

La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389. Édition critique précédée des observations philologiques et accompagnée de la reproduction phototypique du texte. By MARIAN LEWICKI. (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, ser. A, nr. 29.) Pp. 228. Wrocław, 1949.

The next most important Middle Mongolian text in Chinese transcription, after the Secret History, is a work entitled *Hua-yi yi-yu*. The significance of this work was recognized long ago by Paul Pelliot, the Reverend Antoine Mostaert, and other scholars who frequently quoted Mongolian words occurring in it in various works.¹ However, this important source remained unpublished until Lewicki's book appeared. Its publication is to be welcomed, because it deals with a valuable source of the Mongolian of the 14th century and is also a model scholarly work in the field of Mongolian historical linguistics, written with profound knowledge of the material and of Mongolian languages in general. The book is divided into several chapters: a brief introduction (5-15), containing the history of the problem and a survey of previous works on related subjects, is followed by a long chapter dealing with the methods of restoration of Mongolian texts in Chinese transcription, as applied by the predecessors of Lewicki. In connection with Lewicki's remark that Pozdneev repeated the observations of Palladius and made minor changes in the transcription of *Yuan-ch'ao pi-shih* (18), it is necessary to point out that Pozdneev did not perform independent work on the Secret History at all. He got from Palladius the latter's manuscript, and published a small portion of it after making a few changes in the transcription which he considered necessary from the point of view of Mongolian phonology, but not from the viewpoint of Chinese historical phonology. The latter could not even be expected from Pozdneev, who had an inadequate knowledge of Chinese. As Pozdneev

published one part of Palladius' manuscript and wrote a few articles which did not even mention Palladius' name, this led to the misunderstanding of too often attributing to Pozdneev theories of which he in reality was not the creator. The fact that Palladius had restored the Mongolian text of the Secret History became known only in 1924, when the manuscript was found in Pozdneev's papers purchased from his widow by the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Therefore, Pozdneev should be mentioned only in so far as he is responsible for certain alterations of Palladius' transcription.

Similarly, Kozin's book as discussed by Lewicki on pp. 22-24, is not a product of independent research either. Kozin is not a Sinologist and he does not know Chinese. He did not restore the Mongolian text of the Secret History, but only romanized Palladius' manuscript which had been written in Cyrillic transcription. He, too, introduced a few insignificant changes in transcription and made a Russian translation mainly on the basis of the Chinese glosses as translated by Palladius.

The third chapter of Lewicki's book contains an analysis of the Chinese transcription of the Mongolian texts of the 14th century. This is the central and most responsible part of his work, because his entire research is based on it. Lewicki performed the difficult task of restoration of the text seriously and conscientiously, and he is right in insisting that the text restoration be based on the pronunciation of the 14th century and not that of the modern period (26). Pages 28-55 consist of tables containing 509 Chinese characters, their Ancient Chinese equivalents, and their *hP'ags-pa* and Mongolian equivalents. These tables are much more detailed than those by Haensch.² As the latter bases his work on the modern North Chinese pronunciation, the difference between his transcription and that of Lewicki is considerable. On p. 51 ff. we find a complete list of syllables with an enumeration of all the Mongolian words in which they occur. This part of the work is also written excellently, and the author of this review has only a few corrections to add to Lewicki's transcription of the Written Mongolian forms given in his book in parentheses:

1. *boγum* (51) should be *boγom*: the second syllable has the vowel *o* < **a*.

² Erich Haensch, *Wörterbuch zu Manḡol un Niuca Tobaca'an* (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi), *Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, Leipzig, 1939, p. 185-187.

¹ Cf. e. g. Paul Pelliot, *Les mots à h-initiale aujourd'hui amuie dans le mongol des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, *JAS* Avril-juin 1925; A. de Smedt, C. I. C. M. et A. Mostaert, C. I. C. M., *Le dialecte Monguor parlé par les mongols du Kansou Occidental*, III^e partie, *Dictionnaire monguor-français*, Peip'ing, 1933, p. iv; Antoine Mostaert, C. I. C. M., *Textes oraux ordos*, Peip'ing, 1937, p. xxii; Antoine Mostaert, *A propos du mot široly'a de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, *HJAS* 12, p. 473.

