

COMMUNIQUE REVIEWS

UZBEK-ENGLISH DICTIONARY

by

Natalie Waterson

New York: Oxford University Press, 1980

190 pages; \$55.00

The rapid rate of natural increase for the Muslim heritage populations of the Soviet Union has caused a growing interest in these peoples among scholars and students in the West. The nearly fourteen million Turkic-speaking Uzbeks of Central Asia, because they are the most numerous non-European Soviet ethnic group, have received much attention. The larger part of Western studies on the Uzbeks has been done from Russian language materials. Relatively few works have been based on Uzbek language sources, in great part due to deficiencies in Uzbek language knowledge. However, the present upsurge of interest in Soviet Central Asia shows signs of producing instructional materials and research tools which will facilitate work with Uzbek language sources. An early indication of this is the recent appearance of Natalie Waterson's short *Uzbek-English Dictionary*, which makes a commendable contribution toward satisfying a very acute need.

Ms. Waterson, a Lecturer in Phonetics at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, in conjunction with two unnamed native Uzbeks (listed only as B.H. and I.T.) from the Fergana Valley in eastern Uzbekistan, has produced a concise and useful dictionary of the "essential vocabulary of modern spoken Uzbek" with "9,000-10,000" main entries and many usage examples. At the back of the dictionary is a list of over 300 suffixes, which are so very important for the study of this Turkic language. Also to be found is a helpful list of almost 100 abbreviations and acronyms. The front part of the work contains a two-page table of correspondences between the various writing systems (Arabic, Latin and Cyrillic scripts) which have been used for Uzbek during the past century; this is intended to facilitate using older texts.

The lexical items are presented with somewhat of a break from tradition. Most words appear in their unsuffixed root form. For example, verbs are found without the usual "infinitive" suffix *-moq* (*ol-*, "to take," rather than *olmoq*); passive and causative verb forms, characteristic adjectives in *-li* and *-siz*, abstract nouns in *-lik*, etc., are seldom listed. The compiler believed that in most instances the user could determine the meaning of a word by referring to the suffix list at the rear of the dictionary. Suffixed stems usually have been presented only in those cases where it was felt that an inexact meaning would otherwise be obtained.

The contents of the Waterson dictionary were selected for the most part from four dictionaries published in the Soviet Union during the past two decades. The foremost of them is the *Uzbeško-russkiy slovar'*, edited by A.K. Borovkov (Moscow, 1959), a scholarly and comprehensive work. The others are the *Russko-uzbekskiy slovar'*, edited by R. Abdurakhmanov (Moscow,

1954); the *Russko-uzbekskiy tematichskiy slovar'*, edited by A.K. Tikhonov, et al. (Tashkent, 1975); and the *Uzbek-English School Dictionary*, compiled by J.B. Buronov, et al. (Tashkent, 1969). The latter item, until the appearance of Waterson's work, was the only Uzbek-English dictionary, but its small printing quantity of 10,000 copies and limited distribution in Uzbekistan has allowed only very few examples to trickle to the West. This work, by the way, although quite useful, has a limited content of approximately 6,900 lexical items, as well as numerous typographical and English language errors. These Soviet dictionaries are somewhat difficult to find at the present, even in Uzbekistan, and are even more unavailable in the West. Thus, the value and service of this present Waterson dictionary is heightened.

However, as worthwhile as this dictionary may be, especially because of its relatively great expense, a few criticisms should be raised.

The first is length: The announced length of the dictionary is "9,000-10,000" entries. A count of the lexical items on the first 35 of the 177-word entry pages totals 1,506, or an average of 43 lexical items per page, which projects to a probable full total of approximately 7,600 entries. And then considering that nominal items which can function as both a noun and an adjective are often listed twice (e.g., *badan* I, "body, physique," and *badan* II, "physical") in variance with the usual practice, and that there seems to be an average of one such dual listing per page, a more realistic estimate of "unique" entries would be 7,400, or approximately 2,000 less than the proclaimed total.

