

NOTES ON F. W. CLEAVES:
AN EARLY MONGOLIAN VERSION OF THE *HSIAO CHING**

CHAPTERS ONE TO EIGHTEEN

I. DE RACHEWILTZ

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

Abbreviations

- emc. = Early Middle Chinese
mma. = Middle Mandarin
mmo. = Middle Mongolian
mo. = Written (Script) Mongolian
mtu. = Middle Turkic
pmo. = Preclassical Mongolian (i.e. mmo. in Uighur-Mongol script)
'ph. = 'Phags-pa (i.e. mmo. in 'Phags-pa script)

1r, 1–7: These lines are missing in the text because the entire fol. 1r is missing (together with the title page). Lu, L and C1 have attempted to restore some of the words of the original. For a more scientific attempt and an almost full restoration see de Rachewiltz (2004). The text as reconstructed in the latter is as follows:

1. [孝經 (一卷)]
2. **Qiauging*/**Kauging bičig* (*nigen debter*)
3. 開宗明義章第一
4. *Tool udq'a-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*
5. 仲尼居曾子侍 *Jungni sayuju Singsi taqin büküi-dür*

* See Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. 1. Facsimile of the Bilingual Text. *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 59 (2006), No. 3, pp. 241–244; Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. 2. Chapters Ten to Thirteen, revised and edited by I. de Rachewiltz. *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 59 (2006), No. 4, pp. 393–406; Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. 3. Chapters Fourteen to Seventeen, revised and edited by I. de Rachewiltz. *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 60 (2007), No. 2, pp. 145–160.

6. 子曰先王有至德要道以順天下 *Kungvusi ügüler-ün*
7. *uridu boydas qad angqan-u sayin ayali aburi*]

In de Rachewiltz (1986, pp. 36–37), I stated that the word *hsiao* 孝 can be transcribed in pmo. as *kau* (as suggested by Ligeti) as well as *qiau*; hence the title of the book *could* have been either *Qiauging* or *Kauging*. In the case of the Chinese initial *hsi* (*xi*, 'ph. *h̄i*), the regular transcription of this syllable in pmo. is, in fact, *qi* (e.g. *hsing* 行 = *qing*, *hsing* 興 = *qing*, *hsio* 學 = *qio*); the final *au* (*aw*, 'ph. *aw* [Ligeti], *av* [Poppe]), is transcribed as *au* (e.g. *ch'ao* 鈔, 朝 = *čau*, *mao* 毛 = *mau*, *shao* 少 = *šau*). However, there is unfortunately no attested occurrence of *hsiao* 孝 = *qiau*. On the other hand, we have more than one occurrence of *hsiao* (*xiào*, mma. *xjaw'*) 學 transcribed as *kau* (Cleaves 1949, p. 75a; 1950, p. 85a). The reason for this 'irregular' transcription is that it is based not on mma. *xjaw'*, but on emc. *ɣaiwk/ɣæ:wk* (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 340), hence in pmo. *kau* we have an archaising orthography or 'ouigourisme orthographique' (Ligeti 1984, p. 349, n. 50). But it is unlikely that *hsiao* 孝 (*xiào*, mma. *xjaw'*) would have been treated in the same way as 學 by the Mongol transcriber/translator since the emc. pronunciation of the former was *ɣaiw^h/xɛ:w^h* (Pulleyblank, loc. cit.). Therefore, I would exclude now a transcription *kau* for 孝 and would retain only the reading *Qiauging* for the book title, with some reservations.

The revised reconstruction of the Mongol text is thus as follows:

2. [**Qiauging bičig* (*nigen debter*)
4. *Γool udq-a-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*
5. *ǰungni sayuǰu Singisi taqin büküi-dür*
6. *Kungvusi ügüler-ün*
7. *uridu boydas qad angqan-u sayin ayali aburi*]

In R, p. 41, the missing lines (1a, 2, 4–5) of the translation should read now as follows:

1a [THE BOOK (CALLED) **QIAUGING* (ONE VOLUME)

First Chapter, On Explaining the Central Meaning (of the Text).

When ǰungni (Chung-ni, Confucius) was sitting and Singisi (Tseng-tzu) was waiting upon (him),

Lines 6 and 7 of the restored Mongol text are translated in R, p. 41; however, the word read *ilüberteke*[*n*] 'suitably' in the same sentence but on 1b, 1 (R, p. 28), should instead be read *ilübertege*[*n*], as explained in de Rachewiltz (2004, p. 55, n. 27).

1v, 2–3: C1 *irgen oryan* [...]-*iyar anu nayiralduǰuyui* 'their people were by [...] in harmony with one another'. As shown in R, pp. 53–54, n. 8, the most likely candidate for the obliterated word of the text is *udum* 'example'; hence *udum-iyar anu* 'by their (i.e. the sage rulers': *boydas qad*) example'. Cf. Ligeti (1984, p. 322), and de Rachewiltz (1986, pp. 29–30).

1v, 4: *uqamuyu*[*ɣu č̄i*] 'do you know?' Lu reads *uqamuyuu* [*č̄i*], L *uqamuyu*[*u č̄i*], and C1 *uqamuiu*[*ɣu č̄i*]. Cleaves' reading presupposes a *praesens imperfecti* in

-*mui* of *uqa-* 'to know'. This is, I think, unlikely. In the *HC*, the only four other occurrences of this tense are in *-mu* (*čidamu*, 7v, 2 and 9r, 5; *bolumu* 29r, 6 and 7); and, in general, *-mu* is used in pmo. for the singular and *-mui* for the plural. See *Untersuchungen*, p. 133. If so, the interrogative form of the text must be *uqamuyuyu*, the *yu* of the interrogative particle *-yuyu* joined to the verb being clearly visible.

1v, 5: *jay[ilaju]*. This is the only possible restoration of the partly obliterated last word of this line. The other reading suggested by Cleaves (C1, p. 81, n. 27), viz. *jay[ilayad]* cannot be taken into consideration because the final letter *d* with its characteristic ductus would take too much space.

2r, 2: Lu *[bu]yu*, L *[bu]yu*, C1 *[(?)anu bu]yu*, R *[?kü bu]yu*. In support of the restoration *kü* (mmo. *gü!*) *buyu*, cf. 38r, 1: *töb ujayur anu edüi kü buyu* 'this much, indeed, is the central origin (= fundamental duty)'.

2r, 4: Lu *[čimadur]*, L *[čimadur]*, C1 *[? čimada]*, R *[čimada]*. I think that Cleaves (C1, p. 83, n. 43) is absolutely right in stating that 'in the language of the time the form might well have been *čimada*'. The form *čimadur* was, indeed, used much less in pmo. texts. Besides the *Secret History* (see *SH Index*, p. 208b), see *Die Mongolica*, p. 209a, s.v. 'či.'

