

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2001

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0005 | LOG_0036

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Müjgân Çakır: Review of Mustafa Argunşah (ed.), *Muhammed b. Mahmûd-ı Şirvânî, Tuhfe-i Murâdî. İnceleme – metin – dizin*. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 722. Ankara. 1999. XV + 586 pp. ISBN 975-16-1130-X.

In classical Turkish literature, there are written works which deal with stones, the countries where these stones are found and the way they are used in medicine. These works, written in verse and in prose, are interesting in terms of their subjects, and Ahmet Bican's *Cevher-name*, which is written in verse, is one of them. *Tuhfe-i Muradî*, written in the 15th century, is an example of a prose work in this field.

Tuhfe-i Muradî has been published recently. This work, written by a famous doctor, Muhammed bin Mahmud-ı Şirvanî, who lived at the end of 14th and the beginning of the 15th century, has been edited by Mustafa Argunşah. This work examines various stones and fine odors. In the preface of his book, Şirvanî mentions the name of his work and describes its content as follows: "Pes ben fakîr ve hakîr dahı bu fennün mu'teber kitâblarından ve hâtırumda olan mesmû'âtdan fevâid ve letâ'if ve mesâ'il cem' itdüm. Bu kitâbı otuz iki bâb üzre yazdum ve her bâbı bir cevhere mahsûs itdüm ve ol bâb içindegi cevher neden oldugın ve eyüsin ve yatlusın ve hâsiyyetin ve fâidesin ve kıymetin ve ne yirde oldugın ve cilâsın ve düzmesin ve saklamasın beyân itdüm ve adını Tuhfe-i Murâdî kodum ve anı hazret-i Süleymân-i ehl-i İslâmın hazîne-i ma'mûresine mûrçe-vâr tuhfe-i mâ-hazar pîş-keş getürdüm." *Tuhfe-i Muradî*, completed on Saturday, February 5, 1427 (831 H.) in Bursa, was presented to Murad II, the Ottoman sultan of the time. This work is an expanded version of *Cevher-name*, written by the same author upon the request of a writer called Timurtaş Paşaoğlu Umur Bey. In this work, some stones and the use of various odors in medicine are described. Argunşah asserts that this work is seen by many as the first book of medicine written in Anatolia by writers with an interest in the history of medicine. Yet, he rejects this idea, stating that *Tuhfe-i Muradî* cannot be regarded as a book of medicine in the first place, since it was not intended as such. He also says that in the process of writing *Tuhfe-i Muradî*, Şirvanî benefited from the works of Arab, Persian and Latin doctors who lived before him. Looking at the text, we can see that in his description of stones and odors, Şirvanî was influenced by İbni Baytar's *Müfredat*, Alayî's *Itr-name* as well as by the ideas of certain famous doctors such as Tığaşı, İshak İbni İmran, Muhammed İbni Zekeriyya, Arestatalis, Ebu Reyhan, Farabî and Belinas. Şirvanî was influenced especially by Nasreddin Tusî's *Cevher-name*, called *Tansuk-name-i İlhanî*, and often cited from this work.

Mustafa Argunşah's study on *Tuhfe-i Muradî* is divided into three main sections. The first section, "Research" (pp. 1-66), discusses the life of Muhammed bin Mahmûd-ı Şirvanî and his works in detail. One of the most important points made in the "Research" section is that some of the sources which give information about Şirvanî's life confuse him with another person of the same name. The works of

Muhammed bin Mahmud-ı Şirvanî are studied under the headings “Works in Turkish”, “Works in Arabic” and “Works dedicated to Muhammed b. Mahmud-ı Şirvanî”. His works in Turkish include *İlyâsiyye*, *Sultâniyye*, *Cevher-nâme*, *Kitâbü’l-tabîh Tercümesi*, *Tuhfe-i Murâdî*, *Mürşid*; some of his works in Arabic are *İlyâsiyye*, *Yakûbiyye*, *Ravzatü’l-l’utr*, *el-Faslu’l-âşiru fî Mârifeti’l-evzânî ve’l-mekâyili min Mürekkebât-ı Ravzatü’l-l’utr*, *Risâletü mine’t-tıb fî Beyânî Mübtelâ bihî mine’l-kulunc*, *Miftâhu’n-necât lemâ Yenfetihu bihî Ebvâbü’l-birri ve’s-sââdet*; all the works listed above are introduced in the “Research” section. Another important point appears under the heading “The works dedicated to Muhammed b. Mahmud-ı Şirvanî”. Here, M. Argunşah provides information about works such as *Kemâliyye*, *Tarih-i İbn-i Kesir Tercümesi*, *Haridatü’l-acâ’ib ve Faridetü’l-garâ’ib Tercümesi*, *Baz-nâme Tercümesi*, *Murâd-nâme* which are said to be written by Şirvanî.

In the “Research” section, we learn that *Tuhfe-i Muradî* is divided into 32 chapters, and is based on Tığaşı’s *Ezhârü’l-efkâr*. This section also deals with the descriptions of the manuscripts of *Tuhfe-i Muradî* and their linguistic features, especially of 15th century Anatolian Turkish. The linguistic features of *Tuhfe-i Muradî* are discussed under the headings “Grammatical features”, “Phonological features” and “Morphological features”. Here, the researcher has made the right decision by pointing out the interesting characteristics which, he thought, would contribute to the studies carried out in this field, rather than giving a general account of the grammatical features of Anatolian Turkish. In any case, there would be no point in repeating the known features of the Turkish language of that time, since they are already laid out in many sources.

The second section of the book is devoted to the content of the *Tuhfe-i Muradî*. Şirvanî’s 140-page text, which is formed by the three copies of the six existing manuscripts of the book, is presented on pages 69-256. In the preface of his work, after pronouncing the formula *besmele*, *hamdele* and *salvele*, Şirvanî praises the Ottomans and Murad II, to whom he dedicates his work by saying “Âl-i Osmân dahî hademi ve haşemi ve begleri birle Hak rızâsı-çün küfrün kam’ına teveccüh itmişler durur ve sıyt-ı İslâmı eknâf-ı ‘âleme irişdürmişler durur ve kılıçlarınun be’sinden kâfirler bütleriyle hor ve nigûn-sâr olmuşlar durur”. At the end of the preface, he introduces himself and gives the index of his work. The first stone that Şirvanî introduces is the *inci* ‘pearl’. Later on, he talks about some stones, specifically *yakut* ‘ruby’, *zümürrüd* ‘emerald’, *zeberced* ‘garnet’, *la’l* ‘chrysolite’, *benefş* ‘violet’, *becadi*, *elmas* ‘diamond’, *aynü’l-hirr* ‘cat’s eye’, *padzehr* ‘bezoarstone’, *piruze* ‘turquoise’, *akik* ‘carnelian’, *cez*, *mugnatis* ‘lodestone’, *senbadec* ‘whetstone’, *dehene*, *laciverd* ‘azure’, *mercan* ‘coral’, *şebe* ‘black amber’, *cümşüt*, *hammahan*, *yeşm* ‘jade’, *yasb* ‘jasper’, *billur* ‘crystal’, *mina* ‘enamel’, *çini alet* ‘encaustic tile’, *kehrüba* ‘amber’, *talk* ‘talc’, *mühreler*, *balasan yagı*, and also *scinus officinalis* and other fishes which increase coition, fish teeth, ivory and aromas, and their use in medicine. Şirvanî ends his book by noting the date of the completion of his work, *Tuhfe-i Muradî*, and by asking his readers to pray for him.

