Thanks to the initiative and competence of Jill Zai, after an interruption of three years a new issue, in a new garb of this Newsletter is presented to the PIAC membership. Of course the title Newsletter is a misnomer because in fact, the raison d’être of this erratic publication is to keep record of our activities. I think and hope that this issue satisfies this requirement.

In the last twelve months or so, as a partial result of the political fall-out of the terrorist attacks on New York City and Washington, public interest in Central Asia has increased dramatically. Websites, ephemeral periodicals, discussion-groups, conferences dealing with the region multiply, and the terms of “Eurasia,” “Central Eurasia,” “Central Asia” have become almost household words. For scholars, of which the membership of the PIAC is composed, this is a welcome change, first and foremost because contacts with local scholars and institutions of countries belonging to the former Soviet Union have become easy. Mainly in the field of archeology important collaborative projects are underway and - thanks to the exchange of language teachers - at least in the U.S., the acquisition of language competence in almost any Turkic language has been greatly facilitated. There is almost no day when one cannot find in one’s electronic mail, offers of employment and of scholarships linked with our field. Such openings, such possibilities to make a living, encourage young people to seek instruction in “our” subjects, a promising development because a larger pool of students is likely to produce a larger number of young scholars devoted to serious research. To them, the PIAC extends a warm welcome.

Denis Sinor

The PIAC Newsletter is published at irregular intervals and is distributed free of charge to members of the PIAC and other interested parties. The Editor requests and welcomes items of interest for publication. All correspondence should be addressed to: Prof. Denis Sinor, Goodbody Hall 157, 1011 E. 3rd St., Bloomington, IN 47405-7005.
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The PIAC is an informal gathering of scholars, old and young, interested in Altaic and Inner Asian studies. Specialists in many fields and disciplines are welcome as long as their work is relevant to the PIAC's interests. The PIAC has no permanent membership, and although no endeavor is made to augment the number of participants at the conferences, all bona fide scholars interested in any aspect of Inner Asian studies are welcome. Deliberate efforts have been made to channel the PIAC away from the "great congress" syndrome and to maintain it on the level of a symposia where, in a relatively small circle of experts, problems of communal interest, both scientific and organizational, can be discussed. A much-prized feature of these meetings are the so-called "confessions" at which each participant in his turn informs the plenum of his work, projects, and future publications. The obvious usefulness of such exchanges of information is further increased by the participation of scholars who would not normally meet. Each meeting unites experts from between 15 and 20 countries. At one meeting or another participants from the following countries attended: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, People's Republic of China, Republic of China, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (both Democratic Republic and Federal Republic), Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea (South), Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, USA, USSR, Uzbekistan and Yugoslavia.

As can be expected, over the thirty odd years of its existence the PIAC has acquired an international respectability of no small import. It has been received with pomp and circumstance in many countries and its influence on the development of Altaic studies, informal though it may be, has been considerable. Since 1966 the PIAC has issued a Newsletter which has a world-wide distribution of about 650 copies. Its pages have been used for communications originating in all parts of the world. Since 1962 the proceedings of most of the meetings of the PIAC have been published.

The administrative organization of the PIAC is skeletal. The burden of running it rests on the shoulders of the Secretary-General. The first to have this title was Professor Walther Heissig (Bonn, 1957-1960). In 1960 his place was taken by Professor Denis Sinor (Indiana University) several times reelected. Since 1963 the PIAC has had a president in the person of the scholar hosting the forthcoming meeting.

As mentioned before, the PIAC has no permanent membership and does not collect membership fees. Voting rights are limited to participants who have attended more than two meetings. Clerical help and ongoing administrative expenses are provided, principally, by Indiana University.

An international commission appointed on a yearly basis by the annual PIAC meeting has the responsibility of awarding the Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies, established in 1962 to honor an outstanding scholar for his or her life's work in the field. The recipients of the award, consisting of a gold medal, have come from a variety of countries.

"And this is Ghengis Khan, the backbone of the organization."
Founded in 1957 during the 24th International Congress of Orientalists held in Munich, the Permanent International Altaistic Conference (PIAC) had its first meeting in Mainz, West Germany, in 1958. Since then the PIAC has convened regularly every year.

2. 1959 Mainz (German Federal Republic) 23. 1980 Strebersdorf (Austria)
3. 1960 Burg Liebenstein (German Federal Republic)
4. 1961 Cambridge (England)
5. 1962 Bloomington (Indiana, U.S.A.)
6. 1963 Helsinki (Finland)
7. 1964 De Pietersberg (Holland)
8. 1965 Wahlscheid (German Federal Republic)
9. 1966 Ravello (Italy)
10. 1967 Manchester (England)
11. 1968 Hørsholm (Denmark)
12. 1969 East Berlin (German Democratic Republic)
13. 1970 Strasbourg (France)
14. 1971 Szeged (Hungary)
15. 1972 Strebersdorf (Austria)
16. 1973 Ankara (Turkey)
17. 1974 Bad Honnef (German Federal Republic)
18. 1975 Bloomington (Indiana, USA)
19. 1976 Helsinki (Finland)
20. 1977 Leiden (Holland)
21. 1978 Manchester (England)
22. 1979 Ghent (Belgium)
24. 1981 Jerusalem (Israel)
25. 1982 Uppsala (Sweden)
27. 1984 Walberberg (German Democratic Republic)
28. 1985 Venice (Italy)
29. 1986 Tashkent (USSR)
30. 1987 Bloomington (Indiana, U.S.A.)
31. 1988 Weimar (German Democratic Republic)
32. 1989 Oslo (Norway)
33. 1990 Budapest (Hungary)
34. 1991 Berlin (Germany)
35. 1992 Taipei (ROC)
36. 1993 Alma-Ata (Kazakhstan)
37. 1994 Chantilly (France)
38. 1995 Tokyo (Japan)
39. 1996 Szeged (Hungary)
40. 1997 Provo (Utah, U.S.A.)
41. 1998 Helsinki (Finland)
42. 1999 Prague (Czech Republic)
43. 2000 Lanaken (Belgium)
44. 2001 Walberberg (Germany)
45. 2002 Budapest (Hungary)

For the Record...

42nd PIAC Meeting
The 42nd annual meeting of the PIAC was held August 22-27 1999, in Prague (Czech Republic) under the presidency of Dr. Charles F. Carlson.

43rd PIAC Meeting
The 43rd annual meeting of the PIAC was held September 3-8 2000, in Lanaken (Belgium) under the presidency of Prof. Dr. Aloís van Tongerloo.

44th PIAC Meeting
The 44th annual meeting of the PIAC was held August 26-31, 2001 in Walberberg (Germany) under the presidency of Prof. Dr. Veronika Veit.

45th PIAC Meeting
The 45th annual meeting of the PIAC was held June 23-28, 2002 Budapest (Hungary) under the presidency of Dr. Alice Sárközi. Denis Sinor was reelected Secretary General for a term of five years.
Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies

The Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies (usually referred to as the “PIAC Medal”) was established by Indiana University to honor an outstanding scholar for his or her life’s work in Altaic Studies. The recipients of the award, consisting of a gold medal, are chosen by an international committee elected by PIAC members in the course of the meeting previous to that at which the Medal is awarded.

The Medal Committee consists of five members: the President of the meeting at which the Medal is awarded, the Secretary General, and three members of the PIAC, elected by secret ballot at the previous meeting. The president of any given meeting is not barred from serving on the Medal Committee of the next meeting, but his participation in the work of the Medal Committee depends entirely on the outcome of the secret ballot.

At the 42nd annual meeting (1999) held in Prague, the Medal was awarded to Hiderhiro Okada (Japan)

At the 43rd annual meeting (2000) held in Lanaken, the Medal was awarded to Geng Shimin (China)

At the 44th annual meeting (2001) held in Walberberg, the Medal was awarded to András Róna-Tas (Hungary)

At the 45th annual meeting (2002) held in Budapest, the Medal was awarded to Jirō Ikegami (Japan)

1963 Antoine Mostaert (U.S.A.)
1964 Erich Haenisch (Federal Republic of Germany)
1965 Rinchen (Mongolian People’s Republic)
1966 Gyula Németh (Hungary)
1967 Martti Räsänen (Finland)
1968 Louis Ligeti (Hungary)
1969 Sir Gerard Clauson (United Kingdom)
1970 N.N. Poppe (U.S.A.)
1971 Annemarie von Gabain (Federal Republic of Germany)
1972 V.I. Cincius (U.S.S.R.)
1973 Walter Fuchs (Federal Republic of Germany)
1974 Owen Lattimore (U.S.A.)
1975 Karl Jahn (Holland)
1976 A.N. Kononov (U.S.S.R.)
1977 Gunnar Jarring (Sweden)
1978 Not awarded
1979 John Andrew Boyle (United Kingdom)
   (Posthumous award)
1980 N.A. Baskakov (U.S.S.R.)
1981 Not awarded
1982 Walther Heissig (Federal Republic of Germany)
   Denis Sinor (U.S.A.)
   (Professors Heissig and Sinor were each awarded the Medal in honor of the PIAC’s 25th Anniversary)
1983 Shiro Hattori (Japan)
1984 Karl H. Menges (U.S.A.)
1985 Aulis J. Joki (Finland)
1986 Károly Czegledy (Hungary)
1987 Pentti Aalto (Finland)
1988 Francis Woodman Cleaves (U.S.A.)
1989 Johannes Benzing (Federal Republic of Germany)
1990 Omeljan Pritsak (U.S.A.)
1991 Edmond Schütz (Hungary)
1992 A.M. Shcherbak (Russia)
1993 Not awarded
1994 James Hamilton (France)
1995 Jean Richard (France)
1996 L.P. Potapov (Russia), Denis Sinor (U.S.A)
1997 Gerhard Doerfer (Germany)
1998 Edward Tryjarski (Poland)
1999 Hidenori Okada (Japan)
2000 Geng Shimin (China)
2001 András Róna-Tas (Hungary)
2002 Jirō Ikegami (Japan)
Past PIAC Proceedings


4th Meeting (Cambridge, England 1961): A short report was included in the proceedings of the 5th Meeting.


10th Meeting (Manchester, England, 1967): No *Proceedings* have been published.


18th Meeting (Bloomington, Indiana, USA, 1975): *Aspects of Altaic Civilization II*. *Proceedings of the XVIII*

20th Meeting (Leiden, Holland, 1977): No Proceedings have been published.

21st Meeting (Manchester, England, 1978): No Proceedings have been published.

22nd Meeting (Ghent, Belgium, 1979): No Proceedings have been published.


25th Meeting (Uppsala, Sweden, 1982): Altaistic Studies. Papers Presented at the 25th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference at Uppsala June 7-11, 1982. Edited by Gunnar Jarring and Staffan Rosén. Published as vol. 12 in the series Konferenser of the Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien (Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982). It can be ordered at a reduced price from the PIAC’s Secretariat.

26th Meeting (Chicago, Illinois, USA. 1983): No Proceedings have been published.


29th Meeting (Tashkent, USSR., 1986): No Proceedings have been published.


31st Meeting (Weimar, German Democratic Republic, 1988): No Proceedings have been published.


35th Meeting (Taipei, Republic of China, 1992). Proceedings of the 35th Permanent International Altaistic Conference. Edited by Chieh-hsien Chen. (National Taiwan University: 1993). 581 pp. ISBN 957-8528-09-4. - *The office of the Secretary General at Indiana University has a few copies which it would be pleased to send free of charge. Send requests to PIAC, Goodbody Hall 157, 1011 E. Third St., Bloomington, IN 47401-7005 U.S.A.

36th Meeting (Almaty, Kazakhstan, 1993). No Proceedings have been published.


Remembering Dick Howell -

[e-mailed to Denis Sinor 10/05/2000]

Just a fond farewell -- the piper is pounding at my door screaming for his payment. I've known for 50 years the day would come, so I did not have to wait for the Surgeon-general's pronouncement.

Mainly I wanted to thank you for your hospitality [via PIAC] for the past 15 years -- I have given little of serious interest to most members, but my life was enriched enormously.

Sincerely, Dick Howell

[the reply]

Dear Dick,

your words fully compensate for and reward all the efforts I have ever put into the PIAC. Of course you are wrong: your very presence has been a great asset to all our meetings and we missed you at Pietersheim.

So: wherever you go, be it the next PIAC or another assembly even more harmonious, I bid you godspeed and am looking forward to meeting you - somewhere. I am holding your and Jacqueline's hands.

God bless you!
Denis

In Memory--

Nikolaj Alexandrovich

Baskakov (1905-1996)

by Edward Tryjarski

received by the PIAC 09/18/97

The sad news of the passing of Professor Nikolaj Alexandrovich Baskakov caused heart-felt sorrow among his colleagues and disciples. He was linked with many people in numerous countries having made long-lasting ties of collaboration and friendship.

