ties get little specific attention: there is still a need for an up to date survey of the Welfare Party, Turkey's only (though unofficially) 'Islamic' party, and of the important pro-Islamic wing of the formerly ruling Motherland Party. Some comparisons with Islamic revivalist movements in other countries—in particular, Egypt and Algeria—would also have been valuable. Nevertheless, this book has to be counted as a major achievement, and an invaluable source of new ideas and information on a fascinating and complex topic.

WILLIAM HALE

PETER ZIEME: *Die Stabreimtexte der Uiguren von Turfan und Dunhuang: Studien zur alttürkischen Dichtung.* (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XXXIII.) 450 pp. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1991. £24.

The work under review describes the extant verse output of the Uygur Turks, who, in the ninth century, flocked to the oasis towns on the eastern part of the silk road, adopted Manichaeism, Buddhism or, rarely, Christianity and began taking part in the cultural life of the sedentary or merchant population. The literature which they produced in writing is mostly translated, mostly religious and imbued with foreign influence. The book under review reveals verse which was meant to be read rather than to be listened to: the stanzaic alliteration patterns which characterize it are (as shown on pp. 358ff.) based on the written shape of words, where different (occasionally widely different) sound does not appear to matter (or rather, is acceptable as poetic licence). To the west of the Uyghurs lived the Qarakhanid Turks, who embraced Islam; the earliest written literature which they produced already uses the sophisticated Islamic metres. However, Maḥmūd Kāšγarī, the eleventh-century Qarakhanid linguist and ethnologist, quotes numerous snatches of popular verse which also have different features from those found in the east. This book brings us a good deal closer to an answer to the question of which corpus retained more of the original poetics of the Turkic tribes.

The term 'alttürkisch', which appears in the subtitle, is rather inexact in view of the verse from 1688 included here. Most of the literature discussed was composed in the fourteenth century, no early Buddhist verse having, for some reason, been discovered. On p. 340, e.g., Zieme reads *Qara Qoča* in a clearly very late piece of verse, identifying this with the recent name of the town which, in Old Uygur, is called *Qočo*; the footnote thereto then expresses surprise at this 'sehr früher Beleg' for this late form of the name. This is an instance of circular thinking, as *Qara Qoča* in fact shows that the text is not early at all. Just as Atticist Greek is not quoted as Attic Greek and in fact betrays its secondary character, even the most learned adherer to the tradition of classical Buddhist Uygur writing cannot have written as if he spoke the language and should not be quoted as evidence for Old Uygur.

The book starts with a general introduction to the subject, followed by an account of Uygur practice in translating foreign texts written in verse. The largest section of the book is a classification of Buddhist Uygur verse by content. Then follows a section on the persons involved in the production of such material, together with whatever historical information can be gleaned from it, and one dealing with Manichaean hymn writing and non-religious folk poetry (including proverbs showing alliteration and the like). The last section is an analysis of the formal means employed, such as graphic arrangement, stanzaic structure, end rhyme, internal structure of the verses, and parallelism.

The preface states that the text of this book, defended in 1984 as an East German 'Habilitation' thesis, was, for the most part, already completed in 1983. The eight years which elapsed before publication have by no means made the work obsolete, however, as it constitutes the base for further research. Dr Zieme refers throughout to his 1985 edition of approximately 60 manuscript and xylograph texts and inscriptions in verse, in the *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren* (Berliner Turfantexte XIII). Practically all of the texts analysed in the work under review have appeared in this book or elsewhere, but a few (e.g. on pp. 342–3) are unedited. Material published subsequently is to some extent known to the author and is taken into consideration; publications from the years 1985–90 are referred to in a 'Nachbemerkung'. The present work is a further step in the advancing decipherment of Old Turkic, as numerous passages have here received a new and more solid interpretation. This is achieved above all through a minute comparison of Uygur translations with the source texts, a practice often neglected by earlier editors. Zieme's contribution mostly serves phraseology and the lexicon, especially in the domain of borrowings from Indian and Chinese. Basic grammar has also, occasionally benefited; e.g., where the author shows that some Manichaean text has *tarma-yur* and not '*yad-ma-yur*', removing such a form from alongside the normal *yad-maz* in future grammars.

