HARVARD JOURNAL
OF ASIATIC
STUDIES

VOLUME 13 1950 NUMBERS 1 & 2

REVIEW ON

Histoire secrète des Mongols
de Paul PELLIOT

(N. POPPE)

HARVARD-YENCHING INSTITUTE

1950

severe critic of BHARTṚHARI. To him BHARTṚHARI is the poet of a useless class, the lettered but frustrated office-seeker. His poetry is, *par excellence*, literature of escape (*Q* 59, *E* 81). His love "shows nothing but unsatisfied desire," his renunciation is "a hankering to be realized in the vague future, with growing disgust" (*E* 80-81, surely *K.* 301 is excepted from this judgment).

This criticism I find stimulating even when I disagree, for too little attention has been given to the social origins of Indian literature. Personally I feel that the status concept is more useful than that of class in examining such origins. To me BARṬṚHARI represents that part of the Brahmin status group that was tempted away from the proper and useful social function of the group.[9] The beauty and the sorrow of his poetry are the products of temptation and disappointment.

But if either of these interpretations explains the mood of the poems it does not explain the expression. Beethoven too was a hanger-on at rich men's houses and a singularly frustrated one. The poetry of BHARTṚHARI remains beautiful and sometimes truly great. KOSAMBI, even with his strong social conscience, is well aware of this. And we may be thankful that he is, for it has led him to do more for our enjoyment of BHARTṚHARI than has been done these many centuries.

DANIEL H. H. INGALLS

Harvard University

Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot: I. Histoire secrète des Mongols. Restitution du texte mongol et traduction française des chapitres i à vi. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1949. Pp. ii + 196.

PELLIOT spent many years working on this book and its publication was impatiently awaited by all Mongolists. PELLIOT's

[9] The group as a whole was certainly useful, giving to India its cultural unity, its self-respect and what understanding it had of the universe. The economic class of courtly sycophants may have been useless but this class was not specifically Brahmin. The Brahmin tradition seems to me more important for the understanding of BHARTṚHARI's poetry than the class situation of sycophants.

premature death prevented him from completing this brilliantly planned work; all that was found in his papers was the reconstruction of the text and the translation of the first 185 paragraphs of the total 282 paragraphs. No commentary and no notes were found. Thus it is impossible to understand what conceptions guided PELLIOT when choosing his system of transcription. In certain respects, those missing parts of his work would be of even greater importance than what has been published, because there are already several other reconstructions and translations of the *Secret History*.

PELLIOT's transcription coincides, in general, with that used for the Written Mongolian: *č* = English *ch*; *ǰ* = Eng. *j*; *š* = Eng. *sh*; *q* = velar postlingual consonant; *ö* and *ü* = German *ö* and *ü* (or French *eu* and *u*). There is only one deviation from the usual transcription: *ä* instead of *e*. PELLIOT's preference for *ä* cannot be justified from the point of view of Mongolian phonology, because Mongolian *e* is a closed *e* and, besides, there is in the Colloquial Mongolian the vowel *ä* < **a* in certain positions, e. g., Kalmuck *bäṛi* < *bari* "keep," *täräṇ* < *tariyan* "field," and so on. The ḥP'ags-pa script, on the other hand, has two characters for *e*-sounds: one for *e* and another for a closed, narrow *ė*, e. g., *ėbeč'in* "disease," *ėde* "these," *ėǰen* "master," *ėlč'in* "messengers," *ėse* "not," *ėŋk'e* "peace," *dėŋri* "heaven," *t'ėri·un* "first," etc. Therefore, it is beyond doubt that in the language of the *Secret History*, which coincides, in general, with that of the ḥP'ags-pa script, there was *ė* and not *ä* in the following words: *ebečin* "disease," *ede* "these," *eǰen* "master," *elčin* "messengers," *engke* "peace," *ese* "not," *tengeri* or *tengri* "heaven," etc.

