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This contribution contains an annotated edition of a sample of a Middle Azerbaijani transcription text in Georgian letters from 1739. The text is given in transliteration along with an interpretive transcription and a literal translation. Further sources, including another Middle Azerbaijani transcription text, have been consulted in order to make the linguistic material accessible.
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Introduction

The following philological notes concern the account of the birth of Jesus according to the Gospel of Luke (Lk 2.1-20) in a Middle Azerbaijani version from the 18th century. The text from which the passage under consideration has been selected is an Azerbaijani translation of the four Gospels. This text is written in Georgian letters and consequently belongs to a class of texts that in Turcology are traditionally referred to as “transcription texts”, i.e. pre-modern texts in islamicized Turkic languages that are not written in Arabic script. These texts are important for historical comparative Turcology as they are largely unaffected by the norms and conventions of the standard orthographies in Arabic script and often reflect a naïve and innocent view of the linguistic material. They also provide us with clues concerning phonetic features that are concealed in the Arabic orthography. Naturally, they are not free from problems, as they have frequently been written down by foreigners whose command of the language we cannot always be sure about, and who might have imposed features from their native tongue onto the Turkic text. The actual value of a given transcription text is strongly dependent on the particular author or writer, and of course on how the data are evaluated by the researcher, i.e. which features are chosen for investigation and whether the material is investigated with critical caution.

The text under investigation, which will be labeled G here, consists of 403 pages of Turkic material and is kept at the Museum of Local History in Zugdidi in Min-

1 The same problem pertains of course also to Turkic texts in Arabic script, many of which were also composed by non-native Turks and by Turks in bi- and multilingual environments.
grelia (signature 89:4). It is dated the 27th of November 1739 (Enwall 2010: 137-138). The text has been the object of scientific investigation before. Beltadze (1967) published linguistic observations on this text, some of which Stein (2007) has summarized. Some historical and cultural information is given by Enwall (2010). Comparative notes on the consonantism of this text are found in Rentzsch (in print).

Concerning the genesis of the Azerbaijani translation, little is known. There is some relation between text G and an earlier transcription text in Latin script (henceforward L), which was recorded by the French traveler Balthasar de Lauzière in Isfahan and handed over to the Swedish scholar Johan Gabriel Sparwenfeld, who brought it to Sweden in 1687.2 Text L contains the Gospels of Matthew and John. Parts of these two texts must be based on a common model, which is lost. Some passages of L and G are almost completely identical, except for a few differences concerning phonetics, morphology and syntax that seem to reflect the dialectal situation of the respective environment; other passages are completely different. It is obvious that the younger text G cannot directly derive from the older text L, as G contains material that is missing in L. As a whole, L is much more carefully written than G and seems to reflect the natural features of the language more accurately. G appears to be more “standardized” with less phonetic vacillation, but copied negligently and with many mistakes, probably by a copyist with only meager command of Azerbaijani.


Some features that distinguish text G from L, and make G a very valuable source for supplementing the data of L, are the differentiation between <g> and <γ> (ג vs. ღ; L: always <g>) and between <q>, <k> and <x> (צ vs. ק vs. ק; L: always <k>). Moreover, at several places of articulation (not the uvular position, though), the Georgian script distinguishes between three classes of plosives (and affricates as well), namely voiceless aspirated (ג, ט, ק; in this contribution transliterated p, t, k), voiceless unaspirated with glottalization (ך, דך, םך; transliterated p̣, ṭ, ḳ) and voiced (ד, דג; transliterated b, d, g). As I have argued elsewhere (Rentzsch in print), in initial position (in which they do not occur in the passage under consideration here) the letters <p t k> seem to represent the transitional stage in the characteristic Oghuz shift from [b t k] to [p d g]. This transitional stage, usually a voiceless unaspirated

2 On this text, see Johanson 1985a and 1985b.
plosive (tenuis inaspirata),\textsuperscript{3} is traditionally represented by the symbols BDG in Turcology, which practice is adapted here for the phonetic interpretation of the orthography. Whether writings like ṭaš in text G mean that in the dialect underlying this text there was in fact a glottalized articulation [t’aš] (which is very well possible in a Georgian-Azeri contact setting), or whether they represent just the unaspirated tenuis with its features [-aspirated] and [-voiced], i.e. a sound for which neither the letter <t> nor the letter <d> was considered appropriate, is an open question. In the present passage, the letters <ṭ> and <ḳ> occur only word-internally after a preceding voiceless consonant (čxṭi, vaxṭ, askar etc.).\textsuperscript{4} While in theory, it would be possible to have glottalized plosives in this environment as well, it seems reasonable to assume that here at least these graphemes just represent sounds that were neither aspirated nor voiced, which is a quite common realization in this position in several Oghuz varieties. For that reason, these letters have been transcribed as D and G in the phonetic interpretation (čṭxD, vaxD, asGär).

