

CRITICA

SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON CHUVASH

The interest in the Chuvash language has recently considerably grown. This is due to the key position of this language spoken by about 1,7 million people (census of 1970), from which 856.000 live in the Chuvash Autonomous Republic, 153.000 in the Tatar AR, 113.000 in the Kuybishev region and the rest scattered over the other territories of the Soviet Union. The Chuvash language has a special position within the network of the Turkish languages because it shows a series of features not common with the other Turkish languages, and some of these have interesting parallels in Mongolian. Most of the special Chuvash features have been recognized by Klaproth, Schott, Budenz and others, but J. Németh was the first who tried to determine the position of Chuvash. According to Németh's early opinion¹ Chuvash and Yakut underwent a common secondary development. Later on Németh himself abandoned this hypothesis, but insisted that most of the Chuvash peculiarities are secondary developments.²

¹ *Az ősjakut hangtan alapjai* [The outlines of the Proto-Yakut Phonology: *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 43 (1914), p. 278.

² From the 30's of this century Németh already abandoned this hypothesis in his university lectures. A good survey of his Turkological views can be found in: *Special'nye problemy tjurkskogo jazykoznanija v Vengrii*: *VJa* 1963: 6, pp. 126—136 and

In 1922 appeared the fundamental work of G. J. Ramstedt with the title *Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Tschuwassischen*.³ In the debated question whether Chuvash is a Turkicized Finno-Ugrian language or a genuine Turkish one, Ramstedt followed the opinion of scholars like Klaproth, Schott, Budenz, Paasonen, Gombocz, Németh and others. He clearly declared that Chuvash is «eine regelrechte Entwicklung der Türk-Sprache» (*op.cit.*, p. 34). But in contradiction to earlier opinions he considered the well-known Chuvash-Mongolian parallels (among others the rotacism and lambdaism) as preserved archaisms reflecting a pre-Turkish (Vortürkisch) stage. According to Ramstedt these pre-Turkish features do not reflect an early Turkish-Mongolian contact.⁴

Obščie problemy tjurkskogo jazykoznanija v Vengrii: *VJa* 1964: 6, pp. 119—125.

³ *JStFOu* 38 (1922—23), pp. 1—34.

⁴ «Es genügt hier klargelegt zu haben, dass das Tschuwassische eine regelrechte Entwicklung der Türk-Sprache ist und zwar ohne jede direkte Berührung mit dem Mongolischen» (p. 34). He writes, however, a few lines earlier: «Damit kommen wir aber schon auf eine andere Frage, die nach dem Lautbestand des Vortürkisch-Vormongolischen und auf die Geschichte der altaischen Ursprache. Diese Frage lasse ich aber hier absichtlich beiseite» and then he adds: «Sie kann ja nichts liefern zur Erklärung der Stellung der Tschuwassischen und des Tschuwassischen zu den Dialekten der übrigen länger zusammengebliebenen Türken».

1. The accumulation of knowledge on Chuvash and the continuing debates on its position inspired N. Poppe who, after more than 50 years and a series of important works written by himself on this and connected questions, returned to the problem of the position of Chuvash. It is not a mere chance that even the title of his paper is echoing that of Ramstedt: *Zur Stellung des Tschuwaschischen*.⁵ Poppe has outlined the position of Chuvash in one of his earlier works as follows⁶

Pre-Turkic	
Proto-Chuvash	Proto-Turkic
Chuvash	Presently existing Turkish languages
I II III IV V	

Here I. is Yakut, II. the Northern or Siberian languages (Tuva, Karagas, Abakan dialects, Baraba, Altai, Teleut), III. Western group called also Kipchak (Kirgiz, Kazak, Nogai, Karai, Kuman, Tatar, Bashkir, Kumyk, Karachai-Balkar), IV. Eastern group (Modern Uigur or East Turki, Uzbek), V. Southern group (Turkmen, Anatolian Turkish or Osman-Turkish, Azerbaijan). Though there are some inconsequencies in this grouping (e.g. why is Kuman, an old language, included and other old Turkish languages not?), for the time being this seems to be the only acceptable one if this type of grouping can be maintained at all.⁷ The fact that Poppe

⁵ *Central Asiatic Journal* 18 (1974), pp. 135—147.

⁶ *Introduction to Altaic Linguistics*, Wiesbaden 1965, p. 33.

⁷ J. H. Greenberg (*Essays in Linguistics*, 1957, p. 66) has put forward very reasonable arguments in favour of the fact that the genetic classification of the languages is not only for practical purposes but also theoretically the best way of their grouping. However in all branches of historical linguistics the areal aspect is gaining ground and if it is used for refining the genetical classification new insights can be gained. The main task in the work of classification of the Turkish languages is to detect the oldest isoglosses which crossed the ancient Turkish languages.

calls the whole group not Turkic or 'Turkish but Chuvash-Turkic (for the reason that «Chuvash is the descendant of a *r*- and *l*- language (. . .) which was close to Common Turkic (otherwise called Proto-Turkic) but not identical with the latter»), can give the impression that there are four Altaic languages (Chuvash, Turkic, Mongolian, Manchu-Tunguzian). But if he calls the stage before Proto-Chuvash: Pre-Turkic, it becomes clear that Poppe's opinion is essentially the same as that of Ramstedt and we are confronted only with a blur of terminology. This is also clear from Poppe's concluding words: «Wenn man das Čuv. zu den Türkisprachen zählt, so muss dies mit einem gewissen Vorbehalt getan werden, denn das Čuv. verhält sich nicht so zum Tatarischen wie das Türkmenische sich zum Tatarischen verhält» (*op. cit.*, p. 147). One can only but agree with the description of the situation. Quite another question is, how we do interpret it.

The special Chuvash features can be divided into three groups. To the first group pertain those which are due to the influence of the surrounding languages and to the substratum influence of languages earlier spoken on the territory where the Chuvash people lives. The most important are the influence of the Finno-Ugrian languages (Permian and Volga-Finnish) and the Volga Kipchak languages (Kazan Tatar, Misher, Bashkir). Poppe has a great merit in investigating the latter⁸ and in the main lines the former is also clear. The distinction between the second and the third group of the Chuvash peculiarities is more difficult. To the second group pertain those innovations which are due to the inner history of this language and came

⁸ *Die Tschuwassischen Lautgesetze: AM* 1 (1924), pp. 775—782; *Türkisch-Tschuwassische vergleichende Studien: Islamica* 1 (1925), pp. 409—427; *Die tschuwassische Sprache in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Türkisprachen: KCsA* 2 (1926), pp. 65—83 and the most important paper: *Die türkischen Lehnwörter im Tschuwassischen: UJb* (1927), pp. 151—156.

into being after its separation from the other Turkish languages. From these innovations those features have to be separated which are preserved archaisms.

