

**Book review**

Orçun Ünal\*

**Boeschoten, Hendrik: A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic. With the editorial assistance of John O’Kane (Handbook of Oriental Studies = Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section One, Ancient Near East, Vol. 169) Leiden & Boston: Brill 2023. Hardback €148.40. ISBN 978-90-04-52518-4.**

<https://doi.org/10.33063/os.v74.666>

Almost two decades ago, the late Professor Claus Schönig told me that the next most important task in Turkology would be to edit Middle Turkic texts and study their vocabulary and grammar. Since then, many important early and late Middle Turkic texts have been edited and published with varying degrees of success. These efforts have been crystallized in the recently published *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic* by Hendrik Boeschoten. The dictionary compiles the vocabulary of the 14th-century works from various regions of the Turkic world, excluding Anatolia. These works are written in various scripts (Arabic, Uyghur, Latin) with diverse intentions, as the author describes in the introduction of the book (pp. 1–11). They include interlinear translations of the Quran, Islamic and pagan literary texts, religious texts on Islamic topics, treatises on specialized subjects, diplomatic documents (*yarlıqs*) and phrasebooks, as well as grammarians’ wordlists and multilingual dictionaries. The “Early Middle Turkic” of the author corresponds to the Late Qarakhanid, Khwarazm Turkic, Early Chaghatay, and Middle Kipchak varieties of the Mamluk Empire and the Golden Horde. In some cases, Middle Turkic vocabulary is more significant than Old Turkic, since a considerable part of the modern Turkic vocabulary can only be traced back to this period. But Boeschoten includes not only the Turkic vocabulary of Early Middle Turkic texts, but also foreign elements (Arabic and Persian) “if they have become more or less conventionalized, that is, if they occur in a number of sources and/or are morphologically integrated” (p. 9). Unfortunately, although the donor languages are identified, the donor forms are not. It would be better for the reader if the author had also provided the forms.

Until the publication of Boeschoten’s dictionary, only a few dictionaries (Fazylov 1966–1971, Toparlı et al. 2003, Ünlü 2012, Bayat 2020) served a similar purpose. It should be noted that the latter three sources should be used with caution, as they are unreviewed compilations of the indices of the respective works.

Boeschoten’s task must have been challenging due to the numerous shortcomings of many editions of Early Middle Turkic texts, including misreadings and misinterpretations. Additionally, important texts such as Ibn al-Muhannā’s *Kitāb Ḥilyat al-insān wa-Ḥalbat al-lisān* lack proper and comparative editions based on all extant manuscripts.

Although I warmly welcome *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic* and see it as filling a need, I can hardly agree with its structure and some of the etymologies proposed in it. First, in its present form the dictionary is vulnerable to criticism and arduous to use. Although the author states that “the aim was [not] to produce an etymological dictionary” and “the procedure has an ordering function” (p. 8), the current order proposes countless etymologies that require further elaboration and discussion. In my view, many words that are unlikely to be etymologically related or identical are grouped under a single heading, while others are treated separately even though they belong together. Even as a Turkologist, it can be difficult to find a particular derivative in the dictionary if one has different opinions about its etymology. The same task is virtually impossible for a reader unfamiliar with the field. For this reason, an index of 153 pages (pp. 435–587) is included, listing all forms alphabetically.

\* Department of Turkology and Central Asian Studies, University of Göttingen, Germany, E-mail: [orcununal@live.com](mailto:orcununal@live.com)

Furthermore, the selected structure results in some entries being excessively long, impeding the reader's ability to discern the subheadings. It should also be noted that lemmas with superscript numbers are usually confusing. For example, *ayig*<sup>2</sup> (p. 46), *bağış*<sup>2</sup> (p. 69), *bal*<sup>1</sup> (p. 69), *ban*=<sup>2</sup> (p. 70), *bu-run*<sup>2</sup> (p. 97), etc. appear without corresponding entries. Their counterparts can be found under other lemmas.

## Gaps in the Bibliography

On page 4 Boeschoten states of the *Kitāb bayṭarat al-vāḍih* that “so far no proper edition of this work exists”. However, in 1986 Mehmet Emin Aḡar prepared a complete edition of this work with an index as a master's thesis at Marmara University (see Aḡar 1986). The edition was based on the Istanbul manuscript of the work preserved at the Library of the Topkapı Palace.

There are a few other references whose absence surprised me. The most recent and probably most comprehensive edition of Codex Cumanicus is that of Alexandr Garkavec (2015), but it is not mentioned at all. Similarly, Kaçalin (2011) has published a complete re-edition of the anonymous *Abuška Dictionary*. Boeschoten, however, prefers to use an unpublished dissertation instead. Furthermore, Güner (2017) has published a Turkish dictionary of *Rasulid Hexaglot's* Turkic vocabulary with a few important suggestions for corrections. Unfortunately, this work, which also contains corrections in several reviews, is not mentioned either. For *Oḡuzname*, the author uses Balázs Danka's 2019 edition, whereas Ferruh Aḡca published another complete edition of *Oḡuzname* in the same year (see Aḡca 2019).

Boeschoten states of QT<sub>3</sub> (ms. TİEM 73) that “so far the work is available in the form of two doctoral theses by Kök (2004) and Ünlü (2004)” (p. 5), though Ünlü published a complete edition of the manuscript in 2018 (see Ünlü 2018). Unfortunately, Ünlü retained almost all the misreadings and errors of interpretation in the new publication.

*Kitāb maǧmū' tarǧumān Turkī wa-ʿAǧamī wa-Muǧalī* is given according to Houtsma's 1894 and Garkavec's 2019 editions, although it has also been edited by Kuryšzanov in 1970 and by Toparlı, Çöngenli and Yanık in 2000. Other works also have editions that are not mentioned by the author. For example, *Kitāb al-tuḥfat al-zakiyya fī luyat al-Turkiyya* has been edited by Al-Turk (2006), *Qawānīn al-kulliyya li-ḍabṭ al-luyā al-Turkiyya* by Toparlı, Çöngenli and Yanık (1999), and *Kitāb bulyat al-muštāq fī luyat at-Turk wa-l-Qifḡāq* by Alturk (2012). These missing editions, which happen to be almost exclusively of Turkish origin, should at least have been mentioned and at best used as alternative sources.

Probably after Boeschoten completed the manuscript of his book, another edition of *Kitāb bulyat al-muštāq* was published by Savaş Karagözlü and Musa Salan (2022). This edition, which is based on the so-called Kastamonu manuscript of this Arabic-Turkic dictionary, was not included in Boeschoten's dictionary.

