CODEX CUMANICUS



BUDAPEST 1981

BUDAPEST ORIENTAL REPRINTS

SERIES

B 1

EDITORS: E. SHÜTZ–É. APOR

CODEX CUMANICUS

EDITED BY

G. KUUN

WITH THE PROLEGOMENA TO THE

CODEX CUMANICUS

BY

LOUIS LIGETI



BUDAPEST 1981

Kőrösi Csoma Társaság – Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára
Kőrösi Csoma Society – Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences



L. Ligeti's "Prolegomena" reprinted from
Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung.
XXXV (1981), pp. 1–54.

Edited by
É. Apor

ISBN 963 7301 47 X

kadémia Könyvtára
Academy of Sciences

from
n Hung.



Count G. KUUN
1838–1905

CONTENTS

L. Ligeti, Prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus pp. 1–54.

CODEX CUMANICUS pp. (2), CXXXIV, 395.

Marginal numbers refer to the pagination of the manuscript

PROLEGOMENA TO THE CODEX CUMANICUS

BY

LOUIS LIGETI

It has been over a hundred years now since Géza Kuun published the complete text of the Codex Cumanicus, together with a lengthy introduction, ample footnotes, several indices, and even an «Addenda et Corrigenda». Géza Kuun addressed non-Hungarian readers in Latin because in those days the Hungarian Academy did not publish foreign language works. Latin, of course, did not number among foreign tongues, since it had been the official language of the country for centuries.

Few books have had such a lasting and profound influence. Several academic generations considered and reconsidered the problems raised by the Codex, criticized and disputed Géza Kuun's views, accepted many of his assertions, and repeated them without mentioning his name. Each succeeding generation contributed valuable partial monographs, yet there remains a lot to be explored. Some details have been superficially handled, if not completely neglected.

A reprint edition of Géza Kuun's Codex Cumanicus will soon appear in a series of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Csoma de Kőrös Society (*Budapest Oriental Reprints*, Series B 1). This gave me the opportunity to make a few remarks concerning the general problems of the Codex hitherto explained in an unsatisfactory way and to comment on some of the details connected with these problems. The results of my research are put forward in the present study.

Count Géza Kuun was born in Nagyszeben (Hermannstadt, Sibiu) in Transylvania, in 1838, and died in Budapest in 1905. He was elected to the Academy of Sciences in 1867 and filled the post of vice president of the Academy between 1901 and 1904.

He studied classical philology and Semitic languages at the University of Pest, and later he improved his knowledge of the latter in Göttingen. With a firm knowledge of Hebrew and Syriac, he next took up the study of Arabic, Persian and the Turkic languages. Oriental studies were, however, only a part of his wide range of interests. Since he was not a linguist, he relied on the metho-

dology used in classical philology when dealing with Oriental philological questions.[1]

His Oriental studies focus on two major subjects. The first is the history of the early Hungarians as revealed in Muslim sources. One study, the *Relationum Hungarorum . . . historia antiquissima*,[2] was written in Latin, while the rest of his works, the text editions, translations and comments of the Arabic and Persian sources concerning early Hungarian history were written in Hungarian.[3] He used a similar method to elaborate Gardēzī's description of the Turks.[4] The other part of Kuun's Oriental studies focuses on the problems of the Coman people and language. These include his study «Data on the History of the Crimea».[5] Two other of his writings were prompted by critical reviews of his publication of the Codex Cumanicus, one responding to the comments of E. Teza, and the other, «On the Language and Nationality of the Comans»,[6] answering I. Gyárfás' paper entitled «The Coman Language of the Petrarca Codex.»[7]

Géza Kuun's edition of the Codex Cumanicus created a stir among a group of Hungarian historians who maintained that the Comans spoke the Finno-Ugric Hungarian language from the earliest times on. The eminent historian, G. Pray (1723–1801) and also the renowned researcher of the Jazygs and Comans, I. Gyárfás (1822–1883) shared this misconception.

[1] Goldziher, I., *Emlékbeszéd Gróf Kuun Géza fölött.* [A Commemorative Address to Count Géza Kuun], Budapest 1906, *Emlékbeszédek* XIII, 4.

[2] Kuun, Comes Géza, *Relationum Hungarorum cum Oriente gentibusque orientalis originis historia antiquissima.* Vol. I–II, Claudopoli 1892, 1895.

[3] Kuun, Count Géza, *Keleti kútfők* [Oriental Sources]. Edited, translated and annotated by –. In: Gy. Pauler–S. Szilágyi, *A magyar honfoglalás kútfői* [Sources of the Hungarian conquest], Budapest 1900, pp. 137–184.

[4] Kuun, dr. count Géza, *Gurdēzi a törökökről* [Gurdēzi on the Turks]: *Keleti Szemle* (Revue Orientale) II (1901) 1–5, pp. 168–181, 260–270; III (1902), pp. 32–44, 81–94, 253–261; IV (1903), pp. 14–40, 129–141, 257–287.

[5] Kuun, Count Géza, *Adalékok Krím történetéhez* [Data on the History of the Crimea], Budapest 1875.

[6] Kuun, Count Géza, *Újabb adatok a kún Petrarca-Codexhez* [New Data on the Coman Petrarca-Codex], in: *M. T. Ak. Értekezések az I. Oszt. köréből* IV, 12, Budapest 1892. Kuun, Count Géza, *A kúnok nyelvéről és nemzetiségéről* [On the Language and Nationality of the Comans], Budapest 1885, in: *Értekezések az I. Oszt. köréből* XII, 11. Upon the publication of the Codex see Hunfalvy, Pál *A Kún- vagy Petrarka-Codex és a kúnok* [The Coman or Petrarca Codex and the Comans], in: *Értekezések az I. Oszt. köréből* IX, No. 5, Budapest 1881; in German: *Der Komanische oder Petrarca-Codex und die Kumanen*, in: *Ungarische Revue*, Leipzig 1881, pp. 602–632. In his basically positive review Hunfalvy criticized Kuun for the casualness of his Latin and justly complained of the clumsiness of the Latin index.

[7] Gyárfás, I., *A Petrarka Codex kún nyelve* [The Coman language of the Petrarca Codex], in: *Értekezések a II. Oszt. köréből* X, 8, Budapest 1882.

Basically, Géza Kuun's edition of the Codex Cumanicus was favourably received in Hungary. The role of the Comans in the history of Hungary was clear, not even I. Gyárfás denied it. It was a well-established fact that King Béla IV of Hungary allowed 40 000 Coman families who were headed by Kuthen (*Kütän*) and in flight from the Tatars, to settle in the country. The Hungarian population, however, received the numerous alien nomads with apprehension, and before long regarded them as spies of the Tatars. An incited mob finally killed Kuthen, upon which the Comans left the country, plundering and murdering as they went.[8]

After the Mongol invasion, Béla IV called in the Comans again (joined by a part of the Jazygs[9]), and attempted to bring them over to his side by granting them various privileges, and arranging royal marriages with them. Coman influence reached its climax during the reign of Ladislaus IV, called the Coman (his mother was the Coman princess Elisabeth). Their privileges were confirmed by several laws enacted in 1279.[10] After the murder of Ladislaus IV, however, their role diminished, and they gradually merged with the Hungarians. By the end of the 18th century even their language had died out, and all that was left of it to posterity was a distorted version of the Coman Lord's prayer, and some other prayers consisting only of a few words. Later scientific examination of mediaeval Coman personal and place names revealed their Turkic origin (Gombocz, Rásonyi). More recently, interest has been turned

[8] R. Grousset, *The Empire of the Steppes. A History of Central Asia*, New Brunswick 1970, p. 264. C. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols depuis Tchinguiz-khan jusqu'à Timour Bey ou Tamerlan* II, Amsterdam 1852, pp. 135–241.

[9] The Jazygs enjoyed the same privileges as the Comans. The mediaeval Latin diplomas of Hungary refer to them as *Jazones* or *Philistei*. They retained some of their privileges, like the Comans, up to 1848, and their administrative area, established with the Comans under the name «Jászkún-körzet» [Jazygian-Coman district] was abolished in 1867. According to an earlier view, they spoke the Coman language when they settled in Hungary, as they had lived together with this Turkish people for a long time prior to their arrival. Recently it has come to light that at the time of settling in Hungary, the Jazygs spoke their own Iranian tongue which was related to Osset, and Alan. This is evidenced by the Jazygian personal names of Iranian origin in the Latin diplomas, and above all by a Jazygian–Latin word-list from the 15th century found in the Budapest National Archives in 1957. Cf. Z. Gombocz, *Osseten-Spuren in Ungarn: Gombocz Zoltán összegyűjtött művei* [The Collected Works of Z. Gombocz] I, Budapest 1938, pp. 78–83. Idem, *Ossètes et Yazyges: op. cit.*, pp. 91–95. J. Németh, *Eine Wörterliste der Jassen, der ungarländischen Alanen: ADWB*, Berlin 1959. Idem, *Spisok slov na jazyke jasov, vengerskich alan.* Perevod s nemeckogo i primečanija V. I. Abaeva, Ordzonokidze 1960. The Hungarian Jazygs also abandoned their native Iranian tongue for the Hungarian language.

[10] B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde, die Mongolen in Russland, 1223–1502*, Leipzig 1943, pp. 67–68. Hóman–Szekfű, *Magyar történet* [Hungarian History] I, Budapest 1935, pp. 537–543; II (1936), p. 10 sqq. Jean Richard, *La Papauté et les missions d'Orient au Moyen Age*, Rome 1977, pp. 31–33.

to the words of Coman origin in the Hungarian dialects of present-day Coman regions (Mándoky). It is easy to see why Hungarian Turcologists devote special attention to the problems of Coman history and language.

As is well known, the first mention of the Codex was made by Tomasini in 1656. Leibnitz discovered the manuscript in the catalogue of the Venice Library in 1768. In 1769 Daniel Cornides of Hungary, secretary to Count József Teleki sought out the Codex Cumanicus in Venice and copied its first 22 pages. Later, in Hungary he informed Pray about the manuscript with reference to the on-going controversy concerning the Coman Lord's prayer.[11] Finally, through Tomasini, Klaproth re-discovered the manuscript, managed to obtain a copy of the first part of it, and in 1826 edited the copied text. This touched off a series of scientific examinations of the Codex Cumanicus. Despite its deficiencies, G. Kuun's edition constitutes a significant step forward from Klaproth's pioneering edition. Its publication marks the beginning of research on the manuscript itself, together with analyses of its contents.

From Tomasini's time until recently, the Codex Cumanicus was called the Petrarca-Codex, on the basis of the belief that it was one of Petrarca's books left to Venice.

G. Györffy has closely studied the manuscript and its background in Venice, and has arrived at several significant conclusions.[12]

[11] The topic in question is treated by Kuun in detail, (pp. I—XIV). Only the section on Cornides needs some elucidation. According to Kuun, and after him, Gyárfás (*op. cit.*, p. 13), Cornides and József Teleki visited Venice in 1770. They determined this date from Cornides' letter to György Pray. According to Dóra F. Csanak (in her book «Két világ határán» [On the Frontier of Two Worlds], in press), this visit took place in May, 1769. The text (draft) of the letter addressed to Pray can be found almost unaltered in the previously mentioned (Kuun, p. X) manuscript, entitled *Commentatiuncula*, kept in the Manuscript Department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Tört. 2° 164). The part copied from Cornides begins with the first word of the Codex (*Audio: Mesnoem esiturmen*; he thought the first two words were a single Coman word), and ends with *equita — Atlan*, which is on p. 22 instead of 23. The copy made in Venice soon went astray, as he himself wrote in a letter: «aduersaria mea in Transilvania reliqui». If not definitively lost, it must lie hidden somewhere there (perhaps in Szeben, Sibiu).

[12] G. Györffy, *Autour du Codex Cumanicus*, in: *Analecta orientalia memoriae Alexandri Csoma de Kőrös dicata. Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* V, Budapest 1942, pp. 110—137. Györffy's argument was accepted by A. v. Gabain, *Komanische Literatur*, in *Fundamenta* II, pp. 243—244. Referring to Gabain, Louis Bazin, *Les calendriers turcs anciens et mediévaux*, Paris 1974, p. 625 reiterated Györffy's view. Györffy's study is a bibliographical rarety, as Vol. V of *BOH* came out in a very limited number of copies due to the devastations of the war. Dagmar Drüll, in her doctoral dissertation entitled *Der Codex Cumanicus, Entstehung und Bedeutung*, Stutgart 1980 (*Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Band 23, Klett-Cotta), re-examined the date, place, and circumstances of origin of the Codex. Miss Drüll saw and studied the Codex itself, had experts examine the watermarks again, and thoroughly analyzed the paper used for the Codex. All her research confirms Györffy's findings in essentials.

To start with, he has established that the name Petrarca Codex, was an inveterate error. This Nolhac also pointed out in a book published in 1892, but which passed completely unnoticed by Turcologists. Petrarca did indeed leave his books to Venice in his will, but they never arrived there since he lived near Padua at the time of his death in 1374, and the adversities between the two towns prevented the book collection from ever reaching Venice. Nolhac, incidentally, studied each of the 17 manuscripts in the San Marco Library allegedly belonging to the Petrarca collection, including the Codex Cumanicus, and maintained that none of them could have come from the Petrarca library. This is certainly true of the Codex Cumanicus, whose paper (not parchment) pages and leather binding from the 18th century did not blend in at all with the rest of the bibliophile Petrarca's books.

Györffy examined the pages of the manuscript, their water marks, and the former fascicules of the manuscript now bound in one volume.

His research led him to conclude that the manuscript originally consisted of three fascicules. Both Teza and Györffy stress this fact, which means more precisely that the Codex was written on three types of fascicules, the first two of which were of equal size, and contained the same watermark. The third fascicule, however, was larger and apparently clipped round at the time of stitching or binding, which damaged the writing on a few pages. The watermarks of the latter differ from those of the other two types of paper. Apart from this proof, a view had earlier evolved to the effect that the Codex had two parts, a «German» and an «Italian» part.

Let it be noted here that the Codex today consists of 164 pages. This subsequent, modern pagination was used by G. Kuun, A. v. Gabain, Grönbech (in his dictionary) and Monchi-zadeh. We will also adhere to this pagination, as the arbitrary mediaeval paging seems gratuitous and anachronistic, using 82 r-v folios.

The «Italian part» comprises pages 1—110, which simply means that the Italians left pages 111—118 of the second fascicule blank. This is how the next owners obtained the Codex. According to this conception, the new owners started adding their notes on page 119, and continued through to page 164 of the third fascicule. This part, therefore, contains only their material.

The first, or Italian part, offers several chronological clues, first at the very beginning of the manuscript: the date June 11th, 1303 apparently refers to the manuscript from which the present Codex was (either directly of indirectly) copied. This work was undoubtedly not an autograph one, as amply evidenced by the mistakes arising from copying.

Györffy has pinned down the date of copying by showing that the paper was of North Itaian origin, the watermark dating around 1330. This may be considered the copying date of the extant Italian part.

Earlier an older chronological clue was thought to have been discovered, in the names of the months in Latin, Persian and Coman in the Codex. The

Latin names of the Christian calendar, contrasted with the Persian names of Arabic origin, outline the Muslim calendar. The sequence of the Christian and Muslim months in the Codex correspond only cyclically. Disregarding the earlier (1259—1261) and later (1324—1326) concordances, the lists of the months in the Codex coincide only in the years 1292—1294.[13] Through various com-

[13] The correspondence between the Latin and Persian names of months listed on p. 72 of the Codex points to the year 1294, Samojlovič suggests (*Doklady Ak. Nauk* 1924, pp. 86—88); Malov (*Izv. Ak. Nauk SSSR* 1930, pp. 347—349) placed this date at 1295—96. (The questions of the Coman calendar were studied by Kowalski, *Zu den türkischen Monatsnamen*: *Archiv Orientalní* I (1930), pp. 3—26, especially pp. 17—26, and by K. Grönbech, *Wörterbuch*, pp. 30—31). The date 1294—95 inferred from the Muslim chronology is attractive but, as stated above, not convincing. In the course of copying, the list of months got mixed up, as seen in the Coman column. It is also obvious that the copier noticed this, and tried to join the horizontal correlations by adding dashes. The names of the Coman column are, in any case, perplexing. Why, for example, is June an autumn month? Why are three summer months missing? Other curiosities were referred to by Kowalski along with possible explanations. Bazin devoted a whole chapter of his book to the Coman calendar (pp. 624—650), and the deficiency of the list did not escape his attention either. He ascribed it to the careless copier. Bazin tried to overcome the difficulties by reconstructing the Coman calendar with 16 months (pp. 642—643), in the following manner: one year starts with November and ends with October, then the next year starts with November again, but ends with February (that's all the list of 16 can provide for). The period November—December of the 16-item list falls in 1293, January—December in 1294, and JanuaryFebruary in 1295. This seems to bolster up the hypothesis of the 1294—95 date. The problem is, however, that Bazin's cleverly reconstructed list of 16 months can in no way be verified. Another proof of the delicacy of the Coman calendar is the fact that erroneous copying can be clearly shown in the Persian column containing the Moslem month-names in distinct Arabic forms. Let us start from a tangible point: *aprilis — gimediaual* (Bazin: *J̌umādā* I, mai); *madius — regep gimedielachel* (B: *J̌umādā* II, mai). The copier left this out, and realized his mistake only after he had put down *regep*. He corrected the error by inserting it afterwards (B: *Raǰab*, juin). From this point on, the list is one line off, marked by the additional dashes of the copier (the dashes are hardly visible in the facsimile, but much clearer in Kowalski's facsimile); *junius — saabam* (B: *Šaʿbān*, juillet); *julius — ramadâ* (B: *Ramaḍān*, août); *augustus — saugal* (B: *Šawwāl*, septembre); *septemb(e)r — čil chaade* (B: *Ḏū'l qaʿda*, octobre); *octub(e)r — dilchiɹ* (B: *Ḏū'l ḥiǰǰa*, novembre) *noue(m)ber — mugarâ* (B: *Muḥarram*, décembre); *decemb(e)r* — the space for the Persian word is blank here. If the word *regep* is fitted in its right place, the lacuna of December disappears in the Persian column. Bazin's Muslim chronology involves only the year 1294 (excluding 1295). His proposed interpretation of the Persian calendar of the Codex basically agrees with Samojlovič's. Both of them name 1294 as the date in question, and both exclude the years 1295—96 suggested by Malov for the date of origin of the calendar. In fact, the date now generally accepted, 1294, is not so convincing, as there are three successive years in which the month *safar* correlates with January, and *muḥarram* with December: 23. 1. 1292 (Wednesday) — 12. 12. 1293 (Friday); 11. 1. 1293 (Tuesday) — 2. 12. (Wednesday); 1. 1. 1294 (Friday) — 21. 12. (Tuesday). In the Moslem calendar: H 691—1291/2; H 692 — 1293/4, H 693 — 1293/4. Cf V. V. Cybuljskij, *Sovremennye kalendari stran Bližnego i Srednego Vostoka, Sinchronističeskie tablicy i pojasnenija*, Moskva 1964, p. 66. Bazin chose the last of the possible three. It is hard to tell how this Moslem date found its way into the Codex, and whether or not

binations with Coman calendars, this agreement seems to point to the year 1294. In my opinion, the value of this date is disputable, though a number of eminent Turcologists accept it. It suggests that the date of the original Codex was 1294, its first copy was made in 1303, and the existing copy dates around 1330.

The «German part» much more eludes chronological dating. Györffy detected a different kind of paper with three watermarks, but only two of these can be dated more or less precisely. On the basis of the paper and the watermarks, Györffy suggested that this part of the Codex was written between 1340 and 1356. An earlier conception maintained that this part was not a copy, but rather a collection of original texts, glosses and insertions, which were added continuously in the course of a relatively long time. However, it is not difficult to prove that a part of these texts are copies of previous texts, or were written down after dictation. At any rate, the «German part» was compiled later than the Italian, which was earlier believed to have reached German Franciscan friars, accounting for the additional German glosses inserted in the Italian part. The manuscript changed hands again, ending up in Italy. This makes it clear how the Codex, now stitched, got to Venice (and not Genoa) without Petrarca's mediation.

The place of origin of the Codex is not independent of the chronology of its separate parts.

The first, or Italian, part is today believed to have been made in the Crimea. Kuun firmly attributed this part to a Genoan author. Brătianu (1929) shared this view. Some researchers (Rasovski, Györffy) named Solkhat as the place of origin. Miss Drüll tried to confirm the theory of the Genoan origin by eliminating all other possibilities.

---

the Christian terminology contrasted with it is correct; correcting either of them with the Coman chronology is too risky a venture. Let us consider one example: after the previously mentioned emendation, the *curbâ barâ ay* (= *qurbān bayrām āy*) of the Coman column corresponds to *dilghia* in the Persian; this name did indeed denote (*Ḏū'l-ḥiǧǧa*) November in 1292 or 1293. In 1294 the Coman name of November (= *muḥarram*) in Bazin's «corrected» list is *soŋ küz ay*, «the last month of autumn». *Soŋ küz ay* and *qurban bayrām āy* of the Coman column refer to two different mnths. Bazin attempted to eliminate the contradiction with the 16-item list, while Kowalski (*op. cit.*, p. 25), after much hesitation, tended to regard *qurbān bayrām āy* as a special name for «the last month of autumn». In such circumstances, the Coman calendar of the Codex cannot be considered a firm chronological base, and the data inferred from the Persian column of the Moslem calendar are at best shaky hypotheses. Monchi-zadeh's date of 1358 (p. 13), based on the legend of the Petrarca-Codex, is totally unwarranted. Relying on the corrected third edition of Mahler—Wüstenfeld, *Vergleichungstabellen* 3., Miss Drüll tried to modify Malov's dating by identifying the calendar of the Codex with the period of 1292—95, in harmony with the Muslim chronology. We have come back to the former dating; 1295 was commonly disregarded as its last two months extend over to 1296; the «emendations» can be ignored as they only affect days.

The 1303 variant is believed to have been made in the Monastery of St. John near Sarai. No attempts what so ever were made to establish the place of origin of the extant (cc. 1330) copy. The second, «German» part was allegedly compiled by the native German friars of a Franciscan monastery in South Russia (Gabain).

There is no denying that the first part was composed in an Italian setting for other than religious purposes.

The idea entertained from time to time that the author was a friar can be discarded. It is indeed conspicuous that a number of substantives denoting certain groups of subjects, are absent from the text. Brătianu (*Recherches*, p. 231, note 5) also remarked that certain words unbecoming a friar are detectable (Codex p. 68: *bordellum*, *rofiana*, *meretrix*; p. 99: *rofianus*, *castratum*).

It cannot be questioned that the first part of the codex had a secular function. It certainly played a significant, though not exclusive, role in promoting commercial interests. Even Gyárfás emphasized that the trilingual parts had a commercial purpose. To fortify his argument, he cited 89 names of spices, 70 words denoting commercial articles, 17 names of precious stones, and 91 terms connected with office work from the glossary classified by subjects. Regardless of the accuracy of those figures, we must admit that Gyárfás got to the core hinting to questions well worth elaborating.

At this point, a passing remark should be devoted to the role of the Monastery of St. John, mentioned in the 1303 copy, since it seems to contradict the conclusion drawn from the lack of clerical terms.[14] This seeming contradiction can be somewhat resolved if we consider the fact that it is not an original manuscript, but rather a copy whose second part is indisputably of ecclesiastical origin and purpose. The only way to resolve definitively the apparent contradiction is to clear up the relationship between the extant (and lost) copies.

