

STUDIA ORIENTALIA
EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA
XVII:7

ALTAISTICA

BY
PENTTI AALTO

HELSINKI 1952

I The Mannerheim Fragment of Mongolian Quadratic Script.

This fragment of a Mongolian xylograph printed in »quadratic» (Dörbelžin, 'phags-pa, Pa-sse-pa) type was acquired by the late Marshal of Finland C. G. Mannerheim in 1906 during his Asiatic travels somewhere in Eastern Turkestan. It was first published and interpreted by G. J. Ramstedt in JSFOu 27, 1912,3 (the article itself being, however, dated already March 1909). The same paper was then reprinted in English translation in 1940 as the 7th article in the second volume of the great work of Mannerheim »Across Asia from West to East in 1906—1908» (SFOu, Travaux ethnographiques, vol. 8, Helsinki 1940). Ramstedt had thus transliterated the text of the fragment, conjectured some syllables, commented some words and also tried to give a translation, noting, however, that such an attempt is »particularly ticklish» in Mongolian, where the sense of a word can with certainty be established only in a sentence. Ramstedt further concluded that he had no idea whatsoever to which work this fragment belongs, guessing, however, that it may be from some Buddhistic treatise.

Ramstedt's transliteration with some minor modifications:

Line 1	s(a) l(a)n ö lö
» 2	re q(a) q(a) lu ju h(a) s(a) qul
» 3	(—)e ni u q(a)n ü lü č(i) d(a)
» 4	se de le du 'e su ° bu
» 5	qu
» 6	sur ta qui e ne ž(a) j(a) 'n dur mer

- Line 7 i tö röl dur ° ö 'e run a
 » 8 (—)un ab qui dur a d(a) li
 » 9 e se ber qu ri j(a) 'a su

Later on this fragment has been treated by Poppe in his *Ist.* p. 82. Considering the two first lines as too fragmentary to be successfully dealt with he rendered only lines 3—9 in transliteration with a translation and some notes (p. 129 f.). We can now, however, see that Ramstedt's reading of the lines 1 and 2 with his ingenious conjecture *arslan* has proved itself as correct and made possible my identification of the fragment: it is obviously the lower right hand corner of the first folio of a printed copy of the Mongolian translation



The Mannerheim Fragment.
 (By courtesy of the Finno-Ugric Society).

of the well known collection of maxims titled *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*¹, in Tibetan *Legs par bsad pa rin po che'i gter*, in Mongolian *Sajin ügetü erdeni jin sang*, by the famous Saskya Paṇḍita.

The text of our fragment corresponds to that on fol. I 4 *a*—*b* and fol. I 5 *a* in the photographic edition of Ligeti and to the sentences 5—8 in the Tibetan text edited by Campbell. I give the corresponding passage of the Mongolian text according to the edition of Ligeti comparing it with our fragment:

- I 4 *a* // jeke uqagatan sintarabasu ber tüled uqagan inu
 küčütü bolumui / görüged un qan arslan ölü-
 1 **slan ölü**
 sbesü ber / žagan u ekin mön degere qagaluju (*b*) asagul-
 2 **re qaqaluju hasagul-**
 čan temečeldüge inagsida / mergen i uqan ülü čida-
 3 **eni uqan ülü čida-**
 ju / könggürge ji dokigur ijer ese deledbesü / bu-
 4 **ese deledü esü bu**
 sud teče ilgal inu jagun i a aqu //
 5 **qu //**
 erdem i managar ükübesü ber surtaqui / ene žajagan dur mer
 6 **surtaqui ene žaja'an dur mer**
 gen ese bolbasu ber / qojiči törül dur öber un a-
 7 **i törül dur ö'er un a**
 saragulugsan / ed ijen öbesün abqui dur adali
 8 **ün abqui dur adali**
 // erdem tu ele bügesü bügüde aran / ese ber qurijabasu
 9 **ese ber quarija'asu**
 öbesün (5 *a*) quramui / ünür tü čečeg qola ber bügestü /
 žöges egülen e metü orčin čiguluju //

¹ Cf. Bu ston Čhos 'byuñ p. 25, where Subhāṣita, one of the appellations for the Word of Buddha, is treated. As to the title of our work, the Subhāṣitaratnakadaṇḍa by Āryaśūra and Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra by Nirṇayasāgara, which were translated into Tibetan, may have been a possible model.

