

Western Congregational Mosque in Dunaysir because it was an appointment of the ruler's (*wilāya sulṭāniyya*).

### Abbreviations

GAL = Brockelmann (1937–1949).

TD = *Ta'riḫ Dunaysir*.

### References

- Baski, Imre (1986): *A Preliminary Index to Rásonyi's Onomasticon turcicum*. (Debter – Deb-ther – Debtelin, Materials for Central Asiatic and Altaic Studies 6) Budapest.
- Bosworth, C. E. (1996): *The New Islamic Dynasties. A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*. Edinburgh.
- Bosworth, C. Edmund (2005): Studies on the Jazīra – I. Some Fragments on the History of Medieval Islamic Harrān. In: Alexander P. S. et alii (eds): *Studia Semitica. The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*, JSS Supplement, Vol. 16, Oxford, pp. 213–221.
- Brockelmann, C. (1937–1949): *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*. Leiden.
- Cahen, Claude (1934): La Djazira au milieu du treizième siècle d'après 'Izz ad-din ibn Chaddad. *REI* VIII, p. 127.
- Cahen, Claude (1940): *La Syrie du nord au temps des Croisades*. Paris.
- Canard, M. (1951): *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdanides*. I. Algiers.
- Chabot, J.-B. (ed. and French tr.) (1899–1924): *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*. Paris.
- Eddé, Anne-Marie (1994): Sources arabes des XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles d'après le dictionnaire biographique d'Ibn al-Adīm (*Buḡyat al-ṭalab fī ta'riḫ Ḥalab*). In Curiel, Raoul–Gyselen, Ryka (eds): *Itinéraires d'Orient. Hommages à Claude Cahen*. (Res Orientales VI) Bures-sur-Yvette, pp. 305–306.
- Elisséeff, N. (1967): *Nūr ad-Dīn. Un grand prince musulman de Syrie au temps des Croisades (511–569H./1118–1174)*. Damascus.
- Fiey, J. M. (1977): *Nisibe, metropole syriaque orientale*. (CSCO, Subsidia 54) Leuven.
- Ibn Jubayr (1907): *Rihla*. Ed. W. Wright, 2nd revised ed. M. J. de Goeje. (Gibb Memorial Series, V.) Leiden. French tr. M. Gauthier-Demombynes (1959): Ibn Jobair. *Voyages. Documents relatifs à l'histoire des Croisades*. IV. Paris; English tr. R. J. C. Broadhurst (1952): *The Travels of Ibn Jubair*. London.
- Le Strange, G. (1905): *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*. Cambridge.
- Rosenthal, F. (1968): *A History of Muslim Historiography*. 2nd revised ed. Leiden.
- Şafadī (1988): *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*. Vol. XXII. Ed. Ramzī Ba'albakkī. Damascus.
- Sam'ānī (1382–1402/1962–1982): *Kitāb al-Ansāb*. Ed. M. 'Abd al-Mu'īd Khān et alii. Hyderabad, Dn.
- Yāqūt (1374–1376/1955–1957): *Mu'jam al-buldān*. Beirut.

## SOME REMARKS ON THE *CHIH-YÜAN I-YÜ* 至元譯語 ALIAS *MENG-KU I-YÜ* 蒙古譯語,\* THE FIRST KNOWN SINO-MONGOL GLOSSARY

IGOR DE RACHEWILTZ

Division of Pacific and Asian History, The Australian National University,  
Canberra ACT 0200, Australia  
e-mail: ider@coombs.anu.edu.au

*In memory of Henry Serruys (1911–1983)*

The present study investigates the various editions of the earliest Sino-Mongol glossary known as the *Chih-yüan i-yü* or *Meng-ku i-yü* which is contained in the early-Yüan encyclopedia *Shih-lin kuang-chi* by Ch'en Yüan-ching. There are numerous editions of this popular encyclopedia dating from the Yüan and Ming periods, as well as an important Japanese edition of 1699 reproducing the Chinese edition of 1325/26 which is no longer extant. There are considerable variations in the Chinese phonetic transcriptions of the Mongol words in the glossary, mostly due, however, to scribal errors. The *Chih-yüan i-yü/Meng-ku i-yü* was the subject of two detailed linguistic investigations by L. Ligeti and G. Kara in 1990 (*AOH* 44, 3). The present study is meant to complement and supplement their investigations by providing further information on the textual history of the glossary. At the same time the author offers possible explanations for a dozen or so terms that could not be satisfactorily interpreted by previous researchers.

*Key words:* *Chih-yüan i-yü*, *Meng-ku i-yü*, *Shih-lin kuang-chi*, Sino-Mongolian glossaries, Yüan dynasty, Chinese popular encyclopedias.

The *Shih-lin kuang-chi* 事林廣記 (*The Encyclopedia [Which Guides Through] the Forest of Affairs*, hereafter SLKC) was originally compiled in 10 or 12 *chüan* 卷 by Ch'en Yüan-ching 陳元覲, a prolific writer of the late Sung–early Yüan period about whom, however, very little is known. No exemplar of the original edition has survived (see Huang 1913, ch. 15, 46a, cf. Pelliot 1948, pp. 273–274, n. 356).<sup>1</sup> The SLKC was subsequently revised and enlarged, with the additions of maps, diagrams and other material. Several editions of the Yüan and Ming periods are known, and complete and incomplete exemplars of them are found in libraries in China, Japan and

\* The Wade-Giles transcription of Chinese has been used here in preference to the Pinyin system in view of the fact that the former is still employed by the vast majority of scholars in the field of Sino-Mongolistics.

<sup>1</sup> For this *genre* of compilation see Sakai (1958).



Taiwan, as well as in Europe. It was also reprinted in Japan in 1699. The contents of these editions vary and items found in some editions are omitted in others; the quality of printing also varies considerably from edition to edition (see Wada 1954, pp. 28–30; Sakai 1958, pp. 62–78).<sup>2</sup>

At least three Yüan editions of the SLKC contain a Chinese–Mongolian vocabulary called *Meng-ku i-yü* 蒙古譯語 (*Mongolian Vocabulary*, hereafter MKIY) or *Chih-yüan i-yü* 至元譯語 (*Vocabulary of the Chih-yüan [Period]*, hereafter CYIY), in which 541 Chinese words, arranged under 22 topical headings or subject categories (*men* 門) are listed with their Mongol equivalents in Chinese phonetic transcription.<sup>3</sup>

The three Yüan editions are the following:

I. The 1325/26 edition (G), no longer extant, was reprinted in Japan in the 12th year of the Genroku 元祿 period (1699) under the title *Hsin-pien ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi* 新編羣書類要事林廣記<sup>4</sup> (in Japanese, *Shinpen gunsho-ruiyō Jirin-kōki*) in 10 *chi* 集, 94 *chüan* 卷, 10 *ts'e* 冊. Copies of the Japanese reprint are found in various libraries in Japan and Taiwan, notably the Tōyō Bunko 東洋文庫 in Tokyo, the Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo 人文科學研究所 in Kyoto, and the National Central Library (國立中央圖書館) in Taipei (where the exemplar is, however, in 15 *ts'e*). On this edition see Wada (1954, p. 30 [8]); Osada (1953, p. 93 [1]); Sakai (1958, pp. 62–64); Ishida (1973, pp. 90–93); as well as Hu (1963, 11b–12a [3]). The CYIY is found in *chüan* 10 of *keng-chi* 庚集, 53a–59a. The subject categories (*men* 門) are the following:

1. 天文門 Astronomy (53a: 14 entries)<sup>5</sup>
2. 地理門 Geography (53a–b: 20 entries)
3. 人事門 Human Affairs (53b–54a: 62 entries)
4. 鞍馬門 Saddles and Horses (54a–b: 38 entries)
5. 器門 Utensils (54b//56a: 55 entries)
6. 文字門 Writing (55a: 6 entries)
7. 珍寶門 Precious Things (55a–b: 16 entries)
8. 飛禽門 Birds (55b: 25 entries)
9. 走獸門 Quadrupeds (55b//57a: 22 entries)
10. 五穀門 Cereals (56a: 9 entries)
11. 飲食門 Food and Drinks (56a: 12 entries)
12. 身體門 The Body (56a–b: 27 entries)
13. 衣服門 Clothes (56b: 24 entries)
14. 器物門 Implements (56b//55a: 35 entries)
15. 虫魚門 Insects and Fishes (57a: 9 entries)
16. 草木門 Plants and Trees (57a: 23 entries)
17. 菜果門 Vegetables and Fruits (57b: 12 entries)
18. 數目門 Numbers (57b: 22 entries)
19. 時令門 Times and Seasons (57b–58a: 48 entries)
20. 方隅門 Directions (58a–b: 21 entries)
21. 君官門 Officials (58b: 28 entries)
22. 顏色門 Colours (58b–59a: 13 entries)

In examining the arrangement of the above sections or categories, we should say at the outset that they correspond to those of the other editions of the text, except that (1) their order is somewhat different, as we shall see presently, and (2) the present edition is faulty insofar as the pagination is concerned. Forty-four of the fifty-five entries of no. 5 ('Utensils') are on p. 54b, while the remaining eleven are on p. 56a instead of p. 55a. Twelve of the twenty-two entries of no. 9 ('Quadrupeds') are on p. 55b, while the remaining ten are on p. 57a instead of p. 56a; and the first four entries of no. 14 ('Implements') are on p. 56b, while the other thirty-one are on p. 55a instead of p. 57a. This is obviously the fault of the copyist who erroneously numbered leaf 55 as 56 and vice versa, thus misleading the engraver. As for the contents of the various categories, it will be discussed later.