Graphetical remarks

The manuscript is written in the Mxedruli variant of the Georgian script. The handwriting is quite neat and well readable. As a natural result of the writing flow, some ligatures occur.\textsuperscript{5} For example, the letters <x> (b), <z> (b) and <s> (b) are often connected with the preceding letter, e.g. in <čxub> [201/18], <szun> [201/11] and <qaisardan> [200/15]. <i> (o) and <a> (o) are often connected to one another, in that the right downstroke of the <i> functions as the left upstroke of the <a> as well, e.g. <zuriatundan> [201/1-2] and the first <ia> in <iaudiata> [200/19]. The combination of the letters <e> (g) and <ǰ> (χ) results in a special ligature, which can be seen in [202/9]. Some letters are occasionally written above or below the writing line. This phenomenon is especially frequent with the letters <l> (c), <d> (c) and <γ> (c), which are often connected to the preceding letter and elevated above the normal position (compare <ǰalil> [200/19], <zuriatundan> [201/1-2], <idi> [201/5 et passim], <ušaγi> [201/13]). The letter <i> (o) is sometimes lowered, e.g. when combined with a preceding <r> (Φ), in which case it is added as a low hook to the right downstroke of the <r> (compare <šhrindan> [200/19], <birini> [201/19]). The letter <o> (o) appears, besides in its usual form, also in a reduced form, which looks either as a slightly curved line pointing upwards to the right (as in

\textsuperscript{3} It may surface as a glottalized voiceless unaspirated plosive in specific language contact settings. Several Anatolian (probably also Azerbaijani) dialects actually have glottalized consonants.

\textsuperscript{4} <ṗ> does not turn up in this passage.

\textsuperscript{5} According to Enwall (2010: 138), “[t]he ligatures used are basically the same as those encountered in Georgian language manuscripts from the same period.”
The letters <v> (ვ) and <ḳ> (კ) are not easily discernible in this particular handwriting (compare <avalki> [200/16] with <askari> [201/14]).

The passage

Below, the text is provided in three versions: First, there is a transliteration of the text in Georgian letters into Latin script. This is followed by a phonetic interpretation, which of course is subjective and can be questioned in the details. Finally, a literal translation of the Azerbaijani text is given. For the interpretation, both text-internal criteria and information provided by text L<sup>6</sup> or, if there is no pre-modern evidence, by Modern Azerbaijani have been considered. At times, the Latin and Greek versions of this passage have been taken into consideration as well (Nestle & Aland 1979). The critical apparatus is given in footnotes.

The page and line numbers are given in square brackets, while the numbers of the verses are indicated in round parentheses.

Transliteration

[200/14] e pasl
(1) [15] oğularda abr čxṭi oğustos quaisardan ki ja[16]mi olkasi iazsun
(2) bu avalki iazi iazlmişdi qa[17]rin uşına şam hakimi
(3) u hamisi gedarlar idi b[18]r birisi şahrina ki iazsun
(4) ioseb gena čxṭi jali olkasinda nazaret şhrinda iaudiatda laut [201/1] şharina
(5) ki iazsun mariam nšanluγ inan iki ğanlu
(6) onda olduglari vaxṭ doγm[4]ay sahtı tamam oldı
(7) aval ilki oṛṭy doγdi sa[5]rdi gandini axora qoidi čunki ieri iox idi
(8) čobanlar oveliatda oiaγ idilə[7]r surilarini þeṣada saxleub
(10) priştə dedi onlə[10]ra qorxmauz iengi sevmaγ sza getururam ki hamı
(11) čunki bugun şun qurtaran doγldi [12] isa rabi dur şharinda
(12) u bu nšan sza olu[13]r uṣəγi bulursz sarılımiş axora qoimliš

<qoidi> [201/5]) or just a short horizontal line (as in <čobanlar> [201/6; 201/19],
<qorhqdilar> [201/9], <axor> [201/5; 201/13; but not 202/3!]).