According to Poppe: «Es ist anzunehmen, dass das Čuv. in vielen Fällen die ursprünglichen, vortürkischen Akzentverhältnisse widerspiegelt» (*op.cit.*, p. 137). Poppe reconstructs the original (Altaic) stress-system as follows: in words which had only short syllables the accent was on the first syllable. This can be observed in Chuvash and in the present Mongolian languages. The stress moved (*verschob sich*) to one of the following vowels if the latter was long. This is once more the case both in Chuvash and in Mongolian.

In the present Chuvash language we find incompletely articulated reduced vowels and vowels with full articulation. If the word only has vowels with full articulation than the syllabic stress is on this last syllable as in all Turkish languages. If this last syllable happens to be a reduced one, the syllabic stress is on the penultimate vowel if it is not reduced. If this is also reduced, the stress shifts to the ante-penultimate, etc. vowel if it is fully articulated. If there is no fully articulated vowel in the word, the syllabic stress is on the first syllable. Already these facts make it suspicious that the present Chuvash syllabic stress system could be a primary one. In words such as e.g. *xěremeslenter-* «to make reddish» according to Poppe's law the stress should be on the second syllable, though it is on the last. The secondary character of the Chuvash syllabic stress system is made clear, however, if we bear in mind that the present *reduced: fully articulated* opposition does not go back to an earlier *short:long* opposition but to a *closed:open* one. The originally closed vowels became reduced, and this is the natural cause why the last syllable lost its stress if it was originally (or secondarily) a closed one. A reduced vowel can bear a syllabic stress only if there are only reduced vowels in the word. In the word *xěřěx* «forty» the syllabic stress is on the first syllable,

but in *xěřěxri* «the one being in its forties» the stress is already on the last syllable. Thus the present Chuvash syllabic stress system is not «vortürkisch», it is a secondary Chuvash innovation and developed after the closed vowels had become reduced.

According to Poppe Chuvash *čul* «stone» goes back to an earlier **tjal* which cannot be doubted. But he then adds that this earlier **tjal* goes further back to a **tıl* which would be the Altaic form from which Mongolian *čilayun* resulted. We have here two possibilities. The *-i-* of Mongolian *čilayun* has always been a front vocalic vowel or it was originally a back vocalic one and the Mongolian front vocalic *-i-* is secondary. If we opt for the first possibility, we have to assume that the vowel harmony was not a characteristic feature of Altaic. This is in contradiction with all evidence, furthermore we know that the preclassical Mongolian orthography has preserved some hints to the fact that the *-i-* in back vocalic words was a back vocalic *ĩ*. (preclassical *qĩ-* in place of later *ki-*). If we had to depart from a once more earlier *tıl-a* it would lead to contradiction. A long back vocalic *ĩ* was a separate phoneme and had another development as **ja*. Thus *qĩn* «sheath» is in Chuvash *yěně* < **qĩni* < **qĩni*, while Chuvash *yul-* «to remain» is going back to **qjal* and the latter to **qal*. The only possible solution of these contradictions is that Mongolian *čila-yun* is a borrowing, where Mongolian *-i-* is a substitution of a foreign *ja* (*-yun* is a Mongolian suffix). Thus Chuvash *ju* < **ja* reflects an ancient Turkish **ā* and not an Altaic or pre-Turkish **ĩ* or **ĩ* and also in this case we are confronted with a special Chuvash innovation.

One of the great merits of Poppe's paper is that he called attention to the peculiarities of Chuvash morphology. In some cases it is beyond doubt that Chuvash preserved archaic morphological features. Thus e.g. the Chuvash pronouns *epě*, «I» *esě* «you» preserved the original Turkish nominative stems **bi* and **si* (*e-* is a deictic particle going back to earlier *a-* which

figures also in *akā* «this» < **a-ku* < **kü*, *avā* «that» < **a-bu* not **egü* as Poppe supposes), while in all other Turkish languages the oblique stem *ben* > *men* intruded into the nominative case and pushed out the original **bi* and **si*. One of the most striking Chuvash peculiarities is that the plural marker *-lar* known to all Turkish languages is absent in Chuvash while the Chuvash plural marker *-sem* in unknown in the other Turkish languages. Whatever the etymology of Chuvash *-sem* is,⁹ it has to be of relatively late origin for two reasons. In the Anatri dialect and the literary language this plural marker is only front vocalic also in back vocalic words. This would be impossible if it were a very old suffix. In all Turkish languages the personal possessive suffixes follow the plural marker, e.g. *at-lar-ım* «my horses», while in Chuvash first comes the possessive suffix and only after it the plural *ut-äm-sem*. This means that the Chuvash plural marker appeared in Chuvash after the full development of the system of the personal possessive suffixes i.e. relatively late.

It is true that the Chuvash interrogative pronoun *měn* seems to have no parallels in the other Turkish languages. It is a methatetic form of an earlier **nēm* which goes back to the Turkish interrogative pronoun *ne* with the enclitic *me* which is common in most Turkish languages as *neme*, *nime* etc. in place of the earlier *ne*.

The Chuvash prohibitive particle *an* is not the Altaic negative verb *e-* and the suffix of the second person *-η* as Poppe supposes, because this structure would be possible only in the future tense. Furthermore if this would be a second person form, it should have a plural as *kilēn* «you will come(sing)» *kilēr* «you will come(plur)» (< *kel-iη*, *kel-iηiz* < *kel-iηiz*). Chuvash *an* is — as Ashmarin has pointed out — a loan from Votyak which is corroborated by the structural parallelism: Votyak *en mīn*

«don't go»: *en mīne* «don't go (plur)» Chuvash *an pīr* and *an pīrār*.

Finally I would like to stress once more that it is not possible to say that the sound changes $r_2 > z$ and $l_2 > š$ did not occur in Chuvash while they did in the other Turkish languages. Whatever the phonetic peculiarities of r_1 and r_2 and l_1 and l_2 were in Proto-Turkish, they were respectively in phonemic opposition, that is Proto-Turkish had four phonemes. This fourfold opposition is preserved in all Turkish languages while r_1 and r_2 and l_1 and l_2 respectively converged in Chuvash, thus also in this case Chuvash reflects a secondary development.

