

Werk

Titel: Reviews

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2008

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0012|LOG_0037

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reviews

Martine Robbeets: Review of Kyōko Maezono, (1) *Intransitiv-, Transitiv-, Kausativ- und Passivverben im Mandschu und Mongolischen*. (Tunguso-Sibirica 18.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007. 159 pages. ISBN: 978-3-447-05360-7, (2) *Verbbildungs-Suffixe im Mandschu und Mongolischen*. (Tunguso-Sibirica 19.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007. 184 pages. ISBN: 978-3-447-05361-7

Martine Robbeets, Onderzoekseenheid Taalkunde Blijde-Inkomststraat 21 - bus 3308 3000 Leuven België. E-mail: martine_robbeets@hotmail.com

1. Identifying the works

In both of these volumes the author makes a historical comparative study of verbal morphology in Manchu and Mongolian, based on material from corpora dating back to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and translated from Manchu into Mongolian or vice versa. Verbs and verbal suffixes are compared in the concrete context of the translated sentences in which they appear. Although the two volumes share basic material and approach, the nature, purpose and topic of each are radically different. Whereas the first volume (Tunguso-Sibirica 18) is a contrastive typological study that deals with functional parallels between Manchu and Mongolian, the second volume (Tunguso-Sibirica 19) contains a comparative genealogical study that addresses the question of linguistic affiliation. The former study concentrates on markers of verbal inflection in the category of diathesis such as transitive, intransitive, causative and passive, while the topic of the latter study is verbal derivation, comparing suffixes that derive verbs from nouns and verbs.

In spite of these differences I have chosen to evaluate both volumes in a single review because they are published as subsequent volumes in one series, have the same author and year of publication, and approach the same texts in a similar way. The main source underlying these studies is the *Manjou Shihlu* (1636), a Manchu dynastic genealogy written in Manchu, Mongolian and Chinese, in a version edited in 1781. Additional sentence samples are taken from the *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (1662), the classical chronicle on the history of the Mongols that was translated into Manchu in 1790. The approach taken in both volumes is to compare verbal morphology in the context of full sentences along with their translations. According to the author, the advantage of this procedure lies in the fact that the functions of the verbal suffixes are illustrated more accurately than would be the case when using lists of verb pairs (vol 18, 146: “Dadurch, daß die Wörter meistens in Sätzen und nicht in der lexikalischen Auflistung

angeführt wurden, wurden ihre Bedeutungen und Funktionen im Gebrauch konkret dargestellt"). As I will illustrate in a critical evaluation of the proposed cognates below (cfr. Ma. *-ca-* / *-ce-* / *-co-* denominal cooperative, Ma. *-ra-* / *-re-* / *-ro-* medium, Ma. *-cile-* denominal verb suffix, Mo. *-lǰa-* cooperative), her approach proves to be more fruitful for the contrastive and comparative typological study of the first volume than for the historical comparison of derivational suffixes of the second one.

In what follows, I will, for each volume separately, provide a theoretical background, describe the content and evaluate some theoretical issues. By way of conclusion, I will offer a joint assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of both works and briefly comment on the general significance of these volumes for the field.

2. Volume 18

In the first volume Maezono compares diathetical markers in Manchu and Mongolian from a contrastive typological viewpoint. Instead of studying concrete form-meaning correspondences in particular markers, she makes a comparative study of functional features and examines the category of diathesis in the abstract. In the goals section of the book (p. 11) the author claims that the typological contrasts and similarities between the languages under inspection can be used as a measure for genealogical classification. In this respect she refers to a study on the role of syntax in establishing genealogical relationship, written by Fokos-Fuchs in 1962. However, the author does not meet this goal in her analysis, as she restricts herself to factual comparisons, without going into theoretical issues.

Typological similarity may result from genealogical retention, but not necessarily so. Other possible motivations for structural parallels are coincidence, universal implicational tendencies (Greenberg 1966; Dryer 1992; Plank 1998), areal diffusion and substratum interference. Although it remains extremely difficult to distinguish between these different determinants of typological similarity, there is ongoing research unmentioned by the author that contributes to understanding stability of typological features (see especially Johanson 2002; Nichols 1992, 1995, 2003 and Maslova 2000).

Although Maezono does not rely on the typological comparisons advanced in her work, she makes it clear to the reader that she believes that Manchu and Mongolian share a common origin. Interestingly, she bases her argumentation on form-function matches instead of using the typological arguments referred to in the goals section. On p. 16, for instance, she finds that the relative or directive suffixes are cognate: "Die folgenden Beispielwörter zeigen, daß die NN-Suffixe (Ma) *-ši* und (Mo) *-ǰši* hinsichtlich der Formen sowie der Funktionen bzw. Bedeutungen auf den gleichen Ursprung zurückzuführen wären, von denen die Form (Mo) *-ǰši* älter als (Ma) *-ši* sein soll". On p. 34, she proposes a list of cognate verb roots including Ma. *bi-* 'sein' and Mo. *bü-* 'id.', Ma. *yabu-* 'gehen' and Mo. *yabu-* 'id.', Ma. *dasa-* 'in Ordnung bringen' and Mo. *ǰasa-* 'id.', Ma. *gabta-* '(mit dem Bogen / der Lanze) schießen' and Mo. *qarbu-* 'id.', Ma. *hori-* 'einschließen, sperren' and Mo. *qori-* 'id.', Ma. *ka-*

‘(ab)sperren, belagern, umgeben’ and Mo. *qaya-* ‘id.’, Ma. *saci-* ‘(ab)hacken’ and Mo. *čabči-* ‘id.’, Ma. *tata-* ‘(ab)ziehen’ and Mo. *tata-* ‘id.’, Ma. *temše-* ‘streiten’ and Mo. *temče-* ‘id.’.

