

Werk

Titel: Review

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2018

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0022 | LOG_0018

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Review

Mutsumi Sugahara: Review of *A Turkic medical treatise from Islamic Central Asia: A critical edition of a seventeenth-century Chaghatay work by Subhān Qulī Khan*. Edited, translated and annotated by László Károly. (Brill's Inner Asian Library Volume 32.) Leiden: Brill. 2015.

Mutsumi Sugahara, Institute of Global Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 3-11-1, Asahi-cho, Fuchu-shi, Tokyo 183-8534, Japan. E-mail: mutsumi@tufs.ac.jp

As has been repeatedly pointed out, the study of Chaghatay, or of Middle Turkic in general, is a less developed area within the vast field of Turcology. We admittedly possess a long list of text editions of works of Mīr ‘Alīshēr Nawā’ī and other poets of the Timurid period published in Turkey and Uzbekistan. However, editions that are fully equipped with text in transcription, translation, notes, glossary, and facsimile are still astonishingly rare.

The book under review is one such rare exception. It provides the text of a medical treatise written in post-classical Chaghatay (which itself is an even less researched language variety) by Sayyid Subhān Qulī Muḥammad Bahādur khan (ca. 1624/1625–1702), who was born into the Ashtarkhānīd dynasty and patronized the arts and sciences. The text edition is based on two manuscripts, one preserved in the Oriental Collection of the Library and Information Center of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and the other in the Al-Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences. They have hitherto been known under different names as *Ṭabīblik kitābī* (thus named by Vámbéry, abbreviated as TK) and *Hulāsat al-ḥukamā’* (abbreviated as HH) respectively, and it was the editor of this book who succeeded in identifying them as the same work.

This book consists of a brief preface and six chapters, an introduction (pp. 1–40), bibliography (pp. 41–52), transcription (pp. 53–125), translation (pp. 127–216), lexica (pp. 217–354), and facsimiles of the two manuscripts used (pp. 355–452).

The introduction begins with a general remark about the basic medical traditions in which the Turks were involved. There then follows relevant information about the author and his two medical works, that in Chaghatay treated here and the other a pharmacopoeia written in Persian. After some technical remarks on the edition, the remainder of the introduction is devoted to the analysis of the medical system of the author, Subhān Qulī, from various angles, including the sources used and the traditions that lie behind it. All of these provide essential information for those interested in the history of the Muslim medicine of Central Asia, as do the extensive footnotes given to the English translation of the text.

On the other hand, apart from the remarks on transcription found on pages 16–18, descriptions of the characteristics of the language of the text are scattered throughout the introduction, which makes it difficult for a reader to view them com-

prehensively. One of the most notable characteristic features of the text is the Oghuz Turkic influence mentioned on page 7. Indeed, the sound changes *b-* > *ø* (as observed in *ol-* ‘to be, become’ or *ilä* ‘with; by means of’, used along with *bol-*, *bi(r)-lä*) and *t-* > *d-* are both among the typically Oghuz features. However, *durur* ‘being; is’, given by the editor as an example of the latter sound change, is in fact widely observed in fifteenth-century Chaghatay texts as well, and the initial *d-* may not necessarily be due to such influence. The distribution of the word as a copular clitic may be the reason for voicing of the initial consonant. Note that its cognate verb *tur-* ‘to stand, to stop’, used only lexically, shows no initial voicing. Besides the Oghuz influence, we can show *bayla-* ‘to bind up, etc.’ (about 80 examples) with its medial *-y-* as an example of a Qipchaq feature shared with such forms as Kazakh and Kirgiz *bayla-* and Tatar *bäylä-*. It must be noted that its corresponding Chaghatay form *bağla-* occurs only rarely in the text. Considering all these points, further linguistic studies of this important text are very much hoped for.

The lexica contain a general vocabulary, as well as several thematic indices including, among other things, scientific names of herbs/plants, minerals and chemicals, diseases, and related terms.

