

P O L S K A
K O M I T E T

A K A D E M I A
N A U K
O R I E N T A L I S T Y C Z N Y C H

ROCZNIK ORIENTALISTYCZNY

ukazuje się od 1914/1915 r.

TOM LXXI

ZESZYT 2



WARSZAWA 2018

Wydawca:

Komitet Nauk Orientalistycznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk

Komitet Redakcyjny:

Marek M. Dziekan (redaktor naczelny), Marta Woźniak-Bobińska (sekretarz redakcji),
Jaakko Hämeen Antilla, Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, Eduard Gombár, Lidia Kasarekło,
Agnieszka Kozyra, Ewa Siwierska, Lidia Sudyka, Gábor Takacs

Rada Redakcyjna:

Janusz Danecki (Warszawa), Edward Lipiński (Bruksela), Alfred F. Majewicz (Toruń),
Piotr Taracha (Warszawa), Przemysław W. Turek (Kraków),
Vladimir Uspensky (St. Petersburg), Witold Witakowski (Uppsala)

Adres:

“Rocznik Orientalistyczny”
Faculty of Oriental Studies
University of Warsaw
00-927 Warsaw 64
e-mail: rorient@pan.pl

© Copyright by Komitet Nauk Orientalistycznych PAN and Dom Wydawniczy Elipsa

ISSN 0080-3545

ISBN 978-83-8017-238-8

Nakład 200 egz.



Realizacja wydawnicza:
Dom Wydawniczy ELIPSA
ul. Inflancka 15/198, 00-189 Warszawa
tel. 22 635 03 01, 22 635 17 85
e-mail: elipsa@elipsa.pl, www.elipsa.pl

Spis treści / List of Contents

Preface	7
Ákos Bertalan Apatóczy, <i>Early Mandarin Profanity and Its Middle Mongolian Reflection in the Vocabulary of the Wu Bei Zhi 武備志</i>	9
Viacheslav Chernev, <i>On the Use of Past Participle Forms in Ożon-ożak bala saĭ ("Quite a Long Childhood") by Mostay Kärim</i>	39
Gohar Hakobian, <i>Landscape Terminology in Western Iranian</i>	57
Murat Işık, <i>Oghuzic and Kipchak Characteristics in the Book of Leviticus, Gözleve Bible (1841)</i>	66
Stanisław Jan Kania, <i>Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla on the Cārvāka/Lokāyata aphorism: 'from these, consciousness' (tebhyaś caitanyam)</i>	77
Shahla Kazimova, <i>The Lost Legacy: The little known heritage of Azerbaijani emigration literature in Poland on the example of Mehmed Emin Resulzade's works</i>	94
Patrycja Koziel, <i>Oral Literature and Indigenous Knowledge: The Case of the San People from Southern Africa</i>	105
Petra Maurer, <i>Lexicography of the Tibetan Language with Special Reference to the "Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache"</i>	118
Michał Németh, <i>A Historical Phonology of Western Karaim. The Process of Its Diversification into Dialects. Part 2. Supplementary Data on the Absolute and Relative Chronology of Sound Changes</i>	146
Jamila Oueslati, <i>The Valued Beauty of Ġnā. A Genre of Tunisian Women's Songs</i>	162
Lidia Sudyka, <i>Kerala Women's Writing in Sanskrit: Ambādēvi Tampurāṭṭi of Cemprol Koṭṭāraṇi – Her Life and Literary Oeuvre</i>	187
Mark Turin and Benjamin Chung, <i>Colour Terms in Tibeto-Burman Languages</i>	198
Vladimir Uspensky, <i>About an Attempt to Use the Cyrillic Alphabet for the Mongolian Language</i>	249
Anna Zalewska, <i>Forgotten Jewels: Japan in Poetry and Prose Written by Polish Authors until 1939</i>	259
Lista Autorów / List of Authors	269
Lista Recenzentów RO LXXI, z. 1, 2 / List of Reviewers RO LXXI, nos 1, 2	270

ÁKOS BERTALAN APATÓCZKY

**Early Mandarin Profanity and Its Middle Mongolian Reflection
in the Vocabulary of the *Wu Bei Zhi* 武備志**

Abstract

Terms of impoliteness, rudeness and profanity are segments of vocabulary which old Chinese dictionaries, glossaries or encyclopaedias are not introducing in their full varieties. For this reason it is a kind of rarity when one finds a bunch of expressions apparently of vernacular origin, and it is even more extraordinary that they are not only listed in Chinese but being a part of a bilingual glossary included in the largest Chinese military compilation, the *Wu Bei Zhi* (武備志), they are provided with their Middle Mongolian translations. The author presents a study introducing the related vocabulary from both sides of the glossary and alongside he analyses the likeliness of their actual use by the time of compilation from the point of view of historical pragmatics.¹

Keywords: Cross-cultural pragmatics, profanity, vulgarity, obscenity, impoliteness, Early Mandarin Chinese, Middle Mongol, lexicology, diachronic linguistics, historical pragmatics

Historical pragmatics has been engaged in the scrutiny of various aspects of politeness in the past few decades when academia has experienced an upheaval in that topic.² Specialists of the field versed in Sinology also placed a focus on Chinese ways of

¹ I wish to express my gratitude to Profs. Elisabetta Ragagnin, Suying Hsiao, György Kara and Dániel Z. Kádár, as well as to Olivér Kápolnás, Béla Kempf, Hans Nugteren and all the colleagues at Academia Sinica, the National Central Library Taipei and Károli University Budapest for their help during the writing of this paper. A special acknowledgement is due to my anonymous reviewers for their thorough, helpful and thought provoking work. All remaining errors are entirely my own. The research which allowed to reach the present form of this paper was supported by the Taiwan Fellowship grant of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China No. MOFATF20190022.

² See the comparative figures on the frequency of the terms ‘politeness’ and ‘impoliteness’ used in academic works during the past decades in Culpeper–Haugh–Kádár 2017, pp. 3–6.

expressing courtesy.³ The opposite sign, i.e. linguistic rudeness, discourtesy, vulgarity, profanity and obscenity have also been researched but mostly on contemporary data, as it is difficult to attain historical records on that field.⁴ Written sources infrequently include explicit impoliteness and it is exponentially true speaking of scholarly Chinese (or Mongolian⁵) sources, let alone their translations into other languages.⁶ Although some vulgar expressions have penetrated into the classic novels of the Ming-Qing era (like the *Jin Ping Mei* 金瓶梅⁷), Chinese literati never really broke the tradition of linguistic chastity until modern times. It is therefore an especially rare chance to be able to examine a relatively large portion of the related lexicon, many items of which are forming idiomatic structures. The rarity of the data presented here is even doubled up as the source is a Sino-Mongol bilingual glossary giving a chance not only to see into the Early Mandarin Chinese profanity but also into its representation in the Late Middle Mongolian. As the research on linguistic politeness considers it of importance to take the most diverse data possible as the subject of analysis, this study may contribute a significant amount of information for historical cross-cultural pragmatics.

The *Wu Bei Zhi* 武備志 (‘Remarks on Military Preparations’ 1621; WBZh) by *Mao Yuanyi* 茅元儀 is the largest ever military compilation in the history of Chinese literature with its 240 volumes. Its rich contents consists of descriptions of strategy, tactics, historical depiction and analysis of famous battles, structural setup of military units, wartime logistics, training of troops as well as outlines of, by the time of compilation, state-of-the-art applied military science including geography, meteorology, navigation etc. Next to its invaluable contribution to Chinese military theory it also contains chapters that are important sources for historical linguists. Chapter (*juan* 卷) 227 consists of two separate Sino-Mongol glossaries. First of them is the famous *Yiyu* 譯語 (not titled so in the WBZh where both glossaries are listed under the chapter title *Beilu kao* 北虜考),⁸ also known from the somewhat earlier *Dengtan Bijiu* 登壇必究 (1599) under the same

³ For comprehensive studies on the topic see Kádár 2007, 2017; Culpeper–Kádár 2010; Pan–Kádár 2011, Kádár–Mills 2011 and Kádár–Haugh 2013.

⁴ The examples that do appear in scholarly literature from historical corpora are mostly semi-rude, bookish utterances – no wonder, as they are all from literary works, or at least from the texts written by lettered authors, although representing different styles but very seldom unsophisticated spoken variants (cf. Pan–Kádár 2011, pp. 65–66). Nevertheless we may very well agree with the authors’ view that: “The existence of rude language in Chinese might not be too surprising, considering that the existence of rudeness is the intercultural standard and a language completely exempt of rudeness, in particular swearwords, would be somewhat ‘exotic’”. (p. 66). The only thing we may add as a preliminary ascertainment is that in this respect Mongolian is not an exotic language either, as it will soon be apparent in the following pages.

⁵ For a collection of obscene vocabulary in Middle Mongol see Rybatzki 2017.

