Middle Mongolic: When and Where was it Spoken?

Volker RYBATZKI
Institute for Asian and African Studies,
University of Helsinki

Nicholas Poppe states in his *Grammar of Written Mongolian*[1] that "the history of Mongolian dialects can be divided into three main periods: ancient, middle, and modern. Accordingly, science recognizes Ancient Mongolian, Middle Mongolian, and Modern Mongolian". Further he states that "the middle period of the Mongolian languages extends *from the thirteenth to the end of the sixteenth century*". Into this group fall, according to Poppe, the Middle Mongolic texts written in hPags-pa [P] and Arabic script [A], as well as in Chinese characters [S]. Poppe differentiates the spoken languages from the written languages, which according to him, can also be divided into three periods: the pre-classical, the classical, and the modern. More or less identical with the periodization of the spoken language, "pre-classical Mongolian extends *from the very beginning* [i. e. the thirteenth century] *to the beginning of the seventeenth century*". All the Mongolic texts of this period written in Uighur script [U] are classified by Poppe as pre-classical. The periodizations offered in other studies are basically the same as the one of Poppe and differ mainly in terms of terminology.[2]

Traditional periodization of Mongolic languages (f. ex. Poppe 1974, Janhunen 2003)

Spoken Mongol	Ancient Mongolian (P) Proto Mongolic (J)	Para Mongolic (J)	pre-13th c.
	Middle Mongolian (P) Common Mongolic (J)		13th–16th c. post-13th c.
	Modern Mongolian (P)		post-16th c.
Written Mongol	Preclassical Mongolian (P, J)		13th–17th c.
	Classical Mongolian (P, J)		17th–20th c.
	Modern Mongolian (P, J)		20th c.

I think that these periodization schemes, as well as the distinction between Preclassical (i. e. written) and Middle/Common (i. e. spoken) Mongolic contain serious inaccuracies. First of all, are we really allowed to distinguish between Preclassical and Middle Mongolic in respect of terms of spoken and written language? And further, does Middle Mongolic in Uighur script differ to that extent from texts using other scripts that we can make a distinction between written and spoken languages? In order to answer to these questions, I would like to quote one stanza of the *Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels* (*Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*). The first line is according to a blockprint in hPags-pa script from the 14th century, recently discovered in Dunhuang,[3] the second one comes from a

[1] Poppe, Nicholas: *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium NS 1.) Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 1–4.
[2] Rachewiltz, Igor de: Some Reflections on So-called Written Mongolian. In: *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube)*. (Indica et Tibetica 34.) Swisttal-Odendorf 1999, pp. 235–246, on pp. 240–245.
[3] Peng Jinzhang – Wang Jianjun: *Northern Grottoes of Mogaoku, Dunhuang* (Vol. 3.). Beijing 2004, pp. 415–417.

Tibeto-Mongolian bilingual manuscript of the sixteenth century.[4] The two following lines are reconstructions of mine, and show how the text would look if written with Chinese characters or in Arabic script. Please note that all the words of these reconstructions are actually attested.

Extract from the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* "A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels" (§ 314.)

i		P	yos**u·a**r oluqsan [ėd id**e·e**n-i abta]quė :
		U	*yos**uγa**r oluγsan ed id**ege**n-i abtaqui :*
	[*	S	yos**u·a**r oluqsan et id**e·e**n-i/ideyen-i abtaqui]
	[*	A	yos**ā**r oluqsan et id**ē**ni abtaqui]
ii		P	jo**qi**s ügeė [busud-i ülü] ė[ri]gdekuė :
		U	*jo**qi**s ügei busud-i ülü erigdeküi :*
	[*	S	jo**ki**s ügei busud-i ülü erigdeküi]
	[*	A	jo**qu**s/jo**qi**s ügei busud-i ülü erigdeküi]
iii		P	j**e**mis modun[-u oqi]-**aca** abta**yu** :
		U	*j**i**mis modun-u oqi-**aca** abta**yu** :*
	[*	S	j**e**mis modun-u oqi-**aca** abta**yu**]
	[*	A	j**i**miš modunu oqi**sa** abta**yi**]
iv		P	te·**ü**n**ece h[ü**le·esü] unan **buė** .·.
		U	*te**gü**n**ece ü**le**be**sü unan **bui** ::*
	[*	S	te·**ü**n-**ece hü**le·esü unan **bui**]
	[*	A	t**ū**n**ese hü**le**be**sü unan **bī**]

"One should accept properly acquired goods and food, (but) one should not seek for the other unrightful (things). One should take fruit from the top of the tree, (but) if one exceeds that, one falls."

