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Abbreviations

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

lr, 1–7: These lines are missing in the text because the entire fol. 1r is missing
(together with the title page). Lu, L. and Y. 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. *Qiäungi/*Kuäing bičig (nigen debter)
3. 開宗明義章第一
4. Tool udağ-a-yi tayilqu nigeđäger hölög
5. 仲尼居曾子侍 Jungni sayiju Singsi taqin bükii-dür

* See Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching. 1. Facsimile of the
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 Mon-
golian Version of the Hsiao Ching. 3. Chapters Fourteen to Seventeen, revised and edited by I. de
Rachewiltz.
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 *qiaw*; hence the title of the book could have been either *Qiauging* or *Kauwing*. In the case of the Chinese initial *hsi* (xi, *ph. hi*), the regular transcription of this syllable in pmo. is, in fact, *qi* (e.g. *hsi* 行 = *qing*, *hsix* 興 = *qing*, *hsio* 學 = *qio*); the final *au* (aw, *ph. aw* [Ligeti], *av* [Popple]), is transcribed as *au* (e.g. *ch’ao* 銓, 朝 = *cau*, *mao* 毛 = *mau*, *shao* 少 = *sad*). However, there is unfortunately no attested occurrence of *hsiao* 孝 = *qiaw*. On the other hand, we have more than one occurrence of *hsiao* (xia0, mma. *xjaw*’) 孝 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. *xawk*/*xaw*:*wk* (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 340), hence in pmo. *kau* we have an archaising orthography or ‘ouiourgisme orthographique’ (Ligeti 1984, p. 349, n. 50). But it is unlikely that *hsiao* (xia0, mma. *xjaw*) would have been treated in the same way as 孝 by the Mongol transcriber/translator since the emc. pronunciation of the former was *xawk*/*xaw*:*wk* (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 bǐtīg (nigen debter)*
4. Iool uadq-a-yi taytluq nigeđiγer bõlõğ
5. Jungni sayaju Singsi taqin bûkûn-dûr
6. Kungvusi uğüler-un
7. uridù boydas qad angqan-u sayın 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 *ilüheke*[n] ‘suitably’ in the same sentence but on 1b, 1 (R. p. 28), should instead be read *ilühtege*[n], as explained in de Rachewiltz (2004, p. 55, n. 27).

1v, 2–3: C1 irgen orjan [.?] iar anu nayiralhuyuyi ‘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-* iar 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: *uqamuyuu*[u ći] ‘do you know?’ Lu reads *uqamuyuu* [ći], L *uqamuyuu*[u ći], and C1 *uqamuyuu*[u ći]. 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 (čiđamu, 7v, 2 and 9r; 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 uqamayuyu, the yu of the interrogative particle -yuyu joined to the verb being clearly visible.

1v, 5: jay[ilaj]. 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[ilajad] 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 [âmu bu]yu, R [âkù bu]yu. In support of the restoration kâ (mmo. gü!) buyu, cf. 38r, 1: tób ujayw amu edii kâ 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. ‘čî.’

2v, 6: Lu eng türin, L qeng (= neng?) türin, C1 ang türin, R qang türin. The readings ang and qeng (= eng) of the first word have been discussed in detail by Cleaves (C1, p. 86, n. 60) and de Rachewitz (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. en “the width of textiles,” Urd., Kh., Kalm. en, Bur. en = Mong. ân id.’), and partly because of the inherent phonetic ambiguity of this Turkic word (cf. Clauson 1972, p. 166a, s.v. ‘en’). However, the weight of the evidence in pmo. is in favour of the reading eng (ang). In the Turfan document TMD 130, the seventh line begins with the words eng urida. See Mongolica, p. 12, and Die Mongolica, p. 137. Whereas it is quite common to find in pmo. texts the initial e (e) written as a (a), i.e. a, the reverse is most unusual. For eng terigin and eng urida see also the Subhašitaranamidhi of Sa-skya Paṇḍita translated by Sonom Gara (TS Index, p. 106).

3r, 1: kūčiū ögkū, 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 (ših chhin 事君 ‘to serve the ruler’). Cf. below, 2iv, 3.