Born on March 9 (22) 1905 at Solvychegotsk (on the Vologda River, tributary of Dvina) he died after a long life on August 26, 1996 in Moscow. His body was cremated. He originated from a family belonging to the Russian "inteligentsija" and his father was an office holder. In 1929 he graduated from the History and Ethnology Faculty of the State Moscow University, then, until the Autumn of 1931, he organized a Philological Section in the Scientific Research Institute at Turkul, in the Karakalpak Autonomous Republic. In 1934 he became candidate of sciences and, in 1951, he received a Doctorate in Philology. In 1934 he was nominated Assistant Professor and, in 1946, Senior Researcher. In the years 1941-1943 he was sent to the Gorno-Altajsk area to help the local scholars. This gave him a good opportunity to widen his knowledge of the language and culture of the Turkic peoples.

He acknowledged academician V.A. Gordlevskij (1876-1956), prominent philologist and historian, as his master in Turkic studies. Though fascinated by the many areas of study in this field, he chose to specialize: though on several occasions he encroached on domains of largely conceived Altaic problems including ethnology, the study of beliefs and political history. He remained the Turcologist par excellence showing at the same time, an interest in Ottoman studies and the language of modern Turkey. He had the ability not only to analyze old and new linguistic phenomena but also to formulate bold hypotheses which only a few of his opponents considered too bold. His scientific activity based on a deep erudition, along with his eagerness to formulate and record his opinions in print (his personal bibliography, up to 1974, embraces 361 items, among them several books; he continued publishing new texts up to his very last illness) determined his leading position in Russian human studies and in professional Turcological centers abroad. He was a member of many societies and organizations such as:
“Societas Uralo- Altaica,” “Polish Oriental Association,” “Societas Orientalis Fennica,” “Türk Dili Kurumu,” and others. He attended numerous congresses and conferences, he was also a member and a decided supporter of the PIAC (I will come back to this topic later).

Prof. N.A. Baskakov enjoyed a full approbation in many countries and became a model of the Orient researcher (difficult, it is true, to be imitated) for several generations of students. For many years he was not engaged in regular university teaching being a scientific research worker at the Institute of Linguistics at the Academy in Moscow, however, he played an important role in the education of young Turcologists. Active in various commissions for postgraduate and doctoral promotion, he prepared programs of study valid not only in Moscow but also in many other republics. He was closely linked with specialists from Karakalpak Republic, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan who, in their turn, highly appreciated his achievements and bestowed upon him diplomas and other distinctions.

It is no easy task to characterize the rich scientific output of the late Professor. Generally speaking it could be observed that there is nearly no branch of Turc studies on which N.A. Baskakov would not have left important traces of his scientific investigation. He devoted much of his interest and time to such topics as: (a) transcription and transliteration – either common for all Turkic languages, or designated for particular languages, mainly those having not possessed any written literature; orthoepy and terminology; (b) classification of Turkic languages based on a specification of two supposed basic units: Eastern - and Western Hunnish branches of Turkic languages; this proposal was accepted by relatively numerous specialists; (c) bilingualism and multilingualism; (d) onomastics, especially anthroponymy and oronymy; (e) methodology of linguistic research from the historiotypological standpoint; agglutination, grammaticalization; word and phrase structures, aspects, voices etc. Important both from scientific and practical points of view are his descriptions of separate Turkic languages – Altaic, Nogay, languages of the South Siberian group. His veritable opus magnum has become his monography Karakalpak Language, in four volumes, in Russian (Vol. I, 1951. Vol II 1952; in a letter dated Sept. 5th, 1995, N.A. Baskakov informed me that in Nukus Volumes III. and IV would be soon printed). It is a work without parallel in the world of Turcological literature. With much interest and approbation was received his compendium Turkic Languages (1960), in Russian; in a slightly different form entitled Introduction to the study of Turkic Languages, (1952) in Russian, not only an instrumental book for teaching history and construction of those languages but also a text containing new scientific proposals concerning classification and terminology.

N.A. Baskakov’s merits in lexicology and lexicography cannot be overstated if one takes into consideration the fact that almost none of the Turkic dictionaries published in the ex-Soviet Union during several decades could do without his personal collaboration as author, co-author, reviewer or editor. Suffice it to cite here such dictionaries as, Uighur-Russian, Karakalpak-Russian, and many others. Quite original and useful, the Karaim-Russian-Polish Dictionary (1974) was the result of a collaboration of the Russian, Polish and Lithuanian Turcologists (N.A. Baskakov, A. Zajaczkowski, and M. Seraja Shapshal).

Much attention was given by the late Professor to the contacts between Russian and Turkic languages. This interest resulted in his studies on Russian surnames of Turkic origin, Turkic elements in the names of Moscow streets etc. Educated not only as a philologist and linguist but also as an anthropologist, N.A. Baskakov studied related questions such as: Soul in Ancient Beliefs of Altai Turks (1970), Relics of the Taboo Totemism in the Languages of the People of the Altai (1975), Abodes of the Ilim Kazakhs (1971) and others. A year before his death he succeeded in printing two papers, viz. those on the history of Karakalpak theater and literature. He also wrote obituary notices devoted to his colleagues V V Minorsky, A. Zajaczkowski, V.I. Filonenko, A. Bombaci, and Sir Gerard Clauson.

He much appreciated the idea of the PIAC and its yearly meetings. He started to attend them relatively late (I remember his participation in the following meetings: 12th PIAC, Berlin 1969, 19th PIAC Helsinki 1976, 29th PIAC Tashkent 1986, but probably he was present during other meetings), we should not forget, however, how difficult it was for Soviet scholars to attend meetings abroad. Once having attended personally the meeting (earlier he was able only to deliver his reports by post), he became enthusiastic of that “informal organization.” Good-humored, he came to the conclusion that the PIAC should absolutely possess an anthem of its own, and soon after he authored one himself composing both the music and facettious words. He offered the whole to the PIAC and delivered it to the Secretary General who published it in the PIAC Newsletter No.19 (February 1990) and also again in Newsletter No.23 (February 1995) with Turkish lyrics by Prof. A. Temir.

He was awarded the Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies (PIAC Medal) in 1980.

He was a reliable letter-writer and witty joke-teller. After a creative and fruitful life Prof. N.A. Baskakov departed at the age of ninety.

Lux perpetua luceat ei.
Some Notes on Central Asian Studies.
A “Confession” by H. Walravens.

Received by the PIAC 02/26/02

One of the prominent features of PIAC Meetings are the confessions, round robin fashion reports on the participants on their current work. The following notes contain some of the author's sins (1998-2002) - if they are not forgiven they may contribute to unexpected cooperation and a better exchange of information.

[ed.] Wolfgang Seuberlich (1906-1985). Ostasienwissenschaftler und Bibliothekar. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin 1998. 125 pp. The editor contributed: 5-6 Vorbemerkung, 5-30 Schriftenverzeichnis W Seuberlich. The little volume consists of personal recollections and appreciations of this scholar who for many years headed the East Asian Department of the Berlin State Library, currently Germany's largest library. Seuberlich grew up in Harbin and was fluent in Russian and Chinese; he also had a good command of Japanese. His doctoral thesis submitted to Berlin University in 1943 seemed to have been lost during the destruction of WW II; fortunately, a copy was rediscovered at Berlin University Library, and as the author never managed to revise it, it was published as it was - only the transliteration system was switched to Pinyin and some formal editing was, of course, necessary. Even after more than fifty years, Seuberlich's thesis is valuable as (at least in Western languages) nobody has ventured upon an administrative history of Manchuria:

1998 was the 60th anniversary of the death of Peter Schmidt, the eminent Latvian sinologist, Altaist and folklorist. Jelena Staburova, Head of Oriental Studies at Riga University, organized a conference in his honour, the papers of which will hopefully be published some day. The following notes deal with Schmidt's relationship with Berthold Laufer (1874-1934) and Erwin von Zach (1872-1942), both of them eminent Manchurists. Schmidt was professor of Chinese and Manchu at the Oriental Institute in Vladivostok, and after the establishment of an independent Latvian state became professor of ethnography at Riga University.1 Two little papers deal with other aspects of Schmidt's work and are therefore only mentioned as footnotes:


Among the excellent collections of the Wolfenbüttel Library (which boasts, among others, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729-1781), the German dramatist, among its librarians) has a small but interesting Manchu collection. It was first described in Walter Fuchs' landmark catalogue Chinesische und mandjurische Handschriften und selten Drucke (Wiesbaden 1966) and then in the present author's China illustrata, a 1987 exhibition catalogue. The earlier notes were revised and became part of a short catalogue of Wolfenbüttel's collection of Chinese books:


The rise of Chinese and Manchu Studies in Russia in the 18th and 19th centuries are closely connected with the collections of books and manuscripts in these languages. In spite of the fact that a number of catalogues were prepared, and some also published, it is still difficult to decide which books and which editions scholars had at their disposal. Two articles focus on an analysis of the available catalogues (Bacmeister, Leont'ev, Klaproth, and Kamenskij/Lipovcov), with Chinese characters added whenever possible: Chinesische und mandjurische Bücher in St. Petersburg im 18 Jahrhundert. Monumenta Serica 46. 1998, 397-418. Der Büchertatlog von Kamenskij und Lipovcov. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte von Sinologie und Mandjuristik in Rußland. ZDMG 151. 2001, 367-406.

Julius Klaproth who, with Abel Rémy, may justly be considered the father of East Asian Studies in the modern scholarly sense, was indeed an outstanding and industrious researcher. While he did not teach (despite the fact that he was appointed Professor of Asian Languages at Bonn University in 1816) but preferred to work in Paris where he was one of the founding members of the Societé asiatique and a frequent contributor to the Journal asiatique, he did not found a school. His main interests were history and

---

geography of East and Central Asia, and there are more than 300 publications to his credit, a number of them on Manchu Studies. So far three volumes of a documentation list his published and unpublished works (vol. 1.), print his correspondence (vol. 2), and give details on some scholars with whom Klaproth worked (vol. 3); surprisingly enough, there was no satisfactory bibliography of the publications of Abel Rémusat, and therefore such a list was included in vol. 3. Julius Klaproth (1783-1835). Leben und Werk. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999. X, 230 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen.3.) Julius Klaproth (1783-1835): Briefe und Dokumente. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999. 235 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen.4.) Zur Geschichte der Ostasiawissenschaften in Europa. Abel Rémusat (1788-1832) und das Umfeld Julius Klaproths (1783-1835). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999. 183 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen.5.) Vol. 4, containing correspondence files in the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, is ready for the press.

Ferdinand Lessing, Curator at the Berlin Museum of Ethnology and subsequently Professor of Oriental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, is best known for the Mongolian-English Dictionary, still the standard work in its field. While he considered dictionary work just "Brotarbeit" he worked indefatigably on a description of the famous Peking Lama temple Yonghegong. The complete work - had it ever seen the light of day, would have comprised five volumes: a veritable encyclopaedia of Lamaistic cults and rituals. Unfortunately, only volume 1 was published (Stockholm 1942), and the whereabouts of the ms. of vol. 2 are not known. Lessing was a personal friend of the explorer Sven Hedin whose expedition he had belonged to for some years (1930-1933). Some letters were published in the jestschrift for Manfred Taube: Ferdinand Lessing und Sven Hedin. Briefe aus dem Jahre 1931 zur Forschungsarbeit in der Mongolei und China. Studia Tibetica et mongolica (Festschrift Manfred Taube). Redigenda curaverunt Helmut Eimer, Michael Hahn, Maria Schetelich et Peter Wyżlic. Swiastl-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1999 (India et tibetica.34.), 307-322. The complete correspondence with Hedin, reports to the Berlin Museum, a revised list of publications etc. form the following volume: Ferdinand Lessing (1882-1961), Sinologe, Mongolist und Kenner des Lamaismus. Materialien zu Leben und Werk, mit dem Briefwechsel mit Sven Hedin. Osnabrück: Zeller Verlag, 2000. 425 pp.

Lessing was for a few years coeditor of the Ostasiatische Zeitschrift which contains a number of articles and reviews on Central Asian Studies. The following bibliography provides better access to this important journal: Ostasiatische Zeitschrift (1912-1943), Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Ostasiatische Kunst (1926-1943). Bibliographie und Register. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000. XIII, 206 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen.10.)

Another journal indispensable for Central Asian specialists is ZAS, the contents of which were analysed in a way similar to Ostasiatische Zeitschrift: Zentralasiatische Studien des Seminars für Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft Zentralasiens der Universität Bonn (ZAS). Bibliographie und Register (1967-1998). Berlin: Staatsbibliothek, 1999. 94 pp. (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. Neuerwerbungen der Ostasiensammlung. Sonderheft 2.) The bibliography was updated in the meantime to cover all 30 volumes published; individual copies are available free of charge from the Berlin State Library.

