

Les Lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Arγun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel by Antoine Mostaert; Francis Woodman Cleaves
Review by: John C. Street
Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 83, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1963), pp. 265-268
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/598384
Accessed: 14/02/2012 13:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

http://www.jstor.org

as *Puteh Khazeneh* p. 108 by Wilber) "Secret Treasury," even those attributed to the eighth and ninth centuries A.D., are in modern Pashto. The reference to "efforts to standardize the orthography" may have been suggested by the "orthography" meetings in Kabul in 1942, 1948, 1958. Their published recommendations reveal clearly, however, that they were intended to ensure the preservation of Standard Pashto, i.e., the status quo, and to discourage, e.g., Peshawar and other writers from writing Pashto according to the phonology, particularly the consonantal distinctions of their own dialects.

It is correctly hinted at (p. 64) that the most striking division among Pashto dialects concerns the consonant inventory. The following table can show the pertinent major phonemic correspondences. ṣ ẓ are symbols for retroflex sibilants, x for the velar, x̣ for the palatal spirant.

Kandahar	*Central-Eastern (Kabul)*	*Peshawar*
g^1 x^2	$g^{1,9}$ x^2 x^5	$g^{1,9}$ $x^{2,5}$
ts^3 s^4 $ṣ^5$ $š^6$	ts^3 s^4 $š^6$	$s^{3,4}$ $š^6$
dz^7 z^8 $ẓ^9$ $ž^{10}$	dz^7 z^8 $ž^{10}$	$z^{7,8}$
j^{11}	j^{11}	$j^{10,11}$

Thus Kandahar's and (the province of) Kabul's *tsok* 'who,' *sur* 'red,' *dzi* 'goes,' *zə* "I" correspond to Peshawar's *sok, sur, zi, zə,* Kandahar's *ẓíra* 'beard,' *grān* 'dear' to Kabul's and Peshawar's *gíra, grān.* (The dialect of Quetta has *žíra* with $ž^{10}$, the dialect of Wardak *ǧíra* with a voiced fricative.) Kandahar's *paṣtó* 'Pashto,' *xwā* 'side,' *špa* 'evening' correspond to Kabul's *paxṭó, xwā, špa* and Peshawar's *puxtó, xwā, špa*; Quetta has *paštó* with $š^6$. Kandahar's *žə́ba* 'tongue,' *jang* 'war' correspond to Kabul's *žə́ba* (or *zə́ba* with z^8), *jang* and Peshawar's *jə́ba, jang.* The written standard forms show the distinctions of Kandahar's consonant distribution. Even the orthographic symbols for /ṣ/ /ẓ/ suggest the sibilant character of the phonemes; the symbols for /ts/ and /dz/ resemble those for the other affricates /j/ (or /dž/), /č/ (or /tš/). Because of this close agreement between Pashto orthography and the phonemes of the Kandahar dialect I have always maintained that Kandahar must have been the cradle of standard Pashto orthography (cf. e.g., *JAOS* 74 (1954), 80). Donald N. Mackenzie in a recent article (*BSOAS* 22 (1959), 232 ff.) seemed somewhat reluctant to accept this.

The Kandahar forms are written even in Peshawar. The political strife between Pakistan and Afghanistan has tended to interrupt consultation and cooperation in the sensitive area of Pashto scholarship but no trend to abandon the written standard in favor of regional representation can be observed in Peshawar.

I have gone into some detail on the subject of Pashto because some readers may be inclined to use Wilber's publication also as a reference book for language matters. Necessarily its information is less complete and detailed in this field than in other areas. In general, the volume is written in a very readable style and contains, like its previous version, a wealth of pertinent data and helpful, usually very knowledgeable comments.

HERBERT PENZL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Les Lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Aryun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel (Harvard-Yenching Institute, Scripta Mongolica Monograph Series I). By ANTOINE MOSTAERT, C.I.C.M. and FRANCIS WOODMAN CLEAVES. Pp. vii + 104. 12 plates. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1962. $10.00.

The valuable Scripta Mongolica series, instituted by the Harvard-Yenching Institute in 1952, is devoted exclusively to the reproduction of otherwise inaccessible Mongolian texts. With the publication of the present volume the Institute adds a Scripta Mongolica Monograph Series, which will be devoted not only to the reproduction of such texts but also to their translation and explication. Mongolists and historians alike will welcome this new series; it is to be hoped that the many serious students and scholars to whom this first Monograph might be useful do not find its rather high per-page cost prohibitive.

