

Published in: Shamans Unbound. Papers at the VI. Shamanistic Congress, Dobogókő, 2007. Budapest 2009, Akadémiai Kiadó.

The Ancient and New Reputation of the Northern Mongol Shamans

Maria Magdolna Tatár

Rumours about foreign peoples, especially confessors of other religions or about a population of distant areas who are “sorcerers”, are important ethnic markers, as were e.g. among the Nordic peoples, who referred to the Shamanic Saami population as possessing knowledge of sorcery. A typical example is told by Rubrouck (Chapter XXXV) about the Christian nanny in the court of Möngke Khan, who was killed together with her children for such an acquisition by the shamans. Such statements are often used for political purposes as well, as it was e.g. used against Ogulkaymish, the Merkit widow of Güyük Khan, when descendants of Toluy ousted her and her sons from the power during a dynastic conflict in 1251.¹ In this paper I intend to deal with such ancient rumours or reputations, which lately became of current interest again in the Republic Mongolia.

The question is what is the position of Buryat and Darkhat Shamanism within the Mongolic or Mongolian Shamanism. The political development and the technical possibilities in our days cause an exchange of cultural phenomena not only among nations but within the regions of one nation as well which eliminate the historically interesting differences of the substrate/subcultural units. Such a phenomenon is Shamanism. Although most research compares all Mongolian and Mongolic materials without taking any ethnic differences in consideration (e.g. BUMOCHIR 2002), which might be fully justified from a theoretical or structural point of view of the religion, such a study based on ancient ethnic differences is not without importance for the history, even for religion history as well. This point is even more actual now, because in the last seventeen years, we are witnessing the renaissance of Shamanism² in the Republic Mongolia³, not only among autochton groups who kept it alive in spite of difficulties or who awakened it, based on almost forgotten traditions, but among urban population as well.⁴

Old people, who earlier practiced in secret and descendants of local shamans, who knew but not really practised the traditions, perform now the inherited rites of their ancestors openly among the Darkhat people in Khövsgöl aymag as well as among the Buryats in North-Eastern part of Mongolia. In their case the shamanic traditions were strong enough to survive the political restriction during Socialism because the ancient beliefs still were alive in spite of the influence of the expanding Lamaism, most active in these remote areas since the 18th century.⁵ Although Shamanic materials were collected among other groups in the territory of Mongolia as late as at the beginning of the 20th century as well (and occasionally even in our days), there are very few descendants of those peoples living now, so the lineage of shamanic inheritance often is broken. It is noteworthy that the few shamans, who live in these territories, are often of foreign origin. So is the “Tuvín” shaman in Bayan-Ölgiy aymag, who was “found” by the government’s representative in 1990 (CAMPI 1991:10). Actually, he

¹ Cf. Rubrouck, Chapter XXVII/6-8; Juvaini 1997:265.

² It is documented by scholars as well as by reporters, e.g. a film about the oboo cult by V. LEGENDRE, 1993.

³ This paper is based only on material from the Republic of Mongolia, i.e. not on material from Inner Mongolia.

⁴ About a similar development in Siberia cf. HOPPÁL 1995:263-72.

⁵ Diòszegi (1961:10-26) was obviously mistaken when he wrote that Shamanism is already absent among the Buryats in East Mongolia.

belonged to the mongolized Uriangkhay group.⁶ From Tuva was also the ancestor of a “yellow” shamaness in Uvs aymag called to a sick member of the local prince’s family in the 20th century (BIRTALAN 1996). In these cases there were historical causes to survival besides the dogma-free and secret system, which resulted in survival, according to HUMPHREY (1983:chapt. I-III). The most obvious historical causes are political-administrative ones: most Buryats were organized in units which did not belong to the administrative sphere under the Mongol princes. The area around the Khövsgöl lake was organized outside of the aymaks. Between 1691 and 1724 the west side of the Khövsgöl lake was the area of the *Darkhat šav`*, and the east side a territory of the Uriangkhay. From 1760 the whole area was a border region (RINČEN 1979:16-7). Lamaism was less influential in these territories not only because the distance to the capital, but also because the laws, which prohibited shaman activities⁷ were often not carried out there. While the activities of the Russian Orthodox missionaries resulted in a superficial Christianization of some Buryats, a syncretistic folk-religion was formed under the strong influence of the dominant Lamaism. It replaced Shamanism in various degrees in the Khalkh districts. Therefore urban peoples, especially Khalkhs, whose ancestors mostly followed traditional ceremonies performed not by shamans but lamas and the so-called yellow shamans, had none or few genuine shamanic traditions left when the government allowed easier conditions for religions. However, in Ulaanbaatar, the capital of Mongolia, also people, without any known shaman ancestors started to perform shamanic ceremonies. In their case, the following components are necessary to a successful rebirth or start of urban Shamanism:

1. A spiritual need which requires the rebirth of the ancient belief and religious practices;
2. A political situation, which at least allows it, even perhaps uses it in the rebuilding of the nation;
3. Knowledge of the traditions, which can be obtained both from living persons, ancient manuscripts and from scholarly books;
4. Inherited shaman ancestors.

The first three components exist in Mongolia without doubt. While the local renaissance of Shamanism first of all meet the people’s primary need of a traditional belief, the urban rebirth of Shamanism was administrated by political actors as well. This fact was obvious e.g. in 1990, when by occasion of the conference, dedicated to the highly celebrated 750th Anniversary of the Secret History of the Mongols (cf. Materials... BULLETIN 1990: 2(6)), both a shaman and a lama performed ceremonies. There were many similar occasions since then, when the political leadership of the country demonstrated by its presence that the traditional religions in Mongolia, i.e. Lamaism, and its syncretistic variant as well as Shamanism are now not the “opium of the people” any more, but an important element of the new Nationalism on which the revival of the country is based. Let me just mention the syncretistic cult of the mountain *Otgontenger* here. It was one of the holy mountains to which ceremonies and sacrifices were administrated by the state before Socialism (cf. TATÁR 1976). Its sacrifices started in public again in 1990, and the first official celebration of the state took place in 1995, repeated in 1999 and 2003 (SÜHBAT 2004:II). As for the third point, the necessary texts, “students” learn them and the traditions from ancient manuscript, from “masters”, and from scholarly books (e.g. DULAM 1992, PÜREV 2002, RINČEN 2006) as well, privately or at the Lamaist University of Mongolia (*Mongolyn Burhan Šašiny Ih Surguul`*) in Ulaanbaatar now. However, they still need a spirit of an

⁶ Uriangkhaies joined the Mongols in different times. Some other groups, especially those living among the Khakhs, are ancient habitants and more assimilated (cf. BADAMHATAN 1987:45).

⁷ E.g. the Oirat regulation of 1640, which prescribed the removal of the *ongons* from private homes and punished with fine if somebody invited a shaman for a ceremony, or performed a shamanistic ritual act or killed animals for religious purposes (RIASANOVSKY 1937:92).

ancestor. Even more so, because the other solutions, namely to become a tragic *ongon* or to find such one (cf. TATÁR 1985), or to acquire a Lamaist spirit instead a shamanic one, are not only less popular, but almost absent. Most shamans, even if they do not belong to these ethnic groups, acquired a Buryat or a Darkhat *ongon*, in some cases beside a Lamaist spirit as well (mostly Očirvani, the ancient guardian deity of Mongolia).

A. Buryats in North-Eastern Mongolia are one of the groups which often provide the urban shamans with the necessary shaman ancestors. As *G. Gereltuyaa*, a 40 years old shamaness told me in Ulaanbaatar in 2006, she not only studied at the Lamaist university, but also travelled to Dornod aymag, where a local shaman became her master and found for her an ancestor on the mother side by performing a shamanistic act. As her master, the local shaman of Buryat origin said, this ancestor, *Amgalan*, was an Aga Buryat *zairin* (great shaman), who lived four generations ago. She got the contact established with this “ancestor” through the local shaman. Any matriculation book being unknown at that time and in lack of any memory of this person in the family, this ancestor is supposedly “historical” and mythical for the believer but imaginary for a scholar. However, he is absolutely needed. Other urban shamans, who may even have travelled as far as to South-Korea, but lack such ancestors, are not always fully accepted as “true” shamans in lack of any shaman spirits who should “come into them” during the shamanistic act.

