glass beads were found. The subject is one of great interest and its further study should serve to throw new light on Asiatic trade relations in early times. The author draws attention to some of the questions involved; and some of the finer and more striking beads are illustrated in color on three plates at the end of the volume.

This is but a sampling of the many subjects treated in this book and of the vast number and variety of the questions they raise. By no means all the answers are here; but the material is now available for further study, and the solutions to many problems may be materially aided by the rich contents of these tombs. Dr. JANSE's reports take their place beside the publications of the Japanese excavations in Korea as indispensable material for the study of Han culture.

John A. POPE

Freer Gallery of Art

A. v. GABAIN, *Alttürkische Grammatik, Mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch Neutürkisch, Mit vier Schrifttafeln und sieben Schriftproben, 2. verbesserte Auflage, Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Sammlung von Lehrbüchern für das Studium der orientalischen Sprachen, herausgegeben von Richard Hartmann*, XXIII. Leipzig: Otto HARRASSOWITZ, 1950. Pp. xviii + 357 + 18 unnumbered.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1941, but most of the copies were lost as a result of air raids. This second edition is, therefore, a very welcome contribution to Turcology.

Although Ancient Turkic has been explored by many well-known scholars, and the material collected and published on it is considerable, before the publication of Dr. v. GABAIN's book, there was no adequate grammar of the language and the data was scattered in various, often inaccessible, publications. Even to undertake a simple summary of what had been published previously would have been a work deserving much appreciation. The grammar by Dr. A. v. GABAIN, author of numerous publications on Ancient Turkic, is not merely a compilation of what had been published earlier, but the result of independent research and scholarly work on a high theoretic level.

In addition to the section on grammar, this book is an indispensable manual of Ancient Turkic, supplying the reader with everything necessary for the study of that language. It contains a bibliography of works on Ancient Turkic, and on the history, culture, religions, and folklore of the ancient Turks (pp. 225-246 and also in the addenda), and a chrestomathy of Ancient Turkic texts in Roman transcription (pp. 247-290) with vocabulary (pp. 291-357).

The Ancient Turkic to which this book is devoted is the language of the documents in Runic and the so-called Uighur script. The linguistic peculiarities of the documents written in Brāhmī and the Manichean script are also taken into consideration. Chapter I entitled "The Script" (pp. 9-41) contains tables of the Runic, Uighur, Sogdian, Manichean, and Brāhmī characters and samples of texts written in these scripts.

In the Introduction (pp. 1-8) the author discusses the ancient dialects. I agree with Dr. v. GABAIN that the term "Uighur language" is rather misleading (p. 1). As a matter of fact, there is no Uighur language but only a Uighur script that is used to write several dialects or subdialects of Turkic which on the whole do not differ very much from the language of the Runic script. The word "Uighur" should be used solely as a cultural and political term, not as a linguistic one.

The author distinguishes between the following dialects: (1) the *n*-dialect (*anïγ* and *añïγ* "evil" *versus ayïγ id.* in the *y*-dialect), (2) the *y*-dialect, (3) the dialects of the Runic inscriptions, and (4) the dialect of the Brāhmī script. This interesting introduction into the dialects and scripts is followed by Chapter II entitled "Phonetic Remarks" (pp. 42-58). It is, of course, impossible to define precisely the phonetic value of certain ancient characters. Only comparative phonology of the Turkic languages can give us a key to the approximate pronunciation of Ancient Turkic. Chapter II does not raise any objections; I would, however, like to make a few remarks on it. I doubt whether *anča* and

munča, ančulayu and *munčulayu* are really examples of the alternation *a*||*u*. In my opinion *anča* "some, more or less, to some extent" and *munča* "so much, so many" are what the author calls "Äquativ" (with the suffix *-ča*) of the pronominal stems *an-* and *mun-*, while *ančulayu* "in the same manner as . . ." and *munčulayu* "so" are converbs in *-yu* of verbs in *-la-* derived from *ančy* and *munču* (with the suffix *-ču* not related to *-ča* at all). The forms *ančulayu* and *munčulayu* are derived in the same manner as the Mongolian forms *egünčilen* "in this manner" and *tegünčilen* "in that manner" (derived with the suffix *-či-le-n* [*-n* is *converbum modale*] from the pronominal stems *egün-* and *tegün-*). The element *-či-* in *egünčilen* is different from Mo. *-če* in *egün-če* "from this." In my opinion *anča*: *ančulayu* = Mo. *egünče*: *egünčilen*.[1]