Translation:

Though the men with great intelligence grow old, their intelligence only becomes stronger. Though the King of the wild animals, the Lion, be starving, the leader of the elephants is in an instant slain by him. Until one has disputed and questioned a wise man, he can not comprehend him. If a drum be not beaten with a drumstick, what is its distinction from other things? If one, though dying tomorrow, be learning wisdom (*or »virtues»*) though he can not become wise in this existence, he is like himself cashing capital supplied for the following existence. If one possesses wisdom (*or »virtues»*), all the people will spontaneously assemble around him though not invited. A fragrant blossom, though far off, is surrounded by bees like by a great cloud.

The corresponding passage of the Tibetan text according to the edition of Ligeti:

(I 4 a) blo gros čhen po rgud na yañ / lhag par blo gros stobs ldan 'gyur / ri dgas¹ rgyal po bkres pa na / glañ čhen spyi bo myur du 'gems / (b) mkhas pa bread² čin ma dris pa / de yi bar du gtiñ mi dpogs / rña la dbyugs³ gus ma bsnun⁴ par / de srid gžan dañ khyad č'i yod / rig pa nañ par 'čhi yañ bslab / che 'dir mkhas pa mi srid⁵ kyañ / skye ba phyi mar bčol ba yi / nor la rañ ñid len pa 'dra / yon tan ldan na skye bo kun ma bsdus par (5 a) yañ rañ ñid du⁶ / dri ldan me tog rgyaň riñ yaň / buñ ba sprin⁷ gyi chogs bžin⁸ 'khor //

The variae lectiones in the edition of Campbell: 1) dwags, 2) read, 3) dbyug, 4) bsnan, 5) ma gyur, 6) 'du, 7) sprin, 8) bžin.

The translation of Campbell differs in certain points very much from that given above, especially in rendering the second and third maxims »Wenn man in einer schwierigen Lage nicht den Weisen um Rat fragt, dann reisst man das Übel nicht mit der Wurzel aus» and »Selbst wenn du nächstes Jahr sterben müsstest, strebe nach Weisheit. Wenn du auch in diesem Leben nicht mehr weise werden kannst, so ist doch die Weisheit wie ein Kleinod, dessen Wert sich wieder bezahlt macht». Especially in the former the parallelism of both parts of the maxim is much clearer in the Mongolian translation. The edition of Campbell cannot be considered as a definitive one,

and when a new critical edition of *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* will be made, the Mongolian translations must be used as a control (cf. also Ligeti p. VII).

The author of our text 'Jam mgon Sa skya Paṅ čhen was born in 1182 and was famous for his large erudition already in his youth. His main works were: *Sdom pa gsum gyi bar du dbye ba*, *Chad ma rig pa'i gter* and *Legs par bśad pa rinpo čhe'i gter*, which have been very highly esteemed by Tibetan literary criticism (see Huth p. 125 f.). The Mongol Imperial Duke Godan (1234—1251) invited him to his capital, where he then lived until his death in 1251. *Sa-skya Paṅḍita* has formerly been mentioned as the inventor of the Mongolian alphabet, but as shown by Pelliot (AM 2, p. 284 ff.) his merits were in fact very unpretentious.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi is no work of great originality but rather a compilation of older literature (cf. Ligeti p. VIII ff. and Vladimircov p. 44 ff.), but it became popular very soon and was also translated into Mongolian. The date of this translation is not known, but just our fragment proves that it must have happened sometimes around 1300. In the ancient manuscript preserved in Leningrad the name of the translator is not mentioned (cf. Vladimircov p. 44 fn. 1), while according to Ligeti (p. XIII) the preface of the Budapest manuscript gives the name *tarniči tojin Sonom gar a*. It may, however, be doubtful, whether he was the first translator. This work has later been very popular among the Oirats and there is a copy of it in Oirat, e.g. in the Ethnographical Museum at Stockholm and several others in Leningrad (cf. Vladimircov pp. 43 ff.).