Argunşah adds to the end of the text, (pp. 257-258), the verses of the Quran which are mentioned within the text, sayings of the prophet Mohammed, and also the translations of other Arabic and Persian passages.

In my opinion, the most important part of Argunşah's edition is the "Grammatical index". The index, which constitutes the third section of the study (pp. 259-286), includes all the words in *Tuhfe-i Muradî* together with their suffixes. Yet, while in academic studies, the practice of giving the meanings of the words in this kind of indices is always neglected, M. Argunşah has managed to faithfully render the original meanings of the words in the text.

Argunşah's study is a great achievement for readers who are interested in the history of medicine, folk dance, classical Turkish literature and the Turkish language.

Claus Schönig: Review of Peter B. Golden & Thomas T. Allsen (eds.) *The King's dictionary. The Rasûlid hexaglot: fourteenth century vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. Translated by Tibor Halasi-Kun, Peter B. Golden, Louis Ligeti and Edmund Schütz with introduction by Peter B. Golden and Thomas T. Allsen. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill. 2000. xii+418 pp. 22 facsimiles.

The book in question is the result of a project which started in the late 1960s, when Tibor Halasi-Kun became acquainted with some photographs of the manuscript of the so-called Rasûlid hexaglot, a manuscript of twenty pages consisting of several word lists. In 1974, he brought together an international team of researchers to work collaboratively on this interesting find. The work was finished twenty-five years later. But even if the labor was frequently interrupted, it resulted in one of the most interesting editions of Medieval Turkic and Mongolian sources which have been published in the last years.

In the *prolegomena* (pp. 1-58) the editor of the publication, Peter B. Golden, gives an introduction to the world in which the Rasûlid hexaglot was written. He comments on the ethno-linguistic changes in the Middle East, which reached their climax with the Mongol invasion in the thirteenth century. Furthermore, he gives information about states and languages in the Middle East in the fourteenth century, the sources and languages of the hexaglot (including several types of Turkic), and the Rasûlid dynasty in Southern Arabia, an offspring of which is the author of the hexaglot (Al-Malik al Afḍal al-ʿAbbâs b. ʿAlî, 1363-1377). Golden's part of the *prolegomena* ends with some notes on the hexaglot's author. There follow Thomas T. Allsen's notes on the Eurasian cultural context of the hexaglot. They contain—

beside many other interesting observations—important remarks on the role of translators, interpreters, grammars and translations in the multilingual Chingissid empire and neighboring states in the fourteenth century. Then we find a comparative table which demonstrates structural parallels and differences between the Sino-Mongolian vocabulary compiled during the reign of Qubilay, the Sino-Mongolian vocabulary of 1389, the Arabic-Persian-Turkic-Greek-Armenian section of our hexaglot and its Arabic-Persian-Turkic-Mongolian section. Like many vocabularies of this time, these were not organized alphabetically but with respect to semantic fields. The *prolegomena* end with remarks on the organization of the text and the transcription used by the authors.

The main part of the book contains the edition and translation of the word lists (pp. 61-328) followed by a bibliography (including abbreviations, pp. 329-334) and indices (English, Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Mongol, Persian, and Turkic; pp. 335-418). The book ends with a facsimile of the text.

Thanks to the editors a new set of important medieval language materials is now accessible to scholars of various disciplines. In general the presentation of the materials is satisfying. Especially the comments in the *prolegomena* are not only very helpful for the user of the edition, but have a scientific value of their own. Nevertheless, I am compelled to add some critical remarks. Because of my limited knowledge, I am only able to comment on the Turkic and, to some extent, on the Mongolian parts of the edition. My first remark concerns the small amount of comments on graphical, lexical and morphological problems. Therefore, I shall not only make critical remarks, but also add some comments concerning various phenomena in the hexaglot which—from my point of view—should have been made in the edition.

The transcription of the text often appears to be a mixture of transcription and transliteration. There are some problems in connection with the Arabic sign *yā'*, which is used as a vowel sign to represent *i*, *ī*, and *e*. The use of only one *e*-sign in the transcription is problematic because in the edition this sign is also used to represent open *e* (*ä*), often represented by *alif* or *tā' marbūṭa*. In contrary, the sign *yā'* is only used to represent closed *e* (*é*) in Arabic script. The editor does not even discuss the possibility that such a closed *é* existed in the various kinds of Turkic documented in the hexaglot. Instead he simply uses the vowel signs of the Turkish alphabet, which offers no possibility to differentiate between open *e* (*ä*) and closed *e* (*é*). In this context one often misses some clarifying comments or consistent transcriptions. In some words in the hexaglot the vowel of the first syllable appears sometimes with *yā'* and sometimes without *yā'*. Thus we find the imperatives 63

(24)¹ QWY BYR *qoy bir* 'set free!', 64 (25) BRĠL *birġil* 'give!', and 78 (27) KRY BR *kirâ bir* 'give rent!'. They are derived from a verb which is often reconstructed as *bêr-* or *bâr-*. One may assume that the verb was pronounced *bir-*, but then one should at least comment on this assumption—and mention the oscillation between the two different notations BYR and BR in the hexaglot which are reminiscent of the situation, e.g. in the Orkhon inscriptions. The same holds true for the auxiliary verb of denominal verb derivation which, I would prefer to read as *êt-*. Here we find a 'T-form in 76 (10) 'YŠ 'T *iš et* 'work!' besides many 'YT-forms, e.g. 83 (10) 'YTMDNKZ *itmedingiz* 'you (pl.) did not do', 84 (16) SN 'YTNK *sen itting* 'you (s.) did do', etc. Comparable cases are the copula forms (95 (12) 'RDM *irdim* 'I was', but, e.g. 87 (2) QLĠŠ 'YRNĠ *qilgaš irinč* 'perhaps you do', 95 (9) 'YDY *idi* 'he was') and the numeral for 'two' (190 (27) 'KY *iki* 'two', but 239 (15) 'YKNĠ 'Y *ikinč ay* 'second month'). But whereas entry 116 (9) 'RKK 'male' is transcribed as *erkek*, 262 (4) 'YRKK is given as *irkek*. All these words show oscillating notations in Old Turkic sources and exhibit closed *e*-sounds in some modern Turkic languages (e.g. in Uzbek, Altay Turkic, etc.). The same holds true for another group of words which are only attested once and are written with *yā*', e.g. 97 (1) KYRW *kirū* 'backwards, behind', 170 (21) BYĠN, 221 (15) BYĠYN *bičün* 'ape, monkey', 190 (30) BYŠ *biš* 'five' (always written with Y), 199 (13) YYL *yil* 'wind', 205 (26) 'YRNY 'YRN *irni, irin* 'lip', and 281 (24) BYŠYK *bišik* 'cradle'. Here I would also prefer a transcription with *ē* in the first syllable. A comparable case written without *yā*' is 65 (4) 'ŠT *išit-* 'listen', which may also be read as *ešit-*. In the case of the cognates of the old word for 'political unit, community, people, etc.' entry 248 (20) 'iYl *il* 'countries' written with *kasra* may be interpreted as a hint not only to read this but also 112 (7) 'YL *il* 'subordinate' and 144 (30) 'YL *il* 'province' with *i*. But one should keep in mind that the inherited forms of this word (not those created by language reformers) in Turkish of Turkey have (closed) *e*, e.g. in *el* '(other) people' or in the place name *Rumeli*, used today for the European part of Turkey.

