

## REVIEW ARTICLES

*The Kalmyk-Mongolian Vocabulary in Stralenberg's Geography of 1730.*  
By John Krueger. Stockholm: Asiatica Suecana, Early 18th Century Documents and Studies, Volume 1. The Royal Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities. Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1975, 205 pp. No price.

In 1709, a Swedish officer named Philip Johan von Stralenberg (born Tabbert) was taken prisoner by the Russians subsequent to the defeat of the Swedish army at Poltava. Stralenberg was to spend 14 years in captivity, of which more than 10 (1711-1722) were passed in the frontier city of Tobolsk in West Siberia. There, he occupied himself with, among other things, the compilation of a variety of historical, geographical, ethnological and linguistic information on parts of Russia and its inhabitants. Following his release in 1723, Stralenberg put together the book that made him famous: *Das nord- und ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia* (Stockholm 1730) [= *NOTEA*]. Despite its historical obfuscations and etymological ramblings, the *NOTEA* was one of the first books to introduce to a large public the fascinating diversity of the peoples of Northern Asia, and to Stralenberg it is customary to attribute the first classification of the "Tatar languages", the first publication of illustrations of the Turkic Runic inscriptions from the Yenisey, the first use in Western scholarship of the XVII century genealogical work *Sağara-i Turk* of Abu'l-yāzī, and the first extensive recordings of vocabulary in various Mongol, Turkic, and other Asian languages.

At the scholarly remove of several centuries, it is possible to deny Stralenberg first place in certain of these categories. Indeed, it is largely in his ethnographical and linguistic notations that we are able to find

anything of current value, highest among which is the *Vocabularium Calmucko-Mungalicum* (NOTEA, pp. 137-156).

It is with the latter material that Professor Krueger deals in *The Kalmyk Mongolian Vocabulary in Stralenberg's Geography of 1730* [= *KMV*]. In his Introduction, the author sketches the historical circumstances of Stralenberg's capture (*KMV* 10-11), his life and career (11-13), and the publishing history and translations of the NOTEA (15-22). In the German original of the NOTEA, the vocabulary contained some 1431 entries of Kalmyk words in Latin spelling with German definitions in Fraktur script. Krueger provides a facsimile of this list (32-42), as well as facsimiles of the vocabulary in the English (154-165), French (167-187) and Spanish (189-201) translations, thereby rendering reference to the original book and its offspring unnecessary.

Here, I should like to make equally unnecessary any scholarly concern as to a fifth version, unnoticed by the author, of a portion of the *KMV*. On pp. 53-57 of the *Vocabolario Poliglotta con prolegomeni sopra piu' di CL. lingue* (Roma 1787) by Don Lorenzo Hervas, one finds approximately 160 "Kalmuka" words with Italian glosses which are clearly derived from the *KMV* of Stralenberg. Even a cursory comparison reveals that Hervas used neither the French nor the Spanish translations. For example, Hervas has *A-medo* "io vivo" [I live], whereas the Spanish has "me veo" [I see], an error there that reflects misreading the French "je vis" [I live] as "je vois" [I see] (cf. *KMV* 62 *amidu*). Hervas has *Alema-modo* "albero-di-mele" [apple-tree], whereas the French and, after it, the Spanish have the error *alenia modo* (*KMV* 61 *alima modun*). That Hervas had at his disposal the English translation and not the German original is shown by the following: Hervas *Chankaila* "io cuopro" [I cover] = English *Chankayla*, but German *Chankagla* (*KMV* 110 *qabqayla*); Hervas *Doboel* "popolo" [the people] = English *Doboel*, but German *Doböl* (*KMV* 143 List B). The Hervas duplications, of course, may safely be ignored.

Krueger devotes some attention to the problems of the dating and authorship of the Kalmyk vocabulary (*KMV* 24-27). To the latter, the author concludes, rightly, in my opinion, that "... more can be explained about the Glossary and how and why it was written the way it is, by presuming it to be the work of someone other than Stralenberg" (27). There is evidence, to be sure, that at least some of the linguistic materials

