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 1578–1579,1 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 / Broniovius 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.2 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.3

1 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).

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

3 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 commentaries⁴ 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) and the importance of the source for archaeological studies (Schreg 2011, pp. 23–44). 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. 1–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.

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

⁵ 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. Хартахай / F. Hartahaj is twice misspelled as Chartaj or Chartaraj; the title of H.-V. Beyer’s study lacks the beginning. The Russian proverb “не зданный [sic] gost’ huže tatarina” in fact sounds as “nezvannyj 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 “merci less people” whose only occupation was raiding neighbouring countries and taking slaves (Evliya Çelebi 2003, 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, French, Italian and other sources.

---

⁶ 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. Rueva 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: Černihov for Černjašov (Russ. Черниховская культура); O. Mahneva never had a double surname Mahneva-Gercen; Cardakli Bajre should be spelled as Čerkaš (Karaite) is Karäer and not Karäim.
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 Kniazi / Kuiazii is not a Turkic term, but Latin rendering of the Russian kniazi / князь (princes or dukes). The editors of the German translation also failed to identify the geographic term Salaticum with the Tatar settlement of Sancak / Salaçık in the vicinity of Bahçeştevär (Albrecht – Herdick 2011, p. 79, fn. 108). The Polish editors did not provide the necessary commentary to the fact that the term seniatus is a Latin rendering of sancaq bey (the governor of the Kefe sub-province sancaq / sancak) (Maćzyńska 2011, p. 99, fn. 86). 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. The main concern regarding the commentaries and introductory articles to the translations is that both editions provide very few data regarding details of Broniowski’s stay in the Crimea. Complicated and hitherto under-studied questions regarding his place of origin, the visits to the Crimea, details of his stay and imprisonment there were not really answered in either of the publications. 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.
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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 Santesson 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 Biritalán (2009, 2011). 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

---

1 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 list2) 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.3 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, ṭ instead of y, ṭ instead of ṭ, and distinguishes the variant of u as o where it occurs without its diacritical stroke (which is quite frequent in the second element of double letter for ū, and also in non-first syllables where the back vocalism of a word

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

3 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 todays 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 texts relatively frequently contain spelling errors or results of misunderstanding the Oirat orthography. Some examples of this phenomenon:

- **RS cəğən, cəgən, zugən ‘white’**, WM cəyən, čəyəyən ‘white’, Kal. ʒəhan ‘bənən’
- **RS žagasun, čagəsun ‘fish’, WM žayəsun, WM ʒyəyəsun ‘fish’, Kal. žəkən ‘pəba’
- **RS gebelı ‘belly, womb’, WM kebeļi ‘belly, stomach, womb’, Kal. kəkən ‘ənipıt, ʊyroba, maqka’
- **RS elesun ‘sand’, WM elesən, WM elesən ‘sand, dust’, Kal. əxən ‘nəcəx’
- **RS soyl, ssəy, səl ‘tail’, WM səəl, səəl, WM segreg ‘tail’, Kal. uyəz ‘1. хвост 2. конец’
- **RS gyroson, gysəson ‘wild goat, game’, WM gəroiysən, WM görəgesən ‘wild hervorous animal, game, beast’, Kal. gorosn ‘aŋtəpənapa-çaııraq’

