

Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Károly, László

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2010

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0014 | LOG_0037

Kontakt/Contact

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

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

László Károly: Review of Leland Liu Rogers, *The Golden Summary of Činggis Qayan. Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči*. (Tunguso-Sibirica 27.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009. xii+151 pages, ISBN 978-3-447-06074-5.

László Károly, Universität Mainz, Seminar für Orientkunde, Jakob-Welder-Weg 20, 55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: karoly@uni-mainz.de

In the book reviewed here, the author, Leland Liu Rogers, presents a Mongolian source entitled *Činggis Qayan-u Altan Tobči* (hereinafter ČQAT) in a diplomatic edition. The edition was based on a manuscript published by Dorongy-a (1998) in a facsimile edition. The original manuscript, unearthed in 1958 near Hohhot, comprises 48 folios, with an average of 14 lines per page. Since Dorongy-a's publication is hardly accessible to Westerners, the work of Rogers can be considered as a welcome source for the study of ČQAT.

ČQAT is a compilation of 17 shorter or longer stories about certain episodes in Činggis Qan's life. The stories are based on historically existing personages, but they are full of impossible, legendary elements. This literary genre, sometimes referred to as *čadig* compilation, is well known from other Mongolian chronicles, such as the *Altan Tobči* (see, e.g., Bawden 1955), the *Altan Tobči (nova)* (see, e.g., Vietze and Lubsang 1992) and Sayang Sečen's *Erdeni-yin Tobči* (see, e.g., Krueger 1967). Also well known similar stories in a different narrative can be found in the *Mongyol-un Niyuča Tobčiyin* (cf. de Rachewiltz 2004).

In the introduction to the edition, Rogers briefly describes the source, discusses its origin and some of its writing peculiarities. In addition, he gives an ordered list of the stories appearing in the compilation, and places the whole source among the above-mentioned Mongolian works. However, the reader misses such introductory notes that form an obligatory part of a traditional text edition: description of the manuscript (e.g. its measurements), overview of the literary genre, the historical and linguistic background, etc. This is a deficiency of the edition; especially for those who are not familiar with the subject. The interested reader may consult *The Mongol chronicles of the seventeenth century* by Žamcarano (1955). Another useful source is a book by Heissig (1959) in which he analyses the available chronicle composition; see chapter 2 titled 'Chroniken der frühen Mandju-Zeit (1644–1700)' on pages 50 to 111.

In chapter 3, where the English translation is placed, the author starts each story with a lengthy note in which he makes a systematic comparison with the corresponding stories of the above-mentioned Mongolian sources. These notes are valuable parts of the edition and help the reader to find the position of the actual stories among the already known chronicle compositions of the 17th century. However, the reviewer would prefer a compact discussion of these questions in the introduction, under a title such as 'Literary position of' ČQAT according to Bawden or Hangin.

The author devotes chapter 1 to a detailed discussion of the dating of the manuscript. Although its sections (reviewing the *ductus*, comparing materials, and dates of the lexicon) partly cover what may be missed in the introduction, everything here is subordinated to the main question, i.e. the dating.

Concerning the *ductus*, the author uses Kara's framework (Kara 2005) on the basis of which he suggests a period for the writing of the manuscript. However, he does not include a single page of the facsimile, and thus the reader has to rely on his or her own imagination.

In the following passages Rogers continues his analysis, which turns to a speculative and partly controversial chain of statements. For example, he overestimates the role of the lexicon in the dating of the text. The terminology, the grammatical characteristics etc., can indeed provide invaluable information about the formation of a written source, but they are by no means a tool for an accurate definition of the decade of writing.

Another shortcoming of this chapter is that Rogers does not consult two important chronicles of the 17th century: the *Asarayči* (Kämpfe 1983) and the *Šara tuŋi* [Sira turyŋi] (Šastina 1957), and a short fragment from Khara Khoto, which is an early record about the wisdom of Činggis Qan, cf. Kara (2003: 5–7; G110 verso) with additional literature on the topic.

As a summary of Rogers' dating efforts we read that "the most probable date of the compilation of the first copy of the ČQAT was likely somewhere between 1570 and 1620" (Rogers 2009: 10). This wording amounts to nothing less than the author's stating that the ČQAT compilation is the earliest known example of this sort; cf. also "...the peculiarities of this manuscript suggest that it is an earlier version of the Činggis Qayan legends than any of the other compilations known" (Rogers 2009: vii). Unfortunately, such a result cannot be deduced from the source.

