Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. Volume 59 (4), 493–505 (2006)
DOI: 10.1556/AOrient.59.2006.4.4

REVIEWS

The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century. Translated with a historical and philological commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2004. (Brill's Inner Asian Library 7/1–2) ISBN 90-04-13159-0

It would probably not be an exaggeration to call the work under review the masterwork of Igor de Rachewiltz as it summarises thirty-five years of his own activities, and the much longer overall studies by his scientific predecessors. The former began in 1971, when de Rachewiltz commenced the task of translating the *Secret History of the Mongols* into "up-to-date English", in contrast with Cleaves' biblical English version, which was completed in 1956, but published only in 1982. De Rachewiltz began to publish his translation in the journal *Papers on Far Eastern History* in 1971, and finished it in 1985. Additions and corrections were made to this translation in the same journal in 1986. Immediately afterwards, in 1987, de Rachewiltz reopened his work, to publish his revised translation with detailed commentaries, which was completed in 2002.

The importance of the *Secret History of the Mongols* for the different arts can hardly be overrated. As a treasury on the history, language, literature, ethnography, etc. of the Mongols, it is probably the most investigated piece in the field. Its subject-matter comprises the ancestry, life and deeds of Činggis Qan, and in connection with this the establishment and rise of the Mongol Empire during his own life and that of his successor'. The uniqueness of this epic chronicle lies in its genuineness, vividness and linguistic purity, free of the Buddhist influence so peculiar to later texts. Even if it is not always entirely reliable in describing historical events, no other source describes more realistically the tribal and everyday life and the social and military organisation of the Mongols in the 12th and 13th centuries. To quote the words of de Rachewiltz, "it adds both flesh and soul to much that we learn from the Persian and Chinese historians" (p. lxiv).

Its extreme popularity is revealed, among others, by the many translations, into some twenty different languages (including the Modern Mongol translations in Uighur and Cyrillic script) and the mass of literature relating to this text, cf. *Bibliography and abbreviations* (pp. 1081–1194). These numerous translations reveal that the *Secret History* has found its way into national literatures. Below, the pertinent

0001–6446 $ 20.00 © 2006 *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest*

bibliographical data are listed in the alphabetical order of the languages of the different translations. A similar list is to be found on pp. lxxii–lxxiv of de Rachewiltz's work, but the items there are listed in chronological sequence:

Bulgarian

Fedotov, A. (1991): *Tajnata istorija na mongolite*. Sofia.

Chinese

Xie zai shan shi (1951): *Meng gu mi shi. Kai ming wen shi zhuan kan*. Bei Jing.

Yao Cong wu – Za ji si qin (1960–1962): Han zi meng yin meng gu mi shi xin shi bing zhushi. *Wen shi zhe xue bao* 9 (1960), pp. 17–99; 10 (1961), pp. 185–258; 11 (1962), pp. 339–408.

Dao run ti bu (1978): *Xin shi jian zhu meng gu mi shi*. Hu he hao te. ^{2}1979.

Za ji si qin (1979): *Meng gu mi shi xin shi bing zhu shi*. Tai bei.

Yü Da jün (2001): *Meng gu mi shi*. Shi jia zhuang.

Czech

Poucha, Pavel (1955): *Tajná kronika mongolů*. Praha.

English

Kuo-yi Pao (1965): *Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols*. Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series 58. Bloomington, Indiana University–The Hague, Mouton & Co. [only chapter no. 9].

de Rachewiltz, Igor (1971–1985): The Secret History of the Mongols. *Papers on Far Eastern History* 4 (1971), pp. 115–163; 5 (1972), pp. 149–175; 10 (1974), pp. 55–82; 13 (1976), pp. 41–75; 16 (1977), pp. 27–65; 18 (1978), pp. 43–80; 21 (1980), pp. 17–57; 23 (1981), pp. 111–146; 26 (1982), pp. 39–84; 30 (1984), pp. 81–160; 31 (1985), pp. 21–93. Additions and corrections *Papers on Far Eastern History* 33 (1986), pp. 129–137.

Cleaves, Francis Woodman (1982): *The Secret History of the Mongols for the first time done into English out of the original tongue and provided with an exegetical commentary* 1. (Translation) Cambridge (Ma)–London [translation finished in 1957].

Kahn, P. (1984): *The Secret History of the Mongols. The Origin of Chinghis Khan. An adaptation of the Yuan Ch'ao Pi Shih, based primarily on the English translation by Francis Woodman Cleaves*. San Francisco.

Onon, Urgunge (1990): *The History and the Life of Chinggis Khan (The Secret History of the Mongols)*. Leiden. ^{2}*The Secret History of the Mongols. The Life and Times of Chinggis Khan*. Richmond, Surrey, Curzon Press 2001.

Onon, U.–Bradbury, S. (1993): *Chinggis Khan. The Golden History of the Mongols.* London, Folio Society [revised by Bradbury, S. without critical apparatus].

French

Pelliot, Paul (1949): *Histoire secrète des Mongols*. Restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres I à VI. Paris.

Mostaert, Antoine (1950–1952): Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 13, pp. 285–361. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 14, 329–403. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 15, pp. 285–407. Reprint in one volume with the same title: Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard-Yenching Institute 1953 [numerous sections of the text, cf. Appendix 4 of de Rachewiltz's work].

Even, Marie-Dominique–Pop, Rodica (1994): *Histoire secrète des Mongols. Chronique mongole du XIII^{e} siècle*. préface de Robert N. Hamayon. Paris: Gallimard.

German

Haenisch, Erich (1941): *Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Aus einer mongolischen Niederschrift des Jahres 1240 von der Insel Kode'e im Keluren-Fluß*. Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz. [2]1948. Reedited twice by Walther Heissig as *Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Köln 1981, 1985.