An imperial collection of generals’ seals from the Peking Historical Archives was published some years ago in an edition of 100 copies. This publication seems to be virtually unknown, and therefore it was made the subject of a presentation at the Helsinki PIAC meeting: Eine Kaiserliche Siegelsammlung in chinesischer und mandjurischer Sprache. Studia Orientalia 87.1999, 275-297.

Martin Gimm, Professor of Chinese and Manchu Studies at the University of Cologne, was honoured by a Festschrift on his 65th birthday; unfortunately its publication was delayed; the splendid volume contains some contributions on Manchu subjects. The present author is responsible for the list of publications which is, in the meantime, in need of an update. He gratefully acknowledges information received from his colleagues and from Prof. Gimm himself.


A bibliographical survey of Christian material in Manchu was - just by accident - paralleled by a similar article by Prof. Stary published in CAJ. While dealing with the same material, the focus is different, and both contributions are to a large degree complementary: Christian literature of the Manchus. Some bibliographic notes Monumenta Serica 48.2000, 445-469.

While “Pelliot” is a household word in East and Central Asian Studies, there was so far no bibliography of Pelliot's many publications. Professor Denis Sinor was kind enough to arrange for the inclusion of this bibliography in
One of the most prolific and most modest orientalists of the 19th century was Wilhelm Schott, Professor of Asian Languages at the University of Berlin and member of the Prussian Academy of Sciences. Privadozent for Oriental Studies (Arabic, Turkish, Persian), he was self-taught in Chinese and Manchu, and became a leading specialist on Finnish and Hungarian. Unlike most of his colleagues he was a serious linguist, and to this day, many of his publications are well worth reading, among them 5 volumes of Altaisca Studien - he was one of the fathers of the Altaic Theory. He also taught Mongolian and Tibetan as well as Chagatay. One of his better known students was Bernhard Jülg; and Józef Kowalewski who held the first chair of Mongolian Studies (in Kazan) was pleased to communicate that his works (especially his Mongol'skaja xrestomatija) were used for teaching at Berlin University. Wilhelm Schott (1802-1889). Leben und Wirken des Orientalisten Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001. 220 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen.13.) The volume contains also Schott's translations from Kowalewski's xrestomatija as well as Eerö Salmelainen's Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita. Some documents on Schott's career were published earlier: Wilhelm Schott und die Königliche Bibliothek. Scrinium Beroliniense. Tilo Brandis zum 65.Geburtstag. Berlin: Staatsbibliothek, 2000, 577-594. Karl May (1842-1912) has been one of Germany's most popular authors, and his works - a bibliography. Bloomingstorn, IN: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 2001. XXXV, 248 pp. (Indiana University Oriental Series.9.)


For a while Konstantin Jachontov was active in describing the holdings of Manchu collections in various places in the Soviet Union, e.g. Vilnius, Irkutsk, and Leningrad. For understandable reasons it was difficult to get the catalogue of the Manchu books at St. Petersburg published in Russia. The present writer translated the book from the manuscript into German, but unfortunately the catalogue saw the light of day only ten years later, when the progress of computer technology made it easy to include Chinese characters in a suitable form: K. S. Jachontov: Katalog der mandjurischen Handschriften und Blockdrucke in den Sammlungen der Bibliothek der Orientalischen Fakultät der Sankt-Petersburger Universität. Aus dem russischen Manuskript übersetzt und herausgegeben. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001. 197 pp. (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen. 14.) Albert Grünewedel (1856-1935), Director of the Indian Department of the Berlin Museum of Ethnology, became famous as the leader of two of the four Prussian expeditions to Turfan, besides being one of the pioneers in Tibetan Studies. His correspondence with several scholars, especially his teacher, the Indologist Ernst Kuhn, throws some light on life and works of this gifted and controversial scholar: Albert Grünewedel: Briefe und Dokumente. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001. XXXVI,206 pp. (Asien- und Afrika-Studien der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.9.)

ICANAS 1997 in Budapest included a panel of Altaists on the role of the fox in Central and East Asia. The proceedings of this panel, enriched by some additional contributions by scholars who were not able to participate in the event, is finally being published in two volumes. [ed.] Der Fuchs in Kultur, Religion und Folklore. Zentral- und Ostasiens. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001. X,203 S. (Asiatische Forschungen.141) Contents:
W. Heissig: Marginalien zur Fuchsgestalt in der mongolischen Überlieferung.
Á. Birtalan: A survey of the fox in Mongolian folklore and folk belief.
J. Coloo: Incense offering of the fox in Oirat script.
A. Sárközi, A. G. Sazykin: An incense offering of the fox.
C. Römer: The fox in Turkic proverbs.
K. Uray-Köhalmi: Der Fuchs und seine Doppelgänger in der Folklore der tungsudischen Völker.
G. Stary: The fox in Sibe-Manchu culture.
F. A. Bischoff: Sex tricks of Chinese fox-friends.
D. Kehren: The fox in the early period of China. Text and representations.
E. von Mende: Warum brach man dem Fuchs das Genick?
S. Scholz-Cionca: Fuchsgestalten im frühen Kyögen.

I. J. Schmidt, pioneer Mongologist and Tibetologist, was a fascinating personality. Member of the community of the Moravian Brethren at Sarepta, he started his scholarly activities by translating parts of the Bible into Kalmuk, then published a Mongolian grammar and a Mongolian dictionary, translated Sagang Secen's History of the Eastern Mongols, and edited and translated the Geser saga. Based on Csoma's work, he also published a Tibetan dictionary and a Tibetan grammar. A revised bibliography of Schmidt's...
publications (including Schmidt's prefaces and explanations) was dedicated to Prof. Barbara Kellner-Heinkele on the occasion of her 60th birthday. Only 6 copies were published. *Isaak Jakob Schmidt (1779-1847); Schriftenverzeichnis*. Berlin: Staatsbibliothek, 2002. 71 pp. 4°

Work in progress comprises a short biography of Albert Regel (1845-1905), son of the director of the St. Petersburg Botanical Garden, Eduard Regel. Albert R. won the acclaim of geographers and explorers by the reports on his travels in Central Asia. So he is credited to be the first Westerner to have visited Turfan, after the Jesuit Bento de Gois. To be published in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. Russische Ärzte bei der Russischen Geistlichen Mission P. E. Skačkov's classic article on the subject in German translation. Several of the physicians were also proficient in Manchu, like Osip Vojcexovskij who held a chair of Chinese and Manchu at Kazan University. Accepted for *CAJ*. M. P. Volkova: *Manchu Studies at the Asiatic Museum*. Translation of this brief historical sketch for *ZAS* 31. The De Harlez/Bang controversy. Paper given at the Maastricht PIAC, which focused on C. de Harlez and W Bang, the founding fathers of Altaic Studies in Belgium. A Manchu gynecology. Paper given at the Walberberg PIAC. The original unique blockprint (single known copy at the Institut Vostokovedenija, St. Petersburg) was already published in 1810 by Joseph Rehmann, physician to the Czar, in German translation. It shows a very modern approach to birth and child care.

Joseph Rock [1884-1962]: *Berichte, Briefe und Dokumente*. Correspondence of the well-known traveller, botanist, and Naxi researcher with fellow botanists, but also with the Harvard-Yenching Institute; including a revised bibliography of Rock's publications, reproduction of newspaper articles on him, and his own reports on his botanical work in Hawaii. To be published by Steiner, Stuttgart. Joseph Rock: *Von Cho-ni nach rGyu-par 1926*. This volume contains a description of Rock's trip to the Amnye Machen mountain as given in his letters to C. S. Sargent, Director of the Arnold Arboretum, Harvard University, as well as his field notes. To be published by Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden. *Von Rußland über die Mongolei nach China*. Collection of Russian reports on the trip from Russia to Mongolia and China, chiefly from the first half of the 19th century. All texts were published in German (translation) but are very little known as most of them are not listed in bibliographies. Among the authors are J. Kowalewski, Iakinf (Bichurin), Alexander Bunge, and the pseudonymous De Ming whose identity was established thirty years ago in an article by Boris Riftin et al. To be published by Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
Bibliography of Mongol Studies
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- Einige Aspekte der Exploitation der Qalq-a-Mongolen durch die manjurische Qing-Dynastie, (Diplom-Arbeit) Ulaanbaatar 1981. (in mongolischer Sprache)
- "O nekotorych aspektach stanovlenija feodal'nych otnosenii v mongol'skom ko evom obs estve v period pravlenija ingis-chana (Über einige Aspekte der Etablierung feudaler Verhältnisse in der mongolischen Nomadengesellschaft während der Herrschaft ingis Chaans)," in Mongolica, I(22), Ulaanbaatar 1990, S. 17-23.
- "1815 ond gargasan 'hese-i toktobuha tulergi golo-be dasara jurgan-i kooli hacin-i bithe'd mongolyn chutagt naryn erch chem eenij tuchaj ögüüslen n'. (Über die Stellung mongolischer Chutags im 1815 herausgegebenen "hese-i toktobuha")," in The second International Symposium of Mongolian Studies unter Auspiscus of Inner Mongolia University, Part History, Kōke Qota (China) 1991, S. 3137-3143.
- "Einige Bemerkungen zur Institution des Zölhibats mongolischer Lamas unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Aussagen der Manju-Gesetzgebung für die Mongolei," in Ulaanbaatar, Nijslėlijn törijn bajguullaga, zachirgaany cheveli, 15.08.92, S. 7.
- "Mongolische Republik. Joint ventures; Staatsbetriebe; Betriebe und Einrichtungen mit dem Recht auf Außenhandel, Ostasiatischer Verein e. V., Hamburg April 1993, 40 S.
- "Verlustreiche Träume, Privatisierung im Osten, Teil 12, Mongolei," in Ost-West-Wochenzeitung, hrsg. v. Günter Gaus, Nr.21/ 19.05.1995
- "Zur politischen Selbstverständnis der Mongolischen Revolutionären Volkspartei," in Asien, Afrika,


"Geschichte der Mongolei oder Die "Mongolische Frage" - Die Mongolen auf ihrem Weg zum eigenen Nationalstaat, Bonn 1999, 422 S.


For the Proceedings of the 40th meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference edited by David B. Honey and David C. Wright, and published under the title Altaic Affinities (Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series vol.168, Bloomington, Indiana 2001, viii+290 pp.), I sketched the history of this organization (pp.1-21). I then remarked that a semi-centennial volume would have been even more appropriate for this purpose, but noted that there was a hitch: by that time I will no longer be on this land and there is no one else who, like myself, would have attended all the meetings or would have been as much involved in the running of the PIAC. Well, five more years have passed since the meeting held in Provo, the PIAC is still prospering, I am still around and I thought that it might be a good idea to bring up to date this history and publish it in this ephemeral Newsletter which, actually, may reach more people than did the Proceedings of the 40th meeting.

The PIAC is the brainchild of Walther Heissig the distinguished Mongolist, professor at the University of Bonn, founder of the famous Zentralasiatisches Seminar of that university. During the 24th International Congress of Orientalists (ICO) in Munich, he invited the participants of its Altaistic Section to share his view that the framework of big congresses such as the ICO was not suitable as a forum for an exchange of ideas among those few who devote their scholarly pursuits to the arcane and little known field of Altaic studies. Then, as now, the number of scholars working in this field was really minimal when compared to the crowds focusing their interests on Biblical Studies, Islam, or Sinology, to give but a few examples. In retrospect I find it interesting that Heissig, a pure Mongolist, felt that his field of study organically belonged to a wider unit, encompassing Turc or Tunguz.

On September 4, 1957, a dozen or so of us gathered in a rather shabby room of the University of Munich where Heissig put forward his idea. Of those present, besides Heissig and myself, I recall with certainty the presence of only Annemarie von Gabain and Omeljan Pritsak. At that time I did not think that there was a need for yet another orientalist organization but supported the idea out of friendship for the proponent of the plan although I felt reasonably certain that nothing would come of it. Time has shown that I was wrong. Heissig took it upon himself to organize the first gathering. It took place in the Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur in Mainz, from June 25 to June 28, 1958. Present were: Pentti Aalto, Charles Bawden, Gerhard Doerfer, Wolfram Eberhard, Walther Heissig, Karl Jahn, Karl H. Menges, Udo Posch, Omeljan Pritsak, Klaus Sagaster, Denis Sinor, and Kaare Thomsen Hansen. Just a dozen, but from six different countries, a propitious start. Colleagues from the so-called Socialist countries had also been invited; some of them sent their greetings - but none could attend.