3r, 4–5: šiša duradgu 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 niën 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: sayijirajuń, C2 ‘have benefited’, R ‘have become better’. I think that the verb sayijir– (< sayin ‘good’ + jir, 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 sayfira- cf. Pyurbee (2001–2002, vol. III, p. 70a), s.v. 'safira'.

4v, 3; 17v, 5: qari-yin ezed, C3 ‘lords of vassal states’, R ‘lords of principalities’. Pmo. qari-yin ezed 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’ (HIY). Leaving aside Ligeti’s remarks (in Ligeti 1984, p. 330, n. 30) which are inconclusive, Cleaves’ translation of qari-yin ezed as ‘lords of vassal states’ is more accurate than ‘lords of principalities’.

5v, 1–2: bayajigu noyalaqu qoyar-iyar beyes-eçegen ese ele angiyijiru-yul-bazu, 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 bayajigu ‘being rich’ and noyalaqu ‘being noble’, cannot as an instrumentalis in -iyar be the object of the verb angiyijiru- ‘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 -iyun and translates accordingly. I think that -iyar is not a scribal error and that the Mongol translator has somewhat paraphrased the Chinese text 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: taqimtau 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 taqimtau yosun, lit. ‘the filial manner (or way)’, i.e. ‘the manner or way of being filial’ = taqimtau bolqu-yin yosun (4r, 4–5), in other words ‘the filial course’. For yosun(t) ‘way, course’ (= ch. tao 道) in mmo. see Haenisch’s Wörterbuch, p. 171. In each instance, taqimtau yosun renders the single word hsoao 育 ‘filial piety, filiality’ of the original.
Nevertheless, I think that in this particular case the Mongol expression should be translated uniformly as 'the filial course (or way, manner)'.

6r, 4: noyaliyudun ügülekči, 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 noyality, 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 ügülekči, lit. 'speaking of (= concerning)'. He suggests that some words may have mistakenly dropped out of the chapter heading, which he thinks originally was noyaliyudun tagimaqta (sic) yosun-i ügülekči dörbedeyar bög '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 ügülekči 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 other chapter headings in which the nomen futuri ügülekči 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 (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 suryaldi '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, ügüle, like the verbal noun ügülekči, designates the action of speaking, telling, etc., and my impression is that ügülekči is used in the same way in the present case, in apposition to dörbedeyar bög, i.e. 'Chapter Four, The Speaking of (= What One Says About) the High Officials', 'of the High Officials' (noyaliyudun) being the genitivus objecti of ügülekči. 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 (1938, pp. 101–114; limited, however, to the Secret History); Yavk, pp. 91–97. In the HC we encounter several 'irregular' (grammatically speak-
ing) forms. In the present chapter, cf. the *yabuqiban* (for *yabuqulqiban*) in 6v, 4, discussed in C4, pp. 146–147, n. 23.

9v, 2–3: *išii bōged yutuveydagii*, 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 *bōged* (this reading is preferable to Cleaves’ *būged* for pmo. since its pronunciation in mns. was prevalently *bō’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 (*išii*), 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 *bōged* with the negative *buu* (*buu bōged* 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 *išii* (*buu*) *bōged* does not mean ‘do not, then’, but ‘do not!’ (emph. prohibitive) = ch. *wu 無 or *wu 𢤲

