



Review: [untitled]
Author(s): T. Gandjeï
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1961), pp. 364-365
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/610180
Accessed: 19/03/2011 06:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and *School of Oriental and African Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

http://www.jstor.org

matter to his own work since all the important documents were published. This does not prevent him listing all the F.O. 78 series from 1873 to 1914 in his bibliography. Even his use of published sources does not inspire confidence. He misses some obvious studies such as A. C. Wood, *A history of the Levant Company*, and F. R. Chesney, *Narrative of the Euphrates expedition*, which must be the starting-point for any account of this project. His account of Anglo-French rivalry in Persia is based largely on J. W. Kaye, *The life and correspondence of Sir John Malcolm*, and makes no use of Wellesley's dispatches, little of other published documents, and none of any archival material.

It is not easy to feel happy about Professor Saleh's interpretation of his evidence. He misinterprets a statement by Professor Margoliouth and uses it as support for the argument that official British policy was opposed to the Pan-Islamic movement. He dismisses Dr. Chapman's argument that the Baghdad railway was not an important cause of the first world war, nor a major problem in pre-war years, on *a priori* grounds. 'What really counts in international affairs are ultimate objectives and basic motives which ... are of a thoroughly egotistical nature' (p. 287). He claims that down to 1830 'Britain strengthened her hold on Persia' (p. 113) and completely misunderstands the nature of the modifications of the Preliminary Treaty of 1809, and the subsequent actions of Castlereagh and Canning, which show clearly that Britain was steadily withdrawing from her commitments in Persia, because they were likely to involve her in hostilities with Russia.

One final point ought to be made. Professor Saleh is writing in a foreign language and it is necessary to make allowances for certain peculiarities of spelling and phraseology. But allowances may lead to misunderstandings. It is difficult to read, for example, the passage on pp. 190–4, which describes certain negotiations concerning the operations of the Lynch Company, without deriving the impression that the author must be implying that something much more significant than is apparent lies behind this seemingly unimportant affair.

M. E. YAPP

Sir GERARD CLAUSON: *Sanglāx: a Persian guide to the Turkish language, by Muḥammad Mahdī Xān. Facsimile text, with an introduction and indices.* ('E. J. W. Gibb Memorial' Series, New Series, xx.) [vii], 113 pp., 732 facsims. London: Luzac and Co. Ltd., 1960. 63*s*.

The publication of the *Sanglāx* since the edition of the *Mabāni'l-luġat*, the grammatical section of the *Sanglāx*, by the late Sir Denison Ross, which was followed by the excellent studies of Eckmann and Menges, has been a desideratum for Turcology. The present work is a facsimile edition of the *Sanglāx* provided with a long and learned introduction and various indices. The editor discusses in detail all problems concerning the work and its edition. I should like to touch briefly upon two points.

p. 8 seq., para. 26. Here, as was the case in the preceding studies, the identity of the author, so important, especially for this work, remains unclarified. A hitherto unknown document can, I think throw a little light on this subject. In a *Majmū'a-yi Munša'āt*,[1] containing letters written in Arabic and Persian, we come across three letters in Turkish, two of them from Navā'ī's *Munša'āt*, and the third a letter written by Mīrzā Mahdī Xān on behalf of Ibrāhīm Āqā, to the Governor of Baghdad, Ḥasan Pāšā, 'in the days of the martyr Xāqān Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusain'. In this letter, which is written in a very elaborate style in Turkish, Ibrāhīm expresses the wish to be permitted burial in Karbala or Najaf. As is known, during the reign of the Ṣafavids, Chaġatay had a considerable vogue together with Azeri, which was the language of the court and was used sometimes in diplomatic correspondence. Ṣā'ib composed some of his ghazals in Chaġatay and Ṣādiqī used it in his poetry and prose. From the colophon of a MS in the British Museum (Or. 3379) we learn that Sulṭān Ḥusain ordered the translation of the *Dīwān* of Ḥusain Bayqara from Chaġatay into Persian for his personal use. In view of these facts we can deduce that Mīrzā Mahdī Xān, who was from Astarābād and hence most probably a Turkoman, had studied and worked in Iṣfahān in a milieu in which Turkish was used, before being designated by Nādir as his Private Secretary and Chronicler. Probably it was Sulṭān Ḥusain, whose interest in Chaġatay poetry we have already seen, who encouraged him to compile this vocabulary. We can also attribute to Mīrzā Mahdī Xān the authorship of a Turkish letter sent by the same Sulṭān to the Duke of Saxony and King of Poland Frederick Augustus (edited by Fekete in *TM*, v, 269 seqq.).

p. 7 seq., para. 25. The editor knows only three MSS of the *Sanglāx* of which he tries to establish the stemma. The existence of two other MSS of this work in Tehran (Majlis Library, No. 860, cf. catalogue, p. 98 seq., and National Library) makes the revision of the

[1] I am greatly indebted to Professor A. K. S. Lambton, the owner of the MS, who kindly permitted me to use it.

whole problem necessary. The MS of the National Library, containing as it does the author's correction,[1] has, in the present state of the transmission, the value of an autograph.