The main value of our fragment lies in the fact that it is the first material proof we have of the use of the 'Phags-pa letters in printing. This alphabet was composed by 'Phags pa blo gros rgyal mchan (1235—1280) at the request of the Emperor Khubilai (1260—1296) and promulgated 1269 (cf. Poppe *Ist.* p. 11 ff.). It was mainly used in official documents, but even here the older Uigurian alphabet is sometimes met with, e.g. the great inscription of 1362 is already in Uigurian letters, though the 'Phags-pa alphabet remained to some extent in use until the dethronement of the Mongolian Yüan dynasty.

According to Laufer (T'oung Pao 8, 1907, p. 391 ff.) the »Dolugan ebügen neretü odunu sudur», edited in 1330, is the oldest known printed Mongolian book. Here as well in all other prints the Uigurian alphabet is used. It is in my opinion not impossible that the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi had been translated and printed already before the year 1330, since it seems to be very improbable that such a great work had been printed with this uncomfortable alphabet after that year, when the above mentioned Sūtra was printed in the Uigurian characters. We can thus very well have here a fragment of the earliest printed Mongolian book and very probably an of the editio princeps of the Mongolian Subhāṣitaratnanidhi.

Laufer asserted (p. 187) that the quadratic script has not been used in print and also Ramstedt stated (p. 5) that this use was not known before this fragment was found. In his paper JA V sér. tome XIX, 1862, p. 21 f. Pauthier, however, quotes several Chinese sources, which tell us that some Chinese treatises (e.g. Hiao-king in 1307 and Tching-kouan in 1332) were published »in the language and the characters of the Empire» viz. in Mongolian written with the quadratic alphabet (cf. also Poppe Ist. p. 16).

As to its language our fragment obviously represents an earlier stage than the MS of Ligeti. Ramstedt noted (p. 3) that it contains some noteworthy details for the phonetics of ancient Mongolian, but promised to discuss them in some other connection. This has, however, never been done. As in the Phagspa script in general, even in our fragment **q** is written instead of a **g** (cf. Lewicki p. 109 ff.). The most archaic detail in the language of the fragment is the writing **hasagulčan** to which corresponds *asagulčan* in the Ligeti MS (cf. Poppe AM N. F. 1, 1944, p. 97 and Ist. p. 30 and 40 as well as Lewicki p. 111). The basic verb *hasag-* ~ *hasagu-* occurs in MNT according to the vocabulary of Haenisch two times with an initial *h-* (§§ 38 and 100). In our text as well as in MNT have *g* and *b* ~ *w* in intervocalic position already disappeared being rendered only through the hiatus ':

žaja'an: MNT (§§ 66, 194, 248 etc.) *žaja'an*: Houa-yi yi-yu *žaja'an*
(Lewicki p. 97): MS Ligeti *žajagan*;

ö'erün: MNT (§§ 25, 26, 40 etc.) *ö'erün:* MS Ligeti *öberün;*

deledü'esü, qurija'asu: MNT conditional converbs e.g. § 154 *daru'asu, bara'asu, iču'agda'asu* etc.: MS Ligeti *deledbesü, qurijabasu* (cf. Poppe AM 1, 1924, p. 670 and AM N. F. 1, 1944, p. 98 and 113, and Ist. p. 40 f.); Houa-yi yi-yu has e.g. *durala'asu* etc. but also *čidabasu* (see Lewicki p. 131).

Ligeti calls the language of his MS «moyen mongol», but if we use this term in the meaning attributed to it e.g. by Poppe and Vladimircov, who denote with it the language of MNT and its equals, it would be the Mannerheim fragment, which represents the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi in a Middle Mongolian drafting, while the text of Ligeti is so much later, though with some archaisms, that the normal orthography had in most details been fixed (cf. Ligeti Rapport p. 58 f.).¹

Literature:

CAMPBELL, W. L., Die Sprüche von Sakya. Ostasiatische Zeitschrift N. F. 2, 1925, p. 31 ff.

HUTH, G., Hor čhos 'byuñ. Geschichte des Buddhismus in der Mongolei. II Strassburg 1896.

LAUFER, B., Skizze der mongolischen Literatur. Keleti Szemle 8, 1907, p. 165 ff.

LEWICKI, M., La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV^e siecle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389. Wroclaw 1949.

