

Recenzje / Reviews

Mária Ivanics, *The Book of the Činggis Legend. A Critical Edition of a Seventeenth-Century Volga-Turkī Source* (Brill's Inner Asian Library 44), Brill, Leiden, Boston, 2024, VIII + 395 pp.

Ivanics's *Book of the Činggis Legend* is a critical edition of a well-known story of the Turkic peoples who were inheritors of Genghis Khan's tradition and the post-Genghisid states. Three manuscripts used for the edition were written in seventeenth-century Volga Turkic or a Tatar variety of Eastern Turkic, also known as Chaghatay. The edition is based on these three manuscripts assessed as the best ones among many others. The basic manuscript marked as manuscript O has 48 folios of approximately fifteen short lines per page. The edited text has been complemented and corrected basing on two other manuscripts, marked as B and C as well as another manuscript that is lost but known from a nineteenth-century publication, marked as A.

The edition is composed of the preface (pp. vii–viii), the introduction (pp. 1–16), the transcription of the text (pp. 19–63), the English translation (pp. 67–137), the glossary (pp. 139–251), the facsimiles of manuscripts O, B and C (pp. 255–372), the bibliography (pp. 373–385) and the index (pp. 386–395). This is the second, updated and extended edition of this text, initially published by Mária Ivanics and Mirkasym Usmanov in 2002.¹ The first edition contained a preface, an introduction, a transcription, a glossary and facsimiles. It was planned for two volumes, the second volume should contain a German translation, but only the first volume has been published. The second revised edition contains two parts lacking in the first one, the annotated translation and the index. Although the German preface in the first edition was written by Mirkasym Usmanov, Mária Ivanics stresses in the new edition (p. vii) that in fact she worked on the edition herself, since her partner was elected the Deputy President of the Academy of Sciences

¹ Mária Ivanics and Mirkasym A. Usmanov, *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende (Däfiār-i Čingiz-nāmā) I.*, Szeged 2002.



of Tatarstan and could not participate in their common project for the lack of time. Mária Ivanics has dedicated this new edition to the memory of Mirkasym Usmanov who passed away in 2010. The change from German into English in the new edition is the *signum temporis*.

There are various mistakes in the manuscripts of the legend. For example, the word *tārāzā* ‘window’ of Persian origin (< *dārīče*) was in one occurrence confused with a similar Persian word denoting ‘scales’ and spelled *tārāzū*. In my opinion, Mária Ivanics choose a good solution to render it in the form *tārāzū* (p. 20), ignoring long vowels. There are more cases of the lack of marking long vowels in the transcription, e.g. *arzula-* ‘to wish (for)’ (pp. 33, 147) instead of *ārzūla-* and this is because the editor regards the forms like these phonetically adapted.

The *Činggis Legend* is an amazing book. It is a narrative story but contains a few couplets of verse. It presents the history of Turkic peoples intertwined with the Mongols from its legendary beginnings through the real history of the Golden Horde organised by Genghis Khan and his successors up to the end of the seventeenth century, and in some manuscripts to the beginning of the eighteenth century. It describes many events and historical persons. The language of the version of *Činggis Legend* edited by Mária Ivanics is very vivid and rich, e.g. *ğabalanīb ğimirğanīb qičqirub baqirub tedi* (p. 52) translated as ‘they said [...] nervously gesticulating and shouting’ (p. 52). As the form of the verb *te-* ‘to say’ demonstrates, it is an old form which shifted in the contemporary literary languages, including Chaghatay, into *de-*, and nowadays is retained only in a few Turkic languages such as Bashkir and Northeastern Turkic.

The legend also contains a range of idioms, e.g. *közi yaru-* in the meaning of ‘to give birth’ (pp. 29, 84, 192). There are some very interesting words hardly evidenced in other sources, especially from the flora and fauna, e.g. *qawdu* ‘stork’ (pp. 37, 98, 212), preserved in modern Bashkir, and *köyüldü* ‘snipe *Scolapax rusticula*’ (pp. 37, 98, 192). Another interesting word is *ödür* ‘mourning, funeral feast’ (pp. 78, 205) and the verb *ödürlä-* ‘to hold funeral feast’, derived from it, used in the expression with the former word as *ödürin ödürlä-* ‘to hold somebody’s funeral feast’. As Mária Ivanics notes, the noun *ödür* is attested only in Karaim, more exactly Crimean Karaim, and let us add, there is evidence for the verb *ödürlä-* in no Turkic language.

