nach Osten, nach dem hinter der Großen Mauer gelegenen *China proper*, orientierte, sondern nach Westen oder Süden, nach dem jenseits hoher Berge liegenden West-Turkestan und Britisch-Indien (z.B. Part I, p. 135: „Do those caravans come from India or from Andijan?“).

Dass Raquettes *Eastern Turki Grammar* in einer Zeit neu aufgelegt wird, in der nicht nur die Bezeichnung „Ost-Turkestan“ in der VR China schon seit mehr als einem halben Jahrhundert verfemt ist, sondern sich die KP China anschickt, auch die uyghurische Sprache und das Uyghurisch-Sein an sich „auszumerzen“, ist sicher Zufall. Aber ein Zufall, der zur rechten Zeit kommt.

Michael Friederich (Berlin)

Röhrborn, Klaus: Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien. – Neubearbeitung – II. Nomina – Pronomina – Partikeln. Band 2: aš – äžük. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2017. XXX + 359 S. ISBN 978-3-515-11862-0. € 66,00.

Klaus Röhborn had, in 1977, begun to publish a dictionary of Old Uygur (from here on called Uygur), a Turkic language spoken in present-day Xinjiang between the late 9th and the 13th centuries, though texts in this language were produced also later. It is not clear why Uygur manuscripts in runiform script are excluded from this dictionary in its earlier and present versions. The *Lieder aus Alt-Turfan* published by Bang and Rachmati should not have been included, on the other hand, as they are outside Old Turkic both by content and by language; their entries *ayıpsız* and *ayıpsızlık* should be deleted. The fascicles of the *Uigurisches Wörterbuch* which appeared till 1998 covered words starting with *a*, and those starting with *ä* till the middle of the entry for *ärŋäk*. A reedition was launched in 2010: a volume covering the verbs *ab- – äzüglä-* appeared in 2010, one covering the non-verbal elements *a – asvık* in 2015 and, in 2017 and reviewed here, a volume covering the non-verbal elements *aš – äžük*. This volume completes the treatment of the letters *a* and *ä*; the entries *ärŋäk – äžük* are new. While the 1977-1998 fascicles listed all instances of all entries, this has been given up for the reedition. Nor does it appear to be meant to be the final one; e.g.: The entry *ärnim* says that this is a defective spelling in HamTouHou for *ar(a)nem*, to be added to the entry *aranemi*; but the entry *aranemi* has not been changed to include this instance.

The reedition gives Turkish translations for entry headings, a sensible idea since, nowadays, most Turcology students are Turkish. Some Turkish translations are erroneous; when, e.g. *avtadan*, a Manichaean title, is termed “... piskoposun adı” ‘the name of the bishop who ... ’, or when *avıčga* is translated in German as “der Alte, der Greis”, which shows that the denotee is male, but as “ihtiyar, çok yaşlı kimse” in Turkish, which can also be a woman. (This entry quotes *OTWF* 84 for supporting the view that the term contains a suffix *+gA* of opaque designations of animals, but the *OTWF* there expresses opposition to this view.) The term ‘aorist’ is translated with ‘geniş zaman’: Turkish has an *-Iyor* form for continuous aspect and *-(V)r* for events with no time limitation (whence the Greek term *a-horistos* ‘with no borders’ used for it). In Old Turkic, however, there is only the *-(V)r* form for expressing continuous aspect, and it is used for the present tense when not accompanied by any auxiliary. This Old Turkic form should therefore in Turkish be referred to as ‘şimdiki zaman biçimi’.

The dictionary has entries not only for real elements but also for errors: There is no element "*asvık*", e.g., though there is an entry for it: It is a misreading of *arvıš* in a book from 1928. Nor is there a noun *ayagl(ı)k*, nor a verb *ab-*: *abıp* is a misspelling of a converb form of *av-*, as we read in the entry for that verb. Through the entry *ayran* we know that there is no *ayran* in Uygur (though Maḥmūd does list it in his *Dīvān*): Hamilton's "*ayran*" is a misreading for *arka*. Such entries are very useful, as errors easily become fictional words grabbed by non-specialists. A dubious feature is the appearance of hypothetical entries, e.g. the entry "*äyig*", based on a single word transliterated as ''YYK in the Xuanzang biography. It is translated as 'precipice' and derived from non-existing **äy-* 'to frighten'. Basing an entry on a single instance with the shaky semantic connection of 'precipice' with 'fright' is bad for students using the dictionary. It is useful only for specialists, as it documents the reading and gives the possibility to come up with new ideas when further instances bring more information. In several places, the author expresses strange views concerning the influence of word stress. In the entry for *ayı* 'very' < *ayıg* 'bad' he says, e.g., that the loss of the velar could have come from strong initial stress, though stress influences only vowels. The change 'bad' > 'very' is a case of downgrading towards grammaticalization; such downgradings are universally accompanied by reduction of phonic volume.