The question originally raised by Gyárfás and later reiterated by others,

[14] W. Bang directed attention to the role of the Monastery of St. John (*Über die Herkunft des Codex Cumanicus*: *SPAW* 1913, pp. 244—245). In his opinion, the monks of this monastery began to write the Codex Cumanicus here in 1294/5. The Monastery of St. John was one of the 17 monasteries north of the Black Sea. According to a text dating from 1314 the monastery was located near Sarai. Bang based his opinion on the last line of the invocation which contains the name of the saint (*Ad honorem dei et B(ea)ti St(ephan)-is euangelifte*). Györffy rightly argued that this invocation was inserted at the head of the text later, during copying. Strangely enough, the name of St. John does not occur at any other place in the Codex. Rather, a passage on the death of St. Stephen can be read among the Coman texts of the second part, cf. Codex, p. 122; Kuun, pp. 159—160; Drimba, *Syntaxe comane*, pp. 228—230 (De la mort de Saint Étienne), which contains the Coman text, its French translation and the relevant part of «The Acts of the Apostles» in Latin. St. Stephen was the only saint whose story the friars thought worthy of including in the Codex. It would lead us too far to search for the causes of this, but it should not be forgotten. It is advisable to check whether there was a monastery with this name among the 17.

should now be worded in the following way: With which Oriental peoples did the Italian colonists settled along the northern fringe of the Black Sea trade? What routes did the Italians use for this trade? What commodities were involved in the exchange? In what sort of offices was the Persian-Coman dictionary used?

The answer to the first question is seemingly pat. Yet only seemingly, as the definition of the Italian colonists itself presents a problem. What sort of Italian colonists have to be reckoned with? No doubt the Genoans played a significant role in the region, yet the more modest but no less active Venetians cannot be bypassed either. So far the aim of research has been to establish in which colony the Codex was written. This question should, however, be extended: were the original and the copies used only in one colony or in both?

The Genoans and Venetians had a wide mediating role in the trade of this region (Pisa and Florence can be disregarded here, since their role was comparatively insignificant). We will leave out of account the radiation of this widespread trade towards the West and North Africa, and will concentrate on the Levant, or more precisely, on the Persia of the Ilkhans, the Golden Horde, and, through the latter, on Central and East Asia.

As for the exchanged commodities in this huge area, detailed information can be drawn from the extant lists of goods which indicate that a wide range of natural resources and products of human activity was involved, including slaves in some places.

Two of the trading routes are of special importance. One led to the Levant with a branch leading to Persia via Trapezunt. This latter demands greater attention in our context. This route being widely known, requires little elaboration here. The same cannot be said of the other route which led through the capital of the Golden Horde to Central Asia and Peking. We owe our description of this route to the 14th century author, Pegolotti.

The starting point of this remarkable trade route was Tana (today Azov). The first leg of the journey ending in Astrakhan (*Gintarchan*) could be made in 25 days in an ox-cart, or 12 days in a horse-drawn cart. Highwaymen also used this stretch of road, so it was rather dangerous. A one-day waterway followed to Sarai (*Sara*), then another 8 days sailing to Saraichik (*Saracanco*) (on the river Ural). A camel-drawn cart covered the next leg from Saraichik to Urgenj (*Organci*) in 20 days. Travelling merchants found a flourishing market in this town. 35—40 days were needed to travel from Urgenj to Otrar. Those travelling without cargo avoided Otrar and reached the next station, Almalik (*Armalec*) in 50 days. The travellers were then carried by pack donkeys along a road which was also full of highwaymen, to Kanchou (*Caexu*) in Chinese territory. This was a 70-day trip. Then came a 75-day journey on horseback to the city of Hangchou (*Cassai*), by a «great water». Here silver coins had to be exchanged for Chinese notes. The trip from Hangchou to Peking (*Cambalec*) took 30 days.

Pegolotti added to his record of the journey: It is advisable for the mer-

chant to take two skilful Coman interpretors with him, and a Coman-speaking woman interpretor might come in handy too.[15]

Of interest for us in Pegolotti's itinerary are the chapters on the journey up to Almalik, and on the Coman language and interpretors.

Mention should be made of Gyárfás' «office vocabulary» as well.

What kind of offices used the Persian—Coman dictionary of the Codex Cumanicus? The Codex itself provides the answer, notably its chapter «Nobilitas hominum et mulierum» (p. 90). As is known, the Genoans as well as the Venetians called their senior official in the Black Sea colonies (and elsewhere like in Tebriz) *consul*. The corresponding words in the Codex are: P *qadi* [chadi] «judge», C *šeriyat* [seriat]. In the same chapter also see: L *potestas*, P *šāna* [saana], C *yarγučï* [yarguzi] «Bürgermeister»; L *torcimanus*, P *kalamači* [ta-

[15] The terms of «office activities» in the Codex contain an intriguing material group; «N(om)i(n)a arti(um) et que per(ti)ne(n)t eis» (p. 80). The Persian and Coman equivalents of L *scriba* can be found here. The chapter makes it clear that the task of the «scribe» or «notary» was to execute the documentation of trading activities: it is preceded by «money» (*pecunia*) and followed by «debtors» and «creditors» (*depitores*, *creditores*), «ledgers» (*manuale*), ink, touchstone» (*lapis auri*), «business paper» (*litera*) and «writing paper» (*papirum*) The chapter is headed by Italo-Latin *bancherius*, the Coman equivalent of which (*saraf*) Grönbech interpreted inaccurately as «Geldwechsler». As for commodity goods, the Latin-Persian-Coman list of the Codex deserves a small monograph (including the careful interpretation and etymology of each word). The Florentine Francesco Balducci Pegolotti was neither a merchant nor a traveller, but he carefully collected information from them. His work *La Pratica della Mercatura* has long been in the focus of attention. For an up-to-date treatment of this subject see Sir Henry Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither* III, London 1914, pp. 137—173. Cf. also H. Cordier, *Histoire de la Chine* II, Paris 1920, pp. 430—432. The latest edition of Pegolotti's work: Allan Evans, *Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, La Pratica della Mercatura*, ed. by —. Cambridge Mass. 1936. Cf. also R. S. Lopez, *Venezia e le grande linee espansione commerciale nel secolo XIII*, in: *La civiltà veneziana del secolo di Marco Polo*, Florence 1952, pp. 39—82. Let me add here that in Pegolotti's book, the name of the Chinese paper money *baleš* was referred to by Pelliot in *T'oung Pao* XXVII, pp. 190—192. He asserts here that *baleš* is identical with the distorted form of Turkish *yastuq*, mentioned by missionaries visiting the Mongols. Both words originally meant «cushion». Let me stress that the prime meaning of *bāliš* is not «paper money», cf. P *bāliš* «a cushion, a pillow; a weight of gold (eight miskāls and two dānaks)» (Stg.). On the role of Tana, see Elene C. Skržinskaja, *Storia della Tana*, in: *Studi veneziani* X (1968), pp. 3—46. W. Heyd's *Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen Âge* II, Leipzig 1885, pp. 555—711 is very instructive on the commodity goods of trade in the Levant. Comprehensive studies have often referred to the export and import goods of Black Sea trade; cf. Brătianu, *Recherches*, p. 247 (with further references), Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, p. 407 sqq. D. Drüll used her findings to explain the «business» words of the Codex (pp. 39—92). A relatively late goods list is of special importance (E. Schütz has drawn attention to it): Devon Khachikian, *Le registre d'un marchand arménien en Perse, en Inde et au Tibet (1682—1692)*, in: *Annales* 1967 (Paris), pp. 231—278. This study was translated from English into French, but retains the original English spelling of the names of articles taken from the native tongue. This list also contributes interesting data on the Persian names of the Codex.

lamaci], C *tïlmač* [tilmaç] «Dolmetscher». The commercial aspects of office activities will be discussed later.

The connections between the Italian colonies and the Golden Horde deserve much more attention, since the Golden Horde was more than just a trading partner to the Genoans and Venetians of the Black Sea region.

On several occasions the two Italian rivals concluded written treaties with the central, or more frequently, with the local, representatives of the Golden Horde. These pacts were generally bilingual, with the original draft in Turkish, and the translation, done by an interpretor, into Latin or Italian. Let me refer to some of these documents that are already familiar to researchers.

During the reign of Özbeg (1312 – 1340) the Venetians signed a contract with Kutluctemir in 1333, and gained thereby the right to build in certain areas near Tana. The agreement was worded in the Coman language, and translated into Latin by Dominicus Polonus (*de Cumanico in Latinum*). In 1358, the Venetians concluded a treaty with Berdibek himself, «the Lord of the Mongols and Comans» (1357 – 1359), which confirmed their trading privileges originally granted in the conventions of 1338 and 1346.

Though the Genoans preceded the Venetians in colonization, their documents date back to later times. One of their pacts is dated 1380, the time of Toqtamïš (1380 – 1395). Upon the order of the Genoan consul of Kaffa, the treaty was translated from the original «ugaresca» into Latin by a scribe named Julianus Panicarius, with the help of an interpretor. The Genoans signed another pact with the delegates of Toqtamïš in 1387. The original of this treaty, written in «ugeresca», was translated into Latin by Franciscus Gabelete.

The Turkic texts of the diploms have been lost, but it can be argued that the «ugaresca» script of the latter two documents denotes the Uighur script, in which the famous yarlïq of Toqtamïš was written. It can hardly be doubted that both the language and the script were identical. The source does not reveal in what language the Venetian contract of 1358 (and the two previous ones) was written, but it is certain that the 1358 document was drafted in Coman. I do not doubt that this Coman language is identical with the Coman tongue of the first, Italian part. The first document shows clearly that the Venetians did not only use the Coman language for commercial purposes but also in their diplomatic contacts.[16]

[16] For a detailed analysis of the diplomas of the Golden Horde see I. Vásáry, *Chancellery of the Golden Horde* (*BOH*, in press). Gyárfás, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 – 17. Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde*, Pesth 1840, p. 250. Hammer also disclosed that according to a document issued by Temür Qutluγ the Venetians were granted three ports in the Crimea, and their consul resided in Tana. G. Kuun dealt with a document dating 1387 in his *Adalékok Krím történetéhez* [Data on the History of the Crimea] (cf. *supra*, note 5). He mentioned three documents (dating 1380, 1381 and 1387), giving only a sketchy translation of the last written in vulgar Genoan. The date of the first document is H 782, the last day of Ša'ban (28), i.e. November 28th, 1380 (*op. cit.*, p. 43). These two

dates are congruent. The Latin translation of this text dates from July 28th, 1383; its Genoan dialectal variant was most likely written in this same year. The document of 1387 fared badly, as Kuun had no time to copy (and edit) the whole text. Acting upon the advice of A. Vámbéry, Géza Kuun explored the material of the Genoan archives, which had also been in Paris for a time during Napoleon's reign, searching for documents in Uighur script, but he found none. It is worth noting that the use of the Italian language did not figure among the privileges of the Genoans. Its dialectal properties are striking, e.g. *consoro* (consul) and *Sorchat* (Solchat). Hammer edited the Italian texts of two contracts signed with the Venetians (*op. cit.*, pp. 517—522). One was endorsed by *Janibek* (1340—1357), dating: *Dado in Gulistan sette cento quarant otto in lo mese de Ramadan die venti doi. in lo anno de porcho.* The year 1347 was indeed the year of the pig. I am afraid Bazin was too rash in his judgment, asserting that the Comans had no knowledge of the animal cycle of 12 years. It is true that the Codex provides no trace of the animal cycle, but this is simply because the author of the Codex started out from Latin, and not vice versa. In those days the calendar of the animal cycle was known by the Mongols, Turks, and even the Persians. The month name *Ramaḍān* in the Persian column of the Codex denotes August, not February. The other diploma comes from *Berdibek* (1357—1359), dated 1358. In Italian: *Dado in Lordo in Accuba* (read *Actuba*) *alli otto di della luna in mese de Siwal, corando lo anno de Can anni sette cento cinquanta nove.* 1356 was the year of the dog; the Venetian *Can* also means «dog». The month *Siwal* corresponds to September, as is recorded in the corrected Persian calendar of the Codex Cumanicus. The correspondence is also confirmed by informations from known concordances. Gulistan was a place famous for its mint; cf. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, p. 544. Spuler (*op. cit.*, p. 99 sqq) misspelled the name of *Janibek* as *Jambek*. On the correct form, *Jani bek*, see Pelliot, *Notes sur l'Histoire de la Horde d'Or*, Paris 1949, pp. 98—101. It is read *Janibek* by B. D. Grekov—A. Ju. Jakubovskij, *Zolotaja Orda i ee padenie*, M.-L. 1950, p. 451. Heyd (*Histoire du commerce du Levant* II, p. 181) refers to a decree forbidding the Genoan citizens to spend the winter in Tana or to buy houses there. He also touches upon a diploma dating from 1332, the year of the monkey (the correspondence is faultless), which permitted the Venetians to build a residential area there. This date falls in the early reign of *Özbeg* (1312—1340), the predecessor of J̌anibek. The question is, how does this diploma compare with the documents of similar content dating from 1333 (the year of the hen)? The documents of 1342 and 1357, which renewed the diploma of 1332, show that the Genoans were banned from Tana. From about 1322 on Venetian galleys from Trapezunt regularly put in at this port. Later Venetian trade agencies were set up in the town, and all this was done in agreement with the Tatar lords of the city. Delegations of this character are often mentioned between 1293 and 1303. Heyd gives a lengthy account of the Venetians' settlement and arrangements in Tana, as well as of their trade and other relations with the Muslim leaders in the area. Difficulties gradually arose with their Tatar overlords, and these were aggravated by the Genoans living on other parts of Tana. Eventually bloody clashes took place between the Tatars, Venetians and Genoans, resulting in the expulsion of the Venetians from Tana for a while. Only in 1347 did they once again obtain permission from J̌anibek to settle in the town (on this diploma see above). Heyd (II, p. 198, note) points out that the month of the date is incorrect. He thinks that the 22nd day of *Ramaḍān* corresponds to December 26th, and not to February. Modern concordances also confirm his position, but far-reaching conclusions cannot be drawn from this divergence, since the date of February is found in the short Latin introduction, and not in the Italian translation. On the diplomas of the khans of the Golden Horde concerning the privileges of the Franciscans, from the time of Möngkä-Tämür (1267—1280), see J. Richard, *La Papauté et les missions d'Orient*, p. 92. sqq.

All this leads us to believe that the former conception which contributes the origin of the Codex to the Genoans, should probably be revised. The more urgent this revision appears since the hypothesis was based on the «Petrarca Codex» theory. The final answer seems to be within reach.

It seems highly likely that the codex was written and compiled by Italian lay persons, perhaps by the scribes of consuls or merchants, for the use of interpretors. The role of merchants in writing of the Codex should not be exaggerated. Their business was trading with the help of interpretors, not tinkering with the compilation of Coman—Persian data.

The views regarding the place of origin of the «German part» have been mentioned earlier. Let me add here that the Codex was probably not used in a single missionary monastery. The fact that at times Latin dominates besides the German glosses proves this claim. Consequently, non-German Franciscans must have contributed to the writing of the second part of the Codex.

Gabain maintains (*Fundamenta* II, 244) that the Codex in its present form was purchased from German (and other) Franciscan friars by Italian merchants (I cannot prove this hypothesis). Anyway, there is no room for doubt that these Italians were Venetians (even if earlier Genoans might have been somehow involved) and that the Codex eventually reached Venice through their offices.

As for the contents of the Codex, it has been discussed almost exclusively in terms of the second part. So far the notion has prevailed that this part was written during a lengthy period, and contains mostly religious texts in prose and verse. It was not compiled by a single person, but by several tireless German (and other?) Franciscans. As curios were the riddles included, priceless remnants of Coman folklore and folk literature, however damaged they may be. The word-lists, and grammatical glosses were included to aid the friars in improving their knowledge of the Coman tongue.[17]

[17] Gabain, *Fundamenta* I, p. 46; II, p. 245. Even more instructive are two passages quoted by Györffy (*op. cit.*, p. 130), one of them (121) about a priest who tells his flock that he does not know their language, and has no interpretor (*til bilmen tolmač yoχ*). He asks them to pray to God that he might be able to learn their tongue easily. The other passage (125) speaks of a friar ignorant of the local language, who is forced to hear confessions with the help of an interpretor. The interpretor is also obliged to observe the seal of confession. It was a long way from the Franciscan friar hearing confessions through interpretors to the excellent Coman translator of the Latin hymn (it is not impossible that he was a native Coman). In any case, several persons of varying levels of Coman knowledge have to be reckoned with. Turkish barbarisms resulting from the servile translation of Persian expressions should be judged in a different way: e.g. *biçak etikçi*, Persian *card muxadufi* «cultellû», more precisely «cobbler's knife» (86: 5). Compound verb forms like *χarǰ et-* «to spend» (P *χarǰ kardan*), *pešman bol-* «to repent» (P *pēšman būdan*) belong to another category. The latter type of compounds is limited in number, the ones cited here were not created by the influence of the Persian expressions of the Codex. It is remark-

To date there has been no ambitious investigation of the contents and the authorship of the first part of the Codex. It contains a grammar and word-list arranged by subjects. There have been suggestions that the anonymous author created his work with the help of a single interpretor who spoke both Coman and Persian. If this indeed was the case, the interpretor, was of mediocre ability, failing now in one, now in the other language, frequently attributing a single word to both.

The Italian part calls for a more thorough analysis. Suffice to mention here that as is presently known, it was not the brainchild of a single anonymous person, but the application of a lost or so far unknown model. The core of the model is a simple and lucid grammatical outline written in Latin, containing verbs, adverbs, and substantives, followed by a list of substantives grouped by subjects. The verbs and adverbs are listed in alphabetic order. Next comes a sketch of the conjugation of verbs and the declension of pronouns and substantives. The section on verbs starts with the full conjugation of the first verb (*audio*), while the rest of the verbs are represented by three forms (present, past, imperative) and one or two nomina verbalia. Subsequently, between two verbs, some semantically independent substantives are inserted in the alphabetical order.

Passages of a similar grammatical and lexical material can be read in the second part of the Codex. They do not constitute an entity; one tends to regard them rather as random glosses from individual collections. The grammatical glosses on pages 127—132 start with brief grammatical notes, eg. on the plural suffix (*lar*), the comparison of adjectives (*asru* and *rac*), the nomen agentis suffix (*či*), the nominal suffix (*lic*), the interrogative particule (*mä*), the privative suffix (*sis*), etc. This, however, is succeeded by the full conjugation of *intelligo — anglarman* in two columns. The affirmative takes the left, the negative the right column (*non intelligo — anglamaman*). The complete Latin—Turkish paradigms are given without a single omission. They take up all of page 129 and part of page 130. On the same page the paradigms are followed by Latin—Coman substantives in alphabetical order, the first five of which (referring to the seasons) being later additions. The alphabetical word-list continues on page 131 with a sample of words beginning with *b*, followed by a completely chaotic list of Latin—Coman words, and, from p. 132 onwards, Latin—Coman expressions.

The compiler of this grammatical material did not necessarily know the grammatical sketch of the Italian part. He may have used either its source, or a similar outline, so it is a matter of coincidence that the two sets of para-

able that the verbal compounds characteristic of Persian have very simple equivalents in Coman: *war kardan* [uar chardam] «to light a lamp» — *yandur-*; *pēda šudan* [peda suden; Cl. *paida sudan*] «to appear» — C *körün-*; etc.

digms complete each other. The second part contains the Coman equivalents of each Latin verbal form, in contrast to the Italian part, in which the Persian and Coman equivalents of the more complex verbal forms are missing. The (fragmentary) alphabetic listing of the substantives in the «German» part is conspicuous. It allows for the suggestion that the grammatical material of the «German» part also derives from another written text, copied or dictated. Thus, this part must have had a written source just like the grammar of the Italian part had. The sources of the two parts were apparently similar but by no means identical; the author of the Italian part drew on the whole (however imperfectly), while the compiler of the second part only randomly selected from it.

The grammatical outline (and its variant), which served as a model, however, did not aim at teaching the Latin language, since it ignored certain characteristic features of Latin like the grammatical genders, classes of verbal conjugations, and nominal declensions, etc. The obvious purpose of the sketch was to assist persons with a perfect command of Latin to learn Oriental languages which lacked the above grammatical categories. The three-column format facilitated the orientation in the material.

Latin, the language of mediaeval erudition, was most probably chosen because it was also the written language of the Black Sea colonies of Genoa, Venice, and other Italian cities.[18] Besides the Codex Cumanicus there is no other example of a polyglot Oriental grammar and dictionary compiled for interpretors on the basis of the Latin language.

In the Mongol period, primarily in the 14th century, the Arabic language had a similar function. With the triple categories of the Arabic grammar-dictionary (verb, substantive, particule) in view, scholars tried to treat the Turkish, Persian, Mongolian, and sometimes even the Armenian and Byzantine Greek tongues, either in bilingual, or in ploy glot form. These works also list the verbs in (Arabic) alphabetic order, and classified the substantives (including a chapter on adjectival antinomies) according to subjects. The group of particula includes the pronouns, adverbs, etc.[19] It is noteworthy that their

[18] G. I. Brătianu, *Actes des notaires Génois de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle (1281—1291)*, Bucarest 1927. M. Balard, *Gênes et l'Outre-Mer I., Les Actes de Caffa du notaire Lamberto di Sambuceto, 1289—1290*, Paris—La-Haye 1973. G. L. Fr. Tafel—G. N. Tomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig, mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante*. Vom neunten bis zum Ausgang des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts. Zweite Abteilung: Diplomataria et Acta XIII—XIV (Wien 1856—1857). *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*. These Latin documents are not totally void of Italianisms. Even so, the Genoan records spanning a very short time provide a large number of idiosyncracies, good specimens of which can be found in Brătianu, *op.cit.* pp. 7—11.

[19] The tripartition of the Arabic lexicon can be found in most compendia: *fi'l* «verb», *ism* «substantive», *ḥarf* «particula»; cf. J. A. Haywood—H. M. Nahmad, *A New Arabic Grammar of the Written Language*, London 1965, p. 327. The structure of the well-

material, especially the verbs and substantives, is also arranged into columns. However instructive these vocabularies may be for material research, there is at present no proof that the anonymous authors of the Italian and German parts of the Codex Cumanicus drew upon any of them. The contemporary handbooks (manuscripts) of Northern Italian Latinity might offer further clues here.

It remains to be the major task to edit the complete text of the Codex Cumanicus. Despite its several defects, G. Kuun's work renders great help. A new acceptable edition requires profound knowledge, so it is not surprising that no one has dared to undertake the task during the last hundred years. The facsimile edition of the Codex, published by K. Grönbech, is of great help[20]; but regrettably, it is technically of mediocre quality, and often lets researchers down, right at the crucial points. The editor of a new edition cannot proceed without the original manuscript, no matter how good his fascimiles may be.

