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The officially sanctioned Manchu translation of the Analects, completed in 1654 and revised in 1756, is valuable for the insights it provides into Qing-dynasty traditions of Lúnyü interpretation and the then-contemporary understanding of key Confucian ethical notions of rén, yì, lǐ, dào, and dé. By examining the words employed in the Manchu translation of the Analects and exploring their etymology, which is sometimes Chinese and Mongolian as well as Manchu, it is possible to identify the aspects and nuances that the Manchus apparently understood these Confucian ethical terms to possess. The existence of a significant corpus of words borrowed from Mongolian, combined with evidence from Jurchen suggest that there may have been some kind of northern border tradition of Lúnyü interpretation that began with the reign of the Khitans and lasted for almost a millennium, in contradistinction to the established Chinese tradition.

Given the prominent place of Confucius in Chinese culture and society, one would expect that the text most directly associated with him, i.e., the Lúnyü 論語 or Analects, would have been the first of the Confucian classics to have been translated by Manchus eager to familiarize themselves with Chinese civilization. It is notable that among the five completed and five unfinished Manchu translations of Chinese works done by the eminent translator Dahai (ob. 1632), only one belongs to the Confucian classics. The fact that he did not complete his translation of the Mencius would seem to indicate the lower priority accorded to it. If the translation of the Confucian classics played an important role in the sinicization of the Manchus, then it is certainly curious that the Mencius was the first of the Four Books to be translated, since it is less directly associated with Confucius than is the Analects.

Although memorials urging the translation of the Confucian classics were submitted to Húng Taiji (1592–1643) as early as 1632, translations of the Four Books and Five Classics were not completed until after the court had moved to Peking in 1644. In 1652, the Manchu official Asitan (ob. 1683 [possibly 1684]) translated the Dàxué 大學 and Zhōngyōng 中庸. Miáo Chéng 苗澄 (fl. 1644–61) directed the translation of all of the Four Books, which was completed in 1654. The Mencius had been at least partially translated into Manchu, and the Dàxué and Zhōngyōng had been completely translated before translation of the Lúnyü was undertaken. The underlying reason for this phenomenon may be the more difficult language of the Analects and the heterogeneous nature of the text. In 1677, the Yùzhī rèjiāng Sīshū jiéyì 卸製日講四書解義 or Han i araha inenggidari giyangnaha sy ṣu i jurgan be

1 I became interested in the Manchu translations of the key ethical terms of the Analects while reading through the entire Manchu version of the text with Jerry Norman. I noticed that a number of the Manchu words seemed to have different connotations from the Chinese terms they were rendering and subsequently began researching the etymologies of these Manchu words. I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation to Prof. Norman for his assistance and encouragement during the preparation of this paper. I also wish to thank Professors Igor de Rachewiltz, Stephen W. Durrant, and William G. Bollzt for their advice and suggestions.


4 See Hummel, 1–3.

5 Durrant, 653–54, describes two memorials from 1632 and 1633 encouraging the translation of the Four Books, and the Lúnyü, Xiǎojìng, and Dàxué, respectively.


8 I follow the dates given for Miáo Chéng in Durrant, “Chou Dynasty Texts,” 53.
suhe bithe was published with a preface by the Kangxi Emperor (reg. 1661–1722), and in 1756, a revised edition entitled Yûchì fânyì Sishû (御製翻譯四書 or Han i araha ubaiyamubaha dain bithe) was completed under the auspices of the Qianlong Emperor (reg. 1736–95).9 By 1838, the entire text of Zhu Xi’s 朱熹 (1130–1200) Sishû jízhù 四書集註 had been translated into Manchu. The appearance of the rijiàng 日講 “daily lecture” edition of the Four Books in 1677 and the revised edition in 1756 more or less coincides with the two major periods in which the corpus of Sino-Manchu translations grew rapidly.10

That the Manchus valued the Four Books for containing “the subtle principles of the doctrine by which an emperor governs and pacifies” is apparent as early as 1632 in a memorial presented to H嘴唇 Taiji.11 Given the value the Manchus attached to obtaining a familiarity with and an understanding of the moral and ethical principles underlying Chinese conceptions of good government, their translations of the Confucian classics are an invaluable source for scrutinizing both Qing-dynasty traditions of textual exegesis and the contemporary understanding of key Confucian ethical terms, such as rén 仁, yì 義, lì 禮, dào 道, and dé 德. Judging from an extensive reading of the Manchu version of the Lunyû, considerable energy was expended on a precise translation of both the language of the text in general and the specific moral terminology it contains. As Stephen Durrant notes,

By the great wave of Sino-Manchu translations that appeared during the Ch’ien-lung reign (1736–1796), the Manchu translations were regarded by the emperor as works of textual exegesis surpassing the available Chinese language commentaries and explanations.12

---

9 Although the Qianlong Emperor’s preface is dated the fourth day of the twelfth month of the twentieth year of his reign, i.e., in the early part of 1756, in the Catalogue of the Manchu-Mongol Section of the Tôyô Bunko (Tokyo, 1964), 193, n.247, the editors mistakenly date it to 1755 and suggest that P. G. von Möllendorff is wrong to list it as 1756 in his “Essay on Manchu Literature,” Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 24 (1889–90): 15, n. 49.

10 Durrant, “Chou Dynasty Texts,” 52, identifies these periods as the middle years of the Kangxi reign (approx. 1680–1700) and the latter part of the Qianlong reign (approx. 1760–95).

11 This quotation is from Durrant, “Sino-Manchu Translations,” 654.

12 Ibid., 657.

Given this emphasis on accuracy and pride in quality, it is important to pay close attention to the words chosen by the Manchus to translate both the text of the Analects and its key ethical terms. By examining the words employed in the 1756 revised Manchu edition of the Lunyû, and by exploring their etymology, it is possible to identify aspects and nuances that the Manchus apparently understood these terms to possess.

The Manchu words used to translate the key ethical terms of the Analects consist of loan words from Chinese and Mongolian, as well as native Manchu words. Borrowing words from Chinese, e.g., xiào 孝, gōng 恭, and jìng 敬 (Manchu hiyoośun, gungne-, and ginggaun, respectively) reflects the general Manchu tendency to borrow directly from Chinese, rather than use already existing Manchu words, to translate new concepts or create new words. Other examples of Chinese loan words in Manchu include official titles (such as Manchu dzai siyang from Chinese zǎixiàng 宰相 ‘prime minister’, gung from gōng 公 ‘duke’), terms of respect (jùdzy from fùsī 夫子 ‘master, respectful term for teachers and elders’, fujin from fùrén 夫人 ‘wife of a feudal lord, wife of a beile, lady’), and names for Chinese things new to the Manchus (dooshi from dăoshi 道士 ‘a Taoist priest’, dzanse from zānzi 抄子 ‘a finger presser, a torture device used in interrogating women’).13

Although words borrowed from Mongolian or native Manchu words are often used to render the key ethical terms of the Analects, there are a few cases where the Manchus instead chose to borrow directly from the Chinese. This practice is not unlike the Classical Japanese kanbun 漢文 tradition of reading words such as rén, yì, lì, dào, and dé with an on 音 reading rather than with a native Japanese kun 訓 reading.14 By examining several of the Chinese loan words employed in the Manchu translations of the Lunyû, one gains insight into Manchu perceptions of cultural similarities and differences

---

13 Definitions of Manchu words are taken from Jerry Norman’s A Concise Manchu-English Lexicon (Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press, 1978).

14 Andrew Markus has pointed out to me that in proper names, and only in proper names, some of the key Confucian terms have peculiar kun readings. Examples he cites are the readings of 仁 as hito, which is clearly related to the kun reading of 人 hito ‘person’; 忠 as tada, which is undoubtedly akin to 正 tadasī ‘upright, honest’; 義 as yosi, which is the classical version of modern ii/yoi ‘good’; and 信 as nobu, which may be connected to the classical form of either of the related words 達ぶ nobu ‘to express’ 延ぶ or nobu ‘to extend’.
between themselves and the Chinese, as well as into Manchu rules of word-formation as they apply to the adoption of borrowed words, and intriguing aspects of Chinese historical phonology.

The Manchu word used to render xiǎo 孝 ‘filial piety’ is hiyōoshun, which is clearly borrowed from Chinese xìoshùn 孝順. Other Manchu words derived from the stem hiyōoshun include (1) hiyōoshula ‘to be filial, act filially’, where the common denominal verb suffix -la (~ -le ~ -lo) has been added and the -n has dropped out, as it usually does before suffixes beginning with consonants, (2) hiyōoshuntu ‘to show one’s filial piety through offerings to one’s deceased parents and grandparents’, where -tu represents a rare denominal verb suffix, and (3) hiyōoshunga ‘filial, a filial person’, where the denominal adjectival suffix -ngga (~ -ngge ~ -nggo) means ‘to possess a given quality’ and is roughly equivalent to the English suffixes -ish and -like.

