



East
Asian
History

NUMBER 27 · JUNE 2004

Institute of Advanced Studies
Australian National University

Editor Geremie R. Barmé
Associate Editor Helen Lo
Business Manager Marion Weeks

Editorial Advisors Børge Bakken
John Clark
Louise Edwards
Mark Elvin (Convenor)
John Fitzgerald
Colin Jeffcott
Li Tana
Kam Louie
Lewis Mayo
Gavan McCormack
David Marr
Tessa Morris-Suzuki
Benjamin Penny
Kenneth Wells

Design and Production Design ONE Solutions, Victoria Street, Hall ACT 2618
Printed by Goanna Print, Fyshwick, ACT



This is the twenty-seventh issue of *East Asian History*, printed August 2005, 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
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200, Australia
Phone +61 2 6125 3140 Fax +61 2 6125 5525
Email marion@coombs.anu.edu.au

Subscription Enquiries to Marion Weeks, *East Asian History*, at the above address, or to marion@coombs.anu.edu.au

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

ISSN 1036-6008

史 CONTENTS

- 1 Friendship in Ancient China
Aat Vervoorn
- 33 The Mystery of an “Ancient Mirror”: An Interpretation of
Gujing ji in the Context of Medieval Chinese Cultural History
Jue Chen
- 51 The Missing First Page of the Preclassical Mongolian
Version of the *Hsiao-ching*: A Tentative Reconstruction
Igor de Rachewiltz
- 57 Historian and Courtesan: Chen Yinke 陈寅恪 and the
Writing of *Liu Rushi Biezhuan* 柳如是别传
Wen-hsin Yeh
- 71 Demons, Gangsters, and Secret Societies in Early Modern China
Robert J. Antony
- 99 Martyrs or Ghosts? A Short Cultural History of a Tomb
in Revolutionary Canton, 1911–70
Virgil Kit-Yiu Ho

- Cover Calligraphy Yan Zhenqing 顏慎卿 Tang calligrapher and statesman
- Cover Illustration A painting commemorating the *Huanghua gang* martyrs by the Famous Lingnan School painter He Jianshi 何劍士, Xiu Jinhua, *Huanghua gang gongyuan* [The Huanghua gang Park], Guangzhou: Lingnan Meishu Chubanshe, 2001, p.53.

THE MISSING FIRST PAGE OF THE PRECLASSICAL MONGOLIAN VERSION OF THE *HSLIAO-CHING*: A TENTATIVE RECONSTRUCTION

史 Igor de Rachewiltz

The Preclassical Mongolian version of the Chinese *Classic of Filial Piety* (*Hsiao-ching* 孝經) is a well-known text, several times edited by Mongol and Western scholars and twice translated into English.¹ It is the only 'Mongol' book of the Yüan period to have physically survived in China, almost certainly because it was a Chinese classic in a bilingual

/idem, "The seventh chapter ...," in 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, The Mongolia Society Occasional Papers No.23* (Bloomington, Ind.: 2001), pp.7–58. For Cleaves' subsequent chapters, see *ibid.*, pp.59–131; and "The eighteenth chapter ...," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (hereafter *HJAS*) 45 (1985): 225–54. For further references, see de Rachewiltz, "Preclassical Mongolian version," (1982): pp.14–15, and below, n.3. The Mongol text of the *Hsiao-ching* is frequently cited and discussed in the works of A. Mostaert, F. W. Cleaves and other scholars. Cf., e.g., A. Mostaert, *Sur quelques passages de l'Histoire Secrète des Mongols* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard-Yenching Institute, 1953), [270a] (Index); F. W. Cleaves in *HJAS* 12 (1949): 110, n.78; M. Weiers, *Untersuchungen zu einer historischen Grammatik des präklassischen Schriftmongolisch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969), p.24 *et passim*; M. N. Orlovskaya, *Yazyk mongol'skikh tekstov XIII-XIV vv.* (Moscow: IVANR, 1999), p.18 *et passim*. In Japan and Inner Mongolia, scholars like H. Kuriyabashi, Jaḡunasutu (Junast), Qasartani and others have also dealt with various aspects of this interesting text.

