

charitable benefactor, to her role as the lead actor in hagiographic accounts of her life and reign. The Queen clearly carried considerable political and cultural capital in later-nineteenth-century India, and was flexible in the uses to which she could be put. As Taylor remarks, she was “all things to all people” (p. 242). But the book leaves us wanting to know more about why different groups in Indian society understood Victoria in the ways they did, and about the deeper dynamics which conditioned specific uses of her name and likeness. Which versions of the Empress were most common, which most powerful, which most controversial? Where precisely did Indians draw the lines between Victoria and the Crown? Which other figures and symbols did those appealing to the Queen appeal to, and in what hierarchies? What trajectories of change over time can we identify? And, crucially, what patterns of regional peculiarity can we establish? The book draws on evidence from all across the subcontinent, but some of Taylor’s distillations of the convictions of “the people of India” or “Indian nationalists” still seem to require a little artistic licence. *Empress* hints at answers to all the questions above, but never stays in one place for long enough to give entirely satisfactory responses. At times the sheer reach and velocity of the book threaten to turn it into an encyclopaedia of Indian Victoriana. There is ample scope for further, more focused case studies, and especially for the integration of Taylor’s findings within the wider currents of the endlessly vibrant field of modern Indian political history.

With that said, it may be that a full recapitulation of the place of the Empress in the Indian imagination is beyond the grasp of modern scholars. The most tantalising part of the volume is the bibliographical appendix of published nineteenth-century texts relating to Victoria and her family in sixteen Indian vernacular languages, of which only a small number has survived. These source issues presumably help to account for why the book lavishes so much space and detail on more tangible manifestations of Victoria and the monarchy in India, such as jubilees, statues, currencies, and (at greatest length) royal tours. But *Empress* hints at a more substantial intellectual dimension than it has time to excavate: it passes very lightly over numerous intriguing Indian texts and debates, drawing out just an illustrative quotation or two. Future labourers in this vineyard will be in Taylor’s debt for his indications of where to start.

Taylor’s achievement is to show that a single book on either of his subjects – Victoria and India, and the reception of ‘Victoria’ in India – would not be complete. *Empress*, as such, makes a major contribution to modern British imperial history, at the same time as it opens up an important neglected theme in the history of nineteenth-century Indian political culture. It is hard not to wonder what the book might have told us had it focused in greater depth on particular aspects of its subject, and engaged more closely with the vast historiographies around its varied concerns. But that would be a project of a different kind. Taylor tells a sweeping story with great verve, and succeeds in re-embedding the Victorian monarchy within our picture of the tangled relationship between Britain and India. <alex.middleton@history.ox.ac.uk>

ALEX MIDDLETON
University of Oxford

MONGOLIC COPIES IN CHAGHATAY. By ÉVA KINCSES-NAGY. (*Turcologica* 115). pp. 292. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2018.

doi:[10.1017/S1356186319000063](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186319000063)

Chaghatay is an elusive term generally used in scholarly literature to designate the language of all Central Asian Turkic texts produced between the fifteenth and twentieth centuries in a vast geographical

area extending from Anatolia in the West to the Tarim Basin in the East and from the Volga region in the North to Northern India in the South. It is important to note here that native authors hardly ever applied the word Chaghatay as a linguistic term and when they did, the term was meant to refer to the language of the Persianate classical literary tradition Mīr ‘Alī-šīr Nawāyī (1441–1501) established in the mid-fifteenth century in the Timurid heartlands and it didn’t mean the simple Turkic that for example the Khivan ruler Abū al-Ghāzī (r. 1644–1663/64) used for writing his historical works in the seventeenth century. The term Chaghatay as it is used today gained ground quite late in European scholarship after the publication of *Čagataische Sprachstudien* (Leipzig, 1867) Arminius Vambery’s (1832–1913) pioneering work on the subject. The inconsistencies in the use of the scholarly term Chaghatay can be assessed very well by the short summary of its history Éva Kincses-Nagy supplies the reader with in the general introduction to her book (pp. 16–17). Though the author fails to give her own definition of the term at this point, from the sources she consulted throughout her research it seems to be clear that she uses the term in a broad sense covering classical poetical texts composed in early-fifteenth century Khurasan to historical works written in simple Turkic in the late-seventeenth century in the Volga–Ural area.