Some well-known words appear with word-forming suffixes, e.g. *qarawulči* ‘guard’ (pp. 21, 211) or *qurtulğu* ‘escape’ (pp. 24, 218), which also make the lexicon of the legend distinct from other known documents.

There are also interesting phonetic features in the text, especially the change *y- > (j-) č-*, discussed by Mária Ivanics (p. 13). Although the change *y- > j-* is a normal Northwestern Turkic development, the shift into *č-* is characteristic of Northeastern Turkic languages such as Khakas.

Most of these interesting cases have been commented and explained by Mária Ivanics with great erudition. She commented and annotated the text with hundreds of very valuable comments on language, history, religion and culture. She used an abundant literature and clarified almost all aspects of the legend in a highly satisfactory way, see, for instance,

her comment on the compound *quš qurt* ‘birds and game’ (p. 86) or the note on *Burtaq Hān*, identified with Berke (p. 69).

If we compare Mária Ivanics’s edition with the edition of another version of the *Činggis Legend* by Judin et. al. which is roughly the same length (48 folios), we see the superiority of the former over the latter. Firstly, Judin’s posthumous edition by Abuseitova has eighty-nine comments to the translation while Ivanics’s edition has two hundred and eighty, to start with Noah’s four daughters and to finish with the Bashkir uprising of 1704–1711 (pp. 67 and 137). All indexes to Judin’s edition take up ten pages, while Ivanics’s edition has a glossary which at the same time is the index of all words on one hundred and twelve pages in addition to ten pages of the index of proper names and terms. Secondly, both the notes and the indexes in Judin’s edition show proper names not in Turkic but Russian forms. Thirdly, Judin’s transcription is odd, full of un-Turkic forms, untypical of the sixteenth-century literary Eastern Turkic, e.g. *Toqtağā, tāqī, oğlanlaridā, tağigā, xangā, atqunčā*, etc.² The editor of Judin’s transcription and translation, M.X. Abuseitova, has made many valuable comments, but she could not totally revise Judin’s work after his death.

In fact, a short review would be enough to present the contents of Mária Ivanics’s edition and emphasise its strongpoints. I am personally convinced of the excellence and importance of this book. However, since this legend may be compared to the Oghuz legend, full of secrets and cases of ambiguity, even this new edition may not be the last voice in the discussion. The discussion will certainly be long and my comments attempt to contribute to it. They are basically of linguistic character since there is little to add to the editor’s comments on the history and culture. However, the language does not betray all its secrets on the crossroads of multiple linguistic influences. Therefore, this review is intended to be a bit more than the sheer presentation of the contents.

The introduction is composed of two chapters preceded by the introductory notes. In these notes, the author presents six parts of the legend. These parts are not equal in length. Part one is dedicated to Genghis Khan and his descendants, part two to Timur, part three to less known Amet, Isa’s son, part four to Edige, part four to places and sites and part six to later historical events. The first two parts take most of the manuscripts. Parts three to six are short, from one to two folios.

Chapter one of the introduction presents the manuscripts containing the legend as well as its editions and translations. According to Mária Ivanics, nearly fifty copies are known in the Volga region, mostly copied at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. Outside Russia, four copies are preserved in Berlin, London, Edinburgh and Paris. Mária Ivanics describes three copies taken for her edition, the printed Kazan

² V.P. Judin, Ju.G. Baranov and M.X. Abuseitova (eds.), *Utemiš-xadži. Čingiz-Name. Faksimile, perevod transkripcija, tekstologičeskie primečaniya, kommentarii i ukazateli*, Alma-Ata 1992, p. 129; there is a new edition of this version of the legend by Takushi Kawaguchi, Hiroyuki Nagamine (*authored*) and Mutsumi Sugahara (*supervised*), *Ötämiš Hāji. Čingiz-nāma. Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text*, Tōkyō 2008, in Japanese, but with a transcription in Roman script and an English introduction, in which the authors corrected Judin et al.’s shortcomings, but not all problems have been solved.

edition of 1882, as well as the just mentioned four copies among the holdings of West European libraries.

