

Zhuge Liang's «The General's Garden» in the Mi-nia¹ Translation

Kepping Ksenia (Academy of Sciences, Russia)
Gong Hwang-cherng (Academia Sinica, Taiwan)²

The British Library houses several thousand fragments of Mi-nia texts (OR12380 collection). This material was acquired from the famous Khara-Khoto, or Black City, in 1914 by M. Aurel Stein. Collection OR12380 is inferior only to the Kozlov collection held in St. Petersburg (Russia), which represents the largest Mi-nia collection in the world, consisting of about nine thousand Mi-nia texts and innumerable fragments. The Russian collection comes from the same site, but its discovery was made five years earlier, in 1909, and, thus, colonel Kozlov, the discoverer of Khara-Khoto, could take nearly everything found by him inside and outside Black City. The remains (these were obviously damaged texts and fragments) were taken by Stein.

Nowadays the content of the Russian collection is rather well known³ and a lot of Mi-nia texts from this collection have been published by scholars of different countries (the enumeration of these publications being rather lengthy is obviously out of place in this essay).

However, what is held in the British Library collection, in general still remains a mystery. We know for sure about thirteen Buddhist texts held in London: the list of these Buddhist texts (seemingly not short fragments, but rather lengthy parts of respective texts) is given by Chinese scholar Shi Jin-bo (Shi 1988:368). And it goes without saying that the great mass of the thousands of Mi-nia fragments in London represents Buddhist texts. But the most interesting part of any Mi-nia collection in

¹ We use for the people who founded «the Great State of the White and Lofty» (982-1227) their self-designation, Mi-nia, instead of the foreign ethnonyms, Tangut (used by the Mongols) and Xi Xia (used by the Chinese) (for details see Kepping 2001).

² Zhuge Liang's «The General's Garden» in the Mi-nia Translation is a very important work. Although my name is listed as the first author, Professor Kepping did more than 90% of the work. I asked her to put her name before my name. But she did not agree. When the paper was submitted to the foundation after her death, I changed the order of the authors and placed her name first. I think you can put her name as a single author when you publish her work. All the honor belongs to her. She included my name in the paper, because I was the project organizer and we were supposed to work together. (Prof. Gong Hwang-cherng)

³ So far two catalogues of the Russian collection are available: 1) Gorbacheva and Kychanov 1963 and 2) Catalogue 1999.

the world is its non-Buddhist part, i.e. the secular texts, and among them especially fascinating ⁴ are Mi-nia indigenous texts.

However Mi-nia secular and indigenous texts are very rare and to the best of my knowledge, so far are known to be held only in St. Petersburg and London.

E. Grinstead, the curator of the Mi-nia collection in London in the 1950's –1960's, was quite conscious of the importance of secular works in the Mi-nia language. The list of his publications reveals his special interest in this kind of Mi-nia texts.

From the London collection Grinstead has published one page of the military treatise (a wood-block) the *Art of War* by the famous Chinese strategist Sun zi (in the British Library there are altogether two pages of this text preserved) (Grinstead 1961). The page he published represents the beginning of Sun zi's seventh chapter. St. Petersburg collection also has a wood-block containing the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War*, but it lacks the beginning of the seventh chapter. The binding («butterfly»), the number of characters both in a line and on the page in both wood-blocks and the fact that there are not eleven, as in the traditional text⁵ of Sun zi, but only three commentators — Cao Cao (155-200)⁶, Li Quan (8th century) and, seemingly, Du Mu (803-852)⁷ — indicate that Sun zi's two pages held in London belong to the same edition as the text of Sun zi housed in St. Petersburg.

Grinstead has also published the last part of the scroll (eleven lines) of another military treatise from the London collection, which is a manuscript representing Zhuge Liang's the *General's Garden* (Grinstead 1963). So far this text is not registered in the list of texts held in the St. Petersburg collection (not to mention any other Mi-nia collections in the world). Thus, we may suppose that it is a unique Mi-nia text which gives access to the Chinese text *before* it was edited during the *Sung* dynasty.

As Grinstead claims, «The *General's Garden*» was «the first non-Buddhist manuscript to be identified in the fragmentary remains of Tangut literature excavated by Sir Aurel Stein» (Grinstead 1963:35).

First we have to turn to the Chinese original of the *General's Garden*.

⁴ Only such texts can give access to the mythology of Mi-nia people and, consequently, their world-view.

⁵ The term «a traditional Chinese text» is used in this essay for the ancient Chinese texts available today. It is well known that all these texts have undergone editing during the *Sung* dynasty (960-1279).

