

Профессор доктор филологических наук Г. Д. Санжеев, Монгольские языки и диалекты, Введение, Ученые Записки Института Востоковедения, Том IV, Лингвистический Сборник, Москва, 1952 [Professor G. D. SANŽEEV, Ph. D., "The Mongolian Languages and Dialects, Introduction," *Learned Memoires of the Institute of Oriental Studies*, Vol. IV, A *Linguistic Collection*, Moscow, 1952], pp. 30-125.

The article here reviewed is the first serious work published in the U.S.S.R. in the field of Mongolian studies after a long period during which comparative linguistics were forbidden. As stated in note 1 on page 30, this article is an introduction to a comparative grammar of Mongolian languages which is being compiled by SANŽEEV. As I, too, have been working on a comparative grammar of the Mongolian languages for a rather long time, it is as a matter of course that I have read SANŽEEV's article with keen interest, not only as a fellow Mongolist but also as his former university professor. The fact that two Mongolists have been working on the same subject simultaneously is evidence that the compilation of a comparative grammar of Mongolian languages is timely. It is questionable, however, whether such a grammar can be very detailed. I have cautiously entitled my own work *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, because I think that the task of writing a complete comparative grammar still rests with the future.

SANŽEEV's article deserves attention, although it is not of high academic quality. Written in the language of propaganda pamphlets, it is replete with expressions which are inadmissible in an article of a truly scientific nature. Thus, on page 33, SANŽEEV speaks about the Mongols at the time of Chingis Khan, "that enslaver of peoples," and, a few lines below that, he mentions the military expeditions of "the man-hater Chingis Khan" (человеконенавистника Чингисхана). On the same page we also learn that the Mongolian people were exhausted in consequence of the military expeditions "of their exploiters" and the wars "for the benefit of the greediness of the Mongolian feudal lords." On page

39 the armies of Chingis Khan are called "beastly hordes." We find such expressions as "the bourgeois nationalists" who "polluted the Buriat language for the purpose of counter-revolution and sabotage" (page 88). These and numerous other expressions of this kind create a very sad impression, particularly for one who knew Garma Dantsaranovič in earlier days.

On page 37, SANŽEEV states that in consequence of "the victory of the Chinese people guided by their leader MAO Tse-tung" the Oirats ultimately obtained the possibility of developing their language and literature. I do not know the source of SANŽEEV's information about the Oirats, but I doubt that the group of Oirats called Kalmucks are in so fortunate a position as their fellow-tribesmen under MAO's guidance.¹

SANŽEEV's book is written in full accordance with STALIN's statements concerning linguistics (cf. pages 43, 67-69, 74-77, etc.) and the occasional remarks of ENGELS about the American Indians (pages 44-45) and the Frankish dialect (pages 96, 115-116). Thus, in this respect, it is a book reflecting official doctrines. This fact is important to note, because it explains many of SANŽEEV's statements.

On page 34, SANŽEEV says that, as a consequence of the disintegration of Chingis Khan's empire, the unity of the Mongolian language also dissolved. I think that the unity of the Mongolian language dissolved long before the collapse of the empire. It should be noted that SANŽEEV uses, instead of the term "the dissolution of the linguistic unity," the very queer expression "the uniform Mongolian language became bankrupt" (потерпел крах). This expression occurs time and again on pages 34, 77, etc. It is, as a matter of fact, the expression which STALIN used in his speech on linguistics. Obviously, it has become part of the Soviet official linguistic terminology.

A serious contradiction is found in SANŽEEV's work. As remarked above, on page 34 of his article, he says that the unity of the Mongolian language dissolved in consequence of the collapse of Chingis Khan's empire, and a few lines below he states that the

¹ All Kalmucks were deported in 1943 behind the Urals for not having fought the Germans.