Taube, Manfred (1989): *Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Herkunft, Leben und Aufstieg Cinggis Qans*. Leipzig–Weimar.

Hungarian

Ligeti Lajos (1962): *A mongolok titkos története*. Budapest. [1]1962, [2]2004.

Italian

Olsufieva, Maria (1973): *Storia segreta dei mongoli. Le gesta dei mongoli nella piu antica cronaca originale scritta all'epoca di Gengis Khan*. Intr. di Fosco Maraini. Milano. [2]1995. [3]2000 [translation based on the Russian version of Kozin].

Japanese

Naka Michiyo (1907): *Chingisukan Jituroku*. Tokyo.

Kobayashi Takashiro (1941): *Mouko-hishi*. Tokyo.

Naka Michiyo (1943): *Chingisukan Jituroku*. Tokyo.

Iwamura Shinobu (1963): *Gencho-hishi. Chingisukan Jituroku*. Tokyo.

Murakami Masatsugu (1970–1976): *Mongol-hishi. Chingisukan-monogatari.* 1–3. Tokyo.

Ozawa Shigeo (1984–1989): *Gencho-hishi zenshaku*. 1. Jo; 2. Chu; 3. Ge; 4. Zokko-jo; 5. Zokko chu; 6. Zokko ge. Tokyo.

Ozawa Shigeo (1997): *Gencho-hishi* 1–2. Tokyo.

Kazak

Magauiya, Sultaniyaŭlï (1979): *Mońgoldiñ qŭpiya šežïresï*. Ölgiy.

Korean

Yu Won-su (1994): *Monggol Pisa*. Seoul, Hyean.

Pak Won-gil (1997): *Monggol Pisa*. 1. Seoul, Tusol.

Mongol
Modern Mongol in Uighur script and Khalkha

Kesiγbatu (1940): *Mongγol udqa-yin Yuvan ulus-un niγuča tobčiya*. Degedü bölüg. Kökeqota [text of the first 153 paragraphs].

Altanvačir (1941): *Altanvačir-un orčiγuluγsan Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiya*. Kalgan.

Bökekesig (1941): *Mongγol-un niγuča tuγuǰi*. K'ailu.

Kesigbatu (1941): *Kesigbatu-yin orčiγuluγsan Yuvan ulus-un niγuča tobčiya*. Kökeqota. [2]2000.

Čengdü-yin Damdingsürüng (1947): *Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan*. Ulaγanbaγatur. Inner Mongolian edition: Kökeqota 1948. [2]1957 The Cyrillic version of 1947: *Mongolīn nūc towčō*. Ulaanbaatar 1957. [2]1976. [3]1990.

Doronatib (1980): *Mongγol ündüsün-ü songγodaγǰokiyal-un songγomal. "Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan"-ača songγoba* 1. Kökeqota [partial translation].

Bayar (1981): *Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan* 1–3. Kökeqota.

Mansang (1985): *Sine-ber orčiγulǰu tayilburilaγsan Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan*. Kökeqota.

[Gaadamba] Γadamba, Š. (1990): *Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan*. Ulaγanbaγatur.

[Cerensodnom] Čeringsodnam, D. (1993): *„Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan"-u orčiγulγa tayilburi*. Beiǰing. Cyrillic version: *Mongolīn nūc towčō*. Ulānbātar. 2000.

Cendīn Xandsüren (ed.) (1997): *Cend Gün ba Mongolīn Nūc Towčō*. Ulānbātar [translation finished in 1917].

Buryat

G. Čimitov (1989): Mongoloi nyūsa tobšo. *Baikal* 3, pp. 114–136; 4, pp. 68–104; 5, pp. 97–125.

Namžilov, Č.-R. (1990): *Mongoloi nyūsa tobšo*. Ulan-Ude [Buryat and Russian translations].

Darvaev, P. A.–Čimitov, G. G. (1990): *Sokrovennoe skazanie mongolov. Anonimnaja mongol′skaja hronika 1240 goda. Mongol-un niguča tobčijan. Juan′ čao bi ši*. Elista [Kalmuck, Russian and Buryat translations].

Oirat and Kalmuck

Dorba, K. (1987): *Mongγol-in nuuca tobziyan – Cinggis Xa ni šaštar*. Urumči.

Darvaev, P. A.–Čimitov, G. G. (1990): *Sokrovennoe skazanie mongolov. Anonimnaja mongol′skaja hronika 1240 goda. Mongol-un niguča tobčijan. Juan′ čao bi ši*. Elista [Kalmuck, Russian and Buryat translations].

Polish

Kałużyński, Stanisław (1970): *Tajna historia Mongołów. Anonimowa kronika mongolska z XIII w*. Warszawa.

Russian

Kafarov, P. I. (1872–1879): Unpublished manuscript [translation based on the Chinese interlinear translation of the text].

Pozdneev, A. M. [n.d. 1880 or 1887]: *Transkripcija paleografičeskogo teksta Yuan′-čao-mi-ši*. Sankt Petersburg [text until the middle of paragraph no. 104].

Kozin, S. A. (1941): *Sokrovennoe skazanie. Mongol′skaja hronika 1240 g. pod nazvaniem Mongγol-un niγuča tobčiyan. Juan′ čao bi ši. Mongol′skij obydennyj izbornik*. 1. Vvedenie v izučenie pamjatnika, perevod, teksty, glossarii. Moskva–Leningrad.

Namžilov, Č.-R. (1990): *Mongoloi nyūsa tobšo*. Ulan-Ude [Buryat and Russian translations].