We notice immediately that the variants written in Chinese characters, Uighur or hPags-pa script may be basically considered identical, whereas the one in Arabic script differs considerably from the others. I will come back to the differences soon, at this point it should be noticed that only the variant written in Arabic script reflects the *spoken language*, whereas, for the moment, I shall call the other three variants *texts based on slightly different dialects*.

Two features used to distinguish Middle Mongolic from other stages of Mongolic languages are the development of the initial consonant *h-*, as well as the development of the intervocalic velar *g* as in *-aγa-/-ege*, etc. As can be seen from our example, initial *h-* is preserved in the hPags-pa, Arabic and Chinese variants, whereas in the Uighur variant it does not occur. It has been stated that the reason for this lies in the fact that the Uighur script as used by the Turks did not possess a letter for initial *h-*. Although basically correct, this statement needs verifications. First of all, I would like to make a distinction between *Steppe-Uighur script orthography*, as exemplified f.ex. by the *Legend of Oγuz Qaγan*, and *Oasis-Uighur script orthography* as exemplified by the texts from Turfan and Dunhuang. Secondly, I presume that the orthography used by the Mongols goes back to the steppe-orthography. The differences between these two traditions have never been studied, but with regard to initial *h-* and the development of the intervocalic velar *g* some remarks can be made. In the steppe-orthography there was no special sign for initial *h-*. In the oasis-orthography, on the contrary, there were some possibilities, although not employed regularly, to write this letter. One possibility was to write *heth* accompanied by one dot to the left, the other one

[4] Bosson, James E.: *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa-skya paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 92.) Indiana University, Bloomington 1969, pp.178–179, 268–269; Ligeti, Louis: *Trésor des sentences, subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya paṇḍita*. (Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta III.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1973, pp. 103–104.

was to write an initial *yodh* as in *ürüng ~ yürüng* "white" i. e. **hürüng*, compare Khalaj *hürün*. With regard to the development of the intervocalic velar *g*, four stages are usually distinguished: uncontracted forms, i. e. *-aɣa-/-ege-*, dissimilated forms, i. e. *-aya-/-eye-*, elisioned forms, i. e. *-a·a-/-e·e-*, and lastly contracted forms, i. e. *-ā-/-ē-*. In our example, hPags-pa and Chinese *ide·en* go together against Uighur *idegen* and Arabic *idēn*, but the Chinese variant *ideyen* stands against all the others. The analysis of this data is further complicated by the fact that the Uighur variant is interpreted as if reflecting the oasis-orthography where long vowels are not expressed[5]. The situation seems to be different in the steppe-orthography where uncontracted forms can be used to express long vowels, as f. ex. in *qaɣar* "snow" for *qār*, oasis-orthography *qar*, or *taɣam* "wall" for *tām*, oasis-orthography *tam*. If the Uighur variant of our text is interpreted along these lines, we would obtain *yosūr* instead of *yosuɣar*, *idēn* instead of *idegen*, and *tūnece* instead of *tegünece*, and this would in fact represent the spoken language, very close to the Arabic variant.

