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The Late Ming Chinese *Lulongsai lüe* (盧龍塞略) and the Peculiarities of the Reconstruction of its “Translation” Chapter

Abstract

In a recent academic project I have reconstructed the Middle Mongol vocabulary of the 17th century comprehensive Chinese military work called *Lulongsai lüe* (盧龍塞略), a document of key importance containing one of the last Sino-Mongol glossaries without proper critical reconstruction until now. The reconstruction resulted in a near complete clarification of the earlier sources the compilers of this work used in the bilingual part. I found that in opposition to what scholars have thought of it until now the material is not homogeneous and does not represent a single linguistic status, it does, however, throw some light on the chronological and philological questions concerning the earlier works incorporated in it.
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During the course of the twentieth century most of the medieval Sino-Mongol glossaries were reconstructed by pioneers of the field providing invaluable lexical support for diachronic Mongol linguistics (Lewicki, Haenisch, Cleaves, Ligeti, Mostaert etc.). Later on many of these publications were corrected and reprinted as new data and new linguistic approaches emerged (Kara, Kuribayashi, de Rachewiltz, Apatóczky etc.). However, there

---

1 The paper was presented at the 4th International Conference of Oriental Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, 24–25 November 2014. This paper was supported by The Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (project №. RG006-EU-12).
are still some sources that are almost unknown to the academic public and even if some of them are not entirely unfamiliar to the researchers, most of them lack proper analysis let alone appropriate reconstruction. One of the poorly researched works is the Sino-Mongol glossary *Yibu* (譯部 ‘Translation chapter’), incorporated in the 17th military work, the *Lulongsaí lüe* (盧龍塞略 ‘Outline of the Lulong pass’; henceforth abbreviated as LLSL).\(^2\)

The LLSL is a late Ming treatise on military issues concerning the territories now belonging to the Eastern part of Hebei province in China bordering the western part of Liaoning. The compiler of the LLSL was Guo Zaoqing 郭造卿, a Fujianese writer and poet, author of the books like *Yanshi* 燕史 (‘The History of Yan’), *Yongping zhi* 永平志 (‘The record of Yongping’), etc. Being a military work, the official publisher of this edition was Wang Xianggan 王象乾, the head of the Ministry of War in the Ming court. The LLSL was finally published in the *Gengxu* 庚戌 year of the *Wanli* 萬曆 period (1610 A.D.), almost two decades after the death of Guo Zaoqing in 1593. The LLSL is made up of 20 chapters (卷), which contain various compilations, from biographies of outstanding military personnel to descriptions of the defence system, military organization, logistics and geography of the area, with a large number of maps and illustrations as well as an extra chapter for the appendix. The part, however, which has mostly been in the forefront of this relatively poorly appreciated work is the Chinese-Mongol bilingual glossary included into the 19th chapter. This document is of key importance since it contains one of the last Ming Sino-Mongol vocabularies without proper critical reconstruction until now. The glossary has not yet been thoroughly investigated nor was its linguistic data systematically processed. A photocopy of the complete LLSL including the glossary itself was republished in Taiwan unceremoniously, without much explanation.\(^4\) Some efforts were made by mainland Chinese scholars to give a general view about the Mongol material included in it but these attempts did not stand the test of time (Jia-Zhu 1990: 169–192;\(^5\) Manduqu 1995: 379–598). A transcription of the LLSL text was also published by Ishida in Japan (1938, revised 1973).

\(^2\) It actually consists of two separate glossaries marked 譯上 and 譯下.

\(^3\) The original copy of the LLSL is preserved in the National Central Library in Taipei (№ 210.3 03790, Rare Books/Special Collection), a photocopy of which was the one I used in my research.


\(^5\) Here we can find transcriptions of the LLSL and other bilingual texts published in simplified (!) Chinese character set as well as a lot of very questionable and doubtful reconstructed forms.