The manuscript was written in the black letters commonly used in the Middle Ages. This script was retained by only a few scholars (Bang, Németh), and only for text editions. Kuun replaces this archaic script with Latin letters we use today. His decision cannot be objected to; several others did the same. The proposed new edition must be a precise transliteration, retaining abbreviations as well as errors due to copying. A good many examples of *lapsus calami* arising from copying are known. Errors due to dictation have received

known *Mugaddimat al-adab* also follows this pattern. Cf. I. G. Wetzstein, *Samachscharii Lexicon Arabicum Persicum ex codicibus manuscriptis Lipsiensibus, Oxoniensibus, Vindobonensi et Berolinensi* edidit atque Indicem Arabicum adiecit —, Lipsiae 1850. Among the dictionaries of the Mongol period, reference should be made to Ibn Muhannā's work presenting the Turkish language of the Oγuz type. Its Turkish part: P. M. Melioranskij, *Arab filolog o tureckom jazyke*, St. Pbg. 1900, pp. 01—043. Its Mongolian part: P. M. Melioranskij, *Arab filolog o mongoljskom jazyke*, St. Pbg. 1904. The Persian, Turkish and Mongolian parts were edited by K. Rifat, Istanbul, H 1238—1240. By way of example, let us see the arrangement of Ibn Muhannā's Mongolian grammar-dictionary. The material is divided into 25 chapters following the order of tripartition. These are: 1. The name of God and the like (I). 2. Verbs in the past tense, in Arabic alphabetic order; 3. Grammatical rules, conjugation (II). 4. Particulas. (III) Substantives. 5. Adjectives and antinomies; 6. Parts of the human body; 7. Names of kinship; 8. Time and cycles; 9. Heaven and heavenly phenomena; 10. Seasons; 11. Earth and seas; 12. Places and regions; 13. Foods, drinks; 14. Trees, fruits; 15. Cereals; 16. Bed clothes, instruments, tools; 17. Clothing, jewels, precious stones; 18. Flowers, colours; 19. Animals and beasts; 20. Weapons and accessories; 21. Illnesses, deficiencies; 22. Birds, birds of prey; 23. Trades; 24. Counting, numerals; 25. words not included in the previous chapters.

[20] K. Grönbech, *Codex Cumanicus*. Cod. Marc. Lat. DXLIX. In Faksimile herausgegeben, mit einer Einleitung von —. Kopenhagen 1936. (*Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris* I.) The facsimile of «Ave porta paradisi» (Grönbech, pp. 137—144)i earlier published by Bang (W. Bang—J. Marquart, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*, Berlin 1914, III—X tables) is worth comparing. Undoubtedly, Bang's facsimiles are technically better than the reproductions of the same text in Grönbech's otherwise splendid volume.

somewhat less attention. Such are: *borci* «(person)» with a hat in place of *borcci* (87:27); the absence of *k* in the cluster of consonants indicates that the word was recorded on the basis of pronounciation. The absent-minded scribe failed to notice that he took down the word *borc* «hat» correctly in the next line. Also, *ylias ay* (72:12) «the first month of spring» in place of *ilc yas ay*.

E. Teza[21] made a thorough study of Kuun's edition after its publication, which Kuun answered in detail. The author appreciated the loyal criticism, and readily accepted a large number of corrections. The bulk of these errors were made through oversight, and inconsistent attention to abbreviations (sometimes retained, sometimes written out). Worse errors were the omission of words, and at times whole lines. Teza succeeded in deciphering several of the hardly readable Italian verses.

From time to time, however, Teza got carried away in his zeal, imputing to Kuun the printer's errors, which had already been corrected in «Addenda et Corrigenda.» One mistake generally invites another. Let us quote a passage of the Codex (p. 95:6—17), which Kuun edited with a line-shift. He corrected the mistake at the end of his book (p. 389), but not entirely. The list also contains errors of the copier of the Codex. From the facsimile the following (83:6—18) can be read:

Galanga	*Coligiâ*	*Choligia*
Ladano	*Ladan*	*Ambar*
Mumia	*imſiri*	*imſiri*
N. sarche	*Girdahan indu*	
Oleû oliue	*Rugan*	*yag*
Oleû sufima		
O. roſatû	*Rugay Gul*	*Gulaf yage*
O. violatû		
O. nucis	*Rugan yGerdohâ*	*Chox yagi*
Picis	*Cuſt*	*Samala*
Req̄riciū	⟨*Gul*, crossed⟩	*Buyu*
Roſa	*Gul*	*Chulaf*

The copier's errors are: *Rugay Gul*, in place of *Rugan yGul*; *Cuſt* (*šust* in Kuun's), in place of the correct *Çuft* (commentators on the Persian material also use this form). The second line was in fact two lines in the original, the first retained L *Ladano* and P *Ladan*, but the C equivalent was missing. C *Am-*

[21] Emilio Teza, *Un' altra occhiata al Codex Cumanicus*, in *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lindei*, Classe de Scienze Morali, storiche e filologiche VI (Roma 1891), pp. 315—327. Kuun answered Teza's critical comments in detail in his paper, *Újabb adatok* [New Data]; see *supra*, note 6. Kuun introduced the corrections which he accepted from Teza into his own copy, which is preserved today in the Manuscript Department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

bar, on the other hand, was the third item of the missing second line, whose L and P equivalents escaped the scribe's notice.

Kuun's reading errors concerning any item in the Codex, are easy to correct now with the help of the facsimile. Correcting Kuun's mistakes, however, does not mean in the least that the Coman, Persian, and other material, cleared of subsequent, added mistakes, will be completely authentic. What has been shown of the passage quoted above from the Italian part holds true of the second part too, worsened by the fact that the scribes, well-intentioned but ignorant of the language, added numerous Coman language barbarisms.

No one doubts that a distinction must be made between transliteration and transcription. The latter relies on the former; it explains and elucidats it. That is why transcription contains an individual hypothetical element. In any given case it is up to the researcher whether he acknowledges a transliterated Persian or Coman form either as authentic, or considers it an error of the copier. The explanation of the transliteration, either accepting or rejecting, is after all an explanation meant to elucidate the reading as well as explain the string of problems stemming from it.

This appears to justify Kuun's method of edition according to which the material of the Codex is published in transliteration, with the editor's transcription and relevant explanations given in the notes. The method used in editing the works of classical authors cannot be imitated: one cannot put the interpreted text, as thought correct by the given editor, in the forefront and relegate the correct or erroneous forms of the transliterated Codex to the footnote section.

Scrupulous accuracy in transliteration is naturally not an end in itself, but its purity must be seen to. Washing over the differences between transliteration and transcription could result in incorrect conclusions. W. Bang, whose contribution to interpreting the texts of the Codex is most valuable, committed this mistake. Interpreting the material of the Codex on the basis of the transliteration, he believed the Coman language to be eastern Turkish, although there can be no doubt that it belongs to the Kipchak tongues.

By way of illustration, let us compare the strophe, «Ave porta paradisi», as semi-transliterated or semi-transcribed by Bang, and as transcribed by Drimba.[22]

[22] In Kuun's edition (see p. 186), the uninterrupted Coman text is divided into verses. He presumed that a line consisted of seven or eight syllables. Bang, the perceptive, severe critic, failed to notice Kuun's priority in these questions. This, however, does not excuse Kuun's readings, poor as they were already in his own time. In his exemplary edition Drimba (*op. cit.*, pp. 265—299) included the Coman text, its French translation and the Latin original, but also an accurate list of earlier editions and critical comments, suggested emendations, the transliteration of the Codex (where necessary), and the different readings of the Latin original (pp. 295—299).

Aue üčmakniṅ kabagi	*Ave učmagnïŋ čabayï*
tirilikniṅ agači	*tiriliknïŋ ayačï*
jemišiṅ bisgä tejirdiṅ	*Yemišïŋ bizgä teyirdiŋ*
Jesusne kačan tuurduṇṅ	*Yesusnï qačan tuwurduŋ.*

The two editions differ in other respects as well. In his notes appended to the text, Bang published Kuun's and Radloff's incorrect, or allegeldy incorrect readings, adding to them his frequently caustic remarks; Drimba's notes, on the other hand, carry the precisely copied form of the Codex in every case that he considered unusual or in need of comments.

We have now plunged into the midst of the problems of the Turkish material of the Codex. There is no denying that most of the efforts done in the past century were concentrated on this area.

Let me mention here only the most outstanding works of an immensely rich bibliography: A. v. Gabain's two small monographs devoted to the evaluation of the Coman language and literature; Grönbech's facsimile edition and dictionary; Drimba's book containing the best edition and interpretation to date of the «German» part; J. Németh's short paper clearing up some basic aspects of Coman phonology.[23] The Mameluk-Kipchak grammar-dictionary and other contemporary linguistic records, as well as the Armenian-Kipchak tongue, deserve increased attention.[24] The present-day descendants of one-time

[23] A. v. Gabain, *Die Sprache des Codex Cumanicus*, in: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* I, Wiesbaden 1959, pp. 46—73; Idem, *Komanische Literatur*, in: *Fundamenta* II, pp. 243—251. On Grönbech's facsimile edition cf. note 20. K. Grönbech, *Komanisches Wörterbuch, Türkischer Wortindex zu Codex Cumanicus*, in *Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris, Subsidia* Vol. I. Kopenhagen 1942. VI. Drimba, *Syntaxe comane*, Bucureşti—Leiden 1973. J. Németh, *Die Inschriften des Schatzes von Nagy-Szent-Mikló*. Budapest 1932 (*Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* II), pp. 51—59.

[24] Sources of the mentioned Mameluk-Kipchak data: AL: Anonym of Leiden, Houtsma, *Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*, Leiden 1894; a more recent edition of this work: K. Kuryšžanov, *Issledovanie po leksike «Tjurksko-arabskogo slovarja»*, Alma Ata 1970. The date of this dictionary is not, as Houtsma, and after him, Kuryšzanov, thought, 1245, but rather 1343 (cf. B. Fleming: *Der Islam* 44, 1948, pp. 226—229). Idr.: A. Carferoğlu, *Abû Hayyân: Kitâb al-Idrâk li lisân al-Atrâk*, Istanbul 1931. Bul.: A. Zajączkowski, *Bulġat al-muštāq fī luġat at-turk wa-l-qifǰāq, Vocabulaire arabe-kiptchak*, Warsaw 1958. Tuh.: *Tuḥfat-az-zakīyya*, ed. Besim Atalay, Istanbul 1945, E. I. Fazylov—M. T. Zijaeva, Taškent 1978. Qaw.: *Qawānin*: S. Telegdi, *Eine türkische Grammatik in arabischer Sprache aus dem XV. Jhdt*: *Kőrösi Csoma Archivum* I. Erg. Bd., 1937, pp. 282—326. Dur.: *Durrat al-mauḍi'a fī-l-luġat at-turkiya*, ed. A. Zajączkowski in: *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* XXIX (1965), fasc. 2, pp. 67—116; XXXII (1969), fasc. 2, pp. 19—61. There are Kipchak features in the Turkish material (unpublished) of the Tetraglot dictionary of the Rasulids of Yemen (cc. 1365). On Armeno-Kipchak cf. Ed. Tryjarski, *Dictionnaire arméno-kiptchak*, tome I, fasc. 1—4, Varsovie 1963—1972.

Kipchak languages, Karaim, the Crimean Tatar of Kipchak origin, Karachay-Balkar and other Turkish languages of the Kipchak type should be kept in mind.[25]

The issue of the Coman dialects of the Codex continues to remain at the forefront of discussion. It has long been known that the Coman language of the Codex is not homogeneous. Grönbech was the first to show the significant deviations. His view that the Italian part recorded a different Coman dialect than the «German» part also holds grounds today. Here are some examples to illustrate the differences: *kendi — kensi*; *tizgi — tiz*; *berkit — berk et-*; *tōdaq — totaq*; *oqša- — ovša-*; *sučul- — čučul-*; *astlan — arslan*, etc. I disagree, however, with his conclusion that classifying the Coman texts into distinct dialectal groups is not feasible (Wb. 11). To my mind, the question itself is incorrectly raised. The Coman texts, just like the entire material of the Codex, changed hands several times, and contrary to earlier views, copying has to be reckoned with in the second part, too, even if it can be proved perfectly only for certain passages.

Roughly speaking, the material of the Codex can be divided into two major dialects. Sir Gerard Clauson's method of distinguishing the items of the Codex Cumanucus in his dictionary according to the part (Italian: CCI; German: CCG) which they come from is excellent.[26]

The correct interpretation of the Coman material of the Codex must start with the transcription. It can be contended that today's works on the Coman material of the Codex rarely give erroneous transcriptions. Seldom does a case like *čarčav* [ciarzau] «sheet» (Grönbech, *Wb.* 122), correctly *čaršav* (or *čaršau*) occur, which is identical with the adopted Persian word transliterated in the same way; cf. Osm. *çarşaf* «sheet (of a bed)» (Hony 71). Another ex-

[25] For brevity's sake, I considered only some of the present-day Kipchak tongues. Tat.: Tatar of Kazan, TRS, *Tatarsko-russkij slovarj*, Moskva 1966. Bashk.: Bashkir, BRS, *Baškirsko-russkij slovarj*, Moskva 1958. Kar. T.: Karaim of Troki, T. Kowalski, *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*, Kraków 1929. Kar. L: Karaim of Luck, A. Mardkowicz, *Karaimisches Wörterbuch*, Luck 1935. Krch.-Blk.: Karachai-Balkar, *Russko-karačaevo-balkarskij slovarj*, Moskva 1965. On modern Kipchak languages cf. Karl H. Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies*, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 60.

[26] Sir Gerard Clauson (*An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish* Oxford 1972) quotes the Coman words drawing upon Grönbech (*Wörterbuch*). This dictionary is a reliable guide, since in every case it marks the later additions to the Italian part (by German or other hands) by setting the page number in cursive, the insertions in normal typs. E.g. *boš* «empty» and *uv* «hunting» are in the Italian part but added later by Germans. Clauson marks both with CCG. With a view to *ED* it makes no difference that one word is not in its place in the Coman column but right after the Latin entry. It is another matter that several of the rare words of the Codex Cumanicus are missing from *ED*. Regrettably, the word *bitik*, for example, is registered both after I and G in the dictionary, while *bitiv*, *bitüv* G are separated without any reference.

ample: *bayov* [baiyow] «colour» (Grönbech, *Wb.* 48), correctly *boyov* [boiyow]. The latter form occurs already in Kuun's book (p. 18:25); Clauson (*ED* 302, s. v. *boduγ*) also gives the *boyow* «dye» form, but confused by the false reading of Grönbech, he inserts a question mark after the correct reading, which is a regular derivative of the Old Turkish *boduγ*. *Boyow* [boiyow] «dye» is a later insertion in the Italian part followed by the German translation «varbe». It should also be noted that the German glossator failed to realize that the word he recorded had already been included in the Italian part in its correct place, with the related verbal family (p. 54:8—12; Kuun, pp. 58—59). It appears there in the regular form, *boya* «dye», in conformance with the dialect of the Italian part.

Certain amount of standardization, of course, has to be used in making the transcription. Its extent, however, cannot be arbitrary, as it cannot neglect differences that might possess the value of distinguishing a language or dialect.

The distinction between the open and closed *e* belong to this category. Grönbech ignores it and misleadingly transcribes the Montecasino *a* (*ɑ*) into *á*. Gabain essentially follows Grönbech's method.

As is well known, in some of the Kipchak tongues the phoneme *e* is closed in the first syllable, and open in the second (and in the rest). Traces of this characteristic are apparent in both parts of the Codex, though the transcription is inconsistent. There is no standardization in our transcription. We simply respect the written form of the Codex. Thus, our *ä* corresponds to *a* in place of the I *a*, and G *ɑ* or rarely *ae*. In all other cases the original *e* letter is retained. Controversial cases can easily be resolved by consulting Grönbech's method of references: the transcribed form is given first, followed [in brackets] by the original form of the Codex in transliteration:

I *birlä* [*birla*] «together» — G *bilä* [*bilɑ*]
I *inčkä* [*inçka*] «thin» — G *inčkä* [*inčkɑ*]
I *keräk* [*cherac*] «necessary» — G *kerek* [*kerek, kerec*]
I *kertmä* [*chertma*] «pear» — G *termä* [*termɑ*] «uterus»

Variant notations: G *bezgek* [bezgek] «ague»; *ämgäk* [ämgäk] «suffering»; *ägäč* [ägäč] «being». In the latter two cases and in other similar ones both Grönbech and Gabain decided upon the *emgek, egeč* transcription. Drimba retained the *ä*, and I share his view.

The open *ä* occurs in the Codex as a continuation of the former *a* after *y* or *č* (Németh: *BOH* II, 56—57; Gabain, *Fundamenta* I, 51). Gabain extended this explanation to *o* and *u* as well. This form of palatalization is detectable in certain Kipchak languages (Tatar, Bashkir) today. The examples are found in the «German» part of the Codex: *čänäk* [čɑnɑk] «dish, mug»; *čäpčačïq* [čäčačik, sic] «little barrel»; *čäx* [*čäH*] «time»; *yäy* [yɑy] «summer»; *yälči* [yälči] «day-wage man»; *yälin* [yälin] «flame».

Ä in place of the final *a* must also reflect a linguistic characteristic: *yarlï-lergä* [yarlilergae] «for the frail» (137:20), *yarqïnïndä* [iarkinindae] «in its light».

Gabain (*Fundamenta* I, 63–64) interprets the initial *g-* before *i* as *ǰ-*: *ǰïltra-* [giltra-] «it's lightning», *ǰil* [gil] «year», *ǰemiš* [giemis] «fruit». Grönbech disregarded this possibility, presumably because *gi* in the German part equals *yi*, and *ǰ* occurs in very few words besides regular *y-*. Gabain's position is acceptable not only because certain Kipchak languages of today also have the initial *ǰ-* but also because this initial phoneme existed in the language of the Hungarian Comans (*ǰer* «land», *ǰaman* «evil»; Németh in: *BOH* II, 53). The phenomenon is limited to the Coman dialect of the Italian part. An exact analogy of this can be detected in the Kazan Tatar language, where the two initial phonemes co-exist. i.e. besides the dominating *y-*, *ǰ-* can also be found: *ǰil* «wind», *ǰimes* «fruit». In the Codex such are: *ǰïlan* [gillan] «snake», *ǰïrγaq* [girgac] «hook», *ǰïšqïč* [gischic] «mint» and some others. Also, conforming to the Northern Italian dialect (which?), *i* is used to denote *ǰ*: *ǰovap* [ioap] «answer», *ǰahan* [iaghan] «world».

Gabain claims that the copier of a passage of the second part translated into Coman («Reminiscens beati sanguinis», pp. 149—150) made a distinction between the velar and palatal *i*. The Coman words are written under the relevant notes, but their transcription is so blurred, as Kuun already pointed out, that not even the facsimile can provide sufficient clues to establish the difference. Gabain thus remains alone in her view. Kuun fails to comment on it (this would not be decisive in itself, though), nor does Drimba mention it, who was a very careful reader of the Codex. Cf. Gabain, *Fundamenta* I, 50 and 70–73; the latter pages carry the transliteration of the text along with its transcription («standardization») and translation.

Traces of the sporadic final *-z* > *-s* occurrence are detectable in both the Codex and the Hungarian Coman language, as Németh (*BOH* II, 56) pointed out. These cases, however, are not marked in the transcription. It is worth remembering Németh's observation, though I myself would not distinguish the final unvoicing, partly because of the inaccuracy of the orthography in the Codex, and partly because it does not constitute a distinctive phonemic feature of the Coman (Kipchak) tongue.

There is no room here to elaborate on the dialects of the Coman material of the two parts. A single item devoid of problems of transliteration will shed light on this issue which was regarded as hopelessly intangible by Grönbech. Let us consider the behaviour of the final Old Turkish *-γ* (*-g*).

In I, it generally remains in monosyllabic words, and changes into a diphtong with *u* (*v*) in G:

I *yaγ* [yag] «fat, oil» — G *yav* [javˊ];
I *taγ* [*tag*] «mount» — G *tav* [tavˊ].

In polysyllabic words, a sporadic *-q* (*-k*) replaces it:

I *satuq* (Grönbech: *satuq*, *satuχ*) [satuc, satugh] «trading», *satuqčï* (Grönbech: *satuχčï*) [satugzi] «tradesman» — G *satov* [satov] «trade»;

I *bitik* (Grönbech: *bitik*) [bitik] «writing», followed by *bitik* in «ugaresca» script (surrounding data make it certain that the word in Uighur script cannot be read here as the traditional *bitig*)— G *ƀitiv* [bitv́, bitiv́].

Apart from the above exceptions, the final *-γ* (*-g*) is completely missing from the dialect of I; G continues to notice the above observed correspondence:

I *boya* [boya] «dye» — G *boyov* [boiyow];

I *arï* [arri] «saint» — G *arov* [arov] «pure»;

I *ačï* [açi, azi] «bitter» — G *ačuv* [ačuv] «bitterness, pain».

Similar data in I: *quru* [churu] «dry, dried out», *biši* [bisi] «ripe», *quyu* [chuyu] «well», *alïčï* [aliçi], etc.

At the same time the material of G also provides such vowel correlation, especially in texts after or next to which a Latin interpretation can be found. Undoubtedly this reveals a dialect of G different from the former one.

Such are: G *arï* [ari, are] «saint», *quru* [kuru] «dry», *ačï* [ači] «bitter» (in the Latin word-list), *sasï* [sasi, sassi] «stinking», etc.

Let us have a look at the corresponding forms of the observed Coman words in the closely related Kipchak tongues: *yaγ* «fat, oil» AL, Tuh. (Tkm.) Idr., Bul., Qaw. (*yaγï*), Yem. T, Arm.-Kip.; *yav* Tuh., Kar. T.; *yaw* Kar. L. Krch.-Blk. *jau*;

taγ «mount, mountain» AL, Tuh. (Tkm.), Idr., Qaw., Bul., Dur., Yem. T., Arm.-Kip.; *tav* Tuh., Qaw., Kar. T, Nog.; *taw* Kar. L; *tau* Tat., Krch.-Blk.;

satïχ «selling» Arm.-Kip. (*χ* is regular instead of *q*); *satuw* Kar. L; *satuv* Nog.; *satu* «trading» Tuh., Tat.; *satuvsï* «tradesman» Nog.; *satuvcu* Kar. L, *satïčï* AL, Dur., *satučï* Tat.;

bitik «document, writing, letter» AL, Tuh., Idr., Dur., Yem. T, Arm.-Kip., Kar. T, L; *betek* Tat.; *biti* Idr.; *bitikči* «scribe» AL, *bitikci* «letter-carrier» Kar. L;

boya «dye» AL; *boyav* Tuh., *boyov*, *boyóv* Arm.-Kip., *boyaw* Kar. L, *buyau* Tat., *boyau* Krch.-Blk.; *boyaq* Nog.;

arï «pure» Idr., Yem. T, *aru* AL, Tuh., Qaw., Tat.; *aruv* Krm.-Kip.; *aruw* Kar. L., *arïu* Krch.-Blk.; *arïγ* Yem. T.;

ačï «bitter» AL, Tuh., Idr., Dur., Kar. T, Tat., Krch.-Blk.; *ačï* Arm.-Kip.; *ačuv* «anger» Kar. T, *acuv* Kar. L., *ašuv* Nog., *ačïu* Krch.-Blk., *aču* Tat.;

quru «dry» AL, Tuh., Idr., Bul., Qaw.; *kuru* Kar. T, L, Krch.-Blk.; *χuru* Arm.-Kip.; *kurï* Nog., *korï* Tat.; *quruγ* Yem. T; *quruq* Yem. T;

biši «boiled; ripe» Idr., Chag.; *pïšïq* Yem. T, Chag.;

quyu «well» Tuh., Idr., Yem. T, Krch.-Blk.; *χuyu* Arm.-Kip., *kuyu* Kar. T, L; *quyï* Bul.; *kuyï* Nog.; *koye* Tat.;

sasï «stinking» Idr., Tat.; *sasuq* «stink» Kar. L; *sasïq* «stink» Nog.;

alïčï «buyer, sy who takes sg» (*qan alïčï* «blood taker») AL; *alučï* «celui qui prend» Arm.-Kip., Tat. *aluvču* «nehmend, Nehmer», Kar. T, *aluvšï*, Nog., *alïuči* Krch.-Blk». *alu* «buying» Tuh.; *alïq* «a buy» Chag.; *alïy* «trading» Chag.