2. The form *äbügä* (53) is correct and in Written Mongolian, too, there is a word *ebüge*, i. e. without a final *n*; cf. *ebüge* in the letters of the Il Khans and in the inscription in memory of Hindu; its meaning is 'great-grandfather.'³ It occurs also in the Dagur language in the form *eükə* 'the elder brother of the mother, the husband of the elder sister of the father.'⁴ Thus, there is no need for addition of a final *n* as Lewicki suggests.

3. The vocalism of the second syllable of *nöküčägsän* (54) is *ö* < **e*, i. e. it should be *nökö-čägsän* < **nökečegsen*.

4. The consonant in *čükäbüri* 'jackal' (54) is not *k* but *g*; cf. Mo. *čögebüri*, Kalmuck *tšöwr*. If there had been *k* it would not have vanished in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* and the latter would not read *čü'ä*.

5. An interesting form is *čürgä* 'locust' (55), which is certainly a Turkic word; cf. Uzbek *čegirtkä*.

6. The words *doγulaŋ* 'lame' and *soχur* 'blind' (68) should be transcribed as *doγolaŋ* < **doγalaŋ* and *soχor* < **soqar*.

It should be mentioned that Lewicki's observation that the Chinese voiceless occlusive consonants correspond to Mongolian voiced consonants, but the Chinese aspirated voiceless consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless consonants (81), is correct from the phonemic point of view, while from the purely phonetic point of view the Chinese voiceless aspirated consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless aspirated consonants, and the Chinese voiceless unaspirated consonants correspond to Mongolian voiceless weak consonants (*mediae lenes*): Chin. *t'* : Khalkha *t'* = Chin. *t* : Kh. *ᠳ*. This fact explains why the Chinese authors did not have any difficulty in transcribing the Mongolian words concerned.

The fourth chapter (89-132) deals with the Mongolian language represented in the *Hua-yi yi-yu*. This is an interesting description of one of the Middle Mongolian dialects.

Lewicki starts with the problem of vocalic harmony and remarks that among the former scholars engaged in the study of Sino-Mongolian texts of

the 14th century there was no complete agreement as to whether there had been vocalic harmony or not (89). I do not think this is so. The fact of the matter is that we find in the works of the European scholars two different methods of transcription of Chinese characters: Pelliot and Mostaert did not confine themselves to a simple transliteration of the Chinese characters, but rendered the Mongolian words according to what their historical pronunciation was. Hence Pelliot wrote, for example, *ügülarün*, *bö'äsü*, *dä'ünär*, *mün*, and so on,⁵ and in Mostaert's works we find such forms as *nökör*,⁶ *öki-ben*, *ö'esün*, *hüdekü-ben*, and *kesedkün*.⁷ On the other hand, Pozdnev, who published part of Palladius' manuscript, slightly modified the vocalization of Palladius' original text and brought the Mongolian text closer to the phonetic features of the Mongolian language. Palladius confined himself to a transliteration of the Chinese characters according to their modern North Chinese pronunciation. His transcription is only a conventional transliteration. Kozin mechanically romanized the text of Palladius' restoration of the Secret History, but in the second part of his book, where he gives a Written Mongolian version of the text, he writes *ö* and *ü* where they are supposed to be. Haenisch, too, confined himself to transliterating the Chinese characters and did not use a transcription reflecting the historical Mongolian pronunciation. Therefore, he writes *nikan*, *udur*, *déu lu'e*, *tunggelik*, *bolek*, *nou'uju*, and *ujeju*.⁸ In the preface of his book Haenisch remarks that the back and front vowels are not distinguished in the Chinese transcription but hinted at only by the consonantism or eventually by formants ('nur durch den Konsonantismus oder etwaige unterscheidende Formantien angedeutet').⁹ Haenisch does not deny vocalic harmony, but he is fully aware of the difficulty in distinguishing between, for example, *ö* and *o*, because the first syllable of the words *nökör* and

⁵ Paul Pelliot, *Histoire Secrète des Mongols, Restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres I à VI*, Paris, 1949, § 36-37, p. 9.

⁶ Mostaert, *HJAS* 12, p. 470.

⁷ Antoine Mostaert, *Trois passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols, Studia Orientalia XIV: 9*, p. 2.

⁸ Erich Haenisch, *Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an* (Yüanch'ao pi-shi), *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen aus der chinesischen Transkription* (Ausgabe Ye Têh-hui) im mongolischen Wortlaut wiederhergestellt, Leipzig, 1935, § 5, p. 1.