It is not just a detailed theoretical framework -as it relates to the issue of using typological evidence as genealogical evidence- which is missing: what is also lacking is an up-to-date background on how the major empirical observations made in the book relate to other scholarly works on the subject.

The main similarities between Manchu and Mongolian diathetical constructions observed by Maezono are the following. Causatives derived from intransitive verbs mark the agent with an accusative suffix (p. 66-72), whereas causatives derived from transitive verbs mark the direct object with an accusative suffix and the agent with a second accusative or with a dative-locative suffix (p. 72-74). In the latter case, Mongolian, unlike Manchu, may also mark the agent with an instrumental suffix. From the examples on p. 88-90 it appears that dative-locative marked agents tend to be restricted to permissive causative constructions (“Zulassung vom Subjekt”). Maezono further finds two types of passive constructions in Manchu and Mongolian (p. 97-106). In the first type, a prototypical passive, the subject is the direct receiver and the agent is marked in the dative-locative. In the second type, which we can refer to as an adversative passive because the subject is negatively affected, the direct receiver is marked in the accusative and the agent is marked in the dative-locative.

As one of the most eye-catching contrasts, Maezono refers to the use of a causative-passive suffix in Manchu against the absence of such a polysemy in Mongolian (p. 22, 55): “Ein auffallender Unterschied zwischen den beiden Sprachen ist jedoch, daß im Mandschu das gleiche Suffix wie für die Transitiv-Kausativverbbildung auch für die Passivverbbildung verwendet wird, während im Mongolischen dafür selbständige Suffixe vorhanden sind”. However, she adds examples (p. 95-96) of Mongolian causative constructions in which the subject is the receiver of an unexpected action, where a passive interpretation is possible, pointing out that: “... die letzten der oben als Kausativ angeführte Beispiele zeigen sogar eine dem Passiv ähnliche semantische Funktion”.

The correlation between passive and causative observed in Manchu and to a certain extent in Mongolian is a somewhat mysterious correlation in view of the difference in syntactic characteristics of these verbal categories. Although it is left unexplained by Maezono, similar polysemies are attested cross-linguistically, and in the Transeurasian languages (Japanese, Korean, other Tungusic languages and Turkic languages) in particular. This polysemy finds its explanation in the historical development of passives across the world. The pathway of this development involves a permissive, a causative of the ‘let’ type and an adversative passive or a reflexive-causative construction (Johanson 1974, 1975; Keenan 1985: 262-263; Babby 1993; Malchukov 1993; Haspelmath 1990: 46-49, Robbeets 2007b). A semantic difference between causative and passive is that the former denotes two situations, whereas the latter denotes only one situation. A syntactic difference is that the initial subject becomes the direct object of causation, whereas it becomes the indirect object of the passive construction. The

permissive occupies a common ground between the two categories. Semantically it denotes two situations (Subject did not do sth. and agent does V because of that) as the factitive causative does (Subject did sth. and agent does V because of that), but the causation in permissives is nonvolitional (Subject did not want V to happen) and due to a nonoccurrence of an action. Syntactically, as with the passive, the agent can become the indirect object of the permissive construction. In Japanese, the native language of the author, for instance, the causative conversion of intransitives transforms the initial subject into an agent with the dative-locative suffix *ni* for permission and with the accusative suffix *wo* for coercion (Martin 1988: 292-293).¹ Malchukov (1993: 372) illustrates how in causative constructions of Even transitives, the agent is marked with an accusative suffix for factitives, whereas it is marked with a dative suffix for permissives. This is reminiscent of the dative-locative marked agents in permissive causatives in Manchu and Mongolian observed by Maezono. The availability of adversative passives in Manchu and Mongolian is paralleled by similar constructions in Japanese and other Tungusic languages. Malchukov (1993: 382-383) characterizes the Even adversative passive as a verbal category which combines the semantic features of a prototypical passive (one situation) on the one hand and the permissive causative (nonvolitional) on the other. This typological framework could account for the main empirical observations made by Maezono and correlate them as implicational features of causative-passive development.

3. Volume 19

In the second volume Maezono compares verb derivative suffixes in Manchu and Mongolian from a historical comparative viewpoint. Her purpose is to determine whether some of these suffixes can be traced back to a common origin. She situates her work against the background of the Altaic affiliation question, defining the Altaic languages as being made up of the Manchu-Tungusic languages, the Mongolic languages and the Chuvash-Turkic languages. In reference to the scholarly literature on this subject, she leaves out some of the more recent contributions that also include Japanese and Korean such as Starostin et al. 2003 and Robbeets 2005. Investigating shared verbal morphology as an indicator of genealogical relationship between the languages under investigation, the author fills a considerable gap in Altaic literature.

Although this reviewer is in agreement with the conclusion that some derivational suffixes indicate that Manchu and Mongolian are genealogically related, this does not mean that every single etymology or every line of argumentation advanced by the author is found acceptable. Suffixes for which the author explicitly states that they come from a common origin in the sense that they (p. 100:) “sollen sowohl von den

¹ For many speakers Japanese *Kodomo-ni gakkou-ni ika-se-ru* (child-dat. school-dat go-caus.-ind.) ‘let the child go to school’ seems to have a softer implication than *Kodomo-o gakkou-ni ika-se-ru* (child-acc. school-dat. go-caus.-ind.) ‘make the child go to school’.