This short set of examples clearly displays the major traits of the Coman dialects of the Codex. It is worth noting that here too the final Old Turkish *-γ* (*-g*) is irregularly represented by *-q* (*-k*): *bitik, bilik, satïq.*

The double distribution of the Coman language of the Codex Cumanicus clearly proves that the two dialects were spoken in two different regions; the first in territories in direct contact with the Italian colonies, and the second by the Comans (Tatars) among whom the Franciscan missionaries worked.

It is easy to understand why the Coman linguistic material of the Codex Cumanicus and the relevant historical, commercial, and cultural-historical problems attrscted so much attention.

Initially, the Persian material of the Codex was largely neglected. It is true that only the first part contains such material, and this is limited to grammatical and lexical glosses, without coherent texts. Oddly enough, the Persian material was at first resorted to when researchers hoped to use it to find the solution to a Coman linguistic problem.

After the publication of the Codex some thirty years passed before a genuine interpretation of the Persian material appeared. Its author, the eminent Iranist, C. Salemann pointed out almost every essential feature of this valuable Persian linguistic record.[27]

No less time passed before an up-to-date edition of the Persian part of the Codex was completed. Two scholars embarked upon this task almost simultaneously. Davoud Monchi-zadeh undertook the job with the advantage of native fluency in Persian,[28] while A. Bodrogligeti, a scholar of Persian-Turkic

[27] G. Salemann, *Zur Kritik des Codex Cumanicus*: *Izv. Ak. Nauk.* 1910, pp. 943—957. The first section of this paper (pp. 945—+51) covers the Coman texts of the Codex, challenging Bang. The second part (pp. 951—957) contains his valuable comments on the Persian section of the Codex.

[28] Davoud Monchi-zadeh, *Das Persische im Codex Cumanicus*, Uppsala 1969. The first part of this work (pp. 13—19) focusses on the linguistic characteristics, origin, and purpose of the Persian material. Part II (pp. 20—167) deals with the Persian vocabulary of the Codex. Part III (pp. 168—195) contains an index of Persian words in the Coman part of the Codex in Arabic alphabetic order. Part IV (pp. 169—283) carries additions, and omitted words. Finally, Part V (pp. 204—219) reconstructs the whole Persian vocabulary in the Arabic script, marking the number of page and line. It is a significant source, and of great help in cases when a reading suggested by the author is not unambiguous. The index in Part III needs elaboration. Its material includes Persian words whose Persian and Coman forms are homonymous (contrary to M, *aqšam* «evening» written similarly belongs here). Words of differing forms like P *ādīna* «Friday», C *ayina* require some attention. These differences stem from various causes. Finally, a separate category is made up by words borrowed by Persian from Coman, or other Turkish languages.

linguistic and literary relations, presented the Persian material on the basis of his thorough knowledge of linguistic history.[29] The two editions were completely independent, though Monchi-zadeh's book preceded Bodrogligeti's by two years. Linguistically, Bodrogligeti's work offers more profound insight, but Monchi-zadeh's book, reflecting a specific Persian view, cannot be neglected.

How does the Persian part contribute to the solution of the problems surrounding the history of the Codex? We have seen that the Persian calendar supports the hypothetical date 1294, a date which is of disputable meaning and value. How does the purpose of the Persian grammar-dictionary bear upon this date?

Monchi-zadeh's view that it was made for the Comans can be wholly discarded.[30] It is beyond doubt that similarly to the Coman part, the Persian material was made by appointment to the Black Sea Italian colonies for interpretors. That it appeared together with the Coman part can hardly be a coincidence. The secular (non-missionary) purpose of the entire Italian part is unquestionable. It is also reasonable to assume that the Italian colonies needed multi-lingual interpretors for their commercial activities.

A knowledge of the Coman language was necessary, above all, in the region north of the Black Sea, up to Sarai or beyond, where Comans lived. It was also needed when Turks, whose mother tongue or second language was Coman, arrived at (or were brought to) the Italian colonies. It has been demonstrated that communication with local representatives of the Mongol authorities who licensed the Italian colonies, had to be (or could be) conducted in Coman, both in speaking and writing.

It would be an oversimplification to assert that the Persian language was only used in trade with the Persian Ilkhans. It should not be forgotten that in this period and region not only was Persian known and indispensable around the Levant and Persia, but it also constituted a sort of «lingua franca»

[29] A. Bodrogligeti, *The Persian Vocabulary of the Codex Cumanicus*, Budapest 1971 (*Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* XVI). After the Introduction, the book comprises the following chapters: Orthography (pp. 21–39), Phonology (pp. 40–63), Morphology (pp. 63–90), Syntax (pp. 89–92), Word Formation (pp. 92–96), Lexicon (pp. 96–105). This is followed by the actual word-list (Glossary, pp. 105–211), and an English Index (pp. 212–239). It ends with the Bibliography (pp. 233–235).

[30] According to Monchi-zadeh, *op. cit.*, p. 14 this Persian language was spoken by the Comans: «Das von Fremden (Komanen) gesprochene und von Fremden (Italienern) niedergeschriebene Persisch». His hypothesis on how the Comans learned the Persian togue is even more starting: «Hat man alle diese Tatsachen vor Augen, wird man zu dem Schluß gelangen, daß die Komanen ihr Schulpersisch (sic!) in chorasanischen Traditionen lernten — was bei einem türk. Volk selbstverständlich scheint — aber das Umgangpersische entweder in den kaspischen Provinzen — von Baku (vielleicht noch weiter nach Norden) bis Masenderan — oder bei den persischen Kaufleuten und Mullas aus denselben Gebieten lernten.»

along the routes to distant lands. Persian was Marco Polo's «language of travel» as far as China. It is hardly an accident that the Great Khan's letter to the pope was translated for Plano Carpini from Mongolian into Persian so as «to be easily understood». For this same reason, Elǰigidei sent a letter to the pope in Persian. One could fare well with this language on the frequent journeys to Khwarezm; it was spoken and understood in Urgenj, too. Tranoxiana was also a Persian speaking are at this time.[31]

There can be no doubt, of course, that the Italian colonies had trade (and missionary) relations with the Persian Ilkhans.[32] On the other hand, it is well known that the peaceful existence of the Italian colonies largely depended on the leaders of the Golden Horde, who, in turn, were hostile te the Ilkhans, but had favourable connections with the bitter foes of the Ilkhans, the Egyptian and Syrian Mameluks. The Mameluks, as we know, obtained their slaves in the northern ports of the Black Sea.[33]

At this point, a question related to the place of origin of the Codex must be raised: Which Italian colony was in greatest need of the Persian language?

[31] P. Pelliot, *Notes sur l'Histoire de la Horde d'Or*, pp. 164–165. He reiterates his long-established view that «le persan est la seule langue orientale, que Marco Polo ait vraiment connue et pratiquée à la Cour mongole.» Several examples bear out his position in his great, unfinished, posthumous book: *Notes on Marco Polo* I–III, Paris 1959, 1963, 1973. Disregarding now the Persian terms of Levantine (partly Arabic) origin in Polo's works that found their way in to the Latin of the age, let us refer only to some Chinese place names which have come down to us through merchants using the Persian language. One of them, *Çardandan*, is nothing else than P *Zar-dandān* "Gold-teeth", which, in turn, is the translation of Chinese *Chin-ch'in*. Rašīdu-'d-Dīn relates that the province got this name because its men and women covered their teeth with gold (*Notes* I, pp. 603–606). The Japanese name of *Cipingu* (var. *zipangu*) also occurs in the Persian historian's works, which in fact reflects the Chinese *Jih-pan-kuo* (*Notes* I, pp. 599–600). There are two interpretations for *Pulisanghin*: either P *Pūl-i Sang-kan* «Sang-kan's bridge», or P *Pūl-i sangīn* «Stonebridge». The latter is more probable, since it is a genuine Persian expression (*Notes* II, p. 812). *Facfur* is the Persian title of the Chinese emperor; cf. P *faġfūr* (*Notes* II, pp. 652–661). Cf. R. Grousset, *The Empire of the Steppes*, p. 307.

[32] G. L. Brătianu, *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la Mer Noire au XIII^e siècle*, Paris 1929, pp. 180–191. B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, pp. 393–398. Grekov–Jakubovskij, *Zolotaja Orda i ee padenie*, pp. 83–87. B. Grekov–A. Iakoubovski, *La Horde d'Or, la domination tatare au XIII^e et XIV^e siècles de la Mer Jaune à la Mer Noire* (*Bibliothèque Historique*, Paris, Payot), pp. 72–97. The presents sent by Baibars, Sultan of the Mameluks, to Berke include (p. 80) «des tapis de prières avec des baldaquins (?)». The right meaning of this suspicious word is a special textile coming from *Baldak* (the name of Baghdad) (see note 62).

[33] B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, pp. 405–406. Grekov–Iakoubovski, *La Horde d'Or*, pp. 115–117. The latter authors lay special emphasis on the fact that the slave-trade was very profitable for the Genoans, and every so often they came into conflict with their Tatar lords for kidnapping Tatar children. G. I. Brătianu, *Actes des notaires génois, de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle, 1281–1290*. The documents of Kaffa only

The Pisans had access to the Ilkhan court, and briefly figured among the colonists of the Black Sea until the Genoans had defeated them in a spectacular sea battle, and ousted them from the region.[34]

Adventurers of Genoan origin, some of them rising to the rank of Mongol envoys, were at the Ilkhan court in great numbers. The most famous of them, Buscarel de Gisolf, visited Philippe le Bel in 1289 and Pope Boniface VIII in 1302, as the delegate to Khan Arghun.[35]

---

shed light on the trading activities of ten years. They also include the slave trade, and oddly enough, give the main particulars of each slave sold. The Kaffa records (of these ten years) reveal that the majority of the slaves were 8-10-year-old girls and boys. By way of illustration: *Tamara*, girl about 12 (p. 127), *Camusia*, a girl of 12 (p. 147), an Abkhaz girl (p. 150), *Cuhina*, a white Moslem girl (p. 147), a Cherkess girl of 5 or 6 (p. 157), *Achina*, a Cherkess girl (p. 164), a 5—6-year-old Cherkess girl (p. 165), *Probius*, a Russian slave of 8 or 9 (p. 168), *Balaban*, a «maniar» slave (p. 178), *Aluza*, a Cherkess girl of 10 (p. 183), *Cali*, a Bulgarian girl of around 20 (p. 200), *Paulus*, «Ugalus», (Genoan: Ungarus), around 30, *Cressena*, a Bulgarian woman with her sons Manuel and Potame (p. 220). Miss Drüll (pp. 88—90) classified the data of 32 of the 74 Genoan documents in tables. A thorough study of each document reveals that there was no slave of Kipchak origin sold in Kaffa One of the reasons is that the Mameluks themselves of Kipchak origin, ruled between 1250 and 1390 under the name *Baḥrī mamlūk*, and did not require Kipchak replacement, but were succeeded by the *Burǰī mamlūks* (1282—1517), the descendants of Cherkess and other Caucasian slaves. (D. Avalon, *L'esclavage du mamelouk*, Jerusalem 1951, in: *Oriental Notes and Studies*, published by *The Israel Oriental Society*, No. 1.) One more thing: the Genoan documents in question contain data on slaves sold and bought by private persons. It is in vain to search for traces of the slave trade with Egypt in the records of the Kaffa notaries. It accounted for, as Spuler thinks (*Die Goldene Horde*, p. 406), an average of 2000 slaves a year, even as late as 1420. On the slave trade to Egypt and the West, and the role of Kaffa and Tana in this trade, see W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant* II, pp. 555—563. Not only individuals, but entire families were carried off the Genoa or Venice, by the hundreds and thousands. This resulted in an actual uprising by involuntary immigrants in Venice in 1368. In the West, a slave often performed the household chores of a domestic servant. Marco Polo's Tatar slave must have been one of them. It is a well known fact that the role of slaves in Egypt and Syria was essentially different. They constituted the guards of the Moslem ruler, and were eventually able to seize power. From slaves, freed slaves and the offspring of these a military elite was born which was carefully trained, groomed and given special privileges. Cf. Godefroy-Demombynes, *La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks d'après les auteurs arabes*, Paris 1923, esp. pp. X—CXIX. F. Quatremère: *Makrizi, Histoire des sultans mamlouks de Caire*, trad. par —. I—II, Paris 1837—1845.

[34] Brătianu, *Recherches*, p. 251. On August 24th, 1274, a sea battle between the Pisans and Genoans took place in the harbour of Soldaia, about a mile from the coast, which the inhabitants of the city turned out in force to watch. Not only did the Pisans lose the battle, but they were also driven out of the region.

[35] The name of the Genoan envoy is *Muskaril qorči* in the Mongol text containing the message of the 1289 delegation. The Mongol text: Ligeti, *Monumenta* II, pp. 230—231; ibidem. further bibliography. The Mongol court title, *qorči* «quiver bearer», denoted a person belonging to the guards of the khan. On this title, see Doerfer, *TMEN* I, pp. 429—

In his capacity as envoy, Tomaso of Siena took a letter of Khan Öljeitü to Philippe le Bel in 1305.[36]

Among the Italians engaged in the Ilkhan court, Ciolus of Pisa deserves special mention. The great Persian historian Rašīdu-'-d Dīn refers to him as J̌ol bahādur, pādišāh of Pisa, and he was supposedly the governor of a Mongolian province. Though his taking the latter high dignity cannot be proved, it is certain that he was the major source for the Persian historian's chapter concerning the Franks.[37]

As early as the time of the early Ilkhans a thriving Italian colony was established in Tebriz, soon followed by a bishopric relying on Dominicans, and two Franciscan monasteries. Several documents attest to the trading activities of the Genoans between 1289 and 1293. Raffo Pallavicini was their consul in 1304, and members of the colony also rendered their services as interpretors and envoys. Around 1300, a Venetian colony also existed in Tebriz. A treaty signed in 1320 laid down the rights and immunity of the Venetians.[38]

---

432. In the same year, Pope Nicolaus IV wrote to Edward I, king of England, «dilectus filius nobilis vir Biscarollus de Gisulfo, civis Januensis, nuncius Argone regis Tartarorum illustris»; cf. Mostaert—Cleaves, *Scripta Mongolica* I, pp. 48—49. The same Genoan person is referred to as *Bisqarun* in a letter addressed to Pope Boniface VIII (this time he was not member of the delegation); the Mongol text: *Monumenta* II, p. 250: 2, 4; text, translation, notes: Mostaert—Cleaves, in *HJAS* XV, pp. 467—495. He must have been a delegate to the West on other occasions, since we have a letter by Edward I King of England dated from 1302, which mentions that Khan Gazan sent a written message to him via «Buscarell de Guisurfo». Cf. d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols* IV, p. 345. Most probably the same person is referred to in a document dated July 4th, 1289, in which Buscarello Ghisulfo invests Giacomo di Guisulfo with general powers. See Brătianu, *Actes des notaires*, p. 344 (missing from the index).

[36] His name in the Mongol diploma is mis-spelled as *Toman* (in place of *Tomas*; *n* and *s* in final position can be easily confused in the Mongolian script); the Mongol text: *Monumenta* I, pp. 30—34. The verso of the Mongol diploma contains the Italian translation of the Mongol text. In the translation the name of the envoy is «Tomaso mio iulduci». Here Tomaso is given the Mongol title *yüldüči* «sword bearer», which is missing from the original (presumably he bestowed this dignity upon himself). In the summer of 1307, Tomaso paid a visit to Edward II, King of England, and on his way back, in 1308, to Pope Clement V, in connection with the same matter. The only available edition of the Italian translation is Abel-Rémusat's *Mémoires sur les relations politiques des princes chrétiens, et particulièrement des rois de France avec les empereurs mongols*, Paris 1824, pp. 178—180. Both the English king and the pope replied to Öljeitü; d'Ohsson, *Histoire des Mongols* IV, pp. 591—598.

[37] P. Pelliot, *Isol le Pisan*: *Journ. As.* 1915 II, pp. 495—497. V. V. Bartold, *Pisan Isol. Zap. Vost.* I, pp. 327—329 (Bartold, *La découverte de l'Asie*, Paris 1947, p. 101. K. Jahn, *Histoire universelle de Rašīd al-Dīn Faḍlallāh Abul-Khair*, Leyde 1951. J. Richard, *Isol le Pisan, un aventurier franc, gouverneur d'une province mongole?*: *CAJ* XIC, pp. 186—194.

[38] L. Petech, *Les marchands italiens dans l'Empire mongol*: *Journ. As.* 1962, pp. 560—574.

Here too, Genoa and Venice were both present. Via Trapezunt the former and through Cyprus the latter, both could reach Iran easily and establish settlements there. Which of them needed the Persian language more?

No doubt the aim of the interpretors' handbook was not to facilitate their communication with the Ilkhans, for this would not have necessitated the inclusion of the Coman language. The handbook was apparently prepared for a region where Persian was necessary in addition to Coman. It is hardly possible to prove the crucial need for Persian in Kaffa or Solchat. Significant material indications suggest Tana where the major trade route described by Pegolotti started, leading to Sarai and further to the East. In this region both languages were indispensable. This possibility must have priority over all other hypotheses. It is, however, not totally proved due to chronological snags cropping up around the primacy of the Genoans and Venetians, and also due to the lack of a background against which such a work could have been created.

It is beyond doubt that the Codex did not come about to satisfy a non-recurrent need. This is borne out by the fact that the extant material is a copy, most probably one of the several copies lost.

The existing manuscript copy is indicative of other things as well. It shows quite plainly that of the two Oriental languages, Persian was more important for those who ordered the work. Persian stands right next to Latin, preceding Coman. The Persian language lost its domination when the second part, which contains no Persian, was attached to the first part. Only then could the trilingual manuscript, headed by the Persian language, be correctly called the Codex Cumanicus.

The presently known first part is a copy (if not the copy of a copy). When it was completed, the role of the Persian tongue was still predominant. A scribe who was ignorant of the language could have hardly made it into such a serviceable work. There is only one technical question which still intrigues the researchers of the first part. A concensus of opinion holds that the copier first put down the Latin column, then the Persian, and lastly the Coman. This method explains the errors arising from the horizontal line shifts in the columns; The shifting affects the Persian and Coman columns in the first place. Rarely was the Latin column also affected (see the mentioned shifted lines of *december — muharrâ*).

The question is, what was the original like? On the basis of the copy, it appears likely that the Latin column was put down first according to some model. This ready list (probably a draft with insertions, corrections, and cancellations) was completed horizontally by the «author» on the basis of oral information supplied by an interpretor with a knowledge of Persian and Coman. Do the items of both languages derive from the same interpretor, or were the Persian and Coman linguistic data dictated by separate interpretors?

Both views have their advocates, and both have ample arguments for and against.[39]

When interpreting the Persian material of the Codex Cumanicus, both the errors of the copier (just as in the Coman part) and those arising from G. Kuun's edition must be taken into account. In this context, the latter are negligible, and even Teza ignored them in his review of the publication. Later editors could easily disregard Kuun's erroneous readings as the facsimile edition of the Codex was then available to them. Kuun's edition, however, contains a section worthy of our attention. This is the Persian word-list (pp. 308—322), where the Persian words in Latin script are followed by the Arabic-Persian written forms of the classical Persian language, which Kuun intended as an explanation. Every so often they prove the priority of Kuun's correct interpretations. It is also noteworthy that relying upon Vullers' dictionary Kuun quoted the «vulgar» forms of Lit. Pers. in addition to the classical forms (e.g. *ayn* «ferrum» (besides *ahin*), *aou* «aqua» besides *ap*). These data illustrate that the Persian material of the Codex was based on the living, and not on the standard written language. Variants coexisted, which reflect either inconstant features in a single dialect or differences in pronounciation of the several native informants.

We must also be aware of the simple literals of mediaeval manuscripts also present in the Persian data of the Codex. Monchi-zadeh (M) and Bodrogligeti (B) pointed this out, too. One of the most common mistakes is the mixing of *t* and *c*. Such are *targos* for *cargos* «hare», *talamaçi* for *calamaçi* «interpretor», *noghuc* for *noghut* «pea», *duc* for *dut* «smoke». Similar errors of the copier are: *batran* for *barran* «rain», *aut* for *art* «flour», etc.

[39] According to G. Györffy, *Autour du Codex Cumanicus*, pp. 121—122, the Persian-Coman words were dictated by a single interpretor with a knowledge of both languages. He points out that 363 equivalents of the 414 Latin entries are missing in both languages. From among the non-parallel lacunae, 13 Persian equivalents and 38 Coman ones are missing. If only the figures are considered, one might conclude that the interpretor had a better command of Persian than of Coman. However, Györffy also stresses that the Persian and Coman words frequently overlap. He selected seven concordant names of birds from the chapter «Nomina volucrum» (p. 109), which do not even follow each other. Such a comparison is misleading, since there are altogether 24 bird names (Kuun's 23 is a mistake), 20 of them to be found in Persian, and 23 in Coman (one Latin entry has neither a Persian nor a Coman equivalent; this was left out by Kuun). If we take the whole material into consideration, we find that only 8 words are identical in Persian and Coman, and only three of the 8 are of Turkish origin. This was not what Györffy aimed at. His objective was to prove that the Persian—Coman part could not have been written gradually testified to by the large number (which is not so large, after all) of identical words in the two languages. His assertion is also weakened by the fact that the list includes the international loan words of falconry. I am afraid this issue cannot be definitely settled on the basis of the extant manuscript, as it is a copy itself. Under such circumstances, naturally, the opposite of Györffy's hypothesis cannot be proved either.

The original manuscript itself must have contained mistakes arising from mishearing, and misunderstanding. The simplification of the consonant cluster in *kak* for *kark* «dowing» might belong to this category.

The Italian Latin orthography of the Codex is generally a good source of reconstruction. However, there are cases when the reconstructed pronounced form is problematic or clearly wrong. Such is the *si* sign for *š*: already Salemann (p. 953) pointed out this feature of orthography. Such are: *tasina* for *tašna* «thirsty» (M *tišna*, B *tašəna*), *siac* for *šāx* «twig». Similar is the case of *ys*, *is*: *teysa* for *tēša* «a carpenter's axe» (M, B id.), *harais* for *hatais* read *ātaš* «fire» (M *ātaš*, B *hātaš*)[40], *piuskseu* for *puiskseu* read *puškšeu* «froast» (M *paš(ak)-i šab*, B *puškšäw*), *aysdaha* read *ašdaha* «dragon» (M *aždahā*, B *aždahān*).

