

REVIEWS

APATÓCZKY, ÁKOS BERTALAN: *Yiyu – An Indexed Critical Edition of a Sixteenth-Century Sino-Mongolian Glossary*. Manoa, Global Oriental, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 2009 (The Languages of Asia Series. Series editor: Alexander Vovin). 258 pages. ISBN 978-1-905246-02-1

In the 14th century the Chinese government set up the *Bureau of Translators* and the *Bureau of Interpreters* to help the dialogue with the neighbouring nations. These Bureaus compiled word-lists and vocabularies to facilitate communication and education in the respective languages. Most of these glossaries were published by outstanding scholars such as Lewicki¹, Haenisch², Ligeti³, Mostaert⁴, Kara⁵, Kuribayashi⁶,

¹ Lewicki, M.: *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*. Wrocław, 1949 (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, Seria A, Nr. 29).

² Haenisch, E.: *Sino-Mongolische Dokumente vom Ende des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin, 1952.

³ Ligeti, L.: Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul. *AOH* 14 (1962), pp. 3–99.

⁴ Mostaert, A.: *Le matériel mongol du Houa I I yu, de Houng-ou (1389)*. Ed. by Rachewiltz,

de Rachewiltz, and others. Now Ákos Apatóczy made a further one accessible to research. The manuscript preserved in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences was copied at Louis Ligeti's request, during his first expedition to China between 1928 and 1931. This document, the *Dengtan Biju* is a bulky work consisting of forty rolls and it was compiled as a handbook of military service during the reign of *Wanli* of the Ming ruling house in 1599. The vocabulary presented here formed a part of this bulky work. The author used three known versions of it: manuscript preserved in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, another catalogued in the Beijing University Library and a third one was published in the series *Zhongguo Bingshu Jicheng* in Beijing with the title: “*Yiyu the Translation of the Language of the Northern Slaves*”.

Igor de-Schönbaum, A. Bruxelles, 1977 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques, XVIII).

⁵ Ligeti, L. – Kara, Gy.: Un vocabulaire sino-mongol des Yuan le Tshe-yuan y-yu. *AOH* 44 (1990), pp. 259–277.

⁶ Kuribayashi, H.: *Word- and Suffix-Index to Hua-yi Yi-yü based on the Romanized Transcription of L. Ligeti*. Sendai, 2003 (Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University Monograph Series, No. 10).

Ákos Apatóczy publishes the critical edition of these variants of the Sino-Mongol (*Bailu Yiyu*), which up to now has not been critically analysed. He based his work on a relatively late copy of the original work. Apatóczy's aim was to provide a phonological reconstruction of the manuscript version by comparing all the available pieces in order to correct the errors.

The vocabulary contains 639 entries (words), as well as expressions grouped in the well-known order of Chinese encyclopaedias beginning with the holiest and moving towards the more mundane and smaller things. The following chapters are incorporated: Astronomy and Heavenly Bodies, Geography, Time and Seasons, People, Precious Things, Animals, Sounds and Colours, Flowers and Plants, Fruits, Trees and Vegetable, Food and Beverage, Clothes, Birds, Parts of the Body, Harness, Machinery, Vessels and Implements, Habitations and Coaches, Metal Tools, Weaponry and Other Goods. The structure of an entry is the following: the Chinese word is followed by the Mongolian translation written in Chinese characters and an English translation is added. If there is difference between the meaning of the Chinese word and the Mongolian one, both are translated into English. The Chinese transcription of the Mongolian words is more-or-less systematic with numerous inconsistencies.

In a separate chapter Apatóczy analyses the typical linguistic features of the document, among others, the use of the unstable *-n* the use of which shows significant differences in various dialects and periods. The question of the use of noun phrases and verb phrases is discussed in a passage pointing out that nouns constitute the largest part of the vocabulary. The explanation for that can be the fact that these handbooks were primarily compiled to help people communicate in these idioms on a basic level.

To settle the number of syllables on the basis of the Chinese transcription creates some difficulties. In case of emerging problems the author regularly takes into consideration the evidence of other Middle Mongolian sources. The absence or presence of the intervocalic velar fricatives in Middle Mongolian words is equally a challenging problem of the given period. Certain

phonetic features of the transcriptive Chinese characters let the supposition that the intervocalic fricative might still have existed in the original Mongol words at the time of the composition of the vocabulary. The Middle Mongolian initial *h*- sound is clearly attested in the document thereby providing a proof that it was still extent during the time of the time of compilation: *harban* 'ten', *hon* 'year', *hüker* 'ox', etc.