Formen als auch von den Funktionen her auf einen gleichen Ursprung zurückgehen” are the Mongolian forms *-da-/-de* (p. 68), *-la-/-le-* (p. 100), *-ra-/-re-* (p. 137) and *-siya-/-siye-* (p. 150) along with their Manchu cognates. Suffixes for which she notes a formal and functional similarity without tracing them back to a common origin are the Mongolian forms *-du-/-dü-* (p. 16, 87), *-ča-/-če-* (p. 33, 56), *-čila-/-čile-* (p. 62), *-lja-/-lje-* (p. 91) and *-ldu-/-ldü-* (p. 15) along with their Manchu parallels. In reference to formally and functionally similar suffixes in the other Tungusic languages, Japanese, Korean and the Turkic languages, genealogical retention can be supported from a wider Transeurasian perspective for Mo. *-da-/-de-* and *-la-/-le-* (Robbeets 2007 a & b, forthcoming). The comparison of Mo. *-lja-/-lje-*, *-siya-/-siye-*, *-ra-/-re-*, *-čila-/-čile-* and *-ldu-/-ldü-* is problematic due to an illegitimate internal analysis. The shared properties between *-du-/-dü-* and *-ča-/-če-* can more easily be attributed to code-copying.

Although Maezono provides only a single example of a verb which includes the suffix Mo. *-lja-/-lje-*, namely (p. 91) *gilbalja-* ‘schimmern’ and although she does not attempt to define the functional load of the suffix, it is legitimate to posit a formant MMo. *-lja-/-lje-* in reference to verbs expressing multiple actants such as MMo. *a’ulja-* ‘pay one’s respects to, meet’, *bol-* ‘become’ => *bolja-* ‘make an appointment’, verbs expressing multiple objects such as MMo. *si’a* ‘bone stone (n.)’ (over **si’ala-?*) => *si’alja-* ‘play with bone stones’, *unji-* ‘rest, halt’ => *unjlja-* ‘hang down (e.g. of feet)’, *alhun* ‘be missing’ => *alja-* ‘be in distress’, and verbs expressing multiple occurrences in rhythmic motions such as MMo. *sicabalja-* ‘crawl’, *darbalja-* ‘jiggle’, *gilba-* ‘gleam’ => *gilbalja-* ‘glimmer’. It is illegitimate, however, to analyze Mo. *-lja-/-lje-* as a compound of a deverbal noun suffix *-l* and a denominal verb suffix **-ja-/je-* since we lack internal evidence for the latter segment. Reconstructing Mo **-ja-/je-* in reference to a Manchu look-alike *-ja-/-je-/-jo-* is methodologically circular because it presupposes genealogical affinity in an attempt to demonstrate affinity. Besides, although the semantics of the Manchu formant are left undescribed by Maezono, Ma. *-ja-/-je-/-jo-* is described by Gorelova 2002: 237, 242-243 as a derivative suffix used to form verbs which denotes the duration or intensity of the mental or emotional process which a person experiences (e.g. *golohon* ‘fright’ => *golohonjo-* ‘to be exceedingly frightened’). The semantic comparison to the Mongolian cooperative **-ja-/je-*, if ever it existed formally, would require some additional explanation.

Another problematic semantic analysis is that of the suffix Mo. *-siya-/-siye-*, which the author characterizes as (p. 150:) “Intensivität” in contrast with Poppe’s (1954: 65) analysis as a suffix used “to express acknowledgement of the qualities expressed by the primary noun, e.g. *sayin* ‘good’ => *sayišiya-* ‘approve’”. The examples provided by Maezono, Mo. *jöb* ‘richtig’ => *jöbsiye-* ‘für recht halten’ Mo. *buru yu* ‘Fehler, Unrecht, böse’ => *buru yusiya-* ‘für unrecht halten’; Mo. *örü* ‘Innen, Herz, Innere’ => *örüsiye-* ‘Gnade gewähren’ all contradict her own analysis and confirm Poppe’s. Applying the correct semantics reduces the quality of the functional match with the so-called Manchu intensive, which Gorelova (2002: 236) describes as a “derivative suffix used to form verbs to denote durative and continuous actions, e.g.

Ma. *banahu:n* ‘lazy’ => *banahu:ša-* ‘be lazy’”. The verb (p. 150) Ma. *sayiša-* ‘für gut halten’ is likely to be a case of direct verbal insertion, copied from WMo. *sayišiya-* ‘approve’. The formal comparison is not without problems either because we have to suppose phonological reduction in Manchu. Besides, unlike Mongolian, the Manchu suffix is also used to derive duratives from verbs (Gorelova 2002: 242-432) and since it has no cognate in the other Tungusic languages, Benzing (1955: 1067) treats it as a phonological alternant of the Manchu *-ca-* intensive.

On p. 46 the author proposes a deverbal formant Ma. *-ra-* /*-re-*/ *-ro-*, which she compares to the medium or anticausative Mo. *-ra-* / *-re-*. There is, however, no evidence for such a suffix in Manchu. Maezono provides only a single example, namely Ma. *colgon* ‘Bergspitze, hochragender Berg’ => *colgoro-* ‘hervorragend, überragend’, but this example is invalid because it illustrates denominal rather than deverbal derivation.

Evidence is also missing for a denominal verb suffix Ma. *-cile-* ‘geziemend handeln’, for which Maezono gives only a single example with front vocalism in Ma. *deo* ‘jüngerer Bruder’ => *deocile-* ‘sich als jüngerer Bruder richtig verhalten’. Gorelova (2002) does not mention this suffix in her grammar. Besides, the verb mentioned by Maezono can better be analyzed as a *-la-* / *-le-* derivation of the noun Ma. *deocin* ‘Pflicht des jüngeren Bruders’.

There is no attempt to draw a distinction between code-copying and genealogical retention as a probable account for the shared properties. The author finds, for instance, that (p. 86-89): “Die Entsprechung der NV-Suffixe (Ma) *-du-* (NV) - Mo *-du-* / *-dü-* (NV) kommt im Textkorpus hauptsächlich in den Verben (Ma) *jabdu-* ‘Zeit/Gelegenheit haben, etw. zu tun’ - Mo. *jabdu-* ‘id.’ vor. Es gibt im Mongolischen das Nomen (Mo.) *jab* ‘(freie) Zeit’ und davon abgeleitet mehrere Wörter, während im Mandschu lediglich das Verb (Ma) *jabdu-* belegt ist”. Since the suffix has only a single occurrence in Manchu and since the verb is morphologically complex in Mongolian while it is unsegmentable in Manchu, it goes without saying that we are dealing with a verbal borrowing from Mongolian into Manchu.

