

## Altaica from Harrassowitz

Harrassowitz Verlag, founded in Leipzig in 1872 but since 1947 located in Wiesbaden, has grown into the single most important European publisher in the field of Oriental

studies. Among the dozens of series and periodicals it publishes there are also several pertaining to Altaic studies, including the well-known journals *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*,

*Central Asiatic Journal* and *Turkic Languages*. Importantly, these journals do not go to extremes in following the politically correct but ethically questionable system of referee evaluation. Instead, they rely on competent editors. Another positive note is that they do not apply the dull English-only policy, but also publish in German and even in other languages.

Recently, several important volumes have appeared in Harrassowitz's two Altaic monograph series, *Turcologica* and *Tunguso-Sibirica*. The former, published since 1985 and edited by Lars Johanson, today lists as many as 94 volumes (some of them still forthcoming), while the latter, published since 1995 and edited by Michael Weiers and Hans-Reiner Kämpfe, comprises 32 volumes (2011). What is perhaps even more remarkable is that the range of topics covered by these two series is often broader than their names would suggest. The very first volume in the series *Turcologica*, for instance, was the Kalmuck grammar of Johannes Benzing (1985), and the series *Tunguso-Sibirica* likewise contains several Mongolistic contributions. A somewhat odd item in the Tunguso-Siberian context is also the publication of the proceedings of the 43rd PIAC:

MICHAEL KNÜPPEL & ALOÏS VAN TONGERLOO (eds.): *Life and Afterlife & Apocalyptic Concepts in the Altaic World*. Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC), Château Pietersheim, Belgium, September, 3-8, 2000. Tunguso-Sibirica, Band 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011. 163 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06591-7.

The editing of this volume took an exceptionally long time (11 years), which also meant that the volume never reached the hands of the long-time secretary-general of PIAC, Denis Sinor (1916–2011). The 43rd meeting of PIAC itself was dedicated to the memory of two Belgian Orientalists, Johann Wilhelm (Willi) Max Julius Bang-Kaup (1869–1934) and Simon Joseph Nicolas Charles Harlez de Deulin (1832–1899), to whom Aloïs van Tongerloos devotes a biographical article in the volume. Today de Harlez is relatively little known among Altaists, but he was in fact the author of an important early grammar of Manchu and an accompanying collection of texts (1884).

Bang and de Harlez are also discussed by Hartmut Walravens, whose article in this volume contains an annotated bibliography of the Manchu contributions of

these two scholars, as well as of their contemporary Paul Georg von Möllendorff (1847–1901). Another article, by the late Shamil F. Muchamedjarov and Elena A. Antonova, deals with Bang's connections with Russian Orientalists. Finally, Giovanni Stary presents a historiographical survey of Manchu shamanic studies “from Charles de Harlez till present times”. In this connection, Stary quotes interesting anecdotal information concerning the at times violent disputes between the great Manchurists of the 19th and early 20th century.

Much of the rest of the volume is loosely dedicated to the titular topic of an “afterlife” and related issues. Here we find a rather eclectic collection of papers on shamans' drums by Roger Finch, on Turkic premodern poetry by İsmail Parlâtır, on the Karakorum fountain by Sarolta Tatár, on Armeno-Kipchak prayers by Edward Tryjarski, and on Old Turkic descriptions of the Buddhist Hell(s) by Peter Zieme. A particularly interesting contribution is that by Maria Magdolna Tatár on Mongolian Christian terminology. Since the end of the Communist era, Mongolia has become a hunting ground for North American and South Korean (pseudo-)Christian fundamentalist sectarians, but many Christian terms and concepts have no normative Mongolian

forms. The modern missionaries are of course ignorant of their Catholic and Orthodox predecessors, which is why Biblical personages (such as ‘Mary’ and ‘James’) are being (re)introduced under their English names. The American God speaks English, but He should be more concerned with the local context.

The volume also contains the thematically unrelated contribution by Alexander Vovin on the only extant Khitan bilingual text, the so-called Langjun inscription (1134), written in the Khitan Small Script and accompanied by a Chinese text on the same stele, which itself still stands in its original location in the Tang imperial tomb complex (*Qianling*) close to Chang'an (present-day Xi'an). This is also basically a very important contribution, although development in the decipherment of the Khitan Small Script during the past decade has been particularly rapid, and some of Vovin's conclusions are no longer valid. Even so, he also makes many correct observations and gives relevant etymological suggestions. Many of his results are now confirmed by the study of the same text carried out by Daniel Kane in his handbook on Khitan (*Handbuch der Orientalistik* VIII, 19/2009, pp. 185–189). What is frustrating is that this relatively short text still contains so much that cannot be ‘read’.