2v, 6: Lu *eng türün*, L *ang* [= *neng* ?] *türün*, C1 *ang türün*, R *ang türün*. The readings *ang* and *ang* (= *eng*) of the first word have been discussed in detail by Cleaves (C1, p. 86, n. 60) and de Rachewiltz (R, pp. 57–58, n. 29). In view of the fact that *in the same text* there is a fluctuation *angqa(n)-engken* (2r, 7, 27r, 5, 33v, 3; 26r, 2), presupposing *ang-eng*, the first word of the compound *could* be read either way. The Mongol translator may have been uncertain as to the correct orthography partly, I think, because of the short initial vowel (see *Introduction*, p. 45: 'Mo. *eṅ* "the width of textiles," Urd., Kh., Kalm. *eṅ*, Bur. *eṅ* = Mong. *āṅ* id.'). and partly because of the inherent phonetic ambiguity of this Turkic word (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 166a, s.v. 'eṅ'). However, the weight of the evidence in pmo. is in favour of the reading *eng* (*ang*). In the Turfan document TMD 130, the seventh line begins with the words *eng urida*. See *Mongolica*, p. 12, and *Die Mongolica*, p. 137. Whereas it is quite common to find in pmo. texts the initial *e* (') written as *a* ("), i.e. *a*, the reverse is most unusual. For *eng terigün* and *eng urida* see also the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* of Sa-skya Paṇḍita translated by Sonom Gara (*TS Index*, p. 106).

3r, 1: *küčü ögkü*, rendered in C1 as 'to give [our] strength'. This is a literal translation of a Turkic expression borrowed in Mongolian (see *ibid.*, p. 87, n. 64), the actual meaning of which is 'to serve', as clearly shown by the Chinese text (*shih chün* 事君 'to serve the ruler'). Cf. below, 21v, 3.

3r, 4–5: *ülü duradqu busu*, lit. '(you) are not (= must not) not to think of (= remember)' – an emphatic double negative rendering the (equally emphatic) rhetorical negative question in the original Chinese: *wu nien* 無念 'should (you) not think of ...?' See *The Book of Odes*, p. 186 (6). The Chinese expression is not really 'enigmatic', as stated by Cleaves (C1, p. 88, n. 73).

4r, 7: *sayijirafuyui*, C2 'have benefited', R 'have become better'. I think that the verb *sayijira-* (< *sayin* 'good' + *-jira*, on which see *Grammar*, p. 65, § 244) 'to improve, become better' is more accurate, in this context, than 'to benefit', which

may be understood as 'to gain advantage' rather than 'to improve oneself'. For *sayiji-ra*- cf. Pyurbeev (2001–2002, vol. III, p. 70a), s.v. 'sažrax'.

4v, 3; 17v, 5: *qari-yin ejed*, C3 'lords of vassal states', R 'lords of principalities'. Pmo. *qari-yin ejed* renders ch. *chu-hou* 諸侯 'prince(s) of state, feudal ruler(s)', with reference, of course, to the feudal lords or princes of the Chou 周 dynasty. In mmo. *qari* meant 'a (foreign) state or nation; the various (other) tribes' (YCPS), 'a prince or leader (of a foreign tribe or nation); a nation' (HIIY). Leaving aside Ligeti's remarks (in Ligeti 1984, p. 330, n. 30) which are inconclusive, Cleaves' translation of *qari-yin ejed* as 'lords of vassal states' is more accurate than 'lords of principalities'.

5v, 1–2: *bayajiqu noyalaqu qoyar-iyar beyes-ečegen es-e ele angyjirayul-basu*, C3 'If they but not let both richness and nobility separate from their persons', R 'If they do not cause to themselves the loss of both their wealth and noble standing'. Cleaves (C3, p. 135, n. 30) has rightly pointed out that *qoyar-iyar*, referring as it does to *bayajiqu* 'being rich' and *noyalaqu* 'being noble', cannot as an *instrumentalis* in *-iyar* be the object of the verb *angyjirayul*- 'to let (or cause to) separate (or part)', i.e. 'to cause the loss of'. The Chinese text says, in fact, 'When (or if) their wealth and nobility do not leave their (i.e. the lords of vassal states) persons'. Cleaves, therefore, is of the opinion that *-iyar* is a scribal error for *-iyan* and translates accordingly. I think that *-iyar* is not a scribal error and that the Mongol translator has somewhat paraphrased the Chinese into Mongolian along the lines suggested by J. C. Street, whose interpretation has been, in my view, too hastily dismissed by Cleaves. Street (1986, p. 230) understands the Mongol passage as follows: 'By means of their continuing wealth and noble standing – if they never allow [such wealth and rank] to be separated from their persons – [rulers] will thenceforth be able to carry out their sacrifices ...' Cleaves (op. cit., p. 136) rejected this interpretation on the ground that the conditional clause in the Mongolian text, treated by Street as an interpolated remark, is not treated as such in the Chinese text. In the present case, I think Cleaves has failed to realise that the Mongol translator is not slavishly following the Chinese text to produce a literal translation, but is in fact freely, albeit accurately, rendering the Chinese in his own tongue, as Cleaves himself has noted elsewhere (C1, p. 71). I would, however, slightly modify Street's interpretation as follows: 'By having wealth and noble standing, if they but not lose them, only then can they carry out their sacrifices ...'. 'If they but not lose them' is, literally, 'If only they do not let (them, i.e. riches and noble standing) part from themselves'. This interpretation makes perfect sense and is in accord with the Chinese text that says: 'When their riches and nobility do not leave their persons, then they are able to preserve the altars ...' (Legge 1899, p. 468).

5v, 6: *taqimtayū yosun*, C3 'the filial piety'. Cf. C4, p. 142 and C6, p. 11: 'the filial manner', C5, p. 24: 'filiality' – all rendering the same expression *taqimtayū yosun*, lit. 'the filial manner (or way)', i.e. 'the manner or way of being filial' = *taqimtayū bolqu-yin yosun* (4r, 4–5), in other words 'the filial course'. For *yosu(n)* 'way, course' (= ch. *tao* 道) in mmo. see Haenisch's *Wörterbuch*, p. 171. In each instance, *taqimtayū yosun* renders the single word *hsiao* 孝 'filial piety, filiality' of the original.

Nevertheless, I think that in this particular case the Mongol expression should be translated uniformly as ‘the filial course (or way, manner)’.

6r, 4: *noyaliyudun ügülekü*, C4 ‘wherein one speaks of the [High] Officers’, R ‘concerning the high officials’. In R, p. 62, n. 73, I have explained why we must take *noyaliyud*, pl. of *noyaliy*, as meaning ‘high officials’ rather than simply ‘officials’. C4, pp. 143–144, n. 4, has correctly pointed out that there is something syntactically abnormal in placing the noun *noyaliyud* in the genitive case *noyaliyudun* (= *noyaliyud-un*) instead of the regular accusative required by *ügülekü*, lit. ‘speaking of (= concerning)’. He suggests that some words may have mistakenly dropped out of the chapter heading, which he thinks originally was *noyaliyudun taqimtaqu* (*sic*) *yosun-i ügülekü dörbeduyar bölög* ‘The Fourth Chapter Wherein One Speaks of the Filial Manner of the [High] Officers’. I do not share his view. In my opinion it is very doubtful that not one, but two words would have been omitted from the text: if that had happened the block would have been recarved; moreover, the Mongol title proposed by Cleaves would have not corresponded to the Chinese one, although this is a secondary consideration. What is more likely is that only one word was affected, viz. *noyaliyudun* where the final *un* could be an orthographic mistake for *i*. However, I exclude even this possibility because *noyaliyud-i* would have been written with a final *-d* with ductus followed by a separate accusative suffix *-i*. Cf. the word *noyad-i* in 14r, 1. In other words, it would have looked quite different from the genitive form. I think that the expression *noyaliyudun ügülekü* is the original one, even though it is syntactically irregular: the author made a slip of the brush in the original ms. and did not bother to correct it after the printing block had been made. Possibly, he did not regard it as so serious an error to warrant a change at that stage. Which, of course, raises the question of how serious, in fact, the mistake was in the first place. It certainly departs from the pattern of the other chapter headings in which the *nomen futuri ügülekü* is preceded by the object in the accusative. But this is not, in itself, a mistake. The fact is that, normally, *ügüle-* governs the accusative, or it has a direct (suffixless) object (*üge ügüle-* ‘to say a word’). However, there is in Mongolian also a *genitivus objectivus* designating the object of someone’s action, e.g. *kelen-ü suryayuli* ‘school of languages’, and, with a deverbal noun from *ügüle-*, *kelen-ü ügülel* ‘pronunciation of the word’. Cf. *Grammar*, pp. 143–144, § 501; Kow., p. 569a. Now, *ügülel*, like the verbal noun *ügülekü*, designates the *action* of speaking, telling, etc., and my impression is that *ügülekü* is used in the same way in the present case, in apposition to *dörbeduyar bölög*, i.e. ‘Chapter Four, The Speaking of (= What One Says About) the High Officials’, ‘of the High Officials’ (*noyaliyudun*) being the *genitivus objecti* of *ügülekü*. It would undoubtedly be an unusual, but not impossible construct (especially at a time when the written language was being elaborated), and one that could perhaps be associated with a rather original and unconventional translator like ours. The use of the *nomen futuri* in pmo. has not, in my view, been sufficiently investigated, as indeed other aspects of pmo. syntax which, in many respects, is quite at variance with the syntax of mo. and the modern literary language. See, provisionally, Orlovskaya (1958, pp. 101–114; limited, however, to the *Secret History*); Yazyk, pp. 91–97. In the *HC* we encounter several ‘irregular’ (grammatically speak-