⁶ Cao Cao (Cao gong in the Chinese text of Sun zi) is named in the Mi-nia text of commentary as Wei Cao.

⁷ In the page published by Grinstead there are only two commentators, Wei Cao and Li Quan. But Grinstead claims that there are three commentators (the third, Du Mu, seemingly appears on the second page of Sun zi, which was not published by Grinstead). Grinstead has not indicated the name of the third commentator, but according to the Mi-nia text of Sun zi housed in St. Petersburg we may reconstruct his name as Du Mu.

The text of the *General's Garden* is ascribed to the famous Chinese general Zhuge Liang (181–234), the founder of the Shu kingdom (one of the three kingdoms, Wei, Shu, Wu, of the so-called «The Period of the Three Kingdoms», 220–265). If so, it means that the text was written more than a millennium and a half ago. No doubt, during such a long period of time it was edited more than once.

Today we have the traditional Chinese text of the *General's Garden* consisting of fifty sections; in some editions (the editions that carry the title *Xin Shu* 心書 *Heart Book*) the sections are numbered, in others not.

It goes without saying that the Mi-nia being constantly at war with their neighbors (Chinese, Tibetans or Khitans, etc.), felt an urgent need of the knowledge of the art of fighting. The importance of it for the Mi-nia is mirrored in their translation activities—in the St. Petersburg collection are registered several books (altogether hundreds of pages) on the art of war translated from the Chinese. Among these books first of all the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War*, the most ancient military treatise, is to be mentioned. Seemingly the whole text of Sun zi's text had been translated into the Mi-nia language and published supposedly in the first half of the 12th century (Kepping 1979:10), but, regrettably, only a part of the text has come down to us (chapters 7-13 and Sun zi's biography, which comprise altogether 102 pages, see Kepping 1979: 477-578).

As is known, Sun zi's the *Art of War* is included into the collection of military treatises the *Seven Books*. From this collection two more texts⁸ are preserved in the Mi-nia translation: Huangshi gong's the *Three Tactics* (Tang. 9, inventory No 578, 715, 716, altogether 168 pages)⁹ and Lu-shang's the *Six Secrets* (Tang. 6, inventory No 139 - 142, 768 -777, altogether 47 pages)¹⁰.

Even a cursory reading of the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War* shows that the principles of translation of this military treatise differ from that of Canonical texts (i.e. Buddhist and Chinese Classics). In the respective literature it was mentioned more than once (see, for example, Kepping 1985:15-17) that the translation into the Mi-nia language of Canonical texts was made, as a rule, *verbatim* (i.e. word for word). Nishida Tatsuo while studying Mi-nia translations of Buddhist texts has noticed that the Mi-nia translators were especially careful in their rendering the text, and, as a result, sometimes the Mi-nia grammar in translations of Buddhist texts turns to be «sinicized» (Nishida 1966: 562-565). In the same «word for word» way were translated Chinese classical books (*Lun yu*, *Men zi*, *Xiao Jing*) (Kolokolov and Kychanov 1966).

However, the analyses of the translation of Sun zi's text has shown that the

⁸ We know about three military treatises from the *Seven Books* translated into the Mi-nia language, but there might be Mi-nia translations of other military texts from the *Seven Books* which have not come down to us.

⁹ The numbers of pages are given according to the Catalogue (Gorbacheva and Kychanov 1963: 38-39).

¹⁰ The numbers of pages are given according to the Catalogue (Gorbacheva and Kychanov 1963: 37-38).

Mi-nia translator of Sun zi was not so much restricted by the text of the original, as the translators of the sacred Buddhist and canonical Chinese texts. Seemingly, his main aim was to convey adequately the contents of the military treatise, which in most cases give direct instructions concerning various battle situations. Because of that, the Mi-nia text of Sun zi in general turns to be an explanatory translation of respective Chinese passages. For example, Chinese sentence *wu ying shui liu* 無迎水流 «Do not dispose [the army] against the stream» is translated into the Mi-nia as 鎡縱死殺礙 «Do not dispose [the army] in the place where is a dam» (Kepping 1979: 20, 96). At first glance the Chinese text is not clear — why the army is not to be disposed against the stream? But in the Mi-nia translation the word «dam» elucidates the situation: the enemy may use the dam to flood one's troops.

Below is given a list of characteristic features of the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War* (for more details see Kepping 1979: 20-24):

1. Abstract notions are rendered by means of concrete expressions, for example: *Kuo di fen li* 廓地分利

Extending lands, divide the profit.