Kincses-Nagy’s aim is to collect words of Mongolic origin from an apparently huge corpus of Central Asian Turkic texts. Her research is an important one from two points of view. First, because Chaghatay is thought to be a Turkic language where “the influence of Mongolian was restricted to a number of loanwords from the domains of warfare and administration”¹ and secondly because modern scholarly works on Chaghatay lexicography are not abundant. Students and scholars of Central Asian Turkic know quite well that one of the biggest problems is the lack of easy to use and reliable dictionaries like “the *Redhouse*” and “the *Steingass*” in Ottoman and Persian studies respectively. Without proper dictionaries those who study Chaghatay texts are forced to resort to native Chaghatay–Persian, Chaghatay–Ottoman vocabularies and nineteenth century general Turkic dictionaries that cannot always provide the data needed. In this situation any reliable modern work that can facilitate the reading of Central Asian Turkic texts counts as a welcome contribution to the field and Éva Kincses-Nagy’s book is by all means one of them.

The book consists of four larger units, a general introduction (pp. 9–36), the lexicon (pp. 38–239), the finishing chapters containing the author’s conclusions (pp. 240–261) and the bibliography (pp. 263–292).

The introductory chapters are short and they aim at supplying the reader with essential information on topics like the history of Turkic–Mongolic language contacts, the place of Chaghatay in the Turkic language family or the history of research previously done. This Introduction also lists the sources used, gives an outline of the theoretical framework for studying loanwords and describes the structure of the lexicon entries.

This chapter includes Kincses-Nagy’s ideas on how Mongolic loanwords entered Chaghatay and her views raise a few questions. Kincses-Nagy appears to suggest that the Mongol conquest in the thirteenth century resulted in a period of Turkic–Mongolic bilingualism that had an impact up until the fifteenth century when the Chaghatay literary language emerged. Even if the author’s supposition is correct and the Mongolic linguistic presence in the Timurid heartlands in Central Asia and Khurasan was strong enough to influence the use of everyday Turkic two hundred years after the Mongols arrived, its impact on a literary language that was shaped to serve the purposes of a classical Persianate literary tradition couldn’t have been significant. Classical Chaghatay as a literary language developed in a bilingual Persian–Turkic linguistic environment where being cultured was equal to being well-versed in Islamicate Persian literary culture.

¹Hendrik Boeschoten–Marc Vandamme, Chaghatay. In: Lars Johanson–Éva Ágnes Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages* (London and New York, 1998), p. 167.

There's no doubt that even the earliest known Chaghatay literary texts aimed at imitating Persian models and tried to comply with the rules of a rigid and conventional Persianate literary system. Most authors were not simple people constantly subjected to a supposed Mongolic influence; they were members of a highly cultured and educated Islamicate élite who were bilingual in Turkic and Persian rather than in Turkic and Mongolic. This world is very far from the world of Mongolic speaking nomads.

The process of creating a Turkic classical literary tradition and a language that would serve the purpose of producing quality content in Turkic was started by authors like Aḥmadī (fl. late 14th/early 15th c.), Yūsuf Amīrī (fl. early 15th c.), Luṭfī (d. 1492). It was given a great push by Nawāyī (1441–1501) an educated intellectual statesman and administrator who wrote poetry both in Persian and Turkic. He composed Turkic texts in all the important classical genres of his age and created a textual canon that served as a model for oncoming generations of poets and writers even as late as the nineteenth century. The creation of a classical canon also meant the construction of a signifying universe that included a wide range of various rhetoric devices, poetic images and most importantly a heavily Persianised vocabulary. It is true that this poetic lexicon contained Mongolic loans as well. Nevertheless, the words of Mongolic origin present in the vocabulary of this emerging new literary language were not newcomers that entered the language as a result of a continuous Turkic–Mongolic language contact but rather they were part of the classical lexicon Chaghatay inherited from its Turkic predecessor languages or from Persian.² Scattered remarks in the text of Kincses-Nagy's entries³ and contemporary Persian sources seem to confirm this hypothesis.

