

**ТҮРКІТАНУ
ТЮРКОЛОГИЯ
TURKOLOGY**

IRSTI: 18.00

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9618-5614>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5010-1019>

Ercan Alkaya.*, Ertuğrul Zorlu

Prof.Dr. Fırat University. Elazığ, Türkiye

Arş.Gör. Osmaniye Korkut Ata University. Osmaniye, Türkiye

**THE PLACE OF THE OF THE BULGAR GROUP IN THE CLASSIFICATIONS
OF THE TURKIC DIALECTS**

***Corresponding author:** ealkaya16@gmail.com

Abstract: Turkic dialects have been classified by many researchers since old times. These classifications vary and change in many ways. At the same time, they also have effects on each other in terms of method, system, etc. In these classifications, which ethnic, phonetic, morphological and geographical criteria were taken as basis within the system, the places of Turkic dialects changed and they were evaluated in different groups.

Chuvash Turkic and its predecessor Volga Bulgar Turkic are Turkic dialects that mostly taken place in the classification of Turkic dialects; however, some authors did not include these Turkic dialects. And Chuvash Turkic weren't evaluated under the same title in every classification. It was taken place in different classifications with different titles by using different criteria. In this study, the place of Chuvash and Volga Bulgar Turkic in the classification of Turkic dialects and the criteria used in the classification of these dialects have been examined.

Key Words: Chuvash Turkic, Volga Bulgar Turkic, classification of Turkic dialects, Bulgar group Turkic dialects.

FTAXP: 18.00

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9618-5614>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5010-1019>

Беркан Алкая.*, Ертугрул Зорлу

Фират университетінің профессоры, доктор Элазиг, Түркия

Османия Коркут Али атындағы Университет. Османия, Түркия

ТҮРКІ ДИАЛЕКТІЛЕРІНІҢ ЖІКТЕЛУІНДЕГІ БОЛГАР ТОБЫНЫҢ ОРНЫ

Автор-корреспондент: ealkaya16@gmail.com

Түйін: түркі диалектілерін көптеген зерттеушілер бұрыннан жіктеген. Бұл жіктеулер көптеген жолдармен ерекшеленеді. Сонымен қатар, олар бір-біріне әдіс, жүйе және т.б. тұрғысынан әсер етеді. этникалық, фонетикалық, морфологиялық және географиялық критерийлер негізге алынған осы жіктеулерде түркі диалектілерінің орындары өзгеріп, олар әртүрлі топтарда бағаланды.

Чуваш түркі тілі және оның алдындағы Еділ-Болгар түркі тілі-негізінен түркі диалектілерінің жіктелуінде кездесетін түркі диалектілері; дегенмен, кейбір авторлар бұл түркі диалектілерін қамтымаған. Чуваш түркі тілі әр классификацияда бірдей атпен бағаланбаған. Ол әртүрлі атаулармен және әртүрлі критерийлерді қолдана отырып, әртүрлі классификацияларға енгізілді. Бұл зерттеуде чуваш және Еділ-Болгар түркі тілдерінің түркі диалектілерін жіктеудегі орны және осы диалектілерді жіктеуде қолданылатын критерийлер қарастырылды.

Кілт сөздер: Чуваш-түркі, Еділ-Болгар-түркі, түркі диалектілерінің жіктелуі, түркі диалектілерінің Болгар тобы

МРНТИ: 18.00

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9618-5614>

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5010-1019>

Беркан Алкая.*, Ертугрул Зорлу
профессор университета Фират д-р Элязыг, Турция
Университет имени Османия Коркут Ата. Османия, Турция
**МЕСТО БУЛГАРСКОЙ ГРУППЫ В КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯХ ТЮРКСКИХ
ДИАЛЕКТОВ**

Автор-корреспондент: ealkaya16@gmail.com

Аннотация: Тюркские диалекты издавна классифицировались многими исследователями. Эти классификации различаются по многим параметрам. В то же время они оказывают влияние друг на друга с точки зрения метода, системы и т.д. В этих классификациях, за основу которых были взяты этнические, фонетические, морфологические и географические критерии, места тюркских диалектов менялись, и они оценивались в разных группах.

