

Московский Государственный Университет имени М.В. Ломоносова
Институт стран Азии и Африки

Санкт-Петербургский Государственный Университет
Восточный факультет

ЯЗЫКИ СТРАН ДАЛЬНЕГО ВОСТОКА, ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОЙ АЗИИ И ЗАПАДНОЙ АФРИКИ

Материалы XIV Международной научной конференции

Москва, 23–24 ноября 2020 г.



LESEWA

Издательство «Ключ-С»
Москва, 2020

УДК 811(5-012+6-15)(082)
ББК 81.2(255)(58)(63)я43
Я41

Ответственный редактор – А.Ю. Вихрова, Институт стран Азии и Африки

Языки стран Дальнего Востока, Юго–Восточной Азии и Западной Африки :
Я41 материалы XIV Международной научной конференции, Москва, 23–24 ноября 2020 г. /
Моск. гос. ун-т им. М. В. Ломоносова, Ин-т стран Азии и Африки, С.-Петербург. гос. ун-т,
Вост. фак. ; отв. ред. А. Ю. Вихрова. – Москва : Ключ-С, 2020. – 140 с.

ISBN 978-5-6045244-4-2.

Тематика конференции сфокусирована на значимом параллелизме в морфосинтаксических и семантических структурах языков Дальнего Востока, Юго-Восточной Азии и Западной Африки который не может быть объяснен ни генеалогическим родством языков, ни ареальными факторами: так, например, для языков этих ареалов характерно использование тонов как смысловозначительного фактора, преобладание аналитической модели в грамматике, общее тяготение к «изолирующему типу».

Результаты, полученные в ходе анализа конкретных языков, а также оригинальных изысканий в области типологии и универсальной грамматики, имеют первостепенное значение для раскрытия внутренней логики строения и развития языка как такового. В последние годы тематический спектр конференции расширился путем включения проблем сравнительно-исторического языкознания, социолингвистики, этнолингвистики и обогатился за счет применения к описанию языков Юго-Западной Азии и Западной Африки типологического и терминологического аппарата современной функциональной и типологической лингвистики.

Конференция 2020 года посвящена памяти Марка Ильича Каплуна, известного ученого африканиста, фонетиста, специалиста по языку йоруба, покинувшего нас в октябре 2019 года.

УДК 811(5-012+6-15)(082)
ББК 81.2(255)(58)(63)я43

ISBN ISBN 978-5-6045244-4-2

© Институт стран Азии и Африки,
Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Восточный факультет, 2020
© Оформление. Издательство «Ключ-С», 2020

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

К.В. АНТОНЯН	
Результативная конструкция в древнекитайском и среднекитайском языке	5
И.Н. КОМАРОВА	
Категория падежа в грамматической системе тибетского языка	8
С.Ю. ДМИТРЕНКО, М.В. СТАНЮКОВИЧ	
Заметки о бетельной терминологии в языках Юго-Восточной Азии	13
М.А. КОСОГОРОВА	
Грамматикализация адлогов в гвинейском пулар	17
М.Б. КОНОШЕНКО	
Локативные имена в гвинейском кпелле	22
Е.С. ТРЕТЯКОВА	
Analysis of Difficulties in English for Japanese EFL learners related to Noun Countability	26
Д.А. САПАРОВА	
Нестандартное отрицание в кхмерском языке	33
С.А. БЫКОВА	
Диалектальные стереотипы и «виртуальные» диалекты японского языка	38
Р.Г. ЖАМСАРАНОВА	
Параллелизм в исторической антропонимии: субстрат или заимствование?	42
Н.В. МАКЕЕВА	
Формантная картина и вариативность гласных языка акебу (ква)	45
А.С. ПАНИНА	
Коллокации с названиями эмоций в японском языке	51
PENGLIN WANG	
The Turkic Influence on Kitan: Kitan Bori (the Name for an Evil Person) and Old Turkic Bōri ‘Wolf’	55
CHINGDUANG YURAYONG, PUI YIU SZETO	
A parallelism in the postverbal auxiliary verb constructions in languages of Northeast and Southeast Asia	60
В.А. АНДРЕЕВА	
Особенности вьетнамского молодежного сленга	67
В.Н. ГЛИНСКАЯ	
Пространственный дейксис в современном китайском языке	70
Н.Г. РУМАК	
Двойственная природа лексемы мина/минна «все» (на основе корпусных данных японского языка)	76
Н. КРНЕТА	
О разграничении повелительного и желательного наклонений в японском языке	81

