

Recenzje

Berta, Árpád, András Róna-Tas, with the assistance of László Károly, *West Old Turkic. Turkic loanwords in Hungarian. Part I. Introduction, Lexicon »A–K«, Part II. Lexicon »L–Z«, Conclusions, Apparatus*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2011, XX + 1494 pp.

As the authors write at the beginning, the main goal of this book is the reconstruction of Old West Turkic, a second aim is etymology of West Old Turkic words, and a third aim is to contribute to the history of Hungarian, all basing on the evidence of Turkic loanwords in Hungarian. Therefore, this study tries to combine the methods and the results of Hungarian and Turkic studies which has been a long tradition in Hungary since the rise of etymological research in this country.

The dictionary contains 384 Hungarian words of claimed or supposed West Old Turkic origin regarded as Oguric, including some proper names, all documented, compared, examined and concluded in a very detailed way, with the addition of 35 words borrowed from Kuman. This monograph is the most voluminous and detailed ever published in this field, the most important earlier studies being Gombocz (1908, 1912, 1914–1915) and Ligeti (1986).

A detailed review of such a voluminous monograph on which two authors worked a dozen of years being assisted by a few younger colleagues should comprise several dozens of pages, especially if a reviewer wished to get in a debate with the authors on particular etymologies or other debatable questions. Therefore, I will limit myself to a general overview and some critical remarks rather than to reviewing all findings and lexicon entries. Despite some objections and many specific critical remarks, my general opinion of this book is positive.

The first volume (Part I) contains a preface (pp. vii–x) by András Róna-Tas, an introduction divided into three chapters (pp. 3–49), also written by András Róna-Tas, as well as the first part of the lexicon, the entries *ács* ‘carpenter’– *küllő*³ ‘spoke (of a wheel)’ (pp. 53–618). The remaining part of the lexicon is found in the second volume (Part II) and includes the entries *lék* ‘a hole in the ice (for fishing)’– *zerge* ‘chamois, *Rupicapra rupicapra*’ (pp. 619–1008). The lexicon is at the same time chapter four of the book and the part *Conclusions* (pp. 1011–1176) that follows the lexicon contains the following three chapters: Chapter 5 *A historical phonology of Hungarian* (pp. 1011–1069), Chapter 6

West Old Turkic and Hungarian (pp. 1071–1146) and Chapter 7 *Who spoke, where and when West Old Turkic* (pp. 1147–1176). This part of the book is devoted to various questions of historical Hungarian, Hungarian-Turkic and other, e.g. Alanian language contacts as well as West Old Turkic. The authors establish the area of these contacts as the territory between the Kuban and the Don rivers (p. 1148). They argue that Hungarian copied words from Khazar and Bulgar which both were Oguric languages. The final part of the study called *Apparatus* consists of the following sections: Chapter 8, “Lists and indices” (pp. 1179–1369); Chapter 9, *Bibliography* (pp. 1371–1459); and Chapter 10, *Abbreviations* (pp. 1462–1483). Then there are two maps, Chapter 11 (pp. 1486–1487), and the last section, *Numerical data, addenda and corrigenda* (pp. 1489–1394). Some or whole parts of these final chapters were compiled by other contributors, e.g. Mónika Biacsi, Béla Kempf and Borbála Gulyás, though we learn from the introduction that two other collaborators, namely Éva Csáki and Előd Kovács helped the authors in compiling lists of bibliographies, Éva Csáki and Mónika Biacsi participated in the editing of the lexicon, whereas László Károly, István Lengyel and Sándor Szatmári helped the authors in collecting the data.

In most cases traditional Hungarian study on loanwords of Turkic origin draws conclusion from historical phonology and lexicology of both Hungarian and Turkic. In Berta and Róna-Tas’s book this tradition is extended even farther, since the authors pronounced their opinions on many questions of Proto-Finno-Ugric, Proto-Ugric etc. Thus they compile a list of Hungarian words of Finno-Ugric (pp. 1272–1293) and a list of words of Proto-Finno-Ugric and Proto-Ugric origin (pp. 1294–1316). On the other hand, it should be stressed that according to a classical approach in Hungarian studies applied since Gombocz (1908: 2), most researchers reconstruct Old Bulgar phonology on the basis of Turkic loanwords and this line and method of reconstruction is partially present in the reviewed book. For example, many claims on the WOT consonant *z* are based on Hungarian loanwords (pp. 1096–1097).