⁹ Haenisch, *op. cit.*, p. xi.

³ Francis Woodman Cleaves, *The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 in Memory of Prince Hindu*, *HJAS* 12, p. 63.

⁴ N. N. Poppe, *Dagurskoe narečie*, Leningrad, 1930, p. 81.

noyai are rendered by the same Chinese character.¹⁰ Thus, as a matter of fact, nobody doubted that vocalic harmony had existed in the 14th century, and the only difference between the two groups of scholars is that some harmonize their texts¹¹ and others do not.¹²

On page 94 (note 1) Lewicki quotes Kotwicz and admits the existence of a form *sü* which might have existed along with *su*. Lewicki seemingly is not acquainted with my book on the Mongolian *ḥP'ags-pa* script, published a few days before the German invasion of the USSR, in which I demonstrated that the form *sü* had never existed.¹³

Lewicki also analyses the groups **-aγa-*, **-ägä-*, etc. His remarks on **-oγo- > o'o* need correction: Mo. *boγol* < **boγal* (but not **boγul*) 'slave, serf.' The form *χo'osun* has developed from **quγasun* (and not **qoγusun*) 'empty.'¹⁴ Just the same, *to'osun* "dust" is not derived from **toγusun* but from *toγosun* < **toγasun* < **toβasun* / *tobaray* 'dust, earth.'

The form *ijügür* 'end, top' (96) is a misprint instead of *üjügür*.

The translation of a few words also needs correction: *nökö'ä* itself does not mean 'the day after to-morrow' but 'another' (but *nökö'ä üdür* is 'the day after to-morrow,' verbatim 'another day'). The word *ö'ärün* (97) is not 'soi même' but only 'own.'

An interesting form is *körgä* 'drum' (98) which occurs in Mongolian languages as Mo. *kögerge* < **köβerge* 'drum' and 'bellows' (primarily 'an animal hide inflated with air') = Buriat-Alar

¹⁰ Erich Haenisch, *Bemerkungen zur Textwiederherstellung des Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an* (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi), *ZDMG* 92 (1938), p. 245. Cf. my review of Haenisch's works in *ZDMG* 99, p. 275. Cf. N. Poppe, *Stand und Aufgaben der Mongolistik*, *ZDMG* 100, pp. 67-69.

¹¹ Sometimes at random and erroneously; cf. my review of Pelliot's restoration in *HJAS* 13, pp. 264-265.

¹² Incidentally, the vocalic harmony already existed in Common Altaic; cf. Martti Räsänen, *Zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen*, *Studia Orientalia* XV, p. 97.

¹³ N. N. Poppe, *Istoriia mongol'skoï pis'mennosti*, t. I, *Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1941, p. 98; cf. also *Khalkha sütb* "wise" in A. R. Rinchine, *Kratkii mongol'sko-russkii slovar'*, OGIZ, Moskva, 1947, p. 185.

¹⁴ Mo. *qoγosun* < **quγasun*, *Mogol quasun* 'empty' was thoroughly discussed in N. Poppe, *Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi*, *Asia Major* N. F., I Jahrgang, I Heft, p. 100-101.

χörgä 'bellows,' Buriat-Bokhan *χürχə* id.¹⁵ The form *körgä* in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* resembles the Buriat form *χürχə* (with a short vowel) and also the Turkic form *körük* 'bellows.'¹⁶

Lewicki says on p. 98 that the groups **-aγa-* and **-ägä-* in the language of the *ḥP'ags-pa* script are contracted and become either *ā* (*ā*) or *a'a* (*ä'ä*). He considers the latter development a rare one and thus corrects what has been written previously on this subject.¹⁷ I cannot agree with Lewicki's remarks for the following reasons. The character transcribed as -' by Lewicki renders a glottal stop of the Arabic type (ع).¹⁸ According to the spelling rules of the *ḥP'ags-pa* script, this character is written jointly with the preceding character when the vowels before and after -' are the same. Thus, e.g. *qa'a* is written *q'a* (cf. *q'an* = *qa'an*). On the other hand, when the vowel after -' is different from that before the glottal stop, the character rendering the latter is written separately from the preceding character: *a'u* is written *a-'u* (cf. *ba-'u-t'u-qayi* = *ba'ut'uqayi*).¹⁹ Sometimes the vertical line connecting the character for -' with the preceding character is damaged or otherwise not to be seen, and this creates the impression of the character for -' being written separately. That an indiscernible connective line is able to mislead can be demonstrated by words misread by Lewicki in his edition of the documents in the *ḥP'ags-pa* script, e.g. the passage *a-rab-nas-k'i-'ul-ju* (= *arabnas k'i'ulju*) 'letting make a consecration' which he erroneously reads as *ar-ban-sa-k'i-'ul-ju* (= *arban sak'i'ulju*) 'causing to guard it ten times.'²⁰ This example suffices to demonstrate how difficult it is to divide a word, written with the *ḥP'ags-pa* characters, into syllables. However, even if it were possible to see a difference between the words spelled as *q'an* and