ing) forms. In the present chapter, cf. the *yabuquiban* (for *yabuyulquiban*) in 6v, 4, discussed in C4, pp. 146–147, n. 23.

9v, 2–3: *ülü böged yutuyaydaqui*, C5 ‘may ... not, then, disgrace [them]’, R ‘may you on no account disgrace them’. As I have indicated in R, pp. 64, 103, following Ligeti (1964, p. 268, § 56), the word *böged* (this reading is preferable to Cleaves’ *büged* for pmo. since its pronunciation in mmo. was prevalently *bö’et*; see below, 13v, 7; 14r, 3) in this instance is not a coordinating particle or conjunction (‘then, and’), but a particle strengthening the preceding negation (*ülü*), as in 31r, 2 and 36r, 7. Cleaves had some reservations on this score (C5, p. 39, n. 60), but I think that the weight of the evidence is in favour of Ligeti’s interpretation. Cf. the identical use of *böged* with the negative *buu* (*buu böged* followed by the verb in the imperative form). See *Twelve Deeds*, F 22a (6), 55a (4–5). Various other examples can be adduced (the Sino-Mong. inscription of 1362, etc.) showing that *ülü (buu) böged* does not mean ‘do not, then’, but ‘do not!’ (emph. prohibitive) = ch. *wu* 無 or *wu* 毋.

9v, 7–10r, 1: *yajar-un oliy-i uqaju tariyalayad*, C6 ‘when ... and, having understood and cultivated the advantages of earth, ...’, R ‘When ... and farm, understanding the benefits (afforded by different kinds) of soil ...’. I think Cleaves has misunderstood this sentence. The people (lit. ‘the many [= multitude of] people’, i.e. the common people: ch. *shu-jen* 庶人) – in this case, obviously, the farming population – do not ‘cultivate’ (*tariyala-*) the advantages or benefits (*oliy*) of the earth or soil (*yajar*): they cultivate the latter, i.e. they engage in farming, understanding ‘the various processes of agriculture, as conditioned by the seasons and the qualities of different soils’ (Legge 1899, p. 472, n. 1). *Tariyala-* is a concrete verb meaning ‘to cultivate the soil’. The term is discussed at length in C6, pp. 14–15, n. 10, and Cleaves’ over-literal rendering of the passage is, therefore, puzzling.

10v, 2: *kemejügü*, C6 ‘[So], one has said’, R ‘(Thus) he (= Kungvusi) said’. The subject of the verb *keme-* ‘to say’ is definitely Confucius (see Legge, loc. cit.); therefore, Cleaves’ ‘one’ should have been qualified. As it is, anyone could have said what is stated in the previous lines.

10v, 7: *masi menegün ayui yeke aysan ajuyu* (in C7 the second ‘*ayui yeke*’ is redundant), C7 ‘has been very immense and grand’, R ‘has (always) been very vast (?) and immense’. In C7, p. 22, n. 11, Cleaves has clearly explained the etymology and meaning of the word *menegün* – a *hapax legomenon* – thus complementing and supplementing my remarks in R, pp. 65–66, n. 115. Therefore, the question mark in my translation should be removed.

11r, 4: *nasu aburid-ta*, C7 ‘always’, R ‘always and consistently’. In Cleaves (1954, p. 85 (167a)), Cleaves had translated the expression *nasu aburi-da* as ‘for ever and ever’, pointing out in his note 330 on p. 125 that *nasu* ‘year, age, lifetime’ = *nasuda* ‘throughout one’s lifetime, all the time, always’. In the expression *nasu aburid-ta* of the HC, *aburid-ta* = *aburi-da*, mo. *aburida* (← *aburi* ‘habit, manner, conduct, etc.’ + adv. suff. *-ta* ‘habitually, consistently’). See Lessing (1982, p. 7a). With regard to *aburid-ta*, I stated (R, p. 66, n. 119): ‘I do not know the origin of the final *d* of *aburid*. It seems to be a plural suffix; hence, possibly, **aburin*, pl. *aburid*, adv. *aburidta*; cf. *genen*, *gened*, *genedte* “unexpectedly.”’ In C7, p. 25, n. 23, Cleaves con-

firms that *aburid* 'is a pluralis in *-d* of *aburi*, a *nomen deverbale* in *-buri* of *a-* "to be", for which cf. Kow., p. 47a–b: "coutume, usage, habitude, temperament, penchant inné, conduite, caractère." Since nouns formed with the suffix *-buri* do not normally have a variable *-n* stem, the plural form *aburid* is anomalous or, at any rate, most unusual. As both *nasu* (= *nasuda*) and *aburid-ta* are adverbs expressing the same concept but each having, at the same time, slightly different connotations ('always/consistently'), I think it is better to translate them individually.

11v, 1: *tngrī-yin gegegen*, C7 'the luminosity of Heaven', R 'the bright (bodies) of Heaven'. *Tngrī-yin gegegen* is, literally, 'the light(s) of Heaven', i.e. 'the luminaries of Heaven', in other words, the bright heavenly bodies (= the sun, the moon and the stars), which is exactly what is meant by the ch. *ming* 明. See Morohashi (1955–1960, no. 13805 (19)). Cf. Legge (1899, p. 473). Cleaves is correct, however, in specifying the subject of the sentence as being '[the former sovereigns]', rather than identifying it with 'the ideal ruler' (R, p. 66, n. 120). See Legge, loc. cit. 'The sage rulers of old' (*uridu boydas qad*) are, indeed, explicitly mentioned only a few lines later (11v, 7). The entire passage in R must, therefore, be rephrased as follows: 'Because (the sage rulers of old) governed ..., even though they did not set their teachings in order ...; even though they were not strict ...'