In recent years, academic dissertations on the Paris and Yozgat manuscripts (the latter copied in 1257) of *Muqaddimat al-Adab* have also been written in Turkey. These include studies by Özçamkan Ayaz (2020) and Cihan (2021). Özçamkan Ayaz's dissertation was also published by Türk Dil Kurumu in 2023 (see Özçamkan Ayaz 2023).

## Etymological Notes

In the following, I will present some of my etymological objections and additions. Similar reservations can be made about other lexemes in the dictionary. Note that the “=” symbol used for verbs in the dictionary is replaced by “-”.

p. 17: *açığ*<sup>2</sup> ‘anger’ must be placed under *açī-* ‘to be sour’ where it belongs. German *sauer* ‘sour; angry, peevish’ has the same variety of meanings.

p. 22: MA *ağra-* ‘to be/become heavy’ (s.v. *ağram*) is not necessarily a backformation from *ağram*. It may be a real derivation of *agīr* with {+A-}.

p. 25: In a previous study (Ünal 2012), I considered *alay* ~ *allāy* ‘thus’ to be a corrupted form of the Old Turkic *anilayu* ‘like this, thus’. The similar form *ayla* ‘thus’ (p. 46), on the other hand, is probably a metathesized form of *al(l)ay*.

p. 38: CC *artmaq/AH arımaq* ‘saddlebag’ (s.v. *art*<sup>-2</sup> ‘to load’) is rightly analysed by Erdal (1991: 110) as derived from CT *ārt* ‘back, behind’ with the formative {+mAk}.

p. 40: It should be noted that the Middle Turkic *asru* ‘extremely’ may be a reborrowing of the Old Turkic *aşru* ‘very much, extremely’ from Mongolic. The word occurs in preclassical Written Mongol as *asuru* ‘very, rather, excessively’.

p. 44: CC *yüvüt* ‘consolation’ can hardly come from *\*uvut* < *awūt*, the latter supposedly being a derivative of *\*awī-*. The word in the CC is simply related to the word in the MA, which is read as *yövüt* ‘help’ on page 424. If the vocalism of the form attested in the CC is primary, the form in the MA must also be read as *yüvüt*. This Early Middle Turkic word is derived from the Old Turkic verb *yuw-* ~ *yüw-* ‘to make contact with someone, share one’s wealth and overwhelm her/him with kindness’, which is attested in the DLT (Clauson 1972: 871).

p. 47: CC *ayran*<sup>2</sup> ‘stable’ does not go back to *ayīrgan* (< *hadīr-*); rather, it is related to DLT *aran* ‘stable’ and thus belongs to the heading *aran* ‘yard, enclosure’ (p. 35).

p. 49: *ādā* ‘master, owner’ is simply a hypercorrect form of CT *āyā*, just as CT *ayak* ‘cup, bowl’ is occasionally written as *adaq* and *adaq* in Early Middle Turkic sources (p. 46). Therefore, it would be more appropriate to give *āyā* as the heading.

p. 53: MG *āksū* ‘half-burnt log’ and MA, QT<sub>4</sub> *āksündü* ‘half-burnt log’ are unlikely to be derivations of *āksū-* ‘to grow less, be deficient’. Rather, they are metathesized forms of *\*kösā-g* and *\*kösā-ndü*, whose common base goes back to the Old Turkic *\*kōzā-* ‘to poke a fire’ (Clauson 1972: 757).

p. 61: QT<sub>3</sub> *āsin-* ‘to winnow’ does not derive from *ās-* ‘to blow’, but comes from *\*āvsin-*, a derivative of the Common Turkic *hāvis-* or *hāvūs-* ‘to winnow’. It therefore belongs under the heading *öyüs-* ‘to winnow’ on page 225.

p. 64: AH †*āvšaṭ-* ‘to be civilized, sociable’ is better read as *ovšaṭ-* or *uvšaṭ-* and connected to OU *ogšaṭ-* ‘to compare, equate’ or *uvšaṭ-* ‘to grind, crush, pound, break’.

p. 68: Since *bağda-* ‘to intertwine legs’ is derived from *bağ* (Erdal 1991: 455), it must be placed under the heading *ba-* and the subheading *bağ* on page 67.

p. 74: *basa* is a loanword from Sogdian ps’ *pasā* ‘then, afterwards, on the other hand’.

p. 78: Although phonetically unproblematic, it is semantically unconvincing to derive XŠ, CC *belā-* ‘to swaddle’ from *bel* ‘waist’. Note that the Old Turkic *bälā-k* ~ *belā-k* ‘present’ is also a derivation of *belā-* ‘to wrap up’.

p. 79: *bäläg/beläg/böläg* ‘present’ can also be read with *-k*, as suggested by Erdal (1991: 230). Erdal’s assumption may turn out to be wrong, since the Ottoman Turkish and Kazakh forms may also be reborrowings from the Mongolic *beleg* ‘gift, present’.

p. 92: *bölčäk* ‘wolf puppy’ can be etymologized as derived from *bōri* ‘wolf’ with the diminutive suffix {+čAk}.

p. 96: TZ *burun* ‘shred, clipping’ is not derived from *bur-* ‘to twist, bend’, but is a misspelling of *yurun* (written with ب instead of ي). So it has to be placed under the heading *yurun* on page 428.

p. 98: Skr. *mudhuka* is a mistake for *madhuka*.

p. 106: TZ *čalīnlan-* ‘to worry’ cannot be compared to the Khakas *čalīnnan-* ‘to be on fire’, which comes from the Common Turkic *yalīn* ‘flame’.

p. 107: TZ *čalqa-* ‘to shake’ is a secondary and corrupted form of *čayka-*, a variant of CT *yāyka-* ‘to shake’.

p. 107: Another cognate of QT<sub>3</sub> *čandaš-* ‘to dispute’ occurs in Khalaj as *čandış-* ‘to become entangled in each other’ (Doerfer & Tezcan 1980: 98).

p. 114: QT<sub>3</sub> *čiglaš-* ‘to dispute loudly’ is derived from \**čig*, which is related to DLT *čik* ‘a low cry’.

p. 114: KA, QT<sub>4</sub> *čigril-* 1. ‘to be drawn together, contract’ 2. ‘to shiver’ is not a variant of *yigril-* contaminated with *čig-*, but simply derived from *čik-* ~ *čig-* ‘to tie, fasten’ (p. 113) with the causative {-Ur-} and the passive {(X)l-}.