Chapter two of the introduction raises the question of sources of the Genghis Khan legend. The editor assumes that one can be the lost Mongol legend or history which could also be the 'forerunner' of the Oghuz legend with which the Genghis Khan legend shares certain linguistic features. Another Mongol source must have been *The Secret History of the Mongols*. She stresses that there are also other written Turkic stories parallel to the Volga Turkic Genghis Khan legend, e.g. Ötemish Khaji's *Genghis Khan legend*, mentioned above, and some plots may be found in Rabghuzi's *Stories of the Prophets*. In the further part of this chapter, the author discusses linguistic features of the text and presents the principles of transcription. Special letters used in the transcription are *ǰ Ƿ ǵ ǵ̃*. Difference is made between an open and a close variety of /e/, i.e. *ä* and *e*. The reading of the text is in general identical to that of the first edition, but a range of corrections have been made.

Regarding the rendering of the text, it has been noted that the manuscripts can be read in a Tatar, Bashkir or literary Middle Turkic (Turkī) way. It is because phonological, morphological and lexical forms of the text are often mixed and reflect both northwestern (Kipchak) and southwestern (Oghuz) forms (p. 14), in addition to many literary Eastern Turkic features and words.

The editor chose the third option, and, in my opinion, this was a good solution. However, in several cases we see Volga Turkic readings, especially of vowels, e.g. 'Aräb (pp. 19, 146) 'Arab' reflects Tatar *garäp*, in contrast to the European and Turkish reading 'Arab of Eastern Turkic texts.³ Not only the loanwords, but sometimes also genuine Turkic words are provided according to the Tatar or semi-Tatar pronunciation, e.g.

- (1) *Aq Tübä*, river name, a tributary of the Volga (pp. 60, 132, 145), cf. non-Volga Northwestern Turkic *Aq Töbä*;
- (2) *bulǵal* translated as 'term or place (of reunion)' (pp. 43, 165), cf. non-Volga Northwestern Turkic *bolǵal*;
- (3) *čit* 'border, edge' (pp. 51, 168), cf. non-Volga Northwestern and Eastern Turkic *čet*;
- (4) *čuqundir-* 'to christen' (pp. 62, 168), cf. non-Volga Northwestern Turkic *čoqundir-*;
- (5) *hödhöd* 'hoopoe' (pp. 37, 97, absent from the glossary), cf. Common Turkic *hüdhüd*;
- (6) *imän* 'oak' (pp. 37, 181), cf. non-Volga Northwestern and Eastern Turkic *emen* ~ *emän*;
- (7) *ona-* translated as 'to prefer, to agree' (pp. 32, 203), cf. the southern group of Northwestern Turkic *una-*, e.g. Kazakh;⁴ note that this verb is not used in Standard Tatar and Bashkir, though there is Siberian Tatar *ona-* 'to like';⁵
- (8) *orliq* 'seed' (pp. 22, 204), cf. Common Turkic *urliq* or *urluq*, see also *uruq* 'clan, descendants' (p. 240);

³ E.g. W.M. Thackston, *Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur Mirza. Baburnama. Part Three: Hindustan. Chaghatay Turkish Text with Abdul-Rahim Khankhanan's Persian Translation*, New York 1993, p. 747.

⁴ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar'*, Almaty 2001, p. 898.

⁵ D.G. Tumaševa, *Slovar' dialektov sibirskix tatar*, Kazan' 1992, p. 160.

- (9) *sinäk* 'fork' (p. 37), cf. non-Volga Northwestern Turkic *senek* ~ *senäk*;
- (10) *tiräk* 'poplar' (pp. 37, 96, 234), cf. non-Volga Northwestern Turkic *terek* ~ *teräk* 'tree'; 'poplar', etc.;
- (11) *ülät* 'epidemic' (pp. 62, 241), cf. Common Turkic *ölät*;
- (12) *üzän* 'river' (pp. 60, 242), cf. Common Turkic *özän*.

There are also words which may be read variously, e.g. *čigir* 'wine' (p. 167), as in the edition, but also as a more typical *čagır* <čgr> or *čičäk* 'flower' (p. 168), as in the edition, but also as a more typical *čečäk* <čč'k>.

However, in some cases Mária Ivanics's reading of Turkic words according to the Volga Tatar or Bashkir, e.g. *bit* 'face' (p. 14), and not the Common Turkic pronunciation, i.e. *bet*, is justified, for this word is written <byit>. I think that the editor's option for reading <kil> *kel-* and <kl> *käl-* is a good one. The word *baškünäk* 'leather bucket' (pp. 52, 120, 154), although it reflects Common Turkic *baš könek*, is justified, for this is a special Bashkir word. It is true that this kind of bucket used for milking a mare was well known among other Turkic peoples, but mostly in the short form *könek* as in Kazakh.⁶ However, in this case we should expect the reading of the name of the Bashkir capital city *Öfö* and not Ufa (p. 60, 239) <'wfy>. In Bashkir documents, this name was usually spelled <'vfv>, transcribed *Öfö*,⁷ which in literary Eastern Turkic should be read *Üfü*.