Чувашский тюркский язык и его предшественник волжско-булгарский тюркский язык - это тюркские диалекты, которые в основном фигурируют в классификации тюркских диалектов; однако некоторые авторы не включали эти тюркские диалекты. И чувашский тюркский язык не оценивался под одним и тем же названием в каждой классификации. Он был включен в разные классификации с разными названиями и с использованием разных критериев. В этом исследовании было рассмотрено место чувашского и волжско-булгарского тюркоязычных языков в классификации тюркских диалектов и критерии, используемые при классификации этих диалектов.

Ключевые слова: чувашско-тюркский, волжско-булгарско-тюркский, классификация тюркских диалектов, булгарская группа тюркских диалектов

Introduction

Turkic is a language that was divided into branches and these branches also have variations within themselves. The branches/dialects of Turkic, which are also accepted as a language family by some researchers, are at different distances from each other in terms of closeness. Although there are many factors affecting this distance, the most important factor is related to the time of separation from the mother language, or the common root language shared with the other group. The languages of the tribes and communities that are separated from each other due to religious, political, geographical, economic etc. reasons also begin to differentiate over time. This difference increases in time and as a result, new dialects and languages that are separated from the mother tongue are formed at a later stage. This is the case for Turkic.

The Turkic language was divided into two main branches during the Early Turkic period due to the reasons mentioned above. In the literature of Turkology, one of these branches is called Old Eastern Turkic and the other Old Western Turkic. While Old Western Turkic is the Turkic dialect from which Chuvash Turkic, one of the modern Turkic dialects, was derived, Old Eastern Turkic is the ancestor of other Turkic dialects. For this reason, Chuvash Turkic differs from other Turkic dialects in many ways. This situation made the way Chuvash Turkic was handled in dialect classifications quite interesting. Chuvash Turkic is the only modern Turkic dialect that belongs to the Bulgar group of Turkic dialects. It is distinguished from other Turkic dialects by many features and has its own unique characteristics.

The aim of this study is to examine the place of Chuvash Turkic, which separated from Common Turkic in ancient times, and its predecessor Volga Bulgar/Bulgarian Turkic in the classifications of the Turkic language, the ways they were handled, and the criteria used when classifying these dialects.

Chuvash and Volga Bulgar Turkic in Dialect Classifications

Adelung (1806) classified Turkic dialects by considering their grammatical and lexical features. Chuvash Turkic was ranked sixth under the title of "Mongol-Tatar race" (as cited in Arat, 1953: 64-66). However, Arat (1953: 63) objected to this classification due to the place of Chuvash Turkic and stated that Chuvash Turkic should be mentioned among the Tatar dialects. At this point, it is necessary to object to Arat. Chuvash Turkic is the representative of an independent branch of Turkic, whereas Tatar dialects are a part of Common Turkic.

Klaproth (1823) created a classification based on dictionary material and gave the Turkic dialects under twenty-three headings. Chuvash is in twenty-third place (as cited in Arat, 1953: 66-67). According to Arat (1953: 67), Balbi's (1826) classification is a consistent classification within the framework of the conditions of his time. Arat is considered right in this regard. Although the criteria he used are not available, his classification seems to have been made in a systematic manner. Turkic dialects were divided into three main headings: 1. Turkic language (8 subheadings and their subheadings), 2. Yakut language, 3. Chuvash language (as cited in Arat, 1953: 67-68).

Palmblad (1827) made an ethnic classification rather than a linguistic classification. The Chuvash were classified under the title of "*Turkic-Speaking, but not of Turkic Origin Tribes*" (as cited in Arat, 1953: 69-70). It is far from being a linguistic classification. Hammer (1836) classified Chuvash together with Yakut Turkic and Bashkir Turkic under the title of "Siberia" (as cited in Arat, 1953: 70-72). In this classification, which has its own errors, it is not correct to include Chuvash together with Bashkir and Yakut under the title of "Siberia". Berezin (1849), on the other hand, did not include Chuvash Turkic in his classification (as cited in Arat, 1953: 72-74).