In the Japanese edition the glossary is preceded by two lines of introduction (p. 53a2–3) stating that the content of the CYIY is (in North China), like the jargon used for all sorts of things (*shih-wu ch'i-t'an* 事物綺談)<sup>6</sup> in the South and must, therefore, be regarded as most valuable (i.e. useful); it is divided into categories and added to the (market) jargon glossary (in *chüan* 9) as an aid to current speech.

<sup>5</sup> This and other 'categories' are understood *sensu lato*: under 'Astronomy' we find terms related not only to the sky, but also to the weather.

<sup>6</sup> I do not think that the expression *ch'i-t'an* means 'Discours délicieux' as in Kara (1990, p. 279). Cf. the similar expression *ch'i-yü* 綺語 'artful language' applied to the colourful and unconventional language, peppered with non-Han elements, of the Yüan-Ming plays and novels. In Buddhist usage this expression means 'propos enjôleurs, propos rudes'. See Chavannes (1962, I, p. 37, n. 1). We are dealing here with a contemporary jargon used by certain groups in society.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed discussion on the author and contents of the SLKC by Hu Tao-ching 胡道靜 is found in his 1963 'Foreword' (*ch'ien-yen* 前言, 1a–14a) to the photo-reproduction of the Ch'un-chuang shu-yüan 春莊書院 edition of the SLKC of 1330/32 (Hu 1963). See below, n. 11.

<sup>3</sup> As in the case of virtually all the Sino-Mongol glossaries of the Ming, the number of headings, and of the entries under each heading, vary considerably. The earliest, and best known, glossary of the Ming contains 17 'categories' comprising altogether 844 terms. See Mostaert (1977, p. xiv).

<sup>4</sup> This is the title found at the beginning of each *chüan*. The title appearing at the end of each *chüan* is, however, somewhat different: *Hsin-pien fen-men tsuan-t'u Shih-lin kuang-chi* 新編分門纂圖事林廣記. In the 'Table of Contents' (*mu-lu* 目錄, 1a) of the first volume we find *Hsin-pien tsuan-t'u tseng-lei ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi*, and the title on the title page is simply *Shih-lin kuang-chi*. This work in 10 *chi* 集, numbered 甲集 to 癸集 (甲集: 12 卷, 乙集: 4 卷, 丙集: 5 卷, 丁集: 10 卷, 戊集: 10 卷, 己集: 10 卷, 庚集: 10 卷, 辛集: 10 卷, 壬集: 10 卷, 癸集: 13 卷) has a preface dating of 12 July–10 August 1684 (貞享元年六月), and a postface with the date of printing corresponding to 31 March 1699 (元祿十二年姑洗日); it is only from the postscript on p. 4b of the *mu-lu* that we learn that the 1699 edition is based on the Chinese edition of 6 December 1325–4 January 1326 (泰定乙丑仲冬). However, it is quite clear from the references to the end of the Sung dynasty, the unification of the north and south of the empire by the Great Yüan (大元), and to the Chih-yüan 至元 reign (1264–1294) of 'The Present Sovereign' (今上皇帝), i.e. Shih-tsu 世祖/Qubilai Qa'an, in *chia-chi* 甲集 8, 50a and 9, 55a, that the 1325/26 edition is, in turn, based in part on a Chih-yüan edition. This no doubt accounts for the very title of the vocabulary – *Chih-yüan i-yü* – which must have been contained in the earlier edition, an edition which, because of the above-mentioned historical events, must date from the period 1279–1294. This, then, was in all probability the first Yüan edition of Ch'en's encyclopedia. The division of the work (in the 1325/26 edition) in 10 *chi* 集 (called, however, *chüan* 卷 on the mid-leaf title!) may also reflect the original division in 10 *chüan*.



The above statement is interesting insofar as it provides additional evidence to the effect that, in the last quarter of the 13th century, the influence of the Mongols and their language was quite pronounced in North China, as would soon become apparent also through the hybrid language of the Yüan plays;<sup>7</sup> and an examination of the vocabulary of the 'market' or tradesmen's jargon (*shih-yü* 市語) used in the South (Chiang-nan 江南) indicates that it, too, had incorporated by that time some Mongol words, as already noted by G. Kara (see Kara 1990, p. 280).<sup>8</sup>

A photocopy of the Japanese edition of 1699 of the CYIY is found in Ligeti (1990).

II. 1. The edition of 1330/32 of the Ch'un-chuang shu-yüan 椿莊書院 of Chien-an 建安 (i.e. Chien-ou hsien 建甌縣 in Fu-chien) in 4 *chi* (前集, 後集, 續集, 別集), 42 *chüan*, 12 *ts'e* (C).<sup>9</sup> Its title is *Hsin-pien tsuan-t'u tseng-lei ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi* 新編纂圖增類羣書類要事林廣記. The only known exemplar of this edition, formerly in the collection of the National Palace Museum Library of Peiping (北平故宮博物院藏), is now in the National Central Library (國立中央圖書館), Taipei.<sup>10</sup> Microfilms of this unique exemplar have been available since 1974 and the entire work was published in photo-reproduction in China in 1976 in 6 *ts'e*.<sup>11</sup> The MKIY is found in *hsü-chi* 續集 8, 7b–11b. For this edition see Hu (1963, 1aff., 10a–b).

II. 2. The edition of 1330/32 of the Hsi-yüan ching-she 西園精舍, same title as C, 4 *chi*, 50 *chüan*, 8 *ts'e* (H).<sup>12</sup> The only known exemplar of this edition is in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko 內閣文庫 (Cabinet Library) in Tokyo.<sup>13</sup> From the 'Table of Contents' (*mu-lu* 目錄) in *hsü-chi*, 4b11, we know that the MKIY was in *chüan* 8 of the *hsü-chi* section. Unfortunately, the Naikaku Bunko copy lacks *chüan*

<sup>7</sup> For a thorough investigation of the Mongol and non-Han terms and expressions found in the Yüan and Ming plays see Fang (2001).

<sup>8</sup> The short 'Market Jargon' (*Ch'i-t'an shih-yü* 綺談市語) glossary that accompanies the CYIY/MKIY likewise deserves a thorough investigation. On it, see Hu (1963, 4b–5a).

<sup>9</sup> *Ch'ien-chi* 前集 and *hou-chi* 後集 contain 13 *chüan* each; *hsü-chi* 續集 and *pieh-chi* 別集 contain 8 *chüan* each.

<sup>10</sup> See *Kuo-li Ku-kung...shu-mu*, p. 401. This exemplar lacks *chüan* 9–13 of *hsü-chi* and *chüan* 9–11 of *pieh-chi*. On it, cf. Wu (1950, p. 508).

<sup>11</sup> Microfilms of all the rare editions in the NPM collection were made between 1942 and 1946, when the collection was still 'housed' in the Library of Congress, Washington, DC, before being sent to Taiwan. The microfilm collection thus became available to libraries around the world. In 1976, the Chung-hua shu-chü 中華書局 in Peking published the SLKC in photo-reproduction under the title [*Sung*] *Ch'en Yüan-ching pien Shih-lin kuang-chi* [宋]陳元靚編事林廣記, 6 *ts'e*. This publication, originally restricted for use in research, became available almost immediately through library exchanges. It has a long and exhaustive 'Foreword' (前言: 1a–14a) by Hu Tao-ching 胡道靜 dated 1 October 1963 (!). Since the original work was then outside China, the photo-reproduction must have been carried out from the microfilm of the original. The date of C is inferred from the list of Yüan emperors in *hou-chi* 2, 30b–31a, where (31a2) the last *nien-hao* 年號 of 'The Present Sovereign' (今上皇帝) is Chih-shun 至順 (1330–32).

<sup>12</sup> In this edition the number of *chüan* in the four *chi* are as follows: *ch'ien-chi*, 13 *chüan*; *hou-chi*, 13 *chüan*; *hsü-chi*, 13 *chüan*; *pieh-chi*, 11 *chüan*.

<sup>13</sup> See the *Naikaku Bunko...moku-roku*, p. 293b. This exemplar is not in as good a condition as C.

5–9 of that section. For this edition see Wada (1954, p. 28 [2]); Sakai (1958, pp. 64–65 [2]); Osada (1953, p. 93 [3]) (where, however, the author fails to mention that the MKIY in this exemplar is *physically* missing); and Ishida (1973, p. 89 [2]). There are substantial differences between C and H, but most of the printing blocks used for these two editions are obviously identical; however, internal evidence seems to indicate that, although dating from the same period,<sup>14</sup> H is actually a later, enlarged and revised edition of C.

Thus, both C and H contained the MKIY in *chüan* 8 of *hsü-chi*, and we may safely assume, I think, that the lost vocabulary in H was identical to that, fortunately extant, of C. Now, in what does the MKIY of this edition differ from the CYIY of G?

To begin with, both the title of, and the introduction to, the vocabulary are different. The original title *Chih-yüan i-yü*, still preserved in the 1325 edition, was probably deemed too anachronistic in the Chih-shun period and was changed to the more generic *Meng-ku i-yü*. As for the short 5-line introduction (called *chi* 記 'Memoir' in the text), there is no longer any reference to a resemblance between the Mongol words in the North and the market jargon in the South. Instead, the compilers of the new edition pointedly refer to the general diversity of languages and stress the need of interpreters in order to avoid 'the trouble of producing uncouth sounds like someone who has a fish bone stuck in the throat' (缺舌鯁喉之患) (cf. Kara 1990, p. 279). Now, we know that under Emperor Wen-tsung 文宗 (Tuq Temür, 1330–32), unquestionably the most erudite and 'sinophile' – literary speaking – of Mongol rulers, there was an unprecedented cultural revival in China (see Franke 1994, pp. 34–37) which may perhaps account for the above editorial changes which raised the status, as it were, of the glossary from that of a mere tool for 'market' purposes to that of a valuable means of communication between different people 'so as to penetrate their minds and understand their desires' (以達其志通其欲). This, however, is speculative.

