



East
Asian
History

NUMBER 31 · JUNE 2006

Institute of Advanced Studies
The Australian National University

Editor Geremie R. Barmé
Associate Editors Benjamin Penny
Lindy Shultz
Business Manager Marion Weeks
Editorial Board Børge Bakken
John Clark
Helen Dunstan
Louise Edwards
Mark Elvin
John Fitzgerald
Colin Jeffcott
Li Tana
Kam Louie
Lewis Mayo
Gavan McCormack
David Marr
Tessa Morris-Suzuki
Kenneth Wells

Design and Production Oanh Collins, Marion Weeks, Maxine McArthur
Printed by Goanna Print, Fyshwick, ACT



This is the thirty-first issue of *East Asian History*, printed in October 2007, in the series previously entitled *Papers on Far Eastern History*. This externally refereed journal is published twice a year

Contributions to The Editor, *East Asian History*
Division of Pacific and Asian History
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200, Australia
Phone +61 2 6125 3140 Fax +61 2 6125 5525
Email marion.weeks@anu.edu.au

Subscription Enquiries to Subscriptions, *East Asian History*, at the above address, or to
marion.weeks@anu.edu.au

Annual Subscription Australia A\$50 (including GST) Overseas US\$45 (GST free) (for two issues)
ISSN 1036-6008

史 CONTENTS

- 1 Building Warrior Legitimacy in Medieval Kyoto
Matthew Stavros
- 29 Building a Dharma Transmission Monastery in Seventeenth-Century China: The Case of Mount Huangbo
Jiang Wu
- 53 The Genesis of the Name “Yeke Mongγol Ulus”
Igor de Rachewiltz
- 57 Confucius in Mongolian: Some Remarks on the Mongol Exegesis of the *Analects*
Igor de Rachewiltz
- 65 A Note on Yelü Zhu 耶律鑄 and His Family
Igor de Rachewiltz
- 75 Exhibiting Meiji Modernity: Japanese Art at the Columbian Exposition
Judith Snodgrass
- 101 Turning Historians into Party Scholar-Bureaucrats: North Korean Historiography, 1955-58
Leonid Petrov

Cover calligraphy Yan Zhenqing 顏真卿, Tang calligrapher and statesman

Cover illustration Higuchi Haruzane, Tea and Coffee set – “Exhibiting Meiji Modernity: Japanese Art at Columbina Exposition” by Judith Snodgrass, see p.90.

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

史 Igor de Rachewiltz

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

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

/Rossabi, *Khubilai Khan. His Life and Times*, (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1988), pp.15, 237, n.60. The (as yet unpublished) *nien-p'u* 年譜 of Qubilai prepared by the Australian National University Yüan Biographical Project team confirms the date 1251 already reported by Hai, "Several Questions," p.1; however, Chao's exegetical activity may well have continued in the following year or two.

³ This was, indeed, the practice at the time. See H. Franke, "Could the Mongol Emperors Read and Write Chinese?," *Asia Major*, New Series 3 (1953): 29–30 (reprint in H. Franke, *China Under Mongol Rule*, Aldershot: Variorum, 1994, V). See also the case of the Chinese Taoist (Ch'üan-chen 全真) Patriarch Ch'ang-ch'un 長春 (Ch'iu Ch'u-chi 丘處機, 1148–1227) lecturing to Činggis Qan on the art of longevity in 1222. See A. Waley, trans., *The Travels of an Alchemist. The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang-ch'un from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan, Recorded by His Disciple Li Chib-ch'ang* (London: Routledge, 1931), p.113. For the term *kelemeči* (mo. *kelemürči*), see L. Ligeti, "Le tabghatch, un dialecte de la langue sien-pi," in L. Ligeti, ed., *Mongolian Studies* (Amsterdam: Grüner, 1970), pp.292–3.

⁴ See Fuchs, "Analecta," p.35ff.

Respectfully dedicated to Professor Dr. Shigeo Ozawa, doyen of Mongol Studies in Japan. *Tümen nasulatuyai!*

¹ See S. Jagchid and P. Hyer, *Mongolia's Culture and Society* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1979), pp.228, 424, n.16; Baatar C.H. Hai, "Several Questions in the Mongolian Language Editions of the *Four Classics*," paper presented at the International Symposium of Mongolian Culture, Taipei, Taiwan, 29–31 May 1992, pp.1 and 3,

/n.1 (unpublished).