There are also some cases in which the sign *yā*' is transcribed as *e*, e.g. 72 (12) 'YSKL *eskil* 'streich!' and 115 (2) 'YŠ *eš* 'companion, friend'; for Mongolian *e* expressed by *yā*' see, e.g. 204 (10) 'YRH *ere* 'man', (13) TYRKWN *tergün* 'head' (see also below), 207 (6) 'YK'M *egem* 'shoulder', and—even in word-final position—210 (28) HYLKY *helige* 'liver'. For the word for 'earth, etc.' different tran-

¹ The first number refers to the page of the edition, the second number in brackets refers to the running number of the entry in the original text. I use this system instead of giving the pagination of the manuscript for the sake of the reader so that he may easier look up the entries discussed here in the edition.

scriptions are used for identical spellings, e.g. 141 (14) YYR *yer* 'earth', but 201 (22) YYR TTRYMQ *yir titremaq* 'earthquake' and 320 (2) YYRDAŠ *yirdaš* 'native, compatriot, countryman'. The same holds true for derivations of the word for 'to eat'. Whereas we have 124 (7) YYMK *yemek* 'to eat, food' and 254 (2) YYMYŠ *yemiš* 'fruit(s)', we find 155 (3) YYMŠ *yimiš* 'fruit(s)'.

Somewhat astonishing in the hexaglot is the case of the Oghuz word for 'hand' 105 (16) 'L *el*, but 207 (9) 'YL *il* in the hexaglot. To my knowledge a form *il* (or even *él*) is not attested in modern Oghuz. But it is possible that such a form had developed at the time of the hexaglot, but vanished later—if it is not a mere misspelling in the manuscript.

As for Turkic 201 (22) YYR TTRYMQ *yir titremaq* 'earthquake', the editor takes the *yā* 'sign to represent of *e* (= 'é?) in the second syllable. This is very astonishing, since the *yā* 'sign normally is used for *é* only in first syllables. Even if the given transcription seems plausible (because of Old Turkic *titre-*), in this type of edition should at least mention that a form in the text points to *titri-* or metathetical *tetri-*; with respect to the back-vocalic suffix MQ one may also think of *tütri-* or *tatri-*, see also below. The notation may also be a mere misspelling in the manuscript.

If the manuscript does not exhibit any vowel sign and other Turkic sources and languages exhibit *i* as well as *e* (and perhaps even *é*), it is of course not easy to decide how to read the word in question. Such cases are, e.g. 96 (19) 'MDY *imdi* 'now' (or *emdi*?) and 157 (15) ĞĜK *čiček* 'rose' (or *čeček*?). Here one should always mention the different possible reading in a footnote, as done in the case of 314 (34) NĜ' *neje* 'how much? how many?' (where the footnote states "or *nije*, *neče*"), but not in the case of variant 96 (23) NĜH *nije* 'id.' Undoubtedly wrong is the notation of the aorist vowel as *i* instead of *e* in 86 (29) BZ 'YDRYZ *biz idiriz* 'we do'.

There are also some open questions and inconsistencies concerning the distribution of labial vowels in the edition. In the case of the zero-suffixed imperative form of the second person singular 65 (7) *KRKZ² *körgüz* 'show!', the authors decided to transcribe a labial vowel in the second syllable although there is no *wāw* or *ḍamma* in the text. This may go back to the fact that the causative suffix in question (Old Turkic *-gUr-*) originally had a labial vowel. But the aorist form 82 (3) QLR 'he does' is rendered as *qilir*, although the most ancient form is *qilur*. For 136 (30) YĜMR 'rain' we find *yağmır*, although forms like *yağmur* appear throughout the Old and Middle Turkic periods. Other transcriptions of *u* or *ü* for *zero* in the manuscript are, e.g. 96 (22) 'YRQ *ayruq* 'other than', 105 (9) 'M ĞQ *amčuq* 'pudendum of the female', and 121 (18) YWNĜL *yüngül* 'light (of weight)' (but 262 (2)

² The asterisk is used to mark reconstructed forms.

*YNKL *yingil* 'id.'). The forms of the imperative suffix *-Gll-* are always given with illabial vowels, even after labial stem vowels, e.g. 72 (9) SWRKL *sürgil* 'rub!' and 66 (11) KLKL *külgil* 'laugh!'. In the case of the privative suffix we find 122 (22) KĠSZ *küčsüz* 'weak' and 183 (26) KŞZ *kössüz* 'blind', but also illabial forms like 127 (3), BLKASZ *bilgesiz* 'ignorant', 100 (20) SQL SZ *saqalsiz*, and 262 (8) *KWĠ SYZ *küčsiz* 'slack', the latter even after a labial stem vowel. Only sometimes are alternative readings given. In the case of 129 (15) 'RQ 'lean, emaciated' we find besides *aruq* the alternative reading *ariq* given in the footnote; see also 219 (2) 'NK *enik*, footnote *enük* 'puppy'. In the case of 141 (8) BLT 'cloud' the entry is transcribed as illabial *bulit* as the transcription of the entrance, whereas labial *bulut* is given as an alternative in the footnote. The alternative vocalized form 199 (14) BLuT *buluť* appears without any comment. For 120 (8) 'SRK *esruk* 'drunk' we find the alternative form 263 (14) 'SRWK, which may have served as a pattern for the labial vocalization of the second syllable. The same holds true for 75 (6) DWNDR *dönidür* 'turn' (see also below), but 64 (3) DuNDur **döndür*- 'id.'. On the other hand, 134 (16) KWN YLDZ *kün yıldız* 'Venus' (already with *d*) is given with illabial vowels, although the text also exhibits a clearly labial form 199 (11) ***YWLDWZ *yulduz*. In principle, such interpretative transliterations seem acceptable. But the editor should at least have explained his criteria for the different uses of labial vowels in cases where the text gives no hint for such an interpretation. As a whole, the use of labial vowels looks very unsystematic.

There are some problems in connection with the distribution of the signs for the gutturals *ğayn*, *kāf* and *qāf* in the hexaglot as well as with their transcription in the edition. Thus in the case of the imperative suffix *-Gll* we find more or less expected notations with *kāf* in words like 72 (12) 'YSKL *eskil* 'stretch!' with front vowels, and with *ğayn* in words with back vowels like 71 (1) QS ĠL *qışğil* 'press, squeeze!'; the sign *qāf* is never used in this suffix, even after (signs for) voiceless consonants. It is acceptable that the authors of the edition decided to use the sign *ğ* in back-vocalic words, even if one could expect a more or less devoiced pronunciation of the guttural consonant, i.e. that they decided to make a mere transliteration of the text. But it does not seem convincing to me that in the case of front-vocalic words they changed to a mixed system of transliteration and transcription. Thus we find besides a transliteration like 62 (12) BTYKYL *bitikil* 'write!' many transcriptional forms like 63 (16) YaKL *yegil* 'eat!', 71 (3) BLKL *bilgil* 'know!', 72 (9) SWRKL *sürgil* 'rub!', and 66 (11) KLKL *külgil* 'laugh!', where the Arabic sign *kāf* is represented by *g*. In back-vocalic 62 (15) 'YTKL *ayitğil* (why not *eyitkil* comparable to, e.g., Tatar *eyt*?) the *kāf* is transcribed as *ğ*. Furthermore, there are some cases where the hexaglot shows back-vocalic suffix forms after front-vocalic stems, e.g. 72 (8) YWLĠL *yülüğil* 'shave!' and 73 (15)

SWKĠL *söggül* 'curse, revile!'; additionally we find 64 (25) BRĠL 'give!' *birġil*, which may be a mere misprint in the edition. From my point of view, these forms are mere misspellings in the hexaglot and / or mistakes in the edition. However, if one actually thinks that the hexaglot represents real pronunciation, i.e. that in these cases really back vocalic suffix forms were added to front-vocalic stems or that *ġayn* is used in combination with front-vocalic *i*, one should at least comment on it.