We gathered around a table. There were a few formal papers, such as Aalto’s on the general theme of the nature of the relationship of languages, but the bulk of the discussions focused on the needs of Altaic studies, on projects that can facilitate and advance research. Participants provided information not only on their own work but also on that of their universities or even on that of whole countries, such as the Soviet Union (Pritsak) or the USA (Menges). Thus the pattern of the “confessions” - the characteristic feature of all future meetings - was established. Some resolutions were passed in favor of projects to be undertaken and, over the years, some of the ideas put forward would be realized.

It was at this meeting, in 1957, that the PIAC was formally established, the name “Permanent International Altaistic Conference” adopted, and Walther Heissig elected as its Secretary General. To the best of my knowledge the PIAC was never registered in Germany as a scholarly society, and it
is certainly not registered in the United States.

If the PIAC could survive and prosper it was due partly to a propitious start. It had the support of that organizational genius, Helmut Scheel (1895-1967). Thanks to him, the resources of his brainchild, the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, were made accessible to the fledgling PIAC. The Akademie housed our first two meetings, which set the pattern of our future deliberations. Not only were our discussions held there, but we all stayed there and had all our meals in common. It was more than a meeting of colleagues, it was a gathering of friends of the "PIAC family" as it was to be called in later years.

At the second meeting (June 23-28, 1959) the number of participants increased from 12 to 23. With the exception of Eberhard, all the participants of the first meeting were present and they were joined by a strong contingent from Turkey (Mansuroglu, Ogel, Rahmeti Arat, Ahmet Temir) and Italy (Bombaci, Gandjei). Zajaczkowski was the first and only representative of a socialist country to appear at a PIAC meeting.

Because of repairs undertaken on the building of the Mainz academy, the third meeting (June 26 - July 1, 1960) took place in the picturesque location of Burg Liebenstein, high above the Rhine over Kamp-Bornhofen. The 19 participants included some senior people, Nicholas Poppe, Walter Fuchs and Erich Haenisch, as well as some students. It was a welcome extension of our circle, to open it to the forthcoming generation. The practice of inviting young scholars has continued in the course of years.

At Burg Liebenstein the focus of the meeting was a rather unpretentious Guesthouse which offered ample opportunity to taste the local wines. It should be put on record that participants of the first three PIACs made good use of the products of the local viticulture of the Rhineland and that, as a result, good, high-spirited conversation and singing marked the end of a day of scholarly deliberations. Karl Jahn was an inexhaustible source of jokes which he had a special gift of telling. One evening of the second meeting we all adjourned to a Weinkeller. On our way back, most, if not all of us were squeezed into a Volkswagen bus, with Richard Frye trying to place his legs in a position at least tolerable if not comfortable, when Jahn, once again, started telling jokes. They were not only good, but he had a knack of telling them and his Viennese accent was powerful enough to make a sad story funny. Soon he set all of us in a roar until a sudden stop of the Volkswagen put an end to the general hilarity. The car stopped just a few meters short of a solid brick wall. The driver, shaking with laughter, lost his way and in the darkness drove into a cul-de-sac; another few feet and the local hospital would have been overflowing with Altarist in need of medical attention.

The three meetings were subsidized by the Kultusreferat des Bundesinnenministeriums and I have no recollection whether, and if so to what extent, participants had to pay for their lodgings. It is my guess that Heissig could take care of the expenses of the students and of the two Poles present at this third meeting. It could well be that, having found subsidies for three consecutive meetings, there would have been need to look for other sources of financial help - a tiresome assignment. Be that as it may, Heissig felt that he had done enough, and that it was time for someone else to carry the PIAC forward. So he resigned and I was elected Secretary General for the obvious reason that I was willing to organize the next meeting in Cambridge, England. At that time I taught at the Oriental Faculty of Cambridge University.

I accepted the assignment without any hesitation. The Cambridge colleges are ideal venues for any conference, symposium, or seminar, and I had the necessary connections with several of them. My choice fell on St.Edmund’s House, not a college at that time, but a home to some Roman Catholic dons and students. The premises were excellent, more comfortable than those of, say, Burg Liebenstein, and we could have our discussions in the beautiful garden. It was the first PIAC meeting with stronger British participation, but no documentation survived and I cannot tell who was present and how many we were. I do remember that Sir Gerald Clauson was present. Nor do I have the exact date of the meeting.

Unavoidably the flavor, as it were, of the PIAC changed in Cambridge. Born in the German Federal Republic, where the first three of our meetings were held, the PIAC had within its tradition a strong German - should I say "Rhineland"? - component. The personality of our first Secretary General, Walther Heissig - settled if not born in that beautiful part of the world - further deepened this imprint and was instrumental in creating the happy, informal atmosphere which, with very few exceptions, was to characterize all our future meetings. Cambridge put its mark on our gathering. There was mid-morning coffee and mid-afternoon tea, and sherry before dinner and some wine during it. All this was just as "English" as the previous meetings were "German." Perhaps more importantly, and quite imperceptibly, English replaced German as the principal language of communication. Although the very name of the PIAC was English, while in Germany we normally used German in our communications and discussions. There was also a slight shift to more formality, the Head of St.Edmund’s House honored us with a sherry party and I invited the participants to a modest garden-party given in my home.

A change in the character of our meetings was even more marked at our 5th meeting held at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, June 4-9, 1962. In the Spring Semester of 1962 I had accepted a professorship in the Uralic and Altaic Program (as it was then called) of Indiana University and, beyond the fact that it appeared a logical step for me to bring the PIAC to Bloomington, there were some weighty reasons why such an invitation appeared advantageous for the university as well as for myself.

Under the presidency of Herman B Wells, Indiana
University made a concerted effort in the field of international studies and there was hope that a National Defense Education Center in Altaic studies might be established on campus. It was in the interest of the university to make its mark in Altaic studies (after all, this is why I had been invited to join the faculty), and it was in my interest to show that I was the right man in the right spot. It was clear that no successful PIAC meeting could be held without massive European presence and it was equally obvious that few, if any European or Asian scholars, would be willing and able to pay for a short trip to the United States. Funds were needed and the university was ready and capable of providing them. Of the 34 participants 18 came from outside the USA, to wit from Australia, Denmark, Finland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Poland, and Turkey.

Clearly, substantial sums were needed to cover travel expenses, board and lodgings, for all the participants. They were provided by the United States Office of Education which, for the specific purposes of this meeting, entered into a contract with Indiana University. It was well worth the trouble: the word got around in the world of Altaic Studies and related fields, and in the Office of Education (as the US Department of Education then was called), that something great was happening at Indiana University. In turn, the university saw that I could “deliver” and had the style and connections for similar tasks.

It may mean little to most readers of these lines, but at that time it was a considerable achievement to bring to Bloomington scholars working behind what was called the Iron Curtain. At the time of the PIAC meeting, the so-called “Hungarian Question” was still on the agenda of the United Nations (it was to be removed on December 20 of that year), so the visit of two Hungarian scholars (Schütz and Czeglédy) to the USA was not easy and needed good connections also in Hungary. The ever-cautious Louis Ligeti helped the project simply by not opposing it. Travel arrangements for the third “Iron Curtain” scholar, Ananiasz Zajaczkowski from Poland, caused fewer problems.

Two important steps were taken at the Bloomington meeting. I was elected Secretary General of the PIAC for a period of five years. To cite the magniloquent words used in the minutes of the meeting (which, after all, had to be forwarded to the Office of Education and were worded in the appropriate style), participants at the meeting “did so in the hope that by fixing the seat of the PIAC for five years in the USA, they would give the newly elected Secretary General the possibility of carrying out some concrete plans likely to give a new impetus to Altaic Studies both in the USA and in the world.” Of course nothing of the sort happened on this grand scale but, it is safe to say that the PIAC was of help in supporting scholarship in the field.

The second step was taken by Indiana University which, in commemoration of the 5th Conference, offered to establish an Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies, consisting of a medal to be awarded annually by the PIAC to a scholar who in their opinion “had made an outstanding contribution to the advancement of Altaic Studies.” There were a number of provisos given in that first resolution, many of them never implemented, but two of them, with some slight amendments, survived the test of time. One was that “At each meeting a committee of four, if possible previous holders of the medal, will be elected by those eligible to vote, whose duty it will be to submit to the next meeting at least two and not more than four names of scholars deemed worthy to receive the medal.” According to the second proviso, “Those persons eligible to take part in the election will be all bona fide scholars in the Altaic field who have been present at a previous meeting of the PIAC and are present when the election is held.”

The medal to be awarded was modeled on the seal of Indiana University but the circular inscription “*Indiana Universitatis Sigillum* MDCCCXX*” was replaced by “Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies.” The first three medals to be struck were in bronze, the rest were, and are, in gold. In recognition of his outstanding contribution to Mongol studies, the first recipient of the prize was Fr. Antoine Mostaert C.I.C.M., a Belgian missionary, then living in retirement in the U.S.A. He received the award in absentia at the 6th meeting of the PIAC, held in Helsinki in 1963.

Experience has shown that the original rules regarding the composition of the committee in charge of awarding the medal were impractical. For one, they were amended at the 10th meeting of the PIAC, held in Manchester, England, in 1967, to read as follows: “Resolved that the Committee recommending candidates for this prize shall consist of the chairman for the time being, the Secretary General *ex officio*, and three ordinary members to be elected annually.” The decision taken in Manchester stood up well to the test of time, and still governs the proceedings. Within the PIAC “family” the Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies is usually referred to as the “PIAC medal” - a practice I will follow in this essay.

The more formal framework given to the PIAC in 1962, coupled with the fact that, thanks to the generosity of Indiana University, there was now an office to keep the archives, and produce and send out circulars gave the PIAC an aspect of “permanency” which earlier had existed only in its name. The 6th (1963) meeting was held in Helsinki with Pentti Aalto as president, the 7th (1964) was convened by Karl Jahn and held in the conference center De Pietersberg, near Arnhem in Holland. It had a central theme “The horse in ancient Altaic civilizations.” There were thirty-six participants, a very small number when compared to some later meetings. The 8th (1965) meeting was held once again on the Rhine, in Wahlscheid near Bonn, with the Founding Father Walther Heissig presiding. For its 9th (1966) meeting the PIAC moved to Italy, to the lovely city of Ravello. Under the presidency of Alessio Bombaci - whom I tried to convince that a four-hour siesta is just a little too much for the PIAC - it was a very Neapolitan affair, reflecting the atmosphere of the place and the sunny, charming
character of the president. The opening session took place in the Church of San Giovanni in Toro, recently restored but not yet consecrated. There were thirty-three participants, among them two Russians, V.M.Nasilov and E.Tenishiev. The Ravello meeting also inspired my remarkable Irish secretary Deirdre to write the following:

By the beaches of Naples you linger
Discussing ‘titles’ of yore
While I slave like a brave to prepare you
A Meeting like none before.
Four years have I thus laboured stoutly
So please bear in mind if you will
While I cannot be there in substance
My spirit is with you still.

With my tacit agreement she inserted this piece in the first issue of the PIAC Newsletter which came out in July 1966.

John Andrew Boyle convened our 10th meeting, held in Manchester June 26-30th 1967, in the course of which I was re-elected Secretary General for a further five years. Following the meeting, on July 10th I could write Boyle that “there is no doubt whatsoever that this was the most solemn meeting of the PIAC and fitted extremely well to our 10th anniversary.”

The 11th meeting - held in Hørsholm, Denmark in 1968 - was the first to be held under the presidency of a woman, Iben Meyer. It was also only the second meeting attended by Soviet scholars, both of high repute: V.I.Cincius, specialist in Tunguz linguistics and the Turcologist N.A.Baskakov. Cincius was to receive the PIAC Medal in 1971, Baskakov received his in 1980.

Before moving to weightier topics let me stop for the anecdotal. The appearance of Soviet colleagues was a great and happy surprise and I wondered how they managed to get permission to go to Denmark. Here is their story. Apparently, the invitation to the meeting included the word “Royal” - perhaps a reference to a royal academy? Cincius, a delightful, shy Russian lady, rushed with it to the responsible party apparatchik with the question of what was she to do about it, and with the statement that the last thing she wished to do was to go to Denmark. The bureaucracy was set into motion but there was no one willing to shoulder the responsibility to refuse the invitation of something “royal” coming from a neutral state such as Denmark. So she was ordered to go. Yes, but not without some reason, the bureaucracy did not trust the elderly lady completely, there was a danger - certainly not of desertion - but that she might not be a worthy, authoritative representative of the Soviet Union and of Socialist Scholarship. So, Baskakov, who also received an invitation, and who was a male, was also ordered to go to chaperon Vera Cincius. They both had a very good time.