The question still is: how Mongolian is the Buryat Shamanism? Buryats are now, after the political separation by state borders from Mongolia since the 18th century⁸, generally meant being a Mongolic people, although in the past it was a continued passage from location to location, from dialect to dialect, with groups migrating from south to north and vice versa. Many of them, who are called Mongolic now, were called Mongolian then. Their mythology is much richer than that of the Mongols.

The Buryats in this part of Mongolia belong mostly to the Aga and Barga groups⁹. The last gave name to the Barguzin basin. As we know, even the mythical ancestors of Chinggis Khan came from the northern side of the Baykal, and he had some ancestress originating from Barguzin on his mother side, according to the Secret History of the Mongols (SHM §§ 1-10). The Barguzin basin was obviously not under the control of Chinggis Khan, therefore could his enemies as the Merkit people, and Jēbke of the Jalair clan, a member of the entourage, flee to this area (cf. SHM §§ 157, 177, 244). This northern area from Barguzin to Khövsgöl was populated by non-Mongolic Uriangkhai tribes, as the Qori, Bargut and Tümet, according to RAŠID AD-DIN (I:156-7), who collected much materials about these peoples. The exact ethnicity of these peoples is not clear¹⁰, however, they became more and more assimilated by the Buryats (some places even by the Mongols) during the centuries. The special fame of their shamans is documented several times:

1. Rašid ad-Din reported an interesting fact about the people living in Bargu (i.e. in the Barguzin basin): they have spirits, who talk to them. This remark describes the most important activity of the shamans, the seance. JUVAINI (1997:39) used a similar wording about Teb-Tengri (Teb-Tenggeri in the Secret History), the famous shaman of Chingis Khan, who used to come back from the desert saying that God has spoken with him, telling the future. The identical wording indicates that the ancient informants referred to the same

⁸ The ethnicity of the population was not a subject during the negotiations about the border. It was rather whether the Russians were able to build a fort on the territory of the autochthon population which settled the case, cf. MUT IV:334.

⁹ About the movements of this tribe during the history cf. ERHEMBAT 1997.

¹⁰ The Mongols use this ethnonym about the Turkic peoples in Siberia, west from the Khövsgöl lake. In Eastern Mongolia it was probably the name of some Tungus groups. Cf. JANHUNEN (1996:126, 148), who supposed that the word is connected to the ancient ethnonym in the Ussuri basin, *warka*, and was used as the name of some unassimilated Kumo Xi groups in the Ming period.

religious practice. However, Rašid ad-Din remarked about these Uriangkhaays that they have exceptionally many shamans, especially in the remote areas. This saying marks a typical ethnic difference.

2. This fame of the local Uriangkhaay shamans is still traceable among the Buryats. Among the clans, which are famous for their shamans (e.g. the *Durlag*, who immigrated from the Altay, cf. BALDAEV 1970:331), there are three, especially interesting clans having historical contacts to the Barga and the Uriangkhaay. They are the *Haytal*, the *Hurdut* and the *Ongoy*. The *Hurdut* originates from the eastern, i.e. Barguzin side of the Baykal and all descendants of their ancestor were shamans (op. cit.:346-7). Also their relatives, the *Ongoy*, whose name comes from the word *ongo* “shamanic spirit”, are on the mother side from Barga and known as a shamanic clan (op. cit.:151-3). About the *Haytal* clan (whose ethnonym by the way means Hephtalites) is said that they migrated from the Altay to the river Lena, where Buryats lived on the steppe and Tungus people in the forest. When the Russians invaded the Baykal region, they migrated to the other side of the Baykal, where they are now famous of having many shamans and shamanesses, thanks to their Uriangkhaay ancestress on mother side (op. cit.:323-4). This migration of the Barguzin shamans is reflected in a Buryat legend about the shamaness, who escaped from the Buddhists from Barguzin to Tunka and from there to Alar (ŠARAKŠINOVA 1959:60).