\(^6\) While Manduqu’s book despite its contribution of giving modern Mongol translations of the entries in Mongol script as well as proposing reconstructed forms, unfortunately contains quite a few errors both in transcription and translation. The quality of the reconstructions is very uneven, a large number of them are not convincing. Listing all the doubtful or erroneous items here is impossible but to demonstrate their quality a short arbitrary collection of inaccurate emendations will suffice (numbering is according to Apatóczky 2016):

1.2b13 xiá yuè chē-de-gān 趴的干 Ch. ‘afterglow (of the setting sun), red clouds’ (read zhī 柱 instead of chē 車 and ēr 而 instead of de 的) jirγan. WMong jirγa- ‘the Sun sets’. Manduqu: čedigen?

1.4a14 qí dīng yuè tuō-luó-huò 其頂曰拖落害 Ch. ‘head, top, (peak of a mountain)’ (read tā-luó-hài 禿落害) toloqai. WMong toloyai. Manduqu has not compared it to the relevant section of the WBZh/2 text (禿落害) where the entry was copied from, hence the erroneous reconstruction toloqo.
As most of the Yuan and Ming Sino-Mongol linguistic data are embedded in bilingual glossaries, when I took the voluminous lexicon (compared to other similar works) of the LSL as a topic of my recent research, the original goal of the project was to present a detailed and precise classification of its Middle Mongol vocabulary. Therefore as a part of a larger scale research project it aimed to demonstrate that the once assumed hypothetical Middle Mongol language was in fact a dialect-geographical frame of many independent dialects rather than a more or less uniform linguistic state in Mongolian diachronic data.7 The key element in this work was the reconstruction of the Middle Mongol vocabulary represented in LSL.

However, during the reconstruction phase a striking discovery has somewhat changed the original focus of the investigation. As it was customary in the Chinese literary tradition the compilers and scribes of LSL did not cite the sources they used quite extensively. Even after a superficial reading of the text it seemed clear that there are complete sections copied from previous works, like the Hua Yi yiuy8 (‘Chinese-Barbarian Translation’: Hy) and the Beilu yiuy9 (‘Translation of the Northern Caitiffs’: BLYY). At some places complete sections of the original texts turn up, like the part on heavenly bodies taken from BLYY, in which even the sequence of the entries is identical. Processing slowly through the material, it has become clear that the Mongol lexical data of the LSL that was thought of the Mongol material taken from Jimen fang yu kao to’a debüt. For a detailed analysis of the Sino-Mongol transcription methods see Rykin 2012 (the material

7 This work started with the analysis of the dialectal elements observable in the BLYY, cf. Apátóczky 2009a.
8 Published many times by outstanding scholars like Lewicki 1949, Haenisch 1957, Mostaert (Rachewiltz-Schönbaum) 1977.
9 Apátóczky 2009. For a detailed analysis of the Sino-Mongol transcription methods see Rykin 2012 (the material he quotes from Pozdneev 1908 – in accordance with the facsimile – as “Dada yu 韃靼語” is actually a late copy of the Mongol material taken from Jimen fang yu kao 剪門防禦考 ‘the defence of Jimen’, incorporated in the 227th chapter of Wu bei zhi 武備志, right after the BLYY; see later in this paper).
a complete plagiarism from three earlier literary works. As the above result was attained a readjustment of the scholarly goals had to be made as well. These findings prove one couldn’t expect any relevant linguistic data concerning the early 17th century to be extracted from the text. The focus was now on the clarification of the available sources the authors of the LLSL used, and it was necessary to determine the sources at the level of the independent entries. This part of the reconstruction was probably the most time consuming one as the sources had to be clarified one by one at each and every entry.

After having checked the possible sources of the version of Hy which were used by the compilers, the source could be securely verified as the one quoted in Kuribayashi (2003: i,) as „乙”, which is a later version of Hy from 1407. Proofs for the source are the following entries where the copied forms contain characters, which are attested only in this later version of Hy.