Radloff (1882) based his classification on phonetic criteria and made a more systematic classification than the ones listed before. In his work "*Phonetik der nördlichen türkischen Sprachen*" he gives the phonetic characteristics of Turkic dialect groups and their dialects. However, Radloff did not include Chuvash Turkic and Yakut Turkic in his classification. According to Radloff, Chuvash Turkic was not a Turkic language in essence, but it became Turkic (Radloff, 1882: 89). In this respect, he expressed an unacceptable view.

Vambery (1885) made a classification based on ethnicity and geography rather than a linguistic classification. In this classification, the Chuvash were grouped together with Kazan, Bashkir, Mishar and Tatar under the name of "Volga Turks" (as cited in Arat, 1953: 88). It is a geographical classification that should not be accepted as a language classification; because while the speakers of the other Turkic dialects with which it was given speak with a dialect based on -z, Chuvash Turkic is a Turkic dialect based on -r. Furthermore, Chuvash Turkic is clearly distinguished from these dialects in terms of both phonetics and morphology. Katanov (1894) did not include Chuvash Turkic in his classification (as cited in Arat, 1953: 89-91).

There is no Chuvash Turkic in Aristov's (1896) classification (as cited in Arat, 1953: 91-92). Although he mentioned the Volga region under the title of the Western group, this is not enough. There is no Chuvash Turkic in Çahun's (1896) classification either (as cited in Arat, 1953: 92-93).

Korsh (1910) emphasized that Turkic dialects can be classified according to the status of the /g/ sound and the structure of the present tense. It is incomplete as a system, but it is not wrong. Using inadequate criteria while classifying dialects has led to the creation of incorrect dialect groups. He classified Chuvash Turkic together with Yakut Turkic in the second subgroup under the "mixed group" that he gave as the fourth heading, and in the first subgroup there are Chagatai dialects, and dialects of New Uyghur Turkic Dialects such as Tarançi, Hami, Aksu, and Kaşgar (as cited in Arat, 1953: 93-95). Chuvash Turkic cannot be classified under the same subheading as these dialects. Yakut Turkic and Chuvash Turkic are two different Turkic dialects.

Ramstedt classified Turkic dialects according to the case of the -ag- sound group at the end

of monosyllabic words, the case of the /d/ > /z, y/ sound in the Old Turkic period, and the case of the /t/ sound at the beginning of words, and distinguished Chuvash Turkic from other dialects according to the tag >tu form (as cited in. Tekin, 2013a: 322).

Németh (1917) divided Turkic dialects into two as "y-" and "s-" and gave Chuvash Turkic together with Yakut Turkic under the title of s- group (as cited in Arat, 1953: 96-97). This sound event is one of the important changes seen in Turkic dialects. However, using it alone as a criterion is not enough. Chuvash Turkic and Yakut Turkic were given under the title of "s-". Tekin (2013a: 324) objected to Chuvash Turkic and Yakut Turkic being shown as close relatives in the classification. The sound in Chuvash Turkic is the sound /ş/ and it is seen that this sound was in the structures with /ç/ and /c/ in the Volga Bulgar Turkic period. Although the sounds /s/ in Yakut Turkic and /ş/ in Chuvash are used parallel to each other, they are not similar sounds in terms of their formation. It is clear that initial y- sound are not found in all the Turkic dialects listed in the the y- subgroup, as Tekin (2013a: 324) also states. This is clearly seen in the table quoted from Alkaya (2017: 26):

"The appearance of y- in the front voice position in the Turkic dialects"						
y-	c-	j-	ç-	s-	ş-	y- ~ c-
BaşkurtN	Kırgız	Kaza	Tuva		Çuvaş	
ogayKırım-	Karaçay- k		Hakas	Yakut		Tatar
Tatar	Balkar	Kara				
KumukKarayT	Altay	kalpak				
ürkiyeAzerbay						
canTürkmenGa						
gavuzÖzbek						
Uygur						

(Alkaya, 2017: 26)

Samoyloviç (1922) classified Turkic dialects using the following criteria: 1. z>r; 2. d > r, d, y; 3. bol- >ol-; 4. -ag >- İv/-u, -ag>-aw; 5. -ıg>ı, -ıg, ık,-ı; 6. -gan> -nı, -gan, -an (as cited in Arat, 1953: 97-102; Tekin, 2013a: 324).