Another evidence of the Tatar pronunciation is rendering Arabic ' as ğ, e.g. *ğammāzliq* 'spaying' (p. 175) for 'ammāz+, *ğarlan-* 'to be ashamed' (p. 175) for 'ār- and *qalğa* 'fortress, town' (p. 210) for *qal'a*.

Mária Ivanics stresses that she could not always be consistent in choosing a uniform form, for the chapters of the manuscript were copied in different periods (p. 13). As far as Arabic and Persian words are concerned, they are in principle transcribed in the literary, non-adapted forms, especially with reference to long vowels, since vowel harmony is frequently assumed to work in them, e.g. *bālīg* 'adult' (p. 20) and 'āfīz 'weak' (p. 63), not *bālīg* and 'āfīz. This is a very good solution not employed by Turkish researchers and many others influenced by the Turkish tradition in which the bulk of Arabo-Persian words are rendered in the modern Turkish spelling based on the high Ottoman style. However, Mária Ivanics does not extend this principle to open vowels, see such renderings as *sārāy* 'palace' (p. 20), despite the fact that this Persian word is often rendered harmonically even by the Turkish editors⁸ and has the harmonically adapted modern Tatar form *saray*.⁹ Another example is *habār* 'news, message' (p. 25), based on Turkish *haber*, see Tatar *xābār*¹⁰ and Eastern Turkic *xabar* as read by some researchers.¹¹ Good examples for

⁶ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar*, p. 396.

⁷ E.g. Özkan Öztekten, *18. Yüzyılda Karışık Dilli bir Metin: Bahâdur Şâh'ın Arz-Nâmesi (Baturşa Aliyev'den Çariçe Elizaveta Petrovna'ya)*, Konya 2010, pp. 242, 292.

⁸ E.g. Zuhâl Kargı Ölmez, *Ebulgazi Bahadır Han Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soykütüğü)*, Simurg, Ankara 1996, p. 441 and Münevver Tekcan, *Hakim Ata'nın Hz. Meryem Kitabı*, İstanbul 2008, p. 96.

⁹ M.M. Osmanov (ed.), *Tatarsko-russkij slovar*, Moskva 1966, p. 469.

¹⁰ Ibidem, p. 618.

¹¹ E.g. W.M. Thackston, *Zahiruddin Muhammad*, p. 659.

double rendering are provided by the transcription of verb suffixes, e.g. *qaytur-biz* ‘let it return’ (p. 55) and *bağlağay-sän* ‘tie’, just a few lines above. Taking the opportunity, *mingar* ‘thousand each’ (pp. 40, 197) should be rendered *mingär*. Turkish influence also manifests in such renderings as *hiç* ‘nothing’, more exactly ‘nobody’, for it occurs in *hiç kim ersä* (p. 34), cf. Turkish *hiç* < Persian *hič*, though it may be *häč*, since no vowel is marked in the spelling of this word in this occurrence. This word is not included in the glossary.

To be consistent with Northwestern Turkic languages, most of which do not have long vowels in Turkic words, I would prefer *tuwčï* to *tüčï* ‘standard bearer’ (pp. 57, 236), for the base *tuw* is a reflex of the Turkic *tuğ*, as noted by the editor, cf. Eastern Turkic *tuğ*.¹² This remark is valid for all words which end like this, e.g. *aču* ‘angry’ and *bağučï* ‘seer’ in *fäl bağučï* ‘soothsayer’ (pp. 140, 151), etc.

At this point we should note that work with the local varieties of Eastern Turkic is difficult because of the mixed character of these varieties. In this particular text, we have typical forms of Eastern Turkic, e.g. the ablative suffix +dIn, as in *ešäkdin* ‘from a donkey’ (p. 19), local Tatar and at the same western forms as the adjective suffix +II as in *körklü ~ körüklü*, in addition to Eastern Turkic *körklüg* ‘beautiful’ (p. 192), and the forms influenced by Turkish, e.g. the use of verb *ol-* ‘to become, to be’, especially when used as the light verb in compound verbs, but not only, for a list of its occurrences, see pp. 202–203 in the glossary. The mixed character of language is evident from many other parts of the text, e.g. *äylä olsa güzäl kemä birlä* [...] (p. 21) translated as ‘if it has to pass [...], on a beautiful ship [...]’ (p. 72), in which *äylä olsa* ‘so; in that case’ is dialect Turkish, *güzäl* ‘beautiful’ is also a Turkish word, though used in Modern Tatar,¹³ *kemä* ‘ship, boat’ may be both Tatar and Eastern Turkic, and *birlä* ‘with’ is Eastern Turkic, cf. Modern Tatar *bilän*.