13r, 2; 17r, 3; 17r, 5: Lu Čiu, L Čiu, C7 Ĵiu, R Ĵiu. For the readings Čiu and Ĵiu of the Mongol text corresponding to Chou 周 of the Chinese text, cf. the discussion in Ligeti (1984, pp. 347–348); and de Rachewiltz (1986, pp. 35–36). Ligeti is correct – the *uyiyurĵin* form should be transcribed as Čiu even though *čiu* has in this case the value of *ĵiu*. However, the transcription 'Čiu' should be followed in C7 and R by '(= Ĵiu)' for the sake of precision.

13r, 3: *gegegen uqayatu*, C7 'possessed of luminous sagacity', R 'enlightened and sagacious'. In his long note 86 on pp. 54–57, Cleaves has shown conclusively that *gegegen uqayatu*, somewhat loosely rendering ch. *ho-ho* 赫赫 'majestic, awe-inspiring (lit. "brilliant – brilliant")', means 'possessed of luminous sagacity'. For this expression cf. mo. *gegegen oyutu* 'intelligent, enlightened, having a clear mind' (Lessing 1982, p. 374a; Kow., p. 424a) and mo. *gegen uqayan* 'wisdom, sagacity' (MKT, p. 1659a). While Cleaves' rendering is a strict but rather awkward literal translation, I believe that far from being inaccurate, the rendering 'enlightened and sagacious' conveys in current English the exact meaning and force of the original which embodies *both* these concepts. These two concepts are, in fact, clearly separated in the final section of this chapter: *gegegen qad* in 15v, 3, and *qan kümün yeke uqayan ayali aburi-tu* in 15v, 6.

13v, 6: C8 *daqi* 'again', R *taqi* 'even'. The reading *taqi* in R has been adopted in preference to *daqi* (> mo. *daki*) because the form with initial *t-* is the one attested in the *YCPS* and the *HHY*. Cf. L *taqi*. As for its meanings, see R, pp. 69–70, n. 150; *Matériel mongol*, vol. II, p. 88 (10r, 2–3); and *Secret History* (2), p. 544, n. 149.

13v, 7; 14r, 3: C8 *bügetele*; *mön*, R *bögetele*; *mün*. As in the case of *böged* (see above, 9v, 2–3), the readings *bögetele* and *mün* (L id.) are preferable as they reflect the mmo. pronunciation of the first syllable of these words (*bö'etele* and *mün*). See *SH Index*, pp. 200b, 268a. As for *mün* (pl. *müd*, see 14v, 3) 'the (very)

same', beside the note 155 in R, p. 70, cf. *Matériel mongol*, vol. II, pp. 21 (4v, 5), 63 (25r, 1). In C8, p. 70, n. 31, the note on 'möd' is out of place (it should be n. 48); note 31 is actually missing on p. 64.

14r, 3: see above, **13v, 7**

15r, 2: C8 *sedkil-i anu čidayšabar*, the word *abun* between *anu* and *čidayšabar* has been inadvertently omitted in CHC, p. 63. Although the translation of this passage in C8, p. 65, is correct, note 60 on p. 73 is not *ad rem* insofar as Cleaves states in it that 'In this instance we have an example of *cida-* governing *sedkil-i* ... For another example of *čida-* governing an *accusativus* cf. ...', thus ignoring the verb *abun* which is the one, in fact, that governs *sedkil-i*. I think that some confusion may have also occurred in the editing of the Cleaves ms. of this chapter. See J. R. Krueger's remarks on p. 58 with reference to note 46 of Chapter Seven.

15r, 5–6: *taqil taqibasū sür-tür anu kürteyü*, C8 'If one sacrifice a sacrifice [unto them (i.e. the fathers and mothers – I.R.), at the moment when they are dead], [the enjoyment thereof] is attained unto their spirits', R '(and when they are dead,) if one offered a sacrifice to them, (the sacrificial offering) attained to their spirits'. The Chinese text says that when parents were sacrificed to, their spirits enjoyed their offerings (祭則鬼享之). Cf. Legge (1899, p. 475). The character *hsiang* 享 has several meanings, viz. 'to sacrifice, to offer, to receive, to enjoy'. Because of this, the Mongol translation is ambiguous, the verb *kürte-* meaning 'to attain, to receive', but not 'to enjoy'. That meaning must be extrapolated from the context itself. A Mongol reader without knowledge of classical Chinese would not automatically understand the sentence in question as Cleaves does, regarding *taqil* or 'sacrificial offering' as the thing that 'attained to (= reached) their spirits' – the corollary being that the spirits would, thereby, enjoy it. The translation in R is grammatically correct, but it needs some amplification to introduce the 'enjoyment' factor in form of a parenthetical '(which, thereby, enjoyed it)', completing the sentence.

15v, 7: *dörben eteged-ün ulus*, C8 'the people of the four quarters', Ligeti 1984 '(son propre) empire des quatre points cardinaux', R 'the states of the four quarters (of the world)'. The three Mongol words render ch. *ssu kuo* 四國 'the states of the four (quarters)', i.e. 'all the states'. *Ssu* 四 = *ssu fang* 四方 'the four quarters (or sides)', i.e. 'everywhere, in all directions'. The full quotation from the *Shih-ching* 詩經 in B. Karlgren's translation reads: 'Is he not strong, the (real) man! The (states of) the four quarters take their lesson from him; straight is his virtuous conduct, the states of the four (quarters) obey him' (無競維人, 四方其訓之, 有覺德行, 四國順之). See *The Book of Odes*, p. 217 [2]. Legge's translation (1899, p. 475) quoted by Cleaves (C8, p. 76, n. 88) 'All in the four quarters of the state renders (*sic*) obedient homage' is actually incorrect. *Dörben eteged* is the exact Mongol counterpart of *ssu fang* which qualifies *ulus*, corresponding to ch. *kuo* 國 'country, state, nation'. Already in the first quarter of the 13th century, the Mongol term *ulus* 'people, tribe' was used to designate a 'state' or 'nation', hence the rendering of *kuo* with *ulus* is perfectly normal and, indeed, correct. While Cleaves' translation is not accurate only insofar as *ulus* is concerned, Ligeti's rendering is totally off course.

16r, 5–16v, 1: *Singsi ügüler-ün ... kemen emiyegeđ asayun* (the *asay un* in C9 is a misprint) *abasu*, C9 ‘When Singsi spoke, as, having trembled, he was asking, saying, ...’, R ‘When Singsi hesitantly asked (Kungvusi) saying, ...’ As already noted by Cleaves (C9, p. 89, n. 7), in this sentence the verb *emiye-* (~ *emige-*, cf. 2r, 6) translates ch. *kan* 敢 ‘to dare, to presume, to venture’ in the opening sentence of Chapter Nine: ‘Tseng-tzu said, “May I venture to ask whether there was not (something) in the virtue of the sages greater than (lit. ‘whether the virtue of the sages lacks [that which might be] used to add to’, i.e. ‘includes nothing greater than’) filial piety?’” (曾子曰敢聞 [pro 問] 聖人之德無以加於孝乎). Now, *emiye-* ~ *emige-* (mo. *emiye-*) means ‘to fear, to be fearful (= careful, cautious; see R, p. 56, n. 24, p. 62, n. 74); to be shy or embarrassed’. Cf. *Wörterbuch*, p. 44, s.v. ‘emi’egu’; *Matériel mongol*, vol. I, p. 54; Lessing (1982, p. 313a). It does not mean ‘to tremble’. The verb *emiye-* conveys the feeling of mild apprehension and timidity experienced by the disciple when addressing and questioning the Master, rather than one of extreme agitation as conveyed by the verb ‘to tremble’. Hence the rendering ‘hesitantly’ of R. The turn of sentence of the *HC* is typically Mongolian and Cleaves’ literal translation, consisting almost entirely of gerundives without a predicate, leaves the entire passage in midair, as it were. However, as correctly pointed out by Cleaves (loc. cit.), the statement in R, p. 72, n. 78, concerning *abasu* must be deleted owing to an involuntary confusion between *abasu* and *abubasu* not detected at the time, and missed later. A more ‘palatable’ literal rendering of the initial sentence would be: ‘When Singsi spoke and hesitantly (or cautiously) asked (Kungvusi), saying, ...’

