

CRITICA

MAHMŪD AL-KĀŠĀRĪ, *Compendium of the Turkic dialects* (Dīwān luḡāt at-Turk). Edited and translated with introduction and indices by ROBERT DANKOFF in collaboration with JAMES KELLY. Vol. I-III Printed at the Harvard University Printing Office. Sources of Oriental languages and literatures 7. 1982-1985, XII 416, III + 382, 338 pp. with one map and 7 microfiche cards.

"... I am one of the most elegant among them in language, and the most eloquent in speech; one of the best educated, the most deep-rooted in lineage, and the most penetrating in throwing the lance. Thus I have perfectly acquired the dialect of each one of their groups; and I have set it down in an encompassing book, in a well ordered system." — this is how the author of the Dīwān luḡāt at-Turk estimated his own person and work (the translation is quoted from the book under review, I. 70). And the first known reflection on it: "I have studied many compilations on Turkiyya, and I know the language well; but I have not seen any [book] more comprehensive [than this one]. Only he will understand its value who is well versed in the language of the Turks." (AKD, I. 10) This statement can be read on the title-page and is written by a later hand, according to D/K, in 1266. This judgement is still valid; even if some of the later works contain a larger number of lexical items, it remains the best and most fascinating work written on Turkic.

The unique MS-copy of 1266 of the lost original was first edited by Kilisli Rifat in 1917-1919 and since then we have more or less complete editions by Brockelman (1928), Besim Atalay (1939-1942), Abdurahmanov and Mutallibov (1960-1963) and two works which contain the whole lexical material: the Drevnetjurkskij Slovar' (1969) and the Etymological Dictionary of Sir Gerard Clauson (1972). A new, complete Russian edition has been in print for a longer time. The number of studies on parts or details of the Dīwān is extraordinarily extensive. All earlier works have their special merits, but their respective deficiencies made it necessary to publish a new edition.

The edition under review is a joint work of R. D. and J. K. D is responsible for the final form of the translation, the introduction and the indices. K wrote the grammar outline, contributed substantially to the translation and had a critical role in formulating the introduction. All matters relating to methodology were decided jointly (see I, p. V). The work consists of three parts: Introduction, Translation and Indices. Three Appendices and the microfiche are added.

The high scholarly level of this edition was facilitated by the possibility to study the original unique MS in detail, take colour photographs for later use, further by a new translation of the Arabic text and by using a more adequate editing method than the earlier editors did. One of the major merits of this edition is that D/K have

done everything to distinguish the hand of the author of the MS-copy from later hands, which added to or corrected the original. Until now we had access to the facsimile-edition of Besim Atalay (1941) which, being black-and-white, did not allow the different shades of the colours of ink to be distinguished and thus it was almost impossible to distinguish the later changes. The study of the ink colour made it possible to select out one of the later hands, which has worked through the whole MS, even where this hand did not use a different, now brownish, ink. According to D/K "the most, perhaps 99% of the additions and corrections to the main text belong to a single individual" (p. 10) whom they call *the* later hand to distinguish him from others who are called "*a* later hand" — not a very ingenious, but practical distinction.

D/K made an attempt to get behind the fourteenth-century additions and to reconstruct the original thirteenth-century autograph (p. 11). Their success is an important step forward in the Kāšyarī-studies.

The Introduction consists of thirteen chapters. The first three deal with the description of the MS, the previous editions, the principles of this edition and translation, general remarks on the author, title and contents. The fourth chapter recalls the discussion on the dates of the original. D/K propose that the work, which the author begun to write on January 25th 1072, was finally finished and left the workshop of the author on January 9th 1077, that is they do not accept the arguments of L. Bazin who put the final date at 1083. Since it is clear that some of the dates in the texts are miswritten, none of the calculations can work without emendation. The author himself stated in the colophon that he revised, corrected his work and redacted it four times. The caliph al-Muqtadi to whom the work was, finally, dedicated, ruled between 1075 and 1094. That means that the final form of the original could not have been finished

before 1075. That eight years passed before it was sent to Baghdad is unlikely, though not impossible.