p. 116: In connection with *čiqir* ‘spinning wheel’ and its derivatives, possible donor forms can be mentioned, such as Tocharian A *cākkār* ~ *cākrā*, Tocharian B *cākkār*, Sogdian *ckkr-* ~ *cxr-* ~ *cyr-* and finally Skr. *cakra*.

p. 117: QT<sub>5</sub> *čola* ‘free time’ is a clear loanword from the Mongolic \**čölē* ‘free time’ (< \**čilöe*). Despite the backvocalic Kyrgyz *čolo* ‘opportunity, free time’, the Middle Turkic form might be better read as *čölä*.

p. 125: MA †*dügüz* ‘having a blaze’ is related to DLT *twKüz* ‘with a blaze on the forehead (horse)’. It was borrowed from Bulgar Turkic into Mongolic and surfaced as *tögelī* (төөл) ‘spot on the forehead of an animal’ (< \**tögerī*) in Written Mongol (Lessing 1995: 832). Thus, the word in the DLT and MA is better read as *tögüz* and *dögüz*, respectively.

p. 145: I have emphasized several times that CT *idi* and *äyā* ~ *eyä* (with its hypercorrect variant *ägä*) are different lexemes that have merged over time. Although it may not always be easy to distinguish between the descendant forms, they must be treated differently.

p. 145: QA *igäš-* ‘to quarrel’ is better be read as *egäš-*. The verb occurs in Old Uyghur as *egiš-* (sic) ‘to dispute’, in Kyrgyz as *eges-* ‘to quarrel, argue’, in Kazakh as *eges-* ‘to dispute, argue’, and in Turkish dialects as *eğēš-*, *eğiš-*, *ekēš-*, *eyeš-*, *igaš-* ~ *iğēš-* ~ *iyeš-*, and *üyeš-* ‘to quarrel, compete’. Turkmen *igen-* ‘to grumble, mutter; to growl’, the reflexive derivation of the same base, suggests a protoform \**ēkā-* or \**ēgä-*. If the former is correct, it may be identical with \**ēkā-* ‘to rub, scuff, saw’.

p. 145: Boeschoten interprets CC *ih-* as ‘to float’ on the basis that it is related to Khakas *iχ-* ‘to sail before the wind’ and that the German translation *das schif l[e]get czu ru* in the CC is incorrect. However, in Ottoman Turkish and contemporary Turkish dialects we find another homophonous verb *ih-* with the meaning ‘(for camel) to kneel, to sit; to sit in sadness and confusion’.

p. 148: *išim* and *yišim* (s.v. *im*<sup>2</sup>) do not belong there. CT *yīšim* ~ *yišim* cannot be a compound of *ič* and *üm* because it already appears as *yīšim* in the DLT.

p. 149: FZ *inī* ‘day after tomorrow’ is mentioned in isolation. However, as Dankoff (1987: 12) points out, IM *ina* اينه *kün* ‘day after tomorrow’ also belongs here.

p. 149: \**inīr* is considered by the author to be the common onomatopoeic base of *inīrčaq* ‘packsaddle’ and *inrā-* 1. ‘to wail, lament’ 2. ‘to roar (lion)’. However, the base of the former survives in Yakut as *inīr* ‘saddle’. The form *inīrčak* is the diminutive of the latter.

p. 153: CC *išliq* ‘chimney’ is better read as *išliq*. The base occurs in Armenian Kipchak as *iš* ‘carbon monoxide’.

p. 153: CC *išir-* ‘to stir up (a fire)’ is related to the Kumyk *išir-* ‘to stir up (the fire); to nudge’ and the Karachay-Balkar *išir-* ‘to stir up (the fire)’, and is not derived from \**iš* ‘soot, dirty smoke’. It may be the causative of *iš(i)-* ~ *yīš(i)-* ‘to rub’.

p. 166: Chuvash *kasmik* needs to be corrected to *kasmāk*.

p. 170: AH, KT, TZ *kögān* ~ *kögām* ‘plum’ goes back to CT \**kōkän*, which is derived from *kōk* ‘blue’ with the suffix {+gAn}. In all three sources, this word is written in such a way that it can be read as *kōkän*. Turkish dial. *göğem* is the regular reflex of \**kōkäm*.

p. 170: CC *kögān* ‘rope to fasten young lambs and kids with’ is considered by Boeschoten to be a loanword from Mongolic. However, it already occurs in DLT *kōkän* ‘noose’ (Clauson 1972: 712) and

OU *yelü kökän* ‘tether’ (Wilkens 2021: 887). The word survives in the Turkish dialects of Zonguldak, as *köken* ‘small stake for tethering animals’, and Gaziantep, as *köken* ‘short rope tied at one end to the foot of a sheep or goat and at the other end to a stake’.

p. 171: *kökräk*<sup>2</sup> ‘chest’ belongs under *kögüz* ‘chest’ (< \**köküz*) on page 170, from which it was derived.

p. 177: *körk* ‘beauty’ belongs under the heading *kör-* ‘to see, see after, to consider’ (p. 176).

p. 178: CC *köšägän* ‘curtain’ is not a Turkic derivation from \**köšü-* ‘to hide’ with {-gAn}, but a borrowing from the Middle Mongol \**köšegen* (= Written Mongol *kösige(n)* ‘curtain’). This in turn is borrowed from the antecedent form of the Old Turkic *köšik* ‘veiling, curtain’. The form *köšege* is attested in the *Muqaddimat al-Adab* and the *Istanbul Vocabulary*.

p. 180: *közäd-* (sic) ‘to observe, protect, tend, keep’ does not belong under *köz* ‘eye’ because it goes back to *küzäd-*, which is derived from *kü-* ‘to guard, protect’, probably {kü-z+ä-d-}. The first vowel of the Old Uyghur *küzäd-* is secured by Brāhmī instances.

p. 207: *obur* ‘desert demon’ must be considered a derivative of CT *ōp-* ‘to swallow’ and therefore belongs under the heading of *op-* on page 210 (see Stachowski & Stachowski 2017).

p. 217: QT<sub>4</sub> *öyül-* (or *üyül-*?) ‘to be granted respite’ must be related to QT<sub>3</sub> *öd-* (or *üd-*?) ‘to grant respite’ (Ünlü 2018/8: 406), which is not included in the dictionary. Both forms suggest a verb \**üd-*, possibly the verbal equivalent of *öd ~ üd* ‘time’.

