in Evidentiality*, Typological Studies in Language, 54 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins).

Akbaev, Č. X. (1963) *Fonetika Dialektov Karačaevo-Balkarskogo Jazyka* (Čerkessk: Karačaevo-Čerkesskoe Knižnoe Izdatel'stvo).

Alekseev, M. E. and Ė. M. Šejxov (1997) *Lezginskij jazyk* (Moscow: Academia).

Appaev, A. M. (1960) *Dialekty Balkarskogo Jazyka v ix Otnošenii k Balkarskomu Literaturnomu Jazyku* (Nal'čik: Kabardino-Balkarskij Naučno-Issledovatel'skij Institut).

Baskakov, N. A., P. A. Azimov, G. I. Donidze, S. K. Kenešbaev, L. A. Pokrovskaja, V. V. Rešetov, E. V. Sevortjan, E. R. Tenišev, E. I. Ubrjatova, M. J. Xamzaev, Š. Š. Širaliev, K. K. Judaxin (1966) *Jazyki narodov SSSR 2* (Moscow: Nauka).

Benzing, J. (1959) 'Das Kumükische', in Deny *et al.*, *Philologiae*, pp. 391–406.

Berta, Á. (1998) 'West Kipchak Languages', in L. Johanson and É. Á. Csató (eds), *The Turkic Languages* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 301–17.

Boeder, W. (2000) 'Evidentiality in Georgian', in Johanson and Utas (eds), *Evidentials*, pp. 275–328.

Caferğlu, A. and G. Doerfer (1959) 'Das Aserbeidschanische', in Deny *et al.* (eds), *Philologiae*, pp. 280–307.

Chrikba, V. (2003) 'Evidential Category and Evidential Strategy in Abkhaz', in Aikhenvald and Dixon, *Studies in Evidentiality*, pp. 243–72.

Christophe, B. (2004) *Studier i de sydkaukasiske sprogs aspektologi*, Acta humaniora, 190 (Oslo: University of Oslo, Faculty of Arts).

Christophe, B. (2005) 'Some Remarks on Postterminality and Evidentiality in South Caucasian', in Dag Haug and Eirik Welo (eds), *Haptacahaptaitis: Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson* (Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture).

Comrie, B. (1981) *The Languages of the Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Deny, J., K. Grønbech, H. Scheel, Z. V. Togan and P. N. Boratav (eds) (1959) *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta, vol. 1* (Wiesbaden: Steiner).

Dmitriev, N. K. (1940) *Grammatika kumykskogo jazyka* (Moscow/Leningrad: Akademija nauk SSSR).

Dmitriev, N. K. (1962) *Stroj tjurkskix jazykov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury).

Donabédian, A. (1996) 'Pour une interprétation des différentes valeurs du médiatif en arménien occidental', in Z. Guentchéva (ed.), *L'énonciation médiatisée*, Bibliothèque de l'infomation grammaticale, 35 (Louvain and Paris: Peeters), pp. 87–108.

Džidalaev, N. N. (1990) *Tjurkizmy v dagestanskix jazykov* (Moscow: Nauka).

Friedman, V. A. (2000) 'Confirmative/non-confirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with Additional Observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian and Lak', in Johanson and Utas, *Evidentials*, pp. 329–66.

Gadžieva, N. Z. (1979) *Tjurkojazyčnye arealy Kavkaza* (Moscow: Nauka).

Gecadze, I. O. (1977) *K lingvo-geografičeskomu obzory kavkazskogo jazykovogo areala. Areal'nye issledovanija v jazykoznanii i etnografii* (Leningrad: Nauka).

Geiger, B., T. Halasi-Kun, A. H. Kuipers, and K. H. Menges (1959) *Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus. A Synopsis*, Janua Linguarum, 6 ('s Gravenhage: Mouton and Co).