This Chinese sentence is rendered into the Mi-nia language as: 鎡糶辦殺
Seizing lands, divide them between everybody.

As we see, the Mi-nia translation omits the abstract notion 'profit' (Chinese *li* 利) and plainly states that everyone has to get a share of the lands which were seized (Kepping 1979: 20).

2. Often metaphors, comparisons, allegories well known to the Chinese readers are either omitted or translated in a descriptive way (especially it concerns the commentary). For example:

Xiang wang shi ren you gong dang feng jue zhe, ke yin wan, ren bu neng yu... 項王使人有功當封爵者,刻印刑忍不能與

[When] Xiang wang employed meritorious people who were to be endowed with lands, his engraved round seal proved to be worn out—he could not give out the lands.

In the Mi-nia translation the allegory «his round seal proved to be worn out» is omitted, but the gist of the sentence is rendered quite correctly:

鎡糶辦殺礙礙歸終礙礙歸終礙礙歸終礙礙歸終礙礙歸終

As to Xiang wang, he never gave lands and titles to the meritorious officials of his state.

One more example. In the following passage the metaphor «a flying blade» (Chinese *fei feng* 飛鋒) is translated into Mi-nia as «go quickly away» (Kepping 1979:21, 97).

Chilu zhi di cao mu bu sheng, wei zhi fei feng

斥鹵之地草木不生 謂之飛鋒。

to indicate the exact number of characters in a line. The longest surviving lines consist of 17 characters, but it is clear that in the original (the text before being damaged) was no less than twenty or even more characters.

The manuscript is written in a standard handwriting. The beauty and elegance of the calligraphy is really remarkable, obviously revealing a very skilled and experienced hand (however, regrettably the name of the scribe has not come down to us being damaged, see line 113).

There are some dots made with red paint, however so far the meaning of them is not clear (see line 15, character 4; line 21, character 4; line 60, character 3; line 62, character 3; line 63, character 12; line 64, character 10; line 108, character 13). To show his errors in copying the Mi-nia text, the copyist uses two kinds of symbols (he puts them to the right side of the character).

1. the symbol v, obviously borrowed from the Chinese tradition, indicates the reverse order of the characters — the character with this symbol has to stand in front of the previous character (see line 49, character 8; line 65, character 12; line 112, character 12);
2. the symbol + (a little cross) means that the character has to be deleted (line 34, characters 3 and 4; line 43, character 2; line 55, character 11)¹².

Correcting his mistakes, in line 39 to the right of the first character 𠄎 𠄎 «small» the copyist added the character 𠄎 𠄎 «big», and to the right of the third character 𠄎 𠄎 «big» (the same line) he wrote the character 𠄎 𠄎 «small».

The Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* consisted of 37 sections: the number of the last section in Mi-nia text is 37 (see Mi-nia text, line 98). The section 37 is the final one, since immediately after this section the text runs as «The book the *General's Garden*», the end, revised and copied ¹³ [by]...» (see line 113). The beginning of the scroll has been lost and the first section preserved in the Mi-nia manuscript is the last line of the section 21. Thus, we may claim that in the Mi-nia translation are preserved the sections from 21 to 37.

The correspondence between the sections in the Chinese traditional text and in the Mi-nia translation is shown in Table II.

We have stated above, that in contrast with the Mi-nia translation of the Canonical texts made *verbatim*, the translation of Sun zi's military treatise tends to be an explanation of its contents.

Our study of the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* has shown that it shares with the translation of Sun zi the tradition of an explanatory translation. And, even more, it uses, as in the following example, words which are peculiar only to the Mi-nia language and do not have correspondence in Chinese language.

¹² As Professor Menshikov states (personal communication, St. Petersburg, September 27, 2002), such symbol is not characteristic of ancient Chinese copyists (beginning from the Dunhuang period).

¹³ The character is half-visible, but seemingly it may be reconstructed as 𠄎 𠄎 «to write», «to copy».

Table II

Number of the section in the Chinese text	Number of the section in the Mi-nia translation	Line in the Mi-nia translation
21	20	
22	21	between 2 and 3
23	22	7
26	23	between 11 and 12
27	24	17
28	25	between 22 and 23
29	26	31
32	27	36
34	28	41
35	29	47
36	30	52
38	31	58
39	32	69
40	33	75
42	34	79
43	35	90
45	36	95
46	37	98

Thus, the first seven characters in section 22 in Chinese run as follows:
fu yi yu ke zhi, ni ye 夫以愚克智，逆也

It is known that when a silly one overcomes a wise one, it is [as if to] go against the current. These seven characters are rendered by means of the following eight characters into the Mi-nia language (see line 1):

屮	殺	殺	莽	禰	織	織	敵
lə	la	sɿɕ	wə	phi	ta	liɔ	ngu
愚	以	智	服	令	者	幸	是

[When] a silly one overcomes a wise one, it is liɔ 織.

