

INFORMATION

International Conference “Altaic Studies in Interdisciplinary Research”

On September 9–14, 2014, the International Conference, “Altaic Studies in Interdisciplinary Research”, took place in Vladivostok at the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Peoples of the Far East of FEB RAS as a part of the “Permanent International Altaistic Conference. 57th Annual Meeting (PIAC-57)”. The international community of Altaic scholars has been working in the form of an annual conference for 57 years, bringing together world’s leading experts in the field. In the previous 56 years, the conferences took place in Germany, France, Japan, USA, South Korea, China, Russia, Hungary, Romania, Great Britain, Finland, and other countries. In the Asian region of Russia, such a conference was held for the first time. The scholars gathered in the Far East—the homeland of the Tungus-Manchu peoples—to discuss the current state of history, language, archaeology, and ethnography of the Altaic ethnic groups. Fifty five scholars, as well as students of the Far Eastern Federal University and the Far Eastern State Academy of Arts, participated in the conference. The welcoming addresses at the opening of the conference on September 10 were given by the Chairman of the Far Eastern Branch of the RAS Dr. V.I. Sergienko, the Director of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of the Peoples of the Far East of FEB RAS, Prof. Dr. V.L. Larin, and the President of the 57th Conference, Prof. Dr. O.V. Dyakova. The plenary report on the work of the Society of Altaic Studies was presented by the Secretary General, Prof. Dr. B. Kellner-Heinkele (Germany).

Twenty three scholars from Germany, France, Hungary, Finland, Japan, China, Norway, Turkey, and other countries attended the Conference. Russia was represented by the researchers from Moscow (Institute of Linguistics of RAS), St. Petersburg (Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of RAS, St. Petersburg State University, Institute for Linguistic Studies of RAS), Novosibirsk (Institute of Philology of SB RAS), Chelyabinsk (South Ural State University), Ulan-Ude (Institute for Mongolian, Buddhist, and Tibetan Studies of SB RAS), and Vladivostok (Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography of the Peoples of the Far East of FEB RAS).

Section 1. Ethnoarchaeology. In the report of *Lyubov Abaeva* (Ulan-Ude), “Sacralization of the Sky in the Religious Culture of the Altaic Peoples”, with

the use of contemporary materials, the return to the daily practice of prayer to the Sky was shown, typical of all Altai ethnic groups since ancient times. *Geyaz Samigulov* (Chelyabinsk) in his report “The Formation of Turkic Groups in the Estate Russian State (Using the Example of the Ichkinskiye Tatars)” argued that the ethnic identity of the Ichkinskiye Tatars was formed on the basis of the service class. The report of *Roman Gvozdev* (Vladivostok), “Traditional Military Knowledge of the Tungus-Manchu Peoples (on the Basis of the Materials of the 18th–20th Centuries)”, focused on the art of war of the Nanai and Udege people. The report of *Lidia Fetisova* (Vladivostok), “The Ulchi Narrative Folklore in the System of Folk Arts of the Amur Peoples”, analyzed the originality of the Ulchi narrative folklore in its choice of motifs and genres. *Dmitry Nosov* (St. Petersburg) recreated folklore activities of the Mongols in the early 1920s, in his report “Reconstructing a Folklore Act: On Some New Challenges for the Mongolists”. *Vladislav Shevchenko* (Vladivostok) presented a report “Settlement of the Nanaian Kins in the Works of Y.A. Sem”, where he analyzed the settlement of the Nanai family clans in the Amur region in the 17th century. *Galina Ermak* (Vladivostok) showed that ethnicity is the main priority in the system of social identities among the peoples of Primorye, in her report “Indigenous People of Primorsky Region: Ethnicity and Identity”. *Dmitry Funk* (Moscow) in his report “The Identity Discourses of the Indigenous Groups on the Internet” suggested some criteria for determining the identity. *Olga Dyakova* (Vladivostok) identified the Mongolian type of earrings among the Tungus-Manchu peoples, and dated the appearance of such adornments in the Far East to the 13th century, in her report “The Tungus-Manchu and Mongols Contacts”. *Vladimir Shavkunov* (Vladivostok) in the report “Smolninskaya Culture of Primorye” described a culture of the Medieval Paleoasians. *Elena Sidorenko* (Vladivostok) presented a report “The Ancient Paleoasians of Primorye” with the analysis of ethno-cultural situation in Primorye in the Paleometal Period. *Cajjilahu Saijirahu* (Osaka) pointed to the revival of shamanism, and showed its role in the national policy of Mongolia, in his report “Shamanic Ritual as Identity Politics of the North Asian Mongolian People”.