The Arabic word *awwal* ‘first’ is mostly transcribed *äwwäl* (p. 171), but in a Turkic phrase translated as ‘first ancestor’, just after an Arabic text at the end of the legend, it is rendered as *ewwel babası*. The author gives reason for this and does not include this word in the index, but I think it could have been *äwwäl* like elsewhere in the legend.

Arabic script brings about ambiguity also in reading consonants. For example, ⟨brdbkk'⟩ may be read *Bärdibäkkä* or *Bärdibäggä*, and the editor prefers the latter (p. 54). However, once *Bärdibäg* is chosen, *tirik* (p. 25) should be *tirig* ‘alive’ as in the glossary (p. 234), and *kičik* (pp. 26, 188) should be *kičig* ‘small’. It is also more natural to render *k q* as weak consonants in the intervocalic position, e.g. *söyägimiz* is better than *söyäkimiz* ‘our bone(s)’ (p. 27), and *başığa* is more natural than *başıqa* ‘on her head’ (pp. 35, 154). A more difficult position to render is that after sonorants, though I would rather opt for *fälkärlarni* or *fälgärlarni* than *fälgärlarni* ‘fortune-tellers’ (p. 41), since the spelling in manuscript O clearly reads *fälkär-*. Note that the derived form may be

¹² Ibidem, p. 856.

¹³ M.M. Osmanov, *Tatarsko-russkij slovar*, p. 122.

a Turkic innovation, for the Persian word is *fālgīr* 'soothsayer'.¹⁴ If we consider such high-adapting languages as Kazakh in which this word sounds *balger*,¹⁵ we cannot exclude a reading like *fālkärlärni* or even *fālgärlärni*, but the spelling gives no support for this.

Mária Ivanics provides transliteration of difficult words in addition to transcription in the footnotes, mostly for some unclear proper names. The transliteration is given in capital letters enclosed in parentheses, e.g. (ZHB) for *Zühüb* (p. 19).

In the new edition, the reading and spelling of some words, especially proper names, have been revised, e.g. (2002, p. 31) *Ruĵam* versus (2024, p. 19) *Rūĵām*, (2002, p. 32) *Yöci* versus (2024, p. 19) *Yoĉi*, (2002, p. 32) *Tuġali* versus (2024, p. 19) *Tuġay*, (2002, p. 31) *Toqtoga* versus (2024, p. 19) *Toqtaġa* and (2002, p. 31) *Berdibeg* versus (2024, p. 19) *Bärdibäg*.

In such a great work, some shortcomings are inevitable. In my opinion, the biggest weakness of the book is of the editorial character. Its essence is that the author has not updated all entries and words in the glossary as she did in the rest of the book, i.e. introduction, transcription, translation and the footnotes. For example, the Persian word for 'God', transcribed *hudā*, comes up in the text in the phrase *hudā-yi tabāraka* (p. 35) and is translated as 'God – may he be blessed' (p. 96), but it appears in the glossary in two entries as *hodāy*: ~ *tebākā* and *hudā*: ~ *i tebākā* [sic] (p. 180) [ħd'y tbr'kh]. None of these forms is good. *Hoday* is the best, but it a characteristic Tatar form and the Common Turkic equivalent should be *huday*. The marker of the possessive relation *-(y)i* is unnecessary, for *tabāraka* is a verb, therefore the correct form should be *huday tabāraka*. Note that this word occurs in two forms, *huda* and *huday*, but the spelling clearly shows the latter one. There are many other differences between the forms in the glossary and those in the rest of the book, e.g. *Aq Sārāy* (p. 57), but *Aq Saray* (p. 145) in the glossary; *muyni* 'its neck' (p. 27), apparently influenced by Tatar *muyin*,¹⁶ and *moyun* 'neck' > *moyni* 'his neck' (p. 197) in the glossary, which is correct; *qoyurĵaq* (p. 39, 100), but *quyurĵaq* (p. 219) 'an untranslated suit of armour' in the glossary; one occurrence of the word for 'God' is *tengri* for (p. 33), while the glossary has only *tängri*, which is correct. The verb transcribed as *ayart-* (p. 56) was corrected in the glossary to *iyärt-* (p. 183) and shown together with two other occurrences but has not been corrected in the main text and the form *ayart-* is absent in the glossary. The translation '[...] chose [...]' (p. 126) also follows the reading *ayart-*, glossed in the first edition as 'aswählen', i.e. 'to choose' (p. 107). In a note on the basic verb *iyär-* 'to follow' (p. 183), Mária Ivanics refers to Budagov's dictionary from 1869, but both *iyär-* and *iyärt-*, the latter as 'to take with oneself, to make follow', are attested in Modern Tatar as well.¹⁷ It is to note that the Common Turkic reading of *iyärt-* should be *eyärt-*. Despite this, the glossary which is in fact also an index of all words and proper names occurring in the text, is very helpful.

