

## Werk

**Label:** ReviewSingle

**Autor:** Kempf , Béla

**Ort:** Wiesbaden

**Jahr:** 2008

**PURL:** [https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797\\_0012](https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0012) | LOG\_0039

## Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.  
SUB Göttingen  
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1  
37073 Göttingen

✉ [info@digizeitschriften.de](mailto:info@digizeitschriften.de)

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*, *myālālga*, *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,<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> 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 bulγa 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: qadayuǰılaysan-ıyan qadayalayulun*” ‘[I send you] for the administration of what I have seized, for the preservation of what I have toiled’. *Qadayuǰılaysan-ıyan* must be *qatayučılaysan-ıyan* 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 *artıq* ~ *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 *adıg* ‘bear’.

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