With regard to the arrangement of entries in, and the actual contents of, the Chinese–Mongolian vocabulary, we note the following:

1. In C, the subject categories (門) are the same as in G (22) and the entries in each category are also the same; however, the names of two categories in C are somewhat different.<sup>15</sup>

2. The order of the categories in C is different from G as follows:

G (CYIY)	C (MKIY)	G (CYIY)	C (MKIY)
1	=	1	12
2	=	2	13
3	=	3	14
4	=	5	15
5	=	6	16
6	=	12	17
7	=	13	18
			9
			10
			11
			16
			17
			18
			19

<sup>14</sup> The date 1330/32 for H can likewise be inferred by the same *nien-hao* as in C (see above, n. 11) in *hou-chi* 2, 6b2.

<sup>15</sup> Thus Cat. 5 in G: 器門 'Utensils' is called 車器門 'Carts and Utensils' in C; Cat. 15 in G: 虫魚門 'Insects and Fishes' is called 蟲魚門 id. in C.



8	=	14	19	=	20
9	=	15	20	=	21
10	=	7	21	=	4
11	=	8	22	=	22

We note immediately that Cat. 21: 君官門 'Officials' in G is Cat. 4 in C, immediately after 人事門 'Human Affairs'. This is not a transposition in C, but in G: the original Chinese 1325/26 edition undoubtedly had the category 'Officials' in fourth place, not at the end of the glossary. The other Yüan edition (1340) and the Ming editions confirm the fact since they all follow the sequence we find in C. *Therefore, the order in G is arbitrary and does not reflect the original state of affairs.*

3. There are numerous textual differences between C and G which are due to copyist's or engraver's errors in either edition; they can be mostly identified and rectified. For example, G (1, no. 6): 朵樂阿不干 (for 干) = C (1, no. 6): 朵樂何 (for 阿) 不下 (for 干); G (1, no. 7): 于 (for 于) 呂哥兒 = C (1, no. 7): 干 (for 于) 呂哥兒; G (3, no. 29): 撒里荅歹 = C (3, no. 29): 撒甲 (for 里) 荅歹; etc.

Thus, the differences between G and C are in form rather than substance.

III. The edition of 1340 of the Chi-ch'eng t'ang 積誠堂 of Mr. Cheng 鄭氏 in 10 *chi* (集) each divided into *shang* 上 and *hsia* 下, thus altogether 20 *chüan* in 10 *ts'e*. Its title is *Tsuan-t'u tseng hsin ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi* 纂圖增新羣書類要事林廣記 (CC). Exemplars of this edition are kept in the University of Peking Library (北京大學圖書館) and in Kunaichō Shoryōbu 宮內廳書陸部 (Imperial Household Agency Library) in Tokyo (see Lo-Ts'ai 1959, p. 42; *Wakan...mokuroku*, p. 130a; *Toshoryō...Kanseki-hen*, p. 168).<sup>16</sup> On this edition see Wada (1954, p. 28 [1]); Osada (1953, p. 93 [2]); Sakai (1958, pp. 65–66 [3]); Ishida (1973, p. 89 [1]); Hu (1963, 12a–b [2]). Although both Ishida and Osada (loc. cit.) state that the Chinese–Mongolian vocabulary is missing in the 1340 edition, it is actually found in *keng-chi* 庚集, 下 (= *chüan* 14), 16b–20b.

The title and the introduction of the vocabulary in this edition, the blockprints of which were cut anew, are the same as in C. The arrangement of entries is also identical with C, and so are the copyist's or engraver's errors, indicating that CC is based on C, and that no attempt was made to rectify the latter's faults.

The MKIY in CC has never been reproduced in facsimile. The Kunaichō Shoryōbu exemplar is in poor condition, partly because of the quality of the printing blocks that were used for that SLKC edition, and partly on account of paper damage; thus, the reading of numerous characters would be impossible without constant recourse to C and the other editions. Unfortunately, I have not been able to check the Peking exemplar.

The SLKC continued to be printed under the Ming. The three Ming editions containing the MKIY which are known to me are the following:

<sup>16</sup> There is no doubt as to the date of this edition. In *chia-chi* 甲集, 上, 2b, it is stated that the work was printed in the *keng-ch'en* year of the Chih-yüan period (至元庚辰). This year could be either 1280 or 1340, but it is clearly the latter since in the list of Yüan emperors in *ping-chi* 丙集, 上, 25b, the last reign period (*nien-hao*) mentioned is Chih-shun 至順 (1330–32), as in C and H.

I. The 1392 edition of the Mei-hsi shu-yüan 梅溪書院 in 6 *chi* (前集, 後集, 續集, 別集, 新集, 外集), 35 *chüan* (5 in the *ch'ien-chi* and 6 in each of the other *chi*) and 6 *ts'e*. Its title is *Tsuan-t'u tseng hsin ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi* 纂圖增新羣書類要事林廣記 (M). An exemplar of this edition is found at Keiō University Library (慶應大學圖書館) in Tokyo. It is not mentioned in Ishida (1973), and the second-hand reference in Osada (1953, p. 93 [4, with question mark]) is incorrect.<sup>17</sup> On it see Wada (1954, pp. 28–29 [3]); Sakai (1958, pp. 66–67 [4]). The MKIY is found in *hsin-chi* 新集, 7b–10a. Although the MKIY in this edition, the printing blocks of which were again cut anew, does not differ in contents from C and CC, the incorrect characters are not consistent with those we find in C (and CC), nor with those in G. For example, G (1, no. 6): 朵樂阿不干, C (1, no. 6): 朵樂何不下, M (1, no. 6): 朵樂何不干; G (1, no. 7): 于呂哥兒, C (1, no. 7): 干呂哥兒, M (1, no. 7): 干呂哥兒; G (3, no. 29): 撒里荅歹, C (3, no. 29): 撒甲荅歹, M (3, no. 29): 撒里荅歹. This indicates that M relied on an earlier edition which occasionally had better readings than either G and C, and of which we have no record. The MKIY in M has not been reprinted in facsimile or in edited form.

II. The 1418 edition of the Ts'ui-yen ching-she 翠巖精舍 of Chien-yang 建陽 has the same title as the 1392 edition;<sup>18</sup> also six *chi*, but divided into *shang* and *hsia*, hence 12 *chüan*, and 6 *ts'e* (T). Exemplars of this edition are found in the Seikadō Bunko 靜嘉堂文庫 and the Sonkeikaku Bunko 尊經閣文庫 in Tokyo; and an incomplete exemplar is found in the Vatican Library (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) in Rome (VL).<sup>19</sup> On this edition see Osada (1953, p. 93 [5]); Wada (1954, p. 29 [5]); Sakai (1958, pp. 68–69 [7]); Ishida (1973, pp. 89–90 [3], where the date of the Seikadō Bunko exemplar is given as 'the Yung-lo period', and 93 [4], where it is incorrectly dated the 9th year of Yung-lo, i.e. 1411); Hu (1963, 12b–13a [4]). The MKIY is found in *chüan hsia* (下) of the *hsin-chi* (= *chüan* 10), 24b–27a. The Seikadō Bunko copy lacks 2 leaves (4 pages), i.e. 25a–26b; the Vatican Library copy lacks the first leaf (24a–b), the vocabulary beginning on 24b.<sup>20</sup> The copy of the Sonkeikaku

<sup>17</sup> Osada's date for this edition is Hung-wu *chi-yu* 洪武己酉 (= Hung-wu 2/1369) instead of the correct Hung-wu *jen-shen* 洪武壬申 (= Hung-wu 25/1392). The latter date was furnished by Prof. M. Hiramatsu, formerly of Keiō University (who at the same time supplied an excellent photocopy of the MKIY contained in that edition), but see also Sakai (1958, p. 67), where, however, '1329' is a misprint for '1392'.

<sup>18</sup> See, however, below, n. 19.

<sup>19</sup> See the *Seikadō Bunko...mokuroku*, p. 561; *Sonkeikaku Bunko...mokuroku*, p. 718 (which shows that whereas *chüan* 1–2 [*ts'e* 1], 7–8 [*ts'e* 4], 9–10 [*ts'e* 5] and 11–12 [*ts'e* 6] have the same title as in M, *chüan* 3–4 [*ts'e* 2] and 5–6 [*ts'e* 3] bear the title *Hsin-pien tsuan-t'u tseng-lei ch'ün-shu lei-yao Shih-lin kuang-chi* 新編纂圖增類羣書類要事林廣記). This well-known edition is often cited by Chinese and Japanese scholars, such as Lu Hsin-yüan, Kanda Ki-ichirō, Nagasawa Kikuya and Wada Hisanori. Cf. Wada (1954, p. 29 [5]); Sakai (1958, pp. 68–69). However, whereas Osada (1953, p. 93, n. 5), has the correct date (Yüing-lo *wu-hsü*/1418) for it, Ishida (1973, p. 93 [4]) gives the date 1411 (Yung-lo 9) which is not justified, the *wu-hsü* year being mentioned in the *mu-lu* of the *ch'ien-chi*. See Sakai (1958, p. 68). The Vatican Library exemplar consists of two *chüan* (*shang* and *hsia*) of the *hsin-chi* (= *chüan* 9 and 10), and two *chüan* of the *wai-chi* (= *chüan* 11 and 12).