¹⁴ F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, London 1892, p. 905.

¹⁵ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar*, p. 119.

¹⁶ M.M. Osmanov, *Tatarsko-russkij slovar*, p. 378.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 184.

Everybody who compiled an index to a major text critically edited knows how tedious job it is, even if assisted by indexing text-editing applications.

In the linguistic description, $y > o$ (p. 13) should be $y > \emptyset$, but this is probably a typographical error.

There are some small mistakes in the English texts, e.g. *mongol* (p. 19) for *Mongol* or *titel* (p. 132) for *titles*.

I can propose a few different readings. Firstly, the verb *tüšärmü* in *argamaqning ayağın yibäk birlä tüšärmü* must be read *tušarmu* and translated not as ‘if one [tie] the feet of a thoroughbred horse with silk does it fall?’ (pp. 56, 126), but ‘does he tie the thoroughbred horse’s legs with silk?’ The verb *tüš-* glossed in the glossary as ‘to fall, to collapse, to reach’ (p. 238) does not fit the context and this is in fact the verb *tuša-* ‘to tie horse’s legs’, as, e.g., in Kirghiz.¹⁸

Secondly, the word read as *örüt* ‘gunpowder’ (pp. 61, 135, 206) can be found in no Turkic sources I looked up and seems to be a ghost word. Moreover, it does not fit the context *müslümānlardın örütin bildürmäy birikib darularğa suw qoydurdı* ‘he secretly gathered the gunpowder from the Muslims and had water poured on the powder’. Gunpowder is what is rendered as *daru* < Per. *dārū* in further part of this sentence. The second word is a characteristic Tatar word *urtin* ‘secretly’, a variant of *orintin*,¹⁹ mentioned by Zajączkowski²⁰ as *uryntyn* ‘potajemnie’, i.e. ‘secretly’. This rare word is attested in the basic form *urin* ‘secret’ in Kazakh.²¹ Secondly, the causative verb *qoydur-*, although correctly rendered in the translation, is glossed in the index as ‘to let put’ (p. 217). Since it is preceded by the word *suw* ‘water’ which is its object, the base of the causative verb is not Turkic *qoy-* ‘to put’, but *quy-* ‘to pour’. Therefore, the correct reading should be *quydurdi*. Naturally, the Tatar vowel shift results in the reverse forms, i.e. *quy-* ‘to put’ and *qoy-* (more exactly *qıy-*) ‘to pour’, thus in the Tatar reading it is correct.

Thirdly, the word *tu* with the assumed suffix *+sı* which precedes *nišan(i)* and is taken by Mária Ivanics as a collocation or a pair *tusi nişāni*, and interpreted as ‘mark’ (pp. 31, 88, 235), should be in my view read *tüsi* ‘its colour’. Two arguments speak in favour of this interpretation. The first is that it is spelled <tsy> and should not be taken for the same word with *tū* (or better *tuw*) in *tūčı* (pp. 57, 236), which is spelled with the consonant *t* typical of the back phonetic vicinity. The second is that the marks listed in the text are all characterised by colours. Therefore, the reading and the interpretation of these two words should be *tüsi nişāni* ‘their colours and marks’.

Fourthly, *bir azna* (p. 32) in the translation context rendered as ‘some (way)’ (p. 89) and in the glossary glossed as ‘a little, a few’ should be translated ‘a week’ or ‘one week’. Although Mária Ivanics refers to Budagov’s dictionary, Budagov provides only *azğana*

¹⁸ K.K. Judaxin, *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar*, Moskva 1965, p. 774.

¹⁹ M.M. Osmanov, *Tatarsko-russkij slovar*, pp. 593, 414.

