

## REVIEWS

### **On Two New Translations of Marcin Broniewski's *Tartariae Descriptio* (1595)**

Marcin Broniewski's (Latin: Martinus Broniovius; Russian: Martin Bronevskij / Мартин Броневский) *Tartariae Descriptio*, a travel account composed as a result of his visits to the Crimea as an ambassador to the Tatar Khans in 1575 (?) and 1578–1579,<sup>1</sup> is a classical source for any study of the mediaeval and early modern Crimea. The original Latin text of *Tartariae Descriptio* was first published in Cologne in 1595; its abridged version was printed by Elzevir in 1630 together with a few other important sources on early modern Russia and the Crimean Khanate (Broniewski / Broniovius 1595; 1630). The appearance of this highly important source did not pass unnoticed by European public. Its first translation was published by the famous Samuel Purchas as early as 1625; this translation was several times reprinted later (Broniewski / Bro-

niovius 1625; 1906). Considerably abridged extract from Broniewski's work was published in Poland about the same time, in 1624; it was also reprinted in the 19th century (Broniewski / Broniovius 1624; 1854). Both editions (especially the Polish one) looked rather as retelling the proper translations and were done in archaic 17th-century English and Polish. For this reason they can hardly be used by modern scholars. The European audience practically forgot about *Tartariae Descriptio* until 1867 when the Russian translation by I. Šeršenevič with commentaries by N. Murzakevič made Broniewski's work known to the wide Russian-speaking audience interested in Crimean studies. Although it was done in accordance with academic standards of the time, it certainly lacked the professional approach of modern academic translations.<sup>2</sup> This is why recently, with the growth of interest in the history of the Crimea and its peoples, two new academic translations into European languages (German and Polish) appeared simultaneously.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As will be demonstrated below, the fact that Broniewski had apparently visited the Crimea thrice and, furthermore, spent a long time there as a prisoner, remains unknown to European scholars including the editors of the two translations reviewed in this article (see below).

<sup>2</sup> Its infelicities were noticed by many readers, e.g. Ernst (1929, p. 16).

<sup>3</sup> *Non vidi* the Turkish translation of 1970 (Broniewski / Broniovius 1970).

The aim of this note is to review and analyse these two translations.

The German publication of *Tartariae Descriptio* (Albrecht–Herdick 2011) contains the original text of the source, its German translation with commentaries<sup>4</sup> and several articles focusing on Marcin Broniewski, his travel account and biography (Albrecht 2011a, pp. 1–10), the history of the Crimean Khanate in early modern times (Jobst 2011, pp. 11–22)<sup>5</sup> and the impor-

<sup>4</sup> Albrecht–Herdick (2011, pp. 45–121) (the Latin text with the German translation on facing pages).

<sup>5</sup> This valuable article also has its shortcomings. The historiography of the question is much wider and richer than is presented in the article; it is unthinkable to write the general article on the history of the Crimean Khanate during the early modern period without references to several classical (Novosel'skij 1948; Sanin 1987) and modern (Zajcev 2004; 2009; Vinogradov 2007) monographs in Russian. The name of Ф. Храпай / F. Hartahaj is twice misspelled as *Chartaj* or *Chartaraj*; the title of H.-V. Beyer's study lacks the beginning. The Russian proverb "ne ždannij [sic] gost' huže tatarina" in fact sounds as "nezvanyj gost' huže tatarina;" it has its parallels not only in Russian, but also in the Polish folklore (*Nieproszony gość gorszy od Tatarzyna / Gość nie w porę gorszy (od) Tatarzyna*) (for more details, see Zajcev 2004, pp. 187–204). According to K. Jobst the Slavic historiography presented the Crimean Khanate as a predatory state because of a certain imprint on the Slavic "collective historical memory" (Jobst 2011, p. 19). This statement certainly misinterprets the real situation. Such negative presentation of the Crimean Khanate was left by many non-Slavic sources as well. Perhaps the most pejorative portrayal of the Crimean Khanate was left by the famous 17th-century Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi who characterised the Crimean Tatars as the "merciless people" whose only occupation was raiding neighbouring countries and taking slaves (Evliya Çelebi 2008, pp. 25–26; cf. any other translations of this pivotal source – *nota bene* not used by K. Jobst in her article). Çelebi's memory, however, seems to be free from the collective historical imprint – as well as that of scores of the 18th- and 19th-century German, English,

tance of the source for archaeological studies (Schreg 2011, pp. 23–44).<sup>6</sup> High-quality illustrations help the reader, not acquainted with Crimean history, visualise the objects described by the traveller. The Polish translation (Mączyńska 2011) contains the introductory article by Stefan Albrecht (Albrecht 2011b, 13–23), facsimile of the Latin edition of the source of 1595 (Mączyńska 2011, pp. I–XXX), Polish translation by Ewa Śnieżewska (ibid., pp. 27–85), commentaries by the Crimean historian Aleksandr Gercen (ibid., 87–104; translated from Russian by M. Mączyńska) and illustrations (ibid., pp. 107–116). The specificity of the Polish translation is that its publishers tried to imitate the original book's layout and even inserted Broniewski's references on margins of the book in the same manner as was done in the Latin edition of 1595.