While the Gospel of Luke is not included in text L, many lexical items naturally occur there as well.
(14) beuklu 
γ tan 
γ alar [16] da u ier üstinda salamat adamlara ki aradati eidu [17] r
v pas l
(15) [18] malaiklar goga 
č xub onlarindan ki airldila [19] r čobanlar bir birina dedilar betlema gedarum [202/1] gorarum bza taŋri bilduran olmiş sozi
(18) u harkim eşidi mat oldi u onlara ş [6] banlarun deduglarindan
(19) mariam bu sozlari [7] saxlar idi

Interpretation

5. pas 
(1) o günlärđä änbr, čixdi oğusDos qaysardan ki jämä ölkäsi yazilsun. 
(2) bu ävvälki yazı yazilmışdï, qarinus šâm hâkimi. 
(3) væ hâmisi gedärâr idî hâr birisi sahrina ki yazılısun. 
(4) yoseb genâ čixdi jalll ölkäsindä nazaret sahrindän yahudiyatda dâvut sâhrinâ adî betenia, onu içündi dâvut zûrriyâtundan evindän idi,

7 The Georgian letter <e> represents the numerical value ‘5’.
8 < Ar. ħos. The realization of /f/ (which is not a native Turkic sound) as /p/ is extremely common in the Turkic languages. Cf. pršta/pršta [201/7, 201/9, 201/14].
9 <abr>: < Ar. 'ämër 'decree'; occurs in text G elsewhere as <ämër> or <ambr>, i.e. /ämør/ or /ämbr/, the latter with ex crescence, i.e. non-etymological insertion of the corresponding plosive. In the Turkic languages, this phenomenon is particularly common with the consonant /ŋ/, e.g. yaŋgı > yaŋgî ‘new’. Text L has this lexeme in the forms <ember>, <ember>, <ambre> and <ambr>, i.e. always with ex crescence.
10 <olkasi> with a mid vowel as in Standard Azerbaijani əlkə (ADIL 3: 464); cf. L <ulke>, Tur. ulke.
11 The manuscript has <iazsun>, but our expectation would be <iazlsun>, which is actually found in a similar construction in [200/18].
12 Lat. haec descriptio prima facta est. The Azerbaijani translation looks awkward, as it translates *haec prima descriptio facta erat, cf. translation.
13 <qarin ustina>, lit. ‘onto the stomach’, is without doubt a corruption of something that should be <qarinus> for ‘Quirinius’, ‘Quirinus’, ‘Cyrius’ etc., which was obviously ‘corrected’ by the copyist into the noun qarin and the postposition üstina <ustina>, which is extremely common.
14 <hr> with the vowel dropped, possibly due to the line break.
15 ‘Bethany’. Inserted by mistake for <betlem> ‘Bethlehem’, cf. [201/18].
16 Regular: onun.
(5) ki yazılısn meryam nişanlı i̇n, ıkı jânlu¹⁹.
(6) onda oldurırlar²⁰ vaxd doşmaray²¹ sahâri²² tamam oldi.
(7) âvvâl ıkı²³ ûrî doşdi, sardi gândini²⁴, âxûrâ²⁵ qoydî, ênki yeri yox i̇dî qondurîlaysî yerdâ.
(8) çobanlar o veliāyâtda²⁶ oyağ²⁷ idîlîr, sürîlîrîni²⁸ gejîdî saxîyub.
(9) allâhun pirişâsi²⁹ durdî yenlîrînî 30 và allâhun nûr düșdü üşülârinî. çox qordîlar.³¹