Although the text in transcription and the translation are carefully prepared, there are still several readings and interpretations that are not free from doubt.

aq ‘white’ etc. (p. 224)

What is read as *yaḥṣī aq olğay* [HH 88r23] is to be read as *yaḥṣīraq olğay*, and its translation should be ‘will become better’ instead of ‘will become ... white’ (p. 177), where the adjective/adverb *yaḥṣī* ‘good, well’ is left untranslated.

asr ‘firmness; firm’ (p. 227)

Examples of this uncommon Arabic word are the following:

asr wa quwwat [HH 87v18] ‘firmness and strength’ (p. 175)

asr wa uluğ wa küčlüg [HH 87v24] ‘firm, big and strong’ (p. 175)

asr wa čoŋ [HH 88r2] ‘firm and big’ (p. 176)

asr wa tar [HH 88r23] ‘firm, narrow’ (p. 176)

In all these cases, the reading *asru* ‘very’ instead of *asr wa* would fit the context perfectly, and is much preferable. The translations will then be ‘much strength’, ‘very big and strong’, ‘very big’, and ‘very narrow’, respectively.

būy ‘odour, fragrance’ (p. 244)

In what is read as *ağiz būyī* [HH 87v margin] ‘fragrance of the mouth’ (p. 174), the initial letter of the second word is not *bā* but *sīn* (note the three dots below). It should be read *ağiz suyī* ‘water of the mouth’, that is, ‘saliva’.

čarp et- ‘to spatter, splash on; to absorb (liquid)’ (p. 244)

What is read as *čarp etkäy* [TK 42r2] and translated as ‘absorb (the juice)’ (p. 169) is to be read as *jazb etkäy*. The last meaning must be removed from this entry in the Lexica, and a new one *jazb et-* AT ‘to attract, absorb (liquid)’ should be added.

čončuq ‘swallow’ (p. 246)

Among the examples given in the transcription, that at TK 66r7 is actually written as *čum-čuq*, while *čončuq* is the corresponding form at HH 98v12, which should be indicated in footnotes. It may be noted that the Uzbek word *čumčuq* means ‘sparrow’.

damağ ‘the throat’ (p. 247)

In TK 26r10-11 the text has *za farān-ni damağqa tütün qılmaq zukām-ğa naḥ etkäy* ‘drawing saffron smoke into the throat is useful for a cold’ (p. 150). As this sentence is from Chapter Seven, titled “on treatments for the nose” what is read as *damağ* (spelled as *dm’ğ*) might in fact be *damāğ*, a Persian word meaning ‘nose’.

dar ‘difficulty’ (p. 247)

In *darğa asa turğan kiši* [HH 103r11] ‘someone who falls upon hard times’ (p. 214), *dar*, spelled with a medial *alif*, is a misreading of *dār* ‘gallows’, a word of Persian origin. The phrase means ‘someone (going to be) hanged on a gallows’. Note that *dārğa as-* is attested in Classical Chaghatay, for example, in Nawā’ī’s *Nafahāt al-uns*.

dök- ‘to pour; to throw out’

On page 40, the editor remarks: “The auxiliary word *dök-* ‘to pour; to throw out’ in converbial constructions is used to express the heavy or serious character of a disease, (...)”. Neither in Chaghatay nor in other Turkic languages is the verb *dök-* or its cognates known to occur as a common auxiliary in converbial constructions. Note that this auxiliary appears in this text only as the participle form in *-kan* with its suffix-initial consonant left unwritten, for example, *suw aqa dök[k]än köz* [TK 22v2] ‘eyes that have strong mucous flow’ (p. 145), *qusa dök[k]än kiši* [TK 34r10-11] ‘one who vomits heavily’ (p. 160), *süt emä dök[k]än oğlan* [TK 66r12-13] ‘a child who sucks milk forcefully’ (p. 205). This suggests another possibility; that is, what is read as *dök[k]än* is in fact to be read *dugan*, deriving from *durğan*, the participle form of the auxiliary verb *dur-/tur-* ‘to stand’ expressing continuity. For the loss of the consonant *r*, compare the corresponding Uzbek *-digan* and Uyghur *-diğan*, which are part of the suffixes *-adigan/-ydigan* and *-idiğan/-ydiğan*, respectively. The continuative or serial meaning is confirmed by its co-occurrence with such adverbials as *paywasta* ‘continually’ in TK 34r13 or *tört kündä bir kün* ‘every four days’ in TK 55v6. Furthermore, the corresponding HH text has mostly *durğan/turğan* (as the editor remarks in footnote 74 to the Introduction), and even *dugan* at 82r21, 83r15, and 83r18.