in the *NOTEA* were collected by persons other than Stralenberg. In the *Tabula Polyglotta* appended to the work, there is a small Yaqut glossary of some 60 words and numerals (see the edition of J. R. Krueger, *Yakut Manual*, UAS 21, 1962, pp. 305-309). Stralenberg most certainly was never in Yaqutia, and it is increasingly probable that this glossary was adapted from a list provided him by Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt, who did record Yaqut material in Irkutsk from a Russian who had been born in Yaqutsk and knew Yaqut as a second language (see D. G. Messerschmidt, *Forschungsreise durch Sibirien, 1720-1727*, Volume II, Berlin 1964, pp. 201-202 *et passim*; this scientific edition of Messerschmidt's journals has reached four of the projected seven volumes in the *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas, VIII*, Berlin 1962-1968, but was unknown to Krueger, cf. *KMV* 12, 25). Consciously or unconsciously, Stralenberg appears to have "Tatarized" several of the Yaqut words in this list, which is the only way to account for *baschput* "our head" = Tatar *baş*, Yaqut *bas*, *utsch* "three" = Tatar *üč*, Yaqut *üs*, etc. Already in the Yaqut glossary in the *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (Amsterdam 1692, pp. 430-431) of Nicolaes Witsen, there occur the expected forms *bos* and *us*, respectively (cf. G. Kara, *Le glossaire yakoute de Witsen, Acta Orientalia Hungaricae XXV*, 1972, pp. 431-439).

The Yaqut case points to one possible explanation of the errors in the *KMV*, that is, to the recording, haphazard in itself, of the basic glossary or of a group of word-lists by a person or persons other than Stralenberg, and the latter's subsequent editing of the material. It is known that Stralenberg frequently relied on bi-lingual natives in Tobolsk for his information on various subjects. As an example, it has been shown that a Tatar named Azbakevič translated the work of Abu-l-γāzī mentioned above to Stralenberg from the Chayatai original into Russian, which was the basis of his German translation (cf. A. N. Kononov, *Istoriia izučeniia tjurkskikh jazykov v Rossii*, Leningrad 1972, pp. 58ff.). A native Kalmyk fluent in Russian could certainly have been the source of the entry in *KMV* 91 *zaræ* [= WMo *ǰirγaqai*] "the ribs", which reflects a confusion of Russian *ryba* "fish", as well as of the occasional Written Mongol forms as *KMV* 60 *agutschi* [= WMo *ayučī*] "good". One cannot suppose that Stralenberg knew how to read Written Mongol, nor that he would have recorded such a glossary with Russian instead of German glosses.

Another avenue of investigation that presents some hope for the

solution of this issue is the relationship between Stralenberg and the great historian of Russia, Vasilij Tatiščev. The two had met already in 1720 in Tobolsk to discuss the translation of Abu-l-γāzī, and then, in 1724, while on official business, Tatiščev again called on Stralenberg (Kononov, *Op. cit.*, pp. 62-63). These meetings must be seen in the light of the Tatiščev papers that exist in Leningrad archives, among which are some multi-language glossaries that include Kalmyk and a large "Russian-Tatar-Kalmyk Dictionary" (Kononov, *Op. cit.*, pp. 72-73). The manuscript form of the latter work seems to date from 1737-1741, during which Tatiščev served as Director of Public Works in the Orenburg Kraj (cf. *Biobibliografičeskij slovar' otečestvennykh tjurkologov. Dooktjabr'skij period*, Moskva 1974, pp. 16, 269), but it is possible that even earlier collections were undertaken by Tatiščev, and the question of the relationship of these with the *KMV* of Stralenberg could easily be answered by those with access to these archives.

However that may be, the main purpose of the work under review was to provide an edition of the *KMV* material and, in this regard, the author has succeeded in a highly commendable fashion. His organization of the vocabulary (cf. *KMV* 22-24) follows principles that facilitate the location of a given word and its comparison with Written Mongol and modern Kalmyk forms. Thus, the *KMV* is presented in two sections. List A (58-140) contains those words for which the author was able to find a Written Mongol equivalent in Lessing's dictionary of that language. The headwords in this list are the WMo forms in alphabetical order, accompanied by the Kalmyk form from Ramstedt's *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch* [= *KW*]. These are followed by the *KMV* word spelled and defined as in the German original, with precise references, glosses and variant spellings in the English, French and Spanish versions. Most entries are terminated by relevant discussions of peculiar recordings or errors. The author has identified better than 90% of the material, and one is left with the impression that the monograph reflects a labor of patience and care in the face of baffling spellings and definitions and the host of vagaries that such a recording situation creates (cf. *KMV* 27-28). List B (141-149) contains the material for which the author could not locate a Written Mongol form or an appropriate equivalent word in other Mongol languages. To these two Lists there is provided a Locator Index (43-57), which lists the Kalmyk words in their original order in *NOTEA* next to the

Written Mongol or other identifications made by the author. A third List C (150-151) contains all the other Kalmyk words cited by Stralenberg in the pages of *NOTEA* and in the appended *Tıbula Polyglotta*. At the end of the monograph are found references to archival and published sources concerning Stralenberg, and a bibliography (202-205).