The Turkic forms 219 (1) SWRK *sürük* 'drove, flock, herd' and 309 (6) BTYK *bitik* are transcribed with *k*, i.e. in a form one would expect in Modern Southeast Turkic or in Chagatay. But as one can see from entries like 122 (26) 'LWK *ölüg* 'dead' and many others, in these derivations the editor normally transcribes final *kāf* as -g (like in Old Turkic). The corresponding Mongol form 219 (1) SuRWK *sürüg* 'id.' is given according to the spelling traditions of Mongol as -g, whereas we find *k* in Mongol 309 (6) BĠYK *bičik* 'book', which probably is closer to the real pronunciation.

The hexaglot shows different graphical representations of the sounds *s* and *t* in back-vocalic Turkic words. In the majority of cases these two sounds are represented by the Arabic signs *sīn* and *tā'*, designating non-emphatic sounds as in Chagatay. But there are also cases in which the signs for the corresponding emphatic Arabic sounds *šād* and *tā'* are used in back-vocalic words as in Anatolian Turkic / Ottoman. Thus on the first sixty pages of the edition *sīn* represents *s*-sounds in 61 (7) SQYŠ *saqış* 'reckoning', 63 (19) SWR *sor* 'suck!', 64 (26) 'SBRLH *isparla* 'hand over!', 64 (2) 'S'QY *asa qoy* 'hang!', 67 (20) S'ĠL *saġil* 'reckon!', 71 (1) QS ĠL *qisġil* 'press, squeeze!', 74 (22) S'RĠL *sargil* 'wrap up, roll up!', 75 (7) S'NĠL *sangil* 'think, suppose!', 77 (21) SN'ĠL *sanagil* 'count!', 82 (6) QLM'S *qilmas* 'he does not, will not do', 84 (17) SN QLRSN *sen qilirsīn* 'you dot', 98 (4) SĠ *sač* 'hair', 99 (19) SQL *saqal* 'beard', 104 (4) Q'SQ *qasiq* 'pubes', 108 (6) SNR *sinir* 'nerve', 111 (1) YSMQ *yasmīq* 'safflower', and 119 (31) SNYQ *sinīq* 'broken'. With *šād* we find, e.g., 72 (11) ŠYL *šil* 'wipe!', 102 (1) QŠQĠ *qışqač* 'crayfish', and 114 (29) ŠNĠY *šongī* 'its end'. The forms 65 (9) ŠQLH *saqla* 'conceal!', 113 (21) ŠĠR 'KWZ *siġir öküz* 'bovines, cattle', and 117 (19) QYŠĠ' *qisġa* 'short' are not transcribed with *šād*. Alternative forms of the same word are, e.g., 316 (A) S'Ġ *saġ* 'right', but (B) ŠWL *šol* 'left'. Because of the unstable use of the two Arabic signs for *s*, there is no need to read Turkic 148 (27) SNDW '(pair of) scissors' as *sindü*, only because a *sīn* is used; it can also be read as *sīndü*, which in a footnote the editor designates as the more common form. The same holds true for 261 (25) 'YSY *isi* 'heat, warmth', which may be read *isi*; but see 308 (1) 'SYK *isig* 'heat, warmth', which because of the *kāf* must be read with front vowels. Furthermore, the spelling of a reconstructed form like 97 (2) *'SR' *asra* 'below, beneath' seems to be completely correct, even if the *sīn* in the manuscript looks a bit damaged. The proposal

in the footnote of an alternative reading “’ŠR’ *ašra*” is unnecessary and does not match the form of the sign in the manuscript.

There editors have committed some mistakes concerning *s*-sounds written with *šād*. Thus they give 153 (16) QWĠY *šuči* ‘wine’, which is clearly written ŠWĠY in the manuscript; see also Mongol 261 (23) Q’YN *sain* ‘good; fine’ instead of Š’YN in the manuscript.

For *t*-sounds we find writings with *tā*’ in, e.g., 61 (6) TMQ *tamuq* ‘hell’, 62 (15) ’YTKL *ayitgöl* ‘say!’, 63 (21) ’LTR *oltur* ‘sit down!’, 71 (4) ’uNWuT *unut* ‘forget!’, 71 (7) ’RuWT *arut* ‘clean!’, 74 (24) YWTĠL *yutgöl* ‘swallow, gulp down!’, 76 (14) QT *qat* ‘mix!’, 77 (20) QWTRĠL *qotarġöl* ‘empty!’, 99 (14) TWTQ *tutaq* ‘lip’, 106 (20) TiRN’Q *tirnaq* ‘fingernail’, 106 (21) BWT *but* ‘thigh, leg’, 107 (26) QLTQ *qoltuq* ‘armpit’, 109 (12) ’T’ *ata* ‘father’, 109 (14) QRNT’Š *qarīntaš* ‘brother’, 113 (18) QWRT *qurut* ‘dried curds used as a kind of cheese’, 116 (7) ’WRT’ *avurta* ‘wet nurse’, 118 (26) YXTĠ *yaxtġ* ‘light’, and 119 (1) TWQ *toq* ‘satiated’. With *tā*’ we have, e.g., 63 (20) and 76 (13) TR *tur* ‘raise, stand up!’ (but 262 (7) TRMYŠ *turmiš* ‘stood’), 64 (28) YT *yat* ‘lie down!’, 67 (24) YRT *yirt* ‘tear!’, 77 (16) ’WTR *oŋur* ‘stand up!’ (*sic*), 105 (8) T’ŠQ *tašaq* ‘testicles’, 105 (12) TLQ *ŋalaq* ‘spleen’, 109 (16) TĠ’YY *taġayī* ‘uncle (maternal)’, 114 (25) TLW *tolu* ‘full, fullness’, and 115 (3) T’YZH *taŋza* ‘maternal aunt’ (see also 147 (22) ’WT *oŋ* ‘fire’). Sometimes we find alternating forms like 74 (27) ŠT *šat* ‘sell!’, but 74 (28) S’TN ’L *satīn al* ‘buy!’, 63 (22) TT, TT *tut*, *tuŋ* ‘seize!’, 108 (3) TaMaR *ŋamar* ‘vein’, but 213 (22) TMR), 120 (5) ’TLĠ *atlġ* ‘horseman’, but 262 (6) ’TLYG *atlġ* ‘rider’; there is also a mixed form 74 (29) TRTĠL *ŋartġöl* ‘weigh!’.

