



Chants d'un barde mongol by G. Kara
Review by: Henry Serruys
Monumenta Serica, Vol. 29 (1970-1971), pp. 784-789
Published by: [Monumenta Serica Institute](#)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40725957>
Accessed: 08/10/2012 14:07

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Monumenta Serica Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Monumenta Serica*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

G. Kara: *Chants d'un barde mongol*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1970. 351 pp.

The Budapest center of Mongol studies has become justly famous for its outstanding publications, and every new book from there should be warmly welcomed. Mr. Kara who has already published several important studies, here offers a collection of twenty-nine songs by a professional entertainer from Jarūd banner in Eastern Mongolia, recorded in 1959 at Sui-yüan. Besides the texts of those songs in phonetic transcription and the translation, Mr. K. briefly discusses the motifs of the songs and how they are treated in other texts published in various countries, especially in Mongolia where a new generation of scholars have lately begun to take great interest in their own oral literature; he provides information on versification, rhythm, alliteration, and even music; also on epic literature, especially on the Geser Khan legend. There is a section on language and grammar of the songs, and a vocabulary. Finally a copious bibliography.

As an introduction to his Mongol texts, Mr. K. briefly discusses the history of the Jarūd, and the career of the bard who sung for him. The information on the singer is based on a biographical sketch published in Mongol under the new regime in mainland China. The singer was born in 1902 and spent his early years in a lamasery. Lately he has joined the Communist Party and the government has tried to make use of his talents for its own political purposes, just as the Manchukuo regime had tried to do. It should not be surprising that some statements in this biographical sketch seem to read modern considerations and interpretations into an earlier and largely different situation and mentality.

The characteristics of the Jarūd dialect, as described here, place it among the Eastern dialects, rather sharply differentiated from other dialects of Inner Mongolia, for example Čaqar and Ordos. Whereas in these two dialects, an initial voiceless aspirate followed by another voiceless consonant in the second syllable (unless separated by a long vowel) develops into an unaspirated consonant, this law does not operate in the Eastern dialects and in Khalkha. And whereas Jarūd and most Eastern dialects have a strong tendency to reduce the quality of the vowels in non-initial syllables, Čaqar shows this tendency only slightly, and in Ordos vowel reduction is hardly noticeable at all. Mongol dialects can be grouped differently according to various factors. Mr. K. briefly reviews various classifications attempted by other authors, and shows where in his opinion they are deficient; while tentatively proposing his own classification, he also admits that too many questions remain unclear for any definitive conclusions. In his discussion of this problem (p. 282), Mr. K. mentions a Čaqar form *badā* "rice, millet," allegedly agreeing with the Eastern dialects, but in my notes from Čaqar I find the form *budā*, in agreement with Ordos and with the written form. And in this connection (p. 279), K. makes mention of the Kalmuk vocabulary of N. Witsen's *Noord en Oost Tartaryen*. The first edition of this book is from 1692, not 1695. This vocabulary has recently been published by G. Doerfer in *Ältere westeuropäische Quellen zur Kalmückischen Sprachgeschichte*, Wiesbaden, 1965, pp. 27-30; on pp. 31-38, there is another list from the 1705 edition.

The Jarūd dialect presents serious difficulties for one not already familiar with

it; I cannot claim to understand all of Mr. Kara's texts; in fact, at times he also admits of a certain hesitation. I shall come back in a moment to some of his translations; here I would like to say a word on the author's approach. Words and sentences when actually sung in any language can be difficult to understand unless one knows them beforehand; especially so in a little-known dialect. It seems to me that what we need first is the normal speech, and that it would have been better to take down those poems and songs from dictation in normal or near-normal speech. As the author himself indicates, poetry when sung involves far too many cases of bookish and artificial pronunciations and distortions: unusual lengths, geminations, inversions, extra syllables and the like, which are likely to give a very different aspect to the finished product and confuse the reader. One gets the impression that the author has been carried away by his enthusiasm at having a professional singer perform for him. A more prosaic approach of dictation in ordinary speech would have eliminated many a difficulty and, at least for now, would have been more useful. It is to be feared that few readers will have the knowledge and the courage to plow through Mr. Kara's texts.