At this point, I should like to present a few clarifications on the entries in Lists A and B:

*KMV* 70 *buqa* "bull", S[tralenberg] *bucha* "a dove"; this is probably a clipping of a form such as *kök puγa* "dove" ("blue" + "bull") found in Siberian Turkic dialects (Radloff, *Wörterbuch* IV 1362).

*KMV* 82 *eliye* "hawk, vulture", S *ilga* "hawk"; phonetically, the S form seems to be an error for KW 211 *itłya* ~ *itłyan* "bird of prey; gyrfalcon", that is, WMo *itelgü* ~ *italγu* rather than *eliye*.

*KMV* 106 *oimasun* "felt stockings", S *orimissun* "stockings", with intrusive *r*, is a firm identification; however, the author includes S *omedun* ~ *amedun* "trousers" under this heading, which is an error; the latter is, of course, WMo *ömüdün* "trousers" (see below).

*KMV* 127 *talbiča* "place of deposit", S *tepchi* "ein Molte"; the modern German equivalent "Mulde" means "tray, trough, tub, basin", which points clearly to the correct WMo *tebsi* "large oblong plate, platter or tray, trough" as the identification for S *tepchi*.

*KMV* 141 S *balgus* "wax", KW 32 *balūs* ~ *balūs*, is originally a Qipchaq Turkic composition of *bal* "honey" + *aγuz* "biestings", and is found in Qarachay, Balqar, Qazaq, Tobol *balauz* "wax" (cf. M. Räsänen, *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türkssprachen*, Helsinki 1969, p. 60); here, one can only speculate about the -g- in the *KMV* form which, if it is not an error, reflects a borrowing from some Turkic language other than Qipchaq (where -γ- > -v-/Ø), or a very early Qipchaq loanword (prior to the XIII c., cf. the *Codex Cumanicus*, where the change is already in effect) into the Western Mongol dialect base from which Oirat dialects developed; the latter is extremely improbable, and serves to emphasize the limitations of such materials.

*KMV* 144 S *karssu* "paper" is not, as the author suggests, really very reminiscent of Turkic *qayāt* ~ *qayaz* ← Persian *kāγad* (cf. Räsänen, *Op. cit.*, p. 219); nor is it a question here of WMo *qayudasun* "a sheet of paper"; KW 201 *xūd'sn* "bark (of a tree), etc.", let alone of WMo *čayasun* "paper"; in my opinion, this word recalls most closely the entry in *KMV*

85 *γuγursun* "feather, quill", *S garssu*, and should reflect a recording error of "paper" for "quill" (the POINT-AND-ASK type of error noted by Krueger, *KMV* 27-28).

As the author points out, judgment of the value of the *KMV* for the history of the Oirat dialects must be postponed, if only for the reason that there is a large body of still unsifted early Kalmyk material (*KMV* 28-30). He reviews (14-15) the glossaries of Witsen, Gmelin and Bergmann, and the sources reproduced in the valuable *Ältere westeuropäische Quellen zur Kalmückischen Sprachgeschichte (Witsen 1692 bis Zwick 1827)* (Wiesbaden 1965) [= *Quellen*] by Gerhard Doerfer. An index to the sources in the *Quellen* is in the process of compilation at Göttingen, but it should be pointed out that the *Quellen* and the appearance of the present monograph do not exhaust the early sources of Kalmyk available to scholarship.

There exist, as one would expect, manuscript Kalmyk glossaries in Russian archives (cf. Kononov, *Op. cit.*, pp. 72-73, 81, 82; T. I. Tepljašina, *Pamjatniki udmurtskoj pis'mennosti XVIII veka, I*, Moskva 1966, pp. 78-79, speaks of a manuscript containing 286 words in Tatar, Votyak, Cheremis, Tepter and Kalmyk, that perhaps served as the source of the Kalmyk list in the comparative dictionary of Pallas). It is possible that XVII century Polish documentation contains Kalmyk material, as Polish interest in the area and specifically in alliance with Kalmyks led to the formulation of a major diplomatic effort in 1653 which, however, proved abortive (cf. Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, The Unrealized Legation of Kasper Szymański to the Kalmuks and Persia in 1653, *Folia Orientalia* XII, 1970, pp. 9-23). Of more immediate interest is the important description of the Azov Kalmyks contained in a Latin manuscript written in 1700 by the Czech Jesuit, Johannes Milan, a missionary in Russia in 1698-1719. This manuscript, which includes line drawings and ethnological and linguistic notes, was edited long ago (A. V. Florovskij, Ein tschechischer Jesuit unter den Asowschen Kalmücken im Jahre 1700, *Archiv Orientalní* XII, 1941, pp. 162-188), and, recently, Pavel Poucha has treated the Kalmyk words and phrases scattered through its pages (see: Kalmückische Ausdrücke beim tschechischen Jesuiten Johannes Milan-Franciscus Emilianus, *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* XXXII/1, 1968, pp. 61-66 [note that p. 65 *Aldar Scheschan* is not *aldar sayıqan* as Poucha, but *aldar sečen/čečen*, cf. KW 428 *tsetsn* "wise"]). In the same polyglot compilation of Hervas