Both editions provide European audience with modern translations of this pivotal source together with critical notes, supplementary articles and historical commentaries, with up-to-date bibliography of relevant Crimean studies,

---

Italian and French travellers who visited the Crimea and also gave a rather negative characterisation of the Crimean Tatars and their state.

<sup>6</sup> One may disagree with Shreg's somewhat overoptimistic approach towards the possibility of comparing Broniewski's data with archaeological evidence. Indeed, sometimes Broniewski's testimonies help coming to essential conclusions regarding the history of the monuments of Crimean history and architecture. On the other hand, Broniewski's data, when uncritically taken for granted, can lead to erroneous conclusions. E.g. as has been demonstrated by V. Ruev on the basis of (*nota bene*) archaeological evidence, Broniewski's story about heroic fight between the Genoese and Ottoman army for Sudak in 1475 is but a picturesque legend – repeatedly used by scholars with reference to Broniewski (Ruev 2014, pp. 175–179). Some technical misprints also should have been corrected: *Černiahov* for *Černjacov* (Russ. *Черняховская культура*); O. Mahneva never had a double surname Mahneva-Gercen; Čardakli Bajre should be spelled as *Çardaklı Bayır*; correct German for *караимы* (Karaites) is *Karäer* and not *Karaim*.

including those in the Russian, Polish and Ukrainian languages. Special difficulty arose due to the necessity of identifying Turkic and Slavic terms within the original Latin text. Although this complicated task had been properly done, some minor inaccuracies can still be noticed. To give an example, in our opinion, the unusual term *Kiuazii* / *Kuiazii* is not a Turkic term, but Latin rendering of the Russian *kniazi* / *князи* (princes or dukes).<sup>7</sup> The editors of the German translation also failed to identify the geographic term *Salaticum* with the Tatar settlement of *Salacıq* / *Salaçik* in the vicinity of Bahçesaray (Albrecht–Herdick 2011, p. 79, fn. 108).<sup>8</sup> The Polish editors did not provide the necessary commentary to the fact that the term *seniacus* is a Latin rendering of *sancaq bey* (the governor of the Kefe sub-province *sancaq* / *sancak*) (Maçzyńska 2011, p. 99, fn. 86).<sup>9</sup> In general, both editions would have needed additional assistance on the part of specialists in Turkic studies: several Turkic terms, personal names and toponyms were given somewhat inaccurately.<sup>10</sup> The main concern regarding the

commentaries and introductory articles to the translations is that both editions provide very few data regarding details of Broniewski's stay in the Crimea. Complicated and hitherto understudied questions regarding his place of origin,<sup>11</sup> the visits to the Crimea, details of his stay and imprisonment there<sup>12</sup> were not really answered in either of the publications.<sup>13</sup>

These minor infelicities certainly do not spoil the overall positive impression. Both publications represent highly professional editions of *Tartariae Descriptio*. It is to be hoped that more modern critical editions and translations of this source into other European languages (first of all in English) will follow in the nearest future.

### Bibliography

Albrecht, S. (2011a): Die *Tartariae descriptio* des Martinus Broniovius. In: Albrecht–Herdick (2011), pp. 1–10.

ruler (*Palatinus* / *beg*) of Perekop (Or Qapı) could have been Jewish and not Muslim (Albrecht–Herdick 2011, p. 65, fn. 66). This is an obvious misunderstanding. Indeed, according to Mihalon Litvin, in the mid-16th century the head of the *customs office* in Perekop was Jewish. The *governor* of Perekop (the so-called *Or bey*), however, could only be Muslim.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. the editors of the German edition failed to notice that Latin *Biezdzedea* (Broniewski's birthplace) was a corruption of the Polish *Bieździedza* (Albrecht–Herdick 2011, p. 49).