One feature of this poetical language is the excessive use of the reflexive possessive (*suus*) where the regular possessive (*eius*) is sufficient, and in this connection we may compare the suffix of the reflexive possessive genitive *-ihān* (*sui, suus*) (p. 255) with the Ordos equivalent *-iγχān* (Ant. Mostaert, *Textes oraux ordos*, Peip'ing, 1937, p. xxxix, § 38). Still with regard to the genitive, I would point out that Mr. K. (p. 254) lists the genitive of the first and second personal pronouns as *mini* (my) and *šini* (your). N. Poppe gives the same endings for Khalkha (*Khalkha-Mongolische Grammatik*, Wiesbaden, 1951, p. 71), an interesting difference from Ordos where *mini*, *tšini* "my, your" are adjectival, and *mini* and *tšini* are predicative ("this book is mine, yours"). The ending *-i* corresponds to *-ai* of the language of the *Secret History*, etc.

The difficulty of the language of the songs could perhaps have been partly avoided with a few devices such as separating enclitics and meaningless sounds from the main parts of the words, for example: *tatād-ā*, *salgād-ā*, *onād-ā* instead of *tatādā* (p. 72: "le brouillard s'étendit"), *salgādā*, *salgādēh* (pp. 96, 97: "en séparant"), *onādā* (p. 97: "elle tomba"), etc.

On p. 17, K. speaks of the *Secret History* of the Manchus; he seems to suppose an analogy with the *Secret History of the Mongols*, but the particular reasons why this Mongol document came to be known as *Secret History* in no way apply to the early documents of the Manchus. In other words there is no *Secret History* of the Manchus.

In note 140 on p. 42, "matelot" is an unfortunate misprint for "matelas," and on p. 243, fifth line from the bottom, "autour" has to be replaced by "capricieux," and vice versa.

With regard to Mr. Kara's translations, here and there a line or two have been skipped through inadvertence. For example, on p. 57, lines 7, 8, and 9 are mixed up in the translation on p. 106 and reduced to two lines. I would suggest: "(The horse) has a back the size of a hill, hindquarters the size of a mound, and flanks the size of a plain." On p. 140 (Nr. 9) we read "qui viennent avec des forces croissantes — qui viennent avec des forces augmentantes," but on p. 82 only the first of these two lines

(line 5) can be found in the Mongol text. Lines 16–17 of p. 93 are not translated (p. 155): “He runs backward and forward: the frolicking drunk.”

I would like to suggest a few other corrections: on p. 57, line 14: *širmel haǰārīg*, rendered on p. 106 as “bride piquée (avec l’anneau estampé).” I am not sure I understand what K. means by “piquée.” *Haǰār*, Mo. *qaǰaǰar* is “bridle (including the bit: cf. *qaǰa*- “to bite”). I understand “bit in cast iron.” Two lines below the same idea recurs “precious bit (*amgā*) in *šiŋ*-steel.” With regard to this *šiŋ*-steel, on p. 330, the word *šiŋgaŋ* is explained as “nom d’une pierre précieuse,” and the reader is referred to the long note 185 on pp. 106–107. I believe that *šaŋgaŋ* ~ *šiŋgaŋ* simply is a kind of steel (Chin. *kang*), although I do not know the origin or the exact meaning of *šiŋ* ~ *šaŋ*. On p. 58, we have *šaŋganēn heǰin* which is a “(buckle) tongue of *šaŋ* ~ *šiŋ* steel” (p. 111) and has nothing to do with precious stones.

On p. 59, line 5 of Nr. 3, *šaŋdman erden širētē* “with a table (as precious as) a čindamani”; the same line reappears in Nr. 3a, on p. 61, “overtranslated” (p. 116) as “elle a une petite table de pierres précieuses miraculeuses.”

Lines 3–6 of p. 60 should be compared with the corresponding passage of the printed Geser story quoted on p. 180, but it seems to me, neither the spoken nor the printed versions are correctly translated; the printed version I would render as follows: “Two Mahāyāna books, the Kanjur and the Tanjur, precious as a čindamani, written with flawless [lit. “without a crack”] coal and with gold.” This is a reference to the custom of having sūtras written in gold on a black background; the “absence of cracks” means the flawless black color of the background. In *Textes oraux ordos*, p. 238 (3), we find: *altan-yū ganǰūrān*..., translated in *Folklore ordos* (Peip’ing, 1947), p. 338 (3) “le Kandžur écrit à l’encre d’or, n’est-ce-pas.” These are the famous *chintzu-ching* 金字經 “gold-lettered sutras” so often mentioned in Sino-Mongol relations of the late sixteenth century.