The Manchu pronunciation of the initial x- of Chinese xìoshùn is intriguing, for it accurately reflects the Middle Chinese velar initial x- which xiǎo originally had. The transcription of Chinese names in the Ilan gurun i bithe, a Manchu translation of the Sānguō zhī yānyì 三國志演義 published in 1650, and in other Manchu texts from the early part of the seventeenth century proves that velars and plain sibilants followed by high front vowels had already become palatalized by the beginning of the Kängxi reign.15 Examples from the Ilan gurun i bithe include the Manchu transcription of jiān 建 as jìyan, jān 軍 as jìyān, jiāo 角 as jiyo, qìn 篤 as cin, and qiū 丘 as cio. Obvious exceptions to this rule in the same text are the Manchu pronunciations of giya for jīe 藝, giyang for jiāng 江, and qing for jing 靈. That these three words are used in the Manchu version of the Sānguō zhī yānyì for their meanings and not just as names suggests that they may be early Chinese loan words borrowed at a time when velar initials before high front vowels had not yet become palatalized, which would account for their exceptional pronunciations.

A second interesting exception is the inconsistent transcription of words beginning with the modern palatal sibilant initial c-, which is written in pīnyīn as x-. Note, for example, that xiù (< MC x-) 習 is transcribed in the Ilan gurun i bithe as sīo, xì (< MC x-) 信 as sin, xiān (< MC s-) 先 as siyan, and xuān (< MC γ-) 元 as hiowan, but xìng (< MC ฤ-) 興 is transcribed as sing, xī (< MC ฤ-) 許 as siōi, and xiàng (< MC 俸-) 象 as hiyang. The irregular transcription of Chinese words with the modern palatal sibilant initial c- implies that, although velars and plain sibilants followed by high vowels had already merged into the palatal sibilants at the time of the composition of the Manchu version of the Sānguō zhī yānyì, the Manchus were just beginning to be aware of this distinction in etymological origins but had not yet begun to reflect it systematically in their transcription of Chinese words.16

It is often difficult to determine whether Manchu loan words that have palatal sibilant initials in modern Chinese are early loan words, borrowed at a time when velars before high front vowels had not yet become palatalized or are late loan words borrowed during or after the Kängxi era when the Manchus had begun to distinguish the palatal sibilants according to their etymological origins in the velars or plain sibilants. The word hiyōoshun is clearly an early loan word, because it appears in the translations of the classics completed in the first decade of the Qing dynasty. This is not surprising, since the Chinese concept of filial piety is not only a fundamental Confucian concept, but is also ostensibly important to aspiring rulers who wish to instill a sense of respect and obedience in their subordinates.

The use of the Manchu word hiyōoshun to render Chinese xiǎo reflects the Manchu tendency to borrow words directly from Chinese. This is in marked contrast to the Mongols, who seldom engaged in this practice. In both pre-Classical and Classical Mongolian, the Chinese word xiào was translated with native Mongolian words that the Mongols must have thought best reflected its meaning. The pre-Classical Mongolian word used to translate xiào is taqimtayu, a deverbal noun derived from tagi- ‘to serve, attend upon (parents, ruler, etc.).’17 Since the suffix -mtayu is a pre-Classical form which indicates fondness or propensity, Igor de Rachewiltz translates taqimtayu as ‘[one] who likes, is

15 See Ilan gurun i bithe (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1979). The examples I cite are all from jùn 14. The Chinese Materials Center has published a microfilm reprint of an undated edition held by the Far Eastern Library at the University of Chicago.

16 These comments are based on “The Periodization of Written Manchu,” a paper presented by Jerry Norman at the Western Branch meeting of the American Oriental Society, held in Boulder in October 1989. In it, he discussed the confusion of Chinese plain sibilant and velar initials followed by the vowels i and u in the Manchu transcriptions of Chinese words in pre-Kängxi texts.

inclined or prone to serve or attend upon = filial; the quality (characteristic, act) of being filial = filiality, filial piety.'

In the Wūtì Qingwén jiàn 五體清文鑑, Chinese xiăo and Manchu hiyoošun are translated with the Classical Mongolian equivalents takimdaŋłu and elberi. The word takimdaŋłu, which means 'filial piety, respect for one's parents and elders', is clearly related to pre- Classical Mongolian taqimtayu. The word elberi, which means 'veneration, respect; filial piety', is a deverbal noun derived from elberi- 'to respect or honor parents or elders'. In contrast to pre-Classical Mongolian taqimtayu, which emphasizes action in the form of service, the Classical Mongolian words for filial piety both stress an attitude of respect.

It is curious that, whereas the Mongols had native words which they used to convey the concept of filial piety, the Manchus evidently felt they had no such words. The Manchu words meaning 'to serve, attend upon' and 'to respect, honor', were not used to translate Chinese xiăo. The borrowing, instead, of the word hiyoošun directly from Chinese suggests that native Manchu culture may have lacked the concept of filial piety. It undoubtedly also reflects both the desire to achieve as precise an understanding of Chinese society as possible and the general tendency of the Manchus to become sinicized and adapt themselves to Chinese culture.

Another example of direct borrowing to render one of the key terms of the Analects is the Manchu word ginggun, which comes from jing 敬 'respect'. Similar to the Manchu transcription of the initial of Chinese xiăo, the use of g- to transcribe the initial of jing accurately reflects its Middle Chinese origin in the velar series. Since, as far as I know, ginggun and words derived from it are consistently transcribed in early Qing texts with the initial g-, it seems likely that they are early loan words borrowed from Chinese at a time when velar initials before high front vowels had not yet become palatalized. Given the emphasis traditional Chinese society placed on the concept of respect and the need for rulers to instill a sense of respect in their underlings, it is not surprising that Manchu ginggun represents an early loan word.

The addition of the ending -un to the stem ging also indicates that ginggun is an early loan word. Native Manchu words rarely end in -ng. When they do, they do not stand alone, but tend to be followed by seme, the imperfect converbal form of the verb se-, e.g., hing seme 'honest, sincere, earnest; serious (of an illness)' and teng seme 'hard, firm, fast, solid, resolute'. Thus it is not surprising that the Manchus added -un to ging to give it a more assimilated form. The addition of the ending -un, which consists of the linking vowel -u- and the common noun-suffix -n, makes ging into *gingun, and the doubling of g is an orthographic convention regularly employed when -ng- occurs intervocally. That the ending -un also occurs in the Manchu word fajun 'law, decree, prohibition', which must be an early Chinese loan word borrowed at a time when fɑ̌ 法 still retained a final -p, suggests that this ending may have been regularly added to early loan words to give them an assimilated Manchu form.

Other Manchu words derived from Chinese jing include (1) ginggule- 'to respect, honor, act respectfully', where the denominal verb suffix -le (~ -la ~ -lo) has been added to ginggun, (2) ginggulen 'respectful, attentive, careful', which is a deverbal noun from ginggule-, and (3) gingguji 'respectful, chaste'.
In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing 孝經, jing is translated with the verb kündüle-‘to show respect, revere, honor; to be polite’, which has been borrowed into Manchu as kundule-. It is curious that, although the Manchus could have followed the Mongolian tradition of textual exegesis and used kündüle- or the deverbal noun kundulen to translate jing, they instead chose to borrow a word directly from Chinese. In the Classical Mongolian version of the Lünyù, jing is translated with the verb kiciyenggüile-‘to be zealous or studious; to be cautious, be attentive; to be respectful or humble’, which is clearly related to the Mongolian verb kiciye- ‘to exert oneself, apply oneself to; to make an effort, endeavor, strive’. Because the Manchus borrowed Mongolian kiciye- as kice-, it is curious that they did not also borrow kiciyenggüile- (as kicenggule-) and use it, or a deverbal noun derived from it, to translate Chinese jing.

Since the Manchus had already native words meaning ‘to honor, revere’, such as wesihule-, and the Mongolian loan words kündule- and kice-, it is intriguing that they did not use them to translate jing. A clue to the underlying reason for the Manchu’s borrowing directly from Chinese to translate jing lies in the confusion evident in both Chinese and Mongolian regarding the difference between the meanings of jing 敬 and gong 恭. That Xu Shên 許慎 (58–147) defines both gong and jing with sù 諧 ‘solemn, reverent’ in the Shuowen jiezi 說文解字 suggests that whatever difference in meaning the two words originally had was already obscured by the Han dynasty.21

The lack of an obvious difference between the meanings of the Chinese words gong and jing naturally affected the Mongolian and Manchu versions of the Lünyù and other Confucian classics. In Mongolian, the translation of jing does not appear to have been standardized until relatively late. Jing is translated as kündüle- in the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Classic of Filial Piety. Since it is later translated as kiciyenggüi ‘zeal, application’ in the Wűi Qinwên jian and as kiciyenggüile- in the Mongolian version of the Analects, it appears that kiciyenggüi and the derived deverbal verb kiciyenggüile- had become the standard Classical Mongolian translation for jing.22 In the Manchu version of the Lünyù, jing is always translated as either ginggun or ginggule-. That the Wűi Qinwên jian gloss for jing is also ginggun suggests that the Manchus were able to achieve a greater semantic consistency than the Mongols in their translation of this Confucian term, although the shorter history of written Manchu may also be a factor underlying this phenomenon. Semantic overlap between gong and jing, combined with the lack of a consistent Mongolian exemplar for translating jing, may have provoked the Manchus to borrow Chinese jing rather than use either a native Manchu word or a Mongolian loan word. By consistently using a loan word derived from jing, the Manchus were able not only to maintain a distinction between gong and jing, but also to achieve as precise and unambiguous a translation of the Chinese word jing as possible.