p. 217: CC *üksün-/üpsün-* ‘to remember’ is not a derivative of *ög<sup>1</sup>* ‘mind, intelligence’. It must have changed from an older form \**ödik+sin-*, the base of which is *ödik* ‘report, note, register; tradition; monument, memorial’ (Wilkens 2021: 523). Similarly, OU *ödiklä-* means ‘to remember’. \**ödik+sin-* must first have yielded \**öyüksün-/övüksün-*, then *üksün-* and finally *üpsün-*.

p. 221: AH *öñ-*, i.e. *öñ-*, ‘to lie in wait’ is certainly a cognate of the Old Uyghur *on-* ‘to hide (intr.)’ (Wilkens 2021: 509). This verb also occurs in Kyrgyz as *öñ-* ‘(of a hunter) to sneak up on’ and in Teleut and Shor as *öñ-* ‘to lie in wait, hide’. Clauson (1972: 168) mentions the verb only in a preliminary note.

p. 222: From a morphological point of view, *öräg/örä* ‘pillar’ cannot be derived from the verb *ör-* ‘to rise’. Rather, it is the rhotacistic form of CT *özäg* and *özäk*, which yielded Yakut *öhüö* ‘a beam in the wooden frame of a yurt’ and Khakas *özek ~ öžek ~ üzek* ‘stake, peg’, respectively. It should be added that the word also occurs as *öräk* in *Abuška* (Kačalin 2011: 986). The common base of CT *özäg* and *özäk* survives in the Turkish dialects as *öz* ‘thick wood, log, pole used in buildings’.

p. 225: KA *öyüş* ‘mildew’ is hardly related to the Bashkir *önäd*, i.e. *ünäd* ‘mould, mildew’. It must be related to *üwüş* (p. 412) and can be traced back to CT (*h*)*ödüş*, which gave OU *ödüş* ‘moisture, damp’ and the Turkish dialectal form (Kars) *höyüş* ‘wet’ among others.

p. 226: QT<sub>3</sub> *öznäklik* ‘rebellion’ (s.v. *öz<sup>1</sup>*) is related to OU *wznä-* ‘to rebel’ and DLT and QB *wznä-* ‘to disobey’. Despite Clauson (1972: 289) and Özertural (2023: 135), the verb in question cannot be derived from *özän* ‘heart, centre (of something)’. Therefore, *öznäklik* does not belong under the heading *öz<sup>1</sup>* ‘own’. Its true base may have survived in the Turkish dialect of Çankırı as *hözen* ‘disagreeable (person)’. Old Ottoman *özün* ‘cheating’ is another candidate, although its semantics differ from those of *öznä-*.

p. 226: In connection with *özän-* ‘to take pains’, DLT and QB *özäl-* ‘to suffer’ (*uzal-* in Clauson 1972: 287) and Khakas *özel-* ‘to be sad, grieve’ should also be mentioned. AH *özät-* (†*özän-*) ‘to wrong, to ill-treat (*zalam*)’ also belongs under this heading.

p. 230: Chuvash *xupa* ‘bark’ must be corrected to *xupä*.

p. 232: QA *qağ-* is assumed by Boeschoten to be the base of *qağur-* ‘to fry, roast’. However, it may be related to Tuvan *kag-* (aor. *kaar*) ‘to leave; to put (down), place’. QA *boğuzğa q[a]ğa bitgän aš* must be translated as ‘food consumed as soon as it is put into the mouth’.

p. 233: TZ *qalavun* ‘wedding gift’, written perfectly clearly in the manuscript, must nevertheless be related to *qalīn/qalīn* ‘marriage gift, bridal money’ (p. 234), which entered Mongolic as *qalim* ‘the fat and flesh adhering to the hide of an animal just skinned; a whole sheep skinned carefully in order to leave these tissues on the body of the animal (formerly offered as a gift to the bride’s family to formalize an engagement)’ (Lessing 1995: 920). The form itself is reminiscent of the Middle Mongol *qala’un* ‘hot’.

p. 235: CC *qaña* ‘plank’ has cognates in several Turkic languages, such as Karachay-Balkar *kaṇṇa*, Kumyk *kaṇa*, Tatar *kaṇga*, Tobol *kaṇga* and Chuvash *xăma*.

p. 237: TZ *qaril-* ‘to swallow food the wrong way, choke’ does not belong to *qar-* ‘to mix (into)’. The former comes from the Old Turkic *kār-* ‘to choke with’ (Clauson 1972: 643; Erdal 1991: 190), which occurs in the DLT and QB. This may be identical with *kār-* ‘to overflow’, as suggested by Kāşyārī, but not with *kār-* ‘to mix’.

p. 238: *qaraq* ‘eyeball, pupil of the eye’ and the common base of *qaraqçı* ‘highwayman’ and *qaraqqa-* ‘to rob’ must be distinguished. The former derives from CT *kara* ‘black’ and the latter possibly from *\*kar-*, from which DLT *karma* ‘plunder’ is also derived.

p. 240: It is not clear to me why *qarşı* ‘opposite, against’ is not given under *qarış-* ‘to confront’ (p. 239), where it belongs.

p. 242: TZ *qaṭa qal-* ‘to be astonished’ and TZ *qaṭa qaldır-* ‘to surprise’ belong to *qat-* ‘to become strong/hard’ (p. 242); cf. Turkish *donakal-* ‘to be petrified with astonishment or fear’.

p. 244: *qavug*<sup>1</sup> ‘bladder’ (s.v. *qav-*<sup>1</sup>) cannot be derived from *\*kav-* ‘to be collected’ if the variant *kaguk* in the Old Uyghur medical texts (Wilkens 2021: 319) is the older and original form of the word.

p. 246: QK *qazğič* ‘stingy’ and *qazğan/qazan* ‘cauldron’ (s.v. *qaz-*) are phonetically and semantically difficult to derive from *kaz-* ‘to dig’. The former seems to be an opaque derivative of *kiz* ‘stingy’, although the vocalism is slightly different. It may be a metathesized corruption of *\*kizganč*, the origin of the Turkish *kıskanç* ‘jealous, envious’. CT *\*kāzan* ~ *\*kāzgan*, on the other hand, is incompatible with the short vocalic verb *kaz-*.

p. 251: *qisgan-/qizgan-* ‘to be stingy, mean’ is not derived from *\*qisig*, i.e. *kisig* (already proposed by Clauson 1972: 667), but from CT *kiz* ‘stingy’ > OU *kiz* id. (Wilkens 2021: 376).