² See W. Fuchs, "Analecta zur mongolischen Übersetzungsliteratur der Yüan-Zeit," *Monumenta Serica* 11 (1946): 35, 47–8, and nn.45–7. For Chao Pi, see I. de Rachewiltz, H.–L. Chan, C.–C. Hsiao, P.W. Geier, with the assistance of M. Wang, eds, *In the Service of the Khan. Eminent Personalities of the Early Mongol-Yüan Period (1200–1300)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993), p.763a (Index); M.

⁵ For the Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Classic of Filial Piety* and its history, see I. de Rachewiltz, "The Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*," *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16 (1982): 14–9. For F.W. Cleaves's contribution to the study of this important text, see F.W. Cleaves, *An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching (The Book of Filial Piety). Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine Transcription, Translation, Commentary. Chapters Ten through Seventeen Transcription, Translation, Publications of the Mongolia Society Occasional Papers* 23 (Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, Inc., 2001).

⁶ For this date and edition of the Manchu version, entitled *Han i araba ubaliyambuba duin bithe. Yü-chih fan-i Ssu-sbu* 御製翻譯四書, as well as for previous and subsequent translations of the *Four Classics* into Manchu, see L.E. Hess, "The Manchu Exegesis of the *Lünyü*," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 113 (1993): 402–17, and the references on pp.402–3. See also N. Poppe, L. Hurvitz, H. Okada, *Catalogue of the Manchu-Mongol Section of the Toyo Bunko* (Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko and The University of Washington Press, 1964), pp.193–4, nos.247–50; G. Kara, *The Mongol and Manchu Manuscripts and Blockprints in the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica* 47 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2000), pp.411–5, Man. 5.

⁷ Apparently, in some exemplars the order of the prefaces is inverted. See Hai, "Several Questions," p.2 (citing Professor Boyinhu of the University of Inner Mongolia). For detailed descriptions of the 1892 blockprint edition, see the *Dumdadu Ulus-un erten-ü Mongyol nom bičig-ün yerüŋkei yarčay. Chung-kuo Meng-ku wen ku-chitsung-mu* 中國蒙古文古籍總目, I (Peking: Pei-ching T'u-shu-kuan 北京圖書館, 1999), p.1012, no.05649; N. Poppe et al., *Catalogue*, p.153, no.158; W. Heissig with K. Sagaster, *Mongolische Handschriften Blockdrucke · Landkarten* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1961), pp.280–1, no.514.

⁸ For this personage, see A. Mostaert in *Altan Tobči. A Brief History of the Mongols* by bLobzañ bsTan-jin, ed. F.W. Cleaves, *Scripta Mongolica* I (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), Introduction, p.xii, n.4.

⁹ On the MBQ and its literary output, see L. Ligeti, *Rapport préliminaire d'un voyage*

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

Incredible as it may seem, the capital work of Confucianism was not translated into Mongolian until the second half of the nineteenth century and first appeared in print in 1892. An educated Mongol from the Tümed Banner (Tümed Qosiyun) called Galzang worked for over twenty years (1869–92) on a Mongolian version of the Chinese *Four Classics* (*Ssu-sbu* 四書), following Chu Hsi's 朱熹 (1130–1200) "orthodox" interpretation of the Confucian Canon. There existed at the time a Manchu version of the *Four Classics* which had originally been commissioned by the Ch'ien-lung 乾隆 emperor (r. 1736–95). This had been completed and printed, with an imperial Preface, in 1756.⁶ The 1892 blockprint edition in twenty volumes (*ts'e* 冊) contains Ch'ien-lung's preface to the 1755 edition in Mongolian, Manchu and Chinese from which we obtain the trilingual "title" of the work, viz. *Qayan-u bičigsen orčiyuluysan dörben bičig. Han i araba ubaliyambuba duin bithe. Yü-chih fan-i Ssu-sbu*. This is followed by a preface in Mongolian giving the date of the completion of the work as "the first month of summer of Kuang-hsü 光緒" (27 April–25 May 1892). This, in turn, is followed by the text of the *Four Classics* in the three languages side by side and in the following order: *Great Learning* (*Ta-hsüeh* 大學, 1r–50v), *Analects* (II–V), *Doctrine of the Mean* (*Chung-yung* 中庸: VI), and *Mencius* (*Meng-tzu* 孟子: VII–XX). The Mongol text is Galzang's version and the Manchu text that of the 1756 bilingual edition. Copies of the edition are found in libraries in China, Japan, Taiwan and Europe.⁷