²⁰ Ananiasz Zajączkowski, *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraïmskim (Przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich). Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des Karaïms occidentaux (Contribution à la morphologie des langues turques). Avec résumé français*, Kraków 1932, p. 50.

²¹ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar*, p. 900.

‘a little, a few’ at that place. *Azna* is the Persian word denoting ‘Friday’, well-known in Turkic languages affected by Islam. The Persian form is *ādīna*²² and this loanword is used in various forms in Turkic languages such as *āzīnq*, *ādīnq*, *aynā* and *ayna*.²³ If we look at manuscript O, it is spelled ⟨ādynh⟩ and should be rendered *āzīne*, and the forms provided from the other manuscripts shown in the footnotes should be *azine* not *azina* in A and *azine*, not *azina* in C.

Apart from these new readings, some alternative semantic interpretations are possible. For example, *čaqrum*, translated as ‘verst (Russian mile)’ (p. 166), is a unit of length known in many cultures and its interpretation through Russian reference is by no means certain. It may be approximately rendered as ‘yard’. The form *kütärgän* (p. 27) should not be related to the verb *küt-* ‘to guard; to pasture; to await’, as it is explained and glossed in the glossary (p. 194), since *küt-* has no form like this. A better reading is *kötärgän*, a participle of the verb *kötär-* ‘to lift, to raise’, but neither this nor the preceding one make sense. Therefore, one may think of a form like *könärgän* ‘worn out; dated; which turned old’ as in Kazakh,²⁴ the base of which is the Persian word *kohne*, phonetically adapted to Kazakh. Probably this reading may be considered in this obscure part of the text.

There is much to deliberate on the names of suits of armour which come up on pages 37–38 in the text, discussed on pages 99–100. Probably some of those left untranslated may be explained. *Arnaw* (pp. 37, 100, 146) is known in the front form *ernew* ‘rim, lip (of a vessel)’.²⁵ *Uyılma* (pp. 39, 100, 241) is the Tatar adjective and noun denoting ‘hollowed out, hollow’²⁶ < *uyıl-* ‘to be hollowed out’, the Common Turkic form of which should be *oyulma* ~ *oyılma*. These two words may be considered as belonging to this group, for some names of suits of armour are the names and qualities of containers, e.g. *altun sanduq* ‘golden case’ or denote the shape and quality of part of vessels, e.g. *qatı qapaq* ‘hard cover’.

Buzaw baš (pp. 39, 100, 165) also fits well this semantic group of words as in some Turkic languages, e.g. Kazakh, in which *buzawbas* denotes ‘mole cricket’,²⁷ literally ‘calf’s head’. The head and the prothorax of this large insect are heavily sclerotised, and they make an appearance of an armour plate so that it may be associated with the suit of armour. *Köyläksä* (pp. 39, 100, 192) denotes a ‘shirt’, especially ‘undershirt’ in Crimean Tatar. Unfortunately, this word is not listed in the standard dictionaries, but it is found in a Dobruja Tatar dictionary as *köylekse* ‘shirt’, just under *köylek* ‘shirt’.²⁸

²² F. Steingass, *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, p. 30.

²³ Hendrik Boeschoten, *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*, Leiden 2023, p. 19.

²⁴ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar*, p. 235.

²⁵ Gulayhan Aqtay and Tülay Çulha, ‘A New Version of the Edige Epic from the Crimea: Karaim or Krymchak?’, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 75/3 (2022), p. 452.

²⁶ M.M. Osmanov, *Tatarsko-russkij slovar*, p. 583.

²⁷ R.G. Syzdykova and K.Š. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar*, p. 168.

²⁸ Karahan Metin Osman, *Dobruca Kırımıttatar Ağzı Sözlüğü. Dicționarul graiului tătar dobrogean*, 2 E–O, Köstence 2011, p. 365.

My last remark is the lack of the table of editorial symbols and abbreviations. Some abbreviations like GN or PN are easy to understand, since they precede geographical names and personal names, respectively, but some symbols and abbreviations may be difficult to identify with the meanings and words.