NB (Abbreviations: ch. = Chinese; mo. = Written [Script] Mongolian; mmo. = Middle Mongolian; pmo. = Preclassical Mongolian)

¹ See Xa. Luvsanbaldan, *Ačlalt nomyn tuxaĩ. Ačlaltu nom-un tuqai*, *Studia Mongolica Inst. linguae et litterarum Comit. Scient. et Educ. Altae Reipublicae Populi Mongoli*, III/12 (Ulan Bator: 1961) (hereafter Lu); L. Ligeti, "La xylographie sino-mongole du Hiao-king," in L. Ligeti, *Monuments préclassiques I. xiii^e et xiv^e siècles*, *Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta* II (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972), pp.76–106; *idem*, *Monuments préclassiques I. xiii^e et xiv^e siècles (deuxième partie)*, *Indices verborum linguae Mongolicae monumentis traditorum* II (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972): pp.71–153; 'Der Blockdruck des Xiàojīng aus dem Palastmuseum in chinesischer und mongolischer Sprache', *Zentralasiatische Studien* (hereafter *ZAS*) 12 (1978): 159–235; I. de Rachewiltz, "The preclassical Mongolian version of

/the Hsiao-ching," *ibid.*, 16 (1982): 7–109; F. W. Cleaves, "The first chapter of an early Mongolian version of the *Hsiao ching*," *Acta Orientalia Hung.* (hereafter *AOH*) 36 (1982): 69–88; *idem*, "The second chapter ...," in K. Sagaster, M. Weiers, eds, *Documenta Barbarorum. Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), pp.39–46; Dobu et al., eds, and comm., *Ujyürjün Mongyol üsüg-ün durasqaltu bičig-üd*, (Peking: 1983), pp.78–157; L. Ligeti, "A propos de la traduction mongole préclassique du *Hiao-king*," *AOH* 38 (1984): 303–49; I. de Rachewiltz, "More about the preclassical Mongolian version of the *Hsiao-ching*," *ZAS* 19 (1986): 27–37; F. W. Cleaves, "The third chapter of an early Mongolian version of the *Hsiao ching*," *Mongolian Studies* 14 (Bloomington, Ind: 1991): 117–43; *idem*, "The fourth chapter ...," *ibid.*, 15 (1992): 137–50; *idem*, "The fifth chapter ...," *ibid.*, 16 (1993): 19–40; *idem*, "The sixth chapter ...," *ibid.*, 17 (1994): 1–20;

² The only other Preclassical Mongol work to have survived the Ming restoration and the nationalist fervour accompanying it is the famous tetraglottal blockprint of 1431 of two Buddhist Tantric texts edited by W. Heissig in W. Heissig, "Zwei mutmasslich mongolische Yüan-übersetzungen und ihr Nachdruck von 1431," *ZAS* 10 (1976): 7–115. It is quite possible that the *Hsiao-ching* version that has been handed down is also a Ming print, possibly made from original Yüan blocks. See de Rachewiltz, "Preclassical Mongolian version," 1982, pp.17, 25, n.25.

³ A single leaf (5r-v) from another (lost) exemplar of the same work was found by W. Fuchs in Peking in the 1930s; it was published together with a transcription, translation and commentary by A. Mostaert in *Monumenta Serica* 4 (1939–40): 325–9.

⁴ See Lu, 4 (lines 2, 4–7); Cleaves, "The first chapter," 1982, p.71 (lines 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7); de Rachewiltz, "Preclassical Mongolian version," 1982, p.28 (lines 6–7).

⁵ As it will become apparent, the strict limits imposed by the amount of space available for the Mongol text in each line leave little room for choice. Therefore, while in theory several reconstructions are possible, this is not so in practice.

⁶ The measurements in ems are purely conventional, but since they are used for comparison with passages and lines throughout the book, they are valid for the purpose of the present reconstruction.

⁷ See above, n.1.

⁸ It is unlikely that, as postulated by Cleaves, "The first chapter," 1982, p.71, the Mongol title followed immediately after the Chinese title since this is not the case with the section title, which is always by itself, on a separate line. Lu, 4 and 27, has, in fact, correctly (in my view) placed the Mongol title in 1r2.

⁹ This is the practice throughout the work. See 3r-b (4 char.), 4v (2 char.), 6r (3 char.), 7v-8r (3 char.), 9v (3 char.), 10v (3 char.), etc.