Mongol words demonstrate the same distribution of signs used for *s* and *t*. A *sīn* for *s*-sounds is used, e.g., in 69 (12) *HWSWN *husun* ‘semen, sperm’, 70 (23) BWS’QH *bosaqa* ‘threshold’, 80 (15) QRMSQ’ *qorumsaqa* ‘quiver’, 91 (2) TWSWN *ŋosun* ‘butter’, 92 (12) N’SWD’ *nasuda* ‘always’, 93 (28) SYŠĠW *saišāġu* ‘to praise’, and 102 (9) SWNĠĠW *sonġaġu* ‘choose, choosing’. A *šād* can be found in, e.g., 92 (14) ŠWLTQĠW *sulatqāġu* ‘to loosen, to empty’ (not transcribed as *šād*). For *t*-sounds see, e.g., 81 (23) TTM’Ġ *tutmač* ‘name of a dish’ (113 (15) given as Turkic), 92 (14) ŠWLTQĠW *sulatqāġu* ‘to loosen, to empty’, 101 (4) T’TĠW *tataġu* ‘drag, draw, pull’, but 80 (16) NQTH *noŋta* ‘halter’ and 91 (2) TWSWN *ŋosun* ‘butter’. In the case of one etymon we find the non-emphatic sign used for the Mongol form (70 (21) TRMT’Y *turumtay* ‘merlin’), whereas the Turkic entry is written with emphatic signs (103 (11) *TRMT’Y *ŋurumtay* ‘a kind of eagle, vulture ...’ (the second *t*-sign is not transcribed as *tā*’)).

The unstable use of emphatic and non-emphatic signs must go back to the fact that the author of the hexaglot had access to Central Asian sources (and/or informants) as well as to Old Anatolian Turkic ones. This assumption is strengthened by

the fact that the hexaglot gives the imperative form of the verb for 'to sit (down)' in its Anatolian Turkic (and Western Turkic) form as 77 (16) 'WTR *otur* written with *tā*' (with the wrong meaning 'stand up!'), whereas it has the Central Asian (and Eastern Turkic except Lena-Sayanic) form 63 (21) 'LTR *oltur* 'sit down!' written with *tā*'. Probably the author did not differentiate carefully enough between the two different types of written Turkic of this time and thus mixed up the different orthographies in his entries.

There is an inconsistent representation of Arabic emphatic *tā*', most possibly going back to insufficient proof reading. Thus we find, e.g., 126 (27) TGMQ *toğmaq* 'to bear', 67 (24) YRT *yirt* 'tear!', and 64 (28) YT *yat* 'lie down!', besides notions with *t*; see above. See also Mongol 103 (11) TRMT'Y *ṭurumtay* 'a kind of eagle, vulture ...'. The same holds true for emphatic *ṣ*, e.g., Turkic 65 (9) SQLH *saqla* 'conceal', 113 (21) ŠGR 'KWZ *sīgür öküz* 'bovines, cattle', and 117 (19) QYŠGA *qışga* 'short'; see also Mongol 92 (14) ŠWLTQGW *sulatqaḡu* 'to loosen, to empty'. Of course the use of the signs for emphatic consonants would be quite superfluous, if the editors intended to give a transcription of the Turkic and Mongolic expressions. But the notations in the edition remain somewhere between transcription and transliteration. Yet they should be done consistently.

In the case of Turkic 295 (13) BYNR *beynir* 'cheese' I see no reason for a representation with *b*. In other cases the editor has always used *p* for Arabic *bā*' where most modern Turkic languages use *p*, e.g. 126 (28) TBMQ *ṭapmaq* 'to find', 292 (36) BYŠMYŠ BYSYK *pišmiš wa* (the W of the manuscript is not represented in the transliteration) *pišig* 'boiled' and 'cooked'—and 113 (17) Y'Š BYNYR *yaš peynir* 'unsalted fresh cheese'.

Clearly of Chagatay type are the graphical representations NK of the velar nasal *ng* instead of Ottoman K, e.g. 83 (10) 'YTMDNKZ *itmedingiz* 'you (pl.) did not do', 84 (16) SN 'YTNK *sen itting* 'you (s.) did do', 181 (14) 'RNK *ürüng* 'white', 258 (5) KNK KWZLK *keng közlük* 'large-eyed; beautiful-eyed' etc. Sometimes *ḡayn* is used instead of *kāf* like in the case of back-vocalic Mongolian 250 (5) TNĠL'SWN *tanglasun* 'brick'. But there are also front-vocalic Turkic examples like 121 (18) YWNĠL *yüngül* 'light (of weight)' (but 262 (2) *YNKL *yingil* 'id.') and 142 (20) DNĠZ *dengiz* 'sea'. For this reason and because of the use of *tā*', it is not sure that 198 (1) Turkic TNĠRY really has to be read as *tangrī*. But if the reading with back vowels is correct, the form would have to be considered an Oghuz form (as Golden does; see p. 18). This of course is possible, because the text clearly contains some Oghuz material (see below). Such an assumption is additionally strengthened by the fact, that the synonymous Mongol form is given with *kāf* as TNKRY *tengri* (why not *teng(g)eri*?)—like 61 (1) Turkic TNKRY *tengri*, which then should be an Eastern Turkic (e.g. Chagatay) form. Perhaps the sporadic use of

gayn goes back to the fact the author of the hexaglot was not familiar with the (notation of the) velar nasal, because is not part of the phonetic inventory of Arabic.

There seems to be at least one example of the Ottoman way of representing the velar nasal, namely Turkic 108 (9) BKY *bengi* 'brain'. But one may also assume that the author simply forgot the *nūn*. An obvious misspelling is Turkic 118 (27) QRNW *qaranu* 'darkness' (for *qaraŋu*, see 201 (25) Turkic QR'NGW). In the case of 243 (14) Turkic MNK, BYN *ming*, *bin* 'thousand' we find beside a non-Oghuz Turkic form of the numeral a quite modern form with *n* insted of *ng* (*ŋ*).³ Because in this early time one can still expect preservation of the velar nasal, I consider this a mere misspelling, too (perhaps brought on by the non-Turkic background of the author of the hexaglot), i.e. the author forgot to write a *kāf* (or a *gayn*); the same holds true for 107 (2) SNWK *sönük* 'bone', which should be *söngük*, see also below. The corresponding Mongol numeral for 'thousand' is given as MNQ'N *minqan*; the use of Q is perhaps a reflex of the combination of the velar nasal and a guttural in Mongol *miŋgan*). For Turkic 108 (8) BaNK *benek* 'a small spot, a speck, a freckle' I assume a misinterpretation by the editor, who reads a diminutive instead of a simple *beŋ* 'spot, etc.'. As in the case of *bin* 'thousand' the original final velar nasal of Old Turkic *beŋ* should still be preserved.

For reconstructed Turkic 124 (8) *TNKLMQ *tīŋlamaq* the editor states in a footnote that it may also be read as *tinglemaq*. Because he gives no further explanation, it seems that he comes to this conclusion because of the use of *tā*' and *kāf* in this word. But the *kāf* is used in combination with *nūn* to express the velar nasal and is not an indication of a front-vocalic pronunciation, and *tā*' may also appear in back-vocalic words (see above). On the other hand we find Turkic 201 (22) YYR TTRYMQ *yir titremaq* 'earthquake', which must be connected with Turkish *titremek* 'to quiver', see above. If we do not want to assume a mere misspelling, we have to assume a pronunciation with broken vowel harmony. Such forms appear, e.g., in some Azeri dialects, in which the suffix of the verbal noun always has the back-vocalic pronunciation *-maq*.

In Turkic 324 (2) QZL 'RY *qizil* 'ari' 'red bee' we find the Arabic sign 'ayn designating the glottal stop; here the editors again prefer to transliterate the entry. In the case of Mongolian 241 (29) ĞR'W'N *jur'uan* 'six' the 'ayn is probably an undotted *gayn*. Furthermore I doubt that the reading with *u* in the first syllable is correct, as Middle Mongolian normally has *jirguḡa(n)*. Thus I would prefer to transcribe this entry as *jir'uan*.