According to some opinions expressed, f. ex., by Michael Weiers[6], these variations might reflect dialectical features. I don't think that this interpretation can represent a complete picture of the matter. It is well known that with the unification of the Mongolic tribes by Cinggis qan, there started not only a unification of society and culture, but also of language. This unification of different languages and/or dialects was highly successful, and as I have tried to show in a study about the Middle Mongolic *Alexander Romance*,[7] it is extremely difficult to sort out dialectical traces in the Middle Mongolic text corpus. For this reason, I would interpret the data presented not so much in terms of dialectology, but in terms of reflecting a language that is in a transitional stage, in this case towards Modern Mongolic. In this way, it is also possible to explain why, what concerns initial *h-*, within the same text variants with or without *h-* occur, and why uncontracted, dissimilated, elisioned, or contracted forms of the intervocalic velar *g* are attested side-by-side. Here should be noticed also that in steprhymes, as attested in the *Secret History*, initial *h-* is not considered an independent phoneme anymore, but goes with words having an initial vowel.

Concluding these remarks one may state that there was no literary, supra-linguistic language before the translation of the Tibetan *Kandjur* under Ligdan (1628–1629), and the revision of these translations under the Qing dynasty in 1718–1720. Although the linguistic examples from the 13th century onwards occur as written examples, these are not literary sources, but attempts to record the spoken language in a written form, because literacy demands a certain degree of standardization, not visible in the Middle Mongolic text corpus.

This brings us to the answer of our first question, when was Middle Mongolic spoken? We know that in certain contact areas languages might change dramatically in a relatively short period. The Mongolic languages of the Gansu and Qinghai provinces of China, f. ex., exhibit radical changes in vocabulary, morphology and/or phonology. If the ancestors of these Mongolic languages-speaking people settled in the area only in the second half of the Yuan and in the beginning of the Ming dynasties, then these changes must have developed in a period of only two-three hundred years. But it should be stressed that in this kind of temporally quick changes, it is always a question of typologically very different languages meeting each other; in the case of the Gansu-Qinghai complex, Mongolic, Turkic, Sinitic and Bodic languages. A similar situation can not be attested for Middle Mongolic. Structurally different languages were not around, and changes, for this reason, have been probably rather slow. The thirteenth century can not be considered the beginning of the Middle Mongolic period; on the contrary, this period represents the final stage of the Middle Mongolic period. In the thirteenth century Middle Mongolic must have had already a considerable depth in time, and I would therefore suggest tentatively that

[5] In the Uighur *Totenbuch* the forms *tïïn* vs. *tïn*, *yïl* vs. *yïïl* do not indicate length, but are attempts to differentiate ortoghraphically two words with different semantics that are traditionally written in the same way.

[6] Weiers, Michael: Zur Frage des Verhältnisses des Altmongolischen zum Mittelmongolischen. In: *Mongolian Studies*. Ed. by Louis Ligeti. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XIV.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1970, pp. 581–590.

[7] Rybatzki, Volker: Linguistic particularities in the Middle Mongol Alexander Romance. In: *Turfan Revisited — The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Ed. by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst – Simone-Christiane Raschmann – Jens Wilkens – Marianne Yaldiz – Peter Zieme. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17.) Berlin 2004, pp. 284–296.

Middle Mongolic came into existence around the 9th century at the latest. As we will see in connection with the answer to the question where Middle Mongolic was spoken, this hypothesis might get some support from historical evidence.