<sup>12</sup> In fact, the ambassador spent much of his time in the Crimea as a prisoner, most likely in *Tassarlaganus pagus Tartaricus* whence Broniewski wrote his letter to the Polish king on 1.01.1579; this strange toponym is a reference to the Crimean village of *Taş Yarğan* / *Taş Carğan* in the vicinity of Aq Mescit (Simferopol). While the exact chronology of Broniewski's first two visits, which happened most likely in 1575 and in 1578–1579, remains unclear, Polish archival sources indicate that he visited the Crimea for the third time between 1583 and 1585 – and most likely stayed there even for a longer period of time (I intend to dedicate a separate article regarding this issue, based on archival evidence).

<sup>13</sup> These important questions were also not analysed in Žarkih (2004, pp. 313–350).

<sup>7</sup> This term is used twice as a synonym for “prince / duke” together with its Turkic and Latin equivalents (*Kiuazios vel Duces*; in another place – *Soldanos Kuiazos et Murzas*). The use of Russian terms by Western observers in conjunction with the Crimea is not astonishing: to give another example, the main Western term to denote the fortress of *Or Qapı* was Russian *Perekop* and not the original Turkic toponym.

<sup>8</sup> The identification offered by the German editors (*Sahıyrçyq*) is not correct.

<sup>9</sup> Subsequently *eyalet* (province) of Kefe.

<sup>10</sup> The German commentaries have *Eski Kırım* for Eski Kırım / Qırım, *Barin* for Barn, *Qıpcaq* for Qıpçaq / Kıpçak, and *Argin* for Argin; the map attached to the German edition does not have large settlements such as Gözleve, Karasubazar and any of the smaller towns on the southern coast (Lusta, Sikita, Yalta etc.). The Khan who ruled during Broniewski's visit was Mehmed Giray II (ruled from 1577 to 1584) and not Gazi Giray II (ruled from 1588 to 1596 and from 1596 to 1607) as the German editors have it (Albrecht–Herdick 2011, p. 51, fn. 3). With reference to my article (Kizilov 2007) the editors of the German translation stated that the

- Albrecht, S. (2011b): Życie i dzieło Martinusa Bronioviusa alias Marcina Broniewskiego. Translated by M. Mączyńska. In: Mączyńska (2011), pp. 13–23.
- Albrecht, S. – Herdick, M. (eds) (2011): *Im Auftrag des Königs: Ein Gesandtenbericht aus dem Land der Krimtataren. Die Tartariae Descriptio des Martinus Broniovius (1579)*. Mainz (Monographien des Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseums 89).
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1595): *Martini Broniovii de Biezdzfedeae, bis in Tartariam nomine Stephani Primi Poloniae Regis Legati, Tartariae Descriptio, antehac nunquam in lucem edita, cum tabula geographica eiusdem Chersonesus Tauricae*. Cologne, in Officina Birkmannica, sumptibus Arnoldi Mylij.
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. [1624]: Pogrom Tatarow pzez Wielmożnego Hetmána Koronnego Stánisława Żółkiewskiego ... w wołoskiej ziemi, 6 Octobris, w roku 1620. Przy tym ordynek wyprawy Tatarskiej ná woynę, Marcina Broniowskiego. Y zás edykt Kozakow Nizowych [Zamość].
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1625): Collections out of Martin Broniovius de Biezerfedea [sic] sent Ambassadour from Stephen King of Poland to the Crim Tartar: Contayning a Description of Tartaria, or Chersonesus Taurica, and the Regions Subject to the Perecop or Crim Tartars, with their Customes Private and Publike in Peace and Warre. In: *Purchas His Pilgrims in Five Bookes*. Part 3. London: printed by William Stansby for Henry Fetherstone, pp. 632–643 (= Chapter XXI).
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1630): Martini Broniovii de Bezdzfedeae, ad Tartarum legati, Tartaria. In: *Russia, seu Moscovia, itemque Tartaria*. Leiden, ex Officina Elzeviriana, pp. 254–327.
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1854): Pogrom Tatarow pzez Wielmożnego Hetmána Koronnego Stánisława Żółkiewskiego ... w wołoskiej ziemi, 6 Octobris, w roku 1620. Przy tym ordynek wyprawy Tatarskiej ná woynę, Marcina Broniowskiego. Y zás edykt Kozakow Nizowych. In: *Biblioteka Starożytnych pisarzy polskich*. Zebrał K. Wł. Wojcicki. Vol. 3. Warsaw, pp. 223–248.
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1867): Opisanie Kryma. Translated by I. G. Šeršenevič, commentaries by N. N. Murzakevič. *Zapiski Odesskiego obščestva istorii i drevnostej* 6, pp. 333–367.
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1906): Collections out of Martin Broniovius de Biezerfedea [sic] sent Ambassadour from Stephen King of Poland to the Crim Tartar: Contayning a Description of Tartaria, or Chersonesus Taurica, and the Regions Subject to the Perecop or Crim Tartars, with their Customes Private and Publike in Peace and Warre. In *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrims*. Vol. 13. Glasgow, J. Maclehose and Sons, pp. 461–491.
- Broniewski / Broniovius, M. (1970): *Kırım*. Translated by Kemal Ortaylı. Ankara.
- Ernst, N. L. (1929): Eski-Kermen i peščernyje goroda Kryma. *Izvestija Tavričeskogo obščestva istorii, arheologii i étnografii* 3, pp. 15–34.
- Evliya Çelebi (2008): *Kniga putešestvija*. Translated by E. Bahrevskij. Simferopol’.
- Jobst, K. S. (2011): Das frühneuzeitliche Krim-Khanat. In: Albrecht–Herdick (2011), pp. 11–22.
- Kizilov, M. B. (2007): Slave Trade in the Early Modern Crimea from the Perspective of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish Sources. *Journal of Early Modern History* Vol. 11, Nos 1–2, pp. 1–31.
- Mączyńska, M. (ed.) (2011): Broniewski, M. *Tartariae description / Opis Tatarii*. Translated by Ewa Śnieżewska, commentaries by Aleksandr Gercen [Gertsen]. Łódź (Biblioteka Archeologiczna SNAP Łódź 1).
- Novosel’skij, A. A. (1948): *Bor’ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s tatarami v XVII-m veke*. Moscow–Leningrad.
- Ruev, V. L. (2014): *Tureckoe vtorzenie v Krym v 1475 godu*. Simferopol’.
- Sanin, G. A. (1987): *Otnošenija Rossii i Ukrainy s Krymskim hanstvom v seredine XVII veka*. Moscow.