The Hørsholm meeting was sponsored by a great Danish brewery, and there was a lavish reception at which the products of the sponsoring firm created, how best to put it, a very happy, relaxed atmosphere. I will never forget the sight of the Finn Räsänen, the Pole Zajączkowski, and the Russian Baskakov, holding high their steins, and singing at the top of their voices the old tsarist hymn, the anthem of the land in which the three of them were born. In looking and listening to them, I felt rewarded for my work in keeping the PIAC alive.

With no political ambitions of my own, I have tried as long as it was necessary to bridge over political differences, to bring together scholars irrespective of the political systems of their respective countries. Since the early 1950s I had done this quite successfully in the wider domains of the International Congresses of Orientalists (as they were formerly called) and was all the more eager to bring “communist” scholars into the PIAC because, as it happens, Russian, Hungarian, and Polish achievements in the Altaic studies are of the highest quality. This openness was reflected in the award of the PIAC medal. Of the first six medals awarded, three went to scholars working in socialist countries: one to a Mongol, two to Hungarians.

The breakthrough came from the least amenable socialist country and was the merit of the Hungarian Turcologist György Hazai then teaching in East Berlin. How he managed to convince the notoriously dogmatic and rigidly communist leadership of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR to invite the “American” PIAC to Berlin remains, for me, a mystery, and I can only hope that he will reveal the secret in his memoirs. Clearly, much skill, courage - and a sense of the adventurous - were needed even to think of such an act. It was in June 1968, when following the PIAC held in Hørsholm I was spending a few days in Hamburg, that Hazai’s invitation reached me, to come to East Berlin for an exploratory visit.

For the benefit of those unfamiliar with the warped mind-set characteristic of the Cold War warriors, again I must have recourse to an anecdote. At that time it was not yet legally possible to have several nationalities, and mine was French. Although I was a Permanent Resident of the USA, every time I was to visit a socialist country, before my departure, I was supposed to obtain permission from the Immigration and Naturalization Services to do so. It was a mere formality, to me the permission was never refused, but the fact was that in June 1968, in Hamburg, I did not have it since it had not been my intention to visit a socialist country that summer. So how should I go to East Berlin? With some experience in clandestine operations, I was willing to take the risk but only on condition that no stamp of the German Democratic Republic should appear in my passport. Let me be brief. I entered and exited by car the DDR, stayed in several hotels, all of them under rigorous police control, and my passport bore no trace of the excursion. On my return I had no problems with the American authorities. Hazai worked a small miracle, and we had real fun in this adventure.

One delicate point in need of preliminary clarification was the presence of West German scholars. I received assurances that no obstacles would be raised to their coming to
East Berlin and, indeed, some came, among them the incomparable Annemarie von Gabain, our beloved Maryam apa whom I first met in Berlin, in 1937. She was then an enthusiastic follower of Hitler but, with the passing time, no one reproached her this aberration. She had done no harm and her disarming openness about her work in the Frauenwerk was enough to forestall any criticism. Her political naivete was, indeed, touching. The PIAC coincided, almost to the day, with the centenary of Willy Bang’s birthday. Kononov assessed his place in Turcology and Maryam apa recalled her memories of her former teacher.

The meeting was one of the largest ever, perhaps around one hundred and fifty participants and, as could be expected, fairly formal. We did not stay under the same roof and dispersed for the meals, but we had one or several very generous receptions. On a purely scholarly level - perhaps because of massive Soviet participation - the 12th meeting was probably among the best ever held. The impressive volume of the Proceedings bears witness to this statement.

From the beginning, there was no French participation in the PIAC. The fact was noticed and deplored by Heissig, and it would need a separate essay for me to try to explain the probable causes of this absence. Be that as it may, five French colleagues appeared in Berlin and were delighted in meeting with so many people from behind the Iron Curtain. As a result of this late-born enthusiasm, the PIAC received an invitation to have its 13th meeting in Strasbourg. I, of course, was particularly happy since I hoped that it would mean a sort of homecoming and a renewal of ties with colleagues with whom I had studied.

For me it was a bitter disappointment that the 13th meeting, convened in Strasbourg in June 1970, turned out to be nothing short of a disaster. The president, Irene Melikoff - a charming lady with whom I used to sit together at Jean Deny’s classes - had no conception of what the PIAC was all about. The first and only meeting she had ever attended was the 12th meeting, run very much on conventional congress-lines, and this was to be the format also of the Strasbourg meeting. Also, seeing the extent of Soviet participation in Berlin, completely misjudging the political realities of the time, she took it for granted that Soviet scholars would be allowed to come to Strasbourg, moreover to a meeting presided over by a lady of Azerbaijani origin. Also, the theme she had chosen for the meeting “Traditions religieuses et para-religieuses des peuples altaïques” was in itself enough to keep away Soviet scholars on whose presence she had put great store. In Strasbourg the atmosphere among participants was not always friendly and there were some rather nasty discussions, not limited to purely scholarly matters. In the course of the meeting I received many vigorous complaints and quite a few members wrote me indignant letters, many of them containing useful suggestions on the future of our meetings. In the PIAC Newsletter No.8, (April 1971), I reproduced those written by, in alphabetic order, Hazai, Heissig, Hovdhaugen, Jahn, and Johansen. All of them advocated measures to limit the number of participants. I cite here Karl Jahn’s suggestion:

[denken wir daran] die Beschränkung der Teilnehmerzahl, dadurch zu erreichen, dass ausschliesslich Fachleute und durch diese empfohlene junge Forscher eingeladen werden.

In a most polite way, Walther Heissig, remarked that:

Nun ist die PIAC wieder zu einem grossen Kongress geworden und die eigentliche ursprüngliche Aufgabe ist völlig in den Hintergrund getreten.

Not just the “old hands” were dissatisfied with what they perceived as a development toward a “big congress syndrome.” Even Hovdhaugen, who described himself as “a young member of the PIAC”, went so far as to suggest that a committee should be established to decide who should be invited to the PIAC.

These and many other views and my personal experience has led me in years to come to find a common ground between the desirable and the feasible. Until today, invitations to the PIAC are not sent out on the basis of some address lists provided free or against payment by various organizations. Invitations go only to bona fide scholars who either attended a previous meeting or had been recommended by a former participant.

From these weighty matters let me pass briefly to some personal memories. In February 1970 I suffered a massive heart-attack and by the time of the meeting in Strasbourg I had not fully recovered and bore the tensions apparent during the meeting with less equanimity than I would have done so otherwise. There was also a painful incident, not directly connected with the PIAC. One of our foreign (non-French) participants had too many drinks in one of the night-spots of Strasbourg, and became obnoxious. On the arrival of the police he made the major mistake of physically resisting arrest. Of course, once at the commissariat, he was beaten up - not too severely but badly enough to carry the traces of the confrontation. It befell me to go to the police and negotiate his release by offering not to lodge a complaint against the police for their behavior. It was tough bargaining.

The following year the PIAC was moving to Hungary. Under the nominal presidency of Ligeti but effectively run by András Róna-Tas. Our next, the 14th, meeting was held in in Szeged. Róna-Tas had a difficult task, with the ever-cautious Ligeti - teacher of both of us -- looking over his shoulders. But, familiar with PIAC traditions, he acquitted himself of the task with real mastery.

I have no list of the participants but the finely produced Proceedings show that it was probably among the most “international” of meetings we have ever had. There was enough free socializing, good “confessions” – the real, essential hallmark of our meetings – and not too stuffy
formalities. Within the framework of our meeting, on August 24th a solemn session of the Kőrösi Csoma Society (the Hungarian Oriental Society) was held in the ceremonial hall of the József Attila University at which were elected Honorary Fellows of that society: N.A. Baskakov (USSR), Sir Gerard Clauson (Great Britain), T Gökbilgin (Turkey), and Denis Sinoz (USA).

I have so far a number of times mentioned the PIAC Newsletter. The time has now come to give some additional information. The idea of a modest publication filling the hiatus between two successive meetings came up at our 7th meeting in De Pietersberg (Holland) and then, in a more imperative form, the following year at the meeting held in Wahlischeid (German Federal Republic) with the Founding Father Walther Heissig as president. The first issue, a very modest-looking publication (those were pre-word processor times) appeared in July 1966. Since then, at a rhythm of more or less once a year, the Newsletter appeared, serving mainly the purpose of recording the history of the PIAC. Without these issues at my disposal this essay could not have been written.

Karl Jahn had retired, and moved from Utrecht to Vienna where, in the nearby Strebersdorf, he organized our 15th meeting (August 7-11, 1972). Among the participants were three coming from the Republic of China (Taiwan), a very welcome extension of our reach. By that time Soviet participation at our meetings had become routine. On a motion of Ane Nauta (the Netherlands) it was decided that invitations for future meetings should be sent out with the joint signatures of the President and the Secretary General. Before that time only the president (the convener of the meeting) signed the invitations. The decision was made to facilitate the keeping of the records. At the same time I was re-elected Secretary General for another term of five years.

An invitation issued by the Türk Kültürun Arastırma Enstitüsü was received for the 16th meeting to be held in Ankara, marking also the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the Republic of Turkey. The meeting was held October 21-26 under the presidency of the mongolist Ahmet Temir, and there was no lack of lavish receptions and official speeches. The invitation coming from Turkey was generally welcomed by our membership and also by myself. Turkish scholars had long been associated with the PIAC; four of them — including Ahmet Temir — were present already at the 2nd meeting. Regrettably, these PIAC members were swamped in Ankara by a multitude of Turkish scholars who used the occasion to read papers in Turkish to Turks on Turkish (not Turkic) subjects. There were about one hundred participants, far too many for the purposes of the PIAC, and far too many who took our meeting for an international congress of Turcologists. It should be noted that several of our Turkish colleagues voiced disapproval of this attitude.

The PIAC recovered its original format in the subsequent three meetings. The 17th (1974) convened by Walther Heissig met once again in the Rhineland, in Bad Honnep, the 18th (1975) returned to Bloomington, and the 19th (1976) convened in Helsinki under the presidency of Aulis J. Joki.

At our 20th meeting held August 15-19, 1977, in Leiden under the presidency of A.N. Nauta. I was re-elected Secretary General for another term of five years. In my introductory remarks to Newsletter No. 12 I remarked that, unlike the PIAC “I was not ‘permanent’ and that it would be advisable to pay some thoughts to the question of my succession.” My reelection may have reflected a “faute de mieux” philosophy. I also sustained with some vigor the necessity to keep the PIAC independent and that the Secretary General should “not be hampered by an international committee, notoriously difficult to run unless a costly administrative machinery is ready to cover the travel and telephone expenses caused by constant consultation.” I said it then and I am saying it now, all that is needed to run the PIAC is a middle-aged Secretary General with a secure home-base and ready to give priority to the PIAC. I have never missed one of our meetings.

For our 21st meeting (1978), John Andrew Boyle was again ready to shoulder the task of convening it in Manchester. A few months later, on November 19, 1978 he died unexpectedly. He was so much loved and respected by our membership that in 1979 he was posthumously awarded the PIAC medal, an unprecedented and until now unique honor.

On the initiative of Luc Kwanten, a Belgian by nationality teaching at the University of Chicago, for the 22nd meeting we once again moved to a “new” country namely Belgium. Under the nominal presidency of Charles Willemen, we gathered in Ghent, May 27 - June 2, 1973.

It is probably due to the peculiar charm of our meetings that people were not only willing to organize them but, after some years of rest and recuperation, they felt ready to shoulder the burden once again. On his retirement, Karl Jahn, founding member and convener of the 7th (1964) and 15th (1972) conferences, was ready to organize the 23rd meeting (1984) in Strebersdorf, near Vienna. Jahn and I were good friends and I have already referred to his inexhaustible storehouse of good jokes. Yet, in Strebersdorf we strongly disagreed on an issue which he envisaged from a political and I myself from a scholarly angle. The contentious issue was the presence of employees of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL).

Quite a few of my brighter students in the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies at Indiana University found employment with the violently anti-communist RFE/RL. In the years of the Cold War I had no sympathy with most of the activities of this organization but what these students were doing was research in contemporary Central Asian languages and area studies and I saw no reason to exclude them from our meetings. They were not involved in policy decisions. In any case, within the PIAC I have always been politically neutral. We were scholars bound by common scholarly interest,
irrespective of political views that some participants may have held or were supposed to hold. The argument could have been made that the presence of RFE/RL staff would cause grave inconvenience to participants coming from behind that Curtain which, as their presence at the PIAC clearly showed, was not all that impenetrable. Also, I could have said that any inconvenience they may have experienced on their return home - namely that they were in contact with "enemy agents" - was their problem, and could have washed my hands of. However, I did nothing of the sort, just asked these ex-students to behave with discretion. They followed my request and now - when all this lies way back in the past - it is clear that the apolitical stance I took caused harm to no one, and the openness of the PIAC suffered no restrictions.