From the lack of internal evidence for Ma. *-du-*, it follows that a second comparison proposed by the author, namely (p. 15) the reciprocals Ma. *-ndu-* and Mo. *-ldu-* / *-ldü-* is based on an illegitimate morphological analysis. The author suggests treating these suffixes as compounds of a deverbal noun suffix Ma. *-n* and Mo. *-l* followed by the obscure common segment **-du-*. Besides being methodologically circular, this comparison disregards the fact that Ma. *-ndu-* goes back to pTg **-ldu-* (Benzing 1955: 1069). The comparison of the Tungusic and Mongolian reciprocals is far more elegant and simple without segmentation.

The author’s assumption (p. 33) that Mo. *-lča-* / *-lče-* is morphologically complex, on the other hand, is legitimate because both the deverbal noun suffix *-l* and the denominal cooperative verb suffix *-ča-* are attested in Mongolian. The data seem to suggest that the cooperative Mo. *-ča-* was originally limited to denominal derivation, whereas Mo. *-ldu-* was used as a deverbal cooperative. Attached after verbal nouns in *-l*, the denominal suffix was reanalyzed as *-lča-* in analogy with *-ldu-* and Mo. *-ča-*

transferred to verbal bases. This scenario suggests that the deverbal cooperative *-ca- / -ce- / -co-* has entered and spread in Manchu as the result of extensive borrowing of Mongolian verb stems. In order to reduce the copying factor, we need examples of a denominal cooperative Ma. *-ca- / -ce- / -co-*. However, Gorelova (2002: 243, 250-51) and Benzing (1955: 1067) restrict the use of this suffix to deverbal derivation. Unfortunately, Maezono provides us only with a single example in support of denominal derivation, namely (p. 61) **ama* ‘Hinten, Rücken, Norden’ in *amaga* ‘später, künftig’, *amala* ‘hinten, später, danach, hinterher’, *amargi* ‘Hinterseite, Rückseite, Norden’, *amari* ‘nachdem’ => *amca-* ‘nachgehen, nachfolgen, nachsetzen, verfolgen’. Finding more examples could help us distinguish between code-copying and genealogical retention.

In the conclusion the author recognizes that in cases of massive copying of verb bases along with derivational suffixes, the suffixes may spread in the recipient language and attach independently to unrelated bases. However, she claims that it is unlikely that non-native suffixes would be attached to borrowed bases. She takes the Manchu verb *dayisela-* ‘vertretungsweise verwalten, verwesen’, derived from a Chinese borrowing Ma. *dayise* ‘Vertreter’ and the denominal verb suffix Ma. *-la- / -le- / -lo-* as an indication that the Manchu suffix is native, i.e. not copied. Since speakers do not store diachronic information on productive suffixes, the logic of this argument is unclear. Other arguments against code-copying of verbal morphology are not given in the books, but reference can be made to Robbeets (2007b & forthcoming).

4. Conclusion

Coming to a joint analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of both volumes, a major methodological shortcoming is that Maezono restricts herself to comparisons at a synchronic level in order to draw conclusions about long-range diachrony. Whereas the tools of historical linguistics, internal and external reconstruction, could help us access forms and functions in proto-Tungusic or proto-Mongolic, Maezono does not attempt to go back further in time than the linguistic forms synchronically attested in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Above we have shown for instance how internal reconstruction could give us an insight into the historical development of the Mongolian cooperative suffix *-lʃa- / -lʃe-*, how external comparison with the Tungusic languages could lead to the reconstruction of the cooperative pTg **-ldu-*, or how typological comparison with other Tungusic languages such as Even could provide information on the diachronic origins of passive morphology. In this respect it is unfortunate that no reference is made to comparative Tungusic perspectives such as those in Benzing 1955, to an up-to-date analysis of Manchu grammar as Gorelova 2002, to a typological reference work on Mongolic as Janhunen 2003 or to general typological studies such as the ones cited above.

A practical inconvenience for readers who are not fluent in Manchu and Mongolian is the lack of interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses that give information about the meanings and grammatical properties of words and bound morphemes. Using

uniform glossing rules would have prevented many disturbing additions between brackets “(wörtlich: ...)”.

The volumes contain only a few typographical mistakes or smaller misinterpretations such as (vol. 18, p. 96:) “*ene kelen* (=Agens)” for [*ene kelen* (=dir. Obj.)], (vol. 18, 150; vol. 19, p. 177:) Fokus-Fuchs [Fokos-Fuchs] and (vol. 18, p. 154:) Paitsak [Pritsak].

In spite of their weaknesses, both works have many strengths. Although controversy marks the literature on the genealogical relationship of Manchu and Mongolian, many linguists would agree on at least one point, namely that shared verbal morphology could help unravel the question. Altaic literature in general abounds with lexical comparisons, but relatively little research has been done in the field of comparative verbal morphology. In this respect Maezono’s contributions fill a considerable gap in Altaic comparative linguistic literature. The further strengths of her work lie in the originality of her approach comparing translations of historical documents in order to retrieve linguistic information, the well-balanced selection of linguistically relevant passages and the accurate description and translation of sample sentences. Her work provides a solid empirical base for further theoretical research.