⁶ Rybatzki 2017, p. 581: *Obscene (and not so obscene) words are, due to prudery, seldom dealt with in Turkic and Mongolic lexicography. (...) Due to puritanism, Mo[n]golian./Tu[rkic].-Ru[ssian]. dictionaries do not quote most of words dealt with in this paper.*

⁷ The stormy history of this notorious novel and its fluctuation between permitted and banned statuses under the Ming and mostly the even more rigorous Qing censorship is examined substantially in Qi 2018, pp. 14–16.

⁸ Although the title *Beilu yiyu* is actually mentioned in the explanatory text separating the two glossaries but it is meant for the second glossary.

name as well as by the title *Beilu Yiyu* 北虜譯語 (distinguish the *Beilu yiyu* or *Dada yu* 韃靼語 presented by Alexei Pozdnev (1908) that covers the same contents as the second glossary of the WBZh, i.e. the topic of this article).⁹ The *Dengtan Biji* version of the *Yiyu/Beilu yiyu* (abbreviated as *By* in Apatóczy 2009) was copied in the WBZh in its entirety, keeping the structure of the original, but omitting some details, like that on the authorship (or more precisely the identity of the scribes) of the compilation, which is clearly stated in the Peking University Library blockprint version (abbreviated as *PUL* in Apatóczy 2009).¹⁰ The second glossary incorporated in the WBZh is cited in the linking text between the two glossaries from a source called *Jimen fang yu kao* (JFYK 薊門防禦考), the original of which is not extant but its data (henceforth abbreviated as WBZh/2) which will be investigated in this study is known owing to the WBZh. This bilingual Sino-Mongol data recorded in the WBZh although published by the end of Ming, was copied from the JFYK, collecting its vocabulary partly from an earlier period, probably from the late Yuan or early Ming era, and partly from the very late Ming times.¹¹ Thus, its Chinese transcriptions represent both a northern version of Late Old Mandarin along with Modern Mandarin while the transcribed Mongolian material consists of both Middle Mongolian and (very) Late Middle Mongolian (or as Shimunek refers to it: Early Modern Mongolian) vocabulary.¹²

⁹ On its various versions see Rykin 2016, pp. 148–151. In this paper the photocopy of the original WBZh version (i.e. the one containing *juan* 228 on Jurchens before it got censored out in the Qing times) ff. 15a–29a, while for a partially censored Qing version the copy of the National Central Library, Taipei were used: *Wu Bei zhi* 武備志, by Mao Yuanyi 茅元儀, call No. 302.1 22268.


¹⁰ *Shanben tezang yuelanshi* 善本特藏閱覽室 (‘Collection of rare and special books’) № 9060. On its various versions see Apatóczy 2009, pp. 3–6.

¹¹ The explanation for the assumable existence of an earlier version lies in the interconnecting text inserted between the two WBZh glossaries, which states that the second glossary was copied from the JFYK, and not much is known about its source. Rykin’s elaborated dating of the text between 1567 and 1603 (Rykin 2016, pp. 151–158) is based on the late Ming toponyms included in it and that dating is certainly true for the extant version. In lack of the original JFYK, it does not, however, exclude the theoretical possibility, that these specific terms are late insertions that matched the then actual needs of a refurbished military compilation. This would not be a rare phenomenon as the Sino-Mongol glossaries are often using updated, corrected or emended data (or at least what compilers meant as such) of earlier glossaries, along with an extremely large number of “cross-references”, practices that are very rarely mentioned by the authors. Another fact that supports the idea of a chronologically multi-layered lexicon here is that its Mongolian vocabulary contains words in both their Middle Mongol “proper” and their early Modern Mongol versions (cf. Shimunek 2014, pp. 101–102), and likewise, the Chinese transcriptive characters represent different historical stages of the Chinese language (cf. Shimunek 2014, pp. 101–110). According to Rykin, the Mongolic language material of the glossary “should be better identified as belonging to a transitional stage between Middle Mongol and Modern Mongolian, with a statistically significant predominance of linguistic features characteristic of the latter” (Rykin 2018, p. 319). An equally plausible scenario for the phenomenon is that the vocabulary was at least partly copied from earlier sources and supplemented with the material of the actual time of compilation. One may also think of the case of the LLSL *Yibu*, which is still quoted even by our contemporaries as a valid linguistic source for the beginning of the 17th century only because the dating of the text, even though its complete material was proved to have been collected from earlier sources (cf. Apatóczy 2016).


¹² On the versions of the WBZh/2 text see Rykin 2016, pp. 149–151. On the characterization of the Mongol material therein cf. Shimunek 2014, pp. 100. and Rykin 2018, pp. 318–319, while for that of the Chinese material cf. Shimunek 2014 pp., 103–104.

The terms discussed in this paper can be divided into two main groups: 1. body parts and 2. physiological functions. They are usually omitted in similar compilations as most often they are considered taboo.

There is but a single entry not fitting into either of the above mentioned two categories, yet to be introduced here as it often functions as an element of curses and that is 衍衍 ‘brothel; prostitute’:

WBZh/2 238	
衍衍 háng yuan	
火岳利 huǒ-yuè-lì ¹³	

This expression was not even listed by the compilers among the curses but together with other vocations, in which sense it is not even to be treated as a vulgar term. However, I decided to include it here because it appears in truly vulgar expressions below (WBZh/2 629 as *huǒ-yán-lì* 火言力). In the present WBZh photocopy the left characters of this part are hardly visible, but with the help of the other WBZh versions and the LLSL text they are recognisable.

LLSL 1.7a25	
衍衍曰火岳利 háng yuàn yuē huǒ-yuè-lì	

The second character of the Mongolian word is either a scribal error existing already in WBZh/2 238 copied by the LLSL, and should be read 言 like in WBZh/2 629, or we may reconstruct two different variants *qoyoli* and *qoyalli*, respectively (衍 is a character variant for 衍).

Ch. WBZh/2 238 衍衍 and 629 養漢, LLSL 1.7a25 衍衍 ‘brothel; prostitute’; Mong. *qoyoli*, *qoyalli* ‘lust, lasciviousness; prostitute’ (cf. WMong. *quyali* ‘lust, lasciviousness’).¹⁴

¹³ Pinyin Romanization of the transcriptive characters is not representative in terms of relevant quondam phonetic or phonologic values, it is only a mean to make the identification of the characters easier.

¹⁴ The primary aim of this paper is to present the concerned data on both sides from a point of view of historical pragmatics, therefore the question of the exact phonetic manifestations will be disregarded and somewhat

1. Body parts and physiological functions

Intimate parts and their bodily roles are often ignored in the Chinese lexicons but in the WBZh/2 they are widely mentioned. It is noticeable, however, that they form a separate body of lexicon not mixed up with other “ordinary” words and, as such, listed in one block in the text. The first headword of this section is the Chinese 奶頭 ‘breasts’:

WBZh/2 257	
奶頭 nǎi tóu	奶頭
可可 kě-kě	可可

It is translated into Mongolian as *kökö* ‘id.’ The whole entry reappears in the LLSL with the Chinese headword changed to 乳 bearing the same meaning:


LLSL 1.9b25	
乳曰可可 rǔ yuē kě-kě	乳曰可可

Ch. WBZh/2 257 奶頭; LLSL 1.9b25 乳 ‘breasts’; Mong. *kökö* ‘id.’ (cf. WMong. *kökö*).


*

“normalized” phonemic reconstructions will be used for the sake of usability. Should a strict phonetic reconstruction have been the goal, then an initial *χ*- would have been used in the present entry, and likewise *ʈ* would have been used in WBZh/2 624 and 630; cf. Rykin 2012a, 2013, 2014, 2015. Whenever the identification of the expressions used in either of the language is reliably possible, no further diachronic data will be cited (unless they are inevitably necessary to reconstruct a term), as they are readily available in the cited literature. In the case of the LLSL headwords the characters taken into account in the reconstruction are set bold typeface (along with their respective transcription), whereas explanatory parts are left in regular typeface.

In the case of WBZh/2 258 a semantic inaccuracy between the Chinese and Mongolian term is apparent as 腎囊 primarily means ‘scrotum’ while its Mongolian translation 我着害 reconstructs as *oǰ<o>qai* ‘penis’.

WBZh/2 258	
腎囊 shèn náng	
我着害 wǒ-zhe(zhù)-hài	

This entry was also copied to the LLSL without any changes:

LLSL 1.10a25 腎囊曰我着害 shèn náng yuē wǒ-zhe(zhù)-hài	

The character 着, a variant of 著, already functioned as the toneless progressive aspect marker *zhe* by the time of compilation, and it appears as such in this text several times (e.g. 看着人行 etc.). What further supports a disyllabic, i.e. Modern Mongolic reading here instead of reading it with a *-ǰo-* or *-ǰu-* middle syllable, is an earlier headword in WBZh/2: 秃子 哈着蓋兒 *qaj<e>gar* ‘bald’ (WMong. *qojǰar*; Khal. *xoǰgor*; Barin (Sun 1990) *xodǰgar*, Kharchin (Sun 1990) *xodǰgor* etc.). For these words it was a convenient way to use Chinese 着 for a lone Mongolian *ǰ* in a *-VǰC-* sequence.