16v, 3: C9 for *ɣajar-un ɣajar-a* read *ɣajar-un ɣajur-a*

16v, 5 and 6: C9 for *taqimtay u* read *taqimtayū*

17r, 3: see above, **13r, 2**

17r, 5: see above, **13r, 2**

17r, 7: Lu Siu, L Qiu, C9 ɣiu, R ɣiu. Same problem of transcription as in 13r, 2 (see above). The correct reading is Ligeti’s Qiu. See Ligeti (1984, pp. 348–349).

17v, 1: *ečige-yügen Wun ong qan-i*, C9 ‘to Qan Wun ong’. After ‘to’ add ‘his father’.

17v, 5: see above, **4v, 3**

17v, 6: C9 for *aɣuy ui* read *aɣuyui*

18r, 1: C9 for *ɣay un* read *yayun*

18r, 2–4: *tegüber kümün ečige eke-düriyen čiqulalaqu kemebesü ebedügčege nilq-a üčügen-eče boluyū*, C9 ‘Therefore, ...⁶² that a man has affection for his father and mother, it begins from [the time when he is still so] young and little [that he scarcely comes] up to [their] knees’, R ‘Therefore, a person’s affection for his parents grows from (the time he is) young and small, and (barely) reaching (their) knees’. In note 62 on p. 94 of C9, we read: ‘Lit., “if one say”.’ I cannot explain the unnecessary dots after ‘Therefore’, which would normally indicate a lacuna in the text. Possibly the Cleaves ms. was illegible at this point. Fortunately, this lacuna can be filled thanks to the copy of the typescript in the Rome C.I.C.M. Archives. The missing words to which note 62 applies are ‘as for the fact’, and refer to the word *kemebesü* of the Mongol text. For *kemebesü* cf. C18, p. 245, n. 30. With regard to the

reading *üčüken* (18r, 3) of L and R vs. that of *üčügen* of C9, the former reading in R, 18r, 3, is an inadvertent mistake for *üčügen* (cf. R, 13b, 5 and 32a, 4). The correct reading in pmo. is still a moot point. See C8, 68, n. 18. In view of the fact that the form *üčügüken* (mo. id.) is found in the *Rasûlid Hexaglot*, 265 (26), as well as in the *Bca.* of 1312, [4–156a, 4], we may postulate a development mmo., pmo. *üčügüken* > *üčüken* (cf. *MA*, 273a = *öčüken* – to be read *üčüken* ?) = pmo. *üčüken*; cf. mo. *üčüken*, *öčüken*. However, in mmo. we also have a fluctuation *üčüken* ~ *üčügen* (see de Rachewiltz 1986, p. 32 [13]), and the Chinese transcriptions as well as the 'Phags-pa script regularly give *üčügen*, not *üčüken*. It would, then, appear that *both* forms coexisted already in the 13th–14th centuries, in which case the pmo. form is phonetically ambivalent and either reading is acceptable. Having to choose one, I have opted for the *üčügen* of the *YCPS* and the *HIYY*, as Cleaves has done.

18r, 6; 18v, 3: C9 for *boy da* read *boyda*

18v, 3: see above, **18r, 6**

18v, 5: C9 for *qatay uda* read *qatayuda*

19r, 3: C9 for *nayiramtay u* read *nayiramtay*

19r, 5: C9 for *jalj amji* read *jaljamji*

20r, 6; 21r, 5: C9 for *siliy u* read *siliyu*

20v, 1: Lu *sedejü*, L *sedejü*, C9 *sataju*, R *sataju*. The reading *sedejü* is discussed and confirmed in Ligeti (1984, pp. 333–334). In de Rachewiltz (1986, p. 33), I accepted his findings and conclusions. In C9, p. 103, n. 137, Cleaves has defended the reading *sataju*, and I am now of the opinion that Cleaves is right and that the pmo. reading is back-vocalic. However, I believe that the two words *sata-* and *sede-* are one and the same verb meaning 'to consider, to determine, to deliberate'. In mmo. the alternance *t* ~ *d* is common (see Mostaert 1999, pp. 243–244), and several words with back vocalism appear also with front vocalism (*yatul-/getül-*, *naiyam/ne-yigem*, *angqan/engken*, *dorona/döröne*, etc.). It is, therefore, possible and, indeed, likely, that mmo. *sata-* (= **sada-*) > mo. *sede-*, *sedü-* 'to plan, to think out, etc.' In the *HC*, *sata-* renders ch. *ssu* 思 'to think, to ponder, to deliberate, to consider, etc.' Pace Ligeti (op. cit., p. 334), 'au point de vue sémantique' there is no problem.

20v, 1: C9 for *yabuy uldaqu* read *yabuyuldaqu*

21r, 2: C9 for *ay ali* read *ayali*

21r, 5: see above, **20r, 6**

21r, 7–21v, 1: C9, p. 21r, 7, should contain the Chinese title of Chapter Ten, viz. 紀孝行章第十. The meaning of the title is 'An Orderly Description of the Acts of Filial Piety' (Legge 1899, p. 480); however, *hsiao-hsing* 孝行 can also be rendered as 'filial conduct', and this is the way it was understood by the Mongol translator (*taqimtay yabudal*). As for *belgede-* (mo. id.), its basic meaning is 'to signify' since the verb derives from *belge-* 'sign, token', hence also 'to prognosticate'. Here, however, it renders ch. *chi* 紀 'to record in order (or sequence), to relate in an orderly fashion', and in the present context 'to orderly set out or describe (the characteristics)'. Cf. R, p. 76, n. 232.

Lacunae in the Footnotes of 'The Ninth Chapter' (C9)