In the early 1920s, Temgetü (Chinese name: Wang Jui-ch'ang 汪睿昌), an enterprising Mongol from the Qaračin Right Banner,⁸ established the Mongyol-un bičig-ün qoriya, or Mongol Book Company (Chinese name: Meng-wen shu-she 蒙文書社) in Peking.⁹ One of the first publications that the MBQ issued was Galzang's version of the *Four Classics*.¹⁰ Temgetü reprinted the Mongol and Chinese texts of the 1892 edition with lead-type, i.e., by re-setting them without the Manchu text, and published the whole in 12 volumes (21 x 14cm) under the title *Meng-Han ho-pi Ssu-sbu* 蒙漢合璧四書. *Mongyol Kitad-iyar qabsuruysan dörben bičig*. Temgetü wrote the informative but undated preface in Mongolian and Chinese (I, 1–4) and rearranged the order of the *Classics*, with the *Analects* following the *Great Learning* and the *Doctrine of the Mean*. The *Analects* are divided into five books (*debter/chüan* 卷) with individual pagination, altogether

/d'exploration fait en Mongolie Chinoise 1928–1931 (Budapest: Société Körösi-Csoma, 1933, reprint 1977), pp.21–7, 45–8; J.R. Krueger, "The Mongyol bičig-ün qoriya," in W. Heissig, ed., *Collectanea Mongolica. Festschrift für Professor Dr. Rintchen zum 60. Geburtstag,*

/Asiatische Forschungen 17 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966), pp.109–15. The MBQ also had a branch office in Nanking.

¹⁰ In the list of publications issued by the MBQ, the Mongol-Chinese *Four Classics* is entered as the sixth item.

comprising 316 pages.¹¹ The bilingual *Four Classics* was published at the end of 1924 or early in 1925¹² and soon became a bibliographical rarity. Few, if any, copies are now found outside China and Japan.¹³

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

In January 1971, the Mongolian and Tibetan Affairs Commission (Meng-Tsang wei-yüan-hui 蒙藏委員會) in Taiwan published a photo-reproduction of Temgetü's edition of the *Four Classics* in one volume, with the original Chinese title *Meng-Han bo-pi Ssu-shu* and a new preface by Kuo Chi-ch'iao 郭寄嶠 dated 10 October 1970. Parts of the Mongolian text in this reprint, made from an uneven-quality microfilm of the original held in Japan, are, unfortunately, difficult to read; however, in view of the virtual inaccessibility of the original, we must be grateful to the MTAC for having undertaken its publication.¹⁴

In December 2002, the Inner Mongolia People's Publishing House (Nei Meng-ku Jen-min Ch'u-pan-she 內蒙古人民出版社. Öbör Mongγol-un Arad-un Keblel-ün Qoriya) in Hohhot (Köke Qota) issued a five-volume edition of Galzang's version of the *Four Classics*, entitled *Meng-Han bo-pi Ssu-shu. Mongγol Kitad qabsuruysan dörben bičig*, under the general editorship of Sedenjab. Unfortunately, this edition is incomplete, as the entire fifth book of *Mencius*, i.e., *Wan-chang* 萬章 I and II, is missing (the *Kao-tzu* 告子 I and II, and the *Chin-hsin* 盡心 I and II [= *Meng-tzu* 6 and 7] are published together as the fifth volume). This is a most regrettable omission.¹⁵

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

With regard to the Mongol version of the *Analects*, besides Galzang's translation, there is also a modern Mongolian edition which appeared in Inner Mongolia in 1978. It was prepared by two scholars in the Department of Mongol Language and Literature of the University of Inner Mongolia (Öbör Mongγol-un Yeke Surγayuli-yin Mongγol Kele Jökiyal-un Salburi) in Hohhot, with M. Qataγu as translator and T. Sudu as editor-collator. Their work, entitled *Kitad Mongγol qabsurayarsan Sigümjüel ügüel. Han-Meng bo-pi Lun-yü* 漢蒙合璧論語, was published for internal circulation only (*nei-pu shu-chi* 內部書籍).¹⁶ It consists of a "modernized" version of Galzang's translation, revised with regard to the actual textual interpretation

/about the Mongol title of the work which the *Dumdadu ... yarčay*, gives as *Mongγol Kitad-iyar qabsuruysan dörben bičig*, while Ligeti, *Rapport préliminaire*, p.47, gives as *Dörben baysi-yin bičig*. The Taiwan reprint shows only the Chinese title 蒙漢合璧四書 on the title pages of the *Four Classics*. The rest of the description is based on the Taiwan reprint.

