

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. *Fool udq-a-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*
5. 仲尼居曾子侍 *Jungni sayužu Singsi taqin бүкүй-дүр*

* 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* [Pope]), 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 *xaɪw^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. *Fool udq-a-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*
5. *Jungni sayuju Singsi 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 Jungni (Chung-ni, Confucius) was sitting and Singsi (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 *ilübteke[n]* 'suitably' in the same sentence but on 1b, 1 (R, p. 28), should instead be read *ilübtege[n]*, as explained in de Rachewiltz (2004, p. 55, n. 27).

1v, 2–3: C1 *irgen oryan* [..?..]-*iyar anu nayiraldujuɣui* '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: *uqamuyul[ɣu č̄i]* 'do you know?' Lu reads *uqamuyuu [č̄i]*, L *uqamuyul[u č̄i]*, and C1 *uqamuiul[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 ujaγur 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 *qng [= neng ?] türün*, C1 *ang türün*, R *qng türün*. The readings *ang* and *qng* (= *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. *eγ* "the width of textiles," Urd., Kh., Kalm. *eγ*, Bur. *eγ* = Mong. *āγ* id.'). and partly because of the inherent phonetic ambiguity of this Turkic word (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 166a, s.v. 'eγ'). However, the weight of the evidence in pmo. is in favour of the reading *eng* (*qng*). 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: *sayijirajuyui*, 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. 'saižrax'.

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' (*HIYY*). 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: *bayaŋiqu noyalaqu qoyar-iyar beyes-ečegen es-e ele angyijirayul-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 *bayaŋiqu* '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)’.

Gr, 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: *yaġar-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 (*yaġar*): 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: *kemejügi*, 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 aġyü* (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, température, 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: *ngri-yin gegegen*, C7 'the luminosity of Heaven', R 'the bright (bodies) of Heaven'. *Tngri-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 čidaysabar*, the word *abun* between *anu* and *čidaysabar* 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 asaγun* (the *asaγ 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 *γajar-un γajar-a* read *γajar-un γajur-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 ʒiu, R ʒiu. 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 *aγuy ui* read *aγuyui*

18r, 1: C9 for *yay un* read *yayun*

18r, 2–4: *tegüber kümün ečige eke-düriyen čiqulalaqu kemebesü ebedügčege nilq-a üčügen-eče boluyu*, 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 *üčūken* (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 *üčügūken* (mo. id.) is found in the *Rasūlid Hexaglot*, 265 (26), as well as in the *Bca.* of 1312, [4–156a, 4], we may postulate a development mmo., pmo. *üčügūken* > *üčūken* (cf. *MA*, 273a = *öčūken* – to be read *üčūken* ?) = pmo. *üčūken*; cf. mo. *üčūken*, *öčūken*. However, in mmo. we also have a fluctuation *üčūken* ~ *üčügen* (see de Rachewiltz 1986, p. 32 [13]), and the Chinese transcriptions as well as the 'Phags-pa script regularly give *üčügen*, not *üčūken*. 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 *nayiramtayū*

19r, 5: C9 for *ǰaly amǰi* read *ǰalyamǰi*

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

20v, 1: Lu *sedeǰü*, L *sedeǰü*, C9 *sataǰū*, R *sataǰū*. The reading *sedeǰü* 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 *sataǰū*, 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 uldaqū* read *yabuyuldaqū*

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 (*taqimtayū 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 *ingri-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 *kücü 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 mmo. (*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 pmo. 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 čayača* ‘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. *tí* 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 *jöriyulbsu* in CHC, p. 111, is a misprint for *jöriyulbasu*. 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 bayasulcaqun 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 *HIYY*, 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 *boluysayar*, 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 *qng*, *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 ayuydaqas* 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 *γurbadugar* read *γurbaduyar*.

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 *ū* ('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 amaguluhyçi* read *joqirayulun amuyuhyçi*.

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: *soyul 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: *emiyegeged 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 *-ača/-eče* see the important remarks by A. Mostaert cited in C4, p. 147, n. 24.

29v, 4: *delekei ulus-iyān es'e aldajuyū*, 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

also n. 18 on pp. 77–78 of C1, where this compound is rendered literally as ‘earth and nation’. In the latter instance the expression in question translated ch. *t’ien-hsia* 天下 ‘all under heaven’ = ‘the world’, but in 29v, 4, it translates *kuo* 國 ‘state, nation’. Within the context of the HC the concept of ‘empire’ would be anachronistic, hence the word ‘realm’ is, I think, more appropriate. We may add that in the *YCPS* and the *HIY delegei* alone renders ch. *t’ien-hsia*. In *delekei* is implicit the meaning of ‘vast and wide’, cf. mmo., mo. *delger* ‘vast, extensive, full’, *delgere-* ‘to expand, to spread’. Indeed, in the *YCPS delegei* means also ‘broad’. See *Wörterbuch*, p. 35. For mo., cf. Lessing (1982, p. 248b): ‘earth, world, universe, cosmos; surface of the earth’. For further references see R, pp. 52–53, n. 5. Thus, *delekei ulus* is, literally, ‘the earth and the people(s) (on it)’. In translating ch. *kuo*, the Mongol compound is used in its narrowest sense.

30r, 4: see above, 29v, 3

30r, 6–30v, 1: *üile-dür kereglegdegsen aran-i jalan duradqayčïn sayin nökör següder inu бүкү-yin tula*, C15 ‘Because there were good companions who redressingly reminded the commoner who was employed in affairs’, R ‘Because a commoner entrusted with affairs had a good friend who corrected and advised him’, Ligeti (1984, p. 341), ‘Après des fonctionnaires [= gens qui sont chargés d’affaires] il y avait de bons camarades qui les dirigeaient et exhortaient’. The main difference between C15, R and Ligeti is that the latter’s rendering has all the nouns in the plural. Since the word *duradqayčïn* (*nomen actoris* of *duradqa-* ‘to advise’) is a plural form in *-yčïn*, in de Rachewiltz (1986, p. 35), I agreed with Ligeti’s correction and wrote: ‘Prof. Ligeti is correct in translating it with plural forms throughout. My own translation has to be revised accordingly’. The comment is valid also for Cleaves’ translation. The Mongol translator was indeed very punctilious in distinguishing singular from plural forms, especially with regard to *nomina agentis*.

30v, 4–5: *beye inu*, C15 ‘their persons’. In CHC, p. 127, n. 61 should be n. 62 and vice versa.

32r, 6–32v, 2: *ingri-yi ba jayar-i temdegtei-e uqajū qayaraqai-a bolyaysan-u tula ingri-de ibegegdejū öljei qutuy kürteged belgetei-e uqaydaǰūyū*, C16 ‘Because they recognised Heaven and Earth in a signal manner and [because] they recognised [them] in a manifest manner, being protected by Heaven, happiness and prosperity having been attained, they (i.e., the brilliant sovereigns of antiquity – I.R.) were recognised in a distinctive manner’, R ‘Because they had a lucid understanding and a clear comprehension of Heaven and Earth, they were protected by Heaven: good fortune and blessings were (thereby) perceived (= became manifest) in a significant manner’. This passage is a paraphrase of the Chinese text which simply says: 天地明察神明彰矣 ‘When Heaven and Earth were served with intelligence and discrimination, the spiritual intelligences displayed (their retributive power¹).’ (Legge 1899, p. 485.) Note 1 on p. 485 reads: “‘The Spiritual Intelligences’ here are Heaven and Earth conceived of as Spiritual Beings. They responded to the sincere service of the intelligent kings’ – in other words, they ‘were perceived’ (*uqaydaǰūyū*) ‘in a distinctive (or significant) way’ (*belgetei-e*), i.e. they manifested themselves by conferring happiness and prosperity, these blessings consisting (as Hsing Ping expounded in his

commentary) in ‘the harmony of the active and passive principles of nature, seasonable winds and rain, the absence of epidemic sickness and plague, and the repose of all under heaven’ (HC, p. 8 [16], 1b; tr. Legge, loc. cit.). From the above it would appear, then, that the subject of ‘being perceived’ (Cleaves’ ‘being recognised’) is not ‘the brilliant sovereigns of antiquity’, but Heaven and Earth conceived as ‘spiritual intelligences’ (*shen-ming* 神明), to use Legge’s expression. Cf. below, 33r, 6–33v, 1.

33r, 4: *uridus-uγan ner-e aldar-i yutuyaydaqui-ača emiyekü-yin tula*, C16 ‘it is because he fears lest the name and fame (?) of his ancestors be disgraced’. The question mark refers to the words ‘of his ancestors’ (*uridus-uγan*) and, in particular, to the genitive-accusative possessive suffix *-uγan* which in Cleaves’ transcription of the text (CHC, p. 118, 33[r], 4) is incorrectly written *-yuyan*. In the HC text there is, in fact, no initial *yod*, nor enough room for one to be. As I pointed out in R, p. 82, n. 318, this suffix is extremely rare in pmo., the regular form being *-yuyan/-yügen*. Cf. Cleaves (1952, p. 69 [8]): *uridus-yuyan*. It is not mentioned in *Untersuchungen*, pp. 70–71, §13. However, it is well attested in mmo. in the forms *-u’an/-ü’en*. See *ibid.*, p. 71. The question mark can, therefore, be removed. For *yutuyaydaqui* see C5, pp. 39–40, n. 61.

33r, 6–33v, 1: *uridus-tayan* (the *iridus-tagan* of CHC, p. 118, 33[r]6, is a misprint) *cing ün-en-iyer kündülemtegü sedkil-iyer taqibasuridus-un sür sünesün mün tendeken-e ülegü uqaju an bui*, C16 ‘If he sacrifice to his ancestors with pure truth and with respectful thoughts, precisely then do the spirits of the ancestors not comprehend?’, *Lettres*, p. 67, ‘If he (i.e., the *qan*) tender honor to his ancestors with pure truth and with respectful thoughts, precisely then do the spirits of the ancestors not comprehend?’, R ‘If he (i.e., the ruler – I.R.) reveres his ancestors with utmost sincerity and respectful thoughts, precisely then do the spirits of the ancestors not perceive (= manifest themselves)?’ The Chinese text says: 宗廟致敬鬼神著矣 ‘When in the ancestral temple he (i.e., the Son of Heaven – I.R.) exhibits the utmost reverence, the spirits of the departed manifest themselves.’ (Legge 1899, pp. 485–486.) As observed earlier (see 32r, 6–32v, 2), this ‘manifestation’ took the form of various blessings. Legge (1899, p. 486, n. 1) explains: ‘The reader will have noticed many instances of this, or what were intended to be instances of it, in the translations from the Shih, pp. 365–368, &c’. (See, e.g., *She King*, vol. II, p. 257 [5]: ‘The spirits [of the ancestors – I.R.] come/ And confer on thee [i.e., the ruler – I.R.] many blessings’; and, especially, vol. II, pp. 370–373 [2–6].) The Mongol translator has used the verb *uqa-* ‘to perceive’ to render ch. *chu* 著 ‘to manifest (oneself, themselves)’. Cleaves’ rendering of *uqa-* with ‘to comprehend’, and my rendering of it with ‘to perceive’, while lexically correct, fail to establish an obvious correlation with the concept of ‘manifestation’, i.e. the granting of favours and blessings as implicit in the HC. A more appropriate translation of *uqa-* in the present context is ‘to acknowledge’, for with the spirits’ *acknowledgement* and acceptance of the sacrifice the blessings would naturally follow. This is what the translator clearly had in mind when he employed the verb *uqa-*. The rhetorical question in Mongolian is, of course, meant to convey the force of the emphatic final *i* 矣 of the Chinese.

35r, 1–5: *sedkil-degen oyisiyaγsan-i qola ber bögesü oyir-a sitü sedkil-dür ele ayulbasu umartaqu üdür inu keñiy-e bolqu*, C17 ‘If, even though he be far, I but cause to be in [my] heart as if [he were] near [him] whom I have loved in my heart, when will come the day when I shall forget [him]?’; R ‘Even though the one whom I love in my heart is far, if I cause him to be in (my) heart as if he were near, when will the day come that I shall forget him?’, Street (1986, p. 43), ‘If [I] cause [him] whom I have loved in my heart – although [he] is far [off] – to be *in my heart* as [though he were] near [by], ...’ This passage is discussed at length in Cleaves (1951, pp. 80–81, n. 54; cf. R, p. 84, n. 245). According to Street, loc. cit., the particle *ele* ‘apparently has intensive or emphatic force: it emphasises the *sedkil-dür*’ – hence the italicised *in my heart* in his translation of the pertinent clause. In Cleaves’ translation, the force of *ele* is expressed with the emphatic ‘but’ (‘if ... I but ...’) before ‘cause to be in [my] heart’. I think this is the correct rendering of *ele*, and in R a ‘but’ should also be inserted between ‘I’ and ‘cause’ to obtain the same effect.

36r, 2: *quγur dayun sonosbasu ülü kögjin*, C18 ‘If he hear the sound of a zither, he does not delight in [it]’, R ‘If he hears the sound of the fiddle, he does not feel gay’. Strictly speaking the Mongolian stringed instrument called *quγur* is the fiddle, sometimes inaccurately referred to as the lute, and corresponding to ch. *huch’in* 胡琴, whereas the zither (or zither harp), ch. *ch’in* 琴 or *ku-ch’in* 古琴, is called *yatuyā* in Mongolian. The Mongol fiddle is often seen held and played by the Mongol bard (*quγurči*, lit. ‘fiddler’). The *morin quγur* or ‘horse fiddle’, with a horse’s head carved on top and strings made of horsehair, is claimed by some to be the progenitor of the Western violin. Cf. Kow., p. 886b; Lessing 1982, p. 982a; *MKT*, pp. 1464b, 1866b–1867a; *Rasūlid Hexaglot*, p. 306 (29); *MA*, p. 139a, s.v. ‘*da’ün*’. See also *KMT*, p. 627c, s.v. 胡琴, and p. 1251c, s.v. 琴. For the Chinese zither or lute (琴) see R. H. van Gulik’s classic monograph, *The Lore of the Chinese Lute*, especially the historical ‘Introduction’ which contains excellent illustrations of the instrument, an altogether different one from the Mongolian *quγur*, on which see *Information Mongolia*, pp. 373–374 and Fig. 1; N. Tsultem’s *Mongolian Arts and Crafts*, Pl. 110 and 111; and *Inner Mongolia Today*, pp. 149 and 150. I think that the confusion, which first occurs in Cleaves (1951, p. 100, n. 153; see also Cleaves 1959, p. 61 [13r, 6]), originates from the fact that the zither is often called lute (as in van Gulik’s book); and the Turkish *qopuz*, usually identified with the Mongolian *quγur*, is often referred to as a ‘lute’. See, e.g., Clauson (1972, p. 588b); *Rasūlid Hexaglot*, loc. cit. On the word *quγur* and mtu. *qopuz* see now Doerfer (1963–1975, nos 314 and 1546). In the *YCPS* 7, 9b, we find the word *qu’urda-* (= pmo. *quγurda-*) ‘to fiddle’ (cf. Cleaves 1959, p. 95, n. 412: ‘to zither’) which, however, in *Secret History* (I), p. 116, §189, Cleaves translates as ‘to play the *qu’ur*¹⁶’. Note 16 on the same page reads: ‘A stringed instrument.’ on the basis of the Chinese gloss *t’an* 彈 ‘to play on a stringed instrument’ of the *YCPS*. With regard to the verb *kөгji-*, Kow., p. 2636a, gives as the third definition ‘s’appliquer d’affection’ (cf. C18, p. 244, n. 22); in Lessing (1982, p. 481b), we find the definition ‘to be in a gay mood’. Cf. Bawden (1997, p. 456a), s.v. ‘*xөгžix*’ (2), ‘to enjoy oneself, to be happy, to be cheer-

ful'. It is this meaning that applies here, I think, since the *HC ülü kögjin* renders *pu lo* 不樂 'he feels no delight' (Legge 1899, p. 487) of the Chinese text.

37r, 1–2: C18 [(?) *bey-e-yi*/(?) *kegür-i* (?) *qubčasun*] *könjilei selte abs-a-dur [oroyuldai j]-e* '[(?) The body/(?) the corpse is deposited] in the coffin, together with [(?) the clothing] and the blanket', R [?] *absalaqui-dur qubčasun*] *könjilei selte abs-a-dur [oroyuldai j]-e* [?] 'When one coffins (the corpse),] one shall place it in the coffin together with [the clothing and] the blanket'. This sentence translates the ch. 爲之棺槨衣衾而舉 'An inner and outer coffin are made; the grave-clothes are also put on, and the shroud; and (the body) is lifted (into the coffin).' (Legge 1899, p. 487.) In C18, p. 240, 36v, 7, the two initial characters 爲之 are missing, but they are given in note 52 on p. 247, and in note 54 on p. 248. In note 52, Cleaves justifies the alternative readings *bey-e-yi/kegür-i* in the badly damaged line, and in note 56 on p. 249, the reading *qubčasun* in the same line, referring also to Lu and L [*qubčad*]. I entirely agree on the restoration of *qubčasun* (part of the ductus of the final *n* is clearly visible), but do not agree with Cleaves on the word before it because both *beye-yi* and *kegür-i* are too short for the space available at the beginning of the first line. I assume that the *q* of *qubčasun* is on the same level of the short vertical line visible in the second line, which is the beginning of the ductus of the final *-e* of *ǰe*. See C18, pp. 247–248, n. 53. Moreover, *bey-e-yi* would have been written *beye-yi* (cf. *beye-yin* in 7r, 1), thus further reducing the length of this word. I think that, on this ground alone, we can exclude both words. *Absalaqui-dur* 'when one coffins (the corpse)' is the right length. The object of the verb *absala-* i.e. the corpse, is understood, as is the case of *ǰaryaqui-dur* 'when one takes it out'. Indeed, there is no reference to it in the Chinese text either. However, my reconstruction is purely tentative and given with reservation, since the word(s) in question has (have) been totally obliterated.

37r, 3: C18 *ta[qil-un sabas-i abs-a-yin] emün-e inu ǰergeleǰü* 'One arranges before [(?) the coffin the vessels of] *sa*[crifice], R *ta[qil-un sabas-i] emün-e inu ǰergeleǰü* 'Disposing [the sacrificial vessels] in front of it'. In C18, pp. 249–250, nn. 59 and 60, and R, pp. 85–86, n. 364, reasons are given for the restored words in the damaged text. Unfortunately, neither Cleaves nor I took into account the available space in the line. Cleaves' restoration would occupy too much space because of the word *abs-a-yin* with the ductus of the final *n* of *-yin*, and my restoration is definitely too short. I think that the incomplete line should read *ta[qil tabiy-un sabas-i] emün-e inu ǰergeleǰü* 'Disposing [the vessels of the sacrifice] in front of it'. For *taqil tabiy* 'sacrifice(s)', lit. 'sacrifice(s) and offering(s)', see C4, pp. 148–149, n. 39; R, p. 62, n. 80. Cf. Lu (1961, p. 119, n. 191 (a)).

37r, 6: C18 *kö[ǰ]-iyen dergelüged* 'having (?) stamped⁶⁵ his feet', R 'repeatedly stamps one's feet³⁶⁸'. In note 65 on p. 251 of C18, Cleaves refers to the verb *derbel-* 'to quake' in the *YCPS* 2, 42b (§98; cf. *Wörterbuch*, p. 36) and, on the basis of the *HC* text in which the corresponding word is *yung* 踴 'to jump up and down, to leap', renders *kö[ǰ]-iyen dergelüged* with '(?) stamped his feet'. However, in R, p. 86, n. 368, I had already indicated that *dergel-* is the iterative form in *-l-* of *derge-* = *mo. derbe-* 'to flutter, to flap (one's wings)'. See Lessing (1982, p. 252b). For *-g- ~ -b-* see

Introduction, pp. 99–100. But *derbe-*, kalm. *derw²-*, has also the meaning of ‘to try to rise, to violently move up and down’ (Ramstedt 1935, p. 90a). Hence, the meaning of the expression *köl-iyen dergel-* must be ‘to move one’s feet repeatedly up and down, to stamp one’s feet repeatedly’ – as a sign of anguish and part of the prescribed mourning behaviour. Cf. Legge’s rendering (1899, p. 487) of the Chinese text: ‘and the men stamp with their feet’. Therefore, I think that the question mark in Cleaves’ translation can be removed and the word ‘repeatedly’ inserted instead.

37v, 1: *orosiyul dai j-e*, C18 ‘and [(?) the body/(?) the corpse] is deposited’. The unexpressed subject of *orosiyul-* ‘to bury’ (lit. ‘to put into [a permanent position]’) is, of course, the corpse (*kegür*) which has just been mentioned in the previous line (37r, 7) with reference to the grave (*kegür-ün yaǰar*, lit. ‘the place of the corpse’). Moreover, *kegür[-i] orosiyul-* ‘to bury the dead’ is a set expression. See Kow., p. 456a; Lessing (1982, p. 624a).

38r, 1: *aqū irgen-ü töb uǰayur anu*, C18 ‘the fundamental duty of the people which are [alive]’, R ‘the fundamental (duty) of the living people’. *Aqu irgen* = ch. *sheng-min* 生民 ‘living people’. *A-* ‘to be’ means also ‘to exist, to live’, hence *aqū irgen* means ‘living people’ rather than ‘the people which are [alive].’ See the numerous examples cited in Kow., p. 24a–b. As for the expression *töb uǰayur* (= ch. *pen* 本 ‘the root/origin: the fundamental thing or matter’), lit. ‘central (or the very) origin (or source)’, one assumes that it refers here to the essence of one’s moral obligations, viz. one’s fundamental duty. This is, indeed, how Legge has rendered *pen* in the passage in question: 生民之本 ‘the fundamental duty of living men’ (Legge 1899, p. 488). Since in 2r, 1 and 18v, 7 (in C1, p. 82, n. 38, ‘18r7’ is an error for ‘18v7’) *töb uǰayur* refers to ‘virtue’ (*ayali aburi*) and ‘the sages’ teachings’ (*boydas sayid-un sqyül suryal*) respectively, while in 38r, 1, ‘duty’ is not expressed, I think that this word, being extrapolated from the context, should be bracketed.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

Bawden, C. (1997): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. London–New York, Kegan Paul International, 1997; repr. [Ulan Bator, n.d.].

Bca. see Cleaves 1954.

C1 = Cleaves, F. W. (1982): The First Chapter of an Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. *Acta Orient. Hung.* 36, pp. 69–88.

C2 = Cleaves, F. W. (1983): The Second Chapter.... In: Sagaster, K.–Weiers, M. (eds): *Documenta Barbarorum. Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 70. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, pp. 39–46.

C3 = Cleaves, F. W. (1991): The Third Chapter... *Mongolian Studies* 14, pp. 117–143.

C4 = Cleaves, F. W. (1992): The Fourth Chapter... *Mongolian Studies* 15, pp. 137–150.

C5 = Cleaves, F. W. (1993): The Fifth Chapter... *Mongolian Studies* 16, pp. 19–40.

C6 = Cleaves, F. W. (1994): The Sixth Chapter... *Mongolian Studies* 17, pp. 1–20.

C7 = Cleaves, F. W. (2001a): The Seventh Chapter... In: CHC (see below), pp. 7–58.

C8 = Cleaves, F. W. (2001b): The Eighth Chapter... In: CHC, pp. 59–76.

C9 = Cleaves, F. W. (2001c): The Ninth Chapter... In: CHC, pp. 77–106.

- C10 to C13 = Cleaves, F. W. (2006): An Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. 2. Chapters Ten to Thirteen, revised and edited by I. de Rachewiltz. *Acta Orient. Hung.* 59, pp. 393–406.
- C14 to C17 = Cleaves, F. W. (2007): An Early Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao Ching*. 3. Chapters Fourteen to Seventeen, revised and edited by I. de Rachewiltz. *Acta Orient. Hung.* 60, pp. 145–160.
- C18 = Cleaves, F. W. (1985): The Eighteenth Chapter... *HJAS* 45, pp. 225–254.
- CHC = Cleaves, F. W. (2001): *An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao ching (The Book of Filial Piety). Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine. Transcription, Translation, Commentary. Chapters Ten through Seventeen. Transcription, Translation.* Bloomington, Indiana (Publications of the Mongolia Society Occasional Papers 23).
- Clauson, G. (1972): *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1948): The Expression *Jöb Ese Bol-* in *The Secret History of the Mongols.* *HJAS* 11, pp. 311–320.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1949): The Sino-Mongolian Inscription in Memory of Prince Hindu. *HJAS* 12, pp. 1–133.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1950): The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1335 in Memory of Chang Ying-jui. *HJAS* 13, pp. 1–131.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1951): The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1338 in Memory of Jigün-tei. *HJAS* 14, pp. 1–104.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1952): The Sino-Mongolian Inscription of 1346. *HJAS* 15, pp. 1–123.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1954): *The Bodistw-a Čari-a Awatar-un Tayilbur* of 1312. *HJAS* 17, pp. 1–129.
- Cleaves, F. W. (1959): An Early Mongolian Version of the Alexander Romance. *HJAS* 22, pp. 1–99.
- Code = Ratchnevsky, P.: *Un code des Yuan, I–IV, Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises* 4, Paris: E. Leroux (I), 1937; Presses universitaires de France (II), 1972, (III), 1988; Collège de France, Inst. des Hautes Etudes Chinoises (IV), 1985.
- CWTTT = Chang Ch'i-yün 張其鈞 (1973) (ed.): *Chung-wen ta tz'u-tien* 中文大辭典, I–X. Taipei, Chung-hua hsüeh-shu yüan 中華學術院.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (1981): Some Remarks on Töregene's Edict of 1240. *Papers on Far Eastern History* 23, March 1981, pp. 38–63.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (1986): More About the Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 19, pp. 27–37.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (1993): Some Reflections on Činggis Qan's *Ĵasay*. *East Asian History* 6, Dec. 1993, pp. 91–104.
- de Rachewiltz, I. (2004): The Missing First Page of the Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*. A Tentative Reconstruction. *East Asian History* 27, June 2004, pp. 51–56.
- Die Mongolica* = Cerensodnom, D.–Taube, M. (1993): *Die Mongolica der Berliner Turfansammlung.* Berlin, Akademie Verlag (Berliner Turfantexte XVI).
- Doerfer, G. (1963–1975): *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen.* I–IV. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner Verlag.
- Fraser, E. D. H. (1930): *Index to the Tso Chuan* (左傳), rev. by J. H. S. Lockhart. London, etc., Oxford University Press.
- Grammar* = Poppe, N. (1954): *Grammar of Written Mongolian.* Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz; repr. 1964, 1974.

- HC = Hsing Ping 邢昺: *Hsiao-ching chu-shu* 孝經注疏, *Shih-san ching chu-shu* 十三經注疏 ed., 1815; repr. by Chung-wen ch'u-p'an-she 中文出版社 (Kyoto, 1971), VII, pp. 5511–5570.
- HC = Yuan blockprint of the bilingual (Chinese–Mongolian) *Hsiao-ching* 孝經 (*Canon of Filial Piety*) in the collection of the Palace Museum, Peking.
- HCCC = Kuan Yün-shih 貫雲石: *Hsin-k'an ch'üan-hsiang Ch'eng-chai Hsiao-ching chih-chieh* 新刊全相成齋孝經直解, pref. 1308, photoreprint Peking, Lai-hsün ko 來薰閣, 1938.
- HC Index = Index to the 'Hiao-king'. In: Ligeti, L. (1972): *Monuments préclassiques I. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. Deuxième partie, IVLMMT II*, pp. 71–153.
- HIY = Hua-i i-yü 華夷譯語 (1389). In: *Han-fen-lou pi-chi* 涵芬樓祕笈. 4th ser., 1918. See *Matériel mongol*.
- HJAS = *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.
- Information Mongolia = Academy of Sciences MPR, comp. and ed.: *Information Mongolia. The Comprehensive Reference Source of the People's Republic of Mongolia (MPR)*. Oxford, etc., Pergamon Press, 1990.
- Inner Mongolia Today, published by the Nationalities Publishing House, Peking, 1957.
- Introduction = Poppe, N. (1955): *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*. Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- IVLMMT = Ligeti, L. (1970–1974): *Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum*. I–V. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KMT = *Kitad Mongyol toli. Han Meng tz'u-tien* 漢蒙詞典, rev. ed., Kökeqota: Öbör Mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriya, 1983.
- Kow. = Kowalewski, J. E. (1844–1849): *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*. I–III. Kasan, Imprimerie de l'Université; repr. Tientsin, 1941, Taipei, 1993.
- L = La xylographie sino-mongole du Hiao-king. In: Ligeti, L. (1972): *Monuments préclassiques I. XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. MLMC II*, pp. 76–104.
- Legge, J. (1899): *The Texts of Confucianism, Part I, The Shü King, The Religious Portions of the Shih King, The Hsiao King*. 2nd ed. Oxford (The Sacred Books of China, The Sacred Books of the East Translated by Various Oriental Scholars, ed. by F. Max Müller, III, 2nd ed.).
- Lessing, F. D. (1982) (gen. ed.): *Mongolian–English Dictionary*. Comp. by M. Haltod, J. G. Haingin, S. Kassatkin, F. D. Lessing, corr. repr. Bloomington, In., The Mongolia Society, Inc.
- Lettres = Mostaert, A.–Cleaves, F. W. (1962): *Les lettres de 1289 et 1305 des ilkhan Arḡun et Öljeitü à Philippe le Bel*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Ligeti, L. (1964): Les fragments du *Subhāṣitaratmanidhi* mongol en écriture 'phags-pa. Mongol préclassique et moyen mongol. *Acta Orient. Hung.* 17, pp. 239–292.
- Ligeti, L. (1984): A propos de la traduction mongole préclassique du *Hiao-king*. *Acta Orient. Hung.* 38, pp. 303–349.
- Lu = Luvsanbaldan, Xa. (Lubsangbaldan, Qa.) (1961): *Ačlalt nomyn tuxai/Ačilaltu nom-un tuqai*. Ulan Bator (Studia Mongolica 3/12).
- MA = Poppe, N. (1938–1939): *Mongol'skij slovar' Mukaddimat al-Adab*. I–III. Moscow–Leningrad, Izd. Akad. Nauk SSSR; repr. in one volume by Gregg International Publ. Ltd., Westmead, 1971.
- Matériel mongol* = Mostaert, A.: *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i iu* 華語譯語 de Houng-ou (1939). I: éd. par I. de Rachewiltz avec l'assistance de A. Schönbaum. Bruxelles, Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, 1977 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 18); II: *Commentaires*, par A. Mostaert et I. de Rachewiltz. Bruxelles, Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, 1995 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 27).
- MKT = *Mongyol Kitad toli. Meng Han tz'u-tien* 蒙漢詞典, rev. ed., Kökeqota, Öbör Mongyol-un Yeke Suryayuli-yin keblel-ün qoriya, 1999.

- MLMC* = Ligeti, L. (1971–): *Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Mongolica* = Haenisch, E. (1953–1954): *Mongolica der Berliner Turfan-Sammlung, I. Ein buddhistisches Druckfragment vom Jahre 1312*. Berlin, Akademie Verlag (Abh. d. Deutschen Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Klasse f. Spr. Lit. u. Kunst, 1953, Nr. 3).
- Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋徹次 (1955–1960): *Dai Kan-Wa jiten* 大漢和辭典. I–XIII. Tokyo, Dai-shūkan shoten 大修館書店; repr. 1968.
- Mostaert, A. (1999): Quelques problèmes phonétiques dans la transcription en caractères chinois du texte mongol du *Iuen tch'ao pi-cheu*, ed. by I. de Rachewiltz and P. W. Geier. In: Sagaster, K. (1999) (ed.): *Antoine Mostaert (1881–1971) C.I.C.M. Missionary and Scholar*. Leuven: Ferdinand Verbiest Foundation, vol. I, pp. 225–271 (Louvain Chinese Studies 4).
- Orlovskaya, M. N. (1958): Upotreblenie pričastij v “Sokrovennom skazanii” mongolov. In: Sanžeev, G. D.–Mikhajlov, G. I.–Šastina, N. P. (1958) (eds): *Filologiya i istoriya mongol'skikh narodov. Pamyati Akademika Borisa Jakovleviča Vladimircova*. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury, pp. 101–125.
- Pelliot, P. (1925): Les mots à H initiale, aujourd'hui amuic dans le mongol des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. *Journal asiatique* 206, pp. 193–263.
- Pulleyblank, E. G. (1991): *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver, UBC Press.
- Pyrubeev, G. C. (2001–2002): *Bolšoj akademičeskij mongol'sko-russkij slovar'*. I–IV, Moscow, Akademiya.
- R = de Rachewiltz, I. (1982): The Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*. *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16, pp. 7–107.
- Ramstedt, G. J. (1935): *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 3).
- Rasūlid Hexaglot* = Golden, P. B. (2000) (ed. and comm.): *The King's Dictionary. The Rasūlid Hexaglot: Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol*. Tr. by T. Halasi-Kun, P. B. Golden, L. Ligeti, E. Schütz, with introductory essays by P. B. Golden and Th. T. Allsen. Leiden–Boston–Köln, Brill (Handbuch der Orientalistik VIII/4).
- Secret History* see *Secret History (1)* and *Secret History (2)*
- Secret History (1)* = *The Secret History of the Mongols For the First Time Done into English out of the Original Tongue and Provided with an Exegetical Commentary* by F.W. Cleaves, I (Translation), Cambridge, Mass.–London, Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Secret History (2)* = *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century. Translated with a Historical and Philological Commentary* by I. de Rachewiltz. I–II. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2004; repr. 2006.
- SH Index* = de Rachewiltz, I. (1972): *Index to the Secret History of the Mongols*. Bloomington, Indiana University (Uralic & Altaic Series 121).
- She King* = Legge, J. (1871): *The Chinese Classics with a Translation, Critical and Exegetical Notes, Prolegomena, and Copious Indexes*. Vol. IV. *The She King or Book of Poetry*, I–II. London, H. Frowde; repr. in China, 1939.
- Shoo King* = Legge, J. (1865): *The Chinese Classics with a Translation, Critical and Exegetical Notes, Prolegomena, and Copious Indexes*. Vol. III. *The Shoo King, or the Book of Historical Documents*, I–II. London, H. Frowde; repr. in China, 1939.
- Street, J. (1986): The Particle *ele* in Early Middle Mongolian. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 80, pp. 195–258.

- The Book of Odes* = Karlgren, B. (1950): *The Book of Odes. Chinese Text, Transcription and Translation*. Stockholm, The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.
- Treasury* = Bosson, J. E. (1969): *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels: The Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian*. The Hague, Mouton & Co. (Uralic and Altaic Series 92).
- TS Index* = Ligeti, L. (1973): *Trésor des sentences. Subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya Paṇḍita, traduction de Sonom Gara*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó (IVLMMT IV).
- Tsultem, N. (1987): *Mongolian Arts and Crafts*. Ulan Bator, State Publishing House.
- Twelve Deeds* = Poppe, N. (1967): *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha. A Mongolian Version of the Lalitavistara. Mongolian Text, Notes, and English Translation*. Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz (Asiatische Forschungen 23).
- Untersuchungen* = Weiers, M. (1969): *Untersuchungen zu einer historischen Grammatik des präklassischen Schriftmongolisch*. Wiesbaden, O. Harrassowitz (Asiatische Forschungen 28).
- van Gulik, R. H. (1940): *The Lore of the Chinese Lute. An Essay in Ch'in Ideology*. Tokyo, Sophia University (Monumenta Nipponica Monographs [4]).
- Wörterbuch* = Haenisch, E. (1939): *Wörterbuch zu Manḡol un Niuca Tobca'an (Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi)*. *Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*. Leipzig, O. Harrassowitz; repr. Wiesbaden, 1962.
- WTCWC* = *Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wen chien* 五体清文鑑. I–III. Peking, Min-tsu ch'u-pan-she 民族出版社, 1957.
- Yazyk* = Orlovskaya, M. N. (1999): *Yazyk mongol'skikh tekstov XIII–XIV vv*. Moscow, Institut Vostokovedeniya ANR.
- YCPS* = *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史, *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊 ed., 3rd ser., 1936. See *Secret History*.