Whereas jing tends to be translated uniformly in both Classical Mongolian and Manchu, the translation of gong is not nearly as consistent. When we examine all the occurrences of gong in the Manchu version of the Analects, we discover that gong is translated with words derived from the stems gungne- and kündule-, which ultimately come from Chinese and Mongolian, respectively. The stem gungne- ‘to show respect to’ consists of gung, which is a loan from Chinese gōng, and the denominal verb suffix -ne (- -ne -no), which regularly becomes -ne (- -na -no) when it follows nasal endings. The word gungnecke, which means ‘respectful’, is an example of a word derived from the stem gungne-. The suffix -uke (- -uka) makes gungne- into an adjective. Similar to the case of ginggun and ginggule-, the Manchus have borrowed a Chinese word, deriving words from it according to the Manchu principles of word formation. Yet unlike the words ginggun and ginggule-, which are always used to translate Chinese jing in the Manchu version of the Lünyù, gungnecke and gungne- are not consistently used to translate gong.

Where gong functions in the Analects as an adjective, it is always translated with Manchu gungnecke. But in the two instances where gong functions as a verb, it is translated once with gungne- and once with kündule- ‘to respect, treat with respect, honor’, which comes from Mongolian kündule-.23 Where gong functions as a verb in the other three works included in the Yûchi fûyi Sîshû, it is regularly translated with kündule-. It is curious that the Manchus, who prided themselves on their meticulous translations of the Chinese classics, did not

---

20 Citations of forms appearing in the Classical Mongolian version of the Analects are based on Hân Mêng hêbi Lünyü 漢蒙合璧論語 (Hohhot: Inner Mongolian Univ., Dept. of Mongolian Language and Literature, 1987 [?]).
21 See Shuowen jiezi zhù 說文解字 (1815; rpt., Taipei: Hanjing wenhua shiyue, 1983), 9A.434, 10B.503.
22 See Wûi Qinwên jian, 1:1480.
23 See Yûchi fûyi Sîshû (1890), v. 2, 7.34b, 3.10a, for gungne- and kündule-, respectively.
consistently use *gungne-* to translate *gōng* in its verbal function, since it is a Chinese loan word ostensibly borrowed specifically to translate *gōng*. In the occurrences of *gōng* in the Lún yù where it functions as a grammatical subject or predicative nominative, the Manchus use *kundulerenge*. The word *kundulerenge*, which means 'one who respects; the act of respecting', consists of the imperfect participle of *kundule-* and the suffix -*ngge*, which is used to create forms that can serve grammatical functions such as subject or predicative nominative. It is unclear why the Manchus did not use *gungnerenge*, a word based on the stem borrowed from Chinese *gōng*, to translate *gōng* in these two instances. The above examples indicate that there is a certain inconsistency in the Manchu translation of *gōng* in the Analects. Although the Wǔtì Qingwèn jiān entry for Chinese *gōng* is Manchu *gungne-*; the expression dài rën gōngjīng 待人恭敬 is glossed as *kundule-*; which suggests that there may not have been any real distinction between the meanings of *gungne-* and *kundule-*; but simply a difference in origin.24

The Mongolian words used to translate *gōng* are also characterized by a certain inconsistency. In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiāojīng, *gōng* is translated as *kiciye-* to exert oneself, strive, be diligent or careful, which is not only related to *kicyenggūle-*; the Classical Mongolian word used to translate *jing*, but is also similar in meaning. In the Wǔtì Qingwèn jiān, Chinese *gōng* and Manchu *gungncuake* are glossed by Mongolian *bisirel* 'pious, devout, believing, religious', an adjective derived from *bisirel* 'faith, belief, trust; reverence, respect, worship, homage', which is in turn a deverbal noun from *bisire-* to believe in, revere, worship; to adore, admire; to respect, esteem.25 Just as the Wǔtì Qingwèn jiān Manchu entry for the Chinese phrase dài rën gōngjīng implies that the Manchu words *kundule-* and *gungne-* were not clearly differentiated semantically, the fact that *kundule-* is given for this entry, whereas *bisirel* is given for *gōng*, suggests that the Mongols did not actually distinguish the meanings of *kündule-* and *bisire-*; That words derived from both *kundule-* and *bisire-* are used to translate *gōng* in the Classical Mongolian version of the Analects implies that the pre-Classical Mongolian word for *gōng*, *kicyenggūle-*; was replaced by the seventeenth or eighteenth century with words derived from the stems *kündule-* and *bisire-*; although a standard translation for *gōng* had not yet been established.

The inconsistent translation for *gōng* in Mongolian leads us to suspect that the Mongols’ lack of an established standard translation for *gōng* may have influenced the Manchus and may have even prompted them to create the stem *gungne-* by borrowing directly from Chinese. It is curious that the Manchus went to the trouble of adopting a Chinese loan word but did not create an adequate range of words from that stem so that they could consistently use words derived from it to translate *gōng*. A good example of this is the lack of a noun meaning ‘respect’ derived from *gungne-*; That the Manchus did not create such a word, but instead resorted to using either *kundu* or *kundulen*, which are both loan words from Mongolian, to translate *gōng* when it functions as a noun may be due in part to the existence of some sort of northern border tradition of interpreting the Chinese classics. Yet, however influential this tradition may have been, the Manchu passion for knowledge about Chinese culture and the emphasis on precise translation, combined with the propensity to assimilate a large number of Chinese loan words, led them to borrow words from Chinese to render the ethical terms *xiào*, *gōng* and *jīng*, concepts important to inculcate in one’s subjects for the effective ruling of the nation.

Many of the Manchu words used to translate the key Confucian terms of the Analects come from Mongolian. Examples include *doro* for *dào* 道 ‘the Way’, *dorolon* for *lǐ* 礼 ‘ritual’, *erdemu* for *dé* 德 ‘innerheld power’, *jurgen* for *yi* 義 ‘propriety’, *deocin* for *lì* 悌 ‘fraternal deference’, and, as was noted above, *kundule-*; one of the two words used to translate *gōng* 恭 ‘reverent’. The existence of a significant corpus of Mongolian loan words used to translate these terms, combined with the fact that some of them occur in Jurchen, suggests that among the northern border peoples there may have been a kind of tradition of Lún yù interpretation which began in the twelfth century with the reign of the Jurchens, and possibly even as early as the tenth century with the Khitans.

The Manchu words for *dào* and *lǐ* are interesting both for their divergence from the meanings of the Chinese words that they translate and for their inherent semantic congruity. Whereas the Chinese word *dào* encompasses both the abstract meaning ‘the Way’ and the concrete meaning ‘roadway’, the Manchu word *doro*, which is used to render *dào* ‘the Way’, not only does not mean ‘roadway’, but also is clearly unrelated to the Manchu word *jugūn* ‘road, way, street’. Although the Chinese word *lǐ* < *lǐdix*; which means ‘ritual, proper form’, is graphically, phonetically, and semantically related to 體 *lǐ* < *lǐdix* ‘corporal form’, which is the only other common word to share the phonetic 體, *dorolon*,

---

24 See Wǔtì Qingwèn jiān, 1:1481.
25 Ibid., 1:1482.
the Manchu word used to translate lì, is not related to Manchu words meaning 'form' (such as arbun, durun, gırı or muru) or 'body' (such as beye).

In contrast to Chinese dào and lì, which do not appear to be related concepts in their native guise, the Manchu words doro and dorolon clearly share a common stem, which implies that the Manchus understood dào and lì to be related concepts. The word dorolon is a deverbal noun derived from dorolo-, which means 'to salute, greet with the hands joined in front of the face, pay one's respects; to perform a rite', plus the addition of the common noun-suffix -n. Both dorolon and dorolo- consist of the stem doro and the nominal verb suffix -lo (~ -la ~ -le). That the meaning of doro includes 'doctrine, morality, way, rule' as well as 'rite, ritual' is further evidence of the overlap between the Manchu concepts of dào and lì. Since the words doro and dorolon both come from Mongolian törö 'law; order, regime; rule',26 examining the use of törö in Mongolian should help us to understand better the nature of the semantic link between doro and dorolon.

The pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Classic of Filial Piety shows that dào and lì were conceived of as related concepts as early as the thirteenth or fourteenth century. In it, both dào and lì are translated with the phrase törö yosun, where yosun means 'generally accepted rule, traditional custom, habit; etiquette; manner'.27 De Rachewiltz literally translates törö yosun, which is an appositional noun phrase, as 'the norm(s) and manner(s)'. The phrase törö yosun has been borrowed into Manchu as doro yoso 'rites and customs, norm, form'. Elsewhere in the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing, lì is translated as törö when it is understood as a noun, and as töröle- when it functions as a verb. De Rachewiltz describes töröle-, which he translates as 'to observe (or respect) the norm (of propriety)' or 'to perform the rites', as "a rare and obsolete denominial verb in -le (Il-la) from törö." Based on the use of the phrase törö yosun to translate both dào and lì, the use of törö to translate lì, and the obvious relation between törö and the denominal verb töröle-, it appears that the Mongols understood both dào and lì to mean 'rule' or 'norm', with lì possessing the specific overtone of 'the norm of propriety'.

