HARRASSOWITZ Verlag

Introduction à l'étude de l'Eurasie Centrale by Denis Sinor
Review by: Nicholas Poppe
Central Asiatic Journal, Vol. 10, No. 1 (March 1965), pp. 71-75
Published by: Harrassowitz Verlag
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41926711
Accessed: 21/10/2014 14:51

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.

Harrassowitz Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Central Asiatic Journal*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

REVIEWS

Denis Sinor, *Introduction à l'étude de l'Eurasie Centrale*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1963, 371 pages in 8°, price DM 98.

It is always a pleasure to discuss a good book like the one under review which is a valuable introduction to the study of a group of languages and history of a number of peoples who inhabit vast areas in Europe and Asia, and which represents the most complete and up-to-date bibliography in the fields mentioned. The author is a well-known scholar in the fields of Uralic and Altaic linguistics and history of Central Asia and Eastern Europe. The literature on the languages and history of the peoples in question is very large, and the author does not exaggerate when he calls it immense (p. xiii). Sinor's work is not a general bibliography which includes all the books and articles on the subjects concerned. Such a bibliography would probably give no less than ten or fifteen thousand titles, but it would be of little use because it makes no sense to list everything that has ever appeared in print, including obsolete and misleading works. Sinor's book gives more than 4400 titles and is a selective bibliography. It deals with works which are indispensable or, at least, still usable. Careful examination of the bibliography leads to the conclusion that Sinor has performed his task very well. He has not omitted important works and, *vice versa*, he has not included works which should have been left out.

Sinor's *Introduction* demonstrates clearly where research stands and what problems still await their solution. It is a useful work which not only answers questions but also poses new questions. One of such questions refers to the term *Central Eurasia*. What is Central Eurasia and where is it? The book does not give a definition of what and where it is, and the writer of these lines must admit that he is not quite sure about the borders of that area. It can be assumed that Central Eurasia includes Central Asia (i.e., the region between the Hingan mountains in the east and the Caspian Sea in the west, between Siberia and Himalaya) and the region between the Urals and the Volga river. However, the geographical frontiers rarely coincide with the linguistic, ethnic, or cultural frontiers. Some peoples speaking the languages covered by the bibliography live within the regions mentioned but many speakers of related languages live far away from *Central* Eurasia and inhabit areas on the fringe of Eurasia. This makes it necessary to include also Finland, Transcaucasia, Asia Minor, the Balkan, and even the subarctic parts of Siberia (the Yakut country and the areas inhabited by the Even). A linguist or a historian will understand the reasons for including all those areas. Still some doubts arise with regard to the expediency of the term *Central Eurasia* in the title of the book which deals with peoples living in various parts of Eurasia, even on the fringes of it. Moreover, some areas which really belong to *Central* Eurasia have not been included, e.g., Tadjikistan. The Transcaucasian Azerbaijan Turks, the Turks of Daghestan, and

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Northern Caucasus have been included but the Ossetians, the Chechens, Circassians, or Georgians have been left out. On the other hand, the Yakut, Evenki, and Even are covered by Sinor's bibliography but the Chukchi, Yukagir, and other Palaeoasiatic peoples have been omitted. A striking case is that of the Oroki and Gilyak who live on the island of Sakhalin: whereas the Oroki have been included the Gilyak have not. What is the matter? Is it inconsistency? It would be unfair to accuse Sinor of lack of system. He has a system and is very consistent. He lists in his *Introduction* only the so-called Uralic and Altaic peoples and, in the historical part, also such peoples which influenced the Uralic and Altaic peoples. Sinor's system is absolutely clear, but still one wonders why he avoids the term Ural-Altaic. It might have been more correct, under the circumstances, to entitle the book *Introduction to Uralic and Altaic Studies*. Such a title would have been in full agreement with the contents of the book which, contrary to the title, is an introduction to the study of the Uralic and Altaic languages and peoples and a bibliography of literature on the Turkic, Manchu-Tungus, Mongolian, Samoyed, and Finno-Ugric languages and peoples, with the exception, however, of Estonians, Karelians, Vatja, and Vepsä the omission of which is hard to explain in view of the fact that they inhabit areas much closer to *Central* Eurasia than those inhabited by the Finns and Lapps.