LIGETI, L., Rapport préliminaire d'un voyage d'exploration fait en Mongolie Chinoise 1928—1931. Budapest 1933.

Le Subhāṣitaratnanidhi mongol I. Bibl. Or. Hung. VI, Budapest 1948.

MNT: Manghol un ni'uca tobca'an. Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Ed. by E. Haenisch, Leipzig 1935/1937. Wb. 1939.

POPPE, N., История Монгольской Письменность I, Квадратная письменность. Москва—Leningrad 1941.

VLADIMIRCOW, B. J., Монгольскій сборникъ разсказовъ изъ Раңцатантра. Сборн. Музея Антропологии и Этнографий V. Petrograd 1921.

¹ I likewise feel some doubts as to the high age of the Mongolian drafting of the Bodhicāryāvātāra edited in the Bibliotheca Buddhica vol. XXVIII (cf. Poppe ZDMG 100, 195 p. 59), since there occur already such dialectal forms as *sečeg* and the Nomen possibilitatis *ülesi ügei* is already common (no instances in MNT?). The compilative and eclectic character of this edition is announced in the colophon.

II The Suffixes *-lar*, *-nar*, *-lār*.

Beside the sociative in *-lā* ~ *-lē*, e.g. *gallā*, *taɣlā*, *emgūlē*, *usnlā*, *dūlē* or with the reflexive possessive suffix *gallāγān*, *taɣlāγān* etc., which is to be traced back to the sociative in *-luga* ~ *-lūge* of the Mongolian literary language, Kalmuckian also has a suffix *-lār*, which, however, occurs in general only in connection with the reflexive suffix, thus *-lārān*, e.g. *gallārān*, *usylārān*, *dūlērān* (cf. Ramstedt KWb. p. xiv § 19, Kotwicz Gramm. p. 193) 'together with his fire, water, younger brother' (as to the reflexive suffix see Ramstedt VA p. 31 ff.). A suffix *-lar* + the reflexive suffix *-an* is also met with in the comitative-sociative of the reflexive declension in Ordos. Mostaert (Textes oraux ordos, Peiping 1937 p. xxxvii f.) quotes the following instances: *bačsilāran*, *ɔālāran*, *χānlāran*, *emlēren* 'together with his teacher, chief, emperor, medicine'. Even in Buryat we have a corresponding suffix for the sociative case which is, however, used without the reflexive suffix, thus *šamolār*, *aɣlār*, *tengrālēr* 'together with you, the elder brother, the God' (Poppe Bury. Gramm. p. 128). According to Castrén (Burj. Gramm. p. 10) this case does not here necessarily express concomitancy but only a mutual contact. He quotes instances only of the personal pronouns. While discussing the Comitativus-sociativus of the various Mongolian languages and dialects in his paper »Geserica» (Asia Major III, 1926, p. 24 § 11) Poppe does not mention the forms in *-lar*, which seem not to be used in Khalkha-Mongolian (cf. Poppe Kh.-Mong. Gr. p. 62 f.). In his grammar of the literary language (p. 61) he explains *-lār* as being a combination of *-luga* (Sociativus) and *-bar* (Instrumentalis). Rudnev enumerates in his lectures (p. 81) as suffixes of the Comitativus *-luga*, *-lā*, *-lār* (the last one with a question mark) and *-taj* without further details.

The above explanation of Poppe is not, in my opinion, sufficient. The writing *-luga-bar* (which is indeed read *-lār*) can also be a learned »popular etymology» of the form *-lār*, since we have some early instances of *-lar* in the literary language too. The printed Chinese edition of the MNT has in § 214 a reading *Qargil-šira ji süke ler kitugai bar mōn tende alažui* 'schlugen den Q. mit Beil und Schwert