The purpose of the editor has not been the elaboration of the existent material in an alphabetical order, such as Brockelmann's *Mitteltürkischer Wortschatz*, though this elaboration would have been most desirable; but simply through various indexes to facilitate the use of this facsimile edition. One would not object to the 'semi-alphabetical arrangement' of the material, considering the editor's justification, and one could even admit to some extent the advantages of this system if the technical imperfections (such as the reduction of the facsimile to one-half of its original size, its arrangement in a horizontal position with some disorder in the sequence of the folios) were not a considerable hindrance to the use of this book. In the course of the main index, in footnotes, here and there, the editor makes some textual criticisms and etymological observations. Not all of them seem to be convincing; for example:

öt-: for 'to penetrate' read 'to pass by'.

tawsan is not a misreading of the word *tosun* (Kāš., II, 25; III, 316); we find it with the same meaning already in Manučahrī, rhyming with *āhan, xarman*, etc.

terem is not a corruption of *teyrim*, but a different spelling of the Old Turkish title *tarım* (Kāš., I, 331).

gubçaçı: read *gunçaçı* (cf. *Bābur-nāma*, ed. Beveridge, 8v., 12v., 28v.).

kobsa-: *ba-ğurīda navāxtan* is morphologically impossible; read *ba-'arbada*. . . .

künes < *küneš*: this is not because the word rhymed with a word ending in *-s*; we find it also in prose (cf. P. de Courteille, *Dic. turk or.*, s.v.). In my opinion this is a mongolized form like *ulus* (< *uluš*).

la is not a scribal error for *-a*, but an exclamation in Navā'ī's language (cf. *Dīwān*, BM Or. 1374, 9v.).

haray is a well-known exclamation. To derive the etymology of this word from *har* 'all' and *ay* 'month' is impossible.

yon: read *yön* 'side' and not *yüz* 'face'. The Persian word *rū* has also the meaning of 'side'.

yele-: this is a ghost-word. The author and editor are both victims of a scribal error. The quotation from the *Maḥbūb al-qulūb* in Kononov's critical edition is: *alarğa taqarrub tilämäk öz qatlïğa balā tïğın bilämäk-dur* (p. 129).

yarpı: read, according to the facsimile, *yarı*.

Turcologists will be sincerely grateful to Sir Gerard Clauson and to the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial for having made this very important work available.

T. GANDJEÏ

[1] Communication made by Dr. Mehdī Bayānī, Director of National Library, Tehran.

MUHARREM ERGİN: *Dede Korkut kitabı. 1. Giriş—metin—faksimile.* (Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınlarından, Sayı 169.) xix, 253, 97, 154, [viii] pp. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1958. Lira 25.

Until 1950, the only known manuscript of the 'Book of Dede Korkut', the collection of twelve tales from the heroic age of the Oghuz Turks, was the one in the Royal Library of Dresden. From photographs of a nineteenth century copy of this in Berlin, Kilisli Mu'allim Rif'at published in 1916 a text on which Orhan Şaik Gökyay in turn based his edition (in Latin characters) of 1938. Although Gökyay had at his disposal photographs of the Dresden MS too, he does not seem to have made much use of them, with the result that his edition, which has been used by most modern Turkish students of the work, can at best be described as a third-hand copy of the Dresden MS.

In 1950, Ettore Rossi announced his discovery, in the Vatican MS Turco 102, of a text of six of the twelve stories, and he subsequently published a facsimile of the new text, with introduction, translation into Italian of all twelve stories, notes, and glossary: *Il Kitāb-i Dede Qorqut* (Vatican City, 1952).

The book under review comprises, after five and a half pages of corrigenda and five of foreword: an introduction containing a useful summary of what is known or has been written about the work (pp. 1–70); an *edisiyon kritik* in Latin characters with diacriticals (pp. 73–251); and facsimiles of (*a*) the Dresden MS (pp. 1–154) and (*b*) Rossi's facsimile of the Vatican MS (pp. 2–97). Whether Rossi's permission was given or sought is not stated, but one is a little surprised not to see his name in the list of people to whom the author expresses his indebtedness (p. xvii). It is not till p. 64 that the fact emerges that it is Rossi to whom we owe the discovery of the Vatican MS.

Dr. Ergin's contribution is the *edisiyon kritik*. But it is hardly justifiable to speak of a critical edition based on one and a half manuscripts, particularly when the text in question is one which must have undergone many changes of phraseology in the process of oral transmission before it was ever committed to writing. In such a case, the proper attitude towards any additional material which turns up in a newly discovered MS is surely not to banish it to the cellar but to kill the fatted calf for it. The author has, however, in principle doggedly printed the text of D, relegating V to