9v, 7–10r, 1: *yafar-in oliy-i tugãj tariyallayad*, 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 此人*) – in this case, obviously, the farming population – do not ‘cultivate’ (*tariyala*) the advantages or benefits (*oliy*) of the earth or soil (*yafar*): 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: *kêmejügi*, C6 ‘[So], one has said’, R ‘(Thus) he (= Kungvusti) 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: *mäsì menegün ayui yeke aysan ajusù* (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’ = *nasu*-da ‘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, *aburín*, pl. *aburid*, adv. *aburida* of *aonon aoned aomoto* “unexpectedly”. In C7 n 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, témperament, 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: *tngr-iyn gegegen*, C7 'the luminosity of Heaven', R 'the bright (bodies) of Heaven'. *Tngr-iyn 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 *Chiu, L Chi, C7 Ji, R Ji*. For the readings *Chiu* and *Ji* 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 *uyiurfin* form should be transcribed as *Chiu* even though *chiu* has in this case the value of *Ji*. However, the transcription 'Chiu' should be followed in C7 and R by ('Ji') 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* 誠诚 'majestic, awe-inspiring (lit. "brilliant – brilliant"); means 'possessed of luminous sagacity'. For this expression cf. mo. *gegegen ouyutu* '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 *HIIY*. C8 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; 14v, 3: C8 *bügetele; mün, R bögotele; mün*. As in the case of *böged* (see above, 9v, 2–3), the readings *bögotele* and *mün* (L *id.*) are preferable as they reflect the mno. pronunciation of the first syllable of these words (*bögi-tele* and *müni*). See *SH Index*, pp. 200b, 268a. As for *müni* (pl. *müid, 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 ‘mōd’ is out of place (it should be n. 48); note 31 is actually missing on p. 64.

15r, 3: see above, 13v, 7

15r, 2: C8 sedkil-i anu ēdâysabar, the word abun between anu and ēdâysabar 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 ēda- governing sedkil-i ... For another example of ēda- 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 taqibusu sîr-tür anu kürteyî, C8 ‘If one sacrifice a sacrifice [unto them (i.e. the fathers and mothers – L.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 hsiâng 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’ (無兢維人, 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.
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16r, 5–16v, 1: Singsi ügüler ün ... kemen emiyeged asayun (the asay un in C9 is a misprint) abasu, C9 'When Singsi spoke, as, having trembled, he was asking, saying, ...', R 'When Singsi hesitantly asked (Kungvusi) saying, ...' As already noted by Cleaves (C9, p. 89, n. 7), in this sentence the verb emiye- (~ emige-, cf. 2r, 6) translates ch. kan 敢 'to dare, to presume, to venture' in the opening sentence of Chapter Nine: 'Tseng-tzu said, "May I venture to ask whether there was not something in the virtue of the sages greater than (lit. 'whether the virtue of the sages lacks [that which might be] used to add to', i.e. 'includes nothing greater than') filial piety?"' (曾子曰敢問 [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. 1, 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 gerundsives 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 abusasu 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 ṣajur-un ṣajur-a read ṣajur-un ṣajur-a
16v, 5 and 6: C9 for taqim-tay u read taqimtayu
17r, 3: see above, 13r, 2
17r, 5: see above, 13r, 2
17v, 1: oqige-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 aqur ui read aqurui
18r, 1: C9 for yaq un read yaqun
18r, 2–4: tegüber kümind oqige eke-düriyen čiqualaqo kemebesi ebediğçege nilq-a ılıçigen-eche 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 says"'. 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 kemebesi of the Mongol text. For kemebesi cf. C18, p. 245, n. 30. With regard to the
reading ücüken (18r, 3) of L and R vs. that of ücügen of C9, the former reading in R, 18r, 3, is an inadvertent mistake for ücügen (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 ücügikken (mo. id.) is found in the Rasulid Hexaglot, 265 (26), as well as in the Bca. of 1312, [4–156a, 4], we may postulate a development mmo., pmo. ücügikken > ücüken (cf. MA, 273a = öçiken – to be read ücüken ? = pmo. ücüken; cf. mo. öçiken, öçiken. However, in mmo. we also have a fluctuation ücüken ~ ücügen (see de Rachewiltz 1986, p. 32 [13]), and the Chinese transcriptions as well as the 'Phagspa script regularly give ücügen, not ücüken. 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 ücügen of the YCPS and the HIIY, as Cleave 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 nayiramtax u read nayiramtaxu
19r, 5: C9 for jaly amji read jalyamji
20r, 6; 21r, 5: C9 for siliy u read silyu
20v, 1: Lu sedejü, L sedejü, C9 sataju, R sataju. The reading sedejü is discussed and confirmed in Ligeti (1984, pp. 333–334). In de Rachewiltz (1986, p. 33), I accepted his findings and conclusions. In C9, p. 103, n. 137, Cleaves has defended the reading sataju, and I am now of the opinion that Cleaves is right and that the pmo. reading is back-vocalic. However, I believe that the two words sata- and sede-
are one and the same verb meaning 'to consider, to determine, to deliberate'. In mmo. the alternance t ~ d is common (see Mostaert 1999, pp. 243–244), and several words with back vocalism appear also with front vocalism (yatul/~getul-, nayam/ne-
yigem, angqan/engken, doronai/döröme, etc.). It is, therefore, possible and, indeed, likely, that mmo. sata- (= *sata-) > mo. sede-, sedü- ‘to plan, to think out, etc.’ In the HC, sata- renders ch. ssn 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 yahuy ildaqu read yahuyildaqu
21r, 2: C9 for ay ali read ayali
21r, 5: see above, 20r, 6
21v, 7–21v, 1: C9, p. 21r, 7, should contain the Chinese title of Chapter Ten, viz. 續孝行章第十. The meaning of the title is ‘An Orderly Description of the Acts of Filial Piety’ (Legge 1899, p. 480); however, hsiao-hsing can also be rendered as ‘filial conduct,’ and this is the way it was understood by the Mongol translator (taqimtar 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 記 ‘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 93, n. 51 to read as follows: See Cleaves, “The Second Chapter”, p. 45, n. 35.