Section 2. Linguistics. The joint report by *Jacques Legrand* and *Jadwiga Karkucińska-Legrand* (Paris),

“Beyond Interdisciplinary Research – A New Place for Altaic Studies and Area Studies (The Mongol Case)”, shared the experience of applying various sciences for comparing and cross-checking of research results. *Juha Antero Janhunen* (Helsinki) offered a comprehensive etymological analysis of appellative nouns in six subfamilies, and suggested the availability of the Indo-Arian element ‘Pur’ in Far Eastern languages (Korean and Manchu), in his report “From Singapore to Khabarovsk. The Far Eastern Dimensions of a Euroasian Wanderwort”. The report of *Albina Girfanova* and *Nikolai Sukhachev* (St. Petersburg), “Controversial Issues of Historical Lexicology and Underlying Etymology (Complexity and Multifacetedness in Prospective and Retrospective Diachrony)”, revealed the limitations of historical lexicology. *Kam Tak-sing* (Taipei) proposed a new interpretation of the ethnic name of “Mongyol”, identifying it with the name of the Argun River where the ancient Mongols had lived, in his report “The Term ‘Mongyol’ Revisited”. *Gulbeyaz Abdurrahman* (Osaka) showed how the Japanese linguists examine the problem of the origins of the Japanese language and establish its relationship to other language families, in his report “On the Reception of Macro-Altaic Theory in Japanese Studies”. *Gong Hairong* (Beijing) and *Ding Shiqing* (Minzu) argued that the Daur people and the Oroqen people have more in common with each other than any of them with the Manchu people, in their report “Languages of the Daur and Oroqen in Contact in Northern China – A Comparative Study of Kin Terms (Culture and Variation of Kinship Terminology)”. *Koichi Higuchi* (Tokyo) established that the translations made in the Middle Ages and the Modern Age reflect sophisticated relationships in a multi-ethnic society, in his report “How Were Mongolian Versions of the *Lotus Sutra* Translated, Compiled, and Transmitted; Through Examination of the Turfan Fragments”. *Victor Yakovlev* (Moscow) in his report “On the Interrelatedness of Turkic and Germanic Runic Scripts” showed that the runic script came to the Eastern Europeans from the Central Asia in the 8th–9th centuries. *Liu Ge* (Shaanxi) in her report “An Inquiry into ‘č’in bitig’ in Uyghur Contract with 亲 契 as Its Chinese Version”, on the basis of Uyghur documents of the Yuan period, showed the influence of Chinese culture on the subcultures of the northwestern ethnic groups. *Kobayashi Yoko* (Tokyo) established several stages in the loss of the native language by the Mongolian students who found themselves in the Chinese linguistic environment, in her report “How is a Language of a Minority Surrounded by an Overwhelming Majority Changed? – A Case Study of Mongolian Spoken in Inner Mongolia and Liaoning”. *Mihály Dobrovits* (Budapest) analyzed the language of the Orkhon Turks, in his report “On the Orkhon Inscriptions One Can Read the Well Known Phrase”. *Hsiao Suying* (Taipei)

