glass beads were found. The subject is one of great interest and its further study should serve to throw new light on Asiatic trade relations in early times. The author draws attention to some of the questions involved; and some of the finer and more striking beads are illustrated in color on three plates at the end of the volume.

This is but a sampling of the many subjects treated in this book and of the vast number and variety of the questions they raise. By no means all the answers are here; but the material is now available for further study, and the solutions to many problems may be materially aided by the rich contents of these tombs. Dr. Janse’s reports take their place beside the publications of the Japanese excavations in Korea as indispensable material for the study of Han culture.

John A. Pope

Freer Gallery of Art


The first edition of this book appeared in 1941, but most of the copies were lost as a result of air raids. This second edition is, therefore, a very welcome contribution to Turkology.

Although Ancient Turkic has been explored by many well-known scholars, and the material collected and published on it is considerable, before the publication of Dr. v. Garain’s book, there was no adequate grammar of the language and the data was scattered in various, often inaccessible, publications. Even to undertake a simple summary of what had been published previously would have been a work deserving much appreciation. The grammar by Dr. A. v. Garain, author of numerous publica-

tions on Ancient Turkic, is not merely a compilation of what had been published earlier, but the result of independent research and scholarly work on a high theoretic level.

In addition to the section on grammar, this book is an indispensable manual of Ancient Turkic, supplying the reader with everything necessary for the study of that language. It contains a bibliography of works on Ancient Turkic, and on the history, culture, religions, and folklore of the ancient Turks (pp. 225-246 and also in the addenda), and a chrestomathy of Ancient Turkic texts in Roman transcription (pp. 247-290) with vocabulary (pp. 291-357).

The Ancient Turkic to which this book is devoted is the language of the documents in Runic and the so-called Uighur script. The linguistic peculiarities of the documents written in Brâhmi and the Manichean script are also taken into consideration. Chapter I entitled “The Script” (pp. 9-41) contains tables of the Runic, Uighur, Sogdian, Manichean, and Brâhmi characters and samples of texts written in these scripts.

In the Introduction (pp. 1-8) the author discusses the ancient dialects. I agree with Dr. v. Garain that the term “Uighur language” is rather misleading (p. 1). As a matter of fact, there is no Uighur language but only a Uighur script that is used to write several dialects or subdialects of Turkic which on the whole do not differ very much from the language of the Runic script. The word “Uighur” should be used solely as a cultural and political term, not as a linguistic one.

The author distinguishes between the following dialects: (1) the n-dialect (anîy and aînî “evil” versus aînî id. in the y-dialect), (2) the y-dialect, (3) the dialects of the Runic inscriptions, and (4) the dialect of the Brâhmi script. This interesting introduction into the dialects and scripts is followed by Chapter II entitled “Phonetic Remarks” (pp. 42-58). It is, of course, impossible to define precisely the phonetic value of certain ancient characters. Only comparative phonology of the Turkic languages can give us a key to the approximate pronunciation of Ancient Turkic. Chapter II does not raise any objections; I would, however, like to make a few remarks on it. I doubt whether anê and
§ 19. I agree with the author that the so-called d-diphthongs are in reality groups consisting of a vowel with the consonant y. I may add to what is said on page 50 that the diphthongs in question behave as syllables ending in consonants: the possessive ending of the third person after a diphthong is *i and never -si.

Chapter III is entitled "The Derivation of Words," and constitutes a thorough discussion of its subject. I believe, however, that a few forms explained therein should be interpreted in another manner.

An interesting ending is -chant or -qand in certain titles. Its different meanings in various words suggest varied origins. In pārīkān, "the queen of the fairies," and in tānīkān, "divine," it might be an ancient diminutive suffix -Mo. -qand. In burqan "Buddha" it can be *qand "khan, king." In the light of Paul Pelliot's remarks in his article "Tāŋrīm>tārīm" in TP 37 (1944).163-165, it is obvious that there is no etymological relationship between tarqan "a high title of nobility" and tārīm "a woman's title," because tārīm is a misreading for tārīm. The word tarqan is, of course, identical with Mo. dārgan "a person exempt from corvée or taxes." The name of the mountain qādīrīqan might be an older form of Mo. qājīr "griffon" with the diminutive suffix -qand, and qūkān is possibly the same as Mo. etūgik eke, the name of the shamanist god of the earth.2

The suffix -kūn, -qūn, -yūn (§ 50) is obscure. The author believes it might be a plural ending but is not quite sure about it, and compares it with Mo. kiūmīn "a person, man," in the Secret History qūīm id. This hypothesis is doubtful. I prefer a comparison with the Mongolian suffix -yūn in adyūn "horses," qurūrūn "finger," omtūrūn "sternum," etc.