The fifth chapter deals with the title-page not pertaining to the original text. This is the only place where the author is called not only Maḥmud ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad, but also al-Kāšyarī. D/K find the *nisba* suspect, since the author was not from Kāšyar but from Barsyān. (p. 4 note 5). In spite of all the arguments raised so far, I am not quite sure that our author was born there. On p. 220—221 of the MS we read a verse, which runs in the translation of D/K:

The worst bird is the magpie
 The worst tree is (the) one (called)
 Azyān
 The worst land is the eroded
 The worst people are those of Barsyān

and the author adds: — since they are unsociable and miserly. Even if we assume that our author was born there and this statement reflected some feud between him and other inhabitants of Barsyān, it is sure that he did not live there when he wrote the book, but in Kāšyar, which was also called Ordu känd. It must not be forgotten that Kāšyar was also the name of a larger territory cf. e.g. MS 60 *artuĉ* "Juniper; in Kāšyar there are two villages named Artuĉ". Since the *nisba* does not necessarily reflect the birthplace, but can also be given after the place where somebody is residing and working or acting, I do not see any reason to doubt the authenticity of the *nisba* al-Kāšyarī. D/K do not accept the opinion of K. Rifat and Rossi, according to whom the author of the text on the title-page was Muhammad ibn Aḥmad Khaṭīb Dārayyā and that it was written in 1400—1401. This is convincing, Dārayyā was a later owner of the MS. D/K's hypothesis is "that it was written in Damascus around 664/1266 — i.e. that it was written down (though not necessarily composed) by the copyist of the main text, who names himself in the colophon (MS. 638) as Muḥammad ibn abī Bakr ibn abī

l-Fatḥ of Sava, then of Damascus" (p. 9). This is based on their judgement that the text of the title-page was written down by the copyist of the rest of the MS., "though perhaps with a different pen" (p. 8). Though I am not fully convinced, I am ready for the time being, to accept the opinion of two colleagues who have worked with the original manuscript for long years. But in this case, one cannot wholly dismiss the doubt: is our MS in fact the autograph of the text written in 1266? The author of the text of the title-page expresses his view that the language of the Diwan is not "Türkmän", but it is Turk, that is "Qifčaq" and who says the contrary knows neither Qipchak nor Türkmän. This curious statement, treated by Rossi, is typical for later Mameluk authors. In 1266 it is not impossible, but would need some corroboration. Since Qipchak is mentioned in the Diwan many times as being different from the language of the author, one asks: did the author of the title-page text read the Diwan in detail? The copyist had to. Thus we cannot exclude the following: Muhammad of Sāva copied the autograph in 1266. A second person wrote the remark on the title page a few years later and then somebody recopied the whole work, including the text of the title page. The extant text ends at the bottom of what is now numbered as p. 638, and if there was a third colophon of the second copyist it would have been on a 639. page.

Further chapters deal with the later hand and other later interpolations, glosses, and marginal notes, most of them noted in the translation. It seems to be a correct observation of D/K that the later hand spoke a Kipchak language (e.g. *āw* "house" is 'corrected' to *ōw*) but once again, if the 1266 text had *āw*, why did the author of the text on the title-page claim that this reflects the Qipchak dialect. In a later chapter, D/K discuss the question whether Badraddīn al-'Aynī who quotes at length from the Diwan in the first volume of his book, written in 1422, used our MS or had seen another copy. D/K's arguments

convincingly prove that it was our MS. Further chapters deal with scribal errors, ghost words and textual emendations, further with the structure of the Diwan. The treatment of the Arabic terminology used by Kāšyarī (more detailed in UAJb 1972, 1973, 1976) is very useful. The chapter Phonology is rather the description of how Kāšyarī explains the phonology reflected in the Diwan than its modern analysis and this is an important contribution of the former to the second, and a sound basis for further studies.