gleich auf der Stelle tot'. Haenisch, who has accepted in his edition the reading *ber* of the other sources, compares in his note 7 this *ler* with the Kalmuckian suffix treated above. Such an occasional instance can, of course, be a pure mistake, but hardly all the cases in which this suffix is met with in the Mongolian translation of the Pañcarakṣā, e. g. Mahāmāyūrī fol. 15 r:¹ *tere ber köbegüd ijer ijen nigen e / ači nar lar ijan nigen e / aqa degü ner ler ijen nigen e / nojad lar ijan nigen e / güregen terigülegčid ijer ijen nigen e / žarudasun lar ijan nigen e / elčid ijer ijen nigen e / nöküd ijer ijen nigen e /*. This same sequence with almost the same cases of *lar* is then repeated several times after each Lokapāla, e. g. fol. 15 v, fol. 16 r und v, fol. 33 r. The corresponding passage of the Sanskrit original reads as follows (ed. of Oldenburg p. 229): *so'pi saputraḥ sapautraḥ sabhrātā samātyaḥ sasenapatiḥ sapreṣyaḥ sadūtaḥ sapravaraḥ sapāriṣadaḥ*, and in Tibetan (in the block-print copy of Stockholm H 3503, II fol. 16 v): *de yañ bu dañ bčas / cho bo dañ bčas / spun dañ bčas / blon po dañ bčas / sde dpon dañ bčas / mdag pa dañ bčas / pho ña dañ bčas / gyog dañ bčas / 'khor dañ bčas pas /*.

In the MS copy H 1829 of the same museum (cf. Ethnos I. c.) which represents obviously a corrected and normalized drafting of the Mongolian text the same passage runs (II fol. 13 v): *tere ber köbegüd lüge nigen e / ači nar luga nigen e / aqa degü ner lüge nigen e / tüsimed lüge nigen e / gürijen terigülegčid lüge nigen e / žarudasun luga nigen e / bogol luga nigen e / talbigčid luga nigen e / nöküd lüge nigen e /*. In the older drafting we thus have the instrumental in its sociative function, which it often has (cf. Latin, where the pure Abl. instr. is used when speaking of soldiers accompanying their chief), but also the correct sociative is to be found there, e. g. in Mahāśīta-vanī fol. 5 r: *ai jekes qad a jirtinčü tur tegri ner lüge nigen e / simnus luga nigen e / sirua luga nigen e / tojin bira-man luga nigen e / törül ten kiged / tegri ner lüge nigen e /*.

It is not easy to explain why the suffix *-lar* has here been used

¹ I am quoting the Peking block-print copy of the Ethnographical Museum at Stockholm, where this very edition is represented by 6 copies (see my paper in Ethnos 1950: 1—2 p. 7).

only after some of the nouns and always furnished with the reflexive suffixe. We can guess that its use is a dialectical feature which later editors have tried to eliminate and replace with the correct literary forms. It is to note that the Pañcarakṣā was one of the Buddhist works earliest translated into Mongolian.¹ We must here also take into account the influence of Uigur, which is mentioned in the colophon of our copy as well as in the source quoted by Schmidt in his edition of Sanang Setsen p. 398.

The length of the vowel of *-lār* in the spoken dialects can in my opinion be explained through the analogy of the other instrumental and comitative suffixes, e. g. Bury. *garār*, *modōr*, *ɣarguigār*, *bur'āhār* ~ *bur'āsār*, *ulāgār*, *ɣargovjār* etc. (Poppe Bury. Gr. p. 127), Kalm. *usār*, *dūgēr*, *usŋlā*, *dūlē*, *ustā*, *dūtē* etc. (Ramstedt KWb. p. xiv), Khalkha *garār*, *utāgār*, *noɣoigōr* etc. (Poppe Kh.-Mong. Gr. p. 64).

If we thus suppose the (New-) Mongolian suffix *-lar* to be unitary and not a compound, and look for correspondences in the other Altaic languages, the Turkic suffix *-lar* which is now the general suffix of plural seems to be the nearest relative. The Turkic affixes expressing plurality had originally no obvious plural meaning but only a collective (cf. Grønbech p. 57, Gabain § 168), and such affixes were only used with nouns denoting persons. A kind of plural was paraphrased in the Orkhon inscriptions by the addition of the noun or adverb *qop* 'all (together), many, whole, several', e. g. *kiši oyli qop olgāli törümüš* 'alle Menschenkinder werden geboren um zu sterben' (cf. Grønbech p. 57, Gabain § 302). Other words with a collective meaning could also be used in the same function e. g. *qun* ~ *ɣun* ~ *kün* ~ *gün* originally »people», *alqu* 'jederman, alles, alle, sämtlich, allerhand', *saju* 'jeder', *qopan* 'alle', e. g. *kālin-gün-üm* 'my daughters-in-law' < »my daughter-in-law people» (cf. Grønbech p. 58, Gabain §§ 3, 50, 169). Even *lar* seems to have had originally only a collective meaning, e. g. in the inscriptions of Orkhon *türk oyuz bäglär budun ešidin* 'hört dieses, Adel der Türken und Oguzen