The second is the selected vocabulary: The announced aim of the dictionary is "to cover the essential vocabulary of modern spoken Uzbek." This apparently should not be interpreted to mean modern colloquial Uzbek, especially with regard to the inclusion of some rather specialized "international" vocabulary items. It is questionable whether words such as *bismut*, "bismuth," *filogenez*, "phylogenesis," *isomorfizm*, "isomorphism," and *manometr*, "manometer," as well as several others should be considered "essential vocabulary." If in the compilation process there was a need to assemble a certain quantity of words, more care should have been given to selecting Uzbek words instead of specialized international technical terms. Not all of the unsuffixed Uzbek words in the *Uzbek-English School Dictionary* have been incorporated, and the excellent Borovkov dictionary should have been a source for essential Uzbek words, especially since native speakers participated in the vocabulary selection.

The third is the assumption that a list of suffixes adequately compensates for the listing of basic roots and stems: A person with a certain level of skill with the Uzbek language could function well with basic listings. On the other hand, the beginning student of the language may encounter difficulties in obtaining the proper meaning of a derived form by relying on the suffix list. Forced reliance on the suffix list could retard the speed of the work, even for the talented novice. The idea of compiling this dictionary from basic roots and stems is understandable, but the failure to include all the suffixes found in the Borovkov dictionary is not.

Despite these minor editorial and tactical shortcomings, the Waterson dictionary is a good basic dictionary. Relying on it, a reader should be able to deal with the larger part of the vocabulary in a wide variety of texts. This is a volume which should be found in every university library and on the book shelves or, better yet, on the work desk of every serious student of Soviet Central Asia. Quite likely, this unique work will be a basic research tool for the most part of the 1980s.

Unfortunately, because of its high price, the Xerox Corporation may well derive a greater income from this dictionary than Oxford University Press.

David C. Montgomery
History and Near Eastern Studies
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602
U.S.A.

GÖCTEN SONRA

by

Gabdesch Cumadilov

Translated from Kazakh by G. C. Kazakbalasi

Istanbul: Buyuk Turkeli Yayinlari
1980, 320 pages

Kazakh author Gabdesch Cumadilov's book, *Songi Kös*, has been translated to Turkish under the title, *Göcten Sonra (After the Exodus)*. The author is a Kazakh from Eastern Turkestan (Xinjiang) and a prominent member of the Soviet Kazakh Writer's Union. The book originally was published in Kazakh in 1974 by the Kazakhstan publisher "Jazusi."

Written from a pro-Russian point of view, the book provides interesting information about the Eastern Turkestan Republic in 1944 and about the situation in Eastern Turkestan following the Chinese communist takeover. For the first time, Osman Batur, previously vilified as an "American spy" and a "bandit" by the Soviet press, is described as "a national hero."

G. C. Kazakbalasi's (a pseudonym) translation is masterful; the cover illustration is exquisite for a paperback.

Göcten Sonra was published in Istanbul in 1980, the sixth book of the "Büyük Türkeli" publishing group. The book is available from "Türk Dünyasi Arastirma Vakfi," P.K. 94, Aksaray-Istanbul, Turkey. (SEW)

TURKESTAN İM HERZEN EUROASIENS

by

Baymirza Hayit

Köln, Studienverlag, 1980, 308 pages

Baymirza Hayit's book about the land that lies at the heart of the Eurasian Continent is, in fact, a volume which could easily fit into the category of "civilization" surveys. As such, it makes a contribution to the understanding of the land, the people, and the process of culture change that shaped their history.

The publication of this volume is representative of the growing interest in the study of the *Soviet Asian Ethnic Frontiers*, to borrow the title of the volume recently edited by W.O. McCagg, Jr. and B.D. Silver (Pergamon Press, 1979).