Darvaev, P. A.–Čimitov, G. G. (1990): *Sokrovennoe skazanie mongolov. Anonimnaja mongol′skaja hronika 1240 goda. Mongol-un niguča tobčijan. Juan′ čao bi ši*. Elista [Kalmuck, Russian and Buryat translations].

Krol′, Ju. L. (1993): Pankratov, B. I. Obrazcy perevod Juan′-čao bi-ši. In Solncev, V. M. et al. (eds): *Mongolica. K 750-letiju „Sokrovennogo skazanija"*. Moskva, pp. 103–125 [partial translation].

Pankratov (1998), cf. Krol′, J. L.–Kuz′menkov, E. A. (1998): Perevody iz "Juan′-čao bi-ši". *Strany i Narody Vostoka* 29, pp. 44–65 [partial translation].

Turkish

Temir, Ahmet (1948): *Moğolların gizli tarihi*. 1. *Tercüme*. Ankara.

The translation of the Mongol text (pp. 1–218) is preceded by several introductory parts: the *Preface* (pp. xi–xiv), *Notes on the illustrations* (pp. xv–xvii), *Abbreviations and conventional signs* (pp. xix–xxii) and the *Introduction* itself (pp. xxv–cxiii), discussing such subjects as contents (pp. xxvii–xxviii), place and date of composition (pp. xxix–xxxiv), authorship (pp. xxxiv–xl), textual history (pp. xl–liii), the *Secret History* text in the Altan tobči (pp. liv–lix), the *Secret History* as history and literature (pp. lix–lxx), different transcriptions and translations of the text (pp. lxx–lxxvi), modern and contemporary studies on the *Secret History* (pp. lxxvii–lxxix), and some technical remarks on the publication (pp. lxxix–lxxxii), each supplied with various notes (pp. lxxxiii–cxiii). Unfortunately, in many cases these endnotes do not contain supplementary data, but simply refer to the bibliography, given at the end of the second volume. This, together with the high num-

ber of abbreviations used, sometimes makes the work a little difficult to handle. A unified system, with the name of the author and the year of publication, would often be more informative. The publisher should perhaps ponder the possibility of publishing the second edition in one volume (of course, with a different page layout).

The introductory parts are followed, still before the translation of the text, by a summary of the contents of the chapters (pp. cxv–cxxvi). This furnishes the chronological sequence of the different events and episodes, while a chapter and paragraph concordance (p. cxxvii) offers a convenient way to search for them.

Next follow the *Translation* (pp. 1–218) and the *Commentary* (pp. 221–1044), which are the main parts of the work. The aim of de Rachewiltz was to achieve an "accurate but at the same time fairly fluent translation into modern English" (p. lxxx), as opposed to Cleaves' King James Version's English, with as few footnotes as possible. This makes its reading a pleasant task even for those who have no special scientific goal.

The Commentary "has grown over the years and is now almost twice the size of that of the first edition" (p. lxxxi). The author states that "Although meant to be both historical and philological, the Commentary does not deal with *all* the linguistic features of the *Secret History*, but only with those that are relevant to the understanding of the text and are still dubious and/or contentious" (p. lxxxi).

In the *Introduction*, de Rachewiltz quotes Waley, who considered that it would be possible to furnish this work with endless annotations (Waley 1963, p. 7). As concerns the present work it may be stated that Igor de Rachewiltz has done great work in approaching the endless or infinite, cf. the 823 pages of the commentary as opposed to the 218 pages of the translation.

The *Bibliography and abbreviations* (pp. 1081–1194) contains such a mass on the topic that it probably deserves independent publication. It is somewhat regrettable that, while the Cyrillic items have been transcribed into Latin script, the Chinese and Japanese items have been left in the original.

The work has seven appendices, from which the most interesting ones are: (1) a *chronological summary of events on Činggis Qan's campaigns in Mongolia, Siberia and Central Asia* (1204–1219) (pp. 1045–1050), (2) *the Secret History passages in the Altan tobči* (pp. 1051–1054), (4) *a paragraph-page reference list to A. Mostaert's Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols* (pp. 1056–1059).

Orientation in the two volumes is facilitated by the index, which consists of three parts, enumerating the proper names (pp. 1195–1245), the different subjects (pp. 1246–1314) and the quoted Mongol grammatical and lexical units (pp. 1315–1342).

Mention may be made of some of the cardinal points treated in the *Introduction*:

Unlike the place of the composition, *Dolo-'an Boldaq* of *Köde'e Aral*, the Year of the Rat mentioned in the colophon is a topic long discussed among scholars. The Year of the Rat was suspected to be 1228, 1240, 1252 and even 1264. Igor de Rachewiltz plumps for 1228, rendering it very likely that the colophon of the "Urtext" – that is *Činggis qan-u huǰa'ur* – later, after an editorial work was transferred to the end of an edited and enlarged version of the text.

The name of the author or/and compiler still remains a mystery. Attributing the authorship to Tata Tonga, Činqai or Šigi Qutuqu would be mere speculation: the name of the author will probably never be known. However, Šigi Qutuqu still seems the best candidate, as he possessed many qualifications for the performance of such a project as the *Secret History*.

The history of the text is very complicated, and cannot be summarised in two or three sentences. Those who wish to learn about it should check on pp. xl–liii. An interesting point here relates to the title of the chronicle. De Rachewiltz states that "Since Činggis Qan never bore the title of *qaγan* (first assumed by his son and successor Ögödei), but only that of *qan*, the original opening words must have been *Činggis Qan-u uǰaɣur*" (p. xli). Some lines earlier, he writes that "our epic chronicle did not require a proper title since it was not written to be published as a book, but was compiled solely for

the members of the imperial clan" (p. xli). These words of de Rachewiltz are true, but it is also possible that the work really did not originally have a title at all, and that the words **Činggis Qaγan-u uǰaγur* are later interpolations, as suggested by the fact that the word *qaγan* was used. Other evidence could be indirect, cf. the text of the *Altan tobči*, which does not contain these words.