The monograph was completed in 2009, but the process of editing continued to 2011 when it came out in print. András Róna-Tas is the author of lexicon entries beginning with the letters A, B, GY, H, I, J, K, and Árpád Berta wrote those beginning with the letters C, CS, D, E-É, G and L-Z, i.e. the whole lexicon part of the second volume (the letters L, O-Ó, Ö-Ő, S, SZ, T, U-Ú, Ü-Ű, V and Z). Not only the long history of writing this work, but also the death of one of the authors (Árpád Berta, 2008) brought about some inevitable shortcomings, what András Róna-Tas, who was obliged to write much of introductory and concluding parts himself, discloses. Although the lexicon was composed in co-authorship, Róna-Tas says “I covered 561 Hungarian words with a possible or hitherto proposed Turkic origin” or “Thus, I dealt with 419 etymologies in detail (pp. 53–1008).” (p. 1489), which suggests that the bulk of final work was done by him.

Chapters 1–3 of the introduction are very informative, for they outline previous research (Chapter 1, pp. 3–17), historical background (Chapter 2, pp. 19–39) and demonstrate the structure of the lexicon (Chapter 3, pp. 41–49). From this part we see that Turkic loanwords in Hungarian are present in early Hungarian chronicles from the 13th century on and the

first comparative work on them goes back to Medgyes in the 17th century, though based on late 16th–17th-century Ottoman material. Serious modern research starts in the 19th century with the contributions of such linguists as Budenz, Munkácsy, Gombocz, much criticised Vámbéry, and continues in the 20th century with the works of Németh, Ligeti, Palló, Mándoky-Kongur and others. From the works on Turkic historical lexicology, the dictionaries by Budagov, Radloff, Räsänen, Doerfer, Clauson, Sevortjan and others are mentioned. The authors also show many mono- and bilingual Turkic dictionaries, historical grammars and individual studies on historical grammar and lexicon.

Historical background is a very helpful chapter which gives the reader a short overview of the history of Turkic peoples relevant to the topic. The authors explain the term Western Turkic as a generic term for all Turkic languages used in the West Turkic Kaghanate, but they also discuss other peoples with which the Turks and Hungarians were in contact, e.g. the Goths, the Avars and the Slavs. There are some shortcuts, e.g. the question of the identification of the Ruanruan with the Avars presented as an undoubted fact (pp. 20–21) and cases of inexactness in this chapter, as the identification of Kherson with Sevastopol (p. 25). The forms of some historical concepts, e.g. “the Conquest”, as the Hungarians usually translate the Hungarian term *honfoglalás* for the event of the settlement of the Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin (p. 36) and the form of many proper names show a Hungarian hand, e.g. the river “Tisza” for a more usual “Tisa” or “Nyitra” for ‘Nitra’ (p. 37).

The lexicon discusses 419 words of which 384 are considered Oguric, the rest being Kuman. It is interesting that no word was assigned to Pecheneg, another Turkic language with which the Hungarians were in contact by the 12th century. Of these 384 Oguric words, 290 are regarded as certain (p. 1176). At another point of the study, the authors (actually Róna-Tas) say that West Old Turkic words are grouped into three classes, two Oguric and one Oguric mixed with Oghuz or Kipchak elements.

Historical attestation of loanwords is based on the etymological dictionary of Hungarian edited by Benkő (two editions, one in Hungarian, the other in German), though much abridged, cf. the entry *disznó* ‘pig’ in the reviewed monograph (p. 296) and in Benkő (1967: 646), but incidentally the documentation is extended with other sources, mostly dialect words. The structure of an entry is presented on p. 42 and discussed on the following pages. The structure of a typical entry is clear and it resembles the structure of entries in some other dictionaries. There is a headword, documentation in Hungarian sources, etymological status in case of doubtful words, Turkic documentation, Turkic etymology, Hungarian etymology and bibliography.