The material falls into three categories, by far the largest consisting of literature inspired by Buddhism; non-religious verse (second category, discussed on pp. 338–46 of the book) is quite scanty. All of this belongs to the thirteenth century or later, when the Uygurs were under Mongolian rule. It could therefore have been influenced by Mongolian poetics, as is maintained notably by Doerfer in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta II* (Wiesbaden, 1964) 866ff. From its beginnings, Mongolian verse is characterized by stave rhyme, the assonance of all the first vowels of the lines of a stanza and of the opening consonants (if any). Stave rhyme also marks all of the Buddhist and non-religious verse described in Zieme's book, as well as the poetry of some of the Turkic nations who were under Mongol domination. It is, however, absent from the folk poetry of some Turkic peoples who lived remote from Mongolian influence, and from Qarakhanid

verse (which preceded this influence). There is no trace of stave rhyme either in the Qutadgu Bilig or in the verse cycles in syllable-counting metres quoted by Maḥmūd (collected by Robert Dankoff and James Kelly, *Maḥmūd al-Kāšγarī: Compendium of the Turkic dialects*, Part III, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University, 1985, 290–310 and edited in Talât Tekin, *XI. Yüzyıl Türk Şiiri: Dīvānu Luġāti't-Turk'teki Manzum Parçalar*, Ankara, 1989).