<sup>20</sup> See Pelliot (1948, p. 273, n. 356), where it is suggested that the Vatican Library exemplar may be the original Yüan edition which, however, is not the case; and Pelliot (1922, p. 82, no. 332



Bunko is in excellent condition; therefore, the missing sections in the Seikadō Bunko and Vatican Library exemplars do not affect the investigation of this edition of the MKIY. The printing blocks of T have also been cut anew and have been used for our next edition of the SLKC (1496). The contents and arrangement of the glossary are the same as in the previous edition (M), and the misprints being also the same that we find in M, we may assume that T is based on M, even though in several cases the block-cutter of T has misread and miscarved the readings of M.<sup>21</sup>

The Vatican Library exemplar has been photo-reproduced in Ligeti (1990, pl. 8–12).

III. The 1496 edition of the Chin-te ching-she 進德精舍 of Mr. Chan 詹氏, same title of the 1418 and 1392 editions. The division in *chi* (each divided also into *shang* and *hsia*) forming 12 *chüan* altogether is identical with the 1418 edition, but the Naikaku Bunko exemplar is in 4 *ts'e* (CT).<sup>22</sup> For this edition see Wada (1954, p. 30 [6]); Osada (1953, p. 93 [6]); Sakai (1958, p. 69 [8]), also with regard to the date, corresponding to 5 Nov.–4 Dec. 1496; Ishida (1973, p. 90 [4], p. 93 [5]); Kara (1990, p. 261, n. \*). The MKIY is likewise found in *chüan hsia* of the *hsin-chi* (= *chüan* 10), 24b–27a. However, both Osada and Ishida incorrectly report that the vocabulary is missing in this edition. In fact, the MKIY, being reproduced from the same printing blocks of T, is absolutely identical in format and contents with the latter.

The Naikaku Bunko exemplar is photo-reproduced in Ligeti (1990, pl. 1–7).

There exist other editions and ms. copies of the SLKC but they are not available to me.<sup>23</sup> However, I very much doubt whether they could add anything to what is already available on the CYIY/MKIY in the editions that have been described above.

The CYIY and the MKIY, which are essentially the same Sino-Mongol glossary, have been investigated by several scholars and the text has also been edited several times. I shall list below the various studies and editions known to me, arranged by date.

1. 1934/1964/1973. Ishida Mikinosuke 石田幹之助, “Shigen yakugo” ni tsuite ‘至元譯語’ について [‘Concerning the *Chih-yüan i-yü*’], *Tōyōgaku sōhen* 東洋學叢編 1,5 (1934): 1–26; Idem, *Tōa bunka-shi sōkō* 東亞文化史叢考 (*Studies in Cultural History of Central Asia*), Tokyo, 1973, pp. 87–111. The latter is the reprint of the 1934 article revised by the author in 1964 (see p. 111); to my knowledge, the revised 1964 version did not appear in print until 1973. The CYIY/MKIY is edited on pp. 97–107 (of the 1973 edition) on the basis of three texts (G, CC and T). The

of the ‘Fonds Vatican Extrême Orient Manuscripts’). Cf. Pelliot (1995, p. 69, no. 332); Ligeti (1990, pp. 260–261, 279). Cf. also Ligeti (1950, p. 177, n. 28), where, however, the Chinese character discussed by Ligeti, which in the vocabulary appears in the abbreviated form 襲, does not correspond to 赤 as suggested by the author, but to 襲. See below, n. 38.

<sup>21</sup> Thus, e.g., M (1, no. 5): 忽名 (for 忽多), T (1, no. 5): 忽各; M (1, no. 13): 急里按論必, T (1, no. 13): 急里安合必; M (2, no. 14): 石魯环 (for 歪), T (2, no. 14): 石曾金.

<sup>22</sup> See the *Naikaku Bunko...mokuroku*, p. 294.

<sup>23</sup> Such as the Ming edition (1478) entitled *Hsin-pien tsuan-t'u tseng-lei ch'ün-shu lei-yao* *Shih-lin kuang-chi* of Liu T'ing-pin 劉廷賓 and others of Fu-chien 福建, enlarged by Chung Ching-ch'ing 鍾景清, in 40 *chüan* and 16 *ts'e* listed (with G) in *Kuo-li Chung-yang...shu-mu*, II, p. 626, and mentioned in Hu (1963, 13b [5]); the Lin-chiang fu 臨江府 edition, also of the Ming, on which see Hu (1963, 13b–14a [6]); and the Chen-chieh t'ang ms. copy referred to in n. 29 below.

sequence of the 541 entries follows CC and T, thus rearranging G in the proper order of subject categories. The endnotes (pp. 108–109) provide variant and faulty readings. There is no attempt at a reconstruction of the original Mongolian terms.

2. 1936. Takeuchi Ikunosuke 竹内幾之助, ‘Shigen yakugo ni arawaretaru Shina goin’ 至元譯語に表はれたる支那語音 [‘The Chinese Sounds Which Appear in the *Chih-yüan i-yü*’], *Shina gakuhō* 支那學報 3 (1936): 1–8. The author has listed all the graphs used in the CYIY for transcribing Mongol sounds with their Yüan-period Chinese pronunciation (元代支那語音). This early contribution is, of course, totally superseded by the more recent works of Hattori Shirō, Tōdō Akiyasu, H.M. Stimson, and E. G. Pulleyblank.<sup>24</sup>

3. 1948. P. Pelliot, ‘Les Houa-yi yi-yu et autres vocabularies polyglottes’ in Pelliot (1948, pp. 272–290), where on pp. 273–274 and n. 356 the author discusses the CYIY (in line 3 of n. 356, ‘1282’ is a misprint for ‘1280’); however, Pelliot’s remarks on the subject are no longer relevant.

4. 1953. Osada Natsuki 長田夏樹, ‘Gendai no Chū-Mō taiyaku goi “Shigen yakugo”’ 元代の中蒙對語彙 ‘至元譯語’ [‘The Sino-Mongolian Vocabulary *Chih-yüan i-yü* of the Yüan Period’], *Kōbe Gaikokugo Daigaku ronsō* 神戸外國語大學論叢 4, 2–3 (1953): 91–118. A detailed study of the CYIY/MKIY based on the G, CC and T editions, and consisting of i) an introductory section dealing with the various editions of the SLKC, with and without the vocabulary (pp. 91–94), a discussion of the system of transcription employed in the vocabulary compared with that of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史 and the *Hua-i i-yü* 華夷譯語 (pp. 94–98), and a list of Chinese graphs used in the CYIY/MKIY to transcribed Mongol sounds with their Mongol values arranged in alphabetical order (pp. 98–101); ii) the vocabulary itself arranged by the original categories but following the incorrect sequence of G;<sup>25</sup> the words are given in Chinese, Chinese transcription, romanised transliteration of each graph of the Chinese transcription, and reconstruction (whenever possible) of the original Mongol term (pp. 101–116); iii) instances of words in the CYIY/MKIY with initial *h*, *q*, *γ*, *t*, *G*, *d*, and *y* before *a* and *ä*; of the disappearance of final *γ*; *l* ~ *r*; *ö* → *u*, *ü*, *ə*; *o* + *C* + *a* > *o* + *C* + *u*, *o*; and *n* > *ng*. Although teaming with errors of all kinds, this article was still a useful contribution before the appearance of the articles by Ligeti and Kara (see below).

5. 1973–1975. The study on the CYIY by Ha-k'an-ch'u-lun 哈戡楚倫 (Hakanchulu) entitled “Chih-yüan i-yü” tzu-tz'u k'ao-shih’ ‘至元譯語’字詞考釋 [‘An Investigation and Explanation of the Words and Expressions in the *Chih-yüan i-yü*’], published in seven instalments in the Taiwan journal *Chung-kuo pien-cheng* 中國邊政 43 (1973): 4–9; 44 (1973): 25–33; 46 (1974): 2–10; 47 (1974): 5–9; 48 (1974): 6–16; 49 (1975): 2–7; and 50 (1975): 13–22. Each word of the vocabulary is examined and the reconstruction of the Mongol form is provided in a non-conventional transcription, together with exegetical comments which are often interpretative and

<sup>24</sup> See, in particular, Hattori (1973); Tōdō (1983); Stimson (1966); Pulleyblank (1991). Cf. also Lewicki (1949, pp. 29–50); Ligeti (1956).

<sup>25</sup> However, Osada (1953, p. 105) has changed the designation 器門 of G to 軍器門, thus arbitrarily prefixing 軍 to 器 to signify ‘Implements of War’ rather than ‘Utensils’, as in the original.



unscientific. This contribution has likewise been superseded by those of Ligeti and Kara listed below.

6. 1974. The CYIY reproduced in vol. 5 of the *Liao Chin Yüan yü-wen chin-ts'un lu* 遼金元語文僅存錄, Taipei, 1974,<sup>26</sup> pp. 1–32. This, as the colophon (p. 33) informs us, is the photo-reproduction of a hand-copy made by the well-known Ch'ing scholar-official and bibliophile Li Wen-t'ien 李文田 (1834–95)<sup>27</sup> of the G text of the vocabulary which is held in the collection of the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica (Chung-yang yen-ch'iu yüan shih-yü so 中央研究院史語所) in Taipei, Taiwan. Li Wen-t'ien has added numerous glosses to the entries which are mostly of scarce philological interest. However, Li's copy, which covers 16 leaves, does not follow the order of subject categories of G, transposing as it does some early entries at the end of the glossary and rearranging the sections, no doubt through a general confusion of sheets when the copy was first made and before it was re-copied and glossed.<sup>28</sup> In view of the fact that several original editions of the SLKC of 1699 are available to us, Li's copy is of no value today.