For answering the question where Middle Mongolic was spoken, we have to go back in time until the beginning of the Christian era. At this time, the territory of Western Mongolia, Xinjiang, Gansu and Western Inner Mongolia was inhabitated by Indo-Iranian and Tocharian people; to the east the territory was held by a people called Xiongnu. The Xiongnu had once succeeded to force one of the Tocharian groups, the Yuezhi, inhabiting Gansu, the western parts of Inner Mongolia and the eastern parts of Xinjiang, to move to the west, but this had not resulted in a western extention of Xiongnu power. The Xiongnu, probably speaking a language related to Ketic, included into their empire among others also ethnic people speaking Turkic and Mongolic languages. This ethnic picture changes around the 2nd/3rd century A. D. when the Xiongnu empire broke down. At this point the Xiongnu started to emigrate westwards. In their emigration they were followed by the Bolghar-Turkic component of their former empire, whereas those Turks speaking Common Turkic seem to have stayed behind, spreading into Western Mongolia and Southern Siberia, formerly inhabited by Indo-Iranian people. It is interesting to notice that the Old Turkic Runic inscriptions of the Turk empire come mostly from this very same area. Probably, some Common Turkic and Mongolic groups followed the Xiongnu westwards, but this can not be verified by linguistic evidence. The eastern part of Mongolia was at this point ruled by the Ruanruan, most probably a Mongolic speaking ethnic group, who around the 4th century seems to have pushed the Turks out of Western Mongolia into Southern Siberia. In Manchuria, on the other hand, another Mongolic group, the Xianpi, started to build an empire around the 2nd–3rd century. Their empire was in turn followed by those of the Toba-Wei and Tuyuhun, covering roughly the areas of Western Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, Gansu/Qinghai and Eastern Xinjiang, in successive order. The situation in Mongolia changed to some degree with the emergence of the First and Second Turk Empires in 552 and 691. After the defeat of the Ruanruan by the Turks in 552, the later built an empire centered in Western-Middle Mongolia. We have a quite clear picture about the western conquests of the Turks, but we do not know how far their influence reached eastwards, perhaps it was only a nominal domination. In this case, Eastern Mongolia might still have been inhabited by Mongolic groups. In fact, the Old Turkic inscription from the 8th century mention some Mongolic groups living to the east and south of their power-center in Mongolia. These include the Toquz and Otuz Tatar, as well as the Khitan and Tatabï in the east, the Tabγac, i. e. the Toba-Wei, and the Taŋut, perhaps to be identified with the Tuyuhun, in the south. The Mongolic groups mentioned until now seem to have spoken, at least as far as we know, Mongolic dialects to some extent different from Common Mongolic. The only exception are the Toquz and Otuz Tatar who are supposed to have spoken a Common Mongolic dialect. The ethnical picture of Mongolia did not change greatly when the Second Turk Empire was conquered in 742 by the Uighurs, another Turkic speaking group. Conversely, the conquest of the Uighur empire by the Kirghiz, a Turkic group from Southern Siberia, in 840, was the onset for a change in the ethnic picture of Mongolia. Although the Uighurs left Mongolia, settling in Inner Mongolia, Gansu and Xinjiang, the Kirghiz did not make any attempt to occupy the former Uighur empire. Thus Mongolia lost, at least for that moment, its Turkic population and, at the same time, a political power-vacuum came into existence. This power-vacuum was temporarily filled by the Khitan, who by the 920ies had conquered Mongolia up to the Orkhon river. However, being more interested in the conquest of Northern China than occupying Mongolia, the Khitan invited the Uighurs to return to their former homeland, which the later rejected. It must have been at this point, beginning around the middle to the end of the 9th century, and for sure after the Uighurs' refusal to return to Mongolia, that western parts of the country were inhabited again by Turkic speaking groups steming from the steppe-region to the west of Mongolia. In the eastern part of Mongolia, older Mongolic ethnic groups began to be absorbed by new groups speaking other dialects or languages. Käthe Uray-

Kőhalmi has shown in a number of studies[8] that the Middle Mongolic culture as represented in the *Secret History* contains elements of various cultural layers, some of which seem to originate from events that happened at this point of history. During the 8th and 9th centuries, ancestors of those Mongolic groups who later spoke Middle Mongolic, were living approximately in an area situated to the southeast of Lake Baikal and in Northeastern Mongolia. This region might be characterized as taiga-region, and the main subsistence was hunting. The transformation of this forestial culture to a steppe orientated culture of cattle-breeders, as depicted also in the first chapters of the *Secret History*, seems to have occurred in the 9th and 10th centuries, following the collapse of the Uighur empire. The emergence of Middle Mongolic around the same time would thus coincide with the movement of these Mongolic people from the forest-zone to the steppe-zone. This was a radical change in the mode of life, culture, and environment that properly further strengthened and intensified the developmenent of Middle Mongolic.

Finnishing this paper, I would like to make a new proposal for the diachronical classification of Mongolic languages:

(i) 2nd/3rd to 7th/8th century: Old Mongolic. Mongolic languages of this period include those of the Xianpi, Ruanruan, Toba-Wei and Tuyuhun. Examples are recorded only in Ch. sources. Due to the ambiguity of the Ch. script, the exact relation of these languages with regard to Middle and Modern Mongolic languages is unclear, for some of these languages also a Turkic background has been claimed.