Ch. WBZh/2 258; LLSL 1.10a25 腎囊 ‘scrotum’; Mong. *oǰ<o>qai* ‘penis’ (cf. WMong. *oǰoǰai* ‘id., (also vulg.)’). 着 is a character variant for 著.

WBZh/2 entry No. 259 is a result of a scribal error. Its Chinese item 卵子 literally meaning ‘eggs’ is a euphemistic metaphor for male genitals.

<p>WBZh/2 259</p> <p>卵子 luǎn zǐ</p> <p>好兒當 hǎo-er-dāng</p>	<p>卵子 好兒當</p>
--	-------------------

The Mongolian part poses some difficulties in reading, and the LLSL text is not helping either, as the Mongolian word is represented by the very same characters:

<p>LLSL 1.10a26</p> <p>勢曰好兒當</p> <p>shì yuē hǎo-ér-dāng</p>	<p>勢曰好兒當</p>
---	--------------

The only difference there is that the Chinese word had been exchanged to 勢 ‘male genitals; potential’ probably because the original expression sounded too coarse to the compilers. It seems also clear that the base of the scribal error regarding the Mongolian word in the WBZh/2 (and thus also in the LLSL) text was the similarity, frequent use and the relative position of the characters *hā* 哈 and *ér* 兒. In order to come to a satisfactory reconstruction of the word in question we have to make an emendation and read *hā* 哈 instead of *ér* 兒.¹⁵ When using *dāng* 當 for rendering the Mongolian syllable *naḡ* two separate sets of phonetic substitutions were applied: a weak one (a substitution by the place of articulation: alveolar plosive for alveolar nasal) for the onset, and a strong one (substitution by both the place and the manner of articulation: uvular nasal for velar

¹⁵ This assumption seems to be likely considering the fact that the character 兒 here stands right next to 合, a very similar character to 哈, of the next line, and even more so, if we realize that 兒 reappears in the same position in the following line again, creating a cluster of similar characters easy to get confused with. The frequency of these transcriptive characters also supports the setup in which an inattentive scribe might have mixed up the two characters.

plosive) for the coda.¹⁶ Thus the speculated Mongolian word is Mong. *qauqanaġ* ‘scrotum’ perfectly matching the Chinese headword.

Ch. WBZh/2 259 卵子 ‘egg; male genitals, informal for testicles’, LLSL 1.10a26 勢 ‘id.’; Mong. *qauqanaġ* ‘scrotum’ (cf. WMong. *quuqanay*).

*

The Chinese headword of WBZh/2 260 陰戶 is a neutral term for female genitals.

WBZh/2 260	陰 戶
陰戶 yīn hù	戶 五
五毒戶 wǔ-dú-hù	毒

The Mongolian translation *üdühü/üdügü* ‘vagina, vulva; cunt’ is accurate inasmuch it also may belong to a less vulgar register where context allows. It also covers nonetheless a much ruder tone. What is worth mentioning here is the lack of the initial *h-* in *üdühü/üdügü*, which would be expected as an usual form recorded in the Middle Mongolian (cf. VdI/Ligeti *hütügün*; MA *hütügün*) and its absence probably reflects a later Middle Mongolian or a pre-modern linguistic status or else an Eastern dialectal form of the Middle Mongolian.

The character that appears in the LLSL for the headword of this entry is slightly modified, containing a more vulgar form. However, the character 閉 representing the word is not the usual 屙, since 閉 is used as an euphemism for the other character thought to be discourteous.

LLSL 1.10a27 閉曰五毒戶 bì yuē wǔ-dú-hù	閉 曰 五 毒 戶
--	-----------------------

¹⁶ For the latter type cf. Rykin, p. 2012b 331/2b.

Ch. WBZh/2 260 陰戶 ‘vagina, vulva’, LLSL 1.10a27 閉 lit. ‘to close; hole of a door bolt’ here: ‘cunt’; Mong. *üdühü/üdügü* ‘vagina, vulva, cunt’ (cf. WMong. *ütügün*).

*

The Chinese headword 陰毛 of WBZh/2 261 is a neutral term for pubic hair.

WBZh/2 261	陰 毛 各 卜
陰毛	
yīn máo	
卜各	
bo-lin	

The Mongolian part, however, is more challenging to capture for which one can make use of the LLSL text where the entry looks as follows:

LLSL 1.10a28 其毛曰小各 qí máo yuē xiǎo-lìn	其 毛 曰 小 各
--	-----------------------


It seems now obvious that one of the initial characters (卜 and 小) of the Mongolian word in the two versions is a scribal error and if we consult the diachronic data, the LLSL text proves to contain the correct character. The reconstructed Mongolian word is thus *seüril* ‘pubic hair’¹⁷ (cf. MA *se’ürel*, Ord. *süril* ‘poils sur les parties génitales’, WMong. *segürel*, *següril* Khal. *süürel* ‘id.’).

Ch. WBZh/2 261 陰毛 ‘pubic hair’, LLSL 1.10a28 其毛 ‘its hair (referring to the previous entry)’; Mong. *seüril* ‘id.’ (cf. WMong. *segürel*).


*

¹⁷ Revised reading of Apatóczy 2016, p. 22 and 147.

The interpretation of the following item is an intricate one. The Chinese headword 大便 ‘excrement’ is followed by an ambiguous Mongolian translation.

<p>WBZh/2 262</p> <p>大便 dà biàn</p> <p>卜合兒¹⁸ bǔ(/bo)-hé-er</p>	
---	---

The parallel LLSL text contains a different Chinese headword 尻戶 ‘anus’ paired with the same Mongolian equivalent:

<p>LLSL 1.10a29</p> <p>尻戶曰卜合兒¹⁹</p> <p>kāo hù yuē bǔ(/bo)-hé-ér</p>	
---	---

As for the Mongolian part, the words representing either meaning of the different Chinese headwords are relatively easy to find and theoretically by establishing a more likely scenario the possible original Chinese headword might also be speculated. The question of originality of the WBZh/2 texts has already been dealt with by Rykin (2016):

For these reasons, P[ozdneev] may be viewed as the best and earliest copy of the glossary, closer to the lost original, whereas W[u Bei Zhi], on the contrary, looks like a later and somewhat emended version. However, the fact that W contains five entries (Nos. 395, 397, 630, 633, 684) which are missing in P, as well as an extensive group of more reliable readings than those preserved in the latter, enables us to regard both copies as separate, independently deriving from a non-extant original.

Here we may add that although there is a chance that in certain instances one may securely rely on Pozdneev’s text when it differs from that of the WBZh/2’s, but some

¹⁸ Pozdneev, p. 17 卜兒合.

¹⁹ 尻 is a character variant for 尻/尻.

philological issues (like the whole entries copied in erroneous context because of copying the wrong lines)²⁰ make it difficult to state that his text is superior in terms of originality or accuracy. This seems likely to be the case with the present entry, as well, since Pozdneev's text contains 大偏 卜合兒, a very confusing instance on both sides. First of all, a semantically utterly unfitting character *piān* 偏 replaced *biàn* 便, while the three characters of the Mongolian word have been mixed up. Besides, the whole entry is a whole line afar from its logically matching neighbour meaning 'to urine'.

On the other hand the extensive contingent of entries copied to the LLSL supplements further information on the enigma of the copying sequence.²¹ One thing is certain: some of the LLSL entries differ a lot from both the WBZh/2 and Pozdneev's version, and although some of them can be mere scribal errors (and continuations of scribal errors already present in the earlier texts), quite a few of them seem to feature either the untouched parts of an assumed original text or are intentional emendations. It looks like the LLSL's corresponding headword for the ones present in both the WBZh/2 (大便) and in Pozdneev's source (大偏) was either still there in its unchanged form 尻戶 in the LLSL (or rather, in the unknown version that was copied, to be more precise) or it was "corrected" by the LLSL editors (quite unlikely as LLSL is probably the most carelessly compiled glossary we can deal with in terms of philological accuracy).

There are two possible disentanglements for unfolding this entry with a considerably larger possibility of the second one.

1. The meaning of the Chinese headword in WBZh/2 大便 is regarded as the base of reconstruction. Thus the Mongolian part 卜合兒 may be reconstructed as *bokir* 'dirt (i.e. excrement)'. If we accept this reconstruction, it also means that in Pozdneev's text the whole entry has been misplaced from the part on physiological functions to the part on body parts (this would not be unprecedented, see footnote 20). The reconstruction of the Mongolian word is highly problematic, though.
2. The meaning of the Chinese headword of the LLSL 尻戶 is regarded as the base of reconstruction. Thus the Mongolian part 卜合兒 may be reconstructed as *buqar* 'anus'. This inherently conveys the assumption that the compilers of the LLSL had access to a version of the text (probably the JFYK) which still contained the matching Chinese headword.²² With this assumption the LLSL seems to contain the full original entry, while Pozdneev's text the original sequence, as in his version the entry, although in quite a distorted form and not even containing the matching headword, is not next to 'urine' but among parts of the body. However likely is the Mongolian reconstruction of this solution, it triggers the question: why such an important and manifest physiological function as defecation is missing from the enumeration if urination is included?