Based on the above changes, Samoylovich divided the Turkic dialects into six groups. He gave Chuvash Turkic under the title of "r-group (Bulgarian)" together with the historical dialects of Danube and Volga Bulgarian Turkic and showed their features as follows: "z>r (tokuz>tihir), d>r (adak>ura), bol->pul, -ag>-İv>-u, -ıg>-İ, -gan>-nı" (as cited in Tekin, 2013a: 324).

The place of Chuvash Turkic was determined in the most accurate way among the classifications made up to that period and distinctive phonetic criteria were used. However, although it is a very systematic and linguistic classification, it also has some errors. First of all, the verb pul- developed from the verb bal-, not from the verb bol-. This is clearly seen in the Volga Bulgar inscriptions. Probably, in the Proto-Turkic period, the /a/ sound in this verb preserved its existence in the –r group, while it turned into the /o/ sound in the -z group. In other language groups (Persian, etc.), a>o or a>u transitions are also common. Our other objection is that the suffix –nı, which is a participle-verb suffix and past tense, were accepted as derived from the suffix -gan by Samaylovich. In Chuvash Turkic, there is the suffix –an, which developed from the suffix –gan. The origin of the suffix -nı should be sought in the suffix -mİş in Common Turkic.

Bogoroditsky, in his first classification (1922), gave Chuvash Turkic in the seventh place and added that there was not enough information about its origin. However, in his second classification made in 1934, he did not count Chuvash Turkic among the Turkic dialects. He

considered it as an independent Altaic language like Mongolian and Manchu-Tungusic (as cited in Arat, 1953:102-105). While the history and language structure of the Chuvash are clearly evident, it is not correct to equate it with two distant relatives or neighboring languages such as Mongolian and Manchu-Tungusic.

Ligeti (1941) grouped Turkic dialects into six groups and showed Chuvash Turkic in fifth place. Chuvash Turkic, which he considered as an independent dialect, was followed by Yakut Turkic, which was also considered as an independent dialect, in sixth place (as cited in Arat, 1953: 105-107).

Räsänen (1949) tried to complete Ramstedt's classification with Radloff and Samoylovich (as cited in Arat, 1953: 107). He criticized the fact that Chuvash Turkic, which he considered under the title of 1(A) "Chuvash Language", was not shown in other classifications, was considered as a Turkified Finno-Ugric language, was considered as an independent member of the Altaic language group and was considered in the s- group with Yakut. He stated that Chuvash Turkic contains many lost archaic features of Turkic and that it was not a mixed language (as cited in Arat, 1953: 107).

Baskakov's classification in his book "Türk Dillerinin Tarihi-Tipolojik Sesbilimi" [History of Turkic Languages - Typological Phonology] is based on two systems. In the first system, it consists of general features for certain dialect groups, and in the second system, it consists of special, distinctive features for these dialects to separate sub-dialects and accents. In other words, there are the principles that separate dialect groups from each other, and then there are the principles that separate dialect groups within themselves. In his own words, as a result of existing monographic research, he divided the Turkic dialects into two as "Western Hun" and "Eastern Hun" (Baskakov, 2006: 115).

In Baskakov's classification, historical and contemporary dialects were considered together, but only the phonetic distinctive structure of contemporary dialects was given. In the Western Hun Branch of the Turkic dialects that he divided into two, Baskakov included Chuvash Turkic in the "Bulgar Group" together with the historical dialects Bulgar Turkic, Khazar Turkic, Avar Turkic and the language of the Sabirs. In addition to the Bulgar group, this group also includes the Oghuz Group, the Kipchak Group and the Karluk Group. In the Eastern Hun branch, there is the Uyghur-Oghuz Group and the Kirghiz-Kipchak Group (Baskakov, 2006: 115-188). He distinguished the Western Hun branch from the Eastern Hun branch according to the following characteristics:

1. Absence of secondary long vowels,
2. Transformation of d/t- (and transitional forms) sounds into r and y,
3. Existence of a clear distinction between voiced and voiceless sounds (b/p, z/s, d/t, g/k)

(Baskakov, 2006: 118).