П.О. КИСЕЛЬ	
Опыт семантического подхода к анализу комбинаторики раздельно-слитных слов лихэцы в современном китайском языке	86
Е.Н. КОЛПАЧКОВА	
Валентностные классы прилагательных в современном китайском языке	92
Н.В. КУТАФЬЕВА	
Оппозиция «свой-чужой» на примере зооморфной метафоры японского и русского языков.....	96
Н.М. СПАТАРЬ	
Пассивные конструкции в кхмерском языке	100
С.Г. КРАМАРОВА	
Категория отрицания в балийском языке.....	103
Е.Г. ФРОЛОВА	
Синтаксические показатели в сложных предложениях тагальского языка	109
А.Н. АЛЕКСАХИН	
Инспирированные гласные в вокализме мзяньского и шанхайского диалектов и их диахронические генетические корреспонденты ретрофлексные гласные в вокализме китайского языка Путунхуа	112
С.В. ЧИРОНОВ	
Японские коннекторы логического развития	115
В.Я. ПОРХОМОВСКИЙ, Ю.Г. СУЕТИНА	
Язык хауса в типологической перспективе лингвистики и филологии	120
Hausa Language from a Typological Perspective of Linguistics and Philology	
В.А. БОГУШЕВСКАЯ (Victoria Bogushevskaya)	
Что скрывают китайские палиндромы	124
S. ROS	
Senegalese sabar – Is it a drum language?	132
Е.Ч. ДЫЖИТОВА	
Лексическое значение и семантическая интерпретация личных имен хори-бурят Цаганского рода (Сагаанууд).....	135
С.С. ХРОМОВ	
М.И. Каплун о тонах в языке Йоруба	138

**THE TURKIC INFLUENCE ON KITAN:
KITAN *BORI* (THE NAME FOR AN EVIL PERSON)
AND OLD TURKIC *BÖRI* ‘WOLF’**

Summary

One of the glossed or annotated Kitan words attested in *Liaoshi* is *bori*. It is annotated as ‘the name for an evil person’. Based on the Turkic influence on Kitan, this paper proposes to connect Kitan *bori* with Turkic *böri* ‘wolf’. This connection can have a cross-linguistic support of metaphorical extension of the notion for ‘wolf’ to an evil person.

The fact that Kitan had been in contact with Turkic and once periodically subject to Turkic rule is reflected in the available Kitan glossary included in *Liaoshi* completed in 1343. The glossary stands as the final section of *Liaoshi* and has the sound title in Chinese as *guoyujie* (國語解) meaning ‘explanation of the national language’. By ‘the national language’ the authors of *Liaoshi* referred to the Kitan language spoken by the Kitan people and used for official affairs during the Liao dynasty (907-1125). The section includes some two-hundred entries, many of which are, however, not Kitan words, let alone glossed Kitan words. The exact number of Kitan words depends on what counts as native Kitan words, and what is rather Chinese notions such as *yingjun* (鷹軍) ‘eagle troops’ and *xilou* (西樓) ‘western building’. Here the Eagle Troops and Western Building (or the building complex in the west) were among the Kitan institutions, and they were probably named in native Kitan and then translated into Chinese as such. The glossary contains many such Chinese items with no original Kitan equivalents. With this kind of ambiguity, it is not difficult to understand the problems encountered by the authors of *Liaoshi* at the lexicographic level. They chose to collect Kitan words in the then available Chinese publications, not going through fieldwork or native Kitan informants. That is why the so-called ‘explanation of the national language’ contains only a small number of glossed or annotated Kitan words.