From these traditions is clear that the fame of the Buryats, especially those whose ancestors were connected to Barguzin, as a people having many and powerful shamans existed before the invading Lamaism destroyed many shamanic traditions in the southern habitation area of the Mongols. It is noteworthy that in several cases the shaman ancestor, especially the Uryangkhaay one, was provided by the mother side, i.e. the clan was an immigrant one.

3. The mythical power of the Uryangkhaays is expressed in an Üjümchin tradition as well. According to it, an Uriangkhaay, especially one of the *Čonod* (wolf) clan, wearing white clothes and mounting a white horse, should assist a person, who was struck by the lightning. He calls the lightning over to himself (DISAN 1996:142, GANTULGA 2000:192-3). This was not a self-offering act, because the lightning would not harm an Uriangkhaay¹¹, who all belonged to “white” clans. In this case white means obviously not so much a noble but a heavenly origin (cf. the white shamans who serve the *tengris* versus the black shamans who serve the dead). This regarded especially the *Čonod*. I base this opinion on the Khamnigan tradition in Eastern Mongolia, where there are Uriangkhaay families as well, about the two kinds of wolves: one connected to the heaven, the other to the dead (TANGAD 1996:373). By other means, they have the same characteristics as the shamans. The heavenly wolves are obviously their ancestors.

4. However, this fame was not only based on the shaman knowledge of their ancestors, but also to their marital connections with the clan of Chinggis Khan. Furthermore, Barguzin was part of the *Yeke Ğaĵar* (RINČEN 1975:III:XI) “the great country”, the primary area of the ancestors of Chinggis Khan. As it says in the so-called Maxims of Chinggis Khan, every boy born in Barguzin, on the Onon and the Kerülen, are wise, manly and heroic, without guidance and knowing without instructions and every maiden from the same places are beautiful without combing and adornment (RIASANOVSKY 1937:89). Wisdom and knowledge, inherited without instructions must be first of all a shamanic knowledge. This special role of Barguzin is reflected in the shaman songs as well. *Bargalĵin Bogd* (RINTCHEN 1975:III:1-2),

¹¹ Many Mongol groups, among others the Uriangkhaays practices the wide-spread custom to call out to the heaven during storms to signalize to the lightning that they are heavenly people who should not be struck (TANGAD 1996:374). However, here the heavenly connection is not used profilactic but as a cure.

the ancestor and probably the ruler of Barguzin¹², who is obviously elevated over the niveau of the usual local master spirits, is venerated in spite of the fact that Tungus groups became dominant in Barguzin before the 18th century (cf. HANHARAEV 2000, map). The special fame of the Barga shamans is reflected in the manuscripts, in the remarks that a cunning Barga shaman should perform the ritual for the fertility of the camels and oxen (RINTCHEN 1975:III:21, 23), i. e. rituals which are not directly connected to the cult of the ancestors.

5. The fact that the Buryats kept Shamanism alive also after the Lamaist missions, strengthened this fame. These peoples even were teased for their belief, as e.g. by the following saying (ENTUUL 2000:190):

Buriadyn buh jülden „The old-fashioned sword of the Buryats

Buruu išilsen süh jülden Is an axe-sword with the handle on the wrong side.”

The old-fashioned sword refers to the most important shamanic ongon of the Buryat, namely to Buha Yülden baatar, the Bull-hero with the sword like horns. He is called “the bull without a book” in a shaman song (RINTCHEN 1975:III:74), which means that the Bull did not accepted the Lamaist teaching. These teasing words mean that the Buryats still were old-fashioned, different, barbaric shamanists when the rest already became Buddhists. It is remarkable how history turned this humiliating position to a desirable one. In their case, the unbroken tradition not only got its first renaissance in Buryatia (SCHMIEDT 1955:XII/3, 252) actually as early as in the 1920ies and 30ies, and the second one in the 1990ies both in Buryatia and Mongolia, but it also won new followers among people originating from dominantly Lamaist districts. It is transplanted in the urban milieu of the capital, where the shamans with Buryat education (by other words with a Buryat ongon) are very popular in the shamanist centra offering services for public. It is noteworthy that the turbulent history of the 20th century erased the memory of the differences between Buryat ethnic groups, at least among the Mongols. As we heard and read lately, some new shamans went from Buryatia to Mongolia to find a shaman master, and some Buryat shamans were invited from Mongolia to Buryatia as well. In their case, the living oral tradition was highly appreciated. However, it is not less important that Zhamtsarano`s collection of Buryat shaman texts was published by Rintchen together with his own. In this way, many forgotten oral texts can be studied by the Buryat shamans as well, although such rich collections are not yet published in Buryatia.