¹⁰ *Idem* as above, n.9. Cleaves, loc. cit., is consequently mistaken in making the Mongol version of the sectional title follow immediately after the Chinese text. Lu, 4 and 28, has correctly isolated

edition; the Chinese text in it has saved it for posterity.² It is virtually complete, except for a few minor lacunae, and the title page and the first page (1r) which are unfortunately missing.³ We do not know whether it contained also a preface and/or a postface or a colophon.

Xa. Luvsanbaldan (Qa. Lubsangbaldan), F. W. Cleaves and the present writer have already attempted to reconstruct in full or in part the missing page on the basis of the Chinese text; however, none of them seriously tried to restore the entire Mongol text of 1r taking into account the space available in each of the lines, and the arrangement and distribution of the Chinese text which, in fact, determines the availability of space.⁴ I shall endeavour now to establish a new reconstruction taking all factors into consideration. I am reasonably confident that the solution presented here is the correct one or, at any rate, quite close to it.⁵

The two basic criteria for the 'selection' of the missing words in the Mongol text are 1) the arrangement of the Chinese text following the pattern and format adopted in the book, and 2) the amount of space available in each line for the Chinese characters and the Mongol words on the basis of the average distribution of both throughout the work. The portion of a line occupied by a letter of the Uighur-Mongol alphabet will conventionally be referred to as an em. Please note that, for the sake of convenience, the space between words (and between a Chinese character and a Mongol word following it) is reckoned as 2 ems, and the characteristic Uighur final ductus as being equivalent to 3 ems.⁶ The letters with a ductus will be highlighted in transcription whenever necessary by being printed in bold type. Since measurements by ems and cm. must be carried out on a photo-reproduction of the text which is clear and in which the frames are of uniform size, all references are to the text published in *Zentralasiatische Studien* 12:1978, 159–235.⁷ With regard to (1), it is evident that the first line of 1r contained the Chinese title of the book; the second line, the corresponding title in Mongolian on the same level;⁸ the third line, the title of the first section (章) in Chinese at a lower level (corresponding to the space occupied by two to four Chinese characters above it);⁹ and the fourth line, the Mongol version of the title of the first section on the same level of the third line.¹⁰ The following three lines (1r5–7) must, therefore, have been occupied by the first two sentences of the text proper with their respective Mongol translations, the Mongol rendering of the second sentence continuing on 1v1–2. To fit the above in one seven-line page it is essential that we adhere strictly to the limits imposed by (2).

/the Chinese sectional title in line 3, but he has spread its Mongol counterpart over lines 4 and 5, thus reducing too much the remaining space (lines 6 and 7) for the first two sentences of the text.

¹¹ Cf., e.g., the *Ssu-pu ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊 (First Series) edition of the *Hsiao-ching* (reproducing a Sung edition) where, in the first line of the text, we have 孝經一卷.

Concerning the book title in the first line, it is likely that it was followed by the two words *i chüan* 一卷 ‘one chapter’.¹¹ Since the Mongol term *bölög* ‘chapter’ is used by the translator to render ch. *chang* 章 ‘chapter, section’ throughout the work (see below), the only other term that could be employed in the circumstances is *debter* ‘book, volume’. There is, indeed, some evidence that in the 13th–14th centuries the word *debter* was used in the Mongol translations of Buddhist texts in the same way as ch. *chüan*.¹² However, since it is by no means certain that in this book the title *Hsiao-ching* was followed by *i chüan*, I shall put both *i chüan* and its presumed Mongol version *nigen debter* in parentheses.

As for the Mongol rendering of *Hsiao-ching*, I have discussed the issue in de Rachewiltz 1982, 19, where I reached the conclusion that, contrary to Luvsanbaldan’s opinion, it must have been a phonetic transcription of the Chinese followed by *bičig* ‘book’, viz. **Qiauging bičig*. In place of **Qiauging*, Ligeti suggested **Kauging*.¹³ Since either transcription is possible,¹⁴ I propose **Qiauging*/**Kauging bičig* (*nigen debter*) for the Mongol title of the *Hsiao-ching* in 1r2.