noted above, there is a list of Kalmyk numerals from 1 to 10 (p. 243: *negen, chour, gurban, dorben, tabun, surgan, dolen, naimen, gesin, arban*). These, however, duplicate the 1775 list of Lindheim reproduced by Doerfer (*Quellen*, p. 213). Finally, there is a five line Kalmyk panegyric composed and read on the occasion of the inauguration of the Kazan Viceregent in 1781. It forms part of a collection of such panegyrics composed also in Chuvash, Tatar, Cheremis and Votyak that was edited from the manuscripts much later (for the Kalmyk, cf. *Sočinenija v proze i stikhakh na slučae otkrytija Kazanskogo namestničestva v publičnom sobranii na raznykh jazykakh govorenyye v tamošnej seminarii 26 dnja 1781 goda, Izvestija obščestva arkheologii, istorii i etnografii pri Kazanskom Universitete* XVIII/4-6, 1908, p. 153; I have edited the Chuvash version in my *Utilizing Early Turkic Linguistic Sources: Eighteenth Century Chuvash*, M.A. Thesis, Indiana University 1970, p. 83).

To return to the question of the value of this glossary for Kalmyk historical linguistics, it should be said that Krueger's aim was to identify the words in the *KMV* and not to provide a phonological analysis of the dialect(s) it reflects. Indeed, since the frequently erratic spellings of given words point to a compilation based on multiple glossaries, whose isolation and recording procedures are irretrievable in the present form, it is perhaps futile to attempt to establish a meaningful sound pattern as though the material in *KMV* reflected one or more homogeneous dialects. Generally, the retrieval of "fine" phonetic distinctions in such a glossary is jeopardized, although "gross" distinctions, those resulting from major sound changes, may occasionally be recognized, and constitute evidence for the relative chronology of such changes. Doerfer has postulated several such changes on the basis of the material in the *Quellen* (pp. 17-24), although, in his review of the *Quellen*, Georg Kara has shown several of these to be unconvincing (cf. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* LXIV, 1969, cc. 206-209).

For his part, Krueger points out two further phonetic phenomena in the *KMV* (p. 30): (1) a "d/s alternation", and (2) a "b/m alternation". The first of these is based on the following examples:

1. *KMV* 61 [*altan*] *subud* "(gold) and pearls", S *altan subus* (KW 332 *sowsŋ* ~ 339 *suwsŋ* = WMo *subusun*);
2. *KMV* 69 *bolod* "steel", S *bolos* (KW 50 *bol<sup>o</sup>D*);
3. *KMV* 80 *eske*- "to cut", S *aetke-/etka-* (KW 211 *išk<sup>i</sup>-*);

4. KMV 90 *ḡasa-* "to put in order", S *dsada-/dsasa* (KW 468 *zas-*);

5. KMV 106 *oimasun* "felt stockings", S *omedun/amedun* "trousers"; as pointed out above, this identification is an error for WMo *ômüdün* "trousers".