While discussing the rhymed passages in the *Secret History* (p. lxvii), as a parallel de Rachewiltz mentions the *Book of Dede Qorqut*. Here, from Lewis he quotes the term *soylama* 'declamation', which is probably the Turkish *söyleme*, a deverbal noun from *söyle-* 'to say, speak, tell'.

One of the most puzzling questions concerning the *Secret History* is its Mongolic language (dialect). It is extremely interesting to ponder on how much it reflects the colloquial language at the time of the transcription, and how much the text in Uighur-Mongol script. De Rachewiltz writes that "In the more than 150 years between the time the *Secret History* was written and the time when it was transcribed phonetically into Chinese, the so-called Middle Mongolian language had undergone and was still undergoing various changes, some of which are attested to in the transcribed text, affecting both vowels and consonants. Among the phonetic changes one should mention the following: *ï* > *i*, *q(ï)* > *k(i)*, *h* (init.) ~ zero, *a'a* ~ *ā*, *e'e* ~ *ē*, *o'o* ~ *ō*, *u'u* ~ *ū*, *ü'ü* > *ǖ*, *a* ~ *o* and *a* > *u* (through assimilation). Moreover, the value of certain consonants (*q/γ*, *k/g* and *t/d*) is still uncertain" (p. lvx).

This view is not entirely acceptable. For the change of *ï* to *i* and *q(ï)* < *k(i)* (if there were such changes), we do not have a clear idea when they took place. They might have been occurred much earlier than the Middle Mongol period: cf. the Kitan word *šawā*, which corresponds to the Literary Mongol word *sibaγun* and supposes that the *-i-* after the sound *s-* was already palatal, since the sound juncture *sï* never results in *ši*. "Proof" for the fact that the vowel *ï* existed in Mongolic is found in the pre-classic monuments in the Uighur script, which show *Q* before *i*. However, even at the time of the writing of the *Secret History*, this was probably merely an orthographic rule, taken from the Turkic Uighurs, in whose language such a differentiation was needed. Further, instead of thinking that the values of the consonants mentioned above were uncertain, it is more probable that the reader or/and transcriber was/were uncertain.

"The ancestral wolf, the crossing of a large body of water (lake or river), the migration to a mountain site and even the presence of a deer – all these elements are common to the two traditions, of which the Turkish is historically the earliest and thus, presumably, the original one" (p. 233). Unfortunately, this is merely an assumption. The date of first documentation can never be taken as evidence of origin. This idea, however, is also present among many researchers of Altaic linguistics: words are considered to be Turkic just because the first documented form appears in Turkic sources, the etymology as yet remaining unknown.

One field where there are many possibilities for further research is etymology. Let us consider an example.

While de Rachewiltz quotes several literature items on the concept of being "endowed with destiny", in the text of the Secret History *de'ere tenggeri-eče ǰaya'atu*, no mention is made of the etymology of the word **ǰayaga*, cf. the Literary Mongol *ǰayaγ-a(n)* 'fate, destiny, predestination, etc.'. The etymology of this word seems to be quite clear. This is a deverbal noun from **ǰiga-*, cf. the Literary Mongol *ǰiγa-* 'to point out, show, demonstrate; to teach, instruct'. The process from **ǰiga-* to **ǰayaga* is very interesting, and reveals that the history of the Mongolic languages does not start in the 13th century. First of all, this word-pair demonstrates the fact that the regressive assimilation (also called the breaking of *i*) in this case happened at a very early date, which explains the modern forms such as the Khalkha *jāx*, and the Buryat *zāxa*, as opposed to the example **mika*, cf. the Literary Mongol *miq-a(n)* 'meat, flesh, body; real, actual', the Khalkha *max(an)*, and the Buryat *myaxan*. This second example clearly reveals that the assimilation did not take place at the same time and in the same way in the two languages. The word in the *Secret History* re-

sulted from the process **ǰiga-gA(n) > *ǰiyaga(n) > ǰayaga(n)* > SH *ǰaya'a(n)*. As evidence for this etymology, mention may be made of pilgrims' inscription of 1323 from Tun-huang, where we find *tngri-eče ǰaɣaritu törögsen* (also quoted by de Rachewiltz, but for other reasons, p. 227). In this location *ǰaɣaritu* is a derivative of the verb **ǰiga-* too: **ǰaga-ri(n)+tU < *ǰiga-ri(n)+tU*.

Numerous questions remain regarding the etymology of proper names, including the different clan or tribal names.

It is stated on p. 228 that " 'Baikal' is a Tungus word meaning 'ocean' ". The etymology of this name, however, is not so simple. The word is present in many Altaic languages, and even other languages, such as Russian, but in the Tungus languages it is not too frequent. It seems to be present in two dialects of Evenki as *bayga*, meaning 'see' and 'wave' (Cincius 1, p. 66). It is usually explained as stemming from the Turkic **bāy köl*, meaning 'rich lake'. If this etymology is correct, then the Tungus word is probably a loanword from the Yakut, which has such forms as *bayaġal*, *bayġal*, *bāyġal* (Pekarskij 1, p. 340), and *bayxal*, *bayaxal* (Pekarskij 1, p. 343).

