

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2009

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0013 | LOG_0019

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Heidi Stein: Review of György Hazai & Andreas Tietze (eds.), *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* "Freud nach Leid" (Ein frühosmanisches Geschichtenbuch). 1. Band: Text. 2. Band: Faksimiles. (Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der Türkvölker 5.1, 5.2) Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag 2006, 650 pp., 595 pp.

Heidi Stein, c/o Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Seminar für Orientkunde.
E-mail: hstein@uni-mainz.de

The linguistic history of Turkic languages is still in need of relevant sources, i.e. carefully prepared texts that can serve as the basis for theoretical analyses. With Hazai & Tietze's present edition of the Old Ottoman *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde*, Turcology has been provided with a voluminous narrative text in prose that is particularly suitable for investigations into the history of the Ottoman Turkish language.

The need to make this eminent text accessible was already felt early on by Andreas Tietze, and during the forties and fifties of the last century he had prepared an edition of the text for publication, but unfortunately the work was accidentally lost. It is thanks to György Hazai that Tietze agreed to undertake the edition once more, this time together with him. In his preface (pp. 7-9) Hazai explains the complicated genesis of the work in detail so that the reader is able to understand the respective roles of the two authors. The main part of the edition, the text in transcription, is more or less Hazai's work and is based on the rules he defined together with Tietze and the constant exchange between the two concerning the philological problems of the text, plus the help of Tietze's translation which had been preserved. Sadly, Andreas Tietze was not able to witness the final phase of the work - the turcological world having lost him in 2003.

The introduction (pp. 10-27), which is the original text written by Tietze, offers useful information about *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde*. This collection of 42 tales as it is represented in the oldest dated manuscript of 1451, written in Edirne, was certainly translated from Persian, but Tietze makes clear that it has no connection with some other collections in Persian, Arabic or Turkish known by this title. The work itself is assumed to have been composed in the middle of the 14th century; the location and author are unknown, but it must have been widely read in Ottoman court circles. The language is, as Tietze says, "ganz und gar das, was wir als die osmanische Literatursprache des 14. Jahrhunderts kennen" (p. 15). Thus, *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* as a linguistic monument of the Old Ottoman language had already served as a basis for Vámbéry's important *Altosmanische Sprachstudien* (1901), which published the

second tale in Arabic script, transcription and translation.¹ Finally, Tietze provides a list of manuscripts of this work, which contains the eight oldest and most important manuscripts, followed by 39 more recent ones. He then explains why he chose ms. Török F.71 of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, for the edition: it is the oldest dated one, completely vocalised, well written and well preserved. Lacunae in this manuscript were filled in firstly by consulting Istanbul ms. Hamidiye 1173 (898/ 1492-93), which represents the text in a somewhat higher style, but later on the authors chose—also justified in my opinion—Istanbul ms. Lâleli 1698 (2nd half of the 15th century), which is stylistically more similar to the Budapest version (see the footnotes by Hazai pp. 26-27). The Budapest manuscript was also used by H. Anetshofer (2005) for her edition of the 25th tale of *Ferec ba'd eş-şidde* in her study on Old Ottoman temporal clauses, where she also gives some information on the literary history of this story.²

A literary analysis of the text, its genesis and motifs, was not the aim of this present edition. Tietze gives only short notes in his introduction and refers to further volumes that had been planned (but were not realised). Hazai anyway concentrates from the start on philological and linguistic aims. This explains his detailed description of the manuscript, its graphical specifics and the scrupulous presentation of the principles of the edition respective of the transcription (pp. 31-81). Some formal principles relate to the literary structure of the text and try to demonstrate narrative specifics by separating, for instance, the parts of the text in rhymed prose, or by using special marks for the hierarchy of main and interpolated stories, which proves of use to the reader. The same is true of the indication of direct speech by means of quotation marks (but the forms of *dê-* generally do not introduce, as p. 35 says, but close the speech in this text!).

The reconstruction of the text is handled most carefully by Hazai. Necessary add-ons or deletions are given in cases of damaged spots, lacking or redundant letters, dots, *hareke*-marks, or if the understandibility of the passage is jeopardised. Other likely corrections are mostly avoided and left to the reader, who can see variants of the three compared manuscripts in the respective footnote.