The two letters treated here are of considerable historical interest. The first is Aryun's answer to Philippe's letter of 1288, in which the King of France had agreed to send troops to aid the Ilkhan in retaking Syria (which had fallen into the hands of the Mamelukes during the reign of Hülegü). Aryun's letter suggests that the Mongols attack Damascus on February 15th, 1291; if the French

king sends the promised troops and if the attack is successful, Arγun promises to hand over Jerusalem to the French. But before embarking on this attack, Arγun requests that Philip send him news and various sorts of gifts. The letter of Öljeitü is less specific. It announces the new Ilkhan's intention of continuing the good relations with the west initiated by his predecessors, and informs Philip that the forty-five years' wrangling among Mongol princes is at an end; as evidence of Öljeitü's desire for the continuation of cordial relations with the west, the letter refers to the Ilkhan's ambassadors, Mamalaγ and Toman, who are being sent to France. On the back of the second letter is barely legible a free translation in Italian, which is of considerable help in interpreting the Mongol text.

The present work begins with an editor's foreword (by Cleaves, pp. v-vi), and introduction (pp. 1-7), and some preliminary remarks on the format, punctuation, and orthography of the documents (pp. 9-16). The main body of the book contains transcription, French translation, and commentary for each of the letters (Arγun pp. 17-54, Öljeitü pp. 55-85). Following this are an index verborum, a bibliography, an additional note, and—most important—twelve plates showing new photographs of the texts.

These plates are beautifully clear: reproduced from photographs taken on the occasion of the twenty-first International Congress of Orientalists in Paris in 1948, they alone—to any Mongolist interested in details of the vertical Mongolian script—are fully worth the price of the entire book. It was partly through the help of these new photographs that Mostaert and Cleaves were able to correct a number of errors in reading and translation that had persisted even in the many treatments of these letters by first-rate scholars.

Like all other publications of these two writers, this monograph is thorough, clear, and carefully documented in every detail. Where new readings, translations, or interpretations are suggested, the authors' reasoning is explained in fullest detail; in nearly all cases new solutions—once suggested—are so self-evidently preferable to the old as to require little comment. Hence there is no need for this reviewer to point up the many important philological and historical virtues of this work; rather I would prefer to make a few miscellaneous comments on specific passages or problems.

(1) Pp. 12-13 and passim. The orthography of these letters is divergent in a few words: e.g. we find what is here transcribed *andeče* for the expected *endeče*, *jug* for *jüg*, *jobsiyejü* for *jöbsiyejü*, *kembei* for *kemebei*, *Mamalγ* for *Mamalaγ*, *mörilabasu* for *morilabasu*. Now the transcription of script Mongolian is a very complex matter: transcribing even a single word involves a whole system of interlocking etymological and phonological assumptions. For example, the transcription *öbül* 'winter' assumes (a) that there was vowel harmony at the time of this document, (b) that labial attraction was not a feature of the West Middle Mongolian of this period, and (c) that, judging from cognates in other Mongolian dialects, this word had initial /ö/ rather than /ü/; the script writing of this word could theoretically be transcribed as *übül*, *übul*, *üböl*, *übol*, *öbül*, *öböl*, *öbul*, or *öbol*. Similarly the transcription *jüg* 'direction' (rather than *jük*, *jög*, *yüg*, *yök* etc.) assumes that non-prevocalic stops were voiced or at least lax at this time.

It is clear that in the romanization of script Mongolian we are dealing with a transcription rather than any sort of transliteration: why then should the present authors balk at transcribing *endeče*, *jüg*, *jöbsiyejü* etc.? In effect they here seem either to be abandoning transcription in favor of a quasi-transliteration, or else to be admitting doubts about the etymological or phonological assumptions that are applied to every other word of these and other texts. Most if not all script writings such as the above result from a carry-over to Mongolian of Uighur spelling conventions; as Mostaert and Cleaves quite correctly state, such writings do not represent actual pronunciations of any period. But why should a few Uighur spelling conventions—those that are infrequently applied—be carried over even into a romanized transcription, when the vast majority of more systematically applied conventions are not? When in Old Uighur texts a front vowel of an initial syllable is written with the letter for a back vowel, many Turkologists transcribe with two dots beneath the back-vowel letter; thus transcription *a̤* for script *a* where *e* (=ä) is expected, transcription *o̤* for script *o* where *ö* is expected, etc. If the present authors wanted to mark in their transcription unexpected spellings such as those above, they might well have written *a̤ndeče* (for their *andeče* in place of expected *endeče*), *j̤ug*, *j̤öbsiyejü*, etc Similarly, a raised vowel could well be introduced into words defectively written: *kem^{e}bei*, *Mamal^{a}γ*, *n^{i}gdüni*, etc. However it seems to me that the

entire transcription system for all stages of script Mongolian (classical as well as pre-classical) is in need of re-examination and modification.