The extensive quoting of outdated etymologies is quite unhelpful, e.g. Bang's proposal of *ädgü* 'good' coming from Proto-Turkic **äd-* 'to do' or his idea of *aš* 'food' from **a-* signifying 'to grow (intr.)' or 'to eat'; Pritsak is quoted on p. 113 with the assumption of **a-* 'to be': No wonder the proponents of the *Güneş Dil Teorisi* posited a verb **a-* which they took to be basic for human language as a whole! The suggestions of Sevortyan that *ayaz* 'clear sky' comes from "a nominal-verbal base **ay ~ *ay-*" or of Radloff and of Bang that it comes from *ay* 'moon' are baseless: There is no suffix "*-az*"! The reported useless etymologies for *aydıŋ* 'moonlight' include Sevortyan's idea of a hypothetical verb **aydı-* with a hypothetical suffix *-ŋ* said to make nouns for 'the bearer of a process', misquoting Clauson, and his derivation of *azgan*, the name of a certain shrub with thorns, from a hypothetical verb **az-* 'to sting', which he relates with "Anatolian *azı-* 'to chew'". Sevortyan thinks the same **azı-* should be the base also of *azıg* 'canine tooth, tusk'. There is an entry for such a verb recorded in a single village close to Adapazarı (Turkey) in the *Derleme Sözlüğü*, but that work was prepared quite unprofessionally by village teachers with the aim of finding sources for Turkish neologisms. Such nonsense would certainly not be worth mentioning here, were it not that it gains support by appearing in a serious scholarly work.

Binomes are sometimes not noticed: *atım* 'valiant' is never used by itself, e.g. but, in its three Uygur and seven *Kutadgu Bilig* examples, always in the phrase *alp atım*. This is one case showing the closeness of Khakanî Turkic with Uygur. One might here also remember the name of *Bägräk Atım Ügä*, mentioned in some 10th-century Khotanese documents, and wish for the creation of an Uygur onomastic corpus including extraneous sources.

The term "Hypostase", the lexicalisation of inflected words, is often used erroneously. It is, e.g., suggested that *ata+č+ım* could be a hypostasized noun because caritative *ata+č* is not used without *+Im*; but the link of affection with 1st person possessivity is a pragmatic feature in Turkic languages and elsewhere, often addressing close relatives. There

is an entry for *azu* (I) as "conjunctional adverb" and as a "conjunction", and one for "hypostasized" *azu* (II) as a "false" postposition. The only example quoted in the entry *azu* (II) is *azusınta*, but there also is a separate entry *azusınta* (with a single example!), there considered to be a "petrified case form of the noun *azu* (II) which cannot be used freely". It is unnecessary to have an *ay* entry for 'moon; month' and then another entry for when the bare term *ay* is, without locative suffix, used for dates or for time stretches: The nominative form of Turkic temporal terms like 'day', 'month' or 'year' is generally used for dating or for stretches of time; this is not a matter for the lexicon but for case syntax. Similarly, the adverbial uses of *az* 'a little' do not need a separate entry.

älik 'roe-buck', is considered to be "no longer part of the spoken language, as it is attested only as proper name". The word is, however, used in the *Irk Bitig*, an Uygur text written in runiform script and discovered in the south east of the Tarim basin, as well as in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, in Middle and in modern Turkic. The reason it is not attested is presumably that no roe-bucks appear in Uygur religious texts, whose personages belong to other nations; Uygur private documents, whose actors are Uygurs, are unlikely to contain such a word.

Röhrborn supports the interpretation of the hapax in *ärki kişi* 'the Primeval Man' opposed to *yaŋı kişi* 'the New Man' as *är+ki*, from the base of petrified *ertä* ~ *ärtä* 'early', retained only in Oghuz languages and Chuvash; he is probably right, although its vowel was /e/ and not /ä/. There is no reason why this *ärki* (not to be confused with the particle *är-ki*, formed with a deverbal formative) should have become "*ärgi*", as he writes: The onset of the common suffix *+kI* gets assimilated in some modern languages but not in Uygur. The conjunction *ärkän* 'while' is not a converb from *är-* 'to be' as there is no converb suffix *-kän* or *-gän* (though there is such a participle suffix).

är-ig 'exhortation, admonition' is unlikely to come from *ärig+lä-* 'to exhort' by backformation, as stated. *ärig*, an *-(X)g* derivate from *är-* 'to be', signifies 'abode' and also 'one's manner of being'. The meaning 'exhortation' exists only in the binome *üt ärig* with *üt* 'advice' and follows the semantic development also found in English 'manner' > 'manners'; *üt sav ärig* is common with this meaning in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. *äriglä-* is attested only in Uygur but nowhere else in Early Turkic, practically always in combination with *üt+lä-* (once with *üt ber-* 'give an advice' instead). Since the linking of *ärig* with *üt* was a wider one than the consistent linking of the two verbs, the semantic development of the nouns must have preceded the creation of the biverb.

Here one or two suggestions: In the entry **ämzig* "Brust", the instance in *bilgä biliglig közümüz ürtüldi ämzig boltı* (ZiemeAraṇ 32) belongs to *ämäzig* < **ärmäz+sig*. *äbä äbirä* ~ *äpä äpirä* are described as petrified converbs from the extinct verbs **äb-* and **äbir-*, with *äb-ä* quoted as evidence from column 918 of Radloff's dictionary. However, Radloff there refers to couplets 587 and 1107 in the late Vienna ms. of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, where the other two mss. have *ev-ä*. *ev-* 'to hurry' does not fit the *DKPAM* 266 context; *b(ä)k*, the reading of the editor, may be better.

All these are marginal matters in the incredibly erudite result of many years of scholarly endeavor. We hope that Prof. Röhrborn's students Jens Wilkens and Zekine Özertural will fruitfully cooperate in bringing this work to a just as brilliant conclusion.

Marcel Erdal (Berlin)