Page 94, n. 53: after a add con verbum 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 Lubangbaldan, op. cit.,


Page 97, n. ??86: delete ??86, and In irruilabsu should follow immediately after n. 86.


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-yi 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. 97: after note add 37


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: “la même”. Cf. ibid., II, p. 18 (3v, 3).

Page 105, n. 164: after note add 132

21v, 3: tabyla- ‘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, tabyl signifying a ‘sacrificial offering’. Cf. C4, pp. 148–149, n. 39. The other verb for ‘to serve’ is kičču őg- (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-tu bolju erüküben erkilegedekü, C10 ‘may he make his being anxious [his] primary concern with all his mind’, R ‘he should place above all his thoughtful concern’. Pmno. erü- (mm. 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 eregül ‘torture, torment’ (< ere- + dev. nom. suff. -gulü); cf. ile- ‘to remain’ > iletü, ilegül ‘superfluous’; see Grammar, p. 46, § 152). Sedkil-tu bol-, lit. ‘to be thoughtful’, has the meaning of ‘to be concerned’. Cf. Twelve Deeds, F 10v (27), 11r (25) sedkil-tu 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 pmno. synonym jöb (written jöbu) ese bol-, lit. ‘not to be(come) right’. See Cleaves (1948). Contextually, I think that ‘when’ is more appropriate here than ‘if’.

22r, 2: qaturfüji furcimlaqirban erkilegedekü, 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 furcima- ‘to put or set in order’ (< furcim ‘order’) see C7, p. 30, n. 38; R, p. 66, n. 124.

22r, 3: ede tabun jüll, C10 ‘these five categories [of things]’, R ‘these five things’. Jüll is not used here in its usual acception of ‘category, class, kind, etc.’, but with its secondary meaning of ‘item’. See MKT, p. 1372a (2) = t‘ao 條 ‘item, thing, article’. Cf. Bawden (1997, p. 184b), s.v. jüll (1). This is borne out by the Chinese text (wu che 買五者 ‘the five ones’ = ‘these five things’; cf. Legge 1899, p. 480), and it applies also to the ede yurban jüll ‘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: bireleyü ’(büreleyü).

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

23r, 3–4: aći ügei taqimtaru, 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)? Aći (mm. 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 niets, 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 pieties are incomplete, and a son thus morally deficient is, in the words of the HC, ‘not filial’, and, in those of the HC, ‘filial without aži’. 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 aži. (Cf. CHC, p. 122 ‘without grati-
tude’). 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 jüül ereküleikü 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 jüül erekülekü would be ‘the five kinds of punishment’: this is, in fact, the way the HCDC, 10a, renders in Yüan vernacular the expression wu xing 五刑 ‘the five punishments’ of the HC, i.e. wu têng xing 五等刑. In the WTCWC, vol. I, pp. 529–543, there is a section entitled ereküül qoor-un jüül ‘the kinds of punish-

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 ... (...-ačai-eča’), 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 聯 ‘connected with, pertaining to’ of the HC.