The most crucial problem is of course how to perform an appropriate transcription, which ought to render the phonology of the text up to a certain extent. A fully vocalised text like this one sheds light on the status of rounded vs. unrounded vowels, but the front-back relations in Arabic-Persian loanwords require interpretation. Normally such interpretations proceed from the standardised forms, but Hazai & Tietze also opted for others. Thus they mark certain cases of back harmony in the word stem that are proved by suffixes written with a back velar consonant, as *hurramlığıla* (instead of *hurrem*³), *bîçāralık* (instead of *bîçāre*), and in the same way

¹ Anetshofer (2005: 24) adds that Vámbéry had also published another tale, the 38th, in *Keleti Szemle* 2 (1901).

² Anetshofer's partial edition, briefly mentioned on p. 27, was published just shortly before.

³ Erroneously written with *h* on p. 38, but correctly in the text on p. 244.

even a shortening and backing of \bar{i} to ι in words like *ġarībıġa*, *zārılıġ* (instead of *ġarīb-*, *zārī-*). In the last cases the symbol \bar{i} is used to show that the vowel is interpreted as ι from a written \bar{i} and is not transliterated. These interpretations are based on earlier findings, for instance those formulated by Tietze (1992), who had analysed the features and distribution of a front versus back status of words in the first stage of adaptation of Arabic-Persian loanwords and had found a general preference for back vowels in that first stage.⁴ The loans were quickly adapted to Turkish phonology and the original vowel length did not play a major role. Hence, the development of an originally long \bar{i} to a back ι (*ġarīb* > *ġarīb*)⁵ was also possible. Hazai (1997: 232-233) had pointed out that especially disyllabic words with the vocalism *a-i*–be it originally \bar{a} - \bar{i} or *a- \bar{i}* , or \bar{a} - \bar{i} –were often documented as being back-harmonic in Old Ottoman texts. Similar examples can be found in Middle Ottoman transcription texts like Megiser (*fakır* [“fakür”] < Ar. *faqīr*, *hasır* [“hasser”] < Ar. *ḥaṣīr*; *hasıl* [“hasel”] < Ar. *ḥāṣıl*, *cahıl* [“gahül”] < Ar. *ġāhil*; see Stein (2006: 148-149, 155-156). It seems that these phenomena were widespread in Old Ottoman, and one might think of them as a rule. However, justifiably, Hazai avoids too much interpretation and confines himself in his transcription to cases that are legitimated by the shape of the respective suffixes.

Except for these problems concerning the relation between phonology and transcription, the chapter on “Rendition of sounds” (“Wiedergabe der Lautverhältnisse”, pp. 37-39) deals mostly with external graphical specifics of the text and their marking in the transcription, such as some fluctuations between plene and hareke notation or special spellings in the Arabic script.

Subsequently all these notes are illustrated in detail by a large number of examples, first in transcription (with references to page number and line), then by facsimiles of the respective words, given in tables (pp. 41-81). The reading is a little laborious because the reader has to compare the examples and their explanations in three different places, but there were obviously technical reasons for such an arrangement. The same might apply to the placement of the commentary as endnotes in the text edition, which is somewhat inconvenient as well. It must also be noted that the German text of the introduction contains quite a few printing errors.

I do not deem it proper to try to perform a detailed critique of this text edition, which comprises 247 folios. It is obvious at a glance, together with the exhaustive explanation of the editing principles, that Hazai has done enormous work in order to present the text in a way that takes into account all its philological specifics and that clearly marks the few cases of corrections and interpretations. Together with the facsimiles in the second volume, readers can rely on the text as it is and can draw their own conclusions if undertaking analyses in different fields of linguistic history.

⁴ The text he used for his analysis (“die Arbeit an einem vollvokalisierten Text der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts” (Tietze 1992: 352), was in all probability *Ferec ba’d eş-şidde*.

⁵ Tietze sees an intermediate stage *-iy-* marked by the notation of *yā’* with *kesre* + *sükün*; Hazai leaves this aside in his transcription.

A translation with glossary might be left, of course, as a desideratum, but at the present time G. Hazai deserves the most sincere thanks for his initiative and for the realisation of this fine edition.