For the rendering of the section title 開宗明義章第一, lit. ‘First Section on (Opening =) Explaining the Essentials and Elucidating the Meaning’,¹⁵ comprising altogether seven characters, its Mongolian version in the fourth line must have ended with the words *nigedüger bölöğ* ‘first chapter’ as shown by Cleaves 1982, 75, n.3, on the basis of the regular renderings of section numbers throughout the text. Since the fourth line began at the same level of the third line, the space available for the Mongol version of the first four Chinese characters of the title is, by necessity, limited, and a full literal rendering is excluded. In the available space we cannot, in fact, fit more than five average-length words (ca. 45 ems, see below), two of which are *nigedüger bölöğ*, together with their suffixes.¹⁶

What the Chinese four-character text says in effect is that this section explains the essence of Confucius’ discourse and the meaning of filiality; the Mongolian version must say the same with not more than three words.¹⁷

Now, ‘to explain, elucidate’ in pmo. and mo. is *tayil-*, and ‘meaning’ is *udqa*, written *udqa*.¹⁸ For ‘essential’, i.e., ‘basic’, the two words that immediately come to mind are *γool* and *tüb*, both also well attested in pmo.¹⁹ The expression *γool udqa* is, indeed, a common compound in mo. and the modern Mongolian languages for ‘basic meaning, central concept(s) → plot (of a play),’ ‘idée de l’essentiel’;

/debter ‘book’ (= ‘volume’) and *bölög* ‘chapter’ in the *Arban qoyar jöki-yangyui* (üiles), translated from Tibetan by Šes-rab señ-ge (fl. 1325). See N. Poppe, *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha. A Mongolian version of the Lalitavistara. Mongolian text, notes, and English translation* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967), pp.21, 42. In later texts (cf., for instance, the *Manju-yin ünén mayad qauli*, Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü, 1986), *debter* is the regular Mongol rendering of ch. *chüan*.

¹³ See Ligeti, “A propos de la traduction,” 1984, p.349, n.50.

¹⁴ See de Rachewiltz, “More about the preclassical Mongolian version,” 1986, pp.36–7.

¹⁵ For other English renderings, cf. Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, p.75, n.5; M. L. Makra, tr., *The Hsiao Ching* (New York: St. John’s University Press, 1961), p.3.

¹⁶ Cf. 3v (5 words), 4v (5 words), 6r (4 words), 8r (5 words), 9v (5 words), etc.

¹⁷ This factor alone would preclude the rendering proposed in Lu, pp.4, 24–5, which consists of ten words altogether. Cf. Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, pp.75–6, n.5.

¹⁸ For *tayil-* ‘to explain’, see, e.g., the fragment of the *Bodistva čarya avatar* with commentary by Čhos-kyi ‘od-zer (1312 ed.) where it occurs once. Cf. F. W. Cleaves, ‘The *Bodistva-čari-a awatar-un tayilbur* of 1312’, *HJAS* 17 (1954): 45 [4–158b6], 76. For *udqa* ‘meaning’, see, e.g., I. de Rachewiltz, *The Mongolian Tanjur Version of the Bodhicaryāvatāra* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), V, 79.2 (l. 1059). For the other connotations of this word, see below, n.21.

¹⁹ For *γool* and *tüb* (= mo. *töb*), see E. Haenisch, *Wörterbuch zu Manḡol un Niuca Tobca’an (Yüan-ch’ao pi-sbi). Gebeime Geschichte der Mongolen* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1939), p.65 (s.v. ‘ḡol’), 153 (s.v. ‘tub’); N. Poppe, *The Mongolian Monuments in hP’ags-pa Script*, 2nd ed. transl. and ed. by J. R. Krueger (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957), p.129a (s.v. ‘qol’). Formmo. *qol* = pmo. *γool*, cf., e.g., the Olon Süme material in W. Heissig, *Die mongolischen Handschriften-Reste aus Olon süme Innere Mongolei (16.–17. Jhd.)* (Wiesbaden: 1976), p.587b (s.v. ‘γool’).