In some cases we find signs for voiceless consonants where modern languages use voiced ones. Thus the more modern form of the word for 'hare' is 170 (19)

³ It should be noticed that the manuscript shows something like MaNK.

TFŠN *tafšan* 'hare; rabbit' with *f* (e.g. Turkish *tavšan*), whereas the more archaic form is given as 221 (11) TWŠQ'N *tavišqan*. The correspondent of modern (y)az- is given as 124 (3) YSMAQ *yasmaq* 'going astray'. Instead of *közsüz* we find the notation 183 (26) KSZ *kössüz* 'blind', which seems closer to the real pronunciation of the word. On the other hand there are the forms 193 (20) SKZN *sekzen* 'eighty', (21) TKZN *toqzan* (without any comment by the editor). From my point of view they simply have to be read as *sekizen* and *toquzan*; this would easily explain the appearance of a sign for a voiced consonant after the sign for a voiceless consonant in Arabic script in the manuscript. Furthermore we find 190 (29) TWRT *tört* 'four', but 192 (8) 'WN DWRT *on dört* 'fourteen', which may be interpreted as sonorization of the initial consonant in *sandhi* after a nasal.

In some cases vowels are left out in the transcription if they are not noted by consonantal or vocalization signs in the manuscript. Turkic 315 (45) YQRDA *yuqarda* 'above, upwards' can be interpreted as *yuqarida*. The same holds true for 122 (20) YMŠQ *yumšaq* 'soft', which can also be read as *yumušaq*. In such cases the vowels in question should at least be given in brackets. For 122 (25) TYRLK 'living, alive' the edition gives *tirlig*. I would prefer to read *tirilig*, a deverbal adjective of *tiril-* 'to live, revive', which itself is a derivation by means of a passive suffix from the old verb *tir-* 'to live'. We find a nominal derivation of the same type directly from this verb in 261 (29) TYRK *tirig* 'living, lively'. In the case of Mongol 204 (13) TYRKWN 'head' the editor reads *tergün*, whereas Middle Mongol normally has *terigün*. The same problem appears in Mongol 212 (10) *HTKWN *hütkün* 'pudendum of the female', which normally is *hütügün* 'hole'. The word 297 (26) TKL' *tegle* 'a short upper garment' should be better read as *tegele*, see Doerfer (1963: 327-328 and 1975: 386).

As the editor briefly mentions, some of the Turkic entries in the hexaglot are clearly of the (Western Anatolian) Oghuz Turkic type. Sometimes we find Western Anatolian Oghuz forms in one part of the hexaglot (e.g. 88 (9) BN *ben* 'I', 94 (5) BNDN *benden* 'from me', and (7) BNĠ' *bunġa* 'to this', all with preservation of *b-* before a nasal at the first syllable border; see also 95 (11) QNGY *qanġi* 'which?'), whereas another part exhibits non-Western Anatolian Oghuz forms (e.g. 312 (22) MaN *men* 'I', 314 (38) QY W QYĠ *qay wa* **qayġ* 'which' and 'which?'). Sometimes non-Oghuz forms are followed by (Western Anatolian) Oghuz forms in one and the same entry, e.g. 313 (30) *MND' BND' *munda, bunda* 'here', 313 (32) BNDQ BWYL' *bundaq, böyle* 'thus, like this, in this way', 313 (33) 'NDQ 'YL' *andaq, öyle* 'this way, that way', 243 (14) MNK BYN *mıng, bin* 'thousand', and 205 (26) 'YRNY 'YRN TWTQ *irni, irin, tutaq* 'lip' (the first form is recorded with a possessive suffix, a phenomenon common with many parts of the body; the Oghuz word also appears as 99 (14) TWTQ *tutaq* 'lip'). Only in the case of 225 (9) QRNĠ'

QMRS'Q *qarınča*, *qumursaq* 'ant' the Oghuz form does come first, see Turkish *karınca*, Azeri *garişga*, Turkmen *garınža*, but cognates of *čümeli* in Eastern Turkic and of *qumursqa* mainly in Northern Turkic.

Whereas the dative 94 (8) BLR' *bulara* 'to these' shows the Oghuz form without suffix-initial *g*, the form 94 (7) BNĠ' *bunğa* 'to this' exhibits a non-Oghuz dative suffix with initial *g*. The forms 64 (3) DuNDur **döndür*- 'id.' and 75 (6) DWNyDR *dönidür* is an Oghuz feature. In Modern Turkic this verb with the meaning 'to return home' is only attested in Turkish *dön-* and Lena Turkic *tönün-*. But it still also exists in many other modern Turkic languages with deviant meanings like 'to turn around', 'to turn into', 'to fall down', etc. As to the enigmatic Y in the middle of the word it should be mentioned that the manuscript has only two undotted Arabic letters for N and Y. Thus some other readings like DWYNDR, DWNNDR, etc. are also possible. It should be noted that the synonymous verbs *qayt-* and *yan-*, which are characteristic for most of the modern Turkic languages (including Azeri and Turkmen), are not attested in the hexaglot. Another typically Oghuz (and Chuvash) lexeme is 104 (3) KWBK *köbek* 'navel', whose non-Oghuz counterpart appears as 209 (25) KNdK *kindik* 'id.'

Because of the preservation of the intervocalic nasal consonant, cases like 107 (2) SNWK *sönük* 'bone' (see also above) and 214 (23) SYNKWK *singük* 'bone' can also be interpreted as Oghuz, see Azeri *sömük*, Turkmen *söŋk*, but Kipchak *süyäk*, *süwäk* etc. If 198 (1) TNĠRY really has to be read as *tangrı*, it has to be considered an Oghuz form, but see above. The form 61 (1) TNKRY *tengri* would be its non-Oghuz counterpart, if the reading with front vowels is correct.

In the field of morphology we find a genitive of the personal interrogative pronoun 89 (20) KMNK *kiming* 'of whom?' (instead of, e.g., Kipchak, Southeast and South Siberian Turkic *kimniŋ*). An optative form like 83 (14) BN QLM *ben qılam* 'that I may do (it)' may also be considered Oghuz, whereas 87 (4) QLĠ'Y *qılğay* 'doer, actor' (with an unusual meaning!) represents non-Oghuz Turkic. In one case we find the neighboring entries 237 (5) 'LMYŠ YYL *olmıš yıl* '(year) before last year' and 237 (6) KLK'N YYL *kelgen yıl* 'next year'. Because of the *-mıš*-participle, one may interpret the first form as being of the (Western-)Oghuz type, whereas the other form could be of the non-Oghuz type (because of the *-GAn*-participle). There is a slight chance that even the second form is Oghuz, i.e. the precursor of modern Turkish and Azeri *gelen*. Then the *-GAn*-participle would still have preserved the *-G-* in this temporal expression at the time when the hexaglot was written—especially if the informant came from Mamluk Egypt, where Oghuz had steady contact with Kipchak Turkic. The same holds true for 203 (4) TL BLK'N *til bilgen* 'translator'. Nevertheless I prefer to categorize the *-GAn*-forms as non-Oghuz, mainly because in the Ana-

tolian Oghuz sources of this time the *-GAn*-participle has already lost its *-G-* and has become *-(y)An*.