The main part of the work is, of course, the translation which also partly functions as an edition. The Turkic words are transliterated with a special system, e.g. *آقوچو* is transliterated as 'AWUVS·KUV where' stands for the *aliph*, A for the *fatha* on the *aliph*, W for *ḥ*, U for the *damma* on it, but underlined because it is added by the later hand, V is for the *vav*, and the raised dot for the *sukun* on the *sīn*, etc. This type of transliteration is very helpful, but does not substitute the original, since in the above case the fact that the *sīn* is written with three dots beneath is not marked. If dots are misplaced, the transliteration follows the original, and the following transcription has the correct reading, so e.g. YAWRA' *tawra*, YURKAK *bürkāk* which means that in the original two dots are beneath though in the first case two should be above and in the second one should be beneath. It is, however, not possible to see from this transliteration when the dots are missing at all and when not correctly placed. The transliteration is followed by the transcription, which is already an interpretation which "represents what we believe is the phonemic system of the language Kāšyarī is describing, with some allowance also for phonetic peculiarities as indicated by the orthography . . . To a large extent, especially in the vocalism, it is a reconstruction based on historical principles." (p. 3). In a footnote the authors acknowledge their debt to "the industry and judiciousness of Sir Gerard Clauson . . ." which is not an

empty compliment even if in many cases they go a step forward and depart from Sir Gerard's interpretation. Samples of the corrections to the readings and translations of earlier scholars are presented on Vol I. pp. 27–31.

The English is throughout a translation of the Arabic and not of the Turkic. In those cases where the Arabic is not a direct translation of the Turkic, e.g. in verses or proverbs D/K give a verbatim translation of the Turkic, in parentheses, as well.

Perhaps a longer daily use of the Translation will convince me that the repeating of the head items on the right margin is useful. The cross references are given to MS page and head item. In this case I would have put the pagination of the edition down to the page bottom, and use the pagination of the MS as running headings on the top of the page.

In the third volume we find the indices and appendices. The "Base Index" takes 237 pages. Here the words are grouped according to "roots". D/K are aware that to put *äšgäk* "donkey" under *äš-* "to trot" "is plausible, though speculative" (III, p. 2). I am afraid that to put together e.g. *quzyir-* "come pouring and swirling(snow)", *quyma* "type of bread; tool manufactured by casting", *qudur-* "to exert oneself, do the utmost", *qutur-* "pour out" and *qutuz* "rabid (dog)" under an asterisked **qud-* (III, pp. 145–6) is not only implausible and speculative, but definitely wrong. With the exception of a few very common words, this is a full index giving, or intended to give, all occurrences of the same word on the same place with crossreferences from variants. An index of proper names is followed by a topical index, this index also registers papers, which have dealt with some semantic groups of the lexical stock of Kāšyarī. The Dialect Index gives all instances where a dialectal form is mentioned as such. It is grouped according to phonological, morphological, lexical and semantical peculiarities. Here a cross index gives the occurrences according to dialects. Index 5 is a verse index arranged according

to rhyme and is followed by a cross index according to "theme".

Appendix I deals with the grammar of the Diwan, with the exception of phonology, which was treated in the introduction. It is a skeleton-grammar mainly of the morphology following the scheme of the *Philologia Turcicae Fundamenta*. We know that Kāšyarī wrote another work (*Kitāb ĵawāhir an-nahw fi luyat at-turk* cf. MS p. 18) on the grammar of the Karakhanid language, which was lost. D/K try to reconstruct in a very succinct way, the main traits of the morphology as used by Kāšyarī. The last, but one, Appendix lists forms peculiar to verses and proverbs assuming that they "may represent not only dialectal, but even different historical stages in the development of Turkic" (III, p. 333). This is a short index of sixty-odd items, thus it is not very disturbing that at the end of the great work the editors had no time or possibility to also put this and the following list in an alphabetical order. This last list contains dialectal forms occurring in verses and proverbs. The entire MS is attached to the third volume on microfiche cards, in black-and-white.

I gave a detailed account of the content and structure of the book to make it clear that it is an indispensable tool for everybody working in Turkological studies. It would not be fair to point out some misprints (they are few and in most cases not disturbing) and this is not the place to offer alternative readings. I would mention only one question, which seems to me to be of theoretical relevance. D/K consider the phoneme *i* to be neutral, i.e. they assume that there did not exist an opposition of front and back vocalic *i* in Kāšyarī's language (I, pp. 61–62). From the fact that in the MS *d* and *ḍ* are wavering in the text they conclude that "It seems to us that the wavering in the text reflects confusion in K's mind, perhaps compounded by carelessness of the copyist" (I, p. 56). The fact that in the Diwan there are some words with *i* which take only back vocalic suffixes, others only front vocalic

ones, while many are "wavering", is the same phenomena as with *d* and \underline{d} . In the first case, we can observe the *process of the disappearing of the opposition i : ä*, in the second case, we find a stage where the stop *d* is *just changing into* the fricative *d* which in other dialects is already *y* or *z*. This change occurring in the time of Kāšyarī may have caused "a confusion in K's mind", but should not in ours. These kinds of "irregularities" reflect regularities of the diachrony.