In modern publications, the misidentification of the Persian words of the Codex is rare. E.g.: *ǰawān* [gaouâ] «millet» (105:3), the presumed equivalent of P *ǰawān* «rice» (B p. 151); *gaouâ* «pistû» should be correctly read as *hāvan*, meaning «mortar». It is an earlier mistake later corrected (without the cancellation of the erroneous reading).[41]

There are other points of contention between the two modern editors regarding details of transcription, phonemic and semantic interpretation of the Persian items in the Codex. Differences of opinion are possible in future as well.

Salemann's position is valid to date: the Codex reflects a 13th century vulgar dialectal Persian, which has nothing to do with the contemporary Literary language (pp. 951–952). Consequently, greater attention should be devoted to the Persian linguistic records of the 13th–14th centuries, and on the findings of Persian dialectology.

The excellent work of Gilbert Lazard[42] is highly instructive with regard to classical texts containing dialectal vulgarisms. To improve our knowledge on

[40] B (p. 29) emended P [harais] to [harmis] «fire» and compared it with Cl. *garmiš* (meaning «heat; a fever»). Obviously there was a mistake here, realized by B himself who left it out of the glossary (p. 139), replacing it with the reading *hātaš* [harmis for hatais], compared with P *ātiš* «fire». Personally I would think the initial *h*-is a characteristic of Italian orthography, and would disregard when dealing with Persian. M (p. 20) started from an **ātaiš* form. He considered the initial *h* a prostetic element, and tried to derive the *ai* diphtong from Middle Persian antecedents. This is completely unwarranted: *is* is a special sign to denote the phoneme *š*; cf. *supra*.

[41] The incorrect «millet» *ǰawān* also slipped into the English index (p. 223). Interestingly enough, the word in question occurs twice in the Codex, parallel with another word. Thus, e.g. on p. 105, lines 2–3: *mortale* — P *haouâ* — C *touguç* and *pistû* — P *gabouâ* — C *cheli*; the two words are listed here among the names of kitchen utensils. On page 82, lines 17–18 they can be read in the section on spices among relevant utensils: *mortalis* — P *aouan dasta* (the second word is crossed out) — C *touguç* and *pistû* — P *haouan dasta* — C *touguç ul cheli*. M (p. 164) would change *gaoua* to *g. dasta* on p. 105. He is right, too. Kachikian's list of wares also includes this article (p. 249) in the form *Khavandasta*, meaning «mortier et pilon».

[42] Gilbert Lazard, *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane*, Paris 1963.

13th—14rh century Persian, the polyglot dictionaries of the Mongol period should be studied (e.g. Ibn Muhannā's work presenting the Persian of Khorasan, the fragmentary Mongolian-Persian dictionary of the Anonyme of Leiden, the Persian columns of the polyglot dictionaries of Yemen, and finally the Persian part of the tetraglot dictionary of Istanbul). These sources, along with Lazard's work, present useful clues.[43]

The Persian material of Chinese origin dating from the Ming period (early 15th century) also deserves attention. It records the Persian language of Transoxiana. The glossary of the Translators' Office contains entries both in the Arabic script and in Chinese transcription; the words are interpreted in Chinese. The vocabulary of the Interpretors' Office includes the Persian words only in Chinese transcription, followed by Chinese translation.[44]

With regard to dialectology, the dialects of Khorasan (including the so-called Afghan-Khorasan) have priority. We must also bear in mind the Iranian elements found in the Mogol dialects of West Afghanistan which originate from the one-time Mongol garrisons. The same applies to the dialects of the Iranized Hazaras of Mongolian origin. The findings of research on Tajik dia-

[43] I have used Ibn Muhannā's *Hilyat al-insān wa ḥalbat al-lisān* in its well-known Istanbul edition by Rifat (pp. 4—69). I corrected the misprints of this edition on the basis of the photocopy of the manuscript (pp. 2b—57a). I give the fragmentary Persian-Arabic glossary of the Anonym of Leiden on the basis of a photocopy of the manuscript (Poppe moulded the Persian—Mongol and Arabic—Mongol fragments of the Anonym of Leiden into one). I drew upon the Persian material of the polyglot dictionary of Yemen, using its photocopy. The Persian material of the tetraglot dictionary of Istanbul can be controlled in the facsimile edition in *Acta Orient. Hung.* XIV, pp. 77—99.

[44] One of the major advantages of the Sino-Persian glossaries of the Ming period is that they are not recorded in the Arabic script, or, more specifically, that the Sino-Persian word-list of the Translators' Office which contains the forms in Arabic script, gives the pronunciation also in Chinese transcription. In several cases this is a great help, but the Chinese script also has its drawbacks. The short *ä* of Persian words can be reconstructed perfectly when the Chinese syllable with a velar vowel is paired with a syllable with a palatal vowel (*ba — be; ta — te*, etc.). Otherwise the scribes had to be content with using the velar vowel. The Middle Mandarin dialect, the core of the transcription, does not include the *hän* type of syllable beside *han* (its *hen* is very closed; *hien* cannot be used for other reasons), so P *xändäk* reads *han-tê-k'ê* (Cl. *xandag*; Coll. *xändäg* Miller 198). In this Chinese dialect the final nasal merges with the preceding vowel into a naso-oral phoneme. This led to the transcription of the clear final P *-n* using a separate syllable: *t'a-pi-ssŭ-t'a-en* «summer», Cl. *tabistān*. In this dialect of specific final nasals, the transcription *pang-ta-tê*, «in the morning», Cl. *bāmdād* is regular. *Pi-la-tse-êrh* read *birāzär* «younger brother» and the like are not special features of Chinese transcription since the Arabic form next to it is *birādar*. A Supplement and some Persian applications in Arabic script with their Chinese translation are attached to the glossary of the Translators' Office. The glossary of the Interpretors' Office represents the above dialect in essentials, but the number of its words, and mainly its expressions is far greater.

lects and on the Tajik literary language also provides helpful information for the examination of this material.[45]

On the basis of the Codex, A. Bodrogligeti elaborated the Persian grammar to the extent which the material permitted, while Monchi-zadeh confined himself to summary remarks.

In the following, comments will be made on certain phonemic problems. Some of these are characteristic of the Persian dialect of the Codex, and some are problematic, and need further research.

It has long been known that the Persian language of the Codex reflects the *maǰhūl* and *ma'rūf* difference in the vowels. Apart from Cl. P., this difference was preserved in the two Sino-Persian glossaries of the Ming period, in certain Persian dialects of Khorasan, in some of the Persian dialects of Afghanistan, including Kabuli, in Tajik, in the Mogol dialects of Afghanistan, and finally, in the Persian elements of Afghan, Urdu, and Kurdish.[46]

Maǰhūl *yā* (*ē*):

mēša [mesa] «forest», also *wēša* [uexa], id. — Cl. *bēša* «a forest, wood, wild, uncultivated country», *wēša*, id.; Coll. *bišä*, *višä*; Kab. *bêša* (Far. 11); Her. *bēša*; Tj. *beša*; Mog. M *bēša* «desert, lieu desert»; Ur. *beša*; Kurd. *mēša*; *biše*, *beše* (Jaba);

šēr [ser] «lion» — Cl. *šēr*; Coll. *šir*; Ming Tr. *šēr* (*shê-êrh* 54b); Ming Int. *šēr* (12); Kab. *šêr* (11); Tj. *šer*; Afg. *šer*; Ur. *šer* «tigre; lion»; Kurd. *šêr* (W);

tēz [tex] «fast» — Cl. *tēz* «sharp, cutting; swift, prompt»; Coll. *tiz*, id.; Kab. *têz* «tranchant; rapide» (11); Her. *tez*; Haz. *tez*; Tj. *tez* «sharp»; Mog. *tez* «tranchant, aigu;» Afg. *tez*; Ur. *tez* «sharp; swift»; Kurd. *tiz* «sharp, swift»; Osm. *tez* «quick, quickly, prompt», *tiz* «high-pitched»; cf. Horn *tēz* «scharf, heftig; schnell».

Similar examples are: *rēg* [reg] «sand», *spēd* [sped] «white», *mēx* [megh] «nail», *nēk* [nec] «well; good»; *pēš* [pes] «before», *hēč* [hec] «nothing»; etc.

[45] The data of the Mangut and Marda dialects, of the Mongol, Persian (Herat) and Hazara dialects of Afghanistan come from the data (so far unpublished) I collected in Afghanistan in 1936 and 1937. On Lit. Tj. cf. *Tadžiksko—russkij slovarj*, ed. by E. Ê. Berteljs, M. V. Rachimi and L. V. Uspenskaja, Moskva 1954. On Tajik dialects see: V. S. Rastorgueva, *Očerk po tadžikskoj dialektologii* I—IV, Moskva 1952—1961.

[46] Abd-ul-Ghafoûr Farhâdi, *Le persan parlé en Afghanistan, Grammaire de Kāboli*, Paris 1955. M. G. Aslanov, *Afgansko—russkij slovarj (puštu)*, Moskva 1966. V. M. Beskrovnyj—V. E. Krasnodembskij (pod red. A. P. Barannikov), *Urdu—russkij slovarj*, Moskva 1951. Taufquiq Wahby, *A Kurdish—English Dictionary*, Oxford 1966. K. K. Kurdov, *Kurdsko—russkij slovarj*, Moskva 1960. A. Jaba, *Dictionnaire kurde—français* (publié par F. Justi), St. Pbg. 1879. On Cl. Persian the well-known dictionaries of Vullers, Steingass and Desmaisons. On Coll. Persian: S. Haïm, *New Persian—English Dictionary* I—II, Tehran 1934—1936; H. Junker—B. Alavi, *Persisch—deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig 1965; V. V. Miller, *Persidsko—russkij slovarj*, Moskva 1953 (marks open *ä*). Paul Horn, *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*, Strassburg 1893.

Maǰhūl *wāw* (*ō*):

rōbāh [robagh] «fox» — Cl. *rōbāh*; Coll. *rubāh*; Ming Tr. *rūbāh* [*lu-pa-he*; 55b]; Ming Int. *rōbā* (12); Kab. *rôbâh* (12); Tj. *rūbōh*; Mog. Mr, M *rōbā*; Ur *robāh*;

pērōza [peroxa] «turquoise» — Cl. *pīrōza*; Coll. *piruza*; Tj. *pirūza, firūza*; Afg. *pērōza*; Kurd. *pīrōze*;

rōz [rox] «day» — Cl. *rōz*; Coll. *ruz*; Ming Tr. *rōz* (*lo-tsŭ*; 15b); Ming Int. *rōz* (6); Kab. *rôz* (12); Tj. *rūz*; Afg. *roz-* (initial component of a compound word); Ur. *roz*.

Similar examples are: *rōšan* [rosan] «light»; *bōsa* [bosa] «kiss»; *dōst* [dost] «friend»; *drōgān* [drogaan] «liar»; *gōšt* [ghoist] «flesh»; etc.[47]

A part of the old maǰhūl vowels appears in *ma'rūf* form (*ī*, *ū*) in the Codex.

ī replaces the former *ē*:

bīmār [bin mar] «sick» — Cl. *bīmār*; Coll. *bimār*; Kab. *bêmâr* (11); Tj. *bemōr*; Mog. M *bēmār*; Mog. Mr. *bīmār*; Ur. *bīmār*; Afg. *bimār*; Kurd. *bimar* (Jaba); Uzb. *bemōr*; Osm. *bimar*. Etymology is questionable; cf. Horn n° 209;

mīwa [miua] «fruit» — Cl. *mīwa, maiwa* (Stg.), *mēva* (Laz. 143); Coll. *miwe*; Mirg Tr. *mēwa* (*mie-wa*; 62a); Ming. Int. *mēwa* (10); Kab. *mêwa* (11); Tj. *meva*; Her *mēwa*; Mog. Mr, M *mēwa*; Afg. *meva*; Ur. *meva*; Kurd. *mêwe* (W), *meva, maivé* (Jaba);

mīx [migh] «nail» — Cl. *mēx*; Coll. *mix*; Kab. *mêx* (11); Her. *mēx*; Tj. *mex*; Mog. M *mēx*; Afg. *mex*; Ur. *mex*; Kurd. *mêx* (W); Uzb. *mix*. Cf. Horn n° 1005.

Such are: *dīr* [dir] and *dēr* [der] "late"; *dīwāna* [divana] "mad"; *mīzāk* [nizech] «urine»; *darwīš* [daruis] and *darwēš* [darues] «poor».

[47] In Kabuli, the most extensively studied dialect of Afghanistan, some phenomena can be detected that may throw light on certain Persian data of the Codex. It should be noted in connection with maǰhūl cases that compared with colloquial *ê*, literary pronunciation wavers between *ê* and *ai*: *omêd* «espoir», *bêrân* «détruit» (lit. *wairân*). At times *ai* changes into *ê*: *šêx* «cheik». Similar variance can be observed in the pronunciation of *ô* and *au*: *rôšan*, *rôaan* (Lit. Tj. *ravgan*; I myself heard the form *rauyan* in Afghanistan). The Arabic *au* sometimes changes into *ô*: *tôba* «répantir» (Farhad, pp. 8—9). The latter word occurs in the German part of the Codex as *tōba* «Reue», and in the Italian part among the month-names as *tōb ay* «Reuemonat, Aprilis» (Grönbech, *Wb.* 246). Bazin (*Les calendriers*, p. 633) was right in stating that the correct form of the Coman month is *tōba āy*, and that Coman *tōba* derives from the Arabic *tawbat* «répentir, retour au Dieu» (BK I, 210). Lit. P marks vulgar *tōba* besides *taubat*, *tauba* (Stg.). Unlike Bazin, I think *tōb āy* is not a contraction, but an inaccuracy caused by dictation. Bazin's explanation is fully confirmed by the quoted Osm. *büyük tövbe* and *küčük tövbe* expressions. The correct interpretation of *tōb āy* was already given by Kowalski (*Archiv Orientalní* I, 21), who pointed out that this month of «confession» referred to Easter, since the converted Comans had to make confessions at that time. Consequently, this month of the «shifting feast» could not denot a fixed month. The Coman *tōba* originates in Persian, but not necessarily in the Persian dialect of the Codex. A similar explanation applies to the name of *Toris* found in Italian documents of the Mongol period, referring to *Tabriz* (*Tawriz*).

ū replaces the former *ō*:

gūš [gouis] «ear» — Cl. *gōš*; Coll. *guš*; Ming Tr. *gōš* (*ko-shih*; 43b); Ming. Int. *gōš* (25); Kab. *gôš* (12); Tj. *gūs*; Ur. *goš*;

gūspand [guspend] «sheep» — Cl. *gōspand*; *gōspand*, *gōsfand* (Laz. p. 138); Coll. *guspänd*, *gusfänd*; Ming Tr. *gōšfänd* (*ko-ssu-fan-tê*; 55a); Ming Int. *gōsfänd* (13); Kab. *gôspand*; Tj. *gūsfand*; Ur. *gospand*, *gosfand*;

mūza [mussa] «boot» — Cl. *mōza*; Coll. *muzä*; Ming Tr. *mōze* (*mo-chie*; 74b); Ming Int. *mōze* (13); Kab. *môza* (12); Tj. *mūza*; Afg. *moza*; Ur. *mūza* «stocking».

Also: *kūistān* [chouistan] «mountain», but *kōī* [koy] «mountainous»; *kūtāī* [cutay] «shortness», *lūč* [lux] «squinteyes» (M *lōš*, B *luž*); *pūst* [pust] «skin», *čākūč* [ciachuc] «hammer», *xāmūš* [ghamus] «tame».

The relatively frequent occurrence of *imāla* in words of Arabic and Persian origin also bear upon the vowel system.[48]

Examples: *fēnus* [fenus] «lamp», Cl. *fānūs*; *nēbīnā* [nebina] «blind», Cl. *nābīnā*; *besbēze* [besbese] «the cover of nutmeg», Cl. *bazbāz*; *selēx* [selech] «arme», Cl. *silāh*; *andēm* [anden] «member», Cl. *andām*; *miēn* [mien] «waist», Cl. *miyān*; *rikēb* [richeb] «stirrup», Cl. *rikāb*.

With regard to historical dialectology it is noteworthy that the Codex contains a relatively large number of forms with *ä* (*e*), *e*, *o*, besides the regular short *a*, *i*, *u*. Mention will be made here only of *e*, conceding that it cannot be established whether it is an open or closed *e*.[49]

Examples: *belend* [belend] «height». Cl. *baland*; *belk* [belch] «leaf», Cl. *barg*; *dēn*, *deen* [deen] mouth, Cl. *dahan*; *dendān* [dendan] «tooth», Cl. *dandān*; *ferbe* [ferbe] «fat», Cl. *farbih*; *gerd* [gerd] «dust», Cl. *gard*; *gez* [gex] «ell», Cl. *gaz*; *ǰeld* [geld] «quick»; *pesīn* [pesin] «back, Cl. *pasīn*; etc.

A similar phenomenon can be observed in the Sino-Persian glossary of the Ming period. The following examples are taken from the glossary of the Translators' Office: *yex* [*ye-he*] «ice». Cl. *yax*; *deryā* (*tie-êrh-ya*) «sea, ocean», Cl. *daryā*; *češme* (*ch'ê-shih-mê*) «fountain», Cl. *čašma*; *lešker* (*le-shih-k'ê-êrh*) «army», Cl. *laškar*; *pider* (*p'i-tê-êrh*) «father», Cl. *pidar*, *padar*; *melex* (*mie-le-hê*) «locust», Cl. *malax*; *berk* (*pe-erh-k'ê*) «leaf», Cl. *barg*; etc.[50]

[48] M. Th. Grünert, *Die Imāle, der Umlaut im Arabischen*: *SBWAW* LXXXI, pp. 447—542. J. Cantineau, *Cours phonétique arabe*, Alger 1941, reprinted in: *Études de linguistique arabe*, Paris 1960, pp. 96—102. D. C. Phillott, *Higher Persian Grammar*, Calcutta 1919, pp. 38. Monchi-zadeh, *op. cit.*, pp. 15—16.

[49] In practice they are the first signs of the short vowels of Cl. Persian shifting towards present-day pronunciation of Coll. Persian. The inconsistent orthography of the Codex, however, provides no firm grounds to establish this trend authentically, not to mention the fact that the shift might have different causes as well, as in Kabuli.

[50] As mentioned above (note 44), there was only one feasible way, with a velar vowel, for Chinese glossators to transcribe certain Persian syllables (*fa*, *fä*; *tan*, *tän*, *dan*, *dän*, etc.) (*fa*; *t'an*, *tan*, etc.). The mechanical usage of a palatal vowel in these transcrip-

The Persian consonant system of the Codex shows several conspicuous dialectal traits. Some of them are the following:

D is sometimes omitted in intervocal position. The same phonemic phenomenon can be observed in certain dialects, e.g. the Caspian dialects, Tat of Azerbaijan,[51] and the Mogol of Afghanistan. Examples:

piar [piar] «father (M *pidar*, B *piyar*) — Casp. dial. *piyar*; Tat. *piyar* (116); Mog. M *piar*; Cl. *pidar*;

brar [brar] «brother» (M *birār*, *birādar*; B *brar*) — Casp. dial. *brār*; Mog. Mr, M *birar*; Mog. Zirni, Kundur *birar*; Her. *birar*; Haz. *birār*; Tat. *birar* (117). *Brādar* [bradar] also occurs in the Codex. Cl. *birādar*;

mār (mar) «mother» — Casp. dial. *mār*; Tat. *may* (116). *Mādar* [madar] also occurs in the Codex besides *mār*.

čāršau [çiarsau] «sheet» — Coman derivative *čaršau* [çiarzau]; Tat. *čaršou* «a woman's kerchief of dark colour» (120); Kurd. *čaršêw* (W), *čaršeb*, *čaršaf* «drap de lit, voile de femme» (Jaba); Osm. *çarşaf* «bed-sheets; a large veil, covering the whole dress.»

B at the end of syllables or words often becomes a fricative, forming at times a diphtong with the preceding vowel. It is found as a vulgar variant in Lit. Pers., and also in numerous Persian, and Afghan dialects, some Tajik dialects, and Mongolian.[52]

Examples:

---

tions accounts for mistakes. Is *ta-ni-ssu-t'an* «to know» really to be interpreted as *dānistän* (P. Coll. *danestän*, in Miller), or is *dānistan* the correct reading? Similarly, is the correct reading of *an-tie-she* «though» *andēše* or *ändēše* (the final *e* is doubtless closed), cf. Coll. *ändiše*, Mill. (Codex: *andīša*); is *fa-kê-êrh* «poor» *fäġir* as Coll. *fäġir* (Mill.), or rather *faġir*? The following is unambiguous: *ê-na-ye-t'ê* «grace, faveur», read *enāyät*, like Coll. *enayät* (Mill.). It seems likely that initial open *a* (if short) should be interpreted as *ä*, as there is a sign *e* to transcribe closed *e*: *a-pu-lo* «sourcil», read. *äbrō* (Coll. *äbru*), Cod. *abrū*; close *e* in initial position only occurs with *ʿayn*.

[51] A. L. Grjunberg, *Jazyk severoazerbajdžanskich tatov*, Leningrad 1963.

[52] A voiced bilabial spirant may occur both in initial and intermediate position (also before a consonant); see Lazard, *La langue des plus anciens monuments*, pp. 137—143. I have come across it only as the second component of a final diphthong in the Persian, Mogol and Hazara dialects of Afghanistan. In different dialects this diphthong (*aw*) might have been rising, falling or floating. Thus, *au* is coupled with *au̯* (usually written as *aw*), *o̯u* and even *o̯u*. In the Codex it occurs in initial position: *wāz* [uas] «open», Cl. *bāz*; in intermediate position: *tawar* [taouar] «axe», Cl. *tabar*; *tawa* [taoua] «frying pan», Cl. *taba*. Other examples: Bodrogligeti, p. 57. A similar phenomenon can be observed in today's dialects, e.g. in Kabuli: *tawa* «poële à frire», *aftâwa* «aiguière», *šorwâ* «soupe»; *sawz* «vert», *kawk* «perdrix», *awšâr* «chute d'eau», *qaws* «constipe», *aftaw* «soleil», *mâtaw* «lune», *xaw* «sommeil», *aw* «eau», *simaw* «mercure», etc.; see Farhādi, p. 23. In Kabuli *-êb* changed into *-êw*: *sêw* «pomme», *sar-nesêw* «en pente» (ibid.). «Apple» is *sēf* in the Codex. In Ibn Muhannā's work (Rifat, p. 56) it is *sēb* and *sēw*. *Sēw* (and *sēwa*) can be found in Lit. P. as a vulgar variant (Stg. 716).

au [aou] «water», also *ap*. — Lit. P. *āv* (Stg.), Kab. *aw* (24); Tj. *ōv* (Rast. I, 32); Her. *au*; Haz. *au*; Kurd. *âw* (Jaba);

šau [sau] «night» — Lit. P. *šaw* (Stg.); Kab. *šaw* (23); Tj. *šav* (Rast. I, 32); Kurd. *šaw* (W), *šew* (Jaba);

sauz [saus] «green» — Kab. *sawz* (23), Kurd. *sawz* (K, W), *sowz* (Jaba).

