Recenzje / Reviews

Danka, Balázs, *The 'Pagan' Oɣuz-nāmä, A Philological and Linguistic Analysis*, Harrassowitz Verlag (Turcologica 113), Wiesbaden, 2019, 377 pp.

Danka's *Pagan Oɣuz-nāmä* is a new critical edition of the famous manuscript written in Uyghur script and edited earlier a few times. This manuscript has 42 pages (21 folios) and is held in the French National Library in Paris. The monograph contains eight chapters as well as acknowledgements (p. 11), a list of abbreviations (pp. 12–13), a bibliography (pp. 285–289), an appendix including all words of the text edited and examined (pp. 291–356), and an appendix containing all suffixes with all occurrences (pp. 357–377). The chapters, apart from the introduction (pp. 15–18), can be subdivided into three chapters related to the edition of the text, i.e. paleography (pp. 19–41), text edition (pp. 42–135), and notes on the text (pp. 136–153); and three chapters devoted to grammatical analysis of the text: phonetics and phonology (pp. 154–184), word formation (pp. 185–211), and morphosyntax and inflection (pp. 212–256). This part of the book is followed by the chapter devoted to the interrelation between the newly edited *Pagan Oɣuz-nāmä* and four other "Islamic" versions (pp. 257–275). The last chapter, although not aligned as a chapter in the table of contents, is "Final conclusions" (pp. 276–283).

Before going into details of this careful critical edition and in-depth study, it is worth considering the appropriateness of its title. Danka refers to this version of the Oghuz story using the abbreviation PON, i.e. "Pagan Oɣuz-nāmä". Although in most of his papers he uses this label, in a paper not listed in the bibliography (Danka 2017), the same abbreviation stands for "Pre-Islamic" Oɣuz-nāmä. The attribute "Pre-Islamic" is not a good one, for the story was recorded in the post-Genghisid Turkic world after the conversion to Islam, though the Paris version has no relation to this religion, which was recognised by the researchers, see e.g., Mélikoff's article in the Encyclopedia of Islam. However, the attribute "pagan" is also inappropriate, as it is often disapproving, although Danka stresses (p. 15) that he means no derogatory connotation. Therefore, if the author wants to emphasize the religious factor, probably the best solution is to use

the term Tengrist. It is true that the representatives of the classical Turkic studies try to avoid the terms *Tengrism* and *Tengrist*, for this Turko-Mongolic religion was not codified and receded in favour of such world's religions as Manicheism, Buddhism and Islam. Despite this the faith in the Sky God is clearly present in this version, e.g. *Kök Täŋrigä män ötädüm* 'I have carried out (my obligation) to the Sky God' (42, line 6).

Moreover, the title *Oɣuz-nāmä* is also unjustified. It is very likely that the epic stories recounted and recited by Turkic peoples in the Golden Horde did not contain the word *nāmä*, cf. such stories as *Čora Batïr*, *Alpamïš*, *Qobïlandï* etc., and the titles with *nāmä*, modelled on *Šāhnāmä* and later Persian epics and poems, appeared as written learned names. In fact, "Pagan *Oɣuz-nāmä*" is quite different from Islamic versions and the name *Oɣuz-nāmä* does not appear in it, although it is unknown if it originally existed, since the beginning of the manuscript is lost. Nevertheless, following the author this version will be referred to as *Oɣuz-nāmä* in this review.

Oɣuz-nāmä is a very important Middle Turkic text. In contrast to abundant literature translated from other languages, it relates a genuine Turkic story unaffected by Islam and its leading languages, Arabic and Persian, so that its importance may only be surpassed by *Dede Korkut*. As for other Turkic epics, Central Asian and Siberian epic literature existed in the oral form and was recorded relatively late in the pre-modern and modern times. Therefore, it is not surprise that *Oɣuz-nāmä* has attracted much interest on the part of Turkologists and was edited a few times. Another point to stress is that despite the relation to *Oɣuz*, the language of this story is not Oghuzic or South-West Turkic. The story was written in the Golden Horde, most probably in the 15th century, and reflects the language used in this state, i.e. Middle Kipchak. At least the language of the narrative part of the story written down in *Oɣuz-nāmä* should be identified with a Kipchak variety (p. 177), though the vocabulary of this work is heterogeneous. Danka demonstrated some western words, e.g. *čoq* 'many, much' and *qoyun* 'sheep', new words, e.g. *üy* 'house' and *yïbär-* 'to send', and archaic ones, e.g. *balïq̊* 'town', *ögüz* 'stream' (p. 292). This short story documents a text in which there are words, meanings and forms not attested to in any other Turkic document. Among the words unevidenced elsewhere there are such hapax legomena as *čoŋ* 'left', *tutulunč* 'capturing', *urušunč* 'battle'; among the meanings there are *tapuɣ* 'nearness; front' and *yumša- ~ ǰumša-* 'to send'; among grammatical forms there is jussive or optative *-sunyïl* in *bolsunyïl*.