- Page 89, n. 6: *after* Chapter” *add*, p. 75, n. 4, and pp. 76–77, n. 11; cf. also Cleaves, “The Second Chapter”, pp. 42–43, n. 17.
- Page 91, n. 21: *add* “The Fourth Chapter”, p. 146, nn. 19 and 20.
- Page 92, n. 36: *add op. cit.*, pp. 32–39, n. 452.
- Page 92, n. 39: *add* A. Mostaert et F. W. Cleaves, “Les Lettres de 1289 et 1306”, p. 59.
- Page 93, n. 45: *add* Cleaves, “The Third Chapter”, p. 127, n. 3.
- Page 93, n. 51 *to read as follows*: See Cleaves, “The Second Chapter”, p. 45, n. 35.
- Page 94, n. 53: *after a add converbum finale*
- Page 94, n. 54: *add* for which cf. Kowalewski 1.474a: “oeuvre, ouvrage, travail, occupation”.
- Page 94, n. 56: *after* Chapter 1, *add* pp. 78–79, n. 20. *After* Chapter 8 *add*, 15v, 6.
- Page 94, n. 57 *to read as follows*: For *boyda sayid* see above, n. 3.
- Page 94, n. 58: *for* L. read Lubsangbaldan, *op. cit.*,
- Page 94, n. 63: *add* the Chinese 親 (*ch'in*), translated “the feeling of affection” by Legge, *op. cit.*, p. 478.
- Page 96, n. 82: *add*, p. 30, n. 38.
- Page 97, n. ??86: *delete* ??86, and In *iryuilabasu* should follow immediately after n. 86.
- Page 97, n. 88: *for* Mostaert read; cf. Mostaert, *Le matériel mongol*, I, p. 103 (“Glossaire”); II, p. 50 (18v, 4), 65 (26v, 3).
- Page 97, n. 92: *after* note *add* 3
- Page 97, n. 93: *after* note *add* 27
- Page 98, n. 94 *to read as follows*: For *tingri-yin jayayabar* cf. *The Secret History* § 197 [47v, 5] *tenggiri-yin jaya'ar* “by the destiny of Heaven”; and the *Hua-i i-yü* IIb, 1r, 5; 11r, 3; 12v, 3 *tenggiri-yin jaya'an-bar* “par décret du Ciel”. See Mostaert, *op. cit.*, I, p. 66 (“Glossaire”); II, p. 70 (1r, 5).
- Page 98, n. 95: *add* *nayiramtayū yosun* in 38r, 3. As for *nayiramtayū*, see below, n. 141, and Cleaves, “The Seventh Chapter”, p. 39, n. 58.
- Page 98, n. 96: *at the end of the note, after op. cit.*, *add* pp. 397–398,
- Page 98, n. 97: *after* note *add* 37
- Page 101, n. 117: *delete* note above and *after* See *add* Cleaves, “The Seventh Chapter”, p. 44, n. 68. Cf. also 21r, 6.
- Page 104, n. 149: *add* 3. 2268b–2269a: “corriger, ... mettre en ordre, ...”
- Page 105, n. 160: *to read as follows*: For *ba* “even”, see *Le matériel mongol*, I, p. 38: “*ba même*”. Cf. *ibid.*, II, p. 18 (3v, 3).
- Page 105, n. 164: *after* note *add* 132
- Page 106, n. 165 *to read as follows*: For *aran* (pl. *arad*) “commoner” see Cleaves, “The Eighth Chapter”, p. 71, n. 41. Cf. Cleaves, “The Fifth Chapter”, pp. 27–28, n. 6.

21v, 3: *tabiyla-* ‘to serve’ (see C10, n. 7) is normally used with reference to one’s parents and seniors for it implies a feeling of ceremonial reverence, *tabiy* signifying a ‘sacrificial offering’. Cf. C4, pp. 148–149, n. 39. The other verb for ‘to serve’ is *küçü ög-* (lit. ‘to give one’s strength’), which means ‘to render service’ – usually to a leader or person of superior rank and status, especially one’s lord and, of course, the sovereign. Cf. C1, pp. 86–87, n. 62, 87, n. 64; R, p. 58, n. 30; and above, **3r, 1**. This dichotomy is observed in the *HC*.

21v, 7: *sedkil-tü bolju erüküiben erkilegdeküi*, C10 ‘may he make his being anxious [his] primary concern with all his mind’, R ‘he should place above all his thoughtful concern’. Pmo. *erü-* (mmo. *herü-*) means ‘to be sad or afflicted, to be anxious’. See *Wörterbuch*, p. 75. Cf. Pelliot (1925, pp. 215–216, n. 21). Mo. has only *eregüü* ‘torture, torment’ (< *ere-* + dev. nom. suff. *-gü[ü]*; cf. *üle-* ‘to remain’ > *ülegü*, *ülegüü* ‘superfluous’; see *Grammar*, p. 46, § 152). *Sedkil-tü bol-*, lit. ‘to be thoughtful’, has the meaning of ‘to be concerned’. Cf. *Twelve Deeds*, F 10v (27), 11r (25) *sedkil-tü bolju* ‘became worried’ (p. 118). Cf. also R, p. 77, n. 236. The above sentence literally reads: ‘he should put first the fact of his being concerned (or worried) and anxious (i.e. concerned [or worried] with anxiety)’.

22r, 1: *ügei bolbasu*, C10 ‘if they die’, R ‘when they die’. For *ügei bol-* ‘to die’, lit. ‘not to be(come) (= to be no longer, i.e. disappear)’, cf. its pmo. synonym *jöb* (written *jöb*) *ese bol-*, lit. ‘not to be(come) right’. See Cleaves (1948). Contextually, I think that ‘when’ is more appropriate here than ‘if’.

22r, 2: *qatayujju jarčimlaquiban erkilegdekü*, C10 ‘may he make his being circumspect and [sense of] being orderly [his] primary consideration’, R ‘he should be careful and place above all his (concern for) orderliness’. For *jarčimla-* ‘to put or set in order’ (< *jarčim* ‘order’) see C7, p. 30, n. 38; R, p. 66, n. 124.

22r, 3: *ede tabun jüil*, C10 ‘these five categories [of things]’, R ‘these five things’. *Jüil* is not used here in its usual acceptation of ‘category, class, kind, etc.’, but with its secondary meaning of ‘item’. See *MKT*, p. 1372a (2) = *t’iao* 條 ‘item, thing, article’. Cf. Bawden (1997, p. 184b), *s.v.* *züil* (1). This is borne out by the Chinese text (*wu che* 五者 ‘the five ones’ = ‘these five things’; cf. Legge 1899, p. 480), and it applies also to the *ede yurban jüil* ‘these three things’ of 23r, 1–2. Cf. also the *HCCC*, pp. 9b–10a, where the expressions *wu che* 五者 and *san che* 三者 are rendered *che wu chien-erh* 這五件兒 ‘these five items’ and *che san chien-erh* 這三件兒 ‘these three items’ respectively. See also below, **23r, 6**.

22v, 5: *CHC*, p. 110 *buralyu*. This reading is incorrect and has been duly rectified in C10, p. 397, n. 35: *burelüyü* (= *bürelüyü*).

23r, 1–2: *ede yurban jüil*, C10 ‘these three categories [of things]’. See above, **22r, 3**.

23r, 3–4: *ači ügei taqimtayü*, C10 ‘filial without requital’, R ‘filial without merit’. The Chinese text does not help for it only says ‘not filial’ (不孝). Is it ‘requital’ or ‘merit’ (two very different things)? *Ači* (mmo. *hači*) means ‘benefit’, hence also ‘merit’ (see Lessing 1982, 7b; Bawden 1997, p. 31a [2]), but here ‘benefit’ implies ‘requital’, i.e. the repayment of a favour (cf. *Secret History* (2), pp. 361–362, n. 75; p. 542, n. 149), something that, in the context of filial piety, we owe to our

parents and which cannot be 'repaid' merely by providing physical sustenance for them. It implies a certain moral behaviour, summarised in the 'three things' enumerated by Confucius in this chapter purposely devoted to filial conduct. Without them filial piety is incomplete, and a son thus morally deficient is, in the words of the HC, 'not filial', and, in those of the HC, 'filial without *ači*'. The rendering 'without merit' is therefore inaccurate; 'without requital' is more appropriate, but rather awkward in English without an explanatory note. 'Without (due) gratitude' is closer to the mark, although not actually matching the meaning of *ači*. (Cf. CHC, p. 122 'without gratitude'.) A much better, albeit not literal, rendering of the entire expression would be 'filial but without fulfilling his obligations (to his parents)'. This is one more instance of the Mongol translator interpreting rather than translating the Chinese text.