in her report “‘Say’ Verbs in Manchu, Mongolian, and Chinese” conducted a comparative analysis of the verb “say” in Manchu, Mongolian, and Chinese languages. *Lyudmila Shamina* (Novosibirsk) shared the results of comprehensive integrated description of the linguistic areal of the Siberian languages, in her report “Analytical Constructions as the Source of Grammaticalization in Tuvan Languages”. *Tuohoti Lirifu* (Beijing) presented a report “A Historical Survey on Vowel Raising in Uyghur” containing an overview of ascending vowels in the Uyghur language. *Evgenia Korovina* (Moscow) showed vulnerability and ambiguity in interpretations of lexemes, proposed in the reconstructions of A.M. Pevnov, in her report “Issues of Linguistic Decisions of the Tungus-Manchu Problem”. *Iraida Selyutina* (Novosibirsk) in her report “The Sound Systems Investigations of the Siberian Peoples’ Languages by the Latest Research Technology” overviewed the results of the interdisciplinary studies aimed at the preservation of languages of small peoples as a part of the biological, cultural, and linguistic unity. *Alla Sizova* (St. Petersburg) in her report “A Comparative Analysis of Special Terminology Used in the Mongolian Version of ‘Lam Rim Chen Mo’ based on Available Sources” showed that for the adequate translation of the terminology used in the Mongolian version of “Lam Rim Chen Mo” one would need to use the techniques corresponding to the time when the translation was made. *Guan Xinqiu* (Beijing) highlighted an important issue of 60-year-old linguistic interaction between the Manchu and the Chinese, in his report “On Language Concept in Contact”.

Section 3. History. The report of *Hartmut Walravens* (Berlin), “Wilhelm Radloff’s Manchu Interest”, on the studies of the Manchu (Sibu) language by the Orientalist Friedrich Wilhelm Radloff provoked a particular interest at the section. *Barbara Kellner-Heinkele* (Berlin) in her report “New Routes of Discovery and Research: Railways (Mid-19th to Early 20th Century)” showed the role of infrastructural development in the 19th century as a means for colonizing Asia. *Maria Petrova’s* (St. Petersburg) report “Poet about Poet: G. Mend-Ooyo’s Novel about D. Ravjaa” analyzed the works of D. Ravjaa, the famous Mongolian poet of the 19th century. *Nakami Tatsuo* (Tokyo) in the report “Shiratori Kurakichi’s Visit to Vladivostok in the Early 20th Century: From the First Page of History of ‘Oriental Studies’ in Japan” elucidated the process of familiarization of the Japanese with Primorye, using the documents he discovered. *Vyacheslav Zaitsev* (St. Petersburg) made a report “The Unique Khitan Large Scripts Text Containing Biographical Records about Liao Emperors (from the Collection of the IOM RAS): Approaches to a Comparative Analysis of the Khitan and Chinese Historical Sources”. *Oliver Corff* (Berlin) in his report “The Contribution of Legal Studies to the History

of the Manchu Empire” analyzed the newly discovered archival documents on the legislation in the period of the Manchu Empire. *Tatiana Pang* (St. Petersburg) shed some light on the unknown aspects of studies by A.V. Grebenshchikov, using the documents from the collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, in her report “Manchu Studies by A.V. Grebenshchikov at the Oriental Institute in Vladivostok”.

Section 4. Visual Anthropology. *Vladimir Podmaskin* (Vladivostok) presented five documentaries about indigenous peoples of Primorye, Amur region, and Sakhalin.

At the closing session, the results of the conference were summed up, and a new presidium was elected for coordinating the work of the Society between the conferences. O.V. Dyakova (Vladivostok) and T.A. Pang

(St. Petersburg) became the Russian representatives of the Presidium. The resulting statement of the conference emphasized the need for focusing further research on the fundamental problems of Altaic Studies and on the contemporary processes among the Altai ethnic groups. All participants noted good organization of the conference, high scholarly quality of presented reports, and great capacity of the Far Eastern Humanities.

**O.V. Dyakova, A.K. Girfanova,
E.V. Sidorenko**

Received April 24, 2015.