²⁰ Like WBZh/2 entries 636 《看着人行》 and 637 《叫南朝人》 were copied mistakenly between the wrong lines in Pozdneev 1908, pp. 34–35.

²¹ For the scheme of assumed relative chronology see also: Apatóczy 2018, p. 11.

²² For detailed diachronic data on this word see Rybatzki 2017, p. 584 *baqaur* (dev. n. ← **baqa-*) 'hind, buttock'. Khal. бyxууp 'buttock, ramp', Baoan *bogor* (Bökh-Liu 1982, p. 86.); Kangjia бᠪᠠᠭᠠᠷ~бᠪᠠᠭ 'female genitals' (Sečencogtu 1999, p. 283b). Cf. also Nugteren 2011, p. 284 **bogar*; Nugteren-Ragagnin-Roos 2015, p. 343 **bogaar*.

In the first case the reconstruction of the Mongolian word is problematic, as the character 合 is not perfectly matching, and 卜 in most cases renders Mongolic *bu* in Sino-Mongol texts, but considering the accuracy of the transcriptions in question the possibility of this reading is not zero. The Chinese headwords of both WBZh/2 and Pozdneev's text further assists this assumption. What in spite of all makes the second case more plausible is the linguistic evidence it contains, that is, it offers a much more straightforward reconstruction on the Mongolian side (only a *hā* 哈 → *hé* 合 textual corruption is presumable), and that the reconstructed word is matching the Chinese headword of the LLSL without special efforts.

Ch. WBZh/2 262 大便 'excrement', LLSL 1.10a29 尻戶 'anus'; Mong. *bokir* 'dirt (i.e. excrement)', or *buqar* 'buttocks, anus' (cf. WMong. *bokir* and *buqur*). 尻 is a character variant for 尻/尻.

*

In WBZh/2 263 the Chinese headword is 尿 'to urinate':

WBZh/2 263	尿
尿 niào	伯捨
捨伯 shě-bǎi	

It was translated into Mongolian as *šē-be* 'has urinated'. The entry was also copied to the LLSL:

1.10a30 溺曰捨伯 ²³ niào yuē shě-bǎi	溺 曰 捨 伯
---	------------------

This is a simple case, only the compilers of the LLSL chose a more elegant form of the character for the Chinese headword. As the entry features a verb phrase on both sides, one of the few verbal suffixes, i.e. the past tense marker *-ba* (often utilized as


²³ 溺 is a character variant for 尿, 捨 is a character variant for 捨.

a dictionary form in such compilations, cf. WBZh/2 25 霹靂 滕格利你兒克伯) in the Mongolian translation can be found.


Ch. WBZh/2 263 尿; LLSL 1.10a30 溺 ‘urine; to urinate’; Mong. *šē-be* ‘has urinated’ (cf. WMong. *sige-*). Alternatively read *sù* 宿 instead of *bǎi* 伯 for Mong. *šēsü* ‘urine’ (although it is difficult to explain why would the compilers have used a different character for *-sü* than for *-su* in the next entry).

*

More has happened to the next entry of WBZh/2 when it was copied to the LLSL:

WBZh/2 264	
屎 shǐ	
把素 bǎ-sù	

First of all the character of its Chinese word has been exchanged to *shǐ* 矢 (lit. ‘arrow’) either as result of negligence, or to use a less explicit character to blunt the impoliteness of its meaning – ‘excrement; to defecate’.²⁴ What is surely to blame for the inattention of the scribe is making 孛 out of the original 素, of which the latter is to be read in the LLSL text, too.

LLSL 1.10a31 矢曰把孛 shǐ yuē bǎ-bó	

²⁴ On the replacement of characters impolite in their meanings with more polite ones see a short summing up at Spielmanns-Rome 2014, pp. 72–73. In her description she also mentions the word 屎 replaced by other characters: “Während obszöne Ausdrücke mit „pornographischen“ Inhalten in einsprachigen Sammlungen chinesischer Sagwörter tabuisiert und komplett ausgespart werden, ist der als vulgär zu bezeichnende Fäkalbereich in nahezu allen Sammlungen vertreten. So gibt es u.a. einige Sagwörtern, in denen das Wort shǐ 屎 (Kot, Mist, Kacke) für Wortspiele mit den Homiophonen shì 事 (Angelegenheit) oder sǐ 死 (Tod) verwendet wird.”

The Mongolian translation is quite precise in terms of lexicology, for the Chinese noun lacking verbal meaning is not translated into Mongolian as a verb phrase, as it could be expected following the example of the previous entry, but as a noun.

Ch. WBZh/2 264 屎 ‘excrement; to defecate’, is rendered in the LLSL 1.10a31 as 矢, lit. ‘arrow’ (here = 屎 ‘excrement’); Mong. Mong. *bāsu* ‘excrement’ (but one should read *sù* 素 instead of *bó* 孛), (cf. WMong. *bayasun*.)

2. Scolding

The general Chinese term for scolding 罵 ‘to scold’ serves as the preamble of the “scolding section” in WBZh/2 623:

WBZh/2 623	罵
罵	罵
mà	喇哈
哈喇	
hā-lǎ	

The regular Mongolian equivalent *qarā-* ‘to scold’, written as *hā-lǎ*, is given here as a verbal stem.

Ch. WBZh/2 623 罵 ‘to scold’; Mong. *qarā-* ‘to scold’ (cf. WMong. *qariya-*).

*

Chinese headword *dǎ* 打 ‘to hit; to beat up’ in WBZh/2 624 is an odd one among the terms on scolding, but as the act described in them, it often accompanied them and the compilers evidently found this word fitting the context.

WBZh/2 624	打
打	打
dǎ	乞眼
眼乞	
yǎn-qǐ	

With an initial *y-* vs. WMong. and Khal. *ǰ-* (SH *ǰanči-*, AT *ǰanči-*; MA *ǰanči-*; cf. Clauson 1972, p. 945b *yanč-* ‘to crush’) the Mongolian translation *yanči-* ‘to hit; to beat

up’ perfectly equals modern peripheral Mongolic data (cf. Mostaert 1968, p. 396a *jantš* ‘i-‘frapper (avec un fouet, un bâton)’; Ramstedt 1935, p. 214b *Ölöt jantš* ‘χp ‘schlagen, klopfen’.²⁵ Since e.g. the Ordos region and the geographical districts mentioned in the WBZh/2 are located not far from each other it is rational to assume that the WBZh/2 data here features an early forerunner of certain modern forms, or rather, that those modern forms are not that modern after all (see Clauson’s Turkic data above).

Ch. WBZh/2 624 打 ‘to hit; to beat up’; Mong. *yanči*- ‘id.’ (cf. WMong. *janči*-)

*

The Chinese term in WBZh/2 625 罵奴才 ‘to scold a slave’ was copied fragmentarily from the WBZh/2 to the LLSL omitting the verb and changing its object to an entirely unfitting one.

WBZh/2 625 罵奴才 mà nú cái 頂什散 dǐng-shí-sàn	
---	--

Having a look at the actual character used in the LLSL it is easy to posit the possible cause of the change, namely the inattention of the scribe who merged the two separate characters 罵奴 into 駑.

LLSL 1.9a13 駑材曰頂什散 nú cái yuē dǐng-shí-sǎn	
--	--

²⁵ On the origin of Kalmyk *y*- here cf. Kempf 2012, p. 159, where he analyses it as Tatar influence (<*yan* ‘č ‘id.’).

The Mongolian translation is a bit different from the Chinese meaning as it features an expression of an actual scolding rather than describing it as the Chinese term does. The verb *dengši-* is supplemented by the perfective suffix *-(G)saAn*.

An important difference in Pozdneev's *Dada yu* text is that the character 奴 'slave' is marked missing with a symbol 𠄎 often used when a certain character was illegible or if it fell victim to imperial censorship:²⁶



Ch. WBZh/2 625 罵奴才 頂什散 'to scold a slave', LLSL 1.10a31 驚材 (read *mà nú cái* 罵奴才 instead of *nú cái* 驚材) 'id.'; Mong. *dengši-(g)sen* '[scolding someone for being] indolent, idling; gossiping' (+PFV), (cf. WMong. *dengsi-*).

*

The remaining entries were not copied to the LLSL so we must rely on the WBZh/2 and Pozdneev's data. The Chinese expression in 罵老漢子狗骨頭 WBZh/2 626 means 'to curse the man/husband [to be a] *dog's bone*', the latter part being a common swearing.

