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CONFUCIUS IN MONGOLIAN. SOME REMARKS ON THE MONGOL EXEGESIS OF THE ANALECTS

Igor de Rachewiltz

It is generally assumed that the Confucian Analects (Lun-yi 諭語) were translated into Mongolian and, presumably, published as early as the middle of the thirteenth century, and that this translation did not survive the fall of the Yuan.1

What we know, in fact, is that the Analects were explained to Qubilai Khan c. 1251, when he was still a prince, by Chao Pi 趙璧 (1220–76), a Chinese scholar in his entourage.2 Given the time and circumstances, we can safely assume that someone else in Qubilai's retinue translated Chao's lectures for the prince's benefit, i.e., an interpreter (kedeme) who rendered Chao's exegesis into spoken Mongolian.3 It is, indeed, very doubtful that there existed a written translation of the Analects in Mongolian; at any rate, no Chinese source confirms the existence of such a translation, whereas they give us the titles of several other Chinese works translated into that language.4 While the great sage's obiter dicta as recorded in the Classic of Filial Piety (Hsiao-ching 孝經) were subsequently translated

Respectfully dedicated to Professor Dr. Shigeo Ozawa, doyen of Mongol Studies in Japan.

and published as a bilingual Chinese-Mongol text, which has miraculously survived, the Analects were, apparently, ignored.5

Incredible as it may seem, the capital work of Confucianism was not translated into Mongolian until the second half of the nineteenth century and first appeared in print in 1892. An educated Mongol from the Tümed Banner (Tümed Qoştyn) called Galzang worked for over twenty years (1869–92) on a Mongolian version of the Chinese Four Classics (Ssu-shu 四書), following Chu Hsi's 朱熹 (1130–1200) "orthodox" interpretation of the Confucian Canon. There existed at this time a Manchu version of the Four Classics which had originally been commissioned by the Chi-lun-lung 乾隆 emperor (r. 1736–95). This had been completed and printed, with an imperial Preface, in 1756.6 The 1892 blockprint edition in twenty volumes (is’é 蒙文) contains Chi-lun-ling’s preface to the 1755 edition in Mongolian, Manchu and Chinese from which we obtain the trilingual "title of the work, viz. Qoyan-u bigisén örçixulysan dörben bigiγ. Han i araba ulaytambușa dūin bīhe. Yā-chiβ shi-fan-i Ssu-shu. This is followed by a preface in Mongolian giving the date of the completion of the work as the “first month of summer of Kuang-hsi 光緒” (27 April–25 May 1892). This, in turn, is followed by the text of the Four Classics in the three languages side by side and in the following order: Great Learning (Ta-bstieh 大學, 1r –50v), Analects (II–V), Doctrine of the Mean (Chung-yung 中庸; VI), and Mencius (Meng-tzu 孟子; VII–XX). The Mongol text is Galzang’s version and the Manchu text that of the 1756 bilingual edition. Copies of the edition are found in libraries in China, Japan, Taiwan and Europe.7

In the early 1920s, Temgetü (Chinese name: Wang Jui-ch’ang 汪睿昌), an enterprising Mongol from the Qaraqin Right Banner,8 established the Mongol-un bigiγ-un gorīya, or Mongol Book Company (Chinese name: Meng-wen shu-shè 蒙文書社) in Peking.9 One of the first publications that the MBQ issued was Galzang’s version of the Four Classics.10 Temgetü reprinted the Mongol and Chinese texts of the 1892 edition with lead-type, i.e., by re-setting them without the Manchu text, and published the whole in 12 volumes (21 x 14cm) under the title Meng-Han bo-pi Ssu-shu 美漢合璧四書. Mongol Kitab-üs gabsburusun dörben bigiγ. Temgetü wrote the informative but undated preface in Mongolian and Chinese (1, 1–4) and rearranged the order of the Classics, with the Analects following the Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean. The Analects are divided into five books (deber’ chülan) with individual pagination, altogether

"/d’exploration faht en Mongolie Chinoise 1928–1937" (Budapest: Société Kőrösi-Csoma, 1933, reprint 1977), pp. 21–7, 45–8; J.B. Krueger, “The Mongol bigiγ-un gorīya,” in W. Hensig, ed., Collectanea Mongolica Festschrift für Professor Dr. Rintelen zum 60. Geburtstag, "/Asiatische Forschungen 17" (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966), pp. 109–15. The MBQ also had a branch office in Nanking. 10 In the list of publications issued by the MBQ, the Mongol-Chinese Four Classics is entered as the sixth item.
comprising 316 pages. The bilingual *Four Classics* was published at the end of 1924 or early in 1925 and soon became a bibliographical rarity. Few, if any, copies are now found outside China and Japan.