p. 251: IM, AH *qit* ‘scanty’, also attested in Ottoman and modern Turkish, as well as Turkmen, Kumyk and Nogay, is either a corruption of CT *kiz* (or *kiz*) ‘stingy, miserly; scarce, scanty; expensive’ or a borrowing of the Arabic *qahṭ* ‘dearth, lack, want, scarcity’.

p. 255: *qoğuş*<sup>2</sup> ‘woof’ and *qoğuş/qavuş* ‘plane’ must be separated from *qoğuş*<sup>2</sup> ‘hollow’. *qoğuş*<sup>2</sup>/*qavuş* ‘plane (tool)’ is the base of OU *kovša-* ‘to smooth’ and *kovuşa-* ‘to be smoothed’ (Wilkens 2021: 398). It should be noted that the latter two forms in Old Uyghur are only variants of the same verb.

p. 260: TZ *qoyqa* ‘withers’ must be read as *quyqa*, because it is certainly identical with the Old Turkic *kuyka* ‘skin; fur; plumage’ (Clauson 1972: 676; Wilkens 2021: 434). Its first vowel is identified by the Yakut form *kuyaxa* ‘scalp’. This word also occurs in the MG as *kuyka* ‘the part of the body between the shoulders and the buttocks’ (*koyka* in İzbudak’s reading), which is not found in the dictionary under review.

p. 277: *saq* ‘wakeful, alert; safe’ is not derived from CT *sā-* ‘to count’. The former has a short vowel in Turkmen, while the latter has a long vowel in Common Turkic. For the time being, *saq* must be considered a simplex.

p. 281: *sark-* ‘to hang down’ cannot be equated with CT *\*sārk-* ~ *sīrk-* ‘to drip’. The latter survives in MG *sark-* ~ *sīrk-* ‘to flow, leak’ (not listed in the dictionary) and Turkmen *sīrik-* ‘to flow, leak, stream’.

p. 282: *sawaş/savaş* ‘controversy, fight’ and *sawaş-/savaş-* ‘to fight one another’ are hardly related to *saw/sav* ‘speech’. Stachowski (2019: 295) derives the Turkish noun from CT *\*savā-* ~ *\*sabā-*, which

he identified with the verb *saba-* in Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Karakalpak and Altai. The latter, however, is a loanword from Mongolic \**saba-* ‘to beat’.

p. 290: KA *siklä-* ‘to urinate’ does not belong under *sik* ‘penis’. In Common Turkic, there were two different words, *sik* ‘penis’ and *sik* ‘urine’ (> Yakut *ik* ‘urine’, cf. Chuvash *šäk* ‘urine’).

p. 290: TZ *silk* ‘spittle’ is a loanword from a Middle Mongol form related to the Common Mongolic \**silükei* ‘saliva; slobbering’.

p. 294: CC *sïy* ‘salutation’ is a continuation of the Old Uyghur *tsi ~ si* ‘appropriate behaviour’ (Wilkens 2021: 750), which in turn was borrowed from Chinese *zī* 姿 ‘manner’.

p. 310: *tab* ‘mark on the body’ is better read as *tap* with /p/ as in the Turkish dialectal form *tap*. There is no obvious reason to read -b in the final position.

p. 315: AH *tañaz-* ‘to get red and hard (swelling)’ is related to the Old Uyghur and DLT *tañiz-* ‘to swell, to give milk’ (Wilkens 2021: 672), which Clauson (1972: 527) misread as *teñiz-*.

p. 319: *tarlawsiz* ‘uncultivated’ (taken from Danko 2019) should be read as *tarlagusiz* {tarla-gU+sIz} (Ağca 2019: 121) since it is spelled <d’rl’qw syz>. *sanaguluksiz* in ON 35/2-3 confirms that {+sIz} follows two-fold harmony in the *Oğuzname*.

p. 334: Under the heading *täwšäk*, the author refers to *ušağ*, but under *ušağ*, we find only *tüwšäk*.

p. 334: It should be added that IM *tävük* ‘so-and-so’ is related to Turkish *tefek* as in *ufak tefek* ‘trifling’.

p. 337: *tılmaç* ‘interpreter’ and its variants should be placed under the heading *til* ‘tongue’ on page 336.

p. 338: The adjective *tin* (yer) ‘fallow (field)’ is likely to be distinct from *tin* ‘breath’ (cf. Wilkens 2021: 713–714, <sup>1</sup>*tin* and <sup>4</sup>*tin*).

p. 338: The author brings together the examples of *tin*<sup>-1</sup> ‘to breathe’ and *tin*<sup>-2</sup> ‘to speak’ under *tin*-. It is essential to distinguish between these two verbs, as Clauson (1972: 514) and Wilkens (2021: 714) did.

p. 340: *tıyan-/tayan-* ‘to cease, stop’ does not come from \**tidin-*, which is identical with OU *tidin-* ‘to abstain, to hold back, to endure’ (Wilkens 2021: 712). The Old Turkic /d/ must have been preserved in the relevant works as *d*. Therefore, the forms *tıyan-/tayan-* are rather related to Common Turkic *tin-* ‘to breathe; to rest; to stop’ (Wilkens 2021: 714; Clauson 1972: 514). The change of CT (h)ik ‘spindle’ to *iyik* in some Middle and Modern Turkic varieties is a similar phonetic development. The examples of *tıyan-/tayan-* belong under the heading *tin-* (p. 338). It survives in the Turkish dialect of Bergama (İzmir) as *dayan-* ‘to stop, to rest’.

p. 341: MA *toğdarı* ‘dove’ (cf. Turkmen *toğdarı* ‘bustard (Otis tarda)’) must be a loanword from an unattested Mongolic or Para-Mongolic form \**toğdar(i)*, a variant of *toğ(a)day* ‘bustard’, which is in turn a borrowing from Bulgar Turkic \**tōd+ak* id. (> \**tōzak* → Hungarian *túzok* [tüzok] ‘bustard, Otis’). This is reminiscent of the change from \*g to r in Dagur. All forms attested since Middle Turkic, such as *toğdak*, *togadak* and *tugadak*, are reborrows from Mongolic.

p. 344: BM *topa* ‘covering for a grain pit (oru)’ is not a cognate of Turkish *tıpa/tapa* ‘stopper’, but is rather related to Kyrgyz *topo* ‘soil; earth from the grave’ and Uyghur *topa* ‘soil, dust’.