23v, 4: taqmaya üllü bolqui ereküli-eči 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 tsuu 罰 of the Chinese text, a term meaning ‘crime, criminal act or offence’, as well as ‘penalty, punishment’ (‘châtî-
ment 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, ereküi, corresponds to mo. eregti(ī) ‘torture, punishment’; the term occurs in mmo. (ere’ti) meaning ‘punishment’, and as a verb (ere’ti-le) meaning ‘to punish’. See de Rachewiltz (1981, pp. 54–55, n. 50). In our chapter, the same verb (eregti-le) 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 eregti means also ‘offence, sin, harm’. See Treasury, p. 327, n. 151 (and the reference in it to the Bea.), and Twelve Deeds, F 3v (13). And, in mo., as evident from various compounds
with eregi̇i, such as e.-yin čayaja ‘criminal law’ and e.-yin kereq ‘criminal act’, the term in question likewise means ‘crime (entailing punishment)’, i.e. ‘a punishable offence’. (See Pyurbee 2001–2002, vol. IV, p. 431a, s.v. ‘ēriū’ 1 (2): ‘crime, criminal act.’) Thus, eregi̇i has the same semantic dichotomy of ch. tsui. Cf. the expression aldai̇ (aldai̇) bol- ‘to be held guilty of an offence and liable to punishment’, aldai̇ meaning ‘faulted, 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 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), eregi̇i (= eregi̇i) should be understood as ‘offence’, not as ‘punishment’. Unfortunately, the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily.

23v, 5: C11 degedīs-iyor (read -iyen) ‘His Majesty’, R ‘one’s superiors’. In pmo. degedīs, lit. ‘superiors’, is the well-attested plural of respect of degedī ‘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. igger or shang 皇帝 ‘the Emperor’. See Cleaves (1949, p. 103, n. 46; 1950, p. 124, n. 206). In the HC, degedīs appears four times beside the present occurrence, i.e. in 9r, 2, 25r, 3; 34v, 1 and 35r, 1. Only in 34v, 1, degedīs 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’ (似沒上不的一大般有 – where 不 is a mistake for 人). In view of the fact that in the HC the word does not mean ‘the sovereign’ and that in the HC degedīs is followed by the poss. acc. suffix -iyen, I doubt whether the rendering ‘His Majesty’ is the correct one. In that accpetation, the word does not occur in the poss. acc. case.


24v, 4: ede kemebei sūrīqu buduqu ěque samuqu bolui, C11 ‘As for these, they constitute great trouble’ which overthrows [homes] and creates disorder’, R ‘These 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’ ( ěque samuqu), they render ch. ta luan 太亂 ‘great (or serious) trouble (or disorder)’. The rendering ‘great nuisance’ of R is, therefore, inadequate, pmo. and mo. samuqu being the exact counterpart of ch. luan. However, I am not sure whether the translation of burīqu as ‘which overthrows [homes]’ is warranted. In pmo. the verb burīq 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 ‘démolir (une maison)’. In the present context, I think that the Mongol translator means. sensu laito, 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 joriyulsbu in CHC, p. 111, is a misprint for fortyulbasu. See C12, p. 401, n. 100.

25r, 5: törö kemebsü erkin kündilekütüer 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’ (廣宣要) (HCCC, p. 10b). In the HC, the sentence in question is 廣要敬而已 ‘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’ (kündilekütü) being the root or foundation of the ‘norm’ (töror) of propriety. Cf. the commentary of Hsing Ping 鄭雲 (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: kündilegedekü anu cogen bögetele bayasulacgen anu olan bolysa- bar kemebsü eme böged erkin qadayatu töro buyu, C12 ‘as much 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 bolysabar ‘having become’, cf. the HILY, part 11b, p.3a, 1–3. See Matériel mongol, vol. I, pp. 1, 15. A literal rendering would be: ‘As for (kemebsü), the whereby of the fact of having become (= happened: bolysabar) 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 bolysabar, 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).