Now, the existence of a "d/s alternation" is well-known in Mongol linguistics (for a recent discussion, with bibliography, cf. A. Róna-Tas, A Study on the Dariganga Phonology, *Acta Orient. Hung.* X, 1960, p. 25). It has been evident up to now that this so-called "alternation" in fact reflects a sound change of *s* > *d*; cf. the clear cases of WMo *Jes* ~ *jed* "copper" ← Turkic *ḡez* [yez], WMo *ulus*, Buryat *ulus* ~ *ulud* "country" ← Turkic *uluš*, and now example 4 above, S *dsada-* ~ *dsasa-* < Mo *ḡasa-* in all Mongol languages. Nor does the example 3 above contradict this, for it is but one of several cases of a very old change in Mongol dialects that surfaces in one or the other form in various texts and dialects; cf. "Secret History", *Hua-yi I-yü etke-*, Ibn Muḥannā *hitke-*, *Lalitavistara* 59v4 *edke-*, *Sub-ḡāṣitaratnanidhi* 162 *etke-*, Moghol *etqa-*, beside the WMo *eske-*, KMV *etka-/aetke-*; also cf. "Secret History" *getki-* "to trample", beside WMo *giski-*, KMV 86 *giski-* [note that KW 211 *isk<sup>i</sup>* belongs with WMo *iskül-*, KMV 88 *iskuhl-* "to trample"!], where the *t/d* form failed to surface in Kalmyk. Occasionally, it happens that both *d/s* forms surface in modern dialects (WMo *egüs-/egüd-* "to begin", Kalm, Bur, Khal *ūs-/ūd-*), and occasionally only the *d* form (WMo *naḡas-/naḡad-* "to play", Kalm, Bur, Khal, *nād-*). Now, this picture is obscured by examples 1 and 2 above, in that both reflect a change *d* > *s* in the Stralenberg material; moreover, 2 *bolod* is a loanword from Persian *pōlād* "steel", so that the direction of change is fixed. It is true that example 1 *subud* is considered by Sir Gerard Clauson to be a metathesized form of *\*busud*, which he takes to be a loanword from Persian *bussad* "coral" (Three Mongolian Notes, *Collectanea Mongolica*, Wiesbaden 1966, pp. 33-34); if correct that would fix the direction of change in this word as well, but the semantic and phonetic difficulties make the etymology suspect. One might conjecture that Stralenberg's *subus* is equivalent to WMo *subusun*, which is the *indiv-ualis* (+ *-sun*) of the plural *subud* "pearls"; other examples of the rendering of *-sun* as *-s/-ss* in KMV are: 83 *ḡadasun* "nail" S *kadss/kadasu*, 91 *ḡirasun* "fish", S *tzagas/tsagassun/sagassun*, 71 *burḡasun* "willow", S *burgas* "broom", *burgasu* "fir" (questionable). This is not especially convincing, and the fact remains that *bolod* "steel" is neither plural, nor does a WMo



form *\*bolosun* exist. Thus, *bolod* > *bolos* and *subud* > *subus* constitute potentially important, if still unclear, evidence from this 1730 glossary.

The “*b/m* alternation” in the *KMV* rests upon the following examples:

1. *KMV* 65 *bačay* “fast”, S *matsag* (KW 258 *mats<sup>a</sup>G*);
2. *KMV* 88 *irbis* “panther, tiger”, S *irmis* (KW 210 *irwš* [*< \*irbis*]);
3. *KMV* 109 *qabar* “nose”, S *kamar* (KW 164 *xamr*). The first example is but one of several cases in Mongol languages in which a sound change *b* > *m* occurs: WMo *bečín* ~ *mečín* “ape” ← Turkic *béčín* KW 31 *balta* ~ 255 *malt<sup>a</sup>* “axe” ← Turkic *baltu*; KW 35 *bars* ~ 257 *mars* “tiger” ← Turkic *bars*. In fact, beside *bačay* exists the form *mačay* (Lessing, p. 519; Kowalewski, p. 1996), although only the latter is found in Buryat *masag*, Ordos *ma’tš’ak* and Kalmyk as above. This is not, therefore, peculiar to the *KMV*. The modern dialects all reflect WMo *irbis* in example 2, and not Stralenberg’s *irmis*, but the third example WMo *qabar* is found as *qamar* in nearly all dialects (Khalkha, Buryat, Ordos, Kalmyk, Dagur). The change *-b- > -m-* is not unknown in other words; cf. WMo *čolbon* “Venus”, which appears as *čolmon* in Khalkha, Ordos, Jarut, and surely further examples could be adduced. Again, this change does not constitute a characteristic feature of the material.

The glossaries recorded during the XVII-XVIII centuries, of which the *KMV* is unquestionably the most substantial, are a precious source of data on the formative period of the modern dialects. Other things being equal, such materials may be expected to attest: (1) the relative chronology of major sound changes; (2) vocabulary, often in rare or primary meanings, or otherwise unattested; (3) dialects that have since disappeared or that remain virtually unstudied (in regard to such materials for Turkic and Tunguz languages of Siberia). Sufficient materials are available for such study, whose preliminaries entail the identification of the lexical items and the organization of the results in such a way as to facilitate comparison on both the diachronic and synchronic planes. The present monograph constitutes the first major edition of such material. In his careful deliberations upon the context of such recordings and in his presentation of the vocabulary, Professor Krueger leads the way to future studies.