B. The other source of revival is the Darkhat-Tsaatan tradition of the Khövsgöl area, where I had the good fortune to meet secretly practising shamans already in the 1970ies, while others “gave back”, or “the spirits helped them to forget” their knowledge in order to save their lives (PÜREV 2002:149). The shaman, who performed on the celebration of the anniversary of the Secret History of the Mongols, came from Khövsgöl aymag, as did others who practise now in the capital frequently. Their native territory belonged to Tuva until 1878 (MANNAJ-OOI 1986:95), so the Lamaist influence were never so strong there as in other districts. The non-Mongolic components of the mixed population of the Darkhat cannot be doubted. The not very ancient Turkic components of these peoples and those of their Shamanism is well-known (cf. DIÓSZEGI 1963, TATÁR 1981, 1984), as well as their Buryat heritage (cf. GALBAABADRAH 2000). Therefore it is not surprising that some shamans went from here to Tuva to become shamans there (e.g. RINTCHEN 1975:III:77). However, there are some traces after an older tradition witnessing about the special knowledge of the ancient Turkic peoples in the Altay – Sayan area, the wider background of the Darkhat and the Tsaatan peoples.

¹² Unfortunately, Rintchen did not mention where the text was collected. The only clan called Barguzin in Mongolia lives in Dornod aymag, Hölönbüj sum now (BADAMHATAN 1987:48). They are probably recent immigrant among the Barga, with whom they fled from the Chinese side of the border into Mongolia at the end of the WW II, as the modern form of their ethnonym shows it, while that of the spirit is a much older variant.

1. Let just mention here the invocation of the shaman spirit *Khan Tömörliḡ* (RINTCHEN 1975:III:82-4). It is said about him that he spoke the Uygur languages (which by modern understanding, refers simply to the Tuva language, the only Turkic language spoken in the vicinity now). He made a stand on the northern Tagna mountains. He drinks from the rivulet Agar in the Darkhat basin. It says also that his rout runs through *Qara balgasun*, the ancient Uygur capital. By other means the territory of his realm is not the habitation area of the newly immigrated Tuvas, but the same as the historical territory of the Uygur Khanat. By this placing the text expresses geographically the mythical connection to the distant past, one of the genetic roots of the present population. Let us see some information about their shamanic past.

2. As RAŠID AD-DIN (1952:I:122-3) reported it, the forest peoples *Urasut* (Ursut in the SHM, § 239), *Telengüt* and *Küştem* (Kesdim in the SHM, *ibid.*), who live in the vicinity of the Kirghiz (Kirgis or Tümen-Kirgis, *ibid.*), i.e. west-north-west of the Darkhat basin, are similar to the Mongols, know very well the Mongolian method of healing. Keshtim was the name of the autochthon population, subjugated by the Turkic Khaganat (KYZLASOV 1969:51-2). Telengit was a Turkic tribe, which descendants still exist in the Altay region. At that time healing was mostly a shamanic practice¹³, so this remark refers to the shamans of these Turkic peoples who followed a practice, similar to that of the Mongols.