har kâz ‘always; never (*in negative sentences*)’ (p. 260)

Should be read as *hargiz* ‘ever, never’. Note that all the examples are negative sentences.

har kimsä ‘whoever’ (p. 260)

In HH 67v18 and HH 102r6, the second word is not spelled *kym sh*, as the editor assumed, but *kymr sh* with a *rä* before *sīn*. Should be read as *har kimärsä* (same meaning).

kawr ‘ground unfit for cultivation’ (p. 211)

In HH 101r19, this word is preceded by the adjective *eski* ‘old’. This would make little sense, since a ground unfit for cultivation can be neither old nor new. Considering that the word is used in both examples to designate a place where something is buried, the reading *gōr* ‘grave’ fits the context much better.

kūr al- ‘to go blind’ (p. 278)

Occurs in *yā közdä parda bolsa kim anī bilä kūr almağay* [TK 20r1], which the editor translates as ‘or there is cataract in the eye, and to not become blind for that reason’ (p. 141). *kūr almağay* should be, however, read as *kör-almağay*, a contraction from *körä almağay* expressing impossibility, and the whole phrase means ‘or there is cataract in the eye, due to which one will not be able to see’. For similar examples of contraction see *bišür-almağay* [TK 35r5] < *bišürä almağay*, *čiq-almağay* [TK 63v8] < *čiqä almağay*.

mayl ‘wish, desire’ (p. 284)

agar azraq bolsa mayl ilä tartğay [TK 21r12] is translated by the editor as ‘if it is mild, put as you wish’ (p. 143). This does not suit the context well. Read as *mīl* instead of *mayl*, it would mean ‘..., put with a needle’.

na ‘no’ (p. 286)

What is read as *na* in *böğüči bolğandīn na du ‘ālarnī oqub* [TK 46r7] is spelled as *ny* and should be read as *nē* if the Persian negative particle is intended. Note, however, in Chaghatay the Persian negative particle *na/nē* is not normally used singularly, but in conjunction with another one to form a correlative negative with the meaning ‘neither ... nor’. As the verb that follows is the converb form of *oqu-* ‘to read’, *ny* may possibly be the interrogative-indefinite *ne* ‘what’, whose Old Turkic cognate *nä* can form a temporal clause with a converb form as in *nä anī körüp ök* ‘the moment they saw that’ (see Marcel Erdal, *A Grammar of Old Turkic*, p. 476.)

nafas ür- ‘to breathe, respire’ (p. 286)

The verb used may actually be *ur-* ‘to hit’ and not *ür-* ‘to blow’, since examples of *nafas ur-* ‘to breathe’ are attested in Classical Chaghatay and also in the Middle Turkic translation of ‘Aṭṭār’s *Tadkirat al-awliyā*. Note the verb meaning ‘to blow’

is *hür-* in this text, except for the example here and *kām ür-* [TK 11v11], which is translated by the editor as ‘to desire, wish’ (p. 272). The reviewer proposes to read this latter as *kām örmäk* instead, a calque of Persian *kām bâftan*.

oğurlan- ‘to be stolen’ (p. 291)

In *agar kiši nāmārsā oğurlansa* [TK 63v5] ‘If something is stolen’ (p. 200), the passive verb *oğurlan-* is accompanied by two bare nominals *kiši* ‘man’ and *nāmārsā* ‘thing’. Since the first of these is left untranslated, it is not clear how the editor understood its syntactic function. The corresponding HH 97r3 text, with the causative verb *oğurlatsa* instead of *oğurlansa*, is wholly intelligible as ‘if someone has something stolen’, and is much to be preferred.

qayy tur- ‘to vomit’ (p. 302)