Over the years, by tacit rather than formal agreement the "membership" in the PIAC was equated with "voting rights" in the election of the committee charged with awarding the PIAC medal. According to the resolution passed at the 5th meeting, this right was the privilege of those who had been present at a previous meeting of the PIAC and were present when the election was held. Eighteen years had passed since the wording of that resolution and there was a feeling that one previous presence over so many years did not attest to much interest in the activities of the PIAC and that voting rights should therefore not be given to such casual attendees. Gunnar Jarring with his rich diplomatic experience therefore proposed that henceforth three attendances (i.e. the presence at two previous meetings) would be the qualification required for voting. His proposal was adopted.

At Strebersdorf I had the pleasure of meeting Yuri Bregel, a Russian specialist of pre-modern Central Asia, who had recently emigrated to Israel. He offered to organize the 24th meeting. Of course, I was happy to follow up on his suggestion. The 24th meeting was held August 16-21, 1981, in Jerusalem with Yuri Bregel as president. It was a small meeting marked by excellent scholarship and great cordiality. The latter contrasted sharply with the rudeness of the Israeli passport control. The PIAC could "check off" another country.

This was done again the following year when in Uppsala, under the presidency of Gunnar Jarring assisted by Staffan Rosén, we celebrated twenty-five years of PIAC (1975, June 8-11). In a quarter of a century PIAC meetings were held in fifteen countries. With the award of the PIAC Medal, Jarring contrived a not very "constitutional" surprise. To mark the Silver Anniversary of the PIAC, two medals were awarded simultaneously to the two Secretaries General, namely to Walther Heissig and to myself. My term of office was again extended for a further five years, a period the end of which I did not expect to reach. My heart was in very bad shape indeed, and walking even for very short distances caused violent chest-pains. A couple of weeks following the PIAC, I underwent a quintuplet by-pass surgery - and I am still around to tell the tale. To continue on a further personal note, on receiving the award, I was jokingly telling Jarring that, back in Bloomington, I was then to hand over to myself the medal. But nothing of the sort happened. This very busy man - I think at that time he was still one of the Deputy Secretaries General of the United Nations - traveled to Bloomington for the sole purpose of handing me the medal. This was then done at a dinner, for me unforgettable, given by Indiana University’s then President, John Ryan. It should be noted that because the decision to whom the medal be given takes place during the meeting, the medal, with the recipient's name engraved on it, is usually sent by mail at a later date.

Luc Kwanten, who organized our 22nd meeting in his native country took upon himself to convene another PIAC, this time at his university. Convened by him, and sponsored by the University of Chicago, our 26th meeting was held, August 15 to 20, 1983. It was the third meeting to take place in the United States. Professor Shiro Hattori was awarded the PIAC Medal and I had the great pleasure of presenting it to him personally on the occasion of an "International Kuriltay" organized for that purpose in the Haseda Memorial Hall of Kyoto University on September 5, 1983.

The ceremony was held within the framework of the 31st International Congress of Orientalists (officially called the International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa) which attracted many Soviet scholars, and had far reaching consequences for our future. In Kyoto I met I. F. Vardul, a general linguist with strong interest in Altaic, and clearly a person with an open mind, and I approached him with the idea of having one of our next meetings in the Soviet Union. To my surprise, Vardul was quite aware of our existence and revealed to me that there had been some discussions in Moscow on the desirability of having a meeting organized in the Soviet Union. I even learned from him that questions had been raised concerning my personal history, specifically my Hungarian origin, Soviet scholars did not wish to appear to be cooperating with an "emigre", perhaps one not acceptable in Hungary. However, enquiries made in Hungary (by whom and with what sources?) have shown that I was persona grata there and thus the fear of hurting Hungarian political sensibilities was put to rest.

The 27th PIAC (1984, June 12-17) was held, under the presidency of Klaus Sagaster in the Dominican Monastery of Walberberg, near Köln. There was a central theme: "Religious and lay symbolism in the Altaic world." According to my notes, admittedly subjective, "it was the nicest PIAC ever held." Be that as it may, it was the first meeting with a participant from the People's Republic of China. His name was MA Yong and I got to know him on the international UNESCO Committee in charge of the production of the History of Civilizations of Central Asia. I had played a certain role in securing Chinese participation in this project, vehemently opposed by the Soviets, and Ma appreciated my help. A vociferous Maoist on the Committee, he would considerably mellow in private conversations. There was to be given a Saturday concert of classical music in the church of the
monastery and I asked him whether he would be interested in coming. He readily agreed. Next morning, I asked him whether he would like to come with me to Mass. He responded in the affirmative and when, as the Mass was said, I tried to explain to him the meaning of the liturgy, it turned out that he was quite familiar with its essential elements. Later he revealed to me that the PIAC allowed him to fulfil one of his dreams: before coming to Walberberg he could visit in nearby Bonn the house where Beethoven was born... How deep had this dream been buried in him during the horrors of the cultural revolution? I then thought that my labors on behalf of the PIAC had not been in vain if thanks to them Ma could visit Beethoven's birthplace. He died in 1985 at the early age of 51, and I remembered him in PIAC Newsletter 16 (1986).

In June 1984, shortly after the Walberberg PIAC, I was in Moscow, guest of the Institute of Linguistics of the Soviet Academy. The invitation was clearly initiated by Vardul and I was received with great cordiality. Much help was given by the Japanologist Alpatov who was to remain a stalwart supporter of the PIAC. I was dragged from office to office and met a great number of important people, among them Vadim Solntsev who at that time was head of the linguistic section of the Oriental Institute of the Soviet Academy. I had met him in 1982 in Mongolia, at the 4th International Congress of Mongolists, where we represented widely differing views. Since that time I had no personal contact with him but, thanks to Vardul and Alpatov he received me with good grace. During my stay in Moscow I gave several lectures, including one on my 1983 trip along the newly built Karakorum Highway linking Pakistan to China, a region of great interest and yet unknown to the Soviets. Before my arrival, I had an invitation to Kazan but, with some typical Soviet excuse, the trip had to be canceled and replaced by a visit to Uzbekistan and Azerbaijan, all courtesy of the Academy. I was shepherded by a charming and efficient young man called Sasha Barulin with whom I lost touch. With hindsight it would appear that, having made my round of “important persons” in Moscow, they were in need of some time to exchange their impressions and agree on a course to follow. There is no need to recount here the details of my trip but it belongs to this story that I had long and very constructive conversations with some members of the Uzbek Academy, who were well aware of my administrative work at Indiana University. Several of my students had already visited and stayed in Tashkent. To use a fashionable term, the chemistry was good. So must have been the impression communicated by my new Uzbek friends to Moscow. On July 18, during a very pleasant dinner in his home, Solntsev informed me that he was ready to organize our 29th meeting in Tashkent and would make the definite commitment in May 1985.

In 1985, after an absence of nineteen years, the PIAC returned to Italy. This time it was Venice. At our 26th meeting in Chicago appeared Andrea (András) Csillaghy, a professor at the Università degli Studi of Venice. Delightful in his manners, he confessed to much interest in Altaic studies. He reappeared at Walberberg and invited us to Venice for the 28th PIAC. Of course I was delighted, because since the death of Bombaci we had almost no Italian contact. It remains a mystery to me why Csillaghy took upon himself the task of organizing this meeting, the last at which he ever participated. Years later I met him, always charming, in Udine where he had moved. The Proceedings of the meeting were then published by Giovanni Stary.

Solntsev came to our meeting in Venice and clearly enjoyed it. I was not surprised that he was willing to shoulder the burden of organizing the next meeting. The difficulties he had to overcome were enormous, political as well as technical. On the political level the problems were caused, or so it seemed to me, not so much by Soviet-Western relations but rather with the care that had to be taken not to hurt Uzbek sensibilities. On the technical level one must remember that those were days without e-mail or fax, the telephone connections were utterly unreliable and an exchange of correspondence between Bloomington and Moscow could easily take two months. I know less about the negotiations between Russians and Uzbeks. The end result was that our 29th meeting took place in Tashkent, September 15-21, under the joint sponsorship of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Linguistics of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences. Vadim Solntsev was the president. The central theme of the meeting was “Historical and cultural contacts between the peoples of the Altaic linguistic unity.”

An article by me, entitled “Prolegomeny k 29j sessii PIAC” was published in a special issue of Uzbek tili va adabieti (1986,4). In it, as well as in my opening speech, partly in English, partly in Russian, I emphasized that scholarship must be international as well as supranational. Not a very original thought, yet one that had been seldom expressed in Tashkent. To my chagrin most of the Turkish participants used the occasion to emphasize the notion of the brotherhood linking all Turkic people. Whatever it may mean, I have no quarrel with this undeniable “brotherhood,” but such matters - I thought then and I am thinking now - should not intrude into PIAC gatherings.

In a lighter vein, let me switch to an anecdote which may help in evoking the difficulties in running the meeting. As already mentioned, the committee which decides on the award of the Indiana University Prize in Altaic Studies is elected through a secret ballot cast by those entitled to vote. Our Uzbek members were reluctant to believe that this was really the case and through the intermediary of Solntsev they kept asking for “instructions” on how to vote. Then suddenly the emphasis shifted, and a slightly flustered Solntsev informed me that the local scholars would very much take it amiss if the new committee would not include one of them. What should we do he asked. Well, so went my reply, let us bring some Chicagostyle electoral technique to a Soviet-style election. The result
satisfied everyone, and an Uzbek scholar was duly elected. The solution was simple. The number of “electors” is relatively small and each of them has to write three names on the ballot. Unavoidably, the votes are scattered among many names. So, through buttonholing as many electors as I could and suggesting that one of their votes should be cast in favor of X, the gentleman was duly elected, Uzbek honor was saved and Solntsev’s authority further strengthened. Of course it was for the first and last time that I was lobbying for a candidate.

I have always attached great importance to involving Soviet scholars in the work of the PIAC. In my opening speech in Tashkent I publicly stated the reason for this. “In the field of Altaic studies, in the study of the present and the past of Central and Inner Asia, Soviet scholarship holds a special place. Much of what has been the history of Altaic people happened on the territory now united in the Soviet Union.”

In 1987, for its 30th meeting the PIAC returned to its headquarters at Indiana University in Bloomington. There were fifty-four participants from thirteen countries, and I was re-elected Secretary General for yet another five-year term. Not surprisingly, American participation was quite high (25) but most of them were local people. More importantly, we could bring to Bloomington four colleagues from the PRC. Slowly the bamboo-curtain was lifting.

This may be an appropriate place to say a word on PIAC finances. Ever since 1962, Indiana University generously supported the basic needs for office supplies, postage, and secretarial help. It was the presidents’ task to provide the means for the meeting he had accepted to convene. For the majority of the membership, resident in Europe, the travel expenses to any meeting held elsewhere (e.g. Israel, the USA, or the USSR) were prohibitive. Also, until about the great political changes of 1989-1990, colleagues from the Socialist countries found it difficult to obtain the necessary foreign currencies to cover their travel expenses. From the mid-1970s, permission to travel was readily granted at least in Hungary and Poland. The task to find funding for the meeting has always been the responsibility of the President who recouped a large part of the expenses from the fees charged to the participants. The largest part of the subsidies received was used to cover the travel expenses of, and to offer hospitality to, the participants coming from socialist countries. Also, it has become the tradition to consider the immediate past-President and the Secretary General guests of the meeting.

Socialist countries where Altaic studies were well represented reciprocated the hospitality offered to their scholars abroad by inviting the PIAC. For reasons difficult to understand, over the course of the years, only Poland has made no such gesture, while in 1988 the German Democratic Republic was ready to receive us for the second time. Under the presidency of Hans-Peter Vietze, the 31st meeting was held in Weimar, at that time within the DDR. The Humboldt University of Berlin and the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR sponsored the meeting. Soon after both these institutions were to undergo tremendous changes.

In 1989, under the presidency of Bernt Brendemoen, the 32nd meeting met in Oslo, adding thus Norway to the ever-lengthening list of countries where we had been received. Baskakov, the great Russian Turkologist, unable to come, sent the text of a facetious “Hymn of the PIAC” with text and music composed by himself. The piece prompted Ahmet Temir to prepare a Turkish variant of the text. If eyebrows are raised to see such trifles mentioned in what should be a serious history of the PIAC, the appropriate response is that such lighthearted matters are part of the very core of this unusual gathering of serious scholars.