p. 346: *toşgu/toşgu/doşgu* ‘food served to a guest’ already occurs in Old Uyghur as *tuzgu* ‘viaticum; gift, offering’ (Wilkens 2021: 768) and in the DLT and QB as *tuzgu* ‘a gift of food given to a traveller’ (Clauson 1972: 573). This fact argues against the borrowing from Mongolian suggested by Boeschoten. The base of CT *tuzgu* survives in the Western Yugur *t<sup>h</sup>oz- ~ toz- ~ tuz-* ‘to meet’ and it entered Mongolian as *tos-* ‘to receive; to encounter, go to meet someone who is coming; to catch something moving toward the subject’ (Lessing 1995: 828). Clauson, on the other hand, suggested deriving *tuzgu* from *tüz* ‘salt’.

p. 348: *tölä*<sup>-2</sup> ‘to (re)pay; to remit (sins)’ is not necessarily a borrowing from Mongolic. The direction of the borrowing is uncertain.

p. 352: CC *tuluq* ‘balcony’ is a hapax. Drimba (2000: 224) emended it to *tü[η]lük*. *Tu[r]luk* is another possible emendation, cf. Turkish dial. *turluk* ‘1. felt covering the tent 2. shepherd’s house next to the corral 3. small tent covered with sticks and sackcloth 4. corral for sheltering goats 5. bower, pergola 6. hut’.

p. 354: *turlaq* ‘emaciated’ is better read as *torlaq* (see Ünal 2022a).

p. 354: IM *туруq* ‘emaciated’ should be read as *toruq* and is not borrowed from Mongolic (see Ünal 2022a).

p. 346: YL *totqavul* / XŠ *tatqavul* ‘file closer’ is hardly distinct from XŠ *tutħaul* / XŠ *tatğaul* ‘tax collector’ on page 357. They are all borrowed from the Middle Mongol *todqa’ul* ‘watchman, guard’. In addition, XŠ *tutħaul* must be emended to *tothaul*. XŠ *tatqavul*, on the other hand, does not simply exist. It appears to be a ghost form.

p. 364: IM *tüwšä-* ‘to be/become wet’ must be emended to *yöwšä-* (written with ت instead of ي). It is derived from \*(y)öwüş ‘wet’ < CT (h)ödüş id.

p. 369: KT *uğurt* ‘a sip’ is better read as *oğurt* because it is a phonetic variant of *avurt*. The form in question was also read as *oğurt* by Clauson (1972: 65). KT *uğurtla-* ‘to sip’ should also be corrected to *oğurtla-*.

p. 374: Although the sources do so exclusively, it is wrong to regard CC *us* ‘wet’ as a loanword from the Mongolic *usun* ‘water’. The word must be read as *üş* and considered related to CT (h)ödüş ‘wet’. It is contracted from the form *üwüş* ‘wet’.

p. 374: TZ *uruṭqa* ‘old man’ is hardly related to Altai/Teleut *ūru-* ‘to be ill’, which goes back to CT *hagri-*. TZ *uruṭqa* is related to the Old Turkic *kurtga* ‘old woman’. Other examples of the loss of the initial *k-* in Middle Kipchak can be found in Ünal (2023b: 303).

p. 375: CC *uşqu* ‘wood plane’ is hardly from \**uwuşqu*. The reading is correct, but the word is related to the Turkish dialectal form *hişki* ‘wood plane’ and Tatar *işki* ‘plane’, derived from *iş(i)-* ~ *yış(i)-* ‘to rub; to smooth, plane’. The reason for the rounding in the CC is unknown.

p. 378: Boeschoten confuses Middle Turkic *üg-* (not †*ük-*) ‘to pile up’ with the base of *üküş* ‘many, much’, *ükli-* ‘to multiply’ and their derivatives. These two verbal roots must be strictly distinguished.

p. 382: TZ *ön[-]üz* (= *önüz*) ‘sebum’ is correct in reading and meaning. However, Boeschoten’s analysis of it as a compound of *ön* (‘front’?) and *üz* ‘fat’ can hardly be correct. The word survives in Bashkir as *ünäð* ‘mould, mildew’. More importantly, it was borrowed into Mongolic from Bulgar Turkic as \**önger* ‘mold’ > WM *öngger* ~ *önggör* ‘mold; coating on the tongue; mucous membrane on the inside of the alimentary canal’ (Lessing 1995: 638).

p. 386: *yad-* and *yaz-* are two different verbs and they should be treated separately. However, Boeschoten lists them both under *yad-*.

p. 387: ON *yagır* ‘shoulder’ is not related to CT *yagır* ‘saddle gall’, under which it is presented. It is rather a reanalysis of *yagrın* ‘shoulder blade’ (p. 388).

p. 389: *yalıl-* and *yalq-* ‘to be nauseated’ are unlikely to be related to *yal-* ‘to blaze’. The semantic connection is weak.

p. 390: XŠ (and Sanglax) *yalin-* ‘to lick friendlily’ (dog) is not related to CT *yalin-* ‘to plead’, but is a later form of *yalgan-*, the reflexive of *yalga-*. Note that in both XŠ and Sanglax, *yalga-* occurs as *yala-* without the postconsonantal velar.

p. 395: KA *yapur-* ‘to flatten’ is not a causative of *yap-* ‘to cover’. It already occurs in Old Uyghur as *yapır-* ‘to destroy, flatten’ (Wilkins 2021: 865). The rounded vowel in the Middle Turkic form is secondary.

p. 396: *yaqtu* ‘light’ etc. cannot be derived from *yak-* because there is no Common Turkic formative {-tU}. A regular derivation with {-dI} would have the form \**yakdī*, thus \**yaktī* in Middle Turkic. OU *tamtu*, which has a similar form, is derived from *tamit-* with the suffix {-O} (Ünal 2023a: 40). However, a similar morphological analysis for *yaqtu* as \*{yak-īt-o} is unlikely. Note that Ünal (2022b: 44–



45) regarded *yaqtu* and its variants as a simplex and connected it with the Tocharian B *ñakte* ‘god’ and the Xiongnu *\*ñakte* (glossed as *xiào* 孝 ‘filial piety’).

p. 397: Kyrgyz *yar* should be emended to *jar*.

p. 400: QA *yargaq* ‘skin coat’ must be included under *yarig* ‘leather strap’ on the same page from which it is derived.