The key to the question of whether stave rhyme was an essential part of Proto-Turkic poetics seems to lie with Manichaean verse, the third category of *Stabreimtexte*. This category consists of six short poems published by Le Coq and of the 'Great Hymn to Mani', edited by Bang and Gabain. After these texts, the first Manichaean verses to be found appeared in print only after Zieme's book was written. These are some lines on p. 57 of *Manuscrits ouïgours du IXe-Xe siècle de Touen-Houang* (James Hamilton, (ed.), Paris, 1986), a variant of which has now also been published by Zieme himself. (See 'Notizen zum altürkischen Sprichwortschatz', 401–9 of *Altaica Osloensia. Proceedings from the 32nd Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference*, Oslo, 1990; note that Hamilton's MS is from Tunhuang, that of Zieme from Turfan.) Several of the Manichaean poems feature stave rhyme stanzas, the 'Great Hymn to Mani' alone comprising more than 120 quatrains of alliterated verses. This hymn constitutes a part of the Manichaean Pothi book, which Professor Gabain assigned to the first quarter of the tenth century by identifying persons named in its colophon with the founder of the Liao dynasty and his royal consort. Zieme now (pp. 21–23) shows this identification to stand on rather shaky ground. By linguistic criteria, the Pothi book must be rather late. As shown in Erdal. 'The chronological classification of Old Turkish texts' (*Central Asiastic Journal*, 23, 1979, 151–75, see pp. 169–71), it belongs to the third of four stages of Old Turkic set up in that paper. It has numerous confusions between voiced and voiceless consonants, the third person possessive suffix appears in the base form before postpositions, and the formative of the °*t*-causative has the vowel /I/ and *-Ur* as its aorist suffix. In view of these points, and the fact of *aŋa* replacing *anar* as the dative form of *ol*, the aorist *tarïk-ur* instead of earlier *tar-ïk-ar*, and especially in view of dental confusion, Doerfer ('Chronologische Klassifikation des älteren Türkischen', *Altorientalische Forschungen*, XVIII, 1991, 170–86) assigns the book to the Yüan period (p. 182). This is despite the fact that the MS contains a Tokharian hymn as well, and that the latest year on a Manichaean Turkic source is 1025. These points are dismissed as irrelevant by Doerfer, who considers all confusion between *t* and *d* to be due to Mongolian influence. The Hami MS of the Maitrisimit, which was copied in 1067, does, however, have some cases of dental confusion, e.g. *tätrü* and *ät-iz-* spelled with *d*, *yeg+äd-* spelled with *t*. (Doerfer quotes this same spelling variant of *yegäd-* to claim that one of Müller's stake inscriptions was written in the Mongol period!) I can think of three inner-Turkic factors which could have caused this confusion (possibly worsened by the Mongolian adstratum): the phonemes /d/ (or better: /δ/) and /t/ (to remain with the dental non-sibilants) covered (at least) three allophones, [δ], [d] and [t]. [d] may have represented an area where the two phonemes intersected, being the postconsonantal variant of the first and (say from the ninth or tenth century on) the postvocalic variant of the second. Having two letters cover three distinct sounds would necessarily lead to hesitations; these would not occur in the Arabic script, which has *dhāl* as well as *dāl*. Secondly, hesitation may have arisen from the conflict between morphemic invariance, with morphemes written the same way irrespective of phonotactics, and adherence to a closer representation of sound. Thirdly, the analogy of the labials, where the voiced stop is written with the same letter as the unvoiced, but is different from the voiced fricative, may have influenced the consonants of the other points of articulation. Doerfer believes that the documents written down in Muslim Yarkand around the year 1100 in Uygur script make a clear distinction between *d* and *t*, which is not the case: my transcription (*BSOAS*, XLVII, 1984, 260–301) does feature the letters δ, *d* and *t*, but the latter two transcribe the same Uygur character *t* on the basis of my own reconstruction (as is made clear on pp. 267–8 of the paper). Whoever wrote the documents also used Uygur *t* to transcribe the [d] of Arabic and Persian words. This confirms the above presentation of the Old Turkic dentals. Dental confusions and other marks of *relative* lateness are, incidentally, found not only in the Pothi book but inother Manichaean texts as well, e.g. the poem quoted in *Stabreimtexte*, 333. Lexical borrowing remains the only linguistic sign of Mongol influence, then, and of that there is nothing at all in Manichaean texts. The hypothesis that stave rhyme must be a Turkic phenomenon is supported thereby, and also by its presence in late popular verse. The loss of this poetic means in Qarakhanid literature need not be due solely to the influence of Islam but also to the culturally and ethnically Iranian component in Qarakhanid society.

Stave rhyme is not, of course, the only formal feature of early Turkic verse. The status of the quatrain as the basic stanza form is as strong in the east as in the west, the couplet being the norm for proverbs. The task of stave rhyme in holding the stanza together is in the west borne by rhyming at verse-ends; end-rhyme was not, however, unknown in the east either. The constraint that verses have an equal number of syllables appears to have weakened in the east, but much less so than Zieme appears to think. He treats synaloepha (the pronunciation of a vowel at the end of a word together with the vowel beginning the next word as one syllable) as the main reducer of syllables; a more potent means may here be the syncopation of vowels in second syllables of words: *ärtrü* instead of *ärtürü* in text C stanza 8 a, for example, or *yïglïšu* instead of *yïgïlïšu* in E3 stanza 28 verse d. Such syncopation (dealt with on pp. 86–8 of Marcel Erdal, 'Variable forms in the Qutadgu Bilig', *Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi, Tebliğler* I. *Türk Dili*, cilt 1, Istanbul, 1985, 79–88) should

be considered preferable to synaloepha of unlike vowels in cases like *komïdu ilšälim* for '*komïdu ilišälim*' or *asgï üčün* instead of '*asïgï üčün*' in D2. Zieme may have treated intentional variation as irregularity: the Uygurs *may*, on the other hand have considered it refreshing to have an anapaest replaced by a spondee once in a while.