Final *-G* after the first syllable border seems to have been given up in the Oghuz and Kipchak sources of the hexaglot. Thus we find forms like 119 (29) BGLW *baġlu* 'bound, tied', 274 (8) YRLW *yaralu* 'wounded', and 261 (25) 'YSY *isi* 'heat, warmth' (or *iši*; see above). They contrast with typically Chagatay and Khwarezm Turkic forms like 120 (5) 'TLĠ *atliġ* 'horseman' (262 (6) 'TLYG *aṭliġ* 'rider'), 120 (6) YYĠ *yayaġ* 'pedestrian' (262 (5) YD'Ġ *yadaġ* 'pedestrian'), 122 (26) 'LWK *ölüg* 'dead', and 308 (1) 'SYK *isig* 'heat, warmth'. The influence of Chagatay also becomes clear from forms like 100 (20) SQL SZ *saqalsiz* 'beardless', (21) SQL LĠ *saqalliġ* 'bearded', and 105 (9) 'M ĠQ *amčuq* 'pudendum of the female', which exhibit the typical separated notation of stem and suffix in the Arabic script.

The words for 'hand' also show two different forms. Whereas the word for 'hand' in 207 (10) S'Ġ 'LYK *saġ ilig* 'right hand' is of the Chagatay type, the forms 105 (16) 'L *el* 'hand' and 207 (9) 'YL *il* 'hand' are reminiscent of modern Oghuz (including Salar) *el*; at least in modern Kipchak this word has been given up. In the same way, the form 112 (7) 'YL *il* has the meaning 'subordinate' like in Chagatay, whereas 144 (30) 'YL *il* 'province' exhibits the meaning which has survived sporadically in Western Oghuz, e.g. in Turkish *Rumeli* 'land of the Christians; the European part of Turkey'.

Some forms may be interpreted as of especially of the Western Oghuz type. Thus 94 (1) QNDN *qandan* 'whence?' has for Old Turkic palatal *ń* (*qaño*: 'which?') the nasal *n* instead of *y* as in Eastern Oghuz Turkmen and most modern non-Oghuz languages (*qaydan* etc. 'id.'). One may also assume that 72 (9) SWRKL *sür gil* 'rub!' because of its meaning (only in Ottoman and Turkish) belongs to the Western Oghuz forms, too. But the editors may also be right with their assumption (given in a footnote) that it is a mere misspelling of *sürtgil*.

Forms like 126 (28) TBMQ *tapmaq* 'to find' and 261 (23) YXŠY *yaxši* 'good; fine' do not correspond with modern Western Anatolian Oghuz ("Western Western Oghuz", including Standard Turkish), but with Azeri, Turkmen and non-Oghuz. The form 126 (27) TĠMQ *toġmaq* 'to bear' shows at least a meaning different from Turkish and Chagatay, but the same as in, e.g., Azeri. Because of the stem-final *-ġ* it should also be non-Kipchak. But this is not certain because the change *-g > -w* may still have been in progress and was perhaps not fully completed.

There are some elements with close parallels in modern Turkmen, e.g. 63 (24) QWY BYR *qoy bir* 'set free!' (Turkmen *goyber-*) and 67 (22) YuQLH *yoqla* 'kill!' (see also footnote 2, p. 67). A form like 95 (10) BLDY *boldi* 'he became' is at least non-Western Oghuz, but could be Turkmen as well as non-Oghuz. Some words have not survived in modern Western Oghuz, but are attested in Ottoman and modern

Turkmen, e.g. 319 (1) 'WZK' *özge* 'other, other than' and 96 (18) QĠN *qačan* 'when?' (Turkmen *xačan*). Golden mentions 130 (27) DYN *düyn* 'yesterday', "a form unique to Modern Türkmen" (p. 18). But to my knowledge the combination *üy* in Turkmen is a purely graphical designation of a long vowel which is pronounced as a semi-diphthong [üw]; see Baskakov (1970: 35) and Clark (1998: 31). Furthermore the entry in the hexaglot is not vocalized. Thus the *ü* has to be considered as a mere reconstruction.

In connection with the term 222 (19) TLW QRT *telü qurt* 'hyena' (= 'mad wolf') Golden thinks that *qurt* may be an Oghuz term, whereas *telü* is more typical of Kipchak (p. 19). Furthermore he claims that in Mongolian *deltü činâ* 'id.' the element *deltü* comes from Oghuz *deli* (see also p. 222, fn. 3). These assumptions look quite plausible. Furthermore Golden mentions a Kipchak form *övrén* (p. 18), which appears as 62 (13) 'uWRaN 'learn!'. But, as he has to admit, such a form exists in Türkmen, too. This makes it difficult to designate this form as Kipchak, especially if we take into account that most modern Kipchak languages have *öyrän-*, *üyrän-* and the like.

The imperative 78 (26) 'YĠL *ryġil* 'send!' contains the cognate of the Old Turkic verb *i:d-*, which in this short form has only survived in Chuvash and Northeast Turkic. In most other languages it has only survived in the verbal combination **i:du: ber-* 'id.' (e.g. Tatar *ĵibär-*, Turkmen *iber-*), whereas in Western Oghuz it is only attestable as the second component of the biverb *veribi-* 'to send', e.g. in Ottoman.

A typically non-Oghuz morphological feature in the hexaglot is the negative aorist in *-mAs*, e.g. 82 (6) QLM'S *qılmas* 'he does not do, will not do' and 86 (27) 'NLR 'YTM'S *anlar itmes* 'they are not doing'. The ordinal numbers look archaic, too. They are derived by means of the Old Turkic suffix *-(I)nč*, e.g. 243 (18) 'YKNĠ *ikinč* 'second month', 239 (16) 'WĠNĠ 'Y *üčünč ay* 'third month'; only the ordinal of 'one' has its own form 243 (16) BYRYN *birin* 'first'.

In the case of 324 (13) YL' *yile* 'together with' (footnote: "More commonly *ile* or BYL' *bile* < *birle* 'together with'") the manuscript exhibits something like a *fathā*, which would render YaL', making the form even more enigmatic. At any rate, the initial Y may go back to enclitic forms of this postposition mainly after stem-final vowel, where the initial *i* of *ile* may be interpreted as *y*. It is also possible that it is a mere misspelling of *bile* (see also Dankoff's review of the hexaglot (2002: 514-516), which contains many valuable comments on readings and interpretations).

