



Lexical Similarities and Differences between Kerman Turkic and Azeri Turkic (Tabriz Variety)

Pooneh Mostafavi¹

Received: 30/12/2021

Accepted: 24/09/2022

1. INTRODUCTION

The main geographic locations of Turkic languages speakers are Turkey, the Caucasus, Iran, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tatarstan. There are also substantial Turkic-speaking communities in northwestern China (Kornfilt, 1991). Johanson (1998) distinguishes following 6 branches for Turkic languages, attempting to combine the area distribution of this language family with typological and genetic features: 1-Southwestern branch, Oghuz Turkic 2-Northwestern branch Kipchak Turkic 3-Southeastern branch Uyghur Turkic 4-Northeastern branch Siberian Turkic 5- Chuvash representing, Oghur or Bulghar Turkic 6-Khalaj representing, Arghu Turkic. Each branch includes subbranches that due to article limitation, they are not mentioned here. Azeri Turkic, is the language of a large part of northwestern of Iran, including East Azerbaijan, West Azerbaijan, Ardabil and Zanjan provinces and also some parts of central areas of Iran and Gilan province. Azeri Turkic has different varieties which are spoken in cities like Tabriz, Ardabil, Urmia, Khalkhal, Sarab, Pars Abad and other cities in Iran. The Turkic language which is spoken in Iran and all over Azerbaijan, south of Caucasus, and Anatolia is the Oghuz Turkic. There are two Turkic-speaking tribes in Kerman province. Afshar tribe whose language is Oghuz Turkic (Field, 1964, p.49; Hamedani, 1959, p.35) and Bochaghchi tribe.

The present study aims at surveying the lexical similarities and differences between the Turkic spoken in some Turkic-speaking villages in Orzuiye county in Kerman province and Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic. The corpus of study consists of available data in Iran linguistic atlas (ILA) which have been gathered based on the questionnaire prepared for this atlas. The data belongs to 10 villages of Orzuiye county in Kerman province including, Damane Tiroft, Sorkhan, Sargaz Dolat Abad, Shahmaran, Ali Abad, Fath Abad, Mahmood Abad, Motor Bistohaft-e Khordad, Motor Zargarha and Motor Ghorkhmazei. The main questions of the present study are as follow:

- 1- How much lexical similarities and differences are there between the studied words in Turkic spoken in Kerman Province and their equivalents in Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic statistically?
- 2- What is language contact effect on the language of the Turkic-speaking villages of Orzuiye county in Kerman province? Has local Persian which is spoken in the neighboring villages of the studied ones effected on their Turkic language?

¹ Assistant professor of Linguistic, Inscriptions and Texts, Research Institute of Cultural Heritage and Tourism, Tehran, Iran; mostafavi1972@gmail.com, pmostafavi@richt.ir

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The language contact between Turkic and Persian and other Iranian languages has caused some changes in both languages during the time. When different language speakers contact each other, they naturally tend to make compromise between their forms of speech (Winford 2003). Such contact may have different linguistic outcomes, but linguistic borrowing is one of the major manifestations of it. Traditionally, borrowing has been identified with lexical borrowing (Capuz 1977). For years, scholars believed that syntax and the structure of languages are not borrowed, but researches of some linguists like Thomason and Kaufman (1998), Harris and Campbell (1995), and Aikhenvald (2002) showed that language structures are borrowed under different circumstances. According to Thomason & Kaufman (1988) there are five scales of intensity of contact which they believe the boundaries between them are fuzzy:

1- casual contact 2-slightly more intense contact 3-more intense contact 4-strong cultural pressure 5-very strong cultural pressure

The first one of the above, refers to the situation in which there is the minimum cultural pressure. Thomason and Kaufman (1988) expect only lexical borrowing (only nonbasic vocabularies) in this condition. In the second and third situations, function words like conjunctions, adverbial particles, adpositions, minor phonological, syntactic and lexical semantic features are borrowed. Furthermore, derivational and inflectional affixes may enter the borrowing language. From the third situation, personal and demonstrative pronouns and low numerals which belong to the basic vocabulary start to be transferred from the donor language to the recipient one. In strong cultural pressure conditions, major structural features are borrowed which cause relatively little typological change, so borrowed inflectional affixes and categories are added to the native words. The phonological borrowings in this stage are more extensive than previous stages. Under very strong cultural pressure, in the fifth stage, borrowing the major structural features that cause significant typological disruption may take place. Morphophonemic rules are added and phonetic changes may occur. The morphology may change from flexional toward agglutinate one. According to the above scale the more intense the contact, the more features can be borrowed. Lee (1996) believes that Azeri Turkic in Iran, sits around category 4 in this scale.