¹ The first translation was made by Chos-kyi 'Od-zer in the beginning of the 14th century and revised later by Šes-rab Sen-ge; cf. also Poppe AM I, 1924, p. 668 f., who does not, however, mention sociatives like these above.

und das gemeine Volk' (cf. Grønbech p. 57). According to Gabain *lar* is used in the inscriptions much more scarcely than in the manuscripts, and it is in general written separately. There are also instances where *lar* has no plural meaning at all, e. g. *bodhisawattlar* 'a Bodhisatva', which are perhaps to be compared with Mongolian expressions like *lama tan* 'a Lama' (cf. Poppe Bury. Gr. § 113).

The syntactical use of the Turkic *lar* has been studied by Kowalski, who also (p. 25 ff.) summarizes the etymological explanations proposed by various scholars. These etymologies are also discussed by Kotwicz (p. 28 ff.). Thus Munkácsi and Deny derived *lar* from the plural form *olar* of the demonstrative pronoun, which would have been used enclitically as »copula», while Bang would trace it back to a deverbal *ula-r* and Räsänen to *il-er*, respectively. Even Kowalski regards *lar* as an originally independent word and proposes a possibility of combining it with the other suffixes beginning with an *l*, e. g. *-lyγ*, *-lyq* (p. 31). According to Kotwicz (p. 29 f.) there are no traces of an independent use of *-lar*, and he therefore connects it with the comitative suffixes *-lan* and *-lyn* of Yakutian. He also mentions p. 30 the Mongolian comitative suffix *-lar* without any further explanation. This hypothesis of Kotwicz implicates a similar semantic development as my above supposition, though in my opinion both plural and comitative meanings can have arisen from the same origin, viz. from an independent word with a collective meaning like »several, all, together». The probable instances of the Mongolian *-lar* in the Secret History and in the Pañcarakṣā suggest that this suffix is old in Mongolian.

We also find *lar* in other Altaic languages in a comitative or sociative function. The Yakut comitative in *-lary* seems to be the accusative case of this affix or word: *žäätin süösüläri atylata* 'verkaufte sein Haus mit dem Vieh' (cf. Yastremski § 223). It has a correspondance in the Goldi adverb *lari* 'neben, zu, gemeinsam' (Grube p. 57).¹

¹ RAMSTEDT also connects with these: Goldi and Olcha *largi* (Grube p. 57, P. Schmidt Olcha p. 263), Oroche *larki* (P. Schmidt Oroche p. 48) and Manchu *largin* 'Sorge, Pein'.

Ramstedt supposed (VA p. 35 f.) — as did Kotwicz p. 28¹ — that the Mongolian plural suffix *nar* is to be etymologically connected with the Turkic *lar* as being a younger euphonic form of this. It is used only after nouns denoting persons. By the side of it Mongolian has also an adjective *narmai* 'alles, all, alle überhaupt' (Golstunski II p. 13), in Kalmuckian *narmā* 'alle, all' (Ramstedt KWb. p. 272) and *nar-ugē* 'einmal für immer', where Ramstedt supposes an original noun **nar* »Gesamtheit, das Nebeneinander» > 'alle, zusammen' corresponding to Yakute *nār* 'together' (Pekarski p. 91).²

We can suppose that this independent substantive *lar* ~ *nar* »Gesamtheit» was in the oldest Turkic and Mongolian used as the last member of a kind of nominal compounds and become thus an affix and at last a suffix denoting either concomitance or plurality. The Mongolian *nar* is the younger form of these two being based on a similar phonetic development which has produced the Mongolian *nojan* out of the Chinese *lō-jā* (cf. Ramstedt KWb. p. 278: *nojŋ*), since there were no initial *l* in Mongolian or Turkic. The same development has taken place in Mong. *nal* < Persian *la'al* 'ruby' (cf. Vladimircov Mongolica I No. 25, who supposes a Tibetan intermediary), mong. *načín* < Turk. *načyn* ~ *lačyn*, Sino-Korean *la-tjēn* '(the Latin) falcon' (Ramstedt SKE p. 135); cf. Pelliot p. 159 fn. 1.