A more strictly Tungusological work is the monographic corpus of Ewen (Lamut) folktales published by Michael Knüppel on the basis of materials originally brought together by Gerhard Doerfer:

GERHARD DOERFER: *Lamutische Märchen und Erzählungen*. Teil I: *Kategorisierte Märchen und Erzählungen*. Teil II: *Nicht-kategorisierte Märchen und Erzählungen*. Nach dem Tod des Verfassers herausgegeben, eingeleitet und kommentiert von Michael Knüppel. Tunguso-Sibirica, Band 30, 1-2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011. 120 + 168 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06551-1.

Gerhard Doerfer (1920–2003) was by far the most important German Altaist of the 20th century. Unlike his teacher, K. H. Menges (1908–1999), Doerfer was a critically-minded comparatist, who came to be the foremost opponent of the Altaic Hypothesis of G. J. Ramstedt and Nicholas Poppe. Doerfer also worked specifically on several ‘Altaic’ languages, including Manchu (the topic of his PhD thesis) and Khalaj Turkic (his important discovery in Iran). The Northern Tungusic Ewen language was another of his constant favorites, though he never got an opportunity to do personal fieldwork on it.

Ewen also occupied a prominent place in the project on “North Asian Cultural History” (*Nordasiatische Kulturgeschichte*) that Doerfer directed from his chair in Göttingen (1972–1985). The project resulted in important publications, but also in some curiosities, such as the huge Ewen-Russian-German dictionary in Romanized Cyrillic (*Lamutisches Wörterbuch*, 1980; reviewed by the present author in *FUF* 45/1983). Much more was supposed to be done, but due to the lack of competent disciples and collaborators much remained unpublished in spite of the immense productivity of Doerfer himself (he once wrote to the present author that “he was publishing more than all the others at his department taken together”). This situation is now being rapidly amended by Doerfer’s last disciple, Michael Knüppel, who, finally, is showing a level of both competence and productivity worthy of Doerfer’s heritage.

Among the enterprises successfully completed by Knüppel there is already the critical edition of S. M. Shirokogoroff’s (1887–1939) *Tungus Dictionary* (2004, originally published in mimeographed autograph manuscript in 1944). With the publication of the Ewen folktales another task initiated by Doerfer has been completed. This is basically a folkloristic work; the tales are pre-

sented only in German translation, and many of them have not even been available in the Ewen original. As it is, the two volumes contain close to 100 tales, some of them in several versions. The material is organized into ‘categorized’ and ‘uncategorized’ tales, the latter of which also include a few ‘untypified’ and ‘untypifiable’ items. The relevance of this classification may of course be questioned, and in any case it is based on the classic version of the Aarne-Thompson system, while the extended version by Hans-Jörg Uther (2004) has apparently not been used (though it is referred to in the bibliography).

During his lifetime Doerfer already demonstrated a keen interest in folktales, publishing a volume of Siberian tales (*Sibirische Märchen*) in the series *Die Märchen der Weltliteratur* (1983). This earlier publication contains only four Ewen tales, while the rest come from the other Tungusic groups, as well as from Yakut. In the postscript to the volume, Doerfer discusses the folkloric and ethnohistorical background of the tales. Similar information is contained in the volumes published by Knüppel, though in some cases it is not quite clear which comments come from Doerfer and which from Knüppel. From the linguistic point of view, the most interesting comments (apparently by Doerfer him-

self) are those contained in a section on “Buddhist reminiscences” in Tungusic (pp. 16–28 in Volume 2). Among other things, this section contains notes on the etymology of the term *shaman*. Even so, the conclusion remains a bit diffuse, leaving the way open for a definitive treatment of the term.

It may be added that Knüppel’s publication contains a well-informed biographical presentation of Doerfer, as well as other kinds of background material pertaining to Doerfer’s oeuvre and his role in the project on ‘North Asian Cultural History’. There is also a outline grammar of Ewen (pp. 21–27 in Volume 1), though it remains rather irrelevant in this publication, which contains no material in the Ewen language.