Some entries in the word lists refer to cognates of words which have initial *y-* in one group of Turkic languages, whereas Turkish and some other languages have initial vowel, e.g. 148 (25) YKNH *yigne* 'needle', 164 (10) YNĠW *yinčü* 'pearl' (see also 303 (11)), and 124 (3) YSM'Q *yasmaq* 'going astray' (like, e.g., Tatar

yaz-); the case of 114 (27) YĠLMQ *yığlamaq* 'crying' is a bit more complicated, because we have the more deviant basic forms *ağla-* versus **hiğla-*. There are also alternating forms with and without initial *y-* in different parts of the hexaglot which probably stem from different types of Turkic, e.g. 120 (4) YNĠH *yinje* 'fine, thin', but 262 (3) ʸYNĠKʸ *inčke* 'fine, slender', 170 (23) YLʸN *yılan* 'snake', but 221 (13) ʸYLʸN *ilan*, 105 (14) YRK *yürek*, but 264 (18) ʸWRʸKLW *ürekli* 'courageous', and 326 (1) YRN *yirin* 'pus, matter', but 108 (5) ʸiRN *irin* 'id.'. For 'summer' two words are attested, 239 (13) YʸZY *yazı* 'summer' (like Turkish *yaz*; for the enigmatic final *ı* see Dankoff's review, where the reading *yaz* is proposed) and *yay* (like Azeri *yay* 'summer') in 239 (14) YʸY ʸWLY *yay evveli* 'first (month) of the summer', a situation well known from, e.g., Turkish, where we find *yaz* 'summer' and *yay* in *yayla* 'summer pasture'. For 'summer' we find an additional alternate 238 (9) ʸZ *az*, which I do not know of in any Turkic language. The words 120 (9) ʸYRʸQ *irag* 'distant' and 199 (12) ʸLDRM *ildirim* 'lightning' only appear in forms without *y-* as they do in Azeri; in most of the Turkic languages they have initial *y-*. The case of *ildirim* is mentioned by Golden (p. 18), who notes that "forms such as *ildirim* ... are noted in Mamlūk Qıpçaq texts." One may add other non-Turkish but Azeri parallels to forms of the hexaglot, which have initial *y-* in Turkish, e.g. *ilan* 'snake', *irag* 'distant', *ürek* 'heart'. Like in Azeri (mainly dialects and older language) we find two different verbs 75 (7) SʸNĠL *sangıl* 'think, suppose!' and 77 (21) SNʸĠL *sanağıl* 'count!' in the hexaglot.

There are many interesting Turkic morphological forms in the hexaglot awaiting an explanation, e.g. 135 (22) KYDRĠH YL *kiderje yıl* 'next (year)'. Here the word *kiderje*, which would better be read as *kēderje*, looks like an equative form of the aorist of *kēt-* 'to go away'. The entry 199 (10) TWLW ʸaY *tolu ay* 'full moon' appears without any comment by the author, although at least in Western Oghuz the form *tolun ay* normally is in use. Furthermore we find a double-marked causative form with simple causative meaning 66 (19) ʸLRT *ölürt* 'kill!'. Such forms exist in many Turkic languages and are still not sufficiently investigated.

There are two cryptic forms whose interpretation is complicated by probable misprints in the edition and the absence of any comment: 87 (2) QLĠŠ ʸYRNĠ *qılğas irinč* (better: *érinč*, see above) 'perhaps (you) will do' and 87 (3) QLĠŠ ʸYRNĠ *qılğas irinč* 'perhaps (you) will do'. If we compare the edition with the facsimile, it seems that the positions of the forms in the hexaglot are given in the wrong order, i.e. the *qılğas*-form comes first (position 2). Additionally the second form should be given as QLĠS and not as QLĠŠ. But if we take into account the manuscript's poor punctuation, we may also assume that the editor really wanted to read two QLĠŠ-forms. In this case *qılğas* would be a misprint for *qılğaš*. But then we would have one form for singular and plural—a case we normally do not observe in Turkic for

the second persons. Furthermore both forms are not easy to analyze. As far as I know these forms do not have any correspondent in other Turkic languages. Because the manuscript does not show any vocalization, it is unclear to me why the editor decided to read ĠŠ and ĠS with *a*. One may also read *-guš* and *-gus* to connect these forms somehow with the *nomen futuri* in *-GU*. Or is there a connection with the Chuvash verbal noun in *-As*?

The hexaglot exhibits Turkic 311 (20) BLKW' *belgü* 'sign, mark' (with *alif pleonasticum*) as well as 312 (21) BLK' *belge* 'mark' (reborrowed from Mongolian)—the latter with a hint to Sevortjan (1978: 108-109), but not to Doerfer (1963: 216-217 and 1975: 376-377). For Turkic 143 (29) 'LS *ulus* we find 'town'. The same deviant meaning for this word normally meaning 'nation, etc.' is attested by Kāšgarī for the dialects of the Arghu and Balasagun; for Čigil he gives *uluš* (?) 'village'. For Turkic 327 (5) KŠWR *kešür* 'carrot' we find in a footnote "Or *kešwer*, *gešür*"; this word is already attested by Kāšgarī as a typically Oghuz word borrowed from Persian, see *gäšür* 'carrot', see Dankoff & Kelly (1982-1985).

As to the Turkic loanwords in Mongolian, the forms (Mongolian) 180 (8) QLĠ'N *qalğan* and (Turkic and Mongolian) 288 (8) QLQ'N *qalqan* 'shield' exhibit a final *-n* as the material in the Mongolian *Muqaddimatu'l-Adab* does (see Poppe 1938: 290a, *qalqan jasaqči* = *qalqan yasayuči* 'izgotoljajuščij ščity'). The other Middle Mongol sources and modern Kalmyk have forms without final *-n* of the *xalxa* type of this early Turkic loanword. Additionally the Mongol form in the hexaglot exhibits *-lq-* > *-lġ-*. Therefore one may assume that in the Mongolian *Muqaddimatu'l-Adab* and the Rasūlid hexaglot the early Turkic loanword *xalxa* was replaced by a more recent borrowing from Turkic. Another early Turkic loanword in Mongol (because of *t-* > *d-*) is 68 (4) *D'MWQ *damuq* 'hell', which I would prefer to transliterate as D'aMWQ; its Turkic counterpart is given as 61 (6) TMQ *tamuq* 'hell'.

The Mongolian entry for 'hood of predatory bird' is almost completely spoiled in the manuscript. What remained readable can be best interpreted as *-ĠH*. This would match with the regular form *tomaga* of this word in Mongolian. Therefore I reject the reconstruction 230 (16) *TMĠ'Ġ* *tomaġaġ* given in the edition. The Mongol word 226 (19) SNQWR *sonqur* 'gerfalcon' with initial *s-* resembles the corresponding loanwords in Chagatay and Anatolian Oghuz (except Kadi Burhanettin, see Schöniġ 2000), but not, e.g., in Azeri and Turkmen, where we find forms with initial *š-*.

From my point of view the *prolegomena* of the book in question contains many important notes and observations on the Mongolian world of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and its neighbors. The edition of the Rasūlid hexaglot itself—at least of its Turkic and Mongolian parts—is of lower quality. But despite all its

inconsistencies, shortcomings, misreadings, and (probable) mistakes, it is an important and inspiring piece of scholarly work which helps to clarify questions concerning the linguistic situation in the Near East in the Mongol period.

References

- Baskakov, N. A. 1970. *Grammatika turkmenskogo jazyka* 1. *Fonetika i morfologija*. Aşxabad: Ylym.
- Clark, L. 1998. *Turkmen reference grammar*. (Turcologica 34.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dankoff, R. 2001. Review on *The King's dictionary. The Rasûlid hexaglot: fourteenth century vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 121, 514-516.
- Dankoff, R. & Kelly, James 1982-1985 (eds.) *Maḥmūd al-Kāşyarī. Compendium of the Turkic dialects (Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk)* 1-3. (Sources of Oriental Languages and literatures, Turkish Sources 7.)
- Doerfer, G., 1963, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* 1. (Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 16.) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Doerfer, G., 1975, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. 4. (Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 21.) Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Poppe, N. 1938. *Mongol'skij slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*. (Trudy Instituta vostoka 14.) Moskva: AN SSSR.
- Schönig, C. 2000. *Mongolische Lehnwörter im Westoghusischen*. (Turcologica 47.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sevortjan, Ė. V. 1978. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov*. Moskva: Nauka.