One annotated Kitan word out of these two-hundred entries is *bori*. The students interested in Kitan studies may feel perplexed by the meaning of Kitan *bori* and face the difficulty of getting it etymologized with any suitable words in Altaic languages. Fortunately, the Kitan word *bori* according to *Liaoshi* (116.1535) is in Chinese as follows: 暴里 惡人名也. This Chinese sentence can be transcribed as *baoli eren ming ye* and translated as *bori is the name for an evil person*. Although *bori* literally functions to name and seems not in itself to mean directly an evil person, it indeed has its contextual reference to an evil person. Here I am adjusting the Chinese transcribed *baoli* to Kitan *bori* for two reasons. First, foreign syllable *bo* or *bu* may receive a transcription of *bao*. Second, foreign trill or *r*-sound commonly corresponds to lateral *l* in Chinese transcription. The representative examples are Chinese *baolisi* (鮑里斯) for both Russian *Bopuc* and English *Boris*, and Chinese *baotou* (包頭) as a city name in Inner Mongolia for Mongolian *buğutu*. Yet the character used may reflect certain semantic consideration. As the Chinese word 暴 means ‘violent, fierce’, we cannot rule out the possibility whereby early transcribers chose it to imply the sense of Kitan *bori*.

Given its semantic reference to an evil person and its phonetic makeup, all that I want to say with certainty about the origin of Kitan *bori* is that Kitan speakers had adopted it from Old Turkic *böri* ‘wolf’, presumably used it in this sense, and at the same time metaphorically transferred it to name an evil person. One would expect that the image of wolves is multivocalic in the human eye. What features of semantic discourse on this canine notion are metaphor bound, or what features transcend semantic or other imaginary boundaries? People may speak highly of the bravery, strength, and speediness of wolves when they needed and prepared to fight vigorously.

Meanwhile, often people who knew of the predatory and ferocious nature of wolves compared the greedy and brutal ones to wolves.

The Kitan people had to cope with wolves and came up with an attentional attitude toward the ferociousness of wolves, thinking of them reminiscent of evil persons. *Liaoshi* (4.46, 30.354) recorded instances of wolves eating people and hunting wolves. Moreover, the Kitan dynastic politics could not get rid of frame-up and entrapment. The Kitan people were aware of how treacherous court officials made false and even fatal charges against those officials, empress consorts, and princes loyal to their duties and sovereign. They were very disappointed at seeing such aftermaths and sarcastically wondered how long it would and could go to employ a wolf to herd sheep (*Liaoshi* 99.1420). It appears that in this way there has been a common metaphorical contrast between wolves and sheep as formulated in *Shiji* (122.3145) two millennia ago and in *Hou Hanshu* (49.1645) and continued down to the modern state system when, in January 1787, Thomas Jefferson warned of the danger of the dividing nations into ‘two classes, wolves and sheep’.

The word for ‘wolf’ in many languages undergoes metaphorical extensions appreciably converging in greediness or evilness. The Chinese *lang* (狼) ‘wolf’ is often used to refer to the undesired, greedy or brutal persons. In collocation with some other words or animal names, the word *lang* expresses very notorious senses: *langxin* (狼心) ‘wolf-hearted, rapacious’, *langxing* (狼性) ‘wolf character, ferocious in character’, *hulang* (虎狼) ‘tiger and wolf, cruel and ferocious people’, and *selang* (色狼) ‘pervert’. Similarly, the English *wolf* means ‘a fierce, rapacious, or destructive’ and ‘a corrupting or destructive agency’.

One area of penalty where a Kitan innovative approach to criminology is easy to see is in renaming an evil person with the word *bori*. This could have been part of Kitan judiciary leniency, achieving a range of penal effects. Lage (刺葛) is then Kitan Qagan Abaoji’s (阿保機) oldest younger brother, who served as high-ranking officials such as Tiyin (惕隱), Yilijin (夷離堇), and General. However, his personality is stupid, vicious, and arrogant (*Liaoshi* 64.964).