Apatóczy translated some of the geographical names into English in an unsatisfactory way: *čaqān suburγa* "White gate", *čaqān qāl[γ]a* "White gate" *imātu* "Goat mountain", but did not others: *Nüken qāl[γ]a*.

The Mongol lexicon of the *Yiyu* contains a number of Chinese loan words, however, Mongol words are also frequently to be encountered in the Chinese vocabulary. Especially the lexical material concerning horse-breeding displays a Mongol impact, e.g. Chin. *shi-la wen ma*, Mong. *šira'ur morin* 'yellowish horse', Chin. *hai-liu ma*, Mong. *qaliwun morin* 'isabelline horse with dark mane and tail', etc. The document presents words that disappeared in the later Mongolian language, e.g. *orγan* 'people', *qubi sara* 'the first month of the year in the lunar calendar', or others the meanings of which have been changed, e.g. Chin. *dou*, Mong. *burčay*, "green pea, bean" that in Modern Mongolian is *vandui*. The vocabulary is of great linguistic value since the Chinese transcription reflects some phonetic peculiarities characteristic of other Middle Mongolian sources.

The main body of the book is the transcription and reconstruction of the words in the vocabulary. The structure of the book is clear-cut and facilitates an easy orientation. The book ends up with indices. The main index comprises all the Mongolian words, and another list is given of the uninterpreted and problematic words. The latter await suggestions for new solutions. A third index of transcriptive character is also added, together with the Mandarin pronunciation and another list of the phonetic value of the characters. Finally, an index of suffixes help orientate in grammar, and an index of Written Mongolian forms further facilitates to find words. A rich bibliography closes the book which con-

tains all the relevant works on the theme and further readings on the subject. Facsimiles of the manuscript preserved in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the blockprint of the Peking University Library are presented at the end of the book.

The publication of this valuable work is a welcome event in Mongolian studies. This volume will be a useful tool for all those dealing with the Middle Mongolian language. Ákos Apatóczyky deserves praise for this thorough work. As a student of Sino-Mongolian Studies he is a worthy follower of the path of his outstanding masters, Louis Ligeti and György Kara.

Alice Sárközi

YU, WONSOO: *A Study of Mongol Khamnigan Spoken in Northeastern Mongolia*. Seoul, Seoul National University Press, 2011 (Altaic Languages Series 04). 254 pages.

After Yu *et al.*'s study of the Tacheng dialect of Dagur,¹ this is the second book based on extensive field research by the Mongolic languages team of the "Researches of Endangered Altaic languages of the Altaic Society of Korea" that collected data on overall 29 varieties of Mongolic. Documentation was done using different versions of a unified questionnaire that for Khamnigan elicited over 2700 words and 731 short sentences. While a small amount of narrative data was also collected, it is not included. The book consists of a short introduction to the fieldwork and the informants (pp. 7–16), a grammar sketch covering phonology (pp. 17–34), morphology and syntax (together pp. 35–91), a wordlist (pp. 95–190) and a list of elicited sentences that can be subdivided into conversational and grammar-oriented data (pp. 191–250).

Most data were elicited from a single informant, J. Tsetsegmaa, born 1957 in Tsagaan

¹ Yu, Wonsoo–Jae-il Kwon–Moon-Jeong Choi–Yong-kwon Shin–Borjigin Bayarmend–Luvsandorj[iin] Bold: *A Study of the Tacheng Dialect of the Dagur Language*. Seoul, Seoul National University Press, 2008.

Nuur, Binder sum, Khentii. Next to Khamnigans, the area is also inhabited by numerous Buryat and some Khalkha. Moreover, she had lived in Ulaanbaatar for grade 7 and 8 and between the age of 24 and 41 as a manual worker; these facts are responsible for the substantial Khalkha influence in her speech. Even so, she was the best informant available for a sufficient span of time. Moreover, one might think, her language skills are probably more representative of the state of Khamnigan in Mongolia than the speech of old people. Part of the questionnaire was also elicited from two informants born in 1945 and 1947.