As we would expect in a lead-type edition of this kind, there are printing errors and a comparison with the 1892 edition is absolutely necessary to vouch for its textual accuracy.

In January 1971, the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission (Meng-Tsang wei-yün-hui 蒙藏委員會) in Taiwan published a photo-reproduction of Temgettin’s edition of the *Four Classics* in one volume, with the original Chinese title *Meng-Han bo-pi Ssu-shu* and a new preface by Kuo Chi-ch’iao 郭寄喬 dated 10 October 1970. Parts of the Mongolian text in this reprint, made from an uneven-quality microfilm of the original held in Japan, are, unfortunately, difficult to read; however, in view of the virtual inaccessibility of the original, we must be grateful to the MTAC for having undertaken its publication.

In December 2002, the Inner Mongolia People’s Publishing House (Nei Meng-k’u Jen-min Chu’-pan-shè 內蒙古人民出版社) produced a five-volume edition of Galzang’s version of the *Four Classics*, entitled *Meng-Han bo-pi Ssu-shu*. Mongol *Kitad qabsuranysan dörben bichig*, under the general editorship of Sedenjāb. Unfortunately, this edition is incomplete, as the entire fifth book of *Mencius*, i.e., *Wan-chang* 萬章 1 and 2, and the *Chin-bsin* 盡心 1 and 2 [*Meng-tzu* 6 and 71 are published together as the fifth volume]. This is a most regrettable omission.

Thus, Galzang’s text is now available in the 1892 blockprint edition, as well as in the Taiwan and Inner Mongolian (albeit incomplete) reprints of the 1924/25 Peking edition.

With regard to the Mongol version of the *Analects*, besides Galzang’s translation, there is also a modern Mongolian edition which appeared in Inner Mongolia in 1978. It was prepared by two scholars in the Department of Mongol Language and Literature of the University of Inner Mongolia (Өөр Монгол-ун Яке Сурягули-ын Монгол Көк жил-үн Салбур) in Hohhot, with M. Qataruu as translator and T. Sudu as editor-collator. Their work, entitled *Kitad Mongol qabsuranysan Sigümjilet tügüel*. *Han-Meng bo-pi Lun-yi* 漢蒙合譯論語, was published for internal circulation only (nei-pu shu-chi 內部書籍). It consists of a “modernized” version of Galzang’s translation, revised with regard to the actual textual interpretation of the Mongol title of the work which the *Dumadu ... yarčay* gives as *Mongol Kitad-yr-gabdurusyn dörben bichig*, while Ligeti, *Rapport préliminaire*, p. 47, gives as *Dörben bichig-yin bichig*. The Taiwan reprint shows only the Chinese title 羅漢合譯論語 on the title pages of the *Four Classics*. The rest of the description is based on the Taiwan reprint.

The date given in *Dumadu ... yarčay* is “1924 ulsan arban yarbaisamyar on” (1924), but the Bākī ... yarčay is more specific: “1924 on-u11 sua-sa,” i.e., November 1924. However, no date of publication is found in the Taiwan reprint itself, but the 1970 preface to it by Kuo Chi-ch’iao (p. 3) states that the book was published in 1925, a date accepted by Bai, “Several Questions,” p. 1. In the “Introductory Remarks” (Li-yen 例言) of the 1978 Mongol version of the *Analects* it is stated that Temgettin’s (特木里克) Chinese-Mongolian side by side version of the *Lun-yi* was published in 1923; this is probably a printing error for 1925.

See *Dumadu ... yarčay*, Bākī ... yarčay. According to Bai, “Several Questions,” the Taiwan reprint was made from a microfilm of the original work found in Japan. No details are given as to its location in that country, see below, n. 14. See also Krueger, “The Mongol bichig-yin gooruy,” p. 115, no. 16 (“No copies are known to exist in the West”).

It is from Bai, “Several Questions,” that we learn that “Commissioner Wu-chan-kun of MTAC brought back a microfilm copy of this work (i.e., of Temgettin’s edition of the *Four Classics*—1–1) from Japan, and the 1971 edition was photocopied from the microfilm”. The place of publication of the 1971 reprint is not given in the book, but it is, of course, Taipei.

It should be mentioned, in this connection, that various libraries in China hold many manuscript copies of the Mongol and Manchu versions of the *Four Classics* dating from the Qing period. See *Dumadu ... yarčay*, pp. 1013–21.


---

11 The *Dumadu ... yarčay*, p. 1013a, no. 05651, gives the number of volumes of the *Four Classics* published by the MBQ as 12; the earlier Bākī Ulus-un Mongol qayqya nam-un yarčay, *Ch’üan-liao Meng-teun bu-chü t’u-shu tzu-liao hien-bo mu-ta* 全國蒙文古書書目聯合目錄 (Hohhot: Ööbö Mongol-ün Arad-un kebel-ün /gorya, 1970), p. 20, no. 00566 (5), as 14; and the above-mentioned MBQ list of publications as 10. Since the 1971 Taiwan reprint is in one volume, it is impossible to confirm any of these figures; however, the Taiwan reprint contains 14 sections with individual pagination (see below). There is also inconsistency about the Mongol title of the work which the *Dumadu ... yarčay* gives as *Mongol Kitad-yr-gabdurusyn dörben bichig*, while Ligeti, *Rapport préliminaire*, p. 47, gives as *Dörben bichig-yin bichig*. The Taiwan reprint shows only the Chinese title 羅漢合譯論語 on the title pages of the *Four Classics*. The rest of the description is based on the Taiwan reprint.

12 The date given in *Dumadu ... yarčay* is “1924 ulsan arban yarbaisamyar on” (1924), but the Bākī ... yarčay is more specific: “1924 on-u11 sua-sa,” i.e., November 1924. However, no date of publication is found in the Taiwan reprint itself, but the 1970 preface to it by Kuo Chi-ch’iao (p. 3) states that the book was published in 1925, a date accepted by Bai, “Several Questions,” p. 1. In the “Introductory Remarks” (Li-yen 例言) of the 1978 Mongol version of the *Analects* it is stated that Temgettin’s (特木里克) Chinese-Mongolian side by side version of the *Lun-yi* was published in 1923; this is probably a printing error for 1925.

13 See *Dumadu ... yarčay*, Bākī ... yarčay. According to Bai, “Several Questions,” the Taiwan reprint was made from a microfilm of the original work found in Japan. No details are given as to its location in that country, see below, n. 14. See also Krueger, “The Mongol bichig-yin gooruy,” p. 115, no. 16 (“No copies are known to exist in the West”).

14 It is from Bai, “Several Questions,” that we learn that “Commissioner Wu-chan-kun of MTAC brought back a microfilm copy of this work (i.e., of Temgettin’s edition of the *Four Classics*—1–1) from Japan, and the 1971 edition was photocopied from the microfilm”. The place of publication of the 1971 reprint is not given in the book, but it is, of course, Taipei.

15 It should be mentioned, in this connection, that various libraries in China hold many manuscript copies of the Mongol and Manchu versions of the *Four Classics* dating from the Qing period. See *Dumadu ... yarčay*, pp. 1013–21.
of the *Analects*, departing as it does from the one by Chu Hsi slavishly followed by Galzang. It contains a full critical apparatus and a very useful Chinese glossary cim index. This new contribution by Qatayu and Sudu is a great step forward in presenting the Confucian *Analects* in modern literary Mongolian, and even though it relies heavily on Galzang’s version, it represents a notable improvement over the latter’s rather stilted, and by now certainly outdated, rendering.

In her interesting article “The Manchu Exegesis of the *Lûn-yû*,”17 Laura E. Hess examines in detail the way a number of key Confucian ethical terms are rendered in the 1756 Manchu version of the *Analects*. She also draws comparisons between the Manchu rendering and the Mongol translation of the same terms in the Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Classic of Filial Piety*18 and in the 1978 version by Qatayu and Sudu. The terms in question are:

1. Hsiao 孝
2. Ching 敬
3. Kung 恭
4. Tao 道
5. Li 禮
6. Te 德
7. I 義
8. Ti 悼
9. Chün-tzu 君子
10. Jen 仁
11. Chung 忠

Hess also has something to say about the Manchu and Mongol translations of the Chinese title of the *Analects*, viz. *Lûn-yû* 諮語.19

The results of Hess’s investigation are summarized below. I have only added the corresponding Mongolian term from the 1978 Qatayu and Sudu version, designating it as “mo. (QS)”, in order to differentiate it from the 1892 Galzang version which is designated as “mo. (G)”.

1. Hsiao 孝 “filial piety; filiality; proper behaviour towards parents”: ma. *hsiao* (< ch. *hsiao-shun* 孝順 “obedience [to parents]”; pmo. *taqimtayu* (< *taq* “to serve; attend upon [parents, ruler, etc.]”) “respect for one’s parents and elders”; mo. (G) *elberi* (< *elberi-* “to respect or honour parents and elders”) “respect for one’s parents and elders”; mo. (QS) id.

2. Ching 敬 “reverent, reverence; respectful”: ma. *ginggule* (< ch. *ching-kung* 敬恭 “to respect, honour, act respectfully; to be attentive, careful”, *ginggun* “respect, honour”; pmo. *kîndûle* “to show respect, reverence, honour; to be polite”; mo. (G) *kî-chînggûle* “to be zealous or studious; to be cautious, be attentive; to be respectful or humble”; mo. (QS) id.

"respectful"; pmo. kičye- "to exert oneself, strive, be diligent or careful"; 21 mo. (G) kündüle- "to show respect, reverence, honour", bisire- "to revere, respect, esteem"; 22 mo. (Q) id.

4. Tö 道 "The Way, the way(s); doctrine, the (right) principle(s)"; ma. doro (< mo. törö "law; order, regime; rule") "doctrine, way, rule, rite"; pmo. törö yesun "norm(s) and manner(s)"; mo. (G) yusu "rule, custom; doctrine, principle"; mo. (Q) id. 23

5. Li 禮 "ritual, rites, ceremonies; rules of propriety, proper form"; ma. dorolun (? < mo. töröle- "to observe [or respect] the norm [of propriety]"; "rite, ceremony; propriety"; pmo. törö, töröle-; mo. (G) yesulal "rite, ceremony; etiquette, rules of conduct"; mo. (Q) id.

6. Te 德 "virtue, essence; moral force or power, inner power, inner aptitude or quality"; ma. erdemun (< mo. erden "knowledge, learning, skill, ability; wisdom; virtue") "capacity, virtue, power"; pmo. aydul abun "natural disposition, innate qualities or faculties"; mo. (G) erdem; mo. (Q) id.

7. I 道 "righteousness, what is right; justice; to be moral"; ma. jürgän (< mo. jrina "line") "rectitude, loyalty, duty, devotedness, the principles according to which people should act"; pmo. sayir-"accord, harmony", joq- "to agree, to be appropriate"; mo. (G) jürum "line; established order, system, regime; code of laws; rule, norm, standard"; mo. (Q) id.

8. Ti 首 "fraternal, submissive as a younger brother, obedient as a young man; duty of a younger brother; as befits a junior; fraternal deference; to behave well towards elder brothers, to show respect to (or to respect) one’s elders"; ma. deocin (< mo. degüüt "one who is respectful towards his elder brother or to an elder person of his generation" < degü "younger brother or sister; younger") "duty of a younger brother, fraternal deference"; pmo. aqan-nar yekez-legen joqtili- "to be on good terms with (or to show deference to) one’s elder brothers and seniors"; mo. (G) degüüt; mo. (Q) id.

9. Chün-tzu 君子 "the superior man, the Sage, a (or the) gentleman; the true philosopher, Great Man"; ma. ambasatsaas (< mo. erdemten sayid a scholar and a worthy) 24 "a rather great dignitary"; pmo. silyu sayid "the upright and worthy"; 25 mo. (G) sayid erdemten, erdemten sayid "a worthy and a scholar" and vice versa; mo. (Q) sayid erdemten id.

---

21 The "kičyeŋgülde" in Hess, "Manchu Exegesis," p.407a (bottom), is a lapsus for kičye-.

22 And, as Hess, "Manchu Exegesis," says, "words derived from both kündüle- and biserle- such as bisirlele 'respectful', and bisiregtil 'respect'.

23 Discussing the etymology of the word törö < tu. törö/törö, Hess writes: "The Turkish verb *törö/*töörö 'to give birth, to procreate, to bud, to come into being, to be created' and the Mongolian verb törö- 'to be born, to come into being, to appear, to arise; occur' appear to be related to the noun *törö/*töörö, respectively, which suggests that Turkic *törö/*töörö, Mongolian törö and Manchu doro all have the sense of 'a natural law or order, an inherent norm'". Ibid., p.409a. For a possible etymology (mo. törö < tu. törö "traditional customary law" < törö- or *törö-) "to come into existence, to be formed or born"; cf. Le costume bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en version équatorienne texte établi, traduit et commenté par J.-R. Hamilton (Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1971), p.133a.

24 As stated by Hess, "the Manchu term ambasatsaas—I.R. for jürum has clearly been influenced by Mongolian", i.e., by the mo. erdemten sayid. Hess, however, proposes "that the use of the adjective ambasatsaas to modify sayid is a conscious attempt to convey the meaning of the Chinese diminutive suffix 子", ibid., p.413b. I doubt this and believe that ambasatsaas, a plural in -s of ambas (or ambas) "high official, dignity", is simply a rather imperfect calque of mo. erdemten, a plural in -erdem ten of erdemten "learned, skilled, virtuous, wise", as confirmed by the second element of the binominal expression (ma. sasaas = mo. sayid). In fact, the Manchu expression is the Manchu version of the Mongolian one. As for the Mongol use of the plural for the singular (likewise borrowed by the Manchu), it is quite common as a mark of respect—akin to the honorific plural or of plural of respect—since early times. See I. de Rachewiltz, trans., The Secret History of the Mongols: A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century (Lexden: Boston: Brill, 2001, 2006), pp.226, 951, 961.

25 In her reference to the Ming Sino-Mongolian vocabulary Huai-i-iyl "edited by Lavesbaldan and Tsovel" (Hess, "Manchu Exegesis", p.413a), "Tsevel" is an error for "A. Boostiyang". Also, the word sayid in the expression "bilmun sayid" of the Ming Huai-i-iyl, "which usually functions as an adjective meaning 'good', appears to be the otherwise unattested singular form of sayid 'worthy, dignitary'" (ibid.), is actually a scribal error for sayid/mo. sayid, final -n and final -id in the preclassical Uighur-Mongol script being easily confused with each other.
10. *Jen* 真 “benevolence, perfect virtue, humanity, goodness, Goodness, the Good, virtue, virtue proper to humanity, Manhood-at-its-best, human-heartedness; benevolent (actions, man), the good (person, man), the virtuous, unselfish; (one's) fellow men”: ma. *gosin* (< *gosi* “to pity, have mercy; to love, cherish”) “pity, mercy, love”; pmo. *nigšlekšō* “the fact (or action) of being compassionate, compassion”; mo. (G) *örsisteltei yabu-*, *örsisteltei kūtūn* “to be compassionate; compassion; compassionate: man”; mo. (QS) *örsisteynggi-, örsisteyk*; *örsisteynggi-, örsisteltei “compassion; compassionate”.

11. *Chung* 忠 “self-devotion, (generous) sincerity; faithfulness, conscientiousness (to others), loyalty; trustworthy, doing one’s best”: ma. *tundo* “straight, upright, loyal, fair”; pmo. *chung tūn* “sincere and true (feelings), completely sincere (= loyal) mind (heart, thoughts, feelings), utmost loyalty or sincerity”; mo. (G) *sidaŋtg* “straight, honest, loyal, faithful, truthful”; mo. (QS) id.

Hess’s list does not exhaust—but that is not its intention—the key ethical terms of Confucianism that are found in the *Analects*. Nine more common terms for Confucian ethical notions are reviewed below. The survey covers the Manchu and Mongol terms we encounter in the *Analects* as well as in the Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Classical of Filial Piety*.

12. *Hsin* 欣 “sincere, true (to one’s word), trustworthy, faithful, sincerity, faithfulness, to keep or observe promises or to be cautious in giving promises, to be of good faith”: ma. *akdat* “firm, dependable: trust”; pmo. *bāširiğde-* “to be trustworthy”; mo. (G) *teghm*, *teghmjet* “trust, faith, loyalty; true, trustworthy, reliable, loyal”; mo. (QS) id.


14. *Jang* 藉 “courteous, humble, yielding; to decline, yield, renounce, avoid, abdicate, not to give preference, surrender oneself”: ma. *anabu-* “to yield to”, *anabijniga- “to be yielding, modest, humble; to yield to”, *anabijnjaga- “modest, humble, reticent”; pmo. *buyarqamert* “deference”; mo. (G) *nayirtalb* “to yield as a gesture of friendship”; mo. (QS) id.

15. *Tsu* 慈 “kind, compassionate; kindness”: ma. *jila-* “to be compassionate”; pmo. *nigšlekšō* “the fact (or action) of being compassionate, compassion”; mo. (G) *nigšlekšō (?)* “to be compassionate”; mo. (QS) *nigšlekšōt* “to be compassionate”.

16. *Chin* 慈 “earnestly” careful, earnest, cautious, circumspect; sparing of speech”: ma. *gimggul* “to be attentive, careful” (cf. above, no. 2), *olbôso-* “to be cautious or careful; to respect, revere”; pmo. *gatayqâ* “to
be careful, cautious, restrained; to be diligent”; mo. (G) 끼치 hạng가IDDLE- “to be zcalous, attentive, respectful, humble”, 복음밀래- “to be cautious, careful; to consider or think carefully”; mo. (QS) id.

17. Shen 晋 “(to be) careful, cautious (in or about), prudent, to exercise careful attention, care or caution, to show proper respect, to give the greatest attention, to conduct with meticulous care; to honour; to approach with circumspection; carefulness, prudence; carefully”; ma. olbo- to be cautious or careful; to revere, respect (cf. above, no.16); pmo. 킷기- “to be careful of or about”; mo. (G) 복음밀라- “to be cautious, careful, to consider or think carefully (cf. above, no.16); seremjile- “to be vigilant attentive, careful; to take precautions”; mo. (QS) id.

18. Shao 晋 “(the) good, good example, goodness; to make good, reform; to be good at, to do (perform) something well, do good (work), know the art of, excel; good, worthy, skilful; ability, politely, tactfully, kindly”; ma. sain “good, well”, saikan “properly”, babana- “to be able”, sain obu- “to do something well”; pmo. sain “good, proficient; well”; mo. (G) sain id., icaid “to be (capable), sayin 복마- “to perform well”, sayigan “nicely”; mo. (QS) id.

19. Ho 和 “harmony, peace, (natural) ease; harmonious(by), conciliatory, affable; to manifest ease, to agree with others”; ma. 터울야서 “harmony, harmonious; gentle”, 터울이다- “to harmonize, conciliate”; pmo. nairaldu- “to live in harmony with each other”, nairayul “to keep something/one in harmony”, jojiru- “to be in harmony”; mo. (G) nairamdal “peace”, eyetel nairamdayu “peaceful and harmonious”, nairaldu- “to be (or live) in harmony with each other”;32 mo. (QS) nairamdayu “harmonious”, nairamdua- “to be in harmony”.

20. Sheng 聘 “sage, Divine Sage, saint; wisdom, sagehood”; ma. endurangge “divine, holy, sacred”; pmo. 보다 sayid “sage-excellent (pl.), Holy Worthies”,33 mo. (G) 보다 족리킷 “sage-born”, 보다 “sage”; mo. (QS) id.

In the above nine instances (12–20), except for no.18 (晋): ma. sain, saikan < mo. sayin, sayigan, there is no Manchu borrowing from Mongol-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Preclassical Mongolian</th>
<th>Classical Mongolian (G)</th>
<th>Modern Literary Mongolian (QS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 孝</td>
<td>taqimtayu</td>
<td>elberil</td>
<td>same as G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 敬</td>
<td>kündile-</td>
<td>kičiyenggait-il-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 畏</td>
<td>kičiy-</td>
<td>kündile,-, bitire-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 道</td>
<td>törö yosun</td>
<td>yosulal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 德</td>
<td>törö, töröle-</td>
<td>erdem</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 徳</td>
<td>ayali aburi</td>
<td>jirim</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 義</td>
<td>nayir, joqi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Preclassical Mongolian</td>
<td>Classical Mongolian (G)</td>
<td>Modern Literary Mongolian (QS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 悯</td>
<td>aqa-nar yeke-togen joqildu-sitü sayid</td>
<td>degel ürdü</td>
<td>same as G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 君子</td>
<td>nigûleskûi</td>
<td>örösiyeltey yamu, örösiyel, örösiyelti kimûn</td>
<td>örösiyonggûi, örösiyel, örösiyonggûli, örösiyellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 仁</td>
<td>čing ünen (sedkil)</td>
<td>tigelmi, tigelgütel</td>
<td>same as G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 忠</td>
<td>bûstarde</td>
<td>surya, suryaq, suryaqü</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. 信 | surya-, soyûl suryal, soyûger | nayir talbi-nigûleskûi bol-
kiyonggûli, bolsyonjila-
boljil, seremjile-
sayin, sayan, ču-
nairamad, *nairali, eyetel-
nairamdayü, nairaldu-
boyda törökten, boyda | |
| 13. 教 | buyarqantaryu | | |
| 14. 讓 | nigûleskûi | | |
| 15. 慈 | qataryi | | |
| 16. 謹 | kişîge | | |
| 17. 慎 | sayin | | |
| 18. 善 | nayiraldu, nayirayül, jogir-
boyda sayid | nayiramdayü, nayiramda-
boyda | |
| 19. 和 | | | |
| 20. 聖 | | | |


35 In the recent translation of the *Analects* into Khalkha Mongolian by M. Čiùddelüe (Köön: Śuunzöö, 2005), the terms discussed in the present paper are rendered with the same words used in the written Mongolian versions except for nos. 1 (ačid), 6 (čän illeb), 8 (čai luxor) for aaxa ęstgü, haaqal xandilüe, 12 (čiimû), 16 (qitü cën), zhentüülie, 17 (türk xandilüg), xamnuur boloq, 18 (ñoqorx), 19 (nifčel ąxar, zorxar), and 20 (önög bóq), which are all Modern Mongolian equivalents or near equivalents. Therefore, the same general conclusion obtains for the contemporary Mongol language version.
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ian, and except for no.16 (通): ma. gënggûle < ch. chëng-kung 敬恭 (see no.2), there is no Manchu borrowing from Chinese.

With regard to Preclassical, Classical and Modern Literary Mongolian renderings, the above table shows the different terms employed by the translators.

It is a well-known fact that, insofar as Buddhism is concerned, the learned Mongol translators of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts "remplirent consciencieusement leur tâche, s'appropriant rarement les mots étrangers et faisant tous leurs efforts pour y suppléer leur propres expressions quand ils le pouvaient sans altérer le texte". With regard to Confucianism, it will be observed that whereas there are minor and, indeed, insignificant differences between the Galzing and Qaraqu and Sudu renderings of the terms in question, the difference in the terminology employed in the Preclassical and Classical versions is quite substantial, but *none of the terms in either version is a borrowing from Chinese*. Only 20 per cent of the terms examined are identical in Preclassical and Classical Mongolian (nos.13, 15, 18, 19). This may give us a rough idea of the gap in the "conceptual" vocabulary of the two stages of the language. Additional research along these lines may not only throw further light on the evolution of Written Mongolian in the last five hundred years, but also refine our understanding of the way Mongol translators handled concepts and terms alien to their culture without resorting to borrowing.
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