Under the leadership of Abaoji, Kitan political system was changing to the Chinese-style emperorship from its three-year tenure for top leadership via tribal election (*Jiu Wudaishi* 137.1828), and it did Abaoji would certainly become the lifetime emperor and eliminate Lage’s hope to ascend the throne sometime in the future. As he had his eye on the paramount position occupied by his brother Abaoji, Lage, who solicited and won a support of his three younger brothers, broke ranks with Abaoji and led three consecutive rebellions against him in May 911, October 912, and March 913 (*Liaoshi* 1.5, 1.6f).

When each of these three rebellions were defeated, Abaoji made great effort to mitigate the offenses by his four younger brothers while killing three-hundred odd rebel plotters and participants in addition to some other specifically enumerated executions (*Liaoshi* 1.9). After the third and the most devastating rebellion was crushed, Abaoji proceeded to treat his brothers, each varying according to their role and age. Lage was renamed into Bori as he was identified as the chief evil (*Liaoshi* 1.7). Lage and Diela (迭刺, who was the next to Lage in role and seniority) were flogged with a stick and released. Yindish (寅底石) and Anduan (安端) were released without charges due to their mediocre and weak personality vulnerable to Lage’s abetting (*Liaoshi* 1.7, 1.9). Just as the use of the name Yelü Lage signaled his royal princship, the renaming him with Bori signaled his new identity as an evil person and could also imply his removal from Yelü royal family. As a result, in 917 Lage and his son Saibaoli (賽保里) escaped from Kitan and defected to Youzhou (幽州); then from there Lage went down southward and was killed by someone as noted in *Liaoshi* (1.12, 64.964).

Although the argument and evidence presented thus far of Turkic influence in Kitan may escape easily from attention since Kitan *bori* was not glossed ‘wolf’, but a number of above supporting examples could hardly be dismissed as mere coincidence. A further examination of the Kitan glossary presents a various picture. Having been well aware of the cultural and linguistic similarities between Kitan and its neighboring tribal polities, the authors of *Liaoshi* (116.1533), in their introductory remarks, declared that at the beginning of its development Kitan was

close to Xi (奚) and Shiwei (室韋) and henceforth generally shared its indigenous customs and language with them. In my analysis of this insightful observation, the authors were talking about genealogical classification of Kitan, Xi, and Shiwei into one group. In other words, they knew enough the linguistic commonality running through the group of these three languages adjacent to one another in the region. On the other hand, they could have found Turkic impossible to join the group as a member owing to its obvious difference from the group. That was why they kept silent to what relationship existed between Kitan and Turkic. Meanwhile, when listing lexical items in their glossary, the authors did jot down a couple of Turkic loanwords in Kitan just as those of Shiwei, Xi, and Bohai (渤海). Two Kitan words were identified as originated in Turkic. One is 俟斤 (*qijin*), which is a Turkic official title. The other is *qatun* (可敦 *kedun*), which is the Turkic title for ‘empress, emperor’s consortium’. Of course, the Turkic influence on Kitan is not limited to these two words. Leaving aside *qatun*, I would like to clarify how 俟 of 俟斤 could have erroneously scribed.