(ii) 7th/8th and 9th century: Transitory stage between Old and Middle Mongolic. In the Old Turkic inscriptions of this period are mentioned the Toba-Wei (Tabγac) and Tuyuhun (Taŋut) already known from the previous period. Newcomers in these sources are the Toquz and Otuz Tatar as well as the Khitan. Another ethnic group of Mongolic origin was that of the Tatabï (cf. the suffix -*bï* = *Xianpi*?) mentioned in the Old Turkic sources always together with the Khitan people.

(iii) 9th/10th to the end of the 14th, middle of the 15th century: Middle Mongolic. This stage includes the language(s) of the Khitans, Mongols, and other ethnic units. The exact linguistic status of these ethnic groups, as well as the relationship between them has still to be investigated. Possibly some of them represented different branches of Mongolic than the modern Mongolic languages (cf. Modern Turkic languages vs. Chuvash vs. Khalaj). Examples of these languages are attested through foreign transcriptions and indigenous texts for Khitan and Middle Mongolic. However, the examples for Khitan, written in a Sinitic script, still need to be fully deciphered. For this reason, they are not yet available for the periodization of Mongolic languages. The examples of Middle Mongolic should be investigated with regard to dialectical variants, but as mentioned before, this task is not an easy one due to the language policy of Cinggis qan. Taking into consideration the number of Modern Mongolic features in some late Middle Mongolic sources, as for example the Muqaddimat al-Adab, the 14th–15th centuries should be considered the end of the Middle Mongolic period.

(iv) 15th/16th to 17th/18th century. Transitory stage between Middle and Pre-Modern Mongolic. This period saw the formation of supra-linguistic languages for the Buddhist translations of the time, Early Classical Literary Mongol for the Easterns Mongols, Early Classical Literary Oirat for

[8] Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Sibirische Parallelen zur Ethnographie der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen. In: *Mongolian Studies*. Ed. by Louis Ligeti. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XIV.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1970, pp. 247–264; Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Synkretismus im Staatskult der frühen Dschingisiden. *Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens*. Ed. by Walther Heissig – Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. (Studies in Oriental Religions 13.) Wiesbaden, 1987, pp. 136–158; Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen aus ethnologischer Sicht. In: *Tümen tümen nasulatuγai · The Early Mongols: Language, Culture and History. Studies in Honour of Igor de Rachewiltz On the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*. Ed. by Volker Rybatzki – Alessandra Pozzi – Peter W. Geier – John R. Krueger. (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Studies 173.) Indiana University Bloomington, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Bloomington 2009, pp. 183–194.

the Western Mongols. Besides the large body of Buddhist literature, mainly translated from Tibetan, there existed also other groups of texts, namely non-canonical religious texts, chronicles [for example *Cayan teüke* (middle of the 16th century), *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur* (after 1607), *Altan tobci* (1651–1655), *Sira tuγuji* (1651–62), *Altan tobci anonymus* (after 1655), *Erdeni-yin tobci* (1662), *Asaraγci neretü-yin teüke* (1677)], Sino-Mongolian vocabularies [for example *Yiyu* (middle of the 16th century), *Lulang sailüe* (1610), *Wubei zhi* (1621), *Bahong yishi* (end of the 17th century), *Yishi yiyu* (end of the 17th century)], calender fragments, inscriptions and civil documents. The exact relation between these different sources on one hand, and Early Classical Literary Mongol and the spoken languages of that time on the other, is nearly unexplored, some investigations have been made by Poppe (1926)[9] and Weiers (1989).[10]

(v) 18th to the end of the 19th century. For this period, that might be called Pre-Modern Mongolic with regard to the spoken languages, and Classical Literary Mongol with regard to the supra-linguistic literary language, there exist a large number of sources. Mainly these are literary sources, the spoken language can be investigated through the different wordlists and grammars produced by travellers among the Mongols, for example M. A. Castrén, J. E. Fischer, J. G. Gmelin, R. Leech, W. R. H. Merk, D. G. Messerschmidt, P. S. Pallas, J. T. Stralenberg, N. Witsen, H. A. Zwick and many others. Besides the Mongol-Uigur and Clear script, some Mongols use the Arabic script as literary tool.