²⁶ Although this symbol is used throughout in Pozdneev's material also when the original character was unclear, it would be tempting to blame imperial Chinese censors who, under the Qing, were overly sensitive to certain characters that were being hunted for and cut out from the earlier texts. The character 奴, for instance, could easily be disliked in the Qing dynasty not only for its primary meaning, which was often used by the Chinese to stand for their barbarian neighbours, Manchus included, but also for earlier it had been used in the ethnonyms *Núdi* 奴狄 and *Núzhí* 奴直, earlier variations of *Rúzhēn* 汝真 or *Rúzhēn/Nǚzhēn* 女真 (cf. Crossley 2016, p. 38), the Chinese name of the *Jurchen*, the 10–13th century predecessors of the Manchus. Nurhaci's son Abahai (Hong Taiji) was the one who had changed the ethnonym *Jurchen* (*jušen*) to *Manchu* in his 1635 decree (cf. Gernet 1996, p. 466), as even that form was not glorious enough for his dynastic plans (on the related taboos and character use cf. Wang 2018, pp. 241–244 and Kápolnás 2016, p. 42: "A névváltás egyik oka az lehetett, hogy a dzsürcsi szónak szolgálja jelentése is volt." ["One of the reasons for changing the ethnonym was that the name *Jurchi* had also a 'servant' meaning".]). From a later version of the WBZh an entire part on the *Jurchens* (*juan* 228) was removed (cf. Franke 1968, p. 209). Following this thread one may hypothesize that the 𠄎 symbol in Pozdneev's text may well mark that its source was copied (or undergone censorial editing) during the Qing. The hypothesis, however, fails at the point where one finds WBZh entry no. 646 with the Mongolian term *unu-* 'to ride a horse' written with the characters 兀奴, both of which also appear in Pozdneev's text, thus ruling out a possible censorial deletion or, at least, a thorough one. The National Central Library copy is unique in this regard as some expressions, mostly related to the appellations of the *Jurchens* have already been deleted by the censors, while others of the same kind have been preserved. The so far best dating for the WBZh text is that of Rykin's superb philological analysis (Rykin 2016), in which he estimates the *post quem* and *ante quem* termini to be 1567–1603 (or 1590), but it only concerns the direct source of Pozdneev's manuscript, the latter being, in all likelihood, a later copy of the original (see also footnote 11).

WBZh/2 626 罵老漢子狗骨頭 mà lǎo hàn zi gǒu gǔ tou 只各言奎路 zhǐ-gè-yán kuí-lù	罵 老 漢 子 狗 骨 頭 奎 只 路 各 言
---	--

The Mongolian translation is not less interesting, as it is not a verbatim one but a real-life equivalent that can be reconstructed as *jige-yen kūrū* – ‘*kūrū* of [your] father’ (cf. WBZh/2 219). Chin. 老漢子 ‘man, husband’, Mong. 奎路 *kūrū* ‘id.’, here and elsewhere in the WBZh/2 material 奎路 is used to translate Chinese 老漢子 (cf. also Mostaert 1968 p. 702a *tš’igejē turū* ‘tête de ton père’ and 434a–435b *k’uīlī* ‘?’.) It is also possible that 奎 is a miscopied character and should be read 秃 like in the following WBZh/2 627 entry and thus it can be reconstructed as *jige-yen turū* ‘head of [your] father’.

Ch. WBZh/2 626 罵老漢子狗骨頭 ‘to curse the man/husband [to be a] dog’s bone’; Mong. *jige-yen kūrū* – ‘*kūrū* of [your] father’ or *jige-yen turū* ‘head of [your] father’ (cf. WMong. *ečige*; *terigün*).

*

In the case of WBZh/2 627, the Chinese offense 罵老婆子老養漢 means ‘to scold the wife [being an] old whore’.

WBZh/2 627 罵老婆子老養漢 mà lǎo pó zi lǎo yǎng hàn 我克言秃路 wǒ-kè-yán tū-lù	罵 老 婆 子 老 養 漢 秃 我 路 克 言
--	--

The Mongolian translation, again, is rather reflecting the temper of the speaker by equalling the Chinese term as *öke-yen turū* ‘head of [your] mother’ than giving its literal meaning.

Ch. WBZh/2 627 罵老婆子老养漢 ‘to scold the wife [being an] old prostitute’; Mong. *öke-yen turū* ‘head of [your] mother’ (cf. WMong. *eke; terigün*).

*

The Chinese expression in WBZh/2 628 罵漢子忘八 ‘to scold the man (or husband) [to be a] pimp (lit. a tortoise)’ contains one of the most widely used Chinese curses. The word 忘八 (often written as 王八) may refer to immoral and corrupt persons, and its connotation with the meaning ‘turtle’ is based on the alleged promiscuity of that animal, thus meaning ‘misbegotten’. Further explanations of the term analyse it as ‘someone who forgets the eight virtues’ (for 忘八) as well as ‘the eighth [child] of the Wang [family]’ (for 王八).

WBZh/2 628 罵漢子忘八 mà hànzi wàng bā 把喇散也麥惱害 bǎ-lǎ-sàn yě mài-nǎo-hài	
--	--

In this case the Mongolian translation *bele[w]sen ē menekei* ‘oh [that/you] widowed tortoise’ is a partial metaphrase, as the first word is an old Mongolian swearword, but *menekei* is not a widely mentioned animal in Mongolian vulgarism. The word *ē* (and its back vowel form *ā*) on the other hand is an often used exclamation to address someone in Mongolian, as well as a form of interjection. Another equally probable elucidation for 把喇散 is *bara[q]san* ‘finished off, ended; worn out; wasted’ (cf. Rykin 2012a p. 99), but its likelihood can only be sustained if 也 is not interpreted as a Mongolian addressing *ē* (which, when used after a word, implicates vowel harmony) but something else (like Inner Mongolian genitive *-(n)ā*). What superficially looks like a valid argument against *bele[w]sen* is the back vocalic Chinese rendering of the front vocalic Mongolian word, but that is very usual for Sino-Mongol glossaries (*Yiyu*, for instance, transcribes a Mongolian *be* solely by 八, 伯 and 把; cf. Apatóczky 2009 p. 210).

Ch. WBZh/2 628 罵漢子忘八 ‘to scold the man (or husband) [to be a] pimp (lit. a tortoise)’; Mong. *bele[w]sen ē menekei* ‘oh, [that/you] widowed tortoise’. (Cf. WMong. *belbesün; ye; melekei/menekei*). Alternatively read *bara[q]san-(n)ā menekei* ‘wasted tortoise’ (+PFV) (cf. Wmong. *bara-*).

*

The Chinese headword of WBZh/2 629 is almost a complete reduplication of no. 627:

WBZh/2 629 罵老婆子養漢 mà lǎo pó zi yǎng hàn 把喇散火言力 bǎ-lǎ-sàn huǒ-yán-li	
---	--

The Mongolian counterpart, however, is totally different from that of 627 and reads: *bele[w]sen qoyalli* ‘widowed whore’.

Ch. WBZh/2 629 罵老婆子養漢 ‘to scold the wife [being a] whore’; Mong. *bele[w]sen qoyalli* ‘widowed whore’ (cf. WMong. *belbesün*; *quyali*.) Alternatively read *bara[q]san qoyalli* ‘wasted whore’ (cf. WBZh/2 628; Wmong. *bara-*).

*

The Chinese rude expression 罵小子狗雜種 in WBZh/2 630 translates ‘to scold the child [being a] bastard’ (lit. ‘various seed of dogs’). The compound 雜種 is a common insult for illegitimate children.

WBZh/2 630 罵小子狗雜種 mà xiǎozi gǒu zázhǒng 我納暗海納也乞 wǒ-nà-àn hǎi-nà yě qǐ	
---	--

In Mongolian: *öne'en qaina[g] ē ċi* – ‘you *qainaḡ* (i.e. ‘a hybrid of a yak and cow’) of a cow’. The fact that the Mongolian translation is not a metaphor of the Chinese headword but a specific Mongolian phrase vouches for the actual existence of the expression.

Ch. WBZh/2 630 罵小子狗雜種 ‘to scold the child [being a] bastard’ (lit. ‘various seed of dogs’); Mong. *ōne’en qaina[ǰ] ē čī* – ‘you *qainaǰ* (i.e. ‘a hybrid of a yak and cow’) of a cow’ (Cf. WMong. *üniye*; *qayinuy*; *ee*; *či*.) Alternatively read *naqai* ‘dog’ instead of *qaina[ǰ]* for a tentative transposition of 海納 (which is not very likely knowing WBZh/2 575 狗那害).

*

Headword no. 631 of the WBZh/2 罵女子淫婦 ‘to scold a woman [to be a] prostitute’ is translated into Mongolian as 把喇散大力海兔, the first part of which, *bele[w]sen*, is already known from the earlier entries.