Another way to suit the metre was to choose between semantically identical possibilities already existing in the language. A case in point are the accusative suffix variants *+(X)g* and *+nI* when added after vowels, where *+(X)g* does not constitute a syllable by itself. Text E2 mostly has verses of 13 syllables; in 4 b, this number is reached by using the variant *ärdini+ni*), but in 6 d, however, by using *ärdini+g*. This is not free variation, the present use (exploited also in the Qutadgu Bilig, as pointed out by Erdal, 1985: 85) justifying the simultaneous existence of the two forms. According to Erdal, 1979 (q.v. above), the allomorph *+nI* gradually spread to more and more areas along with the development of Old Turkic. At stage I it is added only to simple demonstrative and personal pronouns and to *kim*; in stage II also to pronouns with *+lAr*, to nouns used together with the plural possessive suffixes and to a few collective nominals. At stage III it comes into use with all the collective nominals and, significantly, with foreign nouns. The reason for this new domain for *+nI* may have been the use of this ending as a distinct syllable, making a clearer pronunciation of the base possible. At stage IV, finally, *+nI* spreads to Turkic stems as well, not, however, completely pushing *+(X)g* out of use. *ärdini* being foreign, it was normal for it to have either of the two accusative suffixes already at stage III, whereas much of the verse under discussion can clearly be assigned to stage IV even. Zieme presents *+nI* used with simple nouns as the principal sign of lateness, couching his formulation in statistical terms; however, overall statistics are rarely useful when dealing with language. In text J 3, for example, which has only *+nI* and no *+(X)g*, the accusative suffix happens to appear only with foreign nouns and plural forms, which is 'standard'. The choice between these two variants serves verse-end rhyme as well. In E 2 stanza 8, the Skt. borrowing *siddhi* is used with *+(X)g* so as to rhyme with three nominatives in *°ig*; in text O stanza 11, on the other hand, three instances of *+nI* with Turkic nouns are there for the same purpose. Although they contradict the rule characterizing stage III, these instances should not by themselves be a reason for assigning the texts in question to group IV; what we have here is poetic licence, a concept with Zieme *could* have put to good use: *kar mu yagmur* 'Schnee oder Regen' or *kïzlar kïrkïn* 'die Mädchen und Jungfrauen' on p. 340, e.g., can only be thought of in such terms.

I have noticed hardly any errors. Worth mentioning is '*ävirä*' in the last line of p. 139 and '*qaltïm(ï)z*' in verse 34 b on p. 155, which are, on the facsimile, visible as *ävirü* and *saltïm(ï)z* respectively. 'Streit' is *tötüš*, as shown in Brāhmī writing in TT VIII O 8, not *tütüš* as written on p. 201. Instead of '*tašïm*' of text F 3 on p. 203, G. Kara has, in his review of BT XIII in *OLZ*, 84, 1989, 355, proposed the reading *asïg*; Zieme was not sure of his own reading. *bir ažunluk asïg* has the much more appropriate meaning 'profit useful for one (single) existence'. The second vowel of the word quoted on p. 217 from BT III 226 as '*küräp*' is in fact not explicit and should be an *i*. On p. 296, '*yayït* is to be read as *yaylag*: see Erdal, 1991, p. 685, n. 382. Read *ögirmäkig* instead of '*ögirmäkingä*' on p. 373; the word is an object of *išlälim*. '*ïraqtïn bädizlägäy*' on p. 74 should be *ïraqtïn bädizälgäy*, and *tuglar pralar* should be understood as the subject of this verb. Of the two editors, Arlotto (who presumably used a facsimile) has *bädizlä-* whereas Geng (who must have seen the original) wrote *bädizäl-*; even if Arlotto is right, *bädiz+ä-l-* fits the context and *l*-hooks are often misplaced. In this passage, Zieme has translated the Chinese original and not the Uygur text as we have it: this latter is clearly based on a misunderstanding of the source, but still makes perfectly good sense and should be rendered as it stands. The words *yelü kömä[n]* in this sentence may not be a simple 'Schreibfehler' for *yelü kögän* 'rainbow' however, as *yelvi kömä[n]* 'magic' would fit the context very well: in view of the dialect alternation *tälvä/tälü* 'mad', the etymology of *yelü kögän* may be **yelvi kögän* 'magic rope'; this connexion may have been felt, and caused the confusion.