References

- Anetshofer, Helga 2005. *Temporale Satzverbindungen in altosmanischen Prosatexten. Mit einer Teiledition aus Behcetü'l-Ĥadā'iq (1303 und 1429), Muqaddime-i Quṣṣeddīn (1433) und Ferec ba'de ṣ-ṣidde (1451)*. (Turcologica 57.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hazai, György 1997. Review of Adamović, Milan 1994. *Kelile ü Dimne*. Türkische Handschrift T 189 der Forschungsbibliothek Gotha. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 33.2, 231-234.
- Stein, Heidi 2006. Palatal-velar vocalism of Arabic-Persian loanwords in 16th century Ottoman Turkish. In: Johanson, Lars & Bulut, Christiane (eds.) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 143-157.
- Tietze, Andreas 1992. Überlegungen über die lautliche Form der arabischen und persischen Lehnwörter im älteren Osmanischen. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 82, 349-358.
- Vámbéry, Ármin 1901. *Alt-osmanische Sprachstudien mit einem azerbaižanischen Texte als Appendix*. Leiden: Brill.

Martine Robbeets: Review of Veronika Veit (ed.), *The role of women in the Altaic world. Permanent International Altaistic Conference 44th Meeting, Walberberg, 26-31 August 2001*. (Asiatische Forschungen 152.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006. 335 pages, 12 black-white illustrations. Dimensions 24 x 17 cm. Hard cover. 98 Euro. ISBN10 3-447-05537-5, ISBN: 978-3-447-05537-6.

Martine Robbeets, Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, DE-55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: martine_robbeets@hotmail.com

The leading role in the Altaic world was, just as it still is in large parts of the world today, reserved for men. Comprising a collection of thirty-seven papers presented at the 44th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference held in Walberberg, Germany, this volume concentrates on the part played by women. They feature as the main actresses in this multi-disciplinary exploration of the so-called "Altaic world". Recent decades have seen an increase in Gender Studies, but studies of women in Central Asia have remained relatively underrepresented. The publication of the 44th PIAC proceedings contributes to filling this gap in scientific literature.

When skimming through the contributions, the reader may wonder whether the label "Altaic" is used as a synonym for "Central Asian": twenty-nine articles deal

with the Turkic and Mongolic peoples inhabiting the region from the Caspian Sea in the northwest to present-day Mongolia in the northeast. Different uses of the term “Altaic” circulate in literature, but in the PIAC sense, it is commonly used as the collective name for the languages belonging to the Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic families and the peoples that speak them. In a number of previous PIAC proceedings the term also covered contributions on Japanese and Korean. The present volume includes only a single article in the area of Japanese studies, none in Korean studies, five in Tungusic studies, twenty in Mongolic studies and thirteen in Turkic studies. Only two papers take a comparative approach in the sense that they cross the borders of the individual areas. According to the editor’s note in the preface (7), the title of this volume is inspired by the Mongolian proverb: “It is not good for man to act differently than woman”, with a smoother translation by Frey Nāf (69) and Gálik (80): “a man should not act differently from his wife”. The provenance of the proverb may perhaps explain the imbalance between the areas of contribution, the majority being in Mongolic studies.

The designation “world” in the title covers the people, their artifacts, their societies and beliefs, their language and history. Eight articles take a historical approach on gender issues; seven articles deal with contemporary sociological matters relating to women; ten articles analyze the role played by women in classical or folk literature; six articles deal with marking feminine gender in linguistics; four belong to the sphere of religion in the sense that they discuss female characters in the system of beliefs and rituals; and one article is on art, dealing with women’s jewelry.

Although the “women” referred to in the title make up about half of the population of the Altaic world, it is not always easy to obtain accurate information about their lives. This is because the number of women appearing in literature is low to begin with. (Gálik (80): “There are only two women in Wang Meng’s Maimaiti cycle, not much in relation to the number of male characters here. The Chinese world is a world of men...”; Rybatzki (211): “Female n. pr. represent only a small part of the corpus of the Middle Mongolian names in indigenous sources. Out of about 900 n. pr., only around 50 are female n. pr.”; (E. Taube (279): “In den insgesamt 11 Lobpreisen (maqṭār) kommen Frauen expressis verbis nicht vor”). Second, if women appear at all, reference is often restricted to a certain class of women. (Sinor (266): “historical sources focus mainly on outstanding persons of the upper classes”). Indeed, the majority of observations on women in history and classical literature, such as those made by Drompp, Gol’man, Lam, Miyawaki-Okada, Okada, Pang, Pozzi, Sinor, Tryjarski and Wright, deal with upper-class women: concubines, princesses, *qatun* and empresses. A third obstacle to accessing information on women is the fact that women usually are relegated to the private sphere and that they play only a marginal role as mothers of sons or wives of husbands. (Kellner-Heinkele (118): “Women play only a marginal role ... a female character is given a positive, though traditional role, that of the faithful, intelligent wife or mother”; Pang (183): “The early history of the Manchus is not rich with information about the private life of the first Emperors”). Only few women are involved in power politics. (Wright (332):