A rare suffix is -n or -an (§ 50). In my opinion, it is only -an and not -n. The author is not quite sure about its function, but believes that it might be an ancient plural (cf. § 171); this is possible. To the examples quoted by the author I may add also qopan "all" (cf. qop id.), bāyan "rich" = Mo. bāyan (cf. Turk.

---

2 With the suffix -s as in urūs "battle" from urūs "to beat." It is interesting that Mongolian būgūdārūna "battle" is derived from the verb būgū- "to stand."
that entitled “Accidence” (Chapter IV, pp. 84-146) in which the author discusses the plural, the declension of nouns, the pronouns, possessive endings, numerals, and conjunction.

In § 170 ff. the author speaks about plural forms. Regarding the suffix -z, I should remark that it is not identical with the Mongolian suffix -s, but -re in ike-re “twins,” muge-re-sun “cartilage” - Turic mügiż | mügiż | mügiż “horns,” etc. A very interesting observation concerning the use of the plural is made in § 174. There we learn that in ancient songs the plural suffix -lar is, in the Mongolian manner, affixed to the attribute instead of to the noun which is modified, e.g., aqlar bulut “white clouds.” This phenomenon is also known in the Buriat language, e.g., jejenud ger “large houses,” hajniud nom “good books,” bayanud tuyal “small calves.”

The original declension abounded in forms. Many ancient case forms were dropped, but certain fossil forms remained and became what are generally called adverbs. Such a fossil group is that of the forms ending in -ra, e.g., tašra “outside” - Mo. -ra in dotara < *dotara “within.” The only Mongolian language in which the suffix -ra is still productive is the Monguor language, in which the locative is formed with the suffix -re.10 In all the other languages such forms are fossil adverbs.11 Such a fossil and rather mysterious form is antirdin “from there” in which the author sees the Mongolian locative suffix -tur (p. 95). In my opinion antirdin < *antin yärin “from there, from the place” (yär “land, place”).

Ancient Turric has personal possessive endings as has any Turkic language. The ending of the third person is -i and, after final vowels of the stem, -si. Dr. v. Garaix asks herself whether these suffixes had the back vowel i when affixed to back vocalic stems (§ 198). As I have demonstrated in one of my articles, this suffix occurred in Ancient Turric and in Chuvash with only

the front vowel i, because the ending -i had originally been an independent word, namely, a pronoun of the third person *i= Manchu i “he,” Mo. *i, gen. inu, acc. imayi, etc.12 Therefore, there is no doubt that in Ancient Turkic the suffix was only -i and -si as written in the Orkhon inscriptions.

The author classifies the verbal forms into four main groups: the vocative verbal forms (imperative and semantically related forms), tempora (“einfache Zeiten”), verbal nouns, and convers. This terminology was taken, as Dr. v. Gabain remarks in her Preface, from the Mongolists (p. vii). This is Ramstedt’s classification and terminology.13 As all Turokists are not familiar with this terminology, the author explains what she means by convers (§ 299).

The next important section after the conjugation is that dealing with the postpositions. They are of either verbal or nominal origin. In § 272 we learn that the postpositions are, from the point of view of grammar, words governing the nouns to which they refer. This is, of course, correct. However, I find that the author sometimes is not consistent and includes as postpositions words which do not govern the preceding noun, e.g., aqil, a verb of aqil “to do completely”: cf. ani aqil okür bir “we repent of all them” (§ 272). Here ani is governed by okür, and aqil is not a postposition at all. The form bašlayu in § 275 is not a postposition either: kisrā tardoš baglr, kül čur (to be corrected to čor) bašlayu ulayu šadarät baglr . . . “in the West the Tarduš nobility, at the head Čor (a title) Kül . . . .” Here bašlayu means “leading.” Thus, this passage can be translated verbatically as “in the West the Tarduš nobility, Čor Kül leading . . . .” For the same reason, ulayu, in the passage of (u) m qatun ulayu oglārim ṣakālārim kālin (u)m qunčuylarim “my mother, the queen, and also my step-mothers, aunts, and the elder sisters, daughters-in-law, the princesses . . . .” (§ 228), is not a postposition, because ulayu does not govern any word in this passage.

It is a conjunction and a verb of the verbal stem ｕla “to join.” Thus, this passage means “my mother, the queen joining . . . .” At any rate, the word followed by ulayu is not syntactically different from the other members of this sentence, and is not governed by them, but is a juxtaposed member.

There are quite a number of such words, which occupy the place after a noun, but are not postpositions in the above sense: ymd “also, and” (§ 219), qatun “repeatedly,” qop “all” (§ 302), artiq “more than . . . .” or “exceeding” (§ 318), and so on. Obviously, if artiq is a postposition, all words following an ablative of another word should also be considered as postpositions, e.g., andin ulayu “greater than he.”

The morphologic part of the book is followed by one on syntax giving a clear and exact picture of the word groups and the structure of the Ancient Turkic sentence. An index containing all the suffixes concludes the grammar.