The name of the offspring of the blue-gray wolf and the fallow doe appears in the *Secret History* as *Batačiqan*. This name has been interpreted in several ways by many researchers. Some of them render it as *Batači Qan*, following the idea of Rašīd ad-Dīn, who has *b.t.ǰī-kaan* in his work. We find *Bata Čaɣan* in the Altan Tobči (Ligeti 1974, p. 13) and *Batcagān* as its Khalkha counterpart, while de Rachewiltz thinks that the ending *-qan*, *-ɣan* is probably a diminutive suffix in this name. Its Turkic origin was proposed on the basis of the Kirgiz word *badačï* 'herdsman' (Radloff 4, p. 1518). I think the Mongol form *batačiqan* could well originate from Turkic, as a compound of two Turkic verbal nouns: thus, it would be **bata-čïqġan*, from the Turkic *bat-*, cf. the Old Turkic *bat-* 'to descend and disappear' (ED 298a), with the gerund in *-A*, while *čïqġan* is the past participle in *-gAn* of the Turkic verb *čïq-*, cf. the Old Turkic *čïq-* 'to go out; to come out' (ED 405b).

In connection with the name *Toroqolǰin Bayan* in section 3, Poppe is quoted, who derives it from *torqon/torqan* 'silk' with the suffix *-lǰin*. Although Poppe is possibly right in deriving it from the word meaning 'silk', it is easy to recognise that the base of that word is *tor*, meaning 'net', the origin of which is not perfectly clear, as we find *tor* in Mongolic (Literary Mongol *toor/toor-a*, where the double *o* is probably used to distinguish it from the dative-locative case marker *+DUr*) and *tor* in Turkic, cf. the Old Turkic *tor* (Clauson has *tōr*, but that has not been proved) 'a net for catching birds or fish' (cf. the Chagatay *tor* 'a (hair-) net made of silk, or a fish-net') (ED 528b).

In a note to section 7, we read "On *qo'a* 'fair, beautiful' (not to be confused with *qo'ai* 'fallow') […]" (p. 245). In fact *qo'a* and *qo'ai* must belong together, and the meaning 'fair, beautiful' is secondary, since the idea of fallow, pale skin, not burnt by the Sun is beauty for the Mongols, and also other nomad peoples. Its etymology is not known, but cf. the Old Turkic *quba* 'pale, pale yellow, pale grey'.

A novelty of this work is the reading *Tumat* (p. 248) instead of *Tümed*. This name also recently appeared in this form in the work of Rybatzki (2004, p. 114), who rejects Šastina's idea that this ethnicon is a Mongolic form of the Turkic ethnicon *Tuba*, but he also takes a stand on the form *Tumat*, considering it very likely that it is connected with the Turkic *tuman* 'fog, mist', and that later chronicles interpret it wrongly as *tümet*. An interesting point here is that the Altan Tobči has *Tümed* (Ligeti 1974, p. 15). Even if we accept this reading as *Tumat*, the question remains of why merely the *Secret History* and no other sources mentions these people.

Among the *Additions and corrections* (pp. 1343–1347), de Rachewiltz makes mention of the second edition of Ligeti's Hungarian translation. Meanwhile, this edition has appeared, and contains some corrections by György Kara to the first edition, dating from 1962. I have compared these corrections with the present English translation, and have come across one interesting point.

Section 194 contains the expression *gürdün-ü tuqul*. De Rachewiltz writes that "This

expression is understood by Haenisch to mean a calf as tall as a wheel (Ha, 80), by Kozin as a calf that turns around because it is sick (Ko, 146), by Ligeti as a calf which is as round as a wheel (Li, 80), by Damdinsüren as a small calf (Da[5], 144), and by Murakami, Ozawa, Cleaves, Onon, Even and Pop, among others, as a calf tied or tethered to a (cart) wheel near the tent to prevent it from sucking its mother's milk, since she is milked every day" (p. 701). De Rachewiltz himself prefers this last interpretation, so he gives "a wheel-*tied* calf". It should be mentioned that Ligeti's first translation was not 'a calf which is as round as a wheel', but "keréknyire megnőtt tulok" 'calf as big as a wheel', which in the second edition was corrected by Kara to "kerékalja kisborjú" 'calf below the wheel(s)' (= below the cart).

Much has been done, and much remains to be done. The merits of this work are many, like the beautiful and intelligible translation of the Mongol text, making available a source for many researchers on a topic which is outstanding even in the world history. The greatest merit is that Igor de Rachewiltz has collected and presented a large number of contradictory views on different questions (or at least has given the pertinent bibliographical data), and this work will therefore surely be a reference handbook in Mongolic studies. Fortunately, it does not eliminate the need for further investigations, but offers many starting-points for researches on different topics. It is also possible to use this work as an encyclopedia on the Mongol culture, after which it may be hoped that the translations of the other (important) Mongol chronicles (such as the *Bolor toli*, *Erdeni-yin erike* and *Altan tobči*) will follow, as urged by Poppe.

References

Cincius, V. I. (1975–1977): *Sravnitel´nyj slovar´ tunguso-man´čžurskih jazykov*. 1–2. Leningrad.

ED: Clauson, G., Sir (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford.

Ligeti, L. (1974): *Histoire secrète des Mongols. Texte en écriture ouigoure incorporé dans la chronique Altan tobči de Blo-bzan bstan-'jin*. Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta 6. Budapest.

Pekarskij, E. K. (1907–1930): *Slovar´ jakutskogo jazyka*. I–III. St. Peterburg–Leningrad.

Radloff, W. (1893–1911): *Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. 1–4. Sanktpeterburg.

Rybatzki, V. (2004): The Personal Names and Titles of the "Forest-folk". *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90, pp. 109–186.

Waley, A. (1963): *The Secret History of the Mongols and Other Pieces*. London.