The example of the noun *ayalghu* 'tone, melody' illustrates this point well. Though according to Kincses-Nagy the first occurrence for the word are from the works of Nawāyī, it seems to have entered the vocabulary of Persian texts a bit earlier as the compound *ayalghu-pardāz* 'musician' makes its appearance in the description of a feast in Mu'īn al-Dīn Natanzī's chronicle written in 1413.⁴ The context of Natanzī's account suggests that *ayalghu* wasn't used for 'melody' in a general sense but it had a special meaning and denoted a special kind of folk or Mongolian tune. A long list of military terms or words pertaining to falconry could also be mentioned here that made their appearance in Persian texts much earlier, in the Mongol period.

An important issue that could have been discussed in this part of the book is how frequently words of Mongolic origin appear in Chaghatay texts and which semantic fields are most heavily influenced by them. It can be supposed that even during the initial phase of Chaghatay the rate of Mongolic loans changed from author to author, from text to text and from genre to genre. A remark by Kincses-Nagy characterising one of her sources, the *Tazkirat al-Awliyā* an Islamic hagiographical work as a text not abounding in Mongolic loans (p. 20) suggests that she realised these differences but, as her results indicate, she failed to capitalise on this opportunity for a deep and thorough synchronic research.

As one of the early texts Kincses-Nagy also made use of suggests even contemporary authors were well-aware of the differences characterising the language use of various social or geographical groups and when they deemed it appropriate poets used dialectal words as a stylistic device. In Aḥmadī's *Debate of Stringed Instruments* the *tanbura* an instrument used in classical music has an argument with the *yatughan* a folk instrument of Mongolic origin.⁵ During their debate the *yatughan* tries to show himself

²For a detailed study on Mongolic loanwords in classical Persian see Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. I. (Wiesbaden, 1963).

³See e.g. the entries *besārek* (p. 62), *bātākā* (p. 63), etc.

⁴Mu'īn al-Dīn Natanzī, *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh-i Mu'īn*. Bi-ihitām-i Parvīn Istakhrī. (Tehran, 1383), p. 295.

⁵The word doesn't appear in Kincses-Nagy's wordlist. For a detailed description of *yatughan* see Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente I*, pp. 546–550. Natanzī's description of a feast speaks about two instruments of supposed Mongol origin, *yatughan* and *shidīrgu* that were used to accompany singers specialised in singing Mongol tunes (*yaruchiyān-i ayalghu-pardāz*). Natanzī, *Muntakhab*, p. 295.

as an educated gentleman and uses many Persian words and expressions in his speech. In his answer the *tanbura* aims at highlighting the *yatughan's* ignorance and lack of education⁶ and while doing so he uses mostly Turkic words, three of which are included in Kincses-Nagy's list.⁷

Besides the synchronic differences observable in the use of Mongolic loans in various registers of the vocabulary it can also be surmised that there can be chronological differences as well. It is possible that historical events, the coming of the nomad Uzbeks at the turn of the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries or the Kalmuck invasion could have a bearing on the vocabulary of Central Asian Turkic and these changes are reflected by texts. It would be good to learn how history affected the language in the post-Nawāyī period and whether there are any chronological or regional differences in the number of Mongolic loans in Chaghatay texts. Though research done in the field in the past one and a half centuries resulted in a huge amount of text editions ranging from poetry and literary prose to historical, religious and medical texts that would make such analyses possible,⁸ the range and the quantity of the textual sources Kincses-Nagy chose to use is not sufficient for these purposes.

Kincses-Nagy's Chaghatay sources can be divided into three groups: original texts, native dictionaries and nineteenth century lexicographical works. As far as textual sources are concerned the early period of Chaghatay is represented fairly well. Though the subchapter introducing Kincses-Nagy's sources doesn't mention them but from the bibliography it is clear that the most important texts were checked. Still, a work much quoted in native dictionaries, Haydar Tilbe's (d. early 15th c.) *Makhzan al-asrār* is unfortunately missing from the list.⁹