WBZh/2 631 罵女子淫婦 mà nǚ zǐ yín fù 把喇散大力海兔 bǎ-lǎ-sàn dàlì hǎi tù	罵 女 子 淫 婦 力 把 海 喇 兔 散 大
--	--

The second part, on the other hand, is more mysterious. A **daliqaitu* form is not known from the historical data to the best of my knowledge, and I could not have come to a satisfactory disentanglement with this item either treating it as a single word or by dividing it into shorter sequences. The last syllable *-tu* can be regarded as a denominal noun suffix *-tU*, in which case the syllable *-Q*A*i* in the previous syllable, denoting qualities, may be assumed, leaving us with a *dali-* stem (cf. WMong. *dalii-* ‘to lean to one side, to be uneven; awry, sideling, leaning’). Even if this proves to be the case the semantic link to the headword is still opaque.

Ch. WBZh/2 631 女子淫婦 ‘to scold a woman [to be a] prostitute’; Mong. *bele[w]sen daliqaitu?* ‘widowed ...’ (cf. WMong. *belbesün*.) Alternatively read *bara[q]san* ‘wasted ...’ (cf. WBZh/2 628, WMong. *bara-*).

*

Another term of discourtesy is introduced in WBZh/2 632: Chinese 罵婦人懶 ‘to scold the wife [to be] lazy’. The Mongolian part is a direct translation: *mau jal(i)qau* ‘bad and lazy [one]’.

WBZh/2 632 罵婦人懶 mà fùrén lǎn 毛甲里皓 máo jiǎ-lǐ-hào	罵 婦 人 懶 里 毛 皓 甲
--	--------------------------------------

Ch. WBZh/2 632 罵婦人懶 ‘to scold the wife [to be] lazy’; Mong. *mau jal(i)qau* ‘bad and lazy one’. (Cf. WMong. *mayu(i)*; *jalqayu*)

*

The Chinese insult 罵漢子討吃鬼 ‘to scold the man/husband [to be a] (food) beggar’ in WBZh/2 633 has a partial metaphrase as its Mongolian translation *bele[w]sen guili[n]či/guili[q]či* ‘widowed beggar’ with the recurrent adjective *bele[w]sen*.

WBZh/2 633 罵漢子討吃鬼 mà hàn zi tǎo chī guǐ 把喇散歸力乞 bǎ-lǎ-sàn guī-lì-qǐ	罵 漢 子 討 吃 鬼 歸 把 力 喇 乞 撒
--	--

Ch. WBZh/2 633 罵漢子討吃鬼 ‘to scold the man/husband [to be a] (food) beggar’; Mong. *bele[w]sen ġuili[n]čĭ/ġuili[q]čĭ* ‘widowed beggar’ (cf. WMong. *ɣuyilinčĭ, ɣuyirinčĭ*). Alternatively read *bara[q]san ġuili[n]čĭ/ġuili[q]čĭ* ‘wasted beggar’ (cf. WBZh/2 628, WMong. *bara-*).

*

A severe obscenity is the content of the Chinese headword in WBZh/2 634 罵禽戾 ‘to scold: fuck a cunt!’.

WBZh/2 634 罵禽戾 mà cào bī 五毒戶我合 ²⁷ wǔ-dú-hù wǒ-hé	
---	--

Although the Mongolian phrase *üdühü/üdügü oqo-* ‘fuck a cunt!’ is a word-perfect translation of the Chinese term and as such a possible subject of presumption to be a made-up one, it would be probably groundless to assume that this or a similar expression did not exist in the Mongolian (and although there is no supporting parallel Sino-Mongol data, there is sufficient Mongolian data from various Mongolic languages).²⁸ As this curse is in all likelihood one of the most universal ones, one stays on the safe side to accept the Mongolian translation as a curse in actual use by the time of compilation. The lack of initial *h-* in *üdühü/üdügü* has already been mentioned above.

Ch. WBZh/2 634 罵禽戾 ‘to scold: fuck a cunt!’; Mong. *üdühü/üdügü oqo-* ‘fuck a cunt!’ (cf. WMong. *ütügün; oqo-*).

*

²⁷ Pozdneev 1908 p. 35: *wǔ-dú-hù* 五獨戶.

²⁸ Cf. Rybatzki 2017 p. 593.

The case is slightly different in WBZh/2 635 where the Chinese profanity 罵胖老婆大屌 ‘to scold the fat wife [for having/being a] big cunt’ (here, probably: ‘arse, buttocks’) is found.

WBZh/2 635 罵胖老婆大屌 mà pàng lǎo pó dà bī 塔太他兒紅一克五毒戶 ²⁹ tǎ-tài tā-er-hóng yī-kè wǔ-dú-hù	罵 胖 老 婆 大 屌 一 塔 克 五 毒 戶 紅
--	---

The case is complicated by the fact that the Chinese 屌 is meant, like it happens in many other languages, not only for the female genitals, but also for the surrounding area including perianal parts as well as the human posterior and groin.³⁰ It is thus quite likely, or at least has to be taken into consideration, that 屌 in this case marks this latter, more extended meaning and should be interpreted as a vulgar term for buttocks. If that holds true, the Mongolian translation *ta[i]tai tarqun yike üdühü/üdügü* ‘[scolding] the wife [for being] fat, [and having] a big cunt’ can easily be judged a more-or-less perfect metaphor (and as such not necessarily an actual living term), as the Mongolian word *üdühü/üdügü* does not correspond to the extended semantics of the Chinese word, but only to its default sense, missing thus the overall meaning of the Chinese headword.

Ch. WBZh/2 635 罵胖老婆大屌 ‘to scold the fat wife [for] having a big cunt’; Mong. *ta[i]tai tarqun yike üdühü/üdügü* ‘[scolding] the wife [being] fat [and having] a big cunt’ (cf. WMong. *taryun*; *yeke*; *üdühü/üdügü*. Cf. also Ch. *tàitài* 太太 ‘wife’).

²⁹ Pozdnev 1908 p. 35: *wū-dú* 五獨 (sic!).

³⁰ Cf. Nugteren-Ragagnin-Roos 2015 pp. 343–344.

Conclusion

A few observations of this special vocabulary are worth mentioning:

1. The actual vernacular nature of some of the terms can be questioned at least on the Mongolian side and be thought of as mere translations – i.e. metaphrases, as they (full or partial alike) may, although not necessarily, mark a verbatim translation without the actual existence of a corresponding term in Mongolian.

2. As a natural tendency, some of the terms are considered rude or even taboo for the reader now; they were not necessarily (or not all of them and not to the same extent), however, sounding coarse for the quondam audience. This phenomenon seems to be working inversely analogous to the evolution of terms of politeness, in which case traditionally polite expressions sound exaggerating and pompous to a contemporary reader or listener today. Expressions of explicit scolding are of course exceptions, but again, just like a counter effect, they might sound milder or – by the charm of awkwardness – less insulting to a contemporary listener than they sounded (if they were ever uttered – see point 1.) for someone by the time of the compilation. Interestingly, these perceptions hold true for both languages concerned.

3. The change of the original register can also be traced by the examination of a special part of this vocabulary that was partially copied to a later glossary incorporated in the military treatise called the *Lulong sai lue* 盧龍塞略. Some of the characters here have been exchanged to others, probably, because the original ones were already deemed taboo. This change did not apply to the Mongolian part, as the copiers were Chinese scribes lacking any knowledge of the Mongolian language.

Index of Chinese expressions

dǎ 打 WBZh/2 624 ‘to hit; to beat up’

dà biàn 大便 WBZh/2 262; LLSL 1.10a29 (尻戶 ‘anus’; 尻 is a character variant for 尻/尻) ‘excrement’

háng yuán 衙衙 WBZh/2 238; LLSL 1.7a25 (衙衙; 衙 is a character variant for 衙) ‘brothel; prostitute’

kāo hù 尻戶 see *dà biàn*

luǎn zǐ 卵子 WBZh/2 259; LLSL 1.10a26 (*shì* 勢 ‘male genitals; potential’) ‘egg; male genitals, informal for testicles’

mà 罵 WBZh/2 623 ‘to scold’

mà cào bī 罵禽屎 WBZh/2 634 ‘to scold: fuck a cunt!’

mà fūrén lǎn 罵婦人懶 WBZh/2 632 ‘to scold the wife [to be] lazy’

mà hàn zi tǎo chī guǐ 罵漢子討吃鬼 WBZh/2 633 ‘to scold the man/husband [to be a] (food) beggar’

mà hànzi wàng bā 罵漢子忘八 WBZh/2 628 ‘to scold the man (or husband) [to be a] pimp (lit. a tortoise)’