In conclusion one can say that Poppe is right when he supposes that Chuvash has separated from the other Turkish languages earlier than the remaining ones from each other. During its long separate life Chuvash has preserved only very few features of the common Ancient Turkish linguistic stock that the others did not. Most of the «Chuvash peculiarities» are special Chuvash innovations. Perhaps the greatest merit of Poppe's paper is that he called attention to the morphological peculiarities of Chuvash.

2. To this important aim is devoted the second work to be reviewed. In 1976 appeared the major work of L.S. Levitskaja: *Istoričeskaja morfoložija čuvaškogo jazyka*.¹⁰ It is regrettable that her former work on the historical phonology of Chuvash remained unpublished and is accessible only in the form of an *avtoreferat*¹¹ though its manuscript is constantly used by Soviet scholars. The book under review deals exhaustively with the morphological features of Chuvash. Its main chapters are: I. Inflection, 1. Substantives, a. plural, b. possessive inflection, 2. Vocative forms, 3. Declension, 4. Pronouns, 5. Numerals, 6. The verb, 7. Participles, 8. Converbs,

¹⁰ Moscow 1976, 206 p.

¹¹ *Istoričeskaja fonetika čuvaškogo jazyka*. Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoi stepeni kandidata filologičeskikh nauk, Moscow 1966, 28 p

9. The infinitive(supine), 10. Adverbs, 11. Postpositions, 12. Particles. II. Word formation: 1. Substantives, 2. Verbs.

The work is a great step forward as compared to earlier publications. In every case the author discusses earlier opinions on the origin and functions of the given morphological feature. She includes the accessible Chuvash dialectal material and places the Chuvash data into the framework of the other Turkish languages which may offer a help to the solution of the question of the origin and development of the Chuvash data. The author is conscious of the requirement that the origin of a morphological feature can be given only if it is investigated as a part of a system, thus in many cases not isolated suffixes but their system, their modifications in the several declensions or conjugations are likewise treated. In such a work where practically the entire morphological stock has to be dealt with, it is understandable that in some cases there is no evident solution for the time being, in other cases more possibilities are of equal value at the stage of our present knowledge. It is also a merit of the book that in such cases the author does not give forced and unconvincing solutions but leaves open the yet unsolvable questions. This gives an impetus to further studies and at the same time a greater authority to those cases where Levitskaja is giving a positive solution. Levitskaja is taking into account also the possible influence of the neighbouring Finno-Ugrian languages which is realized sometimes indirectly.

One can only but regret that the rich data and the many new and good solutions are not generalized in a concluding chapter. This would have been a good help in giving answer to the important question put by Ramstedt and Poppe: what is the position of Chuvash among the Turkish languages.

For this reason, of course, attention has to be paid to those features which are present in all (or most) Turkish languages but absent from Chuvash. To this

questions scattered remarks can be found in Levitskaja's book.

In some cases it is very difficult to state whether an absence in Chuvash is an original lack or due to a secondary disappearance. I would like to give only one example. The suffix *-r* of the aorist is a common Turkish feature but it seems to be absent in Chuvash. Levitskaja deals with this question and she has three strong arguments in favour of the fact that the *-r* aorist was earlier part of the Chuvash verbal system.

1. The praesens futurum in Chuvash has the marker *-t* (*-D-*). Levitskaja quotes Ashmarin, Benzing and Ramstedt according to whom this goes back to an earlier **turur* (i.e. the *-r* aorist of the verb *tur-*, to this see also Z. Gombocz: *KCSA* I, 921–25, pp. 262–266). She points to a series of Turkish paradigms where the stages **turur* > *tur* > *tu* > *t* can be well observed.

2. The origin of the negative particle after substantives *mar* is reconstructed by her as the aorist of the negative stem of the verb *er-* «to be»: **ermä-r*, > **emär* > **mär* > *mar*.

3. The simple future in Chuvash has no special tense marker: *kaläp*, *kalän*, *kalë*, *kaläpär*, *kalär*, *kalës*. Already Ashmarin and later Räsänen expressed the opinion that here the original marker was the *-r* of the aorist, which has been dropped. Benzing and Pritsak reconstructed a suffix **γu/gü* where *-γ/g-* in postconsonantal position has been dropped. Levitskaja quotes some Turkish languages where the *-r* of the aorist has been dropped (Tatar and Bashkir dialects, Karaim, Karachay-Balkar). But this occurred in these languages only after stems ending in *-r* or *-l*. Levitskaja points to the fact that the marker of the categorical past **d* became *r* (with exception of stems ending in *-n*, *-l*, *-r* where it is *-t-*, cf. Volga Bulgarian **erti* > *eti* ~ *eči* «he was», **ölti* > *velti* «he died»). Thus the paradigm of the categorical past became: *kalarëm*, *kalarän*, *kalarë*, *kalarämär*, *kalarëš*. The fact that

the phonetical shape of the marker of the categorical past and that of the aorist coincided (both *r*) could be one of the reasons why the *r* has been elided. One question remained however open. Why is the vowel in the simple future form reduced before the personal suffixes (surely this was the cause why Benzing and Pritsak supposed here a *-yu/gü* where *u/ü > ä/ë* is normal). We find however the same reduced vowel in the concessive and the conditional. In the concessive *kalä-p-in* etc. and not **kala-p-in* and in the conditional *kalättäm*, etc. This second is the more instructive because it goes back to *kala* (< **kele*) + *erti* + possessive suffix, and nevertheless we do not find **kala-tt-äm*. That we have here to do with **erti* is corroborated by the Viryal dialects where the conditional is not *kalättäm* but *kaläpčë* from *kala-p-erti*, *kalänčë* from *kala-n* (< η)-*erti* etc.

I think that the above arguments are strong enough that we accept Levitskaja's interpretation. But if this is so then the lack of the *-r* aorist in present Chuvash is not an original absence but a secondary disappearance of something which was common to ancient Chuvash and the other Turkish languages.