Lexical similarities and differences cause lexical varieties to be noticed. Geeraerts et al (1994) divided lexical varieties into four types: 1-semasiological variation (a particular lexical item may refer to distinct types of referents) 2-onomasiological variation (a type of referent may be named by means of various conceptually distinct lexical categories) 3- formal variation (a particular referent may be named by means of various lexical items, regardless of whether these represent conceptually different categories or not) 4-contextual variation (It correlates with contextual factors like the formality of speech situation or geographical or sociological characteristics of the participants in a communicative interrelation). In the present article only, the formal variation is considered.

The present study is a descriptive-analytic one. As mentioned above the corpus of study is extracted from ILA database. There are 10 informants (5 women and 5 men). The informants are selected based on ILA's protocols. The sociological factors of the informants such as gender, social class and style are not considered in the study. For manageability of conducting the study, the 85 extracted words are classified to 11 class: kinship words (17 items), nature words (11 items), plants (5 items), organs (4 items), animals (10 items), foods (4 items), numbers from one to ten, "twenty", "hundred" and "thousand" (13 items), subject pronouns (6 items), locative adverbs (4 items), demonstratives (2 items), and other words (10 items). By

other words here we mean the words which are not classified in none of the classes. Then the data are transcribed by IPA alphabets. The research corpus consists of 860 words. The corpus is described and analyzed based on theoretical framework. The comparison with Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic is done according to the author's linguistic intuition and the available Turkic dictionaries.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Comparing the studied words in Kerman Turkic with their equivalents in Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic shows that regardless of differences in phonology, most of the words are similar in both Turkic varieties. Lots of the words in "kinship word" category, are similar to Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic except for "sister", "brother" and "grandfather" which are affected by local Persian spoken in the region. It can be concluded that the "kinship words" are considered as basic vocabularies and they are less subject to change in spite of language contact. The "nature words" are the same as the words in Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic. The similarities show that the "nature words" are basic words too. But the words which belong to "plants" category, are affected by local Persian under the language contact situations more than others. The words for "organs" in Kerman Turkic are completely the same as their equivalents in Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic. The most words for "animal" category are the same, two words out of five, are borrowed words for Azeri Turkic. The words in "edible" category are same in both varieties except for two which are borrowed from Persian. "Subject pronouns" are completely the same. Therefore, it can be concluded that they are the basic words in the languages. The small numbers (one to ten) are considered as basic words, so in both Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic and Kerman Turkic are the same. However, for the equivalents of "twenty", "hundred" and "thousands" the informants express the Persian words for them except the speakers of one village who use the words close to Azeri ones. In both Turkic varieties the equivalents for the "demonstratives" are the same except in some cases that the speakers use Persian words under the influence of interviewer's language. The four "locative adverbs" in Kerman Turkic are similar to Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic ones. In the last category i.e., "other words" among ten words, eight words are the same in both Turkic varieties.

4. CONCLUSION

The similarity rate of the studied words between the two Turkic varieties indicates that the Turkic language which is spoken in the Turkic-speaking villages of Orzuiye county in Kerman province like Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic is in Oghuz branch of Turkic families. Nevertheless, in spite of these similarities, a small number of differences can be observed between the studied vocabularies in two Turkic varieties and this is because of the impact of language contact. There are local Persian-speaking villages adjacent to Turkic-speaking ones in the studied area. In addition, some examined villages are in bilingual situation, that is the Persian speakers are living along with Turkic speakers in the villages. Therefore, it is expected that the two languages affect each other under the contact language situation and the effect of local Persian on the Turkic variety spoken in the studied area is obvious.

Keywords: Kerman Turkic, Language contact, Lexical differences, lexical similarities, Tabriz variety of Azeri Turkic, Turkic-speaking villages in Kerman Province