The classical period that abounds in texts is treated in a surprisingly disappointing way. Kincses-Nagy used only one text, a short though famous pamphlet by Nawāyī, the *Muhākamāt al-Lughatayn*. In this short treatise Nawāyī does his best to extol the virtues of Turkic compared to Persian endeavouring to convince his fellow poets to use Turkic for poetic purposes. It is a pity that Kincses-Nagy singled out only one text out of Nawāyī's enormous literary output because it would have been interesting to see how Nawāyī himself implemented the principles he advised his contemporaries to follow and how often he used the Turkic words of Mongolic origin he advertised in the *Muhākamāt*. Kincses-Nagy's decision to leave almost the whole of Nawāyī's *oeuvre* untouched means an exciting opportunity left unused because the twenty volume edition of Nawāyī's works published in Tashkent is available online in a searchable form on the homepage of the National Library of Uzbekistan.¹⁰

For the post-Nawāyī period Kincses-Nagy selected only four historical works, Bābur's autobiography, Abū al-Ghāzī's chronicles¹¹ and the *Daftār-i Chingis-nāma*, an anonymous seventeenth-century text from the Volga-Ural region. Kincses-Nagy's choices for this period are rather problematic. Though it is true that Abū al-Ghāzī's works on the history of Turks and Turkmens are usually categorised as Chaghatay, Abū al-Ghāzī's statement that in order to make his text understandable even to a five year old child he used plain Turkic and avoided Chaghatay, Persian

⁶Kemal Eraslan, 'Ahmedî: Münazara (Telli Sazlar Atışması)', *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 24 (1986), p. 154.

⁷*āda-, çiray, çura-*

⁸For a comprehensive list of edited and published Chaghatay texts see Farhad Rahimi, 'Çağatay Türkçesi ve Edebiyatı Üzerine Bir Bibliyografya Denemesi', *Turkish Studies* 9:3 (2014), pp. 1157–1218. For unpublished MA theses and PhD dissertations see the relevant homepage of the Turkish Council for Higher Education. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/giris.jsp> [Last accessed 06. 11. 2018].

⁹Ayet Abdülaziz Goca, *Hayder Tilbe'nin Mahzenü'l Esrâr Mesnevisi. Önsöz, Giriş, Metin ve Tercüme, Dizin*. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi. (İstanbul, 2000); Haydar Xorazmiy, *Gulshan ul-asror*. In: M. Abduvohidova–H. Muxtorova–B. Qosimxonov–O. Jo'raev, Muborak maktublar. (Tashkent, 1987), pp. 211–216.

¹⁰<http://navoi.natlib.uz:8101/uz/> [Last accessed 06. 11. 2018]. A .pdf version of all the volumes is also accessible at the following homepage: <http://n.ziyouz.com/kutubxona/category/40-alisher-navoiy-asarlari> [06. 11. 2018].

¹¹The edition of the *Shajara-i Tarākima* prepared by Zuhul Kargı Ölmez contains a wordlist and notes on select words, some of them are included in Kincses-Nagy's book, that makes research on Abū al-Ghāzī's vocabulary much easier. This edition is not included in Kincses-Nagy's bibliography. Ebulgazi Bahadır Han, *Şecere-i Terākime (Türkmenlerin Soykütüğü)*. Hazırlayan Zuhak Kargı Ölmez (Ankara, 1996).

and Arabic expressions seems to refute this categorisation.¹² The inclusion of the *Chingis-nāma* poses an even greater theoretical problem as the editors of the text, Mária Ivanics and Myrkasim A. Usmanov think that the language of the text is “sixteenth and eighteenth-century literary Volga Tatar”¹³ and not Central Asian Turkic.

The second group of sources Kincses-Nagy made use of are native dictionaries written between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries. These lexicographical works can be divided into two groups and should be treated separately. The first group consists of Nawāyī dictionaries. Scholars working on Chaghatay tend to view these lexicographical works as Chaghatay dictionaries. This classification however is true only if the term Chaghatay is meant in a narrow sense referring to the classical Turkic Nawāyī used as the *Badāyī‘ al-Lughat* (late 15th/early 16th c.), the *Abushqa* (16th c.), the *Sanglakḥ* (18th c.) and the *Bahjat al-Lughat* (19th c.) were compiled with the intent of facilitating the reading of Nawāyī’s work for a readership in Iran or the Ottoman Empire that due to the differences between Turkic languages had difficulties in understanding some parts of the texts. The authors of these dictionaries as Mahdī Khān (d. between 1759 and 1768) writes “had an insurmountable drive ... to collect difficult words from his works and compile a dictionary of them”.¹⁴

With the exception of the *Abushqa*¹⁵ the published versions of the works belonging to the first group are not easy to use. The original Persian text of the *Badāyī‘ al-Lughat* and the *Sanglakḥ* were published in a not easily legible facsimile which scares scholars and induces them to use the various word lists prepared by the editors instead of the full text. These word lists however do not contain all the information available in the entries’ texts and relying solely on the lists can lead to serious misunderstandings.