This survey of the civilization of Turkestan is organized in nine chapters preceded by a preface and an introduction in which the author defines the concept of Turkestan. He discusses first the etymology of the name as a springboard to a definition which rests on a cultural criterion.

Chapter #1 - *Die natur des Landes* (pp. 20-31) deals basically with the geography of the land. It is in his second chapter - *Die Bevölkerung Turkestans* (pp. 31-48) that Baymirza Hayit introduces the people of Turkestan. Alongside with brief profiles of the "native"

ethnic groups: the Tadzhiks on one hand, and the Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Kirghiz, Turkmens, Karakalpaks and other Turkic groups on the other, he provides a concise discussion of two other groups of population: the Russian settlers and the deported peoples.

It is within the content of his discussion of the settlement of Russians into Turkestan that Baymirza Hahit addresses the issue of Russification in terms of both demographic pressure (translated in the increase in the number of settlers from 1,718,000 in 1926 to 8,508,505 in 1970) and cultural-political pressure of the deported peoples. The Ukrainians (1,232,287 in 1970) and Koreans (238,540 in 1970) are briefly discussed while the existence of others, such as Armenians, Belorussians, Poles, Mordvinians, Moldavians, Lithuanians, Georgians, is only mentioned. It is surprising that Baymirza Hayit whose knowledge of, and interest in the area is beyond challenge, should fail to mention the Crimean Tatars who were deported "en masse" in 1944, who live mainly in Uzbekistan, and who are at least as numerous as the Koreans.

The third chapter - *Skizzen sus der Geschichte Turkestans* (pp. 48-108) is an historical background in which the common roots and heritage of the people of Turkestan are emphasized.

A political-administrative criterion prevails in the discussion of the fourth chapter - *Das Staats und Gessellschaftsleben in Turkestan* (pp. 108-149) which presents the relationship between the Soviet State and the traditional society of Turkestan, the role of the Communist Party in shaping the new society, as well as the emergence of the five union republics.

The main theme of the chapter on economy - *Die Wirtschaft Turkestans* (pp. 149-164) is the perception of Turkestan as a source of raw materials by the Tsarist as well as Soviet rulers.

There is a chapter - *Die Lebensgewohnheiten des Volkes* (pp. 164-195) which provides an anthropological insight into the culture of the peoples of Turkestan. Certainly, this chapter merely alerts the reader to the complexity of any "civilization" study, without having the pretense of providing an in-depth analysis (comparable to Elizabeth E. Bacon's *Central Asians under Russian Rule: A Study in Culture Change*, Cornell University Press, 1966).

Yet another chapter - *Die Kultur Turkestans* (pp. 195-244) based on the broadest definition of culture approaches the issues of language, folk, literature, science, music, and even sport.

Chapter #8 - *Des Islam in Turkestan* (pp. 244-266), despite its brevity, is by far the most interesting. Islam emerges as a unifying force and as a source of diversity while becoming a main attribute of the identity of the people in the Soviet period.

It is Islam that renders the land and the people of Turkestan with the special quality of members and an *umma* that extends beyond the borders of Turkestan. And it is this quality that comes under scrutiny in the last chapter of B. Hayit's book, *Turkestan-Hinterland fur Sowjetrussische Mittelostpolitik* (pp. 266-305). Here he discusses Islam in Turkestan within the context of the Soviet policy *vis a vis* the Middle East and argues that policy changes and statements regarding Islam in the Soviet Union should be interpreted as reinforcements of foreign policy positions.

There is a brief bibliography (pp. 305-308) of the German-language literature at the end of this volume which not only is a reminder of the fact that the Soviet state is a multinational state but contributes to the understanding of the complexity of the multinational fabric of Soviet society.

Azade-Ayse Rorlich
Department of History
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California
U.S.A.