- Schreg, R. (2011): *Der Reisebericht des Broniovius – Text und Archäologie*. In: Albrecht–Herdick (2011), pp. 23–44.
- Vinogradov A. V. (2007): *Russko–krymskie otnošenija. 50-ye–vtoraja polovina 70-h godov XVI-go veka v 2-h častjah*. 2 vols. Moscow.
- Zajcev, I. V. (2004): *Meždu Moskovj i Stambulom. Džučidskie gosudarstva, Moskva i Osmanskaja imperija (načalo XV-go–pervoj poloviny XVI vv.)*. Moscow.
- Zajcev, I. V. (2009): *Krymskaja istoriografičeskaja tradicija XV–XIX vekov. Puti razvija. Rukopisi, teksty i istočniki*. Moscow.
- Žarkih, M. I. (2004): *Opis Tatarii M. Bronevskoho: džereloznavčy sposterežennja*. In: *Do džerel: zbirnyk naukovyh prac' na pošanu Olega Kupčyns'koho z nahody joho 70-riččja*. Kyiv–L'viv. Vol. 2, pp. 313–350.

*Mikhail Kizilov*

SVANTESSON, JAN-OLOF (ed., transl.): *Cornelius Rahmn's Kalmuck Dictionary*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012 (Turcologica, 93). 199 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-06690-7

This book contains one of the lost and found treasures from the unpublished works of the pioneers of oriental studies in the 19th century. The Kalmyk–Swedish dictionary of Cornelius Rahmn compiled in the first quarter of the 19th century is the very first Kalmyk (and even Mongolian) dictionary in a European language, which contains far more entries and data than the earlier glossaries or vocabularies of Nicolaes Witsen (1692), Philip Johan von Strahlenberg (1730) and some other authors. The book edited by Jan-Olof Svantesson is not simply an introduction to an interesting but slightly outdated excerpt from the history of oriental studies written in a rather exotic language. By translating Swedish texts into English and rearranging the content of the dictionary, the editor turned it into a modern, handy and easy to use publication, which could be useful for researchers involved into Oirat, Mongolian and Altaic studies even

today. It perfectly fits into the series of some similar materials, such as Gábor Bálint of Szentkatolna's grammar of East and West Mongolian languages (the very first grammar of the spoken Kalmyk and Khalkha languages), as well as his Kalmyk texts collected during his trip in 1871–1873, which were kept in manuscript for a long time and only recently published by Ágnes Birtalan (2009, 2011).<sup>1</sup> Such sources as Rahmn's work and Bálint's texts, which became available to the academic world only in the past few years, provide unique and invaluable material for studying the Kalmyk language and culture of the 19th century.

