

Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Stein , Heidi

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2009

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0013 | LOG_0020

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 *hurramlıgıla* (instead of *hurrem*³), *bîçâralık* (instead of *bîçâre*), 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.