¹² The date given in *Dumdadu ... yarčay* is "Irgen ulus-un arban γurbaduyar on (1924)," but the *Bükü ... yarčay* is more specific: "1924 on-u 11 sara-du," i.e., November 1924. However, no date of publication is found in the Taiwan reprint itself, but the 1970 preface to it by Kuo Chi-ch'iao (p.2) states that the book was published in 1925, a date accepted by Hai, "Several Questions," p.1. In the "Introductory Remarks" (*Li-yen* 例言) of the 1978 Mongol version of the *Analects* it is stated that Temgetü's (特木图 [sic]) Chinese-Mongolian side by side version of the *Lun-yü* was published in 1923; this is probably a printing error for 1925.

¹³ See *Dumdadu ... yarčay*; *Bükü ... yarčay*. According to Hai, "Several Questions," the Taiwan reprint was made from a microfilm of the original work found in Japan. No details are given as to its location in that country, see below, n.14. See also Krueger, "The *Mongγol bičig-ün qoriya*," p.113, no.16 ("No copies are known to exist in the West").

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

¹⁵ It should be mentioned, in this connection, that various libraries in China hold many manuscript copies of the Mongol and Manchu versions of the *Four Classics* dating from the Ch'ing period. See *Dumdadu ... yarčay*, pp.1013–21.

¹⁶ In H.G. Schwarz, *Mongolia and the Mongols. Holdings at Western Washington University* (Bellingham: Western Washington University, 1992), p.460, no.2111, this work is entered with the date of publication 1987 (a lapsus for 1978). The "1987 [?]" in Hess, "Manchu Exegesis," p.406, no.20, must be amended accordingly.

¹¹ The *Dumdadu ... yarčay*, p.1013a, no.05651, gives the number of volumes of the *Four Classics* published by the MBQ as 12; the earlier *Bükü Ulus-un Mongγol qayučin nom-un yarčay. Čb'üan-kuo Meng-uen ku-čhiut'u-shu tzu-liao lien-bo-mu-lu* 全國蒙古古舊圖書資料聯合目錄 (Hohhot: Öbör Mongγol-un Arad-un keblel-ün

/qoriya, 1979), p.20, no.0066 (5), as 14; and the above-mentioned MBQ list of publications as 10! Since the 1971 Taiwan reprint is in one volume, it is impossible to confirm any of these figures; however, the Taiwan reprint contains 14 sections with individual pagination (see below). There is also inconsistency

¹⁷ See above, n.6.

¹⁸ See above, n.5.

of the *Analects*, departing as it does from the one by Chu Hsi slavishly followed by Galzang. It contains a full critical apparatus and a very useful Chinese glossary *cum* index. This new contribution by Qataγu and Sudu is a great step forward in presenting the Confucian *Analects* in modern literary Mongolian, and even though it relies heavily on Galzang's version, it represents a notable improvement over the latter's rather stilted, and by now certainly outdated, rendering.

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

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

¹⁹ Hess, "Manchu Exegesis," pp.413–5. I shall not deal with this expression in the present paper.

²⁰ But also *kičiyenggüi* "zeal(ous); careful, cautious".

Hess also has something to say about the Manchu and Mongol translations of the Chinese title of the *Analects*, viz. *Lun-yü* 論語.¹⁹

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

1. *Hsiao* 孝 "filial piety; filiality; proper behaviour towards parents": ma. *hiyoošun* (< ch. *hsiao-shun* 孝順 "obediency [to parents]"); pmo. *taqimtayū* (< *taqi* "to serve, attend upon [parents, ruler, etc.]") "respect for one's parents and elders"; mo. (G) *elberil* (< *elberi* "to respect or honour parents and elders") "respect for one's parents and elders"; mo. (QS) id.
2. *Ching* 敬 "reverent, reverence; respect(ful)": ma. *ginggule* (< ch. *ching-kung* 敬恭) "to respect, honour, act respectfully; to be attentive, careful", *ginggun* "respect, honour"; pmo. *kündüle* "to show respect, revere, honour; to be polite"; mo. (G) *kičiyenggüile* "to be zealous or studious; to be cautious, be attentive; to be respectful or humble";²⁰ mo. (QS) id.
3. *Kung* 恭 "to revere, reverence, reverent; respect(ful); obeisance; humble, courteous; dignified": ma. *kundule* (< mo. *kündüle*) "to respect, treat with respect, honour", *gunnecuke* (< ch. *kung* 恭)