In the sentence *nēirōlsan erden širētē* (p. 59) translated as “(couverture)... muni d’une corde de pierres précieuses qui se sont amalgamées,” in my opinion, the word *širētē* does not qualify the cover over the central hole, but the tent itself: “having precious ropes well ordained.” On p. 61 (Nr. 4), *agār teŋgerin deŋnēsān* / *Ariyāwālīn burǰlwā* is rendered as “elle a été la fée du ciel de l’air; elle est la réincarnation d’Ariyawal”; in note 224, Mr. K. seems to explain the verb *deŋnēsān* through the noun *dagini* “fée,” which is impossible. He lists the verb *deŋen*- “équivaloir, etc.,” which may well be a Chinese loan word *teng* 等 + *-ne*-. I would translate: “(She) is an incarnation of Ariyabalu who equals the very heaven.” The third stanza on p. 62 is rendered (p. 118) as follows: “Si elle allait sous le soleil ardent, elle fondrait; voilà comme elle est née! Si on la serrait un peu durement, elle se briserait: voilà comme elle est née.” This may be correct, but the turn of the phrase, I am afraid, may lead to misunderstanding. I would suggest something like this: “She was born (with such a nature) that if she walked in the sun, she might melt...”

Line 20 on p. 66, *hātōn sūlwān goydaǰ* is not exactly (p. 123) “battit sa queue postérieure(!),” but “behind, it beats its tail.” On p. 74 (line 6 from bottom) *hušen bātran solarallā*: (p. 132) “la force et le courage s’affaiblirent”; on p. 75 (line 1): *huǰūgēn oddō sollallā*: (p. 133) “(L’ogre) allongea le cou.” Mr. K. lists only one verb

solar-, Mo. *sulara-* “devenir faible,” and I see no reason why the verb should not be the same in both lines: “Its forces diminished . . . ; its neck weakened.” As to the line *beyyin būhen ošighellē* (14 on p. 76), I fail to see how the author arrives at his translation (p. 134) “Il aurait voulu ne pas y aller.” I do not understand this line too well, but *beyyin* is from Mo. *beye* “body, person,” *ošighellē* could be Mo. *očiḡu kelele*: “said ‘I will go.’” *Šandamōnī meḡnētē* (p. 84, top line) is not “Il a un garrot de pierres précieuses miraculeuses” (p. 143), but “having a forehead (Mo. *mangnai*) (precious like) a čindamani.” On p. 84, *sahsah* of line 6 is translated (p. 143) as “(queue) touffue,” but a few lines below *sahsag durweḡ suīlwertē* is rendered (p. 144) as “Il a quatre rames (= pieds) en rangs.” I think that *sahsah* and *sahsag* are the same word, and if *suīlwertē* refers to the legs, then *sahsag* may well mean “shaggy (fetlocks).”

An interesting line, *saḡsrīn urdeḡ tōrētē* (line 12 on p. 84): “Ses pattes (ont la valeur) du trésor du monde tournant” (p. 144) calls for some comment. This line, as the author also seems to imply in note 300, refers to the hoofs (*tuḡurai*) rather than to the legs. In W. Heissig’s *Mongolische volksreligiöse und folkloristische Texte* (Wiesbaden, 1966), we find lines like *sansar-un kürdün tuḡuraitai* (pp. 234, 236) “with hoofs (in the shape of) the wheel of samsara”; *sansara kürdün turmatai* (read: *tuḡuratai*) (p. 237); *raḡg turai-ban gilbal ḡilan* (p. 232): “It flashes its steel hoofs”; *raḡg kürdün tuḡuratai* (p. 234): “It has hoofs like steel wheels.” I wonder if the word *urdeḡ* (Mo. *erdeni*: jewel) is not a mistake for *kürdün* “wheel”; the *Ĵarūd* text then would mean: “It has hoofs like the wheel of the samsara.” In Mongol poetry the hoofs are also compared to cups (Heissig, *op. cit.*, p. 231): *dörben tuḡurai anu ayara metü* “Its hoofs resemble iron cups.” I may also refer to *Textes oraux ordos*, pp. 273, 274, and *Folklore ordos*, pp. 364, 365 (Nrs. 42, 43): “il avait quatre sabots grands comme des jattes” (var.: “il avait des sabots aussi grands qu’une jatte *ayara*”).

“(Il galope aussi vite que) le froid de l’air (double)” (p. 144) is only an approximation of *agārīn ḡawriḡ hḡssaldḡg* (p. 84). I would translate: “(The horse) runs abreast (= as fast as) with the cold wind.” For the same image, see Ant. Mostaert, in *HJAS* 20 (1957), p. 561, n. 95.