PELLIOT also uses two characters for *i*: one for the front vowel *i* and another for the back vowel *ï* of the Turkic type. This is not an innovation, because B. Ya. VLADIMIRCOV already used *i* only in front-vocalic words and transcribed the same vowel with *ï* in back-vocalic words (*Sravnitel'naya grammatika*, Leningrad, 1929). In this connection we must point out that at the time when the *Secret History* was written the back vowel **ï* had already merged with **i* in almost all cases. This process began in the Proto-Mongolian and its consequence was the palatalization of consonants and the

development of **γ > y*, **t > č*, **d > ǰ*, **s > š*: *ayil < *aγil < *aγïl* "nomad house," *čilaγun < *tilaγun < *tïlaγun* "stone," *aǰirγa < *adirγa < *adïrγa* "stallion," *širuγa < *siruγa < *sïruγa* "earth." There was no *ï* in Common Mongolian, except for the syllables *qï* and *γï*, which were preserved longer than all the others. Thus in manuscripts of the fourteenth century we still find such forms as *qilinča* "sin" and so on. The Moghul language in Afghanistan, too, preserved *qi* and *γi*, in which the vowel *i* is, in RAMSTEDT's opinion, a back vowel (*Mogholica*, pp. 50-51). The group *qi* occurs several times in the language of the ḥP'ags-pa script, e. g., *ǰoqiyaqu* "to establish," *saqiqč'in* "those who protect, protectors," but sometimes *k'i* is substituted for this group: *tak'iya* "hen." The ḥP'ags-pa script does not have any special letter for *ï* and the vowels in *qi* and *k'i* are rendered by the same letter. But the presence of the consonants *k* and *g* in the syllables *ki* and *gi* in the language of the *Secret History* is evidence that *i* could not be a back vowel: otherwise we should expect *qi* and not *ki*.

Therefore, PELLIOT's transcription of such words as *a'ušgïtu* (§13), *yadanggï* (§14), *kïlbar-a* (§22), *kïlqasun-bar* (§25), *algïnčï* (§37), *kïyan* (§50), *kïtad-un* (§53), *takï* (§55), *tolkïstala* (§56), *kïsal kïsan* (§58), and so on, in which the velar *q* (in HAENISCH's transcription *ḳ*) developed into *k*, is ample proof that **ï* had already merged with **i*: otherwise *q* would not have become *k*. Thus if even the groups *qï* and *γï*, which, as remarked above, were preserved longer than all other groups with *ï*, had already become *ki* and *gi*, this is proof that there was no *ï* at all in the language of the *Secret History*.

PELLIOT also renders the *i̯*-element in diphthongs with *ï* : *hoï* (§12), *asuqaï* (§24), *aquï-dur* (§25), and so on. Such diphthongs never existed in Mongolian and they are impossible from the phonophysiological point of view. Even in the Turkic languages, where there is a sharp distinction between *i* and *ï*, there are only *i̯*-diphthongs, e. g., *ai̯* or *ay* "moon."

The Chinese transliteration, with few exceptions, does not distinguish between *o* and *ö*, *u* and *ü*, and renders these four sounds only as *o* and *u*. PELLIOT tries to distinguish *o* and *ö*, *u* and *ü*, i. e., he substitutes *ö* for *o* and *ü* for *u* in supposedly front-vocalic words. Since, with few exceptions, the Chinese transcription does not distinguish between *o* and *ö*, *u* and *ü*, such forms as *ökba* (§19), *kötöljü* (§56), *ügüläjü* (§53), *hünür* (§55), and so on, are forms reconstructed with regard to the Mongolian dialects. Therefore, it is difficult to decide what *o* and *u* mean in cases where the word concerned is unknown in Colloquial Mongolian. PELLIOT admits in all such cases the possibility that *o* may be *o* as well as *ö* and that *u* may be both *u* and *ü*, e. g., *tün-tür* (§50 and another form *tun-a*), *büyür* (§53 and *buyur*), and so on. But there is often the danger that back-vocalic words may be transformed into front-vocalic ones and vice-versa, and, indeed, we find in the romanization of the text numerous forms which need correction: *ǰöči* (or *ǰoči* §51), the name of Chingis Khan's son, which is only *ǰoči* and never *ǰöči* and means "guest"; the name of the lake is *buyur* or *buyir* and not *büyür* (§53); the word *möyilsün* "bird-cherry tree" (§74) is only *moyilsun* (cf. Buriat *moi̯hoŋ*, Khalkha *moe̯l~moe̯s id.*); the name of the *süldüs* tribe (§82) can be only *suldus* because in §120 we find the ablative form *suldus-ača*.

The verbal forms *bui* and *buyu* seem to have nothing in common with the defective verb *bü-* "to be" and must not be transcribed as *büi* and *büyü* (§35, 20), because the traditional Mongolian reading is *bui* (and even *boi̯*) and *buyu̯*, and in the Aga-Buriat dialect *bui* developed into *bi̯*, i. e., with a back *i̯* < **ui̯*: cf. *xaraŋxi̯* < **qaraŋγui̯* "darkness."