Unvoicing of final plosives sometimes occurs, most frequently *-d* > *t*; *bunyāt* [buniat] «foundation», Cl. *bunyād*; *dūt* [dut] «smoke», Cl. *dūd*; *kabūt* [chabut] «blue», Cl. *kabūd*; *kilit* [kilit] «lock», Cl. *kilid*; *xarāp* [carap] «spoiled», Cl. *xarāb*; *noxūt* [noghuc for noghut] «pea», Cl. *nuxūd*. Analogues from dialects: cf. Kab. *naxot* «pea», Cl. *naxwod*; *zut* «quickly»; Cl. *zud*; *šat* «honey», Cl. *šahd*; *dâmât* «son-in-law», Cl. *dāmād*; etc. (26).

Sporadic examples of *-g* > *-k* change can also be observed: *dēk* «kettle», *belk* [belch] «leaf», *sek* [sec] «dog»; besides them also *seg* [seg] «dog», *dig* [dig] «yesterday», *reg* [reg] «sand».

Some examples of the unvoiced variant of final *-b* can also be found in the Codex: *āp* «water» besides *au*; *ǰoāp* [ioap] «answer», Cl. *ǰawāb*; *qāp* [cap] «instep», Cl. *qāb*; *šerāp* [serap] «wine», Cl. *šarāb*. Apart from the unvoiced final phoneme, voiced variants abound in the Codex: *xōb* [ghob] «good» and *xūb* [ghub]; *kanab* [canab] «hemp»; etc.

Among the sporadic phonemic phenomena, the final *-m* > *-mb* change is of special importance. We have several data for it from early times. Lazard maintains (p. 163) that the forms *xunb* and *xum(m)* "jarre", *sunb* and *sum(m)* «sabot (d'un animal)», *šikanb* and *šikam* «ventre», *karanb* and *karam* «chou», etc. alternate in old manuscripts. The Codex contains the following: *pāldomb* [*paldomb*] «crupper», Cl. *pal-dum* «the crupper-leather», *pār-dum* «a crupper» (*pār* «a skin, a tanned hide»), Lit. P. *dumb*, *dump* «the tail» (Stg.); Kab. *domb* (29); Tj. *pōrdum*. Ming Tr. *sumb* (*sun-pu*) «hoof» (58b) belongs to this category.

The word [ambrut] in the Codex does not reflect a special orthographical feature, but it is an authentic reference to the 13th century Persian pronunciation of *ambrūt*, which Lazard (p. 164) quotes as *anbrūδ* «poire». This is essentially the same form as the Lit. P. *ambarūd* (sic) «pear» (Stg.). Besides *amrūd* and *amrūt*, Vullers (I, 121) mentions the colloquial variant *anbrūt*.[53]

Similarly, *marǰand* [mariâd] «coral», as opposed to Cl. *marǰan*, is not an orthographical distortion. Other dialects also contain a similar unorganic *-d* after final nasals. E.g. Kab. *čamand*, *yâsamand*, *fand*, *golxand*, *ǰend*, *send* (29).

It seems certain that an unorganic *n* should be reckoned with in similar positions. E.g. *namand* [namand] «felt», Cl. *namad*, old *namaδ* (Lazard, p. 201:

[53] Bodrogligeti reads *amrūt* (p. 110), *pāldom* (p 176), and *namad* (p. 111). In Monchizadeh's interpretation they are: *amrōd* (in brackets: *amrō(t)*, *armōt*, *anbrōt*; p. 30); *pārdum* (*pāldum*) (p. 49; also puts the corollary forms *dunb* and *dumb* in brackets); *namad* (p. 159; he omits *n* from the form of the Codex as well).

namaδ-pāra «morceau de feutre»). Analogous forms could be cited from the Ob Ugric languages.[54]

Examples can also be found for the sporadic $r > l$ change: *sulāx* [sulach] «hole», Cl. *surāx*. It is one of the old variants. Lazard (p. 155) quotes the *sûlâ* form from old records, and *sl'x* from Judeo-Persian. Also Kab. *solâx* (26). From the Codex: *belk* [belch] «leaf». According to Lazard (p. 155), *balg* appeared with *barg* already in Firdausi's work. He also quotes Judeo-Tj. *balg*, Māz. *valg*. Also Lit. P. *balg* «feuille d'arbre» (Desm.) besides *barg*; Haz. *balgau* «pâtes de farine fine bouillies» (a compound of *balg* «leaf» and *au* «water»); Afg. *balg* «leaf», Kurd. *belk* «feuille» (Jaba).

In the majority of the cases the original *r* is retained, e.g. *dīwār* [diuar] «wall», but Kab. *dêwâl*; *zangār* [xangar] «vert-de-gris» but Kab. *zangál*; etc.

In some cases Bodrogligeti interprets the initial Cl. *q-* (even in words of Arabic origin). as *ġ-*. This reading reflects the pronunciation of today's Colloquial Persian. The dictionaries of Junker-Alavi, Haim and Miller also mark it this way. The few examples in the Codex are, however, not convincing.[55] Strangely enough, a similar phenomenon can be detected in the Sino-Persian glossaries of the Ming period, with the difference that *ġ* in place of *q* does not only occur in initial position. Examples: *ġāz* «goose» (55b), Cl. *qāz*; *ġulġās* «the edible root of a plant» (65a), Cl. *qulqās*; *ġedeh* «tumbler» (70b), Cl. *qadah*; *nuġre* «silver» (82a), Cl. *nuqrah*; *ġāš* «money» (83a), Cl. *qāš*; *ġäläm* «pen; brush» (89), Cl. *qalam*; *ġawī* «strong» (104), Cl. *qawī*; etc.

At this point the questions should be raised: Where was this Persian dialect spoken? Whose native tongue was it? So far there are only hypotheses instead of precise answers. Salemann located this dialect in Khorasan, while Monchi-zadeh tended to indentify it with the Caspian dialects. Bodrogligeti, an eminent scholar of the Kurdish language, looked for Kurdish affinities in it. His position is compatible with the former ones if we consider the fact that the so-called Kurdish features[56] are the specificities of the Persian elements of Kurdish.

[54] An *n* preceding the final *d* is unetymological, but it is still possible that it reflects an actual pronunciation. A similarly unetymological *n* can be found before the final *t* in the Persian form borrowed into Vogul. It is also possible, however, that the secondary *n* developed in Vogul, see Aulis Joki, *Uralier and Indogermanen*, Helsinki 1973, pp. 290—291. It escaped Joki's attention that the form *namaδ* exists in old New Persian also; cf. *supra*.

[55] Bodrogligeti, pp. 137—139: *ġādi* (chadi) «judge», Cl. *qāżī*; *ġaḥba* (chagba) «prostitute», Cl. *qaḥba*; *ġalp* (chalp) «false», Cl. *qalb*; *ġaranful* (garanful) «clove», Cl. *qaranful*; *ġard* (chard) «loan», Cl. *qarż*; *ġaṣāp* (hasap) «butcher», Cl. *qaṣṣāb*; *ġasīs* (chasis) «priest», Cl. *qissīs*; *ġōz* (chos) «crooked», Cl. *qūz*. Yet in 23 other words he retained the initial *q-*. Monchi-zadeh reads *q-* in all these cases (pp. 122—125).

[56] The words singled out by Bodrogligeti (pp. 99—100) as elements of Kurdish almost exactly coincide with those thought characteristic of the Caspian dialects by Monchi-zadeh (pp. 17—18). Both arguments point to the same fact, namely, that the enumerated features belong to the phonetic and lexical features of a Persian dialect spoken in some unidentified region.

The question remains open, but let me point out that there are two aspects of this problem. One is the question of the homeland of the Persian language of the Codex. This cannot be answered for the time being, although the correct solution doubtless lies somewhere in the above-mentioned hypotheses. The other aspect of the question, namely, where was this language used, can be answered without hesitation. It was used at the caravansaries along the trade routes, and it was the interpretors who were its vehicle and medium. They played a great role in the Mongol empire along with the "coming and going envoys", and the tradesmen.

The interpretor of the Persian part of the Codex was obviously not a Christian, but a Moslem. Suffice it to refer to the names of months, whose Arabic origin points to a Moslem source. The enumeration and examination of single words will be dispensed with here, — but one group of data should perhaps be mentioned.

The chapter of the Codex on time (p. 71), which includes the calendar, also gives the names of the seven *horae canonicae* of the Christian terminology. However hard the Persian (and Coman) interpretor of the Moslem faith tried, he could not translate the Latin definitions of these. He got around the problem by giving the names of the times of Muslim prayers for five of the seven *horae*. It was not plain sailing, however; confusion arose at two points. The Latin column lacked the name of (*hora canonica*) *sexta*, while in the Persian and Coman columns spaces for the Persian and Coman counterparts were left blank. Géza Kuun (p. 80) tried to make up for this deficiency by leaving the Persian and Coman equivalents of *completorium* blank. In the Codex, the Persian and Coman correspondents of L *hodie* shifted a line upwards; the same happened to the lines above it up to *tercia*. The erroneous list can be corrected by inserting *sexta*. The original list of the Codex can be reconstructed as follows:

1. L *matutinû* — P *nî saou* — C *tank*
2. L *prima* — P *sabagh* — C *erta*
3. L *tercia* — P *seft* — C *aš octi*
4. L *sexta* — P *nim rox* — C *tüš*
5. L *nona* — P *namaz digar* — C *echindu*
6. L *vesperas* — P *acſan* — C *acſan*
7. L *completorium* — P *souagam* — C *chezae*.

The interpretor chose analogues for the first and third *horae canonicae*, while the rest he coupled with the names of the five Muslim prayer hours. Our examples are from the pentaglot dictionary of Yemen, which gives the Persian, Arabic and Turkic equivalents. (N. B. this dictionary used a Turkish tongue belonging to the Oγuz, not to the Kipchak languages.) The data are (f. 4rA29—31 and 4rB1—2):

1. P *bāmdād* — T *ärtä* — A *al-fajr*
2. P *namāz-i pēšīn* — T *öylāk* — A *al-zuhr*
3. P *namāz-i digar* — T *ikindü* — A *al-ʿaṣr*
4. P *namāz-i šām* — T *aχšam* — A *al-ʿišā'*
5. P *vaqt-i xuftī* — T *yatγu* — A *al-ʿatama.*

The Persian name of the fifth *hora canonica* directly demonstrates the Moslem origin. The Turkish equivalents of the second, fourth and sixth *horae canonicae* are either the same as, or synonyms of, the Persian equivalents.

Originally, the names of Christian and Moslem praying hours were meant to denote the periods of a day, like daybreak, evening, nightfall, or were derived from the expressions of certain human activities (meal-time, bed-time). This double semantic function persisted, and later the terms used for religious activities became the definitions of the hour of day.[57]

It is worth noting that the septenary division of the day is recorded in other Turkic sources of the Mongol period in the same order. The following example is quoted from the Anonyme of Leiden in a Kipchak-type language: 1. *ṭayin* «dawn» (*waqtu'l-saḥr*); 2. *ertä* «daybreak» (*bukra*); 3. *qušluq* «early morning meal» (Clauson, *ED* 672); 4. *düš* and *öyläη* «midday» (*al-zuḥr*); 5. *igiz*

[57] One of the terms in the above list of five, P *bāmdād*, meaning «in the morning, at break of day», exemplifies the chronological independence. The name of prayer to be said at this time is *namāz-i bāmdād*. This applies to A *fajr* as well. P *vaqt-i xuftī*, also one of the five, likewise restricts its meaning to «bed-time», while A *ʿatama* means 1. «le premier tiers de la nuit, à partir du crépuscule du soir» and 2. «prière du soir, qu'on fait avant de se coucher». T *yatsun* «(time of) going to bed» exists in Bulġat, too, meaning «soir, entrée de soir» (Zaj. 25). In the form of *yatsu* in Idrāk and *yatsïγ* in Ibn Muhannā's work, it means «Schlafzeit» (Brockelmann, *Osttürk. Gramm.*, p. 136). Its P equivalent is *namāz-i xuftan* «prayer before going to bed, two hours or more after sunset» (Stg.). Grönbech (*Wb.*, p. 269) noticed that *sexta* was missing from the *horae canonicae*, but he was very tentative in identifying it with Coman *tüš*, pointing out that it corresponds to *nona* in the extant manuscript. He relates *ekindü* as well as the correct Persian *namāz-i digar* to *vesperas* (p. 86), which is a mistake. The Coman *aqšam* is not the translation of *completorium* (p. 39), but of *vesperas*. He ignores later (p. 135) that the Coman word *keče* is the equivalent of *completorium*. The facsimile clearly shows that the users of the Codex were perplexed by the above inaccuracies, and tried to emend them in the margin, unfortunately not in a faultless way. The Persian equivalents of *horae canonicae* in Bodrogligeti's work are: 1. *nīm šow* «midnight; 2. *ṣabāḥ* «early in the morning (LL prima)»; 3. *šest* «breakfast time, the third canonical hour; Cl. P *čāšt*»; 4. *nimrōz* «midday»; 5. *namāz digar* «the time of the afternoon prayer»; 6. *aqšam* «evening; LL conpletorium»; 7. *šäw-hangām* «nighttime; Cl. P *šab-hangām*». Monchi-zadeh reduced the list to six times of day: 1. *ṣabāḥ nēm-šab* «Tagesanbruch, Morgen»; 2. *čāšt* «Essenzeit (3. kanonische Stunde)»; 3. *nēm-rōz* «Tagesmitte»; 4. *namāz(i) digar* «abends, nach Sonnenuntergang»; 5. *axšām* «Conpletorium; Abend»; 6. *šab-hangām* «sero; nachts». Neither editor realized the omission of L *hora sexta*, and the consequent shift of lines.

and *ikindü* (Tkm.) «afternoon till sunset» (*al-ʿaṣr*); 6. *aqšam* «evening» (*al-maġrib*); 7. *yaṭsun* «bed-time» (*ʿišāʾ al-axir*).[58]

The above examples clearly show how closely the Oriental languages of the Codex were related to each other and to Islam. Arabic and Coman elements are mixed with the native Persian vocabulary, and Persian and Arabic elements mingle in with the Coman. It is not always easy to find our way in their midst, and this often makes us forget that the two explanatory Occidental languages, Latin and German, are right there too with their complex mediaeval problems.

So far no one has systematically worked on the Latin language of the Codex. G. Kuun (pp. 369—378) annotated some of the seemingly irregular Latin words of the Italian part in their order of occurrence, mainly relying upon Du Cange's dictionary. Grönbech appended an alphabetical list of the Latin words of the Codex to his dictionary (pp. 278—301), but this list does not include the Latin words which have no Coman equivalents. Since it was compiled for Turcologists, it even fails to show whether a word appears in the Italian or German part.

Let me put forward a few passing remarks on the Latinity of the Codex.

Even a cursory glance reveals that two variants of mediaeval Latinity are present. In the first part a vulgar Latin with special Italian features is apparent. This Latin was used by the Italian colonists living along the Black Sea. The second part of the Codex reveals the ecclesiastical Latin of the mediaeval monasteries.

The idiosyncrasies of Italo-Latin seemed strange and unintelligible to the users of the latter variant. No sooner had the Franciscan friars obtained the first part than they started translating the Italian idiosyncrasies into normal Latin. This trend dominates in the beginning of the Codex: a corrector elucidated the words *abrachio, abrachiaui, abrachia,* by inserting *amplector, amplexatus sum, amplecte* next to the Coman counterparts, in black ink (p. 71). Hoping to clear up the meaning of *aleno, alenaui, alena,* the same corrector added *suspiro, suspiraui, suspira* (and *suspirio*) to the Coman equivalents on the same page. Also on this page we find the explanatory, «intelligible» Latin words *libero, liberaui, libera* (and *liber homo*) beside the Coman equivalents of *abasso, abassaui, abassa.* On page 9 the Latin equivalent of *ballo* etc. is *plaudo* etc.; on page 10, *casso* etc. is explained by the Latin *destruo* etc. The Latin

[58] Cf. The Anonym of Leiden, Ms. f. 30a: 12—13 — 30b: 1—5. Th. Houtsma, *Ein türkisch—arabisches Glossar,* the Arabic text, p. 18: 13—17. A. K. Kuryšžanov, *Issledovanie po leksike «Tjurkske—arabskogo slovarja»,* pp. 58—59, arbitrarily changed the sequence of words and even inserted three words that originally came after the list. This is all the more surprising since Kuryšžanov worked with Houtsma's printed Arabic text, and not the manuscript.

glosses gradually disappear, giving way to the Coman counterparts as explanations; Persian seems to have been totally alien to the monks.

A correct interpretation of the orthographic, phonemic and lexical characteristics of this Italo-Latin language would certainly help us to determine the place of origin of the Codex, and the nationality of its author. Can Kuun's suggestions about Genoan features be proved?[59] Be that as it may, caution is needed, since we have to reckon with a certain Italian *koine*, not to speak of the fact that the copier could not escape putting the characteristics of his own dialect into the text.

The mounting questions can only be answered by an Italo-Latinist familiar with the 13th–14th century linguistic records.

The Italo-Latin language of the Codex contains several words of Oriental, primarily Arabic and Persian origin. Without aiming at completeness, let us mention some of these here.[60] For easier orientation, the Persian and Coman words are spelled as they appear in the Codex. On the other side of the colon, the presently accepted transcribed form is given, along with my interpretation

[59] To confirm his assertion, G. Kuun (pp. CXXI–CXXII) quoted orthographical, pronunciational and lexical differences detectable in the Genoan and Venetian dialects. In light of the transcription of the Persian and Coman words, his orthographical explanations are hardly warranted. He considered the words *gragnora* «pea», *sivoro* «to whistle», *carubius* (Du Cange: *carubeus*, carubium) «street, lane», *turcheysa* (recte *turchese*) «tong» clearly Genoan. Kuun (p. CXXII) also pointed out some phonetic and lexical features which he regarded as characteristic of the Venetian dialect. Such are: *endego* (in place of *indigo*), *tenagis* «a farrier's forceps»; *chibebe* «cubeb, Piper cubab»; *latonum* «copper»; *merzarius* «grocer», *caramella* «reedpipe»; *turta* «cake». G. Kuun did not attach great importance to this, however, since these words, in these forms, can be found in other North Italian dialects as well. On the other hand, Prof. A. Csillaghy, whom I asked on the subject, thinks that the Latin words in question display a great many Venetian, or more precisely, Veneto, and not Genoan, characteristics. He includes here: *scarpinu'* «short socks» (p. 102); *specie* (for *spezie*) «spice» (without P and C equivalents), *sal* «salt» (without P and C equivalents), *calderon'* «cauldron», *cazia* «spoon», *pignata* «kettle» (p. 104); *scutella* «plate», *flama* «flame» (reduction of geminata), *ranpin'* «hook», *rama arb̄* «branch» (p. 104); *cocomarû* «cucumber», *papauarû* «poppy» (without P and C equivalents) (p. 106); *gata* «cat», *gatus* «tomcat» (p. 108); *falchon* «falcon», *galina* «hen», *galus* «cock», *paon* «peafowl», *faxan* «pheasant», *cardarina* «goldfish», *paser* «sparrow» (p. 109); etc. Only a detailed monograph will give us the definitive word in this matter.

[60] I used the following abbreviations in the above list: P: Persian; C: Coman. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*. Peg.: Pegolotti, Yule (*Cathay and the Way Thither* III) and in the edition by A. Evans, referring to Dr. Drüll's compendium. Lauf.: B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago 1919. Pelg.: Pellegrini, *Gli arabismi nelle lingue neolatine con speciale riguardo all'Italia*, I–II, Brescia 1972. Schaf.: Edward H. Schafer, *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand, A Study of T'ang Exotics*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1963. Polo: P. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* I–III, 1959–1975. Stg.: Steingass, *Persian–English Dictionary*. BK: Biberstain Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe–français* I–II, Paris 1960. Vull.: I. A. Vullers, *Lexicon Persico–Latinum* I–II, Graz 1962. Desm.: J. J. P. Desmaisons, *Dictionnaire persan–français* I–IV, Rome 1908–1914.

in unsettled cases. Where no difficulties arise, the data of other Italo-Latin sources follow, together with the reconstructed Oriental form (which is never the direct source).

gingabel «ginger»; P *gingibil*: *ǰinǰibil*; C *gingibil*: *ǰinǰibil* (81:1) — Heyd II, 619–623; Peg. (Yule 167, Dr. 61); Lauf. 583. P *šangalīl* «ginger» (Stg. 763), A *zanǰabīl* (Stg. 724), *zanǰabīl* «aunee» (Dozy I, 605);

lacha «gum lacker»; P *luc*: *luk*; C *lac* in: *rangi lac*: *rang-i lak* (81:8) — Pelg. I, 121 (*laca*, Du Cange; *lacha* Stat. Genov.), I, 351 (*lacca*, *lacha*, Ligur.); Heyd II, 624–626; Peg. (Yule 167; Dr. 60 «Gummilack»); Lauf. 475–478; Schaf. 208. P *rang-lāk*, *rang-lukā* «tincture of lac» (Stg. 589); A *lak* «laque», sorte de gomme-resine avec laquelle on prépare des vernis» (BK II, 1019);

titua «zinc-sulphate»; P *tutia*: *tūtiyā*; C *tutia*: *tutiya* (81: 20) — Pelg. I, 121 (*tucia* and *tuzia* after Polo and Pelg.), II, 588 (*tuzia*, Venice); Heyd II, 674–676; Peg. (Dr. 75); Lauf. 511–515, 555. P *tūtiyā* «tutty» (Stg. 333); A *tūtiyā* «tuti» (Dozy I, 154);

chibabe d., s. «cubebe; P *chabāba*: *kabāba*; C *chababa*: *kababa* (81: 25). — Pelg. I, 351 (*cubeba*, *cubebe* piper; *cubebe* ; Ligur.), II, 588 (*chubebe*; Venice); Heyd II, 658–664 («poivre noir et blanc»); Peg. (Yule 168; Dr. 64): Kubebe «getrocknete und unreife Frucht eines Pfeffergewechses»); Schaf. 151. P *kabāba* «Cubebs» (Stg. 1011); A *kubāba* «piment; poivre cubebe» (BK II, 851);

canfora «camphor»; P *canfor*: *kānfōr*; C *canfor*: *kanfor* (Grönbech's reading *ganfor* is unwarrantable) (82:1). — Pelg. I, 121 (*canfora*, 14th c.; *canfera*, *canfara*; Polo; *caffera*, Peg.; *ganfora*); Heyd II, 59–595; Peg. (Yule 168; Dr. 62); Lauf. 585; Schaf. 166–168. P *kānfūr* «camphor» (Stg. 1007); A *kāfūr* «camphre» (BK II, 915);

safranum «saffron»; P *zafran*: *zafrān*; C *zafran*: *zafran* (82:12). — Pelg. I, 118 (*zafferano*, 14th c.; *safrani*), I, 351 (*zafferano* 1156, Ligur.; *safranum*, North-Afr., Ligur.); Arm. *zafran* «safran» (251). P *za'farān* «saffron» (Stg. 617); A *za'frān* «sorte de safran» (Dozy I, 593);

galanga «galangale»; P *coligiâ*: *xōlinǰān*; C *choligian*: *xolinǰan* (83:6). — Pelg. I, 120 (*galangga*, *galange*, Venice; *galanga*, *galinga*, *galingale*, Peg.), II, 588 (*galanga*, Venice); Heyd II, 616–618; Peg. *galanga* (Yule 168; Dr. 59); Lauf. 545–546. P *xūlanǰān* «the herbe galangale» (Stg. 488);

ladano «the gum-herb ladanum»; P *ladan*:*lādan*; C is missing, replaced by *ambar* due to line-shift (83:7). — Heyd II, 631–632 *ladanum* (also refers to Pegolotti); Peg. (Yule 167: ladanum of Cyprus). P *lādan* «the gum-herb, ladanum» (Stg. 1111);

turbiti «a purgatif Indian root»; P *turb*: *turb*; C *turbut*: *turbut* (83:22). — Pelg. II, 588 (*turbiti* «nota pianta la cui radice e purgativa», Venice) Peg. *turbit* (Yule 168); Lauf. 584. P *turbid*, *turbud*, *tirbid* «a purgative Indian root, convolvulus turpethum» (Stg. 292); A *turbid* «convulvulus turpethum» (Dozy I, 143);

nachus «a kind of brocade»; P *nagh*: *nax*; C *nac*: *naq* (91:27). — Heyd II,

698 (*Nacco*); Peg. (Yule 169: *nacchi*; Dr. 57: «Brokat»); Polo (*nac*; Pelliot I, 483); Lauf. 496. P *nax* «filum sericum vel bombycinum vel aliud; tapetum vel stratum elegans et pictum» (Vull. II, 1297); A *nax* «étoffe de soie brochée d'or, brocart» (Dozy II, 648);

nasicius «gold brocate with pearls»; P *nasiz*: *nasič*; C *nasiç*: *nasič* (the reading *našič* put forward by Grönbech is possible only in Mongol) (91:28). — Heyd (*nachetti*) II, 698; Peg. (Yule 169: *nachetti*; Dr. 57: «Goldbrokat»); Polo (*nasici*, *nasiti*, Pelliot I, 332); Lauf. 496. P *nasīǰ* «vestis serica auro testa» (Vull. II, 1314); A *nasīǰ* «étoffe de soie brochée d'or» (Dozy II, 666); cf. A *nasīǰ* «tissé», *našaǰa* «tisser (une étoffe)» (BK II, 1247)[61];

scarlata «scarlet cloth»; P *scarlat*: *sqarlāt*; C *yscarlat*: *ïsqarlat* (92:5) — Heyd II, 607 (grana da tignere scarlatti, graine d'écarlate»); Lauf. 496—498 (makes distinction between the derivatives of P *saqirlāt* and *saqalāt* in the western languages); Pelg. I, 114. P *saqirlāt* «warm wollen cloth; purpet; broadcloth» (Stg. 686);

cremixi «scarlet»; P *cremixi*: *qirmizi*; C *cremixi*: *qïrmïzï* (Grönbech considers the Coman form a mechanical repetition of the Latin) (92:29). — Pelg.