“Power politics in the Liao was very much a man’s game.” (333): “And we note that while there were long periods in Liao history without a reigning empress dowager, there was of course always a reigning emperor”). Fourth, even if some women play a decisive role, essential biographical data are treated with less care than in the case of their male counterparts. (Pozzi (190): “Indeed, although they appear only here and there in the documents and it is often difficult to know even their major biographical data, such as birth and death dates, and personal name, some women did not play a secondary role in the history of the Manchu”).

A fifth impediment is the fact that the information about women is more often than not second-hand: history is written by men. (Gießauf (82): “Alle relevanten Texte stammen aus Federn, die Männerhände führten”). Perhaps connected with the exclusively male viewpoint on women is the sixth difficulty, namely that sources on women often reflect a negative image. (Sárközi (231): “The figure of the goddess having a negative role in this story, reflects the ideology of a later, paternal society”). There is little room for heroines (Stary (277): “to our great surprise, not a single word is spent about the heroines. ... At this time, there was no more space for Manchu female heroes in Qianlong’s Qing China”) and, as is observed in the articles written by Birtalan, Heissig, Meserve, Sárközi and J. Taube, women are frequently depicted as evil beings, witches, harmful spirits or monstrous goddesses. A final impediment is that historical foreign sources on women in Central Asia tend to focus on shocking news such as polygamy, levirate, concubines and harem ladies. (Tryjarski (308) citing Baranowski’s opinion on Starowolski’s book: “it was a success of a porn book, and not of an Orientalist work”; Gießauf (92): “Vielmehr spiegelten die präsentierten Bilder sehr häufig die Intentionen der Verfasser unserer Quellen, die Erwartungshaltungen sowohl der Berichterstatter als auch des potentiellen Publikums ... bei der Konstruktion des und der Fremden wider.”).

In spite of the great difficulty of accessing women’s life in the past, the reader is offered more than just a glimpse of the lives of Altaic women in history. It is impossible, in a limited space, to do full justice to all the contributions under review, but a leitmotif that connects many articles is the observation that women enjoyed more authority, freedom and respect in the context of nomadic societies than in sedentary societies. But, even if their status was relatively high, the leading role in society was still reserved for men. Although the volume abounds with historical perspectives, the contemporary status of women in the Altaic world is, with only three articles written by Anayban, Chmielowska and Hisamitdinova, poorly studied.

Another perspective that is unfortunately lacking is the comparative Altaic angle. Although the volume studies a single, pre-arranged theme, i.e. women, in the context of different area studies, namely Turcology, Mongolistics and Tungusology, it fails to cross the boundaries of the individual areas and to investigate parallels and differences in a truly Altaic context. There are only two contributions that somewhat escape this criticism. One is the article by Dobrovits, which studies the spread of an ethnogenetical myth from east to west. The other is written by Frey Näf and compares labour division in Mongol culture with Turkic nomadic cultures of Central

Asia. In spite of his remark (98) “... dass ein Vorschlag ..., die weiblichen dämonischen Gestalten Eurasiens zu vergleichen, noch immer nicht aufgegriffen worden ist”, Heissig limits his study of the motif of burning witches to an exclusively Mongolian context. The lack of a comparative perspective is most blatant for the articles dealing with linguistic topics. Alpatov concentrates on Japanese, Kurpeshko on Shor and Kalchofner, Rybatzki, Senderjav and Solntseva all focus on Mongolian.