COMMUNIQUE REVIEWS

Tsinskaia imperia, Dzhungariia i Vostochnyi Turkestan
(*Kolonial'naia politika tsinskogo Kitaia vo vtoroi polovine xix v.*)

by

Ablat Khodzhaev

Moscow, "Nauka," 1979, 128 pp., 75 Kopeks

Ablat Khodzhaev's book represents one of the newest contributions to the already impressive, but still growing field of Soviet studies on China. The field itself has grown remarkably in the aftermath of conflicts in Sinkiang (Hsin-Chiang), especially in the area of ethnic tension and ethnic policy studies. One is tempted to argue in favor of a causal relationship that might exist between the 1962 border clashes involving China and India and the urgency with which Soviet scholars addressed themselves to issues of Chinese history in the ensuing years.¹ One could speculate also that the 1969 Sino-Soviet conflict over Damanskii island had a similarly catalytic effect upon Soviet sinologists, in view of the annual conferences on *State and Society in China*, which were initiated in 1971.²

The title of A. Khodzhaev's 128-page study is misleading, for Khodzhaev concentrates only on the events of the 1860s and 1870s without providing a thorough analysis of either the establishment of Ch'ing rule in Dzhungariia and E. Turkestan or the evolution of government policies in that area. Khodzhaev's four-chapter analysis of the revolts of the 1860s and 1870s is preceded by an introductory essay, which in addition to the bibliography is, at least from the viewpoint of the Western reader, the most valuable contribution of the book.³ The introduction is a survey of the historiography on Tso Tsun-tan's Western campaign (Hsi Cheng) which led to the reincorporation of Dzhungariia and Eastern Turkestan (today's Sinkiang-Uigur Autonomous District) into Ch'ing China in 1878.

Khodzhaev argues that Russian authors such as H.N. Kuropatkin, Iu. A. Sosnovskii, P. Ia. Piasetskii, N.M. Przhevalskii and G.E. Grumm-Grzhimailo have dealt incompletely with Tso-Tsun-tan's Western campaign. He is equally critical of the fragmentary nature of English missionary accounts and emphasizes that works such as those produced by the Chinese historian Chu Wen-chang could only be biased since they ignore the national liberation dimension of the anti-Ch'ing revolts of the 1860s.

Even if the polemical purpose of Khodzhaev's study eludes the reader for the first eight pages of the book, his much more detailed survey Communist Chinese scholarship prepares the reader for a political-ideological battle to be fought with an historian's weapons.

Khodzhaev praises the works of historians such as Ho Ing-teh, Shan-Wu, and Fan Weng-lan who wrote in the years immediately after the victory of the revolution and criticized the policy of *divide et impera* of the Ch'ing, characterizing Tso Tsu-tan's 1875-78 campaign as expansionist. He is sharply critical, however, of the works produced under the influence of what he calls the "nationalist political line of Mao Tse-Tung's group," arguing that they all were written from the position of Great Han chauvinism. To document his point, Khodzhaev reviews some of the major theses developed by this school. For instance, he notes that Hung Yuan

fully justified Tso Tsun's campaign which reincorporated Dzhungaria and E. Turkestan into the Ch'ing empire, thereby furthering the national interests of China. Other historians whose double standards Khodzhaev criticizes have emphasized the reactionary character of Tso Tsun-tan's punitive campaigns against the peasant rebellions in Yunan but, like Hung Yuan, viewed as progressive the campaign against Dzhungaria and E. Turkestan because it was aimed at "reuniting" those lands with China.

Khodzhaev implicitly accuses the "new principle" school of Chinese historical scholarship of ideological betrayal. Ironically, the Chinese "new principle" school reminds one of the Soviet "lesser evil" theory in which Soviet historians went from a complete vilification of the Russian conquest of non-Russian peoples as an "absolute evil" to hailing this conquest as a most positive development, a "lesser evil." What "new principle" and "lesser evil" have in common is an overwhelming emphasis on national interest as the guiding principle for interpreting historical phenomena.