Unfortunately, *Oɣuz-nāmä* has a fatal drawback. The Uyghur script as used in it does not make clear difference between many vowels and consonants important for the phonetics and the phonological system of the language, so the reading and interpretation of the text will always be a kind of conjecture. For example, a single letter <ʾ> can render all vowels except *ö*, but especially *ï*. Another problem is the copyist's inconsistent writing of identical words, e.g. the name of Volga, Turkic *Etil ~ Edil*, is written <ʾʾdʾl>, <ʾdʾl>, and <ʾydʾl> (p. 43, 314). Moreover, in some instances the initial *alef* comes up in words which begin with a consonant, e.g. <ʾyʾmʾn> for *yaman*, Danka's ⁽ᵃ⁾*yaman* 'evil' or <ʾdʾq> for *taɣ*, Danka's ⁽ᵃ⁾*taɣ* 'mountain' (p. 141). To make the reading more complicated, in some words in which the *alef* is expected, it is omitted, e.g. *aš-* for *aša-* 'to eat' and *baš-* for

baša- 'to wound; to attack' (p. 142 and 148). Despite these deficiencies in spelling, the author of the manuscript tried to indicate centralization (p. 165), which is an important feature not marked in other manuscripts.

In the introduction Danka outlines all previous editions from Radloff (1890) through Bang and Arat (1932), Ščerbak (1959) up to Ağça (2016), translations into other languages, and some important articles. He argues that a new edition is needed, because none of the preceding ones discussed the language of the manuscript in a detailed way and only one contained a good-quality facsimile.

The chapter on paleography is quite long, but this is justified because of what has been said above – the spelling allows many readings of particular letters and letter combinations, and finding a key to reading is very important, if possible. He uses the term grapheme not in the meaning of a written sign or unit, but as a visual depiction of sounds (p. 22). Therefore, it is defined in relation to phonetics and this is why this definition is problematic. Namely, if a grapheme renders more than one sound, and this is a typical situation, it "depicts" more than one sound. The graphemes are discussed according to the degree of their similarity. The author established the archetypes of the graphemes. Each grapheme is shown in many written variants in all positions, i.e. initial, medial and final (pp. 23–39). Danka's claim that <w> may render *a* as in <ʾwqwz> what he transcribes *aɣuz* (p. 43), though later *åɣuz* (p. 53, 293), is difficult to accept. The combination of <ʾw> in the initial is the normal way of rendering a round vowel, so this word should be transcribed *oɣuz* 'colostrum'.

Concerning the method of Danka's edition, it should be noted that it has been carried out in a way convenient to the reader. We have everything an a spread, a good-quality reproduction on each left-hand page as well as a parallel transliteration, transcription, English translation and the footnotes on the right-hand page. Some readings are debatable. Putting aside the problems with the spelling which allows various readings, there are also some problems that affect morphology, e.g. *küδᵒyä* in *küδᵒyä turur erdi* 'he always pastured' (p. 55). It is strange, for there is nothing like that in Turkic. It is probably a spelling mistake for *küdä turur erdi*. The translation is a good example for a balance between literal translation and free rendering of the Turkic text so as not to violate English. Incidentally, some translations without an additional commentary are too arbitrary, e.g. *qïrᵒq* 'forty' translated as 'many' (p. 73), and in the index 'forty, many'. In some cases Danka glosses the words in the index differently than in the translation, e.g. *amᵒraq* 'peaceful' (p. 79), but *amᵒraq* 'friendly, benign' (p. 295), clearly relying on Clauson in whose dictionary this word is glossed 'benign, friendly' (Clauson 1972: 162). Saying that he does not interpret spellings, but gives Eastern Old Turkic equivalents (p. 42), Danka contradicts himself. In fact, using diacritics for centralization (an under-dot), closing (an over-dot) and labialization (a circle), he does interpret the spellings. Moreover, in some instances we find a long vowel, e.g. *qātïr* 'mule' for <q̇ʾq̇ʾdʾr>, but this question is discussed later and regarded as hypercorrection (p. 166–167), influenced by Mongolian writing. In a reconstructed passage (p. 79), he reads the common Turkic *qulač* 'fathom' as *qolač*. The word for 'deep' is read *täriŋ* (p. 91), although the spelling <dʾrʾnk> rather