Although the volumes are written in German by a Japanese author, the phrasing is clear and exact in a way that it is easily accessible to native as well as non-native speakers of German with a moderate command of the language. Elementary knowledge of Manchu and Mongolian would help the reader to overcome the inconvenience caused by the missing glossing system. The volumes can be recommended to students and researchers of Manchu-Tungusic and Mongolic linguistics, but also to those with an interest in the history and development of the Transeurasian languages (Japanese, Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic) in general. Typologists working on topics that relate to valency and historical linguists interested in controversial cases of language classification and in the impact of language contact will also benefit from reading these books. These readers will gain more by taking these two volumes into account than they would lose by not reading them.

References

- Benzing, Johannes 1955. *Die tungusischen Sprachen. Versuch einer vergleichenden Grammatik.* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 11.) Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.
- Babby, Leonard H. 1993. Hybrid causative constructions: Benefactive causative and adversity passive. In: Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.) 1993. *Causatives and transitivity.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 345-367.
- Dryer, Matthew 1992. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68, 81-138.
- Gorelova, Liliya M. 2002. *Manchu grammar.* (Handbook of Oriental studies.) Leiden: Brill.
- Greenberg, Joseph 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: Greenberg, Joseph (ed.). *Universals of language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 73-113.

- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14, 25-71.
- Janhunen, Juha (ed.). 2003. *The Mongolic languages*. London: Routledge.
- Johanson, Lars. 1974. Zur Syntax der alttürkischen Kausativa. In Voigt, Wolfgang (ed.) 1974. *XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 1. bis 5. Oktober 1972 in Lübeck*, 529-540. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Johanson, Lars. 1975. Die Ersetzung der türkischen -t- Kausativa. *Orientalia Suecana* 23-24, 106-133.
- Johanson, Lars 2002. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. Richmond: Curzon.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1994. Passive in the world's languages. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.) 1994. *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol 1 Clause structure*, 243-281. Cambridge: University Press.
- Malchukov, Andrej L. 1993. Adversative constructions in Even in relation to passive and permissive. In Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.) 1993. *Causatives and transitivity*, 369-384. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1988. *A reference grammar of Japanese*. Tokyo: Tuttle.
- Maslova, Elena 2000. A dynamic approach to the verification of distributional universals. *Linguistic typology* 4, 307-333.
- Nichols, Johanna 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nichols, Johanna 1995. Diachronically stable structural features. In: Andersen, Henning (ed.) 1995. *Historical linguistics 1993: Papers from the eleventh international conference on historical linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 337-56.
- Nichols, Johanna 2003. Diversity and stability in language. In: Joseph, Brian D. & Janda Richard D. (eds.) 2003. *The handbook of historical linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 283-310.
- Plank, Frans 1998. The covariation of phonology with morphology and syntax: a hopeful history. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 195-230.
- Poppe, Nicholas 1954. *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Robbeets, Martine 2005. *Is Japanese related to Korean, Tungusic, Mongolic and Turkic?* (Turcologica 64.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Robbeets, Martine 2007a. How the actional suffix chain connects Japanese to Altaic. *Turkic Languages* 11.1, 3-58.
- Robbeets, Martine 2007b. The causative-passive in the Trans-Eurasian languages. *Turkic Languages* 11.2, 235-278.
- Robbeets, Martine I. (forthcoming). Trans-Eurasian: Can verbal morphology solve the controversy? In: Johanson, Lars & Robbeets, Martine (eds.). *Verbal morphology and the historical comparison of the Transeurasian languages*. (Turcologica.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Starostin Sergei & Dybo Anna & Mudrak Oleg 2003. *Etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages*. Leiden: Brill.

Béla Kempf: Review of *Florilegia altaistica. Studies in honour of Denis Sinor on the occasion of his 90th birthday*. Edited by Elena V. Boikova and Giovanni Stary with the assistance of Elizabeth and Charles Carlson. (Asiatische Forschungen 149.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.

Kempf Béla, MTA-SzTE Turkológiai Kutatócsoport, Egyetem u 2., H-6722 Szeged, Hungary. E-mail: bela_kempf@hotmail.com

This Festschrift is a collection of papers presented to Denis Sinor by colleagues and friends on the joyous occasion of his 90th birthday. The volume begins with the selected Altaistic bibliography of Denis Sinor (vii-xvii), followed by the essay in honour of Denis Sinor by Barbara Kellner-Heinkele (1-10). The reader gets an insight into the everyday life of Denis Sinor, and we also learn how Uralic and Altaic Studies, but especially Altaic Studies, were built up by him in the United States.

The rest of the volume consists of 17 scholarly papers, which I will briefly introduce below.

Vladimir D. Alpatov presents a comparison of the concepts and approaches regarding the phonetic and grammatical units in European and Japanese linguistic tradition (11-19).

Ágnes Birtalan, after a classification of the Mongolian shamanistic texts, enumerating 24 genres, gives a detailed typology of the genre *dūdlaga* (21-39). The classification was carried out according to the spheres of use, thus (1) pure shamanic genres (*dūdlaga, tamlaga, dātgal*), (2) genres used primarily in non-shamanic spheres (*magtāl, jūxel* and *xarāl, cacal* or *sacal, dallaga, xurailga, xelēlge/xelelge/xelex üg, šiwšleg, myalālga, beleg demberelīn üg*), and (3) genres of literary origin (*jalbiral, öčig, ailtgax (üg), san, serjīm, unšlaga, sudur, tügel, taxilga, tūx, yos, ugiyal*).

The genre called *dūdlaga* ‘invocation or calling’ is the most widespread genre of the Mongolian shamanistic tradition. According to Birtalan, “*dūdlaga* is on one hand, a general genre designation indicating shamanistic texts, but on the other hand, it is the main genre of a shamanistic ritual requiring an altered state of consciousness and incorporating numerous other genre fragments, even non-ritualistic ones”. Her typology lists the following components of the *dūdlaga*: (1) addressing and invoking the spirit(s); (2) the descriptive, enumerative sections (inserted *magtāl*); (3) narratives about the story of the spirit, usually from times when he/she was a human being; and (4) enumeration of requests and the offerings offered to the invited spirits. These are the usual parts of a *dūdlaga* recited outside the ritual. Those recited in rituals contain several additional “modules”, depending on the purpose of the ritual, requests of the clients.