unity was broken up before a uniform literary language could be created. It is known, however, that the Mongols already had a written language in the first quarter of the XIIIth century, whereas the collapse of the empire occurred more than one century later. That the Mongolian written language spread rapidly throughout the vast territory held by the Mongols is evident from the fact that ancient inscriptions and other documents in Mongolian were found in Transbaikalia, Mongolia, the Kansu province, East Turkestan, and Russia (in the last, the so-called *p'ai-tzu*, fragments of a manuscript written on birch bark found on the bank of the Volga River,² etc.). SANŽEEV's statement that the Mongolian script at the beginning of the XIIIth century was hardly older than two decades is not improbable, but it is a hypothesis which cannot be corroborated by any facts. A grave chronological error is found in his statement concerning the language of the Mogols "who established themselves in Afghanistan as an outpost of Chingis Khan's empire." According to SANŽEEV, their language was the first to diverge from that spoken by the majority of the Mongols. It is known, however, that the Mogols came to Afghanistan only under Hülegü (Hulagu) many years after Chingis Khan, and that they maintained their contact with other Mongols in Turkestan through the entire period of the Timurides. In this connection, I should remark that the weakest points of SANŽEEV's article are the chronology and the lack of a knowledge of history. Even where he discusses the origin of the Buriat dialects (page 100 ff.), a subject which is more familiar to him, he replaces true history with analogies to the history of Russian dialects³ and disregards the fact that the present territory of the Buriats was occupied in the XIIIth century, according to Rašid ad-Dīn, not only by the Ikires (obvious ancestors of the Ekhirit tribe of the Buriats), Bulayačın (probable ancestors of the Bulagats), and Qori (the ancestors of the Khori-Buriats), but also by the Merkid at the lower course of the Selenga River and

² Н. Н. Поппе, Золотоордынская рукопись на бересте, Советское Востоковедение, т. II, Ленинград-Москва, 1941, p. 81 ff.

³ It should be noted that instead of the outstanding works of SHAKHMATOV, SOBOLEVSKIĪ, MIKKOLA, VASMER, etc. only a few general statements of LENIN are quoted by SANŽEEV.

on the Kilyo (presently Khilok) and Chikoi Rivers, by the Bargud who live in Manchuria at the present time, by the tribe of the Qorči whose name is preserved in the Tungus appellation of the Bargut (*korčihol*), and by many other tribes. Thus, in the territory of SANŽEEV's native district, the Alar area, a village still exists which is called Khurkhat. This name goes back to **quriqad*, a plural of **quriqan* the latter being the tribal name *Üč Quriqan* "The Three Quriqan" mentioned in the Orkhon inscriptions of the VIIIth century. Not far from Alar the Zalari (Залари) railroad station is located. Its Buriat name is *Zalār* < **Ĵalayir* the latter being the name of a tribe still living in Inner Mongolia. In concluding this excursion into Buriat prehistory, I should like to point out that the name of the city of Irkutsk originated from the river Irkut, in Buriat *erχū* < **erkegün*, the latter being the word for Christians in the XIIIth-XIVth centuries. The latter name probably comes from the tribes of the Kereyid and Naiman who lived in adjacent areas at that time. Thus, the history of the Buriats is not so simple as it may appear in some quarters. Only thorough historical research aided by archaeological data will help us to solve this problem, not conclusions drawn from analogical developments in Kievan Russia as some have understood them.

On page 35, SANŽEEV repeats the antiquated opinion that Dagur contains a great number of Manchu-Tungus elements. As I have demonstrated in my publications,⁴ Dagur is a conservative Mongolian language preserving certain features characteristic of Middle Mongolian. On the same page, SANŽEEV correctly states that the Oirat dialects already differed from other Mongolian dialects in the XIIIth-XIVth centuries, as is evident from what Rašid ad-Dīn tells us about them,⁵ but SANŽEEV's remark on page 36 that the modern Oirat dialects differ very little from the language of the XIIIth century cannot be taken seriously. Whether they differ greatly or little depends upon what is meant by these terms.

⁴ Н. Н. Поппе, Дагурское наречие, Ленинград, 1930; N. POPPE, "Über die Sprache der Daguren," *Asia Major* 10 (1935).1-32; 183-220.

⁵ If I am not mistaken this was noted first in my book *Монгольский словарь Мукаддимат ал-Адаб*, Москва-Ленинград, 1938, p. 30.

The fact remains, however, that the Oirat dialects have lost their initial *h* (*harban* > *arwŋ* “ten”), the “breaking” of the vowel **i* has occurred (*miqan* > *maχŋ* “meat”), the vowel **e* has developed into *ö* in some positions (*ebüsün* > *öwsŋ* “hay”), all short vowels have disappeared in the non-initial syllables (*harγasun* > *arγ^asŋ* “dry dung”), the diphthongs have developed into long vowels (*dalai* > *dalā* “sea”), the group **ayu* > *a’u* has become *ū*, etc. (*aγula* > *a’ula* > *ūl^a* “mountain”), etc. These developments show that the phonological difference alone is considerable.