The Chinese character 俟 has two pronunciations: *qi* and *si*. It is a classic problem in the field of Inner Asian studies concerning the transcription of 俟 of 俟斤. Although it is commonly agreed that 俟斤 is from Turkic *irkin* ‘ruler, chief’, to the best of my knowledge, there is virtually no explanation of how the 俟斤 pronounced either *qijin* or *sijin* in Chinese could be phonetically reconciled with Turkic *irkin* in their first syllable. When touching on this conundrum, we should note that Old Turkic *irkin* was alternatively spelled *erkin*, i.e., there was an alternation between the vowels *i* and *e* in the word-initial position. In my view, at the beginning of its occurrence 俟 was a wrong choice resulted from a slip of the writing brush when intended to write down the character 埃 (*ai*) or 矣 (*yi*), and all the following authors had copied it without any critical thinking. Such accidental confusions could hardly be avoided in handwriting. Further slips of the writing brush occurred to 俟斤, which became either 候斤 (*houjin*) or 俟分 (*qifen*) (*Weishu* 44.2297, *Beishi* 98.3298, 3273) or 俟斥 (*qichi*) (*Zhoushu* 49.899). Therefore, the original transcription should have been 埃斤 (*aijin* < **aigin*) or 矣斤 (*yijin* < **yigin*), with the Turkic postvocalic *r* in *irkin*~*erkin* omitted as sometimes seen in Chinese transcriptions. In practice, Chinese transcribers tend to use 埃 or 爰 (*ai*) to correspond to foreign *i* or *e*~*e* sounds or spellings such as 埃及 (*aiji*) for Egypt, 埃里克 (*ailike*) for Eric, 埃塞俄比亞 (*aisai’ebiya*) for Ethiopia, and 愛丁堡 (*aidingbao*) for Edinburgh wherein the *bu* gets matched with the Chinese *bao*, with the following string *rg* being left out.

In addition, both *JTS* and *XTS* used *jiej*in (頡斤) in the place of *qijin*. *JTS* (103.3193) records: General Zhang Shougui (張守珪, 684-740) of Tang dynasty attacked Tujue (Turkic) invaders in Luntai (輪臺) (in what is nowadays Ürümqi, Xinjiang), decapitating a thousand plus fighters and capturing alive their commander alone, i.e., one Jiejin. *XTS* (217.6148) mentions: the chieftain of three Wooden-Horse Tujue all was Jiejin. Consequently, at least some of the occurrences of *qijin* in *XTS* (217.6142, 6144) take the prefixing interpretive Chinese title 酋 (*qiu*) ‘chieftain’ when modifying *qijin*, virtually putting an equal sign between the Chinese *qiu* and the Turkic 俟斤 (*qijin*). Moreover, *XTS* (217.6111) notes that Qijin of the Huihe (回紇) Yaoluoge (藥羅葛) tribe, whose name was Shijian (時健), was elected into the Sovereign position. All these sources converge in supporting the sameness between *qijin* and *jiej*in in Chinese transcription. Yet there is hardly confusable similarity between 俟 and 頡 in Chinese logography. How did the contemporaneous writers substitute 頡 for 俟? This remains enigmatic. I estimate that they became creative in following the phonetic similarity between the two characters, for 俟 and 頡 in Mandarin Chinese read [tɛ^hi] and [tɛiɛ], and in Cantonese *git*-*kit* and *kei*, respectively. In other words, their initial consonants are alveolo-palatal affricates in Mandarin and velar stops in Cantonese. This natural class feature might have been the source of confusing transcriptions.

The authors of *Liaoshi* had no intention to review Kitan words from etymological perspectives and just selectively identified the foreign elements in Kitan when they felt it convenient to do so. For instance, Kitan *qijin* and *yilijin*, both corresponding to Turkic *irkin*~*erkin*, are a doublet in the Chinese transcriptions. Namely, like *qijin*, Kitan *yilijin* came from Turkic *irkin*~*erkin*, too,

as the Chinese transcribers significantly improved their phonetic matching between the two. Yet the *yilijin* was not indicated of its Turkic origin in the Kitan glossary probably because it did not appear prior to the Kitan era. Thus, the Kitan leadership chose to use *yilijin* to appoint its officials rather than *qijin*, making it scoring numerous occurrences in *Liaoshi*. In contrast, *qijin* occurred in *Liaoshi* (63.952, 116.1543) only twice, all in the Turkic context. The Kitan *yilijin* also made its way in Jurchen. *Jinshi* (2892) maintains that *yilijin* as originally from Kitan was used by the Jurchen people in the similar yet slightly different manners.