Although Manchu doro is rarely used to mean 'rite, ritual', the fact that its meaning encompasses both dào and lì suggests that the pre-Classical Mongolian usage of törö to render both dào and lì influenced the Manchu understanding of these terms. It may be the case that Manchu doro was originally used to translate both dào and lì, and only later was the word dorolon used for lì so as to differentiate the two terms. According to de Rachewiltz, the Mongolian verb töröle- is rare and obsolete. In contrast, its exact analogue, Manchu dorolo-, is a very common form. Although it is possible that Mongolian töröle- is the source for the Manchu denominal verb dorolo-, it may be that the Manchus created dorolo- in accordance with the Manchu rules of word formation and vowel harmony, and in ironic ignorance of the existence of Mongolian töröle-.

Although dào and lì are not translated with törö or words derived from törö in Classical Mongolian, the same kind of semantic link between dào and lì that exists in both pre-Classical Mongolian and Manchu is preserved. In the Classical Mongolian version of the Lanyü, dào is translated as yosu, which is equivalent to the form yosun cited above. The word lì is translated as yosulal 'rite, ceremony; etiquette, rules of conduct'. The word yosulal is a deverbal noun derived from yosu- 'to act according to custom, law or rule', which is in turn a denominal verb from yosu, the word used to translate dào. In contrast to the lack of a clear distinction between dào and lì in pre-Classical Mongolian, the two terms are clearly differentiated in Classical Mongolian. Like pre-Classical Mongolian törö and töröle-, and Manchu doro and dorolon, the Classical Mongolian forms yosu and yosulal reflect a definite relationship between dào and lì. The Classical Mongolian words exhibit the same semantic relation as Manchu doro and dorolon. The word used to translate lì is a deverbal noun derived from a denominal verb formed by the addition of the Mongolian suffix -le (~ -la) or the Manchu suffix -lo (~ -la ~ -le) to the stem used to translate Chinese dào, i.e., törö or doro, respectively. It is interesting to note that Chinese dào is glossed by three sets of Mongolian and Manchu words in the Wūtī Qingwén jiān (i.e., yosu and doro, yosun and yosu, and törö yosun and doro yosun) since it is regularly translated as doro in the Manchu version of the Analects.28

The consistent semantic link between dào and lì in the Mongolian and Manchu renderings of these terms forces us to reconsider the question of a semantic relation between them in their original Chinese forms. One suspects that the Mongols and Manchus would not

26 Gerhard Doerfer denies that Manchu doro comes from Mongolian törö and instead claims that doro is a loan from Chinese dào. See his Türkische und mongolische Elemente in Neupersischen (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963), 1:267.
27 See de Rachewiltz, 53, n. 6; 78 n. 252, for a discussion of törö yosun, törö, and töröle-.
28 See Wūtī Qingwén jiān, 1:418.
have made such a linkage if it did not already exist in the Chinese tradition. When one examines the numerous definitions of liest listed in the Jingji zuangäi 經籍纂譯, the semantic link between dao and li becomes clear.29 The word li < *lidx is glossed as 雒 lü < *lidx in a number of early texts, including the Shuowen jiézi.30 Although the use of lü to define li, a word belonging to the same rhyme group, may be dismissed as a contrived paronomastic gloss, the word lü is in turn glossed in the Shuowen jiézi as zú suò yi yé 足所依也 'that which the feet follow [i.e., a path]'31 and it occurs in the Book of Odes with the meaning 'path'. This suggests that the Mongols and Manchus may have based their translations of dao and li on an existing Chinese tradition that understood li to mean "the act of following or enacting the Way." The morphological structure of the Manchu words doro and dorolon aptly reflects this tradition, for doro is a noun pure and simple, expressive of a concept, whereas dorolon is a deverbal noun, hence 'an enacting of the concept doro'.

Ferdinand D. Lessing notes that the Mongolian word törö comes from Uyghur törä.32 According to Annemarie von Gabain, the Early Written Turkic word törül törö means 'law, constitution, ceremony, government, teaching = Sanskrit dharma'.33 Reflexes of törülöro can be found in Early Written Turkic, Middle Turkic, and Modern Turkic, with a common Turkic form of *töri/*töria.34 The Turkic verb *tör-i-l*törä- 'to give birth, to procreate, 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 *töril*töriä and törö, respectively,35 which suggests that Turkic *töril*töriä, Mongolian törö and Manchu doro all have the sense of 'a natural law or order, an inherent norm'. It appears that the Mongols and Manchus both understood Chinese dao and li to be related aspects of this order, i.e., 'the inherent norm' and 'implementing the inherent norm', respectively.

Although these aspects were not originally distinguished clearly, they were later differentiated as separate qualities of the natural order.

The occurrence of the word doro in the Sino-Jurchen vocabulary studied by Jin Qicong 金啓訟 suggests that Manchu doro is an early loan word.36 The word doro is used in expressions meaning liguàn 禮官 'officer in charge of rituals', fādū 府法 'laws and institutions' and lānli 倫理 'structure and order'. The use of doro to translate fādū aptly reflects the meaning 'law; regime; rule, government' of the Early Written Turkic word törtlörö from which doro was ultimately borrowed. The use of doro to render lānli is interesting, since lānli is a term that was invested with significant moral overtones in the Song dynasty. That doro was used to translate both fādū and lānli, as well as liguàn, implies that the Jurchens understood the primary sense of doro to be 'order, norm, rules'. The Jurchen usage of doro suggests that the Mongols and Manchus used words borrowed from Early Written Turkic törtlörö to translate the ethical terms dao and li because they understood them to mean 'inherent norm, intrinsic order, general rules', with li specifically meaning 'implementing the inherent norm, i.e., the rules of propriety'.

One interesting aspect of the Manchu word doro is the irregular pronunciation of both its initial consonant and vowels. Mongolian t- regularly corresponds to Manchu t-. Although the initial t- becomes d- in some Mongolian dialects, it is never voiced before r.37 Thus it is highly unlikely that the Manchus could have borrowed doro from a Mongolian dialect that pronounced törö with an initial d-. The vowels of Manchu doro are also irregular, because the Mongolian front rounded vowels ő and ü regularly correspond to the Manchu high vowel u, not to the lower vowel a. In eastern Mongolian dialects, the vowel ő of western Mongolian dialects is pronounced [o], which could have been heard as an o in Manchu. However, given the irregular pronunciation of both the initial consonant and the vowels of doro, it seems probable that both the voiced initial consonant and back vowel of Chinese dao influenced the

---

30 See Shuowen jiézi zhù, 1A.2.
31 Ibid., 8B.402.
32 See Lessing, 835.
34 I am grateful to Ron Hahn for his assistance in identifying the Turkic sources of doro and for providing me with reconstructions of common Turkic forms.
35 This semantic relation was suggested to me by Ron Hahn.

36 For the Jurchen forms, see Jin Qicong, Nàzhdewnén cídian 女真文辭典 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1984), 16, 56.
37 In the Zhènglán 正籟 banner dialect of Inner Mongolia, initial t- becomes d- when it precedes a short vowel and a voiceless fricative or aspirated stop or affricate in the second syllable: Written Mongolian tös = Zhenglan dös. See Sün Zhū 孫竹, Mengguyú wénjí 蒙古語文集 (Xining: Qinghai renmin chubanshe, 1985), 67.
Manchu pronunciation of Mongolian törö, causing it to become voiced and to lose its front vowels.\(^{38}\)

Since doro comes from Mongolian törö, we would expect that it would be pronounced turu, not doro. There is in fact a Manchu word turu, which means ‘the sayings of holy or wise men, traditional methods handed down by the disciples of wise men’. This meaning appears to preserve the Early Written Turkic meaning of ‘teachings’ which has otherwise been lost in Mongolian törö and Manchu doro. That the word turu refers to established teachings or traditional methods suggests a clear semantic link to doro, which means ‘doctrine, precept’. Similar to English skirt and shirt which both come from Old Norse skyrta, and mint and money which both come from Latin moneta, Manchu turu and doro appear to constitute an etymological doublet, with the latter word acquiring its irregular pronunciation under the influence of Chinese dào.\(^{39}\)

The word used in the Manchu version of the Analects to translate Chinese dé 德 ‘innerheld power’ also comes from Mongolian and ultimately from Turkic.\(^{40}\) The Manchu word erdemu ‘capability, virtue, power’ comes from Mongolian erdem ‘knowledge, learning, skill, ability; wisdom, virtue’. Since native Manchu words never end in any consonant but n (except for onomatopoeic words), the common ending -u has been added to Mongolian erdem. Mongolian erdem is in turn a loan word from Early Written Turkic erdem ‘goodness, good qualities, virtue’.