On page 37, SANŽEEV expresses his regret that the Oirat dialects are insufficiently explored. He says that his knowledge of these dialects is fragmentary and based only on data from the dialects spoken in Northwestern Mongolia. This needs a lot of explanation. As a matter of fact, the Oirat dialects are better known than any other Mongolian language, because Oirat includes the Kalmuck language which is well studied. There are large dictionaries (e. g., by RAMSTEDT, BASANGOV, etc.) and excellent grammars (by KOTWICZ, RAMSTEDT, etc.). It should be noted that SANŽEEV himself spent a long time in the former Autonomous Kalmuck Republic in the Volga region and published a Kalmuck grammar.⁶ It is commonly known that the Kalmuck republic was dissolved in December 1943 and the Kalmucks were deported beyond the Urals to places unknown. Their name has become taboo and is no longer mentioned in the new edition of the *Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* and in Russian books on history and geography. It is as if they had never existed. Of course, this makes any mention of the Kalmuck dialects impossible for SANŽEEV, who must pretend to an inadequate knowledge of the Kalmuck language.

On page 40, SANŽEEV enumerates the Mongolian languages. He counts six of them, namely Mogol, Monguor, Dagur, Oirat, Buriat, and “Mongolian proper” (i. e., the language spoken in Outer and Inner Mongolia, namely Khalkha, Chakhar, Urdus, etc.). I am pleased to state that this classification coincides with that in my *Comparative Grammar*. I also treat these six languages as separate languages and not dialects of a smaller number of languages.

⁶ Г. Д. Санжеев, Грамматика калмыцкого языка, Москва-Ленинград, 1940.

The only difference is that in my comparative grammar seven languages and not six are discussed, because I also include the Kalmuck language. Otherwise, our schemes are similar and I agree with SANŽEEV in this aspect.

To facilitate comparison of my scheme with that of SANŽEEV, I give mine here:

I West Mongolian	II East Mongolian
1. Mogol	1. Dagur
2. Oirat	2. Monguor (also Shirongol, etc.)
3. Kalmuck	3. Mongol (Khalkha, Urdus, etc.)
	4. Buriat

I should add, however, that this scheme is not absolutely new, because it is found in a less elaborate form in VLADIMIRTSOV'S *Comparative Grammar*.⁷

Some inadequacies in SANŽEEV'S work are attributable to the inaccessibility of recent publications in Western languages. Thus, SANŽEEV remarks that he has had no opportunity to see the Monguor grammar by the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT (page 66).⁸ This explains why he still believes that the *Secret History* is not explored and that the language in which it is written is different from anything else known to science (page 45.) This is not quite correct, because after the appearance of the posthumous work of PELLIOT⁹ and the outstanding work of the Reverend Antoine MOSTAERT,¹⁰ the article of HAENISCH,¹¹ and my article on the relation of the language of the *Secret History* to that of the hP'ags-pa script,¹² the *Secret History* and other documents of the

⁷ Б. Я. Владимирцов, Сравнительная грамматика монгольского письменного языка и халхаского наречия, Введение и фонетика, Ленинград, 1929, p. 17-18.

⁸ A. DE SMEDT, C. I. C. M. et A. MOSTAERT, C. I. C. M., *Le dialecte monguor parlé par les Mongols du Kansou occidental, IIe partie, Grammaire*, Peking, 1945.

⁹ Oeuvres posthumes de Paul PELLIOT I, *Histoire Secrète des Mongols, Restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres I à VI*, Paris, 1949.

¹⁰ Antoine MOSTAERT, *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, Harvard-Yenching Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1953.

¹¹ Erich HAENISCH, "Grammatische Besonderheiten in der Sprache des Manghol un niuca tobca'an," *Studia Orientalia* XIV:3 (1950).

¹² N. POPPE, "Die Sprache der mongolischen Quadratschrift und das Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi," *Asia Major—Neue Folge*, I. Jahrgang, 1944, I. Heft, p. 97 ff.

Yüan period¹³ are open to research and much has already been achieved in this field. It should also be added that many valuable observations on the language of the *Secret History* and preclassical written Mongolian are found in the important works of CLEAVES.¹⁴

On page 58, SANŽEEV states that the ḥP'ags-pa script was introduced for all languages spoken by the subjects of the Yüan Empire, i. e., Mongolian, Chinese, Tibetan, Uighur, and Sanscrit. First of all, the Yüan Empire never had any subjects speaking Sanscrit and, secondly, Tibetan has to be excluded, because the ḥP'ags-pa is based on the Tibetan script.

