

Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols. (Ural and Altaic Series, vol. 58) by Kuo-yi Pao
Review by: Henry Serruys
Monumenta Serica, Vol. 24 (1965), pp. 477-480
Published by: Monumenta Serica Institute
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40725813
Accessed: 12/09/2012 14:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Monumenta Serica Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Monumenta Serica.*

http://www.jstor.org

Kuo-yi Pao: *Studies on the Secret History of the Mongols.* Published by Indiana University, Bloomington; Mouton & Co., The Hague, The Netherlands, 1965. vii, 163 pp. (Ural and Altaic Series, vol. 58.)

The *Secret History of the Mongols*, also known by its Chinese name as *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* 元朝秘史 because it came down to us in Chinese transcription with abbreviated translation, is a book of utmost importance for the history of the Mongol language. It is also an important historical document, and in the opinion of this reviewer, it may one day be recognized as an outstanding work of literature. However it is a difficult book, and what we need in the first place is a reliable translation reflecting the subtle shades of meaning of the original; only then will an aesthetically satisfying translation become possible. The present work under review is a step towards that goal.

For several decades now many scholars, linguists and historians have applied themselves to the study of the *Secret History*. There exist several editions of the Mongol text in transcription; it has been translated into German, French, Turkish, Hungarian, Russian, Japanese, modern Chinese and modern Mongol. Not all those translations are of equal quality or accurate in all details, but the very number of existing translations bespeaks the world-wide interest in the *Secret History*. In 1950–1952, the Rev. Ant. Mostaert CICM published a series of articles dedicated to a detailed study of a good number of passages, many more than 68, as stated by Mr. Pao (p. 5) (*Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 13, 14, 15 (1950–52); re-issued in 1953 as *Sur Quelques Passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols*, Cambridge, Mass., 277 pages). Up to the present time there existed no English translation of any substantial part of the *SH*. Mr. Pao's book partially corrects this situation; it comprises the transcription of the original text of the ninth chapter, with translation, notes, and a vocabulary of all words appearing in this section.

With his knowledge of both modern Mongol and Chinese, Mr. Pao is exceptionally well qualified for this task. Not that every problem has been solved. I am sure that Mr. Pao will agree that many passages remain somewhat obscure. I would suggest that a translation into any modern language must take into account the literary devices and imagery employed in the original; I am referring in particular to the numerous passages in alliteration, a form of poetry still used by the Mongols. If Mr. Pao recognized those passages, he has often disregarded them in his translation. Some poetical passages have been torn into two parts going into separate sentences. A poetical passage should be treated as one unit and retain as far as possible the flavor of the original. Morever as long as the exact meaning of many passages remains in doubt, I think that a translation of the *SH* will have to follow the original rather closely, without, again as far as this is possible, impairing too much the quality and the readability of the translation. I wish Mr. Pao had done that more consistently. In many instances he inserts words not found in the Mongol text; such a device may at times be unavoidable, but for the time being extra words should be put between parentheses so as not to mislead the reader. In his notes Mr. Pao, although giving some comment on difficult words or

strange expressions, hardly ever provides anything by way of grammatical or linguistic justification for his translation.

There are a number of passages which in my opinion are translated inaccurately; here follow a few examples.

§ 211 (pp. 13, 33) *törekü-lü'e töröldügsen, öskü-lü'e ösülčegsen, buluγan nelke huǰa'urtu:* "when we were born, we were born together; when we grew up, we grew up together. The sable swaddles was the cause of our relation." I would translate: "that he was born with [i.e. when] (my) being born; that he grew up with (my) growing up, has as its origin the swaddling clothes of sable."

§ 213 (pp. 14, 34) *yeke tüsürge* "large wine pot" is not quite correct. In § 130, the Chinese translation for *tüsürge* is "jar"; here, the Chinese translates: *chiu-chü* 酒局 which Haenisch renders as "Weindepot" in his dictionary, but as "Weintrog" in the translation. Neither is correct. Char. 局 appears in many names of offices, and this seems to have prompted Haenisch to render it as "depot." But I believe that *chü* 局 really stands for *chü* 具 "utensil." Kovalevski reads *düsürge:* "arrosoir... etc." which is not relevant in our text. The *tüsürge* containers used by the Mongols of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were skins. The accounts of William of Rubruc and other travelers leave no doubt. For example he states that "bancus cum utre lactis vel cum alio potu et cum ciphis stat in introitu" (A. Van den Wyngaert, *Sinica Franciscana* I [1929], p. 175): "A bench with a skin of milk, or some other drink, and with cups, stands in the entry." (W. W. Rockhill, *The Journey of William of Rubruck* [1900], p. 61.) For other references, see V.d. Wyngaert, *op. cit.*, p. 179, and Rockhill, *op. cit.*, p. 68, et passim. Ibn Battuta, too, states that in Central Asia, milk and milk beverages were kept in skins (Ibn Battuta, *Travels in Asia and Africa, 1325-1354*, The Broadway Travellers, London, 1953, p. 146). B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde* (1965, p. 439) lists those skins as manufactures of the Mongols in South Russia. As late as 1870, W. Radloff noted that among the Western Qalqas "weiter nach rechts [in their tents] stehen grössere und kleinere Lederschläuche mit Kumys, Airan, Buttermilch, u.s.w. auf hölzernen Unterlagen" (*Aus Sibirien*, Leipzig, 1893, II, p. 213). Hsieh Tsai-shan in his Chinese translation of the *SH* both of 1951 (p. 139) and 1956 (after C. Damdinsürüng's modern Mongol version) (p. 218) takes the easy way out and leaves the expression *chiu-chü* unexplained. The word *tüsürge* probably is related to Turkic *tüs, tüs* (W. Radloff, *Aus Sibirien*, I, p. 354, and *Versuch eines Wörterbuches* [1960], col. 1578) "Cylinderförmige Gefässe aus Birkenrinde," with this difference, however, that in the *SH* containers made of birch bark are called *daγtai.*

§ 214 (pp. 15, 34) *Basa ebüges ečige-yi baraγsad öšten kišten Tatar irgen-i doraγida'ulǰu ösül ösün kisal kisan...* "Again, you have conquered our enemies, the Tatars, who exterminated our ancestors. When we slaughtered in revenge..." The following is closer to the original: "Also we conquered the Tatar people, object of our hatred and revenge, who had exterminated (my) ancestors and father, exacting vengeance and requiting retribution..." It should be born in mind that Činggis' father had been assassinated by the Tatar.

§ 214 (pp. 16, 34) *kö'ün baraba:* "he is murdering the child." The Mongol is far more forceful and means something like: "the boy is done for!".

man-i ügei bö'esü is not "had we not come" but "had we not been there."

§ 216 (pp. 18, 35) *Ba'arin aqa-yin uruγ büle'ei* is not "Ba'arin are the descendants of the elder brother." Contrary to the interlinear translation, Ba'arin here is not the tribe, but a personal name: Ba'arin-aqa: "(Üsün) is a descendant of B.-aqa."

§ 219 (pp. 19, 36) *aqa de'ü-de'en nayitaγdamu ke'en, Sorqan-šira Čila'un Čimbai kö'üd-iyer-iyen — Qada'an ökin-iyen asara'ulju — ni'uju aju namayi talbiju ilebeje ta* does not mean "you, worrying that I might have been harmed by the brothers, caused your sons Čimbai and Čila'un and your daughter Q. to take care of me, to hide me and to set me free" but "You Sorqan-šira saying 'he [i.e. Činggis] is envied by his brethren [the Tayiči'ud],' with your sons Čil. and Čim.— making your daughter Q. take care (of me)— hid me, and releasing sent me away." And the sentence immediately following *tere tusa sayin-i tan-u sedkijü qara süni je'üden-tür gege'en üdür če'ejitür sedkijü yabuba-je bi* (pp. 20, 36) is far more expressive than "I have always kept the memory of that merit of yours, whether in my dreams in the black of night, or in the bright of day." I would prefer to follow the original more closely: "mindful of this service and benefit of yours, in the dark night in (my) dreams, in the bright day in my heart, I kept the memory [lit. thinking]."

ötög, ötögle- is the ceremony of sharing the cup. *Wo-t'o* in the *Cho-keng-lu* 21.17a (note 75 on p. 59) should be read *ötög*: a final clusile is rarely expressed in transcriptions of the Yüan period. The word *ötög* appears in other passages of the *SH.* Pelliot has pointed out in *T'oung Pao* 27 (1930), p. 33, that most probably the word *ötög* and the custom were not of Chin origin as the *Cho-keng-lu* states but of Turkish origin. In his opinion, *ötög* is a loan word from Tu. *ötüg*; the corresponding verb is *ötü-* "to pray." *öči-, öčig, öčög* are more regular correspondences in Mongol.

§ 223 (pp. 22, 37) *ende tende qubčiju*: "(People) were collected from here and there." Although agreeing with A. Mostaert's translation (*Sur Quelques Passages*, pp. [131]-[135]), the author has failed to notice that the action described here had not yet taken place, and is part of the order issued by Činggis on this occasion: "collecting here and there, let.... become officers of a chiliarchy."

§ 224 (pp. 23-25, 37-39). There are a number of inaccuracies in this section, a good part of which is also translated in *Sur Quelques Passages*, pp. [243]-[257]. (Pp. 23, 38) *tenggeri γajar-a güčü auγa nemegdejü* means: "(my) might and power being increased by Heaven and Earth," not, as the author has it: "the power has been increased in the domain (in Heaven and Earth the power has been increased)." Here suffix *-a* does not indicate a locative but the agent of the passive verb.

§ 227 (pp. 28, 40) *γuta'ar γuta'ar kešig-tür* is not "every third day" but "every third shift." As is indicated a few lines above, a shift remained on duty for three days. The sentence *mököri'ülkün yosutan bö'esü bida mököri'ülü-je* "those liable to decapitation we shall have decapitated" has been omitted in the translation.

§ 229 (pp. 29, 41) *bidan-i šülen idetele* is not exactly "at the time when we have our morning soup" but "until..." (pp. 30, 41). *kebte'ülün ǰaqa'un* is not "along the border of the nightguards," but "passing through their midst." There is no reason to identify *ǰaqa'un* as used here (explained as 兩間) with modern *ǰaqaɣur* "alongside" (note 110 on p. 71).

For the convenience of the reader it may be noted that the roman numerals in the vocabulary refer to the pages, and the Arabic numerals to the lines, of the Chinese transcription of Chapter IX of the *SH*.

Let me make clear that by these suggested corrections I do not intend to minimize the importance of Mr. Pao's contribution. As I have explained above, the *SH* contains very difficult passages which I would hesitate to translate, and we should be grateful to the author for having translated this important chapter of the *Secret History of the Mongols*.

Henry Serruys CICM

Walther Heissig: *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen.* Teil II: 1. *Vier Chroniken des 19. Jahrhunderts in Facsimilia mit einer Einleitung und Namenregister.* Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1965, xx, 129 pp. (Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 16.)

This is the first volume of the second part of Prof. Heissig's long-range study of Mongol historical literature, the first part of which was dedicated to a detailed analysis of 20 works from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with facsimile reproduction of four of them. In this new volume he continues his survey with a review of the historical literature of the nineteenth century.

Apart from the large amount of Mongol manuscripts and prints in foreign libraries and private collections, the Mongols themselves, both of Inner Mongolia (China) and Outer Mongolia (Mongolian People's Republic) have become intensely interested in their own literature and a great effort has been made lately to assemble and preserve all documents from the past. A good deal is also being studied and written by the Mongols on the subject. In a brief introduction Prof. Heissig makes a few observations regarding new information and additional material pertaining to the matters discussed in his previous volume. Then he notices that a large number of historical works from the nineteenth century are known to exist in libraries but hardly any of them have been published; he lists 31 titles, the existence of which he knows of only from quotations and references, mostly from Mongolia.

Originally history as conceived by Mongol authors was hardly more than the