briefly the protégé of the vizier Rustem Pasha who is known more as a Philistine and fiscal conservative than as a patron of the arts.

Unfortunately Yahya Bey's work has not been available to scholars in any reasonable form and the many interesting questions raised by his life and poetry have never been adequately addressed. In reviewing what has been said about him one finds tantalizing references to his 'originality,' to his 'simplicity and clearness of language,' to his 'naturalness of expression'—most of which attributes contrast sharply with descriptions of the work of some of his better known and more accessible contemporaries. It is, therefore, with great pleasure that students and scholars of Ottoman poetry greet Çavuşoğlu's edition of the *Divan* of Yahya Bey—and the good news does not end with the *Divan* for Çavuşoğlu is also in the process of editing Yahya Bey's *mesnevi* works and preparing a monograph of the poet himself.

Çavuşoğlu is the direct scholarly descendant of Ali Nihat Tarlan whose careful and meticulous editions have contributed so tremendously to work on Ottoman poetry—and the scion of this scholarly line seems as thorough and skillful in his work as the master. If one considers the monumental task of editing a massive collection of poems from an ill-assorted, indifferently copied and, more often than not, hopelessly eclectic group of manuscripts one will appreciate the learning and sensitivity necessary to produce an edition of high quality. In the case of the *Divan* of Yahya Bey, Dr. Çavuşoğlu appears to have done an outstanding job of threading his way through the numerous pitfalls of such an undertaking. The transliteration seems to be accurate with a very reasonable and readable approach to the phonology of sixteenth-century Turkish. The critical apparatus is sparse but to the point as the editor has used his judgment to eliminate a plethora of obvious copyist's errors and unreasonable interpolations. Clearly some such selection procedure must be followed if the poetry is not to be lost in a welter of irrelevant details. In such a case, however, one must be able to place considerable trust in the acumen of the editor and a sampling of poems from Çavuşoğlu's edition would indicate, to this reviewer at least, that his work is eminently trustworthy.

Certainly every scholar and student interested in Ottoman divan poetry will be interested in obtaining a copy of this valuable source material. Hopefully the result will be some added interest in the work of Yahya Bey and a better understanding of the nature and development of Ottoman poetry at a crucial period.

University of Washington, Seattle WALTER G. ANDREWS

J. ECKMANN, *Middle Turkic Glosses of the Rylands Interlinear Koran Translation* (Budapest: Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1976). Pp. 359.

How do you say 'Qur'ān' in Eastern Middle Turkic? Was the word *ätöz* 'self' still used in the Late Karakhanid period? What meaning did a learned Central Asian Turk living in the thirteenth century attribute to Arabic *ḥašr* in Qur. 59,2? Answers to such questions will be found in Eckmann's Turkic–English glossary, published posthumously in a deluxe edition by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

This valuable glossary is based on an undated Qur'ān which has Turkic and Persian interlinear glosses and is presently preserved in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, England (Arabic MSS 25–38). The glosses cannot be read as a continuous narrative and therefore cannot be used independently, that is, without the Arabic original, as translations of the Qur'ān into Turkic or Persian. Rather, they translate individual words or smaller morphological groups with little or no regard for the full grammatical or semantic context. Thus the Rylands manuscript is not, as the title of Eckmann's book might suggest, a Qur'ān translation in the strict sense of the word, but an Arabic Qur'ān

© *1980 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/80/010130-01 $00.35/X*

provided with Turkic and Persian definitions that served the purpose of helping those who read the Qur'ān in Arabic, and perhaps those who wished to learn Arabic on the basis of the language material of the Qur'ān. Because of these features the Rylands Qur'ān with its interlinear glosses is an appropriate source for Turkic or Persian lexical studies.

Eckmann was one of the first Turcologists to recognize the linguistic value of interlinear Qur'ān translations in general, and of the Rylands manuscript in particular. Disturbed by the fact that 'Turcology could not yet produce a comprehensive book on the history of the Turkic languages' (p. 11), he set out to prepare such a comprehensive history by making accessible some of the primary Turkic lexical sources. He published his *Chagatay Manual* with a chrestomathy and a glossary, edited Gadāī's *Dīwān* and provided it with a detailed Turkic–English vocabulary, wrote a series of articles on the philological and linguistic problems of Eastern Middle Turkic, and then started work on the Turkic glosses of the Rylands Qur'ān. His untimely death prevented him from carrying out his long-range plan. The Turkic–English glossary which he began to prepare on the basis of the Rylands Qur'ān, however, was already at such an advanced stage that, with appropriate editing, it could be published.