In certain cases, different sounds are written in the ancient script with the same character. Dr. v. GABAIN, therefore, does not insist upon the suggested reading but sometimes uses an interrogation mark to indicate that other readings are possible. Occasionally her doubts are not justified and she could be more resolute. Thus, the vowel of the first syllable in *munγul* "desperate" (p. 319) should be transcribed only as *u*, because this word is an obvious derivative from *muŋ* "sorrow, mourn, grief" = Mo. *mungqaγ* "stupidity." The word *ögüt* "advice" (p. 323) should be transcribed *ügüt* (cf. Uzbek *ügət*); *qodï* "down, below, under, ordinary" (p. 329) is *qudï*, because the Uzbek pronunciation is *quyï*; the word *supuryan* occurs only with the vowel *u* (p. 335). Also the translation "Leichenhalle, Verbrennungsstätte, Grabmal" should be completed by adding "Stūpa, Caitya," because in Buddhist texts it has that meaning. The correct vocalization of the word *toruš* "quarrel" (p. 343) is *u*: *turuš* is from *tur-* "to stand."[2] The word *urï* "son, male" (p. 347), on the other hand, should be transcribed *orï*: cf. Mo. *ori* "young, youthful."

A useful list of suffixes subject to "labial attraction" is given in

[1] G. J. RAMSTEDT, "Zur Verbstammbildungslehre der mongolisch-türkischen Sprachen," *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 28, Nr. 3, § 100.

[2] With the suffix *-š* as in *uruš* "battle" from *ur-* "to beat." It is interesting that Mongolian *bayilduγan* "battle" is derived from the verb *bayi-* "to stand."

§ 19. I agree with the author that the so-called *i*-diphthongs are in reality groups consisting of a vowel with the consonant *y*. I may add to what is said on page 50 that the diphthongs in question behave as syllables ending in consonants: the possessive ending of the third person after a diphthong is *-i* and never *-si*

Chapter III is entitled "The Derivation of Words," and constitutes a thorough discussion of its subject. I believe, however, that a few forms explained therein should be interpreted in another manner.

An interesting ending is *-χan* or *-qan* in certain titles. Its different meanings in various words suggest varied origins. In *pärikän*, "the queen of the fairies," and in *täŋrikän*, "divine," it might be an ancient diminutive suffix = Mo. *-qan*. In *burqan* "Buddha" it can be **qan* "khan, king." In the light of Paul PELLIOT's remarks in his article "*Tängrim*>*tärim*" in *TP* 37 (1944) .165-185, it is obvious that there is no etymological relationship between *tarqan* "a high title of nobility" and *tarïm* "a woman's title," because *tarïm* is a misreading for *tärim*. The word *tarqan* is, of course, identical with Mo. *darqan* "a person exempt from corvée or taxes." The name of the mountain *qadïrqan* might be an older form of Mo. *qaǰir* "griffon" with the diminutive suffix *-qan*, and *ötükän* is possibly the same as Mo. *etügen eke*, the name of the shamanist god of the earth.[3]

The suffix *-kün, -qun, -γun* (§ 50) is obscure. The author believes it might be a plural ending but is not quite sure about it, and compares it with Mo. *kümün* "a person, man," in the *Secret History gü'ün id.* This hypothesis is doubtful. I prefer a comparison with the Mongolian suffix *-γun* in *aduγun* "horses," *quruγun* "finger," *omuruγun* "sternum," etc.

A rare suffix is *-n* or *-an* (§ 56). In my opinion, it is only *-an* and not *-n*. The author is not quite sure about its function, but believes that it might be an ancient plural (cf. § 171); this is possible. To the examples quoted by the author I may add also *qopan* "all" (cf. *qop id.*), *bayan* "rich" = Mo. *bayan* (cf. Turk.

[3] Б. Я. Владимирцов, По поводу древне-тюркского *Ötüken yïš*, Доклады Академии Наук СССР (1929), Серия В, 133, 135.

bay), Mo. *uran* "craftsman" = Turk. *uz. id.*, Mo. *aran*, Middle Mongolian *haran* < **φaran* "a person, people."