¹⁵ N. N. Poppe, *Alarskiï govor*, *Čhast' I*, Leningrad, 1930, p. 57.

¹⁶ *Divanü Lûgat-it Türk Tercümesi I*, *Çeviren Besim Atalay*, p. 391.

¹⁷ N. N. Poppe, *Mongol'skiï slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab, chast' I-II*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1938, p. 16.

¹⁸ A. Dragunov, *The ḥPhags-pa Script and Ancient Mandarin*, *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS* 1930, p. 637; Poppe, *Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'*, p. 30.

¹⁹ Poppe, op. cit., p. 35; cf. Lewicki, *Houa-yi yi-yu*, p. 101.

²⁰ Marian Lewicki, *Les inscriptions mongoles inédites en écriture carrée*, *Collectanea Orientalia* 12 (1937), pp. 50, 54.

those written as *qa'anu* quoted by Lewicki,²¹ it would not prove anything, because, as I have demonstrated, there are in the *hP'ags-pa* script forms of the type *d'ulqaquë* (i. e. with -' written jointly with *d*) and forms of the type *'ihe'en, 'ülu'u*.²² This is merely an orthographic difference. As the character -' renders a glottal stop it requires a preceding vowel, no matter whether the latter is denoted in writing or not, simply because a glottal stop after a consonant is impossible in Mongolian. My remarks made in *Muqaddimat al-Adab*²³ refer only to the pronunciation and not to the orthography. I may add, that, contrary to Lewicki (102), the group *iya* does occur in *hP'ags-pa*; cf. *t'ak'iya* 'hen' in the edict of Dharmapāla's widow, cf. also *jarlik'iyar* 'by the edict' in the inscription of *Kiu-yung kwan*.

Lewicki's statement concerning the history of the long vowels is correct, as is his remark that the quality of a long vowel resulting from the contraction of two vowels usually corresponds to that of the second vowel of a group, e. g. **ayu > ü* (103). However, there are exceptions: **oya* and **uya > ö*, **öge* and **üge > õ* (e. g. **toya > tō* 'number,' **jiluya > Kh. džolō* 'bridle,' **kögesün > Kalm. *kōsq* 'foam,' **čilüge > tsölō* 'space').

The Mongolian language as represented in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* is marked by numerous examples of assimilation of the vowel of the second syllable to that of the first syllable (105): *nököt < *noked* 'companions,' *törö < *töre* 'law,' *kölösün < kölesün* 'sweat,' *bökö'unä < *bökegüne* 'gnat.'²⁴ A particularly interesting form is *čino* 'wolf' (106); cf. *Muqaddimat al-Adab* (28) *čino*, Secret History *čino*, Khalkha *t'sono*, Buriat *šono* id. In connection with these forms I might add that in the modern Mongolian languages (Khalkha, Buriat, Kalmuck, etc.) the ancient diphthong **ua < *βa* has become either a short or a long vowel: Kh. *jorv* 'omen' < **irua*, but Kh. *džodō* and Bur. *žodō* 'fir-tree' < **jidua*. Interesting also are the forms *čiyorsun* 'juniper' and *čitkor* 'devil.' The former corresponds to a form occurring in the Secret History and transcribed by Haenisch as *cigorsun*²⁵