In my opinion, a weakness of this monograph is the qualification of many words as West Old Turkic in spite of the fact that they have identical forms or at least not distinct from East Old Turkic. The same treatment was employed by many other Hungarian scholars. I agree with much of linguistic and historical argumentation of the authors and also believe that most Old Turkic loanwords in Hungarian were borrowed from a Turkic language or languages of Chuvash type, also called Oguric and Bulgar Turkic. Nevertheless, only some of them show typical Oguric distinctive features, e.g. *borjú*

'calf' ← WOT * *buraxu*; *tūr*¹ 'to endure, to suffer, bear, stand' ← WOT * *tör-*; or most words with the initial *gy-* ← WOT *ğ-*. Here is a list of words regarded as borrowed from WOT, although they have similar or identical EOT equivalents, as demonstrated by the authors themselves: *ács* 'carpenter', *ágyú* 'cannon', *ál* 'false, imitation', *alacs* 'pied', *alma* 'apple', *apró* 'small, tiny', *arat* 'to mow', *árik* 'to decay, to putrefy', *árok* 'ditch, canal', *árpa* 'barley', *ártány* 'barrow', *balkány* 'soggy place, moor' (it is worth adding the name of Balkan Peninsula in the Caspian Sea to the comparative data shown at this entry; although the authors derive this word from WOT only, it may also be derived from EOT), *balta* 'hatchet, axe', *balvány* 'pagan idol', *barom* 'cattle, livestock', *tūr*² 'to roll up (a scroll or one's sleeves), to suffer, bear, stand' etc. It should also be noted that some phonological features regarded as typical Oguric, e.g. *o-* → *wo-* → *vo-*, e.g. in *váj* 'to hollow out, to scoop out', are also known from non-Oguric languages, e.g. Yakut and Kazakh (not marked by the current spellings). Probably a more difficult case is the supposed Turkic form from which Hungarian borrowed the word *tyúk* 'hen'. According to the authors, it must be * WOT *tixuk* (p. 965). It is true that EOT had the form *taqixu* ~ *taqaxu*, but in Middle Turkic languages the form **taxuq* → *tawuq*, which is the source of the Hungarian word, was quite general.

Another weak point of this monograph is modern Turkic documentation, though in numbers the amount of documentation provided at the entries is very extensive. Documentation contains Old Turkic and Middle Turkic, modern Turkic languages classified into four geographical groups as well as such distinct languages as Chuvash and Khalaj. In fact such an extensive documentation is not necessary. For instance, an extensive attestation of such words as *yasi* ~ *yassi* 'broad, flat' etc. at the entry *disznó* 'pig' does not deliver any evidence, since the direct source of the Hungarian word is Chuvash *sisna* 'pig', the etymology of which is unknown. The authors themselves admit that it may be a borrowing from an unknown language and the proposed etymology from a reconstructed WOT verb *jasV-* 'to be or become huge, wide, broad' is a mere hypothesis, in my opinion a relatively risky one. Another example is the entry *barom* 'cattle, livestock'. In my opinion, if this word is Turkic, it should be related to *bar* +Vm 'existence', and not to *bar-* 'to go', in contrast to Erdal, since the word for 'existence' is more naturally linked to the idea of 'possession, property', also in Turkic languages. Therefore, the extensive documentation of the verb *bar-* 'to go' in many forms and meanings, does not have any relevance to the entry. By the way, the former verb, as defective, should be represented as *bar* 'to exist' and not *bar-* 'to exist'.

The method of quotation from various languages shows some deficiencies. In general, all Soviet and the current post-Soviet dictionaries of so-called Aral-Caspian or Central Group, i.e. Noghai, Kazakh and Karakalpak provide words in inadequate current orthographies which lack rounded-unrounded vowel harmony. For instance, it is absolutely clear to everybody who heard any Kazakh that such a word as *jüzik* 'ring' is never pronounced as its transliteration suggests, but as *jüzük*. Naturally one may not expect from the authors of such a great work a transcription of words quoted from various dictionaries, but as far as phonetics and phonology is concerned, exactness is important.

Another problem is the quality and reliability of dictionaries. For example, Kazakh words were excerpted from three dictionaries, Shnitnikov (1966), Balakayev (1999) and Radloff (1893–1911). Kazakh material in Radloff's dictionary is very good, but this is not the case with the two former. We can understand that the authors did not have access to a good modern Kazakh dictionary, the more so as the first reliable, voluminous Kazakh Russian dictionary was published only recently (Syzydyq, Husajyn *eds* 2001), but until it was not published careful researchers used Bazylkhan's (1977) Kazakh-Mongolian dictionary or the monolingual ten-volume dictionary of Kazakh (Ysraqov *ed.* 1974–1986). As a matter of fact, Bazylkhan (Bazylhaan) is present in the bibliography, but it was barely used as the source of Kazakh words.