How a word with a collective meaning has been weakened to a suffix denoting plurality can be shown by many parallels. We have e. g. Turkic *böläk* 'detachment, army' (= Japanese *buraku* 'division') > Chuvass. (Ramstedt) **-büläk* as a plural suffix > Cheremissian *-wläk* id. Ramstedt connects the Tungusian plural suffix *-sal* ~ *-sel* (with the variant *-nasal*, where *-na-* according to Ramstedt = Kor. *nai* 'man, person') as an originally independent word **sel* '(all) together' with the Mongolian sociative adverb *selte*, Kalm. *selte*

¹ The Buryat suffixe *-nad* (Poppe Bury. Gr. p. 115 § 111) referred to by Kotwicz is naturally a double plural of *-nar* of the type *gažar* ~ *gažad*; there are also such double plurals as *lamanarūd*, *ažanarnūd*.

² There is in Tibetan an adjective *nar-ma* 'continuous, without interruption' which could perhaps be somehow related.

(KWb. p. 232) 'alle einbegriffen', 'alles das', 'zusammengenommen'; e. g. Tung. *kān* 'King', *kāsal* 'kings', Kalm. *tegeD eD bolŋ mōŋgŋ selteḡān bār-tsoḡ bolāD* 'darauf boten wir als Opfergeschenk unsere Waren und auch unser Geld dar', etc. A contamination of the sociative and plural meaning is met with in the Mongolian Mahāpratisarī (= Pañcarakṣā III) fol. 3 v: (text B) *nökür selte lüge*: (text A) *nöküd lüge*.

The Chuvassian plural suffix *-sam* ~ *-sem* is according to Ramstedt < **sen* < Turkic *sajyn* 'each, every'.

Similar semantic and functional developments are to be found also in other languages. Thus we have in Tibetan a substantive *rnam* 'piece' of which the instrumental case *rnams*, originally meaning »piece by piece«, is the most common particle of the plural. Also *bčas-pa* »together with« is in Tibetan often used as a sign of plural.

The supposed Turco-Mongolian noun **lar* »Gesamtheit« can not be of Altaic origin since there were no initial *l-* in Altaic, i. e. *lar* must be a loan word. In his paper »A Comparison of the Altaic Languages with Japanese« (Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan, Second Series I p. 41 ff. Tokyo 1924) Ramstedt mentions (p. 53) in passing the possibility that Turkic *lar* could be a Chinese loan word and possibly even connected with the Japanese suffix *-ra*.

If this supposition is true, we must, in my opinion, suppose that there has taken place a phonetic development similar to that which has given us the Mongolian and Turkic name of Buddha *bur-qan* and the Uigurian *pu-sar* 'Bodhisatva'. In the former the initial syllable *bur*¹ is to be traced back to some dialectal form of the Ancient Chinese *b'ust* > Mandarin *-fo*, Cantonese *fo* (Karlgren Anal. Dict. p. 48, No. 47), while the latter according to Stael-Holstein (p. 140) is loaned from the Chinese (Cantonese) *p'o-sat*.

The same phonetical development is attested in Mong. Turk.

¹ We have probably this very *bur* in Mongolian *bursan* which occurs in the common hendiadyoin *bursan quwarag* 'the Buddhist Community', where *san* no doubt is derived from Sanskr. *saṅgha*, *quwarag* being borrowed from the Uigurian *quwray*, which translates already Sanskr. *saṅgha*.

tarqan < Chin. *t'ât-kuan* (Ramstedt VA p. 63) and further in many proper and place names, e. g. Persian *Mîhr* 'sun' is written in Chinese with a sign pronounced in Mandarin *mi*, in Cantonese *mít*, Persian *Tîr* 'Mercury' is respectively in Mandarin *tiə*, in Cantonese *tit* (see Müller in SBAW 1907 p. 458 ff.), the local name *Termez* (*Tarmid* ~ *Tarmed*) was written by Hiuan-tsang *Ta-mi* (< *tât-miēt*, see Pelliot in CR de l'Acad. d. Sc. URSS, 1929, 297 f.); cf. further Stael-Holstein p. 141 fn. 3.