The only Manchu word derived from erdem is erdemungge ‘virtuous, talented, moral’, which consists of the stem erdem plus the demonstrative suffix -ngge (–ngga – nggo).

In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing, Chinese dé is translated as ayali aburi, an appositional noun phrase of two words with the primary meaning of ‘natural disposition, character, innate faculties or qualities’. De Rachewiltz suggests that the meaning of this phrase may have come to encompass ‘moral character or worth, virtue’ under either Buddhist or Confucian influence.\(^{41}\) If Chinese dé does in fact mean ‘innerheld power, inner aptitude, innate quality’, then perhaps it would be preferable to understand the phrase ayali aburi with its primary meaning ‘innate faculties or qualities’, rather than investing it with Western notions of ‘moral character or worth, virtue’.

In both the Wǔtì Qingwèn jiàn and the Classical Mongolian version of the Lünü, dé is translated as erdem.\(^{42}\) This suggests that erdem had become the standard translation for dé by the seventeenth or eighteenth century, a hypothesis that is further supported by the fact that the Manchus borrowed the word erdem, not the phrase ayali aburi. The Early Written Turkic word erdem appears to be composed of the stem er, which means ‘man, male’; the denominial verbal ending -d-, which is a common Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu suffix meaning ‘to act in the manner of’; and the linking vowel -e-; and -m, which is a common Turkic and Mongolian deverbal noun ending.\(^{43}\) If this etymology is valid, then erdem means ‘acting in the manner of a man, being manly’. This provides an interesting parallel to Latin virtus, from vir ‘man’, which is not only the standard Latin translation of dé but also the source of English virtue, the word commonly used now to translate dé. It is ironic that the early Jesuits of the Ming dynasty, who did not know Manchu, chose to translate Chinese dé with a term that echoes the etymology of the Turkic, Mongolian, and Manchu words for dé, which impart to the concept a masculinity not present in the original Chinese word.

The Chinese word yī 義 is yet another example of a key Confucian term that the Manchus translate with a Mongolian loan word. The Manchu word jurgan, which means ‘rectitude, loyalty, duty, devotedness, the principles according to which people should act’,\(^{44}\) as well as ‘line, column, row’, is particularly interesting, for it reflects an understanding of yi that is markedly different from that of the original Chinese. It is clearly related to (1) the denominial verb jurgala- ‘to make lines, stripes, or creases; to mark lines on cloth (of tailors)’, which consists of the stem jurgan plus the

---

\(^{38}\) Gerard Clauson’s An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), 532, and Doerfer, 1.266, both list a Turkic form with the rare initial -d-. Doerfer, 1.264, also lists a Mongolian form from The Secret History of the Mongols with an initial -d-

\(^{39}\) This idea was suggested to me by Jerry Norman.

\(^{40}\) I am grateful to Igor de Rachewiltz for pointing out the Turkic origins of Mongolian erdem. See Doerfer, 2.31–32.

\(^{41}\) See Clauson, 206.

\(^{42}\) See de Rachewiltz, 53, n. 6.

\(^{43}\) See Wǔtì Qingwèn jiàn, 1:1458.

\(^{44}\) Clauson, 206, states that erdem, which he translates etymologically as ‘manly qualities’, esp. ‘bravery’, is derived from er, but does not analyze the suffix -dem. Doerfer, 2.32, quotes Ramstedt’s etymology of Mongolian erdem, but does not identify -dem as a compound suffix.

\(^{45}\) This last definition is from the Yazhi Qingwen jian 項製清文鑑 or Han i araha Manju gisun i buleku bithe. See Dictionary of Mancha Language (1708; rpt., Taegu: Institute for Altaic Studies, Hyosung Women’s Univ., 1978), vol. 2, 6.276.
common denominal verb suffix -la (~ -le ~ -lo), and (2) jurgangga, which consists of the stem jurgan plus the denominal adjectival suffix -ngga (~ -ngge ~ -nggo). That jurgangga means both 'honorable, loyal, upright' and 'for the public benefit' is intriguing, since one of the secondary meanings of Chinese yi is 'public'. It seems likely that after jurgan was employed to translate the Confucian term yi, it became the standard translation for yi, and as such took on some of its secondary meanings. But it is curious that jurgan is associated with lines, columns, and rows, since yi does not appear to have any such connotations in Chinese.

Although Manchu jurgan is semantically closer to Mongolian jirum 'line; established order, system, regime; code of laws', it actually comes from Mongolian jiruy-a 'line'. The Manchu vowel -u- implies that jurgan was borrowed from the vernacular pronunciation of jiruy-a in which "i breaking" caused the -i- to become -u-. The Manchus simply added the common noun-suffix -n. We can hypothesize that in Middle Mongolian there must have been a form *jiruyə(n) with the sense of modern jirum and that this is the source of Manchu jurgan.

Although the meaning 'line' of jirum is obsolete, there are a number of related words that preserve this early meaning. Note, for example, (1) jiru- 'to draw (as a line or picture)', (2) jiruyadasun(n) 'line; stroke', (3) jiruyadasula- 'to draw a line, trace, make a stroke', (4) jiruyasun(n) 'line', (5) jiruy-a 'the act of tracing, drawing, writing; line', (6) jirulta 'the act of jiru-; ruler (for drawing)', and (7) jirumla- 'to draw a line; to follow or be guided by a rule; to take as a norm or standard'. Like the meaning 'line' of jirum, the meaning 'to draw a line' of jirumla- is also obsolete, which suggests that the primary concrete meanings of jirum and jirumla- were obscured as they acquired the more abstract and intangible sense of 'rule, norm, standard' and 'to follow or be guided by a rule, to take as a norm or standard', respectively. Since jirum originally meant 'line', and is clearly related to jirult, which means 'ruler' or 'guide for creating proper lines', it seems natural that jirum evolved from meaning 'line' to 'rule or guide for proper behavior, norm, standard'.

In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Classic of Filial Piety, yi is translated with both nayir 'accord, harmony' and joqi- 'to agree, be appropriate'. The fact that nayir and joqi- are both used to translate yi, and that joqi- is also used in the same text to translate Chinese ti 恭 'fraternal deference' implies that a standard Mongolian translation for yi had not yet been established in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. That jirum is not used to translate yi in the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing suggests that it may have still retained its primary meaning of 'line' in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and only later taken on the more abstract meaning of 'rule, norm, standard'. Based on the Wǔtí Qǐngwén jiànsuā use of jirum to gloss Chinese yi and Manchu jurgan, and the consistent use of jirum to translate yi in the Classical Mongolian version of the Lünyù, we can infer that jirum had lost its original concrete meaning of 'line' by the seventeenth or eighteenth century and had gained the more abstract meaning of 'rule, norm, standard'.

It is curious that the Mongols and Manchus used words whose primary meaning is 'line' to translate the Confucian term yi, since yi does not appear to have any such connotation in Chinese. I suggest that they may have been somehow influenced by the Chinese xing 朝廷, which, as an ethical term, has the sense of 'proper department' or 'fine conduct'. It is not impossible that the Mongols and Manchus were influenced by the fact that the graph 朝廷, with which the word xing is written, also has the reading hāng and means 'line'.

English rectitude aptly reflects the Mongolian and Manchu understanding of Chinese yi. Rectitude, which comes from Latin rectus 'a straight line, straight, upright', conveys a sense of 'straightness' or 'moral integrity'. Latin words related to rectus include regere 'to keep straight, lead aright, guide' and regula 'straight stick, ruler, rule, pattern, principle'. The Mongolian words jirum, jirumla- and jirulta provide a striking parallel to Latin rectus, regere and regula, all derived from a root *rege.

The word used in the Manchu version of the Analects to translate the ethical term 悌 'fraternal deference' also comes from Mongolian. The Manchu word is deocin, which is clearly derived from deo 'younger brother; younger (of males)'. Other Manchu words derived from deo include (1) deocingge 'one who is assiduous in performing the duties of a younger brother', and (2) deocile- 'to perform the duties proper to a younger brother, to show fraternal deference', which is a denominal verb from deocin, formed by the addition of the common suffix -le (~ -la ~ -lo); and (3) deotelembi 'to behave like a younger brother', which is a denominal verb derived by adding the suffix -le (~ -la ~ -lo) to deote, the plural of deo.

The Manchu word deo comes from Mongolian degü 'younger brother or sister; younger'. The Manchus must
have borrowed this word from Middle Mongolian at a time when the \( g \) had already dropped out.\(^{48} \) The Modern Mongolian form \( ñû \) attests to the loss of the \( g \) in degici. Middle Mongolian deguci, which means ‘(one who is) respectful toward his elder brother or to an elder person of his generation’, would have been de'uci at a somewhat later stage. The Mongolian word deguci (to which the common Manchu noun-suffix -\( n \) has been added) is clearly the source for Manchu deociin. The Manchu verb deocile- also comes from Mongolian degucile- ‘to treat as one’s younger brother; to perform the duties of a younger brother toward an elder; to be respectful toward older people of one’s generation’. Given the large number of Mongolian loan words in Manchu, it is curious that the Manchus chose to create the verb deotele- by adding the denominal verb suffix -\( le \) (\( ñ.\) -\( la \) -\( lo \)) to the plural form of deo rather than borrowing the Mongolian verb degile- (as deole-) ‘to act as a younger brother; to respect one’s elder brother or older people of one’s own generation; to be younger’.