The next problem is Karaim, especially the Crimean dialect. Unfortunately, in contrast to Kazakh, Radloff's Karaim material is absolutely unreliable and must be used with utmost care. As for Troki dialect, this was demonstrated by Kowalski (1929: xxvii), while Radloff's mistakes in Crimean dialect were identified during this reviewer's own study. As for Luck-Halicz dialect, Mardkowicz's dictionary (1935) should still be the most important lexicographical reference book.

Another language of north-western group, Crimean Karaim, has also weak documentary grounds, since the authors used Radloff's Crimean Tatar words and Asanov, Garkavets and Useinov's dictionary (referred to as Asanov *et al.* 1988). This dictionary was very important when it came out, since it was the single modern lexicographical work on Crimean Tatar – if we disregard some word lists – but it should have been replaced with Useinov's dictionary (1994 and 2005). If Crimean Turkic languages are concerned, one should also use a very good Urum dictionary by Garkavets (2000).

In the following, I will demonstrate inconsistencies and wrong transcriptions, various mistakes in existing dictionaries, uncritically repeated by the authors of the study, and some other errors. Because the number of the cases of this kind of inexactness is very high, only a small part of documentation at the initial entries up to p. 332 (the entry *erkölcs*) will be outlined.

1. Inadequate transcription: (1) *bäl'gi* 'znak, priznak, primeta' (KarH, KarC), (p. 114) – the correct transcription is *belgi* for both dialects, see the forms provided in squares from Mardkowicz and Shapshal; (2) *bäg* 'gospodin' (KarC), *bäy* 'gospodin' (KarC), (p. 166), for the correct forms *beg* or *bey*; (3) the same letter in Karaim-Russian-Polish Dictionary was differently transcribed in another word, *čiček* 'cvetok, ospa' (KarC), (p. 232), for the correct form *čiček*; (4) *čüvre* 'okružnost', 'krugom' (KarC), cf. (p. 277), for the correct form *čüvre*; (5) *bürtük* 'das Korn, das Körnchen' (KarTR), (p. 119) – as said above, Radloff's transcription of Troki dialect is wrong and it should not be repeatedly applied; (6) in many cases the transcription is inconsistent, e.g. the Crimean Karaim consonant *κ̣* is once transcribed *q* as in *budaq* 'vetv', 'vetka' (KarC), (p. 162), while in other cases it appears as *k* as in *alačik* 'jurta iz kory, šalaš, letnjaja kuhnja' (KarC), (p. 60).
2. The words shown in the book as KarC, but absent from Karaim-Russian-Polish Dictionary: (1) *matur* 'tapfer, heldenhaft' (p. 106) – it should be shown as KarTL;