- “respectful”; pmo. *kičiyē* “to exert oneself, strive, be diligent or careful”;²¹ mo. (G) *kündüle* “to show respect, revere, honour”, *bisire* “to revere, respect, esteem”;²² mo. (QS) id.
4. *Tao* 道 “the Way, the way(s); doctrine, the (right) principle(s)”: ma. *doro* (< mo. *törö* “law; order, regime; rule”) “doctrine, way, rule, rite”; pmo. *törö yosun* “norm(s) and manner(s)”; mo. (G) *yosu* “rule, custom; doctrine, principle”; mo. (QS) id.²³
5. *Li* 禮 “ritual, rites, ceremonies; rules of propriety, proper form”: ma. *dorolon* (? < mo. *töröle* “to observe [or respect] the norm [of propriety]”); “rite, ceremony; propriety”; pmo. *törö, töröle*; mo. (G) *yosulal* “rite, ceremony; etiquette, rules of conduct”; mo. (QS) id.
6. *Te* 德 “virtue, essence; moral force or power, innerheld power, inner aptitude or quality”: ma. *erdemu* (< mo. *erdem* “knowledge, learning; skill, ability; wisdom; virtue”) “capability, virtue, power”; pmo. *ayali aburi* “natural disposition, character, innate faculties or qualities”; mo. (G) *erdem*; mo. (QS) id.
7. *I* 義 “righteousness, what is right; justice; to be moral”: ma. *jurgan* (< mo. *žiruya* “line”) “rectitude, loyalty, duty, devotedness, the principles according to which people should act”; pmo. *nayir* “accord, harmony”, *žoqi* “to agree, be appropriate”; mo. (G) *žirum* “line; established order, system, regime; code of laws; rule, norm, standard”; mo. (QS) id.
8. *Ti* 悌 “fraternal, submissive as a younger brother, obedient as a young man; duty of a younger brother; as befits a junior; fraternal deference; to behave well towards elder brothers, to show respect to (or to respect) one’s elders”: ma. *deocin* (< mo. *degüči* “[one who is] respectful towards his elder brother or to an elder person of his generation” < *degü* “younger brother or sister; younger”) “duty of a younger brother, fraternal deference”; pmo. *aqa-nar yekes-tegen žoqildu* “to be on good terms with (or to show deference to) one’s elder brothers and seniors”; mo. (G) *degüči*; mo. (QS) id.
9. *Chün-tzu* 君子 “the superior man, the Sage, a (or the) gentleman; the true philosopher, Great Man”: ma. *ambasa saisa* (< mo. *erdemten sayid* “a scholar and a worthy”)²⁴ “a rather great dignitary”; pmo. *siliyu sayid* “the upright and worthy”;²⁵ mo. (G) *sayid erdemten, erdemten sayid* “a worthy and a scholar” and vice versa; mo. (QS) *sayid erdemten* id.

/to bud, to come into being, to be created’ and the Mongolian verb *törö* ‘to be born, to come into being; to appear, to arise, occur’ appear to be related to the nouns **tori/*törä*, respectively, which suggests that Turkic **tori/*törä*, Mongolian *törö* and Manchu *doro* all have the sense of ‘a natural law or order, an inherent norm’. Ibid., p.409a. For a possible etymology (mo. *törö* <) tu. *törü* “traditional customary law” < *törü-* (or **tör-?*) “to come into existence, to be formed or born”, cf. *Le conte bouddhique du Bon et du Mauvais Prince en version ouïgoure*, texte établi, traduit et commenté par J.R. Hamilton (Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1971), p.133a.

²⁴ As stated by Hess, “the Manchu term (*ambasa saisa*—I.R.) for *jünzī* has clearly been influenced by Mongolian”, i.e., by the mo. *erdemten sayid*. Hess, however, proposes “that the use of the adjective *ambasa* to modify *saisa* is a conscious attempt to convey the meaning of the Chinese diminutive suffix *zī* 子”. Ibid., p.413b. I doubt this and believe that *ambasa*, a plural in *-sa* of *amba* (= *amban*) “high official, dignitary”, is simply a rather imperfect calque of mo. *erdemten*, a plural in *-ten/-tan* of *erdemtei* “learned, skilled; virtuous, wise”, as confirmed by the second element of the binomial expression (ma. *saisa* = mo. *sayid*). In fact, the Manchu expression is the Manchu version of the Mongolian one. As for the Mongol use of the plural for the singular (likewise borrowed by the Manchus), it is quite common as a mark of respect—an honorific plural or plural of respect—since early times. See I. de Rachewiltz, trans., *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian Epic Chronicle of the Thirteenth Century* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004, 2006), pp.226, 951, 964.

²⁵ In her reference to the Ming Sino-Mongolian vocabulary *Hua-i i-yü* “edited by Luvsanbaldan and Tsevel” (Hess, “Manchu Exegesis,” p.413a), “Tsevel” is an error for “A. Boosiyang”. Also, the word *sayin* in the expression “*šili’un sayin*” of the Ming *Hua-i i-yü*, “which usually functions as an adjective meaning ‘good’, appears to be the otherwise unattested singular form of *sayid* ‘worthy, dignitary’” (ibid.), is actually a scribal error for *sayid* (mmo. *sayid*), final *-n* and final *-d* in the preclassical Uighur-Mongol script being easily confused with each other.