As a possible Chinese starting-point for the Turco-Mongolian *lar* ~ *ler* I would suggest Ancient Chinese *liät* (< *liat*), in Mandarin *liè*, Cantonese *lit* (Karlgren Anal. Dict. No. 548 p. 178) 'divide, arrange in order, classify; rank, order; various', which according to a friendly statement by Professor Karlgren was pronounced *liäd* in Northern China in the early T'ang and would thus have given *ler* in Turkic. In Chinese this word, however, is, according to Prof. Karlgren, used before its regens.¹ Perhaps we must suppose the form with the front vowel *ler* be the original in Turkic and Mongolian, as suggested already by Räsänen (in *Studia Orientalia* IV: 2 p. 6). Since this suffix does not occur in Chuvassian, it seems to be loaned to the Turkic languages after the ancestors of the Chuvassians (= the Huns?) had separated from the linguistic and ethnic unity. On the other hand, the borrowing seems not to have happened long before the writing of the Orkhon inscriptions and thus we would come to times around the beginning of the T'ang period referred to by Professor Karlgren. If the Turkic form with *e* is the original, the phonetic ($e > a \sim e$) — as well as the semantic — development were the same as in the Ancient Chinese *təng* (Mandarin *təng*, Cantonese *təng*, Japanese *tō*; Karlgren Anal. Dict. No. 811 p. 243) 'equal, of the same sort; sort, class, rank; classify; various; plural mark', which according to Ramstedt is the origin of the Mongolian and Tungusian plural suffix *-tan* (corresponding to Mongolian

¹ In Karlgren *Grammata Serica* p. 258 we have the No. 519k (No. 528 in Anal. Dict.) * *liər* 'numerous, all', which, however, was not used after the beginning of our Christian era.

singular *-tu* ~ *-tai*). Since *-tan*, however, is a regular Mongolian plural in *-n* to the singular *-tai*, I doubt whether all cases of *-tan* in Mongolian can be traced back to this Chinese word.

Literature:

- CASTRÉN, M. A., Versuch einer Burjätischen Sprachlehre. Nordische Reisen und Forschungen X. St. Petersburg 1857.
- GABAIN, A. v., Alttürkische Grammatik, Leipzig 1950.
- GRØNBECHE, K., Der türkische Sprachbau, Kopenhagen 1936.
- GRUBE, W., Goldisch-deutsches Wörterverzeichnis. St. Petersburg 1900.
- HAENISCH, E., Manghol un niuca tobca'an. Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen. Leipzig 1935/37.
- YASTREMSKI, S. V., Падежные суффиксы в якутском языке. Irkutsk 1898. Грамматика якутского языка. Irkutsk 1900.
- KOTWICZ, WL., Les pronoms dans les langues altaïques. (Prace komisji orientalistycznej Nr. 24). Krakow 1936.
- Опыт грамматики калмыцкого разговорного языка. Prag 1929.
- KOWALSKI, T., Zur semantischen Funktion des Pluralsuffixes *-lar -lār* in den Türkisprachen. Krakow 1936 (PKO Nr. 25).
- PEKARSKI, E. K., Краткий русско-якутский словарь. Jakutsk 1905.
- POPPE, N., Грамматика писменно-монгольского языка. Moskva—Leningrad 1937.
- Грамматика бурят-монгольского языка. Moskva—Leningrad 1938.
- Khalkha-mongolische Grammatik, Glückstadt 1951.
- RAMSTEDT, G. J., Kalmückisches Wörterbuch. Helsinki 1935.
- Aufsätze und Vorträge, Journ. Soc. F.-ougr. 55: 2, Helsinki 1951.
- Lectures and manuscripts.
- RUDNEV, A., Лекции по грамматике монгольского писменного языка. St. Petersburg 1905.
- SCHMIDT, P., The Language of the Olchas. Riga 1923.
- The Language of the Oroches. Riga 1928.
- STAËL-HOLSTEIN: Bemerkungen zu den Brähmīglossen des Tišastvustik-Manuscripts. Bibliotheca Buddhica XII p. 77 ff. St. Pétersbourg 1910.