In ancient Turkish there were two ways of expressing temporal or modal functions. The first model had the structure: stem + marker + possessive pronoun, the second: stem + gerund + auxiliary verb in aorist + possessive pronoun. It is clear that the second model developed much later since the «auxiliary verb in aorist» is nothing else but the first model. In the praesens futurum *paratäp* «I give» we have a PT **ber + e + turur + beniñ* where *-e-* is the gerund. Here we have two possibilities. Either the whole structure is inherited from the common ancient Turkish verbal system or Chuvash has developed its system parallelly to the other Turkish languages. It seems to be very likely that we have to do with the second possibility because in the case of the praesens futurum most other Turkish languages have

not the gerund *-a* but the gerund in *-p*, as e.g. Tuva *körüp tur men* «I see» < **körüp turur meniñ* < *beniñ*. In this case Chuvash was structurally rooted in the common Turkish verbal system and therefore developed the same structural way.^{11a}

Chuvash has two «cases» which express functions for which other Turkish languages use postpositions. The instrumental with the suffix *-pA* (*lašapa* «with the horse») developed from *birle*, and the purposive *-šÄn* (*lašäšän* «for the horse») is *üëün* in the other Turkish languages. On the other hand the old instrumental in *-n* is only rudimentally preserved (e.g. *uran* «with the foot» cf. *allän par ma uran ut* «give with the hand but go with the feet, i.e. by foot») (This *-n* is used also in temporal function: *kunän-šërën äš-* «to work by day and night»). The fading out of the old instrumental and the development of a new one from a common Turkish postposition gives a clear example how the peculiarities of Chuvash came into being.

The overwhelming majority of Chuvash morphology is of genuine Turkish origin and we can observe a regular development. However, there are loan morphemes too. As we have already seen the prohibitive particle is of Votyak origin. A stronger influence can be observed from the Kipchak or more precisely from Kazan Tatar. It is according to the expectation that this influence is the greatest in the field of word formative suffixes. Levitskaja enumerates a series of such suffixes (e.g. the deverbal suffix *-kän/kën*). The Chuvash participle in *-akan/-eken* is now one of the most productive suffixes (*vulakan* «reader», *širakan* «writer» etc.). It is beyond doubt that this suffix is a loan. In this case Tatar

^{11a} *Proof note:* After having given into print this review article, I got the excellent paper of L. Johanson, *Das tschuwaschische Aoristthema: Orientalia Suecana* 22–23 (1974–1975), pp. 106–158. This paper raised so many questions that it deserves a special review. Concerning the problem dealt with here, Johanson is also of the opinion that the absence of the *-r* aorist in Chuvash is due to a secondary development.

has *-yan/gen* (*baryan* ~ Chuv. *p̄irakan* «goer, walker»). This suffix had to be borrowed after the Chuvash development $q > x, g > \gamma > \emptyset$ but before the elision of *-a* in Kipchak.

There are some conclusions in the book which can be debated, as e.g. the assumption that the origin of the ordinal suffix *-mēs* is a merger of an original *-m* and a substantivizing *-ši* (← *si* of the third person). The Chuvash *-mēs* is a regular development of an older *-minč(i)* which is quoted also by Levitskaja but only as a «structural parallel».

I think that the above remarks show clearly that Levitskaja's work is a great step forward not only in the study of the history of the Chuvash language but also in comparative-historical Turkology. We came nearer to the reconstruction of the ancient Turkish morphological structure in the working out of which Chuvash will always play a key role.

3. All competent scholars, including Poppe and Levitskaja are aware of the fact that a large amount of the «Chuvash peculiarities» are due to the complicated history of the language during the 8th–20th centuries. To these complicated problems is devoted R. G. Ahmet'janov's book: *Sravnitel'noe issledovanie tatarskogo i čuvaškogo jazykov*.¹² Ahmet'janov is investigating the historical phonology and lexicology of the two languages and comes to the conclusion that the ancient Bulgarian language separated from the other Turkish languages in very early times. After the Bulgarian tribes moved to the Middle Volga region they came under the influence of Ugrian and especially under the strong influence of early Kipchak languages. Later one part of the «Kipchakized» Bulgarians under the influence of the local Finno-Ugrian languages underwent further changes and so emerged the present Chuvash language. The remaining part of the already «Kipchakized» Bulgars changed their language and in the 9th–13th cen-

turies took over an old Kipchak-Tatar dialect, and at the same time their language was also influenced by Karluk, Oguz dialects and the literary Turkish language of Moslem impact. Chuvash is the direct continuation of the Old Bulgarian language, more precisely of one of its dialects («*Drevnečuvaškij jazyk — odin iz dialektov srednebulgarskogo*» *op.cit.*, p. 83), this is reflected in its consonantism, vocalism, and in a not too great, but basic lexical stock. In Tatar the traces of Old Bulgar are reflected in its vocalism and a relatively great amount of lexical items.

The book consists of four parts. In the Introduction a brief sketch of the earlier investigations and the outlines of the aim of the book is given. The second part deals with the problems of phonetics, the third with that of the lexical stock. In the concluding part the historical background and the results are summarized.

The results of the chapter on phonetics are the following:

1. The phonological (in Ahmet'janov: phonetical) system of the ancient common Turkish language underwent such an essential change that it caused a breach (*narušenie*) even in the lexical system which resulted in emerging of homonyms. This is not the case with Tatar. This essential change in the phonological system of Chuvash is overwhelmingly due to foreign influence.

2. If we compare the phonological systems of Chuvash and Tatar on one hand and the ancient Turkish on the other then the Chuvash language has more traits preserved from the ancient Turkish than Tatar has.

3. The Chuvash secondary developments are due to the local Finno-Ugrian substrate in the cases of Chuvash syllabic stress, the disappearance of the opposition voiced : unvoiced consonants, the development $q > x$ and $k > x$ further $s > š$. The causes of the development $\ddot{a} > a$ and the disappearance of the phoneme η are not clear but they are surely of foreign origin. All other phonetical peculiarities of Chuvash

¹² Moscow 1978, 248 p.

are common with that of the neighbouring Kipchak languages (here only the secondary developments are meant).

4. Ahmet'janov reconstructs three phonological systems: a. Viryal Chuvash, b. Bashkir and Tatar, c. Anatri Chuvash. Their difference is characterized by the word stress, the system of the vowels and the synharmonical sequences.

5. Chuvash *š*- is due to the local Finnish (Volga-Finnish) languages, while the reduced labials *ǒ* and *Ǔ* are due to Ugrian influence.

Ahmet'janov works with an excellent command on the material and a good knowledge of the earlier literature. His not always clearly formulated investigations contain a lot of keen observations. E.g. Ahmet'janov notes that the open *ä* in Arabo-Persian loanwords developed into *i* in case of early borrowings, while remained *ä* in later ones (p. 31) or thinks that one of the possible reasons of the existence of initial *ǰ*- in the central Tatar dialects was the influence of the Bulgar language (p. 77). These examples show that Ahmet'janov is aware of the requirement that the complicated interrelationship between the Chuvash and Tatar languages can be solved only with the help of a strict historical method.