In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing, \( ti \) is not rendered with deguci but with joqi-, which means ‘to agree, be on good terms’ and, by extension, ‘to show deference’. That deguci does not appear in pre-Classical Mongolian as the translation for \( ti \) suggests that it is a later word, which may have been coined specifically to translate \( ti \). Like the Chinese word \( ti \) < *thidh, which is clearly related phonetically, semantically, and graphically to \( dti < *dix \) ‘younger brother’ (the two words were both originally written with the graph \( d \)), the Mongolian and Manchu terms for ‘fraternal deference’ are also derived from the word for younger brother. It seems likely that the Mongolian word degici was created from degii in a conscious effort to translate the term \( ti \) as accurately as possible by echoing the semantic relation between Chinese \( ti \) and \( dti \).

The translation of the key Confucian ethical terms dào, lì, dé, yì, and \( ti \) in the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing tends not only to be inconsistent but also to differ from the words used in Classical Mongolian. This suggests that standard Mongolian translations for these terms were not established until the seventeenth or eighteenth century. It is noteworthy that, with the exception of doro and dorolon, the Manchu words borrowed from Mongolian to translate these terms tend to reflect the language of Classical Mongolian. This implies that the period of Manchu-Mongolian contact during which the Manchus borrowed several key Confucian ethical terms from the Mongols occurred sometime after the Mongols fled north, following the collapse of the Yuan dynasty.

Although the Manchu word used to render jūnzi 君子 does not represent a pure Mongolian loan word, the Manchu translation of this key sociological term from the Analects nonetheless reflects a Mongolian influence. The expression ambasa saisai appears to be composed of two appositional nouns, ambasa and saisai. The word ambasa is ostensibly the plural of amban ‘high official, dignitary’, formed by the addition of the common plural suffix -\( sa \) \( ñ.\) -\( se \) -\( so \). Although saisai ‘a man proficient in letters and good in his speech and conduct; scholar, gentleman’ contains the same plural suffix -\( sa \), there is no singular noun sain with a meaning similar to that of saisai from which saisai is derived. Since the Manchu word sain ‘good, well; auspicious, favorable’ only functions as an adjective or a noun that does not refer to people, it is curious that a plural noun saisai referring to people would be derived from sain.

Once again, an examination of the Mongolian translations of these ethical terms helps provide a key to understanding the mystery. In the pre-Classical Mongolian version of the Xiaojing, jūnzi is translated as siliyu sayid.\(^{49} \) According to de Rachewiltz, siliyu is equivalent to siliyun ‘straight; plain; simple; straightforward; frank; honest’. The Mongolian word said means ‘magnate, dignitary, minister’ and is a plural noun derived from sain ‘good (physical and non-material sense), well; without trouble or danger; free from discomfort, illness, etc.’, with the common plural suffix -\( d \). Similar to Manchu sain, Mongolian sayin usually functions as an adjective or a noun that does not refer to people. Since sayid, like Manchu saisai, is generally used in the singular, it is curious that it has the common Mongolian plural suffix -\( d \). Mongolian sayin and sayid are clearly the source for the Manchu words sain and saisai. The Manchus have simply imitated the Mongolian plural suffix -\( d \) of sayid by using the common Manchu plural suffix -\( sa \) \( ñ.\) -\( se \) -\( so \). The pre-Classical Mongolian translation of jūnzi as siliyu sayid ‘the upright and worthy’ suggests that in the Yuan dynasty the Mongols understood the Chinese term jūnzi to refer to some sort of high dignitary. This is ironic, as jūnzi literally means ‘son of a lord’ and in Confucius’ time referred most often

\(^{48} \) The loss of \( g \) between the vowels \( e \) and \( u \) is attested in the The Secret History of the Mongols, where the vowel-consonant-vowel combination egii is regularly given the pronunciation e'ui. For the Middle Mongolian form de'ui, see Erich Haenisch, Wörterbuch zu Monghol un niucu tobec'ani (Yuan-chao pi-shih) (1939; rpt., Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1962), 36.

\(^{49} \) My discussion of the Mongolian translations for jūnzi is primarily based on de Rachewiltz, 75–77, and n. 224.
to those lords' sons who lacked seniority in their clans and were forced to become déclassés.50

De Rachewiltz notes that the word šili’un (= Pre-Classical Mongolian sili’un, Written Mongolian silu’yun) occurs twice in The Secret History of the Mongols, where it is glossed as jüńzi 君子 and qingjun 清俊 ‘fine, elegant’. The word silu’yun means ‘straight, plain; simple; pure; straightforward, frank; honest’ and is related to the verb sluiyud ‘to be straight or honest; to become straightened out’. In The Secret History of the Mongols, Chinese jünzǐ is ostensibly understood as ‘one who is upright. In a Sino-Mongolian inscription from 1338, jünzǐ is translated as sečed, the plural form of sečen ‘wise, sage, intelligent; prudent’, which suggests that it is understood as ‘wise man, sage’. Again, it is curious that jünzǐ, generally used in the singular, is translated with a word containing a plural suffix. In the Ming Sino-Mongolian vocabulary Huáyí yìyǔ 華夷譯語 edited by Luvsanbaldan and Tsevel, jünzǐ is glossed as šili’un sayin, where sayin, which usually functions as an adjective meaning ‘good’, appears to be the otherwise unattested singular form of sayid ‘worthy, dignitary’. The expression šili’un sayin ostensibly means ‘upright and worthy’ or ‘an upright worthy’. The aforementioned expressions for Chinese jünzǐ are all obsolete and have been replaced by the forms sayid erdemten and erdemten sayid, although the former is more common. The word erdemten means ‘learned person(s), scholar(s)’ and is clearly derived from erdem, the Mongolian word which the Manchus borrowed as erdemu to translate Chinese dé. These two terms appear to be composed of appositional nouns meaning ‘a worthy and a scholar’ or vice versa.

Since the various expressions used to translate jünzǐ, such as Mongolian sayid and sečed, and Manchu saisa, are generally used in the singular, it is curious that they should have plural suffixes. In the Wūtǐ Qīngwén jiàn, the phrase dà chén 大臣 is glossed by Manchu amban ‘high official, dignitary’, which is clearly a singular form, and Mongolian sayid, which appears to be a plural form.51 This suggests that, although the Mongolian word sayid may have in origin been a plural, when it came to be used as a general term for ‘worthies’ it lost the concrete and tangible sense of its plurality.52 As a loan word from Mongolian, Manchu saisa also seems to behave as a singular, although it has the plural suffix -sa.

Based on their adoption of saisa from Mongolian sayid, the Manchus, like the Mongols, appear to have understood jünzǐ to be some sort of worthy or dignitary. However, the use of ambasa in the expression ambasa saisa is rather puzzling. The word amban is clearly a noun derived from the adjective amba ‘big, great, vast, important’ by adding the common noun-suffix -n. The semantic link between amba and amban undoubtedly lies in the sense of ‘great, important’, for what is a high official or grandee if not great or important? If, in the expression ambasa saisa, ambasa is in fact the plural form of amban ‘high official, dignitary’, then ambasa saisa would mean ‘high officials and worthies’, which seems redundant. Although the Manchus were clearly influenced by the Mongolian translations of jünzǐ which included sayid, there is no obvious Mongolian source for ambasa.

I would like to suggest that the term ambasa saisa represents a conscious attempt by the Manchus to provide as accurate and technical a translation of Chinese jünzǐ as possible. It seems likely that ambasa does not represent the plural form of amban ‘high official or dignitary’, but instead has the less common meaning of ‘rather large’. Although the common diminutive form of amba is ambakan, which is formed by adding the suffix -kan (~ -ken ~ -kon), ambasa is also a diminutive form of amba, albeit a form which appears only to occur in the expression ambasa moo ‘rather large tree’.53 However, the occurrence of ambasa in Jurchen with the meaning ‘great, large’ suggests that the adjective ambasa may not have originally been as limited in usage as it appears to be in Manchu.54 I propose that the use of the adjective ambasa to modify saisa is a conscious attempt to convey the meaning of the Chinese diminutive suffix zi 子. Just as Chinese jünzǐ may be understood as ‘junior lord’ rather than ‘son of a lord’, Manchu ambasa saisa appears to mean ‘a rather great dignity’.

Whereas the Manchu term for jünzǐ has clearly been influenced by Mongolian, the evidence for a Mongolian influence on the Manchu translation of the title Lûnyū is less certain. Leolen gisuren consists of two deverbal suffix that is the final of sayid. See Nicholas Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1954), 70–71, no. 265.

53 See Qīngwén zōnghuì 清文緯恊 (1897 [?]), 21.

54 See Jin Qícóng, 245. I confess that I am left with the dilemma that, whereas Manchu ambasa is a diminutive form of amba and is equivalent to the more common ambakan, the suffix -sa does not seem to have had a diminutive sense in Jurchen ambasa.