p. 407: MA *yözül-* ‘to become putrid’ is not a variant of *yazıl-*, as Boeschoten suggests, but rather of *čözül-* ‘to disperse (intr.)’ (Wilkens 2021: 239). The alternation of onset *č-* and *y-* in Common Turkic can also be found in pairs such as *čāyka-* ~ *yāyka-* ‘to shake’, *čemril-* ~ *yemril-* ‘to collapse, break down’, *čig* ~ *yig* ‘raw’, *čirü-* ~ *yirü-* ‘to decay’, and *čörgä-* ~ *yörgä-* ‘to wrap’.

p. 408: AH *yäläs* ‘breeze’ is related to the Tatar *jiläs* ‘slightly windy’, which Bálint (1876: 84) gave in his dictionary as *yiláz* ‘breeze, gentle wind’.

p. 409: *yelpi-/yälpi-* ‘to fan’ belongs under the heading *yel* ‘wind’ (p. 408), from which it is derived.

p. 410: XŠ *yänsüg* (s.v. *yāñ-*) ‘conquering spirit’ is probably not derived from *yāñ-* ‘to conquer’. Its interpretation is arbitrary. The word survives in Nogay *yeñsik* ‘desire’ and Kazakh (Radloff) *jeñsik* ‘desire for something’. QB (5799) *yañsaguči* ‘desirous’ may be related to this group with its obvious base *\*yañsa-* ‘to desire’.

p. 412: *üwüş/üvüş/üviš/üyüş* ‘wet’ etc. are not derivatives of *\*yibi-* ‘to get wet’ but descendant forms of CT (*h*)*ödüş*. The change can be conceived as (*h*)*ödüş* > *öyüş* > *öwüş* > *üwüş*.

p. 414: CC *yihöv* ‘church’ certainly does not belong to *yig<sup>-2</sup>* ‘to save, collect, pile up’. It goes back to the compound *\*iyik öv* < *\*idok äv* ‘holy house’.

p. 417: Although MA *yışgu/yışqu* ‘device for straightening a lance’ is rightly connected with the Turkish dialectal *işkī*, it is unlikely to derive from *yış-* ‘to tie a cord’, which comes from CT (*h*)*iš-* (> OU *iš-în* ‘hair braid’, *iš-ig* ~ *yış-ig* ‘cord, rope’). As mentioned above, there is another verbal root *iš(i)-* ~ *yış(i)-* ‘to rub; to smooth, plane’. This is the more likely base of *yışgu/yışqu*.

p. 417: NF *yışir* ‘straw’ lives on in Turkish dialects as *hişir* ‘unripe fruit; rotten vegetables and fruits; leftovers, crumbs, useless parts, rubbish; large straw, etc.’, which does not appear to be a borrowing from Armenian, contrary to Eren’s (1999: 178) argument.

p. 425: QT<sub>3</sub> †*yugur-* in *tün yugur-* ‘to stay awake at night’ must be read as *yogur-* and identified with OU *yogur-* ‘to traverse, pass; to spend’ (Wilkens 2021: 909), possibly related to *yöl* ‘road, way’.

## Missing lexemes

When using the dictionary, I noticed that some important words were not included. The reason for their exclusion is unclear to me. Without claiming to be exhaustive, some of these missing lexemes can be listed as follows: CC *čīnay* ‘wife’, *yañ* ‘infectious disease, epidemic’ (< chin. *yàng* 恙 ‘sickness’?), IM *küsmān* ‘oar’, *yülün* ‘cloud’ (< mong. *ülen* < *\*eülen*), AH or (better) *ur* ‘son’ (cognate to Old Turkic *urī*), KT *käy* ‘good’, MG *ikāš-* ‘to become obstinate’, *kalakda bol-* ‘to be moving’ (< mong. *kala-*), *sar* ‘membrane’, *sark-* ~ *sirk-* ‘to flow, leak’, *yilmir-* ‘to sob’, *yigük* ‘crippled’, MM *sar* ‘membrane’, TZ *ala-* ‘to change’ (< mong. *kala-*), *ösäk* ‘poker’.

In order to have a complete Early Middle Turkic vocabulary, these and other lexemes need to be included in future editions.

## Typographical errors

There are also a few minor typos in the book: *Özyetkin* (for *Özyetgin*) (p. IX, 5), *beteen* (for *between*) (p. 10), *existence* (for *existence*) (p. 71), *contamiated* (for *contaminated*) (p. 114), *Iziskannyj* (for *Izyskannyj*) (p. 593), *Ayagka egimlig bakşı* (for *Ayagka tegimlig bahşı*) (p. 589). Also, in the alphabetical order of letters on page 14, the letter *q* is missing between *p* and *r*.

## Concluding remarks

All in all, although Hendrik Boeschoten's *A Dictionary of Early Middle Turkic* fills a long-standing and significant gap in Turkological studies, it does not fulfil this task properly. In my opinion, a non-etymological dictionary is not the place to propose hidden etymologies. This work would be much more practical if words and their derivatives were treated separately under different headings without implying etymologies.

More time and effort will be needed before we have a complete dictionary of Early Middle Turkic. This future edition might also include the Oghuz vocabulary of Old Ottoman texts.

As I was writing this review, I learned that Hendrik Boeschoten had suddenly passed away. I was very saddened by his passing. I am equally saddened that he will not be able to continue his work on Early Middle Turkic, which is of great value despite the shortcomings discussed in this review.

## Abbreviations

AH	Kitāb al-Idrāk
aor.	aorist
BM	Kitāb bulġat al-muštāq
CC	Codex Cumanicus
chin.	Chinese
CT	Common Turkic
DLT	Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk
FZ	Farhang-i Zafān-gūyā
IM	Ibn al-Muhannā (Kitāb Ḥilyat al-insān wa-Ḥalbat al-lisān)
intr.	intransitive
KA	Kitāb al-Af'āl
KT	Kitāb maǧmū' tarǧumān Turkī wa-'Aǧamī wa-Muṣṣalī
MA	Muqaddimat al-Adab
MG	Margin Grammar = El-İdrak Haşiyesi
MM	Mu'in al-Murīd
mong.	Mongolic
ms.	manuscript
NF	Nahj al-Farādīs
ON	Oğuzname
OU	Old Uyghur
p.	page
QA	Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'
QB	Qutadgu Bilig
QK	Qawānīn al-kullīyya
QT <sub>3</sub>	Interlinear translation, Türk ve İslām Eserleri Müzesi TİEM 73
QT <sub>4</sub>	Interlinear translation, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi
QT <sub>5</sub>	Interlinear translation, Mashhad
Skr.	Sanskrit
TZ	Kitāb al-tuḥfat al-zakiyya fi luyāt al-Turkiyya
XŞ	Ḥusrāv u Şīrīn
YL	yarliq documents

