

This is the meaning of “suffering” in “truth of suffering”, and in this sense *dukkha* even includes a pleasant feeling (*sukhavedanā*), which is impermanent and liable to change, and is therefore unsatisfactory. Ledi Sayadaw’s discussion of this point (JPTS VII, pp. 133–5) is wonderfully clear and points towards the value of the *Yamaka*’s applied logic. The *Yamaka* may be hard to access just by reading, but nevertheless Shaw and Cousins’ new translation of the text makes a very clear English translation easily accessible for students who are ready to try to understand it.

Dhivan Thomas Jones
University of Chester

CENTRAL ASIA

ÁKOS BERTALAN APATÓCZKY and CHRISTOPHER P. ATWOOD (Guest editor:
BÉLA KEMPF):

Philology of the Grasslands. Essays in Mongolic, Turkic, and Tungusic Studies.

(The Languages of Asia Series.) xiv, 458 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2018. ISBN 978 90 04 35195 0.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X1900096X

This fine composite volume is, as the preface (but not the title or the front cover) reveals, a *Festschrift* in honour of one of the most prolific and influential contributors to the field of Altaic studies of our time – György Kara (b. 23 June 1935).

The tome collects 24 scholarly papers which cover the breadth and wealth of the different fields on which Kara was and remains active, namely (and mostly) Mongolian studies, Turkology and Tungusology. Most papers address problems of early written Mongolian monuments – or even the earliest, as in the case of Wu Yingzhe, “The last-words [sic] of Xiao Chala Xianggong in Khitan script”, pp. 384–93, on “Para-Mongolic” Khitan. Ákos Bertalan Apatóczy, “The Yibu (譯部) chapter of the Lulong sai lüe (盧龍塞略)”, pp. 1–15, deals with the Mongolian entries in a seventeenth-century (1610) military text, with a detailed elucidation of its copying history and a thorough demonstration that this material does not represent a coherent dialect or chronological layer. Otgon Borjigin, “Some remarks on page fragments of a Mongol book of Taoist content from Qaraqota”, pp. 80–100, is actually a full edition of these fragments (possibly from the early fourteenth century), with facsimile, transcription, translation, commentary and glossary. Olivér Kápolnás and Alice Sárközi, “A Mongolian text of confession”, pp. 147–73, edit, with facsimiles, transcription and translation, a Buddhist text, probably from the seventeenth century.

Volker Rybatzky, in “Some medical and related terms in Middle Mongyol”, pp. 273–307, offers 147 thematically chosen entries from his much anticipated forthcoming *Etymological Dictionary of Middle Mongyol*, a work which will without doubt be a major contribution to Mongolian studies. Brian Baumann, “The scent of a woman: allegorical misogyny in a Sa skya pa treatise on salvation in pre-classical Mongolian verse”, pp. 28–58, is not a linguistic study, but deals with Buddhist attitudes towards women, with a *tour de force* through parallels, from the *Epic of Gilgamesh* to *Dante*. Michael Weiers, “Zum Werktitel mongolischer Texte seit dem 17. Jahrhundert”, pp. 369–83, examines Mongolian book-titles

with the well-known formulaic termination in *orusiba(i)*, which, according to the author, is (often) to be read as an indication that the text at hand is based on other, earlier, texts which are reported on, presented again, compiled etc., thus not stipulating a translation as “has begun, begins here”, as it is usually done, but rather along the lines of “is the basis of this text, was present/available, is given here” (not as an “original work”). Natalia Yakhontova, “Proper names in the Oirat translation of *The Sutra of Golden Light*”, 394–429, discusses 71 (often translated and thus “talking”) proper names from the West Mongolian *Altan Gerel*.

Modern Mongolian variants are the subject of six papers: Ágnes Birtalan, “Some aspects of the language usage of Darkhat and Oirat female shamans”, pp. 59–79, based on the author’s fieldwork in Mongolia since the 1990s. Benjamin Brosig, “Pronouns and other terms of address in Khalkha Mongolian”, pp. 101–11, is a preliminary report on a longer study on addressing others in Ulaanbaatar Khalkha. Jacques Legrand, “Contraction, anticipation et perseveration en mongol xalx: quelques réflexions”, pp. 194–213, offers original thoughts on some Khalkha verbal suffixes (e.g. -жээ/-чээ). Ines Stolpe and Alimaa Senderjav, “On the phenomeno-logic behind some Mongolian verbs”, pp. 347–56, also deal with modern Khalkha Mongolian, mostly with what the present writer would refer to as metaphorical extensions of more concrete (verbal) meanings. Jan-Olof Svantesson, “Spelling variation in Cornelius Rahmn’s Kalmuck manuscripts as evidence for sound changes”, pp. 357–65, presents a number of variant renderings of identical words in this early-nineteenth-century source on oral Kalmyk, but reaches the conclusion that it remains unclear whether these can really be attributed to “ongoing sound change” at the time of recording. Finally, a Santa (prosecutive/directive nominal) suffix is the subject of Hans Nugteren’s “The Dongxiang (Santa) ending -ḡun and its allies”, pp. 214–29, where the dean of Gansu-Mongolic studies offers a well-reasoned and amply documented (new) etymology of this marker.