23r, 6: *tabun jüil eregülekü jasay*, C11 'the code of the Five Categories of Punishment', R 'the Law (Governing) the Five Classes of Punishments'. The renderings of *jasay* as 'code' and 'law' are both defensible. See de Rachewiltz (1993). Cleaves had, in fact, translated it as 'law' in CHC, p. 122. Also, one can speak of 'classes' or 'categories' of punishments since they were broad groups comprising different forms and variations according to the time and circumstances. An alternative translation of *tabun jüil eregülekü* would be 'the five kinds of punishment': this is, in fact, the way the HCCC, 10a, renders in Yüan vernacular the expression *wu hsing* 五刑 'the five punishments' of the HC, i.e. *wu teng hsing* 五等刑. In the WTCWC, vol. I, pp. 529–543, there is a section entitled *eregüü qoor-un jüil* 'the kinds of punishments (lit. torture and punishment)'. On the five punishments see CWTTT, vol. I, pp. 631c–632a.

23v, 2–3: *jasay-ača... janggi*, C11 'which is knotted from the code', R 'relating to the law'. The obsolete word *janggi* literally means 'that which is tied to ... (... -ača/-eče)', and, by extension, 'bond, stipulation'. See the *Secret History* (2), p. 469, n. 126; Doerfer (1963–1975, no. 151). Cf. *mo. janggiya* 'knot'. Here, however, and always as an extension of its original meaning, it designates the 'connecting point', 'what is connected with', hence 'with regard (or relating) to'. See R, p. 77, n. 245. The term *janggi* renders the word *shu* 屬 'connected with, pertaining to' of the HC.

23v, 4: *taqimtayü ülü bolqui eregüi-eče kündü*, C11 'There is nothing more grave than the punishment for not being filial', R 'Nothing is more serious than the offence of being unfilial'. *Eregüi* translates the *tsui* 罪 of the Chinese text, a term meaning 'crime, criminal act or offence', as well as 'penalty, punishment' ('châtiment pénal, peine criminelle'). See *Shoo King*, vol. I, p. 59 *et passim*; Fraser (1930, p. 295b); cf. *Code*, vol. I, p. 21; vol. II, p. 51; vol. III, p. 184. Its Mongol counterpart, *eregüi*, corresponds to *mo. eregü(ü)* 'torture, punishment'; the term occurs in *mno. (ere'ü)* meaning 'punishment', and as a verb (*ere'üle-*) meaning 'to punish'. See de Rachewiltz (1981, pp. 54–55, n. 50). In our chapter, the same verb (*eregüle-*) is used with the identical meaning (see above, **23r, 6**). Cleaves' translation is, therefore, quite correct. However, there are several instances in *pno.* texts where *eregü* means also 'offence, sin, harm'. See *Treasury*, p. 327, n. 151 (and the reference in it to the *Bca.*); and *Twelve Deeds*, F 3v (13). And, in *mo.*, as evident from various compounds

with *eregüü*, such as *e.-yin čayaǰa* ‘criminal law’ and *e.-yin kereg* ‘criminal act’, the term in question likewise means ‘crime (entailing punishment)’, i.e. ‘a punishable offence’. (See Pyurbeev 2001–2002, vol. IV, p. 431a, s.v. ‘*eriüü*’ I (2): ‘crime, criminal act’.) Thus, *eregü(ü)* has the same semantic dichotomy of ch. *tsui*. Cf. the expression *aldaltu (aldaltai) bol-* ‘to be held guilty of an offence and liable to punishment’, *aldal* meaning ‘fault, offence, infraction’. See de Rachewiltz (1981, p. 56ff.). In view of this basic ambiguity of both the Chinese and the Mongolian terms, the correct meaning must be extrapolated from the text, and there is no doubt that the HC text refers to the seriousness of the offence, not of the punishment. See Legge (1899, p. 481). The Chinese vernacular expression used in the *HCCC*, p. 10a, for *tsui* is, in fact, *tsui-kuo* 罪過 ‘crime, transgression’. Unless the Mongolian translator has grossly misunderstood the text of the HC (which I think is unlikely), *eregüi* (= *eregü[ü]*) should be understood as ‘offence’, not as ‘punishment’. Unfortunately, the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily.

23v, 5: C11 *degedüs-iyen* (read *-iyen*) ‘His Majesty’, R ‘one’s superiors’. In pmo. *degedüs*, lit. ‘superiors’, is the well-attested plural of respect of *degedü* ‘superior, supreme’, designating the sovereign, hence = ‘the Emperor’ or ‘His Majesty’. It occurs frequently in the Sino-Mongolian inscriptions of the 14th century rendering ch. *ti* 帝 or *shang* 上 ‘the Emperor’. See Cleaves (1949, p. 103, n. 46; 1950, p. 124, n. 206). In the *HC*, *degedüs* appears four times beside the present occurrence, i.e. in 9r, 2; 25r, 3; 34v, 1 and 35r, 1. Only in 34v, 1, *degedüs* is used with reference to the sovereign, rendering ch. *shang*. In the HC, the text says: 要君者無上 which Legge (1899, p. 481) rendered ‘When constraint is put upon a ruler, that is the disowning of his superiority’. The expression *wu shang* 無上 means ‘(it is as if) he has no superiors’ – ‘he’ being the individual who ‘puts constraint on his lord’, i.e. who does not treat him as such. Cf. the *HCCC*, p. 10a: ‘it is just as if he had no superiors’ (似沒上不的一般有 – where 不 is a mistake for 人). In view of the fact that in the HC the word 上 does not mean ‘the sovereign’ and that in the *HC* *degedüs* is followed by the poss. acc. suffix *-iyen*, I doubt whether the rendering ‘His Majesty’ is the correct one. In that acceptation, the word does not occur in the poss. acc. case.

24v, 2: C11 for *buruyusiyabasu* read *burüsiyabasu*. Cf. R, p. 77, n. 248.

24r, 4: *ede kemebesü burčiqu buduliqu yeke samayu bolui*, C11 ‘As for these, they constitute great trouble⁵⁰ which overthrows [homes] and creates disorder’, R ‘These (three things) constitute a great nuisance which upsets (order) and creates confusion’. Note 50 in CHC, p. 123, reads: ‘I.e., anarchy’. With regard to ‘great trouble’ and ‘great nuisance’ (*yeke samayu*), they render ch. *ta luan* 大亂 ‘great (or serious) trouble (or disorder)’. The rendering ‘great nuisance’ of R is, therefore, inadequate, pmo. and mo. *samayu* being the exact counterpart of ch. *luan*. However, I am not sure whether the translation of *burčiqu* as ‘which overthrows [homes]’ is warranted. In pmo. the verb *burči-* means ‘to crush, to destroy, to subdue or suppress (e.g. a rebellion)’. See Cleaves (1949, pp. 64 [20], 86 [20]). It has also the extended meaning of ‘to throw into confusion’. Cf. Kow., p. 1223b, which gives the additional meaning of ‘détruire (une maison)’. In the present context, I think that the Mongol translator means, *sensu lato*, the upsetting of the order of things in general, rather

than of homes in particular. This interpretation is supported by the verb *buduli-* ‘to cause confusion’ accompanying it. In my opinion we have here a verbal compound *burči- buduli-*, meaning simply ‘to create havoc’.

25r, 1: the reading *joriyulbsu* in CHC, p. 111, is a misprint for *joriyulbasu*. See C12, p. 401, n. 100.