In the following chapter Rogers gives the transcription of the text with a great number of notes: possible typographic errors, inconsistent spellings, corrupt forms, etc. Additionally he provides corrections on the base of the other chronicles, e.g. the name *Naqun* is correctly changed to *Nekün* (Rogers 2009: note 6), since all the other sources read it with front vocalism. For special vocabulary, such as proper names, names of plants and animals, Rogers adds detailed explanations. For example, he writes that "An *aryamay* is translated by Tsevel as 'pure-blood central Asian horse' (1966: 50a), and *tobočay* is translated as 'hillock' by Kowalewski (1964: 1819b), suggesting that the animal is a 'pure bred central Asian hill horse'. *Aryamay tobičay* is translated by de Rachewiltz as 'Arabic race horse' (2004: 1008)" (Rogers 2009: 19, note 22). These are without question useful comments for the better understanding of the source, but they should not be discussed alongside the transcription. Transcription has two aims: (1) to reconstruct the contemporary reading of a text, and (2) to indicate the peculiarities of the spelling. Accordingly, such etymological remarks as "The word *Čambudvib* is from the Old Uyghur version of the Sanskrit word *Čambudvīpa*, or *ġambudvīpa*, literally 'rose apple island' ..." (Rogers 2009: 23,

note 27) have nothing to do with the transcription and could have been relegated to another chapter where they belong.

The next chapter, namely the English translation, is no doubt the best part of the edition. Rogers has made a smooth, easily intelligible translation of the original. His comments about the personages appearing in the stories, and about the problematic words and phrases make the translation an elaborated work.

After the core chapters of the book, the reader will find a complete list of the Mongolian words, which is a handy tool for further linguistic analyses. The end of the book presents the bibliography, which can easily be supplemented with other important publications.

In the followings I add some minor remarks to the edition:

A significant group of Mongolian proper names are transparent, their connection with common words being easily detectable; see, e.g., *Buq-a čayan*, which is possibly related to ‘bull’ and ‘white’ (p. 88, n. 90) and *Gürbeljin yoo-a*, which highly likely means ‘beautiful lizardess’ (p. 98, n. 117). However, many such names are not etymologizable. For example, Roger remarks:

“The meaning of *Küsbalad* is uncertain; it is possible that the *s* was orogianlly [sic!] a *ke*, making it *köke* ‘blue’, [sic!] It is also possible that *küs* has been incorrectly written for the old Turkic *koš* ‘a led, or spare, horse’ (Clausen [sic!] 1972: 670a), or *küse-* ‘to wish, desire’ (Clausen [sic!] 1972: 749). The word *balad* may be a distortion of *bolud* ‘steel’ (Lessing 1995: 118a), or of the Old Turkic *bulit/bulut* ‘cloud’ (Clausen [sic!] 1972: 333a), but neither is certain.” (p. 48, n. 79)

This is not realistic, or to be more exact, rather unscientific.

As for the name-giving strategies of the Mongols, the reader can profit from Rybatzki’s voluminous work titled *Die Personennamen und Titel der mittelmongolischen Dokumente* (2006), available on the Internet.

The term ‘transformation’ used by Rogers in such contexts as “The transformation of *-ngn-* into *-gn-* has been a common sound transformation in Khalkha Mongol” (p. 20, n. 23) seems very odd to me. In this usage the standard word would be ‘change’.

Rogers sometimes incorrectly writes the name of the authors quoted in his work, e.g. Clausen (p. 19, n. 22; p. 43, n. 69; p. 48, n. 79), Kowelewski (p. 5, n. 9) and Gyorgy Kara (p. 8, n. 16) instead of Clauson, Kowalewski and György Kara, respectively.

In conclusion, I can state, despite my mostly methodological critiques, that Rogers’ edition has partly reached its goal. On the one hand, the reader interested in the cultural and historical aspects of the Mongol peoples will enjoy and profit from the English translation. On the other hand, specialists of the field *may* find the transcription of the text a useful addition for the further study of the Mongolian chronicle compositions of the 17th century.