In her entry on the word *abağa* ‘uncle’ for example Kincses-Nagy refers to Borovkov’s facsimile edition of the *Badāyī‘ al-Lughat*. However, she fails to inform the reader that the noun is not contained in the dictionary part but in a word list added to the original text of the early-eighteenth century manuscript by a later hand should greatly influence the evaluation of the data concerned.

It’s not mentioned by Kincses-Nagy either that several of the entries in the *Sanglakḥ* contain an important notice: “in Mongolic it means... (*bi-lughat-i Mughūlī ... buvad*) and she treats them as Chaghatay words. In his entry on the word *mōḡān* ‘silver’ for example Kincses-Nagy writes that “it’s a hapax in Chaghatay” in spite of the explicit statement found in the *Sanglakḥ* that “*bi-lughat-i Mughūlī nuqra buvad ...* (In Mongolian it means silver)”.¹⁶ An exception of Kincses-Nagy’s usual treatment of such words is found in the entry *doḡolan* ‘lame’ (p. 99) where she writes that it’s “a foreign word in *Sanglakḥ*”. It is hard to understand the inconsistencies in the treatment of words termed Mongolic by Mahdī Khān and it’s difficult to explain why foreign words that are not part of the vocabulary of Chaghatay are added to the list of Mongolic copies in Chaghatay.¹⁷

¹² „Bu tāñkhūi yakshshū va yaman barchalari bilsün tep Türkī tili bilen aytdım. Türkīni ham andaḡ aytıp men kim beş yaşar oḡlan tūshūmür bir kalima Chaghatay Türkīsindin, Fārsēdin, ‘Arabēdin qoshmay men ravshān bolur” (In order to enable good and bad people to [fully] understand it I have written my chronicle in Turkic. I used Turkic in a way that even a five year old boy can understand it and it’s clear that I avoided including words of Chaghatay, Persian and Arabic.) Desmains, P. I., *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatars par Aboul-Ghazf Behādur Khan* (Amsterdam, 1970), 37.

¹³Ivanics Mária–Myrkasim A. Usmanov, *Das Buch der Dschingis-Legende (Dāftār-i Dschingis-nāmā)* (Szeged, 2002), 1.

¹⁴E. Denison Ross (ed.), *The Mabānī‘l-Lughat Being a Grammar of the Turki Language in Persian by Mirzā Mehdi Khān* (Calcutta, 1910), p. 1.

¹⁵The critical edition of the *Abushqa* was published by Mustafa Kaçalin in 2011. Niyāzi, *Nevāyī‘nin Sözləri ve Çaḡatayca Tanıklar. El-Luḡātu ‘n-Nevā‘iyye ve ‘l-İstihādātu ‘l-Caḡātā‘iyye*. Hazırlayan Mustafa S. Kaçalin (Ankara, 2011). Kincses-Nagy didn’t use this edition.

¹⁶Clauson, *Sanglakḥ* f. 320v/26. The list of such words is quite long. See e.g. *adıḡan* (p. 39), *amīdun* (p. 47), *dabusun* (p. 89), *dūlāy* (p. 102), *ālākā* (p. 105), *eljiḡān* (p. 106), *elinčig* (p. 106), *emāḡān* (p. 107), *ḡaşun* (p. 110), etc.

¹⁷It’s not the only word termed foreign in the book. See e.g. *dotur* (p. 100), *dörben* (p. 101), *eḡḡā* (p. 104), *elinčig* (p. 106), *ḡaşun* (p. 110), etc.