Pavel Rykin, “Reflexes of *VgV and *VxV groups in the Mongol vocabulary of the Sino-Mongol glossary Dada yu/Beilu yiyu (late 16th–early 17th c.), pp. 308–32, and Bayarma Khabtagaeva, “The role of Ewenki VgV in Mongolic reconstruction”, pp. 174–93 deal, incidentally, with the same phoneme groups in Proto-Mongolian, and manage to elucidate the chronology of events from very different perspectives.

Tungusic languages and (early and recent) linguistic data are the objects of this latter paper and of: Andrew Shimunek, “Early Serbi-Mongolic-Tungusic lexical contact: Jurchen numerals from the 室韋 Shirwi (Shih-wei) in north China”, pp. 331–46, José Andrés Alonso de la Fuente, “Past tenses, diminutives and expressive palatalization: typology and the limits of internal reconstruction in Tungusic”, pp. 112–37, and Alexander Vovin, “Four Tungusic etymologies” (pp. 366–8), the shortest contribution to this volume; this would invite several comments, for which there is insufficient space here, but I would add the non-trivial correction that this reviewer does *not* view “*Udihe* and *Uilta* as Northern Tungusic languages” (p. 367), but the former and *Oroč*.

Turkology, old, middle and new, is represented by Christopher P. Atwood, “Middle Turkic dialects as seen in Chinese transcriptions from the Mongol Yuan era”, 16–27, Daniel Prior, “Sino-Mongolica in the Qırğız epic poem *Kökötöy*’s memorial feast by Sağımbay Orozbaq uulu”, 230–257, Klaus Röhrborn, “Kollektaneen zum Uigurischen Wörterbuch: Zwei Weisheiten und Drei Naturen im Uigurischen Buddhismus”, 266–272, and Elizabetta Ragagnin, “Badəkšaan”, 258–265 (on a supernatural creature from the mythology of some South-Siberian Turkic-speaking (Tuvan and Dukhan) groups, with a compelling etymological explanation).

Finally, Juha Janhunen, “From Tatar to Magyar: notes on Central Eurasian ethnonyms in -r” (138–146), draws a broad picture which encompasses the three

mentioned language families plus Hungarian and explains the ubiquitous element *-r* found in many ethnonyms and also, among other things, in the name *Magyar*, as going back to a Proto-Turkic plural suffix, which, ultimately, goes back to **-s*.

Stefan Georg
University of Bonn

SOUTHEAST ASIA

TH. C. VAN DER MEIJ:

Indonesian Manuscripts from the Islands of Java, Madura, Bali and Lombok.

(Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 3 Southeast Asia, volume 24.)
xliii, 575 pp. Leiden: Brill, 2017. €168. ISBN 978 90 04 34811 0.
doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000971

Until recently, researchers working with Southeast Asian manuscripts taught themselves how to understand their material as they went along, leaning on catalogue descriptions and the unwritten lore of more experienced colleagues. For a long time the only methodological overview of the field was Stuart Robson's *Principles of Indonesian Philology* (Dordrecht: Foris, 1988), which defended the importance of textual study and outlined how to go about producing an edition, but deemed beyond the scope of the book "the auxiliary subjects" of codicology and palaeography (p. 45). Gallop and Arps' amply illustrated *Golden Letters: Writing Traditions of Indonesia* (Jakarta and London: Yayasan Lontar and the British Library, 1991) made it abundantly clear that there is in fact something to see here, and that illumination, hand, binding, writing media, and so on are essential aspects of the study of manuscripts from island Southeast Asia. Since then, further illustrated catalogues (e.g. Pudjiastuti and Hanstein (eds), *Catalogue of Indonesian Manuscripts: Collection Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin*, Jakarta: Museum Nasional Republik Indonesia, 2016) and studies of extra-textual aspects of Southeast Asian texts (e.g. Yahya, *Magic and Divination in Malay Illustrated Manuscripts*, Leiden: Brill, 2016) have appeared, while Fathurahman's *Filologi Indonesia: Teori dan Metode* (Jakarta: UIN Jakarta Press, 2015) has extended Robson's work to include a chapter on codicology and palaeography. Van der Meij's book is a substantial contribution to this developing field within island Southeast Asian manuscript studies, presenting an abundance of information on verse metres, chronograms, colophons, library stamps, bookbinders' seals, and the like. Packed with surprising details and presented in an accessible and sometimes chatty style, the book is the result of hands-on study of many hundreds of manuscripts.

The book's introduction delineates its scope – note that, despite "Indonesian" being in the title, it is actually more narrowly focused on "the traditions of Central and East Java and the Javanese-inspired worlds of West Java, Bali, Madura and Lombok" (p. 1). In practice, this means that it covers manuscripts in varieties of Javanese, Sundanese and Balinese, and Sasak, and excludes Arabic, Malay, Chinese and European languages (p. 3). (The exclusion of Malay and Arabic, while understandable for practical reasons, is something of a pity, since it perpetuates an artificial segregation of what may have been a highly multilingual literary culture, as the examples of interlinear translation on pp. 26 and 27 indicate.)