In contrast to the previous publications on Khamnigan, the most notable advantage of this publication is that it provides most of the language material on which the analysis is based (at least in transcribed form). Previously, scholars had to be content with Janhunen's work on Manchurian Khamnigan² that seldom goes beyond the morph level and that does not contain texts (which exist but are still unpublished). The reader will notice, though, that Khamnigan in Manchuria and Mongolia differ quite noticeably. I will continue by recapitulating Yu's linguistic description of Khamnigan and then briefly assess it.

The vowel system of Mongolian Khamnigan is described as consisting of 6 short vowels, 7 long vowels and 4 diphthongs, contrasting with Manchurian Khamnigan that is analysed as having 6 (/5) short vowels, 6 (/5) long vowels and 10 (/6) diphthongs.³ Like in Khalkha and in contrast to Janhunen's description,⁴ the difference between alveolar and alveo-palatal consonants is taken to be phonemic, while a Buryat-like phoneme /h/ is absent. Diachronically, the realisation of a number of Written Mongol affricates and fricatives (e.g. *kubtas* 'garment' vs.

² Janhunen, Juha: *Material on Manchurian Khamnigan Mongol*. Helsinki, Finno-Ugrian Society, 1990.

³ See Janhunen *op. cit.*, pp. 18–35 and Janhunen, Juha: *Khamnigan Mongol*. München, Lincom Europa, 2005, pp. 21–24.

⁴ See Janhunen 2005, p. 26.

kubcas ‘clothes’ vs. WM *qubcasu* ‘clothes’; *ulad* ‘state’ vs. WM *ulus*) by dental plosives is notable.

As far as can be assessed from the data provided, the properties of nouns, adjectives and numerals differ from those of Khalkha in only very minor ways. For instance, apart from minor allomorphic variants, the noun case system is the same as in Khalkha, including the presence of a directional case *-ruu* and a canonical Khalkha accusative *-iig*. Manchurian Khamnigan, in contrast, has no directional except for occasional forms such as *tan-taa-si* where *-si* is the directive morpheme from the spatial declination, and it uses the traditional accusative in *-ii* that would also fit into an Inner Mongolian contact scenario.⁵

Details about the exact semantic and distributional properties of the respective case suffixes are another issue, but by and large the documented uses are as expected. While data was not collected exhaustively, irregular stems in personal pronouns are documented quite extensively. Interesting forms for the first person plural exclusive are nominative *manuus*, genitive *manay*, *manaree*, *manuusee*, dative *manart*, accusative *manariig*, instrumental *manuusaar* and comitative *manuustai* based on the root *man-* and the two plural stems *man-nar* and *man-uus*. When comparing these forms to Khalkha, Yu does not provide any forms for Khalkha except the genitive *manai*, thereby following the normative standard variety, but as Poppe⁶ still provided an almost complete paradigm (excluding the nominative) for the stem *man-* and as the stem *manuus* is not uncommon even in contemporary Ulaanbaatar, the overall dialectal situation is not clear at all.

Looking at verbal morphology, the mood system for the first and second person is quite distinct from major related dialects. There are simple markers such as *-suy* (decision, as in Khalkha legal documents), standard *-yi* (voli-

tion), standard *-Ø* (immediate command), standard *-aaree* (prescription), *-gtii* (polite request, as in Buryat), but even such dialect-specific complex markers such as first person *-gtii#bi* and *-yā-gtii#bi* (polite notice) and second person *-yā-gtii* (persuasion), *-aara-gtii* (polite prescription) and *-aarfeet-yā-gtii* (polite persuasion). The possibility of such complex forms is much less interesting, though, than their discourse-pragmatic usage which (as in other dialects) even includes combinations with focus clitics (it should be *gar buu kūrū-Ø=l-či* ‘don’t touch it with your hand’ on p. 78 with the zero imperative inserted), illocutionary particles as well as forms based on the future participle and (as suggested in Appendix 2, example 211) the present suffix *-n*. The system is also much more complex than the corresponding system in Manchurian Khamnigan.⁷ But unless a certain stock of free conversational and interactional materials is recorded quite soon, no functioning interactional setting will be left in which this data could be meaningfully evaluated.