p. 403, n. 3, engken-ũ is called ‘a variant of anggan-ũ in 27[r] below’. On angqa(n) ‘the first, the most…’, a word related to ang, eng (< tu.) id., see the extensive notes in C1, p. 86, n. 60, and R, pp. 57–58, n. 29. Because of the ambiguous reading of mtn. an (＝ en) (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 貴雲石, 1286–1324), for example. This is, of course, purely speculative. In his translation of the title of Chapter Thirteen, Cleaves renders the words engken-ũ sayin ayali aburlahan ayūdaq as ‘in Which One Amplifies His Best Virtue’, the ‘His’ referring to the ‘pure-good’ (silivy sayiv), i.e. the chün-tzu 君子 (see CHC, p. 124, n. 53, where the two Chinese characters have been inadvertently left out). However, in the translation of this chapter the ‘pure-good’ are regularly referred to as ‘they’.

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

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

27r, 2: In CHC, p. 113, for foqiragulun amaguluyči read foqiragulun amaguluyči.

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: idqaq falqatu, C15 ‘Redressing Admonishingly’, R ‘Admonishing and Correcting’. For idqaq- see Kow., p. 293b: arrêter, retenir, appaiser; ‘mettre obstacle, empêcher’. However, none of these meanings apply here, but the acceptance ‘to warn, to admonish’ is well attested in the Secret History. See Wörterbuch, p. 84, s.v. ‘iṭahā’. Cf. Lessing (1982, p. 401a).

29r, 1: soyul suryal, C15 ‘the doctrines and teachings’. Cf. C1 (2fr) ‘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: emiyeged aṣaybasu, 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-iyan erε aldafuyu, 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. 11vl. where the expression delekei ulus is translated ‘the world’.
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 国 ‘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 HIIY delegai alone renders ch. *t'ien-hsia. In delegai is implicit the meaning of ‘vast and wide’, cf. mmo., mo. delger ‘vast, extensive, full’, delgere- ‘to expand, to spread’. Indeed, in the YCPS delegai means also ‘broad’. See Wörterbuech, 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, delegai 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: *ülü-dür kereglegdeg sen aran-i jalan duradgayčin sayin nökör segider inu bütki-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 *duradgayčin (nomen actoris of *duradga- ‘to advise’) is a plural form in -*čin, 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 ha jayar-i tendegtei-e uqaqy qayaraqai-a bolyaysan-u tula *ingri-de ihegegedji öljei qutuy kürteged belgetei-e uqaqdayişu, 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 power).’ (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’ (*uqaqdayişu) ‘in a distinctive (or significant) way’ (*belgete-i), i.e. they manifested themselves by conferring happiness and prosperity. These blessings consist in (as Hsine 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-tayan ner-e aldar-i yutuyadaqui-aça emiyekil-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-tayan) and, in particular, to the genitive-accusative possessive suffix -tayan which in Cleaves' transcription of the text (CHC, p. 118, 33[r], 4) is incorrectly written -yutan. 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 -yutan/yugen. Cf. Cleaves (1952, p. 69 [8]): uridus-yutan. It is not mentioned in Untersuchungen, pp. 70–71, §13. However, it is well attested in mno. in the forms -u an/-i'en. See ibid., p. 71. The question mark can, therefore, be removed. For yutuyadaqui see C5, pp. 39–40, n. 61.