²¹ The “*kičiyenggüile*” in Hess, “Manchu Exegesis,” p.407a (bottom), is a lapsus for *kičiyē*.

²² And, as Hess, “Manchu Exegesis,” says, “words derived from both *kündüle* and

/bisire-” such as *bisireltei* “respectful”, and *bisirenggüi* “respect”.

²³ Discussing the etymology of the word *törö* < tu. *törü/törö*, Hess writes: “The Turkic verb **töri-/*törä-* ‘to give birth, to procreate,

- ²⁶ Since Hess does not discuss the Mongolian terms corresponding to ch. *jen* and ma. *gosin*, they have been added within square brackets. Although there is no occurrence of this word in the *Classic of Filial Piety*, its counterpart in Preclassical Mongolian was *nigülesküi*. See A. Mostaert, *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i yu* 華夷譯語 *de Houng-ou (1389)*, I, ed. Igor de Rachewiltz with Anthony Schönbaum (Bruxelles: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises, 1977), p.79, s.v. “*niülesküi*”.
- ²⁷ *Hsin* is often used in conjunction with *chung* 忠: the two terms are virtually synonymous.
- ²⁸ See also E. Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manghol un niuca tobca’an (Yüan-ch’ao pi-shi). Gebeime Geschichte der Mongolen* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1939, reprint Wiesbaden, 1962), p.24.
- ²⁹ See de Rachewiltz, “The Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*,” pp.55–6, n.17.
- ³⁰ See *ibid.*, p.67, n.128.
- ³¹ See *ibid.*, p.68, n.134.
10. *Jen* 仁 “benevolence, perfect virtue, humanity, goodness, Goodness, the Good, virtue, virtue proper to humanity, Manhood-at-its-best, human-heartedness; benevolent (actions, man), the good (person, man), the virtuous, unselfish; (one’s) fellow men”: ma. *gosin* (< *gosi*- “to pity, have mercy; to love, cherish”) “pity, mercy, love”; [pmo. *nigülesküi* “the fact (or action) of being compassionate, compassion”; mo. (G) *örösiyeltei yabu*-, *örösiyel*-, *örösiyeltü kümün* “to be compassionate; compassion; compassionate man”; mo. (QS) *örösiyenggüi*-, *örösiyel*-, *örösiyenggüiti*-, *örösiyelten* “compassion; compassionate”].²⁶
11. *Chung* 忠 “self-devotion, (generous) sincerity; faithful(ness), conscientiousness (to others), loyal(ty); trustworthy, doing one’s best”: ma. *tondo* “straight, upright, loyal, fair”; pmo. *čing ünén (sedkil)* “sincere and true (feelings), completely sincere (= loyal) mind (heart, thoughts, feelings), utmost loyalty or sincerity”; mo. (G) *siduryu* “straight, honest, loyal, faithful, truthful”; mo. (QS) id.
- Hess’s list does not exhaust—but that is not its intention—the key ethical terms of Confucianism that are found in the *Analects*. Nine more common terms for Confucian ethical notions are reviewed below. The survey covers the Manchu and Mongol terms we encounter in the *Analects* as well as in the Preclassical Mongolian version of the *Classic of Filial Piety*.
12. *Hsin* 信 “sincere, true (to one’s word), trustworthy, faithful; sincerity, faithfulness; to keep or observe promises or to be cautious in giving promises, to be of good faith”:²⁷ ma. *akdun* “firm, dependable: trust”; pmo. *büsiregde*- “to be trustworthy”;²⁸ mo. (G) *itegemji*-, *itegemjitei* “trust, faith, loyalty; true, trustworthy, reliable, loyal”; mo. (QS) id.
13. *Chiao* 教 “to teach, instruct; teaching, instruction, reform”: ma. *tacibiya*- “to instruct, train”, *tacibu*- “to teach, instruct”; pmo. *surya*- “to teach”, *sqyül suryal* “teaching-instruction” = “teaching”,²⁹ *sqyüiger* “precept(s)”;³⁰ mo. (G) *surya*-, *suryaqui* “teaching”; mo. (QS) id.
14. *Jang* 讓 “courteous, humble, yielding; to decline, yield, renounce, avoid, abdicate, not to give preference, surrender oneself “: ma. *anabu*- “to yield to”, *anabünja*- “to be yielding, modest, humble; to yield to”, *anabünjangga* “modest, humble, reticent”; pmo. *buyarqamtaγu* “deference”;³¹ mo. (G) *nayir talbi*- “to yield as a gesture of friendship”; mo. (QS) id.
15. *Tz’u* 慈 “kind, compassionate; kindness”: ma. *jila*- “to be compassionate”; pmo. *nigülesküi* “the fact (or action) of being compassionate, compassion”; mo. (G) *nigülesküi* (!) *bol*- “to be compassionate”: mo. (QS) *nigülesküiyiti* *bol*- id.
16. *Chin* 謹 “(earnestly) careful, earnest, cautious, circumspect; sparing of speech”: ma. *ginggule*- “to be attentive, careful” (cf. above, no.2), *olbošo*- “to be cautious or careful; to respect, revere”; pmo. *qatayuji*- “to

