

Dynasty was marked by wide-ranging efforts to restore the defaced walls in the temples by covering up traces of Atenist iconoclasm. This restoring activity is also clearly recognisable on the blocks under discussion.

S. Bickel's pioneering research is important to be emphasised. Up to now the destructive rage of the Amarna Period was mostly characterised in general terms, and it is the present book in which one first finds an in-depth analysis of this question on the basis of the evidence of an important building.

While the original location of the huge gate poses some problems the authors suggest that it may have belonged to the northern enclosure wall of the temple. One of the two smaller gates again contain remarkable details, although its significance cannot be compared with the former one. Only one block remained preserved from another gate.

Of the numerous topics treated in the book the petrographic analysis of the limestone by Raphael J. A. Wüst should be mentioned, which demonstrates the growing importance of the exact differentiation in the various kinds of limestone. The question of the quarry and most of the architectural problems are dealt with by Horst Jaritz.

In view of the reviewer the importance of the luxuriously produced book lies very largely in the fact that every small detail of the stones was subjected to a micro-analysis by the authors. This led on one hand to the reconstruction of a stately architectural monument of the New Kingdom and to a better understanding of the destruction in the temples in the Amarna Period on the other.

László Kákosy

EDMUND SCHÜTZ, *Armeno-Turcica. Selected Studies*. Bloomington, Indiana 1998 (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, 164).

This volume contains reprints of 16 selected papers, written by E. Schütz, distinguished scholar on the relationship between the Armenians and the Turks. The papers are divided

into three groups. Part I contains studies on Armeno-Kipchak, Part II on other linguistic studies and Part III studies on history. The grouping is necessarily arbitrary, because one of the great merits of E. Schütz is that he always tries to investigate linguistic problems against their historical background and to solve historical riddles with the help of linguistic data. If somebody will write a new, comprehensive monograph on the history, culture and languages of the Armenian diaspora in East Europe, the works of Schütz will offer a sound and solid basis. Schütz concentrates on how and when did a group of Armenians change their language and began to speak, pray and write in a Kipchak idiom of Turkic. This process may not only interest those who investigate Armenian or Turkic but would also interest sociolinguists. The gradual bottom-up change in the language, while retaining religion and script is not unprecedented in this region. Similar changes occurred to the Karaim, another Kipchak Turkic group that proselytised to the Jewish faith. The key historical questions (in both cases) are: when and where did the change of language occur? The scene where both events happened or at least began was the Crimean peninsula. Less clear is the chronological framework. Schütz argues convincingly that the migration of the masses of Armenians to the Crimea began only after the Mongolian invasion of East Europe, that is in the 13th century. He goes even further and demonstrates that the Armenians came in the 13th–14th centuries from the Ilkhanid Persia and from about 1600 from Cilicia, that is from East Anatolia in connection with the anti-Armenian atrocities by the rebellious Turkish Jelali movement. However, the Ottoman Empire conquered Crimea gradually after 1475 which resulted in the emigration to Podolia and Moldavia. Those newcomers who fled in the 17th century from Anatolia found only a very thin Armenian layer in the Crimea. Schütz stresses that the whole migration process was gradual and warns against oversimplification.

An extremely interesting and important paper is on Re-Armenisation and Lexikon. From Armeno-Kipchak Back to Armenian (*AOH* 13,

1966, pp. 123–130). The language of the Podolian Armenians underwent fundamental changes in the second half of the 17th century: spoken Armeno-Kipchak gave place partly to Polish, and partly to Armenian. The reasons for the shift to Polish are more or less clear. The change of the world trade, which after the discovery of the Americas and the circumnavigation of the African continent, reshaped the network of the commercial connections, drastically narrowed the importance of trade through East Europe. The Armenian archbishop of Lvov accomplished the union with the Catholic Church and thus the Polish influence grew. The Ottoman Turks took Podolia with the centre Kameneć. Shelter against the invasion could have been found at the Polish landlords. Without going into details the triple linguistic change Armenian → Kipchak → Polish by the same ethnic group is well documented and Schütz prepared the field for a thorough sociolinguistic investigation.

Even more interesting is the question of re-Armenisation. As Schütz states “As a matter of fact ‘re-Armenisation’ sounds paradox since the official language of the Church of the colony had always been Armenian”. However, the local idiom of certain regions was Kipchak and became step-by-step Armenian. Schütz discusses this in connection with the dialect of Kutý, a town founded in the 17th century. Armenians who moved to the region from different areas of the Diaspora triggered the change. Some came from Moldavia, others from Kameneć, a third group from Transylvania. Having analysed the language of Kutý Schütz is summing up. In the Armenian dialect of Kutý approximately 30 Kipchak loanwords can be detected. These loanwords were acquired from the language of those Armenians who settled in the region earlier and spoke an Armeno-Kipchak language. This means that Kipchak words were transmitted by an Armeno-Kipchak dialect to the Armenian dialect of Kutý.