(2) Pp. 20, 38, and passim. The Kalmyk phoneme /ä/ is written with the symbol *ä* in an initial syllable on p. 20, but with epsilon in a non-initial syllable on p. 38—both in accordance with Ramstedt's phonetic transcription of the words involved. Predictable aspiration of stops is written for Ordos on pp. 69 and 72. It is unfortunate that nearly all Mongolistists continue to write present-day dialects in the traditionally over-differentiated transcriptions which make cross-dialect comparisons so unnecessarily difficult, and which are so complicated for the typesetter and hence so expensive to print.

(3) Pp. 23, 59. The French phrase *Roi de France* is transcribed *ired barans* in the letter of 1289, and *iridiwarans* in that of 1305. It would be interesting to compile a full list of the European names and phrases that occur in pre-classical Mongolian texts, and also of those Mongolian names and phrases in the better-known European languages of the Middle Ages. While great caution must of course be exercised in the analysis of such items (cf. the problems involved in interpreting Marco Polo's spellings), it is likely that important phonological facts about Middle Mongolian might be gleaned from such sources. E.g. from the spelling *ired barans* one might conclude that word-final /d/ was released at this time, and possibly that /d+b/ even at this early date could represent [dᵊβ]. (For the [β] note also 1289 *Berenggüd* = 1305 *Wirengüd* 'Franks'.) Could we perhaps even reconstruct Mongolian */ireed+baraans/ = ?*[iɾ́E:dᵊβaɾ́a:nsᵊ] with stress or high pitch on the long vowels? Or is it untrue that a long (or geminate?) vowel could at this time be represented by a single letter?

(4) Pp. 51, 61. To my mind, footnotes are at best a nuisance, since they interrupt the reader's train of thought. 258 footnotes on 85 pages of text is bad enough; I cannot help feeling that footnotes to footnotes are simply ludicrous.

(5) Pp. 68-70. Mostaert and Cleaves still insists that in a phrase such as *Činggis qahan dotora'an Ong qan Nilqa senggüm qoyar-tur dura qočorču'u* of the *Secret History*, *Činggis qahan* (element 1) is subject of *dura qočorču'u*, while *dura* (element 2) is subject of *qočorču'u* (the verb); thus literally '[as for] Chingis qahan . . . [his] affection for Ong qan and Nilqa sengüm remained behind,' i.e. 'Činggis qahan intérieurement laissa se perdre son affection pour Ong qan et Nilqa senggüm.' Apparently their interpretation is based partly on the fact that the Chinese translation of this phrase uses such a 'double nominative' construction, and partly on the supposed meaning and intransitivity of the verb in this and analogous constructions. But the structure of a translation is irrelevant, and the knotty problem of transitivity and intransitivity in Mongolian verbs has yet to be adequately handled.

I cannot believe that Mongolian has a 'double nominative' construction; second elements such as *dura* still seem to me to function as inner objects of specification.[1] While Mostaert and Cleaves introduce several examples (cf. the last three of paragraph two on page 69) that seem simply irrelevant to the present construction, they fail to consider two important facts. (a) The *Secret History* shows a number of examples in which a second element is followed by the possessive-reflexive suffix, which typically occurs on objects:[2] e.g. . . . *jürügeben amumu je či* 'you will surely be peaceful at heart' 201.20r, and *Öködey sujiya-suban sumuna tusdaju* 'Ögödey being struck in the jugular vein by an arrow' (lit. 'being struck [as to] his jugular vein by an arrow') 173.13v. As in cases without the possessive-reflexive morpheme, such second elements are single words referring to a body part or to an emotional state (one of the latter being sometimes a metaphorical extension of one of the former, e.g. *jürüge* 'heart; courage'). (b) In Buriat, where *n*-stems consistently retain their *-n* in the 'nominative' but loose it in the 'accusative,' the second element of constructions analogous to *dura qočorču'u* either ends with the possessive-reflexive suffix or lacks final *-n*: e.g. /gedehee ~~u~~ldexe/ 'to get hungry' (lit. 'to hunger [as to] own stomach'), /hanaagaa zobexe/ 'to worry' (lit. 'to suffer [as to] own thought'), but

[1] On p. 47 of *The Language of the Secret History of the Mongols* I called second elements of this sort absolute nominals, but I now prefer the term inner object; my interpretation is rejected by Mostaert and Cleaves on pp. 69-70. With regard to their objection (p. 70) that the *Secret History* shows some cases (relatively few, I insist) of subject *n*-stem nouns without *-n*, it may be countered that if—given the nature of the *Secret History* text—one insists that all grammatical statements be exceptionless, one will then be unable to make any grammatical statements whatsoever.