A question arises also with regard to the order in which the languages are discussed. Languages can be listed in two different sequences. First of all, one can enumerate them as they are given in linguistic classifications. This order has the advantage that closely related languages which possess common features are given in the same section or chapter. The other possible way is the enumeration in the order of the geographical distribution. This method is less advantageous because languages closely related may be spoken in areas which are far apart. As for the book under review, it does not adhere to any principle, and the languages are almost given in a random sequence. Thus, the literature on the Uralic languages is given in an order which follows that of the classification of the languages concerned. Discussion of Hungarian is immediately followed by that of Ob'-Ugric which is correct. The Finnic languages are also given in an order which follows the classification. The Turkic languages, however, are listed in an order which is rather geographical. Osmanli, Balkan Turkic, and Crimean (which belong together and are members of the Southern group) are followed by Karai, Tatar, and Bashkir (which belong to the Kipchak group). The latter are followed by Chuvash which does not even belong to "Turkic proper", being a *r*- and *l*- language. Then comes Azerbaijan Turkic which belongs to the Southern group and should have been listed together with Osmanli. After this, come Kumyk, Balkar, Karachai, Nogai, Kazakh, and Kara-Kalpak which belong to the Kipchak group and should have followed Bashkir. Then comes Turkmenian which is also a language of the Southern group. It is followed by Uzbek and East Turki, etc. Of course, the order in which languages are listed is not the most important thing, but it would have been more consistent if the Turkic languages had been given in the order adopted by Samoilovich, Ramstedt, or Baskakov in their respective classifications and if the groups had not been disrupted. To disrupt the Southern Turkic group of languages is tantamount to listing the Germanic languages in such an order: Swedish, High-German, Norwegian, Dutch, Danish, English, Icelandic, Gothic, Frisian. Sinor's book being an introduction to the study of the languages concerned, should have given the languages in another sequence.

A problem still awaiting solution is the periodization of history of Turkic and other Altaic languages. To speak of Turkic, it should be remarked that the beginning of Ancient Turkic is unknown. As for the end of the Ancient Turkic period, Sinor believes that it lasted until the XIV century (p. 86). This is, however, incorrect because the X century is the end of Ancient Turkic. Sinor is, on the other hand, correct in saying that definition of Middle Turkic is rather difficult (p. 99). Indeed, there is a great disagreement with regard to what Middle Turkic is but it will not be incorrect to say that

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Middle Turkic is the stage between the XI and the XVII century. It includes Karakhanide, Khwaresmian, Chaghatai, Kuman, and Old Osman.

There is a great confusion in literature as far as the terms Ancient, Middle, and Classical Mongolian are concerned. Ancient Mongolian is the stage of language development which preceded the emergence of the Mongolian script. However, Sanžeev and some other Soviet mongolists use the terms *drevnemongol'skij* or *staromongol'skij* to denote Written Mongolian, even as recent Written Mongolian as that still in use in the 1930's. Middle Mongolian is the spoken Mongolian language in the XIII-XVI centuries. It is represented in the *Secret History*, *Hua-yi yi-yü*, the ḥP'ags-pa documents, and in the glossaries compiled by Moslem scholars. Ligeti confused, however, Vladimirtsov's middle period of the history of Written Mongolian (XIV-XVII cent.) with Middle Mongolian and called *Subhaṣitaratnanidhi* a Middle Mongolian text whereas it is a preclassical Written Mongolian text belonging to Vladimirtsov's middle period of history of Written Mongolian. As for Classical Mongolian, Vladimirtsov called so Written Mongolian of Buddhist xylographs (in the XVII century and later), but for some reasons hard to understand, the late Grønbech and his then assistant Krueger gave the name of Classical Mongolian to any kind of Written Mongolian, even that which is saturated with elements of local dialects, is stylistically poor, and violates all the rules of Classical Mongolian grammar. This confusion created by the scholars mentioned for which Sinor is not responsible is, unfortunately, reflected in the book under review.

The linguistic part of Sinor's bibliography gives 2655 titles of books and articles (pp. 1-188). It is followed by more than 1600 titles (items n°n° 2655-4287) of historical works (pp. 191-346) which are subdivided in the following manner:

I. General works.

II. Antiquity: 1. European sources; Islamic sources; Chinese sources. 2. The West: the Scythians; the Sarmatians. 3. The East: general works; the Hiung-nu; the Yüeh-chih, the Tokharians, the Wu-sun; the Hsien-pi and T'o-pa; the anonymous peoples.

III. The mediaeval ages: 1. The East: the Jou-jan; the Ephtalites; the T'u-yun-hun; the Turks; the Toquz oγuz; the Qarluq; the Uighurs; Central Asia in mediaeval time; the Kirghiz; the Kitan; the Ju-čen; the peoples of Manchuria; the Tanguts. 2. The Chinese Turkestan. 3. The West: general works; the Huns; the Avars; the Sabirs; the Onogurs; the Bulgars; the Khazars; the prehistory of the Hungarians; the steppe-and-forest zone; the Turkestan and Asia Minor; the Pečenegs; the Kumans; the Qay.