Béla Kempf

Keith W. Slater (2003): *A Grammar of Mangghuer – A Mongolic Language of China's Qinghai-Gansu Sprachbund. Asian Linguistics Series*. xviii, 382 pages. London, Routledge Curzon. ISBN: 0-7007-1471-5.

Mangghuer is a language with about 37,000 speakers, who live in Minhe County in the Qinghai Province of China. It is strongly influenced by Chinese, from which vast parts of its lexicon and almost its entire phonology are taken. Officially, Mangghuer is recognised as a dialect of Monguor, as is Mongghul of Huzhu County. The area borders areas where the following languages are spoken: Turkic Salar in the Northwest, Mongolian in the North and Northeast, local Chinese dialects in the South and East, Amdo Tibetan in the Southwest and South, and Mongolic Santa and Baonan in the South. Through religion, Central Tibetan might have influenced Mangghuer as well.

After referring to the English and Chinese literature available on Mangghuer, Mongghul, Baonan, Santa, and on Mangghuer culture, Slater states that he has written a theory-independent grammar which accounts for the function and the development of Mangghuer. His corpus consists of approximately 1400 sentences from folktales (Chen et al. 2005) and 2050 elicited sentences.

Chapter 2 (pp. 25–81) deals with "the phonology", which is based on the speech of one young, highly educated male speaker. It begins with a presentation of phonemes with their allophones and an account of where they may appear in a syllable and in a word. Thus, we find the consonant phonemes /p^h, p, f, m, w, t^h, ts^h, ts, s, n, l, $tɕ^h$, tɕ, ɕ, j, $tʂ^h$, tʂ, ʂ, ɻ~ʐ, k^h, k, ŋ, q^h, q/ and /χ/ and the vowels /a, o, e, i, u/. Slater then introduces Poppe's (1955, p. 95, but see page 105) theory that Proto-Mongolic ("Common Mongolian") had a voiceless/voiced distinction, but even if Svantesson et al. (2005) are more accurate in postulating that Proto-Mongolic had an aspired/non-aspired opposition, the language did not have any retroflexes or palatals except for *j. Svantesson et al. (2005, pp. 118, 124) reconstruct *p, *m, *t^h, *t, *s, *n, *l, *r, *$tʃ^h$, *tʃ, *j, *k^h~*q^h, *k~*q, *ŋ, *h. On the other hand, regional Linxia Hui Chinese would only slightly differ from Mangghuer, lacking uvulars and having /v/ and /x/. Then, Slater draws from conditioning vocalism as exhibited by contemporary Mangghuer words to trace back the evolution of "*dʒ" and "*tʃ", without giving a reconstructed or at least Written Mongolian (WM) cognate (as he almost never does). Thus, when he writes "In native Mongolic words, both /zh/ ([tʂ]) and /j/ ([tɕ]) arose diachronically as reflexes of the Mongolic voiced alveo-palatal affricate *dʒ. Phonologically, the distinction between the two phonemes has to do with which segments follow them: when followed by a front vowel, *dʒ gave rise to the palatal /j/; when followed by anything besides a front vowel, *dʒ became the retroflex /zh/." (p. 46), it is easy to overlook that this indeed only holds synchronically, for in the case of "[tʂwəˇ'kaj] zhuergai 'heart'", WM is <jirüke(n)>[1], which means that *dʒ/tʃ was in any case followed by a front vowel in Mongolic and only ceased to be after i-breaking had taken place and *y and *u had merged into Mangghuer /u/. When discussing the development of [ɕ] and [ʂ], he uses the synchronic data of Sun (1990) to speculate about a peculiarity of the source morpheme, without realising that Sun had already cleared the issue with an item in Mongolian Script. He also quotes Poppe's (1955) Middle Mongolian items as reconstructed, even though Poppe clearly indicates that these are mere transcriptions from a Sino-Mongolian source. The syllable structure is $(C_1)(C_2)V(C_3)$ where C_2 may only be a glide, C_1 anything but /ŋ/ or a glide and C_3 /ɻ, ŋ, n, j, w/. Then the alternative approaches of regarding affricates as single consonants or glides as vowels are discussed and convincingly rejected. A section follows in which phonological differences from Mongolic are discussed with examples from Sun (1990) and Poppe (1955): the disappearance of codas, the epenthesis of *i* behind word-final *s and the loss of secondary vowel length. In cases with different vowels, the loss of *h seems to have had different results: *ʃibao'un 'bird' became [ʂɨˇpaw], but *qala'un 'hot' became [q^ha'lʊn]. However, the reconstructions of Svantesson et al. (*sipahu/n, *k^halahun), any dictionary of Written (Classical) Mongolian, or the Khalkha forms (<šuvuu>, dative <šuvuund> and <xaluun>) would have shown that the disappearance of *n in the former case is completely regular. Mangghuer itself has a few instances of unstable *n* as well, surfacing in the dative case. Vowel harmony has disappeared, and rounding harmony may never have taken place. Stress generally falls on the last syllable in Mongolic words, while it may be lexical in Chinese loans. When case markers are attached, the stress shifts to the new last syllable, making word boundaries easy to define. There is a large set of enclitics, including all case markers and the reflexive-possessive marker, which behave just like the similar forms called suffixes in other descriptions of Mongolian languages. Yet, case and possessive markers may follow a number marker that follows the head noun, e.g. Mangghuer:

laohen [aguer san-ge]=nang berqie=du sao-gha ge danang,
old:man daughter three-CL-REFLPOSS pasture=DAT sit-CAUSE do after
After Old Man had his three daughters sit in the pasture, (Slater 2003, p. 106)

[1] Svantesson et al. reconstruct *tʃiryk(ʰʔ)e/n.