- (2) *buğou* ‘uzda, uzdečka, cep’, kandy’ (p. 112) shown as (KarT, KarH, KarC) – in fact, Karaim-Russian-Polish Dictionary provides the form *buğov* (p. 136); in addition, not all meanings are listed in Berta and Róna-Tas; if they spell *buğuw*, *bukaw* etc., they should add the form *buğov*, as in other words with the similar final, e.g. *buzov* ‘telenok’ (KarT, KarH), *buzuv*, *bizuv* ‘telenok’ (KarC), (p. 151).
3. Inadequate meanings selected from comparative literature. It is a general procedure by the authors that they do not provide all available meanings of words, but only select some, mostly those which fit their findings. However, sometimes it is just the opposite. For example, for Hungarian (p. 135) *bocsát* [bočät], *bocsájt* [bočäyt] ‘to forgive’, much more appropriate is Kar. *bošat-* ‘to forgive’ (as in Kar 133 from which they quote) than *bošat-* ‘oporožnjat’, *vylivat*, *vystupat*’ (KarT, KarC). Moreover, since the authors quote only the Halicz form *bosat-* in the meaning ‘to forgive’, the reader may conclude that the form *bošat-* is absent from the two other dialects, which is not the case.
 4. Inadequate phonetic forms selected. For example, there is CKar. *bozuq* ‘isporčennyj’ (p. 189), but there is no *buzuq*, provided with the same meaning in the same source ‘isporčennyj’ (Kar 137), i.e. ‘destroyed’, the more as it better fits Hungarian *buzogány* [buzogāń], for which these quotations are shown. A little below (p. 189), Berta and Róna-Tas conclude that „though Kar has *-u-*, KarC and CrTat both have *-o-*, which seems to be an Ott influence”. As is evident, this conclusion was made on selective, incomplete documentation and is untrue.
 5. Inadequate quotation with reference to languages or dialects, e.g. *bit-* ‘rasti, urodit’sja, končit’sja, istoščat’sja’ (KarT, KarH, KarC), cf. (p. 195) – it is impossible to know which meaning should be attributed to which dialect; moreover, there are two homonyms in the quotations cited, one being *bit*⁻¹ ‘to grow up’, the other *bit*⁻² ‘to finish, to end up’.
 6. Confusing phonetically similar, but semantically unrelated words: Turkic *čaq* ‘time’, provided at the entry *csak* ‘only’, was needlessly compared with some similar words of different meanings, e.g. “*šak* ‘odnako, ved’” (KarC ← Pol)” (p. 208) – Polish word (*wszak*) ‘therefore’ is completely unrelated to the Turkic word. In addition, it may be used in Western Karaim, but by no means in Crimean Karaim.
 7. Uncritical quoting from dictionaries, e.g. *tjy-* ‘zatykat’ (KarT, KarH, KarC) (p. 304) – this meaning is only one and the last out of eight (Kar 556); in addition, it is certainly wrongly provided in Kar.

As said above, in a work of such a scope and volume, a reader would hardly find all claims and findings up to his/her expectations. Therefore, I will indicate only a few quite debatable statements and etymologies. One of my remarks considers phonology of WOT. The authors claim the existence of word initial *h-*, although they give no argument for that (p. 1099). Therefore, this claim remains a sheer supposition. At this point it is to be noted that the existence of initial *h-* in Proto-Turkic was recently accepted on the basis of a single Turkic language, Khalaj, extremely affected by Persian. In fact, the traditional opinion that initial *h-* is secondary is in my opinion more reasonable. As far

as etymologies are concerned, we shall point out that the etymology of the Turkic name of Kiev, more exactly the component *Man* of *Man Kermen* from Chinese and relating it to Chuvash *mǎn* ‘great’ (p. 1087), is a good idea, but quite dubious.

In a similar way, the alleged Turkic semantic copies postulated for the following words are quite doubtful:

1. *Farkas* ‘wolf’. Regarding the Hungarian word as a semantic copy from Turkic on the basis of a single evidence *quduruqtug* ‘tailed; wolf’ from Karagas (Tofalar) is a stimulating, but at the same time a risky idea (p. 1225).
2. *Fokhagyma* ‘garlic’. Explained as a compound of *fog* ‘tooth’ and *hagyma* ‘onion’, it seems to have no good grounds in Turkic. The association of a clove of garlic with a tooth is also found in other languages, it may be a Slavic impact (p. 1326).
3. *Terhes* ‘pregnant’. The idea of deriving the Hungarian word as a semantic copy from Turkic languages (p. 1328) is my opinion false. All the data come from North-West languages (Tatar, Bashkir, Noghai, Kazak, Karakalpak and Kirghiz), strongly affected by Russian. It is Russian *беременная* lit. ‘with burden’ (cf. Polish *ciężarna* with the same meaning) that must have been adopted by those languages. In fact, all the aforementioned languages have their own, different means to express the idea of pregnancy, e.g. Kaz. *eki qabat*, Kir. *boorundo bar*, in addition to the general expression *awur ayaq* ~ *ayağı awur*, even if one regards some of them as euphemisms. I may add my own personal evidence to this. I have heard the expression *yüklü* ‘with burden’, i.e. ‘pregnant’, from a single Crimean Tatar speaker whose native language competence was very low and who just copied Russian words into Tatar semantically, while all other Crimean Tatar speakers used their genuine term *awur ayaq*.

There are also some other points of minor importance to correct. For instance, some abbreviations are not easy to identify with the works the authors refer to, e.g. A5D – „Uyghur data in Arabic Script in the Pentaglott Dictionary” (p. 1463). Some are absent from the list, e.g. MGr for Middle Greek.