¹⁸ <evildan>.
²⁰ <olduglari> with <g> instead of <ğ>.
²¹ doşmaray ‘to give birth’, cf. doşdi ‘she gave birth’ [201/4] and doşldi ‘he has been born’ [201/11]. In this text, doğ is a transitive verb, while doğul- (with the passive suffix) is intransitive. The same situation pertains in Standard Azerbaijani: doğmaq ‘dünyaya bala götürmek, balalaşmaq’ (ADIL 2: 124); doğulmaq ‘anadan olmaq, dünyaya gelmek’ (ADIL 2: 126). This situation is typical for a couple of Eastern Turkic languages, while in Turkish doğmaq means ‘to be born’, and doğurmak (with the causative suffix) is ‘to give birth’. Old Turkic had tuğ ‘to be born’ (same meaning as in Turkish), see Clauson 1972: 465.
²² < Ar. sâ ‘at ‘hour’. The Arabic ‘Ain surfaces as /h/ in this lexeme in text G, which reflects a development that is quite common in several Turkic varieties. – The lexeme is written either <saht> or <sahat> in text G, cf. [201/13].
²³ âvvâl and ıkî are synonymous. About ilk vs. ilkî cf. Clauson 1972: 140. Standard Azerbaijani has ilk (ADIL 2: 389), Turkmen ilki (TDS 336).
²⁴ The pronominal stem gândî still survives in this source, where it coexists with öç. In Modern Azerbaijani, gândî has been replaced totally by öç. – In texts G and L, both gândî and öç are commonly employed not in their original function as a reflexive pronoun, but as a personal pronoun (only in oblique cases). Another competing pronoun in these texts is bilâ (originally ‘with’, ‘together’). Cf. Csató 2002-2003; Bulut 2003. For examples of pronominal uses of bilâ in text L, see Rentzsch (in print).
²⁵ < Prs. âhûr. For this lexeme, Steingass (1892: 26) gives the meanings ‘a stable, stall; litter or straw laid under cattle; the collar-bone’. The meaning ‘manger’ (cf. Lat. in praesepio), however, is given by Junker & Alavi 1965: 15 (‘Pferdestall, Pferdeboxe; Krippe; Viehstall’). In Ottoman Turkish, the meaning ‘manger’ does not seem to be common, cf. e.g. Redhouse 1968: 26 (‘stable, shed, barn’).
²⁶ <oveliatda>, Lat. in regione.
²⁹ < Prs. firişta ‘angel’ (Steingass 1892: 919). Written either <prişta> or <priştâ> in text G [201/7, 201/8, 201/14]. Cf. L <prichta>, <prista>, <prischta>.
PirişDä dedi onlara: qorxmayunuz, yenə sevma sizä getürürəm ki hämi ra’iyätə olur.

11 cümki bugün sizə olur: uşarı bulursiz sarılmış. 34 o sahada pirişDä inan gög asgə r çıx kördü. Hax ta’alaya sükr edüb diyarlar idi:

14 beyükli tanrîya ujalarda və yer üstində salamât adamıla ki irädəti eyi dur!

15 malayiklər gögü çıxub onlarından ayrıldilar çobanlar birbirinə dedilər: betlemə gedərük göərək bizə tən Dində salırmət adamıla ki irädəti eyi dur!}

30 < yanlarında. The striking fronting yan > yen is frequent in both text G and text L (where we find <yenina>, <yenuma>, <yenlarinda> etc.). The fronting seems to be triggered by the initial y-. Variants with <a> occur as well in both texts.

31 In this instance written <qorhq->, but <qorx-> is common, cf. [201/10].

32 Lagaudium magnum. – The stem sev- usually means ‘to love, to like’. However, in L and G the lexeme sevma commonly seems to mean ‘gladness, joy’, cf. sevin-. Examples from text L: odur ki suzlari echitur ve se uemag inan kaboul eider gandilarini ‘This is the one who hears the words and receives them with joy’ (Mt 13.20); guir cenun aganun sevemaguina ‘Enter into the joy of your master’ (Mt 25.23). – The verbal noun in -ma is invariably back in text G, which complies with the situation in several Turkic varieties in close contact to Persian.

33 < Ar. ra’īya ‘ flock, parish, subjects, citizens (Herde, Pfarrgemeinde, Pfarrrei, Untertanen, Bürger)’ (Wehr 1985: 480).


35 Lat. multitudo militiae caelestis; the NRSV translates ‘a multitude of the heavenly host’. While <k> points to a front stem, <γ> indicates a back suffix; obviously the sound harmony is violated in this instance.

36 Lat. altissimus. – L <ougia> [uğ], hence the interpretation of G <aça> as [uğ], not [iğ], uğ has velar vowels in Standard Azerbaijani (uca, ADIL 4: 238) and Turkmen (TRS 656), while it has palatal vowels in Turkish (yüce) and several Anatolian, Azerbaijani and South Oghuz dialects.

37 The Georgian letter <v> represents the numerical value ‘6’.

38 Without obvious reason with possessive suffix.

39 The subjunctor ki (from Persian) marks the complete passage malayiklər...ayırlılar as an embedded temporal clause.

40 <gedarum gorarum> is to translate Lat. transseamus [...] videamus. The Azerbaijani forms look like 1st person singular forms at first sight, but actually the 1st person singular (which is inappropriate here) should be <gedarum goraram>, while the 1st person plural would be <gedaruk goraruk>. As both possible readings imply one wrong letter per word,
the interpretation as 1st person plural, which is adequate in terms of content, is to be preferred here.