suggests the reading *täräŋ*, as in a few Middle Kipchak documents and some modern languages. The letters used for consonants in transcription also demonstrate arbitrary reading, e.g. *aδïγ̊* for <ʾadwq̄> 'bear' (p. 55). The idea of using a symbol (ᵒ) for an underspecified vowel is good, but in a range of cases such a vowel can be established with a high degree of certainty, e.g. *qïrïq*, not *qïrᵒq* 'forty', *türük*, not *türᵒk* 'proper name: Turk', and probably *amïraq*, not *amᵒraq* 'peaceful' (p. 79). With regard to *türᵒk*, it is hard to agree with Danka's claim that this name 'must have had the shape *türkü* in the earliest Eastern Old Turkic sources' (p. 182). Róna-Tas's **trukă* in his West Old Turkic to which Danka refers is nothing more than a hypothesis and many Turkologists consider Clauson's *türkü* a mere mistake.

As far as the notes on the text are concerned, there are a few forms worth mentioning. Firstly, this is the third singular jussive or optative form *-sUn γïl* which occurs only with the verb *bol-* 'to be, to become', transcribed as *bolsunγïl* (p. 136; *γïl* is always written separately with two dots on the right of the letter *q*). It is not evidenced in any other Turkic document, see Brockelmann (1954: 226) who provides this form in a defective way as *bolsuγïl*. The supposition that *γïl* comes from *qïl-* 'to do', pronounced by earlier researchers and maintained by Danka, seems to be correct, although Danka's glossing it as PRT 'particle' is not a good solution. In fact, Danka regards it as a compound suffix, for he transcribes both components jointly. Secondly, the reading *küδᵒdi* 'waited' of the word formerly read *bodadï* etc. is better, although some problems with this reading remain (pp. 136–137). Thirdly, concerning *yig ~ yėg* 'row' (p. 138), Danka who remarks that this word is nearly extinct in modern languages should have add that it is nearly extinct in these forms, for it is present in various languages in the form *čig ~ čiy ~ šiy*. Lastly, the reading *sorma* glossed as 'wine' seems to be correct.

Some words in *Oγuz-nāmä* are still unclear and no edition proposed a plausible solution to explain them, e.g. *čamat* blame, anger' (p. 148), *qaqïz* '?temperamental' (p. 139), and *usuγ* (Danka: *ᵒsuw*) 'water' (p. 141), but especially the beast resembling a rhinoceros depicted on page 6 that is variously spelled in different occurrences which Danka calls 'monster' and leaves untranscribed. I have one remark to this matter, which unfortunately does not contribute to the solution of this riddle. Danka does not transcribe the last consonant in the occurrences in which it resembles *-d*, although he recognises the similarity. He adds that in other words *-d* does not have a long tail as in *Oγuz-nāmä*. As a matter of fact, in other contemporary manuscripts from Herat both *-d* and *-t* does have a long tail, e.g. the Vienna manuscript of Qutadgu Bilig, e.g. 2,1 *minät* or 2,3 *yarad-γan* 'created'. A long-tailed *-t* also appears in Toḫtamyš's letter to King Jagiełło (1393), e.g. line 6, in the name *Bekbolat*.