Converbs are entirely standard (compared with the reduced system in Manchurian Khamnigan,⁸ and so is the *inventory* of participles and finite verbal suffixes. However, how these forms are used to express tense and aspect is not clear at all. *-ku* is future (as in Middle Mongol) at least with activities, but seems to be habitual under negation, *-ba* seems to be a fairly neutral and highly frequent past marker (again as in MM), *-aa* also fulfills past-like functions in quite a lot of cases (as in Buryat), *-san* is not infrequently attested and does not resemble a simple perfect either (cf. 1), even *-laa* (firsthand past in Khalkha and MM) is used sometimes, and the habitual participles *-dag* and *-gči* are attested to alternate in question–answer pairs like 2. As the latter can even be used with adverbials, and postpositional phrases (Appendix 3, example 180), designating it as a deverbal noun⁹ as in other modern Mongolian varieties seems to be questionable.

⁵ See Janhunen 1990, pp. 62, 53–55.

⁶ See Poppe, Nicholas: *Khalkha-mongolische Grammatik*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner, 1951, pp. 71–72.

⁷ See Janhunen 1990, pp. 70–71.

⁸ See Janhunen 1990, pp. 77–80.

⁹ See Janhunen 1990, p. 77.

1. I went to school yesterday.
bi üčügüdür surguuli[-]d[-]aa yaba[-]san[=]bi
 (Appendix 3, example 197)

1SG yesterday school-DAT-RPOSS go-?PST=1SG

2. What do you like to do when you have time?

– I climb mountains.

čүүлээ cag[-]aar[-]aa yuu xii[-]dэг[-]t
 free time-ins-RPOSS what do-HAB.PTCP=2SG.HON
uulan[-]d gara[-]gči[=]bi

(Appendix 2, examples 337–338)

mountain-DAT go.up-HAB.PTCP=1SG

Negation is handled the Buryat way, with regard to whether the verb is finite or a participle. Given that the causative marker *-gul-* acquired passive functions in most, but not all Central Mongolic dialects,¹⁰ one would wish that a few sentences containing adversative passive meanings had been included into the questionnaire. As it is, only the existence of cognates of the MM Passive and Causative in their canonical meaning is shown with three items each. Similarly, basic negation types such as locational and possessive negation would have been easy to include.

While examples within the grammar sketch are glossed, this is not the case for appendix 2 and 3 that consists of the English rendering of Khalkha sentences used for elicitation and their Khamnigan translation. As the translations of Khalkha examples sometimes differ substantially from their actual Khamnigan renderings (e.g. perfective English verb forms rendered with Khamnigan Progressives), a reader with no knowledge of Mongolic might have felt happier with translations of the actual Khamnigan examples (the more so as the wordlist does *not* function as a lexicon to the sentences), while any Mongolist would surely have preferred the original Khalkha stimuli.

The English contains occasional mistakes, but they tend to be slight. Even in the rare cases where more serious mistakes occur, a basic familiarity with Mongolian studies should be enough to overcome them.

Overall, the timely fieldwork of Yu and his associates very substantially enhances our knowledge of Khamnigan Mongolian, both as it is spoken in Mongolia today and in general. Yu's book contains a grammar sketch accessible to anyone and language materials immediately accessible to any Mongolist and easy enough to figure out without too much confusion even for anyone who properly reads the grammar part. Therefore, it can be recommended both to the Mongolist and to a careful general linguist reader.

Judging from the still sketchy data that Yu's materials provide, Mongolian Khamnigan synchronically appears to be a dialect in-between Khalkha and Buryat, even though it exhibits a number of idiosyncratic features that set it apart somewhat. This seems to hold more for the verbal system than for the nominal system, though, for in spite of the usual, diffuse distribution of pronoun stems there are no actual innovations as could be found, for example, in Khorchin or Chakhar-Baarin. Possible diverging constructions that still show some peculiarities in case usage and that could provide the linguist with a better idea of possible grammatical idiosyncrasies of Khamnigan are difficult to find in a material like this, so conversational materials of elderly informants should be collected and processed before the near time when fruitful fieldwork will have become impossible altogether.

Benjamin Brosig

¹⁰ Kurebito, Tokusu: On the Passive in Mongolian Dialects – With a Focus on the So-called Causative Suffix *-UUL*. In: Kurebito, Tokusu

(ed.): *Ambiguity of Morphological and Syntactic Analyses*. ILCAA. Tokyo, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2008, pp. 103–111.