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 /ə/, /ɛ/, /ɔ/ and /ʊ/ are indicated by a letter of a short vowel and an additional mark of length, called udən (a short horizontal stroke put on the right of the vertical axis), and they are usually transcribed as ā, ē, ō and ə (ā, ē, ə and ò by Svantesson). Long /ā/ and /ʊ/ are indicated by a kind of reduplication: ou or ur (where the second u is usually written without its diacritical mark), and ū or ui. Long /i/ is a little bit unique, because it is written similarly to diphthongs as iy, but it can be considered a kind of duplication, too. Traditionally letters u, ū or i followed by udən do not indicate /ɨ/, /ũ/ or /ǚ/, 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 exceptions that the use of udən has been widened and generalised occasionally, and a short u, ū and i with a following udən marked a real /ū/, /ũ/ and /ǚ/, but it never became a standard (Rákos 2009). In Rahmn’s dictionary we can notice this change in the role of udən 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 sajiida ‘administrator, manager, director’ (with a plural marker) instead of saji- duu or sajiduu (WO sayiduu, sayiduud, WM sayid-ud ‘magnate, dignitary, minister’ + pl., Kal. ʃədəd ‘вельможи, благородныце’ + pl.)
- **RS böyrə ‘saddlebow’ instead of byyryg or bayryg (WO бүүргү, бүүрүү, WM bïïrgere ‘the pommel of a saddle’, Kal. бүүрə ‘рү- ки (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 ~ gër ‘house’, expected ger (WO ger, WM ger ‘yurt, house’, Kal. ʃəp ‘дом, зданье, изба, юрта’)
- **RS odə ~ ödo ~ odə ‘now’, expected odə (WO odə, WM odo, edüge ‘now, at present’, Kal. odo ‘теперь, сейчас’)
- **RS todə ~ todə ‘clear, distinct’, expected todo (WO todo, WM todə ‘clear[ly], evident[ly]’, Kal. mod ‘1. ясны, отчётливый 2. ясно, отчётливо’)
- **RS cär ~ car ‘ox’, expected car (WO car, WM sär ‘ox’, Kal. ʃəp ‘вол, казыриванный бык’)
- **RS cəğən ~ cəgən ‘white’, expected cəğən (WO cəyən, WM čəyən, čəyəyən ‘white’, Kal. ʒəhan ‘bənəy’)

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 ưdān, 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/ûd/ûdûd. E.g.:
- RS ūkin ‘girl, maiden’ > plural okìd, instead of okid
- RS enûcùn ‘orphan’ > plural enûcùd, instead of enocid
- RS dorbûn, dorbûn ‘four’ > plural dorbūd, instead of dorbûd
- RS nûkûr, nûkû ‘friend, comrade, husband’ > nûkûd, instead of nokûd or nokûd

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 arayxan, WM arayûgan ‘not quite, hardly, barely’, Kalm. ergency ‘1. eđa, liśx, eľe, чуть-чуть, 2. тихий, медленный’
- RS malë ‘(small) horsewhip’, WO mali, WM mîlay-a ‘whip, scourge’, Kalm. mały ‘плеть, нагайка’
- RS morîtêgan ‘horse’ + SOC + REF.POSS, WM moritai-bên, morita-yîgan ‘horse’ + SOC + REF.POSS, Kalm. moritai-ban ‘horse’ + SOC + REF.POSS

Change of diphthongs into long vowels:
- RS arēxan ‘with difficulty, hardly’, WO arayxan, WM arayûgan ‘not quite, hardly, barely’, Kalm. ergency ‘1. eđa, liśx, eľe, чуть-чуть, 2. тихий, медленный’
- RS äsinai ‘he is coming, be going to come’, WM aﬁis-, aﬁisû-, aﬁisî ‘to approach’ + PRÆS.IMP, Kalm. aaw ‘приближаться, подходить близко’ + PRÆS.IMP

Deletion of /i/ or /d/ before suffix -sun/sün:
- RS gesen, gesyn ‘guts, belly’, WO gesësûn, WM gesësûn ‘belly, stomach’, Kalm. gesi ‘живот, брюхо’
- RS bajisaj ‘three-year-old mare’, WO bayidasun, WM bayidasun ‘three or four-year-old mare, young mare’, Kalm. bajis ‘гвёз-гвёзная кобилица’

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 xudaldaži orkibai ‘it has been sold’ is given as chudalschkiwa that contains the already shortened and grammaticalized form of auxiliary verb orki- (compare with modern Kalmyk modal suffix -ye) and very close to its today’s Kalmyk equivalent халдохк.

As the Kalmyks had close interactions with people speaking Russian or a Turkic language, these languages exerted significant influence on Kalmyk. Some Russian and Turkic loanwords that do not exist in other Mongolic languages and dialects could be observed in Rahmn’s dictionary. E.g.:
- RS xabustun ‘cabbage’ < Russian хапуста ‘cabbage’ (Kalm. хапстын ‘хапуста’)
- RS ustul ‘chair’ < Russian стул ‘chair’ (spelling of Kalm. стул ‘стул’ 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 суг ‘stack’ (this word is not found in modern Kalmyk dictionaries)
- RS ajou ‘bear’ < Turkic, e.g. Kazakh аю, Nogai аю ‘bear’ (Калм. аю ‘медведь’)
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
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