[61] *Nachus* and *nasicius* often occur side by side in our sources, and several researchers treat them together. W. Bang was the first to consider them in his *Über den angeblichen «Introitus natorum et nascitorum in den Genueser Steuerbüchern»*: *Bulletin de l'Académie Roy. de Belgique*, 1912, pp. 27—32. P. Pelliot, *Une ville musulmane dans la Chine du Nord sous les Mongols*: *Journ. As.* 1927 II, pp. 261—279. In this study Pelliot states that one of the trades of the 3000 Muslims transferred from around Samarqand was brocade making. (These people were settled in the North Chinese city of Hsün-ma-lin.) According to Chinese records these textiles were called *na-shih-shih* (*nàšiš* and *na-shih-ssû* (*našis*) in Mongol. Pelliot enlarged upon the explanation of *naq* and *nasīǰ* at this time (p. 269, note 1). Pelliot wished to elaborate on these two terms in his work *Notes on Marco Polo*, and even referred to the planned entry, *Nac and Mascici* (I, p. 332). Unfortunately, he never carried out his plan. Actually, Bretschneider, *Mediaeval Researches* II, pp. 124—125 already mentioned the data of Marco Polo and Pegolotti, and also referred to the *Secret History of the Mongols*, which includes *naqut* «a kind of gold brocate», and *načidut* «a silk stoff interwoven with gold» among the «presents» sent from Baghdad to Khan Ögödei. The Mongol text actually reads: *širamal altatan naqut načidut* (Ligeti, *Histoire secrète des Mongols*, in: *Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta* I, Budapest 1971, p. 247). Haenisch (*Wörterbuch*, p. 113) mistranslates *naqut* as «Golderz». *Naqut* is the Mongol plural of *naq*. *Načidut*, in turn, is the Mongol plural of *načit*, which also occurs in the *Secret History* (Mongolian text: *Monumenta* I, p. 204), in the passage containing the message of Chinghis to the Uighur *Iduqut*, instructing him on what presents he should bring before him. *Načit* is also a plural, derived from *načič*, *načīǰ* or some other related form. Since it is an irregular form, it needs further interpretation. Otherwise, double plurals are not rare in the above mentioned passage of the *Secret History*. Dozy, *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes* II, p. 648 contents that *nax* (referring to its Persian equivalent) was made in Tebriz, meaning, among other things, «étoffe de soie brochée d'or». Dozy II, p. 666 also contains the form *nasīǰ* of the same meaning. In both cases reference is made (via Defrémery) to Marco Polo's data.

I, 123 (*cremisi, chermesi, chermisi, chermisino, cremisino*); Heyd II, 608 (*chermisi*). P *qirmizī* «crimson, scarlet» (Stg. 183); A *qirmizī* «rouge, teint de rouge, cramoisi» (BK II, 725). Cf. Dozy II, 337;

bachami «red of brazil-wood»; P *bachami*: *baqami*; C *bachami*: *baqami* (92:30). — Heyd II, 587—590. The name of the tree in the Codex is *braçile*; P *bachâ*: *baqami*; C *bachan*: *baqam* (81:12); Peg. (Yule 167: «brazil-wood»). P *baqam, baqqam* «brazil-wood; the red extracted of it» (Stg. 194); Uig. *baqam* «arbre dit sapan (Caesalpinia sappan)» in *Acta Orient, Hung.* XIX, 137; A *baqqam* «bois de campêche employé dans la teinture; couleur rouge; teinture en rouge» (BK I, 151);

balaxius «ruby of Badakhshan»; P *balacs*: *balaxš*; C (another word) (93:12). — Pelg. I, 122 (*balscio, balasso, balagio* «gemma color rubino, cca 1230: *balagius*); Heyd II, 653—654; Peg. (Dr. 70); Polo (*balasci*, Pelliot I, 63—65); Schaf. 231 («balas ruby»). P *badaxš* «Badakhshan», *badaxšī* «a ruby» (Stg. 162); A *balaxš* «rubis balais, vient du mot *balakhchan*, qui est employé souvent pour désigner la province de Badakhchan» (Dozy I, 109).[62]

spinatium «spinach»; P *spanac*: *spanāq*; C *yspanac*: *ïspanaq* (106:25) — Pelg. I, 118 (*spinaci, spinachinum, spinachia*); Lauf. 392—398; Schaf. 146—147. *aspanāǰ, aspanāx, aspānaǰ* «herba pulmentis indi solita B. spinachia» (Vull. I, 89); A *asfānāx* «épinards» (Dozy I, 22).

The number of examples could be increased. It seems likely that all of them are international loanwords which occur in mediaeval Latin texts just as in several other contemporary documents. For the time being, it is hardly possible to establish the exact time and route of each borrowing. However, it is highly probable that none of the Italo-Latin words of the Codex is a direct borrowing from the Persian or Coman word mentioned next to it. The Genoan or Venetian features of these Italo-Latin words cannot be decisive in determining the nationality of the author, since they likely reflect both the dialect of the scribe, and the mechanical imitation typical of the contemporary clerical practice.

As is well known, the Codex contains Latin words, texts, and glosses in addition to the Italo-Latin material. To make things clearer let us return for a moment to the three paper-fascicules making up the Codex. The first two are related, forming an organic unit, so to speak. The Italo-Latin material was written on these two fascicules.

[62] Several researchers have dealt with the phonetic explanation of *balaxš*. On East Iranian $d > l$, see E. Benevistine, *Notes parthes et sogdiennes*: *Journ. As.* 1936, p. 234 (*Baδaxšān* > *Balaxšān*). Phonetically, the name of Baghdad (in mediaeval sources often *Baudach* or *Baldac*) calls for a totally different explanation. Marco Polo's manuscripts contain all the variants, see Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* I, pp. 90—91, s. v. *Baudac*. On the phonetic explanation, see: N. Pellegrini, *Gli arabismi nelle lingue neolatini* II, p. 588.

Originally, the third fascicule comprised a single independent booklet, made and used by Franciscan missionaries, before they got to know the Italians' guide for interpretors, written on two fascicules. It is possible that the existing third fascicule was preceded by a Franciscan first fascicule, which has not come down to us.

The extant third fascicule is worth studying closely. We can contend that the first two pages of it (today pp. 120—121) contain a «neutral» text: Coman riddles. It is this very material, totally different in content from the rest, which leads us to believe that these two pages may not be the beginning, but rather the continuation of an earlier, lost fascicule of similar contents.

The riddles are followed by a new subject, the actual subject-matter of the Franciscans, on pages 122—159. The bulk of it is religious writings in Coman along with a few comments on the Coman language and grammar.

The explanatory language of this part is exclusively Latin. Its word-lists also serve religious purposes, e.g. p. 131 contains: *baptiste(r)ium* «baptistery», *venalia pec(ca)ta* «venial sins», *confiteor* «I confess», etc. This Latin language also needs a thorough examination before we can rest content with the definition «mediaeval clerical Latin».

The Latin material of the Codex has a third group which should be subjected to an extensive investigation. It emerges in the glosses, and was obviously included by the German glossators. They can be found in the Italian part together with, or without, the later inserted German glosses. Most of them, however, are found on the blank pages at the end of the second and third fascicules, in other words, in the vicinity of the German glosses of the Codex.

For this reason alone we need to focus our attention on the other explanatory language of the Codex, German.

The hometown of G. Kuun was one of the centres of the Transylvanian Saxons. The Saxons were settled there by Géza II, king of Hungary, in the 12th century. Their privileges enabled them to preserve their language and culture. G. Kuun devoted special attention to this archaic German language, so he naturally looked closely at the German glosses of the Codex, as far as his rudimentary philological method allowed him to. This is evidenced by the appendix of his book entitled «Vocabularium Germano-Latinum» (pp. 353—368), which enumerates the German glosses of the Codex in alphabetic order.

In his review, Teza also touched upon the explanations which Kuun had added to the German glosses. Kuun responded to these comments in *Addidamenta zu dem germ. Glossen des Codex Cumanicus*, published in No. 11, Vol. XIV of *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde*, which is hard to come by these days. At any rate, Kuun was fully aware of the importance the German glosses had for the history of the German language. This awareness must have induced him to include an explanation of Busbecq's

Crimean Gothic glosses in the second appendix of his book (cf. Kuun, pp. 239—244).[63]

Grönbech also published an index of the German glosses of the Codex (*Wb.*, pp. 302—309).

Dagmar Drüll dwelled upon the German glosses of the Codex in her book. It is an indispensable work for Germanists, and some of its conclusions may be of interest to Turcologists as well.

The second, so-calid German part of the Codex has been examined more thoroughly by Turcologists, for unlike the first, it contains longer texts as well as words and grammatical material. Only on the basis of this German part it became possible to form a more or less satisfactory picture of the structure of the Coman language.

Let us see first some facts and figures before discussing this topic. The first, Italian part contains 110 pages, while the second or so-called German part contains 54, two of which are blank (134, 135), and one of which (152)

[63] It is well known that Ogier Ghislain Busbecq, a nobleman of Flemish origin, in the service of Ferdinand I of Austria as Imperial Ambassador to the Ottoman Porte, met with two envoys from the Crimea in Constantinople, one of whom knew the Crimean Gothic language. Busbecq included excerpts from this language in his fourth «Turkish letter»: two glossaries and sentences, and 18 cardinal numbers with Latin translation The beginning of a song (*cantilena*) was also added to this, without any translatien or comment. Many scholars have dealt with this famous record of the Crimean Gothic tongue, most recently: MacDonald Stearns, Jr., *Crimean Gothic. Analysis and Etymology of the Corpus*. Anma Libri 1978 (USA). This is a dissertation submitted at the University of California, Berkeley. Not only Germanists, but also outsiders interested in the migrations and linguistic conditions in the Crimea can greatly profit from it. The author gives a precise survey of the history of research. Also aware of Kuun's edition, he mentions that Kuun was the first scholar to trace the text of the mysterious *Cantilena* back to Turkish. No doubt his attempt is indefensible though he had followers. Stearns wisely refrains from interpreting this really enigmatic text. The comments of the Flemish Rubruk, on Crimean Gothic are well worth looking at in his paper also (Wyngaert, *Sinica Franciscana* I, p. 170: *Goti quorum ydioma est teutonicum*). It is of greater import here that Iosaphat Barbaro, a Venetian merchant and traveller wrote in his book, entitled *Viaggio alla Tana*, that while living in Tana between 1436 and 1452, he visited the Crimea and noticed that the Goths living there spoke German. As evidence of this, he refers to his German servant's conversation with these Goths which sounded like two dialects of the same language, like Friuli compared with Florentine (*Gothi parlano todesco; so questo perche, havendo un fameglio todesco con mi, parlavano, insiene et intendevansi assai rasevolmente, cusi como se intenderia un furlano co fiorentino*). MacDonals Stearns (p. 7) quotes Barbaro's text from the edition of E. C. Skržinskaja. E. Schütz, *The* Tat *people in the Crimea: Acta Orient. Hung.* XXXI (1977), p. 93 is sceptical of Barbaro's report and the traditions related to the Gothic language in the Crimea. Georgius Torquatus, a German historian and theologian made a striking statement around 1560, referring to earlier sources. He said that the Crimean Goths used their native tongue only among themselves, otherwise communicating with foreigners they used Greek, Tatar or Hungarian (*foris autem et ad alios vel graeca vel Tartarica sive Ungarica utuntur lingua*; MacDonald Stearns, p. 9).

contains the notes of the last owner of the Codex. The actual German parts, the (Coman-German) glossaries can be found only at the beginning and the end of the second part, on pp. 111, 113, 114, 115, 116 and 160, 161, 162, 163, 164. These are complemented by a few little here and there: one word on p. 117, and two German glosses on p. 118 (which also contains an Italian verse and a Latin-Coman vocabulary in hardly legible condition).

As was earlier mentioned, the Italian part also contains German glosses, added to it later. They amount to only 15 in the 110 pages. These 15 words throw interesting light on the command of languages of the missionaries. A part of the glosses can be accounted for by the fact that the missionaries, not understanding the Italo-Latin words, inserted either the Latin equivalents they used, or the German forms, if their native language was German (in theutonico). They also added a gloss to a word if the Coman form did not coincide with the one they knew; in such instances the explanation was in German.[64]

Thus, the German glosses consist of single words and expressions. The number of glosses inserted later into the Italian part is 15. Adding these to the

[64] In the case of the unfamiliar Italo-Latin words, the lines are complete, containing both the Latin and the Persian and Coman equivalents. The latter is followed by the German gloss meant to clarify its meaning. Such are: 1. *blasmo* «to curse», P. *nafrin mecunem*: *nafrin mēkunem*, C *cagirmen*: *cayırmen*, in theutonico *scäppin* (9, 20); *culo uinum* «to purify wine», P *mepalanem*: *mēpālānem*, C *susarmen*: *süzärmen*, G *Ich sye* (16:1); *culaui*, P *palanden*: *pālāndem*, C *suxdum*: *süzdüm*, G *ich sey* (16:2). It also occurs that the complete line of three items is supplemented with a Coman addition, which in turn is explained by the German gloss, e.g. *veletrum* «penis», P *cher*: *kēr*, C *sic*: *sik* (95:17). For the sake of clarity, the writer added the adjective *trienir*, read *tirenir*, to the Coman entry, followed by the German gloss *stet pitte*, having the same meaning. After the last, Coman item of the three item line, he added another Coman word without any precedence, and attached a German gloss to it, e.g. (99:6) *auogulus* «blind» (cf. Fr. *aveugle*), P *nebian*: *nēbīnā*, C *touluc*: *tövlük*. He then put down C *kotur*: *cotur* «scourf» with no Latin or Persian antecedent, and explained it with the word *š*(*orf*). At another point, the Coman item of the tripartite line is replaced by a Coman word, followed by its correspondent German gloss, which has no connection whatever with the previous two items, e.g. (95::22) *brion'* «the muscles of the upper arm», P *ghost ibaxou*: *gōšt-i bāzū*; the corresponding Coman word is missing, and instead we find *koymič* «rump bone»: *qoymič*, G *der arsbeyn*. Or, only the Latin word is put down. The German scribe who knew no Persian, left the Persian column blank, but inserted the correct Coman word in the appropriate column, followed by a German gloss, e.g. (95:20) *petengriû* «backside, buttocks», C *koti*: *köt-i* (*i* is 3rd person Gen. suffix), G *der ars*. Examining the 15 German glosses of the Italian part should direct our attention to the importance of the Latin and other glosses of this part which were inserted by foreign hands. Most of them were singled out by G. Kuun in the notes of his edition, but Grönbech's facsimile edition enables us to look at them much more closely. The following are later additions: (35:5) *marcesco* «to turn pale, to fade, to wilt», C *oŋarmen*: *oŋarmen*, G *valwit*, and as such, they are crammed into the Latin column: (16:25) *color* «dye», G *varbe*, C *boyiow*. It should be stressed again that the dialect of the Latin and Coman glosses inserted later into the Italian part differ greatly from that of the Italian ones.

225 glosses on the blank sheets at the beginning of the second part (8 German glosses corresponding to 8 Latin words are missing on page 114 due to damage), and to the 254 glosses on the blank pages at the end of the second part, we arrive at the total number of German glosses in the Codex Cumanicus, 499.

The location of the German glosses in the Codex coincides with that of similar Latin glosses, both are located at the beginning and the end of the second part.

To sum up, only 50 of the 54 pages of the extant second part contain written texts. 40 of these pages contain only Latin glosses next to the Coman material (some of these were inserted in small letters above certain words of the Coman text which needed elucidation). Only 10 pages come indisputably from German friars.

Out of respect for the tradition of my predecessors, I retained the label «German» for the second part, with the restriction that it should, in fact, be called the Book of Franciscan missionaries. These missionaries naturally included Germans (the authors of the German glosses), as well as other nationalities. Our sources reveal that there were Hungarian, German, English, French, Italian and even Polish friars in these monasteries. The sources also bear out, as confirmed by Miss Drüll (p. 130, note 257), that the Hungarians, Germans and Englishmen mastered the Coman language most easily, while the French and Italian friars had difficulties.[65] Whenever they had the chance, the non-German monks added their comments to the Codex naturally in Latin.

[65] This statement is based on a letter of 1323 sent by a Franciscan friar from Kaffa to Avignon. The Hungarian friars' ability to master the Coman language quickly must have been due to the fact that Coman was not totally alien to them as in those days a significant number of Comans lived in Hungary, and they still used their language. Richard, *La Papauté et les missions d'Orient*, p. 94 sqq enlarged upon the activities of missionaries in the territories of the Golden Horde. Between 1279 and 1284 the provost of the Franciscan order sent numerous missionaries of various nationalities *ad partes infidelium aquilonares*. Several letters from these missionaries tell of the hardships and occasional successes of the propagation of their faith. E.g., in a letter to the provost of the order, Frater Johanca of Hungary reported that he and his companions were following the migrating nomads (*castra Tartarorum sequendo*). While visiting Sarai, some Bashkir dignitaries asked them for missionaries, and in response three Franciscans, an Englishman and two Hungarians, were sent to the Bashkirs. The Mongol lord of Sibir, around Tobol, also asked for missionaries. Johanca complained that he was unable to meet the requirements, and begged the order to send more missionaries, possibly Englishmen, Germars, or Hungarians. Johanca was apparently very efficient as in 1321 he baptized *Estokis*, «dominus totius Baschardiae». Incidentally, the Franciscans often purchased slaves for themselves. «Convertis au christianisme, ils recevaient la cléricature, certains devenaient convers ou même frères dans l'ordre franciscain. Et dans ces missions où la question des languages se posait avec acuité, les Franciscains pouvaient ainsi disposer de catéchistes ou d'interprètes» (Richard, *op. cit.*, p. 97).

A careful examination of the German glosses also reveals some new information about the Coman material of the Codex. It is conspicuous that this material contains a good many words of unknown origin, while its loanwords include several of Mongol and even Caucasian origin. The Kipchak material of the lexicon is identical in nature with the specific form of the second part, but apparently contains phonemic and lexical differences. It would be worth while working on this Coman material for purposes comparison.[66]

Miss Drüll's Germanistic arguments are very attractive for an outsider. Let me, however, add two remarks. First, Miss Drüll distinguishes 16 different hands in the German part. Isn't that a few too many cooks in the kitchen? Second, Miss Drüll maintains that the German material has Middle-High German roots (we have suspected this too), but exceptions to this rule crop up in the glosses. This can hardly come as a surprise. The German friars did not come from one particular province, or locale, but from different places in the large German-speaking world. The cohesion among these friars was not rooted in their nostalgic desire to foster a certain language (even if some of them used

[66] Miss Drüll also gives the modern German meaning of the German glosses found in the trilingual part (see pp. 125—128). Her non-German readers can only be too sorry that she failed to do the same with the German glosses of the second part (pp. 107—123). Even Grönbech had difficulties in reading and interpreting some German glosses. On the Mongol elements of the Coman language, see N. Poppe, *Die mongolischen Lehnwörter im Komanischen*, in *Németh Armağanı*, Ankara 1962, pp. 331—340. Let us refer here only to some Mongol loan words in the vicinity of German glosses; the German interpretation of the Codex is followed by Grönbech's translation. E.g.: *arčila-* «ich scheyde; einen Streit beilegen»; *čeber* (*kiši*) «en reynlich ma'; nett, anständig»; *elpek* «óberik; übrig»; *emegän* «en babe; alte Frau»; *eremsi-* «birumet sich; prahlen»; *erkelen-* «hae czar[t]; «weichlich, verzärtelt sein»; *kenetä* «gelich; plötzlich»; *sergek* «ein wachinde man; wachsam, wach»; *seröün* (*serovn*; Gr.'s reading as *serövün* is not convincing) «kvle; kühl»; *solayay* «eyn liker; Linkshändler»; *totχar* «schade; Böses, Schaden»; *udā* (Gr. *udaa*) «no; nacheinander»; *yege* «breit; breit». Poppe's list fails to include *daraya* «eyn greve; Oberhaupt, Gouverneur. Ähnl.»; *qurulta* «hof; Ratsversammlung; *enči* in: *enčim* «miynes selber; Eigentum.» A Caucasian loan word: *kešene* «der t(oden) hu(w) (Gr.), des toden hws (Dr.)»; «Grabhügel (?)». This word is detectable in some cognate languages of Coman: Karachay *k'ešene* «Friedhof», Balkar *kešene* «Gruft, Mausoleum» (see G. Schmidt, *Über die kaukasischen Lehnwörter des Karatschaischen* in: *MSFOu.* LXVII, p. 468). On occasion even Grönbech, a well-versed scholar, had difficulties with German interpretations, and this naturally hindered the precise indentification of the related Coman words. Such is: *čerê* «en kopicze». Kuun's explanation, *koppizen* «eructare» (p. 360) is unacceptable. It is not impossible that Radloff's interpretation (*Wb.* IV, p. 199) «der Heuhaufen (?)» (s. v. *ceren*) is correct, since Balkar contains a word *ceren* «Garbe» (Pröhle: *KSz.* XV, 214). See also Vl. Drimba, *Quelques mots comans précisés par leurs gloses allenades*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* III/IV (1979—1980), pp. 205—214. But the three subsequent words of the Codex: (p. 162; Kuun pp. 227—228) *saygät* «des heres teyl», *kölöüt*, ? *bölöüt* «des vundes teyl», *yovacä* «des marctes teyl» are still a mystery. D. Drüll's semantic definitions would have been of great help here.

it as a prop for their difficult work), but rather in their pious intention to convert Comans to the Christian faith.