Another Tungusological monograph, but written in a rather different spirit, is the work by José Andrés Alonso de la Fuente on the historical morphology of Manchu and the other Tungusic languages:

JOSÉ ANDRÉS ALONSO DE LA FUENTE: *Tense, Voice and Aktionsart in Tungusic: Another Case of “Analysis to Synthesis”?* Tunguso-Sibirica, Band 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011. xix, 144 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06632-7.

The starting point of this work is the well-known discrepancy that exists between the relatively analytic structure of Manchu and the highly synthetic structure of the rest of the Tungusic languages. This discrepancy is conventionally assumed to be due to the “simplification” of Manchu morphology under the impact of Khitan(ic), Mongolian and Chinese. Morphological complexity in Northeast Asia is a feature that increases towards the north and west and decreases towards the south and east. Alonso de la Fuente now proposes that Manchu represents in this respect an ‘archaic’ state, while the other Tungusic languages are ‘innovative’. This he attempts to prove by claiming that some of the synthetic structures in the Tungusic languages can actually be derived from more primary analytic constructions still attested in Manchu.

As a working hypothesis, at least, the idea is sound. There is no reason to assume that complexity is *a priori* primary; rather the contrary, for it is a generally accepted fact that morphological elements quite often represent traces of independent words. Examples of this are known also from Tungusic: for instance, the Proto-Tungusic dative (dative-locative) case ending *\*-dOO* (> Manchu *-de*) is now known to derive from the postpositionally used spatial *\*doo(-)* ‘inside’. Alonso de la Fuente

focuses on a number of verbal constructions, pertaining to the categories of tense, voice and *Aktionsart*, which in Manchu still seem to be at the analytic stage, while elsewhere in Tungusic they have according to him resulted in synthetic morphological forms.

A common source of secondary verbal stems in the ‘Altaic’ (better, ‘Ural-Altaic’) languages is the combination of the converbial form of a lexical main verb with the stem of an auxiliary verb. In Manchu itself we have the ‘present tense’ form in *-mbi*, which involves a transparent union of the converb in *-me* with the copular-existential *bi*. Along similar lines, Alonso de la Fuente postulates that the Manchu analytic construction *-me+gene-* ‘to go to do something, to be going to do something’ is the prototype of the future marker *\*-ngAA-* in the other Tungusic languages. In this connection he also mentions the “completive” in *\*-nAA-* and the “purposive” in *\*-ngnA-*, but suggests more complicated explanations for these. One wonders, in particular, why the marker *\*-ngnA-*, as in (Ulcha) *waa-* ‘to kill’ : *waa-ngna-* ‘to be going to kill’ could not simply derive from the verb *\*ngene-* ‘to go’, preceded by either a zero converb (*\*-Ø*) or an otherwise lost converb marker (*\*-mV*). Even so, the derivation of the future marker *\*-ngAA-* from the

same verb (in combination with a preceding converb) cannot be ruled out as a possibility.

As far as voice markers are concerned, Alonso de la Fuente explains the reciprocal marker *\*-mAA-ti-* as a combination of the converb in *\*-mV* with the auxiliary *\*oo-* ‘to do, to become’. Although this is both phonologically and semantically plausible, one problem is that the corresponding analytic construction in *-me+o-* in Manchu is not used in a reciprocal function. Moreover, the element *\*-ti-* in the complex reciprocal marker is – despite efforts by de la Fuente – rather difficult to explain. A further proposal by Alonso de la Fuente is that the captative suffix *-mAA-*, as in (Ewenki) *ollo* ‘fish’: *ollo-moo-* ‘to catch fish’, would also derive from the combination *\*-mV+oo-*, with the converb marker attached to a noun. This, however, is impossible, as converbs are a strictly verbal category in Tungusic.