- mà lǎo hàn zi gǒu gǔ tóu* 罵老漢子狗骨頭 WBZh/2 626 ‘to curse the man/husband [to be a] dog’s bone’
- mà pàng lǎo pó dà bī* 罵胖老婆大屌 WBZh/2 635 ‘to scold the fat wife [for having/being a] big cunt’ (here, probably: ‘arse, buttocks’)
- mà lǎo pó zi lǎo yǎng hàn* 罵老婆子老養漢 WBZh/2 627 ‘to scold the wife [being an] old whore’
- mà lǎo pó zi yǎng hàn* 罵老婆子養漢 WBZh/2 629 ‘to scold the wife [being a] whore’
- mà nú cái* 罵奴才 WBZh/2 625; LLSL 1.10a31(*nú cái* 驚材, read *mà nú cái* 罵奴才) ‘to scold a slave’
- mà nǚ zǐ yín fū* 罵女子淫婦 WBZh/2 631 ‘to scold a woman [to be a] prostitute’
- mà xiǎozi gǒu zázhǒng* 罵小子狗雜種 WBZh/2 630 ‘to scold the child [being a] bastard’ (lit. ‘various seed of dogs’)
- nǎi tóu* 奶頭 WBZh/2 257; LLSL 1.9b25 (*rǔ* 乳) ‘breasts’
- niào* 尿 WBZh/2 263; LLSL 1.10a30 (溺 *niào*; 溺 is a character variant for 尿) ‘urine; to urinate’
- shèn náng* 腎囊 WBZh/2 258; LLSL 1.10a25 ‘scrotum’
- shǐ* 屎 WBZh/2 264; LLSL 1.10a31 (*shǐ* 矢 lit. ‘arrow’, here: = 屎 ‘excrement’) ‘excrement; to defecate’
- shǐ* 矢 see *shǐ* 屎
- shì* 勢 see *luǎn zǐ*
- yīn hù* 陰戶 WBZh/2 260; LLSL 1.10a27 (*bì* 閉 lit. ‘to close’, here: ‘cunt’) ‘vagina, vulva’
- yīn máo* 陰毛 WBZh/2 261; LLSL 1.10a28 (*qí máo* 其毛 ‘its hair’ – referring to the previous entry) ‘pubic hair’

Index of Mongolian expressions

- bāsu* WBZh/2 264; LLSL 1.10a31(*bǎ-bó* 把孛, read *sù* 素 instead of *bó* 孛) ‘excrement’
- bele[w]sen/baraq[ʃ]san daliqaitu?* WBZh/2 631 ‘widowed/ wasted ...’
- bele[w]sen güili[n]či/güili[q]či* WBZh/2 633 ‘widowed/wasted beggar’
- bele[w]sen ye menekei* WBZh/2 628 ‘oh, [that/you] widowed/wasted tortoise’
- bele[w]sen qoyalli* WBZh/2 629 ‘widowed/wasted whore’
- buqar* WBZh/2 262; LLSL 1.10a29 ‘buttocks, anus’ see also *bokir*
- bokir* WBZh/2 262; LLSL 1.10a29 ‘dirt (i.e. excrement)’ see also *buqar*
- dengši-(g)sen* WBZh/2 625; LLSL 1.10a31 ‘[scolding someone for being] indolent, idling; gossiping’ (+PFV)
- öke-yen turū* WBZh/2 627 ‘head of [your] mother’
- jige-yen kürū* WBZh/2 626 ‘*kürū* of [your] father’ see also *jige-yen turū*
- jige-yen turū* WBZh/2 626 ‘head of [your] father’ see also *jige-yen kürū*
- kökö* WBZh/2 257; LLSL 1.9b25 ‘breasts’
- mau jal*̣*i>qau* WBZh/2 632 ‘bad and lazy one’
- oǰ<o>qai* WBZh/2 258; LLSL 1.10a25 ‘penis’

qarā- WBZh/2 623 ‘to scold’

qauqanağ WBZh/2 259; LLSL 1.10a26 ‘scrotum’ *qoyoli* WBZh/2 238; LLSL 1.7a25
‘lust, lasciviousness; prostitute’

seüril WBZh/2 261 (*bo-lìn* 卜吝); LLSL 1.10a28 (*xiǎo-lìn* 小吝) ‘pubic hair’

šē-be WBZh/2 263; LLSL 1.10a30 ‘to urinate (+PAST)’

ta[i]tai tarqun yike üdühü/üdüğü Ch. WBZh/2 635 ‘[scolding] the wife [being] fat [and
having] a big cunt’

öne’en qaina[ğ] ē čī WBZh/2 630 ‘you *qainağ* (i.e. ‘a hybrid of a yak and cow’) of a cow’

üdühü WBZh/2 260; LLSL 1.10a27 ‘vagina, vulva, cunt’

üdühü/üdüğü oqo- WBZh/2 634 ‘fuck a cunt!’

yanči- WBZh/2 624 ‘to hit; to beat up’

Chinese terms and their register in WBZh/2 and LLSL

	neutral	vulgar/offensive	medical
奶頭 <i>nǎi tóu</i>	+		+
腎囊 <i>shèn náng</i>	+		+
卵子參 <i>luǎnzǐ cān</i>	+		+
陰戶 <i>yīn hù</i>			+
閉 <i>bì</i> (only in LLSL replacing 陰戶)	+		
陰毛 <i>yīn máo</i>	+		+
尻戶 <i>kāo hù</i>			+
大便 <i>dà biàn</i>	+		+
尿 <i>niào</i>	+		+
屎 <i>shǐ</i>	+		+
矢 <i>shǐ</i> (only in LLSL replacing 屎)	+		
衍衍 <i>háng yuán</i>	+	+	
養漢 <i>yǎng hàn</i>	+	+	
狗雜種 <i>gǒu zázhǒng</i>		+	
罵女子淫婦 <i>mà nǚ zǐ yín fù</i>	+	+	
懶 <i>lǎn</i>		+	
討吃鬼 <i>tǎo chī guǐ</i>		+	

	neutral	vulgar/offensive	medical
禽屎 <i>cào bī</i>		+	
胖 <i>pàng</i>		+	
大屎 <i>dà bī</i>		+	
忘八 <i>wàng bā</i>		+	

Mongol terms and their register in WBZh/2 and LLSL

	neutral	vulgar/ offensive	medical	metaphrase of the Ch. term (Partial/Full)
<i>kökö</i>	+		+	
<i>oǰ<o>qai</i>	+		+	
<i>qauqanaġ</i>			+	
<i>üdühü/üdügü</i>	+	+	+	
<i>seüril</i>	+		+	
<i>buqar/bokir</i>	+		+	
<i>šē-</i>	+		+	
<i>bāsu</i>	+		+	
<i>dengši-(g)sen</i>		+		
<i>qoyoli</i>	+	+		
<i>bele[w]sen/baraq]san qoyalli</i>		+		
<i>öne'en qaina[ġ]</i>		+		
<i>bele[w]sen/baraq]san daliqaitu?</i>		+		P?
<i>mau ĵaki>qau</i>		+		F
<i>bele[w]sen/baraq]san ġuili[n]či/ ġuili[q]či</i>		+		P
<i>üdühü/üdügü oqo-</i>		+		F
<i>tarqun yike üdühü/üdügü</i>		+		F
<i>bele[w]sen ē menekei/ baraq]san-(n)ā menekei</i>		+		P

Abbreviations

- AT: *Altan tobči* (Vietze 1992).
 Ch.: the Chinese headword.
 Khal.: Khalkha (Kara 1998; Lessing 1960 etc.).
 LLSL: the *Lulongsai lüe* (Apatóczky 2016).
 MA: *Muqaddimat al-ādāb* (Bao 2002, Poppe 1938).
 Mong.: the reconstructed Mongolian word.
 PFV: perfective.
 SH: *Secret History of Mongols* (Kuribayashi 2009).
 Sun 1990: *Menggu yuzu yuyan cidian*.
 VdI/Ligeti: *Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanboul* (Ligeti 1962).
 WBZh: the *Wu Bei Zhi*.
 WMong.: Written Mongolian (Kara 1998; Lessing 1960 etc.).

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Guo Zaoqing 郭造卿 (ed.), *Lulongsai lüe* 盧龍塞略 [Outline of the Lulong pass], 明萬曆庚戌(三十八)年, 新城, [38th *Gengxu* year (1610) of the *Wanli* emperor of *Ming*, *Xincheng*], National Central Library, Taipei, Rare Books Collection, call № 210.3 03790.
 Mao Yuanyi 茅元儀 (ed.): *Wu bei zhi* 武備志 (Qing edition). National Central Library, Taipei. Call No. 302.1 22268.