Baskakov (2006) gave the following characteristics of the Bulgar group: "a/e > y/i ~ u/ü: *pilik* "five", *yul-* "to stay"; o/ö > u/ü: *vut* "fire"; full vowelization: *kīvak* "sky, blue"; v-derived in the front vowel: *vun* ~ von "ten", y-derived in the front vowel: *yır* "trace"; r ~ z > r: *hir* "girl"; ş ~ l > l: *hıl* "winter"; ç ~ (c) ~ ş (~s) ~ s (ş); /h/ derived in the front vowel: *hoturogur* "thirty Ogur"; k ~ ħ ~ ğ > y: *yul-* "to stay" (Baskakov, 2006: 118).

Baskakov's (2006) classification of the Bulgar group with the dialects listed above under one heading, based on these three features, shows that he was wrong from the very beginning. First of all, it should be said that theoretically he explained the classification system correctly and that it is an orderly system. However, when it comes to practice, the criteria he took are insufficient. If his first criterion is accepted as correct, the second criterion should separate the Bulgar group from other Turkic dialects. Therefore, he contradicts himself. He emphasized that the criteria he took as basis and determined the main group should be common to all groups (Baskakov, 2006: 115-116). The Bulgar group differs from the dialects it coexists with in the Western Hun branch in many ways.

The Bulgar group is a -r/-l dialect group, while the rest are in the -z/-ş group. In Old

Turkic, the /d/ sound, which was usually found inside, is in the Bulgar group with –r-, while in the others it is in the –y-. Chuvash and Bulgar Turkic were not separated only from the Western Hun branch group but from all Turkic dialects with these two basic features. In addition, giving historical and contemporary dialects together disrupts the classification system. While Old Oghuz, the ancestor of the Oghuz group Turkic dialects, is in the Eastern Hun branch, the dialects that are its continuation are in the Western Hun branch. In short, while the classification system established by Baskakov (2006) is correct, the criteria he used are incomplete and sometimes dysfunctional, and his groupings are incorrect.

Arat (1953: 125-138) classified Turkic dialects using the criteria "y-s, r-z, l-ş, d-t-z-y, tag-tav-dag, +lı+lık, t-d" and divided them into dialect and accent groups [şive]. Chuvash Turkic was included in the "r-" group among the dialect groups. Another member of this group is Yakut Turkic in the "t-" group. The remaining Turkic dialects are given as "Turkic Accent Groups". Tekin (2013a: 331) rightly objected to the use of the /s/ sound as a criterion.

Benzing (1959a: 1-5) stated that he based his classification on a geographical method. He gave Chuvash Turkic as the only member of the Bulgar group. He emphasized that it was spoken by approximately 1.3 million people and mentioned that it was a written language. He stated that the final sound /g/ was dropped as in the Oghuz group, the /d sound in Old Turkic became /t/, and the genitive and locative cases are +ın and +a after consonants.

Menges's (1959: 5-8) classification was published together with Benzing's classification. In the classification, Chuvash Turkic was given in the Volga Bulgar Turkic or Hun Bulgar Group. He stated that this group included Volga Bulgar Turkic and Chuvash Turkic. Menges stated that this branch was the "Old Northwestern Branch" and that it did not break away from any branch of Early Turkic, but was somewhere between Early Mongolian and Early Turkic, which could be seen through some common equivalences between Mongolian and Chuvash Turkic. He also emphasized that some Hunic remnants were found in Volga Bulgar Turkic and Chuvash Turkic, and added that the sufficient intensity of the Turkification process turned this branch into a marginal Turkic language (Menges, 1959: 6).