¹² Cf., the title of the lost Preclassical Mongolian translation of a known Buddhist *sūtra* discussed by G. Kara in his article “On a lost Mongol book and its Uighur version,” in G. Hazai, P. Zieme, *Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur der altaischen Völker, Protokollband der XII. Tagung der Permanent Inter-*

/national Altaistic Conference (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1974), pp.287–289, at p.287. In the second line we have the expression *qoyar debternom* ‘a book in two parts’, in which *qoyar debter* would obviously correspond to ch. *erb chüan* 二卷 ‘two chapters.’ See Kara’s remarks, *ibid.*, p.288. Cf. also the use of

20 See J. É. Kowalewski, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français*, Kazan, 1844–49, I, 390a, II, 1018a; Sumatiratna, *Tibetan-Mongolian dictionary* (Ulan Bator: 1959), II, 718f; Ch. Bawden, *Mongolian-English dictionary* (London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1997), p.95b; K. M. Čeremisov, *Buryatsko-russkii slovar'* (Moscow: Sovetskaya Ėnciklopediya, 1973), p.155b; *Mongyol kelen-ü toli* 蒙古語辭典 (Hohhot: 1997), p.1691b. With regard to 13th–14th century Mongol usage, in the colophon of the *Arban qoyar jokiyangyui (üiles)* we find the expression *yool bičig*, lit. 'central/basic writing' = 'original text'. See N. Poppe, *The Twelve Deeds of Buddha*, 68 (F 65r20), 162 ('original'). For the use of *yool* 'basic (text)' in connection with *tayilburi* 'explication', cf. A. Sárközi in collab. with J. Szerb, *A Buddhist terminological dictionary. The Mongolian Mahāyānupatti* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1995), p.114b, no.1455. For this reason, I am in favour of giving preference to *yool*, rather than *tüb*, as a qualifier of *udqa*. However, *tüb* cannot be excluded, also in view of its identical length in writing.

21 See I. de Rachewiltz, *The Mongolian Tanjur Version*, IV, 39.3 (l. 0706); VI, 127.2 (l. 1690) ('purpose, intention, aim'); J. E. Bosson, *A treasury of aphoristic jewels: the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi of Sa Skya Paṇḍita in Tibetan and Mongolian*, Uralic & Altaic Series 92 (Bloomington, Ind., 1969): 137, 28.1, 206 (l. 1690) ('concept'); 10 (cf. Col. A, 6, in L. Ligeti, *Trésor des sentences. Subhāṣitaratnanidhi de Sa-skya Paṇḍita, traduction de Sonom Gara, Monumenta linguae Mongolicae collecta* IV [Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1973], p.140 ['essence']); F. W. Cleaves, "The Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1362 in memory of Prince Hindu," *HJAS* 12 (1949): 68 [53], 92 [53] ('[natural] qualities'); the two occurrences of *udqa* and the single occurrence of *udqas* (pl.) in the 1312 edition of the Mongol version of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* are rendered as 'meanings', 'intentions', and 'meanings' in F. W. Cleaves, "The *Bodistw-a*...", 1954, 76 [4–158b, § 42.4], 77 [4–159b], and 85 [4–166b]. However, these renderings

although to my knowledge not attested in pmo. texts, there is no reason to doubt that this expression already existed in the 13th–14th centuries.²⁰

From the early 14th-century Mongolian version of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and other preclassical texts we know that the word *udqa* had a rather wide semantic range, expressing notions like 'purpose, aim, intention (→ duty, obligation)', 'concept, idea', 'the essential (= what is useful), essence', and '(natural) quality or qualities', beside that of 'meaning (→ truth)'—a conceptual relation existing between 'quality' and 'essence', and between these and 'concept', 'meaning' and 'purpose'. Several of these derivative meanings developed under Buddhist influence.²¹

Thus, the translator of the *Hsiao-ching*, taking advantage of the polyvalent nature of the word *udqa*, could have brilliantly solved the problem confronting him by rendering the Chinese sectional title with a simple sentence like *Γool udqa-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*, i.e., 'First Chapter Explaining the (Central =) Fundamental (or Basic) Meaning (of the Text)', viz., the very essence of the work. Such a sentence, while adequately conveying the sense of the original,²² occupies only 45 ems and is exactly within the space limit. Cf. 3v1 (44+7 ems), 4v3 (47 ems), 6r4 (41+4 ems), 8r1 (46 ems), 9v5 (48 ems), 10v4 (43+6 ems), etc.