Lastly, it should be said that many personal names treated by Mandoký-Kongur (1992: 131–153) as Kuman are not included in this study.

In conclusion, I can recommend this book to everybody interested in Turkic-Hungarian language contacts. The reader will get up-to-date information on the history and state of research and will find many tools to formulate an idea about a possible reconstruction of historical languages such as Bulgar and Khazar which the authors term West Old Turkic. This term is still a working hypothesis, since it is certain than West Old Turkic also included non-Oguric languages of Oghuz and Kipchak type and not all may be attributed to the West Turkic Kaghanate. However, Gombocz’s “Bulgarisch-Türkische” is too narrow, for it ignores Khazar, and Berta and Róna-Tas, as earlier Ligeti, provide convincing evidence that the Hungarians also copied words from this language. Therefore, perhaps the term “Oguric”, used alternatively by the authors of the monograph would be better? However, what to do with Kuman in such a case? And there is still the problem of Pecheneg, another riddle, almost fully disregarded in this study. It is because the authors doubt if there were be any major contact between the Hungarians and the Pechenegs

before the settlement in the Carpathian Basin and they claim that after that the Pechenegs assimilated to the Hungarians in a very short period of time (p. 39), despite Györffy (1939) who devoted a long study to the place names where the Pechenegs settled in Hungary and at least one Hungarian word *tolmács* ‘interpreter’ which is likely to be a Pecheneg loanword. I am sure that the readers will have differentiated opinions on this and the similar questions, raised by Árpád Berta and András Róna-Tas.

References and abbreviations*

- EOT = East Old Turkic (an abbreviation used at linguistic quotations, following Berta and Róna-Tas).
 Гаркавец, О.М. 2000. *Урумський словник*. Алма-Ата: Центр Дешт-и Кипчак.
 Kar = (Karaim–Russian–Polish Dictionary, following Berta and Róna-Tas).
 Kowalski, Tadeusz. 1929. *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
 Mardkowicz, Aleksander. 1935. *Karaj sez-bitigi. Słownik karaimski. Karaimisches Wörterbuch*. Łuck.
 Сыздыкова, Р.Г., К.Ш. Хусаин (ed.). 2001. *Казахско-русский словарь. Около 50000 слов*. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс (Сыздыкова, Р.Г., К.Ш. Хұсайын. 2001. *Қазақша-орысша сөздік. 50 мыңға жуық сөз*. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс).
 Усеинов, С.М. 1994. *Крымскотатарско-русский словарь. Свыше 20 000 слов. Кърымтатарджа-Русча лугъат. 20 000-ден зияде сѣз*. Тернополь: Диалог.
 Усеинов, С.М. 2005. *Къырымтатарджа-русча лугъат. 25 000-ден зияде сѣз ве сѣз бирикмеси. Крымскотатарско-русский словарь. Свыше 25 000 слов и словосочетаний*. Симферополь: Оджакъ.
 WOT = West Old Turkic (an abbreviation used at linguistic quotations, following Berta and Róna-Tas).
 Ысқақов, А.Ы. (ed.). 1974–1986. *Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. 1–10 том* (I том – 1974, II том – 1976, III том – 1978, IV 1979, V том – 1981, VI том – 1982, VII том – 1983, VIII том – 1985, IX, X том – 1986). Алматы: ҒЫЛЫМ.

Henryk Jankowski

Grażyna Zajac, Smutna ojczyzna i ja smutny... *Kregi literackie epoki Abdülhamita II w świetle tureckiej autobiografii*, Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków 2008, 519 s.

Книга Гражины Зайонц посвящена весьма интересному периоду турецкой истории, хронологически охватывающему время правления султана Абдулхамида II (1876–1909). В истории турецкой литературы этот период называется II. Meşrutiyet (второй конституционный период). Изменения в литературе уже были предопределены предшествующей эпохой и деятельностью султанов-реформаторов (Селима III и Махмута II). Поэтому логичен замысел автора книги – начать с исторического описания эпохи. Именно этому вопросу посвящен 1-й раздел книги *Najdłuższy wiek imperium...* (Самый долгий период империи, с. 17–77). Описание важнейших

* Only those works are listed which are not included in the bibliography of the reviewed book.