Golden, P. B. (1992) *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State-formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia and the Middle East*, Turcologica, 9 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
Golden, P. B. (1994) 'Georgio-Turkica', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. 13, pp. 101–16.
Golden, P. B. (1999) 'The Nomadic Linguistic Impact on Pre-Činggizid Rus' and Georgia', *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi*, vol. 10, pp. 72–97.
Grjunberg, A. (1962) 'K voprosu o jazykovom vzaimodejstvii (na materiale jazyka severoazerbajdžanskix tatov)', *Kratkie soobščenija Instituta Narodov Azii*, vol. 40, pp. 11–23.
Grjunberg, A. (1963) *Jazyk severoazerbajžanskix tatov* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR).
Gukasjan, V. L. (1973) *Vzaimootnošenie Azerbajdžanskogo i Udinskogo Jazykov* (Baku: Institut Jazykoznanija Akademii Nauk Azerbajdžanskoj SSR).
Haspelmath, M. (1993) *A Grammar of Lezgian*, Mouton Grammar Library, 9 (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter).
Harris, A. C. (1985) *Diachronic Syntax: The Kartvelian Case*, Syntax and Semantics, 18 (Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press).
Johanson, L. (1971) *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*, Studia Turcica Upsaliensia, 1 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell).
Johanson, L. (1992) *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*, Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 29 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
Johanson, L. (1996) 'On Bulgarian and Turkic indirectives', in N. Boretzky, W. Enninger and Th. Stolz (eds), *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte, Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen*, Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung, 24 (Bochum: Brockmeyer).
Johanson, L. (2000a) 'Turkic indirectives', in Johanson and Utas, *Evidentials*, pp. 61–87.
Johanson, L. (2000b) 'Linguistic convergence in the Volga area', in D. Gilbers, J. Nerbonne and J. Schaeken (eds), *Languages in Contact*, Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 28 (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi), pp. 165–78.
Johanson, L. (2000c) 'Viewpoint operators in European languages', in Ö. Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe* (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 27–187.
Johanson, L. (2002) *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts* (London: Curzon).
Johanson, L. (2003) 'Evidentiality in Turkic', in Aikhenvald and Dixon, *Studies in Evidentiality*, pp. 273–91.
Johanson, L. (2004) 'On the Turkic origin of Hungarian *igen* "yes" ', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, vol. 57, pp. 93–104.
Johanson, L. (2005) 'Participles in Caucasus Turkic', in Christophe, *Festschrift Fridrik Thordarson*.
Johanson, L. and B. Utas (eds) (2000) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages* (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter).
Karakoç, B. (2005) *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen*, Turcologica, 58 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
Kerimov, I. A. (1967) *Očerki kumykskoj dialektologii* (Maxačkala: Dagučpedgiz).
Kozintseva, N. (2000) 'Perfect forms as a means of expressing evidentiality in Modern Eastern Armenian', in Johanson and Utas, *Evidentials*, pp. 411–17.
Magomedov, A. G. (1966) 'Kumykskij jazyk', in Baskakov *et al.*, *Jazyki*, pp. 194–212.

Menges, K. H. (1959) 'Die aralo-kaspische Gruppe', in Deny *et al.*, *Philologiae*, pp. 434–88.
Menges, K. H. (1968) *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies*, Ural-Altaische Bibliothek, 15 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).
Nasidze, I. and M. Stoneking (2001) 'Mitochondrial DNA Variation and Language Replacements in the Caucasus', *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, B 268 (London), pp. 1197–206.
Nedjalkov, V. P. (2002) 'Karachay–Balkar reciprocals', *Turkic Languages*, vol. 6, pp. 19–80.
Pakendorf, B. (2001) 'Genetic and linguistic perspectives on the prehistory of the Yakuts', *Turkic Languages*, vol. 5, pp. 138–43.
Pritsak, O. (1959) Das Karatschaische und Balkarische', in Deny *et al.*, *Philologiae*, pp. 340–68.
Šagirov, A. K. (1989) *Zaimstvovannaja leksika abxazo-adygskix jazykov* (Moscow: Nauka).
Siemeniec-Golaś, E. (2000) *Karachay–Balkar Vocabulary of Proto-Turkic Origin*, Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia, 7 (Kraków: Księgarna Akademicka).
Stilo, D. (1994) 'Phonological Systems in Contact in Iran and Transcaucasia', in M. Marashi (ed.), *Persian Studies in North America. Studies in Honor of Mohammad Ali Jazayery* (Bethesda, Md: Iranbooks), pp. 75–94.
Stilo, D. (2004) 'Some Preliminary Thoughts on the Non-Persian Iranian Substratum of Azerbaijan'. Paper read at the conference 'The Evolution of Turkic in Iran', Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, 17–19 December.
Stilo, D. (2005) 'Ambipositions as an Areal Response: The Case-study of the Iranian Zone', in L. Johanson and C. Bulut (eds) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz), pp. 297–320.
Sumbatova, N. (1999) 'Evidentiality, Transitivity and Split Ergativity', in W. Abraham and L. Kulikov (eds), *Tense–Aspect, Transitivity and Causativity* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), pp. 63–95.
Wixmann, R. (1980) *Language Aspects of Ethnic Patterns and processes in the North Caucasus*. (Chicago: University of Chicago).
Xabičev, M. A. (1966) Karačaevo-balkarskij jazyk', in N. A. Baskakov *et al.*, *Jazyki*, pp. 213–33.