[2] This suffix does of course occur also after three very restricted types of subjects, but none of these types is at all similar to the second element here being discussed.

/ame xurexe/ 'to touch with the lips' (lit. 'to reach [as to one's] lips'; as an ordinary subject, 'mouth' would be /amen/).

In the study of a language like Middle Mongolian, represented by a closed corpus of rather moderate size, actual proof of grammatical statements is often impossible since there is no way to test grammaticalness of sequences not in the corpus. In any case, if Mostaert and Cleaves wish to redefine the uses of the possessive-reflexive morpheme in Mongolian as a whole and of *-n* in Buriat—calling the preverbal second element in all examples such as those above 'subject' or 'inner subject' or the like—then our disagreement is a purely terminological one: their 'inner subject' and my "inner object' would refer to the same class of constructions. Clearly this is a unique and well-defined class (having little to do with the ordinary classes of subject and object) which is of very real importance in Mongolian languages.

(6) Pp. 71-2. The word *čimadul-čaγsan-i* in the following sentence is particularly interesting: *Döčin tabun od-ača inaγsi-da čimadul-čaγsan-i edüge tngri-de ibegdeǰü bürin aqa degü ǰoqilduǰu* 'alors que depuis quarante cinq ans jusqu'à ces derniers temps nous récriminions les uns contre les autres, maintenant, protégés par le Ciel, [nous] tous, frères aînés et frères cadets, nous sommes arrivés à un accord mutuel.' On page 72 it is stated that this *čimadulčaγsani* is the accusative of the nomen perfecti (past participle), but the grammatical function of the form—before an intransitive verb—is not fully explained. In fact, the *-i* here is not the 'accusative' ending, but a remnant of the third person singular pronoun **i* 'he, she, it' occurring in the forms *inu, imada, imaari, imayi* of the *Secret History*; its use as a suffix here is reminiscent of Turkic languages, where reflexes of **i* (in various shapes) occur as the regular 3rd person possessive suffix. Occasionally one finds *-i* after a case suffix in script Mongolian: one example, *dörben ǰüg-tür-i* 'in its four directions,' is cited and discussed by Poppe on page 81 of his *Grammatika pis'menno-mongol'skogo jazyka* (Leningrad 1936). Another example, ending in . . . *čaγ-tur-i* may be found in line 1 of page 45 of Vladimirtsov's *Bodhicaryāvatāra Çāntideva* (Leningrad 1929).[3] This possessive use of *-i* is briefly mentioned on page 214 of Poppe's *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies* (Helsinki 1955): 'In pre-classical Mongolian . . . [the nominative of **i*] served as a possessive suffix, e. g. *iregsendür-i* "when he came." It served also as a kind of article.' *Čimadulčaγsani* is thus not an 'accusative,' but may be considered a kind of possessive absolute (perhaps historically a nominative absolute). To judge from the one Ordos parallel cited by Mostaert and Cleaves, this *-i* after the past participle was lengthened in that dialect; possibly Ordos *itšisenī* can or should be called the 'accusative' of the past participle from a purely descriptive point of view. In Khalkha, on the other hand, the *-i* after the participle has—graphically at least—become identified with the reflex of old *inu*, the genitive of **i*; hence what I have called absolute possessive sequences such as (Cyrillic Khalkha) *uudee neesen n'* 'when [he] opened the door . . .' (lit. 'his having opened the door').

The few criticisms made above are indeed minor, and are in no way intended to belittle the importance of this book; for many years one may expect it to be cited as the definitive work on these letters of Aryun and Ölǰeitü.

JOHN C. STREET

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

[3] I am grateful to Nicholas Poppe for calling my attention to these references.

Sun Tzu—The Art of War. By SAMUEL B. GRIFFITH. Pp. 197, two maps. London: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1963. $5.60.

With the ever-growing importance of China in the present world scene, we may yet see the time when the name of Sun Tzu, the classic military thinker, is as well known in the West as the names of his Confucian and Taoist contemporaries. Quotations from the book attributed to him are already frequently to be encountered, especially in writings on the strategy of his twentieth century follower, Mao Tse-tung. If the ideas of this ancient book are indeed a vital influence on policies of the present, then it is surely incumbent upon specialists to make available to the public a presentation of them from which their full significance can be appreciated. Towards this end, Dr. Griffith's work