51 See Wūtǐ Qīngwén jiàn, 1:311.

52 Another example of a plural usage in Mongolian for the singular is keikede ‘boy; children’, the plural of keikedi ‘child, girl’, where the final -d of keikede is the same common plural
nouns derived from the verbs *leole* - 'to discuss, talk over' and *gisuren* - 'to speak, talk', and ostensibly means 'discussions and talks [with the Master]'. Both *gisuren* and *gisure* are clearly related to *gisun*, which means 'speech, word, language'. The title of the Classical Mongolian translation of the Analects is *Sigümjilel ügülel*, where *sigümjilel* means 'discussion, debate, deliberation; criticism; commentary' and *ügülel* means 'speech; utterance, saying, talk'. Like *leole* and *gisuren*, *sigümjilel* and *ügülel* are deverbal nouns derived from verbs meaning 'to discuss, criticize, debate' and 'to speak, say', respectively, i.e., *sigümjile* and *ügüle*. The words *ügulen* and *ügüle* are derived from a word meaning 'word, utterance; phrase; language, speech', namely *üge*(n). Like Manchu *leolen gisuren*, the Mongolian title also ostensibly means 'discussions and talks [with the Master]'. Both the Manchus and Mongols translated the title in a manner that differs markedly from the traditional Chinese interpretation of the name *Lányū*.55

The ‘Monograph on Literature’ of the History of the Han Dynasty contains the earliest account of the compilation of the Analects. It says,

The *Lányū* consists of discussions in which Confucius responds and replies to his disciples, and contemporaries and disciples talk with one another about what they have heard from the Master. At the time, each of the disciples kept his own notes. When the Master died, his students gathered [their notes] together, and discussed and edited them. For this reason, they called it the *Lányū*.56

Depending on whether one follows the explanation of Zhēng Xuān 鄭玄 (127–200), Yán Shīgū 領師古 (581–645), Huáng Kān 皇侃 (488–545), and Xīng Bīng 邢昺 (932–88), who say that the graph 論 (suān < *tsuanx) is equivalent to 撰 (zuān < *tsuanx) 'to collect, edit, write', 57 or whether one understands крыт to be a graphic variant for 撰 (zuān < *tsuanx) 'to compile, collect', a member of the same xiēshēng iesheng 詣聲 series, the title *Lányū* can be understood as 'edited conversations' or 'collected conversations'. As far as I am able to determine, 論 is not glossed as 論 論 'discussed and edited/compiled' until the first century A.D., approximately half a millennium after the Analects was compiled. Consequently, one must regard this explanation with a certain amount of skepticism.

In the *Shiming* 释名, Líu Xi 劉熙 (fl. 200) says,

The Analects records the words of the conversations between Confucius and his disciples . . . 論 [lùn < *ljan] means 倫 [lùn < *ljan] 'order'. It means 'to possess order and structure'.58

Líu Xi’s defining lùn 論 with lùn 倫 can be supported by the use of 論 in pre-Han texts as a graphic variant of the word conventionally written as 倫, a member of the same xiēshēng series. The meaning of lùn 倫 'structured, ordered' only seems to make sense in the title Lányū if one assumes that it is a reference to the process of compilation and collation referred to in the History of the Han Dynasty.

In his Wénxuān 文選 commentary to Liú Jīn’s 劉俊 (462–521) “Bàiánmíng lùn” 辨名論, Li Shàn 李善 (ob. 689) quotes the no longer extant Fázi 孫子, a work by Fú Xuán 孫玄 (217–78), which says,

Formerly, when Zhòngní died, the followers of Zhòng- gōng posthumously discussed the words of the Master, and named the text the *Lányū*.59

Differing from the explanation of Bān Gǔ 班固 (32–92), Fú Xuán appears to understand the title to mean 'discussed conversations'.

Regardless of the differences in their understanding of the meanings of the words lùn and yú, the conventional Chinese explanations of the title all reflect a similar understanding of the grammatical structure underlying the name Lányū. Beginning with Bān Gǔ in the first century A.D., the Chinese appear consistently to have understood the grammatical relation between lùn and yú as adjunct to head, where lùn functions as an adjective modifying yú. This is intriguing, for those unfamiliar with the accumulated exegetical tradition might well opt to understand Lányū as ‘discussions and conversations’, and would perhaps be hard-pressed to explain the title any other way.

The Mongolian and Manchu translations of the title Lányū differ markedly from the conventional Chinese explanations of the name of the text. Although Manchu *leolen gisuren* is clearly not related to Mongolian Sigümjilel ügülel, both the Manchu and Mongolian translations treat lùn and yú as appositional nouns, a

---

55 The following discussion is based on Yáng Bójūn’s 楊伯峻 Lányū yìzhù 論語譯注 (Hongkong: Zhonghua shuju, 1984), 25–26.
57 See Wáng Xiānqiān 王先謙 (1842–1917), comp., Hán shà bāchù 漢書補注 (1900; rpt., Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), 875. It is interesting to note that one of the definitions given for suān 論 in the Ciyuán 詣院 (Hongkong: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1984), 2372, is zuānshū 撰述 ‘to compile a narrative’, and a passage from the History of the Han Dynasty is cited.
58 See Líu Xi, Shiming (Taipei: Guomin chubanshe, 1959), 6.94.
59 See Wénxuān (1809 ed.; rpt., Taipei: Hanjing wenhua shiyè, 1983), 54.748.
treatment which does not appear to have any basis in the traditional Chinese explanation of the title. Coupled with evidence for Mongolian influence on other aspects of the Manchu exegesis of the Analects, this suggests that here too the Manchus were influenced by the Mongolian tradition.

Although the Manchus borrowed a significant number of words from Mongolian to translate key ethical terms of the Lûnyû, the fact that they also used both Chinese loan words and native Manchu words to render some of those concepts results in a version of the Analects that reflects a uniquely Manchu understanding of the text. Borrowing words from Chinese to render xiào, gōng, and jīng suggests that the Manchus felt that some of these terms had a distinctly Chinese flavor that could not be effectively translated by using either Mongolian loan words or native Manchu words. That rēn 仁 and zhōng 忠 are translated with the native Manchu words gosin and tondo, respectively, implies that these key ethical concepts were perceived to be similar to aspects of Manchu culture and society. An examination of the etymology of gosin and tondo is intriguing, for it reveals that Chinese rēn and zhōng have been given a distinctly Manchu flavor.

The Chinese word 仁 rēn < *njin is both graphically similar to and homophonous with the word 人 rēn < *njin 'person', which implies that the Confucian term rēn specifically pertains to personal relationships. As Peter A. Boodberg notes, the only common translations of the term rēn that convey this etymological overtone are 'humaneness' and 'humanity', words clearly derived from 'human'.

Gosin, however, which is the native Manchu translation for rēn, is not related to nīyālma, the Manchu word for 'person'.

The Manchu word gosin is a deverbal noun from gosī- 'to pity, have mercy; to love, cherish', which also means 'to hurt (of an abrasion)'. Other words derived from gosī- include (1) gosīta- 'to like, love', where -ta (- -te ~ -to) represents an intensifying suffix, and (2) gosicuka 'pitiful; lovable', where -cuka (~ -cuke) is an adjectival suffix. The word gosin is also related to (1) gosihon 'bitter; miserable, suffering', where the adjective ending -hon (- -hun ~ -hūn) has been added to gosin (although -hūn is expected since gosin does not contain only back vowels), (2) gosihori 'a larger bitter exotic fruit', where -hori (- -huri) is an ending used for exotic things, and (3) gosiholo- 'to be bitter; to act in a miserable or distressed manner, be miserable or distressed', where the denominal verb suffix -lo (~ -la ~ -le) has been added to gosihon (although the expected ending is -la). In the Qingwén zōnghuì 清文總彙, the verbs gosī- and gosīta- are both glossed by the Chinese phrase téngài 疼愛 ‘to be fond of (a child)’, where téng by itself means 'to be fond of (a child); to ache, suffer.' These glosses provide us with valuable insight into the meaning of gosin and its relation to gosihon, which means ‘suffering’. It seems that Chinese téngài and Manchu gosī- both convey a nuance of the pain that is an integral part of love.

In the Wūtī Qingwén jiān, the Chinese words lián‘ài 儀愛 and rēn‘ài 仁愛 are both translated with Manchu gosī-. This suggests that gosī- encompasses the meaning of ‘compassion, pity, love’ as well as ‘humane love, love for one’s fellow man’. The aforementioned Wūtī Qingwén jiān glosses for gosī- are in the categories of yōuti 友悌 ‘friendship and fraternal deference’ and rényì 仁義 ‘humanity and propriety’, respectively. This implies that gosī- and, by extension, gosin encompass the spectrum from everyday personal relationships to idealized and morally correct ones, whereas Chinese rēn only seems to include the latter type.

