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Abbreviations

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

1r, 1–7: These lines are missing in the text because the entire fol. 1r is missing
(together with the title page). Lu, L and C1 have attempted to restore some of the
words of the original. For a more scientific attempt and an almost full restoration see
de Rachewiltz (2004). The text as reconstructed in the latter is as follows:

1. [孝經 (一卷)]
2. *Qiauging/*Kauging bičig (nigen dehber)
3. 開宗明義章第一
4. Tool uḍa-a-yi tayilłu nigeđüger bőłög
5. 仲尼居曾子侍 Jungni sayüju Singsi taqin büküi-dür

* See Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching. 1. Facsimile of the
Mongolian Version of the Hsiao Ching. 2. Chapters Ten to Thirteen, revised and edited by I. de Ra-
chewiltz. Acta Orientalia Hung. 59 (2006), No. 4, pp. 393–406; Cleaves, F. W.: An Early Mon-
golian Version of the Hsiao Ching. 3. Chapters Fourteen to Seventeen, revised and edited by I. de
6. 子曰先王有至德要道以順天下 Kungvusi ügüler·ün
7. uridu boydas qad anggan-u sayin ayali aburi]

In de Rachewiltz (1986, pp. 36–37), I stated that the word *hsiao* 孝 can be transcribed in pmo. as *kau* (as suggested by Ligeti) as well as *qiau*; hence the title of the book could have been either Qiauging or Kauging. In the case of the Chinese initial *hsi* (šī, 'ph. *hi*), the regular transcription of this syllable in pmo. is, in fact, *qi* (e.g. *hsing* 行 = *qing*, *hsing* 興 = *qing*, *hsio* 學 = *qio*); the final *au* (aw, 'ph. aw [Ligeti], av [Poppe]), is transcribed as *au* (e.g. *ch'ao* 鈔, *朝* = *čau*, *mao* 毛 = *mau*, *shao* 少 = *šau*). However, there is unfortunately no attested occurrence of *hsiao* 孝 = *qiau*. On the other hand, we have more than one occurrence of *hsiao* (xiáo, mma. *xjaw˘*) transcribed as *kau* (Cleaves 1949, p. 75a; 1950, p. 85a). The reason for this ‘irregular’ transcription is that it is based not on mma. *xjaw˘*, but on emc. *γai wk*/ *γœ:wk* (Pulleyblank 1991, p. 340), hence in pmo. *kau* we have an archaising orthography or ‘ouigourisme orthographique’ (Ligeti 1984, p. 349, n. 50). But it is unlikely that *hsiao* 孝 (xiào, mma. *xjaw˘*) would have been treated in the same way as 學 by the Mongol transcriber/translator since the emc. pronunciation of the former was *xai wh*/ *xε:wh* (Pulleyblank, loc. cit.). Therefore, I would exclude now a transcription *kau* for 孝 and would retain only the reading Qiauging for the book title, with some reservations.

The revised reconstruction of the Mongol text is thus as follows:

2. [*Qiauging bičig (nigen debter)
4. Tool udq·a-yi tävilqu nigeđüger bölög
5. Jungni sayuju Singsi taqin büküi-dür
6. Kungvusi ügüler·ün
7. uridu boydas qad anggan-u sayin ayali aburi]

In R, p. 41, the missing lines (1a, 2, 4–5) of the translation should read now as follows:

1a [THE BOOK (CALLED) *QIAUGING (ONE VOLUME)
First Chapter, On Explaining the Central Meaning (of the Text).
When Jungni (Chung-ni, Confucius) was sitting and Singsi (Tseng-tzu) was waiting upon (him),
Lines 6 and 7 of the restored Mongol text are translated in R, p. 41; however, the word read *ilübteke*[n] ‘suitably’ in the same sentence but on 1b, 1 (R, p. 28), should instead be read *ilübtege*[n], as explained in de Rachewiltz (2004, p. 55, n. 27).

1v, 2–3: C1 irgen oryan [?..?]-iyar anu naviraldųjų ‘their people were by […] in harmony with one another’. As shown in R, pp. 53–54, n. 8, the most likely candidate for the obliterated word of the text is *udum* ‘example’; hence *udum-iyar* anu ‘by their (i.e. the sage rulers’; *boydas qad*) example’. Cf. Ligeti (1984, p. 322), and de Rachewiltz (1986, pp. 29–30).

1v, 4: *uqamuyu*[yu či] ‘do you know?’ Lu reads *uqamuyuu* [či], L *uqamuyulu*[u či], and C1 *uqamuu*[yu či]. Cleaves’ reading presupposes a *praesens imperfecti* in