In the second line of p. 94, *ḡstē* (if correct) means “has good manners,” not “manque de conduite” (p. 156). *Negḡen hayad inēḡēn* (p. 89, bottom line) probably means not “ayant mis hors de combat l’un et l’autre, ils rient” (p. 151), but “having thrown (each) his own one (adversary), they laugh.” The word *yaḡna-* in *yaḡnahš uguī* “n’observe pas les convenances” (p. 95, 159), is not from Chin. *yang* 養 “to feed, to care for,” but probably from *yang* 樣 “form, appearance, pattern, style,” with the Mo. suffix *-na-*. Cf. *deḡnēsan* (above).

Although Mr. K. gives a brief survey of *Ĵarūd* grammar, the reader is often at a loss to know how to explain forms and constructions appearing in the texts. For example, *hawri~ šagaš* (p. 95, first line of Nr. 26) “le printemps.” *Šag* is Mo. *čar*; but *šagaš*? On p. 96 (top line), we find the expression *šagal (~ḡagal) bōral*: “(vieillard) blanchi par l’âge” (p. 159); in the vocabulary, on p. 328, *šal bōral* is listed “tout à fait gris (cheveux),” with a reference to Mo. *čal*, *čel*, but that does not explain *šagal*, nor *ḡagal*. (Mo. *saḡal*: beard?).

This brings us to the question of the vocabulary itself which lacks quite a few words. The question is further complicated by the many artificial and unusual bookish readings which should have been listed for the convenience of the reader. For example, *jalō širgūn* (p. 96): "jeune et robuste" (p. 159); Mo. *jalaṛu, siregūn*? Neither is listed. On p. 96: *hāgō b'lb'ol*: "n'importe où" (p. 160): *hāgō* no doubt is somehow derived from *hā*, Mo. *qamiṛa*, listed only as *hān(ā)*.

It is a known fact that the Eastern Mongols of Manchuria have undergone Chinese influence much earlier and to a larger degree than Western and Northern Mongolia, and traces of this influence appear in several of the poems studied by Mr. K. Some are directly inspired by Chinese stories, or contain motifs borrowed from the Chinese. Yet the reader must ask himself how much of this original material has been misunderstood, or misrepresented and become distorted in the transmission. On pp. 8 and 190, Mr. K. mentions a section of the *Shui-hu chuan* in the repertoire of his *Jarūd* informant (not translated here), and it is interesting that the Mongol version is called *Kūiten aṛula-yin biṭig* "Book of the Cold Mountain," evidently a misunderstanding of Liang-shan 梁山, not 涼 "cold." K. mentions that his informant at one time studied a *Da Tang-un üliger* "Story of the Great T'ang." He is not aware that this must be the *Hsi-yu chi*, a famous parody of Hsüan-tsang's travels. Nrs. 8, 8a, and 9 in Mr. Kara's collection are adaptations of brief sections of the story of the Three Kingdoms, but the Mongol texts are rather unclear, and one would have to check the original Chinese passages for a better understanding. In the *Central Asiatic Journal* III (1957): 180, Prof. W. Heissig lists an incomplete Mongol ms. of a translation of the *San-kuo chih* from Eastern Mongolia now at Louvain. Copies of this translation may well have been known among the *Jarūd* and other tribes. Nr. 12 "Complainte d'un souverain qui a perdu son royaume," and Nr. 13 "Une nouvelle dame de la cour devant l'empereur" are evidently of Chinese inspiration, and according to Mr. K., so is Nr. 15. But as he indicates more than once, Chinese influence is seen in other pieces as well. For example, Rogmo, Geser Khan's wife, is said to "have eyes shaking an empire" (pp. 63, 119, n. 236). This is an allusion to the *femme fatale* who "with one look made city walls crumble, and with a second look made empires collapse" (*Han-shu*, Po-na-pen, 97A. 14a). The author notes (p. 123, n. 251) how the mythological Anavatapta Lake of Lamaism has been multiplied by four under influence of the Chinese "Four Seas." The word *hōloṇšāṇ* of pp. 80 and 138 probably is Chinese *huo-lun-ch'uan* 火輪船 "steamer."