1.13a18 tuicí yuè shen-dá-ā-lán 推辭曰申答阿藍 ¹⁰ Ch. ‘to decline (an invitation)’ (read tā 塔 instead of dá 答, 辭 is a character variant for 辭) šiltālam ‘to excuse oneself, to have an excuse’ (copied erroneously from Hy/乙, cf. Hy 611. «推辭 申答塔藍» Kuribayashi 2003: 48 «申塔阿藍»).


2.4a21 mí yuè ā-lá-hē-tài 麋曰阿剌黑台 Ch. ‘roebuck’ (read zhāng 麋 instead of mi 麋) alaqtaï (copied erroneously from Hy/乙, cf. Hy 143. «麂 阿古剌台»; Kuribayashi 2003: 16 «阿剌黑台 <阿古剌台»).

2.4b24 zhē-ē-sù huáng yáng yē 者額速 黃羊也 Ch. ‘Mongolian gazelle, Procapra gutturosa’ (read lián 連 instead of sù 速) jēren (copied from Hy/乙, cf. Hy 134. «黃羊 者舌連»; Kuribayashi 2003: 16 «者額舌連»).

Following the same method, the version of BLYY which the compilers of LLSL used can be identified as the one quoted and abbreviated “By” in Apatóczky 2009b. Some proofs for the source are the following entries where the forms copied to LLSL are only attested in that version of BLYY:

1.14a11 cū yuè bó-dū-wén 蠹曰伯堵文 Ch. ‘rough, coarse, big’ būdi‘īn ‘thick’ (copied from BLYY/By, cf. BLYY 361. «粗 伯堵文»).

2.9b10 qí tū-ē-hā ăo zi yē 其禿兒哈 褡子也 Ch. ‘coat’ (裡 is a character variant for 襡) tūrqa? (< WMong. tuγurya ‘pieces of felt covering the frame of a tent’) (or alternatively read 無哈兒 *uγar (Manduqu 1985: wu-ha-er, uγar = Mo. kürme ‘small coat’) (copied from BLYY/By, cf. BLYY 455. «裡子 禿兒哈»)

¹⁰ The characters taken into consideration in the reconstruction and their Romanised forms are set in boldface whereas all other characters that belong to the explanations are written in their normal forms.
2.10b5  **mi yuē bā-ér 蜜曰把兒** Ch. ‘honey’ (蜜 is a character variant for 蜜) bal copied fragmentarily from BLYY/By, cf. BLYY 432. «蜂蜜 把兒»

2.11a25  **huá yuē ān-zhā-sù 銜曰安札速** Ch. ‘plowshare’ anjasu ‘plow, plowshare’ (copied fragmentarily from BLYY/By, cf. BLYY 611. «銜子 安札速»).

After having done some more investigation into the other Sino-Mongol sources one could speculate that the third main source of the compilers was the **Jimen fang yu kao 蓼門防御考** (‘The defence of Jimen’), the glossary of which was incorporated as a whole into the 227th chapter of the famous and grandiose military work, the **Wu bei zhi 武備志**11 (‘Remarks on Military Preparations’; WBZh), along with the complete BLYY text.12

One can easily notice throughout the work that the scribe(s) of the LLSL had very limited – if any – knowledge of the Mongolian language. The most striking examples are those where forms of the very same Mongolian word transcribed with different Chinese characters in the different sources are treated as different lexemes in the LLSL:

2.9b16  **wà yuē huái-mù-sù 懷曰懷木速** Ch. ‘socks, stockings’ (懷 is a variant character for 襪) hoimusu.

2.9b17  **qí yuē kuò-yì-mō-sūn zhān wà yē 其曰濶亦抹孫 濶也** Ch. ‘felt socks’ (濶 is a variant character for 襪) hoyimosun ‘socks’.

Not surprisingly the structure of the sections which are found in the bilingual chapters of the LLSL also seems very familiar when compared with other similar bilingual works, with only slight modifications.13

---

11 茅元儀: 武備志, 卷 227 «四夷考, 北虏考» [Mao Yuanyi (ed.): Wu bei zhi. juan 227 «Study on the barbarians of the four cardinal directions, Study on the northern caitiffs»]. As I am currently working on the first critical reconstruction of this material, the references made to its entries will be left unnumbered in this paper.