From chapters 5–7, chapter 5 is probably the most important, for the author tries to explain and interpret the phonetic structure of the language of *Oγuz-nāmä* and offers a range of proposals. Among the questions raised, one may comment on the alleged existence of an underspecified vowel *ï* in Old Turkic which is debatable. The fact that *ï* changes to *i* in the vicinity of *č š ń y* is not a decisive argument. In various Turkic languages also *a* changes to *ä* in this position, e.g. *čač → čäč* 'hair', *šay → šäy* 'tea',

ayt- → *äyt-* 'to say, to tell', *yaš* → *yäš* 'young' etc., and the whole segment with the suffixes attached becomes front. However, Danka's assumption that vowels spelled with <ʾ> become lax and less specified (p. 164) is correct.

As far as the change *e-* → *ye-* is concerned, it is evidenced not only in present-day Kipchak languages such as Kazakh, Noghay and Karachay-Balkar, but is also attested in Middle Kipchak, e.g. in *Ad-durra al-muḏiyya fī al-luġa at-turkiyya*.

Chapter 6 "Word formation" is an analysis of all derived words formed by suffixation and composition. One may have some small remarks, e.g. Old Turkic *qïð-* (p. 192) is both transitive and intransitive verb, not only intransitive.

Chapter 7 "Morphosyntax and inflection" presents a grammatical analysis of selected inflectional and syntactic categories. We can have the following remarks: (1) in modern North-Western languages, a noun preceded by the quantifier *köp* often takes the plural suffix +lAr as it is the case in *Oɣuz-nāmä* (p. 213), so it is not unusual. It is to stress that *köp* 'much; many' is regarded by Danka as a generic numeral; (2) *munlar qanqᵒ yörîmäkᴅä* (p. 215) is probably a mistake and instead of interpreting this phrase as 'these carts, while moving' it is enough to remove the word *qanqᵒ* and the whole structure will be correct, that is (*qanqᵒlar taqï yapᴅīlar) munlar yörîmäkᴅä (qanqᵒ qanqᵒ söz bẹrä turur)* '(And they built) carts. These, while moving, (were clattering, i.e. were making a clattering noise)'.

Appendix 1 "Lexicon" is in fact an index to the text. As the author stresses, all occurrences of words are listed in a more or less narrow context. In contrast to some classical text editions whose indexes contain references to respective languages or literature, the only source of Danka is Clauson's etymological dictionary, and in the case of loanwords, Lessing for Mongol, Steingass for Persian, Zenker for Arabic (Zenker's dictionary is also Danka's reference work for some Middle Turkic words, e.g. p. 337) etc., but in many cases reference is made not to a given word in Clauson, but to the stem, e.g. *batuš* 'west' is referred to Clauson's *bat-*. At *uran* 'warcry, password', Danka admits that this word is absent from Clauson, Lessing, and Zenker, and provides Ščerbak's quotation from *Bāburnāma*. However, it is enough to look up these words in Radloff (1893: 1653–1654) to find two modern languages (Kazakh and Altay) in which they are evidenced. The lack of the reference to a derived word is especially frequent in the case of -GU derivatives, e.g. *aŋɣu* 'reminder, memory', but Clauson *aŋ-* 'to remember, to call to mind', *awlaɣu* 'the act of hunting', but Clauson *avla:-* 'to to hunt (wild game)', *tarᵒtġu* 'tribute, present', but Clauson *tart-* 'to pull, to drag'. In such cases, providing a relevant parallel from a Turkic language would be much better, e.g. instead of Clauson's *bakın-* for *baqïntur-* 'to make somebody obey', Kirghiz *baɣïndïr-* 'id' (Judaxin 1965: 92); instead of Clauson's *bel* and *baɣ* for *bẹlbaɣï* 'waistbelt', Kirghiz *belbō* 'id' (Judaxin 1965: 127); instead of Clauson's *karaŋɣu* for *qaraŋġuluq* 'darkness', Middle Kipchak (e.g. Quṭb, Sayf-i Sarāyī) 'id' (Bodrogligeti 1969: 344), instead of Clauson's *ko:ñ* for *qoyun* 'sheep', Turkish *koyun* 'id' (TS 1225); and instead of Clauson's *sana-* for *sanaɣuluqsïz* 'uncountable', Erdal's (1991: 369) *sanguluksuz* 'id', though Erdal's grammar of Old Turkic is referred at the discussion of this word in the word formation chapter (p. 197).