The originality of the contributions is at times questionable. Alpatov's contribution, for instance, is not only a summary of an article that appeared elsewhere in Russian; his discussion of the use of the 1st person pronouns in male and female speech and of the different words for 'wife' has appeared under a different title in the previous PIAC proceedings (Boikova & Rybakov 2006: 7-11). The overlap between the present theme and the theme of “Kinship” of the previous PIAC proceedings further becomes apparent in the contributions of Anayban (compare Boikova & Rybakov 2006: 13-18) and Boikova (compare Boikova & Rybakov 2006: 63-70). Novelty also appears to be lacking in Solntseva's contribution, in which she makes reference to previous articles on the same topic by the same author. The articles on the expression of feminine gender in Mongolian, contributed by Kalchofner and Senderjav, deal with exactly the same topic, with the difference that one is written in English and the other in German. Finally, the articles contributed by Okada and Tryjarski lack creativeness because the bulk of their contributions consists of translated passages with little room given to scholarly analysis.

Three articles do not achieve the stated purpose of the book. In spite of the reference to “Two Women in Wang Meng's Xinjiang Stories” in Gálik's title, the article is rather an analysis of the (male) Chinese writer Wang Meng than of two of his female Uighur characters. It is not only the title of Kurpeshko's article, “Female Names Shor Textbooks” [sic.], that will puzzle the reader. Apart from a list of about thirty-three Shor female names lacking any linguistic analysis, the majority of the article is devoted to a rather schoolish description of the Shor people, their economy, culture and education. The conclusion (121) “Representatives of different nationalities help the Shor people to regain their education and culture *through the means of female names*” [emphasis added] is just as puzzling as the title. Finally, Solntseva's article on kinship terms would have fitted in the previous PIAC proceedings on kinship (Boikova & Rybakov 2006), but the connection to the present theme is hard to discover.

Although the title of this volume is in English, the preface, the structural divisions and six articles are written in German. This may limit the accessibility of the work for some readers. The book further contains two translated articles, one by Nima from Mongolian into German and one by Remilev-Schlüter from Russian into English. The translations are clear and readable, and the original text is appended to the end of the article. It is disturbing that there is no standard for the transcription of linguistic expressions: most are romanized, some are given in Cyrillic script, and the contributions by Kalchofner, Sárközi and Solntseva alternate between the two systems within the same article. The system of reference also lacks standardization.

Whereas the reference section normally occurs at the end of each article, some articles have the references in the footnotes. The articles written by Heissig, Hisamitdinova, Kurpeshko and Tryjarski do not list references at all. A subject or author index is not included.

One could object that the volume is not very up-to-date because six years elapsed between the 44th PIAC meeting in 2001 and the actual publication in 2007. For a subject such as Gender Studies in Central Asia, which is relatively under-explored, however, the elapsed time is not expected to have any serious repercussions on the actual state of the art. Taking time for compilation and correction resulted in a carefully edited and elegantly bound volume. There are only minor errors such as some typographical mistakes (17: *characteritics* [characteristic], 104: *neagative* [negative], 106: *genitve* [genitive], 128: *gezetteer* [gazetteer], 151: *centures* [centuries], 161: *Vermehrungung* [Vermehrung]) and problems with the representation of special fonts (104: “the terms *fvfg* and *qmqq*”, 105: “two lexemes such as *qm xYn*”, 245: “*Kanour*” 294: “*čil øi øija*”). Reference is made to two pictures that are not included in the volume (160: “..., wie im Bild 1 gezeigt, ...”, “Wie im Bild 2 gezeigt, ...”).

One of the major strengths of this book is the significance of its theme. Although Gender Studies is prospering across the world, the study of women in Central Asia has only had a modest share up to the present. This situation has improved with the publication of the 44th PIAC proceedings. The volume reflects interdisciplinary and international cooperation of a considerable standard. Most articles in this volume are highly informed about the methodological and factual complexities of their discipline, while only a few are not.

The contributions are thematically coherent. It would increase the readability of the book if the articles were not ordered alphabetically by the family name of the author, but in thematic subsections. This would prevent the reader from having to hop back and forth between different areas and different disciplines such as sociology, history, literature, linguistics, religion and art. Out of five articles on the Tungusic area, for instance, three (Pang, Pozzi and Stary) deal with the founding period of the Manchu Qing-empire under emperor Nurhaci and two (Meserve and Walravens) deal with medical history. Six articles (Dobrovits, Frey Näf, Gießauf, Miyawaki-Okada, Okada and Sinor) deal with the status of women in medieval Mongolian society. Three articles (Kalchofner, Rybatzki and Senderjav) deal with marking feminine gender in Mongolian. Three articles (Birtalan, Heissig and Sárközi) deal with demons in Mongolian epic stories. The volume would even gain in relevance if these interconnections were marked in some way or other.