IV. The Mongol period: 1. Remarks on the sources; the Islamic sources; the European sources; the Armenian sources; the Syriac sources; the Chinese sources. 2. The history of the Mongols: general works; the Eastern Mongols; the Mongols in Iran; the Mongols in Asia Minor; the Golden Horde; the Mongols and the West; the Mongolian civilization. 3. The period of decline: introduction; the decline of the Mongols; Timur and the Timurides; the Turkmenian principalities; Turkestan; the Chinese Turkestan; the Manchus and Manchuria; Siberia; the regions on this side of the Urals.

This enumeration of chapters and their subdivisions gives an idea about the considerable wealth of bibliographic information which is contained in the second part. Whereas the linguistic part of Sinor's introduction does not quite justify the title of the book, the second part is indeed an introduction to the study of history of Central Eurasia. History of Central Asia and Eastern Europe is a very complicated matter, and it is by no means easy to orient oneself in the vast literature on this subject. Sinor's bibliography will be indispensable to all students of history of Eurasia. It is rather complete, although some areas have been left out, e.g., Finland. Whereas the Finnish language is covered by the bibliography, the latter does not give titles of works on Finland's history. The reason for this may be that Finland's history is part of history of Scandinavia and Western Europe in general (e.g., one should not forget the presence of Finnish troops in Gustav Adolf's army in the Thirty-year war). Careful examination of the second

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

part leads to the conclusion that only literature on ancient and mediaeval history of the areas and peoples concerned is given. Modern history, e.g., Russian conquest and domination, revolution, and the emergence of the Mongolian People's Republic or the Soviet republics are not covered by this bibliography if one disregards general historical works. This is justified by the fact that modern history of most of the peoples concerned is part of the history of China and Russia, and involves problems of imperialism and colonialism. The bibliography serves, in the first place, the interests of the philologists. Sinor does not say this but one notices it instantly the moment one opens his book. It gives the titles of books on the languages, literature, and old history of a number of peoples, a combination for which all philologists should be very thankful.

The third part of the bibliography deals with ethnography. It is considerably shorter than each of the preceding parts and comprises the items n°n° 4288-4403 supplemented by cross references to many works listed in parts one and two which deal, *i.a.*, with problems of ethnography.

Sinor's work is not exactly what is called *bibliographie raisonnée*. True, some titles are accompanied with remarks such as "a very valuable [*or* excellent, useful, *etc.*] work" but only few titles have such labels. This is inevitable because the bibliography would probably have doubled in size if each title had been supplied with an appraisal of its scholarly merits. However, very brief remarks referring to the merits of a book, without any explanation, do not always serve the purpose. To give here a few examples, let it be said that the remark made about the item n° 981 (Baskakov's *Karakalpakskij jazyk*) "un manuel splendide" cannot be accepted without reservations. Some parts of Baskakov's work are very good, indeed, but the phonemic analysis and certain portions of the syntax are not good at all. Likewise, Malov's *Pamjatniki* (n° 1264) cannot be labelled as splendid without reservations because it contains errors. Being good in general, perhaps, even having some advantages over von Gabain's book on Ancient Turkic, it is much inferior to Western European works on Ancient Turkic, although Malov was an outstanding scholar. In this connection, let it be remarked that great names frequently inspire us with such awe that greatness is attributed to everything published by a famous scholar. Such a scholar was Brockelmann. His achievements and merits in the fields of Arabic history and Semitic studies can hardly be disputed. However, this cannot be said about his Middle Turkic studies (Maḥmūd al-Kāšġarī) and his *Osttürkische Grammatik* because these works are rather superficial, obviously having been written in a great hurry. To conclude these remarks, the undersigned wishes to say that, in view of very critical reviews by Duda (*WZKM*, 52, pp. 326-345) and the undersigned (*HJAS*, 17, pp. 462-471), Benzing's *Einführung* (item n° 2493) should not have been characterized as meritorious, without any further comment.

It has been stated at the very beginning that Sinor's bibliography or, as he himself defines his work, "un guide dans l'immense littérature..." (p. xiii) is sufficiently complete as far as a bibliography can be complete at all, because new works appear even while a bibliography is being printed. The inevitable result is that supplements must be made almost the moment such a bibliography appears. Sinor's bibliography has been brought up to 1961 although it includes also a few books and articles which appeared in 1962.