I am sure that it is a typographical error,² the usual Literary Mongol form of the Khalkha word *dūdlaga* is not *dayudlaga* but *dayudalya*.

Elena V. Boikova, in her paper *The Mongolian factor in the history of Russia (Turn of the 19th and the 20th Centuries)* (41-50), discusses how the “Mongolian question” evolved from a minor factor to a priority of the Russian foreign policy, and compares the approaches of Qing China and that of Russia towards Mongolia.

Lars Johanson, in his paper “*Der Orientalist*” als “*Turkologe*” (51-59) gives interesting complementary data on the life story of the ill-fated Lev Nussimbaum, who, under the pseudonyms Essad Bey and Kurban Said, in a short period published several informative books on Orientalist topics in the German part of Europe, all of which became bestsellers in their time. However, from this paper we learn that although Nussimbaum attended some Turkological lectures, his works contained many errors.

Sergej Grigorevič Kljaštornyj, in his paper *The Asian aspect of the early Khazar history* (61-67) guides us to the beginning of the history of Khazar people. Without entering into the details, Kljaštornyj attempts to prove that the Khazars were genetically related to the Ogur-Oghuz tribes.

In their philosophical paper *The birth of the world history in the Mongol Empire: History education in Modern Japan* (69-83) Hidehiro Okada and Junko Miyawaki-Okada introduce us to the traditional approach to history in Japan, according to which originally there were three branches: Japanese history, Occidental history and Oriental history, according to the division of civilizations into Japanese, Chinese and Mediterranean-West European ones. After several unifications and divisions of these three branches, the reform of the educational system after the Second World War incorporated Occidental History and Oriental History under World History, excluding however the history of Japan. The authors also illustrate the approach to the concept of “history” of other civilizations (Indian, Islamic, American, Mediterranean, Chinese).

After that, a quite surprising statement follows: “The world history has begun from the Mongol Empire” (81). That means that it was the Mongol Empire which for the first time connected the Chinese and the Mediterranean worlds.

In the paper by Tatiana Pang (85-91) three versions of a poem composed by Emperor Qianlong are compared to one another. The first of them is the original in the Manchu language, the second is its versified translation into Chinese, while a third version is in Manchu again, but this latter one is a prose version, probably re-translated and based on the Chinese version.

Rodica Pop gives an account of the image of matrimonial kinship among the Mongols (93-104).

Doubtlessly, the most fitting paper to the occasion is that of Alessandra Pozzi *A birthday banquet for our guest of honour Professor Denis Sinor à la mode of the ancestors of Manchu People* (105-118), in which the author introduces the mysteries of

² In general, the volume unfortunately contains more typographical errors than acceptable.

the versatile Early Manchu cuisine to the reader. We learn from this paper that “thanks to generous nature and to preserving techniques, nothing was missing at the table of the Manchus: from vegetables to game, to livestock and poultry meat, to aquatic product, to fruit, everything that is necessary for a complete, healthy diet was represented” (107-108).

Jean Richard writes about the military cooperation of the Franks and the Mongols in the Middle East (119-128).

András Róna-Tas presents *Etymological notes on Hungarian gyapjú* ‘wool’ (129-132). This etymology is part of a work written together with Árpád Berta, in which the authors “revisit all etymologies of Hungarian words being or suggested to be of Turkic origin”. According to Róna-Tas, the Hungarian word *gyapjú* is of Turkic origin, though its etymon is not the verb *yap-*, but the “imitative” word *yap-* expressing the curling of the hair.

The detailed genealogical lineage of the family of Chinggis Khan is compiled by Volker Rybatzki in his paper *Genealogischer Stammbaum der Mongolen* (135-192). The paper is extremely useful for those who are interested in Mongol onomastics, since Rybatzki compares the relevant data of the different sources.

Alice Sárközi writes about how the ideology of conquering the world appears in the Mongol written sources. She cites the Seal of Güyük and the message of Ögödei to Béla IV, which state that the Mongols received their mission from Heaven to rule over the nations of the world. It is interesting to note how the approach towards ruling appears here. The texts do not speak about countries to conquer but peoples (*il bulya irgen* in the first case, and “subicientes mihi se exaltare et deprimare adversantes” in the second). There is, however, a misread passage cited from the Altan tobči. On p. 194 Sárközi writes “... *ejelegsen-iyen ejelegül-ün: qadayuǰilaysan-iyen qadayalayulun*” ‘[I send you] for the administration of what I have seized, for the preservation of what I have toiled’. *Qadayuǰilaysan-iyen* must be *qatayučilaysan-iyen* here, meaning ‘what I have firmed/hardened’. The paper illustrates how the straightforward wording about the cruelty of the Mongols during their wars of conquest changes after their adoption of Buddhism as a religion.

The volume also contains an article by the recently deceased Aleksandr Mixajlovič Ščerbak which describes the project of an etymological dictionary of the Manchu-Tungus languages, in which the material of the “Comparative dictionary of the Manchu-Tungus languages” would be corrected and supplemented with etymological notes (209-214). Among his examples he lists the Evenki word *aduk* ‘big’, which he claims to be a copy of Yakut *artiq* ~ *orduq* ‘surplus, superfluous’ (211). Ščerbak himself admits the difficulty of the etymology, as there is no other example which would show the disappearance of an inlaut *-r-*. If one searches for a Turkic original of the Evenki word, I think it would be more preferable to trace it back to Turkic *adig* ‘bear’.