Khalkha would allow for a similar construction, e.g.:

… dajn, dajsan, Gitlėr gurvyg "taniad" bür üzen[_]jadaž javav.
war enemy Hitler three:ACC come_to_know: CV3 completely hate:CV1 go:PAST
… [he] "came to know" the war, the enemy and Hitler and went on completely hating them.

In this case, too, the case marker is attached to the word in the final position of the noun phrase, regardless of word class and syntactic function (as also in *Erdeni deslegčijg* 'lieutenant Erdeni (Acc)'), so that it might be more precise to analyse such an "affix" as an enclitic as well, as Slater suggests (p. 166).

Chapter 3 (pp. 82–111) deals with nouns and noun phrases. The pronominal system of Mangghuer has the Qinghai peculiarity of having the third person pronoun *gan* that is possibly related to Mongolic *irken 'people'. There is also a reflexive pronoun *jie* that always appears with a genitive or reflexive enclitic, so that it morphosyntactically resembles WM <öber>. Numerals, which are almost completely Chinese except for 'one', always take a classifier; demonstratives do so optionally. Quantifiers are *ge* for singular indefinite, resembling WM <nige(n)>, and *si* for plural, resembling the Mongolic plural suffix *-*s*, but being a phonologically independent word.

Chapter 4 (pp. 112–193) deals with "the clause". The verb may be derived from a noun, and all such Chinese borrowings irrespective of their former lexical category are derived this way. While most or all finite declarative inflections are historically Mongolic and aspectually/temporally remain in appropriate environments, their old meaning has given way to a Tibetan-type "subjective/objective speaker involvement" system parallel to a perfective/imperfective/future paradigm. Copulas have become obligatory for equational clauses and adjectival predication; they are always imperfective. Causatives still exist and change the valency of their verb by shifting the causee along the chain nominative > accusative > dative. Similarly, some verbs have acquired changing valency, shifting less affected participants to dative if the accusative slot is already occupied.

There are at least ten auxiliaries of identifiable Mongolic origin that rule the bare verb stem. They express inability, high transitivity (highly affected patient), continuity, highly affected experiencer-subject, benefactive and directionality and are treated in notable detail. Some verbal suffixes, combined with a copula, exhibit meanings like processive. Among the particles, Slater considers the hearsay marker *gelang* an areal feature of Gansu-Qinghai and gives examples from regional Mandarin and Amdo Tibetan, yet a similar (but rarely mentioned) marker based on the same stem *ge-* 'to say' exists in Khalkha as well:

Stiven Sigal (…) Žėjms Kameronyg ažilluulax bololtoj gene.
S.S. J.C. employ:IMPF probably(particle) HEARSAY(particle)
It is rumoured that Steven Seagal will probably employ James Cameron (…) as an actor in his movie.

Grammatical relations are treated rather straightforwardly by the author: the subject is unmarked, and the direct object may be unmarked, and therefore the indirect object that always has to be marked by an enclitic is only a PP. There are seven case enclitics, most notably the directive *=ji*, an innovation that Mangghuer only shares with Mongghul. Reflexive possessive *=nang* and non-reflexive possessive *=ni* replace the accusative marker and attach to all other cases. Slater supposes that there are a few instances in which they may be placed *between* the noun and another element as case, e.g. *bieri=ni=du banhua guang* wife=POSS=DAT method OBJ:NEG:COP 'His wife had no recourse' (p. 178). However, there is a genitive-dative with locative or allative meaning in WM, and as genitive and non-reflexive possessive are homophonous in Mangghuer, it is difficult to decide whether Slater is right. The "parallel" construction *puzighuo=nang ge* deep:fried: dough: stick=REFLPOSS SG:INDEF (p. 177) does not

strengthen this point, as the indefinite marker *ge* is an independent word, while =*du* is not. In addition to case, some "relational nouns" can express relative location. None of these rule the genitive or ablative case as their WM cognates do, and Slater's two arguments that they indeed "may also behave in any syntactic way that other nouns do" (p. 180) are one instance of an ablative case and – a nominal compound!

Du qi ti khuonuo yanzi=du wuji-la xi.
now 2:SG that back yard=DAT take:note-PURP go
Now you go look in that backyard.
(Slater 2003, p. 180)

Here, *khuonuo* obviously does not rule anything and should therefore be regarded as the same gram as the postpositional *khuonuo*, but in another stage of grammaticisation (see Bybee et al. 1994, pp. 17–18, 21–22). In the absence of better evidence, these words should not be considered relational nouns, but postpositions.

A rather detailed account on the placement of locatives within the sentence and marked and unmarked time obliques follows. For example, obliques expressing duration never take dative/locative marking and tend to immediately precede the verb, while phrases expressing the temporal context in which actions occur tend to be realised clause-initially and take dative marking if they do not belong to a class of lexical time obliques that never take any markings.

Chapter 5 (pp. 194–220) deals with the subjective/objective system of Mangghuer, a category for which every non-imperative final predication has to be marked. In an unmarked declarative, a first person pronoun will independently of aspect/tense take "subjective" while second and third person take "objective" marking. In interrogative clauses, the distribution is 2–1,3, and in clauses with predicates of uncontrolled action (e.g. perception) ø–1,2,3. If a first person subject used objective marking, this would indicate that her/his actions were not controlled by her/him, ordered by someone else or must be accepted. Using the subjective marking with second or third person subjects would imply certainty or commitment. This system has similarities to Tibetan systems. Lhasa Tibetan, for example, has a system of mirativity (DeLancey 1997), where new and/or unexpected information is marked differently from familiar information.