The Chinese text obviously means that when a silly one overcomes a wise one, it is against laws of nature. And the Mi-nia translator has chosen a special way of rendering the essence using a purely Mi-nia word liɔ 織 which, according to our observation, does not have direct correspondence in Chinese. Importantly, in the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War* one does not find the word liɔ 織.

This word is rendered by scholars into Chinese chiefly as fu 福 «luck» (Nevsky 1960. 2:129; Li 1986: 471, 53B52; Ne 2002: 72-73, 74-75, 76-77), but sometimes it is translated as xing 幸 «good fortune» (Ne 2002: 42-43).

It is to be noted that in the famous Mi-nia explanatory dictionary the *Sea of Characters* the word li_o 𪛗 is defined only by its correspondence in the Mi-nia ritual language — ꠘꠗ 𪛗 and no other synonyms for li_o 𪛗 are given here (Kepping et. al. 1969 I: 272).

We believe that li_o 𪛗¹⁴ stands for supernatural powers; the following example from the ritual song 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗 . «The Usage of the Wise in the Times of Prosperity»¹⁵ appears to be crucial in defining the meaning of this word as «supernatural powers»:

ngwə mə khju tɔ ʉ nja li_o mbi mbm 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗
 phio ldje tshja khri ni nm sje mi ka 𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗𪛗

The li_o 𪛗 of the heavenly thousand black-headed are low [or] high.
 The wisdom of the ten thousand red-faced on the earth is not equal.

In the two cited above sentences are juxtaposed the characteristic features of the black-headed and the red-faced. The song claims that the red-faced possess wisdom and differ in their wisdom, whereas the black-headed possess li_o 𪛗, which may be low or high. Since, as was shown (Kepping forthcoming), the black-headed are descended from the priests of the Mi-nia pre-Buddhist religion, the so-called Root West, the personification of heavenly white cranes, we may suppose that li_o 𪛗 stands for supernatural powers (it is known that some Tibetan lamas «are credited with supernatural powers», see, for example, Waddell 1985: 378). Thus, the two sentences from the ritual song cited above should be translated as:

The supernatural powers of the heavenly thousand black-headed are low [or] high. The wisdom of the ten thousand red-faced on the earth is not equal.

Now, let us insert the meaning of the word li_o 𪛗 «supernatural powers», «supernatural» into the Mi-nia sentence, which was translated above as «When a silly one overcomes a wise one, it is li_o 𪛗»

[When] a silly one overcomes a wise one, it is supernatural.

Thus, amazingly, the Mi-nia translator having used the word li_o 𪛗 in its primary meaning (hardly found in all other cases of its usage) quite precisely rendered the idea of the Chinese text: it is against laws of nature, i.e. supernatural, when a silly one overcomes a wise one.

Seemingly the translator of the *General's Garden* went even further than those who had been engaged in translation of Sun zi: his work not only represents an explanatory translation of the *General's Garden*, but it is also rather an adaptation of the text for Mi-nia readers.

¹⁴ The meaning of the word li_o 𪛗 was discussed recently in Kepping 1998:369, note 21. This word is registered in the Mi-nia text of the famous Liangzhou bilingual stele. In the article was quite correctly stated that li_o 𪛗 is a characteristic feature of the black-headed, but its definition as «grace» was not quite correct («grace» belongs to Christian notions, which is not in keeping with the Mi-nia world-view).

¹⁵ «Prosperity» is a tentative translation of the word swe? 𪛗 .

The main argument for defining the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* as a Mi-nia adaptation is the contents of the last concluding section of the Mi-nia text.

As we know, the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* consisted of 37 sections (whereas in the Chinese traditional text there are altogether 50 sections). The last section (section 37) in Mi-nia language combines the section *wei ling* 威令 (section 46 in the Chinese text) with the section *bei di* 北狄 «northern *di*» (section 50 in the Chinese text). However, the Chinese text includes the description of three more peoples (section 47 «eastern *yi*» 東夷, section 48 «southern *man*» 南蠻 and section 49 «western *rong*» 西戎), which for some reasons prove to be omitted in the Mi-nia translation.