Coming back to Mahdī Khān's recurring remark it suggests that he was well aware of the fact that words he termed Mongolic were not part of Turkic vocabulary.¹⁸ In the *Mabānī al-Lughat* a short summary of Turkic grammar meant as a preface to the *Sanglakh* Mahdī Khān mentions that he included several Rūmī (Ottoman Turkish) and Mongolic words in his dictionary as well.¹⁹ Though he doesn't say where he collected these words the text makes it clear that his main sources for Ottoman words were Fuzūlī's (d. 1556) poetic *oeuvre* and Sa'd al-Dīn's chronicle.²⁰ As far as the source or sources for Mongolic words are concerned it is possible that these he came across in historical works from the Mongol period, perhaps in Vassāf's chronicle. Mahdī Khān was a historian himself and wrote two chronicles covering the rule of Nādir Shāh. One of them titled *Durra-yi Nādīra* was written with the intention of surpassing the florid style of Vassāf's work a text considered one of the greatest achievements of Persian narrative prose so it's not without reason to believe that Mahdī Khān knew Vassāf's work and other chronicles from the period very well and he was familiar with the foreign words included in them. The entry *čumča* 'shirt' where Mahdī Khān included a reference to the fourth volume of Vassāf's chronicle seems to support this theory.²¹

Speaking of Nawāyī dictionaries it's a pity that Kincses-Nagy didn't check the Budapest manuscript of the *Bahjat al-Lughat* that would have been easily accessible for her at the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences²² and used only a list of selected words included in an article by József Thúry a previous owner of the manuscript because she would have been able to see that in a lot of cases Fath 'Alī Qājār Qazwīnī simply repeated what he read in the *Sanglakh*.²³

The other group of native dictionaries and word lists used by Kincses-Nagy were compiled in Mughal India from the late-sixteenth century onwards.²⁴ Since they targeted language learners who wished to study Turkic for practical purposes the vocabulary contained in them can be considered as a snapshot of the basic vocabulary of contemporary everyday Turkic as it appeared in Mughal India where besides standard Central Asian Turkic other Turkic languages, Özbek, Iranian Turkic and Ottoman were also present.

The case of the word *bökä* 'wrestler, hero' illustrates this point well.²⁵ Kincses-Nagy's entry makes it clear that Bābur considered the noun an Özbek word which means that for him it wasn't an ordinary Central Asian Turkic word and he considered it part of the vocabulary of the Turkic speaking nomadic Özbek tribes brought with them from their original South-Western Siberian homeland. Özbek nomads originally spoke a Qipchaq language quite different from the Central Asian Turkic Bābur and Nawāyī used. It seems though that, by the time Abū al-Ghāzī's chronicles were written in the second half of the seventeenth century the word *bökä* had become part of the vocabulary of Central Asian Turkic and the fact that the *Kelür-nāma* contains the word reflects this situation. It's interesting to note here that in the case of *bökä* Kincses-Nagy refers to a passage in Abū al-Ghāzī's text where the

¹⁸Many of these words are termed by Kincses-Nagy "temporary copies".

¹⁹Ross, *The Mabānī al-Lughat*, p. 3.

²⁰Ross, *The Mabānī al-Lughat*, p. 16.

²¹Clauson, *Sanglax* f. 215r/19–20.

²²Ismail Parlatur–György Hazai, *Macar Bilimler Akademisi Kütüphanesi'ndeki Türkçe El Yazmaları Kataloğu* (Ankara, 2007), pp. 455–459.

²³Fath 'Alī relates in his preface to the dictionary that he was lucky to find a copy of *Sanglakh* at a private library and he had three days to consult it. Fath 'Alī Qājār Qazwīnī, *Fihrist-i Bahjat al-Lughat*. Ms Török O. 325, f. 17b.

²⁴For a detailed account of the role Turkic played in Mughal India see Benedek Péri, *Turkish Language and Literature in Medieval and Early Modern India*. In: Ismail K. Poonawala (ed.), *Turks in the Indian Subcontinent, Central and West Asia. Turkish Presence in the Islamic World* (New Delhi, 2017), pp. 227–262.