In conclusion, I can say that I was very happy to see Mária Ivanics's new edition of the Genghis Khan Legend with the English translation and many new comments. For example, she interpreted *kökün qırğan kütän hān* as 'the last khan, who exterminated his roots' (p. 123). She has proven her mastery in detecting many rare and less known words, e.g. the above mentioned *ödür* 'funeral feast' or dialect words such as *şay* 'as' (pp. 34, 227), known only in Tatar dialects. There are also many other fine findings in Mária Ivanics's edition. For example, the word *älmağaj* (pp. 36, 171), spelled with a long initial *a-* to evoke an 'apple-tree', interpreted as *alma ağaç* in the printed edition of 1882, and initially read and interpreted by the editors as *almağaj* 'Apfelbaum', i.e. 'apple-tree',²⁹ in the new revised edition was changed to *älmağaj* 'Caucasian elm'. It was argued that a fruit tree does not fit the context of trees assigned by Genghis Khan to chieftains (p. 96). In fact, *elme* ~ *elmen* etc. is a word that denotes various species of trees in some Turkic languages, such as 'elm' and 'aspen'.

I warmly recommend this new edition to everybody interested in the history of Eurasia as well as in the Turkic and Mongol studies. Mária Ivanics is the author of an excellent study 'Authority in the steppe' dedicated to the Hungarian reader, based on the Genghis Khan Legend, in which she examined many questions that she could not address in this critical edition.³⁰ I would like to encourage her to publish it in an English version likewise.

References

- Aqtay Gulayhan and Tülay Çulha, 'A New Version of the Edige Epic from the Crimea: Karaim or Krymchak?', *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 75/3 (2022), pp. 439–462.
- Boeschoten Hendrik, *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic*, Brill, Leiden 2023.
- Ivanics Mária, *Hatalomgyakorlás a steppén. A Dzingisz-náme nomád világa*, MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont, Budapest 2017.
- Ivanics Mária and Mirkasym A. Usmanov, *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende (Däftär-i Čingiz-nāmā) I.*, Department of Altaic Studies, University of Szeged, Szeged 2002.
- Judaxin K.K., *Kirgizsko-russkij slovar'*, Sovetskaja ènciklopedija, Moskva 1965.
- Judin V.P., Ju.G. Baranov and M.X. Abuseitova (eds.), *Utemiš-xadži. Čingiz-Name. Faksimile, perevod transkripcija, tekstologičeskie primečanija, kommentarii i ukazatel'i*, Gylm, Alma-Ata 1992.
- Karahan Metin Osman, *Dobruca Kırımtatar Ağzı Sözlüğü. Dicționarul graiului tătar dobrogean*, 2 E–O, Köstence 2011.
- Kawaguchi Takushi, Hiroyuki Nagamine (authored) and Mutsumi Sugahara (supervised), *Ötämiš Hāji. Čingiz-nāma. Introduction, Annotated Translation, Transcription and Critical Text*, Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tōkyō 2008.
- Osmanov M.M. (ed.), *Tatarsko-russkij slovar'*, Sovetskaja ènciklopedija, Moskva 1966.

²⁹ Mária Ivanics and Mirkasym A. Usmanov, *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende*, p. 102.

³⁰ Mária Ivanics, *Hatalomgyakorlás a steppén. A Dzingisz-náme nomád világa*, Budapest 2017.

- Ölmez Zuhal Kargı, *Ebulgazi Bahadır Han Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soykütiüğü)*, Simurg, Ankara 1996.
- Öztekten Özkan, 8. *Yüzyılda Karışık Dilli bir Metin: Bahâdur Şâh'ın Arz-Nâmesi (Batrışa Aliyev'den Çariçe Elizaveta Petrovna'ya)*, Kömen, Konya 2010.
- Steingass F., *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, Sampson Low, Marston & Company, London 1892.
- Syzdykova R.G. and K.Ş. Xusain (eds.), *Kazaxsko-russkij slovar'*, Dajk-Press, Almaty 2001.
- Tekcan Münevver, *Hakim Ata'nın Hz. Meryem Kitabı*, Beşir, İstanbul 2008.
- Thackston W.M., *Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur Mirza. Baburnama. Part Three: Hindustan. Chaghatay Turkish Text with Abdul-Rahim Khankhanan's Persian Translation*, Harvard University, New York 1993.
- Tumaşeva D.G., *Slovar' dialektov sibirskix tatar*, Izdatel'stvo Kazanskogo universiteta, Kazan' 1992.
- Zajączkowski Ananiasz, *Sufiksy imienne i czasownikowe w języku zachodniokaraïmskim (Przyczynek do morfologii języków tureckich). Les suffixes nominaux et verbaux dans la langue des Karaïms occidentaux (Contribution à la morphologie des langues turques). Avec résumé français*, Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Kraków 1932.

Henryk Jankowski

(Poznań, Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2576-1204 