On page 59, SANŽEEV correctly remarks that there is reason to believe that ḥP'ags-pa was not used only for official documents, but also for "unofficial" books. The well-known fragment in ḥP'ags-pa script discovered by MANNERHEIM has been identified as a fragment of the didactic work *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*.¹⁵ SANŽEEV has probably not seen the recent article of AALTO who made this identification.¹⁶

The dative-locative suffix is always *-da* or *-dur* in the ḥP'ags-pa

¹³ Marian LEWICKI, *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIVe siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*, Wrocław, 1949; Erich HAENISCH, "Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Abh. d. Deutschen Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, Jahrgang 1950, Nr. 4, Berlin, 1952.

¹⁴ Francis Woodman CLEAVES, "The Expression *Jöb Ese Bol-* in the *Secret History of the Mongols*," *HJAS* 11 (1948) 311-320; "The Mongolian Names and Terms in the *History of the Nation of the Archers* by Grigor of Akanc'," *HJAS* 12 (1949) 400-443; "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1362 in Memory of Prince Hindu," *HJAS* 12 (1949) 1-133; "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1335 in Memory of Chang Ying-Jui," *HJAS* 13 (1950) 1-131; "The Sino-Mongolian Edict of 1453 in the Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi," *HJAS* 13 (1950) 431-446; "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jigünteï," *HJAS* 14 (1951) 1-104; "A Chancellery Practice of the Mongols in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries," *HJAS* 14 (1951) 493-526; "The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1346," *HJAS* 15 (1952) 1-122; "The Mongolian Documents in the Musée de Téhéran," *HJAS* 16 (1953) 1-107; and "*Daruyā* and *Gerege*," *HJAS* 16 (1953) 237-259.

¹⁵ G. J. RAMSTEDT, "Ein Fragment mongolischer Quadratschrift," *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 27:3 (1912); G. J. RAMSTEDT, "A Fragment of Mongolian 'Quadratic' Script," reprinted from C. G. MANNERHEIM, *Across Asia from West to East in 1906-08*, Helsinki, 1940; cf. Louis LIGETI, *Le Subhāṣitaratnanidhi mongol, Un document du Moyen Mongol, Partie Ire, Le manuscrit tibéto-mongol en reproduction phototypique avec une introduction*, Budapest, 1948.

¹⁶ Pentti AALTO, "Altaistica," *Studia Orientalia XVII*:7 (1952), 4-5.

script,¹⁷ but this is not the result of a "confusion" of *t* and *d*, as SANŽEEV believes (page 60). On the contrary, this is an instance of the preservation of an older stage. The suffixed consonant **d* became *t* at a later period (after the XIVth century). Cf. Khalkha *galda* "to the fire" but *adagta* "at the end." The suffixed consonant is always *d* in Monguor and is preserved in many cases also in Dagur.¹⁹

It is not correct to speak of three different suffixes of the so-called *nomen futuri*, i. e., *-qu*, *-qui*, and *-qun* as SANŽEEV does (*l. c.*). As I have observed, the suffix *-qun* is the plural form, while *-qui* is the suffix of the singular form.²⁰ Thus, there are only two forms, i. e., one in *-qu* and another one in *-qui* their mutual relation being the same as in *maγu*~*maγui* "evil," *qaraγu*~*qaraγui* "darkness," *aγuγu*~*aγuγui* "was," etc.

SANŽEEV is right when he believes that all Moslem sources on Mongolian, including the dictionary *Muqaddimat al-Adab* represent one and the same language (page 61). All of them are sources of what I call Western Middle Mongolian.

SANŽEEV mentions several times the "breaking" of the vowel **i* and in the comparative grammar which he is preparing he seems to distinguish between several types of breaking which he calls the first, the second, and the third breaking.²¹ As a matter of fact only one breaking occurred. It started only in the second half of the Middle Mongolian period, i. e., in the second half of the XIV century and first occurred in Western Middle Mongolian the descendents of which are Mogol, Oirat, and Kalmuck. SANŽEEV regards the "appearance" of such words as *qadār* "bridle" (page 62) as a consequence of the "first" breaking, but the truth is that *-d-* in *qadār* is primary. It occurs not only in the *Secret History*, in *Muqaddimat al-Adab*, Monguor, Mogol, and

¹⁷ Н. Н. Поппе, История монгольской письменности, т. I, Квадратная письменность, Москва-Ленинград, 1941, p. 45.

¹⁸ A. DE SMEDT et A. MOSTAERT, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹⁹ Поппе, Дагурское наречие, p. 153.