“Cherchez la femme” was the task assigned to the contributors of the 44th PIAC meeting. This assignment has been successfully accomplished and skillfully edited in a volume that fills a considerable gap in gender literature. People interested in Gender Studies who want to know more about the status of women in Central Asia in history would benefit from reading this book. The proceedings are also of interest to students and specialists in Central Asian Studies who want to learn more about

historical gender issues in their field. Altaicists in search of gender-driven parallels and contrasts between different Altaic societies, however, will not find what they are looking for. Sociologists interested in the social conditions of Altaic women today will equally be disappointed.

Contents

1. Alpatov, Vladimir M. Female Variant of Japanese. 11-14.
2. Anayban, Zoya. The Women of Tuva in the Context of the Transformation Period in Russia. 15-17.
3. Birtalan, Ágnes. Ada: A Harmful Female Spirit in the Mongolian Mythology and Folk Belief. 19-33.
4. Boikova, Elena. Common-Law Marriage in Pre-Revolutionary Mongolia. 35-38.
5. Chmielowska, Danuta. The Image of Woman in Turkish Literature in the Second Half of the 20th Century. 39-45.
6. Dobrovits, Mihály. Maidens, Towers and Beasts. 47-55.
7. Drompp, Michael R. From Qatun to Refugee: The Taihe Princess among the Uighurs. 57-68.
8. Frey Näf, Barbara. "Compared With the Women the ... Menfolk have little Business of their own." - Gender Division of Labour in the History of the Mongols. 69-76.
9. Gálik, Marián. The Twenty-Fourth Nasreddin? Two Women in Wang Meng's Xinjiang Stories. 77-82.
10. Gießauf, Johannes. Mulieres Bellatrices oder Apis Argumentosa? Aspekte der Wahrnehmung mongolischer Frauen in abendländischen Quellen des Mittelalters. 83-92.
11. Gol'man, Mark I. The Mongolian Women in the Russian Archives of the XVIIth Century. 93-96.
12. Heissig, Walther. Zum Motiv der Hexenverbrennung in der mongolischen Volksdichtung. 97-98.
13. Hisamitdinova, F. G. The Place and Role of the Bashkir Woman in Family and Society: The Present and the Past. 99-101.
14. Kalchofner, Peter. Expressing Feminine Gender in Mongolian. 103-108.
15. Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara. Abu l-Ghazi Bahadur Khan and the Famous and Infamous Women. 109-118.
16. Kurpeshko, N. Female Names Shor Textbooks. [sic.] 119-121.
17. Lam, Yuan-Chu. A Khotanese Chaste Wife and her Biographer in Yuan China. 123-130.
18. Meserve, Ruth I. The Red Witch. 131-141.
19. Miyawaki-Okada, Junko. The Role of Women in the Imperial Succession of the Nomadic Empire. 143-149.
20. Nazirova, Nina. Traditional Jewelry Decorations of Uighur Women of Eastern Turkestan at the End of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Centuries. 151-158.
21. Nima. Die weiblichen Heiligtümer und ihre historische Funktion. 159-171.
22. Okada, Hidehiro. The Role of Women in the Erdeni-Yin Tobchi: The Post-Imperial Period in Particular. 173-181.
23. Pang, Tatiana A. The Destiny of Qing Taizu Nurhaci's Second Wife Gundai. 183-188.
24. Pozzi, Alessandra. Manchu Women of the Early Stage: Fantasy and Reality. 189-198.
25. Remilev-Schlüter, Elena. The Role of Women in the Oirat-Kalmyk Society. 199-209.
26. Rybatzki, Volker. Female Personal Names in Middle Mongolian Sources. 211-229.