In Budapest L. Ligeti and his staff (T. Iványi, an Arabist; E. Jeremiás, an Iranist; and E. Schütz, an Armenologist) undertook the demanding task of preparing Eckmann's manuscript for publication. The fact that our Hungarian colleagues did so is of cultural-political significance. It is well known that in Hungary in the last thirty-five, Russia-dominated years, studies in Eastern Turkic and other areas of scholarship directly associated with the history and heritage of Soviet minorities in Central Asia were strongly discouraged. This was partly demanded by the Russians, partly promoted voluntarily by gung-ho party members or by overcompliant low- and middle-echelon cadres. This attitude led to the total elimination of Eastern Middle Turkic studies from the university curriculum and from academic research. Hungarian Turcologists who wanted to follow in the footsteps of Vámbéry did so in exile. J. Eckmann himself was one of them.

In the last few years Soviet-bloc détente strategy has led to a slight change in Hungary's cultural policy. In the new atmosphere, for example, Vámbéry, whose achievements had been either ignored or deprecated in the postwar period, was again recognized and his long-forgotten grave was given a new marker. The same détente-inspired efforts have now led to the publication of Eckmann's work in his native land.

The handsome, neatly printed volume consists of (1) a short preface by L. Ligeti, (2) an article on Eastern Turkic Qur'ān translations which Eckmann had written for the seventeenth volume of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, and (3) the glossary itself.

In his preface Ligeti touches upon two basic questions which arise in connection with all posthumous publications: the state of the author's manuscript as it was submitted and the nature and extent of the editor's contribution. Some of Ligeti's statements require further comment.

On page 7 he writes, 'the most important part [of Eckmann's work relating to the Rylands Qur'ān], the glossary, had been finished. . . .' This statement must be the result of a misunderstanding. I had the privilege of working with Eckmann at the University of California, Los Angeles where I shared an office with him in his last years, and I know from him that he did not regard his glossary as completed. I also know that it was communicated to the editor that Eckmann not only planned to subject his glossary to a thorough revision, but that he also had further plans. One was to prepare an Arabic–Turkic index. The reader of Eckmann's Turkic–English glossary will observe that Eckmann used as entries not only single words, but also word groups, for example *kenglik ḥāl* 'prosperity' (p. 157), *saġ qol* 'right hand' (p. 224), and *turġu ew* 'dwelling, habitation' (p.

© *1980 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/80/010131-01 $00.35/X*

295). He did so on the grounds that these word groups had single Arabic words—in the above cases *sarā', yamīn, and maskan,* respectively—as equivalents and that in the Arabic–Turkic index these word groups would occur as definitions for the Arabic entries. Eckmann also envisaged the preparation of two additional indexes: one English–Turkic–Arabic, the other Persian–Arabic.

On page 7 Ligeti remarks, 'The posthumous work has come down to us in a carefully typed and corrected copy.' That is not the case: Eckmann's manuscript, while perhaps carefully typed, was never submitted to an English-speaking editor: 'good tiding' (p. 189) for 'good tidings,' 'to loose spirit' (p. 162) for 'to lose spirit,' 'private part' (p. 118) for 'private parts' and so on, make this amply clear. The Publishing House of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences usually provides an English reader to check the language of any English manuscript before it goes to the printer. Why was it not done in this case?

Ligeti exaggerates when on page 7, in an attempt to explain why the editor did not provide an introduction, he notes that 'the posthumous work was to mirror [i.e., would properly reflect] Eckmann's view in every respect.' An incomplete work which the author planned to modify cannot fully reflect its author's views.

In his preface Ligeti explains the principles that guided him and his staff in preparing Eckmann's manuscript for publication. He writes, 'The Turkic text as well as the Arabic and Persian glosses and English translations have been fully respected, correcting [sic] only minor technical inconsistencies that resulted from the lack of the finishing touches' (p. 7). This statement contradicts what we find in the book at least in two respects:

(1) The editor made some major changes which are not mentioned in the preface. For example he changed the letter *c* in Eckmann's transcription to *ǰ* throughout. Eckmann prefered *c* because he sought to keep his Turkic text as close as possible to Modern Turkish orthography. Apart from this, in an English work the use of *ǰ* where a simple *j* suffices, looks awkward.