Due to inadvertence, several notes in Mr. Kara's book refer to the wrong words in the text: e.g. note 186 should refer to "anneau" of the tenth line of p. 106 (not to "boucle" of p. 107); note 238 should refer to "n'a pas sa pareille" of p. 120 (not to "merveilleuse"); note 251a should refer to "hautes montagnes" (*agöl*) of the second line of p. 124 (not to the ninth line [*öl*]); note 279 is the strangest of all: it should refer to "multicolore" of Nr. 8a, on p. 140 (not to "bleu et haut" of Nr. 8); moreover it should be noted that the word *elyēnū*, from *elē* "milan" does not mean "multicolored!" and most certainly was not in the original text. The text should read *erēn*, Mo. *eriyen* "varicolored"; the correct reading appears on p. 191: *eriyen önggetü oṛtaryuy-a* "varicolored sky." Finally, note 328 should refer to "jeter leurs adversaires" (seventh line from bottom on p. 151) (not to "l'un et l'autre"). Has by any chance another hand than the author's been at work here?

One final remark. Wherever possible, the author notes the corresponding forms in written Mongol; but *onā* "monture (cheval)" is not from *ulaya* "relay, relay horse" (p. 322), but from *unuṣa* "mount."

Henry Serruys

Matthias Hermanns: *Schamanen-Pseudoschamanen, Erlöser und Heilbringer: Eine vergleichende Studie religiöser Urphänomene*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970.

Teil 1: *Schamanen*. 705 S. u. xxii S. Einleitung.

Der Verfasser legt seinem Werk die Definition des Begriffes Schamanismus durch M. Eliade ("Einführende Betrachtungen über den Schamanismus," *Paideuma* V: 3 [1951]: 87-97) zugrunde. Danach sind als Kennzeichen das Erlebnis der Skelettierung und eine mit Hilfe der Schamanentrommel zum Seelenflug bzw. zur Seelenreise entwickelte Technik der Ekstase (S. 63, Zeile 12, lies: Enstase) unerlässlich. Den Ursprung des Schamanismus sucht er in Vorstellungen von der Knochenseele und in damit verbundenen Praktiken einer Skelettierung der Jagdbeute zwecks Wiederbelebung bei Jagdvölkern des Iran und des westlichen Zentralasien und die Herausbildung dann im östlichen Grenzgebiet des Iran und in anschliessenden Gegenden. Es ist allerdings merkwürdig, wenn der Verf. in den religiösen Vorstellungen des Iran auch nur die Quellgründe sehen muss, aus denen sich durch Religionsmischung der mittel-, ost- und nordasiatische Schamanismus allmählich entwickelt habe (S. 1-84). Diese Konstruktion einer Lokalisierung, vor allem deren Bausteine, sind weithin problematisch.

In der Geschichte der Entstehung des Schamanismus spielt nach den Vorstellungen des Verf. Tibet eine bevorzugte Rolle. Zu den vorgelegten Realien nur folgende Bemerkungen: Im Tibetischen wird nicht immer zwischen einem materiellen und einem transzendenten Himmel unterschieden. Vielmehr gehen die Bedeutungen oft unentflechtbar ineinander über. Das gilt im Zusammen mit einem ausgeprägten Photismus aller tibetischen Religionen auch für die Begriffe von Licht, Helligkeit und Weite; z.B. *Sangs-rgyas* (in der Zhang-zhung-Sprache: *Mu-sangs*) = transzendentes Prinzip und Firmament. Desgleichen weisen die Sinngehalte entsprechender Begriffe bald auf religiös bzw. philosophisch Prinzipielles, bald auf Gegebenheiten der materiellen Natur, bald auf göttliche Personen, wobei dann *gNam* gegenüber *Nam-mkha'* bevorzugt wird, die entsprechenden Vorstellungen aber meist recht vage sind, sodass wir bei einer Formulierung fester Grössen gewarnt sind (S. 85 ff.; S. 87 lies: *rgyal-po*, statt Druckfehler: *rg alvpo*). *gShen* (S. 88) wird nach den kürzlich bekannt gewordenen Bilinguen (Zhang-zhung-Tibetisch) vielleicht mit *Shen* im Zhang-zhung (tib.: *rNam-shes*, auch *shes-pa*) zu verbinden sein (vgl. altchinesisch: *d'zien*), aber auch das ist noch ungewiss. Ähnliches gilt für *Khri* (hierzu die Rezension zum 3. Teil). Nach jenen Bilinguen können wir allerdings sTag-gzigs und 'Ol-mo-lung-rings, das Kernland von Zhang-zhung im Gebiete von sTag-gzigs mit der Hauptstadt Khyung-lung, nun nicht mehr auf iranische Gebiete beschränken (S. 87, 106). Andersartige tibetische Erklärungen sind einfach