²⁰ Поппе, Квадратная письменность, p. 48-49.

²¹ I am afraid these three breakings are the result of blindly following the pattern of Russian historical grammar, which distinguishes between the first and second Slavic palatalization, which, together with the softening of the syllables кы, гы, and хы into ки, ги, and хи respectively, makes three.

Dagur (in the last it is *xadāla*), but even as a very old borrowing in Tungus (cf. *kadamār* "bridle"). There are many more examples with *-d-* in Mongolian languages: Mogol *qadār* < **qadaɣar* || **qadiɣar* > **qajɣar* > Urduš *xadžār*, in the same manner as Mo. *qaduɣur* "sickle" < **qaduɣur* || **qadiɣur* > **qajɣur* > Bur. *xažūr* "scythe." I have found many such examples and the explanation is that here we find traces of a very old, probably pre-Mongolian alternation *i~a*. It is not difficult to prove that Mongolian *-*j-* is of secondary origin, because in Ancient Turkic its equivalent is *-d-*, e. g., Mo. *kijɣar* < **qijɣar* < **qijɣar* < **qidiɣar* "frontier, edge" = Turkic *qidiɣ* || *qizɣ* || *qiyɣ* "edge, border," etc.

SANŽEEV's article does not contain any reference to his sources. On pages 31-32, he states that he used "the entire material contained in the works of our native Mongolists" (whom he enumerates) "and also the foreign explorers G. RAMSTEDT, A. MOSTAERT, L. LIGETI, and others." Numerous examples taken from the hP'ags-pa documents, the dictionary *Muqaddimat al-Adab*, the Dagur language, etc. and formulations of phonetic laws taken almost verbatim from my works²² are appreciated by me as evidence that SANŽEEV accepts many results of my work. In this connection, I should like to point out that certain amendments to my older works, made in my recent publications, have remained unknown to SANŽEEV. Therefore, I should correct and complete some of his statements.

On page 65, SANŽEEV remarks that the vowels **o* and **u* have developed in Dagur into *oa* and sometimes into *o*. This formulation taken from my book *Дагурское наречие* (page 110) has been emended in a recent article in which I have stated that **o* and **u* of the initial syllable have developed into *oa* in Dagur only when followed by **a* in the second syllable. When followed by **u* they result in *o*.²³

Likewise, two of the examples illustrating the development of the final consonant into *l* in Dagur, also taken from my book, are

²² As a matter of course, SANŽEEV could not have quoted my works.

²³ Nicholas POPPE, "Remarks on the Vocalism of the Second Syllable in Mongolian," *HJAS* 14 (1951).195; 198.

not correct. This fact which I only recently discovered is herein published for the first time. The words in question are the Dagur *nídžēl* = Mo. *nījiged* "by one, each one" and *emelkē-* = Mo. *emüske-* "to put on (a garment), to dress."²⁴ The Dagur form *nídžēl* is not an example of the development $*d > l$, as I believed in 1930, because the form *nije'el* or *niji'el* is found in the *Secret History*. It is much older than Mo. *nījiged*. The latter arose by analogy with *γurbayad* "by threes," *dörbege* "by fours," etc., which are regular plural forms of $*γurbayal$ and $*dörbege$ respectively (as *tuyud* "calves" from *tuyul* "calf," *tüsimed* "officials" from *tüsimel* "official," etc.). Thus, the old system was obviously *nijigel* (a singular form) but *γurbayad* (plural). By analogy with *γurbayad* the numeral "one" also appeared in this plural form.

The other word, i. e., *emelkē-* is not an example of the development of $-s$ into l as I then believed, because the consonant l belongs to the suffix of the causative verbs $-lkē-$ < $*lge-$ before which the final $*s$ has disappeared.

It is not possible to dwell on all the minor inaccuracies found in SANŽEEV's article. Although they are numerous and the theory about three subsequent breakings of $*i$ contradicts everything already definitely established, SANŽEEV's article and his forthcoming comparative grammar deserve attention. I should add, in conclusion, that allowance should be made for the conditions under which SANŽEEV is working. On the one hand, he has to comply with official "theories" and political developments and, on the other hand, he has had, to judge by his article, no access to new publications. Although his article contains, without doubt, some new and interesting ideas, it is not likely that SANŽEEV's *Comparative Grammar* will replace VLADIMIRTSOV's work.

Nicholas POPPE

University of Washington

²⁴ Санжеев, p. 65; Дагурское наречие, p. 141.