Chapter 6 (pp. 221–289) deals with clause combining. Slater finds a conflation in Mangghuer of what has been described as converbal (i.e. adverbial) clause modification on the one hand and clause serialisation on the other hand: both phenomena use the same syntactic devices and "seem simply to be two different pragmatic functions, to which any non-final clause can be put." (p. 229) Subordination (+dependent, +embedded) is hard to determine because Mangghuer clauses are rarely a constituent of, or surrounded by, a matrix clause. There are a few constructions of non-final verbs that are clearly embedded such as the finalis construction *-la* or complements of a few verbs like 'begin' (taking non-final zero suffix). The remaining non-final verbs are less clear. *-Ø* (a true innovation!) and *-ji* are almost devoid of meaning, may not be postponed, have subject continuity as implicature and are hardly ever unambiguously embedded. Other converbs may be postponed[2], thus *-tala* 'before' (WM <-tala> 'until') and *-sa* that is claimed to be conditional and concessive-counterfactual, but the concessive examples can easily be interpreted temporally; indeed a rare temporal use is mentioned as well. There are a few converb plus particle syntagms, e.g. *-Ø danang* and *-sang zhi* for temporal succession. Such syntagms are unusual for Mongolian, but Slater presents evidence showing that *danang* cannot be analysed as a juncture. Next to the Mongolic verbal noun *-sang* ~ *-ksEn, *-ku* ~ *-k^{h}y has turned into a converb as well. While

[2] Postponability as an afterthought does occur in other Mongolian languages as well, e.g. with the Khalkha conditionalis in spoken language (according to my own observations). However, it is never mentioned, which is unfortunate because a semantically weak converb as -ž (like Mangghuer *-ji*) may (probably) never be postponed.

it can be postponed, its meaning is difficult to define, ranging from imperfective to perfective in a few cases. *-ku* and *-sang* retain one of their former functions, in that they constitute complement clauses and relative clauses that immediately precede their heads. Relative clauses may gap subject, direct object and obliques, and the head may be dropped. *-ku* and *-sang* may optionally be followed by *-ni*, which is considered an extension of the genitive marker *=ni* to function like Chinese nominaliser/genitive *de*. For relative clauses, this explanation might be correct, but *-ni* occurs with complement clauses as well. There is no instance where *-ni* combines with case markers, and, thus, its syntactic behaviour could be typical of another possible cognate, **inu*, the genitive of the defective third person singular pronoun **i*, which came to express focus after noun phrases and nominalisation after participles.

Chapter 7 (pp. 290–326) deals with reported speech and is mainly devoted to the verb *ge-*. Reported speech may be either not integrated at all or preceded by verba dicendi et sentiendi that take finite suffixes or *-ji* (cf. WM <ögüle-rün> say-CONVERBUM PRAEPARATIVUM or Khalkha *khel-ekh-d-ee* say-default_verbal_noun-dative-REFLEXIVE-POSSESSIVE), so that the matrix clause holds the speech content. Verba sentiendi et dicendi may follow the quotation accompanied by the complementiser *geji*, or else *geji* or *ge-Ø* may function as verbs of quotation themselves. *geji* also appears sentence-finally, which may be related to the use of Mongolian *-ž* in folktales as the main narrative suffix akin to *-žee*. *ge-Ø* may follow onomatopoetic words and even introduce names:

Gan ghu=la Madage, Shu'erge ge yaoliang.
3:SG two:COLL Madage Shu'erge QUOTE go-OBJ:PERF
The two of them, called Madage and Shu'erge, left. (Slater 2003, pp. 301, 356)

In combination with demonstratives, forms of *ge-* may form recapitulation clauses or junctures, especially if *ge-* has already been dropped as in *tingku* < *ting geku* that QUOTE-IMPERF 'thus'. Finally, the ancient meaning 'do' survives in the use of *ge-* as a full verb, i.e. *weilie/diantou/ya ge-* work/nod/what do 'to work, to nod, to do what'.

The last chapter "language contact: summary and implications" (pp. 327–342) presents a discussion of the genetic position of Mangghuer in the Mongolic language family based on Binnick (1987). Binnick's criteria are discussed and, as far as shared innovations as the only reliable criterion are concerned, tentatively lead to a Gansu-Qinghai branch with a sub-branch containing Mangghuer and Mongghul.

A folktale of eight pages, endnotes (unfortunate as always), the list of references, an index of those Mangghuer words and suffixes subject to discussion, and an index of subjects complete the book. The synchronic part of the grammar is generally accurate. Some unusual analyses might become an impetus to improve Mongolian studies in general, i.e. the concept of enclitics presented, and the discussion of converbs vs. serial verbs might help to refine that concept in general linguistics. The diachronic and Mongolian comparative part is rather interesting, too, but contains a number of mistakes and shortcomings that would cause difficulties at least for a general linguist. As the grammar is written clearly and covers the basics of Mangghuer grammar, it can be recommended to a language learner as well.

References

Binnick, Robert (1987): On the Classification of the Mongolian Languages. *Central Asiatic Journal* 31:1–2, pp. 178–195.

Bybee, Joan et al. (1994): *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Language of the World*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Chen Zhaojun et al. (2005): *Folktales of Chinese Minhe Mangghuer. München, Lincom* Europa.

DeLancey, Scott (1997): Mirativity: the Grammatical Marking of Unexpected Information. *Linguistic Typology* 1, pp. 33–52.

Poppe, Nicholas (1955): *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Helsinki: Suomolais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Sun Zhu (ed.) (1990): *Menggu Yuzu Yuyan Cidian*. Xining, Qinghai Peoples Press.

Svantesson, Jan-Olof et al. (2005): *The Phonology of Mongolian*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Benjamin Brosig