The most interesting and new in Ahmet'janov's work is his attempt to demonstrate the early Ugrian and Kipchak influence on Volga Bulgarian. The early presence of Ugrian and Kipchak-Turkish groups in the Middle Volga region is the object of a vivid discussion among the archeologists. The arguments of those who deny the existence of the pre-Bulgar groups speaking a Turkish idiom are more convincing¹³ but methodologically it has to

¹³ A recent and good overview of the question is I. Fodor, *Altungarn, Bulgarotürken und Ostslawen in Südrussland (Archäologische Beiträge)* mit einem Vorwort von S. Szádeczky-Kardoss: Acta Universitatis de Attila József Nominatae. Acta Antiqua et Archeologica Tomus XX, Opuscula Byzantina IV, Szeged 1977, especially pp. 18–21.

be stressed that in questions of the language of a population only linguistic arguments are of decisive value. Ahmet'janov is aware of this and tries to give some.

According to Ahmet'janov the emergence of the reduced labial vowels *ǒ* and *Ǔ* is due to an Ugrian influence (*op.cit.*, p. 19). This is however unacceptable. Ahmet'janov describes the process himself quite clearly. In case of the process of narrowing of *o* to *u*, *ö* to *ü*, the original *u* and *ü* had to move forward and become *ǒ* and *Ǔ*. If the choice of *ǒ* and *Ǔ* would have been done under Ugrian influence this would be possible only in case of borrowing a great number of Ugrian words which had these phonemes. Neither Ahmet'janov nor anybody else could demonstrate a considerable Ugrian lexical borrowing in the Volga Turkish languages.

One of Ahmet'janov's arguments in favour of an early Kipchak influence on Bulgar is, that the labialisation of PT *a* occurred under such influence. He points to the Russian rendering of Cumanian words, where the old Russian sources show an interchange *a* ~ *o* (*Altunopa* ~ *Oltunopa*). The labial *ä* in Cumanian would be due to a Schythian-Sarmatian influence. That this «okanie» is of old age would also be corroborated by the Turkish loanwords in Hungarian where such doublets as *alma* ~ *olma*, *balta* ~ *bolta* etc. do exist. The Hungarian *o*-forms are special Hungarian dialectal variants and have nothing to do with Turkish. The alternation of *a* ~ *o* in the Russian sources is due to the South Russian «okanie» and if anything then only the origin of this «okanie» can be the object of investigation (in Cumanian there does exist a kind of labialization but only under the influence of the following *-w*: *ovuč* «Handvoll» < **avuč* < *abuč*).

Without going into further details one can state that none of Ahmet'janov's arguments in favour of an early Ugrian or Kipchak influence on Volga Bulgar is convincing. I would, however, suggest not to take off the question of the gender in hope that in the run of further investigations

more convincing arguments and data can be found. If so, it will be Ahmet'janov's merit who initiated this trend.

There are some questions of detail where one cannot agree with the author. The development of Chuvash *ï* in place of Turkish *a* in the first syllable cannot be ascribed to the change in the syllabic stress: the treatment of the *e*-vowels do not take account of the fact that ancient Turkish had long open and closed *e* sounds; in case of Mountain Cheremiss *ä* ~ Meadow Cheremiss *a* the former is a late secondary development and not a preserved archaism; the lack of the third person possessive suffix *-si* in Chuvash can not be explained by a development *s* > *z* > *y* > \emptyset , the grapheme *g*- on place of Chuvash initial *y*- before *i* in old Chuvash wordlists (*girana* = *yärana* «stirrup») is not due to a Misher component in Chuvash, but an orthographical feature of Russian, where the initial *yi*- was impossible, and in foreign words rendered by the graphic solution using *g*-. In some other cases Ahmet'janov's contrastive examples are misleading. E.g. when comparing Chuvash *ï* with their Tatar parallels he finds that it can be represented by *a*, *u*, *ö*, *i* and *e*. This is confusing. In such cases as e.g. Chuvash *vür-* «to mow» ~ Tat. *ur-* «id.» Chuvash *ï* is only seemingly corresponding to Tatar *u*. The original PT **or-* became first **vär-* in Chuvash, then this *ä* regularly developed into *ï*. Chuvash *tüt-* «to hold» is not the corresponding form of Tatar *töt-*, the first is Turkish *tart-*, the second Turkish *tut-*. If we exclude the Tatar loanwords in Chuvash as *kilčik* → *xilčäk* «awn» and a few special developments as *yütä* «dog» < *iyt*, it becomes clear that Chuvash *ï* developed only from *ä*, and that beyond a seemingly variegated correspondence a very simple one is hidden.

The third chapter deals with the following questions: a quantitative-statistical comparison of the Chuvash and Tatar lexical stock, the comparison of ethnonyms and anthroponyms, terminology of relationship, sex and age, terminology of customs, mythology and calendar, terms

of the material culture, social life, folklore. The material is very rich and one can only but regret that Ahmet'janov does not quote the sources of his data (mostly dialectal ones and not fixed in the dictionaries). It seems that in many cases the words are from his own collection (e.g. some Kazan Tatars call some Misher Tatars *Mačar*, while Russians use also *Mažar* in place of *Mišar*, p. 130). Nevertheless without a possibility of a control one is hesitating to use these data. The more is regrettable that there is no index to the lexical material, which hampers the use of data elsewhere not to be found.

Sometimes a greater criticism to earlier opinions would have been advisable. Ahmet'janov quotes Jusupov, according to whom in the Eastern regions an ethnonym *Nogor* ~ *Logor* exists, and this would be the remnant of the ethnonym *Onogur*. If it were true this would be of great importance. In fact, however, no such ethnonym exists. Jusupov in his cited paper¹⁴ investigated the ethnonym *Nokrat* ~ *Nukrat*, which he analyzed as consisting of the components *Nokr* and *at*, the latter a suffix. In some Misher dialects living behind the Kama river the local population is called *Lokor*. From these two data Jusupov supposed an ethnonym **Nokor* ~ *Lokor* (and not *Nogor*, *Logor*), which he connected with the name of the Onogurs.