I wish to emphasize that, while other solutions are of course possible, they would involve a greater number of words (as the one proposed in Lu) or longer words, which in either case would automatically disqualify them.

The fifth line would necessarily begin with the first sentence of the *Hsiao-ching*: 仲尼居曾子侍, lit. 'Chung-ni (i.e., Confucius) was sitting (and) Tseng-tzu was waiting upon (him)', i.e., 'When Chung-ni was sitting (at leisure, at home) and Tseng-tzu was waiting upon him, ...'. Taking into consideration the pmo. language and the space available in the line, the above sentence could be rendered as *ǰungni sayuǰu Singisi taqin büküi-dür* "When ǰungni (= Chung-ni) was sitting (and) Singisi (=

/may need revising. Cf. D. Cerensodnom, M. Taube, *Die Mongolica der Berliner Turfansammlung* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1993), p.225a (s.v. *udqa*). In the title of the lost Preclassical Mongol version of the Buddhist *sūtra* discussed above (n. 12), *udqa* definitely corresponds to ch. *i* 義 'meaning, purport'. See Kara, "On a lost Mongol book," 1974, pp.287–8, where *udqa* is rendered as 'reason'. The various acceptations of the word *udqa* are found in mo. and the modern Mongolian languages. Cf. F. Lessing, gen.

/ed., *Mongolian-English dictionary*, comp. by M. Haltod et al., corrected reprinting (Bloomington, Ind.: The Mongolia Society, Inc., 1982), p.862b; Ya. Cévél, *Mongol xélnii tovč taiľbar toľ* (Ulan Bator: 1966), p.604a; Sárközi, *A Buddhist terminological dictionary*, p.815a–b (s.v. 'udq-a').
22 Cf. James Legge's non-literal translation of the Chinese sectional title as "The scope and meaning of the treatise" in his *The texts of Confucianism* (Oxford: 1899), p.465.

Tseng-tzu) was waiting upon (him).²³ The space occupied by these words is 43 ems, also within the permissible limit. Cf. 6v2: 43 ems followed by six Chinese characters, exactly as in our sentence but in the inverse order, which makes no difference.

The sixth line contains thirteen characters of text, viz., 子曰先王有至德要道以順天下, lit. “The Master (i.e., Confucius) said, ‘The former kings possessed (supreme =) perfect virtue and the essential course (i.e., principles, rules) of conduct by means of which they regulated ([all] under Heaven =) the world’.”²⁴ The space left in that line is 5.9 cm., which is just what is required to accommodate the first two words of the Mongol translation, viz. *Kungvusi ügüleriün* ‘Kungvusi (= Confucius) said.’²⁵ Cf. 14r5 which has fourteen characters: if we remove the fourteenth character and measure the remaining space, it is 5.9 cm. The length of the two words *Kungvusi ügüleriün* in 11r2 is exactly 5.9 cm.

The seventh line would then contain the first part of Confucius’ statement which continues in 1v1–2. The following reconstruction, proposed in 1982,²⁶ still stands (the continuation of the sentence in 1v1–2 is given in parentheses): *uridu boydas qad angqan-u sayin ayalı aburi (törö yosun qoyar-iyar delekei ulus-i ilübege[n] jäsaysan -u tula)* “(because) the sage rulers of old (suitably governed the world with) perfect virtue (and propriety).”²⁷ Both Lu, 4, and Cleaves, 71, omit in their reconstructions of the same line the words *angqan-u sayin* which render ch. *chih* 至 ‘(supreme =) perfect’, but they should not be left out since they are not only required by the context, but there is space for them in the line. With their inclusion, the last line of 1v occupies 56 ems—a long line indeed, but there are even longer ones in the Mongol text. Cf., e.g., 13v7 (65 ems!).