7. 1990. The CYIY/MKIY edited by Chia Ching-yen 賈敬顏 and Chu Feng 朱風 in their *Meng-ku i-yü Ju-chen i-yü hui-pien* 蒙古譯語女真譯語匯編 [*The Meng-ku i-yü and the Ju-chen i-yü Collected and Edited*], T'ien-chin, 1990, pp. 1–15. This edition, which is based on Ishida's work (see above, no. 1), contains also nine pages of notes (pp. 16–24) giving the variant readings of other editions of the MKIY<sup>29</sup> and correcting obvious mistakes in G. It contains also a translation of Ishida's introduction to his 1964/1973 revised version of his article (pp. 324–332 = Ishida 1973, pp. 87–96), and of Ishida's notes on individual entries and postscript (pp. 333–338 = Ishida 1973, pp. 108–111). Although this contribution is useful for the purpose of comparing and rectifying variant Chinese readings, insofar as the reconstruction of the Mongol terms are concerned it is largely superseded by Ligeti's and Kara's articles.

8. 1990. The edition of the CYIY/MKIY edited by Ligeti in 'Un vocabulaire sino-mongol des Yuan. Le *Tche-yuan yi-yu* déchiffré par Louis Ligeti, édité par G. Kara', *AOH* 44 (1990): 259–277, with facsimile reproductions of CT (pl. 1–7), VL (pl. 8–12) and G [52b–59a]. A masterful contribution consisting of an introduction (pp. 259–261) followed by the Mongol terms in transcription (with the Chinese phonetic transcription in parentheses) and the French translation, following the order of subject categories and words in CT (the Naikaku Bunko exemplar), and giving for each entry the reference to the same entry in Ishida's edition of 1934. Ligeti's work

<sup>26</sup> Published by the T'ai lien kuo feng ch'u-p'an-she 臺聯國風出版社. Volume 5 contains four other Sino-Mongolian glossaries of the Ming. The anonymous colophon (*hou-chi* 後集) on p. 33 is dated 1958 and 1961.

<sup>27</sup> On Li Wen-t'ien see Hummel (1943, I, pp. 494–495).

<sup>28</sup> Entries 25–62 of section 3 (人事) have been transposed to section 22 of the original (顏色) on pp. 10b–11b; however, whereas this section is the last one in G, in Li's ms. it is also misplaced, being followed by section 4 of G (鞍馬).

<sup>29</sup> Besides G, C and CT, Chia and Chu have also consulted the MKIY in a ms. copy of the SLKC which is not available to me. However, judging by Chia's and Chu's notes on pp. 16–24, this ms. copy is very poor and unworthy of consideration.

has been duly edited and completed in the same issue of the journal by G. Kara with the following contribution (no. 9).

9. 1990. G. Kara, 'Zhiyuan yiyu. Index alphabétique des mots mongols', *AOH* 44 (1990): 279–344. Likewise a fundamental investigation of the Sino-Mongolian glossary in which are discussed the linguistic peculiarities of the Mongol language of the CYIY/MKIY, with an 'Index moyen mongol' (pp. 281–334) in which each Mongol entry (except for a few that could not be deciphered) is discussed in detail with references to other Middle Mongolian forms, etc. This, in turn, is followed by an 'Index des mots en mongol écrit' (pp. 336–341), and by 'Notes techniques et bibliographiques' (pp. 341–344). Ligeti's and Kara's contributions have not only surpassed any other investigations of the text of the CYIY/MKIY which have appeared so far, but have solved virtually all the linguistic problems connected with this text. Ligeti was unable to reconstruct (in part or fully) 22 entries, and Kara lists 11 undeciphered words out of 541 entries.

10. 1995. The MKIY edited by Ü. Manduqu in his *Mongyol i yü toli biçig* [*The Mongyol I-yü Dictionary*], Peking, 1995, pp. 35–149. After an informative introduction (pp. 35–65) on the various editions of the SLKC and the system of transcription of the MKIY (relying mainly on C, two pages of which are reproduced on pp. 66–67), the Sino-Mongolian vocabulary is edited (pp. 68–149) with each entry followed by the Chinese transcription, the romanised transliteration with the reconstructed romanised transcription in parentheses, the Preclassical Mongolian form in *uyiyurjin*, and the modern Mongolian form of the word or its equivalent if the ancient form has not survived. Doubtful or difficult entries are followed by philological notes (*jegülte*) indicating that the editor has profited by the work of previous investigations, although these contributions are not acknowledged.

Thanks to the editorial labours and linguistic skill of the above scholars, it has been possible to reconstruct most of the Mongol words in the CYIY/MKIY from the often only approximative (or outright inaccurate) Chinese transcription. A few terms, however, have proven intractable, and the transcription and/or decipherment of some others are doubtful. In the following I shall review these 'problem words' with reference to the articles by Ligeti (no. 8) and Kara (no. 9), and Manduqu's contribution (no. 10). They will be designated respectively as L, K and M. The entry number of each word is that in Ligeti's list (pp. 262–277); it is followed by Ligeti's full entry.

No. 137: 'del [?] *qan muri* (*tie-li-ban mou-li*) "cheval à robe couleur sable".' K 323: '*širqal* 137 (*die li han*, lire 失 *shi* pour 迭 *die*): *š. muri* "cheval à couleur sable/horse of sand colour" (*sha bai ma*). For his part, M 91 proposes the form *širqan* which is closer to the Chinese transcription, although the latter can, of course, be rendered also as *širqal*. M's reconstruction cannot be dismissed since we have other occurrences of final *-l ~ -n*; cf., for example, mmo., mo. *saqal* 'beard', dong. *sagan*. See Ligeti (1962, p. 62). However, as pointed out by Prof. Kara (personal communication), Dongxiang is not too relevant in the matter.

No. 175: '[ ] (*ngao-tao-li-k'o*) "baguette de tambour".' K 290: '*deldeürge* [?] 175 (*ao dao li ke*; lire 典 *dian* pour 奧 *ao* et 哥 *ge* pour 可 *ke* "baguette de tambour/drumstick" (*putou*); cf. mong. *deled-* "battre, frapper" + suffixe déverbal *-gür*



des noms d'outil + suffixe dénominal *-ge*.' No reconstruction is proposed by M 95 who reads 'odoliko' – an aberration. I am sure that K is right in view of the metathetical form of the verb *deled-* in the spoken languages (*deld-*, *delde-*).

No. 178: '[ ] (*sieou-pu*) 'bâtonnets (pour manger)'. K 334: 's[ ] 178 (*xiu bu*) "bâtonnets (pour manger)/chopsticks" (*zhu*). K lists various terms in Mongol languages meaning different types of 'bâtonnets'. However, an error has somehow crept into Ligeti's text which has also misled K. Entry No. 178 is actually the Chinese term *chin* 筋 'tendon(s), sinew(s)', not 'chopsticks' (*chu* 箸). The Mongol term in transcription is, indeed, *hsiu-pu* 秀布 \*šü[r]bü[s] (秀[兒]不[四]), mmo. *širbüsü(n)* and mo. *sirbüsü(n)* 'tendon, nerve, sinew, (bow)string.' Cf. dag. *širbüs*, kh. *šörvës* id. See M 96. The Mongol term had already been identified in Hakanchulu (3), 6, no. 150. The form \*šürbüs is due to regressive assimilation. Middle and final *erh* 兒 and final *ssu* 思, 四, etc., are often omitted in the Chinese transcriptions of Mongolian; however, one cannot exclude the possibility that a final *-su* (速) or *-sun* (孫) has dropped out, although it is unlikely in my opinion.

No. 186: '[ ] (*ta-li-pan*) "seau (faite de saule)". K 334: 'd [ ] 186 (*da li ban*, *Y fu* pour *da*) "seau (faite de bois de saule)/pail woven of willow branches" (*kaolao*). M 96-97 transcribes this word as *shih-li-pan* 失立班 (reading *shih* 失 for *ta* 大) 'šili-ban', which he glosses as *buryasu-bar güriügsen saba* 'container plaited with willow (twigs)', without, however, any supporting authority for such a reconstruction. I think that *ta* (= *da*) is the correct initial syllable; *-li-* can, of course, represent the foreign sounds *-li-*, *-l-* or *-r-*. The meaning of this word (*k'ao-lao* 栲栳) is, more accurately, 'wicker basket made of bamboo or other wood' (see Morohashi 1968, no. 14736). In view of this, it appears that the original word is an Uighur-Chinese hybrid term, viz. *dal<i>ban* (\**dalban*) < uig. *dal* 'twig' and chin. *pen* 畚 (Yüan [Tödö]: \**pən*) 'a rough basket made of twisted rope or bamboo, hod' (see Morohashi 1968, no. 21809 [1] with illustration), i.e. 'a twig-basket', 'a basket made of plaited twigs'.

No. 213: '[ ] (*k'iu-lien-pi*) "massue, gourdin, maillet". K 334: 'k[ ] 213 (*qu lian bi*) "massue, gourdin, maillet/bludgeon with chain" (*lian chui*). M 100 transcribes this word as 'gülenbi (gürenbi)' with the gloss '*bilayu* (?)' 'cudgel (?)'. The weapon in question must, in fact, be a cudgel with several chains attached at the end, a sort of metallic cat-o'-nine-tails and a formidable weapon. ('Implements' of this sort were still used to whip bandits to death in Inner Mongolia a hundred years ago, as amply documented in the reports of the Scheut Mission in the Ordos.) Now, the 'tails' of this whip may be regarded also as the 'braids' of the cudgel, particularly on account of the twisted coils of the chains. I think this *may* provide a clue to the original Mongol word rendered by the puzzling transcription *chü-lien-pi* 居連必. M has transcribed it as *gülenbi* (*gürenbi*); but the first two syllables can also be read *gürel*, and this could be the iterative form in *-l-* of *güre-* ~ *gürö-* (mo. *gürü-*, *görö-*, *güre-*) 'to twist, to braid.' The final syllable is undoubtedly wrong, possibly a scribal error for *k'o* 克 (= *kei*).<sup>30</sup> If so, we would have a reading \**gürelkei*, a deverbial noun

<sup>30</sup> For 居 *gü* (rather than *kü*), see Ligeti (1956, p. 45, no. 287); for 連 *lel*, *rel*, see the transcription of the name 'Gürelgü' in the *Secret History of the Mongols* 2, 27a, 37a; 4, 4a, 31b: §§ 89, 94, 129 and 141 (where 連 is accompanied by one or two small diacritical signs which are not used

in *-kei* (mo. *-gei*) of *gürel-* 'to twist (frequently or in great numbers)', i.e. 'the multi-twisted', the mmo. suffix *-qai/-kei* (mo. *-γai/-gei*) designating things fashioned by, or resulting from, the action of the verb.<sup>31</sup> I admit that the above interpretation is very problematic.