Secondary sources

- Apatóczky, Ákos Bertalan, *Yiyu. An Indexed Critical Edition of a 16th Century Sino-Mongolian Glossary*, Global Oriental Publishers, Folkestone 2009.
 Apatóczky, Ákos Bertalan, *The Translation Chapter of the Late Ming Lulongsai Lüe. Bilingual Sections of a Chinese Military Collection*, Brill, Leiden, Boston 2016.
 Apatóczky, Ákos Bertalan, *The Yibu Chapter of the Lulongsai Lüe*, in: Á.B. Apatóczky, C. Atwood, and B. Kempf (eds.), *Philology of the Grasslands: Essays in Mongolic, Turkic, and Tungusic Studies*, Brill, Languages of Asia, vol. 17, Leiden, Boston 2018, pp. 1–15.
 Bao, Zhaolu 保朝魯, *Mukadimate Mengguyu cidian* 穆卡迪玛特蒙古语词典 [The *Muqaddimat* Mongol dictionary], Kökeqota 2002.
 Bökh [Buhe] and Liu, Zhaoxiong, *Bao'anyu jianzhi* 保安语简志 [A brief description of Bao'an], Beijing 1982.
 Clauson, Sir Gerard, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1972.
 Crossley, Pamela Kyle: *Bohai/Parhae Identity and the Coherence of Dan gur under the Kitan/Liao Empire*, "International Journal of Korean History", vol. 21, No.1 (Feb. 2016), pp. 11–45.
 Culpeper, Jonathan, Haugh, Michael and Kádár, Dániel Z. (eds.): *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*, Palgrave Macmillan, London 2017.
 Culpeper, Jonathan and Kádár, Dániel Z. (eds.): *Historical (Im)Politeness*, Peter Lang, Bern 2010.
 Franke, Wolfgang, *An Introduction to the Sources of Ming History*, University of Malaya Press, Kuala-Lumpur–Singapore 1968.

- Gernet, Jacques, *A History of Chinese Civilization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1996.
- Kádár, Dániel Z., *Terms of (Im)politeness, A Study of the Communicational Properties of Traditional Chinese (Im)polite Terms of Address*, Eötvös Loránd University Press, Budapest 2007.
- Kádár, Dániel Z., *Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual: Maintaining the Moral Order in Interpersonal Interaction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017.
- Kádár, Dániel Z. and Haugh, Michael, *Understanding Politeness*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2013.
- Kádár, Dániel Z. and Mills, Sara, *Politeness in East Asia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011.
- Kápolnás, Olivér, *A mandzsu birodalom megalapítása és a mongolok a Daicing gurun i fukjin doro neihe bodogon i bithe című mű alapján* [The foundation of the Manchu Empire and the Mongols, based on the *Daicing gurun i fukjin doro neihe bodogon i bithe*], (PhD dissertation, ELTE University, Budapest 2016).
- Kara, György, *Mongol-magyar szótár* [Mongol-Hungarian Dictionary], Terebess, Budapest 1998.
- Kempf, Béla, *Kalmyk – Semantical Categories of Turkic Elements in Kalmyk*, in: Birtalan, Ágnes (ed.): *Oirad and Kalmyk Linguistic Essays*, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest 2012, pp. 134–162.
- Kuribayashi, Hitoshi, *Word-Index to the Secret History of the Mongols with Chinese Transcriptions and Glosses*. CNEAS Monograph Series No. 33, Tohoku University, Sendai 2009.
- Lessing, Ferdinand Dietrich, *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, University of California Press, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1960.
- Ligeti, Louis, *Un vocabulaire mongol d'Istanbul*, “Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae”, vol. 14 (1962), pp. 3–99.
- Mostaert, Antoine, *Dictionnaire Ordos*, 2nd edition (reprint of 1241–42–44), Monumenta Serica Monograph Series 5, The Catholic University, Pei-p'ing, 3 vols, Johnson Reprint Corporation, New York–London 1968.
- Nugteren, Hans, *Mongolic Phonology and the Qinghai-Gansu Languages* (PhD dissertation. Leiden University, Utrecht 2011).
- Nugteren, Hans; Ragagnin, Elisabetta and Roos, Marti: *On the wandering semantics of Turkic *köt*, in: Ragagnin, E. and Wilkens, J., (eds.): *Kutadgu Nom Bitig, Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*, Societas Uralo-Altaica, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2015.
- Pan, Yuling and Kádár, Dániel Z., *Politeness in Historical and Contemporary Chinese*. Continuum, London–New York 2011.
- Pozdneev, Alexei, M., *Lekcii po istorii mongol'skoj literatury*, vol. 3, Vladivostok, 1908.
- Poppe, Nicholas, *Mongol'skii slovar'* Mukaddimat al-Adab, vol. 1–3, Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva–Leningrad 1938.
- Qi, Lintao: *Jin Ping Mei English Translations. Texts, Paratexts, and Contexts*, Routledge, London–New York 2018.
- Ramstedt, Gustaf J.: *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*, Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 3, Helsinki 1935.
- Rybatzki, Volker, *How to Say 'to fuck' and Other Things in Middle Mongyol*, in: M. Németh, B. Podolak, M. Urban (eds.), *Essays in the History of Languages and Linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, Kraków 2017, pp. 581–602.
- Rykin, Pavel, *Kitajskaja transkripcija mongol'skix veljarnyx i uvuljarnyx soglasnyx v slovare Dada juj/Bejlu ijuj (konec XVI–načalo XVII v.)*, in: A.D. Vasiljev, S.V. Dmitriev (eds.): “Živem družno, “molodye” raznogo vozrasta”: Sbornik statej v pamjat' vostokoveda-tjurkologa A.N. Samojloviča. Moscow 2012, pp. 87–120.
- Rykin, Pavel, *On the Principles of Chinese transcription of Mongolian Sounds in the SinoMongolian Glossary Dada yu/Beilu yiyu (Late 16th–Early 17th Century)*, “Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae”, vol. 65 (2012), pp. 323–334.
- Rykin, Pavel, *K voprosu o principax kitajskoj transkripcii mongol'skoj leksiki v kitajsko-mongol'skom slovare “Dada juj/Bejlu ijuj” (konec XVI–načalo XVII v.)*, I. V. Kul'ganek (ed.): “Mongolica”, vol. X (2013), Sankt-Peterburg, pp. 41–48.
- Rykin, Pavel, *O kitajskoj transkripcii mongol'skix affrikat v slovare Dada juj/Bejlu ijuj*, in: B.K. Salaev (ed.), *Materialy Meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii “Aktual'nye problemy sovremennoj altaistiki”*,

- posvjaščenkoj 75-letiju so dnja roždenija i 55-letiju naučno-pedagogičeskoj dejatel'nosti professora V.I. Rassadina*, Elista 2014, pp. 296–300.
- Rykin, Pavel, *Chinese Transcription of Mongol Affricates in the Sino-Mongol Glossary Dada yu / Beilu yiyu from the Ming Period*, in: *Zhongguo disi jie mengguxue guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwen huibian* 中国第四届蒙古学国际学术研讨会论文汇编 = *Proceedings of the Chinese Fourth International Symposium on Mongolian Studies*, 1. Huhehaote 2015, pp. 218–228.
- Rykin, Pavel, *The Sino-Mongolian Glossary Dada yu/Beilu yiyu from the Ming Period and the Problem of its Dating*, in: Johannes Reckel (ed.), *Central Asian Sources and Central Asian Research. Selected Proceedings from the International Symposium “Central Asian Sources and Central Asian Research, October 23rd–26th, 2014 at Göttingen State and University Library*, Göttinger Bibliotheksschriften, vol. 39, Göttingen 2016, pp. 147–164.
- Rykin, Pavel, *Reflexes of the *VgV and *VxV Groups in the Mongol Vocabulary of the Sino-Mongol Glossary Dada yu/Beilu yiyu (Late 16th–Early 17th Cent.)*, in: Á.B. Apatóczy, C.P. Atwood, and B. Kempf (eds.), *Philology of the Grasslands: Essays in Mongolic, Turkic, and Tungusic Studies*, Brill, Languages of Asia, vol. 17, Leiden, Boston 2018, pp. 308–330.
- Shimunek, Andrew, *The Phonology and Lexicon of Early Modern Mongolian and Late Southern Middle Mongol as Documented in a 17th century Ming Chinese-Mongolian Dictionary*, “Ming Qing Yanjiu”, vol. 18 (2013–14), pp. 97–130.
- Sečenčogtu [Siqinchaoketu], *Kangjiayu yanjiu* 康家语研究 [Research on the Kangjia language], Shanghai 1999.
- Spielmanns-Rome, Elke, *Chinesische Sagwörter (xièhòuyǔ 歇后语) in lexikographischen Quellen*, (PhD dissertation, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn 2014).
- Sun, Zhu 孫竹 (et al. ed.), *Menggu yuzu yuyan cidian* 蒙古语族语言词典 [Dictionary of Mongolic languages], Xining 1990.
- Vietze, Hans-Peter and Lubsang, Gendeng, *Altan Tobči. Eine mongolische Chronik des XVII. Jahrhunderts von Blo Bzan' bstan 'jin. Text und Index*, Tokyo 1992.
- Wang, Penglin, *Linguistic Mysteries of Ethnonyms in Inner Asia*, Lexington, London 2018.