The chrestomathy contains the following texts: the inscription in honor of Kül Tağin, fragments of ancient calendars, several colophons, a passage from a medical treatise, fortune-telling (Chi- nese, Christian, and Manichean) and didactic (Buddhist and Manichean) texts, stories, and poetry. This is a fortunate selection enabling the student to acquaint himself with all the kinds of ancient literature in Turkic.

The vocabulary deserves much attention. There is no complete dictionary of Ancient Turkic and we should, therefore, be grateful to the author for this useful glossary. Its contents are, for the most part, verified forms not raising any doubts, and the translation of the words is beyond reproach in most cases. However, a few translations need to be supplemented. Sanskrit rahu (p. 331)

12 This word occurs in the following context: bilgii qarqan ursor; aqil qarqan ursor; buynurqii ymda bilgii ursors . . . . “they were wise kings; they were valiant kings; their buynurqa (a title), too, were obviously wise . . . .” This ymda functions in the same manner as the Mongolian particle ču or ber. As ymda occupies a place after a noun it is similar to a postposition, but is a particle, a conjunction. I would call it “a postpositional particle,” “postpositional conjunction,” or “an enclitica conjunction.”

13 This word is an adverb and means “again.” The author considers it a verb in -n of qat, “to make layers, to pile up” (§ 299), but it can also be an ancient instrumental in -n of the noun qat “layer.” Thus, it literally means “by layers,” i e., “time and again.”


G. J. Ramstedt, Über die Kónjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen (Helsinki, 1903), p. 3.
means in the first place "a demonic being causing an eclipse"; tatar "Mongol" (p. 388) is not quite exact, because Tatar is only one of the Mongolian tribes; tayyan (or toyyun ?) "a dignitary" (?) is, perhaps, the same word as Mongolian tayyan "eunuch" < Chinese t'ai kam 太監.

University of Washington


This volume is a major contribution to the historical literature on Japan. The University of California Press has done justice to BOXER’s careful scholarship and literary talent in making his book as handsome externally as it is valuable for its contents.

The title of the volume, however, is somewhat misleading. BOXER does not recount the history of Japan during the century in question but rather the story of the Portuguese and other Christians in Japan at this time. The central figures are the foreigners, and the Japanese come in only as they had dealings with these men from abroad or became their converts. The real history of Japan during the period is no more than a somewhat shadowy backdrop for the story of the Christians.

This is one major difference between BOXER’s handling of his subject and the treatment given it by MURDOCH. Another is BOXER’s organization of the material topically, with less emphasis on chronology and full detail. There is perhaps some resultant loss in clarity regarding the sequence of events, but this is probably more than offset by BOXER’s more rounded and better balanced treatment of the significant aspects of the story as a whole.

BOXER is clearly in a position to handle the Portuguese and other Western materials, which are the major sources for this subject, with considerably more mastery than MURDOCH or most of the other Occidental and Japanese scholars who have dealt with the subject. He has made relatively little use of primary sources in Japanese, but he demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the Western materials and is able to correct his predecessors on many points. He has included a very helpful bibliography, and his excellent notes, which are appended at the back of the volume, contain additional bibliographical material of great value. He has also included a forty-eight-page series of appendices which contain full translations of certain important documents and original accounts as well as useful material in tabular form on the Nagasaki bugyō, the chief Jesuit dignitaries, the apostate fathers, and the martyrs.

BOXER has, on the whole, stayed very close to his source materials, and the errors and contradictions within these materials are not always clarified for the reader. For example, on page 187 he quotes without question a Jesuit claim of 750,000 converts, (made, he says, in 1606 though later he gives the date 1605), but on page 230 he suggests that steady growth in the church had brought its members up to 300,000 by 1614. Not until page 320 does he comment on this discrepancy in estimates in his sources.

This handsome and valuable volume is marred by only a few minor imperfections. BOXER unfortunately does not seem to be at home with Chinese names and not only disregards diacritical marks but also sometimes runs hsing and ming together to form combinations such as Chuhuan and Lutang (p. 255). Some of his Japanese Romanizations are in a system now little used (Shizuoka p. 273, Kwambaku p. 139, Sahiyo p. 268 and elsewhere, which also appears as Sahiyoe on p. 262 and Safoye on p. 323). More serious is his omission of all long marks and the lack of a character index of any sort. There are a few minor slips and misprints, such as the date 1276 instead of 1274 for the Mongol invasion, the date 1592 instead of 1597 for the great martyrdom, Schichizayemon for Ichizayemon on page 304, and both Olivier and Olivier for Olivier van Noort on page 286. However, except for the lack of a character index these are all indeed very minor detractions in what is a most valuable and also most pleasantly readable piece of solid scholarship.

E. O. R.