Following Jegorov, Ahmet'janov quotes a few Chuvash-Mongolian parallels, among them such as Chuv. *kakaj* «meat» ~ Mong. *yaqai* «pig» which were according to him borrowed not earlier and not later than the first centuries A.D. (p. 122). The comparison of Chuv. *kakaj*, which is a word of the children's language, with Mong. *yaqai* is impossible because of serious phonetical problems. Thus such conclusions as «In early times, with all probability, the ances-

¹⁴ G. V. Jusupov, *Bulgaro-tatarskaja ėpigrafika i toponimika, kak istočnik issledovanija ėtnogeneza kazanskih tatar: Voprosy ėtnogeneza tjurkojazyčnyh narodov srednego Povolž'ja*, Kazan' 1971, pp. 217 — 231.

tors of the Chuvash bought pork from the Mongols» (p. 121) fall.

Notwithstanding such and similar problems Ahmet'janov's work is the first serious attempt to make a systematical comparison between the Chuvash and the Tatar lexical stock. We have to consider his work as a serious step forward in the areal linguistics of the Volga region.

4. Another book is devoted to an aspect of the history of the Chuvash language which is not of less importance. B. Scherner's book: *Arabische und neupersische Lehnwörter im Tschuwaschischen. Versuch einer Chronologie ihrer Lautveränderungen*¹⁵ has as its aim, as is stressed by its subtitle, to use the Arabic and Modern Persian loanwords in Chuvash as a help for the chronologization of the special Chuvash sound changes. The work was inspired by Professor Benzing and concluded in 1974.

In comparison with the earlier works, discussed by the author on pp. 4–7, one of the merits of the book is that Scherner takes into account the way how and the time when the loanwords were borrowed. He duely recognizes that the great majority of the A. and MP. loanwords came into Chuvash by Tatar mediation. In cases where it is possible he also tries to distinguish between loans transmitted through Tatar dialects and those which were borrowed through the Tatar literary language. For Scherner, Chuvash is a direct descendant of the language of the Volga Bulgars — as reflected in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions — and thus a third possibility, the mediation of another Middle Chuvash or Bulgar dialect remained out of the scope of his work.

Scherner divided the history of Chuvash into three periods:

- I. 8/9th centuries—12/13th centuries: Old Chuvash
- II. 13th century—15/16th centuries: Middle Chuvash

¹⁵ Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission, Bd. XXIX, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1977, 232 p.

III. 16th century—20th century: New Chuvash.

One can only agree with this periodization. It was however not a good idea to avoid the question what was before the 8/9th century. Thus we read that the sound change $\acute{s} > l$, ($z > r$) occurred in Old Chuvash. This late chronology of the rotacism and lambdaizm proposed by Benzing, in view of the r and l forms in Samoyed, Mongolian and Hungarian has not been accepted by any scholar, independently of their opinion about the priority of z versus r or \acute{s} versus l or whether they are in favour or against the «Altaic theory». According to Scherner the changes $\acute{c} > \acute{s}$ $\acute{s}^2 > \acute{s}$ (*baš* «head» > *puš*) and $\acute{j} > \acute{s}$ occurred «ungefähr zur gleichen Zeit im Altčuv.». In face of this opinion the testimony of the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions, where \acute{j} and \acute{c} are preserved is put aside with the assumption «Die Wolgabulgarischen Grabinschriften des 13/14 Jhs. spiegeln nicht den Sprachstand des Bolgarischen des 13/14 Jhrs. wider, sondern vermutlich den einer älteren Zeit» (p. 10). This opinion goes back to Jusupov's views¹⁶ and is shared also by Hakimzjanov¹⁷ according to whom the language used in the inscriptions was already a dead one. This conclusion is impossible. The Volga Bulgarian inscriptions are written in Arabic, and Turkish words are used only for those parts of the epitaphs the understanding of which was important for the family of the deceased. Moreover we have a few but important facts which point to the spoken language standing behind the normative orthography used for rendering the Turkish words. Further, it is inconsequent to quote the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions as a source of

¹⁶ G. V. Jusupov, *Vvedenie v bulgarotatarskuju épigrafiku*, Moscow—Leningrad 1960.

¹⁷ F. S. Hakimzjanov, *Jazyk épitafij volžskih Bulgar*, Moscow 1978. On p. 23 Hakimzjanov writes: «Vidimo, arhaičnyj drevne-bulgarskij jazyk uže v XI v. ne primenjalsja v celjah komunikacii, a liš' u masterov po tradicii peredavalsja iz pokolenija v pokolenie.»

the change $q > x$ (quoting *هیر hir* < *qiz*) but suppose that the *řim* in *veřim* «third» is reflecting an *ř* or *š*. The Arabic had a series of letters for denoting spirants. It is impossible to suppose that the sound change *si* > *ši* occurred in Middle Chuvash, because Hungarian is reflecting this change in such words as *seper* «to sweep» < **sipir*, *serke* «nit» < *sirke* (Hung. *s* is denoting *š*). The change *ti* > *či* is relatively late, as Scherner correctly states, but it is reflected in the Volga Bulgarian inscriptions (*erti* > *eti* ~ *eči* «he was») and thus in the terminology and system of Scherner it should be Old and not Middle Chuvash.

Though Scherner is not discussing the problems involved here he is aware of them which fact can be seen in his attempt to give some arguments in favour of the late date of the Chuvash rotacism. Since this question is of importance for the whole history of the «Chuvash peculiarities», I have to deal with them in detail.

Scherner demonstrates that the A, NP *z* is represented in the overwhelming majority of the loanwords by *s*. Then he follows «Wenn auch der Lautwandel güt. **z* > čuv. *r* (bis jetzt noch) nicht durch eine grosse Anzahl von ar.np. Lehnwörter gestützt werden kann, so reichen die wenigen Tatsachen doch aus, einen solchen zu bejahen» (p. 67). Scherner quotes six examples. The first is Chuv. *pir* which is according to Scherner a Greek word which came into Chuvash either directly or through Arabic *bazz* or through a further Turkish mediation. From our point of view it is of no importance that the word seems to be ultimately of Old Egyptian origin.¹⁸ The fact remains that the immediate source of this word had a *z*. For understanding the existence of the final *r* in this word we have to distinguish between the two kinds of rotacism. In the first case PT *z* has an *r* representation, in the second to PT *d* an *r* does correspond in Chuvash. This

second «rotacism» made through the way $d > đ > z > r$ and we know that this happened between the 9th and the early 12th centuries, i.e. in Old Chuvash. This means that Old Chuvash, for a time had a *đ* or *z*. If a word with *z* was borrowed in this time, it underwent the same change as all other words having then a *z*, originating from an earlier *d*. Thus Arabic *bazz* had the same fate as NP *adina* which became *arna* in Volga Bulgarian and *erne* in Chuvash.

