

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit. Bd. II: Türkische Elemente im Neupersischen, alif bis tā by Gerhard Doerfer

Review by: Gerard Clauson

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, No. 3/4 (Oct., 1966), pp. 152-153

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25202935>

Accessed: 25/08/2012 10:23

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.



Cambridge University Press and Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

qu'ils sont". They are equally reluctant to divide between two rulers of each name the coins of Diodotus, Euthydemus, Demetrius, Antimachus, Eucratides, and Heliocles. In the case of the first and the last the present reviewer would concur. Especially important is the inclusion of the first authentic account of the finding of the hoard at the frontier-post of Khisht Tepe on the Oxus. Some readers may regret that the Afghan commandant's report of the discovery was not translated in full, or perhaps cited in the original. Of particular interest none the less is the visit to the site by M. Le Berre, and the resulting map. This publication as a whole marks a decisive epoch in the progress of Graeco-Bactrian numismatics.

A. D. H. BIVAR.

TÜRKISCHE UND MONGOLISCHE ELEMENTE IM NEUPERSISCHEN, UNTER BESONDERER BERÜCKSICHTIGUNG ÄLTERER NEUPERSISCHER GESCHICHTSQUELLEN, VOR ALLEM DER MONGOLEN- UND TIMURIDENZEIT. BD. II: TÜRKISCHE ELEMENTE IM NEUPERSISCHEN, ALIF BIS TĀ. By GERHARD DOERFER. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission, Bd. XIX.) pp. iv, 671. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag, 1965. DM. 140.

The first volume of Dr. Doerfer's *magnum opus*, which was reviewed in *JRAS*, 1965, p. 62, contained 409 loanwords in Persian which were immediately derived from Mongolian, although some of them were originally loanwords in that language. The present volume contains the first half of a similar list of words immediately derived from Turkish, 606 in number. It is safe to say that it will be for many years to come an indispensable work of reference for all students of the history of the Persian and Turkish languages and a useful subsidiary source of information for students of the other languages, in the Balkans and the Soviet Union, which Dr. Doerfer has taken into account. He is a scholar in the great tradition of Professor Markwart, not over reluctant to follow a word wherever it takes him, even if this is not strictly relevant to his theme. This often results in the supply of information of great interest. For example, under 888, the ethnonym *Türk*, which is unfortunately marred by some mistakes, he marshals, *inter alia*, the earliest references to the name in Arabic, the dates of which are vital in connexion with the history of Turkish penetration of the West several centuries before the earliest Turkish loanwords appear in Persian. Sometimes, indeed, his net is cast much wider than his terms of reference permit. For example, nos. 985-7 are Chinese phrases, and no. 989 a Tibetan word; it is nice to have them identified, but they did not reach Persian *via* Turkish. Dr. Doerfer's erudition is enormous, and so too is the range of authorities which he has consulted. The collection of references based on his card indexes of this enormous mass of authorities is invaluable; but anyone who employs such a technique inevitably pays one penalty: what he gains in coverage he loses in depth. Dr. Doerfer is unhappily less at home in Turkish than Persian and Mongolian, and too often he merely repeats previous authors' mistakes instead of correcting them. For example, his principal authority for Xākāni Turkish is Atalay's *Index to Kāşğari*. As an index this is almost faultless, but its translations are by no means above reproach. For example, under 460, *arkış*, he quotes the whole of Atalay's translation including *büyük, afsun*, "magic, spell". A scholar more familiar with the language would have realized immediately that these words translate not *arkış* but *arvış*, and are there only because in one passage in the MS the -v- lost its third dot and Atalay did not spot the error. Again, under 997, *tirek*, "pillar, support", he quotes Atalay's translation *direk, kavak*; but *tirek* does not occur in *Kāşğari*, the entry indexed is in fact *térek*, "poplar" (*kavak*); *direk* was an invention of Atalay's. Similarly, under 486, *eşek*, "donkey", originally *eşgek*, he quotes with approval Bang's etymology "eş with the Diminutive Suffix -gek, 'little comrade'". But there is no diminutive suffix -gek in Turkish, there is a *deverbal* suffix -gek connoting habitual or constant action. The word is actually derived from *eş*- "to trot" and means literally "constantly trotting". Nor are his translations of the *Kutaqğu: Bilig* impeccable. Anyone