After Oslo, in 1990 the meeting, our 33rd, returned to Hungary, this time to Budapest, under the presidency of Alice Sárközi, the first lady-president since our meeting in 1968. She found her way with great skill in the maze of Hungarian life changing from a socialist regime, well, to another. The central theme of the meeting was “Altaic Religious Beliefs and Practices.” Sárközi handed the torch to Barbara Kellner-Heinkele, who presided over our 34th meeting, held in Berlin in 1991. With the recent unification of Germany and the fall of the “Berlin Wall” the circumstances were widely different from those that had obtained at our last meeting held in that town (12th meeting, 1969). It was a pleasure to see German scholars formerly from East and West mingling freely. Also, one felt bound to recall the splendid Altaistic traditions represented by that city where such scholars as Bang, Le Coq, F. W. K. Müller, Annemarie von Gabain, Erich Haenisch, to mention but a few of the great, had been active. The central theme of the meeting was “The concept of sovereignty in the Altaic world.”

East Asian scholars attended PIAC meetings right from the beginning but because of the travel expenses involved their attendance record was rather poor. To compensate, regional meetings were organized. The initiative was that of Japanese colleagues who organized the so-called Mojiri-Lake Quriltay, the Junior Altaists’ Meeting in Japan. To the best of my knowledge, the third of these meetings, held in July 1976 decided to establish an East Asian Altaistic Conference (EEAC), not in competition with, but as a complement to the PIAC.

The first Secretary General of this EAAC was Nobuo Yamada and the meetings were held yearly, probably in Japan. The 4th meeting, however, took place in Taiwan, in 1971. I was invited to attend as “academic advisor” and was greatly impressed by the dynamism of the two organizers, Sechin Jagchid and Ch’ en Chieh-hsien. The latter was responsible also for the organization of the 5th meeting of the East Asian Altaistic Conference, held in Taipei December 26, 1979 - January 2, 1980.

Our Taiwanese colleagues were showing increasing interest in developing what they called China Border Area Studies and several of them, but principally Jagchid and Ch’ en became, at least since 1976, regular participants at our
meetings. While aware of the extraordinary financial and political difficulties which the organization of a PIAC meeting in the Republic of China had to overcome, I urged them to shoulder the task. Ch’en Chieh-hsien performed miracles, and our 35th meeting (1992) was held in Taipei. To the pleasure of all and the surprise of some, several scholars from the People’s Republic of China attended. Once again it appeared that, in its limited field of interest, the PIAC could serve as a bridge between opposing political forces. The meeting was organized under the joint sponsorship of the National Taiwan University and the Center for Chinese Studies Materials of the United Daily News Cultural Foundation and the subsidies allowed for the offer of the air-fare to every bona-fide PIAC member who wished to attend. At this meeting I was re-elected Secretary General of the PIAC for a further five years.

I would have preferred that our next meeting be held at a place with easier access for our members (we could have come back to Europe) but a unique opportunity presented itself to hold our 36th (1993) meeting in Alma-Ata (as it was then called) in Kazakhstan. E.Z. Kakhibeck (Erden Kazhibekov), director of the Center for Oriental Studies of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences, became the president of the meeting sponsored by the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The merit of brokering the arrangement belonged to Dimitri Vasilev, Vice-President of the Association of Orientalists of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Associaicja Vostokovedov RAN). The logistical difficulties in organizing the meeting were considerable, most of the correspondence had to go through Moscow, and the fax connections were unreliable at best. Those were pre-e-mail days. The news of the meeting held at what, at that time, was considered a fairly exotic place brought out from the woodwork a strange assortment of people who, in years past, had shown no interest in the PIAC and, to the benefit of our members, after the meeting, disappeared from our horizon. On a personal level, the highlight of my stay was a delightfully long lunch, lasting til evening, at the home of Smet Kenesbaev, Nestor of Kazakh linguistics.

After an absence lasting almost a quarter of a century, in 1994 the PIAC returned to France. With Jean Richard as our president, we had our 37th meeting in Chantilly, near Paris. The central theme was “L’Eurasie Centrale et ses contacts avec le monde occidental.”

By that time the PIAC had met in nineteen countries. Hidehiro Okada, who with his wife Junko Miyawaki had attended a great many of our previous meetings, made sure that Japan should become the twentieth country to offer hospitality to the PIAC. Under his presidency, the 38th meeting could convene for the first time in a country that had done so much for the development of Altaic studies. The meeting was held in Kawasaki, near Tokyo, August 7-12, 1995. It was most unfortunate that, the same year but prior to our meeting, passed away two great Japanese Altaicists, Shiro Hattori (1908-1995) and Shichiro Murayama (1908-1995).

The following year, in 1996, for its 39th annual meeting the PIAC was back in Hungary, in the city of Szeged, site of our 14th meeting. This time our president was Árpád Berta. The central theme was “Historical and linguistic interaction between Inner Asia and Europe,” a topic most appropriate for a year in which Hungarians celebrated the 1100th anniversary of the conquest of their country. It was our third meeting held in Hungary. I could not help smiling when I noticed the efforts made by our hosts to avoid the use of the word “conquest” - deemed politically incorrect.

The 40th anniversary of the PIAC was celebrated in Provo (Utah) in the United States of America, June 2-6 1997, David B. Honey being president. The central theme was “Altaic affinities: historical, cultural, and linguistic.” At the Business Meeting, after considerable discussion, it was unanimously decided to change the rule governing voting rights at our meetings. The rule adopted at our 23rd meeting whereby voting rights were held by those present at a given meeting who attended at least three previous PIAC conferences, was amended. Henceforth, only those participants who had attended at least three previous conferences held in at least two different countries would have voting rights at any given meeting. The justification for this change lay in the fact that in the long history of the PIAC some countries hosted more than three meetings, and it could well be that some participants attended only those held in their own country. While welcome at the meetings, it was felt that such occasional participants, with very limited experience, and possibly little interest in the workings of the PIAC, should have no voting rights. For better or for worse, I was once again re-elected Secretary General for a term of five years.

In 1998, for our 41st meeting, under the presidency of Juha Janhunen, we gathered once again in Helsinki, our venue in 1963 and 1976. The 42nd meeting was held in Prague, in the Czech Republic, a country which the PIAC had never visited before. The meeting was sponsored by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) and our president was Charles Carlson. Times, indeed, had changed. I have mentioned above the difficulties I had in 1984 admitting to the PIAC scholars who worked for that organization. For the 43rd meeting, in 2000, the PIAC returned to Belgium where we last met in 1979. Our president was Alois van Tongerloo who lodged us in the most pleasing little Chateau of Pietersheim, near Lanaken. The central theme was “Life and Afterlife and Apocalyptic Concepts in the Altaic World” and the meeting was dedicated to the memory of two Founding Fathers of Altaic Studies connected with Belgium: Charles de Harlez de Lanaken. The central theme was “Historical and linguistic aspects of the conquest of the Republic of Kazakhstan.”

The 44th meeting was something of a “homecoming.” It was held in the Rhineland where the PIAC originated, to be specific, in the Dominican Monastery of Walberberg where we had our 27th meeting, back in 1984. Veronika Veit was our president and it was with the greatest of pleasure that participants could greet Walther Heissig, the Founding Father of the PIAC. Under the presidency of Alice Sárközi the 45th
meeting was held, once again, in Budapest where we last met in 1990. It sounds somewhat unbelievable but I was re-elected Secretary General. Were I to see the end of my term, I would be ninety-one. I strongly suggest that senior members of the PIAC should pay more attention than I think they do to the question of my succession. I have done my best to ensure the orderly transfer of the PIAC database and have taken some steps that Indiana University should continue the lovely tradition of awarding the Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies.

So, I told my story, as unpretentiously as I could, as unpretentiously as behooves the scholarly circle of like-minded people who, once a year, gather to renew old acquaintances and welcome new friends. That in doing so the PIAC could transcend political divisions separating countries and political systems, that it could give some help to beleaguered colleagues in permanent need of justification in their academic surroundings, was a welcome by-product of this activity.

The history of the PIAC is a happy one; frictions have been rare and never heated. I am deeply grateful to all those colleagues to whom I usually refer as “nevertheless friends” for their continuing confidence and, dare I say, their affection manifested so often in so many ways. And my very sincere gratitude goes to generations of administrators of my marvelous Indiana University which sheltered and, indirectly or directly, financed the PIAC since 1962. Collectively they deserve the “Indiana University Prize for Altaic Studies” which should continue to be awarded long after I am gone.

Notes
1. PIAC Newsletter No.3 (1968), p.3. For reasons of public relations, in the course of the years, the title “chairman” was replaced by that of “president.”
4. The first twenty-nine congresses, beginning with 1873, went under the name of “International Congress of Orientalists.” At the 29th gathering, held in Paris in 1973, a highly politicized French-dominated Advisory Committee changed the name to the impossibly clumsy and grammatically incorrect “International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and Africa.” At the 31st Congress, under the wise presidency of Tatsuro Yamamoto, common-sense prevailed, and the name was changed to “International Congress for Asian and North African Studies” (ICANAS).
5. In a most kind and generous piece written on the occasion of my 85th birthday (“Denis Sinor. Yubiley uchenogo”) Al'taica V. Institut Vostokovedeniya RAN, 2001, pp.9-13) Professor Alpatov describes this visit and the subsequent Tashkent PIAC from a different point of view.
6. The original English text was reproduced later in PIAC Newsletter 17 (1987), pp.4-8
7. The texts of the papers read in Turkish by Turkish participants in Tashkent appeared in Türk dili araştırmaları yıllığı Belleten 1986 (appeared in 1988).
8. Published in PIAC Newsletter 19 (1990), pp.9-19, and reproduced on pages 28 and 29 of this newsletter.
12. See PIAC Newsletter 26 (1999), p.3. Because of an unfortunate misprint, the Provo meeting is mentioned as the 47th (and not correctly the 40th).

ALTAICA I-VI
In 1997, Russian members, friends (in this context the words are synonymous) of the PIAC working in the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences produced a neat volume entitled Al'taica. It was “dedicated to the 40th Anniversary of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference.” Until now five more volumes of sbornik statej i materialov followed, one per annum, vol.V (2001) being dedicated to Denis Sinor on the occasion of his 85th birthday.

The volumes are co-edited by V.M. Alpatov, E.V. Boikova, and D.D. Vasil'ev. Articles written in Russian are followed by an English summary. They cover the whole gamut of Altaic studies and represent the results of serious research. The publication can be ordered from: Institut Vostokovedeniya RAN, 103031 Moskva GSP, ul. Rozhdestvenka 12, Russia.
Гимн ПИАК-а

1. Высокого Алтая горы -
Праэдика и рубиокон,
Алтайских всех народов сборы
Объединяет шесть племен:

2. Монголов, тунгусов, корейцев
И тюрков всех воюют,
Маньчжуров дальней и японцев
В одну Алтайскую семью.

3. Не все согласны алтайцы
С Алтайской теорией,
Есть ортодоксы, скептицисты,
Ностратики с фанталией.

4. Швед Стразденберг, наш узник пленна,
Шот, Кемет, Винклер и Рамостедт,
Трунд и Гронцеля, Кастрина -
Алтайский септет.

5. Бомбачи, Лигаты, Минорский,
Владимирков и Рялмнен,
Санжареев, Котвич, Зайончковский,
Дени, Ван, Поппе, Клоусон/en/.

6. Всех наших классиков Алтая
И всех живущих ныне - нас
ПИАК ведь всех объединяет
В Алтайский Парис.

7. Хельсинки, Манчестер истрас,
И Штрембердорф и Акжа,
Ерусалим, Хорогольм и Гамбург -
ПИАК-а сессий города.

8. Ташкент, Чикаго, Осако, Сегад,
И Упсал и Блумингтон,
Гент, Литербейр, Вержин и я.
Не перечислить всех сторон.

9. **Vivat!** ПИАК-а переменный
По каждой Сессии главарь
И Денис Широк непременный
Наш генеральный секретарь.

10. **Vivat!** ПИАК-а орган славный,
И м каждый алтайский город
**Vivat!** журнал, редактор главный
"Ньюсlette" и Карина Форд !

22 мая 1969 года
Интернациональной
Посвящается Постоянной Алтайской Конференции

Приложение - Ноты гимна на одном листе.
INTERNATIONAL DUNHUANG PROJECT (IDP)

Following a meeting in 1993 of curators and conservators from the National Library of China, the British Library, the National Museum, New Delhi, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the Institute of Oriental Studies in St.Petersburg and the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, the International Dunhuang Project (IDP) was established with the aim of promoting the study and preservation of these manuscripts through international collaboration.

In order to make the manuscripts more accessible it was decided to design a cataloguing database which would be made freely available on the web with high quality color images. By 2001 the database has grown to 30,000 manuscripts and 15,000 images. The images show the entire manuscript - both front and back, and even areas where there is no text - at larger than actual size and with a clarity which makes the images at least as legible as the originals.