This book consists of three parts: an introduction (pp. 1–12), a short manual on how to use the dictionary (pp. 13–18), and the dictionary itself (pp. 19–199). The introduction contains a brief summary on the Kalmyk language, the Kalmyk (Oirat) script and its transliteration, the life and works of Cornelius Rahmn, and also includes some information concerning the content of Rahmn's dictionary and its relation to other works on the Kalmyk language. The manual describes the structure of dictionary entries, the usage of abbreviations and special symbols.

According to the introduction, Cornelius Rahmn was a Swedish missionary born in 1785, who worked as a member of the London Missionary Society among the Mongols of Russia. In 1818 he started his missionary service in Irkutsk among the Buriats, but due to his wife's poor health condition he shortly had to leave Siberia and went to the Kalmyks, another Mongolian group living at the lower reaches of the Volga river and the shores of the Caspian Sea. Rahmn settled down on the bank of the Volga near Tsaritsyn (today's Volgograd) in a small colony called Sarepta founded and run by the mission of the Moravian Church from Herrnhut (United Brethren). He lived here in the vicinity of the Kalmyks until 1823, when due to the pressure of the Russian authorities he had to

<sup>1</sup> Bálint's collection of Khalkha texts is also expected to be published by the same author soon.

give up his missionary service in Sarepta and move to St. Petersburg. Later on he worked in the centre of the London Missionary Society in England from 1832 and only in 1841 did he return to Sweden where he became the pastor of a small village called Kalv and worked there until his death in 1853.

The present book under review is based on Rahmn's three manuscripts written probably during his stay in Sarepta, where he was working on the Kalmyk translation of the Bible. It seems likely that these manuscripts (a Kalmyk grammar, a Kalmyk–Swedish dictionary and a Swedish–Kalmyk word list<sup>2</sup>) were written as preparation for the Bible's translation (unfortunately nothing is known about the translation itself). Rahmn's all three manuscripts deal with the literary language of the Kalmyks (usually called Written Oirat), which is written in Oirat (Clear) script.<sup>3</sup> Although this literary language is different from the living speech and is sometimes rather archaic, it often reflects a great amount of colloquial influence (see also Rákos 2002b).

Rahmn was not the first one who started to translate the Bible into Kalmyk, some parts were already available as the result of the work of Moravian missionaries performing service among the Kalmyks. Isaak Jakob Schmidt, the famous Mongolist who worked for the United Brethren for long time in Sarepta before Rahmn's arrival, already published the Gospel of Matthew translated to Kalmyk in 1815, and also the

other three Gospels during the following years (Schmidt 1815, 1820, 1821). In his dictionary Rahmn often uses citations from the Bible as example phrases and sentences. Without comparing these examples with Schmidt's translation of the New Testament, it cannot be decided whose translations they are, since for the most part Rahmn does not indicate the author (with a few exceptions where he refers to Schmidt), so some of them may belong to Rahmn himself.

The present dictionary contains not only the material of Rahmn's Kalmyk–Swedish dictionary, but some additional words from his Swedish–Kalmyk wordlist were also incorporated, just like the words and examples found in his Kalmyk grammar. The entries in the dictionary do not follow the original structure of Rahmn's manuscript in all details, but they had been rearranged in order to present data in more compact and clear format. A Kalmyk headword is given in Latin transcription based on Rahmn's Oirat script original. In addition to the Swedish and some rare German translations and notes of Rahmn, their English equivalents are also given by the editor. Alternate variants and inflected forms of a Kalmyk word (and in several cases also derived words) are collected together under a single headword.

The system of Romanisation used for transliterating Rahmn's Oirat script words in the present book is not the traditional one, but it is consistent and easy to read. Rahmn himself did not give a Latin transliteration in his dictionary, but in his Kalmyk grammar he uses a system of Romanisation based on German pronunciation of Latin letters. The editor included Rahmn's system into the present book as an illustration and also described it in detail, but it was not used actually for transliterating the Kalmyk words. Svantesson's transliteration system differs from the traditional one by using *ø* instead of *ö*, *y* instead of *ü*, *j* instead of *y*. He does not make difference between the letters *γ*, *g* and *q* (uses *g* for all three), and distinguishes the variant of *u* as *u* where it occurs without its diacritical stroke (which is quite frequent in the second element of double letter for /*ü*/, and also in non-first syllables where the back vocalism of a word

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the grammar and other manuscripts of Rahmn see Svantesson (2009a, 2009b).