Another ancient and rare plural suffix is *-t* = Mo. *-d* (§ 65), e. g., *tigit* "princes" (sing. *tigin*), *süt* "milk" = Mo. *sün id.* As for the forms *alpaγut* "the heroes" and *bayaγut* "the rich people" it is doubtful that they are derived with the same suffix, *-t*, because, so far as I know, there are no singular forms *alpaγu* and *bayaγu* attested in texts, although we find them in the vocabulary (pp. 293 and 301), seemingly as abstractions from the forms *alpaγut* and *bayaγut*. In the latter two forms I find the old plural suffix *-γut* known in the Mongolian although not mentioned in the grammars; for example, the names of the tribes in the *Secret History*: *baya'ut*[4] (cf. *bayan* "rich"), *salǰi'ut*[5] (cf. *salǰi*, the name of a person), and *tayiči'ut*[6]; note also the forms *alaqči'ut qonindi* "the motley sheep" (acc. plur. of *alaqčin*, a feminine form of *alaq* "motley"),[7] and *čaγčiyud* (a misprint for *čaγaγči-γud*) "the white mares" (sing. *čaγaγčin*).[8] From the point of view of Mongolian grammar, *alaqči'ut*<*alaγčiγud* is *alaγči-γud* and not *alaγčiγu-d*. Thus I think that *alpaγut* is *alpa-γut* but not *alpaγu-t*.

A trace of an old dual is the suffix *-z* in *köz* "eyes" (§ 71). As for the word *mäŋiz* "the outer appearance" I agree with the author that it does not contain the dual suffix *-z*, but it is doubtful that this word is derived from *mäŋ* "the manner of walking, walk." I compare it with Mo. *mengge* "birthmark, mole."

All words are not necessarily derived from simpler stems. The author tries to establish many etymologies of words which, in my opinion, are not derived from anything; e. g., *äškäk* "ass, donkey" from *iš* or *äš* "companion" (with an interrogation mark) in § 59. This word corresponds to Mo. *eljigen id.* and the Turkic consonant *š* is a further development of the group **lč* or **lǰ*.

The chapter dealing with the derivation of words is followed by

[4] Paul Pelliot, *Histoire secrète des Mongols* (Paris, 1949), § 213.
[5] Pelliot, *op. cit.*, § 42.
[6] Pelliot, *op. cit.*, § 47.
[7] Pelliot, *op. cit.*, § 124.
[8] Isaac Jacob Schmidt, *Geschichte der Ost-Mongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses, verfasst von Ssanang Ssetsen Chungtaidschi der Ordus* (St. Petersburg, 1829), p. 136.

that entitled "Accidence" (Chapter IV, pp. 84-146) in which the author discusses the plural, the declension of nouns, the pronouns, possessive endings, numerals, and conjugation.

In § 170 ff. the author speaks about plural forms. Regarding the suffix *-z*, I should remark that it is not identical with the Mongolian suffix *-s*, but *-*re* in *ike-re* "twins," *müge-re-sün* "cartilage" = Turkic *müyüz* || *mügüz* || *müŋüz* "horns," etc. A very interesting observation concerning the use of the plural is made in § 174. There we learn that in ancient songs the plural suffix *-lar* is, in the Mongolian manner, affixed to the attribute instead of to the noun which is modified, e. g., *aqlar bulït* "white clouds." This phenomenon is also known in the Buriat language, e. g., *jeχenūd ger* "large houses," *haiŋūd nom* "good books," *bayanūd tuγal* "small calves."[9]

The original declension abounded in forms. Many ancient case forms were dropped, but certain fossil forms remained and became what are generally called adverbs. Such a fossil group is that of the forms ending in *-ra*, e. g., *tašra* "outside" = Mo. *-ra* in *dotora* < **dotara* "within." The only Mongolian language in which the suffix *-ra* is still productive is the Monguor language, in which the locative is formed with the suffix *-re*.[10] In all the other languages such forms are fossil adverbs.[11] Such a fossil and rather mysterious form is *antïrdïn* "from there" in which the author sees the Mongolian locative suffix *-tur* (p. 95). In my opinion *antïrdïn* < **antïn yärdin* "from there, from the place" (*yär* "land, place").