The *Secret History* is, from the point of view of its language, a difficult text and contains many passages which are difficult to understand and translate adequately. We do not know whether PELLIOT made his translation directly from the Mongolian text or from the Chinese interlinear translation and to what degree he took the latter into consideration. We do not know why PELLIOT sometimes rejects the Chinese interpretation of words and expressions and sometimes fully agrees with it. PELLIOT's translation is in general precise and excellent, but there are also passages which need correction. It is impossible to subject his translation to a thorough revision in this brief review, and, therefore, we confine ourselves to a few examples.

§82: *tärä aldaqsan gü'ün yäkä dawu-bar bariya gü'ün aldaba kä'än qayïlaqu-tur* " comme cet homme qui l'avait laissé échapper criait à grande voix: Saisissons-le; j'ai laissé l'homme échapper . . ." The correct translation must be: " when that man who let him escape shouted with a loud voice: 'I let the prisoner escape,' . . ." The word *bariya* is not a voluntative of *bari-* " to seize " but a noun: cf. Kalmuck (RAMSTEDT) *bäŕä* < **bariya* " Arrest, Haftung, Pfand," Ordos (MOSTAERT) *barïā* " fers qu'on met à un prisonnier," *barïāt'ā* " portant des fers (prisonnier)." In this sentence *bariya* is not a verb but a syntactical attribute to *gü'ün* " man." In HAENISCH's dictionary there is no such word, but HAENISCH's translation (*Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, Leipzig, 1948, p. 16) is correct: " Der Gefangene ist entkommen " (better: " I let the prisoner escape ").

§96: *bökörä-yin böksä-tür čäkäri-yin čä'äji-tür aduqai* [" Cette pensée] demeurera à la pointe de mes reins, au diafragme de ma poitrine." HAENISCH translated this in the following manner: " Ich will dir anhangen wie der Hintere an der Lenden und die Brust am Halse " (p. 21). Both translations are inadequate. This is an interesting passage, as it shows that the Chinese transcribers did not understand the Mongolian text, which seems to have been written in the Uighur script. It is known that the Uighur script sometimes renders different sounds with the same letters, e. g., *k* and *g*. If we substitute *g* for *k* in *bökörä* and *čäkäri* and take into account the fact that *g* becomes ' in the language of the *Secret History*, this passage must read as follows: *bö'örä-yin böksä-dür čä'äri-yin čä'äji-dür atuqai*. This is a well-known Mongolian proverb: cf. Khalkha *bȫr bȫgsanda t'sēr t'sēdžɪndə* " the kidneys [are] in the back, the sacred [thought is] in the chest." In the *Secret History* this appears in another recension: " that of the kidneys must be in the back, that of the holiness in the chest."

§111: **qa***tar mawuï Čilgär bï*₀ **qa***tun Üjin-tür* **qa***lqu bolun* **qa***muq Märkit-tä huntawu* (?) **qa***raču mawu Čilgär*₀ **qa***ra täri'ün-dür-iyän gürtägü bolba*₀ . . . **qu***nar mawu Čilgär bï*₀ **qu***tuqtai sutaï Üjin-i* **qu***riyaju irägü bolun*₀ **qo***tola Märki*[*t*]*-tä huntawu* (?) *bolba*. Translation: " mauvais Čilgär *avide* (?) que je suis! Étant

. . . . . sur la dame *üjin*, j'ai été un fléau pour tous les Märkit. Mauvais et vil Čilgär, je suis arrivé au rang de mes << têtes noires >> . . . . mauvais Čilgär *rapace* (?) que je suis! En venant et recueillant l'*üjin* sainte et auguste, j'ai été un fléau pour l'ensemble des Märkit. Mauvais Čilgär pourri, je suis arrivé au rang de mes têtes desséchées." This passage must be translated in another manner. First of all, we must again reconstruct the Mongolian text according to the rules of the Uighur spelling and remember that *t/d* and *q/γ* are not distinguished (especially in ancient texts). We reconstruct this passage as follows:

γadar mayui Čilger bi
qatun Üjin-dür qalqu bolun
qamuγ merkid-te untayu
qaraču mayu Čilger
qara terigün-dür-iyen kürtekü bolba.
. . . . . .
qunar mayu Čilger bi
qutuγtai sutai Üjin-i
quriyaju irekü bolun
qotola merkid-te untayu bolba.
qokir mayu Čilger
qokimai terigün-dür-iyen kürtekü bolba bi.