12 Although Manduqu mentions the sources of LLSL (just like Ishida), he only states that LLSL “in many cases” apparently used them as means of “important orientation” (čiquła labaltä; Manduqu 1995: 389) and he does not recognize that practically the whole Sino-Mongol material of LLSL is borrowed from other sources, making it impossible to analyse its data as a representation of a single linguistic entity. Without this recognition he makes further analyses about the crucial features of Middle Mongol, like the initial h-, the unstable -n and sound changes of Middle Mongol in general, as if the LLSL data were relevant to a language spoken by the time of compilation (ibid., pp. 385–386). From the listing of the words kebit and qudaltu či ger in LLSL Manduqu comes to a conclusion that the word kebit was not in use at the end of the 16th century and it was replaced by the term qudaltu či ger (“kebit gesen' Uyiyur' yarul-tai ṣüge ni 16-daǰar jayun-u segülči bolqu-du nigeju keregdeki-ben boliju, qarq qudaltu či ger gesen őge-ber soliydaysan bayin-a” ibid., p. 386). In fact, the copyist of the LLSL did not list the latter because he considered kebit to be an obsolete form unfamiliar to him, but because he did what he was doing in all other cases of multiple entries, he routinely copied the various forms from other sources into the LLSL without any criticism and probably without even comprehending their actual meaning.

13 For a comparison see Kuribayashi 2003: ii; Apatóczky 2009: 7, etc.
The structural sequence of the entries in the LLSL is not as clear as in other Sino-Middle Mongol sources. The overwhelming majority of them, however, fit either of the following structures:

Ch曰Mo
Ch曰Mo也
MoCh也
其MoCh也
其曰MoCh也
其用Ch曰Mo
曰MoCh也
其ChMo

Ch曰Mo
Ch曰Mo也
MoCh也
其MoCh也
其曰MoCh也
其用Ch曰Mo
曰MoCh也
其ChMo
The most typical entry pattern looks like the following one:

1.3b10 秋曰納木兒.

Its explanation is:

1.3b10 qiū yuē nà-mù-ér 秋曰納木兒 Ch. ‘autumn, fall’ namur,

while in the index it will be listed as:

namur 1.3b10 (nà-mù-ér Ch. qiū) ‘autumn, fall’ (copied from WBZh «秋 納木兒»).

Even in the past decade scholars have made partial linguistic analyses of the “Translation” chapter in the LLSL thinking of it as a coherent and homogenous source for the Middle Mongolian.14 Now one of the most significant findings of the current project is that – with a handful of exceptions15 – every single entry of the LLSL is copied from somewhere else.

From this perspective we may say that the project has reached a perfect result as almost all entries found in the glossary were traced back to their original sources, thus unveiling the secret of the compilers. As a by-product, however, we can now seek some answers to the chronological and philological questions that so far were unclear about

---

14 Reading some of the very recent works published in China on various aspects of LLSL from university theses to academic papers, it is apparent that the scholars are analysing the Mongol vocabulary of the LLSL as if it represented a certain Middle Mongol linguistic entity; moreover, they are quoting LLSL data extensively to demonstrate a linguistic status relevant to the beginning of the 17th century. Some of these works are: Huang 2004: passim; Jiang 2012: 4; Wu 2013: 27–29.

15 See Appendix 1. These are mostly toponyms copied from other chapters of the LLSL. The number of original entries is extremely low compared to the approximately 1400 entries in LLSL; here it is important to point out that LLSL entries outnumber those of Hy (844) or BLYY (639).
the sources which the authors had used. With this help many uncertain or dubious cases have been clarified and corrected already.