Like gosin, the use of the native Manchu word tondo to translate zhōng 忠 reflects a uniquely Manchu understanding of a Confucian ethical concept. The word tondo ‘straight, upright, loyal, fair’ is clearly related to the verb tondolo- ‘to go straight’, which suggests that the primary meaning of tondo is ‘straight, upright’. The occurrence of tondo as a translation for zhōng in the Sino-Jurchen vocabulary studied by Jin Qiçong implies that tondo had been the standard Jurcheno-Manchu translation for this Confucian ethical term for several hundred years before the completion of an imperially sponsored Manchu translation of the Analects in the mid-seventeenth century.

A comparison of the meaning of the Manchu word tondo with that of the terms employed to translate zhōng in pre-Classical and Classical Mongolian reveals similarities and differences between the Manchu and Mongolian understandings of zhōng. The pre-Classical Mongolian translation of zhōng, cēng ünen sedkil, literally means ‘sincere and true’ or ‘completely sincere (= loyal) mind (heart, thoughts, feelings)’ and emphasizes the qualities of sincerity and truthfulness.

---

60 See Boodberg, 327–30.

61 The word gosihori is likely to be a late artificial coinage from the period in the mid-Qing when increased ethnic consciousness led to a preference for using native Manchu words rather than Chinese loan words. An example of this trend is the creation of the word jofohori ‘citrus fruit, orange, tangerine’ to replace cendz tubihe ‘orange’, where cendz is a loan from Chinese chéngzǐ 橙子 ‘orange’ and tubihe is the Manchu word meaning ‘fruit’.

62 See Qingwén zōnghuì, 88.

63 See Wūtī Qingwén jiān, 1:1428, 1.1434.

64 See Jin Qiçong, 115.

65 See de Rachewiltz, 63, n. 93.
Wàiti Qingwén jiànr, Chinese zhōng and Manchu tondo are glossed by the Mongolian words sidurya and youlci, which mean 'straight, honest, loyal, faithful, truthful' and 'straight, just, unbiased, honest', respectively.\(^6\) The word sidurya is a deverbal noun derived from siduru- 'to rise, stand erect, straighten' and is the source for the Manchu word sijirhan 'straight, not crooked'. The word youlci, which also means 'diameter', is derived from youl 'axis; pivot; trunk; core; kernel; wick of a lamp; center; origin; foundation; central; pivotal; fundamental; general'. The use of the Mongolian word youlci to translate zhōng is intriguing, for it reflects the relationship which exists in Chinese between zhōng 忠 and zhōng 中 'center'. As with their use of deguci, a word derived from degu 'younger brother', to translate ti 達, the Mongols may have intentionally used youlci to translate zhōng 忠 so as to reflect a perceived semantic relationship.

Manchu tondo and Mongolian sidurya, which is one of the standard Classical Mongolian translations of zhōng, are both related to the concept of 'straightness', a nuance that is not obvious in the Chinese term zhōng. Based on the evidence we have for a Mongolian influence on the Manchu translation of key terms in the Analects, it seems to be more than coincidental that Manchu tondo, which is an attested Jurchen translation for zhōng, and Mongolian sidurya both interpret Chinese zhōng to mean 'straightforward, loyal', while possessing an underlying sense of 'straightness'. The concurrence of the meanings of the Jurchen, Mongolian, and Manchu translations of zhōng provides further evidence for the existence of a kind of northern border tradition of Lūnyú interpretation.

An examination of the etymology of some of the key ethical terms of the Manchu version of the Analects reveals that a significant number have either been borrowed from Mongolian or been influenced by their Mongolian counterparts, or that they occur in Jurchen. Although it is not possible to find direct evidence to bolster the claim that a northern border tradition of Lūnyú interpretation existed, one can speculate on its nature. I am not suggesting that the Manchu, Mongols, and Jurchens actually had established exegetical schools, but rather that, unlike the early Jesuits of the Ming period who embarked on their translations of the Classics in a virtual vacuum in the West, the northern border peoples had been exposed to and influenced by Chinese ideas for centuries and thus had a wealth of assimilated Chinese traditions on which to draw. Confucianism was well known among the Manchus, Mongols, and Jurchens, and some of the important terms and concepts from the Analects may well have entered into the respective languages of these peoples. Since there is no evidence for precisely how these terms were borrowed into Manchu, one can only surmise that this northern border tradition of Lūnyú interpretation arose as the result of a combination of linguistic borrowings into the colloquial language, an established oral tradition, and possibly through examination of previous translations.

In addition to the linguistic evidence focused on here, there is some indirect evidence that suggests the existence of a northern border tradition of interpretation of the Lūnyú and other Chinese classics. Owing to both the size of the corpus of extant materials and the relative length of the Yuan and Qing dynasties, the most accessible and best documented example of the relation between two northern border peoples is that of the Mongols and the Manchus. In his discussion of the influence of Chinese ideas on early Manchu political conceptions and institutions, David M. Farquhar observes:

> These Chinese ideas seem to have come to the Manchus primarily through a Mongolian strainer; they are recognizably Chinese but modified and reformulated as a result of 300 years of Mongolian handling. Indeed the antique flavor of a number of these ultimately Chinese notions (the role of Heaven and Earth, the emperor as a cog in the cosmic machine, and so forth) suggests that they are remnants of ancient Chinese cultural influences in Inner Asia, old and widespread before Činggis Qan was even born. . . . The Mongolian written language, itself a very important cultural loan, was probably the greatest supplier of these new terms and ideas, for Mongolian was the only written language the Manchus had before Nurhaci's famous order of 1599 instituting the Manchu written language by the adaptation of the Mongolian script.\(^6\)

Erdeni (ob. 1623)\(^6\) and Gagai (ob. 1599), the Manchu officials Nurhaci commissioned to adapt the Mongolian script to Manchu, both knew Mongolian, and Erdeni also knew Chinese. Shortly after the Manchu script had been borrowed, Erdeni and other Manchu officials began translating Chinese works into Manchu. It seems likely that they would have relied on and been influenced by already existing Mongolian translations of these works. Louis Ligeti suggests that it is precisely

\(^6\) See Wàiti Qingwén jiànr, 1:1443.


during this period, i.e., the first half of the seventeenth century, that the influence of Mongolian on Manchu was particularly strong.69

The existence of a thirteenth- or fourteenth-century pre-Classic Mongolian version of the Xìaojìng implies that the Mongols viewed the translation of the Chinese classics as important. The History of the Yuan Dynasty records that a Mongolian translation of the Classic of Filial Piety in Phags-pa script was presented to the Emperor Wǔzōng 武宗 /Qaišān (reg. 1307–11) in 1307.70 De Rachewitz notes:

The emperor decreed that this work contained the profound utterances of Confucius, and that all, from the nobility to ordinary people, should act according to it. Therefore, he ordered the Secretarial Council to cut the blocks and print it, and copies of the work were then widely distributed.71

The Mongols had clearly established a precedent for the Manchus' appreciation of the Chinese classics.

The Chinese classics were also greatly esteemed by the Jurchens during the Jin dynasty. The History of the Jin Dynasty records that in 1183 Emperor Shǐzōng 世宗 (reg. 1161–89) ordered the Jurchen translation of a number of Chinese works, including the Book of Changes, Book of Documents, Analects, and Mencius.72 He explained that his reason for commissioning the translation of the Five Classics was “precisely because I desire the Jurchen people to know where Humanity and Propriety, and the Way and Innerheld Power are located.” A Jurchen translation of the Four Books en-
titled the Sìshù yìjiè 四書譯解 was also completed during the Jin dynasty.73 Although none of these Jurchen versions of the Chinese classics is extant, one expects that there would be a certain amount of linguistic consistency between the Jurchen and Manchu translations of both the language of these texts in general and the specific moral terminology they contain.

The translation of the Chinese classics was also important to the Khitan rulers of the Liao dynasty (937–1125), who ordered Tangut translations of a number of Chinese texts, including the Lùnyǔ, Xiǎojìng, and Ėryā 尔雅.74 Even the rulers of the Toba Wei dynasty (385–550) valued the Chinese classics, as attested by the existence of an entry listing a Guōyǔ Xiǎojìng 國語孝經 (“National Language Version of the Classic of Filial Piety”) in the “Monograph on Literature” of the History of the Sui Dynasty.75 Ligeti asserts that this entry refers to a Toba Wei dynasty Tabghatch translation of the Classic of Filial Piety. He also suggests that the languages spoken by the rulers of both the Toba Wei and Liao dynasties were dialects of the Xiānbēi language and represent a sort of “Pre-Mongolian.”76 Given the linguistic relations and extensive contact between these various northern peoples, who all ruled China at some point, and their interest in learning about the ethical and political underpinnings of Chinese culture and society, it is possible that a northern border tradition of interpreting the Analects and other Chinese classics could have existed for over a millennium before the Manchus began their translations of these canonical texts.

---

70 See Yuán shì (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1976), 22.486.
71 See de Rachewitz, 18.
73 See Gong Xiánzèng 金顯曾, comp., Jin Yiwén zhì bālù 金藝文志補錄, in Lìdá Jīntú Yìwén zhì 留大元藝文志 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1958), 2.47.
75 See Suí shā (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1973), 32.934.