It is well known that the ethnonym «northern *di*» (Chinese *bei di* 北狄) together with three other ethnonyms – eastern *yi*, western *rong* and southern *man* – comprises *si yi* 四夷, the term which stands for four non-Chinese peoples surrounding China. Thus, for a Chinese military treatise it was quite natural to give information on all the neighbours of China.

It goes without saying that the term *si yi* 四夷 representing the Chinese idea of their neighbours was alien for the Mi-nia¹⁶, who had their own indigenous terms for naming their own neighbours. In the Mi-nia ritual songs are registered three terms for naming Mi-nia neighbours indicating the peoples who dwelt to the west, east and south respectively (however so far we have not encountered the term for those who lived to the north). These terms are formed by means of adding to nouns the bound morpheme¹⁷ 𠄎 後 «owner» (in two cases to the cardinal points of the world). In Mi-nia ritual songs there are registered the following ethnonyms to designate peoples surrounding the Mi-nia:

liɛ 𠄎	𠄎後	«lords of the West» (i.e. the Tibetans)
viɔ 𠄎	𠄎後	«lords of the East» (i.e. the Chinese)
śân 𠄎	𠄎後	«lords of the mountains» (supposedly those who dwelt to the south of the Mi-nia).

Fortunately, in section 37 of the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* which renders section 50 devoted to the *bei di* 北狄, we find the missing indigenous term – the designation for those who dwelt to the north. It is the ethnonym «the lords of the steppes»¹⁸ which is formed similarly to the aforementioned three Mi-nia indigenous ethnonyms («steppes» + «owner» 𠄎). Since the ethnonym «the lords of the steppes» obviously stands for the Chinese term *bei di* 北狄,

¹⁶ However, the Mi-nia obviously knew at least three terms out of four: the terms «western *rong*», «southern *man*» and «northern *di*» are mentioned in the Mi-nia translation of the *leishu Lei Lin* (Kepping 1983:109).

¹⁷ By «bound morpheme» we mean a morpheme which cannot be used separately, but only in combination with other morphemes.

¹⁸ Grinstead translates this term as «lords of the great plain» (Grinstead 1963: 36).

we may state that we have the fourth so far lacking ethnonym which belongs to the set of four Mi-nia indigenous ethnonyms. And, thus, this set of four Mi-nia indigenous terms for their neighbors is as follows:

to the west lived	«lords of the West» (the Tibetans)
to the east lived	«lords of the East» (the Chinese)
to the south lived	«lords of the mountains' (not clear what people is meant)
to the north lived	«lords of the steppes» (see below)

That in the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* we find only the information about the northern *di*, whereas three sections on other peoples belonging to the *si yi* 四夷 (i.e. on eastern *yi*, western *rong* and southern *man*) are lacking may be explained by the fact that in the Mi-nia military activities these people were not relevant. And seemingly the translator just deleted the description of these peoples. Thus, it means that he had the right to leave out the text of the sections which he had considered as unimportant.

Perhaps, that is the reason why in the final line of the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* does not stand the word «translated [by]...», but is used the word *nja* 敕¹⁹ which means «edited [by]..., i.e. revised and corrected [by] ...»

Having left out three sections out of four on the *si yi* 四夷, the Mi-nia translator inserted the section on the *bi di* 北狄 in the section *Wei ling* 威令, which obviously has nothing to do with the description of the northern people, or, as the Mi-nia put it, lords of the steppes. However, it seems that the most important part of *Wei ling* 威令 section are the lines connected with lords of the steppes: out of fourteen lines (99-112) comprising the section *Wei ling* 威令, less than four lines (99-102) represent the text of *Wei ling* 威令, whereas more than ten lines (102-112) are connected with the description of lords of the steppes. Significantly, the text on the lords of the steppes runs as if it is a continuation of the section *Wei ling* 威令: the eighth character in line 102 starts the text on lords of the steppes. This gives an impression that the text on lords of the steppes was intentionally hidden inside of another text.

Quite naturally a question arises — who stands for the lords of the steppes? This ethnonym is used four times in the part describing *bei di* 北狄 in the Mi-nia translation of the section *Wei ling* 威令. In the Chinese text (section *bei di* 北狄) this term once corresponds to the ethnonym *bei di* 北狄 and three times to the ethnonym *lu* 虜 «prisoner», «barbarian». Thus, the Mi-nia term «lords of the steppes» renders two Chinese terms, *bei di* 北狄 and *lu* 虜.