No. 267: '[ ] (*houai-t'ie-eul*) "manche". K 334: 'q[ ] 267 (*huailhuan tie er*) "manche/sleeve" (*hexiu*); il doit être mong. *qančui/qančun*; ..., mais comment?' M 107 transcribes this word as 'quitar' with the gloss '*örgen qančui* (?)' 'wide sleeve (?)'. Obviously, before examining the puzzling Mongolian term we must first consider the Chinese one, which is also not obvious. According to Hakanchulu (6), 5, no. 372, the expression *ho-hsiu* 合袖 corresponds to *t'ao-hsiu* 套袖, i.e. the muff to keep the hands warm in cold weather; and, as we have seen, M renders it as 'wide sleeve' with a question mark. However, there is no evidence that *ho-hsiu* has ever been used in the sense of *t'ao-hsiu* or that it means 'wide sleeve'. I believe that *ho* simply means 'paired', hence *ho-hsiu* is 'paired sleeves', 'sleeves in a pair' (or 'side by side, together'; *ho* = *ping* 並), i.e. 'sleeves', as L and K have indeed understood it. This is confirmed by the corresponding Mongol term \**qan[čü] dēl* (pmo. \**qančü degel*), lit. 'sleeve – coat (or robe)', a typical '*mot-couple*'<sup>32</sup> the meaning of which is identical with that of the first element of the binome. Thus *qančü dēl* = *qančü* 'sleeve(s)'. The Chinese transcription is both mutilated and contracted. It lacks, in fact, the character for *čü* (? 出) after *huan* 懷 (*qan*), but this should not surprise us because, besides complete lacunae, there are several mutilated and incomplete transcriptions in the CYIY/MKIY; cf. L, nos. 230, 297, 306, 331, 373 and 375. *T'ieh-erh* 帖兒 = *ter/tel* pro *der/del*, i.e. *dēl* < *de'el* < *degel* (mo. *debel*, *degel*). For *der* = *dēr* = *dēl* see L, 269, no. 270: '*dēl* (*tie-eul*) "robe"'; cf. K 291. For the use of *t'ieh* 帖 (*te*) for *tieh* 迭 (*de*), cf. Pelliot–Hambis (1951, pp. 225–226).

No. 269: '*simgen* (*sin-kan*) "devant de corsage, bande portée autour des reins".' K 334–335: '*simgen* [?] 269 (*xin/m qian*, lire *gan* pour 千 *qian*) "bande portée autour des reins, devant de corsage/band covering the belly" (*guodu*). K then mentions possible correlations with terms like *nimgen* 'thin' (in the expression *nimgen de'el* 'unlined robe'), and *čirim* (prob. = mo. *jirim*) 'right-hand saddle-strap under the horse's belly', but he acknowledges that 'pour le moment ce n'est qu'une tentative désespérée de combiner deux cas difficiles'. M 107 transcribes this word as '*simgen*', glossing it as '*eligebčü*' 'abdominal band (protecting the belly against cold)'. *Eligebčü* ← *elige* 'belly' + denominal noun suffix *-bčü*. The first and most obvious explanation that comes to mind is to read *hsin-kan* 心干 as \**šimqan* and take it as a plain borrowing from the Chinese, *hsin-kan* meaning, literally, 'heart-shield', i.e. 'stomach protector', hence 'stomacher'. For a similar type of borrowing see L, 267, no. 188; K 323. For *hsin* 心 'stomach, chest; the middle', see Morohashi (1968, no. 10295 [1], [3]); Couvreur (1966, p. 307a–b). For *kan* 干 'protection', see Moro-

in the less sophisticated system of transcription of the CYIY/MKIY; for 克 *kei* see Hattori (1973, p. 42, line 3). For *gürel-*, cf. de Rachewiltz (2004, p. 716).

<sup>31</sup> For the mmo. deverbial noun suffix *-qai/-kei*, see Godziński (1985, pp. 42–43, § 55); cf. Poppe (1974, p. 45, § 148).

<sup>32</sup> For this type of binomial expressions, cf. Mostaert (1953, pp. 42–43).



hashi (1968, no. 9165 [5]); Couvreur (1966, p. 270a). Unfortunately, to my knowledge the expression *hsin-kan* ‘waistband, abdominal band, stomacher’, is unattested in either vernacular or literary Chinese; the solution of the problem must, therefore, be sought elsewhere. The only other candidate I can propose and one which, like its Chinese equivalent (*kuo-tu* 裹肚) and its English counterparts, has a clear relationship with the abdomen, is \**šinggel*. This word is acceptable transcription-wise since *kan* 干 can render Mongolian *gen* as well as *gel*.<sup>33</sup> To be sure, the transcription *hsin-kan* renders, in principle, \**šinggel*, not \**šinggel*, but the occurrence of *šin* for *šing* is attested elsewhere in our glossary and presents no problem.<sup>34</sup> Now, \**šinggel*, a deverbal noun in *-l* from *šingge-* (mo. *šingge-*) ‘to dissolve, digest’, does not occur in Written Mongolian; it occurs, however, in Kalmuck as *šinl* with the meanings of ‘digestion’ and ‘a big stomach’ (see Ramstedt 1935, p. 359a; cf. Krueger 1978–1984, p. 442b). Here we have a word that has a definite connection with the stomach and, in my opinion, possibly the one transcribed as *hsin-kan*. In the 13th–14th centuries Mongol dialect recorded in the CYIY/MKIY, the word \**šinggel* may have had as a primary or, more likely, secondary meaning (‘big stomach’ → ‘stomacher’) that of ‘waistband’, the garment in question being regarded as an ‘enlargement’ of the stomach, but this is rather speculative.

No. 314: ‘*yinese* (*yi-nie-sie*) “pince, pincette”.’ K 335: ‘*yinese* [?] 314 (N *yi qin xie*; lire 聶 *nie* avec Y au lieu de 晶 *qin*) “pincette/pincers” (*niezi*), hapax legomenon; on pourrait changer les caractères chinois comme suit: 兀 *wu* ou 云 *yun* pour 亦 *yi*, 辟 *pi* pour 薛 *xie*, alors *wu/yün nie bi*, lire *ü<r>re[l]bi* ou *ü<l>le[r]bi* qui correspondrait au mong. *örölbi*, Wuti “pince” ...; toutefois la différence sémantique *pincette* : *pince* semble être trop grande pour les mots chinois et mongols en question’. M 113 reads ‘赤晶薛 *čimose/kimsa*’ with the gloss ‘*kimsa, čimkigür*’ ‘tweezers’. M is right: the confusion between *ch’ih* 赤 and *i* 亦 is a constant in the Chinese transcriptions of the 13th–14th centuries; and *ching* 晶 for *mo* 晶 also needs no explanation. *Ch’ih-mo-hsieh* is, quite correctly, \**čim<o>se*, i.e. \**čimse* (= \**čimsē*) < \**čimsege*; cf. mo. *kimsaya*, kh. *xyamsaa* ‘nippers, tweezers’. It appears, therefore, that in the Mongol dialect of the CYIY/MKIY the word in question was frontvocalic, not backvocalic. As is known, several mmo. frontvocalic words are backvocalic in mo.<sup>35</sup> The initial *či* is not surprising either: in one of the more ‘archaic’ Mongol languages, Monguor, *ki* > *či* (cf. ord. *tš’i*), i.e. (roughly) *či*. See Poppe (1955, pp. 133–134). Thus, the transcription of this word may not be as aberrant as it seems at first sight; however, its reconstruction remains hypothetical.

No. 398: ‘[ ] (*lin*) “scorpion”.’ K 335: ‘?[ ] 398 (*lin/m*) “scorpion” (*xie*)’. K lists the various terms for ‘scorpion’ in the Mongolian languages. M 126 reads *lim* and glosses the word as ‘*kilinčetü qoroqai*’ ‘scorpion’. As evident from two other contiguous entries (nos. 394, 396), the text of this section is quite corrupt and unreli-

<sup>33</sup> For *kan* 干 = *gen*, cf. Pelliot–Hambis (1951, p. 91) (*Türgen*); for *-en/-el*, cf. chin. *pian* 邊, 便 = *ben, bel*; *pan* 半 = *ban, bal*. See *ibid.*, pp. 185, 295; Hattori (1973, p. 40); and Lubsang-baldan–Boosiyang (1959, p. 33). Cf. also *Yüan-shih* 4, 49: Po-lan 孛蘭 = Boral.

<sup>34</sup> Cf., e.g., L, 271, no. 349: *šinqur* for *šingqur* (= *šingqor*); cf. K 323.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., *ümere/lumara, dörönel/dorona, söyü-/soyü-*. Cf. de Rachewiltz (1982, pp. 20, 83, n. 326).

able. I think that the character *lin* 林 is all that is left of a much longer word or words, coming possibly from the middle of the transcription of the word *kilinčetü* (*qoroqai*), as already suggested by Hakanchulu (5), 9, no. 283, but this is just a guess.