By combining the Chinese and Mongol texts of the missing first page (1r) of our *Hsiao-ching*, we obtain the following tentative reconstruction, line by line:

23 For the names Jungni = Chung-ni, and Singi = Tseng-tzu, see Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, p.76, nn. 6, 8. Pmo., mo. *sayu*- (mmo. *sa’u*) is the exact counterpart of ch. *chü* 居 ‘to dwell, stay; to sit’, just as pmo. *taqi*- (mmo., mo. *taki*-) is of ch. *shih* 侍 ‘to attend upon, to wait upon.’ In § 216 of the *Secret History of the Mongols* these two verbs occur in close association in the following alliterative passage: *čaqa’an de’el emüscü / čaqān aqta unu’ulju / sa’uri de’ere / sa’ulju takiju* ‘He (i.e., Old Üsün) shall wear a white dress / And ride a white gelding; / He shall sit on a (high) seat

// And be waited upon.’ Cf. *The Secret History of the Mongols. A Mongolian epic chronicle of the thirteenth century*, translated with a historical and philological commentary by Igor de Rachewiltz (Leiden: Brill, 2004), I, p.148. Cf. also the use of both verbs in lines 15–17 of the Mongolian text of the Sino-Mongolian inscription of 1335 studied by Cleaves [*HJAS* 13 (1950): 72–3], where *tayi*- = *taqi*-. I have little doubt that *sayu*- and *taqi*- were likewise used in the passage of the *Hsiao-ching* under discussion.

24 For a discussion of the key expressions found in this sentence, see de

/Rachewiltz, “Preclassical Mongolian version,” 1982, p.53, n.6. In his reconstruction, Lu, p.4, ignores the space taken by the thirteen Chinese characters, whereas Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, p.71, makes them fill the entire sixth line. Both authors are obviously at fault.

25 For the Mongolian transcription ‘Kungvusi’ of ch. ‘K’ung *fu-tzu*’ 孔夫子 ‘Master K’ung’, K’ung being Confucius’ surname, see Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, p.76, n.10. For the expression *Kungvusi ügüleriün*—a recurrent one in the Mongol version of the *Hsiao-ching*, see *ibid.*, pp.76–7, n.11.

26 See de Rachewiltz, “Preclassical Mongolian version,” 1982, pp.28, 41.

27 In my former transcription of the Mongol text of 1v1 (*ibid.*, p.28), I wrote *ilübeke[n]*. It is now my opinion that this word should instead be read *ilübege[n]*, as in Lu, pp.4, 28 (d), the meaning being unaltered (‘suitably’). I think, in fact, that the *Secret History* word *ilübe* in § 280, meaning ‘convenient, suitable’ (see Haenisch’s *Wörterbuch*, 82; cf. de Rachewiltz, *The Secret History of the Mongols*, I, p.216, II, p.1030), corresponds to the *ilübe*, *id.*, of the *Hua-i i-yü* 華夷譯語 of 1389, IIb, 6v4. See A. Mostaert, *Le matériel mongol du Houa i i yu* 華夷譯語 *de Houng-ou (1389)*, I, ed. by I. de Rachewiltz with the assistance of A. Schönbaum (Bruxelles: Inst. Belge H.É.C., 1977), p.63. Pace Cleaves, “The first chapter,” 1982, p.78, n.19, I regard *both* the *ilübe* of the *Secret History* and the *ilübe* of the *Hua-i i-yü* as *nomina adiectiva* in *-te* (~ mmo. *-de*) from **ilüb* ‘advantage, convenience.’ See de Rachewiltz, “Preclassical Mongolian version,” 1982, p.52, n.4. However, I now believe that the end suffix is not, as formerly assumed, the so-called diminutive suffix *-ken/ -qan*), but the rare suffix *-gen/ -yan*), on which see A. Mostaert, F. W. Cleaves, “Trois documents des Archives secrètes vaticanes,” *HJAS* 15 (1952): 452–3.

1. [孝經 (一卷)]
2. *Qiauging/*Kauging bičig (*nigen debter*)
3. 開宗明義章第一
4. *Fool udq·a-yi tayilqu nigedüger bölög*
5. 仲尼居曾子侍 *Žungni saγužu Singisi taqin büküi-dür*
6. 子曰先王有至德要道以順天下 *Kungvusi ügüler-ün*
7. *uridu boydas qad angqan-u sayin ayali aburi*]

In memory of my friend James Russell Hamilton, 1921–2003

Igor de Rachewiltz

Division of Pacific
and Asian History
Research School of
Pacific and Asian Studies
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 2000
ider@coombs.anu.edu.au

EAST ASIAN HISTORY 27 (2004)