If a word is absent from Danka's few reference works, it is just left without any hints to languages. For instance, *ǰürčäd* can be referred to Kazakh *šüršit* '*dated* 1. the old name of the Chinese. 2. stranger, foreigner' (Januzaqov 1999: 745) and Kirghiz *čürčüt* 'unbeliever; pagan' (Judaxin 1965: 879).

The method of referring to only Old Turkic without Middle Kipchak or other Middle Turkic is debatable, since *Oɣuz-nāmä* is not an Old Turkic document, but Middle Turkic. It is especially evident if the form of a word is different from Clauson's 'Old Turkish', e.g. *birinči* 'first' versus Clauson's *birinç*. Sometimes the way of referring to Clauson is a bit confusing, e.g. *bäk* 'very' is referred to East Old Turkic *bärk* as documented by Clauson, though the headword in Clauson's (1972: 323) dictionary is *bek,* not *berk*.

Moreover, some derived words are referred not to corresponding items in Clauson where they may not be found, but to their bases, e.g. both *biṭi-* and *biṭil-* are referred to Clauson's *biti-*, or conversely, e.g. *atla-* 'to ride' is referred to Clauson's *atlan-* 'to set out, to march against'.

My last comment to this appendix concerns the interjection *oχ*. This interjection is found in many languages of the world and there is no need to refer to Mongol *aq-a*.

In Appendix 2 "Index of suffixes" most suffixes are also referred to Old Turkic, in this case to Erdal's two publications. However, if a suffix is absent from Old Turkic, Danka says that he cites a corresponding form from Bodrogligeti's Chaghatay grammar, but in fact Bodrogligeti is referred to only once. It must be noted that the suffix *-sunɣïl* is not discussed in the studies shown by Danka (p. 365). It is probably only Brockelmann who has included it in his grammar. Taking the opportunity, at *-GU* reference to Erdal should be (2004: 304), not (2004: 301) and at *-GUlIK* to (2004: 307), not (2004: 301).

Summing up, Danka has done very tedious and systematic work on the Paris version of the *Oɣuz-nāmä*. Few short Turkic texts can boast such a detailed monograph, but the Tengrist *Oɣuz-nāmä* deserves it. Unfortunately, deficient spelling of this manuscript makes the solution of all linguistic questions impossible. Despite this Danka's book is an important step in the study on this document and, more generally, on Middle Turkic. He approached many questions on a good theoretical basis and proved to be very careful philologist who examined every word and every form, and included them in the study. His idea of the underspecified vowels rendered by the *alef* is his original contribution to the study, although some individual problems may be debatable. In my opinion, all the other Middle Turkic documents written in Uyghur script from the Golden Horde, Timurid, Hülegid and Chaghataid states should be edited and discussed in a way similar to Danka's study.

References

Bodrogligeti András*, A fourteenth century Turkic tranlation of Saʿdī's Gulistān (Sayf-i Sarāyī's Gulistān biʾt-turkī*), Akademia Kiadó, Budapest 1969.

Brockelmann Carl, *Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischen Litteratursprachen Mittelasiens*, Brill, Leiden 1954.

Clauson Sir Gerard, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*, Clarendon Press, London 1972.

Danka Balázs, 'About the historical and religious context of the "Pre-Islamic" *Oɣuz-nāmä*', in: Éva Csáki, Mária Ivanics, Zsuzsanna Olach (ed.), *Role of religions in the Turkic culture. Proceedings of the 1ˢᵗ International Conference on the Role of Religions in the Turkic Culture held on September 9–11, 2015, 2015*, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest 2017, pp. 307–319.

Erdal Marcel, *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to the lexicon. Vol. I–II*, Harrasowitz, Wiesbaden 1991.

Januzaqov 1999 = Телғожа Жанұзақов (ed.), *Қазақ тілінің сөздігі*, Дайк-Пресс, Алматы 1999.

Judaxin 1965 = К. К. Юдахин, *Киргизско-русский словарь*, Советская энциклопедия, Москва 1965.

Radloff Wilhelm, *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte. Band I*, Commissionnaires de l'Académie impériale des sciences, St. Pétersbourg 1893.

TS = Şükrü Halûk Akalın, Recep Toparlı, Nevzat Gözaydın, (ed), *Türkçe sözlük. 10. baskı*, Türk Dil Kurumu, Ankara 2005.

Henryk Jankowski
(Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland)
ORCID: 0000-0003-2576-1204