25r, 5: *törö kemebesü erkin kündüleküiber buyu*, C12 ‘As for the norm, it consists in the fact of eminently respecting’, R ‘The norm consists in respecting pre-eminence’. R (p. 78, n. 256) takes *erkin* as meaning ‘those who are more important in relation to oneself’. The word *erkin* (mo. *erkim*) occurs three times in this chapter, twice (24r, 6 and 25v, 7) in combination with *qadayatu*, both words meaning ‘important’ (‘important and weighty’ in C12), hence the rendering of the compound as ‘all-important’ in R, corresponding to the ch. *kuang-yao* 廣要 ‘all-embracing’ (Legge 1899, pp. 481, 482), ‘widely important’ (廣宣緊要) (HCCC, p. 10b). In the HC, the sentence in question is 禮者敬而已 ‘The Rules of Propriety are simply (the development of) the principle of Reverence.’ (Legge 1899, p. 482.) The rendering of the Mongolian version in R is patently incorrect. Cleaves’ translation ‘eminently respecting’ requires some elucidation. What the Mongol translator has done by using the word *erkin* in this context is to express the force of ch. *erh i* 而已 ‘and that’s all, nothing more (than)’, stressing the importance of the principle of respecting all those who deserve respect (as illustrated in this chapter), ‘respect’ (*kündüleküi*) being the root or foundation of the ‘norm’ (*törö*) of propriety. Cf. the commentary of Hsing Ping 邢昺 (932–1010) to the passage 敬者禮之本也 ‘Respect (or reverence) is the root of propriety’ (HC, p. 6 [12], 5b). Thus, by ‘eminently respecting’ we must understand ‘respecting absolutely’, i.e. above everything else, with *erkin* = *erkin-iyer*, mo. *erkim-iyer* ‘par excellence’ (Kow., p. 270a), i.e. above all.

25v, 5–7: *kündülegdekü anu cögen bögetele bayasulçaqun anu olan boluysabar kemebesü ene böged erkin qadayatu törö buyu*, C12 ‘Inasmuch as those who are respected are few, whereas those who rejoice have been many, this, then, is the important and weighty norm’, R ‘When the ones who are honoured are few, but those who rejoice are many – this, precisely, is the all-important norm’. Cleaves’ revised translation is a great improvement over the earlier one in CHC, p. 124, where this passage is divided into two separate sentences. For another example of the special construct with *bögetele* ‘whereas’ and *boluysabar* ‘having become’, cf. the *HIY*, part IIb, p. 3a, 1–3. See *Matériel mongol*, vol. I, pp. 1, 15. A literal rendering would be: ‘As for (*kemebesü*), the whereby of the fact of having become (= happened: *boluysabar*) that whereas (*bögetele*) those who are honoured are few, those who rejoice are many, this, then (or precisely = *böged*, see above, 9v, 2–3)...’ The rendering in R avoids a very awkward construction in English, but it is too free and the temporal ‘when’ is misleading. It would have been better to say: ‘The fact that while the ones who are honoured are few, those who rejoice are many – this, precisely, is...’ For *boluysabar*, the instrumental of the *nomen perfecti* of *bol-* ‘to become, to happen’, and its usage in pmo., cf. *Matériel mongol*, vol. II, p. 17 (3r, 3).

26r, 2: Lu *angqan-u*, L *angkan-u* (HC Index: *angkan-u*), C13 *engken-ü*, R *engken-ü*. The correct reading is *engken-ü*, a *hapax legomenon* for *angqan-u*. In C13,

p. 403, n. 3, *engken-ü* is called 'a variant of *angqan-u* in 27[r] below'. On *angqa(n)* 'the first, the most...', a word related to *ang*, *eng* (< tu.) id., see the extensive notes in C1, p. 86, n. 60, and R, pp. 57–58, n. 29. Because of the ambiguous reading of mtu. *aŋ* (= *eŋ*) (see above, 2v, 6), we find the present alternation *angqa(n)* (2r, 7; 27r, 5; 33v, 3) ~ *engken* (26r, 2), which is, however, exceptional. We may well wonder whether such a 'slip' would indicate that our 'Mongol' translator was, perhaps, a man of Uighur Turkish background fluent in both Chinese and Mongolian, a man like Sewinč Qaya (Kuan Yün-shih 貫雲石, 1286–1324), for example. This is, of course, purely speculative. In his translation of the title of Chapter Thirteen, Cleaves renders the words *engken-ü sayin ayali aburiban ayuydaqu* as 'in Which One Amplifies His Best Virtue', the 'His' referring to the 'pure-good' (*siliyu sayid*), i.e. the *chün-tzu* 君子 (see CHC, p. 124, n. 53, where the two Chinese characters have been inadvertently left out). However, in the translation of this chapter the 'pure-good' are regularly referred to as 'they'.

26r, 3: In CHC, p. 112, for *yurbadugar* read *yurbaduyar*.

26r, 7: *üdüür büri üjeldüjü*, C13 'interview [the members thereof] every day', R 'seeing (their members)'. In R, 'every day' has dropped out. Cleaves reads *ödür* instead of *üdüür*, but the latter form is that attested in the *YCPS*, the *HIYY* and the documents in 'Phags-pa script; mo. has *edür*. As for *ödür*, the form which occurs almost exclusively in the Muslim sources, one wonders whether it should not be read *üdüür* in all cases, initial *ü* and *ö* being indistinguishable in the Arabic-Persian script, both being transcribed indiscriminately with *ü* ('v') (see *Rasûlid Hexaglot*, p. 52). Cf. *Introduction*, p. 48, where Poppe writes 'MMo. (SH, P, Mu. [!-I.R.]) *üdüür*'. *Deest apud* Doerfer. The form *ödür* for mmo. and pmo. may have to be re-examined.

27r, 2: In CHC, p. 113, for *joqiragulun amaguluyçi* read *joqirayulun amuyuluyçi*.

27v, 4–5: In CHC, p. 125, for (K'ung Fu-tzu spoke, he said, "may ... read (K'ung Fu-tzu) spoke, he said, "May ...

28v, 3: *idqan jalaqu*, C15 'Redressing Admonishingly', R 'Admonishing and Correcting'. For *idqa-* see Kow., p. 293b: 'arrêter, retenir, appaiser; ²mettre obstacle, empêcher'. However, none of these meanings apply here, but the acceptation 'to warn, to admonish' is well attested in the *Secret History*. See *Wörterbuch*, p. 84, s.v. 'ithaḥu'. Cf. Lessing (1982, p. 401a).

29r, 1: *sqyul suryal*, C15 'the doctrines and teachings'. Cf. C1 (2[r]) 'the teachings', and note 39 on pp. 82–83 of C1, also with reference to the occurrence of this compound expression in 29r, 1, where it translates ch. *ming* 命 '(your) instructions'.

29r, 5: *emiyegeḍ asaybasu*, C15 'When, having feared, he asked'. See above, 16r, 5–16v, 1.

29v, 3; 30r, 4: In CHC, pp. 115, 116, for *etegen* read *eteged*. With regard to this word following *-ačal-eče* see the important remarks by A. Mostaert cited in C4, p. 147, n. 24.

29v, 4: *delekei ulus-iyān es-e aldaḷjuyu*, C15 'they did not lose their land and people', R 'they did not lose their realm'. Note 76 on p. 149 of C15 reads: 'I.e., empire'. Cf. C1, 1[v], where the expression *delekei ulus* is translated 'the world'. See