According to Scherner Chuvash *xir(ě)* «pine tree» is a loanword from the local Finno-Ugrian languages. The PU form of the word in question is **kouse*. All Finno-Ugrian languages of the region have a labial vowel in the first syllable from which Chuvash *-i-* cannot be explained (Mordv. *kuz*, Cher. *kož*, Zyry. *koz*, Voty. *köz*). The Chuvash word is in fact a Uralic word, but it is of Old Samoyed origin. The Proto Samoyed form has to be reconstructed as **káât* + *âyâ* and the intermediate form borrowed was **kadi* (cf. Enetz *kari*, *kadi*, Nenetz *xadi*, Selk. *kādě* etc.).¹⁹ We find the word in Tuva as *qadi*, Hakass *xazi*, Tofalar *hadi* and Nižne Iyus *xayi*.²⁰ Thus in this case we have to do with the «second rotacism», the $d \gg r$ development. According to Scherner two other words should be Turkish loanwords. Chuv. *tävär* «narrow» has to be a loanword, because *t-* before the original *i* (cf. Turkish *tığız*) did not become *č-* as in original words. First we have to state that the *ti-* did not become in all cases *či*, as e.g. in Chuv. *ultä* «six» < **altä* while Chuv. *sičě* is from **yěti*. This clearly shows that *tš* became *či* only if earlier *i* became *i*, which is very frequent in Chuvash, but not without exception. Moreover in Old Chuvash texts (Sočine-nija, Višnevskij) we find *tuvir*'' which

¹⁹ See the data in detail in: J. Janhunen, *Samojedischer Wortschatz. Gemeinsamojedische Etymologien*, Castrenianumin toimitteita 17, Helsinki 1977, p. 61.

²⁰ The Chuvash word has been connected with the Tofalar and the Nenec word by V. I. Rassadin in: *Fonetika i leksika tofalarskogo jazyka*, Ulan-ude 1971, p. 185.

¹⁸ Cf. *Böz in the Altaic World: Altorientalische Forschungen III*, Berlin 1975, pp. 155–163.

points to the fact that the first vowel was labial. I have collected in the Viryal dialect of Morgauš *tuvār, tövör* and *tör*. Thus, whether the word has to be connected with Shor, Sagay *tobir* «blunt» or not, it is sure that the *t*- remained preserved because the following vowel was not *-i-*.

The Chuvash word *tir*- «to thread» can go back, if it is not a very recent loanword, only to an earlier **ter-*, because *i* in original and early loanwords developed into *ě*. It is true that the word in most of the early documents and the present Turkish languages has the form *tiz-*, but in an early Uigur document (Hsüen-tsang 12: 151) we find *tüz-*, and this form survived in Türkmen, Azeri and Osmanli (*düz-*). Ramstedt (*JSFOU* XXXVIII, p. 21), Poppe (*UJb* VI, pp. 100, 113) have connected the word with Mongolian *dürü-*. The supposed *-e-* can be found in Turki (*tez-, tez-*) and in the dialect of Lob Nor (*tez-*).

The two remaining examples of Scherner are personal names: *Pinever* and *Minever*. These names are dealt with by Scherner in detail on pp. 161–162 and 168–169 respectively. According to Scherner Minever would be *min*, «Muttermal» + NP نياز *niyāz* «Bitte, Bedürfnis», while Pinever would consist of Tatar *biy* < *bäg* and the same *niyāz*. It is doubtful that personal names, the meaning of which we do not know can be used for such purposes at all. Further neither Tatar *Miñniyāz* nor *Biñniyāz* are attested (Scherner quotes an Uzbek *Meñniyāz*). An intervocalic *-y-* in non-labial environment remains *-y-* (cf. Turkish *ayaz* «bright, clear weather» Chuv. *uyar*). From the parallel forms *Pinever*: *Pinepi* and *Minever*: *Minepi* it is clear that the first part of the name is *Pine-*, and *Mine-* (*-pi* is the same as in *Narspi*) and not *Pin-* and *Min-*. Finally from the parallel names *Pinever*: *Pinemer* it is also clear that *-v-* is going back to *-b-*.

Scherner concludes his investigations: «Die wenigen Beispiele (. . .), die deutlich für den Wandel **z > r* sprechen, werden die «Anhänger» der umgekehrten Entwicklung ürtü. *r > čuv r, tü. z* nicht völlig

überzeugen können, doch genügen sie, ihr Lehrgebäude zu erschüttern». The case on the gender is here not the problem of the rotacism but its chronology.

In some other cases Scherner made not only valid but also very important observations. Among these I would call attention to the Chuvash representation of MP *ř* and *č*. In early loanwords both are represented by *ś* in Chuvash. For the chronology of the Chuvash vocalism it is of relevance that in the oldest loanwords Arabic and New Persian *a* became *ě*.

As I have pointed out above it is of great methodological importance that Scherner separated the direct and indirect loanwords. The second group gives a great help to put the Tatar loanwords of Chuvash in a more exact chronological framework.

Altogether Scherner's work is an indispensable aid for everybody who wishes to investigate the complicated history of Chuvash. Scherner writes on p. 8, in note 2: «Die restlichen ar.np. Lehnwörter, darunter auch čuv. PN ar.np. Herkunft wurden schon mitausgewertet, sollen aber später noch gesondert erscheinen». One can only but hope that this will happen in a not very far future.

5. Chuvash in the narrower sense has literary monuments only from the 20s of the 18th century on. In Chuvashia a very important enterprise has been undertaken to work up these early monuments. N.P. Petrov's new book: *Čävāš literatūra čělvin istoriye. Jakovlevčėnhi tapxār*²¹ is a university manual with the scope to outline the early history of the Chuvash literary language until the orthographical reform in 1871 and the activity of Jakovlev. The first chapter deals with the concept of «literary language». The second chapter tangles the problem of the Runic and Arabic scripts used to render early Chuvash texts. It is only to be regretted that the Runic monuments in the western Turkish region have not been dealt with. The Volga Bulgarian inscriptions are treated without taking into

²¹ Šupaškar, 1978, 110 p.

consideration that they could reflect another dialect than the direct ancestor of present-day Chuvash. Together with many valid observations some old opinions have been maintained which cannot be upheld. A rather obscure statement of Katanov gave the basis to some scholars to suppose that the *alif* and *faḥa* in the inscriptions can be read as *o*. A labial *ā* is possible but not an *o*.