It is not correct for Menges (1959: 6) to place this group somewhere between Early Mongolian and Early Turkic. Some equivalences between Mongolian and Chuvash Turkic are not sufficient to prove this. Menges, who mentions the existence of Hunic remnants in Chuvash Turkic, did not specify what these are. Moreover, there is no document or remnant that would satisfactorily define Hunic. Although the place of Chuvash Turkic is shown correctly within the Turkic dialects, it should be emphasized that what he says about its source is a debatable subject.

Poppe (1965), unlike others, used the name "Chuvash-Turkic Languages". He emphasized that the name of the Turkic languages was not correct with the addition of Chuvash Turkic, that all Turkic dialects except Chuvash Turkic are –z-, –ş- Turkic languages, and that Chuvash Turkic is a –r-, –l- language, close to Common Turkic, but not identical. At this point, he distinguished Chuvash Turkic from other Turkic dialects. He wrote that the predecessor of Chuvash Turkic and the predecessor of Common Turkic were separated from Proto-Turkic. He criticized Samoylovich's classification because Chuvash Turkic was given as a Turkic language (Poppe, 1965: 33-34).

Poppe (1965), who gave information about Chuvash Turkic, stated that it is the only living –r language and added that it is the successor of a dialect close to Volga Bulgar. He also said that Khazar could be a close language or dialect, but that it was not certain due to the lack of material. He also emphasized that Old Hungarian borrowed words from Volga Bulgar. He also pointed out that the Bulgar Turkic remnants in today's Hungarian are relics of Volga Bulgar Turkic (Poppe, 1965: 36-37). Poppe can be criticized for his view that the term Turkic language cannot be used for Chuvash Turkic.

Doerfer's classification is important because it includes Halach Turkic (Doerfer et al., 1971a: 175-181). He considered Chuvash Turkic in the "Chuvash or Bolgar Group". It is seen that Doerfer, who made a general classification, based it on the average of the classifications of

his predecessors. He mostly discussed the place of Halach Turkic in his classification. He emphasized the relation of the Bolgar group with rhotacism and lambdasm, and pointed out that there was a -z->-r- and -ş->-l- change, and said that since these events are not seen in Halach Turkic, it could not be included in the Bolgar group (Doerfer et al., 1971a: 176).

Tekin (2013b: 351) named his classification as "Chuvash-Turkic Languages" like Poppe. He thought that the term Turkic language would not be appropriate for Chuvash Turkic. He stated that Chuvash Turkic with other Turkic dialects could not be sister languages but the successor of two sister languages (2013b: 351). He included a lineage such as Early Turkic and Early Chuvash Turkic or Early Bulgarian Turkic derived from Proto-Turkic. However, he also has an article called "A New Classification of Turkic Languages" and here again he emphasizes that the term Chuvash-Turkic languages is more accurate (2013c: 361). Tekin distinguishes Chuvash Turkic from other Turkic dialects by using the r-z, l-ş criteria (2013b: 351).

The views expressed for Poppe (1965) on the subject of naming are also valid for him. Tekin's (2013b) finding the term Turkic language inappropriate for Chuvash Turkic, while finding it appropriate for its predecessor, Proto-Turkic, creates a contradiction in itself. Therefore, there is no harm in classifying Chuvash Turkic under Turkic dialects.

Johanson (1998: 82-83) formed his classification under six headings. Chuvash Turkic is included in the Ogur branch as the only representative of this branch. It seems like a geographical classification. However, it cannot be said to be a purely geographical classification. Because dialects such as Chuvash Turkic and Halach Turkic were not evaluated in a group with the dialects with which they share the same geography due to their differences. In addition, it is seen that some traditional classification criteria were taken as basis. For Chuvash Turkic, he showed the /r/ sound at the end of the word *tihir* "dokuz" as a criterion.