3. At the 12th century, the Darkhat basin was populated by the Tümen-Oyrat people, whose leader, *Quduqa beki* and his two sons, *Inalči* and *Törelči* had Turkic names (SHM §§ 141-4, 239). This must have been a part of the Tümet group, while the other part, called Qori Tümet, was unified with the Qori tribe (SHM § 240), later a part of the Buryats. Rašid ad-Din (1952:I:118, 121-3) wrote about the Tümetes that they originated from Barguzin (see above), and earlier they lived between the upper course of the Yenisey and the Angara, where the Oyrat lived in his time. A little group of them still lived along the right-side confluent of the Upper Yenisey in the 18th century (DULOV 1951:63, MANNAJ-OOL 1986:93). Another part of them were settled by the Uvs lake in 1716 (MUT 332). Although there is no details mentioned about their Shamanism in the sources, there is an interesting description known about their tribal leader, Quduqa beki, whose exact ethnicity is unknown (Tümet? Uygur?). According to the Secret History (§ 143) he and the Nayman Buyruq Khan could arise a storm by sorcery against the enemy, the soldiers of Chingis Khan during a battle. This strategic sorcery of Central Asian origin is well-known among many Turkic peoples. This data and at least two similar stories, mentioned by Molnár (1993:39-44) was interpreted as a Mongolian custom.¹⁴ However, the sorcerers mentioned in the medieval sources were not Mongols but Turks (besides Quduqa, a Kangli, i.e. a Kipchak and some genetically mixed warriors of Chagatay in East Iran are mentioned in the sources, cf. MOLNÁR 1993:39-42). Furthermore, the name of the stone, used in this rite, is of Turkic origin in Mongolian and is known only from the Western dialects and from Buryat. It is also known that the Mongols and the Mongolic Kitays had other magic practices to arise rain (*op. cit.* 38). Even more, according to an Oyrat tradition, this Central Asian magic practice was thought to them by prince *Čoytu tayiji* (1581-1637, cf. BIRTALAN 2005:211), by other means, it is not part of their original tradition. It is logical to suppose that this sorcery belonged to the non-Mongolian heritage of the local Tümet population in the Darkhat basin or their possibly Uygur leader. At that time, this was obviously not a shamanic practice, rather a part of the strategic knowledge of the leaders, however, it signalize a difference in the beliefs of this people.

¹³ The Buryat shaman was the usual physician even in the 19th century, cf. BANZAROV 1946:37). As we know, one of the important activities of the shamans is still to provide help in sicknesses.

¹⁴ There is a description of a similar Lamaist ritual from Uvs aymag, collected from a shamaness of Tuva origin (BIRTALAN 2001:19-142 and 2005:210-20).

C. So, the holiness of the original homeland and the ancestry of Chinggis do not cover over the foreign substratum (Uryanghay in Barguzin and Turks in the Darkhat basin), who lies behind the fame. However, this mixture of traditions, both similar and foreign with that of the Mongols does not remain unchanged either. The last decades with intensive impact of the massmedia about the great celebrations of the Secret History and Chinggis Khan, are now changing the local identity. People are not so much talking about their foreign roots. They say more often than before that they were the first and most loyal warriors of Chinggis Khan (actually, they were first subjugated by the Khan's son, Jöci). In the contexts of this new, unified ethnicity, their Shamanism appears as a genuine Mongol inheritance.

This revival process resulted in some changes in the shamanist belief as well. The traditional antagonism between shamans and lamas is toned down as a result of the cooperation with the Lamaist University in Ulaanbaatar. The nationalistic point of view of some Mongols that Lamaism caused harm on the original Mongol religion Shamanism is more or less absent. Now leading personalities as e.g. SÜHBAT (2004:I:30-1) greet the yellow shamans as desirable and codify again their place within Lamaism. They are fully accepted if they stay away from bloody offerings, replace the shaman *duudlaga* (invocation) texts with Lamaist *unšlaga* (written prayer), and work for the protection of the environment, first of all around the holy places. It is interesting that this development resulted in the disappearance of the ancient yellow shamans in the cities, probably because people, still remembering some ancient shamanic tradition, are sceptical to their abilities to contact the ongons. The ongons do not come to them who have no shaman spirits - as people in the capital say. On the other hand, there are still some Darkhat yellow shamans living, or people who practised both as shamans and lamas by different occasions. In their territory, the concept of yellow shamans is still accepted. Their black or white shamans still possess the ancient antagonist feelings against the lamas. This resulted in a debate between the performing shaman and the lama after the seemingly peaceful cooperation during the festivity on the anniversary of the Secret History. During the night, they were sitting and arguing against each other over a seemingly innocent question of S. Tatàr about the essence of the soul in their traditions. Such a debate is hardly possible between the lamas and the shamans, educated at the Lamaist University. These shamans, even if they call themselves black shamans, abstain from cursing. Therefore became the definition of the white shamans unclear. Some Buryats say that they serve the white *tengris*, while more and more people say that they are the shamans who converted to Lamaism and who do not have a shaman ancestor or paraphernalia and are not capable to come into a trance. (Cf. e.g. VAN DEUSEN 1999:154-5). By other words, these so-called white shamans appear more and more like the former yellow ones. The evening out of the ethnical, regional and religious differences will continue in our age.