be careful, cautious, restrained; to be diligent”; mo. (G) *kičiyenggüile* “to be zealous, attentive, respectful, humble”, *bolūyomjila* “to be cautious, careful; to consider or think carefully”; mo. (QS) id.

17. *Shen* 慎 “(to be) careful, cautious (in or about), prudent, to exercise careful attention, care or caution, to show proper respect, to give the greatest attention, to conduct with meticulous care; to honour; to approach with circumspection; carefulness, prudence; carefully”: ma. *olbošo* “to be cautious or careful; to revere, respect (cf. above, no.16)”; pmo. *kičige* “to be careful of or about”; mo. (G) *bolyomjila* “to be cautious, careful; to consider or think carefully (cf. above, no.16)”, *seremjile* “to be vigilant attentive, careful; to take precautions”; mo. (QS) id.
18. *Shan* 善 “(the) good, good example, goodness; to make good, reform; to be good at, to do (perform) something well, do good (work), know the art of, excel; good, worthy, skilful; ability; politely, tactfully, kindly”: ma. *sain* “good, well”, *saikan* “properly”, *bahana* “to be able”, *sain obu* “to do something well”; pmo. *sayin* “good, proficient; well”; mo. (G) *sayin* id., *čida* “to be (cap)able”, *sayin bolya* “to perform well”, *sayiqan* “nicely”; mo. (QS) id.
19. *Ho* 和 “harmony, peace, (natural) ease; harmonious(ly), conciliatory, affable; to manifest ease, to agree with others”: ma. *būwaliyasun* “harmony, harmonious; gentle”, *būwaliya* “to harmonize, conciliate”; pmo. *nayiraldū* “to live in harmony with each other”, *nayirayul* “to keep something/one in harmony”, *joqira* “to be in harmony”; mo. (G) *nairamdāl* “peace”, *eyetei nairamdayu* “peaceful and harmonious”, *nairaldū* “to be (or live) in harmony with each other”;³² mo. (QS) *nayiramdayu* “harmonious”, *nayiramda* “to be in harmony”.
20. *Sheng* 聖 “sage, Divine Sage, saint; wisdom, sagehood”: ma. *enduringge* “divine, holy, sacred”; pmo. *boyda sayid* “sage-excellent (pl.), Holy Worthies”;³³ mo. (G) *boyda törökiten* “sage-born”, *boyda* “sage”; mo. (QS) id.

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

³² Galzang’s text has *naira-* for *nayira-* throughout. See F.D. Lessing, gen. ed., *Mongolian-English Dictionary* (corrected reprint, Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, Inc., 1982), p.559b. Furthermore, in ch.13 (子路), p.53, line 5, and p.54, line 1 of the Mongol text, Galzang uses the word *nairalta* for ch. 和 “affable (or conciliatory)”. For the use of the deverbal noun suffix *-lta/-lte*, forming nouns designating process, see N. Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1954, reprint 1964, 1974), §163; however, in the present instance I think that *nairalta* (= *nayiralta*) is an error for *nairaltai* (= *nayiraltai*) “harmonious, friendly, amicable”, from *nayiral* “harmony” + the denominal noun suffix *-tai/-tei*. See *ibid.*, §138. In the corresponding passage of QS, p.109 (13-23) the word *nayiramdaqu* “to be in harmony” is preceded by (*jasamjilan*) “(amending)”, indicating that Qatayū and Sudu have revised Galzang’s rendering.

³³ For the expression *boyda sayid*, see de Rachewiltz, “The Preclassical Mongolian Version of the *Hsiao-ching*,” p.72, n.176, and the references contained therein; Cleaves, *An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching*, p.88, n.3. For the hon. plural *sayid*, see above, n.24.