(vi) From the end of the 19th century onwards: The Pre-Modern Mongolic languages change into Modern Mongolic languages, greatly due to the adaption of various "modern" traits, mainly in terminolgy, from Russian and Chinese. The Classical Literary language changes into Literary languages. These languages are used in a supra-literary way not only for religious texts, but also for texts of the daily life. The script of the literary languages changes for some Mongolic languages from Mongol-Uighur or Clear sript into Roman and/or Cyrillic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bosson, James E.: *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa-skya paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian.* (Uralic and Altaic Series 92.) Indiana University, Bloomington 1969.

Janhunen, Juha: Proto-Mongolic. In: *The Mongolic Languages*. Ed. by Juha Janhunen. (Routledge Language Family Series) London – New York 2003, pp. 1–29.

Ligeti, Louis: *Trésor des sentences, subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya paṇḍita*. (Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae Collecta III.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1973.

Peng Jinzhang – Wang Jianjun: *Northern Grottoes of Mogaoku, Dunhuang* (Vol. 3.). Beijing 2004.

Poppe, N. N.: Geserica. Untersuchung der sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten der mongolischen Version des Geserkhan. In: *Asia Major* 3 (1926), pp. 1–32, 167–193.

Poppe, Nicholas: *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium NS 1.) Wiesbaden 1974.

Rachewiltz, Igor de: Some Reflections on So-called Written Mongolian. In: *Studia Tibetica et Mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube).* (Indica et Tibetica 34.) Swisttal-Odendorf 1999, pp. 235–246.

[9] Poppe, N. N.: Geserica. Untersuchung der sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten der mongolischen Version des Geserkhan. In: *Asia Major* 3. (1926), pp. 1–32, 167–193.

[10] Weiers, Michael: Bemerkungen zu einigen sprachlichen Eigenheiten des Südostmongolischen im 17. Jahrhundert. In: *Gedanke und Wirkung. Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag von N. Poppe*. Ed. by Walther Heissig – Klaus Sagaster. (Asiatische Forschungen 108.) Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden pp. 366–372.

Rybatzki, Volker: Linguistic particularities in the Middle Mongol Alexander Romance. In: *Turfan Revisited — The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Ed. by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Simone-Christiane Raschmann – Jens Wilkens – Marianne Yaldiz – Peter Zieme. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17.) Berlin 2004, pp. 284–296.

Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen aus ethnologischer Sicht. In: *Tümen tümen nasulatuγai · The Early Mongols: Language, Culture and History. Studies in Honour of Igor de Rachewiltz On the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*. Ed. by Volker Rybatzki – Alessandra Pozzi – Peter W. Geier – John R. Krueger. (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Studies 173.) Indiana University Bloomington, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Bloomington 2009, pp. 183–194.

Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Sibirische Parallelen zur Ethnographie der Geheimen Geschichte der Mongolen. In: *Mongolian Studies*. Ed. by Louis Ligeti. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XIV.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1970, pp. 247–264.

Uray-Kőhalmi, Käthe: Synkretismus im Staatskult der frühen Dschingisiden. *Synkretismus in den Religionen Zentralasiens*. Ed. by Walther Heissig – Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. (Studies in Oriental Religions 13.) Wiesbaden, 1987, pp. 136–158.

Weiers, Michael: Zur Frage des Verhältnisses des Altmongolischen zum Mittelmongolischen. In: *Mongolian Studies*. Ed. by Louis Ligeti. (Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XIV.) Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1970, pp. 581–590.

Weiers, Michael: Bemerkungen zu einigen sprachlichen Eigenheiten des Südostmongolischen im 17. Jahrhundert. In: *Gedanke und Wirkung. Festschrift zum 90. Geburtstag von N. Poppe*. Ed. by Walther Heissig – Klaus Sagaster. (Asiatische Forschungen 108.) Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden pp. 366–372.