Here are a few further points of interpretation: *sïzïz* of text G 2 stanza 6 verse a (p. 214) is unlikely to be *sïz-ïz* and the translation 'schwächend' is impossible: this would be the meaning of a verbal noun coming from a causative derivate. I take the word to represent *sï+sïz* 'dishonest', the negative counterpart of *sïlïg* discussed in the n. to BT III 964 and in Marcel Erdal, *Old Turkic word formation: a functional approach to the lexicon* (2 vols., Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1991, p. 204, n. 245). The translation of E 2 stanza 15 a as proposed on p. 182 and explained in n. 313 is not very satisfactory. I think *bošug* is here used with the same grammatical status as *yaŋ* and *kep*; it seems to mean 'instructions', as it does in UigTot 1005. This *bošug* must, moreover, have served as base for *bošg+u-n-*, etc. Instead of what has been, on p. 247, read as *tanišbin mangaγu . . .*, I propose (cf. facsimile): *taniš(ï)pan, maŋranu . . . siziŋä ök ïnangay* '(They) will, all together, deny their faith and, calling out . . ., will believe in you instead'. *danišbin* 'der Weise' is a word made up by Zieme and does not fit the context very well. For *yaḍaniš* vs. *yatgiš* on p. 259 cf. Erdal, 1991, 265–6 with n. 290. The base of the word *ülälig* in a text dealt with on p. 261 (and *ülä* in an unpublished fragment quoted in the n.) is by Zieme considered to be 'a palatal variant' of what has, in the *Dīvān Luġāti 't-Turk*, been read as *ula*. Instead, the word in the Dīvān (in Arabic writing) should also be read as *ülä*; I do not think there are 'palatal variants' in Old Turkic (except for monosyllables with /ï/ changing this vowel to /ı/) and there is no justification whatsoever for '*ula*' becoming *ülä*. (The twentieth century Anatolian word mentioned in the Clauson entry for '*ula*' then needs some other etymology.) The interpretation of verse b in stanza 19 of text O (p. 275)

is unacceptable, as ' sich rüsten ' is *säpil-* and not *sapïl-*, see Erdal, 1991, 670. It there seems likely that the last word in the line is *san* ' number ' and not Chinese ' *šan* ' ' das Gute (?) '; the MS elsewhere often marks /š/ with two dots, and has done so thrice in this same line. *mantïlmiš* of p. 276 is ' baptised ': *ban-/man-* ' to dip something into a liquid ' is in the Codex Cumanicus used in the sense ' to baptise '. The instance of the Buyan Ävirmäk (the text from 1688 mentioned above, which is, after all, later than the Codex Cumanicus by several centuries) probably also comes from this secondary meaning. *unup sïnïp* (p. 279) is better translated as ' (alternately) succeeding (*u-n-*) and faltering (*sï-n-*) ': a similar use of *sïn-* is attested in the QB, and cf. Republican Turkish *düşe kalka*. In the text discussed on p. 365, Zieme now proposes *ačḍulsun* for the word he had previously read as *arḍulsun* < **art-ïl-*; I think the reading *ardulsun* is to be retained, but take this to be a metathesis (cf. *ädräm*) of *adrulsun* < *adr-ïl-* ' to get separated ', with regressive rounding.

