Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Bd. III: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen, .ordinal bis kāf by Gerhard Doerfer; Türkische Lehnwörter im Tadschikischen by Gerhard Doerfer

Review by: Gerard Clauson


Published by: Cambridge University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/25203033
Accessed: 25/08/2012 10:53

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.
and records a magnificent collection of 244 MSS. The earliest are grouped according to their scripts and the later according to their country of origin. The introduction is to the point and there are lists of calligraphers and dates. The plates in these catalogues have always been good and in this volume the publishers have surpassed themselves.


A brief general description, preceded by a historical sketch, in accordance with the normal pattern of the series illustrated.


A biography, originally published in Arabic in 1962, which questions the veracity of many episodes of Lawrence’s campaigns as described in his own writings and others by Western authors. A brief comment by A. W. Lawrence is added.


A popular illustrated biography of the present king of Saudi Arabia with appendices giving the political programme issued by him as head of the government in November, 1962, extracts from his speeches, and a diagram of the Saudi administrative system.


A well-illustrated popular account of the author’s travels and archaeological expeditions in Oman and Dhufar.

Central Asia, Turcology


Dr., now Professor, Doerfer’s magnum opus, of which Vol. I was reviewed in JRAS, 1965, p. 62, and Vol. II in JRAS, 1966, p. 152, proceeds on its stately way; the present volume brings up the score to nearly 2,000 pages and 1,706 Elemente with one more volume
to come. Doerfer recently pointed out in *CAJ*, XI, p. 220, that it is not a mere list of loanwords in Persian and that the word *Elemente* was deliberately chosen to cover, as well a loan-words proper, other things like Turkish words quoted as such in Persian texts. Nevertheless, as pointed out in the review of Vol. II, it has been broadened to include as well a few *Elemente* in Persian which reached the language with no Turkish contact at all. There is an interesting example of what appears, at first sight, to be a word of this kind in the present volume, no. 1614, *kabin* "dowry". As Doerfer points out, where the word has been found in modern Turkish languages, it is clearly a Persian loan-word, and he ventures the opinion that it might originally have been Iranian Xwarazmian, in which he has found it in the form *kabîna*. The odd thing is that, in the form *kabîn*, with back vowels, it does actually occur more than once in a late Uyghur text which he had never seen, one recently published in Tashkent of which I hope to publish a revised text in this country, but that does not make it Turkish either. The likeliest theory is that it is the Chinese phrase *chia pien* "bride capital sum" (*Giles, Chinese–English dictionary*, nos. 1141, 8846), which like other Chinese loan-words was taken into late Uyghur and may have reached the Iranian languages through Turkish, Mongolian, or direct. It would not be difficult to find other minor points on which correction is required or disagreement possible, but these are only small blemishes and do not affect the fact that this will be an indispensable work of reference for many years to come.

The second work listed above is a much less substantial affair. It is based primarily on a study not of the literary Tajik language but of V. S. Rastorgueva’s vocabulary of the northern Tajik dialects, and lists 527 words which Doerfer regards as Turkish loan-words. This is an extraordinarily high proportion, about 25 per cent, of Rastorgueva’s total vocabulary, and is no doubt too high. It is quite true that Tajikistan is almost encircled by Uzbekistan, and that since the two peoples have lived side by side for generations there has been a massive invasion of the Tajik vocabulary by Uzbek elements, but it is going too far to suggest that every word in Tajik which is not Persian by ancestry must have reached that language via Uzbek. Tajikistan also has quite a long common frontier with Afghanistan, and a word like no. 176, *kiciri*, synonymous with the English word *kedgeree* and like it derived from the Hindi word *khichiri*, is much more likely to have come directly over the Afghan frontier than indirectly via Uzbekistan. Nevertheless, even if 25 per cent is too high a figure, it may not be much too high. The more interesting part of the book is a detailed study of the influence of Uzbek not only on the vocabulary, but also on the accent and syntax of Tajik. Indeed, the process of infiltration has gone so far that a scholar examining present-day Tajik and Uzbek but knowing nothing of the ancestry of the two languages might well be tempted to conclude that they were distant cousins descended from a common ancestor. Only a careful analysis of the two vocabularies using the negative method, that is paying particular attention to the kind of words which are not common to the two languages, would suggest that they could not in fact be related. Doerfer embarked on this study for its own sake, but he has also, quite legitimately, used it as a cautionary tale to discourage scholars who are inclined to accept the "Altaic theory" that the Turkish, Mongolian, and Tungus language-groups are genetically related because the same kind of grammatical resemblances and common vocabulary elements exist in the three groups, or at any rate some members of them, as exist in Tajik and Uzbek.

GERARD CLAUSON.


An objective survey, thoroughly documented from Russian and Western European
sources, describing the traditional ways of life of the pastoral nomads and the oasis-dwellers of Central Asia, and the modifications (relatively slight) which they have undergone during the past century of Tsarist and Communist rule.


The University of Michigan possesses a copy of a report submitted in French in 1766 by the British ambassador in Istanbul (the original, as V. J. Parry has pointed out in BSOAS, XXX, 1967, 408, is in the British Museum). Professor Ehrenkreutz places this source "into academic orbit" (sic) with a transcription of the Michigan text (pp. 1-74), an English summary (pp. 75-90), notes, and an index.


The vita of Sheykh Bedreddin composed by his grandson Khalil b. Ismâ‘îl survives in a single manuscript (Istanbul, Belediye Library, Çevdet 228). A transcript of it was published by F. Babinger in 1943 and the work was discussed by H. J. Kissling in ZDMG, C-=-N.S. XXV, 1950, 112-76. Wartime conditions not only prevented the publication of Babinger's projected second volume of commentary but also made his edition practically unobtainable, so that this text in Latin script, with useful notes and glossary, is a particularly welcome substitute.


English translation of Grousset's life of Jenghiz Khan, Le conquérant du monde (Paris, 1944). Professor Sinor has updated some of the footnotes and added a valuable critical bibliography of 79 titles.

South Asia and Buddhism


Extremely enlightening for those who wish to know the nature of dharma as a source of law, this will at once become the standard introduction to the indigenous Indian legal system. A translation into English will be desirable. The style is as charming and easy as the immense complexity of the subject will allow, but the use of such a book (needed nowhere more than in India itself) should not be confined only to those who understand French. A particularly welcome incidental feature is the citation of A. Barth, whose comments on the Nelson-Innes controversy about the suitability of the Sanskrit book-law for South India were previously buried in the Revue critique or his Œuvres; there is also a useful reference to that erratic scholar G. Dumézil. Discussion of the views of Indian writers (the bibliography is very rich), of Ludo Rocher, and of this reviewer, occurs unobtrusively in a fully integrated, consistent, and comprehensive explanation of what role the actual literary sources played in begetting or inspiring, rather than propounding, law. The discussions of