The most instructive and interesting part of the book is the chapter which deals with the early Chuvash texts. We get a good picture of the literary activities of the missionaries, the main characteristics of the works translated by them and composed in original. The differences in the style of the religious and official texts are analyzed and contrasted to the folklore texts the collection of which began also in this period. The book will surely inspire young Chuvash students to devote themselves to the elaboration of questions of detail of several early monuments. It can only be hoped that in the near future we shall possess scholarly written monographs on the separate monuments of 18th–19th century Chuvash.

6. Though it has only an indirect impact on Chuvash linguistic studies, last but not least, I would like to review the book *Chuvash Folksongs*²² by L. Vikár and G. Bereczki. Following their earlier monograph on the *Cheremis Folksongs*²³ the musicologist Vikár and the linguist Bereczki offer a solid and rich treatment of the Chuvash folkmusic. The brief sketch of the ethnic origin and history of the Chuvash, the description of the earlier collections and the history of the Hungarian studies in Chuvash folkmusic is followed by a chapter on the dialects and the melody types. Further the most important musical features (note-sets, forms, melodic lines, metre, rhythm, syllable number) are dealt with.

²² Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1979, 580 p.

²³ Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1971, 544 p.

A short chapter reports on the experimental measurement of the musical material. The main part of the work consists of 350 Chuvash folksongs collected by the authors all over Chuvashia. The musical material is accompanied by the Chuvash text in Latin transcription and at the end of the book the English and the Hungarian translations are given.

For the texts a phonemic transcription was elaborated and used by the authors, the same which they used for the Cheremis folksongs. Though this system is somewhat differing from that used by linguists it will not make much difficulties. It is, however, to be regretted that the voiceless media character of the consonants is not noted (as it is neither in the official orthography). It is true that the medialization of the fortis consonants is in most cases allophonic, there are, however, some cases where this is not the case. E.g. in such words as *šaxan* «raven» the intervocalic *-x-* is, against the expectation, not voiceless media but fortis, which is due to the fact that before *-x-* there existed earlier a *-t-* (PT. **yutqan*). The media pronunciation is also emerging if the word initial consonant is in sandhi position, i.e. if the former word ends in a vowel and the two words are spelt as one unit. This would have made possible to separate the phraseological units, which could be of importance also for the musicologists.

The Chuvash folkmusic is pentatonic, and thus pertaining to the Turkish folkmusic structure. As Vikár states: «The characteristic musical tradition, reflecting a long past history among the Turkish people, still preserves its pentatonic nature, and the influence of the neighbouring Finno-Ugric and Slav peoples has not modified this essentially» (p. 51). The joint investigation of the musical «language» and the prosaic one is thus corroborating each other. One thing is, however, of paramount importance. As is known Hungarian is a Finno-Ugric language, while its folkmusic is of Turkish type, it is pentatonic like Chuvash folkmusic. The Turkish impact

on the Hungarian folkmusic was greater than the Turkish influence on the Hungarian language. Therefore the comparison of the Chuvash and Hungarian folkmusic is of great historical importance. For this reason the study of the Chuvash folkmusic is essential. It can only be hoped that the Tatar and Bashkir collections of the same authors will be published soon and enable to make a comparative study on the history of the folkmusic of all Turkish peoples in the Volga region. This will help to solve some aspects of the interrelationship among the Volga Turkish and Finno-Ugrian peoples.

A. Róna-Tas

A. İYBATOV, *Qutbning «Husrav wa Širin» poëmasining sözdigi (XIV gasir)*. Qazaq SSR-ning «Gılım» baspası, Almatı 1974, 279 pp.

The findings made so far confirm the fact that the oldest Turkic literary piece, written in the time and area of the Golden Horde, was the epic poem *Husrav u Širin* by Qutb. This work not only has a significant position among the Turkic linguistic records, but as the first Turkic translation of the similarly entitled work of Nizami (altogether 21 translations have been revealed so far), it is also of outstanding importance regarding Turkic literary history. Qutb's poem of 4730 couplets, written in 1341–42, did not survive in the original version, only the manuscript of its translation compiled in Egypt in 1383 by the *faqih* Berke of Kipchak origin, which is available today in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris under the reference Mss. Turcs, Anc. F. 312. The facsimile and the text of the manuscript were first edited by A. Zajaczkowski, who was also the first to publish the record's vocabulary (*Najstarsza wersja turecka Husrav u Širin Qutba*. Część I, Tekst, Warszawa 1958; Część II, Facsimile, Warszawa 1958; Część III, Słownik, Warszawa 1961). A. Zajaczkowski deserves eternal credit for his research into

this outstanding literary and linguistic remnant of the Golden Horde, because so far Turcologists relied almost exclusively on his editions to support their research, nevertheless it is a fact that he could not accomplish the complete scientific examination of this work from both the literary, historical, cultural historical, and linguistic aspects.

M. N. Hacıeminoğlu is the scholar who made a thorough and precise philological analysis of this record from the linguistic viewpoint. He corrected several of Zajaczkowski's mistakes and errors, summarized the major orthographic, phonetic and morphological features of the poem and re-edited its complete text (*Kutb'un Husrev ü Širin'i ve Dil Hususiyetleri*, İstanbul 1968, 477 pp.).

M. N. Hacıeminoğlu's very helpful volume could have earned even more credit if the author had published the complete vocabulary of the record, thus supplementing A. Zajaczkowski's rather out-dated vocabulary of hardly half of the words in the record. This gap has been recently bridged by the valuable dictionary of A. İybatov, a researcher of the Koman-Kipchak linguistic records in Alma-Ata, whose work comprises the entire vocabulary of Qutb's poem *Husrav u Širin* in about 4,410 entries.

In the introduction, A. İybatov gives a detailed analysis of the history of this record, the major philological problems and the positions of researchers — A. N. Samojlovič, A. Zajaczkowski, A. M. Ščerbak, É. N. Nadžip, É. Fazylov, N. A. Baskakov — concerning the nature of the language of the *Husrav u Širin* (pp. 9–18). He points out that former classifications rested either solely on phonetic or lexical aspects. All the researchers working on a phonetic basis agreed that the language of the *Husrav u Širin* belongs to the *d* group of Middle Turkic, or at least it manifests several features characteristic of the Middle Turkic literary language, while some of those who took the lexicon as their starting-point regard the language of