Even more problems are involved in the explanation of the habitual-repetitive-iterative suffix *\*-pAA-ti-* (> *\*-wAA-ti-*) from the combination *\*-mV+bi-*, the source of Manchu *-mbi(-)*. In the absence of independent supporting evidence, the derivation is simply phonetically unacceptable. One wonders why Alonso de la Fuente does not derive *\*-pAA-ti-* from the more obvious

combination of the converb in *\*-pV* (> Manchu *-fi*) with the auxiliary *\*oo-*. In this connection, it might also be relevant to consider the two different aorist stems that the verb *\*oo-* has: the transitive *\*oo-ra(-)* ‘to do’ and the intransitive *\*oo-da(-)* ‘to become’ (< ?‘to be done’). We really do not know if these two stems represent a single etymon, but irrespective of this, the morphological difference might have something to do with the element *\*-ti-* in both *\*-pAA-ti-* and *\*-mAA-ti-*.

It may be concluded that Alonso de la Fuente has succeeded in raising the question of the possibility of an analytic origin of certain Tungusic verbal forms. His general claim concerning the ‘archaic’ status of Manchu is, however, premature. The development from analytic constructions to synthetic forms is observed in all Tungusic languages, including Manchu. On the other hand, Manchu has clearly lost some of the morphology that must have been present in Proto-Tungusic. For instance, it seems much more plausible to assume that the system of enclitic personal markers (both predicative and possessive) was lost in Manchu, rather than created secondarily in the other Tungusic languages. The relative looseness of many morphological elements, especially in the nominal realm, is also likely to be an inno-

vation rather than an archaism in Manchu. In any case, in the verbal realm Manchu shows many bound morphemes that seem to be directly inherited from Proto-Tungusic.

Whatever we may think of the validity of the hypothesis proposed by Alonso de la Fuente, his work is a welcome addition to the literature on Manchu, a language that has all too long been studied in an exclusively philological framework without interaction with linguistic theories. It is also laudable that Alonso de la Fuente is not a proponent of any particular linguistic theory, but simply of a theoretically more ambitious approach to the synchrony and diachrony of Manchu. From this point of view it is regrettable that his text contains rather many typos and other occasional errors. It is, for instance, not clear what he means when he claims (on p. 31) that Jurchen became “a dead language already by the 15th c[.]”. This claim (contradicted elsewhere in his work) is, of course, wrong, for Jurchen as a linguistic lineage is still alive today, having merely changed its name first to Manchu and then to Sibe. Even Written Jurchen was not yet dead in the 15th c., as Alonso de la Fuente must very well know from the relevant publications of Gisaburo N. Kiyose and Daniel Kane.

It happens that linguistics has also made another incursion into the field of Tungusology, in that a collective volume titled *Recent Advances in Tungusic Linguistics*, edited by Andrej L. Malchukov and Lindsay J. Whaley, has recently been published by Harrassowitz. Curiously, this volume (not reviewed here) appeared in *Turcologica* (volume 89/2012), though one would have thought that *Tunguso-Sibirica* would have been its natural place. This may be due to differences in the editorial profiles of the two series, with *Turcologica* (and Lars Johanson) being more likely to accept volumes connected with theoretical topics.

Fortunately for Altaic studies, many general linguists seem to be overcoming their decades-long aversion to diachronic issues. The return to a more balanced panchronic view of languages is taking place via areal and typological studies, for which the ‘Altaic’ languages offer particularly interesting and intricate cases. At the same time, many conventional Altaists (and Ural-Altaists) are increasingly using the methods of general linguistics to explain diachronic and areal phenomena. This is illustrated by the work of Jorma Luutonen on the ‘syntactic nominalizers’ in Chuvash and other ‘Ural-Altaic’ languages:

JORMA LUUTONEN: *Chuvash Syntactic Nominalizers: On \*-ki and its Counterparts in Ural-Altaic Languages*. *Turcologica*, Band 88. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011. 133 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06581-8.

In view of its connection with Chuvash, this volume fills well its place in *Turcologica*. The issue studied by Luutonen, however, has much wider relevance, as ‘syntactic nominalizers’ are present in many languages in the trans-Eurasian zone. In the prototypical case, these elements turn oblique forms of nominals into new basic forms with a wide range of uses, as in Russian *tam* ‘there’: *támo-shn-ii* ‘that which is there, located there’. The term ‘nominalizers’ is just one option, and perhaps not the best one, to summarize the status and functions of the elements concerned. Other terms that have been used, or that could be used, include ‘adnominalizers’, ‘adjectivizers’, ‘substantivizers’, and ‘relativizers’. A further option (proposed by the present author) is to call them ‘nominativizers’, since they transform oblique forms into new, ‘marked’ nominatives, which in turn can take other case endings. Obviously, the terminology depends on whether we focus on the lexicon (parts of speech), mor-

phology (nominal forms), or syntax (roles and constituents).