(2) Many times when corrections were intended, new errors were introduced. For example, in transcribing into Latin letters the Qur'ānic words that Eckmann had given in Arabic, the Arabic editor gave *maljā'* for *malja'* (p. 255) and *ṭa'bān* for *ṭu'bān* (p. 91). He also omitted *aṣḥaṭa,* the Arabic illustration in the entry *nāḫušnūd* (p. 190). In transcribing Persian words, the Persian editor gave *jāduvī* for *jādūī* (p. 256), *nusipās* for *nūsipās* (a variant of *nāsipās*) (p. 277), *piẓrufta* for *paẓīrufta* (p. 196), *ba-zānū dar-āmadan* for *bazānū-dar ā-madan* (p. 115), and *ba juz-i rāstī* for *ba juz rāstī* (p. 127), and so on.

In his preface Ligeti names the Armenologist E. Schütz as the editor of the Turkic material of Eckmann's manuscript. Schütz's job required the utmost care since Eckmann's work was not in final form. In order to determine the nature and extent of Schütz's corrections I compared the published work with a copy of Eckmann's manuscript. I found only a few corrections. For example, Schütz introduced the missing entry *ač-* 'to be hungry.' He put it, however, not where it belonged in alphabetical order, but after the entry *'ačmaq* "hunger" (p. 30). He also introduced the entry *Tavrāt,* a form not extant in the Turkic material of Rylands, with the remark that this is 'the proper reading of Tavrīat,' the form we find in Rylands. The editor's intent is not clear. If he meant to correct Eckmann's reading, he is wrong. If he meant that the glossist had made a mistake, he is wrong again: the manuscript has *tavrīt,* proper or improper, and this form is attested in Arabic, Persian, and even Central Asian Turkic works.

Much longer is the list of corrections Schütz should have made. The need for many of them arises from the fact that Eckmann was not able to complete his work himself. Since these errors were not matters of substance but rather of presentation and style resulting 'from the lack of the finishing touches' (p. 7), the editor, in accordance with the editorial

© *1980 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/80/010132-01 $00.35/X*

principles laid down in the preface, was obliged to correct them. Let us consider a few areas where such corrections were called for but not made:

The same Turkic phrases when they occur in different parts of the glossary are very often translated into English differently. For example, *ay oġulqïnam körär män uyqu ičindä, män boġuzlayur män seni* (37, 102) on page 104 is translated 'O my son, I see in a dream that I shall immolate thee,' and on page 196, 'O my little son, I have seen in a dream that I shall sacrifice thee'; *yoq sizkä sïġïnču ol kün* on page 146 is translated 'on that day you will have no shelter' and on page 255, 'you will have no refuge on that day'; *yaġuq elätgil älgingni qoltïqing tapa* (20,22) on page 321 is translated 'draw thy hand close to thy armpit' and on page 232, 'clasp thy hand to thy armpit'; *taturdï angar Tangrï ačlïq örtüki* on page 30 is translated 'God made it [the town] taste a pall of hunger'' and on page 213 'God let it [the city] taste the garment of hunger'; *qačan törütsä män anï, ürsä män aning ičingä ṟuḥmdïn, tüšünglär angar sacda qïlïnglar* on page 242 is translated 'When I have created him [and] breathed My spirit in him, prostrate yourself before him,' and on page 315, 'When I have created him, [and] breathed into him of my spirit, fall down before him prostrate,' and so on.

Eckmann, as he was assembling his glossary, at several points introduced changes both in structure and style. He no doubt planned in his final version to eliminate any inconsistencies that might have arisen. Since this was not possible, the work was again left to the mercy of the editor who failed to notice these inconsistencies, obvious as they were.

As an example we have the treatment of word groups of the *fārïġ qatġusuz* type. Before he had realized their abundance in Rylands and their intriguing lexicosemantic features, Eckmann regarded them as phrases and listed them as such under both constituents. Later he came to regard them as coordinate words and listed them as separate entries. Most of these coordinate words are found in the glossary according to his more recent view. Some, however, still occur according to his earlier conception. This leads to confusion. For example, *fārïġ qatġusuz* 'free from care and anxiety' is listed under the entry *fārïġ* (p. 119). Under *qatġusuz* (p. 218), however, we are sent to *fārïġ qatġusuz*, which does not, in fact, exist as a separate entry. Also, *ačuq āškārā* 'open and public' is given under *ačuq* (p. 30), while under *āškārā* we are sent to *ačuq āškārā* which, again, is not listed.