The editor reads *qayy turmak kiši* [TK 34r8] and translates it as ‘one who vomits’. However, *qayy* meaning ‘vomiting’ is unlikely to form a compound with *tur-* ‘to stand’ to designate the action of vomiting, nor does a verbal noun in *-mak* normally modify a following noun. The corresponding HH text 82r19 has *qayy turmas kiši*, which may be interpreted as ‘one whose vomiting doesn’t stop’.

qiyān ‘servants’ (p. 304)

Examples from Chapter Fifty-one, titled “on escapes and lost properties”, are *hēč qiyān bar-almağay yanib kelgäy* [TK 62r7–8] ‘no servant will be able to abscond; they turn and come back’ (p. 198) and *hēč qiyān bar-almağay* [TK 63r2–3] ‘No servant will be able to go away’ (p. 199). For both of these sentences, the lost objects to be sought are explicitly mentioned in the preceding contexts, ‘runaway, slave or other properties’ in the first case and ‘someone’ in the second. This takes the word *hēč qiyān* ‘no servant’ out of context; *qiyān* is a misreading of *qayan* ‘where’, and the phrase should be translated ‘((s)he/it/they) will not be able to go anywhere’.

goru- ‘to protect’ (p. 304)

The sentence *bu du‘ānī kāğizgā bitib rišta-ğa baylasalar rišta qorugay* [TK 61r2] is translated as ‘If someone writes this prayer on paper and bandages it onto the [place affected by] guinea worm, he will be protected’ (p. 196). As *goru-* is a transitive verb, ‘he will be protected’ is not an appropriate translation of *rišta qorugay*. If read as *rišta qurugay*, the meaning will be ‘the guinea worm will be dried up’.

sök- ‘to smash into pieces’ (p. 317)

In *qiwāmga sök[k]ünčä* [TK 17v4] ‘After pulverizing it to the proper degree of consistency’ (p. 138), the letter read by the editor as *sīn* is in fact a combination of two undotted letters, which yields several readings, while the vowel *ö* is not written. A plausible reading would be that with *yā* and *tā*, that is, *qiwāmga yätkünčä* ‘until it

reaches a proper consistency'. Compare the expression *qiwām-ğa kelgäy* [TK 47r4], translated as 'it comes to a proper consistency' (p. 180).

tärs 'excrement; inverted' (p. 327)

What has been read by the editor as *tärsini* at TK 11r5 and TK 27r9 is in fact in both instances spelled *tyrysny*. Moreover, the editor's interpretations of *käyik-niñ tärsidä* (...) *bitib* [HH 103r9] 'write [the words] on the excrement of a gazelle' and *bu ta'wīzni käyik tärsidä yā kāgizdä bitib* [HH 103r9] as 'write this amulet on the excrement of a gazelle, or on paper' (p. 214) are totally inconceivable, although the spellings of *tärsidä* are not as clear as in the two TK examples given above. In all these cases *tärsini* and *tärsidä* should be errors for *terisini* 'its skin' (accusative) and *terisidä* 'on its skin' respectively. On the other hand, an example of *tärs* 'inverted' is found in *tärsidä egirgän ip* [HH 102r13], translated correctly as 'inversely twisted yarn' (p. 212). Note the spelling is *t'rsyd* here.

There are also a number of simple mistranscriptions. The following are from the TK text:

11r1 for *törlüg*, read *türlüg* (cf. HH 102v5 *türlüg*).

21r12 for *bunuñ*, read *munuñ*.

25v11 for *aq-liqnī*, read *aq-likni*.

34v3 for *tafarrus*, read *taqaddasa*.

38r9 for *ašasa*, read *ašamak*.

38v12 for *olturgursalar*, read *olturguzsalar* (the dot of the *zā* is visible).

42r12 for *qoymak*, read *qoymaq*.

44v1 for *šaqaq*, read *šakar*.

56v6 for *birlä*, read *bilä*.

61v4 for *bi-rabbi'l-falaki*, read *bi-rabbi'l-falaqi*.

61v6 for *wa'l-ḥamdu'lillāh*, read *wa'l-ḥamdu lillāhi*.

65r1 for *'anhmā*, read *'anhumā*.