As for the fame of shamans in distant areas, it will continue. In 2001 I visited the northernmost dwelling places of the Darkhats. My driver from the aymag centre, Mörön, asked the local shaman, who was the burglar who stolen his belongings from his house in Mörön some weeks ago. The shaman told him that it was a man of such and such age and what he stolen. On our way back, the driver stopped by different relatives. To the first one, he told that the shaman told *almost correctly* what the burglar took and who he was, except that it was not a man but a woman and some other objects were stolen. When we came so far as to Mörön, the driver told a somewhat re-written version to everybody: the shaman told him *exactly* who the burglar was and what she took. So something changes, other remains. Therefore it is important that scholars are observant on the differences and describe them when it is still possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BADAMHATAN, S.
1987 Halh jastny ugsaatny bajdal. In: *Mongol Ulsyn ugsaatny zүй 1*. Ulaanbaatar.
- BALDAEV, S. P.
1970: *Rodoslovnye predanija i legendy burjat. I. Buharaty i ehirity*. Ulan-Ude: Burjatskoe kniž.izd.
- BANZAROV, D.
1846 *Černaja vera ili šamanstvo u mongolov*. St. Petersburg.
- BIRTALAN, À.
1996 A Lineage of Tuvinian Shamans in Western Mongolia. In: *Proceedings of the 38th Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC) Kawasaki, Japan, August 7-12. 1995*. Ed. G. Stary, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz:85-105.
2001 The Tibetan Weather-Magic Ritual of a Mongolian Shaman. *Shaman* 9/2:119-142.
2005 Kürlää, a mongol sàrga sàmàn időjárás-varázsló tevékenysége. In: *Sámánok és kultúrák*, Budapest: 208-222.
- BUMOCHIR, DULAM
2002 *Mongol Shamanic Ritual. Types of Chants. Mongol бөөгijn зан үйл*. Ulaanbaatar: Mönhijn Üseg Press.
- CAMPI, A. J.
1991 The Rise of Nationalism in the Mongolian People`s Republic as Reflected in Language Reform, Religion and the Cult of Chinggis Khan. *Bulletin. The IAMS News Information on Mongol Studies* 1991:2(8):3-17, Ulaanbaatar.
- VAN DENSEN, K.
1999 In Black and White: Contemporary Buriat Shamans. *Shaman* 7/2.
- DIÓSZEGI, V.
1963 Ethnogenetic Aspects of Darkhat Shamanism. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica XVI* :1: 55-81.
1998 Problems of Mongolian Shamanism (1961). In: *Shamanism. Selected Writings of Vilmos Diószegi*. Ed. M. Hoppál. (Bibliotheca Shamanistica 6) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- DISAN, T.
1996 Üземчин. In: *Mongol Ulsyn ugsaatny зүй 3*. Ulaanbaatar: Шинзлех Ухааны Академи.
- DULAM, S.
1992 *Darhad бөөгijn уламјлал*. Ulaanbaatar: МУИС.
- DULOV, V. I.
1951 Perežitki obščino-rodogovo stroja i rodogovo byta u tuvincev v XIX –načale XX veka (do 1917 goda). *Sovetskaja etnografija*:4:57-76.
- ENTUUL, G.
2000 Ugsaatnyg hošignoson üg helleg. In: *”Buriad-mongolčuudyn ugsaa-tүүhijn зарим асуудалд”*. *Olon ulsyn erdem шинжилgeenij бага hurlyn илгел*. Ulaanbaatar:187-190.
- ERHEMBAT, R.
1997: Barga ajmagtny товч түүх. *Түүhijn судлал XXX*. Ulaanbaatar.
- GALBAABADRAH, L.
2000 Baruun ”doloон” buriad. In: *”Buriad-mongolčuudyn ugsaa-tүүhijn зарим асуудалд”*. *Olon ulsyn erdem шинжилgeenij бага hurlyn илгел*. Ulaanbaatar: Altargana IV: 113-116.
- GANTULGA, C.