The editor should also have revised the English definitions of the Turkic entries. First of all he should have provided us with lexicomorphological information on English words the forms of which are ambiguous. For example, with -ing forms he should have indicated whether the word is a noun, a gerund, or a participle, for example, *aḍmaq* (p. 302) 'following' (noun), *käligli* (p. 155) 'coming' (participle). He should have noted whether certain verbs are transitive or intransitive, for example, *sï-* (p. 254) 'to break' (transitive), *qodï ävür-* (p. 230) 'to bend over' (transitive). Definitions such as 'killed one' for *kušta šuda* (p. 265), 'level ground' for *dak* (p. 159), and 'way out' for *čïqġu yär* (p. 115) are also ambiguous without the aid of articles or rephrasing: 'the killed one [a person who has been killed],' 'a level ground [an area that has been leveled to the ground],' 'a way out.' *Sïdr yïġačï* (p. 256) is not 'lote tree,' that is, a kind of tree, but 'the Lote Tree,' the particular tree in Paradise.

Schütz should have observed that many entries include English definitions that are not justified by the context. This occurred because Eckmann included in his working draft most of the potential meanings of a word but intended to eliminate in his final draft meanings not attested in his sources. For example, *quḍruq* is defined as 'tail, last remnant' (p. 236), *qatïġsïz* as 'unmixed, pure, sincere' (p. 225), *öč* as 'revenge; rancor, secret hatred'

© *1980 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/80/010133-01 $00.35/X*

(p. 206), whereas Rylands has these words only in the sense of 'tail,' 'pure,' 'rancor,' respectively. We must remember that the glossaries to Eckmann's *Chagatay Manual* and to his edition of the *Dīvān* of Gadāī contain only meanings which actually occur in these texts.

It is clear from this discussion that Ligeti and his staff, qualified as they were, did not take the necessary pains with Eckmann's manuscript. Détente strategy permits only showcase changes of cultural policy. None of our Hungarian colleagues could risk deeper involvement in putting out this book—a consideration which also caused Ligeti to turn down a proposal to publish a memorial volume to Eckmann.

Even so, unfinished and without proper editing, Eckmann's glossary as presented here is of great value. It provides new information on the status of the Turkic lexicon in the Early Middle Turkic period. It includes hitherto rarely attested Turkic words as well as idioms and meanings not attested in other lexical sources. It also enables us to compare the Turkic glosses to the Arabic words and phrases which they define and thereby to understand how the glossist worked as an interpreter of the Qur'ān. Thus we get a glimpse of the true nature of early interlinear Qur'ān translations and their function as a genre.

University of California, Los Angeles A. J. E. BODROGLIGETI

H. A. QAFISHEH, *A Basic Course in Gulf Arabic* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press and Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1975). Pp. xxii + 482.

This course consists of forty-two units which give in the first lessons instructions as to pronunciation and, throughout, texts, translations, vocabulary, grammar, and drills. It is well graduated, but in the manner of many American manuals takes a very long time to set out the formal grammar. There has been a great need for this kind of elementary teaching handbook. Most of the material published up till now is descriptive (Johnstone, Matar), in thesis form, or available easily only to the personnel of the interested oil companies.

The author is quite right to say that one can talk of Gulf Arabic, though it might have been useful to bring out some of the differences among Kuwaiti, Bahraini, Qatari, and the dialects of the United Arab Emirates.

It is a legitimate criticism of this textbook, however, that the author has not observed correctly the facts of the spoken Arabic of the Gulf littoral. It is quite true that there are two kinds of Arabic in the Gulf countries, the dialect local people speak to one another and a local variety of *koine*, this latter influenced by other dialects and by the literary language. It is true also that one can be left under the impression that the local dialects have now been replaced by *koine*. That is not so, however, and, indeed, in some Gulf countries the opposite is happening. In Kuwait for example the ability to speak Kuwaiti marks one automatically as a member of a privileged elite.

The author does not state his aims specifically, but it is a reasonable assumption from the vocabulary he gives that his course deals with Gulf *koine*. This is less complex phonologically than the dialects spoken by native speakers among themselves, but it still has the same basic phonological features. These are set out in my *Eastern Arabian Dialect Studies*, and it is interesting that although H. A. Qafisheh quotes from the introduction to this book, he cannot have read it, though it is one of the few books on the Arabic of this area. In particular Qafisheh has not understood that in Gulf Arabic (with the exception of certain Bahraini dialects) *i* occurs in open syllables to the exclusion of *a* (except in definable phonetic contexts); that (original) *i* is always elided in open syllables, and that long

© *1980 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/80/010134-01 $00.35/X*