Schöning (2013: 221-257) classified Turkic dialects in a multitude of ways according to their different characteristics. However, in general, he classified Turkic dialects under the titles of "Common Turkic", "Coastal Languages", "Central Turkic", "Non-Common Turkic Languages" etc. Schöning did not take a dialect under one title, but evaluated it under different titles as a result of its characteristics. Chuvash Turkic was classified under the title of "Coastal Languages" and "Non-Common Turkic Languages" together with Halach Turkic and Lena group Turkic dialects. The reason for classifying them together is that they are outside of Common Turkic.

Conclusion

Chuvash Turkic was included as a separate branch of Turkic in most classifications. However, it was evaluated in different dialect groups in some places. It has been observed that it was evaluated under the same heading with Yakut Turkic in some times. The fact that Yakut Turkic is a Turkic dialect distant from Common Turkic had an effect on the formation of this situation, which is completely unacceptable. However, it has also been observed that Chuvash Turkic was not included in older classifications. This situation stems from the fact that some researchers accept Chuvash as a language that later became Turkic. In addition, Chuvash was not accepted as a Turkish language in Poppe's (1965) classification, but it is considered as a language related to Turkic. A similar situation is also seen in Tekin's (2013b) classification. The most important phonetic criterion used when classifying Chuvash is the r~z equivalence. In addition, phonetic criteria such as y~s equivalence and morphological criteria was also used.

Referens list:

1. Alkaya, E. (2017). Tatar Türkçesi Yazı Dilinde ve Ağzlarında y-/c- Sesi. *Uluslararası Türk Lehçe Araştırmaları Dergisi (TÜRK LAD)*, 1(1), p. 24-38.
2. Arat, R. R. (1953). Türk Şivelerinin Tasnifi. *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, p. 59-138.
3. Baskakov, N. A. (2006). *Türk Dillerinin Tarihi-Tipolojik Sesbilimi*. (K. Koç and O. S. Karaca, Çev.) İstanbul: Multilingual Yayınları.

4. Benzing, J. (1959a). Classification of the Turkic Languages. J. Deny, K. Grønbech, H. Scheeland Z. V. Toganiçinde, *PhilologiaeTurcicaeFundamenta*(p. 1-5). Wiesbaden: Tomus Primus
5. Doerfer, G., Hesse, W., Scheinhardt, H. andTezcan, S. (1971a). *Khalaj Materials*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
6. Johanson, L. (1998). The History of Turkic. L. Johansonand É. Á. Csató (Dü) içinde, *The Turkic Languages* (p. 81-125). Londraand New York: Routledge.
7. Menges, K. H. (1959). Classification of The Turkic Languages. J. Deny, K. Grønbech, H. Scheeland Z. V. Togan, *PhilologiaeTurcicaeFundamenta I* (p. 5-8). Wiesbaden: Tomus Primus.
8. Poppe, N. (1965). *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
9. Radloff, W. (1882). *Phonetik der nördlichenTürksprachen*. Leipzig.
10. Schöning, C. (2013). Modern TürkDillerininEşZamanlıTasnifiveTarihselYönleri. *DilAraştırmaları*(İ. Sarı, Translator, p. 221-257).
11. Tekin, T. (2013a). TürkDilveDiyalektlerininYeniBirTasnifi. T. Tekin, E. Yılmaz and N. Demir (Ed.), *Makaleler 3, ÇağdaşTürkDilleri*(p. 319-342). İstanbul: TDK.
12. Tekin, T. (2013b). A New Classificationof the Chuvash Turkic Languages. T. Tekin, E. Yılmaz and N. Demir (Ed.), *Makaleler 3, ÇağdaşTürkDilleri*(p. 351-359). Ankara: TDK.
13. Tekin, T. (2013c). A New Classification of the Turkic Languages. T. Tekin, E. Yılmaz and N. Demir (ed.), *Makaleler 3, ÇağdaşTürkDilleri*(p. 361-375). Ankara: TDK.

Information about the author responsible for the correspondence (place of work, phone number, e-mail): **Ercan Alkaya** - Prof. Dr. Fırat University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Contemporary Turkic Dialects and Literatures, Elazığ/Türkiye [ealkaya16@gmail.com](mailto:alkaya16@gmail.com)