No. 416: ‘[ ] (*kou-yeou-souen*) “catalpa (*Bignonia catalpa*)”.’ K 335: ‘[g] 416 (*gu\*? sun*, N \* = ? *xiang*; Y \* = ? *xing* ou *zha/cha*, etc.) “catalpa (*Bignonia catalpa*)” (*qiushu*); avec le suffixe *-sun/-sün*, ce mot semble être d’origine mongole, bien que l’arbre en question ne soit pas indigène sur les traditionnels territoires mongols; ainsi le sens primitif doit être différent de celui du mot chinois’. M 129 mechanically transcribes ‘*gühešün*’ with no further identification of this word with a pmo. or mo. term. As rightly pointed out by K, the catalpa tree while common in China is not native to Mongolia, which poses a problem of semantics. I think that we are dealing with a term coined *ad hoc*; a Mongol term, however, in view of its characteristic denominative suffix *-sun/-sün*, used, *inter alia*, for plants (see Poppe 1981, pp. 387–388, n. 4). A possible candidate – unattested so far – could be \**gür[r]jesün* (mo. \**kürjesün*), from \**gürje* (mo. *kürje*) ‘shovel, spade’, owing to the cordate-ovate, and abruptly acuminate leaves of the *Catalpa Kaempferi* (= *C. ovata*) strongly reminiscent of a shovel. In mmo., the initial *gü* (古) often corresponds to mo. *kü* (see Mostaert 1999, p. 240). The second syllable, usually read as *yüeh* (*yao*) 杳 or *hsiang* 香 is (I believe) *chih* 者 (*je*).

No. 503: ‘[ ] (*ngo-tch’ao-eul*) “quand ?”’ K 335: ‘? [ ] 503 (*e chao er*) “en ce temps-là/then” ou, ce qui est moins vraisemblable, “quand?/when?” (*na shih*); la transcription actuelle ne se laisse identifier avec aucun de ces mots: mong. *tejiye, ejiye, kejiye; teli, keli; ene/tere čay-tur*’. M 145 transcribes this word as ‘*öčör/učayur*’, with the gloss ‘*tere üye-dü*’ ‘at that time’. As correctly noted by K, *na shih* can only mean ‘at that time’ in view of the entry immediately following (no. 504), which is *chih shih* 這時 ‘at this time, now’. The Chinese transcription *wo-ch’o-erh* 訛綽兒 must, in fact, represent mmo. \**uǰaur* = *uǰa’ur* (~ *huǰa’ur*) (cf. Haenisch 1962, p. 78),<sup>36</sup> pmo. *uǰayur*, mo. *ijayur* ‘origin, etc.’, but also ‘once upon a time, formerly, in the past (= fr. “autrefois”)’.<sup>37</sup> The Chinese transcription is only approximate (but we have to take into account the dialect variation in Mongolian), and so is the Chinese gloss.

No. 526: ‘[ ] (*ni-mou*) “cela ne va pas; inconvenient”.’ K 335: ‘? [ ] 526 (*ni mu*), ? lire *ene mü*, cf. *mü*.’ On p. 310, K writes: ‘*mü* [?] 526 (*ni mu*): [*e*] *ne m*. “cela ne va pas/this is improper” (*bu dang*); cf. MNT *mawui*, Hy, MA *mawu*; TMEN no. 361; dah. *mō*, yogor *mū*, baoan *muṅ*, santa *mau*, mgr. *maū*; khal. *muu*, etc.; mong. *mayu(i)*.’ M 147 transcribes ‘*nimü*’ querying, however, the Chinese transcription and not offering a script reading. He glosses it as ‘*jokis ügei*’ ‘improper’. K is undoubtedly right in reading *ene mü* (< *ma’u*; pmo., mo. *mayu*) ‘this (is) bad (= improper)’. For *ni* = *ene* ‘this’, cf. mong. *nie*, san-ch’uan *ni* id.

No. 529: ‘[ ] (*ngai-la-hou*) “couleur”.’ K 335: ‘? [ ] 529 (*ai la hu*) “couleur/colour” (*yanse*); cf. mong. *alay* ou *eriyen* “bigarré/variegated” (? 歹 *lie* pour 刺 *la* et 恩 *en* pour 忽 *hu*).’ M 148 transcribes the word as ‘*siuladu*’ (reading *shou* 受 for *ai* 愛 and *tu* 都 for *hu* 忽 with a question mark), glossing it as ‘*öngge*’ ‘colour’. I think *alag*

<sup>36</sup> For mmo. *ǰ* ~ *č* see Mostaert (1999, p. 244).

<sup>37</sup> See the *Mongyol kelen-ü toli*, p. 354, s.v. *ijayur* (3).



(= *alay*) ‘multicoloured’ is the only likely candidate, even though neither the Chinese transcription nor the Mongol term registered are accurate, but only approximate. However, the CYIY/MKIY is not a model of accuracy and a far cry from the later Sino-Mongol glossaries.

Although in L and K there are still quite a few readings which are questionable and require further investigation,<sup>38</sup> the above concludes the present survey. Most of the major problems concerning the editions of the CYIY/MKIY and the vocabulary itself have been dealt with; the ground is now ready for a comparative linguistic analysis of all the extant Sino-Mongol glossaries – an important task for future researchers.

### References

- Chavannes, E. (1962): *Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripitaka chinois*. I–III. Reprint of the 1910–1935 edition. Paris.
- Couvreur, S. (1966): *Dictionnaire classique de la langue chinoise*. Reprint of the 1904 Ho Kien Fou edition. Taipei.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (1982): The Preclassical Mongolian Version of the Hsiao-ching. *ZSt* 16, pp. 7–109.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (2004): *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century*, translated with a historical and philological commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz. I–II. Leiden–Boston.
- Fang Ling-kuei 方齡貴 (2001): *Ku-tien hsi-ch'ü wai-lai-yü k'ao-shih tz'u-tien* 古典戲曲外來語考釋詞典 [A dictionary of loanwords in classical dramas of China]. Shanghai, K'un-ming.
- Franke, H. (1994): Could the Mongol Emperors Read and Write Chinese? In: Franke, H.: *China under Mongol Rule*. Variorum, Aldershot, V, pp. 28–41.
- Godziński, S. (1985): *Język średniomongolski. Słownik i wyrazów. Odmiana wyrazów. Składnia*. Warsaw.
- Haenisch, E. (1962): *Wörterbuch zu Mangᡤol un niuca tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi)*. *Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Reprint of the 1939 Leipzig edition. Wiesbaden.
- Hattori Shirō (1973): The Chinese Dialect on which the Transcription of the Yüan-ch'ao *Mi-shih* was Based. *Acta Asiatica. Bulletin of the Institute of Eastern Culture* (Tokyo) 24, pp. 35–44.
- <sup>38</sup> E.g., no. 42: K 288: 'čulqur [?] 42 (*chu lu hu er*) “prêtre bouddhiste/Buddhist monk or priest” (*heshang*), mot mystérieux’. In a letter of N. Poppe to me dated 14 March 1974, he wrote: ‘The Mongolian word *čulyur* (or *čuluᡤur*) is not a particularly difficult one although it does not occur very often. Its meaning is “large and thick, massive, bulky”. It is a noun deriving from the verb *čuluyi*- “to become thick, fat, big-bellied”. The noun *r'šulugur* is found in Mostaert's Ord. dict., p. 719. The verb occurs in Khalkha and other languages. When a monk is meant, this word must have been used in a derogatory sense: “big-bellied one”, “the corpulent one”, etc.’ No. 297: K 306 'kō<n>nök [?] “bassin, pot/basin” ...; ou lire [*punsar*], emprunt au chin. *penzi + er*?’ The latter interpretation is correct. The first character of the Chinese transcription must be read *pen* 賁 (~ 噴; cf. the MKIY in CC, 18b, T and CT, 26a), hence *pen-sa-erh* 賁撒兒 < chin. *pen-tzu(-erh)* 盆子(兒 – redundant) \**benser*, cf. mo. *pengse* ‘large bowl, washbasin’. See M 111. No. 348: K 316: 'qarčā<i>qa 348 (*he li chai he*) “faucon/falco” (*ying*); ... cf. Ligeti: *Acta Orient. Hung.* I (1950), p. 177, n. 28.’ See above, n. 20. The third character of this word is a variant of *hsi* 襲, hence *ho-li-hsi-ho* 曷里襲合 \**qaršiya* (= *qaršiya*), cf. tu. *qaršiya* id.