On p. 237, the translation offered for *sansarta irinč mini täg / sakïnsar ärti kim mä yok* is impossible, since *sakïnsar* is not a participle but here belongs to an analytical modal form (in the third person instead of the second as an expression of politeness). The verses probably mean: ' I wish you would consider that there is none as pitiful as me in saṃsāra '. Alessio Bombaci has said of Yüan Buddhist verse that its products are ' di carattere edificante ' and ' assai poveri di lirismo '. The verse from which these lines come is the only instance of ' good poetry ' which I, for one, feel I have come across in this book: both because of some rare formal means, to which Zieme calls our attention, and because of the feeling of authentic emotion which this poem is able to convey. The rather aberrant word order of the two lines, which were misunderstood, no doubt stems from the need to adhere to the stave rhyme. Word order is, rather universally, that domain in which poetic licence operates under maximal leniency; the rules, constraints and aesthetics of poetic licence cannot, however, be determined before we have discovered more of Old Turkic grammar.

MARCEL ERDAL

SHEILA S. BLAIR: *The monumental inscriptions from early Iran and Transoxiana.* (Studies in Islamic Art and Architecture. Supplement to Muqarnas, v.) xv, 306 pp. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1992. Guilders 185, $108.75.

If Islamic art as an academic subject is to have a patron saint many would consider the eipgrapher Max van Berchem to be he. His thoroughness and patience in the recording and transcription of inscriptions, his ingenious emendations to lacunary or defective texts and his deep historical knowledge have set standards of scholarship which are virtually impossible to rival. In his generation travel, if arduous and slow, was still relatively cheap: he was thus personally acquainted with practically every inscription he published and of a good many more as well. This gives one confidence in his readings of inscriptions, even when they are apparently anomalous in one respect or another. His work, was basically confined to Syria–Palestine, Egypt and parts of Anatolia, though with occasional diversions to Mesopotamia and Persia; and to historical inscriptions in Arabic on stone. These self-imposed restrictions sometimes excluded material relevant to the history of the monuments he recorded but his coverage nevertheless was remarkably complete.

East of Syria, despite some excellent epigraphical studies of isolated monuments, the recorded material is less satisfactory. Far fewer inscriptions survive; many standing monuments are inaccessible; and the often vast distances between them virtually rule out comparative treatment. Those inscriptions which have been recorded were often hastily, incompletely or inaccurately transcribed and many readings are in consequence conjectural, though notwithstanding many of them have found their way into the standard literature. This is partly because of the regrettable practice in most of the volumes of the *Répertoire chronologique d'epigraphie Arabe* [*RCEA*] of including inscriptions only in the form in which they had previously been published. Even more regrettably, many archaeologists working in the Caucasus, Transcaucasia and Central Asia in the days of the Soviet Union treated inscriptions merely as a source for names and dates, ignoring all the rest or leaving the work of producing an accurate transcription and text to ' specialists '. A case in point is the mausoleum at Tim (no. 11) on which G. A. Pugachenkova published a monograph in 1963, giving an incomplete reading of the date, 367/977–98, which Sheila Blair has here improved, on the basis of photographs, to Rabī' I 367/October-November 977; but nothing more has ever been heard of the rest.

Dr. Blair makes no secret of this chaotic state of affairs. Her work is a compilation on the lines of *RCEA* but making use of a wider range of source material, covering Greater Iran, from Mesopotamia to Transoxiana and from the Persian Gulf to Transcaucasia, though omitting northern India. In fact there is little or nothing from Mesopotamia, for, so much of the time, the 'Abbāsid Caliphate was under the shadow of Iranian dynasties; but this is offset by a concentration upon Persia and Afghanistan, where the author has worked, where the material is most abundant, and where the work of recent scholars like A. D. H. Bivar has done much to establish critical texts for some of the inscriptions. Her cut-off date is 500/1106: subsequently, she observes, the extant material can be usefully presented by dynasty or by region. Her inscriptions include not only the Buwayhid rock-cut inscriptions at Achaemenid and Sasanian sites in Iran and a number of comparable commemorative inscriptions from Central Asia, foundation inscriptions, and funerary inscriptions from monumental constructions (though not gravestones); extracts