Only a few publications which had appeared before 1960 escaped Sinor's attention. Thus, to literature on Karachai (p. 64-65) the works of A. K. Borovkov "Karačaevo-balkarskij jazyk" (*Jafet. Sb.*, VII) and "Očerki karačaevobalkarskoj grammatiki" (*Jazyki Sev.Kavk. i Dag.*, I) should be added. Likewise, the literature on the Altai Turks (p. 81) should be supplemented with A. V. Anokhin, "Materialy po šamastvu u altajcev" (*Sb.Muz. Antr. i Ėtn.*, V). Further on, A. N. Samojlovič's article on the Turkic numerals is to be added to the literature on numerals (p. 115). There are bibliographies of Mongolia which are missing from Sinor's work, namely E. N. Jakovleva, *Bibliografija Mongol'skoj Narodnoj Respubliki* (Moskva, 1935), and V. P. Tjuljaeva,

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Mongol'skaja Narodnaja Respublika, Bibliografija knižnoj i žurnal'noj literatury na russkom jazyke 1935-1950 gg. The literature on the ḥP'ags-pa script (pp. 146-147) should have included P. Pelliot, "Un rescrit mongol en écriture 'phags-pa", G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Rome, 1949), vol. II, pp. 621-624; the superb edition of the Chü-yung-kuan inscriptions by Jiro Murata (vol. I-II, Kyoto University, 1957) and E. R. Hope, *Karlgren's Glottal Stop Initial in Ancient Chinese with Particular Reference to the hPHags-pa Alphabet* (Ottawa, 1953).

The valuable work *Jazyki i pis'mennost' narodov Severa*, I-III (Leningrad, 1934) which represents a general survey of the languages spoken in the Arctic regions of Europe and Asia includes important articles on the Ob'-Ugric, Samoyed, and Palaeoasiatic languages which have escaped Sinor's attention.

The literature on the Tungus languages should be supplemented, *i.a.*, with V. A. Gorcevskaja, *Kharakteristika govora barguzinskikh ėvenkov* (Leningrad, 1935) and T. I. Petrova, *Nanajsko-russkij slovar'* (Leningrad, 1960).

It is impossible to continue the list of works, which, for one reason or another, are not mentioned in the bibliography, but, generally speaking, Sinor's bibliography has not missed many important older works.

It is inevitable that some works are listed in the wrong places. This happens in many bibliographies, including the one under review. Here a few corrections will be made.

n° 1731 is not a collection of dialect texts but a collection of specimens of Mongolian literature in Written Mongolian and printed in the old alphabet.

n° 1740 is not a manual of Khalkha but of Written Mongolian.

n° 1800 is a manual of Written Mongolian but not of Buriat.

n° 2036 is the translation of a chapter of Vandan Jumsunov's chronicle which was translated in full by the undersigned, cf. *Letopisi khorinskikh burjat, Khroniki Tuguldur Toboeva i Vandana Jumsunova, Perevod* (Moskva-Leningrad, 1940).

Sinor's bibliography makes a very good impression in that the print is clear and a variety of types is used. There are only few misprints which, however, do not distort the meanings unless they occur in proper names, e.g., Syktykvar (n° 273) instead of Syktyvdinkar (capital of the Komi country, former Ust'-Sysol'sk); Collinger (n° 397) for Collinder; *imen'šitel'noj* (n° 453) for *umen'šitel'noj*; Verboy (n° 558 and in the Index!) instead of Verbov; *nördlich türkischen* (p. 45, 8 up); Filel'strup (n° 1165) instead of Fiel'strup; *istorika-ėtnografičeskie* (n° 1184a) for *istoriko-ėtnografičeskie*; Abašaev (n° 1798) instead of Abašeev; Novikov (n° 1824) instead of Novikova; Nevskiy (n° 3213a) instead of Nevskij; Orlevskaja (p. 366) pro Orlovskaja who is listed as Orlevskaja and Orlovskaja in two different places, etc.

To conclude the review, it should be remarked that Sinor's work is an important contribution and will be of great help to all students of the Uralic and Altaic languages and of history of vast regions of Central Asia and Eastern and Central Europe.

Seattle — Nicholas Poppe

Gerhard Doerfer, *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*, Band I: *Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen* (= *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission*, Band XVI). Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1963, XLVIII + 557 pages in 8°.

This impressive looking volume is the result of industrious study of a vast material and extensive literature. Suffice it to say that the list of abbreviations of titles of works

This content downloaded from 64.115.250.2 on Tue, 21 Oct 2014 14:51:10 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions