



Notes on the "Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih"
Author(s): Arthur Waley
Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (1960), pp. 523-529
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/610035
Accessed: 17/03/2011 12:11

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

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.



Cambridge University Press and *School of Oriental and African Studies* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.*

http://www.jstor.org

NOTES ON THE *YÜAN-CH'AO PI-SHIH*

By ARTHUR WALEY

I HAVE in the following notes expressed occasional disagreement with Pelliot, Haenisch, Mostaert, and Cleaves. This does not mean that in general I underrate their immense services to Mongol studies.

I have used the text of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* printed in Shiratori's *Onyaku-Mōbun Genchō-hishi*, 1942.

Par. 13. 將這鹿取下頭皮帶肺子自要了 'He kept for himself the underneath skin (i.e. the midriff, 'skin' here meaning 'membrane')'. For 'skin' in this sense compare German 'Zwerchfell', literally 'cross skin', i.e. midriff. The phrasing, both of the Mongol original and of the Chinese continual and interlinear translations, implies that the *p'i* ('skin') and the lungs are contiguous. If the surface skin were meant (as translators from the Mongol have supposed) this would make nonsense, as the ribs come between. Palladius with his *bryushina* (peritoneum) got fairly close. Compare par. 197 where skin (*p'i*) is used for another membrane, that is to say the hymen.

What the Uriangqan man kept for himself was in fact the lowest kind of offal. The midriff and lungs in Europe to-day are chopped up and used in the manufacture of sausages. The lungs of a hart are referred to as 'dog's fare' in Gottfried's *Tristan*; see A. Hatto's translation, p. 81.

Par. 24. 由他死呵死 'It's all one! If I die, I die'. *Yu-t'a* seems to have been misunderstood. It is an idiom, similar to the 任他 *jên-t'a* of T'ang poetry, which means 'let things take their course', 'it is all one', 'it does not matter', etc.[1] The 'it' (or 'things') refer to the situation in general, as when we say 'The worst of it is'. There are numerous examples of *yu-t'a* in the 曲 *ch'ü* of the fourteenth century, e.g. (1) 陽春白雪 *Yang ch'un po hsüeh*, II, 24, 富貴由他 'Riches and honour do not matter' (i.e. are all alike to me); (2) 雍熙樂府 *Yung-hsi yo-fu*, XVIII, 12, 由他成敗 'Success and failure are all one to me'.[2]

It seems probable then that the *inu* . . . *inu* 'its . . . its' construction of the Mongol original is a similar idiom and that *inu* is not here simply an 'emphatic particle' as suggested by J. C. Street, *The language of the Secret history*, p. 41. Incidentally, at any rate in the view of the Chinese translator (as shown by the way the clauses are arranged) it is a question of whether Bodoncar lives or dies, not of whether the horse does so; for differing views on which subject see Cleaves, *HJAS*, XII, 1949, 505, where it seems that 由他 is misunderstood.

Par. 31. 日裏來俺行 'During the day he comes to us'. Mongol, *üdür-büri man-dur ire-*.

[1] Compare Japanese *mama-yo*!

[2] *Yu-t'a* does of course sometimes mean 'give him freedom to do . . .', and there are cases where it is uncertain whether the *t'a* is personal or abstract.

The use of 行 (*hang*) [1] as a locative suffix from the eleventh century onwards is discussed by Chang Hsiang (*Shih tz'u ch'ü yü-tz'u . . .*, 詩詞曲語辭 . . .), p. 679. It was a well-established colloquial usage; there are about forty examples in *The hundred plays of the Yüan dynasty*, occurring chiefly in the songs. To Chang's earlier examples may be added one from a *tz'u* by Ou-yang Hsiu [2]: 娘行有些針線 'There is some needlework (that I have left lying about) at my mother's (i.e. in her rooms)', and another in the *Liu Chih-yüan chu-kung-t'iao* 劉知遠諸宮調 (p. 46 of the 1958 facsimile): 向耶行无替新換舊 'At your father's you have not been given new clothes in exchange for the old'.

The use of *hang* in the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* has been analysed by Kobayashi Kōshirō in his *Genchō-hishi no kenkyū*, 1954 (p. 93 seq.). Besides being used as a locative and ablative it occasionally translates the Mongol suffix *-i*, when that suffix represents an accusative; e.g. par. 99, 兒子每 . . . 喚起來 'Wake the children!'. Whether the way in which *hang* is used in the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* belongs to some extent to translator's 'pidgin' or merely represents one form of fourteenth century (northern ?) colloquial remains to be shown.

Par. 85. 龍多兒 (Mongol, *turumtai*).

This word occurs, written 龍脫, as a word for 'hawk' in the *Kuang ya* (third century A.D.). It would appear then that the *erh* at the end is simply a diminutive. In the *Yüan tien chang*, XXII, 12, it is written 龍朶 without *erh*. Professor Haenisch [3] (given the occurrence of the word in the third century) must be wrong in regarding it as a borrowing from Mongol. If it is a loan-word, which seems likely, it must be derived from the language of the Hsiung-nu, Hsien-pi, or some other early 'barbarians'. Father Mostaert [4] prefers to leave *turumtai* untranslated; but as in this passage it evidently means a kind of hawk that preys on sparrows, we cannot be far wrong in translating it 'sparrow-hawk'.

Par. 87. 'A lamb that had been fattened by the milk of two ewes.' This expression raises a question of principle in dealing with the *Secret history*. Both the continuous and the interlinear translation take *tel quriqan* ('increase-lamb') in the sense 'a lamb fattened by two ewes'. N. Poppe in the *Central Asiatic Journal*, II, 1956, 312, says that the corresponding expression in the chronicle *Altan tobči* does not mean 'a lamb who has sucked two mothers' but 'a lamb at the beginning of its second year'. It is no doubt true that the expression to-day refers to the age of the lamb. But what evidence is there that this was so in the thirteenth century? Surely the two Chinese translators, writing in the fourteenth century, are better evidence than twentieth century Mongol usage?

[1] That this, not *hsing*, is the pronunciation we know from rhymes in poetry and from the pronunciation-glosses of the *Hundred plays*.

[2] Quoted by Tanaka Kenzō in *Tōhōgaku*, III, Oct. 1953, 52.

[3] *Sinomogolische Glossare*, I, 1957, p. 15.

[4] *HJAS*, XIII, 1950, 313.

Par. 126. 這般說將來了. In the Mongol text, *ke'ejü ilejü*. The double converb *chiang-lai* that plays so great a part in the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* does not figure in Giles or Mathews or in most native Chinese dictionaries, but it is duly noted in Wang Yün-wu's four-volume *Kuo-yü tz'u-tien* (1948). It first occurs in the phrase 唱將來 with which in Tun-huang MSS [1] the singer of the verse portions gives his cue to the chanter of the scripture, with the meaning 'go ahead with the chanting!' or 'Chant away'. It survived down to modern times chiefly in certain fixed phrases, such as 走將來 'run up' (to some one) and 赶將來 'follow (some one) up'. It seems to add continuity or completeness to the action of the verb it follows. Translators of the *Secret history* have taken *ile-* in this passage as a transitive verb; e.g. Pelliot: 'Sur ces mots il les renvoya', though in the Mongol *ile-* lacks an Object and 'les' (i.e. the messengers) has to be arbitrarily supplied. Both the Chinese translations, on the other hand, take *ile-* as a converb, the continuous translation rendering it by *chiang-lai* and the interlinear by 去, and they are surely right. That *ile-* is sometimes simply a converb no one could deny; for example in *niru'u inu ququl-ju ilebe* (par. 140), 'quite broke his spine'.

It seems that Pelliot's 'Sur ces mots ils les renvoya' should be 'ainsi fit-il son discours'; compare Palladius's *Tak on skazal* 'thus he discoursed'.

For the development of a word meaning 'to send' into a converb, compare the Japanese *yaru*. For example in the *Tale of Genji*, *ii-yaru* means (1) 'to send a message', (2) 'to carry on discourse', 'speak straight ahead'. In his recent *The Chinese Secret history of the Mongols*, M. A. K. Halliday on pp. 104, 204, 214, treats *chiang-lai* in what appears to me to be a rather indecisive way.

It is to be noticed that in both the Chinese translations *chiang-lai* also occurs in the sense 'bring'; e.g. continuous translation, par. 260 都將來獻 'bring all these things and offer them'.

Par. 177. (1) 我雖少, 也似多的般來 . . . 'I (and my followers) may be few; but it is as though we were many'. The Mongol original says 'but it did not cause to seek many', without expressing the Object of 'cause'. The *Ch'in chêng lu* (Wang Kuo-wei edition, fols. 34 and 35) says 不使汝有慕於他衆也: 'Did not cause you to hanker after others (more) numerous'. Mostaert, *HJAS*, xv, 1952, 350, under the influence of the *Ch'in chêng lu*, understands both in the Mongol and Chinese versions a 'you' which is not expressed. Whether this is justifiable in the case of the Mongol text I am not qualified to decide; but in the case of the Chinese version quoted at the head of this note I do not see that any translation but the one I have given is justified.

(2) 我豈不比 . . . 一箇輪麼道在前. Here a stop has sometimes [2]

[1] *Tun-huang pien-wen chi*, p. 515, and *passim*.

[2] e.g. by Halliday, op. cit., p. 229.

been put after *tao* and a pseudo-example of the idiom *ma-tao* created. But comparison with the Mongol: 'Was I not your second wheel? If one is to speak of old times . . .' shows that the stop should come after *ma*, and that *tao tsai ch'ien* means 'To speak of old times (of what happened formerly)'. There are, I think, fourteen genuine examples of *ma-tao* in the Chinese text. Of these, ten correspond to *ke'en* ('saying') in the Mongol original and the rest to other parts of the verb *ke'e-*, except in the first sentence of par. 133 where *ma-tao* corresponds with *büle'e* in the Mongol original (i.e. 'have been'), which is entirely anomalous, but cannot be lightly dismissed as a textual corruption. The Mongol *ke'en* ('saying'), as is well known, corresponds to our closing inverted commas (that is to say, it is equivalent to the 'unquote' of telegraphese), and *ma-tao*, not only in the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih* but also in colloquial official documents and inscriptions of the Mongol period, seems always to fulfil the same function. It can also serve to put a slang phrase into inverted commas, as in 肥心行着麽道[1] 'to conduct oneself with "affability"', where the ultra-colloquial 肥心 replaces the usual 厚心 *hou-hsin*. In such a case one might translate *ma-tao* by 'so to say'.

That *ma-tao* literally means 'thus (he) said' is assumed by Chavannes[2] and Ts'ai Mei-piao.[3] For six alleged examples of *ma* in the sense 'thus', 'such a . . .' see Chiang Hsiang, op. cit., p. 351. Halliday's 'interrogative particle' *ma-tao* (op. cit., pp. 122 and 123) is based partly on wrong punctuation of the passage in par. 177 that I am here discussing. He ignores on principle all evidence outside the Chinese *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*. This seems to me to be the result of a confusion between two processes: (1) finding out what a text means; (2) analysing it. For the purpose of the first process one should use every means (dictionaries, comparable contemporary texts, the original from which the text has been translated, if it is a translated text, and so on). Only after the completion of this preliminary process[4] can any valid analysis begin, and it is the analysis and not the preliminary process that should eschew reference to any evidence save that of the text itself.

I see that the method I suggest has its dangers. It is theoretically possible that some idiom in the text to be analysed may in that text have a meaning different from its meaning in outside sources. But the only alternative, that of 'counting heads'—by which I mean deducing the meaning of an idiom by comparing the contexts in which it occurs in a single text—has far greater dangers. I should regard Halliday's explanation of *ma-tao* ('interrogatory or exclamatory') as an example of this. One may have twenty examples of an idiom and yet draw a quite false conclusion about its meaning. Here I would

[1] From the 孝經直解, quoted on p. 394 of Kobayashi Kōshirō's *Genchō-hishi no kenkyū*, 1954.

[2] 'Inscriptions et pièces de Chancellerie', *T'oung Pao*, Sér. II, Vol. v, 1904, and Vol. IX, 1908, *passim*.

[3] *Yüan-tai pai-hua-pei chi-lu*, 1954, p. 24.

[4] Only in the case of the language of the text being the native language of the analyst, which does not here concern us, can the preliminary process be omitted.

hasten to add that I do not wish to imply that Halliday's book, though I disagree with him on certain points, is otherwise than an important and interesting piece of research.

Par. 178. 兒子行有不可離的道理 'From my son it was right and proper that I should not part'. Father Mostaert [1] translates this, 'Concernant mon fils, il y avait une norme dont je ne pouvai pas me départir'. This sounds more like Chu Hsi than the *Secret history*. I take it that the 'how-can part rule' of the Mongol original means 'a rule forbidding me to part', i.e. to part from my son. The attempt to translate the double suffix *-qu-yu*, here and also in par. 174 [2] simply as an interrogative has compelled Mostaert to supply in brackets a whole series of words that do not occur in the text. The Chinese translator thought that *-qu-yu* was an idiom meaning 'should not', 'ought not to have', and it seems unlikely (since he was probably bilingual) that he was wrong. It seems evident that *-yu* in such cases asks a rhetorical question and hence is equivalent to a negative. Also that *-qu* is permissive rather than potential; compare 可 which has both meanings.

Par. 201. 是可以學的人, Mongol *Surdaqu kü'ün büle'e*. *Surdaqu* being a passive form this has been taken [3] to mean 'a man to be learnt from', on the assumption that 'to be learnt from' is the passive of 'to learn', which would not seem to be the case. Palladius, in his Russian translation of the *Yüan-ch'ao pi-shih*, took the meaning to be 'a man capable of reforming himself' (i.e. learning from experience), which is surely right.[4] In that case we should take *surdaqu* as a *passivum commodi*: 'able to be influenced by learning'.

The words are spoken by Chingiz to Jamuqa when the latter has just refused to accept a reconciliation. It is true that Chingiz in the sentence before admits that, so far as he knows, Jamuqa has never threatened personal violence against him. But a general statement that Jamuqa, the villain of the *Secret history*, was a suitable object of imitation, is inconceivable.

Par. 245. 推辭不肯起, literally 'He gave inability to rise as an excuse'. For the construction, cf. par. 190, 您如何推辭馬瘦 'How can you give the thinness of our horses as an excuse?' or again *Tou-ê yüan* (No. 86 of the *Hundred plays*), Act III, 休推辭路遠 'Do not make the excuse (as a reason for refusing my request) that it is a long way round'. The meaning 'decline' for *t'ui-tz'u* (the only one given by Giles) is secondary and arises from the fact that, if one declines, it is polite to make some excuse.

[1] *HJAS*, XIV, 1951, 351. [2] loc. cit., 342.

[3] By Haenisch, *Die Geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, 1948, p. 91: 'Er ist ein Mann gewesen, von dem man lernen konnte'; and by Street, *The language of the Secret history of the Mongols*, 1957, p. 25: 'He is a man to be learned from'.

[4] Naka in *Chingiz Khan jitsuroku*, 1907, p. 312, translates '*Manabaruru hito nariki*', which I take to mean 'He was a man capable of learning', i.e. of profiting by experience and turning over a new leaf.

The second difficulty arises with 肯 *k'ên*, and its relation to the Mongol *bol-*, which it constantly translates. In ' Sur quelques passages ', n. 228 (*HJAS*, XV, 1952) Father Mostaert writes ' Il est évident que le verb *bol-* ne signifie pas " vouloir " et si les traducteurs du XIV^e^ siècle ont rendu *ulu bol-* par 不肯, " ne pas consentir, ne pas vouloir ", c'est qu'ils se sont appliqués à rendre le sens général du texte '. I find this unconvincing. The real explanation is not that the translators were so vague and inaccurate as Father Mostaert makes out, but that *k'ên* besides its classical meaning of ' consent ' has in less formal language the meaning ' to manage to ', ' to achieve by an effort ', ' be capable of ' (physically or morally). The Japanese are well aware of the distinction ; when *k'ên* means ' consent ' they gloss it *gaen-zuru* and when it means ' manage to ' they gloss it by *aete suru* (' do by an effort '). When Chinese poets say that youth (or spring) 不肯重來, they mean ' cannot possibly come twice ' (i.e. once these are gone, they do not come back) ; ' are not willing to come twice ' would barely make sense. The best example of a *k'ên* which cannot possibly mean ' consent ' is to be found in the play ' P'ang plunders four commanderies ', Act III ; p. 10 (*Ku-pên Yüan-Ming tsa-chü*, vol. III). An assassin returns to his employer, bringing the severed head of the victim. The employer says ' Are you sure you killed the right man ? ' and the assassin replies that the victim himself said plainly who he was : 我怎肯錯殺了別人, which can only mean ' How can I possibly have killed someone else by mistake ? '. ' How did I consent to kill . . . ? ' does not make sense.

Let us for once engage in wild speculation. May not the original meaning of *k'ên* have been ' manage to ' ? People declining an invitation said politely ' I can't manage to come ' meaning, as everyone knew, ' I don't want to come '. Hence ' manage to ' acquired in polite society (compare the development of *t'ui-tz'u* noted above) the meaning ' accept ', ' consent '. This became the usual meaning in high-class literature, whereas in informal literary style and in colloquial *k'ên* continued sometimes to mean ' manage to '.

Par. 274. ' Previously Jalairtai had been told to advance against the Nü-chen and the Koreans. Now a second order was given to Yesüder to act in support, and he accordingly advanced to the attack. He was then ordered to reside there as Governor.'

We know from the *Koryŏsa* [1] that in the autumn of 1254 a report reached Korea that a Mongol leader called 車羅大 (Sino-Korean, Ch'a-la-tae) had been appointed to 主東國, ' be master of the Eastern Lands '. Shortly afterwards he crossed the Yalu, escorted by 5,000 men. In the summer of 1258 a second Mongol leader 余愁達 (Ye-su-tal) appeared on the scene, and announced that the Mongol Khan had ' appointed me and Ch'a-la-tae to manage Korean affairs '. They appear to have ruled jointly till the summer of 1259, when Ch'a-la-tae suddenly died and Ye-su-tal was left in sole charge. It

[1] History, in Chinese, of the Korean Ko-ryŏ dynasty ; completed in 1451. I quote pp. 365 seq. of the Kokusho Kankōkai edition.

seems evident that the Ch'a-la-tae and Ye-su-tal of the *Koryŏsa* are the Jalairtai and Yesüder of the *Secret history*, and that the *Secret history* cannot therefore have reached its present form till well after 1258.

This view was first put forward by Naka Michiyo (died 1908) in an essay first published in his posthumous works (*Naka Michiyo isho*) in 1915. It has not so far as I know been mentioned outside Japan. What seems to have happened was that the compiler of the *Secret history*, having been told something about the doings of Jalairtai and Yesüder *c.* 1258, confused this episode with the invasion of Korea in 1231 seq., and therefore inserted this sentence in his account of Ogodai's reign ; Naka's theory that the sentence is an interpolation made in the text long after its composition seems to me unlikely.

It is improbable that such a confusion would have occurred till fairly long after 1258. I see no objection to a date well after the middle of the thirteenth century for the composition of the *Secret history*, if we assume that it transmits tales orally handed down by story-tellers for several generations and that the compiler deliberately intended the work to be an account of the first two Khans only.

Par. 282. The colophon. 寫畢了 (Mongol, *biciju da'usba*). The Mongol is presumably ambiguous and could mean either ' the composition of the work finished ' or ' the copying of the text finished '. Is the Chinese expression equally ambiguous ? Only having come across *hsieh-pi* in the sense ' copying finished ', I incline (perhaps wrongly) to think that this is what it means here. It occurs in this sense in the colophons of a number of Tun-huang MSS, for example Stein Catalogue No. 3863 and 4631 and *Tun-huang tsa-lu* (a *Prajñāpāramitā sūtra*) fol. 2 recto. On the other hand ' wrote ' in the sense ' composed ' is *chuan* 撰, as in the ' Dispute between Tea and Wine ' copied in 970 (*Tun-huang pien-wen chi*, p. 267) where *chuan* follows the author's name. *Hsieh* is often used when someone writes down something which he already has in his head, for example a poem he has just made ; but it might perhaps be difficult to find an example of *hsieh* used simply as a synonym of *chuan*. Father Mostaert [1] has suggested that the ' précision et pour ainsi dire la solennité ' of the colophon preclude its having reference merely to a particular copy. But here again it might be pointed out that in the colophons of Buddhist texts from Tun-huang the date and the circumstances under which a copy was made are sometimes given with the greatest precision. An example is Stein Catalogue No. 4523 where the date of copying, along with numerous particulars about the attendant circumstances, is given with the maximum precision, not only year, month, and day, but even hour being specified !

It rather looks then as though, whatever *bici-* means in the original, the translator probably took it as meaning ' copied '. In that case the discussion about which Rat Year is intended becomes of minor importance.

[1] *HJAS*, XV, 1952, 393.