²⁵The meaning of the word given by Bābur is 'strong man'. Zahiruddin Muhammad Babur Mirza, *Bāburnāma. Part One. Chaghatay Turkish Text with Abdul-Rahim Khankhanan's Persian Translation. Turkish Transcription, Persian Edition and English Translation* by W. M. Thackston, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass, 1993), p. 41.

word appears together with another Mongolic loan *mārgān* ‘sharpshooter’ as *üçünçisi taqi mārgān ve bökä erdi* (‘the third one of them was a sharpshooter and a strong man’).²⁶

In the entry *īdār* ‘hobbles for horses’ (p. 81) Kincses-Nagy refers to “the so called Calcutta Dictionary”. This Turkic–Persian dictionary was compiled by Fazl Allāh Khān Barlas for the use of a Mughal prince perhaps during the reign of Aurangzeb.²⁷ Though the sources of the dictionary are not mentioned in the short preface, entries like *čanghur* ‘rain’, *judruq* ‘fist’, *danip* “knowing”, *demür* “iron” suggest that the words contained in the dictionary are from various Turkic languages and dialects²⁸ which would mean that words appearing in the dictionary are not necessarily part of the vocabulary of the Chaghatay literary language.

The third group of sources Kincses-Nagy used consists of dictionaries written with the exception of Suat Ünlüs’s work by nineteenth-century authors who as far as Chaghatay words are concerned based their dictionaries on almost exactly the same native lexicographical works and texts and thus they often repeat the same data. Though Kincses-Nagy lists the sources Abel Pavet de Courteille (1821–1889), Julius Theodore Zenker (1811–1884), Lazar Zakharovich Budagov (1812–1878) and Friedrich Wilhelm Radloff (1837–1918) used she didn’t compare the data contained in their dictionaries and in the list of sources given in the entries it often appears as if they were independent pieces of evidence.

The largest unit and the main part of Kincses-Nagy’s book contains a lexicon of approximately 300 headwords of Mongolic origin arranged in alphabetical order. The entries are well-structured. Headwords are followed by essential pieces of information (transliteration of the Arabic script forms, meaning(s), list of sources, Mongolian etymon). The first two paragraphs list all the Mongolian and Turkic languages where the word occurs and give all available forms together with references to the sources. The third paragraph provides the reader with further information on the word’s first occurrence in Turkic texts and includes a short account of the history of research. All entries are finished with a list of references to relevant items in scholarly literature.

It has already been mentioned that Éva Kincses-Nagy seems to have relied on various word lists prepared by the editors of the printed versions when it came to native lexicographical works and she didn’t check the original text of the entries. This method resulted in failing to find essential pieces of data.

Out of the many examples a few should be highlighted here. The earliest source mentioned by Kincses-Nagy for the noun *širalğa* ‘a piece of the meat of the prey’ (p. 201) is the *Bābur-nāma*. Nevertheless, the *Sanglakh*, a source also contained in the entry’s list, gives a reference to an earlier source, Nawāyī’s *Mahbūb al-Qulūb* finished in 1501 where it occurs in the 35th chapter, a section on falconers and hunters.²⁹

Atalay’s edition of the *Abushqa*, a sixteenth-century Chaghatay–Ottoman Nawāyī dictionary is the first in the list of sources for the verb *bürke-* ‘to cover’ (p. 73). The entry in the *Abushqa* however contains a reference to an earlier text, Nawāyī’s divan titled *Fawāyid al-Kibar* compiled between 1492 and 1498.³⁰ The poem containing the word is also included in the *Nawādir al-Nihāya* an earlier redaction of Nawāyī’s lyrical poems copied in Herat in 1487 which would put the date of the first appearance of the word in a text a few decades earlier than it was previously thought.³¹

It’s the *Abushqa* again appearing first in the list of sources referred to in the entry *dapqur* ‘row of troops’ (p. 93) and Kincses-Nagy writes that the noun’s “first occurrence is in early 16th century

²⁶Ebulgazi, *Şecere-i Terākime*, p. 201 (f. 95b/16).

²⁷Charles Ambrose Storey, *Persian Literature. A Bio-Bibliographical Survey* III/1 (Leiden, 1984), pp. 111–112.

²⁸Fazl Allāh Khān, *Lughat-i Turkī* (Calcutta, 1825), pp. 152, 154, 163. The first two words appear to be from a Qipchaq, the second two words from an Oghuz language.

²⁹Clauson, *Sanglax*, f. 259v/26–28; Mir ‘Alī-shīr Nawāyī, *Mahbūb al-Qulūb*. (Ed.) A. N. Kononov (Moskva, 1948), p. 52 (text in Arabic script).

³⁰Besim Atalay, *Abūška Luğatı veya Çağatay Sözlüğü* (Ankara, 1970), pp. 145–146.