and by Pelliot as *čigörsün*.²⁶ The correct transcription is that of Lewicki; cf. Mo. *čuyursu* 'une sapinière, forêt de sapins.'²⁷ The form *čitkor* corresponds to Mo. *čidkür*, Kh. *t'södχör*, Kalmuck *tšötkr / tšütkr*, Ordos *džödχör*, and the development **ü > õ* in the second syllable is difficult to explain. Similar cases are Khalkha *šölö < *silü* 'bouillon, soup,' Kh. *t'söddör < *čidür* 'hobble,' Kh. *šörwös / šörmös < *sərbüsü* 'tendon,' Kh. *šölök / šülläk < *šilüg* 'verse,' and others. The word *ädö'ä* 'now' corresponds to Mo. *edüge* and Dagur *ėdė* and is interesting because of the vowel *ö < *ü* in the second syllable. This development corroborates the rule that **uya > õ* through **oya*; cf. *hP'ags-pa jirgo'an* 'six,' Buriat-Alar *žoryōŋ*, Buriat-Ekhirit *joryōŋ* id.²⁸ Analogically, **üge* has developed into *õ* through **öge*: **edüge > *edö'e*, **čilüge > *čilö'e > Kh. t'sölō* 'space, freedom,' and so on. The transitional groups **oya* and **öge* are also responsible for the development **i > o* and **i > õ* in the first syllable in the Kalmuck language where **uya* and **üge* in the non-first syllables have resulted in *ā* and *ε*: Kalm. *džolā < *jilo-ya < *jiluya* 'bridle,' Kalm. *tšölε < *čilöge < *čilüge* 'space, free time, freedom.'

The word 'new' occurs in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* in the ancient form *šini* (106); cf. Mo. *sine*, Kh. *šinə*, Bur. *šenə* id., but *Muqaddimat al-Adab* (36) *šini*, Ibn Muhannā's glossary (p. 446 of my edition) *sini*, Monguor *seni* id.

Peculiar features of the language represented in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* are the voiced consonants in the place of voiceless consonants and vice versa (107). Lewicki quotes interesting examples of which *χudusun* 'boot' has its equivalents in the Buriat dialects; cf. Alar *godohōŋ* but in other dialects *gutohōŋ*,²⁹ *Muqaddimat al-Adab qudusun / yutusun* id. It should be remarked about *nikän* 'one' (107) that this is probably the original ancient form but not an example of 'assourdissement' as Lewicki states; cf. Secret History *niken*, Dagur *ne'k'ə*, Mogol *nikän* id.

Lewicki's hypothesis that Mongolian had primarily only one series of occlusives (108) gives

²¹ Lewicki, *Hua-yi yi-yu*, p. 98.

²² Poppe, *Kvadratnaja pis'mennost'*, p. 31.

²³ Poppe, *Mongol'skiĭ slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*, p. 16.

²⁴ Lewicki erroneously derives them from forms with a **ü* in the second syllable.

²⁵ Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un Niuca Tobca'an*, p. 27.

²⁶ Pelliot, *Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, § 74, p. 16.

²⁷ J. E. Kowalewski, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*, t. III, Kasan, 1849, p. 220.

²⁸ Poppe, *Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi*, p. 100-101.

²⁹ N. N. Poppe, *Zametki o govore Aginskikh buriat, Trudy Mongol'skoi Komissii* 8 (1932), p. 16-17.

rise to objections; the most ancient documents of the Mongolian languages, e. g. the texts in *hP'ags-pa* script and the dictionaries compiled by Moslem authors, show that there were *t* and *d*, *q* and *γ*, *k* and *g* (though the relations were somehow different from the modern languages). Moreover, the Common Altaic, too, had a complete series of voiceless occlusives **t*, **q*, **k*, **p* and another series of voiced occlusives: **d*, **γ*, **g*, and **b*.⁸⁰ Lewicki's remarks on the final postlingual consonants in the language of the *hP'ags-pa* script (109) need an addition: **γ* > *q* and *g* become -' before the suffix of the plural: *ayima'udun*, *č'eri'udun*.⁸¹ An interesting form is *χajarli'χun*, a genitive of *χajarliχ* < **γajarliγ*. Certain words ending in **liγ* lose their **γ* in the plural also in Buriat dialects where **liγud* becomes *-l'ūt*, e. g. Buriat-Aga *χāl'ūt* < **qayaliγud* 'the people of a khan,' *χāl'ūši* < **qayaliγudi* (accusative).