Giovanni Stary, in his paper *Two names for one country? Manchu Solho and Coohiyān — ‘Korea’* (215-219), points out the distinction in use of the Manchu designations Solho and Coohiyān in the different Manchu sources. Both indicate

Korea, but while the first one was used as a geographical and ethnic designation, Coohiyian indicates the ruling dynasty of Korea.

Edward Tryjarski, in his paper (221-226), quotes fragments based on the memoirs of Faustyn Ciecierski, a Polish Catholic priest, who was condemned to forced settlement and labor in Nerchinsk in 1798-1801. Tryjarski has collected those parts of the memoirs that reveal the nature of tea barter between Chinese merchants and the population of Dauria (that is the mountainous region east of Lake Baikal). The author also sheds light on the production and consumption of “kirpičnyj čaj” (tea in bricks) and various strong alcoholic drinks like vodka and milk brandy.

Hartmut Walravens, in his paper *Fünfzehn Kamelladungen Gelehrsamkeit. Russische Bücherkäufe in Peking im Jahre 1821* (227-251), gives a catalogue based on the inventory-list of the Chinese and Manchu books bought by Egor Fedorovič Timkovski in China in the year of 1821. We learn that the books were bought for the Imperial Library in Sankt-Petersburg (29 items), for the Library of the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (20 items) and for the Oriental Institute planned to be set up in Irkutsk (19 items).

Mark Kirchner: Review of Astrid Menz & Christoph Schroeder (eds.), *Türkiye’de dil tartışmaları* [Language discussions in Turkey]. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2006. 257 pages.

Mark Kirchner, Justus-Liebig-Universität, Otto-Behaghel-Str. 10 E, D 35394 Giessen, Germany. E-mail: Mark.Kirchner@turkologie.uni-giessen.de

The volume under review is edited by two German scholars who were employed in academic institutions in Turkey at the time of publishing. It contains ten highly interesting papers presented at an interdisciplinary symposium entitled *Türkiye’de Dil tartışmalarında yeni yönelimler* “New Directions in Language Discussions in Turkey” held at Bilgi University İstanbul in 2004. The range of the topics under discussion is rather broad. Colleagues from departments of English or German studies may wonder how it is possible to discuss questions of the status of minority languages, orthographic issues and problems related to the language vs. dialect status within a language family in a single volume. Besides that, some papers are clearly scientific in their approach while others are written in a more or less journalistic style. What may look rather accidental and disparate to colleagues in more established disciplines is actually a very important contribution for the discussion in Turkey and in Turkology. There are two reasons for that: Firstly, sociolinguistic issues and language politics are less established as a field of research in Turkology, which is and was dominated by

traditional philological approaches and by structural linguistics. Secondly, language issues are a highly politicized topic in Turkey. Several major questions can hardly be discussed in an open atmosphere because of national taboos. In most cases the general political attitude of the author determines the discussions. This book is an important step toward developing less biased discussions in Turkey and in Turkology and bringing together divergent positions. However, the present book is far from presenting a neutral, purely academic perspective on these issues. It is to the same degree a volume about “language discussions” as it is a contribution to ongoing discussions. With this in mind, the author of this book review cannot refrain from commenting on some never ending discussions.

The first paper, on “Turkish after 1980” (11–23), is by Murat Belge, who is the author of many important contributions in the fields of Turkish politics, society and language. The author gives a general outline of the development of Turkish after the 1980 coup d'état. According to Belge, major factors are the end of the language reform process and the development of private radio and television channels. In connection with the end of the language reform, which was in fact a project of language purification, Belge wonders why Turkish leftists identified themselves with a movement which can be suspected of having close relationship with racist and nationalist ideology (12). When we take Kemalism as an anti-imperialist, anti-religious modernist movement, it is not astonishing that leftists could identify with many aspects of this movement—and that the military junta put an end to language purification, which had developed from a Kemalist to a “socialist” project. Murat Belge is not very positive about the development of Turkish in the past 25 years. In a conversational tone, he complains that new unintelligible idiomatic expressions and wrong syntactic features have emerged from the incompetent translations of foreign films (18). Belge's pessimistic criticism of language in (new) media bears the imprint of pessimistic conservative language critics when he laments over incorrect use of original Arabic vowel length and Persian *izafet*-constructions in contemporary Turkish and proposes the introduction of Ottoman Turkish as an elective in Turkish schools (21).

Bernt Brendemoen's paper “Deviations and Norms in Popular Linguistic Discourse” (25–39) is a thorough evaluation of Turkish popular discussions on problems in the field of lexicon and orthography. Astrid Menz, one of the editors, treats “Turkish Spelling in Spelling Guides and in Practice” (41–71) and Tevfik Turan makes some comments on “Literary Criticism as Linguistic Criticism” (73–82). M. Berk Balçık's paper “Language Politics in Turkish Television” (85–118) should be read in the context of Belge's aforementioned contribution. He agrees with Belge in pointing to the fact that liberalization and de-monopolization of the national Turkish broadcasting market was of major significance for the development of Turkish language and culture, but he cannot agree with those who are constantly bemoaning the degeneration and loss of correct Turkish as a consequence of this process (94). The second part of Balçık's paper is a critical analysis of the developments and discussions in Turkey when it was decided in 2004 in the context of EU negotiations to permit, under very limited conditions, TV-broadcasting in the language of Muslim minorities.