³¹‘Alī-shīr Nawāyī, *Nawādir al-Nihāya*. Ed. Aziz Kayumov (Tashkent, 1987), p. 592.

Chaghatay”. However, a short glance to the edition of the *Abushqa* is enough to see that the text quotes two works by Nawāyī, *Farhād wa Shīrīn* composed in 1484 and *Sadd-i Iskandarī* finished one year later.³² Both are naturally earlier than the *Abushqa*.

The case of *bürke* illustrates how important it is – to use texts instead of simply relying on dictionaries. While “Chaghatay” dictionaries usually give only the meaning of a given word, texts provide a historical context and through a series of data the career of a word could be drawn. A thorough analysis of a corpus of Chaghatay texts can help to determine when a word first appeared in the written language and how frequently it was used. If a scholar relies only on dictionaries and doesn’t compare their data with pieces of evidence supplied by texts, the research can necessarily lead to misunderstandings. Though the list of sources given for *bürke*- ‘to cover’ in Kincses-Nagy’s book would suggest that it was a common everyday verb there seems to be the only one piece of evidence for its use in written Chaghatay. The source in question is Nawāyī’s poem mentioned above. It should be noted here though that *bürken*- the reflexive form of *bürke*- also occurs once in Chaghatay texts, in a poem composed by Husayn Bayqara a contemporary and friend of Nawāyī.³³ Besides these two pieces of data the research done on a wide range of sources from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century hasn’t yielded more results.

The third unit of the book contains the results of the linguistic analyses Kincses-Nagy has done on words of Mongolic origins she found in her sources. This part of the book contains sub-chapters on the phonology of these words, on issues pertaining to semantics, on the various types of loanwords and on the characteristics of the Mongolic language the loans were borrowed from. The book finishes in a comprehensive bibliography that could still be enriched with several important items like several more articles by Zuhul Kargı Ölmez written on the subject.³⁴

As a conclusion it can be said that though Kincses-Nagy’s book can be seen as a book of missed opportunities for reasons explained above it is still a useful volume and a welcome contribution to the field of Chaghatay studies. <peri.benedek@btk.elte.hu>

BENEDEK PÉRI
Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest

THREADS OF GLOBAL DESIRE: SILK IN THE PRE-MODERN WORLD. Edited by DAGMAR SCHÄFER, GIORGIO RIELLO and LUCA MOLÀ. (Pasold Studies in Textile, Dress and Fashion History). pp, xvii, 414. Woodbridge, Suffolk and Rochester, NY, Boydell & Brewer, 2018.
doi:10.1017/S1356186318000603

Silk is the smoothest and most lustrous of the natural fabrics. Desire for these wonderful textiles, originating in China, wove webs of diplomacy and trade radiating through the ancient world, from Korea and Japan to India, Persia, the Mediterranean and beyond. As a global economy took shape in the early

³²Atalay, *Abūška*, p. 250. The 1993 Tashkent edition of *Sadd-i Iskandarī* contains one more couplet where the noun *daḡqur* occurs. ‘Alī-shīr Nawāyī, *Sadd-i Iskandarī*. (Ed.) Sodir Erkinov (Tashkent, 1993), p. 487.

³³Talip Yıldırım, *Hüseyn Baykara Dīvānı. İnceleme, Metin, Dizin, Tıpkıbasım* (İstanbul, 2010), p. 63.

³⁴Zuhul Ölmez, Şecere-i Türk Sözcüklerinden Örnekler. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 11 (2001), pp. 23–32; Zuhul Ölmez, Ali Şir Nevâyî’nin Eserlerinde Moğolca Sözcükler II. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 25:2 (2015), pp. 183–206; Zuhul Ölmez, Ali Şir Nevâyî’nin Eserlerinde Moğolca Sözcükler IV. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 26:1 (2016), pp. 137–138; Ali Şir Nevâyî’nin Eserlerinde Moğolca Sözcükler V. In: M. Ölmez–T. Çuha–K. Özçetin (eds.), *Dīvānu Luġātī’-t-Turk’-ten Senglah’a Türkçe. Doğumunun 60. Yılında Mustafa S. Kaçalin armağanı* (İstanbul, 2017), pp. 513–520.