## References

- Ağar, Mehmet Emin 1986. *Baytaratü'l-Vâzıh (İnceleme-Metin-İndeks)*. Unpublished master's thesis, Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Ağca, Ferruh 2019. *Uygur Harfli Oğuz Kağan Destanı. Metin-Aktarma-Notlar-Dizin-Tıpkıbasım*. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü.
- Al-Turk, Gulhan 2006. *Et-Tuhfetü'z-Zekiyye fi'l-Luğati't-Türkiyye Üzerine Bir Dil İncelemesi*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Alturk, Gulhan Abedalaziz Moh'd Jalal 2012. *Kitābu Bulğatu'l-Muštāk fī Luğati't-Türk ve'l-Kıfçāk*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Bálint, Gábor 1876. *Kazáni-Tatár nyelvtanulmányok*. II. füzet. *Kazáni-tatár szótár*. Budapest: A M. T. Akadémia Könyvkiadó Hivatalában.
- Bayat, Fuzuli 2020. *Orta Türkçe Sözlük (11–16. Yüzyıllar)*. İstanbul: Ötüken.
- Cihan, Serkan 2021. *Mukaddimetü'l-Edeb (Yozgat Nüshası)-(Giriş, Metin, Notlar, Sözlük-Dizin)*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Clouston, Sir Gerard 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Danka, Balázs 2019. *The 'Pagan' Oyuz-namā: A Philological and Linguistic Analysis*. (Turcologica 113) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Dankoff, Robert 1987. *The Turkic Vocabulary in the Fārhang-i Zafān-güyā*. (Papers on Inner Asia 4) Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Doerfer, Gerhard and Tezcan, Semih 1980. *Wörterbuch des Chaladsch (Dialekt von Xarrāb)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Drimba, Vladimir 2000. *Codex Cumanicus. Édition Diplomatique Avec Fac-Similés*. Bucarest: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic Word Formation: A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. 2 vols. (Turcologica 7) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Eren, Hasan 1999. *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü*. Ankara.
- Fazylov, Ergaš 1966–1971. *Staroubekskij Jazyk: Xorezmijskie Pamjatniki XIV Veka*. 2 vols. Taškent: Fan.
- Garkavec, Aleksandr 2015. *Codex Cumanicus*. 4 vols. Almaty: Baur.
- Güner, Galip 2017. *Resûli Sözlüğü'nün Türkçe Söz Varlığı*. İstanbul: Kesit.
- Kaçalin, Mustafa S. 2011. *Niyâzi. Nevâyi'nin Sözleri ve Çağatayca Tanıklar: El-Luğātu'n-Nevâ'iyye ve'l-İstişhādātu'l-Çağātā'iyye. Giriş, Metin, Dizinler, Tıpkıbası*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Karagözü, Savaş and Salan, Musa 2022. *İmām Cemālu'd-dīn ebū Muḥammed 'Abdullah et-Turkī. Kitābu Bulğatu'l-Muštāk fī Luğati't-Türk ve'l-Kıfçāk. Kastamonu Nüshası (Giriş, İnceleme, Tıpkıbasım ve Transkripsiyon, Dizin)*. Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi.
- Kuryšzanov, Abžan Kuryšzanovič 1970. *Issledovanie po leksike starokypčakskogo pis'mennogo pamjatnika XIII v. — «Tjurksko-Arabskogo Slovarja»*. Alma-Ata: Nauka.
- Lessing, Ferdinand D. (ed.) 1995. *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Compiled by Mattai Haltod, John Gombojab Hangin, Serge Kassatkin and Ferdinand D. Lessing. 3rd reprinting with minor type-corrections. Bloomington, Ind.: Mongolia Society.
- Özcamkan Ayaz, Gülşen 2020. *Mukaddimetü'l-Edeb. Paris ve Yozgat Nüshaları (Giriş-Metin-Dizin)*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon.
- Özcamkan Ayaz, Gülşen 2023. *Mukaddimetü'l-Edeb. Paris ve Yozgat Nüshaları (Giriş-Metin-Dizin)*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Özertural, Zekine (unter Mitwirkung von Klaus Röhrborn) 2023. *Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien I. Verben Band 3: odgur- – üzüš-*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Stachowski, Kamil and Stachowski, Olaf 2017. Possibly Oriental Elements in Slavonic Folklore. Upiór ~ Wampir. In M. Németh, B. Podolak, M. Urban (eds.) *Essays in the History of Languages and Linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. 643–693. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Stachowski, Marek 2019. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch der türkischen Sprache*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- Toparlı, Recep, Çögenli, M. Sadi and Yanık, Nevzat H. 1999. *El-Kavânînü'l-Küllîyye Li Zabti'l-Luğati't-Türkiyye*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Toparlı, Recep, Çögenli, M. Sadi and Yanık, Nevzat H. 2000. *Kitâb-ı Mecmû-ı Tercümân-ı Türkî ve Acemî ve Mugalî*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Toparlı, Recep, Vural, Hanifi and Karaatlı, Recep 2003. *Kıpçak Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. (Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları 835) Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Ünal, Orçun 2012. Oğuzca Ayla 'Öyle, O Şekilde' Kelimesinin Kökeni Üzerine. *Dil Araştırmaları* 10, 151–165.
- Ünal, Orçun 2022a. Zum Ursprung des kitanischen Verbs <tu.úr> 'sterben'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 112, 281–291.
- Ünal, Orçun 2022b. *On \*p- and Other Proto-Turkic Consonants*. (Sino-Platonic Papers 325) Philadelphia: Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, University of Pennsylvania.
- Ünal, Orçun 2023a. A Word of Turkic Origin in Altaic Languages: \*pür- 'to foretell'. *Turkic Languages* 27/1, 35–47.
- Ünal, Orçun 2023b. A Korean Loanword in Middle Kipchak? *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 5, 301–306.
- Ünlü, Suat 2012. *Harezmi Altınordu Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. Konya: Eğitim.

- Ünlü, Suat 2018. *Karahanlı Türkçesi İlk Türkçe Satır-Altı Transkribeli Kur'an Tercümesi - Türkiye Türkçesi Mealli Karşılaştırmalı Kur'an-ı Kerim*. 8 vols. Konya.
- Wilkins, Jens 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch-Deutsch-Türkisch. Eski Uygurcanın El Sözlüğü. Eski Uygurca-Almanca-Türkçe*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.