42 Lat. hoc verbum quod factum est quod fecit Dominus. From the Azerbaijani perspective, the phrase bizä tajri bildur'an olmïs sözi is odd in two respects. First, while the combination of two participles is principally possible in periphrastic constructions, e.g. *bildürmiš olduγ, the involvement of the participle -(y)An in such constructions is very uncommon in either Azerbaijani or Turkish. Here, rather two independent participles seem to be intended: olmïs for Lat. quod factum est and tajri bildur'an for Lat. quod fecit Dominus. Secondly, the whole relative clause has an Eastern Turkic appearance, as in Western Oghuz we would expect the subject of the relative clause to be in the Genitive case if it is not co-indexed with the head.

43 <talasuk> very much looks like Ar. talâṣuq ‘attachment’ (‘Aneinanderhaften, gegenseitige Berührung, Zusammenhang’, Wehr 1985: 1154), but this renders the passage difficult to interpret. Here, the English translation as ‘together’ has been attempted. Another possibility is that <talasuk> is a corruption of some form of Prs. talâš ‘confusion, embarrassment, hurry’, which could comply with Lat. festinantes but would presuppose a misreading of a model either in Arabic or possibly in Latin script, where <s> and <š> can be confused. In Georgian script, <s> and <š> look very different.

44 <gordugini vaxD> does not make sense, while *gördügi vaxD does. The causative seems more reasonable in terms of content. Greek has ἐγνωρισαν from γνωρίζω, which can mean both ‘to make known’ and ‘to recognize’ (Györkösy et al. 1993: 210), while the Vulgata has cognoverunt ‘they recognized’ from cognosco (cf. Finály 1884: 398-399), which does not make much sense in this context. The Azerbaijani form could either be a misspelling of *bildürdilär or a correct translation of the bad Latin form.

45 <bildilar>. The causative seems more reasonable in terms of content. Greek has ἐγνωρισαν from γνωρίζω, which can mean both ‘to make known’ and ‘to recognize’ (Györkösy et al. 1993: 210), while the Vulgata has cognoverunt ‘they recognized’ from cognosco (cf. Finály 1884: 398-399), which does not make much sense in this context. The Azerbaijani form could either be a misspelling of *bildürdilär or a correct translation of the bad Latin form.


47 <u onlara>: The conjunct u does not make sense here.


49 ne≤ ki ‘as’, lit.: ‘how-that’. Compare Chaghatay necík kim ‘as’ (for an example, see Baburnama 129a3). Items composed of a native question word and ki(m) are frequent in languages in close contact with Persian, cf. Hindi kyothki ‘because’, lit. ‘why-that’.
Literal translation

Chapter 550
(1) In those days a decree went out from Emperor Augustus that his whole country should be registered.
(2) This first writing had been written; Quirinius was the ruler of Syria.
(3) And all of them were going, everybody to his town, in order to be registered.
(4) Joseph went out as well from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to the city of David in Judea, its name was Bethany (sic), because he was of the offspring and house of David,
(5) in order to be registered together with his fiancée Mary; she was pregnant.
(6) When they were there, the hour of giving birth was fulfilled.
(7) She gave birth to the first son, wrapped him and put him into a manger, because there was no place for them where they had settled down.
(8) In that area, shepherds were awake, keeping watch over their flocks in the night.
(9) The angel of God stood by their side and God’s light fell upon them. They were very terrified.
(10) The angel said to them: Do not be afraid, I am bringing you a new joy, which will be for all the people.
(11) Because today your savior has been born, he is Jesus, my Lord, in the city of David.
(12) And this will be a sign for you: You will find the child wrapped and put into a manger.
(13) At that time, many heavenly troops became visible with the angel. Praising God the Exalted one, they were saying:
(14) Greatness to God on high, and peace on earth for those men, of whom his will is good.

Chapter 6
(15) When the angels went into heaven and left them, the shepherds said to one another: We go to Bethlehem and see the word that God has made known to us.
(16) Together they came and found Mary and Joseph and the child (which had been) laid into the manger.
(17) When they saw this, they made known the word said to them about the one being great,
(18) and everybody who heard this became stunned by the things the shepherds told them.
(19) Mary treasured these words.

50 In text G, the chapters are divided and numbered differently from the common tradition.
The shepherds returned and thanked God because of the things they had seen and heard, as he had told it to them.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Transcription text in Georgian script, 1739</td>
<td>Ott.Tur. Ottoman Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prs.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.Az.</td>
<td>Standard Azerbaijani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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