Nurettin Demir's article (119-146) on the status of Turkic languages other than Turkish (the English translation of the title in the English summaries at the end of the book is not correct and obscures Demir's thesis!) is an attempt to argue for the official Turkish position which denies language status to Turkic languages like Uzbek, Tatar, Kazakh, etc., defining them instead as Uzbek Turkish, Tatar Turkish, Kazakh Turkish, etc. – and Turkish as the language of a whole language family. According to the official Turkish point of view, the members of 'Turkish' as a language family are not languages, *dil*, but a kind of dialects, *lehçe*. Interestingly, adherents of this approach do not use the term *lehçe* for Turkish, the official language of the Republic of Turkey. Not unlike other discussions in the field of language and politics in Turkey, the discussion whether other Turkish languages are really "languages" has been highly politicized. Turkish Turkologists who employed the internationally accepted nomenclature for the other Turkic languages were often suspected of supporting the Soviet politics of creating many small nations with national languages. What is analyzed as divide and conquer politics by many, not only Turkish scholars, can probably be better understood as circumstances wherein those politicians who were responsible for implementing the official language politics of the Soviet Union applied the conditions in the closely related Slavic languages to the Turkic languages in question. In addition it should be noted that the development of several Turkic languages as independent literary languages had begun many years before the October Revolution. Demir (119-120), however, gives the impression that Turkic languages are a product of artificial separation and language engineering. The fact that in Turkish *Türkçe* is the denomination of the official language of Turkey as well as the denomination of all Turkic languages as a language family causes several problems that do not exist in other language families. However, Turkologists in Turkey like Demir could have easily accepted or created a terminology like *Türkçe* "Turkish" vs. *Türk dilleri* or *Türki diller* "Turkic languages" if there had been a wish to separate the name of the most important language of this language family from the name of the language family as a whole. Mingling both concepts is part of a more general concept which insists on the "Turkishness" of the speakers of Turkic languages living outside Turkey. Thus the language of the Tatars and of many other Turkic peoples is called *Tatar Türkçesi*, lit. "Tatar Turkish," etc., despite the fact that these denominations are refused by the local peoples. Demir is aware of that (143), but he even uses the denomination *Türk* in designations beyond languages. Thus, in Demir's terminology as well as in the commonly used Turkish terminology, the Central Asian Turkic speaking republics are named *Türk cumhuriyetleri* "Turkish republics" (142), which in fact implies a close relationship between these ethnically rather heterogeneous states and the Republic of Turkey in a more than purely linguistic sense. Without a doubt, the denomination system used in Turkey can be useful when varieties spoken outside Turkey are clearly descendents of Turkish, like *Bulgaristan Türkçesi* "Turkish of Bulgaria". In the search for objective measures for defining the language vs. dialect status of "entities" such as Tatar or Uzbek, Demir discusses mutual intelligibility. This is the most interesting part of his paper (133–136). He is right when he says that unprepared tests based on written

texts are not a suitable base for the evaluation of mutual intelligibility. Such tests may be useful when they are applied in combination with other, more elaborate methods, such as the evaluation of the learning process on a time scale. Mutual intelligibility and the use of mutual intelligibility in foreign language teaching is an important research field in the study of Romance languages, which form a language group similar in the degree of mutual intelligibility to the Turkic languages. In Turkish academic or popular discussions, the degree of mutual intelligibility between Turkic languages is generally exaggerated. Demir (135) quotes statements of Turkish Turkologists who believe that Turks working in Kazakistan will understand 80% of everyday Kazakh within six weeks. In practice, the Turkish claim denying the language status of other Turkic languages does not motivate students to invest much effort in learning these languages. In Turkey, even in the academic field of Turkology, few students or scholars have relevant active competence in other Turkic languages. In his article Demir goes to some length to show that those few Turkish Turkologists who use the international denomination system for the members of the Turkic language family had originally accepted the official Turkish position and changed their opinion after going abroad. He gives the impression that these scholars unnecessarily argued against the established denomination system (128–132). The international position is discussed in brief by Demir under the heading “Yabancı Bilim Adamlarının Görüşleri” (‘The opinions of foreign scholars’ 137–139). The author mentions Wilhelm Radloff’s famous “Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialekte” (1893–1911), but he fails to notice that the state of the art handbook and the present journal are both entitled “Turkic languages”. Turkish is the largest and most elaborate language within the family of Turkic languages. It has great potential to serve one day as a lingua franca in the independent Turkic-speaking republics of the former Soviet Union in addition to Russian if the speakers of Turkish are not suspected of disregarding and undervaluing the richness and the tradition of other Turkic languages.

Özlem Eraydın Virtanen’s contribution on “Language Politics in Turkey in the Light of European Union Relations” (147–184) casts a light on the development of the legal status of languages other than Turkish spoken on the territory of the Republic of Turkey. The first part of her paper (–162) is a general introduction to the problem; in the second part the reader finds interesting material and critical analyses especially on the restrictive attitude of the Turkish government towards the languages of Muslim minorities and on recent changes in this politics. Together with Balçık’s paper, the reader obtains valuable information on a topic that is often discussed without deeper knowledge in international newspapers and journals. In her argumentation, Eraydın Virtanen supports demands of the European Union and stresses that she does not know of any historic situation where the recognition of minority language rights has led to the partition of a country (180). This sounds rather strange in light of what happened in the Soviet Union and in several Eastern European countries during the last decade of the 20th century. The volume under review contains three more papers: Meryem Şen’s empirical study “Attitudes towards Regional Dialects” (185–208) investigates the attitudes of Turkish standard language speakers towards the various regional dialects

of Turkey. Christoph Schroeder gives an excellent survey on “Turkish as a Mother Tongue or as a Foreign Language and the Teaching of Turkish in Western Europe” (209–228). Schroeder recommends taking into consideration the fact that children who learn Turkish as a mother tongue in Western Europe may be more successful if Turkish were taught considering the real bilingual and diaspora-Turkish background of the pupils. The last paper of the book by Zeynep Kızıltepe and Seran Doğançay-Aktuna is on “The Status of Foreign Languages in Turkey with an Emphasis on Higher Education” (229–240).

The volume was reviewed in several Turkish newspapers and journals; a second edition is being prepared in these days. All this shows a vivid interest in Turkish languages politics, in sociolinguistic and related issues. The volume edited by Menz and Schroeder is an important step to establishing new research fields in Turkology.