One has to congratulate Šinasi Tekin and Gönül Alpay Tekin, the editors of the series: *Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures* for including this important work as its seventh volume. This is a major service to the scholarly world and to their native culture.

It may be useful to add here that the book is available from the Tekins: P. O. Box 1447 Duxbury, Mass. 02332, USA where it should be less expensive than through bookshops.

A. Róna-Tas

С. Ю. Неклюдов, Ж. Тумурцэрэн, *Монгольские сказания о Гесере*. Новые записи. Ответственный редактор Б. Л. Рифтин. АН СССР, Институт мировой литературы им. А. М. Горького. Издательство «Наука». Главная редакция восточной литературы. Москва 1982.

[S. NEKLJUDOV et Ž. TÖMÖRCERING, *Chants épiques (des bardes) mongols sur Geser*. Textes récemment enregistrés] Moscou 1982], 373 p.

S. JU. NEKLJUDOV und Ž. TÖMÖRCEREN, *Mongolische Erzählungen über Geser*. Neue Aufzeichnungen von — Asiatische Forschungen 92. Wiesbaden 1985. VII + 326 S.

Dans les années soixante-dix deux philologues de Moscou enregistrèrent de nouveaux matériaux folkloriques au Sud de la Mongolie. Ils les ont réunis maintenant, à l'intention du public, sous forme de volume séparé. L'un d'eux, B. L. Rifting (qui est aussi un excellent spécialiste

du folklore et de la littérature populaire chinois) a rédigé aussi une brève note d'éditeur (pp. 4—6) sur l'histoire de leur enquête, au cours de laquelle les textes publiés dans le volume ont été enregistrés de la bouche de Čoinxor et de Sambūdaš, bardes (*würči*) bārin et qaračin, resp., qui pendant les années de la «révolution culturelle» chinoise s'étaient réfugiés dans la province de Dundgowi de la R. P. M.

Ces textes mongols, chants épiques du cycle de Geser, sont édités (déchiffrés, traduits et commentés) par l'autre philologue de Moscou, M. S. Nekljudov et par Ž. Tömörčering, éminent mongolisant d'origine tchakhare qui publie, également ici, une petite épopée üjümčün (Est), enregistrée par lui en 1969 dans le district de Bayantūmen (de la province Dornod de la R. P. M.).

Outre les données «techniques» la préface (pp. 7—12) contient d'importants renseignements concernant les bardes, leur vie, leur «théâtre à un seul acteur», leurs différents styles et manières. Sous les «Notes dialectologiques» (pp. 13—33) M. Tömörčering esquisse brièvement l'histoire des «tribus» mongoles en question et précède à une étude des dialectes mongoles de la Mongolie chinoise; il relève bien des traits intéressants de la phonétique et de la morphologie des dialectes bārin, qaračin et üjümčün, p. ex. la convergence des allophones palatales et vélaires des phonèmes gutturaux dans le bārin et dans le qaračin (*g* et *x* contre $\underline{üj}$. g/g et x/x), **egü* > qar. de Wangfu \bar{d} (comme dans certains dialectes occidentaux); l'assimilation semi-consonantique *w(a)* < **u* dans la première syllabe des mots qaračin polysyllabiques (comme, entre autres, dans le dahour), qaračin *nanār* (instrum. de *bi* «je»), adverbe déverbal (de cause) *-mānj'in*^A, adverbe concessif *-yāč*^A (voluntatif + **čü*), etc.

Trois chapitres écrits par M. Nekljudov sont consacrés aux aspects folkloriques des textes: «Le chant épique dans la Mongolie du Sud et de l'Est», avec une histoire des recherches (pp. 34—47); le cycle de Geser dans le répertoire des