Ancient Turkic has personal possessive endings as has any Turkic language. The ending of the third person is *-i* and, after final vowels of the stem, *-si*. Dr. v. Gabain asks herself whether these suffixes had the back vowel *ï* when affixed to back vocalic stems (§ 193). As I have demonstrated in one of my articles, this suffix occurred in Ancient Turkic and in Chuvash with only

[9] Г. Д. Санжеев, Грамматика бурят-монгольского языка (Москва-Ленинград, 1941), p. 85.
[10] A. de Smedt, C. I. C. M. et A. Mostaert, C. I. C. M., *Le dialecte monguor parlé par les mongols du Kansou occidental, IIe partie, Grammaire* (Peking, 1945), § 11.
[11] Cf. M. Lewicki, "Suffiksy przysłówkowe *-ra*~*-rä*, *-ru*~*-rü*, *-rï*~*-ri* w językach ałtajskich," *Collectanea Orientalia* 16 (1938).

the front vowel *i*, because the ending *-i* had originally been an independent word, namely, a pronoun of the third person **i* = Manchu *i* "he," Mo. **i*, gen. *inu*, acc. *imayi*, etc.[12] Therefore, there is no doubt that in Ancient Turkic the suffix was only *-i* and *-si* as written in the Orkhon inscriptions.

The author classifies the verbal forms into four main groups: the vocative verbal forms (imperative and semantically related forms), *tempora* ("einfache Zeiten"), verbal nouns, and converbs. This terminology was taken, as Dr. v. GABAIN remarks in her Preface, from the Mongolists (p. vii). This is RAMSTEDT's classification and terminology.[13] As all Turcologists are not familiar with this terminology, the author explains what she means by converbs (§ 229).

The next important section after the conjugation is that dealing with the postpositions. They are of either verbal or nominal origin. In § 272 we learn that the postpositions are, from the point of view of grammar, words governing the nouns to which they refer. This is, of course, correct. However, I find that the author sometimes is not consistent and includes as postpositions words which do not govern the preceding noun, e. g., *alqu*, a converb of *alq-* "to do completely": cf. *anï alqu ökünür biz* "we repent of all of them" (§ 272). Here *anï* is governed by *ökünür*, and *alqu* is not a postposition at all. The form *bašlayu* in § 275 is not a postposition either: *kisrä tarduš bäglär, kül čur* (to be corrected to *čor*) *bašlayu ulayu šadapït bäglär* . . . "in the West the Tarduš nobility, at the head *Čor* (a title) Kül . . . ." Here *bašlayu* means "leading." Thus, this passage can be translated verbatim as "in the West the Tarduš nobility, Čor Kül leading . . . ." For the same reason, *ulayu*, in the passage *ög (ü) m qatun ulayu öglärim äkälärim kälin (ü) m qunčuylarïm* "my mother, the queen, and also my step-mothers, aunts, and the elder sisters, daughters-in-law, the princesses . . ." (§ 228), is not a postposition, because *ulayu* does not govern any word in this passage.

[12] N. POPPE, "Türkisch-tschuwassische vergleichende Studien," *Islamica* 1 (1925). 409-427. Cf. Martti RÄSÄNEN, "Zur Lautgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen," *Studia Orientalia* 15 (1949). 106.

[13] G. J. RAMSTEDT, *Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen* (Helsingfors, 1903), p. 3.

It is a conjunction and a converb of the verbal stem *ula-* "to join." Thus, this passage means "my mother, the queen joining . . . ." At any rate, the word followed by *ulayu* is not syntactically different from the other members of this sentence, and is not governed by them, but is a juxtaposed member.

There are quite a number of such words, which occupy the place after a noun, but are not postpositions in the above sense: *ymä* "also, and" (§ 219),[14] *qatïn* "repeatedly,"[15] *qop* "all" (§ 302), *artuq* "more than . . ." or "exceeding" (§ 318), and so on. Obviously, if *artuq* is a postposition, all words following an ablative of another word should also be considered as postpositions, e. g., *andïn uluγ* "greater than he."

The morphologic part of the book is followed by one on syntax giving a clear and exact picture of the word groups and the structure of the Ancient Turkic sentence. An index containing all the suffixes concludes the grammar.

The chrestomathy contains the following texts: the inscription in honor of Kül Tägin, fragments of ancient calendars, several colophons, a passage from a medical treatise, fortune-telling (Chinese, Christian, and Manichean) and didactic (Buddhist and Manichean) texts, stories, and poetry. This is a fortunate selection enabling the student to acquaint himself with all the kinds of ancient literature in Turkic.