27. Sárközi, Alice. Goddess With the White Parasol! Protect us! 231-246.
28. Sečenmönke. The Role of Women in Traditional Mongolian Society. 247-251.
29. Senderjav, A. Bezeichnungen des Weiblichen im modernen Khalkha-Mongolisch. 253-260.
30. Sinor, Denis. Some Observations on Women in Early and Medieval Inner Asian History. 261-268.
31. Solntseva, Nina. Kinship Terms and Third Person Pronouns in Mongolian and South-East Asian languages. 269-272.
32. Stary, Giovanni. Three Manchu Heroines and Their "Destiny" in Qing Historiography. 273-277.
33. Taube, Erika. Die Frau in der Volksdichtung der Tuwiner im Altai. 279-292.
34. Taube, Jakob. Albasty und das Motiv der Vielbrüstigkeit. 293-305.
35. Tryjarski, Edward. On Turkish Women in a Polish Work of the 17th Century. 307-318.
36. Walravens, Hartmut. A Manchu Gynaecology. 319-324.
37. Wright, David. The Political and Military Powers of the Kitan Empress Dowagers. 325-335.

Julian Rentzsch: Review of Mark Kirchner (ed.), *Geschichte der türkischen Literatur in Dokumenten. Hintergründe und Materialien zur Türkischen Bibliothek*. (Mizân 15.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2008. ISBN: 978-3-447-05790-5, 243+3 pages.

Julian Rentzsch, Department of Altaic Studies, University of Szeged, Egyetem utca 2, HU-6722 Szeged, Hungary. E-mail: rentzsch@uni-mainz.de

The volume under review is an anthology of texts that mirror the development of modern Turkish literature from the late 19th century up to the present. It is aimed to be neither an account of the history of Turkish literature in itself nor a reader of literary texts *sensu stricto*. Rather, it comprises a selection of metatexts on Turkish literature.

These texts cover the important stages and currents of modern Turkish literature. The selection of texts slightly focuses on material that has some relationship to publications in the *Türkische Bibliothek* (a series of translations of important works of modern Turkish literature into German which appears in the Swiss publishing house *Unionsverlag*) but contains many other documents as well.

The target group, according to the introduction, is non-specialists in the field of Turkish studies, and one of the declared aims of the book is to facilitate comparative literary studies involving Turkish literature. With regard to the intended audience, as the introduction has it, the critical apparatus has been confined to the necessary minimum. However, precisely given the target group, it occurs to the reviewer that

the book is too scant on annotations here and there. The short introductory notes preceding both the seven main chapters as well as some of the individual texts are in fact instructive, but in quite a few cases a little bit more information would have been helpful. For example, the full significance of the blatant harangue by Nihal Atsız against Sabahattin Ali (p. 92–94), which is barely less than a death threat, only becomes apparent if the information is added that Sabahattin Ali was actually murdered. While information on authors and works referred to in the texts is often provided in the footnotes, at times the reader is also left alone with unexplained names that occur in the texts. The non-specialist might possibly wonder who, e.g., “Enderunlu Vasif” or “Scheich Muhiddin-i Arabi” were and what the “Hadikatüssüeda” is (all p. 13). In quite a few instances, a little more information would have been desirable.

The choice of texts, as the editor emphasizes, is arbitrary; it is clear that a one-volume work must be highly selective. The selection however is very convincing and includes a few extremely interesting and valuable texts, the diversity of which not only the “general reader”, but also the specialist will benefit from. Trivial writings that would have been dispensable are the exception. Many of the texts are fragmentary and only very loosely interconnected by the historical context. Through their combination however, the mosaic pieces ultimately result in something that appears as a coherent whole.

Almost all texts are excerpts and have been shortened here and there in order to make them more easily digestible for the reader. This is of course a concession to the non-specialist target group; however, this sometimes results in the loss of the original Turkish character, which as a matter of fact tends to be a little longwinded time and again. In a few instances, the shortening has not been carried out in the most felicitous fashion. The reader is sometimes irritated by passages that appear truncated and incomplete (e.g. Tanpınar’s exposition on “The novels in our country”, p. 120–122, in which much ink is spilled in order to raise a number of problems, while only a part of Tanpınar’s answers is given before the text breaks off). In some cases, it would have been better to try the reader’s patience a bit more and deliver a coherent text in return.

As a whole, this volume provides a collection of at times highly interesting writings from which by no means only the general reader interested in literature will benefit, but in which also the specialist will discover many interesting, partly enjoyable, partly moving or even shocking details.