Qijin (俟斤) occurred in *Weishu* (103.2297), *Suishu* (84.1879), *Beishi* (14.528) and some other books prior to *Liaoshi*. In fact, according to *Suishu* (84.1881), the Xi tribal polity was initially subject to Tujue, subsequently grew a bit strong and prosperous, and then reshuffled itself into five hordes, with each being led by one Qijin. *XTS* (219.6167) observed that the lead Dahe (大賀) tribe of Kitan was armed with forty-thousand triumphant soldiers, consisted of eight hordes, yet subjected themselves to and made Tujue their Qijin. The authors of *Liaoshi* (63.952) exactly copied this paragraph and for this reason must have known the title *qijin* introduced into Kitan from Tujue. May it be true, as is generally agreed among the interested scholars, the title had earlier usage in Tuoba and Rouran. *Nan Qishu* (57.985) written in 537 took note of the official title *qiqin* (俟慙) used by the Tuoba group of Xianbei ethnicity and compared it to Chinese *shangshu* (尚書) ‘minister, secretary’. Likewise, *Weishu* (103.2297) written in 554 recorded that in 511 Rouran Qagan Chounu (醜奴) sent his envoy, Qijin Weibijian (尉比建), to the Northern Wei dynasty for tribute. The prominent historian Hu Sanxing (1230-1302) annotated: Qijin was the title for ministers in Rouran (*Weishu* 103.2297). Henceforth, words traced back to Old Turkic were not necessarily to the exclusion of other Altaic groups and Altaic-external sources.

How big is the difference between Mongolic Kitan and Turkic Huihu (回鶻)? Let us go through an episode pertaining the Kitan hosting of a Huihu diplomatic mission as observed in *Liaoshi* (64.964). A Huihu delegation arrived. However, there was no one who could understand the Huihu language. The empress advised the emperor: “Diela is brilliant and swift enough to enjoy accomplishing this task. Having accompanied the delegation for twenty days, Diela became able to practice the Huihu language and scripts. Thus, he is entrusted to create Kitan small scripts with a small number of characters for due consistency”.

Having read this paragraph, we cannot help raising some questions: Was really there no one conversant with the Huihu language in the Kitan government? Was Diela so smart that he could use the Huihu language and writing? Since these records associate the creation of the Kitan small scripts with Diela’s acquaintance with the Huihu scripts and his inspiration to design somewhat alphabetic writing for Kitan, we can assume the visit of the Huihu delegation to Kitan in September 924 according to *Liaoshi* (2.20) wherein we read: Huihu sent a delegation for tribute. Yet prior to this visit, following *Liaoshi* (1.8, 1.12), two Huihu delegations came to Kitan; one was in 913, and the other in 918. We do not know if these two delegations brought their own Kitan interpreter or otherwise Diela’s interaction with the Huihu included these previous visits. If the latter was the case, Diela’s study of the Huihu language and scripts could not be limited to just twenty days.

Further review can reveal some threads of information on interpreter service in Kitan even though it could have taken place after 924. *Liaoshi* (45.687, 689) noticed an official position for language interpreters in the Kitan government. Of course, Kitan from time to time received foreign diplomatic missions, and an interpreter could not be expected to understand every language the foreign envoys spoke. As Kitan was a major power in Inner Asia during the Liao dynasty, the Kitan language once attracted some foreign non-native Kitan speakers to study for career development. According to *Songshi* (261.9044), an ethnic Chinese, whose name was Liu Chongjin (劉重進, 899-968) and who was a native of Youzhou began to study Kitan around 936 and got a job as an envoy to Kitan. When he visited Kitan again, the Kitan leader found him shrewd and smart and had him stayed there working as an interpreter in the front of the leader’s tent. *XWD* (9.90) noted that in 942 Kitan envoy and interpreter arrived (in the Later Jin state (936-947) established by Shi Jingtang 石敬瑭). Again, according to *XWD* (72.897), when

the Kitan took over a Chinese town, in order to stabilize the panic situation, Kitan Emperor Yelü Deguang (耶律德光, 902-947) ordered his interpreter to announce his declaration to a crowd of people: “I am a human being, too. There is nothing to fear. I originally had no intention at all to come here, but it was the Chinese troops that led me here”.