33r, 6–33v, 1: uridus-tayan (the uridus-togan of CHC, p. 118, 33[r]6, is a misprint) èng iinen-yer kündiлемiği sedkil-yer taqibasu uridus-un sır stinesin mân tendeken-e ilegû uqaju an bai, 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: 在綏致敬鬼神著矣 ‘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 畢 of the Chinese.
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35r, 1–5: sedkil-degen ovisiyapsan-i qola ber bögestii oyir'a sittii sedkil-dür ele ayulbasu umartaqq üdür inu kefiye bolqii, 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: quyur daryn sonoshasu iili kögün, 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 quyur is the fiddle, sometimes inaccurately referred to as the lute, and corresponding to ch. hu-ch' in 胡琴, whereas the zither (or zither harp), ch. ch' in 琴 or ku-ch' in 古琴, is called yatuya in Mongolian. The Mongol fiddle is often seen held and played by the Mongol bard (quyuru, lit. 'fiddler'). The morin quyur 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; Rasulid Hexaglot, p. 306 (29); MA, p. 139a, s.v. 'da 'in'. See also MKT, 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 quyur, 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, 6l]), 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 quyur, is often referred to as a 'lute'. See, e.g., Claussen (1972, p. 588b); Rasulid Hexaglot, loc. cit. On the word quyur and mtu. qopuz see now Doerfer (1963–1975, nos 314 and 1546). In the YCPS 7, 9b, we find the word qu'urda- (= pno. quyurda-) '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'. Note 16 on the same page reads: 'A stringed instrument.' on the basis of the Chinese gloss t'an 琴 'to play on a stringed instrument' of the YCPS. With regard to the verb kögit-, 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. 'xögïx' (2), 'to enjoy oneself, to be happy, to be cheer-
ful'. It is this meaning that applies here, I think, since the *HC tilû köğin* 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 (?) qubçasun* köñjilei selte abs-a-dur [oroyuldai] f-e ‘[?] The body(?) the corpse is deposed in the coffin, together with [?] the clothing] and the blanket’, R [? *absalauq-dur qubçasun* köñjilei selte abs-a-
dur [oroyuldai] f-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 *qubçasun* in the same line, referring also to Lu and L [*qubcâd*]. I entirely agree on the restoration of *qubçasun* (part of the ductus of the final *n* is clearly visible), but do not agree with Cleaves on the word before it because both *bey-e-yi* and *kegür-i* are too short for the space available at the beginning of the first line. I assume that the *q* of *qubçasun* is on the same level of the short vertical line visible in the second line, which is the beginning of the ductus of the *f-e* of *f.e.* See C18, pp. 247–248, n. 53. Moreover, *bey-e-yi* would have been written *beye-yi* (cf. *bey-yin* in 7r, 1), thus further reducing the length of this word. I think that, on this ground alone, we can exclude both words. *Absalauq-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 *yarraq-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 *taqil-un sabas-i abs-a-yin* emûn-e inu jeregeljî ‘One arranges before [?] the coffin the vessels of [sa]c[ris]c[s], R *taqil-un sabas-i* emûn-e inu jeregeljî ‘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 *taqil tabiy-un sabas-i* emûn-e inu jeregeljî ‘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 *köl-i-yen dergeljû‘having (?) stamped his feet’, R ‘repeatedly stamps one’s feet’ 865. In note 65 on p. 251 of C18, Cleaves refers to the verb *derbel- ‘to quake’ in the *YCP* 2, 42b (§98; cf. *Wörterbuch*, p. 36) and, on the basis of the HC text in which the corresponding word is *yung* 譁 ‘to jump up and down, to leap’, renders *köl-i-yen dergeljû* 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.* *dorho- ‘to flutter to flail (one’s winner’ See Lessing (1982, p. 252b). For *-a ... b* see
Introduction, pp. 99–100. But derbe-, kalm. derw-, has also the meaning of ‘to try to rise, to violently move up and down’ (Ramstedt 1935, p. 90). Hence, the meaning of the expression køl-lyen 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: orosiyuldaif e, C18 ‘and (??) the body(??) the corpse’ is deposed1. 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-un ɑyjar, lit. ‘the place of the corpse’). Moreover, kegür-['] orosiyul- ‘to bury the dead’ is a set expression. See Kow., p. 456a; Lessing (1982, p. 624a).

38r, 1: aqu irgen-ü tōb ɑyjar 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 aqu 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 tōb ɑyjar (= 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, ‘18v7’ is an error for ‘18v7’) tōb ɑyjar refers to ‘virtue’ (ayati abur) and ‘the sages’ teachings’ (boydas sayid-un sayila ɑyjar) respectively, while in 38r, 1, ‘duty’ is not expressed, I think that this word, being extrapolated from the context, should be bracketed.
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