For further details about IDP contact:
Kate Hampson
The International Dunhuang Project
The British Library
96 Euston Road
London NW1 2DB.
E-mail: <kate.hampson@bl.uk> Online database: <http://idp.bl.uk>


PAPERS ON INNER ASIA

The Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies of Indiana University publishes a series entitled 'Papers on Inner Asia'. It consists of scholarly papers of variable size (from 20 to 100 pages), each published and bound separately. Inner Asia is defined as the region that includes Islamic Central Asia (the areas sometimes called Western, Eastern, and Afghan Turkestan), Mongolia, and Tibet. The papers deal with various topics related to this vast region: history, philology, linguistics, anthropology, archeology, economics, contemporary problems, and so on. Works on certain subjects that transcend the boundaries of Inner Asia in its strict sense, but are relevant for the study of its languages, history and culture, are also included, for instance, the ancient and medieval history, etc. of the peoples of the East European steppes, or the modern history of Afghanistan.

The series is divided into the following subseries: (1) General; (2) Ancient Inner Asia; (3) Central Asia; (4) Mongolia, Manchuria, and Tibet (5) Altaic linguistics.

The series 'Papers on Inner Asia' is designed to ensure prompt publication of scholarly papers and to facilitate the publication of papers, which are too long to be accepted by most scholarly journals. As a rule, no stylistic editing is done, with possible exceptions for papers written in a language other than the author's native tongue. After the manuscript submitted for publication is reviewed, it is returned to the author whose responsibility is to prepare a camera-ready copy of the text in accordance with technical requirements set up by the Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, which undertakes to publish the paper within one month after the receipt of the camera-ready copy.

All correspondence related to the 'Papers on Inner Asia' (requests for the copies of the technical requirements, proposals of papers for publication, submission of manuscripts, orders for single papers and standing orders) should be addressed to:
The Editor, 'Papers on Inner Asia' Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, Indiana University, Goodbody Hall 344, 1011 East Third Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7005, U.S.A.
The price of individual copies is $5.50 for papers up to 50 pages in length and $6.50 for papers of 51-100 pages. Postage determined by weight and country of destination. Specify Economy Letter Post or Airmail Letter Post for overseas shipments.

Titles published during the last ten years:
23. A. Burton, Bukharan Trade 1558-1718. 117 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 1993. $6.50
24. A. Mukhtarov (Translated from Russian by R. D. McChesney with Nadia Jamal and Michael Lustig), BALKH in the late Middle Ages. 110 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 1993. $6.50
27. A. Frank, The Siberian Chronicles and the Taybughid Biys of Sibir’. 26 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 1994. $5.50

PAPERS ON INNER ASIA SPECIAL SUPPLEMENT [No. 1] Historical Central Asia
Maps (11 maps from the 9th to the 19th Century prepared by Yuri Bregel) In either a loose-leaf set in a sturdy portfolio or in a tape-bound set.
2000. $13.95.
33. D. Prior, Patron, Party, Patrimony, Notes on the Cultural History of the Kirghiz Epic Tradition, 46 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 2000. $5.50
34. Y. Bregel, The Administration of Bukhara Under the Manghists and Some Tashkent Manuscripts, 36 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 2000. $5.50
35. V. Trepavlov, The Formation and Early History of the Manghit Yurt, 55 pp. (Subseries: Central Asia) 2001. $6.50
SELECTED PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE BY THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY

FOR A COMPLETE LISTING OF OUR PUBLICATIONS, PLEASE CONTACT THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY OFFICE

MONGOLIAN STUDIES: JOURNAL OF THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY (Selected volumes)
Volume II, 1975, 163 pages.
Volume V, 1978-9, 121 pages.
25th Anniversary Issue
Volume XX, 1997, 173 pages

MONGOLIA SURVEY (A periodical replacing Newsletter, n.s., with similar, expanded content.) (Selected Issues)
Issue Four, 1997, 73 pages.

THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY OCCASIONAL PAPERS (Selected Issues)
Number Sixteen, 1995, Mongol Oral Narratives, Gods, Tricksters, Heroes & Horses. 83 pages. Folktales from Inner Mongolia
Number Twenty-two (Fall, 2000) Tömörin Namjin, edited by William V. Rozycki, The Economy of Mongolia From Traditional Times to the Present. A comprehensive work on the Mongolian economy, with data never before revealed about the Socialist years. Written by a doctor of economics who rose to ministerial level in the Socialist period, the book includes an inside view of both the achievements and mistakes of that era, and also describes the traditional herding economy, as well as the rocky road of transition to the current market economy. 118 pages $30.00
Number Twenty-three (Spring, 2001) Francis W. Cleaves. An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao ching (the book of filial piety) Chapters 7-8-9, 10-17. The present chapters 7-9 represent the final ones prepared by the late Prof. Cleaves. Chapters 10-17 consist solely of the transcription and translation. 131 pages. $15.00

THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY SPECIAL PAPERS. Text in Old Script Mongolian (Selected Issues)
Issue Seven (Fall, 1978). Thirteen Kalmyk-Oirat Tales from the Bewitched Corpse Cycle. Text, glossary, translation; compiled by John R. Krueger. 119 pages.
Issue Thirteen. Early Kalmyk Primers and Other Schoolbooks. Samples from Textbooks 1925-1930. Preface and selection by György Kara. Among the nations of the Russian Federation, the Kalmyks had the most laborious experiments with writing systems. Since the October Revolution their Western Mongol language has seen at least six reforms of orthography. The extracts reproduced in this publication are taken from four Moscow publications as examples of the different Cyrillic and Romanized orthographies that have been used. Also contains readings and illustrations depicting Kalmyk life and tradition. 133 pages.
Issue Fourteen (Spring, 2001). Journal of the Lamas. Text in Tibetan and Mongolian scripts, with an introduction in English by Stephane Grivelet. A journal put out by the Mongolian government in the 1930s to propagate its policies to the large lama population. Written partially in Mongolian script and partially in Mongolian written in Tibetan letters. 86 pages. $20.00

DICTIONARIES (See list of publications for complete listing of dictionaries.)
Concise Mongol-English and English-Mongol Dictionary, by William V. Rozycki. The only Mongol-English and English-Mongol dictionary in one book. Over 5000 words and phrases. Excellent for students and travelers. 4.5 x 8 inches in size. 68 pages. $20.00
Mongolian-English Dictionary, by Ferdinand D. Lessing, et al. The largest and most comprehensive work of its kind, in a corrected reprinting of 1,246 pages. The dictionary is back to its original 85 x 11 size, and contains all three scripts, i.e., Old Script Mongolian, Cyrillic, and English. Special Members Price. $95.00 Non-members price $120.00
English-Mongolian Dictionary by D. Altangerel, 1998. This new English to Mongolian dictionary contains more than 30,000 entries, 6,636 examples, 4, 248 phrases, and 350 illustrations. 581 pages. Comes in an easy to carry 4.5 x 7 inch, pocket size. $40.00
A Modern Mongolian-English Dictionary by D. Altangerel, 1998. A new Mongolian to English dictionary with over 16,000 new words and phrases, including the latest up-to-date vocabulary, with clear, simple definitions. Comes in an easy to carry 4.5 x 7 inch pocket size. 654 pages. $40.00

FOR A COMPLETE LISTING OF OUR PUBLICATIONS, PLEASE CONTACT THE MONGOLIA SOCIETY OFFICE
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LANGUAGE LEARNING AIDS (Selected Issues)

*Sain Baina uu? Mongolian Language Textbook One*, 2002, L. Tserenchunt and Sharon Luethy. This is a grammar-based textbook to assist you in learning basic Mongolian, which is a grammatically complex language. Comes with one cassette tape. 303 pages. $60.00

**Basic Course in Mongolian**, 1968, John G. Hangin. This book comprises an introduction to the Mongolian language. Emphasis has been placed on giving the student spoken command of the language. $30.00

**Basic Course in Mongolian** is also available on nine cassette tapes. $50.00

**Intermediate Mongolian**, John G. Hangin. This is a textbook for second-year students in modern Mongolian. 379 pages. $85.00

**Intermediate Mongolian** is also available on three cassette tapes. $25.00

**Mongolian Grammar**, by Rita Kullmann and D. Tserenpil. A complete grammar of the Mongolian language, written with a new, indigenous approach, featuring Cyrillic Script, Classical Mongolian Script, and English Explanations. This grammar is relevant and recommended for both learners and researchers of the Mongolian language. 447 pages. $60.00

**An Introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian**. New Edition 1994. Kaare Gronbech and John R. Krueger. This book presents a brief and practical introduction to classical and literary Mongolian, especially for those who may pursue their study unaided. 100 pages. $45.00


ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR SALE

**Women of Mongolia** by Martha Avery. 1996. This book contains a colorful, and extremely informative description of the changes and continuities in the lives of Mongolian women. 187 pages. $20.00

**The Last Mongol Prince: The Life and Times of Demchugdondrub, 1902-1966**, by Sechin Jagchid (Western Washington University Vol. 21; 1999). A deeply admiring biography of the last descendant of Chinggis Khan to play an active role in 20th-Century Mongolian politics and Sino-Japanese-Mongol relations by an active participant in the events he recounts. 500 pages, ill., maps, bibliography, index. $50.00

**Mongolia's Wild Heritage: Biological Diversity, Protected Areas, and Conservation in the Land of Chinggis Khan**, C Finch ed. 1996. (Avery Press) This book provides an overview of the natural history of Mongolia and recent conservation efforts. In color with several photos and maps. $20.00

**Modern Mongolia, A Concise History**, compiled under the auspices of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences (Ulaanbaatar, 1996). This book traces the history of 20th-Century Mongolia beginning from 1911 and closing with the events of the July 1996 elections. 128 pages, 2 maps, 22 photos. $20.00

**Mongolian Portrait** by Andy Pax. Travel with Andy as he spends a year in Mongolia exploring its outer regions as no other photographer has, as he takes in the excitement of life in Mongolia. 70 color photographs in a 64 page book. $25.00

**Information Mongolia**, compiled under the auspices of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences. The work of the foremost experts in many disciplines and spheres of activity. Information Mongolia is the most extensive English language reference work on Mongolia yet to appear. The text is liberally illustrated with both black & white and full color illustrations. Detailed maps, tables, and diagrams augment the contributions on geography and the economy. An indispensable source of information, not only for the scholar with a specific interest in Mongolian history and culture, but also for the businessman, policy maker, and the general reader. 19 maps, 505 pages. $100.00

**Two Friends, Mongolian Tales**, translated and edited by B. Khurelbat. This book contains twenty delightful folktales from Mongolia (in English), including Erkhiy Mergen, Two Friends, and The Legend of Tarvaa. 88 pages.$10.00


**General Reading List for Mongolia**. 2000. The editors have selected material in English and, with a few exceptions, books which many libraries might have or which could easily be borrowed through interlibrary loan systems from your public library. Both popular items and scholarly works are represented. The list is not complete, but covers a wide range of topics. 16 pages. $5.00

**Mongolian Colouring Book** by the National Museum in Denmark. English explanations for each page of drawings. $12.00

**Mongolian Bible** by the Mongolian Bible Translation Committee. 2000. A new translation in Cyrillic script. 400 pages. Hardbound on five CDs $60.00

**Mongolian Grammar** is also available on nine cassette tapes. $50.00

**Mongolian Bible** is also available on three cassette tapes. $25.00

**Tuvan Manual** is also available on three cassette tapes. $25.00

**Watercolors**. Beautiful watercolors, hand painted in Mongolia, depicting various Mongolian scenes, i.e., gers on the steppe, livestock, Mongolian landscapes, in every day life. Small watercolors: matted, approximately 7 x 5 inches $10.00

Medium watercolors: matted, approximately 9 x 5 inches $15.00

OFFICIAL MONGOLIAN FLAG from the United Nations, in the traditional colors—red and blue with yellow design, measuring 11 inches tall. Comes complete with stand. $8.00

**Mongolian Maps**. Maps are 38" by 20" in size. This map is **ALL** in English with Ulaanbaatar on one side and the country of Mongolia on the other. Comes complete with new Aimag, street names, nature preserves, etc. Printed in 1998. $20.00

**Traditional Mongolian HATS**, male and female. $20.00

To place an order, please contact The Mongolia Society, 322 Goodbody Hall, Indiana University, 1011 E. 3rd. St., Bloomington, IN 47405-7005 Telephone #: (812)855-4078; FAX #: 812-855-7500

E-Mail: <monsoc@indiana.edu> Or visit our Website: www.indiana.edu/~monsoc