The outcome of the work is not only a phonological and lexical reconstruction but it also resulted in a crucial ascertainment. As the findings of the project made it clear, the linguistic material in the LLSL is not homogenous and does not represent a single linguistic status. It can, however, throw some light on the chronological and philological questions concerning the earlier works incorporated in it.

Conclusion

The significance of the results of the reconstruction work lies in the fact that any linguistic conclusion reached during the investigation of the Mongol vocabulary in the LLSL is only valid for the actual source the compilers of the LLSL used, and that this material does not represent a single dialect or vernacular. Now, that owing to the findings of this project we already know the sources, further philological research can be performed. The first stage of this process will be the publishing of the full reconstructed text of the Mongolian vocabulary included in LLSL. As the similar Sino-Mongol glossaries are excessively cross-referenced, the questions of chronology, reinterpretation of uncertain cases and renegotiating of miscopied entries in the sources concerned could be the targets of future research.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLYY</td>
<td>Beilu yiyu (Yiyu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy</td>
<td>Hua Yi yiyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFYK</td>
<td>Jimen fang yu kao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLSL</td>
<td>Lulongsai lüe ‘Strategy of the Lulong pass’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>Mongol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBZh</td>
<td>Wu bei zhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMong</td>
<td>Written Mongol (or Classical Mongolian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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茅元儀: 武備志. 天啟元年(1621)本清活字本 [Mao Yuanyi (ed.): Wu bei zhi. Movable type copy of the original (first year of Tianqi period, 1621) version]. National Central Library, Rare Books/Special Collection Taipei, № 302.1 22268.
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Appendix

1. List of the original Sino-Mongol entries of the LLSL

a. Toponyms and ethnonyms

Čaqān qoto 1.6a23 会州城曰挿漢河套 (chā-hàn hé-tào Ch. huì zhōu chéng ‘Huizhou city’) lit. ‘white city’ (挿 is a character variant for 插, the Chinese toponym can be found throughout the non-bilingual chapters of LLSL, the Mongolian equivalent however, is copied from JFYK, cf. WBZh/2 «陽和 插汗 合托»);

ike marā 1.5a14 大鹹場曰以克馬喇大虜聚兵地也 (yī-kè mǎ-lā Ch. dà jiǎn cháng) toponym, lit. ‘great salt(y marsh)’;

Oyr[d] 1.7b3 北稱屬夷曰我勻兒 (wǒ-yūn-ér Ch. shǔ yí ‘subordinate barbars’) ‘the Oirats’ (夷 is a character variant for 夷);

qalā[n] usu 1.4b4 湯泉曰旱落兀素 (hàn-luò wù-sù Ch. tāng quán toponym, lit. ‘hot spring’) toponym, lit. ‘hot water’ (湯 is a character variant for 湯; the words are copied from the earlier scrolls №. 12 and 17 of LLSL that do not belong to the ‘Translation’ chapter);

qoyar su[b]raqa 1.6a2 曰火亞兒蘇喇哈 雙塔也 (huǒ-yà-ér sū-lā-hā Ch. shuāng tǎ) toponym, lit. ‘two pagodas’or ‘two stupas’;

Šangdu 1.5a15 濱河曰商都口外及大川入口也 (shāng-dū Ch. luán hé ‘Luan river’) ‘Xanadu (<Ch. 上都, Mongol city near the Luan river)’ (the Chinese toponym can be found throughout the non-bilingual chapters of LLSL).

b. Other

biże 1.8b4 姜曰鬮只 (bì-zhī ‘concubine’ qiè) ‘favorite concubine’(<Ch. 鬮妾);

daus-ba 1.13b12 終曰島思八 (dāo-sī-bā Ch. zhōng) ‘(has) finished’;

majī[ng] 2.8a16 藥脂曰馬支 (mā-zhī Ch. yán zhī ‘rouge, lipstick’) ‘ointment, lotion’.
2. Illustrations

Image 1. The first page of the “Translation”

Image 2. A page of the *itineraria picta* in chapter in the *Lulongsai liü* (LLSL) showing a section of the Great Wall