Chinese	Preclassical Mongolian	Classical Mongolian (G)	Modern Literary Mongolian (QS)
1. 孝	<i>taqimtayū</i>	<i>elberil</i>	same as G
2. 敬	<i>kündüle-</i>	<i>kičiyenggüile-</i>	”
3. 恭	<i>kičiye-</i>	<i>kündüle-, bisire-</i>	”
4. 道	<i>törö yosun</i>	<i>yosu</i>	”
5. 禮	<i>törö, töröle-</i>	<i>yosulal</i>	”
6. 德	<i>ayali aburi</i>	<i>erdem</i>	”
7. 義	<i>nayir, joqi-</i>	<i>žirum</i>	”

Chinese	Preclassical Mongolian	Classical Mongolian (G)	Modern Literary Mongolian (QS)
8. 悌	<i>aqa-nar yekes-tegen joqildu-</i>	<i>degüči</i>	same as G
9. 君子	<i>siliyu sayid</i>	<i>sayid erdemten</i>	"
10. 仁	<i>nigülesküi</i>	<i>örösiyeltei yabu-, örösiyel, örösiyeltü kümün</i>	<i>örösiyenggüi, örösiyel, örösiyenggüütü, örösiyelten</i>
11. 忠	<i>čing ünen (sedkil)</i>	<i>siduryu</i>	same as G
12. 信	<i>büsiiregde-</i>	<i>itegemji, itegemjitei,</i>	"
13. 教	<i>surɣa-, soɣül surɣal, soɣüger</i>	<i>surɣa-, surɣaqui</i>	"
14. 讓	<i>buyarqamtaɣu</i>	<i>nayir talbi-</i>	"
15. 慈	<i>nigülesküi</i>	<i>nigülesküi bol-</i>	"
16. 謹	<i>qataɣuɣi</i>	<i>kičiyenggüile-, bolyomjila-</i>	"
17. 慎	<i>kičige-</i>	<i>bolyomjila-, seremjile-</i>	"
18. 善	<i>sayin</i>	<i>sayin, sayiqan, čida-</i>	"
19. 和	<i>nayiraldu-, nayirarɣul-, joqira-</i>	<i>nairamdal, *nairalta, eyetei</i>	<i>nayiramdayu, nayiramda-</i>
20. 聖	<i>boyda sayid</i>	<i>boyda törölkiten, boyda</i>	<i>boyda</i>

³⁴ J.E. Kowalewski, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*, I-III (Kasan: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1844-49, several reprints), I, p.v.

³⁵ In the recent translation of the *Analects* into Khalkha Mongolian by M. Čimědcěyeě (*Künz. Šüümžlél ögüülél*) (Ulan Bator: 'ADMÖN', 2005), the terms discussed in the present paper are rendered with the same words used in the Written Mongolian versions except for nos.1 (*ačlab*), 6 (*zan üülděb*), 8 (*ixěs axsyg [or axas ixsiig, busdyg xündlěx]*), 12 (*ünenč*), 16 (*ügěe cěněx, těncüülěx*), 17 (*ěrxěm xündětgěx, xyamuur bolox*), 18 (*nöxörlöx*), 19 (*ničěl zoxirol, zoxirox*), and 20 (*örlög bogd*), which are all Modern Mongolian equivalents or near equivalents. Therefore, the same general conclusion obtains for the contemporary Mongol language version.

ian, and except for no.16 (謹): ma. *ginggule-* < ch. *ching-kung* 敬恭 (see no.2), there is no Manchu borrowing from Chinese.

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

It is a well-known fact that, insofar as Buddhism is concerned, the learned Mongol translators of Sanskrit and Tibetan texts "remplirent consciencieusement leur tâche, s'appropriant rarement les mots étrangers et faisant tous leurs efforts pour y suppléer leur propres expressions quand ils le pouvaient sans altérer le texte".³⁴ With regard to Confucianism, it will be observed that whereas there are minor and, indeed, insignificant differences between the Galzang and Qataɣu and Sudu renderings of the terms in question, the difference in the terminology employed in the Preclassical and Classical versions is quite substantial, but *none of the terms in either version is a borrowing from Chinese*. Only 20 per cent of the terms examined are identical in Preclassical and Classical Mongolian (nos.13, 15, 18, 19). This may give us a rough idea of the gap in the "conceptual" vocabulary of the two stages of the language. Additional research along these lines may not only throw further light on the evolution of Written Mongolian in the last five hundred years, but also refine our understanding of the way Mongol translators handled concepts and terms alien to their culture without resorting to borrowing.³⁵

Igor de Rachewiltz

Division of Pacific and Asian History
Research School of Pacific & Asian Studies
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200, Australia
ider@coombs.anu.edu.au