¹⁹ This very word is used in the collocation *me nja* 敕 «royally edited» which stands after the name of the Mi-nia emperor (as a rule, Ren-zong, r.1140—1193) in Mi-nia translations of the Buddhist Canon, meaning that this very emperor has looked through and corrected the translation.

As the Mi-nia text claims, the lords of the steppes had no walled cities. They were perfect horsemen and skilled archers, and for the Chinese²⁰ it was rather risky to fight with them, since the cavalry of the lords of the steppes was superior to the Chinese foot-soldiers.

We share Grinstead's opinion that «there is so far no reason for identifying this term with the Tangut themselves» (Grinstead 1963:36). However, Grinstead does not give any argument to support his thesis. In our opinion, lords of the steppes cannot stand for the Mi-nia, since, according to the *Secret History of Mongols* (paragraph 265), «the Tanguts are the people who *have cities with walls* (cursive is ours) and moats» (Chinese *cheng chi* 城池).

We suppose that the lords of the steppes implied the Mongols, who by the time when the *General's Garden* was translated (not earlier than the second half of the 12th century²¹, but seemingly much later), were apparently a real threat in the steppes to the north of the Mi-nia state²². The description of the lords of the steppes in the *General's Garden* corresponds to the image of Mongols (no wall cities, perfect horsemen and skilled archers, their cavalry superior to the Chinese infantry).

The information on lords of the steppes was «hidden» inside a section which has nothing to do with any Chinese or Mi-nia neighbours, may serve as an additional corroboration for our supposition that the Mongols were meant — we know that the fear of the Mongols among the Mi-nia was so great that in a Mi-nia ritual song written decades after Chinghis Khan's death his name was encoded (Kepping 1999).

One can observe in Table II, that more than 10 sections from the traditional Chinese text of the *General's Garden* (sections 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 37, 41, 44, 47, 48, 49)²³ are not translated into the Mi-nia language. Since, as it became clear from the translation of the sections on the *si yi* 四夷, the Mi-nia translator could have left out some sections which he had considered unimportant for the Mi-nia, we cannot be sure whether the translator has omitted these ten or so sections, or the Chinese text which he had at his disposal lacked these sections.

* * *

²⁰ In the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* the Chinese are *named za* ?, the character, which, as Grinstead has quite correctly noticed (1963: 36), «appears to be rather uncomplimentary, being formed from parts of the characters for 'small' and 'insect'».

²¹ The translation of Chinese secular writings, which included military treatises, were performed in the Mi-nia state mainly in the 12th century (for details see Kepping 2002: 46).

²² The first Mongolian raid into the Mi-nia territory was in 1205 (Dunnell 1994: 206).

²³ Section 50 entitled *bei di* 北狄 is not translated, but, as we already know, the text of this section is included into the translation of the Chinese section 46 entitled *Wei ling* 威令.

This essay represents the first publication of the Mi-nia manuscript the *General's Garden*, which has come down to us (altogether 113 lines) (mind that Grinstead published only the concluding eleven lines of the manuscript). It proves to be the first publication of a complete text held in the British Library. We hope that it is just the beginning and in the nearest future more texts from the London collection will be published giving the scholars an idea of the content of Stein's findings.

The publication is supplied by a detailed study of the Mi-nia text of this military treatise, which has shown that the contents of this Chinese text being quite well understood by the translator was adequately rendered by him into the Mi-nia language. The translator, undoubtedly a highly qualified scholar, was not much bounded by the Chinese text of the *General's Garden* – he even omitted some sections which he seemingly had considered unimportant for the Mi-nia readers. What is specific about this translation of a Chinese text, is that the translator uses Mi-nia indigenous vocabulary and terms, which do not have direct correspondence in Chinese language (this is not characteristic for the Mi-nia translation of Sun zi's the *Art of War*).

Importantly, the study of this text has unveiled an indigenous Mi-nia nomenclature for neighbouring peoples, which consists of four ethnonyms, each of which is connected with one of the cardinal points of the compass.

In our opinion, the Mi-nia translation of the *General's Garden* differs from Mi-nia translations of other military treatises in that here the contents of the Chinese military treatise were adjusted to suit the Mi-nia situation and that is why it seems appropriate to define the Mi-nia text of the *General's Garden* as an adaptation of the respective Chinese text.

Now it is clear that the Mi-nia had a differentiated approach to the translations of Chinese literature — from «word for word translation» up to an explanation or even adaptation of a Chinese text. This obviously testifies to the fact that the art of translation from the Chinese became an integral part of the Mi-nia culture.