- Hu Tao-ching 胡道靜 (1963): 1963 ‘Foreword’ (前言) to [Sung] *Ch'en Yüan-ching pien Shih-lin kuang-chi* [宋]陳元靚編事林廣記. Peking, 1976.
- Huang Yü-chi 黃虞稷 (1913): *Ch'ien-ch'ing-t'ang shu-mu* 千頃堂書目. *Shih-yüan ts'ung-shu* 適園叢書 edition, 2nd Series.
- Hummel, A. W. (ed.) (1943): *Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644–1912)*. I–II. Washington.
- Ishida Mikinosuke 石田幹之助 (1973): ‘Shigen yakugo’ ni tsuite ‘至元譯語’に就いて [Concerning the *Chih-yüan i-yü*]. In: Ishida Mikinosuke: *Tōa bunka-shi sōkō* 東亞文化史叢考 (*Studies in Cultural History of Central Asia*). Tokyo, pp. 87–111.
- Kara, G. (1990): *Zhiyuan yiyu*. Index alphabétique des mots mongols. *AOH* 44, pp. 279–344.
- Krueger, J. R. (1978–1984): *Materials for an Oirat-Mongolian to English Citation Dictionary*. I–III. Bloomington, Ind.
- Kuo-li Chung-yang...shu mu = *Kuo-li Chung-yang t'u-shu-kuan shan-pen shu-mu* 國立中央圖書館善本書目. Edited by the Kuo-li Chung-yang t'u-shu-kuan. I–IV. Taipei, 1967.
- Kuo-li Ku-kung...shu-mu = *Kuo-li Ku-kung po-wu-yüan shan-pen shu-mu* 國立故宮博物院善本書目. Edited by the Kuo-li Ku-kung po-wu-yüan. Taipei, 1968.
- Lewicki, M. (1949): *La langue mongole des transcriptions chinoises du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle. Le Houa-yi yi-yu de 1389*. Wrocław.
- Ligeti, L. (1950): Mots de civilization de Haute Asie en transcription chinoise. *AOH* 1, pp. 141–188.
- Ligeti, L. (1956): *Le Po kia sing* en écriture 'phags-pa. *AOH* 6, pp. 1–52.
- Ligeti, L. (1962): Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul. *AOH* 14, pp. 3–99.
- Ligeti, L. (1990): Un vocabulaire sino-mongol des Yuan. *Le Tche-yuan yi-yu* déchiffré par Louis Ligeti, édité par G. Kara. *AOH* 44, pp. 259–277.
- Lo Ch'ang-peï 羅常培-Ts'ai Mei-piao 蔡美彪 (1959): Pa-ssu-pa tzu yü Yüan-tai Han-yü 八思巴字與元代漢語 [The 'Phags-pa Script and the Chinese Language of the Yüan Period]. Peking.
- Lubsangbaldan, Q.–Boosiyang, A. (1959): 'Quva i i yü' toli bičig-ün jarim keseg [Some Sections of the *Hua i i yü* Vocabulary]. *Mongᡤol kele jökiyal teiuke* 12, pp. 24–34.
- Mongᡤol kelen-ü toli*. Compiled by the 'Mongᡤol kelen-ü toli' editorial committee. Öbör Mongᡤol Arad-un keblel-ün qoriya. Hohhot, 1997.
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次 (1968): *Dai kanwa jiten* 大漢和辭典 [Great Chinese–Japanese dictionary]. I–XIII. Reprint of the 1955–1960 edition. Tokyo.
- Mostaert, A. (1953): *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols*. Reprinted from *HJAS* 13 (1950), 14 (1951) and 15 (1952). Cambridge, Mass.
- Mostaert, A. (1977): *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i iu* 華夷譯語 *de Houng-ou (1389)*. I. Edited by I. de Rachewiltz with the assistance of A. Schönbaum. Bruxelles.
- Mostaert, A. (1999): Quelques problèmes phonétiques dans la transcription en caractères chinois du texte mongol du *Luen tch'ao pi cheu*. Edited by I. de Rachewiltz and P. W. Geier. In: Sagaster, K. (ed.): *Antoine Mostaert (1881–1971) C.I.C.M. Missionary and Scholar. Louvain Chinese Studies* IV, Leuven, I, pp. 229–271.
- Naikaku Bunko...mokuroku* = *Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 內閣文庫漢籍分類目錄. Edited by the Naikaku Bunko. Tokyo, 1956.
- Osada Natsuki 長田夏樹 (1953): Gendai no Chū-Mō taiyaku goi 'Shigen yakugo' 元代之中蒙對譯語彙‘至元譯語’ [The Sino-Mongolian vocabulary *Chih-yüan i-yü* of the Yüan Period]. *Kōbe Gaikokugo Daigaku ronsō* 神戸外國語大學論叢 4, 2–3, pp. 91–118.
- Pelliot, P. (1922): Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits et imprimés chinois de la Bibliothèque vaticane. Typescript. [Rome].



- Pelliot, P. (1948): *Le Hōja et le Sayyid Husain de l'Histoire des Ming*. Paris.
- Pelliot, P. (1995): *Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits et imprimés chinois de la Bibliothèque vaticane*. Revised edition by T. Takata. Kyoto.
- Pelliot, P.–Hambis, L. (1951): *Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan. Cheng-wou ts'in-tcheng lou*. I. Leiden.
- Poppe, N. (1955): *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Helsinki.
- Poppe, N. (1974): *Grammar of Written Mongolian*. Reprint of the 1954 edition. Wiesbaden.
- Poppe, N. (1981): On Some Suffixes of Plant Names in Mongolian. *ZSt* 15, pp. 383–390.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1991): *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver.
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1935): *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki.
- Sakai Tadao 酒井忠夫 (1958): Mindai no nichiyō ruisho to shomin kyōiku 明代の日用類書と庶民教育 [Ming encyclopedias for everyday use and popular education]. In: Hayashi Toyoharu 林友春 (ed.): *Kinsei Chūgoku kyōikushi kenkyū* 近世中國教育史研究 [Studies on the history of Chinese education in modern times]. Tokyo, pp. 25–153.
- Secret History of the Mongols = Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史. Po-na 百衲 edition. Shanghai, 1935.
- Seikadō...mokuroku = Seikadō Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 靜嘉堂文庫漢籍分類目錄. Edited by the Seikadō Bunko. Tokyo, 1929.
- Sonkeikaku Bunko...mokuroku = Sonkeikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku* 尊經閣文庫漢籍分類目錄. Edited by the Sonkeikaku Bunko. Tokyo, 1934.
- Stimson, H. M. (1966): *The Jongyuan in yunn: A Guide to Old Mandarin Pronunciation*. New Haven.
- Tōdō Akiyasu 藤堂明保 (1983): *Kanji gogen jiten* 漢字語源辭典 [Etymological dictionary of Chinese characters]. Tokyo.
- Toshoryō...Kanseki-hen = Toshoryō tenseki kaidai. Kanseki-hen* 圖書寮典籍解題. 漢籍編. Edited by the Kunaichō Shoryōbu. Tokyo, 1961.
- Wada Hisanori 和田久徳 (1954): Sōdai Nankai shiryō to shite no Tō-I Zasshi 宋代南海史料としての島夷雜誌 [The *Tao-I tsa-chih* as a historical material on the Southern Sea in the Sung Period]. In *O-Cha no Mizu Joshi Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kiyō* お茶の水女子大學人文科學紀要 5, pp. 27–51.
- Wakan...mokuroku = Wakan tosho bunrui mokuroku* 和漢圖書分類目錄. Edited by the Kunaichō Shoryōbu. I. Tokyo, 1951.
- Wu, K. T. (1950): Chinese Printing Under Four Alien Dynasties. *HJAS* 13, pp. 447–523.
- Yüan-shih = Sung Lien* 宋濂 et al.: *Yüan-shih* 元史. Chung-hua shu-chū 中華書局 edition. Peking, 1976.

## ZUM FOMU JING 佛母經 (,SŪTRA DER MUTTER DES BUDDHA')

NISHIWAKI TSUNEKI

Kyoto University, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies,  
Yoshida-Nihonmatsu-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto, 606-8501, Japan  
e-mail: t\_nishiwaki@nifty.com

Das in dieser Arbeit behandelte *Fomu jing* ist ein buddhistisches Werk, das nicht in den historischen Sūtrakatalogen enthalten ist. Die große Anzahl von Manuskripten dieses Werkes, die in Dunhuang entdeckt wurden, zeigt, daß es zu einer bestimmten Zeit dort sehr verbreitet war. Im ersten Abschnitt wird unter Berücksichtigung dieser Manuskripte ein Überblick über die Gestalt des *Mohemoye jing* bzw. des *Fomu jing* gegeben und es werden Petersburger Dunhuang-Manuskripte des Textes vorgestellt, die bisher in den Nachdrucken nicht benutzt wurden. Im zweiten Abschnitt wird ein Berliner Turfan-Manuskript präsentiert und es werden die „Sechs Großen Alpträume“ betrachtet, die den Beweis für den apokryphen Charakter des *Fomu jing* liefern. Im dritten Abschnitt wird das *Foshuo xiaoniepan jing* aus der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek vorgestellt und gezeigt, daß dieses mit den Dunhuang- und Turfan-Manuskripten des *Fomu jing* in Verbindung steht. Im Schlußkapitel wird versucht darzustellen, in welcher Form das *Fomu jing* tradiert wurde. Dazu wird der Verlauf der Überlieferung vom *Fomu jing* zum *Foshuo xiaoniepan jing* verdeutlicht, und der Umstand erklärt, warum das Sūtra keinen Eintrag in den Sūtrakatalogen fand.

*Schlüsselwörter:* Dunhuang, Turfan, Buddhica, Apokryphen, Zou Yan, *Fomu jing*, *Mohemoye jing*.

### 1. Dunhuang-Manuskripte

Das *Fomu jing* trägt verschiedene Namen wie *Da banniepan moyefuren pin jing* 大般涅槃摩耶夫人品經, *Da banniepan jing fomu pin* 大般涅槃經佛母品, *Da banniepan jing fo wei moye furen shuojie pin jing* 大般涅槃經佛爲摩耶夫人說偈品經. Obwohl vom Inhalt her gleich, kommt es nicht selten vor, daß die Titel, die zu Beginn oder am Ende desselben Manuskriptes angegeben sind, voneinander abweichen. Zum Beispiel heißt es am Anfang des Manuskripts P. 2055 (Sammlung Pelliot): *Da banniepan moye furen pin jing* 大般涅槃摩耶夫人品經, am Ende desselben aber: *Fomu jing*. Auch bei Manuskripten, die als gleich klassifiziert werden, gibt es zum