Khodzhaev concludes his introduction with a review of the major sources on Tso Tsun-tan's campaign which he himself consulted: *Ching ting ping ting Sheng Han Hsin-chiang Hai Fei Fong lei*; the reports of Tso Tsun-Tan; the collection of documents *Huimin Chi chi* edited by Pai shou-i and published in 1953; the account of Tseng Wei-Wei entitled *Cheng Hsi Chi luch*; the account of Yang Wei-hsiu entitled *Ping Hui chi* and *Kang ting Hsin-chiang chi* to which Wei Kuan-Tao, one of the financial administrators of Sinkiang, contributed. In addition to the sources mentioned above, Khodzhaev notes that equally useful were the official Ch'ing chronicles, Uigur accounts such as *Tarih-i-Eminie*, as well as M.I. Fanahi's 111-page manuscript on the history of E. Turkestan, which the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences acquired in 1976.

In chapter one, "The Ch'ing Rule in Dzhungaria and E. Turkestan and the Anti-Ch'ing Movements of the 1860s," Khodzhaev discusses the impact of the Ch'ing rule on Dzhungaria (Tien Shan Pei lu) and Eastern Turkestan (Tien Shan Nan lu) after their incorporation into the Chinese empire in mid-eighteenth century. He points to the heavy burden of supporting a huge Ch'ing bureaucracy and army and the discriminatory fiscal and economic policies of the Ch'ing toward the native populations as the appropriate background against which the anti-Ch'ing rebellions of the 1860s should be viewed. Khodzhaev argues that in addition to increasing state revenues, the state's monopoly of trade resulted in a weakening of the ties between various groups of non-Chinese peoples. In this chapter Khodzhaev reviews the revolts in Kuchar, Urumchi, Yarkand, Khotan, Turfan, and Kashgar which secured their freedom from Ch'ing rule and paved the way for their unification in 1867 into the Muslim state of Yettishar under Yakub Bek. Compared to his detailed account of the events which led to the emergence of Yettishar, Khodzhaev sums up the fate of the Uigur Taranchin Sultanate in a single-sentence acknowledgment of its occupation by Russian armies in 1871. This, in addition to his selective use of sources (he draws mainly upon accounts of "non Mao" Chinese historians) reflects Khodzhaev's understanding of and commitment to objectivity.

Chapter two contains a detailed account of the 1864-1871 Ch'ing campaigns against the insurgents of Dzhungaria and E. Turkestan, as well as a discussion of the role of the tuan-lien detachments in these punitive campaigns. Again, the chapter's title, "The Policies of the Ch'ing Government in Connection with the 1864-71 Revolt of the Peoples of Dzhungaria and E. Turkestan" is misleading. Khodzhaev concentrates mainly on Ch'ing strategy toward the insurgents rather than on general policy analysis as the title would suggest.

Tso Tsun-tan's campaign against Dzhungaria is the topic of chapter three, "The Punitive Operations of the Ch'ing Rulers in Dzhungaria in 1871-76." Khodzhaev focuses on the military

operations which led to the reincorporation of N.E. Dzhungaria into the Ch'ing empire, emphasizing the cruelty of the conquerors toward the defeated Dungans. Particularly interesting is his analysis of the Russian occupation of the Ili region in May 1871. Khodzhaev justifies the Russian operation by arguing that it was aimed at preventing the Muslim revolt from spreading to Central Asia and establishing profitable trade ties with the Western regions of the Chinese empire. Interestingly, he chooses to ignore the Russo-Chinese negotiations for the evacuation of the Ili Valley, as well as the handsome compensation and trading rights that Russia extracted from the Ch'ing in the aftermath of this episode. Similarly, Khodzhaev dismisses any official Russian involvement in helping Tso Tsun-tan to secure food supplies for his army. Siberian merchants such as I.O. Kamenskii, argues Khodzhaev, engaged in a lucrative trade with Tso Tsun-tan, despite an official Russian government ban against such trade.