Lewicki correctly points out that various scholars have transcribed the velar, postlingual consonant in different manners: some used the letter *q*, others *χ* (109). The mark *q* is to be preferred, because in Ancient Mongolian it really was *q* and not a spirant. This is evident from the *hP'ags-pa* transcription of Chinese words in which the Chinese *h* (pronounced as *χ*) is rendered by another character and not *q*; cf. *γiv t'u mēv* = *Hou-t'u miao* (name of a temple), *γoη jhi* = *huan tsē* 'prince,' *γoη t'ay γiv* = *huan t'ai hou* 'the dowager empress,'⁸² *γuan ši yim bodisi'ud* = Mongolian pronunciation *Huan shi yin* for the Chinese *Kuan she yin* 'Avalokiteśvara.'⁸³ This shows that the creators of the *hP'ags-pa* script were anxious to distinguish between the Mongolian *q* and the Chinese *h*. We might add that the Moslem authors use for the Mongolian *q* the Arabic character ق = *q* while the Arabic script has three characters for various *h*-sounds: ح = *h*, ħ = *χ*, and ه = *h* (the latter is used to transcribe the Mongolian *h* < **φ*).

Lewicki discusses on p. 112 the Middle Mongolian *h*- < **φ* (or **p*). First of all, a misprint

⁸⁰ N. Poppe, *Altaiisch und Urtürkisch, Ungarische Jahrbücher* VI, p. 94 ff.; Räsänen, *op. cit.*, p. 24-25.

⁸¹ Poppe, *Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'*, p. 41; Poppe, *Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüanch'ao pi-shi*, p. 99-100.

⁸² Poppe, *Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'*, p. 30.

⁸³ Paul Pelliot, *Un rescrit mongol en écriture 'Phags-pa*, p. 624, note 19.

should be corrected: Dagur has *χ*- and not *f*-.⁸⁴ To Lewicki's remark about the difficulty of distinguishing between *χ*- and *h*- in Chinese transcription I might add that in Dagur *χ*- < **q*- and *χ*- < **h*- < **φ*- have converged; cf. Dag. *χarboη* < **harban* 'ten' and *χarbo*- < **qarbu*- 'to shoot.' The same thing occurred in the Monguor language: *χ*- < **h*- and *χ*- < **q*- have converged, cf. *χarwan* < **harban* 'ten' and *χawar* < **qabar* 'nose.' It is impossible to agree with Pelliot's opinion that the sound *k* in *koyimosun* 'stockings made of felt' is due to a strong aspiration (Lewicki, p. 112); *koyimosun* is simply misspelled, and this word is written in all the remaining documents with an initial *h*.

To Lewicki's discussion of the sounds *s* and *š* (113) it should be added that the groups **-sqi* and **-ski* always result in *-ški*: cf. Mo. *ayuški* < **ayusqi* 'lungs,' *giški*- < **giski*- 'to step, to trample.'

The form *χada'ar* 'bridle' = Mo. *qajaγar*, Kh. *χadzār*, Bur. *χazār* is very old: cf. Secret History *qada'ar*, Muqaddimat al-Adab *qadār*, Mogol *qadār*, Dagur *χadālo* < Solon *χadal*, cf. Tungus (Barguzin) *kadamār* < **kadaβar* id.⁸⁵

The phonetic description is followed by a chapter on morphology. Lewicki starts with the derivation of nouns which are of no particular interest, because the suffixes concerned are well known. Much more interesting is the data on the declension (113 ff.). Of the forms given on p. 118 those in *-u'ai* (e. g. *känü'ai*) do not belong in the declension, because these are substantive forms of pronouns of the English type *mine*, *yours*. They are never used as attributes; cf. *tädä irgän Bodončar-i künü'ai ba ya'un-u'ai bä kü'an asaqqu ügü'ai*⁸⁶ 'ces gens ne questionnèrent pas Bodončar sur qui et comment il était.'⁸⁷ This is not a double genitive as Lewicki believes (118) but a genitive in *-u* + suffix of derivation of nouns **-γai* (cf. Buriat-Alar *garmāηx'i* 'those of Garma, Garma's folks'). The correspondence **γ* = Mo. *q* (cf. Mo. *tanuqai* 'yours') is not unusual in suffixes; cf. Mo. *surumγai* 'gifted' but *martamqai* 'forgetful.'

The ablative *čaxča* is really unusual and it may

⁸⁴ Poppe, *Dagurskoe narechie*, p. 129.

⁸⁵ N. N. Poppe, *Materialy po solonskomu iazyku, Materialy Komissii po issledovaniju Mongol'skoi i Tuvinskoj Narodnykh Respublik i Buriat-Mongol'sk. ASSR* 14, Leningrad, 1931, p. 77.

⁸⁶ Pelliot, *Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, § 29, p. 8.