So far so good.

The seemingly firm, logical foundation of this argument, however, totters if we recall the paperstructure of the Codex. The first, Italian part contains two fascicules with 118 pages, 110 of them used by the Italians. Pp. 111—118 were left blank. Surprisingly, the third fascicule begins on page numbered 119 today. On this page the Coman riddles begin, followed by the Coman texts, and the glosses of the Franciscan friars in Latin. This continues until page 151, when several pages are left blank (pp. 152, 153, 154, 155 and 158). Pages 157 and 158 contain a few lines at the top. The last continuous Coman passage can be found on page 159.

From all indications, the next five pages (160—164) were also left blank. It cannot be a coincidence that the five blank pages of the second fascicule and the similar five pages of the third fascicule are filled up with G e r m a n glosses.

This prompts the supposition that the Codex Cumanicus passed through three, not two hands: 1. Italian colonists; 2. Franciscan friars with a knowledge of Latin; and 3. clerical and (lay) persons of German origin.

The Germans may also have been Franciscans, they may have been missionaries as well. Nevertheless, it is certain that the German glosses were the last items to be added to the Codex, since they take up only the pages left blank. This circumstance contradicts the earlier view that the religious Coman texts of the Latin-speaking Franciscans were written by German glossators. Were this true, we would inevitably come across a German glossary or some other evidence pointing to German origin among the clerical passages. Such, however, cannot be found. It is also striking that the clerical purpose of the German glosses is not all that apparent either.

In his edition of the Codex, G. Kuun amply commented on its Italian verses, jumping to the conclusion that they were written by the great Italian poet Petrarca, the alleged owner of the Codex. Teza did not neglect this question either, and following Kuun's path, he deciphered several Italian verses which remained illegible for Kuun. His firm conviction that the poems had nothing to do with Petrarca was later confirmed by other Italian literary scholars. In a new, authentic edition these poems must be, of course, included. They have no bearing upon the Coman, or for that matter upon any other language of the Codex, but they cannot be ignored with regard to its history.

To sum up the research to date, it can be concluded that the Codex Cumanicus was made up of two independent parts. The first can be called the «Interpretors' Book» (pp. 1—110), and the second the «Missionaries' Book» (pp. 111—164).

The Interpretors' Book was compiled using earlier, so far unknown, sources in one of the Italian colonies along the Black Sea. Its compiler remains unknown. Besides Genoa, Venice also figures in its origins. The work must have been frequently copied at the behest of the Italian colonists, and was used by both Genoans and Venetians. The date of its origin is unsettled. The hypothesis that its predecessor goes back to late (perhaps mid-) 13th century, cannot be excluded. The date July 11th, 1303, at the very beginning of the Codex, was preserved in the existing copy which itself dates from around 1330. This precise date (July 11th, 1303) does not mark the date of writing so much as the date of beginning (or ending) of the copying. No copy made by an Italian in an Italian colony has come down to us. The existing copy was made in a Franciscan monastery around 1330.

The predecessor of the Missionaries' Book is shrouded in even deeper mystery. From its original contents, only the so-called third fascicule remained extant headed by the Coman riddles.

This inherited part is followed by the clerical passages used for missionary purposes. It should be stressed, however, that the copy of cc. 1330 was not suitable for missionary objectives, and most probably was not used for such. A letter of Pascal intimates its purpose insomuch as he states in it that the Franciscans (and other friars and tradesmen) went to Sarai to learn Coman.[67] The 1330 copy did not yet contain the glosses. The extant copy of 1330 might have been made in the Monastery St. John, but it might just as well have been written in Sarai.

On the other hand nothing proves that the Missionaries' Book, dating from around 1340—1356, was likewise compiled in the Monastery of St. John, in nearly Sarai. Should this hypothesis hold ground, the question why the Franciscan friars of the monastery waited for over ten years to start with the Missionaries' Book could not be explained.

[67] The friars of the Monastery of St. John were by no means native Germans exclusively, since it was here that the intriguing story of Frater Stephen of Peterwaradin (a town in one-time Hungary called *Pétervárad*) took place. The young Franciscan publicly converted to Islam, but soon after regretted his step, and returned to the Christian faith. This enraged the Muslims, however, so they tore friar Stephen apart, and burned him. His martyrdom was included in the histories of the Franciscan order. Pascal of Vittoria also relates this story in 1338 for his fellow friars left in the Convent of Vittoria from Almalik (*Armalec*). This letter also reveals that Pascal set out from Tana, and arrived in Sarai accompanied by Greeks. His fellow missionaries went on to Urgenj (*Urganth*). He did not join them because he wanted to learn the Coman language and Uighur script in the capital. His Franciscan brothers returned to their monastery from Urgenj, but Pascal remained and preached the faith in the newly mastered language, without, as he stressed, an interpretor. He had been in Sarai for over a year when the martyrdom of Stephen took place. The rest of his letter gives a somewhat vague account of his missionary activities, and of his return to Almalik. Cf. Yule, *Cathay and the Way Thither* III, pp. 81—86.

It seems highly likely that the place of origin of the Missionaries' Book was another, presently undetermined, monastery. In this monastery, the Persian language was no longer needed (as opposed to the vicinity of Sarai), and what is more, a substantially different dialect of the Coman tongue was spoken.

As was seen, this monastery was not the final resting place of the Missionaries' Book. It went on to a third monastery operated by German friars. These friars also obtained the Interpretors' Book, and it was they who filled in the blank pages of the two books with German and Latin glosses.

The three fascicules subsequently passed from the German Franciscans to the Italians again under unknown circumstances.

Finally, the last owner of the Codex has to be mentioned. The following can be read on the originally blank page 156: «iste liber est de Antonio de Finale». This is followed by a verse putting the plague on anyone who tries to steal the book, a common inclusion in mediaeval books. G. Kuun discussed this curse in detail (pp. 218—219). E. Teza also touched upon it in his review (elucidating the abbreviations), he read *malla morte non videatur* in the second to last line. G. Kuun rightly refused the reading *videatur* in his Hungarian response to the criticism (p. 11), replacing it with *viduetur*, the only reading which fits the context. The meaning of the curse confirms him: who ever steals my book «shall not be deprived of the bad death (the plague shall not avoid him)».

According to Kuun, it argues in favour of the Genoan origin of the Italo-Latin part that this certain Antonio di Finale (the reading *Ziuale* or *Zinale* adopted by Györffy is unwarrantable) came from a renowned Genoan family, also called di Finari or di Finar. Referring to an oral comment made by S. Simoni, Kuun claims that a member of the family, Andreas di Finale, is mentioned in documents of the 14th century.[68]

For some reason, the Ligurian origin of the di Finale family is still used today as a big argument in favour of the Genoan origin of the Codex. Somehow it has escaped the attention of researchers that the registration certifying the ownership of di Finale is on a page belonging to the third fascicule of the Codex, and this is the really crucial piece of evidence, it proves that the Codex was no longer in the possession of Italian colonists, nor in the hands of the Franciscans of the Monastery of St. John, near Sarai. But it did not belong to the

[68] D. Drüll reiterates (pp. 131—132) Kuun's arguments in favour of the Genoan origin of de Finale, quoting data on the possible family relations from documents dating from 1281, 1289 and 1290, edited by Brătianu: Naturally, the 14th century reference mentioned by Kuun is not among them. Györffy gives the authentic text of this remarkable record after Frati (*Versi italiani*, p. 7): *Iste liber est de ant(onio) de Ziuale (Zinale?) q(ui) manet aput. Qui sc(ri)ssit sc(ri)bat semper c(um) do(mi)no viuat in celix ant(onius) no(m)i(n)e felix. Qui me furat(ur) malla m(or)te no(n) uid(u)atur n(o)n.*

Franciscans compiling the Missionaries' Book, nor to the German Franciscans, who had apparently disposed of it in some way or another. According to the dating of the paper of the third fascicule, the Codex must have come into di Finale's possession around (or probably after) 1356, from whom strangers, the Venetians, obtained it, despite all the threats of plague. How and when did this happen?

The Codex Cumanicus has not yet unveiled all its secrets . . .

UMANICUS

the German Franciscans,
nother. According to the
must have come into di
3, from whom strangers,
f plague. How and when

its secrets . . .

CODEX CUMANICUS

BIBLIOTHECÆ

AD TEMPLUM DIVI MARCI VENETIARUM

PRIMUM EX INTEGRO EDIDIT

PROLEGOMENIS NOTIS ET COMPLURIBUS GLOSSARIIS INSTRUXIT

COMES GÉZA KUUN,

ACAD. SC. HUNG. SODALIS

BUDAPESTINI

EDITIO SCIENT. ACADEMIÆ HUNG.

1880

PRÆFATIO.

Opus editionis totius codicis cumanici bibliothecæ ad divi Marci Venetiarum sex abhinc annis a me susceptum tandem exequutus sum. Hoc opus sane arduum mihi etiam eo aggravavi, quod prolegomena, annotationes interpretationemque textuum cumanicorum lingua latina scribenda constitueram. Linguam latinam ob duas causas elegi 1, quod hujus generis opera lingua omnibus viris doctis notissima scribi debent 2, glossæ vocabularii cumanici in ipso codice Venetiano per vocabula latina explicatæ sunt. Te autem candide Lector! oro atque obsecro, ut mihi defectus et menda sane multa et gravia styli benigne ignoscas. Hoc quoque bene scio nec prolegomena defectibus et erroribus exemta fore, nam ea procul a suppelectili bibliothecarum in solitudine castelli Maros-Némethiensis conscribere necesse habui, attamen confidenter spero me saltem in solutione quarundam quæstionum arduarum proxime ad verum accessisse. Etiam in lectione et interpretatione vocabulorum textuumque cumanicorum me sæpe errare haudquaquam me latet.

Viris doctis Antonio Schiefner, lib. baroni Carolo Geringer, Carolo Julio Schröer, Ottoni Keller, Attilio Hortis, Gabrieli de Bálint, Angelo de Gubernatis et Aroni de Szilády acceptas refero nonnullas observationes et indicationes summi momenti, quas illi mihi roganti insigni bene-

volentia communicaverunt. Insuper doct. Schröer mihi interpretationem glossarum germanicarum hujus codicis humanissime suppeditavit. Denique cl. præfecti bibliothecæ „Marcianæ" viri summæ doctrinæ et humanitatis Johannis Veludo et ill. comitis C. Soranzo erga me benevolentiam silentio prætermittere non possum.

Ad explicandas glossas cumanicas præcipue professoris Vámbéry vere egregio glossario čagataico, A. Hindoglu vocabulario osmanico et Gabrielis de Bálint glossario Kazanico usus sum. Id quoque annotatum esse volo, nos in notis editionis glossas cumanicas præcipue osmanicis et Kazanicis comparasse, quia illæ apud nos magis notæ sunt, quam aliarum dialectorum formæ, hæ vero ad cumanicas recte explicandas maxime idoneæ sunt. Ad formam osmanicam in hac operis parte interdum non annotavimus, eam arabicæ vel persicæ esse originis, quoniam in vocabulario cumanico editioni nostræ adjuncto quæ ad originem arabicam vel persicam spectant, locis suis annotata inveniuntur, in quo glossas cumanicas præcipue cum čagataicis et Kazanicis comparavimus.

Denique de multis impressionis erratis nobis graviter conquerendum est, quæ sane longe pauciora fuissent, si nobis per totum illud tempus Budapestini degere licuisset. Emendationem erratorum lector benevolus fine operis inveniet. Nonnullæ emendationes, quæ ad lectionem interpretationemque glossarum codicis spectant, in vocabulario cumanico et persico inveniuntur.

Dabam Maros-Némethii, Anno 1879, Kalendis Juliis.

PROLEGOMENA.

I.

Codex latino-persico-cumanicus, quem nunc primum ex integro luci publicae damus, in catalogo codicum bibliothecae ad templum divi Marci Venetiarum consilio et labore quondam celeberrimi hujus bibliothecae praefecti Antonii Zanetti conscripto sic breviter signatus est:

«Codex DXLIX

in 4°, chartaceus, foliorum 62, Saeculi XIV.

Lexicon latinum, persicum et comanicum.

Initio legitur:

MCCCIII. die XI. Julii.»

Zanetti hanc brevem mentionem codicis in calce catalogi fecit, videlicet sub titulo: «Appendix codicum, qui nuper in parte superiori ducalis ecclesiae inventi sunt». Doctissimus bibliothecarius initio appendicis observat: «Ex his aliquot, quos scilicet asterisco signavimus, descripsit Tomasinus in Biblioth. Ven. Mss. pag. 56.»[1]

Tomasinus loco citato de hoc codice ita scripsit:

«Alphabetum persicum, comanicum et latinum Anonymi, scriptū anno MCCCIII die XI Julij. Cuius libri initium est tale. In nomine Domini Jesu Christi etc.

Hec sunt prima verba et nomina de litera *A*.

audio	mesnoem	esiturmen
audis	mesnoy	esitursen
audit	mesnoet	esitir».

[1] V. «Latina et italica D. Marci Bibliotheca Codicum manu scriptorum.» MDCCXLI.

Tomasinus codicem cumanicum ait a Francisco Petrarcha, humaniorum litterarum in Italia instauratore, serenissimae reipublicae Venetorum cum aliquot aliis codicibus donatum esse et hoc loco de pretioso dono uberius disputans enumerationem codicum acceptam Fortunato Ulmo refert: «Codices qui adhuc extant è bibliotheca Francisci Petrarchæ, ut mihi communicavit D. Fortunatus Ulmus abbas cassinensis.»[1] Doctissimus Ulmus in historia monasterii S. Georgii ab eo, dum in hoc claustro degeret, ex antiquis annalibus et documentis conscripta de hac re ita loquitur:

«Era in Venezia il Petrarca nel 1362 quando donò la sua libreria alla Republica; il che scrive il Sansovino nel libro secondo a carte 25, dove parla della Chiesa del santo sepolcro. Qualche poco residuo dei libri della quale da me ricercati et riconosciuti per ordine degli Eccellentissimi Procuratori di San Marco Francesco Moresini, Girolamo Cornaro, et in particolare di Francesco Molino all' hora Cassiere fu inventariato, e datagline la nota nel 1634. L'altra maggior parte de quali, per neglienza de vecchi ministri, essendo perita, darà che piangere a' buoni in ogni avvenire; quando intenderano, che, essendo già riposti come in un sacrario per ordine buono de vecchi Procuratori in certo camerone sopra la chiesa di San Marco, accompagnati anco da una moltitudine di singolari scritture publiche, e de particulari; è risorta quindi un' immensa perdita della maggior parte di queste cose tutte; altre da topi divorate, altre offese dall' humidità, in maniera tale, che con questa congiogendosi gran quantità di polvere: si sono quindi impetriti la maggior parte de i libri, e delle scritture stesse. Per più di dugento pezzi de' originali delle quali importantissime, et al publico spettanti rimaste illese, ho io con somma fatica, et diligenza ricuperate, et offerte divotamente al Serenissimo Principe Francesco Erizzo. Tra quali vi è quella

[1] Bibliothecae venetae manuscriptae publicae et privatae (quibus etc.) opera Jacobi Philippi Tomasini episcopi aemoniensis. Utini, Typis Nicolai Schiratti. MDCL.

autentica de patti nel 1123 di Domenico Michele Doge con Guarimondo Patriarca di Gierusaleme, et Baroni del Regno, et altre non meno degne, De quali tutte, et de libri residui del Petrarca ho formatone gl' Inventarij, et consegnatili l'uno ad medesimo Serenissimo Principe et Eccellentissimo Collegio, l'altro agli Eccellentissimi Procuratori hora viventi Francesco Molino, Gio. Nani Kav^re et Gio. Pesaro Kav^re.» Codex manuscriptus Fortunati Ulmi, ex quo textum hunc citavi, in bibliotheca D. Marci Venetiis asservatur.[1] Sansovinus (Franciscus, 1521—1586), quem Fortunatus Ulmus, loco citato allegat in descriptione sua Urbis Venetae de dono Petrarchae et de curatione librorum suorum per mandatum Patrum amplissimorum urbis adhibita in sequentibus ad lectorem refert: «Considerando quanto habbi ad esser à laude di Dio, e del B. Marco Euangelista, et ad honor et fama, quello ch'è offerto per D. Francesco Petrarcha, la cui fama hoggi è tâta in tutto il mondo, che non si ha in memoria di huomini, che fra Christiani sia stato giamai, ò sia, un Filosofo Morale, et un Poeta, che gli si possa paragonare, sia accettata la sua oblatione secondo la forma della infrascritta polizza scritta di sua mano. Et sia preso, che si possa spendere del Monte, per la casa, et habitatione sua in vita sua per modo di affitto, si come parerà alli Consiglieri, et Capi, ò alla maggior parte offerendo li Procuratori della Chiesa di S. Marco, far le spese necessarie per il luogo doue haueranno ad esser riposti, et conseruati i suoi libri.» Ecce tenor testamenti, ad quem Sansovinus allusit: «Desidera Francesco Petrarcha di hauer herede il B. Marco Euangelista se cosi piacerà à Christo, et à lui, di non so quanti libretti, i quali egli possiede al presente ò che forse possederà. Con questo che i libri non sieno venduti, ne per qual si voglia modo mal trattati, ma sieno conseruati in alcun luogo da esser deputato à questo effetto, il qual sia sicuro dal fuoco, et dalle pioggiè à honor di esso

[1] I. VII, 217, f. 438.

Santo, et à memoria di esso FRANCESCO, et per consolazione, et commodo perpetuo degli ingegnosi, et nobili di questa Città, che si dileteranno di cose tali» etc.[1] TOMASINUS in pretioso suo libro «PETRARCHA Redivivus» de diversis bibliothecis PETRARCHÆ et de libris ab eo serenissimae reipublicae Venetae dono oblatis quaedam memoriae prodidit, quae digna sunt, ut hic repeterentur: «Huius vero muneris memoriam publico in aede S. Sepulchri monumento conservari placuit Venetiis. Plures autem PETRARCHAM habuisse bibliothecas ex ipsius Epistolis cõstat. Nimirum in Valle clausa unam, quam filius custodis domus, dum in Vallem latrones irruerent, translatam in Arcem ab impiorum furore liberavit. Alteram Parmae, quam sub Italici Parnassi nomine concelebrat: tertiam Veronae, in qua sub die XXV. Januarii Anno pestilentiae memorabili terraemotum praesensit. Nec Arquadae in Collibus suburbanis hac supellectile destituebatur. Epistolas CICERONIS ad ATTICUM calamo scriptas è bibliotheca PETRARCHÆ apud PETRUM VICTORIUM ingentis doctrinae virum dilaudat SEBASTIANUS CORRADUS in Praefatione Scholiorum ad Lectorem. Ex quibus omnibus selectiores Reipublicae Serenissimae donasse jam senio confectum credibile est. Quamquam et bona rariorum pars aliò fuerit distracta, è quibus Aetnam CLAUDIANO ascriptam se vidisse fatetur LILIUS GYRALDUS de Latinis Poetis dialogo IV. Nec tamen ii Codices in Bibliothecam D. MARCI repositi, sed in peculiarem locum trâslati in sacrae Aedis fastigio, apud equos aeneos Plateam versus, ubi commissariae (ut loquuntur) scripturae Procuratorum D. MARCI asservantur, propè cellam Abbatis JOACHIMI. Unde me in eos inquirente Illustriss. Viri et de re litteraria bene meriti D. BENEDICTI CAPELLI Serenissimi FRANCISCI ERIZZI Ducis ex sorore nepotis indicio, pro summa ipsius vigilantia in lucem producti, inque ordinem ut licuit redacti, providentia Illustrissimorum Senatorum ac D. MARCI Procuratorum FRANCISCI MAUROCENI, FRANCISCI MOLINI The-

[1] V. SANSOVINI lib. «de rebus Venetis».

saurarii, et JOANNI
vierat edax tempo
urbes destruuntur.
inter manus penè
mutatum. Laudan
ULMI Abbatis C
decreto haec erat
et eximium PETRA
dicaret. Horum,
viro laudato ad
ingratum spero.

Missale vetust
reperitur memoria

Antiphonariu

Psalterium in

Praecationes

Libri Job, et
4 magno, membr.

Prosperi Aqu

Aristotelis O
De Meteoris, De

Virgilij Aenei

Horatius de

Parabola Mag
Generales curation
Illustriss. Regis F
Item Abbreuiatio
Conseruanda Sani
Crisi. Tractatus
pervenerunt omni

Compendium

[1] Hic ARNOLDUS
fertur, litteris graecis, h
studium navavit. V. lib.

saurarii, et Joannis Nani. Immane vero in ipsos Codices saevierat edax temporis calamitas eo dente, quo theatra, moles, urbes destruuntur. Adeo quicquid heic erat partim in pulverê inter manus penè collapsum, partim (dictu mirum) in saxa mutatum. Laudanda heic in primis egregia Cl. D. Fortunati Ulmi Abbatis Cassinensis diligentia, cui Sereniss. Senatus decreto haec erat commissa cura, ut libellos tenebris eximeret, et eximium Petrarchae donum à temporis situ, ac tineis vindicaret. Horum, quos fortuna superstites voluit, Syllabum à viro laudato ad me perhumaniter transmissum curiosis non ingratum spero.

Missale vetustum in membranis in folio maiori, in quo non reperitur memoria Conceptionis B. Mariae Virginis.

Antiphonarium geminum fol. in membr.

Psalterium in 8. in membr. et Breuiarium in 8. membr.

Praecationes Missae solemnes fol. paruo, membr.

Libri Job, et Salomonis Sapientia, Ecclesiastes, et Cantica in 4 magno, membr.

Prosperi Aquitani Carmina in 4. membr.

Aristotelis Opera, De Physico Auditu, De Caelo, et Mundo, De Meteoris, De Generatione, et de Anima.

Virgilij Aeneis in fol. paruo, membr.

Horatius de Arte Poetica in 4. membr.

Parabola Magistri Arnoldi de Villa Noua scilicet Regulae Generales curationis morborum factae, (ut ipse ait) ad honorem Illustriss. Regis Franciae D. Philippi. Item Canones de Podagra. Item Abbreuiatio Regiminis auctorum. Tabulae. Item liber de Conseruanda Sanitate. Abbreuiatio libri Prognosticorum, ubi et de Crisi. Tractatus Astrologicus pro Medicis. Quae hodie ad nos pervenerunt omnia Lugd. impressa 1504. et alibi.[1]

Compendium Medicinalis Astrologiae a Fratre Nicolao de

[1] Hic Arnoldus natus est in *Ville neuve* (in Languedoc), anno 1250. Uti refertur, litteris graecis, hebraicis et arabicis a juvenili aetate magna cum sollicitudine studium navavit. V. lib. Strobelbergeri «historia monspeliensis» inscriptum.