The final chapter, "The Conquest of Eastern Turkestan by the Ch'ing Armies in 1877-78" examines Tso Tsun-tan's campaign against Yakub Bek. In analyzing the main factors which led to the demise of Yettishar, Khodzhaev agrees with traditional interpretations. However, noting the numeric superiority of the Ch'ing army, and the damaging effect which internal strife had on Yettishar's military preparedness, Khodzhaev argues further that the Muslim Khanate fell because of Yakub Bek's failure to understand that the relationship between his state and the Ch'ing empire could not be regulated peacefully. Here again Khodzhaev underlines what he considers the devious Ch'ing policy of *divide et impera*, characterized by their cruelty toward the defeated.

Khodzhaev's study, printed in only 2300 copies, is a book intended for the specialist. Its contribution lies in the detailed information on Tso Tsun-tan's campaigns, which Khodzhaev extracted from a number of lesser known sources, rather than in the originality of the analysis.

Azade-Ayse Rorlich
Department of History
University of Southern California

Notes:

¹Some of the Soviet studies on Sinkiang and China, published after the 1962 border clashes in Sinkiang:

Chekanov, N.K., *Vosstanie nian'tsziunei v Kitae 1853-1868gg.* Moscow, 1963.

Khokhlov, A.N., *Popytki ukrepleniia man'chzhurskikh voisk v Kitae vo vtoroi polovine XIX veke -- Voprosy istoriografii i istoriografii Kitaia.* Moscow, 1968.

Mamedova, E.M., *Iz istorii vzaimootnoshenii narodov Turkestanskogo kraia Sin'tsziana (so vtoroi poloviny XIX v. do 1917g)* Tashkent, 1963.

Ocherki Sovetskikh Dungan. Frunze, 1967.

Tikhvinskii, S.L., *Man'chzhurskoe vladychestvo v Kitae.* Moscow, 1966.

²Some of the Soviet studies on Sinkiang and China, published after the 1969 conflict over Damanskii Island:

Isiev, D.A., "K voprosu ob administrativnon ustroistve gosudarstva Dzhettishar". (Paper delivered at the conference on State and Society in China, Moscow, 1971.)

Natsional'no-osvoboditel'naia Bor'ba uigurov (1864-1878). Gosudarstvo Iettishar i ego vneshniaia politika, Moscow, 1972.

Notes (continued):

Isiev, D.A., "O vneshnei politike gosudarstva Iettishar v Kontse 60-kh godov XIXV." (Paper delivered at the sixth conference on State and Society in China, Moscow, 1975.)

"Khotanskoe vosstanie 1864g." (Paper delivered at the third conference on State and Society in China, Moscow, 1972.)

"O nachal'nom etape antitsinskogo vosstania 1864g. v Vostochnom Turkestane (po uigurskim istochnikam). (Paper delivered at the eighth conference on State and Society in China, Moscow, 1977.)

Kuznetsov, V.S., *Ekonomicheskaiia politika tsainskogo pravitel'stva v Sin'tsziane*, Moscow, 1973.

Novaia istoriia Kitaia, Moscow, 1973.

Skladovskii, M.I., *Istoriia trgovno-ekonomicheskikh otnosheni narodov Rossii Kitaem (do 1917)*. Moscow, 1974.

³The bibliography is organized under three categories:

1. The Classics of Marxism-Leninsim: A total of 3 items.
2. Sources (i.e., primary sources): Russian (31 items), Chinese (23 items), Uigur (7 items), Tatar (1 item).
3. Literature (i.e., secondary sources): Russian (61 items), Chinese (27 items), Uigur (7 items), Uzbek (1 item), Japanese (1 item), and English (12 items).
What makes Khodzhaev's bibliography useful for the Western reader is not only the rich Russian and Chinese language materials which it lists, but the less known Uigur, Uzbek, and Tatar language sources which it mentions.