In one of his papers Schütz follows the history of the Turkic word *taŋsoq* (Tangsox in Armenian, *AOH* 17, 1964, pp. 105–112). Though the word itself could not have been detected in

Armenian, the fact, however, that it is a frequent name makes it plausible that they knew it. Since the publication of this paper, M. Erdal has dealt with the word and the suffix *+sOk* which seems to have been unclear to Schütz. Erdal also mentions that in the Berliner Turfan-texte XIII 46, 35 the form *Tangusok* appears as a proper name (*Old Turkic Word Formation*, Wiesbaden 1991, p. 157).

One of the highly informative articles summarises the history of the ethnonym Tat. The name was used for Iranian ethnic elements in the neighbourhood of Turks, later it denoted also the neighbours (of whatever origin), and certain subdued people. Schütz analyses the history of the Tat on the Crimean peninsula and in Dobrudja (The Tat people in the Crimea, *AOH* 21, 1977, pp. 77–106). Schütz, joining others, claimed that the language of the Goths in the Crimea died out early and that the notes on Crimean Gothic by Ogier Ghislain de Busbecq in 1560–1562 “was highly misleading”. However, Macdonald Stearn in a book published in 1978 (*Crimean Gothic. Analysis and Etymology of the Corpus*, Saratoga, California) convincingly demonstrated that Crimean Gothic lived until the 16th century, which is important for the special relationship for the languages of the Crimea. Schütz is quoting Maḥmūd al-Khāshgharī as one of the early sources on the ethnonym Tat. In fact *apud* Khāshgharī Tat has the meaning ‘Persian’ (*fārisī*) and ‘Uighur infidels’ (*kafara Uighur*), that is the Buddhists or Manicheans. Khāshgharī cites two proverbs to illustrate their position. The first is *tatig közrā tikānig tüpre* “The Persian on the eye, the thorn on the root” and gives to it the explanation: “the proverb also originally refers to them, because they lack loyalty; just as the thorn should be cut at its root, so the Uighurī should be struck on the eye”. More interesting is the following proverb: *tatsiz türk bolmas, bašsiz bōrk bolmas* “There is no Türk without a Tat, as there is no cap without a head”. In the Arabic “Persian” and “Türk” are reversed (see Dankoff, R. – Kelly, J., *Mahmud al-Khāšgharī, Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*. 1984, II, p. 103). Which-

ever of the two is correct, the proverb refers to the close coexistence of the two people or to the interdependence of the nomads and the settled people.

To the history of the ethnonym Tat we can add two cases. Among the people of Caucasia, there exists a group that is called Tat. In fact they are Jewish by religion but ethnically Iranians. They were first mentioned by Berezin in 1853. (See A. L. Grjunberg, *Tatskij jazyk*, in: *Jazyki narodov SSSR*, t. pervyj, *Indoevropskie jazyki*, Red. V. V. Vinogradov, Moskva 1966, pp. 281–301). N. Poppe (*Reminiscences*, Western Washington 1983, p. 166) who met them in 1942 in Nalchik, writes a few words about them. The Germans, who occupied the territory, were in doubt whether these Jews had to be annihilated, and Poppe testified that they were of Iranian origin, so they were rescued as most of the Karaims were in Poland, but not the Krimchaks, the Jews of Crimea.

In Hungarian the name of the Slavs was *Tót*, it denoted all Slavs and has been narrowed to the designation of the Slovaks only in the early 19th century. This ethnonym is usually connected with the German name *Teut* (> *deutsch*, cf. *Teuton* etc.). However, the Old High German form is *diot*, the Gothic is *Þiunda*. It is at least not impossible that the Hungarians called the Slavs *Tat and the change *a > o* occurred in Hungarian.

In a paper (*Könige und Eidechsen [Bemerkungen zum Fortleben des ungarischen Wortes*

király 'König' in kiptschakischen Sprachen], *Proceedings of the IXth Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference ...*, Naples 1970, pp. 259–267) Schütz differentiated the data which refer to the king of Poland (*korol, korel, körel*, etc.) from those denoting the Hungarian king (*kiräl* etc.). It may be deceiving to suppose that the Turkic name of the turkey *körel* and that of the lizard *kerel* or the Hungarian word *király* played a role in the emergence of the front vocalic forms. Foreign words with /k/ + back vowels show in many cases two reflexes. In Kalmuck we find both *korül* and *körül* for 'king' in card-play, a clear borrowing from Russian *korol*'. Interesting is the Noghay and Karachay-Balkar *qiral* 'land, country; strana' quoted by Schütz. I would, however, not follow Hasan Eren and Pritsak in connecting this word with *qara el*, neither would I think of a Hungarian origin. I would connect it with *qir* 'steppe', the Kipchak-Noghay equivalent of the Persian *dešt* 'desert, country'. The whole region was called, as we know, *Dešt-i-Kipchak*, 'the steppe of the Kipchak'. The steppe country was the *qir eli*, from which *qiral* developed. In the Noghay-Russian dictionary of Baskakov (*Nogaisko-Russkij slovar'*, Moscow 1963, p. 201) we find *qir šešekeyleri* 'steppe flowers'.

All together I think we all are in debt to Denis Sinor, who published this interesting volume.

András Róna-Tas