The vocabulary deserves much attention. There is no complete dictionary of Ancient Turkic and we should, therefore, be grateful to the author for this useful glossary. Its contents are, for the most part, verified forms not raising any doubts, and the translation of the words is beyond reproach in most cases. However, a few translations need to be supplemented. Sanskrit *rahu* (p. 331)

[14] This word occurs in the following context: *bilgä qaγan ärmiš; alp qaγan ärmiš; buyuruqï ymä bilgä ärmiš ärinč* . . . "they were wise kings; they were valiant kings; their *buyruqs* (a title), too, were obviously wise . . ." This *ymä* functions in the same manner as the Mongolian particle *ču* or *ber*. As *ymä* occupies a place after a noun it is similar to a postposition, but is a particle, a conjunction. I would call it "a postpositional particle," "postpositional conjunction," or "an enclitical conjunction."

[15] This word is an adverb and means "again." The author considers it a converb in *-n* of *qat-* "to make layers, to pile up" (§ 299), but it can also be an ancient instrumental in *-ïn* of the noun *qat* "layer." Thus, it literally means "by layers," i. e., "time and again."

means in the first place "a demonic being causing an eclipse"; *tatar* "Mongol" (p. 338) is not quite exact, because Tatar is only one of the Mongolian tribes; *tayγun* (or *toyγun* ?) "a dignitary" (?) is, perhaps, the same word as Mongolian *tayiγan* "eunuch" < Chinese *t'âi' kam'* 太監.

N. POPPE

University of Washington

C. R. BOXER, *The Christian Century in Japan. 1549-1650.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951. Pp. xvi + 535. $7.50.

This volume is a major contribution to the historical literature on Japan. The University of California Press has done justice to BOXER's careful scholarship and literary talent in making his book as handsome externally as it is valuable for its contents.

The title of the volume, however, is somewhat misleading. BOXER does not recount the history of Japan during the century in question but rather the story of the Portuguese and other Christians in Japan at this time. The central figures are the foreigners, and the Japanese come in only as they had dealings with these men from abroad or became their converts. The real history of Japan during the period is no more than a somewhat shadowy backdrop for the story of the Christians.

This is one major difference between BOXER's handling of his subject and the treatment given it by MURDOCH. Another is BOXER's organization of the material topically, with less emphasis on chronology and full detail. There is perhaps some resultant loss in clarity regarding the sequence of events, but this is probably more than offset by BOXER's more rounded and better balanced treatment of the significant aspects of the story as a whole.

BOXER is clearly in a position to handle the Portuguese and other Western materials, which are the major sources for this subject, with considerably more mastery than MURDOCH or most of the other Occidental and Japanese scholars who have dealt with the subject. He has made relatively little use of primary sources

in Japanese, but he demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the Western materials and is able to correct his predecessors on many points. He has included a very helpful bibliography, and his excellent notes, which are appended at the back of the volume, contain additional bibliographical material of great value. He has also included a forty-eight-page series of appendices which contain full translations of certain important documents and original accounts as well as useful material in tabular form on the Nagasaki *bugyō*, the chief Jesuit dignitaries, the apostate fathers, and the martyrdoms.

BOXER has, on the whole, stayed very close to his source materials, and the errors and contradictions within these materials are not always clarified for the reader. For example, on page 187 he quotes without question a Jesuit claim of 750,000 converts, (made, he says, in 1606 though later he gives the date 1605), but on page 230 he suggests that steady growth in the church had brought its members up to 300,000 by 1614. Not until page 320 does he comment on this discrepancy in estimates in his sources.

This handsome and valuable volume is marred by only a few minor imperfections. BOXER unfortunately does not seem to be at home with Chinese names and not only disregards diacritical marks but also sometimes runs *hsing* and *ming* together to form combinations such as Chuhuan and Lutang (p. 255). Some of his Japanese Romanizations are in a system now little used (Shidzuoka p. 273, *Kwambaku* p. 139, Sahioye p. 263 and elsewhere, which also appears as Sahiyoe on p. 262 and Safioye on p. 323). More serious is his omission of all long marks and the lack of a character index of any sort. There are a few minor slips and misprints, such as the date 1276 instead of 1274 for the Mongol invasion, the date 1592 instead of 1597 for the great martyrdom, Schichizayemon for Ichizayemon on page 394, and both Oliver and Olivier for Olivier VAN NOORT on page 286. However, except for the lack of a character index these are all indeed very minor detractions in what is a most valuable and also most pleasantly readable piece of solid scholarship.

E. O. R.