<sup>3</sup> The Oirat or Clear script was created by an Oirat buddhist monk, Zaya Pandita (1599–1662) in 1648 as a modified variant of the Uighur–Mongolian script. It eliminated most of the ambiguities of the latter and introduced new letters and diacritics for reflecting the sounds of the contemporary language more precisely. It was also the primary script of the Oirats living in the Jungar Empire (17th–18th centuries), and its modernised form is still in use by the Oirats of today's Xinjiang, China. Kalmyks abandoned the Oirat script in the 1920s in favour of the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, but some educated Kalmyks still use it (see Rákos 2002a, b).

is already obvious). Some *galig* letters occurring in words of Tibetan or Sanskrit origin are transliterated by adding a dot above or below the basic Roman letter.

Rahmn's Oirat script headwords and sample texts relatively frequently contain spelling errors and inconsistencies of various kinds. Especially letters with very similar graphic shape are confused and alternate with each other in the dictionary. These are mostly the letters for rounded vowels (*u, o, ü, ö*), *c* and *z*, as well as *k* and *g* in front vowel words. E.g.:

- RS *caḡān, cagan, zaḡān* 'white', WO *caḡān*, WM *čayan, čayaḡan* 'white', Kalm. *цаһан* 'белый'
- RS *zagasun, cagasun* 'fish', WO *zaḡasun*, WM *jḡyasun* 'fish', Kalm. *захн* 'рыба'
- RS *gebeli* 'belly, womb', WO *kebeli*, WM *kebeli* 'belly, stomach, womb', Kalm. *кевлә* 'живот, утроба, матка'
- RS *elesun* 'sand', WO *elesün*, WM *elesün* 'sand, dust', Kalm. *элсн* 'песок'
- RS *söyl, syyl, sāl* 'tail', WO *söül, süül*, WM *segül* 'tail', Kalm. *сүн* '1. хвост 2. конец'
- RS *gyrāsun, gyrāsun* 'wild goat, game', WO *göröösün*, WM *görügesün* 'wild herbivorous animal, game, beast', Kalm. *зәрәсн* 'антилопа-сайгак'

It is striking at first sight that Rahmn's marking of long vowels is often inconsistent, not strictly unified and even sometimes confusing. Traditionally Written Oirat indicates long vowels by two different ways. Vowel /ā/, /ē/, /ō/ and /ḡ/ are indicated by a letter of a short vowel and an additional mark of length, called *udān* (a short horizontal stroke put on the right of the vertical axis), and they are usually transcribed as *ā, ē, ḡ* and *ḡ* (*ā, ē, ḡ* and *ḡ* by Svantesson). Long /ū/ and /ḡ/ are indicated by a kind of reduplication: *ou* or *uu* (where the second *u* is usually written without its diacritical mark), and *öü* or *üü*. Long /ī/ is a little bit unique, because it is written similarly to diphthongs as *iyi*, but it can be considered a kind of duplication, too. Traditionally letters *u, ü* or *i* followed by *udān* do not indicate /ū/, /ḡ/ or /ī/, but it is a mere orthographic feature for marking the etymological final short vowel of a word stem (which has already disappeared

in the spoken language) and a long vowel (mostly /ā/ or /ē/) of a connected suffix. It is not without examples that the use of *udān* had been widened and generalised occasionally, and a short *u, ü* and *i* with a following *udān* marked a real /ū/, /ḡ/ and /ī/, but it never became a standard (Rákos 2009). In Rahmn's dictionary we can notice this change in the role of *udān* several times, but it is not clear whether these cases reflect a Kalmyk literary tradition or they are just spelling errors or results of misunderstanding the Oirat orthography. Some examples of this phenomenon:

- RS *sajidūd* 'administrator, manager, director' (with a plural marker) instead of *sajiduud* or *sajidoud* (WO *sayiduud, sayidoud*, WM *sayid-ud* 'magnate, dignitary, minister' + PL, Kalm. *сәэдүд* 'вельможи, благородные' + PL)
- RS *bḡrgy* 'saddlebow' instead of *byrgy* or *börgy* (WO *büürgü, böürgü*, WM *bügürge* 'the pommel of a saddle', Kalm. *бүүргэ* 'луки (седла)')

Rahmn indicates long vowels several times where they are unexpected, although frequently he gives an alternate and more usual variant with a short vowel, too. Of course, the reverse situation can be observed, too, and instead of an expected long vowel sometimes he writes a short one. E.g.:

- RS *ger* ~ *gēr* 'house', expected *ger* (WO *ger*, WM *ger* 'yurt, house', Kalm. *зеп* 'дом, здание, изба, юрта')
- RS *odō* ~ *ōdo* ~ *odo* 'now', expected *odō* (WO *odō*, WM *odu, edüge* 'now, at present', Kalm. *ода* 'теперь, сейчас')
- RS *todo* ~ *todō* 'clear, distinct', expected *todo* (WO *todo*, WM *todu* 'clear[ly], evident[ly]', Kalm. *тод* '1. ясный, отчётливый 2. ясно, отчётливо')
- RS *cār* ~ *car* 'ox', expected *car* (WO *car*, WM *šar* 'ox', Kalm. *цар* 'вол, кастрированный бык')
- RS *caḡān* ~ *cagan* 'white', expected *caḡān* (WO *caḡān*, WM *čayan, čayaḡan* 'white', Kalm. *цаһан* 'белый')

Rahmn often gives the plural form of nouns, and in many cases the addition of plural marker

-d to a noun makes the preceding short vowel long in his notation (and the length is mostly marked by *udān*, even at vowels where it is usually marked by duplication), which is not attested in any Mongolic language including Kalmyk. Maybe the appearance of this phenomenon in Rahmn's spelling is somehow motivated by the influence of the long vowels in plural markers *-oud/uud/öüd/üüd*. E.g.:

- RS *okin* 'girl, maiden' > plural *okīd*, instead of *okid*
- RS *önöcin* 'orphan' > plural *önöcīd*, instead of *önöcid*
- RS *dorbön*, *dorbyn* 'four' > plural *dorbōd*, instead of *dorbød*
- RS *nökyr*, *nökör* 'friend, comrade, husband' > *nökūd*, instead of *nökod* or *nökud*

Rahmn's dictionary offers valuable material for the study of the history of Kalmyk or Oirat language, since beside or together with the traditional written forms it contains some colloquial variants and traces of the contemporary spoken language. Hereby examples of some sound changes are given, which are typical of Kalmyk and Oirat and reflected in Rahmn's material.

Palatalisation of back vowels under the influence of /i/ of non-first syllables:

- RS *arēxan* 'with difficulty, hardly', WO *arayixan*, WM *arayiqan* 'not quite, hardly, barely', Kalm. *әрәхн* '1. едва, лишь, еле, чуть-чуть, 2. тихий, медленный'
- RS *malē* '(small) horsewhip', WO *malī*, WM *mīlay-a* 'whip, scourge', Kalm. *маля* 'плеть, нагайка'
- RS *moritēgan* 'horse' + SOC + REF.POSS, WO *moritōi-bēn*, WM *moritai-ban*, *moritayiqan* 'horse' + SOC + REF.POSS, Kalm. *мөр-тәһән* 'horse' + SOC + REF.POSS

Change of diphthongs into long vowels:

- RS *arēxan* 'with difficulty, hardly', WO *arayixan*, WM *arayiqan* 'not quite, hardly, barely', Kalm. *әрәхн* '1. едва, лишь, еле, чуть-чуть, 2. тихий, медленный'
- RS *āšīnai* 'he is coming, be going to come', WM *ayis-*, *ayisu-*, *ayisi-* 'to approach' + PRAES.IMP, Kalm. *ааи-* 'приближаться, подходить близко' + PRAES.IMP

Deletion of /t/ or /d/ before suffix *-sun/sün*:

- RS *gesen*, *gesyn* 'guts, belly', WO *gedesün*, WM *gedesün* 'belly, stomach', Kalm. *гэсн* 'живот, брюхо'
- RS *bajisaŋ* 'three-year-old mare', WO *bayidasun*, WM *bayidasun* 'three or four-year-old mare, young mare', Kalm. *бәэсн* 'трёх-летняя кобылица'

At some headwords where Rahmn considered the pronunciation of a Kalmyk word being too far from its written form, he gives the pronunciation in Latin transcription. These data even more clearly reflect the contemporary spoken language than the Oirat script words influenced by colloquial speech. E.g. the pronunciation of *xudaldazi orkibai* 'it has been sold' is given as *chudulschkiwa* that contains the already shortened and grammaticalised form of auxiliary verb *orki-* (compare with modern Kalmyk modal suffix *-чк-*) and very close to its today's Kalmyk equivalent *хулдчкв*.