- 2000 *Altajn urianhajčuud*. Ulaanbaatar: Šinžleh Uhaany Akademi.
- HANHARAEV, V. S.
2000 *Burjaty v XVII-XVIII vv.: demografičeskaja istorija i etničeskie processy*. Ulan-Ude: Izd. Burjatskogo naučnogo centra SO RAN.
- HOPPÁL, M.
1995 Shamanism in a Postmodern Age. In: *Shamanism in Performing Arts*. Eds. M. Hoppál - Taegon Kim. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- HUMPHREY, C.
1983 *Karl Marx Collective: Economy, Society and Religion in a Siberian Collective Farm*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr.
- JANHUNEN, J.
1996 *Manchuria. An ethnic history*. Helsinki (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 222).
- JUVAINI, `ALA-AD-DIN `ATA-MALIK
1997 *Genghis Khan. The History of the World Conqueror*. Ed. J. A. Boyle. Manchester Univ. Press.
- KYZLASOV, P. R.
1969 *Istorija Tuvy v srednie veka*. Moskva: Nauka.
- MANNAJ-OOL, M. Kh.
1986 *Tuva v epohu feodalizma*. Kyzyl: Tuvinskoe kniž.izd.
- Materials
1991 Materials of the International Conference dedicated to the 750th Anniversary of the "Secret History of the Mongols". *Bulletin. The IAMS News Information on Mongol Studies* 1991, no 2(8):3-30. Ulaanbaatar.
- MOLNÁR, Á.
1993 *Időjárás-varázslás Belső-Ázsiában*. (Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 21) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- MUT
2004 *Mongol Ulsyn Tüüh. 4. bot` (XVII-XX zuuny ehen)*. Red. A Očir, B. Enhtüvšin. 2. ed. Ulaanbaatar.
- PÜREV, O.
2002 *Mongol böögijn šašin*. Ulaanbaatar.
- RAŠID AD-DIN
1952 *Sbornik letopisej I-II*. Per. L. A. Hetagurov. Moskva – Leningrad: Nauka.
- RIASANOVSKY, V. A.
1937 *Fundamental Principles of Mongol Law*. Tientsin.
- RINČEN, B. (red.)
1979 *Mongol Ard Ulsyn ugsaatny sudlal, helnij šinžlelij atlas*. Ulaanbaatar: Academie des Sciences de RPM.
- RINČEN, B.
2006 *Mongol böögijn duudlaga*. Ulaanbaatar: TIV delhij holboo, Golomt töv.
- RINTCHEN, [Y. B.]
1959-1961-1975: *Matériaux pour l'étude du chamanisme mongol. I-III*. (Asiatische Forschungen 3, 8. 40). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- SHM
1971 *Histoire Secrète des Mongols*. Ed. L. Ligeti. (Monumenta Linguae Mongolicae collecta 1). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- SÜHBAT, Etügen Avga Pürevžalyn, Luvsan Darža
2004 *Bogd Očirvaan` Otgontenger hajrhany tüüh šastir, tajlga tahlilga, zan üjljin tovčoon oršiboj I-II*. Ulaanbaatar.

ŠARAKŠINOVA, N. O.

1959 *Burjatskij fol'klor*. Irkutsk: Vostočnosibirskoe knižnoe izd.

TANGAD, D.

1996 Hamnigan. In: *Mongol Ulsyn ugсаatny züj 3*. Ulaanbaatar.

TATÁR, M. M.

1976 Two Mongol Texts Concerning the Cult of the Mountains. *Acta Orientalia Hungarica XXX* (1976): 1-58.

1981 K južnosibirskom tjurkskim svjazam mongol'skoj šamanskoj poezii. In: *Literaturnye svjazi Mongolii*. Moskva: Nauka:117-122.

1984 Mongolsk sjamanisme. In: *Gads religionshistoriske tekster*. København: Gads forlag: 247-253.

1985 Tragic and Stanger Ongons among the Altaic Peoples. In: *Altaistic Studies*. (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Konferanser 12). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell:165-171.