who has read much of that great work knows that when the author is short of a syllable in a verse he shoves in *kör* "see!"; and if a passage is difficult it is always wise to look in *Kāşgari* and see whether any of the words have other meanings besides the ordinary ones. By ignoring these two points Dr. Doerfer, under 955, *tör*, "seat of honour", has produced a wildly inaccurate translation of verse 262. What it actually says is "if an ignorant man has a place in the seat of honour, see! [kör] this seat of honour is reckoned to be (no better than) the yard in front of the house"—an alternative meaning of *él*—"and the seat of honour finds (a place in) the yard". His translation is "if an ignorant man has a place in the seat of honour, he is blind" (Persian *kōr*, a word unknown in Turkish until some centuries later). "He thinks that the seat of honour is for all the people"—a later meaning of *él* unknown to *Kāşgari*—"but only the king"—accusative of *él* mistaken for *élig* "king"—"finds the seat of honour". There are two other faults to which attention must be drawn. The first is highly technical and rather abstruse. The Turkish "runic" alphabet, like the Iranian version of the Aramaic alphabet which was its principal source of inspiration, was not designed for writing short vowels except vowels other than a/e in the first syllable; the reader was left to supply these for himself. Even 1,100 years later scholars with a good knowledge of the cognate dialects can usually do this with confidence. But Dr. Doerfer writes all short back vowels as *ä* and all short front vowels as *ë*, for example, *bodän* for *bođun* and *eşedëj* for *eşidij*; this is not only unsightly, but also, if taken literally, misleading. The other is more serious. In his laudable campaign against the Altaic theory Dr. Doerfer has poked a good deal of legitimate fun at the *teleologische Sternchenforme* (a much more compact phrase than the English equivalent "imaginary forms marked with a star invented to provide a common ancestor for Mongolian and Turkish words") which are part of the stock-in-trade of the proponents of the theory. Unfortunately he has himself produced a whole string of *teleologische Sternchenforme*, not to prove the Altaic theory but to provide supposedly "urtürkisch" words which are more like the early Turkish loanwords in Mongolian than the same words in standard Turkish. In framing these *Sternchenforme* he has silently accepted three of the most implausible contentions of the Altaists: (1) that there were no *ş*'s or *z*'s in *Urtürkisch*, but two kinds each of *l* and *r*; (2) that there was an *urtürkisch* initial **p*- which became zero in Turkish and *h*- in 13th-century Mongolian; (3) that there were many final short vowels in *Urtürkisch* which had disappeared in 8th-century Turkish but lingered on in Turkish loanwords in 13th-century Mongolian. It is very much to be hoped that Dr. Doerfer will have second thoughts on these points. It is disagreeable to have to call attention to the failings of an old and trusted friend, who is a first-class scholar in his own field. Let me therefore close this review, as I began it, by saying that this is an indispensable work of reference, but with the proviso that, so far as the more technical aspects of Turkish lexicography and etymology are concerned, it cannot unhappily be accepted as infallible. Happily, however, we are promised, after the third volume with the other half of the Turkish loanwords, a fourth volume of indexes, addenda, and corrigenda, in which we can hope that these errors will be corrected.

GERARD CLAUSON.

DIE TÜRKEN VON VIDIN: SPRACHE, FOLKLORE, RELIGION. By J. NÉMETH. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica, X.) pp. 420, map, 16 line drawings. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965. \$14.

Our Honorary Fellow, Professor Németh, the *doyen* of Hungarian Turcologists, is probably the last of a distinguished line of field philologists who travelled by local transport or on foot in remote areas where languages of interest to them were spoken, and brought back and published masses of material laboriously written down by themselves in phonetic alphabets in the homes of their informants. We stay-at-home scholars can have no conception, and modern field philologists, who carry about a battery of advanced recording