As the Kalmyks had close interactions with people speaking Russian or a Turkic language, these languages exercised significant influence on Kalmyk. Some Russian and Turkic loanwords that do not exist in other Mongolian languages and dialects could be observed in Rahmn's dictionary. E.g.:

- RS *xabustun* 'cabbage' < Russian *капуста* 'cabbage' (Kalm. *хавстн* 'капуста')
- RS *ustul* 'chair' < Russian *стул* 'chair' (spelling of Kalm. *стол* 'стол' is the same as in Russian, and – unlike Rahmn's data – does not reflect the vowel prefix added to the word in order to avoid the initial consonant cluster, which is not typical of Kalmyk)
- RS *ustug* 'haystack' < Russian *стог* 'stack' (this word is not found in modern Kalmyk dictionaries)
- RS *ajou* 'bear' < Turkic, e.g. Kazakh *аю*, Nogai *аюв* 'bear' (Калм. *аю* 'медведь')

The dictionary contains words, personal and geographical names connected to the Bible and Christianity in remarkable amount. Such words include *jeruuzalem* 'Jerusalem', *jezys* 'Jesus', *judas* 'Judas', *kana-an* 'Canaan', *ibsalma* 'hymn' (< psalm), *galile-jā* ~ *kalilejā* 'Galilee', etc. It is not clear, whether the adaptation of these words to the Oirat script is Rahmn's own work or he



took them from an earlier Kalmyk Bible translation. It is worth mentioning that not only the Christian terminology is covered by the dictionary, and there are many words and expressions connected to Buddhism and even to the folk religion of the Kalmyks. Probably, as a missionary Rahmn was interested in the religious life and beliefs of the Kalmyks, and frequently gives a longer and more detailed explanation of Buddhist religious terms.

In sum, the present dictionary is a modern and easy to use presentation of Cornelius Rahmn's Kalmyk materials, which contains many interesting data and is a valuable source for studies on the history of the Kalmyk (Oirat) language. The presented material offers telling data for research into various questions concerning Kalmyk (Oirat), a few of which have been touched upon in the present review. Since scholars, researchers and individuals interested in the sources and monuments of the Oirat literary tradition are not well equipped with comprehensive, reliable and, in particular, abundant Oirat dictionaries, this work is a useful and welcome addition to the already existing publications. Its usefulness is unquestionable and maybe it is only the reviewer's personal opinion, but presenting a few pages from Rahmn's original manuscript in facsimile would have been very interesting for the readers.

### Abbreviations

RS – Rahmn's data written in Oirat script and transliterated to Roman by Svantesson  
 WM – Written Mongolian  
 WO – Written Oirat in traditional Romanisation  
 Kalm. – Modern Kalmyk

### References

- Birtalan, Ágnes (ed.) (2009): *Gábor Bálint of Szentkatolna: A Romanized Grammar of the East- and West-Mongolian Languages*. Budapest, Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences–Csoma de Kőrös Society.
- Birtalan, Ágnes (2011): *Kalmyk Folklore and Folk Culture in the mid-19th Century. Philological Studies on the Basis of Gábor Bálint of Szentkatolna's Kalmyk Texts*. Budapest–Elista, Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences–Kalmyk Institute of Humanitarian Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Rákos, Attila (2002a): *Written Oirat*. München, Lincom Europa (Languages of the World 418).
- Rákos, Attila (2002b): Beszélt nyelvi hatások az ojrát „világos írásos” szövegekben [Influence of the spoken language in Oirat “Clear script” texts]. In: Birtalan, Ágnes–Yamaji, Masanori (eds): *Orientalista Nap 2001* [Day of oriental studies, 2001]. Budapest, MTA Orientalisztikai Bizottság–ELTE Orientalisztikai Intézet, pp. 81–89.
- Rákos, Attila (2009): Long Vowels in the Oirat Script. In: Бичеев, Б. А. (ed.): *Мир «ясного письма»*. Элиста, КИГИ РАН, pp. 36–40.
- Schmidt, Isaaco Jacobo (1815): *Evangelium St. Matthaei in Linguam Calmucco-Mongolicam*. Cura et Studio Societatis Biblicae Ruthenicæ.
- Schmidt, Isaak Jakob (1820): *Das Evangelium Johannis in die kalmükische Sprache*. St. Petersburg.
- Schmidt, Isaak Jakob (1821): *Die Evangelien Marci und Lucae in die kalmükische Sprache*. St. Petersburg.
- Strahlenberg, Philip Johann (1730): *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia*. Stockholm.
- Svantesson, Jan-Olof (2009a): Cornelius Rahmn's Kalmuck Grammar. *Turkic Languages* Vol. 13, pp. 97–140.
- Svantesson, Jan-Olof (2009b): Cornelius Rahmn and his Works on the Kalmuck Language. *Northeast Asian Studies* No. 13, pp. 111–126.
- Witsen, Nicolaes (1692, 1705, 1785): *Noord en Oost Tartarye* [North and East Tartaria]. Amsterdam.

Attila Rákos