In their relation with the Turkic, the Kitan were once periodically under the Turkic rule and hence familiar with and influenced even demographically by the Turkic, let alone cultural and linguistic impact on Kitan. The Kitan empress Shulü Ping was by ethnicity from the Turkic Huihu tribe. Accordingly, Kitan and Turkic traditionally were in diplomatic terms. When the vicinity of two or more groups overlapped in potential power to too great an extent, they found themselves in strategic competition with one another and, often, all but one were pushed out, sometimes to the point of severe diminishment. In the Chinese historians’ inking, the Kitan under the emperorship of Abaoji, the husband of Shulü Ping, deliberately planned to subjugate the Yellow-Headed Shiwei and indeed did so decisively. So, when Abaoji sought to gain power through subjugation in the vicinity, a number of ethnic Chinese elite were motivated to advise him to become an emperor in his own right and invade the adjacent polities including Shiwei. This had a substantial effect, with the result that the indigenous Kitan and Kitan-like tribes and ethnic Chinese were governed by the two Kitan government systems. By the linguistic essence of grammar and simplicity of scripts, Kitan and Huihu were far more similar to each other. But Abaoji chose to create Kitan national scripts (2.16, 76.1246) on the model of Chinese logographic writing because of strong Chinese influence and his adoption of the Chinese-style governance.

Diela seemed very attractive to the Huihu language and scripts. The latter’s underlying alphabetic principle inspired him to design the Kitan small scripts. The achievement of such linguistic studies was facilitated by three factors. First, Kitan and Huihu had pooled their vocabulary to a certain degree, with the regnal title *qagan* being the classic example. To what percentage? It is hard to pin down since we are short of Kitan vocabulary. Second, the grammatical structure of Kitan and Huihu must be of agglutinative typology with the subject-object-verb word order. Third, at a deep genealogical level, the two languages could have shared a common root as reflected in the common Altaic theory by Altaicists. Those with linguistic talent therefore had an adaptive advantage to learn each other’s language by analogy. Over time, definitely far beyond twenty days, linguistic talent became amplified, sustained bilingual repertoire for such people as Diela.

It is clear that the answer to the possible question “How could Diela practice the Huihu language and scripts within twenty days?” cannot be because Diela was so ‘brilliant and swift’ – look at what any brilliant and swift novices can do to the Mongolian scripts emerged in the thirteenth century and blueprinted from the Huihu or Old Uyghur scripts. Rather, the answer must come from realistic and scientific considerations. The study just for twenty days is serious and can enable the novice students to gain a preliminary knowledge of the scripts, let alone the twenty days for Diela including learning to speak the Huihu language. It can be assumed that Diela had understood the merit of alphabetic writing with a small number of graphemes for spelling out numerous morphemes, but his knowledge of the Huihu scripts could in no way be compared to that of Chinese logographic writing. Perhaps that was why he chose Chinese structural components and modified them for his four-hundred plus basic Kitan graphemes. If Diela otherwise had a good command of the Huihu scripts, he should have applied them to the Kitan language with much more ease and accuracy. In contrast, the Uyghur pundit Tata-tonga, who had a profound knowledge of Uyghur scripts, was entrusted by Chinggis Khan to teach how to spell out the Mongolian speech.

Main References

JTS = Jiu Tangshu (Old Book of Tang), Liaoshi (History of Liao), Shiji (Records of the Grand Historian), Weishu (Book of Wei), XTS = Xin Tangshu (New Book of Tang), XWD = Xin Wudaishi (New History of the Five Dynasties). All the Chinese dynastic histories cited are from <http://hanchi.ihp.sinica.edu.tw/ihp/hanji.htm>.