⁸⁷ Pelliot, *op. cit.*, § 29, p. 125.

be a misspelled word, as Lewicki believes (119), though in the ancient language there are such forms as *morin-ča* 'from the horse,' *ger-če* 'from the house,' and in the modern language the forms *egünče* 'from this' and *tegünče* 'from that' occur.

A particular feature of the declension of stems ending in *n* in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* is the gemination of it before the vowel of a suffix. The cause of this phenomenon is not known, but at any rate this gemination does not have anything in common with the appearance of the consonant *n* in the Turkic genitive and accusative: *qan-niŋ*, *qan-nü* quoted by Lewicki (121). Lewicki should know that the consonant *n* in Turkic languages is due to the influence of the pronominal declension, cf. *män* and genitive *män-in* > *mä-niŋ* 'of me.'³⁸

Interesting plural forms are those in *-an* and *-l* (121-123): *dä'älän* 'coats,' *daba'al* 'passes,' *kimul* 'nails.' The form in *-n* mentioned by Lewicki (122) has already been thoroughly discussed in various articles.³⁹

³⁸ N. Poppe, Türkisch-tschuwassische vergleichende Studien, *Islamica* I, p. 409 ff. with a quotation of V. Thomsen's Inscriptions de l'Orkhon.

³⁹ Erich Haenisch, Steuergerechteste der chinesischen Klöster unter der Mongolenherrschaft, *Berichte über die Verh. d. Sächsischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften zu Leipzig (Phil.-hist. Klasse)* 92 (1940), p. 71, note 31; Poppe, *Kvadratnaia pis'mennost'*, pp. 47, 49; Poppe, *Die*

The pronouns (125 ff.) are of little interest. Lewicki's explanation of the meanings of the inclusive and exclusive pronouns is not quite correct; they are not 'nous en général' and 'moi et ceux dont il est question' (125) but 'we, the speaking and addressed persons' and 'only we, the speaking persons without the addressed persons.' The pronoun *mun* (= *hP'ags-pa* singular *mun*, plural *mud*) = Turk. *bu* 'this' (the stem of the oblique cases is *mun*) does not necessarily ascend to a front-vocalic form. The pronoun *äyimün* is translated 'tel ou tels' (126); this is only a plural in *-n* of the form *eyimü* / **eyimüi*.

The verbal forms occurring in the *Hua-yi yi-yu* do not differ from the usual. Only the form *bülä'ä* (129) instead of *bölöge* < **bülüge* is of interest.

The final part of the book is a restoration of the texts—edicts, letters, and so on. There is no translation or glossary, both of which probably will be published in the future.

In conclusion it should be said that Lewicki's book is a useful contribution to Mongolian linguistics and it is to be hoped that this work will be continued.

N. POPPE

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüanch'ao pi-shi, p. 102-103.

Japanese Prints, Sharaku to Toyokuni, in the Collection of Louis V. Ledoux. Catalogue by the Owner with 16 plates in full color and 45 in halftone. Princeton: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1950.

This is the fourth volume of a series of five, three of which have been reviewed in this JOURNAL (JAOS 67. 220 ff.; 70. 141 ff.). Mr. Ledoux died just before the publication of the third volume; fortunately, he had finished the MSS for the two volumes that were to follow. His heirs must be thanked that they have decided to complete the catalogue in the manner it was begun. Since the collection is going to be sold, as it was the wish of Mr. Ledoux, these books will be the only record left. It is a model record of a model collection, and a monument to a model collector.

Of what caliber this collector was, can be gleaned from the fact that he had assembled

twenty-two Sharakus. It takes, of course, means far exceeding those of an average person to do so; but this was not the decisive factor in Ledoux's case. He was deeply interested in this enigmatic genius, and spent considerable work and expense to lift the mystery that surrounds this artist: he is the co-author, with Harold G. Henderson, of "The Surviving Works of Sharaku" (New York, 1939), which probably will remain for some time the standard work in a Western language, now that Fritz Rumpf has died.

Each print is shortly described, usually in the words of that monograph, to which the reader is referred for further details. It seems that Ledoux did not come around to make use of a correction Rumpf offered about no. 21, the famous double-portrait of Nakamura Konozō and Nakajima Wadaemon. According to Rumpf, the part played by Konozō is that of the keeper of a funayodo kanagawaya, kanagawaya being houses that rented