While the phenomenon is attested in many languages and language families, it is particularly well developed in Turkic and Mongolic, which moreover share the material element *\*-ki* (or *\*-KI*) as the principal marker of this category. This is one of the ‘Altaic’ bound morphemes whose origin remains enigmatic: although certainly not an element inherited from ‘Proto-Altaic’, it has no internal etymology in either Turkic or Mongolic. Even so, the general direction of early areal influences between the two language families would favor the assumption that it is more primary on the Turkic side. In any case, *\*-ki* is typically added to oblique case forms, especially the genitive and the dative-locative, as in Turkish *ev* ‘house’: (locative) *ev-de* ‘in the house’: *ev-de-ki* ‘located in the house’. Its status with regard to inflection vs. derivation is difficult to determine, but an argument in favor of its inflectional status is its full productivity, though the situation varies from language to language.

Luutonen, who is basically a specialist in the languages of the Volga region, was originally inspired by the fact that *\*-ki* in the Turkic languages is traditionally described in a variety of different ways, none

of which appears to be fully adequate. Many grammars of Chuvash in particular place the reflexes of *\*-ki* under the rather misleading term ‘category of distinction’ (*kategoriiia vydeleniia*). The synchronic situation in Chuvash is in fact more complex than in most other Turkic languages, in that *\*-ki* has two different modern reflexes, *-xi* and *-i*, of which the latter (often accompanied by the gemination of the preceding consonant) is moreover formally identical with an allomorph of the 3rd person possessive suffix. In addition, Chuvash has a third, unrelated element, *-sker* (< *+üşker* ‘object, thing’), which has similar functions, but which is also used as an individualizing suffix after the bare stem of various types of nominals (nouns, adjectives and nominalized verbs). There are also connections with the categories of definiteness and specificity.

Luutonen’s description of the relevant synchronic and diachronic properties of the Chuvash elements concerned is exemplary in its concise comprehensiveness. As a basis for the morphological and morphosyntactic discussion he uses the ‘Turku Chuvash Corpus’, which turns out to be an important tool especially for the understanding of the functional differences between the elements *-i*, *-xi* and *-sker*. Other ‘Ural-Altai’ languages are

discussed more cursorily, but the reader is nevertheless informed of the presence of analogies in several Uralic languages, including Hungarian (*-i* after adverbial case endings), Finnish (*-inen* : *-ise-* after the coaffixes *\*-s-* > *-h-* > *-Ø-* and *-ll-*), and Nenets (*-i* after the coaffix *-x-*). It is also not surprising that Mari and Udmurt exhibit features functionally similar to those encountered in the neighboring Chuvash and Tatar.

For the future synchronic and diachronic analysis of *\*-ki* and its reflexes in the various Turkic and Mongolic languages, its role as a ‘relativizer’ appears particularly promising. It is, for instance, interesting to note that the reflex of *\*-ki* in modern Mongolian is formally identical with the most basic (‘futures’) participle marker (originally *\*-kU/i*), both being represented as *-x*, as in *id-* ‘to eat’ : *id-e(.)x* ‘eating’ (= ‘one who eats’) vs. *end* ‘here’ : *end-e.x* ‘located here’ (= ‘one who is here’). Whether this parallelism is secondary and accidental or primary and etymologically motivated, cannot yet be established.<sup>1</sup>

As a final note on the Altaic volumes of Harrassowitz, both those reviewed here and others, it may be said that they are technically well produced as well as reasonably priced. There is, however, one tech-

nical detail that seems to vary in an unsystematic way, in that some of the volumes (such as *Turcologica* 88 and *Tunguso-Sibirica* 31) are properly printed on folded sheets and stitched together, while others (such as *Turcologica* 89 and *Tunguso-Sibirica* 30 and 32) are printed on unfolded sheets and glued together by the cheap and primitive method offered by many modern printing houses. It goes without saying that even soft-cover books should al-

ways be produced with a technology that allows the purchaser to have them properly hand-bound in hard covers.

*Juha Janhunen*

*Note*

- 1 The author is grateful to Matt Shibata for a series of email discussions concerning the relativizing aspect of *\*-ki* and its counterparts in the participial system.