The word *qatar* must be read *γadar* " outside, appearance," *qalqu* means " to offend," *huntawu* = *untayu* (~ Mo. *untuγu*, Khalkha *un't'ū*) " anger," the expression *terigün-dür-iyen kürtekü* is well known and means " to pay with his head " (or " to lose his head "), *qunar* " cloth " (a well-known word), *quriya-* " to collect, to take, to confiscate," *qokir* " miserable," *qokimai terigün* " skull." The only possible translation is: " I, Chilger, of poor appearance, I caused anger in all the Merkits, when offending the queen Üjin. The plebeian, bad Chilger paid with his black head. . . . I, Chilger poorly clothed, I caused anger in all the Merkits, when coming to take the holy and august Üjin. The miserable, bad Chilger, I paid with my skull." HAENISCH's translation of this passage (p. 28), though not very precise, is better than that of PELLIOT.

There are several passages misunderstood by the Chinese transcribers and, therefore, also by the translator. We chose these passages purposely, because mistakes in the Chinese transcription prove that the original was written with Uighur letters, which can be easily confused. For instance, one who did not understand the text could easily incorrectly transcribe the words in question. The original was transcribed according to the phonetic system of the ḥP'ags-pa script and it is not impossible that the original text was first rewritten with the ḥP'ags-pa letters and contained mistakes which were automatically reproduced in the Chinese transcription. All these questions will find a satisfactory solution in the future, but it is beyond doubt that the transcribers sometimes did not understand the text.

PELLIOT's work is a great achievement, but it is, together with all works of his predecessors on the *Secret History*, only the beginning of large-scale research. In this connection, we may express our deep sorrow that PELLIOT himself was not destined to continue his research on the *Secret History*.

Nicholas POPPE

University of Washington

Jimbun Kenkyū, Studies in the Humanities (The Journal of the Literary Association of the Osaka City University), Vol. 1, Nos. 1-4, Nov. 1949–Feb. 1950.

It is a pleasure to see that in a period when interest in humanities is losing ground, the Literary Association of the Ōsaka City University has begun to publish a new quarterly devoted to this field. The articles cover general interest in humanities as well as some specific items dealing with China and Japan. I should like to mention those which are within the scope of our journal. In the first number, TANIYAMA Shigeru 谷山茂 publishes an important article on the concept of "purity" in Japanese poetry, "Seifūbi to sono tenkai" 清風美とその展開. He has discussed the origin of the terms *kiyo* 清 pure and *saya*; the latter has its origin in the onomatopoeia *sayasaya*, the noise of the running

water in a brook or the noise of a gentle wind, and has the connotation of purity and transparency 清明. In the second and third paragraphs, TANIYAMA has examined these two terms and their usage in the Man'yōshū 萬葉集 and in ancient Japanese prosody. In the fourth paragraph he has dealt with these concepts in the Kokinshū 古今集. In the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth paragraphs he has shown how these concepts of purity and transparency were treated by MIBU no Tadamine 壬生忠岑, one of the well-known 36 poets, by FUJIWARA Kintō 藤原公任 (966-1041) and by FUJIWARA Toshinari 俊成 (1114-1204). In the last paragraph TANIYAMA has cited the importance of these poetical terms during the Kamakara period (1183-1333). In the same number, HAMADA Atsushi 濱田敦 publishes the first part of an article on obstructed sounds and those represented by a final *n* "Sokuon to hatsuon" 促音と撥音.

In the second number the following articles are printed: the second and last part of HAMADA's composition, a very interesting work by YAMANE Tokutarō 山根德太郎 on the city-planning of Ta-tu, capital of the Yüan dynasty, "Gen daito no heimen haichi" 元大都の平面配置. KANDA Kiichirō 神田善一郎 has contributed an article on NOMURA Kōen, author of a Chinese poem of the *tz'u* 詞 genre, "Wasureraretaru tenshi sakka Nomura Kōen ni tsuite" 忘れられたる填詞作家野村篁園について and an informative article by MAEDA Masato 前田正人 on the publications of 1949 dealing with Japanese language studies. He mentions the publication of the new quarterly *Kikan kokugo gaku* 季刊國語學 in 1948 in which appeared many important articles on the Japanese language. MAEDA Masato especially mentions several works of TOKIEDA Motoki 時枝誠記 dealing with the history of the Japanese language. He also mentions articles published in the monthly journal *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 國語と國文學. MAEDA brings to the attention of the reader the interesting article by IKEGAMI Teizō 池上禎造 in *Kokugo kokubun* 國語國文, No. 1, on the pronunciation in Japanese of the *h* sound which disappeared in an intervocalic position toward the end of the eleventh century, but not in compounds like *haha* "mother" or *asahi* "morning sun." He also mentions the newly published book of